

# PRÁVNÁ FAKULTETA

## Unterstützung der Vakuum-Korrosion

**Mednarodni odnosaji po klinops-  
nihi morcellih iz el-amarnskega  
in heitskega državnega arhiva**

**INDEX**

ZARDENITW ZARDENITW ZARDENITW ZARDENITW ZARDENITW

## 1950

www.2020stg.com

**Stomatološka klinika Slovenskega Porocnega**

иска к вавилонянам. — Письмо Тушратты EA 29 (см. 173 cc.) касается особо сложного случая. Фараон выдал Тушратте для наказания двух митанийцев, совершивших какой-то проступок в Египте. Тушратта наказал их изгнанием, но выражает готовность исполнить желание фараона и приговорить их к смертной казни.

Вторая группа примеров касается случаев, в которых автор письма защищает собственные интересы своих граждан, поскольку таковым грозит ущерб в государстве адресата. Интересно, что очень много таких столкновений возникало между фараоном и небольшим государством Алашиа. — В большинстве случаев фараон упрекает царя Кипра в содействии его подданных с враждебными лужьями. Кипрский царь возражает против этих обвинений, но все же готов наказать виновных и предоставляет фараону по своему усмотрению карать (пленных?). Тем не менее египтяне прибегают к репрессалиям, задерживая кипрские корабли и купцов. Это ведет вновь к интервенции кипрского царя и его рабису. Кроме этого, кипрский царь требует от фараона уплаты за доставленный лес (EA 35, 27 cc.). Затем он просит выдать движимое имущество своего подданного, скончавшегося в Египте. (EA 35, 30 cc.).

Выяснение выше упомянутых спорных случаев ценно для нас особенно потому, что хотя бы отчасти рисует картину тогдашних общих экономических и социальных отношений.

#### International Relations according to Cuneiform Reports from the Tall al-Amarna and Hittite State Archives

(A Summary)

§ 1. Introduction. Among the cuneiform juridical texts which are especially important for studying the relations between the states of the Ancient East, is the diplomatic correspondence preserved in two state archives: in the Egyptian archives in Tall al-Amarna and in the Hittite archives in Khattushash (Boghaz-Keui).

In the present essay are not included the documents that have been discovered, in recent times, at Mari (Tell Hariri); eventually they might be the subject of a special investigation.

§ 2. Review of sources. In al-Amarna, in the late capital of Amenophis IV (= Ikhnaton), part of the correspondence between the Pharaohs Amenophis III and Amenophis IV (1405—1352) and the Western Asiatic rulers was found in the year 1887 (cf. V. P. Potemkin, History of Diplomacy, Vol. I; V. S. Sergejev, Diplomacy of the Ancient East). As their contemporaries are mentioned the following rulers: in Babylon Kadeshman-Kharbe, Kurigalzu II, and Burna-buriash II; in Assyria Ashur-uballit I; in the Hittite State Shuppiluliumash; in the then still independant State of

Arzava Tarkhundaradu, while the name of the ruler of the State of Alashia (probably identical with Cyprus) is not known.

Of the 358 cuneiform texts which Knudtzon's\*) collection contains there are only 42 belonging to the diplomatic correspondence between the two Pharaohs and the Western Asiatic rulers. In four of them we find only gifts enumerated. Among the letters there are three of Amenophis III, two of which he sent to Kadeshman-Kharbe and one to Tarkhundaradu (EA 1; 5, 31). The other letters are addressed to the Pharaoh: nine of them are from Babylon (EA 2—4; 6—11), two from Assyria (EA 15, 16), eleven from Tushratta (EA 17—21; 23—24; 26—29), one is addressed to Teie, the widow of Amenophis III; seven letters are from the ruler of Alashia (Cyprus) (EA 33—39), one letter is from the *rabīqu* of Cyprus written to the *rabīqu* of Egypt (EA 40), one is from the ruler of Arzava (EA 32), and one or two are from Shuppiluliumash, the Hittite ruler (EA 41, 42). Owing to the damaged tablet it is not possible to identify the author of the letter EA 43. Neither is known the author of the letter EA 30, who sent a safe-conduct, addressed to the rulers of Canaan, subjects of the Pharaoh, asking them not to hinder in any way his messenger Akia who was travelling to Egypt in order to express the author's condolence to the Pharaoh.

The correspondence found in the Hittite state archives (1906-07) contains, besides an earlier letter of Shuppiluliumash to a Pharaoh (KUB XIX, 20), the correspondence between the Hittite rulers from the time of 1285—1230 (Khattushilish III, his wife Pudukhepa and their son Tutkhaliash IV) and the rulers of: Egypt (Rameses II and his wife Naptera), Babylon (Kadeshman-Turgu, Kadeshman-Enlil), Assyria (Adad-nirari I, Shalmaneser I, Tukulti-Enrta), Akkhiyavā, and probably also of Cyprus (Alashia). Of the material which is considerably damaged and not yet collected in a single collection, we take into consideration mainly the texts which have been philologically, at least somehow, made accessible. Among this material the letter sent by Khattushilish III to Kadeshman-Enlil (KBo I, 10) is especially important. Besides the diplomatic correspondence between the various rulers there is preserved in the Hittite archives also the Akkadian text of the international treaty between Rameses II and Khattushilish III (1278).

The al-Amarna correspondence is written in Akkadian which was the diplomatic language of that time. Among the exceptions there is a letter written by Tushratta in the Mittannian language (EA 24) and two Arzava letters written in the Hittite language (EA 31: 32). The diplomatic correspondence found in Khattushash is partly written in the Akkadian language (and so is KBo I, 10) and partly in the Hittite language.

\*) J. A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln. Anmerkungen und Register, bearbeitet von O. Weber und E. Ebeling (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek II. Leipzig 1915).

§ 3. General characteristics of international relations of that period. It is characteristic for the al-Amarna period that in the Eastern Mediterranean and Mesopotamia a greater number of states existed which recognized one another's independence, entertained mutual diplomatic relations, but at the same time were jealously guarding their equality.

The Hittite rulers discerned between the great powers and the small states of that period; they considered the rulers of great powers, such as of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, the Mittanni State, being their equals in rank (*annavali*, Akk. *Lūmihruṭti*, *Lūmehir-šu*); there was some hesitation in this respect regarding Akhkhivā. The rulers of the small states are referred to as *šarrani ša limiti* i. e. kings of the environs (neighbourhood). That shows that their states were situated in the immediate neighbourhood of the great powers and were only nominally independent of them.

To denominate the »State« there is not yet a special term in our sources, it is called just »country« (e. g. Mizri = Egypt) or »country of the town...« (e. g. of Babylon [= Karduniyash], Assur).

The states of that time were despotic states where the inhabitants were mainly divided into slave-owners and slaves. All the state activity was concentrated in the hands of the independent, to nobody responsible, monarch. Owing to his preponderate position also the relations between the states were looked upon as relations between their rulers. Thus, by the treaty between Egypt and the Hittite State above all »brotherhood and alliance (peace?)« was established, in the first place between Rameses II and Khattushilish III, which relations then extended to their sons and the two states. Similarly, Khattushilish III declared the substance of his alliance with the Babylonian King Kadashman-Turgu to be the establishment of »friendship and brotherhood« (KBO I, 10, I, 7) between them. It is, therefore, easy to understand that in the documents under discussion so much stress is laid upon the »brotherhood« among the independent rulers and that consequently international relations appear, above all, in the mutual exchange of messengers and gifts.

The occasional statements of the Babylonian (EA 4, 7 ff and 23 ff) and Mittannian (EA 29, 154) rulers in which they blame the Pharaoh's actions for being not autocratic enough, show, that the idea of despotism in the two states was at least as strong as in Egypt.

§ 4. Analysis of the arrangement of diplomatic letters. The letters preserved in the two archives are composed on a fixed scheme. Their constituent parts are:

a) **Introduction** giving the names of both the addressee and the author, whereby also the title »brother« is used, as a rule.

b) **Salutations** (*šulmu*). The author expresses the wish that the addressee, his »house« and family, nobles, armed forces, and countries may enjoy happiness, assuring at the same time that he is enjoying happiness himself.

c) **Subject matter.** The al-Amarna letters deal, on the one hand, with marriages between the daughters of the Western Asiatic rulers (that of Babylon, Mittanni, Arzava) and the Pharaoh, and, on the other hand, they emphasize the exchange of gifts, the Pharaoh's gold in particular. Occasionally they deal with various disputes between both states. The letter mostly ends by giving a list of gifts which the author is sending to the addressee. In the diplomatic correspondence from the Hittite archives marriages and gifts are not discussed as much as political relations and alliances.

It is characteristic, that in drawing up the introduction and salutations the equality of the addressee and of the author was carefully kept.

It is interesting, too, how, in spite of the traditional forms of the introduction and salutations, some other forms were used which are characteristic for the style of the state secretariats of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria and the Mittanni State.

§ 5. **Brotherhood.** The good relations between the independent states are characterized by the »brotherhood« between their rulers and by the periodical exchange of messengers and gifts.

In the introduction of their letters the rulers of the al-Amarna period address each other »brother«; only the ruler of Arzava (EA 31) is not addressed in this manner by the Pharaoh. Through »brotherhood« the equality and independence of the rulers of the various states is acknowledged, while subordination and superordination are symbolized as the relation between master and slave (*belu-ardu*), sometimes between father and son.

The question of addressing each other as brothers was a matter of dispute between the Hittite and Assyrian kings. Khattushilish III refused to address Adad-nirari I »brother«, saying, that this was customary only among those being on good terms (*a-aš-ši-ia-an-te-eš ku-i-e-eš*, KUB XXIII, 102, 11); neither his ancestors did address the Assyrian rulers in this way (1. 16 f). Nevertheless, his successor Tutkhaliash IV uses the address »brother« in his letter KUB XXIII, 99, 2 to the Assyrian King.

»Brotherhood« is the most significant among the numerous synonyms denoting good relations between the rulers. Burnaburiash, writing to Amenophis IV (EA 11, II, 22 f), combines the most important terms: »between the Kings there is brotherhood (*ahhutum*), good friendship (*tabutum*), alliance (peace?) (*salimu*) and »good/ word« (*amatum* [*banitum*]), when the jewels are heavy, when the silver is heavy, when the [gold] is heavy«. In the same sense Tushratta uses also *ra'amutu* = love. In a general meaning, good relations are spoken of as *temu*.

§ 6. **Messengers and gifts.**

a) **Messengers.** As already mentioned, good relations between independent rulers make themselves especially apparent in the periodical exchange of messengers. As suggested by the ruler of Alashia that should be done every year.

It is understood from the al-Amarna correspondence and from the Hittite feudal treaties that only the rulers of independant states were entitled to send messengers to the rulers of other states and to receive their messengers (*ius legationis activum et passivum*).

On the contrary, the vassal sent his messengers only to the ruler he depended on, but was not allowed to send them to other states nor receive their messengers. Whenever an independant ruler received messengers from a ruler who was up to that time only a dependant ruler, and, when he established diplomatic relations with him by sending him messengers, he recognized by this act his independence. In this way diplomatic relations were established between Amenophis IV and the King of Assyria, Ashur-uballit, though the Babylonian King Burna-buriash II was alleging that the Assyrians were »his subjects« (EA 9, 30).

b) **Gifts.** When a ruler sent messengers to another ruler it was customary to send him, at the same time, also a gift which the messenger handed over, probably, when expressing his salutations *šulmu*; therefore, the gift was called *šulmanu*, sometimes also generally *šubultu*, or in the Hittite language *uppeššar*, literally »the matter sent«. The exchange of gifts between the rulers is largely discussed in the al-Amarna correspondence. The independence of the rulers is stressed by the bilateral way how the gifts were exchanged between them. The vassal that is sending gifts to his ruler cannot expect any counter-gifts. In the al-Amarna period there obtained the rule, though unwritten, that the ruler who had accepted a gift, sent to him by a foreign ruler, must not dismiss the foreign messengers empty-handed, but was obliged to hand them over a suitable gift for their ruler. We learn from the al-Amarna diplomatic correspondence how some rulers tried in different ways to evade this obligation when they were not able to fulfil it entirely: sometimes they sent gifts of a lesser value, sometimes they retained the foreign messengers for several years; sometimes they used various pretexts (dangerous journeying, epidemics). The rulers of Western Asia endeavoured to guard at least the aspect of reciprocity of giving presents by assuring the Pharaoh that, on account of »brotherhood«, he might consider their countries as being his; the Pharaoh should just let them know his wishes and they would readily comply with them.

Among the gifts the Egyptian gold was by far the most important; in return the rulers of Western Asia supplied the Pharaoh mainly with lapis lazuli.

They tried by every means, such as supplications, reproaches, and threats to obtain from the Pharaoh »gold, much gold«, »plenty of gold, as much as there is«, »gold more than can be counted over«. Ashur-uballit and Tushratta deliberately assured that in Egypt »there is as much gold as dust«. As a matter of fact, in the reign of Thutmosis III, only from the Nubian mines were extracted 300—

400 kg of gold yearly (Kees). How horribly thousands and thousands of wretched people were exploited for the output of this gold, vividly depicts Diodorus (III, 12—14) for the Ptolemaic period; in the al-Amarna period the conditions certainly were not better (Ermann-Ranke).

The great economic importance of the Pharaoh's gifts is clearly shown by the expressed intentions of the Western Asiatic rulers to build up larger constructions by using the Pharaoh's gold. Thus, »brotherhood« is only a disguise for economic exploitation. As the counter-gifts, lapis lazuli in particular, could not make up for the value of the gifts received from the Pharaoh, the latter's generosity can be explained only by the weak military and political situation of Egypt in that period. By sending rich gifts the Pharaoh protracted the period of peace with the Western Asiatic rulers, and thus, the Egyptian domination over his Asiatic provinces, which he could hardly defend with armed forces. The exchange of various goods with the small state of Alashia was carried on much more on the principle of compensation: the ruler supplied the Pharaoh with copper asking from him silver; he also supplied him with timber and demanded the Pharaoh to pay for it.

In the diplomatic correspondence from the Hittite archives the exchange of messengers and gifts as well as marriages are mentioned likewise. The economical conditions, however, were rather different. The Hittites supplied iron receiving from Babylon in return especially lapis lazuli and horses, which were said, to be there »more abundant than straw« (KBo I, 10, I, 41). Egypt and Babylon, the culturally more progressive states, helped the Hittites by sending them physicians. Supplications for gifts receded somewhat into the background, though they did not disappear entirely (cf. KBo II, 11, I, 11).

c) **Obligatory missions.** In the course of time some general principles asserted themselves, by which it was considered binding that friendly rulers should send each other messengers on certain occasions. Thus, the king announced his accession to the throne by sending messengers to friendly rulers, who, in return, sent their messengers bringing appropriate gifts. Khattushilish III asserts that »the order relating to kings« (*paršu ša šarrani*, KBo I, 14, II, 6) requires the other rulers to send, on such occasions, »royal robes and fragrant ointments«.

At the decease of a ruler the other rulers performed the official mourning and sent messengers of condolence to the successor (cf. safe-conduct for Akia in EA 30). It seems, as well, that royal festivals were attended by messengers of friendly foreign states. As for the complaint of Burna-buriash II that the Pharaoh did not send him a special messenger when he was ill, it is difficult to state, whether such a mission was expected being only international courtesy (*comitas gentium*) or obligatory by law.

d) **Composition and juridical status of missions.** It is not likely that, in the al-Amarna period, there were permanent, accredited ambassadors. The envoys who mediated between independent rulers (states) were itinerant.

It happened several times, indeed, that they were staying for years with the ruler they had been sent to. Probably, they were not allowed at all to return home without his permission. (This presumption has now been confirmed by the correspondence of Märi; cf. F. Thureau-Dangin, RA XXXIII, 1936, 169 ss.)

At the head of the mission there was usually but one person, in very important cases, there were two. The messenger was accompanied by the interpreter (*targumannu*) and on account of security, as well as of prestige, by an armed escort.

The messenger was chosen, as a rule, out of the richest set of the slave-owning class. In the al-Amarna correspondence some experts in settling diplomatic relations are mentioned: the Mittannian diplomat Gilia who was a favourite with the Pharaoh; similarly, the Egyptian diplomat Mane was highly esteemed by Tushratta, and the Egyptian diplomat Khaa by the King of Babylon. Often foreign rulers demanded that only definite persons should be sent to them as messengers.

The rulers paid special honours to foreign messengers, though, there is no mention of diplomatic privileges, especially of their inviolability.

The messenger's statements held good merely as much as they were in accord with the text of the letter he was charged to deliver. That was expressly laid down in the Hittite feudal treaty with Shunashshura. It is understood from KUB XIV, 7 (IV, 48 ff.) that a messenger who would falsely alter the substance of his message should be put to death.

§ 7. **Settling of conflicts.** The aforesaid correspondence also deals with the settling of international conflicts, partly between the rulers, and partly between the citizens of different states. As he, who suffered damage, was not protected by law in a foreign country, his ruler appealed to the foreign ruler to grant him such protection. So, Burna-buriash II demanded in two cases (EA 7, 73 ff., EA 8, 13 ff.) from Amenophis IV to punish those who had attacked on Egyptian territory his messenger and his merchants (*tamqaru*), and to ensure that indemnity be granted to the damaged persons. Thus, regarding any crime, perpetrated in a certain country, justice was administered by the ruler of that country. And by the territorial principle he was obliged to take care that such offences be punished. So, Ashur-uballit let the Pharaoh know that he had punished the Bedouins Sutu who had attacked the Egyptian mission (EA 16, 37 ff.). Khattushilish in his letter KBo I, 10 gave answer to two Babylonian interventions. The first one dealt with the Babylonian merchants who were attacked on their way to Ugarit and Amurru. The second one concerned his vassal Bantishshini. The Hittite ruler

promised to put to trial his vassal for the alleged hostility against Babylonia. But, at the same time, he himself demands from the Babylonian king to give Bantishshini the chance to sue his Babylonian debtors for payment. In Tushratta's letter EA 29 (1.173 ff.) a rather complicated case is referred to. Two Mittannian subjects who had perpetrated a crime in Egypt were extradited by the Pharaoh to Tushratta for punishment. The latter condemned them to exile, but declared himself to be ready to put them to death, should the Pharaoh so desire.

In another group of cases the author defended either his own interests or those of his subjects which were threatened in any way in the foreign country. It is interesting to note how numerous were such conflicts between the Pharaoh and the little state of Alashia.

The Pharaoh reproached the ruler of Cyprus that his men had collaborated with the hostile Lukki-people. Though the ruler of Cyprus rebuked such allegation, he was ready to punish the culprits and left it to the Pharaoh to punish the (prisoners?); nevertheless, the Egyptians used self-help and seized upon some ships and merchants from Cyprus. Such action gave rise to intervention on the part of the ruler of Cyprus and his *rabišu*. On the other hand, the ruler of Cyprus urged the Pharaoh to pay for the timber he had delivered to him (EA 35, 27 ff.). Furthermore, he asked him to return the movable goods of one of his subjects who had died in Egypt (EA 35, 30 ff.) his family having remained in Cyprus.

The afore mentioned cases reveal at least to a certain degree the general economical and social conditions of that period.

