Title

Reading the Roman-Jewish treaty in 1 Maccabees 8: narrative, documents, and Hellenistic historical culture

Author

MacRae, Duncan E

Publication Date

2016

Peer reviewed

Reading the Roman-Jewish Treaty in 1 Maccabees 8: Narrative, Documents, and Hellenistic Historical Culture

Duncan E. MacRae

Abstract: This article examines the historiographical poetics of the Roman-Jewish treaty that is quoted in 1 Maccabees 8. On a narrative level, the unusual verbatim quotation of the treaty acts as a guarantee for the narratorial voice, while the evocation of an epigraphic bronze copy of the text allows the text to fulfill an archival function. The inclusion of a bilateral treaty document in a piece of Hebrew (or Hebraizing) historiography also indicates a moment of cultural transfusion, when a habit of Greek history writing – the verbatim quotation of treaty documents – was incorporated into a distinct historiographical tradition. This analysis offers a new perspective on the question of the Hellenism of 1 Maccabees. This article is offered to Brian McGing in gratitude for his teaching.

Keywords: 1 Maccabees, Hasmoneans, Roman Republic, documents, historiography, Hellenism

Given Brian McGing's scholarly interest in Hellenistic historiography and documentary texts, it will be appropriate, I hope, to focus in this article on a text that is both, the second half of 1 Maccabees 8, which narrates a diplomatic mission from Judaea to Rome in 161 BCE and quotes the resulting treaty text:

> [17] Καὶ ἐπελέξατο Ιουδας τὸν Εὐπόλεμον υἱὸν Ιωαννου τοῦ Ακκως καὶ Ἰάσονα υἱὸν Ελεαζαρου καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς Ῥώμην στῆσαι φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν [18] καὶ τοῦ ἆραι τὸν ζυγὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι εἶδον τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καταδουλουμένους τὸν Ισραηλ δουλείᾳ. [19] καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς Ῥώμην, καὶ ἡ ὁδὸς πολλὴ σφόδρα, καὶ εἰσήλθοσαν εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον [20] Ιουδας ὁ καὶ Μακκαβαῖος καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν

Ιουδαίων ἀπέστειλαν ἡμᾶς πρὸς ὑμᾶς στῆσαι μεθ' ὑμῶν συμμαχίαν καὶ εἰρήνην καὶ γραφῆναι ἡμᾶς συμμάχους καὶ φίλους ὑμῶν. [21] καὶ ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν. [22] καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἀντίγραφον τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ἧς ἀντέγραψαν ἐπὶ δέλτοις χαλκαῖς καὶ ἀπέστειλαν εἰς Ιερουσαλημ εἶναι παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖ μνημόσυνον εἰρήνης καὶ συμμαχίας.

[23] Καλῶς γένοιτο Ῥωμαίοις καὶ τῷ ἔθνει Ιουδαίων ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ξηρᾶς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ ῥομφαία καὶ ἐχθρὸς μακρυνθείη ἀπ' αὐτῶν. [24] ἐὰν δὲ ἐνστῇ πόλεμος Ῥώμῃ προτέρᾳ ἢ πᾶσιν τοῖς συμμάχοις αὐτῶν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κυριείᾳ αὐτῶν, [25] συμμαχήσει τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Ιουδαίων, ὡς ἂν ὁ καιρὸς ὑπογράφῃ αὐτοῖς, καρδίᾳ πλήρει· [26] καὶ τοῖς πολεμοῦσιν οὐ δώσουσιν οὐδὲ ἐπαρκέσουσιν σῖτον, ὅπλα, ἀργύριον, πλοῖα, ὡς ἔδοξεν Ῥώμῃ· καὶ φυλάξονται τὰ φυλάγματα αὐτῶν οὐθὲν λαβόντες. [27] κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ ἐὰν ἔθνει Ιουδαίων συμβῇ προτέροις πόλεμος, συμμαχήσουσιν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ἐκ ψυχῆς, ὡς ἂν αὐτοῖς ὁ καιρὸς ὑπογράφῃ; [28] καὶ τοῖς συμμαχοῦσιν (read: τοῖς πολεμοῦσιν) οὐ δοθήσεται σῖτος, ὅπλα, ἀργύριον, πλοῖα, ὡς ἔδοξεν Ῥώμῃ· καὶ φυλάξονται τὰ φυλάγματα ταῦτα καὶ οὐ μετὰ δόλου. [29] κατὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους οὕτως ἔστησαν Ῥωμαῖοι τῷ δήμῳ τῶν Ιουδαίων. [30] ἐὰν δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους βουλεύσωνται οὗτοι καὶ οὗτοι προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν, ποιήσονται ἐξ αἱρέσεως αὐτῶν, καὶ ὃ ἂν προσθῶσιν ἢ ἀφέλωσιν, ἔσται κύρια. [31] καὶ περὶ τῶν κακῶν, ὧν ὁ βασιλεὺς Δημήτριος συντελεῖται εἰς αὐτούς, ἐγράψαμεν αὐτῷ λέγοντες Διὰ τί ἐβάρυνας τὸν ζυγόν σου ἐπὶ τοὺς φίλους ἡμῶν τοὺς συμμάχους Ιουδαίους; [32] ἐὰν οὖν ἔτι ἐντύχωσιν κατὰ σοῦ, ποιήσομεν αὐτοῖς τὴν κρίσιν καὶ πολεμήσομέν σε διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ διὰ τῆς ξηρᾶς.

[17]So Judas chose Eupolemus son of John son of Accos, and Jason son of Eleazar, and sent them to Rome to establish friendship and alliance, [18] and to free themselves from the yoke; for they saw that the kingdom of the Greeks was enslaving Israel completely. [19] They went to Rome, a very long journey; and they entered the senate chamber and spoke as follows: [20] "Judas, who is also called Maccabeus, and his brothers and the people of the Jews have sent us to you to establish alliance and peace with you, so that we may be enrolled as your allies and friends." [21] The proposal pleased them, [22] and this is a copy of the letter that they wrote in reply, on bronze tablets, and sent to Jerusalem to remain with them there as a memorial of peace and alliance:

[23] "May all go well with the Romans and with the nation of the Jews at sea and on land forever, and may sword and enemy be far from them. [24] If war comes first to Rome or to any of their allies in all their dominion, [25] the nation of the Jews shall act as their allies wholeheartedly, as the occasion may indicate to them. [26] To the enemy that makes war they shall not give or supply grain, arms, money, or ships, just as Rome has decided; and they shall keep their obligations without receiving any return. [27] In the same way, if war comes first to the nation of the Jews, the Romans shall willingly act as their allies, as the occasion may indicate to them. [28] And to their enemies there shall not be given grain, arms, money, or ships, just as Rome has decided; and they shall keep these obligations and do so without deceit. [29] Thus on these terms the Romans make a treaty with the Jewish people.

> [30] If after these terms are in effect both parties shall determine to add or delete anything, they shall do so at their discretion, and any addition or deletion that they may make shall be valid. [31] Concerning the wrongs that King Demetrius is doing to them, we have written to him as follows, 'Why have you made your yoke heavy on our friends and allies the Jews? [32] If now they appeal again for help against you, we will defend their rights and fight you on sea and on land."
>
> (NRSV translation)

For understandable reasons, this text has been the object of intensive study for centuries and key topics remain hotly contested: is this an authentic document? What was the juridical form of the relationship that it created between the two states? What were the motives of each party?[1] These are all vital questions for understanding both Jewish history and Roman Republican imperialism, but I propose in this article to take a different approach and read 1 Maccabees 8:17-32 from the perspective of cultural and literary history and set aside, for now, questions of historicity and authenticity.[2]

Until recently the dominant interest in scholarship on 1 Maccabees as history-writing has been the composition and redaction of the text, and the end of chapter 8 in particular has often been the target for accusations of "interpolation" or claims that it is "secondary" or an "island" in the text without proper narrative function.[3] Contemporary scholarship on the book, however, has taken a "unitarian" turn, to emphasize the coherence of the text as it is transmitted in the

[1] Two recent monographs have each approached these questions: Seeman 2013 and Zollschan 2017; solutions to the problems are still elusive, however: see Zack 2018 and Coşkun 2018. The modern scholarly bibliography on the political history, 1 Maccabees, and the other biblical and classical historiography that I discuss in this essay is extremely extensive; for reasons of space, I have cited only recent and (in my view) essential discussions of these topics, all of which provide good access to the earlier and wider literature.

[2] For the stakes of the historicity and authenticity of quoted documents in post-exilic Jewish historiography, Bikerman 1953 is exemplary. I am supportive of both the basic historicity of the embassy and the likelihood that the quoted document, except for 8:31-32, is at least a proximate version of some real legal text (see MacRae 2021); but my interest here is in how this diplomatic encounter is presented to readers of 1 Maccabees. Hampton 2009, and a conversation with Tim Hampton himself, pushed me to think harder about the diplomatic poetics of 1 Maccabees 8, though there is a significant distance between Hellenistic Jewish and early modern diplomatic textuality.

[3] The argument for interpolation is most forcefully set out by Gauger 1977: 153-339, more recently by Tilly 2015: 183; "secondary", Borchardt 2014: 96; an "island", Martola 1984: 226-236.

Septuagint.[4] Although we read it in Greek, its language reveals that the book was originally written in Hebrew (or, less likely, was written in Greek to match the "translationese" of much of the rest of the Septuagint) and broadly echoes the style of the so-called Deuteronomistic History (the sequence of canonized historical books in the Hebrew Bible from *Joshua* to *2 Kings*), notably through the reuse of distinctive formulae and use of anachronistic nomenclature. The text narrates Judaean political history in the years 175-134 BCE, though the account opens with the arrival of Alexander in Asia and the final lines appear to allude to a city wall for Jerusalem that was probably built around 130 BCE. A common, and in my view justified, characterization of the book is that it represents a biblicizing Hasmonean dynastic history, very likely produced under John Hyrcanus, who ruled in Judaea at the end of the second century (135/4-104 BCE), and consequently provides valuable testimony to the political, religious, and literary ideologies circulating in the Hasmonean court.[5]

But, if we are not inclined to see it as an intrusive interpolation, why is the treaty document with Rome quoted in this Hasmonean 1 Maccabees? Verbatim quotation of documentary texts in ancient historiography is a particularly awkward challenge for the modern reader, who is primed by the importance of documentary citation in modern historical practice to either see the quotation as an index of the diligence (or not) of ancient historical research or explain away the citation as a generic aberration in a piece of premodern historiography.[6] Instead

[4] There is good reason to believe that the transmitted text shows the features of an even redactorial polish: see Ettelson 1925 (not refuted on a philological level by Williams 1999b: 114-122).
[5] The assumption that 1 Maccabees served as Hasmonean dynastic history has been conventional since the nineteenth century. For more recent ideological readings of the text, see, e.g., S. Schwartz 1991; Rappaport 1998; Honigman 2014; Eckhardt 2016a; D. R. Schwartz 2017; Berthelot 2018: 65-185; Eckhardt 2021.
[6] For documents in ancient historiography and the question of research practices, see Higbie 1999, Rhodes 2007. For attempts to minimize these documents, consider the tendency to dismiss quoted documents as forgeries or the claims about the unfinished state of Thucydides' history as a way to deal with his citation of treaties, as Wilamowitz-Möllendorf 1908: 596-602 notoriously proposed; for responses to this argument, see Momigliano 1992: 90-103 (first published in 1930); Canfora 1990; Lane Fox 2010.

of an implicit comparison with modern historical writing, however, I propose that we seek to understand this citation of the Jewish-Roman treaty in both the Hellenistic and Hebrew historiographical context of 1 Maccabees. Part of the task is to "see double" in the words of Susan Stephens, to read this text in terms of both the particular historical poetics of Hasmonean Judaea and the "global" historical culture of the Hellenistic world.[7] For some readers, this may seem like an unusual approach – it is 2 Maccabees that has been seen as a prime exemplar of Hellenistic historiography and (perhaps) diasporic narrative of the Maccabean revolt; 1 Maccabees is the more reliable Hebrew and Palestinian version of the story – but part of my contention here is that there is more to 1 Maccabees than a sober chronicle of the Hasmonean rise and a traditionalist view of Jewish history and Torah.[8] In order to make this case, this article offers three distinct readings of the passage in 1 Maccabees 8 – a narratological reading, a media-historical contextualization, and a perspective from the history of historiography – before returning to the question of the "Hellenism" of the text.

* * *

We can start from the place of the embassy to Rome in the book, taking it to be not simply a clumsy insertion but as an integral part of a deliberately constructed narrative.[9] The embassy to

[7] Stephens 2003. I use "historical culture" in the sense suggested by Woolf 1997: the full set of media for the presentation of the past in a particular society, not limited to formal genres of historiography.
[8] These stereotypes about the two narratives are clearly expressed by Bickerman 1979: 94-98. 1 Maccabees as "sober and straightforward": Attridge 1984: 172; as "non-Hellenized": Troiani 2008: 348-359; as "proto-rabbinic": Munnich 2014 and Borchardt 2014. For 2 Maccabees, see, e.g. Habicht 1976: 1, "an eloquent product of Hellenistic Greek historiography," and D. R. Schwartz 2008: 45-55 for a recent argument for diasporan perspective. Note Rappaport 1998: 178 suggesting consideration of the Hellenism of 1 Maccabees.
[9] The narratology of 1 Maccabees has largely been neglected in favor of a concern with composition history, but see Williams 1999a on the literary artistry of 1 Maccabees 6. For other recent narratological and rhetorical studies of the verbatim quotation of documents in ancient historiography, see Spielberg 2015 (on Roman historiographers) and Wiater 2018 (on Polybius).

Rome of chapter 8 comes at a pivotal point in the politico-military career of Judas Maccabee. At the end of the previous chapter, which relates the events of 161 BCE, the Judaeans celebrate their victory over the Seleucid general Nicanor and proclaim a festival of remembrance (7:48-49). This is the moment when the other main ancient narrative of the Maccabean revolt, 2 Maccabees, concludes; but the scope of 1 Maccabees is to be different. The text continues, "So the land of Judah had rest for a few days" (7:50) and then introduces the narrative of the Roman embassy, to which I will return shortly. Once the embassy has been narrated, the text continues with the next Seleucid incursion into Judaea, led by Bacchides and Alcimus, and Judas' death (9:1-22). Not all readers have been satisfied with this narrative sequence: Jonathan Goldstein writes that "if ch. 8 had been omitted, no modern reader would have missed it," and I have already alluded to other scholars who find it to be an "island" in the text.[10] But 1 Maccabees is obviously invested in the political success of the Hasmonean dynasty and this diplomatic postscript to the day of Nicanor makes clear that the consequence of the victory was that Judas was now effectively in power.[11] This is a pattern in 1 Maccabees: after his victory in the plain of Hazor, Jonathan, Judas' brother and successor, "saw that the time was favorable to him, chose men and sent them to Rome to confirm and renew the friendship with them" (12:1); similarly, Jonathan's own successor, Simon, when he has "established peace in the land" (14:11), also commissions an embassy to Rome as his first narrated action (14:24). We should read chapter 8 as part of this broader pattern: when a Hasmonean has won a victory and established himself as a ruler of a peaceful Judaea, he sends an embassy to Rome. Retrospectively, therefore, the chapter is not as

[10] Goldstein 1976: 346.

[11] The actual political power and office of Judas in 161-160 BCE is a difficult question: 1 Maccabees hints that Alcimus was High Priest in this period (1 Macc 7:5-7 and 9:54-56), but Josephus (*AJ* 12.414, 419, 434) and, perhaps, 2 Maccabees (14:26) suggest that Judas was High Priest: see D. R. Schwartz 2008: 474-475 and Eckhardt 2016b for different recent positions.

extraneous as it might seem to Goldstein's "modern reader," but, rather, fits the dynastic patterning that is a clear feature of the whole book.[12]

Chapter 8 opens with a famous and much-discussed "encomium" of Rome (8:1-16), which portrays republican Rome as the dominant power in the Mediterranean, but clearly distinguishes it from the oppressive monarchies of the Greeks.[13] The account of the Roman Republic is focalized through Judas himself – "Now Judas heard of the fame of the Romans…" (8:1) – and justifies his decision to send an embassy to seal an anti-monarchic alliance. The remainder of the chapter is the narrative of Judas' Roman embassy itself (8:17-32), quoted in full above. Looking closer at this text, it is apparent that it is structured by repetitions: the text is marked by surfeit, even pleonasm.[14] The aim of the mission – to establish alliance and friendship with the Romans – is first the desire of Judas and then elaborated into speech by the ambassadors themselves. The text of the treaty reiterates and instantiates the positive response of the Romans to the speech of the ambassadors: it fulfills the narrative's pithy statement "the proposal pleased them". The treaty document itself is marked as a copy (ἀντίγραφον) of the Roman response, that is, a repetition of the copy sent to Jerusalem. Finally, the letter of the Romans to Demetrius reiterates the treaty: they announce that the Jews are now allies and friends. The Romans echo Judas' language of the Greek "yoke". All this narrative surplus, however, does not go to waste – rather the effect of the iteration is to highlight the semiotic character of the diplomatic mission. The narrative reports, in varying levels of directness, first the speech of Judas in Judaea, then the speech of Eupolemus and Jason in the *curia*, and finally the Romans' positive answer, once

[12] As Goldstein 1976: 346 also goes on to suggest: "nevertheless it is an essential part of our author's narrative."
[13] I discuss elsewhere 1 Maccabees as evidence for Hasmonean constructions of Roman imperial power: MacRae 2021, with further bibliography; for a good overview, see also Flusser 2007.
[14] One ancient reader seems to have noticed this and removed most of this repetition from his version: Josephus *AJ* 12.414-419.

indirectly and then again in the form of the treaty document that seals the alliance and friendship of the two peoples. Repetitions in narrative match repetitions of discourse that took place (or could have taken place) in the actual diplomatic exchange.

Beyond these mimetic repetitions, the iteration of discourse also has a pragmatic function as a guarantee of the efficacy of diplomatic representation and communication. The shift between the narratorial voice that reports Judas' thinking and the direct quotation of the ambassadors in Rome allows us to observe an act of diplomatic representation. The ambassadors' rhetoric faithfully represents the purpose of Judas and articulates it as the will of the *plethos* of the Judaeans.[15] In a similar way, the treaty itself demonstrates the success of the communicative act, as Judas' wish for friendship and alliance is tangibly fulfilled. Even the treaty document symbolizes communication, as a copy that the Romans sent to Jerusalem, where it matches the words originally written in Rome. The repetitions of the final part of 1 Maccabees 8, therefore, echo the language of the diplomatic exchange and demonstrate its success.

But we also encounter difference within the repetitions of the passage. Most clearly, the event of the embassy is represented in two distinct ways: as a piece of what we might call "regular" historiographical narrative, which tells the story of the embassy directly from verses 17 to 21, and in the form of the treaty document, which is the product of the embassy. The shift from narrative to documentary quotation is a re-presentation that makes the narrative representation convincing: the quoted document becomes a rhetorical proof, πίστις, albeit it an "artless" (ἄτεχνος) one in the terms of Aristotle.[16] In the case of 1 Maccabees 8, the difference

[15] Goldstein 1976: 365 raises the question of whether this *plethos* (not *ethnos*, for example) was really a legitimate political community, but, as he notes, the Roman people are themselves called a *plethos* at 8:15.
[16] Aristotle *Rhet.* 1355b. Marincola 1997: 105 points out that this rhetorical use of documents shaped their appearance in classical historiography, "they were, like any witness, to be used to build a case".

from the main narratorial voice allows the treaty text to affirm the authorial narrative and to join with it to create the impression of the successful Jewish mission to Rome in 161. And ultimately, this is the purpose of the narrative structure of both the whole book and this section of it: 1 Maccabees works hard to tell a story about successful Hasmonean leadership and the eighth chapter's depiction of a fruitful embassy to Rome, directed by Judas, is an integral part of that narrative.[17]

* * *

The difference between the historiographical narrative and the Roman treaty document can also take us beyond the text of 1 Maccabees 8 and into the wider context. Literary history was only one way to mediate the past in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, including in Judaea.[18] Among other modes, including oral communication and ritual performances, epigraphic monuments also made the past visible.[19] In fact, the idea (if not the reality) of such monuments is apparent from 1 Maccabees 8 itself: the copy of the treaty with Rome in the text is taken from bronze tablets sent to Jerusalem to be a μνημόσυνον*,* a record, and so presumably to be archived and/or put on display. This is not the only example of 1 Maccabees' concern with epigraphic monuments: during the narration of the leadership of Judas' brother Simon, the text gives another extensive

[17] On the place of Rome in this legitimizing narrative as a whole, see MacRae 2021.
[18] Written history might have been particularly prominent in Judaea because of the importance of the biblical text (even if not yet canonized as "the Bible"), as the patterns of concern with literary preservation and interpretation visible in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the *Letter of Aristeas* attest.
[19] See Regev 2013: 36-57 for Hasmonean establishment of the festival of Hanukkah and the consequent politics of memory. See Chaniotis 2012 for memorialization through ritual in the wider Hellenistic eastern Mediterranean. For epigraphic records of the past *qua* past, see the fundamental study by Chaniotis 1988.

quotation from an inscribed document, an honorary decree which had also been written on bronze tablets and displayed on Mount Zion (14:27; 14:48-49).[20]

Although it is reasonable to be suspicious of the historicity of these reports in the absence of direct evidence for a Hasmonean public epigraphy, they do have verisimilitude when compared to the surviving epigraphy of the Eastern Mediterranean.[21] To focus just on the treaty document, we can note that the monumentalization of treaties has a long history within the Greek epigraphic habit; from the second century BCE in particular, treaties with Rome seem to have been important documents for public inscription in medium and small-sized polities.[22] These treaties, which often, as in the case of the Jews, implied the interactions of peer polities, were in reality embedded in the pattern of Roman expansion in the Hellenistic East, where local elites and Roman agents co-produced the hegemony of the Republic.[23] The texts of these treaties have often been compared to the one contained in 1 Maccabees, but we would do well not to neglect their materiality as (historical) monuments.[24] For example, the treaty from the 160s between Rome and Maroneia, a *polis* on the Aegean coast of Thrace, was originally, as the inscribed text itself reveals, displayed on stone in the sanctuary of Dionysus, the privileged cult space in Maroneia.[25] At Kibyra in Anatolia, the treaty was to be attached to the base of a gold statue of

[20] Van Henten 2001: 118-119 notes the particular emphasis on epigraphic documents in 1 Maccabees and Orian 2018 uses a suspect letter from Demetrius I (10:25-45) as evidence for the author's archival mentality.
[21] Van Henten 2001 compares the honorary decree for Simon with the Egyptian priestly decrees for Ptolemaic kings (cf. Ma 2008: 376-377 for the "paradoxical" Hellenistic aspect of these decrees); but note Krentz 2001, making the point that both the Jewish and Egyptian decrees are truly commensurable with the much broader Hellenistic practice. For the absence of surviving Hasmonean public epigraphy from Jerusalem, see Cotton et al. 2010: 41.
[22] For a recent survey of the epigraphically-preserved treaties between Roman and Greek-speaking polities, see Schuler 2007: 67-74; for a fuller survey of treaties (not just on stone), see Gruen 1984: 731-744. For the evidence for the importance of preserving inscribed treaties (even no-longer valid ones) in Greek cities, presumably as historical monuments, see Bolmarcich 2007.
[23] This co-production of empire is the major theme in Dench 2018.
[24] See Seeman 2013 and Zollschan 2017 for such comparisons of the texts and the previous bibliography.
[25] *SEG* XXXV 823, l.43.

the goddess Roma.[26] The extant text from Kibyra is on stone, but we learn from the inscription that the version attached to the statue base was on a bronze stele, like the one in Jerusalem. A more tangible parallel to the material form of the Jewish treaty is the recently-published bronze tablet that bears a treaty from 46 BCE between Rome and the Lycians.[27] Although the tablet lacks an archaeological context, its editor, Stephen Mitchell, has proposed that it was displayed in the Letoon at Xanthos in Lycia; if this was the case, we have a close analogue to the bronze copy of the treaty that was sent by the senate to Jerusalem over a century earlier, according to 1 Maccabees.[28]

In verse 22, which emphasizes the relationship of the quoted text to a physical copy of the Roman-Jewish treaty, therefore, 1 Maccabees 8 both foregrounds a materiality for the treaty parallel to that we encounter in the archaeological record and links that materiality to the memory function of the document. Why draw the reader's attention to this alternative medium for the perpetuation of the past? In the previous section of this article, I have already noted how the quotation of the treaty in 1 Maccabees 8 works to subsume its *contents* into the narrative of the embassy to Rome. But the emphasis on the materiality of the treaty and the claim that the quoted text is a copy (ἀντίγραφον) of this text on bronze suggests that the historiographical text can also replicate its memorializing *function*. In this light, the use of the verb ἀντιγράφω in the Greek translation to describe the production of the text on bronze may suggest an early reader's conflation of the material and textual copies of the treaty, if the verb serves as a reminder that we

[26] *OGIS* 762, l.15.
[27] *SEG* LV 1452. The *editio princeps* is Mitchell 2005. Another, fragmentary, bronze treaty from Lycia is published by Schuler 2007.
[28] We might doubt that the treaty was *actually* brought to Jerusalem (or to Lycia) on bronze (see Schuler 2007: 54 n.15), but there is evidence that inscription on bronze was commonly used in the Eastern Mediterranean for treaties with Rome (Eck 2015: 139-142). It would have been easy for an author writing half a century later to have misconstrued the process, especially if they had seen the bronze version or had read clauses of publication that are standard for such treaties, but omitted in the text of 1 Maccabees.

read a copy of a copy.[29] We can, therefore, understand the inclusion of the treaty in 1 Maccabees in the context of the varied media of commemoration plausibly available in the eastern Mediterranean: the spectre of a memorializing bronze version of this treaty is used both to bolster the authority of the citation and allow the historiographical text to take up the archival role of the inscribed treaty document.[30]

* * *

In a short article on 1 Maccabees published in 1976, Arnaldo Momigliano observed that "nobody has so far rigorously distinguished between what is Hebrew and what is Greek in 1 Maccabees."[31] Although I would hesitate to join Momigliano in his confidence that a "rigorous" distinction can be made between the Hebrew and the Greek elements in Hellenistic Jewish texts, the treaty document in 1 Maccabees offers an opportunity to return to this question and, therefore, to think again about where to position this text in relation to the two extant historiographic traditions from the mid-first millennium Mediterranean, Greek historiography and post-exilic Hebrew historical literature.

In his first Sather lecture and a related essay, Momigliano himself pointed out that quotation of documents is a feature of both classical Greek and post-exilic Hebrew historical traditions, a phenomenon he linked to Achaemenid imperialism.[32] However, there are clear

[29] The primary meaning of this verb here appears to be "write in reply" (as it is translated in the NRSV) and that is an appropriate meaning for the other two occasions that it is used in the Septuagint (1 Esdras 2:19, where it translates Aramaic *šlh* "send" of Ezra 4:17; and 1 Macc 12:23, again in reference to a letter which is represented in the text by an ἀντίγραφον). But Greek ἀντιγράφειν can be used to mean "copy" and it is used in this sense to describe the copying of a treaty onto a stele in a Hellenistic inscription from Miletus: *Syll*.[3] 588.
[30] For similar readings of inscriptional authority in relation to Greek historiography, see Moles 1999, Kirk 2014, Wiater 2018, and Spielberg 2019 (who also discusses Roman examples).
[31] Momigliano 1976: 658.
[32] Momigliano 1977: 31-33, and 1990: 5-28, at 12-14.

differences between the documentary habits of the two historiographies; 1 Maccabees, as I mentioned in the introduction, belongs securely in the latter tradition, but, if there was a Hebrew *Vorlage*, the treaty text in chapter 8 would have been the first time such an agreement between the Jews and another people appears in Hebrew historiography. Deuteronomistic historical narratives describe the making of treaties with other states, perhaps most prominently the covenant between Solomon and Hiram of Tyre (1 Kings 5:12), but the texts of these treaties are not given. Rather, the quoted documentary texts in Hebrew history writing are concentrated in the post-exilic books of Ezra-Nehemiah. Ezra-Nehemiah quotes verbatim from Achaemenid royal correspondence to show both the challenges to the return from Babylon and the support given by Persian monarchs for the temple. In comparison with the Roman-Jewish treaty, it is notable that the quoted documents explicitly display Achaemenid suzerainty: they include letters that are marked by formulas of address, of the kind, "To King Artaxerxes: Your servants, the people of the province Beyond the River, send greeting" (Ezra 4:11) or "Artaxerxes, king of kings, to the priest Ezra, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven" (Ezra 7:12), and decrees, which are given explicitly in the name of the king: "Thus says King Cyrus" (Ezra 1.2) or "I, Darius, make a decree" (Ezra 6:12). These documents are mostly quoted in the imperial administrative *lingua franca* Aramaic, rather than in Hebrew, perhaps to signal that they belong to the personal monarchy of the Persian kings and the epistolary practices of Achaemenid governance.

Although it may not be as easily classified as historiography, the author of the Hebrew book of Esther also uses Achaemenid epistolary governance as a central plot device: both Haman's order to kill the Jews (Esther 3:12-15) and Ahasuerus' decision to revoke the anti-Jewish decree (Esther 8:9-14) are dramatized as official letters to the peoples of the empire. This

appears to have encouraged the Greek translator of Esther, perhaps Lysimachus of Jerusalem, to interpolate "verbatim" texts of these letters into his version (Greek Esther additions B and E).[33] Indeed, under the influence of both the literary tradition and contemporary Hellenistic imperial government, an interest in direct quotation of (fictive and real) royal letters and decrees is visible in Greek Jewish texts of the second and first centuries BCE, including in the Letter of Aristeas, the fragmentary historical work by Eupolemus, and in 2 and 3 Maccabees.[34] Such documents are also found in 1 Maccabees itself, including important letters from Alexander Balas, Demetrius I, Demetrius II and Antiochus VII that grant privileges to the Hasmoneans.[35] However, the Roman treaty in 1 Maccabees 8, I contend, reads as a different kind of document. The treaty's opening acknowledgement of both parties as collectivities and the broadly reciprocal clauses of its body signals that it is a document not of hierarchical relations but of "peer polity interaction".[36]

In contrast to the Hebrew tradition, interstate treaty documents (alongside quotation of inscribed dedications) are a visible feature of Greek historiography. In a foundational work for the genre, Thucydides had included nine treaty documents in the fourth, fifth and eighth books of his history.[37] The three treaty documents in book eight are between the Spartans and the Achaemenid King and his satraps (8.18, 8.37, 8.58) and look utterly unlike the royal decrees and governors' letters of Ezra-Nehemiah, but at least pretend to a peer relationship. The third of

[33] See Bickerman 1951 for Lysimachus and for the history of the additions to Greek Esther.
[34] *Letter of Aristeas* 22-25 and 35-40; Eupolemus *BNJ* 723 F2b (Solomon is the king issuing royal letters; Souron of Tyre and Vaphres of Egypt reply to him as their overlord); 2 Macc 9.19-27; 11: 16-33; 3 Macc 3:12-29; 7:1-9. Such documents are also a significant element in Josephus' *Antiquitates Judaicae*, especially the collection of Roman documents at *AJ* 14.145-264. Hengel 1974: 110 argues that this interest in epistolary form is characteristically "Hellenistic," but this downplays the literary and governmental continuities with the Persian period pointed out by Momigliano.
[35] 1 Macc 10:18-20, 25-45; 11:30-37; 13:36-40; 15:2-9, 16-24 (letter of Roman consul Lucius to Ptolemy VIII).
[36] Peer polity interaction: Ma 2003. Another pair of documents in 1 Maccabees that accords with this sort of peer polity interaction, including fictive kinship, is the (probably unhistorical) epistolary exchange between the Spartans and the Hasmoneans (1 Macc 12:5-23 and 14:20-23).
[37] Verbatim citation of treaties: Thuc. 4.118, 5.18-19, 5.23-24, 5.47, 5.77, 5.79, 8.18, 8.37, 8.58.

these, for example, opens: "In the thirteenth year of King Darius and in the ephorate of Alexippidas at Sparta, a treaty was made in the plain of the Meander by the Spartans and their allies with Tissaphernes and Heramenes and the sons of Pharnakes concerning the affairs of the King and of the Spartans and their allies…"[38] The treaty opens with a pair of dating formulae according to the conventions of each party and the parallelism is maintained for the naming of the parties to the treaty and its scope.

Although the place of these quoted texts in Thucydides' intention for his finished history has been long debated, this documentary habit did leave a mark on later historiography, particularly in the Hellenistic period.[39] We know less than we might like about the late fourth- or early third-century work of Craterus of Macedon who made a collection of Athenian decrees, but Plutarch reports that he quoted a text of the notorious mid-fifth-century Peace of Callias between the Athenians and Persians, the existence of which was debated even in antiquity.[40] Polybius criticizes Timaeus of Tauromenion for his investigation of a treaty document that attested to the relationship between mainland and western Locrians and, generally, for his "display of accuracy regarding chronology and inscriptions and his concern for this part of history writing".[41] But the same criticism could be levelled at Polybius himself. In the extant portions of his history,

[38] Thuc. 8.58.1: τρίτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει Δαρείου βασιλεύοντος, ἐφορεύοντος δὲ Ἀλεξιππίδα ἐν Λακεδαίμονι, ξυνθῆκαι ἐγένοντο ἐν Μαιάνδρου πεδίῳ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων πρὸς Τισσαφέρνην καὶ Ἱεραμένη καὶ τοὺς Φαρνάκου παῖδας περὶ τῶν βασιλέως πραγμάτων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων.
[39] Lane Fox 2010 makes the case for Thucydidean influence on this habit. But cf. Jacoby in the introduction to *FGrH* 342 (Krateros der Makedone): "während die hellenistische Historie (vielleicht, wenn auch nicht allein, unter dem Einfluss der peripatetischen Forschung) freigebiger mit Zitaten von Urkunden, Gedichten und anderen Dokumenten war (Hellenistic historiography was more generous with citation of documents, poems and other sources (perhaps, if not entirely, under the influence of Peripatetic programs of research))"; I owe the reference to Wiater 2018: 151.
[40] Plut. *Cim*. 13.5 = *BNJ* 342 F13. For Craterus and his work, see Jacoby *ad FGrH* 342, Higbie 1999, Erdas 2003, and now Carawan *ad BNJ* 342. It has been suggested that in the same period Hieronymus of Cardia, the historian of the Diadochs, also quoted a large number of documents, including treaties: Rosen 1967.
[41] Polyb. 12.10.4: τὴν ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις καὶ ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς ἐπίφασιν τῆς ἀκριβείας καὶ τὴν περὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἐπιμέλειαν. Bickerman 1951: 119 dates the Hellenistic historiographic interest in verbatim citation of documents to Timaeus, rather than to Thucydides or Craterus. On Polybius the historical critic, in action here, see McGing 2010: 83-93.

Polybius presents verbatim texts of the treaties between Rome and Carthage, Rome and the Aetolians, and of a Phoenician-style covenant sworn by Hannibal with Philip V of Macedon.[42] Under the influence of Polybius, Livy too quotes treaty texts, including an archaizing Latin version of one of the Roman-Aetolian treaties that had been reproduced by Polybius himself.[43] The number of these documents is admittedly not large and it is unlikely, of course, that the historical narratives of these writers were truly shaped by these documents; nevertheless, this evidence suggests that verbatim quotation of interstate treaties had been domesticated in Greek historiography by the second century BCE.

The political reorientation of Judaea from being subject to kings, whether Persian or Greek, to being one of the polities of the eastern Mediterranean is matched, I suggest, by a turn towards the generic norms of Greek historiography, a genre that had developed to represent the interconnected histories of those Mediterranean polities.

* * *

The aim of this essay has been to show that there is more to 1 Maccabees 8 than an insular interpolation in a sober Hebrew chronicle of second-century Judaea. Instead, if we read the treaty text for its narratology and in a wider context of the Hellenistic habit of epigraphic memorialization of communal action, we can see how it functions both to celebrate Judas and to replicate the function of an inscribed monumental treaty. And when we take account of the different historiographical traditions available in late Hellenistic Judaea, we can construe the

[42] Polybius' verbatim citation of treaties: 3.21-27; 7.9; 21.32. For his wider use of inscriptions, see McGing 2010: 92 and Spielberg 2019: 56.
[43] Livy 38.11. Cf. 26.24.9-13 (a treaty text in indirect discourse).

treaty document as the (late) incorporation of a Greek historiographical trope into the venerable genre of Hebrew history-writing.

By way of conclusion and to take this final argument a little further, I would like to return to a passage just cited from the *Histories* of Polybius, an author that I (and many other Trinity students) first encountered in a Senior Sophister class taught by Brian.[44] An isolated excerpt from the seventh book records the covenant sworn by Hannibal to Philip V in 215 BCE to cement an anti-Roman alliance: "An oath which Hannibal swore, with Mago, Myrcan, Barmocar, and the councilors of Carthage with him, and all the Carthaginians on the campaign, to Xenophanes, son of Cleomachus, whom Philip, the king, son of Demetrius, sent to us on his own behalf and on behalf of the Macedonians and their allies. In front of Zeus, Hera, and Apollo, in front of the god of Carthage, Herakles, and Iolaus, in front of Ares, Triton, and Poseidon, and in front of the gods of the camp, Sun, Moon, and Earth, in front of the rivers, lakes, and springs…Hannibal the general says…that we swear this oath for friendship and fair goodwill, as friends and kin and brothers…"[45] The fragment continues to describe the terms of a military alliance and the conditions for any future peace agreement with the Romans. Elias Bickerman long ago demonstrated that this text represents a Greek translation of a Phoenician *berit*, a unilateral covenant that was typical of Levantine diplomacy.[46] Without narrative context, it is difficult to know how an ancient reader would have perceived this Punic oath and what

[44] McGing 2010: ix questions whether we enjoyed this encounter, I hope that he finds here *quod erat demonstrandum*.

[45] Polybius 7.9 (= Cod. Urb. fol. 96^{v}): Ὅρκος, ὃν ἔθετο Ἀννίβας ὁ στρατηγός, Μάγωνος, Μύρκανος, Βαρμόκαρος, καὶ πάντες γερουσιασταὶ Καρχηδονίων οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντες Καρχηδόνιοι στρατευόμενοι μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ξενοφάνη Κλεομάχου Ἀθηναῖον πρεσβευτήν, ὃν ἀπέστειλε πρὸς ἡμᾶς Φίλιππος ὁ βασιλεὺς Δημητρίου ὑπὲρ αὑτοῦ καὶ Μακεδόνων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων. Ἐναντίον Διὸς καὶ Ἥρας καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος, ἐναντίον δαίμονος Καρχηδονίων καὶ Ἡρακλέους καὶ Ἰολάου, ἐναντίον Ἄρεως, Τρίτωνος, Ποσειδῶνος, ἐναντίον θεῶν τῶν συστρατευομένων καὶ Ἡλίου καὶ Σελήνης καὶ Γῆς, ἐναντίον ποταμῶν καὶ λιμνῶν καὶ ὑδάτων... Ἀννίβας ὁ στρατηγὸς εἶπε … τὸν ὅρκον τοῦτον θέσθαι περὶ φιλίας καὶ εὐνοίας καλῆς, φίλους καὶ οἰκείους καὶ ἀδελφούς.

[46] Bickerman 1944 and 1952. See Barré 1983 for a reconstruction of the Carthaginian pantheon through the gods listed in the oath.

Bickerman calls its "non-Greek coloring", but it is tempting to consider that it may have been the mirror-image experience of a Jewish reader encountering the Roman treaty in a Hebrew version of 1 Maccabees: a verbatim translation of an exotic diplomatic document, perhaps a novelty for the historiographic genre. At the very least, we can use the comparison to see that when we read the end of 1 Maccabees 8, we face a similarly "Hellenistic" instance of cultural contact and transfusion and of (postclassical) documentality, not at the service of an explanation of the rise of the Roman hegemon in the *oikoumene*, but to place the independent Hasmonean-led Jewish polity within that global order.[47]

Duncan E. MacRae

University of California, Berkeley

Bibliography

Attridge, H. W. 1984. "Historiography." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 157–84. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Barré, Michael L. 1983. *The God-List in the Treaty between Hannibal and Philip V of Macedonia: A Study in Light of the Ancient near Eastern Treaty Tradition*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Berthelot, Katell. 2018. *In Search of the Promised Land? The Hasmonean Dynasty between Biblical Models and Hellenistic Diplomacy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bickerman, Elias J. 1944. "An Oath of Hannibal." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 75: 87–102.

———. 1951. "Notes on the Greek Book of Esther." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 20: 101–33.

———. 1952. "Hannibal's Covenant." *American Journal of Philology* 73: 1–23.

[47] The term "Hellenistic" as applied to cultural products (rather than just to a conventional periodization or the post-Alexander imperial polities) is notoriously slippery. I advocate no return to paradigms of Judaism/Hellenism, but something like "Hellenistic" as the tendency to paradox, proposed by Ma 2008. For a sweeping account of Jewish Hellenism that goes beyond "fusionism", see Gruen 2016: 21-75; the other essays in the same volume and Gruen 1998 offer more detailed studies in the same direction.

———. 1979. *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. Leiden: Brill.
Bikerman, Elias (= Bickerman, Elias J.). 1953. "Une question d'authenticité: Les privilèges juifs." In *Mélanges Isidore Levy*, 11–34. Brussels: Université libre de Bruxelles.
Bolmarcich, Sarah. 2007. "The Afterlife of a Treaty." *Classical Quarterly* 57: 477–89.
Borchardt, Francis. 2014. *The Torah in 1 Maccabees: a literary critical approach to the text*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Canfora, Luciano. 1990. "Trattati in Tucidide." In *I trattati nel mondo antico: forma, ideologia, funzione*, edited by Luciano Canfora, Mario Liverani, and Carlo Zaccagnini, 193–216. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider.
Chaniotis, Angelos. 1988. *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften: epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.
———. 2012. "The Ritualised Commemoration of War in the Hellenistic City: Memory, Identity, Emotion." In *Cultures of Commemoration: War Memorials, Ancient and Modern*, edited by Polly Low, Graham Oliver, and P. J. Rhodes, 41–62. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Coşkun, Altay. 2018. "'Friendship and Alliance' between the Judaeans under Judas Maccabee and the Romans (1Macc 8: 17–32): A Response to Linda Zollschan's Rome and Judaea." *Electrum* 25: 85–125.
Cotton, Hannah M., Werner Eck, Denis Feissel, Marfa Heimbach, Benjamin Isaac, Alla Kushnir-Stein, Eran Lupu, et al., eds. 2010. *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae: A Multi-Lingual Corpus of the Inscriptions from Alexander to Muhammad. Volume 1/1: Jerusalem, Part 1: 1-704*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Dench, Emma. 2018. *Empire and Political Cultures in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Eck, Werner. 2015. "Documents on Bronze: A Phenomenon of the Roman West?" In *Ancient Documents and Their Contexts: First North American Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (2011)*, edited by John Bodel and Nora Dimitrova, 127–51. Leiden: Brill.
Eckhardt, Benedikt. 2016a. "The Hasmoneans and Their Rivals in Seleucid and Post-Seleucid Judea." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 47: 55–70.
———. 2016b. "The Seleucid Administration of Judea, the High Priesthood and the Rise of the Hasmoneans." *Journal of Ancient History* 4: 57–87.
———. 2021. "Reading the Middle Maccabees." In A. M. Berlin and P. J. Kosmin (eds), *The Middle Maccabees: From the Death of Judas through the Reign of John Hyrcanus (ca. 160-104 BCE). New Archaeological and Historical Perspectives*. Atlanta, GA, 349-62.
Erdas, Donatella. 2003. "Niebuhr, Jacoby e l'identità di Cratero il Macedone." In *Ricerche di antichità e tradizione classica*, edited by E. Lanzillotta, 91–102. Roma: Edizioni Tored.
Ettelson, Harry W. 1925. "The Integrity of 1 Maccabees." *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 27: 249–384.
Flusser, David. 2007. "The Roman Empire in Hasmonean and Essene Eyes." In *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: Volume 1, Qumran and Apocalypticism*, translated by Azzan Yadin, 175–206. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Gauger, Jörg-Dieter. 1977. *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik: Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im 1. Makkabäerbuch*. Köln: P. Hanstein.
Goldstein, Jonathan A., ed. 1976. *I Maccabees: A New Translation, with Introduction and Commentary*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday.

Gruen, Erich S. 1984. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. 2 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. 1998. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. 2016. *Constructs of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays Onearly Jewish Literature and History*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Habicht, Christian. 1976. "Royal Documents in Maccabees II." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80: 1–18.
Hampton, Timothy. 2009. *Fictions of Embassy: Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Hengel, Martin. 1974. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
Higbie, Carolyn. 1999. "Craterus and the Use of Inscriptions in Ancient Scholarship." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129: 43–83.
Honigman, Sylvie. 2014. *Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochos IV*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.
Kirk, Athena. 2014. "The Semantics of Showcase in Herodotus's Histories." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 144: 19–40.
Krentz, Edgar. 2001. "The Honorary Decree for Simon Maccabee." In *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, edited by John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling, 146–53. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
Lane Fox, Robin. 2010. "Thucydides and Documentary History." *Classical Quarterly* 60: 11–29.
Ma, John. 2003. "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age." *Past & Present*, no. 180: 9–39.
———. 2008. "Paradigms and Paradoxes in the Hellenistic World." *Studi Ellenistici* 20: 371–85.
MacRae, Duncan E. 2021. "1 Maccabees, John Hyrcanus and Roman Mediterranean Hegemony." In *The Middle Maccabees: From the Death of Judas through the Reign of John Hyrcanus (ca. 160-104 BCE). New Archaeological and Historical Perspectives*, edited by Andrea M. Berlin and Paul J. Kosmin, 331-345. Atlanta: SBL Press.
Marincola, John. 1997. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Martola, Nils. 1984. *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi.
McGing, Brian C. 2010. *Polybius'* Histories. New York: Oxford University Press.
Mitchell, Stephen. 2005. "The Treaty between Rome and Lycia of 46 BC (MS 2070)." In *Papyri Graecae Schøyen I*, edited by R. Pintaudi, 165–242. Florence: Gonnelli.
Moles, John. 1999. "ΑΝΑΘΗΜΑ ΚΑΙ ΚΤΗΜΑ: The Inscriptional Inheritance of Ancient Historiography." *Histos* 3: 27–69.
Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1976. "The Date of the First Book of Maccabees." *Publications de l'École Française de Rome* 27: 657–61.
———. 1977. "Eastern Elements in Post-Exilic Jewish, and Greek, Historiography." In *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*, 25–35. Oxford: Blackwell.
———. 1990. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. 1992. "La composizione della storia di Tucidide." In *Nono Contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, 45–113. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

Munnich, Olivier. 2014. “Le premier livre des Maccabées, entre fresque dynastique et traditions rabbinique.” In *Le mémoire des persécutions: autour des livres des Maccabées*, edited by Marie-Francoise Baslez and Olivier Munnich, 183–229. Louvain: Peeters.
Orian, Matan. 2018. “The Temple Archive Used for the Fabrication of 1 Maccabees 10:25b-45.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 108: 502–16.
Rappaport, Uriel. 1998. “A Note on the Use of the Bible in 1 Maccabees.” In *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Michael E.. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, 175–79. Leiden: Brill.
Regev, Eyal. 2013. *The Hasmoneans: Ideology, Archaeology, Identity*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Rhodes, P. J. 2007. “Documents and the Greek Historians.” In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, edited by John Marincola, 56–66. Oxford: Blackwell.
Rosen, Klaus. 1967. “Political Documents in Hieronymus of Cardia (323-302 B. C.).” *Acta Classica* 10: 41–94.
Schuler, Christof. 2007. “Ein Vertrag zwischen Rom und den Lykiern aus Tyberissos.” In *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien: Eine Zwischenbilanz*, edited by Christof Schuler, 51–79. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Schwartz, Daniel R. 2008. *2 Maccabees*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
———. 2017. “1 Maccabees 14 and the History of the Hasmonean State.” In *Die Makkabäer*, edited by Friedrich Avemarie, Predrag Bukovec, Stefan Krauter, and Michael Tilly, 69–84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
Schwartz, Seth. 1991. “Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42: 16–38.
Seeman, Chris. 2013. *Rome and Judea in Transition: Hasmonean Relations with the Roman Republic and the Evolution of the High Priesthood*. New York: Peter Lang.
Spielberg, Lydia. 2015. “The Rhetoric of Documentary Quotation in Roman Historiography.” Ph.D Thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
———. 2019. “Monumental Absences in Ancient Historiography.” *Trends in Classics* 11: 51–73.
Stephens, Susan A. 2003. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Tilly, Michael. 2015. *1 Makkabäer*. Freiburg: Herder.
Troiani, Lucio. 2008. “Note storiografiche sopra I e II Maccabei.” *Studi Ellenistici* 20: 347–70.
Van Henten, Jan Willem. 2001. “The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee (1 Macc 14:25-49) in Its Hellenistic Context.” In *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, edited by John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling, 116–45. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
Wiater, Nicolas. 2018. “Documents and Narrative: Reading the Roman-Carthaginian Treaties in Polybius’ *Histories*.” In *Polybius and His Legacy*, edited by Nikos Miltsios and Melina Tamiolaki, 131–65. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. von. 1908. “Thukydides VIII.” *Hermes* 43: 578–618.
Williams, D. S. 1999a. “Narrative Art in 1 Maccabees VI 1-17.” *Vetus Testamentum* 49: 109–18.
———. 1999b. *The Structure of 1 Maccabees*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
Woolf, Daniel. 1997. “Disciplinary History and Historical Culture. A Critique of the History of History: The Case of Early Modern England.” *Cromohs* 2: 1–25.
Zack, Andreas. 2018. “Rezension zu L. Zollschan, Rome and Judaea: International Law Relations, 162-100 BCE.” *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 21: 1027–47.

Zollschan, Linda. 2017. *Rome and Judaea: International Law Relations, 162-100 BCE*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.