THE MEDIAN ‘EMPIRE’, THE END OF URARTU AND CYRUS THE GREAT’S CAMPAIGN IN 547 BC (NABONIDUS CHRONICLE II 16)*
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Abstract
The focus of this paper is, first, the reading of the toponym in Nabonidus Chronicle II 16 of which only the first character is preserved, and, second, an historical reassessment according to which the territory loosely controlled by a Median ‘confederation’ cannot be called an ‘empire’. Contrary to the generally held view the first character cannot be read as ‘LU’ which would require us to restore the text as lu-[ud-di], i.e. Lydia. Collation shows beyond doubt the character represents ‘Ú’ and the only plausible restoration is ú-[nā-tu], i.e. Urartu. Urartu was therefore not destroyed by the Medes at the end of the 7th century BC but continued to exist as an independent political entity until the mid-6th century BC. Thus Nabonidus Chronicle II 16 shows that it was the conquest by Cyrus the Great which brought about the end of Urartu.

Introduction
In 1988, 1994 and 1995, the late Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg questioned with arguments of considerable weight, the existence of a Median ‘empire’ as a political entity with structures comparable with those of the so called Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian or the Achaemenid ‘empires’.1 She called for a methodologically fresh approach, cast doubt on the general validity of our most important source, i.e. Herodotus’ Medikos Logos, and pointed out gaps in the non-classical sources, primarily for the first half of the 6th century BC. She also considered anthropological models of state formation and conceptual systems used in the social sciences.

Independent from each other Burkhart Kienast and I questioned the alleged vassal status of the early Persians vis-à-vis the Medes.2 Amélie Kuhrt recently showed that the Assyrian heartland as well as its eastern fringes (the region around Arrapha)

* This paper was originally intended to be published as part of the Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Ancient Cultural Relations Between Iran and West Asia. An earlier draft was also placed at www.achemenet.com/ressources/souspresse/annonces/annonces.htm. Since these Proceedings are no longer scheduled to appear, the article was updated, and the totally revised (and definitive) version is now published here. I would like to thank Konrad Kinzl (Peterborough) for reading the manuscript and improving my English and Wilfrid Allinger (Innsbruck) for creating the map (Fig. 1).

2 Kienast 1999, 65; Rollinger 1999, 127-34.
were part of the Neo-Babylonian empire. Both regions stayed under the firm control of the Babylonian empire after the downfall of its Assyrian predecessor. A 2001 international conference held in Padua focused on the problem of the Median ‘empire’ from an interdisciplinary point of view. It especially considered historical, archaeological and philological perspectives. Although it became clear that even the most recent attempts to reconstruct the so called Median language do not rest on firm enough ground there remained disagreement concerning the existence of a Median ‘empire’. Some questioned the existence of such an entity; others, however, maintained that there existed a Median ‘empire’, which played an important role in the history of the ancient Near East. At any rate it became clear that modern views of this ‘empire’ largely depend on the picture painted by Herodotus in his *Histories* completed around 420 BC. It is also worth noting that cuneiform sources dealing with the Medes from the 9th century BC onwards do not support the view of a Median ‘empire’. This is also true of the archaeological remains, the interpretation of which often depends on the written sources. More recent studies add weight to the doubts about the existence of a Median ‘empire’ and demonstrate that we must distinguish between ancient Near Eastern ‘empires’ in general and the ‘state’ the Medes formed in the first half of the 6th century BC.

The present study is intended to draw attention to one specific problem connected with the Median ‘empire’ and its geographical dimensions which was treated at the Padua conference only in passing and which therefore warrants closer exami-
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3 Kuhrt 1995.
6 Panaino 2003; Parpola 2003; Roaf 2003. See also Tuplin 2003.
8 Lanfranchi 2003; Liverani 2003; Radner 2003a-b. See also Fales 2003; Greco 2003.
9 Curtis 2003; Gopnik 2003; Kroll 2003; Roaf 2003; Rollinger 2003b; Sarraf 2003; Stronach 2003. For the archaeological remains in the supposed Median territory of western Iran, see now also Curtis 2005; Genito 2005. For the idea of Media acting as mediator between Urartian, Assyrian and Persian cultural traditions, see Huff 2005; Kleiss 2005. Concerning the problem of Median art, compare the affirmative (and quite optimistic) view expressed by Razmjou 2005 and the much more critical one by Genito 2005, 326.
10 Rollinger 2004b; 2005; Genito 2005, 325-29. Even Tuplin (2004, 242), who is very reluctant to revise the traditional view, has to concede: ‘Perhaps the term “empire” should be avoided lest people be misled by false equivocation with the neo-Assyrian, Babylonian or (developed) Achaemenid Persian empires.’ Instead he proposes to speak of a Median ‘domination’. Cf. also Van de Mieroop (2004, 256-57), where we encounter ‘a large Median state’, and Van de Mieroop (2006, 273-75), where we read: ‘No Median empire ever existed.’ See also Vogelsang (1998, 212-14), who reckons with a Median ‘empire’ but who stresses the nomadic background of this political entity.
nation: the end of the kingdom of Urartu, a topic which is inextricably linked to the Median 'empire' question.

We know very little about this event because the evidence of the written sources ends in the forties of the 7th century BC. Yet there seems to be a general consensus that the state of Urartu was destroyed by the Medes at the end of this century. One particular reason for this view is Herodotus' claim that the Median 'empire' reached as far west as the River Halys. Herodotus' Halys border is generally accepted as a historical fact: the Medes were somehow able to extend their dominion westwards. Herodotus' image of the Median 'empire', however, is based to a large degree on the much later model of the Achaemenid empire, and the Halys border seems to be a construct.

The Evidence of the Chronicles
Apart from Herodotus we have no other source that would shed light on how this Median expansion to the west unfolded. The scanty information provided by our cuneiform sources suggests Babylonian rather than Median influence in eastern Anatolia. The Babylonian Chronicles time and again mention Babylonian and Median forces as acting in alliance but with only the Babylonian army engaged in campaigns in Anatolia. In 609 BC, for example, Nabopolassar led his troops to the north on an operation towards the region of Izalla and as far as the ‘region of Urartu (piler μαUrāštī)’:

Chronicle 3, lines 70-74:

70 LUGAL URIki ana re-su-at ĖRINme-šū DU-ma šal-tū [ul DŪtā ana kūl]-za-al-la i-li-ma
71 URUme šā KURme ma-a-du-tū […]-šū-nu ina IZI iš-ru-up 72 ina UD-mi-šū-ma ĖRINme

See Kroll 2003. For an updated overview on 'Achaemenid' remains in Transcaucasia, see now Knauss 2005; 2006. See also the preliminary report of the archaeological excavations of the Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altorientalistik, Leopold-Franzens Universität Innsbruck, Austria, at Aramus, Armenia, and, in the meanwhile, http://www.uibk.ac.at/grabungarmenien. Final publication of the results of the campaigns for the years 2004-2006 is in preparation.


Rollinger 2003a.


The transliterations and translations of the chronicles are with minor changes those of Glassner’s edition (Glassner 2004; see already Glassner 1993).
The king of Akkad came to the aid of his troops, but [did not join(?)] battle. He went up [to Izalla and he set fire to the [...] in many mountain localities. At this time the troops of [...] moved as far as the region of Urartu. In [...] they pillaged their [...] They drove out the garrison that the king of [...] had set up there and went up to [...].17

This text documents Babylonian military activity not only in the far west but also in regions belonging to, and bordering on, the eastern part of Anatolia.

Chronicle 4, which starts with the eighteenth year of Nabopolassar (ca. 608 BC), records continuing Babylonian military advances. In 608 and 607 BC the Babylonian army operated again 'in the region of Urartu (piḫat kūr Urašṭu)':

Chronicle 4, lines 1-4:


The eighteenth year (of the reign) of Nabopolassar (ca. 608 BC), in the month of Elul, the king of Akkad mustered his troops, moved along the bank of the Tigris, climbed the mountain of Bit-Ḥanūniya, a region of Urartu, burned and pillaged towns. In the month of Ṭebeth, the king of Akkad returned to his own country.

This is also true for the following year (ca. 607 BC):

Chronicle 4, line 11

... ih-[tab]-ta EN pi-ḫat kūr[U-ra-dî-tu(?)] gi-miš KUR[m] ik-šu-ud.

... He (i.e. Nabopolassar) conquered [all] of the mountains as far as the region of [Urartu(?)].18

17 Like Glassner (2004) I prefer to translate piḫat ušu Urāštū with 'region of Urartu' and not with 'district of Urartu' like Grayson 1975 and others did. CAD P, 364-65 offers 'province, district' as translations but does not consider our source. For the problems connected with see also Salvini 1995, 117-119; Kessler 1986; Kroll 1984. For the location of Izalla, see below.

18 But cf. Reade 2003, who proposes to read ... EN pi-ḫat tam-īrim', '...as far as to the district of the sea (Lake Van)'. He also suggests restoring line 7 kū-[za-’tu-ri'], Zaduri in the upper Tigris.
The Babylonian army must in the meantime have gained considerable experience in campaigning in these mountainous regions. Chronicle 6 which reports Neriglissar’s military advance into Cilicia against Appuašu of Pirindu emphasises the ability of the Babylonian army to fight in mountainous terrain:

Chronicle 6, lines 9-23:


He (i.e. Neriglissar) decimated the large army, captured its many troops and horses. He chased Appuašu over a distance of fifteen double-hours, across difficult mountains, where men have to march one behind the other, as far as Ura’, his royal residence; he did [not] capture him19, (but) he took Ura’ (and) plundered (it). (erasure) After a march over a distance of six double-hours, in a very mountainous region, through difficult passes, from Ura’ to Kirši, the royal residence of his ancestors, he captured Kirši, the mighty city, the home of his kingship. He burnt its surrounding wall, its palace, and its inhabitants with fire. With the aid of boats, he took Pitusu, a land in the middle of the Ocean, and six thousand soldiers, fighters stationed in the town. He destroyed the town and took its inhabitants prisoner… 20

The chronicles mention eastern Anatolian toponyms like Izalla, Bīt Hanûniya and pihât Uraštú as well as the ‘many mountain localities’ (alâni ša šadâni madâtu) in connection with only the Babylonian army. Because it is only Babylonian (and no Median) action in the Urartian mountains and only Babylonian military activities in eastern Anatolia which is documented it would seem that the Babylonians were the principal military (and political) players in these regions. 21

19 Grayson (1975, 103) reads line 13 as [gāša]ša(?) ikšu-ud-su and translates it as ‘He captured him…’, but this cannot be correct since lines 25-26 state explicitly that Appuašu was able to escape and was not captured in this campaign.
20 For the location of Ura, Kirši and Pitusu, see Grayson 1975, 265, 259, 261; Kessler 1980, 179 (Ura); Zadok 1985, 200, 251, 320.
21 Reade 2003 restores the broken lines 54 and 55 of Chronicle 3 (fifteenth year of Nabopolassar, ca. 611 BC) as ‘Tuššana’ and ‘Sinigša’ – both on the upper Tigris. See also Radner and Schachner 2001; and now Radner 2007.
Nabonidus Chronicle II 16

There is one further source which sheds light on the history of eastern Anatolia in the first half of the 6th century BC: for Nabonidus' ninth year (ca. 547 BC) Chronicle 7 (Nabonidus Chronicle) II 16 reports a campaign of Cyrus the Great to a land for which only the first character is still recognisable in the text. Even though it has been and still is being stated, time and again, that this land was Lydia, this position can no longer be defended because it is, plain and simple, not supported by the text of the chronicle. In 1997 Joachim Oelsner re-examined and collated the relevant passage of the text with a clear result:

This collation was re-confirmed by Matthew Waters in autumn 2005: 'Oelsner's collation of u₂ is clear. I don't see how it could have been read anything else.'

This new reading must be the basis for all future discussion. Since line II 17 informs us that the king of the country mentioned in line 16 was defeated by Cyrus it follows that lines 16-17 deal with the end of a political structure and are not simply a reference to a geographical entity. Thus the passage contains important information for the end of Urartu and has no bearing whatever on the history of Lydia. We must therefore translate Chronicle 7 II 15-18:

---

22 Cf. just recently Arnold and Michalowski 2006, 419 with n. 67. Very cautious is Allen (2005, 25): '... the defeat of the Lydian king Croesus is usually assumed to have happened in the 540s, with n. 36 (p. 186): 'The association with the date 547 was established by a reference in the Babylonian Chronicle to a victory in that year, but no place or opponent is named.'

23 Thus the traditional date of the conquest of Lydia of 547 BC is also surely untenable. We simply do not know the year in which Cyrus defeated Croesus and conquered Lydia: Even a date after the fall of Babylon is possible. Cf. Rollinger 1993, 188-97; Oelsner 1999-2000, 378-30; Schaudig 2001, 25, n. 108; Haider 2004, 86.


25 I thank Matthew Waters for communicating this to me by e-mail (6th October 2005).

In the month of Nisan, King Cyrus (II) of Parsu mustered his army and crossed the Tigris downstream from Arbëla and, in the month of Iyyar, marched to 'U'ratu. He defeated its king (or: put its king to death), seized its possessions, and set up his own garrison there. After that, the king and his garrison resided there.

It has been argued that the crossing of the Tigris downstream from Arbëla is evidence that this region towards the Lesser Zab was controlled by the Persians whereas the territory south of this river was Babylonian. This view, however, contradicts all other sources according to which the Assyrian heartland was under not Median but Babylonian control. Although there is no evidence for Median control Babylonian control is at least hinted at. The Cyrus-Cylinder furthermore shows that the cult image of Aššur was returned (ana aššumut utirma) to its traditional place after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. This seems to be incontrovertible evidence that the territory in question was under Babylonian control until 539 BC.

If we add to this John MacGinnis’ reading of BM 63283 we might even have evidence for a Babylonian governor at Aššur. It is also worth recalling that the Babylonians controlled at least considerable parts of the north-eastern Tigris region around Arrapha. This becomes clear from Nabonidus’ inscriptions where we learn that Neriglissar was able to revive the cult of Anunitu in Sippar-Amnanum after the ‘Guteans’ had plundered her sanctuary in Sippar-Anunitu and taken her statue to Arrapha from where Neriglissar seems to have reconquered it.

We must ask, however, why an otherwise insignificant detail, i.e. Cyrus’ crossing the Tigris river downstream from Arbëla was recorded at all? The obvious answer is that every Babylonian knew that it was by this route that Cyrus passed through Babylonian territory.

29 ‘K2.1’ 30-34; Schaudig 2001, 553.
30 MacGinnis 2000, 335-36. See also Jursa 2003 with further evidence. That after 614 BC important elements of Assyrian culture remained alive in Aššur has recently been shown conclusively by Oelsner (2002, 32-33), who points out that the gods Aššur and his wife Seru (Seru’a) are still mentioned in 2nd- and 3rd-century AD Aramaic inscriptions from Parthian Aššur. An analogous situation is attested for Hatra: Gzella 2006, 36 with n. 78: ‘Der Stadtgott Assur und seine Gemahlin Serü beispielsweise sind in Personennamen stärker vertreten als jeder andere Gottermame mit Ausnahme des Sonnengottes.’ For the survival of the Assyrian culture in Tell Sheikh Hamad/Dūr-Katlimmu after 612 BC, see Kühne 2002.
To turn to Urartu, the target of this campaign: by suggesting that at the end of the 7th century Urartu was overrun by the Medes but rebelled after Cyrus’ victory over Astyages, only to be reconquered by Cyrus in 547 BC, Oelsner ignores the logical consequence of his own reading. The notion of an Urartian rebellion is based on a new reading of line II 18 of the Nabonidus Chronicle where Oelsner suggests transliterating ‘sar-ri’ instead of ‘šar-ri’. These ‘wrong-doers’ ought, however, to have been mentioned in a preceding section of the text and Oelsner’s interpretation is as hypothetical as his supposition that Cyrus crossed the river from west to east is implausible. Oelsner hypothesises that

Die Frage ist nur, ob von Ost nach West oder von West nach Ost. Hüsing hat das Problem durchaus richtig gesehen und bemerkt – u. E. zu Recht –, daß bei einem Zug nach Sardis der Text anders aussehen müßte. Nach ihm (und nach anderen) wäre bei einer Flußüberquerung von Ost nach West das Ziel in Mesopotamien zu suchen, was wohl ausscheidet. Dann bleibt aber nur der Flußübergang in Richtung Osten. Kyros muß also von Süden auf der Hauptverbindungsstraße, die am Tigris entlang führt, Richtung Assyrien gezogen sein.

This argument fails to convince on two counts. First we would have to assume that Cyrus had already crossed the Tigris once further to the south at an earlier stage of his campaign. Why would the chronicler have failed to mention Cyrus’ march that far to the south – and through Babylonian territory?

Second there is no reason why a crossing over the Tigris downstream from Arbela and heading westward precludes a Mesopotamian target of the campaign located somewhere in the lowlands south to the Tür ’Abdîn (see Fig. 1). By comparing the campaigns of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar in eastern Anatolia in the years after the fall of the Assyrian cities a more plausible solution to the problem emerges. The mention of a military advance against Izalla, Bit Ḥanûniya, pīḥāt Urāšṭu and the ‘many mountain localities’ seems to refer to operations which took place after the army had crossed the Tigris from east to west and followed the bank of the river only for some time to the north. Indeed recent research has shown that in order to get from the Assyrian heartland to the upper Tigris the route along the Tigris river is best avoided because of the extremely rough and mountainous terrain. As Karen Radner put it:

The Upper Tigris region is never accessed by water, as the Tigris cuts deeply through the mountains north of Cizre/Jazīrat ibn ’Umar (at the border between Iraq and Turkey)

and cannot be navigated upstream; also going downstream is extremely dangerous and usually avoided. The Upper Tigris region is most directly and most easily reached by crossing over the Tür 'Abdin mountain range. In order to reach the highlands of eastern Anatolia the Tigris valley itself offers no easy passage. Much better suited are two routes west of the Tigris which both lead to the southern and south-eastern piedmont of the Tür 'Abdin (Mazı Daıları). The first one is located in the central part of the Tür 'Abdin and approaches directly from the south. It runs from its starting point at Nusaybin along the valley of the Çağgar to Madiyätu (Midyät). The second one enters the Tür 'Abdin from the south-east where the gentler slopes of the basalt ranges offer easier access to the plateau. One may add a third route which passes Nusaybin and crosses the northern Jezîra to the west. It heads north from where theTür 'Abdin can be crossed via Midyat to reach the upper Tigris valley or one can continue to Mardin and further on to Diyarbakır.

Radner studied the historical geography of this region in detail by analysing the annals of the Assyrian kings beginning with Adad-nērāri I (1300-1270 BC). She was not only able to demonstrate that the route crossing the Tür 'Abdin from the south-east was the preferred one (Sufan Çay plain–Midyät–Savur–upper

---

34 Radner 2007.
Tigris)\textsuperscript{36} but she also succeeded in establishing the location of Izalla – between Nusaybin and Idil/Asakh rather than west of Mardin as traditionally proposed.\textsuperscript{37} This region called Izalla may be equated with the Dibek Dağı, an area where the limestone is coated by a layer of basalt from the long extinct volcano of Alem (Elim) Dağı in the vicinity of the source of the Sufan Çay.\textsuperscript{38}

This evidence can directly be linked with Babylonian Chronicle 3, lines 70-73 (see above): Nabopolassar 'went up to Izalla and the many mountain localities'. These sources show that the Babylonian king followed in the footsteps of his Assyrian predecessors by choosing the old and fairly easily passable approaches to the upper Tigris region. The Babylonian chronicle also more precisely identifies the target of this campaign: it is the 'region of Urartu'. The most convenient way to reach this 'region of Urartu' was no doubt to start out somewhere to the west of the Tigris in the plain of the Sufan Çay and to cross the Tür 'Abdin by approaching it from the south-east. This route can be documented for about half a millennium; it was the one taken by the Assyrian kings and later by the Babylonian army; and it surely was also taken by Cyrus in his attack on Urartu. We cannot of course define the exact status of the political entity (or entities) lurking behind the designation 'region of Urartu'. If, however, we consider how shaky Median power on its western flank was and in particular how problematical it seems to assume that there really existed a Median 'empire' with its western border abutting the Halys river,\textsuperscript{39} it would appear highly probable that Urartu survived the Median 'episode', only to be conquered by Cyrus about the middle of the 6th century.

The Urartian state may in its last stages have become fragmented and the monarchy unifying all parts of the country may have disappeared at some earlier point.\textsuperscript{40} It is also possible that there was at least for some years a kind of Median

\textsuperscript{36} One of the best documented itineraries is the campaign (V) of Assurnasirpal II (883-859 BC) in 879 BC related in his Annals. It starts from Tillê (Tiluli) in Katmuḫḫu and heads forward via Ba Sebrina/Haberli (the pass of Istarâte) and Kîvak (Kibaki) to Mîdyât (Matîatu) whence it continues via Savûr (Šûru) to the upper Tigris region. Since the campaign of 882 BC starts from the source of the River Supnat, which can safely be equated with the Sufan Çay, it is clear that also the campaign of 879 BC started from the the Sufan Çay plain. Cf. Liverani 1992, 57-62 with fig. 6; and see now Radner 2007.


\textsuperscript{38} Radner 2007. The source of the Sufan Çay (Supnat) is situated at Babil ca. 26 km south-west of Cizre.

\textsuperscript{39} Rollinger 2003a.

\textsuperscript{40} See now also Çilingiroğlu 2002, who questions the generally held view that the Urartian fortresses were destroyed by foreign powers. He blames internal turmoil (similar Zimansky 2005, who believes that the extensive building programme of Rusa II stretched the resources to the limits) and
supremacy or overlordship.\textsuperscript{41} The Behistun inscription (DB) treats the revolts of the first year of Darius’ reign in this region (DB §§26-30) as part of the revolts in Media (DB §§24-34). ‘Media’ is here divided up into at least three different parts: Media proper, Sagartia and Urartu.\textsuperscript{42} Urartu – now, beginning with the Old-Persian and Elamite versions of DB, referred to as Armenia\textsuperscript{43} – evidently survived as a political entity and its inhabitants seem to have retained some kind of local identity. Darius does not in DB name a usurper but the uprising clearly involved the whole of Urartu and there seems to have been fierce Urartian/Armenian resistance. Darius dispatched his generals Dādāršīš and Omises who had to fight three and two battles, respectively, until they finally put down the rebellion. The locales where these actions took place are named in DB but we are able to identify only one place name with certainty: Izalla, where Omises fought the last and decisive battle against the Urartians/Armenians (DB § 29) – significantly the same place where about 90 years earlier Nabopolassar fought and from where the Assyrian kings preferred to approach the Tūr ‘Abdīn.\textsuperscript{44}

We are thus presented with an excellent example how various armies for centuries follow tradition in their movements – in this particular instance those of the respective ‘southern armies’ when on campaign against Urartu: the Assyrian kings, Nabopolassar, Cyrus the Great, and again Darius’ general Omises.

Together with the new reading of Nabonidus Chronicle II 16 and the reservations concerning the existence of a Median ‘empire’ all evidence points in the same direction. The history of Urartu as a political element in the ancient Near East did not end in the last decades of the seventh century. It continued until 547 BC when Cyrus conquered this region and integrated it into his empire. Nabonidus Chronicle II 16 represents further testimony for this important political event. When Darius seized power Urartu tried to regain its political freedom which it had lost to Cyrus about 25 years earlier. But the ‘rebellion’ was quelled within a matter of months.\textsuperscript{45}

considers it possible that an Urartian ‘Reststaat’ continued to exist. This seems to be about the time when the Armenian ethnogenesis began.

\textsuperscript{41} Oelsner (2004, 25) as well as Starke (2004, 80) talk about ‘Medische Oberhoheit’ in the 6th century BC. Starke even suggests the existence of an Urartian ‘Reststaat’.

\textsuperscript{42} In detail, see Rollinger 2005, 21-24.

\textsuperscript{43} Old Persian: ‘Armina’, Elamite: ‘Ḫarminuya’. The Babylonian version has ‘Urašṭu’.

\textsuperscript{44} Radner (2007) did not take this evidence into account.

\textsuperscript{45} The first battle is dated ‘month II, day 8’ (DB §26) = 20 May 521 BC, the last one ‘month x, day 15’ (DB §29) = 31 December 522 BC.
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