

The Journal of INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES

GEORGE PHILIP

From PIE **h₂ek-* 'to cut' to Germanic and Baltic **h₂ek-* 'to
cut'. An hypothesis based on the concept of notional
etymology

ALWIN KLOEKHORST

Hittite *hāpūša(šš)* (formerly known as *hāpuš-* 'penis')

WILLIAM STIVERS

Round Rigumit, Royal Fool, Oromaster and Cultural

MARTIN E. HULD

Gbanan *and* Indo-European 'water'

VACLAV BLAZEK

THE PRANT LEONES Indo-European 'lion' *et alii*

ALEXANDRA GURSHTEN

Did the Pre-Indo-Europeans Influence the Formation of the
Western Zodiac?

REVIEWS

Lexicology

Language

Culture and Mythology

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Hittite *hāpūša(šš)*- (formerly known as *hāpuš-* 'penis')

Alwin Kloekhorst

Leiden University

The Hittite word *hāpūša(šš)*- (often cited as *hāpuš-*) 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).¹ In 1982, Watkins, who analyzed all attestations of the word as belonging to a stem *hāpuš-*, provided the word with a broadly accepted etymology by connecting Gk. *ὀπνίω* 'to marry' with it and reconstructing **h₃pus-*. If this etymology is correct, it would mean that **h₃* is retained in Hittite as *h-* 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. [*ha-*] *a-pu-ú-ša-kán* (KUB 9.4 i 13)
gen.sg. *ha-a-pu-ú-ša-aš* (KUB 9.4 i 31)
dat.-loc.sg. *ha-a-pu-ú-ša-aš-ši* (KUB 9.4 i 13)
dat.-loc.sg. *ha-pu-ša-ši* (KUB 9.34 ii 34)
erg.sg. *ha-pu-ša-aš-ša-an-za* (KUB 7.1 ii 35)
erg.sg. [*ha-a-p*] *u-ša-an-za* (KUB 9.4 i 30)
nom.-acc.pl. *ha-pu-ša-aš-ša* (KUB 7.1 ii 35)
nom.-acc.pl. *ha-a-pu-ša-aš-ša* (KUB 17.8 iv 5)
nom.-acc.sg.n. *ha-pu-ú-še-eš-šar* (KUB 7.1 ii 16)

She correctly remarks that it is quite untransparent to what stem the forms belong. Some forms seem to point to a thematic stem *hāpūša-* (gen.sg. *hāpūšaš*, erg.sg. [*hāp*] *ušan-za* and the derivative *hāpūšeššar*). Other forms seem to belong to

¹ Also 'penis' in e.g. Puhvel 1991: 132, HEG 168, Melchert 1994: 32, Rieken 1999: 204. HW² (H, 259f.), however, translates 'Bein', but does not indicate for what reasons.

a stem *hāpūšašš-* (dat.-loc.sg. *hāpūšašši*, erg.sg. *hāpūšaššan*, nom.-acc.pl. *hāpūšašša* and *hāpūšašša*). The dat.-loc.-form *hāpūšaši*, on the contrary, seems to point to an *s*-stem *hāpūšaš-*.² The nom.-acc.sg.-form [*h*] *āpūša=kan* (neuter because it has an adjective *handan* next to it) is hard to interpret. In case of a thematic stem as well as in case of a stem *hāpūšaš(š)-*, a nom.-acc.sg. *hāpūša* is aberrant.³

Watkins (1982) tries to argue that the stem in fact is *hāpūš-*, which he needs in order to justify his etymology with Gk. *ὀπνίω*. Although a stem *hāpūš-* in principle could be correct for gen.sg. *hā-a-pu-ū-ša-aš*, erg.sg. [*hā-a-p*] *u-ša-an-za*, and the derivative *hā-pu-ū-še-eš-šar*, the other six attestations have to be emended in order to make them belong to a stem *hāpūš-* (e.g. dat.-loc.sg. *hā-a-pu-ū-<ša-aš>-ši*, erg.sg. *hā-pu-<ša-aš>-ša-an-za*). Further-more, Watkins has to assume that the manifold plene writings of the first *a* (*hā-a-*) is a scribal error, as it speaks against a reconstruction **h₂pūs-*. It therefore is not hard for Zeilfelder to dismiss Watkins' interpretation, and subsequently his etymology.⁴

In my view, the best interpretation regarding the formal side of this word is to assume with Zeilfelder that the original stem was *hāpūšašš-* (n.) (although Zeilfelder cites this as an *s*-stem *hāpūšaš-*). Because of the nom.-acc.sg.n. **hāpūšaš*, this word was reinterpreted as a (commune) thematic stem *hāpūša-*. In this way, a stem *hāpūša(šš)-* would give a meaningful interpretation to almost all forms. The only form that remains aberrant, is nom.-acc.sg.n. [*h*] *āpūša=kan*. If we emend this form to [*h*] *āpūša<š>=kan* (adding only the sign AŠ), however, it would fit the stem *hāpūša(šš)-* as well. One could argue that dat.-loc.sg. *hāpūšaši* has to be emended to *hāpūša<š>ši*, but a

² Zeilfelder herself does not distinguish between a stem *hāpūšašš-* and *hāpūšaš-*, interpreting both as an *s*-stem *hāpūšaš-*. Ignoring the geminate *-šš-* in the forms that have *hāpūšašš-* seems incorrect to me.

³ HW² (H, 259f.) divides the forms into two stems, viz. *hāpūš-* 'Bein' and *hāpūšašš(a)r*, *hāpūšeššar* 'Schäft'. For 'Bein', it therefore has to assume that some forms are followed by an enclitic possessive pronoun: dat.sg. *hāpūša=šši* and *hāpūša=ši*. This is unlikely, as no other word in the list in which these forms occur (see below for the full text), bears a possessive enclitic.

⁴ Zinko's attempt (1999) to save Watkins' etymology in spite of Zeilfelder's criticism is unconvincing. He reconstructs nom.-acc.sg. **h₂ép-us*, gen.sg. **h₂p-us-és*, loc.sg. **h₂p-us-i*, giving pre-Hitt. **habus* (with an illicit lenition as **é* does not lenite), **hbusas*, **hbusi*, after which the loc.sg. became *hbusasi*, through influence of gen.sg. *hbusas*.

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

A meaning 'shaft (of an arrow)' is clear in, for example, KUB 7.1 ii (35) ŠA GI=ma=ua *hāpūšaššan* *maḥḥan hāpūšašša* (36) EGIR-anda ŪL *uemiazzi* TUR-ann=a *idalauēš karāteš* QATAMMA *le uemianzi* '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 **Kamrušipa itten=ua=za gimma[ri]* IZI-*hur da[itten]* *ššuraš* (4) ZÍZ-tar datten *nu=ua=za* SÍG.SA₅ SÍG.MI SÍ[G.SIG]₇.SIG₇ datt[en G]I-aš (5) *hāpūšašša datten nu=uar=at ud[d]* *anijatten nu=u[ar=at]* INA GÚ=ŠU (6) *nāišten ki=ma=ua INA GİR^{IES}=ŠU nāišten* 'Kamrušipa 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.'" By the way, we see that the term GI-aš *hāpūša(šš)-* is used for both 'shaft (of an arrow)' as well as 'stem (of reed)'.

Denoting a body part, *hāpūša(šš)-* is attested in the ritual of Tunnauija (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 8057 i 1f. // KBo 27.81 (= A i 1-5) (edition Beckman 1990)

(1) *kinun=an anniškimi kân* [UD.]KAM-an

(2) 12 ^{UZU}ŪR^{HLA}=ia anda *handāmi*

Now I am treating him, to[d]ay. The twelve body parts I arrange together.

(3) SAG.DU-aš=kan SAG.DU-i *handanza*

tar<ašn>aš=ma=kan (4) *taraššani handanza*

Head is arranged against head. Throat' is arranged against throat'.

^{UZU}ištamanaš=kan (5) ^{UZU}ištamašni *handan[za]*

Ear is arranged[d] against ear.

- ^{UZU}ZAG.LU=kan (6) ANA ^{UZU}ZAG.LU *handan* [nza] Shoulder is
arrang[ed]
against shoulder.
-
- (7) [^U] ^{UZU}išhun[auyar=ma=kan ^{UZU}iš] hunau<i> KI.MIN Upper [arm
against up] per
arm likewise.
(8) [^U] ^Uk[alulupaš=k] an ^{UZU}kalulupi KI.MIN F[inger] against
finger likewise
(9) [šankuuaiaš=ka] n šankuuaiaš<ši> KI.MIN [Nail] against nail
likewise.
(10) [^{UZU}i] āp[uy] ašša=kan tāpūuaš<ši> KI.MIN [R]ib against rib
likewise.
(11) [^{UZU}Ú]R=kan ANA ^{UZU}ÚR *handan* [Pe]nis is
arranged against
penis.
(12) [hāpp]arattiiaš=kan hāppa<r>attiiaš (13) *handan* [Pel]vis' is
arranged against
pelvis.
taškuš=kan taškui KI.MIN *t.* against *t.*
likewise.
-
- (14) [h]āpūša=kan hāpūšašši *handan* *h.* is arranged
against *h.*
(15) [GİR-i]š=kan GİR-i KI.MIN [Foo]t against
foot likewise
harganau=kan harganaui (16) [KI.MIN Sole against sole
[likewise.]
[B]one is
arranged against
bone.
(17) [^{UZU}SA=ka] n ANA ^{UZU}SA *handan* T[endon] is
arranged against
tendon.
ēšhar=kan (18) *ēšhan*[i] *handan* Blood is arranged
against blood.
-
- (19) ANA 12 ^{UZU}ÚR^{HLA}=ia=šši=kan *handanun*
(20) *kinun=a kã[š]a ŠA UD[U.SI]R-aš*
happišnan[i]ēš (21) *kēl ŠA*
DU[MU.NA]M.LU.ULÙ.LU happišnaš (22)
inan ueu[a]gganzi

- (23) SAG.DU-iš=kan S[AG.D]U-aš GIG-an *karapzi* Head lifts the
illness of h[ea]d.
(24) *tarašnaš tarašnaš* GIG-an *karapzi* Throat' lifts the
illness of throat'.
(25) *HAŠŠIŠU HAŠŠIŠI-ias* GIG-an KI.MIN Ear the illness of
ear likewise.
(26) *išhunauuanza išhunauuaš* GIG-an KI.MIN Upper arm the
illness of upper
arm likewise.
-
- (27) *šankuuaiaš šankuuaš* GIG-an *karapzi* Nail lifts the
illness of nail.
(28) *tāpūuaššanza tāpūuaššas* GIG-an KI.MIN Rib the illness of
rib likewise.
(29) *taškuš taškuua[š GI]G-an karapzi* *t.* lifts the illness
of *t.*
(30) *hupparrattiiaš* [iš] *hupparrattiiaš*<aš> (31) GIG-an *karapzi*
Pelvis' lifts the
illness of pelvis'.
[hāp]ušanza (32) *hāpūšaš* GIG-[an kar] *apzi* *h.* lifts the illness
of *h.*
(33) *harganauuanza hargan[auuaš]* GIG-an [karapzi] Sole [lifts] the
illness of sol[e].
(34) GİR-iš GİR-aš GIG-an [karapzi] Foot [lifts] the
illness of foot.
(35) *kalulūpanza kalulup[ijaš]* GIG-an *karapzi* Toe [lifts the
illness] of to[e].
(36) *šankuuaianza šankuui[aijaš]* GIG-an *karapzi* Toe nail [lifts the
illness] of toe
na[il].
-
- (37) ^{UZU}SA ^{UZU}SA-aš GIG-an *kar[apzi]* Tendon li[fts] the
illness of tendon.
(38) *haštianza haštiaš* [GIG-an *karapzi*] Bone [lifts the
illness] of bone.
(39) *ēšhananza ē[šh]ana[š GIG-an karapzi]* Blood [lifts the
illness] of
b[l]ood.

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).

(22) [kinun=*an anniškini kū*] *n* UD.KAM-an 12
UZU^{HLA} ŪR^{HLA} (23) [*anda handāmi*]

[SAG.DU-*aš=kan* SAG.DU-*i h*] *andanza*

tar<aš>naš=ma=kan (24) [*tarašni handanza*]

[UZU^{HLA} GEŠTU-*aš=ka*] *n* UZU^{HLA} GEŠTU-*ni* KI.MIN

(25) [UZU^{HLA} ZAG.LU=*kan* ANA UZU^{HLA} ZAG.LU KI.MIN]

[U]^{HLA} iṣḥuna<*u>aš=ma=kan* (26) [UZU^{HLA} iṣḥuna*ui* *hand*] *anza* [U]pper arm is arranged against upper arm].

ŠU-*aš=ma=kan* ŠU^{HLA} KI.MIN

(27) [UMBIN ANA U]MBIN^{HLA} *handanza*

(28) [UZU^{HLA} TI ANA UZU^{HLA} TI] *handanza*

UZU^{HLA} ŪR^{HLA}=*ma=kan* (29) [ANA UZU^{HLA} ŪR^{HLA} *ha*] *nda<n>za* Penis is arranged against penis].

UZU^{HLA} hupparatiia<*t>iš=ma=kan* (30) [UZU^{HLA} hupparatti*iati*] KI.MIN

UZU^{HLA} taškuš=*kan* UZU^{HLA} tašku*ui* KI.MIN

(31) [*hapušaš=k*] *an hapušaši* KI.MIN

GİR=*kán* GİR-*ia* KI.MIN

(32) [*harganauš*] =*kan* *hargan[ai K]* I.MIN

[Now I am treating him, today. The twelve body parts [I arrange together.]

[Head is arranged against head].

Throat² [is arranged against throat].

[Ear] against ear likewise.

[Shoulder against shoulder likewise].

[Upper arm is arranged against upper arm].

Hand against hand likewise. [Nail] is arranged against nails.

[Rib is] arranged against rib].

Penis is arranged against penis].

Pelvis² against [pelvis²] likewise. *t.* against *t.* likewise.

[*h.*] against *h.* likewise.

Foot against foot likewise.

[Sole] against sole [likewise].

Hittite ḫāpūša(šš)- (formerly known as ḫapuš- 'penis')

UM[BIN ANA UMBIN^{HLA}] ^{HLA} KI.MIN

(33) [*ḫaštiianza*] =*kan* *ḫa[štiia* KI.MI]N

UZ^{HLA} SA ANA UZU^{HLA} SA KI.MIN

(34) *iṣḥar=ma=kan* *iṣḥa[ni* KI.MIN]

(35) 12 UZU^{HLA} ŪR^{HLA}=*ši=šša* [*n handanun*] [*kinuna kaša*] (36) ŠA UDU.ŠIR *ḫap[pišnant]* *eš* (37) *kēl* DUMU.LÚ-*iš[naš* UZU^{HLA} ŪR^{HLA}]^{HLA} *aš inan ueuakanteš*

Toe [nails against toe nail]s likewise.

[Bone against bone] likewise. T[endon against tendon likewise] Blood against blood likewise].

[I have arranged] the twelve body parts for him. [And behold], the body parts of the ram are [now] claiming the illness of the [body part]s of this man.

(38) S[AG.DU-*iš=kan* SAG.DU-*aš* GIG-*an k*] *arapdu*

tar<aš>naš tar<aš>našša GIG-*an* KI.MIN

(39) [UZU^{HLA} GEŠTU-*aš=kan* UZU^{HLA} GEŠTU-*aš* KI.MIN]

[UZU^{HLA} ZAG.LU U]^{HLA} ZAG.LU-*ni* KI.MIN

(40) [*iṣḥunauanza=kan* *iṣḥunauaš*] KI.MIN

UZU^{HLA} kalulupaš UZU^{HLA} kalulupi KI.MIN

(41) [UMBIN^{HLA} ŠA UMBIN^{HLA} KI.MI]N

UZU^{HLA} TI-*anza* UZU^{HLA} TI-*i* KI.MIN

H[ead must I] ift [the illness of head].

Throat² the illness of throat² likewise.

[Ear of ear] likewise]

[Shoulder of shoulder] likewise.

[Upper arm of upper arm] likewise.

Finger of finger likewise.

[Nails of nails] likewise.

Rib of rib likewise.

(42) [UZU^{HLA} ŪR UZU^{HLA} ŪR]-*aš* KI.MIN

[Penis of penis] likewise.

huppar<attija>tiš (43) [*hupparattiijatiš* KI.MIN]

[*har*] *ganaṽanza ḥarganauṽaš* KI.MIN

(44) [*GİR-iš GİR-aš* KI.MIN]

[*k*] *alulupieš ŠU^{HLA}-aš ḥandan⁵*

(45) [*UMBIN^{HLA} ŠA UMBIN^{HLA}*] KI.MIN

UZU SA-aš^{UZU} SA-aš=šan KI.MIN

(46) [*ḥaštiṽanza ḥaštiṽ*] *aš* KI.MIN

išhana<n>za (47) [*išhanaš* KI.MIN]

Pelvis[?] of [pelvis]
likewise].

[S]ole of sole
likewise.

[Foot of foot
likewise.]

[F]inger is
arranged of
hands.

[Nails of nails]
likewise.

Tendon of
tendon likewise.

[Bone of bo]ne
likewise.

Blood [of blood
likewise].

The four rows agree for a large part, but there are some differences. It is useful to order the rows schematically. First I will give the rows in which the body parts are arranged together (A and B), and then the rows in which the body parts of the ram lift the illness of the body parts of the man (C and D).

A	B	C	D
KUB 55.20+ i 3-19	KUB 9.34 ii 22-34	KUB 55.20+ i 3-19	KUB 9.34 ii 38-47
SAG.DU	x (SAG.DU?)	SAG.DU	SAG.DU?
<i>taršna-</i>	<i>tarš-na-</i>	<i>taršna-</i>	<i>tarš-na-</i>
<i>ištaman-</i>	<i>GEŠTU</i>	<i>HAŠŠIŠU</i>	x (<i>GEŠTU</i> ?)
<i>UZU ZAG.LU</i>	x (<i>UZU ZAG.LU</i> ?)		<i>UZU ZAG.LU</i>
<i>išḥunauṽa-</i>	<i>išḥana<u>a-</i>	<i>išḥunauṽa-</i>	x (<i>išḥunauṽa</i> ?)
<i>kalulupa-</i>	<i>ŠU</i>		<i>kalulupa-</i>
<i>šankuṽai-</i>	<i>UMBIN^{HLA}</i>	<i>šankuṽai-</i>	x (<i>UMBIN</i> ?)
<i>tāpuṽaš-</i>	x (<i>TI</i> ?)	<i>tāpuṽaš-</i>	<i>TI</i>
<i>UZU UR^{HLA}</i>	<i>UR^{HLA}</i>		x (<i>UR</i> ?)
<i>hupparattiijati-</i>	<i>hupparattiija<t>i-</i>	<i>tašku(i)-</i>	<i>huppar<attija>i-</i>
<i>tašku(i)-</i>	<i>tašku(i)-</i>	<i>hupparattiijati-</i>	
<i>ḥāpūša(šš)-</i>	<i>ḥāpūša(šš)-</i>	<i>ḥāpūša(šš)-</i>	
<i>GİR</i>	<i>GİR</i>	<i>ḥarganau-</i>	<i>ḥarganau-</i>
<i>ḥarganau-</i>	<i>ḥarganau-</i>	<i>GİR</i>	x (<i>GİR</i> ?)
		<i>kalulupa</i>	<i>kalulupa-/ŠU</i>
	<i>UMBIN</i>	<i>šankuṽai-</i>	x (<i>UMBIN</i> ?)
<i>ḥaštai-</i>	<i>ḥaštai-</i>	<i>UZU SA</i>	<i>UZU SA</i>
<i>UZU SA</i>	<i>UZU SA</i>	<i>ḥaštai-</i>	<i>ḥaštai?</i>
<i>ēšhar</i>	<i>išhar</i>	<i>ēšhar</i>	<i>išhar</i>

⁵ Here, *ḥandan* probably has been taken over incorrectly from the first row, instead of expected KI.MIN.

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 ZAG.LU*, *kalulupa-/ŠU*, *UZU UR^{HLA}*). Furthermore, *tašku(i)-* and *hupparattiijati-* have switched places, just as *GİR* and *ḥarganau-* have. A switch between *GİR* and *ḥarganau-* is possibly found in row D as well, if in this row *GİR* is correctly added. In row D it is remarkable that the terms that we find in the other rows between *hupparattiijati-* and *ḥarganau-* (including *ḥāpūša(šš)-*), are missing.

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

SAG.DU	'head'
<i>taršna-</i>	'throat'
<i>ištaman-/UZU GEŠTU/HAŠŠIŠU</i>	'ear'
<i>UZU ZAG.LU</i>	'shoulder'
<i>išḥunauṽar</i>	'upper arm'
<i>kalulupa-/ŠU</i>	'fingers/hand'
<i>šankuṽai-/UMBIN^{HLA}</i>	'nail(s)'
<i>tāpuṽaš-/UZU TI</i>	'rib'
<i>UZU UR^{HLA}</i>	'penis'
<i>hupparattiijati-</i>	'pelvis'
<i>tašku(i)-</i>	'?'
<i>ḥāpūša(šš)-</i>	'?'
<i>GİR</i>	'foot'
<i>ḥarganau-</i>	'sole'
<i>(kalulupa-</i>	'toe')
<i>šankuṽai-</i>	'toe nail'
<i>ḥaštai-</i>	'bone'
<i>UZU SA</i>	'tendon'
<i>ēšhar</i>	'blood'

It is remarkable that, despite the fact that the texts themselves refer to twelve body parts (12 *UZU UR^{HLA}* and *ḥandāmi* '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

the Atharvaveda and the Merseburg Spells as well.⁶ 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 insertions⁷ 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) *tašku(i)*-
- (11) *hāpūša(šš)*-
- (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 *hāpūša(šš)*- as 'penis'. He states (1957: 25): "den Körperteil *hāpūša*- bzw. *hāpūšant*- wird man schwerlich von *hāpūša*-, in dem von Götze in AOr 5, 11 das Wort für "Stiel" vermutet worden ist, trennen können. Bei seiner engen Beziehung zu den Geschlechtsteilen liegt es nahe in *hāpūša*- = *hāpūšant*- das hethitische Wort für "Penis" zu sehen". For *tašku(i)*- he assumes that it denotes 'testicle': (id.) "nachdem wir in *huppant*- und *hāpūša*- die Wörter für "Becken" und "Penis" gewonnen haben, vermute ich in *tašku*-, das mit

⁶ Cf. Watkins 1995: 250. For a detailed treatment of the Merseburg Spells see Eichner & Nedoma 2001. On the connection between the Merseburg Spells and certain parts of the Atharvaveda see Griffiths & Lubotsky 2001 and Eichner 2001.

⁷ Probably on the basis of 'fingers' and 'finger nails'.

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

A translation 'penis', however, is problematic. If *hāpūša(šš)*- indeed denotes 'penis', I do not understand why earlier in the row we find the word ^{UZU}UR^(HIA). In his treatment of this text, Alp (1957: 37f.) translates ^{UZU}UR 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 ^{UZU}UR 'genitals', *hāpūša(šš)*- '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)*-, *hāpūša(šš)*-, 'foot (with sole)'. When we look at this list objectively, we see that *tašku(i)*- and *hāpūša(šš)*- could denote any body part between the pelvis and the foot, but *hāpūša(šš)*- is situated lower than *tašku(i)*-. I agree with Alp that the body part *hāpūša(šš)*- has to be equated with *hāpūša(šš)*- '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. *cévka* 'hollow bone, shin-bone' besides Cz. *cevnice* 'reed' and SCr. *čjev* 'pipe, shin-bone', *čjevanica* 'shin-bone';⁸ Lith. *káulas* 'bone' besides Gk. *καυλός* 'shaft, stalk' and Lat. *caulis* 'stalk, stem'). I therefore would like to propose that, as a body part, *hāpūša(šš)*- denotes 'shin-bone'. This beautifully coincides with the fact that in the list of body parts, *hāpūša(šš)*- directly precedes the word for 'foot'. If *hāpūša(šš)*- means 'shin-bone', I would rather suggest to interpret *tašku(i)*- as 'thigh-bone'.⁹

⁸ Cf. Lubotsky 2002: 322-3.

⁹ This translation might be supported by the following context, where we find *tašku(i)*- in another enumeration:

KBo 24.35 Vs.	2' [...]	KI.MIN	'[... li]kewise.'
	3' [...]	-i]s GABA=KA	'[...] your breast'
	4' [...]	x SI ¹⁰ A=KA KI.MIN	'[...] your horns likewise.'
	5' [...]	KA] R-SI=KA ŠA=KA KI.MIN	'[...] your [be]ly, your heart likewise.'
	6' [...]	x hu-uh-pa-m-aš-le-rš gi-mu-u-t-i(-il)	'[...] your pelvis, vo[ur] knee(s)'
	7' [...]	i] a-aš-ku-rš-le-rš GİR=KA	'[...] your [i]ašku(i)'s, your feet'

Summing up, we have to conclude that the often-cited word *hapuš-* 'shaft, penis' has to be read as *hāpūša(šš)-* 'shaft (of an arrow), stem (of reed), shin-bone'. Originally, the stem must have been *hāpūšašš-* (n.) that in the course of time is reinterpreted as a thematic stem *hāpūša-*. Because of this new semantic and formal analysis, the etymological connection with Gk. *ὀπίω* and the reconstruction **h₃pus-*, 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 *hāpūšašš-* (I know of no other stems ending in a geminate *-šš-*).

References

- HEG: Tischler, J. 1977ff.: *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, Innsbruck.
 HW²: Friedrich, J. - A. Kammenhuber, 1975ff. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grund der edierten hethitischen Texte, Heidelberg.
- Alp, S.
 1957 Zu den Körperteilnamen im Hethitischen. *Anatolia, revue annuelle d'archéologie* 2: 1-47.
- Beckman, G.
 1990 The Hittite "Ritual of the Ox" (CTH 760.1.2-3). *Orientalia* 59: 34-55.
- Eichner, H.
 2001 Kurze "indo"- "germanische" Betrachtungen über die atharvavedische Parallele zum Zweiten Merseburger Zauberspruch (mit Neubehandlung von AVŚ. IV 12), *Die Sprache* 42 (2000/01): 211-234.
- Eichner, H. & Nedoma, R.
 2001 Die Merseburger Zaubersprüche. Philologische und sprachwissenschaftliche Problemen aus heutiger Sicht. *Die Sprache* 42 (2000/01): 1-195.

In line 5' we find weak body parts, '[be]lly' and 'heart'. Line 6' contains joints: 'pelvis' and 'knee(s)'. Line 7' contains [t] *aškuēš* and 'feet'. In my view, this strongly indicates that *tašku(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 *tašku(i)-* reflects **tošk(i)-*, it is remarkable that it contains the same phonemes as the other word for thigh-bone, Hitt. *šakkuttai-* ~ Skt. *sákthi-* < **sok^hth-i-*.

- Griffiths, A. & Lubotsky, A.
 2001 Paippālaḍa Saṃhitā 4.15. To heal an open fracture: with a plant. *Die Sprache* 42 (2000/01): 196-210.
- Katz, J. T.
 1998 Hittite *tašku-* and the Indo-European Word for 'Badger'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 111: 61-82.
- Lubotsky, A. M.
 2002 The Indo-Iranian Word for 'Shank, Shin'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122.2: 318-324.
- Melchert, H. C.
 1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam - Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Puhvel, J.
 1991 *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 3 Words beginning with H*, Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rieken, E.
 1999 *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen (= Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 44)*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Watkins, C.
 1982 A Greco-Hittite etymology. In: J. Tischler (ed.) *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann*, 455-457. Innsbruck.
 1995 *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, New York - Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zeilfelder, S.
 1997 Heth. *hapusa(s)-* 'Schaft; Penis' und die Frage des dritten Laryngals. *Historische Sprachforschung* 101: 188-210.
- Zinko, C.
 1999 Einige Überlegungen zu hethitisch *hapus-*. In: P. Anreiter, E. Jerem (eds.) *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica, Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag*, 559-571. Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány.