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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 Kültepe 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 Kültepe 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 ERKKR reverse, Carchemish A 4a, and TCNP. The links between the first two are immediately apparent, since they are both documents written under the authority of Kanmanis, king of Carchemish. Yet even without this information, the documents would be associated by certain internal characteristics which may also be seen on TCNP, an inscription not explicitly connected with Carchemish or Kanmanis (the preserved portion of the text does not indicate the name of the principal(s) or the city or

---

country of origin). It may be, however, that Tûnp, 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 CERK, reverse, and Tûnp, this determines the verb CUM-ni “344”(Hi-ia)-sa/ta-; which Meriggi has already interpreted as “acquire, buy from” (“acquisto da”; *Manuale II/1, 160; II/2, 102). If, as argued below, we may identify this verb with the CUM-ni i-ta-ta (2nd pers. sing. imperative) of Assur letter g, we may also establish that the CERK / CARCHEMISH A 4a verb is split 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) [iwa]-ia-i[a] ka-pa’ā + ra-t-ā + ra/i-sa [Rel-i-ha] [via-sa] i-ni-i
   (ii) [ni-pa-wa]-a-tu-u-“ [NE] “[2a]-sa-ri
   (iii) [iwa]-a-[i]-a [Hi-ia]-ni [vona]-ni-ia + ra/i-sa [”I”jā-mū + ra/i-t]-1-dā/i/u + ra/i-t]-[2a]-sa-ri
   (iv) [iwa]-a-[i]-a-[i]-a [S]-um-ni-[“I”j-a-i-a
   (v) [iwa]-i-a-i [via-sa] i-ni-i

   (i) “Send us any KAPARA/s!
   (ii) (or) to you there is not (any),
   (iii) and there is (one) to [Parr]inwarsa the AMURALUKA,
   (iv) buy it from him,
   (v) (and) send it to us”

   (i) ka-pa’ā + ra/i-t-ā + ra/i-sa: on ASSUR letter f, i, towards the end of the topic is of objects called ka-pa’ā + ra/i-t (acc. pl.), and it was pointed out (Bosse, *Or 20* (1951), 79f.; *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, i, and therefore “iii” is to be taken as g, i. The form ka-pa’ā + ra/i-t-ā + ra/i-, as against ka-pa’ā + ra/i-t-, could represent an extension of the root, but could perhaps simply represent karparat (cf. KARATEP Hir/Ho, 280, ta-i-ta + ra/i-t = “a-i-ta-ri-i”)


   (iii) [vona]-ni-[iwa]-i-[i]-a: Parninwa was the address of Tusaq in ASSUR letter b, which suggests the restoration here as plausible (so Meriggi).

   (iv) CUM-ni i-ta-ta: Contextually, if the addressce has no KAPARA, but Parninwa has, and the addressce is to send it to the writer, the verb must express the means by which the KAPARA passes from Parninwa to the addressce. A more specific sense than “take (away) from” (“arhaa-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 (-te), which indicates the original owner, and the presence of CUM-ni before the verb are easily understood. Not all verbs which mean “buy” are followed with a “from” preposition as in English: cf. e.g. French acheter à. The Akkad. construction itti PN  sûna, “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 CERK, reverse, and Tûnp, and is also strengthened by the contrasting phrase on CARCHEMISH A 4a.

2. CERK, reverse, 1-2 (collated):

   (ii) [jā]-ta-ta [600] ASINUS (ANIMAL)-i-2 a DARE-ta

   (i) “Kamanius the ruler, country-lord of the cities Carchemish (and) . . . . (and) Sasturas, prime minister of Kamanius — the city Kamana from the Kansuwaes they bought by with their . . . . (ii) (and) to them they gave 600 donkeys.”

   Cf. *An. St. 29* (1979), 161 and note 59, but amend the translation there offered as above. For this and the following citation, cf. Meriggi, *Manuale II/2, 102*. CERK is the record of a settlement of fifteen pairs of fathers and sons by Kamanius and his prime minister in the city (rechristened 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. Tûnp, 1-2:
   [. . . ] jara’i-prater-la-i-[a] CUM-ni [sati-te]-i-[a] [ra/i-sa]-na (“terra”)-te-ti-ša-rel [xi]-ita CUM-ni “344” i-i-sa-ta

   “[. . . ] from [!]jartalas/(‘) Santatiwaras’ son he they bought the land.”

   Cf. *A. Morpugo 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 igara- constructed with a postpositional phrase “dative + CUM-ni”; the pattern is similar to that of Latin cum aliquo edulcorpe or cum aliquo modo commisione est. Tûnp then, written on a small blackish boulder from which up to half of the inscription has been destroyed, is a kudurrur-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 8.

8 It is possible that a further instance of the verb igara- occurs in ASSUR letter f iv (-sa-ta), but both form and context require further discussion.
The texts discussed above have led us to the identification of two verbal phrases Cum-ni подобн — “buy from” and Cum-ni arba pipy — “sell”. The latter phrase, however, invites the comparison of a curious graphic usage in Buharimadd.  

5. Buharimadd, 1-4:

(i) [arba] pipy [arba] pipy [Nomijn-ni i wayl + raj-pa-la-raj-ta'-1 [bex-ti-i] “bontu”


(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 zala for the mules.”

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

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. *MAMAS + CULTURE* 

“wadi” — An. St. 36 (1938), 143), and one is reminded of the Akkadian periphrasis for “sell”, anal kaJos naddatu (“give for silver”). The possibility that the logogram *257 might stand for “money” and specifically “silver” should be tested by reference to other occurrences. This takes us back to our original texts CekkE, Carhemish 4 A 4, and Tump, 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 Buharimadd writing, the “giving hand” is not repeated; instead of (*257. DARE*) DARE-pip, one finds *257. DARE-pip*—, *257-pip*—. It seems likely, however, that the two words are to be associated with the fuller writing. The forms are *257-pip*—, *257-pip*— (CARCHEMISH A 12, 4; 5), of uncertain case, morphology and syntactic function; and *257-pip*—, *257-pip*— (CARCHEMISH A 11 a, 5) in the clause “and they were the first (B011-ni”) “kifatu”, which follows descriptions of building works. Both forms could perhaps be taken as derived from pip— (cf. Hier. *p-*t-i-aa, “gift”), and *p-i-t-i-aa, “gift” (KULAND head fragment): also Lyce. pipiti — “gift” — Leucock, in BIA 31 (1973), 94, and Papiwlo de Xelo 63 (Paris, 1979), 17, and note 32); in both forms it is conceivable that *257 convey the same nuance as in *257-DARE-pipa*—.  

---

The term *pi-t-i-aa* (ANZI 1), cf. An. St. 36 (1938), 90; the logogram determines a different root. In the context of offerings to the gods the word refer to either tithe or financial payments.
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*257-za: throughout Crikke and TESP 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 ptim- in a context suggesting "selling"; and (ii) it follows a word tentatively identified as a unit of weight, "x minus...", 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 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 -sa 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 (1986), 175f., and Hoffman, JCS 22 (1966), 41f.).

(i) "257-za:

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 Kolak and Kemnitz, Zend Accent 4 (1977), 89 (KUB 40, 95 ii 13E). Cf. also below, citation 8 (i).

(ii) 257-za: other unknown word apparently acting as a conjunction in place of the usual particle chain.

Inkhu-taus-iz: collocation does not permit certain identification of the first sign (not pa or za). 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 KULU lead strips: e.g. g. KULU lead strip 2, entry 3: 140 over 7 terrai pittin avykatatiaturi ("we", "140 sheep to 7 statues we give from the city Avykataturi")

AQUA.DOMINUS: for this title, of BON.BHIPNARI 1 C, III B 1, (An. St. 20 (1970), 82; cf. Merigg, Manuale II/2, 75). It also occurs in Assur letter e, iii.

(iii) (iv) (Panis, Pittin) av-za-li-za:s: av: ("Panis, Pittin") av-za-li-za:s, CARCHERMIN A 4 a, 2, also the restoration in the same text "PANIS, PITHON-[E]-ZI" (below, citation 7 (i), (iv)). Though all contexts are very similar, and in each case av provides the direct object, it seems that we must distinguish the forms in -sa (both times object of pigmena, "we give") from those in -za (both times object of ingemen, "we make").

The combined logogram was recognized by Merigg as indicating "food (and) drink" (but distinguish from ANNUS, i.e. "HH", no. 336, which probably represents a pithon with a lid). Following this lead, it would be natural to associate the word(s) with 0sir (-0) in(-0)-za:s, maz: ("HII", 184; An. St., 39 (1980), p. 127, note 5), though the morphology would not be easy to explain. The form in -sa would have to be analysed as avali-i-za: (nom./acc. sing. neuter, while that in -za might be taken as an extended form avali yi-0-0-0 > avali(n)i-za:

Deverbatives in -avo- or -all-i- are not registered as common by van Broeck (RHA XXIV/71 (1982), 94f., 113), nor are neutrals 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: szatišu, "food, meal" (cf. Hit. "diri"), which is given to a city (Kanaqa) and a person (the lord of the WASHA, see below); szatišu, "feast, festival", made for the River-Lord, Ahaššu, and the king KAMANIS.

(iv) DOMINUS-NA-SI WAŠAS: see As. St. 29 (1979), 162, note 63 and As. St. 30 (1980), 128, citation 16.

PA-BI: supported by collation, but unparalleled and unexpected in the usual PESET-NA-SI. An attestation of super+raj-si-BI is cited for comparison by Morugii (see Manual, I, 119).

*179. *347. 5-ša-pa-se: undoubtedly the same word as *179. *347. 5-ta-šiš-[pa]: (Assur letter e, i, i). 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 Cum. Luwian tsəs(s)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 the objects. Since in Assur letter e the word seems to represent the direct object in the acc. sing. MI, here it must be taken as genitive dependent on mirasaši(s)zi.

1 SCALPRUM-na: contextually likely to represent the same word as in the preceding sections, namely (-)ma-na-"minas(?)"). Here it must be a further genitive, probably dependent on -ȓe-nap̑a. If this indeed meant "garment", we could then have of garments of one minas(?)". For such a phrase, cf. Cum. Hit.: [1] TUG 7 MAMA KA-LA-LA-III., "[one] garment, its weight 7 minas" (Hitt. Laws II, 1, 68).

CARCHEMISH A 4.a 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 4.a, 1:
(i) [BASED ON 10] *[=] 1 "SCALPRUM"(-)ma-na-"257-zu DARK-MI-NA
(ii) [BASED ON PANCE,PITHOS]-I-za 4-za 2-za MI-NA
(iii) [BASED ON PANCE,PITHOS]-I-za 2-za MI-NA (remainder of line 1, beginning of line 2 largely lost; text resumes with at least 5 sections listing persons)

(iv) ["PANCE,PITHOS"]-I-za 2-za MI-NA DOMINUS-NA-NA "*419"-so-ha-sa DARK-MI-NA
(text concludes with two sections of curse against nullification of deed)

(Text continues directly from citation 4 above)
(i) ["someone 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 CEKKI, above citation 6, is minimal; it assumes that each completely restored word would occupy one vertical column. *419* subject (and speaker) would be Parassarmis, the purchaser; indirect object, the vendor Kamanship.

(iv): it seems probable that this is still a part of the same spoken declaration of the purchaser Parassarmis, and represents a final stage in the transaction. DOMINUS-NA-SI WAŠAS: it does not seem that wašas can be anything other than a genitive dependent on DOMINUS-NA-SI, 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 it—(ii), but perhaps one who occupied a position analogous to that of the persons listed in CEKKI, citation 6 (i—v). For WASHA see below, citation 8.

THUP offers a clause which combines I "257-za 1 "SCALPRUM"(-)ma-na-za with the term *(419)šašu-; and this text, however difficult to interpret, demands consideration here.

8. THUP, 3—4:
(i) *(419)*-šašu-PI 2-za MI-NA-NA-NA 1 "SCALPRUM"(-)ma-na-za 1 "SCALPRUM"(-)ma-na-za DARK-MI-NA

(ii) ["(He) who infringes (this document)" points to (ii) being some penalty. The problem is to determine the grammatical structure of the clause. I "257-za": since we have argued that -257-za is not in use, we must probably identify this form as genitive singular. "Of one silver(?)" recalls the phrase noted in CEKKI, above citation 6 (i), where it was suggested that this might indicate one (ingot of) silver of superior weight (talent 4); perhaps the same sense is intended.

1 "SCALPRUM"(-)ma-na-za, and also *(419)šašu-za-da-za, could be either nominative or genitive singular. I "SCALPRUM"(-)ma-na-so-ha-so-no on the other hand defines attempts to identify ending or suffix, and in spite of its obvious connection with the "minas", its grammatical form and syntactic function are all too 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 minas.

*(419/420)šašu-: the logogram has the form HH, no. 419 (and not HH, no. 420, as stated in HH, vol 2) and in all attestations except ASSUR letter s. This word definitely appears to belong with the type of commercial context which we have been considering, since, besides the CARCHEMISH A 4.a and THUP attestations, it occurs also on ASSUR letter s in the passage immediately preceding citation 1 above. It is also found (in the context of a religious dedication) on BABYLON UP 1. The assumption that šašu- is the full phonetic writing is based on the identification with Cum. Law. wadak-, yet the identity of the two, together with their meaning(s), remains to be established. The identification with Cum. Hit. šaha-, "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 Oslower and HH, šašu- is probably not attested in CEKKI, since the word *(419)šašu-za-da-za (rev. 12) may be identified with the *(417)šašu-za-da-za of BOYD/PIANO IV D + III A, and in any case seems to be an adjective, contrary to *(419/420)šašu-, which is clearly a noun; see now As. St. 31 (1981), 163L, 167L.7
What precedes, if correct, leads first of all to the identification of two verbal phrases: **cum-ni** and **vina** - and **cum-ni** and **buy** 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 Hititite verbs for buying and selling are well known. For buying Hititite uses **swi** and for selling **widiya** or **kappara**. Both **swi** and **widiya** point to an Indo-European root *swi* and exemplify a frequent pattern for which the same root can yield verbs for both concepts (cf. Gothenburg, **frawi**, **frakti**; German **kaufen**, **kaufen**; Cretan Greek **kópěra**). **Kappara**, on the other hand, is connected with **kaper** "business, deal", a word which has alternatively been taken as a loan word and as an inherited formation. We have little evidence for Hititite 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; Lydian only offers some evidence for a verb **spiritye** to which Laroche has tentatively attributed the meaning "sells" on the basis of Hititite. For Lydian there is a very doubtful attempt to connect **happara-** with **afera**.

In view of its ancestry it is likely that *swi* 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 Luwian. Similarly the presence of **spiritye** in Lydian and conceivable the Lydian evidence might point to the diffusion of this root outside Hititie. 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 remodelling. In Roman Latin更是 was variously replaced by Lat. *comparare* (Latin *comparare*, Ital. *comparare*, *buy*, etc.) or *acquisto* (French *acheter*). Sibon must have inherited the cognates of the Indo-European root *swi*, *buy* (cf. O. Russ., *krei*), but most Slavic languages adopted forms related to Modern Russian *kupitš*, "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 *diaphoré* *kupit*, "I give", or in Russian *prodáti* vs. *dat*, "give", or may be diachronically traceable as in English "sell" from Old English, "give". As expected Old and Middle English can use the same sense of the verbs "give" and "sell". The pattern is not merely an Indo-European one; for "selling" Alkedian uses *nadana*, "give" which may or may not be further defined by the phrase *ana kapi*, "for silver". In Hier. Luwian the presence of the preverb *ara* in conjunction with *piro* does not surprise; presumably it fills the same functions as Greek *das* in *diaphoré*, and we may also note that the phrase *ara kapi* is frequent in late Hititite texts. The presence of *cum-ni* before *vina piros* is unexpected, but we shall return to it later.

If in Bulgarian (citation 5) *sén* is the logogram for silver, the phrase *argentum piros* — which we cannot provide a full phonetic rendering, is likely to be a loan translation from Alkedian, a phenomenon which is not surprising in the language of the trading, but which also points to a close relationship between the Alkedian and the Hieroglyphic Luwian vocabularies in this field. "Selling" can be easily explained but "buying" is more complicated. Above we presupposed the identity of *sura-*, *sura-*, since a shift *sura-* > *sura-* causes no problems. We must now account for *sura-* etc., though the root has no obvious parallel in Anatolian.

The morphology points to a *ser*-iterative of an *a*-root. In Anatolian terms this reminds us of two Hititite verbs: *išapar*, "he goes" and *išpar*, "he makes".

The first verb has good cognates in Cuneiform and Hier. Luwian ( *e*", *go*" and *asa,-", "come") and is a *ergative* root, that is, the generalization of the *-s*-are secondary and typical of Hititite. Secondly, though the *sura*-shapes have been used in the vocabulary of verbs, a verb *sura-* "buy" is not as easily paralleled. The syntax of *sura*- 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. *sura-*, with Hit. *sura-, *"make" the first root is *sura*- and not *sura-*. However, the presence of *sura*- is secondary and typical of Hititite. Secondly, though the root is used in verbs of trading, the shift *sura-* > *sura-* does not cause any problems. We must now account for *sura-* etc., though the root has no obvious parallel in any Anatolian.

The alternative suggestion which links Hier. Luw. *sura-*, with Hit. *sura-*, *"make" the first root is *sura*- and not *sura-. However, the presence of *sura*- is secondary and typical of Hititie. Secondly, though the root is used in verbs of trading, the shift *sura-* > *sura-* does not cause any problems. We must now account for *sura-* etc., though the root has no obvious parallel in any Anatolian.

11 Of e.g. P. Werner, *Untersuchungen zur älteren germanischen Ossen* (Stuttgart, 1928; 1930, 32, 44).
13 The forms attested are the third pers. sing. present *di-asi-asi* (Sudanian, 8) and the third pers. sing. pretende *d-al* etc. (ibid., 4, 3-4, ibid., base 10; cf. *An. St. 25* (1975), 141).
or may not be etymologically related. As we have seen Cumaniform and Hieroglyphic Lawinian have a productive class of iterative-intensive formed with *-*a-; suffix; they also have an equally productive class of reduplicated verbs such as Cun. tatur-, Hier. nasar- etc. Finally, there is some evidence for reduplicated ‘iterative’s: Cun. pipit'-la, Hier. pi~a-va vs. Cun. and Hier. pi~a-, “give”. If so, it becomes possible to suggest that *ig~an is a reduplicated ‘iterative’ built on the same root as *a-, *e-. Obviously some of the formation must remain uncertain, since inter alia there is no general agreement about the etymology of *a~-, *e~-. However, if we start from a root *h-i-e- (as suggested by Oettinger, Stammbildungen, 349), we can tentatively reconstruct the Proto-Hieroglyphic Lawinian *h-i-e-i-e-i-o or *h-e-i-e-i-e-i-o, which would yield *lau,* *lau-,* *lau-,* *lau-,* *lau-.* In its turn this could serve as a basis for the ‘iterative’ *ig~an.14

The semantic side of the problem must also be considered. Just as the verbs of selling are often derived from verbs of offering, 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 fai acquisto “I get myself a car”, with faccio from fare, “to do, make”, 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 Anschafling is often best translated as “purchase”.

We have seen that Romance replaced emere, “buy” with compareare, originally “to compare”, colloquial Latin also finds a similar use of confecere (conficere vs. facere, “I make, I do”) with the meaning of “acquire, get” (cf. P.L. s.v.): e.g. Cicero, ad Att. 12.37.2: quaeque hortorum mibi confecisses nescis est, “but you must get me a villa”.15 A similar alternation between parea, “get ready” and facere, “make, do” was pointed out by E. Löffstedt16 with a reference to a passage of Seneca’s epistle (114, 17): Est apud Sallustium exercitium argento facilis, id est, pecunia pararivit, “we find in Sallust ‘he made an army with (his) silver’, i.e. he recruited (it) with (his) money”. As noted by Löffstedt, Seneca found Sallust’s expression peculiar because of the colloquial use of facere for parea and of argutum for pecunia (cf. French argent).

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. ἑμπόρος, “to buy” vs. ἑμπόρος, “market”; Lat. mercari, commercari, “to trade” vs. commercium, “trade”; but also “to acquire” vs. commerce, “business”; Gr. ἱμπόρος, “to trade, import” vs. ἱμπόρος, “trade”; OEC: ceapam, “to trade, buy”; German kaufen, verkauft, “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 сделка, “transaction, deal” vs. дать, “to give, make, do”; Italian affari, French affaires, “business”, vs. faire, faire, “make, do” (cf. also ME affair which replaces ME occurring in one of its senses, see note 9 above); Gr. ἀγοραστής, “affaire, business” vs. προικτικός “make, do”. From Greek ἀγοραστής we have a further derivative in the verb ἀγοραστηρός, which is (or can be) rendered with negotiarius in Latin and καυπηθός in Gothic. The title of the verb of the verb “to make” in Germanic also shows 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 Wb. s.v. “to deal” or in a man an hand, a man makes a verb make, in formal a man makes a noun Madele, which makes (or meant) respectively “to negotiate, to deal, to act as an intermediary”, and “broker, negotiator, arbitrator”; the meaning of the verb at an early stage is well expressed by Corvinus’ gloss quoted in D. Wb. s.v.: quod ordinibus est emere et vendere, paritum (“trade, exchange, barter”), hamberum (“negotiate, trade”), illud urbium Henaeassii est midelen. 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. mädelin). Dutch also preserves a verb maken and a noun maakel, and the similar uses (as mentioned above) of Wb. NEd. staal, s.v.) and the connection between the simple make, “make, do” and the iterative maken is clear (cf. De Vries, Ned. Et. Wb., s.v.).

Proximately these parallels may help to explain the specialized use of Akkadian ṭoppata, the intensive of ṭapatu, “to make”, in Middle and Late Assyrian documents. The verb occurs in statements about the purchase and sale of slaves, land, objects (cf. OAD, 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 sippud a PN, at the price of X didin / ṭili. 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”18. A possible alternative would be “to negotiate”.

12 α-ται (Maraš 1982, 217f.); cf. Hawkins in Death in Monotopnomen, ed. B. Alston (XXVI B. A.I.; Copenhagen, 1980, 217f.).

13 A reduplication with i (rather than e) would yield the same result: *h-e-i-e-i-o or *h-e-E-o which would yield *i-é- and not *i-é-). Yet, given the productivity of the -e- formation, once *i-s- verb had been formed, there could not be any obstacle to the creation of a -e- derivative. In his review for Hitt. sifo- (OHI sifo- Oettinger, op. cit., 509, rejects both the reconstruction *i-e-se and the reconstruction *h-E-E-se, but this is due to the need to justify the phonetic features of some Hittite forms and need not be relevant to our Lawinian problem.

15 This use of confecere is interestingly matched by two of the attested occurrences of cum- in Hier. Lawian (SULTANAS, 4 and MARAS 2), for which a translation “prosecute, obtain, get” may seem more suitable than a simple “make”. Similarly Cuman-lawino-ka against of KARATYPRE 1979–80 may be taken as “procured” (cf. also JARAS, 1975, 2, 128).

16 Phil. Comment. auf Peregriination Aethiopica (Uppsal, 1906), 162f.

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: marineur, “ship, procurer”, marineur, marineur (d. de claus, d. de claus); ... perhaps even masculine “mackel” (see Wurth, Wb. XXVI, 602f.).

19 J. N. Postgate, The Governor’s Palace Archives (CITN II; British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1972), 59, 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 uppāda, the intensive of epēda, “make”, acquired a technical meaning like “negotiate, contract”, iyasa, which we take to be the iterative-intensive of apana, “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 makeles, the iterative of makes, 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 sphere 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 commerçari or commercium. In the TDE 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 conurbation 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 NITI, “with”; other languages too show similar constructions for the verbs of buying (the equivalents of mit jenonden kaafen occur in MHG and Dutch; cf. Grimm D.Wb., s.v. kaafen, l.b). On the other hand, as we have pointed out before, the pattern Novus P, ... P, Verb corresponds to that of Latin cum aliquo colloque, etc.

There remains the question of CUM-ni arba iyasa- “to sell”, also construed with the dative. Here the dative is expected (and is the case found with the simple piyya-, “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 attributed to the contractual aspect of the transaction. The phenomenon reminds us on the one hand of “illogical” compounds like German Urenkel, “grand-grandchild” (built on the model of Unvater) or Lat. prænepos “great grandson” (built on the model of prænus); on the other hand of secondary constructions like that of Latin dixero cum aliquo, “I differ with...”, which replaced the earlier dixero ab... “I differ from...”, under the influence of congroo cum aliquo, “I agree with someone”, etc.

The third word of economic import which emerges from the analysis of the texts discussed above is written SCALPRUM(-)-mana-a in the singular (gen. 1) and SCALPRUM(-)-mana-zi in the plural. If our identification is correct, mana a is the name of the mine, one of the best known migratory terms, which spread all through the Near East and through most of the classical world. The word is written phonetically and gives us the earliest unambiguous evidence for the name of the mine in an Indo-European language of Anatolia. Hititite has endless instances of mana 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 Hititite 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 mana and similar words shared by Semitic, IE and non-IE languages of the area must have had the linguistic background against which the semantic calques and the semantic influence which we have been discussing could both exist and (presumably) prosper.

Addendum: The Hititite verbs for buying and selling are now exhaustively discussed in E. Neu, Die beth, Handels des Kauftens und Verkaufs, Welt des Orient 11 (1980), 78 ff., which appeared when this article was in proofs. Notice especially the discussion on the original meaning of uhiya- and on the value of arba in arba uhiya-. In the same volume of Welt des Orient see also the interesting article by E. Köster on the Alalakh land sales (p. 58 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).