

Fear of Strangers? Ethnicity and Xenophobia in the Amarna Letters*

Jana Mynářová – Charles University, Prague

[The Amarna letters represent a rich source of information on the political, social and economic reality of the ancient Near East in the mid 14th century BC. Given the large geographical area covered by these letters, this set of documents also offers an opportunity to understand the relationships between individual rulers and their people and to study the practices and background of their interactions. Today, an attitudinal or unreasonable hostility towards or dislike of strangers is largely identified as “xenophobia”. It is the aim of this article to provide evidence for the existence or absence of this phenomenon in official written correspondence from the ancient Near East and to set it into a broader socio-political context.]

Keywords: ethnicity, Amarna Letters, Levant, Late Bronze Age, Akkadian.

In modern times, an attitudinal or unreasonable hostility towards or dislike of strangers, foreigners or – in a broader sense – non-natives in a population is largely understood and denominated as “xenophobia”. Although “xenophobia”, or “fear of strangers/foreigners”, is nowadays largely understood as a modern term, it is still legitimate to ask whether this animosity against non-natives can also be identified in ancient Near Eastern societies.¹ The Levant in the Late Bronze Age, and more specifically the period covered by the Amarna letters of the mid 14th century BC, seems to be an ideal environment for exploring this phenomenon. This set of texts was produced over a rather limited period of approximately twenty to a maximum of thirty years (Moran 1992: xxxiv; Mynářová 2007: 13; Miller 2017: 94),² and despite the local specifics of each geographically defined variant (Moran 1992: xviii–xxii; Rainey 2015: 10–13; Vita 2015: 1–3; and esp. Mandell 2015: 3–7) the language used is sufficiently homogeneous to allow comparison of the terminology employed. An integral part of the discussion over the possible (non-)existence of the phenomenon (or set of phenomena) that could be described as “xenophobia” in modern terminology is very closely related to our understanding of the ethnicity of the respective societies,

* This paper was written as part of research funded by the Czech Science Foundation, project GA ČR 18-01897S “Economic Complexity in the Ancient Near East. Management of Resources and Taxation in the 3rd and 2nd Millennium BC”. The abbreviations used in this article are listed on the Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative (CDLI) website available at http://cdli.ox.ac.uk/wiki/abbreviations_for_assyriology (last accessed on 28 December 2019), to which add *J. Archeol. Res.* = *Journal of Archaeological Research*. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the reviewers for their comments and suggestions as their input has been invaluable in making the article more balanced.

1. For a very useful introduction to the logic of xenophobia in modern societies see Rydgren 2004; see also Haas 1980.
2. For the records of dates consult Mynářová 2011.

and the issue of ethnicity has been frequently and extensively treated in ancient Near Eastern studies over the past few decades.³

In the ancient Near East, categories of ethnicity or race – two modern terms most often associated with “xenophobia” – did not exist, and there were no terms for these categories in the respective languages of Mesopotamia, as demonstrated by Bahrani (2006: 48). Therefore, it is reasonable to ask whether it is possible to discuss the underlying concept at all. However, even the earliest written sources feature the dichotomy of “us” vs “them”, “self” vs “other”, “an ingroup” vs “an outgroup” – or, in other words, the way we define ourselves against others, highlighting the differences between the two.⁴ In modern societies such self-identification is largely based on a combination of indicators, including shared ancestral myths and religious beliefs, traditions, a shared way of life or social structure and language, while even material culture cannot be left aside.⁵ It was the discourse on material culture in particular that represented the main topic dominating the discussion on ethnicity in 19th- and 20th-century scholarship, leading to the categorization of identities of peoples and cultures and thereby to the development of the racial theory.⁶ It should be noted that the process of self-identification and/or self-determination is largely a subjective issue. On the other hand, it is a shared phenomenon and therefore everything that does not fit in with this concept – everything “different” or “other” – might actually pose a potential threat or danger to “our” society. In this way, the threat or danger is represented by everything that diverges from a given behavioural norm, at least in the sense of how it is perceived and understood by “us”.

In the mid 14th century BC, the geopolitical, social and cultural reality of the Levant was largely dependent upon the policies of the Great Powers of Egypt, Mittani, Ḫatti, as well as Assyria and Babylonia. Whilst in their activities the rulers of the Levantine city-states were directly affected by the changing interests of these Great Powers, they also tried to use them in order to achieve their own goals. Nevertheless, searching for “foreign” elements in the material culture of the Levant is largely complicated by the “international” character of the given period, aptly described by Feldman as that of “artistic internationalism”⁷ and characterized by continuous fluidity or hybridization of forms. It is also the period when a significant change in the composition of sources becomes visible throughout the Levant, when the previously dominant evidence provided by the material culture began to be supplemented not only by iconographic, but largely also by written data. With regard to the written evidence, the 14th century in the Levant is characterized by a relative abundance of documents of both external (Egyptian, Hittite) and internal provenance (the Amarna letters and some minor corpora⁸) and thus provides a suitable body of evidence for further textual analysis.

3. See especially Limet 1972; Kamp – Yoffee 1980; Paltiel 1980–1981; Foster 1982; Klinger 1992; Neumann 1992; Prechel 1992; Emberling 1997; De Graef 1999a; De Graef 1999b; Emberling – Yoffee 1999; Lindström 2003; Nicolle, ed. 2004; Killebrew 2005; Limet 2005; Soldt – Kalvelagen – Katz, eds. 2005; Bahrani 2006; Lackenbacher 2008; McCarthy – Hill 2009; Spek 2009; Fales 2009–2010; Buccellati 2010; Paulus 2011; Beckman 2013; Fales 2013; Brown 2014; Bryce 2014; Emberling 2014; Killebrew 2014; Schäfer-Lichtenberger 2016; Fales 2017; Fales 2018. For a wider perspective on the ancient Mediterranean consult McInerney, ed. 2014.

4. McGeough 2019; Richardson 2019; Streit 2019.

5. Driel 2005; Pruzsinszky 2019.

6. Bahrani 2006.

7. Feldman 2015.

8. For a summary of the texts of Southern Levantine origin, see Horowitz – Oshima – Sanders 2018.

For the mid 14th century BC, the Amarna letters represent a primary cuneiform source of information on the Levantine region, with respect to both local and external political and socio-economic elements. Leaving aside slightly more than thirty non-epistolary documents that were used in educating the scribes in Amarna in cuneiform writing and the Akkadian language (Izre'el 1997), the remaining texts consist of letters and some related inventories. There is a less numerous group of letters exchanged between the rulers of those Great Powers and some minor political entities, including those of Alašiya and Arzawa, but a much more substantial group is represented by documents of a mostly administrative character.⁹ The letters are formulated in a very personal style, with a clear personal dimension recognizable between the individual correspondents regardless of their social status. Such a personalized concept of international relations helps us to understand better the character and procedures of communication between the respective rulers, but at the same time it only occasionally has any bearing on individual “foreign” elements.

The Amarna letters provide a wealth of information about the economy, administration, security and legal issues of the Levantine states, but at the same time they offer insight into the policies of the Egyptian king and his government towards those states. In the letters of Levantine origin, the Egyptian king and his representatives are often addressed as the supreme authority, who is asked to help to resolve disputes between local rulers. In the corpus, several terms clearly reflecting the social status of the correspondents can be recognized. Among other things, it would have been the correct and adequate employment of these terms that first helped to establish these relations and then significantly contributed to their maintenance. This is not only true of maintaining peaceful relations, but especially in cases of disputes and open conflicts. The social, cultural and legal context of the Amarna correspondence, however, was far from homogeneous, and it was precisely its heterogeneous character that might in practice have resulted in both intended and unintended misinterpretations of the given situation. But could some of the disputes and conflicts have been caused by the origin of the individual protagonists?

The identification of an individual in the correspondence takes several different forms. The most complete is that employed in the letter address.¹⁰ Often, when an enemy is identified in the body of a message, his identity is determined by his geographical concretization (“a man of GN”). The affiliation of an individual to a geographical unit, however, is not limited to a particular title of a ruler, but also occurs in conjunction with other nouns.

The vast majority of letters addressed by the rulers of the Levantine city states to the Egyptian king touch upon the difficult political – and especially safety – situation, whether it involves ongoing conflict or imminent danger. In most cases, the specific identification of the threat is made either through a personal name of the enemy or a personal name followed by a geographical specification of his origin. Even if enemy troops or soldiers are mentioned, it is the name, or the

9. Mynářová 2014. Such a social division of the respective rulers is also clearly reflected in the later Hittite treaty between Muwattalli II of Ḫatti and Alaksandu of Wilusa (CTH 76), cf. “The Kings who are the equals of My Majesty – the King of Egypt, the King of Babylonia, the King of Ḫanigalbat, or the King of Assyria” (translation by Beckman 1999: 90), clearly illustrating the paradigm attested already in the Amarna correspondence, namely the distinction between the Great Kings and other (minor) rulers.

10. For the identification of individuals in the opening parts of the Amarna letters, including the addresses, consult Mynářová 2007: 125–146.

name and the origin of the respective ruler, which represents the key identifying element. The identification of an ordinary individual is thus inextricably linked to the identification of his ruler.¹¹

In the case of the rulers and people of the Great Powers, the situation is different. They are mentioned only rarely – or not at all, which is the case for the Hittites, Babylonians, Alašiyans and Arzawans. While the kings are identified in the addresses by means of their eloquent titles,¹² in the bodies of the letters this identification is limited to its functional component, i.e., the “king of GN”.

The way in which a person is identified is chosen with the intention of affirming, uplifting or humiliating him, and this also applies to kings. A passage from a letter of Amenhotep III to Kadašman-Enlil I can serve as an example. Here, the Egyptian king quotes from a previous letter from his Babylonian partner, who has eloquently expressed his indignation at the questionable identity of a Babylonian princess at the Egyptian court: “And when you write: ‘Maybe it was some daughter of a poor man (= *muškēnu*), or a Ka<s>kean, or a daughter of a Ḫanigalbatean, or maybe from Ugarit, which my envoys saw’” (EA 1: 36–40). By characterizing the identity of the woman, who is presented to the Babylonian envoys as a Babylonian princess, as equal to that of the lower-ranking women, he clearly undermines her social status and refuses to identify her with the Babylonian princess in question. Such an expression is not unusual. It is rather striking, however, that “a daughter of a Ḫanigalbatean”, i.e., in this context the king of Mittani,¹³ is mentioned in order to represent the lower social status of the woman in a message from the Babylonian king. As well as expressing the subordinate status or role of the woman, the Babylonian king is also clearly diminishing the political and social status of the king of Mittani himself. It is, among other things, the overall tone of another Babylonian letter dispatched by Burna-Buriaš II which indicates a disrespectful view of the Babylonian king towards other (in his view) socially and politically unequal rulers, while this view is never apparent in relation to the king of Egypt, his peer and partner in communication.¹⁴ Similarly, in EA 8 from Burna-Buriaš II, the individual Canaanite rulers are also deprived of their titles as rulers of the individual city-states (LÚ) and they are more closely identified by a reference to their origin, i.e., the name of their father or city (EA 8: 18–19). In one case, however, a ruler of Akka Šutatna, which is already mentioned earlier in the text, is also specified by means of an adjective and without his title, *šū-ta-at-na ak-ka-a-a-ú*, “Šutatna, the Akkaean” (EA 8: 38).

Conversely, the use of a royal title in such a context is documented in the correspondence of the Assyrian king Aššur-uballiṭ I. In his letter EA 16 he refers to ancient customs of royal gift exchange dating back to the time of his ancestors. By comparing his social status with that of the Mittanian king he justifies his claims for a gift from the king of Egypt. In both references to the king of Mittani, however, he clearly articulates his royal title (LUGAL *ḫa-ni-gal-ba-tu-ú*, EA 16:

11. Including a more extensive form with a filiation element (PN₁ son of PN₂ [*ša* GN]), cf. *šū-ta-at-na* DUMU *šā-ra-a-tu₄ ša URU ak-ka*, “Šutatna, son of Šarātu of the city of Akka” (EA 8: 19).

12. Mynářová 2007: 125–131.

13. For the identification of the king of Mittani with the king of Ḫanigalbat see esp. EA 20: 17 and EA 29: 49 (probably also in EA 18: 9 but the text is broken; see already Astour 1972). Most recently Novák 2013: 345; von Dassow 2014: 17; de Martino 2014: 62; de Martino 2018.

14. In his letter EA 9, Burna-Buriaš II also mentions the Canaanites (*ki-na-ḫa-a-a-ú*, EA 9: 19) and although he does not mention their titles, it follows from the context that by this reference he means the rulers of the local city-states (“all the Canaanites wrote to him [= Kurigalzu]”, EA 9: 19–20). Unfortunately, his reference to Assyrian vassals in l. 31 is not that clear. Although Rainey (2015: 95) refers in his translation to “the Assyrian” (sg.), *aš-šur-ra-a-a-ú* in EA 9: 31 is a plural form (“Assyrians”). The ruler of Babylon is thus probably referring here to the members of the Assyrian royal delegation representing the Assyrian king himself.

22; LUGAL *ḥa-ni-[gal-b]a-t[i-i]*, EA 16: 26). Aššur-uballiṭ I's scribe has thus followed the expected protocol.

With the exception of rulers, references to respective groups of the population are usually composed as “men (LÚ.MEŠ) of GN”. The question, however, is whether these “other” individuals are somehow associated with negative emotions or even hostile actions on the part of the senders of these letters. As for the words employed in the Amarna letters to identify “foreigners” or “strangers”, the most common (and neutral in relation to the expressed emotions) Akkadian expression with the meaning “1. strange (person), foreigner, outsider, alien (object), 2. additional, extraordinary, 3. strange, abnormal, estranged, unusual, ill-portending, 4. hostile”, i.e.,¹⁵ *aḥû* (written logographically as lú.b a r . r a), is not attested at all.¹⁶ On the other hand, terms that can be encountered in this context of the “otherness” of a respective individual are: *nakru*, *ubāru* and *ayyābu*. While for *nakru* the CAD lists meanings such as “1. foreign, alien, strange, hostile, 2. (in substantival use) enemy, foe”,¹⁷ the meaning of *ubāru* is given as “1. stranger, foreign guest, resident alien, guest-friend”.¹⁸ The word *ayyābu* is also attested with the meaning “an enemy”,¹⁹ similar to *šāru* “hostile, inimical”.²⁰ As is clear from the use of these terms in the individual Amarna texts, the only expression that has a clearly negative connotation is *nakru* or *nukurtu*.²¹

In his letter, Rib-Ḥadda of Byblos writes: “... I am the enemy; and now Yapaḥ-Ḥadda is hostile to me together with Aziru and indeed, he has seized my ship and he is, indeed, going out to the sea to seize my ships. So may the king consult (the situation) of his city and his servant; my peas<an>try seek to desert. If you are not able to save me from the hand of my enemy, then send back word to me so I will know what thing I should do” (EA 114: 15–26). More often, however, it is the identification of the hostile action against these rulers that describes the character of the act. An analysis of the geographical distribution of this type of identification shows that it is extensively employed in letters sent either to the Egyptian king or his officials from the rulers of city-states located in the northern zone, such as Qatna, Tunip and Irqata, but especially Byblos, where references to enemies and hostile actions directed against its ruler Rib-Ḥadda are practically omnipresent. In EA 54: 41 Akizzi of Qatna mentions “and three (or) [four] k[ings] were [h]ostile”, similarly to EA 59: 40 from the “sons” of Tunip: “and three or four kings were hosti[le]”. A personal dimension to these hostile activities is often expressed, as in the phrase “the hostility against me is strong” (Rib-Ḥadda of Byblos, EA 66: 7–8), with the source of said hostility mentioned as well, as illustrated by another example from Rib-Ḥadda's correspondence: “the hostility of the *apîru* against me is very strong ... very strong is the hostility [ag]ainst us” (EA 68: 12–14, 29–30). In EA 76 the creator of this hostility is identified as ‘Abdi-Aširta, a ruler of Amurru: “May the king, my lord, learn that the hostility of ‘Abdi-Aširta against me is strong” (EA 76: 7–9). In some cases, however, the hostile actors are neither identified as particular groups of people or individual rulers, but rather as the respective political entities and individual cities: “The cities of Ampî, the city of Šigata, the city of Ullaza (and) the city of Arwad are hostile to me” (EA 104: 40–43). But Rib-Ḥadda of Byblos is not the only ruler – though he is undoubtedly the most prolific and

15. CAD A/I, 210–211.

16. For a discussion on terminology and related concepts of foreignness, consult especially Beckman 2013.

17. CAD N/1, 189–195.

18. CAD U and W, 10–12.

19. CAD A/1, 222–224 (*sub ayyābu*).

20. CAD Š/2, 132–133.

21. CAD N/2, 328–332.

diligent one – to complain about hostile activities against his person and his city. Similar complaints are widely attested in other Amarna documents as well. Zimredda of Sidon uses practically the same words as Rib-Ḥadda when he appeals to the Pharaoh: “And may the king, my lord, learn that the hostility against me is very strong” (EA 144: 22–23). “The kings of Nuḥašše are hostile to me”, says Aziru, the ruler of Amurru (EA 161: 36–37), and similar words can be encountered in the communications of other rulers as well, including Etakamma of Qadeš, Abimilki of Tyre, Ḥibiya, a ruler of an unknown city, and the representatives of Irqata. None of these mentions, however, that the hostile activity is related to the “otherness” of the agent of the crime or his victim.

Compared to *nakru*, which is employed in the Amarna corpus quite extensively, the substantive *ubru* or *ubāru* is used in five passages only. Three of these five attestations come from the letters from Mittani, one from Byblos and one from Egypt. The use of the term in the Mittanian letters²² is clear and corresponds to what is known from other LBA sources,²³ i.e., it refers to a certain group or class of foreigners, undoubtedly of a higher social status and probably officials representing a king. This is demonstrated by the letters EA 20 and EA 29, where the context clearly reveals a meaning of “my (official) foreign guests” (EA 20: 47 [ú-ba-ru-t]u₄-ia gáb-bá, EA 20: 73 LÚ.MEŠ ú-bá-ru-ti-ia), “(official) foreign nobles” (EA 29: 89 ʾNUN.MEŠ [ú]-bá-r[u]-ti) or – as Naʾaman aptly suggests – “residing foreign delegates”.²⁴

The word *ubāru*, however, is also employed in a communication between the Egyptian king and Aziru, the ruler of Amurru. In his letter, the Pharaoh lists several individuals who evidently acted against the interests of the Egyptian king and Aziru is asked to deliver them to the king: “Here are the men whom you are to deliver to the king, your lord: Šarru together with all his sons; Tuya; Leya together with all his sons; Pišiyari together with all his sons; the son-in-law of Manya together with his sons (and) with his wives; the warrior who knows sacrilege, that one who insults a foreign delegate;²⁵ Dašarti; Baʾluma; Nimmaḥe, the robber in the land of Amurru” (EA 162: 67–77). Unfortunately, the identity of the distressed official remains unknown.

The most complicated or problematic example in which these words are employed once again involves Rib-Ḥadda of Byblos, who writes to one of the officials of the Pharaoh named Amanappa: “[Now,] wh[y have] you [kept si]lent [concerning] the foreign official (Akk. *ub-ri*, l. 19), the d[og(?)] who [is] attacking the territories? [W]on’t you spea[k t]o your lord that he sends you at the head of regular troops that you may drive off the *ʾapīru* men from the city rulers?” (after Rainey 2015: 467; EA 77: 18–25). Although this passage is badly damaged and the identification of the enemy as a “dog” is largely reconstructed on the basis of parallels, it is difficult to identify him with anyone else but ʾAbdi-Aširta of Amurru. Could it be his alliance with Mittani,²⁶ to which Rib-Ḥadda refers in his other missive, which causes him to be labelled with that title? The possibility that ʾAbdi-Aširta became an official agent of Mittani cannot be ruled out completely as the changing political loyalty of Amurru is well attested in the Amarna period.²⁷ There is, however, no

22. As in the Hurrian letter of Tušratta to Amenhotep IV-Akhenaten, EA 24: III, 21–34.

23. For an overview see Neu 1970: 76–79 (for the Hittite context); Bodi 2003; Naʾaman 2005; Beckman 2013: 211.

24. Naʾaman 2005: 477.

25. EA 162: 75 ša-šu <ša> u-bá-a-ra il-tá-na-aš, šanāšu, Moran 1992: 250 “that fellow <who> has mocked a resident-alien”.

26. EA 90: 18–19 a-nu-[ma] [a-]naʾ ʾKUR mi-ta-na i-ba-aš-ši “and now (he) belongs to Mittani”.

27. For a recent account of the topic consult Devecchi 2012.

doubt that there was an obvious reason to use this particular expression – something more than just to demonstrate the hostile activities of ‘Abdi-Aširta and his troops.

The other two, originally West Semitic expressions, *ayyābu* “an enemy” and *šāru* “hostile, enemy, traitor”, are attested only rarely – *ayyābu* once (EA 114: 47) and *s/šāru* possibly twice (EA 100: 16; EA 179: 16) – once again referring to hostile activities against the interests of the Egyptian king.

The Amarna documents thus offer a wide variety of examples in which either individuals from particular regions and/or city-states appear or hostile situations in which enemies play a decisive role are mentioned. With respect to hatred, however, there is not a single example that would suggest that this attitude was anywhere related to the “otherness” or foreign origin of these adversaries. The evidence in the form of the official correspondence does not allow us to identify any such negative attitude towards “foreigners” or “enemies”. None of the groups mentioned in these texts is seen as barbaric or ungodly; they do not have monkey’s features like the Gutians or raven faces like the Lullubeans (The Cuthean Legend of Naram-Sin, l. 31; Westenholz 1997: 308–309). Rather, the sources of friction are deeply intertwined with the political, economic and security issues prevailing in the region. Nor can the Amarna correspondence be said to provide a universal image of the foreigner in the written records. When mentioned, different groups of people or even individuals are considered integral components of their local society or societies and penalties only arise if they violate local rules and/or traditions.

Bibliography

- Astour, M.C. 1972. “Ḫattušiliš, Ḫalab, and Ḫanigalbat”, *JNES* 31/2, pp. 102–109.
- Bahrani, Z. 2006. “Race and Ethnicity in Mesopotamian Antiquity”, *World Archeol.* 38(1), pp. 48–59.
- Brown, B.A. 2014. “Culture on Display: Representations of Ethnicity in the Art of the Late Assyrian State”, in B.A. Brown – M.H. Feldman, eds., *Critical Approaches to Ancient Near Eastern Art*. Boston – Berlin, pp. 515–542.
- Beckman, G. 1999². *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World 7), Atlanta.
- Beckman, G. 2013. “Foreigners in the Ancient Near East”, *JAOS* 133(2), pp. 203–216.
- Bodi, D. 2003. “Outraging the Resident-Alien, King David, Uriah the Hittite, and an El-Amarna Parallel”, *UF* 35, pp. 29–56.
- Bryce, T.R. 2014. “Hittites and Anatolian Ethnic Diversity”, in J. McInerney, ed., *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Malden – Oxford – Chichester, pp. 127–141.
- Buccellati, G. 2010. “The Semiotics of Ethnicity: The Case of Hurrian Urkesh”, in J.C. Fincke, ed., *Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010*, Dresden, pp. 79–90.
- Dassow, E. von 2014. “Levantine Politics under Mittanian Hegemony”, in E. Cancik-Kirschbaum – N. Brisch – J. Eidem, eds., *Constituent, Confederate and Conquered Space* (Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 17), Berlin, pp. 11–32.
- De Graef, K. 1999a. “Les étrangers dans les textes paléobabyloniens tardifs de Sippar (Abi-ešuḫ – Samsuditana) première partie: Sur les inconnus ‘connus’: Cassites, Elamites, Sutéens, Suḫéens, Gutéens et Subaréens”, *Akkadica* 111, pp. 1–48.

- De Graef, K. 1999b. “Les étrangers dans les textes paléobabyloniens tardifs de Sippar (Abi-ešuh – Samsuditana) deuxième partie: Sur les inconnus inconnus: des personnes spécifiées comme provenant de telle ville ou de telle région spécifique”, *Akkadica* 112, pp. 1–17.
- Devecchi, E. 2012. “Aziru, Servant of Three Masters?”, *AoF* 39/1, pp. 38–48.
- Driel, G. van 2005. “Ethnicity, how to cope with the subject”, in W.H. van Soldt – R. Kalvelagen – D. Katz, eds. 2005. *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia. Papers Read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Leiden, 1–4 July 2002* (Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 102), Leiden, pp. 1–10.
- Emberling, G. 1997. “Ethnicity in complex societies: archaeological perspectives”, *J. Archeol. Res.* 5(4), pp. 295–344.
- Emberling, G. 2014. “Ethnicity in Empire: Assyrians and Others”, in J. McInerney, ed., *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Malden – Oxford – Chichester, pp. 158–174.
- Emberling, G. – Yoffee, N. 1999. “Thinking about Ethnicity in Mesopotamian Archaeology and History”, in H. Kühne – R. Bernbeck – K. Bartl, eds., *Fluchtpunkt Uruk. Archäologische Einheit aus methodischer Vielfalt. Schriften für Hans Jörg Nissen* (Internationale Archäologie. Studia honoraria 6), Rahden, pp. 272–281.
- Fales, F.M. 2009–2010. “Ethnicity in the Assyrian Empire: A View from the Nisbe, (II): ‘Assyrians’”, in M.J. Biga – J.Ma. Córdoba – C. del Cerro – E. Torres, eds., *Homenaje a Mario Liverani, fundador de una ciencia nueva*, Vol. I (ISIMU. Revista sobre Oriente Próximo y Egipto en la antigüedad 11–12), Madrid, pp. 183–204.
- Fales, F.M. 2013. “Ethnicity in the Assyrian Empire: A View from the Nisbe, (I): Foreigners and ‘Special’ Inner Communities”, in D.S. Vanderhooft – A. Winitzer, eds., *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature. Essays on the Ancient Near East in Honor of Peter Machinist*, Winona Lake, pp. 47–74.
- Fales, F.M. 2017. “Ethnicity on the Assyrian Empire: A View from the Nisbe, (III) ‘Aramaeans’ and Related Tribalists”, in Y. Heffron – A. Stone – M. Worthington, eds., *At the Dawn of History. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of J.N. Postgate*, Vol. I, Winona Lake, pp. 133–171.
- Fales, F.M. 2018. “The Composition and structure of the Neo-Assyrian Empire: Ethnicity, Language and Identities”, in R. Rollinger, ed., *Conceptualizing Past, Present and Future. Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium of the Melammu Project Held in Helsinki / Tartu, May 18–24, 2015* (Melammu Symposia 9), Münster, pp. 443–494.
- Feldman, M.H. 2015. “Qatna and Artistic Internationalism during the Late Bronze Age”, in P. Pfälzner – M. Al-Maqdissi, eds., *Qatna and the Networks of Bronze Age Globalism. Proceedings of an International Conference in Stuttgart and Tübingen in October 2009* (Qatna Studien Supplementa 2), Wiesbaden, pp. 33–41.
- Foster, B.R. 1982. “Ethnicity and Onomastics in Sargonic Mesopotamia”, *OrNS* 51, pp. 297–354.
- Horowitz, W. – Oshima, T. – Sanders, S. 2018. *Cuneiform in Canaan. The Next Generation*, second edition, University Park.
- Haas, V. 1980. “Die Dämonisierung des Fremden und des Feindes im Alten Orient”, *RO* 41/2, pp. 37–44.
- Izre’el, Sh. 1997. *The Amarna Scholarly Tablets* (Cuneiform Monographs 9), Groningen.

Kamp, K.A. – Yoffee, N. 1980. “Ethnicity in Ancient Western Asia during the Early Second Millennium B.C.: Archaeological Assessments and Ethno-archaeological Perspectives”, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 237, pp. 85–104.

Killebrew, A.E. 2005. *Biblical Peoples and Ethnicity. An Archaeological Study of Egyptians, Canaanites, Philistines, and Early Israel, 1300–1100 B.C.E.* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 9), Atlanta.

Killebrew, A.E. 2014. “Hybridity, *Hapiru*, and the Archaeology of Ethnicity in Second Millennium BCE Western Asia”, in J. McNerney, ed., *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Malden – Oxford – Chichester, pp. 142–157.

Limet, H. 1972. “L'étranger dans la société sumérienne”, in D.O. Edzard, ed., *Gesellschaftsklassen im Alten Zweistromland und in den angrenzenden Gebieten* (ABAW. Philosophisch-historische Klasse NF 75), München, pp. 123–138.

Limet, H. 2005. Ethnicity, in D.C. Snell, ed., *A Companion to the Ancient Near East*, Malden – Oxford – Carlton, pp. 370–383.

Klinger, J. 1992. “Fremde und Außenseiter in Ḫatti”, in V. Haas, ed., *Außenseiter und Randgruppen. Beiträge zu eine Sozialgeschichte des Alten Orients* (Xenia. Konstanzer Althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen 32), Konstanz, pp. 187–212.

Lackenbacher, S. 2008. “Les étrangers dans l'empire néo-assyrien à travers la correspondance des Sargonides”, in J.J. Justel et al., eds., *Las culturas del Próximo Oriente antiguo y su expansión mediterránea*, Zaragoza, pp. 35–51.

Lindström, G. 2003. “Kulturelle und ethnische Identität im hellenistischen Uruk. Ein Beitrag aus der Siegelforschung”, in K.S. Freyberger – A. Henning – H. von Hesberg, eds., *Kulturkonflikte im Vorderen Orient an der Wende vom Hellenismus zur römischen Kaiserzeit* (Orient-Archäologie 11), Rahden, pp. 37–45.

Mandell, A. H. 2015. *Scribalism and Diplomacy at the Crossroads of Cuneiform Culture: The Sociolinguistics of Canaanite-Akkadian*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA, Los Angeles.

Martino, S. de 2014. “The Mittani State: The Formation of the Kingdom of Mittani”, in E. Cancik-Kirschbaum – N. Brisch – J. Eidem, eds., *Constituent, Confederate and Conquered Space* (Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 17), Berlin, pp. 61–74.

Martino, S. de 2018. “Political and Cultural Relations between the Kingdom of Mittani and Its Subordinated Polities in Syria and Southeast Anatolia”, in A. Gianto – P. Dubovský, eds., *Changing Faces of Kingship in Syria-Palestine 1500-500 BCE* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 459), Münster, pp. 37–50.

McCarthy, A.P. – Hill, I. 2009. “Emblems of Ethnicity: Hurrians, Elamites, and the Mittanian ‘Common-style’ Glyptic”, in G. Wilhelm, ed., *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 11/2 in Honor of David I. Owen on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday, October 28, 2005* (Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians 18), Bethesda, pp. 299–322.

McGeough, K. 2019. “‘The Men of Ura Are a Heavy Burden Upon Your Subject!’: The Administration and Management of Strangers and Foreigners in Ugarit”, in J. Mynářová – M. Kilani – S. Alivernini, eds., *A Stranger in the House – the Crossroads III. Proceedings of an International Conference on Foreigners in Ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern Societies of the Bronze Age held in Prague, September 10–13, 2018*. Prague, pp. 197–220.

McNerney, J., ed. *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Malden – Oxford – Chichester.

- Miller, J. L. 2017. "Political Interactions between Kassite Babylonia and Assyria, Egypt and Hatti during the Amarna Age", in A. Bartelmus – K. Sternitzke, eds., *Karduniaš. Babylonia Under the Kassites. The Proceedings of the Symposium Held in Munich 30 June to 2 July 2011. Tagungsbericht des Münchner Symposiums 30. Juni bis 2. Juni 2011*, Vol. 1 Philological and Historical Studies (Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie 11/1). Boston – Berlin, pp. 93–111.
- Moran, W. L. 1992. *The Amarna letters*, Baltimore, MD.
- Mynářová, J. 2007. *Language of Amarna – Language of Diplomacy. Perspectives on the Amarna Letters*, Prague.
- Mynářová, J. 2011. "Expressions of Dates and Time in the Amarna Letters", *ÄuL* 21, pp. 123–128.
- Mynářová, J. 2014. "Egyptian State Correspondence of the New Kingdom: The Letters of the Levantine Client Kings in the Amarna Correspondence and Contemporary Evidence", in K. Radner, ed., *State Correspondence in the Ancient World. From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire* (Oxford Studies in Early Empires), London – New York, pp. 10–31.
- Na'aman, N. 2005. "Resident-Alien or Residing Foreign Delegate?", *UF* 37, pp. 475–478.
- Neu, E. 1970. *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual* (StBoT 12). Wiesbaden.
- Neumann, H. 1992. "Bemerkungen zum Problem der Fremdarbeit in Mesopotamien (3. Jt. v. u. Z.)", *AoF* 19, pp. 255–275.
- Nicolle, C., ed. 2004. *Nomades et sédentaires dans le Proche-Orient ancien. Compte rendu de la XLVIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris, 10-13 juillet 2000)* (Amurru 3). Paris.
- Paltiel, E. 1980–1981. "Ethnicity and the State in the Kingdom of Ugarit", *Abr-Nahrain* 19, pp. 43–61.
- Novák, M. 2013. "Upper Mesopotamia in the Mittani Period", in W. Orthmann – M. al-Maqdissi – P. Matthiae, eds., *Archéologie et Histoire de la Syrie*, Wiesbaden, pp. 345–356.
- Prechel, D. 1992. "Fremde in Mesopotamien", in V. Haas, ed., *Außenseiter und Randgruppen. Beiträge zu eine Sozialgeschichte des Alten Orients* (Xenia. Konstanzer Althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen 32), Konstanz, pp. 173–185.
- Paulus, S. 2011. "Foreigners under Foreign Rulers. The Case of Kassite Babylonia (2nd half of the 2nd millennium BC)", in R. Achenbach – R. Albertz – J. Wöhrle, eds., *The Foreigner and the Law. Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 16), Wiesbaden, pp. 1–15.
- Pruzsinszky, R. 2019. "The Contact Zone along the Middle Euphrates: Interaction, Transaction and Movement", in J. Mynářová – M. Kilani – S. Alivernini, eds., *A Stranger in the House – the Crossroads III. Proceedings of an International Conference on Foreigners in Ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern Societies of the Bronze Age held in Prague, September 10–13, 2018*. Prague, pp. 269–284.
- Rainey, A. F. 2015. *The El-Amarna Correspondence. A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna based on Collations of all Extant Tablets* (Handbook of Oriental Studies 1/110), 2 vols., Leiden – Boston.
- Richardson, S. 2019. "Aliens and Alienation, Strangers and Estrangement: Difference-Making as Historically-Particular Concept", in J. Mynářová – M. Kilani – S. Alivernini, eds., *A Stranger in the House – the Crossroads III. Proceedings of an International Conference on Foreigners in Ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern Societies of the Bronze Age held in Prague, September 10–13, 2018*. Prague, pp. 307–340.
- Rydgren, J. 2004. "The Logic of Xenophobia", *Rationality and Society* 16/2, pp. 123–148.

Schäfer-Lichtenberger, Ch. 2016. “Ethnicity and State Formation in the Levant during the Early Iron Age”, in R. Kessler – W. Sommerfeld – L. Tramontini, eds., *State Formation and State Decline in the Near and Middle East*, Wiesbaden, pp. 99–120.

Soldt, W.H. van – Kalvelagen, R. – Katz, D., eds. 2005. *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia. Papers Read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Leiden, 1–4 July 2002* (Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 102), Leiden.

Spek, R.J. van der 2009. “Multi-ethnicity and ethnic segregation in Hellenistic Babylon”, in T. Derks – N. Roymans, eds., *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity. The Role of Power and Tradition* (Amsterdam Archaeological Studies 13), Amsterdam, pp. 101–115.

Streit, K. 2019. “The Stranger on the Mound: Tracing Cultural Identity at Tel Lachish during the Late Bronze Age”, in J. Mynářová – M. Kilani – S. Alivernini, eds., *A Stranger in the House – the Crossroads III. Proceedings of an International Conference on Foreigners in Ancient Egyptian and Near Eastern Societies of the Bronze Age held in Prague, September 10–13, 2018*. Prague, pp. 355–370.

Vita, J.-P. 2015. *Canaanite Scribes in the Amarna Letters* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 406), Münster.

Westenholz, J.G. 1997. *Legends of the Kings of Akkade* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 7), Winona Lake, IN.