

HOOFDARTIKELEN

THE PREHISTORY OF THE LYDIANS,
THE ORIGIN OF THE ETRUSCANS,
TROY AND AENEAS

“dass jene Polemik... jetzt praktisch... an einem toten Punkt gelangt ist.”
F. Falchetti — Antonella Romualdi,
Die Etrusker, 12. Stuttgart 2001.

Contents

1. The prehistory of the Lydians
 - 1.1 *Mēiones*
 - 1.2 The land *Māsa*
 - 1.3 Ancient testimonies
 - 1.4 Other evidence
 - 1.5 The linguistic position of Lydian
 - 1.6 Historical considerations
 - 1.7 Conclusion
 2. The origin of the Etruscans
 - 2.1 The Etruscans came from the East
 - 2.2 The Tyrsēnoi in classical times
 - 2.3 Ancient testimonies
 - 2.4 Historical considerations
 3. Troy
 - 3.1 The language of the Trojans
 - 3.2 Taruisas
 - 3.3 The Trojan War
 4. Aeneas
 5. Conclusions
- Addendum I ‘Etruscans’ in Homer
Addendum II The Pelasgians
Addendum III The date of the eastern Tyrsēnoi¹⁾

1. THE PREHISTORY OF THE LYDIANS

1.1 *Mḗiones*

The Homeric name for the Lydians is *Mḗiones*²⁾ (the name is sometimes transcribed as *Meïones*, but in Homer the η is always monosyllabic). It occurs in K 431, B 866, -οσι B 864, -ίς ‘Lydian woman’ Δ 142, -ίην Σ 291; gen. -ονος of a personal name E 43. Later the Greek form of the word is *Μαίονες*, with shortening of the vowel (cf. *Τροίη* from *Τρω-*). The α in this form shows that the Homeric η continues a long *ā*; the form with α must be of Aeolic origin (a Dorian origin is less probable). This means that the oldest form was **Māiones*.

**Māiones* might be compared with *Παίονες*, but nothing is known of the formation of this name. (We might expect **Τρωη* from *Τρω+ιη*, parallel to *Mḗiones* from **Mā+ιονες*; the form we find, *Τροίη*, may be the younger form, comparable to *Μαίονες*. The younger form, with -ο-, may have been generalized later; note that it makes no difference for

¹⁾ I am indebted for comments and information to dr. M.P. Cuypers, drs. W.F.H. Henkelman, prof. Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, prof. F.H.H. Kortlandt, W.G. Kuijper, prof. A. Lubotsky, dr. L.B. van der Meer, drs. M. de Vaan.

²⁾ Homer does not have the word *Λυδοί*.

the metre.) Greek has a suffix -ον- to indicate peoples, cf. *Κίκονες*, *Μύγδονες*, *Μακεδόνες*. We also find -ιον- in *Δολίονες* (south of Kyzikos! the long *i metri causa*).

1.2 *The land Māsa.*

It was suggested long ago that *Mḗiones* is derived from the name of the land *Māsas*, mentioned in Hittite texts. The idea originated from Goetze 1924, 23.

In recent years a conviction has grown that in western Asia Minor, in Hittite times, Luwian was spoken; e.g. Starke 1997a *passim*. This raises the question, of course, where the speakers of Lydian were, which is linguistically rather deviant (see below 1.5). Starke suggested that Lydian came from the northeast (1997a n. 101). If one looks, with this in mind, at Starke’s map (ibid. 449; also Troia, Traum und Wirklichkeit 2001, 34f.; Latacz 2001, inside front and back cover), we find there the land of *Māsas*. Thus, it seems obvious to derive the Maiones from *Māsas*. It must be noted that this land was earlier situated quite differently, in the south, near later Lycia (in Hittite called *Lukkā*). As yet there is no agreement on the position of *Māsas*, north or south; see e.g. Hawkins 1984, 29f.; cf. Del Monte — Tischler 1978, 264f, 1992, 102f. I cannot discuss this issue extensively and will start from Starke’s position: we shall see below that everything points to a position in the north.

As an *s* disappears in Greek in many positions, the derivation seems unproblematic. However, there is a problem, as the *s* had already become *h* in Proto-Greek; so when the Greeks learned the name *Māsas*, the *s* could no longer have participated in the Greek development and would have remained, as e.g. in *Ephesos* from *Abasas* (mentioned in Hittite); cf. further e.g. *Amnisos* (Myc. *aminiso*), the harbour of Knossos; χρυσός ‘gold’, Myc. *kuruso*; *Ἀπαισός/Παισός* (in the Troas).

We have a comparable problem, however, with *Wilusas* and *T(a)ruisas*, now generally identified with (F)ίλιος resp. *Τρῶ-(ε)ς*, *Τροίη*, where there is no trace of the first *s* either. This problem has not yet been solved. It would be easiest to assume a local sound law *s > h* in this northern region, but, while Lycian knew such a rule, there is no evidence for it in Lydian or Luwian.³⁾

Another possibility seems that -sa- was a suffix and that the Greeks learned the forms without this suffix. Note that all three forms end in -sa-. For the suffix (to be distinguished from -ssa-), which is very frequent in Anatolian geographical names, see Jin Jie 1994, 91-93. The situation seems most

³⁾ There is a case where *s* disappeared in Lydian. Dionysius of Halikarnassos 1, 24 says that the oldest ancestor of the Lydians was Manes, son of Zeus and Gē (which means that this is the oldest man). This Manes is well-known, e.g. Hdt. 1, 94. However, all manuscripts of Dionysius have *Mās-*νης (the form without *s* is a conjecture). Von Wilamowitz 1899, 222f pointed out that the manuscript reading is correct. Hephaestion (cap. 1) and Herodianos (Etym. M. s.v. *δάσκληρα*) mention as examples of the unusual consonant-clusters of Lydian from Xanthos the Lydian the names *Πάσνης* and *Μάσνης*, which would be river-names (the names have not been identified, I think, as the *Barrington Atlas* does not give them). Von Wilamowitz adds that it is understandable that a first ancestor was called after a river (cf. note 42). The form is furthermore confirmed by Plutarch, *de Is. et Osir.* 360^b, which has: *Μάνην...ὄν ἐνιοι Μάσδην καλέουσιν*. L. Robert, 1937, 156-8, has shown that the oldest form of the name is *Μασδνης*. However, Lydian inscriptions have no trace of this *s*: the name is *manēs*, adj. *maneli-* (Gusmani 1964, 163; Gusmani does not discuss the point). However, this will be an instance of assimilation of *s*, which has nothing to do with *s* between vowels.

clear in the case of *Truisas*. I think that it must be analyzed as *Tru-isa-s*; *-isa-s* is a variant of *-sa-s*, cf. *Kark-isa-s*. Then *Tru-* corresponds with *Τρω-*⁴), which is found in *Τρω-ες* and in *Τροίη* (from *Τρω-* + *-ιη*; see above on the shortening of the long *-o-*).

However, *Wilusas* is often considered as derived from **Wilus*, as *Hattusas* is from *Hattus*; so it would not have a suffix *-sa-*. But this is uncertain. Anyhow, it seems to me that *Wilusas* was adapted as **Wiluos*, which became *Wilios*, with assimilation of the *u* to the preceding *i*. (This may have been helped by the fact that *-υος* is rare in Greek. Kretschmer-Locker give 34 forms, with one more on p. 712, of which nine are neuters; the forms are mostly very unusual, except a few compound adjectives, like *ἀριδάκρυος*, while *-ιος* is, of course, extremely frequent.)

In the same way *Mā-sa-* may have come into Greek without the suffix *-sa-*. *Māsa-* may have been the land of *Mā*. As is well known *Mā* was the name of the Mother-goddess, who was venerated in these lands. This interpretation was already given by Kretschmer 1927. The name of the land may well have been **Mā*; cf. for the structure *P/Blā*, the new reading of Hitt. *Palā*, based on *Βλαήνη*.

Whatever the explanation, *Ilios* and *Troy* 'lost' an *s*, and the same may have happened with *Māsas*. The *-i-* of the Greek form may be explained as follows. *Māiones* indicates the people; the land is called in Greek *Māion-iā*, which is derived from the word for the people. It is therefore obvious to ask whether there was an earlier name for the country, parallel to *Māsa-*. This was made in Greek with *-iā*.⁵ So we get **Māiā*. Alternatively we could assume an Anatolian variant with *-iya-*, cf. *Wilus-iya*.⁶ (For the lengthening of suffixes cf. *-ηνοι*: *-ιηνοι*, Lat. *-ānus*: *-iānus*.) Kretschmer (l.c.) assumes a Greek derivation from *Mā*. (Cf. for a derivation with *-s(a)a-* from the name of a god, *Tarhuntassa-*, note 25, *Tešubassa-*). Cf. for the forms *γῆ*: *γαῖα*, etc. Lastly cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. *Μαῖα*: πόλις Ἑλλησποντία ('a city on the Hellespont').

As in the case of *Wilusas* — *Ilios* and *Truisas* — *Troiē* the circumstantial, geographical and historical evidence combined with the phonetic resemblance, is so great that I think we can consider the equation *Māsas* — *Μαῖον-* as most probable. It is quite improbable that in the same area two great countries existed of which the name began with *Mā-* (*Mā-*, with long *ā*, is much less frequent than forms with short *a*).⁷ What follows confirms the idea so clearly, that there can be little doubt about the etymology.

Geographically the assumption of an 'old Maeonia', in the north, fits very well. Classical Maeonia is notably the area north-east of Sardes (where there is a town *Maionia*); and this area lies south of *Māsas*. Starke indicates that *Māsas* comprised the territory of eastern Phrygia Hellespontica and

⁴) That *-u-* was rendered by *ω* is no problem; cf. e.g. Luw. Lyc. *Runt-* in names as *Ρωνδας*, *Ρωνδερρας*, *Ρωνδερβεμς* etc., Houwink 1961, 130f.

⁵) It was demonstrated long ago (Sommer 1937, 254ff) that single *-ā* in that function only occurs in a few very old names (Θρήκη, Κρήτη, Φοινίκη, Λιβύη; to which *Εὔροπη* must be added).

⁶) Meister 1921, 150f argued for original *Mḥonēs*, without *i*. But then *Μαῖονες* is difficult to explain. (The form has been explained as Boeotian, with *-η-* from *-αι-*.)

⁷) It is a pity that the *Barrington Atlas* does not indicate the length of vowels, a mistake that seriously diminishes its value, as also the decision to give when possible the latinized version of names instead of the original form. Geographical names are linguistic facts that are of historical interest.

western Bithynia; from the mouth of the *Aisēpos*, west of *Kyzikos*, (which probably was the border of the *Troas*), to *Heraklea*, east of the mouth of the *Sangarios*; in the south it runs to the east-west course of the river *Makestos*; he excludes the peninsula east of the *Bosporus*. Classical Maeonia, then, lies due south of *Māsas*/old Maeonia; the distance is some 225 km.⁸)

1.3 Ancient testimonies

That the Lydians came from the north is in my view confirmed by a story given by Greek authors. It is very shortly referred to by Herodotus (7, 74), where he says about the Mysians (Μυσοί): οὔτοι δὲ εἰσι Λυδῶν ἀποικοί, ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου δὲ ὄρεος καλέονται Ὀλυμπιηνοί. ("These are colonists of the Lydians, after the mountain Olympus called *Olympiēnoi*". The Olympus in Mysia is meant.) The story is told at some length by Strabo, 12. 8, 3. He says that there is uncertainty in the authors he consulted about the Mysians, and that some say that they are Thracians, οἱ δὲ Λυδοὺς εἰρήκασι, κατ' αἰτίαν παλαιὰν ἱστοροῦντες ἦν Ξάνθος ὁ Λυδὸς γράφει καὶ Μενεκράτης ὁ Ἐλαίτης, ἐτυμολογοῦντες καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ τῶν Μυσῶν, ὅτι τὴν ὀξύην οὕτως ὀνομάζουσιν οἱ Λυδοί πολλή δ' ἡ ὀξύη κατὰ τὸν Ὀλυμπον, ὅπου ἐκτεθῆναι φασὶ τοὺς δεκατευθέντας, ἐκείνων δὲ ἀπογόνους εἶναι τοὺς ὑστερον Μυσοὺς, ἀπὸ τῆς ὀξύης οὕτω προσαγορευθέντας. μαρτυρεῖν δὲ καὶ τὴν διάλεκτον. μισολύδιον γάρ πως εἶναι καὶ μισοφρύγιον. τέως μὲν γὰρ οἰκεῖν αὐτοὺς περὶ τὸν Ὀλυμπον, τῶν δὲ Φρυγῶν ἐκ τῆς Θράκης περαιωθέντων, ἀνελόντων[?] τε τῆς Τροίας ἄρχοντα καὶ τῆς πλησίον γῆς, ἐκείνους μὲν ἐνταῦθα οἰκῆσαι, τοὺς δὲ Μυσοὺς ὑπερ τὰς τοῦ Καΐκου πηγὰς πλησίον Λυδῶν.⁹)

I give the translation by H.L. Jones in the Loeb edition, with a few slight changes; I add some explanations in square brackets. "but others say that they [the Mysians] were Lydians, thus concurring with an ancient explanation given by Xanthos the Lydian and Menekrates of Elaia, who at the same time explain the origin of the name of the Mysians, (by) saying that the oxua-tree is so named by the Lydians [this means that this tree has a name in Lydian which strongly resembles the word *Mysoi*]. And the oxua-tree abounds in the neighbourhood of Mt. Olympus, where they say that the decimated persons were put out [i.e. where a Lydian colony was established] and that their descendants were the Mysians of later times, so named after the oxua-tree, and that their language too bears witness to this; for, (they add,) their language is, in a way, a mixture of the Lydian and the Phrygian languages, for they lived round Mt. Olympus for a time, but when the Phrygians crossed over from Thrace, and slew the ruler of Troy and of the country near it, those people [the Phrygians] took up their abode there, whereas the Mysians took up their abode above the sources of the [river] *Kaikos* near Lydia [i.e. went to the places where they lived in classical times]."

⁸) Dr. M.P. Cuypers draws my attention to the fact that the *Bebrykes* live in the territory designated by Starke as *Māsas*. They inhabit (later) Bithynia, east of the *Bosporus*, between the *Black Sea* and the *Kian Gulf*; but they are also mentioned near *Lampsakos*. They are even found in *Lydia*, near *Ephesos*; Cuypers 1997, 30f.

⁹) There is a problem with the text: *ἀνελόντων* is a conjecture for *εἴλοντο τὸν* "they took the", but the general meaning is clear.



THE HOMELAND OF THE ETRUSCANS

MASA acc. to Starke; = MAIONIA? = the homeland of the Etruscans

- places where Tyrsenoi lived in classical times — 1. Plakiê 2. Skyllakê — ⊗ Lydian places/Lydians north of Lydia

It may be useful to give some more explanations and to summarize the story.¹⁰⁾ 'To decimate' clearly is a means of deciding who has to leave the country and find a living elsewhere, i.e. to select the people that will found a colony. — Mt Olympos is the Olympos in Mysia, exactly in the area where the land of Māsas is situated, the country which I assume to be 'old Maionia'. — Strabo knows that the Phrygians came from Europe (their language is Indo-European, but does not belong to the Anatolian group of Hittite, Luwian, Lydian a.o.). He also states, as one might expect, that their arrival went with some violence: they overthrew Troy [perhaps rather than the Greeks as they claim in their story of the Trojan War]¹¹⁾ and the land lying near it. This cannot be to the west of the Troas, where you have the sea. It might be to the south of it, but the story is about the country east of it (round Mt. Olympos). It is a pity that Strabo and his sources do not mention who lived there: it will be clear that I think that the (forebears of) the Lydians lived there.

The story may be summarized as follows. There was a tradition that the Mysians originated from the Lydians. For there was a Lydian colony established around the Olympos.

Their descendants became the Mysians. The Mysians were pushed southward by the Phrygians and so came in the position where they are found in historical, classical times, just north of (classical) Lydia. That this story is correct is shown by the fact that the language of these people (who Herodotus calls Olympienoi, and who after Strabo became the Mysians) is a mixture of Lydian and Phrygian. It would also appear from the name of the tree, which would be Lydian. (This etymology of the name 'Mysian' is most improbable: peoples' names are not derived from a tree. But it may be true that in this area the word for this tree was Lydian. The tree-argument is not strong and needs not be stressed.)

My view is that the Lydians mentioned were not a colony, but were the original inhabitants of the area. This can be made probable, and it is also easy to see how the colony-version arose.

To begin with the latter, we have to do with dim recollections of a distant past. It is assumed that the Phrygians invaded after 1200. That is 700 years before classical Greek times (Xanthos wrote in the early fifth century). What people observed was that there is evidence for Lydians around Olympos. As the Lydians lived in (classical) Lydia, this must have been a colony (ἀποικία) of Lydians. That the Lydians might have come from there was no longer known.

I see the following indications for my view. The people about whom the story tells, lived on the Olympos, i.e. they

¹⁰⁾ A discussion of the story is given by Briquel (1991, 55ff), from a traditional point of view, of course.

¹¹⁾ The Phrygians in Homer are an anachronism.

lived in the mountains. That they lived in the mountains, while the surrounding country is so fertile as is the case in this area (Strabo 12, 8, 4) suggests that this is an instance of a people driven to the mountains by invaders; it is a 'Rückzugsgebiet'. — Then, the colony would have been established before 1200. It is excluded that there would be a tradition about such an uneventful occurrence so long ago. The invasion of the Phrygians was such a disaster that there remained a tradition about it. (The precise term δεκατεύω must be sheer phantasy: such minor details cannot be remembered over so long a time. It is just a usual feature of colonizing.)

Thus, there is a tradition which remembers Lydians living in old Maeonia.

This interpretation is confirmed by another passage in Strabo (13, 1, 8), where he says (in the translation of Jones in the Loeb edition): "Now such were the conditions at the time of the Trojan War, but all kinds of changes followed later; for the part round Cyzicus as far as the Practius was colonized by the Phrygians, and those round Abydos by the Thracians;... and the plain of Thebe [Thebe near Adramytion] by the Lydians, then called Maeonians, (and by the survivors of the Mysians who had formerly been subject to Telephus...). (τὸ δὲ Θήβης πεδίον [ἐπέκτισαν] Λυδοί, οἱ τότε Μήονες, καὶ Μυσῶν οἱ περιγενόμενοι τῶν ὑπὸ Τηλέφῳ πρότερον). This statement is important for two reasons. First, it shows that the Maeonians were pushed on in the time when the Phrygians came, and probably by pressure of the Phrygians. Secondly, the movements mentioned must have been roughly from north to south (or from west to east, for the Phrygians, like later the Galatians, moved to the south-east), which gives evidence that the Maeonians earlier lived north (or east) of Thebe; and this is exactly where I propose that they were.

That there were of old Lydians in the north has long since been assumed. Thus, Herodotus (1, 8) states that Gyges, the founder of the Mermaid dynasty (see below 1. 6), was the son of Daskylos. Xanthos the Lydian, in his history of Lydia, says that an early king Meles had profited from the violent death of a prince Daskylos. How-Wells (ad loc.) already commented that this name reminds one of Daskyleion (older Daskylion; cf. below 1.4), where later a Persian satrap resided. It lies to the south of the westernmost of two lakes south of the Propontis (called Aphnitis, mod. Manyas Gölü or Kuş Gölü). There was another town so called further east on the seashore (east of Skylake). Both places are exactly in the country which I suppose to be old Maeonia. In an appendix How-Wells (1, 374, section 8) write: "It is tempting to conjecture that some immigration of fighting men from the North (was the cause...)." The question is not put, however, how a noble Lydian family could have originated so far in the north. It may be a further indication that (the) Lydians once lived in the north, in old Maeonia.¹²⁾

It may be noted here that Hanfmann, the excavator of Sardes, also reckoned with "immigrant Maeonians" (1958, 74).

Another consideration is the following. In the tradition on the origin of the Etruscans it is stated that the Lydian people were divided in two parts, one being that of the later

Etruscans, the other, under the king's son Lydos changing their name (from 'Maeonians') in 'Lydians'. This fact is several times repeated, e.g. Hdt. 7, 74: οἱ δὲ Λυδοὶ Μηίωνες ἐκαλεῦντο τὸ πάλαι, ἐπὶ δὲ Λυδοῦ τοῦ Ἄττος ἔσχον τὴν ἐπωνυμίην, μεταβαλόντες τὸ οὔνομα ("The Lydians were earlier called Maeonians, but after Lydos the son of Atys they got their [present] name, changing their name."); cf. also 1, 7. The latter point requires explanation. That they were named after the prince is very doubtful: it is much probable that the name of the prince was coined to have an eponymous hero to explain the name 'Lydian'. But the story contains something remarkable. Why did the other half of the population change their name? This would have happened at the same time when the Etruscans left the country. So it seems as if the same event that caused the Etruscans to leave the country, was also the cause for (the event leading to) the change of the name of the other half of the population. This is well explained by my assumption that the other half also left the country, heading south, and settling elsewhere. If they settled in a country called Lydia, they were of course called 'Lydians'. In this way the statement about the change of name can be accounted for. To put it shortly, the change of name suggests that they went to another country, as my hypothesis supposes.

I wonder whether Homer gives evidence for Maeonia in the north. In B 866 the Tmōlos is mentioned, so Maeonia is thought in classical Lydia. But in Γ 402 and Σ 291 we find Φρυγίη καὶ Μηονίη (also in K 431 Phrygians and Maeonians are mentioned side by side). Now in classical times this would be unthinkable: Phrygia is a large and mighty country, whereas Maeonia is small and insignificant. So the collocation must date from a time when the two were comparable. Also Phrygia in the Iliad seems to be only the land in the north (the Sangarios is mentioned, further nothing): its southern extension is simply not in view. This may imply that Maeonia is also a land in the north (of roughly the same importance as Phrygia). But it cannot be excluded that the expression, or the idea, Phrygia and Lydia, dates from a (very recent) time when Phrygia had become less strong and when Lydia was growing in strength, so that both were comparable; Maeonia would then be just the traditional name for Lydia.

1.4 Other evidence

When I had nearly completed this article, I saw Neumann's important article on the language of Troy (1999). He remarks that the peoples speaking (Indo-European) Anatolian languages "müssen... den Nordwesten Anatoliens nicht ausgespart haben, ein unüberwindliches Hindernis gab es da nicht." Names connected to Troy do not show typical Luwian elements, but some evidence points to Lydian. Thus, Τρωίλος, e.g. a son of Priamos, has a suffix *-il-*, which finds its closest parallel in Lyd. *-li-* (*mane-li-* '(son) of Manes'). It is found in Μυρσίλος, the name of a tyrant of Mytilene on Lesbos and of a historian from Lesbos; it is a derivation from Μύρσος, the name of a Lydian king and of the son of (the Lydian king) Gyges. The place name *Daskyl(e)ion*, which is found several times in the northwest of Asia Minor, is derived from a personal name *Daskylos*, which is the name of the father of Gyges (Hdt. 1, 8) and of a king of the Mariandyni and his grandson (schol. on Ap. Rh. 2, 724 and 752). This name is known in Hittite as *Taskuili-*, which may mean

¹²⁾ The name Daskylos [sic] is found on inscriptions east of Sardis around 150 AD. See Malay 1999 nr. 105 and 180 (three times).

‘son of (the god) *Tasku*’ (the god is known to us).¹³) The town Gergitha in the Troad is reported to have been founded by the Lydians from Gergithes (Strabo 13, 1, 19). Neumann concludes “Insgesamt machen diese Einzelbeobachtungen wahrscheinlich, dass auch nördlich von Lydien, in Mysien und dann wohl auch in der Troas das Lydische — oder eine ihm nahverwandte idg.-anatolische Sprache — geherrscht hat — vor dem Eindringen der Phryger und anderer aus dem Balkan herübergekommener Ethnien.”

He then goes on to refer to an article by Starke (1997), who discussed the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription of Yariri from 8th century Karkamis, who claimed to speak many languages. Starke concluded that *musu/azza* referred to Lydian. He then connects this term with Mysia (Μυσία), and finds this confirmed by the statement of Xanthos the Lydian (FGrH 765 F 15) that the language of the Mysians was μιξολύδιον and μιξοφρύγιον (we discussed the text in 1.3 above). Neumann: “Das darf man wohl so interpretieren, dass durch das auch Mysien erfassende Ausgreifen der Phryger das dort vorher herrschende Idiom [= Lydian, as appears from the context] beeinflusst, beeinträchtigt worden ist.” Finally Neumann points out that the evidence adduced for Luwian in the Troas is not reliable. About the seal with hieroglyphic text recently found in Troy he remarks that it has “nicht den geringsten Zeugniswert” for the (local) language of Troy; such seals were also found in Mycena and Thebes in Greece. So Neumann differs from Starke, who thinks that the whole northwest of Asia Minor was Luwian. We shall return to the question in 1.7.

I add a few small observations, which may be relevant for our problem. One is the name of the Trojan warrior Πάλμυς. He is mentioned by Homer N 792, together with Askanios and Morus, as having come from Askania. In B 863 Askanios is called a leader of the Phrygians (together with Phorkus).¹⁴) Askania is in the center of old Maeonia/Māsas (the most eastern of the three lakes there is called Askaniē). Now *Palmus* is a Lydian name; we have the word *qalmlu-* ‘king’ in the Lydian texts (Gusmani 1964, 179, 276). The problem is how a Lydian can come from Askania. In the present context it would confirm that the Lydians originated from this area. But the conclusion is not certain. If the word is of Indo-European origin, it may have occurred not only in Lydian. But there is no Indo-European etymology. So it will be a loan from a substratum language in Asia Minor, and from there it may have come not only in Lydian. Further, Homer may just have used an interesting name, without respect of historical fact. (Homer probably lived near Lydia, so he may have known many Lydian names.)

Interesting is the inscription recently found in Daskyleion which mentions a man called Manes (Gusmani — Polat 1999). The inscription, dating from the first quarter of the fifth century, is in Phrygian. But Gusmani remarks that the name “im Lydischen...mehrmals vorkommt, im Phrygischen aber bisher nur eine schwache Spur hinterlassen hat” (it is found on a seal-inscription). It is further remarked that the oldest mention of the name comes from Kyzikos. This may imply that the man is of Lydian descent; probably the text

mentions that his grandfather was also called Manes (gen. *manitos*). (The stela has a relief of a banquet scene, much like those known from the Etruscans. Polat (150) states that this represents “eine tief verwurzelte Tradition...in dieser Region” (i.e. the Propontis area and Phrygia and Lydia.)

We have a Lydian name *Srkastu-*, which may be related to the epithet of Zeus in Tios/n in Bithynia, Συργάστης, -ητος, mentioned on coins of Tios/n. See RE 2, IV 1 c. 967 s.v. *Surgasteus*; Cook 1914, 1, 753, 2. Hesychius has ὄνομα βαρβαρικόν. The word is also found in Phrygian (dat.) *Surgastoj*. Its meaning is unknown.¹⁵) If the name is typically Lydian, it might prove the presence of Lydians in Bithynia (which is supposed if Maeonia was Lydian and if Starke’s assumption of Māsas is correct). But the situation could be explained differently. Gusmani (1980/81) pointed out that -st- is well known in Anatolian onomastics: Μασαστis, Παππουστis, Νεβεστos; Ερεμαστos (Haas 1966, 98), the monster *Agdistis*. Dr. M.P. Cuypers suggests to me that it is continued by *Sergestus*, the companion of Aeneas (see below, section 4.). I would add the possibility that it is found in the Etruscan name *Sekstalus*. -*alu-* is an Etruscan suffix of gentilicia (Rix 1965, 182). Then we may have *Sekst-* < **Serkst-* < **Sergelast-*. (There is a form Τυργαστης found on Chios (L. Robert, BCH 59,1935,455), which may be a variant.)

Lamētru- (Gusmani 1964) is a Lydian name, *Damatrus* the name of a mountain in Bithynia. But the word is derived from Gr. Δάματρη, so it is too late to be relevant here.

Note that the town Adrasteia, north of Troy, recalls the Lydian personal name *Atrašt[a]* (with adj. *Atraštali-*; see also the comment on *atrašali-* in Gusmani 1964,70).

Then there is the tradition that Adramyttion was founded by Lydians; Strabo 13.1,65. Steph Byz. says it was founded by the Lydian king Ἐρμῶν or Ἄδραμυς.¹⁶) But if this was the son of Alyattes or Sadyattes, it would be in the time of the last dynasty.

Pedley 1968, 22 says that Abydos too was Lydian, but I have not found the source.

Taking all pieces of evidence together it seems probable that, before the arrival of the Phrygians about 1200, the whole area north of Lydia to the coast spoke Lydian.

1.5 The linguistic position of Lydian

Linguistically Lydian is the most deviating of the Anatolian languages. Oettinger 1978 argues that Lydian belonged to the

¹³) Note Lemnian *morinail* ‘from [the city of] Myrina’. — Further I recall Καδμῖλος, which will be ‘son of Kadmos’ (on Kadmos cf. note 42). Note that here the *i* is long. (One might compare other suffixes consisting of long *i* followed by a consonant, like Σαλαμῖν-, (Hom.) Μυρίνη, Φοινῖκ-ες.)

¹⁴) Note that names in -*us* are typical of Lydian.

¹⁵) Neumann (1988, 14) discusses Συργάστης, -τωρ. He also mentions *Surgastos* in Old Phrygian (Dd-102, an inscription identified by Neumann). He assumes that it is a parallel formation in Greek and Phrygian, derives it from a verb **surgad-yō* (root **suerg-* ‘to care for’), as a nomen actoris resp. a verbal adjective (‘der, der für seine Schützlinge sorgt’ resp. ‘der Betreute, Beschützte’). This is improbable. In the first place the Greek form is not Greek: it is written in Greek letters, but it is a name, as Hesych states an ὄνομα βαρβαρικόν, i.e. ‘a non-Greek name’. The distribution too suggests a Phrygian — Lydian name taken over in Greek. A present in -*ad-yō* is unknown elsewhere and probably a typical Greek formation. That the *s-* was preserved in ‘Greek’ is because it was a loanword. We do not know whether it went from Phrygian to Lydian or *vice versa*. Gusmani (1980/81) considers connection with Hitt. *sarku-* ‘high, eminent, powerful’. (His comparison with the type *dalugasti-* ‘length’ seems not viable to me, as these words are abstracts, which is not to be expected here.) We should also keep in mind the strange Greek word σύργαστρος, on which see the etymological dictionaries.

¹⁶) Note that Ἐρμῶν is also the name of a king of the Pelasgians (= Tyrsēnoi) who handed over Lemnos to Miltiades; Zenobius Paroim. 3, 85 (Lochner-Hüttenbach 61).

Palaic-Luwian group (which remained after Hittite had left). From this group Lydian would have left first. But see Melchert 1994, 4, who thinks that ideas about subgrouping are premature. In Starke's diagram (1997a, 486) Lydian is at the farthest end of the Anatolian languages. Our reconstruction may help explain this fact. From the proposed position of the Lydians in old Maeonia/Māsas it follows that they lived in the north. Hence they were in the farthest corner of Anatolia, and their contact with the other Anatolian languages may have been limited. This is more probable than that they were an enclave in Luwian territory. This is probably one reason why Starke assumed that the Lydians lived somewhere in the north. (It is improbable that, if Lydians lived in Mysia, there was a small zone with another dialect north of it.) If the Anatolians entered Asia Minor from the west, from Europe, one might think that the Lydians were the last to enter Asia Minor.¹⁷⁾

1.6 Historical considerations

Historically the situation seems also clear. It is generally supposed that around 1200 peoples from Europe crossed the straights. Among them were the Phrygians. So it is very probable that the Lydians were pushed to the south by the Phrygians. The connection with the arrival of the Phrygians is mentioned by Strabo. We pointed out above that classical Maeonia is due south of old Maeonia/Māsas. Sakellariou (1958, 430) also saw a connection with these events. After observing that the Greeks, writing about the colonisation of Ionia, never mentioned the Lydians, he concluded that they did not live in the coastal areas. He then assumed that the Phrygians pushed the Lydians to the west into their later positions. This is geographically less probable, as it supposes that the Lydians lived further east (than in classical times) and that the Phrygians came to the east of them (and pushed them westwards). It is more probable that the Phrygians, coming from the north, pushed people southwards. This means that the Lydians came from the north. The Phrygians lived also east of classical Maeonia. Perhaps, then, they pushed the Lydians also westwards. (In Homer, the Maiones are mentioned immediately after the Phrygians.) The connection with the 1200 crisis was also made by Neumann, as we saw (1.4 above).

It may be mentioned that Strabo already remarked that the region under discussion had a very turbulent history. He says (12, 8, 4) that the history of the peoples in this area is very complicated, because of "the fertility of the country this side of the Halys river, particularly that of the seaboard, on account of which attacks were made against it from numerous places and continually by peoples from the opposite mainland, or else the people nearby would attack one another. Now it was particularly in the time of the Trojan War and after that time that invasions and migrations took place,..."

This hypothesis is confirmed by archaeology and by a remark of Herodotus. Archaeologists have found that Sardes was violently destroyed around 1200. Pedley 1968, 25: "Sardis was destroyed by a fierce and uncompromising foe at the end of the Bronze Age; but at a time of great population disturbances and political upset, it is difficult to assess the responsibility accurately. The Herodotean sons of

Heracles may have been responsible, just as similar legend records the damaging activities of the Heraclids in Greece and elsewhere at this time." In my view it is probable that this were indeed the 'Heraclids', i.e. the population movements of about 1200, but that in this case we have to do with the first arrival of the Lydians in their later land. The argument is simple; before 1200 the Lydians lived in my view in old Maeonia; and after 1200 Sardes was continuously in the hands of the Lydians; so they must have arrived around 1200. (It must be admitted, however, that we do not know how far south the Lydians lived before 1200.)

Herodotus (1, 7) tells us that two dynasties ruled Lydia: the Mermnads (ending with Kroisos), and before them the Heraclids; these were preceded by a few earlier kings sometimes called the Atyades (one of them Atys, whose sons Lydos and Tyrsēnos led the people when the Lydians split in two groups because of a famine, one group leaving for Italy). Herodotus states that the Heraclid dynasty reigned 505 years. The Mermnads seized power under Gyges. This moment is supposed to have been around 680 BC. (Pedley 1968, 5). This gives a date of 1185 for the moment when the Heraclids took power in Sardes. "What is significant is the notice of a change of dynasty around 1200, a fact substantiated by the archaeological material." Pedley 1968, 30. (Pedley gives the year 1221, which is based on the old assumption that Gyges came to power in 716, forgetting his own, more exact, estimate.) Drews (1969) found how this chronology arose. It is based on 1 king = 1 generation = 25 years. There would have been 22 Heraclid kings (Herodotus 1, 7, 4 says generations) and 5 Mermnad kings. The number of 505 years must have arisen as follows: 27 kings × 25 years = 675; later (?) it was known that the Mermnads reigned 170 years; then the Heraclids must have reigned 675 – 170 = 505 years.¹⁸⁾ To reckon with 25 year per king is reasonable, so if there were 22 kings, this gives some 500 years (550). Starting from 680, with Gyges, you get 1180 (1230). However, we do not know how real the 22 kings (generations) are.

As the Phrygians and the Mysians arrived much later, there was a time (before 1200, the fall of Troy) when in the north of western Asia Minor we only have the name of the Lydians (of course the names of other peoples may have been lost). Their territory may have been (much) larger at that time. Perhaps we have a reminiscence of this situation in Diodorus Siculus (3, 58), who tells us that Μηῶν, king of Lydia and Phrygia, was father of Kybele by Dindymene. The story refers to very ancient times, the name refers to the Maeonians, and the fact that Mēiôn is presented as king of both Lydia and Phrygia is remarkable.

We started from Starke's idea of the position of Māsas. This idea will have been based partly on his idea that the whole of western Asia Minor was Luwian. However, we saw above (1,4) that this is not certain, and that rather the north was Lydian.

Bryce argued (1986, 23-35) that the Lycians originally lived in western Caria, east of Miletus, and were pushed south to (classical) Lycia after 1200. This would be a fine parallel to the proposed history of the Lydians. However, in 1992 Bryce seems to be less certain about this reconstruction.

¹⁷⁾ There is no passage from the north-east, passing the Caucasus, to Turkey. Only the Turks and the Mongols came from the east, but they came through Iran.

¹⁸⁾ Drews' comparison with the rulers of eastern Asia (Minor), the Assyrians and the Medes, is irrelevant for the Lydian chronology. — The idea had been found much earlier. Schubert 1884, 8 says that Gutschmid had proposed this explanation in a lecture.

One wonders whence the name Λυδοί comes. As mentioned above, Homer does not have the name Lydians, only Μῆiones. One wonders how this is to be explained. Most probably Homer knew the term Lydians, so he must have consciously ignored it. But why were they not mentioned as allies of Troy, like the Lycians? He also ignored the presence of the Greeks along the coast of Lydia, which may be because Homer knew that there were no Greeks in Asia Minor at the time of the story about Troy, or in general the Greek expeditions against Asia Minor. The general idea is that the Ludoi lived to the south, and at a later date became more important.

1.7 Conclusion

We started from the etymology deriving *Māiones* from *Māsas*. There are however two problems; one is the formal difficulties, the other the fact that there is no agreement on the position of *Māsas*. Starting from there, however, we found several indications for the essential point, that the Lydians once lived (also) further north, notably on the (east)coast of the Propontis. These indications were both historical (data from Greek writers) and linguistic (the view that Luwian has not been ascertained for north-west Asia Minor; notably Neumann's analysis of the linguistic situation around Troy; and the position of Lydian among the Anatolian languages) and a few minor indications.

The further developments leading to the classical situation are perfectly accounted for by the events around 1200: destabilization of the world and large scale migrations, notably that of the Phrygians. Thus part of the prehistory of the area can be accounted for.¹⁹⁾

The conclusion is strongly confirmed by the fact that it solves the origin of the Etruscans in an unexpected way, which at the same time confirms all that we knew about the question.

2. THE ORIGIN OF THE ETRUSCANS

When I had reached the above conclusion that the Lydians earlier lived (also) more north, up to the coast, I realized that this provided the answer to the problem of the origin of the Etruscans. I shall argue that their homeland was in 'old Maeonia', south of the Sea of Marmara.

2.1 The Etruscans came from the East

Herodotus' story (1, 94) of the Lydian origin of the Etruscans met with much scepticism in the scholarly world.

¹⁹⁾ Prof. Th. van den Hout read a paper on the early history of Lydian at the congress on preellenistic Lycia and Lydia in Rome, 1999; the author kindly sent me the manuscript. He assumes that names like Maddunassa, Maduwata, from the 13th and 15th century, have Madun- from *Mai-un- (with a known Lydian sound change), which would be related to Μῆῶνες. But this is mere hypothesis. (It would also be cognate with Maiandros, but this is a Carian river, there is no evidence for Lydians here, and the Greek form with short vowel (B 869), as opposed to Μῆῶνες, rather shows that this root is unrelated.) But as these forms had *-d-* already in the 15th century, he must assume a third unknown language, which kept the original *-i-*, from which the Greek form was taken. Thus the Greek name, from which the idea started, immediately becomes difficult to explain, which rather weakens the proposal. There is no evidence that these hypotheses are correct. The name of a people in personal names is not very probable either. Nor the idea that a fricative *-d-* was represented by double writing.

And rightly so, because there are several stories in antiquity about movements of peoples that are unreliable. In our case, however, the results of research leave no doubt that the story is correct. I consider this at present as proven, and give here just a short presentation of the most important arguments

I take as a starting point a few remarks by Briquel in his thorough study on the tradition (1991). He wants to discuss the tradition without giving an opinion on the matter. And he largely succeeds in doing so, but in some cases he confesses that he himself is very sceptical about the oriental origin.

He admits (79), like most other scholars, that there is a connection between the Etruscans and the Tyrsenoi of the East, because of the identity of their names, and because of the Lemnos inscription. For the explanation he sees (79 n. 273) three possibilities: 1) a movement from the West to the East; 2) a movement from the East to the West; 3) both peoples are remains of a general non-Indo-European substratum.

The first theory was recently defended by De Simone (1996), but this was generally rejected (Steinbauer 1999 shows that it is linguistically impossible; cf also Beekes 2001). This is also clear from the following consideration. A glance at the map (in this article) shows that the eastern Tyrsēnoi are the remnant of a population, that tried to survive at the fringes of the mainland and on (the) islands. This is further confirmed by the fact that these people disappear without trace. Mostly they are mentioned just once, and often it is only stated that they once lived (past tense) there. Why would Etruscans come to these places? One might suggest for trade, but there is not the slightest evidence for trading activities of these eastern settlements; in any case we would have to assume that this trade became a failure. (Let alone the question whether the Greeks would have tolerated them in their country.) Also, the archaeologist Beschi objected that there is no sign that there were Etruscans on Lemnos. But we cannot separate Lemnos from all the other places where Tyrsēnoi are attested, Imbros, Samothrakê, etc. Would Etruscans have settled in all these places? And all these places are found in one contiguous area. For trading posts this is ununderstandable. [See now Add. III.]

The last theory (of the three mentioned by Briquel, defended e.g. by Pallottino, is quite improbable. First, there is no evidence that there was a language covering Italy and (the west of) Asia Minor. On the contrary, whereas there is ample evidence for one language (or language group) in Greece and Asia Minor, there is no evidence that this language also existed in Italy (apart perhaps from a few words, that might easily have spread secondarily). Then, it is almost impossible that the names of these peoples (i.e. Tyrsēnoi) remained the same over so long a period. It is even improbable that peoples with the same language but living so far apart would keep the same name. Further, old languages may hold out in places that are of difficult access, but this cannot be said of Tuscany: this is not a relic area; on the contrary, it is a most fertile and desirable land. If the Etruscans were there already when the Indo-Europeans came, they would have taken Toscane just like the whole rest of Italy. (Whereas the eastern Tyrsēnoi were a remnant, Toscane was an area to settle.) Then, the time depth between Etruscan and Lemnian would be at least some 2500 years in this view (if we assume 3000 as the end of the common language), and one might ask whether so long a distance is linguistically possible for these languages (De Simone called Lemnian a dialect of Etruscan). Also, it would be very curious if exactly only *these* two languages would have been

preserved from a language group, for which there is the tradition that they come from one area, in Asia Minor. Briquel too finds this solution less probable (1999, 72; this remark is not found in the Italian version in Torelli 2000). The theory is a desperate attempt to avoid the evident conclusion from the Lemnian inscription. — There remains only one possibility: the Etruscans came from the East. It cannot be stressed enough that this settles the question.

Briquel then requires (70) that adherents of the eastern theory explain the form of the tradition. Essential is: “Pourquoi et comment une telle tradition se serait-elle élaborée sous la forme sous laquelle nous la percevons?” Earlier he called the tradition very elaborate. I think that the tradition is very meagre: people were forced by hunger to leave their country. Briquel gives himself parallels for this motif, but it is natural enough (even though it may be fictitious). The story about the plays invented during the famine is not worth serious discussion. Briquel also makes a point of the fact that Tyrsênos (who is of course fictitious) would be a son of the Lydian king Atys and brother of Lydos.²⁰ It would point to a close association between the two peoples. But if the Indo-European peoples entered Asia Minor around 2000 (a date which is certainly not too high), and if the Etruscans left about 1200 (see 1.6), the Lydians and the Tyrsênoi would have lived side by side for 800 years. This may be enough for calling them, in mythological terms, ‘brothers’. (Briquel thinks that Tyrsênos was made a son of the Lydian king in the time of the Lydian Empire, and is then at a loss to find why this was done. He suggests, with much hesitation, that the Lydian kings wanted to have a good relation with the Tyrsênoi, because they had the islands of Lesbos and Lemnos, whereas the Lydians did not have a fleet. But Briquel doubts himself whether this was enough to invent the story. So Briquel, who here in fact rejects the oriental origin, has a problem, while the adherents of the oriental theory have no problem at all.)

The way of selecting half of the population is completely phantastic, because they were peoples speaking quite different languages, but a story about the selection of who would take part in a colonisation, was a standard element in these stories; above we saw this in the story of the supposed Lydian colonists (who became the Mysians) given by Strabo, where the element is also fictitious. — That they left from Smyrna is an element that everybody might have imagined. It is an anachronism, as Sakellariou remarked (1958, 471; Smyrna dates from the end of the eleventh century). It probably testifies to a completely unhistorical view of the matter: it is most improbable that the departure was a large-scale operation from a great harbour. I rather think that a few ships found a good place to live, far away. They settled there and next year some went home and brought family and friends in a few ships. Next year more people came over, etc. In the course of time a considerable number of people came to the new country. (Smyrna was only mentioned by Herodotus, not in the anonymous version in Dionysius of Halikarnassos, which is more reliable; see 2.3 below.) — So I see not the slightest difficulty in the form of the tradition.

²⁰ Briquel uses the Torrêbians as an argument, but we know nothing about them! Xanthos said that Atys’ sons were Lydos and Torrêbos, but except that a Torrêbian lake is mentioned, which has not been identified, absolutely nothing is known about the figure or people. Briquel goes on stressing that they had the same language as the Lydians, but nothing is known about their language. This is all sheer speculation.

It may be noted that the Pelasgian story agrees with the Lydian tradition in that it assumes that the Etruscans came from overseas, from the east (and also that it indicates the Etruscans with the same name — Pelasgoi — as people in the north-west of Anatolia). (Homer, B 840-3, mentions Pelasgoi as allies of Troy; they are mostly thought to have lived in the Troas, i.e. very near my ‘old Maeonia’. See Add. I.) An extensive discussion is given in Briquel 1984. He does not discuss the origin of this idea, but does not think that it is original (except perhaps in details); p. 168. I think that it is possible that the story originally was a variant of the Lydian tradition: the Etruscans, called Pelasgoi, came from Asia Minor; only later the Greeks learned their real name, Etruscans/Tyrsênoi (cf. 2.2 with n. 31 and Add. II). Later the Greeks thought that the Pelasgians in Greece, notably Thessaly, were meant.

The fact that Xanthos the Lydian seems not to have mentioned the tradition can be well explained. He wrote about the Lydians, and the Tyrsênoi were no Lydians, even though they lived side by side for a long time. And this was evident to everybody as they spoke a completely different language. So Xanthos needs no excuse for not mentioning their departure. This is also the view of Hencken 1968, 611. After all, Herodotus too does not pay much attention to the story. It may well be asked whether the departure of the Tyrsênoi had any impact on the Lydians. For it seems most probable that in the same time the Lydians were forced to go south. No wonder that Xanthos ‘forgot’ about the Tyrsênoi.²¹)

It is often said that the question of the ‘Origin of the Etruscans’ is wrongly put, following Pallottino 1947. He stressed that the Etruscans only became what they are in the times we know them, as a result of a long process, and with influence from the peoples and cultures of Italy. It was necessary to stress this, as adherents of the eastern origin earlier thought of a much more recent date (like 800), and assumed that they brought an advanced civilization with them, much as we know it. It is a pity, however, that the great scholar was always very sceptical about the eastern origin.

However, this does not imply that there is no question of origins. The question remains where the Etruscan language came from. So the remarks about the wrong question cannot be used to brush away or forget the question. And a language can only come with its speakers, and these bring also other things, notably ideas and traditions. Thus e.g. Pfiffig 1975, 2 recognizes: “ein aus dem Osten eingewanderter Bestandteil” to be called Tyrrhener. “Den ‘Tyrrhener’, den Trägern einer hochstehenden Stadtkultur, dürfte das Wesentliche der Sprache, der Religion und der höheren materiellen Kultur

²¹) A useful statement of the rejection of the eastern theory, is given by Drews 1992. None of his arguments can stand. — He refutes the idea that Herodotus’ story can be ancient, as oral tradition does not normally reach that far back (in our case 700 years). That is correct, but there are exceptions. One need only think of Homer, and his mention of objects that had long since disappeared. (That the drought lasted eighteen years seems to me a genuine folk-tale element. Eighteen is 2 x 9, and nine, much like seven, is a typical folk-tale number. It is frequent in Homer; cf. B 134 ἐννέα δὴ βεβᾶσαι Διὸς μεγάλου ἐνιαυτοί, and Π 785 τρίς δ’ ἐννέα φῶτας ἔπεφνεν. Cf. Germain 1954. For eighteen one cites that Haldan had eighteen sons, that Odin knew eighteen things; Endres-Schinmmel 240. (For the idea compare the seven fat and the seven meagre cows/years of farao’s dream in Gen. 41: 18ff.) Consider also the fact that there is a tradition of the coming of the Phrygians. — Drews suggests that a Lydian scholar made up the theory, in Herodotus’ time. But why would a Lydian scholar be interested in the Etruscans? — As to the drought, see 2.1.

zuzuschreiben sein.” (Note that here we find a trace of the view which Pallottino rightly refuted, in the ‘höhere materielle Kultur’. — For ‘das Wesentliche der Sprache’ I would say ‘die Sprache’, to avoid misunderstandings; there are no mixed languages.) So the exact question would be: ‘the origin of the people who brought the (predecessor of the) Etruscan language’, people who also brought other things with them.

I shall now give a list of the most important arguments for the origin in Asia Minor and the immigration into Italy. Opponents often mention just one or two of the arguemnts, while there are so many arguments. (The first four, and 15, recapitulate arguments mentioned above.)

1) The tradition as given by Herodotus and Dionysius of Halikarnassos.

2) The story that the Etruscans were Pelasgians.

3) The same term, ‘Tyrsēnoi’, for both Etruscans and the people in north-western Asia Minor. Above we argued that the eastern Tyrsēnoi are the remnant of a population. This means that the Tyrsēnoi/Etruscans came from this area.²²⁾

4) The Lemnos inscription.

5) To the testimony of Lemnos now comes that Herodotus says that the people of Plakiê and Skylakê spoke the same language as the Etruscans; see 2.2

6) The Kumdanlı inscription. — Brandenstein refers (1942, c. 1912) to Sittig 1929, who said that Tyrrhenians are attested near lake Askania. Sittig meant modern lake Burdur, on the border of Pisidia. In fact the inscription was found west of Antiochia in Pisidia, in the village of Gondane (mod. Kumdanlı?), at the north-western top of mod. lake Egridir (of which the old name is unknown, unless it was just *Limnai*). This is just over the border of classical Lydia. The inscription dates from the second century AD and is given by Ramsay 1883 (also Papers of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens III 2 nr. 66), lines 66, 67, 68. The same inscription is cited by Sundwall 1913, 221. It mentions three people as Tyrsēnoi (67, 68, 102). Note that the brother of Pythagoras was also called Tyrsēnos. Though very late, the inscription is of great interest, as it is the only time that we have inscriptional evidence for Tyrsēnoi in Asia Minor. (And nobody will argue that these were Etruscans from Italy.) One might assume that these Tyrrhenians went south from the coast with the Maeonians, and later went further east from (classical) Maeonia.²³⁾

7) The suffix *-ānos*. — The suffix *-ānos* in the name Tyrsēnoi points to the north-west of Asia Minor. It has long since been recognized that this suffix for ethnic names is at home in north-west Asia Minor; some think that it is of non-Greek origin; cf. Ἀβυδηνός, Ὀλυμπιηνός, Περγαμηνός, Σαρδιηνός; see Chantraine 1933, 206; Schwyzer 490 (6); De Simone 1993, 88ff.²⁴⁾ This proves that the name Tyrsēnoi originated in the north-west of Asia Minor. This fact has not been given much weight, as it seemed not to fit in with the tradition of the Lydian origin. We shall see that this slightly embarrassing fact excellently fits into the theory here proposed.

²²⁾ Dr. Cuyppers points out that the rare sequence *-urs-* in the name (it is hardly possible in Greek words of Indo-European origin) recurs in θύρσος, which probably came from Asia Minor (cf. Hier. Luw. *tuwarsa-* ‘vine’).

²³⁾ I have not seen a photograph of the inscription. There should be one, because of the unique character of the text.

²⁴⁾ A desperate but unconvincing attempt to refute the argument was made by De Simone in 1996.

8) Loanwords — As to the language, Steinbauer (1999, 367) observes that Etruscan shows most connections (loanwords) with Lydian, and concludes (p. 389): “Unbezweifelbar steht somit wenigstens die kleinasiatische Herkunft der etruskischen Sprache fest.”

9) Tarchon — The definite proof of the oriental origin of the Etruscans is that a ‘hero’ of great significance is Tarchon (Briquel 1991). He is clearly the Stormgod Tarhun(t)-, the highest god of the Luwians and Hittites. The form is of extreme importance, as it represents an element which the Etruscans brought with them from Asia Minor.²⁵⁾ I cite a few remarks on him by Briquel (1991) — who is no adherent of the Lydian origin. Tarchon is “le héros fondateur par excellence, dont l’activité concerne l’ensemble des cités étrusques”. He is also the specialist in the *etrusca disciplina*, “un héros religieux” (p. 25). He has the power to ward off lightnings; the Anatolian Tarhunt was the god of lightning. He is “une des figures les plus importantes de la fable étrusque.” (p. 238). Still Briquel thinks that he is in origin the eponyme of the city of Tarquinia (p. 242). But his properties are much easier explained if we assume that he was in origin the Anatolian god of lightning. His importance is shown clearly by Lykophron (1245-1249) who mentions Tarchon and Tyrsēnos as the leaders of the Etruscans, as sons of Telephos (see n. 38). In Virgil he is the leader of the Etruscans (e.g. 10, 153).

10) Nanas — This identification is strongly confirmed by the story that the Etruscans were Pelasgians who came from Greece. Their leader was Nanas (Nanos), mentioned by Hellanikos. This name was long ago recognized as an Anatolian ‘Lallname’. We have Lydian (!) *Nannas*, *Ναννας*, Hitt. *nannaya-*, *Nani-* and the kinship-terms Luw. *nani*, Lyc. *nēni* (also (*N*)*nannakos*, a Phrygian king); e.g. Kretschmer 1896, 353-357.

11) The *triumphus* complex — In his study of the Roman *triumphus* (1970) Versnel has shown that (p. 293): “the Etruscans brought the New Year festival with them from Asia Minor, together with the god who formed the centre of it, a god whom the Greeks called Dionysos, the Etruscans Tinia (or by an Italic name Voltumna), a figure of the “dying and rising” type, who was invoked by the cry **thriambe* and who on New Year’s Day was represented by the king.” And on p. 300: “The Etruscans brought the New Year festival with them from Asia Minor and gave Rome two ceremonies: the *ludi Romani* as the festival of the New Year, the triumph as the festival of the victory.... Only along this way is it possible to explain the data: 1. the Dionysiac call to epiphany *triumpe*, introduced via Etruria; 2. the identification of the Roman victorious general and of the magistrate leading the games with the god Iuppiter; 3. the typological and historic relation between the *ludi Romani* and the triumph.”

12) The double axe — On a smaller issue Versnel concludes (p. 299): “When this *bipennis* [‘double axe’], property of Zeus Bakchos“, carried as symbol of sacred power by Lydian kings, is encountered again as the symbol of the royal authority of the Etruscan kings, particularly of the supreme king of the federation of cities, this may be considered an important indication of the Asia Minor origin of the

²⁵⁾ It should be noted that this fact was realized long ago. I found it in Schachermeyr 1929, 158 n.12. Horsfall 1987, 96 e.g. takes it as a fact. — In Etruria the city of Tarquinia was called after him. Compare the town of Tarhuntassa in the Hittite world.

entire underlying ideology, and of the ceremony of investiture in which the *bipennis* played a part.”

These conclusions are of primary importance, as they concern a deep-rooted complex of religious views that cannot have been taken over from elsewhere.

13) The Kabeiroi — One might also recall the Latin word *camillus*, which means a young boy of noble birth who assists with ritual actions. The word is stated to be of Etruscan origin; see Ernout-Meillet and Walde Hoffmann s.v. The first handbook states that the initial stress confirms this. Varro derived the word from *Kadmilos/Kasmilos* who is one of the Kab(e)iroi. Cf. Dion. Hal. 2, 22, 2; “And all the functions which among the Tyrrhenians... were performed by those they called *kadmiroi* in the rites of the Kouretes and the Great Gods, were performed in the same manner by those attendants called by the Romans *camilli*.” Again, Dionysius (1, 23, 5) relates: “For the Pelasgians [= Etruscans] in a time of general scarcity in the land had vowed to Zeus, Apollo and the Kabeiroi tithes of all their future increase”. This shows not only that they honoured the Kabeiroi, a group of gods originating from northwestern Asia Minor, but beside Zeus, who is no doubt the god of lightning, Tarchon, and Apollo, who is also probably originating from Asia Minor. (Note that he is the defender of Troy, and cf. Apaliunas, mentioned in the treaty of Alaksandus of Wilusas with the Hittite king, e.g. Latacz 2001, 138).²⁶ The subject is of great importance. We saw that the Etruscans kept the connection with the Kabeiroi. But Herodotus, 2, 52, says very clearly that the cult of Samothrake, was a Pelasgian cult (and he makes it very clear that he means with Pelasgians the Tyrsênoi). That is, they did not, at a later stage, take it over, but the cult *arose* among them. Which means that they lived there (for a very long time). Again, this fact in itself shows that the Tyrsênoi/Etruscans came from there.

There is probably much more in the field of religion. Thus the much discussed hepatoscopy. Quite probable seems to me that the lituus is Anatolian; see e.g. Wainwright 1959, 210 (cf. Haas 1991, Abb. 75, the Stormgod standing on an animal with his lituus over his shoulder).²⁷

14) The Etruscan way of life — There was in antiquity much criticism on Etruscan customs, concerning cruelty,²⁸ sexual behaviour, and the behaviour of women. Much of it may be exaggerated or simply wrong; in the eyes of the Roman and Greek observers they were different, i.e. ‘wrong’, with all the stereotypes this gives. But I think Pfiffig (1975, 216f) has said essential things about it. “Etwas muss doch an den Etruskern gewesen sein, dass man so gern bereit war, alles mögliche von ihnen zu glauben.” Dionysius of Halikarnassos said that they were οὔτε ἰσομόλοισον οὔτε ἰσοδίατον with any other people, which Pfiffig translated: ‘nicht nur in der Sprache, sondern in der ganze

²⁶ The connection with Semitic names is wrong. Kadmilos e.g. is derived with *-il-*, which is found in languages of Asia Minor (cf. *Taskuili-*, from which *Daskyleion* was derived, Neumann in 1.4 above), from *Kadm-*, which is a geographical name in Caria and in Greece. See note 13.

²⁷ I wonder whether the cothurnes worn by the Stormgod, as often seen on representations of Hittites, and often seen also by the Etruscans, are an Anatolian heritage.

²⁸ Thus, after the Etruscans defeated the Phocaeans near Alalia in 540, they stoned the prisoners to death (Hdt. 1, 167). — Mezentius would tie prisoners to dead bodies, Verg. Aen. 8, 483ff. Vergil will have it from Cicero (fr. Hortensius 95M), who said that Aristotle mentioned the practice of Tyrrhenian pirates. — The reproaches resemble very much ideas of ‘the East’ in the western world which persisted until recently.

Mentalität verschieden’. Pfiffig then continues: “Es war die letzte Blüte der grossen vorindoeuropäischen Kulturen” (where e.g. the position of women was much different). “In ihrer so wenig indoeuropäischen Mentalität mussten die Etrusker den Griechen und Römer als etwas fremdartiges erscheinen.” Dionysius concluded from the fact that they were so strange that they had always lived in Italy, whereas it is of course much more natural to explain it by assuming that they *were* strangers.

15) No withdrawal area — We have seen above that Toscana is not a ‘withdrawal area’, where an ancient people may hold out when the country is invaded. On the contrary, it is a desirable area which the Indo-European peoples, had they come later, would certainly have occupied.

16) Archaeology — Many scholars would like to see archaeological evidence, but I think that it is quite possible that we shall never find archaeological evidence. People came slowly, in small groups, with few material objects with them, and these may have been soon lost. One might compare the arrival of the Greeks in Greece. The archaeological evidence is so difficult that it brought a scholar like Renfrew to assume a quite different period (and way of spread) than most Indo-Europeanists do (who almost generally reject Renfrew’s proposal). Still, at one time the speakers of the later Greek language did arrive in the country. So we must perhaps be content with other indications.

The archaeological side has now entered a new phase, it seems. The transition between Proto-Villanova and Villanova appears to be a continuous one, but that between Proto-Villanova and the preceding Bronze Age Apennine culture, about 1200, shows a serious break. “De fait, l’apparition de cette nouvelle culture en Toscane vers 1200 semble bien marquer une rupture importante, que l’on est enclin à interpréter par l’arrivée, dans cette partie de la péninsule, de groupes humains venus de l’extérieur.” (Briquel 1999, 59; this treatment appears slightly shortened in Torelli 2000, 43-51.) Elsewhere the Apennine culture continued (now called Sub-Apennine and later *Tombe a fossa*). Proto-Villanova appears in Toscana, but also in small areas round Bologna and in Campania. And these are exactly the territories which later are Etruscan! (See the maps in Briquel 1999, 60).²⁹ And 1200 is exactly the time I propose for the departure of the Tyrsênoi to Italy. So what we still would like to have is material objects, or art traditions etc., from Etruria agreeing with their homeland. It should be realized that up to now we were not sure about time and place of the homeland. Also, archaeological research in this area has very much concentrated on Troy, and not much has been done in the rest of the area.

17) The 1200 crisis — In 1200 the whole Mediterranean was in commotion; the Mycenaean and Hittite worlds, between which the Tyrsênoi lived, disappeared. So this fits very well in the general picture. (That this was the setting of the migration of the Etruscans has been assumed by many earlier scholars.)

18) The ten saecula — As to the time, it has been argued that the Etruscans thought that their world would last ten saecula (Briquel 1999, 58; Pfiffig 1975, 159ff.). The way of

²⁹ A glance at the map makes it probable that these people came by sea, not from the north, from the Urnfield culture (which are mostly Indo-European peoples). — Proto-Villanova is characterized by the transition to cremation. This is indeed found often in Asia Minor, cf. Mountjoy 1998, 37a, 53b; Jansen 1995, 1126.

counting provides several problems, however. The eighth saeculum ('lifetime', not a 'century') ended in 88 B.C., the ninth in 44 B.C.. The sixth and seventh would have lasted 119 years, the fifth 123. If one assumes 119 also for the eighth saeculum we arrive at 568 for the end of the fourth.³⁰) The first four would have been hundred years each. This is clearly a guess because there was no accurate memory. If we accept it, we arrive at 968 BC. Now we do not know from when one started counting. This might have been a decisive victory over the Umbrians, or a kind of unification of the Etruscans, or the founding of an important city. It could well be that this was some 200 years after the arrival of the Etruscan, which would take us to 1168 BC. It is clear, however, that there are many uncertainties in this reckoning (if the first to fourth saecula consisted of shorter periods, the date of 968 could be a hundred years later. Not much value can therefore be attached to this argument.

19) The famine — Herodotus states that the reason for the departure of the Tyrsēnoi was a long famine. This has been identified as the famine about 1200. Drews (1992, 14ff) denies that there was a famine in this time, but he has to admit that the pharaoh sent grain to help the Hittites. That seems sure enough evidence. A. Kuhrt (1995, 391) says: "There is evidence that in the reign of Merneptah (1214-1204) the Hittite empire suffered from a serious famine..." It is very obvious to identify this with the famine in Herodotus.

20) The sea-peoples — I have nothing to say about the possibility that the Tyrsēnoi are mentioned among the Sea-peoples. Amélie Kuhrt (1995, 386-393) thinks that the concept has been greatly overestimated, and that only peoples near Egypt were concerned. Her conclusion is that the turmoil caused by the 'Sea-peoples' was "one of the *signs* of general collapse and disintegration, but not its cause." But that was evident, I think: people don't migrate without a compelling cause; but such a movement could become itself a cause, e.g. for further movements and destructions. She says that the inscriptions of the pharaohs contain much rhetoric. But when he says that Hatti and Arzawa (= western Asia Minor) were affected, that the islands were in turmoil, would that be just rhetoric? The phenomenon as a whole stands, it seems; the problem is the details: which peoples partook in which movements? In our case, as the Lukka are mentioned (which were very probably the Lycians), the Tyrsēnoi may have been involved as well. So the question is whether the *T(w)r(w)š*, mentioned by Merneptah, were the Tyrsēnoi. We have no confirmation, but it seems quite possible.

21) The journey — About the voyage, we know from the abundant finds of ceramics in the 13th century, that the Mycenaean knew the sea-route to Italy. Still, the distance and the fact that a considerable portion of a people is concerned, remain remarkable. The first comparable movement is that of the Phoenician colonies, from 900 B.C. on, but these were smaller, and it was 300 years later. On the other hand, man occupied Crete at least in 6000 BC. (The islands Fiji, Samoa and Tonga in the Pacific were reached in 1200 BC.)

22) The Umbrians — Pliny (3, 112) states that the Etruscans conquered 300 cities from the Umbrians (*Trecenta eorum oppida Tusci debellasse reperiuntur*). This clearly refers to the 'Landnahme'. It is confirmed by the river Umbro

(Ombrone), which flows in its full length in Etruscan territory. The river will have given its name to the people, or *vice versa*. Anyhow, the river will have flowed in Umbrian territory; so the Etruscans must have pushed the Umbrians out.

23) Sergestus — See section 4. on Aeneas.

[24) See Add. I.]

Conclusion

The conclusion is that the evidence that the Etruscans came from Asia Minor is overwhelming: their name (*Tursēnoi-Etrusci*); the fact that Tyrsēnoi are still living there in classical times (the eastern Tyrsēnoi); their language (Lemnos; Plakiê and Skylakê; the possible connections with Lydian); the names of their leaders (Tarchon; Nanas); their religious beliefs (Tarchon; the triumphus-complex; the double axe; the *camillus* complex and the fact that the cult of Samothrake was of Tyrrhenian origin); the epigraphical evidence (Tyrsēnoi east of Lydia); the fact that they were seen as strangers; the archaeological evidence that a new people arrived around 1200; the fact that around 1200 the whole eastern Mediterranean world was in commotion; perhaps their mention among the Sea-Peoples; the date that roughly agrees with the Etruscan 'belief' that their people would live ten saecula; the famine mentioned by Herodotus, identified with that around 1200; the statement that they conquered 300 Umbrian cities and the Umbro-argument; the fact that Toscana is not a 'Rückzugsgebiet'. [And that the Pelasgian allies of Troy in Homer were 'Etruscans'.] It is no longer possible to ignore the evidence; it must be accepted that the first remarkable high civilization in Italy was essentially developed by an 'oriental people' (Piganiol). The evidence is limited because we have no written texts of the people itself (the inscriptions don't tell much and we can hardly read them), and our first information dates from about 450 BC (Herodotus), i.e. 750 years after the migration. We shall now see that Herodotus' statement that they came from Lydian territory, is literally true, and that this confirms that it is an old tradition, because neither Herodotus nor his informants (probably) could understand it (as Lydians in historical times did no longer live in the area).

2.2 The Tyrsēnoi in classical times

When we look at the places where Tyrrhenians are attested in classical times we find them, as was long since recognized, in the extreme north-west of Asia Minor, on the islands and on the continent east of the Hellespont; see the map. I first follow the list given by Brandenstein 1943 col. 1912-14.

On the islands:

- Lesbos; (he mentions also Samos because the brother of Pythagoras had the name Tyrsēnos, and their father came from Lemnos; however, this may mean only that one individual arrived at Samos);
- Lemnos. Tyrrhenians on Lemnos are confirmed, of course, by the famous inscription and by numerous references in the literature. It is argued that the Tyrrhenians arrived here only late. But they may well have come from some place nearby. Thus Hellanikos (FGH 4, 71) tells us that they came from Tenedos (see De Simone 1996, 73). Thus I add Tenedos (though it may

³⁰) Pffiffig's alternative ("wäre es für uns näherliegend") is without any value.

be that we should strike Lemnos in that case). As I argued in 2001, the Tyrrhenians were probably pushed out of their lands, and wandered along the coasts and islands to find a place to settle, but it seems that they were time and again expelled and then had to find other dwelling places; for the parallel of the Lelegians see Bryce 1986, 31.

- Imbros.
- Samothrake; Hdt. 2, 51 mentions Pelasgians here, which were Tyrsēnoi; see below and cf. 2.1 on the Kabeiroi.

In Thrace:

- two people called Maron are considered Tyrrhenians because of their name; again this can be individual people.

In Macedonia:

- the supposed mention has appeared wrong; see below on Plakiê and Skylakê;

In Attica:

- Athens; the story of the Tyrrhenians being expelled to Lemnos is considered a propaganda-story by many scholars. The idea that Hyttenia was equivalent to Tetrapolis and shows Etruscan *huth* ‘four’ is probably incorrect. *Huth* probably did not mean ‘four’ (cf. Steinbauer 1999a, 97, 430). Cf. also Furnée 1972, 193. Anyhow, Athens is not relevant if we look for the possible homeland of the Tyrsēnoi.

So far Brandenstein. But there is more:

- Chalkidike, the peninsula of Akte, is inhabited by Tyrrhenians; Thuc. 4. 109, 2. [See Add. II.]
- Kyzikos was once Tyrrhenian; Konon FGrH 26 F1 (= Phot. Bibl. 186, 41); see e.g. Lochner-Hüttenbach 54f..
- the case of Plakiê and Skylakê is rather complicated. The two small places east of Kyzikos are mentioned by Herodotus (1, 57). Inquiring about the Pelasgian language, he states that these two villages have the same language as the city of Krêstôn. However, Dionysius of Halikarnassos (1, 29, 3) cites this passage but has Krotôn instead of Krêstôn (which is found in all manuscripts of Herodotus). The problem has been hotly debated, but Briquel 1984, 101-140 convinced me that Krotôn is the correct reading. Meant is the Etruscan city of Cortona in Etruria. First, (1) there is no *town* Krêstôn (only a region Krêstônikê with villages); then (2) the form Κρηστ-ωνιῆται is abnormal, whereas Κροτωνιῆται is the normal formation; (3) the statement that the city is ὑπὲρ Τυρσηνῶν gives awkward problems in the case of Krêstôn, whereas for Cortona it is very apt: it means ‘north of (or: beyond) the Etruscans’, i.e. on the northern boundary of Etruria proper. (4) Also Herodotus does not further mention Tyrsēnoi in the Aegean area. That means that Tyrsēnoi in Herodotus are always the Etruscans in Italy, so we must read Krotôn here. So far Briquel, but there is more. (5) Another argument is that there is no further evidence for Pelasgians between Thessaly and north-western Asia Minor with the islands (= the Tyrrhenian area). Then, (6) the tekst with Krêstôn makes

no sense in itself. It says: the language of Plakiê (and Skylakê) is the same as that of of Krêstôn. But nobody knows anything about the language of Krêstôn. Why should Herodotus give this reference which is of no use? He could just as well have said that you have to go to Plakiê if you want to see that the language is not Greek. If we read Krotôn, however, the statement is informative: the language of Plakiê is the same as that of Cortona, which is Etruscan. And everybody knew that Etruscan was not Greek, i.e. βαββαρικόν. Then again, (7) Herodotus is talking of people that (still) exist and can speak, but there is no evidence that there were in his time still Pelasgians alive in continental Greece: they were a people of the past. Herodotus is talking of Pelasgians in Italy, i.e. Etruscans, which were very much alive. Further, (8) nowhere else is it mentioned that Pelasgians and Tyrrhenians live side by side. What has always been a rather embarrassing bit of information

The inevitable conclusion of this reading is that in Plakiê and Skylakê (a language close to) Etruscan was spoken. In the next chapter, Briquel admits this in a footnote (145 n. 28: “On connaît les diverses explications (faits de substrat, traces de migrations) qui ont été avancées pour rendre compte de la présence d’un parler étruscoïde à Lemnos. La constatation d’Hécatee, dans l’antiquité, [to whom Herodotus’ statement about Plakiê and Skylakê is probably due] relevait un fait parallèle.” (On p. 144 with note 21 Briquel argues for the reliability of the observation.) Note that the two villages are exactly in the region which I identified as the original home of the Etruscans. The testimony is of essential importance: the eastern Tyrsēnoi speak Etruscan. It is a second testimony of the same type and importance as the Lemnos inscription. And it will hardly be possible to maintain that here too (beside Lemnos) Etruscans from Italy had settled: again these people are clearly a relic of the past, a remnant of a disappearing population.

The search for the Tyrsēnoi is hampered very much by the question of the relation between the names Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians.³¹⁾ Some Greek authors say that they must be kept apart (Dion. Hal. 1, 29), others say that they are one and the same (Hellanikos FGrH 4 F 4 = Dion. Hal. 1, 28, 3; Philochoros of Athens FGrH 328, F 99 quoting Hyginus). So much is clear that there was confusion among the ancient authors; and it is also clear that in some cases ‘Pelasgians’ refers to

³¹⁾ The Pelasgians, and their relation to the Tyrsēnoi, are still much of a puzzle. It is clear that the Pelasgoi were a non-Indo-European people which the Greeks met, in Thessaly, when they entered Greece. It seems that their name was later used simply for the old inhabitants of Greece, or at least large sections of them. I consider the possibility that the Pelasgians in Asia Minor were also just a non-Greek people, whether they were related to the continental Pelasgians or not. In the beginning the Tyrsēnoi were simply called Pelasgoi (thus Hellanikos F 4 = Dion. Hal. 1, 28, 3: τοὺς Τυρρηνοὺς φησι Πελασγοὺς πρότερον καλουμένους). In this way the origin of the idea of the Etruscans being Pelasgians becomes clear. Then it becomes understandable that one can also call the Tyrsēnoi Pelasgians, simply because they were a part of them. The more precise name Tyrsēnoi became only known and used later, when it became clear that they were a separate entity, especially after the Greeks got acquainted with the Etruscans. (One might compare Morocco, of which the inhabitants are Arabs; but one learns only later that a large part of the population is Berber, with a different language and different traditions.) Then the ‘confusion’ about these names is understandable. — The stories about Pelasgians sailing from Greece to Asia Minor may all be phantasy. [See now Add. II.]

Tyrrhenians. (The term Pelasgians is much more frequent than the term Tyrsēnoi.) So in some cases Tyrrhenians may be meant with the term ‘Pelasgians’ (in the foregoing I have only cited cases where the term Tyrsēnoi is used — exceptions indicated). Thus Homer mentions Pelasgians as confederates of Troy in B 840-843. They probably lived near Larissa near Hamaxitos, in the south of the Troas. [See Add. I.] — It is stated that Besbikos, a small island in the east of the Propontis, was called after a Pelasgian (St. Byz. s.v.).³² — In Apollonius Rhodius 1, 1024 the Argonauts, returning to the Doliones, by which they had been received hospitably, were taken for Pelasgians. If here Tyrrhenians were meant, it is interesting that it happened east of Kyzikos (where Tyrsēnoi are attested). — Pelasgians are also mentioned for Antandros (Konon FGrH 26 F 1; see Lochner-Hüttenbach 54f). However, according to Strabo Alkaios called it a city of the Leleges. As in Homer Leleges lived in Pedasos (a little west of Antandros), we are here already in Lelegian territory, and no longer in the land of the Tyrsēnoi.

If we admit that *all* Pelasgians of Asia Minor were Tyrsēnoi (see the last note), we have to add (LH refers to Lochner-Hüttenbach) Chios (LH 40) and Samos (LH 59) and, according to Menekrates of Elaia (= Strabo 13, 3, 3; LH 28) the whole coast north of Mykale (the peninsula opposite Samos). As to Samos, Lochner-Hüttenbach mentions that there is no evidence except the mention of (a) Pelasgian Hera. It seems not probable that here too Tyrsēnoi were found, as these regions lie past Antandros, which was probably Lelegian, as we just saw.³³

We saw that in all cases where Tyrrhenians are mentioned, it concerns the extreme north-west of Asia Minor, in fact the Troas and the land east of it down to the Gult of Kios (in the farthest south-east of the Sea of Marmara), and the islands west of the Hellespont, including Lesbos. As Herodotus’ statement (that they came from Lydia) caused difficulties, scholars were uncertain about the original home of the Tyrsēnoi, and it was thought that the actual Tyrsēnoi mentioned in classical sources might have come there secondarily. There is, however, no indication that this is correct; they could as well have stayed in their own land, or moved to places near by. This is what I suggest, as now it appears that this area was Lydian territory. [See the first two addenda.]

2.3 *The ancient testimonies*

A proof that my view is correct is found in one of the basic texts concerning this problem, Dion. Hal. 1, 27. This text, the so-called ‘anonymous version’, is slightly more trustworthy than that of Herodotus; see e.g. Briquel 1991, 44f; Briquel

thinks that it is the Lydian version; *ibid.* 14.³⁴) Though always cited on this point, it has probably always been misinterpreted. This wrong interpretation was easily made, almost necessarily, and the right interpretation could hardly have been found hitherto.³⁵)

Dionysios says: “They say that Tyrrhenos was the leader of this colony; τοῦτον δὲ Λυδὸν εἶναι τὸ γένος ἐκ τῆς πρότερον Μηονίας καλουμένης...” (“he was a Lydian by birth from what was formerly called Maeonia”). Because there was no other option, this was interpreted as: he was a Lydian from the country (of Lydia), which was formerly called Maeonia. This is improbable. Not only would Greek have expressed this in another way (e.g.: from Lydia/his country, (which was) formerly called Maeonia), but in this interpretation the statement would have been quite superfluous: all well-educated readers of Dionysios knew that Lydia was formerly called Maeonia, as they knew their Homer. It would have served no purpose for the story to recall this antiquarian fact. That this view is right, is confirmed by Herodotus (1, 94), who in his story left out the word Maeonia, no doubt because he did not find it relevant; and that is because he did, and could, not know that it was relevant. What Dionysios’ text says is: “He was a Lydian by birth, from the [land] formerly called Maeonia.”³⁶) This means that there was a land Maeonia (which is not Lydia, otherwise he would have said that), from where Tyrrhenos went to found the colony. So there was a, further unknown, country Maeonia from where (the Lydian) Tyrrhenos came. In classical antiquity it was no longer known what country this was. It is now obvious that it is the country which I called ‘old Maeonia’, the former land of Māsas. Dionysios repeats a few lines later that Herodotus says “that the migration of the Maeonians to Italy” etc. (while Herodotus did *not* use the term ‘Maeonians’). Note again that it is not stated that the *Lydians* went, but the Maeonians, which is apparently essential. That Dionysios says “remain in the country”, is a consequence of his ignorance of the facts; so while writing he slips back into his own view of history. The story of the hunger could be fiction: it is common insight that you only leave your country if there is not enough food.³⁷) But we have seen (2.1) that there is historical evidence for famine.

The tradition that the Tyrsēnoi departed from Maeonia is strong. Cf. e.g. Isidorus, *Étym.* XIV, IV, 22, who carefully distinguishes between Lydi (who derive their name from a king Lydus) and Maeonia: *Item et Tyrrhenia a Tyrrheno, Lydi fratre, qui cum populi parte de Maeonia venit ad Italiam.* (Vergil too uses Maeonia, e.g. 8, 499.)

³⁴) One indication is that this text has the form Μάσνης, discussed in note 3. — As to Dionysios’ view that the Etruscans were autochthonous, Briquel (1993, esp. p.20-35 and 192-220) shows that his view was inspired by a preconceived idea (that Rome was of Greek origin, so the Etruscans should not be, nor Pelasgians (from Greece) or Lydians (which are too close to the Greek world). The view was perhaps inspired by Syracusan writers, who propagated it for political reasons.

³⁵) Only Hanfmann, 1960, 570 n. 3, asks the essential question (about Hdt. 1, 94): “Es ist nicht klar, wo diese Lyder [from whom the Tyrsēnoi sailed to Italy] ansässig waren.”

³⁶) I cite the translation by Cary in the Loeb edition, 1968, with a single alteration: I say ‘land’, where he says ‘district’, for Carey did not think of a different country; the Greek text implies γῆ ‘land, earth’.

³⁷) Especially in Lydia droughts, which cause famine, are well known. Dussaud (1958, 89-111) has a chapter called: “Sécheresses et séismes, fléaux de la Lydie.” He then gives an example of his own time.

³²) With Besbikos compare for its formation the Hittite land Karkisa-.

³³) The only other interesting statement I found is LH 42, speaking about the Homeric Pelasgoi in the Troas: “these Pelasgians were annihilated by the Aeolians”, which is a historically most interesting statement. It is once stated that the Doliones were Pelasgians (LH 18, Ephoros FGrH 70 F 61), but this will be due to a confusion; see above in the main text. — Thus it is said that Pitane (east of Lesbos, north of Phokaia) was enslaved by the Pelasgians and later freed by the Erythraeans. The name then became proverbial for happiness following misfortune. Zenobius V 61, who cites Alkaios and Hellanikos. If the town Pitane is meant, this would point to battles; see Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960, 5 and 101f. However, it is much more probable that it refers to a woman (who was taken by pirates); otherwise one would have expected for Πιτάνη εἰμί rather Πιτανναίος.

The fact that these stories mention Maeonia implies that we have to do with an old tradition. For it was not clear to people at that time what it meant: If it was just a synonym for Lydia, why use consequently this synonym? And if Maeonia was something different, they could not understand it, because the only other meaning of Maeonia was an inland part of the country, which makes no sense. (It may be noted that the area indicated by Starke as Māsas, which I suppose to have been old Maionia, has no name in the classical period: it lies in Phrygia ad Hellespontum, Bithynia and Mysia.)

Our solution also solves a strange problem. Lydia has always been a landlocked country. The Mermnads repeatedly attacked the Greek cities (on the coast). “Yet, they never seem to have held a single port for their own use.” (Pedley 1968, 47). “Es ist nahezu ungläublich, dass die Lyder die Dardanellen in ihrem Machtbereich hatten und doch an diesem Schlüsselpunkt keinerlei befestigte Seestützpunkte anlegten.” (Hanfmann 1960, 517f.) This is confirmed by the anecdote in Herodotus (1, 27), where Bias dissuades Kroisos to build ships to attack the islanders. It would be as stupid as when the islanders would try to attack the Lydians with cavalry. The point is that the Lydians had no experience with ships, just as the islanders had no experience with cavalry (the Lydian cavalry was a dreaded weapon). The fact is also noted by Sakellariou (1958, 430). He observes that Greek writers about the Ionian colonization never mention Lydians and concludes that they did not live near the coast. This is confirmed by Pherekydes (ap. Strabo 14, 1, 3 (cf. 7, 7, 2), who says that the coastal areas south of Ephesos were inhabited by Carians, north of it by Lelegians. “Les traditions locales des diverses villes ioniennes ne mentionnaient donc pas les Lydiens parmi les peuples qui ont précédé les Grecs dans ces lieux.” So Drews 1992, 30 is right when he says: “More incredible <still> is that an inland people gripped by famine should have walked to the coast, built a fleet, embarked on a thousand mile voyage to an entirely unfamiliar land, and appropriated it.” On the reference to the Lemnos inscription he answered: “Lemnos is not Lydia.” Hencken (1968, 612, 614) suggested that the Tyrsēnoi came from the north, settled on the Lydian coast and then fled again (to Italy) because of the famine. This is a possible, but not an attractive solution for which there is no evidence at all.

The conclusion is that the Tyrsēnoi/Etruscans are said to come from Maeonia, which must be old Maeonia/Māsas on the Propontis, otherwise it would either have made no sense (as classical Maeonia was not on the sea) or it would have been useless to speak of Maeonia instead of Lydia. This is confirmed by the fact that the remaining Tyrsēnoi lived in this area, not even close to that of classical Lydia.³⁸⁾

³⁸⁾ The story that the Tyrsēnoi came from Mysia, from king Telephos, differs only little from the Lydian version. In my view, Mysia was also Lydian at an early period, so the story could contain historical elements. Schachermeyr 1929 preferred the Mysian version, but I did not find any argument to do so. The story is late; it is given by Lycophron, Alex. 1245-1249; it is mentioned by Dion. Hal. 1, 28, 1 (and indirectly by Plutarch, Rom. 2). Lycophron took it from Timaeus; Schur 1921, 137-143. “Wir können nicht ahnen ob Timaios hier etruskische Ueberlieferung folgt, oder welchem westgriechischen Autor er diese interessante Nachricht entnommen hat” (p. 141). It seems more probable that the story is secondary. Cf. Scheer 1993, 71-152 on the secondary character of myths about Telephos. One might think that the name Rômê, daughter of Telephos, brought Mysia into the story, but she is not always his daughter. On the other hand,

2.4 Historical considerations

We can be short on the historical aspects. As has been supposed by several scholars, it was around 1200 that the Tyrsēnoi emigrated, after or in the time of the great troubles. The famine will have been one of the causes, the arrival of the Phrygians (and others?) will have been the more direct cause. They may have participated in the movements of the Sea-peoples. And some survived in their homeland or moved to places nearby (the islands), perhaps moving on more than once.

The sea route to Italy was already known to the Mycenaean. The Etruscans may already have had one or more bases in Italy, before larger numbers of them went over, as W. Henkelman suggests to me. This is the normal process with colonies: you go to lands which are known to you or your fellow men. They may already have been traders, perhaps they were after the minerals from Elba. “dès l’âge du bronze, les navigateurs en provenance du bassin oriental de la Méditerranée auraient fréquenté les côtes étrusques [better: of Tuscany] à la recherche de ces matières premières.” (Briquel 1999, 109f).

3. TROY

3.1 The language of the Trojans.

After the names of Priamos and Paris had been identified as Luwian, in any case Anatolian (Watkins 1986), and the recent find of the Luwian seal in the city of Troy, it was believed that the Trojans spoke Luwian. Latacz (2001, 142), however, warned that it is not yet certain that this was the native language of the population. The seal only proves that Luwian was used in the highest levels, perhaps as a diplomatic language; thus Neumann (above 1.4). The new perspective makes another answer possible. When the Lydians crossed the straits to enter those fertile lands, it is quite probable that they, like the Phrygians later, occupied the whole area, from the Aegean coast to the east. In that case the inhabitants of the Troas might have been speakers of the (later) Lydian language. We have seen that Neumann, on linguistic grounds, had reached the same conclusion, that it is possible that the whole north-west spoke Lydian.

However, there is still another possibility that might be considered, i.e. that they were Tyrsēnoi. See the following section.

3.2 Taruisas

It remains unclear how the name ‘Troy’ came to be used for the country of Ilios, whereas in the Hittite text *Truisas* is on the same level as *Wilusas*, i.e. (probably) a town with its country, a city-state. I suggest the following course of events. There was beside *Wilusas* a town/city-state *Truisas*. Later this town disappeared — it is no longer mentioned in the later Hittite texts, e.g. the Alaksandus-treaty — but the name remained and was used for the land only (as the town had disappeared). The Greeks understood it in this way that *Truisas* was the name of the country of *Wilusas*, and

we saw that Lycophron stated that Tyrrhenos was accompanied by Tarchon, which must be an old element Both would be sons of Telephos. (For the variation Troas/Mysia one is reminded of Troy/Teuthrania).

consequently limited Wilusas to the city alone.³⁹) (Latacz 2001, 124f too thinks in this vein.) Of course the two towns must have been close to each other. In the Hittite text, Truisas was mentioned directly after Wilusas, supposing that you come from the south; this means that Truisas must have been located further, and as west is excluded because of the sea, it must have been to the east. But I cannot suggest where it was. Near Abydos, Lampsakos?

Against the new background that the Tyrsēnoi lived (in any case) directly east of the Troas (but also to the south: Add. I) the idea that *Truisas* (if it must be thus read) was the town of the Tyrsēnoi becomes very attractive. This is an old idea (e.g. Rhys Carpenter 1946, 63), but earlier there was no geographical evidence in favour of it. Now the geography makes the suggestion more likely. However, I proposed that *Tru-isa-* has to be analyzed as indicated, with *Tru-* = Τρω-. This differs from the element *Turs-* in *Tursēnoi*. We have *-trus-* in *E-trus-ci*, *E-trur-ia*, where the metathesis may have been caused by the prefixed *e-*; the origin of the *e-* is unknown. As the interchange *Trus-/Turs-* has not been explained with certainty, one might think of an original *Trs-*. Thus the resemblance is only superficial, and the analysis forbids the equation.

One step further is that the Trojans were themselves Tyrsēnoi, and spoke Tyrrhenian. (Aeneas would then simply have been a Tyrsenian/Etruscan; see section 4.) We have seen that the Tyrsēnoi lived on both sides of Troy, east and south (for the latter see Add. I). However, if Homer's Pelasgians were Tyrsēnoi (see 2.2), they were distinguished from the Trojans — at least by Homer. Of course, the Trojans may still have been closely related to the Tyrsēnoi. But it is also possible that Wilusas was Lydian, conquered by the invading Anatolians — at whatever date.

3.3 The Trojan War

Archaeology shows that Troy was destroyed and afterwards occupied by people from Europe. We know that around 1200 peoples from Europe entered Asia Minor (Phrygians, Mysians, Thyni and Bithyni; though some may have come at a later date). Strabo mentions that the Phrygians 'took' (or 'killed') a Trojan king. Of course they also took the city. The Phrygians are found afterwards in the whole area of the Troas (Phrygia hellespontica) and the lands east of it. There is no archaeological evidence that Greeks took part in these events; in any case they did not settle there at the relevant times. On the other hand we have the strange story that the Greeks, going to Troy, erred [sic!] and went to Teuthrania, in which expedition Achilles and Patroklos had similar roles as in the Iliad. It is improbable that one made *after* the Iliad a second story which largely imitates it, but was presented as an error! An obvious conclusion is that in the oldest story the Greeks went to Teuthrania, and that this expedition was only later transferred to Ilios, because Ilios was much more considerable, a much greater undertaking, giving much more fame. This agrees with the fact that Achilles took (in the Iliad, I 328) 23 cities, all in the extreme south of the Troas, which is near Teuthrania; it seems unconnected with Troy. He operated probably from Lesbos; it is

³⁹) In Homer, Τρωίη is the name of the country. The cases where it is used for the town are clearly secondary (if one studies the formulaic technique).

now agreed that this island (in Hittite *Lazpas*) was the first Greek position in the north. Thus e.g. Rhys Carpenter 1946, 50-65 (cf. further e.g. Kullmann 1960, 189-203). The Trojan War, then, remains a historical problem. (It is a pity that these doubts are not discussed by Latacz 2001. See e.g. Der Kleine Pauly s.v. Troia. A good modern survey of the problems in Bryce 1998, 392-404; also Jansen 1995.)

4. AENEAS

My proposal may be relevant to the origin of the Aeneas legend. It has long since been considered that the story was based on a story about Etruscans coming to Italy. The earliest information is from Hellanikos (FGH 4 F 31), who says that Aeneas went to Pallene, the western peninsula of Chalkidike, where he would have died. Note that the Tyrsēnoi also settled in Chalkidike. The major new element is that the hero would have come from an area surrounded by Tyrsēnoi, who went to Italy. One might think that this fact made it easier to assume that Aeneas too went to Italy. On the question recently Horsfall 1987b.

The other fact is that the name *Sergestus*, of a prominent friend of Aeneas, is probably identical with Lydian *Srkastu-* and Phrygian *Surkastos*, as dr. M.P. Cuypers suggested to me (see 1. 4). The point is how Vergil got this name. It is evident that he used it because it fitted in the story. But it is excluded that he got it from Lydia or Phrygia, or Asa Minor in general. So he must have got it at home, from a source that was acquainted with Etruscan traditions. This means that the name was known to the Etruscans (or those who studied their traditions).⁴⁰) Above I proposed that it lives on in Etr. *Sekst-alu-*.⁴¹) So we should be aware that the Aeneis may contain more old elements.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In the foregoing I have presented my idea as it gradually developed, but it can also be presented in the following way.

The tradition about the Etruscans says that they sailed away from Maeonia, not Lydia. In classical times (from Homer on), however, Maeonia lay east of Sardes, that is in the middle of a big continent, completely land-locked. This absurdity could not have been created in classical times, so it must refer to an older situation. This is in itself a strong argument in favour of the tradition. We need a Maeonia-on-Sea. Where can this area have been? We need a territory where both Tyrsēnoi and Lydians lived, on the sea-shore. There are several indications in classical sources that Lydians lived in more northern regions. The Tyrsēnoi, i.e. the remnants of this people — as we have always known — lived in the farthest north-west of Asia Minor. Of course, they could have lived originally elsewhere, but it is easier to assume that they always lived in the neighbourhood. This has never led to any proposal, because it seemed so far from

⁴⁰) There may be more in the Aeneid. Thus dr. Cuypers reminds me of the Trojan Amycus, whose name is that of Amykos in Apollonius Rhodius, but who must come from another tradition, as Amykos is an unsympathetic figure.

⁴¹) Mention may be made of the Maxues, a people in Lybia, who would have come from Troy; Hdt. 4, 191; cf. Wainwright 1959, 207.

(classical) Lydia; and it seems never to have occurred to scholars that the Lydians may have lived earlier (also) in other places (or it was not connected with the Etruscan problem). The two meet, then, on the shores of the Troad or Phrygia Hellepontica. Here, then, we must look for the Etruscan homeland. The tradition has now been confirmed since we have found a way to locate a region on the sea where both Lydians and Tyrsēnoi lived.

Note that until now we have not invoked the etymology of the term Maeonians, nor a theory about the position of Māsas. However, at this stage we assume that Maeonia lay near the shore of the Troas or east of it. Now we bring in that Māsas is placed either in the north or in the south of western Asia Minor. If we accept the northern position, the old etymological connection of this country *Mā-sa-* with Greek *Mā-iones* becomes very attractive. If Māsas must be located, as Starke thinks, east of the Troas, in Phrygia Hellepontica — Mysia — Bithynia (the borders/frontiers of these countries were quite unclear as Strabo says), it would confirm our findings.

Part of the Lydians then, like the Tyrsēnoi, left old Maeonia (perhaps at the same time) and settled east of Sardes, in classical Maeonia.

It is also clear why this solution was not found earlier. In the first place, there was the opposition to the idea of oriental origin of the Etruscans. In the course of time, however, the arguments in favour of it have become so much stronger that the conclusion can no longer be avoided. Further, one did not really consider the possibility of Lydians elsewhere than in classical Lydia. But most of all perhaps one did not realize the meaning of Maeonia. It was 'evidently' understood as (classical) Lydia. Already Herodotus did so, as he does not mention Maeonia but speaks only of the Lydians; that he meant classical Lydia is shown by the fact that he mentions Smyrna as the harbour from where the Etruscans sailed. So Herodotus put us on the wrong track, but we can hardly reproach him for that.

We can consider it certain that the Tyrsēnoi, who became the Etruscans of Italy, lived on the south coast of the Sea of Marmara and the Hellespont, and in the Troas. Archaeological research can now be more concentrated and study possible connections with the Proto-Villanova culture. But especially in the field of religion the study of Hittite texts and what we know of western Asia Minor may give new insights. I hope that now the gate has been opened which gives a view on the background of the Etruscans, which will be relevant for both the history of the Etruscans and that of western Asia Minor.

[Now this view is definitely confirmed by the fact that Homer mentions Pelasgians in the Troas who spoke (a form of) Etruscan; see Add. I.]

ADDENDUM I. 'ETRUSCANS' IN HOMER

In 2.2 above I argued that the Pelasgians mentioned in Homer could well be Tyrsēnoi. We know that the term 'Pelasgians' is sometimes used for Tyrsēnoi, and that Hellanikos states that this term was earlier used for the Tyrsēnoi. We now know that the Tyrsēnoi lived in the area near Troy.

Homer mentions Pelasgians in Asia Minor, fighting on the Trojan side, three times: B 840-843, K 429 and P 288. Only two names are mentioned, the brothers Hippothoos and

Pylaios. The first name is clearly Greek, perhaps also the second.⁴² We get two further names when it is stated that they are sons of Lēthos the Pelasgian, son of Teutamios (Λήθοιο Πελασγοῦ Τευταμίδαο). The last name is much discussed (see e.g. Lochner-Hüttenbach, index; his identification of Pelasgian as Illyrian, however, must be rejected. On **teutā* as a non-Indo-European word see Beekes 1998). For *Lēthos* the connection with Lēthē, river of the Underworld (see Wathélet 1988) is just a wild guess. The name occurs only here, and may therefore be of interest. It has not been observed, however, that the name is found in Etruscan, where we find *leḡe*. The fit is complete: Etr. *-e* is the equivalent of Gr. *-os* (cf. Gr. *Daidalos* — Etr. *Taitle*; Lat. *Aulus* — Etr. *av(e)le*); Etruscan has no long vowels. The Etruscan name was studied by Rix 1965 (see the index; together with its derivations *leḡi*, *leḡia*, *leḡai/e*, *leḡiu*, *leḡiunia* it is discussed 23 times). One of the derivations occurs in an archaic inscription, and the origin of the name is unknown (Rix 349 n. 152a).

The consequences of this identification are considerable. It confirms that 'Pelasgians' can stand for Tyrsēnoi, that Tyrsēnoi are mentioned in the eighth century BC. in Asia Minor, that the Tyrsēnoi are Etruscans, that they lived near Troy: they are mentioned directly after the (five groups of) Trojans in the Catalogue of Trojans, which means that they lived next to them, probably to the south, near Larisa in the Troad (see above 2.2). The possibility that Pelasgians here means another minor population like the Leleges (see 2.2) is refuted by K 429, where they are mentioned beside Carians, Paeonians, Leleges, and Kaukōnes. It is not clear to what time it refers. It dates at least back to the time of Homer, i.e. the eighth century, but it may well be a fact preserved by the tradition from much older times. In principle it may go back to the 14th century. Hippothoos may be part of an old tradition, as he plays a part in the death of Patroklos (P 219ff), a story which may have a long tradition.

It may be unnecessary to stress that this fact in itself definitely proves that the Etruscans came from Asia Minor, near Troy.

ADDENDUM II. THE PELASGIANS.

The vexed question of the Pelasgians, and their relation to the Tyrsēnoi, has now become largely clear, I think. (The conclusions of Lochner-Hüttenbach cannot be maintained.) Cf. 2.2 above and Add. I. The view that in Hdt. 1, 57 Krotōn must be read (see 2.2) has solved many problems.

1. The term Tyrsēnoi, when used of Asia Minor and the adjacent area's, is unambiguous.
2. The term Tyrsēnoi used of inhabitants of Italy means Etruscans.

⁴² However, Pylaios occurs only here (and as epithet of Hermes; and for the inhabitants of Pylos). But there is a mountain called Pylaion on Lesbos. In antiquity one supposed that the mountain was called after this leader (Strabo 13, 3, 3). It is rather the other way round. In Asia Minor (not in Greece) personal names are often identical with the names of geographical entities, like rivers; see Sundwall 1913, 271. For a mountain we have the parallel of Kadmos. (Therefore, and for several other reasons, Kadmos is a local figure, which has nothing to do with Phoenicia.) It seems possible, then, that this name too is Tyrrhenian. Note that Πυλαίμενης three times (beside three other instances) is found in Paphlagonia. One is reminded of Etr. **pule*, which is supposed by *pulia* (Rix, 1963, 241, 352).

- 3a. The term Pelasgoi used for continental Greece originally indicated a non-Greek population which the Greeks found in the north of Greece, notably Thessaly, when they settled there.
- 3b. The term was extended to the non-Greek inhabitants of north-western Asia Minor, of which the Greeks learned the proper name, Tyrsēnoi, only later. Thus Homer and Herodotus use 'Pelasgians' for the Tyrsēnoi in Asia Minor. 'Tyrsēnoi' then meant the Etruscans of Italy. Later authors still do the same incidentally, but soon it was no longer clear to them whether they were one and the same people or different peoples. (In fact, this question has not yet been decided — the two peoples may be closely related, but they can as well have nothing to do with each other. In any case the Tyrsēnoi were seen as a particular group within the concept of 'Pelasgians'.) The confusion led to such statements as that which says that Kyzikos was first Pelasgian and later Tyrrhenian (Konon FGrH 26 F 1; see Lochner-Hüttenbach 55; wrong 123).
- 3c. We have seen that sometimes Pelasgians in Asia Minor rather refers to Leleges. (St. Byz. e.g. s.v. Ninoe speaks of Pelasgian Leleges in Caria.) So apparently the term was extended to other minor peoples living along the coast (of more important peoples the appropriate name was known earlier, as in the case of the Mēiones).
- 3d. Because the term 'Pelasgians' was also used of the Tyrsēnoi, the term 'Pelasgians' also meant Etruscans. Later the Greeks thought that they were a people different from the other Etruscans (which is historically wrong, but some writers thought so). Also it was thought, because of the term 'Pelasgians', that these Etruscans came from continental Greece (again this is historically wrong, but some writers had this concept).
- 3e. The term will have been extended to all the non-Greek populations in Greece, in which process the term Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος will have played a role.
- 3f. The situation in Attica is very complicated, but it seems that much that is said about it by ancient authors is phantasy (for the greater part inspired by Athenians interests).
- 3g. In Lemnos there were only Tyrsēnoi.
- 3h. In a late stage 'Pelasgians' was used for the Greeks! In Latin writers, e.g. Vergil, this was very frequent. So the term came to indicate the opposite of what it was in origin. This is however, not as strange as it seems. All designations of the Greeks in origin indicated non-Greek peoples: Achaioi, Danaoi, Hellēnes, and lastly *Graeci*.
4. 'Pelasgians' in Crete will be the designation of the original inhabitants of the island (the Minoans), for which no name was known. (Eteokrētes seems the term for them, but the term is probably only used of a small group. The same is clearly true of 'Kydōnes'. The last two terms found in τ 177.) The stories about Pelasgians sailing to Crete may well be largely phantasy (though it is historically quite possible that Pelasgians fled from Greece before the Greeks).
5. It should be realized that in historical times there were no (real) Pelasgians (in continental Greece) alive anymore. Tyrsēnoi were still alive in Plakiê and Skylakê and in Akte.

Against this background Thuc. 4, 109, 4, which is much discussed, is perfectly clear. A problem was that one wanted to connect it with Hdt. 1, 57, where one read Κρηστων-; this

can now be forgotten. The text says: τὸ δὲ πλεῖστον Πελασγικόν, τῶν καὶ Λῆμόν ποτε καὶ Ἀθήνας Τυρσηνῶν οἰκησάντων. An exact translation is that of Braun: "das., in der Hauptsache aber aus Pelasgern, und zwar jenen vormals auf Lemnos und in Athen heimischen Tyrsenern besteht." ("mostly Pelasgian(s), [i.e. people] of the Tyrsēnoi, who...") So Thucydides speaks of Tyrsēnoi as a part of the Pelasgians. That is, he still calls them Pelasgians, as did Herodotus, but he uses also the specific name Tyrsēnoi, and he is the first to do so.

APPENDIX III. THE DATE OF THE EASTERN TYRSĒNOI.

The suggestion that the eastern Tyrsēnoi were Etruscans from Italy is still used to discredit the eastern origin of the Etruscans. This most improbable idea must be given up if the Tyrsēnoi can be attested in the east at an early date. The date suggested for the arrival of Etruscans is mostly 700. I think there are various indications that the Tyrsēnoi always lived in the east.

In the first place they are in the beginning called Pelasgians, a name which is usually associated with very old, autochthonous inhabitants. It would be very strange if this name was used for people who had arrived in historical times.

Then, it is most improbable that we would have no mention of their arrival. The Greeks were discussing the history of the Pelasgians and they are mentioned very often. If one part of them, those in Asia Minor, would have arrived after Homer, we would certainly have notes about it.

There are at least three positive indications that they lived there for a very long time. 1) Above we already mentioned the cult of the Kabeiroi (2. 1, nr. 13). It may be well to cite Herodotus (2, 51) on this point. Discussing the Pelasgian origin of the ithyphallic statues of Hermes, he says: "Anyone will know what I mean if he is familiar with the mysteries of the Cabiri — rites which the men of Samothrace learned from the Pelasgians [= Tyrsēnoi], who lived in that island before they moved to Attica, and communicated the mysteries to the Athenians. This will show that the Athenians were the first Greeks to make statues with the erect phallus, and that they learned the practice from the Pelasgians — who explained it by a certain religious doctrine, the nature of which is made clear in the Samothracian mysteries." Such a religious doctrine is not taken over from people who just arrived.

2) There are legends around Kyzikos (easily found in Lochner-Hüttenbach; from Dei(I)ochos, p. 7; from Agathokles (of Kyzikos), p. 20 and Konon (of Kyzikos), p. 54). They say, amongst other things that Kyzikos, king of Pelasgians in Thessaly, a son of Apollo (for Apollo in Asia Minor see above 2. 1, nr 13) was driven away by the Thessalians [I think that the Thessalian origin is later fiction] and founded Kyzikos. When the Argonauts came he was (accidentally?) killed. The Argonauts are supposed to have sailed before the fall of Troy. This cannot, of course, be taken simply as historical fact, but it shows that one thought of these events as terribly early, almost as early as a thing can be in the Greek world. Note that the authors from Kyzikos would certainly have been aware of recent events, if the Tyrsēnoi arrived there after Homer.

Then there are the Etruscans in Homer (Add. I). Homer tells about the fall of Troy around 1200, but his data can be both older and younger, but not from after 800. Note also that Homer, B 840, talks of *φύλα Πελασγῶν*. the tribes, the race of the Pelasgians, which hardly points to recent, commercial settlers.

The 'theory' of Etruscans from Italy settled in Asia Minor is utterly improbable (see also 2.1 beginning).

Bibliography

- Beekes, R.S.P., 1998, The origin of Lat. *aqua*, and of **teutā* 'people'. Journ. of Indo-European Studies 26, 459-466.
- Beekes, R.S.P., 2001, Review De Simone 1996. Mnemosyne 54, 359-364.
- Brandenstein, W., 1943, Tyrrhener in RE II 7.
- Braun, Th. Thukydides, Geschichte des Peloponnesischen Krieges. Leipzig.
- Briquel, D., 1984, Les Pélasges en Italie. Rome.
- Briquel, D., 1991, L'origine lydienne des Etrusques. Histoire de la doctrine dans l'antiquité. Rome.
- Briquel, D., 1993, Les Tyrrhènes, peuple des tours. Denys d'Halicarnasse et l'autochtonie des Étrusques. Rome.
- Briquel, D., 1999, La civilisation étrusque. (sine loco)
- Bryce, T.R., 1986, The Lycians I. Copenhagen.
- Bryce, T.R., 1992, Lukka revisited. Journ. of Near Eastern Studies 51, 121-130.
- Bryce, T.R., 1998, The Kingdom of the Hittites. Oxford.
- Carpenter, R., 1946, Folk tale, fiction and saga in the Homeric epics. Berkeley-Los Angeles.
- Chantraine, P., 1933, La formation des noms en grec ancien. Paris.
- Cook, A.B., 1914-1940, Zeus, a study in ancient religion. Cambridge.
- Cuypers, M.P., 1997, Apollonius Rhodius Argonautica 2. 1-310. A Commentary. Diss, Leiden [to be published shortly]
- Del Monte, G.F., Tischler, T., 1978, Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. (Répertoire Géographique des textes cunéiformes, 6 (Suppl. 6/2 1992.) Wiesbaden.
- Draws, R., 1969, The Fall of Astyages and Herodotus' Chronology of the Eastern Kingdoms. Historia 18, 1-11.
- Draws, R., 1992, Herodotus 1.94, the drought ca. 1200 BC, and the origin of the Etruscans. Historia XLI, 14-39.
- Dussaud, R., 1958, Prélydiens, Hittites et Achéens. Paris.
- Endres, F.C., Schimmel, A., 1995 (= 1984), Das Mysterium der Zahl. München.
- Germain, G., 1954, Homère et la mystique des nombres.
- Goetze, A., 1924, Kleinasien zur Hethiterzeit. Heidelberg.
- Gusmani, R., 1980/81, Note d'antroponomastica lidia. Incontri linguistici 6, 21-27.
- Gusmani, R., Polat, G., 1999, Manes in Daskyleion. Kadmos 38, 137-162.
- Haas, O., 1966, Die Phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler. Sofia.
- Haas, V., 1991, Geschichte der hethitischen Religion. Leiden.
- Hanfmann, G.M.A., 1958, Lydiaka. Harvard Stud. in Class. Phil. 43, 65-88.
- Hanfmann, G.M.A., 1960, Sardis und Lydien. Akad. der Wiss. u. Lit. in Mainz. Abh. Geistes- u. Sozialwiss. Klasse 1960, 497-536.
- Hawkins, J.D., 1984, Tarkasnawa King of Mira: 'Tarkondemos', Bogazköy sealings and Karabel. Anat. Stud. 48, 1-31.
- Hencken, H., 1968, Tarquinia, Villanovans and early Etruscans. Cambridge Mass.
- Horsfall, N.M., 1987a, Corythos re-examined. In: J.N. Bremmer — N.M. Horsfall, Roman Myth and Mythography. Bulletin of the Instit. of Classical Studies, Suppl. 52.
- Horsfall, N.M., 1987b, The Aeneas-legend from Homer to Virgil. In the same volume as the preceding, 12-24.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph.H.J., 1961, The Luwian population groups of Lycia and Cilicia aspera during the hellenistic period. Leiden.
- How, W.W., Wells, J., 1928, A Commentary on Herodotus. Oxford.
- Jansen, H.G., 1995, Troy: Legend and Reality, in: Sasson, J.M. (ed.) Civilizations of the Near East, 1121-1134. New York.
- Jin Jie, 1994, A complete retrograde Glossary of the Hittite language. Public. de l' inst. hist.-archéol. néerland. de Stamboul, LXXI.
- Kretschmer, P., 1896, Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache. Göttingen.
- Kretschmer, P., 1927, Mythische Namen. Glotta 15, 74-78.
- Kuhrt, Amélie, 1995, The ancient Near East. London/New York.
- Kullmann, W., 1960, Die Quellen der Ilias. (Hermes Einzelschr. 14) Wiesbaden.
- Latacz, J., 2001, Troia und Homer. Der Weg zur Lösung eines alten Rätsels. München/Berlin.
- Lochner-Hüttenbach, F., 1960, Die Pelasger. Wien.
- Malay, H., 1999, Researches in Lydia, Mysia and Aiolis. Erg. zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris 23. Oesterr. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., Denkschriften 279.
- Meister, K., 1921, Die homerische Kunstsprache. Leipzig.
- Melchert, H.C., 1994, Anatolian historical morphology. Amsterdam/Atlanta.
- Mountjoy, P.A., 1998, The East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface in the Late Bronze Age: Mycenaean and the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa. Anatolian Studies 40, 33-67.
- Neumann, G., 1999, Wie haben die Troer im 13. Jahrhundert gesprochen? Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumsgeschichte NF 23, 15-23.
- Oettinger, N., 1978, Die Gliederung des anatolischen Sprachgebiets. Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachwiss. 92, 74-92.
- Pallottino, M., 1947, L'origine degli Etruschi. Rome.
- Pedley, J.G., 1968, Sardis in the Age of Croesus. Norman (Univ. of Oklahoma Press).
- Pfiffig, A.J., 1975, Religio etrusca. Graz.
- Ramsay, W.M., 1883, The Graeco-Roman Civilization in Pisidia. Jour. of Hellenic Stud. 4, 23-45.
- Rix, H., 1963, Das etruskische Cognomen. Wiesbaden.
- Robert, L., 1937, Etudes anatoliennes. Paris.
- Sakellariou, M.B., 1958, La migration grecque en Ionie. Athens.
- Scheer, Tanja S., 1993, Mythische Vorväter. Zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte. München, Editio Maris.
- Schachermeyr, F., 1929, Telephos und die Etrusker. Wiener Studien 47, 154-160.
- Schubert, R., 1884, Geschichte der Könige von Lydien.
- Schur, W., 1921, Griechische Traditionen von der Gründung Roms. Klio 17, 137-152.
- Schwyzler, E., 1938, Griechische Grammatik. München.
- De Simone, C., 1993, Atti Taranto.
- De Simone, C., 1996, I Tirreni a Lemnos. Firenze.
- Sittig, E., 1929, Zum campanischen Bande des CIE., in: Atti del primo congresso internazionale etrusco, 250-253. Firenze.
- Sommer, F., 1937, Ahhijavā und kein Ende? Indogerm. Forschungen 55, 169-297.
- Starke, F., 1997a, Troia im Komplex des historisch-politischen Umfeldes Kleinasien im 2. Jahrtausend. Studia Troica 7, 447-487.
- Starke, F., 1997b, Sprachen und Schriften in Karkamis, in: B. Pongratz-Leisten et al. edd. Ana šadī Lanani lu allik. Beiträge zu altorientalischen und mittelmeerischen Kulturen. Festschrift für W. Röllig. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 381-395/
- Steinbauer, D., 1999a, Neues Handbuch des Etruskischen. St. Katharinen.
- Steinbauer, D., 1999b, Review De Simone 1996. Kratylos 44, 201-203.
- Sundwall, J., 1913, Die einheimischen namen der Lykier nebst einem Verzeichnisse kleinasiatischer Namenstämme. Leipzig. (Klio Beih. 11).
- Talamo, C., 1979, La Lidia arcaica. Bologna.
- Torelli, M., 2000, Gli Etruschi. Venezia.

- Troia — Traum und Wirklichkeit. Ausstellungskatalog Stuttgart, Braunschweig, Bonn 2001-2002. Stuttgart 2001.
- Versnel, H. S., 1970, *Triumphus*. Leiden.
- Wainwright, G.A., 1959, The Teresh, the Etruscans and Asia Minor. *Anat. Stud.* IX, 197-213.
- Wathelet, P., 1988, *Dictionnaire des Troyens de l'Iliade*. Liege(?).
- Watkins, C., 1986, The language of the Trojans. In: *Troy/Trojan War* ed. M.J. Mellink. Bryn Mawr. 45-62
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. von 1899 *Lesefrüchte*. *Hermes* 34, 203-230.

University of Leiden, April 2002

Robert BEEKES

Corr. Note 1 and Note 2 see Col. 441, 442.

the names. So I suggest that *Tolumnius* derives from an Anatolian *Tunumna* (for the dissimilation *n-mn* > *l-mn* c.f. Hitt. *lamniya* < **namn-*, c.f. Lat. *nomen*, Goth. *namnjan*). Cappadocian, the language of the non-Indo-European names in the texts of the Assyrian merchants in Nesa (near Kayseri) is far to the east. That it had cognates in the west may appear from the following; Pithanas, king of Kussara, who conquered Nesa (and whose son Anittas founded an empire that was the predecessor of the Hittite Empire; we have his account in Hittite) has a name for which Indo-European origin has not been demonstrated (Neu, *Der Anitta-Text*, 1974, 130 n. 319, 133f; cf. Bryce 1998, 14ff, 36ff.) I suggest that we find this name back in the place name Pitane (Πιτάνη), on the west coast, north of Phokaia and east of Lesbos. It occurs also as a woman's name (cf. n. 33).⁴³ The name recurs as the name of a town, village that formed Sparta (Pitana). This would mean that the word belongs to the substratum language in Greece and Anatolia, which provided so many placenames.⁴⁴ — Another western cognate of a Cappadocian name gives Furnée, *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*, 1972, 321, who derives the name *Tektaphos* from Capp. *Tatkapu/Tatkipuš*. (The name may be directly relevant here, because the variant *Tektamos* is also given as *Teutamos*, which is the father of the Pelasgian Lethos in Homer, whom we identified as Etruscan (Add. D).⁴⁵) — It is clear that if the origin of *Tolumnius* proposed here is correct, this is in itself enough to prove the Anatolian origin of the Etruscans.

* *
*
*

* *
*

Corr. Note 1. Hittite texts mention a land Hapalla. This has been identified with *καβαλίς*, a region in north-west Lycia, east of the Kibyris. It contains the towns Oinoanda, Balbura and Bubon. Hdt. 7, 77 says that they are Maiones, Strabo 13, 17, 1 that it was dominated by the Lydian Kibyrites. Here again there is discussion on the position of Hapalla. Starke, on his map put it in the north, directly south of Mâsa. If this is correct, it too moved southward, and it would be a good parallel to what I supposed happened to Mâsa.

Corr. Note 2. Kronasser, *Etymologie d. heth. Sprache* (1966) 113 compares the suffix *-umn-* in e.g. the Cappadocian personal name *Tunumna* with the pre-Greek *-υμν-* (cf. e.g. *Μήθυμνα*, city on Lesbos) and Etruscan e.g. in *Tolumnius*, Etr. *Tulumne* (king of Veii). Now if we are allowed to compare the suffixes, we are also entitled to compare

⁴³ Zgusta, *Kleinasiatischen Ortsnamen*, 1984, 498 thinks that the name was brought by the Greeks, "s. die verschiedenen Personen in der griechischen Mythologie, die diesen Namen tragen." This is improbable. There are only two such persons, one being an Amazone, from whom the town would have its name; so this is the same name as that of the town, and more probably the Amazone was created to explain the town's name. The other is a figure in Lakonia which is no doubt the same name as that of the Spartan village mentioned in the text.

⁴⁴ I do not believe in Furnée (1972, 322, see the text) who assumes 'bewegliche Dentale', cited by Neu, to connect the name with Hitt. *Piha*, *Pihanu*. The *t* may have been lost before the *h*, but I rather think that the *h* was lost after the *t*.

⁴⁵ Lochner-Hüttenbach, 1960, 152 thinks that the forms with *Tekt-* are due to influence of *τέκτων*; I think that this is most improbable. The variation *Tektamos/Tektophos* is typical for the Greek substratum language (Furnée 1974, 222ff; cf. *gérupa* — Arm. *kamurj*, Beekes, Glotta, to appear); the *-φ-* is confirmed by the variant *Κέρκαφος*. This variation testifies to the originality of these forms. I do not know what the relation is between *Tekt-* and *Teut-*, for which I know no parallel.