

mais il n'apparaît pas dans *Ahmad* (prénom masculin) (*loc. cit.*), *ana*: 'je' (: 100) [cf. *ʔanaa* (: 186)] ou *ustaadh* 'professeur' (: 220, n. 17ii, cité *supra*).

Les noms propres sont parfois écrits avec désinvolture: *Sibawayh* (: 93)/*Sibowayh* (: 113) pour *Sībawayhi* (*Sibawayh*), *Naïm-Sambar* (: 75, 84) pour *Naïm-Sanbar*. Sur la page 41 (note 7), on donne comme référence *Hadad 1984*. Dans la bibliographie nous trouvons *Haddad 1983*. S'agit-il de Haddad Ghassan 1984, *Problems and issues in the phonology of Lebanese Arabic*, University of Illinois, Ph.D Dissertation ? (voir aussi *supra* mes remarques sur le corpus de Vinnikov dans l'article de K. Miller). Je ne citerai pas ici les fautes dans la notation bibliographique des titres français (e.g. Cantineau: 59). Le terme arabe 'iḏāfa est noté *iḏafe* (: 108).

Conclusion

Je partage l'avis des éditeurs que cet ouvrage nous donne un aperçu important, informatif et intéressant sur les recherches actuelles dans le domaine de la linguistique arabe (: XIII), notamment de la linguistique théorique, générative et de la dialectologie arabe. Mais il est évident qu'un ouvrage de ce type exige plus de précision. Malheureusement, je ne suis pas le premier rapporteur de la série *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics* à constater que la transcription de l'arabe standard et des dialectes arabes est dans l'ouvrage incohérente (et parfois erronée). La dialectologie arabe continue de s'accroître grâce à de nouveaux instruments scientifiques (atlas, dictionnaires, analyses descriptives, théoriques, textes littéraires *etc.*). À la lumière de ces développements, les articles de l'ouvrage semblent parfois trop focalisés sur les mêmes sources dialectologiques, majoritairement en anglais. Est-il nécessaire de souligner qu'il s'agit là d'une tendance plus générale chez les chercheurs américains?

Tomasz POLAŃSKI, a review article of: A New Panorama of Seleucid Iran Reconstructed from Greek Inscriptions, Cuneiform Texts, Graeco-Roman Histories, Archaeological Research and Coins, a review article of: Sonja Plischke, *Die Seleukiden und Iran. Die seleukidische Herrschaftspolitik in den östlichen Satrapien*, Classica et Orientalia 9, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2014.

For the reader and enthusiast of E. Will's *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique*, S. Sherwin-White's and A. Kuhrt's *From Samarkhand to Sardis*, and S. Eddy's *The King is Dead. Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334–31 BC*, Sonja Plischke's book can legitimately be labelled a long expected development. It has also been a rare pleasure to a student who once learnt

a lot of the Parthian history from the old classic of N. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia* (1938) to take Plischke's book in his hands and evaluate the progress in Hellenistic research, its enrichment in facts, changes in inspirations and ideas, and its new approaches and methodologies.

In the first part of her book Plischke offers the reader a vast perspective of introductory and basic problems of the Seleucid Empire, such as its administrative structures, appended with a discussion on historical geography, (pp. 22ff.), on the ethnic history, ethnicity and nomadism (ff. 55ff.), urbanisation and the foundation of new towns, with the addition of a valuable, extensive catalogue of the Seleucid *poleis* in the east of the Empire (pp. 95ff.). Plischke's discussion also covers the Seleucid mintage and numismatics (pp. 139ff.), and the ancestor, ruler and religious cults remarkable for their symptomatic blend of Greek and indigenous – Iranian and Babylonian – ideas (pp. 159ff.). These chapters make a thorough and erudite introduction to the continuous historical narrative which focuses on the political and military history of the Empire from Seleukos I to Antiochos IV (pp. 173ff.).

In her introductory chapters Plischke clarifies some extensive lacunae in the historical narrative for Seleukos I and Ptolemy I. She argues that the Oriental Hellenistic monarchs remained 'nur in geringem Maße im Interesse griechisch-römischen Autoren des westlichen Mittelraumes' (p. 6). I think the answer may be more complex. Over a fairly long period of time the Roman invaders destroyed or eliminated a large part of the cultural lore of the Greek Oriental kingdoms, including their historiography, which rivalled the Roman imperial historical propaganda. The Seleucids sponsored their own original historiography and geography, which was indispensable to the rulers of their vast Empire (Berossos, Megasthenes, Patroclus' expedition to the Caspian Sea, as Plischke comments on pp. 46, and 198, cf. her valuable note 176, p. 198; Demodamas' expedition to the banks of the Iaxartes; and Apollodoros of Artemita's *Parthika*, p. 206). The same can be said of the meagre remnants of the original Ptolemaic historiography (Kallixeinos in Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai*, Manetho; *The Diaries* of Ptolemy I, cf. a relevant chapter in the old classic by L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*) – I would also add this book as well as Eddy's monograph to the otherwise thorough and extensive bibliography collected by Plischke. They should have been included at least in the bibliography. The Roman destructiveness also had an impact on the historians of Mithridates VI (cf. the concise and still illuminating study by H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*, Berlin 1938(!), which is also missing from the monograph's bibliography; cf. Fuchs's developed and modern version: J. Deininger, *Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland 217–86 v.Chr.*, 1971). It must have also played a decisive role in the destruction of the history books compiled by Hannibal's historians, Silenos and Sosylos, who must have been important for the reign of Antiochos III. The scale of the loss in the Hellenistic Oriental

heritage has been particularly well documented by the recent rediscovery of the impressive cultural lore of the Orontids of Kommagene, the Iranian dynasty on the Upper Euphrates River. All those independent historiographies were almost completely erased by the ‘Western Latin and Roman Greek historiography.’ Two great monographs, M. Pape’s *Griechische Kunstwerke aus Kriegsbeute und ihre öffentliche Ausstellung in Rom* (1975) and W. Speyer’s *Büchervernichtung und Zensur des Geistes bei Heiden, Juden und Christen* (1981), provide an informative insight into the problem. *Habent sua fata libelli* – sometimes a book’s glorious promotion or regrettable sinking into oblivion may be ascribed to sheer chance. The Antigonids, who were defeated by Seleukos I and Lysimachos, were in their own turn lucky enough to win the friendship of Hieronymus of Cardia, the best early Hellenistic historian, who focused on the deeds of his lords in his magnificent epic style, attracting the attention of Diodorus of Sicily (*The Library of History* Books 19–20).

On pp. 32ff. the reader will find important remarks on the ruling class of the Seleucid monarchy. Plischke argues that the administrative elite did not consist exclusively of Balkan Greeks and Macedonians, as believed earlier. It also included a relatively large number of Eastern Greeks and native Orientals, mainly Babylonians and Iranians. Plische adduces interesting linguistic material which shows that double Iranian/Semitic and Greek names, e.g. Anu-uballit Nikarchos, Mithridates Antiochos (IV), or Anu-uballit Kephalos, were used at the royal court and by the members of the administrative class. She also refers to an interesting case of variety and exchange of names in one and the same family: Apames and Antiochos (III), the sons of Antiochos II (pp. 44ff.). We know from cuneiform texts, continues Plischke, that the local administrative officers of Babylonia were recruited from six clans (p. 53). In this connection she mentions a number of Babylonian and Jewish families appointed by the Seleucids in Mesopotamia to different administrative posts (p. 52). *The Book of Tobias* (c. 200 BC) can also be illustrative in this context (see also her apt comment on Oxyartes/Roxana, Spitamenes/Apame, p. 52, on the role played by certain Iranian tribal leaders in Alexander’s and the Seleucid administrative structures). Some of her conclusions are worth quoting: ‘Die Förderung einzelner ethnischer Gruppen als lokale Eliten ist im Seleukidenreich [...] auf ihre exponierte Stellung in achaimenidischer Zeit zurückzuführen [...] In Anbetracht der Beobachtung, die sich für die Situation der lokalen Eliten in Uruk und im seleukidischen Babylon festhalten lässt, wird deutlich, dass die Verwaltung [...] sich in grossen Teilen aus der lokalen religiösen Führungsschicht rekrutierte’ (p. 52).

Now I would like to focus on her chapters which discuss historical geography, ethnicity, and nomadism (pp. 55ff.). She produces a successful section on Bactria (pp. 75ff.) with its panoramic landscapes (Q. Curtius Rufus). Commendation is due to her wide grasp of historical sources (the Edict of Aśoka, the Greek inscription of Aristonax), her insight into the palaces of Ai Khanum with the Bactrian Princess

Apame and her son Antiochos as their inhabitants, along with the narrative of Krateros' dramatic struggle against the threat from nomadic warriors, and the fall of Alexandria Eschate, all set in its geographical, linguistic, numismatic and archaeological context. Plischke adorns her narrative with a panoramic description of the green fields, fertile valleys, and vast deserts of Bactria. She draws on Q. Curtius Rufus' history of Alexander (the passage is also cited in Latin!). An elegant passage from Strabo's *Geography* which also refers to the sources of the River Didhla, now in Turkish Kurdistan, is incidentally missing in the German translation (p. 56, n. 276). Aesthetics in our written work is also important. Hieronymus of Cardia was absolutely fascinated by the landscape of Phars with its horse studs and herds of cattle, shady woods, abundant water resources, and its developed agriculture. This part of Iran is also a breath-taking experience for the contemporary traveller as well, with its perennially green valleys, rivers and ponds surrounded by impressive mountain chains and inhabited by a friendly population. Plischke also focuses on Greek and Latin authors who describe the tribes of Western Iran (pp. 58ff.). She argues that the Classical passages reflect the conqueror's perspective. The enemy is presented as the *latro* and barbarian. The Classical authors emphasise 'die Unrechtmässigkeit seines Handelns,' versus the 'Rechtmässigkeit der Aktionen Alexanders' (p. 60). The Classical descriptions highlight 'den Gegensatz Zivilisation–Barbarenland, der sich ebenso in der Beschreibung der Wohnumgebung Höhle-Dorf niederschlägt,' presenting Alexander, who 'als Personifikation einer zivilisierten und gebildeten Lebensform jagt, räubert und plündert nicht, sondern führt militärische... *gerechte* bzw. notwendige Unternehmungen durch' (ibid.). This part of the book reflects the discussion on the standard views of the Orientals in the Graeco-Roman letters (cf. A. Momigliano *Alien Wisdom. The Limits of Hellenization*, with his interesting Iranian chapter – this study is not in the bibliography). The image of the Persian aristocracy in the Greek letters differs meaningfully from the image of the Black Africans, Egyptians, and Semitic peoples (cf. T. Polański, *Ancient Greek Orientalist Painters*, 2002, with extensive Iranian chapters on Roxana, Rhodogoune, Pantheia, and the Persian warriors in the Marathon and Issos/Gaugamela context). The cave metaphor as a synonym for barbarity and primitivism is a *locus communis* in the Greek letters (cf. Homer's cave of Cyclops).

Plischke's synthetic commentary on nomadism in the modern research (Scholz, 1995 and his classification of *Voll-*, *Teil-*, and *Semi-Nomadismus* sounds very interesting, p. 68; Schubert, 2013) and on its image in the ancient geography of Central Asia is good reading. Plischke aptly concludes that 'das Nomadenbild ergibt sich in Ermangelung eigener Schriftquellen allein durch die Brille der griechischen und römischen Autoren' (p. 71).

The catalogue of the Seleucid urban foundations and municipalities has something of an adventurous travelogue to Ai Khanoum, Alexandria Eschate, Bactra, and Shush (pp. 95ff.). It offers a lot of invaluable information appended

with an updated bibliography. The reader will find information about the Greek fleet in the Persian Gulf (Failaka – pp. 97f.), and about the Greek architecture side by side with Achaemenid and local Bactrian edifices in Ai Khanum. Plischke appends this section of her monograph with an interesting reflection on the polymorphous cultural identity of Ai Khanoum which has come to light in the archaeological research (p. 138). She argues that this symptomatic coexistence of indigenous structures with Greek institutions is also present in other urban centres of the Empire, as for example in Susa, Babylon, and Alexandria in Arachosia. Plischke's book reflects the ideology which was once expressed in such a clear and illuminating way by S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt in their memorable book, *From Samarkhand to Sardis*. I do not say this as a criticism: I, too, admire Sherwin-White's and Kuhrt's book. Plischke's extensive and detailed catalogue of the Seleucid *poleis* (pp. 94–139) should have been supplemented with maps and plans. This is particularly requisite when we read her descriptions of the Frataraka Temple in Persepolis (p. 102f.) and of the archaeological site of Ai Khanum with its theatre, *gymnasion*, and palaces (pp. 103ff.). Ai Khanum actually needs to be illustrated with a number of plans. They would have significantly enhanced the value of Plischke's description and commentary. The same can be said of the indispensability of a selection of photos of the most important sculptures, inscriptions, and architectural monuments of Ai Khanum. They are necessary. When we prepare our research expeditions we collect passages from books together with plans of the archaeological sites we are going to visit. A catalogue compiled by a researcher as erudite as Plischke might have been used by prospective travellers if it had been enriched with plans and maps.

The chapters on ancestors and the ruler cult are very inspiring. Plischke refers to Apame, the Bactrian princess and wife of Seleukos Nikator who practised Zoroastrianism. In this context Plischke discusses the cult of Anahita-Artemis in the Frataraka Temple of Persepolis (p. 162). She also describes a votive statuette of Atrosokes unearthed in the temple of the River God Oxos in Bactra. The god himself was indigenous, the worshipper's name was Iranian, while the inscription was Greek (p. 164, cf. Lindström 2005). Plischke supplements this with the interesting example of the Zeus-Ahuramazda (Zeus-Mithra?) temple in Ai Khanum, which she dates to the reign of Antiochos I (p. 115). In a separate chapter on the origins of the Seleucid ruler and ancestor cult she expresses the opinion that the rites were inspired at the earliest by Antiochos III himself immediately on his return from his Oriental military expedition, that is circa 205 BC (p. 166). She also adds three new inscriptions to her evidence, which speak of the Seleucid royal cult in the making, namely of the ruler cult of Laodike, Antiochos III's wife. These inscriptions were found in places as distant from each other as Laodikeia in Media, Kermanshah, and Erize in Phrygia. Plischke dates them to 193/2 BC (pp. 280ff.). Since my first visit to Kommagene, Kara Kuş, Arsameia on the Nymphaios, and Nemrud Dağ

(2005), I have been looking for analogies to that intriguing blend of Iranian and Greek gods worshipped by the Orontids, and in particular by Antiochos I Epiphanes (Zeus/Oromazdes, Apollo/Hermes/Mithras, Heracles/Varatragna). Inspired by the archaeological sites of Kommagene, the books by H. Dörrie (1964) and H. Waldmann (1973), and Strabo's impressive description of Amaseia in Pontus, I ventured on my next expedition to Amasia and Komana Pontica (2013). Ancient Amaseia is unfortunately only a name, while Komana is a scenic well-watered, fertile, agricultural valley. Nothing at all compared with the richness of the archaeological sites in Kommagene on the Upper Euphrates and the local museums, the best of which is undoubtedly the ultramodern Museum of Gaziantep. Antiochos VIII and Cleopatra Thea's daughter Laodike married Mithridates I of Kommagene and became the Queen Mother of the Orontids. The religious analogies between Kommagene, Pontus, and Seleucid Iran are striking. This chapter of Plischke's book (pp. 280ff.) has made it clear to me that the kings of Pontus and Kommagene constructed their dynastic Iranian/Greek religions and their ancestor cults on the cultural patterns created by the Seleucids in Iran and Central Asia.

From p. 173 on *Die Seleukiden und Iran* provides a continuous historical narrative which focuses on the political and military history of the eastern part of the Empire from Seleukos I to Antiochos IV. Like many other scholars of Graeco-Iranian history, Plischke does her best to reconstruct the early ethnic and political history of the Parthians and the Parthian monarchy. Like many others, she complains about the poor and ambiguous literary tradition which can be collected from the Graeco-Latin letters (p. 209). She points out that the Classical tradition was burdened with anti-Parthian prejudice concocted by contemporary Seleucid and later Roman authors (p. 209). In this predicament she wisely turns to C. Lerouge, *L'images des Parthes dans le monde Gréco-romain* (2007) and her critique of Strabo's Parthian account, and subsequently resorts to Sundermann's linguistic studies on East Iranian borrowings in Parthian (1989), which is one of the West Iranian dialects. Sundermann's work suggests an itinerary the Parthians might have traversed before they eventually settled in Parthyene. In this context Plischke aptly observes that the Graeco-Roman letters were strongly influenced by literary commonplaces, standard views and images of foreigners. For example, she inculcates Arrian's historical books, which are 'stark von literarischen Topoi durchsetzt' (p. 211). She argues that the story of Pherecles, the Seleucid satrap of Bactria who was murdered by two brothers, of whom one had allegedly been sexually abused by the satrap, is strongly reminiscent of the popular Herodotean narrative of Harmodios, Aristogeiton and Hipparchos. And the five accomplices of Arsakes and Tiridates are only too similar to the heroes of the conspiracy of six against Kambyses, she also aptly observes. In addition the Arsacids shared the same myth with other Hellenistic Oriental dynasties – Achaemenid descent (cf. Armenia, the Orontids of Kommagene, the kings of Pontus), which makes

their early history nothing more than a tribal and dynastic legend. Plischke is cautious and judicious in the selection of arguments for her discussion, as her treatment of the early history of the Arsacids shows. How far have we gone from the book by Debevoise (1938) as regards the early Parthian history? ‘Our few authorities differ widely from one another as to who they were and whence they came’ (Debevoise 1938, p. 1). ‘Love of the hunt,’ Debevoise continued, ‘extensive use of the bow, especially as a weapon on horseback, are all suggestive of the nomadic [...] of the steppe country’ (ibid p. 2). Next Debevoise adduced the story of two brothers who led a revolt against Andragoras, the satrap of Antiochos II (before 247 BC), and pointed to variations of this basic story in the historical books of Arrian and Justin, and in Photius’ and Syncellus’ lexica. We are still left with Justin the poor epitomator of Trogus, and his account of world history compiled for the purpose of edifying members of the Roman ruling class, and in particular those of them who were soon tired of reading and any serious intellectual effort.

Plischke develops parallel analyses of cuneiform texts, Greek inscriptions and Graeco-Roman historiographic sources. In particular her focus on the Greek epigraphy which can be observed throughout the book is worthy of a Hellenic scholar’s praise. For example Aristonax’ Greek votive inscription from Kandahar (3rd / 2nd century BC) and the Aśoka edict have prompted her to embark on an interesting discussion on the spread and influence of Greek in Arachosia (p. 75). Her exact and sound methodology can be seen, for example, in her chronological calculation of Antiochos III’s rise to power and the end of his reign, for which she uses cuneiform chronicles, royal lists, and the Thucydidean principle of probability (p. 242: cf. her exact chronological reconstruction of Antiochos II’s rise to power and the chronology of his reign, pp. 272ff.). The same can be said of her identification of the sons of Antiochos III (Antiochos, Seleukos (II) and Mithridates/Antiochos IV). In this instance she draws on a Greek inscription from Heraclea Latmos (p. 244), a scenic archaeological site in Caria. Before I read her book I had concurred with the traditional view which said that ‘die Regenschaft der ersten beiden Seleukiden sei als die glückliche Zeit des Reiches zu bezeichnen, während mit Antiochos II. der Abstieg begonnen habe’ (p. 221). Plischke argues, and for good reason, that the disintegration process did not start until a series of setbacks suffered by Antiochos’ successor Seleukos II in the war with Ptolemy III, and also as a consequence of the fratricidal war between Antiochos Hierax and Seleukos II, and the latter’s defeat in the Battle of Ankyra.

I find it interesting that a person as young as Dr. Sonja Plischke understands the principles of a power struggle so well. Here are some examples: a comment on Molon’s rebellion: ‘Bei dem Aufstand handelte es sich somit nicht um eine antiseleukidische Bewegung der Indigenen, [...] sondern [...] um die Ambitionen eines seleukidischen Funktionärs, der seine Untergebenen zu seinen Zwecken zu instrumentalisieren suchte’ (p. 252: cf. Schmitt 1964). In another section of

her monograph Plischke discusses Molon's coronation (corroborated by his coin issue) and Polybius' intriguing failure to mention this fact. She concludes that Antiochos III managed to cover up this embarrassment so well that Polybius never learnt that Molon was actually crowned in Iran (cf. Schmitt 1964). She also refers to Hermeias' murder as the outcome of hostile intrigues at the royal court, and comments on his ordeal as follows: 'eine Tatsache, die eher dafür spricht, dass seine Gegner Verfehlungen des Hermeias *erfinden* mussten, als dass er tatsächlich eine Gefahr für das Reich und die Dynastie dargestellt hatte' (p. 263). Hermeias was actually not a danger to Antiochos III and his monarchy. He was a gifted military man and administrator who fell victim to his enemies' intrigues. In 294 BC Seleukos I divorced Stratonike, the daughter of Demetrios, who was obviously Macedonian, and married his ex-wife off to his son and future heir Antiochos I. The event inspired one of the best-known and most celebrated romantic love stories of the Classical letters (Lukian of Samosate, Appian, Plutarch). Plischke explains it in purely political, down-to-earth terms (pp. 195f.). Antiochos was the son of Apame, the daughter of Spitamenes, an influential local leader from Central Asia. The Persian princess Apame could win the support of the Iranian aristocracy for her son. Seleukos divorced Stratonike and remarried her to his son to avoid the risk of a power struggle within the royal family in the event of his death and Stratonike having a male descendant by the king. Seleukos sent the young couple to the East where Antiochos was viceroy for the Eastern part of the Empire. 'Antiochos war für dieses Amt prädestiniert wie kein Anderer,' Plischke concludes (p. 196).

From the very outset of my reading Plischke's monograph I was looking forward to pages 265–279: the Anabasis of Antiochos III. I think it may be interesting for the reader to compare two narratives of the Anabasis: E. Will's epic, literary account which followed the best traditions of the Classical historiography on the one hand, and Plischke's exact, cautious, detailed reconstruction which offers the reader numerous alternative interpretations. Will had a better grasp of the Graeco-Roman historiographic sources and gave a better critique of them. He said quite plainly that we have only one citation from Polybius' more extensive account of the Parthian chapter of Antiochos' Anabasis. Polybius' full account is no longer extant. It can only be supplemented by the unreliable and ambiguous passage from Justin's epitome (Will 2, 1967, pp. 47f.). Will also drew the reader's attention to the fact that we learn about the Bactrian campaign exclusively from two incidentally preserved passages in Polybius. However, these passages refer solely to the very beginning of the campaign and then jump to the very end. Consequently we know very little about the course of the military expedition as a whole (Will 2, 1967, p. 49). Will's story of the year-long siege of Bactra (Zariaspa), of which we actually know very little, gives a better view of what could have happened. Will inferred that the area under siege must have been large ('une ellipse [...] d'un kilomètre; les

lacunes dans le système obsidional,' p. 51). Plischke passes over the military aspects superficially and focuses on the diplomatic solution negotiated between Antiochos III and Euthydemos (pp. 272ff.). Will's synthetic discussion of the *Anabasis'* Indian chapter provides a better introduction to the wider historical context of Antiochos' expedition. He drew the reader's attention to the latter scions of the empire of Maurya, and particularly to Sophagasenos, a late and weak successor of Aśoka, a once powerful king (Will 2, 1967, p. 51f.). His account of the last chapter of the *Anabasis* is also more comprehensive as regards strategic and economic aspects. The great French historian, archaeologist and Orientalist commented on Antiochos' long march across the Iranian plateau and his successive expedition to Gerrha. Will explained Antiochos' intervention in the region of the Persian Gulf as a consequence of Seleucid – Ptolemaic economic rivalry along the trade route which led from Gerrha via Petra to Egypt (Will 2, 1967, p. 54). But now Plischke, with her usual expertise, produces a lot of important information based on her numismatist and Greek epigraphic erudition. She attracts our attention, for example, to three Greek inscriptions which refer to the late phase of Antiochos' Oriental military expedition (p. 276; *OGIS* 231–233). They come from Magnesia on the Meander and document two letters dispatched by the king to the city council of Magnesia and its ensuing edict. These letters are evidence of relations over a large distance between Antiochia in Persis and Magnesia on the Meander, and incidentally document Antiochos III's skills in ruling over such vast territories of Western Asia from Phars to the Aegean shores of Asia Minor. The handling of Greek epigraphy and numismatics is a real asset in Plischke's monograph (cf. e.g. her chapter on the coins of Euthydemos, pp. 276ff.).

The book is extensive enough to justify the lack of an expected final chapter on the *Anabasis* of Antiochos VII Sidetes. But I would have loved to read such a vital appendix to her work on the Seleucids in Iran. Sonja Plischke's scholarly acumen predestines her to write such a chapter to round off her Seleucid studies.

Let me add at the conclusion of my review that Plischke's work offers numerous references to important studies, monographs, anthologies and papers. I have benefited from her thorough and professional bibliography. It is one of the strong points of her book. I am also grateful for her original Greek and occasionally also Latin quotations in the footnotes, without leaving the reader exclusively with German translations (cf. e.g. Polybius' and Strabo's citations, p. 56; Polybius p. 260, n. 631).

Minor Greek corrections: erroneous quotations on p. 273, Pol. 11,34,8: ὄν (sc. Demetrios the son of Euthydemos) ὁ βασιλεὺς (sc. Antiochos III) ἀποδεξάμενος, καὶ νομίσας ἄξιον εἶναι τὸν νεανίσον βασιλείας καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἔντευξιν καὶ προστασίαν. On p. 267, Pol. 10,29,1:

ἐπειδὴ δ' ἐκχωρεῖ, δῆλός ἐστι τοῖς ὀρθῶς σκοπυμένοις ἐπ' ἄλλης ὧν (sc. Arsakes) γνώμης· διόπερ ἔκρινε προάγειν εἰς τὴν Ὑρκανίαν et cetera. Now it is correct.

A long time ago I crossed the Judean Desert with the Canadian archaeologist Elaine Myers, from the Murabaat Caves in Wadi Darga to the edge of the Judean Desert by Mitspa Shalem, and on the way we discussed a prospective history of the Seleucid monarchy. We agreed that such a history should be compiled by at least two researchers: one focusing on Iran and Central Asia, and the other on the Aramaic and Greek part of the monarchy. Our discussion was inspired by a reflection that the available Greek perspective on the Seleucid monarchy which is offered by the standard ancient history books compiled by Western Classicist scholars is insufficient by far. Concluding my review, I would like to say that half of the job has now been done by Sonja Plischke.