

Studies in  
Ancient  
Monarchies

# Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity

Edited by Henning Börm

Ancient History

Franz Steiner Verlag



Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity  
Edited by Henning Börm

# STUDIES IN ANCIENT MONARCHIES

Edited by Ulrich Gotter (Konstanz), Nino Luraghi (Princeton)  
and Kai Trampedach (Heidelberg).

VOLUME 3

# Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity

Edited by Henning Börm

With collaboration of Wolfgang Havener



Franz Steiner Verlag

Gedruckt mit freundlicher Unterstützung des Exzellenzclusters 16 „Kulturelle Grundlagen von Integration“ der Universität Konstanz.

Umschlagabbildungen:

Links: King Tiglath-pileser III of Assyria. Stone panel, ca. 728 BCE. From the Central Palace in Nimrud, now in the British Museum.

© akg / Bible Land Pictures

Mitte: Emperor Justinian. Mosaic, ca. 540 CE. Church of San Vitale, Ravenna.

© akg / Bildarchiv Steffens

Rechts: Alexander the Great at the Battle of Issos. Mosaic, ca. 100 BCE.

From the Casa del Fauno, Pompeii, now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli.

© akg / Nimatallah

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Dieses Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist unzulässig und strafbar.

© Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2015

Satz: DTP + TEXT Eva Burri

Druck: AZ Druck und Datentechnik GmbH, Kempten

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-515-11095-2 (Print)

ISBN 978-3-515-11096-9 (eBook)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is my great pleasure to thank the people who made this volume possible. First and foremost my gratitude to the diverse contributors is enormous. I have learned a lot from them all, and I owe them many thanks, especially those who turned in their chapters as long ago as 2010, for the extreme patience that they have shown in the very long process of completion.

I owe particularly important advice to Ulrich Gotter, Nino Luraghi, and Kai Trampedach; and special thanks for helping to organize the original conference *Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity* in Konstanz go to Ann-Cathrin Harders and Christian Seebacher. Moreover, I wish to thank John Noël Dillon, Rosa Maria Fera, and Helen Imhoff for translating into English portions of this book. Funds for translation and editing have been generously provided by the Center of Excellence 16 *Cultural Foundations of Social Integration* of Konstanz University.

Henning Börm  
Konstanz, March 2015



## CONTENTS

Acknowledgments .....	5
1 Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity: A Very Short Introduction .....	9
<i>Henning Börm</i>	
2 “As he Disregarded the Law, he was Replaced During his Own Lifetime”. On Criticism of Egyptian Rulers in the So-Called <i>Demotic Chronicle</i> .....	25
<i>Joachim Friedrich Quack</i>	
3 “Rulers by the Grace of God”, “Liar Kings”, and “Oriental Despots”: (Anti-)Monarchic Discourse in Achaemenid Iran .....	45
<i>Josef Wiesehöfer</i>	
4 Anatomy of the Monster: The Discourse of Tyranny in Ancient Greece .....	67
<i>Nino Luraghi</i>	
5 Hero, God or Tyrant? Alexander the Great in the Early Hellenistic Period .....	85
<i>Hans-Ulrich Wiemer</i>	
6 Demetrius Poliorcetes and Athens: Ruler Cult and Antimonarchic Narratives in Plutarch’s <i>Life of Demetrius</i> .....	113
<i>Steffen Diefenbach</i>	
7 Roman Discourses Against the Monarchy in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Century BCE: The Evidence of Fabius Pictor and Ennius .....	153
<i>Federico Russo</i>	
8 Consort or Despot? How to Deal with a Queen at the End of the Roman Republic and the Beginning of the Principate .....	181
<i>Ann-Cathrin Harders</i>	
9 Penelope’s Web, or: How to Become a Bad Emperor <i>Post Mortem</i> .....	215
<i>Ulrich Gotter</i>	



10	Idleness. Monarchic and Antimonarchic Discourses and the Construction of Roman Imperial Order.....	235
	<i>Mihály Loránd Dészpa</i>	
11	Josephus on Hasmonean Kingship. The Example of Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus .....	249
	<i>Meron M. Piotrkowski</i>	
12	‘In Search of Good Emperors.’ Emperors, Caesars, and Usurpers in the Mirror of Antimonarchic Patterns in the <i>Historia Augusta</i> – Some Considerations .....	269
	<i>Matthias Haake</i>	
13	Procopius, His Predecessors, and the Genesis of the <i>Anecdota</i> : Antimonarchic Discourse in Late Antique Historiography .....	305
	<i>Henning Börm</i>	
	Contributors .....	347
	General Index .....	349

## ANTIMONARCHIC DISCOURSE IN ANTIQUITY: A VERY SHORT INTRODUCTION

*Henning Börm\**

*Oh, der ist noch nicht König, der der Welt  
Gefallen muss! Nur der ist's, der bei seinem Tun  
Nach keines Menschen Beifall braucht zu fragen.*

Friedrich Schiller  
*Maria Stuart* (Act 4, Scene 10)

It may at first seem surprising to approach the phenomenon of monarchy in antiquity by way of a detour via antimonarchic discourse.<sup>1</sup> As a rule, when analyzing the self-image and the character of the different systems and their strategies for creating obedience and acceptance, the focus falls particularly on the self-representation and the ruler ideology of monarchs. However, this approach is conspicuous in concentrating only on one side. For this reason, it seems productive to approach the matter from the angle of real or merely anticipated criticism against the background of which monarchic legitimization was expressed: what conditions, what elements and what strategies are characteristic of negative discussion of monarchy, and to what extent was the relationship between ruler ideology and antimonarchic sentiments marked by mutual dependence? What significance does the eternal background noise have which as a *contre-discours* compelled Greek and Roman monarchs to justify themselves? It is the intercultural comparison in particular that allows us at this point to work out more clearly not just shared features and parallels but also specific individual characteristics. Thus, it is worth considering not just Hellas and Rome, but also the civilizations of the Ancient Near East. These are the places to start if one intends to approach the phenomenon.

\* I owe particularly important suggestions to Ulrich Gotter and Nino Luraghi. Furthermore, I would like to thank Soi Agelidis, Benjamin Biesinger, Boris Chrubasik, Steffen Diefenbach, Johannes Geisthardt, Geoffrey Greatrex, Richard Payne, and Wolfgang Havener. Given the breadth of the topic, it goes without saying that the present short outline cannot do justice to every individual phenomenon.

1 I use “monocracy”, “monarchy” and “sole rule” as more or less synonymous terms here to designate systems in which authority and the highest decision-making power lie with a single individual. This very wide definition of monarchy is, therefore, modelled on the original meaning of the word *μοναρχία*, and it is emphatically not based on constitutional aspects; instead it considers hierarchies of power.

In doing so, however, one must first note that there is no such thing as the “Ancient Near East”, at least not in so far as this traditional expression suggests that the differences between different eras as well as between the different civilizations of the Near East and North Africa are essentially marginal and superficial. As with the “Myth of the Mediterranean”,<sup>2</sup> conceptions which focus on (apparently) connecting features at the expense of special individual characteristics have increasingly been criticized in recent years with regard to the East, too.<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless, there is one thing at least which does seem to have been by all means typical of the ancient civilizations<sup>4</sup> in Mesopotamia, Iran, Anatolia, and Egypt.<sup>5</sup> From the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BCE at the latest monarchy, usually founded on sacral<sup>6</sup> and dynastic principles, had established itself here as a legitimate and almost “natural” form of government.<sup>7</sup> Exceptions, especially as represented by some city states,<sup>8</sup> were something out of the ordinary. This applies all the more if one also intends to take into account tribally organized societies, such as those characteristic of the Arabian Peninsula and early Israel,<sup>9</sup> as monarchic in principle, despite the fact that there was no single supreme lord.<sup>10</sup> This impression is strengthened by the fact that henotheistic and monotheistic religious concepts developed in conditions in which monocracy was fundamentally considered normal.<sup>11</sup>

Thus, if it is possible to speak about an “antimonarchic discourse” in connection with the pre-Islamic civilizations of this area,<sup>12</sup> then it is in the sense of a discussion of what distinguishes a bad ruler from a good one.<sup>13</sup> The focus is, therefore, not monarchy but the monarch. The ideology of monocratic rule, i. e. discussion about the good king, also necessarily produces a counterpart: as it implies that not every monarch is good *per se*, it must be possible to formulate criteria by which a

2 Cf. Timpe 2004; Malkin 2005.

3 Cf. Kolb 1984: 16: “Die Gemeinsamkeiten etwa zwischen der sumerischen und der hethitischen Kultur oder zwischen dem griechischen Mutterland und der römischen Provinz Nordafrika waren geringer als die Unterschiede”. On the phenomenon of “Orientalism” in the Classical Studies, cf. Hauser 2001; Kuhrt 2012.

4 A good starting point for an engagement with this area is still provided by Kuhrt 1995.

5 On the Egyptian ruler ideology, cf. Blumenthal 1980 and Frandsen 2008.

6 Cf. Jones 2005.

7 Cf. Seux 1980–83; Nunn 2011: 77.

8 Cf. Jacobsen 1943.

9 Cf. Rebenich 2012: 1158–1164.

10 “What we may call chiefs – leading members of dominant families who were accorded privileges in their roles as leaders in battle and judges in disputes – exerted local rule” (Meyers/Rogerson 1997: 136).

11 For the younger parts of the Old Testament, at least, Levin 2004: 85 speaks of a postulated “Notwendigkeit des Königtums”. Cf., however, 1 Sam. 8.10–18.

12 Following M. Foucault, “discourse” can – to put it in a simplified way – be considered as a context of meaning which is created by speech and text; it reinforces certain ideas which themselves have certain underlying structures and interests, which they perpetuate and generate themselves; cf. Frank 1989. It is not least this aspect of changeability that makes (anti-)monarchic discourse particularly relevant; cf. Morley 2004: 98.

13 Cf. Maset 2002 on the theoretical background to the concept of discourse, which goes back to Foucault, and on its application in historical research. See also Landwehr 2001.

bad ruler can be described. It is not a great step from the possibility of describing him as unjust and therefore illegitimate to the right of revolution.<sup>14</sup> Although there is no example of a monarchy being abolished, as far as I can see, an overthrow of government as a result of which the ruler was replaced was always possible in the Ancient Near East, too. It goes without saying that it was the elites who were bearers of this discourse; however, it usually only becomes tangible in the sources when it was influenced by the monarch himself, or rather his court, or by priests. In this way, they were of course also able to articulate claims; for this reason, the discourse can also be seen as a continuous process of negotiation.<sup>15</sup>

From the Bronze Age at the latest, there was intensive exchange between the Aegean and the Near Eastern-Egyptian area.<sup>16</sup> In the present context, however, relations during the Archaic period are of greater significance,<sup>17</sup> a time when there was not only close contact between the Cypselides of Corinth (Hdt. 3.48), as well as Lydia and Egypt, but also when the Greeks took over from an eastern language the expression “tyrant” (τύραννος) as an apparently neutral term for a monarch.<sup>18</sup> For although it was assumed in classical times that dynastically legitimated kings had once ruled the Greeks,<sup>19</sup> it has by no means been established that such a ‘monarchic’ tradition really did exist.<sup>20</sup> There are doubts as to whether the term *basileus* designated anything more than just one “big man” among others, and this is true not just for the Dark Ages;<sup>21</sup> by now, even the generally held view that there was, in Mycenaean times, a *wa-na-ka* who ruled as a monarch,<sup>22</sup> is disputed.<sup>23</sup>

This is not to say that the Greeks took over the idea of monarchy from the Orient, adapting it to their own special conditions, since it is hardly possible to find

14 At the same time, the image of the *rex inutilis*, who is not a tyrant but who *is* a superfluous failure, appears to be a comparatively late phenomenon; see, however, Dészpa (in this volume). Light has been shed on this concept, which presupposes a basically high acceptance of the monarchic principle, in medieval studies in particular; cf. Peters 1970.

15 A text from the archive of Aššur-bāni-apli (Assurbanipal) may serve as an example. In this text, an unjust ruler, who does not respect the gods, the law or his advisors, is threatened with divine anger. This, it is said, can, in the worst case, lead to Enlil, the king of the gods, sending out a foreign king in order to destroy the unjust ruler and his army; cf. Meissner 1920: 65 f.

16 For an overview, cf. Mee 2008.

17 Cf. Rollinger 2001.

18 Cf. Anderson 2005. According to the prevailing view, Archil. fr. 19 (West) is the *locus classicus* which proves an initially neutral use of the term: οὐ μοι τὰ Γύγεω τοῦ πολυχρύασου μέλει, οὐδ' εἰλέ πά με ζῆλος, οὐδ' ἀγαιομαι θεῶν ἔργα, μεγάλης δ' οὐκ ἐρέω τυραννίδος· ἀπόπροθεν γάρ ἐστιν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμῶν. Cf. Parker 1998.

19 Cf. Aristot. eth. Nic. 1060b.

20 Cf. Morris 2003.

21 Cf. Hall 2007: 120–127; cf. Schulz 2011: 28 f. The Homeric epics occasionally show to all intents and purposes a positive attitude to monarchy, cf. Hom. Il. 2.204. It is noticeable that, at the same time, there is also already criticism of the unjust ruler; thus, Odysseus himself calls the killing of the suitors problematic: normally murder is punished by death or exile and he has now killed the *aristoi* of Ithaca (Hom. Od. 23.118–122). The killing of (other) nobles by a *basileus* is here considered unambiguously offensive. Cf. also Drews 1983.

22 Cf. Shear 2004; Schmidt 2006.

23 Cf. Schmitt 2009.

evidence for such an idea in the sources.<sup>24</sup> It is, however, certain that by classical times at the latest, the vast majority of poleis were not ruled by monarchs (not in Sparta, either), even if at that time *basileia* – at this point in clear opposition to *tyrannis*<sup>25</sup> – was at least theoretically understood as a legitimate form of rule alongside democracy and aristocracy or oligarchy.<sup>26</sup> In Athens, in particular, democracy, or rather *isonomia*, played a prominent role, although one should not overlook the fact that influential authors such as Thucydides or Aristotle did in fact distance themselves from it. The fact that feasible forms of rule between which one could choose existed alongside each other was crucial; under these circumstances an oligarchic as well as an antimonarchic discourse could develop, which was carried by the intellectual members of the secular elites and which we can grasp far better than in Egypt or the Near East on account of the more favorable preservation of relevant sources. When talking about monarchy, it did, of course, make a great difference in this context whether one lived under a monarch or not.

On account of the existence of plausible alternatives, the pressure to prove oneself as a legitimate ruler increased on anyone who was aspiring to monarchy in the Greek and Roman world or who, indeed, already ruled as a monarch. Every monarch could be accused of being a tyrant or a despot, who turned people into his slaves. Although all strategies that were commonly used in order to delegitimize a ruler in the Orient could also be employed, in principle, in the West, too, the possibility in this context of questioning monarchy as such appears to have been a characteristic of the Greek and Roman world. This assumption is the central premise of the present volume.

In classical times, after the Persian Wars at the latest,<sup>27</sup> “freedom” (ἐλευθερία) had been declared to be a defining characteristic of the Greeks, distinguishing them from the barbarians, and the “Asians” in particular.<sup>28</sup> This view has not only left marked traces in the European history of thought until very recent times: already in

24 See, however, Hall 2007: “That the Greeks should borrow a word to describe an autocratic regime only makes real sense if this was a system of government with which they were relatively unfamiliar” (139).

25 Cf. the contributions in Morgan 2003. This was true above all of the Greek motherland; in that part of Asia Minor which was under Persian control (cf. Wiesehöfer 2008) tyrants did exist at this time, too, in the same way as they did with the Greeks of Sicily and southern Italy.

26 Cf. de Romilly 1959 and Carlier 2010. The *locus classicus* is the fictitious constitutional debate, which Herodotus sets at the Persian court in the year 522 BCE (Hdt. 3.80–82); cf. Lanza 1977: 225–232; Pelling 2002. By using the transparent device of only discussing the ‘ideal’ versions of the three forms of government, Herodotus has Darius I emerge victorious from the discussion as a champion of monarchy: if *basileia* is defined as the rule of the best person, then aristocracy necessarily means that less good individuals participate in the exercise of authority, and this ought to be avoided: *quid enim optumo melius cogitari potest?* (Cic. rep. 3.35.)

27 On the continued influence of this tradition in Rome, cf. Spawforth 1994.

28 Aristot. pol. 3.1327b. It has been pointed out in more recent research that *inner* freedom and autonomy were apparently primarily meant here; by contrast, in case of doubt, freedom with regard to external politics was of subordinate importance for most poleis: the assumption that independence is a constitutive element of a city state derives primarily from modern constitutional thought; cf. Hansen 1995. Cf. also Dmitriev 2011.

antiquity it offered the possibility of characterizing monocrats as enemies of freedom and associating them with barbarians. The relevant teachings concerning tyrant-related *topoi* were fully developed and established by around 430 BCE at the latest. It is true that in Hellas aristocratic-oligarchic and democratic models of government could never claim to be accepted automatically, either, and conflicts between their representatives could, indeed, play a part in the *staseis* of this period.<sup>29</sup> However, the pressure to show himself to be the legitimate ruler was particularly high on every monocrat in the world of the polis,<sup>30</sup> and it is hardly a coincidence that Greek tyrants did not, as a rule, manage to maintain their position for more than three generations at most.<sup>31</sup> The idea of what constituted a “good” ruler appears to have first arisen as a counterpart to tyranny.<sup>32</sup> On the other hand, outside the world of the polis, in Macedon in particular, a legitimate monarchy (*basileia*) succeeded in establishing itself, but it is precisely the example of the Argeads that shows the precariousness of the position of this dynastically legitimated sovereignty, too.<sup>33</sup>

The rule of a single individual was fundamentally contrary to the central norms of the world of the polis. Any individual who ruled alone had to attempt to adapt to this matrix in order to gain acceptance.<sup>34</sup> This is of decisive importance: if monocracy was not considered a matter of course, it had to prove its worth. For this reason, unlike in the Near East, the monarch in question did not just have to demonstrate his personal aptitude; instead, the burden of proof went the other way: it was almost as if he were suspected of being a tyrant on principle. Boundaries were not clearly defined, and he had to show that his achievements and qualities justified the loss of freedom.<sup>35</sup> Put in a very simplified way, in Hellas, it was not just a matter of proving that a particular ruler was unsuitable, but rather, the monarch had to prove that, despite the fact that he ruled, he was not bad. For this reason, even a successful ruler could always be attacked circuitously by way of criticism of the system: in case of doubt, he was unable to give much of an answer to the accusation that he was an enemy of freedom simply on account of his existence. Conversely, criticism of individual rulers could always also be understood as an attack on the political order. This phenomenon was a specific characteristic of monocracy, as it was only within this form of government that the political system and its exponent, the monarch, were largely one and the same.

29 The most famous example is without doubt the *stasis* in Corcyra (Diod. 13.48); according to Thucydides it was at least ostensibly marked by a conflict between oligarchs and democrats (Thuc. 3.79–84); cf. Gehrke 1985: 88–93; Price 2001: 6–66.

30 An illegitimate monocrat was a tyrant, and as such he was, in principle, considered as an ἄσεβης and an outlaw. Cf. Luraghi 2013c.

31 According to some Greek authors, a community which was ruled by an absolute monocrat could not even be called a polis anymore; cf. Soph. Ant. 737; Eur. Suppl. 429–432; Ain. tact. 10.11.

32 Cf. Luraghi 2013b.

33 Cf. King 2010.

34 Cf. Gotter 2008b: 185 f.

35 The virtues which Xenophon ascribes to the king of the Spartans, Agesilaus, are illuminating in this context; cf. Xen. Ag. 11.

This was also true of Alexander the Great, who was unmatched when it came to success: irrespective of his achievements he was not infrequently also seen as a destroyer of Greek freedom. Nevertheless, meritocratic thinking offered a feasible route to securing a person's rule and to making a prominent position plausible, a route taken by Hellenistic rulers in particular.<sup>36</sup> If one did not have any genuine successes to show, it was at least important to claim that one did.<sup>37</sup> The meritocratic principle thus presented an answer to the problem of how to justify one's rule, but on the other hand, it also made the monarch vulnerable, as it made it possible to make statements about the ruler's quality which could be assessed in a more or less objective way.<sup>38</sup> He, for his part, had to live with the basic fear that antimonarchic discussion could, possibly, be followed by corresponding actions.

Although the Greek world was – regardless of the continued existence and vibrancy of democratic structures in many poleis<sup>39</sup> – dominated by monarchies after Alexander, monarchy itself nevertheless was never considered natural;<sup>40</sup> the part played by kings was subject to continuous negotiation.<sup>41</sup> The situation may have been different for most of the non-Greek subjects, especially those of the Seleucids and of the Ptolemaic rulers;<sup>42</sup> and in those Greek towns of Asia Minor which had been under Achaemenid rule prior to Alexander's campaign the longing for *eleuthe-*

36 Cf. Gehrke 2013 and Haake 2013. In addition to this, Schubart 1936 is still of importance. The 17<sup>th</sup> Idyll of Theokritos (in particular 17.73–130), which was composed in around 270 BCE, probably conveys a good impression of the way in which kings wanted to see themselves portrayed.

37 Cf. Gotter 2013; Strootman 2014: 247–263.

38 The basic idea of judging a ruler by his achievements is nowhere clearer than in the famous, and very probably Hellenistic, definition of *basileia*: οὐτε φύσις οὐτε τε τὸ δίκαιον ἀποδίδουσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰς βασιλείας, ἀλλὰ τοῖς δυναμένοις ἡγεῖσθαι στρατοπέδου καὶ χειρίζειν πράγματα βουνεχῶς (Suda B 147). Cf. Ma 2003 for more recent research on Hellenistic kingship; amongst other things, his paper emphasizes the multitude of roles which monarchs could play in different communication contexts.

39 For recent discussion concerning the character of the Hellenistic town, cf. Zimmermann 2008; Wiemer 2013.

40 It is significant that Plutarch, probably going back to Hellenistic sources, claims in a famous passage that the Diadochoi had immediately changed for the worse after accepting the title of king; Plut. Demet. 18. Cf. Plut. Kleom. 13; Pol. 15.24.4.

41 Thus, it is noticeable that kings, for example when communicating with Greek towns, generally did not present themselves as rulers and monarchs, but as “benefactors”; cf., for example, OGIS 223 (Seleucids) or SEG 47.1745 (Attalids). Cf. Bringmann 1993; Strootman 2011. “The whole issue of autonomy and city liberty (...) might be another local tradition, which the kings had to accommodate by playing a specific role to be found within modes of interaction” (Ma 2003: 180). However, one must not forget that the Greek cities were of special importance to the kings: “Auf griechische Funktionäre und Militärs waren die Herrscher in hohem Maße angewiesen, und diese rekrutierten sich im Wesentlichen (...) aus den griechischen Städten” (Gehrke 2006: 217).

42 Cf. Shipley 2000: 59–107. The non-Greek subjects of Hellenistic kings are, as a rule, likely to have largely considered the monarchic principle normal, as for example in Egypt. Cf. Mittag 2003.

*ria* will also have been somewhat limited.<sup>43</sup> All of these had in common the fact that they had been accustomed to monarchic systems for a long time. But there were important groups among which things stood differently, as antimonarchic sentiments were always attractive to the elites. These could be expressed in different genres – in addition to historiography, the most important areas were biography and rhetoric and to some extent also drama –, and it provided an outlet which made it possible to overcome the cognitive dissonance which existed between reality, often marked by opportunism, and the self-image of the aristocracy.

From the very beginning, Hellenistic kings made use of dynastic<sup>44</sup> and later also religious strategies of legitimization<sup>45</sup> in order to immunize themselves better against criticism and attacks,<sup>46</sup> and regardless of the difficult question concerning the extent to which this represents mere analogy or conscious appropriation of older, Near Eastern concepts,<sup>47</sup> comparable approaches can be observed in the *Imperium Romanum*.

Immediately after the end of the last relevant Hellenistic monarchy, Egypt, the Roman Empire for its part turned into a *de facto* monarchy. In this context, the Principate was, historically speaking, a special case: the *nobiles* of the *res publica* had for centuries defined themselves by means of a strict ethic of achievement and the ideal of aristocratic *libertas*.<sup>48</sup> The ostentatious rejection of monarchy was, apparently, the lowest common denominator which most of the members of the Roman ruling classes had been able to agree on for a long time.<sup>49</sup> In this context, however, two things must be considered: on the one hand, it is entirely unclear, not least because of the sources available, as to how and whether monarchy was a subject of discussion in Rome before the second century BCE.<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, for

43 Cf. Errington 2008: 3: “Since these ‘liberated’ Greek states were not used to exercising real political choice, they were generally content to recognize the Macedonian’s essential goodwill and therefore largely acquiesced in being ruled by him as successor to the ‘Great King’, quietly continuing to pay what his governors demanded.” Cf. Strootman 2011: 143: “Monarchic empire was only a new phenomenon for the cities in mainland Greece (...). Greek poleis in Asia Minor had been accustomed to Persian hegemony for centuries”. It is unclear to what extent those towns which had been founded after Alexander felt bound to the tradition of the polis (cf. Kosmin 2014: 183–251); it is certain, however, that Greeks as well as Macedonians were among the first citizens of these towns; cf. Austin 2003: 129.

44 Thus, it is conspicuous that in a Hellenistic *basileia*, the women of the ruling dynasty also played an important public role from an early date; this differs from the state of affairs under a tyrant; cf. Shipley 2000: 71 f.

45 Habicht 1970 still represents the classic investigation on the topic of the Hellenistic ruler cult; an up-to-date overview is offered by Chaniotis 2003. These efforts were doubtless taken to an extreme by the θεός Antiochus I of Commagene; cf. Wagner 2012.

46 On attempted usurpations, especially in the Seleucid Empire, see Chrubasik (forthcoming).

47 Cf. the contributions in Günther/Plischke 2012. On the Hasmonean Dynasty, an especially interesting case, see Trampedach 2013; Bernhardt 2015.

48 Cf. Beck 2008.

49 Cf. Erskine 1991, who assumes that the antimonarchic sentiments in Rome are a later development which only arose after contact with Hellenistic kings. See also Sigmund 2014.

50 Cf. Classen 1965. Thus, it is entirely conceivable that the relevance of antimonarchic discourse only increased after men such as Publius Cornelius Scipio (and perhaps also already Gaius



the period following this, one should not make the mistake of underestimating the variety of positions, interests and opinions inside and outside the ruling classes.<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless, one thing is quite clear: the *regifugium* was, in the late Republic, a central founding myth of the *nobiles* – but perhaps less so for the *plebs* – and it played an important part in political discourse.<sup>52</sup> It was not least because of this ideology that Caesar failed.<sup>53</sup> When he assumed the *dictatura perpetua*, even men like Brutus, who owed him a personal debt of gratitude, reached for the dagger.<sup>54</sup>

It was probably partly because of this experience, too, that Caesar's great-nephew, Augustus, proceeded more cautiously when, after a further civil war, he had gained sole authority in the Empire: *neesse est multos timeat quem multi timent*.<sup>55</sup> The complex web of personal obligations and formal legal powers of authority served in the main to disguise the monarchy of the *princeps* with its huge resources and thus made it easier for the *nobiles* to cooperate.<sup>56</sup> In practice, Tacitus was surely not the first to realize that the *res publica libera* had come to its end and that, effectively, Augustus' rule represented the beginning of a monarchy.<sup>57</sup> However, public discussion of the political situation was often deliberately ambiguous. For Augustus and the *principes* who followed him meritocratic thinking thus remained a central pillar of their position; officially, the main argument employed to create acceptance of their position of authority, and thus voluntary obedience of orders, was that their *auctoritas*, which exceeded everything else, had been gained through achievement.<sup>58</sup> There could be only one *optimus*, and the idea was that he should be the one to rule.

Flaminius) had begun to disturb the equilibrium within the ruling classes.

- 51 Cf. Meier 2014. When a *quaestor* in 69 BCE, Caesar is supposed to have held a eulogy for his late aunt Julia in which he proudly traced his *gens* back to the *rex* Ancus Marcius; cf. Suet. Div. Iul. 6. Assuming that this is not a later invention, it shows that referring back to kings did not have to be a taboo.
- 52 *Nunc mihi dicenda est regis fuga. Traxit ab illa sextus ab extremo nomina mense dies. Ultima Tarquinius Romanae gentis habebat regna, vir iniustus, fortis ad arma tamen* (Ov. fast. 2.685–688). The question of whether there really was kingship in the early Roman period is of secondary importance in this context; on the “nature of kingship at Rome” cf. Cornell 1995: 141–150 (in parts methodologically problematic); Linke 2010; Smith 2011.
- 53 Thus, the murderers of Caesar evidently justified their act as the recovery of freedom: οὔτε γὰρ ἐπὶ δυναστείᾳ οὔτ' ἐπ' ἄλλῃ πλεονεξία οὐδεμιᾷ ἀπεκτονέται αὐτὸν ἔφρασαν, ἀλλ' ἴν' ἐλευθεροί τε καὶ αὐτόνομοι ὄντες ὀρθῶς πολιτεύονται (Cass. Dio 44.21.1).
- 54 Cf. Gotter 1996: 207–232. Outside Rome, too, Brutus and Cassius were sometimes celebrated as tyrannicides, the most famous example undoubtedly being Athens, where it was decided to erect statues in their honor next to Harmodius and Aristogeiton; cf. Cass. Dio 47.20.4. (I will leave aside the question of whether this was truly a voluntary act, given the power structures at the time.)
- 55 Sen. de ira 2.11.3. The aphorism is ascribed to Caesar's contemporary Decimus Laberius and in fact belongs to a different context.
- 56 The co-existence of *princeps* and senate was famously described as “diarchy” by Theodor Mommsen; this conception has recently been advocated again; cf. Winterling 2005.
- 57 Cf. Tac. ann. 3.56; Tac. ann. 4.33.
- 58 Res Gest. div. Aug. 34.3. Cf. Börm/Havener 2012.

It has long been known that the individual Roman emperors of this period were dependent on the assent of their subjects – and especially of the soldiers<sup>59</sup> – to a particularly high degree, as the emperors' position was, *de facto*, indispensable, but its formal legitimization was weak.<sup>60</sup> For this reason, they were not only obliged to distinguish themselves from the rest of the population,<sup>61</sup> but also from their predecessors – and this was true not only in cases of a violent changeover of power. Every *princeps* was expected to guarantee internal peace, in particular, that is, the absence of civil war and lawlessness, and this was often a difficult task. However, the situation of the Empire's elite was also complicated.<sup>62</sup> Writers did not always succeed in judging correctly the extent of the *libertas* which they were allowed.<sup>63</sup> At the same time, a man such as Titus Labienus, who crossed the line, also created a difficult position for the ruler: on the one hand, attacks could, once they had reached a certain intensity, only be tolerated with difficulty without risking a loss of authority; on the other hand, a harsh reaction revealed the *princeps* as an enemy of freedom more than ever and thus proved the accusations to be true. It is likely that a desire to escape this dilemma contributed to the vast majority of historians of the imperial period deciding not to write about living *principes*.<sup>64</sup> More than ever, talk of the past became the playing-field of (anti-)monarchic discourse, while the historians themselves stated that it had become more difficult since the beginning of the imperial period to obtain reliable information about the government; this gap was filled by rumors and allegations.<sup>65</sup>

As time went by, monarchy became more and more natural in the Roman Empire, which was, moreover, surrounded by neighbors in which monarchy was the dominant form of rule. From the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE, in particular, the influence of the ideology of the Principate, which had, anyway, always been di-

59 One of the most astonishing and at the same time most overlooked achievements of the first *princeps* was, by the way, that Augustus managed to maintain his control over the legions, the decisive pillar of his power. The Roman troops do not really appear to have realized until the late second century that they were not only able to proclaim emperors but that they could also kill them.

60 Reference should be made to the influential conception of the Principate as a “system of acceptance”: as there was no official provision in Rome for the position of monarch, it was also not possible for there to be an undisputed source of legitimacy for an individual emperor – if the *princeps* lost the support of vital groups of society, the risk of usurpation increased; cf. Flaig 1992: 174–209 and Flaig 2011. “Falls der Begriff der Legitimität überhaupt einen Sinn ergeben soll, muß er beinhalten: eine Institution ist fraglos akzeptiert. Daß die einzelnen Kaiser gestürzt werden konnten, heißt, daß sie nicht legitim – also nicht fraglos akzeptiert – waren, sondern ihre Akzeptanz sichern mußten” (Flaig 2014: 743).

61 On the Roman Imperial cult, cf. Gordon 2011 (with further literature).

62 Cf. Geisthardt 2015. *Unde angusta et lubrica oratio sub principe qui libertatem metuebat adulationem oderat* (Tac. ann. 2.87). This accusation goes back a long way and is found already in Herodotus: ἦν τε γὰρ αὐτὸν μετρίως θωμάζης, ἄχθεται ὅτι οὐ κάρτα θεραπεύεται, ἦν τε θεραπεύη τις κάρτα, ἄχθεται ἅτε θωπί (Hdt. 3.80.5).

63 Cf. Rutledge 2009: 24–28.

64 Cf. Matthews 2006. However, it should be conceded that most earlier historians also apparently avoided writing about individuals who were still alive.

65 Cf. Cass. Dio 53.19.2–4; Eun. fr. 50 (Blockley).

rected primarily at an Italian audience, decreased significantly. Given the serious crisis to which the Roman monarchy was subject at the time,<sup>66</sup> emperors increasingly looked for new ways of stabilizing their precarious position. Moreover, consideration for the sensitivities of the *nobiles* receded in proportion to the growing marginalization of the senatorial aristocracy. In Late Antiquity, Rome had become close to a ‘normal’ monarchy.<sup>67</sup>

Diocletian systematized court ritual, which was intended to emphasize the singularity and superiority of the *dominus*, and Constantine not only strengthened dynastic thinking,<sup>68</sup> but also quite openly introduced elements and symbols of kingship to Roman imperial rule – the most conspicuous example is probably the diadem.<sup>69</sup> In the period that followed, a common set of stylistic elements of late antique monarchy developed, not least through exchange with the Sasanian Empire.<sup>70</sup> This left its traces in Iran, the Eastern Roman Empire and right into the emerging *regna* in the Roman west. Nevertheless, the distinctive structural features of imperial rule remained visible, not least because the discourse on monarchies exhibited conspicuous features. Thus, even a Late Roman *Augustus* faced the risk of losing legitimacy on account of despotic behavior – especially the killing of *nobiles* – and being considered a tyrant from that point on.<sup>71</sup>

Moreover, traditional elements were preserved for a long time in secular literature because of the markedly conservative nature of *paideia*, which remained a mark of status for the elites until the reign of Justinian at least. “Kaiserkritik” was virtually a marker of genre, especially in late antique historiography, as it allowed authors to demonstrate their love of truth and their incorruptibility. In addition to this, it was possible to voice a fundamental feeling of unease as regards monarchy: even if it was always directed at individual, and usually deceased, rulers<sup>72</sup> and did not directly attack monarchy itself as a system, the omnipresence of criticism of the emperor

66 Cf. Körner 2011.

67 It is, of course, difficult to answer the question of what the characteristics of such a monarchy are. Here, the fact that it was fundamentally accepted as natural is viewed as the most prominent feature of such a system. In addition to this, the aspect which relates to constitutional law is of significance – is the monarch’s position provided for in the ‘constitution’? Furthermore, deriving from this, the presence of an unambiguous rule of succession is relevant. The consistent application of the dynastic principle, however, is not one of the significant elements. One should perhaps not make the mistake of viewing those forms which the western European kingdoms developed from the late Middle Ages onwards as the standard.

68 The dynastic principle had already played an important role since Augustus, as the *principes* had always tried to pass on their power within the family. In this context it is, by the way, significant that the first *princeps* made membership of the senate hereditary, thus creating the *ordo senatorius*; this placed qualifications on strict meritocratic thinking. Cf. Börm 2015.

69 Cf. Kolb 2001: 76 f.

70 Cf. Canepa 2009; Mitchell 2015: 167–175.

71 Cf. Börm 2013: 140–148.

72 It is, of course, usually impossible to establish how much ‘reality’ may lie behind the accusations levelled at individual rulers; however, given the great age and authority of the traditions which were being continued, *mimesis*, for example, of literary models doubtlessly always played an important part.

may be an indication that the secular elites continued to see imperial rule more as a necessary evil rather than anything else. In addition to this, rivalries within the ruling classes, on which every monarch depended, could become manifest in this way. In a monarchy, proximity to the ruler ultimately determined one's career,<sup>73</sup> and this meant that there were necessarily always many losers. In this context, the accusation that the system lacked legitimacy could increase the level of frustration that a person could tolerate, as one's failure could be put down to circumstances rather than lack of personal ability. This function of criticism as an outlet for frustration may be a reason why rulers – especially those whose position was relatively secure – generally tolerated such comments, as long as a certain red line was not crossed.

The second distinctive feature of Late Antiquity is the development of a religious, Christian discourse on monarchy. Constantine had turned to a faith, which, not least because of an increasingly more radical monotheism and claim to exclusivity, appeared to be suited to enabling an affirmative discussion of a monarchic order on earth, as a mirror of heaven,<sup>74</sup> so to speak.<sup>75</sup> But at the same time, this created new points of attack; already in the fourth century, a Christian discourse which was critical of the ruler developed in the *Imperium Romanum*.<sup>76</sup> The Christianization of imperial rule thus increased the acceptance of monarchy in principle, but could also increase the pressure on an individual ruler.

The relationship between monarchy and monotheism, indications of which are already found in pre-Christian times, is of course far too complex for it to be adequately examined here.<sup>77</sup> Nevertheless, it seems likely that the triumphant advance

73 It is not possible to discuss here whether the concept of “Königsmechanismus” (cf. Elias 1997: 235–259) can be applied to the late Roman court, that is, whether the emperor was able to deliberately and successfully play off different groups of his “apparatus” against one another.

74 Eus. vit. Const. 1.43 and Eus. Tria. 3.4. I would like to deliberately leave aside here the old question of whether a personal experience of conversion, in addition to political considerations, also played a role in the *versio Constantini*.

75 Cf. Amerise 2007. Already Tertullian had stated that monarchy and the Christian religion fitted together well: *Christianus nullius est hostis, nedum imperatoris, quem sciens a Deo suo constitui, necesse est ut et ipsum diligat et revereatur et honoret et salvum velit, cum toto Romano Imperio, quousque saeculum stabit: tamdiu enim stabit. Colimus ergo et imperatorem sic quomodo et nobis licet et ipsi expedit, ut hominem a Deo secundum; et quicquid est a Deo consecutum est, solo tamen Deo minorem. Hoc et ipse vult. Sic enim omnibus maior est, dum solo Deo minor est. Sic et ipsius diis maior est, dum et ipsi in potestate eius sunt* (Tert. ad Scapul. 2). – “A Christian is enemy to no one, least of all to the Emperor, whom he knows to be appointed by his God, and so cannot but love and honor; and whose well-being moreover, he must needs desire, with that of the empire over which he reigns so long as the world shall stand – for so long as that shall Rome continue. To the emperor, therefore, we render such reverential homage as is lawful for us and good for him; regarding him as the human being next to God who from God has received all his power, and is less than God alone. And this will be according to his own desires. For thus – as less only than the true God – he is greater than all besides. Thus he is greater than the very gods themselves, even they, too, being subject to him” (tr. Thelwall, with modifications). In the *Apologeticum*, however, Tertullian argues that a Roman emperor cannot be a Christian (Tert. Apol. 21.24).

76 Cf. Börm 2010: 175 f.

77 Cf. Rebenich 2012: 1188–1192.

of monotheism also contributed to the fact that the late antique order which had established itself between the Atlantic Ocean and India by the 7<sup>th</sup> century CE consisted almost exclusively of monarchic systems, both in the east and in the west. At the same time, the demise, to a large extent, of the classically educated secular elites in this period meant that those who had transmitted the Greek and Roman (anti-) monarchic discourse over centuries disappeared. The world followed different rules after the end of antiquity.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHL, F. 1984. "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome". *AJPh* 105: 174–208.
- ALCOCK, S. 1997. "Greece: A Landscape of Resistance?" In *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism*, MATTINGLY, D. ed., 103–116. Portsmouth: Journal of Roman Archaeology.
- AMERISE, M. 2007. "Monotheism and the Monarchy. The Christian Emperor and the Cult of the Sun in Eusebius of Caesarea". *JAC* 50: 72–84.
- ANDERSON, G. 2005. "Before *tyrannoi* Were Tyrants. Rethinking a Chapter of Early Greek History". *CA* 24: 173–222.
- ARENA, V. 2007. "Invocation to Liberty and Inveective of *dominatus* at the End of the Roman Republic". *BICS* 50: 49–73.
- AUSTIN, M. 2003. "The Seleukids and Asia". In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ERSKINE, A. ed., 121–133. Oxford: Blackwell.
- BARCELO, P. 1993. *Basileia, Monarchia, Tyrannis. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung und Beurteilung von Alleinherrschaft im vorhellenistischen Griechenland*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- BECK, H. 2008. "Die Rolle des Adligen. Prominenz und aristokratische Herrschaft in der römischen Republik". In *Die Macht der Wenigen. Aristokratische Herrschaftspraxis, Kommunikation und "edler" Lebensstil in Antike und Früher Neuzeit*, BECK, H. et al. eds., 101–123. Munich: Oldenbourg.
- BECK, H. ed. 2013. *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- BERNHARDT, J. 2015. *Die jüdische Revolution. Untersuchungen zu Ursachen, Verlauf und Folgen der hasmonäischen Erhebung*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- BLUMENTHAL, J. 1980. "Königsideologie". *LexÄgypt* 3: 526–531.
- BOSCHUNG, D./HAMMERSTAEDT, J. eds. 2015. *Das Charisma des Herrschers*. Paderborn: Fink.
- BÖRM, H. 2008. "Das Königtum der Sasaniden – Strukturen und Probleme". *Klio* 90: 423–443.
- BÖRM, H. 2010. "Herrscher und Eliten in der Spätantike". In *Commutatio et contentio. Studies in the Late Roman, Sasanian, and Early Islamic Near East*, BÖRM, H./WIESEHÖFER, J. eds., 159–198. Düsseldorf: Wellem.
- BÖRM, H. 2013. *Westrom. Von Honorius bis Justinian*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- BÖRM, H. 2015. "Born to be Emperor. The Principle of Succession and the Roman Monarchy". In *Contested Monarchy*. WIENAND, J. ed., 239–264. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BÖRM, H./HAVENER, W. 2012. "Octavians Rechtsstellung im Januar 27 v. Chr. und das Problem der 'Übertragung' der *res publica*". *Historia* 61: 202–220.
- BRINGMANN, K. 1993. "Der König als Wohltäter. Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zur hellenistischen Monarchie". In *Colloquium aus Anlass des 80. Geburtstages von Alfred Heuss*, BLEICKEN, J. ed., 83–95. Kallmünz: Lassleben.
- BÜCHER, F. 2006. *Verargumentierte Geschichte. Exempla Romana im politischen Diskurs der späten römischen Republik*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- CANEPÀ, M. 2009. *The Two Eyes of the Earth. Art and Ritual between Rome and Sasanian Iran*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- CARLIER, P. 1984. *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*. Strasbourg: ACER.

- CARLIER, P. 2010. "Les conceptions de la royauté en Grèce classique". In *Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity*, LANFRANCHI, G./ROLLINGER, R. eds., 153–162. Padua: Sargon.
- CHANIOTIS, A. 2003. "The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers". In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ERSKINE, A. ed., 431–445. Oxford: Blackwell.
- CHRUBASIK, B. (forthcoming). *The Men who would be King. Kings and Usurpers in the Seleukid Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CLASSEN, C. 1965. "Die Königszeit im Spiegel der Literatur der römischen Republik". *Historia* 14: 385–403.
- CORNELL, T. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome*. London/New York: Routledge.
- DILLERY, J. 2011. "Hellenistic Historiography". In *The Oxford History of Historical Writing. Beginnings to AD 600*, FELDHER, A./HARDY, G. eds., 171–218. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DMITRIEV, S. 2011. *The Greek Slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DREHER, M. 1998. "Tyrannis (Antike)". *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie* 10: 1607–1611.
- DREWS, R. 1983. *Basileus. The Evidence for Kingship in Geometric Greece*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- DUNKLE, R. J. 1967. "The Greek Tyrant and Roman Political Invective of the Late Republic". *TAPhA* 98: 151–171.
- EICH, A. 2009. "Die Bedeutung publizierter Texte für die Kritik politischer Macht. Historische Entwicklungen von der klassischen griechischen Epoche bis zur Spätantike". In *Ordine e sovverzione nel mondo greco e romano*, URSO, G. ed., 331–351. Pisa: ETS.
- ELIAS, N. 1997. *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation. Vol. II*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- ERRINGTON, R. M. 2008. *A History of the Hellenistic World, 323–30 BC*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- ERSKINE, A. 1991. "Hellenistic Monarchy and Roman Political Invective". *CQ* 41: 106–120.
- FLAIG, E. 1992. *Den Kaiser herausfordern*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- FLAIG, E. 2011. "The Transition from Republic to Principate: Loss of Legitimacy, Revolution, and Acceptance". In *The Roman Empire in Context*, ARNASON, J./RAAFLAUB, K. eds., 67–84. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- FLAIG, E. 2014. "Review of: Jan Bernhard Meister: Der Körper des Princeps (Stuttgart: Steiner 2012)". *Klio* 96: 742–746.
- FRANSDEN, P. J. 2008. "Aspects of Kingship in Ancient Egypt". In *Religion and Power. Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond*, BRISCH, N. ed., 47–73. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- FRANK, M. 1989. "Was ist ein Diskurs? Zur 'Archäologie' Michel Foucaults". In *Das Sagbare und das Unsagbare: Studien zur deutsch-französischen Hermeneutik und Texttheorie*, FRANK, M. ed., 408–426. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- FRIEDMAN, R./FÖRSTER, J. 2002. "The Influence of Approach and Avoidance Motor Actions on Creative Cognition". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 38: 41–55.
- GEHRKE, H.-J. 1985. *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Munich: Beck.
- GEHRKE, H.-J. 2006. "Hellenismus (336–30 v. Chr.)". In *Geschichte der Antike*, GEHRKE, H.-J./SCHNEIDER, H. eds. 195–259. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- GEHRKE, H.-J. 2013. "The Victorious King: Reflections on the Hellenistic Monarchy". In *The Splendors and Miseries of Ruling Alone*, LURAGHI, N. ed., 73–98. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- GEISTHARDT, J. 2015. *Zwischen Princeps und Res Publica. Tacitus, Plinius und die senatorische Selbstdarstellung in der Hohen Kaiserzeit*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- GORDON, R. 2011. "The Roman Imperial Cult and the Question of Power". In *The Religious History of the Roman Empire*, NORTH, J./PRICE, S. eds., 37–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GOTTER, U. 1996. *Der Diktator ist tot! Politik in Rom zwischen den Iden des März und der Begründung des Zweiten Triumvirats*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- GOTTER, U. 2008a. "Cultural Differences and Cross-Cultural Contact. Greek and Roman Concepts of Power". *HSPH* 104: 179–230.

- GOTTER, U. 2008b. "Die Nemesis des Allgemein-Gültigen. Max Webers Charisma-Begriff und die antiken Monarchien". In *Das Charisma. Funktionen und symbolische Repräsentationen*, RYCHTEROVÁ, P./SEIT, S./VEIT, R. eds., 173–186. Berlin: Akademie.
- GOTTER, U. 2013. "The Castrated King, or: The Everyday Monstrosity of Late Hellenistic Kingship". In *The Splendors and Miseries of Ruling Alone*, LURAGHI, N. ed., 207–230. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- GÜNTHER, L.-M./PLISCHKE, S. eds. 2012. *Studien zum vorhellenistischen und hellenistischen Herrscherkult*. Berlin: Verlag Antike.
- HAAKE, M. 2013. "Writing Down the King: The Communicative Function of Treatises *On Kingship* in the Hellenistic Period". In *The Splendors and Miseries of Ruling Alone*, LURAGHI, N. ed., 165–206. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- HABICHT, C. 1970. *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*. Munich: Beck.
- HALL, J. 2007. *A History of the Archaic Greek World ca. 1200–479 BCE*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- HANSEN, M. 1995. "The 'Autonomous City-State'. Ancient Fact or Modern Fiction?" In *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, HANSEN, M.H./RAAFLAUB, K. eds., 21–43. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- HAUSER, S. 2001. "Orientalismus". *Der Neue Pauly* 15/1: 1233–1243.
- JACOBSON, T. 1943. "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia". *JNES* 2: 159–172.
- JONES, P. 2005. "Divine and Non-Divine Kingship". In *A Companion to the Ancient Near East*, SNELL, D. ed., 352–365. Oxford: Blackwell.
- KING, C. 2010. "Macedonian Kingship and Other Political Institutions". In *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, ROISMAN, J./WORTHINGTON, I. eds., 373–391. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- KLAASSEN, Y. 2014. *Contested Successions. The Transmission of Imperial Power in Tacitus' Histories and Annals*. Nijmegen: Gildeprint.
- KLOFT, H. ed. 1979. *Ideologie und Herrschaft in der Antike*. Darmstadt: WBG.
- KOLB, F. 1984. *Die Stadt im Altertum*. Munich: Beck.
- KOLB, F. 2001. *Herrscherideologie in der Spätantike*. Berlin: Akademie.
- KÖRNER, C. 2011. "Transformationsprozesse im Römischen Reich des 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.". *Milennium* 8: 87–123.
- KOSMIN, P. 2014. *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*. Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- KUHRT, A. 1995. *The Ancient Near East, c. 3000–330 BC*. London/New York: Routledge.
- KUHRT, A. 2012. "Orientalism". *OCD* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.): 1047.
- LANDWEHR, A. 2001. *Geschichte des Sagbaren. Einführung in die historische Diskursanalyse*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.
- LANZA, D. 1977. *Il tiranno e il suo pubblico*. Turin: Einaudi.
- LEPPIN, H./SCHNEIDMÜLLER, B./WEINFURTER, S. eds. 2012. *Kaisertum im ersten Jahrtausend*. Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner.
- LEVIN, C. 2004. "Das israelische Nationalepos: Der Jahwist". In *Große Texte alter Kulturen*, HOSE, M. ed., 63–85. Darmstadt: WBG.
- LINKE, B. 2010. "Kingship in Early Rome". In *Concepts of Kingship in Antiquity*, LANFRANCHI, G./ROLLINGER, R. eds., 181–196. Padua: Sargon.
- LURAGHI, N. ed. 2013a. *The Splendors and Miseries of Ruling Alone*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- LURAGHI, N. 2013b. "One-Man Government: The Greeks and Monarchy". In *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, BECK, H. ed., 131–145. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- LURAGHI, N. 2013c. "To Die like a Tyrant". In *The Splendors and Miseries of Ruling Alone*, LURAGHI, N. ed., 49–71. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- MA, J. 2003. "Kings". In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ERSKINE, A., ed., 177–195. Oxford: Blackwell.
- MALKIN, I. ed. 2005. *Mediterranean Paradigms and Classical Antiquity*. London/New York: Routledge.
- MASET, M. 2002. *Diskurs, Macht und Geschichte. Foucaults Analysetechniken und die historische Forschung*. Frankfurt: Campus.

- MATTHEWS, J. 2006. "The Emperor and His Historians". In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, MARINCOLA, J. ed., 290–304. Oxford: Blackwell.
- MEE, C. 2008. "Mycenaean Greece, the Aegean and Beyond". In *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age*, SHELMEIRDINE, C. ed., 362–386. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MEIER, M. 2014. *Caesar und das Problem der Monarchie in Rom*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- MEIKSINS WOOD, E. 2008. *Citizens to Lords*. London/New York: Verso.
- MEISSNER, B. 1920. *Babylonien und Assyrien*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Winter.
- MEISTER, J. 2012. *Der Körper des Princeps. Zur Problematik eines monarchischen Körpers ohne Monarchie*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- MEYERS, E./ROGERSON, J. 1997. "The World of the Hebrew Bible". In *The Cambridge Companion to the Bible*, CHILTON, B. et al. eds., 39–324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MITCHELL, S., 2015. *A History of the Later Roman Empire. AD 284–641*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- MITTAG, P. 2003. "'Unruhen' im hellenistischen Alexandria". *Historia* 52: 161–208.
- MORGAN, K. ed. 2003. *Popular Tyranny. Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Ancient Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- MORLEY, N. 2004. *Theories, Models and Concepts in Ancient History*. London: Routledge.
- MORRIS, I. 2010. *Why the West Rules – for Now*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- MORRIS, S. 2003. "Imaginary Kings. Alternatives to Monarchy in Early Greece". In *Popular Tyranny. Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Ancient Greece*, MORGAN, K. ed., 1–24. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- NUNN, A. 2011. *Der Alte Orient. Geschichte und Archäologie*. Darmstadt: WBG.
- O'GORMAN, E. 2011. "Imperial History and Biography at Rome". In *The Oxford History of Historical Writing. Beginnings to AD 600*, FELDHERR, A./HARDY, G. eds., 291–315. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- PARKER, V. 1998. "Τὸ πᾶνός. The Semantics of a Political Concept from Archilochus to Aristotle". *Hermes* 126: 145–172.
- PELLING, C. 2002. "Speech and Action: Herodotus' Debate on the Constitutions". *PCPhS* 48: 123–158.
- PETERS, E. 1970. *The Shadow King. 'Rex Inutilis' in Medieval Law and Literature 751–1327*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- PRICE, J. 2001. *Thucydides and Internal War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- REBENICH, S. 2012. "Monarchie". *RAC* 24: 1112–1196.
- ROLLINGER, R. 2001. "The Ancient Greeks and the Impact of the Ancient Near East. Textual Evidence and Historical Perspective". In *Mythology and Mythologies. Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences*, WHITING, R. ed., 233–264. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian text project.
- RUTLEDGE, S. 2009. "Writing Imperial Politics. The Social and Political Background". In *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*, DOMINIK, W./GARTHWAITE, J./ROCHE, P. eds., 23–61. Leiden: Brill.
- DE ROMILLY, J. 1959. "Le classement de constitutions d' Hérodote à Aristote". *REG* 72: 81–99.
- SCHMIDT, M. 2006. "Some Remarks on the Semantics of ἀναξ in Homer". In *Ancient Greece. From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, DEGER-JALKOTZY, S./LEMONS, I. S. eds., 439–447. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- SCHMITT, T. 2009. "Kein König im Palast. Heterodoxe Überlegungen zur politischen und sozialen Ordnung in der mykenischen Zeit". *HZ* 188: 281–346.
- SCHUBART, W. 1936. "Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri". *APF* 12: 1–26.
- SCHULZ, F. 2011. *Die homerischen Räte und die spartanische Gerusie*. Düsseldorf: Wellem.
- SEUX, M.-J. 1980–83. "Königtum". *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 6: 140–173.
- SHEAR, I. 2004. *Kingship in the Mycenaean World and Its Reflections in oral Tradition*. Philadelphia: INSTAP Academic Press.
- SHIPLEY, G. 2000. *The Greek World after Alexander*. London/New York: Routledge.
- SIGMUND, C. 2014. *'Königtum' in der politischen Kultur des spätrepublikanischen Rom*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.



- SMITH, C. 2011. "Thinking about Kings". *BICS* 54: 21–42.
- SPAWFORTH, A. 1994. "Symbol of Unity? The Persian-Wars Tradition in the Roman Empire". In *Greek Historiography*, HORNBLOWER, S. ed., 233–269. Oxford: Clarendon.
- STROOTMAN, R. 2011. "Kings and Cities in the Hellenistic Age". In *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, VAN NIJF, O./ALSTON, R. eds., 141–153. Leuven: Peeters.
- STROOTMAN, R. 2014. *Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- TIMPE, D. 2004. "Der Mythos vom Mittelmeerraum. Über die Grenzen der Alten Welt". *Chiron* 34: 3–23.
- TRAMPEDACH, K. 2013. "Between Hellenistic Monarchy and Jewish Theocracy: The Contested Legitimacy of Hasmonean Rule". In *The Splendors and Miseries of Ruling Alone. Encounters with Monarchy from Archaic Greece to the Hellenistic Mediterranean*, LURAGHI, N. ed., 231–259. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- WAGNER, J. ed. 2012. *Gottkönige am Euphrat. Neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in Kommagene*. Mainz: Zabern.
- WEBER, G. (forthcoming). *Antike Monarchie. Hellenistisches Königtum und römischer Prinzipat*. Munich: Oldenbourg.
- WIENAND, J. 2015. *Contested Monarchy. Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WIEMER, H.-U. 2006. "Staatlichkeit und politisches Handeln in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Einleitende Bemerkungen". In *Staatlichkeit und politisches Handeln in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, WIEMER, H.-U. ed., 1–40. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- WIEMER, H.-U. 2013. "Hellenistic Cities: The End of Greek Democracy?" In *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, BECK, H. ed., 54–69. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- WIESEHÖFER, J. 2004. *Ancient Persia. From 550 BC to 650 AD*. London/New York: Tauris.
- WIESEHÖFER, J. 2008. "Republik versus Monarchie? Griechische Stadtstaaten unter persischer Herrschaft". *Iranistik* 5.1–2: 223–231.
- WINTERLING, A. 2005. "Dyarchie in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Vorschlag zur Wiederaufnahme der Diskussion". In *Theodor Mommsens langer Schatten. Das römische Staatsrecht als bleibende Herausforderung für die Forschung*, NIPPEL, W./SEIDENSTICKER, B. eds., 177–198. Hildesheim: Olms.
- WINTERLING, A. 2009. *Politics and Society in Imperial Rome*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- WINTERLING, A. 2011. "Zu Theorie und Methode einer neuen Römischen Kaisergeschichte". In *Zwischen Strukturgeschichte und Biographie. Probleme und Perspektiven einer neuen Römischen Kaisergeschichte*, WINTERLING, A. ed., 1–11. Munich: Oldenbourg.
- ZIMMERMANN, M. 2008. "Stadtbilder im Hellenismus – die hellenistische Polis in neuer Perspektive". In *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, MATTHAEI, A./ZIMMERMANN, M. eds., 9–20. Berlin: Verlag Antike.

“AS HE DISREGARDED THE LAW, HE WAS REPLACED  
DURING HIS OWN LIFETIME”

On Criticism of Egyptian Rulers in the So-Called *Demotic Chronicle*

*Joachim Friedrich Quack*

Before going into detail, it might be appropriate to provide some basic information on Egyptian history and the concept of kingship in Ancient Egypt. Egyptian history is commonly structured by means of a division into “dynasties”, a term which goes back to the historical work, written in Greek, of Manetho, an Egyptian priest living in the early Ptolemaic period (3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE).<sup>1</sup> In Manetho’s work, “dynasties” are defined not by genealogical descent but by common geographic origin. Nevertheless, they are considered nowadays to usually consist of a sequence of kings from the same family. Chronologically, the dynasties are organised into larger units of “kingdoms” (the Old Kingdom, ca. 2700 to 2200 BCE; the Middle Kingdom, ca. 2000 to 1750 BCE; and the New Kingdom, ca. 1550 to 1070 BCE). In between these, there are so-called “intermediary periods”, and it has become customary in recent times to add to this a “Third Intermediate Period” (ca. 1070 to 715 BCE), which follows after the New Kingdom before the Late Period as such sets in.

Whereas Egypt was under indigenous rule for the largest part of the older period (and often expanded into neighbouring territories), from the first millennium BCE onwards it experienced different types of foreign rulers. While the families of Libyan descent ruling for most of the Third Intermediate period had their actual power bases within Egypt, the picture began to change with the Nubian pharaohs of the 25<sup>th</sup> dynasty (ca. 715 to 664 BCE). Although they often still resided in Egypt, their actual home was outside Egypt. The situation became more extreme with the Assyrian invasion of Egypt (671 BCE) and later with Persian rule (526 to 404 and 342 to 330 BCE), when Egypt was only a small part of an empire the center of which lay outside Egypt itself. In between these two phases of foreign rule, we have the 26<sup>th</sup> dynasty (664 to 526 BCE) and a sequence of short-lived dynasties between the two Persian occupations (404 to 342 BCE).

The concept of kingship in Egypt has been the subject of considerable scholarly attention.<sup>2</sup> However, most studies are either very general or restricted to limited time

1 Basic edition Jacoby 1958: 5–112; handy bilingual (Greek-English) edition Waddell 1940; for a recent study of the dynastic tradition and its possible Egyptian antecedents, see Quack 2012b.

2 Besides the “classic” study by Frankfort 1948, more recent studies are e. g. Blumenthal 1970; Barta 1975, Grimal 1986; Schade-Busch 1992; O’Connor/Silverman 1995; Gundlach 1998;

periods, sometimes even to single kings, and there is as yet no overarching diachronic study which traces the changes over time in detail. Such an endeavour would probably be quite difficult to undertake and the time is not yet ripe for it. Nevertheless, we should at least bear in mind that the different concepts are likely to have evolved substantially over such a long period of time, and that even the use of similar or identical expressions can imply different meanings when considered in detail.

In modern times, there has been considerable discussion as to what extent the Egyptians really considered their king to be divine. In general, older publications take such a claim seriously while, since Posener's 1960 ground-breaking study on the question of divine kingship, as well as a more specific study by Goedicke (1960) on Old Kingdom royal phraseology, the preferred solution has been to distinguish between a genuinely divine office and the individual (human) incumbent. I am far from being persuaded that this is the correct solution; it seems to be driven to too great an extent by modern considerations of what is acceptable and what is not.<sup>3</sup> There are even explicit statements that survive that say that the king is a god and not a man (Edfou VI.301.13).

Ancient Egypt was a culture in which monarchy as a form of rule was never questioned as such. This may be taken as confirmation of prejudices concerning Oriental despotism by whomsoever feels so inclined,<sup>4</sup> but at least the Egyptians provided a clear definition of what they considered the king's main tasks to be. However, this definition is not found as part of a discursive, theoretical treatise, but of a religious text which, in research on the subject, is generally called "cult-theological tract" or "The King as Sun-Priest", but which was in fact either a companion text to the representation of the sun cycle in the temple or an integral constituent of funerary compositions for private individuals. In any case, it hardly satisfies the expectations one would have of a politico-philosophical discursive text today.<sup>5</sup>

The passage in question reads as follows:

The sun-god has appointed King NN on the earth of the living for all eternity  
 so that he may judge humans and satisfy the gods,  
 so that he may create truth and destroy falsehood.  
 He gives the gods sacrificial food,  
 invocational sacrifices to those who have become transfigured.  
 The name of King NN is in heaven the same as (that of) the sun-god,  
 his life is in his heart's joy as (is that of) Horus of the horizon.  
 The noble rejoice when they see him,  
 his subjects pay homage to him in his shape of a young man.<sup>6</sup>

Windus-Staginsky 2006; Blöbaum 2006; Frandsen 2008.

- 3 Quack 2010a. Frandsen 2008: 62–65 has argued that the transmission of an *imi.t-pr*-document (a sort of testament) would be an indication of the human character of the king. However, this legal document is also recorded for the divine sphere in Egypt (some examples already in Frandsen 2008: 64; additionally e. g. pCairo CG 58034, l. 9; cf. Quack 2012d: 225).
- 4 On this subject, cf. Assmann 1992, especially 39–44, with a very considered position. He also already refers to the "Demotic Chronicle", discussed below, as the only Egyptian text in which monarchy is criticised.
- 5 On the text, cf. Assmann 1970; Betrò 1990: 27–50.
- 6 Cf. Assmann 1970: 19 and 22; Betrò 1990: 27 and 46–50.

Of course, this definition of function, with its unquestioned and unquestionable religious legitimation, makes a critical reflection regarding the point of a monarchic form of government (or lack thereof) impossible from the outset. At this point, one might consider the extent to which the system would, given this situation, even allow for an open, controversial discussion and, furthermore, to what extent the place of such a discussion is taken instead by court intrigue as the most eminent implement for deciding between two options. In any case, the importance of rituals in Egyptian culture which served the purpose of obtaining favor and popularity, especially with the king is noticeable, as is the amount of evidence which shows that it was possible to systematically obliterate the names and images of high officials with richly decorated graves – the specific reason being, apparently, that they had lost royal favor.<sup>7</sup>

Such an examination could lead on to further discussion of what Egyptologists call the “king’s novel” and which is, in fact, less of a literary genre than a way of describing how political decisions should be made according to the following understanding: the king announces a decision, and either his council rejoices from the outset or they are shown the error of their ways.<sup>8</sup> Controversial situations at court are never mentioned in this context; the court is always represented as a homogenous bloc, although one can assume that, in practice, different opinions and factions existed often enough. But the existence of different factions is subject to negative cultural judgment in Egypt in any case. Key evidence of this is, for instance, the Instructions for Merikare, in which the demagogue is described in the following way: “He creates two factions among the young” (Merikare E 25),<sup>9</sup> furthermore, an explicit appeal is made to oppose such people. Accordingly, the entire decision-making structure in Egypt is strongly marked by the principle of consensus. A judge’s ideal virtue, for example, is the ability to deliver a judgment concerning two people in such a way that both are satisfied.<sup>10</sup>

On the other hand, one should of course bear in mind that in such a situation, too, which involved the court and which was supposedly characterised by a superficial harmony and consensus, different groups with varying interests would, in actual fact, have participated in the decision-making process. It is just that the actual process diverges considerably from that of a parliamentary democracy of today.

For all that, criticism of individual rulers is not entirely out of the question. However, in such cases, the situation tends to turn quickly to the other extreme. Rulers who, often almost immediately after their death, have been classified in a negative way are quickly seen in such a bad light that there is no discursive discussion of their rule, and they are simply forgotten in a process which is as prescribed as it is effective. It is telling how the names of certain rulers who have been subject

7 On this, cf. Quack 2011; Quack 2012c: 111–115.

8 For recent discussions on this group of texts, cf. for example Jansen-Winkel 1993; Loprieno 1996; Beylage 2002: 553–618, Hoffmann 2004; Quack 2010b: 223; Quack 2012a: 282–286.

9 Quack 1992: 20 f. and 167.

10 Cf., for example, Jin 2003; Jin 2014.

to an unfavorable judgement by immediate posterity are indeed actively consigned to oblivion. They are not found in the ritual compilations of kings' names for sacrificial purposes,<sup>11</sup> and, in those cases where lists from the administrative tradition necessitate transmission of the name, for example for administrative purposes, circumlocutions are used in order to avoid naming the ruler explicitly.

In the king lists, which contain a consecutive listing of all rulers along with the length of their reign, the number of years of a given reign has been labelled with the word "empty" at certain points. As the number of years of the reign has, in all cases, been preserved in these entries but the name of the specific ruler hasn't, and as other sources usually indicate that the rulers in question were ones who were problematic in certain respects, one can assume that their names were deliberately considered not worthy of preservation and that the omission cannot be put down to coincidental damage to the archival exemplar that was used in that specific instance.<sup>12</sup> Such rulers are, then, also notoriously subjected to a kind of *damnatio memoriae* insofar as their depictions and names were systematically hacked out of hieroglyphics wherever they were accessible. The difference from Roman *damnatio memoriae* is that no historian preserved the names and facts in his work.<sup>13</sup>

The circumstances are not yet entirely clear in cases in which images and texts of rulers who were later condemned remained on buildings and continued to be publicly visible, and it is a matter which would require more detailed examination. Particularly in the case of Queen Hatshepsut there are occasional instances in which her image was originally present but was then covered by other decoration. However, it is also fairly common for her image as king to have remained intact but for the accompanying names to have been rewritten to refer to unproblematic predecessors (especially Thutmose I and II).<sup>14</sup> The aim is clearly to maintain the function of the images in question as representations of kings carrying out rituals. Furthermore, it means that there is no 'gap' which might cause the observer to ask questions that could potentially keep the ruler in question alive in oral discourse more than ever.

Circumlocution is another tangible method that was used in order to avoid naming a ruler explicitly when referring to his rule was unavoidable for practical reasons. An example of this occurred in a major lawsuit concerning property, which is relatively well documented in an inscription on a grave.<sup>15</sup> The inscription refers to an earlier event, which happened to have taken place during the time of the heretical king Akhenaten, whom later tradition tried very much, and with considerable success, to forget. The inscription states that something took place during the time of the "enemy from Akhetaten". The name of the short-lived Egyptian capital, relevant for the time in question, is just about given, but the inscription avoids giving the actual name of the ruler; the negative classification of the ruler as an enemy is

11 Redford 1986: 18–64.

12 For this view, see, for example, Redford 1986: 14–16.

13 On "the art of forgetting" in Rome, cf. Flower 2006.

14 Cf. the overview in Ratié 1979: 302–209.

15 On the text, cf. Text Gardiner 1905: 11 and 54 (line S 14); Gaballa 1977: 25, pl. LXIII.

firmly defined. Similarly, a fragmentary administrative papyrus from the Egyptian Museum in Berlin states that someone died in the ninth year of “the rebel”.<sup>16</sup>

This very distinctive tendency to act as if events had never occurred or people had never existed forms a conspicuous contrast with conditions in the ancient Near East. There, the concept of “ill-fated kings” did, by all means, exist; their specific names are preserved for posterity, but they are preserved as examples of bad rule.<sup>17</sup>

At most, the admission of mistakes and of events which did not turn out in the best way is possible in a very specific genre, namely that kind of wisdom literature which a king composes for his son and successor and in which he gives good advice for his future rule. There are two surviving texts of this kind, the “Instructions of Amenemhat” addressed to his son Senusret<sup>18</sup> and the “Instructions for Merikare” (a lacuna in the text means that the name of the father whose teachings are represented has been lost).<sup>19</sup> The first text constitutes an apparently successful attack on the father whose teaching is described, while in the other an unfortunate event during the speaker’s own reign is admitted. However, both texts appear to be *de facto* posthumous works and it seems more likely that they represent a later ruler’s attempts to publicize his own political orientation as well as to provide a foil to his own glorious rule.

However, once they have died, criticism of the rulers in question and of their government does not constitute a genuinely discursive and perhaps controversially dealt with point of personal opinion; instead, it is prescribed, official policy. In such a case, criticism of the ruler is not a personal decision that involves risks. Rather, it is only a refusal to accept the official condemnation which would carry risks, and substantial ones at that. Condemnation of a ruler is implemented so consistently, however, that one does not even find the ruler’s name as a negative example along with a list of his terrible deeds (as Tacitus might have done). In the case of an Egyptian ruler, however, the failing which he represents is obliterated by the power of hard facts, as it were, thus making the slightest opportunity of criticizing the fundamental political structures even more impossible.

By contrast, negative statements about a ruler who is still in power carry heavy sanctions. This is to be seen as a culturally pronounced warning in wisdom literature, especially texts of that kind from the Middle Kingdom (c. 1950 to 1700 BCE), which are characterized by a strong exhortation to loyalty.<sup>20</sup> The compositions known to Egyptologists as “The Loyalist Instructions”<sup>21</sup> (by now identified as the “Teachings of Kairsu”) and as “The Teaching of a Man for his Son”<sup>22</sup> are especially relevant.

16 Gardiner 1938; the text is now edited in KRI III 158: 14 f.

17 Cf. for example Braun-Holzinger/Frahm 1999 as well as Wiesehöfer (in this volume).

18 Adrom 2006 is the most recent edition of the original text.

19 For an edition and study, see Quack 1992. On both works cf. Burkard/Thissen 2007: 102–114 with further references.

20 Cf. for example Quack 2005a; Wilke 2006: 127 f.

21 For a basic edition, see Posener 1976. In addition, cf. Chappaz 1982; Verhoeven 2009; Hagen 2011: 25 f.

22 For an edition, see Fischer-Elfert 1999; in addition see Fischer-Elfert 1998; Hagen 2011: 37–39.