

Joachim Friedrich Quack

## Political Rituals

### Sense and Nonsense of a Term and its Application to Ancient Egypt

We are certainly accustomed to using an analytical category of “political rituals”, which are often seen as one basic class of rituals,<sup>1</sup> even if it is admitted that they form “a particularly loose genre”.<sup>2</sup> If we are to appreciate this idea, we have to enter the thorny field of the general classification of rituals. In this, however, I see a systematic problem. Most classifications and typologies of rituals are based on a fairly loose and *ad-hoc* appreciation and suffer from it. The basic point is that categories are formed on vastly disparate criteria, and thus are far from being really helpful, because they operate on too many different levels.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, hardly any category applied to rituals is effective in excluding any other possible category which could be equally applied to the very same ritual. To take but a few examples: a coronation could obviously be regarded as a political ritual, but at the same time, is it not, for the beneficiary of the ritual, a rite of passage? And is it not a status-conferring ritual as well? And in practical relevance, is it not a celebration? In actual performance, it frequently entails acts which would allow classifying it as a ritual of purification. Some Egyptian texts even speak of mystical experiences during such an act;<sup>4</sup> thus it could be considered a mystical ritual. And if we accept that the dramatic Ramesseum papyrus<sup>5</sup> is about a change in rulership, we could even apply the category of dramatic rituals to it.

The primary source of all these problems is obvious: most scholars tend to classify rituals according to a one-dimensional system, where any given ritual has to be either A, or B, or C, etc. But if A and B are not, by their very essence, terms in opposition to each other, then a ritual can very well be A as well as B, perhaps even C at the same time, and our classification does not work at all. On the other hand, if we work with clear oppositions, there are rarely more than two options, and a

1 E.g. Bell 1997: 128–137.

2 Ibid.: 128.

3 The following terms are based on papers circulating internally within the SFB 619 “ritual dynamics”.

4 Some sources are adduced in Quack 2002: 99–102.

5 For the text, see most recently Quack 2006; Gestermann 2008; Schneider 2008.

classification system operating with an exclusive opposition “either A or B” (and nothing else) would only work on parameters so broad that they would not be sufficient to say much that is meaningful about a ritual, and the classes would be so few and with so many members that they could not provide many insights.

The solution should be obvious. We have to abandon our efforts to classify all rituals by means of one single categorisation altogether. The only chance I see is to forgo altogether the simple and easy custom of labelling any given ritual as part of one single class. Instead, we would have to lay a delicate grid of many different categories over rituals, and each ritual would be characterised by a whole pattern of categorisations. Such a classification system would also allow more objective statistical analysis about which rituals are more and which less similar to each other.

Such a system of analysis should be our ultimate goal, and in such a system, the question of being “political” or not would be only one of many traits of any specific ritual. This first step will allow resizing the relevance of being “political”, as far as a ritual is concerned. Its logical implication is that many rituals could, theoretically, have the quality of being “political”, but that this quality could be more or less dominant, or even rather marginal, and would only be one of many characterising traits of any ritual.

However, two further highly important questions come up. The first point is what being “political” really means, and whether all rituals at all times can usefully be submitted to a classification of “political” or “not political”. Is being “political” a human universal, as is seemingly expressed in Aristotle’s definition of man as a *zoon politikon*, “a political animal”, or did it come into being only at a certain point of time and in a certain place? After all, there are serious voices speaking of the “discovery” of the political in Ancient Greece.<sup>6</sup> Then, are we justified at all in applying the term “political” to pre-Greek or non-European cultures? We can of course say that there are options of defining “political” as the way decisions are made and the way they gain enough acceptance to actually work, but from the outset we should be clear that using the term “political” without hesitation can potentially create misunderstandings, as there are political models quite far away from what we are accustomed to. Any discussion of the political element in Ancient Egypt would have to operate within a model of “political theology”, as there is no clearly defined secular politics.<sup>7</sup>

According to a recent definition, political rituals “can be said to comprise those ceremonial practices that specifically construct, display, and promote the power of political institutions (such as king, state, the village elder) or the political interests

6 Meier 1983; see further Raaflaub 1993; Martin 2008.

7 Assmann 1992.



of distinct constituencies and subgroups".<sup>8</sup> An important implication of such a definition is that it is based not on an emic definition of what the aim of any given ritual is, but on an etic point of view which derives from the observer's analysis of what the real aims of the ritual are. We could thus also come to classify as "political" ritual events which are explicitly designed to foster good harvests, to give thanks for them if received, to celebrate the arrival of the annual inundation, or feasts determined by astronomical points (solstice, full moon, etc).

This, of course, brings us to a fundamental question about religion and its meaning. There is a long tradition, going back at least to Durkheim, of seeing religion primarily in its social function, indeed, even considering society to be the source and generator of religion as such.<sup>9</sup> If, then, religious attitudes are, so to say, mirror images of what happens in society, we tend to see any religiously motivated intentions in them as rather secondary and derivative, compared to their relevance for the society.

All this entails a great risk of losing the religious relevance of the rituals. If we understand them primarily as a means of social interaction, the religious intentions often prominently invoked by the culture itself tend to appear as a smokescreen, where religion is just a powerful tool of social control. Such an approach distorts the intentions of the participants. A classical example of this approach is Clifford Geertz with his model of a "theatre state" applied to indigenous Balinese kingdoms, where all rituals were seen as parts of social rivalry.<sup>10</sup> In contrast, Hauser-Schäublin could show how important it is to take the emic conceptions about the religious meaning seriously, and how rather better results could be obtained when incorporating them into the analysis.<sup>11</sup>

Of course, we have to be fundamentally aware of the fact that modern theories about ritual are largely based on contemporary material.<sup>12</sup> Ancient cultures normally play a very minor role in them. If, in specific situations, some ancient material is incorporated into more general theory-building, like the Babylonian New Year feast, subsequent discussions by ritual theorists tend to stay frozen, as regards the factual basis, at the point of what was known at that time, and make hardly any serious effort to update their information, even though much progress is continually

8 Bell 1997: 128.

9 Durkheim 1912. I should stress that I deliberately deviate from the frequent bad habit of citing only the English translation. Some scepticism against Durkheim in Humphrey & Laidlaw 1994: 158f. and 178–181.

10 Geertz 1980.

11 Hauser-Schäublin 1997: 8–11.

12 See e.g. Grimes 1995 (which includes mainly phenomena which might be central for shaping the experience of the author, but are often marginal at best for the question of rituals); Bell 1992; Bell 1997; Humphrey & Laidlaw 1994.

being made in the disciplines in question.<sup>13</sup> This creates a serious imbalance which has to be overcome.

In Egyptology it has not been all that common to regard rituals in themselves as political phenomena.<sup>14</sup> In general, I would say that the state of research concerning political rituals is, surprising as it might seem, worse for Ancient Egypt than for Ancient Mesopotamia, a culture offering many interesting similarities.<sup>15</sup> The reason might be that the study of religion as such has held considerably higher status for a long time in Egyptology than in Assyriology. For Egypt there have been quite a lot of studies on royal rituals, but many of them focus on the questions of religion to the exclusion of political meaning.<sup>16</sup> Perhaps this is all the easier because there is so much to explore about religion, and questions like the one about the divinity of the Egyptian king seem never-ending.<sup>17</sup> But even these discussions are normally more focused on other areas of religion, in trying to reconstruct mythology, or theological and ideological systems. The fact that most of the source material comes from ritual texts is taken less into consideration. They are used rather as a quarry for other questions more of interest to the researcher, but less in line with their primary function.

Contrarily, royal inscriptions are also often studied only for their supposed royal ideology and propaganda context. This is postulated without taking their religious context sufficiently into consideration,<sup>18</sup> which creates obvious problems. If, for example, a royal inscription is high up on a wall or an architrave, reading it from the ground is hardly possible. How, then, could it be a political message intended for the population? The only possibility would be that those texts functioned not by being read, but by being in some way known and transmitted by narration, but such a narrative would likely be more about the primary existence of the inscription than about any intricacies of its content. We have to reckon with the fact that this kind of communication is really and primarily addressed towards the gods.<sup>19</sup> The fact of the existence of such messages to the gods is in itself, of course, something which has potential relevance, in so far as it is known to some persons, but that is only a

13 See e.g. Bell 1997: 17–20; at the time of her writing, works like Pongratz-Leisten 1994 would already have been available; see now e.g. Bidmead 2002; Gane 2004.

14 To some degree, this can be found in Roeder 1996, who has analysed ritual texts for what they say about the semantics of rule. Also Roeder 2008 has occasionally touched on the question of social relevance of ritual (although I do not always agree with his specific conclusions).

15 For Mesopotamia, see e.g. Porter 2005.

16 E.g. Frankfort 1948; Barta 1975.

17 For my own position on this, see Quack (forthcoming)a.

18 E.g. Gundlach 1998; Windus-Staginsky 2006. More specifically focused on phraseology are e.g. Blumenthal 1970; Grimal 1986; Schade-Busch 1992; Blöbaum 2006.

19 In this sense Baines 1996: 351f.; Quack 2005a: 250f.



secondary matter. We, as modern scholars, do not have any need to believe in the Egyptian gods, but we should keep in mind that the ancient Egyptians themselves genuinely worshipped them,<sup>20</sup> and that it was this which motivated their religious behaviour, more than any conscious intention of social control.

So, we have to find some common ground where we can, at the same time, appreciate that what is taking place are rituals, and that these are religious happenings based on genuine conviction, as well as reckoning with their undeniable influence on social life. The area where this is most easily studied is that of public festivals,<sup>21</sup> but we cannot limit ourselves to them. The whole gamut of rituals and formal behaviour has to be looked at.

Obviously, there are a number of rituals focusing on the person of the king as main recipient. If we understand politics to involve actions of the state, some measure of political meaning should be inherent in them, and they should thus be classified as political rituals. One point, however, is of crucial importance, namely the question of the audience. We have a broad spectrum here, going from large public processions with enormous crowds to highly arcane rites where the king and a few ritual specialists seem to be on their own, and the question of audience has obvious implications for any effects of such a ritual on society.

Still, we should not commit the error of supposing that there is a simple direct relation between the number of people present at a ritual and its political relevance. Rather, there are also cases where the politically important part is not relevant for being actually witnessed, but for being known to take place. A good case in point is the matter of certain crucial rituals during the coronation of the Japanese emperor which he performs in solitude.<sup>22</sup> While nobody is a direct witness, and there is considerable doubt about what actually takes place, even this very aura of mystery contributes to the effect the ritual has on the general mentality (as opposed to that on the emperor himself, who knows what is going on; for him, things like a direct contact with the divine world would be important).

For Egypt, the area where this can be most effectively shown is in rituals for the protection of the king and for making his position enduring, especially during the

20 I consciously avoid the term "believe" for labelling the attitude of the ancients, because belief as such is hardly at the core of Egyptian (and many another ancient) religion. The Egyptian term which came to mean "to believe" in Christian texts (**na2te**) goes back to a word *nḥt* which is, on the one hand, a late development within the language, and, on the other hand, has a more ancient meaning "to trust" (with juridical connotations). For the Egyptians, what mattered was knowing and doing, not believing in the sense of accepting as true things which are contrary to everyday experience and at the same time not capable of positive proof. For similar structures in other cultures, see e.g. Scheid 2005.

21 Roth 2006; Baines 2006.

22 Bell 1997: 130–132.

night, but also more generally.<sup>23</sup> The textual attestation is rather good, but whenever we have clear evidence there is no indication of any participants or spectators beyond the king himself and a few priests. Still, we can be sure that it was general knowledge that the king had magical protection. The ritual formulae in themselves do quite a bit to spell out the position and power of the king, but nobody actually hearing them would be seriously in need of being persuaded. Those who just knew the fact that there was protection for the king would not obtain information on how the ritual actually proclaimed the power of the king. Still, the very existence of this protection would have its share in forming their opinion on how to behave towards the king. Thus, such a protection ritual has political implications, but the way they are put into practice is intricate, and not inherent in the specific way of performance of the ritual as such.

Also, when thinking about the efficacy of the ritual, we should not only think about the possible formation of loyalty among those present, but also about the effect on the beneficiary of the ritual himself. Knowing that he had been crowned or been protected in a ritually correct way would quite obviously affect the way the king then feels, thinks, and behaves. And in crucial situations of crisis, his knowledge of divine support might even give him the inner strength necessary to react calmly and appropriately. This is an aspect of “political” rituals which seems somewhat under-represented in most discussions.

Another point of relevance for the question of audience is also which sort of audience was of real interest to the centre of power. In modern democracies, where the majority of the total number of votes is crucial, the conditions are quite different from ancient societies (and genuinely ritual elements tend to play a far lesser role, at least in Europe – the American “civil religion” is quite different). In ancient cultures, especially highly stratified kingdoms like Egypt, the important point was not really the numeric majority of the population whose active consent was needed, it was mainly the elite involved in running the country – but better to be backed by far more than 50.1 % of them. We should keep this in mind and understand that, for their political relevance, large-scale feasts and processions involving all inhabitants of a town were not essentially more important than closer-knit rituals involving the court and priesthood only.

Now we have to go into the details of what happens in everyday Egyptian cult and ritual and how this relates to politics and constructing the power of some players. One important basic fact is the way religion was organised and financed. Egypt is among those cultures where temple cults were a major public affair, i.e. the state actively financed the building of temples and supplied resources for maintaining a

23 See e.g. Goyon 1972–1974 (I intend to provide a new edition of this text); Goyon 2006; Pries 2009.



large staff of temple employees. According to papyrus Harris I, about 86,486 people were given by king Ramses III during his reign to the temple of Amun at Thebes,<sup>24</sup> so temples were a highly important factor in economy and society. Most of the temple staff worked on a rotating basis, where priests were members of one of the four temple phylae, and thus worked in the temple for three months of the year.<sup>25</sup>

The official, state-directed nature of temple cult was also evident in the fact that, theoretically, the Pharaoh was the lord of sacrifices, and temple reliefs always show him officiating before the gods. Priests could be depicted in larger ceremonies, especially festival processions, but they would always remain in a subordinate role.

In practice, of course, it would have been plainly impossible for the king to be personally present at every occasion, so he had to delegate his direct ritual agency to the local priests for most of the time and most of the places. Still, those officiating in the daily offering cult before the statue of the deity had explicitly to state, as part of the ritual, that it was the king who had officially sent them in his place.<sup>26</sup>

Another rule derives, quite logically, from the basic fact of organising and financing the cult officially and directly: the one who pays is the one who gets thanked. Thus, in logical consequence, there is practically no ritual preserved from Egyptian temple cult which does not entail the prayer for benefits for the king and the land, and, especially in the decoration of temple walls with offering tableaux, the reassurance of the deity who promises good things in return for the offerings is fundamental.

Let us take the daily ritual of awakening the deity in the morning, purifying and clothing him or her, and providing him or her with breakfast. It is one of the more fundamental Egyptian temple rituals, and was, at least in theory, performed every day,<sup>27</sup> and it is known as well within the discipline as the “daily temple ritual”. There also prayers for the benefit of the Pharaoh are an integral part of it, as “Pharaoh has come to you, oh (deity NN). May you let him be in front of the living ones, may you be gracious towards him, oh deity NN! May he speak before you and you do for him every good thing! May you save him from all bad and evil things; they should not happen against him in eternity”,<sup>28</sup> or “Pharaoh has come to

24 Grandet 1994.

25 Quack 2004.

26 Quack 2005b: 100.

27 The study by Moret 1902 is not up to modern standards but it has not yet been superseded by any complete new publication; partial re-edition and study by Guglielmi & Buroh 1997; study of contents in Lorton 1999: 131–145. A German translation by E. Kausen can be found in Kaiser 1988: 391–405. A new study by Braun (forthcoming) is announced. Specifically for the Graeco-Roman temples, see Hussy 2007.

28 pBerlin 3055, 15. 8–16, 1.

you, his lord. He speaks what you like. May you be gracious towards him in a good way on this day”,<sup>29</sup> or “may you ward off evil and cut off any evil pollution of Pharaoh, as you turn them against those who did them! May you save him from them! He is the one who has come close to the Abdu-fish and the cat.”<sup>30</sup> He knows this your good name which you made when you were alone in the abyss in that your name of ‘creator who is not weary’”,<sup>31</sup> or “may you not hand over Pharaoh to that impurity which is at the beginning of this year! ... May you protect him, for you are the protector! May you guard him, for you are the guardian. You are the one who made the gods; your form is upon him with life and dominion. He shall not die in all eternity!”<sup>32</sup> Almost as the last words of the ritual we have “All life, stability, dominion, health and happiness are with you, king of upper and lower Egypt Pharaoh, in front of all living ones in eternity!”<sup>33</sup>

The examples could be amplified *ad nauseam*, also including liturgical hymns which normally have the fixed ending “may your good face be gracious towards king NN!”<sup>34</sup> I will only provide a section of a single, somewhat more elaborate text:

“May you let him endure as king of the two lands  
while your enemies are fallen to your massacre!  
May you let him rejuvenate in order to overthrow your enemy,  
kissing the ground (before him) as his chief.  
May Pharaoh be like the one who does everything which you wish as Re day  
by day.

May he guide for me (?) the islands of the Hau-nebut  
as my offering-cattle towards your palace,  
with all things for your Ka, due to the awe of your person.

Pharaoh, beloved of Sobek-Re, lord of Sumenu, he shall not perish in eternity.

May your beautiful face be benevolent towards Pharaoh!”<sup>35</sup>

The logical conclusion should be clear. Egyptian temple cult, *per se* and from its most basic constituents, contains elements which are relevant for constructing and promoting the power of the king, and thus, by current definition, has to be considered a political ritual. However, simply classifying it thus with a major label

29 pBerlin 3055, 17, 10–18, 1.

30 Both animals are helpers of the sun-god.

31 pBerlin 3055, 18, 5–8.

32 pBerlin 3055, 19, 10–19, 3.

33 pBerlin 3055, 37, 5–6.

34 Quack 2007: 100 and 109.

35 pStrasbourg 2, 5, 14–18. Published in a not always reliable way by Bucher 1928–1930; German translation in Assmann 1999: 351–361. See Quack (forthcoming)a.



would hardly do justice to the ritual as such, which contains many other elements as well. The numerous ways of dealing with the divine statues, cleaning and clothing, as well as feeding them, would be unduly diminished by such a judgement. According to the multi-grid analysis proposed above, we could say that being political in some way is part of their nature, but only a part and hardly the most directly relevant one.

Here, of course, the question of audience again comes into play. Performing the rituals directly on the cultic statue of the god was something restricted exclusively to a high-ranking priest, and he would work in solitude. Thus, again the specific performance does not have a chance to directly affect the population. If there is an addressee for the political parts of the message, it can, in the Egyptian intention, only be the gods who alone were supposed to hear it.

From the way pharaoh is presented in rituals, let us go over to the other side of the “political” question. How, then, does the Pharaoh act as a political player?<sup>36</sup> This brings us straight to the question of how actual political decision-making took place. Among Egyptologists, there is the model of the so-called “king’s novel” which has dominated since its inauguration about 50 years ago, but has by now come increasingly into debate.<sup>37</sup> Normally, the texts claimed for this genre depict court sessions where a decision is at stake. The ordinary process is that either the royal view of action is adopted straight away (optionally with special adulation by the court), or confirmed against eventual doubts by courtiers; in the end it always turns out to be correct. In my opinion, the main problem with this group of texts is that it is less a real literary genre category than a depiction of cultural conventions. Firstly, open debate with controversial sides is not often tolerated by the harmony-guided principles of Egyptian culture. Secondly, it is not so much simple actual propaganda which is at stake here, but more a fundamental conviction that the royal insight *is* infallible. There are even mythological texts about a process of decision-making among gods operating within almost identical parameters, e.g. the so-called “Book of the Heavenly Cow”.<sup>38</sup> In any case, official decision-making in Ancient Egypt was, by itself, if not really a ritual, at least a sort of formalised affair. We might not know what went on behind the scenes, which intrigues and faction-building actually had influence on the king, but the final outcome had to be presented ceremoniously in order to be valid. Or, to say it more directly, there was no politics free of ritual.

36 See e.g. Assmann 1984 (= Assmann 2003: 238–258).

37 Original proposal in Hermann 1938; for recent discussions see e.g. Loprieno 1996: 277–295; Jansen-Winkel 1998; Beylage 2002: 553–618; Hofmann 2004. See my short remarks in Quack 2003: 607.

38 Hornung 1982.

What are the main areas of political decision-making? If we look at which decisions were deemed important enough to merit monumentalisation, we might at first be a bit disappointed. A good text genre to examine is the royal annals, wherever they are preserved. We have quite a bit of them, which indicate the most important events in a year.<sup>39</sup> While questions of military campaigns and victory do play a role, more important overall are the fashioning of statues, and the building and furnishing of temples. Actually, military campaigns do not appear as a means in themselves, they are mainly listed because the booty collected provides the source for richly embellishing the temples.

We might be slightly disappointed with this and think that we miss the more important parts of the business; but perhaps we are mistaken, and should trust a bit more that the people then did know what mattered. Given the social and economic relevance of temples in Egypt, decisions about which temple to found, and where, and how to furnish it, were decisions likely to have larger general relevance, comparable to decisions nowadays about fostering economic growth in certain areas by tax cuts or direct subsidies for newly established factories.

How, then, were political events officially represented? Scholars have often complained that Egyptian official inscriptions tend to blend out large parts of reality and focus on selected, carefully chosen, and edited parts. Of course this hampers us if we try to write a history in the sense of what we would wish to know about Ancient Egypt. But we can understand it also as a big chance. To study what *the Egyptians* wished posterity to hear of them and the way they presented it should, inherently, tell us quite a bit about their culture.

Perhaps what is most likely to be understood as reports on political events are official royal inscriptions. In telling us whom they fought and how the campaign went, we are given source material for the *Haupt- und Staatsaktionen* which still informs general histories of Ancient Egypt as written by modern scholars. But how are they set?<sup>40</sup>

The place of erecting royal stelae is almost invariably a religious space, i.e. temples. Exceptions occur only in “outside regions”, foreign countries or quarry areas which do not have any permanent Egyptian-style temple.<sup>41</sup> Also the way they are integrated into overarching compositions is relevant. An Egyptian royal stela is a free-standing monument, even if normally set up with its back to a wall; thus it is rare to have stelae showing inscriptions on both sides. The upper front part, the so-called lunette, invariably shows a ritual scene, with the king in front of a deity – normally the main deity of the temple in question, and sometimes accompanied by other deities as well.

39 For an overview and study, see Baines 2008; Quack (forthcoming)b.

40 See here Beylage 2002; Klug 2002.

41 Where available, even then a temple would be used, e.g. at Beit Shean in Palestine.



If we come to the text of a typical royal stela itself, normally it starts with a royal eulogy which practically always involves the king's close contact with the divine word. The decision for the actual campaign is often either said to be by command of the main deity, or we are even given a detailed description of an oracular setting for receiving such an affirmative answer. After the war is successfully over, it is stressed that success was due to the love of the deity for the king, and in more detailed texts, we are given a list of the booty presented to the temple. The long annals-inscription of Thutmosis III., one of the most directly historically narrative texts we have,<sup>42</sup> closes with admonitions to the priesthood for vigilance, plus declarations about how the king enlarged the supplies of offerings. Obviously, all presentations of political events are deeply steeped in religion.

Still we have to reckon, too, with the fact that most of the royal stelae, and also depictions of military campaigns, were centred on the outside areas of the temple where access was more free than for the inner parts, and royal stelae especially tended to be erected in rather visible spaces near entrance areas, where those entering into the courts of the temple would be most likely to appreciate them. I would therefore by no means deny that they were intended to have an effect on the inner circle, which knew how to read hieroglyphs and had access to at least the more outward parts of a temple.

However, all this means that there was no real "secular" public space thought worthy of appropriating. Whatever was deemed important enough for memorising was entrusted to the temple areas, and it was the religious space where it made its impact on visitors and readers, in the framework of ritual.

So, we can note that acts which we would consider as political are, in Ancient Egypt, never performed on a purely secular level, and their commemoration is always in connection with ritual and religion. On the other hand, the official temple cult was never a completely apolitical affair; at its most basic level it contained elements of constructing and promoting royal power. This means that a term such as "political ritual" becomes a bit problematic. If we have neither genuinely ritual-free politics, nor a politics-free public ritual, it becomes very fuzzy on both sides. A multi-grid analysis which notes the fact of being "political" in some way, but without excluding all sorts of other attributes, seems better fitted for working on such rituals than a simple categorisation which would classify some rituals just as "political" and others as not "political".

---

42 See Redford 2003.

## References

- Assmann, Jan 1984. "Politik zwischen Ritual und Dogma, Spielräume politischen Handelns im pharaonischen Ägypten". *Saeculum* 35: 97–114.
- 1992. *Politische Theologie zwischen Ägypten und Israel*. Munich: Carl-Friedrich-von-Siemens-Stiftung.
- 1999. *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete übersetzt, kommentiert und eingeleitet. Zweite, verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis).
- 2000. *Herrschaft und Heil. Politische Theologie in Altägypten, Israel und Europa*. Munich, Vienna: Hanser.
- 2003<sup>3</sup>. *Stein und Zeit*. Munich: Fink.
- Baines, John 1996. "Contextualizing Egyptian Representations of Society and Ethnicity". In: Jerrold S. Cooper & Glenn M. Schwartz (eds.). *The Study of the Ancient Near East in the 21st Century*. Winona Lake (Indiana): Eisenbrauns: 339–384.
- 2006. "Public Ceremonial Performance in Ancient Egypt: Exclusion and Integration". In: Takeshi Inomata & Lawrence S. Cohen (eds.). *Archaeology of Performance. Theaters of Power, Community, and Politics*. Lanham et al.: Altamira Press: 261–302.
- 2008. "On the Evolution, Purpose, and Forms of Egyptian Annals". In: Evamaria Engel & Vera Müller & Ulrich Hartung (eds.). *Zeichen aus dem Sand. Streiflichter aus Ägyptens Geschichte zu Ehren von Günter Dreyer*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz: 19–40 (Menes 5).
- Barta, Winfried 1975. *Untersuchungen zur Göttlichkeit des regierenden Königs. Ritus und Sakralkönigtum in Altägypten nach Zeugnissen der Frühzeit und des Alten Reiches*. München, Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag (Münchener Ägyptologische Studien 32).
- Bell, Catherine 1992. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1997. *Ritual. Perspectives and Dimensions*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beylage, Peter 2002. *Aufbau der königlichen Stelentexte vom Beginn der 18. Dynastie bis zur Amarnazeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Ägypten und Altes Testament 54).
- Bidmead, Julie 2002. *The Akitu Festival. Religious Continuity and Royal Legitimation in Mesopotamia*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.
- Blöbaum, Anke Ilona 2006. "Denn ich bin ein König, der die Maat liebt". *Herrscherlegitimation im spätzeitlichen Ägypten. Eine vergleichende Studie der Phraseologie in den offiziellen Königsinschriften vom Beginn der 25. Dynastie bis zum Ende der makedonischen Herrschaft*. Aachen: Shaker (Aegyptiaca Monasteriensia 4).
- Blumenthal, Elke 1970. *Untersuchungen zum ägyptischen Königtum des Mittleren Reiches, I. Die Phraseologie*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.



- Braun, Nadja Stefanie (forthcoming). *Pharao und Priester – sakrale Affirmation durch Kultvollzug. Das tägliche Kultbildritual im Neuen Reich und in der Dritten Zwischenzeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Bucher, Pierre 1928–1930. “Les hymnes à Sobk-Ra, seigneur de Smenou des papyrus N<sup>os</sup> 2 et 7 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Strasbourg”. *Kêmi* 1: 41–52; 147–166; *Kêmi* 3: 1–19.
- Durkheim Émile 1912. *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*. Paris: Alcan.
- Frankfort, Henri 1948. *Kingship and the Gods. A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Interaction of Society & Nature*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Gane, Roy E. 2004. *Ritual Dynamic Structure*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.
- Geertz, Clifford 1980. *Negara. The Theatre State in Nineteenth Century Bali*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gestermann, Louise 2008. “Das Ritual des Dramatischen Ramesseumspapyrus”. In: Benedikt Rothöhler & Alexander Manisali (eds.). *Mythos & Ritual. Festschrift für Jan Assmann zum 70. Geburtstag*. Berlin: Lit-Verlag: 27–52.
- Goyon, Jean-Claude 1972–1974. *Confirmation du pouvoir royal au nouvel an [Brooklyn Museum Papyrus 47.218.50]*. Cairo: Institut Français d’archéologie orientale (Bibliothèque d’Études 52); Brooklyn: Brooklyn Museum (Wilbour Monographs 7).
- 2006. *Le rituel du ‘šḥtp šḥmt’ au changement de cycle annuel d’après les archives du temple d’Edfou et textes parallèles, du Nouvel Empire à l’époque ptolémaïque et romaine*. Cairo: Institut Français d’archéologie orientale (Bibliothèque d’Études 141).
- Grandet, Pierre 1994. *Le papyrus Harris I (BM 9999)*. Cairo: Institut Français d’archéologie orientale (Bibliothèque d’Études 109).
- Grimal, Nicolas-Christophe 1986. *Les termes de la propagande royale égyptienne de la XIXe dynastie à la conquête d’Alexandre*. Paris: Boccard.
- Grimes, Ronald 1995. *Beginnings in Ritual Studies. Revised Edition*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Guglielmi, Waltraut & Knuth Buroh (1997) “Die Eingangssprüche des Täglichen Tempelrituals nach Papyrus Berlin 3055 (I, 1 – VI, 3)”. In: Jacobus van Dijk (ed.). *Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Herman te Velde*. Groningen: Styx: 101–166 (Egyptological Memoirs 1).
- Gundlach, Rolf 1998. *Der Pharao und sein Staat. Die Grundlegung der ägyptischen Königsideologie im 4. und 3. Jahrtausend*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Hauser-Schäublin, Brigitta 1997. *Traces of Gods and Men. Temples and Rituals as Landmarks of Social Events and Processes in a South Bali Village*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Hermann, Alfred 1938. *Die ägyptische Königsnovelle*. Glückstadt, Hamburg, New York: Augustin (Leipziger Ägyptologische Studien 10).
- Hofmann, Beate 2004. *Die Königsnovelle. “Strukturanalyse am Einzelwerk”*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Ägypten und Altes Testament 62).

- Hornung, Erik 1982. *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskuh. Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 46).
- Humphrey, Caroline & James Laidlaw 1994. *The Archetypal Actions of Ritual. A Theory of Ritual Illustrated by the Jain Rite of Worship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 2004 [1994]. *The Archetypal Actions of Ritual. A Theory of Ritual Illustrated by the Jain Rite of Worship*. Reprint. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hussy, Holger 2007. *Die Epiphanie und Erneuerung der Macht Gottes. Szenen des täglichen Kultbildrituals in den ägyptischen Tempeln der griechisch-römischen Epoche*. Dettelbach: Röhl.
- Jansen-Winkeln, Karl 1998. "Die ägyptische 'Königsnovelle' als Texttyp". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 83: 101–116.
- Kaiser, Otto (ed.) 1988. *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Band II. religiöse Texte*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag.
- Klug, Andrea 2002. *Königliche Stelen in der Zeit von Ahmose bis Amenophis III*. Turnhout: Brepols (Monumenta Aegyptiaca 8).
- Loprieno, Antonio 1996. "The 'King's Novel'". In: Antonio Loprieno (ed.). *Ancient Egyptian Literature. History and Forms*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill: 277–295 (Probleme der Ägyptologie 10).
- Lorton, David 1999. "The Theology of Cult Statues in Ancient Egypt". In: Michael B. Dick (ed.). *Born in Heaven, Made on Earth*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns: 123–210.
- Martin, Jochen 2008. "Zur Anthropologie des politischen Denkens". In: Monika Bernett & Wilfried Nippel & Aloys Winterling (eds.). *Christian Meier zur Diskussion. Autorenkolloquium am Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung der Universität Bielefeld*. Stuttgart: Steiner: 61–69.
- Meier, Christian 1983. *Die Entstehung des Politischen bei den Griechen*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Moret, Alexandre 1902. *Rituel du culte divin journalier en Égypte*. Paris: Leroux.
- Pongratz-Leisten, Beate 1994. *Ina šulmi ĩrub. Die kulttopographische und ideologische Programmatik der akĭtu-Prozession in Babylonien und Assyrien im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Mainz: P. v. Zabern (Baghdader Forschungen 16).
- Porter, Barbara Nevling (ed.) 2005. *Ritual and Politics in Ancient Mesopotamia*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Pries, Andreas 2009. *Das nächtliche Stundenritual zum Schutz des Königs und verwandte Kompositionen. Der P. Kairo 58027 und die Textvarianten in den Geburtshäusern von Dendara und Edfu*. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag (Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens 27).
- Quack, Joachim Friedrich 2002. "Königsweihe, Priesterweihe, Isisweihe". In: Jan Assmann & Martin Bommas (eds.). *Ägyptische Mysterien?* Munich: Fink: 95–108.
- 2003. "Review of Françoise Labrique: Religions méditerranéennes et orientales de l'antiquité". *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 60: 604–608.



- 2004. "Religious Personnel. Egypt". In: Sarah I. Jones (ed.). *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press: 289–292.
- 2005a. "Medien der Alltagskultur in Ägypten und ihre Auswirkungen auf Palästina". In: Christian Frevel (ed.). *Medien im antiken Palästina. Materielle Kommunikation und Medialität als Thema der Palästinaarchäologie*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 237–268 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 10).
- 2005b. "Ämtererblichkeit und Abstammungsvorschriften bei Priestern nach dem Buch vom Tempel". In: Martin Fitzenreiter (ed.). *Genealogie – Realität und Fiktion von Identität*. London: Golden House: 97–102 (Internetbeiträge zur Ägyptologie und Sudanarchäologie 5).
- 2006. "Zur Lesung und Deutung des Dramatischen Ramesseumpapyrus". *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 133: 72–89.
- 2007. "Kritische Bemerkungen zur Bearbeitung von ägyptischen Hymnen nach dem Neuen Reich". *Die Welt des Orients* 37: 90–111.
- (forthcoming)a. "How unapproachable is a Pharaoh?" In: Giovanni Lanfranchi & Robert Rollinger (eds.). *Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity. Proceedings of the European Science Foundation Exploratory Workshop, Padova, November 29th – December 1st, 2007*.
- (forthcoming)b. "Reiche, Dynastien ... und auch Chroniken? Zum Bewußtsein der eigenen Vergangenheit im Alten Ägypten". In: Josef Wiesehöfer (ed.). *Periodisierung und Epochenbewußtsein in der antiken Geschichtsschreibung*. Stuttgart: Steiner (Oriens et Occidens).
- Raaflaub, Kurt A. (ed.) 1993. *Anfänge politischen Denkens in der Antike. Die nah-östlichen Kulturen und die Griechen*. Munich: Oldenbourg.
- Redford, Donald B. 2003. *The Wars in Syria and Palestine of Thutmose III*. Leiden et al.: Brill (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 6).
- Roeder, Hubert 1996. *Mit den Augen sehen. Studien zur Semantik der Herrschaft in den Toten- und Kulttexten*. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag (Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens 16).
- 2008. "Mundöffnung und rituelle Feindtötung. Die soziomorphe Definition eines altägyptischen Vernichtungsofers". In: Eftychia Stavrianopoulou & Axel Michaels & Claus Ambos (eds.). *Transformations in Sacrificial Practices from Antiquity to Modern Times*. Berlin: Lit-Verlag: 19–74.
- Roth, Silke 2006. "Der Herrscher im Fest. Zur rituellen Herrschaftslegitimation des ägyptischen Königs und ihrer Außendarstellung im Rahmen von Festen". In: Dirk Bröckelmann & Andrea Klug (eds.). *In Pharaos Staat. Festschrift für Rolf Gundlach zum 75. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz: 205–249.
- Schade-Busch, Mechthild 1992. *Zur Königsideologie Amenophis' III. Analyse der Phraseologie historischer Inschriften der Voramarnazeit*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg (Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge 35).
- Scheid, John 2005. *Quand faire, c'est croire. Les rites sacrificiels des Romains*. Paris: Editions Aubier.

Schneider, Thomas 2008. "Neues zum Verständnis des Dramatischen Ramesseumpapyrus: Vorschläge zur Übersetzung der Szenen 1–23". In: Benedikt Rothöhler & Alexander Manisali (eds.). *Mythos & Ritual. Festschrift für Jan Assmann zum 70. Geburtstag*. Berlin: Lit-Verlag: 231–255.

Windus-Staginsky, Elka 2006. *Der ägyptische König im Alten Reich. Terminologie und Phraseologie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Philippika 14).