

Offprint From:

*Tradition and Innovation in
the Ancient Near East*

Proceedings of the 57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
at Rome
4–8 July 2011

edited by

ALFONSO ARCHI

in collaboration with Armando Bramanti



Early Byzantine mosaic from the Hama Museum

Winona Lake, Indiana

EISENBRAUNS

2015

© 2015 by Eisenbrauns Inc.
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

www.eisenbrauns.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Rencontre assyriologique internationale (57th : 2011 : Rome, Italy)
Tradition and innovation in the ancient Near East : proceedings of the 57th
Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome 4–8 July 2011 / edited by
Alfonso Archi in collaboration with Armando Bremanti.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-1-57506-313-3 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Middle East Civilization—To 622—Congresses. 2. Middle East—
History—To 622—Congresses. 3. Assyriology—Congresses. I. Archi,
Alfonso. II. Bremanti, Armando. III. Title. IV. Title: Proceedings of the
57th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Rome 4–8 July 2011.

DS56.R46 2011

935—dc23

2014033751

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48–1984. ©™

Contents

Foreword	ix
Abbreviations	xi
Program	xvii

Part 1

OPENING LECTURES

Rückwärts schauend in die Zukunft: Utopien des Alten Orients	3
STEFAN M. MAUL	
Law and Literature in the Third Millennium B.C.	13
CLAUS WILCKE	
The Soul in the Stele?	49
J. DAVID HAWKINS	

Part 2

PAPERS

Myth and Ritual through Tradition and Innovation	59
DINA KATZ	
A Tale of Twin Cities: Archaeology and the Sumerian King List	75
PETR CHARVÁT	
Where are the Uruk Necropoles? Regional Innovation or Change in Tradition for Northern Mesopotamia	81
JESÚS GIL FUENSANTA AND EDUARDO CRIVELLI	
Changes Through Time: The Pit F Sequence at Ur Revisited	91
GIACOMO BENATI	
Reading Figurines from Ancient Urkeš (2450 B.C.E.)	105
RICK HAUSER	
Wooden Carvings of Ebla: Some Open Questions	121
RITA DOLCE	
The Aesthetic Lexicon of Ebla's Composite Art during the Age of the Archives	135
MARCO RAMAZZOTTI	
DUGURASU = <i>rw-h̄wt</i>	155
ALESSANDRO ROCCATI	
More on Pre-Sargonic Umma	161
SALVATORE F. MONACO	

Professional Figures and Administrative Roles in the Garden (^{ĝeš} kiri ₆) Management of Ur III Ĝirsu	167
ANGELA GRECO	
Tradition and Innovation in Šulgi's Concept of Divine Kingship	179
LUDEK VACIN	
Bemerkungen zur Entwicklung der Beschwörungen des Marduk-Ea-Typs: Die Rolle Enlils	193
MANUEL CECCARELLI	
Prophecy in the Mari Texts as an Innovative Development	205
HERBERT B. HUFFMON	
Mathematical Lists: From Archiving to Innovation	215
CHRISTINE PROUST	
Die lexikalische Serie á= <i>idu</i>	225
FRAUKE WEIERSHÄUSER	
The Rituals of Power: The Akkadian Tradition in Neo-Assyrian Policy	237
KRZYSZTOF ULANOWSKI	
Innovation and Tradition within the Sphere of Neo-Assyrian Officialdom . .	251
MELANIE GROSS	
Tradition and Innovation in the Neo-Assyrian Reliefs	267
NICOLAS GILLMANN	
Une Armure Expérimentale du Premier Millénaire av. J.-C.	277
FABRICE DE BACKER	
A Group of Seals and Seal Impressions from the Neo-Assyrian Colony Tell Masaikh-Kar-Assurnasirpal with More Ancient Motifs	289
PAOLA POLI	
Spätbabylonische Urkunden: Original, Kopie, Abschrift	301
JÜRGEN LORENZ	
Traditional Claims of an Illustrious Ancestor in Craftsmanship and in Wisdom	311
DANIEL BODI	
New Phraseology and Literary Style in the Babylonian Version of the Achaemenid Inscriptions	321
PARSA DANESHMAND	
Aspects of Royal Authority and Local Competence: A Perspective from Nuzi	335
ANNE LÖHNERT	
Continuity and Discontinuity in a Nuzi Scribal Family	345
PAOLA NEGRI SCAFA	
Mission at Arrapha	355
DAVE DEUEL	
Geopolitical Patterns and Connectivity in the Upper Khabur Valley in the Middle Bronze Age	369
ALESSIO PALMISANO	

Writing Sumerian in the West	381
MAURIZIO VIANO	
Territorial Administration in Alalah during Level IV	393
ALVISE MATESSI	
Reciprocity and Commerce in Bronze and Iron Age Anatolia	409
H. CRAIG MELCHERT	
Hittite Clitic Doubling as an Innovative Category: Its Origin	417
ANDREJ V. SIDELTSEV	
Memory and Tradition of the Hittite Empire in the post-Hittite Period	427
MARIA ELENA BALZA AND CLELIA MORA	
Fortifications and Arming as Analytical Elements for a Social-Policy Evolution in Anatolia in the Early Bronze Age	439
TOMMASO DE VINCENZI	
Amurru in der königlichen Ideologie und Tradition: von Ebla bis Israel	449
PAVEL ČECH	
The Assyrian Tree of Life and the Jewish Menorah	459
CHRISTOS G. KARAGIANNIS	
The Ponderal Systems of Qatna	471
LUIGI TURRI	
French Excavations in Qasr Shemamok-Kilizu (Iraqi Kurdistan): The First Mission (2011)	481
OLIVIER ROUAULT AND MARIA GRAZIA MASETTI-ROUAULT	
The Present in Our Past: The Assyrian Rock Reliefs at Nahr El-Kalb and the Lessons of Tradition	491
ANN SHAFER	
Oriental Studies and Fascism in Spain	501
AGNÈS GARCIA-VENTURA AND JORDI VIDAL	

Part 3

WORKSHOP: FROM PARENTS TO CHILDREN

From Parents to Children: Ebla	511
ALFONSO ARCHI	
Family Firms in the Ur III Period	517
STEVEN J. GARFINKLE	
A Chip Off the Old Block: The Transmission of Titles and Offices within the Family in Old Babylonian Sippar	525
MICHEL TANRET	
The Tradition of Professions within Families at Nuzi	555
JEANETTE C. FINCKE	
Crafts and Craftsmen at Ugarit	567
WILFRED VAN SOLDT	

Hereditary Transmission of Specialized Knowledge in Hittite Anatolia: The Case of the Scribal Families of the Empire Period	577
GIULIA TORRI	
The Transmission of Offices, Professions, and Crafts within the Family in the Neo-Assyrian Period	587
HEATHER D. BAKER	
Families, Officialdom, and Families of Royal Officials in Chaldean and Achaemenid Babylonia	597
M. JURSA	



Reciprocity and Commerce in Bronze and Iron Age Anatolia

H. Craig Melchert

LOS ANGELES

The impetus for the following discussion is the existence of a family of words in second- and first-millennium Luvian whose members seem semantically incompatible. Some have religious connotations, while others occur in commercial contexts. For example, the Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luvian adjective /washaiya-/ shows a sense ‘consecrated, dedicated’, used in examples (1) and (2) of ritual objects and cult personnel:

(1) *KBo 7.68 ii 2–12 (text Starke 1985: 361–2, but restorations mine-HCM)*

^{GIŠ}tīrana wašha[īya . . .]KI.MIN ^{GIŠ}talān=za K[I.MIN šarra] wašha ānna=ha wa[šha] § pa=ti(y)=aš aduna aša[r²] ^{GIŠ}waššanza wašhaiyan=za ^{NINDA}ha-x[] wašhaiš ^{NINDA}tannaša wašhaiya [—] NINDA-iš wašhaiš ^{GIŠ}zappalālla KI.MIN ^{DU}-^Gu-x[]x-iš KI.MIN paršul=za KI.MIN gu[r?-]x-ašu KI.MIN maddu KI.MIN [-]iš KI.MIN ^{LÚ}NINDA.DÜ.DÜ-aš KI.MIN [^{LÚ}SAG]I-iš KI.MIN ^{LÚ}ŠA.TAM-aš KI.MIN

‘The t. are consecrated. [The _] likewise. The t. likewise. [Above] are consecrated things, and also below are conse[crated things.] § He/She s[its down?] to eat.¹ The table is consecrated. The h-bread is consecrated. The t-breads are consecrated. The bread is consecrated. The z. likewise. . .The morsel likewise. . .The wine likewise. . .The baker likewise. The drink-server likewise. The chamberlain likewise.’

(2) *BABYLON 2 (text Hawkins 2000: 395–6; interpretation mine-HCM)*

á-mu-pa-wa/i-tu (“*419”)wa/i-sa-ha-i-za ku+ra/i-i-sà()ka-tara/i-hi-ha i-zi-i-ha

‘And for him (Tarhunt) I made (a) consecrated k. (and) k.’

The same adjective is also used in Cuneiform Luvian as the epithet of a tutelary deity (but notably not of any other deity). I therefore interpret it as ‘patron’ (i.e., *dedicated* to an individual person): [. . .AN]A ^dLAMMA wašhai ‘to the patron tutelary deity’ (KBo 34.186:5’) and wašhaiš [^dLAMMA] (KBo 12.100 Ro 13). See for the texts Starke 1985: 211 and 244 and further below.

Likewise the CLuvian adjective *wašhazza-* means ‘patron’, referring to a tutelary deity:

1. For the reading and restoration of *ašar* ‘sits down’ see now Oettinger 2011.

(3) *KBo 35.107 (+) 108 iii 10 (text and reading with Starke 1985: 238)*

^{URU}Taurišizzaš wašhazzaš ^dLAMMA-aš ^dUTU-tī dātī tarkumī[ta]

“The patron tutelary deity of Taurisa reported to the father Sun-god.”

See likewise KUB 25.37 i 7 (1 UDU ANA ^dLAMMA wašhazza “one sheep for the patron tutelary deity”) and KBo 21.54:9,10,21. The direct Lycian cognate *wasaza-* (TL 38,7) is a professional title and thus refers to a kind of priest, that is, someone ‘sacralized, consecrated’ (Melchert 2004a: 78).

The CLuvian noun *wašha-* (which is clearly the base of the preceding adjectives) also means ‘consecrated things, *sacra*’. See in a positive sense the expression [šarra] *wašha ānnan=ha wa[šha]* “[Above] are consecrated things, and also below are con[secrated things]” in example (1) cited above. We find the same noun also in the negative sense of *sacra*:

(4) *KUB 35.54 ii 27–41 (text after Starke 1985: 67*

except for the reading NU[MUN].Ḫ[I.A])

[] KÜ.BABBAR GUŠKIN NU[MUN].Ḫ[I.A?] ḫūman [^{GIŠ}ḫaḫ]ran ^{GIŠ}muwilan ^{GIŠ}intaluzi []x ^{GIŠ}tiddutri katt[a] ḫikzi n=ašta anda kiššan memai § zāwi ziyar NUMUN.ḪI.A-na [p]ūnāta inzagān wašha a=(a)ta [BE]L SÍSKUR ^{GIŠ}ḫattarāti ḫatta[r]itta ^{GIŠ}tūrāti=pa=(a)ta tūr[ā]tta a=(a)ta imrašša<n> ^dIŠKUR-u[nt]i pari tarāwitta § a=(a)ta piyatta imma[r]aššan ^dIŠKUR-ti a=(a)ta zappatta attu[w] al=za utar=ša [ḫal]liš=ša a=(a)ta ā[pp]a DINGIR.MEŠ-anza ŠA EN SÍSKUR parran ni[š] §awiti

(Hittite) “He offers downward [] silver, gold, all the seeds, a rake, a m., a shovel, [. . .], (and) a t. and interjects as follows (Luvian): ‘Here are laid down all the seeds, the inhumations, the *sacra*. The ritual client has hoed them with the hoe, while he has speared them with the spear. He has handed them over to the Storm-god of the open country. He has given them to the Storm-god of the open country. He has z-ed them-the evil word and the illness. Let them not come back before the gods of the ritual client’.”

For the negative sense of *wašha* ‘*sacra*’ referring to the seeds symbolizing evils that are to be relegated to the divine sphere and thus made taboo for humans see Benveniste 1969: 2.187ff. on Latin *sacer* and Watkins 1975a on Hittite *šuppi-*.

On the other hand, the HLuvian noun (*419/*420)*washa-* refers to commercial transactions:

(5) *KARKAMIŠ A4a §§1–4 and §11 (text Hawkins 2000: 152, including restorations)*

§1 [za-ya]-wa/i [DOMUS]-na [. . . .]x-sa-´ [(INFANS)]ni-za-a-sa ka-ma-ni-ya REX-ti

CUM-ni ARHA (CONTRACTUS)DARE-ta

§2 ka-ma-ni-sa-pa-wa/i+ra/i PRAE-ri+i-SARMA-ma-ya-´ FRATER-la-sa-na

| (INFANS)ni-za-´ pa-pi-tà-ti-sà-na-´ INFANS.NEPOS CUM-ni ARHA

(CONTRACTUS)DARE-ta

§3 |wa/i-tu-u 20+2[+?] (“SCALPRUM[?]ma-na-zi ARGENTUM-za DARE-mi-na]

§4 [wa/i-tu-u PANIS.PI]THOS-[li]-za i-zi-ya-mi-na . . .

§11 (“PANIS.PITHOS”)á-za-li-sa-pa-wa/i DOMINUS-na-ní “*419”-sa-ha-sá-´ DARE-

mi-na

“[These hou]ses [X, Y’s] son, sold to Kamani the King, and Kamani sold them to Parisarma (his) brother’s son, grandson of Papidati. To him 22(?) m[inas of silver are to be given(?)], and [for him a] a feast is to be made. . . A meal is to be given to the owner for the *washa*.” (less likely: “to the lord of the *washa*”)

On the terminology for buying and selling see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies 1982, but for the verbal forms in *-mi-na* as gerundives see Melchert 2004b. For the restorations and the provision of a feast for the seller see CEKKE §§6–11 (Hawkins 2000: 145).

(6) ASSUR letter f+g §§27–28 (text after Hawkins 2000: 537)

§27 |á-pi-ha-wa/i-za |(*420)wa/i-sa-ha-sa |REL-za |VIA-wa/i-ni-ta

§28 |wa/i-za |á-pi 4-zi-i |ka-ma_xra/i-zi |i-sa-u-ta

“Furthermore, what did they send us of the *washa*-? They bought another(?) four k’s for us.” (literally “again four”)

(7) TÜNP 1 (text after Hawkins 2000: 155)

§1 [. . . .]ara/i-FRATER-la-ya CUM-ni sà-ta-ti-wa/i+ra/i-sa-na (“TERRA”)ta-sà-REL+ra/i-na CUM-ni (“CONTRACTUS”)i-ya-sá-ta

§2 a-wa/i (“SCALPRUM”)á-su-sa ARHA (“CAPUT+SCALPRUM”)ku-sà-mi-na. . .

§5 (“PES2”)tara/i-pi+ra/i-pa-wa/i REL-sà

§6 |wa/i-´1 “ARGENTUM”-sa 1 (“SCALPRUM”)ma-na-sa |1 (“SCALPRUM”)ma-na-sa-ha-na (“*419”)wa/i-sa-ha-sa

“[X] bought the land from Aralani(?), son of Santatiwari. The (boundary) stone is to be effaced. . . He who shall oppose, one ARGENTUM-unit, one mina, and one manas(a)ha-unit is the *washa*.”

See for the interpretation of the passage in (7) in addition to Hawkins 2000: 155–56 also Yakubovich 2010 and Giusfredi 2010: 264–66.

That there is no connection between the HLuvian and CLuvian words *wašḫa*- (thus Giusfredi 2010: 232) is extremely unlikely. Nor is a sense ‘fine, financial punishment’ (Giusfredi loc. cit.) plausible for examples (5) and (6). These call for ‘purchase, sale’ or the like and connection with the root of Hittite *waš-* ‘buy’ and *ušne-/ušniya-* ‘sell’, as per Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies (1982: 100⁹), who also allow for a sense ‘fine’. Giusfredi’s *formal* analysis, an animate action noun in *-šḫa-*, is surely correct (CLuvian *wašḫa* can easily be the collective nominative-accusative plural to such an animate stem).

The terms for ‘buying’ and ‘selling’ are renewed in HLuvian: see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies 1982 for (CUM-*ni arha*) *piya-* ‘sell’ (a specialized use of *piya-* ‘give’) and CUM-*ni ijas-* ‘buy (from)’ (but for the source of *ija(sa)-* and Lycian *ije-* ‘buy’ < PIE **ai-* ‘give/receive’ see Melchert 1989: 42–5 contra Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies 1982: 101–4). However, the root **wes-* in a commercial sense is reflected in *unattalla-* ‘merchant’ (a hapax legomenon in the Hittite Laws §5 for ‘merchant’, spelled *ú-na-at-tal-la-an*). Derivation of this word from Hittite *u-un-ni/a-* ‘to drive’ with an initial vowel spelled with the sign *u* and a geminate *-nn-* is semantically dubious and phonologically impossible (see the correct remarks of Kloekhorst 2008: 917). I propose that *ú-na-at-tal-la-* is rather a loanword from Luvian with the regular outcome of **usna-* < **us-no-* or syncopated **we/os-no-*. For loss of **s* before **n* in Luvian compare Luvian /ta:na-/ ‘sanctified, inviolable’ < **dh(e)h₁s-no-* (Melchert

1997: 49). Therefore Luvian did inherit the root *wes-* in the sense ‘buy/sell’, and the commercial sense of HLuvian /*washa-*/ (< **was-sha-*) is perfectly in order.

PIE **wes-* clearly referred to *both* buying and selling: see especially Benveniste 1969: 1.125–8 and Watkins 1975b: 100–7, the latter elucidating the prehistory of Latin *uēnum dare* ‘to sell’ and *uēnum ire* ‘to be sold’ and cognate phrases in Greek and Sanskrit. This duality is clearly continued in Hittite *waš-* ‘to buy’ vs. *ušne-/ušniya-* ‘to offer for sale’. Contra Szemerényi (1979: 122) the Hittite and Luvian reflexes show that the root **wes-* was *not* restricted to the sense ‘to buy’ already in PIE (which is also belied by Iranian reflexes he cites 1979: 120–21). See further Mallory and Adams 1997: 184–86 and 224–25 with references.

The question remains: how are we to reconcile these facts with the religious connotations of CLuvian *wašḫa-* and the pan-Luvian adjective /*washaiya-*/? I believe the answer lies in the fact established by Benveniste (1951): in Proto-Indo-European society giving and receiving were regarded as part of a single process of reciprocal exchange. This notion permeated PIE society, including the relationship of host and guest, of poet and patron, and of humans and gods (the principle of *do ut des*). We know that there was no hesitation on the part of the Hittites to invoke the mutual dependence of humans and gods (see Singer 2002: 40 on the prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal and *ibid.* 48 on the plague prayers of Mursili).

I therefore propose that PIE **wes-* originally meant ‘to pledge in exchange’, referring to both parts of any reciprocal exchange: (1) of commodities between people, (2) of people and things dedicated to gods and of a deity dedicated to a person, (3) of a fine or penalty given in exchange for release from debt. All three senses persisted into pre-Luvian, to which was added a new commercial sense, reflecting the exchange of a commodity for a recognized medium of exchange (precious metal).² The Luvian adjective /*washaiya-*/ became specialized in the religious sphere, while the base noun /*washa-*/ was apparently preserved in the same meaning in CLuvian, but evolved to have a commercial sense in HLuvian (recall again the prehistoric presence of such a use for **wes-* in Luvian in *unattalla-* ‘merchant’).

The sense of ‘pledged to’ used of persons is likely also reflected in female personal names with second members *-wašḫa/i-* and *-wašti-* (see Zehnder 2010: 97–8). This is clearest in the latter type with inflected first members in the dative (thus contra Zehnder): *‘Tāti-wašti* ‘a pledge/gift to the father’, HLuvian /*Tarhunti-wasti/* ‘a pledge/gift to Tarhunt’ (MARAŞ 2,§1), *‘Hani-wašti* ‘a pledge/gift to Hani’. The simplex name *‘Wašti* either means simply ‘gift’ or is a “Kurzname” back-formed from a compound. The nominal stem *wašti-* represents an action noun **wés-ti-* ‘pledging’, concretized to ‘the thing pledged’. Likewise then also *‘Aššui-wašḫa-* represents ‘a pledge to the *a*-stone’ (like Hittite *ḫuwaši-*, Luvian /*a:ssu-*/ likely meant ‘cult stone’ as well as ‘boundary stone’), *‘Lalanti-wašḫa-* ‘a pledge to Lalanta (city-name)’, *‘Malia-wašḫi-* ‘a pledge to (the goddess) Maliya’ (rather than ‘a gift from M.’), and so forth.

2. The question of just when and where various sets of Indo-European speakers learned and adopted the ways of commerce (buying and selling in the modern sense) is a topic beyond the scope of this essay. Undoubtedly, this was not a one-time event, and the answer differs for different sets of prehistoric speakers. I insist only that at the earliest PIE stage the underlying notion was one of mutual exchange of persons, goods, and services in a pre-commercial society. I again refer the reader to Benveniste 1951, the relevant portions of Benveniste 1969, and Mallory and Adams 1997: 184–6.

The restriction of *wašḫa-* and **wašti-* to female names may not be coincidental. According to a new suggestion of Pinault (2011), PIE **wes-* was also used to refer to mutual exchange as part of marriage: Greek ὄαρ ‘wife’ (neuter!) by this analysis reflects **wós-r*, **wés-n-* (the latter the source of **wé/ós-n-o-* cited above), against the semantically implausible derivation from **swós-r* by Janda (1999). The wife would be the thing pledged in exchange (HCM). For early Indo-European marriage as yet another instances of exchange see the Sanskrit passages with *ména-* ‘exchange’ and ‘concubine’ in Hoffmann 1960 cited by Pinault.

There are also traces of an older non-commercial sense ‘to pledge, match’ (on a balance scale) for Hittite *ušneške-*:

(8) *KUB 21.27 iv 38–42 (Prayer of Puduhepa, NH)*

^mHattušili[šš]=a ARAD=KA ANA ZI DINGIR-LIM šer dariyat nu=za apē[l] SAG. DU-an ZI=ŠU=ya uššanišket kuitman [ŠA DINGI]R-LIM EN=YA ^{URU}Neriqqan āššiyant[an UR]U-an EGIR-pa wetet

“Also Hattusili, your servant, has exerted himself for the god’s will and pledged his body and soul, until he rebuilt Nerik, beloved city of the god, my lord.”

Singer (2002: 105) renders *uššanišket* as ‘engaged’. Also possible is ‘put in the balance’ in the sense of ‘put at risk’ (cf. Friedrich 1952: iv 40 ‘aufs Spiel setzen’).

(9) *KUB 21.19+KBo 52.17 iii 19’–21’*

(Prayer of Hattusili and Puduhepa, NH)

nu KUR ^{URU}Nerik EGIR-pa ašešanunun ^{URU}N[eriqqan URU-an] EGIR-pa wedaḥḥun nu=za ANA KUR ^{URU}Ner[ik šer?] SAG.DU=YA ZI=YA uššaniškenun

“I resettled the land of Nerik. I rebuilt the city Nerik. For(?) the land of Nerik I pledged my body and soul.”

(10) *KBo 21.22 Ro 14–21 (blessings for the king, OH/MS)*

nu=za kuit labarnaš LUGAL-uš ištanzanaš=šaš [x-x-x]-x-aš ilāliškezzi n=at=ši anda arān ēštu [nu=za kui]t ^{MUNUS}tawanannaš MUNUS.LUGAL ŠA ZI=ŠU ŠA UZU=ŠU ilališkezi [n=a]t=ši anda aran ēštu § kāša ^{GIŠ}RÍN karpiyemi nu labarnaš taluqauš MU.ḪI.A-uš ušneškemi kāša ^{GIŠ}RÍN karpiyemi n=ašta ^{MUNUS}tawanannaš taluqauš MU.ḪI.A-uš ušneškemi AWAT ^{GIŠ}RÍN araḥza QATI

“Whatever the labarna the king desires with his soul and flesh(?), let it come to him. Whatever the tawananna the queen desires with her soul and flesh(?), let it come to her. I hereby lift up the scales and weigh out/match long years for the labarna. I hereby lift up the scales and weigh out/match long years for the tawananna. The word of the scales outside is finished.”

Contra Neu (1980: 81–82) and Watkins (1987: 293), *ušneškemi* is very unlikely to mean “I put up for sale.” As per Otten (1958: 132), Carruba (1964: 415), Kellerman (1978: 201), Archi (1979: 47), and Puhvel (1983: 52), *ušneške-* is rather the technical term for ‘to weigh’ on a balance scale, since such weighing requires putting something in one pan as a pledge/payment against what is put in the other (as per Otten 1958: 132 “einsetzen”). However, contra Puhvel it does not mean here that the king’s and queen’s lifespan “is symbolically hung in the balance,” nor contra Kellerman (1978: 204) that “if the ‘long years’ weigh much, the king will live a long

time.” Rather with Otten (1958: 132) and Archi (1979: 44) the ritual action is to *assure* long years for the royal couple, as indicated by the preceding context. Compare further the similar sentiment of KUB 29.1 ii 7–10 cited by Archi: ^{GIŠ}hūšuš šūwaduš ḫarkanzi nu LUGAL-waš MU.KAM.ḪI.A-uš malkiyanzi wittann=a kudreš=šmit kappūwuwar=šamet ŪL duqqāri “They (the fate goddesses) are holding full spindles. They spin the years of the king, and of the years no reckoning (nor) counting is to be seen.” We also have other ample evidence from prayers that long life was among the blessings most sought for the Hittite king and queen. It is thus not remotely plausible that ‘long years’ would merely be offered to the king and queen as interested buyers. Rather, symbols for long years are placed in the one pan of the scales, and enough weight (surely metal) is put in the other to balance them and thus assure the desired long life of the royal couple (for such symbols of long years compare the hunting bag/cornucopia of Telipinu in KUB 17.10 iv 31). One may compare with Otten (1958: 131–2) the Hurro-Hittite ritual KBo 17.95 iii 5–11, where the king puts a lead ingot onto a set of scales that is then held out to the Sun-god. One would expect *ušne-* to be used either of the object A pledged to match B, or of the object B that is matched by object A.

I have argued that the overall use of Hittite *ušne(ške)-* and of the Luvian family that includes *unattalla-* ‘merchant’ and /washa-/ and its various derivatives can only be fully understood in terms of an inherited Proto-Indo-European notion of a society built on a complex system of mutual exchange, one that was then largely renewed with the advent of commerce in the sense of exchange of goods for precious metals. On the other hand, the reference to some kind of meal or feast being furnished to the seller by the buyer in the first-millennium HLuvian texts involving land sales cited above appears to have no Indo-European background. For a ceremonial meal furnished by the buyer to conclude a land sale in second-millennium Mesopotamia see Gelb, Steinkeller and Whiting 1991: 243–4. For a similar practice in Late Bronze Age Emar see Beckman 1997: 99 and Scurlock 1993. Since the two instances in HLuvian texts are in fact from Syria (KARKAMIŠ and CEKKE), I conclude that this practice belongs to the Ancient Near East and was adopted from there by Luvian speakers. Thus in this case as in other aspects of what we (oversimplistically) label “Luvian” society, we are dealing with a mixture of old and new and with a blending of Indo-European and Ancient Near Eastern elements.

References

- Archi, A.
 1979 Auguri per il Labarna. Pp. 27–51 in *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*. Edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Aurora.
- Beckman, G.
 1997 Real Property Sales at Emar. Pp. 95–120 in *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons: Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on His 80th Birthday*. Edited by G. D. Young, M. W. Chavalas, and R.E. Averbeck. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Benveniste, É.
 1951 Don et échange dans le vocabulaire indo-européen. *L'Année sociologique* 2: 7–20. Repr. pp. 315–26 in *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.
- 1969 *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Carruba, O.
 1964 Hethitisch *-(a)šta, -(a)pa* und die anderen “Ortsbezugpartikeln.” *Orientalia NS* 33: 405–36.

- Friedrich, Johannes
1952 *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Gelb, I. J., Steinkeller P., and Whiting R. M. Jr.
1991 *Earliest Land Tenure Systems in the Near East: Ancient Kudurrus*. Oriental Institute Publications 104. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Giusfredi, F.
2010 *Sources for a Socio-Economic History of the Neo-Hittite States*. THeth 28. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Hawkins, J. D.
2000 *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume 1. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Hawkins, J. D., and Morpurgo Davies A.
1982 Buying and selling in Hieroglyphic Luwian. Pp. 91–105 in *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*. IBS 40. Edited by J. Tischler. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Hoffmann, K.
1960 Der vedische Typus *menāmenam*. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 76: 242–8.
- Janda, M.
1999 Zur Herkunft von homerisch *ῥαπ*. Pp. 315–324 in *Floreat Studia Mycenaea. Akten des X. Internationalen Colloquiums in Salzburg vom 1.-5. Mai 1995*. Edited by Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy et al. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kellerman, G.
1978 The King and the Sun-god in the Old Hittite Period. *Tel Aviv* 5: 199–208.
- Kloekhorst, A.
2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Mallory, J. P., and Adams D. Q.
1997 *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London/Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Melchert, H. C.
1989 New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. *Historische Sprachforschung* 102: 23–45.
1997 Luvian /tāna-/ ‘sanctified, inviolable’. *Historische Sprachforschung* 110: 47–51.
2004a *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave.
2004b Hieroglyphic Luvian Verbs in *-min(a)*. Pp. 355–62 in *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martii anno MMIV*. IBS 60. Edited by Adam Hyllested et al. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Neu, E.
1980 Die hethitischen Verben des Kaufens und Verkaufens. *Welt des Orients* 11: 76–89.
- Oettinger, N.
2011 Indogermanisches **h₁es-* ‚sitzen‘ und luwisch *asa[r]*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 65: 167–9.
- Otten, H.
1958 *Hethitische Totenrituale*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Pinault, G.
2011 Indogermanische Verwandtschaftswörter und das Bild der Gesellschaft. Handout from Arbeitstagung der Indogermanische Gesellschaft, “Menschenbild”, Halle, 31. März 2011.
- Puhvel, J.
1983 Homeric questions and Hittite answers. *American Journal of Philology* 104: 221–7.
- Scurlock, J.
1993 Once more *ku-bu-ru*. *Nouvelles Assyriologique Brèves et Utilitaires* 1993/21.
- Singer, I.
2002 *Hittite Prayers*. Writings from the Ancient World 11. Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature.
- Starke, F.
1985 *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. StBoT 30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Szemerényi, O.

1979 Germanica I (1–5). *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 93: 103–25.

Watkins, C.

1975a La designation indo-européennes du ‘tabou’. Pp. 208–14 in *Langues, discours, société. Pour Émile Benveniste*. Edited by J. C. Milner et al. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

1975b Some Indo-European verb phrases and their transformations. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 33: 89–109.

1987 Linguistic and archeological light on some Homeric formulas. Pp. 286–98 in *Proto-Indo-European: the Archaeology of a Linguistic Problem. Studies in Honor of Marija Gimbutas*. Edited by S. Skomal, and E. Polomé. Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

Yakubovich, I.

2010 The West Semitic God El in Anatolian Hieroglyphic Transmission. Pp. 385–98 in *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*. StBoT 51. Edited by Yoram Cohen et al. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zehnder, T.

2010 *Die hethitischen Frauennamen. Katalog und Interpretation*. Dresdner Beiträge zu Hethitologie 29. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.