Ernst Baltrusch – Dominik Bonatz – Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum – Jörg Klinger

Plenary Agenda Report for Research Group B-II-1

Political Governance and Governed Space

Members:
- Ernst Baltrusch (Ancient History, Freie Universität Berlin)
- Dominik Bonatz (Ancient Near Eastern Archaeology, Freie Universität Berlin)
- Nicole Brisch (Ancient Near Eastern, Freie Universität Berlin; until September 30, 2009)
- Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum (Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Freie Universität Berlin)
- Kristin Kleber (Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Freie Universität Berlin; until July 31, 2010)
- Jörg Klinger (Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Freie Universität Berlin)
- Nadine Riedl (Classical Archaeology, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)

Senior Fellows 2008–2010:
- Brian Brown
- Jesper Eidem
- Olof Pedersén
- Clemens Reichel

Junior Fellow:
- Daniela Crasso
- Joshua Jeffers

Doctoral Fellows:
- Andreas Gräff (dissertation project)
- Daniel Raisbeck (dissertation project)

Abstract: Political authority over extensive territories is a well-known phenomenon of the ancient world, and one conceptualized already in antiquity through the image of the *succession of empires*. Each such politico-spatial order was based on the successful interrelationship of heterogeneous symbolic and concrete forms of *governance* in the context of contingent structural conditions. While each major empire must be regarded as a singular historical case, the question nonetheless presents itself of how an awareness of such *structures of political administration* were constituted in premodern states. In the framework of Area B *Mechanisms of Control and Social Spaces* large-scale phenomena of *governance* were examined particularly with regard to the *forms of knowledge* associated with the organizational implementation of these of hegemonic structures. This research group investigates the interdependency of spatial structures and the organization of authority with reference to four major empires. Brought to light through the analysis of contrasting interventions into these territories are continuities and discontinuities of practice within which the spectrum of forms of knowledge as well as the object of knowledge itself become discernible. The geographic region of investigation is the Near East. Three ancient Near Eastern case studies, namely the Hittite and Mittani Kingdoms and the Middle Assyrian Empire, illustrate the region of Anatolia-Upper Mesopotamia in a dense chronological stratification which traverses a period lasting circa 500 years. Emerging within this chronotope both geographically and chronologically are intersections through which commonalities and differences in the organization of *governance* are revealed, not least of all in their spatial conditionality. In contrast, the subproject in Ancient History dealing with the system of rule of the *Imperium Romanum* in the Ancient Near East focuses on the early period of the Principate, with a special focus on the Palestinian-Syrian realm.

In terms of systematics and chronology, two detailed studies contrast the relatively homogeneous perspectives of the four above-named empires: the first examines »trade relations« in the Neo-Babylonian empire of the 1st millennium BCE, and the second »multiethnicity« in the formation of the ancient Near Eastern empires of the later 1st millennium BCE.

The analysis proceeds via archaeological, philological, and historical methods and focuses on concrete forms of political authority as exercised in interdependency with the governed regions on various scales. Settlement structures, artifacts, and border formations have been investigated along with a multiplicity of textual genres, including historical documents such as treaties, but also epigraphic materials, legal, and commercial documents. Some of the sources are being made accessible and published for the first time in the framework of these investigations. A web-supported map project will permit links to be created between geographically defined discursive horizons and object data such as settlement patterns, areas of settlement, and texts.

Projects:

- Map Project: Interactive Atlas of the Ancient Orient
- »Strategies of Authority in the Imperium Romanum« (Ernst Baltrusch)
- »Material and Cultural Forms of the Representation of Political Authority in the Piedmont Region of Upper Mesopotamia« (Dominik Bonatz)
- »Empire's Memory: Space, Governance and (the Art of) Bureaucracy in the Middle-Assyrian Empire« (Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum)
- »Imperial Power Structures and the Mastery of Geopolitical Multiplicity« (Jörg Klinger)
- »Judea and Syria in the Hadrian-Antonian Period: The Perception and Conception of Political Space from the Perspective of the Rulers and the Ruled« (Nadine Riedl)
- »Material Components of Mittani Hegemony over the Upper Mesopotamian Area« (Daniela Crasso; postgraduate stipend)
- »Greek Ethnic and Cultural Identity in the Societies of Mesopotamia and Its Neighbors« (Andreas Graeff; doctoral fellowship/dissertation project)
- »The Grand Strategy of Emperor Hadrian« (Daniel Raisbeck; doctoral fellowship/dissertation project)
- »Editions of Neo-Babylonian Texts on Trade« (Kristin Kleber; edition project)
- »Satukku-Project. Old Babylonian Satukku Texts from Nippur« (Nicole Brisch; associate)
- »Herodians in the First Century CE« (Julia Wilker; associate)

Contents

1 Results

1.1 Prolegomena

The point of departure for this research project is a recognition of the extraordinary *multiplicity of strategies of authority* – and moreover within regions characterized by high levels of geographical diversity: the Hittite Empire extended from central Anatolia all the way to northwestern Syria; the hegemony of the Mittani followed the Piedmontese regions of Zagros all the way to the Mediterranean coastline; the Middle Assyrian Empire stretched from the eastern Tigris region all the way to the Euphrates, and extended as far as the lowlands of Mesopotamia to the south and to the foothills of the Taurus Mountains to the north. The Roman empire of the early Principate period encompassed the entire Mediterranean region. Typologically, each of these empires was a hegemonic formation, which is to say: each united a number of originally independent political regions under a centralizing power, thereby spanning vast geographical areas and multiple ethnicities. The success of such politico-spatial orders – which is to say, a certain level of historical stability – was a function of the interrelationship of the most diverse symbolic and concrete forms of *governance* in the context of contingent structural conditions. While each major empire must be regarded as a singular historical case, the question nonetheless presents itself of how an awareness of such *structures of political administration* were constituted in premodern states.

This means that the modern systematics of the politics of authority – an approach associated with institutional history which attributes to all empires relatively clear spatial boundaries (»provinces«) and borders regarded as being subject to institutionalized forms of control – is manifestly inadequate if we are to fully grasp the imperial strategies of domination applied by the empires under investigation. For such a systematics constructs clear borders where we in fact find flowing transitions, and conceals the full arsenal of instruments through which a given region may be controlled. It has proven unproductive, for example, to distinguish between »direct« and »indirect« forms of authority while attaching these immediately to administrative-bureaucratic infrastructures, for such an approach entails the application of modern categories instead of contemporary ones. That the boundary lines of such political empires are often indistinct (»fuzzy«) – involving border zones (ALBERTZ et al. 2007) rather than clear demarcations – became evident not least through our discussions with Research Group B-I-2 (*Fuzzy Borders*). At the same time, however, a given territory can – once it has been integrated into functional structures – be rendered accessible and surveyed to a minute degree, as confirmed by the work carried out in B-I-1 (*Definition of Spaces by Means of Surveying*) and B-IV (*Applied Historical Geography*). And finally, as demonstrated in B-III-2 (*The Organization of Diversity in the Ecclesiastical Space of Antiquity*), certain characteristic traits of cultural or social identity formation are well-suited to reshaping apparently firmly-established structures and relations by means of counterstructures.

How, consequently, are the available sources to be investigated? By which means can the sought-after quality of *sovereign knowledge*, which is to say: knowledge concerned with the exercise of the art of governance, be grasped as a conglomeration of various types, techniques, and strategies dealing with the structuring and implementation of large-scale control over space? Since reflexive metatexts on »sovereignty« are accessible only to a very limited degree (CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM 2007), these questions pose themselves

in a very particular way regarding the object of research described at the outset of this report. Visual media, moreover, are useful only conditionally for their visualization of a constructed reality. The question of whether they are effective as *soft power*, as »weapons of communication« (MARESCH 2002, 252–53) in a struggle for authority which rages throughout all strata of society can be clarified only if consideration is given to their specific pictorial formats and modes of representing space (BONATZ forthcoming). Politico-philosophical reflections in the spirit of Machiavelli or Hobbes are not available for the states of antiquity – and even highly self-aware historiographic depictions of the Roman imperium (Tacitus, Agricola 21; BALTRUSCH 2008) provide only limited information. For the ancient Near East, the materials referred to in the earlier historiography as *royal inscriptions* provide no metadiscourse, but instead (more-or-less rhetorically and ideologically shaped) annalististic depictions of the behavior of rulers. Only in the rarest of cases do we find references to the differentiated decision-making processes that transpired in the background and to the preceding stages during which information is compiled and specific situations assessed, compared, confronted, and analyzed – and hence to the activation of the various knowledge horizons on the basis of which decisions were made. Access to configurations of »authority – space – knowledge« is possible at most through information concerning the individuals and institutions involved – informants, scholars, consulted texts, »the gods« (PONGRATZ-LEISTEN 1999) – and via concrete implementations of such sovereign action. The task, then, is to search for *patterns* among the corpora of finds, results, and texts under investigation (whose fragmentation and cultural distance already represents a real hermeneutical problem) in order to reconstruct the configurations of protagonists and space that are indicated by political structures and processes. These are conditioned in essential ways by economic, ecological, and societal contingencies, themselves shaped by geofactors, which is to say, by their concrete embeddedness in geographical space.

1.2 Methodological Premises and Perspectives

The formation of empires and forms of sovereignty are ubiquitous phenomena, and belong to all cultures and epochs from the Sumerians all the way to our contemporary globalized world, from 3000 BCE into the 21st century (MÜNKLER 2005; POSTGATE 1977). They are available, then, as a virtually inexhaustible material for investigation – not just in a historical sense, but also from a systematic and cultural-historical perspective.

In particular in relationship to the intersection of space and knowledge which is a central concern of Topoi, the combination of heterogeneous disciplinary approaches opens up a multiplicity of methodological possibilities, ones which have moreover never been brought together in this way and which promise to generate fresh results. Despite massive disparities with regard to source material in this research group, B-II-1 has recourse to new, transdisciplinary concepts. Relevant as well is a further consideration: concerning the topic of Group B-II-1 (*Political Governance and Governed Space*), the focus has shifted from national and Eurocentric perspectives toward transnational and global ones – most conspicuously since 1989. This shift works to the advantage of our ›empires,‹ which were conceived not nationally, but instead ›globally,‹ and often – at least from the point of view of contemporaries – took the form of world-encompassing structures. In this context, phenomena and problems pertaining to present day political systems may be quite suggestive: among these are globalization (whose equivalents might be

›Romanization,‹ ›Hellenization,‹ ›Assyrianization,‹ ›Hittitization,‹ and ›Mittanization‹), questions concerning statehood (or their interpenetration, e.g. ›limited statehood,‹ and in particular the parallel existence of public and ›private‹ organizations), of governability, etc. (cf. HARDT – NEGRI 2001; HINGLEY 2005; MÜNKLER 2005; BENDER 2003). This perspective is important for studies of the ancient world because it means no longer investigating the formation of empires through approaches based exclusively on the (nation) state, on ›top-down‹ processes, or on clear spatial delimitations (provincial systems), but conversely regarding them as processes of reciprocity which play themselves out as negotiations between periphery and center, and which may assume highly flexible forms. Playing a role in this process, incidentally, are questions related to contemporary political science – which may itself, conversely, draw upon knowledge of social relations that were paradigmatic in antiquity. Not only is our group in a position to profit from current discussions, but can itself contribute to elucidating contemporary research questions.

The following list of examples illustrates some of the ways in which these new concepts can become effective:

1. The basis of all research consists in the respective *disciplinary methods* which guarantee well-grounded expertise as a firm basis for the necessary comparisons in a discipline-specific expert fashion. In contrast to interdisciplinary comparisons of empires, according to our view, they offer a superior likelihood of generating substantial results. Archaeological and philological-historical methods, moreover, with their orientation toward archaeological materials and textual sources, also safe-guard us from reducing historical science to the level of reiterating contemporary views; therefore, basic research remains an essential aspect of our group's activities.

2. Playing an important role for Research Group B-II-1 is the »relational concept of space« which is derived from the *sociology of space* (LÖW 2001); this concept is transferable to »dominions.« For this space too has been shaped previously by political, cultural, and religious factors, and may be incorporated through architectural/engineering measures, human relations, and so forth. This is of considerable importance for political governance (exemplary in this context are the Herodians, who restructured the previous religious configuration of their territory).

3. *Global history* (CONRAD – ECKERT 2007): to begin with, this term is shorthand for approaches which are adapted to the interdependency and relational history of the modern era, and which depart decisively from national histories. The method offers valuable impulses to classical and ancient studies. A consequence of this approach for Research Group B-II-1 is an expansion of focus from center to periphery, one capable of generating interesting results regarding relations between center and periphery during the late Bronze Era empires in comparison to the extreme peripheries of the era of the Roman Empire. Here, the ›administration‹ of the Roman Empire and of the Middle Assyrian Empire display a series of analogies whose examination may provide new insights, in particular regarding phenomena occurring along the ›edges‹ of these empires. Manifestly, the structural counterpart to the ›fuzzy borders‹ being investigated by Research Group B-I-2 (*Fuzzy Borders*) are the autonomous substructures which constitute a kind of buffer zone and are found along certain types of territorial boundaries. Another approach to global history is the analysis of civilizations, which was revived in the early 1990s (for example the »multiple modernities« of Shmuel Eisenstadt [EISENSTADT 2003]), specifically by Samuel Huntington's dictum

concerning the »Clash of Civilizations« (HUNTINGTON 1996)[1]. Employed with caution, this approach is capable of advancing knowledge (for instance regarding the highhandedness of the Imperium Romanum in relation to the Jewish nation, or in its recognition of the equal status of the Parthians – which is to say: in dealings with other cultures, ones often deemed inferior). Imperial expansion, finally, is nothing but a kind of »transcultural interaction« (BENTLEY 1993), not unlike migratory patterns or commercial exchanges. In this sense, the formation of empire, manifested as violent expansion, serves as a catalyst for forms of transnational mobility, a phenomenon which requires commentary that is not confined to a point of view that is exclusively concerned with outcomes (in many cases, however, this is the perspective of the source materials). What part was played, for instance, by ›private actors‹ on both sides of such processes of expansion? Expansion itself may be revealed as a multiform process.

4. *Comparative Studies*: for many areas, comparison is to be sure a customary research praxis (for example in diplomacy: kingship, topologies of war, historical concepts of peace); still, comparative studies does not yet represent an instrumentarium that is applied in studies of the practical implementation of authority within empires. Here, it is necessarily a question of working in close proximity to source material, and less of a theoretical discourse in the realm of political science. The general and particular traits of the Hittites, Assyrians, Mittani, and Romans can only be worked out when they are compared concretely in terms of imperial policies. In fact, it is such analytical work which constitutes the added value of our group. To an increasing degree, then, comparison is revealed as productive because synopsis permits the development of a typological matrix which allows us to identify differences and commonalities in practices and reactions.

5. *Post-colonial-studies*: this method, also developed beginning in the 1980s, is capable of revitalizing discussions of imperial structures and governance. It may be advantageous that this approach harbors reservations in relation to overarching perspectives and that it maintains an interest in local identities[2]. Negotiations with central powers concerning questions of regional status, the dynamics of complex processes of exchange between peripheral/semiperipheral and central territories, phenomena of ›interpenetration‹ in the literal sense, with reciprocal effects on the central power (as can be regularly confirmed for Rome, but probably also for the Assyrian, Hittite, and Mittani contexts): these represent important perspectives for our research group, and their investigation in the context of classical and ancient studies have to date been wholly insufficient. One example of this might be the relations existing between Rome, the Jewish communities, the Greek citizens of the poleis, and the princely families of the Herodians in the Palestinian territories – relations whose complexity was by no means shaped unilaterally by Rome, but which must instead be regarded as the outcome of processes of negotiation. Such dynamics acted upon this (not spatially delimited) region on many levels: in the towns, in Jerusalem, and even in Rome itself.

---

1   Martin Goodman 2007 applies this approach to Roman-Jewish relations, albeit with a negative emphasis (GOODMAN 2007).

2   For an overview, cf. YOUNG 2001; GANDHI 1998.

6. Via the application of concepts such as »commodification« and »territoriality,« we can pursue the question, for example, of whether and if so to what degree archaeological evidence compiled through research in the field allows us to reconstruct the mechanisms which led to the controlled acquisition of knowledge[3]. In this connection, the ›value‹ of an artifact is – as a product of expertise in conjunction with habitually generated knowledge – assessed in symbolic (that is to say: non-material) terms. Instances include the production processes for Mittanic and Middle Assyrian ceramics and their valorization as luxury or standard wares in various social strata. On the other hand, we may rely upon investigations into settlement structures with their basis in archaeological evidence as a crucial corrective to the programmatic statements concerning territorial expansion found in the textual sources. The method itself, however, necessitates a highly critical interrogation of the ceramic record with regard to existing cartographic information. Depending upon the method adopted and the intensity of its deployment, surveys such as the surface surveys undertaken in northern Syria beginning in the 1980s have yielded highly varied results. That which may appear from a macro-perspective as a homogenous area of settlement, one delimited by abstract spatial and temporal boundaries, may acquire highly dynamic, idiosyncratic qualities via a micro-perspective. Particularly at the micro-level, surveys can lead to insights into economic and ecological circumstances (cf. WILKINSON et al. 2005), and should – as in the case of the Tell Fecheriye Area Survey in northern Syria – be responsive to interdependencies between the various factors of relevance to settlement activity.

Dominating the textual primary sources, meanwhile, with regard to imperial geography are hodological formats for conceptualizing space, which is to say, depictions of geographical territories which follow patterns of movement. The surveys are based either on concrete movements, for example descriptions of military campaigns or itineraries, or are formed analogously into blocks of data pertaining to administrative methods, for example regarding tax assessments for a given region or prominent points found along a border as defined by treaties. In contrast, the concept of the »mapping« of the territory proceeds via reference to ethnicities or to differentiable political or administrative entities. Narratological implementation, then, proceeds on the one hand through an emphasis on the simultaneity of space (a cartographic viewpoint), and on the other through the sequentality or linearity of spatial experience under conditions of chronological compression. It is a question of antecedent representations of the territory, that is to say of the controlled representation of spatial knowledge. Political governance, furthermore, is manifested in a plethora of elements such as the expansion, regression, or fulfillment (i.e., according to current criteria) of fundamental governmental tasks such as the maintenance of peace, provision of materials and security, the drawing up of contracts, the establishment of confederations, military control, diplomacy, transformations affected through ›material,‹ juristic, linguistic, religious or even virtual instrumentaria (for example: discoveries, projections of ›world domination‹) – whereby material aspects can be transformed more readily than religious or linguistic ones. What is the source of this multiplicity of forms of governance? They seem to correspond to the thoroughly contentious and diffuse concept of empire: *imperium*, understood fluidly to mean the »sphere of influence,« does not find its limit in physical boundaries (i.e. rivers or mountains), but instead surpasses these, exploits them, incorporates them into the corresponding conception

---

3   On this approach: BINSBERGEN 2005; APPADURAI 1986.

of governance, one which is however far more comprehensive. According to our initial results, the conceptual multiplicity we are able to register already for the late Bronze Age for northern Syria between Mittani and Assyria, and which is likewise displayed by the Hittites and the Romans, involves a deliberate recourse to regional structures on the one hand and to the imperial capacity (or incapacity) to forge bureaucratic apparatuses on the other.

1.3 Governance and Knowledge

Obviously, this multiplicity of concepts of governance must be associated with *various forms of knowledge* – otherwise it threatenes to fail. Traditional discussions of the »legitimation of power« are also related to this question. To what extent does a sovereign exploit available knowledge concerning the special features and preexisting characteristics of the territory over which he rules? How does he work with such knowledge, and what impact does this knowledge have on the concrete implementation of his authority in space? Which strategies were developed (euergesiai, pledges of autonomy, compulsion, material, juristic, cultural-religious, linguistic transformations, etc.)? In the case of Rome, the situation was distinctly malleable: for the central power in a remote capital, the Herodian Dynasty was a kind of ›repository of knowledge‹ in relation to the subject peoples, for instance concerning the Jews, their religion, their laws, and their way of life. As a result, the Romans were able to extend their influence far beyond the boundaries of Palestine, and this transborder influence enabled them to secure Roman authority for a considerable period of time over Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine (since communities of the Jewish diaspora were present throughout). In contrast, the Roman aristocrat Quinctilius Varus, who was close to the emperor, was awarded a position in Germania by virtue of blood ties to Augustus, a role for which he lacked the requisite competence in the form of comprehensive ›knowledge‹ or professional advisers – which is why he failed on a grand scale in the year 9 CE (BALTRUSCH forthcoming). The complex structures of imperial authority, then, were based to a pronounced degree on the provision of knowledge (for example concerning regional elites) and the dissemination of knowledge throughout the region (i.e. via specific architectonic measures which restructured and reshaped the territory, but which at the same time needed to refrain from doing so arbitrarily). Stated as a thesis, we could say that knowledge concerning the governed territory continually stimulated new forms of access (in this case administrative access) to a given space. Developing out of this process – provided it was successful with regard to both the governed territory and the central power – were closer ties and regional modifications which had substantial reciprocal effects on the central power itself (for example the gradual ›internationalization‹ of Rome and Italy through the granting of citizenship rights). The significance of ›knowledge‹ for policies of governance can be extrapolated from various types of source material; whether this means that pre-existing physical, political, religious, or cultural conditions of the territory were modified, adapted, or affirmed by material encroachments or interventions; or whether authority was based on intimate knowledge or conversely on a blatant ignorance of regional religious or legal texts. We can hypothesize that in many cases, the pre-existing political or religious conditions found within the governed territory were no less significant for the exercise of governing power than physical ones, but that all such conditions had to be ›known‹ before they could be incorporated. If we inquire into the topography of the knowledge that was effective in engendering and stabilizing systems of governance on a large scale, we soon become aware with great immediacy of

the problem of the interdependency of knowledge types (and forms) and forms of representation of knowledge. With regard to the conditions prevailing in premodern cultures, the heuristic value of the conceptual distinction between *intuitive knowledge*, *empirical knowledge*, *symbolically representable knowledge*, *technological knowledge*, *scientific knowledge*, and finally *theoretical knowledge*, becomes usable only once we have established sufficient clarity concerning the diagnostic value of the available types of source material – that is to say, of the forms of representation of this knowledge. In the framework of this research group, this problematic can be illustrated by a number of examples:

1. Archaeological sources:
   a) How, for example, can technological and empirical knowledge respectively be identified or categorized in the context of concrete artifacts?
   b) How can we gain access to knowledge that is conveyed in an exclusive or inclusive fashion through pictorial systems and conventions?
   c) How can survey results be described as knowledge concerning the targeted restructuring of governed territories?

2. Textual sources:
   a) Under conditions of limited literacy, to what extent are textual sources actually suited to identifying various types of knowledge? Is it the case for certain sectors, for example, that only »deviations from the everyday or the norm« are noted?
   b) What are the consequences of the limited accessibility of textuality for the implementation of the corresponding encoded knowledge – for example concerning the dissemination of information about spaces?

How is such knowledge secured? Where did the dependent princes, proconsuls, and rulers procure their knowledge about the spaces that were entrusted to them? Where did local social groups acquire knowledge concerning the central power? In many instances, governance failed due to insufficient knowledge or preparation for an office which may have served career advancement rather than effective administration. In this respect, the incorporation of dependent princes often appeared to be the better solution, since they were necessarily aware of the peculiarities and pre-existing conditions of the territory, had established personal contacts, in some cases enjoyed familiarity with the corpus of relevant administrative, religious, and legal texts, and were in addition surrounded by the requisite technical expertise on the basis of which new strategies of governance could be established or long-known ones revived in the interest of the central power. One typical example of this is the development of so-called parity and non-parity treaties, as documented, for example, for the Hittite Empire. Playing a central role in this connection vis-à-vis our knowledge of *governance structures* is the concept of »transformation.«

In the context of the study of governance strategies, it necessarily follows that the center and its actions, considered in terms of a model of a top-down processes, can no longer be the exclusive focus. Indispensable now for a comprehensive examination of policies of governance as well are *relations between center and periphery*. The appraisal of complementary text corpora such as the complex of finds known as Assur 13058 (center) and the palace archive from Dur-Katlimmu (western periphery) will allow us to implement this broadening of our perspective in very concrete ways. But the shift to an investigation of center-periphery relations also integrates an element of cultural studies into historical

debates (ALCOCK 2001; BILDE et al. 1993). We can take advantage, for example, of wide-ranging research into the antipodes of »identity« and »alterity«[4]. Questions concerning governance and foreign policies can also be investigated in terms of the interdependent categories of »self« and »other.« From the very beginning, the Romans created a clear and visible demarcation separating the realms of the »domestic« (*domi*) and of the »out-side« (*militiae*), namely the Pomerium. This clear dichotomy has implications for policies of governance – not only regarding the construction of war, but also regarding forms of collaboration. Emerging through a confrontation between the principles of »established practice« and »change,« moreover, is a revealing situation in which the knowledge potential of certain policies and procedures is mirrored indirectly in the organization of governance within a given territory. A typical phenomenon is the question of the inter-penetration or reshaping of space. This can be demonstrated in an especially striking way with reference to the question of the presence of the Mittani and Assyrians in late Bronze Age northern Syria. Here, the forms of a system of governance (Mittani), present in the local milieu, was supplanted by a ruling system which is exercised from an ›imperial‹ distance (Assur), both of which must be seen in relationship to indigenous populations (Suteans/nomads). Investigated through micro-regional survey as ›measurable‹ expressions of hegemonial control are developments and tendencies in the dissemination of ceramics, instruments of administration (seals and inscriptions), technologies and forms of archi-tecture, as well as specific strategies for gaining access to space. In upper Mesopotamia, for example, processes of transformation occurring under specific political conditions can be investigated quite concretely in relation to the ›territoriality‹ of the respective system (Mittani versus Middle Assyrian Empire). The results can be used as a heuristic model for research into space and the transfer of knowledge in governing contexts in antiquity. It becomes possible, then, to investigate the relationship between the ›transmission of tradition‹ and the generation of space-driven incipient knowledge: how adequate is the paradigm of the preceding society? As we have seen, this is especially striking in the shift from Mittani to Assyrian rule. Similar perspectives are fostered by the investigation of the Hittite-Kashka relations, which exhibit analogous developments, as elaborated in other areas of classical and ancient studies in the wake of the reception of the methodological of ›post-colonial-studies.‹

Strategies of governance were not always successful. Which factors were decisive for *success or failure*? Nameable here are only causes that have been systematized: contingent factors such as famine, natural catastrophes, military aggression, and change of rulers seem to have contributed to crises which called the entire system into question. Systemic overloads also occurred at times, particularly when these bore the forms of an acceptance system[5] – in such cases, changes of inner balance meant massive dangers to governing authority. Local competition (for example between Herodians and Hasmoneans) was also a factor, both between regions (for example Judeans versus Nabateans) or between regional and central parties (for example Herodians versus Roman emperors).

---

4 Cf. also has an overview GEHRKE 2004.
5 The methodological concept in FLAIG 1992.

1.4 Conclusions

Clearly, »space« and »spatiality« represent preconditions which make possible the multiplicity and the simultaneity of the historically various realities (Doreen Massey's »contemporaneity of difference«) in the first place (MASSEY 1999, esp. 28–35). In fact, space itself (as indicated quite decisively by the initial results from the cultures under investigation) is a medium of power: »Space is both the medium and the message of domination and subordination« (KETIH – PILE 1993, 37). This is also true for the spatial organization of the megastates of the ancient world on all spatial scales (GIERYN 2000; MARAN 2006).

Standing only apparently in diametrical opposition to the above is the recognition on the part of this research group of how little »space« in the physical sense plays a role, how little »borders,« for example, are of essential significance. For it is action in space itself, the performance of spatiality, which engenders the decisive signals. Since the regents of the great empires positioned their own strategies within historical spaces, a more precise determination and concrete confirmation is provided by the concept of »historical (memory-)knowledge« (*historical knowledge* CHOO 1996). The deeds and the successes – or failures – of predecessors (and occasionally adversaries as well) served as indices, so that a kind of ›orientating knowledge‹ was evidently generated from their accumulation, one which served as a standard of reference as much in both negative as well as in positive terms.

2 Publications

Baltrusch, Ernst. 2008. *Außenpolitik, Bünde und Reichsbildung in der Antike.* Munich: Oldenburg.

Baltrusch, Ernst. 2008. Review of: Nikos Kokkinos (ed.), The World of the Herods. Volume 1 of the International Conference »The World of the Herods and the Nabataeans« Held at the British Museum, 17–19 April 2001. Stuttgart: Steiner. 2007. *H-Soz-u-Kult* 28.07.2008, http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/rezensionen/2008-3-062.

Baltrusch, Ernst. 2008. Review of: Fergus Millar, Rome, the Greek World, and the East. Ed. by Hannah M. Cotton and Guy M. Rogers. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 2006. *Historische Zeitschrift* 287, 142–144.

Baltrusch, Ernst. 2009. »Die jüdischen Kriege«. In Walter Demel (ed.), *WBG Weltgeschichte. Eine globale Geschichte von den Anfängen bis ins 21. Jahrhundert*, Bd. 2. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 264–280.

Baltrusch, Ernst. 2009. »Herodes – ein König im Kreuzfeuer von Religion und Politik«. *FUndiert. Das Wissenschaftsmagazin der Freien Universität Berlin* 2, 92–99.

Baltrusch, Ernst. 2009. »Herodes und das Diaspora-Judentum«. In Linda-Marie Günther (ed.), *Herodes und Jerusalem*. Stuttgart: Steiner. 47–59.

Baltrusch, Ernst. 2010. Review of: Adalberto Giovannini, Les relations entre États dans la Grèce antique: du temps d'Homère à l'intervention romaine (ca.700–200 av.J.-C.), Historia. Einzelschriften 193. Stuttgart (Steiner). 2007. *Gymnasium* 117, 503–504.

Baltrusch, Ernst. 2011. »Kriege für die Freiheit der Anderen: Roms imperiale Mission im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.«. *Gymnasium* 118, 43–56.

Baltrusch, Ernst. Forthcoming. Review of: Mark Andrew Brighton, The Sicarii in Josephus's Judean War. Rhetorical Analysis and Historical Observations. Leiden/Boston: Brill. 2009. *Historische Zeitschrift* 292, 469.

Baltrusch, Ernst. Forthcoming. »P. Quinctilius Varus und die *bella Variana*«. In Ernst Baltrusch – Michael Meyer – Uwe Puschner (eds.), *Geschichte – Archäologie – Legenden. 2000 Jahre Varusschlacht*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Baltrusch, Ernst – Meyer, Michael – Puschner, Uwe (eds.). Forthcoming. *Geschichte – Archäologie – Legenden. 2000 Jahre Varusschlacht*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Baltrusch, Ernst. Forthcoming. »Konstantin der Große und die Juden«. In Kay Ehling – Gregor Weber (eds.), *Konstantin der Große*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Bonatz, Dominik. Forthcoming. »Bild, Macht und Raum im neuassyrischen Reich«. In Gernot Wilhelm (ed.), *Organisation, Representation and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Würzburg 21.–25. Juli 2008*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Bonatz, Dominik – Bartl, Peter. Forthcoming. »Across Assyria's Northern Frontier: Tell Fekheriye at the End of the Late Bronze Age«. In K. Aslıhan Yener (ed.), *Across the Border. Late Bronze-Iron Age Relations between Syria and Anatolia, Proceedings of the Colloquium at the Research Center for Anatolian Civilizations, Koç University, 29 May–1 June 2010, Istanbul*.

Brisch, Nicole. Forthcoming. »Images of Kingship in Sumerian Literature«. In Karen Radner – Eleanor Robson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*. Oxford: University Press.

Brisch, Nicole. 2010. »Rebellions and Peripheries in Sumerian Royal Literature«. In Seth Richardson (ed.), *Rebellions and Peripheries Rebellions and Peripheries in the Cuneiform World*. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society. 29–46.

Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva. 2009. »Ortsnamenreihungen als Quellen zur historischen Geographie: Der Westen des mittelassyrischen Reiches unter Tukultī-Ninurta I.«. In Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum – Nele Ziegler (eds.), *Entre les fleuves I: Untersuchungen zur historischen Geographie Obermesopotamiens im 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 20. Gladbeck: PeWe. 121–150.

Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva – Ziegler, Nele (eds.). 2009. *Entre les fleuves I: Untersuchungen zur historischen Geographie Obermesopotamiens im 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 20. Gladbeck: PeWe.

Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva – van Ess, Margarete – Marzahn, Joachim. 2011. *Babylon – Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident*, Topoi. Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 1. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva. Forthcoming. »Middle Assyrian Summonses: the Epistolary Format in Judicial Procedures«. In Uri Yiftach – Sophie Demarre (eds.), *The Letter*.

Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva. Forthcoming. »Überlegungen zu Schrift, Schriftlichkeit und der ›Mobilität von Wissen‹ im Alten Orient«. In Elke Kaiser – Wolfram Schier (eds.), *Mobilität von Wissen*.

Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva. Forthcoming. »Überlegungen zur Systematik administrativen Schriftguts der mittelassyrischen Zeit in Dūr-Katlimmu«. In Hartmut Kühne (ed.), *Berichte der Ausgrabung Tall Šēh Hamad/Dūr-Katlimmu* 12.

Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva. Forthcoming. »Verwaltungstechnische Aspekte königlicher Repräsentation: Zwei Urkunden über den Kult der verstorbenen Könige im mittel-assyrischen Assur« In Gernot Wilhelm (ed.), *Organisation, Representation and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Würzburg 21.–25. Juli 2008*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva. Forthcoming. »Writing, Language and Textuality: Conditions on the Transmission of Knowledge and the Emergence of Systematic Thought in the Ancient Near East«. In Jürgen Renn (ed.), *Globalization of Knowlegde and Its Consequences. Papers of the 97th Dahlem Conferences Berlin 2007*.

Eidem, Jesper – Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva (eds.). Forthcoming. *Constituent, Confederate, and Conquered Space in Upper Mesopotamia: The Case of the Mittani Transition*.

Kleber, Kristin. Forthcoming. »Folter, Körperstrafen und Todesstrafe in Babylonien«. In Heinz Barta – Martin Lang – Robert Rollinger (eds.), *Strafe und Strafrecht in den antiken Welten*.

Kleber, Kristin. 2010. »Neither Slave nor Truly Free: The Status of the Dependents of Babylonian Temple Households«. In Laura Culbertson (ed.), *Slavery and the Household in the Near East*, Oriental Seminar Publications 7. Chicago: The Oriental Institute. 101–111.

Kleber, Kristin. Forthcoming. »The Neo-Babylonian Temple – Economy, Politics and Cult«. In Walther Sallaberger et al. (ed.), *Akten des 7. Internationalen Kolloquiums der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft »Tempel im Alten Orient«, 11.–13. Oktober 2009, Institut für Assyriologie und Hethitologie der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München*.

Klinger, Jörg. 2010. »Ethnogenèse et identité dans l'Anatolie de la période hittite ou: qui étaient les Hittites?«. In Isabelle Klock-Fontanille – Séverine Biettlot – Karine Meshoub (eds.), *Identité et altérité culturelles: le cas des Hittites dans le Proche-Orient ancien*. Bruxelles: Ed. Safran. 223–234.

Klinger, Jörg. Forthcoming. »Imperial Space C – The Old Hittite State«. In Jesper Eidem – Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum (eds.), *Constituent, Confederate, and Conquered Space in Upper Mesopotamia: The Case of the Mittani Transition*.

Wilker, Julia. 2008. »Principes et reges. Das persönliche Nahverhältnis zwischen Princeps und Klientelherrschern und seine Auswirkungen im frühen Prinzipat«. In Altay Coskun (ed.), *Freundschaft und Gefolgschaft in den auswärtigen Beziehungen der Römer (2. Jahrhundert v.Chr. – 1. Jahrhundert n.Chr.)*. Frankfurt on the Main: Peter Lang. 165–188.

Wilker, Julia. 2008. Review of: Monika Bernett, Der Kaiserkult in Judäa unter den Herodiern und Römern. Untersuchungen zur politischen und religiösen Geschichte Judäas von 30 v. bis 66 n. Chr. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 2007. *H-Soz-u-Kult* 20.10.2008, http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/rezensionen/2008-4-056.

Wilker, Julia. 2009. Review of: Adalberto Giovannini, Les Relations entre États dans la Grèce Antique du Temps d'Homère à l'Intervention Romaine (ca. 700–200 av. J.-C.), Historia. Einzelschriften 193. Stuttgart: Steiner. 2007. *Classical Review* 59, 518–519.

Wilker, Julia. 2009. Review of: Christian Heller, Sic transit gloria mundi: Das Bild von Pompeius Magnus im Bürgerkrieg. Verzerrung – Stilisierung – Historische Realität, St. Katharinen: Scripta-Mercaturae-Verlag. 2006. *Klio* 91. 499–500.

Wilker, Julia. 2009. Review of: Clifford Ando – Jörg Rüpke (eds.): Religion and Law in Classical and Christian Rome, Stuttgart: Steiner. 2006. *Historische Zeitschrift* 289, 423–424.

Wilker, Julia. 2009. Review of: Ian H. Henderson – Gebern S. Oegema (eds.), The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus. 2006. *Historische Zeitschrift* 289. 421–423.

Wilker, Julia. 2010. Review of: Arieh Kasher, King Herod. A Persecuted Persecutor, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. 2007. *H-Soz-u-Kult* 29.03.2010, http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/rezensionen/2010-1-237.

Wilker, Julia. 2010. Review of: Linda-Marie Günther (ed.), Herodes und Jerusalem, Stuttgart: Steiner. 2009. *Historische Zeitschrift* 291, 486.

Wilker, Julia. 2011. »Von Aufstandsführern zur lokalen Elite – Der Aufstieg der Makkabäer«. In Boris Dreyer – Peter Franz Mittag (eds.), *Lokale Eliten und die Herrschaft und Hegemonie hellenistischer Könige und der römischen Republik*. Berlin: Verlag Antike. 219–256.

Wilker, Julia. Forthcoming. »›God Now Settled in Italy‹: Pro-Roman Jews in the First Century CE«. In Benedikt Eckhardt (ed.), *Groups, Normativity, and Rituals. Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba*. Leiden: Brill.

Wilker, Julia. Forthcoming. »Josephus, the Herodians and the Jewish War«. In Mladen Popovic (ed.), *The Jewish War against Rome (66–70/74): Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill.

Wilker, Julia. Forthcoming. »›…und machten diese zu einem Teil der ihren‹: Zur Motivation und Akzeptanz römischer Proselyten und Gottesfürchtiger«. Papers of the Colloquium »Athen, Rom, Jerusalem: Normentransfers in der Alten Welt«, 27.–29.1.2010, Eichstätt.

Wilker, Julia. Forthcoming. Review of: Clemens Koehn, Krieg – Diplomatie – Ideologie. Zur Außenpolitik hellenistischer Mittelstaaten. Stuttgart: Steiner. 2007. *Gymnasium*.

Wilker, Julia. Forthcoming. Review of: David M. Jacobson – Nikos Kokkinos (eds.), Herod and Augustus. Leiden: Brill. 2009. *Klio*.

Wilker, Julia. Forthcoming. Review of: Gregg Gardner – Kevin L. Osterloh (eds.), Antiquity in Antiquity. Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 2008. *Historische Zeitschrift*.

Wilker, Julia. Forthcoming. Review of: Nikos Kokkinos (ed.), The World of the Herods. Volume 1 of the International Conference »The World of the Herods and the Nabataeans« Held at the British Museum, 17–19 April 2001. Stuttgart: Steiner. 2007. *Gymnasium*.

Research bibliography on Herod I and his rule and the post-classical reception of Herod, available at http://www.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/e/fmi/ arbeitsbereiche/ab_baltrusch/ Forschungsbibliographie_Herodes.html

Wilker, Julia. 2010. The following dictionary entries in *Amici Populi Romani. Prosopographie der auswärtigen Freunde Roms / Prosopography of the Foreign Friends of Rome*, APR 03 (22. April 2010), edited by Altay Coskun, http://apr.uwaterloo.ca/index.html:

    Iulius Agrippa = Agrippa I. Philorhomaios Philokaisar, König von Iudaea

    M. Iulius Agrippa = Agrippa II. Philorhomaios Philokaisar

    Alexandra Salome, Königin von Judäa

    (Iulius) Antipas = Herodes Antipas, Tetrarch von Galilaea und Peraea

    Antipatros von Idumäa, Stratege von Judäa

    (Iulius) Archelaos = Herodes Archelaos, Ethnarch von Iudaea

    Aristobul, Sohn des Aristobul

    Aristobul, König von Armenia Minor und Chalcis ad Belum

    Aristobulos II., König von Judäa

    Berenike, Tochter der Salome

    Berenike, Tochter Agrippas I.

    Drusilla, Tochter Agrippas I.

    Herodes I., König von Judäa

    Herodes II., König von Chalkis

    Herodias, Ehefrau des Herodes Antipas

    Hyrkanos II., König / Ethnarch von Judäa

    Matthatias Antigonos, Sohn des Aristobulos' II. von Judäa

    (Iulius) Phasael, Sohn des Strategen Antipatros

    (Iulius) Pheroras, Sohn des Strategen Antipatros

    (Iulius) Philippos, Tetrarch von Batanaea, Gaulanitis und Trachonitis

    Salome, Königin von Armenia Minor

3   Third-Party Funded Projects

»*ars atque usus* – Systemhaftigkeit und Offenheit des römischen Rechts als Möglichkeit seiner Anverwandlung in Ost und West.« Application for a research group of the DFG (Ernst Baltrusch).

»*Higeomes* – Die historische Geographie Obermesopotamiens im 2. Jt. v. Chr.: Interdisziplinäre Forschungen.« Application for a ANR/DFG cooperation project (Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum/Adelheid Otto/Nele Ziegler).

4 Bibliography

Albertz et al. 2007
Albertz, R. et al. (ed.). 2007. *Räume und Grenzen. Topologische Konzepte in den antiken Kulturen des östlichen Mittelmeerraums*. Munich: Utz.

Alcock et al. 2001
Alcock, S. E. et al. (ed.). 2001. *Empires. Perspectives from Archaeology and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appadurai 1986
Appadurai, A. 1986. »Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value«. In A. Appadurai (ed.), *The Social Life of Things. Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3–63.

Baltrusch 2008
Baltrusch, E. 2008. *Außenpolitik, Bünde und Reichsbildung in der Antike*. Munich: Oldenbourg.

Baltrusch forthcoming
Baltrusch, E. Forthcoming. »P. Quinctilius Varus und die *bella Variana*«. In E. Baltrusch – M. Meyer – U. Puschner (eds.), *Geschichte – Archäologie – Legenden. 2000 Jahre Varusschlacht*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Bender 2003
Bender, P. 2003. *Weltmacht Amerika. Das neue Rom*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Bentley 1993
Bentley, J. H. 1993. *Old World Encounters. Cross-Cultural Contacts and Exchanges in Pre-Modern Times*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bilde 1993
Bilde, P. et al. (ed.). 1993. *Centre and Periphery in the Hellenistic World*, Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 4. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Binsbergen 2005
Binsbergen, W. M. J. van et al. (ed.). 2005. *Commodification. Things, Agency, and Identities (The Social Life of Things Revisited)*. Hamburg/Münster: LIT.

Bonatz forthcoming
Bonatz, D. Forthcoming »Bild, Macht und Raum im neuassyrischen Reich«. In G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Organisation, Representation and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Würzburg 21.–25. Juli 2008*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Cancik-Kirschbaum 2007
Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. 2007. »›Menschen ohne König…‹. Zur Wahrnehmung des Königtums in sumerischen und akkadischen Texten«. In C. Wilcke (ed.), *Das geistige Erfassen der Welt im Alten Orient*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 165–190.

Choo 1996

Choo, C. W. 1996. »The Knowing Organization. How Organizations Use Information to Construct Meaning, Create Knowledge, and Make Decisions«. *International Journal of Information Management* 16, 329–340.

Conrad – Eckert 2007

Conrad, S. – Eckert, A. 2007. »Globalgeschichte, Globalisierung, multiple Modernen: Zur Geschichtsschreibung der modernen Welt«. In S. Conrad – A. Eckert – U. Freitag (eds.), *Globalgeschichte. Theorien, Ansätze, Themen*. Frankfurt on the Main: Campus. 7–49.

Eisenstadt 2003

Eisenstadt, S. N. 2003. *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities*. Leiden: Brill.

Flaig 1992

Flaig, E. 1992. *Den Kaiser herausfordern. Die Usurpation im Römischen Reich*. Frankfurt on the Main: Campus.

Gandhi 1998

Gandhi, L. 1998. *Postcolonial Theory. A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gehrke 2004

Gehrke, H.-J. 2004. »Vorgehen der Forschung. Schlüsselbegriffe und Konzepte. Identität und Alterität«. In E. Wirbelauer (ed.), *Antike*. Munich: Oldenbourg. 362–375.

Gieryn 2000

Gieryn, T. F. 2000. »A Space for Place in Sociology«. *Ann Reviews of Sociology* 26, 463–496.

Goodman 2007

Goodman, M. 2007. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. London: Allen Lane.

Hardt – Negri 2001

Hardt, M. — Negri, A. 2001. *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hingley 2005

Hingley, R. 2005. *Globalizing Roman Culture: Unity, Diversity and Empire*. London: Routledge.

Huntington 1996

Huntington, S. P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Keith – Pile 1993

Keith, M. – Pile, S. (eds.). *Place and the Politics of Identity*. London: Routledge 1993.

Löw 2001

Löw, M. 2001. *Raumsoziologie*. Frankfurt on the Main: Suhrkamp.

Maran 2006

Maran, J. 2006. Architecture, Power and Social Practice: An Introduction. In J. Maran et al. (ed.), *Constructing Power: Architecture, Ideology and Social Practice*. Hamburg/Münster: LIT. 9–14.

Maresch 2002

Maresch, R. 2002. »Hard Power/Soft Power. Amerikas Waffen globaler Raumnahme«. In R. Maresch – N. Werber (eds.), Raum – Wissen – Macht. Frankfurt on the Main: Suhrkamp. 237–262.

Massey 1999

Massey, D. 1999. *Philosophy and Politics of Spatiality: Some Considerations*, Hettner-Lectures 2. Heidelberg: Geographisches Institut der Universität Heidelberg. 27–42.

Münkler 2005

Münkler, H. 2005. *Imperien. Die Logik der Weltherrschaft – vom Alten Rom bis zu den Vereinigten Staaten*. Berlin: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.

Pongratz-Leisten 1999

Pongratz-Leisten, B. 1999. *Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien: Formen der Kommunikation zwischen Gott und König im 2. und 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, State Archives of Assyria Studies 10. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.

Postgate 1977

Postgate, J. N. 1977. *First Empires. The Making of the Past*. Oxford: Elsevier-Phaidon.

Wilkinson 2005

Wilkinson, T. J. et al. 2005. »Landscape and Settlement in the Neo-Assyrian Empire«. *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 340, 23–56.

Young 2001

Young, R. 2001. *Postcolonialism. An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

5 Citation

Ernst Baltrusch – Dominik Bonatz – Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum – Jörg Klinger, »Plenary Agenda Report for Research Group B-II-1 ›Political Governance and Governed Space‹.« In Friederike Fless – Gerd Graßhoff – Michael Meyer (eds.), *Reports of the Research Groups at the Topoi Plenary Session 2010*. eTopoi. Journal for Ancient Studiess, Special Volume 1 (2011). http://journal.topoi.org.