

AN UNRECOGNIZED VASSAL KING OF BABYLON IN THE EARLY ACHAEMENID PERIOD

IV*

WILLIAM H. SHEA
Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, West Indies

V. Evidence for Ugbaru's Kingship of Babylon in 538 B.C.

The Use of Personal Names in the Babylonian Chronicles. The personal name of Ugbaru appears in Column III of the Nabonidus Chronicle at least twice and possibly a third time. While these references are of interest to note, their fuller significance is not apparent until they have been compared with the use of personal names in the other chronicles. This comparison is presented in Table IX.

Table IX
SURVEY OF PERSONAL NAMES IN BABYLONIAN
CHRONICLES FROM THE 8TH—6TH CENTURIES

<i>Chronicle Number</i>	<i>Assyria</i>	<i>Babylon</i>	<i>Media, Persia, Other and Elam Kings</i>	<i>Rulers of the Sealand</i>	<i>Names of Commoners</i>
I	6* (26)**	11 (50)	8 (27)	—	1 (1) 4 (4) overlapping
II	3 (5)	1 (2)	2 (3)	2 (2)	— 4 (4) total, 5 (5)
III	—	4 (5)	—	—	1 (1) —
IV	2 (2)	3 (4)	—	—	— —
V	1 (1)	1 (10)	—	—	— —
VI	2 (5)	1 (2)	1 (4)	—	— —
VII	—	2 (4)	—	—	— —
VIII	—	2 (5)	—	—	— 1 (1)
IX	—	1 (2)	—	1 (4)	— —
X	—	1 (4)	3 (10)	—	— 1 (1)
Totals:	14 (39)	27 (88)	14 (44)	3 (6)	2 (2) 7 (7)

* Numerals not in parentheses indicate the number of kings named.
** Numerals in parentheses indicate the number of times the kings are named.

* The first three parts of this article were published in *AUSS*, IX (1971), 51-67, 99-128; X (1972), 88-117.

A Statistical Summary to the Data Presented in Table IX

1. The number of kings who are named in these Chronicles . . .	58
2. The number of times the names of these kings are used . . .	177
3. The number of persons named who were not kings	7
4. The number of times the names of these persons are used . .	7

Two omissions from Table IX should be noted before the materials compiled there are discussed. The references to Ugbaru in the Nabonidus Chronicle have not been included in the table because they are the object of the comparison. "Nabu-kašir, descendant of Ea-iluta-ibni," the scribe who wrote our copy of the new Extract Chronicle,¹¹⁰ has also been omitted from the list since he was not a participant in the events he recorded. The two individuals from the Sealand who are mentioned in the Babylonian Chronicle and the new

The following abbreviations are used in addition to those listed on the back cover and those listed in the initial note of the first installment of this article (*AUSS*, IX [1971], 51): *BHT* = Smith, S., *Babylonian Historical Texts Relating to the Capture and Downfall of Babylon* (1924); *BIN* = Nies, J. B. and C. E. Keiser, *Historical, Religious, and Economic Texts* (Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies) (1920); *BLC* = Bodleian Library Collection, now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford University; *Cambyses* = Strassmaier, J. N., *Inschriften von Cambyses* (1890); *CUL* = Mendelsohn, I., *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the Libraries of Columbia University* (1943); *Cyrus* = Strassmaier, *Inschriften von Cyrus* (1890); *Darius* = Strassmaier, *Inschriften von Darius* (1893-1897); *GCCI* I and II = Dougherty, R. P., *Goucher College Cuneiform Inscriptions* (1923, 1933); *LBL* = Thompson, R. C., *Late Babylonian Letters* (1906); *LCE* = Keiser, C. E., *Letters and Contracts from Erech Written in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (1918); *MLC* = Morgan Library Collection (at Yale); *Nabonidus* = Strassmaier, *Inschriften von Nabonidus* (1889); *Nabuchodonosor* = Strassmaier, *Inschriften von Nabuchodonosor* (1889); *NBBAD* = Moore, E. W., *Neo-Babylonian Business and Administrative Documents* (1935); *NBC* = Nies Babylonian Collection (at Yale); *NBD* = Moore, *Neo-Babylonian Documents in the University of Michigan Collection* (1939); *NBRU* = Pohl, A., *Neubabylonische Rechtsurkunden aus den Berliner Staatlichen Museen* (1933, 1934); *NCBT* = Newell Collection of Babylonian Tablets (at Yale); *RECC* = Tremayne, A., *Records from Erech, Time of Cyrus and Cambyses* (1925); *REN* = Dougherty, *Records from Erech* (1920); *SCT* = Gordon, C. H., *Smith College Tablets* (1952); *UM* = University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; *YBC* = Yale Babylonian Collection.

¹¹⁰ Millard, *Iraq*, XXVI (1964), 16, 32.

Extract Chronicle present a special problem here; consequently they have been listed separately in Table IX and have not been included in the statistical summary to the table. At the time referred to in these two Chronicle passages, the rulers of the Chaldeans in the marshes at the head of the Persian Gulf were officially subject to Assyria. However, it is obvious from the texts that both Zer-DU-lishir and Nabu-bel-Shumate had cast off such ties and were in league with Elam and Babylon against Assyria. In so doing they were acting essentially as independent rulers, or kings, but the texts of that time did not always refer to the tribal leaders of the Sealand as "Kings" (*šarru*), even when they were independent.¹¹¹ The problem here is one of political terminology and it seems more consistent to group these two individuals with the kings in Table IX than with the persons in the last column there who were all subordinates of the kings. With these preliminary remarks out of the way, the status of the seven persons named in the Chronicles who were not kings can be examined.

The first five cases come from parallel passages in the Babylonian Chronicle and the Esarhaddon Chronicle. The

¹¹¹ Several Chaldean tribes are mentioned in the annals of Shalmaneser III, but "Bit-Jakin, as often on later occasions, appeared as the strongest of the tribes; and its chief was the only sheikh accorded the title 'king' by the Assyrian annalist" (*PHB*, p. 260). The title bestowed upon him was "King of the Sealand." Then, "Over a century later the official accounts of Tiglath-pileser III's campaigns against the Chaldeans likewise bestowed the title of 'King' only on Merodach-baladan head of the Jakin tribe. . . . One should note however, that in the more compressed versions of Shalmaneser III's Chaldean conquests, the chieftains were collectively referred to as 'kings'" (*ibid.*, note 1664). Brinkman's summary of the situation here is that "we know little about the internal organization of the Chaldean tribes. . . . The individual tribes are called *Bit*-PN, 'House of So-and-so,' and members of the tribe are referred to as *mār* PN, 'Son of So-and-so,' Chieftains of the tribes often bear no title other than *mār* PN, *i.e.*, their tribal affiliation, in the Assyrian sources, though leaders of the Jakin tribe sometimes have the additional title 'King of the Sealand.' The Chaldean chieftains are referred to collectively as 'kings of Chaldea' several times in late ninth- and early eighth-century Assyrian sources and as 'headmen' in the times of Tiglath-pileser III" (*ibid.*, pp. 264, 265).

first two persons, [X]-aḥḥe-šullim, the *gú.en.na* official of Nippur, and Shamash-ibni, the "Dakkurean," are mentioned in the entry for the 3rd year of Esarhaddon. The crime of these officials is not mentioned in the texts, but their fate is—they were "led away to Assyria and executed in Assyria."¹¹² Two similar culprits were apprehended during Esarhaddon's 6th year. In this case Shum-iddin (or Nadin-shumi) was the guilty *gú.en.na* official and Kudurru was the "Dakkurean" involved. The texts do not relate their ultimate fate, but they do state that they were taken to Assyria. These four officials were disposed of under the administration of Esarhaddon, but the 5th and final official mentioned by name in these two texts, Bel-eṭir, was apparently taken care of by Shamash-shum-ukin. Actually, Bel-eṭir's name was not written in the part of the Esarhaddon Chronicle that relates to him, but it is present in the corresponding passage of the Babylonian Chronicle. The record for the accession year of Shamash-shum-ukin in the latter text says that, "In the month of Tebetu, the 20th day, Beletir, the (chief) justice of Babylon was seized and executed."¹¹³ The names of these officials are all found in the second, or detail, section of the Babylonian Chronicle that records the reign of Esarhaddon and after; only kings are mentioned by name in the first, or summary, section of that text.

The names of the other two persons referred to in Table IX that were not kings come from two of the last three Chronicles in the list. Nabu-shuma-lishir is mentioned in the text that chronicles the first ten years of Nebuchadrezzar's reign, but little is known of his activities from this Chronicle since the pertinent part of the text is badly damaged. Wiseman says of this passage,

¹¹² *ANET*, p. 302. On the *gú.en.na* official, see note 3 there and also under *guennakku* in *CAD* V (Chicago, 1956), p. 120. The first element of the personal name of this *gú.en.na* official is damaged in both of the chronicles that refer to him. The name of the second person involved is missing from the Babylonian Chronicle but it is attested in the parallel passage of the Esarhaddon Chronicle.

¹¹³ *ANET*, p. 303.

Few details remain but the name of Nabū-šuma-lišir, the younger brother of Nebuchadrezzar, is mentioned with a specific, though broken, date. The text of the record can only be guessed at; nevertheless it is unlikely to have been concerned with a revolt led by Nabū-šuma-lišir in view of the subsequent call-up of the army for yet another campaign in Syria which brought in much tribute to Babylon.¹¹⁴

The seventh and last personal name of an individual who was not a king that is attested in these texts is found in the Nabonidus Chronicle. According to Smith,¹¹⁵ the name of Nabu-Bel-dan-ušur appears in the lower part of the first column of this text where the entry for the 3rd year of Nabonidus apparently was recorded. Unfortunately, however, the passage of the text in which his name appears is so badly damaged that it is impossible to determine anything about this individual or his activities. Evidently Oppenheim was uncertain about the nature of this reference too, for he simply transcribed *aNabû-aEN(?)*.DAN.ŠEŠ for this group of signs in his translation of the Nabonidus Chronicle.¹¹⁶ Smith also suggested that since the conjunction "and" appears in front of this name, another personal name preceded it, but if so, only the last sign of that name is left.¹¹⁷ To summarize this survey of the Chronicles, only seven cases were encountered in which personal names were used in the texts for individuals who were not kings. Of these seven persons named, five were errant officials who received punishment for their misdeeds. The remaining references involve the names of two persons about whom nothing can be determined from the texts in question because of damage to the passages in which their names appear. Another feature of this survey is the fact that the names of all seven of these individuals appear only once each in the Chronicles in which they are mentioned.

The presence and absence of the personal names of the two crown princes mentioned in the Nabonidus Chronicle present

¹¹⁴ *CCK*, p. 29.

¹¹⁵ *BHT*, p. 119.

¹¹⁶ *ANET*, p. 305.

¹¹⁷ *BHT*, p. 119.

an interesting contrast in regard to the use of names in the Chronicles. Belshazzar is referred to five times in the legible portions of the second column of that text, but he is referred to only by his position of crown prince and never by name. On the other hand, Cambyses is mentioned only once in the legible portions of the text, but his personal name is used there. The difference between the treatment of these two individuals in the text might be due to the fact that Belshazzar never came to the throne and therefore is not mentioned by name, whereas Cambyses did become king so his name is present in the text. Another explanation is possible here, however, and that is the suggestion that Belshazzar's name originally appeared in Column I that is now badly broken, and that the references to him by title in the second column presumed upon the antecedent personal name now missing from the preceding section of the text.

The statistics collected above on the seven persons named in these Chronicles who were not kings contrast with the fact that eight times as many kings (58) are mentioned by name in the same ten chronicles, and their names are used in those texts a total of 177 times, which averages out to just about three times per king. Coincidentally, three is precisely the number of times the king of Babylon proposed here is mentioned by name in the third column of the Nabonidus Chronicle. This use of his name in that text does not prove that Ugbaru was a king, but it does add prestige to his person, and it suggests the possibility that perhaps he should be classed with the kings after all. Certainly the seven cases discussed above do not provide any parallel with the way in which Ugbaru's name is used in the Chronicle. However, the evidence here is merely suggestive and not conclusive, so the references to Ugbaru must be examined further.

The Use of Death Dates in the Babylonian Chronicles. The date of Ugbaru's death, the 11th of Arahsmnu, has already been referred to quite a few times in this study. Once again, however, the fuller significance of this reference is better

understood when consideration is given to the comparative materials on the use of death dates in the other chronicles. The death dates in these chronicles are listed in Table X for this purpose.

Table X
LIST OF THE DEATH DATES IN THE BABYLONIAN
CHRONICLES FROM THE 8TH—6TH CENTURIES

<i>Chronicle Number</i>	<i>Person</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Death Date</i>
I	Tiglath-pileser III	King	Assyria	Tebet
	Shalmaneser V	King	Assyria	Tebet
	Hallushu	King	Elam	26 Tashritu
	Kudurru	King	Elam	8 Abu
	Menanu	King	Elam	7 Addaru
	Hummahaldashu	King	Elam	23 Tashritu
	Sennacherib	King	Assyria	20 Tebet
	Name not given	King	Sidon	Tashritu
	Name not given	King	Kindu	Addaru
	Wife of the king	Queen	Assyria	5 Addaru
	Esarhaddon	King	Assyria	10 Arahsamnu
	Bel-eṭir	Justice	Babylon	20 Tebet
	II	Hummahaldashu II	King	Elam
Name not given*		King	Sidon	[Tashritu]
Wife of the king*		Queen	Assyria	6 Addaru
Esarhaddon*		King	Assyria	10 Arahsamnu
Unnamed (Bel-eṭir)*		Justice	Babylon	20 Tebet
VI	Sin-shar-ishkun	King	Assyria	Abu
VII	Nabopolassar	King	Babylon	8 Abu
X	Mother of the king	Queen-mother	Babylon	5 Nisanu
	Name not given	King	Lydia	Aiaru
	Ugbaru	?	Babylon	11 Arahsamnu
	Wife (?) of the king	Queen (?)	Babylon	Month [X]

* Essentially duplicates the information in the Babylonian Chronicle

Table X shows that five out of the chronicles discussed in this section contain death date records, and in all, death dates for 19 persons are present in these five texts. Aside from Ugbaru, there are death dates in Table X for 14 kings, two queens, one queen-mother, and a chief justice. When these individuals are grouped together, it is evident that all but one

belong to royalty. In addition, some doubt may be expressed about the chief justice's death date. The Babylonian Chronicle does not specifically state that Bel-eṭir was executed the same day he was seized, but that is probably the best way to understand the text. A dozen of the death dates in Table X come from the Babylonian Chronicle, seven from the first or summary section of the text, and five from the second, more detailed section. The four death dates in the Nabonidus Chronicle are also evenly distributed between the two sections of that text; two are present in the detailed section in the first two columns of the chronicle, while the death dates for Ugbaru and the wife of the king appear in the second or summary section of the text. Since death dates in these chronicles are used almost exclusively for royalty, with the one exception of Bel-eṭir in the Babylonian Chronicle, this evidence complements the observations above on the multiple use of Ugbaru's name in the Nabonidus Chronicle. Again, the fact that Ugbaru's death date is explicitly stated in the text implies but does not conclusively prove that he was a royal personage, *i.e.*, a king.

Ugbaru Versus Gubaru. The next aspect of this subject for examination is the problem presented by the three names in the third column of the Nabonidus Chronicle that are both similar and different at the same time. The name of the governor of Gutium in line 15 appears to be Ugbaru, Gubaru is clearly the name of Cyrus' governor in line 20, and Ugbaru shows up again in line 22 as the name of the man whose death is recorded there. To complicate matters further, Gubaru is the name of the governor of Babylon found in some 25 business and administrative documents that date from the 4th year of Cyrus to the 5th year of Cambyses. The question here is, what is the relationship of the individuals whose names are present in these various references? Do all of these names refer to the same person? If they do not, then how many different persons are involved?

Scholarly opinion has been divided on this point in the past. Smith favored the view that all three of these names in the

chronicle referred to the same person, but he allowed for the possibility that they might refer to separate individuals.¹¹⁸ Oppenheim's translation of the Nabonidus Chronicle also seems to imply that only one person is referred to by these three names.¹¹⁹ On the other hand, Albright has advocated the view that two separate and distinct individuals are involved here.¹²⁰ Whatever the final solution to this problem may be, Smith's publication of the Nabonidus Chronicle certainly

¹¹⁸ From the body of his remarks on the chronicle it is apparent that Smith considered the most likely interpretation to be that all three names applied to the same person (*ibid.*, pp. 104, 105). However, Smith was less positive on this point in a footnote later: "(20) *Gubaru*. It is possible that the chronicler intended to distinguish Ugbaru of Gutium from Gubaru, whom Cyrus appointed governor of Akkad and Ebir nari, that Ugbaru is the Gobryas of Xenophon, and Gubaru is identical with the governor of . . . Akkad and Ebir-nari who is frequently mentioned on business documents of the time of Cyrus and Cambyses. On the other hand it is possible that the chronicler intended one and the same person by Ugbaru and Gubaru, the Gobryas of Xenophon, that he was appointed governor by Cyrus, but died on the night of the 10-11th Marcheswan, and was succeeded by another Gubaru, not his son, since Xenophon expressly states that his only son had been murdered, *Cyropaedia*, VI, 4, 3-4" (*ibid.*, pp. 121, 122).

¹¹⁹ Oppenheim translated all three of these names with the equivalent Greek name of Gobryas, and only in the first instance did he place the Akkadian name in parentheses after the Greek (*ANET*, p. 306). Dougherty followed a similar course in his translation of this passage. He used Gobryas to translate all three names too, and he placed Ugbaru in parentheses after the first and third names, but he did not put Gubaru after the name in line 20. However, he did transliterate all three names just the same as Smith did in his transliteration of these lines (Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* [New Haven, 1929], p. 173). Dougherty also followed Smith in placing a cautionary comment on the problem here in a footnote, "The reading (BAD = imût) in *BHT*, p. 114, is textually correct, and hence on the assumption that Gubaru and Ugbaru refer to the same person, we must assume that there was another Gubaru (Gobryas), who was the governor of Babylon and the District beyond the River during the early part of Persian control of Babylonia. If, as Smith suggests (*BHT*, p. 121), Gubaru and Ugbaru were different persons, there is less difficulty in interpreting the text, but there must be more light upon the historical situation before final conclusions can be drawn" (*ibid.*, p. 172, n. 561).

¹²⁰ In Albright's book review of Olmstead's *History of the Persian Empire*, *JBL*, LXVIII (1949), 371-377.

clarified one part of it. His copy and translation of the text clearly indicate that Ugbaru died soon after the fall of Babylon, which means that he did not live long enough to be governor there in the 4th year of Cyrus, so he obviously was not the same person as Gubaru the governor mentioned in the business and administrative texts.¹²¹ From this point on, resolving the rest of the problem would seem to be simple and merely require connecting up the names that are alike, Ugbaru in line 15 of the chronicle with Ugbaru in line 22 of the same text, and Gubaru in line 20 with Gubaru in the other texts. A correlation like this would definitely favor Albright's viewpoint on the subject, but the problem is complicated by the orthography of these names in the text of the chronicle. The names in question are reproduced here from Smith's copy of the text to assist in their discussion that follows:

Line 15	𒌶 𒌷 𒌸	<i>X?-ba-ru</i>
Line 20	𒌶 𒌷 𒌸	<i>Gu-ba-ru</i>
Line 22	𒌶 𒌷 𒌸	<i>Ug-ba-ru</i>

The first problem connected with the orthography of these names in the text comes from the first sign in the first name. Obviously, that sign is not the same as the first sign in either of the other two names. It has been suggested, however, that it comes close to the first part of the *Ug* sign in line 22, and since it does not resemble any other sign in the Neo-Babylonian syllabary, that appears to be a fair estimate of the situation. It is interesting to note that the problem with this sign did not result from damage to the tablet, for this part of the passage is not damaged according to Smith's copy. Instead, the sign was written defectively, as Smith pointed out in his footnote to this line, "(15) *Ug(?)*. This sign has not been com-

¹²¹ "The assumption . . . that Gobryas is to be identified with Cyrus and Cambyses' governor of Babylonia and Ebir-nari is disproved by the new reading of the Chronicle III, 22, which accords with Xenophon's statement that Gobryas was an old man" (*BHT*, p. 105, n. 1).

pleted by the scribe, possibly because he could not see the end of it in the original."¹²² In other words, this sign may indicate that this part of the text was not completely legible to the scribe who wrote our copy of the Nabonidus Chronicle, possibly because of damage to the tablet from which it was copied.

In addition to this complication concerning Ugbaru's name in the text, Albright has suggested that the first sign in his name should be read *Uk* instead of *Ug*,¹²³ which would differentiate him even more sharply from Gubaru in line 20. The first sign in the third name does carry the *Uk* value, as well as those of *Ug* and *Uq*, so this interpretation is linguistically permissible. However, there is nothing inherent in the text itself that favors a reading of *Uk* over *Ug* for this sign, and since his name is not attested in other texts of the time outside of the Nabonidus Chronicle, there are no materials available with which to compare it. In other words, the reading of *Ug*

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 121.

¹²³ Or *As*. "Smith's hand-copy . . . distinguishes sharply between the Persian governor of the Zagros region, who occupied Babylon, and the Persian who was appointed governor of Babylonia by Cyrus. The former is said by the very reliable Chronicle . . . to have died soon after the conquest of Babylonia, whereas the latter remained governor of Babylonia and Syria for many years under Cyrus and Cambyses, as attested by many economic texts. The former's name is written in cuneiform something like *Šik(?) -ma -ru* in the first occurrence and *As(?) -ma -ru* or *Uk(?) -ma -ru* in the second; the reading Ugbaru is highly improbable, and motivated chiefly by the desire to identify the name with that of the Greek Gobryas. On the other hand, Gubaru, appointed governor of the richest provinces of the Persian Empire, is undoubtedly to be identified with Gobryas" (Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 375). Albright took up the second of the two interpretations of this matter mentioned by Smith and Dougherty to argue against Olmstead who held to the first interpretation of it. A reading of *Šik?/As?/Uk?* hardly provides a convincing basis upon which to reach such a firm conclusion in the matter. By the same line of reasoning based upon the values he has proposed for these signs, Albright should also have differentiated the person mentioned in line 15 from the person in line 22. This would indicate that not two but three persons are pointed out in this passage of the text. In addition, it was Xenophon's Gobryas (along with Gadatas) "who occupied Babylon."

for this sign is just as reasonable, or unreasonable, as the reading of *Uk* or *Uq*. By the same token, on purely linguistic grounds, the first sign of the name in line 20 could also be read *qu* or *ku*₈ in order to differentiate the individual referred to there from the later governor, but this is a historical and not a linguistic consideration. Only one fact is definite from the orthography of the initial signs in these three names—the vowel follows the consonant in the first sign of the second name (*Gu/qu/ku*₈), and it precedes the consonant in the first sign on the third name (*Ug/k/q*), whatever consonant those signs may indicate.

Albright has also suggested that the second sign in Ugbaru's name should be read *ma* instead of *ba*.¹²⁴ In favor of this view is the fact that Smith did copy the bottom wedge of this sign quite horizontal in lines 15 and 22, while in line 20 of his copy it inclines slightly upwards. However, as is well known, it is very difficult to differentiate between the *ba* and the *ma* signs in Neo-Babylonian orthography. As far as I know, none of the cuneiformists who have examined this tablet, including Smith himself who copied these signs this way, have read any other value than *ba* for the second sign in all three of these names. This interpretation may simply be based on contextual considerations, of course, but if it is, that is a further indication of the nature of the problem here. Finally, the one sign that is not disputed in these names is the last one which clearly is the same *ru* sign in all three cases. In summary, only two of the nine signs that compose these three names in the text are unquestionably different, the first sign in the second and third names, and the only definite difference that these two signs entail is the position of the vowel involved. Since this is not a very firm orthographic basis on which to differentiate between two persons in this passage, other information bearing on this problem must be considered besides just the orthography of the names in the text.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, Albright did not discuss the *ba/ma* problem.

A very interesting and well-documented piece of information pertinent to this problem comes from the business and administrative documents that refer to Gubaru the governor of Babylon. Since the chronological distribution of these texts is of considerable interest in this connection, their distribution has been detailed in Table XI. The reference to Gubaru in the Nabonidus Chronicle has been omitted from the list since that reference is in question here.

Table XI

CHRONOLOGICAL DISTRIBUTION OF BUSINESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE TEXTS THAT REFER TO GUBARU, THE GOVERNOR OF BABYLON

<i>King</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>References</i>
Cyrus	accession	Not attested
	1st	Not attested
	2nd	Not attested
	3rd	Not attested
	4th	<i>NBRU</i> 43 (dated VIII, 1) <i>NBRU</i> 45 (dated XII, 9) <i>NBRU</i> 46 (dated XII, 10)
	5th	Not attested
	6th	<i>RECC</i> 56, 92
	7th	<i>TCL</i> XIII 142
	8th	<i>RECC</i> 70, <i>NBRU</i> 61
9th	<i>GCCI</i> II 103, <i>LCE</i> 169, <i>BIN</i> 114	
Cambyses	1st	<i>Cambyses</i> 96, <i>BE</i> VIII 20
	2nd	<i>TCL</i> XIII 150, 152, <i>GCCI</i> II 120, <i>RECC</i> 127, 128
	3rd	<i>RECC</i> 137, 160
	4th	<i>RECC</i> 168, 172
	5th	<i>RECC</i> 177, 178, <i>TCL</i> XIII 168

The 25 texts cited above cover a span of 11 years which gives an average of two references to Gubaru per year during that period. The number of times his name is attested falls below this average only in two places on the list, during the 5th and 7th years of Cyrus. The first definite reference to Gubaru (*NBRU* 43) dates to November, 535 B.C., and since Babylon fell in October, 539, this reference comes from four

years after that event, and three years after the death of Ugbaru in October, 538. Even though we are dependent upon the chance survival and recovery of materials of this type, as mentioned in Part I, the chronological distribution of these texts still appears to be significant. The complete absence of any reference to Gubaru, the governor, in the texts for four full years after the fall of Babylon raises the question whether he was governor during that time or not. The absence of Gubaru from the texts of those four years is emphasized by the fact that he appears fairly regularly in texts from the next 11 years after that. While a gap of a year or two in these references might be expected statistically (cf. the 5th year of Cyrus), four years in a row is more than one would ordinarily expect if Gubaru was governor during that time. However, this problem cannot be resolved with finality until texts turn up with the name of the governor of Babylon during the first three years of Cyrus. At the present time there is no evidence to connect Gubaru of the Nabonidus Chronicle with the governor in the economic texts except the fact that their names appear to be the same, and since this passage in the chronicle clearly applies to the accession year of Cyrus, the two names in these sources are separated by a gap of four years.

At first glance the fact that the name Gubaru is found in both the chronicle and the administrative texts might appear to be convincing evidence that both sources refer to the same person, but this is not necessarily the case. The onomasticon of this period shows that some personal names were used by many individuals, some were used by a few, and some are attested for only one person.¹²⁵ Gubaru was not a name that was commonly used in the texts of the early Achaemenid period, but other individuals by that name are known. Gaubaruva was one of the famous "six helpers of Darius" when he killed Gaumata, according to the Behistun inscrip-

¹²⁵ Cf. K. Tallqvist, *Neubabylonisches Namenbuch* (Helsingfors, 1905).

tion,¹²⁶ and he can be connected with the Gobryas Megabyzus of Herodotus.¹²⁷ Because of the different political circumstances in which Gaubaruva is found and because he appears on the scene four years after the last reference to Gubaru the governor in the Babylonian texts, it seems likely that the two should be differentiated. Herodotus also mentions another Gobryas who was the son of Darius I and Artystone.¹²⁸ Finally, another Gubaru appears in the Babylonian business texts from the time of Darius II. Thus the mere fact that Gubaru of the chronicle and Gubaru in the administrative texts have the same name does not necessarily prove that they were the same person.

On the other hand, there are two features of the Nabonidus Chronicle that may possibly support the identification of Ugbaru with Gubaru in the third column of the text. The first feature is found in the use of these two names when they are compared with the use of personal names in the chronicles in general as discussed above. Obviously, Ugbaru cannot be judged king of Babylon when he first appears in the chronicle as the governor of Gutium who led a part of Cyrus' army to victory over Babylon without a battle. Gubaru also is simply mentioned as "his [Cyrus'] governor" in line 20 of Column III. Presumably the governorship of Babylon is the office referred to here but that is not explicitly stated in the text and it may be significant in this connection that Ugbaru is mentioned as a governor of Cyrus before this. At any rate, neither of these two references could possibly be interpreted as applying to a king. However, to differentiate between Ugbaru and Gubaru here of necessity means that not one but two non-royal personages are mentioned by name in this chronicle passage. This is not impossible, as the two examples in the Babylonian Chronicle demonstrate, but when the other nine chronicles

¹²⁶ R. G. Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon* (2d rev. ed.; New Haven, 1953), p. 132, § 68. 4.83 (Behistun Inscription).

¹²⁷ Herodotus, *The Histories*, transl. by A. D. Godley ("The Loeb Classical Library"; Cambridge, Mass., 1920), Bk. III, 70 ff.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, Bk. VII, 72.

surveyed above are taken into account, it seems statistically unlikely.

In the second place, there are quite a few elements in this part of the chronicle that can be readily organized into a brief chronicle of Ugbaru's career. When he appears on the scene in line 15 his background as the governor of Gutium is mentioned with his major military achievement, the conquest of Babylon. Ugbaru's control of Babylon before Cyrus arrived is evident from the fact that his Gutian troops are specifically mentioned as the guards of the temple precincts, and the text notes that they performed their duties so efficiently that "no appointed ceremony was passed over."¹²⁹ The chronicle does not specifically state when and by whom Nabodinus was arrested when he returned to Babylon, but the fact that this detail is located in line 16 implies that he was taken prisoner before the end of Tashritu, the date of the next event listed in the text, which means that Ugbaru probably was the principal authority to whom he surrendered. Even the triumphal entry of Cyrus is interesting in this regard, for after "Cyrus proclaimed peace to Babylon"¹³⁰ no further mention of him is present in the legible portions of the text, *i.e.*, this part of Column III certainly does not look like the beginning of a standard chronicle for his reign in Babylonia.

The next event listed in the chronicle after Cyrus sent his greetings to Babylon is Gubaru's installation of governors there. If this Gubaru is the same person as Ugbaru, then this observation also fits very well into a chronicle of Ugbaru's career as a reference to his most important act in post-conquest Babylonia—the organization of the Persian administration. Before considering the other possibility, that Gubaru and Ugbaru were not the same person, it should be pointed out that Ugbaru was present in Babylonia in the 8th month of the next year when he died. The evidence for this comes from the consecutive chronological interpretation of

¹²⁹ *BHT*, p. 117.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

the text in connection with the fact that his death is mentioned in the chronicle. If Ugbaru had returned to his post in Gutium and died there, it is very unlikely that his death would have been reported in a chronicle written in Babylonia. Since it appears reasonable to assume that Ugbaru remained in Babylonia until his death late in 538, the next question is, what position did he occupy during that year? And if Gubaru who appointed the governors was not the same person as Ugbaru and they were contemporaneous in Babylonia for a year, what was the relationship between them? It is difficult to imagine that Cyrus could have made Ugbaru, who conquered Babylon for him, subordinate to the governor he appointed there after the conquest. Since it seems more likely that Ugbaru would have occupied a position equal or superior to Gubaru, only two positions seem to be available that he could have occupied—military prefect over Babylonia, or king of Babylon vassal to Cyrus. However, instead of interpreting the text in such a way as to make Gubaru and Ugbaru two persons contemporaneous in Babylon for a year after the conquest, it seems easier and more reasonable to assume, in view of the dubious orthography of the names in the text, that they were one and the same individual. As stated above, this view of the names involved would fit the reference to the appointment of governors into a brief chronicle of the career of Ugbaru very nicely.

The return of the gods of Akkad to their cities from Kislimu to Addaru must also have taken place under the auspices of Ugbaru, either directly if he was the governor of Babylon at that time, or indirectly through Gubaru the governor who was subordinate to him, if they are to be differentiated. The return of the gods was completed by the end of the last month of the accession period, which takes the record down to the time of the New Year's festival in the spring of 538. The ceremonies of that New Year are not mentioned in the text, but, according to the chronicle materials discussed above,¹³¹ in general it can

¹³¹ See Shea, *AUSS*, X (1972), 110, 111.

be assumed that they were performed when the text does not specifically state that they were omitted. In this case, the gods were ready for the New Year because they all arrived home on time, by the end of Addaru, which implies that the festival was performed even though it is not noted in the text.

In addition, it is suggested here that Ugbaru was elevated from the office of governor of Babylon to be king of Babylon at the time of this same New Year's festival, even though there is no reference to his accession in this passage of the chronicle. In the preceding discussion on the classification of the Nabonidus Chronicle, several other important omissions from this section of the text were pointed out: the fate of Nabonidus and especially a summary statement for his reign, the labels and dividers that marked off the regnal years in the text, and the record of the accession of the king who succeeded Nabonidus, whoever he may have been. In other words, while Ugbaru's accession is not mentioned here, neither is anybody else's, including Cyrus'. In view of the unusual nature of this part of the Nabonidus Chronicle, the accession proposed for Ugbaru has been interpolated here on the basis of the other evidences examined in this study, even though it is not specifically referred to in the chronicle. Since no accession statement is present in this section of the text at all, the chronicle does not contradict this proposed accession; consequently it must stand or fall on the merits of the other materials that have been assembled in support of it. It may be that no events of outstanding importance occurred during Ugbaru's seven-month reign, so perhaps the statement of his accession was simply assimilated into his death date. As discussed above, death dates were used almost exclusively for royalty in the chronicles, so the reference to his death on the 11th of Arahshamnu brings the chronicle of Ugbaru's activities to a fitting close. The case of Nabu-shuma-ukin in the Babylonian Chronicle¹³² provides a somewhat distant parallel in this connection, for he was also a governor who became

¹³² I, 16-17; Delitzsch, *Die babylonische Chronik* (1906), pp. 8, 19.

king of Babylon. He ruled only very briefly, however, as his reign was cut short at a month and 12 days. The chronicle does not mention his relationship to Nabu-nadin-zeri who ruled for two years before him, but the Babylonian King List A informs us that he was his son.¹³³

The third column of the Nabonidus Chronicle closes with the record of Cambyses' participation in the New Year's festival on the 4th of Nisanu. According to the consecutive chronological interpretation of the text, this act of his took place in the spring of 537; therefore it cannot refer to his installation as king of Babylon coregent with his father, for it comes at the end and not the beginning of the gap in Cyrus' titular in the economic texts. It appears that Cambyses participated in the New Year's ceremonies at that time on behalf of his father Cyrus, to ratify his title to the throne of Babylon which he took up by decree some three months before, after the death of Ugbaru. In this context, Cambyses appears to be a dynastic representative as Saggs suggests, "Cyrus' young son, Cambyses, officiated at the New Year Festival in Babylon, whereby the dynasty received investiture from the god Marduk, henceforth exercising kingship over Babylonia not only by right of conquest but by divine vocation."¹³⁴

In closing these comments on the problem of Ugbaru versus Gubaru it should be noted that the final decision on whether these names represent one and the same person or two different individuals does not materially affect the main proposal of this study, that Ugbaru was the official king of Babylon for seven months from the spring to the fall of 538. As a matter of fact, the argument for his kingship is somewhat stronger if they are distinct than if they are identical, as the preceding discussion indicates. It seems to me, however, that when all

¹³³ *ANET*, p. 272. Brinkman doubts the relationship expressed in King List A, *PHB*, p. 235.

¹³⁴ H. W. F. Saggs, *The Greatness That Was Babylon* (New York, 1962), p. 152.

aspects of the problem are considered, the most reasonable interpretation of the text is the view that all three names refer to the same individual. It is also my opinion that the name of the individual in question was actually Gubaru and not Ugbaru. This opinion is based upon two pieces of information. In the first place, the name Gubaru was used by several individuals of the time, both in Persia and Babylonia, but the name Ugbaru is otherwise completely unattested. Secondly, Gobryas is the name of one of the two generals of Cyrus who led the final attack on Babylon, according to Xenophon.¹³⁵ In the commentary on his translation of the Nabonidus Chronicle, Smith suggested that this Gobryas of Xenophon is the same person that is mentioned three times in the third column of the chronicle under the names Gubaru and Ugbaru.¹³⁶ This identification seems quite reasonable and it is accepted here. It may be significant, then, that the name of Gobryas in Xenophon gives no indication that it originally had an initial vowel in Akkadian, but this evidence is a bit remote from the time when the person who carried that name lived. Even though it seems more likely that the man's name was Gubaru than Ugbaru, the name Gubaru has not been used for him in this study in order to avoid introducing further confusion into an already complicated subject.

Whose Wife Died? The supplementary evidence assembled above in support of the hypothesis that Ugbaru was king in Babylon for a part of 538 naturally raises the question, if Ugbaru was the king of Babylon at that time, then why is not there a reference to the fact that he was a king in the Nabonidus Chronicle? The proposal presented in this section is that there may be such a reference in the chronicle after all. Two lines of the text are involved here, the 22d and 23d lines of the third column where the death of a person related to the king is reported immediately following the record of the death of

¹³⁵ Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, transl. by W. Miller ("The Loeb Classical Library"; Cambridge, Mass., 1914), Bk. IV, 6:1-9; Bk. VII, 5:7-34.

¹³⁶ *BHT*, pp. 104, 105.

Ugbaru. Before considering the possible significance of this reference, however, a few problems connected with the translation of the text should be examined. The textual considerations here involve three questions: who died? when did he or she die? and, when did the subsequent period of mourning begin?

The first of these three questions stems from the fact that the identity of the person who died after Ugbaru is somewhat in doubt because the first sign in line 23 where that person was identified is badly damaged now. However, the nature of the official "weeping" that follows next in the text seems to indicate that the person mourned thereby was a female member of the royal household, *i.e.*, the mother, wife, or daughter of the king. In favor of the view that a female personage was referred to by this damaged sign is the fact that the BAD-sign for the verb "died" that accompanies it is followed by the complement *-at* as an indicator of the feminine, in contrast to the same verb in the preceding line where no such complement appears with Ugbaru as the subject. Concerning the sign in question Smith suggested that "the traces favour Pinches' reading DAM"¹³⁷ and the few wedges that he copied at the edge of the damaged area do coincide with the beginning of that sign. That being the case, the wife of the king (DAM/aššat šarri) is probably the person whose death is recorded at the beginning of line 23, and that is the interpretation accepted in this study.

The second question is, then, when did she die? The last sign legible at the end of line 22 in Smith's copy, although it is partly damaged, appears to be the determinative for the month. The actual sign for the month in question is completely missing in the damaged area at the end of the line, so the month in which she died cannot be determined from the text.

¹³⁷ BHT, p. 122. Dougherty is somewhat more reserved on this point: "The writer would state, after an examination of the tablet itself in the British Museum, that the traces which remain of the original cuneiform sign or signs at the beginning of line 23 are not sufficiently legible for decisive conclusion as to what the scribe actually wrote" (*op. cit.*, p. 174).

Oppenheim placed Arahšamnu in brackets here,¹³⁸ but that estimate cannot be verified from the text itself. There is some reason to suspect that she did not die in Arahšamnu. When two events listed in the text occurred in the same month, the scribe who wrote this chronicle generally dated the second of those two events by the day number only; at least there are four examples of this in Column III. In this case the determinative for the month appears to be present and there is not enough room at the end of the line for the month sign and the day number too, so she probably did not die in the same month of Arahšamnu that Ugbaru died.

If this wife of the king did not die in Arahšamnu, is there any way to determine when she died? The record of the death of Nabonidus' mother in Column II of the chronicle might be used here to arrive at a rough estimate as to when she died. The official "weeping" in Akkad for Nabonidus' mother was not performed until the month of Simanu, two months or more after her death on the 5th of Nisanu. Since the three-day "weeping" Belshazzar and his troops performed for her, presumably in Nisanu, is separated in the text from the general and official mourning in Akkad in Simanu, it appears that the length of time between those two events was necessary to take the news of his mother's death to Nabonidus in Tema, to return his decree concerning the official mourning for her to Babylonia, and to carry out that decree there. The fact that an official mourning was performed in Akkad for the wife of the king mentioned in Column III gives reason to suspect that she was in Babylonia at the time of her death. Then presuming that Cyrus was not in Babylonia when she died, the two months or more mentioned in connection with the previous case may also be assumed in this instance for the length of time necessary to notify Cyrus, wherever he may have been, and to return and carry out his order concerning the mourning for her. If the amount of time involved here was approximately equivalent to that in the earlier instance, then she could have

¹³⁸ *ANET*, p. 306.

died as early in the year as the 9th or 10th months, since the mourning for her began in the last week of the 12th month.

The third question concerning the text here is, when did the period of mourning begin? Related to this question is the corollary of it, how long did it last? This question arises because Oppenheim's translation of line 23 gives the 27th of Arahsamnu as the date on which the mourning began,¹³⁹ and since it ended on the 3rd of Nisanu, this would indicate that the mourning went on for over four months. This seems to be an inordinately long period of time; therefore Smith's older translation of the 27th of Addaru¹⁴⁰ is to be preferred here, a reading that D. J. Wiseman has confirmed for me in his recent examination of the tablet.¹⁴¹

With these preliminary considerations completed, we may address ourselves to the principal question of this section, whose wife died? I would suggest that there are five possible answers to this question: Belshazzar, Nabonidus, Cambyses, Cyrus, Ugbaru.

The first three persons listed above as possibilities for the king whose wife's death is referred to here can be dismissed quite readily. The second column of the Nabonidus Chronicle refers to Belshazzar five times, but only by his position of crown prince and never by name. He is not mentioned at all in the third column of the text where the end of the Chaldean rule over Babylon is detailed. Although Belshazzar did act as regent in Babylon for Nabonidus when he was off in Tema, he never was officially invested as king of Babylon, as far as we know. Obviously then, Belshazzar is not the king we are looking for and he can be eliminated from the list. Nabonidus comes a little closer to filling the requirements of this reference than Belshazzar. Since he was the king of Babylon at the time it fell to the Persians, it has been suggested that the queen who

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ *BHT*, pp. 114, 118. Another scholar who examined the tablet read the text as saying the 28th of Addaru (Dougherty, *op. cit.*, p. 172).

¹⁴¹ "I.22 reads 27 ITU.ŠE . . . 3 ITU.BAR" (personal communication, January 10, 1969).

died and was mourned thereafter was his wife. It seems unlikely, however, that such attention would have been paid to his wife after he was deposed, especially in view of the fact that he was a rather unpopular ruler in Babylonia, and since the kingship there had passed to an entirely different power, not to just another king in the ordinary line of succession. It becomes all the more unlikely that Nabonidus' wife would be referred to in this manner when the passage of the chronicle that mentions the death of this wife of the king is interpreted chronologically according to the consecutive order of the text. This interpretation places her death late in 538, a year later than formerly supposed, which makes it very unlikely that the queen whose death is reported in the text was the wife of Nabonidus. The case for Cambyses' kingship as coregent with Cyrus early in Cyrus' reign in Babylonia has already been discussed at length and rejected.¹⁴² It should also be noted in this regard that Cambyses appears in the chronicle only after the mourning for the dead queen was over, so it seems unlikely that he was the king whose wife died.

The elimination of the first three persons from the list above leaves only Cyrus and Ugbaru as possibilities for the king whose wife's death is mentioned in this section of the chronicle. The most common interpretation of this reference in the text has been to identify this king as Cyrus. This is quite a reasonable identification to make, for Cyrus was ruler over Babylonia at the time this woman died. In addition, a reference to Cassandane (the wife of Cyrus, the daughter of Pharnaspes, and the mother of Cambyses) in Herodotus says that "when she died before him, Cyrus himself mourned deeply and bade all his subjects mourn also."¹⁴³ The queen whose death is recorded in the Nabonidus Chronicle could be fitted into this comment about Cassandane very nicely, but this subject is complicated by the fact that there are several conflicting traditions in the classical sources concerning the wife of Cyrus

¹⁴² AUSS, IX (1971), 100-105.

¹⁴³ Herodotus, *op. cit.*, Bk. II, 1.

who was the mother of Cambyses. Herodotus also recounted the tradition that identified her with Nitetis, the daughter of Apries of Egypt, but he rejected that tradition.¹⁴⁴ A third tradition about this wife of Cyrus appears in the writings of Ctesias who says that she was Amytis, the daughter of Astyages the Mede.¹⁴⁵ Smith identified the queen whose death is recorded in the chronicle with Amytis, but in so doing he noted that "Amytis is considered by some a legendary figure."¹⁴⁶ Unfortunately, there are no further details in Herodotus' account that tell us exactly when and where Cassandane died, which makes it difficult to connect her with the queen referred to in the chronicle with assurance. Also, the reference to "all his subjects" is not really specific enough to indicate that the whole empire, and Babylonia in particular, was supposed to mourn for her.

The absence of any reference to Cyrus in the passage of the chronicle that mentions this queen's death may have some significance in this connection. If she died in Persia then it does not mean very much. However, if this queen died in Babylonia, which might be inferred from the fact that her death is recorded in the chronicle and that an official mourning was performed in Babylonia for her, then it may be significant. If this was Cyrus' wife and she died in Babylonia, then one might have expected Cyrus to visit Babylonia sometime thereafter, but there is no record of it in the chronicle, and Cambyses is the one who appeared in the New Year's ceremonies the day after the mourning for her ended. On the other hand, if this was a vassal king's wife who died in Babylonia, and not a wife of Cyrus, then his absence from the record is quite natural. This is a rather indirect line of reasoning, but it may imply that the woman whose death is recorded in the chronicle was not the wife of Cyrus but the wife of somebody

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, Bk. III, 2.

¹⁴⁵ R. Henry, *Ctesias, les sommaires de Photius* (Brussels, 1947).

¹⁴⁶ *BHT*, p. 105.

else. At the time she died Cyrus was the suzerain or "King of Lands" over Babylonia, but it is not certain, pending a more precise determination of the date of her death, that he had become the official king of Babylon by that time.

While the view that the wife of the king whose death has been discussed here was a wife of Cyrus must remain a distinct possibility, I would suggest that another interpretation of this reference is also possible. According to this proposal, the antecedent of the word "king" at the beginning of line 23 in Column III is simply the male personage mentioned in the immediately preceding phrase of the text, Ugbaru. The interpretation proposed here is that Ugbaru the king died in Babylon first, on the 11th of Arahshamnu. Then his wife died shortly thereafter, also in Babylonia, and an official mourning was held for her throughout the land at the end of the year. At the close of the week of mourning, Cambyses participated in the ceremonies of the New Year to reaffirm Cyrus' accession to the kingship of Babylon that he had decreed a few months before when he received the news of Ugbaru's death.

There is no definite proof at the present time that this interpretation of whose wife died is correct. It is simply offered here as an alternative to the view that the queen referred to was Cyrus' wife. It is consistent, at least, with the other materials assembled above in support of Ugbaru's kingship and therefore may be considered a currently viable alternative to the preceding view. In answer to the question that introduced the discussion of this section it can simply be said that there is a possibility that Ugbaru is referred to by the title of king in this text, as the king whose wife's death is recorded in line 23 of the third column of the chronicle.

Some Problems for Consideration. Before the final summary of this subject is presented, three further problems related to it that have not been discussed before need to be examined. Two sources of a somewhat similar nature are involved in the first problem, Ptolemy's Canon and the Saros Table. It is clear that no king Ugbaru is mentioned in these sources, nor

does there appear to be any room for him in these lists. This problem is readily resolved, however, when the location and length of Ugbaru's reign is noted. According to the interpretation proposed in the preceding section, Ugbaru's term of office as king of Babylon began in the spring of 538, at the time of the New Year's festival in Nisanu, and ended with his death on the 11th of Arahsamnu of the same year. From this it can be seen that all seven months of his reign fell within the same Babylonian calendar year. It is well known that kings who ruled for only a part of a year were omitted from Ptolemy's Canon,¹⁴⁷ and a similar practice can be assumed for the Saros Table. The reason for this procedure is evident from the mathematical construction of these sources. To credit one year to a king who reigned for only a part of that year would have increased the total number of years in the list by one beyond the absolute number of calendar years involved, since the other part of that year was reckoned with the years of the king who reigned in the preceding or succeeding year. This evidence in conjunction with the text (*RECC* 5) that is dated to the 4th of Nisanu as the 1st year of "Cyrus, King of Babylon" appears to indicate that Ugbaru did not become king of Babylon until Nisanu in the spring of 538, and that he was the governor, not the king, before that. The case of Cambyses provides a parallel to this, for the evidence indicates that he too was installed as coregent with Cyrus in Nisanu, 530.¹⁴⁸

The second problem for discussion here relates to a recently published king list from Uruk that includes Nabonidus, the last Chaldean king of Babylon, and the first ruler of the Persian period. Since there is no sign of Ugbaru in the list, the question may be raised whether he ruled in Babylon or not.

¹⁴⁷ On Nabu-shuma-ishkun, mentioned above on p. 164, Brinkman says, "The 'Ptolemaic Canon,' in accordance with its usual custom, omits this ruler because he had no official regnal year" (*PHB*, p. 62). The same phenomenon occurs in the cases of Marduk-zakir-shumi II and the second reign of Merodach-baladan II (*ibid.*, n. 303).

¹⁴⁸ See *AUSS*, IX (1971), 103-105.

A prominent feature of the text in connection with this subject is how badly damaged the list is where the Achaemenid kings begin. Only the ends of the names remain for the first three kings there. To illustrate this point, the translation of the last four lines before the break at the bottom of the obverse of the tablet is given here: ¹⁴⁹

[x] + 15 years: Nabonidus

[9 years: Cy]rus

[8 years: Cambys]es

[36 years: Dari]us

Assuming that these names have been restored correctly, we still lack the number of regnal years the text indicated for these kings. The number of regnal years listed for both Cyrus and Cambyses would be of considerable interest here, to see if any acknowledgement was given thereby to the coregency between them. If Cambyses' position as king of Babylon when he was coregent with his father was recognized then he should have one more regnal year to make nine instead of the usual eight. If the year when Cambyses was king of Babylon vassal to Cyrus was not acknowledged in the king list, then there is good reason to expect that Ugbaru's position as king there vassal to Cyrus would not have been recognized in the list either. In other words, the time that these two individuals ruled in Babylon as vassals to Cyrus may very well have been absorbed into the regnal years reported for Cyrus, since he was suzerain over them and Babylonia at the time. However, this is mere speculation until we have a better king list for this period. It should also be noted that this king list was written more than three centuries after the time of Cyrus, for the last king listed on the reverse side of the tablet is Seleucus II (245-226), and additional Seleucid kings were probably listed below him where the text is broken off.

The final and most obvious question of this section is, if Ugbaru was king of Babylon for the period of time proposed

¹⁴⁹ *SANET*, p. 130.

above, why do we not have any contract tablets dated to him? The first possible answer to this question may be emphasized by referring to Table II.¹⁵⁰ While it appears that the textual materials assembled there are statistically significant enough to support the conclusions drawn from them, texts from the first eight months of Cyrus' first year are not as abundant as we might like. With some difficulty, 13 texts with usable titles that definitely date from Nisanu of that year to the time of Ugbaru's death have been collected for use in Table II. Besides that, only a few of the rather modest number of texts available from this period come from the important centers of northern Babylonia: Babylon, Borsippa, and Sippar. There are several museums, especially in Europe, that possess significant numbers of Babylonian texts from the Achaemenid period that have not been published, and it is possible that they might supply some useful information related to this subject. The texts from Sippar in the British Museum are of particular interest in this connection. Oppenheim referred to these texts with the comment, "The Sippar of the Neo-Babylonian (Chaldean) period is known by many administrative and legal texts; only a fraction of these tablets have been published."¹⁵¹ One possible answer to this question, then, is simply that the texts dated to him may not have been recovered yet, or they have not yet been recognized among the texts that have been excavated.

The other possible answer to this question is that the Babylonian scribes did not date their tablets to him. It is clear that they dated their tablets to "Cyrus, King of Lands" during the first five months after the fall of Babylon, when Ugbaru was governor there, according to the interpretation offered here. It is also obvious that at least some scribes continued to date their tablets to Cyrus as suzerain even after the New Year's festival at which it is proposed that Ugbaru was installed as king of Babylon. Since a similar situation obtained

¹⁵⁰ AUSS, IX (1971), 107, 108.

¹⁵¹ A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1964), p. 405.

in the cases of Ashurbanipal and Kandalanu, and Cyrus and Cambyses, this is not unusual in and of itself. The only question here is whether other scribes dated their documents to Ugbaru the vassal king at this time, as they did for Kandalanu and Cambyses in the other two cases. To the present time we have no evidence that they did, but this remains an open question until a more extensive examination of the unpublished Babylonian texts of the Achaemenid period has been made.

Summary

In spite of the amount of documentation and discussion presented in the preceding pages, the procedure followed in this study is quite simple. The first major piece of evidence utilized here comes from the royal titles in the economic texts that date to the first two years of Cyrus' rule over Babylonia. The gap in those titles that the older interpreters observed has been confirmed and amplified by the addition of a few more titles from texts that were not available at the time they made their observations. The few exceptions discussed above notwithstanding, it is clear that the standard title regularly used for Cyrus in the economic texts from the accession period and the first nine months of his 1st year was simply "King of Lands" and that only. Toward the end of his 1st year, "King of Babylon" was added to his former title in these texts, producing the titulary "King of Babylon, King of Lands" that became the standard title used for him throughout the rest of his reign. No satisfactory explanation has yet been arrived at for this gap in Cyrus' titulary during which time he carried only the title "King of Lands" in the economic texts. The coregency of Cambyses with Cyrus must logically be located at the end of Cyrus' reign, not at the beginning, so that explanation does not suffice. That leaves us with only Gray's suggestion that this change in the titulary of Cyrus occurred "for reasons unexplained."¹⁵²

¹⁵² Gray, *CAH*, IV, 14.

The second major piece of evidence presented in this study comes from the Nabonidus Chronicle and it provides, for the first time, a reasonable explanation for the gap and change in Cyrus' titulary in the economic texts. The dated events in the third column of the Nabonidus Chronicle interpreted chronologically in consecutive order demonstrate that Ugbaru died in the fall of 538, not in the fall of 539, as formerly supposed from the retrospective interpretation of the text. When this piece of the puzzle is placed alongside the preceding piece of evidence, they fit together with chronological precision, for it becomes clear thereby that the texts of the time took up the title "King of Babylon" for Cyrus shortly after the death of Ugbaru. That being the case, it has been proposed here that the death of Ugbaru and the change in Cyrus' titulary relate to each other as cause and effect, *i.e.*, when Ugbaru whom Cyrus appointed as king of Babylon died, Cyrus himself took over the kingship there, and the scribes added the title to it into his titulary in the texts they wrote after that. Three supplementary pieces of evidence have been added to support the identification of Ugbaru as king of Babylon that is based on the two lines of evidence summarized above: the way in which his personal name was used in the chronicle, the presence of his death date in the text, and how well this passage of the Nabonidus Chronicle fits as a brief chronicle of Ugbaru's career. The major and minor lines of evidence summarized here, in conjunction with other aspects of this subject discussed elsewhere in this study, have led to the conclusions that Ugbaru, the governor of Gutium who conquered and governed Babylon for Cyrus, was elevated to the kingship of Babylon in the spring of 538, at the time of the New Year's festival in Nisanu, and that he occupied the throne there until his death on the 11th of Arahsamnu, October 26, 538 B.C. A summary of the results arrived at in this study follows in Table XII.

Table XII
 CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF THE INTERPRETATIONS AND
 CONCLUSIONS OF THIS STUDY

<i>Babylonian Calendar Dates</i>	<i>Years and Dates B.C.</i>	<i>Date Formulae in the Economic Texts</i>	<i>Events in the Nabonidus Chronicle</i>	<i>Ugbaru's Career</i>
Tashritu	539 October	17th Year of Nabonidus, <i>King of Babylon</i>	Cyrus attacks Sippar falls Babylon falls Cyrus enters Babylon Return of the gods begins	Governor of Gutium Conquers Babylon Military Prefect
14 Tashritu	10 October			
16 Tashritu	12 October			
3 Arahsamnu	29 October	Accession Year of Cyrus, King of Lands	Return of the gods ends (New Year's Festival)	Governor of Babylon
Kislimu	November-December			
Addaru	538 February-March	1st Year of Cyrus, King of Lands	Ugbaru's death (Cyrus becomes king of Babylon) Queen's (?) death	(Enthroned) <i>(King of Babylon)</i>
Nisanu	26 October			
11 Arahsamnu	?	1st Year of Cyrus, <i>King of Babylon,</i> King of Lands	Mourning begins Mourning ends Cambyses in New Year's Festival	
27 Addaru	537 8 March			
3 Nisanu	14 March	2d Year of Cyrus, <i>King of Babylon</i> King of Lands		
4 Nisanu	15 March			

Statements in parentheses are the author's interpretations.

(Concluded)