

Experiencing Power, Generating Authority

Cosmos, Politics, and the Ideology of Kingship in
Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia



Edited by

Jane A. Hill, Philip Jones, and Antonio J. Morales

EXPERIENCING POWER
GENERATING AUTHORITY

Penn Museum International Research Conferences
Holly Pittman, Series Editor, Conference Publications

Volume 6: Proceedings of “Experiencing Power—Generating Authority:
Cosmos and Politics in the Ideology of Kingship in Ancient Egypt and
Mesopotamia,” Philadelphia, November 5–11, 2007.

PMIRC volumes

1. *Landscapes of Movement: Trails, Paths, and Roads in Anthropological Perspective*, edited by James E. Snead, Clark L. Erickson, and J. Andrew Darling, 2009
2. *Mapping Mongolia: Situating Mongolia in the World from Geologic Time to the Present*, edited by Paula L.W. Sabloff, 2011
3. *Sustainable Lifeways: Cultural Persistence in an Ever-changing Environment*, edited by Naomi F. Miller, Katherine M. Moore, and Kathleen Ryan, 2011
4. *Literacy in the Persianate World. Writing and the Social Order*, edited by Brian Spooner and William L. Hanaway, 2012
5. *Evolution of Mind, Brain, and Culture*, edited by Gary Hatfield and Holly Pittman, 2013

EXPERIENCING POWER, GENERATING AUTHORITY

Cosmos, Politics, and the Ideology of
Kingship in Ancient Egypt and
Mesopotamia

EDITED BY

**Jane A. Hill, Philip Jones, and
Antonio J. Morales**

University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology
Philadelphia

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

ISBN-13: 978-1-934536-64-3

ISBN-10: 1-934536-64-4

© 2013 by the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology
Philadelphia, PA

All rights reserved. Published 2013

Published for the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology
by the University of Pennsylvania Press.

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	xi
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xiii
<i>Glossary</i>	xvii
<i>Contributors</i>	xxiii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxvii
<i>Foreword</i>	xxix

INTRODUCTION

<i>Comparing Kingship in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia: Cosmos, Politics and Landscape</i>	3
Jane A. Hill, Philip Jones, and Antonio J. Morales	

I. COSMOS

1 <i>Propaganda and Performance at the Dawn of the State</i>	33
Ellen Morris	
2 <i>"I Am the Sun of Babylon": Solar Aspects of Royal Power in Old Babylonian Mesopotamia</i>	65
Dominique Charpin	
3 <i>Rising Suns and Falling Stars: Assyrian Kings and the Cosmos</i>	97
Eckart Frahm	
4 <i>Texts before Writing: Reading (Proto-)Egyptian Poetics of Power</i>	121
Ludwig D. Morenz	
5 <i>Images of Tammuz: The Intersection of Death, Divinity, and Royal Authority in Ancient Mesopotamia</i>	151
JoAnn Scurlock	

II. POLITICS

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 6 | <i>Building the Pharaonic State: Territory, Elite and Power in Ancient Egypt in the 3rd Millennium BCE</i> | 185 |
| | Juan Carlos Moreno García | |
| 7 | <i>The Management of the Royal Treasure: Palace Archives and Palatial Economy in the Ancient Near East</i> | 219 |
| | Walther Sallaberger | |
| 8 | <i>Egyptian Kingship during the Old Kingdom</i> | 257 |
| | Miroslav Bárta | |
| 9 | <i>All the King's Men: Authority, Kingship and the Rise of the Elites in Assyria</i> | 285 |
| | Beate Pongratz-Leisten | |
| 10 | <i>Kingship as Racketeering: The Royal Tombs and Death Pits at Ur, Mesopotamia Reinterpreted from the Standpoint of Conflict Theory</i> | 311 |
| | D. Bruce Dickson | |

III. LANDSCAPE

- | | | |
|---|--|-----|
| 11 | <i>Mesopotamian Kings and the Built Environment</i> | 331 |
| | Michael Roaf | |
| 12 | <i>Expeditions to the Wadi Hammamat: Context and Concept</i> | 361 |
| | Alan B. Lloyd | |
| 13 | <i>"Imaginal" Landscapes in Assyrian Imperial Monuments</i> | 383 |
| | Mehmet-Ali Ataç | |
| Appendix 1: <i>Chronologies for Ancient Egypt and the Near East</i> | | 427 |
| Appendix 2: <i>Map of Major Egyptian Sites</i> | | 429 |
| Appendix 3: <i>Map of Major Mesopotamian Sites</i> | | 431 |
| <i>Index</i> | | 433 |

Figures

1.1	The Scorpion macehead; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum E.3632	36
1.2	The Narmer macehead; Ashmolean E. 3631	36
1.3	The Narmer palette; Cairo J.E. 14716, C.G. 32169	37
1.4	Narmer's label from Abydos	38
1.5	Narmer's ivory cylinder seal from Hierakonpolis	42
1.6	Reconstruction of Min colossi	47
4.1	Ceremonial palette; Oxford, Ashmolean E.3924	123
4.2	Development of semiophores	124
4.3	Development of semiophores in the 4th millennium	125
4.4	Davis comb (MMA 30.8.224); rows of animals = iconographic list	126
4.5	Knife-handle from Abu-Zeidan; Brooklyn Museum 09.889.118	127
4.6	Pitt-Rivers knife-handle; British Museum EA 68512	129
4.7	Jackal-human hybrid playing the flute, detail of ceremonial palette; Ashmolean E.3924	130
4.8	Kokopelli (hunchbacked flute-player); Southwestern Puebloan rock art	130
4.9	"Marvels of the East", detail of ceremonial palette; Ashmolean E.3924	131
4.10	Giraffe, detail of ceremonial palette; Ashmolean E.3924	132
4.11	Distribution of animals on ceremonial palette; Ashmolean E.3924	134
4.12	Knife-handle from Gebel el-Tarif	136
4.13	Reading the Davis comb; MMA 30.8.224	136
4.14	Detail of ostrich on the ceremonial palette; Oxford, Ashmolean E.3924	140
4.15	Detail of ibis on the ceremonial palette; Louvre E 11052	140
4.16	Pictorial "text" on a cylinder seal impression from Uruk; iconic narrative of offering	141

4.17	Cylinder seal from Uruk; symmetrical composition in boustrophedon	142
4.18	Cultic vessel from Uruk; Baghdad Museum 19606	143
4.19	Cultic vessel from Maikop culture; Hermitage Museum	144
6.1	Map of Egypt and the Western Desert	186
6.2	Map of Egypt in the 3rd millennium BC	191
6.3	Provincial administration in 19 Upper Egyptian nomes	197
8.1	Volume of the Old Kingdom pyramids	263
8.2	Comparison of the built area of individual funerary temples of the Old Kingdom kings and the areas of the storerooms within them	265
12.1	The Eastern Desert	361
12.2	Greywacke quarries in the Wadi Hammamat	362
12.3	One of many representations in the Wadi of the resident deities. Pharaoh makes offerings to Min	364
13.1	Ashurnasirpal II flanked by bird-headed <i>apkallus</i> , Northwest Palace of Ashurnasirpal II at Nimrud; British Museum, ANE 124584-5	384
13.2	Babylonian Map of the World, probably from Sippar, ca. 700–500 BCE; British Museum, ANE 92687	386
13.3	Detail of marine scene with transport of wood showing a winged human-headed bull (<i>lamassu</i>), Palace of Sargon II in Khorsabad; Paris, Louvre	399
13.4	Detail of marine scene with transport of wood showing a winged bull (Bull of Heaven?), Palace of Sargon II in Khorsabad; Paris, Louvre	399
13.5	Relief decorations in the Botanical Room of the Festival Hall (Akhmenu) of Thutmose III, Temple of Amun, Karnak, Thebes, Egypt	402
13.6	Drawing of the ivory pyxis found in Assur Tomb 45	404
13.7	The Assyrian “sacred tree” flanked by two bird-headed <i>apkallus</i> , Northwest Palace of Ashurnasirpal II at Nimrud; British Museum, ANE 124583.	405
13.8	One side of the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III found at Nimrud; British Museum, ANE 118885	406
13.9	Detail of Figure 8	407

13.10	Detail of one side of the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III; British Museum, ANE 118885	408
13.11	Detail of Figure 10	409
13.12	One side of the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III; British Museum, ANE 118885	410
13.13	Detail of Figure 12	411
13.14	One side of the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III; British Museum, ANE 118885	412
13.15	Relief panel showing royal gardens, North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh; British Museum, ANE 124939	414
13.16	Detail of the “Garden Scene” of Ashurbanipal showing the king banqueting with his queen, North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh; British Museum, ANE 124920	415

This page intentionally left blank

Tables

7.1	Overview of the main archive (L.2769) from Palace G at Ebla (24th c. BC)	221
7.2	Luxury goods in the archives of Ebla, Puzrish-Dagan (Ur III), and Mari	224
7.3	Silver at Ur III Umma: the situation in the province (amounts given in minas, shekels, and grains)	229
7.4	Royal gift of silver rings converted to everyday values	234
7.5	Number of personnel in the palace at Ebla, here listed in decreasing order of the average number of persons	236
7.6	Specified income of silver in the Drehem treasure archive; amounts given in talents, minas, and shekels	238
7.7	Amounts of silver expended for trade by the palace of Ebla during the years Ibbi-zikir 5 and 10	239
7.8	Expenditure of silver for purchases for one year according to the selected annual accounts of Ebla:	
	(a) MEE 10, 29, Ibbi-zikir 5: 108 minas spent for purchase, i.e., 24% of total expenditures	240
	(b) MEE 12, 36, Ibbi-zikir 10: 66,16.8 minas spent for purchase, i.e. 19% of total expenditures	241
7.9	Silver “expended” (E_3) and “stored/present” ($AL_6, \hat{G}AL_2$) in the palace of Ebla (amounts per year in minas); MEE 10 29 and MEE 12 36 added	243
11.1	Selected major new foundations or centers extensively rebuilt by rulers of Mesopotamia	345
11.2	Assyrian kings and their building inscriptions from the 11th–9th centuries BC	349

This page intentionally left blank

Abbreviations

AA = *American Antiquity*

AbB = Altbabylonische Briefe in Umschrift und Übersetzung

ABL = Assyrian and Babylonian Letters

AfO = *Archiv für Orientforschung*

AnOr = *Analecta Orientalia*, Rome

AOAT = *Alter Orient und Altes Testament*

ARET = *Archivi reali di Ebla, testi*. Rome: Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria

ARM = *Archives Royales de Mari* (= *Textes Cuneiformes*, Musées du Louvre, 22–31)

Asb A = Assurbanipal's Prisma A

Ash. = Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, University of Oxford

AUCT = *Andrews University Cuneiform Texts*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press

AVDAIK = *Archäologische Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo*

BACE = *Bulletin of the Australian Center of Egyptology*

BAfO = *Beihefte zum Archiv für Orientforschung*

BaM = *Baghdader Mitteilungen*

BAR = *British Archaeological Reports*

BIN = *Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies*. New Haven: Yale University Press

CA = *Current Anthropology*

CAD = *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*

CAJ = *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*

CBS = *Catalogue of the Babylonian Section*, UPenn Museum, Philadelphia

CdE = *Chronique d'Égypte*

CDOG = *Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*

CF = *Cairo fragment of the Palermo Stone*

CM = *Cuneiform Monographs*, Groningen

CNI = Carsten Niebuhr Institute

CRIPEL = Cahiers de Recherches de l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Égyptologie de Lille

CRRAI = Comptes Rendus de la Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale

CT = Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum.

London: British Museum

CTN = Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud. London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq.

DP = *Documents présargoniques*. Paris: Leroux

EA = *Egyptian Archaeology*

FM = *Florilegium marianum*

GM = *Göttinger Miszellen*

HdOr = *Handbuch der Orientalistik*

HWP = *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*

IFAO = Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, Cairo

JANER = *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions*

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*

JARCE = *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*

JCS = *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*

JEA = *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*

JEOL = *Jaarbericht van het vooraziatisch-egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux*

JESHO = *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*

JNES = *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*

JSOT = *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*

JSS = *Journal of Semitic Studies*

JWP = *Journal of World Prehistory*

KAR = *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*

LÄ = *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*

LAS = Parpola, Simo. *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*, I (= AOAT 5/1, 1970); II (= AOAT 5/2, 1983)

LAPO = *Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient*

LingAeg = *Lingua Aegyptia*

LKA = *Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur*

MARI = *Mari, Annales de Recherches Interdisciplinaires*

MDAIK = *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo*

MEE = *Materiali epigrafici di Ebla*. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale

- MMA = The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
 MOS = Midden-Oosten Studies, Leiden
 MVN = Materiali per il Vocabolario Neosumerico. Rome: Multigrafia Editrice
 NABU = *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*
 Nik 1 = Nikol'skij, Michail Vasil'evič. 1908. *Dokumenty chozjajstvennoj otčetnostj drevnejšej epochi Chaldei iz sobranija N.P. Lichačeva*. St. Petersburg: Gateuk
 NIN = *Journal of Gender Studies in Antiquity*
 OBO = Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
 OECT = *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*
 OIP = Oriental Institute Publications, Chicago
 OLA = Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
 OLZ = *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*
 OrNS = *Orientalia*, Nova Series
 PBS = Publications of the Babylonian Section, Penn Museum, Philadelphia
 PdÄ = Probleme der Ägyptologie
 PNA = *Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*
 PS = Palermo Stone (translations used from Wilkinson 2000; see bibliography in Morris's chapter)
 PT = Pyramid Texts (translations used from Faulkner, R.O. 1969. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press)
 RA = *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale*
 RdE = *Revue d'Égyptologie*
 RIMA = Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian Periods. Toronto
 RTC = *Recueil de tablettes chaldéennes*. Paris: Leroux
 SAA = State Archives of Assyria
 SAAB = *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin*
 SAAS = State Archives of Assyria, Helsinki
 SAALT = State Archives of Assyria Literary Texts
 SAGA = Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte altägyptens, Heidelberg
 SAK = *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur*
 Santag 6 = Koslova, Natalia. 2000. *Ur III–Texte der St. Petersburger Eremitage*. Santag 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz
 SAOC = Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations. Chicago
 StP SM = Studia Pohl, Series Maior
 TCL = *Textes cunéiformes*. Musée du Louvre. Paris: Geuthner.

- TCNY = Sauren, Herbert. 1978. *Les tablettes cunéiformes de l'époque d'Ur des collections de la New York Public Library*. Leuven: Peeters
- TM = Registration number of objects (tablets) from Tell Mardikh/Ebla
- TrDr = Genouillac, Henri de. 1911. *La trouvaille de Dréhem. Étude avec un choix de textes de Constantinople et Bruxelles*. Paris: Geuthner
- UET = Ur Excavations. Texts
- UF = Ugarit Forschungen
- Urk. I = *Urkunden des Alten Reichs I*
- VAB = Vorderasiatische Bibliothek
- VS = *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der königlichen/staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*
- VT = *Vetus Testamentum*
- WdO = *Die Welt des Orients*
- WVDOG = Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
- WZKM = *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
- YOS = Yale Oriental Series
- ZA = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie*
- ZÄS = *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*
- ZAW = *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Glossary

1.1 AKKADIAN

abum – father

adê – covenant

andurârum – remission

awîlum – (a legal category of person)

barû – to watch over

bârû – haruspex (religious official who inspects the entrails of sacrificial animals for omens)

bêl purussî – “master of decisions” (epithet)

birbirru – radiance

dayyānu – judge

elûtum – highness

lû EME.SAG^{meš} – important message or carrier of important messages

ešêru – to direct oneself steadily

ešem kinti – a type of ghost

ešemmu – ghost

gamlum – a divine weapon

haṭṭu – rod

ilku – corvée (unpaid labor owed in return for the right to hold a particular piece of land)

ilûtum – divinity

ina saparrim – “through / with a net,” a description of a type of oath

izuzzum – to stand, to be present

kakkabî – “my star” (royal epithet)

kakkubu – star

kânu – to be stable

kayyamānu – “the steady one,” an epithet of the planet Saturn

kimtu – family

kippatu – ring

kispum – ancestor cult

kittu u mīšaru – truth and justice

lisānu rēštu – important message

- LÚ.ŠAMÁN.LÁ TUR* – junior student
lumāšē – astral constellations
MAŠ.MAŠ É Aššur – chief exorcist of the Temple of Ashur
MAŠ.MAŠ TUR – junior exorcist
maḥlat, maḥḥaltu – mirror
mehret, meḥru – counterpart
melammu – radiance
mīšarum – justice, redress
mu-ša-lum, mušālu – mirror
muškēnum – a social status
muštēširu – royal epithet, “he who guides aright, securer of justice”
muššulu – likeness; mirror
nadītum – a type of priestess
namrirūtum – luminosity
nišēšu – people
nišūtu – kin
nūrum – light
pagrum – body
pisan šarrim – the king’s treasure chest
rē’ūm – shepherd
salātu – kin
šalmu – image
šalmu Enlil dārū – an eternal image of Enlil
šalummatu – radiance
šamšum – the sun; a solar disk
šangû – a type of priest
šar mīšarim – “king of justice,” a royal epithet
šarru – king
šarrūtum – kingship
šewerru – ring
šibirru – ring
šīr ilī/ilāni – “flesh of the gods,” an epithet
šīfir burūmê – “celestial writing”
šīfir šamê – “celestial writing”
šubarūtum – exemption
šubtu, šubat – dwelling
šūrubtum – delivery
tamšīlu – equivalent
tarāku – to be dark
tāwītum – oracle query

terhatum – bride price

têmtum – sea

tupšarru – scribe

tupšikku – basket

ummânu – expert

wardum – servant

zaqiqu – spirit

1.2 HEBREW

gillul – idolatry

hêlêl ben šāḥar – “Bright Star son of Dawn,” epithet of a heavenly body

šlm – graven image

1.3 PROPER NAMES

Bêl – DN

mul^lugal – (= “star of the king”; Regulus)

mât Aššur^{KI} – Land of Assur

MUL.APIN – an astronomical series

dšalam-šarri – DN

dšamšu Bābilim

dutu – DN

1.4 SUMERIAN

al₆-ĝal₂ – stored, present

ê-dub-lá-mah – a building name

ê-eš-bar-zi-da – a temple name

e₂-gal – palace

e₂-mi₂ – “Female Quarter,” a building name

e₃ – expended

ensi₂ – ruler, governor

giĝ₄ – shekel

ĝuruš – worker

tu⁹guz-za – a type of cloth

kunga₂ – an equid

lugal – king

ma-na – mina – (a unit of measurement)

maš a-ša₃-ga – irrigation tax on fields

mu.du – delivered, delivery

nì-gi-na – order

nì-si-sá – redress
 niĝ₂.ba – gift
 niĝ₂.kaskal – a type of gift
 niĝ₂.lim₄ – a type of cloth
 niĝ₂.sam₂ – purchase
 NIN – queen
 sipa – shepherd
 ugula mu-ús-si-rù-meš – a type of foreman

1.5 EGYPTIAN

ḳbdw – sacred site of Abydos
ḳht – horizon
Jbj – magnate, dignitary
jmj-r wpt jdw – overseer of missions of the young men
jmj-r pr n ḥwt-ʕt – administrator of a great administrative center
jmj-r mš^c – military leader
jmj-r nwwt mʕwt – overseer of the new localities
jmj-r ḥm(w)-ntr – overseer of prophets
jmj-r zʕw šm^cw – overseer of the phyles of Upper Egypt
jmj-r šm^cw – overseer of Upper Egypt
jmj-r kʕt nt nzwt – overseer of the works of the king
ikr – superb, excellent
w^cb – pure, clean
w^crt – regional circumscription
wʕh(w) – enduring
Wp-wʕ.wt – Opener of the Ways (jackal deity)
wr – chief
wr 10 šm^cw – greatest of the ten of Upper Egypt
bʕw – effective power
bīʕ – wonder, marvel
bīʕyt – miracle, wonder
bity – King of Lower Egypt
pʕty – primeval
pr – house, home; representative local center
pr-ʕ – lit. great house; pharaoh, the house the king inhabited
pr nzwt – house of the king, i.e., palace
pr-šn^c – production center
pr-qt – domain
pḥr ḥʕ inb – to circle the wall (in a ritual direction)
pzn – bread

- mꜣt* – moral and physical order of the universe
mnḥw – efficient power
mrt – worker
mst – birth, (to be) born
nswt – king of Upper Egypt
nw – western Delta (toponym)
nwt mꜣwt – the new localities; royal agricultural domains
nfr – youthful vigor and creative force
nhḥ – eternal
Nḥn – Hierakonpolis (location); placenta
ntr ʕ – great god
rmnjjt – domain of a private individual
rḥ nzw – king's acquaintance
ḥꜣtj-ʕ – chief of a locality, mayor
ḥw – divine
ḥwt – royal administrative center, royal foundation
ḥwt-ʕt – royal agricultural center
ḥwt-wr(t) – royal executive/legal center
ḥwt-mḥʕ – Lower Egyptian royal center
ḥwt-nbw – center for processing gold
ḥwt-šmʕw – Upper Egyptian royal center
ḥwt-kꜣ – royal cult center
ḥwt-ṯnt – faience production center
ḥm-nzw – serf of the king, servant of the king
ḥrj-tp – chief
ḥrj-tp ʕ n zpꜣt – great chief of the nome
ḥr-sbꜣ-ḥt – Horus-first-of-the-corporation-of-gods (epithet)
ḥr-tpi-ḥt – Horus-star-of-the-corporation-of-gods (epithet)
ḥsbw – work crew
ḥkꜣ – great (leader, governor)
ḥqꜣ ḥwt – governor of a royal center
ḥqꜣ ḥwt-ʕt – overseer of the great royal center
ḥtp dj nswt – “An offering that the king gives” (mortuary ritual formula)
ḥtꜣ – bread
ḥd – mace; white
ḥdt – white crown of Upper Egypt
ḥnrt – work center
ḥntj-š – palace attendants, bodyguards
ḥnw – the interior, inside
Ḥn-Nḥn – the interior of Hierakonpolis

- z3 nzw* – son of the king
si3 – perception
swnw – towers (administrative unit)
sh3 – monument, memorial
sm3 sm^c t3-mhw – uniting Upper and Lower Egypt
sm3-t3wj – uniting the Two Lands, i.e., Upper and Lower Egypt
sr – giraffe, one who sees far, ruler
sr(w) – officials
sšm t3 – ruler of the land
stj – land of Nubia
špsy – august, noble
šm3j – magnate
šmsw hr – the followers of Horus
šsp – perform (as in a miracle)
qnbtyw w – members of the council of the district
k3 – soul, ancestral spirit, essence
k3p – to cense, make offering to the divine
k3-nht – strong bull (royal epithet)
t3 mhw – the Northland (in relation to Upper Egypt)
t3 ntr – God's Land
t3ty – vizier
tnwt – census
tt – official
D^cw – magnate, dignitary
dw – mountain
Db^cwt – Buto (a locality)
dt – eternity, forever

Contributors

Mehmet-Ali Ataç

Department of Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology
Bryn Mawr College
101 North Merion Avenue
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010-2899
USA
matac@brynmawr.edu

Miroslav Bárta

Charles University
Czech Institute of Egyptology
Prague
Czech Republic
miroslav.barta@ff.cuni.cz

Dominique Charpin

Directeur d'études à l'EPHE (IVe s.) Orient Antique
Université Paris I
Centre Glotz 17 rue de la Sorbonne
75231 Paris Cedex 05
France
charpin@msh-paris.fr

D. Bruce Dickson

Department of Anthropology
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4352
USA
dickson@tamu.edu

Eckart Frahm

Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations
Yale University
New Haven, CT 06520-8236
USA
eckart.frahm@yale.edu

Alan B. Lloyd

Classics, Ancient History, and Egyptology
Swansea University
Singleton Park
Swansea SA2 8PP
Wales
UK
A.B.Lloyd@swansea.ac.uk

Juan Carlos Moreno García

Centre de Recherches Egyptologiques de la Sorbonne – CRES
Université Paris–Sorbonne Paris IV
1 rue Victor Cousin
75230 Paris Cedex 05
France
jcmorenogarcia@hotmail.com

Ludwig Morenz

University of Bonn
Regina-Pacis-Weg 7
53113 Bonn
Germany
aegyptologisches.seminar@uni-bonn.de

Ellen Morris

Barnard College
Columbia University
3009 Broadway
New York, NY 10027
USA
emorris@barnard.edu

Beate Pongratz-Leisten

Institute for the Study of the Ancient World
New York University
15 East 84th Street
New York, NY 10028
USA
bpl2@nyu.edu

Michael Roaf

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
Department für Kulturwissenschaften und Altertumskunde
Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1
80539 München
Germany
Michael.Roaf@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

Walther Sallaberger

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität
Department für Kulturwissenschaften und Altertumskunde
Institut für Assyriologie und Hethitologie
Schellingstr. 5
80799 München
Germany
WaSa@assyf.fak12.uni-muenchen.de

Joann Scurlock

History Department
Elmhurst College
190 Prospect Avenue
Elmhurst, Illinois 60126-3296
USA
r-beals@uchicago.edu

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgments

The work contained in this volume is the result of a four-day workshop entitled “Experiencing Power—Generating Authority: Cosmos and Politics in the Ideology of Kingship in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia” held in the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology November 2007. During the course of that week, fifteen scholars from the fields of Anthropology, Assyriology, and Egyptology shared their research, views, and expertise on questions relevant to the cross-cultural study of ancient kingship. After a fruitful week of papers and discussions, three participants—Manfred Bietak, D. Bruce Dickson, and Bradley Parker, along with Simon Martin of Penn Museum’s American Section—presented their research in a series of open lectures at the Penn Museum.

The editors wish to thank the great many people whose help and encouragement aided in the successful arrangement of this working conference. As part of the University of Pennsylvania Museum’s International Research Conference Program, then-Williams Director Richard Leventhal granted us the resources to organize a conference involving some of the world’s most respected and innovative scholars to work on questions of interest to both specialized fields and to anthropology as a whole. Conference Series Director Holly Pittman generously gave of her time and energy in helping us plan and organize the conference and has since helped shepherd the publication of the conference volume to its completion. Many thanks are also due to our outside consultants Drs. David O’Connor and Richard Zettler for their many helpful suggestions during the planning and editing process. Unfortunately, due to time and academic constraints, some of our authors were not able to keep their contributions in this volume. For those

who would like to refer to this work, Bradley Parker's paper, "The Construction and Performance of Kingship in the NeoAssyrian Empire," was published in *The Journal of Anthropological Research* in 2011.

We would also like to thank the Penn Museum personnel who made the conference sessions and associated events run smoothly and efficiently. Special thanks in this regard are due to Museum Events Staff Bethany Robblee Schell and Tena Thomason.

Finally, many thanks are due to the scholars themselves, some of whom traveled great distances to participate in this demanding conference workshop, for so generously giving of their insights, research, and time.

JANE A. HILL, PHILIP JONES, ANTONIO J. MORALES

Penn Museum International Research Conferences

Foreword

For more than a century, a core mission of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology has been to foster research that leads to new understandings about human culture. For much of the 20th century, this research took the form of worldwide expeditions that brought back both raw data and artifacts whose analysis continues to shed light on early complex societies of the New and Old Worlds. The civilizations of pharonic Egypt, Mesopotamia, Iran, Greece, Rome, Mexico, Peru, and Native Americans have been represented in galleries that display only the most remarkable of the Penn Museum's vast holding of artifacts. These collections have long provided primary evidence of many distinct research programs engaging scholars from around the world.

As we moved into a new century, indeed a new millennium, the Penn Museum sought to reinvigorate its commitment to research focused on questions of human societies. In 2005, working with then Williams Director Richard M. Leventhal, Michael J. Kowalski, Chairman of the Board of Overseers of the Penn Museum, gave a generous gift to the Museum to seed a new program of high-level conferences designed to engage themes central to the Museum's core research mission. According to Leventhal's vision, generating new knowledge and frameworks for understanding requires more than raw data and collections. More than ever, it depends on collaboration among communities of scholars investigating problems using distinct

lines of evidence and different modes of analysis. Recognizing the importance of collaborative and multidisciplinary endeavors in the social sciences, the Penn Museum used the gift to launch a program of International Research Conferences that each brought together ten to fifteen scholars who had reached a critical point in the consideration of a shared problem.

During the three years until the spring of 2008, it was my privilege to identify, develop, run, and now oversee the publication of eight such conferences. The dozen or so papers for each conference were submitted to all participants one month in advance of the meeting. The fact that the papers were circulated beforehand meant that no time was lost introducing new material to the group. Rather, after each paper was briefly summarized by its author, an intense and extended critique followed that allowed for sustained consideration of the contribution that both the data and the argument made to the larger questions. The discussions of individual papers were followed by a day discussing crosscutting issues and concluded with an overarching synthesis of ideas.

Experiencing Power, Generating Authority is the edited proceedings of a conference of the same name held in the fall of 2007. It is the sixth of the conferences to see publication. As Series Editor, I look forward to one more volume that will appear in the near future. The publication of the results of these conferences allows the new knowledge and understanding that they achieved to be shared broadly and to contribute to the uniquely human enterprise of self understanding.

HOLLY PITTMAN

Series Editor

Deputy Director for Academic Programs, Penn Museum 2005–2008

Curator, Near East Section

Professor, History of Art

Bok Family Professor in the Humanities, University of Pennsylvania

Introduction

This page intentionally left blank

Comparing Kingship in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia

Cosmos, Politics and Landscape

JANE A. HILL, PHILIP JONES, ANTONIO J. MORALES

If we refer to kingship as a political institution, we assume a point of view which would have been incomprehensible to the ancients . . . Whatever was significant was imbedded in the life of the cosmos, and it was precisely the king's function to maintain the harmony of that integration.

— Frankfort 1948:3

INTRODUCTION

It is now more than sixty years since Henri Frankfort introduced his classic comparative study of rulership in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia, *Kingship and the Gods*, with this basic distinction between the political and cosmic roles of kingship. This volume follows in Frankfort's footsteps in examining the relationship of kingship, cosmos, and politics in the context of ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian civilization. Three millennia of recorded history and social traditions make ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia rich sources for a comparative study of the long-term political and social development of these two "pristine" cultures (for the most recent large-scale comparison, see Baines and Yoffee 1998). They were geographically near, while culturally quite distinct. For almost three thousand years, Egypt and Mesopotamia shared the concept of ultimate legitimate authority being invested in the single sacred

office of kingship. This office was legitimized by the gods, demonstrated through ritual, and reinforced by tradition. Through this sacred office the ruler exercised the essential political authority of the state. Both ancient civilizations provide us a rich material record of royal monuments (civil and religious), iconography, and texts that eloquently define and frame the actions of the ruler: the context of his deeds, the purpose of his commissions, and the accomplishments achieved under his reign.

As Frankfort implies, however, the sacred aspects of kingship in both societies drive a wedge between the ancient evidence and modern attempts to understand it. Was it “the king’s function to maintain the harmony of [the] integration” of human life with the cosmos, as Frankfort argued, or was it, as we would expect of our own rulers, to facilitate the integration of his human subjects with his own regime or with each other? In taking up this challenge, we join a debate that stretches back beyond him to, at least, the late 19th century (Feeley-Harnik 1985). In very broad outline, this debate has inspired three basic approaches to understanding the dichotomy: (i) privileging one of the cosmic and political orientations of kingship over the other; (ii) treating the two as separate but equal facets of kingship; and (iii) exploring the interaction between the two of them.

The first such approach attempts a definite answer to our question posed above. Beginning with the classic work of Sir James Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1894; see also, Frazer 1900; 1905–1915; and 1922), there has been an on-going controversy in anthropology and history as to whether kingship in pre-modern societies should be considered fundamentally either cosmic or political. This debate has often spilled over, more or less overtly, into the study of ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian kingship. Frazer postulated that kings had originally embodied the powers of nature and must therefore be sacrificed before their own physical decline affected the fertility of the world around. Much of this reconstruction seemed congruent with either extant Greco-Roman memories of Egypt and Mesopotamia or the material revealed with gathering pace throughout the 19th century by archaeology. Particularly with regard to the Egyptian evidence, prominent festivals such as the *Heb-Sed* seem to evoke Frazer’s basic principle (Uphill 1965), while the figure of Osiris, known already to Frazer from Classical sources and utilized by him, seemed to be an archetypal “Dying and Rising” god (Otto 1968:24; Griffiths 1980). Mesopotamia fit Frazer’s theories less obviously, but after the First World War, the so-called Myth and

Ritual school of scholars sought to apply a version of Frazer's ideas about cosmic kingship to both Egyptian and Mesopotamian rulers (Fairman 1955; Gadd 1933; Hooke 1933). Frankfort's *Kingship and the Gods* was a rejoinder to the Myth and Ritual school, although it is noteworthy that he judged Egyptian kingship to be significantly more cosmic in orientation than its Mesopotamian equivalent (Wengrow 1999). In general, Frankfort's views were congruent with those espoused by Assyriologists and his work elicited little controversy with respect to Mesopotamia. Traditionally, Assyriologists have tended to treat cosmic aspects of kingship as a mode of legitimation (Postgate 1995) or simple hyperbole (Kraus 1974). Where cosmic kingship was acknowledged, it was often contrasted with non-cosmic kingship in a different period or area (Labat 1939). For many Egyptologists, however, Frankfort's de facto endorsement of the cosmic view of Egyptian kingship provoked a fierce reaction in recent decades, beginning with Posener (1960).

Such a debate, however, risks either denying that a king and his subjects could think as rationally as ourselves or ignoring significant aspects of the source material for failing to replicate our own attitudes to such matters (Caldwell and Henley 2008). One obvious way to overcome this dilemma is simply to treat the cosmic and political aspects of a kingship as separate but equal facets of the institution without attempting to privilege one over the other (Lorton 1979, 1986; Charpin 2004:232–316; and note the remarks of O'Connor and Silverman 1995:xxv).

While avoiding the question of whether a kingship is ultimately political or cosmic does allow a more uninhibited exploration of both aspects, "it may be," as in the words of O'Connor and Silverman (1995:xxvi), "that there is yet a further mystery to be explored." Suggestive in this regard has been the work on medieval and early modern political and constitutional theory by Ernst Kantorowicz (1957) entitled *The King's Two Bodies*. Kantorowicz argued that the king was viewed as a mixture of individual holders of a kingship who were mortal and the office of kingship itself that was effectively immortal. Beyond this dichotomy, however, he was more focused on how the cosmic and political aspects of kingship were interwoven rather than how they could be distilled out. Moreover, he was concerned with exploring the ways in which the relationship between the divine world and the king changes over time. While such studies have been attempted in the ancient Near East (for example, Jones 2005; Machinist 2006), it is an open question whether the source material is abundant or well enough under-

stood for our disciplines to be able to emulate Kantorowicz's work on the much more extensively studied history of Europe.

Each of these approaches has contributed much to our understanding of kingship both in traditional societies in general and Egypt and Mesopotamia in particular, but each has attendant problems. In organizing this book, we aimed to combine these approaches to the problem rather than utilize one to the exclusion of the others. While observing a division of labor between Egypt and Mesopotamia, we asked our contributors to focus on particular topics rather than to produce synthetic accounts of kingship in discrete periods or regions. We grouped those studies overtly into three clusters. The first two of these focused on the relationship of kingship to, respectively, cosmos and politics. In the final section, we focus on a topic where these two relationships seem automatically to merge: landscape. At the same time, we framed our investigations in terms of the experience of power and the generation of authority. In doing so, we were less interested in explicitly defining these terms and more interested in seeing how such general guidelines stimulated the crystallization of themes that cut across any reified dichotomy of cosmos and politics.

PART I: KINGSHIP AND COSMOS

At the end of the 4th millennium the emergence of civilization in Egypt and Mesopotamia brought about a series of transformations in the environment and society that culminated with the establishment of early polities and the consolidation of the institution of kingship. The complex forms of kingship attested at this time in both civilizations emerged from ideological motivations to control their territory and people, so that the king was able to respond to social, religious, and political concerns with both physical and transcendental powers (Beattie 1968; Feeley-Harnik 1985). Therefore, ideological constructions of kingship in Egypt and Mesopotamia defined the figure of the king as a multi-faceted sacred ruler with effective human authority, divine legitimacy, and supernatural attributes. The sacred nature of his office transcended the earthly political dominion and addressed religious issues of greater significance for the benefit of mankind (Mann 1986). In this manner, the sacred aspect of kingship acted as a cohesive factor in the development of the state (Coe 1982; Keatinge 1982), the comprehension of the divine, and the understanding of cosmic order.

The complexity of the royal institution reflects its socially accepted universal role and the king's ultimate responsibility—the preservation of order over chaos and constant rebirth over death. As the mission of the king was to guarantee political stability and cosmic balance (Young 1966), the principles of kingship were founded upon the relationship of the king to the gods. This association has stimulated an intense debate on royal divinity in general (Feeley-Harnik 1985; Quigley 2005), as well as in Egypt (O'Connor and Silverman 1995) and Mesopotamia (Brisch 2008). Although there is evidence linking the prominent position of the king in the cosmos as proof of his divinity (Frazer 1905, 1922), royal equivalence with the gods is not so patent, as several different examples indicate, e.g., son (*z3*) of Re, servant (*b3k*) of Amun, or flesh (*šīru*) of the god (see Charpin and Frahm, both this volume). Thus, the essential purpose of the king from a cosmic perspective is not so much to be an actual god, but rather to act as mediator between the gods in general and his people (Geertz 1980). The scholars whose work is presented in Part I of this volume have engaged in the analysis of the role of kingship as institutional guarantor of life and order for humanity, dealing with specific cases in Egypt and Mesopotamia that bring fresh perspectives—and pose new questions—to the long-standing debate about the divine nature of the king in these cultures.

In taking on the issue of the cosmic aspects of kingship, our contributors divided along disciplinary lines. Charpin, Frahm, and Scurlock focused on the nature of the divine connections enjoyed by the king. Morris and Morenz, in contrast, focus on how such images were created and promulgated.

Morris examines various early dynastic cultic objects from Early Dynastic Egypt, in particular the famous Narmer Palette. Although they differ in artistic conventions from later dynastic art, she sees the basic aspects of Egyptian kingship already encoded in these works. As such, she argues that the king fulfilled a number of both cosmic and political roles. The king is not an ordinary human being and various strategies emerged to support this view. Morris focuses on the use of scent, animal imagery, and association with ithyphallic divine figures to mark the king as extra-ordinary. Such motifs as the “four sacred animals” and the Followers of Horus emphasize the divine protection enjoyed by the king. However, the king himself also provides a charismatic center for the land: he defeats enemies abroad and crushes rebels within, he personifies the union of Upper and Lower Egypt

within himself, and he is an administrator and bestower of largesse.

In delineating the means of separating the king from ordinary mortals, Morris notes the importance of the association of early Egyptian kings with the god Horus. Our next four chapters focus specifically on the issue of royal identification with a divine or at least superhuman figure. In doing so, they elucidate the wider significance such associations may have for the ideology of kingship in their respective cultures. Both Charpin and Frahm examine the relationship between Mesopotamian kings and the sun-god. As with the ancient Egyptians and many other societies, Mesopotamians felt a particular connection between the king and the sun. For them, the sun-god was associated with concepts of justice, and—as Charpin reminds us in his chapter—divination. Through a focus on the sun-god, Charpin explores the wider significance these two attributes have in Mesopotamian conceptions of the cosmos. He shows how for the king, this association has a number of implications. In terms of the extent to which the king is considered divine, Charpin argues that the dispensation of justice constitutes a situation in which the king is actually considered to embody a divine figure. Moreover, he sees this phenomena as reflected not only in literary texts but also in prosaic contexts such as letters and personal names. Through the association with justice, equations of the king with the sun-god imply responsibility as much as any augmentation of royal power through identification with the divine. The association with justice has a double aspect: a static one encapsulated in the concept of an unchanging cosmic order and a dynamic one of the ability to react to threats to this order and restore the cosmos to balance. Charpin also shows how the concepts of justice and divination themselves are not seen as the exclusive domain of the sun-god. They are also associated with other deities such as Adad, Ninsianna, and the moon-god.

Frahm deepens our understanding of the Mesopotamian identification of the king with the sun-god. Beyond explicit identification with the god, ritual actions of the king in important 1st millennium rituals mimic the movement of the solar body. Frahm points out that this identification of the king with a phenomenon of the daytime sky has a counterpoint in the king's identification with the planet Saturn in the nighttime sky. Whereas the sun provides an image of cosmic reliability, Saturn as a planet is subject to the vicissitudes of movement that characterize the night sky. As such, the two astral bodies represent two facets of kingship: on the one hand, the

steady and reliable pivot of people's lives, on the other, a figure exposed to all the ups and downs of political life. Frahm further explores this celestial contrast between order and disorder in terms of two major 1st millennium mythic narratives, *Enuma Elish* and *Erra*, which utilize Jupiter and Mars respectively as embodiments of these forces.

Morenz focuses on cultic objects from Predynastic Egypt and the ways in which political messages can be conveyed through iconography in a pre-literate culture. He identifies three major types of such objects: weapons, tools, and ornaments. These correspond respectively to rituals of victory, agriculture, and enthronement. From this he discerns both a military and a sacred aspect to earliest Egyptian kingship. Each aspect is encoded in contrasting types of animals depicted on ritual objects. Thus, for example, fierce animals such as bulls or lions exhibit an obvious reference to military prowess. Conversely, depictions of giraffes—conceptually associated with seeing or foretelling the future—and hybrid animals such as human-headed hyenas suggest a shamanistic ability to commune with the supernatural world.

Scurlock examines the mythological associations of Mesopotamian kings with the concept of death, chiefly in how they identify with the god Dumuzi. Although literary texts linking kings directly with Dumuzi are limited to the Old Babylonian period, Scurlock argues that the connection can be traced from at least the royal tombs of Ur in the Early Dynastic period (see also Dickson) down to the Neo-Assyrian period. For Scurlock, however, these matters are not just of mythological interest. She analyzes how the king's connections to the Netherworld shape the nature of kingship itself. In particular, she focuses on how the identification with Dumuzi—the archetypal shepherd—implied royal responsibility rather than an augmentation of royal power (see also Charpin).

PART II: KINGSHIP AND POLITICS

In our second section, the chapters focus on various political aspects of kingship in ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt. Traditional studies of Egyptian kingship frequently neglect the actual workings of the institution and the means by which it exercised power. In part, the reason for this is due to the types of information available through our preserved sources. For instance, scholars of 3rd millennium Mesopotamia focus on economy in large part

because of the abundant nature of their preserved texts dealing with temple and palace economy, while the earliest information on kingship from Egypt is iconic, representational, and king-centered. It is perhaps because of these accidents of preservation that Frankfort's interpretation of Mesopotamian kingship as being a rational and political institution while the Egyptian version of the office was an irrational and religious institution has persisted so long in the literature (Wengrow 1999). Even so, in the earliest Egyptian representations and writings denoting kingship, it is the physical manifestation of the institution in the landscape—the Great House (*pr ʕ*)—which was no doubt of both economic and political importance that is used as a signifier of the office. It is also noteworthy that most of what we know about the reach of the power of the office of First Dynasty Egyptian kings comes from these same symbols (*serekhs*) scratched into pottery or engraved onto tags marking valuable trade goods shipped from within and beyond Egypt's borders and denoting official networks controlled by an administrative structure even during this early period.

In later periods official texts treating kingship in both Egypt and Mesopotamia deal in the symbolic and religious aspects of the office and much less in its mechanics, i.e., the means by which the king's authority is legitimated in the eyes of his subjects and how he wields power within the country. Detecting and interpreting the inner workings of government in any of the periods under discussion is extremely difficult and in many cases our surviving primary sources tend to be sparse, diffuse, or even mute on the social texts and subtexts behind issues such as the king's use of deadly force against his own subjects or the abandonment of one style of mortuary complex for another. The scholars whose work is presented in Part II of this volume have undertaken the difficult task of reconstructing the political and social structures through which the king's authority is generated and his power exercised. By looking beyond the bright light thrown by the figure of Shamash or "Son of Re" himself and into the lives of palace servants, priests, exorcists, bureaucrats, weavers, provincial headmen, and tax collectors, these authors draw back the curtain behind the throne to explain how and why the king creates, co-opts, and manipulates the social institutions of his world, and vice versa, in order to maintain order, inspire service, collect taxes and tribute, and exact obedience.

Moreno focuses on the integration of central and provincial elites prior to the New Kingdom. The Egyptian state seems large in size and stable over

time, particularly when compared to contemporary Mesopotamian polities. Its foundation and periodic re-foundation seems to be effected by one particular region—Upper Egypt. Moreno argues that Egypt had a number of regional power centers and therefore that both the prominence of Upper Egypt in state formation and the ability of the center to integrate various provincial nuclei together cannot be taken for granted. He therefore begins by examining the initial creation of a pan-Egyptian state in the Predynastic period. He looks beneath the image of Upper Egypt as a monolithic bloc and instead seeks to elucidate the advantages that led one political component of that region—the city of Hierakonpolis—to unify initially its local region and ultimately the whole valley of Egypt (see also the chapters by Morris and Morenz). Looking mainly at the Old Kingdom, Moreno then traces the modes of regional integration that underpin the comparative stability of the ancient Egyptian state. Kings were able to mold local elites into orienting their economic and ideological interests to the central government. Moreno emphasizes the economic integration achieved by the creation of royal agricultural centers in the countryside and royal land grants to local temples (see also Bárta, this volume).

The economic relationship between palace and temple is taken up by Sallaberger in the contexts of early Mesopotamia. Traditionally, scholars have seen both institutions as examples of great households fulfilling similar economic roles and hence constituting potential rivals. Through an analysis of 3rd and 2nd millennia archives, Sallaberger argues that not only do palace and temple fulfill distinct economic roles, but that we also need to be aware of the different roles of “state” institutions at the provincial and central level. Temples produce food and utilitarian goods. In contrast, the palace was concerned with the distribution of prestige items such as metals, luxury textiles, exotic goods, and fine food. To do this, the palace—often utilizing provincial centers—requisitioned primary products from the temples at home and plundered or traded for raw materials and craft products abroad. These were then used to provide members of the elite—either directly or through the upkeep and supply of skilled craftsmen—with prestige goods. While Sallaberger specifically focuses on 3rd and 2nd millennium archives, he also sees his model as applicable to later states such as the Neo-Assyrian empire. As such, he suggests that the control and distribution of royal “treasure” constitutes not only a crucial means of mediating the relationship between king and elites, but also constitutes as fundamental an

aspect of Mesopotamian kingship as, for example, supreme command of the army or ultimate control of territory.

Bárta analyses royal mortuary complexes of Egypt from the Fourth to Sixth Dynasties to illuminate the relationship between king and elite. He contrasts the laudatory picture of Old Kingdom monarchy propagated on behalf of the king to the evidence of changing patterns of elite tomb placement and the titulary of officials. The claims to overwhelming power found in royal propaganda are often belied by evidence on the ground. Early Fourth Dynasty royal pyramids are some of the most impressive structures ever created by an ancient civilization. By the end of the dynasty, however, these structures had become more modest in size and from the Fifth Dynasty onwards, the storerooms and administrative buildings attending the pyramids become much larger while the pyramids themselves become more modest structures. Utilizing the evidence of autobiographical mortuary stelae, Bárta traces the evolution of the administrative structure from one dominated by members of the royal family in the Fourth Dynasty to the emergence of a non-royal central bureaucracy in the Fifth Dynasty to the kings' attempts in the late Fifth and Sixth Dynasties to forge ties with the provincial elites as a means of loosening the control of the central elites. Lastly, he looks at how the Old Kingdom patterns of administration broke down during the First Intermediate Period and how the system was resurrected in the Middle Kingdom.

Pongratz-Leisten focuses on Neo-Assyrian kingship in the 7th century BCE. She analyzes the nature of the relationship between king and elites as the society attempts to create a royal figure that is independent of social and political frameworks (see also Morris, this volume). Nonetheless, such creation was undertaken by the elite members of these frameworks. Pongratz-Leisten sets out to identify these players and the king's relationship to them. She identifies the so-called scholars—experts in traditional science and lore—rather than the priesthood as the group delineating the king's intermediary role between gods and people. The master scholars of the Assyrian court create a mythological buffer for the king that leaves him dependent on their guidance in cosmic matters. In particular, the city of Assur, although no longer the capital, is turned into an ideological center of the polity effectively undercutting royal authority. Through a close analysis of the events implied by the well-known letter of Sargon II to the god Ashur, Pongratz-Leisten investigates the ways the king has to negotiate with the

traditional capital in order to maintain his legitimacy.

Dickson examines the question of early state formation primarily through the prism of the royal tombs of Ur from Early Dynastic Mesopotamia. He positions his study in terms of the dichotomy between integration theory that sees state formation in terms of the managerial aspects of the emerging state apparatus and conflict theory that in contrast emphasizes the predatory aspects of this apparatus. The royal tombs include large numbers of retainers buried with the royal corpses. The original excavator, Sir Leonard Woolley, argued that these retainers went to their deaths willingly. Dickson, in contrast, argues that the imposition of a violent and unwilling death is much more congruent with what we know about other emergent state forms including the First Dynasty tombs at the royal cemetery at Abydos and the Early Dynastic elite cemetery at Saqqara (see Morris, this volume).

PART III: KINGSHIP AND LANDSCAPE

Frankfort saw the differences he perceived between Egyptian and Mesopotamian ideas of kingship as rooted in the contrasting physical environments of the two civilizations. The Mesopotamians thought in terms of cosmic instability, the Egyptians of cosmic stability. For Frankfort (1948:4–5) the difference he saw in a Mesopotamian view of an unstable cosmos with the Egyptian one of a stable cosmos was:

curiously in keeping with the physiographical differences between the two countries. The rich Nile Valley lies isolated and protected between the almost empty deserts on either side, while Mesopotamia lacks clear boundaries and was periodically robbed and disrupted by the mountaineers on its east or the nomads on its west. Egypt derived its prosperity from the annual inundation of the Nile, which never fails to rise, even if the floods differ greatly in effectiveness. But Mesopotamia is, for much of its grazing, dependent on an uncertain rainfall and possesses in the Tigris an unaccountable, turbulent, and most dangerous river.

In the final section, our chapters explore the relationship between kingship and the physical environment, but from a rather different perspective. By focusing on the concept of landscape, we examine both the physical manifestation of the land and its casting by human hand and mind (Falconer

and Redman 2009:1–2; Schama 1996; Smith 2003). The chapters draw together a number of the many dichotomies that underpin this volume: Egypt and Mesopotamia as distinct civilizations; cosmos and politics as alternative stimuli for royal actions; the experience of power and the generation of authority as subtly different processes contextualizing kingship. Frankfort structured *Kingship and the Gods* around the differences in physical landscape between Egypt and Mesopotamia. In focusing on the human reaction to and cultural appropriation of landscape, our contributors highlight similarities between the two civilizations. In keeping with many societies (Helms 1993), both Egypt and Mesopotamia conceptualized the lands beyond their own border as otherworldly regions that were the source both of power itself and the exotic products that so often signified it. Moreover, in cultures of restricted literacy and public oratory, manipulation of the landscape—both physically and figuratively—was often the most visible means of interaction between the subjects and rulers (Milano et al 2000; Thomason 2001, 2004).

The chapters by Roaf and Lloyd focus on the physicality of landscape, but as with Ataç in his study of landscape in art and literature, attention is paid to the ideological significance of landscape. Roaf in his account of royal building activity in Mesopotamia emphasizes the sheer diversity of kings and kingship throughout the course of the civilization. Despite this diversity, landscape and its manipulation by kings provided one common theme. Furthermore, there tended to be more emphasis on the king's spatial rather than, for example, genealogical status. Kings were generally rulers of particular places—whether a city, a country or even the whole world—rather than scions of a particular dynasty. Roaf focuses briefly on the territorial aspects of kingship and then more fully on the way royal building activities have an impact on the landscape. He emphasizes how fluid all relationships to the landscape were: concepts of territory evolved over time; the urge to surpass as well as simply emulate the building work of predecessors ensured that there was a constant evolution of such work. Moreover, there was a gradual change in emphasis as the interests of Mesopotamian kings switched over the millennia from temples to more “secular” works such as palaces, walls, canals, parks, and gardens. The modification of the landscape through building provides a way of connecting a king both to past and future. The structures themselves are a reminder of the power of past rulers and a means for current rulers to extend a visible reminder of their power into the future. The inscriptions contained within the structures

enable current rulers to encounter the words of their predecessor and leave a means of communicating with their successors.

Lloyd analyzes five inscriptions from Wadi Hammamat, a quarrying area in the desert east of the Nile Valley: four Middle Kingdom inscriptions from Mentuhotep IV year 2 and one New Kingdom inscription from Ramses IV year 3 commemorating quarrying expeditions sent out to the wadi. He focuses on the conceptual world within which the Egyptians understood events taking place in the Eastern Desert rather than the events of the expeditions themselves. First, he examines the practicalities of the Wadi Hammamat. The wadi is a source of a number of raw materials including the greywacke stone that provides the focus for the expeditions he discusses. Beyond its own resources, the wadi also forms part of the transit route for precious goods from farther afield, particularly the fabled land of Punt. The area is of course desert and presents numerous and great obstacles to any expeditions that attempt to exploit the resources of the area. Lloyd argues that both sorts of text treat the Wadi Hammamat as a sacred area. Furthermore, the Egyptians viewed the world as full of imminent divine powers that could be either helpful or harmful. It was possible to enlist, placate, or repel these forces by ritual action. The desert to the east of the Nile was particularly associated with beneficent powers and with the sunrise. Some areas could be seen as especially numinous due to particular physical features. The Wadi Hammamat was one such area due to its associations with savior deities, its physical stillness, and the fact that successful expeditions “obviously” required local divine assistance. The stones quarried from the wadi are themselves imbued with sacred power. The religious conception of the expeditions makes possible their use as propaganda. Our texts emphasize the “miracles” (*bi3yt*) seen en route. The Egyptians considered such miracles as a signal that the king enjoyed divine approval.

Ataç examines both the vertical and horizontal dimensions of the cosmos. He focuses on the relationship between mythic or ritual elements as against real or historical ones in Neo-Assyrian royal art. Mythic or ritual elements such as the sacred tree or the antediluvian sages are juxtaposed with the depiction of more historical events. In the early Neo-Assyrian period, the two elements are kept spatially separate, but in the art of Sennacherib or Assurbanipal they tend to blend into one another. Rather than attempting to analyze the degree of realism implied in such juxtapositions, Ataç reads them through a prism of geography, cosmology, and their respective visual

representations, in which he sees ritual or myth on the one hand and reality on the other as inseparable and blended. To do this, he looks first at concepts of the edge of the earth. He analyzes depictions of fabulous places beyond the edge of the known world in the Babylonian *Mappa Mundi* and the *Gilgamesh Epic*. He then examines the impact of these ideas on Mesopotamian conceptions of the oecumene. The lands beyond the oecumene are treated in Mesopotamian thought as exotic and chaotic, but also paradigmatic and paradisiacal. Mesopotamian royal titles such as King of Totality and King of the Four Quarters imply the integration of these fabulous areas in the body politic. Ataç sees this through the lens of the scholar of Medieval Islamic philosophy, Henri Corbin. Corbin theorized the existence in pre-modern thought of the “imaginal”—“real” places that could nevertheless only be apprehended through the imagination. It is the ideal role of an imperial administration to manifest the paradigmatic aspects of the imaginal at the center. Closely connected to the horizontally distant imaginal lands are the vertically inaccessible realms of the divine world. In particular, the Apsu, the mythical subterranean ocean of freshwater, blends into the horizontal imaginal. It is the home of the antediluvian sages who are the prime example of the paradigmatic sacred power necessary for the optimal well-being of the human center. Depictions of human landscape on Neo-Assyrian reliefs attempt to evoke a connection to the Apsu through depictions of the sages.

EXPERIENCING POWER, GENERATING AUTHORITY

As can be seen, our authors touch upon a wide variety of themes relating to the cosmic and political aspects of kingship. Here, we wish to draw out briefly five themes that cut across our initial categories and throw the relationship between the cosmic and political aspects of kingship into greater relief: violence, the circulation of goods, legitimation, royal death, and elite politics.

Violence

Frankfort's basic distinction between the relative peace and security of Egypt versus the environmental and geo-strategic vulnerability of Mesopotamia is symptomatic of a tendency to associate the cosmic pole of our comparison with passivity and the political one with violence. As our chapters highlight, however, the threat of violence underlies both the cosmic