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The Hittite word ħāpūša (šš) - (often cited as ḫapuš-) is attested several times. It denotes a shaft of an arrow, a stem of reed as well as a certain body part. When denoting a body part, the word is usually translated ‘penis’ as proposed by Alp (1957). In 1982, Watkins, who analyzed all attestations of the word as belonging to a stem ḫapuš, provided the word with a broadly accepted etymology by connecting Gk. ὀρνύω ‘to marry’ with it and reconstructing *ḫapuš-. If this etymology is correct, it would mean that *ḫ was retained in Hittite as ḫ- in initial position before a consonant. Since this word would be the only example of such a retention, however, it might be worthwhile to look closely at the semantics and formation of this word.

Zeilfelder 1997 gives an overview of all attestations:

nom.-acc.sg. [ḫa-] a-pu-uša-kān (KUB 9.4 i 13)
gen.sg. ḫa-ḫa-pu-uša-as (KUB 9.4 i 31)
dat.-loc.sg. ḫa-ḫa-pu-uša-as-ši (KUB 9.4 i 13)
dat.-loc.sg. ḫa-ḫa-pu-uša-ši (KUB 9.34 ii 34)

She correctly remarks that it is quite untransparent to what stem the forms belong. Some forms seem to point to a thematic stem ḫapuaš- (gen.sg. ḫapūšaš, erg.sg. [ḫap]ušaša and the derivative ḫapāšeššaš). Other forms seem to belong to

---

1 Also ‘penis’ in e.g. Puhvel 1991: 132, HEG 168, Melchert 1994: 32, Rieken 1999: 204, HW (1, 259f.), however, translates ‘Bein’, but does not indicate for what reasons.
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a stem ḫāpūsāšš- (dat.-loc.sg. ḫāpūsāššī, erg.sg. ḫāpūsāššāni, nom.acc.pl. ḫāpūsāšša and ḫāpūsāšša). The dat.-loc.-form ḫāpūsāšš- on the contrary, seems to point to an s-stem ḫāpūsāšš-.

3 The nom.acc.sg.-form [h] ḫapās-an (neuter because it has an adjective ḫand-an next to it) is hard to interpret. In case of a thematic stem as well as in case of a stem ḫapūsāšš-), a nom.acc.sg. ḫapūsāš is aberrant.

Watties (1982) tries to argue that the stem in fact is ḫapūs, which he needs in order to justify his etymology with Gk. ὄνυν. Although a stem ḫapūs- in principle could be correct for gen.sg. ḫa-pu-ū-sā-āš, erg.sg. [ba-a-pu]-u-sā-an-za, and the derivative ḫa-pu-ū-se-sā-sā, the other six attestations have to be emended in order to make them belong to a stem ḫapūs- (e.g. dat.-loc.sg. ḫa-pu-ū<sā>s-sī, erg.sg. ḫa-pu-ū<sā>s-s-sī). Further more, Watopies has to assume that the manifold plene writings of the first a (ḥa-a-) is a scribal error, as it speaks against a reconstruction *ḥapūs. It therefore is not hard for Zeilfelder to dismiss Watopies' interpretation, and subsequently his etymology.

In my view, the best interpretation regarding the formal side of this word is to assume with Zeilfelder that the original stem was ḫapūsāšš- (n.) (although Zeilfelder cites this as an s-stem ḫapūsāšš-). Because of the nom.acc.sg.n. ḫapūsāš, this word was reinterpreted as a (commune) thematic stem ḫapūsāš. In this way, a stem ḫapūsāš- would give a meaningful interpretation to almost all forms. The only form that remains aberrant, is nom.acc.sg.n. [h] ḫapās-an. If we emend this form to [h] ḫapās<sā>s-s-an (adding only the sign AS), however, it would fit the stem ḫapūsāš- as well. One could argue that dat.-loc.sg. ḫapūsāši has to be emended to ḫapūsāš<sā>s-si, but a

single writing of an original geminate is a frequent phenomenon, so that ḫapūsāš can be regarded as belonging to a stem ḫapūsāš- without any problems. Let us now look at the semantics of ḫapūsāš-.

A meaning 'shaft (of an arrow)' is clear in, for example, KUB 7.1 ii 95) 64 GI =ma-ya ḫapūsāššān mahān ḫapūsāš-an (65) EGER-anda U.L yemiazi TUR-an-ii idalayus karatā QATAMMA le yemiazi 'like the shaft of an arrow (flying) behind (other) shafts does not reach them', in the same way the evil entrails will not reach the small child'.

A meaning 'stem (of reed)' is likely in KUB 17.8 iv (3) UMMA *Kamruši ša ritem=ya-za gīmna[r] IZI-hur da[t]en šēnušā (4) ZIL-tar daten nu=ya-za SIG-SA, SIG-MI SI[G.SIG], SIG; dat[e]n G1-āš (5) ḫapūsāši datter nu=war-at ud [d]aninjaten nu=ya [ar-at] INA G1-ŠU (6) naššen ka=ma-ya INA GIR* 66=SU našši 'Kamruša as follows: 'Go, take the fire of the field, take the grain of the š, take red, black and green wool, take stems of reed. Conjure it and tie it around his neck, but these you must tie around his feet. ' For the way, we see that the term GI-āš ḫapūsāš- is used for both 'shaft (of an arrow)' as well as 'stem (of reed)'.

Denoting a body part, ḫapūsāš- is attested in the ritual of Tunmuqia (CTH 760). In this ritual, an ill person is cured by arranging the body parts of a butchered ram against the body parts of the person, after which the body parts of the ram lift the sickness of the body parts of the ill person. These body parts are mentioned separately. The text runs as follows: KUB 55.20 + KUB 9.4 + Bo 7125 + Bo 8037 i 1f. / KBo 27.81 (= A i 1-5) (editio Beckman 1990)

(1) kinun-yan anμišaši kan [UD.] KAM-an
(2) 12 ṢA UR 16-a ja anda ḫandami
(3) SAG.DU-āš-kan SAG.DU-i ḫandami
tar-āš-n-āš-μa-kan (4) tarāšami ḫandami

aššašš-kan (5) aššaššami ḫandamu[na]
1 uVAZAG.ŁU=kan (6) ANA uVAZAG.ŁU  handa[n]a

Shoulder is arranged against shoulder.

(7) [uVA]ižun[augār=ma-kan] uVA iži] ūnau=i< KL.MIN

Upper arm against upper arm likewise.

(8) [uVA]kalutipāš-k] a uVA kalutipi KL.MIN

Finger against finger likewise.

(9) ūnaujašaš=k] ūnaujašaš< KL.MIN

Nail against nail likewise.

(10) [uVA] rop[iš]aša=kan ūnaujašaš< KL.MIN

[R]ib against rib likewise.

(11) [uVA]ūR=kan ANA uVA ūR handan

Pelvis is arranged against pelvis.

(12) hoppatašiš=k] ūnaujašaš=attjati (13) handan

Pelvis is arranged against pelvis.

t. against t. likewise.

(14) [h]ošašaš=kan ūnaujašašši handan

$h.$ is arranged against $h.$

(15) [ūR-i]š=kan ĮR-i KL.MIN

Foot against foot likewise.

(16) ūnaujašašaš=handan

Sole against sole likewise.

(17) uVA[k]aš=kan ANA uVA[SA handan

Bone is arranged against bone.

(18) ešjar=kan ANA uVA[SA handan

Tendon is arranged against tendon.

(19) ANA uVA[U]ūR[uššiš-]šaš=kan ūnaujašašaš=handan

Blood is arranged against blood.

(20) kinun=ka[aš=T]a SA UD[U,Š1]k-ša ūnaujašašaš=handan

A parallel text is found in KUB 9.34 ii 22f. This tablet has been largely broken, but by comparing the two rows of body parts, and by comparing the parallel text above, we are well able to reconstruct the text (additions are based on Alp 1957).
Hittite ḫāpuša(ḥ)- (formerly known as ḥāpuš- ‘pelvis’)

The four rows do not agree completely regarding arrangement. It is clear that especially row C is aberrant. In it, a few terms are missing ("uZu/UG.I.U, kalulupe/-SU, uZu/UB(UL.EL)). Furthermore, ṭasku(-) and ḫapparatiṣṭaḥ- have switched places, just as GIR and ḡaranau- have. A switch between GIR and ḡaranau- is possibly found in row D as well, if in this row GIR is correctly added. In row D it is remarkable that the terms that we find in the other rows between ḫapparatiṣṭaḥ- and ḡaranau- (including ḫāpuša(ḥ)-), are missing.

All in all, however, it seems that we are able to reconstruct quite accurately the original arrangement of the rows of body parts:

SAG.DU ‘head’

tarinsa- ‘throat’

ṭiṣma'[GU/Ḫaššušu ‘ear’

uZu/UG.LU ‘shoulder’

kalulupe/-SU ‘upper arm’

šankuṣai/-UMBIN(UL.EL) ‘nail(s)’

ṭaṁuṣa(-)TI ‘rib’

uZu/UB(UL.EL) ‘penis’

ḫapparatiṣṭaḥ- ‘pelvis’

ṭasku(-) ‘?’

ḫāpuša(ḥ)- ‘foot’

ḡaranau- ‘sole’

(kalulupe/-SU ‘toe’)

šankuṣai/- ‘toe nail’

ḥaṣṭai/- ‘bone’

uZu/SA ‘tendon’

ēḥār ‘blood’

It is remarkable that, despite the fact that the texts themselves refer to twelve body parts (12 uZu/UB(UL.EL anda ḡandāmi ‘The twelve body parts I arrange together’), the row listed here contains 19 terms. This might be explained, however, if we take these considerations in mind. The three last mentioned terms are probably not to be seen as separate body parts, but as belonging to an archaic formula ‘bone to bone, tendon to tendon, blood to blood’ as can be found in
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the Atharvaveda and the Merseburg Spells as well. The seemingly superfluous terms 'nails' (which are an integral part of 'fingers') and 'sole' (an integral part of 'foot') are probably to be seen as instructions on how to arrange the body parts ('nail to nail' and 'sole to sole'). The terms 'toe' and 'toe nail' seem to be late insertions as they do not occur in all four lists.

Taking this into account, we see that the 12 body parts referred to in the text are the following:

(1) head
(2) throat
(3) ear
(4) shoulder
(5) upper arm
(6) fingers/hand (nails against nails)
(7) rib
(8) penis
(9) pelvis
(10) tašk(i)-
(11) ḫāpasa(ṣ)-
(12) foot (sole against sole)

This list of body parts falls into two pieces, both consisting of 6 elements, viz. 'upper body' (head to fingers/hand) and 'lower body' (rib to foot). In the 'upper body'-section, we see that the elements are arranged top down. It is likely that this was also the case for the section 'lower body'.

Alp, too, used the assumption of a logical arrangement of the body parts in his identification of ḫāpasa(ṣ)- as 'penis'. He states (1957: 25): "den Körperteil ḫapusa- bzw. ḫapusant- wird man schwerlich von ḫapusa-, in dem von Göze in AOr 5, 11 das Wort für "Stiel" vermutet worden ist, trennen können. Bei seiner engen Beziehung zu den Geschlechtssteilen liegt es nahe in ḫapusa- = ḫapusant- das hethitische Wort für "Pennis" zu sehen". For tašku(i)- he assumes that it denotes 'testicle'; (id.) "nachdem wir in ḫuppant- und ḫapusa- die Worter für "Becken" und "Penis" gewonnen haben, vermuten ich in tašku-, das mit

den vorhergehenden eng zusammengehört, das hethitische Wort für "Hode (♂)".

A translation 'penis', however, is problematic. If ḫāpasa(ṣ)- indeed denotes 'penis', I do not understand why earlier in the row we find the word ḫUR[2]. In his treatment of this text, Alp (1957: 37f) translates ḫUR as 'Geschlechtsteil', without explaining why a word for the genitals would be mentioned twice in a row. It seems to me that the genitals are described out of proportion, viz. with ḫUR 'genitals', ḫāpasa(ṣ)- 'penis' and tašku(i)- 'testicle'.

I therefore would like to propose another interpretation. The section of the 'lower body' consists of: 'rib', 'genitals', 'pelvis', tašku(i)-, ḫāpasa(ṣ)-, 'foot (with sole)'. When we look at this list objectively, we see that tašku(i)- and ḫāpasa(ṣ)- could denote any body part between the pelvis and the foot, but ḫāpasa(ṣ)- is situated lower than tašku(i)-. I agree with Alp that the body part ḫāpasa(ṣ)- has to be equated with ḫāpasa(ṣ)- 'shaft (of an arrow), stem (of reed)', which is an important indication for the meaning. A known characteristic of stems of reed is the fact that they are hollow. This characteristic is also found in one of the body parts situated between pelvis and foot, viz. the shin-bone.

The hollowness of shin-bones was widely known, as can be seen by the fact that many prehistoric communities made flutes out of shin-bones as well as out of stems of reeds. In many languages the words for 'shin-bone' and for 'stem of reed' are cognate or identical (e.g. Lat. tibia 'shin-bone; flute, pipe'; Russ. че́ёка 'hollow bone, shin-bone' besides Cz. cemice 'reed' and SCr. čerov 'pipe, shin-bone'; geváncva 'shin-bone'; Lith. kaulas 'bone' besides Gk. καυλός 'shaft, stalk' and Lat. caulis 'stalk, stem'). I therefore would like to propose that, as a body part, ḫāpasa(ṣ)- denotes 'shin-bone'. This beautifully coincides with the fact that in the list of body parts, ḫāpasa(ṣ)- directly precedes the word for 'foot'. If ḫāpasa(ṣ)- means 'shin-bone', I would rather suggest to interpret tašku(i)- as 'thigh-bone'.

---

* This translation might be supported by the following context, where we find tašku(i)- in another enumeration:

| KBr.24.55 Ye | 27 | KI.MIN | 'likewise to you' |
| 35 | 4 | S3-la.k1.4.K | 'your heart' |
| 4 | 3 | I KI.MIN | 'likewise to you' |
| 5 | 1 | KI.MIN | 'your heart likewise' |
| 6 | 1 | KI.MIN | 'your heart likewise' |
| 7 | 1 | KI.MIN | 'your heart likewise' |
| 8 | 1 | KI.MIN | 'your heart likewise' |

---
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Summing up, we have to conclude that the often-cited word ḫapus- 'shaft, penis' has to be read as ḫāpuṣa(s)- 'shaft (of an arrow), stem (of reed), shin-bone'. Originally, the stem must have been ḫāpuṣa(s)- (n.) that in the course of time is reinterpreted as a thematic stem ḫāpuṣa-. Because of this new semantic and formal analysis, the etymological connection with Gk. ἐπτύχω and the reconstruction *ḫupus-, which still often can be found in the handbooks, has to be given up. Instead, we are probably dealing with a substratum word, because of the very un-IE looking stem ḫāpuṣa(s)- (1 know of no other stems ending in a geminate -s-).
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In line 5 we find weak body parts, [be]lly' and 'heart'. Line 6 contains joints: 'pelvis' and 'knee(s)'. Line 7 contains [t]škhuṣ and 'feet'. In my view, this stringly indicates that tškhuṣ(i) cannot mean 'testicle', but likely denotes a limb from the lower half of the body. If a translation 'thigh-bone' is justified, than the etymological treatment by Katz (1998) does not make sense anymore. Moreover, if tškhuṣ(i) reflects *tshk(i)-, it is remarkable that it contains the same phonemes as the other word for thigh-bone, Hitt. škuttai-

Skt. sākthi-< *tshk(i)-.