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Because of the specific nature of the written sources describing relations between Rome and Iran during the third to seventh centuries A.D., research on Near Eastern history of the era seems focused on the military conflicts and descriptions of warfare. But equally fascinating are the diplomatic relations between the two empires, especially the protocol of receiving embassies which developed during the four centuries of mutual contacts. The main topic of this paper is: can


we assume, based on the language of diplomacy and developed protocol, that Iran and Rome perceived each other as equal partners; and consequently, can we observe mutual respect in the relations between both states? In the context of the diplomatic protocol we should ask whether communication in both verbal and ritual modes was understood in the same way by Iranian kings and Roman emperors, for this affected the relations of the two empires of Late Antiquity.

Diplomatic steps that did not originate directly from military actions were the wishes sent by the rulers to each other on the occasion of accession to the throne. The earliest event of that kind was the sending of gifts to Probus (276–282) by Bahrām II (276–293), mentioned in the Historia Augusta. It seems that the imperial court misinterpreted this gesture and believed that the šāhānsāh sent the gifts to the emperor (who was preparing for war) in order to prevent conflict with its powerful neighbour in the West (HA Prob. 17.4–5):

Parthi legatos ad eum mitterent confitentes timorem pacemque poscentes, quos ille superbius acceptos magis timentes domum remisit. fertur etiam epistula illius repudiatis donis, quae rex miserat, ad Narseum talis fuisse: “Miror te de omnibus quae nostra futura sunt tam paucis poscentes. habeto interim omnia quibus gaudeas. quae si nos habere cupiamus, scimus quemadmodum pos- sidere debeamus.”

By this he achieved such fame that the Parthians (sic) sent envoys to him, confessing their fear and suing for peace, but these he received with much arrogance and then sent back to their homes in greater fear than before. The letter, moreover, which he wrote to Narseus [i.e. Bahrām], rejecting the gifts which the king had sent, is said to have been as follows: “I marvel that you have sent so few of the riches all of which will shortly be ours. For the time being, keep all those things in which you take such pleasure. If ever we wish to have them, we know how we ought to get them.” (transl. Magie)
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We can assume with no doubt that such diplomatic actions took place during the reign of Diocletian (284–305). The inscription of Narseh (293–302) from Pāıkūlī describing the events of 293 names the Roman emperor in the list of the rulers sending regards to the new king (NPi 91):

Pahlav: […] / W ‘stpy W ȳrkmkpy / HQAYMWnt

and Caesar and the Romans were in gratitude (?) and peace and friendship with me (transl. Skjærvø)

Naturally the inscription, of a purely propagandistic nature, must have meant the imperial envoy and not the presence of the emperor himself at the Iranian court. The first treaty between Iran and Rome in 244\(^4\) should be understood as a direct and forceful expression of the will of the great king (ŠKZ 5/4/9):

Pārsīg: ud filipos kēsar amāh ̣ n nemaśīg ţamād, ud gyan xūn dēnār panzsad-hazar ţ-n dād, (ud) ped bāz ēstād.
Pahlav: W plypws kysr LN OL nymstyk ATYt W gy’n DME dynr IIII-C ALPYN OLYN YNTNt pty β’z HQAYMWt.


and Philip Caesar came to terms to us, and, as ransom for the life, he gave us 500,000 denars, and became tributary to us. (transl. Asha)

But the agreement of 298\(^5\) was a result of peace negotiations which were led, on the Iranian side, by hāzāṛft Affarbān (Ἀφφαρβᾶν), the commander of elite forces and a close friend of the king. Petrus Patricius in the speech of king Narseh’s envoy to


the emperor Galerius (305–311) adds the phrase that Rome and Iran were for all the world like two eyes, two lights which should co-exist and not resort to mutual destruction (Petrus Patr. fr.13 FHG):

> φανερόν ἐστι τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅτι ὠσπερανεὶ δύο λαμπτήρες εἰσιν ἢ τε Ῥωμαϊκὴ καὶ Περσικὴ βασιλεία· καὶ χρή καθάπερ ὀφθαλμοὺς τὴν ἕτεραν τῇ τῆς ἐπιρροᾷ κοσμεῖσθαι λαμπρότητι καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν ἑαυτῶν ἁμοιβαδὸν μέχρι παντὸς χαλεπαίνειν.

It is obvious to all mankind that the Roman and the Persian Empires are just like two lamps; and it is necessary that, like eyes, the one is brightened by the light of the other and that they do not angrily strive for each other’s destruction. (transl. Winter)

It must be remembered that the author, writing 250 years after the events described, used the diplomatic language developed in the sixth century. Comparison of Iran and Rome to the two eyes of the world is found in the letter of Xusrō Parvēz (591–628) to the emperor Maurice (582–602) quoted by Theophylact Simocatta (4.11.2):

> δύο τισὶν ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸν κόσμον καταλύμπεσθαι πάντα ἀνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὸ Θεῖον ἐπραγματεύσατο, τουτ’ ἐστι τῇ δυνατωτάτῃ τῶν Ῥωμαίων βασιλείας καὶ τοῖς ἐμφρονεστάτοις σκήπτροις τῆς Περσῶν πολιτείας.

God effected that the whole world should be illumined from the very beginning by two eyes, namely by the most powerful kingdom of the Romans and by the most prudent sceptre of the Persian state. (transl. Whitby)

The details of the proceedings of Byzantino-Iranian diplomacy can be observed in the peace negotiations that resulted in the treaty of 562 between Justinian (527–565) and Xusrō Anōšīrvān (531–579). Justinian was represented by the magister

---

officiorum Petrus, ʿIzad Gušnasp of the Parthian clan Mehrān acted on behalf of the Great King. In his introductory speech Petrus announced that he came at the Emperor’s order, to transform the armistice into lasting peace. He mentioned the greatness of the Roman state and emphasized that the belief that the capture of Antioch and other Roman territories by Xusrō would end the war was nothing but a delusion (Menander Prot. fr.11 FHG):

καὶ μὴ τις ύμᾶς ἀπατάτω λογισμὸς ὡς νενικήκατε Ῥωμαίοις ἐπηρμένοι τῷ τῇ Ἀντιόχειᾳ ἁλόνα τρός ύμῶν καὶ ἄττα Ῥωμαϊκὰ χωρία.

Do not be led astray by the conviction that you have conquered the Romans because you are elated at your capture of Antioch and other Roman towns. (transl. Blockley)

In reply ʿIzad Gušnasp stated that Xusrō was a great king and did not find the capture of Antioch any outstanding success; he called this victory a mere gem on the king’s neck:

Χοσρόης ὁ πάντων ἄνθρωπων, εἵπερ βούλεται, βασιλεὺς οὔτε τῇ Ἀντιόχείᾳ ἁλὼσιν ἐγκαλλώπισμα τι καὶ ἐγκώμιον ἐκεινῷ περιτίθησιν.

Khosro, the king of all men (if he so wishes), does not use the capture of Antioch for his own self-advertisement or glorification.

The envoy pointed out that it was the Roman side that had asked to end the war:

Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ τὸ σύνηθες πράττουσι περὶ σπονδῶν πρότεροι διαλεμόμενοι Πέρσαις.

For the Romans customarily are the first to offer treaty negotiations to the Persians.

However, he claimed that he was not going to negotiate from
duplice volto del protocollo aggiuntivo sulle minoranze religiose nella ‘Pace dei 50 anni’,” Bizantinistica 273–299.

the position of the victor, out of a declared love for peace:

ὅμως δεχόμεθα τοὺς λόγους, τὴν εἰρήνην περὶ πλείστου ποιού-

µεθα.

Nevertheless, since we value peace most highly, we are open to your proposals.

The language of diplomacy suggests that Rome and Iran were fully aware of the differences between the two states, reflected metaphorically in calling them two separate worlds (Malalas 18.66):

ὁτὶ δὲ µεγάλη δόξα καὶ ἐπαυνός ἐστιν ἐν πᾶσῃ τῇ γῇ παρὰ Θεῷ καὶ ὀνθρώποις τῇ εἰρήνῃ γενέσθαι μεταξὺ τῶν δύο κόσµων ἐπὶ τῆς σῆς ἁµερότητος καὶ ἡµῶν τῶν γνησίως ὑµῶς ἀγαπῶντων πρό-

δηλὸν ἐστὶ.

It is clear that great glory and credit is due in all the earth before God and men for the fact that peace has been established between the two worlds. (transl. Canepa)

Both sides considered their sovereignty and the possibility of peaceful coexistence. None of the Roman emperors denied the legal right to the throne of the Sasanian rulers. So for example the actions of Severus Alexander (222–235) after invading Mesopotamia: his envoys did not deny the legitimacy of the rule of Ardašīr (224–242), even though they understood well the circumstances of the change in the throne of Iran, as was expressed in Alexander’s speech to the army (Herodian 6.3.5):

Ἀρταξερξῆς ἄνηρ Πέρσης τὸν ἑαυτοῦ δεσπότην Ἀρτάβανον ἀπο-

κτείνας τὴν τε ἀρχὴν ἐς Πέρσας µεταστήσας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ὑµετέρων ὀπλῶν [καταθαρρήσας] καὶ τῆς Ῥωµαίου δόξης καταφρονήσας, πειρᾶται κατατρέχειν καὶ λυµαινεσθαι τὰ τῆς ὑµετέρας ἀρχῆς κτίµατα.

The Persian Artaxerxes has slain his master Artabanus, and the Parthian Empire is now Persian. Despising our arms and contemptuous of the Roman reputation, Artaxerxes is attempting to overrun and destroy our imperial possessions. (transl. Echols)

What is more important, diplomacy accepted the principle of equality of the two rulers. This was clearly highlighted in the events of 298 when Affarban pointed out that despite his victory in war Galerius is no better than king Narseh (Petrus Patr. fr.13):
μὴ χρῆναι μέντοι μηδὲ Ναρσαῖον ἀσθενέστερον τῶν ἄλλων βασι-
λέων νομίζεσθαι ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων Γαλέριον
ὑπερέχειν ὡστε αὐτὸν τούτω μόνω δικαίως Ναρσαῖον ἤττήσθαι
καίτοι τῆς τῶν οἰκείων προγόνων ἀξίας καταδεέστερον οὐ γενό-
μενον.

He continued by saying that it was not necessary to think that
Narses was weaker than the other kings but rather to see Galerius
as that much superior to the other kings so that Narse himself was
inferior to him alone, and rightly so, without, however, proving
to be lower in dignity than his ancestors. (transl. Winter)

Similar remarks are found, as mentioned above, in the negotia-
tions of Petrus Patricius with Ἰζάδ Γοὔανσπ and the statement
about capturing Antioch by Xusrō Anōšīrvān.

The absolute equality of the rulers came to be expressed in the
courteous claims that the dynasts were relatives. The first at-
tested instance of using “brotherhood” is in the biography of
Constantine (306–337) by Eusebius of Caesarea, who cited a
letter of the emperor to Šāpur II (309–379) (4.11.1):

οὐ μοι δοκῶ πλανάσθαι, ἄδελφε μου, τούτων ένα θεόν ὁμολογών
πάντων ἄρρητον καὶ πατέρα.

I cannot, then, my brother, believe that I err in acknowledging
this one God, the ruler and father of all things. (transl. Richard-
son)

Alleged family ties became father-son relations as in the letter of
Xusrō Parvēz to Maurice (Theophylact Simm. 4.11.11): Χος-
ρόης ὁ σος υἱός καὶ ἰκέτης, “Chosroes your son and suppliant”
(transl. Whitby). Kavād Šērōē (Šīrūya, 628) turned to his
“brother” emperor Heraclius (610–641) (Chron.Pasch. 735):

παρὰ Καβάτου Σαδασάδασάχ Ἡρακλεῖῳ τῷ ἡμεροτάτῳ βασιλεῖ
Ῥωμαίων τῷ ἡμετέρῳ ἄδελφῳ πλείστην χαρὰν· ἀπονέμημεν τῷ
ἡμεροτάτῳ βασιλεῖ Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἄδελφῳ ἡμῶν.

From Kavadh Sadasadasakh to Heraclius, the most clement
Roman emperor, our brother, we offer the greatest thanks.
(transl. Greatrex, Lieu)

who in turn called him “son” (Nikephoros Brev. 15):
Herakleios wrote back, calling Seiroes his son and (saying) that it had never been his wish that a king—not even Chosroes—should lose his glory. (transl. Mango)

Employment of particular phrases depended on the current political situation. Xusrō Parvēz called himself Maurice’s son because he needed the assistance of imperial armies in his fight with the usurper Bahrām Čōbēn (590–591).

Here one should consider the interpretation of the word “brother.” Was it perceived as a synonym of equality in Iran? We can look to the Iranian concept of the past. According to mythical tradition Ferēḏūn divided the world between his three sons: Salm received Rūm (West), Tūz/Tūr received Turkastān (East), and Īraj/Ēriz inherited Ērānšāhr (Abdīh ud Sahīghī ī Sīštān 5–6):

az frazendān ī frēdōn salm kē kīšvar ī hrōm, ud tur (tūz) kē turkestān ped x'adāyīh dāšt, ērij (ērēz) ērān dahebed būd, uš be ōzad

From the offsprings of Frēdōn, Salm who ruled over the land of Rome and Tūz who ruled over the land of Turkestān, they killed Ēraj who was the lord of the land of Ērān (transl. Daryāce)

Following Xwadāy-nāmag both Ferdowsī and Ṭabarī refined this: the elder brothers murdered Īraj, motivated by envy. In this context, calling a Roman emperor a “brother” was not, in the Persian mindset, purely courtly politeness. According to this concept the Romans were the ancestors of Salm, the killer of his own brother. This story about the heroic Kings is preserved in
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the *Avesta*. What is more, Šāpur II decided to consolidate Mazdaism by ordering Ādur-bād-ī Mahrsandān to make a final redaction of the *Avesta* (*Dēnkird* IV 321–322):

Šābuhr šāhān šāh i hormizdān hamāg kīswārīgān pad paykārišn yazdān āhang kard ud hamāg göwišn ō uskār ud wizōyišn āwurd pas az bōxtan ā ādur-bād pad göwišn i passāxt abāg hamāg ōyān jud-sardagān ud nask-ōsmurdān-iz ī jud-ristagān ēn-iz guft kū nūn ka-mān dēn pad sti dēn did kas-iz ag-dēnī bē nē hilēm wēs abar tuxšāg tuxšem ud ham gōnag kard Šāpur, the king of kings, son of Hormizd, induced all countrymen to orient themselves to god by disputation, and put forth all oral traditions for consideration and examination. After the triumph of Ādur-bād, through his declaration put to trial by ordeal (in disputation) with all those sectaries and heretics who recognized (studied) the Nasks, he made the following statement: “Now that we have gained an insight into the Religion in the worldly existence, we shall not tolerate anyone of false religion, and we shall be more zealous.” (transl. Daryaee)

It is possible that the first Sasanian version of the *Avesta* could have been written down already in this century. From the reign of Šāpur II the royal ideology reoriented towards the mythical Kayāniāns, and derived the origin of the Sasanians from the Avestan dynasties. When Šāpur II was replying to Constantine


who called him “brother,” he must have been aware of Iranian tradition, but Constantine was most likely not. For the Western tradition and concept, using “brother” was clearly associated with equality; but it might be understood differently by Iranians.

Another problem in the interpretation of Romano-Iranian relations is the phrase “brother of Sun and Moon,” applied to the rulers. In the letters exchanged between Šāpur and Constantius (Amm. Marc. 17.5.3):

*Rex regum Sapor, particeps siderum, frater Solis et Lunae, Constantio Caesari fratri meo salutem plurimam dico.*

I Sapor, King of Kings, partner with the Stars, brother of the Sun and Moon, to my brother Constantius Caesar offer most ample greeting. (transl. Rolfe)

This phrase thus appears to be one of the elements of the royal titulature of Iranian kings. How should one interpret the fragment of the letter from Kawād I (488–496, 498–531) to Justinian in which the king of the kings, “Sun of the East,” addresses the emperor as “Moon of the West” (Malalas 18.44):

Κωάδης βασιλεὺς βασιλευόντων ἡλίου ἀνατολῆς Φλαβίῳ Ἰουστινιανῷ Καίσαρι σελήνης δύσεως.

Kawād king of kings, of the rising sun, to Flavius Justinian Caesar, of the setting moon (transl. Maksymiuk)

It might seem that the expression mentions two parallel civilizational centers: Western (Moon) and Eastern (Sun). But it should be borne in mind that in the Iranian conception, the world was not divided into East and West. According to Avestan tradition, Ėrānsāhr was the centre of the world. It was at first
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ruled by the Kayānīāns and then by their descendants, the Sasanian dynasty.\textsuperscript{18} It should also be pointed out that in the Avestan hierarchy the Sun stands above the Moon.\textsuperscript{19} Calling Justinian “the Moon of the West” could be interpreted as a disguised insult.

It was a duty of the rulers of Iran, the sole holders of \textit{farrah}, to attempt to unite the world under their rule.\textsuperscript{20} In this context, placing the three empty chairs, symbolically dedicated to Chinese, Turkic, and Roman rulers, in the audience hall in Ctesiphon by Xusrō Anōširvān was a mark of subduing all of the kingdoms to the Iranian monarch.\textsuperscript{21} It should be assumed therefore that the Sasanian concept of the world was different from the one which suggests equality of both states on the basis of the language of diplomacy.

An interesting point relevant to the question of mutual respect of the rulers is provided by the material objects associated with the diplomacy. As an example, one may use the obelisk base in the hippodrome in Constantinople. The relief shows the homage of Iranian envoys paid to the emperor Theodosius I (379–395). This scene is on the western face of the monument, so the ambassadors who accompanied the emperor could not see it. It is therefore hard to defend the idea of mutual respect.

A diplomatic protocol developed in the sixth century and
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unified the court rituals in Constantinople and Ctesiphon. The principles of mutual diplomatic contacts were designed in the utmost detail. One could even say that a certain choreography of receiving of envoys was created and that a characteristic system of signs and symbols was shaped. But the perfect object that can be used to understand the reception of the symbols in their own cultural sense is an equestrian figure of Justinian I from Augustaion in Constantinople.22 Procopius provides a detailed description of the sculpture and, what is even more important, adds his explanation of the meaning of the figure. In his opinion, the emperor watched the rising sun being directed against the Persians. In his left hand, Justinian held the globe, symbolizing the entire earth and sea subdued to him by the power of the cross that crowned the globe. Procopius highlights the fact that the emperor was shown unarmed, thereby explaining his power as originating more from spiritual superiority. The gesture of an extended hand is interpreted by Procopius as an order to the Persians to stay within their borders (Aed. 1.2.10–12):

And he looks toward the rising sun, directing his course, I suppose, against the Persians. And in his left hand he holds a globe, by which the sculptor signifies that the whole earth and sea are subject to him, yet he has neither sword nor spear nor any other weapon, but a cross stands upon the globe which he carries, the emblem by which alone he has obtained both his Empire and his victory in war. And stretching forth his right hand toward the rising sun and spreading out his fingers, he commands the bar-

barians in that quarter to remain at home and to advance no further. (transl. Dewing)

Would Iranian envoys arriving in Constantinopole understand the meaning of the figure in the same way? In the gesture of the raised hand in iconography of the coinage of Sasanian kings23 or of reliefs (e.g. that of Ardašīr at Naqš-e Rajab) we will understand that for the Iranians this gesture meant respect or subduing.

The language of diplomacy best exemplified in the metaphor of comparing Rome and Iran to two lights, two eyes of the earth that have to coexist, rather than try to annihilate each other, should not obscure the mutual distrust or open hostility of both states. Agathias in the sixth century, when mentioning the proposal to transfer the raising of young Theodosius II (408–450) to Yazdgerd I (399–420),24 names the Iranian king as the worst enemy, the stranger barbarian, a cheater and a heathen (Agath. 4.26.6):

ἔμοι δὲ δοκεῖ ὁ τοῦτο ἀγάμενος οὐ τῇ πρώτῃ ὀρμῇ τοῦ βουλεύματος τὸ εὐλογον κρίνειν, ἄλλα τῷ ύστερον ἀποβεβηκότι. ἐπεὶ πῶς ἂν εἴχεν κλαῖσιν ἀνδρὶ ὃθνείῳ καὶ βαρβάρῳ καὶ γένους ἄρχοντι πολεμιωτάτῳ καὶ ὄπως οὔτῳ μετήν πίστεώς τε καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἠγνοημένῳ καὶ πρὸς γε τῇ ἐς θεον πεπλανημένῳ παραδοῦναι.

But whoever expresses admiration for this decision is, in my opinion, judging it in the light of later events and not by the logic of the original situation, since it hardly could have made sense to entrust one’s nearest and dearest to a foreigner and a barbarian, the ruler of a bitterly hostile nation, a man who in matters of honour and justice was an unknown quantity and who on top of everything else was the adherent of a false religion. (transl. Soward)

It must be borne in mind that the majority of the ‘western’ literary sources, e.g. Ammianus, Procopius, Agathias, or Mala-

23 Yazdgerd II (439–457): R. Göbl, Sasanian Numismatics (Braunschweig 1971) I/2; Pērōz (457–484): I/1v, or Kawād I: I/1.

24 Procopius Wars 1.2.1–10; R. C. Blockley, East Roman Foreign Policy. Formation and Conduct from Diocletian to Anastasius (Leeds 1992) 46–59.
las, were written in a time of constant wars with the Sasanians, and none of the authors was an unbiased observer, always describing events from the Roman perspective. It is, therefore, natural for these authors to depict Iran in a biased, negative light. Of course, the picture of the Persians in these sources is not uniformly negative. The authors write somewhat respectfully about the military skills of their opponent, as in this way they could justify Iranian successes in wars against Rome (e.g. an opinion about Šāpur of Ray from Mehrān). In non-Iranian sources a positive picture of Yazdgerd I, who reigned in a period of Romano-Iranian peaceful coexistence in the fifth century, can be found. An almost idealized picture of the state ruled by
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Xusrō Anōšīrvān, rule was based on unity of φιλοσοφία and βασιλεία, is found in the context of the arrival of seven Neoplatonic philosophers to the court in Gondišāpur in 532. A specific instance that might provide an argument for the favourable perception of Iran by the inhabitants of the border zone is the desertion of the Roman garrison of Beroca in 540, when the soldiers voluntarily “went into the land of Persia.”

These isolated examples should not blur the real and general relations between the rulers of the both states, which are revealed in the actual deeds of the monarchs. The kings of Iran demanded of the Roman emperors participation in the defense of the Caucasian border, but, what is important, their demands were not prompted by financial problems of the state. The required regular, annual payments, although relatively low, allowed their interpretation as signs of dependence. A hint that permits such an interpretation of mutual relations is a fragment describing the diplomatic mission of Zemarchos to the Turks in 568–572, when one of the chieftains posed a question to the
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Roman legates (John of Ephesus *HE* 6.23):

Tell me, is it true what the Persians say, that the king of the Romans is their slave, and pays yearly tribute as a slave? (transl. Payne Smith)

The real relationship between the two states is illustrated by the letter of Xusrō II Parvēz, in which the king foregoes all diplomatic jargon and calls the emperor Heraclius his meaningless servant (Ps.-Sebeos 123):

In the 34th year of king Khosrov he wrote a letter to Heraclius as follows: “Khosrov, honoured among the gods, lord and king of all the earth, and offspring of the great Aramazd, to Heraclius our senseless and insignificant servant. (transl. Thomson)

On the basis of these considerations, I fully agree with the view of Nina Garsoïan: “Behind the bland courtesy of diplomatic clichés ran a deep vein of enmity, and, what was perhaps still more damaging, mutual contempt.” 33 The idea of a shared language and tokens of communication should be re-examined and, in my opinion, is totally incorrect. The reception of the symbols and interpretation of the signs was determined by different cultural traditions. The Sasanians did not see contradiction in calling the Romans their brothers and enemies at the same time. They understood differently the symbolic language, as was discussed in the example of the raised hand. These facts allow a better and fuller understanding of the relations between Rome and Iran in Late Antiquity. 34
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34 These are the results of the work carried out under the research theme No. 452/16/S, financed by the grant of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education.
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