

Amenhotep III

Perspectives on His Reign

Edited by

David O'Connor and Eric H. Cline

Ann Arbor

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS

1998

Conclusions

Amenhotep III inherited a Levantine empire that, though not tranquil internally, was submissive to Egypt's economic, political, and military demands. While this king receives glowing praise in the Egyptological literature for his diplomatic skills, it must be remembered that he ruled at a point in history when there was no serious contender to Egypt's rule anywhere in the Levant and when the towns of Palestine and southern Syria were politically divided and militarily weak. Amenhotep III may indeed have been a "master diplomat," but he was dealing from a position of strength unmatched by any pharaoh of the New Kingdom. A few peace treaties and diplomatic marriages were sufficient to maintain harmonious relations between Egypt and its most powerful imperial contemporaries, while the threat or occasional use of limited military force was adequate to control the vassal rulers.

Luck is often a critical factor in the success or failure of modern political and military leaders. We tend to forget, however, that the same luck could be responsible for many of the major successes attributed to leaders in antiquity. In the history of the New Kingdom Empire, Amenhotep III's reign was the last extended period in which Egypt controlled the entire southern Levant and northern coastal region, without any superpower opponent to challenge its authority. In the reign of his successor, the Hittites moved down into Syria, and much of the northern Levant that had formerly been under Egyptian hegemony (including the city of Ugarit) was lost. Though Akhenaten and other pharaohs of the late Eighteenth Dynasty would do their best to regain the lost territory, their efforts at best were only partially successful. Never again would the Egyptian Empire be as stable or secure as it had been in the reign of Amenhotep III.

Amenhotep III, the Aegean, and Anatolia

Eric H. Cline

Amenhotep III and the Aegean

The site of Kom el-Hetan in Egypt, located near the Valley of the Kings across the Nile River from modern Luxor, contains the most important pieces of evidence attesting to contacts between Egypt and the Aegean during the reign of Amenhotep III.⁶⁹ At this site are the remains of the mortuary temple of

69. The following discussion draws heavily upon previous publications by the author, cf. especially Cline (1987); idem (1990); and idem (1990-91); now also idem (1994) and idem (1995).

Amenhotep III.⁷⁰ Two huge statues of the pharaoh stand at the entrance to the temple (fig. 7.1). One of these was famous in antiquity for emitting an eerie whistling sound each dawn for centuries, until restoration work during the Roman period finally put an end to the daily "cries of the god." These statues were, and still are, erroneously called the Colossi of Memnon, as a result of a mistaken identification with Memnon, a mythological Ethiopian prince killed at Troy by Achilles. They are today the most famous remains of Amenhotep's ruined temple.

At the rear of the temple, in the northwest corner, are five statue bases (labeled A₁ to E₅ by Lidel),⁷¹ which are all that remain of an original row of ten statues of the great pharaoh. These statues, each smaller than the Colossi of Memnon, were still much larger than life size. Today, only the sculpted feet and the bases on which they stand still exist. Each of the bases is inscribed with a series of place-names (toponyms) arranged in a single horizontal row, running along the front and sides of the base. Each toponym consists of hieroglyphs enclosed within an oval with projections, surmounted by the figure of a bound prisoner—these are sometimes referred to as "captive ovals."⁷²

Each of these statue-base lists gives the names of countries or regions that are thought to have been involved with Egypt in some way during the reign of Amenhotep III. The list inscribed on the fifth statue base, now known as the Aegean List, consists of fourteen names that can be identified with sites and areas in the Aegean (fig. 7.2).⁷³ It is the only example we have from ancient Egypt of such a list of Aegean place-names. There are seventeen toponyms remaining on this statue base, fifteen of which are inscribed on both the left side and the left half of the front side, with two more on the right half of the front side. The list is composed in the so-called group writing or syllabic orthography, the system used by the Egyptians to transcribe foreign words and names.⁷⁴

The two names on the right half of the front side are separated from the others by a double cartouche of Amenhotep III (*[ntr nfr] Nb-m3t-R' [S3 R'] lnmhlp bk3 w3st*) inscribed above a *sm3*-sign to which two bound captives are attached. These two right-hand toponyms are *Kft(i)w*, vocalized as *Kef-*

70. Haeny (1981).

71. Edel (1966).

72. Redford (1983) 362.

73. Edel (1966) 37-40, 52; idem (1988) 30-35; Strange (1980) 21-27, no. 3; Cline (1987) 2-6, 22-23, 26-29, table 2, with earlier references; idem (1994) 38-39, 112, 115, cat. nos. A24, A34; Bernal (1991) 432-34, 474-77; O'Connor (1996) 56-60, figs. 1-2; Haider (1996) 144. The statue base is no longer intact or in situ, having been accidentally destroyed sometime after 1975.

74. See Kitchen (1969a) 198 on syllabic orthography.

tiu, which is most likely the Egyptian name for the island of Crete and the Bronze Age Minoans, and *Tj-n-3-ji*, read as *Tania* or *Timay*, which refers most likely to the Mycenaean (Danaoi; *Danaia) of the Late Bronze Age Peloponnese, on the Greek mainland. In the register above these two names is written:⁷⁵

ʔ3w nbw šʔ3yt pñw nw šrt

[All secret/difficult countries of the North of Asia]

The other remaining names on the Aegean list have been identified as, in order, *Amnisos*, *Phaistos*, *Kydonia*, *Mycenae*, *Boeotian Thebes* or *Kato Zakro*, *Mathana* (Argolid), *Nauplion*, *Kythera*, *Ilios* (Troy), *Knossos*, *Amnisos* (listed again), and *Lyktos* (i-m-n-y-š3, b3-y-š3-š-y, k3-t-u-n3-y, m-u-k-i-n-u, d-y-q-e-i-s, m-d3-n-i3, nu-p-r-y, k3-ti-š, w3-iu-r-y, k3-in-yu-š, i-m-ni-š3, ry-k3-ti). Remnants of several other toponyms, already destroyed beyond legibility when the statue base was unearthed, indicate that *Lyktos* was originally not the last name inscribed.

In the register above the first three names is written:

ʔ3w nbw [f]ñbw bnt-hn-nfr r rdwy ntr pn nfr

[All countries of the Phoenicians and Khent-hen-Nefer (i.e. the North and the South) are under the feet of this good God.]

In the register above toponyms 4–12 is written:

[wr]w b3swr nbw rs[wyw] mh[tywt] bnmw iit [r] knt . . . iw hr pdwy iry twt m bw [w'] . . .

[the princes of all northern and southern countries who did not know to come to Egypt . . . come on their knees united in one place. . . .]

On a final fragment, F₁, apparently from this same register, is written:

. . . r rdit n.sn ʔ3w n 'nh . . .

[. . . that the breath of life may be given to them. . . .]

75. Following Edel (1966) 34–55, pl. III; Strange (1980) 21–22 n. 33, 24 nn. 42–45; Baines (personal communication). Cf. also Bryan's relevant discussion of similar texts in chap. 2 of this book.

Early controversies, immediately following Edel's publication of this list in 1966, focused on whether the list was "anachronistic propaganda" or was contemporary to the reign of Amenhotep III. The topic is still debated, but most scholars favor the latter, particularly since no earlier mentions of such Aegean sites and areas exist in Egypt.⁷⁶ Moreover, these names never appear again in Egypt; they are confined and are unique to the reign of Amenhotep III and the site of Kom el-Hetan.

This statue base of Amenhotep III, while unique in its own right, is not the only textual or pictorial evidence for connections between Egypt and the Aegean during his thirty-eight years of rule. Additional literary references and a few tomb paintings are well known from publications by Vercouter and others and may now be updated.⁷⁷

In all, there are three Egyptian words or phrases that apparently refer to the Aegean area. *Kft(f)w* (*Keftiu*) and *Tj-n-3-ji* (*Tania*), to be equated with Crete and mainland Greece, respectively, have already been mentioned. *Iw bryw-ib mw W3d-wr*, translated as "the Isles in the Midst of the Great Green," is usually seen as a reference to the Cycladic islands of the Aegean, perhaps including Crete. A final term, *H3w-nbwrt*, vocalized as "Hanebwet," although used as a reference to "Greeks" in the Late Period, more likely was a reference to areas in Syria-Palestine during the New Kingdom period and is not discussed here.⁷⁸ During the reign of Amenhotep III, the term *Keftiu* appears in Egypt five times and the term *Tania* appears three times. The term *Isles in the Midst of the Great Green* does not appear at all.

The range of contexts in which mentions of the Aegean occur in Egypt during the reign of Amenhotep III is fascinating. In the tomb of Anen, brother of Queen Tiye, a "Keftiu" appears in a conventionalized wall painting considered to be copied from earlier tombs.⁷⁹ In the scene, the "Keftiu," shown as a kneeling figure with arms bound behind his back and with an identifying label immediately in front of his face, appears among a group of "captives" painted or inscribed on the lower part of a royal pavilion in which

76. The sole holdouts are Ström (1984) 192–93 n. 9, 203; Wachsmann (1987) 95–99, 111–14, 124–25; and Osing (1992) 25–26. The latter two rely on earlier arguments presented by Merittes (1972) 290–91; Osing's philological discussion is interesting but not ultimately convincing. Their arguments are countered in Cline (1987) 4 n. 18; idem (1990) 210 n. 46; Mulhly (1991) 235–39; cf. also now Häider (1996) 144.

77. Vercouter (1956); Strange (1980); Sakellariakis and Sakellariakis (1984) 197–202; Wachsmann (1987); Häider (1988) 1–33. For the entire corpus of New Kingdom references to the Late Bronze Age Aegean, including those from the time of Amenhotep III mentioned in the following discussion, see now Cline (1994) 108–20, cat. nos. A1–A59.

78. Vandersleyen (1971) 139; O'Connor (1996) 55.
79. Vercouter (1956) 79–82, no. 15, pls. XII:116, XXVI:190, XXXIV:230; Strange (1980) 55–56, no. 20; Wachsmann (1987) 40, pls. XLVIII, L.A.

Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye are sitting. Other named "captives" include *Sangar* (Babylonia), *Kush*, *Naharina* (Mitanni), *Arane*, bowmen of *Nubia*, *Tehenu*, and nomads of *Asia*. The painting is dismissed by Vercouter and Wachsmann as useless for historical considerations, because of the hybrid nature of the portrayed "Kefiu" figure; he is shown sporting an Aegean hairstyle, a Syrian robe, shoes with their toes upturned in the Hittite manner, and an unusual skullcap. However, the identifying label *Kefiu* in this painting is of value, and this evidence should not be dismissed out of hand.

Another occurrence of *Kefiu* in Amenhotep III's Egypt is found in a medical papyrus now in London (*P. Lon. Med.* 11, 4-6), in which medical words in the "Kefiu language" are listed for various ailments. The text, copied in the time of Tutanekhamen, dates originally to the reign of Amenhotep III.⁸⁰ It reads:

Spell for the Asiatic disease in Kefiu language: *ṣṣ-n-ti-kṣ-pw-py-wṣ-y-i-y-mṣ-n-ti-kṣ-kṣ-i-r*. This utterance is said with . . .⁸¹

The term *Kefiu* also appears on an ostrakon that is dated very imprecisely to sometime in the Eighteenth Dynasty but that is possibly to be assigned to Amenhotep III's reign. On the ostrakon is written the name *pṣ kftiwy*, to be translated as "the Kefiuan."⁸²

The rest of the occurrences of these terms are all on topographical lists carved for Amenhotep III. The Aegean List, with its mentions of *Tanja*, *Kefiu*, and specific Aegean sites and areas has already been described. In addition, a second topographical list, engraved on column drums in Amenhotep III's Amon temple at Soleb in Nubia, includes the names *Kefiu* and *Tanja*, as well as the names *Hatti*, *Arzawa*, and possibly *Arušna*. Other names in the list are *Qadesh*, *Tinip*, *Ugarit*, *Sangar* (Babylonia), and *Naharina* (Mitanni).⁸³ A few previous scholars have suggested that this is a list copied by Amenhotep III from one of his predecessors, either Thutmose III or Amenhotep II, but most accept the list as a genuine record of Amenhotep III. The latter assumption certainly seems more likely, given the other occurrences of *Tanja* during Amenhotep III's reign. The most recent work on the Soleb List has been done by Edel, who restores the list on the basis of

better-preserved copies inscribed under Ramses II at Aksha and Amara West.⁸⁴

A third topographical list dating to the reign of Amenhotep III, in the Amon-Ra temple at Karnak, has the name *Tanja* between the names *Alašiya* (Cyprus) and *Ugarit*; the names *Hatti* and *Arzawa* also appear in the list, as do the names *Sangar* (Babylonia) and *Naharina* (Mitanni).⁸⁵ The list is inscribed on the socle of the eastern colossal statue standing in front of the north side of the Tenth Pylon erected by Horemheb in the Amon-Ra temple. The list was accordingly thought to date from the reign of Horemheb, and it remained for a time a matter of debate whether the Karnak list was a copy of an older list or represented an actual historic event during the reign of Horemheb. However, the list has now been convincingly redated to the reign of Amenhotep III, for both this list and the list on the socle of the western colossal statue in front of the north side of the Tenth Pylon, are, according to Edel, closely related to those on the statue bases in front of the south side of the pylon. The easternmost of these southern statue bases bears the name of Amenhotep III. All four statue bases, including the two northern statue bases, and their lists may therefore be redated to the reign of Amenhotep III rather than to that of Horemheb.

Amenhotep III and Anatolia

At least four terms found in Amenhotep III's Egypt refer to inhabitants or political entities in Anatolia. *Ḫ-t-ṣ* (alternatively *Ḫt*), the Egyptian rendering of *Hatti*, is a reference to the Hittite kingdom in central Anatolia. During the reign of Amenhotep III, *Hatti* appears five times in four geographical lists—at Kom el-Hetan (twice), Soleb, and Karnak (twice)—and occurs in at least one Amarna letter (EA 31).⁸⁶ There are additional letters in the Amarna archive (EA 41-44) that are the remnants of direct correspondence between the Hittite and Egyptian courts, but these are dated to the time of Akhenaten or later.⁸⁷

80. Vercouter (1956) 82-85, no. 16; Strange (1980) 99-101, no. 43; Haider (1990) 19 n. 7.

81. Translation after Strange (1980) 99-100.

82. Vercouter (1956) 96-97, no. 21; Strange (1980) 101, no. 44.

83. Simons (1937) 47-49, 132-33, 147; Vercouter (1956) 78-79, no. 14; Jirku (1957) 27; Edel (1980) 63-79, esp. 65-68, 74; Strange (1980) 20-21, no. 2; Haider (1984) 9-14; idem (1988) 11.

84. Edel (1980).
85. Simons (1937) 52, 135-36; Jirku (1957) 27, 31; Edel (1966) 37, 51; Cline (1987) 18; Haider (1988) 11-12.

86. Amarna letter EA 45 may also mention the "King of Hatti." Cf. Kitchen (1962) 34-35; Schulman (1988) 60; Moran (1992) 117-18 n. 5. The first Egyptian mentions of *Hatti* and *Arzawa* appear during the time of Thutmose III. See Breasted (1906) 476, 485; Edel (1980) 69; Wachsmann (1987) 8, 35; Haider (1988) 22-23.

87. Moran (1992) 114-17; Schulman (1988).

l-r-t-lw (alternatively *ʾrlw*) refers to the Arzawan kingdom in southwestern Anatolia. The name *Arzawa* appears twice in the same geographical lists at Kom el-Hetan and Soleb, and *Arzawa* is the actual destination and origin (respectively) of two Amarna Letters (EA 31–32), which are concerned with the marriage of Amenhotep III to the daughter of King Tarkhundaradu of Arzawa. According to recent thinking, these letters were probably written prior to Šuppiluliuma I's reconquest of *Arzawa*, perhaps during the final decade of Amenhotep III's reign.⁸⁸

Amarna Letter EA 31 also mentions the third Anatolian group known to Egyptian sources at this time, the *Kaška* (*KURGa-aš-ḡa*), a people located to the northeast of Hattusas and frequently at war with the Hittites. The *Kaška* are known to have sacked Hattusas ca. 1400 B.C., at about the time when an Arzawan army had marched on the Hatti lands.⁸⁹

A final term, *a-r-t-w-i-š-ḡ-n*, which appears once in the geographical list at Soleb, has been tentatively identified as the name of the Hittite state *Arnušna*, perhaps located in southwestern Anatolia.⁹⁰

When these references to Anatolia appear in Amenhotep III's inscriptions, they are almost always found in juxtaposition with the references to the Aegean. For instance, at Kom el-Hetan *Hatti* appears twice and *Arzawa* once on the first of the statue-base lists (A_n).⁹¹ At Soleb in Nubia, the topographical list engraved on column drums in Amenhotep III's Amon temple includes the names *Hatti*, *Arzawa*, and possibly *Arnušna*, as well as *Kefnu* and *Tanja*.⁹² Similarly, Amenhotep III's topographical list inscribed on the socle of the eastern colossal statue standing in front of the north side of the Tenth Pylon in the Amon-Ra temple at Karnak records the names *Hatti* and *Arzawa*, in addition to the name *Tanja*, as noted earlier.⁹³ We should, perhaps, not be too surprised by such juxtapositioning, for the other names in these lists include *Babylonia*, *Assyria*, *Mitanni*, *Cyprus*, *Carchemish*, *Al-epko*, *Qadesh*, *Tunip*, and *Ugarit*. In short, each list encompasses the known world located to the north (both east and west) of Amenhotep III's Egypt. Thus, an additional topographical list inscribed on the granite socle of the eastern colossal statue to the south of the Tenth Pylon in the Amon-Ra

temple at Karnak has the name *Hatti* sandwiched between the names *Naharina* (Mitanni) and *Sangar* (Babylonia).⁹⁴

Within the Amarna archives there are further possible textual attestations to contacts between Egypt and the Hittites during the time of Amenhotep III. In a letter from Šuppiluliuma I to Akhenaten (Amarna Letter EA 41:7–22), the former refers tangentially to earlier negotiations for peace between himself and Amenhotep III, most likely regarding the disputed border in North Syria.

Neither my messengers, whom I sent to your father, nor the request that your father made, saying, "Let us establish only the most friendly relations between us," did I indeed refuse. Whatsoever your father said to me, I indeed did absolutely everything. And my own request, indeed, that I made to your father, he never refused; he gave me absolutely everything. . . . Now, my brother, [you] have ascended the throne of your father, and just as your father and I were desirous of peace between us, so now too should you and I be friendly with one another. The request (that) I expressed to your father [I shall express] to my brother, too. Let us be helpful to each other.⁹⁵

This treaty between Šuppiluliuma I and Amenhotep III may actually have been concluded, for in *The Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I*, written by Šuppiluliuma's son Muršili II, it is reported that the sending of Egyptian messengers by "Nihhururiya" (Akhenaten, Tutankhamen, or Smenkhkare) represented the second time that Egyptian messengers had come to the Hittite king.⁹⁶ The very existence of this earlier treaty is debated, but recent scholarship suggests that it might be none other than the well-known Kurnišama Treaty,

94. Martínez (1985) 137; Simons (1937) 49, 133; Jirku (1957) 27–28, 30. There seems to be some confusion in previous publications as to the correct findspot of this piece. I thank W. J. Murnane (personal communication) for his on-site help in this matter.

95. Translation following Moran (1992) 114–15; cf. Schulman (1988) 74–75 n. 94. Moran notes the arguments that either Tutankhamen or Smenkhkare was the recipient instead of Akhenaten; this does not affect us here if Tutankhamen and Smenkhkare were also sons of Amenhotep III, as many believe.

96. For the various arguments concerning the identification of "Nihhururiya" in the *Deeds* and "Huriya" in Amarna Letter EA 41 as Akhenaten, Tutankhamen, or Smenkhkare, see Kitchen (1962) 12, 22; Krauss (1978) 9–19; Schulman (1978) 43; idem (1988) 60; Wilhelm and Boese (1987) 97, 101–2; Bryce (1989a) 22, 29–30; idem (1990) 97, 100–101, 103; Moran (1992) xxxv, xxxviii–xxxix and nn. 137–38.

88. Jacob-Rossi (1956) 328–36; Bryce (1974) 105 n. 20; Starke (1981) 221–31; Wilhelm and Boese (1987) 103; Schulman (1988) 74 n. 85; Moran (1992) 101–3 and n. 1.

89. Kitchen (1962) 22; Macqueen (1986) 45–46, 55–56; Schulman (1988) 67; Bryce (1989b) 308–10 and n. 46; Gurney (1990) 21, 26. Cf. Goetze (1940) 22.

90. Haider (1984) 9–14; idem (1988) 11.

91. Edel (1966) 6–7.

92. Cf. references in n. 82 in this chapter.

93. Cf. references in n. 84 in this chapter.

which is thought to have included the resettlement of the Kaskean people of Kurushstama in Egyptian-held territory.⁹⁷

Overall, relations between Egypt and Hatti during the reigns of Amenhotep III and Šuppiluliuma I appear to have been diplomatic but not particularly friendly. They were certainly not as amicable as the relationships between Egypt and Babylon or Egypt and Mitanni during this same period.

Comments on Amenhotep III, the Aegean, and Anatolia

Some two decades ago, Merrillees suggested that the Aegean List represented synbolic domination of the Aegean by Egyptians. Bernal has recently revived Merrillees' suggestion and has hypothesized that the Aegean List may be evidence for Egyptian hegemony over the Aegean area at this time.⁹⁸ He suggests that punitive expeditions were dispatched to the Aegean by the Egyptians, resulting in the sending of tribute, as seen in Egyptian tomb paintings, and in Egyptian suzerainty over the Aegean during the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries B.C.

Bernal is certainly correct that there were numerous instances of contact and trade between Egypt and the Aegean during the Late Bronze Age, that the relationship between the Aegean and Egypt may have been unequal, that there may have been Egyptian influence on Mycenae during the fourteenth century B.C., and that there were formal exchanges of gifts during this time. There is no evidence in the Aegean area, however, to support the hypotheses of Egyptian punitive expeditions or of Egyptian suzerainty at this time; the data that do exist are indicative of more peaceful diplomatic and commercial expeditions. Thus, Bernal's ultimate conclusion that "Egypt exercised some kind of hegemony over the [Aegean] region" is at present unwarranted.⁹⁹

The domination theory rests on the observation that the names on the Aegean List are inscribed on the statue base in fortified ovals surmounted by bound prisoners. A conclusion that such iconography represents Egyptian military or political control is, however, not necessarily correct, for the combination of a toponym in a cartouche or in a fortified oval with a superim-

posed figure of a bound prisoner seems to be a standard New Kingdom iconographic convention for indicating a foreigner.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, a claim of Egyptian physical dominance over the foreign people in question is not necessarily implied. Some of the countries named in these lists (e.g., Babylonia, Hatti, Assur, and Mitanni) were never dominated by Egypt, and their rulers were regarded by the Egyptian pharaoh as equals; yet these names too are inscribed on the Kom el-Hetan statue-base lists in fortified ovals surmounted by bound prisoners.¹⁰¹ Thus the Aegean List cannot be seen as a statement that the Aegean was physically under Egyptian domination at the time of Amenhotep III.

However, the Aegean List might have some political implications, for it has been speculated elsewhere that this inscription may well be the itinerary of a diplomatic embassy sent to the Aegean during the reign of Amenhotep III.¹⁰² The sites listed can be explained as the ports of call made by the voyagers while in the Aegean area. This would resolve other questions, such as why the city of Amnisos appears twice in the list: Amnisos was a great port and would have been a logical stopping place for voyages leaving from and then returning to Egypt. Although the Aegean List has a few internal inconsistencies as an itinerary if the sites are followed exactly in the order inscribed, such inconsistencies are being eliminated one by one, as new interpretations of the names on the list are offered and accepted.¹⁰³ The ordering of the sites is, moreover, not irreconcilable with a geographical itinerary, since it follows a roughly circular pattern from Crete, to mainland Greece, to Crete again. The Aegean List might thus be literally interpreted as a route to and around the Aegean from the eastern Mediterranean.

Why might it be suggested that the Aegean List is the itinerary of an official embassy rather than merely that of a commercial voyage? First, as noted elsewhere,¹⁰⁴ most of the sites listed are either major citadels of the Mycenaean and Minoan or the port cities for these citadels. The inclusion of these particular names in this list is no accident. The register reads like a Who's Who of the politics of consequence in the Late Helladic/Late Minoan IIIA Aegean, which no diplomatic embassy could afford to ignore or overlook. More importantly, there is a striking correlation between the sites

100. Redford (1982) 55–56.

101. See Kitchen (1965) 1–4, pls. VI–IX; Knapp (1992a) 65–67; idem (1992b) 124.

102. For a full explanation see previously Cline (1987) 1–36; idem (1994) 38–42; also idem (1990–91) 22–26; and idem (1995) 94–95. See also Redford (1982) for other examples of geographical itineraries during the New Kingdom.

103. See, e.g., Edel (1988). O'Connor (1996) 56–59 discusses the possibility that at least some of the other lists on the statue bases at Kom el-Hetan (i.e. A₆–D₆) are also itineraries.

104. Cline (1990–91) 25.

97. Langdon and Gardiner (1920) 203 n. 5; Malamat (1955) 2–6; Güterbock (1956) 98; Kitchen (1962) 22 and n. 1; Schulman (1964a) 69 n. 125; idem (1978) 44; idem (1988) 65–68. There may be an additional reference to this treaty in the plague prayers of Mursili II (KUB XIV 8 obv. 13–15); see Bryce (1988) 26–27 n. 20 and Storchagen (1985) 17–39.

98. Merrillees (1972) 290; Bernal (1991) 433–34, 445, 451, 475–76.

99. Bernal (1991) 475–76. Cogent arguments against seeing the Aegean List as a statement of Egyptian dominance over the Aegean have been previously presented in Cline (1987) 4–5; idem (1990–91) 27, 35–36; idem (1994) 38–39, 42; Wachsmann (1987) 95. Cf. also Redford (1982) 55 and nn. 1–4; now O'Connor (1996) 56–60.

inscribed on this list and the sites in the Aegean area that have yielded objects inscribed with the cartouche of Amenhotep III or Queen Tiye.

All told, there are six sites in the Aegean area where objects inscribed with the cartouche of Amenhotep III or Queen Tiye have been found in good Late Bronze Age contexts (map 3). These unique objects consist of a frit vase, six or more faience plaques (fig. 7.3), and seven scarabs; they have been found at Mycenae and Ayios Elias on the Greek mainland, at Ialysos on Rhodes (fig. 7.4), and at Ayia Triadha, Khania, and Knossos (Sellopoulo) on Crete.¹⁰⁵ Of these six sites, four are also inscribed on Amenhotep III's Aegean List statue base at Kom el-Hetan. These are Knossos, Phaistos/Ayia Triadha, Khania/Kydonia, and Mycenae.¹⁰⁶ There is now, in addition, another scarab of Amenhotep III, found at Panaztepe, near Troy on the western coast of Anatolia.¹⁰⁷ Although Panaztepe is too far to the south of Troy to add a fifth correlation to this list (Troy/Panaztepe), the discovery of this scarab shows that there was some kind of contact, either direct or indirect, between Egypt and northwest Anatolia at this time. More importantly, it lends credence to Edel's still controversial reading of the ninth name on the Aegean List (*W3-ju-t-ii-i*) as *Ilios* (Troy). The correlation between these findspots and the names on the Aegean List is unlikely to be coincidental (see map 3). Moreover, while Egyptian scarabs could occasionally make their way to the Aegean as trinkets, souvenirs, or bric-a-brac, the faience plaques of Amenhotep III found at Mycenae are far more unusual. As Hankey has stated, they

are not traveler's trinkets or the product of casual trade, and are likely to have arrived at Mycenae in a formal manner.¹⁰⁸

The findspots of these plaques at Mycenae indicate, moreover, that their religious nature was understood by the Mycenaeans, even if they were not used in exactly the same manner as they would have been in Egypt (e.g., in a foundation deposit under a temple).¹⁰⁹

The Sellopoulo scarab in particular, found virtually unused in a Late Minoan IIIA1 tomb, suggests that these inscribed objects of Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye in the Aegean began arriving during the Late Helladic/Late Minoan IIIA1 period, a time at least partially concurrent with the reign of Amenhotep III.¹¹⁰ The correlation between the Aegean List and the Aegean findspots of these Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye objects suggests further that all of these objects may have arrived in the Aegean together, possibly as the result of a single voyage.¹¹¹

It may be suggested that the inscribed objects of Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye found in the Aegean area, particularly the faience plaques, are the remnants of a pharaonic gift (or gifts) sent by Amenhotep III. Fully nine of the aforementioned fourteen Amenhotep III/Queen Tiye royally inscribed objects in the Aegean are found at Mycenae. It seems likely, therefore as suggested previously elsewhere,¹¹² that such an Egyptian embassy, if it did exist and occur, was directed specifically toward Mycenae, although stops elsewhere in the Aegean were necessarily included on both the outbound and return legs of the voyage. This destination should not be a cause for surprise, since the site of Mycenae was surging to the forefront of the Mycenaean world during the time of Amenhotep III; during the following reign of Akhenaten (e.g., during the Late Helladic/Late Minoan IIIA2-B periods in the Aegean), there was a tremendous increase in the quantity of Mycenaean exports to Egypt, Syria-Palestine, and Cyprus. There was also a tremendous change in the distribution of Egyptian and Near Eastern objects, from Crete to the Greek mainland, after 1300 B.C. The large number of Egyptian objects, both inscribed and uninscribed, found at Mycenae suggests that this site may well have been the focal point of such an Egyptian embassy and that there may

105. Detailed descriptions and references for each of the objects can be found in Cline (1987) 8–12, figs. 3–14, table 1, and idem (1990) 200–212. Several additional scarabs of Amenhotep III found in the Aegean area and in Anatolia are of only passing interest since they were found in contexts dating to much later than the reign of Amenhotep III; they may in fact be much later copies. These include scarabs in eighth- and seventh-century contexts on mainland Greece—namely, those found below the second temple at the Argive Heraion and in the Precinct of Poseidon at Sounion, which Pendlebury hypothesized were later Twenty-sixth Dynasty initiations (see Pendlebury [1930b] 59, nos. 108–9, 111–12, 83, no. 202)—and a scarab found in a phrygian level at Fraktin in central Anatolia; see Özgüç (1955) 306–7, fig. 36.

106. See previously the maps in Cline (1987) maps 1–2; idem (1990–91) map 3; idem (1994) map 3; now also Haider (1996) fig. 6.

107. The scarab of Amenhotep III (PZ 85/24) discovered at Panaztepe is made of faience or frit and is inscribed *Nb-m3-ṛ b' (w) nfr(w) nfr(w)* (Neb-ma'at-Ra, Appearing in Beauty). It was found in Panaztepe N.12, within a pitios grave (Grave I) probably to be dated to the Late Helladic IIIA period (fourteenth century B.C.). Elsewhere in the cemetery was Late Helladic IIIA pottery (a jar, two *dytikies*, an *adidasstron*, and two stirrup jars), as well as local pottery, bronze weapons, tools, and utensils (gold, glass, and silver jewelry; and a second Eighteenth Dynasty scarab. See Ekkanal (1986) 258; Melnik (1987) 13; Warren and Hankey (1989) 148; Jaeger and Krauss (1990) 153–56, figs. 1–2; Cline (1990–91) 24. Yet another faience scarab (PZ 85/25), inscribed *Imn-R* (Amon-Ra) and dating from the time of Amenhotep III, was found in Panaztepe N.11, within a pitios grave holding three skeletons.

108. Hankey (1981) 46.

109. See extended discussion in Cline (1987) 10–11; idem (1990) 200–212; idem (1995) 94–95.

110. Popham, Catling, and Catling (1974) 217; Mully (1991) 242–44; Manning (1991) 254.

111. See Cline (1987) 11–13 and idem (1990) 208–9 for a full explanation of this reasoning; also now idem (1995) 94.

112. Cline (1990–91) 25.

have been a special relationship between Egypt and Mycenae.¹¹³ An Egyptian embassy sent to the Aegean in the reign of Amenhotep III would probably have had a dual mission: to reaffirm connections with an old, valued trading partner (the Minoans on Crete); and to establish relations with a new, rising power (the Mycenaeans on mainland Greece).¹¹⁴

Overall, the reign of Amenhotep III marked a high point in Egyptian diplomacy. During his years of rule, Egypt continued to conquer foreign lands and peoples, but via the pen rather than the sword. The series of treaties arranged at this time between Egypt and other Near Eastern powers (Ugarit, Mitanni, Babylon) are well known, as are the accompanying dynastic marriages between Amenhotep III and the daughters of Šuttarna II and Tušratta (Kings of Mitanni) and Kadašman-Enlil I (King of Babylon).¹¹⁵ We know from Amarna Letters EA 31–32 that Amenhotep III also married the daughter of King Tarkhundaradu of Arzawa (located in southwestern Anatolia) at approximately this time.¹¹⁶ This marriage undoubtedly cemented yet another diplomatic treaty. We now also have possible evidence, just presented, for an embassy to the Aegean. Why did all of these treaties and marriages suddenly occur? Amenhotep III's predecessors—Amenhotep II and Thutmose IV—had also consolidated their holdings via treaties and dynastic marriages, but their efforts pale in comparison to those of Amenhotep III. What had changed?

At this time, under the command of first Tudhaliya II and then Šuppiluliuma I, the fortunes of the Hittites in Anatolia were once again slowly beginning to rise. The emergence of the Hittites from their citadels in the highlands of Anatolia during the early fourteenth century B.C. posed a subtle threat to Egypt and its empire in Syria-Palestine. Thus, it is perhaps no surprise to realize that the treaties negotiated by Amenhotep III were initiated with the rulers of virtually all the lands surrounding the Hittite homelands, ranging from Amīštamru I of Ugarit to Šuttarna II and Tušratta of Mitanni and Kadašman-Enlil I of Babylon.¹¹⁷ Schulman has recently and convincingly suggested that most of Amenhotep III's foreign policies were aimed at leashing the growing power of the Hittites. As he says,

113. Cline (1991c) 62–64, 297–99; idem (1994) 41–42, 87.

114. Haider (1984) 26, 28; Cline (1987) 19–23; idem (1990–91) 23; Bernal (1991) 476–80.

115. See Amarna Letters EA 1–5, 17, 19–22, 24–25; Schulman (1979) 183–85; Moran (1992) 1–3, 6–11, 41–84, 101–3; Cline (1990–91) 26; Haider (1996) 149–52.

116. Moran (1992) 101–3.

117. See now Haider (1996) fig. 10.

it is possible to discern a deliberate policy of containment of Hatti on the part of Egypt. . . . Egypt's policy of containing Hatti via the alliances with Mitanni, Babylon and Arzawa (?) was successful until well after the appearance of Šuppiluliuma I as king of Hatti.¹¹⁸

The additional treaty probably signed with Arzawa would certainly have been in the best interests of Arzawa as well as Egypt, for Arzawa, like the other entities mentioned, had a relationship with Hatti that veered from hostile to friendly and back again over the course of several centuries, until the region was finally overrun by the Hittites under Muṣṣili II.¹¹⁹

An Egyptian embassy to the Aegean—particularly one that stopped at Mycenae, Knossos, and Troy—may have been sent to conclude a similar treaty with the power(s) in the Aegean, with the aim of containing the Hittites or at least partially blocking them from expanding further to the west.¹²⁰ Such a scenario is supported by recent evidence that the Mycenaeans, identified here with the Ahhiyawans of the Hittite texts, actively encouraged anti-Hittite activities in western Anatolia and that the Hittites may have established an economic embargo against the Mycenaeans.¹²¹ Egyptian anti-Hittite overtures, particularly those that benefited Mycenae, may have found an eager ally in the Aegean. Alternatively, the hostility and lack of trade between Mycenaeans and Hittites might well have been the result of an anti-Hittite treaty signed between Egypt and the Aegean during the time of Amenhotep III. However, while there is much circumstantial evidence to support this scenario, the existence of an Egyptian embassy to the Aegean and of a resultant treaty remains hypothetical at present. New evidence that might possibly support the hypothesis of such an Egypto-Aegean treaty may be seen in a fragment of papyrus from Amarna that depicts a group of what appear to be Mycenaean mercenaries rushing to the aid of a fallen Egyptian, possibly signifying some sort of alliance at precisely the time period under examination.¹²²

118. Schulman (1988) 59–60.

119. Schulman (1979) 183–85, 189–90; Moran (1992) 101–3. Cf. Heinrich-Kramér (1977).

120. Suggested previously in Cline (1990–91) 26–27, 34–35; idem (1994) 41–42.

121. Bryce (1989a) 1–21; idem (1989b) 297–310; Cline (1991a) 1–9; idem (1991b) 133–43; idem (1994) 68–74. See now also Cline (1996).

122. Pendlebury (1951) 141; Parkinson and Schofield (1993); Schofield and Parkinson (1994).

Conclusions

It has become clear in recent years that numerous merchants and traders were plying the seas between Egypt and the Aegean during the reign of Amenhotep III. While it must remain hypothetical, it seems likely that contacts between these two areas included occasional diplomatic embassies as well. Diplomatic overtures to the Aegean area would fit well with the archaeological and textual data that have been discovered in both Egypt and Greece and would be appropriate in light of Amenhotep III's treaties with the other major powers of the Late Bronze Age. The marriage arrangement and probable treaty signed between Amenhotep III and Tarkhundaradu of Arzawa shows that Amenhotep's emissaries were interested in the lands to the northwest. As mentioned, Egyptian anti-Hittite overtures, particularly those that benefited Mycenae, may have found an eager ally in the Aegean.

The relations of Amenhotep III to Anatolia and the Aegean set the stage for lasting commercial and diplomatic links to these areas. The finds of Aegean pottery at Akhenaten's capital city of Amarna are justifiably famous, while the evidence attesting to such imports during the Nineteenth Dynasty continues to accumulate.¹²³ Interaction between Egypt and Anatolia, which took a surprising twist when Ankhnesneferibre (or possibly Neferiti) asked for a Hittite prince to sit on the throne of Egypt, reached a crescendo when Ramesses II finally signed a peace treaty with Hattušili III; however, this event occurred less than one hundred years before the Bronze Age itself came to an abrupt end.¹²⁴

Amenhotep III and Mesopotamia

Kenneth A. Kitchen

Very far away from Egypt, Mesopotamia is traditionally the land between the two rivers—the Great River, the river Euphrates, and, to its east, the river Tigris. The vast and long area so enclosed (particularly within the great western bend of the Euphrates) is hemmed in by the mountains of Armenia and Iran along its north and east and by the Syro-Arabian desert to the south and west.

In the mid-second millennium B.C., three major states occupied the terrain "between the rivers." The southeasternmost was Babylonia, by then termed officially as the kingdom of Karduniaš, ruled by a line of kings of

123. Hankey (1981); Cline (1990-91) 29-30; idem (1994) 31-42.

124. Langdon and Gardner (1920); Moran (1992) xxxviii n. 137.

Kassite (non-Semitic) origin. Its northern pendant was Assyria, then a modest realm nominally under the ascendancy of Babylon, but at times more so under our third realm, its western neighbor Mitanni. This state occupied the great west bend of the Euphrates eastward to Assyria and was in place by ca. 1500 B.C. The peoples of Babylonia and Assyria were mainly Semitic speaking, their dialects comprising the Akkadian language. But the main population of Mitanni in the second half of the second millennium B.C. spoke Hurrian, an agglutinative language (adding qualifying elements in a "chain" to a base element), totally unlike Semitic Akkadian. However, names of members of the ruling dynasty in Mitanni were of Indo-Aryan type (cf. Sanskrit in India) and hence were related to the Indo-European family of languages that includes English, for example. So this realm was probably ruled by a dynasty of foreign, eastern origin.

"My forefathers and your forefathers"—Egyptian-Mesopotamian Relations before Amenhotep III

The most enterprising of pharaohs, Thutmose I (ca. 1500 B.C.), is first explicitly known to have reached the banks of the river Euphrates on a sweeping military campaign up through Syria,¹²⁵ perhaps after an earlier raid by Amenhotep I.¹²⁶ Thutmose I left his visiting card in Mitanni territory by setting up a stela on the east side of the Euphrates, as reported by his grandson Thutmose III, who did the same.¹²⁷ The oldest Egyptian mention of the actual name *Mitanni* occurs in a damaged context under either Amenhotep I or Thutmose I.¹²⁸ All these sparse mentions have been dated to between ca. 1500 and ca. 1480 B.C. A generation later, in his Syrian campaigns, Thutmose III (ca. 1479-1425 B.C.) made a more lasting impact. His signal defeat of the pro-Mitannian coalition at Megiddo in ca. 1457 B.C. caused more distant rulers to take notice. So in year 24 (1456) diplomatic gifts arrived from "the ruler of Assyria"—mention of a large block of lapis lazuli of [x] deben weight is alone preserved to us.¹²⁹ His brilliant success in year 33

125. Campaign in Naharin (Mitanni); Breasted (1906) §§ 81, 85; Pritchard (1969) 234 top. Text: Sethe (1927) 9-10.

126. A view based on Thutmose I's prior claim on his Tombos stela of year 2; cf. Breasted (1906) §§ 67:3 and 73.

127. Ibid. § 478; Pritchard (1969) 239 end. Text: Sethe (1927) 697:5.

128. Brunner (1956) 323-27; Heick (1962a) 117 = idem (1971) 115-16. Text: Heick (1975d) 110-12.

129. Text: Sethe (1927) 671:8-9. Breasted mistread *lapis* as "horses" and added in Syrian tribute here (see Breasted [1906] § 449).