LATE BRONZE AGE HYDRONYMS AND TOPONYMS
OF INDO-EUROPEAN NATURE IN WESTERN ANATOLIA

To the memory of Hans Krahe

Abstract: In the present paper hydronyms and toponyms as reported by our Late Bronze Age sources for western Anatolia are discussed which are of a patent Indo-European background. It will be argued that the roots of most of these hydronyms and toponyms are compatible with comparative data from the IE Anatolian language group. Subsidiarily, however, it will be argued that the root of some of the selected names shows deviations from the defining features of the latter language group which can only be attributed to influences of an Old Indo-European substrate.

For various reasons, the study of hydronyms and toponyms of western Anatolia has not received much attention within the circle of Indo-Europeanists. As far as I know, no single article is attributed to this topic. Only Emmanuel Laroche, in the late 50s and early 60s of the former century, showed convincingly that the place-names in -ss- and -nd-, which are so common in western and southwestern Asia Minor, are definitely of an Indo-European (= IE) nature, if not actually of an IE Anatolian one (Laroche 1957; Laroche 1961; cf. Woudhuizen 1989: 194, Fig. 2).¹

In order to meet this desideratum, I have assembled from the Late Bronze Age sources at our disposal, which means in the main Hittite cuneiform texts supplemented by some relevant Luwian hieroglyphic ones, a number of toponyms and hydronyms which in my view are of patent Indo-European background. I focus on the Late Bronze Age material, because it provides us with the earliest data on the topic, which are most likely not yet “contaminated” by secondary influences from other IE languages, like Greek and Latin, and therefore presumably most reliable to work with.

¹ Note that in our set of selected geographic names features one example of each of these types, viz. Ḫuršanašša and Arinnanda, respectively.
A handy tool in the course of this undertaking is provided by previous studies on the localization of hydronyms and toponyms with a bearing to western Anatolia as mentioned in the Hittite cuneiform texts and, to a lesser degree, the Luwian hieroglyphic ones. Most recently, this question received extensive treatment by Max Gander in 2010. As I argued in my review article dedicated to the latter book, its author is much too pessimistic about the possibilities to reconstruct the geography of southwest Asia Minor during the period of Hittite dominance over this region and many place-names can actually be put on the map (Woudhuizen 2010–11: 237, Fig. 1). What is even more, in a sequel to this review article I tried to show that, with the help of suggestions made in the literature on the topic by scholars like Jacques Freu (2008b: 110) and John David Hawkins (2002: 95–98), even the geography of western Anatolia, including the regions to the north of its southwestern area, can also be reconstructed in its bare outlines (Woudhuizen forthc. with map reproduced here as our Fig. 1).

For the present exercise, then, I have selected a total of 15 western Anatolian hydronyms and toponyms as rendered in our Table I below in the order of their location on the map when going from the north to the south. In this table, furthermore, the geographic names, making up column 1, are lined with comparanda from the Hittite and Luwian languages, or, if these are so far unavailable, from other IE languages (placed between square brackets), in column 2 and the Proto-Indo-European (= PIE) roots in column 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geogr. name</th>
<th>Hit./Luw. cognate</th>
<th>PIE root</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Taruša</td>
<td>tāru- “wood, tree”</td>
<td>*dōru- “wood, tree”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wiluš(i)ya</td>
<td>wēllu- “meadow”</td>
<td>*wel- “grass”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arzawa</td>
<td>arš- “to flow, stream”</td>
<td>*er/-or- “to move, stir, raise”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kurupiya</td>
<td>Kurunt- (GN/MN)</td>
<td>*kerh₁- “head, horn”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dura</td>
<td>[Dourios, Durias]</td>
<td>*?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Apaša</td>
<td>ḫapa- “river”</td>
<td>*h₂ep-/h₂eb(²)- “water, rivulet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Arinnanda</td>
<td>arinna- “source”</td>
<td>*er/-or- “to move, stir, raise”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Šeža</td>
<td>[Sequana]</td>
<td>*sekʷ- “to seep, soak”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Šallapa</td>
<td>[Salapia]</td>
<td>*sal- + *h₂ep-/h₂eb(²)- “water, rivulet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Aštarpa</td>
<td>ḫašēr- “star”</td>
<td>*h₂stēr- “star” + *h₂ep-/h₂eb(²)- “water, rivulet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Apawiya</td>
<td>ḫapa- “river”</td>
<td>*h₂ep-/h₂eb(²)- “water, rivulet”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Ḫuršanašša  gurta- “fortress”  *gʰordʰ- “city, town”
13. Lukka  [Λοῦγος, Lugii]  *l(e)ugʰ- “to bind”
14. Awarna  arinna- “source”  *er-/or- “to move, stir, raise”
15. Parḥa  parku- “high”  *bʰṛgh(i)- “high”

Table I. Overview of western Anatolian hydronyms and toponyms of Indo-European nature.

Notes to Table 1:
1. PIE *dóru- “wood, tree” > Hit. tāru-, see Mallory & Adams 2007: 156; for the connection with Tarwiša, see Woudhuizen 2010: 98, note 64.

2. PIE *wel- “grass” > Hit. wēllu- “meadow”, see Mallory & Adams 2007: 163–164; for the connection with Wiluš(i)y)a, see Woudhuizen 2010: 98, note 64.

3. Hit. arš- “to flow, stream” > Arzawa, see Carruba 2011: 321; for the basic PIE root *er-/or- “to move, stir, raise”, see Krahe 1964: 45 and Rosenkranz 1966: 135.

4. For the identification of Kurupiya with Greek Koruphê (Κορυφή), see Freu 2008b: 110; working from this identification, the toponym is related to the Luwian GN or MN Kurunt- and may likewise be traced back to PIE *kerh₁- “head, horn”, see Woudhuizen forthc. Note that this toponym underlines the centum nature of the Luwian language as I have established already in Woudhuizen 2004: 101 and worked out to the full in Woudhuizen 2011: 407–409.

5. For the identification of Dura with classical Tyrrrha (Τύrrha) and modern Tire(h) along the southern bank of the river later called Kaystros, see Freu 2008b: 110; even though the PIE root remains enigmatic, the pertinent parallels are provided by the Iberian or Lusitanian river-name Doúrios or Durius and its Ligurian equivalent Durias as mentioned in passing by Woudhuizen 2010: 107, note 70 (cf. also in this connection the Duranius, a branch of the Garumna or Garonne in southwestern Gaul, see Map to Caesar’s de Bello Gallico in the edition by Sigmund Herzog of 1895), both of which are associated with Old Indo-European population groups, namely Lusitanians and Ligurians. Further of relevance in this context, especially for the interchange between the voiced dental [d] and unvoiced [t], is the Kimmerian name for the river Dniestr, Týrǐς, see Herodotos, Histories IV, 11; 47; 51. If this relationship, proposed here for the first time, does indeed apply, the related ethnonym Tyrrehnŏi “Etruscans” is rooted in Old Indo-European hydronymy!
6. The identification of Apaša with classical Éphesos (Ἔφεσος) and modern Efes is of long standing and can already be found in the map of Garstang & Gurney 1959. For its analysis as a being based on the root apa- (for the suffix -ša, cf. Wiluša being based on a root related to Hit. wēllu-) < PIE *h₂ep-/h₂eb(h)- “water, rivulet”, see Woudhuizen 2010: 98, note 64 and Woudhuizen 2011: 417. As the reflex of the latter PIE root in Hittite and Luwian consists of ūapa- “river”, in which the PIE laryngeal *[h₂] is regularly represented by IE Anatolian *[h], the consequence of the given analysis is that Apaša represents speakers of an Indo-European tongue other than IE Anatolian. Presumably we are dealing here with an Old Indo-European substrate which was already present before of the settlement of the Luwians in this particular region.

7. The name of Mt. Arinnanda, identified by Hawkins 2002: 97–98 with classical Mt. Mycalè or present-day Samsun Dağ, is based on the root arinna-, which occurs here with the well-known suffix -nd-. Now, Hit. arinna- is identified by Rosenkranz 1966: 127 as the word for “source” in like manner as this is the case with the related Greek Ἄρνη (so also Tischler 1983: 57–58, who situates the given Greek parallel in Arkadia, whereas according to Homeros, Iliad II, 507, Strabo, Geography I, 3, 8; IX, 2, 34–35, Pausanias, Guide to Greece IX, 40, 5, and Stephanos of Byzantium, Etica, s.v. Χαρώνεια, the same toponym is attested for Boiotia, too). In its turn, this word for source is, like the related river-name Arnos attested for Etruria, a derivative of the basic PIE root *er-/or- “to move, stir, raise”, see Krahe 1964: 45.

8. The root of the river-name Šeḫa is likely to be compared to that of Gaulish Sequana, as per Woudhuizen 2011: 417–418; this latter hydronym is derived from PIE *sekh- “to seep, soak” by Whatmough 1963: 68. Notwithstanding the fact that palatal *[k] is represented here by lenited [h], we may infer from this identification that the IE language to which this river-name belongs, be it Luwian or that of the Old Indo-European substrate as referred to sub 6 above, is of centum type.

9. The place-name Šallapa, situated along the southern bank of the upper course of the Šeḫa river is, in my opinion, not based on Hit. šall- “great”, but, on the analogy of Illyrian Salapia, referred to by Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 581, note 11, on PIE *sal- “salt” (cf. also in this connection Salapia in the region of Taras or Tarentum in southern Italy as referred to by Huss 2004: 253). Whatever the extent of this suggestion, it is absolutely clear that its second element consists of -apa, a reflex of PIE *h₂ep-/h₂eb(h)- “water, rivulet” which we already came across in connection with Apaša (see sub 6 above).
10. For the analysis of the river-name Aštarpa as a compound of a reflex of PIE *h₂stēr- “star”, see Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 39, 591, 772, and the element -(a)pa, also present, as we have just noted, in Šallapa, which likewise originates from PIE *h₂sep-/h₂eb(h)- “water, rivulet”, see Woudhuizen 2010: 98. As in Hit. ḫaštēr- “star”, just like in the case of Hittite and Luwian ḫapa- “river” < PIE *h₂sep-/h₂eb(h)- “water, rivulet”, the PIE laryngeal *[h₂] is regularly represented by IE Anatolian [ḫ], we are once more confronted with a hydronym rooted in the Old Indo-European substrate inferred already sub 6 above.

11. Apawīya or Abawīya is a geographic name based, just like the place-name Apaša, on the root apa- originating from PIE *h₂ep-/h₂eb(h)- “water, rivulet”, but this time characterized not by the suffix -ša but the suffix -wiya, cf. Woudhuizen 2011: 417. Its location along the upper course of the river known in the classical period as the Marsyas (Μάρσυας) is assured by the association of the second variant with the place-names Ιyalanda and Αtriya, which, as keenly observed by Freu (2008a: 113) correspond with classical Αίλινδα (Ἄλινδα) and Ιδριάς (Ἰδριάς).

12. The toponym Ḫuršanašša, which I have suggested to be a Late Bronze Age reference to what is known in classical times as Ἡλικαρνάσσος (Ἀλικαρνασσοῦς, see Woudhuizen 2010–11: 237; Woudhuizen forthc.), confronts us with a lenited variant of Gurtanašša as attested for the province of Tarḫuntašša, see Woudhuizen 2011: 417. The root of this place-name corresponds to Hit. gurta- “fortress”, see Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 647, which in turn originates from PIE *gʰordʰ- “city, town”. If we realize that voiced velars are regularly lost in Luwian already since the time of one set of its earliest records, the Kültepe-Kanesh texts, see Woudhuizen 2011: 410–412 (where the related MN Kurti(a)s is set apart as a loan from Phrygian Gordiās), the representation of the voiced velar *[gʰ] by the velars [g] or [ḡ] is remarkable. Against the backdrop of our explanation of the loss of laryngeal *[h₂] in apa- < *h₂ep-/h₂eb(h)- “water, rivulet” and aštar- < *h₂stēr- “star” as indicative of an Old Indo-European substrate, one might legitimately assume that the same verdict applies in this particular case as well.

13. According to a commonly held view, the ethnonym and country-name Lukka “Lycia” is based on the PIE root *l(e)uk- “light” in like manner as the name of the Greek island Levkas, related to Greek λευκός “white”. In IE Anatolian this root is further represented by Hittite lukke- “to kindle”, see Mallory & Adams 2007: 328, and related forms like luk- “become bright, becoming day” and lukatta “in the morning, at daybreak”, see Friedrich 1991, s.v. However, this view disregards the fact that in its functi-
on as an ethnonym Lukka corresponds most closely to Celtic Λοῦ-γοι as reported by Ptolemaios in his Geographia II, 3, 12 for Scotland and Germanic Λοῦ-γοι or Lugii as referred to by Ptolemaios in his Geographia II, 11, 10 as a designation of people living in the region north of Bohemia (cf. Woudhuizen 2010: 100, note 66; according to Sergent 1995: 211 = Sergent 2005: 224 the latter were, notwithstanding their habitat in Germania, a “peuple sans doute celtique”). Along the latter line of approach, then, Lukka originates, notwithstanding the fortition of the velar in Greek Λυκία, from PIE *(e)l(eg)̣- “to bind” (Pokorny 1959, s.v. no. 2 [p. 687]). In like manner as in the case of Ḫuršanašša < PIE *ghordh- “city, town” (see sub (12) above), we would have expected the voiced velar *[g̣] to have been dropped, as actually happens to be the case with the related country-name Luwiya presumably referring to population groups to the east of Lukka. Again, the preservation of the voiced velar, foreign to Luwian proper, is likely to be attributed to the influence of an Old Indo-European substrate.

14. The place-name attested only for Luwian hieroglyphic sources, i.e. the texts from Yalburt and Emirgazi, is Awarna. From the context it is clear that it lies in Lukka “Lycia” and that, as first realized by Massimo Poett (1993: 76-78), it corresponds to the later indigenous Lycian name of Xanthos, Arīna, which appears in Greek as Ἀρίνα. With a view to these later forms, it lies at hand to assume that we are dealing here with the same root arin-na- “source” (Rosenkranz 1966: 127; cf. Tischler 1983: 57–58) as we came across in the discussion of Arinnanda sub 7 above, which in turn is a derivative of the basic PIE root *er-/or- “to move, stir, raise”, cf. Krahe 1964: 45.

15. The place-name Parha along the Kaštaraya has been cogently argued by Heinrich Otten (1988: 37) to correspond to classical Πέργη (Πέργη) along the Kestros (Κέστρος). There can be no doubt that this toponym, just like its relatives like Pergamon (Πέργαμος), an alternative reference to the citadel of Troy in classical literary tradition, etc., shows a reflex of the PIE root *bṛgh(i)- “high”. Also derived from this root is Hit. parku- “high”, see Mallory & Adams 2007: 289, 292. But, as this toponym is situated in territory inhabited by speakers of a Luwian tongue, one would have expected the voiced velar to have been dropped, as, in line with our observation sub 12 and 13, is regular for the latter language, see Woudhuizen 2011: 410–412. Once more, then, we are confronted with a form foreign to the Luwian language and likely to be attributable to the influence of an Old Indo-European substrate.

Summarizing the salient points of our preceding notes to Table I, the following remarks may be of relevance:
(1) On account of the Indo-European nature of all 15 geographic names selected and discussed, which cover the region of western Anatolia from the Troad in the north to Lukka in the southwest (see Fig. 1), it may safely be deduced that this region was inhabited by speakers of an Indo-European tongue during the period from which our sources date, i.e. the Late Bronze Age.

(2) In 6 instances, namely Tarwǐša, Wiluš(i)y)a, Arzawa, Kurripiya, Arinnanda, and Awarna, the geographic name is based on a root with a crystal clear comparison in the IE Anatolian languages, Hittite and Luwian. Note, however, that this does not necessarily mean that the language of the inhabitants of western Anatolia must be speakers of an IE Anatolian tongue as well, because the PIE roots in question are a common feature of Indo-European languages more in general. Nevertheless, it may plausibly be argued on the basis of the evidence at our disposal that the kingdoms of Arzawa and Šeḫa and the country of Lukka were inhabited by speakers of a Luwian tongue. If Homeric evidence may be called into play, the dominant language in the Troad was, as cogently argued by Leonid Gindin (1999), presumably of Thraco-Phrygian nature.

(3) In 6 other instances, viz. Apaša, Aštarpa, Apawiya or Abawiya, Ḥuršanašša, Lukka, and Parḫa, the relationship of the root with a comparison in the IE Anatolian languages, in particular the expected Luwian, is not so straightforward but hampered by foreign linguistic features. In the first place, we are confronted here in the first 3 of the given cases with the absence of the reflex of PIE laryngeal *[h₂] as *[ḫ], whereas this particular reflex is a distinguishing feature of the IE Anatolian language group. Secondly, in the last 3 of the given cases we encounter the preservation of the voiced velars *[gʰ] and *[gʰ], which are regularly lost in the Luwian language. As the roots on which these geographic names are based are of patent IE nature, it lies at hand to attribute these features to influences from an IE substrate other than IE Anatolian.

(4) The latter inference is further underlined by the fact that in 3 instances, Dura, Šallapa, and Šeḫa, the closest comparative data are provided by, in Krahe’s terms Old European but for clarity’s sake rather referred to here as Old Indo-European, hydronym, namely Lusitanian or Ligurian Doūrios or Durias, Illyrian Salapia, and Gaulish Sequana. If these comparisons hold water, as I maintain, the IE substrate other than IE Anatolian as inferred sub (3) above may be identified as speakers of the earliest form of Indo-European as reconstructed on the basis of hydronyms and toponyms and referred to here as Old Indo-European.
Whatever the extent of the latter inference, on the basis of the examples of Kurupiya < *kerh₁- “head, horn” and Šeḫa < *še₂kʷ- “to seep, soak” (for instances of lenition of the reflex of palatal *[k] in Luwian, see Woudhuizen 2011: 409) the language of the inhabitants of western Anatolia, irrespective of the question whether this concerns Luwian or Old Indo-European, may safely be grouped with the centum group among the Indo-European family.

Appendix: On the Place-Name Mira

Owing to the fact that the Luwian hieroglyphic legend of the stamp seal from Beycesultan, discovered in a dividing line between levels VI and V and hence likely dating to c. 2000 BC, starts with the place-name Mira, we appear to be facilitated with yet another fixed point in our reconstruction of the geography of western Anatolia, namely; present-day Beycesultan = Bronze Age Mira (Woudhuizen 2012).²

In connection with our understanding of the meaning of the place-name Mira, it might be of relevance to note that, as Gregory Nagy (2010: 235–236) points out, the federal sanctuary of the Aiolians was called Messen (= present-day Mesa) and, in line with its meaning “middleground”, situated in the center of the island of Lesbos. This observation reminded me of the following remark by Wolfgang Meid in connection with Celtic Mide in Ireland (Meid 2010: 68): “The “middle” province, Mide (anglicized Meath), with Tara as the sacral centre of Ireland, was preponderantly of symbolic significance.” Against this backdrop, the Peloponnesian place-name Midea (Μιδέα), also originating from PIE *medhiyos (cf. Mallory & Adams 2007: 290), may also be suggested to have once functioned as a federal sanctuary situated in a central location of its surrounding members.

The relevance of this information as to our understanding of the place-name Mira becomes clear if we realize that medial [r] may well originate from medial [d] by means of the phonetic development called rhotacism. As I have argued (Woudhuizen 2011: 78), this particular phonetic development is already attested for

² It is interesting to note that Fabrizio Giovanetti independently achieved the reading of the place-name Mira at the start of the legend of this stamp seal, but on the basis of archaeological evidence downdates the transition from level VI to level V at Beycesultan to that of level II to level Ib at Kültepe-Kanesh, which means to c. 1830 BC, see Fabrizio 2012 (my thank are due to the author for sending me a pdf-version of his paper, and to Willemijn Waal for drawing my attention to the former’s treatment of the Luwian hieroglyphic legend of the stamp seal from Beycesultan).
yet another Middle Bronze Age Luwian hieroglyphic inscription known as the Erlenmeyers’ seal, in the legend of which the MN Tarkuntimuwas (= classical Ταρκονδίμοτος) appears in form of Tarkunaramuwas.

If we are right, then, in our analysis of the place-name Mira as originating from an earlier *Mida (< PIE *medhiyos), we may, in the light of the given parallels, well be dealing here with an origin federal sanctuary of the Luwians situated in the center of the members involved, which, by and large, would coincide with a land called Luwiya running all the way from the region of Apaša “Ephesos”, the capital of the later kingdom of Arzawa, in the west up to that of Konya, an important site in the later Hittite Lower Land, in the east. In any case, it is no coincidence that this particular region in the given period of time can be positively identified as the cradle of the Luwian hieroglyphic script (cf. Woudhui zen 2011: 81–83).
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Fig. 1. Map of western Anatolia