Harold Craig Melchert

Honor Guest – Convidado de Honra

Harold Craig Melchert is presently the A. Richard Diebold Professor of Indo-European Studies and Professor of Linguistics at the University of California at Los Angeles. He specializes on the languages of the Anatolian branch Indo-European on which he has done significant work.

Besides being the author of more than a hundred scholarly articles, his published monographs include *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (1994), *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, *Lycian Lexicon* (1993). He recently co-authored with Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. the monumental work *A Grammar of the Hittite Language* (2008). His *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* (1993), as well as corpora of Cuneiform Luvian, Lydian and Lycian texts by him are available online. H. Craig Melchert is a supporter of online publication and therefore many of his own articles can also be consulted on the Internet through his homepage:

http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/Index.htm.

Harold Craig Melchert ocupa actualmente o cargo de Professor A. Richard Diebold de Estudos Indo-Europeus e Professor de Linguística na Universidade da Califórnia em Los Angeles. É especialista nas línguas do ramo anatólio indo-europeu, sobre o qual tem desenvolvido importante trabalho.

Para além de ter assinado mais de cem artigos, entre as monografias que publicou contam-se: *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (1994), *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, *Lycian Lexicon* (1993). Recentemente, foi autor, a par de Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., da obra monumental *A Grammar of the Hittite Language* (2008). O seu *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* (1993), bem como os seus *corpora* de textos em luvita cuneiforme, lídio e lício estão disponíveis online. H. Craig Melchert é um defensor da publicação online, pelo que também muitos dos seus artigos podem ser consultados na Internet, através da sua página pessoal:

http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/Index.htm.

REMARKS ON THE KUTTAMUWA INSCRIPTION

H. Craig Melchert
University of California, Los Angeles

ABSTRACT

A funerary stele dating to the 8th century BCE has recently been found at Zincirli (ancient Sam'al). The deceased – who bears a Luvian name (KTMW, to be read approximately as Kuttamuwa) – states in the Aramaic inscription that his soul resides in the stele itself. The concept of an immortal soul separated from the body, unfamiliar to the Semitic peoples, reflects Hittite and Luvian beliefs in a 1st millennium Neo-Hittite state. The new text asserts the belief that the soul could abide in the funerary stele, an idea that is probably the outcome of a cultural synthesis in the area of Syro-Anatolian interaction.

RÉSUMÉ

On a découvert récemment une stèle funéraire à Zincirli (anc. Sam'al), datée au 8[me] siècle a.C. Le défunt, qui porte un nom louvite (KTMW, à lire à peu près Kuttamuwa), déclare dans l'inscription araméenne que son âme réside dans la stèle même. Le concept d'une âme immortelle séparée du corps, alien aux peuples sémitiques, reflète des croyances hittites et louvites dans un état neo-hittite du première millénnaire. Le texte nouvel affirme la croyance que l'âme pouvait résider dans la stèle funéraire, une idée qui résulte probablement d'une synthèse culturelle dans le zone d'interaction syro-anatolien.

It was announced in late 2008 that archaeologists from the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago had discovered a new stele at the site of Zincirli (ancient Sam'al) in south-central Turkey (not far from the border

with Syria).[1] Dated to the eighth century BCE, the stele represents the funeral monument of one Kuttamuwa, who in the text inscribed on the stele indicates that he had the monument built while still living and also refers to 'my soul that is in this stele'. In the initial announcement cited above David Schloen properly emphasizes that the stele "vividly demonstrates that Iron Age Sam'al, located in the border zone between Anatolia and Syria, inherited both Semitic and Indo-European cultural traditions" and adds carefully that "Kuttumuwa's inscription shows a fascinating mixture of non-Semitic and Semitic cultural elements, including a belief in the enduring human soul—which did not inhabit the bones of the deceased, as in traditional *Semitic* thought…" [emphasis mine, HCM]. Finally, he correctly identifies the true novelty of the inscription as "the belief that the enduring identity or "soul" of the deceased inhabited the monument on which his image was carved and on which his final words were recorded."

However, the beginning of the same announcement states misleadingly that the stele "provides the first written evidence in the region that people believed the soul was separate from the body." This claim is arguable even for the region of Sam'al, but further reactions to the new text have gone even further. The New York Times report cited above includes the implication by one scholar that such a belief was found in the Ancient Near East only in Egypt, and in Wikipedia one finds the stele characterized as "one of the earliest references in *a* Near East *culture* to a soul as a separate entity from the body" [emphasis mine, HCM].[2] For those familiar with the belief system of Hittite and Luvian speakers it is not remotely startling or sensational that a man with the good Luvian name of Kuttamuwa[3] from one of the "Neo-Hittite" states in an area formerly

---

[1] See the announcement at http://news.uchicago.edu/news.php?asset_id=1486 and also a report in the New York Times at
http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/18/science/18soul.html?_r=2&8dpc=&pagewanted=all
(both accessed 9/11/2009). A preliminary report on the stele and its inscription was presented by David Schloen and Dennis Pardee at the meeting of the Society for Biblical Literature in Boston on November 23, 2008. The *editio princeps* of the inscription has now been published by Dennis Pardee in *BASOR* 356 (2009) 51-71. See also on the stele and the inscription the articles by David Schloen and Amir Fink, *BASOR* 356.1-13 and by Eudora Struble and Virginia Herrmann, *BASOR* 356.15-49.
[2] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sam'al (accessed 9/11/2009).
[3] On Luvo-Hittite personal names in -*muwa* see the classic studies of Laroche 1966: 322-4 and Houwink ten Cate 1965: 166-9. Güterbock-Hoffner (1986: 314-6) argue cogently against a sense 'sperm, vital fluid'. A basic meaning 'reproductive power, fertility, abundance' (Weiss 1996: 205-7) seems closer to the mark, but a more general 'might, power' is hard to exclude (thus Houwink ten Cate 1965: 124, after Goetze). The latter would permit *Kutta-muwa-* to be analyzed as '(having) the might of a wall' (cf. Hittite *kutt-* 'wall', Cuneiform Luvian NA₄*kuttaššara/i-* and Hieroglyphic Luvian (SCALPRUM)*ku-ta-sa₅-ra/i-* 'orthostat'). However, given the occurrence of compound personal names in

controlled by the Hittite Empire expresses a belief in the continued existence of the soul apart from the body. It would on the contrary be surprising if he did not. That the Hittites of Anatolia already in the mid-second millennium BCE believed in an immortal soul separate from the body has been known for at least half a century. It is true that the evidence for Luvian has become fully accessible only in the last decade, since the publication of the Hieroglyphic Luvian corpus by Hawkins (2000). In any case, since the facts regarding the Hittites and Luvians appear not to be sufficiently known among the wider community of scholars of the Ancient Near East, it seems useful to offer a brief recapitulation of them.

The most thorough treatment of the Hittite concepts relating to body, soul, heart, person and the like we owe to Annelies Kammenhuber, who published two excellent articles on the topic in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* in 1964 and 1965. As set forth by Kammenhuber (1964: 160-1), the Hittites clearly believed that the soul (Hittite *ištanza(n)-* also written ZI-*(a)n-*) lives on after death.[4] There are references of offerings made to the 'soul of the dead' (*akkantaš* ZI-*ni*) in the royal funeral rites still on the twelfth and thirteen days well after cremation on the first or second (see e.g. KUB 30.19+ i 4).[5] Since it is known that the Hittite rulers were thought to become divinized after death, one might question whether the notion of an immortal soul was more general. Affirmation that it did apply more widely is found in the references in Hittite oracular inquiries to angry souls of the dead (not all of whom were kings and queens) who were thought to be causing trouble among the living: e.g. *mān=ma* GIDIM ZI-*an* DUḪ-*ši* 'If you, the dead, relieve (your) soul…' (KUB 22.35 ii 7'; see van den Hout 1998: 187). Important in view of the Luvian designation for the soul discussed below is Kammenhuber's conclusion (1964: 179ff.) that in late Hittite texts what she terms a "near pleonastic" use of *ištanza(n)-* (ZI) suggests a sense close to 'self, person'. This usage may, but need not, reflect another instance of Luvian influence on New Hittite.

A combination of Luvian and Hittite evidence suggests further common conceptions regarding the soul. First, the soul was apparently

---

[4] Hittite *ištanza(n)-* 'soul' may be a derivative of a pre-Hittite participle *sth₂-ént- 'standing, remaining, abiding' (presupposed by attested Hittite *ištantā(i)-* 'to stay put, linger'). The soul would thus have been conceived as that part of a person that remains after death. See Kloekhorst 2008: 414-5 with references to Oettinger and others. This derivation is attractive but necessarily remains hypothetical.

[5] See already the remarks by Gurney (1952: 164-6).

viewed as something put into the body by the gods at birth. This is stated most explicitly in the Hieroglyphic Luvian inscription KULULU 4 (8th century, from the region of Tabal), §§4 and 9: *wa/i-mu-ta* (LITUUS)*á-za-mi-na* COR-*tara/i-na a-ta tu-tá…wa/i-mu-ta* DEUS-*ni-zi-i* (LITUUS)*á-za-mi-na* COR-*ni-na a-ta tu-wa/i-mi-na-' la-ta wa/i-li[?]-ya-wa/i-ti-na* 'They (the gods) put into me a beloved soul…The gods received the beloved soul put into me, *exalted*.'[6] As per Hawkins (2000: 446), one should compare a passage from the Hittite prayer of Kantuzzili (KUB 30.10 iv 24-25; 15th century): *nu=za karū maḫḫan annaza* ŠÀ-*za ḫaššanza ešun nu=mu=kan* DINGIR=*YA āppa apūn* ZI-*an anda tāi* 'As formerly I was born from my mother's womb, oh my god, put that soul back into me.' (translation with Marazzi and Nowicki, *Oriens Antiquus* 17 (1978) 265), against earlier renderings). The suppliant, who is seriously ill, asks his personal god to restore the soul that the latter put into him at birth.

Second, as already intimated in §9 of KULULU 4 just cited, there was at least among the Luvians a hope that upon the death of the body and the end of this life the soul might again return to the gods whence it came. See also KULULU 1 (8th century, Tabal) §§15-16: *á-mu-pa-wa/i* REL-[*i*] DEUS-[*n*]*a-za ta-wa/i-ya-na* ARHA *i-wa/i* [1]*tu-wa/i-ti-sa-ti tara/i-u-na-ti za-ya-pa-wa/i* DOMUS-*na zi-ti* 'But when I myself go away into the presence of the gods by the justice of Tuwati, these houses (will be) here' (translation after Hawkins 2000: 443).

Other texts show that reentering the presence of the gods was by no means assured, and one of them includes the third Hittite-Luvian conception, that the life in which the soul was joined to the body was viewed as a road traveled by the soul. Note first the curse of KARKAMIŠ A2+3 §§22-23 (10th or early 9th century): **a-wa/i-sa ku-ma-na *a-sa-ti pa-la-sa-ti-i a-wa/i* (DEUS)TONITRUS-*sa* (DEUS)*ku+*AVIS-*pa-sa* ("FRONS")*ha-tá* NEG₃-*sa* LITUUS+*na-ti-i* 'When he is off the path/road, let him not behold the faces of Tarhunza and Kubaba' (translation after Hawkins 2000: 110&112).[7] The otherwise somewhat cryptic reference to 'path, road' is explained by a remarkable Hittite passage (KUB 43.60 i 26-28): [Z]I-*anza=wa=kan uriš* ZI-*anza=wa=kan uriš kuel=wa=kan* ZI-*anza uriš tandukieš=wa=kan* ZI-*anza uriš nu kuin* KASKAL-*an ḫarzi uran*

---

[6] For the reading "COR", not "VAS" see below. The sense of *wa/i-li-ya-wa/i-ti-na* is not assured, but the analysis 'exalted, full of exaltation' of Hawkins (2000: 447) seems appropriate to the context.

[7] For the transliterations **a-wa/i-sa* and **a-sa-ti* for *wa/i-sa-a* and *sa-ti-a* see Hawkins 2003: 159-61.

KASKAL-*an ḫarzi* 'The soul is great. The soul is great. Whose soul is great? The mortal('s) soul is great. What road does it have? It has the great road.'[8] Other portions of this text remain obscure, but it is clear that the soul survives its journey along the road of life and that the afterlife is not necessarily a happy one in the company of the gods. As indicated by Hoffner (1990: 39) the shared reference to an 'evil *tenawas'* suggests that the text is at least related if not an indirect join to that edited by Hoffner (1988). The latter describes an unhappy afterlife of deprivation and estrangement from one's family. What we do not know is what factors were believed to determine the fate of one's soul after death and whether one could take actions to try to assure a happy outcome.

While it is clear that the Hittite word for 'soul' is *ištanza(n)-*, the question of the Luvian designation for this concept has not been fully resolved. In the most recent and thorough discussion of the problem van den Hout (2002: 182-5) argues persuasively that the Hieroglyphic Luvian logogram (*341) used for this and related words represents a human heart and not a vase, suggesting that it is better rendered then as "COR" instead of "VAS". He likewise demonstrates (2002: 176-8 and 185) that contra Hawkins no instances of the word behind "COR" need to be understood as 'image' or 'figure', but rather that all may or must be interpreted as 'soul' or 'person'. Less certain is van den Hout's conclusion that Hieroglyphic Luvian conflated two separate words: /atra/i-~atla/i-/ 'person' (cognate with Lycian *atra-/atla-* and Carian *otr-* 'self') and /tan(i)-/ 'soul'. One problem with this is that the putative Luvian /tan(i)-/ cannot easily be derived from a **stan-* and then compared with a Hittite **ištan-*. Whatever its ultimate root etymology, Hittite *ištanza(n)-* can hardly be based on an *n*-stem **ištan-* (on the formation of Hittite stems in *-anza(n)-* see Melchert 2003). Another difficulty is that in the text of KULULU 5 the forms COR-*tara/i-na*, COR-*la-ti-i-'* and COR-*ni-na* co-occur and surely all are variants of the same word. Pace van den Hout (2002: 177) it remains therefore more likely that the common gender stems /atra/i-/ and /atna/i-/ represent different modifications of a single heteroclite neuter noun in *-r/-n-* (for which see Hajnal 1995: 244-5). The late variant /atla/i-/ seen in KULULU 5 would show a replacement of /n/ by /l/ that also appears in Lycian. A definitive

---

[8] My translation follows that of Watkins (1995: 286). That of Hoffner (1990: 34) differs only in detail. His rendering of *ḫarzi* in context as 'travels' is fully justified. I follow Hoffner and Watkins in assuming that *tandukiš* ZI-*aš* 'mortal soul' means 'soul of a mortal=human'. For comparison of features of the Hittite text with aspects of Greek Orphism see the full discussion by Watkins and also Bernabé Pajares 2006.

answer to this problem cannot yet be given. What is to be retained is van den Hout's conclusion that in all its uses the Luvian word refers to that part of a human being that defines the individual, which the Luvians certainly thought outlives the physical body. It is questionable whether the modern distinctions of 'soul, person, self' existed for Luvian or Hittite speakers.

The reference in the Kuttamuwa inscription to a soul independent of the body is thus no novelty in Anatolia. As already indicated by David Schloen, the exciting genuinely new contribution of the text is the explicit statement that the soul of the deceased resides in the funeral stele, which offers confirmation of what has previously only been suspected. See the very cautious claim of Hutter (1993: 104) and also Watkins (2008: 136-9) on the common word for both 'funerary monument' and 'cult stele' in the western Anatolian Indo-European languages: HLuvian *tasa(n)-za*, Lycian *θθẽ*, Lydian *tasẽv*, etymologically *'possessing the sacred/divine'. As stressed by Hutter (1993: 103-4), it is striking that the Hittite word ^{NA_4}*ḫuwaši-* is used only to refer to cult steles believed to contain a deity and to boundary markers, never to funerary monuments (for a summary of uses see Puhvel 1991: 438-40). Since an Indo-European inheritance for the western Anatolian usage seems unlikely, one should rather consider that the notion of the soul residing in the funeral stele is a result of the cultural synthesis that took place in the Syrian-Anatolian contact zone (see already Hutter 1993: 105-6).

REFERENCES

Bernabé Pajares, Alberto.
    2006. El viaje del alma al más allá: un paralelo entre Hititas y Órficos. Revista de filología románica. *Anejo* 4.33-42.
Güterbock, Hans G. and Harry A. Hoffner Jr.
    1986. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.* Volume L-N. Fascicle 3. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
Gurney, Oliver.
    1952. *The Hittites*. London/Baltimore: Penguin.
Hajnal, Ivo.

1995.*Der lykische Vokalismus*. Graz: Leykam.

Hawkins, John David.

2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Volume I. Inscription of the Iron Age. Berlin/New York: deGruyter.

2003. Scripts and Texts. In *The Luwians* (ed. H. C. Melchert), 128-69. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Hoffner, Harry A. Jr.

1988. A scene in the Realm of the Dead. In *A Scientific Humanist: Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs* (ed. E. Leichty, M. D. Ellis, and P. Gerardi), 191-199. Philadelphia: University Museum.

1990. *Hittite Myths*. Society of Biblical Literature, Writings from the Ancient World, Volume 2. Atlanta: Scholar's Press.

van den Hout, Theo.

1998. *The Purity of Kingship*. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.

2002. Self, Soul, and Portrait in Hierglyphic Luwian. In *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. P. Taracha), 171-186. Warsaw: Agade.

Houwink ten Cate, Philo H. J.

1965. *The Luwian population groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic period*. Leiden: Brill.

Hutter, Manfred.

1993. Kultstelen und Baityloi. In *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien, und dem Alten Testament* (ed. B. Janowski et al.), 87-108. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kammenhuber, Annelies.

1964. Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, Herz und Leibesinnerem, Kopf und Person. 1. Teil (= Seele). *ZA* 56.150-212.

1965. Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, Herz und Leibesinnerem, Kopf und Person. 2. Teil (=Körper/Leib). *ZA* 57.177-222, 330-2.

Kloekhorst, Alwin.

2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Laroche, Emmanuel.

1966. *Les noms des Hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Melchert, H. Craig.

2003. Hittite Nominal Stems in *-anzan-*. In *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indo-germanischen Gesellschaft. Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001* (ed. E. Tichy, D.S. Wodtko & B. Irslinger), 129-39. Bremen: Hempen.

Watkins, Calvert

1995. *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York/Oxford: Oxford UP.

2008. "Hermit Crabs," or New Wine in Old Bottles: Anatolian and Hellenic Connections from Homer and Before to Antiochus I of Commagene and After. In *Anatolian Interfaces. Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbors* (ed. B. Collins, M. Bachvarova and I. Rutherford), 135-141. Oxford: Oxbow.

Weiss, Michael,

1996. Greek μυρίος 'countless', Hittite *mūri-* 'bunch (of fruit)'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 109.199-214.