

AN UNRECOGNIZED VASSAL KING OF BABYLON IN THE EARLY ACHAEMENID PERIOD

III*

WILLIAM H. SHEA

Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, West Indies

IV. *A Re-examination of the Nabonidus Chronicle*

I. *Comparative Materials*

Introduction. If a solution to the problem posed by the titulary of Cyrus in the economic texts is to be sought, perhaps it is not unexpected that the answer might be found in the Nabonidus Chronicle, since that text is the most specific historical document known that details the events of the time in question. However, there are several places in this re-consideration of the Nabonidus Chronicle where the practices of the Babylonian scribes who wrote the chronicle texts are examined, and for this reason other chronicle texts besides the Nabonidus Chronicle are referred to in this section. The texts that have been selected for such comparative purposes chronicle events from the two centuries preceding the time of the Nabonidus Chronicle. Coincidentally, the chronicle texts considered here begin with records from the reign of Nabonassar in the middle of the 8th century B.C., the same time when the royal titulary in the economic texts began to show the changes discussed in the earlier part of this study. Although there are gaps in the information available from the chronicles for these two centuries, we are fortunate to have ten texts that chronicle almost one-half of the regnal years from the time of Nabonassar to the time of Cyrus (745-539). The texts utilized in this study of the chronicles are listed in Table V.

* The first two parts of this article were published in *AUSS*, IX (1971), 51-67, 99-128.

TABLE V
THE BABYLONIAN CHRONICLE TEXTS FROM 745 TO 539 B.C.

No.	Reference	Publication	Type	Principal Contents	B.C.
I	BM 92502	Babylonian Chronicle ⁷²	a) Summary	Nabonassar to Sennacherib	745-681
			b) Detail	Reign of Esarhaddon	680-669
II	BM 25091	Esarhaddon Chronicle ⁷³	Extract?	Reign of Esarhaddon	680-669
III	BM 96273	Another Chronicle Text ⁷⁴	Extract	Yrs. 14-18 Shamashshumukin	654-650
IV	BM 86379	Chr. of Years 680-625 ⁷⁵	Extract	Yrs. 16-20 Shamashshumukin	652-648
V	BM 25127	CCK, No. 1	Detail	Yrs. Acc.-3 Nabopolassar	626-623
VI	BM 21901	CCK, No. 2	Detail	Yrs. 10-17 Nabopolassar	616-609
VII	BM 22047	CCK, No. 3	Detail	Yrs. 18-20 Nabopolassar	608-606
VIII	BM 21946	CCK, No. 4	Detail	Yr. 21 of Nabopolassar to Yr. 10 of Nebuchadrezzar	605-595
IX	BM 25124	CCK, No. 5	Detail	Yr. 3 of Neriglissar	557-556
X	BM 35382	Nabonidus Chronicle ⁷⁶	a) Detail	Reign of Nabonidus	555-539
			b) Summary	Early Persian Period	539-?

⁷² An extensive bibliography on this text may be found in *CCK*, p. 1, n. 1. For the purposes of this study I have used the transliteration and translation of F. Delitzsch, "Die Babylonische Chronik", *Abhand. d. Phil.-Hist. Klasse der königl. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* XXV, I (1906), 8ff., in conjunction with the translation of A. L. Oppenheim in *ANET*, pp. 301-303.

⁷³ *BHT*, pp. 12ff. and Pls. 1-3.

⁷⁴ A. R. Millard, "Another Babylonian Chronicle Text," *Iraq*, XXVI (1964), pp. 14-35 and Pl. VII.

⁷⁵ *BHT*, pp. 22-26 and Pl. IV.

⁷⁶ *BHT*, pp. 98-123 and Pls. XI-XIV; Oppenheim's translation appears in *ANET*, pp. 305-307.

Detail Chronicles. The more recently published texts in this corpus of chronicles have added considerably to our knowledge of this type of text. It is now recognized that there are three different types of chronicles among these texts, and they have been classified accordingly in Table V. The most common type of text in the list is the Detail Chronicle which is best represented by the texts published by Wiseman in *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings*. These texts are written on small single-columned tablets that employ catch-lines to indicate the sequence of the texts. The detailed events described in this type of chronicle are often military in character, and they are customarily arranged in a consecutive year-by-year format. The entries for the various years are labeled according to the regnal years of the ruling king and they are ruled off by lines drawn across the tablet between them. The events recounted for the individual years are also commonly listed according to their consecutive and respective day and/or month dates.

Extract Chronicles. The most unusual type of text in Table V is the Extract Chronicle. Millard has described these texts as "Several small tablets [that] comprise the third group, the 'Extracts' (*nishu*). Notes of events of all sorts in various years, often with no connection of subject, and irregular time lapse between them, are entered in these."⁷⁷

(1) The Chronicle of the Years B.C. 680-625: This chronicle was the first text of this type to be published. The record in this text skips from the accession year of Shamash-shum-ukin to his 16th year, and then from his 20th year to the accession year of Nabopolassar. Sidney Smith, who published the text, acknowledged its unusual character with the comment, "The document is not so much a chronicle as an extract of those entries from a chronicle which concern hostilities between the two countries for the years 668-625. For what special purpose the document may have been required is not clear."⁷⁸ Wiseman concurs with Smith's judgment that the data in this text

⁷⁷ Millard, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁷⁸ *BHT*, p. 23.

“have been selected from a more detailed original for a particular purpose and period.”⁷⁹ He also agrees that “the purpose [of the text] cannot be judged.”⁸⁰

(2) The New Babylonian Chronicle Text: This most recent chronicle published has brought the Extract Chronicle into focus again. This text also relates events from the reign of Shamash-shum-ukin, but surprisingly enough it has very little in common with the preceding text, even though the regnal years in them overlap. Millard, who published this text, says that “it is obvious that B.M. 96273 falls into the third category, the Extracts, for its entries are varied and disjointed.”⁸¹ According to the various entries in this chronicle the materials incorporated into it came from at least four or five different sources, undoubtedly from more detailed chronicles in several cases. Millard also points out some additional similarities of this text with the others: “There are some physical features shared by this and other Extract Chronicles; the reddish-brown clay is very like the substance of the Esarhaddon Chronicle and the Chronicle of the Years B.C. 680-625, the script is small and clear, and each year’s entry is ruled off.”⁸² As in the case of the preceding Extract Chronicle, Millard notes in regard to the scribe who wrote this chronicle that “no single theme is discernible in the information he has collected together.”⁸³

(3) The Esarhaddon Chronicle: This text has also been classified with the Extract Chronicles. This has been done on the basis of a notation on the edge of the tablet and because of the contents of the text.⁸⁴ The classification of the Esarhaddon

⁷⁹ CCK, p. 4.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ Millard, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁸⁴ “The sign on the edge of the tablet (*ippiru*) shows that this document belongs to the same category as the first chronicle in vol. II of L. W. King’s *Chronicles Concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, II (London, 1907), which is similarly marked. Its content places it with the ‘Extracts’ rather than with the second type (Detail Chronicles).” *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Chronicle is not very important to this study, but it does seem that the "Extract" nature of this chronicle is much less obvious than it is in the case of the two preceding texts. The text is a chronologically consecutive chronicle of the regnal years of Esarhaddon that is very close in content to the last column of the Babylonian Chronicle, which is also a year-by-year record of Esarhaddon's reign. Sidney Smith compared the correspondences between the two texts and discussed their relationship in his publication of the Esarhaddon Chronicle. He favored the view that the Esarhaddon Chronicle represents an earlier copy of the original text than the Babylonian Chronicle because "the scribe of the former [the Esarhaddon Chronicle] could still read passages on the original which the scribe of the Babylonian Chronicle found broken."⁸⁵ He concluded that the Esarhaddon Chronicle was "a close parallel to, but not a duplicate"⁸⁶ of the last part of the Babylonian Chronicle. One unusual feature of the Esarhaddon Chronicle is the fact that although the regnal years in the text are clearly labeled, they are not ruled off by lines as they are in all the other nine chronicle texts listed above.

Summary Chronicles. The third kind of chronicle for consideration here is the type of text that may be called the Summary Chronicle. The first and last texts in Table V, the Babylonian Chronicle and the Nabonidus Chronicle respectively, may be classed in this category. Both of these texts were written upon large, double-columned tablets. Wiseman describes the Summary Type of Chronicle as follows:

It is, however, evident that some chronicle tablets bear fuller details than the "Babylonian Chronicle" which cannot therefore be regarded as a specimen of their original. The diversity in form of the extant chronicle texts suggests rather that in each case we have summaries designed for different purposes. Thus the two-columned "Babylonian Chronicle" type of texts concentrates on the major internal political events, especially the date of the king's accession and death and the length of his reign. The consecutive

⁸⁵ *BHT*, p. 2.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

outline of the king's activities introduces external or foreign matters only if they mark a distinct change in the control of Babylonia or in its relations with its immediate neighbours such as Assyria or Elam. The emphasis is political, and the style which is formal and brief betrays a long established practice.⁸⁷

(1) The Babylonian Chronicle: The major components of the Summary Chronicles have been itemized in Table V to emphasize the composite nature of these texts. In the Babylonian Chronicle the dividing line between the two principal parts of the text comes toward the end of the third column where the record of Esarhaddon's reign begins. The summary nature of the Babylonian Chronicle in the three columns before that point is clear. Eight of the Babylonian kings listed in the first three columns of the text had short reigns, not exceeding six years. In four of these eight cases the first regnal year is mentioned after the record of the king's accession, but in all eight cases the next entry is the last regnal year with a summary statement of the length of the king's reign, and this is followed by the record of the accession of the succeeding king. Two Babylonian kings mentioned in the first three columns had fairly long reigns, Nabonassar and Merodach-baladan II. Three regnal years of Nabonassar are included in the text, his 3d year (broken) and his 5th year are followed by the record of his 14th and final year with the usual summary statement. In the case of Merodach-baladan, his 2d, 5th, and 10th years are mentioned after his accession and they are followed in turn by his 12th and last year. The record for the rule of Sargon over Babylonia is somewhat exceptional for the first part of the Babylonian Chronicle. His 13th through 16th years are listed consecutively after Merodach-baladan's reign in Babylon, so in this case the scribe reckoned by his Assyrian regnal years. The entries for these four years are quite brief and after a break in the text the chronicle continues in summary fashion.

The foregoing description of the format used in the first part

⁸⁷ *CCK*, pp. 3-4.

of the Babylonian Chronicle and the fact that some 65 years are covered in the first three columns of the text make it obvious that the older historical materials on which this portion of the text was based (Detail Chronicles in all probability) were abridged considerably. A somewhat similar editorial procedure has been observed in the revising and updating that went on with the annals of some of the Assyrian kings. In the case of this chronicle a considerable number of year-entries in the older records were dropped in the process of editing the materials that were finally incorporated into this part of the text. Apparently these entries were omitted because the events listed for those years were not considered to be very important or because they were not germane to the purpose of the chronicler. However, the accession records, the year-entries with the more important events, and the consecutive order of the chronicles were incorporated into the text. The summary statements on the length of reign may have come from the older records too, since a statement of this kind appears in the one case in which the transition from one king to another is attested in a Detail Chronicle.⁸⁸

The summary nature of the first three columns of the Babylonian Chronicle contrasts with the detailed treatment of the reign of Esarhaddon in the fourth column of the text. The year-by-year account of his reign begins at the bottom of column III and continues through column IV to his 12th and last year. His death date there is followed by the summary statement of the length of his reign and the record of the accession of his two sons to their respective thrones. The tablet concludes after that with the record of the accession year of Shamash-shum-ukin. The Esarhaddon Chronicle terminates just beyond that point with the entry for the first year of the Babylonian king. Portions of the record for

⁸⁸ "For twenty-one years Nabopolassar had been king of Babylon. On the 8th of the month of Ab he died (lit. 'the fates'); in the month of Elul Nebuchadrezzar returned to Babylon and on the first day of the month of Elul he sat on the royal throne in Babylon." *CCK*, p. 69.

Esarhaddon's 2d and 3d years are missing from the Babylonian Chronicle in the damage to the tablet at the bottom of column III and the top of column IV, but comparison of the phrases that are still legible in the text with the corresponding portions of the Esarhaddon Chronicle shows that the entries for these years were present in the undamaged text of the Babylonian Chronicle. The only detail definitely omitted from the record of Esarhaddon's reign was the entry for his 9th year, and this was not written in either the Babylonian Chronicle or the Esarhaddon Chronicle. Records from all of his other regnal years are present in the text and they supply a fair amount of detailed information. Since this portion of the Babylonian Chronicle comes considerably closer to the form of the Detail Chronicles than the first part of the text does, the two different types of material in the text have been noted in Table V: (a) the Summary Chronicle from Nabonassar to Sennacherib in the first three columns of the text, and (b) the Detail Chronicle for the reign of Esarhaddon in the fourth and final column.

(2) The Nabonidus Chronicle: In his publication of this text Smith suggested that it "was probably written in the Seleucid period."⁸⁹ He also thought it was "safe to assume that the original itself was written in or after the reign of Artaxerxes."⁹⁰ More recently Wiseman has noted that the Nabonidus Chronicle and the Babylonian Chronicle texts are similar "not only in the arrangement of subject matter but also in script and in the form of the two-columned tablet."⁹¹ On this basis he suggested that the two texts "seem to have been written by the same scribe."⁹² If this conclusion is correct it may indicate an earlier date for the copy of the Nabonidus Chronicle than Smith suspected, since the text of the Babylonian Chronicle tells us that it was copied at

⁸⁹ *BHT*, p. 98.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *CCK*, p. 3.

⁹² *Ibid.*

Babylon from an older text in the 22d year of Darius (*ca.* 500 B.C. if Darius I).

The situation in the Nabonidus Chronicle is just the reverse of that in the Babylonian Chronicle as far as the component parts of the text are concerned. The Detail Chronicle comes first in the text of the Nabonidus Chronicle and the Summary Chronicle follows it. The records for the 17-year reign of Nabonidus constitute the Detail Chronicle in this case, and they occupy the first two and one-half columns of the text. Unfortunately, however, the text is damaged in several places; consequently it is not clear just how complete this chronicle of his reign originally was. The bottom half of the first column of the text is badly damaged, so it is not evident whether the records for his 4th and 5th years were included there or not. The next big break comes at the bottom of the second column. His 11th year is the last definite entry there and the damaged text at the top of the third column apparently takes up with the record from the last part of his 16th year. How many of the four missing years originally filled this damaged gap in the text is not known. Aside from these two breaks in the record, however, the rest of the legible passages in this part of the chronicle detail the reign of Nabonidus in the usual manner. The various entries in the first two columns of the text are dated according to his regnal years and they are ruled off with lines between them in the standard fashion. As the tablet presently stands, ten of his 17 regnal years are definitely recorded in the text.⁹³ How many of the entries for the missing years were present originally in the portions of the text that are damaged now cannot be determined.

This detailed, year-by-year treatment of the king's reign in the first two columns of the Nabonidus Chronicle stands

⁹³ Lines ruling off three years are still evident in column I of the text, six years are ruled off in column II, and two in column III. One exception to this scheme occurs in column II. The eighth year is ruled off and labeled there, but no record was written for that year in the space assigned to it. Perhaps this entry was badly damaged in the text the scribe copied from.

in rather sharp contrast to the nature of the remainder of the text. Column III is the most important part of the text in this connection and fortunately it has come down to us in fairly good condition. Very little of column IV remains and what there is of it is so badly damaged that it is largely unintelligible.⁹⁴ Although much detailed information is found in column III, it is clear that it is structured according to the regnal years of the king only at the very beginning of the column. The first four lines of column III apparently close the record for the 16th year of Nabonidus, although the number for that year is not legible in the text. The last horizontal line on the tablet that divides the regnal years follows this, between lines four and five. Two such lines are still present in the badly damaged first column and five more occur in the second column that is better preserved, but no more such lines are detectable anywhere in the text after this one that divides the record of the 16th and 17th years of Nabonidus. Although various chronological references occur in the remainder of the text, they are only day and month dates, and no date occurs after the beginning of Nabonidus' 17th year in line five⁹⁵ that refers to any year of any king.

Not only are there no further year dates or dividers in the remainder of the text, but the concluding statement on the reign of Nabonidus is also absent. The fact that his death date is not mentioned in the text might be taken as indirect confirmation of the statement in Josephus that he did not die with the fall of Babylon but was exiled to Carmania.⁹⁶ How-

⁹⁴ So much so that Oppenheim did not even attempt a translation of it, *ANET*, p. 307. Smith opines that "the years 536-circ. 520 were described in the broken part of column IV, obviously in a summary fashion, perhaps because there were few events in that period which closely affected Babylon." *BHT*, p. 106.

⁹⁵ The number of the year that marked off this section of the text is missing at the beginning of line five, but it may safely be assumed that it was originally present there in the undamaged text, as it is obvious from the text that the record of Nabonidus' last year began there.

⁹⁶ Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, I, 20-21, cited in *BHT*, pp. 34-35.

ever, that still leaves the absence of any summary statement on the length of his reign unexplained, and there is no *specific* statement in the text regarding the accession of his successor. The accession period in the same year in which the reign of Nabonidus ended is not demarcated in the text in any way, and no succeeding calendar year is mentioned or marked off in the text either—in spite of the fact that the actions of Cambyses in Nisanu (III, 24) must have happened in a year subsequent to the year of the events that precede it in the record. It may be noted in this connection that Smith observed that although lines 23-28 of column III were “not separated from the previous section”⁹⁷ they recorded events of the next calendar year. All these elements of the Nabonidus Chronicle contrast with the customary conventions of the chronicles and they emphasize the exceptional nature of this part of the text. What we have here is not so much a Summary Chronicle as it is an extended appendix with a record of significant events surrounding the transition of Babylonia from Chaldean to Persian control. In essence the Nabonidus Chronicle is (a) a Detail Chronicle for the reign of Nabonidus, with (b) an extended appendix of important events from the earliest part of the Persian period.

2. *The Chronological Order of the Events in Column III of the Nabonidus Chronicle*

The concluding remarks in the preceding section point out the fact that the chronology of the third column of the Nabonidus Chronicle is not as explicitly detailed with regard to the years involved as one might desire. The historical framework in which the events recorded in this part of the text are placed depends in turn on the chronological order one presupposes for those events. Line 21 contains the key passage in this connection. It records the fact that the gods of Akkad

⁹⁷ *BHT*, p. 105.

that Nabonidus gathered into Babylon before the Persian armies attacked were returned to their respective cities after the conquest, and the text states that this activity took some four months to complete, from the month of Kislimu to the month of Addaru. The activity mentioned here is related to the problem of the relationship of Nabonidus and Cyrus to the gods of Babylonia that has been discussed by scholars, but the chronological significance of this reference to the events that surround it in the chronicle has not been noted in those discussions. The last dated events in the text before this notation is the reference to the triumphal entry of Cyrus into Babylon, which occurred on the 3d of Arahsamnu. Up to this point there is no problem, but the next line in the text after the reference to the return of the gods is the record of the death of Ugbaru on the 11th of Arahsamnu. This is the chronological dividing point. The standard interpretation in the past has placed the death recorded in line 22 in the same month of Arahsamnu during which Cyrus entered Babylon mentioned in line 18.⁹⁸ This puts the death of Ugbaru just one week after that event and just three weeks after he and his troops took the capital city.⁹⁹ The problem with this interpretation is that it overlooks the intervening event recorded in line 21 and the dates connected with it. If the death of Ugbaru occurred where it is located in the text, after the four-month period recorded in the line preceding it, then he died in Arahsamnu of the next year, 538, instead of the same Arahsamnu in which Cyrus entered Babylon after the Persian victory in 539. I have

⁹⁸ The most recent complete publication of the text is that of Smith in *BHT*. The most recent translation of the text is that of Oppenheim in *ANET*.

⁹⁹ According to Smith, Gobryas "did not live long enough to see the fruits" of the conciliatory policy toward Babylonia that he initiated when Cyrus appointed him governor there just after the conquest. *BHT*, p. 105. Dougherty was even more specific in this regard, arranging the events from the Chronicle with a few contract tablets in order. It is interesting to note that he omitted the return of the gods from his table in so doing. R. P. Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (New Haven, 1929), n. 557, p. 171.

termed these two chronological views of these events the retrospective and consecutive interpretations, and to illustrate the difference between them more graphically, they have been tabulated according to their Babylonian and Julian dates in Table VI.

TABLE VI

A CHRONOLOGICAL COMPARISON OF THE
EVENTS IN COLUMN III OF THE NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

<i>Line</i>	<i>Event</i>	<i>Babylonian Date</i>	<i>Julian Date</i> ¹⁰⁰
<i>1. The Retrospective Interpretation</i>			
12	Cyrus attacks at Opis	Tashritu	October, 539
14	Fall of Sippar	14 Tashritu	October 10, 539
15	Fall of Babylon	16 Tashritu	October 12, 539
18	Cyrus enters Babylon	3 Arahsamnu	October 29, 539
21	Return of the gods of Akkad	Kislimu to Addaru	November 25, to March 23, 538
22	Death of Ugbaru	11 Arahsamnu	November 6, 539
23a	Death of the king's [wife ?]	date damaged	—
23b	Official period of mourning	27 Addaru to 3 Nisanu	March 20/21 to March 26, 538
24-25	Cambyses enters the temple	4 Nisanu	March 27, 538
<i>2. The Consecutive Interpretation</i>			
12	Cyrus attacks at Opis	Tashritu	October, 539
14	Fall of Sippar	14 Tashritu	October 10, 539
15	Fall of Babylon	16 Tashritu	October 12, 539
18	Cyrus enters Babylon	3 Arahsamnu	October 29, 539
21	Return of the gods of Akkad	Kislimu to Addaru	November 25 to March 23, 538
22	Death of Ugbaru	11 Arahsamnu	October 26, 538
23a	Death of the king's [wife ?]	date damaged	—
23b	Official period of mourning	27 Addaru to 3 Nisanu	March 8/9 to March 14, 537
24-25	Cambyses enters the temple	4 Nisanu	March 15, 537

From the alternate dates determined for the events listed in Table VI, it is obvious that the two interpretations presented

¹⁰⁰ The Julian dates in this table and elsewhere in this study have been abstracted from the tables in *PDBC*.

there involve the chronological difference of a year. As the table points out, the four dated events in lines 22 to 25 that come after the dividing point in line 21 took place one year later (538-537) according to the consecutive reckoning than if the retrospective interpretation is followed (539-538). The question here is, did these events occur in the order in which they are listed in the text, or did the scribe jump back more than four months in the record to tell us of the death of Ugbaru a week after Cyrus arrived in Babylon in 539?

The consecutive nature of these texts has already been referred to several times in the preceding section. By their very nature the chronicles necessitated a consistent relation of the events recorded in consecutive chronological order. The scribes who wrote these texts needed this frame of reference to keep their records accurate, to prevent them from degenerating into a confused and disorganized collection of individual pieces of information. That consecutive dating was the standard practice employed in the construction of these texts is fairly evident from even a cursory examination of the materials. The dividing lines and labels for the different years in the texts have already been discussed. Many instances of the consecutive use of month dates could be mentioned; the record for the 19th year of Nabopolassar¹⁰¹ is one of the better examples of this, as six of the 12 months of the year are referred to there, all in the correct consecutive sequence. References to two or more days within a single month are naturally less common in the chronicles, but the principal text of this section, the Nabonidus Chronicle, has two examples of this in column III, and the entry for the 10th year of Esarhaddon in the Babylonian Chronicle lists four different days in one month, all in numerical order.

Granted that it can be amply demonstrated from the dated events in various chronicles that the consecutive order for days, months, and years was the standard procedure employed

¹⁰¹ *CCK*, p. 65.

in these texts, the question arises—are there exceptions to this rule? Do the chronicles on occasion revert back to an earlier date in the course of a passage? If there are exceptions, how many are there, and when, where, and why do they occur? To answer these questions the practices of the scribes who wrote the chronicles that are included in this study have been examined with regard to the order of the dated events recorded in the texts. The results of this survey are presented in Table VII.

TABLE VII

THE ORDER OF EVENTS IN BABYLONIAN CHRONICLES
FROM THE 8TH TO THE 6TH CENTURIES B.C.

<i>Chronicle No.</i>	<i>Chronological Observations in Consecutive Order</i>					<i>Chronological Observations Not in Consecutive Order</i>			
	<i>Year</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Day</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Day</i>	<i>Total</i>	
Chronicle I	34	35	28	97	0	I	0	I	
Chronicle II	12	15	10	37	0	0	0	0	
Chronicle III	8	5	6	19	I	0	0	I	
Chronicle IV	7	5	2	14	0	0	0	0	
Chronicle V	4	10	8	22	0	I	I	2	
Chronicle VI	8	27	5	40	0	0	0	0	
Chronicle VII	3	10	0	13	0	0	0	0	
Chronicle VIII	12	22	4	38	0	0	0	0	
Chronicle IX	I	I	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Chronicle X	5	17	9	31	0	I	0	I	
Total:	94	147	72	313	I	3	I	5	

The five exceptions to the rule of the consecutive order of the chronicles deserve some comment here. The first case is undoubtedly due to a scribal error. The record for the 8th year of Esarhaddon in the Babylonian Chronicle reports that the country of Shuprisa was conquered and looted in Tebetu, the 10th month, and that the booty from that conquest was

brought to the city of Uruk in Kislimu, the 9th month. Obviously something is wrong here, as one does not conquer and loot a country in the 10th month and bring the booty back from it in the 9th month. The scribe who copied this text tells us that the day number immediately adjacent to the questionable month sign of Tebetu was broken off, so there was a very good reason why the month sign was not clear. The parallel passage in the Esarhaddon Chronicle states that Shuprisa was conquered on the 18th of Addaru, and it places the death of the queen before that event instead of after it as it is in the Babylonian Chronicle. The record for the 9th year of Esarhaddon that followed this entry is missing from both texts. All this is evidence that the scribe who copied this passage was working from a damaged text here and was not able to read the month sign in the original clearly enough to identify it correctly.

The second text in Table VII that has an entry out of order is the one that was published most recently, the new Extract Chronicle. The entry for the 18th year of Shamash-shum-ukin (650) in line 19 of this text is followed in line 20 by a reference to the three-month reign of Shiriqti-Shuqamunu, which we know from other sources occurred in the time of Ashur-rabi II, who ruled Assyria at the beginning of the 10th century.¹⁰² The extract nature of this chronicle is emphasized by the fact that from line 19 to line 20 the text reverts back not just a year or two but three and one-half centuries, which is the greatest chronological gap in the entire text. Technically speaking, even though this is an Extract Type Chronicle, this is the only entry in the text that is out of order. Ashur-nadinshumi (699-694), who is mentioned before Shamash-shum-ukin in the text, ruled before him too, and Nabu-shum-ishkin (762-748), who is referred to after Shiriqti-Shuqamunu, also ruled after him. Since the reference in question here undoubtedly was extracted from a different text than the one

¹⁰² Millard, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

that comes from the Chronicle for the reign of Shamash-shum-ukin, this discontinuity represents a problem in the arrangement of the different extracts that the scribe used, not a retrospective reference within one Chronicle. It is interesting to note that even though the entries in the Extract Chronicles represent selections from various older texts, they still tend to be arranged in consecutive order. In this sense the entry in line 20 of this text is exceptional. The two other texts that have been classified as Extract Chronicles do not have any dated events out of the usual consecutive order.

The next two references for consideration in this connection come from the first chronicle for the reign of Nabopolassar. The first case occurs in lines 10-11 of that text where the time just before Nabopolassar's accession is mentioned. Wiseman's translation is, "In the month of Iyyar the Assyrian army had come down into Babylonia. On the 12th of the month of Tisri the Assyrian troops . . . came against Babylon."¹⁰³ Two dated events appear in the lines that precede this passage, the burning of the temple in Shaznaku on the 12th of Ululu in lines four and five, and the coming of the gods of Kish to Babylon in Tashritu in line six. These dates put the reference to Iyyar (the 2d month) in line ten out of order. One explanation for this is evident from the translation of line ten quoted above. The verb following the month date in question is in the perfect, and in this case the significance of the perfect as denoting past action with present consequences has been made use of to indicate that the Assyrian army that "had come down" into Babylonia in the 2d month engaged the Babylonian forces before Babylon on the 12th day of the 7th month. This use of the verb is quite acceptable and it clarifies the irregular chronological reference here in a satisfactory manner.

Another explanation is possible in regard to this passage, however, and that is simply that the months mentioned in the text are in the correct consecutive order. The last official

¹⁰³ *CCK*, p. 51.

king of Babylon before Nabopolassar was Kandalanu, and he died during the calendar year that preceded the one in which Nabopolassar's official accession took place. As noted earlier, the Babylonian scribes referred to the remainder of the year 627 as "the 21st year after Kandalanu" and to the first part of 626 as "the 22d year after Kandalanu." It is possible that the events chronicled here come from both the 21st and the 22d years "after Kandalanu," and that all the months mentioned in these lines are in consecutive order. In this case the verb in the perfect is simply used in the normal narrative sense which is common in Neo-Babylonian texts, and it may be translated, "In the month of Iyyar the Assyrian army came down into Babylonia." This interpretation would make it necessary to suggest that the dividing line between the 21st and the 22d years "after Kandalanu" was not included in the text, but this might not be considered too remarkable in view of the unusual circumstances that obtained at that time. If this interpretation is correct, it may provide a parallel with column III of the Nabonidus Chronicle which also omits that dividing line at the time of unusual circumstances. For the purposes of this study, it is not as important to decide between these two interpretations of this passage as it is to note that at least two explanations are possible for this chronological reference that is apparently out of consecutive order.

The other date in this Chronicle that is out of order is found in line 21 which states that "on the twentieth the gods of Sippar came to Babylon."¹⁰⁴ The event in the preceding line dates to the 21st of Iyyar. Both of the dates in this passage are clear on the tablet and although the month involved was not specifically written in the second reference, it is obvious from comparison with the dating methods in other chronicles that the day number there applies to the same month mentioned previously. This unquestionably is a case of retrospective dating in a chronicle text, but the one day involved can

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

hardly be considered a very significant statistical difference.

The fifth and final case of non-consecutive dating in a chronicle is the most important case to be considered here since it definitely demonstrates a date that is out of order and because it comes from the special text of this section, the Nabonidus Chronicle. The particular passage of the chronicle involved is the entry for the 9th year of Nabonidus in column II of the text. Line 13 in that passage records the fact that the king's mother died during the 1st month of that year, on the 5th of Nisanu. The next two lines tell us that the official mourning, or "weeping," for her took place some two months later, during Simanu, the 3d month of the year. The scene changes after that reference and the next three lines of the chronicle record a campaign of Cyrus that apparently took him to the kingdom of Lydia. The text states that Cyrus called up his army and crossed the Tigris on his way in Nisanu and that he was involved with the country in question sometime in the next month of Aiaru. The date that is obviously out of order here is the month of Simanu during which the mourning was held for the king's mother, as it fell after the two dates in the account of Cyrus' campaign.

It is pertinent here to note that the record for Nabonidus' 9th year has a very definite structure to it. The entry for the year begins with three lines (10-12) that are concerned with the New Year's festival and the king's absence from it; the next three lines (13-15) refer to the death of the king's mother and the mourning for her; and the last three lines (16-18) for the year describe the campaign of Cyrus. Chronologically speaking, these three sections are in consecutive order as far as the beginning of each section is concerned. The New Year's festival ordinarily would have begun on the 1st of Nisanu, which places it before the death date of the king's mother on the 5th day of the same month, and this in turn probably occurred before Cyrus called up his army, or at least before news of that event was known in Babylonia. The problem here comes from the fact that the event described in the third

section began before the last activity of the second section, the official mourning, had taken place. It seems apparent in this case that the scribe chose to relate each complex of events within the year in its entirety before proceeding to the next section of the record. The distinction between the second and third items entered here is evident from the change of geographic scene, from the nature of the activities in the two sections, and from the different persons participating in them, so there is no confusion between the two events. To place the phrase about the mourning in Akkad for the mother of Nabonidus in the latter part of the account of the campaign of Cyrus in Anatolia would have made a very disjointed record here, since the two events were not related at all. The scribe simply wished to keep the mention of the mourning for the mother of the king connected with the record of her death, even though this involved placing it out of chronological order in the text.

At this point the results of this examination of the exceptions to the consecutive order of the chronicles encountered in Table VII may be summarized. The first case comes from a scribal error, the second from an Extract Chronicle with a difference of three and one-half centuries between the extracts, the third case may not be out of order after all, the fourth only involves the difference of one day, and the last case resulted from the chronicler's intent to keep the record of three different events separate. None of these five exceptions provides any parallel that might explain why the events in column III of the Nabonidus Chronicle would be out of order or why they should be interpreted retrospectively.

The few exceptions cited above contrast directly with the amount of evidence collected in Table VII in support of the rule of the consecutive order of dated events in the chronicles. More than 300 references to days, months, and years in consecutive order have been tabulated there from the century's worth of regnal years that are attested in the ten chronicles surveyed. Since it is obvious that the consecutive chronological

order of the text was the standard rule in these chronicles, it seems reasonable to apply that rule to the events in column III of the Nabonidus Chronicle. The date that is out of order in column II of that text might be mentioned as an example of the opposite practice, but the preceding discussion shows how solitary an example it is, and since this is the only definite example known of a date that is out of order in the Nabonidus Chronicle, it is exceptional for that text too. The difference between the situations in columns II and III of this chronicle is relatively clear. In the former case the geographic scene changed from Babylonia to Persia and Anatolia, but in the latter case Babylonia continued to be the geographic setting all the way through column III, and in column IV too as far as can be determined.¹⁰⁵ The cast of characters involved also presents a point of contrast between these two passages of the chronicle. Nabonidus, his mother, and his son are mentioned in the first episode of the passage in column II, while Cyrus and the king of Lydia participate in the second. In column III, Nabonidus, Cyrus, Ug/Gubaru, and Cambyses all appear in order in a continuous and connected sequence of events in Babylonia.

In addition, the chronological problems involved in these two passages are basically different in nature. The chronological overlap in column II is clear, but an overlap in column III is not clear. In column II the length of time between the death of the king's mother and the period of mourning for her poses the problem, for the campaign of Cyrus occurred in that interval. In column III, however, the death of the king's wife and the mourning period for her appear after the chronological crux of the passage. The beginning dates for the three sections of the record for the 9th year of Nabonidus are still in order in column II even though the beginning of the third event

¹⁰⁵ The name Babylon appears three or four times in the legible portions of the badly damaged fourth column, *BHT*, p. 118. Smith thought that the record there referred to the defeat of Nidintu-Bel at Babylon by Darius I, *ibid.*, p. 106.

there overlaps with the end of the second. The situation in column III is different. According to the retrospective interpretation, the death of the king's wife (?) (date undetermined) and the date for the beginning of the mourning for her (?) (27 Addaru) can theoretically be superimposed upon the period from Kislimu to Addaru during which the gods of Akkad were returned to their cities. However, this still leaves the problem of the death date for Ugbaru (11 Arah-samnu) which, as an independent piece of information, should have been placed before the activity that started in Kislimu, instead of after it where it stands in the current order of the text. This brings up a very important difference between the retrospective and the consecutive interpretation of the events in column III. The problem here is not just the difference between two equally reasonable alternative interpretations, for in the retrospective view of the text—since the date for Ugbaru's death does not overlap with any other dates in column III—a scribal error must definitely be posited here. On this basis it must be assumed that the scribe located this event in the wrong place in the text. The reliability of the chronicles as historical sources has been commented upon by various observers.¹⁰⁶ In his discussion of the chronicle published most recently, Millard concurs with this view in the cautionary comment, "It is unwise to assume a mistake by the Babylonian historian without more supporting evidence, since these chronicle texts have hitherto been shown to be a reliable source of historical fact."¹⁰⁷ As far as can be determined by this investigation, it is not only unwise but also unwarranted to

¹⁰⁶ W. F. Albright says that "the Babylonian Chronicle and related texts from the eighth-sixth centuries B.C. are generally recognized as the most objective and historically reliable annals that have come down to us from the ancient Orient." Cf. "The Nebuchadnezzar and Neriglissar Chronicles," *BASOR*, 143 (1956), p. 28. Wiseman refers to these texts as "a unique and reliable source of knowledge of the history of Babylonia," and says that "they are both accurate and objective in their portrayal of historical facts." *CCK*, pp. 1, 5.

¹⁰⁷ Millard, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

assume that the text in column III of the Nabonidus Chronicle is in error and that the dated events there are out of order.

There is another aspect to the text of the third column of the Nabonidus Chronicle that is relevant to the discussion of the chronological order of the events recorded there. This particular feature of the text is the manner in which the dates were written in this passage. Month names are missing from five of these dates and all five cases occur where the event referred to was only dated by a day number and that day happened to fall in the month mentioned previously in the text. The first three cases of this come from the month of Tashritu at the beginning of the passage that is pertinent to this study. After the initial statement there of Cyrus' attack on the army of Akkad at Opis in that month, the dates that follow in the text are simply "day 14" (I. 14), "day 16" (I. 15), and "the end of the month" (I. 16). Obviously, these three dates refer to the month of Tashritu in line 12 since the next dated event in the text is Cyrus' entry into Babylon on the 3d of Arahsamnu. The same thing occurs at the end of this section where the date that Cambyses entered the temple is simply given as "day four." Again this clearly refers to the last month mentioned in the text. The date in the last phrase of the preceding line is the 3d of Nisanu on which the mourning for the king's wife ended, so this places Cambyses' entry into the temple on the 4th of Nisanu, during the New Year's festival. Had the death of Ugbaru occurred on the 11th of the same month of Arahsamnu that Cyrus entered Babylon, the record of his death should have followed that reference in the text, and according to his custom the scribe probably would have dated it simply to "day 11" without mentioning the month again, in which case the account would have read, "In the month of Arahsamnu, the 3d day, Cyrus entered Babylon, . . . on the night of the 11th day, Ugbaru died."

One final but minor objection to the interpretation of the text proposed here might be raised, and this stems from the fact that the New Year's festival is not mentioned between

the events of lines 21 and 22 where it occurred according to the consecutive interpretation. This objection does not pose any great threat to this view of the text, however, since more often than not the chronicles did not mention the regular occurrences of the New Year's festival. In fact, the chronicles record the omission of the New Year's ceremonies more commonly than they mention the occasions on which they were performed. Statistically speaking, 12 entries in the ten chronicles discussed here tell of a total of 31 years during which these rites were not celebrated, while they refer to the fact that they were performed on only four specific occasions. Although the Nabonidus Chronicle notes that the New Year's festival was omitted during the years that the king was off in Tema, one of the four references to its performance occurs in the record at the beginning of his 17th year, after he had returned to Babylon. The absence of any reference to the contrary may generally be taken to imply that the ceremonies of the New Year were performed. Since the chronicle specifically states that the rites were performed at the beginning of Nabonidus' 17th year, it seems safe to assume that they were performed regularly thereafter too, which would include the occasion in question above. The return of the gods of Akkad to their cities and temples by the end of Addaru points out the fact that they were ready for the ceremonies of the New Year on time, even though the New Year's festival in question is not specifically referred to in the text.

In concluding this section it may simply be said that the consecutive view of the order of the events in column III of the Nabonidus Chronicle has been adopted in this study because it seems to be the most reasonable interpretation of the evidence currently available on the subject. This conclusion makes the dates in part 2 of Table VI requisite to any further discussion that involves the chronology of the events listed there.

3. *The Correlation of the Early Titulary of Cyrus in the Babylonian Economic Texts with Column III of the Nabonidus Chronicle in Consecutive Chronological Order*

In the second installment of this study evidence from the royal titles in the economic texts was presented, that led to the hypothesis that there may have been a king in Babylon who ruled as a vassal to Cyrus for a short time after the Persian conquest. At that point, however, any suggestion as to the possible identity of this king had to be deferred until further information on the subject could be obtained. With the foregoing discussion of the Nabonidus Chronicle in hand this problem may now be approached more positively. The first step in this approach is to correlate the findings from the titles in the economic texts with the chronology of the third column of the chronicle that was adopted in the preceding section.

TABLE VIII

TITLES FROM TABLE II
CORRELATED WITH THE DATES FROM TABLE VI

<i>Date</i>	<i>Chronicle or Tablet Reference</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Day</i>	<i>Title or Julian Date</i>
539	<i>Nabonidus</i> 1052	17	VI	28	King of Babylon
	Cyrus attacks at Opis	17	VII	—	October, 539
	<i>REN</i> 189 (Uruk)	17	VII	4	King of Babylon
	The fall of Sippar	17	VII	14	October 10, 539
	The fall of Babylon	17	VII	16	October 12, 539
	<i>GCCI</i> I 390 (Uruk)	17	VII	17	King of Babylon
	<i>BM</i> 56154	Acc.	VII	23	King of Babylon, King of Lands
	<i>Cyrus</i> 1	Acc.	VII	—	King of Babylon, King of Lands
	<i>NBRVT</i> 21	Acc.	[VII ?]	25	King of Babylon, [King of Lands ?]
	Cyrus enters Babylon	Acc.	VIII	3	October 29, 539
	<i>Cyrus</i> 2	Acc.	VIII	24	King of Lands
	<i>Cyrus</i> 4	Acc.	IX	24	King of Lands
	Return of the gods begins	Acc.	IX	—	from November, 539
	<i>RECC</i> 1	Acc.	X	21	King of Lands

<i>Date</i>	<i>Chronicle or Tablet Reference</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Day</i>	<i>Title or Julian Date</i>
538	RECC 2	Acc.	XI	21	King of Lands
	RECC 3	Acc.	XII	8	King of Lands
	Cyrus 7	Acc.	XII	10	King of Lands
	RECC 4	Acc.	XII	17	King of Lands
	Cyrus 8	Acc.	XII	21	King of Lands
	Cyrus 9	Acc.	XII	—	King of Lands
	Cyrus 10	Acc.	—	—	King of Lands
	Return of the gods ends	Acc.	XII	—	to March, 538
	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
	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
	The death of Ugbaru	I	VIII	11	October 26, 538
	NBC 4761	I	VIII	12	King of Lands
	CUL 357	I	VIII	23	King of Lands
	BRLM 57	I	IX	20	King of Lands
	Cyrus 18	I	X	—	King of Babylon
537	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
	Death of the king's [wife ?]	I	—	—	date undetermined
	Period of mourning begins	I	XII	27	March 8, 537

<i>Date</i>	<i>Chronicle or Tablet Reference</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Day</i>	<i>Title or Julian Date</i>
VAS III 60		1	XII	28	King of Babylon, King of Lands
Cyrus 31		1	—	—	King of Babylon, King of Lands
Cyrus 32		2	I	1	King of Babylon, King of Lands
Official mourning ends		2	I	3	March 14, 537
Cambyses enters the temple		2	I	4	March 15, 537

For the purposes of this study the most important feature of this table is the fact that the change in Cyrus' titulary in the economic texts, which formerly went unexplained, can now be connected with a recognizable event in Neo-Babylonian history—the death of Ugbaru. This correlation of the materials demonstrates that the title "King of Babylon" was added to the titulary of Cyrus shortly after the death of Ugbaru, when that event is located according to the consecutive chronological interpretation of the Chronicle. The implication of this information is readily apparent. Since these two events are closely connected chronologically, it follows that they may be related as cause and effect. If Cyrus waited until Ugbaru died to take up the title "King of Babylon" and become the official king there, it seems reasonable to surmise that Ugbaru held title to that office before him, up to the time of his death. If this line of reasoning is correct, then the king who was vassal to Cyrus in Babylon during the time he carried the suzerain's title ("King of Lands" only) in the texts written there has been identified.

It may be asked in this connection, if Ugbaru was the king of Babylon under Cyrus until late in 538, then why was there a time lag from the time of his death until the tablets took up the title "King of Babylon" for Cyrus? Actually, the six or seven weeks involved are just about the lapse of time that one would expect before such a change in the titulary. Since Cyrus probably was not in Babylonia at the time Ugbaru died,

messengers had to take this news to him in Persia or wherever he may have been on one of his campaigns. Beyond that, additional time must be allowed for the messengers to return to Babylon with the decree that Cyrus made after he received the news they brought to him. There are various historical parallels for a time lag like this after the death of a king. The date on which Nebuchadrezzar arrived from Syro-Palestine to take the throne in Babylon after he received the news of his father's death is recorded in one of the Chronicles that Wiseman published. Assuming that messengers were not sent to summon Nebuchadrezzar before his father died, the report reached him and he returned to Babylon in a remarkably short period of time, just three and one-half weeks.

It is uncertain exactly where Nebuchadrezzar himself was at the time of the death of Nabopolassar on the eighth of Ab (15/16th August, 605 B.C.). The transmission of this news from Babylon to Syria and Palestine by signal through hostile and partly uninhabited territory would have been impossible. Time must therefore be allowed for the intelligence to reach Nebuchadrezzar by fast courier as well as for him to settle local affairs before his return journey with a small mounted party by the shortest desert route to Babylon. Since the crown-prince reached the capital twenty-three days after his father's death the Chronicle supports the tradition of a swift return to Babylon so vividly preserved by Berossus.¹⁰⁸

The accessions that took place subsequent to the death of Esarhaddon occurred at a somewhat slower pace than this. Both the Esarhaddon Chronicle and the Babylonian Chronicle report that Esarhaddon died on the tenth of Arahsumnu while he was on the way to Egypt. The Chronicles do not specify the exact date of Ashurbanipal's accession in Assyria, but they do tell us that it occurred the month after Esarhaddon died, in Kislimu. In addition, Shamash-shum-ukin did not become king of Babylon until sometime in the next calendar year, four months or more after Ashurbanipal's accession, for

¹⁰⁸ CCK, p. 26. Berossus' record of Nebuchadnezzar's rapid return to Babylon after his father's death is found in Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, I, 19 (136-138).

the year after the one in which Esarhaddon died was reckoned as the accession year of Shamash-shum-ukin while it was the 1st year of Ashurbanipal.

Another example of the lapse of time involved in the change of kings and titles occurred in the case of Bardiya that has been referred to in Parts I and II. This case is possibly more pertinent here than the two preceding examples since it is considerably closer in time and geography to the case of Ugbaru and Cyrus. Bardiya revolted in Persia on the 14th day of the last month of 523/522, but since news of this apparently did not reach Babylonia until after the New Year began, scribes there dated documents to him in two different ways for a while: (a) "First year of Bardiya, King of Lands," and (b) "Accession year of Bardiya, King of Babylon, King of Lands." Poebel's solution to the problem posed by these dates and titles has been quoted in this study before, but it bears repeating in this connection.

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 Barzia, king of Babylon and king of lands," a formula of the same type as that used during the reigns of Cyrus and Cambyses. 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.¹⁰⁹

It took considerably less time for the title "King of Babylon" to appear in connection with Cyrus after the death of Ugbaru than it did for the Babylonian scribes to get the dates and titles of Bardiya straightened out. Ugbaru died on the 11th day of the 8th month, and three more tablets dated after that used the sole title "King of Lands" for Cyrus. The last one of these three dates to the 20th day of the 9th month, or about six weeks after Ugbaru's death. The only tablet in Table VIII

¹⁰⁹ Poebel, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-126.

from the 10th month of Cyrus' 1st year (*Cyrus* 18) uses the title "King of Babylon" for him without the title "King of Lands." This text is not dated to the day, but since it is a contract it is very possible that it comes from the 1st day of the month. The compound titulary begins to appear regularly with the next tablet after that (*Cyrus* 22), the first of eight tablets that date to the 11th month. From the evidence currently available, it seems probable that the interval between the death of Ugbaru and the time when Cyrus used the title "King of Babylon" was less than two months in length. This does not appear to be an inordinately long period of time for the news of Ugbaru's death to be taken to Cyrus and for his decree concerning the disposition of the title to the kingship of Babylon to be returned there. Considering the parallels cited above, the amount of time involved here seems to fit such a situation very well.

On the basis of the royal titles in the business and administrative texts that were examined in Part II, the hypothesis was proposed in the conclusion to that section that there was evidence—a gap in the use of these titles—for the existence of a king in Babylon other than Cyrus for a short time after the Persian conquest. Information from the Nabonidus Chronicle studied in this section has brought increased specificity to that hypothesis with the observation that the references to Ugbaru in the Chronicle fit the gap in Cyrus' titulary in the texts with precision. The close correspondence of these materials has led to the identification of Ugbaru as the king of Babylon during that brief period. This brings up the question, is there any other evidence to confirm the identification of Ugbaru as the king of Babylon? That evidence is examined in the next section.

(To be continued)