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In his recent Anchor Bible volume on Esther, C. A. Moore has taken up the question of the personal names, purportedly Persian, occurring in the book. He concluded "most of the personal names are probably Iranian in origin," but their original forms might not be easily discovered since "Successful analysis of personal names presupposes . . . their reasonably accurate transmission" and we must "have reservations about the Hebrew consonantal text of Esther" on the basis of divergencies in the versions.¹

I. The Evidence of the Versions

Moore has supplied a chart to display each name as given in MT, LXX, a manuscript influenced by the Hexapla (ms 93), the "Lucianic" text, Josephus, the Old Latin, and the Vulgate. Three examples, amended from Moore, demonstrate its variety:

Esth 1:10 MT zētēhar LXX abataza ms 93 zarath OL zatâi Vg zarath
Esth 1:10 MT karkas LXX tharaba ms 93 acharbas OL tharas Vg archas
Esth 9:7 MT 'aspaśāh LXX phasga ms 93 aeiphatha Lucian pharne Vg espath'a

The chart shows the text-types nearest to the MT are those dating from the period when the Hebrew consonants are considered to have been set. The Vulgate has slight differences of vocalization (e.g. bazaṭha for MT bizṭāh) and a transposition (zarath for zētēhar). The Hexaplar-influenced ms 93 (to which ms 53 can be added) has some more striking variants, as can be seen above. The Old Latin copies vary among themselves, sometimes being closer to MT than to LXX, e.g. narbōnā for ūr̥bōnā at 1:10, LXX tharrā. The 'Lucianic' text, where available, and the LXX show the widest divergences when placed beside MT. In theory these two text types could reach back to a time before the Hebrew text was standardized, before A.D. 70, and so supply

¹C. A. Moore, Esther (AB 7B; Garden City: Doubleday, 1971) xlv.
Greek forms representative of Hebrew originals that might be superior to the MT tradition. To prove such superiority is almost impossible, however. Looking beyond Moore's list to the critical apparatus in standard LXX editions, especially R. Hanhart's Göttingen volume, we discover the major manuscripts often vary in their writing of the name, though some similarity survives in each. Thus for bīzāthā in 1:10 LXX B and S have mazan, Sō bazan, A bazan; for ḫabaghā LXX B has zatholthā, A has zebathatha; in 9:7 for ḫaspāha, A ḥphaga, Sō ḥphaga; for wazāthā in 9:9 LXX B gives zubouthaion, Sō zabouedethan, A zabougha, while the Sahidic LXX B gives zabouthaion, Sō zabouedethan, A zabougha for these two. Simple scribal errors within the Greek can be detected, confusion of uncial alpha and delta, for example, producing LXX B pharudatha, Sō pharaatha for MT pōrāthā,

9:8. Other errors might be perceived were earlier copies of Greek Esther to be found. (Damage to the Chester Beatty copy of the early third century A.D., Göttingen no. 967-68, robs us of its witness to the lists of names.) Confusion may have arisen, too, in the transfer of strange names from the Hebrew to the Greek script, as Moore observed. When allowance is made for these factors, there would still seem to be elements in the Greek that might suggest arguments in favour of other Hebrew forms than the MT's. Yet the failure of LXX to render all the names in 1:14 (MT), and the technical terms in 8:10 that include a good Hebrew reproduction of a Persian word, gives grounds for treating its evidence with some scepticism.

II. The Sources for Old Persian Names

Instead of questioning Hebrew spellings in the uncertain light of LXX, it may be more profitable to continue the search for Persian parallels. The quest has been pursued by scholars over the past century; earlier results were summarized by L. B. Paton in his ICC volume on Esther (1908), 66–71, and Moore gives references to later studies (Esther, xlv n. 51). The older comparisons relied upon F. Justi's *Iranisches Namenbuch* which collected the names preserved in literature. The recovery of ancient texts, often rich in personal names, has advanced the study of Old Persian since Justi's compilation of 1895. A small proportion of these texts are written in the Persian cuneiform syllabary on imperial monuments and seals; the majority are in other scripts. Part of the administrative archives of Persepolis, written in Elamite cuneiform upon clay tablets during the years 509 to 458 B.C. is the principal source.2 Their records indicate a mixed population at the court, so that any name in them may be Old Persian, East Persian, Median, or non-Iranian, especially Elamite. Further problems of identification arise because the scribes had to reproduce Iranian phonemes with their differently stocked Elamite syllabary. By analysis of some 1900 names, M. Mayrhofer has established the patterns followed. As a result, Old Persian forms can be

---


projected for many of the names with equivalents in contemporary or later Persian sources. Even so, ambiguity persists over a considerable number, and scholars well-qualified to comment upon them have stressed how much remains unknown about Old Persian names, both the newly recovered and the long known ones.3

Equally careful investigation is required for the examples supplied by Akkadian cuneiform texts, where similar problems arise.4

Beside the cuneiform scripts, the Aramaic alphabet was current in the capital and the provinces. Papyrus and leather documents from Egypt continue to contribute to the Persian onomasticon.5 Recently R. A. Bowman's edition of Aramaic annotations on stone pestles and mortars has added further names in this script in the Persian homeland. Bowman has examined the methods of transliterating Persian names into Aramaic on these objects, noting similarities and contrasts with rabbinc reflections of Middle Persian in the Talmud.6 A smaller number of Persian names in Aramaic letters are found on monuments, seals, and coins from every region of the Persian Empire.7

Progress in the understanding of Old Persian has increased in recent years, therefore, yet the interpretation of personal names is still far from complete; the opacity of foreign scripts, and the limited amount of Old Persian vocabulary recovered hinder the work.8

It follows that a name claiming to be Persian but without immediate explanation should not be treated as suspect unless very strong grounds exist; the likelihood of an unknown Persian original should be the first consideration. In the case of the names in Esther we have suggested the ways the Greek versions vary arise from inner Greek scribal failures rather than divergent Hebrew exemplars. Here we take issue with the attitude adopted, though not without qualification, by C. A. Moore in his commentary and in a

---


6R. A. Bowman, *Aramaic Ritual Texts from Persepolis* (OIP 21; Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1970); the transcription methods are described on pp. 64–65.


survey of the historical background to the book of Esther. After observing the
confusion his table of versions displays, he continued:

The nub of the problem in Esther, then, is that we are not always very confident about the
accuracy, or essential correctness, of the Hebrew spelling of many of the non-Hebrew
personal names. Consider, for example, the names of our hero and heroine. While agreeing
that the Hebrew word *Mardukay* represents a more corrupt spelling of *Marduka* than does
the Greek *Mardochaios*, scholars do not agree on whether the Hebrew *‘str*, "Esther," derives
from the Persian *sta*, "star," or from the Babylonian *Ishtar*, the goddess of love. 9

Agreeing that the vowels of *Mardochaios* may be more exact than the Hebrew
form, we would stress that the accuracy of the Hebrew *‘sr* is not affected by the
proposed etymologies, neither need be right. Moore continued to show
"exactly how complicated and confusing all this can be" by setting beside
*parshandatāha*, the name of a son of Haman, Greek renderings from three
major LXX manuscripts: S has *pharsannestai*ns, A has *pharsanestain*, B has
*pharsan* and *nestain*. 10 This was an example of "puzzling variations" to be
found for "many, if not most, of the non-Jewish names in Esther." 

The example chosen, Parshandatha, is unfortunate for Moore's case. In
the ICC volume on Esther, published in 1908, L. B. Paton had already noted
the existence of the name on an ancient cylinder seal. This cylinder is one of a
series bearing typically Achaemenid designs with the owners' names in
Aramaic letters. It is currently displayed in the Persian Gallery of the British
Museum (Western Asiatic Antiquities Department, BM 89152), and has been
included in the standard collections of Aramaic inscriptions and of seals
bearing west Semitic legends. 11 The text reads *Parshandatha*, son of
Artadatha." Only in lacking the final *aleph* does this differ from the name in Esther. With this before us, there is hardly any reason to
doubt the accuracy of the MT and the corruption of the Greek manuscripts.

Until a thorough analysis of all West Semitic transcriptions of Persian
names has been undertaken, it would be rash to claim every strange name in
Esther as a viable rendering of an Iranian one. However, it is worth listing a
few that appear likely, with explanations proferred although they are far from
certain.

*Hammedatha*, the name of Esther's father (Esth 3:1) causes Iranian
scholars little hesitation. In the Aramaic ritual texts from Persepolis it occurs as
*‘mdt;* in the Persepolis Fortification Tablets it is written *ha-ma-da-da*. The
Old Persian form surmised is *‘amadāta*, "strongly made." 12

---

11 CTS 2. no. 100; K. Galling, "Beschriftete Bildsiegel der ersten Jahrtausends v. Chr.
vornehmlich aus Syrien und Palastina," ZDPV 64 (1941) 196 and Taf. 11, no. 163; Vattoni, "Ich
was astynt de *Parshandatha*, son of Artadatha." Only in lacking the final *aleph* does this
differ from the name in Esther. With this before us, there is hardly any reason to
doubt the accuracy of the MT and the corruption of the Greek manuscripts.

Until a thorough analysis of all West Semitic transcriptions of Persian
names has been undertaken, it would be rash to claim every strange name in
Esther as a viable rendering of an Iranian one. However, it is worth listing a
few that appear likely, with explanations proferred although they are far from
certain.

*Hammedatha*, the name of Esther's father (Esth 3:1) causes Iranian
scholars little hesitation. In the Aramaic ritual texts from Persepolis it occurs as
*‘mdt;* in the Persepolis Fortification Tablets it is written *ha-ma-da-da*. The
Old Persian form surmised is *‘amadāta*, "strongly made." 12

---

Mehuman, a eunuch (Esth 1:10) is as satisfactory a rendering of Old
Persian Vahumanah, "intelligent," as it is of an Aramaic participle from *‘mn,
Hebraized, meaning "trustworthy." 13

Karkas, another eunuch in Esth 1:10, was noted by Moore in his
commentary (p. 9) as an Elamite writing of a name at Persepolis. The equation
with Avestan kahrkasa, "vulture," was made long ago (see Paton), and is
maintained by modern scholars. 14 How badly the versions maulled this name is
shown in the chart above.

Keresthen, the name of a counsellor (Esth 1:14) is also found at Persepolis,
in the Fortification Tablets and has been analysed by Mayrhofer as *karša,
"furrow," with the patronymic ending *ina*, a solution reached in part by
Gehman. R. Zadok offers another explanation, "(beautiful) form" on the
basis of Sogdian *kršn*. 15 LXX *arkeisios* ignores the termination or final
consonant. *Mastena*, another counsellor, may exhibit the same patronymic.

Shethar, also a counsellor, may have an abbreviated name containing the
element *cico*, "bright," the Old Persian *č* and *č* being transcribed in the manner
of the Aramaic from Persepolis. 16 If they stand for this name, LXX
*sarsathaios*, *A sarestheos*, Hexaplaric type *ms asatha*, Sahidic *zaalatamos*,
and Old Latin *srothas*, demonstrate the confusion the versions may reach,
and if they are equivalents of MT *taršš*, the next name in the list but one, they
are little better.

These selected instances are sufficient to counter Moore's case. Finding
several names in Hebrew letters reflecting Persian ones so closely rules out any
likelihood of corruption accidentally reaching a true form. That they occur
whether the LXX is close to the MT (as for Hammedatha), or very different,
suggests the MT has the superiority. Thus we conclude the Hebrew text of
Esther can be trusted to give non-Hebrew names accurately, unless we have
clear proof to the contrary; occasionally its vocalization may be less
acceptable than its consonants. If the forms it gives are otherwise unknown,
they are not thereby improbable, and may actually serve to extend the known
Persian onomasticon. 17

III. Foreign Names in the OT

To identify the originals of the Persian names in Esther is not to prove the
historicity of the story; it serves to illustrate the care and accuracy of the

13 M. Mayrhofer, *Onomastica Persepolitana* no. 8.1717; the Hebrew meaning is an old
suggestion, accepted by BDB.
15 M. Mayrhofer, *Onomastica Persepolitana* no. 8.785, cf. 11.1.8.7.6; H. S. Gehman, "Notes
on the Persian Words," 324; R. Zadok, "On Five Iranian Names in the Old Testament," JPT 26
(1976) 246.
17 This result undermines J. Duchesne-Guillemin's attempt to prove that the list of Esth 1:14
duplicates that of 1:10 in reverse order, and his explanations of the names obtained by extensive
emendation; see his "Les noms des eunuques d'Assur," Le Muséon 66 (1953) 105-8.
Jewish copyists when faced with foreign terms. Their faithfulness is demonstrated in their treatment of many other foreign names, too. Now Moore has claimed:

In the Old Testament, when the Hebrew spelling of a non-Jewish name differs from the Greek spelling in either its consonants or vocalization, scholars can not automatically assume, as they once did, that the Hebrew has preserved more accurately the non-Jewish name. From their studies of Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian inscriptions, scholars know for an incontestable fact that sometimes the rendering of the non-Hebrew name has been more accurately preserved in the Greek version—the Septuagint—than in the Massoretic Text.18

Despite his “sometimes,” there appear to be very few cases where Moore’s claim can be proved incontestably. A complete survey is unnecessary here, but samples can be given from each language he has mentioned.

(a) Egyptian Names in the OT

Few of these enter the OT text. Some are by no means certainly identified, and so neither MT nor LXX can be held correct. This applies to Zaphenathpaaneah in the Joseph story (Gen 41:45) which has been disputed by Egyptologists for a century,19 although Potiphar and Asenath fall into categories and are satisfactorily rendered by both Hebrew and Greek. With the royal name Shishaq the LXX may preserve a superior vowel in the first syllable, Sousakeim, agreeing with the Ktib at 1 Kgs 14:25 (Šīṣaq), but adds an otiose final syllable.20 In Tirhaqā a metathesis occurred, the Egyptian apparently being Tharaqa, but LXX moves further with Thara (B) and Tharaka (A) at 2 Kgs 19:9, and Tharaka(B) and Tharatha (A) at Isa 37:9. Again, it is possible that LXX preserves preferable vowels, but this may be accidental.21

(b) Assyrian Names in the OT

A significant body of texts is ready to hand for examining transcriptions of Assyrian and Babylonian names in the bible. This comprises Aramaic writing on stone, clay tablets, papyri, leather documents, metal objects, and seals

18"Archaeology and the Book of Esther," 77.
21K. A. Kitchen, Third Intermediate Period, 453 n. 136. On the case of Tahpenes, 1 Kgs 11:19, LXX thechemeinas, see D. Barthélemy, "A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam 11:2-1 Kings 2:11 in the Light of Certain Criticisms of Les Devaniers d’Aquila," in R. A. Kraft, ed., 1972 Proceedings (SBLSCS 2; Missoula: Scholars Press for SBL, 1972) 56-58, who favors "Lucianic" thechemeinas over MT on the basis of a putative Egyptian original. K. A. Kitchen from the eighth century B.C. onwards. Analysis has revealed the usage of the scribes in transcribing Akkadian names, certain developments over the time covered, and more or less regular equations that kept the dialects of Assyria and Babylonia distinct.22 From that material it is possible to argue for a high degree of accuracy in the preservation of Assyrian royal names in the MT. Tiglath-pileser, for example, appears in this long-accepted form in Hebrew and in the Aramaic stele of Bar-Rakib of Zinjīrī, c. 730 B.C. In Babylonia it was written Tīglath-pileser, with the shift k:q, a known dialect difference between the two regions. Similarly, Sargon (Isa 20:1) is the Assyrian form as exhibited on an Aramaic seal impression from the king's new palace at Dur-Sharrukēn, Khorsabad that reads pn’î:sr m:rsy srng pn’î:sr, "Pān-ashur, chief of Sargon’s eunuchs, Pān-Ashur."23 The Ashur Ostracon, a letter in Aramaic probably sent from Uruk in southern Babylonia about 650 B.C. shows the Babylonian spelling šrkî.24

For Tiglath-pileser the LXX manuscripts offer many readings, ranging from the careful Thaglaphellasar of 2 Chr 28:20 to the Thagnaphamasar of 1 Chr 5:26, ms B. Sargon is reduced by them to Arna, ‘Lucian’ improving slightly with Sarna.

(c) Babylonian Names in the OT

This matter has been discussed in detail by P.-R. Berger in an important recent study taking its rise in the names in Daniel. The Hebrew forms have clearly remained close to their Babylonian originals, and have been elucidated by Berger’s work.25 In some the LXX may retain a small advantage lost in MT; in many, however, it displays the same signs of degeneration already seen, e.g. Marodach huios tou Laadan for Merodach-baladan in Isa 39:1.

IV. Hebrew Transcriptions of Foreign Names

From our survey of the Hebrew scribes’ attempts to transmit foreign names to their fellows we can deduce that they worked with care, and their successors, copying the texts over the centuries, preserved what they found in their exemplars with remarkable accuracy. If there are a few cases where slight changes have crept in, those do not detract from the overall picture. Where no originals are available to compare with the Hebrew, we can rely confidently upon the Hebrew forms, and not treat them with unjustified scepticism simply because the versions differ. It was the Greek scribes who distorted the names

Third Intermediate Period, 274 n. 183 offers another Egyptian original closer to MT, so clearly neither form can be called superior.
as they copied them over the generations, and perhaps as they made their first renderings from the Hebrew; their bizarre results cannot be held superior to the MT without very strong evidence indeed. In the question of foreign names, as in so many other matters, the OT text has often been disparaged, yet when the evidence of its own contemporary world is evaluated beside it, it is seen to be as reliable a source as any newly excavated inscription. 26

26 Dr. A. D. H. Bivar and Dr. D. W. Gooding read a draft of this essay and commented upon the Persian and LXX material respectively. I am grateful to them for their readily given advice.