

June 2013

# Mithridates I: History's Forgotten Conqueror

Cam Rea  
*American Public University System*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.apus.edu/saberandscroll>

 Part of the [Islamic World and Near East History Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Rea, Cam (2013) "Mithridates I: History's Forgotten Conqueror," *Saber and Scroll*: Vol. 2: Iss. 3, Article 11.  
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.apus.edu/saberandscroll/vol2/iss3/11>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the ePress Journals at DigitalCommons@APUS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Saber and Scroll by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@APUS. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@apus.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@apus.edu).

## Mithridates I: History's Forgotten Conqueror

Cam Rea

Parthia, an empire that started with humble origins eventually grew into a behemoth conquering much of Alexander the Great's former empire. Parthia stretched from the borders of India to Asia Minor, from Central Asia to Arabia. The Parthian king who accomplished much of this conquest was known by the name of Mithridates.

King Mithridates I of Parthia (r. 171-138 BCE) undoubtedly inherited a kingdom that was solid and sound in both its economic and military apparatus. Mithridates took the foundation established by Arsaces nearly a hundred years previously and turned it into an empire. He marched east gobbling up lands and kingdoms such as Bactria to the east until Parthia's border touched India. He then marched west into Mesopotamia. His achievements consolidated the future of Parthia's power for centuries to come.<sup>1</sup>

Mithridates' rise to fame was due to his character. His brother Phartes admired him so much that he passed the throne to him. The Roman historian Justin, writing in the 2nd century CE, mentions that the throne was left to Mithridates because he was a "man of extraordinary ability, thinking that more was due to the name of king than to that of father, and that he ought to consult the interests of his country rather than those of his children."<sup>2</sup> Mithridates exhibited qualities that most kings rarely have, experience and maturity. Justin's passage also indicates that Mithridates believed that his subjects came first and not his sons. Mithridates understood that a king could only retain his power so long as the people and nobles were treated fairly. To abuse such power at the expense of his subjects would be devastating. However true Justin's depiction of Mithridates was, is uncertain, what is certain, is that Mithridates was a leader who left a legacy of his conquests starting with Bactria.

### **Invasion of Bactria**

Mithridates' invasion of the Greco-Bactrian Kingdom took place between 171-165 BCE. Justin mentions that the reason for Mithridates' invasion was that the Greco-Bactrians had overextended their borders due to constant warring with their neighbors:

Almost at the same time that Mithridates ascended the throne among the Parthians, Eucratides began to reign among the Bactrians; both of them being great men.

But the fortune of the Parthians, being the more successful, raised them, under this prince, to the highest degree of power; while the Bactrians, harassed with various wars, lost not only their dominions, but their liberty; for having suffered from contentions with the Sogdians, the Arachosians, the Drancae, the Arei and the Indians, they were at last overcome, as if exhausted, by the weaker Parthians.<sup>3</sup>

Justin's passage also mentions that the Parthians were the weaker of the two. However, looks can be deceiving. Parthia was in fact weaker but Greco-Bactria appeared weaker due to over extending its military operations towards the south and east. To make matters worse, the Greco-Bactrian kingdom became much weaker when a coup d'état orchestrated by Eucratides successfully overthrew the Euthydemids dynasty in Bactria. Eucratides' takeover politically divided Greco-Bactria considerably from being a major power. Justin mentions, "the Sogdians, the Arachosians, the Drancae, the Arei" all revolted due to Eucratides' power grab. The Greco-Bactrians were strong but the division caused by Eucratides invited Mithridates in.

Eucratides weakened his state, for Justin also mentions that Eucratides had a number of wars going on even before he fell from power:

Eucratides, however, carried on several wars with great spirit, and though much reduced by his losses in them, yet, when he was besieged by Demetrius king of the Indians, with a garrison of only three hundred soldiers, he repulsed, by continual sallies, a force of sixty thousand enemies. Having accordingly escaped, after a five months' siege, he reduced India under his power.<sup>4</sup>

Eucratides' warring with others to fill his coffers occurred through several or more distinct wars. But these several wars were over a long period of time during his reign. Eucratides was focused on securing not only his domain but expanding his borders towards the south and east. However, Eucratides forgot to secure his western borders.

Mithridates took advantage of Eucratides' blind spot by using spies to gather intelligence on Bactria before he launched an attack. However, Mithridates had another stroke of luck; revolt. Mithridates likely welcomed the rebellion taking place around Bactria when "the Sogdians, the Arachosians, the Drancae, the Arei" revolted.<sup>5</sup> This rebellion placed maximum pressure on Bactrian rule; it was Mithridates' wild card, and it paid off. Eucratides' folly was Mithridates' gain, allowing him to strike Bactria quickly while Bactria was weak and on the offensive. Mithridates had to strike quickly in what almost seems to be a semi-defenseless Bactria due to all the previous wars before

and presently at hand, not to forget that much of the Bactrian military under Eucratides command were most likely engaged in military operations elsewhere. Mithridates gamble paid off. Strabo states that the "satrapy Turiva and that of Aspionus were taken away from Eucratides by the Parthians."<sup>6</sup>

According to Justin, the capture of Turiva and Aspionus greatly affected Eucratides. He declared that "... the Bactrians, harassed with various war, lost not only their dominions, but their liberty."<sup>7</sup> Bactria had lost a great amount of territory. However, it seems that the Bactrians lost something greater, Mithridates may have subdued Bactria itself according to the Greek historian and geographer Strabo. He stated, "they also took a part of Bactriana, having forced the Scythians, and still earlier Eucratides and his followers, to yield to them."<sup>8</sup> Both Justin and Strabo are not saying that Mithridates conquered Bactria, but that he vassalized Bactria, for Eucratides continued to hold his throne after his submission. Mithridates was smart enough to know when to stop, for to continue any further would draw much attention to his activity but more importantly, it was best not to hold complete dominion or annex the territory, for to do so could have resulted in a full-scale revolt due to a quick change in authority. Mithridates understood that it was best to keep still, for he now had a vassal to call upon.

Another interesting aspect in Strabo's statement is that Mithridates forced the Scythians to submit to his rule. To say that the Scythians yielded to his rule is vague, for Scythians inhabited not every province. What Strabo is indicating is that Mithridates' rule was vast, expanding beyond Bactria to the north and south. Once Bactria fell into chaos due to dynastic instability, places like Heart, Seistan, and Gedrosia, among many others, broke from Greek rule in favor of their own. Justin supports Strabo as he mentions examples such as Sogdians, Arachosians, Drancae, and Arei, each of which rebelled and replaced Greek with native rule. Mithridates seems to have conquered or vassalized the areas mentioned that neighbored or were a part of Greco-Bactria and may have gradually advanced toward India. However, it seems unlikely that Mithridates pushed far into India since none of the ancient sources mention it. But there is no doubt that Mithridates did subjugate and vassalize many of named provinces mentioned.<sup>9</sup>

In summary, Eucratides underestimated his enemy through ignorance, believing that they were militarily weak and posed no threat. However, the Parthians launched a surprise attack and were successful in their endeavor by gaining assistance from those who revolted against Eucratides. With Greco-Bactria bloodied, wounded, and vassalized, Mithridates could thus turn his attentions towards the west.

### **Mithridates Invasion of Media**

With the Greco-Bactrian kingdom under his control, he could now

turn west towards the province of Media, and finish what his brother Phaartes had started. One would think that Mithridates would have invaded Media first rather than Bactria. It is not clear why he choose Bactria over Media, but the reason could be due to a man named Timarchus. Seleucid King Antiochus IV appointed Timarchus over Media because he was not only a friend but capable of being an effective satrap in the defense of the Seleucid East. The year Timarchus took over the satrapy of Media is unknown. The reason for his appointment may have been the result of Phaartes' successful invasion of Media around 171 BCE. Timarchus was a capable leader and evidently strong enough to declare and defend his independence from the Seleucids after the death of Antiochus IV in 162 BCE, which the first century CE Greek historian Diodorus mentions:

Emboldened by this decree, he raised an army of considerable size in Media; he also entered into an alliance against Demetrius I with Artaxias, the king of Armenia. Having, moreover, intimidated the neighboring peoples by an impressive display of force, and brought many them under his sway.<sup>10</sup>

Timarchus' break from the Seleucids was due to the succession of Antiochus V Eupator, a nine-year old boy, following the death of Antiochus IV. Antiochus was not the heir, but rather Timarchus may have seen opportunity but it was a mistake, for declaring independence created a two front war.<sup>11</sup> Mithridates still walked the sideline and waited for the right opportunity to conduct a full-scale invasion. Mithridates' reasoning for waiting for such an opportunity could have been due to his brother Phaartes. It is possible that Timarchus defeated and killed Phaartes soon after his appointment to govern Media. This may be why Mithridates decided to look east rather than continue on where his brother left off. Mithridates was not about to challenge a man who was evidently able to field a rather large army. Instead, Mithridates would wait to see what the Seleucid response would be.

News reached Rome that Antiochus V was the new successor, however, Demetrius, brother of Antiochus IV, was actually the successor according to Rome. However Rome liked the idea of a boy king ruling over the Seleucid lands rather than a full-grown man. Before we move on, understand that after the Roman Syrian War which pitted the Roman Republic against the Seleucid Empire resulting in a Roman victory, the Treaty of Apamea in 188 BCE was signed. This treaty ultimately hamstrung Antiochus III and his descendants economically; forcing Antiochus to abandon his European holdings and real estate in Asia west of the Taurus Mountains. Moreover, Antiochus III had to hand over his war elephants and keep only twelve warships for use, but much worse was that for twelve years, the Seleucids sent Rome a massive amount of wealth.<sup>12</sup> The treaty ultimate-

ly bled the Seleucid coffers dry, thus giving Rome hegemony over Seleucid territory and control of the throne.

Demetrius at the time of his brother's death was held hostage in Rome. When he heard the news of Antiochus IV death, he came before the Roman Senate, asking for permission to return home and to claim the throne. The Roman Senate denied his request to return. Demetrius secretly escaped Rome and returned to his home country. Once back in Seleucid territory, he gathered military support and killed the boy king Antiochus V. Once on the throne, Demetrius set out to reclaim and reunite his empire by first going to Media. Once there, Demetrius killed Timarchus, thus bringing back what was left of Media into the Seleucid realm around 160 BCE. Demetrius was granted the title *Soter* "Savior," from the Babylonians for freeing them from Timarchus' rule.<sup>13</sup> Demetrius may have gotten rid of Timarchus, but on the other hand, he inherited Mithridates.

Demetrius' recovery of Media was the moment Mithridates had been waiting for. With the forces of Timarchus defeated and those of Demetrius weakened by war, Mithridates made the push into Media after 160 BCE. Mithridates spent much of his time and attention on conquering Media. According to Justin:

During the course of these proceedings among the Bactrians, a war arose between the Parthians and Medes, and after fortune on each side had been some time fluctuating, victory at length fell to the Parthians; when Mithridates, enforced with this addition to his power, appointed Bacasis over Media, while he himself marched into Hyrcania.<sup>14</sup>

Justin mentions a few interesting aspects in this passage. He indicates that it was a war between "Parthians and the Medes" and not a war between Parthia and the Seleucid Empire. Justin maybe focused on the region where the conflict occurred by using the Seleucid province of Media rather than mentioning the Seleucids. On the other hand, it is possible that Justin's mention of Medes is just that, in which the region of Media is once again independent of Seleucid rule, possibly fragmented, or that the Seleucids only controlled half if not less of the region. Demetrius did recover Media but may have lost it rather quickly due to conflicts back west involving the military and political affairs of the Jews, the region of Cappadocia, and soon an imposter's claim to be the heir of the Seleucid throne. All of this took place between 160 and the time of Demetrius I death in 151 BCE.<sup>15</sup>

Justin further mentions that the conflict between Parthia and Media was a fluctuating war resulting in loss and victory for a short time.<sup>16</sup> If we consider the possibility that Media was divided by the native and Seleucid factions, it seems likely that the native held areas were conquered first and soon after the Seleucid portion; for example, a portion of Media was still under the control of a Seleucid

satrap named Cleomenes, who is last mentioned as late as 148 BCE.<sup>17</sup> Another alternative to consider is that Media was under Seleucid control until 148 BCE, but the Medes just mentioned were those in the region of Media Atropatene. It seems without a doubt that Mithridates overran the territory during his western push.<sup>18</sup> Once Media was secured, he “appointed Bacasis over Media, while he himself marched into Hyrcania.”<sup>19</sup> The Babylonian *Astronomical Diaries* mention a Bagayasa who was believed to be the King’s (Mithridates) brother and was governor of Media and evidently in charge of Babylonia.<sup>20</sup>

Mithridates conquest of Media opened up the possibility of further western expansion. The impact he had on the Seleucid Empire was tremendous: the loss of key territory included the rich trade routes—the Silk Road and the Persian Royal Road—that ran through the eastern provinces were lost, as was the manpower and resources the Seleucids used for military and financial purposes.

### **Mithridates Invasion of Babylonia**

After conquering the Median region, Mithridates marched back to Hyrcania where he resided for four years. It was during that time -- around 145 BCE -- that the Elamite King Kammaskiri left Elam to conduct a campaign in Seleucid Mesopotamia. The Seleucid general Ardaya, stationed in Babylonia, mustered his forces and pushed out of Babylon to counter the Elamite forces. During that time, Kammaskiri was freely plundering the cities of Babylonia with no real resistance and appears to have left before Ardaya arrived. Soon after these events had taken place, Mithridates reappeared on the scene, in approximately 144 BCE, making his way towards Seleucid Mesopotamia. Once he entered Seleucid Mesopotamia, he marched straight for the Seleucia, the former Seleucid capital and captured it.<sup>21</sup>

[Against him] (*the Seleucid king Demetrius Nicator*) Arsaces the king (*Mithridates I*) [went] to Seleucia. [The city of. . . , of] the land of Assur, which before the face of Arsaces 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 (*Seleucid era*), Arsaces the king, on the 30th of the month Du’uzu (9 July).<sup>22</sup>

To secure his precious new possession, he set up a military camp on the other side of the Tigris River called Ctesiphon.<sup>23</sup> After the capture of Seleucia, Mithridates advanced toward Babylon and captured it in the summer of 141 BCE.<sup>24</sup> With Mithridates in control of the Babylonian province, immense pressure was placed upon the Seleucids, for they now had the enemy in their backyard. If Mithridates intended to expand further west, he was temporarily on hiatus, for the Elamites were on their way toward Babylonia.

Around 140 BCE, the Elamites' raids caused alarm in Parthian held Mesopotamia. Mithridates was once again in Hyrcania; when news reached him, he made his way back to Babylonia. The Elamites attacked Apamea-on-the-Silhu. The citizens of Apamea found refuge at Bit-Karkudi on the Tigris. Once the Elamites pillaged what they could at Apamea, they burnt the city down and marched towards Bit-Karkudi. The Parthian general Antiochus left Seleucia and was on his way with citizen troops in hopes of slowing down the Elamite offensive. The Elamites eventually made their way to Babylon and began to tear down, "the brickwork of the Marduk Gate." General Antiochus was able to negotiate with the Elamites (some suggest that he betrayed Mithridates) for which the citizens of Seleucia placed "a curse on Antiochus, the general who is above the 4 generals, because he made common cause with the Elamite." When Mithridates got word of the action, he gave the order for Antiochus to be killed. The Elamite forces would continue to raid Parthian controlled Mesopotamia in search of food, but it was during this period that the Seleucid King Demetrius II would attempt to recover lost lands from the Parthians in his anabasis.<sup>25</sup>

### **A Clash of Kings**

In 138 BCE, Demetrius II launched a campaign of recovery. Justin mentions this endeavor and stated:

As the cities, in consequence, began every where to revolt from his government, he resolved, in order to wipe off the stain of effeminacy from his character, to make war upon the Parthians. The people of the east beheld his approach with pleasure, both on account of the cruelty of Arsacides, king of the Parthians, and because having been accustomed to the old government of the Macedonians, they viewed the pride of the new race with indignation. Being assisted, accordingly, by auxiliary troops from the Persians, Elymaeans, and Bactrians, he routed the Persians in several pitched battles. At length, however, being deceived by a pretended offer of peace, he was made prisoner, and being led from city to city, was shown as a spectacle to the people that had revolted, in mockery of the favour that they had shown him. Being afterwards sent into Hyrcania, he was treated kindly, and suitably to the dignity of his former condition.<sup>26</sup>

The first century CE Romano-Jewish historian Josephus also mentions Demetrius' reason for campaign, which is similar to Justin's passage:

Demetrius passed over [Euphrates], and came into Mesopotamia, as desirous to retain that country still, as well as Babylon; and when he should have obtained the dominion of the upper provinces, to lay a foundation for recovering his entire kingdom; for those Greeks and Macedonians who dwelt there frequently sent ambassadors to him, and promised, that if he would come to them, they would deliver themselves up to him, and assist him in fighting against Arsaces, the king of the Parthians.

According to Justin and Josephus, Demetrius was enticed by the lucrative deal offered by the Greeks and Macedonians living in Mesopotamia, particularly Babylon. Demetrius saw this as an opportunity to gain wealth and to swell his military ranks. If his campaign was successful against the Parthians, he would be able to make war against King Tryphon in an attempt to regain control of Coele-Syria where Tryphon was popular among the Jews. Demetrius was not the most popular fellow in his kingdom, whether Jew or Greco-Macedonian. Diodorus mentioned this and stated:

Many Antiochenes, in fear and hatred of Demetrius, fled the city and wandered all about Syria, biding their time to attack the king. Demetrius, now their avowed enemy, never ceased to murder, banish, and rob, and even outdid his father in harshness and thirst for blood.<sup>27</sup>

Demetrius set off to redeem himself among his people but most likely needed to get away. His eastward push, according to Justin, seems to have brought great joy to the people under the harsh rule of the Parthians. Then again, this may have been mere propaganda. Demetrius, known for his harsh rule, needed news from the front showing how joyous the people were as they waited to be freed. This was likely a public relations stunt. In a sense, it was Demetrius' way of saying to his subjects that "if you think my rule was harsh, look how happy these people are to be under my rule."

Justin also mentioned that "auxiliary troops from the Persians, Elymaeans, and Bactrians" aided Demetrius. A number of issues come into play when reading Justin's passage. The first of which is the auxiliary units that participated in the campaign, particularly the Elamites and Bactrians. It is possible that the Elamites' raids in Parthian controlled Mesopotamia were in fact to aid Demetrius. The mentioning of the Bactrians is interesting, for historian W.W. Tarn provides a provocative theory that Demetrius and Heliocles of Bactria joined forces and created a two front war; but if we count the Elamite raids, one could say it was a three front war against the Parthians. If true, the Arsacid king would have had to turn some of his

forces east to deal with his Bactrian neighbors.<sup>28</sup> Tarn's theory is interesting but there is no proof of a Bactrian uprising to recover former lands under Parthian rule.

Demetrius' push into Parthia did not reach far. Justin mentioned that Demetrius won several battles. If Demetrius won several battles, it had to be in Mesopotamia. According to the Babylonian diaries, Demetrius was in Babylonia, for the diaries mention that Media is secured by Mithridates' brother, Bagayasa. The diaries mention "this king Arsaces went from the cities of Media to Babylon." Arsaces (possibly Mithridates' son Phraates II) marched out of Media and into Babylonia to battle Demetrius. The Parthian king pretended to offer peace to Demetrius and the ruse paid off, he was taken prisoner. As for the army that marched with Demetrius, their fate is uncertain, Justin mentioned that Demetrius "lost his army," they were either slaughtered or forced to join the king's army.<sup>29</sup>

The Parthians paraded Demetrius before those who revolted, mocking the Greco-Macedonian residents who despised Parthian rule, by displaying the Seleucid Empire (Demetrius) in chains. It must have been a powerful image for those witnessing or hearing of the news back west. In many ways Demetrius represented the legacy of Alexander the Great, a legacy led away in chains by those Alexander had once defeated. After the parade had ended, Demetrius resided at the king's court in Hyrcania. Justin mentioned that the king, "not only paid him, with royal magnanimity, the respect due to a prince, but gave him his daughter also in marriage."<sup>30</sup>

With Demetrius out of the picture, the Elamites were still persistent in their raiding. Scholars have often placed the date of the Parthian conquest of Elam around 140 BCE or 139/8 BCE. However, the Babylonian diaries speak of a different story. Instead of conquest, the diaries speak of raids and the Parthians repelling the raids, but with little intervention into Elamite lands by the Parthians. Therefore, the conquest of Elam never occurred during the reign of Mithridates I.<sup>31</sup>

### **Questioning the Final Years of Mithridates Rule**

Did Mithridates I defeat Demetrius II, or did he not? This may sound silly to many who read Parthian history. However, it may very well be possible that Mithridates did not defeat and imprison Demetrius; rather the honor might go to either Mithridates' son, Phraates II or to Mithridates' brother, Artabanus. The Babylonian diaries do not expressly mention Mithridates by name. Rather the diaries say Arsaces. The name Arsaces was on a throne taken by Parthian kings in honor of their founder Arsaces. Neither Justin nor Josephus mention the Parthian king's name that held Demetrius captive.<sup>32</sup> Second century CE historian Appian mentioned that Demetrius "was taken prisoner by them and lived in the palace of king Phraates, who gave him his sister, Rhodogyne, in marriage."<sup>33</sup>

The reason for the assumption that Mithridates defeated and held Demetrius captive at his court is due to coins. There are coins with Mithridates image with the Seleucid Era 174 (139/8 BCE) inscribed on them. Phraates II, son of Mithridates I, issued coins with the inscription that he was king but with no date. It seems plausible that Mithridates never left Hyrcania during the anabasis of Demetrius II, since Justin mentioned that Mithridates' last campaign was against Elam.<sup>34</sup> It is possible that Phraates was the one to counter, defeat, and capture Demetrius. But there is an issue. His mother Ri-'nu, acted as regent according to the diary. Therefore, it seems plausible that Artabanus was in charge of the army in which Phraates may have tagged along.

The coins in question indicate that Mithridates was still alive for a date on the coin is visible, whereas Phraates had no date due to his father being alive, but the coins issued were a likely indication that Phraates was next in line and minted in order to avoid possible rebellion by providing coins bearing his image beforehand.<sup>35</sup>

## Conclusion

In summary, Mithridates built upon the foundation laid before him by his ancestors. From the foundation he constructed an empire quickly, conquering and subjugating Greco-Bactria, and invading and conquering both Media and Atropatene. From Media, he turned south to conquer Babylonia and repulsed the Elamites. However, Parthian rule in Mesopotamia and portions of southwestern Iran was fragile before and at the time of his death. Overall, it is without doubt that Mithridates turned Parthia into a juggernaut, a behemoth.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Kaveh Farrokh, *Shadows in the Desert* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2007), 122.

<sup>2</sup> Justin, 41. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Justin, 41.6.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Strabo, 11.11.2.

<sup>7</sup> Justin, 41.6.

<sup>8</sup> Strabo, 11.9.2.

<sup>9</sup> Richard N. Frye, *The History of Ancient Iran* (München: C.H. Beck, 1984), 188-189.

<sup>10</sup> Diod, 31.27a.

<sup>11</sup> Appian, *Roman History, Syrian Wars* 8.46.

<sup>12</sup> Polybius, *Histories*, 21.42; Appian, *Syrian Wars*, 7.39.

<sup>13</sup> Appian, 8.46-47.

<sup>14</sup> Justin, 41.6.

<sup>15</sup> Peter Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), 444-445.

<sup>16</sup> Justin 41.6.

<sup>17</sup> Susan M. Sherwin-White and Amélie Kuhrt, *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*, 223, (see Plates 27 and 28).

<sup>18</sup> Touraj Daryaee, *The Oxford Handbook of Iranian History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 169.

<sup>19</sup> Justin, 41.6.

- <sup>20</sup> M. Rahim Shayegan, *Arsacids and Sasanians: Political Ideology in Post-Hellenistic and Late Antique Persia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 72-74.
- <sup>21</sup> Frye, *The Heritage of Persia*, p. 212
- <sup>22</sup> Franz Xaver Kugler, *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel*, vol 2 (Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1935) 442.
- <sup>23</sup> Daniel T. Potts, *A Companion to the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East* (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 1004.
- <sup>24</sup> Jacob Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia: The Parthian Period* (Chico: California: Scholars Press, 1984), 20-21.
- <sup>25</sup> Shayegan, 65-66.
- <sup>26</sup> Justin, 36.1.
- <sup>27</sup> Diodorus, 33 4, 3-4.
- <sup>28</sup> William W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 273.
- <sup>29</sup> Justin, 36.1; 38.9.
- <sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.9.
- <sup>31</sup> Shayegan, 79-81, 96-97.
- <sup>32</sup> Justin 36.1; Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 13.5.186.
- <sup>33</sup> Appian, *Syr.* 11.67.
- <sup>34</sup> Justin, 41.6.
- <sup>35</sup> R.j. Van der Spek, "New Evidence from the Babylonian Astronomical Diaries concerning Seleucid and Arsacid history," *Archiv für Orientforschung* 44/45, (1997/98): 167-175.

#### Bibliography

Appian of Alexandria. *Roman History*

Daryaei, T. *The Oxford Handbook of Iranian History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Diodorus.

Farrokh, K. *Shadows in the Desert: Ancient Persia at War*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2007.

Frye, R. N. (1984). *The History of Ancient Iran*. München: C.H. Beck.

Frye, R.N. (1966). *The Heritage of Persia*. New York: New York: New American Library; New English Library.

Green, P. (1993). *Alexander to Actium*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Justin.

Kugler, F. X. (1935). *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel*, vol 2 . Münster in Westfalen:Aschendorff.

Neusner, J. (1984). *A History of the Jews in Babylonia: The Parthian Period*. Chico, California : Schlors Press.

Potts, D. T. (2012). *A Companion to the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Shayegan, M. R. (2011). *Arsacids and Sasanians: Political Ideology in Post-Hellenistic and Late Antique Persia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strabo.

Tarn, W. (1966). *The Greeks and Bactria and India*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Van der Spek, R. (1997/98). "New Evidence from the Babylonian Astronomical Diaries concerning Seleucid and Arsacid history". *Archiv für Orientforschung* 44/45 , 167-175.

White-Sherwin, S. a. (1993). *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

*Cam Rea lives in Indiana, and served in the U.S. Army as a Combat Engineer. He holds a BA and MA in Military History. Mr. Rea is currently a Teaching Assistant for the Ludwig von Mises Institute, and contributing writer for Classical Wisdom Weekly. He has also authored four books, the most current, "March of the Scythians: From Sargon II to the Fall of Nineveh", with two more books on the way dealing with Parthia.*