

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The delivery of Areus' letter

Claude Eilers

McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario

Email: eilersc@mcmaster.ca

Abstract

The letters between Sparta and Judaea preserved in 1 Maccabees and Josephus' *Antiquities* have generated considerable scholarly discussion. Only Josephus' version of Areus' letter to Onias includes information about its courier Demoteles, its 'square' script and the image on its seal. Comparison with contemporary Hellenistic epigraphical evidence suggests that these elements are archival metadata rather than parts of the original letter or Josephan inventions. Similar clauses attested in documents inscribed in several Hellenistic cities are remnants of archival processes, and the presence of such details in Josephus' version of Areus' letter suggests that it derives from an independent source and never underwent the translation process so evident in the Maccabean versions. This strengthens the case for authenticity.

Keywords: Josephus; 1 Maccabees; Sparta; Judaea; archives

1. Introduction

A well-known and much-discussed diplomatic exchange between Sparta and Judaea is found in 1 Maccabees; it consists of three quoted letters: in the first, the high priest Jonathan (12:6–19) writes to the Spartans reporting the discovery of an earlier letter, which is appended; in that letter (12:20–23), the Spartan king Areus wrote to the high priest Onias claiming to have discovered a document showing that Jews and Spartans shared a bond of kinship; in the third (14.20b–23), the Spartans write to Jonathan's successor, Simon, acknowledging the visit of Jonathan's envoys and affirming friendly relations between the two peoples. These documents, and the versions of two of them that appear in Josephus' *Antiquities* (13.166–70, 12.226–27), have been subjected to extensive discussion for centuries, and a full bibliography on the question would involve well over a hundred titles: a volume that shows no sign of abating.¹ I will add to the flood by focusing on the version of Areus' letter that appears in Josephus' *Antiquities* and the light that some epigraphical comparanda shed on it. I will argue that the Josephan version is independent of, and superior to, the one found in 1 Maccabees, and that the case for its authenticity is stronger than has been thought.

It has long been recognized that Josephus' *Antiquities* follows 1 Maccabees very closely for the periods where they overlap.² Their precise relationship, however, is entangled with two complicated questions. The first of these involves the compositional history of 1 Maccabees, which was originally written in Hebrew but now survives only in a Greek

¹ From this extensive bibliography, especially worth reading are Orrieux (1987); Gruen (1996); Jones (1999) 66–80; VanderKam (2004) 124–37; Amitay (2013); Berthelot (2024).

² The parallel presentation of Sievers (2001b) is highly instructive; see also the recent careful analysis of Nodet (2015).

translation.³ The second question is whether Josephus' text of 1 Maccabees looked like ours, which we shall return to below. For now, it should be noted that these questions are connected to three ways in which Josephus' presentation and arrangement of the letters differs from 1 Maccabees.

First, although the *Antiquities* presents versions of Jonathan's letter to Sparta and Areus' letter to Onias, the third document, the Spartan response to Simon, is not included. This is probably related to a change of source on Josephus' part. His narrative follows 1 Maccabees down to the final liberation of Judaea under Simon (1 Macc. 13.41–42; *AJ* 13.213–14), and the Spartan letter to Simon (1 Macc. 14.20b–23) appears after that, which explains its absence from Josephus.

A second difference is that Josephus' version of Areus' letter appears earlier in his narrative. In 1 Maccabees, it is found at 12.20–23, appended to Jonathan's letter (12.6–18), which describes it as 'added below' (τὸ ἀντίγραφον ὑπόκειται, 12.7). Although the Josephan Jonathan also describes Areus' letter as 'appended below' (ἥς ὑποτέτακται τὸ ἀντίγραφον, 13.167), it is not, in fact, included there; rather, it appears at the point of the *Antiquities* where Onias III accedes to the high priesthood (12.277). Josephus had evidently assumed that Onias III was the addressee of Areus' letter and therefore inserted it at what he considered its correct chronological place, thereby separating it from its documentary context and obscuring its provenance. In doing this, however, Josephus misidentified the recipient. As many have noted, the letter's author must be Areus I, who reigned 309–265 BCE, and its recipient must therefore be either Onias I (late fourth or early third century BCE) or Onias II, whose first years as high priest probably overlapped with the end of Areus' reign.⁴ None of this, however, need detain us.

A third difference is the focus of this paper. The Josephan versions of the letters of Areus and Jonathan each include a clause that is absent from 1 Maccabees: first, Jonathan's letter begins with a formulaic wish of good health (*formula ualeitudinis*, *AJ* 13.166, returned to below in section VI), and second, Areus' letter concludes with details of its delivery (*AJ* 12.227):

Δημοτέλης ὁ φέρων τὰ γράμματα διαπέμπει τὰς ἐπιστολάς.
τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐστὶ τετράγωνα. ἡ σφραγὶς ἐστὶν ἀετὸς δράκοντος
ἐπειλημμένος.

Demoteles, the document courier, dispatches (?)⁵ the letter; the writing is square; the seal is of an eagle grappling with a snake.

These extra clauses are much commented upon and variously explained. A key problem, which is indeed baffling, is that they are wholly absent from 1 Maccabees, which was clearly Josephus' main, and possibly sole, source for this part of his Hasmonean narrative. What might explain the presence of these clauses here? There are, as I see it, only three possibilities. Either, first, Josephus had a version of 1 Maccabees that included these clauses, which was thus different from ours (as some argue anyway);⁶ or, second, his versions came from a different source (either literary or archival);⁷ or, third, he added these details himself.

³ See, recently, Darshan (2019) with earlier bibliography.

⁴ On Onias I, see VanderKam (2004) 188–97; on identification as Onias II (as preferred by Gruen (1996) 26 n.3 and others) see, generally, VanderKam (2004) 129–37.

⁵ Elsewhere διαπέμπειν seems to mean something like 'send' or 'transmit' or 'distribute' (see LSJ *q.v.*); here, the context suggests 'deliver'.

⁶ Nodet (2015) 515.

⁷ Willrich (1900) 81–82; Willrich (1924) 26–27; Motzo (1924) 212; Gauger (1977) 20; and those cited in n.30, below.

This last possibility, that Josephus invented the details and added them, has been around in some form for a long time,⁸ and an influential advocate of this approach, Burkhardt Cardauns, even identified what he thought could be its source.⁹ Xenophon's *Hellenica* recounts that, following a great victory over the Arcadians in 363 BCE, Archidamus III 'sent the herald Demoteles home to report the greatness of the victory' (ἔπεμψεν οἴκαδε ἀγγελοῦντα Δημοτέλη τὸν κήρυκα τῆς τε νίκης τὸ μέγεθος, 7.1.32). Later 'in the same chapter' ('im gleichen Kapitel'), Cardauns observed, the delivery of a letter is reported from the Persian king to delegates of Greek cities gathered at Thebes: 'the Persian who bore the document, having shown the king's seal, read aloud what had been written' (ὁ Πέρσης ὁ φέρων τὰ γράμματα δειξας τὴν βασιλέως σφραγίδα ἀνέγνω τὰ γεγραμμένα, 7.1.39). Therefore, Cardauns concluded, Josephus had borrowed Demoteles' name from 7.1.32, the envoy's role and the letter's seal from 7.1.39, merged them, added a description of the seal and then appended them to the end of Areus' letter. This was all done, on this view, to lend an air of authenticity to the document.

Although Cardauns' argument has had followers,¹⁰ its flaws are serious and, indeed, disqualifying. Yes, the parallels appear in the same chapter of *Hellenica*, but only because the chapters in editions of Xenophon are so large: in fact, these sections are several pages apart and come from different episodes that took place in different years. In addition, Xenophon's description of the Persian courier's role, which justifies the argument that Josephus imitated this passage, is too generic to suggest much: dozens of texts describe couriers with similar wording.¹¹ (What other words should have been used instead?) There is, in any case, a key difference between the seal description as it appears in the Josephan version and its supposed source. In Xenophon, before the king's letter is read, the Greeks are shown 'the seal of the king' (τὴν βασιλέως σφραγίδα), thus authenticating the document. Although this phrase would have characterized Areus' seal perfectly, it is not used; instead, its emblem is described as portraying an eagle grappling with a snake. The motif has been much discussed, and several Greek and Levantine parallels have been noted.¹² What has not been explained is why the emblem is described here at all if its model had merely attributed it to the king. The eagle and snake cannot come from Xenophon; more notably, neither can the very idea that there should be a description of the seal.

II. The epigraphical comparanda

The clauses describing Areus' letter and reporting its delivery are likelier to be archival, given some epigraphical comparanda that have not, with one notable exception,¹³ been noticed in this connection. These comparanda can be found in contemporary inscriptions from five stelae.

⁸ For example, Wernsdorf (1747) 162; Drüner (1896) 43.

⁹ Cardauns (1967) 319.

¹⁰ Cohen (1979) 38 n.55; Piper (1986) 149; Bremmer (2010) 52.

¹¹ Parallels from literature include: Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.5: γράμματα φέροντες; [Pl.] *Epin.* 9.1: ἐπιστολὴν φέροντες; Thuc. 7.8.3: φέροντες ... τὰ γράμματα; Joseph. *AJ* 17.93: ἐπιστολὴν φέροντες; App. *B Cív.* 4.17.135: τὰ γράμματα φέρειν. Parallels from inscriptions include: *IG XII* 3.91 with suppl., p. 277, ll. 13–14: γράμματα φέρων; *IG XI* 4.1065 (Delos), l. 10 = *IG XII* 5.128: [φέροντες τὰ γρ]άμματα; Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli (1949–1951) no. 105, ll. 25–26: γράμματα [...] φέροντες; *IG XII* 3.91 [Syll.³ 572], ll. 12–15: Καλλίας πάρεστι | πὰρ βασιλέως Φιλίππου γράμματα φέρων καὶ σφραγίδα τὴν || βασιλέως; *FD iii/4.159*, ll. 5–6: φερὸνθω δὲ καὶ γράμματα οἱ Ἑγγαιοὶ παρὰ τοῦ κοινῶ τῶν Λοκρῶν.

¹² Bremmer (2010) 52, noting Turnheim (2000); Rodríguez-Pérez (2011). Homer, *Iliad* 12.200–50 (an eagle drops a wounded snake among the Trojans, who debate what it might portend).

¹³ Robert (1928) 443: 'De même Flavius Josèphe, copiant une lettre du roi de Sparte Areus au grand-prêtre Onias, a recopié aussi la description du sceau, ajoutée à la transcription de la lettre lors de son insertion dans les archives du destinataire.'

Inscription no. i, now at the Louvre, contains two documents: a letter of 182 BCE written by Eumenes I of Pergamum inviting participation in a new festival, the Nicephoria, and a decree of some Greek city (probably Iasos) in response.¹⁴ Between the two documents is a short note reporting the delivery of Eumenes' letter and its date. In synopsis:

<i>(Letter of Eumenes)</i>	1–11
ἀπέδωκεν Μέγων, Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ἔκτηι. (‘Megon delivered it on the 6th (of the month) of Anthesterion’)	11
<i>(Decree of Iasos)</i>	12–20

This short delivery notice is clearly not part of either document: Eumenes could not have known the specific day on which his letter would be delivered, and the civic decree that follows begins with its own formulary prescript, which included a date. Megon's delivery and its date is its own separate *datum*. The action that is described must have been common (all documents received by a city had to be delivered by someone) so, too, it seems, was the recording of such deliveries. What is unusual in this inscription is that this detail was included when these documents were being prepared for public display. In this specific case, a motive might be guessed: in his letter, Eumenes had named two couriers who were to deliver his letter, Megon of Ephesus and Kalas of Pergamum; only Megon had in fact completed his assignment, and the discontinuity between what Eumenes had described and what actually happened motivated someone to take the unusual step of naming Megon as the sole courier.

Inscription no. ii contains a decree of an unidentified city honouring a foreign judge (δικαστής) who had come from Cos to adjudicate some dispute there. Once he had completed this task, a decree was passed in his honour and forwarded to Cos, where it was inscribed. Again, several supplementary clauses were added (the superscript letters are added to facilitate discussion).¹⁵

<i>(Civic decree honouring a δικαστής, lines 1–21)</i>	
(a) εἰρέ-	22
θησαν πρεῖσβευταὶ Σωκράτης Πολεμοκρά- του, Δίφιλος Διφίλου. (b) ἀνηνέχθη Ἀλσείου τρια- κάδι ὕ<π>ὸ τῶν πρεσβευτᾶν (c) ἔχον ἐπίσημον (vacat) ζώδιον γυναικεῖον.	25
(a) ‘Chosen as envoys (were) Socrates, (son) of Polemokrates, (and) Diphilos, (son) of Diphilos; (b) delivered by the envoys on the thirtieth of Alseios; (c) having (as) seal a female figure’	

Three details are included here. The first (‘a’) reports the names of envoys who had been appointed in a process prescribed by the decree (lines 10–21). Once that selection process had been completed and the individuals chosen, an addendum recording their names was appended. Such appointment riders seem to have been standard practice,¹⁶ and this one was part of what was sent to Cos. The next two clauses reflect what happened after it arrived there: ‘b’ records the date by month and day (but not the year) on which the aforementioned envoys delivered their decree, which is reminiscent of Megon's delivery in

¹⁴ Rigsby (1997) no. 177 (Welles (1934) no. 49; I. Iasos 6); cf. the discussions of Fabiani (2015) 19, 282 n.30, and Boffo and Faraguna (2021) 532 n.86, 534 n.89.

¹⁵ IG XII 4.1 177 (SEG 49.1119).

¹⁶ Rhodes (1997) 5 offers such ‘supplementary material’ as the eighth standard element of Greek city decrees in the Hellenistic period.

no. i. In 'c' the public seal of the sending city is described. (More on this below.) Again, this note was added in Cos and reflects a Coan process.

Inscription no. iii was found at Astypalaia in the Dodecanese. It contains two decrees of Smyrna dating to the second century BCE; the first honours Astypalaia and the judges (δικασταί) whom it had sent to Smyrna; the second decree honours an Astypalaian official who had facilitated the matter:¹⁷

(Decree of Smyrna honouring Astypalaia and its δικασταί)	1–71
(a) πρεσβευτῆς ἡρέθη] Λεύκιος Δ[ιονυσίου. (^(a) Chosen as envoy (was) Leukios (son) of Dionysius')	71–72
(Decree of Smyrna honouring an Astypalaian official)	73–99
(b) πρεσβευτῆς ἡρέ[- [θ]ηι Λεύκιος Διονυσίου. (^(c) ἀπήνεγ[κε] δὲ [τὰ ψηφίσματα μηνὸς Ἀρ]- [τ]εμισίου δευτέραι. (^(d) ἃ σφραγίς τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Σμυρναίων(?)). (^(b) Chosen as envoy (was) Leukios (son) of Dionysius; (^(c) (he) delivered [the decrees] on the second of Artemesios; (^(d) the seal [of the demos of Smyrna])	100–2

Both of these decrees had authorized the appointment of an envoy, just as in no. ii, and to each decree is appended its own separate supplementary clause noting the appointment of Leukios, son of Dionysius ('a' and 'b'). The delivery itself is recorded at 'c' followed in 'd' by a description of the seal that had been applied to them. Again, the clauses dating the delivery and describing the seal are Astypalaian, not Smyrnian.

Inscriptions nos iv, v and vi are from the late third century BCE, part of a large dossier of some 50 responses to an invitation issued by Cos to recognize its sanctuary of Asclepius as 'inviolable'.¹⁸ The royal letters and civic decrees received in response were displayed on a series of marble stelae, a handful on each stele, each document introduced with a title identifying the sending city with a genitive plural governing an assumed ψήφισμα. Thus no. iv introduces a decree of Pella with the title (ψήφισμα) Πελλαίων, and then a pair of decrees from Naples and Elea (Velia in Latin):¹⁹

Πελλαίων· ('Of Pella:') (Decree of Pella follows)	1–16
(a) ψαφίσματα, ἃ ἐκόμισαν θεωροὶ Ἐπιδάυριος Νικάρχου, Φιλόφρων Δαρδά<v>ου·	17
(b) Νεοπολιτᾶν (^(c) ἔχον [ἔχον] ἐπίσamon ζῶιδιον ἀνδρεῖον·	18
(a) 'The decrees which the theoroi Epidaurios (son) of Nicharchos, (and) Philophron (son) of Dardanos brought. (b) (Decree) of Naples, (^(c) having as emblem a male image')	
(Decree of Naples)	19–27
(d) Ἐλεατᾶν (^(e) ἔχον ἐπίσamon ζῶιον γυναικέον καθήμενον· (of Elea, having as emblem a female image, sitting')	28
(Decree of Elea)	29–32

¹⁷ *ISmyrna* 581 (*IG* XII 3 supp. p. 80; *IG* XII 3. 172; second century BCE); for the context and interpretation, see especially Robert (1949).

¹⁸ On the phenomenon, see especially Rigsby (1997).

¹⁹ *IG* XII 4.1 221 (*SEG* 12.378; Rigsby (1997) nos 46–47), side b, ll. 17–32.

Almost all the decrees in this dossier are presented like the one for Pella, with a simple title followed by its text. The decrees of Naples and Elea are introduced differently, apparently to lend more prominence to the *theōroi* who had undertaken the mission to these distant cities. Each is then inscribed with a title that both identifies it and describes the emblem that appeared on the seal ('c' and, possibly, 'e').

Inscription no. v presents the decrees of five cities. It is laid out thus:²⁰

(a) Κασσανδρέων· ('Of Cassandreia:')	1
(Decree of Cassandreia)	2–17
(b) Ἀμφιπολιτῶν· ('Of Amphipolis:')	18
(Decree of Amphipolis)	19–34
(c) Φιλίππων· ('Of Philippi:')	35
(Decree of Philippi)	36–55
(d) [Κορ]κυραίων ἔχον ἐπίσamon γρῦπα (‘Of Corcyra, having as emblem a griffon’)	56
(Decree of Corcyra)	57–63
(e) Λευ[καδίων ἔχον ἐπίσamon - - -] (‘Of Leukas, having as emblem ...’)	64
(Decree of Leukas)	65–71

Note the titles introducing the decrees of Corcyra ('d') and (if the supplement is correct) Leukas ('e'), which again describe the seals. These, together with the titles in no. iv, are the only descriptions of seals amongst the roughly 50 documents related to *asulia* that have survived at Cos.

Inscription no. vi is a recently published stele, part of the same series as iv and v, that presents the decrees of four cities and two royal letters.²¹ Each of the royal letters describes the monarch's seal.

ἐπιστολαὶ δὲ ταῖδε ἦλθον παρὰ Ζιγῆλα ἔχουσαι ἐπίσamon ἵππῃ (‘These letters came from Ziaelas, having an equestrian as an emblem’)	67
(letter of Ziaelas)	68–75
Παρὰ Λαοδίκης ἔχουσαν ἐπίσamon ἄγκυραν· (‘From Laodike, with an anchor as emblem’)	76
(letter of Laodike)	77–90

III. Extra-documentary details as archival metadata

Especially noteworthy in these inscriptions are clauses that have been added by a receiving city: for example, the titles added at the top of the documents in nos iii, iv, v and vi that identify a text as ‘Decree of [city name]’. Cities do not use such titles for their own decrees; they are ubiquitous, however, for foreign documents, for the obvious reason that no one would know a foreign document's origin without such a title. Much rarer are reports of delivery such as those found in nos i, ii and iii,²² and extremely rare are the descriptions of

²⁰ IG XII 4.1 220 (Rigsby (1997) nos 25–27, 45).

²¹ Bosnakis and Hallof (2020).

²² More examples are Welles (1934) nos 47, 65, 66, 67.

seals such as those found in nos ii, iii, iv, v and vi. The rarity of delivery reports and seal descriptions invites explanation, not least because all documents sent from one city to another were delivered by someone (obviously) and sealing is a well-attested practice.²³ Nonetheless, deliveries were rarely reported and seals, almost never. Indeed, the seven examples cited above in nos ii–vi are the only seal descriptions known to me, and it is striking that six of them are from a single city (Cos), all but one of which were part of the same diplomatic project.

But why ever make a record of an incoming document's seal? It is worth stepping back and considering this from the archival perspective. The details that we have been considering (the identity of couriers, the dates of delivery, the descriptions of seals) are not part of their documents but about those documents. In modern terms, these are metadata, data about data, and various kinds of metadata can be found in Greek inscriptions: headings and titles, dates of processing, notes recording delivery, names or titles of officials involved in their reception. As we have seen, such details are sometimes appended below their documents (as in the Josephan letter of Areus and nos ii and iii), but sometimes are added above them either in self-standing fashion (nos iv and v) or included within a 'docket'.²⁴ Each city, one assumes, had its own practices regarding what kinds of details to preserve within its archive and under what circumstances one or more of them might be included when a document was prepared for dissemination or display.

But why keep a record of such details at all? Here it is important to remember that there was a practical side to this. A detail such as an envoy's name would be lost if not recorded. So, too, the appearance of its seal, which will probably have been destroyed during processing. In private contexts, of course, correspondents knew one another's seals at a glance. Between institutional actors, however, such knowledge would have to be bureaucratized and such details kept 'on file', that is, in some piece of metadata. What we find in these documents is a vestige of that.

IV. The epigraphic comparanda and the clauses in AJ 12.227

So, what are the final clauses found at the end of Josephus' version of Areus' letter? That question has been debated for centuries; some scholars have asserted that they are part of Areus' letter and others that they are something that Josephus added.²⁵ In fact, they are neither. When such clauses are found in the epigraphical record, they are archival. The note recording Demoteles' delivery (§227b) finds parallels in the final clauses of nos i, ii and iii, above, and in the heading of no. iv. The same point can be made about the descriptions of seals, as is best illustrated by presenting them together in series:

- seal of Areus' letter: ἡ σφραγὶς ἐστὶν ἀετὸς δράκοντος ἐπειλημμένος (AJ 12.227d);
- seal of unknown city: ἔχον ἐπίσamon | ζῶδιον γυναικεῖον (no. ii, ll. 25–26);
- seal of Smyrna: ἀ σφραγὶς τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Σμυρναίων(?) (no. iii, l. 102);
- seal of Naples: ἔχον ἐπίσamon ζῶδιον ἀνδρεῖον (no. iv, l. 18);
- seal of Elea: ἔχον ἐπίσamon ζῶδιον γυναικεῖον καθήμενον (no. iv, l. 28);
- seal of Corcyra: ἔχον ἐπίσamon γρῦπα (no. v, l. 56);
- seal of Ziaelas: ἔχουσαι ἐπίσamon ἱππῆ (no. vi, l. 67);
- seal of Laodike: ἔχουσιν ἐπίσamon ἀνκυραν (no. vi, l. 76).

²³ Evidence collected by Wenger (1923) 2396–98, Haensch (1996), and (especially) Haensch (2006). For other contexts in which public emblems can be used, including seals, amphora stamps, market weights and coins, see Killen (2017).

²⁴ For the term, Rigby (1997) 138, 260, 268, 371, 510 with Eilers (2023); Robert (1960) 206 refers to them as 'marques d'enregistrement par la chancellerie'.

²⁵ Cf. Samuel Petit *apud* Hudson (1720) 530 n.'m', who denied that the seal could be part of Areus' letter; Haverkamp (1726) 606 n.'k', insisted it must be.

The image of each city's seal is different, of course, that is their entire point, but it is striking how similar these descriptions are to one another formally: each is offered paratactically without subordination or conjunction. This is, of course, consistent with what might be expected of archival practice, where no artistry is needed or appropriate, only the efficient recording of the relevant facts. We should suppose, then, that the clauses at the end of Josephus' version of Areus' letter are not part of Areus' letter, nor Josephus' additions; rather, they are either archival vestiges or clauses forged in imitation of them.

But what is to be made of 'what is written is square' (§227c: τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐστὶ τετράγωνα)? This, too, has provoked some puzzlement. Given, however, that the naming of the courier and the description of the letter's seal are archival, the description of its script (which appears between them) should be, too, and therein lies a possible explanation. During the course of the third century BCE, Greek letter-forms began to move away from 'epigraphic' letter styles, which were upright and square, and towards rounder ones: four-bar sigmas (Σ), for example, gave way to lunate ones (c); epsilons evolved from Ε to ε; omegas, from Ω to ω.²⁶ In this context, one might reasonably guess that an archivist (or someone imitating one) took note of the old-fashioned 'square' lettering of an incoming document, in this case, perhaps, reflecting (or imagining) a Spartan conservatism in orthography that is not (to my knowledge) otherwise attested. If, as seems likely, the archiving of documents typically involved retranscription, this aspect of the physical appearance of a document would be lost if not noted in the archive's records. In this case, it might also imply that whoever was responsible for these clauses, presumably archivists in the temple in Jerusalem, knew what contemporary lettering should look like. In itself, this should probably cause no great surprise. Any interaction with either the Ptolemies or Seleucids will have occurred in Greek, and it has been widely accepted since Martin Hengel that many within the upper echelons of Judaeian society were highly Hellenized.²⁷

V. Why include archival details with Areus' letter?

Even if all this is correct, however, why append these details to the foot of Areus' letter now? Some scholars have invoked a concern for security, suggesting that Areus had included these details to allow Onias, the recipient, to check whether someone had broken the seal and replaced it with another.²⁸ Such a security measure, however, would be comically easy to circumvent by breaking the seal, rewriting the letter, and describing the new, fake seal. A seal only guarantees security if it is already known or delivered separately (as Pliny the Younger seems to have done at least once).²⁹ Neither seems a realistic possibility here.

So, why are these details included with Areus' letter? Again, the specific context is important. As noted above, Areus' missive to Onias had originally been appended to Jonathan's letter, but Josephus had moved it for his own reasons to his narrative of Onias III. This was, as several scholars have noted, a mistake. Jonathan (or whoever composed this letter in his name) seems, however, to have made a similar misidentification.³⁰ That, at least, seems the best way to explain his excuse for the delay in answering Areus' letter, which invokes recent wars and tribulations and a Judaeian reluctance to burden their kin with their own troubles. Such an excuse more plausibly alludes to the quarter century from the time of Onias III (whose assassination in 175 BCE marked the beginning of the turmoil that is alluded to) than to the century-plus that had passed since the time of Onias II (or I). In the light of such an assumption, describing the letter's seal, characterizing its script and naming its courier makes some sense,

²⁶ See the overview with examples in Cavallo and Maehler (2008) 7–8.

²⁷ Hengel (1974); (2001); Gruen (1998); Chrubasik (2017).

²⁸ Destinon (1882) 66 n.1; Goldstein (1976) 457; Klauck and Bailey (2006) 241.

²⁹ Cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 10.74 with Haensch (1996) 449–51.

³⁰ Thus, Momigliano (1931) 1146–47; Abel (1949) 222 n.10; Orrieux (1987) 174.

since these details offer the Spartans a means of authentication: it is reporting to them things about the letter that its sender would recognize. Areus' seal might be remembered; the old-fashioned script might resonate; and Demoteles' diplomatic mission might be recalled. Indeed, given Jonathan's erroneous assumption that only a few decades had passed since Demoteles' mission, he might have supposed that, even if no longer alive, he might be remembered by his countrymen. The archival clauses at the end of Areus' letter, therefore, were added by Jonathan (whether real or fictional) to allow the Spartans to authenticate it.

VI. The *formula ualetudinis* at AJ 13.166

The clauses that appear at the end of the Josephan version of Areus' letter, then, are archival, or crafted in imitation of such. This requires, as several scholars have already deduced, that the ultimate source for Josephus' version must have been archival,³¹ which also requires that it is independent of 1 Maccabees. This also explains the presence of a *formula ualetudinis* in the Josephan version of Jonathan's letter, but not Areus'.³² Again, some have suggested that Josephus had added this to make his text more believable,³³ which is less convincing, especially given that Josephus does not seem to add such clauses to other letters. The *Letter of Aristeeas*, for example, quotes three documents in its narrative, and in his rewriting of that narrative Josephus includes all three. The first does not include a wish of good health (8.29), but neither does Josephus (AJ 12.36). The second (*Aristeeas* 9.35) has a short one in the form of χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρῶσθαι, which Josephus trims to χαίρειν (AJ 12.45). The third (*Aristeeas* 11.41) contains a rather elaborate wish, which Josephus paraphrases fairly closely.³⁴ Similarly, among the Roman letters quoted by Josephus, no additions can be found. Caesar's letter of 47 BCE to Sidon, for example, contains an elaborate wish of good health, which is closely paralleled in two epigraphically preserved letters of Caesar.³⁵ Similarly, the formula found in Antony's letter to Hyrcanus finds an almost identical match in a roughly contemporary letter of (probably) Octavian to Aphrodisias.³⁶ The Augustan letters quoted by Josephus do not include such a clause, but to judge from contemporary epigraphy, usage had changed and such wishes were no longer expected.

None of the evidence suggests, then, that Josephus was inclined to change much, which implies that the *formula ualetudinis* appears in the Josephan version of Jonathan's letter because he found it in his copy, and not in Areus' letter because he did not, both of which would be consistent with the fact that wishes of good health seem to have been a standard feature of official letters of the second century BCE, but not of the mid-third.³⁷

³¹ Goldstein (1976) 457; Gauger (1977) 20 with n.25; Sievers (2001a) 246; Schwartz (2022) 349.

³² AJ 13.166: εἰ ἐρρωμένοις ὑμῖν καὶ τὰ κοινὰ καὶ τὰ ἴδια χωρεῖ κατὰ νοῦν, οὕτως ἂν ἔχοι ὡς βουλόμεθα· ἐρρωμένα δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς ('If you are well, and your public and private affairs are going well, it would be as we wish; we are also well'). On the formula, Koskeniemi (1956) 155–63; on its history, see especially Bickerman (2007) 117–20.

³³ Palmer (1828) 16: 'Ionathae autem litteras a Iosepho interpolatas sive adulteratas et inprimis ad normam Romanarum epistolarum constructas esse, negari non potest'. Cf. Goldstein (1976) 453: 'After the salutation Josephus added the stereotyped formula'.

³⁴ *Aristeeas* 11.41: αὐτὸς τε ἔρρωσο καὶ ἡ βασίλισσα Ἀρσινόη, ἡ ἀδελφή, καὶ τὰ τέκνα, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι καὶ ὡς βουλόμεθα, καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑγιαίνοντες ('Be in good health, both yourself and Queen Arsinoe, your sister, and your children; that would be well, and as we wish; we, too, are well'); AJ 12.51: ἐρρωμένων σου τε καὶ τῆς βασιλίσσης Ἀρσινόης καὶ τῶν τέκνων καλῶς ἡμῖν ἔχει πάντα ('If you and Queen Arsinoe and your children are in good health, all is well with us').

³⁵ AJ 14.191: εἰ ἐρρωσθε εὖ ἂν ἔχοι, κἀγὼ δὲ ἔρρωμαι σὺν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ; cf. RDGE 26, col. 6, ll. 9–10: χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρῶσθαι· κἀγὼ δὲ μετὰ | [τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγιαίνον. --]; RDGE 54, 2: εἰ ἐρρω[σθε], εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· ὑγιαίνον δὲ αὐτὸς μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος.

³⁶ AJ 14.306: εἰ ἐρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι, ἔρρωμαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος. *Aphrodisias and Rome*, doc. 6, ll. 11–14: εἰ ἐρρωσθε εὖ ἂν ἔχοι, ὑγιαίνω δὲ καὶ | αὐτὸς μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος.

³⁷ Bickerman (2007) especially 118; for the data, Exler (1923).

VII. The Josephan versions do not show signs of translation or retroversion

If Josephus acquired these letters from an independent source, the obvious question is whether they, like the Maccabean versions, had been translated from Greek to Hebrew and back to Greek. Almost certainly not, at least to judge from the texts as we find them in the *Antiquities*. The very act of translating a text, it is important to remember, has certain predictable effects that are obvious in 1 Maccabees but absent from Josephus' versions. One such effect is lexical simplification, which is so common in translations that some theorists include it among a short list of 'universals of translation', or features found in translations regardless of the source or target language.³⁸ In the case of the Maccabean versions of these letters, which seem to have been translated at least twice (Greek-to-Hebrew-to-Greek and possibly Greek-to-Aramaic-to-Hebrew-to-Greek),³⁹ simplification is fairly evident. The verb ἀποστέλλειν, for example, appears six times in the Maccabean versions, which are listed here with their Josephan parallels, where they exist:

- (a) 1 Macc. 12.7: ἀπεστάλησαν ἐπιστολαί ('a letter was sent').
AJ 13.167: κομισθείσης ... ἐπιστολῆς ('a letter was brought').
- (b) 1 Macc. 12.8: ἐπέδεξάτο ... τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἀπεσταλμένον ἐνδόξως ('[Onias] warmly received the man who had been sent').
AJ 12.167: τῷ Δημοτέλει ... εὐνοϊκῶς διετέθημεν ('we treated Demoteles well').
- (c) 1 Macc. 12.10a: ἐπειράθημεν ἀποστεῖλαι τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀδελφότητα καὶ φιλίαν ἀνανεώσασθαι ('We are trying to write to renew the brotherhood and friendship').
(Not included in the Josephan version, perhaps in the interest of concision: its point is largely implicit in the rest of the letter);
- (d) 1 Macc. 12.10b: πολλοὶ γὰρ καιροὶ διήλθον ἀφ' οὗ ἀπεστείλατε πρὸς ἡμᾶς ('Much time has passed since you wrote [lit. 'sent (word)'] to us');
AJ 13.168: πολλῶν δὲ χρόνων διαγεγενημένων ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀναποληθείσης ἡμῖν οἰκειότητος ('Much time has passed since we were first reminded of our kinship').
- (e) 1 Macc. 12.16: Νουμήνιον ... ἀπεστάλκαμεν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ('We have sent Numenius to Rome').
AJ 13.168: πέμποντες πρὸς Ῥωμαίους Νουμήνιον ('sending Numenius to Rome').
- (f) 1 Macc. 12.19: Καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἀντίγραφον τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ὧν ἀπέστειλαν Ονίας ('and this is the copy of the letter that he sent to Onias').
AJ 12.25: Ὀνίας ... πρὸς ὃν ὁ Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεὺς Ἄρειος πρεσβείαν τε ἔπεμψε καὶ ἐπιστολᾶς, ὧν τὸ ἀντίγραφόν ἐστι τοιοῦτο ('Onias ... to whom the Lacedaemonian king Areios sent an embassy with a letter, of which the following is a copy').

³⁸ Baker (1996); Chesterman (2004); Toury (2012) 295–315; Pym (2008); Jia et al. (2022).

³⁹ Monerie and Clancier (2023) published a dossier of Seleucid documents translated into Akkadian for local purposes, which raises the theoretical possibility that the author of 1 Maccabees used Aramaic translations of these letters rather than the Greek ones, which would mean these letters were translated from Greek to Aramaic, then Hebrew, then back to Greek. I owe this observation to Avneri Meir (2023).

The difference in verb choice in (e) and (f) (ἀποστέλλειν vs πέμπειν) is trivial. Nor is much more to be made of (b), where 1 Maccabees has 'the sent man' (τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἀπεσταλμένον), probably in order to avoid naming Demoteles. (Simplification may again have been a consideration, or a narrator's understandable disinclination to name a character who plays no further role in the narrative.) In (c) and (d), however, 1 Maccabees uses ἀποστέλλειν in describing written communication, and in doing so probably reflects its Hebrew stage, likely using the verb *šlh*, literally 'send', that is 'send word' or 'write',⁴⁰ which seems a textbook example of interference, another translation universal.

In the *Antiquities*, by contrast, greater lexical variety is evident in these letters. It uses κομίζειν in (a), which is very common in diplomatic contexts and perfectly idiomatic here.⁴¹ At (d), instead of the Hebraism ἀποστέλλειν ('send [word]' or 'write') the Josephan version uses a much less common word, ἀναπολεῖν ('remind', lit. 'turn up the ground again'; hence, 'go over again, repeat', LSJ, *q.v.*), which is unlikely to be the product of a double translation: from a continuum of lexical options, translations typically opt for a midpoint.⁴² Whatever one makes of each of these points individually, taken together it looks like the author of 1 Maccabees has used a single Hebrew verb where his source texts had used five or six different ones, and that the Greek translator had little choice but to render them all with ἀποστέλλειν in his retroversion.⁴³ Once the lexical bridge had been burnt, the translator had no path back. The Josephan versions, however, are consistent with what we would expect of a non-translated text.

Similar flattening can be seen elsewhere in the Maccabean versions. Kinship terms, for example, are limited there to ἀδελφός ('brother') and ἀδελφότης ('brotherhood'); in the Josephan versions we find not only ἀδελφός,⁴⁴ but also συγγένεια ('kinship': 13.167, 169) and οἰκειότης ('familial bond': 12.226, 13.168).⁴⁵ A similar observation could be made about how Spartans are referred to. The Maccabean version of Jonathan's letter (1 Macc. 12:6) is addressed to the Spartiates (Σπαρτιάταις), and Areus refers to himself as the 'King of the Spartiates' (βασιλεὺς Σπαρτιατῶν: 1 Macc. 12:226). The term 'Spartiate', however, referred to the elite warrior class that dominated Sparta, which included other (subordinate) classes;⁴⁶ in inscriptions, it is always 'Lacedaemonians'.⁴⁷ This is another case, one assumes, of lexical flattening. The Josephan versions use the correct term, Lacedaemonians (AJ 12.226, 13.166). It is also noteworthy that the Josephan version correctly calls the chief magistrates of Sparta 'ephors', which is more impressive than it seems at first glance. Letters to Greek cities were typically addressed to some combination of a city's 'magistrates, council and people' (ἄρχουσιν καὶ βουλῇ καὶ δήμῳ); when magistrates are included, they are almost always referred to generically as ἄρχοντες ('magistrates', here), even in cities that had no specific magistracy called that. Although this practice is standard almost everywhere else, Sparta was one of a handful of cities where this was not the case.

⁴⁰ So Tilly (2015) 247 on 12.10 pointing to Joshua 10:3, 11:1; 1 Sam. 16:22. Further examples and context at Muraoka (2009) s.v. ἀποστέλλω 2c-f.

⁴¹ Cf. IG XII 6.1 no. 156. ll. 6–7: τῆς παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως κοιμισθείσης αὐτῷ ἐπιστολῆς ('the letter of the king brought to him'); Badoud (2015) 443–44, no. 65 (Syll.³ 810), ll. 11–12: ἐπιστολῇ πρὸς ὑμᾶς κοιμισθείσῃ ('letter brought to you'); for more examples, see Welles (1934) index VII, s.v. κομίζω.

⁴² See the works cited in n.37, above.

⁴³ On the Greek translator (or translators), see Schwartz (2022) 39–43.

⁴⁴ AJ 12.226: ἀδελφούς ὑμᾶς ὄντας ('because you are our brothers'), but the ἀδελφός at AJ 13.166, in the address of Jonathan's letter, is more likely to be a diplomatic nicety.

⁴⁵ On kinship terms, see Curty (1992); (1995); Jones (1999); Schwartz (2022) 346.

⁴⁶ Cf. Ducat (2018) 608–12 with earlier bibliography.

⁴⁷ IG I³ 1.912 (266/5 BCE): τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τοῖς Λακεδαιμονί[ων]; I. v. Olympia 309 (235–222 BCE): βασιλέα [Κλεομένε]α; IG V 1.961, ll. 24–25 (late second century BCE): Λακεδαιμονίων; ποτὶ τοὺς | ἐφόρους τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων; IG V 1.30, l. 4 (c. 122 BCE): Λ[ακεδαιμονίων ἐφόροις.

Extant letters to Sparta are addressed only to its ἑφοροι.⁴⁸ In short, the Greek translator of 1 Maccabees seems to have assumed that Jonathan had addressed his letter using the generic ἄρχοντες ('magistrates'), which would have been the correct guess for almost every other Greek city. The version presented by Josephus avoids this mistake. Why was Josephus able to get this right? Because he was copying what was in front of him, and it had never been translated.

VIII. Some conclusions and implications

Our findings can be summarized thus: the clauses found at the bottom of the Josephan version of Areus' letter have parallels in Greek epigraphy that are clearly archival (sections II–III), which implies that they are, too (section IV). A motive for including them thus emerges: they had been included when Areus' letter was sent back to Sparta so that the Spartans could authenticate it (section V). Given that the Josephan version had included such archival material, and that his version of Jonathan's letter includes a *formula ualeitudinis*, these documents must be independent of those found in 1 Maccabees (section VI), which explains why they betray none of the typical artefacts of translation that are so apparent in the Maccabean versions (section VII).

These findings have several implications, the most obvious of which pertains to their authenticity, a question that has both dominated previous scholarship and produced a bewildering array of answers.⁴⁹ Little would be gained by rehearsing all the arguments on this question here, and a full exploration of them would lengthen an article that is possibly too long already. I will limit myself to a few observations. First, it is important to acknowledge from the outset that, strictly speaking, authenticity can never be proven for any document, ancient or modern: the best that can ever be said is that evidence of forgery is absent. Because of this, the burden of proof lies with those who allege forgery. Second, any future argument about authenticity needs to concentrate on the Josephan versions of the letters of Areus and Jonathan, which are not only independent of the Maccabean ones, but also (and more importantly) better than them (unsurprisingly, given that the Maccabean versions were translated at least twice and, to judge from the result, not well either time). Third, although a degree of doubt will inevitably linger about these letters, not least because the discovery of 'lost' documents was a tactic in the ancient world for introducing new material into a discourse and elevating its significance,⁵⁰ any argument against authenticity needs to explain where the archival details appended to the foot of the Josephan version came from and why these details were included here. This significantly complicates the argument against authenticity, perhaps beyond the point that it can be reasonably sustained.

Acknowledgements. This article has been improved by discussions with Ory Amitay, Rotem Avneri Meir, Jonathan Reeves and Guy Chamberland, and by suggestions of the anonymous reviewers of this journal.

⁴⁸ IG V 1, 8–10, 30.

⁴⁹ Bickerman (1928) 786–87 and Schunck (1954) 32–33 (only Areus' letter is inauthentic); Momigliano (1931) 141–51 (only the Spartan letter to Simon is authentic); Hengel (1974) 1.72, 2.50–51 n.124 (authenticity of Areus' letter is problematic, Jonathan's possibly genuine); Giovannini and Müller (1971) 164–65 with n.30 (Jonathan's letter is a forgery; the Spartan letter to Simon authentic); Cardauns (1967), Gruen (1996) and Gauger (2000) 261–62 (all letters are inauthentic); VanderKam (2004) 124–37, 274 (Areus' letter is possibly authentic); Amitay (2010) (all are probably authentic); Orian (2023) (all are inauthentic).

⁵⁰ Ní Mheallaigh (2008) 410; cf. also Speyer (1970); Hansen (2003).

Bibliography

- Abel, F.-M. (1949) *Les livres des Maccabées* (2nd edition) (Paris)
- Amitay, O. (2010) *From Alexander to Jesus (Hellenistic Culture and Society 52)* (Berkeley and Los Angeles)
- (2013) 'The correspondence in I Maccabees and the possible origins of the Judeo-Spartan connection', *SCI* 32, 79–105
- Badoud, N. (2015) *Le temps de Rhodes. Une chronologie des inscriptions de la cité fondée sur l'étude de ses institutions* (Vestigia 63) (Munich)
- Baker, M. (1996) 'Corpus-based translation studies: the challenges that lie ahead', in H. Somers (ed.), *Terminology, LSP and Translation: Studies in Language Engineering in Honour of Juan C. Sager* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia) 175–86
- Berthelot, K. (2024) 'A new perspective on the kinship between Jews and Spartans: the issue of ancestral territory', in R. Brody, N. Hacham, J.W. van Henten and M.M. Piotrkowski (eds), *A Vision of the Days: Studies in Early Jewish History and Historiography* (Leiden) 359–75
- Bickerman, E. (1928) 'Makkabäerbücher (I und II)', *RE* 14.1, 779–97
- (2007) 'The dating of Pseudo-Aristeas', in A. Tropper (ed.), *Studies in Jewish and Christian History 1* (new edition) (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 68.1) (Leiden and New York) 108–33
- Boffo, L. and Faraguna, M. (2021) *Le poleis e i loro archivi: studi su pratiche documentarie, istituzioni e società nell'antichità greca* (Graeca Tergestina. Storia e civiltà 6) (Trieste)
- Bosnakis, D. and Hallof, K. (2020) 'Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos VI', *Chiron* 50, 287–326
- Bremmer, J. (2010) 'Jews and Spartans: Abrahamic cousins?', in M. Goodman, G.H. Van Kooten, J.T.A.G.M. Van Ruiten and A. Oegema (eds), *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham* (Themes in Biblical Narrative 13) (Leiden and Boston)
- Cardauns, B. (1967) 'Juden und Spartaner: zur hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur', *Hermes* 95.3, 317–24
- Cavallo, G. and Maehler, H. (2008) *Hellenistic Bookhands* (Berlin and New York)
- Chesterman, A. (2004) 'Beyond the particular', in A. Mauranen and P. Kujamaki (eds), *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* (Benjamins Translation Library 48) (Amsterdam and Philadelphia) 33–50
- Chrubasik, B. (2017) 'From pre-Makkabaeen Judaea to Hekatomnid Karia and back again: the question of Hellenization', in B. Chrubasik and D. King (eds), *Hellenism and the Local Communities of the Eastern Mediterranean, 400 BCE–250 CE* (Oxford) 83–109
- Cohen, S.J.D. (1979) *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 8) (Leiden)
- Curry, O. (1992) 'À propos de la parenté entre Juifs et Spartiates', *Historia* 41.2, 246–48
- (1995) *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques: catalogue raisonné des inscriptions contenant le terme συγγενεια et analyse critique* (Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 20) (Geneva)
- Darshan, G. (2019) 'The original language of 1 Maccabees: a reexamination', *Biblische Notizen* 182, 91–110
- Destinon, J. von (1882) *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII–XVII = Jüd. Kreig. Buch I* (Kiel)
- Drüner, H. (1896) *Untersuchungen uxüber Josephus* (Marburg)
- Ducat, J. (2018) 'The Perioikoi', in A. Powell (ed.), *A Companion to Sparta 2* (Hoboken) 596–614
- Eilers, C. (2023) 'Archival docket in Greek inscriptions', *Tekmeria* 17, 1–43
- Exler, F.X.J. (1923) *The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography* (Washington DC)
- Fabiani, R. (2015) *I decreti onorari di lasos. Cronologia e storia* (Vestigia 66) (Munich)
- Gauger, J.-D. (1977) *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apogetik: Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im I. Makkabäerbuch* (Bonner biblische Beiträge 49) (Cologne and Bonn)
- (2000) *Authentizität und Methode. Untersuchungen zum historischen Wert des persisch-griechischen Herrscherbriefs in literarischer Tradition* (Schriftenreihe Studien zur Geschichtsforschung des Altertums 6) (Hamburg)
- Giovannini, A. and Müller, H. (1971) 'Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und den Juden im 2. Jh. v. Chr.', *MH* 28.3, 156–71
- Goldstein, J.A. (1976) *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible 41) (Garden City NY)
- Gruen, E.S. (1996) 'The purported Jewish-Spartan affiliation', in R.W. Wallace and E.M. Harris (eds), *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C. in Honor of E. Badian* (Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture 21) (Norman) 255–69
- (1998) *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley)
- Haensch, R. (1996) 'Die Verwendung von Siegeln bei Dokumenten der kaiserzeitlichen Reichsadministration', in M.-F. Boussac (ed.), *Archives et sceaux du monde hellénistique = Archivi e sigilli nel mondo ellenistico* (Bulletin de correspondance hellénique Supplément 29) (Paris) 449–96
- (2006) 'Das öffentliche Siegel der griechischen Staaten—Zwischen Kontrollmittel und Staatssymbol', in H.-A. Rupprecht (ed.), *Symposion 2003: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Vienna) 255–79

- Hansen, W. (2003) 'Strategies of authentication in ancient popular literature', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W.H. Keulen (eds), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Mnemosyne 241) (Leiden and Boston) 301–16
- Havercamp, S. (1726) *Flavii Josephi quae reperiri potuerunt opera omnia* (Amsterdam)
- Hengel, M. (1974) *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols) (Philadelphia)
- (2001) 'Judaism and Hellenism revisited', in J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling (eds), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 13) (Notre Dame IN) 6–37
- Hudson, J. (1720) *Flavii Josephi opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia* (Oxford)
- Jia, J., Afzaal, M. and Naqvi, S.B. (2022) 'Myth or reality? Some directions on translation universals in recent corpus based case studies', *Frontiers in Psychology* 13 <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.902400/full>
- Jones, C.P. (1999) *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge MA)
- Killen, S. (2017) *Parasema. Offizielle Symbole griechischer Poleis und Bundesstaaten* (Archäologische Forschungen 36) (Wiesbaden)
- Klauck, H.-J. and Bailey, D.P. (2006) *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis* (Waco)
- Koskenniemi, H. (1956) *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae, Ser. B 102:2) (Helsinki)
- Momigliano, A. (1931) *Prime linee di storia della tradizione maccabaica* (Turin)
- Monerie, J. and Clancier, P. (2023) 'A compendium of official correspondence from Seleucid Uruk', *Altorientalische Forschungen* 50, 63–82
- Motzo, R.B. (1924) *Saggi di storia e letteratura giudeo-ellenistica* (Florence)
- Muraoka, T. (2009) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven)
- Ní Mheallaigh, K. (2008) 'Pseudo-documentarism and the limits of ancient fiction', *AJPh* 129, 403–31
- Nodet, E. (2015) 'Josèphe et 1 Maccabées', *RBi* 122, 507–39
- Orian, M. (2023) 'Spartans or Samaritans? Revealing the creativity of the author of 1 Maccabees', *HTR*, 376–98
- Orrieux, C. (1987) 'La "parenté" entre juifs et spartiates', in R. Lonis (ed.), *L'étranger dans le monde grec* (Nancy) 169–91
- Palmer, H.J.E. (1828) *De Epistolarum, quas Spartiani atque Iudaei invicem sibi misisse dicuntur, veritate* (Ph.D. Diss. Giessen)
- Piper, L.J. (1986) *Spartan Twilight* (New Rochelle NY)
- Pym, A. (2008) 'On Toury's laws of how translators translate', in A. Pym, M. Shlesinger and D. Simeonit (eds), *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia) 311–28
- Rhodes, P.J. (1997) *The Decrees of the Greek States* (Oxford and New York)
- Rigsby, K.J. (1997) *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley and Los Angeles)
- Robert, L. (1928) 'Notes d'épigraphie hellénistique, xxxiii: inscription d'Astypalée', *BCH* 52, 426–43
- (1949) 'Décrets de Smyrne pour des juges étrangers', in L. Robert (ed.), *Hellenica: recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques VII* (Paris) 171–88
- (1960) 'Décret de Lébédos pour un juge de Samos', in L. Robert (ed.), *Hellenica: recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques XI-XII* (Paris) 204–13
- Rodríguez-Pérez, D. (2011) 'Contextualizing symbols: "the eagle and the snake" in the ancient Greek world', *Boreas* 33, 1–18
- Schunck, K.-D. (1954) *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuches* (Diss. Halle)
- Schwartz, D.R. (2022) *1 Maccabees* (The Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries) (New Haven)
- Segre, M. and Pugliese-Carratelli, G. (1949–1951) 'Tituli Camirenses', *ASAA* 27–29, n.s. 11–13, 141–318
- Sievers, J. (2001a) 'Josephus, First Maccabees, Sparta, the three Haireseis—and Cicero', *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32.1, 241–51
- (2001b) *Synopsis of the Greek Sources for the Hasmonean Period: 1–2 Maccabees and Josephus War 1 and Antiquities 12–14* (Subsidia Biblica 20) (Rome)
- Speyer, W. (1970) *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike. Mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Hypomnemata 24) (Göttingen)
- Tilly, M. (2015) *1 Makkabäer* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament) (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna)
- Toury, G. (2012) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (revised edition) (Amsterdam and Philadelphia)
- Turnheim, Y. (2000) 'The eagle and the snake on synagogue lintels in the Golan', *RdA* 24, 106–13
- VanderKam, J.C. (2004) *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis and Assen)
- Welles, C.B. (1934) *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy* (New Haven)

- Wenger, L. (1923) 'Signum', *RE* 2A, 2361–448
- Wernsdorf, G. (1747) *Commentatio historico-critica de fide historica librorum Maccabaicorum* (Breslau)
- Willrich, H. (1900) *Judaica: Forschungen zur hellenistisch-jüdischen Geschichte und Litteratur* (Göttingen)
- (1924) *Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, n.F. 21) (Göttingen)