

RICHARD H. BEAL – BILLIE JEAN COLLINS

Hittite *pankur*, a new suggestion

The Hittite word *pankur* has been long discussed but no satisfactory meaning has yet been adduced.¹ The word occurs in the following passages:

(1) *DINAM*^{III.A} KUR-TI *kue ḥanneškattēni n=at* SIG₅-in *ḥanniškitten n=at=za=kan apēl ŠA É=ŠU ŠA ŠEŠ=ŠU NIN=ŠU ḥaššanna=šši pankuna=šši*^{LU} *kaenanti*^{LU} *are=šši ŠA NINDA KAŠ māniyahḫiyatti lē kuiški iyazi* “Decide fairly the legal cases of the land that you decide. Let no one make it (sc. a decision) for the sake of (one) of his own house, for his brother (or) his sister, for his blood-relations, for his *pankur*, for his inlaw(s), for his friend(s), or for his allotment of bread and beer.”²

(2) [...] *apēl ABU=ŠU ŠEŠ.MEŠ=ŠU NIN.MEŠ=ŠU (?) DUM]U.MEŠ=ŠU pankur ḥašš[atar=šet ...]* “[...] his father, hi[s] brothers, [his sisters (?)], his [so]ns, (his) *pankur*, [his] blood-rela[tives ...]”³

(3) [*nu* LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL] *katta DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL [...] pankur INA KUR*^{URU} *ḫ[atti(?) ...]* “[The king, queen, children of the king,] with grandchildren of the king, [...], *pankur* in the land of ḫ[atti(?) ...]”⁴

(4) *nu=za kuiš i[mma kuiš k]ē uddār=tet šarra[i n=an(?) apēl]ŠUM-an NUMUN-an pankur=šet ... arḫa ḥarni[nkan]du* “Who[so-ever] transgres[ses] these words of yours, may they (the oath gods) [dest]roy [him], his name, his seed, hi[s] *pankur* [...]”⁵

¹ The authors wish to thank Theo van den Hout for reading and making several valuable suggestions. For mistakes which remain the authors have only themselves to blame. Abbreviations can be found in the Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1980–.

² KUB 13.20 i 32–34 (military instr. of Tudḫ., MH/NS), ed. S. Alp, *Hitit Kralı IV.(?) Tuthaliyan'ın Askeri Fermanı* = Military Instructions of the Hittite King Tuthaliya IV.(?), *Belle-ten* XI/43 [1947] 392–95, 407 (differently).

³ KBo 19.42 rev. 15–16 (treaty frag.). N. Oettinger, *Die militärischen Eide der Hethiter*, Wiesbaden 1976 (StBoT 22) 39, restored the last term *ḥašš[a ḥanzašša ...]* “decendants to the third and fourth generation.”

⁴ KUB 34.55 rt. col. 11–13 (prayer and offerings to the Sungoddess of Arinna).

⁵ KUB 23.76 iv 15–18 (instr./treaty frag.).

(5) *n=an=kan* DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU *QADU DA[M=ŠU DUMU.NI]TA=ŠU* *pankur=šet ištarn[a arḫa ḥarni]nkandu* “May they thor[oughly des]troy him, a mortal, with [his] wife, hi[s] [so]n, (and) his *pankur*.”⁶

Clearly *pankur* is some kind of a human relationship term.⁷ Since it is listed among “blood-relatives” and “relatives by marriage”, as was first recognized by Götze⁸, it is now generally accepted that it is a kinship term.⁹

A related usage is:

(6) [*šū*] *minzan=a* l₁RE.MEŠ-*a(n)=mman* UR.BAR.RA-*aš mān pang[ur=šme]* 1-EN *ēšdu* “May the *pangur* of you, my servants, be unified like that of a wolf.”¹⁰

(7) [...] *wetnaš mān pankur=šme[t 1-EN] ēšdu [...-n]uwan ēšdu šiel* l₁RE.MEŠ-ŠU [*IŠTU* 1 AM]A *ḥaššanteš* “Let your *pankur* be [unified] like that of a *wetna*-animal. Let it be [...]. His servants are born [of one mother].”¹¹

From examples (6) and (7), it appears that the kinship term also applies to animals. In these examples, it is clear that the current translation, “(wolf-)pack” or “clan” makes excellent sense. The human kinship group is clearly somehow analogous to the wolf-pack, but whether the term originally referred to the human grouping or to the animal grouping is not clear.

In a number of other passages, however, this meaning is inappropriate:

(8) *nu ŠA ZID.DA ŠE išnan dahḫi nu* UR.GI₇-*aš šalpan menabḫanda imiyami* § *nu tubḫueššar ŠA UZ₆ pankur*^{NA} IM.BABBAR *kalwišnari*^{SAR} *tapalkuššannan*^{SAR} *ḥabḫašittin*^{SAR} *euwan*^{GI₅} *ḥašduēr kuēl imma GIŠ-ruwaš ḥabḫallaš alil* § *nu ki ḫūman ANA ZID.DA ŠE išni menabḫanda immiyami* “I take dough of barley mental. I mix in dog-excrement. Resin,¹² the *pankur* of a nanny-goat, gypsum, *kalwišna*-plant, *tapalkuššanna*-plant, *ḥabḫašitti*-plant, *euwan*-grain, brush, the flower of some kind of tree or shrub, all this I mix together with the barley meal dough.”¹³

⁶ KBo 6.34 iii 9–11 (military oath, MH/NS), ed. N. Oettinger, StBoT 22, 12f.

⁷ See N. Oettinger, StBoT 22, 39 w. n. 74, who suggests that perhaps E. Benveniste, *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen I*, Paris 1935, 37 (and Götze, ArOr 2 [1930] 161 n. 1, see next note), was right in linking this word with *panku*- “all”.

⁸ Über die hethitische Königsfamilie, ArOr 2 [1930] 161 w. n. 1.

⁹ It is of course also possible that it refers to some other close circle of friends who are not kin, but who are bound somehow together more strongly than simply as *areš*, “friends”. Note that Akkadian also has three terms apparently covering the semantic field “blood-relations” and “in-laws” *kimtu*, *nišutu* and *salātu*. The later is clearly “inlaws”.

¹⁰ KBo 3.27 obv. 15f. (edict, OH/NS), translit. E. Forrer, Leipzig 1926 (BoTU 2) no. 10β, cf. B. J. Collins, *The Representation of Wild Animals in Hittite Texts*, Ph. D. Diss., New Haven 1989, 87.

¹¹ KUB 1.16 ii 46f. (edict of Ḫatt. I, NS), ed. F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, HAB, Munich 1938 (ABAW NF 16) 8f., cf. Collins, Diss., 280 (*wetna*- = “hyena?”).

¹² The translation of *tubḫueššar* follows Hoffner, paper at the 1994 AOS meetings at Madison, Wisc.

¹³ KUB 24.14 i 3 – 10 (Ḫepattarakki's rit. to release a bewitched person, NH).

(9) ŠA MÁŠ.GAL UZ₆:¹⁴ Ī.UDU *pankur zamankur* UN-aš *sēhur* [...] [GA.]KIN.AG=pat^{NA}ZU₉ *nu kī dapian šaminuzi* “Of billy-goat and nanny-goat: fat, *pankur*; beard-hair; of a human being: urine, [...] chleese, and flint/obsidian, she removes all this.”¹⁵ It is not entirely clear how many words the initial genive(s) modify. However, as the first of these similar passages (8) makes clear, *pankur* can be a part or product of a goat, so perhaps one should understand everything from the first genitives (“of billy-goat and nanny-goat”) until the second genitive (“of a human being”) as modified by the first genitive.¹⁶ Thus one should probably translate, “The fat,¹⁷ *pankur*; (and) beard-hair¹⁸ of billy-goat (and) nanny-goat, the urine of a human being, [...] ...”.

The same meaning is to be seen in

(10) UMMA EN.SÍSKUR KUŠ UR.MAH=wa *papparški* <<iz>> *mi* KUŠ AM=wa UK[UŠ ...] *papparškimi pāiš=an=mu* DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU KUŠ-an *papparšūwanzi* UZ₆-š=a=mu *pankur pizzauwanzi pāiš kinuna* EN.SÍSKU[R KUŠ] *papparšūwanzi pankur=ma* <<=aš>> *pēzzauwanzi da-x*[...] “Thus speaks the patient: ‘I will sprinkle the pelt/hide of a lion. I will sprinkle the pelt/hide of an aurochs/wild ox and a [...] He gave me, a mortal, the pelt/hide for sprinkling. And he gave me the *pankur* of a nanny-goat for pezz-ing.’ Now the patient [...] -s] the [hide] for sprinkling and the *pankur* for pezz-ing.”¹⁹

¹⁴ The reading of the copy ŠA MÁŠ.GAL MÁŠ “The goat of a billy-goat” or “of billy goat and goat” clearly makes no sense. The sign UZ₆ is easily confusable with MÁŠ.

¹⁵ KBo 21.20 i 25f. (Šuwamma’s rit., NH), ed. C. Burde, Hethitische medizinische Texte, Wiesbaden 1974 (StBoT 19) 44f., A. M. Polvani, La terminologia dei minerali nei testi ittiti, Eothen 3, Florence 1988, 142 (“di una pecora il latte”).

¹⁶ For a similar construction see *n=ašta* DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ŠA LUGAL MUNUS. LUGAL TI-tar *haddulatar* MU.Ī.A GÍD.DA DUMU-latar DUMU.NITA.MEŠ DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ *hāšuš hanzaššuš wiwakten* “Ask from the gods the life, health, longevity, descendants, sons, daughters, down to the third and fourth generation of the king (and) queen” KUB 15.34 iii 39f. (evocation, MH/MS), ed. V. Haas and G. Wilhelm, Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna, Kevelaer-Neukirchen-Vluyn 1974 (AOATS 3) 198f.

¹⁷ Note that the Sumerogram UZU Ī.UDU = Hittite UZU *appuzzi-* can refer to goat-fat as well as sheep-fat: *nu* ŠA MÁŠ.GAL *ēšhar* UZU Ī.UDU = *ya* ANA 1 UPNU BA. BA. [ZA] *menahbanda immiyan[zi]* KUB 32.128 ii 21–23 (hišuwā fest.), w. dupl. having *nu* ŠA MÁŠ.GAL *ēšhar* UZU *appuzzi=*(*ya* ANA 1 UPNU BA.BA).ZA] *menahbanda imiyanzi* KBo 15.49 i 9f. “They mix blood and fat of a billy-goat into 1 handful of gruel.” See J. Puhvel, HED 1, Amsterdam 1984, 103. Similarly in Akkadian texts Ī.UDU = the Akkadian word *lipû* refers not just to sheep-fat, but to the fat of various animals which can be specified by a genitive if specification is needed: *lipûm ša* UDU.NITÁ “fat of a wether”, Ī.UDU.MEŠ *ša* ŠAH.MEŠ “fat of pigs” “and he (the shepherd) will deliver the sinews, the fat (etc. of dead sheep and goats)” BE 14.48:18, all cited from CAD L, Chicago 1973, 203 and Ī.UDU BIR MÁŠ.NITÁ “fat of the kidney of a billy-goat”, cited from CAD L, 204.

¹⁸ The word *zamankur* is not otherwise attested referring to goats, but the word is not well attested. In English we can refer to the distinctive “beard” of a goat, so it would not be surprising if the Hittites referred to this hair in the same manner.

¹⁹ KBo 21.12:19–22 (ritual, NS), translit. F. Starke, Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift, Wiesbaden 1985 (StBoT 30) 375. Cf. UZ₆-aš=šan *pankur* “the *pankur* of a nanny-goat” KBo 21.12:24.

(11) [ALAM^m]U₁₉hhamūwa AN.BAR *šuppišduwaran* [...] [o]-x DÜ-zi ŠU-i=ma=šši=kan anda x[...] § *nu barkantaš parnaš* IM-an *dabhi* [...] IM-aš ŠAH-an DÜ-mi *nu=šši=šša*[n...] ŠA NA₄-NI *hurluš ienzi ti*[...] ŠA ŠAH *pankunit euwaš* [o-] *halzanit tuekkuš warb[unuwanzi(?)]* “One makes an ornamented (?) iron [statue] (of) U₁₉hhamuwa. In his hand [...] § I take clay of a destroyed house. [...] I make a pig of clay. For it [...] They make *hurla*-s of stone/jewels. [...] [They thickly cover(?)...] the limbs with the *pankur* of a pig (and) with [o-] *halzani* of *euwan*-grain.”²⁰

(12) UDU.Ī.A-aš *pankur* “the *pankur* of a sheep.”²¹

(13) [UDU-uš=wa=šši=kan *awan arb*]a *paizzi nu=wa=šši=šta* (?) ^{sīG} *ešri hūittiyazi* GU₄-uš=ma=wa=šši=kan *auān arb*a *paizzi nu=wa=šši=šta* (?) *pankur hūittiyazi kuiē*[š...-(*kui šarā*) ... [*kuiš kūš NĪŠ*] DINGIR.MEŠ *šarrizzi nu=wa=kan* [...] x *apel* URU.DIDLI.Ī.A-aš *pankur* (?) DUMU.MEŠ DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ *hāšša hanzašša* UN-aš GU₄.Ī.A U[DU.Ī.A [...] *IŠTU* ^{G15} KIRI₆.GEŠTIN ^{G15} KIRI₆.[SAR INA EGIR U₄-MI *arb*a [*hūittiyat*]taru ERÍN.MEŠ-az=ma *āppa memai apāt ēšdu* “[The sheep] goes a [way from it], and it [will draw a tuft of wool(?)] from it. The ox [goes] a[way from] it, [and] it pulls [its] *pankur*. (Whatever (pl). [...] upwards [...]. [He who] transgresses [these o]aths, [...] may [...] his villages, *pankur*-clan, sons, grandsons], descendants, people, cattle, sheep [...] with vineyards, gardens [...] in the future be drawn away.” But the army replies(?): “Let it be (?)”.)”²²

All attempted translations begin with the assumption that there is only one word *pankur*. It is then suggested that a *pankur*-“clan” consists of various individuals who shared the same *pankur*. Sommer²³ suggested that *pankur* means sexual parts. This was rejected by Güterbock,²⁴ who noted that the *pankur* of female animals was used as an ingredient in magic rituals (no. 8), and that female genitalia are unlikely to have been so used.

²⁰ KUB 7.55 obv. 1–7 (ritual). *Pankur* in this text was understood by A. Götze, ArOr 2, 161 n. 1 as “Wurf Ferkel”. Puhvel’s translation, HED 3, 1991, 22, “of a barley-with milk [=barley-and-milk-fed?] pig they burn [?] limbs along with *h*.”, makes little sense. Furthermore the copy shows a trace after *war*, which Puhvel missed, which rules out his restoration *war[inuwanzi]*. [o-] *halzanit* is restored as [*hal*] *halzanit* by Puhvel. *halhalzani* is the name of a body part, which, since it is never written with UZU, is presumably non-fleshy. It occurs between “bones” and “eyebrows” and “eyelashes” in lists. This restoration is rejected by A. Kammenhuber, HW², Bd. 3, Heidelberg 1991, 21. Hoffner’s translation, Al-Heth, New Haven 1974, 81, gets the sense of the passage far better than Puhvel, but as HW² notes the large empty space after *euwaš* shows that Hoffner’s [*išni*] cannot be restored at the end of the line. Hoffner’s transliteration of the verb *wa-ar-š[i??-ya-an-zi]* fits the traces only marginally better than Puhvel’s.

²¹ KBo 20.92 iv! 15 (rit., MH/NS).

²² KBo 21.10 i 2–11 (military induction rit.), w. dupl. KUB 40.13 i! 1–6, ed. N. Oettinger, StBoT 22, 14f.

²³ HAB p. 76 w. n. 3 “Eher *pankur* ursprünglich ein mit der Fortpflanzung zusammenhängender Körperteil (vgl. aind. *garbha* “Schoß, Leibesfrucht, Brut, Kind”).

²⁴ Lexicographical notes II, RHA XXII/74 [1964] 102f.

He suggested that *pankur* means “milk”. However, Hoffner²⁵ has pointed out that GA “milk” and *pankur* are used in entirely different contexts. Oettinger²⁶ suggested “udder”. However, pigs do not have udders, thus contradicting no. 11. CHD²⁷ approves Oettinger’s translation by noting that only mammals are attested with a *pankur* but adds that even if *pankur* does not mean udder, it may be “the teats, or some other external portion of the mammarys”. However, while it is not entirely conclusive, it is interesting to note that in not one of the examples of *pankur* as an animal part does the determinative UZU, expected of fleshy body parts, appear. More importantly, no. 9 appears to refer to the *pankur* of a billy-goat. Also it seems odd that *huittiya-* “to pull” would be used to describe what a thorn does to a heavy hanging udder or even a teat. One would think more of a verb meaning scratch or one such as *hattai-* “to cut”. Also, why would a magical analogy involve pain for the analogous animal, for would not this indicate that the patient would also suffer pain in the course of ridding himself of the evils? The best suggestion so far was recently made by Starke²⁸ who suggested „tail“. He even suggested an etymology **b^hēng^h-ur > *b^hēng^h-* “thick, to be thick”. One could imagine a tail being *huittiya-d*, but it is hard to imagine what the magical reason for this was, or why a family of animals would be called “a tail”. The etymology adds nothing one way or another since it is not clear why the tail, as opposed to some other animal body part or product, should have been called “the thick thing”. Additionally, it should be noted that the Sumerogram KUN “tail” is only so far attested overlaying a Hittite word that is a common gender *-a-* stem,²⁹ not a neuter *-r/n-* stem such as *pankur*.

A clue to the meaning of *pankur* may be gleaned from the fact that there are a number of passages similar to no. 13. The various parallel versions of “missing deity rituals” provide an example, while Tunnawi’s ritual against conditions resulting from impurity provides another.

(//1) „As this pipe does not flow backwards, so may the anger, fury, crime, and sullenness of Hanaḥanna not come back” § *ziga-z* ^{GIS} *ḫatalkišnaš ḫamešḫiyaz* BABBAR-TIM *waššaš[i]* BURU₁₄ *ma-az išḫarwanda* *waššaš[i]* GU₄-*uštata-kan* *katti[ti]* *arḫa paizzi nu-šš[e]šta šukšūq^hqan* *ḫuēz[ta]* UDU-*u[š-m]a-ta-kan* *kat-tit[i]* (*arḫa pa*) *izzi [nu-šš[e]šta ēšri [ḫuēz]ta* § [(^dMAḪ-*ya*)] *kan kaṛpin karti-* *im^hmiyattan* [*waštul šāuwar QĀTA*] MMA *huittiya* “You, O hawthorn clothe yourself in white in Spring, but in Autumn you clothe yourself in blood-red. The ox passes beneath you and you pull out its hair. The sheep passes beneath you and you

²⁵ “Milch” in RLA 8–3/4 (1994) 201 section 2a and CHD P 1994, 93 s. v. *pankur*.

²⁶ StBoT 22, 51

²⁷ Vol. P s. v. *pankur* mng. 1 discussion paragraph.

²⁸ Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens, Wiesbaden 1990, (StBoT 31) 606.

²⁹ KUN-an: KBo 6.2 ii 31 (Law § 43, OS); 34/i iv 4, translit. E. Laroche, CTH, Paris 1971, p. 171; KuB 36.12 iii 5, 20 (Ullik. IIB), ed. H. G. Güterbock, The Song of Ullikummi, JCS 6 [1952] 14–17.

pull out its fleece. § In the same way may you pull out the anger, fury, crime, and sullenness of Hanaḥanna.”³⁰

(//2) [EN.SISKUR *naššu LÚ-aš našm*] a MUNUS-za [... *n-aš-kan* ^{GIS} *ḫatalkišnaš ḫamešḫiyaz*] ‘BABBAR(?)’ [*waššaš[i]* BURU₁₄ *ma-az išḫarwanda*] *waššaš[i]* ‘UDU-*uštata-kan* *kattan arḫa paizzi nu-š <š> kan* MUNSUB_x(?)’³¹ *ḫui<ti>yaš[i]* GU₄-*u[š-ta-kan]* *kattan arḫa paizzi nu-šš[i-kan* *šukšukan ḫuittiyaš[i]* § *kēdaniya-kan* ANA EN SISKUR *idalu papratar alwazatar āšayaratar* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš karpin NĪŠ* DINGIR-LIM *pangauwaš* EME-an *maninkūwanda* MU-an *arḫa QĀTAMMA ḫuitiya* “[The patient, whether male or female, [passes under] the hawthorn gate and says [as follows:] § [You hawthorn in spring clothe yourself in] white, [but in autumn] you clothe [yourself in blood-red]. The sheep passes under you and you pull out its fleece. The ox passes under [you] and you pull out its hair. § In the same way let it pull out evil, impurity, sorcery, *a.*, divine anger, curse, the slander of everyone, and an early death.”³²

The purpose of this “pulling off” (*huittiya-*) is not to hurt the sheep or cow, for this might imply that the patient (//2), or worse yet, the goddess Hanaḥanna (//1), was to be hurt. Rather the idea was to pull off the evils with the ease of a hawthorn pulling off tufts of hair or wool from passing animals.

To judge from the parallelism between (// 1–2) and text 13, the most likely suggestion is that *pankur* means “hair” (or a particular sort of hair) in texts 8–13. In fact, this parallelism is sufficiently striking that, if only nos. 8–13 existed and nos. 1–7 were unknown, there would be no question that “hair” was the correct translation. Additionally, in text 10 the pelts of lion and aurochs (which were likely to still be covered in fur) are paralleled by the *pankur* of a nanny-goat. Here again “hair” makes excellent sense. It might be objected that there are other words in Hittite for hair and types of hair. This does not however, help the translation “teats” since there are other words for these as well.³³ In any case, it is not uncommon for there to be multiple words for hair and types of hair in any given language. Note

³⁰ A: KUB 33.54: 13–19 + KUB 33.47: 2–7 (missing Hanaḥanna rit., OH/NS), w. dupl. B: KUB 33.48: 1–4, translit. E. Laroche, Myth. Paris, 1968, 79, and par. C (in 3rd person): KUB 34.76 i 1–12, ed. H. Otten, Ein Reinigungsritual im Hethitischen: ^{GIS} *ḫatalkišna-*, AfO 16 [1952–1953] 69f., N. Oettinger, StBoT 22, 51 n. 1, tr. H. Hoffner, Hittite Myths, Atlanta 1990 (WAW 2) 28, and par. KUB 17.10 iv 1–3 (missing Telipinu rit., OH/MS), translit. Myth., 36, tr. Hittite Myths 17.

³¹ The sign appears to be SÍG.ŠE.BE.ḌI.TAR. This may be the first attestation of the Boğazköy permutation of the MUNSUB sign as suggested by Landsberger, apud Friedrich, HW, Heidelberg 1952, 286, although contra Friedrich, the TAR is clearly part of the sign. (In Neo-Assyrian MUNSUB is SÍG.LAM.SUḪUR and MUNSUB is SÍG.SUḪUR). MUNSUB is the Akk. for *šartu* “hair”. Alternatively, read with Collins, JCS 42 (1990) 219 n. 42: ^{SIG} *pu-u-ut-tar*, a hapax, which must from context mean “(a type of) hair” suggested by Kronasser, EHS 1 (1966) 284, who tentatively translated “Wolliges (?)”.

³² KUB 12.58 iii 32–36 + KUB 7.53 iii 1–8 (Tunnawi’s rit), cf. H. Otten, AfO 16, 70 (correcting ed. A. Goetze, Tunn., New Haven 1938 [AOS 14] 18f.).

³³ *teta(n)-*, *parḫu-* (CHD P), ^{UZU}UBUR.

that J. Sasson's English-Akkadian Glossary for A–K, Š, Z gives seven words for hair and its varieties. F. Iz and H. C. Hony's English-Turkish Dictionary gives three translations of English "hair": "saç, kıl, and tüy". As far as the other Hittite words for hair are concerned, all are rather specialized: *tetana-* is human hair, perhaps just head hair;³⁴ *zamankur* is "beard(-hair)"³⁵ of both humans and goats;³⁶ *laplipa-* is eyelash, so far attested only for humans; *enera-* is eyebrow (-hair) again only attested so far for humans; *išḫeni-/išḫiyeni-* is human, but may or may not be body hair;³⁷ ^{siG}*ešri* refers to sheep's wool;³⁸ *šukšuga-* is attested only for oxen and horses.³⁹ *pankur*, on the other hand, is more general, since it is attested for goats of both sexes,

³⁴ *tetana-* is definitely a word for human hair: *kuit-man=ma=za(š)an BĒL SISKUR IŠTU SAG.DU=ŠU tēta <n> an laplē[pan] enērann=a būttiyannai* "While the patient pulls out of his head a hair, an eyelash and an eyebrow(-hair), ..." KUB 32.8 iii 6–8 (rit., MH/NS), ed. CHD L–N, Chicago 1989, 46a, translit. F. Starke, StBoT 30, 1985, 118. While there are other words for "eyebrow(-hair)", "eyelash(-hair)" and "beard-hair" (see below), it is not clear whether *tetana-* is confined to human head hair or included "body hair" (see below under *išḫeni-/išḫiyeni-*). No animals are attested with *tetana-*.

³⁵ E. Laroche, Études de vocabulaire III, RHA XI/52 [1950] 40f., J. Friedrich, HW 250.

³⁶ See text no. 9, above.

³⁷ *išḫeni-/išḫiyeni-* is definitely human, but it is not clear whether or not it is hair. It occurs only in the Instructions for Temple Personnel. *namma=šmaš=kan išḫēniuš* (dupl. *išḫiyaniuš*) UMBIN.MEŠ=ya dān ešdu "Then let your *išḫeni-* and fingernails be removed." (KUB 13.4 iii 62f., w. dupl. KUB 13.19:5, similarly KUB 13.4 i 15f.). H. Ehelolf, Zum hethitischen Lexikon, K1F 1 [1930] 150f. w. n. 3 suggested "(Bart-, Körper-?)Haar", which is repeated in J. Friedrich, HW, 1952, 86. E. Sturtevant, A Hittite Text on the Duties of Priests and Temple Servants, JAOS 54 [1934] 364, 386 and idem, Chrest., Philadelphia, 1935, 148f., 160f. translated simply "hair(?)". A. Süel, Direktif Metni, AÜDTCFY 350, Ankara 1985, 22f. translates "(saç? ve sakal) kıl" and 68f. simply "kıl". Goetze, in: ANET, Princeton 1952, 207 translated "body(?) hair" (presumably because *zamankur* is "beard") followed by C. Kühne, RTAT, Göttingen 1975, 201. H. Kronasser, EHS 1, Wiesbaden 1966, 222, followed Goetze and called it "ohne nachweisbares Grundwort". J. Puhvel, HED 2, Berlin 1984, 400, similarly follows Goetze on the translation but considers it to be related to *išḫiya-* "to bind", "wrap". (Presumably he thinks it "wraps" the body). Although Puhvel has dropped the question mark, the translation is still no more than a guess.

³⁸ ^{siG}*ešri-* of a sheep is paralleled by the *šukšuga-* of an ox in our //1 and in KUB 17.10 iv 1f. The translation "wool" is likely. It is not attested used of other animals.

³⁹ *šukšuga-* occurs in our nos. //2 and //1 and a similar passage in the missing deity myth of Telipinu (KUB 17.10 iv 1, translit. E. Laroche, Myth., 36), in all of which the hawthorn pulls out the *šukšuga-* of an ox (see Otten, AfO 16, 69f.). In the two latter, the *šukšuga-* of an ox is parallel to the ^{siG}*ešri* (see below) of a sheep (Otten, AfO 16, 70 n. 6). The word also occurs in KUB 29.52 i 2, a horse-training text (ed. A. Kammenhuber, Hipp. heth., Wiesbaden 1961, 196), so presumably it also refers to horse-hair of some sort. The only thing that might have implied that humans had *šukšuga-* – was the lexical text, KBo 1.42 iv 50 (IZI Bogh.), that seemed to equate this word with Akk. *abbuttu*, a human hairstyle with a specific lock of hair unshaven, required of slaves in the OB and perhaps MA periods Mesopotamia. However, Otten, AfO 16, 70 n. 6, collated the text to discover that rather than *šu-uk-š[u-]* the text read *la-az-z[i- ...]*. (Cf. ed. MSL 13:142:277). Thus, we cannot assume that *šukšuga-* was anything other than the hair or a type of hair of horses and oxen (J. Friedrich, HW 196 "Stirnhaar (?) (des Rindes), Mähne (des Pferdes)").

pigs, oxen and even sheep, and, if texts 1–7 show the same word, for humans, at least metaphorically. CHD's note that all the animals attested having *pankur* are mammals would still make sense, since hair, like mammary glands, is definitively mammalian. Starke's etymology "thick" would make just as good sense, since "hair" or a type of hair could be called "the thick stuff".

It is completely possible that *pankur* in nos. 1–7 is a mere homonym of *pankur* in nos. 8–13. However, on the assumption that the two are the same word, how does one get from one to the other? One wonders if the readily apparent fact that hair color is hereditary yielded in Hittite an expression "of the same hair" with a similar meaning in Hittite to English "of the same blood". And so, just as the English word "blood" came to mean "lineage", "clan"⁴⁰ perhaps the word "hair" in Hittite came to have a similar meaning.

⁴⁰ Oxford English Dictionary, H, Oxford 1933, 930 s. v. hair III 8–10.