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Introduction

The Achaemenid Empire: A Brief History

The Achaemenid Empire (c. 550-330 BCE) was the first in a succession of large and powerful Persia Empires, none of which ever were able to achieve the same heights the Achaemenid Empire first reached\(^1\). The Achaemenid Empire by all accounts was massive\(^2\). When Achaemenid Kings boasted about being King of all four corners, the statement was not as hyperbolic as it sounds. The center of the Empire covered what is now Iran and sprawled outward in every direction toward Bactria, Egypt, Anatolia, and the Indus River. The Achaemenid Empire was initially expanded due to the conquests of Cyrus II (559-530 BCE), widely known as Cyrus the Great, and his son Cambyses II (530-522 BCE)\(^3\). The first king of the Achaemenid lineage, king Teispes (c. 650-620 BCE), was king of only a small kingdom located in Pars (Persia). It was his great-grandson Cyrus II who expanded the kingdom into the Achaemenid Empire by consolidating the local Persian and Median kingdoms (550) and annexing Lydia (547 or 542\(^4\)), Babylon (539), and Bactria and Sogdiana\(^5\). Despite the suddenly massive empire, the center remained in Cyrus’ homeland of Pars where he constructed the palace of Pasargadae, establishing important characteristics of Achaemenid architecture and visual rhetoric. Due to the vast and heterogeneous population of the new empire, Cyrus used images to communicate his power and legitimacy to a population that was largely illiterate and spoke a vast variety of languages. Cyrus’ own son Cambyses II was the next

\(^1\) Kuhrt 1995: 647
\(^2\) Kuhrt 1995, 2007 Dusinberre 2013
\(^3\) Kuhrt 1995: 647
\(^4\) There is some controversy over these dates (Dusinberre 2013: 8)
\(^5\) Dusinberre 2013: 8; the dates for the annexation of these regions are unknown.
to take the throne. Cambyses continued the work of his father, annexing Egypt into the empire (525) and working to consolidate the territorial gains of his father. However, the empire was not fully consolidated and stabilized until the reign of Darius I (Fig.1).

Darius I cleverly usurped the throne in 522 BCE. According to Herodotus (III 70), Darius was one of several Persian nobles who helped to remove an imposter from the throne and through careful arguments and tricks Darius ruled on in place of the original pretender. Despite not being a direct descendent of Cyrus the Great, Darius used the powerful visual rhetoric that had been established by Cyrus to lend legitimacy to his rule and to continue to communicate the unsurpassed power of the king to the masses. One of the greatest pieces of evidence we have from the reign of Darius is his Bisitun inscription. Carved high on a rock face in the Zagros Mountains in Pars, the inscription details the efforts Darius made to quell rebellions across the empire in three different languages (Elamite, Akkadian, and Old Persian) A carved relief of nine captured kings and Darius tells the same tale as the inscription, Darius much greater than the conquered kings in scale, denoting his greater power. Darius also constructed Persepolis, his own lavish palace in the center of the empire. Following the glorious rule of Darius I were the reigns of Xerxes (486-465 BCE), Artaxerxes I (465-424/423 BCE), Darius II (423-405 BCE), Artaxerxes II (405-359 BCE), Artaxerxes III (359-338 BCE), Artaxerxes IV (338-336 BCE) and finally Darius III (336-330 BCE) who succumbed to Alexander the Great and the Macedonian army.

---

6 Kuhrt 1995: 662
7 Briant 2002: 107
8 Root, 1979
9 Kuhrt 2007: 135
10 Kuhrt 1995: 648
The empire was organized into several administrative territories called satrapies, and a regional governor, or satrap, governed each satrapy\textsuperscript{11}. The satrapies paid taxes to the central government, but there was considerable difference in the way each one was administered depending on a variety of factors. This thesis considers the satrapy of Armenia in the Achaemenid Empire, exploring the evidence we have for how people lived there at the time. It draws on textual, visual, and material evidence to create the most complete picture possible of people's lives and the impact of the empire.

\textit{The Satrapy of Armenia}

The satrapy of Armenia is one of the more remote satrapies of the empire, stretching west from Eastern Anatolia to the Southern Caucasus Mountains and south to Lake Urmia (Fig. 2). It is located quite a distance from the center of the empire in Pars and creates the northernmost border of the empire in the Southern Caucasus Mountains\textsuperscript{12}. Armenia has several natural borders such as the Black Sea to its northwest and the Great Caucasus range to the north, in the satrapy has a varied geography, containing mountains, plains, grasslands, semi-deserts, large lakes and several rivers and streams. The landscape is harsh and as a result the population was resilient\textsuperscript{13}. While the landscape was severe, it could also be plentiful: the numerous rivers and streams in the region left the landscape fertile, large lakes such as Lake Van provided fish, and the landscape was rich with raw materials, especially metals such as copper, silver and iron\textsuperscript{14}. Although the early history of the region of Armenia is particularly limited with respect to written sources, Assyrian

\textsuperscript{11} Waters 2014:
\textsuperscript{12} Khatchadourian 2008: 5
\textsuperscript{13} Khatchadourian 2008: 6
\textsuperscript{14} Dusinberre 2013: 17
sources describe a great kingdom in the region already by the 13th century, which they called Urartu and which archaeological evidence overwhelmingly supports\textsuperscript{15} (Fig.3).

\textit{Urartu}

Armenia was the name given in the Achaemenid period to a region of the world that had previously been known as the Urartian Kingdom. The Achaemenid Empire flourished in part due to the successful Achaemenid ability to make use of the elites and their existing institutions in each satrapy. Such was the case in Armenia, where the Achaemenid Empire adapted the Urartian governing structures already in place to serve Achaemenid imperial purpose\textsuperscript{16}. The Kingdom of Urartu established and maintained a powerful hold from the 9\textsuperscript{th} to the 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE. Urartu emerged roughly in the area surrounding Lake Van and spread North and East until it eventually covered the entire region that would become the Achaemenid Satrapy of Armenia\textsuperscript{17} (Fig. 4).

Evidence for Urartu comes in several forms. Assyrian annals and inscriptions provide us with mostly a political and military timeline for Urartu as Assyrian kings frequently were waging war against them\textsuperscript{18}. The other major source of written evidence comes from the Urartians themselves in the form of tablets and inscriptions. These written sources provide us with a reliable succession of many Urartian kings and a number of military encounters. In addition, numerous large-scale excavations have been carried out in present day Turkey, Armenia and Iran at Urartian sites. These sites have been, most typically, the great walled fortresses that Urartu is now known for.

\textsuperscript{15} Kuhrt 1995: 548
\textsuperscript{16} Khatchadourian 2008: 59
\textsuperscript{17} Piotrovsky 1969 : 11
\textsuperscript{18} Zimansky, 1995
The name Urartu is first recorded in Assyrian annals and inscriptions as early as the reign of Assyrian King Shalmaneser I (1280-1261 BCE) under the name variations ‘Uruatri’ and ‘Nairi.’ During this earliest manifestation of the Kingdom of Urartu it seems that the Assyrian words Urartu, Uruatri and Nairi all refer to a unified alliance of tribes in the area around Lake Van\textsuperscript{19}. By the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, when Urartu emerges in Assyrian records and inscriptions as a formidable foe, the Urartian state is a fully formed entity and a strong militaristic kingdom\textsuperscript{20}.

It is possible that the region governed by the Urartian kings consisted of a number of separate polities who created an alliance as Urartu in order to ward off repeated Assyrian aggression\textsuperscript{21}. Urartian culture, therefore, should not necessarily be understood as the culture of a single ethnic group, but instead, perhaps, as a political entity that was created to unify a region against Assyrian military endeavors. Urartian political structures created a kingdom that not only was able to withstand the powerful and aggressive Assyrians, but also was able to spread to and conquer new territories in the region. Urartu was able to maintain strong control in the region through a structured hierarchy of elites, strong artistic influence, and an imposing architectural style designed for withstanding attacks and dominating the landscape. Urartian architecture consists almost exclusively of massive hilltop fortresses with tremendous, thick stone or mud brick walls within which all military and administrative activities took place.

*The problem of Armenia’s Annexation*

\textsuperscript{19} Piotrovsky 1969: 43
\textsuperscript{20} Kuhrt 1995: 550
\textsuperscript{21} Kuhrt 1995: 550
There is no written record of the annexation of Armenia into the Achaemenid Empire. In Persian sources, Armenia was already part of the empire as a satrapy when Darius became king. However, Armenia was quite rebellious and it took Darius five attempts to subdue the population. Armenia remained under Achaemenid rule through the reign of the final king, Darius III when it fell into Macedonian hands along with the rest of the Achaemenid Empire. While it is not possible yet to determine exactly how the rapid decline of Urartu and annexation of the region into the Achaemenid Empire as Armenia occurred, it is clear that the change was rather quick and quite massive. The final mention of Urartu in any written account takes place in 643 BCE when an Urartian embassy makes a visit to the court of the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal. After this point there is no mention of Urartu in any written records and our only evidence for the continuation of the kingdom is in the names of a few kings in inscriptions. However, it is unclear if these kings were a continuation of the Urartian line or contemporary decentralized rulers. Darius’ Bisitun inscription, dating to 522 BCE at the very earliest, makes no mention of a local Urartian leader when it details Darius’ numerous attempts to subdue the region of Armenia. Additionally striking is the Greek author Xenophon’s description of the region as he is personally journeys through the Satrapy during the Achaemenid period and recounts the journey in his *Anabasis*. A decentralized people living in subterranean houses now inhabited the region that once rivaled Assyria in its

---

22 DB, Kuhrt 2007:141
23 DB, Kuhrt 2007:145
24 Briant 2002: 876
25 Kuhrt 1995:558
26 Kuhrt 1995:558-9
structures and military. Perhaps because Urartu had been such a strong military presence in the centuries before, and indeed in the early years of Darius reign, the satrapy of Armenia showed disturbing signs of feistiness, by 400 BCE the satrapy was being ruled in a very different way. What Xenophon does not describe, indeed, is any vestiges of the once great Urartian Kingdom that at one time had included these areas. This suggests that while the uniformity imposed by a strong polity can be established, it does not take long for decentralization to develop if the region is not actively maintained.

Conclusion

This thesis will focus on the satrapy of Armenia of the Achaemenid Empire and will gather together the somewhat sparse evidence from archaeological, literary and epigraphic sources in an attempt to create a full and rich picture of the satrapy. Based on the analysis of Persian and Classical sources in their referenced to Armenia, I will demonstrate that the satrapy of Armenia was of great importance to the Achaemenid Empire. Furthermore, I will turn to archaeological evidence to demonstrate the effects and extent of Achaemenid control in the satrapy of Armenia both among the elite and among the most humble members of the satrapy. By using all points of evidence in conjunction it becomes clear that Armenia was not just important to the center of the Achaemenid Empire but that the ideologies and art of the Achaemenid Empire were, in turn, important to Armenia.

The satrapy of Armenia demonstrates a fascinating mix of local tradition and Achaemenid influence in respect to architecture and behavior. The archaeological evidence demonstrates a strong continuity of local tradition in both architecture and

---

27 Xen. Ana. 4.5.25-34
behavior, while at the same time Achaemenid displays of power are adopted and used by the elite. These adopted displays of power do not, it seems, denote a complete overhaul of local structures, as a common tenet of Achaemenid governance includes the repurposing of extant power structures. This means that, while satrapies might be established, local systems of governance were not completely dismantled and replaced but rather transformed to varying degrees in order to suit the Achaemenid king. In essence it appears the Achaemenid kings adhered to the old saying: if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it. It was unnecessary to create a new system of elites in each satrapy if an already existing one could be used in the same way. Instead, behaviors and displays were tweaked or renovated in particular and meaningful ways to tie them to the new imperial might of Persia and to the power of the Achaemenid elite. Such Persianizing behaviors were not limited to the elite, however, and, as the material culture demonstrates, certain aspects of them extended down to the most humble strata of society.

**Epigraphic and Literary Evidence**

**Persian Sources**

Most of what has survived from the Achaemenid period written by the Achaemenids themselves is in the form of royal inscriptions and clay tablets. While there is no mention of Armenia in the Achaemenid tablets that have already been translated, the royal inscriptions provide us with a valuable source of how the satrapy of Armenia

---

28 Khatchadourian 2008: 59

29 These tablets refer to the Persepolis fortification tablets, which were discovered in the 1930s and are now housed and being translated at the Oriental Institute. They are currently in the process of being translated and while many already have been translated, there are many more yet to be translated. Should Armenia be mentioned in the tablets as they continue to be translated and published, it would provide new insight into the relationship between the satrapy and the center of the Empire (Jones, 2008).
was seen through the eyes of the great king. Royal inscriptions were often accounts of the military exploits of the Great King as well as other monumental accomplishments such as building projects. As the King himself commissioned inscriptions and sculpture about his own deeds, they give us a rare glimpse of how he viewed Armenia and how his impression of it was communicated to all of his subjects. As the sources will demonstrate, Armenia was an important component of the empire. Armenia was a region rich with natural resources, such as metals, a region where horses were bred for the Persian King, and a satrapy which produced powerful Achaemenid statesmen such as Darius III who went on to become the Great King himself.

The first in the body of Achaemenid inscriptions that mention Armenia is the Bisitun\textsuperscript{30} inscription (c. 521 BCE) by Darius I (522-486 BCE), which describes (and illustrates) his rise to the throne, and his rapid quelling of several uprisings in the various satrapies. This established Darius I as a legitimate heir to the Achaemenid throne and consolidator of the empire\textsuperscript{31}. This text was not only inscribed high up on the rock face at Mt. Bisitun with accompanying relief sculptures depicting the events, but also distributed throughout the Achaemenid Empire in varying principle languages. This was the version of Darius I’s exploits that became accepted as truth throughout the kingdom, including by Herodotus, and so also it is an indication of how Armenia was viewed by the center as a component of the Achaemenid Empire.

The inscription at Bisitun recounts Darius I’s rise to power and his first year on the throne in Old Persian, Elamite, and Akkadian. The text makes several references to Armenia as a satrapy that was already under Achaemenid control, presumably annexed

\textsuperscript{30} Alternately transliterated as Behistun
\textsuperscript{31} Waters, 59
by one of Darius’ Achaemenid predecessors, however there is no written record of Armenia in relation to the Achaemenid Empire predating the inscription at Bisitun. Armenia is first listed by Darius when he enumerates the regions under his control as Great King (Fig. 5).

“Darius the King says: These are the countries which came to me; by the favor of Ahuramazda I was king of them: Persia, Elam, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, (those) who are beside the sea, Sardis, Ionia, Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara, Scythia, Sattagydia, Arachosia, Maka: in all, 23 provinces (DB §6).”

Armenia is listed here as a country that ‘came to’ Darius I. This indicates that Darius was not the king to annex Armenia. However as the text of the inscription progresses we find that while Armenia was already a part of the empire, the region would not be subdued without a fight. This is perhaps a continuation of the previous Urartian culture in the region, which had been successful in fending off the Assyrians for a period of time before Armenia was annexed into the Empire. This was a region with considerable experience and success in both warding off attacks and successfully rising up when they were conquered. In addition, the harshness of the landscape likely contributed to the ability of the local population to fend off those from parts of the empire who were less accustomed to the mountains and plateaus of Armenia. And so in the

---

32 Khatchadourian, 72
33 Kuhrt, 2007
inscription five separate uprisings by Armenia against the Achaemenid Empire are accounted by the Bisitiun inscription.

All five uprisings are listed in succession by Darius:

“Darius the King says: An Armenian named Dadarshi, my subject -- I sent him forth to Armenia. I said to him: "Go forth, that rebellious army which does not call itself mine, that do you smite!" Thereupon Dadarshi marched off. When he arrived in Armenia, thereafter the rebels assembled (and) came out against Dadarshi to join battle. A place named Zuzahya, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Thuravahara 8 days were past, then the battle was fought by them.”

Darius the King says: Again a second time the rebels assembled (and) came out against Dadarshi to join battle. A stronghold named Tigra, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Thuravahara 18 days were past, then the battle was fought by them.”

Darius the King says: Again a third time the rebels assembled (and) came out against Dadarshi to join battle. A fortress named Uyama, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Thaigarci 9 days were past, then the battle was fought by them. Thereafter Dadarshi waited for me until I arrived in Media.”
Darius the King says: Thereafter a Persian named Vaumisa, my subject-him I sent forth to Armenia. Thus I said to him: "Go forth; the rebellious army which does not call itself mine -- smite them!" Thereupon Vaumisa marched off. When he arrived in Armenia, then the rebels assembled (and) came out against Vaumisa to join battle. A district named Izala, in Assyria -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Anamaka 15 days were past, then the battle was fought by them."

Darius the King says: Again a second time the rebels assembled (and) came out against Vaumisa to join battle. A district named Autiyara, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; on the last day of the month Thuravaharâthen the battle was fought by them. After that, Vaumisa waited for me in Armenia until I arrived in Media (DB §26-30)."

The first three rebellions in Armenia are said to have been ended by an Armenian subject of Darius named Dadarshi. These rebellions took place at “a village called Zuza, in Armenia,” “A fortress called Tigra, in Armenia,” and “a fortress called Uyama, in Armenia.” While Darius informs us that these sites of rebellion are within the satrapy of Armenia, they have not been localized in other texts or inscriptions. A Persian whom Darius identifies as Vaumisa, a Persian subject, deals with the second two rebellions. The first takes place in, “a region called Izala in Assyria” and the second, “in a region called Autiyara, in Armenia.” Once again, according to the inscription, both of these rebellions

---

34 Kuhrt (154), 2007
are swiftly dealt with, strengthening the argument that Darius had control over Armenia, but that the region was not, initially, a willing satrapy.

This illustration of Armenia expands our understanding of Armenia during the period and specifically how the King viewed it. The Bisitun inscription would have been a formidable undertaking. A huge inscription and sculpture carved high up on a rock face is no small feat, and listing the five different uprisings in Armenia in three different languages itself demonstrates the importance of Armenia to the King. So it is surprising that the low relief sculpture accompanying the inscription, which depicts ten different kings who are now subject to Darius’ rule, does not include an Armenian king. In fact, in terms of visual representation we must turn to another monument constructed during the rule of Darius I (522-486 BCE), and finished during the reign of his successor Xerxes (486-465 BCE), the Apadana at the palace at Persepolis.

The Palace of Persepolis, the construction of which began under Darius, is better described as a palatial complex and administrative center. The Apadana refers to the great audience hall portion of Persepolis. A massive columned hall, the Apadana had a grand staircase leading to the main audience hall and relief sculpture depicting a royal procession of subjects bringing tribute to the Great King Darius himself. This monumental undertaking was, of course, not simply for decoration. The depiction of the delegates bringing tribute to the king with such order is a visual representation of the Achaemenid Empire as a whole. It illustrates a reciprocal relationship between the Great King and his subjects and demonstrates Darius I’s idealized notion of his administration of the

---

Khatchadourian, 76
Achaemenid Empire. Each delegation does its part to support the Empire as is illustrated by the gifts each brings to the King. These gifts are visual representations of the resources the different satrapies contribute. The decision to use an orderly and peaceful scene further supports the notion that Darius’ vision for the empire was as a peaceful whole with harmonious parts — one in direct and obvious contrast to the Assyrian portrayals that preceded it, with their emphasis on brutal conquest and suppression.

While there is much to be explored regarding the Apadana and its relief sculpture, most important to this argument is the way the Armenian delegation is depicted and how that reflects the perception of Armenia and Armenians in the center of the Empire. The two separate depictions of Armenians can be found on the northern Wing B and the eastern Wing B. The appearance of the Armenian delegation in the Apadana relief provides an important source for the visual rhetoric of Armenians under the Achaemenid Empire. The way the King has chosen to depict Armenians, how they are dressed, and what they are offering as tribute expands our understanding of Armenia in the Persian imagination. With no accompanying inscriptions referencing the Armenian delegation it is important to consider how the Armenian delegation is being depicted and why.

The Armenian delegations have been established as being Armenian based on their clothing, which matches labeled sculptural Achaemenid representations of Armenians. The Armenian delegation can be identified by their, “…long sleeved, knee-length, tight-fitting tunics worn over trousers (Khatchadourian, 77.)” These garments are horse-riding gear, so the visual representation gives us an instant clue to one of the

__________________________

36 Khatchadourian, 76
defining features of Armenians in the Persian imagination: they are horsemen. The gifts each delegation is seen carrying to the enthroned Darius also give us a good idea. The delegation that appears on the eastern Wing B has only three members who are seen bringing a horse and a vessel. The horse again makes a reference to Armenia being a land of horse breeding, particularly elite horses used by the king himself. This theme of horses and horse rearing will arise again during the discussion of Greek sources below. The vessel is most probably a depiction of a vessel made of precious metal and forms a reference to the Armenians' rich metal resources as well as recalling the skilled metal crafts workers of Urartu. The delegation that appears on the northern Wing B has five members. The gifts this larger group of delegates bear seem to reiterate the same themes as the former delegation. Instead of a horse the delegates carry with them three riding costumes for the king, again referencing the Armenian connection to elite horse rearing. Additionally this delegation is carrying a pair of vessels, however the sculpture is too badly damaged to assert of what type and material the vessels may be.

Further inscriptions by Darius, listed below, are numerous but brief and overall continue to support the rhetoric established in the more extensive sources of the Bisitun inscription and the Apadana sculpture. Again we see a reiteration that Armenia is an important part of the empire, one worth stating and emphasizing.

The statue of Darius at Susa includes a reference to Armenia despite the sculpture’s primary purpose of celebrating a victorious campaign by Darius in Egypt. The base of the sculpture consists of several figures holding the king above their heads with up-stretched arms. These figures are not in an Achaemenid artistic style but, instead, in
an Egyptian style with some Persian influence\textsuperscript{37} (Fig. 6). The figure between Babylon and Sardis has been identified as representing Armenia by the label below it: “(ii) “Babylon, Armenia, Sardis…(DSab)\textsuperscript{38}.” This is not only listing Armenia as belonging to the king, but reinforcing the relationship between king and satrapies that was demonstrated on the Apadana. The image of the Armenian, representing the satrapy and doing his part to hold the king up and support the throne, is a visual representation of how the King viewed each satrapy as vital to upholding the whole empire. While this inscription is brief, listing only the name ‘Armenia’, and the image of the Armenian is not immediately distinguishable as an Armenian based on other Persian representations, it continues to demonstrate the importance the King placed on each satrapy including Armenia.

In an Old Persian inscription on the south wall of the Persepolis terrace we find Darius claiming Armenia as one of the lands he took and the Armenians as a people who pay him tribute:

\begin{quote}
2. Darius the King says: By the favor of Ahuramazda these are the countries which I got into my possession along with this Persian folk, which felt fear of me (and) bore me tribute: Elam, Media, Babylonia, Arabia, Assyria, Egypt, Armenia, Cappadocia, Sardis, Ionians who are of the mainland and (those) who are by the sea, and countries which are across the sea; Sagartia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorasmia, Sattagydia, Arachosia, Sind, Gandara, Scythians, Maka” (DPe).
\end{quote}

From a fragmentary text reconstructed from many partial copies found in Susa, Armenia is again listed as a ‘people’ who bring Darius tribute,

\textsuperscript{37} Kuhrt, 479, 2007
\textsuperscript{38} Kuhrt, 477-482, 2007
“3. King Darius proclaims: These are the people I seized outside Persia; I ruled over them; they brought me tribute; what I said to them, that they did; my law that held them (firm): Media, Elam, Parthia, Areia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorasmia, Drangiana, Arachosia, Sattagydia, Maka, Gandara, India, Saca who drink hauma, Saca with pointed hats, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Armenia, Cappadocia, Sardis, Ionians of the sea, Scythians beyond the sea, Thrace, Ionians beyond the sea, Caria” (DSe).

On an Akkadian stone tablet at Susa, Armenia is listed as one of the lands that brought materials and decoration for Darius’ Palace, “4. These are the lands who brought the materials and the decoration of the palace: Persia, Elam, Media, Babylon, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, the sealands, Sardis, Ionia, Urartu, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Areia, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara, Cimmeria, Sattagydia, Arachosia, Qadie” (DSaa).

Armenia is listed here as Urartu, the Babylonian term for Armenia 39.

Finally on the Tomb of Darius I at Naqsh-i Rustam we see Armenia being listed one last time as one of the countries that gave Darius tribute and that he claims to have seized, “3. Darius the King says: By the favor of Ahuramazda these are the countries which I seized outside of Persia; I ruled over them; they bore tribute to me; what was said to them by me, that they did; my law -- that held them firm; Media, Elam, Parthia, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorasmia, Drangiana, Arachosia, Sattagydia, Gandara, Sind, Amyrgian Scythians, Scythians with pointed caps, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Armenia, Cappadocia, Sardis, Ionia, Scythians who are across the sea, Skudra, petasos-wearing Ionians, Libyans, Ethiopians, men of Maka, Carians” (DNa).

39 Kuhrt, 497
In each of these sources from the reign of Darius I, Armenia is listed as a region and people who pay tribute to Darius and over whom he rules. Darius’ rhetoric is consistent and strong. In each case, Armenia is deliberately mentioned and represented, confirming that the king himself viewed it as an important component of the Empire.

The next two important Persian sources date to the reign of Darius I’s son and successor Xerxes (486-465 BCE). The first is an inscription in a rock-cut niche above Lake Van (Fig. 7). This does not mention Armenia, but the text declares Xerxes’ Kingship is held through the grace of Ahuramazda, and the inscription itself is carved on land that is thought to have been part of the Urartian kingdom — implying that he had domain over the region. Indeed, the placing of the inscription on the great Rock of Van, where the tombs of various important Urartian kings were also hollowed into the cliff, lends it very great weight as a statement of appropriative power.

“1. A great god is Ahuramazda, the greatest of gods, who created this earth, who created yonder sky, who created man, created happiness for man, who made Xerxes king, one king of many, lord of many. 2. I am Xerxes, the great king, king of kings, king of all kinds of people, king on this earth far and wide, the son of Darius the king, the Achaemenid. 3. Xerxes the King says: King Darius, who was my father -- he by the favor of Ahuramazda built much good (construction), and this niche he gave orders to dig out, where he did not cause an inscription (to be) engraved. Afterwards I gave order to engrave this inscription. 4. Me may Ahuramazda protect, together with the gods, and my kingdom and what I have done” (XV).
The second source of Xerxes' reign is from a text inscribed on limestone slabs and found at Persepolis. This text lists Armenia as one of the lands that Xerxes was king over and which bore him tribute:

“3. (13-28.) Xerxes the King says: By the favor of Ahuramazda these are the countries of which I was king outside Persia; I ruled them; they bore me tribute. What was said to them by me, that they did. The law that (was) mine, that held them (firm/stable): Media, Elam, Arachosia, Armenia, Drangiana, Parthia, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorasmia, Babylonia, Assyria, Sattagydia, Sardis, Egypt, Ionians, those who dwell by the sea and those who dwell across the sea, men of Maka, Arabia, Gandara, Sind, Cappadocia, Dahae, Amyrgian Scythians, Pointed-Cap Scythians, Skudra, men of Akaufaka, Libyans, Carians, Ethiopians” (XPh).

These two inscriptions by Xerxes continue the tradition established by Darius I of listing the lands the Great King has control over and which at the same time pay him tribute and contribute to the well being of the empire as a whole. The inscriptions iterate the overwhelming power that the king has over these lands, including Armenia. The first inscription is powerful because it is not found at the center of the Empire but rather within the Satrapy of Armenia itself and asserts Xerxes as rightful king and successor. The inscription invokes the god Ahuramazda, much as Darius had done, and also Xerxes’ royal lineage. The location and text of the inscription both assert Xerxes' right to rule over Armenia. The second inscription, from Persepolis, asserts Xerxes as king over all of the lands he lists and states that these lands behave as dutiful subjects towards their rightful king, Armenia included. Through these two inscriptions we see that Xerxes
continues his father’s strong rhetoric in regards to maintaining Armenia as a vital part of the Achaemenid Empire. Armenia clearly mattered.

Inscriptions by Persian kings that mention Armenia or Armenians are numerous, however they are almost entirely confined to the reigns of Darius I and Xerxes. This does not demonstrate a decline in the importance of Armenia to the great King, but rather reflects an overall decrease in the number extant inscriptions after the reign of Xerxes I⁴⁰. Although there is only a single inscription referring to Armenia after Xerxes, this single reference is enough to confirm that Armenia continued to be a part of the Achaemenid Empire. This inscription comes from the inscribed labels beneath the figures over the royal tomb of either Artaxerxes II (404-358 BCE) or Artaxerxes III (358-338 BCE) at Persepolis. At the tomb, one of the figures in the relief sculpture is labeled as ‘the Armenian:’ “…This is the Egyptian; This is the Armenian; this is the Cappadocian…(A?P).” This brief mention, much in the tradition of earlier inscriptions, confirms the continued existence of the satrapy of Armenia up until almost the end of the Achaemenid Empire.

This overview of the Persian textual sources for the satrapy of Armenia has highlighted several important things. It is clear that Armenia formed an important part of imperial and royal rhetoric early in the empire's history, perhaps in part because it had been difficult to control in those early years. Indeed it was so important that Xerxes even set his stamp upon it in person, with an overt imperial statement in the form of his trilingual inscription on the Rock of Van. Its significance in the everyday workings of the empire at its imperial core at Persepolis seems to have been lesser, however, as suggested

⁴⁰ Kent, 1953
by the absence of reference to Armenia or Armenians in the Persepolis Fortification Archive. As the empire continued in time, the specific importance of Armenia may have been less obvious, or the satrapy taken more for granted as an acquiescent participant in empire. This may be suggested by the silence of the later Achaemenid textual sources about it as a separate province. Perhaps it is its accepted integral nature within the empire that allowed for its satrap, Artashata, to take the throne in the mid-4th century as the last of the Persian kings, Darius III.

**Classical Sources**

**Major Sources**

‘Classical sources’, for our purposes, refers to the canon of Greek and Roman authors who recorded the events surrounding the Achaemenid Empire. Some of these authors were working at the same time or shortly after the described events occurred, while other sources were written at a later date and draw on earlier sources, some of which have survived and some of which have not. The two major sources that fall into this category and provide the most extensive and trustworthy insight are *The Histories* of Herodotus and *The Anabasis* of Xenophon. Both authors are Greek, were writing contemporary with the events, and demonstrate different strengths as sources on Achaemenid Armenia. One weakness of Greek sources in particular, however, is the orientalism they employ, which influences the information provided. Orientalism is a term coined by Edward Said in his seminal work *Orientalism* to explain the phenomenon of the ‘occident’ historically and continuously framing the ‘orient' as an exotic ‘other’\(^{41}\).

In order to do this, and by doing this, the ‘orient’ is given characteristics to set it in opposition to the ‘occident’ and often times these characteristics are negative and static. This allows for the ‘occident’ to be positive and dynamic. While Said’s work on orientalism focuses on the Victorian era in Europe and America as the early breeding ground of orientalism, Xenophon and Herodotus’ works too demonstrate this act of ‘othering’ the ‘oriental’. While this does not mean that Xenophon and Herodotus are unreliable, it does mean that their interpretation of sights and events is colored by the Greek perspective and written for a Greek audience.

The classical sources overwhelmingly confirm and elaborate on the same events and ideas that were demonstrated in Persian sources. In addition to confirming such major events as Darius’ rise to power and military exploits, the location, importance, culture, and resources of Armenia under Achaemenid control are also confirmed and further described. Both Herodotus and Xenophon are writing on the events in literary prose rather than through inscriptions, and for this reason among others they communicate different kinds of information. Whereas Persian inscriptions served an imperial purpose as well as a record keeping one, these Greek sources were written with the purpose of recording and communicating the events and history. As a result, the Greek sources often involve more or different kinds of elaboration, description, and sometimes speculation.

Herodotus (484-425 BCE)\(^{42}\) was a Greek author born in Asia Minor in the Greek city of Halicarnassus, now Bodrum in present day Turkey. Generally regarded as the first

Historian, Herodotus is a valuable source because he is our earliest extensive Greek source on the Persian Empire. His work, *The Histories*, covers the reigns of Cyrus the Great (557-530 BCE), Cambyses (530-522 BCE), Darius I (521-486 BCE), and Xerxes (486-479 BCE). *The Histories* was likely originally a series of lectures that Herodotus read to audiences and was compiled into a book and broken down into chapters at a later point.\(^{43}\)

Herodotus was present during the second part of the Persian Wars and drew from both his own experiences as well as other sources, as he was not present for the entire span of history his text covers. Herodotus claims to have traveled much and as a result his likely sources for the events he describes are stories told to him by others. Herodotus’ description of Darius’ ascent to the throne matches closely the version Darius himself had commissioned at Bisitun, suggesting that Herodotus was exposed to the official Persian Imperial narrative of events. While we cannot be certain how and to what extent Herodotus was exposed to Persian narratives, he certainly incorporated them into his work. Herodotus was a well-educated man with the resources to travel and access much of the intellectual work taking places around the Mediterranean and West Asia. Herodotus’ audience did not always have the same education and resources Herodotus did. As a result, *The Histories* contains extensive descriptions of places, motives, and dramatic flairs that would have helped Herodotus’ audience better understand and follow the events that were being described. These descriptions are especially useful to the conversation of Armenia under the Achaemenid Empire.

\(^{43}\) Dewald, 2008
Herodotus’ discussion of Armenia lends many small bits of information on the ethnography and geography of Armenia under the Achaemenid Empire. In Book I Armenia is mentioned twice in a geographic context. “For the boundary between the Median and Lydian empires was the river Halys, which rises in mountains of Armenia, flows through Cilicia, and then continues with Matieni to the north and Phrygia to the south…(Hdt, 1.72)” and “The Euphrates is a wide, deep, and fast-flowing river which rises in Armenia and issues into the Red Sea (Hdt, 1.180).” From these passages it is clear that Armenia was connected with the rest of the empire through these two rivers, which could be used for trade. In fact, later in Book I, there is a description of how rivers were used to transport goods from Armenia down stream. Based on the description, it seems that both the boats and the trade were Babylonian ventures. However, the boats were built and loaded with wine in Armenia, suggesting that Armenia was involved at the very least in producing the raw materials to build the boats and perhaps even the wine they are carrying. This description confirms the idea that these rivers were utilized for trade and were potentially important to the economy of Achaemenid Armenia. In addition, this demonstrates how Armenia was important to the satrapies in the center, such as Babylonia, by providing wine and also the raw materials to build trade vessels.

In Book III there is a mention of Armenia within a section describing Darius I’s rise to power and the lands over which he ruled, which is very similar to the Bisitun inscription. Presumably because his Greek audience might not understand the political workings of the Persians, Herodotus is more descriptive with his list than is the list in the Bisitun inscription. He describes the different peoples who live within each province, the
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44 Hdt, 1.194 (See Appendix II)
locations of the provinces, and even how much tribute each province owes the king. Armenia’s mention is brief: “The thirteenth province, comprising Pactyic territory, Armenia and their neighbors as far as the Euxine Sea, contributed 400 talents (Hdt, 3.93).” The tribute that the different provinces are expected to contribute to the King vary wildly. According to Herodotus, while the province including Armenia contributed only 400 talents, the sixth province, which consisted mainly of Egypt, was required to contribute 700 talents, revenue of silver from fish, and 120,000 sacks of grain. On the other hand the fifteenth province, home to the Sacae and Caspii, was only required to contribute 250 talents. There is no reason provided for this wide variance, only that Darius decided how much each province should owe him. It is notable that according to Herodotus Armenia was not required to contribute of the many raw materials it is known for, such as metals and livestock.

In Book V, Herodotus gives a detailed description of the Royal Road from Sardis to Susa, and along the journey we receive more geographic and ethnographic details. The Persian Royal Road was a network of roads that used and expanded existing infrastructure so that the King and his subjects could travel, trade, and communicate with ease. Herodotus describes the road extensively so his Greek audience might be able to visualize the enormity of the system of roads as well as the varying lands it passes through. “Next to the Cilicians are the Armenians, and these people too have many herds. Then these people here, next to the Armenians, are the Matieneans” (Hdt 5.49). Here, Armenians are placed between Cilicia and Matieni and they have many herds which might suggest that livestock is important to their region, or at the very least the geography
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is conducive to rearing livestock. Later on in the same section of Book V, Herodotus explains more in depth how the Persian Royal Road would have appeared along the journey, and so Armenia is mentioned again⁴⁶. Armenia is once again identified as lying between the regions of Cilicia and Matieni, and the Royal Road as it appeared in Armenia is described. The Armenian section of the Royal Road has fifteen resting stages and a fortress or watchtower from which the Armenian section of road can be monitored. Herodotus asserts that all the lands through which the road passes are safe and inhabited. This is important because it implies that these regions were not seeing any kind of tension or aggression at this point. It follows that Armenian-Persian relations at the time were solid and friendly and that Armenia was wholly incorporated as an important part of the Empire.

Xenophon (c. 430-350 BCE) is the second Greek source considered here who was writing with first hand experience of the Achaemenid Empire. Written just a few decades after Herodotus' Histories, Xenophon’s work, The Anabasis, provides more cultural geographical and political insight. Xenophon himself spent time in the Achaemenid Empire as a general of a Greek mercenary army hired by Cyrus the Younger. Xenophon participated in Cyrus the Younger’s failed attempt to overthrow his brother Artaxerxes II and usurp the Achaemenid throne. After Cyrus the Younger’s army was defeated at Cunaxa, Xenophon, being a general to the Greeks, led them back to Greece on foot. This is the journey that he has documented in The Anabasis. Fortunately one leg of Xenophon’s return was through Armenia, and so his writings provide us with a firsthand knowledge of the people and landscape he encountered there.

⁴⁶ Hdt 5.52 (See Appendix II)
The first mention of Armenia in *The Anabasis* is indirect; Xenophon mentions the Satrap of Armenia, Orontas, leading his forces back home after Cyrus the Younger’s army has lost to Artaxerxes II’s 47. It can be presumed that Orontas had fought on the side of Artaxerxes II, as he is allowed to simply return home after Cunaxa. It is notable that Orontas is leading his army back to Armenia in the company of his new wife, the daughter of the King. This union between the Satrap of Armenia and the daughter of the King creates a strong political tie between Armenia and the king himself.

The first true mention of Armenia and the Greeks’ journey through its lands appears in Book III, as the generals are deciding how they should continue their journey 48. Here Armenia is described as a ‘large and prosperous province’, which is in line with other general impressions of Armenia given by both Herodotus and Persian resources and not surprising, given that Armenia was a sizeable satrapy with many natural resources, which resulted in its prosperity. This is also the passage that first identifies Orontas as Satrap of Armenia. This helps us to understand why Orontas’ march to lead his forces back home was in the same direction that Xenophon was leading the Greek army.

As the Greek army draws closer to Armenia at the beginning of Book IV, Xenophon provides his readers with more geographic details:

“For they heard from the prisoners who were taken that once they had passed through the Carduchian Mountains and reached Armenia, they could there cross the headwaters of the Tigris river, if they so desired, or, if they preferred, could go round them. They were also informed that the headwaters of the Euphrates were not far from those of the Tigris, —and such is indeed the case” (Xen. *Anab.* 4.1.3).
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47 Xen. Anab. 2.4.8-10 (See Appendix II)  
48 Xen. Anab. 3.5.17 (See Appendix II)
Here, it is confirmed that the Euphrates River rises in Armenia as Herodotus had mentioned in Book I of *The Histories*. As the Greeks draw closer to Armenia they encounter more obstacles. First there are the Carduchian Mountains, but next as they attempt to cross the Centrites River into Armenia, Orontas and his army stop them. With the Carduchians ready to attack the Greek army from the rear, Xenophon describes the Greek decision to assume battle formation and to march on into Armenia.

Finally, Xenophon and his men arrive in Armenia where they are able to come to an agreement with the ‘lieutenant-governor’ Tiribazus for safe passage. This Tiribazus is a member of the elite class of Armenia and is said to govern ‘Western Armenia.’ This passage from Xeneophon hints at the notion that the Satrapy of Armenia may have been divided into two administrative regions. However, because the Greek terms Xenophon uses to describe the local elites do not translate to Persian or indeed equate precisely to similar kinds of political leaders in Greek culture, just how Armenia was governed cannot be certain. What is certain is that Tiribazus was an important man who led troops and held favor with the King. Indeed, later in the passage it is revealed that so long as Tiribazus is around, only he is allowed to help the King onto his horse (a position of extreme honor).

Once they have made an agreement with Tiribazus, Xenophon and the Greeks march on until they arrive at a village where they are able to acquire supplies and rest. During the night the Greeks are snowed on, revealing the difficult climate of Armenia. Additionally, during the same night, a small group of Greeks is sent out to investigate their surroundings and they return with a captured Persian soldier who claims to be under

49 Xen. Anab. 4.3.1-4 (See Appendix II)
the leadership of Tiribazus. It is notable that a Persian soldier is under the leadership of the lieutenant governor of Armenia. This Persian soldier went on to guide the Greeks for the next leg of the journey, which was no doubt incredibly useful in this strange and foreign country to Xenophon and his countrymen.

As the Greeks march on the next day, they march through deep snow, a desert, through the Euphrates River, over a plain, and through more deep snow with strong winds. Here many of the slaves, animals, and soldiers perished from the cold and from hunger (Xen. Ana. IV 5.1-7). This extreme shift from deep snow to desert, as well as the great loss of lives, highlights the incredibly harsh and varying climate of Armenia. Those who survived arrived at an Armenian village as they were close to the seat of the Satrap but could go no further. The Greeks spread out among several villages, where the Athenian general, Polycrates, seized the village along with all of the villagers, the chief, his daughter, and 17 colts being raised for the King. This scene reinforces the notion that Armenia was a land where horses were reared for the King. In the evening, Xenophon has a feast in this village where all of the houses are built below ground and the livestock also is kept underground where the villagers live (Xen. Anab. IV 5.25-27). These types of villages could still be found in Armenia until fairly recently and are an important adaptation to the cold harsh winters and hot summers.

During the feast Xenophon encountered beer, which he describes as ‘barleywine’ and claims is both tasty and strong. This is notable, as beer is foreign to Xenophon despite his extensive travels. Xenophon takes time to describe how barley floats along the
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top of the drink and straws are required to drink from it (Xen. Anab. IV 5.25-27). It
seems thus that beer is a local phenomenon and, at least in this context, sets Armenia
apart culturally. Another oddity Xenophon notes is the dress of local boys, which he only
describes as ‘strange’ and ‘foreign’. We can suppose that these boys might be dressed in
a distinct Armenian style, much as the Armenian delegations on the Apadana were
dressed in a style identifying them as Armenians.

As Xenophon and the rest of the Greeks prepare to march out of Armenia and
continue on their journey home they take with them some of the colts in the village,
exchanging their injured horses in their place, which can be fattened and sacrificed.
Xenophon describes these horses as smaller and ‘more spirited’ than Persian horses (Xen.
Ana. IV 5.36). This smaller size and increased spirit of the horses would have made them
desirable for battle, explaining why Armenia raised and sent horses as tribute. Fortunately,
the locals also provided the Greeks with the important knowledge of tying bags around
the ankles of the animals in order to prevent them from sinking into the snow. This
exchange of knowledge adds to the example of the underground houses to illustrate the
important and creative ways local peoples in Armenia had adapted to the harsh climate
around them. With this, Xenophon and the Greeks move out of Armenia.

These two Greek authors, who lived during the reign of the Achaemenid Empire,
paint a picture of Armenia that is very much in line with how the official Persian texts
and artwork portrayed the satrapy: large, prosperous, and powerful. It is no doubt
significant that in situations when Achaemenid Persia is being discussed, Armenia almost
always is as well.
Minor Classical Sources

The minor sources on Achaemenid Armenia, meaning those with only passing references to the area or of dubious veracity, are overwhelmingly also later sources, primarily later Greek and Roman. These minor sources are important in that they reinforce the impressions of Armenia that Xenophon and Herodotus illustrate and cement classical impressions of Armenia under the Achaemenids. These later authors, who were all born long after the end of the Achaemenid Empire, had to rely on earlier sources, some now extant but some lost, in order to pen their own accounts of the events.

Ctesias (5th c. BCE) is the first and only contemporary minor source available to us now. Like Xenophon, Ctesias had first hand knowledge of the Achaemenid Empire as a physician living in the court of Artaxerxes II. Ctesias mentions Armenia only once in his work Persica, a history of the Achaemenid Empire that now only survives in fragments. One fragment, discussing the Persian General Megabyzus, tells of a Paphlagonian named Artoxares who was exiled to Armenia after he advocated for Megabyzus. While Armenia was part of the Achaemenid Empire at the time, it was also one of the empire’s furthest reaches — as well as harsh of climate — and so might be an ideal place to exile someone to. It is interesting that at the time of Artaxerxes II it was considered secure enough, and securely enough loyal to the King, that it seemed safe to exile a potential dissident to the area without fear of his fomenting revolt.

Diodorus Siculus was a Greek historian from Sicily writing in the 1st c. BCE. In his massive undertaking, Bibliotheca Historica, he writes the history of the world as he
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knew it, from the Trojan War to Alexander the Great. Diodorus Siculus included historical and cultural descriptions of West Asia, India, North Africa, and Greece. In describing the Persian preparations against Evagoras of Salamis in Cyprus, Diodorus Siculus mentions the two men Artaxerxes II sent in order to lead the war.

“He picked his son-in-law Orontes for the land force, for the fleet Tiribazus, a man held in high esteem among the Persians (Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca Historica, XV, 2).”

Orontes here is the same as Orontas from Xenophon’s descriptions. Orontas seems to be a satrap whom Artaxerxes II trusted, as he was able to rely on him in battle several years earlier at Cunaxa and again now when there was a need for Persia to invade Cyprus. Xenophon also mentioned Tiribazus, as lieutenant-governor of Western Armenia, in his descriptions of Armenia when he and his troops arrive in the satrapy. Diodorus Siculus’ mention of these two men reinforces the notion that the men who were leaning Armenia at the time were dedicated to the Great King and, in turn, trusted by him.

The earliest Roman source is found in the 1st century biographer Cornelius Nepos (c. 100-24 BCE). In his Lives of the Great Generals, Cornelius Nepos discusses the life of Datames, a general under the Persian king. In this passage, Cornelius Nepos briefly mentions that Autophradates, perhaps the satrap of Lydia at the time, had ten thousand Armenians in his army. If this is true, it shows that Armenians were serving as soldiers in areas other than their homeland — perhaps because they possessed certain skills, such as mountaineering, that could be employed elsewhere to good effect and perhaps also so
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that these fierce warriors were removed from the naturally defensible hills of their native region.

Strabo (c. 64 BCE - after 21 CE)\(^{54}\) lived on the Black Sea and is the latest of the Greek sources. Strabo was not a historian or biographer, like so many of the other sources, but instead a geographer. In his work *Geography*, Strabo confirms the notion of Armenia’s wealth through a brief description\(^{55}\). Strabo mentions where mines are located within Armenia, mines which produce precious metals, namely gold, as well as describing the production of different kinds of dyes. Additionally he provides yet another discussion of Armenia as a land of horse rearing. Here it is mentioned that Armenian horses were sent to the king every year during the festival held for the Persian god Mithras. Strabo, as a geographer, discusses Armenia in a different context than historians and biographers might. He discusses Armenia’s wealth and power in terms of the land and its vast resources. This confirms and elaborates on earlier texts that suggest Armenia was a land of material wealth.

Justin is another of the Roman sources and was a historian. Justin’s dates are uncertain but as his work is primarily the abridgement of a lost work by Pompeius Trogus (c. 1\(^{st}\) century BCE), on the Macedonian Empire\(^{56}\). It is speculated that Justin may have been writing some time between the 2\(^{nd}\) and 4\(^{th}\) centuries CE\(^{57}\). In his discussion of Darius III’s ascent to the throne, Justin first discusses his efforts in battle, which lead to


\(^{55}\) Strabo, *Geography* XI, 14.9 (See Appendix II)


his appointment as the Satrap of Armenia\textsuperscript{58}. Here, Darius III (336-330 BCE), future and final king of the Achaemenid Empire, is referred to by his Greek name Codomannus. Armenia is this passage is pluralized which could be in reference to the Roman division of Armenia into two provinces\textsuperscript{59}. This detail underscores the likelihood that this source was written much later than the time of the Persian empire, although we have seen that already by 400 BCE there may have been two high-placed administrators overseeing its different parts. Despite its late date, however, this source helps to confirm the idea, which was presented with Orontas and Tiribazus, that satraps of Armenia were held in high esteem by the King and held considerable power. Darius III was rewarded with the satrapy of Armenia, and this position of power was one step closer towards his eventual ascent to the Achaemenid throne.

These later sources all help to confirm the notions established by the earlier, more extensive sources. Those who were satraps of Armenia, or held other important positions in the satrapy, enjoyed the favor of the king. Orontas, Tiribazus and Codomannus all each were active and powerful members of the Achaemenid elite, as both major and minor classical sources confirm. When classical authors describe Armenia, they mention its mountains, its vast resources, and its powerful and skilled inhabitants. Although many of these classical authors may not have visited the satrapy of Armenia themselves, it was certainly a land of resources and power both in the classical imagination and in the Persian reality.

\textit{Material Evidence}

\textsuperscript{58} Justin X 3.2-5 (See Appendix II)
\textsuperscript{59} (Kuhrt, 427)
A great deal of archaeology has been done in the area that encompassed Achaemenid Armenia, producing much evidence over the course of many decades.

This evidence is very difficult to use, however. It is published in many different languages. The excavations have tended to seek glorious treasure and monumental architecture. Few of them have been conducted according to modern scientific standards. Despite these difficulties, however, there now exists a large body of material evidence that enables us to talk about Achaemenid Armenia, not only from the particular charged perspectives of the textual sources but also using the material evidence of people’s lives. This evidence sheds light on the practices of the elite and also non-elite people.

Most of what has been published reflects elite power and status display. That is true of most of the architectural evidence and other artifacts as well. Those include precious metal drinking vessels of Achaemenid type, jewelry, and other elements of visual display, and seal stones. It is probably significant that those very things that demonstrate power and prestige show such a strong and specific Achaemenid face to the world. At the same time there is a clear continuity in local traditional elements as well.

Monumental architecture in Armenia is often dated to the Achaemenid period based on the presence of stone column bases and capitals that overtly reflect the columns of Persepolis and Pasargadae. Certain other forms of monumental architecture, often dated to the Achaemenid period, include particular tower types and fortification walls. It is interesting that the multi-columned hall was also an Urartian phenomenon, pre-dating the Achaemenid period in this area. Thus the multi columned hall should not be understood as an Achaemenid import in the case of Armenia, but rather is a traditional building with associations of traditional power as well as imported. It is particularly
interesting that this architectural form should have been so commonly, overtly Achaemenidizing in its outward display and visible trappings during the Persian period, including the instantly recognizable stone column bases that have come to be considered an Achaemenid indicator. At the moment, we cannot tell if there was a shift in the cultural practice or use of the building type, but it matters that the appearance was overtly Persianized.

Artifacts also show a strong Achaemenidizing tendency in elite behaviors and display, especially drinking and dining behaviors and public appearance in the form of dress. Imperial behavior may also be suggested by the presence of seal stones, which served a practical function as well as functioning for public display. This is the case whether the artifacts are imported or made locally in Achaemenidizing manner: if they look "Achaemenid," they may possibly indicate behaviors associated with the Achaemenid elite elsewhere in the empire as well.

Mortuary evidence demonstrates the commingling of Achaemenidizing material with traditional local material and customs. It is very important that elite public display was conducted using Achaemenid elite signifiers, even at the same time that local traditions continued. Thus the behaviors of the elite might or might not be the same as before, as mortuary remains demonstrate some continuity of traditional behaviors at the same time as new ones may have been adopted. Significantly, however, the manner in which the elite demonstrated status shifted to include imperial markers as well as those associated with long-standing local power.

There is much less evidence at this point for non-elite behavior in the Achaemenid period. What there is demonstrates that Achaemenid imperial notions were
not adopted only by the elite and were not being used only for administrative display and behaviors. Instead, notion of imperial practice and behaviors associated with empire reached also to the non-elite. This is shown in the production of local ceramic imitations of elite metal wares, including in the local production of Achaemenid bowls, and in the widespread use of the new ceramic ware – triangle ware. This last is a buff clay with dark triangles painted upon it and becomes very widespread in Armenia during the Achaemenid period. Thus the ceramic evidence demonstrates the impact of the new empire on the behaviors of non-elite people too.

The sites I have considered in this discussion fall into two major groupings: north and south (see appendix). It is crucial to note that borders of the satrapy are not entirely clear. Indeed, it seems likely that the very notion of "border" may be misleading, and we should probably think instead of the farthest extent of the empire as functioning as some sort of permeable membrane. It is possible that further study will provide new ways of thinking about cultural influence that may help us determine where the boundaries of specific imperial control lay.

I had expected in this study to define three major types of sites: (1) those sites certainly within the boundaries of Armenia, (2) those sites definitely outside direct imperial rule but that nonetheless demonstrated Achaemenid imperial influence, and (3) those that lay somewhere between on the spectrum. In fact, the archaeological evidence does not at this point seem to bear that division out, as will become clear. Thus, the discussion of the archeological material that follows is organized according to artifact category rather than to degree of Achaemenid "influence" or imperial impact.
Monumental Architecture

Column Bases and Capitals

Column bases and capitals made of stone with specific and recognizable reference to heartland Achaemenid types are distinct and often preserve well, as they are made of stone. These two factors make them a good indication of Achaemenid influence over the architecture of Achaemenid Armenia. Achaemenid column bases have a distinctive bell shape and several varieties of identifiably Achaemenid decorations. Four distinct varieties have been identified by Wesenberg⁶⁰ and are used to tie column bases found around the empire to those at the center. Achaemenid column capitals often are shaped in the form of two of the same animal heads facing out and away from each other in what is known as a protome. In the case of Achaemenid protomes, the heads are usually bulls, lions, or lion-griffins. The fact that the capitals take on the shape of these animals also is a reference to important Achaemenid representations of deities in Zoroastrianism, the religious system of the Achaemenids⁶¹. The appearance of the bull protome in Caucasian sites therefore points to the spread of not only the architecture of the center to this outlying satrapy, but also possibly to the spread of religion or religiously symbolic ideas.

Column bases that have been identified as Achaemenid have been found scattered across the former Achaemenid satrapy of Armenia. The sites where column bases are found are often labeled as ‘palaces’ simply because parallel column bases from the center of the empire were found at palaces in such places as Persepolis or Susa. The word
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‘palace’ in this context, however, carries with it a notion of a satrapal headquarters and/or administrative center rather than a royal residence per se.

Achaemenid palaces in the center of the empire served not only as royal residences but also administrative centers from which many of the important functions to keep the Empire running smoothly were carried out. It follows then that such administrative centers would be required to govern each satrapy, and the way that these so-called ‘palaces’ communicated the power and purpose of the structure was through imitating the architectural power markers from the center of the Empire. This demonstrates the trend in the region for elite status display to take on an Achaemenid style. Later on this will be demonstrated in other aspects of society and not only in architecture.

The column bases that have been found in the Armenian Satrapy are of a style that is derived from prototypes at Susa and Persepolis and were in use from the reign of Darius I – Artaxerxes II (521-259 BC)\(^{62}\). This means that the column base could not have come from a pre-Achaemenid period based on current evidence and dates. While multi-columned halls had been an Urartian phenomenon in the region before the arrival of Achaemenid culture, this distinct style of stone bell-shaped column bases is new to the region and demonstrates a highly visible shift in the architecture of the region. The major sites in the region with such column bases present are Qarajamirli, Benjamin, Gumbati, Sari Tepe and Tsikhiagora (Fig. 8).

The site of Sari Tepe has only been partially excavated, however these efforts have revealed a multi-roomed structure with towers (Fig. 9). In the central room of the

\[^{62}\text{Veisi, 2014}\]
structure two bell-shaped column bases were uncovered and suggest Achaemenid influence at the site. These column bases according to Wesenberg classification are of the B variation, which is the most popular style and appears in the center of the empire at Persepolis. Sari Tepe is situated in a low land setting and, as it has no natural defenses, the structure has towers and buttressing. It is interesting to note that this practice of building defensive architecture may be derived from an older, Urartian style of architecture and it is meeting with Achaemenid columns demonstrating the mixture of architectural traditions.

At Benjamin in present-day Armenia a single column base has been revealed as a result of excavations at a large building which is a complex with several rooms. The column base was not found in situ, but the earliest level of the site is assumed to be contemporary with Gumbati and Sari Tepe. This base is constructed of local stone, so it is likely that local craftsmen took a Persian mode of displaying power and incorporated it into the structure at Benjamin. This is interesting because it demonstrates a blending of local and Persian architecture.

The Site of Qarajamirli in present-day Azerbaijan was excavated in recent decades after local villagers found a single limestone column base there. These excavations were carried out in hopes of revealing a larger building that the column base may have been a part of — and they revealed just that. A larger structure at the site, now labeled as a ‘palace’, was excavated in 2006. Four more column bases have been revealed
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as part of a columned room that bears close resemblance to Persian models\textsuperscript{66}. The presence of these column bases and the recently revealed structures confirms that the architecture of this structure borrowed heavily from architecture at the center of the empire and used Persian visual cues to denote power.

At the Site of Gumbati in present-day Georgia, five fragments of column bases have been found. While these five fragments have been removed from their original context, they are associated with a large complex of mud brick rooms that the excavators have dated to the Achaemenid period\textsuperscript{67}. The presence of these fragments again points to Achaemenid architectural influence. Additionally, the excavator’s suggestion that the different sizes of the column bases indicate two different columned halls further confirms an Achaemenid architectural influence.

Because columned halls regularly show up in the architecture of palaces in the center of the Empire and because the column bases are an Achaemenid style it is likely that the entire structure was heavily influenced by new architectural styles from the center. Furthermore, these column bases are made of local stone, as are all the stone column bases in the region. Some stylistic differences between the column bases found within the borders of the satrapy of Armenia and those at the center of the empire suggests that local craftsmen and architects were not simply importing ideas or craftsmen from the center but instead using their own resources to emulate the symbols that demonstrated power at the center of the empire. The stylization and proportions of the bases that have been found at Qarajamirli and Gumbati are so similar that one study investigating Achaemenid column base proportions suggests that they were made at the

\textsuperscript{66} Babaev, 2006
\textsuperscript{67} Khatchadourian 2008, Veisi 2014
same workshop. This is interesting because it shows that this existence of Achaemenid style bases was not an accident, but rather an organized effort to emulate Persian power in the region.

At Oğlan Qala, a site in Nakhchivan, the remains of an unfinished period Achaemenid renovation of an Urartian era structure have been recently uncovered. The occupation of the site is presumed by the excavators to be late in the Achaemenid era. Multiple structures at Oğlan Qala demonstrate signs of Achaemenid era rebuilding, but the most valuable building for this discussion is Room 1 of Period IV\textsuperscript{68}. Room 1 was in the process of being transformed into a large columned hall but was left unfinished for reasons yet unknown. The room contains two column bases, a torus, a capital, and twenty drums. While excavators suggest the column drums might date to a later, Hellenistic period, the column bases bear a striking resemblance to the Achaemenid column bases that have been found at Qarajamirli, Gumbati, Benjamin, and Sari Tepe. The room holding the unfinished column components has been dated to the 4\textsuperscript{th} century using carbon dating. Based on this evidence the excavators suggest that construction at the site may have halted with the fall of Darius III\textsuperscript{69}. The existence of the unfinished Achaemenidizing column components suggests that the work was being done locally and so local craftsmen again were adopting an Achaemenid style of architecture. This effort to transform the previous building into a structure with Achaemenid displays of power once again is a sign of how pervasive Achaemenid visual power cues were in this region of the empire, up until the very end.

\textsuperscript{68} Dan, 2014
\textsuperscript{69} Ristvet et al. 2012
Column capitals have been found less frequently than column bases in the Satrapy of Armenia. However, at Tsikhiagora in present-day Georgia a single well preserved column capital in the shape of a bulls-head protome has been found (Fig. 10). This column capital bears a close resemblance to similar protomes from Persepolis. The major difference between the two is that those column capitals from the center of the empire display more detail in the carving of the bulls' heads. Despite the number of small differences between the Tsikhiagora capitals and the Persepolis capitals, it is evident that the former is an imitation of the latter. These bulls are significant in a religious context at the center of the empire. Their appearance as far north as Tsikhiagora demonstrates not only the influence of Achaemenid architecture but also religious symbols being used in this provincial context. Whether the people of Armenia also understood or believed the religious import the capitals had at the center of the Empire remains yet unknown.

The column bases and capitals that have been identified as Achaemenid are our only evidence for specifically Achaemenid architecture, but the apparent impact of Achaemenid presence only on monumental architecture is probably misleading. The rest of the architecture of the period is poorly understood. For instance, it does seem to be the case that Tsaghkahovit in the Achaemenid period saw the dispersal of habitation from fortresses to pit houses instead. This significance of this is not clear at the moment, but the move may suggest a less violent and more peaceful living situation. For now we can state with confidence that Achaemenid presence had an impact on the appearance of public, probably administrative, buildings. We do not yet know what its effect was on other kinds of architecture, but it is no doubt significant that the administrative buildings were made to resemble their counterparts at the Persian capitals.
Other Architecture

Achaemenid architecture in the region that is not associated with the Achaemenid Empire through column bases and capitals is not uncommon, however such structures have not enjoyed as much attention as sites with columns and bases. Repurposed Urartian fortresses, tower structures, and habitation structures in the region all demonstrate some degree of Achaemenid influence either in form, renovations, or use.

The fortress site of Altıntepe near Erzincan in present day Turkey contains a multi-columned hall, which has been dated to the Achaemenid period based on ceramic finds and stratigraphy\(^{70}\). The site saw habitation from the Early Bronze Age through the Medieval Period, and thus the structure shows several different building phases — one of which is Achaemenid. Based on the assemblage of ceramics at the site, specifically triangle-ware, the multi-columned hall at the site and those structures associated with it have been identified as Achaemenid\(^{71}\)(Fig. 11). The appearance of the columned hall here, at the Achaemenid level of the site, is noteworthy as it recalls columned halls at the center of the empire such as the Apadana at Persepolis. However, while it recalls the Apadana it is important to stress that the purpose of the columned hall at Altıntepe remains unknown\(^{72}\). This style of architecture is again a reminder, much as the column bases and capitals are, of Persian displays of power in architecture. It is also interesting that it appears within a more extensive Urartian structure, forming part of a trend in which former Urartian structures continued in use during the Achaemenid period.
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\(^{71}\) Summers, 1993; Khatchadourian, 2008

\(^{72}\) Khatchadourian, 2008
The site of Erebuni, a major Urartian citadel site, demonstrates several signs of Achaemenid occupation after the fall of the Kingdom of Urartu (Fig. 12). Recent efforts to renew excavations at the site have revealed that the multi-columned hall at the former Urartian citadel was restored on three different occasions, all dating after the end of the kingdom of Urartu during the Achaemenid period. The appearance of the multi-columned hall at Erebuni, which saw restoration during the Achaemenid period, is important because it indicates that the multi-columned hall was not a new phenomenon in the region. The hall existed at Erebuni already during Urartian times and was only renovated later on. It is also interesting that Erebuni was repurposed in Achaemenid times as an administrative center, while the nearby Urartian site of Teishebaini was completely abandoned. This perhaps indicates some nucleation of settlement, or at least concentration in the new administrative center rather than other outlying sites.

At the site of Samadlo in present day Georgia, a tower structure has been uncovered which dates to the 5th through the early 4th century BCE (Fig. 13). The tower is particularly interesting because the plan of the structure is similar to two towers at the center of the empire. The Zendan-e Sulaiman tower at Pasargadae and the Kaabah-e Zardusht in Naqsh-e Rustam are both close parallels to the tower structure at Samadlo. It is interesting to note that both of the towers from the center of the empire appear near otherwise important sites; Pasargadae is one of the several royal residences of the great king, and Naqsh-e Rustam is a royal Achaemenid necropolis. It is important that a structure thus far associated with major heartland Achaemenid sites makes an appearance near the most northern edges of Armenian satrapy of the empire: the visible display of
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Achaemenid power through architecture was employed here at the very outermost edges of the empire in what was certainly a purposive way.

There continue to be sites demonstrating possible Achaemenid influence that are yet to be explored. For example, Ochmik and Oshakan, two sites in present day Armenia, both have architecture that may suggest Achaemenid influence. At Argishtihenale, an Urartian site in Armenia, some renovations may date to the Achaemenid period. However, based on the renovations and associated ceramics the dating remains uncertain.

It is clear that Achaemenid architectural plans and styles reached the satrapy of Armenia in more ways than just column bases and capitals. However, the evidence remains limited and it is difficult to draw any broad conclusions about Achaemenid architectural influence in Armenia. While some former Urartian fortresses were repurposed during Achaemenid times, such as Erebuni, others were allowed to fall into ruin. As more work is carried out in the Achaemenid levels of sites in the satrapy of Armenia it is possible that more solid patterns will emerge.

_Achaemenid Shaped Vessels_

Achaemenid shaped vessels that have been found at sites within the satrapy of Armenia carry with them important indicators about the spread of Achaemenid culture and art. Vessel shape is a useful indicator of cultural shifts, as vessels are used in a wide variety of settings and practices. Achaemenid vessels have many distinct shapes and are made with specific materials. When Achaemenid shaped vessels, either brought from the center or crafted locally with local materials, are found in the satrapy of Armenia it is
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indicative of Achaemenid culture spreading to the satrapy. The presence of vessels from the center could be indicative of several different kinds of interaction with the center. It is possible the items are a sign of the king’s favor\textsuperscript{76} of travel to and from the center of the empire, or also of trade with the center. These items from the center are usually Achaemenid shaped vessels made of precious materials such as metals and glass. These items then are also status symbols and indicators of some degree of wealth or prestige.

The presence of local productions of Achaemenid shaped vessels demonstrates that the spread of Achaemenid culture extended beyond the elite classes and to the non-elite individuals who lived in the satrapy of Armenia as well.

\textit{Habitation Context}

At the site of Tsaghkahovit in the Aragats plain in present-day Armenia, subterranean houses have been uncovered where some of the only vessels from an Achaemenid habitation context have been found in situ. Two important artifacts in particular have been studied by the excavator and have been credibly linked to Achaemenid influence in the region.

The first of these artifacts is a zoomorphic vessel from Room H (Fig. 14). Unfortunately, this vessel is partial, with most of the upper body and the head of the animal lost. However, by comparing it to similar nearby finds, which have been dated to the Achaemenid period, it is possible to conclude that this vessel is also Achaemenid. The excavator identifies the animal as being something of an ibex/goat/gazelle creature that is seen in Achaemenid visual imagery and may be linked to Zoroastrian liturgical practices.

\textsuperscript{76} Cahill, 1985
of the time. It is important to note that the animal depicted on the vessel was not part of the visual vocabulary of the region before Achaemenid presence. Thus, this vessel is indicative of Achaemenid influence in the region. Furthermore, it could point to the spread of Achaemenid religious practice to the region.

A second artifact from the same site is a green serpentine plate (Fig. 15). There are no other plates like it that have been found in the Caucasus, and the closest parallels can be found at Persepolis. This leads the excavator to conclude that the plate is likely an import from the center of the empire where such plates are seen with higher frequency. While one cannot be certain how exactly this plate found its way to the Tsaghkahovit plain, it is significant that an item of such value was found so far from the center of the Empire and not in a palatial context. Both of these vessels are notable because they hold some significance, possibly a religious one, that has ties to the center of the empire. The serpentine plate demonstrates the existence of trade in high-status items, while the local Achaemenidizing vessel demonstrates the assumption of Achaemenid display — and possibly also ideas and practice — at Tsaghkahovit.

**Mortuary Context**

Achaemenid and local imitations of Achaemenid vessels frequently are found in burial contexts. The burials found within and near the borders of the satrapy of Armenia have been exclusively wealthy burials, shedding more light onto the degree of Achaemenid influence on the elite class. Perhaps the most frequently found item that is
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surely a sign of Achaemenid influence in the region is the phiale. A phiale is a shallow bowl with embossing along the base and was frequently used at the center of the empire as a drinking vessel (Fig. 16). Silver phialai have been found at Cincquaro, Vani, Kazbegi, Qanshaeti, and Akhalgori. These silver phialai have all been identified as coming from Achaemenid workshops at the center of the empire. However, all of these sites from present-day Georgia are wealthy burials, where the silver phialai represent only one portion of the wealth displayed. For example, at Kazbegi the Achaemenid silver phiale is accompanied with many artifacts of local production such as jewelry, bronze animal figurines, and weapons. Additionally some of the local productions also demonstrate Achaemenid influence. At Vani there are gold and silver items that have originated from the center of the empire and items that are locally made, but show Achaemenid influence.

It is interesting to note that material that looks strongly Achaemenid or Achaemenidizing is invariably found with more local types as well. This suggests a strong degree of acculturation, in both directions. The popularity of Achaemenid items found outside the reaches of the empire demonstrates their seductive power as items of beauty and prestige. That they are found together with traditional items is important. It shows that people in the area continued using objects with local histories at the same time as adopting the status markers of Achaemenid power. Whether or not the assemblages demonstrate a mixture of behaviors, they certainly demonstrate an assumption of a new set of notions for how to show prestige.
Items of Elite Public Display

Items of elite public display can be understood as anything that might be worn or carried that demonstrates an individual’s elite stature or power. These types of items include items such as jewelry, gold pendants, and seal stones. Jewelry and gold clothing appliques are found in the region exclusively among grave goods and hoards (buried deposits of valuable items).

In the satrapy of Armenia only a single seal stone has been recovered and securely identified as Achaemenid at the site of Horom (Fig. 17). Horom is a major site (200 m x 500 m) with possible Achaemenid levels and areas that have yet to be excavated. The seal is a cylinder seal with a heroic encounter scene. This is such a popular Achaemenid motif that, despite the seal’s uncertain provenience, it can securely be identified as Achaemenid. Seal stones are an important part of Achaemenid administration, demonstrating Achaemenid power and administrative control in Armenia. However, while this seal may point to a shift towards Achaemenid administration practices in the region, it is one of the only secure pieces of evidence that recalls the manner of imperial administration occurring at the center of the Empire. As the seal stone would have likely been worn in some fashion it is an overtly visual communication of Achaemenid power in the region.

Jewelry that can be identified as Achaemenid and Achaemenidizing has been found throughout the northern reaches of the Satrapy of Armenia as well as just outside those lands that were probably under Achaemenid control. At the Akhalgori aristocratic tomb there is a wealth of gold jewelry that demonstrates both Achaemenid and Greek
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influence in style although they have been identified as coming from local workshops. Gold clothing appliques were found in the tomb, a popular demonstration of elite power in the center of the Empire. Additionally there was a collection of horse shaped pendants, which demonstrate Achaemenid influence. The fact that these styles and demonstrations of power were pervasive enough to influence local workshops lying outside of the Empire points to the shift in the region to an Achaemenid influenced style of elite status display.

Similar Achaemenidizing influence has been seen across the region. In several burials at the major site of Vani, local products of gold and silver jewelry demonstrate an Achaemenidizing style in their treatment of horse heads, bulls' heads, lions' heads and other details. The site of Vani has been identified as the possible chief administrative center for the satrapy of Colchis, rather than Armenia, but its proximity to the rest of the sites in this discussion makes it important to mention. Thus we see that other materials that have been found nearby in mortuary contexts point to the differing kinds of Achaemenid influence in the region.

At the nearby site of Sairkhe, also in Colchis, a number of small finds from the necropolis portion of the site show ties to the Achaemenid Empire in terms of elite status display. Most interesting is the number of gold pendants depicting Ahuramazda that were found at the necropolis of Sairkhe at Sabaduris Gora. Ahuramazda was the Persian deity that Darius invoked at the beginning of his Bisitun inscription and one of the major gods in Zoroastrianism, the religion of the Achaemenid royal family. As there was not an
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official state religion for the entire empire it is likely that locals in the satrapy of Armenia and the surrounding areas were worshipping primarily their own deities. For this reason, the appearance of Ahuramazda in a fashion where it could be worn and displayed as an item demonstrating elite ties to the center of the empire is important. As the spread of Zoroastrianism was not a major focus of the Achaemenid royal family it is somewhat surprising that it should turn up, unless we consider the overtones of power wearing such an important image to the great king would communicate. This does not necessarily confirm that practice of Zoroastrianism in the region, but rather the elite status the image of Ahuramazda would convey.

A final object of elite public display comes from a 4th century burial from the necropolis at Uplistsikhe in present day Georgia: a chariot burial. This chariot has been identified as Achaemenid based on the wheel type, a well-known Assyrian and Achaemenid type. Before it was buried the chariot would have been a very visible display of power, using a wheel type that tied it to the center of the Empire.

These objects that would have been worn and displayed openly tied their owners to the center of the Empire. It is notable that these finds come from areas that most probably had not previously been under Urartian control. The sites are further north and are along the northern border of Achaemenid Armenia if not just across the border. This is important as it demonstrates the pervasiveness of Achaemenid elite status display and shows that Armenia functioned as a conduit to convey these ideas to areas farther north as well.
Conclusion

Through the archaeological evidence, it is clear that Armenia demonstrates Achaemenid influence in areas of public display, whether those be administrative buildings or the trappings and behaviors of the elite. However more evidence is needed in order to understand how extensively the non-elite assimilated Achaemenid practices and display, although there is already sufficient evidence to suggest they too took on imperial ideas. Indeed, there is a shift in the ways people lived, as many Urartian fortresses fell into ruin the practice of residing in subterranean houses developed. Additionally, the kinds of vessels available to them for drinking and dining shifted to vessel shapes varyingly influenced by Achaemenid vessels. Consequently, the effect of Achaemenid imperialism on the people of Armenia extended not only to the administrative elite but also to those who played no part in the actual official workings of the empire. The picture provided by the textual sources is supplemented and augmented by material evidence to demonstrate an all-pervasive, wide-reaching impact of imperialism on the people of Armenia living at all ranks of society.

Final Remarks

The Achaemenid satrapy of Armenia remains ill investigated in terms of the archaeological exploration. However, it seems that what literary evidence we have has thus far been supported by the limited archaeological evidence of the satrapy. Excavations of room blocks at Tsaghkahovit support Xenophon’s descriptions of the subterranean houses at the villages he encountered upon entering the satrapy. The
presence of column bases suggests administrative centers in the satrapy of Armenia. This is notable as it supports the existence of well-known leaders of the satrapy such as Tiribazus and Orontes. Administrative centers with multi-columned halls are a reference to the palaces and administrative centers at the heart of the empire and thus suggest the presence of Achaemenid satraps, using Achaemenid symbols of power in order to govern Armenia. As increasing archaeological investigations expose the Achaemenid past of the region, we can detect more patterns and tease out the cultural shifts occurring. Due to the massive size of the Achaemenid Empire and the myriad of cultures and histories contained within, it is important that each satrapy is investigated on its own terms, considering local cultural and political traditions. What has been made clear from this consideration of the satrapy of Armenia is that elite Achaemenid material culture and architecture found its way to the region. Indeed this presence is not limited to a few sites, but nearly every site that dates to the Achaemenid period within the borders of the former Satrapy and beyond. Even in the subterranean houses of Tsagghahovit, there is evidence for elite Achaemenid cultural practice. While broad conclusions cannot yet be drawn on general population pattern shifts or other cultural changes, it is clear that change had occurred in the region from the Urartian to the Achaemenid period.
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Appendix I
Appendix of Persian Inscriptions Concerning Armenia

XPh

3. (13-28.) Xerxes the King says: By the favor of Ahuramazda these are the countries of which I was king outside Persia; I ruled them; they bore me tribute. What was said to them by me, that they did. The law that (was) mine, that held them (firm/stable): Media, Elam, Arachosia, Armenia, Drangiana, Parthia, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorasmia, Babylonia, Assyria, Sattagydia, Sardis, Egypt, Ionians, those who dwell by the sea and those who dwell across the sea, men of Maka, Arabia, Gandara, Sind, Cappadocia, Daeh, Amyrgian Scythians, Pointed-Cap Scythians, Skudra, men of Akaufaka, Libyans, Carians, Ethiopians.

DB

“6. (1.12-7.) Darius the King says: These are the countries which came to me; by the favor of Ahuramazda I was king of them: Persia, Elam, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, (those) who are beside the sea, Sardis, Ionia, Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara, Scythia, Sattagydia, Arachosia, Maka: in all, 23 provinces.”

26. (2.29-37.) Darius the King says: An Armenian named Dadarshi, my subject -- I sent him forth to Armenia. I said to him: "Go forth, that rebellious army which does not call itself mine, that do you smite!" Thereupon Dadarshi marched off. When he arrived in Armenia, thereafter the rebels assembled (and) came out against Dadarshi to join battle. A place named Zuzahya, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Thuravahara 8 days were past, then the battle was fought by them.

27. (2.37-42.) Darius the King says: Again a second time the rebels assembled (and) came out against Dadarshi to join battle. A stronghold named Tigra, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Thuravahara 18 days were past, then the battle was fought by them.

28. (2.42-9.) Darius the King says: Again a third time the rebels assembled (and) came out against Dadarshi to join battle. A fortress named Uyama, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Thaigarci 9 days were past, then the battle was fought by them. Thereafter Dadarshi waited for me until I arrived in Media.

29. (2.49-57.) Darius the King says: Thereafter a Persian named Vaumisa, my subject-him I sent forth to Armenia. Thus I said to him: "Go forth; the rebellious army which does not call itself mine -- smite them!" Thereupon Vaumisa marched off. When he arrived in Armenia, then the rebels assembled (and) came out against Vaumisa to join battle. A district named Izala, in Assyria -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; of the month Anamaka 15 days were past, then the battle was fought by them.

30. (2.57-63.) Darius the King says: Again a second time the rebels assembled (and) came out against Vaumisa to join battle. A district named Autiara, in Armenia -- there they joined battle. Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda my army smote that rebellious army exceedingly; on the last day of the month Thuravaharâ then the battle was fought by them. After that, Vaumisa waited for me in Armenia until I arrived in Media."
**XV (Trilingual inscription from Lake Van)**

1. A great god is Ahuramazda, the greatest of gods, who created this earth, who created yonder sky, who created man, created happiness for man, who made xerxes king, one king of many, lord of many.

2. I am Xerxes, the great king, king of kings, king of all kinds of people, king on this earth far and wide, the son of Darius the king, the Achaemenid.

3. Xerxes the King says: King Darius, who was my father -- he by the favor of Ahuramazda built much good (construction), and this niche he gave orders to dig out, where he did not cause an inscription (to be) engraved. Afterwards I gave order to engrave this inscription.

4. Me may Ahuramazda protect, together with the gods, and my kingdom and what I have done.

**DSab**

(labels below figured typifying subject lands, arranged in two groups)

(ii) “Babylon, Armenia, Sardis…”

**A?P**

(Bottom row from left to right)

“…This is the Egyptian; This is the Armenian; this is the Cappadocian…”

**DPe**

2. Darius the King says: By the favor of Ahuramazda these are the countries which I got into my possession along with this Persian folk, which felt fear of me (and) bore me tribute: Elam, Media, Babylonia, Arabia, Assyria, Egypt, Armenia, Cappadocia, Sardis, Ionians who are of the mainland and (those) who are by the sea, and countries which are across the sea; Sagartia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorasmia, Sattagydia, Arachosia, Sind, Gandara, Seythians, Maka.

**DSe**

3. King Darius proclaims: These are the people I seized outside Persia; I ruled over them; they brought me tribute; what I said to them, that they did; my law that held them (firm): Media, Elam, Parthia, Areia, bactria, Sogdiana, Chorsamia, Drangiana, Arachosia, Sattagydia, Maka, Gandara, India, Saca who drink hauma, Saca with pointed hats, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Armenia, Cappadocia, Sardis, Ionians of the sea, Scythians beyond the sea, Thrace, Ionians beyond the sea, Caria.

**DSaa (Akkadian on stone tablet)**

4. These are the lands who brought the materials and the decoration of the palace: Persia, Elam, Media, Babylon, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, the sealands, Sardis, Ionia, Urartu, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Areia, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara, Cimmeria, Sattagydia, Arachosia, Qadie.

**DNA**

3. Darius the King says: By the favor of Ahuramazda these are the countries which I seized outside of Persia; I ruled over them; they bore tribute to me; what was said to them by me, that they did; my law -- that held them firm; Media, Elam, Parthia, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorsamia, Drangiana, Arachosia, Sattagydia, Gandara, Sind, Amyrgian Scythians, Scythians with pointed caps, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Armenia, Cappadocia, Sardis, Ionia, Scythians who are across the sea, Skudra, petasos-wearing Ionians, Libyans, Ethiopians, men of Maka, Carians.
Appendix II
Appendix of Classical sources
(Listed in the order they are discussed)

**Herodotus**

_Hdt, 1.194_

They make these in Armenia, higher up the stream than Assyria. First they cut frames of willow, then they stretch hides over these for a covering, making as it were a hold; they neither broaden the stern nor narrow the prow, but the boat is round, like a shield. They then fill it with reeds and send it floating down the river with a cargo; and it is for the most part palm wood casks of wine that they carry down. Two men standing upright steer the boat, each with a paddle, one drawing it to him, the other thrusting it from him. These boats are of all sizes, some small, some very large; the largest of them are of as much as five thousand talents burden. There is a live ass in each boat, or more than one in the larger. So when they have floated down to Babylon and disposed of their cargo, they sell the framework of the boat and all the reeds; the hides are set on the backs of asses, which are then driven back to Armenia, for it is not by any means possible to go upstream by water, because of the swiftness of the current; it is for this reason that they make their boats of hides and not of wood. When they have driven their asses back into Armenia, they make more boats in the same way.

_Hdt 5.52_

Now the nature of this road is as I will show. All along it are the king's road stations and very good resting places, and the whole of it passes through country that is inhabited and safe…Ride past these, and you will have a journey through Cilicia of three stages and fifteen and a half parasangs. The boundary of Cilicia and Armenia is a navigable river, the name of which is the Euphrates. In Armenia there are fifteen resting-stages and fifty-six and a half parasangs. Here too there is a fortress. From Armenia the road enters the Matienian land, in which there are thirty-four stages and one hundred and thirty-seven parasangs. Through this land flow four navigable rivers which must be passed by ferries, first the Tigris, then a second and a third of the same name, yet not the same stream nor flowing from the same source. The first-mentioned of them flows from the Armenians and the second from the Matieni. The fourth river is called Gyndes, that Gyndes which Cyrus parted once into three hundred and sixty channels.

**Xenophon**

_Xen. Anab. 2.4.8-10_

Meanwhile Tissaphernes returned with his own forces as if intending to go back home, and likewise Orontas with his forces; the latter was also taking home the King's daughter as his wife. Then they finally began the march, Tissaphernes taking the lead and providing a market; and Ariaeus with Cyrus' barbarian army kept with Tissaphernes and Orontas on the march and encamped with them. The Greeks, however, viewing them all with suspicion, proceeded by themselves, with their own guides

_Xen. Anab. 3.5.17_

The opinion of the generals however, was that they must make their way through the mountains into the country of the Carduchians; for the prisoners said that after passing through this country they would come to Armenia, the large and prosperous province of which Orontas was ruler; and from there, they said, it was easy to go in any direction one chose.
Xen. Anab. 4.3.1-4

For that day again they found quarters in the villages that lie above the plain bordering the Centrites river, which is about two plethra in width and separates Armenia and the country of the Carduchians. There the Greeks took breath, glad to behold a plain; for the river was distant six or seven stadia from the mountains of the Carduchians. At daybreak, however, they caught sight of horsemen at a place across the river, fully armed and ready to dispute their passage, and likewise foot-soldiers drawn up in line of battle upon the bluffs above the horsemen, to prevent their pushing up into Armenia. All these were the troops of Orontas and Artuchas, and consisted of Armenians, Mardians, and Chaldaean mercenaries. The Chaldaeans were said to be an independent and valiant people; they had as weapons long wicker shields and lances.

Xenophon Anabasis 4.4-5

(4) When they had accomplished the crossing, they formed in line of battle about midday and marched through Armenia, over entirely level country and gently sloping hills, not less than five parasangs; for there were no villages near the river because of the wars between the Armenians and Carduchians. [2] The village which they finally reached was a large one and had a palace for the satrap, while most of the houses were surmounted by turrets; and provisions were plentiful. [3] From there they marched two stages, ten parasangs, until they passed the headwaters of the Tigris river. From there they marched three stages, fifteen parasangs, to the Teleboas river. This was a beautiful river, though not a large one, and there were many villages about it. [4] This region was called Western Armenia. Its lieutenant-governor was Tiribazus, who had proved himself a friend to the King and, so often as he was present, was the only man permitted to help the King mount his horse. [5] He rode up to the Greeks with a body of horsemen, and sending forward an interpreter, said that he wished to confer with their commanders. The generals decided to hear what he had to say, and, after approaching within hearing distance, they asked him what he wanted. [6] He replied that he wished to conclude a treaty with these conditions, that he on his side would not harm the Greeks, and that they should not burn the houses, but might take all the provisions they needed. This proposition was accepted by the generals, and they concluded a treaty on these terms. [7]

From there they marched three stages, fifteen parasangs, through level country, Tiribazus and his command following along at a distance of about ten stadia from them; and they reached a palace with many villages round about it full of provisions in abundance. [8] While they were in camp there, there was a heavy fall of snow during the night, and in the morning they decided to quarter the several divisions of the army, with their commanders, in the different villages; for there was no enemy within sight, and the plan seemed to be a safe one by reason of the great quantity of snow. [9] There they had all possible good things in the way of supplies—animals for sacrifice, grain, old wines with a fine bouquet, dried grapes, and beans of all sorts. But some men who straggled away from their quarters reported that they saw in the night the gleam of a great many fires. [10] The generals accordingly decided that it was unsafe to have their divisions in separate quarters, and that they must bring all the troops together again; so they came together, especially as the storm seemed to be clearing up. [11] But there came such a tremendous fall of snow while they were bivouacked there that it completely covered both the arms and the men as they slept, besides hampering the baggage animals; and everybody was very reluctant to get up, for as the men lay there the snow that had fallen upon them—in case it did not slip off—was a source of warmth. [12] But once Xenophon had mustered the courage to get up without his cloak and set about splitting wood, another man also speedily got up, took the axe away from him, and went on with the splitting. Thereupon still others got up and proceeded to build fires and anoint themselves; [13] for they found ointment there in abundance which they used in place of olive oil—made of pork fat, sesame, bitter almonds, or turpentine. They found also a fragrant oil made out of these same ingredients. [14]

After this it was deemed necessary to distribute the troops again to quarters in the houses of the several villages. Then followed plenty of joyful shouting as the men went back to their houses and provisions, and all those who just before had wantonly burned the houses they were leaving, paid the penalty by getting poor quarters. [15] After this they sent Democrats of Temnus with a body of troops
during the night to the mountains where the stragglers said they had seen the fires; for this Democrats enjoyed the reputation of having made accurate reports in many previous cases of the same sort, describing what were facts as facts and what were fictions as fictions. [16] Upon his return he stated that he had not seen the fires; he had captured, however, and brought back with him a man with a Persian bow and quiver and a battleaxe of the same sort that Amazons carry. [17] When this man was asked from what country he came, he said he was a Persian and was on his way from the camp of Tiribazus to get provisions. They asked him how large Tiribazus' army was and for what purpose it had been gathered. [18] He replied that it was Tiribazus with his own forces and Chalybian and Taochian mercenaries, and that he had made his preparations with the idea of taking a position upon the mountain pass, in the defile through which ran the only road, and there attacking the Greeks. [19]

When the generals heard these statements, they resolved to bring the troops together into a camp; then, after leaving a garrison and Sophanetus the Symphalian as general in command of those who stayed behind, they set out at once, with the captured man as guide. [20] As soon as they had begun to cross the mountains, the peltasts, pushing on ahead and describing the enemy's camp, did not wait for the hoplites, but raised a shout and charged upon the camp. [21] When the barbarians heard the uproar, they did not wait to offer resistance, but took to flight; nevertheless, some of them were killed, about twenty horses were captured, and likewise Tiribazus' tent, with silver-footed couches in it, and drinking cups, and people who said they were his bakers and his cup-bearers. [22] As soon as the generals of the hoplites learned of these results, they deemed it best to go back as speedily as possible to their own camp, lest some attack might be made upon those they had left behind. So they immediately sounded the recall with the trumpet and set out on the return journey, arriving at their camp on the same day.

(5) On the next day it seemed that they must continue their march with all speed, before the hostile army could be gathered together again and take possession of the narrow passes. They accordingly packed up and set out at once, marching through deep snow with a large number of guides; and before the day ended they crossed over the summit at which Tiribazus was intending to attack them and went into camp. [2] From there they marched three stages through desert country, fifteen parasangs, to the Euphrates river, and crossed it, wetting themselves up to the navel; [3] and report was that the sources of the river were not far distant.

From there they marched over a plain and through deep snow three stages, thirteen parasangs. The third stage proved a hard one, with the north wind, which blew full in their faces, absolutely blasting everything and freezing the men. [4] Then it was that one of the soothsayers bade them offer sacrifice to the wind, and sacrifice was offered; and it seemed quite clear to everybody that the violence of the wind abated. But the depth of the snow was a fathom, so that many of the baggage animals and slaves perished, and about thirty of the soldiers. [5] They got through that night by keeping up fires, for there was wood in abundance at the halting-place; those who came up late, however, had none, and consequently the men who had arrived early and were keeping a fire would not allow the late comers to get near it unless they gave them a share of their wheat or anything else they had that was edible. [6] So then they shared with one another what they severally possessed. Now where the fire was kindled the snow melted, and the result was great holes clear down to the ground; and there, of course, one could measure the depth of the snow. [7]

From there they marched all the following day through snow, and many of the men fell ill with hunger-faintness. And Xenophon, with the rear-guard, as he came upon the men who were falling by the way, did not know what the trouble was. [8] But as soon as a person who was acquainted with the disease had told him that they manifestly had hunger-faintness, and if they were given something to eat would be able to get up, he went around among the baggage animals, and wherever he saw anything that was edible, he would distribute it among the sick men, or send hither and thither people who had the strength to run along the lines, to give it to them. [9] And when they had eaten something, they would get up and continue the march.

As the army went on, Cheirisophus reached a village about dusk, and found at the spring outside the wall women and girls who had come from the village to fetch water. [10] They asked the Greeks who they were, and the interpreter replied in Persian that they were on their way from the King to the satrap.
Meanwhile they were being followed by the enemy, some of whom had banded together and were seizing such of the pack animals as lacked the strength to go on, and fighting over them with one another. Some of the soldiers likewise were falling behind—those whose eyes had been blinded by the snow, or whose toes had rotted off by reason of the cold. It was a protection to the eyes against the snow if a man marched with something black in front of them, and a protection to the feet if one kept moving and never quiet, and if he took off his shoes for the night; but in all cases where men slept with their shoes on, the straps sunk into their flesh and the shoes froze on their feet; for what they were wearing, since their old shoes had given out, were brogues made of freshly flayed ox-hides.

It was under compulsion of such difficulties that some of the soldiers were falling behind; and espying a spot that was dark because the snow just there had disappeared, they surmised that it had melted; and in fact it had melted, on account of a spring which was near by, steaming in a dell; here they turned aside and sat down, refusing to go any farther. But when Xenophon with some of the rearguard observed them, he begged them by all manner of means not to be left behind, telling them that a large body of the enemy had gathered and were pursuing, and finally he became angry. They told him, however, to kill them, for they could not go on. In this situation it seemed to be best to frighten the pursuing enemy, if they could, in order to prevent their falling upon the sick men. It was dark by this time, and the enemy were coming on with a great uproar, quarrelling over the booty they had. Then the men of the rearguard, since they were sound and well, started up and charged upon the enemy, while the invalids raised as big a shout as they could and clashed their shields against their spears. And the enemy, seized with fear, threw themselves down over the snow into the dell, and not a sound was heard from them afterwards.

Thereupon Xenophon and his men, after telling the invalids that on the next day people would come back after them, continued their march, but before they had gone four stadia they came upon their comrades lying down in the road upon the snow, wrapped up in their cloaks, and without so much as a single guard posted. They tried to get them up, but the men said that the troops in front would not make way for them. Xenophon accordingly passed along and, sending forward the strongest of the peltasts, directed them to see what the hindrance was. They reported back that the whole army was resting in this way. Thereupon Xenophon also and his party bivouacked where they were, without a fire and without dinner, after stationing such guards as they could. When it came toward morning, Xenophon sent the youngest of his troops to the sick men with orders to make them get up and force them to proceed.

Meanwhile Cheirisophus sent some of the troops quartered in the village to find out how the people at the rear were faring. Xenophon's party were glad enough to see them, and turned over the invalids to them to carry on to the camp, while they themselves continued their journey, and before completing twenty stadia reached the village where Cheirisophus was quartered. When all had come together, the generals decided that it was safe for the different divisions of the army to take up quarters in the several villages. Cheirisophus accordingly remained where he was, while the other generals distributed by lot the villages within sight, and all set off with their respective commands. Then it was that Polycrates, and Athenian captain, asked to be detached from his division; and with an active group of men he ran to the village which had fallen to Xenophon's lot and there took possession of all the villagers, the village chief included, seventeen colts which were being reared for tribute to the King, and the village chief's daughter, who had been married eight days before; her husband, however, was off hunting hares, and was not taken in the village.

The houses here were underground, with a mouth like that of a well, but spacious below; and while entrances were tunnelled down for the beasts of burden, the human inhabitants descended by a ladder. In the houses were goats, sheep, cattle, fowls, and their young; and all the animals were reared and took their fodder there in the houses. Here were also wheat, barley, and beans, and barleywine in large
bowls. Floating on the top of this drink were the barley-grains and in it were straws, some larger and others smaller, without joints; [27] and when one was thirsty, he had to take these straws into his mouth and suck. It was an extremely strong drink unless one diluted it with water, and extremely good when one was used to it. [28]

Xenophon made the chief man of this village his guest at dinner and bade him be of good cheer, telling him that he should not be deprived of his children, and that before they went away they would fill his house with provisions by way of reward in case he should prove to have given the army good guidance until they should reach another tribe. [29] He promised to do this, and in a spirit of kindliness told them where there was wine buried. For that night, then, all Xenophon's soldiers, in this village where they were thus separately quartered, went to bed amid an abundance of everything, keeping the village chief under guard and his children all together within sight. [30]

On the next day Xenophon took the village chief and set out to visit Cheirisophus; whenever he passed a village, he would turn aside to visit the troops quartered there, and everywhere he found them faring sumptuously and in fine spirits; there was no place from which the men would let them go until they had served them a luncheon, [31] and no place where they did not serve on the same table lamb, kid, pork, veal, and poultry, together with many loaves of bread, some of wheat and some of barley. [32] And whenever a man wanted out of good fellowship to drink another's health, he would draw him to the bowl, and then one had to stoop over and drink from it, sucking like an ox. To the village chief they offered the privilege of taking whatever he wanted. He declined for the most part to accept anything, but whenever he caught sight of one of his kinsmen, he would always take the man to his side. [33] Again, when they reached Cheirisophus, they found his troops also feasting in their quarters, crowned with wreaths of hay and served by Armenian boys in their strange, foreign dress; and they were showing the boys what to do by signs, as if they were deaf and dumb. [34]

As soon as Cheirisophus and Xenophon had exchanged warm greetings, they together asked the village chief, through their Persian-speaking interpreter, what this land was. He replied that it was Armenia. They asked him again for whom the horses were being reared. He answered, as tribute for the King; and he said that the neighbouring country was that of the Chalybians, and told them where the road was. [35] Then Xenophon took the village chief back for the time to his own household, and gave him a horse that he had got when it was rather old, to fatten up and sacrifice, for he understood that it was sacred to the Sun-god. He did this out of fear that the horse might die, for it had been injured by the journey; and he took for himself one of the colts and gave his captains also a colt apiece. [36] The horses of this region were smaller than the Persian horses, but very much more spirited. It was here also that the village chief instructed them about wrapping small bags round the feet of their horses and beasts of burden when they were going through the snow; for without these bags the animals would sink in up to their bellies.

**Cornelius Nepos**

*Cornelius Nepos, Lives of the Great Generals 14: Datames, 8*

…Autophradates… nevertheless decided to join battle rather than withdraw with such a large army or stay inactive in one place. He had a cavalry of twenty thousand barbarians, a hundred thousand infantry…Further there were eight thousand Cappadocians, ten thousand Armenians, five thousand Paphlagonians…

**Strabo**

*Strabo, Geography XI, 14.9*

There are gold mines in Syspiritis near Caballa, to which Menon was sent by Alexander with soldiers, and he was led up to them by the natives. There are also other mines, in particular those of sandyx, as it is called, which is also called "Armenian" color, like chalce The country is so very good for "horse-pasturing," not even inferior to Media, that the Nesaean horses, which were used by the Persian kings, are
also bred there. The satrap of Armenia used to send to the Persian king twenty thousand foals every year at the time of the Mithracina. Artavasdes, at the time when he invaded Media with Antony, showed him, apart from the rest of the cavalry, six thousand horses drawn up in battle array in full armour. Not only the Medes and the Armenians pride themselves upon this kind of cavalry, but also the Albanians, for they too use horses in full armour. As for the wealth and power of the country, the following is no small sign of it, that when Pompey imposed upon Tigranes, the father of Artavasdes, a payment of six thousand talents of silver, he forthwith distributed to the Roman forces as follows: to each soldier fifty drachmas, to each centurion a thousand drachmas, and to each hipparch and chiliarch a talent. The size of the country is given by Theophanes: the breadth one hundred "schoeni," and the length twice as much, putting the "schoenus at forty stadia; but his estimate is too high; it is nearer the truth to put down as breadth what he gives as breadth, and as breadth the half, or a little more, of what he gives as breadth. Such, then, is the nature and power of Armenia.

**Justin**

*Justin X 3.2-5*

Then, as though he (sc. Ochus) had purified the kingdom, he made war on the Cadusians. In the course of it, one of the enemy challenged the army and a certain Codomannus advanced against him with everyone’s good wish; he killed him and restored to his side along with victory the glory they had almost lost. For this achievement that Codomannus was put in charge of the Armenias
Appendix III
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**Southwest**

*Altintepe*
Excavator and dates: Garstang, Burney, Özgüç (1959-1966)
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site: Armenia
Type of site and dates: “Palace”
Artifacts and provenances: Multi-columned hall
Related Sites: Erebuni

*Oglankala (Oglanqala)*
Excavator and dates: L. Ristvet 2006-present
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site: Armenia
Type of site and dates: “Palace”
Artifacts and provenances: Column Bases/ Multi-columned hall
Related Sites:

*Tsagkhahovit*
Excavator and dates: 1998-present Project ArAGATS
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site: Armenia
Type of site and dates: Bronze Age Fortress Achaemenid Period renovations Subterranean houses
Artifacts and provenances: Green Serpentine plate (Achaemenid) Local wares/ceramics
Related Sites:
**Oshakan**
Excavator and dates:  
1980s S. Esajan and A. Kalantarjan  
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site: Armenia  
Type of site and dates:  
Two structures creating a “palace-complex” on the bank of the Kasakh.  
Evidence at the site for occupation from the 7th C. to the 4th c. BCE.  
There is a rectangular building in the complex that dates to the Achaemenid period.  
Artifacts and provenances:  
Non-Achaemenid small finds.  
Related Sites: 

**Horom**
Excavator and dates:  
Armenian-American-German team (1994-present?)  
Armenian-American Team (1990-93)  
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site: Armenia  
Type of site and dates:  
Major site (200mx500m) inhabited since early Bronze Age  
Artifacts and provenances:  
Huge fortifications (8th-7th C Urartian) preserved to 4m  
Single Achaemenid seal  
Related Sites: 

**Argisthenale (Armavir)**
Excavator and dates:  
1964-present  
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site: Armenia – Urartian Name: Argishtihenale, continued occupation in Achaemenid times  
Type of site and dates:  
Former Urartian fortress, it is unknown to what extent it was used during the Achaemenid period. The excavators of the site have attributed several renovations to the palace to the Achaemenid period of the site’s occupation.  
Artifacts and provenances:  
The ceramic assemblage suggests Achaemenid influence but has not been securely dated to the Achaemenid period and could easily also be dated to the Hellenistic period.  
Related Sites: 

**Erebuni (Arin Berd)**
Excavator and dates:  
1950s and again in the 1990s by F. Ter-Martirosov  
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site: Erebuni  
Type of site and dates:  
Urartian fortress that was later used as an Achaemenid administrative center.  
Artifacts and provenances:  
Silver rhyton with a feasting scene and bulls head  
Related Sites:  
Altintepe 

**Sari Tepe**
Excavator and dates:  
I. Narimanov (late 1950s)  
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
Armenia
Type of site and dates:
‘Palace’
Artifacts and provenances:
Two bell-shaped bases (variation B according to Wesenberg)
Pottery (possibly Achaemenid)
Related Sites:
For column bases: Susa, Benjamin, Gumbati, and Qaradshamirli

Benjamin (Draskhanakert)
Excavator and dates:
F. Ter-Martirosov (1980s – present?)
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
Armenia
Type of site and dates:
Several monumental architectural complexes (5th–1st C)
Huge building with three building phases (possible cult use or a palace)
Artifacts and provenances:
Bell-shaped column bases with torus profile, leaf-decorated capitals of local black tufa
(Possibly the earliest level of huge building)
No small finds
Related Sites:
Earliest levels contemporary with “palaces” at Gumbati and Sari Tepe (Tufa column bases)

Gumbati
Excavator and dates:
Georgian-German Survey team (1994-present)
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
Context obscure
Type of site and dates:
Unprecedented monumental building suggesting Achaemenid craftsmanship
Column bases
- ceramics from “palace” date to late 5th/ early 4th Century
Artifacts and provenances:
Pottery late 5th/early 4th century, local provenance, bowls copy Achaemenid prototypes
Related Sites:
Qaradshamirli (column bases)
Sari Tepe (building layout)
Benjamin (column bases)

Qarajamirli (Karadshamirli Köyi)
Excavator and dates:
Babaev et al. 2006
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
Armenia
Type of site and dates:
‘Palace’
Artifacts and provenances:
Column Bases
Related Sites:
- Gumbati
**Ochmik**
Excavator and dates:
1987-present H. Akopjan
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
- Context obscure
Type of site and dates:
  - Houses (2nd c. BCE and 3rd c. AD)
    - The architecture suggests Urartian influence through Achaemenid and Hellenistic times according to excavator.
Artifacts and provenances:
Related Sites:

**North**

**Sairkhe**
Excavator and dates:
  - N. Gambaschidse (1957-present)
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
  - Colchis
Type of site and dates:
  - Settlement (regional center) (8th-1st C)
  - Necropolis at Sabaduris Gora (5th-4th C)
Artifacts and provenances:
  - Possible remains of a temple building
  - Two limestone capitals (Possibly late Achaemenid)
  - From Necropolis: golden pendants with depictions of Ahuramazda and a glass phiale
Related Sites:
  - Ties with kingdom of Iberia

**Kazbegi**
Excavator and dates:
  - G. Filimonov (1877 recovered some finds with difficulty)
    - Site looted
    - F. Bayern (1878)
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
  - Context obscure
Type of site and dates:
  - Perhaps from a cemetery (6th-5th C) – ‘Kazbeg Treasure’
Artifacts and provenances:
  - An Achaemenid silver phiala with almond-shaped embossing, lotus palmettes, stylized swan heads, and an Aramaic inscription on the rim
  - Bronze vessels tied with bronze chains
  - Animal bronze figurines (perhaps with a ritual context)
  - Harnesses, weapons, jewelry and costume
  - All artifacts of local production show connections with Iberia and the Colchian Lowlands
Related Sites:
  - Qanshaeti

**Qanshaeti (Kanshaeti)**
Excavator and dates:
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
  - Context obscure
Type of site and dates:
Rich tomb (Middle of the 5th C.)
Artifacts and provenances:
   Silver Achaemenid Phiala
Related Sites:
   Kazbegi and Akhalgori

Akhalgori
Excavator and dates:
   1908
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
   Context obscure
Type of site and dates:
   Tomb of a local aristocratic woman (Late 4th C. Some artifacts date earlier)
Artifacts and provenances:
   Achaemenid: two silver Phialai and a silver jar
   Six harnessed horses
   More than 100 small finds
   Gold: horse-shaped pendants (Achaemenid influence), earrings, bracelets, necklaces, gold appliques, a finger ring, and a belt buckle (from local workshops with Greek and oriental influence)
Related Sites:
   Kazbegi
   Qanshaeti

Cincqaro (Tsintsqaro)
Excavator and dates:
   1940 (Algeti valley, single burial)
   1990 (Enageti, cemetery)
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
   Armenia
Type of site and dates:
   Rich burial (4th C.)
   Cemetery (End of 5th/ beginning of 4th C)
Artifacts and provenances:
   Algeti: two silver Phialai and a glass bowl (Achaemenid)
   Enageti: tomb no.16, Small finds – Kohl-tube and Greek glass amphoriskos
Related Sites:

Mtisdziri
Excavator and dates:

Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
   Colchis
Type of site and dates:
   Wood tower (possibly a defense system for Vani) and Necropolis from the 5th/4th century
Artifacts and provenances:
   Local, imported, and local imitating imported grave goods
   4th century silver rython with a goat-shaped protome that imitates Achaemenid rhyta as well as including some Greek decorations
Vani
Excavator and dates:
N. Khoshtaria (1947-1963)
O. Lordkipanidse (1963-present?)
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
Colchis
Type of site and dates:
Minor site (8th-6th C.)
Major center of Colchis - citadel (5th-?)
A number of burials
Housing areas, workshops, and trading bases (near by)
Major Hellenistic site (3rd-1st C.) – ‘Temple-city’
Artifacts and provenances:
Epigraphic evidence supporting the site being identified as Surium
Lavish burials with Imported Greek pottery and 4th and 5th C. gold and silver objects that have been identified as Persian.
Local products, gold and silver bowls, jewelry, and painted pottery, show Achaemenid influence
Religious complexes surrounded by a fortified wall
Related Sites:
Mitisdziri

Uplistsikhe (Upliszikhe)
Excavator and dates:
G. Kipiani, 1999
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
Context obscure
Type of site and dates: Necropolis
Sometimes in use as an Acropolis
Additional ashlar and brick moats wall and towers from Helenistic-Roman
Limestone quarry for monumental architecture
Chariot burial (4th C)
Artifacts and provenances:
Chariot burial- chariot and wheels well known Assyrian and Achaemenid type
Small finds from burial: Greek terracotta figurine – Tanagra/Boeotia Necropolis type
Related Sites:

Zikhiagora (Zikhia-Gora, Kawtiskhevi)
Excavator and dates:
1971 – present
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
Context obscure
Type of site and dates:
 Architectural complex from 3rd – 2nd c.
 Likely earlier Achaemenid site
Artifacts and provenances:
 Monumental buildings (3rd – 2nd c.)
 small finds
 “samadlo-type” pottery with no stratigraphic context
 bell shaped column base fragment
 bull protome capital
 Related Sites:
 For column base – Gumbati, Qaradschamirli, Sari Tepe, and Benjamin

Samadlo
Excavator and dates:
 J. Gagoshidze
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
 Armenia
Type of site and dates:
 Iron Age settlements (8th – 3rd C)
 Ceremonial site? (Samadlo III late 8th/early 7th c.)
 Tower (5th/early 4th c.)
 Buildings (Samadlo I & II late 4th – mid 2nd c.)
Artifacts and provenances:
 Limestone relief carved in an oriental style (4th – 3rd c. early Hellenistic phase)
 Painted pottery of “Samadlo-style” (4th – 3rd c. early Hellenistic phase)
 Related Sites:

Kvemo-Kedi (Širaki)
Excavator and periods:
 Georgian team
Satrapy and Achaemenid name for site:
 Context obscure
Type of site and dates:
 Bronze foundry complex (6th C?)
Artifacts and provenances:
 A clay phiale (6th C level) very similar to Achaemenid metal bowels
 Related Sites:
 Gumbati- similar clay vessels
Sources:
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