

Angela Steiner
Signature of Library Staff Member

The Three Nebuchadnezzars
Of the Seventh and Sixth Centuries B.C.E.

DAVID B. WEISBERG

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for ordination

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion

Cincinnati, Ohio

1977

Referee, Professor Matitiah Tsevat

Summary

The famous King Nebuchadnezzar, familiar from biblical accounts, ruled Babylonia from 605-562 B.C.E. Though it is not generally known, there were two other kings who had the same name, as we learn from Darius, in his Behistun Inscription. According to accepted modern reckoning, they ruled in 522 and 521 B.C.E., respectively.

This paper seeks to examine the evidence for the latter two kings. Entirely new material is presented, coming mostly from the author's forthcoming volume in the Yale Oriental Series. Unfortunately, while the old theory about the existence of these two kings cannot be shaken entirely, enough new evidence exists to cast doubt upon the reconstruction by such historians as Poebel and others, currently accepted in the history books.

Also presented are nine texts from the British Museum that bear upon the problem.

A possible biblical tie-in, relating to the period of Haggai and Zechariah has been studied by the author elsewhere, and is still potentially existent, though for the present work, no additional evidence became available.

"...But is that really relevant?" ---This is the question I frequently hear about my work in Ancient Near Eastern Studies.

And now, as I respectfully submit this work, the product of so many years of research, mindful of its tentative nature and its flaws, I ask myself, "as a rabbinic thesis, is this really relevant?"

My answer is a resounding Yes. For the I share the eloquent belief of Dr. Alfred Gottschalk, who stated:

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion is the institution of higher learning in American Reform Judaism. Its purposes are shaped by our conviction that the study of Judaism in the spirit of free inquiry will enhance the sanctity of our religion and fortify its timely significance... Nothing in the Jewish past or present is alien to our interests.

Without the encouragement of many colleagues here at the College and elsewhere, this study could not have been undertaken. At our own Institution, I wish especially to thank Samuel Greengus and Ben Zion Wacholder, with whom I discussed the subject matter contained herein at length. I thank them for their wisdom and for their profound insights.

Matitiahu Tsevat, who graciously agreed to be my referee, has always been a friend and inspiration. His prodigious knowledge in Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Studies has never ceased to amaze me.

As for scholars at other Institutions, I mention with gratitude the help of Professors Åke Sjöberg and Erle Leichty, of the University of Pennsylvania; Professor William W. Hallo,

of Yale University; and Professor I. J. Gelb, of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. All of these scholars have generously granted the author permission to study their materials.

A special word should be said about a dear friend on a distant shore, Professor Muhammad Dandamayev, of Leningrad. On two occasions in person, and constantly in writing, have I been the beneficiary of his warm friendship and first-rate competence in Neo-Babylonian studies.

The bulk of this complex manuscript was typed by Mary B. Diamond, of Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati. Her diligent work, precise attention to detail, and patience in producing the Yale Volume, and this study, its offshoot, are here gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, I express my gratitude and love for Ophra in the words of Yehuda Ha-Levy:

עפרה תכבס את בגדיה במי דמעי

ותשטחם לשמש זהרה

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	i
PREFACE	ii
CHAPTER I	1
NOTES	10
TABLES	14
ADDENDUM	16
BIBLIOGRAPHY	25

The Three Nebuchadnezzars of the Seventh and Sixth Centuries B.C. E.

In an article written one hundred years ago, W. St. Chad Boscawen seems to have been the first to have made a clear distinction among contract tablets mentioning a king named Nebuchadnezzar. He distinguished between those texts to be assigned unquestionably to Nebuchadnezzar II (ruled 605-562) and those assigned either to Nebuchadnezzar III (Nidinti-Bēl son of Aniri, who ruled according to present theories, for two months and ten days in the autumn of 522) or Nebuchadnezzar IV (Arahu son of Halditi, who ruled according to present theories for three months and two days in the autumn of the following year, 521 B.C.).¹ Boscawen refers to the Behistun inscription where Darius mentions two usurper kings each of whom took the throne name of "Nebuchadnezzar son of Nabonidus" and ruled briefly during his (Darius') first year. Boscawen identifies the figures mentioned in the contract tablets under consideration in his article with those who lived during Achaemenid rule in Babylonia.

During the first few decades of the twentieth century, the problem received the attention of scholars in this country and abroad² and a consensus developed about how best to place these kings that has been ably summarized in Parker and Dubherstein's indispensable "Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.-A.D. 75."³

Among the texts prepared for the present study there are

thirty-eight that bear upon the problem of the three Nebuchadnezzars. These include all that are dated to the Accession Year or to Year one of Nebuchadnezzar (putting aside for a moment which Nebuchadnezzar). There is general agreement that all texts dated after Arahsumnu 22, Year 1 of Nebuchadnezzar must be dated to Nebuchadnezzar II on the basis of the traditional criteria.⁴ The thirty-eight texts have been sorted out and arranged according to regnal years of

- (1) Nebuchadnezzar the Second (Accession Year and Year One),
- (2) There seems to be one text dating to Nebuchadnezzar III, according to the prevailing criteria, and
- (3) Nebuchadnezzar IV (Year One).

The dates, Geographic Names and titles are given in the list below.

Now the following criteria must be taken into account in discussing the problem:

- (1) The Date Formulae of the contract tablets, including Day-Month-Year and Geographic Name;⁵
 - (2) The Titulary of the kings as found in the documents;⁶
 - (3) The Prosopography of the figures mentioned in the contracts;⁷
- and
- (4) The material of the Behistun Inscription especially in Sections 16, 18, 19, 20, 49, 50, 51 and 52.⁸

As I worked through the relevant scholarship, however,⁹ several problems continued to trouble me about the methods used to distinguish

between the three Nebuchadnezzars.

I am accepting as a working hypothesis the position that there were two historic figures, Nebuchadnezzar III and Nebuchadnezzar IV who ruled around 522-520 B.C., though I have doubts about the criteria that have been used to support this position, and even about the tenability of the position itself. Further research may disprove the prevailing theories, and perhaps other writers may find more definite indicators than I have been able to discover. For the present study, though, I feel that the wisest procedure is to keep those texts that may refer to different kings of the same name separate.¹⁰

Though this is not the place¹¹ to enter into a full scale review of the problem, some elements of my reservations can be set forth:

(1) The Date Formulae

An accepted observation concerning the date formulae is that:

It is now quite clear that all tablets assignable to this [Achaemenid] period which belong to Nebuchadnezzar III are dated to the 'accession year of Nebuchadnezzar.'¹²

And that the balance of the tablets assignable to this period dated to "Nebuchadnezzar, Year I"---¹³ are assignable to Nebuchadnezzar IV.

How it came about that Nebuchadnezzar IV had no Accession Year is discussed by Arno Poebel:

Both Nidintu-Bêl, the rebel king of the first Babylonian sedition, and Arahu, the rebel king of the second revolt, claimed to be Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabunaid, and both were officially recognized as such by the priesthood of Babylon. These facts evidently give us the solution of the problem: Because the priests had officially recognized Nidintu-Bêl as Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabunaid, but now had to present Arahu

to the Babylonian people as Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabunaid, they evidently decided, in connivance with the counselors of the king, on adopting the further official fiction-- in whatever manner they may have achieved their purpose in detail-- that Arahu's reign as Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabunaid, simply was the continuation of Nidintu-Bel's reign as Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabunaid. Thus Nidintu-Bel's accession year officially became Arahu's accession year, while Arahu's actual accession year under that fiction became his, or rather Nebuchadnezzar's, first year.¹⁴

I find this solution problematic. Poebel himself admits that

This solution of our problem may seem strange, but we must consider that the official identification of Nebuchadnezzar-- Nidintu-Bel and Nebuchadnezzar--Arahu actually was the only means to save the priesthood from the accusation that less than a year ago it had evidently supported a wrong pretender, if the present king, too, was to legitimize his claim to the throne by representing himself as Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabunaid. But apart from such political considerations, the combinations of the reigns of the two Nebuchadnezzar pretenders to form officially one reign must have recommended itself as a highly practical measure from the viewpoint of official Babylonian chronology. For, by it, the confusion which naturally would have arisen if documents dating from two different consecutive years had been dated with the same formula, "accession year of Nebuchadnezzar," was happily avoided.¹⁵

It is logical to try to fit the extant material into a framework based upon what Darius says in his Inscription, yet there is no evidence for a conniving priesthood that needed to protect itself against an "accusation that less than a year ago it had evidently supported a wrong pretender..."¹⁶

The dates brought by Poebel that allegedly fit together "like the cogs of a cogwheel into two corresponding gaps of the Darius dates....,"¹⁷ and therefore fit his theory, do not in fact do so. In the first place, in the chart itself there are contradictions:

A text that does not seem to fit into the scheme devised by the author, dated by Ungnad to ¹⁸IV 14 Nebuchadnezzar Accession, is rejected

by Poebel with the following explanation:

In order to cover all possible explanations of the [Ugnad] date, it should be mentioned that, if the tablet actually belongs to our period, it would not be altogether inconceivable that already during the reign of Bardia a Nebuchadnezzar different from both Nebuchadnezzar-Nidintu-Bel and Nebuchadnezzar-Arahu had revolted in Bablon, although the reign of such a pretender would have had to be quite ephemeral.¹⁹

Moreover, there are four new dates in the Yale Babylonian Collection which according to Poebel's criteria would be dated to Nebuchadnezzar IV that conflict with his dates of Darius I:

RPD 1	V	16	1	Nebuchadnezzar [YBC 4049]
4066	V	18	1	Nebuchadnezzar [YBC 4066]
RPD 2	V	24	1	Nebuchadnezzar [YBC 7386]
RPD 3	V	26	1	Nebuchadnezzar [YBC 4045]

These texts all date to Uruk and its environs, and seem to destroy the symmetry that is evident in Poebel's chart on p. 135.²⁰

Also worthy of note is the following: I know of no other place where—once the system of dating by Accession Year is adopted— we find an exception to the rule that every king had an Accession Year.

(2) The Titulary

In his section "Königstitel," F.X. Kugler remarks:

Der Titel "König von Babel" ... ist der einzige, welchen die Herrscher von Nabonassar bis Nabonid inkl. führen.

Mit Cyrus beginnt die Reihe der Herrscher, die sich sar matati "König der Länder" nennen.²¹

The problem of these two titles as used by Cyrus and Cambyses cannot concern us here²² though this is of great interest and importance.

Most interesting is a new date, from YBC 3437 (= #162). The text, dealing with the disbursement of dates to two groups of men,

is dated to

IX 30 18 Nebuchadnezzar, LUGAL KUR.KUR.

A text dated to January, 586 B.C. with the title šar matati, would seem to show that Kugler's criterion that this title was used only after Cyrus II should now be modified.

Also noteworthy is the fact that YBC 3799, dated by the prevailing criteria to Nebuchadnezzar IV because of the prosopography has the title LUGAL E.KI.

It seems to me that the only correct conclusion to be drawn from these varying titles is that we cannot use them as hard and fast indicators for a terminus a quo for texts having these personal names in them.²³

(3) Prosopography

Aside from the observations made by Boscawen noted above,²⁴ arguments cited by Weissbach,²⁵ Ungnad,²⁶ and Cameron²⁷ seem to me to be cogent, and in fact form the main reason for my hesitancy to tamper as of yet with the accepted theory on Nebuchadnezzar III and Nebuchadnezzar IV.

My counter-arguments are mostly on procedural grounds. Firstly, is it sound to rely upon what one may call the "single name criterion?" An example: Cameron concludes that a certain ^dBēl-ētir, an epiṣṣanu, is to be dated to Nebuchadnezzar III or IV because a man with a similar title occurs in a Nabonidus text. Yet in populations numbering in the tens of thousands is this reliable?²⁸

One might even raise this caveat where we are dealing with

names of the type Personal Name A-šu ša Personal Name₁, or
 Personal Name A-šu ša Personal Name₁ A Personal Name₂, since it
 must be born in mind that in the last element, we have not an
 additional name of a new individual, but rather a family name
 borne by the two first people mentioned in the formula.

There are however cases where well-known individuals are
 known and they are listed even with four generations. This, it
 strikes me, is unassailable.

(4) The Material in the Behistun Inscription

Professor Goetze used to say that it takes big guns to shoot
 down a tradition; and we must apply that cautious criterion here.
 Yet while it is actually the case that Darius mentions the two
 "pretenders" in his Inscription some doubt about the material
 presented therein might be raised.

Basically, I think these doubts have been alluded to best by
 R. T. Hallock. They revolve about the notion of the use of
 propaganda.

Let it be said that Poebel's attention to detail is
 awe-inspiring. But his basic assumption is naive.

He believes that the purpose of the narrative is simply
 to communicate facts, and he has a²⁹ compulsion to defend
 the literal veracity of Darius..."

Hallock's objections to Poebel's reconstruction of the events of
 "The 'One Year' of Darius I" concern the possibility of fitting
 all the events recorded in the Behistun inscription for that year
 into the logical framework.

How, one might ask, could a forgery of this kind aid Darius' war effort? --a possible answer is that by exaggerating the number of opponents he had in his first year, he would discourage potential opponents from rebelling against him ever again. The argument would run thus: if nine separate rebels all in one year could not subdue me, how can you alone hope to succeed?

But distortion for war propaganda may be only one reason for doubting the veracity of the text of Darius' Behistun inscription. The confused chronological sequence has already been noted;³⁰ would it not be sensible to consider an additional confusion in facts aside from propagandistic distortions? Subject to question are several points raised by Darius himself.

According to Darius, a first rebellion in Babylon was undertaken by a Babylonian by the name of Nidinti-^dBēl, son of Aniri, and a second by an Armenian, Arahū son of ^dHalditi, both of whom took the throne name of Nebuchadnezzar son of Nabonidus.

Now it will be recalled that Poebel argues that "the priests" were responsible for Arahū's assuming the same throne name, as a kind of cover-up for their backing the wrong man in the earlier year. But this would mean that by their reckoning, no one had actually ruled (in the official sense) in the interim; i.e., they were simply trying to fob off the second man as a continuation of the first. If this is so, we must consider them to have ruled consecutively (surely they were not trying to fob him off as the same man!). Yet before the Persian period, no single king in Mesopotamia had ever assumed the exact name of his predecessor. And it would seem odd for the Mesopotamian priests who were undoubtedly trying to restore the Chaldean dynasty to deviate from such a practice (of never duplicating the name of a predecessor).

In summary, we note the following facts: The evidence seems to clearly point to the fact that there was at least one king name Nebuchadnezzar, to whom texts were dated after the end of the Chaldean period. The weight of the prosopographic evidence forces this conclusion. However, as to whether or not there actually were two Nebuchadnezzar's in the Achaemenid period is subject to some doubt. In the opinion of the present writer, there was but one king of such a name; the historical arguments attempting to justify the existence of two figures rests solely, in substance, upon Darius' statement in the Behistun inscription. This, however, has some weaknesses, as a critical review of Poebel's reconstruction shows.

New evidence from titles, prosopography, and, hopefully, new dates to fill in the gap during Darius' first year, will surely enable us to draw the picture more clearly when all this evidence can be evaluated.

- (1) "Babylonian Dated Tablets and the Canon of Ptolemy,"
Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology 6 (1878), 31.
- (2) Note the following: F. H. Weissbach, ZDMG 61 (1907), 730;
Weissbach, "Zur neubabylonischen und achamenidischen Chronologie,"
ZDMG 62 (1908), esp. pp. 635-39; A. Poebel, "The Names and the
Order of the Old Persian...Months..." AJSL 54-55 (1937-38), 130-141;
idem, "The Chronology of Darius' First Year" ibid., 142-165; 285-314;
A. T. Olmstead, ibid., 392-416; Waldo H. Dubberstein, ibid., 417-19;
Walther Hinz, "Das erste Jahr des Grosskonigs Dareios," ZDMG 92
(1938), 136-173; Poebel, "The Duration of the Reign of Smerdis..."
AJSL 56 (1939), 121-145; Richard A. Parker, "Persian and Egyptian
Chronology," ibid., 58 (1941), 285-301; George G. Cameron,
"Darius and Xerxes in Babylonia," ibid., 314-25; 96 (1942), 326-31.
And Richard T. Hallock, "The 'One Year' of Darius I," JNES 19 (1960),
36-39; and Jack Martin Balcer, "The Date of Herodotus IV. 1 Darius'
Scythian Expedition," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 76 (1972),
99-132, esp. n. 41, [2nd part]. Prof. J.D. Bing of the U. of
Tennessee discussed this article with me. I am grateful for his help.
- (3) B.U.S. 19 (Providence, Brown U. Press, 1956), pp. 14-17.
- (4) (see below, notes 5-8)
- (5) TCL 12 22 and 23 (with Moore, Neobab. Documents [Ann Arbor:
U. of Mich., 1935,] p. 284 at note to text 22;); Nbk. 1-18;
Dhorme, RA 25 (1928), Nos. 1 and 2; TuM 2-3: 6 and 150.
- (6) F. X. Kugler, Sternkunde und Sterndienst, (Munster:
Aschendorff, 1909/10), pp. 403-05.

- (7) Weissbach, ZDMG 62 (1908), 636;
 Ungnad, ZA 19 (1905/6), 416 n. 1.; and OLZ 10 (1907), 464 f.;
 Careron, AJSL 58 (1941), 318, n. 23. Also, San-Nicolo,
Prosopographie.... (Munchen, 1941), p. 26, n. 38.

There are, unfortunately, no Personal Names in common with my list.

- (8) In L. W. King and R. C. Thompson, The Sculptures and Inscriptions of Darius the Great on the Rock of Behistun in Persia, (1907) Weissbach, "Die Keilinschriften der Achameniden," VAB 3 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911).

- (9) In general for the classical and Persian sources, see Edouard Will, Le Monde Grec et l'Orient (Paris, 1972), pp. 13 f. nn 1-2. This and other refs. are due to the kind help of Prof. Getzel Cohen of the U. of Cincinnati.

- (10) I am indebted to Professor J. A. Brinkman, who graciously discussed the problem with me and suggested this formulation. Naturally, the opinions expressed herein are my own.

- (11) So many new texts have come to light that a truly definitive study must await their full elucidation. See Addendum.

- (12) Cameron. "Darius and Xerxes in Babylonia," AJSL 58 (1941), 316 f.

- (13) Ibid., p. 318.
- (14) "The Reign of Smerdis and Others," AJSL 56 (1939), 141.
- (15) Ibid.
- (16) Ibid., p. 141.
- (17) Ibid., p. 136.
- (18) OLZ 10 (1907) columns 464 f. (unpublished,) cited ibid.
p. 135 n. 51.
- (19) Poebel, op. cit., p. 140 n. 83.
- (20) Ibid., p. 136.
- (21) Sternkunde und Sterndienst, II (Munster 1909-10), 203.
- (22) See William H. Shea, "An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period," Andrews University Seminary Studies, 9 (1971), pp. 51-67; 99-128; 10 (1972), pp. 88-117 and 147-178.
- (23) It may, however, be true that the title LUGAL KUR.KUR was used mostly after Cyrus II took over in Babylon.
- (24) See n. 1, above.

- (25) See n. 7, above.

- (26) See n. 7, above.

- (27) See n. 7, above.

- (28) On size of population, see R. M. Adams and Hans J. Nissen, The Uruk Countryside (Chicago, 1972), pp. 87, 92 and passim.

- (29) JNES 19 (1960), p. 39.

- (30) See the refs. cited above, n. 2, passim.

Text

*Locale

Date

Royal Title

I. Nebuchadnezzar II Accession Year (605-604)

1.	NBC 4746	?	12 Ulu	0	LUGAL E.KI [Goetze, JNES 3 (1944), p. 44] Canal names: <u>Nar Amurri</u> , <u>Banitu</u> LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI [Ibid.]
2.	YBC 4170	—	[ultu Tas	0]	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI
3.	YBC 9427	—	1 Araḥ	0	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI
4.	YBC 9131	(Uruk)	2 Araḥ	0	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI
5.	YBC 4003	(Uruk)	27 Kis	0	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI [IX 29 Dar. defeats Nbk III, " Parker-Dubberstein, Chronology, p. 15] 1. II: IGI GAŠAN sa UNUG.KI
6.	YBC 9182	(Uruk)	22 Add	0	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI [Note spring month]
7.	YBC 9649	URU KAL-gu-gu	4 Šeb.	0	witnesses + 1. LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

II. Nebuchadnezzar II Year I (604-603)

1.	YBC 9532	—	18 Nis	1	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI [Note spring month, after Nebuchadnezzar IV.] → LUGAL E.KI
1a.	YBC 9632	—	24 Duz	1	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI
2.	RPD 16	—	15 Ulu	1	LUGAL TIN.KIR.KI
3.	RPD 17	Uruk	16 Tas	1	LUGAL E.KI [Deals with dašsu of ^d Innin UNUG.KI]
4.	YBC 9408	(Uruk)	24? Tas	1	LUGAL E.KI
5.	NBC 4668	—	5 Araḥ	1	LUGAL E.KI
6.	NBC 4931	—	10 Araḥ	1	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI
7.	YBC 9495	—	25 Araḥ	1	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI
8.	YBC 8827	—	16 Kis	1	LUGAL E.KI [Note spring month]
9.	YBC 9065	—	4 Add	1	LUGAL E.KI [Note spring month]
10.	NBC 4768	(Uruk)	18 Add	1	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI [Nabû-nadin-šumi was satammu in 604.]
11.	YBC 7398	—	22 Add	1	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI [Note spring month]
12.	YBC 9634	—	5 X	1	LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI [Trace of month: ///]

III. Nebuchadnezzar III Accession Year (fall, 522 B.C.)

1.	YBC 9163	Borsippa	There is only one text from the 2 months and 10 days in Tas - Araḥ - Kis Yr. 0 with the title that includes the phrase LUGAL KUR.KUR. 24 Araḥ 0		
----	----------	----------	--	--	--

IV. Nebuchadnezzar IV Year 1 (fall, 521 B.C.)

1.	RPD 1	Gadēti			16 Abu	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR
2.	YBC 4066	<u>sa</u> KUR.BAD			18 Abu	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR
3.	RPD 2	Uruk			24 Abu	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR
4.	RPD 3	<u>sa</u> Nāru essu			26 Abu	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR
5.	RPD 4	GARIN naḥallum			2 Ulu	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR
6.	RPD 5	<u>sa</u> KA ašurritu			3 Ulu	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR
7.	RPD 6	ālu <u>sa</u> HĀB.KUR			8 Ulu(?)	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR
8.	RPD 7	al-naḥallum			13 Ulu(!)	1	LUGAL E.[KI] u	KUR.KUR
9.	RPD 8	Bitga <u>sa</u> <u>Bel-ēfir</u> <u>sihi</u> <u>sa</u>			3 Taš	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR
		<u>dBelit</u> <u>sa</u> Uruk						
10.	RPD 9	Bitga <u>sa</u> <u>Bel-ēfir</u> <u>sihi</u> <u>sa</u>			3 Taš	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR [Same day as above.]
		<u>dBelit</u> <u>sa</u> Uruk						
11.	RPD 10	Bitga <u>sa</u> <u>Bel-ēfir</u> <u>sihi</u> <u>sa</u>			3 Taš	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR [Same day as above]
		<u>dBelit</u> <u>sa</u> Uruk						
12.	RPD 11	Bitga <u>sa</u> <u>Bel-ēfir</u> <u>sihi</u> <u>sa</u>			5 Taš	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR
		<u>dBelit</u> <u>sa</u> Uruk						
13.	RPD 12	Bitga <u>sa</u> <u>Bel-ēfir</u> <u>eglu</u> <u>sa</u> ^d Nanā			5 Taš	1	LUGAL E.KI [Note absence of KUR.KUR]	
		<u>sihi</u> <u>sa</u> <u>dBelit</u> <u>sa</u> Uruk					[Same day as above]	
14.	RPD 13	Bitga <u>sa</u> <u>Bel-ēfir</u> <u>sihi</u> <u>sa</u>			6 Taš	1	LUGAL KUR.KUR [Note absence of E.KI]	
		<u>dBelit</u> <u>sa</u> Uruk					[Day later]	
15.	RPD 14	Kar Eanna <u>ālu</u> <u>sa</u> ^d Anu-aḥ-ēres			24 [X]	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR [Trace: Uruk]
16.	RPD 15	eglāti <u>sa</u> Kišād <u>nar</u> Bitga			—	1	LUGAL E.KI u	KUR.KUR [Note Gimillu A Innina-šum-ibni.]
17.	YBC 7400	<u>ālu</u> [X.X...] <u>sa</u> <u>Nad-na-A</u> <u>KUR-šu</u>			[X X]	1	[LUGAL E.KI u] [KUR.KUR]	
		<u>dBelit</u> <u>sa</u> Uruk						

* All 35 texts seem to come from Uruk and its environs. Cp. Poebel AJSL 56 (1939), p. 138.

Addendum

Since the completion of the manuscript, several groups of relevant texts have come to the attention of the author. It has been noted that this present work represents only a stage of a "work in process" since many new texts have been and are presently coming to light that undoubtedly will influence the outcome of the discussion of the three Nebruchadnezzars. Consequently, it has been thought wise to merely make reference to these new texts and any relevant information that may have emerged up until now.

A

Professor Erle Leichty, of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania is currently preparing a catalogue of the texts from Sippar (Abu Habbah) in the British Museum, a collection that numbers more than 35,000 Neo-Babylonian texts. A minimum of 90 percent of these come from the É.BABBARA archive; others are from Babylon, Dilbat and Uruk. So far, he has listed 17,000. Of this latter number, Professor Leichty has noted 97 that are dated to either Nebuchadnezzar Year 0 or Year 1 or Darius Year 0 or Year 1. Their museum numbers range from BM 49209 to 69727. Professor Leichty is requesting permission for the author to work on these 97 texts to determine whether by prosopography, titulary or date, they can shed additional light on the problem of the three Nebuchadnezzars.

It so happens that nine of the above-mentioned texts were copied by the late Theophilus Pinches, xeroxes of which are available at the University Museum. Thanks to Professor Leichty, the author was able to make transliterations of these nine texts. These are included below. Unfortunately, none of the nine was able to shed new light on our problem, since there are no new decisive features in them that can definitely push the weight of evidence away from the traditional theories. As a matter of fact, the author feels it necessary to examine all the texts himself, since in a preliminary perusal of Pinches' copies, the author noted that once the copyist copied

[X X X X]URU

but in his catalogue classified this text with those of Neriglissar, quite impossible on the basis of the trace alone. Moreover, Professor Leichty read the name in question as Nebuchadnezzar, also questionable on the basis of the trace. The question is whether either of the two scholars saw more than the copy would reveal. This question must await a collation.

B

A second additional source of texts is the collections housed at the Yale Babylonian Collection, but not officially a part of it.

The author has recently discovered approximately ten unpublished texts dating to Nbk. 0 or Nbk. 1 (but none as yet of Darius).

One of these, NCBT 364, available in photograph, is one of the earliest "Nbk. IV" dates listed so far by Parker and Dubberstein, in their "Babylonian Chronology" (p. 16). It is dated to V/26/1 (Sept. 4, 521) at Uruk. There are nine additional texts, four of

which are available in preliminary copy, and five of which must await further study. All of the texts that have some Geographic Name are clearly from Uruk and vicinity, an unfortunate occurrence, since aside from the Sippar texts mentioned above, we still fail to have a clear-cut cross-section of texts on which we might make some sounder historical judgment.

C

Examination of four other museum collections in this country (Andrews University, Emory University, the Oriental Institute, and the Cincinnati Art Museum) have turned up interesting finds, but nothing from our target years.

Transliterations of Nine British Museum Texts
 Dating from the Years 0 and 1 of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius
 from the Copies of Th. G. Pinches

1

82-7-14,9

BM 55654 = Str Nbk 20

2

82-7-14, 110

BM 55753

1. 1 1/2 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR a-na
2. KI.LAM ša UDU.NÍTA a-na
3. ^{1d}UTU.BA-ša SUM-na
4. ITI.SIG₄ UD.8.KÁM
5. MU.1.KÁM ^{1d}AG.NÍG.DU.URÙ

Rev. uninscribed

3

82-7-14, 134

BM 55776

(not among Pinches' copies)

4

82-7-14, 144

BM 55786

(not among Pinches' copies)

5

82-7-14, 368

BM 56009

1. UDU.NÍTA [2] [X] NÍG.GA ^d[]
2. ^dšÚ [X] šá [X] [X] []
3. ^{ld}UTU.ŠEŠ.[X X X] []
4. "completely defaced (-T.G.P.)"
5. "
6. "
7. "
8. [X] [] ŠID [X] []
9. it-ti UDU.NÍTA i-nam-din
10. LÚ mu-kin-ni ^lir-ya A-šú šá
11. ^lda-di-ya ^{ld}EN.ŠEŠ.MEŠ.MU
12. A-šú šá ^lNUMUN-tú A ^lmi-gir-a-a
13. [X] [X] ^{ld}EN.MU A-šú šá

14. ¹[X.] [X.]^dEN-ta-gab-bi URU ^dUTU
15. [ITI.X UD.(X + ?)] [9.]KÁM MU.1.KÁM
16. [.]URÙ LUGAL [E.] [KI]

Note: Pinches' catalogue reads: "Ng1?" But he read no traces before "URÙ" in his copy.

Leichty read "Nbk." But he read from Pinches' copy, not the original.

6

82-7-14, 378

BM 56019

1. 1 UDU.NÍTA qi-ni-e
2. ša ina É ^{ld}ŠÚ.LUGAL.A.NI
3. A LÚ ŠU.ĦA
4. LÚ pu-lu na? pi? pi
5. ša ina TIN.TIR.KI
6. ^{ld}É.A.NUMUN.DÙ
7. A-šu ša ^{ld}ŠÚ.LUGAL.A.NI
8. ina UD.KIB.NUN.KI
9. it-ta-din
10. ITI.BÁRA UD.1.KÁM

11. MU.1.KÁM

12. ^{1d}AG.NÍG.DU.URÙ

7

82-7-14,398

BM 56039

1. [] tum []
2. [] UD.19.KÁM
3. MU 1 (11?).KÁM ¹da-ri-mu-šú
4. LUGAL E.KI LUGAL KUR.KUR
5. 2 GUR 3 PI ZÚ.LUM.MA
6. [a-na] 7 ma-ši-ši ša sat-tuk ŠE.BAR
7. ina sat-tuk [] mu-tu ša
8. É.AN.N[A] [X?] ša ITI.GAN
9. [a-na] ^{1d}EN it it e (or zalaq?) nu SUM-[na]
10. [X] GUR ina sat-tuk LÚ BAPPIR-tú
11. [¹] la-ba-ši ina lib-bi [X] [X]
12. [] KI ^dAG GU ZU i-na []

"copied on a foggy day"

3. trace: ~~|||||~~

9. it it e: sic (DBW).

82-7-14, 1083

BM 56674

1. 5 BÁN ŠE.GIŠ.Ī 2 GÍN 3 []
2. NÍG.GA ^dUTU ri-ḫi eš-ru-ú ša [su?-ḫu-um x x x]
3. ša ŠU^{II} ^liR. ^dUTU A-sú ša ^lI. ^dŠÚ A ^lDA. ^dŠÚ
4. [X?] UGU-ḫi ^lad-nu-zu A-sú ša ^ldX-la-ḫu-ra-bi-bi
5. ^lmu-še-zib-^dEN A-sú ša ^ldan-nu-^d[zi-] []
6. ^ldAG.LUGAL.URÙ A-sú ša ^lmi-nu-GIM? x x
7. UD.5.KÁM ša ITI.AB i-nam-[din]
8. ^l-en pu-ut 2-i na [šu-ú]
9. LÚ mu-kin-nu ^ldEN?-tab-ni-ú- [sur?]
10. x x lu li li [X] ^ldEN e-x
11. ^ldUTU.MU-ú-kin A-sú ša ^ldEN-da-a } (sic Pinches)
12. ^ldEN.MU A-sú ša ^ldUTU.ŠEŠ.MU A ^le-piš [X]
13. LÚ.ŠID ^ldUTU.TIN-it A-sú ša ^ldAG.MU.SI.SÁ
14. A LÚ.ŠID ^dINNIN TIN.TIR.KI UD.KIB.NUN.KI
15. ITI.GAN UD.27.KÁM MU.1.K[ÁM]
16. ^lda-a-ru-eš-sú LUGAL TIN.TIR.[KI]

4. ~~XXXX~~
 6. ~~XXXX~~
 9. ~~XXXX~~
 10. ~~XXXX~~ ... ~~XXXX~~

82-7-14, 1171

BM 56763

1. 42 ma-ši-ḥu ša ŠE.BAR
2. ^{1d}AG.ŠU-zib-an-ni ¹UGU ¹X.[X]
3. it-ta-din
4. 18 GI.TAR 3 SĪLA 6 NINDA
5. [] X ŠEŠ.MU LÚ UŠ BAR X IM
6. [] X ¹X ma
7. it-ta-din
8. mi TAR 3 SĪLA 6 NINDA
9. [] X X -ma LÚ APIN
10. [] -ḥi
11. ITI.ŠU UD.28.KÁM MU.1.KÁM
12. ^{1d}AG.NÍG.DU.URÙ
13. LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

-
2. ~~HT~~ ~~HT~~ ~~HT~~ ~~HT~~ ~~HT~~
 5. ~~HT~~ ... ~~HT~~
 6. ~~HT~~ ~~HT~~ ~~HT~~ - ma
 9. ~~HT~~ ~~HT~~ ~~HT~~ - ma

Bibliography

Ackroyd, P. R. Israel Under Babylon and Persia.

London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Boscawen, W. St. Chad "Babylonian Dated Tablets and
the Canon of Ptolemy," Transactions of the
Society of Biblical Archaeology 6, 1878.

Cameron, George G. "Darius and Xerxes in Babylonia,"
American Journal of Semitic Languages
56 (1939), pp. 314-325.

Dandamaev, M. A. Persien unter den ersten Achämeniden.
Reichert Verlag: Wiesbaden, 1976.

Goetze, Albrecht, "Additions to Parker and Dubberstein's
Babylonian Chronology," Journal of Near Eastern
Studies 3 (1944), 43 ff.

Hallock, Richard T., "The 'One Year' of Darius I,"
Journal of Near Eastern Studies 19 (1960), 36-39.

Kent, Roland, "Old Persian Grammar," American Oriental Series
33. New Haven, 1953.

Parker, Richard A. and Dubberstein, Waldo, Babylonian
Chronology. Brown University Press, Providence, 1956.

Poebel, Arno, "The Chronology of Darius' First Year,"
American Journal of Semitic Languages 54/5
(1937-38), pp. 142-165; 285-314.

Shea, William, "An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in
the Early Achaemenid Period," Andrews University
Seminary Studies 9 (1971), pp. 51-67; 99-128;
10 (1972), pp. 88-117 and 147-178.

Ugnad, Arthur, "Beiträge zu einer Prosopographie,"

Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie
der Wissenschaften, 1941.

Weissbach, F. H., "Zur neubabylonischen und achämenidischen
Chronologie," Zeitschrift der deutschen

Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 62 (1908), pp. 635-639.