

TRADITION OR INNOVATION? THE UGARITIC-EGYPTIAN CORRESPONDENCE

By Jana Mynářová¹

INTRODUCTION

“Beginning of the victory of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Wesermaatre Setepenre, Son of Re, {Beloved of the Gods},² Ramesse (II) Meriamun, given life forever, which he reached against the land of Ḫatti, Naḫarina, against the land of Arzawa, against Pidassa, against the land of Dardanaya, against the land of Masa, against the land of Qarqiša and Lukka, against Carchemiš, Qedy, the land of Qadeš, against the land of Ugarit (and) Mušnatu”.³

These words represent the beginning of the Egyptian description of the military campaign in Syria that Ramesse II undertook in the 5th year of his reign. It is right here, in the records of the Battle of Qadeš, that we find the land of Ugarit identified as being on the side of the Hittite king and Egypt, its traditional business and political partner, is found to be on the opposing side. But the Battle of Qadeš represents only a tiny – nevertheless a very important – fragment in the mosaic that is the evolving relationship between the two political entities. Over more than two hundred years the political and economic relationship between Ugarit and the land on the Nile

underwent a significant development, which is reflected in sources preserved on both sides.⁴ The nature of this process – from partners to enemies and back again – can also be recognized in the epistolary documents, which were sent from one royal office to the other. The conclusion of the Silver Treaty in 1258 BCE provided Ugarit with the opportunity to revive, once again, the ties with Egypt and it was presumably at that time that the Ugaritic – Egyptian correspondence began again as well. The preserved epistolary documents were indeed written during periods which can be described, without exaggeration, as the real high water marks in the relationship between the two centres.

Following only sporadic references to Ugarit in the Memphis⁵ and Karnak⁶ stelae of Amenhotep II (ca. 1427–1400 BCE),⁷ dated to the early part of his sole reign, and also the mention of Ugarit in the Nubian topographical list of Amenhotep III (ca. 1388–1351/1350 BCE) in Soleb,⁸ the earliest testimony and indisputable evidence of the existing relationship is provided by means of the correspondence between the two royal courts, preserved in the Amarna archive of the middle of the 14th century BCE.

¹ Charles University in Prague. This article is based on a paper presented at an international conference *Society and administration in ancient Ugarit* held in Leiden (December 13–14, 2007). The participation at the symposium and the preparation of the manuscript were enabled by the support of the Czech Science Foundation, research grant No. 404/06/P058, *Amarna – the Crossroad of the Ancient World*.

² For the reconstruction consult KITCHEN 1996, 2.

³ Cf. *KRI* II: 3 §§1–6. For the standard editions of the texts see KUENTZ 1928–1934; HASSAN 1929; GARDINER 1935; I, 23–24, II, pls. 9–10A; CHRISTOPHE, DONADONI and EDEL [s.d.]; and *KRI* II: 2–147; for the translations and commentaries consult especially BREASTED 1906, 125–157, §§298–351; ERMAN 1923, 325–337; WILSON 1927; FAULKNER 1958; GARDINER 1960; LICHTHEIM 1976, II, 57–72; VON DER WAY 1984; FECHT 1984; KITCHEN 1996, 2–26; DAVIES 1997, 55–96; and KITCHEN 1999, 3–54.

⁴ See mainly WARD 1979; ASTOUR 1981; GIVEON 1981; GIVEON 1986; HELCK 1995; LACKENBACHER 1995; NA’AMAN

1996; VITA – GALÁN 1997; SINGER 1999: esp. 614–616, 621–627, 646–650, 673–675, 708–719 (with a detailed discussion and references to further literature); FREU 2000; LACKENBACHER 2000; YON 2003.

⁵ Today in the collections of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (JE 6301). For the text see *Urk.* IV, 1301.3–1309.20, for the toponym see *Urk.* IV, 1303.9. Consult mainly BADAWI 1943, GRDSELOFF 1947, VIKENTIEV 1949.

⁶ See *Urk.* IV, 1310.3–1316.4, for the toponym see *Urk.* IV, 1312.8, reconstructed in *Urk.* IV, 1312.11 (“chief of TN”). For the Karnak stela cf. mainly ERMAN 1889, LEGRAIN 1903, EDEL 1953, 98–103.

⁷ See EDEL 1953, 149–153. For the military campaign of Amenhotep II in the 7th year of his reign consult especially ALT 1954, SPALINGER 1982, 142–152, DER MANUELIAN 1987, 56–68, 221–229 (including the translations of both stelae), GOEDICKE 1992.

⁸ SIMONS 1937, 132–133, 199.

**THE “UGARITIC-EGYPTIAN” CORRESPONDENCE
IN THE AMARNA AGE**

The corpus of Amarna “Ugaritic” correspondence, i.e. documents of Ugaritic origin found in the Amarna archive, consists of five – more or less fragmentary – letters, labeled in Knudtzon’s standard edition as EA 45 (VAT 1692), EA 46 (VAT 1694), EA 47 (VAT 1693), EA 48 (VAT 1690) and EA 49 (CG 4783; SR 4/12238/0).⁹ With the exception of the final text, EA 49, housed in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, the remaining four tablets belong to the collections of the *Vorderasiatisches Museum* in Berlin. All of them were written in Akkadian and addressed by the king or queen of Ugarit to their Egyptian counterparts. However, the identification of the sender is preserved only in two cases – in EA 45 and EA 49 and the Ugaritic origin of the remaining three documents, i.e. EA 46–EA 48, has only recently been confirmed for certain by means of petrographic and mineralogical analyses.¹⁰ Unfortunately,

there are no letters addressed by the king of Egypt to the king of Ugarit within this corpus so it is impossible to reliably reconstruct how the Egyptian king would have identified himself in his letters. Nevertheless, we can get a general idea about this through references to a preserved group of letters sent by the king of Egypt to his other partners.

Despite the fragmentary nature of the Amarna “Ugaritic” letters, it is possible to reconstruct the formal structure of these texts in some detail. It is highly probable that all the letters had a binominal structure, consisting of an opening passage and the body of the letter. Concerning the opening passages, by far the best preserved example can be found in EA 49 (lines 1–7), consisting of the address, followed by a prostration formula and culminating in a well-being wish to the Egyptian king, extended also to the members of his household and belongings (i.e. the so-called “extended” version of the wish). With some reservation, we can also recognize the very same struc-

Identification	Akkadian	References
“the king”	LUGAL	EA 47: 10; EA 49: 1, 3, 4
“my master”	<i>be-li-ia</i>	EA 49: 19 <i>be-l[i-ia]</i> ; EA 46: 26
	<i>b[e-li-ia]</i>	EA 46: 6
	<i>be-li</i>	EA 46: 16, 22, 24; EA 47: 25
	<i>be-l[i]</i>	EA 46: 21;
	<i>EN-ia</i>	EA 47: 12, 13, 25; EA 49: 1, 3, 4, 7
“my mistress”	<i>[E]N-ia</i>	EA 47: 29
	<i>[EN-i]a</i>	EA 47: 11
	<i>be-li-ti-ia</i>	EA 48: 7
	<i>[b]e-li-ti-ia</i>	EA 48: 1
“the Sun”	<i>[be-li-t]i-ia</i>	EA 48: 3
	<i>[be-li-ti-]ia</i>	EA 48: 4
	D.UTU- <i>ši</i>	EA 45: 20; EA 46: 6, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27; EA 47: 10; EA 49: 1, 3, 4
	D.UT[U- <i>ši</i>]	EA 46: 2; EA 46: 25
	D.[U]T[U- <i>ši</i>]	EA 45: 29
	[D].UTU- <i>ši</i>	EA 45: 1; EA 49: 7

Table 1 An identification of the king/queen of Egypt in the Amarna letters of Ugaritic origin

⁹ KNUDTZON 1915, 308–319.

¹⁰ GOREN, FINKELSTEIN and NA’AMAN 2004, 88–91. However, all four tablets – i.e. including EA 45 – from the collections of the *Vorderasiatisches Museum* in Berlin were examined with the identical conclusion that the particular letters were verily sent from Ugarit. Cf. GOREN, FINKELSTEIN

and NA’AMAN 2004, 91: “Our study indicates that letters EA 45–48 are similar in their mineralogical composition, and that they differ from other letters within the Amarna archive. Petrographically they suit the rather unique lithology of the Ugarit area and are identical to the reference material from Ras Shamra.”

ture in the opening passage in the case of EA 45, though the passage (lines 1–7) is largely a mere reconstruction based only on very tiny traces of individual signs. It has already been proved¹¹ that within the context of the corpus of Amarna epistolary documents this particular combination of the “heading + salutations consisting of prostration + greetings (simple) + extended greetings” is attested exclusively in some of the Akkadian epistolary documents of Ugaritic origin. However, a letter from the queen(?) or “mistress” of Ugarit (EA 48) includes in the opening passage (lines 1–4) only an address, a prostration formula and a “simple” form of the well-being wish.¹² The remaining two letters, i.e. EA 46 and EA 47 are too badly damaged to be useful in this case, the preserved parts belonging only to the bodies of the letters. Thus it is impossible to speculate on the form of the relevant opening passages.

The protocols for the addressing or appellation of the Egyptian ruler in the “Ugaritic” corpus is – also due to the fragmentary nature of the documents – rather meager and limited. It is impossible to observe any crucial differences between the forms employed for the identification of the ruler used in the opening passages and those in the respective bodies of letters. Thus, the addressee is identified only as “the king,” “my master,” or “my mistress,” and “the Sun,” as can be witnessed in the Table 1.

THE “UGARITIC–EGYPTIAN” CORRESPONDENCE IN THE RAMESSIDE PERIOD¹³

On the other hand, the Ramesside corpus of “Ugaritic–Egyptian” correspondence, dated to another high point in the relationship, i.e. to the 13th and the very beginning of the 12th century BCE, is much more varied. Just as in the

Amarna collection, the Ramesside group includes an Akkadian letter addressed by the king of Ugarit to the king of Egypt (labeled RS 20.182 A + B)¹⁴ but, in addition, this corpus is also enlarged by a collection of epistolary drafts: RS 16.078 + 16.109 + 16.117 (CAT 2.23),¹⁵ RS 34.356 (CAT 2.76)¹⁶ and RIH 78/3 + 78/30 (CAT 2.81)¹⁷ – all written in Ugaritic.¹⁸ In contrast with the Amarna period, the Ramesside collection also contains letters sent from the Egyptian “foreign” office and addressed to the king of Ugarit. Text RS 88.2158¹⁹ is dated to the reign of Merneptah, and it is highly probable that it was written shortly after the king’s coronation in 1213 BCE. There is also an additional letter dated to the reign of Merneptah – RS 94.2002 + 2003,²⁰ which has not yet been published, and thus has not been integrated into the present article.²¹ A remarkable witness to the Egyptian-Ugaritic relationship can also be found in a letter addressed to the king of Ugarit by an Egyptian high court official and elder statesman Beya, RS 86.2230.²²

As the direction of the correspondence is concerned, i.e. whether the letters were sent from Egypt to Ugarit or from Ugarit to Egypt, as well as the social rank of the individual correspondents and the language in which the correspondence was written, the Ramesside corpus provides us with only a single parallel to the Amarna corpus of documents, i.e. RS 20.182 A + B. Nevertheless, this lack of information can be supplemented, to a certain degree, by the preserved Ugaritic drafts. Although the opening lines of RS 20.182 A + B are almost completely illegible, there are still traces which allow us to reconstruct the very same “tripartite” structure of the opening passage as in EA 49 (see above), i.e. an address followed by a prostration formula and an “extended” version of

¹¹ Cf. MYNÁŘOVÁ 2006; MYNÁŘOVÁ 2007, 108.

¹² For this type of the opening passage consult MYNÁŘOVÁ 2007, 107.

¹³ For the differences in protocol between the Amarna and the Ramesside periods consult recently MYNÁŘOVÁ 2009.

¹⁴ Cf. *Ug.* V, no. 36; BERGER 1970, 288; AHL 1973, 351–353; LACKENBACHER 1994; VAN SOLDT 1994; KOŘÍNKOVÁ 2002.

¹⁵ Cf. *PRU* II, no. 18; AHL 1973, 421–422; DIJKSTRA 1987, 41–42; CUNCHILLOS 1989: 309–311. For the dating of the text see also recently SINGER 1999, 713 with further references.

¹⁶ Cf. BORDREUIL 1982, 10–12.

¹⁷ Cf. BORDREUIL and CAQUOT 1980, 356–358, 371 fig. 9; MILANO 1983.

¹⁸ For the Ugaritic correspondence and letter formats consult especially LOEWENSTAMM 1969; AHL 1973; KRISTENSEN 1977; CUNCHILLOS 1999 (with references to further literature).

¹⁹ LACKENBACHER 1995; LACKENBACHER 1997.

²⁰ Cf. SINGER 1999: 712.

²¹ The association of a fragmentary document RS 18.113 A + B (CAT 2.42 + CAT 2.43) with an Egyptian background cannot be accepted for the purpose of the current presentation.

²² Cf. *RSO* XIV, no. 18; ARNAUD 1992, 181 n. 6

Identification	Akkadian – Ugaritic	References
“the king of Egypt”	[LUGAL KUR.KU]R.MEŠ <i>mi-iš-r[i]</i>	RS 20.182A+B: 1
	<i>mlk mšrm</i>	CAT 2.81: 1, 19’
	<i>mlk mšr[m]</i>	CAT 2.81: 10
“the mighty king”	LUGAL <i>qa-ra-[di]</i>	RS 20.182A+B:2
“master of all lands”	[EN- <i>l</i>]i <i>gab-bi</i> KUR.KUR.ME[Š]	RS 20.182A+B: 3
	<i>b^l kl hwt</i>	CAT 2.81: 3
	[<i>b^l kl h</i>]wt	CAT 2.76: 9–10
“the great king”	<i>mlk rb</i>	CAT 2.76:4, 8; CAT 2.81:1, 16’, 19’, 30’; CAT 2.23:2, 9–10, 23–24; CAT 9.530: 1, 9
	<i>mlk r[b]</i>	CAT 2.23: 17
	[<i>m</i>]lk <i>rb</i>	CAT 2.81: 10
	[<i>m</i>]k <i>rb</i>	CAT 2.76:9; CAT 2.23:7
	[<i>mlk</i>] <i>rb</i>	CAT 2.76:1; CAT 2.23:13–14
	[<i>mlk(?)</i>] <i>rb</i>	CAT 2.81: 22’
“the king of kings”	<i>mlk mlkm</i>	CAT 2.81: 20’
	<i>mlk mlk[m]</i>	CAT 2.76: 9, 10
	<i>mlk ml[km]</i>	CAT 2.76: 1; CAT 9.530: 1, 9
	[<i>mlk m</i>]lkm	CAT 2.81: 3
“the good king”	<i>mlk n^cm</i>	CAT 2.81: 31’
	[<i>mlk n^c</i>]m	CAT 2.81: 2
“the just king”	<i>mlk šdq</i>	CAT 2.81: 2, 20’, 31’
	<i>mlk š[dq]</i>	CAT 2.81: 11
“the Sun”	<i>špš</i>	CAT 2.76: 7; CAT 2.81: 16’, 19’, 30’; CAT 2.23: 1, 7, 23
	<i>šp[š]</i>	CAT 2.81:13’
	[<i>šp</i>]š	CAT 2.76: 8; CAT 2.23: 16, 31
“my master”	<i>b^lly</i>	CAT 2.76: 4, 7, 8; CAT 2.81: 6; CAT 2.23: 2, 20, 24
	<i>b^l[y]</i>	CAT 2.23: 10, 31
	[<i>b^ll</i>]y	CAT 2.23: 17
“my good master”	<i>b^lly n^cm</i>	CAT 2.76: 6; CAT 2.81: 22’, 24’
	[<i>b^ll</i>]y <i>n^cm</i>	CAT 2.81: 29’
“your good master”	<i>b^lly n^cm</i>	CAT 2.81: 21’

Table 2 Appellations of the Egyptian king in the Ramesside corpus

the well-being wish of the sender to the addressee. So, let us now turn to the trinity of the Ugaritic drafts. The greatest representation of opening passages is attested in RIH 78/3 + 78/30 (CAT 2.81) where, again, we can clearly recognize the same “tripartite” structure with the “extended” version of the well-being wish. Since the very same structure has been identified in other royal letters written in Akkadian, and which are also of Ugaritic origin, it is thus very probable that the

“epistolary style” or “epistolary tradition” known to us from some of the Amarna documents of Ugaritic origin simply persisted well into the Ramesside period.²³ The fragmentary text RS 34.356 (CAT 2.76) differs from the previous text to a large extent. While RIH 78/3 + 78/30 (CAT 2.81) contains a complete text in respect of its structure, RS 34.356 (CAT 2.76) involves probably only two specimens of the opening formulae. Unfortunately, the last document belonging to

²³ For other documents of Ugaritic origin containing this very same structure consult MYNÁŘOVÁ 2006, 122.

Identification	Akkadian	References
“the king”	LUGAL	RS 88.2158: 5', 8', 9', 10', 20', 22', 27', 31', 49', 54', 56'
“the Sun”	D.UTU	RS 88.2158: 20'
“the good son of the Sun”	DUMU SIG ₅ D.UTU- <i>a</i>	RS 88.2158: 9'
	DUMU SIG ₅ 'D.UTU'	RS 88.2158: 5'
“the great king”	LUGAL GAL	RS 86.2230: 3
“the king of Egypt”	LUGAL KUR <i>mi-i š-ri-m[a]</i>	RS 86.2230: 3

Table 3 Appellations of the Egyptian king in the Ramesside corpus - RS 88.2158 and RS 86.2230

this group, i.e. RS 16.078 + 16.109 + 16.117 (KTU 2.23), does not contain the opening passage at all.

Despite the earlier assertion as to the possible identical “epistolary tradition” in the structure of the opening passages it is possible to quickly observe that the identification of the addressee, i.e. the Egyptian ruler, differs significantly from that which can be found in the texts of the Amarna age. Although, in the same way as in the Amarna tablets, the king of Egypt is identified as “the Sun,” the other epithets are rather striking and unusual.

The Akkadian letter RS 20.182 A + B contains three titles or epithets – “the king of Egypt,” “the mighty king” and “the master of all lands”. On the other hand, the Ugaritic drafts contain the following items – “the king of Egypt,” “master of all lands,” “the great king,” “the king of kings,” “the good king,” “the just king,” “the Sun,” “my master,” “my good master” or “your good master,” as can be seen in Table 2.

This lengthy list can be still further extended, to a certain degree, if we also include references to the king of Egypt attested in the letters sent to Ugarit from the Egyptian foreign office, i.e. RS 88.2158 and RS 86.2230. However, we must keep in mind that RS 88.2158 contains extensive passages quoted from the earlier letter of the Ugaritic king to his Egyptian counterpart. The Egyptian king is identified here as “the king,” “the king of Egypt,” “the Sun,” “the great king” as well as the “good son of the Sun” (see Table 3).

What emerges from the overview presented above is that the “simple” Amarna repertoire identifying the Egyptian ruler to be “the king,” “my master” and “the Sun” has been fully replicated in the Ramesside collection. Nevertheless, the more varied Ramesside corpus requires a more detailed analysis. In addition to titles and

epithets attested and well-known in other sources, such as “the king of Egypt” and “the great king,” there are still several elements attested exclusively in this moderate corpus of letters, to be specific – “the mighty king,” “master of all lands,” “the king of kings,” “the just king,” “the good king,” “my/your good master,” and “the good son of the Sun”. A comparison of the two corpora can be seen in the Table 4.

	Amarna age	Ramesside period
“the king”	×	×
“my master”	×	×
“my mistress”	×	
“the Sun”	×	×
“the king of Egypt”		×
“the great king”		×
“the mighty king”		×
“the master of all lands”		×
“the king of kings”		×
“the just king”		×
“the good king”		×
“my/your good master”		×
“the good son of the Sun”		×

Table 4 An identification of the ruler – the Amarna age and the Ramesside period

The Mighty King

The Egyptian parallel or equivalent to the epithet “the mighty king” (LUGAL *qa-ra-[di]*, RS 20.182 A + B, l. 2), which – in this context – originates in the realm of the Hittite royal titulary²⁴ (Hittite *ḫaš-tali-*), has been traditionally seen in the Egyptian

²⁴ For the Hittite royal titulary consult especially GONNET 1979.

royal epithet *nšwt nḥt* with a meaning “a mighty king” or “a strong king”.²⁵ However, this association of LUGAL *qa-ra-[di]* and *nšwt nḥt* can no longer be accepted.²⁶ In support of an alternative view we can refer to the text of the Silver Treaty. A comparison²⁷ of the two versions clearly reveals a different parallel – LUGAL *qa-ra-[di]* written UR.SAG and an Egyptian royal epithet *tnr* “hero”, “valiant” or “mighty king”. An analysis of Egyptian royal inscriptions clearly shows a growing number of occurrences of this epithet – above all in the context of royal military expeditions – during the Ramesside period. Thus, it is highly probable that the epithet of the Egyptian king LUGAL *qa-ra-[di]* in RS 20.182 A + B, l. 2 originally represents a Hittite royal title which entered the royal list of titles of Ramesse II on the occasion of the conclusion of the Silver Treaty.

Master of all lands

This epithet, attested in sources written both in Akkadian²⁸ as well as in Ugaritic,²⁹ has usually been compared to the “Amarna” epithet “king of all lands” or “the Sun of all lands”.³⁰ However, the use of the epithet “king of all lands” is limited within the Amarna archive to the letters of Rib-Addi, the ruler of Byblos and it is used solely for the identification of the Egyptian king.³¹ Even the position within the structure of the letter is identical – *i.e.* the scribes employed the epithet only in the opening passages of letters – in the address. There is no example of its usage in the body of the letter at all. Accordingly, we can assume that the epithet composed one part of the official royal titles – the segment of a document where the ruler is first identified. A very striking issue relates to the manner in which the epithet is written. With regard to the attested examples, the manner of writing is largely variable, which is rather unusual in a corpora of texts of the same origin. Therefore, we cannot rule out a possibility that there was no “standard-

ized” form of writing for this epithet, which could also reflect the fact that its origin is outside the cuneiform tradition.

However, German excavations in Qantir (the site of ancient Pi-Ramesses in the Eastern Nile Delta) in 2003 brought to light another example of this epithet, written on a tiny and badly preserved fragment of an Akkadian letter (labelled FZN 03/0260) and belonging to the corpus of Egyptian – Hittite correspondence of the 13th century BCE. Alongside the fragmentary traces of the king’s name in line 7, [...]-^ršē²-šā⁷, the complete representation of the epithet “master of (all) lands” is preserved, cf. EN KUR.KUR.MEŠ “[Riame]šēša, master of (all) lands”. The editors of the publication suggest³² a possible identification of this epithet with the Egyptian royal epithet, *nb t3.wj*, *i. e.* “master/lord of the Two Lands”, although they correctly mention that the very same title was being written in two contemporaneous Ramesside letters as *ni-ib ta-a-ua*³³ and thus there is no example of a “translation” of the title from Egyptian to Hittite or Akkadian. However, the same epithet/title also appears in the Hittite sources, where, unfortunately, only two examples are identified – both of them in Kummani’s Prayer.³⁴ The suggested explanations for this expression are not conclusive.³⁵ However, Hittite sources reveal a similar epithet, dated to the same time as the Qantir fragment – UR.SAG *ša gab-bi* KUR.KUR.MEŠ “hero of all lands”. Once again the epithet is employed in the text of the Silver Treaty³⁶ where it is included in the filiation of the Egyptian king Ramesse II³⁷ and the epithet is only used with the name of Ramesse II. It does not appear with other royal names – Hittite or Egyptian – listed in the text. Thus it is possible to assume an Egyptian background for this epithet. Unfortunately, the parallel Egyptian version of the text translates only the first part of the epithet – UR.SA[G] – in Egyptian *tnr/ṯl* “mighty king,

²⁵ See YOYOTTE 1968; MILANO 1983, 145.

²⁶ See KOŘÍNKOVÁ 2002, 165–166.

²⁷ For the comparison of both texts with further references and extensive commentaries see EDEL 1997, 18–19.

²⁸ Cf. RS 20.182 A + B, l. 3 [EN-] *i gab-bi* KUR.KUR.ME[Š].

²⁹ Cf. CAT 2.81: 3 *bṯl kl ḥwt*, CAT 2.76: 9–10 [*bṯl kl ḥ*] *wt*.

³⁰ MILANO 1983, 143–144.

³¹ MYNÁŘOVÁ 2007, 134.

³² PUSCH and JAKOB 2003, 150 and n. 23.

³³ KUB 3.28, Vs. 1; KUB 3.66 + W. 24, Vs. 1.

³⁴ CTH 382; KBo 11.1, 11, 18: D.UTU-*ši-(ma-aš)* M.NIR.GÁL EN KUR.KUR.ḪI.A “My Majesty/Sun Muwatalli, master of (all) lands”.

³⁵ I would like to express here my sincere thanks to J. de Roos for his valuable suggestions and comments concerning this particular problem.

³⁶ Version A (KBo 1.7 + KUB 3.121 [Bo 6549 + 6674] + KBo 28.115 [81/f + 24/r]), Obv. 4.

³⁷ UR.SA[G] *a^r gab¹-bi* KUR.KUR.MEŠ.

hero". A highly plausible explanation for the epithet "hero of all lands" has been proposed by Elmar Edel, who interprets it as a translation of the Egyptian form *tnr/tl hr h3s.wt* or *tnr/tl hr h3s.wt nb(.t)*, i.e. "mighty king/hero of foreign lands" or "mighty king/hero of all foreign lands".³⁸

However, not a single occurrence of this "Ramesside" epithet "mighty king/hero of foreign lands" or "mighty king/hero of all foreign lands" is known in Egyptian written documents, above all in the royal inscriptions, dated to the 14th century BCE, which would represent a parallel or a "source" to "the king of all lands" or "the sun of all lands" of Rib-Addi's letters.

However, already during the reign of Thutmose III we find another royal epithet "lord of all foreign lands"³⁹ – *nb h3s.wt nb.t* – used as a part of royal titles. Despite the fact that the epithet never became widely used by the kings of Dynasty 18, there are examples of its use from the reign of Amenhotep II,⁴⁰ Thutmose IV,⁴¹ Amenhotep IV–Akhenaten⁴² and Tutankhamun.⁴³ Thus it is possible to suggest a parallel between Rib-Addi's "king of all lands" and the Egyptian "lord of all foreign lands", i.e. *nb h3s.wt nb.t*, being a kind of a "predecessor" of the Ramesside *tnr/tl hr h3s.wt* or *tnr/tl hr h3s.wt nb(.t)*, i.e. "mighty king/hero of foreign lands" or "mighty king/hero of all foreign lands".

Other Epithets

The same Hittito-Egyptian milieu has been correctly identified by S. Lackenbacher⁴⁴ in the case of "the good son of the Sun", attested twice in RS 88.2158,⁴⁵ because the parallel expression appears in a letter of Ramesse II to Pudukhepa KUB 3.68: 4 as DUMU SIG₅-*qú ša D.UTU-aš*.

Nevertheless, more serious problems appear when we try to find Egyptian parallels to the other royal epithets – "the king of kings," "the just king," "the good king," and "my/your good master". The

expression "the king of kings," i.e. *mlk mlkm* (CAT 2.81: 3, 20'; CAT 2.76: 1, 9, 10 and CAT 9.530: 1, 9), cannot be found either in the contemporaneous or in the earlier documents. There is a single royal epithet *hk3 hk3.w m t3.w nb.w* written on a fragment of a royal colossus of Ramesse II at the Temple of Amun in Karnak.⁴⁶ Grimal reconstructs⁴⁷ the passage as *hk3 (n) hk3.w m t3.w nb.w* and gives a translation of "ruler (of) rulers in all the lands". This would fit perfectly into the Ramesside terminology. However, I would suggest here a slightly different translation with a passive participle. Thus the expression *hk3 hk3.w m t3.w nb.w* would be translated without a necessary "amendment" to the text as "ruler of those who are ruled in all lands", which reflects more accurately its precise usage in Dynasty 18.⁴⁸ None of the above mentioned epithets appear either in the Hittite – Egyptian correspondence, or the contemporaneous Egyptian written sources.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is obvious that there was a kind of "epistolary tradition" followed by the Ugaritic scribes. The same structure of the opening passage is attested in both the Amarna corpus as well as in the Ramesside collection of epistolary documents. However, during the Ramesside period, or more precisely after the conclusion of the Silver Treaty, the extent of the vocabulary used to identify the Egyptian king was widened significantly. The "new" or "innovative" terminology – as evidenced in several examples – is closely associated with the terminology used in the area of political and diplomatic relations between the two Great Powers of that time, Egypt and Hatti. The Ugaritic examples show that the royal scribes of Ugarit were, to a certain degree (limited by the small number of preserved documents), familiar with this "new" terminology and subsequently they were able to use it in their own compositions.

³⁸ EDEL 1997, 89.

³⁹ Gebel Barkal Stela, *Urk.* IV 1228,11.

⁴⁰ Karnak Stela, *Urk.* IV 1310, 8; Amada Stela (with a duplicat in Vienna) *Urk.* IV 1289, 9, 10.

⁴¹ Amada temple, *Urk.* IV 1566, 5 and Neferhet's stela (JE 34022), cf. *Urk.* IV 1612, 11.

⁴² Nachtmin's stela, SANDMAN 1938, 145 l. 7.

⁴³ Restoration Stela, *Urk.* IV 2032, 14; copy of the Restoration Stela, *Urk.* IV 2034, 9; further attestations: *Urk.* IV 2054, 8, 13, *Urk.* IV 2056, 8, *Urk.* IV 2135, 16.

⁴⁴ LACKENBACHER 2001, 241.

⁴⁵ 5': DUMU SIG₅ 'D.UTU'; 9': DUMU SIG₅ D.UTU-a

⁴⁶ LE SAOUT 1982, 267.

⁴⁷ GRIMAL 1986: 576 and n. 93.

⁴⁸ As proved by LORTON 1974, 33–35.

Bibliography

- AHL, S.
1973 *Epistolary Texts from Ugarit*, Ann Arbor (unpublished dissertation).
- ALT, A.
1954 Neue Berichte über Feldzüge von Pharaonen des Neuen Reiches nach Palästina, *ZDPV* 70, 33–75.
- ARNAUD, D.
1992 Les ports de la 'Phénicie' à la fin de l'âge du bronze récent (XIV–XIII siècles) d'après les textes cunéiformes de Syrie, *SMEA* 30, 179–194.
- ASTOUR, M. C.
1981 Ugarit and the Great Powers, 3–29, in: G. D. YOUNG (ed.), *Ugarit in Retrospect. Fifty Years of Ugarit and Ugaritic*, Winona Lake, In.
- BADAWI, A.
1943 Die neue historische Stele Amenophis' II., *ASAE* 42, 1–23.
- BERGER, P.-R.
1970 Zu den 'akkadischen' Briefen Ugaritica V, *UF* 2, 285–293.
- BORDREUIL, P.
1982 Quatre documents en cunéiformes alphabétiques mal connus ou inédits, *Semitica* 32, 5–14.
- BORDREUIL, P. and CAQUOT, A.
1980 Les textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découverts en 1978 à Ibn Hani, *Syria* 57, 343–373.
- BREASTED, J. H.
1906 *Ancient Records of Egypt. Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest. Volume III: The Nineteenth Dynasty*, Chicago.
- CHRISTOPHE, L., DONADONI, S. and EDEL, E.
[s.d.] *Abou – Simbel. Bataille de Kadech. Texte et description archéologique*, Le Caire.
- CUNCHILLOS, J.-L.
1989 Correspondance. Introduction, traduction, commentaire, 241–421, in: *Textes Ougaritiques II*, LAPO 14, Paris.
1999 The Ugaritic Letters, 359–374, in: W. G. E. WATSON and N. WYATT (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, HdO 39, Leiden – Boston – Köln.
- DAVIES, B. G.
1997 *Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Nineteenth Dynasty*, Documenta Mundi. Aegyptiaca 2, Jönsered.
- DER MANUELIAN, P.
1987 *Studies in the Reign of Amenophis II*, HÄB 26, Hildesheim.
- DIJKSTRA, M.
1987 Marginalia to the Ugaritic Letters in KTU (I), *UF* 19, 35–48.
- EDEL, E.
1953 Die Stelen Amenophis' II. aus Karnak und Memphis mit Bericht über die asiatischen Feldzüge des Königs, *ZDPV* 69/2, 97–176.
1997 *Der Vertrag zwischen Ramses II. von Ägypten und Hattušili von Hatti*, WVDog 95, Berlin.
- ERMAN, A.
1889 Die syrische Feldzug Amenophis II., *ZÄS* 27, 39–41.
1923 *Die Literatur der Aegypter. Gedichte, Erzählungen und Lehrbücher aus dem 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Leipzig.
- FAULKNER, R. O.
1958 The Battle of Kadesh, *MDAIK* 16, 93–111.
- FECHT, G.
1984 Das 'Poème' über die Qadeš-Schlacht, *SAK* 11 (= *Festschrift Wolfgang Helck*), 281–333.
- FREU, J.
2000 Ugarit et les puissances à l'époque amarnienne (c. 1350–1310 av. J.-C.), *Semitica* 50, 9–39.
- GARDINER, A. H.
1935 *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum. Third Series, Chester Beatty Gift, Vol. I. Text, Vol. II. Plates*, London.
1960 *The Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II*, Oxford.
- GIVEON, R.
1981 Some Egyptological Considerations concerning Ugarit, 55–58, in: G.D. YOUNG (ed.), *Ugarit in Retrospect. Fifty Years of Ugarit and Ugaritic*, Winona Lake, In.
1986 Ugarit, cols. 838–842, in: W. HELCK and W. WESTENDORF (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie VI*, Wiesbaden.
- GOEDICKE, H.
1992 Amenophis II in Samaria, *SAK* 19, 132–150.
- GONNET, H.
1979 La titulaire royal hittite au II^e millénaire avant J.-C., *Hethitica* 3, 3–108.
- GOREN, Y., FINKELSTEIN, I. and NA'AMAN, N.
2004 *Inscribed in Clay. Provenance Study of the Amarna Letters and other Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology. Monograph Series 23, Tel Aviv.
- GRDSELOFF, B.
1947 Sur deux passages de la nouvelle stèle d'Amenophis II trouvée à Memphis, *ASAE* 45, 107–120.
- GRIMAL, N.
1986 *Les termes de la propagande royale égyptienne de la XIX^e dynastie à la conquête d'Alexandre*, Mémoires de l'académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, nouvelle série VI, Paris.

- HASSAN, S.
1929 *Le poème dit de Pentaour et le rapport officiel sur la bataille de Qadesh*, Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté des lettres 2, Le Caire.
- HELCK, W.
1995 Die Beziehungen Ägypten – Ugarit, 87–94, in: M. DIETRICH and O. LORETZ (eds.), *Ugarit: ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient*, ALASP 7, Münster.
- KITCHEN, K.A.
1996 *Rameside Inscriptions. Translated & Annotated. Translations. Volume II. Ramesses, Royal Inscriptions*, Oxford – Cambridge, Massachusetts.
1999 *Rameside Inscriptions. Translated & Annotated. Notes and Comments. Volume II. Ramesses II, Royal Inscriptions*, Oxford – Malden, Massachusetts.
- KNUDTZON, J. A.
1915 *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen*. Anmerkungen und Register bearbeitet von C. Weber und E. Ebeling, Vorderasiatische Bibliothek 2, Leipzig.
- KOŘÍNKOVÁ, J.
2002 A Note on the Date of RS 20.182 A (+) B: A Supplement, *ArOr* 70/2, 163–168.
- KRISTENSEN, A. L.
1977 Ugaritic Epistolary Formulas: A Comparative Study of the Ugaritic Epistolary Formulas in the Context of the Contemporary Akkadian Formulas in the Letters from Ugarit and Amarna, *UF* 9, 143–158.
- KUENTZ, CH.
1928–1934 *La Bataille de Qadech I–III*, MIFAO 55, Le Caire.
- LACKENBACHER, S.
1994 Ugaritica V n° 36, *N.A.B.U.* 1994/3, n. 58.
1995 Une correspondance entre l'administration du pharaon Merneptah et le roi d'Ougarit, 77–83, in: M. YON, M. SZNYCER and P. BORDREUIL (eds.), *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C. Histoire et archéologie. Actes du Colloque International, Paris, 28 juin–1er juillet 1993*, RSO XI, Paris.
1997 RS 88.2158, *N.A.B.U.* 1997/1, n. 35.
2000 Between Egypt and Hatti, *NEA* 63:4, 194.
2001 Une lettre d'Égypte, 239–248, in: M. YON and D. ARNAUD (eds.), *Études ougaritiques. I. Travaux 1985–1995*, RSO XIV, Paris.
- LE SAOUT, F.
1982 A propos d'un colosse de Ramsès II à Karnak, 267–274, in: *Cahiers de Karnak* 7 (1978–1981), Paris.
- LEGRAIN, G.
1903 Le grande stèle d'Aménôthès II à Karnak, *ASAE* 4, 126–132.
- LICHTHEIM, M.
1976 *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings, vol. 2, The New Kingdom*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London.
- LOEWENSTAMM, S.E.
1969 Ugaritic Formulas of Greeting, *BASOR* 194, 52–54.
- LORTON, D.
1974 *The Juridical Terminology of International Relations in Egyptian Texts Through Dyn. XVIII*, Baltimore and London.
- MILANO, L.
1983 Gli epiteti del faraone in una lettera ugaritica da Ras Ibn Hani, 141–158, in: O. CARRUBA, M. LIVERANI and C. ZACCAGNINI (eds.), *Studi Orientalistici in ricordo de Franco Pintore*, Studia Mediterranea 4, Pavia.
- MYNÁŘOVÁ, J.
2006 Ugarit: “International” or “Vassal” Correspondence?, 119–128, in: P. CHARVÁT, B. LAFONT, J. MYNÁŘOVÁ and L. PECHA (eds.), *L'État, le pouvoir, les prestations et leurs formes en Mésopotamie ancienne. Actes du Colloque assyriologique franco-tchèque. Paris, 7–8 novembre 2002*, Praha.
2007 *Language of Amarna – Language of Diplomacy. Perspectives on the Amarna Letters*, Prague.
2009 From Amarna to Ḫattušaš: Epistolary Traditions in the Amarna and Rameside Correspondence, 111–117, in: P. MAŘÍKOVÁ VLČKOVÁ, J. MYNÁŘOVÁ and M. TOMÁŠEK (eds.), *My Things Changed Things. Social Development and Cultural Exchange in Prehistory, Antiquity, and the Middle Ages*, Prague.
- NA'AMAN, N.
1996 Ammishtamru's Letter to Akhenaten (EA 45) and Hittite Chronology, *AuOr* 14, 251–257.
- PUSCH, E. B. and JAKOB, S.
2003 Der Zipfel des diplomatischen Archivs Ramses' II., *Ä&L* 13, 143–153.
- SANDMAN, M.
1938 *Texts from the Time of Akhenaten*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 8, Bruxelles.
- SIMONS, J.
1937 *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia*, Leiden.
- SINGER, I.
1999 A Political History of Ugarit, 603–733, in: W.G.E. WATSON and N. WYATT (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, HdO 39, Leiden – Boston – Köln.
- SPALINGER, A.J.
1982 *Aspects of the Military Documents of the Ancient Egyptians*, Yale and London.
- VAN SOLDT, W.H.
1994 More on Ugaritica V no. 36, *NABU* 1994, n. 98.

VIKENTIEV, V.

- 1949 La traversée de l'Oronte. La chasse et la veillée de nuit du pharaon Aménophis II, d'après la grande stèle de Mit-Rahineh, *BIE* 30, 251–307.

VITA, J.-P. and GALÁN, J.M.

- 1997 Šiptī-Baʿalu, un 'égyptien' à Ugarit, *UF* 29, 709–713.

VON DER WAY, TH.

- 1984 *Die Textüberlieferung Ramses' II. zur Qadeš-Schlacht: Analyse und Struktur*, HÄB 22, Hildesheim.

WARD, W.A.

- 1979 Remarks on Some Middle Kingdom Statuary Found at Ugarit, *UF* 11, 799–806.

WILSON, J.A.

- 1947 The Texts of the Battle of Kadesh, *AJSL* 43/4, 266–287.

YON, M.

- 2003 The Foreign Relations of Ugarit, 41–51, in: N. Chr. STAMPOLIDIS and V. KARAGEORGHIS (eds.), ΠΛΟΕΣ ... *Sea Routes ... Interconnections in the Mediterranean 16th–6th c. BC. Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete September 29th–October 2nd 2002*, Athens.

YOYOTTE, M.J.

- 1968 Note annexe, *Ugaritica* V, 113–114.