



Diplomatic Marriage in the Egyptian New Kingdom

Alan R. Schulman

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. 38, No. 3 (Jul., 1979), 177-193.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2968%28197907%2938%3A3%3C177%3ADMITEN%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

Journal of Near Eastern Studies is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2003 JSTOR

DIPLOMATIC MARRIAGE IN THE EGYPTIAN NEW KINGDOM*

ALAN R. SCHULMAN, *Queens College, New York*

I

WHEN the message of the Egyptian queen, 'Ankhesenamūn, requesting that a Hittite prince be sent to become her husband, reached Šuppiluliumaš while he was besieging Carchemesh,¹ his reaction was a mixture of surprise, suspicion, and disbelief.² While his surprise at the Egyptian queen's unique and unprecedented request is understandable, the reasons for his suspicion and incredulity are somewhat vague.³ It is true

* A shorter version of this paper, dealing with diplomatic marriage in the Egyptian Eighteenth Dynasty, was read on 17 April 1971, at the 181st meeting of the American Oriental Society, held at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. In my translations of both the Egyptian and Akkadian texts which are scattered throughout the body and notes of this paper, restored or conjectural passages usually have not been indicated, and extraneous material has been omitted. Moreover, I have not hesitated to paraphrase in an attempt to arrive at the spirit or meaning of the text in question. At all times I have attempted to guide myself by the principles set down by the late A. L. Oppenheim in his sensitively penetrating essay "Can These Bones Live?: An Essay on Translating Akkadian Texts," *Letters from Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1967), pp. 54-67, esp. pp. 63-65. Any flaws or errors, however, are mine. Publications of the original texts are easily accessible for those who wish to check them. As I know no Hittite, however, I have relied on the translations of Güterbock, Goetze, and Luckenbill.

¹ See Hans Güterbock, "The Deeds of Šuppiluliuma as Told by His Son, Muršili II," *JCS* 10 (1956): 94-95, 97-98 (with omissions = Goetze, apud Pritchard, *ANET*, p. 319): "The queen of Egypt, who was the wife of the king (*š hm.tn nšw.t* [= Dahmunzu]), sent a messenger to my father and wrote the following to him: 'My husband died. I do not have a son. But, they say, many are your sons. If you would give me one of your sons, he would become my husband. I shall never pick out a servant of mine and make him my husband!' . . . Thus spoke Ḫani to my father: 'Oh my Lord! This is . . . our country's shame! If we had a son of the king at all, would we have come to a foreign country and kept asking for a lord for ourselves? Nebkheprurē, who was our lord, died. He did not have a son. Our lord's wife is solitary. We are seeking a son of our Lord for the kingship in Egypt,

and for the woman, our lady, we seek him as her husband! Furthermore, we went to no other country. Only here did we come!'" When this rather extraordinary, indeed unique and unprecedented, request was made is chronologically narrowed down to, if not pinpointed to, within the reign of Šuppiluliumaš by a statement in a Plague Prayer of his son, Muršili II (see Güterbock, "Muršili's Accounts of Šuppiluliumaš's Dealings with Egypt," *RHA* 66 [1960]: 57-63, esp. 60-61): "He sent out Lupakki and Tarḫunta-zalma, and they attacked those countries. But the king of Egypt died in those days . . . , but since the wife of the king of Egypt was destitute, she wrote to my father." For 'Ankhesenamūn as the sender of this letter, see my article "'Ankhesenamūn, Nofretity, and the Amka Affair," *JARCE* 15 (1979), in press.

² See Goetze, *ANET*, p. 319 (with omissions): "When my father heard that, he called the great into council (saying): 'Since of old, such a thing has never happened before me Go! Bring you reliable information back to me! They may try to deceive me. As to whether perhaps they have a prince, bring reliable information back to me.' . . . The Egyptian envoy . . . Ḫani came to him, because my father instructed Ḫattuzitis, while sending him to the land of Egypt, as follows: 'Perhaps they have a prince; they may try to deceive me and do not really want one of my sons (to take over) the kingship.' The Egyptian queen answered my father in a letter as follows: 'Why do you say "they may try to deceive me?" If I had a son, would I write to a foreign country in a manner which is humiliating to myself and to my country? You do not trust me and tell me even such a thing.'"

³ According to the Annals of Šuppiluliumaš (see Güterbock, "Deeds of Šuppiluliumaš," pp. 94 and 97, with omissions), the request was prompted by Egyptian fears after the attack on the Amka: "While my father was down in the country of Carchemish, he sent Lupakki and Tarḫunta(?) zalma forth into the country of Amka. So they went to attack Amka and brought deportees, cattle, and sheep back before my father. But when the people of Egypt heard of the attack on Amka, they became afraid. . . . You (the Egyptians) came(?) and attacked the man of Kinza

[*JNES* 38 no. 3 (1979)]

© 1979 by The University of Chicago.

All rights reserved.

0022-2968/79/3803-0002/\$01.65.

that the relations which had existed between Egypt and Ḫatti had been friendly in the past. They had been deteriorating, however, for more than a decade, after a Hittite army, commanded by a general named Lupakkiš, had invaded the Amka which was clearly within the Egyptian sphere of influence in Asia, around Akhenaton's twelfth year.⁴ Shortly before the arrival of 'Ankhesenamūn's unusual request, Šuppiluliumaš had dispatched this same Lupakkiš against the Amka for a second time, claiming now that this was in reprisal for an Egyptian attack on his satellite of Kadesh,⁵ an attack presumably ordered by Tūt'ankhamūn.⁶ It is possible that the Hittites had not yet

(Kadesh). . . . When I heard of this, I sent forth my own troops and chariots and the lords. So they came and attacked your territory, the country of Amka. . . . And when they attacked the Amka, which is your country, you probably were afraid, and therefore you keep asking me for a son of mine, as if it were my duty. He will in some way become a hostage, but king you will not make him." While this might have been a reasonable request or demand for a hostage if the Hittites had been the defeated party in the Amka affair, and thus in no position of strength to negotiate from, they appear to have been the victors there. And in any event, such a request for a hostage, as Šuppiluliumaš appears to have believed the letter to convey, should not have been couched in the terms of a marriage proposal, all the more since the Hittite conception of such a diplomatic marriage was that if a Hittite princess married a foreign ruler, she was not merely a lesser wife in the harem, as was the case with foreign princesses who married the Egyptian king (see sec. II below concerning the foreign wives of Thutmose III) but became the chief wife. Furthermore, the Hittites expected that the male offspring of such a marriage would ultimately accede to the throne in question as king. (I am grateful to Dr. Aharon Kempinski for calling this practice to my attention.) This seems clear from the treaty between Šuppiluliumaš and Mattiwaza of Mitanni (translation, Luckenbill, "Hittite Treaties and Letters," *AJSL* 37 [1921]: 166): "And I commanded that Mattiwaza, the king's son, should be king in Mitanni, and that the daughter of the king of Ḫatti should be queen over Mitanni. To you, Mattiwaza (Šattiwaza), ten women are to be allowed, but no second wife is to be advanced over my daughter. . . . You shall not bring my daughter into the position of a second wife. In Mitanni she shall rule as queen. The children of Mattiwaza and the children of my daughter, their children, and their children's children, shall rule in Mitanni in future days." It might be noted that in a second Plague Prayer of Muršiliš (translation, Goetze, *ANET*, p. 395), the request for a Hittite prince makes no reference to the Egyptian queen: "Again he (Šuppiluliumaš) sent troops, and again they attacked it (the Amka). When the Egyptians became frightened, they asked outright for one of his sons to take over the kingship." Under such circumstances, one might well expect distrust of the Egyptian request but certainly not the great disbelief or surprise that Šuppiluliumaš showed.

⁴ For Egyptian-Hittite relations prior to the attacks recorded in the Amarna Letters, see my article, "Amka Affair," nn. 10–12 and the sources cited there. For the attacks on the Amka, see *EA* 170 14–29,

which specifically places Lupakkiš at the head of the Hittite forces but gives him a certain Zitanaš as co-commander, and *EA* 363 7–14; *EA* 174 11–17; *EA* 175 7–13; and *EA* 176 7–13, all of which indicate that the leader of the attack was the Syrian prince Etakama of Kadesh, who linked up with the Hittite forces. For the date of these attacks late in the reign of Akhenaton, see K. Kitchen, *Šuppiluliuma and the Amarna Pharaohs* (Liverpool, 1962), pp. 18, 32, and 48.

⁵ That this was the second time the Amka was attacked is clear from the Plague Prayer cited in n. 3 above: "again he sent troops and again they attacked it" (italics mine). See once again my article "Amka Affair," nn. 3–7 and the sources cited there.

⁶ From the passage in the annals of Šuppiluliumaš cited at the beginning of n. 3 above, the following sequence of events is clear: a) Hittite attack on the Amka; b) Egyptian counterattack against Kadesh; and c) second Hittite attack on the Amka in reprisal. How closely the events in this sequence took place is really not known. If, however, as I have attempted to show elsewhere ("Some Observations on the Military Background of the Amarna Period," *JARCE* 3 [1964]: 63, n. 99), Akhenaton was planning a military campaign in Asia just prior to his death (we may assume unexpected) such a campaign at this late date could only have been in response to the attacks on the Amka reported in the Amarna letters, and it clearly failed. This is very strongly suggested by the statement in Tūt'ankhamūn's restoration stela (*Urk. IV* 2027): "if soldiers were sent to Asia to extend the frontiers of Egypt, no success came of their efforts," the implication being that before Tūt'ankhamūn came to the throne, any military activity in Asia failed because it was not under the aegis of Amūn, and this can only refer to an army sent by Akhenaton. But since Ḫoremḫeb, the bulk of whose military activity was waged on behalf of Tūt'ankhamūn, suggests a victory over Ḫatti by the inclusion of Hittite prisoners in his Memphite tomb (see my "Amka Affair," nn. 14–18 and the sources cited there), we may assume that it was the death of Akhenaton which caused the failure of Egyptian efforts alluded to in the Tūt'ankhamūn stela and that it was not a real Egyptian repulse before Kadesh. The Annals of Šuppiluliumaš merely note (Güterbock, "Deeds of Šuppiluliuma," p. 93) that "to the country of Kinza (Kadesh) which my father had conquered, troops and chariots of Egypt came and attacked the country of Kinza," implying, of course, that the Egyptian attack ultimately failed. But just as it would be quite in keeping with the Egyptian character to represent a defeat or even a local success as a mighty victory (here Ḫoremḫeb's over the Asiatics), the best example being the claim

learned of Tūt'ankhamūn's death before the queen's letter arrived, but even if they had, there is no reason to suppose that they would not have been unwilling to profit by it, provided that the offer was a genuine one. Hence the mission of the Hittite envoy, Ḫattušaziti, to the Egyptian court to investigate, since, if the request was indeed legitimate, Ḫatti would have gained Egypt as a rich and powerful ally through such a diplomatic marriage, if not as a direct addition to the Hittite empire with a Hittite prince on the Egyptian throne, and all this without bloodshed.⁷

It is generally assumed that the practice of diplomatic marriage, i.e., the arranged marriage between the ruler of one state and the offspring of the royal house of another, a practice which is well-attested in the ancient Near East during the last two millennia B.C.,⁸ was undertaken for the purely political reasons of reinforcing treaties, strengthening the relationships of the states concerned, establishing alliances, neutralizing potential rivals, and the like.⁹ This may have been quite so; yet the attitude exhibited by the Egyptians towards such marriages was inconsistent or, at best, one-sided. As a case in point, there is the reply of Amūnḥotpe III to Kadašman-Enlil I when the latter sought a bride from Egypt: "from old, the daughter of an Egyptian king has not been given in marriage to anyone."¹⁰ This was rather insulting, particularly when it is remembered that the two rulers were already related by the marriage of the Babylonian king's sister to Amūnḥotpe,¹¹ who was even then in the midst of negotiating a marriage to a second Babylonian princess, this time Kadašman-Enlil's daughter.¹² It would seem then, that

of Ramesses II to victory at the battle of Kadesh, we have no real evidence that Šuppiluliumaš actually conquered Kadesh. To the contrary, EA 174 and its parallels, EA 175, 176, and 363, suggest that Kadesh and its prince Etakama had freely defected to the Hittites.

⁷ See n. 2 above.

⁸ For the most recent and comprehensive study of diplomatic marriage, see W. Röllig, "Politische Heiraten im alten Orient," *Saeculum* 25 (1974): 11–23, which does not, however, deal with the diplomatic marriages attested in the Old Testament. For these, see A. Malamat, "Aspects of the Foreign Policy of David and Solomon," *JNES* 22 (1963): 8–10 and idem, "The Kingdom of David and Solomon in Its Contact with Egypt and Aram Naharaim," *Biblical Archaeologist* 21 (1958): 96–102; the latter was reprinted (with some corrections and additions) in *Biblical Archaeologist Reader* 2 (1969): 89–98.

⁹ So, e.g., Röllig, "Politische Heiraten," p. 11; Malamat, "Foreign Policy of David and Solomon," p. 8; Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt 1100–650 B.C.* (Warminster, England, 1973), p. 282; McDrower, "Syria, c. 1550–1400 B.C.," *CAH*, rev. ed. (Cambridge, 1969), vol. 2, pt. 2, chap. 10, pp. 484–85 and *passim*.

¹⁰ EA 4 6–7. The full context, *ibid.*, ll. 4–21, with omissions, is: "Indeed, when you have written to me . . . that you will not permit your daughter to marry, saying: 'From old, the daughter of an Egyptian king has not been given in marriage to anyone', then I answer, 'Why do you say this? You are still the king, and you can act as you wish. If you want to give a daughter, who, then, can say anything?' After these words of yours were reported to me, I wrote saying: 'My brother has both grown-up daughters and beautiful women. If there is, then, a beautiful woman,

then send her, if you wish. Who here will say that she is not a king's daughter?' If you haven't sent one as a matter of principle, however, . . . then you weren't really seeking brotherhood and good friendship when you wrote that we should draw closer to one another through a marriage. This is what I had in mind . . . So why hasn't my brother sent a single woman to me? Should I, like you, hold a woman back from you? No! My daughters are here and I won't hold one from you."

¹¹ EA 1 10–21. from Amūnḥotpe III to Kadašman-Enlil: "Now, look, I have investigated the matter about which you had written to me, namely: 'Indeed, you want my daughter to be a bride for you even while my sister, whom my father gave you, is there with you, although no one has seen her now or knows whether she is alive or dead'. These are the very words which you wrote to me on your tablet. Now *when* did you send a courtier who knew your sister and who would have, if he had spoken with her, renewed his acquaintance with her? Let someone like that speak with her. These are the people whom you sent: one of them is Rika, a [. . .], and the other is a donkey-herd . . . There isn't one among them who [. . .] and who was close to your father."

¹² *Ibid.*, 11–12. The progress of the negotiation can be followed by several other letters in this file of the Amarna archive. First, in EA 3 7–8: "Concerning the girl, my own daughter, whom you have written that you wish to marry, well, the girl is grown-up. She's ready for a husband. Send a messenger and have her brought back to you." Then EA 4 33–35, 40–43, and 47–50: "Now, in regard to my daughter, whom I am going to send you, you shouldn't [. . .] her birth, so send all of the animal statuettes about which I have written to you. . . . If, during this harvest, whether in Tammuz or Ab, you will send the things about which

the Egyptian king, at the least, held to some sort of double standard in his interpretation of the purpose of diplomatic marriage: while it was perfectly proper for a foreign ruler to be allied with Egypt through the ties of marriage by the giving of a daughter or a sister, the converse was not true for the Egyptian king. Or, as there appear to have been several exceptions to the principle embodied in Amūnhotpe's rather cavalier rejection of the Babylonian request,¹³ we may regard the Egyptian king's statement either as a bombastic exaggeration and not the unwavering policy of Egypt, or else that it was, under certain conditions, indeed Egypt's fixed policy. That it was the latter is the thesis which will be developed in this paper.

Our evidence for the existence of a diplomatic marriage between the Egyptian court and any of the major or minor courts of Western Asia may be one of two types: either a direct, unequivocal statement that such a marriage had occurred or was about to take place,¹⁴ or else a circumstantial indication of its occurrence, such as the attestation of the name of a foreign princess as the wife of an Egyptian ruler, or vice versa.¹⁵ Our sources for both types of statements are limited. A good portion of them, perhaps more than half, come from Akkadian or Hittite documents, mainly the Amarna Letters, the Annals of Šuppiluliumaš, the Hittite-Ramesside marriage correspondence, and the Plague Prayers of Muršiliš II. The Egyptian documents, other than the bare recordings of royal names, consist of the Giluḥepa scarabs of Amūnhotpe III, a possible reference in the Annals of Thutmose III, and the texts recording the two Hittite marriages of Ramesses II.¹⁶ Finally, though chronologically later than the New Kingdom, but still an important source for the topic of diplomatic marriage, are the biblical texts referring to the wedding of a daughter of Pharaoh to Solomon, the son of David.¹⁷

I have written to you, then I will give you my daughter . . . but as soon as I have finished the work which I have undertaken, then what should I need gold for? Indeed, then if you sent three thousand talents of gold, I wouldn't take them, but would send them back to you, and I wouldn't give my daughter for the marriage." *EA* 2 6-11, also deals with this set of negotiations, but the text is too damaged for any coherent translation. However, from *EA* 5 16-17, the impression is gained that the marriage between Kadašman-Enlil's daughter and Amūnhotpe was finally agreed to, since the Egyptian king writes: "I will send everything which is valuable in the eyes of your messenger, the one who is supposed to take your daughter with him."

¹³ The best-known of these is the attempt of 'Ankhesenamūn cited in nn. 1-2 above. The others which involve possible Egyptian princesses are the presumed marriages of Tany and Herit to a Hyksos king Apopi in the Seventeenth Dynasty (see nn. 18 and 22 below) and the remaining exception to Amūnhotpe's statement of principle is the marriage of Niqmaddu II of Ugarit to an Egyptian court lady during the Amarna period (see n. 39 below). For the marriage of Prince Haddad of Edom to the daughter of a Twenty-First Dynasty pharaoh, probably Siamūn (which really does not enter this study as it is later than the New Kingdom and raises problems beyond the scope of this paper), see Malamet, *Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, p. 90 and Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period*, pp. 273-74 and 282-83. Although the marriage of Solomon to the daughter of a Twenty-First Dynasty

pharaoh is likewise later than the New Kingdom, it has been included since it does conform to the general patterns of diplomatic marriage developed in sec. V below.

¹⁴ See, for example, nn. 10-13 above, nn. 17, 30, and 33-37 below and the references cited there.

¹⁵ See nn. 18, 22, 29, and 33 below, and references cited there.

¹⁶ While the cuneiform documents are certainly primary sources, and although some of them may even have been written by Egyptian scribes employed by the Asiatic rulers at their courts (see F. W. Albright, "The Egyptian Correspondence of Abimilki, Prince of Tyre," *JEA* 23 [1937]: 190-203), they clearly are not Egyptian sources. Nevertheless, with regard to the Egyptian conception and practice of diplomatic marriage in the New Kingdom, these sources provide a better and clearer picture than do the stereotyped, rhetorical, and propagandistically distorted Egyptian documents.

¹⁷ 1 Kings 3:1: "And Solomon allied himself with Pharaoh, king of Egypt, for he married Pharaoh's daughter and brought her into the city of David, until he finished building his own palace, and the Temple of Yaweh, and the wall of Jerusalem round about"; *ibid.*, 7:8: "Solomon also made a palace for Pharaoh's daughter whom he had taken in marriage"; *ibid.*, 9:16: "For Pharaoh, king of Egypt, had gone up and taken Gezer and burnt it with fire, and slain the Canaanites who dwelt in the city, and he had given it as a dowry to his daughter, the wife of Solomon"; *ibid.*, 9:24: "Then Pharaoh's daughter

II

In 1959 Simpson published a fragment of an inscribed stela from Tel ed-Daba in the Eastern Delta of a *sn.t nswt Tʿny*, "the sister of the king, Tany,"¹⁸ the name being enclosed in a cartouche. Inasmuch as a previously published offering stand had been inscribed with this same name, though not in a cartouche, but following the cartouche of a king Apopi,¹⁹ it is clear that not only was the lady Tany a princess, but also a member of the Hyksos royal family. On the basis of the similarity of the element *tʿ* in her name with that of several rulers of the Seventeenth Dynasty at Thebes, where *tʿ* is also the first element, Simpson very cautiously suggested that Tany herself was originally a Theban and that she either owned property in the territory controlled by the Hyksos or that she may even have been married to the Hyksos ruler.²⁰ Assuming that the second speculation is the more likely, since there is no evidence to my knowledge of Egyptians in Thebes owning property in Hyksos territory, it should then be noted that this marriage would have taken place while Egypt was still under the domination of the Hyksos.

A fragment of an alabaster vase, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (no. 21.7.7), which was found by Carter in the tomb of Amūnhotpe I at Thebes,²¹ is inscribed with three cartouches. The two on the left read *ntr nfr ʿ3-wsr-Rʿ sʿ Rʿ ʿIpp*, "the good god, Aawosirēʿ, the Son of Rēʿ, Apopi," while that at the right, which faces these, reads *sʿ.t nswt Hrīt*, "the king's daughter, Herit." Carter found the presence of this fragment, bearing as it did the names of a Hyksos king, who was supposedly a hated and despised enemy of the Thebans, as well as that of Hyksos queen, rather inexplicable in the tomb of a Theban king, and could only explain it by suggesting that the princess Herit might have been married to one of the Seventeenth Dynasty Theban kings, thus making the vase a possible heirloom from one of Amūnhotpe I's ancestresses.²² This suggestion has been adopted, though with reservations, by the majority of modern Egyptological scholars.²³ However, in view of the possible marriage of the Egyptian princess Tany to a Hyksos king, and considering that Herit is a perfectly good Egyptian name, it is quite possible that she was an Egyptian by birth, and that we again have an example of a

came up from the city of David to her house which he built for her."

2 Chronicles 8:11: "Then Solomon brought up the daughter of Pharaoh from the city of David to the house he had built for her because, he said, 'My wife must not live in the house of David, the king of Israel, for the precincts to which the ark of Yahweh has come are sacred.'"

1 Kings 11:1: "And king Solomon loved many foreign women, together with the daughter of Pharaoh."

¹⁸ W. K. Simpson, "The Hyksos Princess Tany," *CdE* 34, no. 68 (1959): 233-39 and figs. 18-19.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 237 and fig. 20 on p. 238. For the earlier publication, see P. Labib, *Die Herrschaft der Hyksos in Ägypten und ihr Sturz* (Glückstadt, 1936), p. 30 and pl. 6. Probably the king in question was Aawosirēʿ-*Apopi*, the last ruler of the Hyksos dynasty, for whom a reign of 40-plus years is attested and who is known to have had at least one other (presumably) Egyptian princess as wife (see n. 23 below). For the name *Tny*, see Ranke, *PN I* 381, 6

where it occurs as a masculine name, and *ibid.*, 8 where it is a feminine name, though in a somewhat different spelling.

²⁰ Simpson, "Princess Tany," pp. 236-37. Simpson is perhaps too cautious here. When taken in conjunction with the evidence of the marriage of Herit to Apopi (see n. 23 below) his suggestion, though still circumstantial, nevertheless becomes much stronger and less speculative.

²¹ First published by Howard Carter, "Report on the Tomb of Zeser-Ka-Ra Amen-Hetep I, Discovered by the Earl of Carnarvon in 1914," *JEA* 3 (1916): 152 and pl. 22, fig. 1.

²² *Ibid.*, n. 5.

²³ See H. E. Winlock, *The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes* (New York, 1959), p. 147; W. C. Hayes, *The Scepter of Egypt*, vol. 2 (New York, 1959), p. 7; T. H. G. James, "Egypt from the Expulsion of the Hyksos to Amenophis I," *CAH*, 3d ed. (Cambridge, 1973) vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 312. See also E. Drioton and J. Vandier, *L'Égypte* (= *Les Peuples de l'orient méditerranéen*, 4th ed. (Paris: 1962), vol. 2, p. 332 and the sources cited there.

diplomatic marriage between the Hyksos and Theban courts, with the Thebans clearly the vassals, at least nominally, of the Hyksos.²⁴ Such an understanding would in no way alter the suggestion that Ḥerit was an ancestress of Amūnhotpe I.

While the juxtaposition of two names, one masculine and the other feminine, as in the preceding two instances, admittedly does not in itself constitute unequivocal evidence for the marriage of the two individuals involved,²⁵ it surely does indicate that some kind of relationship existed between them, and, unless other evidence to the contrary is forthcoming,²⁶ it is not unreasonable to assume, as a working hypothesis, that the relationship was, indeed, that of marriage.

There are no further indications of diplomatic marriages in the Eighteenth Dynasty until the reign of Thutmose III. That this king had foreign wives is, first of all, attested by the contents of the Theban tomb of the three princesses, the *hm.t nsw.t M.^c-n-ht*, "the king's wife, Menhet"; the *hm.t nsw.t M.^c-rw-tt-t*, "the king's wife, Mertit"; and the *hm.t nsw.t M.-n-nw-w³*, "the king's wife, Menway,"²⁷ whose names were inscribed on a number of objects found in the tomb, while others bore the name of either Thutmose III or of Ḥatshepsut.²⁸ Very little can be said about the three ladies or about the circumstances by which they came to enter Thutmose's harem. Their foreign-sounding names have led some scholars to suggest that they were the daughters of minor Syrian rulers, while the intact cartouche of Ḥatshepsut on some of the items has led to the assumptions that they died during the coregency of Ḥatshepsut and Thutmose III, and that consequently the

²⁴ While it is true that the Hyksos certainly considered themselves as legitimate Egyptian rulers and certainly were accepted as such by the Egyptians of the Delta whom they ruled, there is no evidence that they were accepted as such by the Theban rulers of the Seventeenth Dynasty and after. On the contrary, the quarrel between Apopi and Sekenenrē, though reflecting a somewhat later New Kingdom literary tradition (see James, "Egypt from the Expulsion of the Hyksos," in *CAH*, 3d ed., vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 289), nevertheless recognizes Sekenenrē as the equal if not the greater ruler (see A. H. Gardiner, *Late-Egyptian Stories*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, vol. 1 [Brussels, 1932], p. 85): "Now it happened that the land of Egypt was in evil straits, and there was no sovereign as king at the time. And it happened that king Sekenenrē was the ruler of the Southern City . . . while Apopi was prince (*wr*) in Avaris, and the whole land paid tribute to him." Certainly it is not disputed that the Kamose stela from which the Carnarvon Tablet was copied was contemporary with the Hyksos and here, clearly, Kamose does not recognize the legitimacy of the Hyksos ruler (see Gardiner, "The Defeat of the Hyksos by Kamose: The Carnarvon Tablet, No. 1," *JEA* 3 [1916]: 95-110; the translation used here is that of J. A. Wilson in Pritchard, *ANET*, p. 232 [with omissions]): "The mighty king in Thebes, Kamose, . . . spoke in his palace to the council of nobles who were in his retinue: 'Let me understand what this strength of mine is for! (One) prince is in Avaris, another is in Ethiopia, and (here) I sit associated with an Asiatic and a Negro! Each man has his slice of this Egypt, dividing the land with me.' It is clear from both of these texts, the contemporary and the later tradition, that there was a separate Egyptian court at Thebes whose rulers considered

themselves as the legitimate kings of Egypt, and although they acknowledged the Hyksos overlordship, they did so reluctantly. Consequently, according to the Theban viewpoint, the marriage of a Theban princess to a Hyksos king could be and probably was viewed as a diplomatic marriage to a true foreign ruler.

²⁵ As K. Seele, "King Ay and the Close of the Amarna Age," *JNES* 14 (1955): 168-80, demonstrated when he disproved the supposed marriage of Ay and Ankhnesenamūn, proposed by P. E. Newberry, "King Ay, the Successor of Tutankhamun," *JEA* 18 (1952): 50-52, which was based on the similar evidence of a ring-bezel on which their names were juxtaposed.

²⁶ First published by Winlock, *The Treasure of Three Egyptian Princesses*, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Publications of the Department of Egyptian Art, vol. 10 (New York, 1948); see esp. pp. 1-5 and the scarabs with their names on p. 41.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁸ See *ibid.*, p. 1, followed by Hayes, *Scepter of Egypt*, pp. 130-40. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 2d ed., Ägyptische Abhandlungen, vol. 5, (Wiesbaden, 1971), pp. 362-63, nos. 17-19, suggests the following Asiatic cognates: *ma-n-h(a)-t* from מַחַת *ma-rú-ta* from מֶרֶה, and *ma-n-nu-wa³* from מִנְעָה; see I. J. Gelb et al., *Nuzi Personal Names*, OIP 57 (Chicago, 1943), p. 98, and *Urk.* IV 1931, "the lady of the house, the chantress of Bastat, *M.^c-n-n₃*," who was the wife of the brigade commander and overseer of all northern countries, Khaemwase, under Amūnhotpe III. Two of the princesses were then Semites and the third a Hurrian which is quite consistent with the demographic make-up of Palestine-Syria during the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

marriages of the princesses to the king should have taken place early in his reign, when he "shared" power with Hatshepsut.²⁹ Clearly, however, neither they nor any other wives of the king who owed their position at the court to a diplomatic marriage were more than wives of the second or third rank. None of them ever held the title of principal wife, *hm.t nsw.t wr.t*, "great wife of the king," i.e., "queen." How these lesser wives, the daughters of the local Asiatic dynasts, came to be at the Egyptian court is suggested in two ways. On the one hand, one of the Amarna kings—unfortunately his name is lost—is attested in the Amarna archive as having written to the ruler of the land of Ammia and telling him: "send your daughter to the king, your lord, and as presents send twenty healthy slaves, silver, chariots, and healthy horses."³⁰ One supposes that if the local dynast complied with such a request, then in the eyes of the Egyptians his compliance would be considered as the rightful payment of tribute. This seems the more probable when we note that, in the Annals of Thutmose III, the first item of the tribute of Retjenu in regnal year 24, after the second campaign, was "the daughter of a chief (*s3.t wr*), together with her ornaments of gold and lapis lazuli of her land, and the retainers belonging to her, male and female slaves, thirty of them."³¹ Moreover, such an explicit singling out of a foreign ruler's daughter in a tribute list makes no sense whatsoever unless we are to assume that she was destined for the harem of the Egyptian king, with her entourage of male and female slaves destined to be her personal retainers, as was clearly the case with the Mitannian princess Giluhepa who was sent as a bride to Amunhotpe III.³²

We know little about the diplomatic marriage of Thutmose IV, save that it was to a Mitannian princess, a daughter of Artatama. The details are furnished in a letter from his grandson Tušratta to Akhenaton:³³ "Now when [Menkheprurē] the father of Nebmārē, wrote to Artatama, my grandfather, and requested for himself the daughter of my grandfather, the sister of my father, he wrote five times and six times, but he did not give her. Then he wrote to my grandfather for a seventh time, and *then* he gave her, perforce."

The best-attested practitioner of diplomatic marriage during the Eighteenth Dynasty was Amunhotpe III. From Babylon he took two wives, one during the reign of Kurigalzu

²⁹ See Winlock, *Three Egyptian Princesses*, pp. 4–5, followed by Hayes, *Scepter of Egypt*, p. 131.

³⁰ EA 99 10–15; see also EA 187 22–25, from Šatiya of [. . .] to the king: "And see, I have sent my daughter to the court, to the king, my lord, my god, my sungod." Although the name of Šatiya's city is lost, it may very well have been En Šaši since in EA 99 12–15 Šatiya claims that En Šaši is a city of the king which he is protecting.

³¹ Urk. IV 668–69. Similarly in Urk. IV 708, which J. H. Breasted, *ARE*, vol. 2, p. 206, par. 494, read and translated "the son of the chief of Irem," Sethe's autographed text shows a lacuna just large enough to restore a *t* over the *s3*-bird's back. Although Sethe restored nothing here, Breasted noted that both Maspero and Petrie read "daughter of the chief of Irem," which, if correct, would be one more example of a princess probably destined for the king's harem. See also sec. IV below (the marriage of Giluhepa with Amunhotpe III).

³² Unlike the numbers of maidens who are often forwarded in groups, as EA 288 and 301 report. In the former, 19–22, Abdiheba of Jerusalem announces

"Sety, the royal commissioner, came to me, and I gave 21 maidens and 80 captives into the hand of Sety as a gift for the king, my lord." While in the latter, 18–22, a city-ruler named Šubandu writes: "Indeed, I have paid very close heed to the word of the king, my lord, and, indeed, I have given 500 cattle and 20 maidens." Clearly the forty-one maidens given here were not the daughters of the two Asiatic princes and were destined either as concubines or servants in the harem and court of the Egyptian king.

³³ See EA 29 16–18 and also n. 54 below. This marriage is also, apparently, referred to in the Mitannian letter EA 24 iii 34–39 where Tušratta makes a comparison between the dowry he is sending with Taduhepa and those of the earlier Mitannian princesses. The translation given here (with hesitation on my part) is that of S. Mercer, *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets*, vol. 1 (Toronto, 1939), p. 117: "My brother shall be satisfied. He shall desire the dowry. In respect to the daughter of my father, my sister, here is a special tablet: a tablet of her dowry . . . and in respect to the daughter of my grandfather, here is a special tablet: a tablet of her dowry. . . . Let my brother read the tablets."

II, and a second from Kurigalzu's successor, Kadašman-Enlil I.³⁴ Likewise from Mitanni he married first Giluḥepa, the daughter of Šuttarna II—the marriage is recorded both in the Egyptian and the cuneiform documents—and later, from Tušratta, the son of Šuttarna and the brother of Giluḥepa, he sought a second Mitannian princess, Taduḥepa.³⁵ Finally, he also took a daughter in marriage from the ruler of Arzawa, Tarḥundaradu.³⁶

³⁴ *EA* 1 10–21 (see also n. 11 above) for the daughter of Kurigalzu; *EA* 4 11–12, 33–35, 40–43, 47–50; *EA* 3 7–8; *EA* 1 11–15; and *EA* 2 6–11 (see also nn. 11–12 above) for the daughter of Kadašman-Enlil.

³⁵ *EA* 17 24–27, from Tušratta to Amūnḥotpe: "My father loved you, and you loved my father evenso. And in measure to his love, my father gave you my sister." However, according to *EA* 29 18–20, from Tušratta to Akhenaton, matters did not appear to have gone so easily: "At the time when Nebmārē, your father, wrote to Šuttarna, my father, and asked for the daughter of my father, my sister, well, he wrote three and four times, but he never gave her. For a fifth and sixth time he wrote, and then he gave her, perforce."

Additional evidence in the cuneiform documents for the marriage with Giluḥepa is found in the salutations of *EA* 17 5–6, *EA* 19, 6, and *EA* 17 41–45 where greetings are sent to "Giluḥepa, my sister," "my sister and your other wives" and where gifts are sent "for Giluḥepa, my sister," as well as *EA* 25 iii 35–36 (see above n. 33), where the tablet of her dowry is mentioned. For the Egyptian evidence on this marriage, see sec. IV below and esp. n. 66 below. For Amūnḥotpe III's marriage with Tušratta's daughter, Taduḥepa, the following documents are preserved: in *EA* 19 17–24 Tušratta replies to Amūnḥotpe's request for the bride: "And when my brother sent Mane, his ambassador, and said 'Bring your daughter to me to be my wife, to be the Lady of Egypt', I caused no pain to the heart of my brother, but answered in a friendly frame of mind 'Indeed, I shall comply.' And I presented her to Mane, and when he saw her, he was delighted with her. So let him bring her safely to the land of my brother. May Ištar and Amūn make her please the heart of my brother."

He continues in this vein in *EA* 20 8–29 (with omissions): "Mane, the messenger of my brother, has again come to fetch the wife of my brother, the Lady of Egypt, and I have read the tablet which he brought and heard his words . . . And I will carry out all of the words of my brother which Mane brought. Now, I will give the wife of my brother, the Lady of Egypt in this year, and she will be brought to my brother . . . In six months I will send my messenger, Gilia, and the messenger of my brother, Mane. I will give them the wife of my brother then, and she will be brought to my brother. Let Ištar, the mistress of the women of my land, and Amūn, the god of my brother, grant that she pleases the heart of my brother. His wife will be brought to my brother, and when my brother sees her, he will be exceedingly delighted. He will find that she is exactly what his heart desired."

Again, in *EA* 21 13–21: "I will give my daughter to my brother, whom I love, as his bride. May Šamaš and Ištar precede her and grant that she pleases the heart of my brother. Let my brother rejoice on that day. May Šamaš and Ištar give my brother great blessings and beautiful joy."

EA 22 is a very lengthy inventory of items which ends, iv 43–49, with the statement: "All these wedding gifts, of all kinds, Tušratta, the king of Mitanni, gave to Nebmārē, his brother, his son-in-law, when he sent Taduḥepa, his daughter, to Egypt and to Nebmārē to be his wife. He gave them at that time."

By the time of *EA* 23 which reached Egypt in Amūnḥotpe's thirty-sixth regnal year, month 4 of Proyet, Taduḥepa appears to have already arrived at the Egyptian court, since 7–8 of the salutation of this letter is addressed to "Taduḥepa, my daughter, your wife whom you love." This being the case, it is probable that *EA* 24, the letter of Tušratta written in Mitannian, is to be chronologically set before *EA* 23 and probably also before *EA* 22, the "dowry" letter, since the bride apparently had not yet been sent; see *EA* 24 iii 1–23 with omissions (the translation is that of Mercer, *Tell el-Amarna Tablets*, p. 117): "And my brother has asked that the bride be sent to Egypt. Then I gave her and she will be sent to my brother . . . Take her and all this and let her possess all this. See, I have given my brother the bride and she will go to my brother. Therefore I have sent her and my brother will receive her . . . Furthermore, although I have sent the bride of my brother and although I have fitted her out for my brother, she shall go from me as my messenger, and as my messenger they shall provide for her."

In *EA* 29 21–31, with omissions, from Tušratta to Akhenaton, the events of this marriage are recapitulated: "At the time when Nebmārē, your father, wrote to me and asked for my daughter, I said: '[. . .]', and before his messenger I said: 'I will, indeed, give her to you when your messenger . . . will come and bring oil for her head, and when he brings along the brideprice for her, then I will give her.' And the brideprice which Nebmārē, your father, sent had no limits. It covered the earth and reached up to the sky. I did not say that I would not give her, and I sent Ḥormose, the overseer of my brother, quickly to Nebmārē. In three months he had him come back and he sent along . . . gold . . . As soon as I had sent my daughter and after he had brought her back to Egypt and Nebmārē, your father, saw her, he was happy. —Why shouldn't he have been happy?—And he was very pleased, and he said. . . : 'From the depths of his heart my brother Tušratta has given her,' and he declared that day a holiday."

³⁶ *EA* 31 11–24, with omissions, from Amūnḥotpe to Tarḥundaradu: "See, I have sent my messenger, Irsappa, to you with the instruction: 'Let us see the daughter which they are bringing here as a bride for my majesty! And let oil be poured upon her head' . . . So send your messenger and the messenger from me quickly back . . . and they will come to you and deliver the brideprice for the daughter, my messenger and the messenger who came from you." *EA* 32 8–9, from Tarḥundaradu to Amūnḥotpe may actually have

His son, Akhenaton, is known to have had at least two foreign wives. The Mitannian princess, Taduḥepa, whom Tušratta had sent to his father's harem, was incorporated into Akhenaton's harem after Amūnḥotpe's death, and a Babylonian princess, probably the sender of the letter EA 12, was negotiated for him as a bride from Kadašman-Enlil's successor, Burnaburiaš II.³⁷

We do not know which of the Amarna pharaohs it was who took the daughter of the ruler of Ammia into his harem,³⁸ but the marriage of an Egyptian court lady, whose name is not known, with Niqmaddu II, the king of Ugarit (who was the contemporary of both Amūnḥotpe III and Akhenaton), the evidence for which is a scene incised on an alabaster vase found at Ugarit which shows her in Niqmaddu's presence, is possibly to be dated to the reign of Akhenaton.³⁹

The futile and fruitless attempt of ʿAnkhesenamūn, the widow of Tūtʿankhamūn, to marry a son of the Hittite king, Šuppiluliumaš, is the last-known instance of a diplomatic marriage for the Eighteenth Dynasty.

preceded EA 31 chronologically; see L. Rost, "Die äusserhalb von Boğazköy gefundenen hethitischen Briefe," *MIO* 4 (1956): 360, suggest, since in it the Arzawan ruler's statement: "If you really desire my daughter, should I not then give her to you? Naturally I will give her to you!" implies that Amūnḥotpe had already written proposing a marriage, while in EA 31 the marriage has apparently already been agreed upon, with only the ceremonial anointing of the bride's head with oil still to be done before she is to be brought to Egypt.

³⁷ The evidence for Akhenaton's marriage to Taduḥepa is implied in the salutations of EA 27 1-5, EA 28 2-4, 8-9, and EA 29 1-3, where Tušratta calls Akhenaton his son-in-law, calls himself Akhenaton's father-in-law, and hopes that all is well with "Taduḥepa, my daughter, your wife." This is also suggested by the salutation of EA 26 4-5, from Tušratta to Teye, where mention is made of "Taduḥepa, my daughter, your daughter-in-law." The recipient of the wedding gifts inventoried in EA 25 was probably, then, Akhenaton, as Knudtzon assumed, since we know that the wedding gifts enumerated in EA 22 were destined for Amūnḥotpe III, and it is not likely that Tušratta would have given two separate dowries for the same marriage. The Babylonian bride of Akhenaton is attested by EA 11, obv. 5-rev. 18, with omissions, from Burnaburiaš II to Akhenaton: "I sent my messenger, Huʿa, and the interpreter [...] with the following message, that they have not been able to bring the daughter of the king, whom my brother had requested for himself, but that they shall bring another [...] this complaint to my father [...]; these are the words which were sent back about that woman: '[...] she died of the plague.' ... But the one who is supposed to come to you, who is going to bring her to you? Haya has only five chariots. Should she be escorted to you with only five chariots? However, if [...], then I will send her to you, for the rulers around me shouldn't say that a daughter of the Great King has been escorted to Egypt with only five chariots. ... The chariots and the retinue which you sent with Haya, your messenger, are few in number. Send chariots and people in great numbers, and then Haya will bring the daughter of the king to you.

Don't send another envoy. The princess whom you desire, I shall not keep her back with me. But send quickly." EA 12, a letter from a Babylonian princess, is probably connected with this marriage, since in 1 she mentions "the gods of Burnaburiaš." Inasmuch as she address the king as "my lord," we may assume that she has already had the oil poured upon her head and is thus already his wife, although she has not yet come to Egypt.

³⁸ See n. 32 above.

³⁹ See Desroches-Noblecourt, "Interprétation et datation d'une scène gravée sur deux fragments de récipient en albâtre provenant des fouilles du palais d'Ugarit" in Schaeffer, *Ugaritica*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1956), pp. 179-220 and esp. fig. 126. Noblecourt, *ibid.*, pp. 218 ff., dates the scene stylistically anywhere from the last years of Akhenaton until the reign of Ay. Kitchen, *Šuppiluliuma and the Amarna Pharaohs*, pp. 34-35, would narrow this down to before Akhenaton's twelfth year, when Niqmaddu had become a vassal of the Hittite king, suggesting that the marriage was arranged by year 36 of Amūnḥotpe III (= year 7 of Akhenaton) in the hope of bolstering the alliance with Ugarit against the threat of the Hittites. This, however, would have been a very radical departure, even so late in his reign, from the principle which Amūnḥotpe followed in regard to diplomatic marriage in his letter to Kadašman-Enlil (see n. 10 above). Since there do not appear to have been any contacts between the Egyptian and Ugaritic courts attested at Ugarit from about year 9 of Akhenaton until the reign of Ḥoremḥeb, Kitchen, *ibid.*, p. 36, takes this to mean that there had been a rupture of diplomatic relations. Of course, if this were the case, we should not expect any diplomatic marriage to have taken place at this time either, in spite of the extension on stylistic grounds of the date of the alabaster vase as late as Ay. On the other hand, there is no evidence to indicate that Akhenaton had departed from the policy of his father and, presumably, his ancestors. However, if Kadašman-Enlil was willing to pass off any woman as an Egyptian princess, who is to say that Niqmaddu was not unwilling to do the same? Even an Egyptian court lady would have been something to boast about, see sec. III below.

Only four diplomatic marriages are known from the Ramesside period, all of them having been contracted in the Nineteenth Dynasty by Ramesses II. From the Hittite king, Ḫattušiliš II, he took two daughters in marriage, the first in his thirty-fourth regnal year and the second at a date somewhat later in his lengthy reign, but exactly when is not known.⁴⁰ These Hittite marriages, like the marriage of Amūnhotpe III and the Mitannian princess, Giluḫepa, are attested by both Egyptian and cuneiform sources.⁴¹

⁴⁰ But see n. 74 below.

⁴¹ For the first Hittite marriage in regnal year 34, see Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1969-), pp. 233-57, a far more accurate copy of the texts than those of C. Kuentz, "La 'Stèle du mariage' de Ramsès II," *ASAE* 25 (1925): 181-235 and G. Lefebvre, "Une Version abrégée de la 'stèle du mariage'," *ASAE* 25 (1925): 34-35. The pertinent portions, with extraneous material omitted, read: "Then the great princes of every land heard these secret counsels of his majesty, and at this they were reduced to despair, and were afraid, for the dread of his majesty was in their hearts. . . . They, themselves, stripped their own possessions . . . and with their children at the head of their tribute in praise and homage to his name . . . Then every country was with head bowed beneath the feet of this good god . . . except for that land of Ḫatti. It alone had not done the same as these princes . . . Therefore he readied his infantry and his chariotry, and they were set against the land of Ḫatti. He ravaged it alone in the presence of his army which was beside him. . . . Now after many years had passed, their land was laid waste and scorched. . . . Then the great prince of Ḫatti wrote and made overtures of peace with his majesty year after year, but he never listened to them. Now after they saw their land in this miserable state under the great power of the Lord of the Two Lands, then the great prince of Ḫatti said to his soldiers and his courtiers: 'Now see this! Our land is devastated. . . . Every land is hostile and fighting against us. Let us strip ourselves of all of our possessions, and with my oldest daughter in front of them, let us carry peace-offerings to the Good God, that he may give us peace, that we may live'. . . . Then he caused his oldest daughter to be brought, the costly tribute before her consisting of gold and silver, many great ores, innumerable horses, cattle, sheep and goats . . . Then a messenger came to delight his majesty, saying: 'Indeed, the great prince of Ḫatti has caused his oldest daughter to be brought, with a great tribute . . . they have reached the frontier of his majesty. Send soldiers and officials to receive them.' Then his majesty received great joy, and the palace was happy, when he heard this excellent news, the like of which was never before known in Egypt. He quickly dispatched soldiers and officials to meet their vanguard. . . . Then the daughter of the great prince of Ḫatti proceeded to Egypt, with the soldiers and the chariotry of his majesty in escort, mingling with the soldiers and chariotry of Ḫatti. . . . Now after many days they arrived at the house of Ramesses-mi'amūn . . . in year 34, month 3 of Proyet. Then the daughter of the great prince of Ḫatti who had come marching to Egypt was led into the presence of his majesty, with the very great tribute behind her. When his majesty saw her, that she was beautiful of face, the

foremost of the women and courtiers like a goddess. Then she was beautiful in the heart of his majesty, and he loved her more than anything. . . . Then she was given the name Maaneḫrūrē, may she live, the daughter of the great prince of Ḫatti, the daughter of the great princess of Ḫatti, and she was caused to reside in the palace of the king's house." The abridged version of the first marriage stela, Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions*, p. 257, gives a much more concise description of these events: "Their princes wrote to appease his majesty since he had heard of the power of his name. He had his oldest daughter led forth, and a very great tribute was before her, consisting of gold, silver, and copper in great quantities, slaves, horses without limit, cattle, goats, and sheep by the ten-thousands, and the goods of his land without end, for the king of Upper and Lower Egypt. . . . Then the oldest daughter of the great prince of Ḫatti was brought into the presence of his majesty, and as she was so pleasing to the heart of his majesty, his majesty caused her name to be made as the wife of the king, Maaneḫrūrē, the daughter of the great prince of Ḫatti, the daughter of the great princess of Ḫatti." A third text of Ramesses, the "Blessing of Ptah," *ibid.*, pp. 274-75, makes just the barest allusion to this marriage: "Their princes stripped all of their own goods as tribute to the power of his majesty, and his oldest daughter was at its head, in order to pacify the heart of the Lord of the Two Lands." For the second Hittite marriage, see *ibid.*, pp. 282-84 or K. Kitchen and G. Gaballa, "Ramesside Varia II: 1. The Second Hittite Marriage of Ramesses II," *ZÄS* 96 (1969): 14-18. Unlike the first marriage, no reason is given why "the great prince of Ḫatti caused the plunder . . . of Ḫatti, the plunder . . . Keškeš, the plunder of Arzawa, and the plunder of Kode . . . to be brought to the King of Upper and Lower Egypt . . . Ramesses-mi'amūn. And likewise, many herds of horses, many herds of cattle, many herds of goats, and many herds of small cattle were in front of his other daughter, she whom he had caused to be brought . . . to Egypt on the second occasion. It was neither the army which caused them to be brought, nor was it the chariotry which caused them to be brought. Rather it was the strength of the gods of the land of Egypt which caused the great chiefs of every foreign land to bring their tribute on their shoulders, themselves, . . . to bring their herds of horses, to bring their herds of cattle, to bring their herds of goats, to bring their herds of small cattle, together with the children of the great prince of the land of Ḫatti . . . up to the frontiers of the land of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt." Alone, among the Egyptian documents, the Bentresh stela (Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions*, pp. 284-87) has not been cited as evidence for these marriages since, not only is it a much later literary tradition, but it reflects too

The evidence for Ramesses's other diplomatic marriages, which is furnished in various of the cuneiform documents from the Hittite court relating to the proposed Egyptian-Hittite marriages, indicate that he took a bride from the king of Babylon, probably Kadašman-Enlil II, and the daughter of a North Syrian ruler, the king of Zulapi.⁴²

After the New Kingdom, at least one other instance of Egyptian participation in a diplomatic marriage is attested. This was the marriage of a daughter of Pharaoh to Solomon, the king of Judah and Israel, which has been shown by Malamat⁴³ and others to have been a real event and not a mere figment of a historiographer's imagination.

III

Certain patterns suggest themselves from the preceding survey of the known instances of diplomatic marriage as practiced by the Egyptian rulers of the New Kingdom. On the one hand, the marriages of the princess Tany and of the princess Herit to the Hyksos king Apopi, the attempt of 'Ankhesenamūn to marry the Hittite prince, Zanzanša, and certainly the marriage of the daughter of Pharaoh to Solomon, all took place at a time when Egypt was politically and militarily weak. The first two of this quartet of marriages took place in the reign of the Hyksos ruler Aawosirē^c Apopi, just at the zenith of the Hyksos domination of Egypt.⁴⁴ 'Ankhesenamūn's unsuccessful bid took place at a time when, internally, Egypt was wracked with intrigue (if not outright civil war between the queen and her partisans, headed by the then viceroy of Kush, Nakhtmin, and the

distorted a version of the first marriage. However, on it, see Wilson in Pritchard, *ANET*, pp. 29-31 and the sources cited there.

Although there is no real way of knowing to which of the marriages the cuneiform documents from Boğazköy refer, their importance lies in the fact that, unlike the Egyptian documents cited above, they present a more realistic picture of the negotiations, as well as being the only evidence for Ramesses's other foreign marriages. The first of these to be considered is *KUB III 63* 13-16, from Ramesses to the Hittite queen Puduḥepa (published by E. Edel, "KUB III 63, ein Brief aus der Heiratskorrespondenz Ramses' II," *Jahrbuch für Kleinasienische Forschung* 2 [1952]: 262-75): "See, the great king, the king of Ḫatti, my brother, has written to me, saying: 'Have people come to pour good, fine oil upon the head of my daughter, and let her be brought into the house of the great king, the king of Egypt'."

From *KUB III 37* + *KBo I 17* + *KUB III 57* (published by Edel, "Weitere Briefe aus der Heiratskorrespondenz Ramses' II.: *KUB III 37* + *KBo I 17* + *KUB III 57*," *Geschichte und Altes Testament* [Tübingen, 1953], pp. 29-63), it would appear that Ramesses had complied with the Hittite king's request, since he writes (ll. 6-11): "Say to my brother the following: 'as to your writing me "see, the bride [. . .] whom I will give to be [. . .], I give her, and her dowry is greater than that of the daughter of the king of Babylon and greater than that of the king of Zulapi. . . . I am giving my daughter slaves, cattle, sheep, and horses, and in this year I will send my daughter who will bring the slaves, cattle, sheep, and horses, to the land of Aya,—and let my brother send a man so that he will take charge of them in the land of Aya," so, my brother, you have written to me, and

I answer you as follows: "In regard to these slaves, and these herds of horses, and these herds of cattle, and these herds of sheep. . . . I have written to Sety, the governor in the city of Ramesses, the city which is in the land of Upi, to take charge of them, and he will be their leader until the bride comes to Egypt. And further, I have written to the governor Ptaḥ . . . in the city of Ramesses, the city which is in Canaan, to take charge of these slaves from the Kaska-land and these herds of horses and these herds of calves and these herds of sheep. He will be their leader until the bride comes to Egypt. . . . and in respect to your message: 'the military escort of the bride, give provisions to its people,' well, I will give orders for it to be done."

⁴² For Ramesses's other marriages, see in addition to *KUB III 63*, cited in the preceding note, *KUB XXI 31* recto 7-8 (mentioned by Edel, "KUB III 63," p. 38) which refers to a "daughter of Babylon who had been given to Egypt," *KUB XXVI 89*, 9 (published by P. Cornil and K. Lebrun, "Fragments hittites relatifs à l'Égypte," *Orientalia Lovaniensia* 6-7 [1975-76]: 87), which, though very badly broken, mentions the "daughter of Babylon who had been sent into Egypt." For the identification of the other bride's homeland as Zulapi, rather than Barga, see Edel, "KUB III 63," pp. 38-39.

⁴³ Malamat, "Kingdom of David and Solomon," pp. 91-93.

⁴⁴ For what appears to me to be the conclusive identification of Aawosirē^c-Apopi with Nebkhepeshrē^c-Apopi and Aakenenrē^c-Apopi, see von Beckerath, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der zweiten Zwischenzeit in Ägypten*, Ägyptologische Forschungen, vol. 23 (Glückstadt, 1965), pp. 127-30. For the marriages, see nn. 18 and 21 above.

ambitious Horemheb and his supporters),⁴⁵ while, externally, Egypt had lost ground in western Asia where it had shown no military prowess, apparently, since the first Hittite attack on the Amka.⁴⁶ While the Pharaoh whose daughter was given in marriage to Solomon has not been conclusively identified, a good case has been made for his having been the penultimate king of the Twenty-First Dynasty, Siamūn, for whom there is strong, albeit circumstantial evidence for a successful military campaign in northern Philistia, culminating in the conquest of the Philistine enclave of Gezer.⁴⁷ It has been convincingly suggested that the giving of Gezer to Solomon as the dowry for Pharaoh's daughter was, in fact, a face-saving device and that Solomon actually received the city because of his superior military strength.⁴⁸ If, indeed, this was the case, then under Siamūn Egypt was the weaker state, both politically and militarily. Certainly all that we know of Solomon's kingdom suggests that it was the most powerful state in the ancient Near East at the beginning of the first millennium B.C.

All of the other diplomatic marriages in which Egypt was involved, including that of the unnamed court lady to the ruler of Ugarit, Niqmaddu II, appear to have taken place at a time when Egypt was, without question, one of the most powerful, if not *the* most powerful of the ancient Near Eastern states. Clearly this was so during the early and middle years of the Eighteenth Dynasty. From Amūnhotpe I until Thutmose IV it had been constantly victorious in its wars in Asia, including those wars which took place during the reign of Hatshepsut.⁴⁹ It is not unlikely that Menhet, Mertit, and Menway, who seem to have entered into Thutmose III's harem in the early years of his reign, did so precisely because of Egypt's preeminent position as the "great power" in the Near East, a position which no other "great power" disputed a few years later, after Thutmose's great victory over the Hurrians at Megiddo.⁵⁰ However, during the reign of Thutmose IV the wars in Asia against Mitanni came to an end.⁵¹ Perhaps this was due to the realization

⁴⁵ See my "Military Background of the Amarna Period," p. 67, n. 188 and my "The 'Berlin Trauerrelief' (No. 12411) and Some Officials of Tut'ankhamun and Ay," *JARCE* 4 (1965): 64-65 and "A Private Triumph in Brooklyn, Hildesheim, and Berlin," *JARCE* 7 (1968): 35.

⁴⁶ See nn. 4-6 above. For a detailed discussion, see my "Amka Affair."

⁴⁷ See Malamet, "Foreign Policy of David and Solomon," *JNES* 22 (1963): 11-13; idem, "Kingdom of David and Solomon," *Biblical Archaeologist* 21 (1958): 99; Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period*, pp. 280-82. For other views, see J. Gray, *I & II Kings*, 2d ed. (London, 1970), p. 118 and the literature cited there.

⁴⁸ See Malamet. Kitchen, however, *Third Intermediate Period*, p. 281, n. 227, disagrees, assuming that it was in the mutual interest of the two kings to form an alliance, and suggests that Siamūn's attack in Philistia was probably nothing more than a raid in force. His arguments, however, are not convincing.

⁴⁹ On the wars of Hatshepsut, see my article "The Alleged Fall of Senmūt," *JARCE* 8 (1969-70): sec. B, pp. 33-36 and esp. p. 34, nn. 38-39, although this view is challenged, unconvincingly, I believe, by Björkmann, *Kings at Karnak* (Uppsala, 1971), pp. 95-96.

⁵⁰ See Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs* (Oxford, 1961), p. 193, nn. 7-9 and the evidence cited there;

G. Steindorff and K. Seele, *When Egypt Ruled the East*, 2d ed. (Chicago, 1957), p. 59; Drower, "Syria, c. 1550-1400 B.C.," p. 457. That this same impression was maintained by Thutmose's militant successors is clear from a passage in the Memphis stela of Amūnhotpe II, *Urk.* IV 1309: "Now when the prince of Naharin, the prince of Hatti, and the prince of Babylon heard of the great victory which I had made, each one vied with his peer with every kind of gift . . . They spoke in their hearts to the father of their fathers, in order to beg peace from his majesty: . . . 'We bring our imposts to your palace.'" It is not improbable that it was this same cognizance of Egyptian military might that prompted Kurigalzu to refuse to make common cause with the Canaanites (Mitannians) in an attack against Egypt, as is reported in *EA* 9 19-30 from Burnaburiaš to Akhenaton: "At the time of Kurigalzu, my father, the Canaanites sent the following message to him: . . . 'And we wish to join in alliance with you.' My father wrote this answer to them: . . . 'If you are considering attacking the king of Egypt, my brother, then ally yourselves with another, for I won't join in. Shouldn't I rather attack you, for he has entered into alliance with me'. My father didn't listen to them on account of your father."

⁵¹ About the only *real* historical evidence for Thutmose IV's wars in Asia is the fragmentary text from Karnak, *Urk.* IV, 1554, 19, which mentions

of Artatama that Egypt could not be successfully dislodged from its Asiatic conquests, but it should be noted that already a few years earlier, after the third campaign of Amūnhotpe II in Asia, an embassy from Mitanni had made overtures to Egypt, undoubtedly at least, in part, as a result of the loss of Aleppo to the Hittites.⁵² And while it is true that Mitanni would have been discomfited by the opening of a new front of hostilities from the northwest, there is no real reason to assume, as has been done, that Egypt likewise would have been alarmed by the Hittite peril. After all, Egypt and Hatti shared no real common frontier, and it is not improbable that the so-called treaty of Kuruštama which may have been signed around this time, recognized or ratified the Hittite action against Mitanni.⁵³ In any event, the alleged difficulties attendant in Thutmose IV's negotiations for a bride from Artatama should not, as is normally done, be taken at face value. To do so is to isolate the passage in which they are mentioned from the main line of thought in Tušratta's letter to Akhenaton, which was that although both Thutmose IV and Amūnhotpe III had to write repeatedly to Artatama and Šuttarna before their requests for Mitannian brides were complied with, he, Tušratta, immediately agreed when Amūnhotpe III made the same request of him.⁵⁴

While the reign of Amūnhotpe III saw Egypt at the height of its power and threatened by no real or potential enemies, Mitanni not only still had the threat of the Hittites to contend with, but with the breakaway of its Assyrian holdings, probably during the reign of Aššur-bēl-nišešu,⁵⁵ had certainly diminished in both strength and extent, and it is in this context, the continual securing of at least one frontier from an otherwise potential enemy, that the Mitannian marriages of Amūnhotpe III, first to Giluhepa and then to Taduhepa, should be viewed. This, likewise, should explain the Mitannian marriage of Akhenaton. The renaissance of Assyria and the resurgence of its military power undoubtedly also disturbed the Babylonians. Surely the urging of Burnaburiaš II that Egypt should not treat with the Assyrians is indicative of this.⁵⁶ And likewise the complaints of the Babylonian rulers to both Amūnhotpe III and Akhenaton about the inroads which the Sutu and other nomadic confederations were making on the trade routes are further indications that all was not well on the frontiers of Babylon and that Babylon was not strong enough, herself, to prevent them.⁵⁷ It is, perhaps, even more

"what his majesty carried off as plunder from wretched Naharin in his first victorious campaign." It is likely that the tiny inscription from his mortuary temple, *ibid.*, p. 1556, which records "the settling of the estate of Menkheprurē with the Hurrians which his majesty had taken prisoner in the city of Gezer," as well as the allusions in the Ta'anach Letters (see Malamat, "Campaigns of Amenhotep II and Thutmose IV to Canaan," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 [1961]: 218-31), refer to nothing more than this "first victorious campaign." Unlike R. Givon, "Thutmose IV and Asia," *JNES* 28 (1969): 54-59, I do not put any stock in the "historical" scarabs of the king, especially since one of them, scarab British Museum 65800, was convincingly demonstrated by H. Schäfer, "Ein angebliches Skarabäus Thutmose des IV mit Nennung des Gottes Aton," *OLZ* 34, nos. 9/10 (1931): cols. 788-91, to be a forgery. Similarly, I put little weight on the battle scenes on the side-panels of Thutmose IV's chariot or the Asiatic toponyms on the chariot list of this king as strong evidence of repeated

active military campaigning in Asia on his part. At best, the "evidence" provided by such documents is circumstantially general, that the king campaigned in Asia, slaughtered the Asiatics, trampled upon them, and put them to flight. While it is implicit in the timelessness of the actions of the king, indeed, of any king, that once he did this, he *always* did this, there is still no indication that there was any more than a single campaign, the first. Certainly we would assume that once the marriage had been negotiated, any further hostilities would have ceased.

⁵² See Drower, "Syria, c. 1550-1400 B.C.," p. 462, n. 7 and the literature cited there.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 462-63.

⁵⁴ See above, nn. 33 and 35.

⁵⁵ See Drower, "Syria, c. 1550-1400 B.C.," p. 464, n. 11.

⁵⁶ *EA* 9 31-38.

⁵⁷ See C. J. Gadd, "Assyria and Babylon, c. 1370-1300 B.C.," *CAH*, 3d ed. (Cambridge, 1975), vol. 2, pt. 2, chap. 18, pp. 24-25.

significant that neither Hatti nor Assyria supplied Egypt with foreign brides at this time, although this is arguing from silence. On the other hand, Arzawa, on the southwest coast of Anatolia, and a long-time foe of Hatti, did send a bride, a fact which is easily understandable if viewed as an attempt to gain a political ally against the Hittites.

Under Ramesses II, when the next group of diplomatic marriages is attested, relations between Egypt and Hatti had started off badly with the war which saw the Hittite tactical victory at Kadesh-on-the-Orontes in Ramesses's fifth regnal year. It was not until his twenty-first regnal year that they improved, when the well-known treaty of peace with Hattušiliš was concluded, and then still another thirteen years passed until the first of the two Hittite marriages took place. What had happened in the intervening three decades to cause the Hittite victors of Kadesh to first make a treaty of peace—a non-aggression and mutual self-defence pact might be a better name for it—with Egypt and then, later, united themselves in marriage with the Egyptian court? According to the Egyptians, it was the Hittite king who initiated the negotiations for the treaty and for the marriage after seeing his lands continually being ravaged and desolated by Egypt, so that after all other overtures for peace had failed, he simply sent out his daughter at the head of vast columns of tribute. Ramesses's account, however, is sheer hyperbole. There certainly was additional Egyptian-Hittite fighting in the years after the Hittite victory at Kadesh, but there clearly was no *sustained* invasion and the ravaging and desolation of the Hittite realms every year by Egypt such as the Egyptian texts describe.⁵⁸ The reasons for the Hittite *volte-face* must be sought elsewhere and can be none other than in the threat to Hattušiliš inherent in the continued freedom of his deposed nephew, Urhi-Tešub,⁵⁹ as well as in the ambitions of Adad-nirari I of Assyria⁶⁰ and perhaps also in the beginning of Hatti's difficulties with Ahhiyawa, although it is true that the earliest evidence we have for the latter indicates that these began in the reign of Tudhališa IV.⁶¹

In the Eighteenth Dynasty, at least, it was Egypt which appears to have been the party which initiated the foreign marriages. Certainly the impression gained from the Amarna letters is that it was the Egyptian king who requested (perhaps demanded would be a better word) the foreign princess, with his Asiatic counterpart always complying. For in spite of their niggling and their carping or their claims that the Egyptian king often had to beg and was frequently refused, the fact remains that, in the end, the Asiatic kings did *exactly* what the Egyptian pharaohs demanded of them. This is well exemplified by the actions of Kadašman-Enlil I, who accused Amūnhotpe III of possibly even doing away with his sister, Amūnhotpe's first Babylonian bride,⁶² or his successor, Burnaburiaš II, who petulantly complained to Akhenaton that Egypt had

⁵⁸ See n. 41 above. It is clear that the initial attack on the Hittites which is described in the marriage stela and in which Ramesses claims to have ravaged their land "alone, by himself, in the presence of his army," is actually a reference to the battle of Kadesh where Ramesses constantly stressed the fact that he fought alone, with neither infantry nor chariotry beside him (see Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions*, vol. 2, pp. 12–124, *passim*). But Kadesh clearly was *not* an Egyptian victory. For the continued Egyptian-Hittite fighting thereafter, see my article "Aspects of Ramesside Diplomacy: The Treaty of Year 21," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 8 (1977–78): 116, esp. nn. 32, 33, and 38.

⁵⁹ The clause in the Hittite version of the treaty which stipulates Egyptian recognition of Hattušiliš's legitimacy and the promise of Egyptian military support to maintain him and his line on the Hittite throne strongly suggests this. See again my "Aspects of Ramesside Diplomacy," pp. 118–19.

⁶⁰ See M. Munn-Rankin, "Assyrian Military Power, 1300–1200 B.C.," *CAH*, 3d ed. (Cambridge, 1975), vol. 2, pt. 2, chap. 25, pp. 277–78 and A. Goetze, "The Hittites and Syria (1300–1200 B.C.)," *ibid.*, p. 255.

⁶¹ See Goetze, "Hittites and Syria," p. 261 and also J. Muhly, "Hittites and Achaeans: Ahhiyawa Redomitus," *Historia* 23 (1974): 139–45.

⁶² See nn. 11–12 above.

sent only five chariots as an escort for a Babylonian princess and that this clearly was an insult.⁶³ Should we then attribute their ultimate acquiescence to the Egyptian "requests" to the preeminence of Egypt on the battlefield which had been so well demonstrated by Thutmose III and his successors? If this were so, it would make good political and military sense to thus neutralize a potentially dangerous foe and simultaneously gain a powerful ally poised on the rear or flank of other potential enemies. This would have been the situation with Mitanni, which was usually on the defensive in respect to Egypt. Having made no headway in counterattacking, it then found itself threatened first by the newly resurgent Hittite power and then by the loss of its Assyrian territories. Babylon, under the Kassites, had remained as neutral as possible in the power struggles of the ancient Near East, but may very well have started to veer from this neutralist course, at least by ensuring itself a powerful ally, when it started to perceive the ambitions of Assyria and found that it could not cope with the depredations of the nomadic confederations. And this was undoubtedly the same sort of reasoning behind the Arzawan marriage of Amūnhotpe III, just as the mutual defense and non-aggression provisions of the treaty between Ramesses II and Hattušiliš a decade before Ramesses's first Hittite marriage strongly suggest that Hittite power was already beginning to wane.

We may then assume that Egypt's diplomatic marriages with the princesses from the major Near Eastern states, Mitanni, Babylon, and Hatti, represented, on the one hand, its claim to be the leading "great power" in the Near East and, on the other, a tacit recognition of the power, if not the claim, by the weaker but still important other "great powers." We could more easily, then, understand the reason for Amūnhotpe's arrogant and curt refusal of Kadašman-Enlil's request for a bride from the Egyptian royal house.⁶⁴ If the daughter of an Egyptian king were to be given in marriage to a foreign ruler, this would not only imply a loss of face and prestige for Egypt, but it would also, though intangibly, elevate such a foreign ruler to the level of Pharaoh.⁶⁵ Such an assumption would also explain Kadašman-Enlil's seemingly unabashed request for and Amūnhotpe's refusal of *any* Egyptian woman—"who will then say that she is *not* a king's daughter?"—since this would have had the same end result.⁶⁶

IV

Although the statements regarding the diplomatic marriages in the cuneiform documents from Amarna and from Boğazköy are full of rhetorical and bombastic hyperbole, they nevertheless make it clear that the marriages in question were actually being negotiated between the Egyptian and foreign courts. This, however, does not exactly seem to be the situation reflected in the Egyptian documents, the first of which are the series of scarabs promulgated by Amūnhotpe III to announce the coming of Giluhepa of Mitanni:⁶⁷ "Year 10 under the majesty of . . . the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, the

⁶³ See n. 37 above.

⁶⁴ See n. 10 above.

⁶⁵ It is true that, in the cuneiform documents, both the Egyptian and the foreign rulers are called *šarrum*, "king," but in the Egyptian documents this certainly was not the case. The best that a foreign king could be expected to be designated was *wr* "prince," "chief."

⁶⁶ See n. 10 above.

⁶⁷ *Urk.* IV 1738 and now also C. Blankenberg-van Delden, *The Large Commemorative Scarabs of Amenhotep III*, Documents et monuments orientis antiqui 15 (Leiden, 1969), pp. 129–33 and 18.

lord of the ritual, Nebmârē^c, the chosen of Rē^c, the Son of Rē^c, Amūnḥotpe-Ḥikawase, granted life, and of the great wife of the king, Teye, may she live The wonders which were brought back⁶⁸ to his majesty, l.p.h., were the daughter of Šuttarna, the king of Naharin, Giluḥepa, and the chief women of her harem, (a total of) three hundred and seventeen women." While it is customary to consider the event commemorated by this text as the marriage of Amūnḥotpe with Giluḥepa, this is not the impression that the text itself conveys. What is commemorated is the coming to Egypt, to the king, of Giluḥepa and her harem women. No mention or allusion to marriage is made and the only wife referred to in the text is Amūnḥotpe's queen, Teye. In fact, it is from the Amarna letters that we know that Giluḥepa's coming was as a bride.⁶⁹ However, the event commemorated by the Giluḥepa scarabs should not be isolated from those commemorated by the other series of scarabs of Amūnḥotpe III. These underlined his excellence and prowess as a sportsman, which substituted for his seeming lack of military achievements.⁷⁰ Thus he appears as the hunter, par excellence, of wild cattle and of lions, a king whose boundaries extended from Nubia to Syria, and the like.⁷¹ When viewed in the light of such achievements, it then seems clear that the Giluḥepa scarab commemorated still another deed of the king's prowess. Particularly informative in this context is the use of the word which has been translated as "which were brought back." When used as a verb, it frequently has the nuances "lead away as booty," "plunder," "conquer,"⁷² and is used in this sense in the texts of Ramesses II which record his two Hittite marriages. When used as a noun, it regularly appears in the royal annals of the Eighteenth Dynasty with the meaning "tribute."⁷³ It is quite consistent with the character of Egyptian inscriptions, particularly those intended for "domestic consumption," to make the obviously inflated claim that what we know were negotiated marriages were the payment of tribute, particularly when we have the already-cited instance of Ṭutmosē III including the daughter of a foreign ruler in a tribute list.⁷⁴

V

The fact that Amūnḥotpe III negotiated a fresh marriage each time a new foreign ruler ascended to the throne in a neighboring state—in Babylon first from Kurigalzu II and then from Kadašman-Enlil I, in Mitanni first from Šuttarna and then from Tušratta—and that Ramesses II married two daughters of Ḥattušiliš within a relatively short span of time (the first marriage in his regnal year 34, about 1271, and the second no later than about 1265, when Ḥattušiliš died, otherwise there would have been no reason to describe the princess of the second marriage as "his other daughter")⁷⁵ suggests that diplomatic marriages forged bonds between the two rulers, the father- or brother-in-law and the

⁶⁸ Taking *innywt* as a passive participle rather than a relative form. Otherwise the translation should read: "the wonderful things which his majesty carried off were the daughter," etc.

⁶⁹ See nn. 33 and 35 above.

⁷⁰ For the sporting tradition of the Ṭutmoside kings in general, see Hayes, "Egypt: Internal Affairs from Tuthmosis I to the Death of Amenophis III," *CAH*, 3d ed. (Cambridge, 1973), pt. 1, chap. 4, pp. 333–38. For the display of Amūnḥotpe III in particular, *ibid.*, pp. 338–46.

⁷¹ See Blankenberg-van Delden, *Scarabs of Amenhotep III*, pp. 62–128 (the lion hunts), 57–61 (the wild cattle hunts), 21–56 (the marriage with Teye), 134–45 (the lake scarabs).

⁷² *Wb.* I 90, 20.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 91, 17–18; see also Liverani, "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts," *Orientalia* 42 (1973): 191–93.

⁷⁴ See n. 31 above.

⁷⁵ See above, end of n. 41.

son-in-law, but *not* between their respective states; thus, if either king or the bride died, then new bonds had to be forged. This would explain why the daughter of Tušratta, Taduḥepa, who had been destined for the harem of Amūnḥotpe III, was then incorporated into the harem of Akhenaton, who had succeeded his deceased father on the Egyptian throne by the time that the Mitannian princess arrived in Egypt. It would also explain why it was necessary for Amūnḥotpe III to marry a daughter of Kadašman-Enlil even though he already had the latter's sister as a wife. In the one instance, the sister forged a bond between Amūnḥotpe and Kurigalzu, in the other with Kadašman-Enlil. And we can the more easily understand why Ramesses II then took a second Hittite bride so shortly after his first marriage. The first bride, Maanefrurē^c, must have died. Even the biblical account of the diplomatic marriage between Solomon and the daughter of Pharaoh tends, though indirectly, to support this hypothesis. Solomon was allied, through the marriage, with one of the last, if not the last king of the Twenty-First Dynasty. When this gave way to the Libyan Twenty-Second Dynasty, however, its founder, Sheshonk I, had no marriage ties with either Solomon or Solomon's successor, Rehoboam, and, as the biblical account corroborated by the list of Sheshonk's conquests, which are inscribed on the Bubastite portal at Karnak, records, Sheshonk devastated both Judah and Israel after the revolt of Jeroboam.⁷⁶

⁷⁶ Although there is no up-to-date translation of the inscription, there is the excellent edition of the text by G. Hughes et al., *Reliefs and Inscriptions at*

Karnak. Vol. 3. *The Bubastite Portal*, OIP 74 (Chicago, 1954).