



**URSULA HACKL, BRUNO JACOBS, DIETER WEBER
(HRSG.), QUELLEN ZUR GESCHICHTE DES
PARTHERREICHES. TEXTSAMMLUNG MIT
ÜBERSETZUNGEN UND KOMMENTAREN. GÖTTINGEN:
VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT 2010:**

**BD. 1: PROLEGOMENA, ABKÜRZUNGEN, BIBLIOGRAPHIE,
EINLEITUNG, INDICES, KARTEN, TAFELN
(NOVUM TESTAMENTUM ET ORBIS ANTIQUUS / STUDIEN ZUR
UMWELT DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS 83), CXLIII, 256 SEITEN MIT
77 ABB. UND 5 KARTEN; ISBN 978-3-525-53386-4.**

**BD. 2: GRIECHISCHE UND LATEINISCHE TEXTE, PARTHISCHE
TEXTE, NUMISMATISCHE EVIDENZ, MIT BEITRÄGEN VON DANIEL
KELLER, LUKAS THOMMEN, DIETER WEBER
(NOVUM TESTAMENTUM ET ORBIS ANTIQUUS / STUDIEN ZUR
UMWELT DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS 84), X, 639 SEITEN MIT 62
ABB., GEBUNDEN; ISBN 978-3-525-53387-1.**

**BD. 3: KEILSCHRIFTLICHE TEXTE, ARAMÄISCHE TEXTE,
ARMENISCHE TEXTE, ARABISCHE TEXTE, CHINESISCHE TEXTE,
MIT BEITRÄGEN VON BARBARA BÖCK, UTA GOLZE, GUDRUN
SCHUBERT, KERSTIN STORM, GIUSTO TRAINA, MARKUS ZEHNDER
(NOVUM TESTAMENTUM ET ORBIS ANTIQUUS / STUDIEN ZUR
UMWELT DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS 85), VIII, 512 SEITEN,
GEBUNDEN; ISBN 978-3-525-53388-8.**

The book under review is the sort of publication that was badly needed by anybody interested in the Parthian Empire, and this is the case simply because it brings together a collection of sources on the Parthian Empire. As is widely known, sources on the Parthian Empire are transmitted in various languages (not

only Greek, Latin, and Parthian, but also Akkadian, Sumerian, Aramean, Arabic, Armenian and even Chinese) and as such are not easily available due to the intellectual difficulty in dealing with so many languages at once. Translations are therefore necessary, and this book certainly has a very good chance of delivering an acute remedy for that difficulty. Another problem has been that various editions of the source material are widespread over many publications and serials, and it is notoriously difficult to collect, or even to keep abreast of all those that are published. In this context, one collection like *Quellen zur Geschichte des Partherreiches* will indeed be very helpful. Furthermore, the book also provides basic information on the Parthian Empire in the form of short essays and introductions preceding the relevant translations. This is also useful, though one may get the impression that this task is secondary to collecting, translating and commenting on all sources, and the value of such essays may vary considerably from one author to another.

The publication contains three volumes. In addition to a foreword, a list of abbreviations, a rich, but definitely not exhaustive bibliography, maps, plates and indices, the first volume offers an introduction into the Parthian history and culture in two chapters that sketch the basics of Parthian geography, history, culture and religion, society and state. The second volume comprises Greek and Latin literary sources, a selection of Greek and Latin inscriptions, parchments and papyri, some Parthian texts, and a discussion of the numismatic evidence. The third volume deals with Cuneiform texts, Aramaic, Arabic and Chinese sources. The selection of Aramaic inscriptions is preceded by short introductions on the history, culture and religion of places where relevant inscriptions have been found. Thus, we are supplied with basic introductions about Hatra, Assur, Edessa, Dura-Europos and Palmyra.

Approaching a collection of sources, the first question that naturally comes to a mind is whether all the important sources were really included. Here, a few reservations can be made.¹ While some sources are explicitly left out by the editors – Indian and new-Persian evidence (volume 1, p. L), Roman poets, except for Lucian, (vol. 2, p. 3) – the absence of others is not explained, and in fact might be controversial. So is the lack of two texts, *Karnamag-i Artaxshir-i Papanakan* and *Denkard* (book 4). Of course, one could argue that – and this is apparently the reason for this omission – they contain only vague references whose value for the Parthian setting is a matter of controversy. Yet, so are many other sources (e.g. Rabbinic texts, *the Hymn of the Pearl*), and so perhaps it could be better to include a wider range of sources with basic bibliographical references enabling everyone to make their own judgment. However, in some cases, the

¹ On this problem, see also U. Hartmann's review, note 1 (<http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/rezensionen/2011-1-186.pdf>).

absence of some important sources in the collection cannot be reasonably explained. For example we know of only five Arsacid inscriptions, and two of them are not included in the collection. The first is the inscription from Behistun (Vologases), and the second a much-debated inscription from Sar-e Pol-e Zahab (Gotarzes, son of Gew). Furthermore, a trilingual inscription of Sapor I is included only in the Parthian version, without the Greek and Middle Persian texts (vol. 2, p. 573–587). Even if the other versions are more damaged than the Parthian text (according to Weber, p. 573), the extant parts still offer very precious insights (e.g. the name of Adiabene: see below). Likewise, not all passages from Josephus are included; though some scholars (e.g. Zehnder, vol. 3, p. 270 and 282) refer to them in the course of the book (the Adiabeneans in the context of the Jewish uprising against Rome – *Bellum Iudaicum* 2.520; 5.474, 6.356–357, 2.388–389, 1.6; Adiabenean palaces in Jerusalem – *Bell.* 4.567, 5.252, 5.253, 6.355, the mausoleum of Helena – *Bell.* 5.55, 5.119, 5.147; references to Helena’s resting place can also be found outside Josephus’ writings in Pausanias, *Periegesis* 8.16.4–5; Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 2.12.3; Hieronymus, *Epistulae*, 108.

As for other comments on specific parts of the collection, I shall restrict my observations to my primary field of scholarly interest, which is Jewish studies. Thus, firstly there is Josephus Flavius, whose passages with an Iranian setting are presented by Lukas Thommen (vol. 2, chapter III.I.2.22, pp. 202–244). Secondly, Markus Zehnder has dealt with Aramaic texts and inscriptions, some of which are of Jewish provenance (vol. 3, chapter III.5, pp. 175–401).

Thommen’s presentation of Josephus’ audience (p. 205) could benefit from being informed by more recent publications on the production of writings in ancient Rome,² and in the instance of Josephus, the publications of Steve Mason are particularly worthy of recommendation.³ While writing a book in ancient times, one could not really reach everyone, the less so appeal to everyone’s taste, but this is exactly what is being suggested by the standard theories adapted by Thommen (p. 203: Josephus addressed *both* “eine gebildete Oberschicht des römischen Reiches” and “die jüdische Diaspora”). Josephus rather produced his writings for a relatively small number of Roman elites who belonged to his company (including some Hellenized Jews) and personally took part in the process of production of his writings (oral recitation and distribution of partial drafts).

² R.M. Ogilvie, *Roman Literature and Society*, Brighton 1980, esp. 11–17; W.V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass. 1989, esp. 222–233; E. Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture. From Cicero to Apuleius*, Baltimore 1996, esp. 1–12.

³ E.g. S. Mason, ‘Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus’s Judean War in the Context of a Flavian Audience’ in S. Mason, *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins. Methods and Categories*, Peabody, MA. 2009, 45–67.

Furthermore, the idea that among Josephus' sources for his Parthian accounts we can distinguish "eine adiabensische Königsbiographie" has indeed been formulated by T. Rajak,⁴ but its root goes back to L.H. Schiffman, who postulated the existence of a royal chronicle of the Adiabene dynasty as a source underlying *Ant.* 20.17–96.⁵ On the contrary, modern Iranists do not even think that there were any written records on the Parthian court, but the role of historians was instead played by royal bards.⁶ Thus, in the light of our present knowledge on the Parthian world, there is no room for official chronicles or biographies written on the Adiabene court. Likewise, Josephus' story on Anilaios and Asinaios in *Ant.* 18.310–373, rightly counted by Thommen among "novellistische Episoden" (p. 203), has recently found a very good commentator in the person of G. Herman, who is not included in the bibliography.⁷ Likewise, a good piece of source criticism on that story has been delivered by N.G. Cohen.⁸

A king of Adiabene in the 1st c. CE named Izates can be only Izates II, and not Izates I (according to Thommen p. 225, n. 339), who in turn was the father of Monobazos I and must have lived before the Common Era (Josephus, *Bellum Iudaicum* 5.147).

The dating of the reign of Artabanos II (p. 223 and 229) is based on Debevoise's contribution.⁹ Though it is the most frequently accepted dating nowadays, there are good reasons to date Artabanos' death later, to 40 CE or even early 41 CE.¹⁰ First, Artabanos is still recalled by Josephus with regard to the accusations against Herod Antipas in 39 CE in Rome. Furthermore, the earliest coins of Artabanos' successor Vardanes come only from July of 41 CE. Next, regardless of when Artabanos died, the date given for his escape to Adiabene, 36 CE, is almost certainly wrong, since in 36 CE Artabanos was still engaged with the fight against Tiridates III, and we can infer from Josephus'

⁴ T. Rajak, 'The Parthians in Josephus' in J. Wiesehöfer (ed.), *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse*, Historia. Einzelschriften 122, Stuttgart 1998, 322.

⁵ L.H. Schiffman, 'The Conversion of the Royal House of Adiabene in Josephus and Rabbinic Sources' in L.H. Feldman, G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, Detroit 1987, 293–312.

⁶ M. Boyce, 'The Parthian "Gōsān" and Iranian Minstrel Tradition' *JRAS* 1–2, 1957, 10–45; G. Herman, 'Iranian Epic Motifs in Josephus' Antiquities (XVIII, 314–370)' *Journal of Jewish Studies* 57, 2006, 261 and n. 74.

⁷ G. Herman, 'Iranian Epic Motifs in Josephus' Antiquities, (XVIII, 314–370)', 245–268.

⁸ N.G. Cohen, 'Asinaeus and Anilaeus. Additional Comments to Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews' *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 10, 1975/76, 30–37.

⁹ N.C. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia*, Chicago 1938, 165.

¹⁰ M. Schottky, 'Parther, Meder und Hyrkanier. Eine Untersuchung der dynastischen und geographischen Verflechtungen im Iran des 1. Jhs. n. Chr.' *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 24, 1991, 86–87; M.J. Olbrycht, 'Vardanes contra Gotarzes II. Einige Überlegungen zur Geschichte des Partherreiches ca. 40–51 n. Chr.' *Folia Orientalia* 33, 1997, 82.

report that Artabanos' trouble came to him when he held power in Parthia, and not amidst the other fighting. Artabanos therefore had to first regain his power from the hands of Tiridates, and the rebellion connected with Kinnamos should be seen as a separate incident occurring before or (rather) after the dynastic conflict of 35–36 CE.

Not entirely clear are Thommen's dates given with regard to Vardanes on p. 229: "Kriegspläne seines Sohnes Vardanes gegen Adiabene (36–43 n. Chr.?)". These dates cannot refer to the reign of Vardanes, and so one has to assume they are meant to refer to the conflict between Izates and Vardanes. Yet, the episode on Izates' conflict with Vardanes can be dated more precisely than 36–43 CE, and indeed Thommen does so on p. 234 n. 72: "wohl ins Jahr 42 n. Chr. zu datieren" (with reference to Karras-Klapproth¹¹). Indeed, Tacitus (*Annales* 11.10) reports Vardanes' plan to regain Parthian control over Armenia, and says that Vardanes had to give up his ambition because of the Roman governor of Syria, Vibius Marsus, who threatened Vardanes with war if he attacked Armenia. Vibius Marsus' tenure in Syria is dated to 41/42–44/45.¹² Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that Vardanes could have come up with his plan before he managed to overcome the tension with Gotarzes and settle the situation in Seleucia (by June 42).¹³ Likewise, it must have taken place before the conflict with Gotarzes inflamed again. Since Josephus' testimony implies that Vardanes could not step against Izates due to the internal conflicts in his kingdom that finally led to his death, one is tempted to date Vardanes' conflict with Izates shortly before Vardanes' long campaign into the Trans-Caspian steppes against Gotarzes. However, it is not clear-cut when the conflict between Izates and Vardanes was rekindled (44 or 45 CE).¹⁴ If we take account of the fact that in 44 and 45 CE coins in Seleucia were struck on behalf of both Arsacid rulers (perhaps because of some power-sharing agreement), it is likely that a renewed conflict can be dated as late as 45 CE.¹⁵ Consequently, Vardanes' conflict with Izates could be dated later than 42 or even 43 CE, perhaps to 44 CE.

As for Kinnamos, Thommen merely reports in his commentary Schottky's identification of Kinnamos with Gotarzes. Although this idea has indeed been

¹¹ M. Karras-Klapproth, *Prosopographische Studien zur Geschichte des Partherreiches auf der Grundlage antiker literarischer Überlieferung*, Bonn 1988, 188, n. 3.

¹² G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, *The Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*, vol. I, Edinburgh 1973, 263–264.

¹³ R.H. McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia on the Tigris*, Ann Arbor 1935, 225–226; M. Schottky, 'Parther, Meder und Hyrkanier', 105; J. Wiesehöfer, *Das antike Persien von 550 v. Chr. bis 650 n. Chr.*, Zürich 1994, 196.

¹⁴ See U. Kahrstedt, *Artabanos III. und seine Erben*, Berlin 1950, 27; M. Schottky, 'Parther, Meder und Hyrkanier', 107.

¹⁵ M.J. Olbrycht, 'Vardanes contra Gotarzes II.', 86.

most thoroughly contended for by Schottky,¹⁶ it can already be found in Kahrstedt, who is not quoted here.¹⁷ This identification is very speculative and as such not very likely, and so it will not be of interest to us here. Let us instead remark that if such a speculative identification found its way into Thommen's footnotes, any attempt to identify King Abias recalled by Josephus in *Ant.* 20.77 (p. 236) should also have done so. Generally speaking, Abias is believed to be either an anonymous local dynast from the north Mesopotamian desert region (see Strabo 16.1.8), or, more specifically, a ruler of Edessa.¹⁸

On p. 234 Thommen refers specifically to the question of sources underlying *Ant.* 20.17–96 (*Ant.* 20.69–74 in particular). A review is surely not a place to discuss this complicated issue in detail, but let us remark that the information on p. 234 n. 69 is a little unfortunate (Täubler¹⁹ is the only source of information for Thommen). The issue of sources of *Ant.* 20.17–96 is actually one of few to have been extensively dealt with in research on the Adiabene royalty to date. After Täubler we had a number of scholars who turned their attention to that issue at some length (A. Schalit, L.H. Schiffman, D. Barish, M. Frenschkowski (included in Thommen on the other occasion), I. Broer²⁰), and so the scholarship went a long way ahead of the position assumed by Täubler. At the same time, Täubler has to be credited for acknowledging some diversity in the source material of *Ant.* 20.17–96. Namely, Täubler's contribution led to what is nowadays labeled as a two-source theory. However, his identification of the primary source is very unlikely. Because of the role played in the narrative by two Jewish "missionaries", Ananias and Eleazar, Täubler thought that the main source for *Ant.* 20.17–

¹⁶ M. Schottky, 'Parther, Meder und Hyrkanier', 102.

¹⁷ U. Kahrstedt 'Artabanos III. und seine Erben', 85.

¹⁸ U. Kahrstedt 'Artabanos III. und seine Erben', 70, n. 48; F. Millar, *The Roman Near East: 31 BC – AD 337*, Cambridge, MA. 1993, 495; M. Sommer, *Roms orientalische Steppengrenze. Palmyra – Edessa – Dura-Europos – Hatra. Eine Kulturgeschichte von Pompeius bis Diocletian*, Wiesbaden 2005, 376–383; R. Fowler, 'King, Bigger King, King of Kings: Structuring Power in the Parthian World', in T. Kaizer, M. Facella (eds.), *Kingdoms and Principalities in the Roman Near East*, Stuttgart 2010, 68, n. 38.

¹⁹ E. Täubler, *Die Parthernachrichten bei Josephus*, Leipzig 1904.

²⁰ A. Schalit, 'Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' "Antiquities of the Jews" *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4, 1965, 171–181; D. Barish, *Adiabene Royal Converts to Judaism in the First Century C.E.: A Study of Sources*, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, 1983, 13–66 (unpublished doctoral dissertation); L.H. Schiffman, 'The Conversion of the Royal House of Adiabene in Josephus and Rabbinic Sources', in L.H. Feldman, G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, Detroit 1987, 294–298, 302–304, 306–308; M. Frenschkowski, 'Iranische Königslegende in der Adiabene. Zur Vorgeschichte von Josephus: *Antiquitates* XX, 17–33' *ZDMG* 140, 1990, 213–233; I. Broer, 'Die Konversion des Königshauses von Adiabene nach Josephus', in C. Meyer, K. Müller, G. Schmalenberg (Hrsg.) *Nach den Anfängen fragen: Herrn Prof. Dr. theol. Gerhard Dautzenberg zum 60. Geburtstag am 30. Januar 1994*, Giessen 1994, 140–149.

96 could be a “Missionsbericht”, that is a sort of travelogue (“Reisebericht”) of an itinerant Jewish missionary. According to Täubler, this source, being of religious character, was used throughout the bulk of the narrative, while the other source underlying *Ant.* 20.69–74 was an anonymous Parthian one that was also used for the other accounts of Parthian affairs in Josephus (especially *Ant.* 18.39–52 and *Ant.* 18.96–105). Täubler’s idea of a Missionsbericht did not attract any support among scholars, and it is not hard to see why. Although Täubler does not express it explicitly, his theory seems to be based on the model of the journeys of Paul, but there is a world of difference between the *Acts* and *Ant.* 20.17–96. *Ant.* 20.34–48 is not a story of the missionary achievements of Ananias and Eleazar; both Jewish teachers in fact play only supporting roles in Josephus’ portrayal of Izates.

Remarkable is the subtitle given on p. 234 for *Ant.* 20.81–93: “Vologases I. vertreibt Izates II. von Adiabene (51 n. Chr)”. Where does the text of *Ant.* 20.81–93 speak of Izates’ “Vertreibung”? Thommen apparently joined two separate literary subunits, *Ant.* 20.81–91 and *Ant.* 20.92–96 – the first text speaks of Vologases’ campaign against Izates, while the second relates Izates’ death, and so Thommen seems to conclude that the war led to Izates’ death (or at least Izates’ expulsion). On the contrary, *Ant.* 20.81–91 presents Vologases’ campaign as a *fasco*, and *Ant.* 20.92–96 speaks of a *peaceful* end to Izates’ life. Thommen’s interpretation is clearly a striking example of reading between the lines, but one may wonder what reasons can be given for taking the opposite out of the straightforward meaning of the text. Further, if Izates’ reign ended in 51 CE, why then is the beginning of Monobazos’ II reign dated so late as 59 CE (p. 237, n. 93)? Do we know of any other ruler of Adiabene between 51 CE and 59 CE? No, we do not, and there is no reason whatsoever to speak about Vologases’ success in his campaign against Izates, and *Ant.* 20.91 is precise in naming the exact historical reason (besides this, Josephus adds his own theological interpretation) – the invasion of the Dahae and the Sacae on Parthian soil forced Vologases to withdraw his forces. This information fits well into the political context of the first decade of Vologases’ reign, as well as the political landscape of domestic divisions among Parthian elites in the years of the 1st-c. CE dynastic struggles.²¹ Namely, the attack of the Dahae and the Sacae can be best understood as the first reaction of the political coalition that once supported Gotarzes. Thus, the early years of the reign of Vologases, before the coup d’état of Vardanis filius in 55 CE and the beginning of trouble in Hyrcania in 57 CE,²² is the most probable dating of Vologases’ campaign

²¹ M.J. Olbrycht, ‘Vardanes contra Gotarzes II.’, 81–100.

²² M. Schottky, ‘Parther, Meder und Hyrkanier’, 117–119.

against Adiabene. Therefore, the date for Vologases' campaign can be placed between 52 and 54 CE;²³ by contrast, see the bright but erroneous interpretation of N. Brüll (followed by J. Neusner) who identified the attack of the Dacae and the Sacae with the rebellion of Hyrcania.²⁴

As for the dating of the reigns of Izates II and Monobazos II, Thommen gives ca. 36 CE as the beginning of Izates' reign, and ca. 59 CE as the beginning of Monobazos' II power in Adiabene (p. 233 and 237). However, what we actually know with certainty is only when Izates appears for the last time in sources (Vologases' campaign in Adiabene), and on which occasion Monobazos is recalled for the first time in sources. Generally speaking, Monobazos II appears in the context of the Roman-Parthian Wars of 58–63 ("the Corbulo wars") over control of Armenia (Tacitus, *Annales*, 13:34–41, 14:23–26, 15:1–17, 15:24–31; and Cass. Dio 62:19–23), but in particular he is mentioned for the first time as king of Adiabene on the occasion of the Armenian incursion into Adiabene in 61 CE (some date it to 59 CE). Yet, if we take literally Josephus' statement in *Ant.* 20.91 that Izates passed away "not long after" the war with Vologases, then the date for Izates' death and Monobazos' succession can be set much earlier than 59 or 61 CE, perhaps as early as 55 CE (since Vologases' campaign can be approximately dated between 52 and 54 CE).

The topic of Vologases' campaign against Izates II returns again in volume 3, in the part on Aramaic sources written by M. Zehnder. Zehnder presents Vologases' intention as theologically motivated and resulting from anti-Jewish resentment. This is not a plausible picture.²⁵ Indeed, in Josephus' *Ant.* 20.17–96 there is a strong thread of anti-Jewish resentment but it is explicitly attributed only to Izates' subjects. Furthermore, this may be simply a topos used by Josephus in order to tune up his picture of Izates' religious commitment (and, generally speaking, part of the theme of danger to Izates that, while taking on different shapes, runs throughout the whole Adiabene narrative, and is clearly used by Josephus to emphasize the greatness of God's inclination towards

²³ N.C. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia*, 177–178 and 182; Kahrstedt, *Artabanos III. und seine Erben*, 69, n. 46; M. Karras-Klapproth, *Prosopographische Studien*, 192, n. 1; M. Schottky, 'Parther, Meder und Hyrkanier', 116–117; M.J. Olbrycht, 'Vardanes contra Gotarzes II.', 85–86.

²⁴ N. Brüll, 'Adiabene' *Jahrbuch für Jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* 1, 1874, 71; J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia, vol. I: The Parthian Period*, Chico, California 1969, 65.

²⁵ For Vologases' policy of reviving Iranian cultural elements see M.J. Olbrycht, 'Das Arsakidenreich zwischen der mediterranen Welt und Innerasien. Bemerkungen zur politischen Strategie der Arsakiden von Vologases I. bis zum Herrschaftsantritt des Vologases III. (50–147 n. Chr.)', in E. Dąbrowa (ed.), *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean World. Studies in Ancient History. Proceedings of an International Conference in Honour of Professor Józef Wolski, Held at the Jagiellonian University, Cracow, in September 1996*, (=Electrum Vol. 2), Kraków 1998, 130. This is not to say, however, that such a policy should be treated as fanatically motivated and a source of intolerance towards other cultural elements of the Parthian Empire.

Izates), especially since, as far as we know Adiabene's material culture, it presents a great deal of diversity including co-existing Iranian, Greek and Semitic elements.²⁶ Thus, in terms of religion, Adiabene seems to be a typically polytheistic environment that does not account for fertile soil for religious intolerance.

What is more, Vologases' demands are explicitly said to be of a political character, and this is the natural context in which one can best understand the reason for Vologases' campaign and Izates' political position *within* royal elites of the Parthian empire.²⁷ Striking is the fact that Izates was on good terms with Artabanos II and Gotarzes, but not with Vardanes and Vologases. Furthermore, he was rescued from the powerful invasion of Vologases through a simultaneous attack of the Dahae and the Sacae, nomadic allies of Gotarzes. Thus, if we ask about Izates' political standing as a member of the Parthian commonwealth during the dynastic struggles from the 40s until the 60s of the 1st c. CE, there is a good indication to see him as being allied with the so-called nomadic coalition and against the Atropatenean party.²⁸ The other alternative could be the "legitimate" party that opposed the other two and sought pretenders to the Parthian throne in Rome.²⁹ Some pro-Roman streak of such a political standing could perhaps be found in *Ant.* 20.69–74, but most probably this is to be attributed to Josephus' ideological agenda. Josephus wrote in Rome, and was at pains to present Jews as friendly towards other peoples and the Romans in particular. In fact, Josephus' language in *Ant.* 20.71 (δύναμις and particularly τύχη of the Romans) strikingly resembles his statements on the leading role of the Romans made in *Bellum Iudaicum* (2.345–401; 3.354; 5.362–374), where he had to come to terms theologically with the fact of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. In Josephus' vocabulary, good Jews do not fight against the Romans chosen by God to rule over the world.³⁰ Lastly – and this is the clinching argument – Izates II most clearly did not support the expedition of Meher-

²⁶ For a good introduction (though mainly based on findings from Nineveh) see J. Reade, 'Greco-Parthian Nineveh' *Iraq* 60, 1998, 65–83; J. Reade, 'More about Adiabene' *Iraq* 63, 2001, 187–199.

²⁷ M. Schottky, 'Parther, Meder und Hyrkanier', 110–111; M.J. Olbrycht, 'Das Arsakidenreich zwischen der mediterranen Welt und Innerasien', 125–126; R. Fowler, 'King, Bigger King, King of Kings', 72–73.

²⁸ M.J. Olbrycht, 'Das Arsakidenreich zwischen der mediterranen Welt und Innerasien', 125–126.

²⁹ On the position assumed by this Parthian party see E. Dąbrowa, 'Les héros de luttes politiques dans l'état parthe dans la première moitié du Ier siècle de notre ère' *Iranica antiqua* 24, 1989, 311–322; M.J. Olbrycht, 'Vardanes contra Gotarzes II.', 81–100.

³⁰ H. Lindner, *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Iudaicum*, Leiden 1972, 42–49, 85–94; H.W. Attridge, 'Josephus and His Works', in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, Philadelphia 1984, 203–206; O. Michel, 'Die Rettung Israels und die Rolle Roms nach den Reden im Bellum Iudaicum. Analysen und Perspektiven' in *ANRW* 11.21, 1984, 974–965.

dates in 49 CE, that is one of the most daring undertakings on the side of the “legitimate” party in the 1st c. CE.

Controversial are Zehnder’s remarks on Adiabene in the context of the Jewish uprising (pp. 270 and 282). According to Zehnder, “Vasallenkönige der Adiabene mit Biligung der parthischen Ober-herrschaft im jüdisch-römischen Krieg von 66–70 n. Chr. Truppen zur Verteidigung Jerusalems gegen die Römer schickten”, this statement is documented by a footnote pointing to *Bellum Iudaicum* 2.19.2 as a source reference, as well as to the publications of Widengren and Neusner.³¹ First, the plural form “Vasallenkönige” is completely out of place; Adiabene had only one ruler at a time, and his name during the 66–70 Jewish uprising is well documented through Josephus’ references, as well as Tacitus’ reports on the Corbulo Wars, and was without any doubt Monobazos II. Further, *Bell.* 2.19.2 (2.517–522) does not speak of any troops from Adiabene. In short, *Bell.* 2.517–555 gives an account of Procurator Cestius’ attempts to put down the revolt at its very beginnings, and *Bell.* 2.517–522 describes the approach of the Roman forces under Cestius towards Jerusalem. In this context, Josephus recalls one of most successful ambushes of the insurgents on the Roman legions that led to the slowdown of the Roman advance. According to Josephus, the success of the insurgents was possible thanks to superior numbers, as well as to *personal* bravery on the battlefield. Further, Josephus enumerates some *individuals* most distinguished among Jewish ranks, and so we hear of two Adiabeneans, “Monobazos (Μονόβαζος) and Kenedaios (Κενεδαίος), kinsmen of Monobazos, king of Adiabene” (τοῦ τῆς Ἀδιαβηνῆς βασιλέως συγγενεῖς), alongside other fighters. Thus, in *Bell.* 2.517–522 there are no troops from Adiabene.³² What Zehnder instead relates is an unfounded speculation made by Widengren, and later repeated, perhaps introduced to a wider audience, by Neusner. Furthermore, the speculation that such an involvement of Adiabene in the Jewish uprising was accepted by “parthische Ober-herrschaft” (what does this term actually mean in the context of the Parthian foreign policy in those years?) does not go along with Zehnder’s vision of Vologases’ anti-Jewish policy that, according to Zehnder, manifested itself in eagerly sending congratulations to Rome after the capture of Jerusalem (p. 272).

Generally speaking, it is evident that Zehnder’s interpretation of literary sources on the Jewish-Parthian relationship is most indebted to Neusner, with

³¹ G. Widengren, ‘Quelques rapports entre juifs et iraniens a l’*époque des Parthes*’ *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum IV*, Leiden 1957, 201. As for Neusner’s publication, Zehnder names it “Neusner 1969, 64”, but there is no such publication in the bibliography. I suppose Zehnder meant the second edition of Neusner’s book published in 1965: J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia, vol. I: The Parthian Period*, Leiden 1969, 64.

³² Likewise K.H. Ziegler, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts*, Wiesbaden 1964, 77, n. 237 and M.J. Olbrycht, ‘Das Arsakidenreich zwischen der mediterranen Welt und Innerasien’, 133.

some support of Widengren and a few other authors (note that Zehnder uses the old numeration of Parthian kings, so Artabanos II functions as Artabanos III, e.g. on p. 270). Much more appealing is Zehnder's presentation of the inscriptions from Hatra, Assur, Edessa, Dura-Europos and Palmyra. Here Zehnder takes advantage of the latest state of research. However, one could expect Hatra inscription no. 21 to be confronted with the inscription on the so-called Natounia coins,³³ as well as with the trilingual inscription of Sapor I. Is Hatra inscription no. 21 parallel to what we find in numismatic evidence and Sapor's inscription? It is very likely. Namely, in the inscription of Sapor I the Greek name Ἀδιαβηνή is rendered twice, once as "nwtštrkn" in Middle Persian and once as "ntwšrkn" in Parthian.³⁴ In turn, some coins from the Nisibis hoard contain the legend Νατουνιασαροκερων.³⁵ This data should have been included in the commentary.

All told, then, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Partherreiches* is surely a publication that will be very useful for scholarship on the Parthian Empire. It is much warranted, and with its release it will be easier for scholars to navigate the sea of sources on the Arsacid Empire. As for the parts of the collection devoted to Parthian-Jewish aspects, it was certainly a great effort to collect and comment on such a vast amount of source material, and this must be appreciated. However, in a few places more recent literature could have been used, and perhaps it will be up to the next editions to fill this gap.

Michał Marciak

³³ H. Seyrig, 'Trésor monétaire de Nisibe' *RN* 17, 1955, 104–105; G. Le Rider, 'Monnaies grecques acquises par le Cabinet des Médailles en 1959' *RN* 2, 1959–1960, 30–32, pl. III: C-E; J.T. Milik, 'A propos d'un atelier monétaire d'Adiabene Natounia' *RN* 4, 1962, 51–58; O. Hoover, 'Camels of Natounia' *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau* 88, 2009, 161–168.

³⁴ A. Maricq, 'Res Gestae Divi Saporis' *Syria* 35, 1958, 295–360, pl. XXIII-XXIV, esp. 304, n. 4 and 335, n. 6; Ph. Huyse, *Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Ka'ba-i Zardušt (ŠKZ)*, B.1., London 1999, 115; P. Huyse, *Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Ka'ba-i Zardušt (ŠKZ)*, B.2., London 1999, 20.

³⁵ J.T. Milik, 'A propos d'un atelier monétaire d'Adiabene Natounia', 161.