



---

Pudenda Hethitica

Author(s): H. Craig Melchert

Source: *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 3/4 (Jul. – Oct., 1983), pp. 137-145

Published by: The American Schools of Oriental Research

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3515963>

Accessed: 18/02/2009 11:58

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=asor>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The American Schools of Oriental Research is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## PUDENDA HETHITICA

H. Craig Melchert  
University of North Carolina

The title of this article is based on the happenstance that all the Hittite expressions discussed below involve either excretory functions and/or genitalia. I did not set out to write on such a specialized topic, but this common theme does lend a certain unity to the discussion which follows.

### 1. *yayāi katta-ya-an-za-kan tarnai*

This collocation is attested in full in KUB 44 61 i 9 and incompletely in i 16. The same expression occurs in KBo 21 76:7 and 13 (with the order of clauses reversed). Burde,<sup>1</sup> to whom we owe the edition of these “medical” texts, finds the expression obscure; she leaves *yayāi* untranslated and renders the rest literally as “und lässt ihn herabhängen(?)”.

I believe, however, that Burde herself has already provided all the necessary information for interpreting the phrase. The preceding context tells us that one of the patient’s symptoms is lack of appetite (or inability to eat), leading Burde to conclude correctly that the illness involves the gastro-intestinal tract. The prescription includes NU.LUḪ.ḪA.SAR, “asafoetida,” and SUM.SAR, “garlic,” both of which according to Burde’s notes were used in ancient Mesopotamia for their diuretic effect. Finally, we know that the expression given above somehow indicates a cure, since the next paragraph begins: “But if he/she does not get well . . . ,” followed by further treatment.<sup>2</sup>

Given a gastro-intestinal ailment and the administering of well-known diuretics, it seems to me that the meaning of *katta-ya-an-za-kan tarnai*, “and he lets it go/releases it downward” is evident: we have here the Hittite expression for “passes” in the sense of “excretes.”<sup>3</sup> Since the action is in a very real sense internal, the reflexive particle is perfectly in order. The reference of the animate anaphoric pronoun *-an*, “it,” is not clear, but there are several possibilities. The Hittite word for excrement known to us is

1. StBoT 19 (1974) 18ff.

2. The negative formulation of KBo 21 76:6-8 leads to the same conclusion: *n-an-za-kan mān kai[ta ḫūta]k ŪL tarnāi yayai-m[a’ Ū]L ḫūtak*, “If he does not release it down at once, and does not *yayai* at once . . .” This phrase is followed by further treatment.

3. As is well-established, Hittite *katta*, “down” is cognate with Greek *katá*, “idem,” while Hittite *tarna-*, “release, let go,” matches Tocharian AB *tärk-*, “idem” (note A pres. 3rd sg. *tärnäs*). Further connections of each are debatable.

neuter (*šakkar*, *šaknaš*), but it is likely that others existed. Depending on the Hittites' conception of the matter, the *-an* could also refer to the illness, an obstruction, or perhaps even a "demon" causing the ailment: see KBo 6 34 iii 19f. (StBoT 22 12) and see Burde's discussion of the role of Išhara.<sup>4</sup>

As for *yayāi*, the fact that it occurs before *katta . . . tarnai* in one text and after it in another<sup>5</sup> argues that the two actions expressed occur together rather than one after the other. Formally, *yayāi* has the appearance of an imitative word, comparable to *wāi*, *wiyanzi*, "cries out" (also reduplicated *wiwāi*). The latter is certainly related to the "noun" *wai-*, "woe," which occurs in the rhyming pair *ain wain* (KBo 17 3 iv 26ff.). Both *ai-* and *wai-* are, of course, in origin exclamations indicating pain: uninflected *ai* is attested in KBo 21 19 rev. 2 and KUB 28 6 ii 16. I know of no \**yai* in Hittite, but compare *i-i ḫalziššai*, "cries ee-ee" in KBo 17 43 i 11. One may also compare the unclear KUB 30 34 iv 31-32: *nu-ššan šarā nep[išaš DING]IR.MEŠ-aš iyauwa ḫalzašš*, "He cried *i*. up to the gods of heaven." I suggest that *yayāi* means no more than "cries yai," expressing pain. It is reasonable that a bowel movement under such circumstances (prolonged constipation) might be quite uncomfortable: the treatment is prescribed for up to seven days.

## 2. *gullant(i)*-GIŠ.ŠU.A-ka-

The use of purgatives is also attested in the Ritual of Ayatarsa (CTH 390), KUB 7 1 i 1ff., which is prescribed for a child who is *alpant-*, "weak, torpid," or whose "innards are devoured" (*garateš adanteš*). The list of ingredients prescribed (i 19ff.) includes once again asafoetida (here written as Akkadian *fiyati*, scil. *tiyade*). All the ingredients are crushed and mixed together, and beer is poured over them (i 25-28). If there is any doubt that the purpose of this concoction is purgative, it is removed by the prescribed mode of treatment: the liquid is administered both orally and anally, as well as poured over the child, who is also ritually washed (i 29-34). Following this, an ointment is prepared, and the child's limbs are rubbed with it (i 37-38). This is followed by *ašašḫi-ma-ššan gullanti* GIŠ.ŠU.Á, "she places him (the child) on a *g*.-chair" (i 40-41). There is then mention of a container full of ritually pure water (*waḫešnaš wātar*), and the tablet unfortunately breaks off.

The adjective *g*. occurs in context, KBo 10 37 i 22 and iii 18, 29 (and the parallel KBo 13 156 v 7-8), where it refers to a type of bread:

4. StBoT 19 (1974) 12ff.

5. See n. 2 above.

NINDA.KUR<sub>4</sub>.RA *gullanti*-. As noted by Hoffner,<sup>6</sup> Hittite bread names may refer to the ingredients, the intended use, the color, or especially the shape. The first two possibilities are eliminated by the use with “chair.” Color is a possibility, but it is not easy to see why the color of the chair would be relevant to its use in the ritual.

On the other hand, after the administration of a purgative, it is reasonable that the child would be placed not on a chair of ordinary shape, but on a “hollow” chair, one with a hole in it, to wit, a toilet. Furthermore, we know that the Hittites had discovered the sandwich or layer-cake (see the “formule des pains” in the Hittite-Palaic Zapparwa Ritual, CTH 751). It would therefore not surprise us to learn that they had also invented the doughnut (or perhaps rather ring-cake, there being more than one way to make bread with a hole in the middle). I suggest then that *gullant(i)*- means “hollow, with a hole in it.” The hapax *gulliya* in KUB 27 67 iv 32 is probably related: INA KUR LÚ.K[ÚR] x *gulliya nanni*, “drive into the enemy land into the/a g.” The context suggests a meaning such as “pit” or “ravine,” basically a “hole.”<sup>7</sup>

### 3. *kiklu-* and *paššari-*

In KUB 44 61 rev. 24-25, the same text discussed in Section 1 above, we find the expression *n-aš mān (ÚL) paššariš* . . . Burde<sup>8</sup> argues convincingly from the context that the meaning is: “If he is (not) circumcised . . .” She believes *paššari-*, “circumcised” to be hapax, but the word does occur elsewhere in Hittite, in a very different context.

6. Alim. Het. 205ff.

7. The form *gullantin* (KBo 10 37 iii 18) requires a stem *gullanti*-. The dat.-loc. sg. *gullanti* in KUB 7 1 i 40 may reflect either *gullant-* or *gullanti*-. The *i*-stem is certainly secondary (an old *i*-stem built on a base in *-ant-* would have produced assibilation: *\*-ant-i* > *\*-anzi*-). The stem *gullant-* could be either a participle or an *-ant-* extension of an unattested adjective *\*gulla*-. Both the shape and the meaning suggest connection with the *\*kul*- seen in Old Norse *holr*, Old English *hol* etc., “hollow,” Gothic *ushulōn*, “hollow out,” and Sanskrit *kulyā*, “ditch, canal.” These are commonly related further to the *\*kaul*- of Greek *kaulós*, “stem,” Latin *caulis*, “stem,” and Lithuanian *kaulas*, “bone.” Superficially, *gulla*- could match *holr* etc. (< *\*kulo*-) and *gulliya* likewise Sanskrit *kulyā*. However, a double sonant in Hittite regularly reflects a sonant-laryngeal cluster; see, for example, *šunna*-, “fill” < *\*su-nh<sub>3</sub>-*. Since *\*kaulo*-/ *kulo*- can hardly be divided other than *\*kau*-/ *ku*- *lo*-, a sequence *\*ku-lh<sub>3</sub>o*- is unlikely. There are words with a similar meaning pointing to *\*kū*-/ *kuh<sub>3</sub>-*: Sanskrit *kūpa*-, “hole, cave,” Latin *cūpa*, “vat, barrel.” A *\*kuh<sub>3</sub>lo*- is thus conceivable. It is quite uncertain at present, however, whether such a sequence would yield Hittite *-ll-* (rather than lengthening the preceding vowel). The relationship of various Proto-Indo-European forms for rounded objects (convex and concave) remains obscure. Compare Pokorny IEW 393f., 537, 588ff., and 592ff. (*\*geu*-, *\*kau*-, *\*keu*-, and *\*keu*-). It seems safe to say that Hittite *gullant(i)*- fits somewhere into this ill-defined group, but it is not clear just where.

8. StBoT 19 (1974) 24-25.

In RS 25.421 rev. 22, a Hittite translation of an Akkadian text termed a “signalement lyrique” by Laroche (CTH 315), we find Hittite *kiklubaššar[iš-m]a-aš*, “She is an iron-ring,” equating with Akkadian *unqi parzulli*. Laroche<sup>9</sup> compares *kiklubaššari-* to the hapax *kiklimaimenzi* in the inventory KUB 12 1 iv 26 (see DLL 55), which he proposes to read *kiklibaimenzi*, “iron-coated” or the like, participle to a verb \**kiklibāi-*, “plate/coat with iron.”<sup>10</sup>

It is clear, however, that *kiklubaššari-*, “iron-ring” must be divided as *kiklu-*, “iron,” plus *baššari-*, “circumcised.” For the relationship of the two uses compare in the same semantic sphere Hittite *pišna-* < \**pesno-*, originally “penis,” but then by pars pro toto “the one having a penis” = “male, man.” In the same way, then, *paššari-*, “circle, ring” is used for “the one having a ring, circle” (around his penis) = “circumcised.”<sup>11</sup>

The *-ba-* of *kiklibaimenzi* (presumably for \**kiklubaimenzi*)<sup>12</sup> must therefore have another explanation. An adjective \**kikluba-*, “of iron,” as the base for the denominative verb \**kiklubāi-* is certainly conceivable, but

#### 9. Ugaritica 5 (1968) 77.

10. H. G. Güterbock has kindly informed me that collation has confirmed the reading with BA: *kiklibaimenzi*.

11. The noun *paššari-*, “circle, ring” (animate) formally recalls *auri-*, “watchtower” to the verb *au-*, “see.” Since the latter also occurs as *awari-*, one could read *paššari-* as /pass-ari-/. On the other hand, with only two occurrences one could also read it as /pass-ri-/. For the spelling compare *ki-iš-ša-ri* beside *ki-iš-ri* for /gissri/, “in the hand,” and many others. As for the base \**pašš-*, one source of geminate -šš- in Hittite is a sequence \*-ns- or \*-h<sub>1</sub>/s-. However, I know of no Proto-Indo-European root of a shape \**Pen-s-* or \**Pe<sub>h</sub>1/s-* from which one could derive a meaning “ring,” “circle.” Since Proto-Indo-European \**s* also appears as -šš- in Hittite before a sonant (compare the example *kūš(ša)ri* cited above), one could also derive /pass-ri-/ from a simple root \**Pes-* or \**Pas-*. Again, however, I know of no likely etymon for “circle, ring.”

There are cases of sporadic -šš- in Hittite from clusters other than those given above. The noun *aršaršura-*, “stream, current,” which is a reduplicated stem from the verb *arš-*, “flow,” also appears as *aršaššura-* (KUB 36 55 ii 20), probably also as *aršašura-* in KBo 12 33 iii 3. Since -rs- normally remains in Hittite, the appearance of -šš- for -rs- in this word is undoubtedly related to the presence of two other *r*’s. Note that this is also possible for *paššari-*, where *pašš(a)ri-* for \**parš(a)ri-* could be due to the second *r*. This permits a derivation from Proto-Indo-European \**bher-s-*, “cut, scratch”; compare Old Irish *berraim*, “shear, cut” (especially the hair), Greek *phársos*, “piece.” A similar root-extension appears in Hittite *karš-*, “cut” < \**ker-s-*. For the sense “circle” from “scratch, cut” compare German *Kreis*, “circle,” which is related to Middle High German *kriizen*, “draw a circle” and also Middle High German *kritzen*, “scratch, scribble,” and Old High German *krizzōn*, “idem.” Grimm, Deutsches Wb sub *kreis*, explains the semantic development from the fact that originally many circles were engraved or scratched onto a surface. The use of Hittite *paššari-*, “circle” for “circumcised” would thus accord well with a derivation from \**bher-s-*.

12. The apparent alternation *u/i* in *kiklu-/kikli-bāi-* is unusual, but not unique; see *išqāruḫ/iškāriḫ*.

I know of no other examples of an adjective suffix *-ba-* in Anatolian, while verbs in *-mā(i)-* from bases in *-u-* are well attested; see Luwian *šaššumāi-*, “?”, and Hittite *enu-māi-*, “make warm,” *ešharnu-māi-*, “make bloody.”<sup>13</sup> Given the very close resemblance of the signs BA and MA, I suspect that the hapax *kiklibaimenzi* is for *\*kiklimaimenzi* and that the verb “plate with iron” is *\*kiklimāi-/ \*kiklumāi-*.

The word for “iron” is normally written in Hittite with the Sumerogram AN.BAR. The only examples with phonetic complements known to me are the genitive AN.BAR-*aš* and the instrumental AN.BAR-*it*. These argue neither for nor against the apparent equation *kiklu-* = *parzillu* = AN.BAR.<sup>14</sup>

#### 4. TÚG.šeknu- (*šarā*) *pippa-*

The literal meaning of this phrase has long been tentatively known: “turn up one’s robe.” However, the real significance of this expression in the contexts in which it appears has remained obscure. Friedrich<sup>15</sup> translates *šarā pippa-* as “(ein abwärts hängendes Kleid) hochstülpen(?)”. However, on the following page he renders the separately-listed *šeknuš pippuwar* as “Rock-Umwendung(?)” and translates the phrase *MAMETUM šeknuš pippuwar* (KUB 26 1 iv 46) freely as “Eid brechen.” Von Schuler<sup>16</sup> retains Friedrich’s literal interpretation, but prefers to translate the passage as “diesen Eid verdreht.” Otten<sup>17</sup> interprets KUB 7 41 rev. 13 (//KBo 10 45 i 2-3) TÚG.šeknu-ššan *kēdaš parnaš šarā pippāš* as “und [hat] nun seinen Mantel über dieses Hauswesen geworfen.”

13. The suffix is originally *-wā(i)-*, as seen in *hišwā(i)-*, “lie open, be exposed,” to the root *bašš-/heš-* “open.” By a regular Hittite sound change *\*-uwā(i)-* > *-umā(i)-*.

14. For a technological term such as “iron,” borrowing is a likely source, but the Hittite word does not resemble the pan-Semitic word reflected in Akkadian *parzillu*, nor any other term for “iron” in geographically close languages. We may therefore consider the possibility that the word has a Proto-Indo-European etymology. Many Indo-European terms for metals are based on color: for example Greek *árgyros*, “silver” < *\*h<sub>2</sub>erǵ-*, “white” (compare Hittite *ḫarki-*, “white”), likewise “gold” < *\*ghel-*, “yellow” (compare Sanskrit *hári*, “yellow”), and Lithuanian *álvas*, “tin” < *\*al-wo-*, “white” (compare Latin *albus*, “white,” and specifically *plumbum album*, “white lead” = “tin”). Hittite *kiklu-* may also be compared formally to other Proto-Indo-European color terms. Compare *\*bhe/i-bhr-u-* < *\*bher-*, “brown,” which is the source of Sanskrit *babhrú-* (kind of ichneumon) and the European word for “beaver.” We may analyze Hittite *kiklu-* likewise as *\*ke/i-kl-u-*, “the gray (metal)” < *\*kel-*, “gray, blackish”; compare Greek *kel-ainós*, “black,” *kállós*, “gray,” and so on.

15. HWb sub *pippa-*.

16. Dienstanw. 16.

17. ZA 54 (1961) 117.

It is clear from the occurrences of this expression that it signifies a hostile and defiling act. We have attested several rituals prescribed for the occasion when someone “turns up his robe” at/against another person. For example, the ritual of Pupuwanni (CTH 408) is to be used when the gods have been bewitched against someone, and they “turn up their robes” at him (KUB 7 2 iv 6-7 // KBo 15 23 vi 2-3).<sup>18</sup> A ritual aimed at the gods of the underworld (CTH 446) contains the phrase cited above (KUB 7 41 rev. 13): “has turned up his robe at these houses.”<sup>19</sup> This is included among such other acts as swearing a (false) oath, committing mutilation, uttering a curse, or entering a house with blood on one’s hands. KUB 30 36 i 2-3 (CTH 401), a purification ritual, is for the occasion when a man “turns up his robe at his companion” (LÚ .*tappi-šu*). The use of the phrase in the Instructions of Tuthaliya (KUB 26 8 iv 33 // 26 1 iv 26) merely reflects an extended application to an object instead of a person: *našma-za kī MAMETUM šeknuš pippuwar kuiški iyazi*, “or (if) someone commits a turning up of the robes against this oath.”<sup>20</sup> Since *pippa-* alone means “overturn” in the sense of “invert,” it can mean “turn up” with clothing even without *šarā*.

Why does “turning up the robe” constitute a hostile act which is treated like a curse or the practice of witchcraft? I believe the answer is that the Hittites wore nothing under their *šeknu-*. Thus “turning up the robe” means “exposing oneself.” In modern Western society self-exposure is considered a (deviant) sexual act whose purpose is to titillate (or embarrass). However, in some cultures such an action is rather an insult or a curse.<sup>21</sup>

18. The syntax of this example is troublesome. KUB 7 2 iv 5-7 reads: *mān antuḫši DINGIR.MEŠ alwanzahhanteš namma-šta apēdani UKÛ-ši TÚG.šeknuš šarā pippan*. The duplicate KBo 15 23 rev. 3 also has *pippan*, as does IBoT 2 115 rev. 4 (beginning of the same text). Despite the appearance of *pippan* in three manuscripts, I believe the context requires emendation to *pippan*<*zi*> with “the” (the gods) as subject. The text of KUB 41 3 rev. 4-5 (colophon of the same tablet as IBoT 2 115) is surely corrupt: *našma-aš-kan apēdani UKÛ-aš TÚG.šeknu* [ ] UGU *pippai*. Neither the case of UKÛ-*aš*, the pronoun *aš*, nor the singular *pippai* makes any sense in the context.

19. Or more likely (with Otten) “at this house(hold),” with a collective plural.

20. Since generally with one person the form is *šeknu*, one could also assume that we have here the genitival construction with a verbal noun and take *šeknuš* as standing for genitive singular \**šeknuwaš*, “a turning up of the robe.” Compare for the syncope dative-locative plural *šeknuš* in KBo 2 3 ii 33 with *šeknuwaš* in the parallel KUB 32 115+ iii 25. However, since *kuiški*, “someone,” stands here for all those bound by the oath, I find it likelier that *šeknuš* is accusative plural depending on *pippuwar*. The (grammatical) incongruity in number would not be surprising in Hittite; see the passage KUB 20 90 iv 15-16 cited below. The accusative case of *kī MAMETUM* versus the usual dative and the unique *-za* are undoubtedly related to the use of the paraphrastic phrase with verbal noun plus *iya-* instead of the usual finite verb. See KUB 6 45 i 25: *-za+acc.+arkuwar iya-*.

21. Among the Kikuyu (East Central Africa), for a woman to expose her genitals is equivalent to a curse. In Malay exposure of the genitals to another person equates to the verbal insult “my balls in your face.” I am indebted to V. Friedman for these useful references.

Modern Europeans and Americans generally content themselves with symbolizing self-exposure by various well-known hand gestures, but the purpose is the same: a serious insult or curse.<sup>22</sup>

Some support for the idea that the Hittites wore nothing under the *šeknu*- comes from the peculiar ritual passage KUB 20 90 iv 15-16: *ašeššar arta TÚG.šiknuš peššiyanzi wappianzi*, “the assembly stands; they throw off their robes and bark.” If the participants are to bark like dogs (for whatever purpose), it is reasonable that the purpose of removing their robes is to make them naked like animals.<sup>23</sup>

A passage in the Old Hittite “Palace Chronicle” leads to the same conclusion. In KBo 3 34 i 15ff., two men Nunnu and Sarmassu are punished by being yoked like oxen, but in i 19ff. the king must be convinced that the punishment was severe enough: *mān luktat nu ABI LUGAL ḫalzaiš kūš arḫa kuiš peḫutet TÚG-ŠUNU TÚG.išḫial-šemett-a kuit natta ešḫaškanta UMMA LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI šekunu-šmet anda nēan nu TÚG.ḪI.A-uš arḫa nāir nu ēšḫar LUGAL-uš(!) aušta*, “When dawn came, the father of the king called the one who had taken them (the culprits) away: ‘Why are their robes and belts not blood-streaked?’ The *mešedi* said: ‘Their robes are turned in.’ They opened/turned out (their) robes, and the king saw the blood.” It makes little sense that *anda nēan* would mean “turned inside out.” I assume rather that it means that the loose robe (probably open in front) was drawn together (perhaps even overlapped) and tied with a belt or sash. It seems highly likely that when the two were harnessed like oxen they were stripped naked. There was some bleeding either from whipping or simply the chafing of the harness, but not enough, apparently, to soak through their robes when they put them back on. Therefore the officials had to open the men’s robes to show the king the blood on their bodies. This again implies near or total nudity.

The usage of *šeknu*- thus supports the proposal that nothing was worn under it, which in turn explains the meaning of the phrase *šeknu*- (*šarā*) *pippa*-, “turn up the robe” = “expose oneself.”

There is another apparently peculiar expression with *šeknu*- attested in the oracle text KBo 2 6 i 39-40 (and see also iii 49-50): *DINGIR.LUM-naš ANA INIM ʾSIN-ʾU šer TÚG.šeknun EGIR-pa UL SUD-yaši nu IGI-ziš*

---

Exposure of the buttocks has, of course, a similar function. Since the Hittite texts do not mention turning around, I find this less likely, but it cannot be excluded that the Hittite expression equates with “mooning” rather than “flashing.”

22. The action is often accompanied by the appropriate verbal phrase, making the meaning crystal-clear. It is likely that the Hittite act of turning up the robe is functionally equivalent to vulgar English “F--k you!”

23. We know from KUB 2 3 ii 14ff. that nudity did play a part in some Hittite rituals.



MUŠEN.ĤURRI SIG<sub>5</sub>-*ru* EGIR-*ma* NU.SIG<sub>5</sub>-*du*, “(If) you the god do not pull back(?) your robe at us over the matter of Arma-<sup>d</sup>U then let the first ĥ-bird be favorable, but let the second be unfavorable.”

It is clear that the action described expresses anger or displeasure. As usual, the god is being systematically asked for the cause of his wrath. It is hard to see, however, how “pulling back” the robe signifies anger. I believe the answer lies in two passages which I have discussed elsewhere.<sup>24</sup> The first of these is §171 of the Laws, where a mother turns her dress around in the face of her son, symbolizing rejection of him. Here the expression used is TŪG-ŠU *edi nāi*, “turns her dress from there,” that is, “from its accustomed place.”<sup>25</sup> In KUB 33 67 i 26-31 the goddesses Anzili and Zukki symbolize their anger by putting on various pieces of clothing backward; they put the left shoe on the right foot and vice-versa; fasten the breast ornaments in back; and reverse the front and back *ĥupiki*-garments. The meaning of *šeknun āppa ĥuettiya-* must be similar: not “pull back” but “pull (around) to the back” so that the front is in back and vice-versa. Again, anger is symbolized by destroying the natural order of things in the form of dress.

I conclude this discussion of *šeknu-* with some formal considerations. Friedrich<sup>26</sup> lists *šeknu-* as both neuter and animate, but in fact it is consistently animate: the accusative singular is always *šeknun*,<sup>27</sup> and the accusative plural *šeknuš*.<sup>28</sup> The nominative singular *šeknuš* is probably attested in KUB 36 39 ii 5 and 7, and in 33 121 ii 21.<sup>29</sup> The only form which appears to be neuter is *šekunu-šmet* in the Palace Chronicle, but this instance may easily be explained as a collective plural: compare English “clothing” or “robes” as in “his judicial robes.”<sup>30</sup>

24. JCS 31 (1979) 62ff.

25. See the other instance which I cite in JCS 31 (1979) 62ff.

26. HWb 189.

27. In addition to the examples cited above see KUB 16 41 iii 12, 16; 16 58 rev. 6; 35 163 iii 13; and KBo 10 45 ii 27. The form *šeknu-šsan* for *šeknun-šsan* shows the usual assimilation of *n* to *s* at a word boundary.

28. Besides the examples above see KBo 13 241 rev. 8, 9 and also 12 100 rev. 6 (the latter an accusative of respect).

29. In each case we seem to have a sentence-initial phrase TŪG.šeknuš-*ši*-(*ya*), “(und) der Rock ist ihm . . .” In the last-cited passage we may in fact have TŪG.šeknuš-*ši anda n[e]-y[a-an-za]*, “His robe is turned in,” but the reading of *ne-ya-<sup>o</sup>* is uncertain.

30. Many cases of variable gender in Hittite do not exist. The vitality of the collective plural as a living category in Hittite (type of Latin *locus*, *loci*, *loca*) has not been fully appreciated. I cite as another example GIŠ.*laḥḥurnuzzi-*, “leafy branch, foliage,” which is listed in the CHD 3/1 (1980) 15 as both neuter and common gender. However, an examination of the occurrences conveniently gathered there shows that in those cases referring to individual branches the word is consistently animate (see sections b and c). In the apparently neuter examples the sense is always that of a collective “foliage” (on the tree or used for various purposes). The gender of the word is thus animate, as we would expect for a noun in \*-*ti*-.

The Palace Chronicle also shows that one of the readings of the Sumerogram TÚG is *šeknu-*. It is clear that TÚG.ĤIA-*uš arḫa nāir* is the opposite action of *šekunu-šmet anda nēan*. The equation TÚG = *šeknu-* is confirmed by other occurrences. In the passage KUB 33 67 i 26ff. cited above, “divine robes” is written as TÚG.DINGIR.LIM-*waš*, that is, *šiunaš šeknuwaš*.<sup>31</sup> The *u*-stem is confirmed further by KUB 20 4 i 12, where we find TÚG.ĤIA-*muš*. In a ritual context with third plural verb forms -*muš* can hardly be an enclitic possessive “my.” It reflects rather an accusative plural \**šeknamuš* with the same dissimilation as in *idālamuš*, and the like. The fact that *šeknu-* originally had adjectival inflection is shown by the dative-locative singular *šeknawi-šmi*, “your/their robe” in KBo 17 36 iii 5 (OH ms.).

I do not claim, of course, that *šeknu-*, “robe,” is the only reading for TÚG. There is also evidence for an *a*-stem cited by Goetze,<sup>32</sup> who suggested that *wašpa-* = TÚG-*a*- may be the generic term for “garment.” In addition to his examples see also KBo 3 23 rev. 8 *nekumanti-ma TÚG-a[n pāi]*, “gives a garment to the naked.” In the phrase URU.Nešaš TÚG.ĤIA of the funeral dirge KBo 3 40 rev. 13, TÚG.ĤIA almost certainly stands for \**wašpa*, “funeral clothing, shroud.”<sup>33</sup> There are ample parallels for such multiple use of Sumerograms in Hittite: see GE<sub>6</sub> = *dankui-*, “dark, black” and *išpant-*, “night,” among many.<sup>34</sup>

---

Like any animate noun, it may have a collective plural as well as an individualized plural (compare *alpa* and *alpuš*, “clouds”). The same applies to *šeknu-*. From *parkuwai* TÚG.ĤIA (KUB 13 4 i 16), Watkins Lg 45 (1969) 239, likewise deduces a collective plural \**wašpa*, “clothing,” to animate *wašpa-*, “garment.”

31. Güterbock apud Laroche, RHA 23 (1965) 136, reads the sequence as TÚG-*an-ši-wa-zan*, which is syntactically impossible. Neither the accusative TÚG-*an*, the enclitic -*ši*, nor the particle -*wa*- fits the context. The -*aš*- after -*wa*- is clear in the autograph, and a dative-locative is needed. The fact that correct Hittite word order is preserved behind a Sumerogram (TÚG.DINGIR.LIM-*waš* = *šiunaš šeknuwaš*) is confirmed by DUMU.LÚ.ULÛ.LU-*li* in KBo 12 128:7 for *dandukišnaš* DUMU-*li*. Compare also É.DINGIR.LIM = *šiunaš pir*.

32. Cor.Ling. 50-51.

33. See Watkins, Lg 45 (1969) 239; cf. note 30.

34. Hittite *pippa*, “overtum” (by bringing the bottom of something upward) has been plausibly related to Sanskrit *ud pīpīte*, “rises up,” by Hoffmann apud Oettinger, Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums (1979) p. 498.

The etymology of *šeknu-* remains unclear. For such a cultural object borrowing is always likely, but it is hard to see why a foreign word for an object (thus a noun) would have taken on the peculiar Hittite inflection of *u*-stem adjectives (*šeknawi*, \**šeknamuš*). On the other hand, that an original adjective used as a substantive would take on the more regular noun inflection is to be expected. For a word indicating a garment (that is, a large piece of cloth), derivation from the root \**šek-*, “cut,” would be plausible; compare English “shirt” and “skirt,” both ultimately from \**sk-er-*, “cut.” However, examples of adjectives in \**-nu-* in other Indo-European languages are generally active in sense; see Wackernagel-Debrunner, Altindische Grammatik II.2.741 with references. It is uncertain whether the isolated \**su(h<sub>1</sub>)-nu-*, “son” < “(the one) born” to \**seu(h<sub>1</sub>)-*, “give birth,” may be used as support for a \**šek-nu-*, “(that which is) cut” > “piece of cloth” > “robe.”