

A POLITICAL HISTORY OF PARTHIA

BY NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE ¹⁹⁰³

THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



KING MITHRADATES II



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO • ILLINOIS

PREFACE

IN 1873 George Rawlinson published his *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy*. Since that time no other extensive study devoted to Parthia has been written, although Rawlinson's admirable work did not include all of the classical references and obviously does not include the new source material which has since appeared. Because of these facts it was felt advisable to insert in this volume extensive references, both old and new, to the source material for the political history. The large amount of evidence for the cultural history of Parthia from Dura-Europus and Seleucia on the Tigris now in press and in preparation makes discussion of the cultural aspects inadvisable at present. This must be reserved for some future work on Parthia where the necessity of less documentation will allow of fuller interpretation of the political side of Parthia and the presentation of the new cultural material.

The present study was begun in 1927 as a dissertation at the University of Illinois under the direction of Professor A. T. Olmstead, now Oriental Institute Professor of Oriental History in the University of Chicago. It has been rewritten more than once since the writer came to the University of Chicago in 1929—a task which has been interrupted at intervals by

four seasons of excavating in the Near East. The work owes much more than appears in the footnotes to the advice and support of Professor Olmstead, who has furnished encouragement, friendly criticism, and references on many obscure points.

Dr. Robert H. McDowell of the University of Michigan by voluminous letters written in the press of field work and by frequent conversations has been of great assistance. The manuscript was read at Se-leucia by Professor Clark Hopkins of the same institution, and many of his suggestions are embodied in the text. Professor Arthur E. R. Boak, also of Michigan, read through the galleys and gave freely of his time during the preparation of the manuscript.

For aid in specialized fields Dr. G. G. Cameron, Dr. Raymond A. Bowman, and Dr. Waldo H. Dubberstein, all of the Oriental Institute, were of great assistance; and many other members of the staff have at one time or another rendered aid.

The painstaking work of Dr. T. G. Allen, one of the editors of the Institute's publications, has eliminated many inconsistencies and infelicities of English. In the final preparation of the manuscript Miss Elizabeth Stefanski has been of great assistance. Members of the Chinese section of the Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures have kindly helped in standardizing the spelling of Chinese names. Both my wife and the editorial staff of the Oriental Institute have spent many hours in working on the manu-

script and in proofreading and indexing. The librarians of the University of Illinois and of the Oriental Institute and the Classics Library at the University of Chicago have been very helpful.

Finally, the whole project was made possible by the late Professor James Henry Breasted, first director of the Oriental Institute, who was never too busy to hear and encourage a young scholar, and by his successor, Professor John A. Wilson, who together have made it possible to devote the time necessary to the preparation of this study.

The portrait of King Mithradates II used as a frontispiece is reproduced about three times original size from a silver drachm in my own collection.

NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE

July 29, 1937

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
SOURCES	xxv
INTRODUCTION	xxxvii
CHAPTER	
I. THE GROWTH OF PARTHIA	I
II. EARLY FOREIGN RELATIONS	29
III. THE INDO-IRANIAN FRONTIER	54
IV. DRUMS OF CARRHAE	70
V. THE STRUGGLE IN SYRIA	96
VI. ANTONY AND ARMENIA	121
VII. THE CONTEST FOR THE EUPHRATES	143
VIII. THE CAMPAIGN OF CORBULO	179
IX. PARTHIA IN COMMERCE AND LITERATURE	203
X. TRAJAN IN ARMENIA AND MESOPOTAMIA	213
XI. THE DOWNFALL OF THE PARTHIAN EMPIRE	240
LISTS OF RULERS	
PARTHIAN KINGS	270
SELEUCID KINGS	270
ROMAN EMPERORS	271
INDEX	275
MAP	<i>at end</i>

ner, Wroth, and more recently McDowell has been very successful.

If the proveniences of the coins were known, assignment to the various rulers would be greatly facilitated. Unfortunately few of the coins come from excavations, and collections seldom possess records of provenience. The studies of McDowell on coins from the Iranian plateau (still to be published) and on the large amount of numismatic material from Seleucia on the Tigris will help to alleviate this difficulty.

While the writer must deal with the Chinese sources in translation only, the major problem connected with them appears clear. Though much has been done with the identification of personal and place names, many still remain uncertain quantities. Further studies in early Chinese onomatology will increase the certainty and number of identifications. On the Indian frontier numismatics again plays an important part, but here unfortunately there is less historical information to assist in the task of assigning the coins. Furthermore, the inscriptions, though dated, create as many problems as they solve, since in some cases the beginnings of the eras by which they are dated cannot be fixed. Excavations, especially that of Marshall at Taxila, promise to provide the solution to many difficulties on the eastern frontier.

INTRODUCTION

UPON the ashes of Persepolis arose a new Orient, a world in which Greek and oriental elements were strangely intermingled. The task of holding together as a political entity this vast area extending from the Mediterranean to the Indus proved too great for the successors of Alexander; their strength was eventually spent in fratricidal wars, and the East once more lapsed into the control of petty kinglets. The time was ripe for the formation of a new empire. Rising out of the obscure mists to the east of the Caspian Sea, Parthian horsemen rode victoriously over all Iran. Governed by strong, able, and resolute kings, they subdued nation after nation until from the slopes of the Zagros Mountains they could look out over the colorless alluvium of Mesopotamia. In 141 B.C. their squadrons clattered down the passes and conquered these fertile lands. Under Parthian administration commerce greatly increased, and cities long abandoned and then nothing more than mounds of dun-colored earth rose again to life. New canals were dug and old ones cleaned of the silt accumulations of centuries.

Unlike other invaders from the northeast, the Parthians did not kill and destroy for the sake of booty, but often took over new territory without creating

more than a ripple in the life of the common man. The greatest changes which they brought about probably took place within the administrative machinery, but unfortunately little firsthand information is available on the internal structure of the Parthian empire, because we possess very few official documents. Most of our knowledge comes from excavations at sites such as Susa and Dura-Europus or by inference from casual statements made by classical authors. Our best information, then, comes from areas on the periphery of the empire, and general conclusions drawn from it can be accepted only with great caution.¹

In effect the Parthian empire became a vast feudatory power, a pyramid the apex of which was the King of Kings, beneath whom came the satraps, the nobles, the Greek merchants, and finally the native tillers of the soil, the ultimate basis upon which any such system must rest. The nobles who controlled the land probably lived in the larger cities, where they and the wealthy Greek merchants who depended upon them for protection would naturally form alliances. The parallel with the Middle Ages in Europe is striking, and the decay of the two systems came about in much the same manner. During much of the period before the Christian era the royal power was

¹ On the organization of the Parthian empire see the publications of the excavations at Dura-Europus, Seleucia on the Tigris, and Susa and the excellent statement by Rostovtzeff in *CAH*, XI, 113-20.

supreme; but after that time the nobles, then firmly rooted and grown wealthy from lands and war, began to usurp more and more authority. Their defiance of the king brought about frequent periods of disruption and eventually the downfall of the empire. Very probably the decline of the royal power and the rise of the nobles were closely connected with the religious revival of the latter half of the first century after Christ. Parallels for the struggle between the nobles and Magi on one hand and the king on the other can easily be found in Achaemenian and Sasanian history.

Some years before the death of Mithradates II in 87 B.C. he had carved on the rock at Behistun a relief in which he and his principal officials appear. The chief of these is called satrap of satraps, the other three simply satraps. Probably these men belonged to the great families of Iran such as the Surens and Karens. Their positions with attendant rights and duties gradually became hereditary. A Suren always placed the crown upon the head of a new king, and, as at Carrhae, a Suren frequently led the Parthian armies in battle.

Evidently the form of government of Parthian dependencies varied widely and changed from time to time. Mithradates apparently appointed a governor to rule over newly conquered Media; Himerus served in the same capacity in Babylonia; and at a later date Mesopotamia was governed by this method. In other

cases, however, either the local dynasty was retained or some other ruler acceptable to the Parthians was installed. Armenia was ruled by a member of the Arsacid family, as was Media Atropatene at times. Vassal kings remained in Adiabene, Characene, Elymais, and Persis and in some of the city-kingdoms such as Hatra and Osroene. Of all these only Characene, Elymais, and Persis were permitted to strike money while under Parthian control. Of the important cities, Seleucia alone seems to have been accorded the right to issue civic coinage; and its small bronze issues, contrary to generally accepted numismatic principles, traveled fairly long distances, for example as far as Susa. However, numismatics must be applied with caution to questions of territorial control. Dura-Europus in the Parthian period used money from Syrian Antioch. Southeastern Iran, though at times directly under Parthian control, does not seem to have used the royal coinage.² Parthian coins traveled eastward along the great silk route into Turkestan; but none has been reported in China, and they are rarely, if at all, found in India proper.

That the royal power extended even to matters of local government is proved by a letter of Artabanus III to the city of Susa validating a contested election. Incidentally it is interesting to note that the letter

² H. H. Wilson, *Ariana Antiqua. A Descriptive Account of the Antiquities and Coins of Afghanistan* . . . (London, 1841); H. T. Prinsep, *Note on the Historical Results Deducible from Recent Discoveries in Afghanistan* (London, 1844).

was in Greek, though documents sent to the eastern part of the empire would probably be in the official Pahlavi. That an election case was of such vital importance as to force the king to intervene over the heads of the properly constituted authorities seems doubtful; hence we must conclude that certain places were more or less under royal jurisdiction.

Careful distinction is made by some contemporary writers between Greek and Parthian cities within the Parthian empire. This may well imply a difference in administration as well as population, for documents from Dura and Susa show that the governments of these places preserved the pattern of the Hellenistic city-state. Such places rarely held Parthian garrisons. Ctesiphon, for example, is said to have been built to house Parthian troops, which evidently could not be installed in Seleucia across the river.

The Parthians secured their revenues as did the Achaemenidae by means of tribute and customs duties, and they were anxious to further peace and the free interchange of commerce to increase the royal income. Although the Parthian revolt was originally a reaction against Iranian Hellenism, its character as a steppe culture modified by Iranian and Bactrian contacts underwent considerable alteration in the presence of the more ancient cultures of Mesopotamia and the strong Hellenistic influence there. For a hundred or more years after the Parthians entered the Land of the Two Rivers, Greek elements formed an

important part of their culture, until at last they were overshadowed by another oriental reaction.

When the Parthian feudal system was at its height, its military power was immense. In addition to mere numbers, the Parthians possessed the compound bow and complete scale armor for man and horse, arms of offense and defense against which the Roman legions had never before been matched. In 53 B.C. the consul Crassus and thirty thousand of his men fell under a hail of Parthian arrows, and the succeeding years saw raids into the rich territory about the pleasure center of Antioch. The armies which humbled the "invincible" legions were almost entirely composed of cavalry, both light- and heavy-armed. Because of the expense of maintaining horses and armor the heavy-armed was recruited from the nobility, who were also expected to supply and equip some light cavalry, not armored, but furnished with the bow as a weapon of offense.

As a result of their exploitation of the land, the success of their commercial alliances, and the profits of the booty from raids into Roman territory, the nobility gained tremendously in power and importance. On the other hand the royal family, the Arsacidae, in whom the succession to the throne remained, was torn asunder and weakened by intrigue, murder, and quarrels between members of the dynasty. The result was inevitable, just as in Europe. The feudal lords no longer responded to the call to arms, no

longer paid their annual tribute, but engaged in plots against the king and were ready to defy him by force of arms should he interfere with their rights. Disorganization within the empire, not force of arms, opened the way for the Roman legions into Mesopotamia. Nevertheless, the plundering of great commercial centers and royal treasures, as well as losses in man power and territory occasioned by the wars with Rome, greatly contributed to the decline of Parthia.

In the last years of the empire the name "Arsaces" became but a shuttlecock, bandied back and forth by claimants who possessed little if any real power. Under such conditions a strong leader backed by a powerful army had little difficulty in overcoming the disunited efforts of the nobles, many of whom must have longed for another strong central authority which should restore peace and prosperity. The Parthians had originally been alien to both Iran and Mesopotamia; their conquerors the Sasanidae came from Persis, where the ruined cities and the tombs of the great Achaemenid monarchs were a constant reminder of former Iranian glories. Ardashir, first of the new dynasty, found it no difficult task to overthrow the tottering and decrepit Arsacid line and thus to write the last chapter in the political history of Parthia.

CHAPTER I

THE GROWTH OF PARTHIA

THE racial origin of the earliest Parthians is largely a matter of conjecture, since our few authorities differ widely from one another as to who they were and whence they came, and archaeological and anthropological evidence is not yet forthcoming. Skeletal remains from Mesopotamia cannot be expected to yield much information, for we know in advance that they contain a large percentage of native population, a sprinkling of Macedonian or Greek stock, and possibly Negro, Chinese, Indian, and Mongoloid individuals.¹ Because of the heavy beards and the lack of detail, little if any anthropological information can be secured from the portraits on Parthian coins.² Language provides no clue to the origin of the Parthians, for their speech as we know it was adopted

¹ Marcel A. Dieulafoy, *L'Acropole de Suse* (Paris, 1893), pp. 109-13, has analyzed three skulls from the Parthian strata at Susa, but there is no reason to suppose they are Parthian. The graves and grave objects from Seleucia on the Tigris, not including the skeletal remains, will be treated by Samuel Yeivin in a volume of the "University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series," the manuscript for which is now in preparation.

² Dr. Henry Field, curator of physical anthropology, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, was kind enough to examine Wroth's publication of British Museum coins (see n. 7 below); cf. Charles E. de Ujfalvÿ, "Iconographie et anthropologie irano-indiennes," *L'Anthropologie*, XI (1900), 199-203.

after they entered the Iranian plateau. Their customs give us more extensive and more certain information, but nothing beyond what we already know from classical writers. Love of the hunt and of hard drinking, extensive use of the bow, especially as a weapon on horseback, are all suggestive of the nomadic or seminomadic life of the steppe country.

Early historians paid little attention to the Parthians; when the western world came into contact with them their story had been much obscured by time. They were reported to have been a division of the Parni, who in turn were one of a group of tribes known to the Greeks as the Dahae.³ We first meet them on the banks of the Ochus (Tejend) River, although this was probably not their original homeland.⁴ These people would not be known as Parthians until they moved southward into the Persian province of Parthava, an event which took place sometime before 250 B.C. Achaemenian and early Greek references to the "Parthians" refer, therefore, to earlier inhabitants of Parthava, not to the Parthians with whom we are dealing.⁵

That as early as the seventh century B.C. the As-

³ Strabo xi. 7. 1 and 9. 2-3, followed by Edwyn R. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus* (London, 1902), I, 284, and Percy M. Sykes, *A History of Persia* (2d ed.; London, 1921), I, 307. Cf. George Rawlinson, *The Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy* (London, 1873), pp. 17 and 42 f.

⁴ Strabo xi. 9. 2; Apollodorus *Parthica* in Strabo xi. 7. 3; Justin xli. 1; Arrian *Parthica* fr. 1 in Photius 58.

⁵ E. Herzfeld, "Sakastan," *AMI*, IV (1932), 36; William Montgomery McGovern, *Early Empires of Central Asia* (in press).

syrians knew the district which was later called Parthava is suggested by reports of a raid by Esarhadon⁶ which penetrated the country south of the Caspian Sea. Among those captured were Zanasana of Partukka and Uppis of Partakka. The raid must have taken place shortly before 673 B.C. Though Assyria's boundaries certainly did not include Parthava,⁷ the latter perhaps formed a part of Media.⁸ Cyrus the Great, who conquered the Medes, conducted a campaign in the eastern part of his newly won empire between 546 and 539 B.C.⁹ He founded

⁶ E. G. Klauber, *Politisch-religiöse Texte aus der Sargonidenzeit* (Leipzig, 1913), Nos. 21-22; R. Campbell Thompson, *The Prisms of Esarhadon and Ashurbanipal* (London, 1931), p. 21; E. Herzfeld, "Medisch und Parthisch," *AMI*, VII (1934), 26-29; George G. Cameron, *History of Early Iran* (Chicago, 1936), pp. 170-74.

⁷ Cf. A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria* (New York, 1923), pp. 46-47; *CAH*, III, map facing p. 1. The following maps also may be of use: W. W. Tarn in *CAH*, IX, facing p. 612; British Museum, *Catalogue of the Coins of Parthia*, by Warwick Wroth (London, 1903), facing p. 1; British War Office, General Staff, Geographical Section, No. 2149, *Persia and Afghanistan*, 1 inch = 64 miles, a copy of which may be found in Sykes, *Hist. of Persia*, Vol. II; Heinrich Kiepert, *Atlas antiquus*; "Murray's Handy Classical Maps": *The Eastern Empires and Asia Minor*.

⁸ Ctesias in Diod. Sic. ii. 2 and 34. Ctesias is not trustworthy; see Cameron, *History of Early Iran*, p. 176, n. 15. I am greatly indebted to Dr. Cameron for suggestions embodied in this chapter.

⁹ An inference from Herod. i. 153, who says that Cyrus conquered the Bactrians and the Sacae; cf. Ctesias *De rebus Persicis* fr. 29. 3f. (pub. with Herodotus, ed. Müller [1844]; Gilmore ed. not available), who places this event before the Lydian war (impossible), and Herod. i. 177, where the account of the conquest of Upper Asia immediately follows that of Lydia. The inclusion of Parthava in the Behistun inscription is almost certain evidence that it was conquered by Cyrus, since Cambyses after his accession went immediately to Egypt.

Cyra on the Jaxartes River¹⁰ and three other cities on or near the Tanais (Oxus) River.¹¹ The conquest of Parthava probably took place during this campaign. The country was placed under the control of Hystaspes, patron of Zoroaster and father of Darius.¹² Cyrus lost his life fighting against the Dahae in an attempt to expand his empire to the north-east.¹³ At that time the satrapy of Parthava included Hyrcania, which lay between the Elburz Mountains and the Caspian Sea.¹⁴ The satrapy revolted about 521 B.C. against Hystaspes and upheld the cause of the Median pretender Fravartish. The first battle was fought at Vishpauzatish¹⁵ on the twenty-second

¹⁰ Strabo xi. 11. 4; Arrian *Anabasis* iv. 3; Curtius Rufus vii. 6. 16. Cyra is perhaps Ura Tepe; see Wilhelm Tomaschek, "Centralasiatische Studien. I. Sogdiana," *SAWW*, LXXXVII (1877), 121 f.

¹¹ Justin xii. 5. 12; PW, art. "Tanaïs," No. 1.

¹² Behistun inscription, § 35, in F. H. Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden* (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 42 f. Cf. Herod. i. 204 ff.; F. Spiegel, "Ueber das Vaterland und Zeitalter des Awestâ" (II), *ZDMG*, XLI (1887), 292-96; F. Justi, "Die älteste iranische Religion und ihr Stifter Zarathustra," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, LXXXVIII (1897), 255-57; A. V. Williams Jackson, *Zoroastrian Studies* ("Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series," XII [New York, 1928]), pp. 17 f.; A. T. Olmstead, "New Testament Times—and Now," *JAOs*, LIII (1933), 313.

¹³ Berossus fr. 55 (Schnabel, p. 275), from Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Karst, p. 15, lines 11 f.

¹⁴ Behistun inscription in Weissbach, *loc. cit.*; cf. Herzfeld, "Zarathustra. I. Der geschichtliche Vištâspa," *AMI*, I (1929-30), 95-97.

¹⁵ Herzfeld, "Medisch und Parthisch," *AMI*, VII (1934), 30 f., identifies the place as Hecatompylos.

day of Viyakhna.¹⁶ Aid arrived from the army at Rhages (Rayy), and another battle was waged at Patigrabana on the first day of Garmapada,¹⁷ when 6,520 of the rebels were reported killed and 4,192 wounded. About this time Margiana revolted, and the satrap of Bactria was sent to put down the uprising.¹⁸ Parthava probably remained united with Hyrcania at the death of Darius.¹⁹

The mention of Parthava in the Behistun inscrip-

¹⁶ Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*, p. 43, makes this February 5, 521 B.C. The translation of Achaemenid dates into the Julian calendar is very uncertain; cf. Charles J. Ogden, "A Note on the Chronology of the Behistūn Inscription of Darius," *Oriental Studies in Honour of C. E. Pavry*, ed. J. D. C. Pavry (London, 1933), pp. 361-65 and bibliography cited therein, also D. Sidersky, "Contribution à l'étude de la chronologie néo-babylonienne," *Revue d'assyriologie*, XXX (1933), 63.

¹⁷ Cf. preceding note. Herzfeld, "Zarathustra," *AMI*, I (1929-30), 109, n. 1, and II (1930), 65, equates Patigrabana with Bagir and Bagir with Nisa.

¹⁸ Weissbach, *op. cit.*, pp. 44 f., § 38. The Aramaic copy from Elephantine in Egypt merely summarizes the Parthian campaign; see A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1923), p. 258.

¹⁹ Naqsh-i-Rustem inscription, § 3, in Weissbach, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-89, and the Xerxes inscription found by the Oriental Institute, for which see Roland G. Kent, "The Present Status of Old Persian Studies," *JAOs*, LVI (1936), 212 f., and "The Daiva-Inscription of Xerxes," *Language*, XIII (1937), 294, lines 19 f. In the Behistun and the Persepolis E inscriptions Parthava is the thirteenth satrapy listed; in the new Xerxes inscription it is sixth; in the Tell el-Maskhūtah inscription from Egypt it is fifth (W. Golénischeff, "Stèle de Darius aux environs de Tell el-Maskhoutah," *Recueil de travaux*, XIII [1890], 102-6); and in the Naqsh-i-Rustem and Susa inscriptions it is third (on the Susa inscription see V. Scheil, "Conquêtes et politique de Darius," *Mém. Miss. archéol. de Perse*, XXIV [1933], 119). The name of the satrapy is written in Akkadian as *Partu*; in Elamite, *Partuma*; in Egyptian, *Prtyw*.

tion seems clear indication that it was acquired by Cyrus; the fact that it appears in the Naqsh-i-Rustem inscription shows that it was still a portion of the kingdom at the death of Darius. The army list preserved in Herodotus vii. 60-81²⁰ can be dated as previous to 479 B.C., and therefore reveals the condition of the satrapies shortly after the death of Darius. Hyrcania had been separated from Parthava and made a province by itself, while the former satrapy of Chorasmia was then joined with Parthava.²¹ Other indications suggest possible losses on this eastern frontier. In the army of Xerxes there was a contingent of Parthians under the command of Artabazus the son of Pharnaces. Since Herodotus tells us elsewhere that the satraps led their contingents to battle, Artabazus was probably satrap of Parthia. Aeschylus²² reports that among those killed in the fighting in Greece was a cavalry leader called Arsaces, a name which later became the throne name of the Parthian kings.

The official tribute list quoted by Herodotus (iii. 89-95) is clearly from his own time, that of Artaxerxes I, not, as he states, from that of Darius.²³ Here again the tendency toward union of the provinces makes us

²⁰ Cf. PW, art. "Artayktes."

²¹ Hecataeus fr. 292 f. (J, I, p. 38) notes the proximity of the Parthians and Chorasmians.

²² *Persae* 995; the names in Aeschylus are generally proper to the country but not historical.

²³ This discussion of the satrapies is based on an unpublished study by Olmstead, "The Persian Satrapies and Their History."

suspect further shrinkage of the frontiers. Parthia was now joined with Chorasmia, Sogdiana, and Aria to form one province, and Hyrcania was united with Media.

When Alexander invaded Asia, the Parthians fought on the Persian side at Arbela.²⁴ Parthia fell to Alexander at the death of Darius III, and its satrap Phrataphernes surrendered himself in Hyrcania.²⁵ Amminaspes, a Parthian who had been in Egypt, was made satrap; and Tlepolemus, one of the Companions, was selected to represent Alexander's military interests.²⁶ Under Alexander, Parthia was reunited with Hyrcania, but the other districts mentioned by Herodotus as joined with it were then definitely separate satrapies.²⁷ Bessus in his attempt to seize the power after the death of Darius III also appointed a Parthian satrap, Barzanes by name,²⁸ who probably never enjoyed opportunity for action.

By the Treaty of Triparadisus in 321 B.C. a certain Philippus was transferred from Bactria to Parthia.²⁹

²⁴ Arrian *Anabasis* iii. 11; Curtius Rufus iv. 12. 11.

²⁵ Arrian *Anabasis* iii. 23; cf. also Plut. *Alexander* 45.

²⁶ Arrian *Anabasis* iii. 22. The name of the satrap is given as Andragoras by Justin xii. 4. 12. See G. F. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Persia* (London, 1922), pp. cxlviii-clx, for a discussion of the attribution of the coins bearing the name Andragoras.

²⁷ Arrian *Anabasis* iii and iv.

²⁸ *Ibid.* iv. 7.

²⁹ Arrian *Res successorum Alexandri* fr. 9. 35 (J, II B, p. 846); Dexippus *Res successorum Alexandri* fr. 8. 6 (J, II A, p. 462) calls him satrap of Sogdiana.

In 318 B.C. Pithon, satrap of Media, seized the province of Parthia, did away with Philippus, and installed his brother Eudamus. The other satraps became alarmed and joined together under the strongest, Peucestas of Persis. The combined armies of Iran drove Pithon out of Parthia, and he retreated to his own province of Media.³⁰ After 316 B.C. the province apparently was joined to Bactria under the command of Stasanor.³¹ By the middle of the third century the Seleucid empire was in difficulty. Antiochus II continued the war which his father had begun in Egypt about 276 B.C. When peace was made Antiochus put away his wife Laodice, who retired to Ephesus, and married Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy II (253 B.C.). Although Antiochus had thus secured peace, his relations with Ptolemy were none too secure. About the time of the marriage Diodotus,³² satrap of Bactria, revolted and assumed the title of king.³³

³⁰ Diod. Sic. xix. 14; Justin xiii. 4. 23. Cf. Bevan, *House of Sel.*, I, 42, 267 n. 6, and 294, and in *CAH*, VI, 417 and 477; Alfred von Guttschmid, *Geschichte Irans* (Tübingen, 1888), pp. 20 ff.

³¹ Justin xli. 4. 1, as Bevan, *House of Sel.*, I, 267 f. and notes, interprets him.

³² Trog. Pomp. xli; cf. Justin xli. 4. 5. Trogus is proved correct by the coins; see *Cambridge History of India*, I, ed. E. J. Rapson, Pls. II 13 and III 9, which apparently O. Seel, editor of the Teubner text of Justin, did not know. My account of events in the Seleucid empire is drawn largely from Tarn in *CAH*, VII, chap. xxii, which agrees substantially with the earlier works of Bevan and Bouché-Leclercq.

³³ Justin xli. 4. 5.

Encouraged by the Bactrian success, the Parthians also rose against Seleucid control. This took place shortly before 247 B.C.,³⁴ the beginning of the Parthian era,³⁵ when two brothers, Arsaces³⁶ and Tiridates, led a revolt against Andragoras,³⁷ satrap of Antiochus II Theos (261–247 B.C.). Even the Greeks

³⁴ Probably about 250 B.C. There is the possibility that 247 B.C., the beginning of the Parthian era, represents the date of the revolt; so Percy Gardner, *The Parthian Coinage* ("International Numismata Orientalia," Part V [London, 1877]), p. 3. Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 576, feels that it marks the coronation of Tiridates I; but it seems unlikely that the event was of sufficient importance to date the era. Moses Chor. ii. 1 refers to the revolt, but the Armenian sources are so varied and distorted that they have not been used except where they can be verified by some reliable historian or by archaeology. J. Saint-Martin, *Fragments d'une histoire des Arsacides* (Paris, 1850), has attempted rather unsuccessfully to make use of the Armenian historians. Cf. also Pseudo-Agathangelus (*FHG*, V 2, pp. 198 f.), Agathangelus (*ibid.*, pp. 109–21), Pseudo-Bardanes (*ibid.*, p. 86). On the revolt see Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Karst, p. 97, Olympiad 133.

³⁵ There is an extensive literature on the question of the Parthian era, but since the matter is now definitely settled there is nothing to be gained by taking it up in detail. Solution of the problem dates from George Smith's discovery of a double-dated tablet (*Assyrian Discoveries* [London, 1875], p. 389), though, owing to an error in his dating of the Seleucid era, his figure was one year too early. Cf. F. X. Kugler, *Sternkunde und Sternendienst in Babel* (Münster in Westfalen, 1907–37), II, 443–63.

³⁶ The figure of the first Arsaces is even more obscure than those of his immediate successors. Until the period of dated coinage, about 140/39 B.C., there is no certain basis for the arrangement of the Parthian kings. The traditional list as found in Wroth, *Parthia*, pp. 273 f., is not, however, purely fictional. W. W. Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 613, has largely discarded this arrangement and based his new list on the cuneiform sources, though they rarely give the king any other name than Arsaces.

³⁷ Justin xli. 4. 6–7. Arrian *Parthica* fr. 1, quoted in Photius 58, gives the name as Pherecles; but Syncellus, p. 539, presumably also quoting Arrian, makes it Agathocles. This Andragoras is not the one of the coins (cf. p. 7, n. 26).

themselves were quite uncertain as to the historicity of their accounts of this early period. There is a story that the first Parthian leader, Arsaces, was a Bactrian who became discontented with the rule of the satrap Diodotus of Bactria, invaded Parthia, and successfully fomented a revolt.³⁸ Still a third and more detailed version is to be found in Arrian,³⁹ according to which either Arsaces or Tiridates was insulted by the Seleucid satrap. The brothers thereupon took five men into their confidence, killed the offender, and persuaded the people to revolt. Without additional evidence it is impossible to determine the correct account.

The two brothers who led the revolt were reputed to be descendants of Arsaces⁴⁰ the son of Phriapites.⁴¹ Later the Parthian kings claimed descent from Artaxerxes II, possibly to support the belief that they were continuing the glories of Achaemenian Iran.⁴² Andragoras, satrap of Antiochus, apparently perished in the struggle. Arsaces may have been crowned in Asa-

³⁸ Strabo xi. 9. 3.

³⁹ *Parthica* fr. 1, quoted in Photius 58.

⁴⁰ To the discomfiture of historians both ancient and modern, all Parthian kings used this name as a title. See Justin xli. 5. 5-6; Strabo xv. 1. 36 and xvi. 1. 28; Moses Chor. ii. 1; Amm. Marcel. xxiii. 6. 5. So regularly the Babylonian documents.

⁴¹ Arrian *Parthica* fr. 1, quoted in Photius 58.

⁴² Arrian *Parthica* fr. 1, quoted in Syncellus, p. 539. Cf. Tarn, "Queen Ptolemais and Apama," *Classical Quarterly*, XXIII (1929), 138-40, who feels the claim was made to substantiate the Arsacid control of the territory of the Seleucidae, who were also connected with the Persian line.

ak (near Kuchan in the upper Atrek River valley) in Astauene.⁴³ For the first years of the new kingdom, if such it might be called, the rulers were busy with warfare,⁴⁴ in the course of which Arsaces must have lost his life.⁴⁵ Not long after the succession of Tiridates to the throne he invaded and conquered Hyrcania.⁴⁶

The death of Diodotus calmed any fears which Tiridates may have had, and an alliance with the Bactrian's son, also called Diodotus, gave the Parthian ruler additional strength.⁴⁷ Through fear of the elder Diodotus and of Seleucus II Callinicus (247-226 B.C.), Tiridates had built a formidable military force, the value of which he was to appreciate later.⁴⁸ The situation had become extremely serious for Seleucus. Laodice his mother and her friends had

⁴³ Isid. Char. *Mans. Parth.* (*Parthian Stations*, by Isidore of Charax, ed. Wilfred H. Schoff [Philadelphia, 1914]) 11; Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 575; cf. PW, art. "Asaak." If Isidore refers to the first Arsaces it is significant that the sacred flame was kept burning in this city, for the Parthians of that period were probably Zoroastrians.

⁴⁴ Strabo xi. 9. 2; Justin xli. 4. 7 f.

⁴⁵ Arrian *Parthica* fr. 1, quoted in Syncellus, p. 539.

⁴⁶ Justin xli. 4. 8. Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 576, following PW, art. "Hyrcania," col. 501, says the conquest must have been made after 217 B.C. because Antiochus III in his campaign of 219-217 in Coele Syria had Cadusian and Dahaeen contingents in his army (Polyb. v. 79. 3 and 7) and hence the Seleucid power must have extended to the Caspian Sea. But mercenaries were common in armies of this period and earlier, even to Greeks among the forces of Nebuchadnezzar, and I do not see how such conclusions can be based on these facts.

⁴⁷ Justin xli. 4. 9.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 4. 8.

done away with Berenice and her son, thus incurring the enmity of Ptolemy III, Berenice's brother. The Egyptian monarch invaded Seleucid territory and marched victoriously at least as far as Syria and perhaps to the Tigris,⁴⁹ though later writers extended his conquests to Bactria and even as far eastward as India. But a revolt in the Delta forced Ptolemy to return home before he could consolidate his position.

Sometime in the course of the struggle between Ptolemy and Seleucus, the latter was forced to conclude a peace with his brother which left Antiochus Hierax an autonomous sovereign in Asia Minor. The war with Egypt once ended, Seleucus soon attempted to recover the lost territory; but after some preliminary successes he was completely defeated at Ancyra (Ankara) about 240 B.C.⁵⁰ by Antiochus and his Galatian allies. For a time it was supposed that Seleucus himself had perished in the fighting, but he escaped in disguise to Antioch.

About 228 B.C. Seleucus gathered an army at Babylon⁵¹ and marched eastward. Tiridates retreated

⁴⁹ Professor Olmstead draws my attention to the fact that the Babylonian documents do not mention Ptolemy and that the dates make his rule in Babylonia improbable.

⁵⁰ The date is very uncertain; see Rapson in *CHI*, I, 440; Bevan, *House of Sel.*, I, 194 and 285. Tarn in *CAH*, VII, 720, refuses to commit himself. See also E. V. Hansen, "The Great Victory Monument of Attalus I," *AJA*, XLI (1937), 53, n. 3.

⁵¹ In later times Seleucia and Babylon were often confused by Greek writers, though contemporary tablets show that natives of Babylonia did not make this error. The importance of this confusion in the Parthian period has been exaggerated.

before him and eventually sought refuge with the Apasiacae, the Apa-Saka or Water Saka,⁵² who lived on the steppes of the Caspian region. In the meantime, about 227 B.C. Stratonice incited a rebellion in Antioch, and in concert with her Antiochus invaded Mesopotamia.⁵³ These domestic troubles caused Seleucus to return to Syria⁵⁴ and left the Parthians in a position to claim the ultimate victory.⁵⁵

Seleucus III Soter, the elder son of Seleucus II Callinicus, after a brief reign of three years was murdered in Phrygia as the result of a court intrigue,⁵⁶ and Antiochus III, the younger son of Seleucus II, succeeded to the throne (223 B.C.). Two of his generals, the brothers Molon and Alexander, were intrusted with the satrapies of Media and Persis. Not long thereafter Molon, possibly inspired by the Bactrian and Parthian successes,⁵⁷ revolted and declared himself king. Liver omens copied in Uruk April 30,

⁵² Polyb. x. 48; Strabo xi. 8. 8; Wilhelm Tomaschek, "Zur historischen Topographie von Persien," *SAWW*, CII (1883), 218; Tarn, "Seleucid-Parthian Studies," *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XVI (1930), 113.

⁵³ Tarn in *CAH*, VII, 722; but cf. Bevan, *House of Sel.*, I, 289 and n. 4.

⁵⁴ Justin xli. 5. 1.

⁵⁵ On the basis of Posidonius *Hist.* xvi. fr. 12 (J, II A, p. 228) in Athen. *Deip.* iv. 153 and of the coinage, Gardner (*Parthian Coinage*, p. 4) argues that Seleucus was once a captive of the Parthians, either after Ancyra or during the campaign under discussion. It must be granted that the beard which appears on his coin portraits is paralleled on the coins of only those rulers who were captives in the east. Cf. Rawlinson, *Sixth Mon.*, p. 49, n. 1. Josephus *Contra Apionem* i. 206 mentions the campaign.

⁵⁶ Appian *Syr.* 66.

⁵⁷ Tarn in *CAH*, VII, 724.

221 B.C., picture the thoughts passing through the mind of a priest. Who was to be the victor in the coming struggle for power? Would the city be destroyed? The omen of "Who was king, who was not king?," once applied to the period of disintegration at the close of the Agade dynasty, was now fully appropriate.⁵⁸ Babylonia was secured; but Antiochus himself took the field and defeated Molon, who committed suicide (220 B.C.). Seleucia, the royal city, was recaptured, and Diogenes of Susa, who had held out against Molon, was rewarded with Media. Antiochus crossed the Zagros and invaded the kingdom of Atropatene, southwest of the Caspian, then under the control of Artabazanes, who was forced to admit vassalage.⁵⁹ Additional omen tablets from Uruk, dated February 7, 213 B.C., make more certain the identification of the Parthians with that ancient enemy from the northeast, the Guti.⁶⁰ Could the expedition of Antiochus have been a feint in the direction of a Parthia which had already begun to expand? Did Parthia lend support to Molon? These are questions which as yet we cannot answer.

Meanwhile Tiridates had employed himself in consolidating his position. He increased the army, built

⁵⁸ F. Thureau-Dangin, *Tablettes d'Uruk à l'usage des prêtres du temple d'Anu au temps des Séleucides* (Musée du Louvre, "Textes cunéiformes," VI [Paris, 1922]), No. 1 rev., esp. line 23. Cf. A. T. Olmstead, "Intertestamental Studies," *JAOs*, LVI (1936), 245.

⁵⁹ Polyb. v. 40-54.

⁶⁰ Thureau-Dangin, *Tablettes d'Uruk*, No. 3 rev., lines 28 and 43.

forts, strengthened existing cities, and built a new one, Dara, on Mount Apaortenon, an almost impregnable position,⁶¹ which he perhaps intended to make the capital of his kingdom.⁶² Tiridates or one of his immediate successors refounded Rhages-Europus under the name Arsacia,⁶³ a designation which it did not long retain. In later times the royal residence of central Parthia was certainly Hecatompylos.⁶⁴ Tiridates

⁶¹ Justin xli. 5. 1-4; incorrect variant, Zapaortenon.

⁶² Rawlinson, *Sixth Mon.*, p. 53. Pliny *Hist. nat.* vi. 46 gives the city as Dareium and the place Apavortene; cf. Apauarktice, Isid. *Char. Mans. Parth.* 1 and 13. The site has been variously identified as the oasis of Attek east of the "Achal-Tekke" (PW, art. "Dara," No. 1), as "probably near Abivard in Apavarktice" (Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 575), as Kala Maran (Sykes, *Hist. of Persia*, I, 310), as perhaps Kelat (Ed. Meyer in *Encyc. Brit.*, art. "Parthia"), and as near Kelat-i-Nādirī (Herzfeld, "Zarathustra," *AMI*, I, 109, n. 1). Victor Chapot, *La frontière de l'Euphrate de Pompée à la conquête arabe* (Paris, 1907), p. 314 and n. 1, confuses the Dara of Tiridates with the Dara founded by Anastasius near Nisibis about A.D. 504, and therefore charges Justin, not his original, Trogus Pompeius, with a bad eye for topography.

⁶³ Apollodorus in Strabo xi. 13. 6; Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Pάγα; Pliny *Hist. nat.* vi. 113. Cf. the boundaries of Parthia as given by Strabo xi. 9. 1.

⁶⁴ Baeton fr. 2 (J, II B, p. 623); Diogenet. fr. 1 (J, II B, p. 626); Strabo xi. 9. 1; Ptolemy vi. 5. 2. Polyb. x. 28 says all roads converge on Hecatompylos. The site is not yet identified, as recent excavations at Damghan failed to produce Parthian material. A. V. Williams Jackson, *From Constantinople to the Home of Omar Khayyam* (New York, 1911), pp. 161 ff. and 176 ff., places it between Frat and Damghan at Shahr-i-Kūmis. See also A. D. Mordtmann, "Hekatompylos. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Geographie Persiens," *Bayerische Akad. der Wiss., Sitzungsberichte*, 1869, I, pp. 497-536; A. H. Schindler, "Beschreibung einiger wenig bekannten Routen in Chorassân," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, XII (1877), 216, and "Notes on Some Antiquities Found in a Mound near Damghan," *JRAS*, N.S., IX (1877), 425-27; PW, art. "Hekatompylos," No. 1. P. M. Sykes, "A Sixth Jour-

died in peace about 211 B.C. after a reign of thirty-seven years.⁶⁵ He left the throne to his son, whose name was apparently Artabanus (I).⁶⁶

In the death of the powerful Tiridates, Antiochus III may have seen an opportunity to regain his eastern possessions; in any case in that same year he turned eastward⁶⁷ and advanced to Ecbatana (Hamadan), where loot from the temple of Anahita served to replenish his treasury.⁶⁸ In 209 B.C. Antiochus continued his eastward march along the great road with

ney in Persia," *Geog. Journal*, XXXVII (1911), 17 f., suggests Darra Gaz, some fifty miles northeast of Astrabad.

⁶⁵ Arrian *Parthica* fr. 1, quoted in Syncellus, p. 539.

⁶⁶ Our only source, Trog. Pomp. xli, must be corrected, either by the substitution of the name Mithradates for Tigranes or by the rearrangement of the text as proposed by Gutschmid, *Geschichte Irans*, p. 81. Of the two, the substitution appears preferable. Gutschmid's rearrangement has been accepted by Th. Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator* (Paris, 1890), p. 310; Wroth, *Parthia*, pp. xxxi-xxxii; A. R. von Petrowicz, *Arsaciden-Münzen* (Wien, 1904), p. 9; J. de Morgan, *Numismatique de la Perse antique*. Fasc. 1. *Introduction*.—*Arsacides* (E. Babelon, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines*. III. *Monnaies orientales*. I 1), col. 85 and n. 2; and Ed. Meyer in *Encyc. Brit.*, art. "Parthia." J. de Morgan and Meyer call the ruler in question Arsaces II. The following scholars have preferred the substitution: F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg, 1895), pp. 31 and 412; Allotte de la Fuÿe, "Nouveau classement des monnaies arsacides," *Rev. num.*, 1904, pp. 320-22; E. H. Minns, "Parchments of the Parthian Period from Avroman in Kurdistan," *JHS*, XXXV (1915), 40 f. and n. 58; Tarn, "Sel.-Parth. Studies," *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XVI (1930), 119 and n. 4.

⁶⁷ Polyb. ix. 43 shows Antiochus at the Euphrates in the fall of 211 B.C.; he invaded rebel Media and Parthia according to Appian *Syr.* i. 1.

⁶⁸ Polyb. x. 27.

a large army.⁶⁹ While no excuse for this attack on Parthia is known, none was necessary beyond the fact that the territory had once been Seleucid domain. On the edge of the vast salt plains to the east the only available water supply was and still is carried through underground canals to prevent evaporation. Artabanus followed the obviously wise policy of retreating and destroying the wells and canals before him. Cavalry was sent forward which established contact with the Parthian horsemen engaged in this work and drove them away, and the Seleucid forces reached Hecatompylos practically unopposed. Antiochus determined to advance into Hyrcania and moved forward to Tagae (Tak?) near Damghan.⁷⁰ His ascent to the summit of Mount Labus (Lamavu) was hotly contested by Parthian troops or their allies posted on the heights above, but he reorganized his system of advance and forced the passage. At the pass itself a pitched battle was fought and the Parthians defeated. Antiochus managed to restrain his troops from headlong pursuit and advanced in good order down into Hyrcania, where he occupied the walled town of Tambrax (Sari?).⁷¹ The important

⁶⁹ Justin xli. 5. 7 grossly exaggerates the figures, giving 100,000 foot and 20,000 cavalry!

⁷⁰ PW, art. "Tagai."

⁷¹ Mordtmann, "Hekatompylos," pp. 531-34; B. Dorn, *Caspia* (Académie impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg, *Mémoires*, 7. sér., XXIII 1 [1875]), pp. 15 and 129-30; PW, art. "Tambrax"; Herzfeld, "Sakastan," *AMI*, IV (1932), 37.

center of Syrinx⁷² was taken after a siege of some duration, and all the Greek inhabitants were put to death by the Parthians just before the town was carried by assault.⁷³ What happened thereafter is uncertain, but Antiochus found it prudent to make peace and a treaty of alliance with Artabanus.⁷⁴ Twenty-one years later Antiochus met his death in a vain attempt to recoup his fortune by the sack of a temple of Bel in Elymais.⁷⁵ We know nothing more of Artabanus I except that his reign is conventionally represented as ending in 191 B.C.⁷⁶

Priapatus, the succeeding monarch, ruled for fifteen years,⁷⁷ but beyond this fact our sources are silent. He left two sons, Mithradates and Phraates. As the latter was the elder,⁷⁸ he inherited the throne at his father's death, as was the Parthian custom.⁷⁹

⁷² Dorn, *op. cit.*, p. 127; W. Tomaschek, "Zur hist. Topographie," *SAWW*, CII (1883), 224 f.; J. Marquart, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran* (Göttingen, 1896-1905), II, 62; PW, art. "Syrinx," No. 3. Possibly Turunga, a day's trip west of Sari.

⁷³ Polyb. x. 27-31; at this point the fragment unfortunately breaks off.

⁷⁴ Justin xli. 5. 7.

⁷⁵ Strabo xvi. 1. 18; Diod. Sic. xxviii. 3 and xxix. 15; Justin xxxii. 2. 1 f.; Porphyry frs. 32. 10 and 47 (J, II B, pp. 1216 and 1224 f.).

⁷⁶ Wroth, *Parthia*, p. xix; cf. Rawlinson, *Sixth Mon.*, p. 59, who makes it 196 B.C.

⁷⁷ Justin xli. 5. 9; until 176 B.C., Wroth, *Parthia*, p. xx; until 181 B.C., Rawlinson, *Sixth Mon.*, p. 59, and Sykes, *Hist. of Per.*, I, 321. The name Priapatus would seem to be the same as that of Arsaces' ancestor Phriapites; cf. n. 41.

⁷⁸ Justin xli. 5. 9.

⁷⁹ Rawlinson, *Sixth Mon.*, p. 85.

Phraates soon turned his arms against the peoples who dwelt in the Elburz range, south of the Caspian Sea. The Mardians⁸⁰ in particular he deported and settled in Charax near the Caspian Gates.⁸¹ Not long after this victory Phraates died and left the throne to his brother Mithradates, for whom he cherished a special affection, although he had several sons presumably of age.⁸² If we follow the traditional date, Mithradates came to the throne about 171 B.C.;⁸³ with his accession we enter one of the greatest periods of Parthian history.⁸⁴

About 175 B.C. the usurper Eucratides wrested control of Bactria from Demetrius, who was more interested in his conquests in the Punjab.⁸⁵ Taking advantage of Bactrian weakness which had doubtless resulted from continued warfare, Mithradates may have invaded Tapuria and Traxiana at this time.⁸⁶

⁸⁰ On these peoples see Arrian *Anabasis* iii. 24; Strabo xi. 8. 1 and xi. 13. 6.

⁸¹ Isid. Char. *Mans. Parth.* 7. Charax is the Greek translation of the native word for "stockade."

⁸² Justin xli. 5. 9-10.

⁸³ Wroth, *Parthia*, p. xx.

⁸⁴ E. Breccia, "Mitridate I il Grande, di Partia," *Klio*, V (1905), 39-54.

⁸⁵ Cf. Apollodorus *Parthica*(?) in Strabo xv. 1. 3; see also xi. 9. 2.

⁸⁶ There is no evidence to date this campaign. On these districts cf. Strabo xi. 11. 2, whose Aspionus and Turiva are so identified by Tarn, "Sel.-Parth. Studies," *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XVI (1930), 122-26. Tarn believes the campaign took place after 163; but his argument in *CAH*, IX, 578 and n. 1, that Parthia was a bar to the transmission of even coinage designs, does not seem strong. Cf. Rostovtzeff in *CAH*, VII, 174.

The belief that Mithradates extended his power as far south and east as Seistan, part of Aria, and Gedrosia rests solely on the identification of the Hydaspes of Orosius with the modern Porali.⁸⁷

The hasty departure of Antiochus IV Epiphanes from Palestine for the far eastern portion of the empire suggests an advance by the Parthians.⁸⁸ True, Palestine was unsettled—not an unusual condition for that region—but such an event as the invasion of the eastern lands by Mithradates at this time would have loomed as far more important in the eyes of the Seleucid ruler. In 165 B.C. Antiochus crossed the Euphrates⁸⁹ and marched into Armenia, where the king, Artaxias, was captured and forced to acknowledge the supremacy of the Seleucid ruler.⁹⁰ Thence Antiochus apparently returned to the great road,

⁸⁷ On this matter see pp. 56 f. There are other possibilities than the Porali. The southern and eastern conquests are doubtfully accepted by Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 579. The elephant on the coins of Mithradates is not evidence for Indian conquests; cf. the coins of Phraates II, Artabanus "II" (my III), and Mithradates III in Wroth, *Parthia*, p. 262, also G. H. Abbott, *The Elephant on Coins* (Sydney, 1919), p. 6. The Parthians apparently made little use of this animal; Tac. *Ann.* xv. 15 and Dio Cass. lxii. 21. 4 are the only literary mentions. This is peculiar, since both the Seleucidae and the Sasanidae made much of their elephants.

⁸⁸ Cf. Tac. *Hist.* v. 8.

⁸⁹ Josephus *Ant.* xii. 295–97. Cf. IV Maccabees 18:5 and Walther Kolbe, *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte* ("Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament," XXXV [Stuttgart, 1926]), pp. 106 and 155–59.

⁹⁰ Appian *Syr.* 45 and 66; Diod. Sic. xxxi. 17a (ed. Dindorf, 1868).

passed through Ecbatana, and attacked Persepolis, where the enraged populace drove him out.⁹¹ Perhaps he entered Elymais also.⁹² Eventually he was defeated and forced to retreat, and on the return journey he died at Gabae (Isfahan).⁹³

The incursion of Mithradates into Elymais must have alarmed Timarchus, king of Media, since he was obviously the next victim of further expansion by Parthia. Timarchus was king of Media as late as 161 B.C.,⁹⁴ and we are told that the invasion of Media by Mithradates was contemporaneous with the murder of Eucratides of Bactria by his son,⁹⁵ which took place about 155 B.C. Between 161 and 155 B.C., therefore, Mithradates waged a long war with Media, the success of which remained for some time in the balance. At length victorious, he set a man by the name of Bacasis to rule over the new territory.⁹⁶

The acquisition of Media opened the door of Mesopotamia for Parthian expansion into that fertile terri-

⁹¹ II Maccabees 9: 1–2.

⁹² Josephus *Ant.* xii. 354 f.; cf. F. Cumont, "Nouvelles inscriptions grecques de Suse," *CR*, 1932, pp. 284 f., an inscription for the safety of an Antiochus and a Laodice, referred by Cumont on paleographic grounds to Antiochus Epiphanes.

⁹³ Polyb. xxxi. 9.

⁹⁴ PW, art. "Timarchos," No. 5; *CAH*, VIII, 518–20.

⁹⁵ Justin xli. 6. 6.

⁹⁶ Justin xli. 6. 7. This was contrary to the usual Parthian custom of feudatory kingdoms.

tory.⁹⁷ A badly broken cuneiform tablet, which must be freely interpreted, gives us a contemporary account of the advance of Mithradates. When news of his approach reached the Seleucid ruler, Demetrius Nicator, then in Babylonia and very possibly at Seleucia on the Tigris, the latter quickly gathered together what men he could secure⁹⁸ and marched into Media to meet the enemy.⁹⁹ Apparently the Parthian managed to outmaneuver him and continued his advance. In the meantime Demetrius had left orders to

⁹⁷ The Parthian invasion is referred to in *Orac. Sibyl.* iii. 303-13. This section of book iii has been dated on other grounds to about 140 B.C. by R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1913), II, 384, n. on lines 295-488.

⁹⁸ That the person referred to is Demetrius, not Mithradates, is shown by the fact that he gathered "men of all sorts." The Parthian ruler would have had with him the army with which he had just invaded the country.

⁹⁹ This account of the campaign is drawn from British Museum tablet SH 108, described by F. X. Kugler, *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel* (Münster in Westfalen, 1907-35), II, 442, and partially published in his *Von Moses bis Paulus* (Münster in Westfalen, 1922), pp. 338 ff. Olmstead restores lines 2-9 as follows:

"... Men of all sorts [Demetrius collected]; to the cities of Media [he marched] In the beginning of that month, on the 22d day *su-bu*(?) . . . the *rab uqu* (general) entered the land of Akkad. [Against him] Arshaka the king to Seleucia [went. The city of . . . , of] the land of Ashur, which before the face of Arshaka the king [had bowed down], [Into Seleucia], the royal city, he entered; that month, on the 28th day, [he sat on the throne].

"Year 171, Arshaka the king, on the 30th of the month Du³uzu"

This passage was followed by astronomical data. While not certain, the restorations are much more probable than would appear to the uninitiated, for they are the common formulas of contemporary documents. Kugler's widely different interpretation of the text is followed by Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 579 f. See now Olmstead, "Cuneiform Texts and Hellenistic Chronology," *Class. Philol.*, XXXII (1937), 12 f.

gather additional troops, and one of his generals entered Mesopotamia, coming probably from Syria, with reinforcements. Mithradates turned southward to Seleucia and defeated him. At Seleucia the Parthian monarch received a deputation which brought word of friendship from some city in the land of Ashur,¹⁰⁰ for that territory must have been fully aware of the turn affairs had taken after the defeat of the general of Demetrius. Mithradates entered the royal city of Seleucia late in June or early in July; he was recognized as king on or before July 8, 141 B.C. Before October 14 of that year Mithradates' sovereignty was acknowledged as far south as Uruk.¹⁰¹ Naturally the inhabitants of Susa and the surrounding region felt uneasy, as is shown by a dedicatory inscription of 171 S.E. (141 B.C.) for the safety of a king and queen whose names are cautiously omitted.¹⁰² Susa was the next logical point in the advance of the Great King.

Sometime between October and December, 141

¹⁰⁰ Moses Chor. i. 7 and ii. 4. 1 makes Assyria subject to Mithradates.

¹⁰¹ The double-dated tablet in Otto Schroeder, *Kontrakte der Seleukidenzeit aus Warka* ("Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler," XV [Leipzig, 1916]), No. 37, proves no more than that Uruk then acknowledged Mithradates as king. Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 576 and 579 f., operating with the *rēš šarrūti*, "accession year," places the capture of Babylon before 1 Nisan, 141 B.C.; but "accession years" were never employed by the Seleucidae, and therefore documents would have been double-dated as soon as the sovereignty of Mithradates was acknowledged.

¹⁰² F. Cumont, "Nouvelles inscriptions grecques de Suse," *CR*, 1932, pp. 278 f.

B.C., Mithradates was on his way to Hyrcania.¹⁰³ The cause of his departure from Mesopotamia at this critical juncture in his campaign was probably a raid by the Sacae, who shortly before 165 B.C. had been forced from their homeland in Turkestan by the Yüeh-chi¹⁰⁴ and by this time were certainly close to the eastern borders of Parthia. The forces in Mesopotamia were turned over to a Parthian commander, and Mithradates never returned to that region, for the remainder of his reign was occupied with campaigns in southern and central Parthia.¹⁰⁵ His departure from the Land

¹⁰³ Justin xli. 6. 6-9, after the Median campaign, omits the capture of Babylonia and then speaks of Mithradates' setting out for Hyrcania. Orosius v. 4. 16 preserves the tradition of activity in the east between the first and second campaigns of Demetrius; cf. p. 25. See also discussions of British Museum tablet Sp. I 176 by Kugler, *Von Moses bis Paulus*, pp. 342 f., and T. G. Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia* (2d ed.; London, 1903), p. 484 and p. 553, n. Kugler dates the tablet astronomically to Kislimu, 171 S.E., i.e., December, 141 B.C. The passage concerned here says, as translated by Strassmaier for Kugler:

"In the same month I heard that Arshaka the king and his troops in (Pinches, 'to') the city of Arqania, the king (Pinches omits) On the 6th the Elamites with their soldiers marched against the city of Apamea on the river Šilḫu" Elsewhere in the tablet Seleucia is mentioned.

¹⁰⁴ See pp. 55 f.

¹⁰⁵ I Maccabees 14:1-3 states positively that Demetrius was captured (see p. 25) by a Parthian general. Other sources on the campaign do not mention Mithradates. Note that Justin xxxvi. 1. 5 f. says that Demetrius, captured not long after Mithradates left Mesopotamia, was sent to Hyrcania; the logical inference is that he was sent to the Parthian monarch. Cf. British Museum tablet SH 108 (see p. 22, n. 99), line 20, Olmstead's restoration:

"That month (Ululu or later), on the 3d day, Nica[tor the king was made prisoner]."

Farther on the text mentions "Arshaka the king" and "Seleucia."

of the Two Rivers for Hyrcania enabled the Elamites to raid the city of Apamea on the Šilḫu River.¹⁰⁶

Mithradates had no sooner gone than Demetrius returned to the attack. Doubtless he was justifiably encouraged by appeals for help from recently conquered peoples,¹⁰⁷ particularly from the Greek elements. As Demetrius advanced, large numbers flocked to his standards; we hear of contingents from Bactria, Elymais, and Persis. He won several victories,¹⁰⁸ but eventually, by either strategy or force, was taken by the Parthians and as a pointed example paraded through the streets of those cities which had aided him. Demetrius was then sent to Hyrcania to Mithradates. There he was treated as became his rank¹⁰⁹ and was given Rhodogune, daughter of Mithradates, in marriage.¹¹⁰

His enemy safely disposed of, Mithradates turned to punish those who had furnished aid to the Seleucid ruler. Not only had the Elymaeans thus provoked an attack, but the wealth of their temples would replenish a treasury depleted by warfare. The loot from

¹⁰⁶ See p. 24, n. 103, also PW, arts. "Apamea," No. 3, "Σελας," No. 2 and "Dialas," and H. H. Schaeder, "Ḥasan al-Baṣṣī," *Der Islam*, XIV (1925), 15 ff.

¹⁰⁷ Justin xxxvi. 1. 2-4.

¹⁰⁸ Justin xxxvi. 1. 4. This is the second campaign of Plut. *Reg. imp. apophtheg.* 184. 1 (Loeb, III, p. 86) and Orosius v. 4. 17. Cf. Kolbe, *Beiträge*, pp. 38-40.

¹⁰⁹ I Maccabees 14:1-3; Justin xxxvi. 1. 5-6 and xxxviii. 9. 2-3.

¹¹⁰ Appian *Syr.* 67.

the temples of "Athena" and Artemis alone is reported as ten thousand talents,¹¹¹ and no doubt there were others. The city of Seleucia (Mange?), formerly Solace, on the Hedyphon (Jarrāhī) River was captured.¹¹² Since the Parthians were established in Susa shortly after the death of Mithradates,¹¹³ that territory was probably added to the empire by the Great King himself. Mithradates died peaceably in 138/37 B.C., the first Parthian date fixed accurately by numismatic and cuneiform evidence.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ Strabo xvi. 1. 18. Note that Justin xli. 6. 7-8 mentions the campaign in Elymais after that in Hyrcania. There was a temple of Artemis on the Eulaeus River below Susa; see Pliny *Hist. nat.* vi. 135 and PW, art. "Eulaios." The Eulaeus is the modern Karun.

¹¹² Strabo xvi. 1. 18. For the identifications see PW, 2d ser., IV, col. 2561, "Σελεύχεια," No. 13.

¹¹³ F. Cumont, "Nouvelles inscriptions grecques de Suse," *CR*, 1932, p. 281, dated to 130 B.C. J. M. Unvala, "Inventaire des monnaies recueillies dans les fouilles," *Mém. Miss. archéol. de Perse*, XXV (1934), 115, No. 129, publishes without illustration a coin of Mithradates I from Susa, "161 Sél.=152/151 ap.(!) J.-C.," actually 151/50 B.C.

¹¹⁴ Wroth, *Parthia*, p. 15. Dates on Parthian coinage throughout this volume are computed on the basis of the Babylonian calendar, with New Year on 1 Nisan (April), and of the Seleucid era, which began in Babylonia in 311 B.C. For numismatic proof of the use of the Babylonian calendar see Robert H. McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia on the Tigris* ("University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series," XXXVII [Ann Arbor, 1935], pp. 147-53, and review by E. T. Newell in *AJA*, XLI (1937), 515-17. A tablet from Uruk dated "day 8, year 109 Arisak, equals year 173(?)," i.e., 139/38 B.C., is published by A. T. Clay, *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*. II. *Legal Documents from Erech Dated in the Seleucid Era* (New York, 1913), No. 52. His No. 53, without year but written by the same scribe, is dated in the reign of Arsak'u and Ri-'in'(?)-nu his mother, who was regent. This king must be the successor of Mithradates. Cf. also Justin xli. 6. 9.

The empire of Mithradates at his death included Parthia proper, Hyrcania, Media, Babylonia, Assyria, Elymais, Persis(?), and the districts of Tapuria and Traxiana.¹¹⁵ Mithradates was the first Parthian ruler whose name did honor to the god Mithra; and the worship of this god, hitherto largely officially ignored, must have received official sanction. The Mithra *yasht* of the *Vendidad* must have been composed in the last years of the reign of Mithradates.¹¹⁶

The language of official communication of the Parthian government was probably Pahlavi, that is, Persian written in Aramaic characters. Whole Aramaic words are rather frequently written, for which the reader substitutes their Persian equivalents. Persian in Aramaic characters appears on the tomb of Darius I. The writing on the early coins of Persis, which date roughly about 250-150 B.C., could be either Aramaic or Pahlavi. The introduction of Pahlavi into the government offices may well have been coincident with Parthian expansion over Iran; cer-

¹¹⁵ It is often assumed that the lands listed in the *Vendidad*, *fargard* i, belonged to Mithradates I; cf. E. Benveniste, "L'Éran-vêž et l'origine légendaire des Iraniens," *Bull. School of Or. Studies*, VII (1933-35), 272. This cannot be, since it is very doubtful, for example, whether Mithradates I ever held Mesene. Even if he did, its conquest must be placed after the occupation of Sogdiana by the Yüeh-chi.

¹¹⁶ Besides the points noted above, the Mithra *yasht* was evidently written in a period of expansion. The western boundary had reached the Tigris but not the Euphrates; see *ibid.* xxvii. 104. Cf. also Olmstead, "Intertestamental Studies," *JAOs*, LVI (1936), 253, n. 40, and Debevoise, "Parthian Problems," *AJS*, XLVII (1930/31), 81.

tainly it could not have been later than the conquest of Mesopotamia.

After the Parthians occupied the ancient and fertile Land of the Two Rivers, conflict with western powers became inevitable. Expansion to the east also brought with it further responsibilities. The story of these contacts on the frontiers of the empire will be dealt with in the following chapters.

CHAPTER II

EARLY FOREIGN RELATIONS

MITHRADATES THE FIRST established Parthia as a world power; whether or not his successors could maintain that position against the Seleucidae remained to be seen. Phraates II came to the throne about 138/37 B.C. on the death of his father Mithradates.¹ He must have been very young, for his mother, whose name was Ri-in¹(?)-nu, acted as regent.²

Babylonia remained for the next seven years in the hands of the Parthians, as cuneiform documents from there show;³ but the coinage of Phraates suggests

¹ Justin xlii. 1. 1.

² A. T. Clay, *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*. II. *Legal Documents from Erech Dated in the Seleucid Era* (New York, 1913), No. 53 and p. 13.

³ A copy of an old astronomical work, dated 27 Aiaru, 111 A.E., 174 S.E. (to be corrected to 175 S.E.; cf. same date correctly written in Reisner, *Hymnen*, No. 5, referred to below), i. e., 137 B.C., Epping and Strassmaier in *ZA*, VI (1891), 228 and 244; a copy of an ancient hymn, dated same year, George A. Reisner, *Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen nach Thontafeln griechischer Zeit* (Berlin, 1896), No. 5; a copy of another, dated 114 A.E., i. e., 134 B.C., *ibid.*, No. 35, Pl. 153; a tablet dated in year 6 of "Ar²siuqqa, king" (i. e., about 132/31 B.C. on the probable assumption that this is Phraates II), Clay, *Babylonian Records*, II, No. 51. Ephemerides from slightly later years calculate a number of dates during this period and always give them to Arsaces; the last is 180 S.E., i. e.,

tainly it could not have been later than the conquest of Mesopotamia.

After the Parthians occupied the ancient and fertile Land of the Two Rivers, conflict with western powers became inevitable. Expansion to the east also brought with it further responsibilities. The story of these contacts on the frontiers of the empire will be dealt with in the following chapters.

CHAPTER II

EARLY FOREIGN RELATIONS

MITHRADATES THE FIRST established Parthia as a world power; whether or not his successors could maintain that position against the Seleucidae remained to be seen. Phraates II came to the throne about 138/37 B.C. on the death of his father Mithradates.¹ He must have been very young, for his mother, whose name was Ri-in¹(?)-nu, acted as regent.²

Babylonia remained for the next seven years in the hands of the Parthians, as cuneiform documents from there show;³ but the coinage of Phraates suggests

¹ Justin xlii. 1. 1.

² A. T. Clay, *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*. II. *Legal Documents from Erech Dated in the Seleucid Era* (New York, 1913), No. 53 and p. 13.

³ A copy of an old astronomical work, dated 27 Aiaru, 111 A.E., 174 S.E. (to be corrected to 175 S.E.; cf. same date correctly written in Reisner, *Hymnen*, No. 5, referred to below), i. e., 137 B.C., Epping and Strassmaier in *ZA*, VI (1891), 228 and 244; a copy of an ancient hymn, dated same year, George A. Reisner, *Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen nach Thontafeln griechischer Zeit* (Berlin, 1896), No. 5; a copy of another, dated 114 A.E., i. e., 134 B.C., *ibid.*, No. 35, Pl. 153; a tablet dated in year 6 of "Ar²siuqqa, king" (i. e., about 132/31 B.C. on the probable assumption that this is Phraates II), Clay, *Babylonian Records*, II, No. 51. Ephemerides from slightly later years calculate a number of dates during this period and always give them to Arsaces; the last is 180 S.E., i. e.,

that he spent little time there,⁴ occupied as he was with nomadic invaders in the east. Proof for Parthian control over Susa appears for the first time in a double-dated inscription of the early part of 130 B.C.;⁵ but, as has been pointed out, the conquest was probably made by Mithradates.

Phraates like his father treated the captive Demetrius in a kindly manner, for he too may have entertained some notion of a Syrian expedition. The Parthian might hope indirectly to control Syria if Demetrius, backed by Parthian arms and money, made a successful attack on the seat of the Seleucid power. Demetrius could not be won over so easily; with the aid of a friend he attempted to escape. Because of their swift horsemen and better knowledge of the terrain, the Parthians were able to recapture the fugitives and bring them before Phraates. The friend was pardoned and recompensed for his fidelity, but Demetrius was severely censured and returned to Hyrcania and his wife. Sometime afterward, when he had become the father of several children, guard was relaxed. Parental cares failed to restrain Demetrius,

132 B.C., Kugler, *Sternkunde*, II, 446. The next document is dated by Antiochus, after his invasion of Mesopotamia; see pp. 31 f.

⁴ Wroth, *Parthia*, pp. 16-19; note the preponderance of drachms, a denomination struck almost exclusively in the east. No coins of Phraates II were found at Seleucia; see McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia*, pp. 182 f.

⁵ Cumont, "Nouvelles inscr. grecques de Suse," *CR*, 1932, pp. 280 f.; dated 117 A.E. (not 116 as restored by Cumont), Xandicus (Addaru), 181 S.E., i.e., 13 March-10 April, 130 B.C. (not 131 as in Cumont).

who fled again with the same friend but was caught almost within the boundaries of his own kingdom. He was led again to Phraates, who refused to see him but returned him to his wife and children. To keep Demetrius amused and make him ashamed, the Parthian king presented him with a pair of golden dice.⁶

In the meantime Antiochus VII Sidetes (139/38-129 B.C.),⁷ having disposed of Tryphon, his rival to the Syrian throne, and defeated the Jews, prepared to secure his brother Demetrius and so remove him as a potential menace to his throne.⁸ He set out in 130 B.C. with a large force, the size of which made a great impression upon later historians.⁹ The Parthian army, whose strength was likewise greatly exagger-

⁶ Justin xxxviii. 9. 2-10.

⁷ See the account of Seleucid history in this period by E. R. Bevan in *CAH*, VIII, chap. xvi.

⁸ Cf. Trog. Pomp. xxxv: "Repetit inde superioris Asiae motus factos per Araetheum et Arsacem Parthum." The problem of who Araetheus was appears to have been neglected. In addition to the sources cited below for this campaign, see Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Karst, p. 120; Livy *Epit.* lix; Orosius v. 10. 8; Val. Max. ix. 1 ext. 4; cf. also J, II C, pp. 166 f.

⁹ Justin xxxviii. 10. 2 says 80,000 foot and 300,000 others, most of whom were noncombatants; Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 17. 1 says that 300,000 exclusive of camp followers were killed; Orosius v. 10. 8 numbers the fighting force at 100,000 and supernumeraries at 200,000. Bevan, *House of Sel.*, II, 242, speaks of the army as numbering 80,000, but on his p. 247 mentions the loss of 300,000 men! Rawlinson, *Sixth Mon.*, pp. 98 f., is incorrect in his statement that Orosius gives the camp followers as one-third the fighting men. Even the smallest figures given above are absurdly large. The campaign is mentioned by Posidonius *Hist.* xiv. fr. 9 (J, II A, p. 227) in Athen. *Deip.* xii. 540 and by Josephus *Bell.* i. 50 and 62.

ated,¹⁰ was to have been supplemented by Saca mercenaries who had been hired but who failed to arrive until after the termination of hostilities.¹¹ The troops of Antiochus, magnificently appointed and supported by a contingent of Jews under John Hyrcanus,¹² were also joined by several monarchs who had formerly been Parthian tributaries.¹³ Antiochus was the victor in three battles. In one, on the river Lycus (Greater Zab),¹⁴ he defeated the Parthian general Idates and raised a trophy in honor of his victory.¹⁵ Another of the Parthian leaders, Enius, met his death at the hands of the people of Seleucia.¹⁶ Because of these successes Antiochus laid claim to the title of "Great."¹⁷ Other Parthian dependencies, when they saw him master of Babylonia (130 B.C.),¹⁸ believed the newly established empire tottering and joined the Seleucid monarch.

When winter closed in, Antiochus went into quarters in Media instead of retiring to Syria as Phraates

¹⁰ Porphyry in Euseb. *Chron.* fr. 32. 19 (J, II B, p. 1217); Moses Chor. ii. 2. 4.

¹¹ Justin xlii. 1. 1-2.

¹² Nic. Dam. fr. 92 (J, II A, p. 381) in Josephus *Ant.* xiii. 251-52.

¹³ Justin xxxviii. 10. 5.

¹⁴ PW, art. "Lykos," No. 12.

¹⁵ Nic. Dam. fr. 92 in Josephus *loc. cit.*

¹⁶ Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 19.

¹⁷ Justin xxxviii. 10. 6.

¹⁸ A cuneiform copy of an old hymn is dated under Antiochus, 22 Aiaru, 182 S.E., i.e., June 2, 130 B.C.; see Reisner, *Hymnen*, text No. 25. On his p. xiv the date is given as "129 B.C. (?130?)."

had hoped. Because of the numbers of his troops he found it advisable to billet them in several cities, where they formed a burden to the populace, only a part of which was friendly. Since Phraates had been thrice vanquished by force, he turned to methods of greater finesse¹⁹ when the coming of spring brought about the renewal of the campaign. Messengers were sent to ask terms of peace from Antiochus, who named three conditions: Demetrius should be set free, all territory outside Parthia proper should be surrendered, and the Parthian king should pay tribute. Phraates peremptorily refused, as indeed he must except in the last extremity.²⁰ At this critical juncture Phraates played his trump card by sending Demetrius back to Syria at the head of a Parthian squadron in the hope that he might thus force Antiochus to return home. But relief came from the people of the invaded territory themselves, for, exasperated by months of violence from the rough Seleucid mercenaries and by demands for provisions, these garrison cities became pro-Parthian. The Seleucid soldiers were undoubtedly weakened by prolonged inactivity, and, scattered as they were, they lost their numerical advantage over the Parthians. Incited by agents of Phraates, the inhabitants of the various cities rose simultaneously and attacked most of the troops quartered in their districts. Antiochus, who may have

¹⁹ Justin xxxviii. 10. 7 ff.

²⁰ Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 15.

passed the winter at Ecbatana (Hamadan),²¹ hastened to aid the nearest contingent, only to discover that Phraates had anticipated that movement. He was urged by his staff not to engage the superior enemy forces, who had but to fly to the neighboring hills to escape pursuit by the Seleucid cavalry. Spring was at hand and travel difficult, but a successor of Alexander the Great could not give ground before a foe whom he had defeated three times, and the Parthian attack was received on the spot. The Seleucid troops, in poor condition, were easily put to flight by the Parthians, and Antiochus died, abandoned by all his men;²² perhaps he was killed in the fighting,²³ or he may have committed suicide.²⁴ So complete was the Parthian victory that Antiochus' young son Seleucus²⁵ and his niece, a daughter of Demetrius,²⁶ were among those captured. Athenaeus, commander of the Syrian forces, was among the first to flee. The number of the slain was placed at the absurdly large figure of three hundred thousand.²⁷ The body of Antiochus was treated with all respect due a monarch and was sent

²¹ Suggested by Bevan, *House of Sel.*, II, 244.

²² Justin xxxviii. 10. 10; cf. Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 16-17.

²³ Justin *loc. cit.*; Orosius v. 10; Porphyry fr. 32. 19 (J, II B, p. 1217); Josephus *Ant.* xiii. 253 and 271; Posidonius *Hist.* xvi. fr. 11 (J, II A, p. 228) in Athen. *Deip.* x. 439; *Chronicon Maroniticum* in *GSCO Syr.*, 3. ser., t. IV, Versio (1903-5), p. 42, lines 14 f.

²⁴ Appian *Syr.* 68; Aelian *De natura animalium* x. 34.

²⁵ Porphyry in Euseb. *Chron.* (J, II B, pp. 1217 f., fr. 32. 19).

²⁶ Justin xxxviii. 10. 10.

²⁷ Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 17.

by Phraates to Syria in a silver casket. The daughter of Demetrius proved so charming to the Parthian king that he took her into his harem, and Seleucus was treated in a fashion befitting royalty. Thus the last serious attempt by a Seleucid monarch to regain the lost eastern provinces ended in complete failure. Incompetent kings and internal struggles rendered farther Parthian advance relatively easy.²⁸

Now that victory was his, Phraates regretted the release of Demetrius and ordered a body of cavalry to recapture him. Once free, however, Demetrius had sought his own country immediately, and the Parthian troops returned empty-handed.²⁹

Encouraged by his success against Antiochus, Phraates determined to invade Syria and entered Babylonia; but he was forced to abandon the whole plan by a Saca invasion in the east. Before leaving Mesopotamia to repel the invaders, he appointed his favorite, Himerus, a Hyrcanian,³⁰ as governor.

The Saca mercenaries hired for the war against Antiochus were probably an advance group of this eastern horde whom Phraates attempted to quiet for a time by a subsidy. If the failure of the sources to mention the presence of Phraates in Babylonia to meet the attack of Antiochus in person is an indication that he was engaged elsewhere we may have additional

²⁸ Strabo xiv. 5. 2.

²⁹ Justin xxxviii. 10. 11 and xxxix. 1. 1.

³⁰ Justin xlii. 1. 3; Posidonius *Hist.* xvi. fr. 13 (J, II A, p. 228) in Athen. *Deip.* xi. 466. Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 21 gives the name as Εὐήμερος.

evidence that the Saca invasion had begun by 130 B.C.³¹ The story that the mercenaries arrived after hostilities had ceased, and consequently were refused their pay, must not be taken too literally. They are said to have demanded either reimbursement for their trouble or employment against some other enemy. When this was refused, they began to ravage the Parthian territory as far west as Mesopotamia.³² Whether any considerable number of them ever reached the Land of the Two Rivers is doubtful.

The question of whence these invaders came and what caused their movement is part of the story of the Indian frontier and will be discussed in the succeeding chapter. Those who entered Parthia were probably a portion of the Sacaraucae (Saca Rawaca)³³ together with a still larger body of the Massagetae and other groups attracted by the opportunity for new territory and plunder. The invasion naturally followed the two main branches of the great road (cf. pp. 205 f.), one leading to Mesopotamia through Merv, Hecatompylos, and Ecbatana, and the other, utilized when resistance to the westward advance turned the hordes southward, leading to India through Merv, Herat, and Seistan.³⁴

³¹ As Tarn points out in *CAH*, IX, 581 f.

³² Joan. Antioch. fr. 66. 2 (*FHG*, IV, 561).

³³ PW, art. "Sacaraucae"; Tarn, "Sel.-Parth. Studies," *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XVI (1930), 111-13, and in *CAH*, IX, 582 f.

³⁴ Tarn, "Sel.-Parth. Studies," pp. 117 f.

In the army which Phraates led eastward against the Sacae were Greek troops, made prisoners during the war with Antiochus. The Parthian is said to have treated these Greeks with great cruelty. Phraates perhaps counted on the fact that they were facing unknown foes far from their homeland and would therefore be fighting for their lives; but when in the battle which eventually resulted between the Parthians and the Sacae the Greeks saw their captors hard pressed, they at once deserted to the enemy. The tide was turned against the Parthians, and in the massacre which ensued, about 128 B.C.,³⁵ Phraates perished.

Artabanus II, son of Priapatius and uncle of Phraates,³⁶ inherited the problem of the Sacae, to whom he may have paid tribute.³⁷ With the invaders in possession of the larger part of his kingdom, Artabanus was soon forced to arms. In an offensive movement somewhere in the region of Bactria against the "Tochari," perhaps the Yüeh-chi of the Chinese records,³⁸ he received a wound in the forearm, possibly from a poisoned weapon, which almost im-

³⁵ Justin xlii. 1; McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia*, p. 183.

³⁶ Justin xlii. 2. 1. ³⁷ Joan. Antioch. fr. 66 (*FHG*, IV, 561).

³⁸ Tarn, "Sel.-Parth. Studies," pp. 106-11 and 115-16, believes the Yüeh-chi are historically improbable in this particular case and suggests the Pasiāni, whose name might have been miscopied as Asiāni, for which the name Tochari would then have been substituted, in the text of Justin xlii. 2. 2. H. W. Bailey, "Ttagara," *Bull. School of Or. Studies*, VIII (1935-37), 912, denies that *ārśi* = Asi.

mediately caused his death. This must have occurred in 124/23.³⁹

In the meantime Seleucia and the other cities of Mesopotamia had become dissatisfied with the rule of Himerus, the viceregent appointed by Phraates II in the year 129 B.C. Among other crimes he is charged with selling numerous Babylonians into Media as slaves.⁴⁰ Besides these internal troubles Himerus was soon face to face with a new power to the south, a new state arising in the territory once occupied by the old Seleucid province of the Erythrean Sea created by Antiochus III before Molon's revolt.⁴¹ Shortly after 129 B.C. the ancient city of Alexandria-Antioch near the head of the Persian Gulf was re-founded as Charax Spasinu by the Arab Hyspaosines, son of Sagdodonacus.⁴² Under the leadership of Hyspaosines the surrounding country was rapidly conquered, and thus was founded the kingdom of Characene. Not long after Himerus was appointed governor of Babylonia he engaged in a war with this king but was defeated.⁴³ By 127 B.C. Hyspaosines was in

³⁹ Justin xlii. 2. 2; McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia*, p. 183. The "Victory" coins of 124/23 were probably struck at Seleucia by Himerus at the order of Artabanus.

⁴⁰ Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 21. Posidonius *Hist.* xvi. fr. 13 (J, II A, p. 228) in Athen. *Deip.* xi. 466 records a banquet given by Lysimachus of Babylon for Himerus and 300 Seleucians (the Senate?).

⁴¹ Polyb. v. 46.

⁴² On Charax see PW, arts. "Mesene" and "Alexandria," No. 13.

⁴³ Trog. Pomp. xlii mentions a war with Mesene, a part of Characene.

possession of Babylon⁴⁴ and probably also of Seleucia. His only dated coins are from 124/23 B.C., and by the next year Himerus again controlled central Babylonia and the mint city of Seleucia.⁴⁵ He celebrated his victory by striking coins which bore a Victory and the legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΑΡΞΑΚΟΥ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΥ,⁴⁶ and his assumption of the title "king"⁴⁷ probably dated from this time. With the Sacae in possession of the larger portion of the eastern empire, Himerus now occupied the most important territory still under Parthian control.

Other interesting details of this period are cited by Pinches from unpublished tablets in the British

⁴⁴ T. G. Pinches, "A Babylonian Tablet Dated in the Reign of Aspasinē," *Babyl. and Or. Record*, IV (1889/90), 131-35; Terrien de Lacouperie, "Hyspaosines, Kharacenian King of Babylon," *ibid.*, pp. 136-44; Pinches, *The Old Testament* (2d ed.), pp. 481-84; Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 584.

⁴⁵ Until recently the attribution of certain coins to Himerus has been considered reasonably definite: Gardner, *Parthian Coinage*, pp. 7 and 34; Wroth, *Parthia*, pp. xxi, xxiii, and 23 (somewhat doubtful); E. T. Newell, "A Parthian Hoard," *Num. Chron.*, 5th ser., IV (1924), 169 ff.; Newell, *Mithradates of Parthia and Hyspaosines of Characene* ("Numismatic Notes and Monographs," No. 26 [New York, 1925]), pp. 13 f. Mr. Newell now prefers to assign them to Phraates II (in *Survey of Persian Art*, ed. Arthur Upham Pope, in press), following Maurice Dayet, "Un tétradrachme arsacide inédit," *Arethuse*, II (1925), 63-66. The problem hinges on the only dated coin of Himerus, 189 S.E., i.e., 123/22 B.C., now considered by Mr. Newell to be of questionable status.

⁴⁶ Wroth, *Parthia*, p. 23, No. 2; his other coins bear the title ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΡΞΑΚΟΥ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝΟΥΣ. The titles at once suggest Mithradates II; but the portraits will not allow this identification, and, if Himerus is rejected, Phraates remains the only other possibility.

⁴⁷ Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 21 and the coins cited in the previous note.

Museum of which not even English translations are available:

From this we learn that the Elamites made incursions in the neighborhood of the Tigris. Pilinussu, the general in Akkad, apparently carried on operations against another general, and seems to have gone to the cities of the Medes before Bāgā-asā [an Iranian name], the brother of the king. A man named Te^cudišī [Theodosius] also seems to have opposed the general in Akkad. Yet another inscription of the same period states that Ti^cimūtušu [Timotheus], son of Aspāsinē, went from Babylon to Seleucia (on the Tigris). . . .⁴⁸

Mithradates II, son and successor of Artabanus, ascended the throne about 123 B.C. As in the case of his illustrious predecessor of the same name, his reign was important, and eventually he was called "the Great."⁴⁹ His first task was the reduction of Babylonia and the defeat of the Characenean ruler; bronze coins of Hyspaosines overstruck with the titles and portrait of Mithradates in 121/20 B.C. furnish proof that this was accomplished.⁵⁰

How much of eastern Parthia remained in the hands of the Sacae we do not know. Perhaps by this date the main force of the westward movement had been spent and the bulk of the invaders had turned southward.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Pinches, *The Old Testament* (2d ed.), p. 483. The words in brackets are my own.

⁴⁹ Trog. Pomp. xlii; Justin xlii. 2. 3.

⁵⁰ Newell, *Mithradates of Parthia and Hyspaosines of Characene*, pp. 11 f.

⁵¹ Tarn, "Sel.-Parth. Studies," *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XVI (1930), 116-19, believes that the Chinese sources prove the Parthians were in possession

Mithradates undoubtedly did recover much lost ground, for, as we have seen, he regained Babylonia and probably a number of provinces to the east.⁵² In far-off Delos at the shrine of Asclepius a dedicatory inscription of about 110 B.C. commemorates a "king of kings," Arsaces the Great, who to judge from the title must be Mithradates.⁵³ Fragments of other records of about the same period, written in Greek, have been found in Babylonia.⁵⁴ Another campaign of Mithradates was against Artavasdes of Armenia, as a result of which Tigranes, the eldest son of the Armenian

of Merv by 115 B.C. and suggests that this reconquest was due to a hypothetical "king of the campaign coins," a joint ruler controlling the eastern provinces. As Wroth, *Parthia*, pp. xxxi-xxxii, had already pointed out, these coins cannot on numismatic grounds be assigned to Mithradates II but must be later. A study of a large hoard of Mithradates II strongly confirms this view; see Newell, "Coinage of Parthia" (in *Survey of Persian Art*, in press). McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia*, p. 211, suggests that the "campaign coins" might plausibly be assigned to Mithradates' successor, Sinatruces, who struck them to celebrate his early victories as he advanced from exile among the "Scythians"; cf. p. 52.

⁵² Justin xlii. 2. 4-5 states that he added many peoples to the empire. Perhaps the Bactrian conquests, taken from the Scythians according to Strabo xi. 9. 2, should be placed in his reign.

⁵³ *OGIS*, I, No. 430; S. Reinach, "Fouilles de Délos," *Bull. de correspondance hellénique*, VII (1883), 349-53; A. von Sallet, "Beiträge zur antiken Münzkunde: Arsaciden-Inschrift von Delos," *Zeitschrift für Numismatik*, XII (1885), 372-75.

⁵⁴ Bernard Haussoullier, "Inscriptions grecques de Babylone," *Klio*, IX (1909), 353, a stone dated 121/20 B.C., and 352 f., a tablet dated 110/9 or 111/10 B.C.; cf. M. I. Rostovtzeff and C. B. Welles, "A Parchment Contract of Loan from Dura-Europus on the Euphrates," *Yale Classical Studies*, II (1931), 40 f. See also Woldemar Schileico, "Ein babylonischer Weihetext in griechischer Schrift," *Archiv für Orientforschung*, V (1928-29), 11-13.

king, was a hostage among the Parthians for a number of years.⁵⁵ From this time onward Armenia was destined to play a major role in Parthian affairs. Eventually its ruling family became a branch of the royal Arsacid line, and its territory a bone of contention over which Rome and Parthia waged a long and bitter struggle.

The increased political importance of Parthia during the reign of Mithradates II was due in large part to the wealth accruing to her treasuries from the development of overland trade. While this certainly began before the Parthian invasion of Mesopotamia,⁵⁶ unification of political control along the whole route from the Roman frontier to the point where the trade was taken over by Chinese merchants proved a tremendous stimulus to business. Our first definite information comes from Chinese sources,⁵⁷ which report

⁵⁵ Strabo xi. 14. 15; Justin xxxviii. 3. 1; cf. Trog. Pomp. xlii, where the war is mentioned.

⁵⁶ G. M. A. Richter, "Silk in Greece," *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXXIII (1929), 27-33.

⁵⁷ A. Wylie, "History of the Heung-noo in Their Relations with China," *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.*, III (1874), 401-51, and V (1876), 41-80; Thomas W. Kingsmill, "The Intercourse of China with Eastern Turkestan and the Adjacent Countries in the Second Century B.C.," *JRAS*, 1882, pp. 74-104; Wylie, "Notes on the Western Regions," *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.*, X (1881), 20-73, and XI (1882), 83-115; Friedrich Hirth, *China and the Roman Orient* (Shanghai, 1885); Édouard Chavannes, *Les mémoires de Se-ma Ts'ien* (Paris, 1895-1905), pertinent chapters not published, but see Introduction; Sylvain Lévi and É. Chavannes, "L'Itinéraire d'Ou K'ong," *JA*, 9. sér., VI (1895), 341-84; Edward Harper Parker, "Chinese Knowledge of Early Persia," *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 3d ser., XV (1903), 144-69; O. Franke, *Beiträge aus chinesischen Quellen*

that about 128 B.C. the famous Chinese traveler Chang K'ien spent a year in that part of Bactria which lay east of the Oxus, territory then in possession of the Sacae. Sometime later the first Chinese embassy journeyed to the Parthian capital. The members of the mission, sent by Wu-ti (141-87 B.C.) of the Han dynasty, were received with great honor, and when they returned they were accompanied by a Parthian delegation which took with it ostrich eggs and conjurers.⁵⁸ Trade between Parthia and China probably preceded rather than followed these events, although the movements of the Sacae and the Yüeh-chi obviously made such ventures hazardous from 165 B.C. onward.

Credit for the discovery and use of the monsoon as an aid to navigation in the Indian Ocean is given to a

zur Kenntnis der Türkvölker und Scythen Zentralasiens (APAW, 1904, No. 1 [part translated into English in *Indian Antiquary*, XXXV (1906), 33-47]); Chavannes, "Les pays d'Occident d'après le Wei lio," *T'oung pao*, 2. sér., VI (1905), 519-71; Chavannes, "Trois généraux chinois de la dynastie des Han orientaux," *ibid.*, VII (1906), 210-69; Chavannes, "Les pays d'Occident d'après le Heou Han chou," *ibid.*, VIII (1907), 149-234; Friedrich Hirth, "The Story of Chang K'ien, China's Pioneer in Western Asia," *JAS*, XXXVII (1917), 89-152; J. J. M. de Groot, *Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens*. I. *Die Hunnen der vorchristlichen Zeit*; II. *Die Westlande Chinas in der vorchristlichen Zeit* (Berlin, 1921-26); Léon Wieger, *Textes historiques* (2. éd.; Hien-Hien, 1922-23); O. Franke, *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*. I. *Das Altertum und das Werden des Konfuzianischen Staates* (Berlin, 1930); McGovern, *Early Empires of Central Asia* (in press). Of these, the works of Hirth, Franke, and de Groot and the translations of Chavannes are the most trustworthy.

⁵⁸ Hirth, "Story of Chang K'ien," *JAS*, XXXVII (1917), 107; on the date see *ibid.*, p. 135.

merchant named Hippalus about the year 100 B.C.⁵⁹ As might be expected, full utilization of this knowledge was not made until later, roughly the middle of the first century of our era.⁶⁰

His widely extended empire undoubtedly forced Mithradates to delegate extraordinary powers to his subordinates and gave greater opportunities than ever for self-aggrandizement. The satrap of satraps, Gotarzes, who appears on a relief cut by Mithradates in the great rock at Behistun, must by that time already have embarked on a career which eventually brought him into open revolt against his sovereign. If we accept the restoration by Herzfeld,⁶¹ based on a copy made before the partial destruction of the relief, the inscription⁶² should read

1 ΚΩΦΑΣΑΤΗΣ ΜΙΘΡΑΤΗΣ ΠΕΤΤ[ΙΣΤΕΥΜΕ-
ΝΟΣ] ΓΩΤΑΡΖΗΣ

2 ΣΑΤΡΑΠΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΣΑΤΡ[ΑΤΤΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ
ΜΕΓΑΣ ΜΙΘΡΑΔΑ]ΤΗΣ

"Kophasates, Mithrates the overseer(?),,
Gotarzes the satrap of satraps, (and) the Great
King Mithradates."

⁵⁹ Date uncertain. See PW, art. "Hippalos," No. 3; W. L. Westermann, "On Inland Transportation and Communication in Antiquity," *Political Science Quarterly*, XLIII (1928), 384 f.

⁶⁰ E. H. Warmington, *The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India* (Cambridge, 1928), pp. 35 ff.

⁶¹ *Am Tor von Asien* (Berlin, 1920), pp. 35 ff.

⁶² *OGIS*, I, No. 431.

The figures thus named represented Mithradates, the chief satrap Gotarzes,⁶³ and three others, probably also satraps.

About 94 B.C., probably on the death of his father Artavasdes, the Armenian prince Tigranes,^{63a} for some years past a hostage among the Parthians, was returned to his country and placed on the throne with the aid of Parthian troops. In payment for their services the Parthians received "seventy valleys."⁶⁴ Tigranes proved an able monarch. Soon after his establishment as king of Armenia he formed an alliance with Mithradates of Pontus, who between 112 and 93 B.C. had built a great and powerful state to the northwest. To further cement the union he married Cleopatra, daughter of his ally. The two kings then proceeded to drive Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia from his throne.

In the meantime Mithradates of Parthia, safe from interference by the growing power of Armenia, pushed rapidly westward. Antiochus X Eusebes Philopator was contending for the doubtful honor of the Seleucid throne with Demetrius III Eucerus and Ptolemy

⁶³ This might be the Gotarzes of A.D. 38-51 (see pp. 166-74), but there are several arguments against such attribution. Tacitus *Ann.* xi. 10 gives the name of the ruler contemporary with Gotarzes II as Meherdates, a form definitely later than that of the inscription. The forms of the letters agree with the earlier rather than the later date. Finally, the name Gotarzes ceases to appear in the same year as the commonly accepted date for the death of Mithradates II, 87 B.C. On this point see p. 44 and Herzfeld, *Am Tor von Asien*, pp. 39 f.

^{63a} PW, art. "Tigranes," No. 1.

⁶⁴ Strabo xi. 14. 15.

VIII Lathyrus. A certain Laodice, when she was attacked by the Parthians, who had now reached the Euphrates,⁶⁵ summoned Antiochus, who fell in the fighting.⁶⁶

Rome deemed it time to interfere in 92 B.C. and commissioned Sulla to replace Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia on his throne. The real but not avowed object was to curb the growing power of Mithradates of Pontus. The rapid advance of Parthia toward the Roman frontier was no doubt a matter of some concern. Orobazus was sent as ambassador of Parthia to meet Sulla on the Euphrates, probably near Melitene. The Parthian asked for the friendship of the Roman people and perhaps also an alliance both offensive and defensive. Schooled in Hellenistic rather than Latin tradition as Orobazus undoubtedly was, he assumed his request would be taken literally, and never dreamed it implied an offer to become tributary. Sulla had little realization of Parthia's military strength and still less of her future potentialities. In Roman eyes Parthia was overshadowed by the more obvious peril of Armenia and Pontus.⁶⁷ Sulla

⁶⁵ Plut. *Sulla* 5.

⁶⁶ Josephus *Ant.* xiii. 371. The text calls her queen of the Γαλιηνῶν—perhaps an attempt by a copyist to make them Gauls. Some correction is demanded. The Sameni (see Steph. Byz. s.v.), an otherwise unknown Arab tribe, have been suggested. See Gutschmid, *Geschichte Irans*, pp. 80 f., and J. Dobiáš, "Les premiers rapports des Romains avec les Parthes," *Archiv or.*, III (1931), 221–23 (full discussion and bibliography).

⁶⁷ On the mission of Sulla and the meeting with the Parthian ambassador see Plut. *Sulla* 5; Livy *Epit.* lxx; Ruf. Fest. 15; Vell. Pat. ii. 24. 3. Dobiáš, *op. cit.*, pp. 215–56, gives an excellent treatment of the subject.

overplayed his hand and treated Orobazus with some arrogance; nevertheless a treaty seems to have been concluded, or at any rate some understanding was reached.⁶⁸ Orobazus was later executed because he had meekly submitted to the treatment accorded him by Sulla and had thus failed to uphold the dignity of Parthia.⁶⁹ This diplomatic blunder on the part of Sulla must have drawn the three great proponents of oriental imperialism closer together than ever before. Mithradates of Parthia took to wife Aryazate,⁷⁰ surnamed Automa, the daughter of the Great King

⁶⁸ Livy *Epit.* c refers to the treaty with Lucullus; but Ruf. Fest. 15' Florus i. 46. 4, and Orosius vi. 13. 2, all following Livy, seem to indicate some agreement with Sulla. Cf. Dobiáš, *op. cit.*, pp. 219 f.

⁶⁹ Plut. *Sulla* 5.

⁷⁰ Our source, Avroman parchment I, is dated 225 of an unspecified era which, following the arguments of E. H. Minns, "Parchments of the Parthian Period from Avroman in Kurdistan," *JHS*, XXXV (1915), 22–65, I take to be the Seleucid, making the date 87 B.C. If it were the Arsacid era, the date would be 23 B.C. The question cannot yet be settled with certainty; but the Avroman parchments show undoubted relationships to contemporary Babylonian business documents, which in every known case where single dating is found employ the Seleucid, not the Arsacid, era. The year 87, not 23, is the time when a Parthian king would boastfully place his Armenian wife between his two sister-wives in his titulary. Tigranes II, who cannot have come to the throne much before 20 B.C., likewise bore, however, according to his coins, the title "great king"; see E. T. Newell, *Some Unpublished Coins of Eastern Dynasts* ("Numismatic Notes and Monographs," No. 30 [New York, 1926]), p. 13. On the arguments for the Arsacid era see Rostovtzeff and Welles, "A Parchment Contract Loan," *Yale Classical Studies*, II (1931), 41 f. Other articles on the Avroman documents are: Ludwig Mitteis, "Miscellen," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Romanistische Abteilung*, XXXVI (1915), 425–29; A. Cowley, "The Pahlavi Document from Avroman," *JRAS*, 1919, pp. 147–54; P. M. Meyer, *Juristische*

Tigranes, and allied himself with Mithradates of Pontus.⁷¹

Some business documents dated in the reign of Arsaces, king of kings, with a date corresponding to 93 B.C.,⁷² and astronomical ephemerides dated under Arsaces in years corresponding to 92/91 B.C.⁷³ suggest that Mithradates was then in control of Babylonia. But early in 91 B.C.⁷⁴ a Gotarzes (I), king, with his queens Ashi²abatum and another whose name we cannot read,⁷⁵ appears on tablets from Babylon. Gotarzes, the former satrap of satraps, had now set

Papyri (Berlin, 1920), pp. 120–24; J. M. Unvala, "On the Three Parchments from Avroman in Kurdistan," *Bull. School of Or. Studies*, I (1920), 125–44.

⁷¹ Appian *Mith.* 15.

⁷² R. Campbell Thompson, *A Catalogue of the Late Babylonian Tablets in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford (London, 1927), pp. 28 f.; Strassmaier in *ZA*, III (1888), 133 f.

⁷³ 156 A.E., [220] S.E., on one; 15[6] A.E., [220] S.E., on the other. See Kugler, *Sternkunde*, II, 500.

⁷⁴ The date in Reisner, *Hymnen*, No. 51, was miswritten by the ancient scribe as 6 II Addaru, 155 A.E., 221 S.E.; but since 155 A.E. had no second Addaru the Arsacid date must be changed to 157 to correspond to the correct Seleucid one. The Arsaces of this hymn is almost certainly Gotarzes, for in 89 B.C. Queen Ashi²abatum appears as his consort; see *ZA*, VI (1891), 222.

⁷⁵ Reisner, *loc. cit.* Minns, "Avroman Parchments," *JHS*, XXXV (1915), 34 f., texts *h-j*, transliterates the GAŠAN sign as *bēlu* ("lady"), whereas *ibid.*, p. 35, *n*, and p. 36, *p*, he transliterates exactly the same sign as *šarratu* ("queen"). This is correct, though confusing, for the GAŠAN sign may be transliterated either way; but Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 587, attempts to deduce historical evidence on the basis of the titles *bēlu* and *šarratu*! Strassmaier in *ZA*, VIII (1893), 112, the source for both Minns and Tarn, was aware of the double value: "... *bilit* (oder: *šarratu*)."

himself up as an independent ruler in Babylonia;⁷⁶ but, as we shall see, there is evidence which leads us to believe that Mithradates still retained control of Iran and northern Mesopotamia, a district always more closely united with the plateau and with Syria than with Babylonia.⁷⁷

Shortly before his death Mithradates received as a prisoner the Seleucid king Demetrius III, nicknamed Eucaerus, brother of Philippos Epiphanes Philadelphus, the ruler of northern Syria, who had established his capital at Damascus. In 88 B.C. a war broke out between the two brothers. When Philip was besieged in Beroea (Aleppo), his ally Strato, dynast of Beroea, appealed for aid to a pro-Parthian Arab tyrant, Aziz,⁷⁸ probably the ruler of Emesa (Homs), and to the Parthian governor of northern Mesopotamia, Mithradates Sinaces. The response was immediate, and Demetrius found himself the besieger besieged; forced at length to surrender, he was taken to Mithra-

⁷⁶ The sole *fact* which these tablets provide is that Gotarzes was then recognized as king in Babylon; the inference regarding the extent of his territory remains uncertain.

⁷⁷ Gotarzes and his immediate successor, Orodes, are the only Parthian kings in all the numerous documents of the period mentioned by name rather than by their title Arsaces. The conclusion is obvious: the name was necessary to denote *which* Arsaces was meant, and we have here evidence of conflict between Mithradates and his former satrap of satraps. On the parallel usage of the coins cf. McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia*, p. 223.

⁷⁸ Mss., Ζιζοῦ.

dates II, by whom he was well treated.⁷⁹ This event, which took place in 87 B.C.,⁸⁰ is the last dated occurrence in the reign of Mithradates II, and we have evidence which suggests that he died soon thereafter. Mithradates had controlled Iran, including Kurdistan, and northern Mesopotamia,⁸¹ while Gotarzes held sway in Babylonia.⁸² Upon the death of his great opponent the personal name of Gotarzes was immediately dropped from the tablets, since there was no longer necessity for a distinction between contenders for the title, and he appears simply as Arsaces, king.⁸³

Mithradates II had been a friend and ally of Tigranes of Armenia. On his death the latter felt free, not to say urged, to proceed against Gotarzes, who

⁷⁹ Josephus *Ant.* xiii. 384-86. Justin xlii. 4 is confused between Mithradates II and Mithradates III; Trog. Pomp. xlii was apparently not the source of error, since he places a number of kings between Mithradates and Orodes.

⁸⁰ The last coins of Demetrius are dated 88/87 B.C.; see Ernest Babelon, *Les rois de Syrie, d'Arménie, et de Commagène* (Paris, 1890), p. clxxii, and J. Eckhel, *Doctrina numorum veterum*, III (2d ed.; Vindobonae, 1828), 245.

⁸¹ Note the Iranian characteristics of his drachms, Wroth, *Parthia*, Pl. VIII, on which Mithradates appears as an old man. Ms. Avroman I, dated 87 B.C., was found in Kurdistan. On Mesopotamia see p. 48.

⁸² Tablets dated in the reign of "Arsaces who is called Gotarzes" continue until 87 B.C.; see Epping and Strassmaier in *ZA*, VI (1891), 222 and 226.

⁸³ Reisner, *Hymnen*, Nos. 27, 49, and 55; Epping and Strassmaier in *ZA*, V (1890), 355.

was perhaps not of the Arsacid line. Tigranes took back the seventy valleys;⁸⁴ he invaded Gorduene, besides overrunning the region about Nineveh; and Adiabene, with the important center of Arbela, fell into his hands.⁸⁵ Thence he advanced into Media, where he burned the royal palace at Adrapana (Artaman) on the great road to the west of Ecbatana.⁸⁶ Atropatene became his vassal state. Eventually Tigranes carried his arms victoriously throughout northern Mesopotamia and as far west as Syria and Phoenicia, flaunting in the very faces of the Parthians their customary title, king of kings,⁸⁷ never claimed by Gotarzes.

Gotarzes continued to control Babylonia until 81/80 B.C.⁸⁸ But in April, 80, there appears on the tablets an Orodes (I),⁸⁹ the use of whose personal

⁸⁴ This is implied in his subsequent offer (Memnon [*FHG*, III, 556 f., fr. 58. 2]) to return them.

⁸⁵ Strabo xi. 14. 15; Plut. *Lucullus* 21 and 26.

⁸⁶ Isid. Char. *Mans. Parth.* 6; cf. Orosius vi. 4. 9. Plut. *Lucullus* 14 says that Tigranes cut the Parthians off from Asia.

⁸⁷ Appian *Syr.* 48; Plut. *Lucullus* 14; Josephus *Ant.* xiii. 419-21; Justin xl. 1; Eutrop. *Brev.* vi. 8.

⁸⁸ [167] A.E., [2131] S.E., i.e., 81/80 B.C., Reisner, *Hymnen*, No. 49. The insertion in the Parthian line of an "Artabanus II" to rule from 88 to 77 B.C. has been suggested by Gutschmid, *Geschichte Irans*, p. 81 and n. 1, followed by Wroth, *Parthia*, p. xxxi, but this is now generally rejected; see p. 16, n. 66. The coins formerly assigned to him must follow those of Mithradates II, and they should be given to Gotarzes, Orodes, or Sinatruces.

⁸⁹ Strassmaier in *ZA*, III (1888), 135, and VIII (1893), 112; Epping in *ZA*, IV (1889), 78. E. Schrader in *SPAW*, 1890, p. 1327, n. 1, on the basis of a re-examination by Bezold of the tablet published in *ZA*, VIII,

name again suggests conflict with the reigning Arsaces, presumably Gotarzes, who is henceforth no longer known to us. Orodes ruled but a brief span, for in 76/75 B.C. an Arshakan, king, and his sister-wife, Isbubarza, queen, appear on the tablets.⁹⁰ This must be Sinatruces, who was undoubtedly on the throne by that date.⁹¹ Sinatruces⁹² was an old man of eighty⁹³ when recalled from among the Sacaraucae to rule over Parthia. Although assisted by these nomads, he presumably was related to the Arsacidae,⁹⁴ and this would explain why he was summoned to end a period of dissension. In the winter of 72/71 B.C. Mithradates of Pontus requested assistance against the Romans, but the aged Sinatruces was in no position to antagonize such powerful opponents and re-

112, rejects *šar šarrâni*, but he restores it in his transliteration. Strassmaier's cuneiform copy should certainly be read *šar šarrâni*. See also Kugler (*Sternkunde*, II, 447, No. 26), who follows Strassmaier.

⁹⁰ Strassmaier in *ZA*, VIII (1893), 112; Kugler, *Sternkunde*, II, 447 f.

⁹¹ Sinatruces died in 70 or 69 B.C.; see Phlegon fr. 12. 6 (J, II B, p. 1164). He ruled seven years according to Lucian *Long.* 15.

⁹² Spellings are: Sintricus, Appian *Mith.* 104; Sinatrocles or Sinatroces, Lucian *Long.* 15; Sinatruces, Phlegon fr. 12. 7 (J, II B, p. 1164).

⁹³ Lucian *Long.* 15; cf. his appearance on the coins, Wroth, *Parthia*, pp. 42 f. and Pl. X.

⁹⁴ Rawlinson, *Sixth Mon.*, p. 139 and n. 4, suggests that he was a son of Mithradates I and a brother of Phraates II. Had he been a candidate from among the Sacaraucae, they would surely have selected a younger man.

fused.⁹⁵ The old king died in 70 or 69 B.C. and was succeeded by his son Phraates III.

With the reigns of Sinatruces and his successors we reach a period for which our sources are both more extensive and easier of interpretation. Let us turn therefore from the western part of the empire to the eastern frontier and examine the events of the past hundred years, events which molded and shaped new boundaries and new customs and which had a powerful effect on the politics of the empire as a whole.

⁹⁵ Memnon (*FHG*, III, 549, fr. 43.2).

CHAPTER III

THE INDO-IRANIAN FRONTIER

EVIDENCE for the story of the eastern frontier of Parthia is scanty, for events there were too remote to interest western historians and archaeological work in eastern Iran has hardly begun. Indian history, which might supplement our inadequate information from the west, helps but little, since, in spite of considerable evidence both literary and archaeological in character and years of study by excellent scholars, the chronology of the period remains still uncertain. Fortunately the accounts of Chinese travelers and historians are fairly complete and accurate, and they possess the additional advantage that events mentioned can be accurately dated. From them, more than from any other source, we can obtain a few clues to the still uncertain question of the Indo-Scythian kingdoms.¹

In the period between 174 and 165 B.C.² a tribe

¹ Little new evidence has been uncovered in the past twenty years, and most of the articles go back to common sources. The bibliography in this chapter is not complete; additional titles will be found in the works cited and in the *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology* (Leyden, 1928—).

² J. Klaproth, *Tableaux historiques de l'Asie depuis la monarchie de Cyrus jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1826), p. 132; S. K. Shiratori, "Ueber den Wu-sun-Stamm in Centralasien," *Keleti Szemle*, III (1902), 115 f.;

known to the Chinese as the Yüeh-chi, who dwelt in the province of Kansu, were attacked by their neighbors, the Hsiung-nu or Huns. As a blow delivered on the last of a series of balls is transmitted to others in contact with it, so this movement of the Huns was reflected far and wide among the tribes to the west. The Greek name for the Yüeh-chi is somewhat uncertain; they were a composite group of which the Tochari formed the bulk and the Arsi the ruling or most important element.³ When the Yüeh-chi were driven from their homeland, they came into conflict with a tribe known as the Sak (modern Sai or Sē), who lived in the region of the Jaxartes River. These were the Sacae or Scyths of the Greek and Roman writers, and in this case probably the Sacaraucae, one of the two principal divisions of the Sacae.⁴ The

O. Franke, *Beiträge aus chinesischen Quellen zur Kenntnis der Türkvölker und Skythen Zentralasiens* (APAW, 1904, No. 1), pp. 29 and 46; Hirth, "The Story of Chang K'ien," *JAS*, XXXVII (1917), 133; W. E. Clark, "The Importance of Hellenism from the Point of View of Indic-Philology" (I), *Classical Philology*, XIV (1919), 312; Rapson in *CHI*, I, 565; V. A. Smith, *The Early History of India* (4th ed.; Oxford, 1924), p. 240; de Groot, *Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens*. II. *Die Westlande Chinas*, p. 17; Franke, *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, I, 332. On the language of the Yueh-chi see Berthold Laufer, *The Language of the Yüeh-chi or Indo-Scythians* (Chicago, 1917).

³ Jarl Charpentier, "Die ethnographische Stellung der Tocharer," *ZDMG*, LXXI (1917), 347-88, esp. pp. 387 f.; cf. similar conclusions reached by W. W. Tarn, "Sel.-Parth. Studies," *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XVI (1930), 106-11. See also Sylvain Lévi, "Le Tokharien," *JAS*, CCXXII (1933), 1-30, and H. W. Bailey, "Ttagara," *Bull. School of Or. Studies*, VIII (1935-37), 883-921.

⁴ Tarn, *op. cit.*, p. 116, and in *CAH*, IX, 582 f. See also Franke, "The Identity of the Sok with the Sakas," *JRAS*, 1907, pp. 675-77;

Yüeh-chi occupied the lands of the Sak and forced the Sak to move westward before them into Bactria.⁵ The Sacae, by this time a large horde consisting partly of Sacaraucae and Massagetae and partly of other smaller groups gathered en route, were thus forced into Ta-hsia (Bactria).⁶

Determination of the time when this migration came into conflict with the Parthians depends upon the uncertain date of the Parthian expansion to the east. While the Parthian invasion of India under Mithradates I (171-138 B.C.) can hardly be styled a "legend,"⁷ there is no good evidence as yet for such conquests beyond the statement of Orosius, a late writer of uncertain accuracy.⁸ If by Hydaspes he

V. A. Smith, "The Śakas in Northern India," *ZDMG*, LXI (1907), 403-21; Heinrich Lüders, "Die Śakas und die 'nordarische' Sprache," *SPAW*, 1913, pp. 406-27; Sten Konow, "On the Nationality of the Kuṣāṇas," *ZDMG*, LXVIII (1914), 85-100; PW, art. "Sakai" (1920).

⁵ For the Chinese sources see pp. 42 f., n. 57. The late Dr. Laufer of Field Museum, Chicago, was kind enough to offer suggestions as to the relative merits of the translations.

⁶ Herzfeld, "Sakastan," *AMI*, IV (1932), 21-25, believes that Ferghana was the point from which the Sacae began their wanderings. His identification of Wu-sun as Ferghana is against the almost universal opinion of Sinologists, who believe Ferghana to be Ta-yüan.

⁷ As does Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 579.

⁸ Orosius v. 4. 16. Note that the drachms collected by G. P. Tate in Seistan (Rapson, "Note on Ancient Coins," *JRAS*, 1904, p. 677) begin with Mithradates II. The small number of coins, however, largely negates the value of the evidence. For a chronological table based on an acceptance of Orosius see V. A. Smith, "The Indo-Parthian Dynasties," *ZDMG*, LX (1906), 71 f.

meant not the Indian Jhelum but some other stream, the Porali, or possibly even the Median Hydaspes of Vergil,⁹ then Parthian conquests in India must remain in doubt. Orosius was influenced by the post-Augustan literary tradition, in which the gem-bearing Hydaspes figured prominently.¹⁰

If the identification of Turiva¹¹ with Traxiana¹² in the upper Ochus River valley be accepted, then the reign of Mithradates I brought the Parthians into a position where contact with the advancing Sacae was inevitable. In 130 B.C. Phraates II engaged the services of a body of Saca mercenaries (see pp. 35 f.), and shortly thereafter the flood of invaders must have reached the eastern provinces. The remnants of the Bactrian kingdom were swept away by these hordes,¹³

⁹ *Georg.* iv. 211. Cf. PW, art. "Hydaspes," No. 2, followed by Rapson in *CHI*, I, 568. Rawlinson, *Sixth Mon.*, pp. 78 f., saw the situation correctly. Cf. also Herzfeld, "Sakastan," *AMI*, IV (1932), 40, who suggests the Choaspes near Susa.

¹⁰ Horace *Od.* i. 22. 8; Seneca *Medea* 723 ff. and *Herc. Oet.* 628; Lucan *De bell. civ.* iii. 236 and viii. 227; Pliny *Hist. nat.* vi. 71; Statius *Thebais* viii. 237; Dionysius Periegetes 1138 f.; Claudian *Paneg. dictus Probino et Olybrio* 70-80, *In Rufinum* ii. 243, *Paneg. tertio cons. Hon.* 4, *Paneg. quarto cons. Hon.* 601, *Paneg. dictus Manlio Theodoro* 29, and *De raptu Proserpinae* ii. 82 and iii. 325. Note the frequency of the references in Claudian, who immediately preceded Orosius.

¹¹ Strabo xi. 11. 2.

¹² Tarn, "Sel.-Parth. Studies," *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XVI (1930), 122-26. On the "campaign coins" which mention Traxiana, see p. 59 and n. 16.

¹³ Tarn, "Notes on Hellenism in Bactria and India," *JHS*, XXII (1902), 268-93; Hugh George Rawlinson, *Bactria—the History of a Forgotten Empire* (London, 1912); Eduard Meyer in *Encyc. Brit.*, art. "Bactria."

against whom the Parthians threw the full weight of their military forces. The severity of this struggle is shown by the fact that two Parthian kings, Phraates II (138/37-*ca* 128 B.C.) and his successor Artabanus II (*ca* 128-124/23 B.C.), lost their lives in battle against the Sacae.

Individual groups may have penetrated into the heart of the Parthian empire, perhaps even as far as Mesopotamia; but the majority of the Sacae were turned back by the exertions of the Parthians, and thus the Roman orient was spared their ravages. The explanation for the close interrelation in later times between the Sacae and the Parthians lies in the contacts which occurred as the hordes moved slowly southward toward India, contacts which must also explain the Parthian cultural influences at Taxila in India. While a portion of the Sacae evidently turned southward from the great road and entered India through Ki-pin,¹⁴ others must have passed through

¹⁴ Ki-pin, which shifted its position at various periods, has not been identified with certainty. Christian Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde* (2d ed.; Leipzig, 1867 and 1874), II, 369 and n. 5, and Herzfeld, "Sakastan," *AMI*, IV (1932), 31-35, on historical grounds believe it part of Arachosia. Lévi and Chavannes, "L'Itinéraire d'Ou K'ong," *JA*, 9. sér., VI (1895), 371-84; Franke, *Beiträge (APAW)*, 1904, No. 1, pp. 55 f., and Hirth, "Story of Chang K'ien," *JAOS*, XXXVII (1917), 133, suggest Kashmir, an identification to which the late Dr. Laufer agreed. Klaproth, *Tableaux hist.*, p. 133, and Wiegner, *Textes historiques*, I, 716, identify Ki-pin with Kabul; but, as Rapson in *CHI*, I, 563, pointed out, the Kabul valley was still in the possession of the Yavana princes and no numismatic evidence of the early Saka kings has been found there. See also H. W. Jacobson, *An Early History of Sogdiana* (unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago, 1935), pp. 14 f. Both Rapson, *loc. cit.*, and F. W. Thomas,

eastern Parthia and entered India perhaps through the Bolân Pass in the Brahui Mountains.¹⁵

Even the energetic Mithradates II was apparently unable to regain complete control of the eastern provinces, though the Sacae may have acknowledged some form of vassalage. After his death one of his successors sometime between 87 and 75 B.C. made a series of campaigns in the east and struck coins to commemorate the recovery of Margiana, Traxiana, and Aria.¹⁶

When the Sacae entered India remains uncertain, and new evidence must be forthcoming to settle the question. The date of the first Indo-Scythian king,

"The Date of Kaniska," *JRAS*, 1913, pp. 634 f., feel that the physical difficulties of the Kashmir route preclude a large tribal migration. Obviously all the Sacae could not have entered India by this route, or so large a Parthian element would not be present in their culture.

¹⁵ Rapson in *CHI*, I, 564. The writer does not agree with the view of F. W. Thomas, "Sakastana," *JRAS*, 1906, pp. 181-216, that the Sacae had long been in eastern Iran.

¹⁶ Wroth, *Parthia*, p. 40 and n. 1. On the assignment of these coins see pp. 40 f., n. 51. Isid. Char. *Mans. Parth.* 18 f. offers only a *post quem* date of about 1 B.C. on the acquisition of Seistan and Arachosia. Tarn in *CAH*, IX, 587, cites the Chinese sources as recording an independent kingdom, "Woo-yi-shan-li," which occupies the same territory as these provinces about 75 B.C. A similar statement was earlier made by Gutschmid, *Geschichte Irans*, pp. 79 f., also without reference. Neither V. A. Smith, "The Indo-Parthian Dynasties," *ZDMG*, LX (1906), 55, nor the writer has been able to locate the source for this statement; cf. de Groot, *Chinesische Urkunden*. II. *Die Westlande Chinas*, pp. 91-93. Note that the Chinese sources almost invariably use such names as Parthia, Chaldaea, Bactria, and Arachosia in a provincial sense rather than in a more all-embracing meaning.

Maues,¹⁷ offers no solution, since it hinges on the doubtful interpretation of a much discussed word in the Taxila copper-plate inscription of the satrap Patika¹⁸ and on the uncertain dating of an era. Probably Maues should be identified with the Great King Moga of the inscription, which is dated in the year 78 of some unspecified era. The month name is Parthian. Since 169 B.C. is out of the question, this cannot be the Arsacid era, which began in 247 B.C.; even if the 78 stands for 178, the date would be 69 B.C.¹⁹ Rapson suggested that the era may possibly mark the capture of Seistan by Mithradates I;²⁰ but a date

¹⁷ V. A. Smith, *Early Hist. of India* (4th ed.), pp. 241 f., because of his acceptance of an Indian invasion by Mithradates I, dates Maues about 95 B.C. Rapson in *CHI*, I, 570, places the invasion between 88 and 72 B.C. Cf. Louis de la Vallée-Poussin, *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas* (Paris, 1930), pp. 262 ff. On the Indo-Scythians see Alexander Cunningham, "Later Indo-Scythians," *Num. Chron.*, 3d ser., XIII (1893), 93-128 and 166-202; Sylvain Lévi, "Notes sur les Indo-Scythes," *J.A.*, 9. sér., VIII (1896), 444-84, and IX (1897), 5-42 (tr. into English in *Indian Antiquary*, XXXII [1903], 381-89 and 417-26, and XXXIII [1904], 10-16); V. A. Smith, "The Kushân, or Indo-Scythian, Period of Indian History," *JRAS*, 1903, pp. 1-64, and "Indo-Parthian Dynasties," *ZDMG*, LX (1906), 49-72; J. F. Fleet, "Moga, Maues, and Vonones," *JRAS*, 1907, pp. 1013-40; R. D. Banerji, "The Scythian Period of Indian History," *Indian Antiquary*, XXXVII (1908), 25-75; Sten Konow, "Indoskythische Beiträge," *SPAW*, 1916, pp. 787-827.

¹⁸ G. Bühler, "Taxila Plate of Patika," in *Epigraphia Indica*, IV (1896/97), No. 5, pp. 54-57; Rapson in *CHI*, I, 570. For a good general discussion see L. de la Vallée-Poussin, *op. cit.*, pp. 272 f.

¹⁹ Edward Thomas, "Bactrian Coins and Indian Dates," *Academy*, Dec. 26, 1874, pp. 686 f.; *Archaeological Survey of Southwest India*, II (1878), 31 (not available).

²⁰ Rapson in *CHI*, I, 570; cf. pp. 19 f.

as late as 9-6 B.C. for the inscription is favored by some on the theory that the era began after the death of Mithradates II in 88/87 B.C.²¹

Heretofore Parthia has been considered almost solely from the Graeco-Roman viewpoint. Parthian influence in India must be regarded as an Indo-Iranian culture in which other elements such as the Hellenistic are present. In a similar manner many phases of the Parthian occupation of Dura-Europus and Seleucia on the Tigris which hitherto have found no counterpart in western Hellenism may be explained as local Graeco-Iranian. That in the Parthian period both India and Mesopotamia faced more toward Iran than toward Hellenized Syria has only recently been recognized.²² Proof for this lies in material excavated at Taxila, Seleucia, and Dura-Europus, some of which has already appeared in print, though much is still in press or remains unpublished in museums.

From the time of the Indian invasion by the Sacae, the latter are so closely connected both politically and culturally with the Parthians that they cannot be distinguished one from the other. The fact that "very few true Parthian coins are found in India"²³ furnishes additional evidence for the belief that the

²¹ See the articles by Konow cited on p. 64, n. 30, and McGovern, *Early Empires* (in press).

²² So both Rapson in *CHI*, I, 568, and M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Caravan Cities* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 157 and 214 f., and in "Dura and the Problem of Parthian Art," *Yale Classical Studies*, V (1935), 298 f.

²³ Sir John Marshall in a letter of April 19, 1935, to the writer.

Sacae and the Pahlavas were independent of the Parthian empire, though they had been vassals of that power.²⁴ In spite of the warlike reputation which the Parthians attained in the west by virtue of their successes against the Romans, they were a people quick to realize and profit by the advantages of peace. Wanton destruction was not one of their characteristics; they had rather a canny instinct for a pact advantageous to both parties. The ability of Mithradates, combined with his victories on the battlefield, would result in agreements for mutual benefit. Treaties would be drawn up which according to the usual Parthian custom bound the signatories within their loose feudal system and guaranteed commercial rights. Indian officialdom probably contained both Parthians and Sacae, but little evidence can be obtained from their names, for one of the first acts of a newly elevated officer would be the adoption of a garb and name suitable to his new station.

For the organization of the Indo-Scythian kingdoms and their relations with the feudatories of southeastern Iran we must depend almost entirely upon numismatic evidence of unknown provenience. Though Rapson's arrangement²⁵ may fit all the facts

²⁴ Note that the Seleucids and the Sasanids both utilized elephants when their possessions extended far enough east to enable them to secure the beasts. There is no record of the Parthians using them in war.

²⁵ *CHI*, I, chap. xxiii. For a different interpretation see Herzfeld, "Sakastan," *AMI*, IV (1932), 91-98, and a briefer account in the *Cambridge Shorter History of India* (ed. H. H. Dodwell; Cambridge, 1934),

now available, new evidence may bring radical changes at any time.

Normally there were three contemporary rulers of royal rank in eastern Iran and northwestern India: a "king of kings" in Iran, some junior member of his family associated with him, and another "king of kings" in India. The junior member in Iran usually became in due course the supreme ruler in India.²⁶ The belief that the title "king of kings" was not used in Parthia from 88 to 57 B.C.²⁷ led logically to the correct conclusion that the rulers of Iran and India were independent of Parthia; but at least one case of its use in Parthia in 64 B.C. is known.²⁸

In eastern Iran the ruler issued coins together with that member of the family associated with him in the government. The legend of the king is in Greek, and that of the prince, on the reverse, in Kharosthi; since the use of Kharosthi in this period is known from Arachosia only, we may infer that the prince governed that territory.

The evidence of the coins²⁹ and the Taxila plate

pp. 62-85. Under Herzfeld's arrangement there would reign only two kings before Gondopharnes, i.e., Maues and Azes; but cf. pp. 64 f.

²⁶ An interesting, though earlier, parallel to this custom is found in Elam; see Cameron, *Hist. of Early Iran*, pp. 20 and 71 f.

²⁷ Rapson in *CHI*, I, 569.

²⁸ Kugler, *Sternkunde*, II, 447, No. 31.

²⁹ For coins of the Indo-Scythian period see Percy Gardner, *The Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India in the British Museum* (London, 1886); E. Drouin, "Chronologie et numismatique des rois indo-

inscription suggests that Maues conquered Gandhara, including Pushkalavati to the west and Taxila to the east of the Indus River. But in the eastern Punjab the conquests of Maues remained to be completed by two of his successors, the first of whom was Azes I.³⁰ This king associated with himself one Azilises, who eventually succeeded him.³¹ The arrange-

scythes," *Rev. num.*, 3. sér., VI (1888), 8-52; A. Cunningham, *Coins of the Indo-Scythians* (London, 1892), reprinted from *Num. Chron.*, 1888, pp. 199-248; 1889, pp. 268-311; 1890, pp. 103-72; 1892, pp. 40-82 and 98-159; Rapson, "Indian Coins," in G. Bühler, *Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, II 3, Heft B (Strassburg, 1897); V. A. Smith, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, Vol. I (Oxford, 1906); J. H. Marshall, "Excavations at Taxila," *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India*, 1912/13, pp. 1-52; Richard B. Whitehead, *Catalogue of Coins in the Panjab Museum, Lahore. I. Indo-Greek Coins* (Oxford, 1914).

³⁰ J. H. Marshall, "The Date of Kanishka," *JRAS*, 1914, p. 986, followed by Rapson in *CHI*, I, 570 f., makes Azes the founder of the Vikrama era in 58 B.C. L. de la Vallée-Poussin, *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas*, p. 267, places his death in that year. On the inscriptional evidence see A. F. Hoernle, "Readings from the Arian Pāli," *Indian Antiquary*, X (1881), 324-31; G. Bühler, "Taxila Plate of Patika," *Epig. Ind.*, IV (1896/97), No. 5, pp. 54-57; A. M. Boyer, "L'Inscription en Kharoṣṭhi du 15 Āṣāḍha 136," *J.A.*, II. sér., V (1915), 281-98; Sten Konow, "Taxila Inscription of the Year 136," *Epig. Ind.*, XIV (1917/18), No. 20, pp. 284-95; Ramaprasad Chanda, "Taxila Inscription of the Year 136," *JRAS*, 1920, pp. 319-24; Konow, "The So-called Takht-i-Bahi Inscription of the Year 103," *Epig. Ind.*, XVIII (1925/26), No. 28, pp. 261-82; Konow, "The Zeda Inscription of the Year 11," *Epig. Ind.*, XIX (1927/28), No. 1, pp. 1-15; Konow in *CII*, II 1, pp. lxxxii-xciv and 1 ff.; Konow, "Notes on Indo-Scythian Chronology," *Journ. of Indian History*, XII (1933), 1-46.

³¹ Konow, "The So-called Takht-i-Bahi Inscription," pp. 273 f., suggested that Azes and Azilises were the same person; but he now rejects this idea in his "Notes on Indo-Scythian Chronology," p. 24. Cf. for evi-

ment of these and the following rulers is based solely on the coinage; in the present case Azes, as the elder, appears on the obverse with a Greek inscription, and Azilises, on the reverse, with one in Kharoṣṭhi.³²

Shortly after the first Saca king commenced his rule in India, a monarch with the Parthian name of Vonones established himself in eastern Iran and took the imperial title. His reign cannot be dated, and it seems impossible to identify him with Vonones I of Parthia (A.D. 8-11).³³ The dynasty established by Vonones is often called "Pahlava" to distinguish it from the contemporary ruling family of Parthia. Azilises as king of kings in India made further conquests in the Punjab; but either voluntarily or perforce he relinquished Arachosia, which came under the control of Vonones. It was ruled by Vonones' brother Spalahores, who held the territory conjointly with his son Spalagadames.³⁴ One of the Indian princes, Azes II, became associated with Azilises in the Indian kingship and eventually succeeded to the supreme power.

dence against the identity of the two N. G. Majumdar, "Notes on the Coins of Azes," in *Ann. Rep. Archaeol. Survey of India*, 1928/29, pp. 169-74 and Pl. LXIV, and Marshall, "Excavations at Taxila," *ibid.*, 1929/30, pp. 72 ff.

³² Gardner, *Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings*, p. 173 and Pl. XXXII 9.

³³ Rapson in *CHI*, I, 573. But cf. Konow in *CII*, II 1, pp. xl-xliii.

³⁴ This is based on the assumption that Spalahores is the equivalent of the Greek Spalyris; so Whitehead, *Cat. of Coins in the Pan. Mus.*, I, 143, followed by Rapson in *CHI*, I, 574.

Vonones was succeeded by Spalirises, who has been identified as a brother of Vonones solely because the coins of Spalirises bear the legend "the king's brother" and Vonones is generally believed to be the king in question.³⁵ Spalirises' son Azes became ruler in Arachosia; and, as we have seen, he was later king of kings in India as Azes II. The next successor whom we know in the Iranian line was a certain Orthagnes. His Iranian name means "victorious," and his coins bear a winged Victory similar to those on the coinage of Vonones I of Parthia, though whether the symbol refers to some conquest or merely to the king's name we cannot tell.

In Arachosia two men were associated at this time in joint rule, Gondopharnes and Guda (or Gudana), possibly a brother of the king of kings Orthagnes. Gondopharnes left Arachosia in A.D. 19 to assume supreme command in India, where he became the most famous of the Pahlava kings. His name also is Iranian, "winner of glory." The coins lead us to suspect that he included within his realm the Pahlava and Saca territory in southeastern Iran and northwestern India as well as the Kabul valley, where large numbers of his coins were found. Abdagases, a nephew(?) of Gondopharnes, acted as viceroy in the new Iranian provinces. Gondopharnes was still in power in A.D. 45, but we do not know the date of his

³⁵ Rapson in *CHI*, I, 573.

death.³⁶ On the basis of numismatic evidence Rapson has suggested that Gondopharnes may have captured some territory from the Parthians. His coins, whether struck alone or with his nephew or his commanders in chief, usually bear the symbol ☸; this mark is found counterstruck on coins of Orodes II (57-37/36 B.C.) and Artabanus III (A.D. 12-38).³⁷

Gondopharnes was succeeded by Pacores, who bears a good Parthian name. Numismatic evidence suggests that he was suzerain in southeastern Iran and that he controlled at least a part of India. His coins, bearing a figure of Victory similar to those of Orthagnes, have been discovered at Taxila; they have also the Gondopharnes symbol and the legend of a well known commander in chief. One more ruler of Seistan is known, Sanabares, conjecturally assigned to that territory because of the Greek legends on his coins.³⁸

The Saca power in India began to dwindle away rapidly under the successors of Gondopharnes. Here the Chinese sources again bring some light. A hundred years or more after the settlement of the Yüeh-

³⁶ Rapson in *CHI*, I, 574-80; J. F. Fleet, "St. Thomas and Gondopharnes," *JRAS*, 1905, pp. 223-36.

³⁷ Rapson in *CHI*, I, 578; Rapson, "Note on Ancient Coins," *JRAS*, 1904, p. 677; A. Cunningham, "Coins of the Sakas," *Num. Chron.*, 1890, p. 119. To this period belongs the "Phraotes" of India whom Apollonius of Tyana visited according to Philostratus *Vita Apoll.* ii. 26 ff. See also Werner Schur, "Die Orientpolitik des Kaisers Nero," *Klio*, Beiheft XV (1923), pp. 69-80.

³⁸ Rapson in *CHI*, I, 580; cf. A. von Sallet, *Die Nachfolger Alex. des Grossen* (Berlin, 1879), pp. 52 f.

chi in Bactria and the departure of the Sacae for India a chief of the Kushans, one of the tribes of the Yüeh-chi, gained supremacy over the entire group (about A.D. 25-81?) and established a kingdom which became known by the name of his tribe. This king, Kujula Kadphises, rapidly expanded his power over Gandhara, Arachosia, and Kabul at the expense of either Gondopharnes or Pacores. Perhaps the Parthian conquests to which the Chinese sources refer³⁹ are those of the Kushans in the Indo-Scythian kingdoms; possibly they may indicate attacks on Parthia proper. The second of the Kushan rulers, V'ima Kadphises, ended his reign not long before the accession of Kanishka, whose date has been so long a subject of discussion (A.D. 125?).⁴⁰

³⁹ Chavannes, "Les pays d'Occident d'après le Heou Han chou," *T'oung pao*, 2. sér., VIII (1907), 190-92; Wieger, *Textes historiques*, I, 716 f.

⁴⁰ Édouard Specht, "Les Indo-Scythes et l'époque du règne de Kanishka," *JA*, 9. sér., X (1897), 152-93; Sylvain Lévi, "Note additionnelle sur les Indo-Scythes," *ibid.*, pp. 526-31, tr. into English in *Indian Antiquary*, XXXIII (1904), 110 ff.; A. M. Boyer, "L'Époque de Kanishka," *JA*, 9. sér., XV (1900), 526-79; H. Oldenberg, "Zwei Aufsätze zur altindischen Chronologie und Literaturgeschichte. 1. Zur Frage nach der Ära des Kanishka," *NGWG*, 1911, pp. 427-41, tr. into English in *Pali Text Society, Journal*, 1910-12, pp. 1-18; J. Kennedy, "The Secret of Kanishka," *JRAS*, 1912, pp. 665-88 and 981-1019; J. F. Fleet, "The Question of Kanishka," *JRAS*, 1913, pp. 95-107; Kennedy, "Sidelights on Kanishka," *ibid.*, pp. 369-78; F. W. Thomas, "The Date of Kanishka," *ibid.*, pp. 627-50; discussion by Rapson, Fleet, Kennedy, V. A. Smith, Barnett, Waddell, Dames, Hoey, and Thomas *ibid.*, pp. 911-1042; J. H. Marshall, "The Date of Kanishka," *JRAS*, 1914, pp. 973-86, with comments by Thomas and Fleet *ibid.*, pp. 987-92. See also bibliography cited by L. de la Vallée-Poussin, *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas*, pp. 318-74, and articles by Konow cited on p. 64, n. 30.

A remnant of the old Saca power existed in the Indus delta for some time. The author of the *Periplus* speaks of the "Parthians" as still in control there and describes the struggles of the various petty chiefs for supremacy.⁴¹

⁴¹ *Periplus* 38; J. W. McCrindle, "Anonymi [Arriani ut fertur] Periplus Maris Erythraei," *Indian Antiquary*, VIII (1879), 107-51; J. Kennedy, "Some Notes on the *Periplus* of the Erythraean Sea," *JRAS*, 1916, pp. 829-37; W. H. Schoff, "As to the Date of the *Periplus*," *JRAS*, 1917, pp. 827-30; J. Kennedy, "Eastern Kings Contemporary with the *Periplus*," *JRAS*, 1918, pp. 106-14.