



SERTA INDOGERMANICA

Festschrift für

GÜNTER NEUMANN

zum 60. Geburtstag

Herausgegeben von

JOHANN TISCHLER

Günter Neumann

Innsbruck 1982

SERTA INDOGERMANICA

Festschrift für

GÜNTER NEUMANN

zum 60. Geburtstag

Herausgegeben von

JOHANN TISCHLER

Innsbruck 1982

eingebettet ist, darauf, daß das ihm unterliegende Appellativum *κάρπυος* schon für das Ende des 6. Jhs. v. Chr. voraussetzen ist, eben für die Zeit, in der es zu den ersten Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Griechen und dem persischen Weltreich kam.

Buying and selling in Hieroglyphic Luwian

J. D. HAWKINS — A. MORPURGO-DAVIES

University of London — University of Oxford

The large majority of the surviving Hieroglyphic Luwian texts are written on rock faces or dressed stone monuments, a fact which, while it has transmitted them to posterity, has also dictated their character in restricting their scope to documents for which permanency was sought. They consist largely of dedications to the gods of buildings, images, or cultic objects by the rulers and their subordinates, who may include in the text historical or autobiographical details; they are "display inscriptions", official or personal works of piety and memorials, which cannot normally be characterized as practical documents. Only the six ASSUR letters written on lead strips represent a genre of documents so common on cuneiform tablets, and offer us the opportunity of a first glimpse into the everyday language. The recent discovery of the KULULU lead strips provides us with evidence for an even more commonplace genre of document, hitherto unknown in Hieroglyphic, the economic text or inventory. Obvious links between these texts and a group of the stone inscriptions have induced us to reconsider the latter, and these in their turn have provided us with the starting point for a preliminary inquiry into some basic terms of the economic vocabulary of Hieroglyphic Luwian. What emerges is how much remodelling occurred in the vocabulary of late Anatolian and at the same time how much commercial and linguistic "give and take" there was among the Indo-European and non-Indo-European populations of First Millennium Anatolia. We hope that these observations may have some interest for Günter Neumann and may serve as a small token of appreciation for the fundamental work he has done in all things Anatolian and for the warm friendship and generosity he has always shown us.

This small group of stone monuments which are linked to each other by common characteristics and share some features with the Kululu economic documents can now be singled out from the other stone texts as documents of practical import. The three most evidently related Hieroglyphic inscriptions are CEKKE reverse, CARCHEMISH A 4a, and TÜNP¹. The links between the first two are immediately apparent, since they are both documents written under the authority of Kamanis, king of Carchemish. Yet even without this information, the documents would be associated by certain internal characteristics which may also be seen on TÜNP, an inscription not explicitly connected with Carchemish or Kamanis (the preserved portion of the text does not indicate the name of the principal(s) or the city or

¹ The system of abbreviations follows that of J. D. Hawkins, A. Morpurgo Davies, G. Neumann, "Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: new evidence for the connection", *Nachrichten Ak. Wiss. Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1973, Nr. 6, pp. 143—97 [*HHL*], at p. 145 note. The transliteration is based on the values tabulated in *An. St.* 25 (1975), 153—55; note also the new transcription PITHOS for the logogram Laroche, *HH* no. 337.

country of origin). It may be, however, that Tūnp, lying south of Gaziantep on a tributary of the Sajur, was within the territory of Carchemish.

The feature which all three texts have in common, and which may serve here as a starting point for discussion, is the occurrence of the logogram *III*, no. 344. On CEKKE, reverse, and TUNP, this determines the verb CUM-*ni* “*344” (-) *i(-ia)-sa/sá-*, which Meriggi has already interpreted as “acquire, buy from” (“acquistare da”): *Manuale* II/1, 109; II/2, 102). If, as argued below, we may identify this verb with the CUM-*ni i-ia-sa* (2nd pers. sing. imperative) of ASSUR letter g, we may both establish that the CEKKE / CARCHEMISH A 4a verb is spelt in full and offer contextual support for Meriggi’s interpretation. We shall also find that the elucidation of this verb facilitates the interpretation of a number of other points common to the inscriptions under consideration.

1. ASSUR letter g, “iii”:

- (i) *wa/i-za ka-pá² + ra/i-à + ra/i-na* |REL-*i-ha* |VIA-*wa/i-ni²*
 (ii) *ni-pa-wa/i-tu-u²* |NEG₂² |*à¹-sa-ti*
 (iii) |*à¹-wa/i* |*á-pi* |DOMUS-*ni-wa/i + ra/i-ia* |["X"]*á-mu + ra/i[- ?]-lá/i/u + ra/i²*
 |*à¹-sa-ti*
 (iv) |*w*|*a/i-tu-u-wa/i-na* |CUM-*ni²* |*i-ia-sa*
 (v) *wa/i-za-na* |VIA-*wa/i-ni-i*
- (i) “Send to us any KAPAR(AR)A!
 (ii) Or (if) to you there is not (any),
 (iii) and there is (one) to [Par]niwaras the AMURALURA,
 (iv) buy it from him,
 (v) (and) send it to us!”

(i) *ka-pá² + ra/i-à + ra/i-na*: on ASSUR letter f, iv, towards the end the topic is of objects called *ka-pá² + ra/i-zi* (acc. pl.), and it was pointed out (Bossert, *Or* 20 (1951), 72ff.; *An. St.* 25 (1975), 141f., citation 45), that since what is apparently the same word occurs here on letter g, “iii”, this passage is likely to form a continuation of the context of letter f, iv, and therefore g, “iii” is to be taken as g, i. The form *ka-pá² + ra/i-à + ra/i-*, as against *ka-pá² + ra/i-*, could represent an extension of the root, but could perhaps simply represent *kaparra/i-* (cf. KARATEPE Hu./Ho. 280, *i-zi-ia + ra/i-ru = i-zi-ia-ru*).

(ii) Cf. *An. St.* 25 (1975), 135 citation 27 b.
-tu: for the identification of this as 2nd person sing. pronoun, see now A. Morpurgo Davies, *KZ* 94 (1980), p. 89f. and note 9.

(iii) |DOMUS-*ni-wa/i + ra/i-ia*: Parniwaras was the addressee of Taksalas in ASSUR letter b, which suggests the restoration here as plausible (so Meriggi).

|["X"]*á-mu + ra/i[- ?]-lá/i/u + ra/i²*: probably the full writing is preserved, if we may suggest a large logogram occupying the top of two columns. The word may be better taken as a title applied to Parniwaras than as the subject of the sentence.

(iv) CUM-*ni i-ia-sa*: Contextually, if the addressee has no KAPARA, but Parniwaras has, and the addressee is to send it to the writer, the verb must express the means by which the KAPARA passes from Parniwaras to the addressee. A more specific sense than “take (away) from” ((*arha*) *ta-*) is probable, and “buy from” may well be argued to be among the most plausible interpretations. If this meaning is the right one, the dative (*-tu-*), which indicates the original owner, and the presence of CUM-*ni* before the verb are easily understood. Not all verbs which mean “buy” are

construed with a “from” preposition as in English: cf. e.g. French *acheter à*. The Akkadian construction *itti PN šámu*, “buy with someone” (for “buy from someone”) provides a close parallel for CUM-*ni*. See below p. 104.

The specific interpretation “buy from” rather than simply “get”, etc. goes well together with our understanding of the character of the documents represented by CEKKE, reverse, and TUNP, and is also strengthened by the observation of a contrasting phrase on CARCHEMISH A 4a.

2. CEKKE, reverse, 1—2 (collated):

- (i) *ka-ma-ni-sa* IUDEX-*sa* *kar-ka-mi-sà*(URBS) VITELLUS.ZÁ(URBS) REGIO.DOMINUS
sa-sá-tú + ra/i-sa ¹*ka-ma-ni-sa* FRONS-*lá/i/u-sa* *mi-ta₄* *ka-ma-na-na*(URBS)
 URBS + *MI-ni-na* *ka-na-pu-wa/i-na-za*(URBS) CUM-*ni* (“*344”) *i-sa-ta á-pa-sa-ti*
 *314(-) *sa-tá-na-ti*
 (ii) *wa/i-ma-za* 600 ASINUS (ANIMAL)-*i-za* DARE-*tá*
- (i) “Kamanis the ruler, country-lord of the cities Carchemish (and) . . . , (and) Sasturas, prime minister of Kamanis — the city Kamana from the Kanapuweans they bought by/with their . . . ,
 (ii) (and) to them they gave 600 donkeys”.

Cf. *An. St.* 29 (1979), 161 and note 59, but emend the translation there offered as above. For this and the following citation, cf. Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, 102.

CEKKE is the record of a settlement of fifteen pairs of fathers and sons by Kamanis and his prime minister in the city (re)named Kamana. The above interpretation would indicate that they acquired the city or the land by purchase from the men of another city. The general purchase price was the 600 donkeys recorded, and the following five sections record further donations (payments) to named individuals (see below, citation 6).

3. TUNP, 1—2:

[. . .] *ara/i-FRATER-la-ia* CUM-*ni* *sà-ta-ti-wa/i + ra/i-sa-na* (“TERRA”) *ta-sà-REL + RA/i-na* CUM-*ni* (“*344”) *i-ia-sá-ta*

“[. . .] from [?]aratalas(?) Santatiwaras’ son he/they bought the land.”

Cf. A. Morpurgo Davies, *An. St.* 30 (1980), p. 128, citation 18. It is remarkable that CUM-*ni* occurs twice (cf. *An. St.* loc. cit.), once in the typical collocation of a postposition and once as a preverb. This points to a verbal phrase CUM-*ni iyasa-* construed with a postpositional phrase “dative + CUM-*ni*”; the pattern is similar to that of Latin *cum aliquo colloquor* or *cum aliquo mihi commercium est*.

TUNP then, written on a small blackish boulder from which up to half of the inscription has been destroyed, is a *kudurru*-like inscription which records, on this interpretation, a land-sale. The identity of the purchaser(s) is lost. For discussion of a further part of the text, see below, citation 8².

² It is possible that a further instance of the verb *i(ya)sa-* occurs in ASSUR letter f iv (*i-sa-u-ta*), but both form and context require further discussion.

As we mentioned before, the interpretation of CUM-*ni* (*344)*iyasa-* as “buy from” receives further support from the contrast of usage seen in the other attestation of the logogram on CARCHEMISH A 4*a*, where it determines a different verb.

4. CARCHEMISH A 4*a*, 1:

- (i) [za-ia]-wa/i [DOMUS]-na [... ..]x-sa- [INFANS](-)ni-za-sa- ka-ma-ni-[i]a
 REX¹-ti CUM-*ni* ARHA¹ (*344)DARE-ta
- (ii) ka-ma-ni-sa-pa-wa/i PRAE-ri + i-SARMA-ma-ia- |FRATER-la-sa-na [INFANS (-)ni-za-
 pa-pi-x¹-ti-sà-na- NEPOS CUM-*ni* ARHA (*344)DARE-ta
- (i) “[These hou]ses [PN₁ PN₂]’s son sold to Kamanis the king,
 (ii) but Kamanis sold (them) to Parisarmas (his?) brother’s son, Papi^x’tis’ grandson.”

This damaged text is inscribed on a broken basalt “drum”. The published drawings of it are not very clear, nor are adequate photographs of the whole inscription available (Carchemish I, plate A 4*a* + II, plate A 18*g** + III, plate AB). A further join, formerly A 18 d* 2 has recently been made: see now Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, 108—111, referring to his earlier work in *St. Cl. Or.* 2 (1953), 28ff., and *Quaderni dell’Istituto di Glottologia*, Bologna 3 (1958), 13f. Collation is needed to establish the present suggestions for reading based on an old squeeze.

Beginning of the text: the transition from line 2 to 3 seems to be at the right hand-edge of the well preserved part, where (DEUS)kar-hu-ha-sa (l. 3) may well be supposed to follow directly from (“CAELUM”. DEUS)TONITRUS-hu-za-sá (l. 2). This, if correct, would indicate that the text begins immediately above in l. 1 with the signs ... wa/i ... na, for which in fact a very plausible restoration is [za-ia]-wa/i [DOMUS]-na, “these houses”; cf. the part of the curse which refers to the object of the transaction. l. 2: —

za-ia-pa-wa/i-ta DOMUS-na- REL-sa á-mi-i [INFANS-ni-i] [NEPOS-si] [NEPOS-REL-la]
 ARHA¹ [CAPERE-i]a

“Whoever [take]s away these houses from my son, grandson (or) great-grandson...”

(ii) For the -(a)san datives of the patronymic adjectives, see now A. Morpurgo Davies, *An. St.* 30 (1980), p. 126, citation 10; note revised reading of name.

Papi^x’tisan hamsi: Kamanis was almost certainly the son of Astiruwas (*An. St.* 29 (1979), 157—162), so that his brother’s son should be Astiruwas’ grandson. Can we suppose that someone else’s nephew is meant, or that Kamanis nephew’s maternal grandfather is named?

CUM-*ni* ARHA *344(-)DARE/pi-: Meriggi recognizes the logogram as “contrattare” or “contrastare, avversare”, and regards -pi- as phonetic complement. We propose to recognize the verb as DARE/pi(ya)- and have transliterated it accordingly. arha piya- is extremely likely to have acquired a specific meaning “sell” (for arha see below p. 101): in writing, this would be expressed by a logogram/determinative reserved for verbs which imply some form of contractual agreement. The preverb CUM-*ni*, which we found earlier in the construction PN (dative) CUM-*ni* ... CUM-*ni* iyasa-, links this verbal phrase with that discussed above and may express, here as there, the contractual side of the agreement (see below, p. 104).

On this interpretation CARCHEMISH A 4*a* is a sale contract for some “houses” (estates?), another kudurru-like document. For its further provisions, see below, citation 7.

The texts discussed above have led us to the identification of two verbal phrases CUM-*ni* iyasa-, “buy” and (CUM-*ni*) arha piya-, “sell”. The latter phrase, however, invites the comparison of a curious graphic usage in BULGARMADEN.

5. BULGARMADEN, 1—4:

- (i) |á-wa/i-ta á-mi-i |DOMINUS-ni-i wa/i + ra/i-pa-la-wa/i-ia- |REX-ti-i |“BONUS”
 (-)wa/i-sà-za-ha
- (ii) wa/i-mu-u (DEUS)MONS-ti-na |mu-ti-na pi-ia-ta
- ...
- (iii) |á-mi-ha-wa/i-ta- |DOMINUS-ni-na wa/i + ra/i-pa-la-wa/i-na- |wa/i-su-u u-sa-nu-sá-ha
- (iv) |á-pá-sa-pa-wa/i-mu-u |(ASINUS)tara/i-ka-sa-ni-ia-za “*91”(-)za-la-la | (“*257. DARE”)pi-ia-ta-
- (i) “I was good to my lord Warpalawas, the King.
 (ii) He gave to me Mount Muti.
 (iii) I treated well my lord Warpalawas.
 (iv) and the latter “gave” to me ZALALA for the mules.”

What is of interest here is the determination of the verb piya- in (iv) with a compound logogram, marked as such, of a “block + a giving hand”, i.e. *257 + DARE. This writing, in determining the common verb piya-, offers the only parallel to (*344)pi(ya)-, and one wonders whether, like *344, the logogram *257 + DARE was intended to mark a special semantic nuance of piya- such as “selling”³.

The type of compound logogram which might be expected to be used to convey a nuance of “selling” etc. might be “money + giving hand” (cf. (“MANUS + CULTER”) kwir(?)-, “cut” — *An. St.* 30 (1980), 143), and one is reminded of the Akkadian periphrasis for “sell”, ana kaspi nadānu (“give for silver”). The possibility that the logogram *257 might stand for “money” and specifically “silver” should be tested by reference to its other occurrences. This takes us back to our original texts CEKKE, CARCHEMISH A 4*a*, and TÜNP, where we find a set of passages which do indeed point in this direction.

³ The “block + giving hand” recurs in the writing of three words which should be mentioned here, although they are of little assistance in establishing the meaning. The difference in two of the words is that, unlike the BULGARMADEN writing, the “giving hand” is not repeated; thus instead of (“*257. DARE”) DARE/pi-, one finds *257. DARE- or (*257)pi-. It seems likely, however, that the two words are to be associated with the fuller writing. The forms are (*257)pi-ia-¹ tara/i¹-[...] (CARCHEMISH A 12, 4—5), of uncertain case, morphology and syntactic function; and *257(-)pi-si-ia (CARCHEMISH A 11*a*, 5) in the clause “and they were the first (FRONS-lá/i/u) PISIYA”, which follows descriptions of building works. Both forms could perhaps be taken as derived from piya- (cf. Hier. pi-ia-za, “gift(?)”, and pi-ia + ra/i-ia-za (KULULU lead fragm. 1); also Lyc. piyata-, “gift” — Laroche, in *RHA* 31 (1973), 94f., and *Fouilles de Xanthos* VI (Paris, 1979), 107 and note 32); in both forms it is conceivable that *257 conveys the same nuance as in (“*257.DARE)piya-.

In (*257.DARE) ti-na-ta (ANCOZ, 1; cf. *An. St.* 20 (1970), 99f.) the logogram determines a different root. In the context of offerings to the gods could the word refer to tithes or financial payments?

6. CEKKE, reverse, 2—4 (collated):

- (i) |za-CRUS + RA|I-pa-wa/i INFRA¹¹-ni I “*257”-ri + i 3 SCALPRUM(-)ma-na-zi *257-za¹ wa/i + ra/i-pa-tá-sa-za |INFANS(-)ni-wa/i-za DARE-mi-na
- (ii) |há-ia-la¹ la-pa + ra/i-na-ia¹ za-za-ia-ha 4 SCALPRUM(-)ma-na-zi *257-za x-nú-hu-za-ti(URBS) DARE-mi-na
- (iii) |há-ia-la URBS + MI-ni ta-ní-mi¹ á-ha-li-ia AQUA.DOMINUS PRAE-na (PANIS.PITHOS)á-zá-li-za i-zi-ia-mi-na
- (iv) wa/i BOS(ANIMAL) 15 OVIS ka-na-pu-ia(URBS) 2 SCALPRUM-na-zi *257-za (PANIS.PITHOS)á-zá-li-sá DARE-mi-na
- (v) DOMINUS-ti-wa/i + ra/i-ia-pa-wa/i á-ha-li-sa-na PRAE-ti *179. *347. 5¹-sà-pa-sá I SCALPRUM-sa (*33)mi + ra/i-sa₅ + ra/i-zi DARE-mi-na

(Text continues directly from citation 2 above)

- (i) “(saying): ‘... 3 minas(?) (of) silver(?) to Warpatas’ sons we give,
- (ii) ... to Labarnas and Zazas 4 minas(?) (of) silver(?) from the town ...-nuhuza we give,
- (iii) ... in every town before Ahalis the River-Lord we make a feast(?).
- (iv) An ox, 15 sheep to the town Kanapu, (and) 2 minas(?) (of) silver(?), (and) a meal(?) we give,
- (v) and before DOMINUS-tiwaras Ahalis’ son MIRASARI’s of (-)WASPA of 1 mina(?) we give’.”

After the general statement that Kamanis and his prime minister gave (paid) 600 donkeys to the Kanapuwians (citation 2 (ii)), the verbs of the following clauses shift into 1st person plural present, marking a transition to direct speech, a recurrent characteristic of these documents, now seen also on the KULULU lead strips 1 and 2, which doubtless reflects the actual wording of contracts. These five clauses seem to represent further payments to individuals and groups, perhaps themselves Kanapuwians or otherwise connected with the sale (we may note that DOMINUS-tiwaras, styling himself servant of Sasturas, claims the credit for the actual erection of the monument on CEKKE obverse (cf. *An. St.* 29 (1979), 162 and note 63).

(i) za-CRUS + RA/I: quite unclear; seems to recur on TOPADA, 6 (cf. *An. St.* 25 (1975), 136, citation 31).

INFRA¹¹-ni: for the logogram *HH*, no. 57 (INFRA/SUB) the phonetic complement is normally -ta (= kata) or -na-na (= anan); -ni is unparalleled: emend to CUM¹¹-ni (*HH*, no. 58)?

SCALPRUM(-)ma-na-zi *257-za: this combination is seen also in (ii) and (iv), should probably be restored in CARCHEMISH A 4a (below citation 7 (i)), and reappears in TUNP (below, citation 8 (ii)). While the two elements seem to belong together the different endings (nom./acc. plur. MF vs. nom./acc. sing. N (?)) mark an absence of agreement.

SCALPRUM(-)ma-na: SCALPRUM, the chisel, is generally used to determine objects made of stone, the equivalent of the Cun. NA₄: thus with *kutasari-*, “orthostat”; *katina*, “(stone) bowl(s)”; (SIGILLUM)sasa-, “seal”; *wani-*, “stone (stele)”. We therefore propose here (SCALPRUM)mana-, “(stone) mina (weight)”; compare the Cun. writings NA₄ x MA.NA, “stone of x minas” (see *CAD*, s. v. *abnu* A (4), *manú* A); and for various Cun. Hittite notations of weight, see Otten, *AfO* 17 (1954—56), 128ff. An interpretation of this phrase as a unit of measure + commodity would fit well with the apparent lack of grammatical concord; cf. Akkadian x *mana kaspum*, “x minas (of) silver”.

*257-za: throughout CEKKE and TUNP the logogram is in fact *HH*, no. 257, though Laroche identifies a separate form *HH*, no. 260. The occurrence of *257 in two different types of context, where (i) it combines with the “giving” hand to determine the verb *piya*-in a context suggesting “selling”, and (ii) it follows a word tentatively identified as a unit of weight, “x minas...”, suggests that *257 represents a commodity used as a medium of exchange. The most common medium of exchange in the early 1st millennium B. C., at least to judge from Neo-Assyrian contracts, was silver, although copper too was much used. We therefore suggest that the sign *257 stands for silver (thus transliterate ARGENTUM (?)), an ingot of which it may represent. The alternative of “copper”, while possible, seems less likely: the two, three or four “minas of silver” mentioned would represent a substantial payment, while the same weight of copper would be much less significant.

We cannot assign a phonological shape to the word written with *257, but, to judge from the -za phonetic complement, it would seem to be a neuter. The Hittite word for silver has not been identified with certainty but a case has been made for it being a neuter too (cf. Laroche, *RHA* XXIV/79 (1966), 175f., and Hoffner, *JCS* 22 (1968), 41 ff.).

I “*257”-ri + i: apparently ablative case. If our interpretation of the logogram is correct, we must translate “by/with/from one silver(?)”. Can we suppose that this means one (ingot of) silver of superior weight (talent?), and that the following fragments of 3, 4 and 2 minas of silver are taken from this? For the breaking up of a (copper) talent into sections measured in minas and shekels, see Košak and Kempinski, *Tel Aviv* 4 (1977), 89 (*KUB* 40, 95 ii 13ff.). Cf. also below, citation 8 (ii).

(ii), (iii) há-ia-la: otherwise unknown word apparently acting as a conjunction in place of the usual particle chain.

x-nú-hu-za-ti(URBS): collation does not permit a certain identification of the first sign (not *pa* or *zá!*). The ablative case, “from the city x”, is of ambiguous interpretation in the context but seems to correspond to a similar usage of city-names in the ablative in the KULULU lead strips: cf. e. g. KULULU lead strip 2, entry 3: 140 OVIS 7 taruti *piyamin asahayalarati*(URBS), “140 sheep to 7 statues we give from the city Asahayalara/i”.

AQUA.DOMINUS: for this title, cf. BOYBEYPINARI I C, III B, 1 (*An. St.* 20 (1970), 82; cf. Meriggi, *Manuale* II/2, 75). It also occurs in ASSUR letter e, iii.

(iii), (iv) (PANIS. PITHOS) á-zá-li-za/sá: cf. (“PANIS. PITHOS”) á-za-li-sa, CARCHEMISH A 4a, 2, also the restoration in the same text [PANIS]. PITHOS-[li]-za (below, citation 7 (ii), (iv)). Though all contexts are very similar, and in each case *azali*-seems to be the direct object, it seems that we must distinguish the forms in -sa (both times object of *piyamin*, “we give”) from those in -za (both times object of *iziyamin*, “we make”). The combined logogram was recognized by Meriggi as indicating “food (and) drink” (but distinguish from ANNUS, i. e. *HH*, no. 336, which probably represents a pithos with a lid). Following this lead, it would be natural to associate the word(s) with Hier. *at(a)-az(a)-*, “eat” (*HLL*, 184f.; *An. St.*, 30 (1980), p. 127, note 5), though the morphology would not be easy to explain. The form in -sa would have to be analysed as *azali* + sa, (nom./acc. sing. neuter, while that in -za might be taken as an extended form *azali(ya)n* + sa > *azali(n)za*. Deverbatives in -ala- or -alli-are not registered as common by van Brock (*RHA* XX/71 (1962), 94ff., 113), nor are neuters of such forms easy to find.

Contextually, different nuances of meaning seem to be implied by the different forms and governing verbs. Proceeding from the indications of the logogram and the possible root, we may tentatively suggest: *azali(sa)*, "food, meal" (cf. Hitt. *etri-*), which is *given* to a city (Kanapu) and a person (the lord of the WASHA, see below); *azali(n)(za)*, "feast, festival", *made* for the River-Lord, Ahalis, and the king Kamanis.

(iv) DOMINUS-*tiwaraya* Ahalisan: see *An. St.* 29 (1979), 162, note 63 and *An. St.* 30 (1980), 128, citation 16.

PRÆ-*ti*: supported by collation, but unparalleled and unexpected in place of the usual PRÆ-*na/i/ia*. An attestation of SUPER + RA/I-*ti* is cited for comparison by Meriggi (see *Manual* II/1, 110).

*179. *347. 5¹-*sà-pa-sá*: undoubtedly the same word as *179.*347. 5(-)*wa/i-sà-pa* (ASSUR letter e, iii). The logogram apparently comprises the first three signs including the numeral. If ASSUR letter e provides the full phonetic spelling, the word could be identified with Cun. Luwian *waš(ša)pa-*, "garment", which might be appropriate here, where some vendors would be given money (minas of silver), others a feast and/or oxen and sheep, and another these objects. Since in ASSUR letter e the word seems to represent the direct object in the acc. sing. MF, here it must be taken as genitive dependent on *mirasari(n)zi*.

I SCALPRUM-*sa*: contextually likely to represent the same word as in the preceding sections, namely (-)*ma-na-*, "mina(?)". Here it must be a further genitive, probably dependent on (-)*waspas*. If this indeed meant "garment", we could then have "of garment(s) of 1 mina(?)". For such a phrase, cf. Cun. Hitt. : [1] TUG 7 MA.NA K.L.LAL.BI, "[one] garment, its weight 7 minas" (Hitt. Laws II, § 68).

CARCHEMISH A 4a seems to have had similar contract-like clauses stating the payment, though much has been lost in the damage to the monument.

7. CARCHEMISH A 4a, 1:

- (i) *wa/i-tu-u* 10[+ x] "SCALPRUM"[(-)*ma-na-zi* *257-*za* DARE-*mi-na*]
 (ii) [*wa/i-tu-u* PANIS.PITHOS[-*li*]-*za i-zi-i-mi-na*]
 (iii) BRACCHIUM-*lá/i/u-sa-pa-wa/i*[...
 (remainder of line 1, beginning of line 2 largely lost; text resumes with at least 5 sections listing persons)

(iv) ("PANIS.PITHOS")*á-za-li-sa-pa-wa/i* DOMINUS-*na-ni* "*419"-*sa-ha-sá*' DARE-*mi-na*

(text concludes with two sections of curse against nullification of deed)

(Text continues directly from citation 4 above)

- (i) "(who said): 'To him 10 + minas(?) [(of) silver(?) we give,]
 (ii) [and for him] a feast(?) we make.
 (iii) ..
 (iv) A meal(?) to the lord of the WASHA we give.'"

(i)–(ii): restoration, based on the similarity with CEKKE, above citation 6, is minimal; it assumes that each completely restored word would occupy one vertical column. -*tu* ... -*min*: subject (and speaker) would be Parisarmas, the purchaser; indirect object, the vendor Kamanis.

(iv): it seems probable that this is still a part of the same spoken declaration of the purchaser Parisarmas, and represents a final stage in the transaction.

DOMINUS-*nani washas*: it does not seem that *wasas* can be anything other than a genitive dependent on DOMINUS-*nani*, although unusually the *rectum* would follow rather than precede its *regens*. The term "lord/master of the WASHA" must designate some participant in the transaction, probably not Kamanis who seems to have been settled in (i)–(ii), but perhaps one who occupied a position analogous to that of the persons listed in CEKKE, citation 6 (i–v). For WASHA see below, citation 8.

TUNP offers a clause which combines I "*257"-*sa* I "SCALPRUM"(-)*ma-na-sa* with the term (*419)*washa-*, and this text, however difficult to interpret, demands consideration here.

8. TUNP, 3–4:

- (i) ("PES₂")*tara/i-pi* + *ra/i-pa-wa/i* REL-*sa*
 (ii) *wa/i-* I "*257"-*sa* I "SCALPRUM"(-)*ma-na-sa* I "SCALPRUM"(-)*ma-na-sa-ha-na* ("*419")*wa/i-sa-ha-sa*

(i), "(He) who *infringes* (this document)" points to (ii) being some penalty. The problem is to determine the grammatical structure of the clause.

I "*257"-*sa*: since we have argued that *257-*za* is nom./acc. sing. N, we must probably identify this form as genitive singular. "Of one silver(?)" recalls the phrase noted in CEKKE, above citation 6 (i), where it was suggested that this might indicate one (ingot of) silver of superior weight (talent?); perhaps the same sense is intended here.

I "SCALPRUM"(-)*ma-na-sa*, and also ("*419") *wa/i-sa-ha-sa*, could be either nominative or genitive singular. I "SCALPRUM"(-)*ma-na-sa-ha-na* on the other hand defies attempts to identify ending or suffix, and in spite of its obvious connection with the "mina", its grammatical form and syntactic function are alike obscure.

The whole sequence may be taken as a nominal sentence or as an abbreviated expression, thus perhaps: "(The) WASHA (is) ... of one (ingot of) silver (and) one mina."

(*419/420)*washa-*: the logogram has the form *HH*, no. 419 (and not *HH*, no. 420, as stated in *HH*, ad locum) in all attestations except ASSUR letter f. This word definitely appears to belong with the type of commercial context which we have been considering, since, besides the CARCHEMISH A 4a and TUNP attestations, it occurs also on ASSUR letter f in the passage immediately preceding citation 1 above. It is also found (in the context of a religious dedication) on BABYLON cup 1⁴. The assumption that *washa-* is the full phonetic writing is based on the identification with Cun. Luw. *wašha-*, yet the identity of the two, together with their meaning(s), remains to be established. The identification with Cun. Hitt. *išha-*, "lord", seems to be excluded by the contexts of the Hieroglyphic word, where a sense such as "purchase, sale, price, payment" would seem more appropriate (cf. below note 9). Further consideration of this obscure term will be necessary.

⁴ Contrary to *Glossar* and *HH*, *washa-* is probably not attested in CEKKE, since the word *476(-)*wa/i-sa-ha-na* (rev. 12) may be identified with the *476(-)*ta-wa/i-sa-ha-na* of BOYBEY-PINARI IV D + III A, and in any case seems to be an adjective, contrary to (*419/*420)*washa-*, which is clearly a noun; see now *An. St.* 31 (1981), 163f., 167f.

What precedes, if correct, leads first of all to the identification of two verbal phrases: (CUM-*ni*) *arha piya-* and CUM-*ni iyasa-isa-* to which we can attribute meanings close to — or identical with — “sell” and “buy”. The values are contextually established, but for basic elements of the vocabulary such as these, it would also be helpful to produce some comparative evidence from Anatolian or elsewhere.

The Hittite verbs for buying and selling are well known. For buying Hittite uses *waš-* and for selling *ušniya-* or *happarai-*. Both *waš-* and *ušniya-* point to an Indo-European root **wes-*⁵ and exemplify a frequent pattern for which the same root can yield verbs for both concepts (cf. Goth. *bugjan*, *frabugjan*; German *kaufen*, *verkaufen*; Cretan Greek *ἀρῆσθαι*, *ἀρῆν*), *happarai-*, on the other hand, is connected with *happar*, “business, deal”, a word which has alternatively been taken as a loan word and as an inherited formation⁶. We have little evidence for Hittite commercial language, so that it is conceivable that other synonyms were used but we cannot recognize them. The other Indo-European languages of Anatolia are not helpful; Lycian only offers some evidence for a verb *epiriyeti* to which Laroche⁷ has tentatively attributed the meaning “sells” on the basis of Hittite. For Lydian there is a very doubtful attempt to connect *happarai-* with *afaris*⁸.

In view of its ancestry it is likely that **wes-* was Common Anatolian; our evidence is so limited that we cannot exclude that it was in some way continued in Cuneiform or even in Hieroglyphic Luwian⁹. Similarly the presence of *epiriyeti* in Lycian and conceivably the Lydian evidence might point to the diffusion of this root outside Hittite. However, the history of other languages shows that the lexical field of buying, selling, and commercial relations in general is prone to a great deal of innovation and remodelling¹⁰. In Romance Latin *emere* was variously

⁵ For the Indo-European roots for buying, see E. Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* (Paris, 1969), I, 125ff.; for **wes-* in particular see most recently Szemerényi, *KZ* 93 (1979), 118ff., with references. For buying and selling in general cf. F. Rundron, “Über einige Verba für “kaufen” und “verkaufen””, *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 47 (1975), 168—71.

⁶ For a non-IE origin see e.g. Gusmani, *Il lessico ittito* (Napoli, 1968), 27 (who follows Fronzaroli, *PdP* 67 (1959), 278); for an IE etymology which connects the noun with the root of *happinant-*, “rich” and of skt. *apnas-*, “property”, cf. Tischler HEG 161 ff.

⁷ *BSL* 53 (1958), 171 f.

⁸ Cf. Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, s. v.

⁹ It is indeed possible that the root *wes-* occurred in Hier. Luwian in the noun *washa-* discussed above (citation 8). A word for a commercial transaction such as “purchase, sale, payment”, and conceivably “fine”, could fit all contexts where *washa-* occurs, and such a wide range of meanings is not unexpected in a term of this nature. At the opposite ends of the geographical, chronological and linguistic spectrum one may compare Akkadian *mahīru*, “market, business, rate, tariff, purchase, price, sale” (*CAD*, s. v.), and Old English *ceap*, Middle English *ceep*, “trade, bargain, purchase, sale, market, price, payment, fine, goods, pledge” (Bosworth-Toller, *AS Dict.*, s. v. *ceap*; B. Fehr, *Die Sprache des Handels in Altengland* (St. Gallen, 1909), passim and especially p. 5 and 59f.). Yet, as pointed out before, both meaning and etymology of *washa-* need further discussion. Hier. Luwian also has a form *wa/i-si-i* (KULULU lead strip 2, 1), which may conceivably be a verb and if so could match Cun. Hittite *waši*, “he buys”, but form and context are not sufficiently clear (see A. Morpurgo Davies, *Festschrift Szemerényi* (Amsterdam, 1980), 587).

¹⁰ For the Near East, cf. G. Steiner, *Iraq* 39 (1977), 11—17. For the Latin and Romance data, which are of considerable interest, cf. C. Beyer, *Die Verba des “Essens”, “Schickens”, “Kaufens” und “Findens” in ihrer Geschichte vom Latein bis in die romanischen Sprachen* (Diss., Leipzig, 1934), 45 ff.

replaced by Lat. *comparare* (Spanish *comprar*, Ital. *comprare*, “buy” etc.) or ACCAPTARE (French *acheter*); Slavic must have inherited the cognates of the Indo-European root **k^wriH-*, “buy” (cf. O. Russ. *křinuti*) but most Slavic languages adopted forms related to Modern Russian *kupit’*, “to buy”, which is of German origin. If so, it is not surprising to find that, in a period which must have seen considerable economic upheaval, Hier. Luwian substituted for — or joined to — the inherited forms some new verbs for the same concepts. Yet the origin of the innovations must be explained.

No great difficulty arises for “selling”. Verbs for selling are often derived from verbs for giving, sometimes in conjunction with a preverb. The connection giving-selling may be synchronically obvious as in Greek *ἀποδίδουμι* vs. *δίδουμι*, “I give”, or in Russian *pradat’* vs. *dat’*, “give”, or may be diachronically traceable as in English “sell” from OE *sellan*, “give”. As expected Old and Middle English can use the verb with the sense of both “give” and “sell”. The pattern is not merely an Indo-European one; for “selling” Akkadian uses *nadānu*, “give” which may or may not be further defined by the phrase *ana kaspi*, “for silver”. In Hier. Luwian the presence of the preverb *arha* in conjunction with *piya-* does not surprise; presumably it fulfills the same functions as Greek *ἀπό* in *ἀποδίδουμι*, and we may also notice that the phrase *arha usniya-* is frequent in late Hittite texts¹¹. The presence of CUM-*ni* before *arha piya-* is unexpected, but we shall return to it later.

If in BULGARMADEN (citation 5) *257 is the logogram for silver, the phrase ARGENTUM *piya-*, for which we cannot provide a full phonetic rendering, is likely to be a loan translation from Akkadian, a phenomenon which is not surprising in the language of trading, but which also points to a close relationship between the Akkadian and the Hieroglyphic Luwian vocabularies in this field.

“Selling” can be easily explained but “buying” is more complicated. Above we presupposed the identity of *iyasa-* and *isa-*, since a shift *iyasa-* > *isa-* causes no problems. We must now account for *iyasa-*, though the root has no obvious parallel in Anatolian.

The morphology points to a *-sa-* iterative of an *iya-* root. In Anatolian terms this reminds us of two Hittite verbs: *iyatta(ri)*, “he goes” and *iyazzi*, “he makes”.

The first verb has good cognates in Cuneiform and Hier. Luwian (*i-*, “go” and *awi-*, “come”), but there are obvious morphological and semantic difficulties if we want to connect it with *iyasa-*. First the root is **ei-/i-* and not *ya-*; the generalization of the *-a-* is secondary and typical of Hittite¹². Secondly, though verbs of movement are often related to verbs of trading, a shift “go” → “buy” is not easily paralleled. The syntax of *iyasa-* also speaks against the hypothesis: the verb is used transitively, while we would expect “go” or one of its compounds to be intransitive.

The alternative suggestion which links Hier. Luw. *iyasa-* with Hitt. *iya-*, “make” does not at first sight look any more promising, but a closer look may show that it is not too difficult to make a case for it.

The Cun. Luwian equivalent of Hitt. *iya-* is *aya-* or *a-*; Hier. Luwian also preserves *aya-* or *a-*¹³, though the normal verb for “to make” is *izi(ya)-*, which may

¹¹ Cf. e.g. R. Werner, *Heth. Gerichtsprotokolle* (StBoT 4) 24, 30, 32, 44.

¹² Cf. Oettinger, *Stammbildung*, 348f. and 133f.

¹³ The forms attested are the third pers. sing. present *á-ia-ti-i* (SULTANHAN, 6) and the third pers. sing. preterite *á-tà-* (ibid., 4), *á-tà* (ibid., base 10; cf. *An. St.* 25 (1975), 141), *á-*

or may not be etymologically related. As we have seen Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian have a productive class of iterative-intensives formed with a *-sa-* suffix; they also have an equally productive class of reduplicated verbs such as Cun. *tatarh-*, Hier. *sasarla-* etc. Finally, there is some evidence for reduplicated 'iteratives': Cun. *pipišša-*, Hier. *pīpasa-* vs. Cun. and Hier. *piya-*, "give". If so, it becomes possible to suggest that *iyasa-* is a reduplicated 'iterative' built on the same root as *aya-*, *a-*. Obviously some of the details of the formation must remain uncertain, since inter alia there is no general agreement about the etymology of *aya-*. However, if we start from a root **k₁ei-* (as suggested by Oettinger, *Stammbildung*, 349), we can tentatively reconstruct besides **H₁ei-e/o-* *aya-* a reduplicated verb **H₁e-H₁(e)i-e/o-*, which would yield Luw. **iya-* (**ē*, **ei > i*). In its turn this could serve as a base for the 'iterative' *iyasa-*¹⁴.

The semantic side of the problem must also be considered. Just as the verbs of selling are often derived from verbs of giving, the verbs of buying often derive from verbs of taking (cf. Latin *emere*, "buy", for which a "take" meaning is still attested in early Latin and in the compounds). Yet a shift from "make, do" to "acquire, buy" is also attested. Colloquially we find usages such as Modern Italian *mi faccio la macchina*, "I get myself a car", with *faccio* from *fare*, "to make, do"; German *wir haben neue Möbel angeschafft*, "we acquired new furniture" (*anschaffen* vs. *schaffen*, "make, do"). German has pushed further the use of *anschaffen* in the sense of "acquiring, buying", and the noun *Anschaffung* is often best translated as "purchase".

We have seen that Romance replaced *emere*, "buy" with *comparare*, originally "to get ready", but in colloquial Latin we also find a similar use of *conficere* (*conficio* vs. *facio*, "I make, I do") with the meaning of "acquire, get" (cf. *TLL* s. v.): cf. e. g. Cicero, *ad Att.* 12.37.2: *atque hortos mihi conficias necesse est*, "but you must get me a villa"¹⁵. A similar alternation between *parare*, "get ready" and *facere*, "make, do" was pointed out by E. Löfstedt¹⁶ with a reference to a passage of Seneca's epistles (114, 17): *Est apud Sallustium 'exercitum argento fecit', id est, pecunia paravit*, "we find in Sallust 'he made an army with (his) silver', i. e. he recruited (it) with (his) money". As noticed by Löfstedt, Seneca found Sallust's expression peculiar because of the colloquial use of *facere* for *parare* and of *argentum* for *pecunia* (cf. French *argent*).

ā + ra/i (MARŠ 2; cf. Hawkins in *Death in Mesopotamia*, ed. B. Alster (XXVI R. A. I.; Copenhagen, 1980), 217f.). We have not been able to trace the imperative *ā-ia-tu* quoted by Oettinger, *Stammbildung*, 567.

¹⁴ A reduplication with *i* (rather than *e*) would yield the same result: **H₁i-H₁(e)i-e/o-* *> *iya-*. It could be objected that a *-sa-* 'iterative' of the *pipišša-* type should call for a simple root without the thematic vowel (hence not **H₁e-H₁(e)i-e/o-* + *-sa-* but **H₁e-H₁i-sa-* or **H₁i-H₁i-sa-* which would yield **issa-* and not *iyasa-*). Yet, given the productivity of the *-sa-* formation, once a **iya-* verb had been formed, there could not be any obstacle to the creation of a *iyasa-* derivative. In his attempt to account for Hitt. *ešša-* (OH *išša-*) Oettinger, op. cit., 509, rejects both the reconstruction **eje-ssa-* and the reconstruction **H₁i-H₁i-ssa-*, but this is due to the need to justify the phonetic features of some Hittite forms and need not be relevant to our Luwian problem.

¹⁵ This use of *conficere* is interestingly matched by two of the attested occurrences of CUM-*ni a-* in Hier. Luwian (SULTANHAN, 4 and MARŠ 2), for which a translation "procure, obtain, get" may seem more suitable than a simple "make". Similarly CUM-*ni/na iziya-* of KARATEPE 79—80 may be taken as "procured" (cf. also *JRAS*, 1975, 2, 128).

¹⁶ *Phil. Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Uppsala, 1936²), 162f.

In all these instances the shift is from a general meaning "make, do" to a more specialized "take, acquire" and perhaps to "acquire for money, buy". But it seems likely that an alternative — or perhaps a complementary — shift may also lead to similar results. A common source of verbs for buying or selling are the verbs which indicate trading, doing business, negotiating, marketing, bargaining etc.¹⁷. We may quote for instance Gr. *ἀγοράζειν*, "to buy" vs. *ἀγορά*, "market"; Lat. *mercari*, *commercari*, "to trade", but also "to acquire" (vs. *commercium*, "trade"; *merx*, "wares"); Latin *negotari*, "to trade, negotiate, acquire" (vs. *negotium*, "trade, commerce, business"); Gr. *ἐμπορεύειν*, "to trade, import" (vs. *ἐμπορος*, "trader"); OE *ceapian*, "to trade, buy"; German *kaufen*, *verkaufen*, "to buy", "to sell" (but originally also "to trade", cf. Goth. *kaupon*, "to trade, to deal, to make business"), etc. In their turn the verbs which indicate trading etc. often derive from specialized uses of the verbs for making or doing. The process of specialization is much clearer when we consider both the verbs and the nouns connected with them; cf. German *Geschäft*, "business" vs. *schaffen*, "make, do"; Russian *sdelka*, "transaction, deal" vs. *delat'*, "make, do"; Italian *affari*, French *affaires*, "business", vs. *faire*, *faire*, "make, do" (cf. also ME *affaire* which replaces ME *ceep* < OE *ceap* in one of its senses; see note 9 above); Gr. *πράγματα*, "affairs, business" vs. *πράττειν*, "make, do". From Greek *πράγμα* we have a further derivative in the verb *πραγματεύεσθαι*, which is (or can be) rendered with *negotari* in Latin and *kaupon* in Gothic. The history and derivatives of the verb "to make" in Germanic also offer some interesting material. In German Grimm's dictionary (*D. Wb.* s. v. *machen*, III 9) registers a specialized use of *machen* in expressions like *in Wein machen*, "to deal in wine". German also has a verb *makeln* and a noun *Makler*, which mean (or meant) respectively "to negotiate, to deal, to act as an intermediary", and "broker, negotiator, arbiter"; the meaning of the verb at an early stage is well expressed by Corvinus' gloss quoted in *D. Wb.* s. v.: "quod enim nobis est emere et vendere, partiren ("trade, exchange, barter"), hanthiren ("negotiate, trade"), illud urbibus Hanseaticis est mäcklen". Both the phonology and the attested history of the words reveal their Low German and Dutch origin (cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb. deutschen Spr.*, s. v. *makeln*). Dutch also preserves a verb *makelen* and a noun *makelaar* with similar meanings (cf. *Wb. Ned. Taal*, s. vv.) and the connection between the simple *maken*, "make, do" and the iterative *makelen* is clear (cf. De Vries, *Ned. Et. Wb.*, s. v.)¹⁸.

Presumably these parallels may help to explain the specialized use of Akkadian *uppušu*, the intensive of *epēšu*, "to make", in Middle and Late Assyrian documents. The verb occurs in statements about the purchase and sale of slaves, land, objects (cf. *CAD*, s. v.); it is normally preceded by the name of the item bought or sold and is followed by the subject, a prepositional phrase which indicates the price, and another verbal form for giving or taking: X *uppišma* PN, at the price of ... *iddin* / *ilqi*. There is no agreed translation but the Chicago Dictionary has "to conclude a sale agreement", and most recently N. Postgate has argued for "to enter into — or to conclude — a contract"¹⁹. A possible alternative would be "to negotiate".

¹⁷ Cf. in general C. D. Buck, *A Dictionary of selected Synonyms* (Chicago, 1949), 817ff.

¹⁸ Noun and verb were widely successful; in French the root survived in some very specialized words: *maquereau*, "pimp, procurer", *maquignon* (*de chevaux*), "horse dealer", and perhaps even *maquereau* "mackerel" (see v. Wartburg, *FEW* XVI, 502ff.).

¹⁹ J. N. Postgate, *The Governor's Palace Archive* (CTN II; British School Archaeology in Iraq, 1972), 29, with the earlier literature.

Chronologically and geographically the Assyrian parallel is too close to our texts to be ignored. We can argue that just as *uppušu*, the intensive of *epēšu*, “make”, acquired a technical meaning like “negotiate, contract”, *iyasa-*, which we take to be the iterative-intensive of *aya-ja-*, “make”, in the late period moved into the sphere of commerce and trade relations and emerged as an alternative term for “acquire, buy”. The semantic development may have occurred independently in the two languages (the history of *makelen*, the iterative of *maken*, is relevant), but at first sight it seems far more likely that Hier. Luwian was influenced by the technical terminology of Akkadian, the dominant commercial language.

If our interpretation of *iyasa-* and its origin is correct we can also explain the preverb with which it is compounded and the syntactical construction of the verbal phrase. Trading and buying are not done in isolation, and the preverb *CUM-ni*, if we are right in attributing it a meaning “with”, matches e. g. the *cum* preverb of Latin *commercari* or *commercium*²⁰. In the TUNP text we noticed the double occurrence of *CUM-ni* first in connection with a dative which precedes and then immediately before the verb. Syntactically this points to univertation in Hier. Luwian; in this context at least *CUM-ni iyasa-* is a compound verb and the construction with *CUM-ni* and the dative is understandable for two reasons. On the one hand it corresponds, as we have seen, to that of Akkadian where *šāmu*, “to buy” is construed with *itti*, “with”; other languages too show similar constructions for the verbs of buying (the equivalents of *mit jemandem kaufen* occur in MHG and Middle Dutch; cf. Grimm *D. Wb.*, s. v. *kaufen*, 1 b). On the other hand, as we have pointed out before, the pattern *Noun P₁ . . . P₁ Verb* corresponds to that of Latin *cum aliquo colloquor*, etc.

There remains the question of *CUM-ni arha piya-*, “to sell”, also construed with the dative. Here the dative is expected (and is the case found with the simple *piya-*, “give”), but is likely that the influence of the “buying” construction was the main reason for the presence of *CUM-ni*, though this could also be due to the contractual aspect of the transaction. The phenomenon reminds us on the one hand of “illogical” compounds like German *Urenkel*, “great-grandchild” (built on the model of *Urvater*) or Lat. *pronepos*, “great grandson” (built on the model of *proavus*); on the other hand of secondary constructions like that of Latin *differe cum aliquo*, “I differ with . . .”, which replaced the earlier *differe ab . . .*, “I differ from . . .”, under the influence of *congruo cum aliquo*, “I agree with someone”, etc.²¹

The third word of economic import which emerges from the analysis of the texts discussed above is written *SCALPRUM(-)ma-na-sa* in the singular (gen.?) and *SCALPRUM(-)ma-na-zi* in the plural. If our identification is correct, *manas* is the name of the mina, one of the best known migratory terms, which spread all through the Near East and through most of the classical world²². The word is written phonetically and gives us the earliest unambiguous evidence for the name of the mina in an Indo-European language of Anatolia. Hittite has endless instances of

²⁰ Latin also has *coemere*, together with *emere*, “buy”, but it has been suggested that *coemptio* and *coemere* reflect an earlier use of *cum* which was semantically much closer to *ad*; cf. R. Köstler, *Glotta* 31 (1951), 121 ff.

²¹ For the “illogical” *Konträrbildungen*, cf. e. g. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 10 (1920), 42ff.; for the extended use of *cum* with *verba dissentiendi*, cf. Leumann, Hoffmann, Szantyr, *Lat. Gram.*, 260 with further references.

²² For the Greek word, see E. Masson, *Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts sémitiques en grec* (Paris, 1967), 32ff.

MA.NA but this is normally taken to be an allographic form, which provides no evidence about the phonetic reality; yet it would now seem likely that in Hittite too the word was pronounced *mana-*.

Hier. Luwian may have taken the term from Assyrian or inherited it as the result of earlier borrowings. The presence of this form gives further evidence for the numerous links among the Near Eastern languages, but need not tell us anything about the historical development of Hier. Luwian as such, since it can have penetrated the Indo-European languages of Anatolia at any stage. Yet *mina* and similar words shared by Semitic, IE and non-IE languages of the area must have created the linguistic background against which the semantic calques and the semantic influences which we have been discussing could both exist and (presumably) prosper.

Addendum: The Hittite verbs for buying and selling are now exhaustively discussed in E. Neu, ‘Die heth. Verben des Kaufens und Verkaufens’, *Welt des Orients* 11 (1980), 76 ff., which appeared when this article was in proofs. Notice especially the discussion on the original meaning of *ušniya-* and on the value of *arha* in *arha ušniya-*. In the same volume of *Welt des Orients* see also the interesting article by B. Kienast on the Alalah land sales (p. 35 ff.), in which in addition to payments in grain and silver there are additional gratuities including clothing and animals, a good parallel for *CEKKE* (citation 6 above).