

The Hittite Seal from Megiddo

Claudia E. Suter – The Oriental Institute, University of Chicago

Although indirectly, the impetus for this contribution came from the honoree himself. In a book that he had invited me to review for *Aula Orientalis* I stumbled upon a drawing that pretends to represent a stamp seal from Megiddo as the only example of a biconvex disk found in Israel.¹ The comment mentions illegible signs recalling "Hittite" hieroglyphs.² The traces of inscription in the drawing, however, look more like (Lydian or Lycian?) alphabetic letters than Luwian hieroglyphs. A check of the reference given for the drawing awoke the suspicion that a mistake may have occurred. While the drawing represents a side view, the referenced illustration shows photographs of the obverse and reverse of a biconvex seal with a clearly Luwian-hieroglyphic inscription. Since the illustrations show different views, one could not entirely exclude the possibility that the alphabetic-looking inscription on the edge was a later addition to the referenced seal. An inspection of the original, however, revealed that the Hittite seal from Megiddo is not inscribed on the edge. The seal with the unusual inscription on the edge remains a mystery. Once my interest in the Megiddo seal was kindled, I found that its publication is unsatisfactory. The present article intends to remedy this situation, and is offered to Gregorio in an attempt to come a bit closer to Ugarit, if at the risk of "transgressing" into another neighboring area.³

The seal was first published in 1948 by George Loud in the reports of the Chicago excavations at Megiddo.⁴ The photos included reproduce a view each of the obverse and reverse of the original as well as of a modern impression at a scale of approximately 1:1. No side view is furnished. The rather small reproductions are of mediocre quality. Shadows obscure the seal images. Loud indicates the excavation number, the provenience, and correctly identifies the material. Concerning the classification of the seal he quotes Gelb as follows:

1. O. Keel, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit: Einleitung*, *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 10, Fribourg - Göttingen 1995, p. 83 fig. 137. The review will appear in *Aula Orientalis* 17 (1999).

2. The comparisons given for the hieroglyphs –R.M. Boehmer, "Glyptica Anatolica", M. Mellink *et al.* (eds.), *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç*, Ankara 1993, pl. 15:1-2– are uninscribed flat disk-shaped stamp seals.

3. I would like to thank Oğuz Soysal for his help in reading the inscription, and Hans Güterbock for patiently listening to an earlier draft and sharing his immense wisdom with me. All mistakes are mine.

4. G. Loud, *Megiddo II: Seasons 1935-39*, Oriental Institute Publications 62, Chicago 1948, pl. 162:7.

«It belongs to the class of perforated button seals. One side is occupied by the name of the owner written in Hittite hieroglyphic characters, the other by a picture of a dog (or panther, according to Bossert) and a few symbols. The form of the seal, the signs, and the pictorial representations are typically Hittite. The seal most probably dates from the time of the Neo-Hittite Empire (i.e., ca. 1400-1200 B.C.).»

Briggs Buchanan, in a footnote of an article published in 1967, dates the seal to "no later than 13th c[entury B.C.]" based on the findspot.⁵ In her 1987 study of the Anatolian glyptic, Clelia Mora agrees on the date.⁶ She is the only scholar who has offered a reading of the inscription. This, however, relies on drawings which are based on the low quality photographs published in the excavation reports.⁷ Aharon Kempinski briefly mentions the Hittite seal in his discussion of stratum VII B at Megiddo.⁸ He attributes it "most probably to the early 13th century", and interprets it as evidence for the "Syro-Hittite connections with Palestine" after the battle of Qadeš. Although based on new photographs,⁹ the drawings he provides of the obverse and reverse of a modern impression are reproduced at a scale less than 100 % of the original, and they are too fuzzy for recognizing any details.¹⁰

The stamp seal under consideration was found by the Chicago expedition in 1934 in locus 1829 of stratum VII B in the CC area of Megiddo. It received the excavation number M 6016, and is presently located in the Oriental Institute Museum of the University of Chicago, where it has been assigned the inventory number A 20551. Its shape is a horizontally perforated disk with biconvex surfaces and a smooth edge. It is made of steatite, and measures 19 mm in diameter, and 12 mm in height. Both sides are engraved. A fine circular line delimits the image fields.

The perforated biconvex disk is the most common shape in the Hittite glyptic of the last phase of the empire, the 13th century.¹¹ The horizontal perforation probably held a metal mounting, as it is preserved in some examples.¹² This seal type is still in use after 1200 B.C. Hans Güterbock mentions two features that distinguish later biconvex seals from imperial ones, though he states that neither is absolutely compelling: the later seals lack the two grooves around the edge common on imperial examples, and their inscriptions tend to be more cursory.¹³ The seal from Megiddo has a flat edge (Fig. 1a). Yet, the inscription is overall clear-cut, and conforms to the typology of Hittite seal inscriptions. Because there exist a few comparable seals from Boğazköy with flat edges but clear-cut typical Hittite inscriptions, I would date the Megiddo seal still within the Hittite empire, but perhaps to the second rather than the first half of the 13th century.

5. B. Buchanan, "Five Hittite Hieroglyphic Seals", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967-69) 21 note 16.

6. C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica del II millennio A.C.: Classificazione tipologica*, Studia Mediterranea 6, Pavia 1987, no. XI 3.4.

7. *Ibidem*, pl. 77; for the source, see p. 372.

8. A. Kempinski, *Megiddo: A City-State and Royal Centre in North Israel*, München 1989, p. 74.

9. The Oriental Institute Museum's archivist John Larsen kindly informed me that a new set of photographs was sent to A. Kempinski for study purposes in 1976.

10. A. Kempinski, *Megiddo*, p. 73 fig. 28:2.

11. B. Buchanan, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967-69) 21-23; C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, 165-166; R.M. Boehmer - H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet von Boğazköy. Grabungskampagnien 1931-39, 1952-78*, Boğazköy-Hattuša XIV, Berlin 1987, p. 65.

12. C.F.A. Schaeffer, "Recueil des sceaux et cylindres hittites imprimés sur les tablettes des Archives Sud du palais de Ras Shamra suivi de considérations sur les pratiques sigillographiques des rois d'Ugarit", *Ugaritica* 3 (1956) 63 fig. 88 = C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, no. XIIa 2.20. Compare also R.M. Boehmer, "Kleinasiatische Glyptik", W. Orthmann (ed.), *Der Alte Orient*, Propyläen Kunstgeschichte 14, Berlin 1975, p. 442 with pl. 377a.

13. R.M. Boehmer - H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet*, p. 65.

Usually both sides of biconvex seals are engraved with Hittite hieroglyphs and symbols. As Mora observed,¹⁴ the typology of hieroglyphic inscriptions on Hittite seals is simple: they consist of a personal name written in a central column, and may include titles and qualifications on either side of the name, and auspicious (or merely decorative?) symbols spread across the image field. The two sides of biconvex seals usually bear the same name, but the second side may also bear another name, an image of an anthropomorphic figure or an animal and/or signs that do not necessarily represent a name. Of 160 biconvex seals with hieroglyphs on either side that Mora recently examined, 27 bear the name of a man on one side and that of a woman on the other.¹⁵ She follows Güterbock's plausible suggestion that the relationship between these men and women is matrimonial.¹⁶ Seals that belonged to a royal couple are known since the 14th century.¹⁷ Her examination further reveals that only one biconvex seal clearly bears two different male names, and this seal dates after the collapse of the Hittite empire (12th/11th century B.C.). The majority of biconvex seals were thus owned by one person only.

One side of the seal from Megiddo (Fig. 1b-d) is inscribed with the name of an owner, as Gelb recognized. The sign on the left depicts the title AURIGA (L.289), "charioteer", as Mora correctly saw. The two signs on the upper right must represent the combination BONUS₂ (L.386) + VIR₂ (L.370), "good(ness)" + "man". VIR₂ is quite clear, while BONUS₂ is slightly diamond-shaped. Because this combination is so common on 13th century seals, and VIR₂ by itself would not make much sense, the slightly diamond-shaped sign can be interpreted as a misshapen triangle. The precise meaning of this expression and the similar combinations of BONUS₂ with FEMINA and with SCRIBA are still debated. Güterbock interprets them as a wish or blessing for well-being in the sense of "well-being (for) the man / woman / scribe",¹⁸ which would agree with the secondary function of seals as amulets, while Hawkins explains it as an (honorary?) epithet, and translates "noble(wo)man/noble scribe".¹⁹

Mora read the signs in the center, which must represent the name of the charioteer: x^2 -ma/i²-VIR²ⁱ.²⁰ Based on the impression furnished here, the first sign can be identified as à (L.450) and Mora's reading of the last two signs (L.312, L.376) confirmed. VIR is facing the wrong direction in the impression. This, however, does not pose a problem, since inconsistency in direction is evidenced on other late imperial seals.²¹ In fact, the sign VIR is more often facing the correct direction in the negative, i.e., on the seal, than in the impression.²² The several bars between à and VIR remain ambiguous. The sign má (L.391)²³

14. C. Mora, "I Proprietari di sigillo nella società ittita", S. Allam et al., *Stato, Economia, Lavoro nel Vicino Oriente antico*, Milano 1988, p. 249.

15. C. Mora, "Halpaziti e Kukulana: indagine sui sigilli ittiti a doppia intestazione", *Eothen* 1 (1988) 167.

16. H.G. Güterbock, "Hieroglyphensiegel aus dem Tempelbezirk", K. Bittel (ed.), *Boğazköy V: Funde aus den Grabungen 1970-71*, Abhandlungen der Deutschen Orient Gesellschaft 18, Berlin 1975, pp. 72-74; Idem, "Seals and Sealing in Hittite Lands", K. de Vries (ed.), *From Athens to Gordion: Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young*, Philadelphia 1980, p. 56.

17. For an inventory, see H.G. Güterbock, *Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young*, p. 55 note 47.

18. H.G. Güterbock, *Boğazköy V*, pp. 73-74, and personal communication.

19. J.D. Hawkins, "The Hieroglyphic-Luwian Stelae of Meharde-Sheizar", *Florilegium Anatolicum: Mélange offert à Emanuel Laroche*, Paris 1979, p. 153. See also C. Mora, *Stato, Economia, Lavoro*, pp. 263-264.

20. C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, no. XI 3.4.

21. As observed by B. Buchanan, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967-69) 20.

22. For other examples of mirror-imaged occurrences of VIR in the impression of stamp seals, see R.M. Boehmer - H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet*, nos. 157, 163, 165, 183, 191, 245, 265; C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, nos. V 5.1; VIb 1.4; X 1.2; 2.4; XIIa 2.11; 2.52; XIIb 1.12; 1.42. If the sign is repeated on the same seal, it may once face left, the other time right; compare H.G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy II: Die Königssiegel von 1939 und die übrigen Hieroglyphensiegel*, Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 7, Berlin 1942, nos. 44-45; R.M. Boehmer - H.G. Güterbock, *op. cit.*, no. 192; C. Mora, *op. cit.*, no. XIIb 1.8.

23. For the reading má for L.391, see most recently H.G. Güterbock, "Notes on Some Luwian Hieroglyphs", J. Jasanoff et al. (eds.), *MIR CURAD: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, Innsbruck 1998, p. 203.

consists of four bars, while our seal image shows seven or eight. Counting eight bars, one could interpret them as a *nú* sign (L.395) which has one bar too few, a phenomenon evidenced in a few other names.²⁴ Alternatively, one could read the second bar from the left, which crosses into the *à* sign, *r(a/i)* (L.383); the smaller bar connected to it could then be interpreted as a mishap, the bar at the extreme left as a filler, and the four remaining bars as the *má* sign. Two small diamond-shaped fillers on either side of *zi* complete the inscription.

In the first scenario the name would be Anuziti (*à-nú-VIR²⁵*), in the second Armaziti (*à+r(a/i)-má-VIR²⁶*). Anuziti is otherwise not attested as a name, although both its parts (*à-nú-* and *-ziti*) are documented as beginning or end of personal names. In contrast, Armaziti is a well-known Hittite name,²⁵ but the present spelling of its first part is not attested so far. The name consists of two parts: *Arma-*, "moon" and Luwian *-ziti*, "man". In all other hieroglyphic witnesses, which happen to be exclusively seals and sealings from the 13th century B.C., the first part is represented by the moon sign LUNA (L.193).²⁶ In cuneiform writing the name can be represented entirely logographic: *^dSĪN-LÚ* or *^dMI-LÚ*, sometimes with its first part followed by the complement *ma* (*^dSĪN-ma-LÚ*) or *ya* (*^dMI-ya-LÚ*);²⁷ entirely syllabic: *Ar-ma-zi-ti*; or the first part syllabic and the second part logographic: *Ar-ma-LÚ*. The seal from Megiddo could thus represent a hieroglyphic adaptation of the latter cuneiform spelling.

Mora described the image on the other side (Fig. 1e-g) as a "lion facing right; hieroglyphs in front of the animal and between its paws; bird (?) on the back", and tentatively read the hieroglyphs *za/i* and *VIR₂*, both with question mark. This reading cannot be maintained. The animal is a dog, as Gelb suggested. It is light and elegant in build, having long legs, an elongated head with upright ears, and a long tail turned upwards in a semicircle. While the tail seems a bit too big in relation to the body, it neither ends in a tuft nor has the typical "cane"-shape exhibited by Hittite lions.²⁸ More importantly, the animal clearly lacks a lion's mane, and the long legs and upright ears speak also against an interpretation as a panther. Its build much rather recalls saluki and greyhound type dogs. The signs above and below the animal are difficult to interpret. The one above could be CERVUS (L.102) in the form of a stag's head with a simplified antler, but could also represent the signs *si* (L.174) and *pi* (L.66). The one below has a diffuse outline and is apparently misshapen. Its overall shape recalls the sign VITA (L.369), but could also be *i(a)* (L.209). In addition, there are two small signs on the left side: an oval next to the dog's head and a croissant-shaped one next to its chest.

If the two small signs on the left stand for the combination BONUS₂ (L.386) + FEMINA (L.79), the three signs in the center must represent the name of the wife of the man named on the other side. In this case we would have to assume that the small oval is a misshapen triangle and the croissant-shape a misshapen oval tapering toward the bottom. The reading *si-pi* for the sign(s) above the dog as well as the reading *i(a)* for the sign below are compatible with a name: the cuneiform writing *sí-pi-* occurs as the first part of a female name in a text from Kültepe,²⁹ and *i(a)* is a frequent final component of personal names.³⁰

24. See A.M. Dinçol - B. Dinçol, *Hethitische Hieroglyphensiegel im Museum für Anatolische Zivilisationen*, Ankara Turizmi: Eskieserleri ve Müzeleri Sevenler Dernegi Yayinlari 10, Ankara 1980, p. 24 no. 8 = C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, no. XIIa 2.30.

25. E. Laroche, *Les noms des hittites*, Paris 1966, no. 141.

26. H.G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy II*, nos. 44-46; C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, nos. V 5.1; VIb 1.16; XIIa 1.6; 2.35; XIIb 1.35.

27. Note that E. Laroche, *Les noms des hittites*, nos. 134 and 141, does not provide evidence for the equation *MI* = *SĪN*.

28. Compare H.G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy II*, no. 100; R.M. Boehmer - H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet*, 308; C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, nos. XI 2.2, 3.1.

29. G. Eisser - J. Lewy, "Die Altassyrischen Rechtsurkunden vom Kültepe", *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft* 33 (1930) 311-312 no. 276: Zibe-zibe; see E. Bilgiç, "Die Ortsnamen der 'kappadokischen' Urkunden im Rahmen der alten Sprachen Anatoliens", *Archiv für Orientforschung* 15 (1945-51) 6 with note 47: 'Sipi+sipi'.

The central column could then be transliterated: *si²-pi²-CANIS-i(a)²*. CANIS (L.98), however, is a rare sign and neither occurs on seals nor in personal names. Furthermore, this hieroglyph depicts a dog of a more stout build than the one seen on the Megiddo seal. Animals that, like this dog, dominate the image field of the seal can represent a hieroglyph that forms part of a personal name,³¹ but seem more often plain imagery,³² perhaps alluding to an underlying meaning that the Hittite society attributed to the particular animal. Such animal representations may be a revival of anepigraphic seal images from the late Karum phase and the early Old Empire.³³ One can, therefore, not exclude the possibility that this side of the Megiddo seal does not represent a name, but an image of an animal and some hieroglyphs, all of which may carry symbolic meaning.

The Hittite laws inform us that dogs were used for shepherding, for hunting, and as guardians of buildings, and that their value diminished in this order.³⁴ Puppies were also used in rituals of prevention and purification.³⁵ These rituals may have derived their inspiration from Mesopotamia, where dogs play a role in the cult of the healer goddess Gula, who finds a parallel in Asklepios in the Greek world.³⁶ Bones of dogs were found at several Hittite sites. Boessneck classifies them as pariah variations.³⁷ Representations of saluki type dogs are common in Egyptian art of the New Kingdom, and the hieroglyphic determinative for "hound/hunting dog" looks just like a saluki.³⁸ Since representations of dogs hardly exist in Hittite art, and because no saluki type dog has positively been identified among the dog bones from Hittite sites,³⁹ it is conceivable that the cutter of the Megiddo seal was inspired by an Egyptian image. The combination of a saluki and the CERVUS sign, if this reading should be correct, is perhaps no coincidence. The saluki is the hunting dog *par excellence* in Egypt, and red deer was, according to the bone remains, the most popular game at Hattusa.⁴⁰ Stags are frequently represented in Hittite art, and they are closely linked to the god of the hunt, whose name is written with this hieroglyph.⁴¹

30. Compare C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, nos. V 4.2; VIa 4.4; VIb 1.12, 1.42, 1.43, 1.46, 1.47; VII 1.3; XI 1.11; XIIa 2.20, 2.30, 2.47, 2.54, 2.70; XIIb 1.70, 1.96.

31. For example, H.G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy II*, nos. 99-100 (lion = L.97); 80-81 (bull = L.105); 90-93 (hare = L.115); R.M. Boehmer – H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet*, nos. 117, 217 (bull = L.105); C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, nos. XI 2.2; 3.1 (lion = L.97).

32. For example, H.G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy II*, nos. 12, 31, 82-86, 242 (bull); 241 (hare); R.M. Boehmer – H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet*, no. 197 (lion). Perhaps also H.G. Güterbock, *op. cit.*, nos. 96-98 (lion); 37, 76 (mountain sheep); 5, 6, 35, 73 (stag); and C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, nos. XI 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6 (lion and indistinct quadruped).

33. Compare T. Beran, *Die hethitische Glyptik von Boğazköy I: Siegel und Siegelabdrücke der vor- und althethischen Perioden und die Siegel der hethitischen Grosskönige*, Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient Gesellschaft 76, Berlin 1967, pls. 4-6; R.M. Boehmer – H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet*, nos. 24-43. For the dating of these seals, see T. Beran, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

34. J. Friedrich, *Die hethitischen Gesetze*, Documenta et Monumenta Oriens Antiqui 7, Leiden 1971, p. 45 §§ 87-89.

35. B.J. Collins, "The Puppy in Hittite Ritual", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42,2 (1990) 211-226.

36. I. Fuhr, "Der Hund als Begleittier der Göttin Gula und anderer Heilsgöttheiten", B. Hrouda (ed.), *Isin-Išan Bahriyat I: Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 1973-1974*, München 1977, pp. 135-145. For a possible connection of Mesopotamian and Hittite beliefs regarding the dog and healing, see *ibidem*, pp. 139-140, and P. Wapnish - B. Hesse, "Pampered Pooches or Plain Pariahs? The Ashkelon Dog Burials", *Biblical Archaeologist* 56,2 (1993) 72.

37. J. Boessneck - A. von den Driesch, "Tierknochenfunde vom Korucutepe bei Elâzığ in Ostanatolien", M.N. van Loon (ed.), *Korucutepe I*, New York 1975, Part I, p. 119. See also J. Boessneck - A. von den Driesch, *Reste von Haus- und Jagdtieren aus der Unterstadt von Boğazköy-Hattuša*, Boğazköy-Hattuša XI, Berlin 1981, pp. 52-54.

38. See H.G. Fischer, "Hunde", *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* III (1980) 77-81.

39. Note, however, the find of a saluki skeleton at Tell Brak, see J. Clutton-Brock, "A Dog and a Donkey excavated at Tell Brak", *Iraq* 51 (1989) 219-220.

40. J. Boessneck - A. von den Driesch, *Reste von Haus- und Jagdtieren*, 21, and compare also 64.

41. R. Mayer-Opificius, "Hethitische Kunstdenkmäler des 13. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.", K. Emre et al. (eds.), *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç*, Ankara 1989, pl. 66 and p. 360.

It might also indirectly allude to the king Hattusili III who had an especially close relation to this god.⁴² VITA is a frequent auspicious symbol on Hittite seals, and therefore the most likely candidate for the misshapen hieroglyph below the dog, if this side of the seal indeed does not represent a female name.

Should the name of seal owner be Armaziti, it is difficult to associate him with any of his known namesakes. Fiorella Imparati arranged the sources that mention a person of this name in seven groups.⁴³ The texts of the first six groups date to the kings Hattusili III and Tudhaliya IV who reigned in the 13th century. Those of the first five groups come from Hattusa. The first group comprises the sources in which Armaziti has the title scribe: three texts with descriptions of festivals and rituals are signed by an Armaziti written ^dMI-LÚ; two catalogues of tablets that contained ritual texts mention one ^dSÎN-LÚ; on four very similar sealings on bullae,⁴⁴ three of them from Hattusa, the name is written in Hittite hieroglyphs; also included in this group are two unprovenienced biconvex seals⁴⁵ of an Armaziti accompanied only by the expression BONUS₂ [+ VIR₂]. The Armazitis of the four remaining groups from Hattusa have no title. The sources include two legal proceedings with the spellings ^dMI-LÚ and ^dSÎN-LÚ (group 2); two texts that concern the organization of the cult with the spellings *Arma*-LÚ and ^dSÎN-LÚ (group 3); several texts that mention a ^dMI-LÚ as participant in ornithomantic activities (group 4); and finally the Vow of Puduhepa which mentions a ^dMI-ya-LÚ, an inventory of tribute that contains a broken off ^dMI-, and an oracular text with a broken off *Ar-ma*- (group 5).

The sources of the sixth group come from Ugarit. There is a prince during the reign of Ibiranu, a contemporary of Tudhaliya IV, who appears in a legal text as judge and witness, and this document also bears his seal.⁴⁶ An Armaziti without title appears to be in charge of establishing borders in two similar letters. Another document from Ugarit sealed by an Armaziti without title informs us that this person was sentenced to a fine of 300 shekels of silver payable to the king of Ugarit and the children of a certain Mušrana.⁴⁷ The last group comprises sources that date to other periods or are difficult to date. Aside from four texts dated before the 13th century, it includes a ^dSÎN-LÚ GAL ^{lu.meš} *tapri* in a fragment dated to Šuppiluliuma II; and a ^dMI-LÚ who is the sender of a letter from Alalah about run-away carpenters.

Imparati attempts to combine into one person practically all occurrences of the name Armaziti that can be dated to the reigns of Hattusili III and Tudhaliya IV, namely those with the title scribe from Hattusa (group 1), those from Ugarit (group 6), those in the letters from Mašat and Alalah (see group 7), and those involved in ornithomantic activities (group 4). In her reconstruction, this person started his career as a scribe in Hattusa toward the end of Hattusili's III reign, where he was in charge of religious documents and divinatory tasks, and was sent to Ugarit and "promoted to prince" by Tudhaliya IV. She tries to support her thesis with evidence showing that several apparently different professional activities could be carried out by the same person. Scribes, for instance, can have administrative tasks, be a physician at the same time, or carry the title "prince". This, however, does not justify the equation of so many otherwise unrelated occurrences of the name with one single person. It seems more likely to me that Armaziti was a popular and frequent name in the 13th century rather than to assume a single person behind all these diverse documents. Furthermore, it seems rather improbable that a non-royal official possessed nine different seals; that, if he started his career as a scribe, would own two seals without this title; and that, after being promoted to Ugarit, would use another seal without even the expression BONUS₂ + VIR₂.

42. *Ibidem*, p. 361.

43. F. Imparati, "Armaziti: attività di un personaggio nel tardo impero ittita", *Eothen* 1 (1988) 80-90.

44. H.G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy II*, nos. 44-46; C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, no. XIIa 1.6.

45. C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, nos. VIb 1.16 and XIIa 2.35.

46. C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, no. V 5.1.

47. For the sealing, see C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, no. XIIb 1.35.

The owner of the Megiddo seal would be the only charioteer by the name Armaziti so far evidenced. This holds true for the hieroglyph AURIGA as well as for the cuneiform terms that can be equated with it, namely the Akkadogram ^{LÚ}KARTAPPU, the Akkadian ŠA combined with the Sumerogram ^{KUŠ}KIR₄.TAB.ANŠE, and the Hittite ^{LÚ}išmeriyaš išha-.⁴⁸ The hieroglyphic title is confined to seal inscriptions.⁴⁹ It constitutes barely three percent of all attestations of titles on seals.⁵⁰ Mora is probably correct in situating it in the realm of the palace.⁵¹ If BONUS₂ means "noble", most AURIGAs are qualified so, and a MAGNUS.AURIGA from Tarsus shares a seal with a princess (FILIA+REX),⁵² probably his wife. The evidence for the cuneiform equations confirms the high position of charioteers. Hattusili III tells us that he was a ^{KUŠ}KIR₄.TAB.ANŠE in his youth.⁵³ ^{LÚ}KARTAPPUs are associated with the king, related to the queen, and receive important missions such as inspecting the troops of Ugarit, overseeing legal cases in vassal states, or being sent to Egypt as emissary.⁵⁴

It is quite obvious that the charioteer of the Megiddo seal cannot be identical with any of the scribes with the name Armaziti (group 1), nor with those namesakes who are involved in cultic and divinatory matters (groups 3-4). An identification with the GAL ^{lú.meš}tapri or the sender of the letter from Alalah, who probably appertained to a scribal milieu (group 7), seems equally unlikely. The same holds true for the namesakes mentioned in the Vow of Puduhepa and the tribute inventory (group 5), since it is doubtful that a defeated enemy could ever be promoted to the position of a charioteer. The only sources that are conceivable in the context of a military career are one of the legal proceedings (KUB XXIII 91) which mentions an Armaziti involved with equipment in a military operation against the Kaskaens; and perhaps the two letters from Ugarit (PRU III 6, RS 15.77; PRU IV 188, RS 17.292) which mention an Armaziti in charge of fixing the borders of this vassal state. The possibility that the latter is identical with the prince from Ugarit of the same name (PRU IV 189, RS 17.314; PRU IV 190, RS 17.449) cannot be entirely excluded. In neither of these cases, however, is there any sound evidence to prove the identification.

Few Hittite seal(ing)s have been excavated outside Hittite territory. In addition to the seal from Megiddo, four exemplars are known from sites in Israel, all dating to the 13th century. A broken bulla with the impression of a seal of a Hittite prince(ss) was found in the palace of the Egyptian governor at Tell Aphek.⁵⁵ This bulla probably sealed a letter or gift from a member of the Hittite royal family on its way to the Egyptian court after the peace treaty of 1258 B.C. (and may have been opened by the governor without permission?). Two signet-rings come from Tell Farah South,⁵⁶ and a third very similar one from Tell Nami.⁵⁷ All three are of rather low quality in carving, and their inscriptions do not represent well-

48. For a discussion of these terms and the relevant sources, see R.H. Beal, *The Organization of the Hittite Military*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago 1986, pp. 66-74.

49. See L.289. Here is an updated list of the occurrences: H.G. Güterbock, *Siegel aus Boğazköy II*, nos. 115, 176; R.M. Boehmer – H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet*, nos. 183, 186, 194, 207; C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, nos. IV 8.2, VIb 1.33, 1.34, VII 1.5, 4.14, X 2.6, XI 1.9, XIIa 2.26, 2.39, 2.63, XIIb 1.37, 1.57, 1.78.

50. This number is based on the numbers given in C. Mora, *Stato, Economia, Lavoro*.

51. *Ibidem*, p. 263.

52. C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, no. VII 1.5.

53. Hattusili III Autobiography I 12; see H. Otten, *Die Apologie Hattusilis III: Das Bild der Überlieferung*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 24, Wiesbaden 1981, p. 4.

54. R.H. Beal, *Hittite Military*, pp. 70-74.

55. I. Singer, "A Hittite Hieroglyphic Seal Impression from Tell Aphek", *Tel Aviv* 4 (1977) 178-190; C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, no. V 5.2; O. Keel, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit: Katalogband I: Von Tell Abu Farağ bis 'Atlit*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 14, Fribourg - Göttingen 1997, no. Afek 4.

56. C. Mora, *La Glittica anatolica*, nos. X 1.6 and 2.3.

57. I. Singer, "A Hittite Signet Ring from Tel Nami", *kinattūtu ša dārāti: Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*, Tel Aviv 1993, pp. 189-193.

known Hittite names or titles. Itamar Singer has noted that this seal type as well as the design of the exemplar from Tell Nami points to a North Syrian, more precisely Middle-Euphratian origin. The same applies to the designs of the Tell Farah rings. He considers the possibility that these private seals as well as the one from Megiddo reached Israel «through immigration of certain individuals or groups from the northern regions, comprised within the confines of the Hittite Empire».⁵⁸ Such an immigration can be conjectured toward the end of the 13th century when the Hittite lands were struck by a famine which hastened the collapse of the empire. The cursory style of the inscriptions on the signet rings agrees with a date late in the 13th century or after 1200.

In contrast to the signet rings, the seal from Megiddo is of good quality and bears a clearly Hittite name with title and the expression BONUS₂ + VIR₂. The locus (1829) where it was found is within a private house in the residential area CC. The excavators attributed this locus to level VIIB, which, together with VIIA, they dated between 1350 and 1150. In his reconsideration of the Megiddo levels, Kempinski attributed VIIB to 1380-1250 and VIIA to 1250-1140.⁵⁹ While the palace area AA and the temple area BB underwent noticeable changes in VIIA, the same level in areas DD and CC continued in use, and thus a separation of the two strata in these areas still causes some difficulties.⁶⁰

The only other Hittite find from Megiddo is the famous ivory panel, which was part of the hoard found in the treasure cellar of the stratum VIIA palace.⁶¹ This piece is evidently a product of a workshop in Hittite North Syria,⁶² and a luxury item the presence of which at Megiddo, like the bulla at Aphek mentioned above, can be explained only within the context of Hittite-Egyptian diplomatic relations after the peace treaty of 1258 B.C. It is noteworthy that the city Makkitta, which Singer has identified with Megiddo, appears as a meeting place for Egyptian and Hittite messengers traveling between the royal courts in an Akkadian letter from Boğazköy.⁶³ This letter must have been written on the occasion of either the peace treaty of 1258 or the royal marriage of a Hittite princess to the pharaoh in 1245, and the ivory could have been left there on one of these, or a similar occasion.⁶⁴

Based on a reconsideration of the ownership of the ivory hoard, Singer made the interesting and plausible suggestion that the palace VIIA was the seat of an Egyptian governor rather than a Canaanite prince.⁶⁵ This thesis would better explain a number of circumstances: the high proportion of Egyptianizing pieces in the hoard; the fact that the five pieces inscribed with Egyptian hieroglyphs belonged to high Egyptian officials stationed in Canaan; the presence of the Hittite panel; as well as the find of a pedestal of a statue of Ramesses VI hurriedly buried under a wall of stratum VIIB in area CC.

With this in mind, let us finally consider the questions where the seal of our charioteer was made, and how it ended up in a residential area of Megiddo. If the saluki type dog was inspired by Egyptian prototypes, the most likely candidate for its manufacture within the Hittite sphere would be Ugarit, a city that was under Hittite control throughout the thirteenth century, but, at the same time, continued to entertain its contacts with Egypt based on its former relations. Ugarit certainly had fine workshops, and

58. *Ibidem*, p. 191.

59. A. Kempinski, *Megiddo*, pp. 71-77.

60. Compare I. Singer, "The Political Status of Megiddo VIIA", *Tel Aviv* 15-16 (1988-89) 101-102.

61. G. Loud, *The Megiddo Ivories*, Oriental Institute Publications 52, Chicago 1939, pl. 11.

62. See R.L. Alexander, "Šaušga and the Hittite Ivory from Megiddo", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 50,3 (1991) 181-182; and especially C. Mora, "Artistes, artisans et scribes entre Kargamiš et Hatti au XIII^e siècle", D. Charpin - F. Joannès (eds.), *La Circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le Proche-Orient ancien*, Paris 1992, p. 247 with note 29.

63. I. Singer, "Megiddo Mentioned in a Letter from Boğazköy", E. Neu - C. Rüster (eds.), *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae: Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 1988, pp. 327-332.

64. So I. Singer, *Tel Aviv* 15-16 (1988-89) 106.

65. I. Singer, *Tel Aviv* 15-16 (1988-89) 101-112.

the excavations have brought to light the largest numbers of Hittite sealings outside of Hattusa as well as two original seals.⁶⁶ Reading Armaziti, the unusual spelling of the first part of the name (*à+r(a/i)-má-*) may be explained by Ugarit's peripheral location. If the seal was made at Ugarit, one could imagine its owner stationed there to take command of troops of this vassal state against the invading "sea people". He may have moved south either as military escort to a Hittite messenger, as a run-away, or as a refugee after Ugarit was destroyed. In light of the two sealings from Ugarit that exhibit the common spelling LUNA-VIR²¹, one could, however, also argue that the unusual spelling of the first part of the name points to a further removed place outside the Hittite sphere proper but in contact with it. Thus a manufacture in Megiddo itself cannot be entirely excluded.

[This article had been finished for some time when the existence of a competent study of the Megiddo seal by Itamar Singer, published in the *Biblical Archaeologist* 58:2 (1995) 91-93, was brought to my attention by Rudolf Werner. Inexplicably there was no official record in the Oriental Institute of Singer's project, nor was the pertinent copy of the *Biblical Archaeologist* available in the Research Archives. I decided immediately to withdraw my contribution, but several colleagues have prevailed in convincing me that it should be published. The few points of disagreement between Prof. Singer and the writer may contribute to a constructive discussion of some of the inevitable difficulties of interpretation of Luwian hieroglyphic seals.]

66. C. Mora, "Scambi di beni e movimenti di persone nell' impero ittita: La Traccia del sigillo", *Athenaeum* NS 66 (1988) 172.



Fig. 1.- The Hittite Seal from Megiddo (scale: 2:1)
(Photos of seal and drawings by the author;
photos of impression Courtesy of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago)