

This pdf of your paper in *Prehistoric, Ancient Near Eastern and Aegean Textiles and Dress* belongs to the publishers Oxbow Books and it is their copyright.

As author you are licenced to make up to 50 offprints from it, but beyond that you may not publish it on the World Wide Web until three years from publication (December 2017), unless the site is a limited access intranet (password protected). If you have queries about this please contact the editorial department at Oxbow Books (editorial@oxbowbooks.com).

ANCIENT TEXTILES SERIES VOL. 18

An offprint from

PREHISTORIC, ANCIENT
NEAR EASTERN AND AEGEAN
TEXTILES AND DRESS

an Interdisciplinary Anthology

edited by

Mary Harlow, Cécile Michel and Marie-Louise Nosch

Paperback Edition: ISBN 978-1-78297-719-3

Digital Edition: ISBN 978-1-78297-720-9



© Oxbow Books 2014
Oxford & Philadelphia

Published in the United Kingdom in 2014 by
OXBOW BOOKS
10 Hythe Bridge Street, Oxford OX1 2EW

and in the United States by
OXBOW BOOKS
908 Darby Road, Havertown, PA 19083

© Oxbow Books and the individual contributors 2014

Paperback Edition: ISBN 978-1-78297-719-3

Digital Edition: ISBN 978-1-78297-720-9

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the publisher in writing.

Printed in Malta by Gutenberg Press

For a complete list of Oxbow titles, please contact:

UNITED KINGDOM
Oxbow Books
Telephone (01865) 241249, Fax (01865) 794449
Email: oxbow@oxbowbooks.com
www.oxbowbooks.com

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Oxbow Books
Telephone (800) 791-9354, Fax (610) 853-9146
Email: queries@casemateacademic.com
www.casemateacademic.com/oxbow

Oxbow Books is part of the Casemate Group

Front cover: Detail of the skirt, showing the loose belt on ivory figurine NAM 6580, Prosymna.

Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Contributors	vii
1 Investigating Neolithic and Copper Age Textile Production in Transylvania (Romania). Applied Methods and Results <i>Paula Mazăre</i>	1
2 Spindle Whorls From Two Prehistoric Settlements on Thassos, North Aegean <i>Sophia Vakirtzi, Chaido Koukouli–Chryssanthaki and Stratis Papadopoulos</i>	43
3 Textile Texts of the Lagaš II Period <i>Richard Firth</i>	57
4 In Search of Lost Costumes. On royal attire in Ancient Mesopotamia, with special reference to the Amorite <i>Ariane Thomas</i>	74
5 Elements for a Comparative Study of Textile Production and Use in Hittite Anatolia and in Neighbouring Areas <i>Giulia Baccelli, Benedetta Bellucci and Matteo Vigo</i>	97
6 Buttons, Pins, Clips and Belts..... ‘Inconspicuous’ Dress Accessories from the Burial Context of the Mycenaean Period (16th–12th cent. BC) <i>Eleni Konstantinidi-Syvridi</i>	143
7 Textile Semitic Loanwords in Mycenaean as <i>Wanderwörter</i> <i>Valentina Gasbarra</i>	158
8 Constructing Masculinities through Textile Production in the Ancient Near East <i>Agnès Garcia-Ventura</i>	167
9 Spindles and Distaffs: Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Eastern Mediterranean Use of Solid and Tapered Ivory/Bone Shafts <i>Caroline Sauvage</i>	184

10	Golden Decorations in Assyrian Textiles: An Interdisciplinary Approach <i>Salvatore Gaspa</i>	227
11	<i>e-ri-ta</i> 's Dress: Contribution to the Study of the Mycenaean Priestesses' Attire <i>Tina Boloti</i>	245
12	Flax and Linen in the First Millennium Babylonia BC: The Origins, Craft Industry and Uses of a Remarkable Textile <i>Louise Quillien</i>	271
13	Two Special Traditions in Jewish Garments and the Rarity of Mixing Wool and Linen Threads in the Land of Israel <i>Orit Shamir</i>	297

7. Textile Semitic Loanwords in Mycenaean as *Wanderwörter*

Valentina Gasbarra

Language is the most direct means of expression and the most spontaneous reflex of the culture which it represents. In this sense, the decipherment of Linear B and the publication of Mycenaean archives have led us to examine how Mycenaean society was organized and, from a strictly linguistic point of view, the contacts and exchanges between the Mycenaean world and its immediate or more distant neighbours, as well as the connections with 1st millennium Greek forms.

Even though Mycenaean tablets consist exclusively in bureaucratic or administrative documents, they testify to the most fundamental linguistic categories of later Greek and allow us to follow and reconstruct the evolution of the language between the two stages under the phonological, morpho-syntactical and lexical profiles. This task does not occur without any surprises: as we can see, for example, by taking a glance at some morphological categories, such as the compounds. The Mycenaean lexicon displays a well consolidated tendency in replacing some terminological blanks with neologisms, which are often not yet included in the standard vocabulary, and for this reason present with a high degree of internal transparency and a clear recognizability in terms of constituents. On this subject, the other strategy available is the borrowing, and particularly, the borrowing of special terminology. This sector of research is not completely exhaustive at the present time,¹ although Mycenaean studies have known a significant impulse in recent years, thanks both to the interest of scholars and to the edition of corpora of documents, which have made a wide survey of the Mycenaean archives and have shown the spread of the language.

The infrequent loanwords in the Mycenaean Linear B archives belong mainly to the field of commercial exchange and they provide valuable evidence of Greek-Semitic interaction in the 2nd millennium BC. Let's start from the examples of textile terminology (e.g. those associated with fibre production, textile names, weaving and manufacture of garments, names of the workers employed in the textile industry) which are borrowed in the Mycenaean tablets: this contribution is aimed at elucidating the procedures and the categorization of linguistic borrowings, taking into account the typology of loanwords and the degree of the adaptation phenomena, such as the formation of compounds and derivatives modeled by using the morpho-syntactical structures of the Greek language. Another topic, which will be focused on, is the continuity between the semantic classes

¹ For a survey of studies about Greek and Semitic interference during the 2nd millennium BC, see: Vaniček 1878; Muss-Arnolt 1892; Lewy 1895; Grimme 1925; Mayer Modena 1960; Astour 1967; Masson 1967.

in the Semitic loanwords of the 2nd millennium BC and those of the later stage of the Greek language. Although the number of Semitic loanwords in the Mycenaean tablets is few, the terms that the Greek language continues borrowing from the Semitic languages are still related to the names of plants, metals, materials and garments and, mostly, to technical and commercial terminology. *A latere* of these considerations, the influence of the Anatolian languages must be underlined: the role of Hittite, particularly as the intermediary language from which Mycenaean Greek inherited some Semitic loanwords, will be also stressed.

The pre-Greek substrate and Greek in contact with other languages

The contacts between Greek and other languages, and the effects produced by these contacts, provide the most conspicuous evidence of the historicity of language. In ancient times, just as today, linguistic borrowing reflects judgements of cultural value and historical progress of a language is dependent on precisely such judgements.² The question of Greek in contact with other languages cannot be separated from the reflection on “common Greek” and on the substrate and contact languages on the Greek territory before the Hellenization. After the collapse of the Mycenaean kingdoms and the disintegration of the palatial societies, the linguistic outline of Greece was completely thrown. The so-called “Greek Dark Ages” (9th–8th centuries BC) corresponds with a social, economic and cultural withdrawal³ as testified by the archaeological evidence, and with the consequent loss of the use of writing. The Dark Ages can therefore be considered as a formative period of the culture of archaic and classical Greece, at the end of which⁴ the adoption of alphabetic writing inherited from the northern Semitic scripts (φοινικία γράμματα ‘Phoenician script’) is one of the most important innovations.

The linguistic outline of Greece before the introduction of the Linear A and B writings is widely debated, and scholars are divided between those who believe that the Greek language has become dominant on a pre-existent Indo-European substrate,⁵ and those who are inclined to believe in a so-called “Indo-Mediterranean substrate” with a very general and indefinite features, but with a clear and discriminating Non-Indo-European origin.⁶

These are both *a priori* assumptions and, as such, cannot be defended. The only fact that we can also evaluate is the presence of a number of words in the Greek lexicon which have no obvious connection in the cognate languages and are therefore suspected of being loans of “autochthonous” population inhabiting those areas before the arrival of the Indo-Europeans.⁷ The generic notion of substrate has to be interpreted in a weak sense, as a sort of “inheritance” or, as “migrant words”, which occur in other Mediterranean languages and for which no plausible etymology can be found (the most well known examples are: ἔλαιον ‘olive oil’ or οἶνος ‘wine’).⁸

On the other hand, the question of loanwords from pre-Greek languages is particularly complex in the evaluation of words like ξένος ‘foreign’, ἄναξ ‘lord’, βασιλεύς ‘king’, πόλεμος ‘war’, θεός ‘god’

² For an exhaustive introduction of languages in contact with Greek, see Christidis 2007, 721–732.

³ On the return to a self-sufficient economy and on the abandonment of complex and hierarchical social organizations as reaction caused by the collapse of the palatial administration, see Snodgrass 1987, 186–188.

⁴ Amadasi Guzzo, 1991, 293–309.

⁵ Palmer 1980, 4–9.

⁶ Belardi 1954, 610; Silvestri 1974, 35–38.

⁷ Szemerényi 1964, 404–405.

⁸ On the names and on the “etymological reasons” of ‘olive oil’ and of ‘wine’ see Silvestri 2013, 335–340.

etc., with a high degree of specialization in the form and in the meaning and with no connection in the other Indo-European languages, although attested in the Mycenaean archives and, afterwards, in all 1st millennium Greek dialects.

It's not possible to go further: all the efforts directed to individualize a specific substrate (Aegean, Pelasgian, Asianic etc.), sometimes according to the testimony of ancient historians about the origin of their language,⁹ have never met unanimous consensus among scholars, because they always show a lot of weaknesses on the phonetic, morphological or semantic point of view, since many of these terms may be borrowed from languages not yet directly attested.¹⁰

Mycenaean Contacts with the Near East

The Mycenaean palatial system required intensive exploitation of regional resources: sudden expansion of the power of a single palatial centre to control broader regional resources and production would have created new hierarchies of power, work and socio-political networks.¹¹ That organization required a high degree of specialization within specific industries (e.g. wool, flax and dye substances for cloth production; olive oil; perfumed substances and related pottery manufacture etc.). The long list of trades and occupations, which can be identified in the Linear B documents, implies the development of a specialization of labour, which goes far beyond that seen in Homer. Textile production in particular, is one of the most ancient human technologies, playing a crucial role in societies world-wide throughout our past and giving a clear measure of the level of technical know-how. Textile production reflects human interactions with the environment since the end of the Ice Age. Across the Mediterranean area, it testifies to cultural contacts and exchanges between the West and the Ancient Near East. The textile loanwords in the Mycenaean archives point primarily to extensive commercial relations with the Semitic East, but also to the high level of lexical (and, consequently, social and cultural) permeability between the Semitic and the Greek world. The study of textile terminology has a strong inter-disciplinary component, because it is closely connected with the study of material culture and techniques and with the role of textile production in ancient societies with its significance in the economy. The complex organization of production in Mycenaean times might in any case be inferred from the high level of trades. They can also be identified on similar tablets from the Eastern archives, in which craft production was of prime importance and, although textiles are largely invisible in the archaeological record due to their perishable nature, the presence of a linguistic term of a given procedure or tool implies its existence in the society where the language was spoken.¹²

When Linear B was first deciphered, it was immediately clear¹³ that “the most useful and significant analogies” lay with the better documented and more fully understood societies of ancient Near East: often, though, the cryptic practices described in the Mycenaean tablets have been illuminated by the Near Eastern documentation.¹⁴ The presence of foreign goods in Greece and

⁹ Strabo (*Geogr.* 7.7.1) said: « Ἐκαταῖος μὲν οὖν ὁ Μιλήσιος περὶ τῆς Πελοποννήσου φησὶν διότι πρὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ᾤκησαν αὐτὴν βάρβαροι ».

¹⁰ Duhoux 2007, 223–228.

¹¹ See Palaima 2004, 285.

¹² For a general introduction to ancient Near Eastern craft and technology, see Sasson 1995, vol. 1 chapter 7. For a recent review of the ancient Western and Near Eastern textile terminology, see Michel and Nosch 2010.

¹³ Ventris and Chadwick 1956, 106; 113; 133; 135–136.

¹⁴ For the analogies between Mycenaean and Near Eastern societies, see Shelmerdine 1998, 296–298.

Crete, confirmed by the presence of foreign words (names of spices, plants, metals and materials) in the Linear B written texts, testifies to trade contacts with the Semitic populations for most of the 2nd millennium BC. For example, many of the foreign references come from Pylos, where the tablets date to the last year of the palace administration at the end of LH IIIB. At this time, trade contacts with the Near East continued, though probably not on as large a scale as prevailed during LH IIIA2–IIIB1. On the other hand, the Pylos archives provide textual evidence for state-organized production of linen textiles and perfumed oil in industrial quantities, similar to the Knossos wool industry.

Mycenaean textile industry

Textile production is, however, labour intensive and involves many different processes: it implies specialization and division of tasks. Textile terminologies are closely associated with the study of material culture and techniques, and to the role of textile production in society and its significance in the economy. For this reason, the tablets record specific occupations such as spinners, weavers and fullers.¹⁵ We have information on textiles from various Mycenaean centres (Thebes, Mycenae, Knossos, Pylos), but the most extensive documentation comes from Knossos,¹⁶ where we can distinguish data about flocks, wool, production of clothes and names of textile workers, and from Pylos, where the production of flax and linen cloths is well documented. In the Mycenaean world, the textile industry – whose expertise already existed throughout the palatial territories, probably inherited from Minoan culture – was controlled and monitored by the palaces by supporting workers¹⁷ and by controlling the quantities of raw materials from stage to stage until products were finished. The raw materials were distributed to textile workers with the expectation that set production targets would be met and finished textiles delivered back to the palace.¹⁸ Distribution and requisition of raw materials to dependent workers is known as *ta-ra-si-ja* system,¹⁹ and well documented in several areas of craft production. The palace control of goods and materials as well as the management of economic activities involved not only the textile industry, but also all the specialized industries evidenced in the Linear B texts²⁰ (furniture and woodworking, the manufacture of perfumed oil, bronze production, pottery, work with precious materials as gold, lapis-lazuli and ivory etc.).

As evidenced above, the main typologies of fibres testified in the Mycenaean archives are wool and flax, which is documented both as cultivated plant and as a fibre ready to be woven.²¹ The cultivation of flax and the linen industry were wide spread in Greece, as it is shown by the terms designating production and manufacture of flax/linen articles in all periods of the Greek language and by place-names²² derived from the term for “flax” etc. Cultivation and manufacture

¹⁵ See Killen 1984; Palaima 1997; Nosch 2000.

¹⁶ See Luján 2010.

¹⁷ As Killen 1984 evidenced, groups of textile workers were supported by palatial food rations.

¹⁸ Cline 2010, 436.

¹⁹ See Nosch 2000; 2011.

²⁰ See Palaima 2003, 166.

²¹ See Del Frio *et al.* 2010, 344–345, who identifies a regular distinction in the tablets between the plant and the fibre through two different syllabograms: *31=SA (LINUM), attested in Pylos and Knossos, and RI, attested in the Ma series of Pylos, in PY Mm 11 and in KN Nc 5100.

²² For a review of ancient, koine, medieval and modern Greek terms and names for “flax”, “linen” and their derivatives, see Georgacas 1959.

of flax (*linum usitatissimum*) are also well attested in the documents from Near Eastern archives, in which different kinds of cloths and different kinds of employment are regularly distinguished. This subtle distinction is not noticeable in the Mycenaean texts, which only make reference to a particular typology of linen in the Knossos tablet J 693 where the expression *ri-no re-po-to*, Gr. λίνον λεπτόν ‘very fine linen’, before *ki-to*, Gr. χιτών is attested. The other terms with a Semitic etymology, like βύσσος ‘byssos’ (Akk. *būsu*; Ugar. and Phoen. *bš*; Hebr. *būš*) and σινδών ‘fine woven cloth, fine linen garment’ (Akk. *saddinu/šaddi(n)um*; Hebr. *sadīn*), that denote different and more valuable typologies of linen, appear in the Greek vocabulary exclusively from the 5th century BC. This late attestation – in a certain sense – confirms the pure nature of “loanwords by necessity”,²³ connected with the need for naming new products obtained thanks to the improvement of cultivation and manufacturing techniques.

Textile terminology and Semitic loanwords in the Linear B texts

Linear B records a very small number of names of garments, in strict connection with the flax industry. The Mycenaean documents record the word *ki-to*, Gr. χιτών ‘chiton, tunic, designation of a garment without sleeves’. The term is *passim* attested in the Knossos archive and it represents a well-known example of a Semitic loanword, probably lent from the Akk. *kitû(m)*, and which can be compared with Ugar. and Phoen. *ktn*, Hebr. *kutonet*.²⁴

Although the etymology of the word is widely debated,²⁵ the Akkadian term *kitû(m)*, on which the Greek χιτών is modelled, is probably inherited from the Sumerian GAD, GADA²⁶ ‘linen, linen garment’.

The term *ki-to* (nom. sing.) is attested in the Knossos archive twice (KN Lc 563.B and L 693.1), as well as the forms *ki-to-ne* (nom. pl.) and *ki-to-na* (accus. sing.) attested respectively in KN L771.2 and KN Ld 785.2b, and the instrumental *ki-to-pi* in KN Ld 787.B. The term represents a good degree of adaptation into the Mycenaean lexicon, making a derivative and internally transparent adjective through the insertion of Greek affixes, like *e-pi-ki-to-ni-ja*,²⁷ Gr. ἐπιχιτωνία, an adjective that specifies a cloth which is ‘worn over the *ki-to*’.

The fact, however, that the term is spread among numerous Indo-European and Non-Indo-European languages and cultures with the regular and very general meaning ‘tunic, linen tunic’, suggests a close relation with the category of “wandering words”, words which have been borrowed from language to language, across a significant geographical area.

In studies of linguistic interference, it is important to record the distribution of words of foreign origin, making a clear distinction between those words which are widely attested in the host language and those of more limited occurrence. The early contacts between Greek and Semitic attested in the Mycenaean tablets belong mainly to the field of commercial exchange, for this reason the borrowed names with a Semitic etymology in the Linear B texts coherently exhibit this kind of behaviour. They also belong to the categories of plants/spices (e.g. Myc. *ku-mi-no-(a)*, Gr. κύμνον

²³ For a general introduction to lexical borrowings see Haspelmath and Tadmor 2009, particularly chapter 2, 35–54.

²⁴ For all the North-West Semitic attestations, see Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995, s.v.

²⁵ See, lately, Vita 2010, 330.

²⁶ Cfr. AHw, CAD (vol. 8) and CDA, s.v.; Ellenbogen 1962, 96; Masson 1967, 29; GEW and EDG, s.v.

²⁷ In KN L 693 and, probably, in KN L 7514.

‘cumin’ to be compared with Akk. *kamūnu(m)*, Phoen. *kmn* and Hebr. *kammon*;²⁸ Myc. *sa-sa-ma*, Gr. σήσαμον ‘sesame’ to be compared with Akk. *šamaššammū(m)* and Ugar. and Phoen. *ššmn*;²⁹ Myc. *ku-pa-ro*, Gr. κύπαιρος ‘cyperus’, whose model, maybe, could be traced in Hebr. *koper*) and metals (e.g. Myc. *ku-ru-so*, Gr. χρυσός ‘gold’). The word for ‘gold’ is widely attested in many Semitic languages, like Akk. *hurāšu(m)*, Ugar. *hrš*, Phoen. *hrš*³⁰ and Hebr. *hārūs*, and its frequency demonstrates the importance of the gold trade in the ancient economy of Aegean and Near East. Beside the noun for ‘gold’, the Mycenaean archives record the material adjective *ku-ru-so* and *ku-ru-sa-pi*³¹ (Hom. Gr. χρύσειος, χρύσεος, Aeol. χρύσιος ‘golden, made of gold’), and a compound in *-wo-ko /worgos/*, *ku-ru-so-wo-ko* (PY An 207.10), Gr. *χρυσο-Φοργός ‘gold-worker’, which is inscribed in a large group (c. 40) of compounded substantives with verbal second member, usually indicating professions or functions, characterized by their internal recognizability.

In addition to the Semitic words just mentioned, two terms for precious materials can be added: Myc. *ku-wa-no*, Gr. κύανος ‘lapis-lazuli’ and Myc. *e-re-pa*, Gr. ἐλέφας, ‘ivory’. *Ku-wa-no* and *e-re-pa* represent a different typology of loanwords,³² because they have been inherited in Mycenaean Greek not directly from a Semitic language,³³ but through the intermediation of Hittite, as the Hittite forms *ku(wa)nna(n)*– and *lahpa* – clearly demonstrate.

Some tentative conclusions

If the analysis conducted is correct, we can also assume that 2nd millennium Greek displays a small nucleus of terms with a Semitic etymology. These loanwords belong to the field of “special terminology” and they shed a light about contacts and exchanges between Mycenaean Greeks and their immediate or more distant neighbours in the Mediterranean basin during the Bronze Age. They also seem to confirm a high degree of continuity in the semantic classes, because the terms that the Greek language continues to borrow from Semitic languages during its history belong mainly to the field of trades and techniques. These later loanwords are evident in a specific proportion of the need for naming new activities and new objects. For example, the etymology of the Greek word μνᾶ (to be compared with Lat. *mina* and Skt. *manā́-*), which appears in Greek texts and inscriptions from the 6th century BC and which designates the name of a weight standard and a sum of money, can be traced in the Akkadian *manū(m)*³⁴ (Hebr. *mānē*, and Ugar. *mn*), the term for the verb ‘to count’ and for ‘a mina-weight (c. 480 grams)’.

Similarly, the Greek word σίγλος/σίκλος (Lat. *siclus*) ‘shekel’, which represents both a coin and a unity of weight (but with a smaller geographical distribution than μνᾶ), can be considered a loanword from Akk. *šiqḷu(m)* (Hebr. *šeḡel*), the name of a weight and capacity measure.

A latere of these more general considerations, it is important to evaluate – although the terminology in Mycenaean archives is always profoundly fragmentary and scarce – the typology

²⁸ For Phoenician and Hebrew, see Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995, s.v.

²⁹ See Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995, s.v.

³⁰ See Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995, s.v. *hrš*.

³¹ *ku-ru-so* in PY Ta 714.2.2 and *ku-ru-sa-pi* in PY Ta 707.1; 714.3.

³² For a further analysis of the role of Hittite as a bridge language between Indo-European and Non-Indo-European world, see Gasbarra and Pozza 2012, particularly paragraph 3.2.

³³ Cfr. the Akkadian terms *uqnū(m)* ‘lapis-lazuli’ and *alpu(m)* ‘bull, ox’.

³⁴ The Akkadian *manū* has been generally interpreted as a loanword from Sumerian MANA, see AHw, CAD (vol. 10 part I) and CDA, s.v.

of linguistic interference we can analyze in the 2nd millennium BC Greek documentation. The analysis of loanwords, within the context in which they appear, suggests a close relation with the category of “wandering words” (*Wanderwörter*). This class of words is spread among numerous languages and cultures, usually in connection with trade, and it reveals a wide range of difficulty in establishing the etymology of the terms, or even their original source-language. The separation of *Wanderwörter* from loanwords is often ambiguous, and they may be considered a special class of loanwords, well distinguished from the category of *Lehnwort*.

In this sense, the textile terminology inherited from a Semitic source shows a coherent behaviour with all the terminology of plants, metals and materials in Mycenaean archives with a Non-Indo-European origin. These loanwords are also well adapted in the Mycenaean lexicon, as shown by the formation of derivative adjectives or compounds, and they represent a particular combination of endogenous and/or exogenous structures, creating new words well anchored to the sphere of technical pertinence and without any secondary semantic developments.

Acknowledgements

This paper is a product of the PRIN project “Linguistic representations of identity. Sociolinguistic models and historical linguistics” coordinated by Piera Molinelli (PRIN 2010/2011, prot. 2010HXPF2, sponsored by the Italian Ministry of Education and Research). More specifically, the author works within the Research Unit at the University of Rome “La Sapienza”, whose coordinator is Paolo Di Giovine.

Abbreviations

- AHw von Soden, W. 1965–1981 *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch: unter Benutzung des lexikalischen Nachlasses von Bruno Meissner (1868–1947)*. Bearbeitet von Wolfram von Soden, I–III. Wiesbaden.
- CAD Gelb I. J. et al. 1956–2010 *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago.
- CDA Black, J., George, A. and Postgate, N. (eds) 2000² *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*. Wiesbaden.

Bibliography

- Amadasi Guzzo, M. G. 1991 The shadow line. In Baurain C. and Krings V. (eds), *Réflexions sur l'introduction de l'alphabet en Grèce, Phoinikeia Grammata: Lire et Écrire en Méditerranée*, Collection d'études classiques 6. Liège, 293–312.
- Astour, M. C. 1967 *Hellenosemitica: an Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greek*. Leiden.
- Aura Jorro, F. 1985–1993 *Diccionario Micénico*. Madrid.
- Belardi, W. 1954 Una nuova serie lessicale indomediterranea. *Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche*, Serie 8/9, 610–644.
- Cline, E. H. 2010 *The Oxford Handbook of Bronze Age Aegean (ca. 3000–1000 BC)*. Oxford.
- Christidis, A. F. (ed.) 2007 *A History of Ancient Greek from the Beginning to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Del Frio, M., Nosch, M.-L. and Rougemont, F. 2010 The Terminology of Textiles in the Linear B Tablets including some Considerations on Linear A Logograms and Abbreviations. In C. Michel and M.-L. Nosch (eds), *Textile*

- Terminologies in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean from the Third to the First Millennia BC*, Ancient Textiles Series 8. Oxford, 338–373.
- Duhoux, Y. 2007 Pre-Greek Languages: Indirect Evidence. In A. F. Christidis (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek: from the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, 223–228.
- EDG = Beekes, R. 2010 *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden/Boston.
- Ellenbogen, M. 1962 *Foreign Words in the Old Testament: their Origin and Etymology*. London.
- Gasbarra, V. and Pozza, M. 2012 Fenomeni di interferenza greco-anatolica nel II millennio a.C.: l'ittito come mediatore tra mondo indoeuropeo e mondo non indoeuropeo. *AION* 1 (N.S.), 165–214.
- Georgakas, D. J. 1959 Greek Terms for “Flax”, “Linen” and their Derivatives; and the Problem of the Native Egyptian Phonological Influence on the Greek of Egypt. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 13, 253–269.
- GEW = Frisk HJ. 1960–1972, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I–III. Heidelberg.
- Grimme, H. 1925 Hethitisches im Griechischen Wortschatze, *Glotta* 14, 13–26.
- Haspelmath, M. and Tadmor, U. 2009 *Loanwords in the World's Languages. A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin.
- Hoftijzer, J. and Jongeling, K. 1995 *Dictionary of the North West Semitic Inscriptions*, I–II. Leiden.
- Killen, J. T. 1984 The Textile Industries at Pylos and Knossos. In T. G. Palaima and C. W. Shelmerdine (eds), *Pylos Comes Alive: Industry and Administration in a Mycenaean Palace. Papers of a Symposium*. New York, 49–63.
- Lewy, H. 1895 *Die Semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen*. Berlin.
- Luján, E. R. 2010 Mycenaean Textile Terminology at Work. The KN Lc(1)-Tablets and the Occupational Nouns of the Textile Industry. In C. Michel and M.-L. Nosch (eds), *Textile Terminologies in The Ancient Near East and Mediterranean from the Third to the First Millennia BC*, Ancient Textiles Series 8. Oxford, 374–387.
- Mayer Modena, M. L. 1960 Gli imprestiti semitici in greco. *Rendiconti Istituto Lombardo di Lettere* 94, 311–351.
- Masson, E. 1967 *Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts sémitiques en grec*. Paris.
- Michel, C. and Nosch, M.-L. (eds) 2010 *Textile Terminologies in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean from the Third to the First Millennia BC*, Ancient Textiles Series 8. Oxford.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1979 Terminology of Power and Terminology of Work in Greek and Linear B. In E. Risch and H. Mülestein (eds), *Colloquium Mycenaeanum. Actes du sixième Colloque International sur les textes mycéniens et égéens tenu à Chaumont sur Neuchâtel (7–13 Septembre 1975)*. Genève, 87–108.
- Muss-Arnolt, W. 1892 On Semitic Words in Greek and Latin. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 23, 35–156.
- Nosch, M.-L. 2000 Acquisition and Distribution: *ta-ra-si-ja* in the Mycenaean Textile Industry. In C. Gillis, C. Risberg and B. Sjöberg (eds) *Trade and Production in Premonetary Greece: Acquisition and Distribution of Raw Materials and Finished Products. Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop, Athens 1996*. Sweden/Åström, 43–61.
- Nosch, M.-L. (2011) Production in the Palace of Knossos: Observations on the Lc(1) Textile Targets. *American Journal of Archeology* 115 (4), 495–505.
- Palaima, T. G. 1997 Potter and Fuller: The Royal Craftsmen. In P. P. Betancourt and R. Laffineur (eds), *TEXNH: Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 6th International Aegean Conference. Philadelphia, Temple University, 18–21 April 1996*, Aegeum 16. Liège/Austin, 407–412.
- Palaima, T. G. 2003 ‘Archives’ and ‘Scribes’ and Information Hierarchy in Mycenaean Greek Linear B Records. In M. Brosius (ed.), *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions. Concepts of Record-Keeping in the Ancient World*. Oxford, 153–194.
- Palaima, T. G. 2004 Mycenaean Accounting Methods and Systems and Their Place within Mycenaean Palatial Civilization. In M. Hudson and C. Wunsch (eds), *Creating Economic Order. Record-Keeping, Standardization, and the Development of Accounting in the Ancient Near East*. Bethesda/Maryland, 269–302.
- Palmer, L. R. 1980 *The Greek Language*. London.
- Sasson, J. (ed.) 1995 *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, I–IV. London.
- Shelmerdine, C. W. 1998 Where do we go from here? And how can the Linear B tablets help us get there? In E. H. Cline and D. Harris-Cline (eds), *The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium, Proceedings of the 50th Anniversary Symposium, University of Cincinnati, 18–20 April 1997*, Aegeum 18. Liège, 291–298.
- Silvestri, D. 1974 *La nozione di indomediterraneo in linguistica storica*. Napoli.

- Silvestri, D. 2013 Interferenze linguistiche nell'Egeo tra preistoria e protostoria. In L. Lorenzetti and M. Mancini (eds), *Le lingue del Mediterraneo antico. Culture, mutamenti, contatti*. Roma, 333–375.
- Snodgrass, A. M. 1987 *An Archaeology of Greece. The present State and future Scope of a Discipline*. Berkeley/Los Angeles.
- Szemerényi, O. 1964 On Reconstructing the Mediterranean Substrata. *Romance Philology* 17, 404–418.
- Vaniček, A. 1878 *Fremdwörter im Griechischen und Lateinischen*. Leipzig.
- Ventris, M. and Chadwick, J. (1956) *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge.
- Vigo, M. 2010 Linen in Hittite Inventory Texts. In C. Michel and M.-L. Nosch (eds), *Textile Terminologies in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean from the Third to the First Millennia BC*, Ancient Textiles Series 8. Oxford, 290–322.
- Vita, J. P. 2010 Textile Terminology in the Ugaritic Texts. In C. Michel and M.-L. Nosch (eds), *Textile Terminologies in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean from the Third to the First Millennia BC*, Ancient Textiles Series 8. Oxford, 323–337.
- Wisti Lassen, A. (2010) Tools, Procedures and Professions: A review of Akkadian Textile Terminology. In C. Michel and M.-L. Nosch. (eds), *Textile Terminologies in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean from the Third to the First Millennia BC*, Ancient Textiles Series 8. Oxford, 272–282.