



HAL
open science

Textile terminologies

Cécile Michel, Marie Louise Bech Nosch

► **To cite this version:**

Cécile Michel, Marie Louise Bech Nosch. Textile terminologies. Textile Terminologies in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean from the Third to the First millennia BC, 8, Oxbow Books, pp.ix-xx, 2010, Ancient Textiles Series, 9781842177532. halshs-01186434

HAL Id: halshs-01186434

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01186434v1>

Submitted on 26 Aug 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

An offprint from

TEXTILE TERMINOLOGIES

IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST AND MEDITERRANEAN
FROM THE THIRD TO THE FIRST MILLENNIA BC

edited by

C. Michel and M.-L. Nosch

ANCIENT TEXTILES SERIES VOL. 8

© Oxbow Books

ISBN 978-1-84217-975-8

Contents

*Acknowledgements and research frameworks for the investigation of textile terminologies
in the 3rd and 2nd millennia BC* vii

Textile Terminologies
by Cécile Michel and Marie-Louise Nosch..... ix

- 1 Synonymic Variation in the Field of Textile Terminology: A study in diachrony
and synchrony
by *Pascaline Dury and Susanne Lervad*.....1
- 2 The Basics of Textile Tools and Textile Technology: From fibre to fabric
by *Eva Andersson Strand*10
- 3 Textile Terminologies and Classifications: Some methodological and chronological aspects
by *Sophie Desrosiers*.....23
- 4 Weaving in Mesopotamia during the Bronze Age: Archaeology, techniques, iconography
by *Catherine Breniquet*52
- 5 Cloths – Garments – and Keeping Secrets. Textile classification and cognitive chaining
in the ancient Egyptian writing system
by *Ole Herslund*.....68
- 6 The ‘linen list’ in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom Egypt: Text and textile reconciled
by *Jana Jones*81
- 7 Clothing in Sargonic Mesopotamia: Visual and written evidence
by *Benjamin R. Foster*..... 110
- 8 Textiles in the Administrative Texts of the Royal Archives of Ebla (Syria, 24th century BC)
with Particular Emphasis on Coloured Textiles
by *Maria Giovanna Biga*..... 146
- 9 Les noms sémitiques des tissus dans les textes d’Ebla
by *Jacopo Pasquali*..... 173

10	New Texts Regarding the Neo-Sumerian Textiles by <i>Francesco Pomponio</i>	186
11	The Colours and Variety of Fabrics from Mesopotamia during the Ur III Period (2050 BC) by <i>Hartmut Waetzoldt</i>	201
12	The Textiles Traded by the Assyrians in Anatolia (19th–18th centuries BC) by <i>Cécile Michel and Klaas R. Veenhof</i>	210
13	Tools, Procedures and Professions: A review of the Akkadian textile terminology by <i>Agnete Wisti Lassen</i>	272
14	Les textiles du Moyen-Euphrate à l'époque paléo-babylonienne d'après un ouvrage récent by <i>Anne-Claude Beaugéard</i>	283
15	Linen in Hittite Inventory Texts by <i>Matteo Vigo</i>	290
16	Textile Terminology in the Ugaritic Texts by <i>Juan-Pablo Vita</i>	323
17	The Terminology of Textiles in the Linear B Tablets, including Some Considerations on Linear A Logograms and Abbreviations by <i>Maurizio del Freo, Marie-Louise Nosch and Françoise Rougemont</i>	338
18	Mycenaean Textile Terminology at Work: The KN Lc(1)-tablets and the occupational nouns of the textile industry by <i>Eugenio R. Luján</i>	374
19	Les textiles néo-assyriens et leurs couleurs by <i>Pierre Villard</i>	388
20	Textile Terminology in the Neo-Babylonian Documentation by <i>Francis Joannès</i>	400
21	Garments in Non-Cultic Context (Neo-Babylonian Period) by <i>Stefan Zawadzki</i>	409
22	Some Considerations about Vedic, Avestan and Indo-Iranian Textile Terminology by <i>Miguel Ángel Andrés-Toledo</i>	430

Textile Terminologies

Cécile Michel and Marie-Louise Nosch

“Words survive better than cloth”, writes textile scholar Elizabeth Barber in her monograph *Prehistoric Textiles*.¹ This is certainly true for the period under investigation, the 3rd to the 1st millennia BC, and for the ancient Near East and the Mediterranean where textiles rarely survive, with the notable exception of Egypt.² The richness and varieties of textual documentation, however, constitute a unique source of information of the ancient textiles, their production and consumption in these areas. Various scholars have over the years investigated this rich textile terminology data in comprehensive works on the role of textiles in ancient societies,³ or in individual studies on single corpus terminologies;⁴ here, for the first time, we attempt a comparative and diachronic study of ancient textile terminologies.

1. Chronological and geographical areas covered

The geographical and chronological framework for the present investigation in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Near East, focused on the period from the 3rd to the 1st millennia BC. During the 3rd millennium in Mesopotamia,⁵ textile production developed from household production to standardised, industrialised, centralised production, on the basis of a division of labour. Sheep developed a white coat/wool through selective breeding,⁶ wool was integrated into textile production as an alternative to plant fibres, which then provided the dynamics for the development of felting,⁷ fulling, dye industries, colour extraction and intensive use of colour symbolism in dress and textiles.⁸ Within this area we also have the development of palace economies and administrations, inscriptions with extensive records on production management, tools, glyptic, frescoes and relief iconography in which various types of dress are visible.

¹ Barber 1991, 260.

² Vogelsang-Eastwood 1999; Kemp & Vogelsang Eastwood 2001.

³ Barber 1991; Gillis & Nosch (eds.) 2007; Breniquet 2008; Völling 2008; Burke 2010.

⁴ Veenhof 1972; Waetzoldt 1972; 1981; Ribicini & Xella 1985; Van Soldt 1990; Archi 1999; Pasquali 1997; Barber 2001; Zawadzki 2006; Pomponio 2008; Durand 2009.

⁵ Breniquet 2008; 2010.

⁶ Ryder 1983.

⁷ Burkett 1979.

⁸ Cardon 2007; Alfaro & Karali 2008; Singer 2008.

The contributions analyse and discuss the parameters for the development of textile terminologies in these areas and periods. The textual analyses reveal how terms for tools, technology and textiles developed over the millennia to meet new demands. In the quasi-absence of Bronze Age archaeological textile remains, it is necessary to join forces and combine specialist knowledge, not only from the region itself, but also from elsewhere, such as in the Scandinavian experimental archaeological tradition,⁹ textile expertise and tool studies from other areas,¹⁰ and comparative linguistic explorations of how terminologies develop within a defined technical field.¹¹

2. Sources, texts and language families

This volume contains studies of textile terminologies in the Semitic and Indo-European languages. In addition, the authors combine their analyses with data from other fields of research such as archaeology, which can yield information about textile remains,¹² imprints of textiles on clay,¹³ mineralised textiles on metal objects, or textile tools.¹⁴ Another rich source of information is iconography,¹⁵ while other scholars include results from ethnographic studies¹⁶ or experimental textile archaeology.¹⁷

The texts preserved from the Bronze Age and Early Iron Age in the eastern Mediterranean and ancient Near East are of a particular nature: each document has a specific function, and accordingly the data about textiles vary a great deal, depending on the category to which a document belongs. Some cuneiform documents are official texts, written for example for the king: accounts of royal victories, descriptions of the king as the builder of monuments and his cultic activities, and in such documents descriptions of luxurious textiles may occur; such types of textiles also occur in the cultic activities as gifts offered to the gods or to their statues.

Another category comprises texts describing economic and daily activities. This includes palace management of textile production (employees, production), accounts from large weaving workshops, rations for the textile workers, the administration and organisation of textile manufacture,¹⁸ or the quantity and quality of wool needed or allocated.¹⁹ The entire Linear B documentation belongs to this category.²⁰ However, despite the accuracy and details, such accounts rarely inform us about textile techniques or about the use of textiles.

A third category of texts, particularly well attested in the cuneiform corpus, consists of the diplomatic correspondence with its lists of gifts between royal courts among which are often textiles and clothes.²¹

⁹ Peacock 2001; Andersson & Nosch 2003; Andersson *et al.* 2008; Nosch forthcoming.

¹⁰ Hoffman 1964; Andersson 2003; 2010; Andersson & Nosch 2003; Gleba 2008.

¹¹ Dury & Lervand 2010.

¹² Recent archaeological textiles published in Frangipane *et al.* 2009; Andersson *et al.* 2010; Andersson Strand & Nosch (eds.) forthcoming.

¹³ Adovasio 1975/77; Möller-Wiering 2008.

¹⁴ Andersson *et al.* 2008; Mårtensson, Nosch, Andersson Strand 2009; Breniquet 2008.

¹⁵ Strommenger 1980/83; Barber 1991; Breniquet 2008; 2010; Foster 2010.

¹⁶ Hoffman 1964; Desrosiers 2010.

¹⁷ Andersson 2003; Andersson & Nosch 2003.

¹⁸ Waetzoldt 1972; Biga 2010; Pomponio 2010; Verderame 2008.

¹⁹ Waetzoldt 2010.

²⁰ Del Frio, Nosch, Rougemont 2010; Luján 2010

²¹ Moran 1987; Lerouxel 2002; Biga 2008.

Finally, another rich category of textile related texts is the private archives documenting trade, daily use etc. The best example is the private correspondence between Assyrians trading textiles in Anatolia and their wives who wove at home in Aššur.²²

Whereas in some languages, there is only one word to designate a type of fabric or material, other languages have developed – or preserved – a richer vocabulary. For example, for the primary textile plant fibre, modern English and German have two different words: “flax” (Engl.) and “Flachs” (Germ.) for the plant, and “linen” (Engl.) and “Leinen” (Germ.) for the cloth, whereas in French just “lin” is the term used for both the plant and the cloth. This recalls the situation in English in which there is a word for the living animal and another for its meat (e.g. “cow” / “beef”). Such parallel terms may reflect various situations, but we can only understand them if we combine linguistic, archaeological and technical knowledge. When the terminological enquiries, technical analyses of tools and archaeological textiles are woven together with the historical, ethnographical, anthropological knowledge and theoretical frameworks, the results yield not only stimulating perspectives but also new knowledge about textile production and its place in ancient societies.

3. Topology of textile terminologies

The textile terminology of the modern era testifies to trade routes, trends and traditions. We employ textile terms with multiple meanings. “Jeans” are garments from Gênes, Genoa; “denim” designates cloth “de Nîmes”, from southern France, an area in which woad was cultivated, processed and used in the large scale dyeing manufacture of blue cloth. Generally speaking, such topographical indications are often employed to designate textiles. A 20th-century AD example of this is the artificial fibre “dederon” developed in the German Democratic Republic (DDR) as a copy of nylon and named after the acronym of DDR.²³ Likewise, the present volume reveals the crossing, development and exchange of textile terms between eras, areas, and cultures of the past.

Words change according to languages, but also to geography and chronology. In the cuneiform documentation, each dialect, each population has developed a specific vocabulary for textiles, which seems typically local. Despite geographical proximities or linguistic and etymological connections, communities in places such as Ebla, Mari and Aššur seem to have created their own textile vocabularies.²⁴ There are, nevertheless, terms which can be traced over wide geographical areas and through the millennia: The Greek word for a long shirt, *khiton*, *Ki-to* in Linear B, derives from a Semitic root, *ktn*. But the same root in Akkadian means linen, in Old Assyrian a garment made of wool, and perhaps cotton, in many modern languages. The Indo-Iranian and Indo-European linguistic reconstruction can contribute to identify the textile terminology which existed before Indo-Iranian was divided into the Indian and the Iranian language groups: some Old Indian and Old Iranian textile terms can be traced back to Indo-Iranian; Indo-Iranian words are furthermore connected to Indo-European textile terminology.²⁵

These examples illustrate on the one hand how related some textiles terms are across time and space, but they also show how very carefully we must conduct the etymological and

²² Veenhof 1972; Michel 2001; 2006; Michel & Veenhof 2010; Wisti Lassen 2010.

²³ Lehmann 1995.

²⁴ Ebla: Biga 2010; Mari: Durand 2009 and Beaugeard 2010; Aššur: Michel & Veenhof 2010.

²⁵ Andres-Toledo 2010.

terminological enquiry with constantly changing semantics as the common thread. Moreover, within a specific corpus such as the Neo-Babylonian, the same term was used for very different types of clothing.²⁶

4. Textile terminologies and technologies: a methodology

In the field of textile terminology, classifications, concept systems and term collections usually include first the fibres, and then the yarns and the structures such as weaving or knitting.²⁷ As a large number of weave derivatives and variations can be created, it is almost impossible to find terms for each of them, and even more complicated to translate them from one language to another. Part of the solution to this problem resides in the use of non-verbal representations. The origin and use of a fabric cannot be represented easily by using graphic components, but the characteristics of form, structure and colour can conveniently be represented graphically. This solution is employed today in the modern textile industry and trade, and was also used in ancient societies, for example, in the form of logograms in Linear B.²⁸ Likewise, in Egyptian hieroglyphs, the “textile” category includes artefacts, verbs, adjectives and also expressions, which (today at least) seem foreign to the concept of textiles.²⁹

Textile classification worldwide may use various criteria; one of them is the logic of the craft.³⁰ Another angle of approach is the functionality of textile tools, which outline and determine the technical possibilities of Aegean Bronze Age textile tools and thus the functional terminology.³¹ The research on functionality is based on textile expertise, tool studies and the experimental testing of textile tools.³² The tool studies, context studies, and experiments enable an assessment of the types and qualities of textiles, which derive from the tools.

Finally, the concept of *chaîne opératoire*, inspired from anthropology and archaeology, is a valid approach to textile production, and was also the theme of a workshop convened in Nanterre in 2007 on the topic of production systems of textiles.³³ Catherine Breniquet’s recent monograph on weaving in Mesopotamia has introduced this concept in Mesopotamian iconography and a new reading of cylinder seal iconography along the processes of the textile production has been proposed.³⁴ This new reading of the proto-dynastic iconography seems to convey a much more realistic image than previously assumed; it is possible to see who weaves, and for what: the entire society is involved in weaving. These depictions may be used for their documentary significance but keeping in mind that they are not those of a hand weaver’s manual. We are clearly within the symbolic world. The beginning and end of the weaving process as spinning and weaving, stretching and folding, which could be a metaphor for human life,³⁵ or two different activities

²⁶ Zawadzki 2010.

²⁷ Dury & Lervad 2010

²⁸ Del Freo, Nosch, Rougemont 2010.

²⁹ Herslund 2010.

³⁰ Desrosiers 2010.

³¹ Andersson *et al.* 2008; Mårtensson, Nosch, Andersson Strand 2009; Frangipane *et al.* 2009.

³² Andersson *et al.* 2008; Andersson Strand 2010.

³³ Breniquet ed. forthcoming. See also Lackenbacher 1982 for a text on textile finishing, and Joannès 1984 on the organisation of crafts.

³⁴ Breniquet 2008 and reviews by Michel 2008 and Biga 2009.

³⁵ On weaving as a metaphor for destiny, see Lyle ed. 2004 with a collection of papers dealing with the metaphorical

related to a cyclic perception of the year and time in which daily and gendered activities occur: churning and weaving, ploughing and weaving, etc. These scenes are parts of more complex systems, like series as they often appear to be combined in linear but not logical compositions. We can conclude that a quite different picture of weaving can be drawn and used for comparative perspectives, where sources are not in conflict and where iconography and archaeology can finally be linked with epigraphy.

The Akkadian period, with its closely dated works of art in which clothing plays a prominent role, as well as its rich administrative archives dealing with textiles and clothes, offers therefore a particularly rewarding opportunity to correlate visual and written evidence for continuity and change in fashion during this dynamic period of Mesopotamian history.³⁶ In a similar manner, the linen lists from the earliest Egyptian dynasties can be compared with the available archaeological textile data and this can shed new light on their interpretations.³⁷ Technology can also be used for the interpretation of the linguistic evidence, deriving from a practical knowledge from experimentations. Such practical knowledge is indeed a key for the understanding of the indications of the precise amounts and weight of warp and weft yarn as they are in some texts in the Ur III documentation.³⁸

5. Specific methodological problems related to textile terminologies

In an investigation of textile terminologies, we encounter several fundamental difficulties when aiming at identifying a term with a tangible item or a technical reality.

The first difficulty is that textiles rarely survive in the archaeological context and thus we have no preserved tangible remains – in museums or in the hands of archaeologists – to target identification. More fortunate situations are when identifying terms for pottery such as the two-handled cup, *depas amphikypellon*, attested both in Homer's epics and in numerous specimens in Aegean museums; a similar situation is when we need to identify the names for plants. In these cases we may be able to verify an assumption by consulting an archaeologist or a palaeobotanist. The material culture sets up a defined range of possibilities and a framework in which we should search for correlations.

Another difficulty is to identify terms within a technology, which is completely foreign to us today. Basic textile knowledge, understanding of techniques, evaluations of possibilities and plausibilities, distinctions such as the fundamental difference between tabbies and twills, these no longer form part of acquired general knowledge among scholars. Furthermore, we hardly possess knowledge of textile terms in our modern languages, or master textile techniques.

An example of the difficulties in understanding and interpreting ancient textile terminology is the term *mazrum* attested at Mari. According to J.-M. Durand, “la laine *mazirtum napistum* doit être celle dont le fil a été tordu par simple cardage”.³⁹ There are precise philological, lexical and etymological reasons for this translation. However, in terms of textile techniques, it remains

meaning of weaving in various cultures. This aspect is also discussed in Vogelsang 1986 and Pasquali 2010.

³⁶ Foster 2010.

³⁷ Jones 2010.

³⁸ Waetzoldt 2010.

³⁹ Durand 2009, 143, 600.

obscure: a thread cannot be twisted by carding; carding does not exist in the Bronze Age where wool fibres are instead combed or treated with a thistle.

Another difficulty is the fact that textile terms appear primarily in lists and inventories without pertinent data about the nature of the textiles. The aim of such lists is not to qualify the textiles (their quality could provably be verified by sight and touch in the storeroom). Instead they register the number, the recipient and sometimes the price of the textiles.⁴⁰

6. Origins and textile categories of textile terminology

In some languages and cultures, textile terminology developed according to materials, in others, according to topography, techniques, colours, qualities, function and usage. The term “undergarment” indicates function and shape; “blue-collar” indicates colour, usage and social context; “lining” is not directly derived from “linen” but from Latin *linea* meaning a “linen thread, string, line”; French “soie de Chine” indicate fibre type and topography, just like the East German nylon type fibre “dederon”. One of the most productive terminological Bronze Age categories for textiles seems indeed to be topology. However, this is perhaps also due to the fact that this topological category is the easiest for modern philologists to identify.

The exact meaning of the topographical indications connected with textile terms is not easily understood. Textiles are “from Akkad” or “Akkadian” in the Old Assyrian documentation, and this opens up the debate about whether the geographical designation indicates origin, place of production, or certain characteristics such as weave or decoration.⁴¹ In Linear B, groups of female textile workers and their children are designated by Anatolian toponyms outside the Mycenaean palace area, and again we must ask whether they come from these places, were purchased or kidnapped at these places, or whether these women and children produce textiles of a quality which is typical for these places.⁴²

The textile terminology thus develops and changes according to languages, but also to time and place; despite the overarching developments, textile terminologies are created locally and acquire their specific meanings within a limited area. In the Linear B documentation, we can furthermore investigate textile terminology on a personal level: palace scribe 103 at Knossos has a distinct handwriting and his records can be identified including his usage of the textile terminology.⁴³ It is, for example, his personal preference to classify textiles from previous years as *pa-ra-ja*, ‘old’, while his fellow scribes chose to designate such textiles with the term *pe-ru-si-nwa*, ‘from the previous year’.⁴⁴ The two designations are employed as synonyms and depend entirely on personal style, and can therefore also form a defining feature for the identification of a scribal hand.

7. The nature and function of the items recorded in the texts: textiles or garments?

In recent years, several studies of ancient clothing have been published, in particular the clothing worn by rulers and the elite.⁴⁵ The majority of texts, however, do not clearly indicate the type or

⁴⁰ Pomponio 2008; 2010; Vita 2010; Nosch 2006.

⁴¹ Michel & Veenhof 2010.

⁴² Chadwick 1988; Nosch 2003.

⁴³ Luján 2010.

⁴⁴ Killen 1972.

⁴⁵ Biga 1992; Pasquali 2005; Sallaberger 2009.

quality or whether the item is a piece of textile or a piece of clothing. The issue of problematic generic translations such as “a garment”, “a cloth” or “textile” and the nature – textile or garment – is addressed and discussed by several authors. Many of them reach the conclusion that the various Bronze Age archives record untailed fabrics rather than tailored ready-to-wear costumes. This again raises the question of how to define a garment, in a world of kilts, cloaks, capes, wrap-around garments, and a habit of using complex devices for attachments. Sewing often seems useless and tailoring a waste of resources.⁴⁶ A way to address the issue is to combine texts and iconography: we find types of wrap-around garments and togas in the Sargonic iconography and texts.⁴⁷ In Ur III, two different terms for textiles are used side by side mixing a piece of clothing with a type of weave.⁴⁸

It should not be forgotten that textile is not only used for clothing:⁴⁹ In palace archives as Ebla and Mari, besides garments, the administrators also deal with large amounts of textiles for furnishing.⁵⁰ Furthermore, it must be taken into account that a majority of the written documentation deals only with luxurious textiles and do not give a complete overview of the many types of textiles used in antiquity.⁵¹ Or when they do, the data are very precise for luxurious garments but remain quite vague for the clothes of ordinary people.⁵²

8. Colour indications: dyed textiles or the natural pigmentation of wool, or both?

This question is raised by several scholars, in particular inspired by the attestation of the term “multi-coloured” in various languages and cultures: In Linear B *po-ki-ro-nu-ka*, ‘with multi-coloured fringes’;⁵³ Numerous multi-coloured (Sum. *gùn-a*) textiles are mentioned in the texts from the royal estate of Garšana;⁵⁴ and in the Neo-Assyrian texts the standardised description of textiles as *lubulti birme u kitû*, ‘multi-coloured textiles and linen textiles’ occurs frequently.⁵⁵

Furthermore, the recurrence of fabrics described as white, dark/black, and red/brown leads to the discussion of the available resources of both dyed and naturally pigmented wool. Several scholars come to the conclusion that the bulk of fabrics recorded with colour indications may possibly have been naturally pigmented.⁵⁶

In the Ur III documentation, the natural colour of wool and clothing was light and white. Occasionally the wool of animals with various naturally pigmented wool hues was used to achieve colour effects. Generally, however, wool and textiles were only dyed in exceptional cases.

Colours are deliberately used to express status and symbolic meaning. Shining, yellow-dyed clothing was reserved for the king.⁵⁷ Colours of textiles bear a symbolic and ritual value, thus

⁴⁶ Wees 2005.

⁴⁷ Foster 2010.

⁴⁸ Vogelsang 1986; Waetzoldt 2010.

⁴⁹ Waetzoldt 2007.

⁵⁰ Durand 2009; Beaugeard 2010; Pasquali 2010.

⁵¹ Vigo 2010.

⁵² Joannès 2010.

⁵³ Del Frio, Nosch & Rougemont 2010.

⁵⁴ Waetzoldt 2010.

⁵⁵ Villard 2010.

⁵⁶ Nosch 2004; Waetzoldt 2010.

⁵⁷ Waetzoldt 2010.

in Ebla we find black textiles for purification rituals after death.⁵⁸ In the Hittite documentation many luxurious linen textiles are blue,⁵⁹ which can only be obtained through dyes containing indigotin, probably from plants, or, alternatively, purpurin from murex.⁶⁰ In the Neo-Assyrian corpus the red colour dominates; but here again, it is primarily valuable textiles that are quoted in the documentation.⁶¹

* * *

These overarching themes and classification frameworks for terminologies are relevant for most languages and cultures of the 3rd to the 1st millennia BC and even beyond. Textile terms indicate origin, material, techniques, at least in their first stage. With time, and over longer distances, these meanings then become blurred or fade, or the terms acquire a new meaning appropriate to a new context. Furthermore, textile terminology seems closely linked to expressions for destiny, cosmology and myths. The Indo-European root **ues-* “to dress” was also used in Indo-European poetic formulas, for example **ues^o ues-* “to dress a dress”, and applied to gods who dressed the sky.⁶²

There is no doubt that textiles generate a comprehensive vocabulary via the development of technologies and the emergence of specialised occupations and division of labour. The costume development and experimenting with wrapped clothing, fibulae, fixation devices, and tailored garments generate yet new terms for the clothing elements, and for the ensemble and combination of such elements.

The present survey includes textile terminologies in various languages and cultures but it also demonstrates the need to carry this investigation further. Diachronic studies and interdisciplinary approaches are the only viable way to continue this endeavour. In a future perspective, it would be interesting to review the relationship between textile terminology, textile production and labour, in continuation of the 1987 publication *Labor in the Ancient Near East*.⁶³ Furthermore, gender in production and costume use should be further explored. The interaction and cross-craft aspects between textile terminologies and terminologies in other crafts would also be a stimulating approach in a future study.

Bibliography

- Adovasio, J. (1975–1977) The Textiles and Basket Impressions from Jarmo. *Paléorient* 3, 223–230.
 Alfaro, C. & Karali, L. (eds.) (2008) *Purpurae vestes II: Vestidos, Textiles y Tintes: Estudios sobre la producción de bienes de consumo en la antigüedad*, Valencia.
 Andersson, E. (2003) *Tools for Textile Production from Birka and Hedeby*. Birka Studies 8.
 Andersson, E. & Nosch, M.-L. B. (2003) With a Little Help from my Friends: Investigating Mycenaean Textiles with the help from Scandinavian Experimental Archaeology. In Foster, K. P. & Laffineur, R. (eds.) *METRON. Measuring*

⁵⁸ Biga 2010.

⁵⁹ Vigo 2010.

⁶⁰ Cardon 2007.

⁶¹ Villard 2010.

⁶² Andres-Toledo 2010.

⁶³ Powell (ed.) 1987.

- the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 9th International Aegean Conference / 9^e Rencontre égéenne internationale, Yale University, 18–21 April 2002.* *Aegaeum* 24, 197–205 and table XLV.
- Andersson, E. Mårtensson, L., Nosch, M.-L., Rahmstorf, L. (2008) New Research on Bronze Age Textile Production, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 51, 171–174.
- Andersson, E., Felucca, E., Nosch, M.-L., Peyronel, L. (2010) New Perspectives on the Bronze Age Textile Production in the Eastern Mediterranean. The First Results with Ebla as a Pilot Study. In P. Matthiae, F. Pinnock, L. Nigro, N. Marchetti (eds.) *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East, Rome 5–10 May 2008*, 159–176.
- Andersson Strand, E. (2010) The Basics of Textile Tools and Textile Technology: From fibre to fabric. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 10–22.
- Andersson Strand, E. & Nosch, M.-L. (eds.), forthcoming. *Tools, Textiles, and Contexts. Investigations of Textile Production in the Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean.* Ancient Textiles Series. Oxford.
- Andrés-Toledo, M. A. (2010) Some Considerations about Vedic, Avestan and Indo-Iranian Textile Terminology. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 430–444.
- Archi, A. (1999) Clothes in Ebla. In Y. Avishur & R. Deutsch R. (eds.) *Michael. Historical, Epigraphical and Biblical Studies in Honor of Prof. Michael Heltzer*, Tel Aviv-Jaffa, 45–53.
- Barber, E. J. W. (1991) *Prehistoric Textiles. The Development of Cloth in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages with Special Reference to the Aegean.* Princeton.
- Barber, E. J. W. (2001) The Clues in the Clothes. Some Independent Evidence for the Movement of Families. In R. Drews (ed.) *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family. Papers presented at a Colloquium hosted by the University of Richmond, March 18–19, 2000.* *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, Monograph Series 38, 1–14.
- Beaugeard, A.-C. (2010) Les textiles du Moyen-Euphrate à l'époque paléo-babylonienne d'après un ouvrage récent. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 283–289.
- Biga, M. G. (1992) Les vêtements neufs de l'Empereur. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 19.
- Biga, M. G. (2008) *Au-delà des frontières: guerre et diplomatie à Ébla.* *Orientalia*, 77, 289–334.
- Biga, M. G. (2009) Review of Breniquet 2008. *Mesopotamia* XLIV, 177–179.
- Biga, M. G. (2010) Textiles in the Administrative Texts of the Royal Archives of Ebla (Syria, 24th Century BC) with Particular Emphasis on Coloured Textiles. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 146–172.
- Breniquet, C. (2008) *Essai sur le tissage en Mésopotamie, des premières communautés sédentaires au milieu du III^e millénaire avant J.-C.* Travaux de la Maison René-Ginouès 5, Paris.
- Breniquet, C. (2010) Weaving in Mesopotamia during the Bronze Age: Archaeology, techniques, iconography. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 52–67.
- Breniquet, C. (ed.) (forthcoming), *Systèmes de production et circulation des textiles*, Cahiers des thèmes transversaux d'ArScAn IX, 2007–2008, Nanterre.
- Burke, B. (2010) *From Minos to Midas. Cloth Production in the Aegean and Anatolia.* Ancient Textiles Series 7. Oxford.
- Burkett, M. (1979) *The Art of the Felt Maker.* Abbot Hall Art Gallery, Kendal.
- Cardon, D. (2007) *Natural Dyes, Sources, Tradition, Technology and Science.* London.
- Chadwick, J. (1988) The Women of Pylos, *Minos supplement* 19, 43–95.
- Del Freo, M., Nosch & M.-L., Rougemont, F. (2010) The Terminology of Textiles in the Linear B Tablets, with some Considerations on Linear A Logograms and Abbreviations. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 338–373.
- Desrosiers, S. (2010) Textile Terminologies and Classifications: Some methodological and chronological aspects. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 23–51.
- Durand, J.-M. (2009) *La nomenclature des habits et des textiles dans les textes de Mari.* Archives Royales de Mari 30. Paris.
- Dury, P. & Lervad, S. (2010) Synonymic Variation in the Field of Textile Terminology: A study in diachrony and synchrony. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 1–9.
- Foster, B. (2010) Clothing in Sargonic Period: Visual and written evidence. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 110–145.
- Frangipane, M., Andersson, E., Nosch, M.-L., Laurito, R., Rast-Eicher, A., Möller-Wiering, S., Wisti Lassen, A. (2009) Arslantepe (Turkey): Textiles, Tools and Imprints of Fabrics from the 4th to the 2nd millennium BC, *Paléorient* 35:1, 5–30.
- Gillis, C. & Nosch, M.-L. B. (eds.) (2007) *Ancient Textiles – Production, Crafts and Society. Proceedings of the First*

- International Conference on Ancient Textiles, held in Lund, Sweden and Copenhagen, Denmark, March 19–23, 2003*, Ancient Textiles Series 1. Oxford.
- Gleba, M. (2008) *Textile Production in Pre-Roman Italy*. Ancient Textiles Series 4. Oxford.
- Herslund, O. (2010) Cloths – Garments – and Keeping Secrets. Textile classification and cognitive chaining in the ancient Egyptian writing system. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 68–80.
- Hoffman, M. (1964) *The Warp-Weighted Loom. Studies in the History and Technology of an Ancient Implement*. Studia Norvegica 14.
- Joannès, F. (1984) Produits pour le travail du bois, du cuir, et du tissu. In J.-M. Durand & D. Charpin (eds.), *Archives Administratives de Mari* 1, ARMT 23, Paris, 133–191.
- Joannès, F. (2010) Textile Terminology in the Neo-Babylonian Documentation. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 400–408.
- Jones, J. (2010) The ‘linen list’ in Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom Egypt: Text and textile reconciled. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 81–109.
- Kemp, B. & Vogelsang-Eastwood, G. (2001) *The ancient textile industry at Amarna*. With A. Boyce, H. G. Farbrother, G. Owen, P. Rose. London.
- Killen, J. T. (1972) Two Notes on the Knossos Ak Tablets. In M. S. Ruipérez (ed.) *Acta Mycenaea. Actes du cinquième Colloque international des études mycéniennes, tenu à Salamanque, 30 mars–3 avril 1970*. Vol. II. Salamanca, 425–440.
- Lehmann, W. P. (1995) The Spindle or the Distaff. In B. B. Kachru & H. Kahane (eds.), *Cultures, Ideologies, and the Dictionary. Studies in Honor of Ladislav Zgusta*. Lexicographica series Maior 64. Tübingen, 53–60.
- Lerouxel, F. (2002) Les échanges de présents entre souverains amorrites au XVIII^e siècle av. n. è. D’après les archives royales de Mari. In D. Charpin & J.-M. Durand (eds.), *Recueil d’études à la mémoire d’André Parrot*. Florilegium marianum VI, Paris, 473–463.
- Luján, E. (2010) Mycenaean Textile Terminology at Work: The KN Lc(1)-tablets and the occupational nouns of the textile industry. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 374–387.
- Lyle, E. ed. (2004) *Cosmos. The Journal of the Traditional Cosmological Society* 20.
- Lackenbacher, S. (1982) Un texte vieux-babylonien sur la finition des textiles, *Syria* 59, 129–149.
- Mårtensson L., Nosch, M.-L., Andersson Strand, E. (2009) Shape of Things: Understanding a Loom Weight, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 28(4), 373–398.
- Michel, C. (2001) *Correspondance des marchands de Kaniš au début du II^e millénaire avant J.-C.*, Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 19. Paris.
- Michel, C. (2006) Femmes et production textile à Aššur au début du II^e millénaire avant J.-C., *Techniques et culture* 46, 281–297.
- Michel, C. (2008) Review of Breniquet 2008. Les comptes rendus HISTARA, publié en ligne le 2008–12–30: <http://histara.sorbonne.fr/cr.php?cr=588>.
- Michel, C. & 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.
- Michel, C. & Veenhof, K. R. (2010) The Textiles Traded by the Assyrians in Anatolia (19th–18th Centuries BC). In Michel & Nosch 2010, 210–271.
- Möller-Wiering, S. (2008) A Textile Impression from Abu-al-Kharaz. In P. M., Fischer (ed.), *Tell Abu al-Kharaz in the Jordan Valley, Vol. I: The Early Bronze Age*, Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, Vienna, 399–400.
- Moran, W. L. (1987). *Les lettres d’El-Amarna*, Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 13. Paris.
- Nosch, M.-L. B. (2003) Centre and Periphery in the Linear B Archives. In N. Kyparissi-Apostolika & M. Papakonstantinou (eds.), *The Periphery of the Mycenaean World. 2nd international interdisciplinary Colloquium, 26–20 September, Lamia 1999. Proceedings*, Ministry of Culture, 14th Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, 63–70. Athens.
- Nosch, M.-L. B. (2004) Red Coloured Textiles in the Linear B Inscriptions. In L. Cleland & K. Staers (eds.) *Colour in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. BAR International Series 1267, 32–39.
- Nosch, M.-L. (2006) More Thoughts on the Mycenaean *ta-ra-si-ja* system. In M. Perna (ed.), *Fiscality in Mycenaean and Near Eastern Archives. Proceedings of the Conference held at Soprintendenza Archivistica per la Campania, Naples 21–23 October 2004*, 161–182.

- Nosch, M.-L. B. forthcoming. L'archéologie expérimentale et les tests systématiques d'outils de la production textile. In F. Blondé & A. Müller (eds.), *L'artisanat en Grèce, table ronde, École française d'Athènes, octobre 2007*.
- Peacock, E. (2001) The contribution of experimental archaeology to the research of ancient textiles. In Walton Rogers, P., Bender Jorgensen, L., and Rast-Eicher, A. (eds.), *The Roman Textile Industry and its Influence. A Birthday Tribute to John Peter Wild*, Exeter, 181–192.
- Pasquali, J. (1997) La terminologia semitica dei tessili nei testi di Ebla. In P. Fronzaroli (ed.), *Miscellanea Eblaitica 4, Quaderni di Semitistica 19*, 217–270.
- Pasquali, J. (2005) Remarques comparatives sur la symbolique du vêtement à Ébla. In L. Kogan, N. Koslova, S. Loesov and S. Tishchenko (eds.), *Memoriae Igor M. Diakonoff, Babel und Bibel 2*, Winona Lake, 165–184.
- Pasquali, J. (2010) Les noms sémitiques des tissus dans les textes d'Ebla. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 173–185.
- Pomponio, F. (2008) *Testi amministrativi: assegnazioni mensili di tessuti. Periodo di Arrugum, ARET 15/1*, Roma.
- Pomponio, F. (2010) New Texts Regarding the Neo-Sumerian Textiles. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 186–200.
- Powell, M. A. (ed.) (1987) *Labor in the Ancient Near East*, American Oriental Series 68.
- Ribichini, S. & Xella, P. (1985) *La terminologia dei tessili nei testi di Ugarit*. Roma.
- Ryder, M. L. (1983) *Sheep and Man*. London.
- Sallaberger, W. (2009) Von der Wollration zum Ehrenkleid. Textilien als Prestigegüter am Hof von Ebla. In B. Hildebrandt & C. Veit (ed.), *Der Wert der Dinge - Güter im Prestigediskurs. Münchner Studien zur Alten Welt 6*. München, 241–278.
- Singer, I. (2008) Purple-dyers in Lazpa. In B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova & I. C. Rutheford (eds.), *Anatolian Interfaces. Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbours*, 21–43. Oxford.
- Strommenger, E. (1980/83) Kleidung B. Archaeologisch. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie 6*, 31–33. Berlin.
- Van Soldt, W. H. (1990) Fabric and Dyes at Ugarit, *Ugarit-Forschungen 22* (1990), 321–357.
- Veenhof, K. R. (1972) *Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and its Terminology*. Studia et Documenta ad Iura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentia, vol. 10, Leiden.
- Verderame L. (2008) Il controllo dei manufatti tessili a Umma. In M. Perna & F. Pomponio (eds.) *The Management of Agricultural Land and the Production of Textiles in the Mycenaean and Near Eastern Economy*, Napoli, 101–133.
- Vigo, M. (2010) Linen in Hittite Inventory Texts. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 290–322.
- Villard, P. (2010) Les textiles néo-assyriens et leurs couleurs. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 388–399.
- Vita, J.-P. (2010) Textile Terminology in the Ugaritic Texts. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 323–337.
- Vogelsang, M.E. (1986) Meaning and Symbolism of Clothing in Ancient Near Eastern Texts. In H. Vanstiphout (ed.) *Scripta signa vocis*, 265–284.
- Vogelsang-Eastwood, G. M. (1999) *Tutankhamuns Wardrobe*, Rotterdam.
- Völling, E. (2008) *Textiltechnik im Alten Orient. Rohstoffe und Herstellung*, Würzburg.
- Waetzoldt, H. (1972) *Untersuchungen zur neusumerischen Textilindustrie*. Studi economici e tecnologici 1, Rome.
- Waetzoldt, H. (1981) Kleidung, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie VI/1–2*, 18–31. Berlin – New York.
- Waetzoldt H. (2007) The Use of Wool for the Production of Strings, Ropes, Branded Mats, and Similar Fabrics. In C. Gillis and M.-L. B. Nosch (eds.), *Ancient Textiles. Production, Craft and Society*, Ancient Textiles Series 1, Oxford, 112–124.
- Waetzoldt, H. (2010) The Colours of Textiles and Variety of Fabrics from Mesopotamia around 2050 BC. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 201–209.
- Wees, H. van (2005) Clothes, Class and Gender in Homer. In D. Cairns (ed.) *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Swansea.
- Wisti Lassen, A. (2010) Tools, Procedures and Professions: A review of the Akkadian textile terminology. In Michel & Nosch 2010, 272–282.
- Zawadzki, S. (2006) *Garments of the Gods. Studies on the Textile Industry and the Pantheon of Sippar according to the Texts from the Ebabbar Archive*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 218. Freiburg-Göttingen.
- Zawadzki, S. (2010) Garments in non-Cultic Context (Neo-Babylonian Period). In Michel & Nosch 2010, 409–429.