

Τεκμήρια

Tóp. 14 (2018)

(2017-2018)

Cyrus the Great as a “King of the City of Anshan”

Antigoni Zournatzi

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.20241](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.20241)

Copyright © 2019, Antigoni Zournatzi



Άδεια χρήσης Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0.

Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

Zournatzi, A. (2019). Cyrus the Great as a “King of the City of Anshan”. *Τεκμήρια*, 14, 149–180. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.20241>

ANTIGONI ZOURNATZI

Cyrus the Great as a “King of the City of Anshan”*

The Anshanite dynastic title of Cyrus the Great and current interpretations

Since its discovery in the ruins of Babylon in 1879, the inscribed Cylinder of Cyrus the Great (fig. 1)¹ has had a powerful impact on modern perceptions of the founder of the Persian empire. Composed following Cyrus' conquest of Babylon in 539 BC and stressing above all his care for the Babylonian people and his acts of social and religious restoration, the Akkadian text of the Cylinder occupies a central place in modern discussions of Cyrus' imperial policy.² This famous document is also at the heart of a lively scholarly controversy concerning the background of Cyrus' dynastic line.

The Persian monarch Darius I –who rose to the throne approximately a decade after the death of Cyrus the Great and who founded the ruling dynasty

* This paper was initially presented in the First International Conference *Iran and the Silk Road* (National Museum of Iran, 12-14 February 2011). A pre-publication version was kindly hosted by Pierre Briant on Achemenet (Zournatzi 2011, prompting the similar reflections of Stronach 2013). The author wishes to express her appreciation to Daryoosh Akbarzadeh and the other organizers of the Tehran conference for the opportunity to participate in a meeting that opened up important new vistas on the complex interactions along the paths of the Silk Road, for their hospitality, as well as for their most gracious permission for both the preliminary and the present final publication. Thanks are equally due to Judith Lerner for a useful discussion concerning the possible wider currency of Cyrus' Anshanite title outside the Babylonian domain, and to Michael Roaf, David Stronach, and the two reviewers of the article for helpful comments and bibliographical references. Photographs and permissions for the images in figs. 1 and 2a,b were generously provided by the National Museum of Iran and the Trustees of the British Museum. Responsibility for the views expressed here and any errors is naturally mine.

1. For editions of the text, see Berger 1975 and Schaudig 2001, 551-554. The English translation followed here is by Finkel 2013, 4-7.

2. See, among others, Kuhrt 1983; 2007, 173-178 and *passim*, with relevant bibliography.

of the Achaemenids—placed great score on the Aryan (i.e. Iranian), Persian, and in particular Achaemenid pedigree of his family.³ He also referred to his seat of rule as Parsa – the ancient Persian form of the name of modern Fars in southwestern Iran, as well as the name of Darius’ royal capital, Persepolis, situated in the same region.⁴

The Cylinder appears to draw a markedly different dynastic profile. In the lengthy, relatively well-preserved text, which is partly expressed in the first person singular, as an address by Cyrus himself, statements of Persian identity are absent. The background, moreover, of the founder of the Persian empire is defined (ll. 12 and 21) in terms of a royal lineage going three generations back (Cyrus introduces himself as a son of Cambyses, grandson of Cyrus, and descendant⁵ of Teispes) which does not include Achaemenes, the eponymous ancestor of Darius’ family; and in terms of Cyrus and his forebears’ kingship over the “city⁶ of Anshan”.

Lack of reference to Achaemenes in Cyrus’ royal lineage in the Cylinder provides one of the main grounds for the now generally accepted distinctiveness of Cyrus’ family and Darius’ line.⁷ In the opinion of a number of scholars,

3. E.g. Kent 1953, 138 (DNA §2).

4. Kent 1953, 119 (DB I §1) and s.v. *Pārsa-* (2) on p. 196.

5. For the translation of Finkel followed here (i.e. “descendant”, as opposed to “great-grandson” which normally occurs in modern translations), see also de Miroshedji 1985, 281 n. 67, 283 n. 76.

6. Cyrus’ dynastic title in the Cylinder is often rendered in translation as “king of Anshan” (see e.g. Pritchard 1969, 315–316 [trans. A.L. Oppenheim]; Waters 2004, 94; Kuhrt 2007, 182) and is actually formulated in other Akkadian documents as “king of the land of Anshan” or simply “king of Anshan” (see p. 155 n. 28). An occasional flexibility in the use of the determinatives for “city” (URU) and “land” (KUR) interchangeably in Neo-Babylonian period texts has also been noted, especially for places outside Mesopotamia (e.g. Zadok 1976, 70; van der Spek 2015). The consistent use of the determinative URU, however, with Anshan in the titulary of Cyrus and his forebears in the text of the Cylinder (e.g. Schaudig 2001, 552–553, ll. 12, 21) may still be taken to signal that, in this particular context, the city itself of Anshan is meant. For a similar view, see Henkelman 2011, 610–611 n. 95.

7. See, among others, de Miroshedji 1985, 280–283; Young 1988, 27–28; Stronach 1997a,b,c; Rollinger 1999.

the claim advanced in the Cylinder, and echoed elsewhere in the Babylonian record, that Cyrus and his forebears were rulers of Anshan (instead of Parsa) might signal still more crucial differences between Cyrus' and Darius' families.⁸

By the early 1970s various epigraphic and archaeological clues had begun to indicate that the lost city of Anshan could be identified with the important ancient urban center whose remains survive at Tall-i Malyan, in close proximity to Pasargadae and Persepolis.⁹ In accord with this identification, the city of Anshan, the ostensible city of rule of Cyrus and his forebears, can be seen to have been located in the heartland of the Persian empire, named Parsa by Darius. The Nabonidus Chronicle, wherein Cyrus' royal domain is identified once as “Anshan” and, a second time, as “[land of] Parsu”,¹⁰ could further be taken to imply that the two toponyms served, at least near the middle of the sixth century BC, as viable alternate designations for the same territory.¹¹ While “Parsa”, however, would have spontaneously evoked a Persian milieu, the fortunes of Anshan were inextricably linked from at least the second half of the third millennium onward with the world of the Elamites, one of the most important groups in Iran, who were culturally and linguistically distinct from the Persians. From just as early, and down to at least the mid-seventh century BC, titularies involving Anshan were also germane to the Elamite sphere.¹²

8. For the titularies of Cyrus in the Babylonian record, see n. 28.

9. Reiner 1973; Hansman 1972.

10. Grayson 1975, 106–107, col. ii 1 and 15, respectively. For discussion of the different locations of Parsu(m)a(š), see Fuchs 1994.

11. Cf. e.g. Hansman 1985a, 34; Stronach 1997c, 37–38; Waters 2004, 101 with n. 29. Compare the different conclusions of e.g. Vallat 2011, 280 and Potts 2011. Certainty that the parallel usage of Anshan and Parsu in this document would necessarily belong in a mid-sixth-century context is undermined by arguments that the present copy of the Chronicle might be dated to the reign of Darius I (as late as 500 BC, Wiseman 1956, 3) or that it might even be a work (composed on the basis of information derived from earlier Babylonian records) of Hellenistic period Babylonian historiography (Waerzeggers 2015). For arguments that the Chronicle was edited by the “entourage of Cyrus” following the Persian conquest of Babylon, see Zawadzki 2010.

12. See conveniently the overviews of such titularies in the second millennium and the first half of the first millennium, respectively, in Potts 2005, 15, and de Miroshedji 1985, 278. The chronology of first-millennium Neo-Elamite rulers appears to remain

Justifiable though it might be in geographical terms owing to Persian settlement in, and the ultimate takeover of, the region of the venerable Elamite city of Anshan, Cyrus' Anshanite dynastic title is bound to have resonated with Elamite associations.

To date a unanimously satisfactory explanation for the contrasting representations of Cyrus the Great, on the one hand, preeminently as a king of Anshan and Darius the Great, on the other hand, as a king of Persia has been impossible to procure. There is nonetheless a consensus that, in contrast to the unambiguous Persian pedigree of Darius' kingship, the pronounced Elamite associations of Cyrus' Anshanite title ought to somehow acknowledge, at the very least, an awareness of an Elamite historical context within which the line of Cyrus rose to prominence.

Taking into account the gradual decline of Elamite strength in the course of the seventh century,¹³ when Cyrus' Teispid dynasty would have risen to power,¹⁴ one view posits a Persian ascendancy at that time over the long established Elamite domain of Anshan, in Fars, which could have occasioned the adoption of an Anshanite title. In the variant formulations of this hypothesis, such an adoption would be, for instance, symbolic of an “héritage élamite assumé par les premiers souverains perses”¹⁵ and possibly allude to a Persian

rather fluid. If, as Waters (2000, 85-87, discussed in Henkelman 2003b, 262; 2008, 56) suggested, Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak (the last Neo-Elamite ruler known to have used the title “king of Anshan and Susa”) was none other than Atamaita, an Elamite adversary of Darius I mentioned in the Bisitun inscription (Kent 1953, 134 [DB V §71]), reference to Anshan in royal Elamite titles would have persisted down to the time of Darius' accession to the throne.

13. Useful overviews of the ancient evidence and modern interpretations concerning political developments in the Elamite world (and the place of the Persians in it) during this period are offered, among others, by de Miroshedji 1985, 1990; Potts 1999, 259-353 (= 2016, 249-347) and 2005; Henkelman 2003a, 182-187 and 2003b.

14. According to two different modern estimates, the Teispids would have risen to power in the course of the first (Weidner 1931-32, 5) or in the second (de Miroshedji 1985, 284-285) half of the seventh century BC. Concerning the viability of the former estimate (which was discredited by de Miroshedji), see Shahbazi 1993 and Waters 1999, 105.

15. de Miroshedji 1985, 299; cf., among others, Briant 1996, 28; Stronach 1997c, 38; Kuhrt 2007, 178; Henkelman 2011, 611.

kingdom of Anshan that was “Elamito-Persian during this first stage of its existence”;¹⁶ or would be specifically aimed to “[supply] legitimacy to a Persian dynasty that had been victorious over indigenous Elamites”;¹⁷ or would, perhaps, reflect a “political rivalry with the Neo-Elamite kings”,¹⁸ who styled themselves “kings of Anshan and Susa”.

The notoriously thin trail of historical evidence about the same period¹⁹ –joined especially with the possibility of the Elamite origins of Cyrus’ name²⁰– has been seen by others as an indication that the first ruling dynasty (and hence, the origins) of the Persian empire might not have been as strictly Persian as would otherwise have been expected. Notably, as Daniel Potts has argued in a number of studies since 1999, Cyrus’ family could have been rulers of a kingdom that was “predominantly ethnically Elamite” and distinct from a “predominantly ethnically Persian” entity of Parsa (ruled over by Darius’ family),²¹ and could have possessed “a far more Elamite cast than Darius’”.²² As a corollary to these contentions, “what we today call the *Persian* empire [could have been], in fact, originally an *Anshanite* empire”.²³

Modern inclinations to explain the purported Anshanite dynastic identity of Cyrus the Great “within the frame of Elamite history”²⁴ would appear to be

16. Expression owed to de Miroshedji 1985, 304.

17. Waters 2004, 95. See, however, the objection of Henkelman (2008, 56–57 n. 136) that “[t]here is not a shred of evidence for a military and/or political clash between pre-Achaemenid ‘Persians’ and Elamites”.

18. Henkelman 2008, 56; cf. Henkelman 2003a, 193–194. Cf. now also Stronach 2013, 66.

19. For the relevant textual and archaeological testimony, see works cited in n. 13. The general paucity of hard evidence concerning the history of the Persians before Cyrus also emerges clearly from the treatments of Young 1988, 27–28, and Briant 1996, 23–38 and 905–909.

20. For this possibility, first suggested by Andreas (1904, 93–94) in 1902 and now widely favored, see Stronach 1997c, 38 (based on Zadok 1991, 237; 1995, 246); Henkelman 2003a, 194–196; 2008, 55–57; Potts 2005, 21–22 (with references to the uncertainties surrounding the linguistic origins of the names of Cyrus’ forebears in general); Tavernier 2011, 211–212, s.v. *Kuras*.

21. Potts 2005, 19.

22. Potts 2005, 22.

23. Potts 2005, 23, cf. 17, 20–22, and 1999, 306–307.

24. Cf. de Miroshedji 1985, 297.

entirely justified. Given the millennial history of the city and region of Anshan as a part of the Elamite world taken over by the Persians, the toponym's prestigious place in Elamite royal protocols, and not least the close co-existence and fusion of Elamite and Persian elements in Fars,²⁵ it would seem highly unlikely that the Cylinder's references to Cyrus and his forebears as "kings of the city of Anshan" merely possessed a neutral geographical significance.²⁶ On the other hand, however, it is at least a fact that the divergent speculations about the Elamite affinities of Cyrus' patrilineal line have developed in a vacuum of reliable evidence.

Stated categorically in the Cylinder, and currently accepted as a marker of a less-than-fully-Persian ideological and/or ethno-cultural identity, the entitlement of Cyrus and his forebears as "kings of the city of Anshan" in this Babylonian document is arguably much more likely to have accommodated ideological and political sensitivities of Cyrus' Babylonian subjects than expressed native realities pertaining to the Teispid line.

The elusive royal Anshanite background of Cyrus the Great

Widely thought to offer insights into universally acknowledged facts about Cyrus' family history and dynastic identity,²⁷ the tradition of the royal association of Cyrus' family with Anshan recorded in the Cylinder is nonetheless exclusively attested so far in Babylonian documents, all of which date, more-

25. de Miroshedji (1985, 296, 299-306) first put forward a cogent hypothesis of a Persian "ethnogenesis" based on the fusion of Elamite and Iranian elements. For phenomena of Elamite-Iranian acculturation, see further Henkelman 2003a, esp. 187-196, with references.

26. Cf. Henkelman 2008, 56. This approach would also rule out (see also de Miroshedji 1985, 296-298; Stronach 1997c, 37-38; 2000, 684) a view, which was especially favored in the course of the 1970s and in the first half of the 1980s, that references to Anshan in the dynastic title of Cyrus attested in Babylonian sources were merely meant to make Cyrus' Persian homeland more readily recognizable by a Mesopotamian audience (Harmatta 1974, 34); or that they merely manifest a tenacity of the Late Babylonian scribal and learned circles to traditional terminology going back to the third millennium (Eilers 1974, 27), when Anshan is first attested in the Mesopotamian record.

27. See e.g. Stronach 1978, 284; de Miroshedji 1985, 298; Stronach 1997c, 38; Potts 2005, 14; Henkelman 2008, 55; 2018, 808-809.

over, from the time of Cyrus or later.²⁸ Outside these Babylonian attestations, there is no incontrovertible evidence to suggest that any of Cyrus' ancestors viewed themselves as Anshanite monarchs or that any of them ruled from the city of Anshan.

In the opinion of several scholars the possibility that Cyrus and his immediate forebears were rulers of Anshan materializes in the contents of an Elamite legend of a seal, now preserved by some 20 impressions on tablets from the Persepolis Fortification archive and supposedly belonging originally to Cyrus the Great's grandfather.²⁹ The seal is featured on tablets dated from the 19th regnal year of Darius I (or 503 BC) onward, and there is no direct

28. The relevant references are clearly set out in Waters 2004, 93-94. As we can glean from his presentation, in addition to the Cylinder of Cyrus, the Teispids' royal Anshanite connections are attested in two further official contexts: namely, a brick inscription from Ur (Schaudig 2001, 549, ll. 1, 3) and the Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus (Schaudig 2001, 417, l. 108), the last Babylonian ruler displaced by Cyrus. The brick inscription, referring to Anshan (in this case, “a land/country” [KUR]) as the domain of rule of Cyrus the Great and his father, Cambyses, evidently postdates Cyrus' accession to the Babylonian throne. The Sippar Cylinder, which is dated between the thirteenth and sixteenth regnal years of Nabonidus' (543/542 BC-540/539 BC) (Schaudig 2001, 415), refers to Cyrus as a “king of the land/country (KUR) Anshan” in a context which is dated to the beginning of Nabonidus' third year (summer 553 BC) and suggests that an Anshanite title was already used by/of Cyrus before his campaign and triumph against the Median king Astyages. One last reference to Cyrus as a “king of Anshan” occurs in the Chronicle of Nabonidus (Grayson 1975, 106, col. ii 1), in a context dated to 550 or 549 BC, thus putatively a decade before Cyrus' conquest of Babylon, though also during his reign. For the uncertainty that surrounds the date of the original composition and the extant copy, see n. 11.

29. For this document (PFS 93*) see initially Hallock 1969, 79 seal 93; 1977, 127 and fig. E-5, and now the detailed study of Garrison (2011) with good illustrations and exhaustive references to earlier discussions. There is no absolute unanimity about the reading and translation of the full Elamite legend of the seal, see e.g. Garrison 1991, n. 22 on p. 23, and Garrison, Root 1996, 98, fig. 2a [C.E. Jones]; Henkelman 2003a, 193 n. 39; 2008, 55 n. 135; Quintana 2011, 175-176, 188; Waters 2011, 290. For a representative sample of scholarly discussions concerning the attribution of the seal, see conveniently the references cited in Potts 2005, 18-19, and Garrison 2011, 378 n. 4.

evidence concerning its original provenance. The inscription, which can be rendered as “Kurash [i.e. Cyrus] the Anshanite, son of Teispes”, admittedly presents us with a suggestive analogy for the names of Cyrus’ grandfather and “ancestor” (or “great-grandfather”) recorded in the Cyrus Cylinder, as well as for these individuals’ purported association with Anshan. Mark Garrison’s recent thesis, that the seal belongs stylistically, compositionally, and thematically to an “Anshanite” (as opposed to a lowland Susiana/Elamite) glyptic environment that emerged in Fars at a late Assyrian date (second half of the seventh century), would appear to further support the possibility that this artifact was produced during the time, and was a possession, of Cyrus’ grandfather.³⁰ The bearing of this document on Cyrus’ family history remains difficult to assess, however. Even though the brief inscription of PFS 93* could imply “rulership of Anzan/Anšan”,³¹ neither the Kurash of the seal nor his father, Teispes, are explicitly identified as royal individuals.³² Thus, if the seal actually belonged to Cyrus’ grandfather, its legend might not necessarily corroborate the royal Anshanite status, let alone the actual royal title, of the homonymous ancestors of Cyrus mentioned in the Cylinder and could induce suspicion that

30. Garrison 2011, 400, suggesting that the seal is representative “of a glyptic art whose origins are to be found ... in the (re)emerging political state of Anšan/Fārs under the Teispids in the second half of the 7th century B.C.” According to different earlier assessments the seal would be an example of late Neo-Elamite glyptic (Amiet 1973), and could have been produced in the late seventh century or no earlier than 600 (e.g. de Miroshedji 1985, 286-287; cf. e.g. Potts 1999, 306 [= 2016, 304-305] and 2005, 20; Stronach 2003, 138 with n. 4) or even shortly before its use on the Persepolitan tablets (Young 1988, 27). Thus, it might date from some moment during the lifetime of Cyrus’ grandfather to as much as three or four generations later. An overview of different earlier opinions concerning the dating and attribution of the seal is offered in Potts 2005, 19-20. See also more recently Quintana 2011, 175-177 and 188, opting for a date in the reign of Darius.

31. Wording Henkelman 2018, 808.

32. This circumstance is widely noted but the uncertainty is thought to be counterbalanced, among others, by the attested uses of the seal in transactions made in the name of the king (de Miroshedji 1985, 285-286), in “an explicit elite context” (e.g. Henkelman 2008, 56 n. 135; Garrison 2011, 282 [classifying PFS 93* here, as elsewhere, as a royal name seal], 383, 400; Henkelman 2018, 809).

“Cyrus the Great...exaggerated his royal lineage”³³ in the latter document. Or, since neither the name “Cyrus” nor the name “Teispes” can be presumed to have been uncommon,³⁴ the question of the intrinsic connection of this seal to Cyrus’ earlier family history could remain open.³⁵

The reliability of the sum of the extant references to the “traditional” dynastic identification of Cyrus’ family with Anshan can also be put to doubt. A much-discussed passage in the annals of Ashurbanipal mentions a certain “Kurash [i.e. Cyrus], king of the land of Parsumash”, who, following Ashurbanipal’s victory over the Elamites (ca. 646 BC), sent his tribute and surrendered his son, Arukku, to the Assyrian monarch.³⁶ Nothing more is reported about this Kurash, and the exact location of his royal domain (which is described as being, from the Assyrians’ northern Mesopotamian perspective, on the “far side of Elam”³⁷) remains difficult to specify due to uncertain modern knowledge of the geography of Iran in the seventh century BC.³⁸ The date of the event (set, at the latest, to some three years after 646) does not preclude, however, a correlation with the reign of Cyrus the Great’s grandfather.³⁹ In the opinion of a number of scholars, the Assyrian evidence also does not preclude that the Parsumash of Ashurbanipal’s annals was located in Fars.⁴⁰ If Parsumash

33. Waters 2011, 292.

34. For the name “Cyrus/*Kuraš*”, see Zadok 1976, 63; Tavernier 2011, 211-212, s.v. *Kuraš*; Henkelman 2011, 602 n. 71.

35. Cf. Young 1988, 27. Speculation (Henkelman 2011, 602-603 n. 71; cf. 2018, 809) that, rather than being a grandfather, the Kurash of the seal inscription “could just as well have been a more distant ancestor of Cyrus”, and that “the title of ‘Great King, King of Anšan’ that Cyrus credits all his ancestors [could be due to] a post-eventum creation of a well-established dynasty” possibly even inspired by the inscribed heirloom seal of “Kurash the Anshanite”, underline the uncertainties that stand in the way of modern attempts to assess the relationship between the Kurash of the seal and Cyrus.

36. Borger 1996, 191-192, 250; Weidner 1931-32, 4-5.

37. After Waters 1999, 105.

38. For presentations of the relevant textual evidence (and contrasting conclusions), see e.g. de Miroshedji 1985, 271-278; Waters 1999.

39. See n. 14.

40. See e.g. Fuchs 1994; Waters 1999, 104-105; 2011, 286. For a contrary view, see de Miroshedji 1985, 271-278.

was indeed a reference to Fars and the mid-seventh-century Kurash of Parsumash was none other than the grandfather of Cyrus the Great,⁴¹ this would mean that at least one of the early Teispids was recognized during his lifetime, notably in a Mesopotamian context, as a Persian, rather than an Anshanite, ruler. This incongruity with the testimony of the Cylinder has been explained away on the grounds that “different labels from different sources cannot be reduced to a single standard of comparison”.⁴² In the lack of incontrovertible evidence, however, about the status and titulary of Cyrus’ grandfather, one ought to at least allow for the obvious alternative: namely, that the Cylinder might be attributing to the grandfather of Cyrus the Great a royal protocol that was alien to his own titulary – and the same could be true in the cases of Cyrus’ two other forebears, Teispes and Cambyses, who are also described in the same text as “kings of the city of Anshan”, but whose actual titularies are not otherwise attested.

Doubts about the accuracy of the claims advanced in the Cylinder also arise from the archaeological domain. Intriguingly, while the Cylinder affirms the rule of Cyrus and his forebears over the city of Anshan itself (as the determinative URU [“city”] of Anshan in the Cylinder indicates), so far at least, the archaeological picture of the site at Tall-i Malyan during the seventh and the first half of the sixth century –when Cyrus’ forebears were ostensibly in power– is one of a city that was completely deserted.⁴³ The very idea, furthermore,

41. For the ongoing debate concerning these identifications, see de Miroshedji 1985, 268–285; Potts 1999, 287–288 (= 2016, 281–282); 2005, 18; Rollinger 1999; Henkelman 2003a, 184 n. 9, 196 n. 49; 2011, 602 n. 71.

42. Waters 2011, 292.

43. Indeed, the general absence of vestiges corresponding to the period of Teispid rule at Tall-i Malyan led Sumner (1986, 11; echoed by Abdi 2005) to comment that though “[s]ome early kings of the Achaemenid (*sic!*) dynasty were styled ‘Kings of Anshan’...it is not clear that the name refers to a city or settlement rather than the land over which the kings ruled” (cf. de Miroshedji 1985, 299). To date the archaeological picture at Malyan in the first half of the first millennium has not altered in any significant way (see e.g. Carter 1994, 66; Abdi 2005; Boucharlat 2005, 230–231). Given the ambiguity of the Elamite determinative AŠ (which could refer to either a city or a region), the suggestion (Potts 2011, 41) that references to a city, rather than the region, of Anshan can be recognized in Persepolitan tablets is difficult to accept at face value (cf. the

that the early Teispids could have been rulers of *any* urban center in Fars is yet to find any adequate corroboration in the archaeological record.⁴⁴ As Daniel Potts cautiously points out, one day the progress of archaeological explorations may produce traces connected with the purported rule of the Teispids over Anshan in hitherto unexcavated parts of the mound of Tall-i Malyan or elsewhere in Fars.⁴⁵ The cumulative impression one forms, however, from the extant morass of uncertain evidence is that the reality of the claim of an age-old royal Anshanite affiliation of Cyrus' dynasty remains difficult to confirm.⁴⁶

The family background of Cyrus the Great was subject to widely divergent interpretations in antiquity.⁴⁷ For instance, in the fifth-century writings of

note of caution in Henkelman 2008, 348 [who also inclines, however, to suppose that, in these particular contexts the references are to a city] and the reservations of Waters [2011, 288, based on Steve 1988]]. Such textual references to Anshan (Hallock 1969, 668) and rare archaeological finds from the area of Tall-i Malyan dated to the Achaemenid period (Abdi 2001, 2005; Boucharlat 2005, 231) do not easily lend themselves to a hypothesis of a continuing existence of the city of Anshan through the seventh and the first half of the sixth century and of Cyrus the Great and his forebears' rule over it.

44. For the hypothesis that habitation in the region largely lapsed into a nomadic or semi-nomadic mode from about 1000 BC until the time that Cyrus initiated construction at Pasargadae, see de Miroshedji 1985, 291-295; Sumner 1986; de Miroshedji 1990, 52-65; Carter 1994, 65-67; Boucharlat 2005, 225-232. Cf. the similar tenor of Hdt. 1.125, with the comments of Briant 1984, 75-76 and 105-108. For the potential of ongoing field research to bridge the gap in our knowledge about the history of settlement in Fars during the period of Cyrus' Teispid forebears, see Abdi and Atayi 2014; Atayi et al. 2016 (information about the discovery of three sites with Iron Age III pottery in the Persepolis region by M.T. Atayi's recent survey was kindly provided by Michael Roaf, pers. comm. November 2018; Seyed Abazar Shobairi helpfully supplied copies of the latter articles).

45. Potts 2005, 21.

46. The uncertainties which surround the affiliation of Cyrus' family with Anshan cannot be remedied by means of appeals to the probable Elamite origin of the name “Cyrus” (and conceivably of the names “Cambyses” and “Teispes”), the implications of which are at least as uncertain (see, in particular, the observations of Henkelman 2008, 55-57), and to an, at least so far, strictly hypothetical dichotomy between an Anshanite/Elamite and a Persian political authority in Fars which were associated, respectively, with Cyrus' and Darius' families.

47. See e.g. Briant 1996, 25-26 and 905 (II).

Herodotus (1.107), the founder of the Persian empire is represented as the son of the princess Mandane, daughter of the last native king of the Medes, Astyages, and a certain Cambyses who, far from being identified as a king of Anshan, is referred to as a Persian of “good family...whom [Astyages] looked on as much inferior to a Mede of even middle condition”.⁴⁸ According to Ctesias,⁴⁹ Cyrus was the son of a poor Mardian couple. In yet another version of Cyrus’ ancestry, attested by brief inscriptions at Pasargadae⁵⁰ and also echoed in the Bisitun inscription⁵¹ and Herodotus (7.11), Cyrus was, like Darius I, a member of the Achaemenid family.

Current speculations on the ideological and/or ethno-cultural Elamite affinities of Cyrus’ line are based on a presumption that the testimony of the Cylinder –which, after all, bears an official stamp of Cyrus’ approval– stands apart from these other versions, which are largely perceived as popular re-workings of Cyrus’ family history among the empire’s subjects informed by different nationalist agendas;⁵² or, in the cases of the laconic Pasargadae texts stating Cyrus’ Achaemenid origins and the similar claim registered in the Bisitun inscription, as a part of an elaborate propaganda of legitimization undertaken by Darius I upon his enthronement.⁵³

“Official” is not always the same as “historically accurate”. Unless the ethnic “Anshanite” on PFS 93* was indeed meant to denote a “ruler of Anshan” and convey, simultaneously, a reality of Cyrus’ line, concrete references to the royal connection of Cyrus’ family with the city of Anshan only emerge in Cyrus’ time and in Babylonian sources. And in this case, it would seem legitimate to explore the significance of this connection with closer reference to the events of Cyrus’ reign and the aims of his policy in the Babylonian domain. The relevance of such an alternative frame of reference is suggested, among others,

48. Trans. Rawlinson 1942.

49. Jacoby 1961, 90 [Nikolaos von Damaskos] F66.2-4.

50. Kent 1953, 116 (CMa, CMb, CMc).

51. Kent 1953, 119 (DB I §10).

52. For instance, for an interpretation of Herodotus’ account of Cyrus’ origins as a piece of Median propaganda, see, among others, Briant 1984, 75.

53. Although it is not entirely abandoned (more notably, Vallat 1997, 2011) the notion of a common Achaemenid lineage of Cyrus and Darius has lost its earlier appeal. See, among other discussions by this scholar, Stronach 1997b, 326; 1997c, 39.

by a famous Achaemenid artifact (**fig. 2a,b**) which clearly demonstrates that the official image of Persian royalty was just as adaptable, as popular accounts of the *vitae* and *gestae* of Persian kings, to the different political and cultural perceptions and expectations current among the empire’s subjects.

Darius as a king of Egypt

The magnificent, more-than-life-size statue of Darius the Great (**fig. 2a,b**), now conserved in the Tehran Archaeological Museum, was excavated at Susa in 1972.⁵⁴ Inscriptions on the body of the statue and on the plinth indicate that it was commissioned in Egypt; it likely stood initially in a temple in Heliopolis, the sacred city of the Egyptian god Atum mentioned in the texts of the statue.⁵⁵

The head and part of the upper body are missing, but the remainder of the statue depicts Darius as a stereotypical Persian monarch.⁵⁶ In common with representations of Persian royalty on Achaemenid reliefs, coins and seals, the king is shown in the pleated ceremonial Persian robe with wide sleeves and possesses a short, pointed sword placed in a scabbard with scalloped edge.

In the trilingual cuneiform text carved down the pleats on the right side of the robe,⁵⁷ the invocations of Darius’ Iranian patron deity, Auramazda,⁵⁸ the proud proclamation that “the Persian man has conquered Egypt”,⁵⁹ and Darius’ dynastic credentials as “a great king, king of kings, king of countries, king in this great earth, son of Hystaspes, an Achaemenian”,⁶⁰ all echo faithfully the

54. See Kervran et al. 1972 and the articles dealing with the excavation, iconography and inscriptions of the statue in the fourth issue of the *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* published in 1974.

55. Yoyotte 1974, 182, ll. 1-2 of the hieroglyphic text (“texte 2”) carved vertically on the pleats of the robe of Darius.

56. For a detailed analysis of the iconography of the statue, see Stronach 1974 and figs. 20-21.

57. Vallat 1974.

58. Vallat 1974, 162-163, ll. 1 and 4 of the Old Persian version and ll. 1 and 3 of the Elamite and Akkadian versions.

59. The notion of conquest emerges more clearly in the Elamite version (Vallat 1974, 163). Observation owed to David Stronach (pers. comm.). Cf. Kent 1953, 138 (DNA §4).

60. Vallat 1974, e.g. 162, ll. 3 and 4 of the Old Persian version. Cf. e.g. Kent 1953, 138 (DNA §2).

tenor of known inscriptions of Darius in the Persian homeland. The work as a whole, however, displays a mixture of Persian and Egyptian elements.

Recorded in cuneiform on the pleats of the robe, the name of Darius is also rendered twice on the tassels of the belt in Pharaonic fashion in the form of a cartouche with hieroglyphic signs.⁶¹ At the same time, in the hieroglyphic inscriptions and the figured decoration of the base of the statue, Darius' status is adjusted to native Egyptian formulations of royal authority.

On the front and back sides of the plinth, the identical representations of two fecundity figures, binding together a lotus and a papyrus –the plants symbolizing Upper and Lower Egypt– reiterate a traditional Egyptian motif of royal power which conveyed the notion of the unification of Egypt under one rule.⁶² Here this ancient Egyptian notion is referred to Darius, to whom, as it is stated in the twin texts carved on either side of the motif, “Upper and Lower Egypt were given”.⁶³ A further reference in these texts to “all the lands of the plains and the mountains reunited under [Darius’] sandals”⁶⁴ –an obvious allusion to Darius’ status as a ruler of a world empire– finds a matching expression in the Egyptian-style figures carved on the long sides of the plinth, all representing peoples that Darius claimed to be his subjects (**fig. 2b**).⁶⁵

Remarkably, there are no references in the hieroglyphic texts to Darius’ Persian identity, let alone to a Persian domination of Egypt; and even Darius’ elsewhere consistent association with the chief Iranian deity, Auramazda, is here replaced by references to his divine affiliation with Atum and Re, divine patrons *par excellence* of Egyptian kings.⁶⁶

Although it may be incongruous with representations of Persian royalty in a homeland Iranian setting, the incorporation of traditional Egyptian motifs in the statue of Darius was not a unique phenomenon. It is also attested in other known monuments of the same ruler, which, like the statue, were executed in Egypt and were addressed to the Egyptian people.⁶⁷ The sum of these

61. Yoyotte 1974, 181 with fig. 24a and pl. XXV.2.

62. For a discussion of this motif, see Roaf 1974, 74 with fig. 22 and pl. XXX.

63. Yoyotte 1974, 183, “texte 4”, l. 3.

64. Yoyotte 1974, 183, “texte 4”, l. 2.

65. A detailed analysis is offered by Roaf 1974, with fig. 23 and pls. XXXI-XXXVI.

66. See now Wasmuth 2017, 101-124.

67. See, for instance, the *stelai* erected along Darius’ canal connecting the Nile with the Red Sea, Posener 1936, 51, 66, 180-181, and pls. IV, V, and the commentary of Roaf

monuments bears testimony to a substantial dialogue between the Persian and Egyptian worldviews.⁶⁸ They eloquently express Darius and/or his advisors' familiarity with and respect for native Egyptian ideology and Egyptian political sensitivities. Simultaneously, they allude to an all-time imperative to legitimize Persian imperial authority among the empire's subjects by making (strategic) allowances for different local norms of legitimate rule and different native notions of royal behavior.

There is arguably good reason for proposing that the representation of Cyrus the Great and his forebears in the Cylinder as kings of the “city of Anshan” was meant to address analogous delicate ideological requirements, this time, in a Mesopotamian context.

The inscription of the Cylinder of Cyrus as a text of legitimization

As a number of earlier commentators have pointed out, the utterances of the Cyrus Cylinder reverberate with the notion of Cyrus' legitimate right to rule and are cast in accordance with traditional Mesopotamian expressions of legitimate kingship.⁶⁹

Royal descent and divine sanction were universal qualifications for legitimate kingship. These qualifications are articulated in the Cylinder by the proem's reference (ll. 11-12) to Cyrus as a ruler chosen by Marduk (the chief god of the Neo-Babylonian pantheon) and by overlapping assertions, made later on in the text, that Cyrus was at once the son, grandson, and “descendant” of kings, as well as “the eternal seed of royalty” (ll. 20-22).

Reference to Marduk (rather than to Cyrus' own Iranian god[s]) as the divinity that made Cyrus a world ruler (ll. 11-12) is a telling indication of the particular Babylonian perspective from which Cyrus' legitimacy is interpreted in this context. It is a perspective that surfaces unerringly throughout the text.

1974, 79-84. For further examples and commentary, see Briant 1996, 490-500 and 973-975.

68. See also Wasmuth 2017, 125-198. Concerning the dialogue in general between the ideology, arts, and practices of the Persians, on the one hand, and their various subjects on the other hand, see, among others, Root 1979 and Briant 1987.

69. See, in particular, Kuhrt 1983 (stressing, like Harmatta [1974] before her, the particularly close stylistic parallels of the Cylinder text with the Babylonian inscriptions of the Assyrian monarch Ashurbanipal) and 2007, 173-176.

Articulated as programmatic announcements of the new lord of Babylon – and certainly consistent with the spirit of Persian imperial proclamations – statements of respect and restoration (e.g. ll. 22, 25–26, 30–32)⁷⁰ were also germane to traditional Mesopotamian formulations of legitimate kingship from the third millennium onward.

The elaborate royal titulary, with which Cyrus was endowed upon his accession to the throne of Babylon, was also meant to confer upon Cyrus’ authority the widest possible gamut of historical Mesopotamian protocols of sovereignty. Proclaimed “king of the universe, the great king, the powerful king, king of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of the four quarters of the world” (l. 20), Cyrus, a newcomer to Mesopotamia, was effectively assuming legitimate succession to all major regimes that had arisen in the land between the Tigris and the Euphrates in the course of the preceding millennia.

Although it points specifically to western Iranian and, in particular, Elamite – rather than Mesopotamian – dynastic realities, the identification of Cyrus as a king of “the city of Anshan” was perhaps the most crucial touch to the elaborate representation of Cyrus as a “normative” Mesopotamian ruler. It arguably supplied a basis for accommodating a further important requirement for legitimate kingship over Mesopotamia. This requirement can be traced as far back as the late third millennium BC.

The testimony of the Sumerian King List and Herodotus

The Sumerian King List, perhaps going back ultimately to around 2100 BC but known from later copies, offers a description of the origins and early history of kingship in Mesopotamia.⁷¹

The text comprises two main sections that purport to document, respectively, the chronological order in which different cities and rulers held power in Mesopotamia before and after the Flood, giving specific numbers of years for the regnal period(s) of each city and (usually) each individual king. There is a repetitive pattern. In the beginning of each section it is stated that “kingship descended from heaven” to a particular city (at first, at Eridu; then, after the Flood, at Kish). The transfer of power from one city to another is expressed by

70. Cf. Kent 1953, 120 (DB I §14).

71. See Marchesi 2010; George 2011. Here references are to the text of the Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature (<http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=t.2.1.1&display=Crit&charenc=gcirc&lineid=t211.p1#t211.p1>)

fixed formulae: “city X fell and the kingship was taken to city Y”, in the section relating events before the Flood; or “city X was defeated and the kingship was taken to city Y”, for the period after the Flood. A summary, concluding each section, gives the total number of cities and kings that ruled before and after the Flood and the overall time span during which kingship was exercised. Thus, “in 5 cities 8 kings ... ruled for 241200 years” before the Flood (ll. 36-39); and there were 11 cities “in which the kingship was exercised” and a total of 134 (or 139) kings, who ruled (according to the more extensively preserved text) for over 28876 (or 3443?) years after the Flood (ll. 426-430).

There is little to commend the overall commitment of the List to historical accuracy.⁷² The statement that “kingship descended from heaven” is difficult to interpret as an objective description of the circumstances that led to the emergence of sovereign rule. Quoted in figures of over 18000 and up to 43200 years (ll. 1-35), individual reign lengths before the Flood are obviously entirely fictitious; and the same holds true of subsequent, lesser reign lengths (of e.g. over 100 and up to 1200 years, ll. 43-129) down to the third millennium (i.e. the first rule of Unug [Uruk]). The personalities and activities of some of the rulers mentioned are the stuff of legend (e.g. ll. 112-114: “Gilgamesh, whose father was a phantom (?), the lord of Kulaba”). The idea of the transmission of rule over the span of millennia in a single sequence of cities, which held power in (linear) succession to one another, also appears to follow a convention that did not acknowledge the existence of rival political authorities. In a sense, there may not have even existed a “standard” version acceptable to all cities in all periods. Variations observed among the different “copies” with respect to the arrangement of the entries and the details of the summaries might speak for the simultaneous currency of different interpretations of the history of kingship in Mesopotamia that were meant to privilege the respective cities in which the various “copies” were composed and/or the dynastic interests of different kings. Despite its partially dubious standing as a document about early Mesopotamian political history, however, the Sumerian King List offers valuable perspectives on timeless principles of the Mesopotamian royal tradition.

Set to around 2100 BC, the initial composition of the text belonged to a time when the several, initially autonomous Mesopotamian cities had already experienced unification under one rule. It has long been suggested, therefore,

72. Among earlier commentaries concerning the tendentious character of this composition, see Michalowski 1983; Marchesi 2010.

that the primary purpose of the account was to “demonstrate that [Sumer] had always been united under one king – though these kings were ruling successively in different capitals”.⁷³ The contents of this famous account also lead, however, to important inferences about fundamental notions of ancient Mesopotamian kingship: namely, that in the Mesopotamian worldview there was only ever a single, divinely sanctioned (and, hence, legitimate) line of kingship; and the right to rule was, above all, the prerogative of cities.⁷⁴

Down to the first half of the first millennium, Mesopotamian documents testify to the rise to power locally of different ethnic/linguistic groups. The boundaries of Mesopotamian political control also fluctuated with time, encompassing at the height of the Neo-Assyrian empire a very substantial part of the Near East. The notion, however, that the (same!) kingship –which had descended from heaven– was transferred from city to city was perpetuated, projecting an impression that the succession of different states, and even different ethnic groups, to power in Mesopotamia was largely a matter of the geographical relocation of the seat of rule.

This Mesopotamian interpretation of the “right to rule” arguably survived down to the time of Cyrus and is echoed, outside the Mesopotamian sphere, by a passage in the work of the fifth-century Greek historian Herodotus. In *Histories* Book 1, prefacing a brief account of the history of Babylon and a narrative of Cyrus’ capture of this city, Herodotus indicates that, in the time of Cyrus, Babylon was “the most famous and the strongest of the numerous, great *polis-mata* of Assyria”, as well as the city (*polis*) where “the royal dwelling (or “the kingship”⁷⁵) was established after Nineveh was laid waste”.⁷⁶

By the term “Assyria” Herodotus is obviously designating in this instance, not just the territory of the Assyrian heartland around the city of Ashur in northern Mesopotamia, but the wider Mesopotamian region – the quintessential land of “numerous, great cities”, including Babylon. The city of Nineveh, whose fall is mentioned in the text, was the very last major capital of the

73. Pritchard 1969, 265.

74. Cf. now also Roaf 2013, esp. 333-334.

75. For this sense, see Powell 1960, s.v. *βασιλήιος*; *βασιλήια*, τά (2).

76. Hdt. 1.178.1: τῆς δὲ Ἀσσυρίης ἐστὶ μέν κον καὶ δῆλα πολίσματα μεγάλα πολλά, τὸ δὲ ὄνομαστότατον καὶ ἴσχυρότατον καὶ ἔνθα σφι Νίνου ἀναστάτου γενομένης τὰ *βασιλήια* κατεστήκεε, ἦν Βασυλών. For a comparison of this formulation with the standard formula of the Sumerian King List, see also Högemann 1992, 57 n. 80.

Neo-Assyrian state. Its destruction was brought about by a joint Babylonian and Median assault in 612 BC and had spelt the final demise of Assyrian power. On the other hand, in the time of Cyrus to which the passage refers (some seven decades after the fall of Nineveh), Babylon was the center of power of the extended Neo-Babylonian kingdom – an entity that had a patently non-Assyrian political identity and had emerged following the collapse of Assyria. Herodotus’ designation of Mesopotamia by the term “Assyria” strikes one as being anachronistic. The passage, referring to Babylon, in Cyrus’ time, as a city of “Assyria” and as the successor capital (in “Assyria”) to Nineveh, would also appear to be confounding two distinct historical eras and two distinct kingdoms.⁷⁷

The description, however, of Babylon (the political center of the Neo-Babylonian kingdom) as the successor to Nineveh (which was the last major capital of the preceding Assyrian empire) can be easily explained on the basis of the fundamental notion, repeatedly evoked in the Sumerian King List, of a

77. Despite Dalley’s (2013, ch. 6) implications, there is no reason to assume that the Hdt. 1.187.1 passage supports the idea of a confusion of Babylon with Nineveh. This is not the place to elaborate on the complex historiographic background of Herodotus’ reference to Mesopotamia – which, properly speaking, was Babylonian territory at the time – by the name of the long obsolete Assyrian state. Considering the phenomenal expansion of the Assyrian empire and its lasting impact on the Near Eastern world, it is possible, for instance, that Herodotus’ references to Babylon and Mesopotamia as an Assyrian domain reflect actual Neo-Babylonian claims of legitimate inheritance of the former Assyrian realm – and perhaps also echo intense, centennial processes of homogenization (“Assyrianization”, Parpola 2004) in the territories under Assyrian rule? Or, Herodotus’ characterization of the Babylonians as Assyrians could derive from an Iranian interpretation of the succession of kingdoms in Asia, which, like the Sumerian King List, did not acknowledge parallel rules, and which co-opted the Neo-Babylonian kingdom into the Assyrian regime “taken over” by the Medes. For a more detailed presentation of these suggestions, see Zournatzi 2013, esp. 242–246. For references to Babylonia as Assyria in Persian period and later Greek texts, see among others Xen. *Cyrop.* 2.5 (“But the Assyrians, both those from Babylon and those from the rest of Assyria...”) and Strabo 6.1.16 (“And in ancient times Babylon was the metropolis of Assyria ...” and further placing in “Assyria” the city complex of Seleucia-Ctesiphon). See also the Iranian (Parthian and Sasanian) use of the term Asuristan (“land of Assyria”) to designate Babylonia which is thought likely to date from as early as Achaemenid times (e.g. Bivar 1983, 89).

single legitimate kingship that passed from one Mesopotamian city to another – a political continuum to which a further allusion might be recognized in the Herodotean reference to the “numerous great cities” that existed in “Assyria”, of which Babylon was “the most famous and the strongest” in Cyrus’ time.

The spirit of the Sumerian King List was very much alive when Cyrus conquered Babylon, and when the text of his Babylonian Cylinder was composed.⁷⁸ Even without direct evidence to this effect, it is most unlikely that the timeless prescripts of the List on the nature of Mesopotamian kingship would have been overridden in the context of representations of Cyrus as a legitimate king of Mesopotamia addressed to a Mesopotamian audience. This brings us back to the perplexing characterization of Cyrus and his forebears as “kings of the city of Anshan”.

Cyrus the Great as a city ruler

As we have seen, there is no incontrovertible indication beyond the evidence in the Babylonian record to the effect that any of Cyrus’ ancestors identified themselves as rulers of Anshan or that they actually ruled from the city of Anshan. Barring the latter possibility, the archaeological and written record does not allow certainty, either, that the traditional Mesopotamian definition of kingship as the prerogative of cities could be fulfilled in a concrete manner by the circumstances of Persian settlement in Fars – unless one takes into account Cyrus’ royal capital at Pasargadae, the earliest known Persian “city” and a setting appropriate for royalty in terms of Mesopotamian standards. Following these leads to Cyrus’ time, one could suggest that, in the particular formulation of Cyrus’ title as “king of the city of Anshan” attested in the Cylinder,

78. Further reflections of the “presence” of the mentality of the King List in a Babylonian environment down to the era of Cyrus might be offered by the usual title, “king of Babylon”, of Neo-Babylonian rulers. According to Harmatta (1974, 36), this title –which sounds very modest by comparison to the expansive Assyrian royal titularies– would imply a Neo-Babylonian awareness that their kingdom (then “in the shadow”, as he states, “of the powerful Median empire”) could not aspire to grandeur. The seemingly modest title “king of Babylon” might have possessed, however, great prestige through an alignment with the age-old Mesopotamian perception of legitimate kingship as the prerogative of cities.

“Anshan” was an *alias* for Pasargadae,⁷⁹ whose beginning date of construction cannot be determined with precision but would belong to sometime after the Persian conquest of Lydia and before Cyrus’ conquest of Babylon.⁸⁰

Be that as it may, the uncertainties which surround the testimony of the ancient record should not stand in the way of appreciating at least the abstract, ideological value of the dynastic association of Cyrus with the “city of Anshan” in a specifically Mesopotamian political context, and especially in a text whose various details aimed to promote an image of Cyrus as a legitimate Mesopotamian king.

Owing to the venerable place of Anshan in the political history of Fars and the Elamite world at large, Anshanite royal titulary might well have been a part of official representations of Cyrus’ royal authority in a western Iranian/Elamite environment before his conquest of Babylon. The special emphasis on Cyrus’ dynastic association with the “city” (rather than the “land”) of Anshan in the Cylinder might also be presupposed by the Middle Elamite royal title “king of Anshan and Susa”, which was revived in the Neo-Elamite period, and which, as Wouter Henkelman considers, “clearly refers to the two capital cities”.⁸¹ The point is, however, that a characterization of Cyrus as a king of Anshan, and in particular of its capital city, would have been especially apt in the context of a representation of Cyrus as a “normative” Mesopotamian monarch. Anshan had been charted as a part of the wider Mesopotamian political realm from as early as the third millennium,⁸² and the important urban

79. Cf. the statement of Potts (1999, 311) that “Cyrus founded a new ‘Anshanite’ capital at Pasargadae” (Potts 2016, 310: “Cyrus founded a new geographically ‘Anshanite’ capital at Pasargadae”). An ancient perception of Pasargadae as “the city of Anshan” could have emerged from a similar line of reasoning.

80. For architectural connections that speak for a beginning of construction at Pasargadae following the Persian conquest of Sardis, and for the commonly accepted *ante quem* before the conquest of Babylon, see e.g. succinctly Stronach 2008. For the viability of Sidney Smith’s (1924) recognition of a reference to the conquest of Sardis in the Nabonidus Chronicle as an event that took place in the ninth year of Nabonidus (547/6), see now van der Spek 2014, 256 n. 184.

81. Henkelman 2003a, 194.

82. See, among others, Hansman 1985b and Potts 1999, 85–129 (= 2016, 79–122), with references.

history of the city of Anshan certainly fulfilled the Mesopotamian “urban requirement” for legitimate rule. Whether or not the depiction of Cyrus and his forebears as “city rulers” agreed with historical realities, from the perspective of the Mesopotamian apologists of Cyrus’ accession to the Mesopotamian throne, an association of Cyrus’ line with the city of Anshan could be justified (just as it could be in a western Iranian/Elamite environment) by the undeniable fact of Persian settlement in the territory of this once prominent Elamite center.

Cyrus’ characterization as a “king of the city of Anshan” in the Cylinder would have linked the new, foreign lord of Babylon with the earliest strata of Mesopotamian political existence.⁸³ Like the rest of the utterances of the Cylinder, it would have been aimed to summon local respect for Persian rule by enabling the “adoption” of Cyrus in the native Mesopotamian continuum of kingship.

Antigoni Zournatzi
National Hellenic Research Foundation (Athens)
azourna@eie.gr

83. Hansman (1985b, 104; cf. Hansman 1972, 101-102; 1985a, 25-27) suggests as a possibility that “the country of Anshan, in part ... included the territories of Awan”. Awan (see Stolper 1987 and Potts 1999, 85-129 [= 2016, 79-122]), a place of much disputed geographical location in western Iran and a seat of power of late-third-millennium Elamite rulers, is included among the centers of kingship mentioned in the Sumerian King List (e.g. ll. 145-159). If Hansman is correct in associating Anshan with Awan, the Anshanite dynastic title of Cyrus would have made an even more forceful statement of kinship between the Mesopotamian royal tradition and Cyrus’ royal authority.

Summary

In the famous inscription of the Cylinder of Cyrus the Great composed after the fall of Babylon in 539 BC, the founder of the Persian empire is referred to as “king of the city of Anshan” and is made to indicate that this title was equally borne by his ancestors, Cambyses, Cyrus and Teispes.

Reference to the venerable –but nonetheless Elamite and to all appearances no longer politically important at the time– city of Anshan in Cyrus’ royal family titulary has triggered much scholarly discussion. It is currently thought that the references to Cyrus’ dynastic association with Anshan might acknowledge some sense of an Elamite affinity on the part of Cyrus’ royal line.

The present study argues that the title “king of the city of Anshan” of Cyrus and his forebears was meant to accommodate traditional perceptions of “legitimate kingship” within a native Mesopotamian/Elamite environment and cannot be used as evidence for an Elamite affiliation of Cyrus’ dynastic line.

Bibliography

Abdi, K. 2001. “Malyan 1999”, *Iran* 39, 73-98.

Abdi, K. 2005. “Maliān”, in E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, online edition (<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/malian>) (accessed on 27/12/2018)

Abdi, K., Atayi, M.T. 2014. “The Pre-Imperial Persians at the Land of Anshan: Some Preliminary Observations”, in T. Daryaee, A. Mousavi, K. Rezakhani (eds.), *Excavating an Empire: Achaemenid Persia in Longue Durée*. Costa Mesa, Calif., 73-87.

Amiet, P. 1973. “La glyptique de la fin de l’Élam”, *AAs* 28, 3-32.

Andreas, F.C. 1904. “Über einige Fragen der ältesten persischen Geschichte”, in *Verhandlungen des 13. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses, Hamburg, September 1902*. Leiden, 93-97.

Atāyi, M.T., Tavakoli, Ā., Azizi, A., Karami, H., Kordshuli, F.Z., Mosavi, M., Ghezelbāsh, E. 2016. “Archaeological Survey at Tappe-ye Qasr dasht, Kamin Plain-Fars: First Report”, *Journal of the Society for Iranian Archaeology* 1, 87-131.

Berger, P.-R. 1975. “Der Kyros-Zylinder mit dem Zusatzfragment BIN II Nr. 32 und die akkadischen Personennamen im Danielbuch”, *ZA* 64, 192-234.

Bivar, A.D.H. 1983. “The Political History of Iran under the Arsacids”, in E. Yarshater (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. 3: *The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanid Periods*, Part 1. Cambridge, 21-99.

Borger, R. 1996. *Beiträge zum Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals*. Wiesbaden.

Boucharlat, R. 2005. “Iran”, in P. Briant, R. Boucharlat (eds.), *L’archéologie de l’empire achéménide: nouvelles recherches. Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France par le “Réseau international d’études et de recherches achéménides” (GDR 2538 CNRS), 21-22 novembre 2003 (Persika 6)*. Paris, 221-292.

Briant, P. 1984. “La Perse avant l’empire”, *IrAnt* 19, 71-118.

Briant, P. 1987. “Pouvoir central et polycentrisme culturel dans l’empire achéménide”, in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Sources, Structures and Synthesis. Proceedings of the Groningen 1983 Achaemenid History Workshop (Achaemenid History I)*. Leiden, 1-31.

Briant, P. 1996. *Histoire de l’empire perse. De Cyrus à Alexandre*. Paris.

Carter, E. 1994. “Bridging the Gap between the Elamites and the Persians in Southeastern Khuzistan”, in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A. Kuhrt, M.C. Root (eds.), *Continuity and Change. Proceedings of the Last Achaemenid History Workshop, April 6-8 1990, Ann Arbor (Achaemenid History VIII)*. Leiden, 65-95.

Dalley, S. 2013. *The Mystery of the Hanging Garden of Babylon: An Elusive World Wonder Traced*. Oxford.

Eilers, W. 1974. “Le texte cunéiforme du *Cylindre de Cyrus*”, *AI* 2, 25-33.

Finkel, I. 2013. “The Cyrus Cylinder: The Babylonian Perspective”, in I. Finkel (ed.), *The Cyrus Cylinder. The King of Persia’s Proclamation from Ancient Babylon*. London, 4-34.

Fuchs, A. 1994. “Parsua(š)”, in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 10, 340-342.

Garrison, M.B. 1991. “Seals and the Elite at Persepolis: Some Observations on Early Achaemenid Persian Art”, *Ars Orientalis* 21, 1-29.

Garrison, M.B. 2011. “The Seal of ‘Kuraš the Anzanite, Son of Šešpeš’ (Teispes), PFS 93*: Susa – Anšan – Persepolis”, in J. Álvarez-Mon, M. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake, Ind., 375-405.

Garrison, M.B. 2017. *The Ritual Landscape at Persepolis. Glyptic Imagery from the Persepolis Fortification and Treasury Archives* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 72). Chicago.

Garrison, M.B., Root, M.C. 1996. *Persepolis Seal Studies. An Introduction with Provisional Concordances of Seal Numbers and Associated Documents on Fortification Tablets 1-2087* (Achaemenid History IX). Leiden.

George, A.R. 2011. “Sumero-Babylonian King Lists and Date Lists”, in A.R. George (ed.), *Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions and Related Texts in the Schøyen Collection* (Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 17). Bethesda, Md., 199-210.

Grayson, A.K. 1975. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Texts from Cuneiform Sources 5). Locust Valley, N.Y.

Hallock, R.T. 1969. *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (Oriental Institute Publications 92). Chicago.

Hallock, R.T. 1977. “The Use of Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets”, in M. Gibson, R. Biggs (eds.), *Seals and Sealing in Ancient Near East*. Malibu, Calif., 127-133.

Hansman, J.F. 1972. “Elamites, Achaemenians and Anšan”, *Iran* 10, 101-124.

Hansman, J.F. 1985a. “Anshan in the Median and Achaemenid Periods”, in I. Gershevitch (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. 2. Cambridge, 25-35.

Hansman, J.F. 1985b. “Anshan”, in E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Vol. 2. New York, 103-107.

Harmatta, J. 1974. “Les modèles littéraires de l’édit babylonien de Cyrus”, *AI* 1, 1st ser., 29-44. (Originally published in English in 1971, “The Literary Patterns of the Babylonian Edict of Cyrus”, *AAntHung* 19, 217-231)

Hdt. = Hude, C. (ed.). 1927. *Herodoti Historiae*, 3rd ed. Oxford.

Henkelman, W. 2003a. "Persians, Medes and Elamites: Acculturation in the Neo-Elamite Period", in G.B. Lanfranchi, M. Roaf, R. Rollinger (eds.), *Continuity of Empire (?)*: *Assyria, Media, Persia* (History of the Ancient Near East / Monographs V). Padua, 181-231.

Henkelman, W.F.M. 2003b. "Defining Neo-Elamite History", *BibO* 60.3-4, 251-263.

Henkelman, W.F.M. 2008. *The Other Gods Who Are. Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts* (Achaemenid History XIV). Leiden.

Henkelman, W.F.M. 2011. "Cyrus the Persian and Darius the Elamite: A Case of Mistaken Identity", in R. Rollinger, B. Truschnegg, R. Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich - Herodotus and the Persian Empire. Akten des 3. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema "Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen"*, Innsbruck, 24.-28. November 2008. Wiesbaden, 577-634.

Henkelman, W.F.M. 2018. "Elamite Administrative and Religious Heritage in the Persian Heartland", in J. Álvarez-Mon, G.P. Basello, Y. Wicks (eds.), *The Elamite World*. London – New York, 803-828.

Högemann, P. 1992. *Das alte Vorderasien und die Achämeniden. Ein Beitrag zu Herodot-Analyse* (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B: Nr. 98). Wiesbaden.

Jacoby, F. 1961. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* IIA. Leiden.

Kent, R.G. 1953. *Old Persian. Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. 2nd rev. ed. New Haven.

Kervran, M., Stronach, D., Vallat, F., Yoyotte, J. 1972. "Une statue de Darius découverte à Suse", *JA* 260, 235-266.

Kuhrt, A. 1983. "The Cyrus Cylinder and Achaemenid Imperial Policy", *JSOT* 25, 83-97.

Kuhrt, A. 2007. "Cyrus the Great of Persia: Images and Realities", in M. Heinz, M.H. Feldman (eds.), *Representations of Political Power. Case Histories from Times of Change and Dissolving Order in the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake, Ind., 169-191.

Marchesi, G. 2010. "The Sumerian King List and the Early History of Mesopotamia", in M.G. Biga, M. Liverani (eds.), *ana turri gimilli. Studi dedicati al Padre Werner R. Mayer, S.J. da amici e allievi*, Rome, 231-248.

Michałowski, P. 1983. "History as a Charter: Some Observations on the Sumerian King List", *JAOS* 103.1, 237-248.

Miroschedji, P. de. 1985. "La fin du royaume d'Anšan et de Suse et la naissance de l'empire perse", *ZA* 75, 265-306.

Miroschedji, P. de. 1990. “La fin de l’Elam: essai d’analyse et d’interprétation”, *IrAnt* 25, 47-95.

Parpola, S. 2004. “National and Ethnic Identity in the Neo-Assyrian Empire and Assyrian Identity in Post-Empire Times”, *JAAS* 18.2, 5-40.

Posener, G. 1936. *La première domination perse en Égypte*. Cairo.

Potts, D.T. 1999. *The Archaeology of Elam: Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*. Cambridge.

Potts, D.T. 2005. “Cyrus the Great and the Kingdom of Anshan”, in V. Sarkhosh Curtis, S. Stewart (eds.), *The Idea of Iran*, Vol.1: *Birth of the Persian Empire*. London, 7-28.

Potts, D.T. 2011. “A Note on the Limits of Anšan”, in J. Álvarez-Mon, M. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake, Ind., 35-43.

Potts, D.T. 2016. *The Archaeology of Elam: Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*, 2nd ed. Cambridge.

Powell, J.E. 1960. *A Lexicon to Herodotus*, 2nd ed. Hildesheim.

Pritchard, J.B. (ed.) 1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. Princeton.

Quintana, E. 2011. “Elamitas frente a Persas: el reino independiente de Anšan”, in J. Álvarez-Mon, M. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake, Ind., 167-190.

Rawlinson, G. (trans.) 1942. *The Persian Wars by Herodotus*. New York.

Reiner, E. 1973. “The Location of Anšan”, *RAssyr* 67, 57-62.

Roaf, M. 1974. “The Subject Peoples on the Base of the Statue of Darius”, *Cahiers DAFI* 4, 73-160.

Roaf, M. 2013. “Mesopotamian Kings and the Built Environment”, in J.A. Hill, P. Jones, A.J. Morales (eds.), *Experiencing Power, Generating Authority: Cosmos, Politics, and the Ideology of Kingship in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia*. Philadelphia, 331-359.

Rollinger R. 1999. “Zur Lokalisation von Parsu(m)a(š) in der Fārs und zu einigen Fragen der frühen persischen Geschichte”, *ZA* 89, 115-139.

Root, M.C. 1979. *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire* (Acta Iranica 9, 3rd ser.). Leiden.

Schaudig, H. 2001. *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Grossen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften. Textausgabe und Grammatik* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 256). Münster.

Shahbazi, A.S. 1993. “Cyrus ii. Cyrus I”, in E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Vol. 6. New York, 516.

Smith, S. 1924. *Babylonian Historical Texts Relating to the Capture and Downfall of Babylon*. London.

Spek, R.J. van der. 2014. "Cyrus the Great, Exiles and Foreign Gods: A Comparison of Assyrian and Persian Policies on Subject Nations", in M. Kozuh, W.F.M. Henkelman, C.E. Jones, C. Woods (eds.), *Extraction and Control. Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper*. Chicago, 233-264.

Spek, R.J. van der. 2015. "'Madinatu = URU.MEŠ, 'Satrapy, Province, District, Country', in Late Babylonian", *AfO* 53, 110-116.

Steve, M.-J. 1988. "Le déterminatif masculin BE en néo-élamite et élamite-achéménide", *NABU* 1988, no. 35.

Stolper, M.W. 1987. "Awan", in E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Vol. 3. New York, 113-114.

Stronach, D. 1974. "La statue de Darius le Grand découverte à Suse", *Cahiers DAFI* 4, 61-72.

Stronach, D. 1978. *Pasargadae. A Report on the Excavations Conducted by the British Institute of Persian Studies from 1961 to 1963*. Oxford.

Stronach, D. 1997a. "Darius at Pasargadae: A Neglected Source for the History of Early Persia", in *Recherches récentes sur l'Empire achéménide (Topoi Suppl. 1)*. Lyon, 351-363.

Stronach, D. 1997b. "On the Interpretation of the Pasargadae Inscriptions", in B. Magnusson, S. Renzetti, P. Vian, S.J. Voicu (eds.), *Ultra terminum Vagari. Scritti in onore di Carl Nylander*. Rome, 323-329.

Stronach, D. 1997c. "Anshan and Parsa: Early Achaemenid History, Art and Architecture on the Iranian Plateau", in J. Curtis (ed.), *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Persian Period: Conquest and Imperialism 539-331 BC*. London, 35-53.

Stronach, D. 2000. "Of Cyrus, Darius and Alexander: A New Look at the 'Epitaphs' of Cyrus the Great", in R. Dittmann, B. Hrouda, U. Löw, P. Matthiae, R. Mayer-Opificius, S. Thürwächter (eds.), *Variatio Delectat. Iran und der Westen. Gedenkschrift für Peter Calmeyer*. Münster, 681-701.

Stronach, D. 2003. "Early Achaemenid Iran: New Considerations", in W.G. Dev er, S. Gitin (eds.), *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina. Proceedings of the Centennial Symposium, W.F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and American Schools of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, May 29-31, 2000*. Winona Lake, Ind., 133-144.

Stronach, D. 2008. "The Building Program of Cyrus the Great at Pasargadae and the Date of the Fall of Sardis", in S.M.R. Darbandi, A. Zournatzi (eds.), *Ancient Greece and Ancient Iran: Cross-Cultural Encounters. 1st International Conference (Athens, 11-13 November 2006)*. Athens, 149-173.

Stronach, D. 2013. "Cyrus and the Kingship of Anshan: Further Perspectives", *Iran* 51, 55-69.

Sumner, W.M. 1986. “Achaemenid Settlement in the Persepolis Plain”, *AJA* 90, 3-31.

Tavernier, J. 2011. “Iranians in Neo-Elamite Texts”, in J. Álvarez-Mon, M. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake, Ind., 191-261.

The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature. 2003-. Oxford (<http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=t.2.1.1&display=Crit&char-enc=gcirc&lineid=t211.p1#t211.p1>)

Vallat, F. 1974. “Les textes cunéiformes de la statue de Darius”, *Cahiers DAFI* 4, 161-170.

Vallat, F. 1997. “Cyrus l’usurpateur”, in *Recherches récentes sur l’Empire achéménide* (*Topoi Suppl.* 1), 423-434.

Vallat, F. 2011. “Darius, l’héritier légitime, et les premiers Achéménides”, in J. Álvarez-Mon, M. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake, Ind., 263-284.

Waerzeggers, C. 2015. “Facts, Propaganda, or History? Shaping Political Memory in the Nabonidus Chronicle”, in J.M. Silverman, C. Waerzeggers (eds.), *Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire*. Atlanta, 95-124.

Wasmuth, M. 2017. *Ägypto-persische Herrscher- und Herrschaftspräsentation in der Achämenidenzeit*, mit einem Beitrag von Wouter Henkelman (Oriens et Occidens 27). Stuttgart, 101-124.

Waters, M.W. 1999. “The Earliest Persians in Southwestern Iran: The Textual Evidence”, *Iranian Studies* 32, 99-107.

Waters, M.W. 2000. *A Survey of Neo-Elamite History* (State Archives of Assyria Studies XII). Helsinki. (n.v.)

Waters, M.W. 2004. “Cyrus and the Achaemenids”, *Iran* 42, 91-102.

Waters, M.W. 2011. “Parsumaš, Anšan, and Cyrus”, in J. Álvarez-Mon, M. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake, Ind., 285-296.

Weidner, E.F. 1931-32. “Die älteste Nachricht über das persische Königshaus: Kyros I. Ein Zeitgenosse Aššurbânaplis”, *AfO* 7, 1-7.

Young, T.C. 1988. “The Early History of the Medes and the Persians and the Achaemenid Empire to the Death of Cambyses”, in J. Boardman et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. IV.1: *Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525 to 479 B.C.*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1-52.

Yoyotte, J. 1974. “Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques de la statue de Darius à Suse”, *Cahiers DAFI* 4, 181-183.

Zadok, R. 1976. “On the Connections between Iran and Babylonia in the Sixth Century BC”, *Iran* 14, 61-78.

Zadok, R. 1991. “Elamite Onomastics”, *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 8, 225-237.

Zadok, R. 1995. "On the Current State of Elamite Lexicography", *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 12, 241-252.

Zawadzki, S. 2010. "The Portrait of Nabonidus and Cyrus in Their(?) Chronicle: When and Why the Present Version Was Composed", in P. Charvát, P.M. Vlčková (eds.), *Who Was King? Who Was Not King? The Rulers and the Ruled in the Ancient Near East*. Prague, 142-154.

Zournatzi, A. 2011. "Early Cross-Cultural Political Encounters along the Paths of the Silk Road: Cyrus the Great as a 'King of the City of Anshan'", Paper Presented in the First International Conference *Iran and the Silk Road* (National Museum of Iran, 12-14 February 2011), pre-publication (28 June 2011) at <http://www.achemenet.com/en/table//?/on-line-publications/in-press/tableau-des-articles>

Zournatzi, A. 2013. "The Median Logos of Herodotus and the Persians' Legitimate Rule of Asia", *IrAnt* 48, 221-252.

CYRUS THE GREAT AS A “KING OF THE CITY OF ANSHAN”



Fig. 1. Cylinder of Cyrus the Great discovered in Babylon. British Museum ANE 90920. L. 0.23 m (© Trustees of the British Museum).



Fig. 2a,b. Statue of Darius I discovered at Susa. National Museum of Iran 4112. H. 2.66 m (© The National Museum of Iran. Courtesy of the National Museum of Iran).