

AN UNRECOGNIZED VASSAL KING OF BABYLON IN THE EARLY ACHAEMENID PERIOD

WILLIAM H. SHEA

Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, West Indies

*Introduction**

One by one the problems posed by the changes in the royal title used in the legal and economic texts from Babylonia during the Achaemenid period have been resolved through the studies of several investigators. Cameron connected the elimination of the designation "King of Babylon" from the titulary with Xerxes' reaction to the revolts of Bel-shimanni and Shamash-eriba.¹ This change in Xerxes' title occurred in his 5th year, and from that time on to the end of Achaemenid control over Babylonia, "King of Lands" was the standard title used in the economic documents of all of his successors. Dubber-

*The following abbreviations are used in this article in addition to those listed on the back cover: A = Asiatic collection in the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago; *AnOr* = *Analecta Orientalia*; *BE* = *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania. Series A: Cuneiform Texts*; BM = British Museum; *BR* = San Nicolo, M., *Babylonische Rechts-Urkunden des ausgehenden 8. und des 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (1951); *BRLM* = *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan* (1912, 1913); *CCK* = Wiseman, D. J., *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings* (1956); *MAOG* = *Mitteilungen der altorientalischen Gesellschaft*; *NBRVT* = Krückmann, O., *Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungstexte* (1933); *NT* = Nippur Text; *PDBC* = Parker, R. A. and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.-A.D. 75* (1956); *PHB* = Brinkman, J. A., *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia 1158-722 B.C.* (1968); *SANET* = *The Ancient Near East: Supplementary Texts and Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. by J. B. Pritchard (1969); *SSB* = Kugler, F. X., *Sternkunde und Sternendienst in Babel* (1907-1935); *TCL XII-XIII* = Contenau, G., *Contrats Neo-Babyloniens* (1927-1929); *UET IV* = Figulla, H. H., *Ur Excavations, Texts IV* (1949); *VAS* = *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler* (1907-1917).

¹G. G. Cameron, "Darius and Xerxes in Babylonia," *AJSL*, LVIII (1941), 324.

stein clarified the matter of the titles on the tablets that point out the existence of a coregency between Cyrus and Cambyses.² The accession of Darius I and the events connected with it present an especially complex problem in this period. While studies on this subject continue,³ Poebel's collection of the economic texts dated to Bardiya, Nebuchadrezzar III, Nebuchadrezzar IV, and Darius' accession year⁴ remains the most extensive and useful correlation of these texts with the events chronicled in the Behistun inscription. Poebel's texts are listed by both date and royal title, and the importance of the addition of the title "King of Babylon" to Bardiya's titulary is stressed in his work.⁵

Although the number of texts available that are dated to the rival claimants to the throne mentioned above is not large, and there are some exceptions to the rule in the use of their titulary, it still is clear from the data collected by Cameron, Poebel, and Goetze⁶ that the standard title the Babylonian scribes used in dating documents to them all was "King of Babylon, King of Lands." It is also clear from the large corpus of materials available⁷ that "King of Babylon, King of Lands" was the standard titulary used in the economic documents throughout the reigns of Cyrus, Cambyses, and Darius I with but one significant exception. The one exception is the change in the titulary that took place early in the reign of Cyrus. The documentation for this problem in the titulary is presented

² W. H. Dubberstein, "The Chronology of Cyrus and Cambyses," *AJSL*, LV (1938), 417-419.

³ R. T. Hallock, "The 'One Year' of Darius I," *JNES*, XIX (1960), 36-39.

⁴ A. Poebel, "The Duration of the Reign of Smerdis, the Magian, and the Reigns of Nebuchadrezzar III and Nebuchadrezzar IV," *AJSL*, LVI (1939), 121-145.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 122-126.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 123; Cameron, *op. cit.*, p. 235. "There is at Yale a group of [17] texts [dated to Nebuchadrezzar IV] . . . giving the king the title *šar Bābili ū mātāti*." A. Goetze, "Additions to Parker and Dubberstein's Babylonian Chronology," *JNES*, III (1944), 45.

⁷ One part of this corpus of texts is discussed in the forthcoming Part III of this article.

below. This interesting and little-noted transition in the royal title at the end of Cyrus' 1st regnal year in Babylon is the first line of cuneiform evidence offered in support of the hypothesis proposed here—that a king vassal to Cyrus occupied the throne in Babylon for a short time after the Persian conquest. The second line of evidence discussed—a re-examination of the Nabonidus Chronicle—is complementary to the first, for it is suggested here that the resolution of the problem of the political implications of the early change in Cyrus' titulary may be found in that document when a few minor misinterpretations are corrected.

I. *The General Evidence from the Economic Texts*

To gain an understanding of the significance of the royal titles in the texts of the Achaemenid period, it is worthwhile to review the precedents in scribal practice in this regard. This involves a survey of the titulary in the Babylonian economic texts through the better part of the first millennium B.C. A preliminary survey of this type is presented here to emphasize the nature of the evidence in the study of the early Achaemenid titulary that follows. The titles dealt with in this section are taken from legal, administrative, economic, and some religious (offering) texts from the large corpus known of ordinary, everyday Neo-Babylonian business documents. The royal titles in the business documents customarily appear in the date formula that is usually found at the end of the text. These titles contrast to some extent with the more expansive and laudatory titles employed in the royal inscriptions. Various titles of the king are attested in the royal inscriptions for centuries during which the Babylonian scribes simply used the title "King" (*šarru/LUGAL*) after the personal name of the monarch mentioned in the business documents. According to the evidence currently available, it was not until the middle of the 8th century that any of the other royal titles came into use in the economic texts. From that point on, the titulary and the changes it underwent serve us as useful pieces of historical

information that help, at times, to determine or confirm some aspects of the political situation. The observations made here on the use of the royal titles in the first millennium B.C. are naturally quite tentative. More final conclusions on the subject must await the appearance of further relevant texts that are known but not yet published, and possibly the recovery of more such texts from the Near East.

At the outset we are confronted with the perennial problem of the chance survival and recovery of the materials, for documentation of this type from the early part of the first millennium is very sparse. In spite of the comprehensive nature of his examination of the sources, Brinkman was able to collect only two legal texts and fourteen administrative texts that date from the middle of the 11th century to the middle of the 8th century (before Nabonassar).⁸ However, the documentation that we do have points out the fact that the standard title in the business documents through this period, where attested, was simply "King"—written either LUGAL or LUGAL.E, but never LUGAL E^{kl}.⁹ An interesting exception in this group is the title from a legal text that comes from the end of the 9th century. It is known from a Neo-Babylonian copy recovered in the excavations at Nippur (4 NT 3). The tablet bears the title "King of the Lands of Sumer and Akkad," written LUGAL

⁸ *PHB*, p. 7.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 97, 116, 123, 224, etc. The problem of when and how E^{kl} came into use as a designation for Babylon is of some interest here as a peripheral part of the subject under study. Brinkman suggests that "This formula . . . was handed down from the economic text tradition of the Kassite period and probably derived ultimately from a misunderstanding of LUGAL.E in the date formulae of the Old Babylonian period. LUGAL.E continued to be used as an epithet for Babylonian kings down into the early days of the Chaldean dynasty, when the Neo-Babylonian scribes seem to have reinterpreted E as a geographical name referring to Babylon and to have added the determinative KI behind it. . . . When E first came to stand for 'Babylon' is uncertain, but the adding of the determinative seems to have originated in the late seventh century." In n. 1021 Brinkman notes that E^{kl} is first attested in a text from Borsippa dated to the first year of Nebuchadrezzar II. *Ibid.*, pp. 167, 168.

KUR.KUR *šu-me-ri ù ak-kad-i*.¹⁰ The title is a very old one, of course, but its appearance in the titulary of a legal text here is unusual, and the form in which it is written is not the most common. The writing resembles that of the title commonly used later, "King of Lands" (LUGAL KUR.KUR), which may have influenced the copyist.

The first statistically significant group of texts available comes from the reign of Nabonassar (747-734). It consists of 18 administrative texts (*BRLM* 4-21) that date from year one to 14. Long ago Kugler noted that the title "King of Babylon" came into use in the business documents for the first time with these texts.¹¹ This is not to say, however, that it came into standard use at that time. Actually, only one (*BRLM* 10) of the 18 texts contains this title in its complete form of LUGAL TIN.TIR^{k1}. One other text (*BRLM* 20) has essentially the same thing, lacking only the determinative KI. These are the only texts in the group that use the title "King of Babylon." Of the remaining texts, the title LUGAL is found in ten, four more have LUGAL.E, and in two the personal name of the king is written without any accompanying title. The few administrative texts from the brief reign of Tiglath-pileser III on the Babylonian throne (728-727) are similar to the preceding texts in that the title "King of Babylon" is not used in them. They customarily use the king's name in the date formula without any royal title (*TCL* XII, 1-3).

Unfortunately, the survey of the titles from the texts of Merodach-baladan II presented here is incomplete. These remarks are based upon information from only one-third of the 18 business documents known from his reign.¹² However,

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

¹¹ *SSB*, II. Buch, 11. Teil, 2. Heft, p. 403.

¹² I wish to acknowledge here that I am deeply indebted to Professor J. A. Brinkman for the use of his unpublished bibliography of the Babylonian economic texts from the period 721-626 B.C. His future publication of these materials will undoubtedly shed considerable illumination on this portion of ancient Near Eastern history. The statistics of comparison here and elsewhere in Part I of this study are based upon that bibliography.

it does appear that his reign was a very important juncture in terms of the transitions in the titulary, for the data suggest that it was during his reign that the title "King of Babylon" came into regular use in the economic texts. Five of the six texts surveyed apply that title to him. The title from the other text is cited by Brinkman,¹³ and since it comes from the period after the Assyrians had expelled Merodach-baladan from Babylon, it naturally differs from the titles in the texts that were written while he ruled there. Perhaps the most important text in the Merodach-baladan group in this respect is the first one (*BM* 98562). It is dated to the 17th day of the 8th month of his 1st year and it carries the title "King of Babylon" (LUGAL TIN.TIR^{ki}).¹⁴ The reason for this change in the titulary is not clear. Possibly the texts took up the title at this time to stress Merodach-baladan's claim to the throne, since he was not a legitimate successor to Shalmaneser V, or perhaps it came into use to emphasize the contrast between him and the two Assyrian kings who occupied the throne of Babylon just before him.

One of the texts that turned up in the recent excavations at Nippur contains a title that is very pertinent at this point. It is dated to the 24th day of the 6th month in the accession year of Sargon II, and the titulary in the text is "King of Babylon," written LUGAL KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki} (2 NT 280).¹⁵ Aside from the

¹³ "UET 4 206 (= UET 1 261) is dated 11-X, year 22 of [Mar]-duk-apla-iddina, *mār ri-du-tu*. *Mār (bīt) rīdūti* in both Assyria and Babylonia ordinarily denotes the crown prince of the ruling monarch, but there is no question of that meaning here. The twenty-second year of Merodach-baladan (if we count consecutively from his first official regnal year in 721) would fall in 700, the year of his last stand in the south against Sennacherib. A possible interpretation might be advanced that the people of Ur, though realizing that Merodach-baladan no longer legitimately bore the title king (since 703), still wished to append some royal title after the name of the individual so long in charge of their city and chose this anomalous designation rather than that of king." Brinkman, Merodach-baladan II," *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim* (Chicago, 1964), p. 16.

¹⁴ I am indebted to Professor D. J. Wiseman for supplying me with the title from this tablet in a letter dated Dec. 10, 1969.

¹⁵ Brinkman kindly called this tablet and its title to my attention.

rarity of such documents dated to Sargon, the titulary in this text is rather unique. It is the only case that was encountered in this study of the titularies of the Babylonian business documents from the 8th and 7th centuries in which the Assyrian king directly carries the title to the Babylonian throne. In addition, the form of the name used for Babylon in the titulary is quite unusual in this context. The name of Babylon in these titularies is most frequently written $TIN.TIR^{ki}$, and E^{ki} is fairly common, but $KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki}$ is rarely used in this connection in Neo-Babylonian texts. It is more commonly employed in the royal inscriptions, especially those from Assyria.

Very few texts are known from the four short reigns between Sargon II and Sennacherib. However, Bel-ibni, Ashur-nadin-shumi, and Mushezib-Marduk are represented by at least one text each in which they carry the title "King of Babylon." The problems involved in the relationship of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon to Babylon and the kingship there lie outside the scope of this study. In passing, we can only observe the titles used by the Babylonian scribes who wrote the business documents of that era. The title "King of Babylon" is conspicuous by its absence from these texts, but the problem of a relative scarcity of materials occurs again in this period. Only three texts of this type are known from the time of Sennacherib, and the titles of the two that were checked both refer to him as "King of Assyria." Texts dated to Esarhaddon are a bit more plentiful. As in the case of Sennacherib, two of these texts use the title "King of Assyria," but five more simply have "King." An additional interesting and significant title occurs in an unpublished text in the Oriental Institute (A 3674) that is dated to the 8th year of Esarhaddon. Although the first sign of the title is damaged, it is evident that the title in the text is "King of Lands" ($LUGAL KUR.KUR$). This is the earliest instance recognized in this study in which this designation is used in the titulary of a Babylonian business document.

The accession of Shamash-shum-ukin to the throne of Baby-

lon begins a new period in terms of the study of this subject, for this is the first reign from which a fairly large number of texts are available to document the titulary. Excluding the texts with illegible titles, one-half of the texts known from his reign were checked (40 out of 80). Geographically speaking, the majority of these 40 texts come from Babylon and Borsippa, but Ur, Uruk, and Nippur are also adequately represented among them. Chronologically the texts range from his 2d to his 20th year. Since "King of Babylon" is the only title found in the date formulae of all 40 of the texts that were checked, we have a fairly clear picture of the titulary used for him. From this it may be concluded that the standard titulary used for Shamash-shum-ukin in the economic texts from the various cities of Babylonia throughout the period when he controlled them was "King of Babylon." ¹⁶

Almost 100 business documents are known from the reign of Kandalanu, and one-fourth of them were surveyed for their titularies. In general, these titles are similar to those in the Shamash-shum-ukin texts. Twenty-one of the Kandalanu texts checked have the titulary "King of Babylon," the title is damaged and illegible in two more, and one text does not have any title written after the king's name. However, all of these titles are found in texts that come from Babylon or Borsippa. Only 14 of the 100 texts from Kandalanu's reign are definitely known to come from any other location than Babylon and its neighboring cities, and they all come from Uruk. Almost all of these texts from Uruk are unpublished; consequently Kandalanu's title in the economic texts from that site is not well known. It is significant, however, that the Uruk texts are dated all the way through his reign; as Dubberstein observes, "Other texts show Kandalanu the recognized ruler of Uruk from his second to his twenty-first year." ¹⁷ At any rate, it may safely be said that the economic texts from

¹⁶ For his period of control over them see Dubberstein, "Assyrian-Babylonian Chronology (669-612 B.C.)," *JNES*, III (1944), 38, 39.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

the cities of the north regularly apply the standard titular "King of Babylon" to him.

The problem of the Uruk texts of Kandalanu is related to the matter of the texts that are dated to Ashurbanipal. These texts can be divided into two groups on the basis of which Babylonian king they are contemporary with, Shamash-shum-ukin or Kandalanu. The first group of Ashurbanipal texts, those contemporary with the reign of Shamash-shum-ukin, can be subdivided further using the point at which war broke out between Babylonia and Assyria as the dividing line. Only five Babylonian business documents are known that are dated to Ashurbanipal during the first 15 years he ruled in Assyria. The first two are dated to his accession year and his 5th year,¹⁸ but they are unpublished so the titularies used in them are not known. The next text comes from Ashurbanipal's 8th year (2 NT 282), but unfortunately the title is illegible. Surprisingly enough, the last two texts from this early period come from Babylon itself.¹⁹ One is dated to his 8th year and the other to his 9th, and the royal title in both of them is simply "King" (LUGAL). These five texts are the only ones known from the early period of documents dated to Ashurbanipal—texts are rare and titles even rarer.

War broke out in the 16th year of Shamash-shum-ukin (the 17th year of Ashurbanipal),²⁰ and the flow of texts dated to Ashurbanipal begins to increase shortly thereafter, which gives evidence of the Assyrian conquests in the south. Texts begin to appear regularly about his 18th year. Because of the importance of the titles in these texts, they are presented in tabular form below. The first one-third of the texts in this list are contemporary with the last years of Shamash-shum-ukin, the remainder parallel Kandalanu. The list lacks about a dozen known Ashurbanipal texts, but most of these are unpublished and consequently their titularies are not available to be included here.

¹⁸ Goetze, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

¹⁹ MAOG, III:1-2 (1927), 33, 34.

²⁰ Dubberstein, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

TABLE I
 ROYAL TITLES FROM THE
 ECONOMIC TEXTS OF ASHURBANIPAL

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Day</i>	<i>Provenience</i>	<i>Title</i>
<i>BR</i> 53	18	VI	21	Uruk	King of Lands
<i>RA</i> XV 83	19	III	14	Uruk	King of Lands
<i>BM</i> 113929	19	III	23	Uruk	King of Lands
<i>BR</i> 13	20	I	20	Uruk	name only
<i>BM</i> 113928	20	I	29	Ur	King of Lands
<i>AnOr</i> IX 4	20	XII	1	Uruk	King of Lands
2 NT 286	21	XII	25	Nippur	King of Assyria
<i>AnOr</i> IX 13	22	I	20	Uruk	King of Lands
4 NT 19	22	—	8	Nippur	King of Lands
<i>BE</i> VIII 1	26	X	—	Nippur	title damaged
2 NT 288	28	VIII	10	Nippur	King of Lands
2 NT 289	31	VII	9	Nippur	King of the World
<i>TCL</i> XII 5	31	XII	26	Nippur	King of Assyria
<i>BR</i> 58	34	VII	15	Nippur	King of Lands
2 NT 342	36	I	27	Nippur	name only
<i>NBRVT</i> 2/3 132	36	VI	17	Nippur	King of the World
<i>BR</i> 24	36	—	—	Nippur	title damaged
<i>BR</i> 59	32 + x	XII	15	Nippur	King of Lands
<i>UET</i> IV 23	—	I	26	Ur	King of Lands
<i>BE</i> VIII 159	—	II	—	Nippur	King of Lands

The first notable feature of the list is the fact that six of the first eight texts come from Uruk, but none come from Uruk after that. Dubberstein's comment on these texts is, "These documents indicate that Assur-bani-apal held Uruk from the time of its capture in the spring of 649 until after the final Assyrian victory in the summer of 648. Thereupon Kandalanu was appointed king of Babylon, and Uruk remained under his control until he was succeeded in 626 by Nabopolassar."²¹ At the time these observations were made, the earliest of these Uruk texts known to me was *BR* 13, dated to the 1st month of Ashurbanipal's 20th year. However, from the list we know of three earlier texts from Uruk, two from his 19th year and another from his 18th. There is also another such text not

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 39, 40.

included in the list that dates to the 2d month of his 18th year,²² which is four months earlier than the first text listed above. On the basis of this additional information, it may now be suggested that Ashurbanipal was already in control of part (if not all) of southern Babylonia as early as the spring of 651—less than six months after the war started.²³

The transition point at which Ashurbanipal gave Uruk over to Kandalanu can also be determined a bit more precisely. Kandalanu's 1st regnal year covered the same Babylonian calendar year as Ashurbanipal's 22d, 647/6.²⁴ The last Uruk text in the list above is dated to the 20th day of the 1st month of Ashurbanipal's 22d year. The last known Ashurbanipal text from Uruk is unpublished. It is dated to the 12th day of the 4th month in the same 22d year, but it has not been included in the list because the titulary in it is not known. The first published text from the reign of Kandalanu is dated to the 6th day of the 10th month in his 1st year, and it comes from Babylon (*VAS* V, 3). However, there is an unpublished Kandalanu text that is dated to the 22d day of the 6th month of his 1st year, and coincidentally it comes from Uruk.²⁵ It would appear from this information that it was some time after Kandalanu was already established on the throne of Babylon—between the 4th and 6th months of his 1st regnal year—that Uruk changed hands and was added to his realm.

The extent of the territory directly under Kandalanu's rule beyond Babylon and its neighboring cities is not well known. Dubberstein points out that "If the evidence of the economic texts may be trusted, the rule of Kandalanu was somewhat

²² Listed in Brinkman's unpublished bibliography for the period.

²³ "War broke out between Babylonia and Assyria on the nineteenth day, tenth month, sixteenth year of Shamash-shum-ukin's reign [seventeenth year of Assur-bani-apal], January 2 or 31, 651 B.C." Dubberstein, *op. cit.*, p. 39. The tablet referred to in n. 22 was written just three months after the outbreak of the war (II, 15), and the first tablet in Table I is dated four months after that (VI, 21).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

²⁵ Both of these references are taken from Brinkman's unpublished bibliography.

less extensive than that of Shamash-shum-ukin.”²⁶ Thus far only Uruk and Nippur have supplied information that is relevant in this regard. As already noted, Uruk went over to the rule of Kandalanu not long after the war ended. Nippur, on the other hand, continued to be connected with the Assyrian king. The list above and the data discussed from the Kandalanu texts combine to point out the fact that “All known texts of this period originating at Nippur are dated to Assurbani-apal; none recognizes Kandalanu.”²⁷ However, Nippur remained an Assyrian stronghold in Babylonia even for a number of years after Ashurbanipal’s death, so the situation there is not very useful to us in trying to clarify the relationship of the rest of central and southern Babylonia to Kandalanu during his reign.

Assyriological opinion has alternated from time to time as to whether Ashurbanipal and Kandalanu were two separate individuals or one and the same with the latter name serving as Ashurbanipal’s Babylonian throne name. It is readily apparent from the preceding remarks that the interpretation accepted in this study is the one that looks on them as two separate individuals. Furthermore, it is suggested here that their respective titles in the economic texts add another small piece of evidence in support of this view. Even though the Ashurbanipal texts and the Kandalanu texts are contemporaneous, they are quite distinct in several respects: 1) Chronology—there is a sharp transition point between the two kings in the Uruk texts; 2) Geography—Nippur is set in contrast with Babylon, Borsippa, Sippar, and Uruk; 3) Titulary—the titles of the two kings are never confused in the texts. The standard title that Kandalanu regularly carries there is “King of Babylon.” Three different titles are present in the Ashurbanipal texts listed above, but “King of Babylon” is not one of them. “King of the World” (*šar kiššati/šú*) is found in two titularies, “King of Assyria” also appears twice, but a dozen texts have the title

²⁶ Dubberstein, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

“King of Lands”—which makes it essentially the standard titulary used for Ashurbanipal in Babylonia.

The titulary produced by combining the standard titularies of these two kings is “Kandalanu, King of Babylon, Ashurbanipal, King of Lands,” but since this composite title is not attested in any one text, it can still be argued that the two names apply to the same individual and that they were used with their appropriate titles only in the geographic area to which they pertained. However, the contrast here is considerably more evident when comparison is made with analogic materials from the Achaemenid period.²⁸ Such a composite titulary is attested at that time in nine texts dated to year one of “Cambyses, King of Babylon, Cyrus, King of Lands.” In this case the two names with their respective titles unquestionably represent two individuals. The picture this titulary presents is that of Cyrus the king of the Persian empire as suzerain with his son Cambyses the king of Babylon vassal to him. There are also texts from the same year that are dated to each of them individually. Furthermore, in the cases in which the same individual held title to both offices, without exception only one personal name is used with the two titles, *i.e.*, “Cyrus (Cambyses, Darius, Xerxes), King of Babylon, King of Lands.”

It seems reasonable to assume that these titles were used in essentially the same sense in the 7th century as they were in the 6th. It is very possible, even probable, that the 6th-century scribes patterned their use of these titles after the practice of their predecessors. If this assumption is correct, then the data from these titularies go a considerable distance toward confirming the idea that Ashurbanipal and Kandalanu were two different persons. More than this, their titles in the economic texts may also say something about the relationship between them. It is well known, especially from the vassal treaties,²⁹ that Esarhaddon’s intention was to have his kingdom divided

²⁸ Discussed in Part II of this study that will appear in the next number of the *AUSS*.

²⁹ D. J. Wiseman, “The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon,” *Iraq*, XX (1958), 1-99; see also *SANET*, pp. 98-105.

between Ashurbanipal and Shamash-shum-ukin, with the Assyrian throne going to the former and the throne of Babylon to the latter. In practice this arrangement did not work out well. It culminated in war between them which concluded with the subjugation of Babylon to Assyria once more. As in the case of Cyrus and Cambyses, the titles "Ashurbanipal, King of Lands," and "Kandalanu, King of Babylon" nicely express the suzerain-vassal relationship between them that was not necessarily in effect in the previous case of Ashurbanipal and Shamash-shum-ukin. Ashurbanipal's title "King of Lands" (= king of the Assyrian empire) serves to emphasize the subordinate position of Kandalanu, a position to which Ashurbanipal undoubtedly relegated him in the hopes of preventing a repetition of the Shamash-shum-ukin affair.

By way of contrast with Ashurbanipal's title "King of Lands," the standard title in the Babylonian business documents dated to Ashur-etil-ilani, Sin-shum-lishir, and Sin-shar-ishkun is simply "King of Assyria." One-half of the dozen economic texts known, that date to Ashur-etil-ilani, were checked for this study. The title is damaged in two of these texts (*BE* VIII 4,6), and no title is written after the king's name in one (*BR* 63), but three texts have "King of Assyria" (*BR* 60, 61, 80). The one text checked for Sin-shum-lishir (*BE* VIII 141) also has "King of Assyria" in the titulary. All seven of these texts come from Nippur. About 50 Sin-shar-ishkun texts are known and one-third of them were surveyed for their titles. Fourteen have the titulary "King of Assyria." Ten of the texts with this title come from Nippur and the other four come from Babylon (accession year), Sippar (2d year), and Uruk (6th and 7th years). Two exceptions to the rule were encountered. The title "King of the World" appears in an accession-year text from Sippar (*BM* 57149) and, interestingly enough, one Nippur text has Ashurbanipal's old title "King of Lands" (2 NT 299). Outside of the Ashurbanipal texts and one text from the time of Esarhaddon, this is the only other text from the 7th century encountered in this study that

has the title "King of Lands." The change in the title from Ashurbanipal to the later Assyrian kings may have come about because of Assyria's decline at the time. The title "King of Assyria" could always be used as long as there was an Assyria, even if the title to an empire ("King of Lands") was no longer appropriate.

More important for our consideration here is what happened to the titulary in Babylon, and the point is that it remained unchanged. A minor problem here is the small gap that occurred between Kandalanu and Nabopolassar. Kandalanu died sometime between May and November, 627.³⁰ According to the Chronicle, Nabopolassar "sat upon the throne in Babylon" on the 26th day of the 8th month, November 22/23 626.³¹ The Chronicle refers to this interval with the remark "for one year there was no king in the land."³² Three interesting business documents are known that date to this short period. The first is dated to the 8th month (day missing) of the 21st year "after Kandalanu" (BM 36514).³³ Obviously, this text was written after Kandalanu's death in what normally would have been the accession period of the next king on the throne. However, since nobody succeeded to the Babylonian throne in that calendar year it remained simply the period "after Kandalanu." The part of the line after Kandalanu's name in this text is broken away, but it probably was not long enough to include the title "King of Babylon." A similar text from this same period (BM 40039)³⁴ is dated a year later, to the 2d day of the 8th month of the 22d year "after Kandalanu," or just three and one-half weeks before Nabopolassar ascended the throne. It is interesting to note that Kandalanu's name still carries the title "King of Babylon" with it in the date formula of this text even though it is posthumous.

³⁰ *CCK*, p. 90.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 93.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 51.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 89 and Pl. XXI.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 89 and Pl. XIX.

The third text from the interregnum (BM 49656)³⁵ poses a different problem. This text comes from the temple records of Sippar and it is dated to the 22d day of the 6th month in the accession year of Nabopolassar "King of Babylon." It can readily be seen that this text calls Nabopolassar the king of Babylonia two months before the date the Chronicle says that he sat upon the throne of Babylon. Wiseman's solution to the problem presented by this text is "that Nabopolassar was acknowledged king at least at Sippar which had become independent of Assyria before the final battle at Babylon . . . the recognition of Nabopolassar may have been precipitated by the necessity for Sippar to take sides in the final phase of the struggle for Babylon."³⁶ This date formula with its royal title provides an important parallel to the problem presented by the titles in the earliest texts dated to Cyrus.³⁷ An even earlier text is known from Nabopolassar's reign.³⁸ It is dated to the 2d month of his accession year, or four months before BM 49656, but I do not have the titulary from that text.

The really important feature of Nabopolassar's titulary in the economic texts is the fact that it continues the title "King of Babylon" passed down from Kandalanu and Shamash-shum-ukin. As a matter of fact, the standard titulary for all the Chaldean kings from Nabopolassar to Nabonidus, attested in well over 2000 texts, is the same—"King of Babylon." In other words, aside from the minor problem just discussed, a textual continuum exists from the beginning of Shamash-shum-ukin's reign to the end of Nabonidus' reign—a period of almost 130 years (667-539)—with the standard titulary of "King of Babylon." This fact should be borne in mind when the titulary of Cyrus for 539-537 B.C. is examined in the next section of this study. Thereafter, from 537 (the 2d year of Cyrus) to 481 (the 5th year of Xerxes), it is clear that the standard

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 93, 94 and Pl. XXI.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

³⁷ Discussed in a later installment of this paper.

³⁸ *PDBC*, p. 11.

titulary used in the economic texts was "King of Babylon, King of Lands." At the end of that period, as has been mentioned in the introduction, the title "King of Babylon" was dropped from the titulary, which was reduced to "King of Lands." This title continued in use through the remainder of the Achaemenid period, and even into the reigns of the first two kings of Hellenistic times (TCL XIII 247-249). However, with the breakup of Alexander's kingdom, the pretense to an empire could no longer be maintained and the title "King of Lands" was also dropped. The title that appears most commonly in the Babylonian business documents thereafter is "King." Thus, in essence, the titulary had turned one full cycle from the 8th century when it started out as "King," to the 4th century when it ended up as "King." Various innovations appear in the economic texts from Hellenistic times; accession-year reckoning disappears from Babylonian usage with Alexander,³⁹ dating to the Seleucid era begins with Seleucus I, coregencies show up the Seleucid titularies (A and B, "Kings"), and the title "King of Kings" was subsequently introduced into the titularies of the period, but these subjects cannot be treated here since detailed work on the Seleucid period lies outside the scope of this investigation.

(To be continued)

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 20.