

A Stranger

in the House – the Crossroads III.

Proceedings of an International Conference
on Foreigners in Ancient Egyptian and Near
Eastern Societies of the Bronze Age held
in Prague, September 10–13, 2018

edited by

Jana Mynářová
Marwan Kilani
Sergio Alivernini



A Stranger in the House – the Crossroads III.

Proceedings of an International Conference on Foreigners
in Ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern Societies
of the Bronze Age held in Prague, September 10–13, 2018

edited by Jana Mynářová
Marwan Kilani
Sergio Alivernini

Prague
Charles University, Faculty of Arts
2019



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University

The book was published with support of the research project of the Czech Science Foundation GA ČR P401/12/G168 “History and Interpretation of the Bible”, a non-investment subsidy No. MŠMT-906/2019-1, VEG2019/1 and The Programme for the Development of Fields of Study at Charles University, no. Q11: Complexity and Resilience: Ancient Egyptian Civilisation in Multidisciplinary and Multicultural Perspective.

Reviewed by Lena Fijałkowska and Filip Coppens.

Contributors: Sergio Alivernini, Danielle Candelora, Gaëlle Chantrain, Susan Cohen, Katrien De Graef, Elena Devecchi, Anne Goddeeris, Caleb R. Hamilton, Ann-Kathrin Jeske, Kevin McGeough, Edward Mushett Cole, Jana Mynářová, Emanuel Pfoh, Regine Pruzsinszky, Clemens Reichel, Seth Richardson, Hannah L. Ringheim, Katharina Streit, Marta Valerio, Sarah Vilain, Federico Zangani

Cover: Illustrations: Caleb R. Hamilton, Ann-Kathrin Jeske

Type-setting layout: AGAMA® poly-grafický ateliér, s.r.o., Praha
Print: TNM print, Chlumec nad Cidlinou

© Charles University, Faculty of Arts, 2019

ISBN: 978-80-7308-928-3

Contents

Preface	12
Contributors	14
List of Abbreviations	18

Danielle Candelora

Hybrid Military Communities of Practice: The Integration of Immigrants as the Catalyst for Egyptian Social Transformation in the 2nd Millennium BC

25

Abstract: The second millennium BC was a period of unprecedented interconnectedness, characterized by the increasing movement of people in conjunction with the transmission of technologies across the Near East. Employing a Communities of Practice approach, this paper investigates the human networks through which this specialized knowledge might have transferred, suggesting that the interaction between foreign and local military and technological specialists was the locus of this transmission. The Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period were characterized by waves of West Asian immigrants moving into the Eastern Delta, bringing with them their mastery of new production processes and technologies. This period also saw the introduction of West Asian military practices and values, including a corpus of military related Semitic loan words. Therefore, this paper will propose that the mixture of immigrant and Egyptian specialists in hybrid military communities of practice played a major role in this cultural exchange. I will also explore the cultural significance behind the adoption and maintenance of these foreign technologies and military values, as well as their impact on the New Kingdom Egyptian military and conceptions of kingship.

Keywords: communities of practice – military – immigration – hybridity – Second Intermediate Period

Gaëlle Chantrain

About “Egyptianity” and “Foreignness” in Egyptian Texts. A Context-Sensitive Lexical Study

49

Abstract: Many interesting studies have already been published about the relations between Egypt and its neighbours. I once more would like to return to this question, through a lexical study. I here propose to examine texts from the Old Kingdom until the Third Intermediate Period, with a special focus on the New Kingdom. I present a context-sensitive lexical analysis of qualifiers and expressions related to foreigners, including the distribution of the classifiers. In so doing, I situate the respective places of Asiatics, Nubians and Libyans on the Egyptian’s mental world and I will retrace the chronological evolution of these connections. This study focuses on the evolutionary process of both concepts of “Egyptianity” and “foreignness”, and on the economy of the continuum between these two ends. The final aim is thus to provide new elements in light of a corpus-based study in order to solve—at least partially—the dichotomy between ongoing stereotypes and actual individuals.

Keywords: lexical study – foreigners – contact – classifiers

Susan Cohen

Not so vile? Rhetoric and Reality in Egyptian-Levantine Relationships in Sinai during the Old and Middle Kingdoms

73

Abstract: Egyptian official text and image traditionally described and presented the peoples of the southern Levant using specific rhetoric, hyperbolic language, and canonized visual representation designed to highlight the concept of “Asiatic” subjugation to Egyptian sovereignty. However, while the majority of public monuments and official accounts provided this formal rhetoric, excoriating the “vile Asiatic” in a manner consistent with the Egyptian worldview, other evidence suggests that the reality of Egyptian relationships with southern Levantine peoples did not always conform to the official policy of bellicosity and disdain, and further, that the nature of this relationship changed over time in keeping with contemporary geopolitical circumstances. Specifically, the inscriptions found in Sinai dating to the Old and Middle Kingdoms that provide both textual and visual description of foreigners from the southern Levant reveal significant differences in the view and treatment of “Asiatics” in each period that can be linked with changes in the southern Levant. Examination of these inscriptions from both Old and Middle Kingdoms, together with analysis of contemporary developments in the Bronze Age southern Levant, provides further insight into the interconnections between these regions.

Keywords: Sinai – Asiatic – southern Levant – inscription – Old Kingdom – Middle Kingdom

Katrien De Graef

It Is You, My Love, You, Who Are the Stranger. Akkadian and Elamite at the Crossroads of Language and Writing

91

Abstract: Of old, a patchwork of different peoples and cultures existed within the territory of Western Iran, subjected to political and military dominance and/or influence from neighbouring Mesopotamia. As a result of a continuous interaction and balancing between Mesopotamian and Elamite traditions, values and influences in political, legal, economic and administrative matters, a basic duality of cultures evolved throughout the second millennium BC. This paper focusses on the legal and administrative formulas used in the documentary texts from Sukkalmah Susa, which seem to be for a great part typically local: some, although written in correct Akkadian, clearly reflect local legal practices, others even include Elamite expressions. It is clear that this is neither just a question of a simple transfer of formulas nor a comparison of two legal systems. The use of Elamite phrases and expressions as well as Akkadian phrases and formulations only used in texts from Iran (but not in texts from Mesopotamia) proves we are dealing with a bilingual and bicultural society.

Keywords: Akkadian – Elamite – Sukkalmah State – biculturality

Elena Devecchi

A Reluctant Servant: Ugarit under Foreign Rule during the Late Bronze Age

121

Abstract: The epigraphic finds from Ugarit always represented an unvaluable source of information on the relationship between this rich Syrian kingdom and the Hittites, who ruled over it during the 14th and 13th century BC. While the interaction between Ugarit and Hatti seems to have been relatively easy and smooth during the first decades of Hittite dominance, the relationship between vassal and foreign overlord starts to fray towards the mid of the 13th century BC. The recently published Akkadian texts from the so-called “House of Urtenu” provide now ample new evidence about this situation, conveying the impression that the last kings of Ugarit regularly tried to shirk their obligations towards the Hittite suzerains and their representatives in Syria. This paper will offer an updated overview on this latent conflict, analysing the occasions which prompted the Hittite reprimands and discussing the geo-political background which set the scene for this quite remarkable situation.

Keywords: Ugarit – Hittites – House of Urtenu – Alalah – vassal’s obligations

Anne Goddeeris

A Sumerian Stronghold. Strangers in the House of Enlil?

137

Abstract: During the Old Babylonian period, the members of the clergy of Nippur consider themselves to be the foremost keepers of the Sumerian traditions. Fellow townsmen circulating in other professional circles, magnates from other Babylonian cities and visitors or immigrants from outside Babylonia are not allowed membership to this exclusive category. The social identity approach comprises a group of theories developed in the field of social psychology during the seventies and the eighties explaining the mechanisms of group formation, and the role out-group bias and in-group favouritism. This approach offers a framework to describe and to understand historical processes of group formation and the mechanisms behind the constant changes in it. Although historical sources do not inform us about individual motivations and decisions, it elucidates some factors playing a role in power shifts.

Looking at the temple management in Nippur, the growing role of the palace in the temple of Nippur can be retraced. Whereas palace magnates remain at the fringes of the temple administration when they visit Nippur during the reign of Rīm-Sîn of Larsa, they are able to acquire temple offices during the reign of Samsuiluna of Babylon. At the end of Samsuiluna's rule over Nippur, the palace plays a key role in the temple management.

In this paper, the first phase in this development will be looked at more closely. The foreigners in the administrative archive will be identified and their role will be addressed.

Keywords: Old Babylonian Period – Nippur – palace – temple – social identity

Caleb R. Hamilton

Egyptians as Foreigners in the Western Desert during the Early Dynastic Period

159

Abstract: The Egyptian representation of foreigners can be traced to the earliest period of pharaonic history. During the Early Bronze Age/0 Dynasty, there was an active intent to separate those groups or regions who did not fall within the developing ideological and iconographic ideals promulgated by the Egyptian elite. In contrast to this, with the expansion of Egyptian interests away from the Nile Valley into the neighbouring desert regions, the evidence for the Egyptians as foreigners in these geographical areas is lacking. This paper presents evidence to convey that, during the Early Dynastic Period, the Egyptians were foreigners in the Egyptian Western Desert. This case study focusses on an array of archaeological, iconographic, and ideological evidence which indicates the Egyptian did not present themselves as foreign, even though they were conducting activity in a geographical area that was not yet part of the Egyptian state.

Interactions with the indigenous peoples of the Western Desert, especially in Dakhleh Oasis, conveys the reliance the Egyptians had on others as foreigners in a non-Egyptian region. These interactions seem to have been generally symbiotic, contrasting Egyptian interactions within other regions close to the Nile Valley, such as the Sinai. As non-natives of the Western Desert, the foreignness exhibited by the Egyptians belies the true nature of their initial presence in this region, and can be linked to the articulation of the dominant ideological conventions and iconographic expressions promulgated by royalty and the elite during the Early Dynastic Period.

Keywords: Egyptians – foreigner – Early Dynastic Period – Western Desert

Ann-Kathrin Jeske

**An Egyptian's Footprint: Members of the Egyptian Administration
and Military in LB I Southern Levant** 179

Abstract: Although Egypt's involvement in the Levant during the Late Bronze Age (LB) has been subject to many studies, the early phases of this period have rarely been the primary focus. Furthermore, those who researched the early 18th Dynasty relied heavily on textual sources and even drew on references from documents written in later periods due to the meagre output of information in contemporaneous texts. Since written sources tend to remain elusive regarding the activities of Egyptian functionaries in the southern Levant, it is appropriate to turn to archaeological evidence, as the leading source, to reconstruct Egypt's engagement in this region. This paper presents an approach to filter and analyse the Egyptian material culture excavated in the southern Levant by providing a method to study and interpret such evidence while disregarding texts—at least initially—as an interpretative complement. The theoretical base of the proposed approach are the three concepts object itinerary, cultural appropriation and affordance. Applied to the archaeological record of LB I, the approach suggests that Egypt's involvement was rather limited during this period. Furthermore, there is not any indication for the maintenance of Egyptian garrisons during the Tuthmosid period, except in Tell el-'Ajjul, situated at the terminus of the Way of Horus.

Keywords: Egypt – Levant – early 18th Dynasty – material culture – military

Kevin McGeough

**“The Men of Ura are a Heavy Burden Upon Your Subject!”:
The Administration and Management of Strangers
and Foreigners in Ugarit** 197

Abstract: The Late Bronze Age city of Ugarit has long been identified as a location of ancient cosmopolitanism, where different people from around the eastern Mediterranean and Near East met and interacted. Given the longstanding excavations of the site, the voluminous textual record that has been recovered, and the long history of scholarship, the site offers a unique opportunity to explore the dynamics of “foreignness” in a Late Bronze Age context where the presence of foreigners was, if not normative, expected. Using insights from critical theory derived from the discipline of Geography, this paper explores how, in Engin Isin's terms, the city is not where difference is found but rather where difference is made (labeled and reified), especially through what Julie Young has called “spatial practices and technologies of governance”. Through the examination of locations of every day encounters, this paper shall explore how foreigners are recognized as such, how their relations with non-foreigners are managed (explicitly and implicitly), how different scales of self and otherness are created and maintained, how these constructed identities are naturalized, and what modalities emerge or are imposed to mediate these relationships. Rather than seeking to identify a monolithic approach to foreignness, by examining different examples of micropublic interactions (such as in moments of palatial administration), this paper seeks to untangle some of the multi-scalar and multi-semiotic aspects of foreignness at Ugarit.

Keywords: Ugarit – ancient urbanism – ancient foreignness – Late Bronze Age – ancient administration – urban legibility

Edward Mushett Cole

Ethnic Enclaves: A Modern Understanding of How Migratory Groups Preserve Ethnic Identity as a Potential Explanation for the Libyans' Retention of a Non-Egyptian Identity in the Late New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period **221**

Abstract: It is increasingly accepted in scholarship that the Libyans who entered Egypt during the late New Kingdom and who rose to power during the Third Intermediate Period retained, at the very least, some of their original non-Egyptian ethnic identity. Despite the evidence for this, as well as that revealing the presence of foreigners generally within the Egyptian population across the dynastic era, there has been no explanation of the mechanisms by which the Libyans would have been able to retain this non-Egyptian identity. Such a lack of explanation is significant given that many of the Libyans are believed to have arrived as prisoners-of-war following the various invasions of the late 19th and early 20th Dynasties, who were supposedly “indoctrinated” in Egyptian culture.

This paper will address this gap through reference to a sociological explanation for how modern migrants often retain their ethnic identities after settling within an area with a dominant culture: “ethnic enclaves”. Using the mechanism of “ethnic enclaves” this paper will seek, therefore, to provide some explanation for the Libyans’ retention of a distinctly non-Egyptian identity after their arrival into Egypt.

Keywords: Libyan Period – Third Intermediate Period – Libyans – ethnicity – ethnic enclaves

Jana Mynářová

Are you an Egyptian? Are you a Stranger? Egyptians in the Levant in the Bronze Age **239**

Abstract: Egypt and the Near East. Interactions between these regions are attested from the earliest days when the first political centers started to develop in both parts of the ancient world. For this period, our information on Egyptians living “abroad” is very limited. We can hardly hope to obtain a complete picture of both the daily life of an individual and the foreign policy of the Egyptian rulers based on the evidence we currently have at our disposal. The interpretation of the Egyptian policy towards the Near Eastern polities and their peoples is hence largely dependent on the interpretation of the character of the Egyptian (or Egyptianizing) objects discovered in Near Eastern sites. The same holds true for the Near Eastern perspective as well. During the third millennium BC, the picture provided by the limited number and much formalized character of the Egyptian written evidence is often supplemented by iconographic and archaeological sources. Moreover, there are practically no ancient Near Eastern records mentioning Egyptians living “abroad”. It is only in the second half of the second millennium BC, when the written evidence—both Egyptian and non-Egyptian—becomes sufficient to provide a more detailed account on the Egyptians living “outside the Egyptian borders”. In my paper I will address the question of evidence of Egyptians living in the Near East. The Egyptian sources provide us only with one part of the story—the Egyptian one. But I will rather pay attention to the evidence provided by Near Eastern written documents, mentioning Egypt and especially Egyptians, being part of local communities. This evidence will be set against the perspective provided by official sources, preserved on both sides.

Keywords: Egypt – Near East – foreigners – Bronze Age – written sources

Emanuel Pfoh

Assessing Foreignness and Politics in the Late Bronze Age 257

Abstract: This paper explores the modes of political sociability in the Late Bronze Age Near East, focusing in particular on the political agency of foreigners in their different historical and social manifestations (notably, messengers/ambassadors, merchants) and the socio-political spheres they interacted with in local society. Sociologically speaking, insiders and outsiders to social systems and communities operate through varied and situational codes of sociability, based on and expressed by, for instance, the circumstance of belonging to a kinship group or to a concrete political body or not, which creates positive situations of assistance and reciprocity or negative situations of partial or full rejection and opposition (and the negotiated possibilities in-between these poles). During the Late Bronze Age, instances of hospitality, alliance and subordination were among the key scenarios for dealing positively with and understanding outsiders, as an integral part of the shared codes of political sociability in the East Mediterranean and in South-west Asia of the period. In the present communication, these practices and situations are analysed after the contemporary textual evidence (mainly, letters from Amarna) from the perspective of social anthropology and sociology with the aim of contrasting the theoretical definitions of hospitality, alliance and subordination with those potentially expressed in the textual evidence from the Late Bronze Age.

Keywords: Late Bronze Age – foreigners – hospitality – reciprocity – political sociability

Regine Pruzsinszky

The Contact Zone along the Middle Euphrates: Interaction, Transaction and Movement 269

Abstract: Regarding the overall topic of the 3rd Crossroads conference on the understanding of foreignness in ancient societies this paper takes a closer look on the Late Bronze Age cuneiform archives from the Middle Euphrates area. Emar, the capital of Aštata served as a trading center and important communications junction and its archives attest to various forms of contacts between locals and foreigners. Given the political changes in the region of Aštata in the late 14th century BC, when Emar entered the sphere of the Hittite Empire, special attention will be given to the Hittite influence on the social, administrative, cultural and religious changes in order to identify various forms of foreignness and to detect in which contexts and how local societies interacted with foreigners.

Keywords: Emar – Mittani – Hittites – Assyrians – onomastics – scribal traditions

Clemens Reichel

**“Human Instincts, Canine Intelligence, and Monkey Features”:
The Gutians and Other “Mountain People” in Mesopotamian
and 20th Century Scholarly Perspectives** 285

Abstract: This paper addresses the topic of xenophobia in ancient times and its reflection in modern day scholarship in the case of the Gutians, a population group from Western Iran that invaded the Mesopotamian lowlands during the later part of the Akkadian Dynasty (ca. 2300–2150 BC). The “Curse of Agade”, a literary composition that rationalizes the fall of the Akkadian Dynasty in ideological terms, shows the Gutians as invading hordes that ravaged the cities and hinterland of Mesopotamia at the command of its supreme god Enlil in retaliation for the destruction of the É-kur, Enlil’s temple at Nippur, by Naram-Sin, Agade’s fourth and most illustrious king. Their description as quasi-beasts with animalistic features and behaviors clearly reflects some of the fears and apprehensions against foreigners that were present in ancient Mesopotamia and which this literary composition uses in highly propagandistic terms. Reviewing the available archaeological data it is clear that post-Akkadian literary and historiographic sources overstated the impact of this invasion since no widespread post-Akkadian destructions

are attested at archaeological sites. As this paper will show, this did not stop notable archaeologists of the 20th century from seeking “Gutian” traits in ancient material culture, using stereotypes that very much echo ancient Mesopotamian sentiment.

Keywords: xenophobia – Gutians – archaeology – 20th century scholarship

Seth Richardson

**Aliens and Alienation, Strangers and Estrangement:
Difference-Making as Historically-Particular Concept**

307

Abstract: By looking at issues of host and guest cultures in a particular historical culture (late Middle Bronze Age Babylonia, ca. 17th century BC), this essay examines how their interactions were not only mutually reactive, but even affected categorical understandings of foreignness itself. The chapter looks at a number of arenas of activity: the international scene; differently protected classes of citizens and aliens; exiles, especially elites; foreign mercenaries; class anxiety; women without households; and the isolated and aging nobles who ran the kingdom at the end of the period. By juxtaposing the different bases on which ideas of “insiderness” and “outsiderness” were constructed, including issues of exclusivity and rank within the host culture. Final consideration is made of a possible paradigm shift in this time, when notions first arose about alienation as a personal and interior matter—about isolation as a primarily social and spiritual experience rather than an ethnocultural one.

Keywords: alienation – foreigners – social difference – Babylonia – ethno-cultural identity

Hannah L. Ringheim

The Pharaoh’s Fighters: Early Mercenaries in Egypt

341

Abstract: This paper addresses one of the fundamental ways in which foreigners and Egyptians interacted during the third to second millennium: as foreign soldiers in the Egyptian army. Frequently it is suggested that these are mercenaries hired by the Egyptians; however, how accurate is this identification? When does a non-local fighter become a mercenary? To approach these questions, the paper examines specific examples from tomb inscriptions that document Nubian and Egyptian interactions and the circumstances that led to Nubians in the Egyptian military. The discussion then looks at the later Shardana contingent of the so-called Sea Peoples in the 13th to 12th centuries BC and the varying types of exchanges with the Egyptians, based on wall iconography and texts. The process in which the Shardana infiltrate the Egyptian military suggests that in certain circumstances, they evince characteristics of mercenaries. The evidence exemplifies the first instances when armies relied on foreign hires, a phenomenon that then resonated throughout antiquity.

Keywords: mercenaries – Egypt – warfare – Shardana – Nubians

Katharina Streit

**The Stranger on the Mound: Tracing Cultural Identity
at Tel Lachish during the Late Bronze Age**

355

Abstract: According to both written sources such as the Amarna correspondence, and to archaeological excavations, Tel Lachish was a thriving city and an important part of the diplomatic network of the Late Bronze Age. However, the precise nature of its power relations remains subject to debate, and opinions are divided on whether Egyptians were actually present at the site. It is notoriously difficult to identify individuals of specific cultural groups in the archaeological record. This is due to the complexity of such identities, and the difficulties to distinguish e.g. ethnic and economic factors in past populations. This is further complicated when different variations e.g. of ethnicities well researched in anthropological literature are considered, such as “fluid”, “acquired”, “segmentary”, and “situational” ethnicities. These can only be discerned

with the help of informants. Nevertheless, indications of cultural background can be observed in how it shapes material culture. In this paper two different modes, “embodied cultural automatism” and “conscious cultural choice”, are distinguished and applied to material culture from Lachish, including architecture, burial practice, the ceramic assemblage, and epigraphic finds. It is concluded that while the ruling elite appear to have been local Canaanites, at least some individuals of Egyptian origin, probably engaged in administrative tasks, seem to have been present at the site.

Keywords: cultural identity – Late Bronze Age – southern Levant – Egypt – Tel Lachish

Marta Valerio

**The Egyptians’ Ambivalent Relationship with Foreigners:
The Case of the Prisoners of War in the New Kingdom** 371

Abstract: This paper will suggest that there was a stark difference in the ways in which Egyptians described the foreigner outside or within Egypt. In the first case, the foreigner was at best a stranger element and often an enemy to be fought, in the second case it was an integral part of the society. The “external” foreigner is represented according to precise iconographic codes and epithets that make it easily recognizable in contrast to “the Egyptian being”. But beyond the propagandistic proclamations, what information on the presence of foreigners in Egypt are provided by sources? In the Pharaonic ideology, foreigners represented the Nine Bows against which the Egyptians fought to maintain the order of the *Maat*, a mission that the deity attributed to the Pharaoh. The relationship between Egyptians and foreigners was thus regulated by a dualism that Antonio Loprieno has synthesized using two antithetical concepts: *topos* and *mimesis*. The *topos* considers the Egyptians as superior to “others”, while the *mimesis* expresses the daily practice of relations with foreigners that goes beyond the violent relations underlying the *topos*. Referring to this theory, and using prisoners of war as a case study, this paper will investigate Egyptians’ ambivalent relationship with foreigners.

Keywords: Foreigners – Egypt – prisoners of war – Egyptianisation – otherness

Sarah Vilain

**The Foreign Trade of Tell el-Dab’a during the Second Intermediate Period:
Another Glance at Imported Ceramics under Hyksos Rule** 387

Abstract: The extensive exploration of the archaeological site of Tell el-Dab’a highlighted that ancient Avaris was an active trading centre, as testified by the discovery of large amounts of imported goods from the Middle Kingdom onwards. This paper presents an overview of the evolution of trade at Tell el-Dab’a during the Second Intermediate Period through the study of foreign ceramics discovered at the site. The examination of the distribution of Levantine, Cypriot and Nubian imports is used to pinpoint periods of disturbances or ruptures in the flux of exchanges. Specific attention is given to the takeover of the Hyksos and how this event could have affected the already existing trading connections with other parts of Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean. Finally, this article concludes with some observations about how these trading connections are closely linked to political and cultural developments that occurred in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period.

Keywords: Egypt – Cyprus – Levant – Nubia – Trade – Second Intermediate Period

Federico Zangani

Foreign-Indigenous Interactions in the Late Bronze Age Levant: Tuthmosid Imperialism and the Origin of the Amarna Diplomatic System 405

Abstract: This paper proposes new avenues of research to investigate foreign-indigenous interactions within 18th Dynasty Egyptian imperialism by charting the evolution of the Egyptian political and economic engagement with the northern Levant, from the phase of territorial expansionism under the Tuthmosids to the development of the diplomatic system of the Amarna archive under Amenhotep III. More specifically, it has never been questioned how the world of the Amarna letters originated in the first place, but it is likely, as I will argue, that this world did not exist at the time of Tuthmose III. In fact, the geopolitical situation in the Levant in the 15th century BC was radically different from a century later: while Tuthmose III campaigned systematically between Canaan and northern Syria, Amenhotep III no longer had this necessity, and military activity was limited to a few, targeted operations. This paper suggests that the analysis of the evidence should include not only the Egyptian royal inscriptions and the Amarna letters, but also contemporary archives from the Egyptian provincial centre in Lebanon at Kāmid el-Lōz and from the Syrian kingdom of Qaṭna, which could elucidate how 18th Dynasty Egypt coerced and/or negotiated with the indigenous realities in order to attain its own political and economic interests, and at the same time maintain regional stability. Moreover, it seems quite plausible that Egyptian territorial expansionism in the New Kingdom originated as pre-emptive warfare after the Hyksos rule, similarly to the development of Roman imperialism following Hannibal's invasion of Italy in the second Punic war. Finally, principles of political realism in the writings of Thucydides and Machiavelli will be discussed, with a view to demonstrating their profound applicability to the geopolitical systems of the Late Bronze Age.

Keywords: Egyptian imperialism – Amarna letters – pre-emptive warfare – Thucydides – Machiavelli

Indices

425

Preface

“The Crossroads III – A Stranger in the House. Foreigners in Ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern Societies of the Bronze Age”, has been held at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University (Prague) between September 10 and 13, 2018.

The main objective of the conference was to enhance our understanding of “foreignness” in ancient societies of the Near East and Egypt between the end of the Chalcolithic period and the end of the Late Bronze Age.

Our goal, while organizing the conference, was to bring together archaeologists, philologists, as well as historians to obtain a balanced insight into the historical, social, cultural and economic aspects of “foreignness” of the respective regions (Mesopotamia, Anatolia, Levant, Egypt) at this particular moment in time. We are firmly convinced that the dialogue between experts of various disciplines is not only highly desirable, but it is also a necessity for gaining a deeper and meaningful understanding of complex social dynamics.

We thus tried to collect papers that treated the topic of “foreignness” from archaeological, historical, iconographic and philological points of view, suggesting to the contributor a series of possible research questions: Who is a foreigner, and how do we recognise foreigners in ancient societies? What is the role of foreigners and how did foreigners and indigenous population(s) interact? What can be said about foreigners as enemies of the state, and about foreigners as allies? What did it mean to be a “foreigner” in an ancient Near Eastern society? And what were the ways of communicating of individuals and societies?

The number of papers we have received, and their quality showed that this topic is very relevant in the contemporary academic discourse, and that there is a widespread desire to explore and discuss it.

This desire was well reflected already in the paper of the keynote speakers that opened the conference. In particular, Clemens Reichel discussed the characterization of the Gutians as attested in the sources of the later third and early second millennium BC, and he reassessed the scale and impact of the “Gutian invasion” taking into consideration more recent historical and archaeological evidence. Seth Richardson reviewed the terminology attested in Old Babylonian texts to refer to social roles that may have been at least in part associated with foreigners, and then discussed the general conceptual construction of “strangers/strangeness” in the Old Babylonian period. Regine Pruzsinsky, instead, explored how one can identify foreigners in the Late Bronze texts from Emar, and what such texts tell us about their interactions with the local societies. Elena Devecchi offered a reassessment of the latent conflict between the Ugaritic elite and their Hittite suzerains in the final phase of the Late Bronze Age on the basis of the documents found in the “House of Urtenu”. Kevin McGeough used insights from critical theory derived from the discipline of geography to explore “foreignness” and foreign identity, by examining examples of micropublic interactions in an urban reality like that of Ugarit. Finally, Jana Mynářová reassessed the evidence

for the presence of Egyptians living in the Near East during the Bronze Age, with special attention given to the Late Bronze Age sources, discussing it in relation with both Egyptian and Near Eastern official documents.

The 26 papers and 6 posters that were presented at the conference declined these topics in multiple different ways. Some decided to approach the discussion from a theoretical perspective, or to present and discuss theoretical frameworks that could be used to explore at least some of elements underlying the concept of “foreignness”. Others investigated sociocultural dimension involved in the presence of foreigners, or in their interactions with local communities. Some papers focused on specific case studies, some looked for foreigners in archaeological evidence or written sources, while others turned to languages and linguistics, exploring the social interactions hidden behind the spread and circulation of loanwords and *wanderworts*, or assessing the meanings and connotations of terms used to refer to various foreign groups. Cases from Egypt, Mesopotamia, Anatolia and the Levant, covering the whole of the Bronze Age have been discussed. The wide range of perspectives, and their combination within the frame of the conference often stimulated that multidisciplinary dialogue that was the primary aim of this third edition of *Crossroads*.

This book collects some of the twenty most significant contributions presented at the conference. The contributions are here presented in alphabetic order, as the numbers of interconnections that could be highlighted among them makes any attempt to group them somehow limiting and counterproductive: we, as the editors, believe that all these papers are part of a single coherent ensemble, and we wish to present them here as such.

In Prague on July 21, 2019

Jana Mynářová, Marwan Kilani,
and Sergio Alivernini

Contributors

Danielle Candelora is an Egyptian archaeologist and Ph.D. Candidate in the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her research investigates the multivariate processes of identity negotiation in the Middle to Late Bronze Ages, focusing on theoretical approaches to immigration and the influence of immigrants on their host culture. In particular she examines the Eastern Nile Delta during the Second Intermediate Period, specifically the Hyksos and their impact on later Egyptian culture and especially the Ramesside conception of kingship. She has excavated a Revolutionary War battlefield in New Jersey, a Roman fortress in Spain, a Crusader site in Israel, as well as a Karanis, a Greco-Roman settlement in Egypt. She is currently co-editing a volume on the social history of ancient Egypt, and is a member of the UCLA Coffins Project directed by Kara Cooney.

Gaëlle Chantrain is a postdoctoral associate and lecturer in Egyptology at the department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization of Yale University and Post-doctoral researcher *in absentia* at the Belgian National Fund for Scientific Research (FNRS). She did her master at the University of Liege (Belgium), where she was also collaborator in the Ramses Project. She completed her Ph.D. at the University of Louvain (Belgium), with a research fellowship from FNRS. During her Ph.D., she worked as an invited research associate at the Humboldt University in Berlin and then obtained a postdoc at the Czech Institute of Egyptology of the Charles University in Prague. Her work lays at the intersection between Egyptology and linguistics. Her main research interests are Egyptian philology, lexical semantics, classifiers studies, cognitive linguistics and semantic typology. She is also very interested in the development of digital humanities and is involved in several collaborative projects both in Egyptology and linguistics.

Susan Cohen received her Ph.D. in Syro-Palestinian Archaeology and Hebrew Bible from the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University in 2000. She directed the excavations at the Middle Bronze Age cemetery at Gesher, and the small rural multi-period site of Tel Zahara, both in the Jordan Valley. She is currently Chair of the Department of History and Philosophy at Montana State University.

Katrien De Graef obtained her Ph.D. in Assyriology from Ghent University, Belgium in 2004. She is currently Associate Professor of Assyriology and History of the Ancient Near East at Ghent University. Her research focuses primarily on the socio-economic history of the Old Babylonian period in general, and that of the cities of Sippar and Susa in particular, including gender studies and sealing praxis, and the relation between Babylonia and Elam in the third and second millennium BC. She published 2 monographs and more than 50 articles and book chapters and was epigraphist during the Belgo-Syrian excavations at Chagar Bazar (Syria).

Elena Devecchi is Researcher in History of the Ancient Near East at the Department of Historical Studies of the University of Turin. After receiving her Ph.D. at the University of Venice, she worked in Germany (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München and Julius-Maximilians-Universität, Würzburg), Belgium (KU Leuven) and Austria (University of Innsbruck), where she carried out postdoctoral projects and taught classes on Akkadian and Hittite. Her scientific interests focus on the Near East during the Late Bronze Age, in particular on historical and diplomatic texts from Anatolia and Syria (see *Trattati internazionali ittiti*, Brescia 2015), and on the economic and administrative institutions of Kassite Babylonia. She is epigraphist of the archaeological mission conducted by the University and by the “Centro Ricerche Archeologiche e Scavi” of Turin at the site of Tulūl al-Baqarat (Iraq).

Anne Goddeeris teaches cuneiform languages and courses on the history of the Ancient Near East at Ghent University. Her research is centered around Old Babylonian society. Her publications include a monograph on the early Old Babylonian economy and society and publications of cuneiform archival documents in various collections (SANTAG 9, TMH 10).

Caleb R. Hamilton completed his Ph.D. at Monash University in 2016, graduating in 2017. His recent research centres on evidence from the Early Dynastic period in the desert margins of the Nile Valley, and also the nature of Egyptian interactions in Western Desert, including a reassessment of evidence for an unnamed king. He has also begun to assist with research on an ARC Discovery Project, exploring the archaeological nature of the cult of Seth in Egypt, under the direction of Colin Hope (Monash University), Gill Bowen (Monash University), and Iain Gardner (University of Sydney). He is also completing several edited volumes, as well as a monograph based on his doctoral dissertation.

Ann-Kathrin Jeske is a Ph.D. student and uni:docs fellow at the Institute of Egyptology, University of Vienna, studying the activities of Egyptian officials and soldiers in the southern Levant from the Protodynastic to the 18th Dynasty. Ann-Kathrin received her BA in “Ancien Cultures in the Eastern Mediterranean” at Georg August-Universität Göttingen and finished her MA studies in “Egyptology” at Johannes Gutenberg-University Mainz.

Kevin McGeough is Professor of Archaeology in the Department of Geography at the University of Lethbridge in Canada and holds a Board of Governor’s Research Chair in Archaeological Theory and Reception. He has been the editor of the *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, ASOR’s *Archaeological Report Series*, and is currently co-editor of the *Alberta Archaeological Review*. McGeough is the author of a three-volume series on the reception of archaeology, called *The Ancient Near East in the Nineteenth Century*. McGeough has also written extensively on economic issues at the Late Bronze Age site of Ugarit, including two books, *Exchange Relationships at Ugarit* and *Ugaritic Economic Tablets: Text, Translations, and Notes*.

Edward Mushett Cole graduated with a Ph.D. from the University of Birmingham in 2017 entitled *Decline in Ancient Egypt? A reassessment of the late New King-*

dom and Third Intermediate Period. He currently works as the Postgraduate Student Experience Officer in the College of Arts and Law at the University of Birmingham and has published several papers, most recently “‘The year of hyenas when there was a famine’: An assessment of environmental causes for the events of the Twentieth Dynasty” in C. Langer’s *Global Egyptology* (London 2017).

Jana Mynářová is Associate Professor of Egyptology at the Czech Institute of Egyptology, Charles University. She obtained her Ph.D. in Philology – Languages of Asia and Africa in 2004. Her research focuses on various aspects of the relations between Egypt and the Ancient Near East in the second millennium BC, with special attention given to documents in Peripheral Akkadian. She is the author and co-author of several books and studies on the topic (*Language of Amarna – Language of Diplomacy. Perspectives on the Amarna Letters*, Prague 2007). Presently, she carries a research project devoted to the study of Amarna cuneiform palaeography and she is a member of a multidisciplinary research project dealing with the collection of the Old Assyrian tablets held at Charles University. She is the main organiser of the Crossroads conferences devoted to study of interrelations among the ANE societies in the Bronze Age.

Emanuel Pfoh is Researcher at the National Research Council (CONICET) and Assistant Professor in the Department of History of the National University of La Plata, Argentina. He is author of *The Emergence of Israel in Ancient Palestine: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives* (2009), *Anthropology and the Bible* (ed. 2010), *The Politics of Israel’s Past* (co-edited with K.W. Whitelam, 2013) and *Syria-Palestine in the Late Bronze Age: An Anthropology of Politics and Power* (2016).

Regine Pruzsinszky is an Assyriologist at the Institute of Archaeological Studies at the University of Freiburg. Her research interests focus on cuneiform records from the Late Bronze Age, the chronology of Mesopotamia, Ancient Near Eastern onomastic and musicians. She is the author of *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar* (Bethesda, 2003), and *Mesopotamian Chronology of the 2nd Millennium BCE. An Introduction to the Textual Evidence and Related Chronological Issues* (Vienna, 2009). Among other edited books she has edited a volume on *Policies of Exchange, Political Systems and Modes of Interaction in the Aegean and the Near East in the 2nd Millennium B.C.E.* (Vienna, 2015) together with Birgitta Eder.

Clemens Reichel is Associate Professor for Mesopotamian Archaeology at the University of Toronto’s Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations and an Associate Curator for the Ancient Near East at the Royal Ontario Museum (*Mesopotamia: Inventing our World*, 2013). His research focuses predominantly on problems of complex societies, state formation, evolution of urbanism, bureaucracy, social and art history, and history of conflict and warfare. He has excavated and surveyed extensively on sites in Turkey, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt. Since 1999 he has been the director of the Diayala Project, aiming to publish an extensive collection of objects from the excavations of the Oriental Institute (University of Chicago) in the Diyala Region during the 1930’s in an online database. Since 2004 he has been directing the Hamoukar Expedition in a joint project between the University of Chicago’s Oriental Institute and the Syrian Department of Antiquities.

Seth Richardson is an Assyriologist and historian of the ancient world. He took his degree at Columbia University in 2002, and currently works at the University of Chicago as Managing Editor for the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* and an Associate of the Oriental Institute. He works on historical topics related to state society and subjectivity, the politics of the body, the collapse of the First Dynasty of Babylon, as well as issues related to slaves, women, and political theory.

Hannah L. Ringheim is a fellow in Greek Archaeology at the University of Edinburgh. She has worked on excavations in Greece, Israel, Turkey, and Cyprus and is currently part of two projects in Egypt. Her main research interests include trade networks and interconnections between the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean. She is currently writing a book on mercenary warfare in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Katharina Streit is a specialist in the archaeology of the southern Levant and her research covers the Pottery Neolithic to Iron Age in this region. She is currently a postdoctoral researcher at the Martin Buber Society of Fellows of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel. Her main research interests include material culture and symbolic behaviour, chronological issues and radiocarbon dating as well as transregional exchange. She directed her first excavation at the Chalcolithic site of Ein el-Jarba, funded by the Fritz Thyssen foundation, which was completed in 2016. Since 2017, she has been the co-director (together with Felix Höflmayer) of the current Tel Lachish excavations.

Marta Valerio is currently chercheur associé at the Université Paul Valéry-Montpellier 3. In December 2017 she completed her Ph.D. at the Université Paul Valéry-Montpellier 3 and the Università degli Studi di Torino with a dissertation on the treatment of prisoners of war during the New Kingdom. Her research interests include social organization, work organization, condition of foreigners in Ancient Egypt, especially in the New Kingdom.

Sarah Vilain is currently a post-doctoral fellow at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, for the ERC Advanced Grant Project “The Enigma of the Hyksos”. She studied both Greek and Oriental Archaeology at the University Rennes 2 (France) before starting a Ph.D. at the University of Strasbourg (France). During this time, she benefited from a scholarship of the French Institute for the Near East (IFPO) and participated in archaeological excavations in Syria and Lebanon. Her dissertation, titled “Pour une archéologie des échanges en Méditerranée orientale, la céramique chypriote au Levant nord aux âges du Bronze moyen et du Bronze récent” investigated the distribution and circulation of Cypriot pottery in the Northern Levant in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. Her main research interest concerns trading connections between Cyprus, the Levant and Egypt in the second millennium BC.

Federico Zangani received a BA in Egyptology and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in 2014 from the University of Oxford, where he studied both Egyptology and Assyriology, and is now a Ph.D. candidate in Egyptology at Brown University. His main research interests include Near Eastern languages, philology, the cultural and political history of Egypt’s New Kingdom and Late Bronze Age Syria, and the interconnectedness of the Near East and the Mediterranean.

Abbreviations

ÄA	Ägyptologische Abhandlungen (Wiesbaden)
AAPSS	The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (Thousand Oaks, CA)
AAR	African Archaeological Review (Cambridge)
AAS	Annales Archéologiques de la Syrie (Damascus)
AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research (New Haven – Cambridge)
ÄAT	Ägypten und Altes Testament. Studien zur Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des Alten Testaments (Wiesbaden)
AbB	Altbabylonische Briefe im Umschrift und Übersetzung (Leiden)
ABBWLS	Alternative Broad Band and Wavy Line Style
ABSA	Annual of the British School at Athens (London)
Ad	Ammiditana
ADAIK	Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo (Glückstadt – Mainz – Berlin)
AE	American Ethnologist (Washington, DC)
Ae	Abi-ešuh
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung (Berlin – Wien)
AHw	W. von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . I–III. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1959–1981.
AIIN	<i>Annali dell'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica</i> (Roma)
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology (Princeton – Baltimore)
AJP	American Journal of Philology (Baltimore)
AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures (Chicago)
ALASP(M)	Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas (Münster)
<i>Am. J. Sociol.</i>	American Journal of Sociology (Chicago)
<i>Am. Sociol. Rev.</i>	American Sociological Review (New York)
AMD	Ancient magic and divination (Leiden – Boston)
ANESS	Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement Series (Louvain)
ANET ³	J.B. Pritchard, <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . Princeton: Princeton University Press 1969 (3 rd edition).
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament (Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn)
<i>AnSt</i>	Anatolian Studies (Ankara)
<i>AoF</i>	Altorientalische Forschungen (Berlin)
ARCANE	Associated Regional Chronologies for the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (Turnhout)
<i>ArchAnz</i>	Archäologischer Anzeiger (Berlin)
<i>ArOr</i>	Archiv Orientální (Praha)
ARWAW	Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Opladen)

As.	Tell Asmar <i>sigla</i>
ASAE	Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte (Le Caire)
ASE	Archaeological Survey of Egypt (London)
ASJ	Acta Sumeriologica (Hiroshima)
ASR	<i>American Sociological Review</i> (New York)
Aş	Ammişaduqa
ÄuL	Ägypten und Levante (Wien)
AuOr	Aula Orientalis (Barcelona)
AV	Archäologische Veröffentlichungen (Berlin – Mainz am Rhein)
BA	The Biblical Archaeologist (New Haven)
BaM	Baghdader Mitteilungen (Berlin)
BAP	B. Meissner, <i>Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht</i> . Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs 1893.
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research (New Haven)
BBS	Broad Band Style
BdÉ	Bibliothèque d'étude (Paris)
BES	Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar (New York)
BES	Brown Egyptological studies (Oxford – Providence)
BiAeg	Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca (Bruxelles)
BIFAO	Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale (Le Caire)
BiMes	Bibliotheca Mesopotamica (Malibu)
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis (Leiden)
BM	Museum siglum of the British Museum, London
BMPES	British Museum Publications on Egypt and Sudan (London)
BMSAES	British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan (London)
BN	Biblische Notizen. Beiträge zur exegetischen Diskussion (Bamberg).
BOQ	W.G. Lambert, <i>Babylonian Oracle Questions</i> . MC 13. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 2007.
BTM	B. Foster, <i>Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature</i> . Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 1996.
BS res.	Black Slip / Reserved Slip
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies (London)
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin)
BzN	Beiträge zur Namenforschung (Heidelberg)
CA	Colloquia Antiqua (Leuven)
CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago</i> (Chicago)
CahDAFI	Cahiers de la Délégation archéologique française en Iran (Paris)
CAJ	Cambridge Archaeological Journal (Cambridge)
CASAE	Cahiers supplémentaires des ASAE (Le Caire)
CBS	Museum siglum of the University Museum, Philadelphia (Catalogue of the Babylonian Section)
CCÉ	Cahier de la céramique égyptienne (Le Caire)
CChEM	Contributions to the Chronology of the Eastern Mediterranean (Wien)

<i>CdÉ</i>	Chronique d'Égypte (Bruxelles)
CDLI	Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative (Los Angeles – Berlin)
CDLN	<i>Cuneiform Digital Library Notes</i> (Los Angeles – Berlin)
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East (Leiden – Boston)
CIS	Copenhagen International Seminar (London – New York)
CLS	Cross Line Style
CM	Cuneiform Monographs (Groningen)
CNIP	Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications (Copenhagen)
CRAIBL	Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (Paris)
CSSH	Comparative Studies in Society and History (New York)
CT	Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum (London)
CTH	L. Laroche, <i>Catalogue des textes hittites</i> . Paris: Klincksieck 1971.
CUSAS	Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology (Bethesda, MD)
DB Suppl.	L. Pirot – A. Robert – H. Cazelles – A. Feuillet, eds., <i>Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible</i> . I–VIII. Paris: Letouzey & Ané 1938–1972.
DN	Divine name
E	texts from Emar, see D. Arnaud, <i>Recherches au pays d'Aštata. Emar 6/1–4</i> . Paris: ÉRC 1986.
EA	J.A. Knudtzon, <i>Die El-Amarna-Tafeln</i> . VB2. Aalen: Zeller 1964 (2 nd edition); A.F. Rainey, <i>El Amarna Tablets 359-379. Supplement to J.A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln</i> . AOAT 8. Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker – Neukirchener Verlag 1970.
EA	Egyptian Archaeology (London)
ÉAO	Égypte Afrique & Orient (Montségur)
EB	Early Bronze (Age)
EES EM	EES Excavation Memoirs (London)
EIW	W. Hinz – H. Koch, <i>Elamisches Wörterbuch</i> . Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag 1987.
<i>Ethn. Racial Stud.</i>	Ethnic and Racial Studies (Abingdon)
ETCSL	Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature (Oxford)
EU	Egyptologische Uitgaven (Leiden – Leuven)
GM	Göttinger Miszellen (Göttingen)
GN	Geographical name
GOF	Göttinger Orientforschungen IV. Reihe: Ägypten (Wiesbaden)
HÄB	Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge (Hildesheim)
HANE/M	History of the Ancient Near East. Monographs (Padova)
HANE/S	History of the Ancient Near East. Studies (Padova)
Haradum II	F. Joannès – Ch. Kepiski-Lecomte – C. Colbow, <i>Haradum II. Les textes de la période paléo-babylonienne, Samsu-iluma – Ammi-šaduqa</i> . Paris: ÉRC 2006.
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik (Leiden – Boston)
Hdt.	Herodotus, <i>Histories</i>
HPA	High Priest of Amun
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs (Atlanta, GA)

HSS	Harvard Semitic Series (Cambridge, MA – Winona Lake, IN)
<i>IJMES</i>	International Journal of Middle East Studies (Cambridge)
<i>IrAnt</i>	Iranica Antiqua (Leiden)
<i>J. Anthropol. Archaeol.</i>	Journal of Anthropological Archaeology (New York)
JA	Journal asiatique (Paris)
JAEl	Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections (Tucson, AZ)
JANER	Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions (Leiden – Boston)
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society (Baltimore – Boston – New Haven)
JARCE	<i>Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt</i> (Baltimore – Boston – Princeton – New Haven)
JAS	Journal of Archaeological Science (London – New York)
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies (New Haven – Baltimore)
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology (London)
JEH	Journal of Egyptian History (Swansea)
JEOL	Jaarbericht van het Voor-Aziatisch-Egyptisch-Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux (Leiden)
JESHO	Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient (Leiden)
JGA	Journal of Greek Archaeology (Oxford)
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies (Chicago)
<i>J. Popul. Econ.</i>	Journal of Population Economics (New York)
JRAI (N.S.)	Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (London)
JSA	Journal of Social Archaeology (London)
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (Sheffield)
JSS	Journal of the Semitic Studies (Manchester)
JSSEA	Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities (Toronto)
KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi (Leipzig – Berlin)
KRI	K.A. Kitchen, <i>Ramesside Inscriptions. Historical and Biographical</i> . I–VIII. Oxford: Blackwell 1975–1990.
KRITANC	K.A. Kitchen, <i>Ramesside Inscriptions. Translated and Annotated. Notes and Comments</i> . I–VII. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell 1995–2014.
KSG	Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen (Wiesbaden)
KTU	M. Dietrich – O. Loretz – J. Sanmartín, <i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit</i> . AOAT 24/1. Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker – Neukirchener Verlag 1976; M. Dietrich – O. Loretz – J. Sanmartín, <i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit</i> . ALASP(M) 8. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 1995 (2 nd edition).
KUB	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi (Berlin)
LAPO	Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient (Paris)
LE	Codex Eshnunna
LH	Codex Hammurabi
<i>LingAeg</i>	Lingua Aegyptia (Göttingen)
MB	Middle Bronze (Age)

MC	Mesopotamian Civilizations (Winona Lake, IN)
MDAIK	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo (Mainz – Cairo – Berlin – Wiesbaden)
MDP	Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse (Paris)
MH	Medinet Habu texts
MHET	Mesopotamian History and Environment (Ghent)
MHET I	K. Van Lerberghe – G. Voet, <i>Sippar-Amnānum: the Ur-utu archive</i> . MHET 3/I. Ghent: University of Ghent 1991.
MHET II	L. Dekiere, <i>Old Babylonian Real Estate Documents</i> , Parts 1–6. MHET 3/II. Ghent: University of Ghent 1994–1997.
MHR	Mediterranean Historical Review (London)
MIE	Mémoires de l’Institut Égyptien (Le Caire)
MIFAO	Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire (Le Caire)
MonAeg	Monumenta Aegyptiaca (Bruxelles)
MRS	Mission des Ras Shamra (Paris)
MVS	Münchner Vorderasiatische Studien (München)
N.A.B.U.	Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires (Paris)
NEA	Near Eastern Archaeology (Atlanta, GA)
OA	Oriens Antiquus (Roma)
OAC	Orientis Antiqui Collectio (Roma)
OB	Old Babylonian
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis (Fribourg)
OBO SA	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archeologica (Fribourg)
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications (Chicago)
OIS	Oriental Institute Seminars (Chicago)
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta (Leuven)
Or NS	Orientalia, Nova Series (Roma)
PdÄ	Probleme der Ägyptologie (Leiden – Boston – Köln)
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly (London)
PIHANS	Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul (Leiden)
PIOL	Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Leuven (Louvain)
PLS	Pendent Line Style
PM	B. Porter – R. Moss, <i>Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings</i> . I–VII. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1927–1951; Oxford: Griffith Institute 1960–(2 nd edition).
PMMAEE	Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition (New York)
PN	Personal name
PRU	Le palais royal d’Ugarit (Paris)
PSBA	Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology (London)
PW	Plain White Hand-made Ware
PWS	Proto White Slip
QS	Qatna Studien (Wiesbaden)
RA	<i>Revue d’assyriologie et d’archéologie orientale</i> (Paris)
RANT	Res Antiquae (Bruxelles)

<i>RdÉ</i>	<i>Revue d'Égyptologie</i> (Leuven)
RIK	<i>Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1936–.
RIME	Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Early Periods (Toronto)
<i>RIA</i>	E. Ebellling – B. Meissner – E. Weidner – W. von Soden – D.O. Edzard, eds., <i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie</i> . 1–15. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1928–2018.
RoB	Red-on-Black
RS	Ras Shamra <i>siglum</i> ; or Red Slip pottery
<i>RSO</i>	Rivista degli Studi Orientali (Roma)
RSO	Ras Shamra – Ougarit (Paris)
SAHL	Studies in the Archaeology and History of the Levant (Winona Lake, IN)
<i>SAK</i>	Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur (Hamburg)
SANER	Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records (Berlin – Boston)
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization (Chicago)
SBA	Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde (Bonn)
SCCNH	Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians (Bethesda, MD)
Sd	Samsuditana
SDAIK	Sonderschrift des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Abteilung Kairo (Wiesbaden)
<i>SEL</i>	Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico (Verona)
Si	Field numbers of tablets from Sippar, held in the collections of the Archaeological Museum, Istanbul
SSL	Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics (Leiden – Boston)
StBoT	Studien zu den Boghazköy-Texten (Wiesbaden)
StMed	Studia Mediterranea (Pavia)
StOr	Studia Orientalia. Edidit Societas Orientalis Fennica (Helsinki)
SVJAD	A.P. Riftin, <i>Staro-vavilonskije juridičeskije i administracionye dokumenty v sobranijach SSSR</i> . Moscow: Izd. AN SSSR 1937.
TA	Tel Aviv (Tel Aviv)
TLOB 1	S. Richardson, <i>Texts from the Late Old Babylonian Period</i> . Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series 2. Boston: ASOR 2010.
TLOB 2	S. Richardson, <i>A Texts from the Late Old Babylonian Period 2.1: Sales of Slaves and Cattle</i> . In prep.
TLS	Tangent Line Style
TMH	Texte und Materialien der Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection, Jena (Leipzig – Berlin)
TUAT N.F.	Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments. Neue Folge (Gütersloh)
TVOA	Testi del Vicino Oriente antico (Brescia)
OREA	Oriental and European Archaeology (Vienna)
UAVA	Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie (Berlin)
Ug.	Ugaritica (Paris)
UF	Ugarit-Forschungen (Münster)

UM	<i>Sigla</i> in the collections of the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
UMM	University Museum Monograph (Philadelphia)
Urk. I	K. Sethe, <i>Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums I. Urkunden des alten Reiches</i> . Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1903.
Urk. IV	K. Sethe, <i>Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums IV. Urkunden der 18. Dynastie</i> , Heft 1–16, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1906–1909; W. Helck, <i>Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums IV. Urkunden der 18. Dynastie</i> , Heft 17–22. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1955–1958.
VB	Vorderasitische Bibliothek (Leipzig)
VS	Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin (Berlin)
WA	World Archaeology (London)
Wb.	A. Erman – W. Grapow, <i>Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache</i> . I–VII. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung 1926–1931.
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World (Atlanta, GA)
WdO	Die Welt des Orients (Wuppertal – Göttingen)
WP	White Painted
WPWM	White Painted Wheel-made
YES	Yale Egyptological Studies (New Haven)
YOS	Yale Oriental Series (New Haven)
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie (Leipzig – Berlin)
ZAR	Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte (Wiesbaden)
ZAW	Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin)
ZDPV	Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins (Stuttgart – Wiesbaden)

A RELUCTANT SERVANT: UGARIT UNDER FOREIGN RULE DURING THE LATE BRONZE AGE

Elena Devecchi (University of Turin)*

Since their first discoveries, the epigraphic finds from Ugarit (modern Ras Shamra) provided a unique insight into the relationship between the Hittite kingdom and one of its most important Syrian vassals. These texts constitute an exceptional corpus, because Ugarit is the only Hittite vassal whose archives cover its political history in such great detail and for the whole period of Hittite domination. The texts found at Ḫattuša, the Hittite capital, contribute very little to our knowledge of Ugarit, and the few references to Ugarit that do appear in the Hittite texts are of little use in reconstructing the relationship between that city and Ḫatti;¹ conversely, other Hittite vassals (in Syria as well as in Anatolia) are amply represented in the documents from Ḫattuša, but often we have no sources from the vassals themselves. Indeed, if Ugarit's archives had not been discovered, we would barely know that it was part of the Hittite kingdom, not only because of the paucity of references to the city in Hittite textual sources, but also because Hittite dominion over Ugarit is not reflected in the material culture of the site, where objects of possible Anatolian origin are extremely rare (Genz 2006; Glatz 2013: 36–43).

The recent publication of Akkadian texts discovered in the so-called “House of Urtenu” (Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016) adds valuable information on the interaction between Ugarit and Ḫatti in the final phase of the Late Bronze Age. The new evidence reinforces the impression that the last kings of Ugarit regularly tried to shirk their obligations towards their Hittite suzerains and at the same time provides a different historical framework for some events known from earlier textual finds, altogether allowing a better understanding of the occasions on which the kings of Ugarit showed insubordinate behaviour and of the Hittite response.

Even though this contribution focuses on the last decades of Ugarit's history in the second half of the 13th century BC, it will be useful to quickly recall its earlier history as a Hittite vassal in order to appreciate how the interaction between subordinate and overlord changed over time.

* This paper was written within the framework of the PRIN-project (2015) “L’Anatolia antica: politiche imperiali e culture locali tra XV e VII secolo a.C. Problemi di etnicità, assetti urbani e territoriali, tradizione e innovazione”.

¹ Ugarit is attested only in the following handful of Hittite texts: KBo 1.10+: letter of Ḫattusili III to Kadašman-Enlil II (CTH 172); KBo 16.39+: fragment of a historical text (CTH 215); KUB 26.66: inventory of metals, tools, and weapons (CTH 242); KUB 42.84: acknowledgment of receipt (CTH 247); KUB 15.35+ and KBo 35.170: ritual for Ištar of Nineveh (CTH 716); KUB 15.34: evocation ritual (CTH 483).

Ugarit became part of the Hittite empire around 1330 BC, in the wake of Suppiluliuma I's military campaigns that led the Hittites to overpower the kingdom of Mittani, previously the leading power in the area, and then conquer northern Syria. At that time, Niqmaddu II (ca. 1350–1315 BC) was on the throne of Ugarit. We do not know the details of the Hittite conquest of his kingdom, since the documents recovered in the “international archive” of Ugarit's royal palace inform us only of the events that followed Ugarit's subjugation, not of those that led to it.² It seems, however, that Ugarit did not resist the Hittites and remained loyal to its new overlord even when a group of neighbouring Syrian kings (the kings of Mukiš, Nuḥašše, and Niya)³ revolted against Suppiluliuma and, by invading Ugarit, tried to involve Niqmaddu in the rebellion. However, Niqmaddu refused to participate and his loyalty was rewarded by Suppiluliuma, who issued edicts granting Niqmaddu territories on the border with Mukiš as well as the right to retain fugitives who might have entered his country from Mukiš and Nuḥašše (Devecchi 2012: 640–643; 2013: 85–87).

Little is known about the rule of Ar-Ḫalba (ca. 1315–1313 BC), Niqmaddu II's successor. To explain his presumably very short reign, it has been suggested that he had been plotting against Ḫatti at the time of the Egyptian-supported rebellion of the Syrian vassals during the reign of Muršili II and therefore was deposed relatively soon after his accession (Singer 1999: 637–638). A travertine vase bearing the name of Horemheb discovered at Ugarit (RS 17.420+17.421) has been traditionally interpreted as evidence supporting Ugarit's alliance with Egypt and its involvement in the rebellion (Lagarce 2008: 268–269, 274–275). However, it is possible that Ḫatti and Egypt were at peace during at least part of Horemheb's reign, thus one should at least consider the possibility that Horemheb's vase reached Ugarit during such a period (Devecchi – Miller 2011: 145–146). In that case, its presence at Ugarit would be an indication that the coastal kingdom was naturally exploiting this favourable situation and entertaining friendly relations with a Hittite ally (Devecchi 2015: 120). Lastly, there is no conclusive evidence supporting Ugarit's involvement in the rebellion and, as Itamar Singer suggested, “Ar-ḫalba's prompt disappearance could simply have been caused by non-political circumstances, such as sudden illness and death” (Singer 1999: 638).

As far as we know, Niqmepa, the next king of Ugarit (ca. 1313–1260 BC), remained loyal to the Hittites throughout his entire reign. He was a contemporary of no less than four Hittite kings (Mursili II, Muwatalli II, Mursili III, and Ḫattusili III), none of whom seems to have had reason to complain about his behaviour. Most importantly, Niqmepa was ready to fight alongside the Hittites on the occasion of the crucial battle of Qadeš against Egypt (see Singer 1999: 644 with n. 122).

² For this dating of the documents issued by Suppiluliuma I for Niqmaddu II, see Devecchi 2013 with references to previous literature.

³ Referred to either as “the kings of Nuḥašše and the king of Mukiš” (CTH 45 and 47) or by their personal names: Itūr-Addu, king of Mukiš, Addu-Nirārī, king of Nuḥašše, and Aki(t)-Teššup, king of Niya (CTH 46).

While the interaction between Ugarit and Ḫatti seems to have been relatively easy and smooth during the first decades of Hittite dominance, towards the mid of the 13th century BC the relationship between vassal and overlord starts to fray.

A certain disregard for Hittite authority is first shown by Ammistamru II (ca. 1260–1235 BC), who had a relatively long reign towards the mid-13th century BC and was a contemporary of Ḫattusili III and Tuḫaliya IV. This is witnessed by an episode recorded in two Akkadian letters sent by Takuḫli, a representative of Ugarit at the court of Karkemiš, to his master, who is simply addressed as the king of Ugarit but with all likelihood should be identified with Ammistamru II.⁴ In the first letter (RS 17.383),⁵ Takuḫli complains to his lord about the dispatch of a load of inferior stone instead of genuine lapis lazuli to the king of Karkemiš, who is infuriated:

(10–11)What is this matter you repeatedly wrote about to the king (of Karkemiš), saying: (12)“Herewith I sent you some lapis lazuli”? (13)The king became very angry (14)and took it out on me, saying: (15–17)“Is this (man) not making fun of me? He picked up some *kammu*-stone from the ground (18–20)and sent it to me saying ‘Herewith I sent you some lapis lazuli!’” (...) (28–29)Now, find from somewhere lapis lazuli and send it to the king: (30–31)may the king not become (even more) angry towards my lord!⁶

Takuḫli subsequently sends a second message urging his lord to look for some lapis lazuli (RS 17.422),⁷ noting that the king of Karkemiš is very upset but a shipment of lapis lazuli would restore Ammistamru to his good graces. Interestingly, Takuḫli stresses that “until now, they have not been unfriendly to me in the Land of Ḫatti” and implores his lord to save him from the embarrassment this situation is causing him.

This episode is representative of a rather contemptuous attitude on the part of the king of Ugarit towards the king of Karkemiš, who was the highest Hittite authority in Syria. This is quite surprising, considering that Ammistamru II was the protagonist of a serious diplomatic incident that must have put him in a rather awkward position within the Hittite empire. I refer to Ammistamru’s well-known decision to divorce the so-called “fille de la Grande Dame”, who was a daughter of Bentešina, the king of Amurru, and of the Hittite princess Gassuliyawiya, therefore a direct descendant of the Hittite royal family. This issue is the subject of a number of documents exchanged between Ugarit, Amurru, Karkemiš, and Ḫatti, which testify to the great trouble that it must have caused for all involved parties (Kühne 1973; Arnaud – Salvini 1991–1992; Singer 1999: 680–681). At last, the conflict was resolved in favour of Ammistamru with the endorsement of the Hittite authorities, who probably were mainly concerned about the mutual relations of

⁴ On the career of Takuḫli(nu) and the synchronism with Ammistamru II, see Singer 2011b: 152ff.

⁵ *Editio princeps*: PRU 4, 221–223; see Lackenbacher 2002: 91–92.

⁶ If not otherwise indicated, all translations of Akkadian texts are of the present author.

⁷ *Editio princeps*: PRU 4, 223–225; see Lackenbacher 2002: 92.

their vassals and wanted to make sure “that possible damage to the stability of Syria caused by this affair was kept to minimum” (van Soldt 2010: 202).

We do not know whether the “lapis lazuli issue” reported in Takuḥli’s letters should be dated to before or after Ammistamru’s divorce from the “fille de la Grande Dame”. If it took place while he was still married to her, one could argue that it was precisely this prestigious marriage that emboldened him to cheat the king of Karkemiš; but if it took place after Ammistamru repudiated the “fille de la Grande Dame”, i.e. after the Hittite king Tuḥaliya IV and the king of Karkemiš Ini-Teššub spent so much energy to resolve the complicated diplomatic crisis caused by his divorce, such deceitful behaviour would have been perceived as a real outrage by the Hittites.

Ammistamru was succeeded by his son Ibiranu (ca. 1235–1225/20 BC), who quickly got into trouble with the Hittites. In a letter by the Hittite prince Piḥawalwi (RS 17.247; PRU 4, 191), Ibiranu is scolded because he did not pay a visit to the Great King upon his ascent to the throne of Ugarit and is urged to quickly send messengers with presents for His Majesty and for Piḥawalwi:

⁽⁶⁻⁷⁾Since you have assumed kingship in Ugarit, ⁽⁸⁻⁹⁾why have you not come to the presence of His Majesty? ⁽¹⁰⁻¹¹⁾And why didn’t you send regularly your messengers? ⁽¹²⁻¹⁵⁾Now, His Majesty is very angry about this matter. ⁽¹⁶⁻¹⁸⁾Now, send your messengers quickly to the presence of His Majesty ⁽¹⁸⁻²⁰⁾and send presents for His Majesty, together with presents for me.

This, as we shall see, is a recurrent issue: paying regular visits and sending presents to the Hittite court were among the duties of Hittite vassals, explicitly ratified in the treaties imposed upon them, and the last kings of Ugarit constantly tried to evade these obligations.

Another document, however, is often cited in the secondary literature as evidence of Ibiranu’s treacherous behaviour towards the Hittites. I refer to the famous letter of an Assyrian king, probably Tukulti-Ninurta I, discovered at Ugarit in the so-called “House of Urtenu” (RS 34.165).⁸ The letter reports on an Assyrian victory against the Hittites and is usually thought to have been written in the wake of the battle of Niḥriya, which probably took place during the reigns of Tuḥaliya IV and Tukulti-Ninurta I (Singer 1999: 689 with previous literature; Bányai 2011). The text is usually interpreted as the Assyrian king’s overture for the cooperation of Ibiranu, whose name is traditionally restored in the position of the addressee in Obv. 2 (Klengel 1999: 281; Singer 1999: 689; Dietrich 2003: 118–119; Schwemer 2006:

⁸ See the editions in Lackenbacher 1991: 90–100 and Dietrich 2003, and the translation by Schwemer 2006: 254–256. The poor state of preservation of this text’s opening lines makes it difficult to identify sender and addressee. The content suggests that the sender was an Assyrian king, either Salmanassar I or Tukulti-Ninurta I (see most recently Llop 2015: 249 n. 25 for a review of the different opinions). Even though the Assyrian origin of the letter was called into question because of its palaeographical and linguistic features (Mora – Giorgieri 2004: 17 n. 86 with references to previous literature; d’Alfonso 2006: 307), I will maintain the identification of the sender as the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I as a working hypothesis.

254; Glatz 2013: 32). However, a different solution was put forward by Lorenzo d'Alfonso, who proposed to restore in Obv. 2 the name of the pharaoh Ramesses II ([*a-na* ^m*Ri-a-ma-še-ša* *ma-a-i* ^d*a-ma*]-*na*) instead of Ibiranu's name ([*a-na* ^m*I-bi-ra*]-*na*) and suggested that the letter might have been intercepted in Hittite-controlled territory while on its way to Egypt (d'Alfonso 2006: 304 n. 3). This possibility fits very well with the fact that the Assyrian king addresses his counterpart as "my brother" (Obv. 6), a title which would be very unusual if the addressee was a "small king", such as the king of Ugarit. Furthermore, as already noted by the text's editor, not even the name of the addressee's country is certain: instead of LUGAL KUR Ṿ-[*ga-ri-it*], the traces at the end of Obv. 2 permit a reading LUGAL KUR Ṿ[^{ru}...] (Lackenbacher 1982: 149), which can be restored LUGAL KUR Ṿ[^{ru}*Mi-iš-ri*]. Another element that renders the identification of Ibiranu as the letter's addressee less certain is the find spot of the tablet it was discovered in the so-called "House of Urtenu", which yielded almost exclusively documents from the reigns of Niqmaddu III and Ammurapi. In any case, there is no evidence suggesting that Ibiranu actually defected to Assyria, unless one assumes that he was the king of Ugarit whom the Hittites exempted from contributing a military contingent in the war against Assyria (RS 17.059), and that this decision was motivated by the Hittites' mistrust of his loyalty.⁹ Thus, the above-mentioned letter of Piḥawalwi remains the only source witnessing tensions between Ibiranu and the Hittites, which resulted in the usual tug-of-war between the king of Ugarit and his overlord, the former trying to elude his vassal duties and the latter trying to bring him into line by talking tough.

With the reign of Niqmaddu III (ca. 1225/20–1215 BC) we enter the phase of Ugarit's history that is now amply documented by the texts of the so-called "House of Urtenu". As we shall see, Niqmaddu challenged the patience of the Great King and of his representatives in Syria on several occasions and on different matters. Even though it is difficult to reconstruct the chronology of these episodes, one gets the impression that they might have recurred throughout Niqmaddu's whole reign.

Following the (bad) example of his father Ibiranu, Niqmaddu too irritates the Hittites with his reluctance to comply with his most basic duties: paying a visit to the Hittite court and sending presents. He is reprimanded for this by Puduḥepa, the famous Hittite queen who played a major political role during the reigns of her husband Ḫattusili III and of her son Tuḥaliya IV. The Ugaritic version of a letter sent by her to Niqmaddu (RS 17.434+)¹⁰ contains the following complaint:

⁹ See d'Alfonso 2005: 174–176 for this reconstruction of the political background behind the issuing of the edict RS 17.059. The name of the king of Ugarit who received the edict is not preserved: it could have been either Ammistamru II or Ibiranu.

¹⁰ See Singer 2011a: 656ff. for the identification of Puduḥepa as the wife of Ḫattušili III, here acting as Queen Mother during the reign of Tuḥaliya IV.

⁽¹⁻²⁾[Messa]ge of Puduḫepa, [Great] Quee[n, que]en [of Ḫatti: To] Niqmaddu say: (...) ⁽⁵⁻¹³⁾Concerning the fact that you have sent to the royal palace your message (as follows): “Now, [I] hereby remit [the g]old of my tribute [to] the Sun [and] as for you, the M[R]T that you stipulated in the tre[atry, certainly] you will receive it,” (...) But to me you have not come [... and] your messenger-party you have not sent to me. (translation adapted after Pardee 2002: 96).

In this context, one should mention also a letter of the king of Karkemiš to Ammurapi, Niqmaddu’s successor, which recalls an episode that happened during Niqmaddu’s reign (RS 34.136 = RSO 7 7). The king of Karkemiš complains to the king of Ugarit about an unsatisfactory shipment of presents to Ḫatti and reminds him of what transpired during the reign of his father:

⁽²⁵⁻²⁹⁾When your father, the son-in-law of His Majesty, was in Ḫakapišša and in Kizzuwatna because of the presents, ⁽³⁰⁾how did they treat him? ⁽³¹⁻³²⁾Didn’t they put his servants into fetters?

The letter refers to the father of the current king of Ugarit as “the son-in-law of His Majesty”; this points to Ammurapi as the addressee of the letter, since it was his father Niqmaddu III who married the Hittite princess Eḫli-Nikkal, probably a daughter of Tuthaliya IV, and was therefore a son-in-law of the Hittite king.¹¹ Singer (1999: 695–696) contextualized this letter by assuming that “Eventually, Niqmaddu must have managed to appease the angry Hittite king, for a Hittite princess was given to him in marriage. Marital connections with the imperial family were usually considered as a great privilege for a vassal king, but surely they were no less in the interest of his suzerain. The Hittite king and his resourceful mother may have thought that a suitable match would provide a good possibility of keeping an eye on this assertive vassal”. If this was the goal the Hittites hoped to achieve through the presence of Eḫli-Nikkal at the court of Ugarit, they must have been deeply disappointed. In fact, one of the recently published Akkadian letters from the “House of Urtenu” shows that Niqmaddu’s behaviour did not improve much after his prestigious marriage. RSO 23 38 (RS 94.2562) is a letter whose sender and addressee are unknown, but its content allows one to assign it to the correspondence between Ḫatti and Ugarit and, more precisely, to the messages sent to Niqmaddu III, since it refers to his position as son-in-law of the Hit-

¹¹ The events related to this marriage have been the subject of different reconstructions. Most scholars identified the king of Ugarit who married Eḫli-Nikkal with Ammurapi (see e.g. Dijkstra 1990; Klengel 1992: 148; Klengel 1999: 301, 303; Beckman 1999: 183–185; Lackenbacher 2002: 126–130; Glatz 2013: 34), but it was also convincingly argued that she was married to Niqmaddu III (Singer 1999: 701–704). The second hypothesis has now been conclusively demonstrated by the letter RSO 23 23, addressed by a Hittite prince to Eḫli-Nikkal after the death of her husband (Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016: 51–52). This letter also shows that the documents recording the division of Eḫli-Nikkal’s patrimony between her and the kingdom of Ugarit (see Nougayrol 1956: 208–210; Beckman 1999: 183–185; Lackenbacher 2002: 126–130) were not issued because the couple divorced, but because Eḫli-Nikkal left Ugarit after she became a widow.

tite king. The message deals with an individual whom the king of Ugarit should deliver to the Hittites:

⁽¹⁷⁾(If) you will not give (him) to him, ⁽¹⁸⁾do not rely on your being a son-in-law: ⁽¹⁹⁾considering how you treat the Hittites, ⁽²⁰⁾if you do not deliver that servant of mine, ⁽²¹⁻²²⁾on the day you will come to me, you will see how I will treat you!

The reference to a future visit might suggest that the letter's author was the Hittite king, who was expecting Niqmaddu to travel to Ḫatti to fulfil his vassal duties. This passage clearly demonstrates that the presence of a Hittite princess at Niqmaddu's side was not enough to spare him the reprimands of the Great King, nor did it render him more submissive.

In fact, other Akkadian letters from the "House of Urtenu" supply ample new evidence about Niqmaddu's insubordination. In RSO 23 4 (RS 94.2352) Niqmaddu is scolded by the Hittite king, who must have been Tutḫaliya IV, for his behaviour towards Zuzulli, a courtier (LÚ ša SAG) of the king¹². The Great King regards this behaviour as so outrageous that he can hardly believe what he heard:

⁽¹⁻²⁾Thus speaks His Majesty, the Great King: say to Niqmaddu. ⁽³⁾Now, I, His Majesty, have heard this: (...) ⁽⁵⁻⁹⁾you have hampered? Zuzulli, the courtier of the king, who came to you, and did not allow [him] to enter your country. ⁽¹⁰⁻¹²⁾Now, I, His Majesty, cannot believe this statement ⁽¹³⁻¹⁴⁾but if (this) statement is true and you have inter[fered? with] the courtier of the king, (...) ⁽¹⁵⁻¹⁶⁾be [aware] of how much you did wrong towards His Majesty. (...) ⁽²²⁻²⁵⁾And if Zuzulli will send a (negative) report to His Majesty, be aware that a punishment will be imposed upon you.

As a courtier of the king, Zuzulli belonged to the innermost circle of high officials who were closely involved in the state administration, which explains why the latter was so upset about the fact that Niqmaddu did not show the respect due to him.

Another troubling issue produced a whole dossier of letters dealing with the pressing request for troops and chariots in order to carry out some "works" (KIN^{meš}) at Alalah.

First of all, one should consider a letter of the king of Karkemiš to Niqmaddu III (RSO 23 31 = RS 94.2079+2367), which gives a clear and vivid image of what was going on:

¹² I prefer Miller's (2013: 294–295) cautious approach in rendering this title as "courtier", rather than "eunuch" (favoured by Peled 2013), since it is still open to debate whether or not the Hittite *ša rēšis* were castrated; both studies refer to previous literature. It is possible that Zuzulli was at the service of the king of Karkemiš: see most recently Bilgin 2018, 331–332.

⁽¹⁻⁴⁾Thus speaks the king [of Karkemiš]: to Niqm[addu], king of Ugarit, say: ⁽⁵⁾may you be well! ⁽⁶⁻⁷⁾Didn't His Majesty entrusted to you the (re)construction of Alalaḥ? ⁽⁸⁻¹⁰⁾(Then), why are your troops not carrying out the works at Alalaḥ? ⁽¹⁰⁻¹³⁾And (even) if you send your troops to Alalaḥ, they stay for 5, 6 days, then get up and disappear. ⁽¹⁴⁻¹⁶⁾Now, herewith I am sending you the scribe Madī-Dagān: ⁽¹⁶⁻¹⁸⁾give him 200 men (lit. troops)! ⁽¹⁸⁻¹⁹⁾If you do not give (them) to him, be aware: ⁽²⁰⁻²²⁾I will write to His Majesty and (his) punishment will be inflicted on you.

Thus, the Hittites were upset because Niqmaddu was failing to complete some works at Alalaḥ with which he had been entrusted. The nature of these “works” is not very clear: this letter speaks of “(re)construction” (*raṣāpa*), while other texts in the dossier suggest that his duties included also the plantation of orchards and the digging of canals. In any case, the issue seems to be required urgent attention, and the king of Karkemiš threatens to inform the Hittite king about Niqmaddu's noncompliance and promises that he will be duly punished by the overlord.

Not only the king of Karkemiš, but also the *uriyanni*, one of the highest officials of the Hittite kingdom,¹³ repeatedly writes to Niqmaddu about the same matter. Among the three letters of the *uriyanni* dealing with this problem, one in particular (RSO 23 28 = RS 94.2578) echoes very explicitly the content of RSO 23 31:

⁽³²⁻³⁵⁾Herewith: in Alalaḥ, there are neither chariots nor troops of yours in Alalaḥ. ⁽³⁵⁻³⁷⁾Did they not entrust to you the works in Alalaḥ? ⁽³⁷⁻³⁸⁾Then give orders (about it) accordingly! Now, herewith ⁽³⁹⁻⁴¹⁾I am sending you the scribe? Madī-Dagān: give him 200 men ⁽⁴²⁻⁴³⁾who will carry out the works in Alalaḥ!

The connection between this letter and the message of the king of Karkemiš is quite obvious, as the two texts are phrased almost identically. Another fragmentary letter of the *uriyanni* to Niqmaddu mentions Alalaḥ and warns the king of Ugarit that “the punishment of His Majesty will be inflicted on you!” (RSO 23 30:44–46).

Niqmaddu III, however, did not seem to be terribly bothered by these threats. In fact, further texts testify to his tenacious reluctance to comply with his orders and the consequent frustration of the Hittites in this matter. RSO 23 32 (= RS 94.2389), for instance, is a letter whose upper half is missing, leaving the identity of sender and addressee unknown. However, what remains of the message is enough to assign it beyond doubt to the dossier about the “Alalaḥ issue” and to hypothesize that it was another letter sent to Niqmaddu either by the king of Karkemiš or by the *uriyanni*,¹⁴ as demonstrated by the following lines:

¹³ I follow Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016: 63 in understanding *mū-ri-ia-an-ni* as a title, rather than as a personal name, despite the presence of the personal determinative; on the office of *uriyanni*, see most recently Pecchioli Daddi 2010 and Bilgin 2018: 176–190.

¹⁴ The text's editors favor the second possibility (Lackenbacher – Malbran-Labat 2016: 69).

^(13'-15')Once, twice I gave you instructions about the troops that have to carry out works in Alalah, ^(16'-17')but you would not listen to my words!

Similarly, another fragmentary letter whose sender and addressee are unknown can be assigned to this dossier because it deals again with Alalah (RSO 23 33 = RS 94.2506) and says:

^(3'-5')Does His Majesty not treat you as a son of him? Then why don't you listen to [his] wor[ds]?

The new evidence provided by these texts allows a different interpretation of another Akkadian letter from the king of Karkemiš to an unnamed king of Ugarit discovered in the "House of Urtenu" and published in 1991 (RSO 7 6 = RS 34.143). Here, the king of Karkemiš accuses the king of Ugarit of having misled him by claiming that his troops were camped in Mukiš,¹⁵ while according to the king's informers Ugarit's troops were located in the northern part of the kingdom of Ugarit; the king of Karkemiš also accuses Ugarit's king of having refused to send chariots and horses, adducing the excuse that they were in poor shape, and of having kept for himself the best *mariyannu*-troops while sending to the king of Karkemiš only worthless soldiers.

Singer (1999: 723–725) suggested that the historical background for this letter was an attack of the Sea Peoples during the reign of Ammurapi, at the end of the 13th – beginning of the 12th century BC, and proposed to link it with a rather fragmentary message in Ugaritic sent by a certain Iriri-Šarruma to the queen of Ugarit, which mentions the presence of enemies in Mukiš (RS 16.402 = KTU 2.33; see translation in Pardee 2002: 105–106).

While this possibility cannot be ruled out conclusively, RSO 7 6 has so many points in contact with the newly published Akkadian texts from the "House of Urtenu" that it seems quite likely that they deal with the same issue. Therefore, I believe that RSO 7 6 dates to the reign of Niqmaddu III and should not necessarily be regarded as evidence for some impending danger in Mukiš, given that it can be connected to the construction works that needed to be carried out by Niqmaddu's troops at Alalah.

There is no explicit evidence about the conclusion of this arm-wrestling between Niqmaddu and the Hittites on the "Alalah issue", and we must rely on archaeological and textual *argumenta ex silentio*. While the nature of the "works" entrusted to Niqmaddu is not entirely clear, the recent archaeological excavations carried out at Alalah did not reveal traces of major construction works that could be associated with this undertaking. The results of the archaeological excavations rather suggest that "Atchana's final phase of widespread Bronze Age habitation ended by around 1300 BC with the exception of the temple area, and that most of

¹⁵ Zeeb 1992 gives a different interpretation of RSO 7 6: 7–8, but I retain the translation of Malbran-Labat 1991: 28, which was followed also by Singer 1999: 723; this interpretation is now supported also by the phrasing of RSO 23 28:34–35.

the site lay deserted throughout the 13th century with only a resettlement sometime in the mid-12th century, the Iron Age” (Yener 2013: 12), thus long after Niqmaddu III and the Hittites were exchanging messages about this matter.

Furthermore, with the exception of the imprisonment of Niqmaddu’s emissaries in return for the delivery of insufficient presents (cf. RSO 7 7 above), we do not know of any other form of punishment inflicted upon Ugarit during his reign. Thus, we can imagine that the Great King reluctantly accepted Niqmaddu’s refusal to comply with his duties and eventually refrained from trying to impose his will on this unruly vassal.

Certainly, one would expect the Hittites to have been terribly annoyed by Niqmaddu’s behaviour. It is therefore surprising to find a positive description of Niqmaddu’s reign in the Ugaritic version of a later letter sent by the Hittite king to Ammurapi, Niqmaddu’s successor (RS 18.038). Here, His Majesty (probably Suppiluliuma II) complains about Ammurapi’s behaviour by contrasting it with that of his father in a sort of “historical prologue” (Fink 2006) to the letter:

⁽¹⁻⁴⁾Message of the Sun: to Ammurapi say: With the Sun everything is well.
⁽⁵⁻⁸⁾Before the Sun’s [fa]ther, [your] fath[er], his servant, did indeed dwell submissively; for a se[rvant] indeed (and) his possession was he, and [his] l[ord] he did indeed guard. My father never lacked g[rain], (but) you, for your part, have not recognized (that this was how things were). (translation by Pardee 2002: 94–95)

Amazingly enough, despite Niqmaddu’s troubled relations with the Hittites, one generation later he was regarded – or at least presented – as a paragon of virtue, the submissive and faithful vassal *par excellence*.

With Ammurapi (ca. 1215–1190/85 BC), the Hittites face again the same old problems: the last king of Ugarit is reprimanded for not paying a visit to the Great King and not sending enough presents. The “presents issue” is recorded by the above-mentioned letter of the king of Karkemiš, which recalls the imprisonment of Niqmaddu’s emissaries as a warning (RSO 7 7 = RS 34.136):

⁽⁵⁻⁷⁾Your messenger you sent to Ḫatti and the presents you sent to the Greats ⁽⁸⁻⁹⁾are very scarce. Was it me who told you: “May the presents ⁽¹⁰⁻¹¹⁾you send to the Greats be scarce”? ⁽¹¹⁻¹⁵⁾Didn’t I write to you as follows: “Send to the Chief Scribe an extraordinary present, don’t send him one less than extraordinary”? ⁽¹⁶⁻¹⁸⁾So, precisely with regard to him didn’t you send such presents? ⁽¹⁹⁻²⁰⁾Why do you act like this?

The “visit issue” is dealt with in the above mentioned letter sent by a Hittite king, most likely Suppiluliuma II (RS 18.038), where Niqmaddu is surprisingly presented as a compliant vassal, while Ammurapi must be reminded that:

⁽¹¹⁻¹⁶⁾Now you also belong to the Sun your master; a serv[ant] indeed, his possession are you. But [yo]u, for your part, you have not at all recognized

(your responsibility toward) the Sun, your master. To me, the Sun, your master, from year to year, why do you not come? (translation after Pardee 2002: 95)

The same letter addresses also another matter that Ammurapi is apparently trying to evade: the dispatch of grain to Ḫatti.

^(17–21)Now, concerning the fact that you have sent a tablet to the Sun, your master, regarding food, to the effect that there is no food in your land: the Sun himself is perishing.

While Ḫatti's need of grain is a recurring topic in several cuneiform texts from the final phase of the Late Bronze Age and has been interpreted as evidence for an actual food shortage in Anatolia,¹⁶ it has been suggested that the claim that grain was lacking in Ugarit was simply an excuse for not complying with the Great King's request (Singer 1999: 717). However, also in this case the new evidence from the "House of Urtenu" offers new data which allow to re-view this reconstruction: in fact, a letter from Egypt records a request for grain by the king of Ugarit because his country is indeed "very hungry" (RSO 23 40 = RS 94.2002+2003).

This and a few other letters exchanged with Egypt at the time of Ammurapi¹⁷ have been interpreted as evidence that Ammurapi's relations with Egypt were too intense and friendly. Two of them, in particular, record repeated declarations of loyalty by the king of Ugarit towards Pharaoh Merneptah, who is addressed as Ammurapi's "lord". This raised understandable doubts about the propriety of Ammurapi's behaviour towards Ḫatti: the Syrian kingdom was seeking help and protection from a still powerful Great King who could guarantee him much needed grain supplies, while his Hittite overlord was losing his grip on his territories and was himself struggling with a food shortage (Singer 1999: 708–715). This does not imply that Egypt and Ugarit had concluded a formal alliance at this time, as suggested by Morris (2015), because one should remember that a Hittite vassal was allowed to entertain diplomatic contacts with other Great Kings, as long as they were Hittite allies (Devecchi 2015). Since at this time the Pharaoh was at peace with Ḫatti, Ugarit's correspondence with Egypt does not necessarily con-

¹⁶ See de Martino 2018 for a recent review of the relevant sources; as the author stresses, the evidence supports the possibility that Ḫatti suffered from temporary shortages of food, but should not necessarily be linked to a long-lasting situation of emergency; see also Miller in press.

¹⁷ The relevant Akkadian texts are two letters of Merneptah⁷ to Ammurapi⁷ (RSO 14 1 = RS 88.2158, RSO 23 40 = RS 94.2002+2003), a letter of Sethi II to Ammurapi (RSO 23 41 = RS 94.2176), and a letter of Beya "Chief of the troops of the Great King, King of the Land of Egypt" to Ammurapi (RSO 14 18 = RS 86.2230); for the Ugaritic texts, see Pardee 2002: 99ff. I agree with Arnaud's (2001: 278) cautious approach in regarding Beya's letter simply as evidence for contacts between Egypt and Ugarit with no major political implications, because only the letter's heading and greeting formula are preserved, while the content is completely lost; Morris (2015: 343) sees it instead as evidence that a pact between Egypt and Ugarit had indeed been forged, because "were the two countries not militarily allied at that time, the reason for this correspondence would be difficult to discern".

stitute treacherous behaviour *tout court*, but could rather represent an attempt to exploit all available diplomatic channels in a context of general uncertainty and insecurity. As for Ammurapi's addressing the Pharaoh as his "lord", that is what diplomatic etiquette required of a small king writing to a Great King.

There are no further sources reporting on Ammurapi's insubordination, and indeed other texts witness his rather obliging attitude towards the Hittites. Two parallel letters of the Great King and of Pendi-Šarruma, a very high-ranking official at the Hittite court (RSO 23 8–9), to Ammurapi report that the Great King is "very happy" (*ḥadi danniš*) about a dispatch of excellent lapis lazuli and the fact that Ammurapi "showed respect" (*tuktabitanni*) to His Majesty, who finally saw his authority acknowledged.

The interaction between Ḫatti and Ugarit in the final phase of the Late Bronze Age is characterized by some recurring patterns. The last three kings of Ugarit (Ibiranu, Niqmaddu III, and Ammurapi) are regularly scolded because they do not comply with two basic obligations of a good vassal: paying visits and sending presents to the Hittite court. Niqmaddu III seems to have been the most problematic offender: he is also accused of hindering Hittite officials from fulfilling their duties, of ignoring the orders that are given to him and refusing to carry out some works at Alalah, and in general of not treating the Hittites with respect. Perhaps precisely because of his assertive attitude, the Great King gave a Hittite princess in marriage to Niqmaddu, whom he perhaps hoped would have a positive influence on his recalcitrant vassal. As we saw, though, even this was not enough to bring him into line.

Such behaviours prompted the reaction and intervention of individuals at all levels of the imperial hierarchy: the kings of Ugarit are reprimanded directly by the Hittite king and queen, by the king of Karkemiš, by princes, and by high officials such as the *uriyanni*. All of these figures complain repeatedly and even promise harsh punishments, but we know of only one occasion when a punishment was actually carried out and Niqmaddu III's emissaries were imprisoned because of some issue related to the delivery of presents.

How shall we explain the accommodating reaction of the Hittites? It certainly depended to some degree on the growing weakening of royal authority that characterized the reigns of the last Hittite kings. The origin of this crisis¹⁸ might be sought in the *coup d'état* through which Ḫattusili III seized power from Urḫi-Teššub/Mursili III and the consequent rift within the Hittite royal family and court, but other factors played a role as well: the conflict with Assyria on the eastern border of the empire, security problems in western Anatolia, perhaps an attempt of the king of Tarhuntašša to seize power in southern Anatolia, the general instability caused in the whole region by the migrations of the "Sea Peoples", and maybe even a shortage of grain.

¹⁸ For a recent overview of the factors that might have contributed to the fall of the Hittite kingdom, see de Martino 2018; cf. Miller in press, who is sceptical about the possibility of identifying any evidence for a collapse in the textual documentation from Ḫattuša.

In this situation, the Hittite kings must have been reluctant to invest any energy in an exemplary punishment against Ugarit, even though they probably had the military strength to do so; in fact, despite the difficulties they were facing, the last Hittite kings were still able to conduct successful military campaigns, which led them, for instance, to annex Alašiya/Cyprus during the reign of Suppiluliuma II. However, campaigning to conquer new territories was worth the effort, while in the larger scheme of things, the troubles caused by Ugarit might have been regarded as minor inconveniences that could be tolerated, as long as they remained confined to forms of “disobedience and delay” (Glatz 2013: 35) and did not precipitate an overtly aggressive rebellion that threatened the entirety of the kingdom.

As we saw, the kings of Ugarit did not lack occasions for betraying their overlords and siding with different enemies: with other Syrian vassals, who rebelled against the Hittite authorities during the reigns of Suppiluliuma I and Mursili II; with Egypt, again during the reign of Mursili II and also afterward, until the peace treaty between Ḫattusili III and Ramesses II inaugurated the age of the so-called *Pax Hethitica*; and finally with Assyria, mainly during the reign of Tuḫaliya IV. However, as far as we can tell, they never graduated to open revolt. It rather seems that they simply tried to exploit Ḫatti’s growing weakness to their own advantage, perhaps in order to bargain for better economic treatment or more freedom, without necessarily planning to subvert the established order. This might be the reason why even Niqmaddu III could be presented in the end as a good subject, who “dwelt submissively and guarded his lord”: he could be accused of being a reluctant servant, but not a disloyal one.

References

- Arnaud, D., 2001. Lettres. In M. Yon – D. Arnaud, eds., *Études ougaritiques*. RSO 14. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 257–322.
- Arnaud, D. – M. Salvini, 1991–1992. Le divorce du roi Ammistamru d’Ougarit: un document redécouvert. *Semitica* 41–42, 1–22.
- Beckman, G., 1999². *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. WAW 7. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- d’Alfonso, L., 2005. *Le procedure giudiziarie ittite in Siria (XIII sec. a.C.)*. StMed 17. Pavia: Italian University Press.
- d’Alfonso, L., 2006. Die hethitische Vertragstradition in Syrien (14.–12. Jh. v.Chr.). In M. Witte – K. Schmidt – D. Prechel – J.C. Gertz, eds., *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke. Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus“ – Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. BZAW 365. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, 303–329.
- Bilgin, T. *Officials and Administration in the Hittite World*. SANER 21. Boston – Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Devecchi, E., 2012. Treaties and edicts in the Hittite world. In G. Wilhelm, ed., *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Würzburg, 21–25 July 2008*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 637–645.
- Devecchi, E., 2013. 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: LoGisma, 81–97.

- Devecchi, E., 2015. The international relations of Ḫatti's Syrian vassals, or how to make the best of things. In B. Eder – R. Pruzsinszky, eds., *Policies of Exchange. Political systems and modes of interaction in the Aegean and the Near East in the 2nd millennium B.C.E.* OREA 2. Wien: Austrian Academy of Science Press, 117–126.
- Devecchi, E. – J.L. Miller, 2011. Hittite-Egyptian synchronisms and their consequences for ancient Near Eastern chronology. In Mynářová, J., ed., *Egypt and the Near East – The Crossroads.* Prague: Charles University in Prague, 139–176.
- Dietrich, M., 2003. Salmanassar I. von Assyrien, Ibirānu (VI.) von Ugarit und Tudḫaliya IV. von Ḫatti. RS 34.165 und die Schlacht von Niḫriya zwischen den Hethitern und Assyriern. *UF* 35, 103–139.
- Dijkstra, M., 1990. On the identity of the Hittite princess mentioned in label KTU 6.24 (RS 17.72). *UF* 22, 97–101.
- Fink, A.S., 2006. The historical prologue in a letter from Šuppiliuma II to 'Ammurapi' king of Ugarit (RS 18.038). In A.M. Maeir – P. de Miroschedji, eds., *"I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times."* *Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 673–688.
- Genz, H., 2006. Hethitische Präsenz im spätbronzezeitlichen Syrien: die archäologische Evidenz. *BaM* 37, 499–509.
- Glatz, C., 2013. Negotiating empire. A comparative investigation into the responses to Hittite imperialism by the vassal state of Ugarit and the Kaska peoples of the Anatolian Black Sea region. In G. Areshian, ed., *Empires and Complexity. On the crossroads of archaeology, history and anthropology.* Los Angeles: The Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press, 21–56.
- Klengel, H., 1992. *Syria, 3000 to 300 B.C.: A Handbook of Political History* Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Klengel, H., 1999. *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches.* HdO I/34. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill.
- Kühne, C., 1973. Ammištamru und die Tochter der „Großen Dame“. *UF* 5, 175–184.
- Lackenbacher, S., 1982. Nouveaux documents d'Ugarit I. Une lettre royale. *RA* 76, 141–156.
- Lackenbacher, S., 1991. Lettres et fragments. In P. Bordreuil – D. Arnaud – B. André-Salvini – S. Lackenbacher – F. Malbran-Labat – D. Pardee, eds., *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville. Les textes de la 34^e campagne.* RSO 7. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 83–104.
- Lackenbacher, S., 2002. *Textes akkadiens d'Ugarit.* LAPO 20. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf.
- Lackenbacher, S. – F. Malbran-Labat, 2016. *Lettres en akkadien de la «Maison d'Urtēnu».* *Fouilles de 1994.* RSO 23. Leuven – Paris – Bristol: Peeters.
- Llop, J., 2015. Foreign kings in the Middle Assyrian archival documentation. In B. Düring, ed., *Understanding Hegemonic Practices of the Early Assyrian Empire. Essays dedicated to Frans Wiggermann (Consolidating Empires Project I).* PIHANS 125. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 244–273.
- Malbran-Labat, F., 1991. Lettres. In P. Bordreuil – D. Arnaud – B. André-Salvini – S. Lackenbacher – F. Malbran-Labat – D. Pardee, eds., *Une bibliothèque a sud de la Ville.* RSO 7. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 26–64.
- de Martino, S., 2018. *The Fall of the Hittite Kingdom.* *Mesopotamia* 53, 23–48.
- Miller, J.L., 2013. *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts.* WAW 31. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

- Miller, J.L., in press. Are there Signs of the Decline of the Late Hittite State in the Textual Documentation from Ḫattusa? In S. de Martino – E. Devecchi, eds., *Anatolia between the 13th and the 12th Century B.C.E.*, Firenze: LoGisma editore.
- Mora, C. – M. Giorgieri, 2004. *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate a Ḫattuša*. HANE/M 7. Padova: S.a.r.g.o.n Editrice e Libreria.
- Morris, E.F., 2015. Egypt, Ugarit, the god Ba‘al, and the puzzle of a royal rebuff. In J. Mynářová – P. Onderka – P. Pavúk, eds., *There and Back Again – the Crossroads II. Proceedings of an international conference held in Prague, September 15–18, 2014*. Prague: Charles University in Prague, 315–351.
- Nougayrol, J., 1956. *Le palais royal d’Ugarit IV. Textes accadiens des archives sud (Archives internationales)*. MRS 9. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Pardee, D., 2002. Ugaritic letters. In W.W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture. Volume III: Archival Documents from the Biblical World*. Leiden: Brill, 88–114.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., 2010. ^{lu}uri(y)anni: una nuova ipotesi di identificazione. *Or NS* 79, 232–241.
- Peled, I., 2013. Eunuchs in Hatti and Assyria. A reassessment. In L. Feliu – J. Llop – A. Millet Albà – J. Sanmartín, eds., *Time and History in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 785–797.
- Schwemer, D., 2006. Briefe aus den Archiven von Ugarit. 1. Briefe in akkadischer Sprache. In B. Janowski – G. Wilhelm, eds., *Briefe*. TUAT N.F. 3. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Singer, I., 1999. A political history of Ugarit. In W.G.E. Watson – N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. HdO I/39. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 603–733.
- Singer, I., 2011a. Dating the end of the Hittite empire. In I. Singer, ed., *The Calm before the Storm. Selected writings of Itamar Singer on the Late Bronze Age in Anatolia and the Levant*. WAW Supplement Series 1. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 655–660.
- Singer, I., 2011b. Takuḫlinu and Ḫaya: Two Governors in the Ugarit Letter from Tel Aphek. In I. Singer, ed., *The Calm before the Storm. Selected writings of Itamar Singer on the Late Bronze Age in Anatolia and the Levant*. WAW Supplement Series 1. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 147–172.
- van Soldt, W.H., 2010. Ugarit as a Hittite vassal state. *AoF* 37, 198–207.
- Yener, K.A., 2013. New excavations at Alalakh. The 14th–12th centuries BC. In K.A. Yener, ed., *Across the Border. Late Bronze-Iron Age relations between Syria and Anatolia. Proceedings of a symposium held at the Research Center of Anatolian Studies, Koç University, Istanbul, May 31–June 1, 2010*. ANESS 42. Leuven – Walpole, MA: Peeters, 11–35.
- Zeeb, F., 1992. “Die Truppen sind unfähig”: Überlegungen zu RS 34.143. *UF* 24, 481–498.



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University



ISBN 978-80-7308-928-3