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John David Hawkins was born on September 11th 1940 in Exmouth, Devon, as the eldest of the three children of John Alexander Sneyd Hawkins and Audrey Joan Spencer. His parents had met and married in India, where John Hawkins served as an officer in the Royal Artillery, and came back to England shortly before David’s birth. In 1948, John Hawkins, who had studied at Cambridge, bought a farm in Devon where David was brought up. It was an old and distinguished family which had a multiplicity of interests both cultural and practical. David’s friends were impressed by the casual and tolerant atmosphere which prevailed at home. In the Hawkins household there was no snobbishness or insularity; all sorts of people mingled and the vagaries of the British upper classes were looked at with affectionate irony. These qualities have been perpetuated by David, as anyone who has known him even briefly can readily confirm. Cats were a great source of amusement in the family and David expanded on his father’s eccentric way of talking to them. Probably David’s first linguistic achievement was the composition of the *Official Cat Phonology*, which is still put to use when stray cats occasionally visit his village house. There was no television in the Hawkins home, so reading aloud in the evenings in front of a roaring fire was the norm, preferably Dickens, Tolkien and Agatha Christie. The latter was a not-too-distant neighbour and David used to visit her and her husband Sir Max Mallowan, the renowned Mesopotamian archaeologist, from time to time. Could these visits have sparked his first interest in the ancient Near East?

David was educated at a local private school, Upcott House, and at the age of 13 he went to Bradfield College, Berkshire, a renowned school with a good tradition of Greek and Latin teaching. He excelled in his studies and took an active part in the school plays, especially Greek drama, for which Bradfield was famous. One of his teachers was the classicist David Raeburn, who authored a number of translations of the classics and books on the performance of classical plays. David has remained in touch with him ever since.

From 1958 David studied, on a state scholarship, Classics and Philosophy (Literae Humaniores or ‘Greats’) at University College, Oxford. He was lucky in his tutors: A.E. (Freddie) Wells for classical languages and literature, George Cawkwell for ancient history and P.F. Strawson and G. Paul for philosophy. His natural inclination was clearly for the linguistic and textual subjects and he finished that part of the course (Honour Moderations) with a First. He received his BA in 1962 and his MA in 1965.

From 1962 he worked for a postgraduate diploma in Western Asiatic Archaeology at the Institute of Archaeology in London. He studied archaeology with Seton Lloyd, history with Peggy Drower, Ancient Hebrew with Raphael Loewe and Akkadian with Harry Saggs and Donald Wiseman. He obtained his diploma with distinction in 1964 and won the Gordon Child Prize. By this time he had already switched his interests from Classics to the Ancient Near East, apparently under the strong impression left on him by the Gilgamesh Epic.

In 1964 he became a Research Fellow in Akkadian at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, and then remained in the Near and Middle East Department where he taught until his retirement in 2005. In 1993 he was appointed to a personal chair in Ancient Anatolian Languages. He also contributed courses in archaeology to the Institute of Archaeology where he became an Honorary Visiting Professor.
In 1993 David was elected a Fellow of the British Academy, and in 1998 a Foreign Member of the American Philosophical Society. Most recently (2009) his old Oxford college, University College, made him an Honorary Fellow. He served as the honorary secretary of the British School of Archaeology in Iraq from 1976 to 1986 and edited its journal *Iraq* from 1970 to 1995. Concomitantly he sat on the council and on the executive committees of the British School of Archaeology at Ankara.

In the 1960s David started to go regularly from London to Oxford to study Hittite with Oliver R. Gurney and there got involved in a seminar on the so-called Hieroglyphic Hittite inscriptions led by Leonard Palmer and attended, among others, by Anna Morpurgo Davies and Jill Hart; this is the subject on which he eventually focused and which he revolutionized. His friendship and scientific cooperation with Morpurgo Davies continues to play an important role in his life. In the country cottage at Minster Lovell near Oxford, which he shares with his life partner, Geoff Ryman, a well known writer, she and countless other friends and colleagues are always welcome for a good chat on professional matters and a hearty drink and meal. David’s culinary capacities are only surpassed by his scholarship, and as a devoted gardener he proudly makes use of his self-grown freshly picked vegetables in his perfect cuisine, which puts pay to the myth that there is no independent British cooking.

From 1965 onwards David traveled regularly to Turkey, Syria and Iraq in order to inspect Hieroglyphic monuments in museums and open-air sites. He immediately realized how inaccurate and incomplete the available drawings and publications were and consequently initiated an ambitious project of copying and obtaining good photographs of the entire corpus of inscriptions. This Sisyphean enterprise was crowned by the publication in 2000 of the three parts of his monumental *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Vol. I, The Iron Age Inscriptions*, exactly a hundred years after the pioneering enterprise of L. Messerschmidt’s *Corpus Inscriptionum Hettitcarum*. He also played an instrumental role in the definitive publication of the Hieroglyphic text of the Karatepe bilingual by Halet Çambel as *Volume II* of the Corpus. A third volume in preparation will include *Addenda* to the Iron Age material, the Empire period inscriptions, and a general Signary, Glossary and Grammar of Hieroglyphic Luwian.

David’s enormous black briefcase containing the full documentation for the Corpus travelled with him everywhere and miraculously has never been lost or damaged even in dire situations (see H. Gonnet’s contribution to this volume). His idiosyncratic handwriting and neat hand copies can be traced back to two of his greatest talents, drawing and close scrutiny: 1. From his early days he developed an interest in political cartoons and for a while even contemplated turning this skill into a profession. 2. His talent for drawing is enhanced by a remarkable ability to notice even the minutest details and changes in other peoples’ appearance or outfit. Many a detail in an inscription or on a seal that went unnoticed by others has immediately been detected and recorded by David. His spectacular decipherment of the Karabell inscription, a western Anatolian monument which was previously visited by countless travellers and specialists, may serve as a notable example. He never gets tired of inspecting a worn down inscription in different lighting conditions, not even the hopeless Nişantaş rock in Boğazköy which he is about to publish shortly.

In tandem with his strenuous efforts to produce an accurate documentation of the Hieroglyphic materials, David is one of the greatest contributors to Anatolian philology, history and culture. Suffice it to mention here, as notable examples, the new interpretation of four wrongly deciphered signs in the early 1970s (in collaboration with Anna Morpurgo Davies and Günter Neumann) which brought about the elucidation of the language and the (re)unification of Cuneiform Luwian and Hieroglyphic Hittite (now Hieroglyphic Luwian); the discovery in 1975 of the signs for the negatives which had been confused with the relatives and which suddenly made sense of countless texts; the demonstration in the 1980s of
the continuity of the royal house of Bronze Age Carchemish in the Iron Age genealogy at Malatya; the
decipherment of the inscription at the sacred pool complex at Boğazköy in 1995 and its Underworld
connections; the refinement of western Anatolian geography in 1998 through the identification of the
figure depicted at Karabel as a king of Mira. Recently he has been working on the spectacular discovery
of the Aleppo citadel inscriptions and their far-reaching historical implications. As anyone who has
collaborated with David will readily confirm, he is a most generous colleague always ready to offer
his expertise and cooperate in publication projects, e.g., his recent involvement in the publication of the
enormous glyptic corpus from Nişantepe in Boğazköy.

As a token of our long friendship, I hope that this Festschrift presented to David by his students
and friends, will serve as an appropriate tribute to this incomparable individual and scholar. A parallel
Festschrift with non-Anatolian articles appears in the journal Iraq 2010, edited by Dominique Collon
and Andrew George. I wish to express my gratitude to several persons who have provided assistance
in the preparation of this volume: Sanna Aro, Natalia Bolatti-Guzzo, Donald Easton, Shirley Gassner,
Graciela Gestoso-Singer, Sivan Kedar, Anna Morpurgo Davies, Denzil Verey and Mark Weeden.

The Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University is congratulated for exceptionally accepting
this volume in its Monograph Series. This book was published with the support of the Israel Science
Foundation.
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A HITTITE SEAL FROM KAMAN-KALEHÖYÜK

Mark Weeden
London

David Hawkins often says that he prefers large, well-preserved seals or seal-impressions, preferably bigraphic. Unfortunately it has not been possible to come up with an example of this type for his delectation. I do hope however, that he will be sufficiently interested by what is presented here and await suggestions from him for the solution of the enigmas of this seal. It is worth mentioning that none of my work on Hittite-related issues would be possible without years of teaching, support and friendship from David, as indeed work on Anatolian studies in general would be so much poorer without his considerable contributions.

The excavations at Kaman-Kalehöyük have produced a wealth of seal material with hieroglyphic writing. Of particular importance are the ca. 450 seal impressions found in an abandoned grain silo, known as Round Structure 1, in the North Sector of the site. These date mostly to the Middle Hittite period, or the first half of the 14th century BCE, and offer very interesting if difficult to interpret data concerning the earlier phases of the hieroglyphic script. Old Hittite sealings are also attested from an Old Hittite level, as are a number of Empire period sealings from a separate and later, as yet only partially excavated, pit also in the North Sector.¹

Furthermore, a number of Empire period button seals have been found, although these are all from later (refuse) pits, and thus without secure archaeological context. The seal presented in the following most probably belongs to the later Empire period and is of interest from the point of view of stylistics, dating and the hieroglyphs attested upon it. It is, however, very difficult to interpret and illustrates some of the difficulties involved in tackling a corpus of hieroglyphic material from a site that was clearly provincial by contrast to imperial Hittite centres.²

This slightly biconvex button seal, KL 92-5, is quite crudely carved and mostly impossible to decipher at present with certainty. It appears to carry different personal names on each side. It was found in a pit (No. 711) in the North Sector of the site.³ Pit 711 belongs to the earliest stage of the Iron Age inhabitation of the site (Kaman-Kalehöyük level IId3).⁴ It is 2.2cm in diameter and is pierced through transversely by a small hole (Fig. 1).

¹. The hieroglyphic seal material from Kaman-Kalehöyük, with its well documented archaeological contexts, provides an excellent opportunity to review the chronological stylistic development of Hittite sealing from the perspective of a provincial town. For details of the copious Middle Hittite/Early Empire Period bullae found at the site see Yoshida 1999; 2006. I am grateful to Dr. Yoshida for discussing issues with me relating to the majority of the seals from Kaman-Kalehöyük. For details of the excavation the reader is referred to the regular publication of the dig, Anatolian Archaeological Studies, Kaman-Kalehöyük (abbr. AAS) published by the Middle East Cultural Centre of Japan, especially the Preliminary Reports therein written by the excavator, Dr. S. Omura. I would like to thank Dr. Omura for allowing me to publish this seal here and for arranging and facilitating a collation in Kırşehir museum, as well as thanking the director of the museum and his staff for their helpfulness.

². Collation shows that the seal is considerably better cut than the photo might lead one to imagine. It is not, however, a masterpiece of seal-craft.

³. North Sector VI (XXXIV-54 (M), Provisional Layer 55.

⁴. I am indebted to Dr. K. Matsumura from the Kaman-Kalehöyük excavation for this information concerning the find-spot.
Fig. 1: Transverse view of the button seal KL 92-5

Fig. 2: KL 92-5 Side A.

Fig. 3: KL 92-5 Side B.
Side A of the seal (Fig. 2) is decorated with a band of dots, as opposed to the notches used on side B, around the border. A name is written in the central vertical axis which may be read:

\[(\text{MAGNUS'}) \text{-} \text{li-} \text{mu}(\text{wa})' \text{ or (Ura)limu(} \text{wa})\]

although there are numerous problems with every aspect of this.

The first sign is far too rectangular to be a form of MAGNUS, but this is the only sign approaching this shape. It is perhaps wiser, especially in view of the fact that the name on the other side begins with exactly the same sign, to assume an as yet unattested sign until MAGNUS is attested more clearly in this form.

The second sign is by no means a usual form of L. 278: \(\text{li}\).

The third sign appears to be an animal’s head of some kind. The signs L.105 BOS, L.107 BOS+\(\text{MI}\) can both be used for the sounds \(\text{muwa}\) and \(\text{uwa}\) on Empire period seals. To accept this as L.107, which is usually \(\text{muwa}\), requires that we see the four upright strokes of the -\(\text{MI}\) partially lost in the jaw of the animal. It is also the case that the snout is far too long for this sign, although a long animal’s head+\(\text{MI}\) may well be used on a Middle Hittite seal from Kaman-Kalehöyük to represent \(\text{mu(} \text{wa})\).

To the viewer’s right of the central name we see the typical BONUS, \(\text{VIR}_2\), “good man”, apparently consisting of only two verticals. To the viewer’s left we have what appears to be a long-necked bird’s head, right-facing, without any depiction of the wings. This is again highly subjective. A wingless, but crested bird (L. 135.2) occurs on seals from Boğazköy and has been tentatively identified with cuneiform \(\text{L}^\text{UL} \text{IGI.MUŠEN}, \text{L}^\text{UL} \text{MUŠEN.DU}\), the “bird-diviners”. The dimples above the head of the bird on KL 92-5 may be an attempt to represent this crest. A long-necked wingless bird (L. 135.8), with a similar vertical protrusion from its mouth to that on KL 92-5 may be part of a man’s name on Güterbock 1942: 171. The protrusion may be a \(\text{THORN}\), or -\(\text{RA/I}\), but this is of little help without a plausible word containing an \(\text{/r/}\) in a plausible position to explain it. One may note the uses of \(\text{AVIS}_3\) (bird with backward pointing wing) as a logogram in the writing of the name \(\text{Arnuwanda}\), as collected at Hawkins \textit{apud} Herbordt 2005:298, but the lack of wing should exclude it from the equation.

Side B (Fig. 3) has rough cut notches in decoration around the edge, a simplistic variation on the typical ladder shape decorating the edges of many button seals of the later Empire period. The name occupies the central vertical axis and may possibly be read:

\[\text{MAGNUS'} \text{-} \text{la-} \text{d}^{-} \text{-} \text{nu} = \text{Ur(a)}\text{lanu}, \text{or better x(} \text{lanu}\]

although a high degree of subjectivity is involved in this reading. As before, the writing MAGNUS is highly suspect, in view of the shape of the sign, and the plene-writing of the vowel is not immediately convincing.

Left and right the name is flanked by what appear to be professional designations. To the viewer’s right the sign BONUS, over an unidentified sign, possibly a schematic representation of a plough, or of an animal, although this is highly speculative: “good ploughman(?)”.

One might also entertain the possibility that the seal conforms to the relatively common genre of “Man and Wife” button-seals, where the good lady appears on the reverse. The triangle shape under

---

5. KL 93-15, with the woman’s name \(\text{Mu(} \text{wa})\text{tti}\).
7. e.g. Boehmer/Güterbock 1987: n. 211. For an example similar to ours without the double ring encircling the notches from Kaman-Kalehöyük see \(\text{AAS}\) 16 (2007:19, Fig. 37).
8. On Empire Period middle plene-writings see Hawkins \textit{apud} Herbordt 2005:279 ad 522.
9. One side of an Empire Period example of this type from Kaman-Kalehöyük is published at \(\text{AAS}\) 6 (1997), third page before page numbers begin. On man and wife seals see Güterbock 1980:55-57; Herbordt 2006:185. The author saw another unpublished Empire Period seal of this type in Yozgat museum when visiting it in the company of David Hawkins, this time with \(\text{Mu(} \text{wa})\text{tti}\) on one side and \(\text{Tarhundapiya}\) on the other.
the BONUS₂, however, is on collation too triangular to pass as the oval shape that is FEMINA. It is also unclear what one would then make of the further additions under the triangle. However, the triangle itself is difficult to interpret if either of the other somewhat desperate proposals here presented are entertained.

To the viewer’s left we have another professional designation, this time apparently BONUS₂ PES₂-RA/I(x2). It is unclear whether there is a further sign after PES₂-RA/I, or whether this is damage or a rough kind of filler. If the traces are to be interpreted as a sign at all it should perhaps be VIA (L. 221), although the corners are somewhat sharp for this sign.

The form of PES₂ is different from that of the clear attestation of PES₂-RA/I at KARAHÖYÜK §2, although it shares the same alignment, with the toes pointing left and the “Thorn” for -RA/I proceeding diagonally rightwards from under the sole. Problematic, however, is the orientation with regard to the “profile” á, if that is what it is, although signs are usually oriented facing outwards on the side axes of a seal. It is also clearly a boot, with a high, splayed top, and not a foot that is here represented, by contrast to the foot represented in KARAHÖYÜK §2. This is highly unusual, and must be said to cast a certain degree of doubt on the identification of the logogram as PES₂, although it is difficult to see what else it could be.10 It is possible, of course, that it is CRUS-RA/I, using L. 82, although the orientation of the foot is not unusual.11 Furthermore, some effort appears to have been made to emphasise the foot of the sign.

OTHER EVIDENCE FOR PES₂-RA/I, CRUS-RA/I

David Hawkins identified a graphically endingless verbal form PES₂-RA/I on KARAHÖYÜK §2:

MAGNUS.REX ì(a)+ra/i-TONITRUS MAGNUS.REX REL+ra/i-ì(a) || POCULUM.PES.*67 (REGIO) PES₂-RA/I

“When Ir-Tešub, the Great King, came to the land POCULUM.” (Hawkins 2000:289, 291)

He considered the -RA/I most likely a phonetic indicator and thought of the Hittite verb ar-, “to arrive, come”, as a likely candidate for a relation to the underlying Luwian word.

A full phonetic writing of this verb appears to occur in the Assur letters:

ASSUR a §6:
|NEG₂-a-wa/i |tara/i-pa/i-mi-i-sa |za-na |a-pa-ha (“PES₂”) a+ra/i-ta/-’ |ka+ra/i-mi-sà (URBS)

“Did not Tarpamis come now and then to Kar(ka)mîš?” (ibid. 534, 542)

ASSUR f+g §24:
a-wa/i-wa/i (“PES”) pa+ra/i-ri+i |ARHA-’ ("PES₂") a+ra/i-wa/i

“Come, shall I go out on foot”. (ibid. 534, 542)

He further adduced a graphic parallel in the writing CRUS-RA/I, also graphically endingless, and suggested that it might correspond to the homophonous Hittite verb, ar- “to stand”. It occurs in the following instances:

KARKAMIŠ A11a §5:
mi-zî-pa/wa/i-mu-ta/-’ |20-tà-ti-zî ARHA CRUS-RA/I

“But my 20-TATI’s revolted against me”!12

10. Collation shows that the end of the ‘foot’ is slightly miscut, at least not as deeply cut as the rest of it, which leads to the slightly misleading shape in the photograph.
11. See Hawkins apud Herboldt 2005: ad No. 534, 549. In No. 549 the orientation of CRUS is similar to here.
12 ibid. 95, with discussion (ibid. 97) of phrasal similarity to Hittite arḫa ar-/arḫa tiya-, “to secede, revolt.”
ADIYAMAN 1 §1:

[... (DEUS)TONITR]US-[s]a [i+ra/i]-ni-la-’ PRAE-i CRUS+RA/I

“Tarhunzas(?) stood/stands in front of the IRNILA.”

ALEPPO 2 §11:

|"VAS"-tara/i-pa-wa/i-na NEG₁ |REL-i-ha a-tá |CRUS+RA/I-nu-wa/i-ha

“but I did not set him up (as) any figure”.

In all cases PES₂ is clearly indicated by having the toes of the sign pointing in the direction of the script, while CRUS has the toes facing against the direction of the script, similarly to PES (= ti).

The semantic distinction in the use of these logograms thus appears to be fairly clear. PES₂(-RA/I) is a verb of motion, while CRUS-RA/I is used of a verb meaning “to stand”, or in the causative “to set up”.

If we can accept that the relevant sign on KL 92-5 is a form of PES₂, then what precisely a BONUS₂ PES₂-RA/I(-VIA?) could be is not immediately clear. Firstly it is clearly a noun. The above-mentioned use of PES₂-RA/I as a logogram to indicate a verb of motion possibly cognate with Hittite ar-, “to come, arrive”, suggests a noun derived from this. The only plausible candidate is arnuwala-, “moveable person, deportee”, although this is derived from the causative stem of this verb: arnu-“to bring, move”.

The use of the graphically and phonetically parallel CRUS+RA/I to mean “to stand”, possibly representing the Luwian cognate of Hittite ar-, “to stand”, shows, however, that the causative stem is phonetically represented in the verb, at least: CRUS+RA/I-nu-wa/i-ha (ALEPPO 2 §11). (BONUS₂) PES₂-RA/I(-VIA?) would thus have to be an ideographic representation of the word *(LU)* arnuwala-.

This assumes that the relationship between arnuwala- “deportee”, arnu-“bring”, and ar-“come” would have been transparent to the speaker who created the ideographic representation. The regular verbs used for the transportation of arnuwala- are dā-“to take” and pē ḫar-“to have away”, but arnu- is also sufficiently attested, as documented at HWb² 330b-331a.

One will object that arnuwala- is hardly fitting as a professional designation. The Sumerogram NAM.RA МеšḪA, which represents Hittite arnuwala- in cuneiform texts, is never prefaced by the professional determinative LÚ. The phonetic writing of the word, however, is sometimes thus prefixed: *(LU)* ar-nu-wa-la-ašša KUB 26.57 obv. i 5 (Instructions of Suppiluliuma I, NS copy).

The definitive study of the status of the arnuwala- remains that of S. Alp 1950-51. The social status of this category is below that of a free man but above that of a slave. One might object to the interpretation of PES₂-RA/I(-VIA?) as arnuwala- on the grounds that an arnuwala- simply would not have had property to seal as his possession. This is an assumption. There is no indication that an arnuwala- would not have had property.

The arnuwala- is at the disposal of the king (after Laws §40). If an arnuwala is given by the king to a settlement (URU LiM), said arnuwala- has to be given fields and “becomes a TUKUL-(man)” according

---

14. ibid. 236, discussion 238. See further SULTANHAN §11.
15. It is unclear whether the Luwian equivalent of VIA, harwan- “road”, can ever have a similar ambiguity of meaning to Hittite palsa-, Sumerographically KASKAL, “road, campaign” (CHD P/1: 71, 75). If it did, this might make some sense in this context: e.g. “deportee of campaign” vel sim. This would more likely be a compound ideogram for arnuwala- than a representation of two words: *harwanas arnuwala- vel sim.
16. This rule is so rigid that RS 25.421, the trilingual from Ugarit (Ugaritica V: pp. 314, 775; supposedly a Hittite import), writes NAM.RA-az in the Hittite column when translating what was clearly pronounced lu-na-am’-r[a] in the phonetic Sumerian column in line 65!
to H. Hoffner’s interpretation of the passage.\textsuperscript{17} It would thus not be entirely surprising that an arnuwala-needed a seal in order to mark his produce or property. This rough little seal from a provincial town would, if this interpretation turns out to be correct, be of considerable interest for social history.

Other interpretations are of course also possible, if equally unappealing. A rebus writing for Hittite (\textsuperscript{\(LU\)}ara-), “friend”, “colleague”, is one possible explanation. This is attested relatively frequently with the “professional determinative”, \textit{LÚ} (HWb\textsuperscript{2}: 221-224; HED vol. I: 116-118). It may also be the Hittite correspondent to Akkadianographic (\textsuperscript{\(LU\)}\textit{TAPPU} (HWb\textsuperscript{2}: 221; HED vol. I: 117). One might compare the rebus usage of GUB/\textit{DU}-\textit{IŠKUR} in the writing of the name \textit{Ari-Teššob} in cuneiform writing. The logogram for standing (GUB) or walking (DU) is used to represent Hurrian \textit{ari}, meaning “gave”, on the basis of phonetic similarity with either Hittite \textit{ar-} “to stand”, or \textit{ar-} “to come”.\textsuperscript{18} On the other hand, this again falls foul of the objection that it is hardly a professional designation. Indeed, the occurrence of the determinative \textit{LÚ} in (\textsuperscript{\(MUNUS\)}ara-) may indicate male rather than female as opposed to profession, as the female equivalent \textit{MUNUS}ara- is rarely attested (HWb\textsuperscript{2}: 222). However, the attestation of two male names, if we can in fact exclude the name on side B being a woman, in combination with the designation of one of them as an \textit{ara-}, may be a sign of a business or other partnership. Neither of these possibilities is eminently likely.

Very unclear as well, is the relation of the Nişantepe officials’ seals No. 534 and 549 (Herbordt 2005), where CRUS, without -\textit{RA}/\textit{li}, appears pointing both inwards and out and is also clearly a professional designation. It is interesting that CRUS in No. 549, where the orientation is identical to PES\textsubscript{2}+\textit{RA}/\textit{li} in KL 92-5, occurs in combination with L. 135.2, the crested bird (AV\textit{IS}3), as is the case here, although the two are on different sides in KL 92-5. Possibly there is a connection between the two professions.

\section*{The Question of Dating.}

This attestation of PES\textsubscript{2}+\textit{RA}/\textit{li} is likely to be earlier than the KARAHÖYÜK example, the early Iron Age pit in which it was found providing a \textit{terminus ante quem}. The seal type itself, as well as its decoration, would usually encourage a dating to the Hittite Empire Period, although the omnipresent ridge or rill surrounding the edge of Empire period seals is missing.

R.L. Gorny has argued that the biconvex button seal should not be dated later than the 13th century BCE. In an article providing an overview of biconvex button seals from securely dated archaeological contexts from other Anatolian sites, Gorny raised the dating of the biconvex button-seals from Alışar Höyük, which show some similarities in style and execution to the present example, on palaeographic and stylistic grounds to the Late Bronze Age II period (1400-1200 BC) from the Iron Age, where they had been put by the excavator, van der Osten (Gorny 1993: 163-191). Gorny’s assumption carries with it the implication that the biconvex seal as such went out of use after the 13th century.

Another issue of debate remaining is whether the apparently hastily executed and crudely carved examples of this biconvex style, such as this one, belong to a later (even post-Hittite) stage in the development of the biconvex type, as suggested as a working hypothesis by H.G. Güterbock, or to an earlier one, as maintained by Gorny.\textsuperscript{19} The evidence of this slightly biconvex seal, possibly partly belonging

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{17} ták-\textit{ku} LUGAL-\textit{sša} NAM.RA\textsuperscript{\(WI\)-an\( extraordinary\)} pa-\textit{a-i} nu-uš-\textit{sša} A.ŠĀ\textsuperscript{\(WI\)-an} pi-an-zí ta-aš 0\textsuperscript{\(OS\)}TUKUL-\textit{li} ki-i-š[a], translated by Hoffner (1997:48, 187): “if the king gives an arnuwala-man, they will give him land and he will become a TUKUL-(man).”
  \item \textsuperscript{18} GUB and DU are two Sumerian readings of the same sign. Whether one reads GUB or DU is dependent on which Hittite verb one wishes to see as the basis of the choice of this logogram. See Miller 2007:131; Weeden 2007:35 with fn. 88.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Boehmer/Güterbock 1987:65; Gorny 1993:190 tentatively assigns the “sketchy” biconvex seals to the period LB Ia, 1400-1280 or earlier.
\end{itemize}
to an arnuwala-, may suggest that this particular stylistic feature should not necessarily be interpreted chronologically, but perhaps in terms of social standing or wealth. This character couldn’t afford a beautiful seal. The interpretation does not sit well with the Auspex attested on the other side, however.

While a number of Kaman-Kalehöyük stone button-seals conform to the usual Empire Period biconvex type found at Alişar, Boğazköy and elsewhere, some deviate, as does this one, in not having a ridge or rill surrounding the seal at its circumference. Instead this seal has notches on side A and dots on side B. This indeed differs from the clearly Hittite Empire period button-seals and their impressions that have been excavated at Kaman-Kalehöyük. One might speculate that this is a sign of changing style, perhaps at the very end of the Hittite Empire period or even after it. Our knowledge of the stylistic development is not as secure as it could be here. Other explanations are of course possible, such as a social significance that otherwise escapes us.

The above suggestions are of necessity provisional interpretations based on the ongoing work in the publication of the seal material from Kaman-Kalehöyük. Firmer ground will only be obtainable once this has been fully investigated, both in regard to hieroglyphic interpretation and stylistic development. Nothing is here proven, merely suggested, and we still have more questions than answers.
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