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MOSES OF CHORENE AND THE EARLY PARTHIAN CHRONOLOGY

Of a handful of major works in Armenian historiography, none has attained such pre-eminence and at the same time aroused as much controversy as the History of the Armenians by Moses of Chorene.\(^1\) This book contains much of the ancient legends and traditions on the origins of the Armenians and their pre-Christian literary heritage. It also embodies an account of the rise of the Armenian kingdom in the late fourth century BC through its fall in the late fifth century AD, including useful hints about Parthian affairs. Yet, most of Moses’ statements are either unattested elsewhere or, when checked against contemporary evidence, found to be in error. This has questioned his authority as a serious historian and rendered his History suspect in many points.\(^2\)

What is, nevertheless, remarkable about Moses is his awareness of the importance of chronology. He claims that there is no true history without it (Book 2.82)\(^3\) and so insists that not only historical events must be dated accurately but that to guarantee accuracy, historical writing must be presented in absolute chronological order (Books 1.32 and 2.27). Unfortunately, Moses himself did not live up to the high standards he set for historiography and compiled his book in a tendentious manner to glorify his patrons and give them a splendid genealogy.\(^4\)

My aim is not to provide here a detailed analysis of Moses’ controversial remarks or scrutinise the authenticity of his sources. Rather, I will attempt to demonstrate that the extant numismatic evidence, Babylonian cuneiform documents and Greco-Latin literary sources support some of his seemingly uncorroborated and vague comments on the early

---

\(^{1}\) I am indebted to Messrs Nader Rastegar and Samir Masri for their support. This work was sponsored by a grant from the Maclaren Foundation and the Morteza Rastegar Endowment.


\(^{3}\) To avoid repeated citation of the work cf. Thomson 1978 for books and chapters in Moses’ manuscript.

\(^{4}\) Thomson 1978: 1.
Seleucid and Parthian histories and reported regnal dates. These have increased our understanding of the events leading to the establishment of the Arsacid monarchy and improved the genealogy of the early Parthian rulers.

**Date of Parthian Insurrection**

Moses (2:1) claims:  

... After ruling over the whole world, Alexander of Macedon, the son of Philip and Olympias, who was twenty-four from Achilles, and after bequeathing his empire to many with the stipulation that the empire of them all would be called that of the Macedonians, he himself died. After him Seleucus reigned in Babylon, having seized the states of all the others. From there he subjected the Parthians in a great war, and for this reason was called Nicobar (sic). He ruled for thirty-one years and left the kingdom to his son Antiochus, called Soter, [who reigned] for nineteen years. To him succeeded Antiochus, called Theos, [who reigned] for ten years. And in the eleventh year [the Parthians rebelled from submission to the Macedonians. From then on, Artaxerxes the Brave ruled...  

At first sight, one is inclined to suspect the accuracy of the above chronology, duration of the first three Seleucid reigns, and the date of the Parthian revolt. According to Moses, the latter fell 31 + 19 + 11 = 61 years after the death of Alexander III of Macedon (336–323 BC). However, using a series of contemporary and post-Alexandrian records leading to the secession of Parthia, it is possible to treat Moses' above passage and derive the following useful conclusions:

(a) A contemporary Babylonian Astronomical Diary dates the death of Alexander III to 29 Aiiâru in his 14th regnal year (10/11 June 323 BC). We then have two Lunar Texts with chronological significance. The first one gives the accession date of Alexander's half-witted stepbrother, Philip III Arrhidaeus (323–317 BC), as 1 Simânû in year 14 of Alexander III (11/12 June 323 BC). The second text states that Philip's death was recorded in Babylon on 27 Kislimu in his 7th regnal year (25/26 Dec. 317 BC). It also indicates that Babylon was passed on from Philip to Antigonus (317–311 BC in Babylon, died 301 BC), the One-eyed marshal of the Macedonian army and the satrap of Phrygia and Lycia in Asia Minor. But there are at least two tablets dated respectively to years 1 and 2 of Alexander...

---

5 The name passage is found in the work of Mar Apsa Ca'ina. Cf. Langlais 1867: 42.
7 Hungor 2001: 90–95, No. 36, Obv. 1, lines 1–2.
9 Ibid., the colophon of the tablet is dated Year 2 of Antigonus beginning 27/28 Mar. 316 BC. This indicates that Antigonus controlled Babylon during his first regnal year, the period 26/27 Dec. 317 – 26/27 Mar. 316 BC. Cf. Assar 2003: 175 and 185, n. 12. It should be noted that unlike Alexander III, Philip III, Alexander IV, Seleucus I and his successors, Antigonus never adopted the title king at Babylon. He is always styled KAR.LU.GUR (General of the Armies), KAL-ERIN (General of the Army), and GAL-Â-QU or GÂ-Â-QU (General). Cf. Kennedy 1968: pls. 8–11, nos. 33–50, covering years 3–6 of Antigonus. But the partially preserved signs following Antigonus' name in the only extant record from his year 2 are inconsistent with his known designations. They appear to read DUMU x ra of GAL-ERIN ra with uncertain interpretations. Cf. Hungor 2001: 6–8, No. 2, Rev. V, line 13–14.
11 Stroper 1953: 86–89, No. A2–8, Rev. 19, gives: Month XI, day 11, year 4 (of Alexander IV) which is year 5 of [Antigonus the] General; Assar 2003: 185, n. 12. Also, at the beginning of the paragraph for planet Mars in an unpublished Goal-Year Text (BM 32228) from year 79 SE, we have, in Obv. 3, 7 Year 3 which is year 5, the date for Mars phenomenon is 79 years earlier than the colophon date, i.e. 79 = 79 ÷ 0 SE (312/311 BC). This coincides with year 5 of Alexander IV and also year 6 of Antigonus at Babylon.
12 Assar 2003: 175, and 184–185. The exact moment of Alexander's accession is unknown.
13 The latest ourseiform record before the return of Seleucus I to Babylon is BM 40882. It is dated 12/17 of Antigonus (12/13 May 313 BC) although it is not mentioned in the colophon. Cf. Kennedy 1968: pl. 11, no. 50, lines 6–7; Del Monte 1997: 216. Thereafter, the earliest text is BM 20022 is dated 19/26 May 313 BC in Alexander from ... This is followed by BM 40467 which is dated 3/16 June 313 BC to Alexander son of Alexander. Cf. Le Page Renouf 1886: 125, no. 110; Strassmaier 1888: 157, no. 12; Kennedy 1968: pl. 4, no. 19; Del Monte 1997: 219. We also have one record dated 8/16 IV (6/7 July 313 BC) to King Alexander son of King Alexander and Alexander son of King Alexander. Cf. Kennedy 1968: pl. 4, no. 17.
14 Sachs and Hunger 1988: 230–231, No. -309, Rev. 11' and Upper edge 1, covering the period 16/17 Aug. to 13/12 Dec. 310 BC.
15 For Year 1 (of Seleucus' Kingship), which is year 7 of the Seleucid Era cf. Kugler 1922: 309, no. "a", Kugler 1933: 105; Schrammburger 1955: 7–8. For Year 7 (of the Seleucid Era), which is year 1 of King Seleucus cf. Sach and Wiseman 1954: 203 and 205. For Year 7 (of the Seleucid Era), King Seleucus, which is year 7 of his kingship cf. Hunger 2001: 278–279, No. 67.
16 Assuming that Die I = 1 Taliru in 312 BC. Unfortunately, the exact relationship between the Macedonian and Babylonian months under the Seleucids remains unknown. I have argued that during the period 48 BC – AD 67, the Parthians took 1 Hyperpyron = 1 Taliru as the beginning of the Macedonian year for dating their tetradrachms struck at Seleucia on the Tigris. Cf. Assar 2003: 182–184. However, I will present and discuss additional evidence in a future article to show that Hyperpyrons remained the last calendar month during that same period and that the Macedonian year at Seleucia on the Tigris began with 1 Gono = 1 Astyanaxia. If the Seleucids too retained the same agreement between the Macedonian and Babylonian calendars, 1 Die 312 BC should be dated to 5/6 November.
17 Bickerman 1944: 73–76; Bickerman 1968: 71; Samuel 1972: 139–144 and 245–246; Bickerman 1983: 781; Assar 2003: 175. I should point out that both Bickerman and Samuel mistakenly equate year 1 of Seleucus I to year 7 of Alexander IV which was year 2 SE (310/309 BC).
Obverse:
5: "A.dek-ku-an-zi Dar A.la' A-lek 'MU 6
7: MU 25 INAKA

5: Alexander son of Alexander, (reigned) 6 years.
6: Year 7 (of SEB), which is (his) 1st year, Seleucus (ruled as) King.
7: (He) reigned 25 years.
8: Year 31 (of SEB), (month) VI, King Seleucus was killed in the land of the Khaṇi.

This clearly indicates that Moses' quoted 31 year reign is counted from the date of Seleucus' recapture of Babylon and his association with Alexander IV in 311 BC (year 1 SEB).

Comparing Moses' above passage with the Babylonian evidence so far presented, it becomes evident that his chronology excludes the approximately six-and-a-half year reign of Philip III and roughly five-and-a-half year authority of Antigonus in Babylon. Moreover, he makes no reference to Alexander IV. These omissions must have been deliberate since Moses clearly states that Alexander III bequeathed his empire to many (Diadochi) and not to Seleucus I alone.

(b) – Moses' claim that Seleucus I conducted a successful campaign against the Parthians is unattested elsewhere. It is possible that he confused Seleucus I Nicator with Seleucus II Callinicus who confronted Arsaces I in the latter part of his reign19 (cf. below).

(c) – The above King List gives the following on the reign of Antiochus I (281–261 BC).20

Obverse:
9: [MI]-32.K[AM] 'An A.la' Me LUGAL MU 20 INAKA
10: [MI]-51.KAM GU 16 'An LUGAL GAL-da BAM.MEŠ

9: [Ye]jahr 32 (SEB), Antiochus, son of Seleucus ruled as) King. (He reigned) 20 years.
10: [Ye]jar 51 (SEB, month) II, (day) 16, Antiochus the Great King died.

The date 16.H.51 SEB of the death of Antiochus corresponds to 1/2 June 261 BC. We also know that Seleucus I was assassinated in month VI of 31 SEB (25/26 Aug.–23/24 Sep. 281 BC). Given that Seleucus and Antiochus started to rule jointly as early as 1.VII.18 SEB21 (17/18 Nov. 294 BC), the latter's own reign after co-regency with his father turns out to be 3–4 months less than the 20 years attested above. However, since Antiochus I began officially to rule independently of Seleucus I on 1 Nisan 32 SEB22 (18/19 Apr. 280 BC), his sole reign in fact exceeded 19 years by only 1½ months. Obviously, this is closer to Moses' quoted figure (19 years) than to the one given in the above mentioned King List (20 years).

The latter simply counts the regnal years of Antiochus I and so overestimates the length of his reign while Moses gives the actual duration of Antiochus' principal kingship.

(d) – The final part of Moses' chronology in his above quoted paragraph pertains to Antiochus II Theos (261–246 BC) and the date of Parthian rebellion. In this, our Babylonian King List offers the following on the inception and end of Antiochus' reign:23

Obverse:
11: [MU]-52.KAM 'An A.la' Me LUGAL MU 15 x...k
12: [MU]-66.KAM NE ina E'[J]-lu-{J-me}
13: um=ma'[A] LUGAL GAL-da NA[AM.MEŠ]

11: [Ye]jar 52 (SEB), Antiochus II son of Antiochus I ruled as) King. (He reigned) 15 years24
12: [Ye]jar 66 (SEB), (in month) V, the following was heard in Babylon:
13: Antiochus II the Great King [died].

At the same time, a contemporary Astronomical Diary confirms that the news of Antiochus' death reached Babylon on 20.V.66 SEB24 (18/19 Aug. 246 BC) and so led to the change of regn.25 Combined with the date of the death of Antiochus I (1/2 June 261 BC), this confirms that Antiochus II ruled for 15 years and 2½ months.26 However, several contemporary texts reveal that prior to his sole reign, Antiochus II co-ruled with his father Antiochus I for five years. The earliest of these is dated 4.V.46 SEB (13/14 Aug. 266 BC) in the triple-regency of Antiochus I, his elder son Seleucus, and Antiochus II.27 But co-ruler Seleucus must have died shortly afterwards28 since our next record from 13.VII.46 SEB

---

19 Droysen 1980: 237, n. 241; and 300–301.
22 The colophon of a deed of gift from Urkû, dated 10.XI.31 SEB to Seleucus I and Antiochus I, strongly suggests that year 31 SEB continued to be assigned to the same co-rulers throughout although Seleucus I died in month VI of that same year. Cf. Clay 1913: pl. 4, no. 5, Oelsner 1986: 126 and 271.
24 Sachs and Hunger 1989: 70–71, No. -245A (dated 66 SEB, 246/245 BC), Rev. 5*: That month (V), on the 20th, it was heard in Babylon [that King Antiochus died ...]. According to Fink (Not. Hist. 7.12.53) and Appian (Syrian Wars 65), Antiochus II was poisoned by his wife, Laodice. Cf., respectively, Rackham 1942: 540–541 (wrongly identifies the king with Antiochus II who was killed while attempting to rob a temple in Elymais); and White 1999: 228–231. Cf. also Grainger 1997: 14.
26 I have assumed that Antiochus II ascended the throne immediately after the death of his father on 16.H.II.31 SEB. However, the earliest extant record from his reign is dated 15.XI.31 SEB (C122 Feb. 260 BC). Cf. Clay 1913: pls. 10–11, no. 14; Kriekmann 1931: 21. Another text dated 17.XI.31 SEB has been wrongly assigned to 17.VII.51 SEB (29/30 Oct. 261 BC). Cf. Contenau 1929: pl. 135, no. 237, clearly gives **DZL = month XI, but Kriekmann 1931: 21, and Parker and Duboispeyret 1956: 21, both misread the month as VI.
27 Stoler 1993: 46, no. 15 (BM 55437); Del Monte 1997: 228.
Moses of Chorene and the Early Parthian Chronology

lead to their freedom under Arsaces I. Hence the discordant dates in the literature on the inception of Arsacid power in Iran.

(qd) – In the Roman Consular Fasti, Q. Caecidius is associated with L. Manlius Vulso as consul ordinarius in 256 BC. But following his death, M. Attilius Regulus is appointed as consul suffectus.\(^{35}\) It is generally accepted that dating by subrogated consuls was wholly exceptional in the third century BC.\(^{36}\) Accordingly, some commentators\(^{37}\) have questioned Justin’s consular date and suggested that he may have intended to place the Parthian insurrection in the joint consulsip of C. Attilius Regulus and L. Manlius Vulso which began in 250 BC.\(^{38}\)

(qd) – Eusebius (Chronicle II)\(^{39}\) dates the revolt of Arsaces I to Olympia 132.3 (250/249 BC).\(^{40}\)

(qd) – Eusebius (Chronicle I)\(^{41}\) places the same event in Olympia 133, covering the period 248/247 – 245/244 BC.\(^{42}\)

The extant Babylonian cuneiform records and Greek inscriptions with preserved double Seleucid-Parthian era dates take 247 BC as the beginning of the Arsacid epoch.\(^{43}\) The earliest document so dated is from the reign of Mithradates I the Great (165–132 BC),\(^{44}\) following his victory in Babylonia and expulsion of the Seleucid forces.\(^{45}\) The latest dated double-arsacid record from Babylon is an astronomical Almanac\(^{46}\) compiled in April/May AD 31 under Artabanus II (c. AD 10–38). However, a Greek parchment from Dura-Europos, dated 26 Daisios 432 SEM = 368 AE (29/30 June AD 121), is the latest known Parthian record with concurrent Seleucid-Arsacid epochal dates.\(^{47}\) Our only numismatic evidence is a handful of drachms (250/232 BC) from the reign of Artabanus I (126–122 BC) dated EKP = 125 AE (123/122 BC).\(^{48}\) These indicate that when supervising a regal issue, Parthic mint masters in Iran also took 247 BC as the epoch of the Arsacid era.

30 Seleucid co-regency began in the reign of Seleucus I with the appointment of Antiochus I as joint king in 187/6 B.C. (cf. n. 21 above), continued intermittently and ended with the death of Antiochus, son of Antiochus IV, in month V of 142 SEB (30/31 Jul.–27/28 Aug. 170 BC). Cf. Sachs and Wiseman 1954: 205–210; Parker and Dubberstein 1956: 21–23. The corresponding Babylonian records always refer to the co-rulers as LUGAL,\(^{49}\) (Kings) and not LUGAL a DUMU-LUGAL (King and Crown Prince). When comparing the reign-lengths of the Seleucid kings, this may have confused some of the later writers who probably counted the regnal years of a subordinate king from the moment of his co-regency. Others apparently took the date of the principal ruler’s death or the first day of the following year as the beginning of the new reign. The most interesting references to a Seleucid co-ruler in the cuneiform material come from a series Antiochus II on Antiochus IV. He retained his royal status down to the moment of his execution on orders from his father. The relevant text reads: [Year 1/2] 42, month 2, at the command of Antiochus, the king, Antiochus the king, his son, was put to death. Cf. Sachs and Wiseman 1954: 204 and 208; Del Monte 1994: 208–209.
31 Unless Antiochus Theos is a mistake for Seleucus II Callinicus in Moses’ book 2.1. If so, year 11 equates to 76 SEB (256/255 BC) in the latter’s reign. But Moses’ statement does not imply that Antiochus had died.
32 To avoid repetition, cf. Waton 1882; Ruhl 1886; and Yardley 1994 on passages in Justin.
33 The dynastic link is obviously incorrect. Seleucus II was the grandson of Antiochus I and great-grandson of Seleucus I. Cf. Assar 2004: 84–87 for other genealogical blunders in Justin.
34 Broughton 1951: 208–209; Samuel 1972: 262; Grüniger 1997: 14, places the Parthian revolt in c. 250 BC.
36 Saint-Martin 1850b: 249–251; Scott 1855: 122–139; Schneller 1876: 569–583; Bouché-Leclercq 1886, 58, n. 1; Droyen 1908: 237–238 and n. 241; Wolski 1956: 51.
39 Schloen 1866: 120; Karst 1911: 201.
41 Schloen 1875: 207; Karst 1911: 97; Helm and Tréguer 1984: 132.
44 For the revised dates of the beginning and end of the reign of Mithradates I cf. Assar 2005.
48 Prezniak-Orlin 1974/75: 6 and pl. I, no. 6; Gardner 1877: 27 and pl. I, no. 10; Rapsin 1983: 211–213 and pl. XVI, no. 3; Wroth 1900: 185; Wroth 1903: xvi, 21, no. 10 and n. 3; and pl. V, no. 7; Petrowicz 1908: 12, no. 10, and Tuf. I, no. 16; Minus 1915: 37, n. 41; Ars Classica-Nicville 1926: 130, no. 2126, and pl. 62; Le Rider 1965: 43, n. 2; Sellwood 1962; Sellwood 1983: 283; shore 1993: 98, no. 65. There is still some uncertainty over the interpretation of EKP as an AE date.
of the reign of Alexander III of Macedon with the inauguration of Seleucus' authority in Babylon. Following Moses' chronology and counting from the beginning of the two Seleucid eras 252/251 BC and 251/250 BC as the dates of Partisan insurrection on the Macedonian and Babylonian counts, these agree perfectly with regnal year 11 of Antiochus II (61 SEB) wherein, according to Moses, the Parthians defeated. However, these later dates too are absent in our extant sources and therefore remain uncertain.

Another possibility is that Moses mistook Alexander III for his son Alexander IV. We are already told by Moses (2.1) that Alexander III left his empire to marry. This implies that he was aware of the Diadochi period. Yet he claims that as the immediate successor of Alexander in Babylon, Seleucus seized the states of all the others and ruled as king. It is quite likely that the very complex nature of the Diadochi wars troubled Moses and induced him to exclude it from his book 2.1. This in turn led to the conflation of the intervening years and so contributed to his erratic chronology of the later events.

As shown above, having terminated Antigonus' authority in Babylonia sometime during 12/13–19/20 May 311 BC, Seleucus associated himself with Alexander IV. But following the assassination of the latter and in spite of his continuous struggle with Antigonus, Seleucus took the crown in 305 BC and began to reign as king in Babylon. We also know that following the murder of Philip III in Europe, Babylonian documents were dated to Alexander IV, beginning with his year 1 (sometime during 27/28 Mar. 316 BC–14/15 Apr. 315 BC). Yet Diodorus (19.52.1–4) and Justin (14.6.13) relate that Cassander (321–297 BC) imprisoned Alexander IV and his brother Roxane and secured the sovereignty of the empire. This took place in 316 BC and practically ended the influence of the young king. Assuming that Cassander (2.2) started his chronology with the captivity of Alexander in 316 BC and not the death of Alexander III in 323 BC, the Parthian revolt can thus be dated to 316 – 60 = 256 BC. This is identical with the consular date in Justin (41.3.4) concerning the first Parthian rebellion (cf. "di" above). At the same time, we know that Moses counted the regnal years of Seleucus I from the beginning of the Seleucid era in 312/311 BC and not his coronation in 305 BC. It is then possible that he recorded the years of Antiochus II from 46 BC when that king began to reign jointly with his father Antiochus I. If so, the 11th year of Antiochus I falls in 56 SEB and places the Parthian defection in 256/255 BC according to computing the accession date of the Sasanian ruler (538 – 312 = AD 225/226). Cf. Frenod 1975: 126. Cf. also Lecoy 1944: 199 and nn. 26. For Islamic writers cf. Taqizadah 1939–1942: 124–130.

Albeit Antiochus I died on 16/151 SEB (12 June 261 BC), the remainder of that year down to 29/XI.51 SEB (67 Apr. 260 BC) was regnal year 1 of Antiochus II on the Babylonian count. On the other hand, the period 16 Daisios – 29 Hyperberaton 51 SEM (12 June–12/13 Oct. 261 BC) was Antiochus' regnal year 1 according to the Macedonian reckoning. In both cases year 61 SEM/56 BC was regnal year 11 of Antiochus II. For the abolition of dating by accession year cf. Assar 2003: n. 4, 7.

The date 251/20 BC is close to the amended consular date in Justin (41.4.3) quoted in (d) above. However, the beginning of 61 SEB (29/30 Mar. 251 BC) falls in the joint consulsrship of L. Caelinus Metellus and C. Furias Paetus. Although not impossible, it is unlikely that Justin mistook these two consuls for C. Agathus Regulus and L. Manlius Vulso. Cf. Samuel 1972: 262.


Gerr 1947: 370–371. Cassander was son of Antipater, the old viceroy of Europe under Alexander III, and the regent of his empire after the murder of Perdiccas in 321 BC.
gylly. This date too is identical with that in the Consular Fasti alluded to by Justin, since year 56 SEB began on 25/26 March 256 BC. Yet it fails to explain why the counting of the years of Arscadic rule, according to the king's reckoning (δικὸς ὦ Βακτρικὸς ίερόν),62 did not begin in 256 BC instead of 247 BC. The latter was year 15 (65 SEB) of the sole reign of Antiochus II and had a profound significance for the Parthians.63 Unfortunately, we do not have the corresponding Astronomical Diary which may well have provided an insight into the political circumstances of that year. The extant short text only partially covers months I–VI and gives little on the events of 65 SEB.64 To confound the situation further, we have the statement of Justin (41.4.9–10) on the beginning of Parthian independence. He alleges that shortly after a peace treaty with the Bactrian king Diodotus II (c. 235–230 BC), Arsaces I won a battle against Seleucus II who had encroached into Parthia to re-impose Seleucid authority.65 The Parthians observed that date with great solemnity and took it as the beginning of their liberation. However, in the next passage Justin (41.5.1) claims that Seleucus was then recalled to Asia because of new disturbances66 and that his departure gave Arsaces I a respite to settle the affairs of Parthia, levy troops and fortify his cities. Obviously, this latter statement is rather more attuned to the passage in Strabo than the momentous victory Justin ascribes to the Parthian leader.67 We are told by Strabo (11.8.8)68 that Arsaces I fled from Seleucus II Callinicus and withdrew into the country of the Apsaxae (Apasaceae = "Water Sacæ").69 It is perhaps this episode that has turned up in Moses' book 2.1 as the victory of Seleucus I (sic.) against the Parthians (cf. "b" above). Moreover, the numismatic legacy of the eastern expedition of Seleucus II paints a rather different picture of the events than the one presented by Justin. Although scholars still disagree on the date of Seleucus'70

war with Arsaces I and place it somewhere in the period 232–228 BC,70 a series of contemporary gold, silver and bronze coins from Ecbatana strongly suggests a Seleucid victory rather than defeat.71 In consequence, we may be obliged to look elsewhere for that elusive triumph that marked the beginning of both Parthia's liberation and Arscadic rise to power.

The first question that springs to mind is whether Justin has correctly identified the Seleucid ruler who was defeated by Arsaces I in Parthia. Unfortunately, lack of contemporary evidence prevents thorough analysis of his testimony. Yet, given his errors, omissions and contradiction of Trogus' accounts in several points, Justin's reference to Seleucus II may be doubtful. To clarify this, it is worth pointing out some of his obvious slips briefly. As highlighted above, Justin (41.4.3) refers to Seleucus II as the great-grandson of Antiochus I instead of Seleucus I. He then claims, in his books 27.3.1–6, that it was the Bithynian king Eumenes I (263–241 BC) who defeated Antiochus Hierax and his allied Gauls. Whereas Trogus (Prologue 27) correctly assigns the victory to Eumenes' successor, Attalus I (241–197 BC). Moreover, Justin (27.3.6–7) alleges that after his defeat of Eumenes I (sic.), Antiochus Hierax fled to his father-in-law, King Ariamenes of Cappadocia. Yet the Cappadocian ruler was in fact the father-in-law of Stratonice, sister of Antiochus Hierax. Another error concerns the relationship between the two Seleucid cousins, Antiochus V (164–162 BC) and Demetrias I (162–150 BC). According to Justin (34.3.6) Demetrias was the uncle of Antiochus. There are, of course, other genealogical inaccuracies and errors of identity in Justin's work. Some of these have already been discussed elsewhere.72 Taken collectively, they cast doubt on his reported victory of Arsaces I against Seleucus II and at the same time strengthen the likelihood of an earlier Parthian success.

An incomplete reference to the presence in Babylon of Antiochus II and his sons, Seleucus II and Antiochus Hierax, and daughter, Apamo (or Apama), during the months I–III of 66 SEB (34 Apr.–30 Jun./1 Jul. 246 BC) is contained in two Astronomical Diary fragments.73 Whether Antiochus II had retreated to Babylon after a defeat in Parthia some months earlier cannot be confirmed at this stage. However, considering Justin's slips and the fact that the Arscadic rulers themselves recorded their regnal years from 247 BC, it is possible that the Parthians scored their first major victory against Antiochus II and not Seleucus II. This in no way precludes other successful outcomes or setbacks against later Seleucid rulers. It only points out that beginning with 250 BC, there may have been a series of revolts, perhaps beyond Parthia or at its northern extremities. These culminated in the invasion of the province by Arsaces I in 238 BC and removal of the Seleucid satrap Andragoras.74 Of the Parthian victories, the one scored in 247 BC was perhaps the first against a Seleucid king. Hence its epoch-making value and also importance as the beginning of

64 Suchs and Hunger 1989: 58–65; Nos. 246, only months I and VI are intact; the end and beginning of months II and V are lost.
65 Tarn 1966: 74; Lerner 1999: 30–31; Will 2003: 308–313, places the Parthian expedition of Seleucus II in the period 235–227 BC and claims that he was probably captured by Arsaces I.
66 Most probably because of the second war between Antiochus Hierax and Attalus I of Pergamum in about 230–229 BC. Cf. Tarn 1928: 722; Bickerman 1944: 82–83; Grainger 1997: 35 and 61; Will 2003: 298–301, dates the battle to 229–227 BC. It is even possible that the incursion of Antiochus Hierax into Babylonia hastened Seleucus' withdrawal from Parthia. The date of this conflict is uncertain. However, we have an Astronomical Diary fragment from year 84 SEB which clearly omits the royal name from its date formula. This may indicate political uncertainty in Babylon and that the struggle between the brothers was still ongoing at the time of the completion of the table around Mar./Apr. 227 BC. Cf. Suchs and Hunger 1989: 128–131, Nos. –226.
71 Newell 1978: 155 and 202, cf., in particular, pl. XLI, 7–12, having on their reverse the bow in case and quiver full of arrows, the characteristic weapons of the Parthians; Lerner 1999: 36–37, disagrees with the attribution of the coinage to Seleucus' victory over Arsaces I; Houghton and Lorber 2002: 282–287.
72 Assar 2004: 84–85.
74 Of the importance of this date has been highlighted by Wolski in a series of articles since 1975. For an extended bibliography cf. Wolski 1993: 209–212.
Parthia’s liberation from Macedonian power. In any case, Moses’ testimony that Parthia succeeded from Seleucid domination under Antiochus II agrees rather well with the date 247 BC of the epoch of the Arsacid Era.

Successors of Arsaces I

Having commented in his books 2.1 and 2.2 on the date of Parthian uprising led by Arsaces I, Moses (2.2) relates:

... He (Arsakes I) made very fierce wars and seized for himself the entire east; and he also expelled the dominion of the Macedonians from Babylon. ... Thus he reigned for thirty-one years and after him his son, Artashes (I) for twenty-six years. He was succeeded by his own son Arshak (II) the Great who waged war with Demetrius and Demetrius’ son, Antigon7 for (this last) had attacked him in Babylon with a Macedonian army. But in the war he was taken prisoner. Arshak (II) bound him and led him to Parthia in iron fetters, whence he was called Strinipota. But his brother, Antiochus Sidetes, learning of Arshak’s departure, came and occupied Syria. Then Arshak (II) returned with one hundred and twenty thousand men. Antiochus, discomfited by the severe winter season, confronted him in a narrow spot and perished with his army. ...

Regrettably, improper chronology and lack of attested regnal dates weaken the historical significance of this passage. It is likely that Arshak I and Artashes I represent Arsaces I and his son Arsaces II quoted in Justin (41.5.7). But the successor of Artashes I, Arshak the Great, can hardly be the third Arsaces, Phriapatius, attested in at least two texts from Nisa16 and mentioned by Justin (41.5.8). There are also difficulties with the thirty-one year reign of Arshak I. It is unclear whether Moses reckons this from the date of Parthia’s independence or the coronation of Arsaces I.17 Adding thirty-one to Moses’ date of the Parthian rebellion terminates the reign of Arsaces I in 232 BC, ninety-one years after the death of Alexander of Macedon. This date is absent in our extant sources and differs significantly from the one derived from numismatic material.18 Yet, given the increases in both the volume of contemporary sources and our understanding of the early Parthian history, it is possible to amend Moses’ above quoted flawed chronology and erratic regnal dates and place them in their proper context. To proceed, we must first consider the following two additional excerpts from Moses’ History:

Book 2.68:

... Arshak the Brave, who rebelled against the Macedonians, reigned in the land of the Kushans for thirty-one years; and after him his son, Arshak, for twenty-six years, and then Arshak, the latter’s son, called the Great, who killed Antiochus and made his brother Vahram king of Armenia, appointing him the second in his kingdom. He himself went to Bahl (Bactria) and ruled se-

77 According to Livy (Eui sometime 50), the eldest son of Demetrias I was called Antigonus. Cf. Schlesinger and Geer 1959: 32-33; Grainger 1997: 8. However, there is no evidence that he ever attacked the Parthians in Mesopotamia. He is said to have been captured by Alexander Balas (150-145 BC) and put to death by the latter’s minister, Ammonius.
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curely for fifty-three years. ... After Arshak the Great, Arshakan succeeded to his throne in the thirteenth year of Valershak, king of Armenia, ...

Book 1.8:

Arshak the Great, king of the Persians and Parthians, who was Parthian by race, having rebelled against the Macedonians, they say, ruled over all the East and Assyria. He killed Antiochus, the king in Nineveh, and brought into subjection under himself the whole universe. He made his brother, Valershak, king over this land of Armenia. ...

Comparing the earlier statement in book 2.2 with that in 2.68 confirms Arshak I and Arshak the Brave as the same figure. Since, according to Moses, Arshak I was the first Parthian ruler to rebel against the Macedonians, we may safely identify him with Arsaces I in Justin (41.4.6-10 and 41.5.1-7). Perhaps Moses’ testimony that Arshak I began his reign in the city of Bahl (Bactria) in the land of the Kushans is an echo of the formative days of Arsaces’ revolution which had its origins in Bactria. Strabo (11.9.3) suggests that Arsaces may have been a Bactrian who fled from Diodotus I, the provincial Seleucid satrap, and caused Parthia to revolt.19 At the same time Syncellus (284.B-C) states that as satraps of Bactria, Arsaces I and his brother Tiridates claimed descent from the Achaemenid king Artaxerxes II (405–359 BC).20 These brief remarks suggest a possible link between Arsaces I and a Persian satrap under Alexander III.

Justin (11.15.1–12.4.12) reports that having pursued Darius III (336–331 BC) to Parthia and found him slain, Alexander went on to subjugate Hyrcania and the Mardians. He then conquered the Parthians and appointed as their governor a Persian nobleman, Andragoras,21 from whom the Parthian kings of later times descended.22 Following this, Justin (12.5.1–12) states that Alexander began to terrorise his comrades. He accused Philotas of conspiracy, put him to death and had the latter’s father, Parmeno, the commander of the Companions (Macedonian cavalry), assassinated. Then, while fighting the tribes of the Caucasus’ foothills, including the Aramissi or Euergetos (Ariaspian in Arrian), Daresac (sic.) and Parapamisade, the regicide Bessus was brought to him in chains and executed later.

We then have Arrian’s narration of the same events during summer 330 – spring 329 BC in books 3.20.1 through 3.30.5 of his Anabasis of Alexander.23 He reports that having found Darius dead in Parthia (July 330 BC), Alexander made Ammianus (sic.) satrap of that province. The latter was a Parthian exile in Macedonia who had helped to win Egypt.

81 Irrespective of the correct name and identity of the Parthian satrap, Justin’s reference to the later Arsacids at this point of Iran’s history strongly indicates a link between them and a prominent ancestor in 330 BC.
for Alexander. Then, to secure his rear, Alexander invaded Hyrcania, forced the Mardi into submission and made for the palace in Zadracarta, the principal city of the satrapy. Having spent fifteen days there, he moved to Parthia, thence to Areia (Hērtē) where Satibarzanes the Areian satrap greeted him and was confirmed in his post. This was followed by a march to Bactra in pursuit of Bessus. In the meantime, Satibarzanes revolted and fled to Bessus. The news of the mutiny compelled Alexander to return to quell the revolt. He followed the rebels, killed some and enslaved others. Having turned off the road, Alexander arrived at Areia and appointed Arseses, a Persian, as the new satrap.44 Whether this was the Arsesaces mentioned by Q. Curtius (Hist. Alex. 232) as the cavalry commander under Mennemon, the marshal of the Persian army at the Battle of Granicus in 334 BC, is unclear at present. In any case, Alexander settled the affairs in Areia and moved south to the palace of Drangiana in Sistān in late summer 330 BC.45 It was there that he learned about the conspiracy, arrested Philotas, put him to death and had his father, Parnomen, murdered. Around early winter 329 BC Alexander placed two hippocasts in charge of the cavalry, arrived among the Artaian tribes to begin the Euergetēs, then proceeded towards Bactra against Bessus, and won over the Drangians, Gedrosians, and the Arachosians. At this time, aided by a contingent from Bessus, Satibarzanes raised Areia and induced the Areians (under Arsesaces) to revolt again. But he was killed by a force despatched by Alexander who then sent Stasanor, one of the Companions, to arrest Arsesaces on the charge of treason and take his place as satrap of Areia. Meanwhile, Alexander himself moved to Mount Caucasus and from there to the Sogdian country to confront Bessus. Around mid-winter 329 BC Bessus was captured and brought to Alexander who sent him to Bactra to be executed.46 Finally, in late 329 BC Alexander arrived at Zariaspa (Bactra) where he received Arsesaces in chains.47 It is possible that Alexander had Arsesaces executed for making common cause with Bessus and Satibarzanes, since we hear of him no more.48 According to Arrian (Anab. Alex. 4.18.1), Stasanor was still satrap of Areia in the winter of 328–327 BC.49

Evidently, in spite of their remarkable agreement, Justin and Arrian differ in two important points of detail. Firstly, Justin is silent about the appointment of a satrap at Parthia where Alexander found Darius slain and before his Hycranian expedition. Yet Arrian is clear that Alexander first confirmed Amminapes as satrap of Parthia and then attacked

44 Berze 1926: 80–81, no. 146; Brunt 1999: 314–315, suggests that this Arsesaces was presumably Arsesaces, satrap of Drangiana under Alexander, mentioned by Q. Curtius (7.3.1). Cf. Rolle 1999: 142–143. However, column 1, line 16 of the commemorative inscription of Darius I at Bastisān leaves no doubt that Areia and Drangiana were two separate satrapies and naturally had different satraps. Cf. Kent 1956: 117–119. Cf. also Bosworth 1980: 6 n. 46 and Holt 1995: 46 on the appointment of Arsesaces as satrap of Alexander.


46 Baslin 1985: 451.

47 According to another version in Arrian (Anab. Alex. 4.7.3) Bessus was sent to Irbatana in Media to be put to death. Cf. Brunt 1999: 360–361.


49 While narrating the events of the winter of 328–327 BC, Curtius (8.3.17) relates that Alexander made over to Phraortesmēnhyrcania and the Mardi with the Topuni. He then replaced Arsesaces, satrap of Drangiana, with Stasanor, and sent Arsesaces to Media in order that Oxylates might be recalled from there. It is, however, very likely that Arsesaces in Curtius is a mistake for Atropates who, according to Arrian (4.18.1–3), was appointed satrap of Media because Alexander thought Oxylates was wilfully neglecting his duties to him. Cf. Rolle 1999: 262–265, and Brunt 1999: 398–399, on Curtius and Arrian, respectively.


Hycrania. Secondly, Justin reports that on his return from Hycrania Alexander conquered the Parthians, installed as their governor Andragoras and then struck his first blow against the Macedonians. But we learn from Arrian that following his march into Hycrania, Alexander returned to Parthia and then headed south for Areia. It was only after the appointment of Arsesaces as the new satrap of Areia that Alexander moved against his companion (cf. Table 1 for additional details). Given these discrepancies, it is possible that Andragoras’ appointment as satrap of Parthia is a slip for the nomination of Arsesaces as the Areian governor.51 All the more so when we realise that Justin associates the first Arsacid ruler of Parthia with a Parthian satrap called Andragoras52 in two occasions. In the first, as stated above, Andragoras is the forebear of Arsesaces I. Whereas, in the second, according to Justin (41.4.7), he is crushed and slain by Arsesaces I after Seleucus I loses at Ancyra about 238 BC. Now, assuming that on becoming satrap of Parthia in 330 BC Andragoras was in his twenties, he would have been a centenarian in 238 BC. This practically removes the possibility of the two Andragoras in Justin being the same man. Moreover, we find Alexander in Areia and then further south in Drangiana in late summer of 330 BC, not in Parthia as Justin’s chronology demands. The obviously flawed sequence of events in Justin suggests that he may have confused Arsesaces, Alexander’s governor of Areia, with Andragoras, the Seleucid satrap of Parthia, because of their inextricable link with Arsesaces I. Alternatively, his reference to Andragoras as the Parthian satrap and the ancestor of the Arsacid rulers may be an error for Phraortesmēnī who too served Alexander as satrap of Parthia.53

We may now invoke the first fragment of Arrian’s Parthica wherein Arsesaces I and his brother Titaretas appear as sons of Arsesaces, son of Arsesaces, descendant of Phraortesmēnī.54 Given the combined references to the genealogy and Bactrian connections of Arsesaces I, it is possible to submit that the leader of the Parthian monarchy was often referred to as Alexander’s governor of Areia, Arsesaces rather than Phraortesmēnī.55 However, at present we have nothing to link Phraortesmēnī (Phraortenius), the great ancestor of Arsesaces I, with the Achaeemeneid royal house. But given the statements of Arrian and Justin on the Persian origins of Arsesaces and Andragoras, Alexander’s satraps of Areia and Parthia, respectively, and the number of wives and concubines Phraortesmēnī assigns to Artaxerxes II, Phraortesmēnī may well have been a descendant of the Achaeemeneid king.

51 The appointment of a Greek satrap at this point in time contradicts Alexander’s early policies. Cf. note "I" under Table 1 on the installation of local satraps after the Battle of Arbeia in 331 BC and before the end of 330 BC.


53 Cf. notes "II" and "I" under Table 1 on Phraortesmēnī.


55 Given Phraortesmēnī’s prominent position as the Achaemenid satrap of the Parthians, Hyrcanians and Taparums, the possibility that he was the ancestor of the Arsacid rulers cannot be entirely ruled out. Cf. Arrig (3.8.4.), in Brunt 1999: 246–247.

In the Old Persian language Artaxaša- (Artaxerxes) is constructed from Arta- "justice" and xša- "kingdom," implying "having a kingdom of justice." Our extant Babylonian astronomical records show that upon acceding to the throne, three Achaemenid rulers assumed the epithet Artaxerxes in addition to their personal names. It is, therefore, reasonably safe to assume that such an epithet could not have been taken as personal name by non-royal Persians.

Moreover, we are told that private endowments for fixed or pat ravān ("for the soul") and pat ahravātī ("for pious purposes") foundations were an institution highly characteristic of Iran. Many inscribed Parthian potsherds from Nisa testify to the existence of the post-mortem cult of the dead members of the Arsacid royal family. Some of these records contain the terms xšapš (tax, debt, arrears) and pšapš (dues), showing that part of the vineyards and other holdings around Nisa, mostly royal foundations for pious purposes, had been let out on indefinite leases to private persons. The cultivation of at least part of these vineyards was carried out by vine-growers who paid to the royal treasury a fixed annuity in kind. Among these, mention may be made of Friyapātākān ("estate or cult of Phriaphati"), Mhrditačān ("of or cult of" Mithradates), Arzabābānčān ("estate or cult of" Artabanus), Gītarāzān ("of or cult of" Gotezē), and Gūšān ("of or cult of" Gutehr) as endowments dedicated to the upkeep of services for the repose of the souls of several early Parthian Kings. However, another vineyard, attested in the texts of at least sixty eight ostraca from the period 92–30 BC is called Artaxšāhrāvātī ("of or cult of" Artaxshahr Artaxerxes). This must have been dedicated to a dead king since, as commented above, it is highly unlikely that private citizens could adopt the regal epithet Artaxerxes as their personal names. But, insofar as the extant evidence is concerned, we know of no Arsacid ruler in the period 3rd – 1st century BC called Artaxerxes. At the same time there are difficulties with attributing the foundation of the Artaxshahr vineyard to an Achaemenid king before the advent of the Parthians, since no other ruler from that dynasty is attested in the Nisa documents. Consequently, we may be obliged

**Note:**

97 Kent 1950: 170–171 on Arta- and Artaxaša-; 181 on xšapš-


99 Cf. Artox (3.25.3) in Brunt 1999: 310–311, and Curtius (6.6.13) in Rolfe 1999: 52–53, on Alexander being informed that having assumed regal attire as King of Asia, Bavus had worn his cap upright, dressed in Persian royal garb, and ordered that he should be called Artaxerxes.


101 Cf. Diakonoff and Livishits 2005: 187 and 201 for the interpretation of xšapš and pšapš, respectively.

102 Cf. Diakonoff and Livishits 1977, 1998, and 2003: 185–200 (Index) for references to each of these estates and vineyards.

103 Diakonoff and Livishits 1998: 128 (No. 1501), 131 (Nos. 1524–1525), 137 (No. 1566), 139 (No. 1589), 139 (1592), and 140 (1593); Diakonoff and Livishits 2003: 164 (No. 2573), and 172 (No. 2625).

104 There are three undated ostraca, Nos. 1592, 1593, and 1594, mentioning Artaxshahr, which might point date 151/150 BC, the earliest date attested at Niss. Cf. Assar 2004: 71 on the date 97 AE of ostracoon 2673.

to assume that the Parthians set up the Artaxshahrān endowment to perpetuate the name of King Artaxerxes II, alluded to by Synceclus as their distant ancestor.

Now, returning to Moses, we note that his cursory remarks in books 2.2 and 2.68 provide little information of historical value on the reign of Artashēs I. I have identified this ruler with Arsaces II and shown the chronological implications of his twenty-six year reign even though it is only attested in Moses and no other literary or documentary source. In fact, this piece of information and the one concerning the reign of Arshak the Great in book 2.68 have been instrumental in unravelling the early Parthian chronological and genealogical problems. However, since the relevant conclusions have already been presented elsewhere, I shall give here only a summary of the influence of Moses' regnal dates on the Parthian chronology of the period 211–132 BC.

Moses claims that Arshak the Great was son of Artashēs I and ruled for fifty-three years. Yet judging from the above quoted statements in books 1.2, 2.2, and 2.68, there is little doubt that he was none other than the Great Mithradates I, a younger son of Phriapatius. It is widely accepted that Mithradates was the real architect of the Parthian Empire. Not only did he extend Parthia's eastern frontiers, he also took Media from the Seleucids, appointed his brother Bagas (Moses' Valarsak) governor of Apurpatana, conquered Mesopotamia, pacified Elymais, and defeated and captured Demetrius II (145–138 BC, 1st reign) in Babylonia. But contrary to the commonly held view that Mithradates died about 138 BC, some Babylonian cuneiform texts show that he was still alive in 179 SEB (133/132 BC) while other literary sources reveal that he ascended the throne in 165 BC. It is thus evident that Moses conflated the reigns of Phriapatius, Arsaces IV (grandson of Arsaces I), Phraates I and Mithradates I, and so extended the reign of the latter to fifty-three years. Thanks to the dated colophon of a Babylonian cuneiform text, we now know that Phraates II, the young son and successor of Mithradates I, began his joint reign with his mother, Rinnu, as early as month V of 180 SEB (30/31 Jul. – 27/28 Aug. 152 BC). Ad- ding to 132 BC the 53 and 26 year reigns of Arshak the Great (Mithradates I) and Arshak I (Arsaces I) places the beginning of the reign of the latter in 211 BC. This date has already been confirmed independently of Moses' above given figures. A systematic analysis of the content of a hoard of early Parthian and non-Parthian drachmas have shown that the reign of Arsaces I ended about 211 BC, which date marked the inception of the reign of Arsaces II. Likewise, taking 247 BC as the beginning of the reign of Arsaces I, and assuming
that Syncellus mistakenly assigned the 37 year reign of that ruler to his brother, Tiridates, I have placed the Parthian leader's death in 211 BC.113 Accordingly, in conjunction with a number of important classical references, I have accepted Moses' figures regarding the reigns of Artashes I and Arshak the Great and proposed the following inaugural and terminal dates for the first six Parthian reigns:

Arshak I (247–211 BC) = Arshak I
Arshak II (211–185 BC), son of Arshak I = Arshak I of Artashes I = son of Arshak I
Arshak III, Phriapatius (185–170 BC),114 grand-nephew of Arshak I, not in Moses
Arshak IV, great-grandson of Arshak I (170–168 BC),115 not in Moses
Arshak V, Phriapatius I, son of Phriapatius (168–165 BC),116 not in Moses
Arshak VI, Mithradates I, son of Phriapatius (165–132 BC) = Arshak II, the Great.

Table 1
Chronology of the main events during summer 330 BC – spring 329 BC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Arrian (Anabasis of Alexander)</th>
<th>Justin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 330 BC</td>
<td>1. Alexander arrives at Parthia and finds Darius slain&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Book (11.15.1): Darius is killed in the Parthian village of Thara a day before Alexander's arrival&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book (3.20.3–3.21.10): Alexander appoints Amminapes (sic) as satrap of Parthia and Hyrcania&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book (3.22.1): Alexander appoints Anatinus (sic) as satrap of Parthia and Hyrcania&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book (3.23.1–3.25.1): Alexander invades Hyrcania, appoints Autophrades as satrap of Tapuria, subjugates the Mardians and moves to the palace at Zadruca&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Book (12.3.4): Alexander conquers Hyrcania and vanquishes the Mardians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book (3.25.1–2): Alexander moves to Parthia, thence to Aria and confirms Satibarzanes as satrap there&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book (3.25.4): Alexander marches to Bactra in pursuit of Bessus&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

113 I have followed the example of Seleucus I in dating the beginning of the reign of Arshak I. Although he took the diadem in 305 BC, Seleucus counted his reignal years from 311 BC when he wrested Babylon from Antigonus. His successors continued the count and today we date the reign of Seleucus I to the period 312/311–281 BC. Since the Arsacid rulers themselves reckoned their reignal years from 247 BC, it is logical to take this date as the beginning of the reign of Arshak I and not 238 BC when the Parthian leader allegedly supplanted Andragoras.
115 Cf. Justin (41.5.9) for the duration of reign (15 years).
117 Cf. Assar 2005 for the inception and terminal dates.
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Late winter
329 BC –
Early spring
328 BC

Book (4.7.1): Alexander arrives at Zarissa
spa and Stasanor brings to him Arsaces
in chains

Not in Justin

8 Curtius (5.13.1–25) agrees with Arrian although he fails to report the location at which Darius was slain. Diodorus (17.73.2–3) and Plutarch (Alc. 42.3–43.3) are silent about the place of Darius' death. But Curtius (6.12.2 and 6.12.15) states that Alexander and his army then came to Parthia and remained at the city of Hecatompylos for several days. Diodorus (17.75.1) too relates that following the demise of Darius, Alexander marched toward Hyrcania and on the third day arrived at the city of Hecatompylos. (sic.)

9 Omitted by Curtius (6.1–3) who mentions that Alexander left Creters and Amyntas, with the forces under them and 600 horsemen and the same number of archers, to protect Parthia against the barbarians. Arrian (3.22.1), on the other hand, reports that Tepelusmen, one of the Companions, was associated with Ammianus to suppress Parthia and Hyrcania. This is consistent with Alexander's policy of installing a local satrap aided by a Macedonian officer in charge of the garrison. Curtius then continues that the Macedonian king made his way through the satrapies to the borders of Hyrcania. According to Arrian (3.8.4), Phrautaperses was Darius' satrap of the Parthians, Hyrcaniaus and the Toipernians (for Tapurnians). Since he surrendered to Alexander in Hyrcania (Arrian 3.33.4 and Curtius 6.4.233) it is highly likely that his satrapies had already been divided among other Persian defectors. Curtius (6.4.23–25) reports that having received Phrautapes (= Autophrades in Arrian), the governor of the tribe of the Tapurnians, Alexander appointed Ammianus as satrap of Hyrcania and gave Tapurnus to Phrautapes. He later placed the Mardii under Phrautapes [also in Arrian 3.22.6–7 and 3.24.33]. These remarks strongly suggest that Parthia and Hyrcania had already been given to Ammianus although Alexander soon returned them to Phrautaperses. Arrian (3.28.2) refers to Phrautaperses as the satrap of Parthia in late autumn 330 BC. We are also told by Arrian (4.18.1–3) and Curtius (18.3.17) that Alexander made over to Phrautaperses Hyrcania, the Mardii and Tapurnus in late 328 BC. Furthermore, Arrian (5.20.7) relates that Phrautaperses was still satrap of Parthia and Hyrcania in 326 BC.

10 Curtius (6.4.3–6.5.23) gives a detailed sketch of Alexander's operations in Hyrcania, including the appointment of Autophrades as satrap of the Tapurnians. Plutarch (Alc. 42.1) and Diodorus (17.75.3–17.76.4) are quite brief, both omitting the nomination of Autophrades.

11 Curtius (6.6.13) clearly implies that Satibarzanes had been received by Alexander and installed as "satrap of the region which he had formerly governed.", Curtius (6.6.13–16) confirms Alexander's march to the region of Baetra to meet Bessus.

12 Curtius (6.6.21–22) and Diodorus (17.78.1–4) both refer to the rebellion of Satibarzanes, the Areian satrap, who had made common cause with Bessus, and Alexander's march against him. Curtius (6.6.25–34) further reports that Alexander captured the city of Artacana (Heart or Asenaxia in Areia) while Diodorus (17.78.1) calls the city Chortacana. This is not reported in other sources. Curtius (6.6.34) relates that the inhabitants of Artacana surrendered themselves to Alexander and were pardoned. Since the previous Areian satrap, Satibarzanes, had already defected to Bessus, Alexander must have confirmed a new governor for Areia.

13 Curtius (6.6.35–36) concurs with Arrian. Diodorus (17.78.4) mistakenly reports that having pacified the satrapy in thirty days, Alexander left Hyrcania (rather than Areia) and marched to the capital of Drangiana. Justin (12.5.1) places this event immediately before Alexander's march against Philotas and Parmenion. He writes that "Alexander began in the meantime to terrorise his men with an animosity characteristic of an enemy, not of one's own kind. ...". This strongly indicates that the appointments of Arsaces and Andragoras as satraps of Areia and Parthia, respectively, may be coincident since both events immediately preceded Alexander's march to the royal residence in Drangiana. However, it is possible that as a result of Justin's confusion of some events we have here a reference to Phrautaperses' nomination as satrap of Parthia before Alexander left for Bactria (cf. n. "d" above). What is certain is that Alexander would not have placed Parthia under a Greek or Macedonian satrap called Andragoras. According to Arrian (3.16.4–3.25.8), before Arsaces' appointment as the Areian satrap, Alexander had installed Mazaeus, Mithridates, Apollodorus (a Persian), Phraeates (son of Rhumilchus), Osares (son of Apollos), Oxyartes (a Persian), Ammianus (a Persian), Autophrades, and Shakhzada to govern Babylonia, Armenia, Susiana, Persia, Partheia, Bactria, Parthia-Hyrcania, Tapuria and the Medii, and Areia, respectively.

Abbreviations

AD Anna Domini
ADRTB Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia
AE Arsacid Era. Epoch = 1 Nisibu (14-15 April) 247 BC = 65 Seleucid-Babylonian Era
BC Before Christ
BM British Museum
CHI Cambridge History of Iran
CIL Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicae
LCL The Loeb Classical Library
SEB Seleucid Era of the Babylonian Calendar. Epoch = 1 Nisibu (23 April) 311
SEM Seleucid Era of the Macedonian Calendar. Epoch = 1 Dioc (67 October) 312

110 Cf. D'Alfonso 1998 and 1999; for references to Q, Curtius.
111 Cf. Wellis 1997; for references to Diodorus.
112 Cf. Perrin 1999; for references to Plutarch.
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