

# AN UNRECOGNIZED VASSAL KING OF BABYLON IN THE EARLY ACHAEMENID PERIOD II \*

WILLIAM H. SHEA

Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, West Indies

The first part of this study published in the preceding issue of *AUSS* detailed some of the changes the royal titulary in the Babylonian economic texts underwent during the first millennium B.C. Since that installment of this study went to the publisher in its final form, additional information on the subject came to the writer's attention by way of some criticisms and suggestions made on the unpublished manuscript by J. A. Brinkman of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago in a personal communication of May 25, 1970. I have already expressed my indebtedness to Professor Brinkman for the use of his unpublished bibliography for the Babylonian economic texts of the 7th century B.C., and now I am further indebted to him for supplying me with additional titles from that bibliography that were not available to me at the time the first part of this study was written. The additional comments presented here on the subject of the preceding section are drawn from Professor Brinkman's observations and have been added here to correct and conclude the foregoing discussion before the major problem of this section, the early titulary of Cyrus, is taken up.

In one of the earlier texts, the legal text from the 9th century (4 NT 3), both LUGAL and the first KUR should have been placed in brackets as the title is more damaged than was previously indicated. The title from another text (BM 38113) should be added to those already discussed from the reign of Nabonassar. Although the title in this text is damaged ([LUGAL TIN.T]IR<sup>kl</sup>), it is evident that the title "King of Babylon" was used here as it was in two other texts dated to him. While it is correct to say that this title appears in the date formulae of the economic texts for the first time during Nabonassar's reign, even with this additional instance it cannot yet be said that it came into regular use at that time, since the 16 texts that use only the title "King" still outnumber the three that have the lengthier title. On the other hand, four more texts from the reign of Merodach-Baladan II with the title "King of Babylon" (LUGAL TIN.TIR<sup>kl</sup>) can be added to the six already mentioned. This means that over half of

\* The first part of this article was published in *AUSS*, IX (1971), 51-67.

the business documents from his reign employ that titulary, and although the number of such texts is not large, it does say something for the importance of his reign as a transition point in the use of that title in this type of text.

The title in the text dated to Sargon II mentioned in the preceding discussion (2 NT 280) is all the more interesting in view of the additional information concerning it. It may be recalled that this text was singled out as the only known example of a business document from Babylonia dated to an Assyrian king that has the title "King of Babylon" associated with his name. From his examination of the cast of the text in the Oriental Institute Professor Brinkman informs me in his previously mentioned communication that, "...the RA (?) and the ki (?) in the title are damaged. The space looks much too small for a RA." In addition to these questionable sign values is the fact that, as far as I am aware, this form of the name for Babylon (KA.DINGIR.RA<sup>kl</sup>) is otherwise unattested in the titularies used in the date formulae of the Babylonian business documents. It seems rather unlikely, therefore, that the titulary in this text dated to Sargon contained the title "King of Babylon." If this assumption is correct, then there is not a single case known among the titularies in the economic texts from Babylonia in which the title "King of Babylon" was used for any Assyrian monarch who ruled there directly or indirectly.

Four more references from texts dated to the short-reigned kings between Sargon and Sennacherib may be added to the few titles cited for them in the foregoing discussion. These new titles supply three more instances in which the title "King of Babylon" was used, twice for Bel-ibni and once for Ashur-nadin-shumi. The fourth text has the title "King of the World" for Bel-ibni. In addition, there is an arki date for Nergal-ushezib that contains the title "King of Babylon." A note in the preceding section referred to the fact that the earliest known reference to the use of E<sup>kl</sup> as a geographical reference for Babylon dated to the first year of Nebuchadnezzar II. Professor Brinkman now informs me that since publishing *PHB* he has found such a reference that dates to the reign of Nabopolassar.

## *II. The evidence for a Coregency of Cyrus and Cambyses from the Economic Texts*

It is important to settle the matter of this coregency before considering the problem of the early titulary of Cyrus because interpreters in the past have connected the two. The older view of the coregency of Cyrus and Cambyses placed it at the beginning of the reign of Cyrus.<sup>40</sup> Apparently, the reason

<sup>40</sup> G. B. Gray, "The Persian Empire and the West" (*CAH*, IV), p. 14; *BHT*, p. 106.

for this was the fact that all of the known coregency texts are dated to year one, and it was assumed that this meant the first regnal year of Cyrus. Since no coregency texts are known that date to any other year, it was assumed on this basis that Cambyses was removed from the kingship of Babylon after a year of reign or less, and that he did not return to that office until eight years later after the death of Cyrus. No explanation ever was advanced that adequately explained such a strange procession of events, therefore the subject remained in this confused state until Dubberstein clarified the significance of the data from the business documents.<sup>41</sup>

The pertinent textual materials involve the dates and titles in 29 texts that fall into two categories. The first group of nine texts includes eight that date to the 1st year of "Cambyses, King of Babylon, Cyrus, King of Lands," written with any one of several minor variations (*Cambyses* 35, 36, 42, 46, 72, 81, 98; *VAS VI* 108). The other text in the first group has the formula reversed. It is dated to the 1st year of "Cyrus, King of Lands, Cambyses, King of Babylon" (*Cyrus* 16). The second group includes 20 texts that are all dated to the 1st year of "Cambyses, King of Babylon" without the customary additional title "King of Lands" used throughout his reign. It is possible that some of these 20 texts could be scribal variants in texts that belong to the 1st regular regnal year of Cambyses (529/8), but it is not possible that all of them could be. The statistical significance of these 20 texts becomes more obvious when they are compared with the texts from the first years of Cyrus and Darius I. Only two texts from the 1st year of Cyrus with the title "King of Babylon" alone were encountered in this survey of the Achaemenid titulary (*Cyrus* 18, *RECC* 5), and only one from the 1st year of Darius (*VAS VI* 118). It is clear, then, that as a group these texts belong to a special

<sup>41</sup> Dubberstein, *AJSL*, LV (1938), 417-419.

circumstance, *i.e.*, the coregency pointed out by the other nine texts with the more specific titulary. The problems posed by the titles can find the following solution according to Dubberstein's hypothesis, which is quoted here at length:

The Greek sources [Herodotus, Xenophon, Ctesias] which assert that Cyrus appointed his son Cambyses his successor before his last campaign and subsequent death apparently embody a correct tradition. At the New Year's festival, the official beginning of the New Year, in March-April, 530 B.C., Cambyses became the official *king of Babylon* while Cyrus retained the broader title *king of Lands*. Already three days later documents were dated to *Cambyses, king of Babylon*. Other scribes, conscious of the pre-eminence of Cyrus, continued to date by him giving the full titulary. A few scribes invented the new formulas already discussed which gave recognition and the respective titles to both Cambyses and Cyrus, and the new era was naturally dated as year *one* of the combined reign begun officially on the first day of the year.

... News of his [Cyrus'] death reached Babylonia in the autumn of 530 B.C., for in September documents are dated to the *accession year of Cambyses, king of Babylon, king of Lands*. Yet the confusion inaugurated by the unusual dual-kingship continued, and some documents were still dated to the two rulers, or at Babylon still to Cambyses, as *king of Babylon*. Illustrative of the situation is a document dated in the eleventh month (Šabātu), February, 529, to *year one, accession year of Cambyses, king of Babylon and Lands*. Apparently the bewildered scribe dated by the old dual-king system, and also by the new accession-year dating. However, by the New Year, March-April, 529, the adjustment had taken place. Cyrus had been dead some months, Cambyses was ruler of the empire, hence logically beginning in March-April, 529, all documents were dated to the first year of *Cambyses, king of Babylon, king of Lands*, to be followed by his second and following years.

... To postulate a dual reign at the beginning of Cyrus' reign instead of at the end has no support in the texts or in tradition, and is apparently opposed by the dual dating already quoted, *year one, accession year of Cambyses, king of Babylon and Lands*.<sup>42</sup>

This view of the coregency has also been incorporated into the chronological work that Dubberstein wrote in co-operation with R. A. Parker.<sup>43</sup> I am not aware of any objection in the literature to this proposal of Dubberstein since it appeared

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> *PDBC*, p. 14.

in print in 1938,<sup>43a</sup> although the older view shows up sometimes in works by writers that have not noted his brief comment on it.

A few observations might be added here in support of this interpretation. The year one in the date formula is more directly connected with Cambyses than it is with Cyrus, since eight of the nine joint titularies have his name first. This does not prove that these texts come from the end of Cyrus' reign instead of the beginning; it merely implies that the date applies to the coregency itself rather than to any specific regnal year of either Cyrus or Cambyses. Additional confirmation of this is found in the fact that the order of the names in the date formula could be reversed.

Dubberstein has also called attention to the fact that Cambyses is referred to as the crown prince (*mār šarri*) in texts that come from the reign of Cyrus. The last of these dates to the 6th day of the last month of Cyrus' 8th year

<sup>43a</sup> Since section II of this study was accepted for publication I had called to my attention the very pertinent remarks of M. San Nicolò in *Beiträge zu einer Prosopographie neubabylonischer Beamten der Zivil- und Tempelverwaltung* (Munich, 1941), pp. 51-53. San Nicolò noted that the name of an official from Sippar that appears in one of the coregency texts disappears from the other business documents by the end of the seventh year of Cyrus, and another person appears in his place early in the eighth year. Assuming that these observations are correct, the location of the Cyrus-Cambyses coregency at the end of Cyrus' reign as proposed by Dubberstein and utilized above must be rejected. However, it should be carefully noted that this conclusion does not necessarily vitiate the main line of argument here since the only definite conclusion that can be made on the basis of this information is that the coregency did not occur during the eighth and ninth years of Cyrus' reign in Babylonia. A further more precise location of the coregency during the other seven years of Cyrus' reign must await a more detailed examination of the chronological distribution of the other personal names in all 29 of the texts that are dated in terms of the coregency. Unfortunately, the writer does not have access to the primary sources necessary to perform such an examination currently, therefore it must be deferred for the present. It may be noted in passing that no reaction to San Nicolò's observations, either positive or negative, was made by Dubberstein in the second edition of *PDBC*.

(Cyrus 325), in other words, less than a month before Cambyses' installation as coregent at the beginning of the 1st month of Cyrus' 9th year. In the normal order of things, Cambyses would have progressed from crown prince to coregent to sole king. The idea that he was coregent first, then was demoted to crown prince, then became king again is both irregular and inexplicable. The fact that only year one of the coregency is attested in the texts is far better explained by the idea that Cyrus died before year two of the coregency began than by the suggestion that Cambyses was demoted. Additional support for the normal order of promotions might be found in the passage of the Nabonidus Chronicle that describes Cambyses' entrance into the temple at the time of the New Year's festival (III, 24). The older view of the coregency would see this as a reference to the installation of Cambyses as king of Babylon at the beginning of Cyrus' reign. According to Smith's translation,<sup>44</sup> though, a crown prince is referred to three lines later (III, 27) who at this time could only be Cambyses. This would seem to eliminate the possibility that the previous reference in the text is a description of his enthronement. However, line 27 is damaged and Smith's reading is not definite. D. J. Wiseman's opinion from a recent examination of the tablet is, "I am not convinced that this should be read *mār šarri*, but wonder if it could be *mar Urukki*, 'x the son of Uruk.'" <sup>45</sup> Since the reading is doubtful, it should not be stressed as an argument against a coregency in the first year of Cyrus. There is also some question about the chronology of the events at this point in the Nabonidus Chronicle.<sup>46</sup> Cambyses' entrance into the temple may have occurred a year later than formerly supposed, which would put it at the end of the coregency proposed for Cyrus' 1st year instead of at the beginning.

The text that is most useful in establishing the chronology

<sup>44</sup> *BHT*, pp. 114, 118, 122.

<sup>45</sup> Personal communication, Dec. 10, 1969.

<sup>46</sup> Discussed in the following installment of this article.

of this coregency is the one pointed out by Dubberstein in his explanation of the situation, *NBRVT* 92. It is dated to "year one, accession year of Cambyses, king of Babylon and Lands," and Krückmann's copy of the text clearly indicates that is the way the date formula should be read. The interpretation proposed by Dubberstein for this date formula is supported by a parallel construction found in three texts from the accession year of Darius II. They read: <sup>47</sup> 1) "4th month, day 25 (?), 41st year, accession year, Darius, king of Lands" (BM 33342); 2) "41st year, accession year, 12th month, day 14, Darius, king of Lands" (*NBRVT* 216); 3) "41st year, accession year, 12th month, day 20, Darius, king of Lands" (BE VIII 127). These dates obviously refer to the 41st and last year of Artaxerxes I which preceded (in the same year) the accession period of Darius II. Applying these parallels to *NBRVT* 92, it seems evident that the year one should be located in the same year as, but prior to, the accession year of Cambyses. However, the accession year of Cambyses came in the same calendar year as Cyrus' 9th, therefore the year one of *NBRVT* 92 must refer to some other situation, *i.e.*, the coregency. There is very little possibility of a scribal error here because the orthography for year one and year nine are considerably different. Thus, the parallels from the three accession-year texts of Darius II provide additional support to the aforementioned interpretation of the date formula of *NBRVT* 92, and this in turn helps to fix the location of the coregency with Cambyses at the end of Cyrus' reign.

### III. *The Titulary of Cyrus from 539-537* *According to the Contract Tablets*

By placing the coregency of Cyrus and Cambyses at the end of Cyrus' reign, another problem in the early Achaemenid titulary has been accentuated. According to the older view of the coregency, three groups of texts were involved here, not just two. The third group of texts consists of those

<sup>47</sup> *PDBC*, p. 18.

from the early part of Cyrus' reign that show a gap in his titulary, a period of just over a year during which he did not carry the title "King of Babylon." Gray's comment illustrates this viewpoint.

... perhaps in view of the necessity for his [Cyrus] absence from Babylon, after the first few months, in the first month of the first full year of his reign, he for a time made his son Cambyses king of Babylon, keeping for himself the more comprehensive title King of Lands; but before the close of his first year he had, for reasons unknown, resumed for himself the double title "King of Babylon, King of Lands," which is henceforward attested for every year down to the ninth and last, though occasionally during this period one or other of the two titles is used alone.<sup>48</sup>

Kugler noted this change in Cyrus' titulary.<sup>49</sup> Olmstead did too, although he did not connect it to Cyrus' coregency with Cambyses. He observed,

... By Oct. 26 [539] at the latest, the scribes were dating by the new ruler [Cyrus] as "king of the lands." This remained the official titulary during the remainder of the "accession year" and for a part of the first full year of reign.

... During his first full year of reign, "king of Babylon" came regularly to be prefixed in his dating formula to "king of the lands."<sup>50</sup>

These three observers are substantially in agreement that the title used for Cyrus in the Babylonian business documents during his accession year and for most of his 1st regnal year was "King of Lands." Then, toward the end of his 1st year, the scribes began to use the compound titulary "King of Babylon, King of Lands" in the tablets they dated to him, and they continued to apply that titulary to him down to the end of his reign. Superficially, the suggestion that the

<sup>48</sup> Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

<sup>49</sup> "Mit Cyrus beginnt die Reihe der Herrscher, die sich *šar mātāti* 'König der Länder' nennen. Cyrus führt diesen Titel fast ausschliesslich während seines Akzessionsjahres und den zehn folgenden Monaten seines ersten Jahres, wo sein Sohn Kambyzes als 'König von Babel' Unterkönig war; in der Folgezeit heisst er in den Geschäftsurkunden 'König von Babel, König der Länder.' Den gleichen Titel haben seine Nachfolger Kambyzes und Darius I. inne." *SSB*, p. 403.

<sup>50</sup> A. T. Olmstead, *The History of the Persian Empire* (Chicago, 1948), pp. 50, 51.



coregency texts should be placed in this gap appears reasonable, but when the coregency with Cambyses is placed at the end of Cyrus' reign, for reasons already discussed, then another explanation must be sought for this third group of texts.

Although the reasons for the use of these titles and the changes in them have not been made clear yet, the statements on the basic data made by these writers appear to be essentially correct. A compilation of the titles from the texts in question is found in Table II. The majority of the texts listed from the 1st year after the fall of Babylon (before the title change took place) come from southern Babylonia, but there are some texts of that period available from the northern cities. The texts in the list from Tremayne (*RECC*), Contenau (*TCL XIII*), and Dougherty (*GCCI II*), all come from Uruk, and three of the four unpublished Yale texts are from Nippur, but Babylon (*Cyrus 8, 12*), Borsippa (*NBRVT 21*), and Sippar (BM 56154) are also represented, giving a fair cross-section of the major cities of 6th-century Babylonia.

TABLE II

BABYLONIAN CONTRACT TABLET TITLES FOR CYRUS,  
539 TO 537

## I. Accession Year

October 12, 539 to March 23, 538

Reference	Year	Month	Day	Title
BM 56154	Acc.	VII	23	King of Babylon, King of Lands
<i>Cyrus 1</i>	Acc.	VII	—	King of Babylon, King of Lands
<i>NBRVT 21</i>	Acc.	[VII?]	25	King of Babylon, [King of Lands?]
<i>Cyrus 2</i>	Acc.	VIII	24	King of Lands
<i>Cyrus 4</i>	Acc.	IX	24	King of Lands
<i>RECC 1</i>	Acc.	X	21	King of Lands
<i>RECC 2</i>	Acc.	XI	21	King of Lands
<i>RECC 3</i>	Acc.	XII	8	King of Lands
<i>Cyrus 7</i>	Acc.	XII	10	King of Lands
<i>RECC 4</i>	Acc.	XII	17	King of Lands
<i>Cyrus 8</i>	Acc.	XII	21	King of Lands
<i>Cyrus 9</i>	Acc.	XII	—	King of Lands
<i>Cyrus 10</i>	Acc.	—	—	King of Lands

II. *First Regnal Year**March 24, 538 to March 11, 537*

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Day</i>	<i>Title</i>
RECC 5	I	I	4	King of Babylon
Cyrus 12	I	I	7	King of Lands
BLC C 1	I	I	30	King of Lands
RECC 10	I	II	1	King of Lands
BRLM 58	I	II	8	King of Lands
Cyrus 15	I	II	25	King of Lands
RECC 8	I	II	30	King of Lands
RECC 9	I	III	5	King of Lands
RECC 6	I	IV	29	King of Lands
TCL XIII 124	I	V	1	King of Lands
GCCI II 102	I	VI	1	King of Lands
RECC 7	I	VI	—	King of Lands
TCL XIII 125	I	VIII	8	King of Lands
NBC 4761	I	VIII	12	King of Lands
CUL 357	I	VIII	23	King of Lands
BRLM 57	I	IX	20	King of Lands
MLC 1824	I	—	3	King of Lands
RECC 13	I	—	14	King of Lands
NBC 4713	I	—	22	King of Lands
RECC 16	I	—	—	King of Lands
Cyrus 18	I	X	—	King of Babylon
Cyrus 22	I	XI	16	King of Babylon, King of Lands
Cyrus 23	I	XI	17	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NBRU 37	I	XI	18	King of Lands
NBC 4664	I	XI	19	King of Lands
Cyrus 24	I	XI	26	King of Babylon, King of Lands
Cyrus 25	I	XI	27	King of Babylon, King of Lands
VAS III 35	I	XI	28	King of Babylon, King of Lands
Cyrus 26	I	XI	29	King of Babylon, King of Lands
Cyrus 27	I	XII	2	King of Lands
Cyrus 30	I	XII	18	King of Babylon, King of Lands
Cyrus 29	I	XII	26	King of Lands
VAS III 60	I	XII	28	King of Babylon, King of Lands
Cyrus 31	I	—	—	King of Babylon, King of Lands

*Notes on Selected Texts in Table II*

BM 56154: I am indebted to D. J. Wiseman for the information utilized here from this unpublished tablet.<sup>51</sup> It comes from Sippar and is dated to the 7th month of the accession year. The day number is slightly damaged; signs for the 23 are clear (◀◀◀), but it could have had two more for 25. This makes it the earliest known Babylonian

<sup>51</sup> Personal communication, Jan. 10, 1969.

business document dated to Cyrus, and it uses the dual titulary for him—"King of Babylon" is clear, but "King of Lands" is damaged.

*Cyrus 1*: The day number is missing from this text, and the month sign is partly damaged and has been questioned.<sup>52</sup> However, since Tashritu has generally been accepted for the sign in question,<sup>53</sup> the text is located in the list according to that date. The fact that this tablet carries the dual titulary may possibly support the 7th-month date. The name of the city of origin is also missing.

*NBRVT 21*: The month sign in this text from Borsippa is illegible, but instead of placing it at the end of the list for the year according to custom, it has been located with the earlier texts because the titulary suggests it might belong there. Krückmann's copy shows a damaged area without any legible signs after the title "King of Babylon" in the last line. The damaged area may be too small for the full form of "King of Lands," but it probably could have accommodated the common variant "... and Lands" (*u* KUR.KUR), so it cannot definitely be determined whether the other title was present or not.

*Cyrus 10*: It is possible that "King of Babylon" was present in this text at the end of line 19, but this is doubtful in view of the amount of space available there, so it has been listed by the one title that is legible, "King of Lands."

*Cyrus 15*: The number of the year in this text is partly damaged, but year one may be accepted because the single sign is horizontal. If the number were two or three it would have been written with vertical strokes. The title listed for this text is taken from the KUR sign that appears at the edge of the damaged area. If this sign is correct, then the full title was "King of Lands" (KUR.KUR) only, for the titles are always written "King of Babylon, King of Lands" in order, and never the reverse. However, if the sign in question is actually TIN instead of KUR, and the two are fairly close, then Babylon (TIN.TIR<sup>k1</sup>) could have been present.

*BLC C 1*: This text is in the Bodleian Library collection and R. C. Thompson listed it in his catalogue of that collection which is now housed in the Ashmolean Museum.<sup>54</sup> I am indebted to O. R. Gurney of Oxford for his recent examination of the tablet on my behalf. The last two lines of the text read,

.....*Ku-ra-dš*  
[LUGAL] KUR.KUR.MEŠ [            ]

Professor Gurney says that "the last line is broken, but there is no

<sup>52</sup> Wiseman says, "I do not believe Strassmaier was right in reading the month. This part of the text is very broken and all I can see is (some traces) but this is very uncertain." *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> *PDBC*, p. 14.

<sup>54</sup> R. C. Thompson, *Catalogue of Late Babylonian Tablets in the Bodleian Library* (duplicated but unpublished?).

room for LUGAL TIN. TIR<sup>ki</sup>." <sup>55</sup> The fact that the title "King of Lands" follows immediately after Cyrus' name confirms that it was the only title written in the text.

*Cyrus 18*: This text was misdated by Strassmaier to the 30th day of the 5th month of Cyrus' 1st year. It is evident that the contract extended from the 10th month of the 1st year to the 5th month of the next year, the 2d. Line two of this text with the year number and the title of Cyrus is most directly connected with the 10th month in line one, not with the 5th month in line three.

NBC 4664, 4713, 4761; MLC 1824: In connection with these texts I wish to acknowledge the courtesy of Professor W. W. Hallo, curator of the Yale Babylonian Collection, who granted permission to me to examine these and other tablets in the collection, and also lent his valuable assistance in reading some of the damaged and difficult signs encountered in them. All the elements of the date and title in NBC 4664 and NBC 4761 are clear and definite and they both come from Nippur. The day and the year in the date formulae of MLC 1824 and NBC 4713 are definite, but their respective month signs are damaged. The 7th month appears the most likely in MLC 1824, but it could possibly be the 2d month or the 5th. The traces remaining in NBC 4713 seem to indicate the 8th or 9th month as the most likely possibility in that text. Since the month signs in both texts are not definite, no month date has been noted for them in Table II. The titles in both texts are definite and MLC 1824 comes from Nippur, but the name of the city of origin is damaged in NBC 4713.

As in the case of *NBRVT 21* in the accession year, the three published (*RECC 13, 16; Cyrus 31*) and the two unpublished (MLC 1824; NBC 4713) tablets from the 1st year of Cyrus in which the month is not certain have been located in the list according to their titles rather than at the end of the list for the year. The damaged signs in the unpublished texts point in that direction, and this procedure seems justified statistically on the basis of comparison with the materials from the other eight years of Cyrus. A published text of considerable importance in regard to the titulary of Cyrus in his 1st year was re-examined at Yale (*RECC 5*), and it was found that the date and title published by Tremayne for this text are unquestionably correct.

#### *Notes on Significant Texts Not Included in Table II*

Inquiry should be made at this point into the reasons why some texts from the accession year and 1st year of Cyrus are not included in Table II. Three unpublished texts from this period came to my attention in the course of this survey that are not included in the list. Two texts in the Yale Collection (MCL 1007, 578) date to the accession year and 1st year of Cyrus respectively, but the titles in both texts are damaged and illegible. Another text in the collection at Chicago

<sup>55</sup> Personal communication, Dec. 6, 1969.

is dated to the 1st year of Cyrus (2 NT 179), but I was unable to locate the cast of this tablet. I did not find any unpublished texts from the accession year or 1st year of Cyrus listed in the card catalogue of the University Museum in Philadelphia. All of the published texts in this category come from Strassmaier's collection (*Cyrus*), for all of the texts from this period that were located in other sources appear in the list. Ten of the first 30 texts of Strassmaier have been omitted because of problems with one of the three main elements in the date formula—the date, the king's name, or the titulary.

Six texts were omitted because of trouble identifying the name of the king to whom they were dated. In four of these (*Cyrus* 6, 14, 20, 21) not even a trace of the king's name is left. Strassmaier labeled them all with a question mark after the name of Cyrus. In another case (*Cyrus* 13) only a few faint traces of the king's name remain, so it is not much better than the others, and again the text was assigned to Cyrus by Strassmaier with a question mark. *Cyrus* 11 is the last of the six texts in which the problem has to do with the king's name. The problem here is that the signs copied by Strassmaier do not make up a commonly known variant form of Cyrus' name. Professor Wiseman was kind enough to collate this text for me recently and he reads the name "*mMa-ku...*" and comments that "If [the name is] Cyrus it is written badly."<sup>56</sup> This text has been omitted from Table II because the name is doubtful, but it is difficult to see what other king's name these signs could make up, so it might belong there after all.

Three texts have been omitted from the list because of problems with the titulary. In two of these (*Cyrus* 5, 17) the title is completely missing. The third text (*Cyrus* 3) is more complicated. In this case Strassmaier copied LUGAL TIN followed by a damaged area at the end of line 29. The name Babylon (TIN. TIR<sup>kl</sup>) stands alone in line 30. It is suggested here that the name of Babylon in the last line is not part of the titulary but that it indicates the place where the tablet was written. It appears that the balance of the titulary has been lost in the damage at the end of the preceding line, but if the TIN sign is correct then it contained "King of Babylon" at least. The case is very similar to that of *Cyrus* 15 and it may very well belong in the list, but since the title is both doubtful and atypical it has been omitted.

The last text of the ten omitted poses a problem in dating (*Cyrus* 19). The number of the year in the text is not definite because the determinative KAM is not present at the end of line 5. Strassmaier's copy of the text is not crosshatched here but lack of the determinative seems to indicate damage to this part of the tablet. One or two more vertical wedges may have been present, in which case the year number would have been 2 or 3. Without the determinative at the end of the year number, it is impossible to be sure whether it was dated to the 1st, 2d, or 3d year of Cyrus. The problem presented by this text

<sup>56</sup> Personal communication, Dec. 10, 1969.

is the reverse of the dating problem in *Cyrus* 15. In the former case the year is definite because the sign is horizontal, but in this case the year remains in doubt because the wedge is vertical; consequently it has not been included in Table II.

The next logical step to take in this study following the foregoing detailed examination of the individual texts in Table II is to look at the overall picture they present. Two main features of Cyrus' titulary stand out from these materials. The first notable feature is the fact that the title given Cyrus in 29 out of 30 texts collected from the 8th month of his accession year through the 9th month of his 1st year is "King of Lands." Only one definite exception comes from this period (*RECC* 5). This exceptional text with the title "King of Babylon" will be discussed later along with the three that stand at the beginning of the list. The important point here is not whether one, two, or six texts carry exceptional titles, but, what was the standard titulary of Cyrus during this period? The titles in Table II give us the answer to this question. Clearly, "King of Lands" was the standard titulary used for Cyrus in the Babylonian business documents throughout these 14 months.

The second main feature of the titles in Table II is the transition in the titulary. The only text from the 10th month of Cyrus' 1st year gives him the title "King of Babylon," and in the 11th month the dual titulary "King of Babylon, King of Lands" begins its regular appearance. The ratio of the titles in the texts from the closing months of Cyrus' 1st year is sharply reversed from that which obtained before. Nine texts from these three months contain the titulary "King of Babylon, King of Lands," while only four use "King of Lands," the title that was in regular use until that time.

This change in the titulary raises the question, how consistent were the Babylonian scribes in their use of these titles? Did they call Cyrus "King of Babylon" sometimes, "King of Lands" on other occasions, and use both titles in still other texts, all in a rather haphazard fashion? Or was there a

definite pattern to their use of these titles for Cyrus? To answer this question the titles from some 575 texts that date from the 2d year of Cyrus through the 1st year of Cambyses have been examined. The list is not as exhaustive as I have attempted to be in Table II, but it contains usable titles from the major published sources most readily available. At any rate, these 575 texts provide us with an adequate sampling of the titles used at that time to answer the question of scribal consistency. Excluding his 9th year with the coregency texts, the titles of Cyrus examined fall into the following statistical pattern:

TABLE III

A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE TITULARIES USED  
IN 414 BABYLONIAN TEXTS FROM THE SECOND  
TO THE EIGHTH YEAR OF CYRUS, 537 TO 530

<i>Regnal Year</i>	<i>King of Babylon</i>	<i>King of Lands</i>	<i>King of Babylon King of Lands</i>	<i>Total</i>
2	4	13	53	70
3	1	7	78	86
4	1	2	49	52
5	0	0	46	46
6	1	0	42	43
7	1	0	49	50
8	4	0	63	67
Total	12	22	380	414

This tabulation of the titles from the 2d year of Cyrus on gives a clear picture of his standard titulary in Babylonia for the rest of his reign. In addition, the titles from the 1st year of Cambyses show that the same titulary continued on into his reign. The titulary "King of Babylon, King of Lands" was found in over 90% of the 400 cases checked, which makes it unquestionably the standard royal titulary in the economic texts from Cyrus' reign. Since this titulary that was standard for the rest of his reign is the same as the one found most commonly in the texts from the last three months of his 1st year, it seems reasonable to conclude that the two stand

in direct continuity and that this titular first came into regular use at that time. This conclusion emphasizes the discontinuity of this standard titular with the one in the texts from his accession year and the first nine months of his 1st year, "King of Lands" alone. Further stress is placed upon this discontinuity by comparison with the texts dated to the early part of Cambyses' reign. Ten texts from the accession year of Cyrus carry the title "King of Lands," but only three were found among the accession-year texts of Cambyses (*Cambyses* 4, 18, 22), and while some 20 texts from the 1st year of Cyrus have this title, only one such text was encountered from the 1st year of Cambyses (*Cambyses* 30).

The 13 occurrences of the title "King of Lands" in Cyrus' 2d year may be questioned. It may be asked if this means that the same political situation that obtained in his 1st year, whatever it may have been, was still operating during his 2d year. Several factors seem to indicate that it was not. First and least important is the fact that the title "King of Lands" is on the decline. There are simply less occurrences attested, and taking the succeeding years into account, they are on a decrescendo curve. Second and more important is the fact that the occurrences of this title in the 2d year are distributed sporadically. They are scattered through 9 months of the year and do not fit any pattern, *i.e.*, they are not grouped in any one contiguous part of the calendar year. Third and most important is the fact that another title was much more commonly used at the time, for the dual titular is attested in 53 texts from the same 2d year during which this single title appears only 13 times. This contrasts with the situation in the preceding period during which, in essence, the use of no other title is attested. For these three reasons it is concluded here that the 13 occurrences of the title "King of Lands" in the 2d year are not politically significant, but that they probably represent incomplete scribal accommodation to the new dual titular from the former single title, *i.e.*, they are simply scribal variants. The same may be said



for the 12 occurrences of the title "King of Babylon" during the seven years surveyed. In this case the variant nature of the occurrences of this title is even more evident because of their random distribution. In view of the evidence, the question about the consistency of the scribes in the use of these titles may be answered positively. While variants do appear occasionally, they are relatively uncommon and are not statistically significant enough to detract from the clear picture of the standard titulary in use.

The next question to arise is, whether it is possible that the future publication of currently unpublished materials will change this picture of Cyrus' titulary to any significant degree? The presumptive answer to this question is found in Table IV, which represents the usable titles from unpublished texts that date to the first 4 years of Cyrus that were

TABLE IV  
TITLES FROM UNPUBLISHED TEXTS  
FROM THE FIRST FOUR YEARS OF CYRUS

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Title</i>
NBC 4761	1	VIII	King of Lands
NBC 4664	1	XI	King of Lands
MLC 1824	1	—	King of Lands
NBC 4713	1	—	King of Lands
UM 29-15-553	2	IX	King of Babylon, King of Lands
YBC 7048	2	XI	King of Lands
MLC 492	2	XI	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NBC 8342	2	—	King of Babylon, King of Lands
UM 29-15-551	2	—	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NCBT 1135	3	II	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NBC 8396	3	IV	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NCBT 685	3	VIII	King of Babylon, King of Lands
1 NT 283	3	X	King of Lands
A 3699	3	XII	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NBC 6220	3	—	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NBC 6182	4	II	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NBC 8379	4	V	King of Lands
NBC 8361	4	Vib	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NBC 4650	4	XI	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NBC 4663	4	—	King of Babylon, King of Lands
NCBT 1237	4	—	King of Babylon, King of Lands

encountered in the course of this survey. The 4th year was arbitrarily selected for the cut-off point, as that portion of the texts dated to Cyrus seemed to provide an adequate sampling of the materials. The titles are taken from tablets in the collections at Chicago, Pennsylvania, and Yale Universities, and I wish to thank Professors Gelb, Sjöberg, and Hallo, curators of the respective collections, for permission to examine the catalogues and selected tablets under their auspices.

The titles in Table IV reveal essentially the same pattern of distribution as those from the published sources found in Table II. The title in all of the texts from the first year is "King of Lands." Fourteen texts from the next three years have the dual titulary, while the title "King of Lands" is found again in the three exceptions from this period. All of these unpublished texts have also been placed in Table II. A few more exceptional titles may turn up in other unpublished tablets from the early years of Cyrus. However, since the description of his titulary in the economic texts outlined above is based upon a fairly significant statistical foundation, it is not expected that enough variants would turn up to materially change the picture of his titulary presented here.

Another small piece of evidence also points up the contrast between the title of Cyrus in the texts from his 1st year and the dual titulary used during the rest of his reign. This documentation comes from the fact that the royal titulary appears sometimes in dates that were cited in oaths or statements in the texts. Several examples of this may be seen in the texts from the Achaemenid period published by Contenau (*TCL XIII* 124, 132, 134, 137), and two of them are quoted below as illustrations of this usage. The translations utilized here are the work of E. W. Moore,<sup>57</sup> and italics have been added to emphasize the titles used. An example of the use

<sup>57</sup> *NBBAD*, Nos. 124 and 134.

of the earlier title of Cyrus in such a context comes from a text dated to his 1st year in which a statement is made about the delivery of some oil to Eanna in Uruk (*TCL XIII 124*),

The wardens and council in whose presence Rīmût, son of Nâdinu, descendant of the weaver, spoke, saying: "As for the fine oil which on the 3d day of Tammuz [4th month], the 1st year of Cyrus, king of the lands, from Êsagila on the ship of the *kusîtu* to Eanna I took, up to the time when at Êanna it arrived, no-one had touched it. . . ." Erech, the first day of Ab [5th month], the 1st year of Cyrus, king of the lands.

The dates and titles in this text contrast with those found in a legal text dated to the 4th year of Cyrus in which an individual's testimony in a sheep-stealing case is recorded (*TCL XIII 134*),

Kinâ, son of Nabû-aḥ-iddina, herdsman of the Bêlit of Erech, spoke saying: "In Elul of the 2d year of Cyrus, king of Babylon, king of the lands, one abandoned (?) mother sheep Mushêzib-Bêl, son of Nûrêa, in Marad gave me, saying: 'Take (it) and give (it) to Êanna.' Gimillu, son of Innin-shum-ibni, took it from my hands. To Êanna he did not give it." . . . Erech, Marchesvan, the 25th day, the 4th year of Cyrus, king of Babylon, king of the lands.

It is evident from the preceding discussion that the early title of Cyrus, "King of Lands," contrasts clearly with the dual titulary used for him afterwards. It also contrasts, perhaps even more sharply, with the title used for the kings who ruled Babylonia before him. In Part I of this study it was pointed out that a very large number of texts attest to the fact that "King of Babylon" was the standard and only titulary used for all of the Chaldean kings of Babylon from Nabopolassar to Nabonidus. More than that, the texts show that the regular use of these titles goes beyond the Chaldean kings, back through the reign of Kandalanu, at least to the time of Shamash-shum-ukin in the first half of the 7th century. In this case then, the title "King of Lands" used in the accession-year and 1st-year texts of Cyrus represents a sharp departure from the standard practice in the texts dated to the kings who ruled Babylonia for more than a century before him. This striking situation was not

changed until late in his 1st year when the title "King of Babylon" was added to his earlier title "King of Lands" to make up the dual titulary used for the rest of his reign.

The contrast between the titles "King of Babylon" and "King of Lands" is evident not only from the texts dated to Nabonidus and Cyrus individually, but also from a tablet that has the names of the two kings and their titles directly juxtaposed. This interesting tablet (*RECC* 8) comes from Uruk. It records the audit of temple offerings that were received during the last three years of Nabonidus, and since the audit was made in the 1st year of Cyrus, the names of both kings are present in the text. Tremayne, who published the text, described it as follows:

A splendid specimen of the auditing of accounts in the Persian period. . . . Shuzubu, whose records were being checked up, was in charge of the animals which were received from temple offerings and sacrifice. The period of business covered the last three years of the reign of Nabonidus. The audit was made in the 1st month of the 1st year of Cyrus. During that time this man received no less than 7,036 animals and had disposed of 6,816, leaving a balance of 220. According to the figures on the tablet, the audit shows that Shuzubu's accounts were correct. A peculiar feature of the tablet is that there are no witnesses to the check and even the auditor did not subscribe his name.<sup>58</sup>

A Neo-Babylonian text has been published recently<sup>59</sup> that is similar in some respects to the previous text. In his review of the publication in which it appeared, Brinkman discussed this text briefly:

In another interesting document that inventories woolen garments made for the cult statues of the gods in Uruk, we find that cult procedures there suffered no interruption during the Persian takeover of the political administration of the land; the text reads almost as though another Babylonian had succeeded to the throne. . . .<sup>60</sup>

<sup>58</sup> *RECC*, p. 13.

<sup>59</sup> Karl Oberhuber, *Sumerische und Akkadische Keilschriftdenkmäler des archäologischen Museums zu Florenz* ("Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft," Sonderhefte VII-VIII; Innsbruck, 1958-1960), No. 165.

<sup>60</sup> Brinkman, "Neo-Babylonian Texts in the Archaeological Museum at Florence," *JNES*, XXV (1966), 202.

This text, though broken or illegible in several places, still is interesting in many ways. It presents a unique year-by-year inventory of wool stuffs made into garments for the cult statues of the deities in Uruk. . . .

This text is also a unique inventory of wool garments in that it is arranged chronologically. Furthermore, it covers the vital years before and after the Persian conquest of Babylonia. . . . Save that the volume of wool stuffs used for cult garments appears to drop off slightly during the critical years 539-538 (Nabonidus, Year 17 and Cyrus, Year 1), the cult at Uruk continues uninterrupted during the change over from Babylonian independence to subjection under the Persian empire.<sup>61</sup>

The damaged section at the end of the tablet (lines 40 and following) indicates that the text apparently was composed at the end of Cyrus' 2d year, although the date there is missing. The date in line 39 labels the inventory for the 1st year of Cyrus that is recorded in the preceding 13 lines; consequently the titulary there comes from the end of his 1st year and is just what would be expected at that time, "King of Babylon, King of Lands," in contrast to his title in the preceding text. Another interesting aspect of this text is the fact that the name of Nabonidus is not legible anywhere in it. His name does not appear in the date formulae that label the inventories of goods from his years (lines 13, 25, 33), even though there is considerable space available in those lines. This absence of his name might be interpreted as supplementary evidence of his unpopularity in Babylonia, but it may not be significant because the most likely place for his name to appear is at the beginning of the tablet, which is badly damaged.

Undoubtedly, these two texts are composite works, *i.e.*, they were made up from other temple accounts recorded on various tablets. As such they were compiled according to the dates of the king who was ruling at the time the original accounts were written. In so doing, the scribes who wrote the two texts have taken along the appropriate titulary

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209.

for the kings referred to and also those that are specific for the different phases of Cyrus' titulary. Thus these two texts provide us with a connected series of three titles: 1) "Nabonidus, King of Babylon," 2) "Cyrus, King of Lands" at the beginning of his 1st year, and 3) "Cyrus, King of Babylon, King of Lands" at the end of his 1st year. This sequence of titles gives additional support to the outline of Cyrus' titulary noted by Gray and Olmstead in their comments quoted at the beginning of this section. Their observations have been amply confirmed by the overall re-examination of the titles in the texts presented here. This examination of the materials presented here illustrates one main point—that the change of titles that occurred in the business documents from the first two years of Cyrus in Babylonia represents a very real transition in his titulary. This conclusion brings us to the most important question that can be asked about this transition in the titulary: what political significance does it have for the history of Babylonia in the 6th century B.C.?

The particular object in question here is the title to the throne of Babylon. Obviously, only two alternatives are possible in regard to the 14 months when the scribes did not ascribe that title to Cyrus. Either he was the official king of Babylon for part or all of that time, or he was not. The first three accession-year texts in Table II enter into the discussion at this point because the title "King of Babylon" is present in the date formulae of all three. The first text in the list (BM 56154) is definitely dated to the 7th month, and it is commonly held that the second text there (*Cyrus* 1) is also dated to the 7th month although the month sign in the text is partially damaged. It should be noted here that any text from the 7th month antedates Cyrus' entry into Babylon, which occurred, according to the Nabonidus Chronicle (III, 18), on the 3d day of the 8th month. It seems very unlikely that Cyrus could have become the official king on the throne of Babylon before he entered Babylon.

A parallel to the dates and titles in these two texts may be

found in the situation at the beginning of the reign of Nabopolassar mentioned in Part I. The Chronicle specifically states that "on the 26th day of the month of Marcheswan [the 8th month], Nabopolassar sat upon the throne of Babylon."<sup>62</sup> However, there is a text from Sippar that is dated "22d of month Elul [the 6th month], accession year of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon."<sup>63</sup> In this case the scribe used the title "King of Babylon" for Nabopolassar two months before the official protocol in Babylon that entitled him to that designation was accomplished. In other words, the scribe used the presumptive title appropriate at the time even though it was not yet officially confirmed. In the case of the two texts mentioned above, one from Sippar and the other from an undetermined location, this happened only a week or two before Cyrus entered Babylon instead of an interval of two months as in the case of Nabopolassar.

I do not necessarily mean to imply by this parallel that Cyrus was enthroned at the time he entered the city. It is interesting to note here that the Nabonidus Chronicle does not say that Cyrus "sat upon the throne in Babylon" as the other Chronicle texts do for the dozen kings of Babylon whose accession is attested during the preceding two centuries.<sup>64</sup> This is the passage in the Nabonidus Chronicle in which one would expect such a report to occur, but it is not present. The fact that the accession-year texts did not use the title "King of Babylon" after that is evidence in favor of the idea that he did not occupy the office at that time.

The other text from Cyrus' accession year that has the title "King of Babylon" clearly written in the titulary is

<sup>62</sup> *CCK*, p. 51.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 94.

<sup>64</sup> The Babylonian Chronicle (see *CCK*, p. 1, n. 1 for a bibliography) contains ten or eleven such references (the text is damaged in the case of Shalmaneser V). It also mentions that Ashur-nadin-shumi was placed on the throne of Babylon by Sennacherib and that Nergal-ushezib was placed on the throne there by Hallushu, the king of Elam. Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar II are the other two kings whose accessions are attested in these terms, *CCK*, pp. 51, 69.

*NBRVT* 21. Unfortunately, the month date in this text is completely obliterated, so the month in which it was written is not known. By hypothesis, it has been placed with the other two texts from the accession year that contain the title "King of Babylon," which makes it third in the list and dates it to the time before Cyrus entered Babylon. There is no way to verify the date suggested for this text here, but the fact that it comes from Borsippa makes it more feasible than if it came from Babylon itself or a city in southern Babylonia.

At any rate, the accession-year texts are not nearly as important here as the texts from Cyrus' 1st year, because it could be argued that he waited until New Year's to sit upon the throne in Babylon. Indeed, it appears as if a scribe in Uruk expected him to do so, for the title "King of Babylon" is used for Cyrus in a text from that city that is dated to the 4th day of the 1st month of his 1st year (*RECC* 5). However, according to the information we have about the *Akitu*-festival, the king made his appearance in Babylon on the 5th day of the feast which was also the 5th day of Nisanu, the 1st month of the year. This was the day on which the priest invested the king with the insignia of kingship. Since this text from Uruk is dated to the day before that event ordinarily would have taken place, it may be that the scribe wrote this title in the text expecting Cyrus to take the office and title at that time. The time it took for the news to travel from Babylon to Uruk may also be a factor here. Another possibility is that this title is simply a scribal error. Through the years of the Chaldean kings the scribes had become accustomed to write the title "King of Babylon" on their tablets. The scribe who wrote this text less than six months after the fall of Babylon may have lapsed into this older convention, and consequently have written the older title "King of Babylon" in place of Cyrus' newer title "King of Lands" in error. The text would be more significant if it contained the dual titulary.



The texts from the 1st year of Cyrus are the texts that are really critical in this regard, for the next 15 texts in Table II dated after *RECC* 5 all use the standard titulary from the accession period, "King of Lands." If Cyrus had become the official king of Babylon at the turn of the year, one would expect the economic texts written thereafter to have taken up the title to that office, but they did not. The length of time texts continued the title "King of Lands" (nine months) is just about twice as long as the corresponding period of the accession year (five months), and the number of texts from the 1st year (19) is proportionally larger than the number of such texts from the accession year (ten). This is the really important fact, that for the first nine months of his 1st full year as ruler over Babylonia, Cyrus does not carry the title to the throne of Babylon in texts written there. If this evidence is significant, and the materials presented previously in this study seem to indicate that it is, then we must choose the second solution to the problem posed above *i.e.*, that Cyrus did not become the official king of Babylon until approximately the 10th month of his 1st year, when the business documents take up that title for him.

The time when the transition in the titulary took place is also interesting. We might expect the change to take place in the 1st month of the next year, but instead it occurred during the last months of Cyrus' 1st year. The case of Bardiya may provide a possible parallel to the mechanism by which this change in the titulary took place. Bardiya revolted in Persia just two weeks before New Year's in the spring of 522. Since news of his claim to kingship did not reach Babylonia until after New Year's when the first official year of the new king would ordinarily have begun, some scribes followed the standard procedure and began to date their tablets to the accession year of Bardiya, "King of Babylon, King of Lands," but as Poebel notes,

Other officials, however, who may possibly have feared to incur the displeasure of the new king by using this mode of [accession

year] dating—it could of course be construed as casting some doubt on the legal position of the king during that year—found a way out of this difficulty by dating their documents not after Bardia as king of Babylon but simply after [the first year of] Bardia as “king of the lands,” i.e., king of Persia and the other provinces. . . .<sup>65</sup>

The use of different dating methods, however, could not go on for any longer time, and actually we notice that from the second half of the fourth month there is used a uniform formula designating the year 522/21 as “first year of Bardia, king of Babylon and king of the lands,” a formula of the same type as that used during the reigns of Cyrus and Cambyses.<sup>66</sup>

Poebel suggested that this change was instituted through a royal decree:

Apparently the change came about in what may be called the usual manner. The Persian authorities in Babylon simply invoked the decision of the Persian king, and Bardia or rather his ministers decreed that the foregoing formula should be used.<sup>67</sup>

Cameron proposed a similar origin for the first change in Xerxes' titulary:

In all the documents from the accession year through the first three months of the first year Xerxes' title is “King of Babylon, King of the Lands,” with a minor variation. In the fifth month of the first year came word—no doubt by royal decree—that the title was to be changed. . . . Thereafter, through the fourth month of the fourth year, the title is always “King of Persia, Media, King of Babylon and the Lands” (with minor variants).<sup>68</sup>

The two changes in the titulary described above occurred near the middle of the calendar year, and Poebel and Cameron suggest that they both came about by royal decree. With these cases in mind, it seems reasonable to suggest that the change in Cyrus' titulary that occurred toward the end of his 1st year as ruler over Babylonia also came about by a royal decree.

If the interpretation proposed here is correct and Cyrus

<sup>65</sup> Poebel, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 125-126.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 126.

<sup>68</sup> Cameron, *op. cit.*, pp. 323, 324.

was not the official king of Babylon for these 14 months, then the next question logically is, why was he not? Again, our alternatives are rather limited, for there are only two possible answers to this question: either 1) Cyrus left the throne of Babylon vacant for this length of time, *i.e.*, there was an interregnum, or 2) someone else was the official "King of Babylon" for at least part of that time and ruled there as a vassal to Cyrus, "King of Lands." While interregna did occur on occasion in Babylon, it is not feasible to present a comprehensive examination of the circumstances surrounding them in connection with this study.

Suffice it to say that an interregnum would have been most unusual at this time—right after the conquest—when Babylon changed hands, not only from one king to another, but from Chaldean control to the Persians. An interregnum here would mean that the throne of Babylon was vacant right at the time when the new administration of the land was being set up, when Persian control of the country was being established. A king is actually the ultimate in this kind of activity and organization, and as Poebel says, "In Babylonia . . . officially the Persian monarch ruled only as king of Babylon . . ." <sup>69</sup> In addition, one might expect the Nabonidus Chronicle to mention the fact that "there was no king in the land" as is recorded in the Chronicle texts that report the two previous cases.<sup>70</sup> In contrast to Xerxes, Cyrus obviously was not opposed to the traditions of kingship in Babylon, since he continued them by taking the title to that throne late in 538. But the question remains, why did he wait so long when it could only have been in the interest of political stability to have filled that office earlier? This brings the second alternative to the present problem into focus: perhaps he did fill the office—with somebody else!

<sup>69</sup> Poebel, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

<sup>70</sup> Between Kandalanu and Nabopolassar, *CCK*, p. 51; and for the eight years of Sennacherib (688-681) between Mushezib-Marduk and Esarhaddon, *ANET*, p. 302.

Since the title "King of Babylon" is conspicuous by its absence during this period, the title that Cyrus did carry at that time should be scrutinized to see if it supplies any clues that help to solve this problem. In this case, instead of using the royal title used by the Chaldean kings just before Cyrus, the scribes harked back to a title that had not been used regularly in the economic texts for almost a century, since the time of Ashurbanipal. Aside from the situation under study here, seven cases came to view in the course of this study in which the title "King of Lands" was used alone in the titulary of the Babylonian business documents from the first millennium B.C. The first two cases for consideration are interesting but not politically significant, since they are sporadic and isolated occurrences. This title is found in two texts from the times of Esarhaddon and Sin-shar-ishkun respectively, but other titles were used more commonly for these kings in the texts dated to them.

The next two cases represent a more general use of the title. From the 5th of year Xerxes on, "King of Lands" was the standard royal titulary in the Babylonian texts from the remaining years of the Achaemenid period, and it is briefly attested at the beginning of the Hellenistic period. However, these two cases do not present any parallel with the early titulary of Cyrus because the title "King of Babylon" had been abandoned in these two cases, whereas Cyrus took up that title after only 14 months had lapsed. The fifth case in which the title "King of Lands" was used alone is found in some of the early texts of Bardiya. These texts present a problem in chronology that stems from the problem of communications between Persia and Babylon.<sup>71</sup> The title "King of Lands" was used by some scribes in dating tablets to him during the first few months of the calendar year, but the matter was straightened out shortly after that when the title was standardized to the customary dual titulary that was used for Cyrus and Cambyses before him. This case does

<sup>71</sup> Poebel, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-126.

not provide any parallel with the one under consideration because the 14 months Cyrus used that title far exceeds the time span involved in the use of this title in the case of Bardiya, and the Cyrus texts date from more than four months before New Year's and as much as nine months after it.

The last two cases of the seven are the most important ones to be considered here, for they are the only cases out of the seven that may possibly provide a parallel to explain the early titulary of Cyrus. The two cases, both well-documented, come from the late 7th and late 6th centuries—the Ashurbanipal texts and the texts with the titularies from the coregency of Cyrus and Cambyses. In both cases a vassal king of Babylon plays a relevant part of the picture presented by the title "King of Lands," Kandalanu in the former case and Cambyses in the latter. These are the only cases found among the seven instances of the use of the title "King of Lands" in the Babylonian texts of the first millennium B.C. that can possibly provide any parallel to the use of that title in this case. This is not to say that these two possible parallels prove that the use of the titulary "King of Lands" during the 1st year of Cyrus necessarily implies a vassal king of Babylon, but they make it a reasonable working hypothesis, and the other five instances in which the title was used are no help at all.

This brings us to a summary of the specific evidence from the economic texts presented in this section. The first and most important point here is that the texts that date from the time when Cyrus entered Babylon after the conquest to the end of the 9th month of his 1st full year make it quite clear that the standard titulary used for him during that period was "King of Lands." The titles that appear to diverge from this practice have tentatively been accounted for in the foregoing discussion. This new title of Cyrus represents an abrupt and striking departure from the title "King of Babylon," the standard title used for Nabonidus and the kings of Babylon for a century before him. The textual

evidence also points out the fact that this title of Cyrus contrasts clearly with the full titular "King of Babylon, King of Lands" that was used for him throughout the rest of his reign, beginning in the last months of his 1st year. Not one example of the dual titular was encountered in the course of this survey of the texts that can definitely be dated to this 14-month period.

The conclusion from the basic data presented by the titles in the texts is that this period of 14 months during which Cyrus did not carry the title to the throne of Babylon represents a very real gap in his titular. In other words, Cyrus did not become the official "King of Babylon" until late in his first full year as "King of Lands." The suggestion that an interregnum intervened at this time is basically an argument from silence, but lacking more positive evidence to the contrary it cannot be completely ruled out. Of the two possibilities presented to explain this phenomenon in the titular, the more reasonable of the two is the inference from the title "King of Lands" that someone else was "King of Babylon" for at least part of that time. This is suggested by the possible parallels in the use of the title "King of Lands" which may be outlined in a series with this case:

647-627 B.C. — Ashurbanipal,	King of Lands,	Kandalanu,	King of Babylon
539-538 B.C. — Cyrus,	King of Lands,	?	King of Babylon
530-529 B.C. — Cyrus,	King of Lands,	Cambyses,	King of Babylon

The most reasonable interpretation of the evidence presented thus far leads to the working hypothesis that there was a king in Babylon vassal to Cyrus for a short time after the fall of Babylon, 539-538. One might say—to borrow a phrase—if the cuneiform materials did not identify him for us, we would be obliged to postulate him. However, it appears that we are not left to mere postulations in this case. The specific identification can be made, in the opinion of this observer, on the basis of a careful examination of the Nabonidus Chronicle. The examination of this important historical document follows in the next section. (To be continued)