

KÖNIGTUM, STAAT UND GESELLSCHAFT
FRÜHER HOCHKULTUREN

4,4

7. Symposium zur ägyptischen Königsideologie /
7th Symposium on Egyptian Royal Ideology

Royal versus Divine Authority

Edited by
Filip Coppens, Jiří Janák
and Hana Vymazalová

Harrassowitz Verlag

KÖNIGTUM, STAAT UND GESELLSCHAFT FRÜHER HOCHKULTUREN

Herausgegeben von
Rolf Gundlach, Detlev Kreikenbom
und Mechthild Schade-Busch

4,4

Beiträge zur altägyptischen Königsideologie

Herausgegeben von Horst Beinlich,
Rolf Gundlach und Andreas H. Pries

2015

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

7. Symposion zur ägyptischen Königsideologie/
7th Symposium on Egyptian Royal Ideology

Royal versus Divine Authority

Acquisition, Legitimization
and Renewal of Power

Prague, June 26–28, 2013

Edited by
Filip Coppens, Jiří Janák,
and Hana Vymazalová

2015

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet
at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our
website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2015

This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage
and processing in electronic systems.

Printed on permanent/durable paper.

Printing and binding: ⊕ Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed in Germany

ISSN 1613-6950

ISBN 978-3-447-10427-2

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-447-19400-6

Contents

Preface	3
Abbreviations	5
<i>Jana Mynářová</i>	
Who's the King? An Image of the Egyptian King According to Non-Egyptian Evidence	9
<i>Miroslav Bárta and Veronika Dulíková</i>	
Divine and Terrestrial: Power Rhetorics in Ancient Egypt (The Case of Nyuserra)	31
<i>Horst Beinlich</i>	
Die Erneuerung der königlichen/göttlichen Macht und das Lebenshaus von Ra-sehet (Fayum)	49
<i>Julia Budka</i>	
The Egyptian "Re-conquest of Nubia" in the New Kingdom – Some Thoughts on the Legitimization of Pharaonic Power in the South	63
<i>Filip Coppens and Jiří Janák</i>	
The Ogdoad and Divine Kingship in Dendara	83
<i>Florence Dunn Friedman</i>	
The Cultic Relationship of the Menkaure Triads to the Small Step Pyramids	95
<i>Andrea Gnirs</i>	
Royal Power in Times of Disaster	109
<i>Katja Goebis</i>	
"Receive the Henu – that You May Shine forth in it like Akhty". Feathers, Horns and the Cosmic Symbolism of Egyptian Composite Crowns	145
<i>Claus Jurman</i>	
Legitimation through Innovative Tradition – Perspectives on the Use of Old Models in Royal and Private Monuments during the Third Intermediate Period	177
<i>Mark Lehner</i>	
The Monument and the Formerly So-called Valley Temple of Khentkawes I: Four Observations	215

Mohamed Megahed and Hana Vymazalová

The South-Saqqara Circumcision Scene: a Fragment of an Old Kingdom
Birth-legend? 275

Massimiliano Nuzzolo

Royal Authority, Divine Legitimization. Topography as an Element of
Acquisition, Confirmation and Renewal of Power in the Fifth Dynasty 289

Anthony Spalinger

Feast Calendars, Royalty, and Economics: A Trio of Unwilling Associates 305

Miroslav Verner

Sanctuary *Meret* and the Royal Cult 325

Anthony Spalinger

Concepts of Kingship: The Golden Horus Name  331

Indices 351

Preface

Royal ideology constitutes one of the key themes that had an enormous impact on all aspects of ancient Egyptian culture, and as such it is not surprising that a series of conferences, *Tagung zur Königsideologie*, have been regularly organised since 1995, under the auspices of Horst Beinlich and Rolf Gundlach, to bring together scholars working on various aspects of this topic.

Between June 26–28, 2013, the Czech Institute of Egyptology, of the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague hosted the already 7. *Tagung zur Königsideologie* / 7th Symposium on Egyptian Royal Ideology, with the main theme “Royal versus Divine Authority. Acquisition, Legitimization and Renewal of Power”. Scholars from Egypt, Europe, America and New Zealand presented eighteen papers focussing on different aspects of the given theme, discussing the characteristics, interactions and developments of royal and divine authority in Egypt throughout all periods of ancient Egyptian history, ranging from the early Old Kingdom to the era of Roman dominance. The papers presented, analysed and interpreted evidence expressed in art, architecture, language, ritual, funerary and other practices, with a spotlight on relations, interactions and exchanges between the divine and royal spheres.

The volume at hand contains fourteen of the eighteen papers presented. The articles are organised alphabetically according to the author, with the exception of the very first and last. The first article, by Jana Mynářová, had also been intentionally chosen as the opening lecture of the entire symposium because it deliberately breached the boundaries of Egypt and provided a glance at how the Egyptian pharaoh was regarded abroad on the basis of non-Egyptian evidence. Her paper thus provided an important counterweight to the indigenous perspective. The very last paper, by Anthony Spalinger, on the development and function of the Golden Horus name from the Old Kingdom to the Ptolemaic period, was not presented at the symposium, but is included in its proceedings as its subject falls perfectly within the symposium’s main theme.

During the editing of the text we did not attempt to unify the transliteration of ancient Egyptian or the writing of personal names and the names of places, sites and monuments, hence several different variants occur depending on the choice of the individual authors.

We would like to thank Professor Emeritus Horst Beinlich as well as all members of the Czech Institute of Egyptology, Charles University in Prague for their help and encouragement during the organisation of the international symposium as well as the preparation of its proceedings.

The editorial work was made possible through funding by the Programme for the Development of Fields of Study at Charles University, No. P14 “Archaeology of non-European Regions,” project “Research of the ancient Egyptian civilization. Cultural and political adaptation of the North African civilisations in ancient history (5,000 B.C. – 1,000 A.D.).”

Filip Coppens, Jiří Janák and Hana Vymazalová
Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
Prague, April 2015

Abbreviations

ÄA	Ägyptologische Abhandlungen
AAA	Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology
ÄAT	Ägypten und Altes Testament
AAWB	Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin
ACE	Australian Centre for Egyptology
AcOr	Acta Orientalia
AegMon	Aegyptische Monumenten van het Nederlandsche Museum van Oudheden
ÄF	Altorientalische Forschungen
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung
AH	Aegyptiaca Helvetica
ÄHK	E. EDEL, Die ägyptische-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi in babylonischer und hethitischer Sprache, I–II, ARWAW 77, Opladen 1994
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AJPA	American Journal of Physical Anthropology
Ä&L	Ägypten und Levante/Egypt and the Levant
ALASP	Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas
AnOr	Analecta Orientalia
AnSt	Anatolian Studies
AOAT	Alter Orient und altes Testament
AoF	Altorientalische Forschungen
ArOr	Archiv Orientální/Oriental Archive
ARWAW	Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
ASAE	Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte
ASAW	Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig
AuOr	Aula Orientalis
AV	Archäologische Veröffentlichungen
BäBa	Beiträge zur ägyptischen Bauforschung und Altertumskunde
BACE	Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BdÉ	Bibliothèque d'Étude
BES	Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar
BiGen	Bibliothèque générale
BIFAO	Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale
BMSAES	British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan
BOREAS	Boreas: Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilisations
BSAK	Beihefte SAK
BSEG	Bulletin de la Société d'égyptologie de Genève
BSFÉ	Bulletin de la Société française d'égyptologie
BSFFT	Bulletin de la Société française des Fouilles de Tanis
CAJ	Cambridge Archaeological Journal

CANEL	Contributions to the Archaeology of Egypt, Nubia and the Levant
CAT	M. DIETRICH/O. LORETZ/J. SANMARTÍN, <i>The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places</i> (KTU: second, enlarged edition), ALASP 8, Münster 1995
CCE	Cahiers de la céramique égyptienne
CChEM	Contributions to the Chronology of the Eastern Mediterranean
CdÉ	Chronique d'Égypte
CENiM	Cahiers Égypte nilotique et méditerranéenne
CRIPeL	Cahier de recherches de l'Institut de papyrologie et égyptologie de Lille
CTH	E. LAROCHE, <i>Catalogue des Textes Hittites</i> , Paris 1971
DÖAW	Denkschrift der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien
EA	Egyptian Archaeology
EA	J. A. KNUDZON, <i>Die El-Amarna-Tafeln mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen. Anmerkungen und Register bearbeitet von Otto Weber und Erich Ebeling</i> , I–II, VAB 2, Leipzig 1964 ²
ENiM	Égypte nilotique et méditerranéenne
EU	Egyptologische Uitgaven
FIFAO	Fouilles de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale
GHP	Golden House Publications
GM	Göttinger Miszellen
GÖF	Göttinger Orientforschungen
GOP	Giza Occasional Papers
GUPEA	Göteborg University Publications Electronic Archive
HÄB	Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge
HES	Harvard Egyptological Studies
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies
HPBM	Hieratic Papyri of the British Museum
IDD	C. UEHLIGER et al. (eds.), <i>Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East</i> , Leiden, forthcoming
JARCE	Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt
JAS	Journal of Archaeological Science
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
JEgH	Journal of Egyptian History
JEOL	Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux
JESHO	Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
KASKAL	Kaskal. Journal of History, Environment, and Cultures of the Ancient Near East
KÄT	Kleine Ägyptische Texte
KAW	Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt
KRI	K. A. KITCHEN, <i>Ramesside Inscriptions. Historical and Biographical</i> I–VII, Oxford 1969–1990
KSGH	Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen
LÄ	W. HELCK/E. OTTO/W. WESTENDORF (eds.), <i>Lexikon der Ägyptologie</i> I–VII, Wiesbaden 1972–1992

LD	K. R. LEPSIUS, Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopien I–VI, Berlin 1849–1859
LingAeg	Lingua Aegyptia. Journal of Egyptian Language Studies
MÄS	Münchener Ägyptologische Studien
MDAIK	Mitteilungen des Deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Abteilung Kairo
MIFAO	Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale
MIO	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung
MittSAG	Der Antike Sudan. Mitteilungen der Sudanarchäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin e.V.
MMAF	Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire
MRE	Monographies Reine Élisabeth
MRS	Mission de Ras Shamra
N.A.B.U.	Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires
NAWG	Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OIC	Oriental Institute Communications
OIMP	Oriental Institute Museum Publications
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OMRO	Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden
Or	Orientalia. Nova Series
PdÄ	Probleme der Ägyptologie
PES	Pražské egyptologické studie/Prague Egyptological Studies
PM	B. PORTER/R. MOSS, Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings I–VII, London, 1927–1951.
PM ²	B. PORTER/R. MOSS/J. MÁLEK, Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings III. Memphis, Part I. Abû Rawâsh to Abûsir, Oxford 1974
PNAS	Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
RANT	Res Antiquae
RdÉ	Revue d'égyptologie
RecTrav	Recueil des travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyrienne
RIA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie
RSO	Ras Shamra – Ugarit
RT	Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes
SAGA	Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens
SAK	Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur
SANTAG	SANTAG Arbeiten zu Untersuchungen zur Keilschriftkunde
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilisation
SBA	Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde
SEAP	Studi di egittologia e di Antichità puniche

SMEA	Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici
SRaT	Studien zu den Ritualszenen altägyptischer Tempel
SSEA	The Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities
TdE	Trabajos de Egiptología
TdH	Texte der Hethiter
UF	Ugarit-Forschungen
Urk.	Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums, Leipzig 1904–1961
VAB	Vorderasiatische Bibliothek
Wb	A. ERMAN/W. GRAPOW, Wörterbuch der ägyptische Sprache I–VI, Berlin 1926–1961
WVPM	Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen des Pelizaeus-Museums zu Hildesheim
WdO	Welt des Orients
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
YES	Yale Egyptological Studies
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie
ZÄS	Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde

Who's the King? An Image of the Egyptian King According to Non-Egyptian Evidence

Jana Mynářová

1. Introduction

The period dated roughly between the very end of the 16th and the middle of the 12th century BC, or – in Egyptian terms from the reign of Thutmose I until the reign of Ramesse III – is often understood as “the international age”. The identification is, of course, linked with the nature and character of the relations between Egypt and other states of the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean. With respect to the archaeological situation, the period is quite well-documented and the same can be said as far as the written evidence is concerned. Numerous Egyptian imports of pottery and stone vessels, statues and statuettes, stelae, objects of personal adornment etc. can be found all over the region alongside with objects produced locally in an “Egyptianizing” style, with their form and function often referring to the Egyptian ideal or paradigm. A different perspective is facilitated by the written evidence which results from local, as well as international or diplomatic traditions (such as diplomatic correspondence or legal texts).

It is not the aim of this paper to discuss the character or intensity of these relations. The present study rather pays more attention to another element, which has been largely overlooked by scholars. In the Egyptian realm the king and his authority represent one of the indisputable pillars that support the infallible functioning of the system, spreading both into the divine and human spheres. A glimpse at the figure of the king and his authority through the prism of Egyptian written evidence provides us with a multi-layered image, depending mostly on the character and purpose of the respective texts. Instead of discussing the image of the great, victorious king, trampling over the dead bodies of his enemies, destroying and slaughtering them with his mighty arm, the present study aims to provide its readers with the “external” perspective, to demonstrate how the Egyptian king is seen and presented on the outside. In order to obtain such an insight a series of typologically different documents written largely in Akkadian, but also in Hittite, Ugaritic and Hurrian from the Late Bronze Age and mentioning the king of Egypt, shall be discussed in order to obtain a representative portrayal of the king and his authority towards the neighbouring political entities.

2. Egypt among the Great Powers¹

“Your regulation concerning the army and chariotry shall be established as follows: If I, My Majesty, go on a campaign from that land – either from the city of Karkisa, the city of Masa, the city of Lukka, or the city of Warsiyalla, then you too must go on campaign with me, together with infantry and chariotry. Or if I send some nobleman to go on a campaign

1 J. MYNÁŘOVÁ, *Language of Amarna – Language of Diplomacy. Perspectives on the Amarna Letters*, Prague 2007, 125–131.

from this land, then you must go on campaign with him also. But from Ḫatti, these are the military obligations for you: the kings who are the equals of My Majesty – the King of Egypt, the King of Babylonia, the King of Hanigalbat, or the King of Assyria – if [someone] in this group comes in battle, or if domestically someone carries out a revolt against My Majesty, and I, My Majesty, write to you for infantry and chariotry, then send <infantry and> chariotry to my aid immediately”. (CTH 76)²

Though the document CTH 76 is rather late, dated to the first quarter of the 13th century BC,³ the words of the treaty between Muwatalli II of Ḫatti and Alaksandu of Wilusa clearly illustrate the paradigm, attested in earlier documents, such as the Amarna correspondence of the middle of the 14th century BC – namely a distinction between the “Great Kings”⁴ and the other rulers, often client kings and frequently under the authority of one (or more) of the Great Kings. Even in his treaty with the king of one of the Arzawa lands in north-western Anatolia the Hittite king mentions the king of Egypt as the first and foremost of those rulers, who are equal to him.

2.1. Hittite evidence

As far as the type and number of preserved documents is concerned the Hittite evidence is the most abundant and divers. The most common type of written evidence for communication between Egypt and Ḫatti – their kings, as well as other members of the respective royal courts – is represented by their correspondence. In this case the evidence is rather prolific, covering both main eras of intense contacts, that means the middle of the 14th century BC, represented by the Amarna material, and the first half of the 13th century BC – the so-called Pax Hethitica –, well-documented by data from the Hittite capital of Ḫattusa.⁵

- 2 G. BECKMANN, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Writings from the Ancient World 7, 2nd edition, Atlanta 1999, 89–90.
- 3 For the recent discussion on Egyptian-Hittite synchronisms see especially J. L. MILLER, Amarna age chronology and the identity of Nibḫururiya in the light of a newly reconstructed Hittite text, in: *AoF* 34, 2007, 252–293; D. GRODDEK, Zu den neuen ägyptisch-hethitischen Synchronismen der Nach-Amarna-Zeit, in: *GM* 215, 2007, 95–107; J. MILLER, The rebellion of Hatti’s Syrian vassals and Egypt’s meddling in Amurru, in: *SMEA* 50, 2008, 533–554; G. WILHELM, Muṣṣilis II. Konflikt mit Ägypten und Haremhab’s Thronbesteigung, in: *WdO* 39, 2009, 108–116; E. DEVECCHI/J. L. MILLER, Hittite-Egyptian synchronisms and the consequences for ancient Near Eastern chronology, in: J. MYNÁŘOVÁ (ed.), *Egypt and the Near East – the Crossroads. Proceedings of an International Conference on the Relations of Egypt and the Near East in the Bronze Age*, Prague, September 1–3, 2010, Prague 2011, 139–176; G. WILHELM, Šuppiluliuma I. und die Chronologie der Amarna-Zeit, in: R. HACHMANN (ed.), *Kämid el-Löz 20: Die Keilschriftbriefe und der Horizont von El-Amarna*, SBA 87, Bonn 2012, 225–257.
- 4 P. ARTZI/A. MALAMAT, The great king. A preeminent royal title in cuneiform sources and the Bible, in: M. E. COHEN/D. C. SNELL/D. B. WEISBERG (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, Bethesda 1993, 28–38; M. LIVERANI, The great powers’ club, in: R. COHEN/R. WESTBROOK (eds.), *Amarna Diplomacy. The Beginnings of International Relations*, Baltimore – London 2000, 15–27; MYNÁŘOVÁ, *Language of Amarna – Language of Diplomacy*, 125–131; A. TUGENDHAFT, How to become a brother in the Bronze Age: an inquiry into the representation of politics in Ugaritic myth, in: *Fragments* 2, 2012, 89–104.
- 5 E. EDEL, KBo I 15 + 19, ein Brief Ramses’ mit einer Schilderung der Kadešschlacht, in: *ZA* 48, 1949, 195–212; J. A. KNUDTZON, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen. Anmerkungen und Register bearbeitet von Otto Weber und Erich Ebeling*, I–II, VAB 2, Leipzig 1964²; E. EDEL, *Die ägyptische-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi in babylonischer und hethitischer Sprache*, I–II, ARWAW 77, Opladen 1994; E. DEVECCHI, *The Amarna letters from Ḫatti. A palaeographic analysis*, in: T. BOIY/J. BRETSCHNEIDER/A. GODDEERIS/H. HAMEEUW/G. JANS/J. TAVERNIER (eds.), *The Ancient Near*

Another perspective on the relations between the two kingdoms can be recognized in the legal tradition, which has no parallel in other textual corpora. The “Eternal” or “Silver” treaty concluded between Ḫattusili III of Ḫatti and Ramesse II of Egypt (CTH 91) is an example of a tradition which extends back to the 15th or 14th century BC by the latest and it is primarily represented by the so-called Kuruštama treaty (CTH 134).

In the Hittite sources references to Egypt and the Egyptian king can be found in other texts as well; texts that can be identified as “canonical compositions”. On the one hand, we have at our disposal the so-called “Second” Plague Prayer of Mursili II (CTH 378.II)⁶ which, among others, refers to the historical context of the Kuruštama treaty (see below), though in this particular text only “the Egyptians”, “Egyptian territory” and “Egypt” itself are mentioned. A different picture, however, is brought to us in the Deeds of Suppiluliuma (CTH 40) – the story of his reign, in which – among other episodes – both the Egyptian military campaign to the land of Kinza/Qadeš but also the famous taḫamunzu affair are thoroughly treated. A historiographical context can be also recognized in the recently expanded texts CTH 63.A, A Dictate of Mursili II to Tuppi-Teššup’s Syrian Antagonists and CTH 72, A Report on Egypt’s meddling in Amurru.

2.1.1. Hittite evidence – correspondence

With respect to the Hittite evidence the category of correspondence presents a series of challenges. First of all it is important to be aware of the fact that in the absolute majority of cases the place of discovery of a letter represents its destination, which is usually not identical with the place from where the letter has been dispatched. Among the material from the Hittite capital of Ḫattusa and belonging – for example – to the Egyptian-Hittite correspondence, the number of letters sent from Egypt exceeds the Hittite corpus more than five times. Moreover, the identity of the sender cannot always be recognized beyond doubt and thus the resulting data can be inexact.

The main source of data for the study represents the direct diplomatic correspondence between the two royal courts, with the earliest texts composed during the reign of Suppiluliuma I,⁷ i.e. the Amarna correspondence plus two documents discovered at Ḫattusa,

East, A Life! Festschrift Karel Van Lerberghe, OLA 220, Leuven 2012, 143–154.

- 6 A: KUB 14.8; B: KUB 14.11 + 650/u; C: KUB 14.10 + KUB 26.86; R. LEBRUN, Hymnes et prières hittites, *Homo Religiosus* 4, Louvain-la-Neuve 1980, 191–239; I. SINGER, Hittite Prayers, *Writings from the Ancient World* 11, Atlanta 2002, 57–61; G. BECKMAN, Plague prayers of Muṣili II (1.60), in: W. W. HALLO/K. L. YOUNGER, Jr. (eds.), *The Context of Scripture, I. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, Leiden – Boston 2003, 156–160.
- 7 Despite an extensive discussion the absolute dates for Suppiluliuma I’s reign remain largely insecure, see G. WILHELM/J. BOESE, *Absolute Chronologie und die hethitische Geschichte des 15. und 14. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, in: P. ÅSTRÖM (ed.), *High, Middle or Low? Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology held at the University of Gothenburg, 20th–22nd August 1987, Part I*, Gothenburg 1987, 74–117, esp. 90–91; T. R. BRYCE, Some observations on the Chronology of Šuppiluliuma’s reign, in: *AnSt* 39, 1989, 19–30; W. J. MURNANE, *The Road to Kadesh. A Historical Interpretation of the Battle Reliefs of King Sety I at Karnak*, 2nd rev. edition, SAOC 42, Chicago 1990, 129–130; G. BECKMAN, Hittite chronology, in: *Akkadica* 119–120, 2000, 19–32; V. PARKER, *Zur Chronologie des Šuppiluliumaš I.*, in: *AoF* 29, 2002, 31–62, esp. 53–54; J. FREU, *La chronologie du règne de Suppiluliuma: essai de mise au point*, in: P. TARACHA (ed.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw 2002, 87–107; P. TARACHA, *The end of Suppiluliuma’s reign and the solar omen Mursili II*, in: *N.A.B.U.* 14, 2008/1, 22–23; V. CORDANI, *La cronologia del regno di Šuppiluliuma I*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Università di Trieste, Trieste 2010;

a letter from Suppiluliuma to the Pharaoh and a letter of Nibhururiya's widow. The other epistolary documents can be dated to the reign of Ramesse II, its earliest subset originating shortly before and after the conclusion of the "Eternal" treaty. Among these a fragment of a letter discovered at Qantir/Pi-Ramesse in 2003 can be counted.

With respect to the Egyptian-Hittite communication the Amarna corpus is rather limited. It contains altogether four letters (EA 41–44)⁸ with EA 43 a mere fragment, and including a letter addressed by the Hittite prince Zita to the Egyptian king (EA 44). Another document of a Hittite origin to be taken into consideration is a fragmentary letter KUB 19.20++ (CTH 154),⁹ usually regarded as a draft of a letter of Suppiluliuma addressed to the Pharaoh. Unfortunately not a single letter, its copy or a draft has been preserved from the letters sent by the Egyptian king to his Hittite partner or partners. Therefore in the Amarna period the ongoing correspondence is represented only by means of the letter of Nibhururiya's widow (ÄHK 1, CTH 170), which is not per se a document which can be taken fully into consideration as far as the identification of the Egyptian king is concerned, because the sender is not the king himself but another party. However, since a similar situation can be identified in the Ramesside corpus as well, these texts are used here as a general illustration. Also not all letters sent from the Egyptian court are addressed to the Hittite king, often also to the queen, princes, or even kings of other territories (cf. ÄHK 28, to the king of Mira, Kupanta-D:KAL). We can also expect that some references to the Egyptian king occurred in the correspondence between the Hittite royal court and a third party, but within the Hittite corpus we can find such references only sporadically.

Hittite corpus

EA 41–44, ÄHK 1–113, FZN 2003/0260, CTH 154, CTH 172, CTH 187, CTH 208

From Egypt to Ḫatti: ÄHK 1 (Nibhururiya's widow), ÄHK 2–7, ÄHK 8 (Pašiyara and the officials), ÄHK 9 (Sethhirkhopešef = Amunhirkhopešef), ÄHK 10–11 (Tuya), ÄHK 12–13

V. CORDANI, One-year or five-year war? A reappraisal of Suppiluliuma's first Syrian campaign, in: AoF 38/2, 2011, 240–253; B. STAVI, A Historical Reappraisal of the Reigns of Tudhaliya II and Šuppiluliuma I, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 2011, esp. 329–331; V. CORDANI, Dating and ascension to the throne of Šuppiluliuma I, in: KASKAL 8, 2011, 141–160; G. WILHELM, Šuppiluliuma I, in: RIA 13, Berlin – New York 2012, 318–322; V. CORDANI, Suppiluliuma in Syria after the first Syrian war: the (non-)evidence of the Amarna letters, in: S. DE MARTINO/J. L. MILLER (eds.), New Results and New Questions on the Reign of Suppiluliuma I, Eothen 19, Firenze 2013, 43–64; E. DEVECCHI, Suppiluliuma's Syrian campaigns in light of the documents from Ugarit, in: S. DE MARTINO/J. L. MILLER (eds.), New Results and New Questions on the Reign of Suppiluliuma I, Eothen 19, Firenze 2013, 81–97.

- 8 KNUDTZON, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln I, 298–308; P. ARTZI, EA 43, an (almost) forgotten Amarna letter, in: A. F. RAINEY (ed.), *kinnattātu ša dārāti*. Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume, Tel Aviv 1993, 7–10.
- 9 KUB 19.20+KBo 12.23; E. FORRER, Die astronomische Festlegung des Soppiluljomas, Morsilis und Amenophis IV, in: E. FORRER, *Forschungen*, 2. Band, 1. Heft, Berlin 1926, 1–37, esp. 28–30; A. HAGENBUCHNER, Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter, 2. Teil, Die Briefe mit Transkription, Übersetzung und Kommentar, TdH 16, Heidelberg 1989; T. VAN DEN HOUT, Der Falke und das Küchen: der neue Pharaon und der hethitische Prinz?, in: ZA 84, 1994, 60–88; missing in Edel's edition, C. ZACCAGNINI, Review of Elmar Edel, Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi in babylonischer und hethitischer Sprache, in: *Orientalia* N. S. 69/4, 2000, 439–442, esp. 440. Against KBo 49.13 as an indirect join to the reverse see convincingly DEVECCHI, in BOYI/BRETSCHNEIDER/GODDEERIS/HAMEEUW/JANS/TAVERNIER (eds.), *The Ancient Near East, A Life!*, 143–144. For the Hittite provenance of the text, see Y. GOREN/H. MOMMSEN/J. KLINGER, Non-destructive provenance study of cuneiform tablets using portable X-ray fluorescence (pXRF), in: JAS 38, 2011, 684–696, esp. Table 1, 686.

(Nefertari to Puduḥepa), ÄHK 14–39, ÄHK 42–52(?), ÄHK 54–55, ÄHK 57, ÄHK 60–65, ÄHK 68–98, ÄHK 104–107, ÄHK 113

From Ḫatti to Egypt: EA 41, 42, 43, 44 (prince), ÄHK 40–41, ÄHK 53, ÄHK 56, ÄHK 58–59, ÄHK 66–67, ÄHK 99–103, ÄHK 108–111 (in Hitt.), ÄHK 112 (in Hitt., to Tuya?), FZN 2003/0260, CTH 154 (in Hitt., draft)

From Ḫatti to the third party: CTH 172 (Ḫattušili III to Kadašman-Enlil II of Babylon), CTH 187 (Great King of Ḫatti to Salmanassar of Assyria), CTH 208 (Great King of Ḫatti to Bentešina of Amurru?)

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Hittite provenance	Hittite provenance to a third party
Prenomen	ÄHK 17, ÄHK 20, ÄHK 28–29, ÄHK 42–46, ÄHK 49, ÄHK 51, ÄHK 69–70, ÄHK 72–73, ÄHK 75–78, ¹⁰ ÄHK 81–82	EA 41	–
Nomen	ÄHK 14, ÄHK 16–17, ÄHK 19, ÄHK 42–46, ÄHK 78	–	–
Nomen (only Ramesse)	–	FZN 2003/0260(?)	–
<i>s3 R^c + Nomen</i>	ÄHK 20, ÄHK 28, ÄHK 42–46, ÄHK 49, ÄHK 51, ÄHK 69–70, ÄHK 72, ÄHK 75, ÄHK 76–77, ÄHK 82	ÄHK 99(?), ¹¹ ÄHK 111(?)	–
<i>nsw-bjty (in-si-ib-ia ni-ib-ta-a-ua)</i>	ÄHK 69, ÄHK 72	–	–
Great King	ÄHK 14, ÄHK 20, ÄHK 24–25, ÄHK 27–30, ÄHK 43–46, ÄHK 51, ÄHK 60, ÄHK 75–77, ÄHK 82, ÄHK 92	ÄHK 56(?), ÄHK 99, ÄHK 102(?), ÄHK 108	ÄHK 12
King of Egypt	ÄHK 14, ÄHK 16–17, ÄHK 20, ÄHK 24–25, ÄHK 28, ÄHK 32, ÄHK 37, ÄHK 42–44, ÄHK 46, ÄHK 51, ÄHK 57, ÄHK 60, ÄHK 68, ÄHK 75, ÄHK 76, ÄHK 77, ÄHK 92, ÄHK 93	EA 41, EA 44, ÄHK 99, ÄHK 100, CTH 154	ÄHK 12, ÄHK 112, CTH 172, CTH 187

¹⁰ In ÄHK 78 it is a name of a temple domain.

¹¹ [DUM]U D:UTU LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR:mi-iš-r[i-i M:ri-a-ma-še-ša ma-a-i-D:a-ma-na...]. The scribe of the letter (addressed by either Ḫattusili or Puduḥepa to Ramesse) probably misplaced the second part of the nomen only after the honorific title of the “Great King” and the functional the “King of Egypt”, as suggested by EDEL, Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi, 209.

(your/my) brother ¹²	–	EA 41, ÄHK 53, ÄHK 66, ÄHK 58(?), ÄHK 100, ÄHK 108–111	–
(your/my lord)	–	EA 44 ¹³	–
King	ÄHK 18, ÄHK 24–25, ÄHK 42–43, ÄHK 47, ÄHK 61, ÄHK 72, ÄHK 75, ÄHK 88(?), ÄHK 94	ÄHK 66(?), ÄHK 109(?)	–
Lord of all lands	–	FZN 2003/0260	–

Table 1 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Egyptian-Hittite epistolary corpus

For the address holds that in his correspondence the king of Egypt is using the full form of the royal titulary. Composing a letter addressed to the Egyptian king the scribe at the Hittite royal court simply follows the customary practice, repeating the phraseology employed in the letters from Egypt. Though the extent of the two corpora differs largely we may easily see that the Ramesside style is more eloquent, while in the 14th century BC corpus we may suppose, among others based on parallelism, that the identification of the Pharaoh on the Egyptian side was limited to his prenomen, followed by the functional element the “King of Egypt” and probably also by the title of the “Great King”. In both corpora we observe that the identification of the Egyptian king as “my brother” did not change or was not abandoned over time and the principle of parity between the Great kings attested in the Amarna letters is systematically employed in the Ramesside period as well. The epistolary corpus thus reveals both devoted adherence to the diplomatic tradition and its phraseology and the ability of the Hittite scribes to accept and further employ the Egyptian type of the king’s identification.

On the other hand it is important to observe that in the letters addressed to a third party, the Hittite sender mentions the Egyptian king only rarely – only three letters have been identified in the Hittite corpus so far and the same holds for the texts discovered at Ugarit: not a single mention of the Egyptian king in letters addressed to Ugarit from Ḫatti at all!

2.1.2. Hittite evidence – legal tradition

As far as legal documents are concerned we have at our disposal two types of sources, first – legal provisions concluded between Egypt and Ḫatti, and second – treaties of Ḫatti and other political centres mentioning the Egyptian king (as we have already seen before).¹⁴ The first group is represented here by two documents only: the Kuruštama treaty (CTH 134),¹⁵ from the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty, and the “Eternal” or “Silver” treaty (CTH 91, in

12 In EA 44 replaced by “my father” because the letter is sent by the Hittite prince.

13 In a letter dispatched from a Hittite prince.

14 Not the Egyptian king but Egypt itself as a territory is mentioned in the following texts: a treaty between Suppiluliuma I and Tette of Nuḫasse (CTH 53, in Akk.) and a treaty between Mursili II and Niqmepa of Ugarit (CTH 66, in Akk.)

15 It is highly probable that between the Kuruštama and the “Eternal” treaty another treaty had to be concluded, though the evidence for the existence of such an act is rather limited.

Akkadian and Egyptian), dated to the twenty-first regnal year of Ramesse II. In this case, however, the analysis of the material is complicated by the fact that both versions are the result of a process of translation and therefore a kind of a halfway solution.

The other group is more numerous, including a treaty between Suppiluliuma I and Aziru of Amurru (CTH 49, in Hitt. and Akk.), a treaty between Mursili II and Tuppi-Teššup of Amurru (CTH 62, in Hitt. and Akk.), a treaty between Muwatalli II and Talmi-Šarrumma of Aleppo (CTH 75, in Akk.), and a treaty between Muwatalli II and Alaksandu of Wilusa (CTH 76, in Hitt.).

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Hittite provenance	Hittite provenance to a third party
Prenomen	CTH 91	CTH 91	–
Majesty + <i>nsw-bjty</i> + Prenomen	CTH 91 [Eg. intro]	–	–
Nomen	CTH 91	CTH 91	–
<i>s3 R^c</i> + Nomen	CTH 91 [Eg. intro]	–	–
<i>s3 R^c</i> + Nomen + given life forever and eternally/... like his father Re daily	CTH 91 [Eg. intro]	–	–
Beloved of Amun-Re, Horakhti, Ptah South-of-his-Wall, Lord of Ankhtawy, Mut, Lady of Ašeru, Khonsu Neferhotep	CTH 91 [Eg. intro]	–	–
He having appeared upon the Horus-throne of the living like his father Re-Horakhti, forever and ever eternally	CTH 91 [Eg. intro]	–	–
His Majesty	CTH 91 [Eg. intro]	–	–
Pharaoh, l.p.h.	CTH 91 [Eg. intro]	–	–
Bull of Rulers	CTH 91 [Eg. intro]		–
Great Ruler of Egypt	CTH 91		–
Great Ruler of Egypt living eternally	CTH 91		–
Great Ruler of Egypt, their Lord, l.p.h.	CTH 91		–
Great King	–	CTH 91	–
Mighty King (= Hero)	CTH 91		–
Mighty King (= Hero) of all lands	–	CTH 91	–

Lord	CTH 91	–	–
Son of Menmaatre, the Great Ruler/King of Egypt, the Mighty King (= Hero)	CTH 91	CTH 91	–
Grandson of Menpehtyre, the Great Ruler/King of Egypt, the Mighty King (= Hero)	CTH 91	CTH 91	–
King of Egypt	–	CTH 91	CTH 49, CTH 62, CTH 75 ³ , CTH 76
Beloved of Amun	–	CTH 91	–

Table 2 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Egyptian-Hittite legal corpus

Table 2 clearly illustrates that the identification used for the Egyptian king is rather rich. We must keep in mind that the Egyptian version of the text contained also an introduction with the extensive royal titulary, and epithets of Ramesse II, which has no parallel in the Hittite version. If we put aside this particular part, the picture looks rather different. The points of concurrence are therefore only the filiation passages – transferred from the Hittite tradition to the Egyptian one – and both nomen and prenomen of the Egyptian king. In the documents addressed to a third party the Egyptian king is invariably identified by means of his functional title as the “King of Egypt”, which corresponds to the means of identification of other rulers in these types of documents.

2.1.3. *Hittite evidence – canonical compositions*

The Hittite canonical compositions represent a completely different type of texts. Compared to both the epistolary and legal documents, discussed above, these texts do not reflect an immediate reaction to or a translation of a document of Egyptian origin. In treaties, the resulting document represents a stipulated “compromise”; a text formed and negotiated by both a parties. Letters, on the other hand, can be seen as more or less immediate reactions to incoming communications and since the Hittite-Egyptian correspondence is largely attested in Akkadian, we may suppose that only a limited number of well-trained scribes were, in fact, involved in such communication both as its “readers” and “letter-writers”, and therefore well-acquainted with the rules of the epistolary etiquette. The same holds for the scribes of the international legal documents.

Even the Hittite canonical compositions may, in fact, reflect the historical situation and even more – though indirectly – bound to both epistolary and legal traditions. Such a situation can be supposed regarding the historiographical texts, represented here by the Deeds of Suppiluliuma (CTH 40),¹⁶ a text composed by Suppiluliuma I’s younger son Mursili II, and

16 For the reconstruction of the text see especially H. G. GÜTERBOCK, The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as told by his son, Mursili II, in: JCS 10, 1956, 41–68, 75–83, 107–130; G. F. DEL MONTE, La gesta di Suppiluliuma. Translitterazione, traduzione e commento, L’opera storiografica di Mursili II re di Hattusa I, Pisa 2008; D. GRODDEK, Die neuen Fragmente der Deeds of Šuppiluliuma: Vorläufige Bemerkungen, in: RANT 5, 2008, 109–119; for the most recent re-ordering of the fragments consult

the recently reconstructed texts A Dictate of Mursili II to Tuppi-Teššup's Syrian Antagonists CTH 63.A¹⁷ and CTH 72, A Report on Egypt's meddling in Amurru.¹⁸

As far as the Egyptian identification of the king is concerned, the Deeds of Suppiluliuma allow us to recognize it in a passage, quoting the words of the Egyptian envoy verbatim and mentioning king's death¹⁹ (1E3 IV 18, ^m*ni-ip-ḫu-ru-ri-ia-aš*), while the same occasion – referring to both the death of the Egyptian king and a dispatch of a messenger by the queen of Egypt to Ḫatti – is mentioned in the “Hittite” part of the text as well²⁰ (1A III 7, ^m*pī-ip-ḫu-ru-ri-ia-aš*).

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Hittite canonical composition
Prenomen	CTH 40 (= quote)	CTH 40
Nomen [?]	–	CTH 72
(our/their) Lord	CTH 40 (= quote)	CTH 40
King of Egypt	–	CTH 63.A, CTH 72
Man [?] /King [?] of Egypt	–	CTH 72

Table 3 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Hittite canonical texts

In the overview given in Table 3 one can observe a very simple structure. In the preserved Hittite canonical compositions the Egyptian king is identified either by means of his functional title as the “King of Egypt”, his prenamen,²¹ or a general specification as the “Lord”.

Problematic and from an interpretative point of view closely related elements are the identification of 'Arma'a as the king's nomen²² and the interpretation of a broken passage

J. L. MILLER, The placement of the death of Tuthaliya III and the Kinza/Nuḫḫašše rebellion within the Deeds of Suppiluliuma, in: S. DE MARTINO/J. L. MILLER (eds.), *New Results and New Questions on the Reign of Suppiluliuma I*, Eothen 19, Firenze 2013, 115–132. For translations see also H. A. HOFFNER, Jr., *Deeds of Suppiluliuma* (1.74), in: W. W. HALLO/K. L. YOUNGER, Jr. (eds.), *The Context of Scripture*, I. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World, Leiden – Boston 2003, 185–192.

17 KBo 3.3 + KUB 23.126 + KUB 31.36 + KUB 19.31; J. L. MILLER, KASKAL 4, 121–152.

18 KBo 50.24 + KUB 19.15; J. L. MILLER, SMEA 50, 2008, 533–554; see also R. LEBRUN/A. DEGRÈVE, *Fragments hittites relatifs à l'Égypte*, in: RANT 5, 2008, 121–131.

19 “Mio signore, questa è l'umiliazione [della nostra regina] (e) del nostro paese! Se ci fosse mai stato per noi [un principe] saremmo andati in un altro paese, avremmo chiesto con insistenza un signore per noi? Il nostro signore, che era Niphururija, è morto e non aveva figli; la moglie del nostro signore per noi è senza famiglia e (perciò) chiediamo con insistenza un figlio del nostro signore per la regalità sull'Egitto e lo chiediamo con insistenza come marito per la donna nostra signora. Inoltre, non siamo andati in nessun altro paese: siamo venuti qui. Nostro signore, dacci un tuo figlio!”, DEL MONTE, *La gesta di Suppiluliuma*, 123 (1E3 IV 13–25).

20 “Quando gli Egiziani vengono a sapere dell'attacco alla regione di Amka si impauriscono, ed essendo loro morto per di più il loro signore, Piphururija, la reina di Egitto, che era Dahamunzu, inviò a mio padre un messo scrivendogli ...”, DEL MONTE, *La gesta di Suppiluliuma*, 113 (1A III 5–10).

21 In this case – CTH 40 – the Hittite usage simply reflects its Egyptian counterpart, preserved by means of a quote within the same document, see above.

22 KUB 19.15++, Vs.[?] (I) 12', 25'.

mentioning a “Man/King of Egypt”²³ in CTH 72. It flows from the text itself that the “Man/King” of Egypt in l. 6’ and ‘Arma’a in ll. 12’, 21’ and 25’ of the verso, are to be understood as a single person.²⁴ It is beyond doubt that the suggested identification of ‘Arma’a with the Egyptian king Horemheb represents a complex and widely discussed topic, a subject, which – of course – bears many historical consequences.²⁵ Unfortunately traces of a sign following a lacuna in Vs. I,? l. 6’ (1806/u) of the tablet does not allow us to decide if the sign preceding KUR URU:mi-’iz’-ri shall be interpreted as LÚ (“man”) or LUGAL (“king”). Nevertheless, from the overview presented in this essay flows that an identification of an Egyptian king by means of his nomen is a possible, though rather infrequent option and as such it cannot be fully excluded from consideration. With the exception of an Akkadian letter of Egyptian provenance discovered at Ugarit (RS 88.2158; RS 14, No. 1) and mentioning a statue of a Pharaoh Merneptah,²⁶ all other attestations can be encountered in the Ramesside Egyptian-Hittite correspondence or in the “Silver” Treaty. In these types of documents the employment of a royal nomen is paralleled in texts of both Egyptian and Hittite provenance²⁷ and CTH 72 would be the sole example for its use in a purely Hittite source. It makes the proposal to read the relevant passage as LUGAL less probable. On the other hand it is important to stress that the overall corpus is limited and the resulting data thus can be distorted.

2.2. Other Great Powers and smaller kingdoms of the Late Bronze Age

Unfortunately, the wealth of data available in the Hittite world is not encountered in any of the remaining kingdoms of the Ancient Near East. Neither the kings of the other Great Powers of Babylonia, Assyria or Mittani, or the minor states of Alašiya and Arzawa left behind similar written evidence for relations with Egypt and above all, the king of Egypt himself. The only witness of these contacts during the Late Bronze Age is therefore the international correspondence preserved in the Amarna corpus.

23 KUB 19.15++, Vs.?⁷ (I), l. 6’; see Das Mainzer Photoarchiv <http://hethiter.net/>: PhotArch B0813b and hethiter.net/: PhotoArch Phb10942 (accessed on January 15, 2013).

24 “Vs.?⁷ (I) (5’)⁷Then [...] became hostile(pl.) towards me, and Titti, [my servant] wrote [to] the [‘ma]n’ of Egypt (saying):⁽⁷⁾ [‘Send] troops and chariots, [and] ... shall ... me forth,⁽⁸⁾and [I] will arise [and] come to the Land of Egypt.⁽⁹⁾Then the troops and chariots of the Land of Eg[yp]t came,⁽¹⁰⁾and Titti arose⁽¹¹⁾and went to the Land of [Eg]ypt. When, however, I wrote to ‘Arma’a (saying):⁽¹²⁾‘[Si]nce Titti was m[y] servant,⁽¹³⁾why then did you send your troops and chariots and [bring] him a[way]?⁽¹⁵⁾Give my [serv]ant back to me!’ [‘Arma’a] ⁽¹⁶⁾did not give [him ba]ck [to me], nor did he [even wr]ite back to me.⁽¹⁷⁾Then it came about that Zirtaya, [his] servant, wrote to me (saying):⁽¹⁸⁾‘Sen[d] troops and chariots,⁽¹⁹⁾and I will arise, and [come] to Ḫattusa.’⁽²⁰⁾So I sent troops and chariots, and they brought Zirt[aya, his servant], to Ḫattusa.⁽²¹⁾Then ‘Arma’a w[rote] to me (saying):⁽²²⁾‘Since [Z]irtaya is my servant, [giv]e hi[m] back to me!’⁽²³⁾But I wrote back to him (saying):⁽²⁴⁾‘An[d you]? Wh[y] did you [not giv]e Titti back to me?’⁽²⁵⁾Then ‘Arma’a remained totally quiet,⁽²⁶⁾[and] said [nothing] at all! [So] we were [not] on good terms with one another.⁽²⁸⁾We were [not] at all on [goo]d(?) terms”, MILLER, SMEA 50, 536.

25 Z. SIMON, Kann Armā mit Haremhab gleichgesetzt werden?, in: AoF 36, 2009, 340–348; WILHELM, WdO 39, 108–116; DEVECCHI/MILLER, in MYNÁŘOVÁ (ed.), Egypt and the Near East – the Crossroads, 139–176; E. DEVECCHI, Aziru, Servant of Three Masters?, in: AoF 39/1, 2012, 38–48.

26 See below note 48.

27 See Tables 1 and 2 above.

2.2.1. Babylonia

As far as the correspondence between Babylonia and Egypt is concerned, we have at our disposal altogether fourteen texts, three of these being texts written down in Egypt while in the remaining eleven letters two Babylonian kings – Kadašman-Enlil I and Burna-Buriaš II, as well as an unnamed Babylonian princess (EA 12) are attested, as the senders of these messages.

Babylonian corpus

EA 1–14

From Egypt to Babylonia: EA 1, 5, 14 (inventory)

From Babylonia to Egypt: EA 2–4, 6–11, EA 12 (princess), EA 13 (inventory)

Comparing the two until now discussed epistolary corpora – the Hittite and the Babylonian one – and leaving aside the fact that the chronological framework of the Babylonian correspondence is limited to the mid-14th century BC only – it is possible to observe the very same structure, defined by the parity of data. The way the Egyptian king identifies himself in his communication is also thoroughly applied in the messages addressed to him by his Babylonian partner.

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Babylonian provenance
Prenomen	EA 1, EA 5, EA 14	EA 2, EA 3, EA 6–11
Great King	EA 1, EA 14	EA 7
King of Egypt	EA 1, EA 4 (= quote)	EA 2, EA 3, EA 6–11
(my/your) brother	EA 1	EA 2, EA 3(?), EA 4, EA 6–9, EA 11
(my/your lord)	–	EA 1 (= quote), EA 12
King	–	EA 4

Table 4 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Babylonian corpus

2.2.2. Assyria

The Assyrian corpus is even more limited: in two letters – EA 15 and EA 16 – Aššur-uballit I is the sender and not a single document addressed by the Egyptian king to his Assyrian partner is preserved. It is impossible to recognize with certainty how the Egyptian king identified himself in his own messages and whether his Assyrian counterpart simply reflected the Egyptian fashion.

Assyrian corpus

EA 15–16

From Egypt to Assyria: n.a.

From Assyria to Egypt: EA 15–16

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Assyrian provenance
Prenomen	–	EA 16
Great King	–	EA 16 (reconstructed) ²⁸
King of Egypt	–	EA 15, EA 16
(your/my) brother	–	EA 16
King	–	EA 16

Table 5 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Assyrian corpus

As far as the Assyrian material is concerned, we can – once again – easily recognize the paradigm preserved both in the Babylonian and Hittite sources. The Assyrian correspondence – despite its limited extent – grants us an interesting hindsight into the etiquette of international communication. As we can see in the present table, in EA 15 the Pharaoh is identified exclusively by his functional title the “king” followed by the geographical specification “of Egypt”. None of the other means of his identification preserved in EA 16 are attested here. Very often such a situation can be encountered in documents in which the opening, that means the upper part, is badly damaged or missing completely. However, for EA 15 it is not the case. The text is well preserved but from the contents it clearly results that the document can be seen as a kind of an initial or inaugural communication. In his message the king of Assyria seeks the establishment of diplomatic ties – including trade relations and the recognition of the status of Assyria and his king as a partner to the Pharaoh. In his wording EA 15 is cautious or even hesitant; its stylistics is highly influenced by the fact that its sender is not yet a recognized peer partner. Therefore in order not to disturb the rules of etiquette the sender of EA 15 employs the most general but formally neutral identification of the “king of Egypt”.

2.2.3. Mittani

Similar to the Assyrian corpus, not a single document of Egyptian provenance has been preserved in the Egyptian-Mittanian Amarna correspondence. The Mittanian king – Tušratta – is the author of thirteen letters and inventories addressed to the Egyptian king, with EA 26 sent to queen Tiye. With the exception of EA 24 – an extensive letter in Hurrian – the remaining texts are written in Akkadian.

Mittanian corpus

EA 17–29

From Egypt to Mittani: n.a.

From Mittani to Egypt: EA 7–21, EA 22 (inventory), EA 23, EA 24 (in Hurrian),

EA 25 (inventory), 26 (to Tiye), EA 27–29

²⁸ Based on a parallel identification of the Assyrian king (PN, king of Assyria, Great King, your brother).

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Mittanian provenance	Mittanian provenance to the third party
Prenomen	EA 26 (= quote)	EA 17, EA 19–24, EA 28, EA 29	EA 26 ²⁹
Great King	–	EA 19, EA 21	–
King of Egypt ³⁰	EA 24 (= quote)	EA 17, EA 19–EA 24, ³¹ EA 27, EA 28	–
(your/my/his) brother ³²	EA 26 (= quote)	EA 17, EA 19–24, EA 27–29	–
(my/his) son-in-law ...	–	EA 19–24, EA 27–29	–
My/your husband	EA 26 (= quote)	–	EA 26
His father	–	–	EA 26 ³³

Table 6 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Mittanian corpus

In the Mittanian correspondence, as shown in Table 6, we cannot recognize a different picture than the one already observed previously: the typical scheme of the international correspondence. It's more personal tone is, of course, related to the real family bounds established between the two royal courts.

2.2.4. The minor “independent” kingdoms of Alašiya and Arzawa

Based on the Amarna evidence and despite the distance, both kingdoms – Alašiya, located at Cyprus and Arzawa in westernmost part of Anatolia – maintained good relations with Egypt. Neither Alašiya or Arzawa ever became subjects of the Egyptian king and their rulers are never identified as the “Great Kings”, therefore their letters must be discussed separately from the Hittite, Babylonian, Assyrian or Mittanian correspondence. The Alašayan subset is more numerous, counting altogether eight documents written in Akkadian and exclusively originating in Cyprus. With the exception of one text – EA 40, addressed by a high official of Alašiya to his Egyptian counterpart – in the remaining seven letters the sender is identified by his title the “king of Alašiya”.

29 Used for both Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV–Akhenaten.

30 The mistress of Egypt in EA 26 (addressed to Tiye), similarly references to Amenhotep III as “my husband” (in quotes).

31 Hurr. *elwri* “Herr, König”, T. RICHTER, Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen, Wiesbaden 2012, 92–95.

32 In EA 26, addressed to Tiye, the respective kings of Egypt are identified also by means of the family relationship to Tiye, i.e. either as her husband or as her son. Often the references to past actions are mentioned including also the name and personal relationship of the past king, such as Amenhotep III being a father of Amenhotep IV, in the correspondence between Mittani and Egypt during the reign of the latter one. The same holds for the relationship of Amenhotep IV and his mother Tiye (both attested widely in EA 29).

33 For the relation between Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV–Akhenaten.

Alašiyān corpus

EA 33–40

From Egypt to Alašiya: n.a.

From Alašiya to Egypt: EA 33–39, EA 40 (official to official)

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Alašiyān provenance
King of Egypt ³⁴		EA 33–35, EA 37–39
(your/my/his) brother ³⁵		EA 33–35, EA 37–39

Table 7 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Alašiyān corpus

As it can be easily observed in Table 7, the Alašiyān correspondence offers us a completely different picture. Unfortunately, we do not have at our disposal a single text sent by the Egyptian king to his Alašiyān partner, but based on the parallels – especially in the Arzawan correspondence (see below) – it is difficult to imagine that being the sender of such a communication the Egyptian king would not have been identified by his full “international” titulary.

The Arzawa correspondence presents a rather problematic situation. A letter or its draft or copy, of the Egyptian king to the king of Arzawa has been preserved in the Amarna archive, but the message of the Arzawan king is preserved only partially. Undoubtedly his communication was rather extensive and therefore written on two tablets, which is a practice attested in other Amarna documents as well. Only the second of these two tablets, which does not contain the opening part with the address and the complete identification of the Egyptian addressee, has been presevered.

Arzawa corpus

EA 31–32

From Egypt to Arzawa: EA 31 (in Hittite)

From Arzawa to Egypt: EA 32 (in Hittite)

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Arzawan provenance
Prenomen	EA 31	–
Great King	EA 31	–
King of Egypt	EA 31	–
My Majesty	EA 31	–

Table 8 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Arzawa corpus

³⁴ In EA 40 the letter is addressed to the “Governor of Egypt”.

³⁵ In EA 40 the “Governor of Alašiya” refers to the “Governor of Egypt”.

For the Arzawan-Egyptian correspondence it is interesting to observe that despite using the Hittite language for his communication the Egyptian king is identified in his message in a standard way. On the other hand, in the Arzawa letter which – as has been recently confirmed by D. Hawkins³⁶ – cannot be seen as a reply to the Egyptian communication in EA 31 but more likely as the antecedent document – not a single identification of the Egyptian king can be recognized. It represents the second part of the message, but in comparison with other Amarna letters, it is still highly improbable that no identification would be encountered. In order to address the recipient of the message the scribe and/or the sender of EA 32 is exclusively using the second person masculine singular verbal forms and without more texts of the same provenance we cannot be sure if it is a mere coincidence or purpose.

2.2.5. The Levantine world

2.2.5.1. Ugarit

From the mid-14th century BC at the latest Ugarit (modern Ras eš-Šamra) – due to its strategic location in the eastern Mediterranean – represented one of the key political and trade centres of the region, as well as an important partner for Egypt. Contacts between Egypt and Ugarit prior to the 14th century BC can be described as sporadic or solitary.³⁷ Until recently, the earliest, yet not truly convincing evidence for such contacts was represented by a stone vessel with the name of Thutmose III supposedly discovered during the early 1950s by a French mission in the area of the Royal Palace.³⁸ The circumstances of the discovery remain ambiguous for with the exception of a short note on its discovery in the excavation report neither its drawing nor its photograph was ever published.³⁹ In the most recent study of B. Lagarce, devoted to the revision of the Egyptian epigraphic material coming from the Royal Palace of Ugarit and housed in the National Museum in Damascus, the respective fragments of the stone vessel with the name of Thutmose III are not mentioned.⁴⁰

36 D. HAWKINS, The Arzawa letters in recent perspective, in: BMSAES 14, 2009, 73–83.

37 See especially J. WEINSTEIN, Egyptian relations with Palestine in the Middle Kingdom, in: BASOR 217, 1975, 1–16; W. HELCK, Ägyptische Statuen im Ausland. Ein chronologisches Problem, in: UF 8, 1976, 101–114; W. A. WARD, Remarks on some Middle Kingdom statuary found at Ugarit, in: UF 11, 1979, 799–806, see esp. 801–805; R. GIVEON, Some Egyptological considerations concerning Ugarit, in: G. D. YOUNG (ed.), Ugarit in Retrospect: Fifty Years of Ugarit and Ugaritic, Winona Lake, In. 1981, 55–58, esp. 56–58; R. GIVEON, Ugarit, in: LÄ VI, 838–842, esp. 839; W. HELCK, Die Beziehungen Ägypten – Ugarit, in: M. DIETRICH/O. LORETZ (eds.), Ugarit – ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Forschung, ALASP 7, Münster 1995, 87–94, esp. 87–89; I. SINGER, A political history of Ugarit, in: W. G. E. WATSON/N. WYATT (eds.), Handbook of Ugaritic Studies, HdO 1/39, Leiden – Boston – Köln 1999, 603–733, esp. 614–616; for the problems of Egyptian statues abroad in the later periods see especially I. FORSTNER-MÜLLER/W. MÜLLER/K. RADNER, Statuen in Verbannung. Ägyptischer Statuenexport in den Vorderen Orient unter Amenophis III. und IV., in: Ä&L 12, 2002, 155–166.

38 C. F.-A. SCHAEFFER, Les fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit, in: Annales archéologiques de Syrie 3, 1953, 117–144, esp. 122; C. F.-A. SCHAEFFER, Les fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit. Quinzième, seizième et dix-septième campagnes (1951, 1952 et 1953), in: Syria 31, 1954, 14–67, esp. 41.

39 See especially M. C. ASTOUR, Ugarit and the Great Powers, in: G. D. YOUNG (ed.), Ugarit in Retrospect: Fifty Years of Ugarit and Ugaritic, Winona Lake, In. 1981, 3–29, esp. 13, n. 53; R. GIVEON, Ugarit, 839; SINGER, in WATSON/WYATT (eds.), Handbook of Ugaritic Studies, 622

40 B. LAGARCE, Réexamen des monuments du Palais royal d'Ougarit inscrits en hiéroglyphes égyptiens conservés au Musée national de Damas, in: V. MATOIAN (ed.), Le mobilier du Palais royal d'Ougarit,

An identification of the toponym “Ugarit” on the Memphis⁴¹ and Karnak⁴² stelae written down in the early years of the sole reign of Amenhotep II and probably referring to his military activities of Year 7⁴³ also remain far from being secure.

In light of this, the earliest unflinchingly attested contacts between Egypt of the Eighteenth Dynasty and Ugarit can be placed during the reign of Amenhotep III. While the Egyptian material is rather debatable in this respect – *de facto* we can refer only to the mention of the name of Ugarit in two topographical lists from Karnak⁴⁴ and Soleb⁴⁵ in Nubia – on the other hand, the material of Egyptian origin from Ugarit is relatively wealthy.⁴⁶

Contrary to the abundance of archaeological material, the preserved written evidence for contacts between Egypt and Ugarit and mentioning the Egyptian king or letters addressed to/by the Ugaritic king with the same mention is very scarce. As far as the chronology is concerned, the earliest documents were discovered in the Amarna archive. The “Ugaritic” Amarna corpus counts only five texts, some of them mere fragments, while EA 48 is a letter sent by the queen of Ugarit to her Egyptian partner, identified only as “my mistress”. The

RSO XVII, Lyon 2008, 261–280, esp. 271.

41 Cf. JE 6301; Urk. IV, 1301.3–1309.20.

42 Urk. IV, 1310.3–1316.4.

43 ASTOUR, in YOUNG (ed.), *Ugarit in Retrospect*, 13–14; SINGER, in WATSON/WYATT (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, 622.

44 J. J. SIMONS, *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia*, Leiden 1937, 135, List XII; see E. EDEL, *Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III.*, Bonn 1966, 51.

45 SIMONS, *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists*, 132–133, 199.

46 Among the important objects of Egyptian provenance discovered at Ugarit a fragment of a commemorative scarab can be mentioned; a scarab which is often mistakenly interpreted as the so-called “marriage scarab” (RS 16.094), at present held in the collection of the National Museum in Damascus (DO 2585), see C. BLANKENBERG-VAN DELDEN, *The Large Commemorative Scarabs of Amenhotep III*, Leiden 1969, 50–51, pl. VII (A 42), for latest photos see LAGARCE, in MATOIAN (ed.), *Le mobilier du Palais royal d'Ougarit*, 265, n. 16 and figs. 3a, b, c. The prenomen of Amenhotep III also appears on two frit tablets housed in the collections of the Louvre, cf. AO 19294 found in the region of the acropolis (acquisition Schaeffer 1937) and AO 19303 from tomb LIH located in the lower eastern town. The most abundant objects containing Amenhotep's name represent a group of fragments of spherical stone vessels related to the celebrations of the king's jubilee. Fragments belonging to two vessels of this type are stored in the Louvre and two more specimens can be found in the collections of the National Museum in Damascus. Both Parisian examples, i.e. RS 1-11.[116] (for the most recently published photo see LAGARCE, in MATOIAN (ed.), *Le mobilier du Palais royal d'Ougarit*, 273, fig. 11) and RS 11.329 (LAGARCE, in MATOIAN (ed.), *Le mobilier du Palais royal d'Ougarit*, 272, fig. 10) have been, based on a description of A. CAUBET, *Répertoire de la vaisselle de pierre, Ougarit 1929–1988*, in: M. YON (ed.), *Arts et industries de la pierre*, RSO 6, Paris 1991, pl. VI.6 a VI.2, XI.7, originally misinterpreted by R. T. SPARKS, *Egyptian stone vessels and the politics of exchange (2617–1070 BC)*, in: R. MATTHEWS (ed.), *Ancient Perspectives on Egypt*, London 2003, 39–56, see esp. 55, as “a flask” (RS 11.329; see “Flask type 2: flat base” in: R. T. SPARKS, *Stone Vessels in the Levant*, PEF Annual VIII, Maney 2007, 308–309, No. 357) and “a lid” (in case of RS 1-11.[116]; “Body sherds type 3: unidentified profile, decorated”, see SPARKS, *Stone Vessels in the Levant*, 341, No. 768). Both specimens from the National Museum in Damascus belong to the same type of spherical *hb-sd* vessel. In the area of the Fourth Court of the Royal palace a fragment of a travertine vessel marked as RS 16.340 (see CAUBET, in YON (ed.), *Arts et industries de la pierre*, 232; and latest LAGARCE, in MATOIAN (ed.), *Le mobilier du Palais royal d'Ougarit*, 263, fig. 1a, 1b and n. 14) was discovered and the titulary of Amenhotep III can also be recognized on a fragment RS 17.058 (see CAUBET, in YON (ed.), *Arts et industries de la pierre*, 232; and latest LAGARCE, in MATOIAN (ed.), *Le mobilier du Palais royal d'Ougarit*, 263–264, fig. 2a, 2b) found in the vicinity of the Fifth Court of the Royal palace (“ex-cour V”).

two only published Akkadian letters of Egyptian origin can be dated to the later phases of the Ramesside period (RS 86.2230,⁴⁷ RS 88.2158⁴⁸). With the exception of an Akkadian text RS 20.182A+B⁴⁹ the remaining documents are all written in Ugaritic and therefore it is highly probable that what we have here are either copies or drafts of outgoing messages written in Akkadian.⁵⁰

Ugaritic corpus

EA 46–49, CAT 2.23, CAT 2.76, CAT 2.81, RS 20.182A+B, RS 86.2230, RS 88.2158, RS 20.33

From Egypt to Ugarit: RS 86.2230, RS 88.2158

From Ugarit to Egypt: EA 46–49, CAT 2.23, CAT 2.76, CAT 2.81

From Ugarit to a third party: RS 20.33

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Ugaritic provenance	Ugaritic provenance to a third party
King	RS 88.2158	EA 47, EA 49	RS 20.33
my Lord		EA 46–47, EA 49, CAT 2.23, CAT 2.76, CAT 2.81	
Great King	RS 86.2230	CAT 2.23, CAT 2.76, CAT 2.81, CAT 9.530	
Sun (= Majesty)		EA 45–47, EA 49, CAT 2.23, CAT 2.76, CAT 2.81	
King of Egypt	RS 86.2230	RS 20.182A+B, CAT 2.81	RS 20.33
Mighty king (= Hero)		RS 20.182A+B	
Lord of all lands		RS 20.182A+B, CAT 2.76, CAT 2.81	
King of kings		CAT 2.76, 2.81, CAT 9.530	
Good king		CAT 2.81	

47 RS 86.2230 = RSO 14, No. 18; see D. ARNAUD, *Lettres* (nos 5–21), in: M. YON/D. ARNAUD (eds.), *Études ougaritiques. I. Travaux 1985–1995*, RSO 14, Paris 2001, 278–279.

48 RS 88.2158 = RS 14, No. 1; see S. LACKENBACHER, *Une lettre d'Égypte* (no. 1), in: M. YON/D. ARNAUD (eds.), *Études ougaritiques. I. Travaux 1985–1995*, RSO 14, Paris 2001, 239–248. For the dating of the letter to the reign of Sethi II see A. B. Сафронов, *Незамеченное свидетельство египетско-угаритских дипломатических контактов периода правления Сети II*, in: *Вестник МГОУ* 3, 2013, 31–35.

49 RS 20.182A+B = Ug. 5, No. 36; see J. NOUGAYROL, *Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit*, in: J. NOUGAYROL/E. LAROCHE/Ch. VIROLLEAUD/C. F. A. SCHAEFFER, *Ugaritica V. Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ougaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit. Commentaires des textes historiques (première partie)*, MRS XVI, Paris 1968, 111–113; S. LACKENBACHER, *Ugaritica V* no 36, in: N.A.B.U. 1994/3, No. 58, 51; W. VAN SOLDT, *More on Ugaritica V* no. 36, in: N.A.B.U. 1994/4, No. 98, 89.

50 For the Egyptian-Ugaritic correspondence, see J. MYNÁŘOVÁ, *Tradition or innovation? The Ugaritic-Egyptian correspondence*, in: *Å&L* 20, 2010, 363–372.

Just king		CAT 2.81	
my/your Good Lord		CAT 2.76, CAT 2.81	
Good son of the Sun	RS 88.2158		
Nomen	RS 88.2158 ⁵¹		

Table 9 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Ugaritic corpus

As is observable in Table 9, the material of Ugaritic provenance gives us an interesting diachronic perspective. The way the king of Egypt is identified is rather economic, while in the later period the repertoire is extended. It is important to stress that all non-Amarna examples date back to the time after the “Eternal treaty” between Ramesse II and Hattusili III had been concluded. The evidence is very scarce but we may easily recognize the introduction of a new tradition, which might – at least with some elements, such as the “Lord of all lands” or the “Mighty king” – find its parallels in terminology employed in the respective legal document. Despite the limitation of the Ugaritic corpus we may suppose that the new, post-Eternal treaty terminology had been recognized by the Ugaritic scribes, who were capable to use it for the identification of the Egyptian king. However, mentions of the Egyptian king are almost exclusively limited to documents dispatched to Egypt itself. As we can see in the preserved sources, the only exception is the so-called General’s letter (Ug. V, No. 20),⁵² sent by the high military official Šumiyanu to his overlord, the king of Ugarit, and describing a military affair in which the army of the Egyptian king was involved. Nevertheless, even here, he identifies the Pharaoh only by means of the very pragmatic title the “King of Egypt”.⁵³

2.2.5.2. Client kingdoms of the Levant

It is of no surprise that the most eloquent system for the identification of the Egyptian king can be found in the state or in other words “vassal” correspondence,⁵⁴ representing the majority of the Amarna corpus.⁵⁵ These letters represent almost ninety percent of preserved documents and among these both letters addressed to the Egyptian king and his officials can be placed. Only a few letters addressed by the king of Egypt to his Levantine “subjects” have

51 Related to the statue of Merneptah, see “an image of Marniptah Hatpamua”, RS 88.2158: 12’.

52 RS 20.33; see especially NOUGAYROL, in NOUGAYROL/LAROCHE/VIROLLEUAD/SCHAEFFER, *Ugaritica V*, 69–79; S. IZRE’EL/I. SINGER, *The General’s Letter from Ugarit. A Linguistic and Historical Reevaluation of RS 20.33 (Ugaritica V, No. 20)*, Tel Aviv 1990; I. MÁRQUEZ ROWE, *An Akkadian Letter of the Amarna Period at Ugarit*, in: *AuOr* 14, 1996, 107–126; M. DIETRICH, *Der Brief des Kommandeurs Šumiyanu an den ugaritischen König Niqmepa’ (RS 20.33)*, in: *UF* 33, 2001, 117–191; D. SCHWEMER, *Diplomatische Korrespondenzen der Spätbronzezeit: Briefe aus den Archiven von Ugarit: 1. Briefe in akkadischer Sprache*, in: B. JANOWSKI/G. WILHELM (eds.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments. Neue Folge* 3, Gütersloh 2006, 273–277.

53 Ug. V, 20 rev. 11, 13, 19, 24.

54 See W. L. MORAN, *The Amarna Letters*, Baltimore – London 1992, xxvi, fn. 68: “The term vassal is used loosely by any ruler subordinate to the Egyptian king, whether or not he was bound by oath and a vassal in the strict sense”. A useful brief summary of the contents of the vassals’ correspondence can be found in R. COHEN/R. WESTBROOK, *Introduction*, in: R. COHEN/R. WESTBROOK (eds.), *Amarna Diplomacy. The Beginnings of International Relations*, Baltimore – London 2000, 1–12, esp. 8–9.

55 See also KBo 8.16 from Bentešina of Amurru to the Great king and mentioning a messenger of the king of Egypt.

been preserved. In these letters the Egyptian king is seen as the supreme authority, while the subordinate rank of the respective senders is eloquently expressed by both the tone of the message and the means the client king identifies himself in relation to the Pharaoh. The repertoire for the identification of the Egyptian king in the communication of the Levantine client kings is, compared to the correspondence among the Great Powers, rather prolific and can be summarized as follows in Table 10. The attested identifications are the king, the King of Egypt, the Great King, (my/our) Lord, (my) Sun, the son of the Sun, the King/Sun of all lands, the King of battle, the God, the Breath of my life, the Sun from the heaven.⁵⁶

Identification of the Egyptian king	Egyptian provenance	Levantine provenance	Levantine provenance, to a third party
Prenomen		EA 51, EA 53, EA 55	
King	EA 99, EA 162, EA 367, EA 369, EA 370	EA 51, EA 54, EA 60–61, EA 63–65, EA 84, EA 90, EA 92, EA 100, EA 103–104, EA 118, EA 124–126, EA 129–130, EA 132, EA 136–141, EA 143–144, EA 147–157, EA 159, EA 165, EA 168, EA 170(A), EA 174–175, EA 177, EA 183, EA 185, EA 187, EA 189, EA 191–195, EA 198, EA 201–207, EA 209, EA 211–213, EA 215–217, EA 220–230, EA 232–235+327, EA 239, EA 241–244, EA 246, EA 248–250, EA 252–255, EA 258–259, EA 261–262, EA 264–274, EA 278–290, EA 294, EA 296–299, EA 301–305, EA 309, EA 314–316, EA 320–326, EA 328–332, EA 334, EA 336–338, EA 360, EA 362–366, EA 378	EA 71, EA 73, EA 77, EA 82, EA 86–87, EA 93, EA 95, EA 102, EA 145, EA 158, EA 164, EA 166, EA 256, EA 333
King of Egypt		EA 51–52, EA 59, EA 88	

⁵⁶ See MYNÁŘOVÁ, *Language of Amarna – Language of Diplomacy*, 131–146.

(my/your/his/our) Lord	EA 99, EA 162, EA 369	EA 51, EA 53–55, EA 58–61, EA 63–65, EA 68, EA 74–75, EA 78–79, EA 81, EA 83–85, EA 90–92, EA 100, EA 103–105, EA 107–110, EA 112, EA 114, EA 118–119, EA 121–126, EA 129–130, EA 132, EA 136–141, EA 143–144, EA 146–150, EA 152–154, EA 156, EA 158–161, EA 168, EA 170A, EA 174–175, EA 177, EA 182–185, EA 187, EA 189, EA 191–196, EA 198, EA 201–207, EA 209, EA 211–213, EA 215–217, EA 220–221, EA 223–230, EA 232–235+327, EA 239, EA 241–244, EA 246, EA 248–250, EA 252, EA 254–255, EA 257–262, EA 264–271, EA 273–274, EA 278–284, EA 286–287, EA 289–290, EA 292–303, EA 305, EA 314–326, EA 328–332, EA 334, EA 336–337, EA 362–366, EA 378	EA 71, EA 73, EA 77, EA 86–87, EA 95, EA 102, EA 145, EA 158, EA 164, EA 166, EA 178, EA 256
(My) Sun		EA 51, EA 60–61, EA 85, EA 100, EA 103–104, EA 118, EA 132, EA 140–141, EA 144, EA 147–149, EA 151, EA 155–156, EA 159, EA 161, EA 168, EA 174–175, EA 177, EA 182–185, EA 192, EA 213, EA 215, EA 224, EA 229, EA 235+327, EA 241–244, EA 246, EA 248, EA 253–255, EA 261, EA 266–274, EA 278–283, EA 288, EA 292–299, EA 302–306, EA 311, EA 314, EA 319–321, EA 323–326, EA 328–329, EA 331–332, EA 337, EA 365–366	
Son of the Sun		EA 53, EA 55	
Great King		EA 58, EA 68, EA 74, EA 76, EA 78, EA 83, EA 89, EA 105, EA 107–109, EA 112, EA 116–117, EA 119, EA 121–123, EA 160–161, EA 260, EA 317–318	

King of all lands		EA 68, EA 74–76, EA 78–79, EA 83, EA 88–89, EA 105–109, EA 112, EA 116, EA 121–123	
Sun of all lands		EA 84, EA 92, EA 94, EA 138	
(My) god		EA 141, EA 144, EA 147–149, EA 151–152, EA 156, EA 159, EA 168, EA 175, EA 177, EA 185, EA 192, EA 198, EA 213, EA 215, EA 235+327, EA 241, EA 243, EA 248, EA 266–268, EA 269–271, EA 273–275, EA 278–283, EA 292–300, EA 302–303, EA 305, EA 309, EA 314–316, EA 319–326, EA 328–329, EA 331–332, EA 337, EA 363, EA 366, EA 378	
Breath of my life		EA 141–144	
My breath		EA 281	
Sun from the sky		EA 221, EA 223, EA 299–300, EA 232–235+327, EA 298–299, EA 301–306, EA 309, EA 314–316, EA 318–326, EA 328–329, EA 331–332, EA 378	

Table 10 Identification of the Egyptian king in the Levantine Amarna corpus

The data in Table 10 clearly reveal an absolute imbalance, without doubt caused by the socio-political context of the state correspondence. On one hand, the client kings are using eloquent and honorific elements to identify the king of Egypt, while – on the other hand – the king himself (or better to say his bureaucracy) expresses his superior status through the usage of the simplest “functional” elements the King and your Lord. Unfortunately, as contrasted by the Ugaritic corpus, the Levantine Amarna correspondence is not paralleled in later period(s) and therefore it is impossible to recognize any development in the means of Pharaoh's identification.

3. Conclusions

It is obvious from the overview given here that the data relating to the identification are very diverse both as far as the types and number of available documents are concerned. On one hand, we can see that in the international correspondence of the Late Bronze Age the Egyptian king is far from being the “first and foremost” of the Great Kings. Most attestations can be found in documents in which he is one of the involved parties. Otherwise, the king of Egypt becomes a subject of communication of other parties only exceptionally. In order to identify him, the other rulers are ignoring all eloquent parts of his titulary, which – on the

other hand – might be (at least partially) employed when the letter is addressed to the Pharaoh himself, and refer to him only as to the “king of Egypt”. Without surprise, a completely different perspective can be recognized in documents whose senders were subordinate to the Egyptian king.

Acknowledgements

This study was written within the Programme for the Development of Fields of Study at Charles University, No. P14 “Archaeology of non-European Regions”, project “Research of the ancient Egyptian civilization. Cultural and political adaptation of the North African civilisations in ancient history (5,000 B.C. – 1,000 A.D.)”.

Divine and Terrestrial: The Rhetoric of Power in Ancient Egypt (The Case of Nyuserra)

Miroslav Bárta and Veronika Dulíková

The pyramids of the four Abusir kings are relatively small compared to their forerunners in Giza, giving one very little reason to think that their royal builders played a major role in the history of Egypt. Yet there is no doubt that the reign of one of them, the Fifth Dynasty king Nyuserra, represents a major if very brief period of the Old Kingdom era, a quite specific interval of time during which profound changes in many aspects of the society and state took place. To understand the mechanism of the principal changes occurring throughout Egyptian history, it has been suggested elsewhere to apply a modified version of punctuated equilibrium theory which seems to explain quite conveniently many of the facts and processes which can be identified over the three millennia of Egyptian history. Perhaps most importantly, this approach is able to uncover the strong dynamics of historical development, a feature that has quite often been suppressed as a consequence of more traditional attitudes towards viewing and studying Egyptian history.¹

The theory of punctuated equilibria is based on long-term observations that major changes and modifications of or within a given society display a tendency to happen in specific, clearly distinguished and historically very brief periods of time which are separated by rather uneventful and long periods of stasis when seemingly no significant development takes place. For the third millennium Egypt, for instance, such periods could be identified in connection with the reign of Den, Netjerykhet, Sneferu, Shepseskaf/Userkaf or Nyuserra. As will be shown, Nyuserra's reign represents a particularly prominent example of this theory.

King Nyuserra has always been standing somewhat in the shadow with regard to more popular subjects or personalities of modern Egyptological research. However, it is without doubt that it was the reign of this particular king that turned out to be a most decisive one for the way in which the Old Kingdom began to navigate towards its demise.² During Nyuserra's reign, many vital changes that exemplified profound impact on the society of the day took place.

Nyuserra reigned between 2402–2374 B.C., most likely for 11–31 years.³ His successor to the throne, king Menkauhor, reigned only briefly and the next king, Djedkara Isesi, took the throne around 2365 B.C. and passed away around 2322 B.C. The date for Djedkara's ascension to the throne is very close to the date proposed for the end of the Early Bronze

- 1 M. BÁRTA, Ancient Egyptian history as the punctuated equilibrium: an outline, in: P. DER MANUELIAN/Th. SCHNEIDER (eds.), *Towards a New History for the Egyptian Old Kingdom. Perspectives on the Pyramid Age*, HES 1, Boston 2015, forthcoming.
- 2 M. BÁRTA, Architectural Innovations in the development of the non-royal tomb during the reign of Nyuserra, in: P. JÁNOSI (ed.), *Structure and Significance: Thoughts on Ancient Egyptian Architecture*, DÖAW 33, Vienna 2005, 105–130.
- 3 M. VERNER, Contemporaneous evidence for the relative chronology of Dyns. 4 and 5, in: E. HORNUNG/R. KRAUSS/D. A. WARBURTON (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, HdO 83, Leiden – Boston 2006, 139.

Age III and beginning of the Early Bronze Age IV in Syria and Palestine, i.e. around 2350 B.C.⁴ With the outset of the 24th century B.C. the region of present day Syria, Israel and Palestine entered troubled times dominated by a vital change in the subsistence economy; the culture of city states disappeared rather quickly, the process of urbanisation backslid and most of the population converted back to nomadism.⁵ This regional crisis became an advantage for the Egyptians who organised several military campaigns into Palestine, as documented in the reliefs depicting besieged cities in some late Fifth Dynasty tombs at Saqqara and Deshasha and the Sixth Dynasty military account of Weni.⁶ Yet, the general worsening of the climate eventually hit the whole northern hemisphere and contributed to the demise of most of the early civilisations and cultures around 2200 B.C.⁷ Many clues to the critical fate of the Egyptian Old Kingdom can be identified as early as in the reign of Nyuserra.

To get a better understanding of Nyuserra's reign which represents a major break between the previous and subsequent developments, different sorts of evidence will be brought together in this study. Specific elements of sacred kingship and symbolical landscape, administrative development, innovations of three-dimensional art and newly emerging religious concepts as reflected (to a large degree) through recent archaeological discoveries in Abusir will be discussed in order to shed new light on the rule of this prominent yet often neglected king of ancient Egyptian history. It will be shown how cosmic order and transcendental hierarchy, so innate to ancient Egyptian civilization, were specifically and purposely deployed and developed by the king and the court elite to display, maintain and elaborate their superior nature and dominance.⁸ To achieve this goal, the elite of the date developed a very specific set of means and forms including monumental architecture, religious concepts, artefacts, iconography and texts, hierarchy reflected in elaborate chains of titles, ceremonies and sets of behaviour. These can be all subsumed in the category of "political rhetoric".⁹

1. Monumental architecture as an icon of power

Major innovations of Nyuserra's reign are tangible above all in its monumental architecture, of both the royal and the non-royal sphere. His mortuary complex, called *Mn-šwt-Ny-wšr-R* "The places of Nyuserra are enduring", is situated in Abusir and Nyuserra is in fact the last one of the four kings of the Fifth Dynasty that erected their funerary monuments there. His complex made extensive use of the previously developed symbolical landscape in the area.¹⁰

4 M. BÁRTA, Radiocarbon dates for the Old Kingdom and their correspondences, in: J. A. SHORTLAND/C. B. RAMSEY (eds.), *Radiocarbon and the Chronologies of Ancient Egypt*, Oxford – Oakville 2013, 218–223.

5 H. WEISS/R. BRADLEY, What drives societal collapse?, in: *Science* 291, 2001, 609–610.

6 A. BEN-TOR, The Archaeology of Ancient Israel, New Haven 1992, 122–125; M. BÁRTA, 'Biblical archaeology' and Egyptology. Old and Middle Kingdom perspective, in: T. E. LEVY (ed.), *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future. The New Pragmatism*, London 2010, 99–122.

7 H. N. DALFES/G. KUKLA/H. WEISS (eds.), *Third Millennium BC Climate Change and Old World Collapse, Global Environmental Change* 49, Berlin – London 1997; K. W. BUTZER, Collapse, environment and society, in: *PNAS* 109/10, 2012, 3632–3639, <http://www.pnas.org/content/109/10/3632.full>.

8 D. CANNADINE/S. PRICE (eds.), *Rituals of Royalty. Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, New York 1992, *passim*.

9 CANNADINE/PRICE (eds.), *Rituals of Royalty*, 3.

10 For his complex see L. BORCHARDT, *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Ne-user-re*, Leipzig 1907 and M. VERNER, *The Pyramids. The Mystery, Culture, and Science of Egypt's Great Monuments*, New York 2001, 311–319.