

# The Economic and Political Situation of Eastern Anatolia in the Classical Age

Nusret Burak Özsoy – Elif Yavuz

One of the names used often in history for the geography that is defined as the Eastern Anatolia Region today in Turkey, has been Armenia. The people of Armenia, taking a geography as a name for themselves, were among those who brought a gift to the king, which has been found in the famous Behistun inscription (520 BC) near Iran / Kirmanşah written during the reign of the Achaemenid ruler Darius (552–486 BC).<sup>1</sup> The first forms of the name Armenia are Arminiya, Arminiya and Har-mi-nu-ya. The name “Arminiya” is considered the first record in this context. The identification is used for the 13<sup>th</sup> Persian satrapy, which was conquered later by Darius in the Achaemenid Empire.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, it is expressed that 400 talanton silver taxes were collected from the region in this period.<sup>3</sup>

Another source of information from ancient writers on the period of Persian domination in the region of Armenia belongs to Xenophon. In his work *Anabasis*, he gives information about the region’s geography, the livelihoods of the ordinary people and their main occupations. Accordingly, the main livelihoods of the people living in Armenia are agriculture, livestock and horticulture. In the work, it is mentioned that Greek mercenaries under the command of Xenophon, who retreated Xenophon using the territory of the region, were able to supply agricultural and livestock products such as wheat, barley, dry beans, raisins, bacon, sesame, almonds, peanuts and peanut oil to almost every village. As well as beverages that were similar to beer and made from barley, high quality wines were also produced. Also, the *Anabasis* wrote down many pets such as goats, sheep, pigs, cows, chickens, horses. Strabo, on the other hand, mentioned that the Armenian lands, which were famous for their horses, had wide grasslands that were very suitable for horse breeding. He added that special war horses were raised for the Persian king in the region, the main horse supplier of the Persian army. In addition to these, the Armenian satrap sent 20,000 little horses to Persia every year for the Mithra festival.<sup>4</sup>

The first encounter between Alexander passing through Anatolia through Canakkale and the Persians was near Granikos.<sup>5</sup> Alexander defeated the Persians in the wars of Issos and Gaugamela<sup>6</sup>, and conquered the whole region from Egypt to Kyrgyzstan. Alexander’s conquest of Persia and his expeditions to the interior of India marked a new era in the economic life of Anatolia.<sup>7</sup> Conquests opened up new markets for Greek trade<sup>8</sup> and the balance of Greek and eastern trade radically changed with the provision of new raw material resources.<sup>9</sup> In the encounter of the Persians with the Greeks, the Armenians took part in the Persians’ army and supported the Persians with horses and infantry.<sup>10</sup> However, our knowledge on the region of Armenia during Alexander and his Macedonian Kingdom is very limited. There is a bluff separation of ideas about how

Alexander pursued a policy in the region of Armenia. While some researchers stated that Armenia had no place in the conquest politics of Alexander,<sup>11</sup> on the other hand, other researchers agreed that Alexander had appointed Mithrines, the commander of Persians in Sardes,<sup>12</sup> as the satrap of Armenia.<sup>13</sup> However, there is no information about whether Mithrines controlled Armenia as a satrap. With the death of Alexander the Great in 323 BC, the military, political and economic constructions in the period before and after the Hellenistic period were divided into four parts: Mesopotamia and Syria were left to the rule of Seleukos. The dominance of Ptolemaios in Egypt, Libya and Levant regions; Lysimakhos in Thrace and Asia Minor, and Kassandros in Macedonia were seen.<sup>14</sup> Diodoros, who gave information about the state's share of the generals, did not mention Armenia.<sup>15</sup> However, Cappadocia, Armenia and Atropatenan are known to maintain their legal status within the Seleucids.<sup>16</sup>

Appianos declared that Armenia was attached to the Seleucid Kingdom during the reign of Seleucid I (305–281 BC).<sup>17</sup> However, as in the Persian period, the region never entered the Seleucids' direct dominance area during the Seleucids period.<sup>18</sup> The colonization activities of the Seleucids were different from the other kingdoms. For the Seleucids, the heart of the kingdom was Syria thus, they carried out their colonization activities in this region.<sup>19</sup> During the Seleucid period, the region was divided into three separate administrative regions: Greater Armenia, Sophene and Lesser Armenia. This distinction continued until the Byzantine period with some changes.<sup>20</sup> In Armenia, Sophene was the closest to the Hellenistic world, immediately bordered on the borders of Mesopotamia in the south and close to the main trade routes of northern Mesopotamia.<sup>21</sup> There was a trade route to Babylon through the Euphrates River coming from the western border,<sup>22</sup> and as previously mentioned, through the special rafts that Herodotus also described.<sup>23</sup> The region of Armenia never came into the intensive colonization area of the Seleucids. The rugged structure of the region and the unfavorable climatic conditions were perhaps the most important reason for this.

The internal turmoil that the Seleucid Empire, which was one of the successors of Alexander and a Hellenistic kingdom based in Antiocheia, experienced in the early 1<sup>st</sup> century BC led to the emergence of different powers in the dominance of this empire. Parths, Romans and Armenians were the main forces that emerged in the Seleucid Empire's sovereignty. While the change of political balances led to the emergence of new powers and new controversies, the economic problems were another reason for Rome to deal with the region. The dominant political power of Rome has felt the need for further attention with the political developments in the Roman region due to the increasing interest of patricians in the eastern world for various luxury consumer goods and exotic products.<sup>24</sup>

The transit trade road, known as "the Silk Road" (Seidenstraßen) between the east and the west, had two important centers.<sup>25</sup> One of them were the ports of the eastern Mediterranean and the other the ports in the Black Sea. An example of these ports in the Black Sea is the port of Tana at the mouth of the Don River, which is located on

the coast of the Sea of Azov. Roads followed during the commercial activities were carried out in east-west direction. They ended in these ports.<sup>26</sup> The main commercial product carried by this road network, with different alternatives from land and sea, was silk. However, a wide range of products, such as lapis lazuli, jade stones, various spices, fabrics, ivory, exotic fruits and animals, were transported. These products from China and India appealed to the emperors, kings, nobles and people of the upper class in western markets. Especially silk was very valuable. It was seen that the Romans and the Parths engaged in an intense struggle in order to obtain the silk and other valuable goods coined with gold and to get more shares of the east-west trade.<sup>27</sup>

With the peace of Apameia, which was signed in 188 BC, Roman domination started in Asia Minor. The period between 189–10 BC are the years when the Artaxias dynasty was in power.<sup>28</sup> In 190 BC, with the emergence of Rome as the dominant power of the Mediterranean world, there was another force in the east, Parth.<sup>29</sup>

Along with these revolutionary changes in the geopolitics of the dominance zone of the Artaxias, Artaxias was recognized as an independent king in Armenia as a result of his alliance with the Romans. In addition to Rome, it was another force that recognized the dominance of Artaxias in Parth. Thus, some new administrative changes occurred in this new dynasty in the region of Armenia. A new administrative system and tax system was established with the new capital established on the Araxes River.<sup>30</sup>

It is known that at least ten new cities were built during the Artaxias dynasty. The most famous of these is Artashat (Artaxata or Artaxhata), which is also the first independent capital of the Kingdom of Armenia. This city is located 24 km south of modern-day Erivan.<sup>31</sup> Cities, which were centers of foreign traders, mediated the spread of Greek cultural values. The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> century BC to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC is the period, in which the Hellenistic influences were strong. Together with the Hellenistic period, the growth of the money economy started a vibrant period of commercial life and industrial activity with the establishment of a number of Greek colonies and cities that had a strong influence on the cultural development of Asia Minor. Artashat, one of the most important cities built by Artaxias and the capital of the new dynasty, was the main political, administrative, economic and cultural center. The city, whose geographical location and the regional economy were important elements, and which dominated the trade routes, was easily accessible for international trade.<sup>32</sup>

Another important factor for the economy in this period was the temple economy. The cult of the temple, which is a common trend among kings and elites is that the temples dedicated to ancestors or gods have great properties and riches become a dominant element in the economy. Temple complexes were like a city center.<sup>33</sup>

The peasants in the lower classes had certain rights in the land where they work, but they cannot be said to receive the full value of their labor. As status, the peasants were free. However, they had to pay heavy taxes. The lowest part of society were slaves. Dynasty members, nobles and temples had many slaves. Thousands of people who were brought and enslaved from the occupied places by military service were an important

labor force and economic value for the economy of the period. Slaves were used in the construction or maintenance of large public projects such as roads, canals, irrigation systems and cities by state. Slavery was, therefore, an important component of the economy.<sup>34</sup>

After the first king of Artaksias dynasty Artachsias I, Artavasdes I (160–115 BC) and Tigranes I (115–95 BC) dominated the sovereignty. In this period, however, the Parthians filled the authority gap which was experienced due to Rome's struggle with Carthage. The two kings who came after Artaksias I could not escape the influence of Parth.<sup>35</sup> When Artavasdes I was defeated by the Parth, his nephew was sent to Ctesiphon, the capital of Parth, as a hostage. It is understood that the Parthians realized the importance of Armenia as a big trade center in this period. Especially the newly established capital of Armenia, Artashata, was an important stopping point in east-west trade. In this period, Artaxias founded a mint to further facilitate trade in Armenia.<sup>36</sup>

After the death of Tigran I, the king of Armenia, Tigranes II who was held in Ctesiphon, was released, reciprocating this with a series of valleys in the Greater Armenia region to the Parthians for his freedom,<sup>37</sup> then he became the new king of Armenia. Tigranes who remained in power between 97–54 BC, continued the expansion policy, which started in the period of Artaksias I.<sup>38</sup>

During the period of economic prosperity under Tigranes II, during which the kingdom of Armenia lived its most brilliant period, significant zoning-settlement activities were observed in the region. In the early 70s BC, II. A new capital was built in honor of the name of Tigranes further south because the old capital Artashata on the river Araxes stayed too far away in the north for governing the kingdom due to the expansion of Armenia's borders. We learn the most important information about this new capital city from Appianos. It also had a theater that resembled the Greek capital of the new capital, with large parks, hunting grounds and lakes.<sup>39</sup>

To populate the new city, half a million people, according to an estimation, from neighboring countries such as Adiabene, Assyria, Gordiene, Arabian Mesopotamia, from different ethnic backgrounds and Greek origin from small Asia were displaced and thus, a cosmopolitan structure was formed. These displaced people guided the commercial and industrial developments within the empire.<sup>40</sup>

The welfare and peace environment provided by Tigranes II in the region of Armenia was not prolonged. The imperialist side in the Roman senate moved in order to get rid of the king of Pontus VI., one of the greatest enemies of Rome, and impose its solution to the east.<sup>41</sup> Lucullus who defeated the king of Pontus, Mithridates, then marched on Armenia and King of Armenia also defeated Tigranes II in the Tigranocerta War.<sup>42</sup>

The Tigranocerta War can be described as a disappointment for the Kingdom of Armenia, which lived its most powerful and fully independent period in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC. After this war, the imperial dreams of the Kingdom of Armenia ended.<sup>43</sup> By 68 BC, after capturing Tigranocerta, Lucullus made a number of unsuccessful attempts to seize Tigranes II and Mithridates VI to root out the matter.<sup>44</sup> After Lucullus failed, the Roman

senate dismissed him and appointed Pompeius.<sup>45</sup> In 66 BC, Pompeius, who took over, quickly moved to protect the Roman sovereignty and economic interests in the east.<sup>46</sup> After the death of Tigranes II, Artavasdes II (55–34 BC) has passed. Artavasdes II tried to maintain the buffer state and balance policy between Rome and Parth.<sup>47</sup>

In this period, the crazier attempt of Marcus Licinius Crassus<sup>48</sup> against the Parths to gain more recognition decayed an about ten year peace signed by Pompeius and Phrates III between the Romans and the Parthian.<sup>49</sup> After Crassus' death in the Battle of Karrhai, the years 49–48 BC there was the scene of civil war between Caesar and Pompeius. Caesar who won this struggle in 47 BC was assassinated on March 15<sup>th</sup> in 44 BC without applying the unrealistic plan of invading Persia from Armenia in 45 BC, passing from the Caspian Sea to southern Russia and from there, via Germany, Gaul and returning to Rome.<sup>50</sup>

After the destruction of Caesar, the second Triumvirate (43 BC–38 BC) was founded in Rome, consisting of Marcus Antonius, Octavian (Augustus) and Lepidus.<sup>51</sup> Following the new Triumvirate, the Romans took action under the leadership of Marcus Antonius to avenge the defeat in Karrhai and restore the lost Roman reputation.<sup>52</sup> The army of Antonius moved in 36 BC. While the process before expedition for Antonius and the Roman army advancing under the supervision of Artavasdes II went on successfully, they failed due to Antony's tactical errors and the Roman army, despite its tremendous magnitude, suffered significant losses from its present with the withdrawal of Artavasdes II's support and took back by taking a heavy defeat.<sup>53</sup> In 34 BC, Antonius invaded Armenia and captured the king to take revenge on Artavasdes II, who let him down, and on his defeat.<sup>54</sup> On the other hand, the people of Armenia declared Artaksias II, the eldest son of Artavasdes II, as the new Armenian king.<sup>55</sup>

The region of Armenia became an obstacle for effective military actions between Rome and Parth sometimes with its own power, sometimes with its rugged topography and geographical features, sometimes together with both elements, the role of a buffer state, in this context, became an identity for the region. Therefore, both powers adopted a policy of keeping Armenia in the periphery of their territory. As a matter of fact, by abolishing the threat of Antony and Cleopatra, *Principatus*<sup>56</sup> in Rome and Augustus, who started the imperial period, tried to control Armenia region.<sup>57</sup>

Augustus was not pleased with the *status quo* of the East in 20 BC. He also wanted to recapture the Roman banners that had been captured by the Parths in the battle of Karrhai. Because this meant a great loss of prestige for Rome. In this direction, Augustus took the initiative to solve these problems to the East in 20 BC and the Roman banners that were captured after the defeat of Crassus took back by the agreement with the Parthians.<sup>58</sup>

After the agreement of the Romans with the Parthians during the period of Augustus, it was once emphasized that the Euphrates had been a border between the two powers. As a matter of fact, the state of the Euphrates being a natural border was also emphasized in the testament of Augustus that he left to his successors after his death. Because, in

order to continue the existence of Rome in Anatolia, the Euphrates River had to be held and the Parths had to stay on the east side of this river.<sup>59</sup>

After Artaksias II, the reign of the Armenian King Tigran III (20 BC–10 BC) did not last long with Roman intervention. On the suspicion of betrayal of Tigran IV, the son of Tigran III, Augustus interfered in his power and Tiberius came to Armenia with Artavasdes III, a cousin of Tigran. This arbitrary movement of the Romans provoked a rebellion in Armenia with the incitement of the Parthians.<sup>60</sup> The power of Tigranes was recognised in consequence of the rebellion that was squashed by Romans and his reconciliation with Rome.<sup>61</sup>

After the death of Augustus in his 16 years, the Parth / Artaksias dynasty tried to break the dominance of Rome in Armenia and Mesopotamia. In this period, the new king of Armenia was Tridates who was the brother of Vologases I, the king of Parth. Tiridates I, who ruled intermittently on the throne of Armenia since 53 AD, ruled Armenia between the years of 62–75.<sup>62</sup> As a result of Parth attacks during the Roman-Parth period between the years 55–63 AD and Rome's loss of Armenia Roman authority was shaken in the region.<sup>63</sup>

In 58 and 63 AD an army was sent under the command of Cn. Domitius Corbulo to intervene in events in the region by the Roman emperor, Nero.<sup>64</sup> They devastated Tigranocerta and Artashat. Tiridates I took refuge in the Parths.<sup>65</sup> And Tigranes I was appointed to the throne of Armenia by Corbulo. But when Corbulo invaded Armenia for the second time in MS 63, Parthlar called for a ground of agreement. In 63 AD, the Rhandaia (modern Kharpert) Peace<sup>66</sup> was signed between Rome and Parth. According to this, the brother of Parthian king Vologases, Tiridates, would remain under the throne of Armenia, but would take the crown from Rome.<sup>67</sup> Thus, the Arsakes / Arshakid / Arsakuni dynasty, which was going to continue until 298 AD, started in Armenia<sup>68</sup> This period was perhaps the most important period of prosperity and superiority that the region had experienced since the Urartu Kingdom. The region, taking advantage of the limited commercial concessions, which were made with Rome increased importance in the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD when the Roman Empire was strengthened in Anatolia.<sup>69</sup>

The major Parthian expedition of Traian led to the conquests from Petra, the major commercial center in the west to Ktesiphon, the capital of the Parthian in the east and to Susa, the historic commercial center and the beginning of the king's road. After this expedition, Armenia became a Roman province and the Romans' historic rival in the east, Parth, was reduced to vassal kingdom status.<sup>70</sup> It is seen that the successes of Traianus were compromised during the reign of Hadrianus, the successor of Traianus. In 120 AD, the Roman armies in the region withdrew and the border was again designated as Euphrates.<sup>71</sup>

The struggles of the Empire of Rome with the Parthians continued until the establishment of the Sassanid State by eliminating the Parths under the leadership of Ardaşir / Artaxerses in the period of Septimius Severus Alexander, the Roman Emperor, (222–235 AD).

As a result, while the Eastern Anatolia Region, an important place in the strategic, commercial and political sense since the oldest periods of history, has provided the connection between Caucasus and Mesopotamia in north-south direction, it has also provided the connection of the roads to the inner parts of Anatolia and Asia in the east-west direction. As well as rich underground and ground resources, the Eastern Anatolia Region with its dominant position in Anatolia, has been the scene of fierce struggles between the Romans and Parthians who wanted to take control of the position of dominating the international trade routes, which have an important place in both the global and local economic system. Nevertheless, its rugged topography and harsh climate has not created attractive conditions for those who want to settle in this land; it has usually been in their periphery although it has been next to large cultural areas. In comparison to the west of Anatolia, the region lacks the traces of the architectural remains that ancient cultures have left behind. As a feature of its physical geography, it often has a fragmented political outlook, and since the Urartian Kingdom, there has not been a centralized power in the region, and its political control has been difficult. Within the scope of Roman-Parthian struggles, it was mostly in the buffer / vassal kingdom position an both powers were not included in the areas of strict control except for short periods. Therefore, the dominant power in the region has often changed. The Romans adopted the Euphrates River as a natural border and they were not willing to move to the east of the Euphrates except for short periods of rule. However, they did not neglect to keep these military forces alert through the north-south legions along the Euphrates River where they recruited their military forces against the danger of Parth in the east. The fierce struggle by the forces that dominated the region has brought profitable commercial activities as well as the destruction during the periods of peace. As a result, the struggle for welfare and prosperity flowing through the international transit trade route, which has passed to modern literature as the Silk Road has determined the economic and political fate of the Armenia region.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> This subject has been discussed more comprehensively in Turkish in a book titled "Economic and Agricultural Life in the Ancient Ages of the Anatolia" (Eds. L. Gürkan GÖKÇEK, Ercüment YILDIRIM, and Okay PEKŞEN), 2018, 459–544. – Frye 1984, 363.

<sup>2</sup> Schmitt 1987, 417.

<sup>3</sup> Tekin 2007, 47.

<sup>4</sup> Xen. an. 4.4.7.; 4.4.9.; 4.4.13.; 4.5.25.

<sup>5</sup> Martin 2013, 245.

<sup>6</sup> Redgate 1998, 62.

<sup>7</sup> Frank 2004, 62.

<sup>8</sup> Rostovtzeff 1936, 233; Manning 2014, 8.

<sup>9</sup> Before Alexander, in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, the Greek trade area was almost entirely limited to the Mediterranean or Black Sea coasts. Trade with Asia's interior regions was clearly only of secondary importance. However, after the conquest of Alexander by Persia, they were all radically changed. Trade has gained a worldwide character by attracting not only Asian Minors, Mesopotamia and Egypt, but also into the circle of live and direct commercial relations in the remote areas of Central Asia and India.

<sup>10</sup> Burney – Lang 1971, 187.

<sup>11</sup> Cook 1962, 162.

<sup>12</sup> Chahin 1987, 187.

<sup>13</sup> For details, see Hammond 1996, 130–137.

<sup>14</sup> Mamandian 1965, 204; Cook 1962, 161; Martin 2013, 255; Rolf 2011, 223–287.

<sup>15</sup> Diodoros Siculus, 18.3.

<sup>16</sup> Mamandian 1965, 204; Mommsen 2005, 95; Rostovtzeff 1936, 237.

<sup>17</sup> Appianos 314, 55.

<sup>18</sup> Burney – Lang 1971, 187–191.

<sup>19</sup> Jones 1971, 242.

<sup>20</sup> Burney – Lang 1971, 191.

<sup>21</sup> Mamandian 1965, 205

<sup>22</sup> Casson 2002.

<sup>23</sup> Hdt. 1991, I.194.

<sup>24</sup> Keaveney 1992, 101; Demir 2014, 55.

<sup>25</sup> (Seidenstraßen); Richthofen 1877, 96–122; Litvinsky 1996; Warmington 1974; Liu 2010; Frankopan 2015.

<sup>26</sup> Hermann 1935, 26 f.; Warmington 1974, 18–34; Litvinsky – Guangda et al. 1996, 35.

<sup>27</sup> Warmington 1974, 105; Tezcan 2005, 3 f.

<sup>28</sup> Kurkjian 1964, 69; Garsonian 1997, 44; Strab. 11.14.5.

<sup>29</sup> Tezcan 2014, 156.

<sup>30</sup> Panossian 2006, 37.

<sup>31</sup> Kurkjian 1964, 70

<sup>32</sup> Payaslian 2007, 15; Lang 1983, 509; Manandyan 1965, 46–49.

<sup>33</sup> Payaslian 2007, 16.

<sup>34</sup> Payaslian 2007, 16.

<sup>35</sup> Diod. 31.17.; App. Syr. 45, 66.; Bournoutian 2006, 29 f.

<sup>36</sup> Bournoutian 2006, 29 f.

<sup>37</sup> Strab. 11.14.15; Justinus Epitome 1853, 38.3.; Debevoise 1968, 45

<sup>38</sup> Bournoutian 2006, 30; Kurkjian 1964, 74; Strab. 11.14.15; Plut. Lucullus 21–26.

<sup>39</sup> Garsonian 1997, 56; Kurkjian 1964, 76; Panossian 2006, 37; Jones 1998, 201; Çiğdem 2011, 97–118; Yavuz 2014, 2–4.

<sup>40</sup> Payaslian 2007, 20; Garsonian 1997, 56; Kurkjian 1964, 76; Panossian 2006, 37; Bournoutian 2006, 32; Payaslian 2007, 20.

<sup>41</sup> Garsonian 1997, 56; Plut. Lucullus 21.534/5. 538/9; Keaveney 1992, 102 f.



- <sup>42</sup>Plut. Lucullus 23.7; Memnon 2007, 38.1; Cic. Manil. 23; Keaveney 1992, 103.
- <sup>43</sup>Strab. 12. 3. 28, 30, 13. 1. 55; Plut. Lucullus 1914, 14,6–8. 21,2. 23,7. 27,7. 29,7. 30,1. 78. 43,2; Sherwin – White 1983, 174–176; Sullivan 1990, 97–99; Jones 1998, 224; Kaya 2004, 73–86; Tekin 2007, 141; Palaz Erdemir 2014, 3–6; Yıldırım 2016, 51–73.
- <sup>44</sup>Plut. Lucullus 31; App. Mithr. 1912, 13.87.
- <sup>45</sup>Eutr. 6.12; Cass. Dio 36.20; Cic. Manil. 27.
- <sup>46</sup>Chahin 2001, 204.
- <sup>47</sup>Chahin 2001, 204; Garsonian 1997, 60.
- <sup>48</sup>Boak 1921, 184.
- <sup>49</sup>Keaveney 1991, 66 f.; Redgate 1998, 76; Benjamin 1891, 163.
- <sup>50</sup>Ball 2002, 14; Payaslian 2007, 24.
- <sup>51</sup>Plut. Antonius 30; Bournoutian 2002, 34.
- <sup>52</sup>Plut. Antonius 37.3; Colledge 1967, 43 f.; Huzar 1978, 173.
- <sup>53</sup>Plut. Antonius 38; Strab. 11.13.4.; Cass. Dio 49,25–26; Vell. 2.82.3; Ball 2002, 107; Redgate 1998, 78.
- <sup>54</sup>Cass. Dio 49.39.2.
- <sup>55</sup>Cass. Dio 49.39.5.
- <sup>56</sup>Momsen 2005, 73; Tekin 2007, 222.
- <sup>57</sup>Sherwin-White 1977, 65.
- <sup>58</sup>Cass. Dio 54.8.1–2; Suet. Aug. 21.3; Eutr. 7.9; Taylor 1936, 163; Gruen 1996, 159 f.
- <sup>59</sup>Gibbon 1987, 23; Kaya 1998, 163; Momsen 1996, 95.
- <sup>60</sup>Kurkjian 1964, 88.
- <sup>61</sup>Cass. Dio 55.9.4–5; Cass. Dio 55.10.18; Tac. ann. 11.4; Vell. 2.101.1; Momsen 1996, 95; Swan 2004, 112. 125; Anderson 1934, 273–277; Campbell 1993, 222.
- <sup>62</sup>Bournoutian 2002, 40.
- <sup>63</sup>Wheeler 2011, 243.
- <sup>64</sup>Shotter 2005, 38; Champlin 2003, 39.
- <sup>65</sup>Benjamin 1891, 168; Shotter 2005, 38; Champlin 2003, 39.
- <sup>66</sup>Garsonian 1997, 67.
- <sup>67</sup>Champlin 2003, 221; Shotter 2005, 39.
- <sup>68</sup>Tac. ann. 13,6. 13,34. 14,23.26. 15,1.17 15,24.31. 16,23.3; Cass. Dio 62,19.23; 63,1–6; Bournoutian 2002, 41; Garsonian 1997, 67.
- <sup>69</sup>Tezcan 2014, 155 f.
- <sup>70</sup>Akşit 1970, 186 f.; Gibbon 1987, 27; Frye 1984, 242.
- <sup>71</sup>Campbell 1993, 215; SHA Hadr. 2.21.11; Gibbon 1987, 27.

## References

**Adontz 1946**

N. Adontz, *Historie d'Armenie Les Origines* (Paris 1946).

**Akşit 1970**

O. Akşit, *Roma İmparatorluk Tarihi* (M.S. 193–395) (İstanbul 1970).

**Anderson 1934**

J. G. C. Anderson, *The Revolt of Armenia and the Mission of Gaius Caesar*, *CAH* 10 1934, 273–279.

**Ball 2002**

W. Ball, *Rome in the East: The Transformation of an Empire* (New York 2002).

**Benjamin 1891**

S. G. W. Benjamin, *The Story of The Nations. Persia* (New York 1891).

**Boak 1921**

A. E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 AD* (New York 1921).

**Bournoutian 2006**

G.A. Bournoutian, *A Concise History of Armenian People* (USA 2006).

**Burney – Lang 1971**

C. Burney – D. Lang, *The Peoples of the Hills* (London 1971).

**Campbell 1993**

B. Campbell, *War and Diplomacy: Rome and Parthia, 31 BC–235 AD*, in: J. Rich – G. Shipley (eds.), *War and Society in Roman World* (London 1993) 213–241.

**Casson 2002**

L. Casson, *Antik Çağda Denizcilik ve Gemiler* (İstanbul 2002).

**Chahin 1987**

M. Chahin, *The Kingdom of Armenia* (London 1987).

**Champlin 2003**

E. Champlin, *Nero* (London 2003).

**Çiğdem 2011**

S. Çiğdem, *Roma-Parth İlişkilerinde Elegeia/Erzurum ve Çevresi*, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 11/46, 2011, 97–118.

**Colledge 1967**

M. A. R. Colledge, *The Parthians* (London 1967).

**Cook 1962**

J. M. Cook, *The Greeks in Ionia and the East, Ancient Peoples and Places* 31 (London 1962).

**Debevoise 1968**

N. C. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia* (New York 1968).

**Demir 2014**

M. Demir, *Roma-Armenia İlişkileri* (MÖ 95 – MS 118), in: M. M. Hülagu et al. (eds.), *Tarihte Türkler ve Ermeniler I* (Ankara 2014) 55–97.

**Frank 2004**

T. Frank, *An Economic History of Roma* (Lancaster 2004).

**Frankopan 2015**

P. Frankopan, *The Silk Roads: A New History of the World* (Bloomsbury 2015).

**Frye 1984**

R.N. Frye, *The History of Ancient Iran* (Munich 1984).

**Garsonian 1997**

N. Garsonian, *The Arsakuni Dynasty*, in: R. G. Hovannisian (ed.), *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times I. The Dynastic Periods: From Antiquity to the Fourteenth Century* (New York 1997) 63–94.

**Gibbon 1987**

E. Gibbon 1987, *Roma İmparatorluğu'nun Gerileyiş ve Çöküş Tarihi* 1–3, Trans.: A. Baltacıgil (İstanbul 1987).

**Gruen 1996**

E. S. Gruen, *The Expansion of the Empire under Octavianus*, in: A. K. Bowman – E. Champlin – A. Lintott (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History X: The Augustan Empire, 43 BC–AD 69* (Cambridge 1996) 147–197.

**Hammond 1996**

N. G. L. Hammond, *Alexander and Armenia*, *Phoenix* 50, 1996, 130–137.

**Hermann 1935**

A. Hermann, *Historical and Commercial Atlas of China* (Massachusetts 1935).

**Jones 1971**

A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford 1971).

**Jones 1998**

A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (New York 1998).

**Kaya 2004**

M. A. Kaya, *Romalılar, Parthlar ve Armenia Krallığı* (İ.Ö. 92-İ.S. 4), *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi* 19/1, 2004, 73–86.

**Kaya 1998**

M. A. Kaya, *Anadolu'da Roma Egemenliği ve Pompeius'un Siyasal Düzenlemeleri*, *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi* 13, 1998, 163–173.

**Keaveney 1991**

A. Keaveney, *Roman Treaties with Parthia circa 95–circa 64 B.C.*, *AJPh* 102/2, 1981, 195–212.

**Keaveney 1992**

A. Keaveney, *Lucullus. A Life* (London 1992).

**Kurkjian 1964**

V. M. Kurkjian, *A History of Armenia* (Dearborn 1964).

**Litvinsky 1996**

B. A. Litvinsky (ed.), *The Crossroads of Civilizations: A.D. 250 to 750*, *HCCA* 3 (Paris 1996).

**Liu 2010**

X. Liu 2010, *The Silk Road in World History* (New York 2010).

**Mamandian 1965**

H. Mamandian, *The Trade and Cities of Armenia in Relation to Ancient World Trade* (Lisbon 1965).

**Manning 2014**

J. G. Manning, At the Limits: Long-Distance Trade in the Time of Alexander the Great and Hellenistic Kings, in: V. H. Mair – J. Hickman (eds.), *Reconfiguring the Silk Road: New Research on East-West Exchange in Antiquity* (Philadelphia 2014) 5–14.

**Martin 2013**

T. R. Martin, *Ancient Greece from Prehistoric to Hellenistic Times* (London 2013).

**Mayor 2013**

A. Mayor, *Mithridates* (İstanbul 2013).

**Mommsen 2005**

T. Mommsen, *A History of Rome Under the Emperors 3* (New York 2005).

**Panossian 2006**

R. Panossian, *From Kings and Priests to Merchants and Commissars* (Columbia 2006).

**Payaslian 2007**

S. Payaslian, *The History of Armenia* (USA 2007).

**Redgate 1998**

A. E. Redgate, *The Armenians* (Oxford 1998).

**Richthofen 1877**

F. V. Richthofen, Über die zenrtalasiatischen Seidenstrassen bis zum 2. Jahrhundert, *Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde*, 1877, 96–122.

**Rostovtzeff 1936**

M. I. Rostovtzeff, The Hellenistic World and Its Economic Development, *The American Historical Review* 41, 1936, 231–252.

**Schmitt 1987**

Armenia and Iran 2 (1987) 417 f. s. v. Armina. Achaemenid Province (R. Schmitt).

**Sherwin-White 1977**

A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Involvement in Anatolia, 167–88 B.C., *JRS* 67, 1977, 62–75.

**Sherwin-White 1983**

A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East: 168 BC–AD 1* (Oklahoma 1983).

**Shotter 2005**

D. Shotter, *Nero* (London 2005).

**Strootman 2011**

R. Strootman, Hellenistic Court Society: The Seleukid Imperial Court Under Antiochos the Great, 223–187 BCE, in: J. Duindam – T. Artan – M. Kunt, *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires* (Leiden 2011) 63–89.

**Sullivan 1990**

R. D. Sullivan, *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome. 100–30 BC* (Toronto 1990).

**Swan 2004**

P. M. Swan, *The Augustan Succession: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 55–56 (9 B.C. – A.D. 14)* (Oxford 2004).

**Taylor 1936**

L. R. Taylor, M. Titius and the Syrian Command, *JRS* 26/2, 1936, 161–173.

**Tekin 2007**

O. Tekin, Eski Anadolu ve Trakya (İstanbul 2007).

**Tekin 2007**

O. Tekin, Eski Yunan ve Roma Tarihine Giriş (İstanbul 2007).

**Tezcan 2005**

M. Tezcan, Eskiçağ'da Roma İmparatorluğu'nun Karadeniz Bölgesi Vasıtasıyla Hindistan ve Çin ile Ticareti, Başlangıçtan 20. yüzyıla Karadeniz Tarihi Sempozyumu I, 3-29.

**Tezcan 2014**

M. Tezcan, İran Armeniası (Pers Armenia), Tarihte Türkler ve Ermeniler (Ankara 2014) 149-182.

**Thorley 1971**

J. Thorley, The Silk Trade between China and the Roman Empire at Its Height, 'Circa' A.D. 90-130, Greece & Rome 18/1, 1971, 71-80.

**Warmington 1974**

E. H. Warmington, The Commerce Between the Roman Empire and India (Delhi 1974).

**Yavuz 2014**

M. F. Yavuz, Antikçağda Armenia: Kısa Bir Tarih, Yeni Türkiye 60, 2014, 1-12.

**Yıldırım 2016**

E. Yıldırım, Antik Yazarların Eserlerinde Sophene Bölgesi İle İlgili Anlatımlar, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 3/7, 2016, 51-73.

**Yorke 1896**

V. W. Yorke, A Journey in the Valley of the Upper Euphrates, The Geographical Journal 8, 1896, 453-472.