

THE OFFICIAL PERSIAN DOCUMENTS
IN THE BOOK OF EZRA

Thesis
submitted in accordance with
the requirements of the
University of Liverpool
for the degree of
Doctor in Philosophy
by

Captain Lee V. Hensley

September, 1977

ABSTRACT

The book of Ezra contains seven documents which the author presents as official Persian documents. These are not a homogeneous collection of documents. There are different types of documents which make up this collection: proclamation, memorandum, letter, decree, and report. While modern scholarship has been divided over the question of the authenticity of the Ezra Documents (ED), it has yet to produce a thorough and comprehensive study of all seven of these documents. With this in mind the present writer has set out to answer the question, Can the Ezra Documents be considered to be authentic official Persian documents? The questions concerning the authenticity of the ED are principally threefold: 1) linguistic, is the language of the ED that of contemporary official Persian documents? 2) stylistic, is the style of the ED consistent with that of known official Persian documents? and 3) historical, are the ED historically compatible with the known history of Achaemenid Persian rule?

Linguistically, the ED correspond with the language situation characteristic of Achaemenid Persia. The Achaemenids used native languages for official purposes as attested by official documents in Greek, Lycian, Elamite, and Egyptian. Thus the Hebrew of Ezra 1:2-4, a proclamation intended for the Jews, is consistent with Persian practice and shows that Hebrew was the language of the Jews at this time. A second, and apparently more common, means of communication among Persian officials was the use of Aramaic as an intermediary language. The Aramaic

of the rest of the ED is clearly homogeneous with Imperial Aramaic of the sixth to fourth centuries B.C. The vocabulary is the same for which the Persian loanwords of the ED are especially telling. Furthermore, Aramaic under the Achaemenids was considerably influenced by Persian, covering loan translations, syntax, phonology, and morphology.

Stylistically, the ED are demonstrably Persian. The ten stylistic features of official Achaemenid correspondence are exemplified in the ED just as they are in the non-Biblical Persian documents. To answer the question of a possible Hellenistic origin of the ED, official Greek correspondence and the LXX renderings of the ED are discussed. The style of official Greek correspondence is completely different from the style of official Persian correspondence so that the two styles can not possibly be confused. The LXX translators were unfamiliar with both the language and style of the ED. They even attempted to change stylistic features that proved awkward for them. Furthermore, two Additions to the Greek Esther, B and E, are patently Hellenistic efforts to create Persian decrees which their Greek character and lack of Persian characteristics amply attest. Their one attempt at copying Persian style is erroneous. Thus knowing the styles of official Persian and Greek documents, the failure of the LXX translators in coping with the language and style of the ED, and the examples of Additions B and E to the Greek Esther is sufficient to demonstrate the Persian character of the style of the ED.

Historically, the ED depict a common relation with non-Biblical Persian documents and more broadly with the known history of Achaemenid Persia. Two areas are added here that add substantially to the historical context of the ED: 1) administration of the empire, and 2) the

religious policies of the Persians. Administratively the ED are everywhere consistent with known Persian practices, such as the combination of native and Persian officials, their appearance in groups, their titles. Archive administration, their locations and names as depicted in the ED are also consistent with known Persian practice. The religious policies of the Achaemenids are amply attested in contemporary documents and those pictured in the ED are fully consistent with non-Biblical sources. The main point in this connection is that the Persians involved themselves with the details of the cults of their subjects both great and small.

So the answer to the question whether the Ezra Documents can be considered authentic Persian documents and are therefore valuable historical sources for the period must be answered in the positive.

PREFACE

This thesis topic came out of the writer's MA thesis which surveyed Israel's history during the Persian period. The writer wishes to thank his MA tutors, Drs. J. B. Payne and H. M. Wolf, who encouraged him in his studies to go on to a Ph.D. and who have continued to assist him when called upon.

The writer is forever in debt for the unstinting direction of his supervisor Mr. A. R. Millard. His gracious acceptance and willingness to continue his supervision after the writer had to return to the United States to finish this work and its consequent problems is especially appreciated. This and his fine scholarly example and friendship have made the writer very thankful to have him as his supervisor. Thanks also go to his friend and colleague Dr. K. A. Kitchen whose help and encouragement along the way were most important. The writer is also indebted to friends who helped him with sources in foreign languages: Heinrich von Siebenthal, Mr. Lawrence Porter, Mario Sesia, Mrs. Bonnie Alexander, Wilhelm Butte, and Herman Schibli.

Endearing gratitude goes to my family who have had to do without many things for the writer to finish his work. For the typing of his thesis which included considerable editing the writer is singularly grateful to his wife, Karen, who has rendered invaluable service to the improvement of this thesis.

Finally, the writer expresses his thanks to the libraries of Wheaton College and the University of Chicago which made their facilities

available when the writer was no longer at Liverpool to benefit from their fine resources and services.

While the writer is indebted to so many who have assisted him, the writer takes full responsibility for the final form of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
PREFACE	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	x
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Ezra Documents in Recent Studies	1
Studies consulted	
Views held concerning the Ezra Documents	
Forgeries	
Authentic	
Current consensus	
Weaknesses of previous studies	
Discussions of style	
Discussions of contents	
Description of this Study	26
Documents Used in this Study	28
CHAPTER II. TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND LEXICAL STUDY	39
Textual Criticism	39
Hebrew MSS	
LXX MSS	
Lexical Study	44
Loanwords	
Persian	
Akkadian	
Hebrew	
Uncertain	
Synonyms	
Distribution	
CHAPTER III. THE STYLE OF THE DOCUMENTS	74
Personal Address	74
Salutation	77
Terms Used for the Classification of the Documents	84
Introductory Terms	94
Formulation of Requests	98
Quotations	101
Dates	109

Subscripts	115
Summary of Contents	120
Address	123
CHAPTER IV. THE STYLE OF OFFICIAL GREEK CORRESPONDENCE	126
Style of Official Greek Correspondence	126
Persian Documents Preserved in Non-Biblical Greek	127
Persian Documents in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament .	131
1 & 2 Esdras	
Greek Additions to Esther	
CHAPTER V. THE QUESTION OF PERSIAN INFLUENCE ON ARAMAIC	142
Supposed Examples of Persian Influence	144
Conclusions	167
CHAPTER VI. ARCHIVES AND ARCHIVE ADMINISTRATION	170
Modern Archive Administration	171
Archives in the Ancient Near East	173
Archives and the Ezra Documents	181
CHAPTER VII. THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE EZRA DOCUMENTS	190
Achaemenid Administration	190
Achaemenid Religious Policies	199
The Achaemenids and the Language Problem	202
CHAPTER VIII. INTERNAL EXAMINATION OF THE EZRA DOCUMENTS	211
CONCLUSIONS	226
APPENDIX I. THE WRITER'S TRANSLATION OF THE EZRA DOCUMENTS	234
APPENDIX II. THE VOCABULARY OF THE EZRA DOCUMENTS	240
BIBLIOGRAPHY	250

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Lexical Distribution in the Ezra Documents	71
2. Documents without a Salutation	78
3. Documents with a Salutation	79
4. Salutation Formulas	80
5. Formulation of Requests	99
6. Formulation of Quotations	103
7. Formulation of Dates	110
8. LXX Renderings of the ED Vocabulary	133
9. Distribution of Persianisms in the Ezra Documents	168

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Achaem. - Achaemenid
Act Or - *Acta Orientalia*
 AD - Aramaic Document, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.*,
 Driver
Aeg - *Aegyptus*
AFO - *Archiv für Orientforschung*
AGWG - *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen:*
Phil.-Hist. Klasse
Ah - *Aḥiqar*, Cowley, *AP*
AION - *Annali dell 'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*
AJBA - *The Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology*
AJSL - *American Journal of Semitic Languages*
AJT - *American Journal of Theology*
 Akk. - Akkadian
 ALW - Akkadian Loanwords
AM - *Asia Major*
 ANE - Ancient Near East
AP - *Aramaic Papyri*, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Cowley
Ar Or - *Archiv Orientalni*
ARTP - *Aramaic Ritual Text from Persepolis*, *Aramaic Ritual Texts from*
Persepolis, Bowman
ASAE - *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*
AUSS - *Andrews University Seminary Studies*
 BA - Biblical Aramaic
BCH - *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*
BDB - Brown, et al., eds., *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testa-*
ment
Beh - *Behistun Inscription*, Cowley, *AP*
 BH - Biblical Hebrew
BH² - *Biblia Hebraica*, Hooght, van der, ed., 2nd ed.
BH³ - *Biblia Hebraica*, Kittel, ed., 3rd ed.
BH - *Buried History*
BJRL - *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*
BMAP - *Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papy-*
ri, Kraeling
BO - *Bibliotheca Orientalis*
BSOAS - *Bulletin of the Schools of Oriental and African Studies*
BZ - *Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW - *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CAD - *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University*
of Chicago, Gelb, et al., eds.
 Cant. - Canticles (Song of Solomon)
 Chr. - Chronicles
CIS - *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*
CRAI - See *CRAIBL*
CRAIBL - *Comptes Rendus: Académie des Inscriptions and Belles Lettres*

- Dan. - Daniel
 DB - Darius, Behistun Inscription, Kent, *OP*²
 Diod - Diodorus
DISO - *Dictionnaire des semitiques de l'ouest*, Jean & Hoflijzer
DLZ - *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*
 DNa - Darius, Naqs-I-Rustam a Inscription, Kent, *OP*²
 DNb - Darius, Naqs-I-Rustam b Inscription
 DPd - Darius, Persepolis d Inscription, Kent
 DSe - Darius, Susa e Inscription
 DSf - Darius, Susa f Inscription
 DSj - Darius, Susa j Inscription
 DZc - Darius, Suez c Inscription
 1E & 2E - First & Second Esdras
 Eccl. - Ecclesiastes
 ED - Ezra Documents
 El. - Elamite
 Elam. - Elamite
 EP - Elephantine Papyri
 EP, Gershevitch - Editor's Preface, *The Cambridge History of Iran*
 EPT, Hallock - "The Evidence of the Persepolis Tablets," *The Cambridge History of Iran*
 Est. - Esther
ET - *Expository Times*
 Fort. 6764 - Fortification tablet #6764, Cameron
 Gk - Greek
GTT - *Gereformeed Theologisch Tijdschrift*
GUOST - *Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions*
 Hdt. - Herodotus
HJAS - *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*
 HLW - Hebrew Loanwords
HUCA - *Hebrew Union College Annual*
 IA - Imperial Aramaic
IOS - *Israel Oriental Society*
 Is. - Isaiah
JA - *Journal Asiatique*
JAOS - *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JB - *The Jerusalem Bible*
JBL - *Journal of Biblical Literature*
 Jer. - Jeremiah
JESHO - *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*
JNES - *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
 Josh. - Joshua
JQR - *Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSS - *Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS - *Journal of Theological Studies*
JTVI - *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*
 K - Kings
 KAC - Koopman, ed., *Aramäische Chrestomathie*
 KAI - *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, Donner and Rollig, eds.
 KB - Koehler and Baumgartner, eds., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*
 LAH - *Le Lettere Aramaiche de Hermopoli*, Brescioni and Kamil
 LBL - *Late Babylonian Letters*, Thompson
 Lev. - Leviticus
LO - *Litterae Orientales*

- LXX - Septuagint
 MB - *Miscellanea Biblica*
 MP - Middle Persian
 MT - Masoretic Text
 MUSJ - *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph*
 NASB - *New American Standard Bible*
 NC - *Numismatic Chronicle*
 NEB - *The New English Bible*
 Neh. - Nehemiah
 NGWG - *Nachrichten von der königliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu
Göttingen: Phil.- Hist. Klasse*
 OLZ - *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*
 OP - Old Persian
 Or - *Orientalia*
 OS - *Orientalia Seucana*
 PAAJR - *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*
 Pad. - Padua
 Padua - "The Padua Aramaic Papyrus Letters," Fitzmyer
 PEQ - *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*
 Pers. - Persian
 PF - *Persepolis Fortification Tablet, Persepolis Fortification Tablets,
Hallock*
 Pher. - Pherendates
 PICSS - *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies*
 PIE - proto Indo-European
 PLW - Persian Loanwords
 PRR - *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*
 PRU III - *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit, III, Schaeffer*
 Ps. - Psalm
 PTR - *Princeton Theological Review*
 RB - *Revue Biblique*
 RSV - *Revised Standard Version*
 SCO - *Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro Oblata*
 SH - *Scripta Hierosolymitana*
 SPAW - *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft:
Phil.- Hist. Klasse*
 TB - *Tyndale Bulletin*
 Thuc. - Thucydides
 TFAPS - *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Society*
 TPS - *Transactions of the Philological Society*
 Ugaritica IV - *MRS XV Ugaritica IV, Schaeffer*
 VF-WU - *Vorträgen der Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität*
 VT - *Vetus Testamentum*
 WO - *Die Welt des Orients*
 XPa - Xerxes, Persepolis a Inscription, Kent, OP²
 XPb - Xerxes, Persepolis b Inscription
 XPh - Xerxes, Persepolis h Inscription
 ZA - *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
 ZASA - *Zeitschrift für die ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*
 ZAW - *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
 ZB - *Zürcher Bibel*
 ZDMG - *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
 Zech. - Zechariah

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Ezra Documents in Recent Studies

It is necessary at the outset of this introduction to point out that very few studies have been published which deal specifically with the Persian documents in the book of Ezra.¹ Equally rare are larger studies in Ezra and the Persian period which discuss specifically and extensively these same documents. The larger studies tend either to refer the reader to the few specific studies that have been published or to treat particular words and features of the documents very superficially. This admittedly generalized statement is not intended to minimize the value of these studies, but rather to point out the existing situation in Ezra studies. However, it does show that the Persian documents are usually not given a very prominent place in the study of the book of Ezra! Thus, commentaries and other reference books will, for the most part, not be included in this survey, although they will be referred to in the study itself.

What was needed for an adequate study of the ED were authentic contemporary Aramaic documents with which to make comparisons. These were provided by the documents discovered at Elephantine in Egypt, which

¹To be referred to as the Ezra Documents (ED), i.e., Ezra 1:2-4, 6:2b-5, 5:7-17, 6:2b-12, 4:11-16, 4:17-22, and 7:12-26.

began to be published in quantity in 1906.¹ Because these discoveries provided scholars with documents that had not gone through the transmission processes of editing and copying as have those in Ezra, they mark a distinct break in the study of the ED. Therefore, the studies of the ED can be divided into two groups: those published before 1906 and those published after 1906.

Studies Consulted

Meyer, E. *Die Entstehung des Judentums*.
Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1896. (Reprinted:
Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965.)

The first chapter of this book is devoted specifically to the ED—one-third of the book—even though they are not Meyer's major concern. He approaches the documents from the viewpoint of the historian to test their credibility against the known facts of Persian history. The literary features of the documents receive little attention, primarily due to the lack of comparable material.²

Meyer considers Ezra 1:2-4 to have been forged by the Chronicler because it is composed in Hebrew instead of Aramaic, the official language of all the western provinces (p. 9). Without any considerations of the contents, he writes it off thus: "Wie nach jüdischen Begriffen der Erlass des Kyros aussehen musste, lehrt das Machwerk, welches der Chronist Chron. II 36,23. Ezra 1,2-4 zu fabricieren nicht unterlassen hat, obwohl ihm das authentische Dokument Ezra 6 zu Gebote stand: . . ." (p. 49). The documents in chapters 4-6 he considers to have been writ-

¹Sayce and Cowley, *APDA*, 1906. Followed by Sachau, *APO*, 1911; Ungnad, *APE*, 1911; Cowley, *AP*, 1923; Driver, *AD*, 1954 (Revised 1957); Kraeling, *BMAP*, 1953.

²Meyer did make use of *CIS*, II, 144 (=Cowley, *AP* 70) and the Gadates Inscription (*BCH* 13:529-42, 1889).

ten originally in Persian. Meyer bases this conclusion primarily on his emended reading of Ezra 4:7: "und die Depesche war persisch geschrieben und ins Aramäische übersetzt." (p. 18). פרסית in MT is ארמית. In addition to this Meyer sees a number of Persianisms: vocabulary; the Achaemenid chancellery mark, "copy of the letter" (p. 28); and syntax and features characteristic of Persian inscriptions, especially the Greek translation of the Gadates Inscription (pp. 19-21), e.g., use of the pronoun אלו, אלו, אל, "these," to indicate a previously mentioned person or thing, and שמה following a personal name (p. 29). In particular, the name אשורבנפד (Ashurbanipal) is taken as a sure trace of the Persian original (pp. 29-30). Ezra 7:12-26, on the other hand, is credited to Ezra himself and his colleagues who had influence at court. They drew up the document—in Aramaic, thus its non-Persian character—and presented it to the king for his approval.

Many of the problems in the documents are attributed to the Chronicler, and "sämmliche Urkunden sind also durch mehrere Hände gegangen, ehe sie auf uns gekommen sind." (p. 8). As a result of his study Meyer comes to the following conclusion:

Damit wäre, denke ich, nicht nur die Aechtheit der im Buche Ezra überlieferten aramäischen Dokumente gegen alle Einwände erwiesen, sondern mehrfach auch ein klarerer Einblick in die Bedeutung dieser für die jüdische wie für die persische Geschichte unschätzbaren Urkunden gewonnen. (p. 70).

Boyd, J. O. "The Documents of the Book of Ezra," *PRR* 11:414-37, 1900.¹

This is a useful synthesis of the basic arguments for and against the authenticity of the ED being debated at the turn of the century.

¹This article is the second in a three-part series on the book of Ezra: "The Composition of the Book of Ezra," *PRR* 11:261-97, 1900; "The Historicity of Ezra," *PRR* 11:568-607, 1900.

While Boyd does make significant contributions to the debate, the main portion of his article is given to presenting the arguments of the chief debaters themselves. Boyd's method is twofold: first, he presents the arguments brought against the authenticity of the ED and then the counter arguments; secondly, he offers what he terms "positive considerations" which in his opinion confirm their genuineness. Boyd concludes that the Aramaic documents in Ezra are genuine Persian documents.

Ezra 1:2-4 is discussed by Boyd in his third article (see above p. 3, n. 1). He considers it to have been translated from Aramaic— itself a translation from the language of Cyrus—and to be incomplete. He first compares 1:2-4 with 6:3-5 (also considered to be incomplete) on the premise that if the former is consistent with the latter, then it can be considered genuine as well. Following this comparison, Boyd provides a "running comment upon its phrases." (p. 587). Boyd's conclusion is ". . . that this professed edict of Cyrus is historical in its contents, that it is authentic in its general form and substance, and that of the 'Jewish coloring' attributed to it, most, if not all, is due to translation into Hebrew, while the remainder, if such there be, is probably due to Jewish influence in its original composition." (p. 587).

Davis, J. D. "Persian Words and the Date of Old Testament Documents." Harper, R. F., et al. eds., *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*. 2 vols. Chicago: U. of C. Press, 1908. Vol. I, pp. 271-84.

Though published in 1908, Davis' article was apparently ready for publication before 1906.¹ The scope of this article can best be

¹"Since this article was finished for publication, a number of Persian words have come to light in Egyptian documents of the fifth century before Christ. From them the foregoing exposition has already

seen by letting the author speak for himself.

The Persian conquest under Cyrus the Great and his successors exerted an immediate influence upon the languages of the West. Persian civilization and political domination were quickly reflected in the speech of the peoples who were suddenly brought into close touch with the men from the eastern highlands. This fact is evident from contemporary literature. It is accordingly proposed in this paper to institute a comparison, and by citing the Persian words which up to the present time have been found in western documents dating from the end of the sixth century before Christ and from the fifth century, to determine, as far as possible, whether the Jewish narratives relating to this period stand on the same footing with the literature of other peoples of the time in respect to the use of Persian words, and thus to discover the date of composition with which the Persian coloring in these Jewish records is compatible.

For the purposes of this inquiry considerable material is available. There are the inscriptions in various languages prepared by command of the Persian monarchs to record the glories of their reigns, royal decrees proceeding from the same high source and the official correspondence of the provincial governors with the imperial court. From Babylonia come numerous business documents written in the Semitic dialect that was current in the busy marts of trade at the head of the Persian Gulf. Greece offers noble literary works; . . . (p. 273).

The vocabulary Davis discusses has to do with terms ". . . connected with a king in his more personal surroundings: . . ." (p. 274), official titles, terms for public business, Persian measures and Persian dress. Davis concludes from his study that ". . . the diction of the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther exhibits such traces of the Persian influence as properly belong to contemporary documents written within the bounds of the Persian empire and concerning imperial affairs." (p. 280). Although this study is not limited to, or even primarily concerned with, the ED, they are thoroughly covered, and it is therefore an important contribution to the study of the ED.

received enrichment." (p. 280, n. 3). However, specific reference to this material is not made.

Torrey, C. C. *Ezra Studies*.
Chicago: U. of C. Press, 1910.

Torrey's first major study of Ezra, *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah*,¹ is here expanded, giving his views the full and detailed explanation called for by the general and brief nature of his first work. The views are essentially the same; thus only *ES* needs to be considered in summarizing Torrey's contribution to the study of Ezra.

ES falls naturally into several distinct yet related sections of which only one concerns us here—his specific treatment of the ED, which is chapter 6. The earlier chapters deal with the two Greek recensions of the Chronicler's work—Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah—and in particular they provide a critical apparatus for the textual criticism of the Chronicler's work, the value of which is still appreciated: "After the lapse of over half a century Torrey's study still holds its place as a most important contribution to the textual problems of the Chronicler's history."² In the later chapters Torrey evaluates the Chronicler as editor and narrator, judging him to be totally untrustworthy, and concludes with an analysis of the exile and restoration as portrayed by the Chronicler—almost solely from his imagination and devoid of any reality in history.

Imbedded in the book of Ezra are what purport to be copies of a number of royal and other official communications relating to the Jews, dating from the Persian period. . . .

This is certainly a very remarkable collection of documents, especially remarkable when it is borne in mind that we are otherwise almost entirely destitute of Jewish historical traditions from the Persian period. Aside from the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, . . . and the story of Nehemiah . . . , we have scarcely even the

¹*BZAW* 2:1-65, 1896.

²Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Studies*, p. 292.

semblance of historical standing ground. (pp. 140-1).

In addition Torrey feels that we could expect a full list of the governors stationed in Jerusalem, rather than just the mention of three governors; that the succession of high priests is only recorded by the Chronicler; and that the Jewish tradition completely muddles the order of the Persian kings. "It seems quite certain, in view of all this, that no extensive written traditions of the Persian period were preserved in Jerusalem." (p. 141).

Torrey holds that the ED serve merely to enliven the narrative, following the contemporary literary custom as exemplified by the writers of the books of Kings, Maccabees, the Greek Esther, and also Thucydides and Josephus. The specific purpose in this case was to aid in the re-establishment of the supremacy of Jerusalem as the only legal site for the Jewish cult, which according to Torrey was the primary purpose of the Chronicler's history.

As far as the Aramaic section of Ezra is concerned, Torrey credits the Chronicler with the creation of the following: 7:12-26 and its context, 6:15-18 and 6:9-10. Ezra 4:8-6:14, also in Aramaic, he credits not to the Chronicler himself, but to one of his school of thought who was probably a contemporary, and which the Chronicler borrowed and inserted with only a few adjustments.

On the Aramaic of Ezra, Torrey dates it to the second or third century B.C. and considers it to be Western Aramaic. The evidence for this dating is chiefly the following: 1) the replacement of certain sibilants by their corresponding dentals, particularly τ by γ ; 2) the change of preformative η to \aleph in certain stems; 3) the change in the form of the infinitive; and 4) the occurrence of Greek words.

The many foreign names and words are further evidence to Torrey of the Chronicler's hand in the composition of Ezra. This foreign element lends "color" to the narrative and also offers subtle evidence against the purity of race (Jewish) claimed by the Samaritans by enumerating ". . . as many different nationalities as possible" (p. 173) of the enemies of the Jews, the anti-Samaritan bias supporting the position of Jerusalem.

In concluding this chapter, Torrey gives the Aramaic text with many valuable notes and his own translation.

Nöldeke, T. "Zur Frage der
Geschichtlichkeit der Urkunden
im Esra-Buch," *DLZ* 26:1849-56, 1924.

The title of this article is somewhat misleading since it is actually a review of Torrey's *Ezra Studies*, 1910. However, he does deal specifically with the ED in columns 1850-52, hence its inclusion in this review. Nöldeke begins by stating, "Ferner habe ich schon vor längerer Zeit die Unechtheit der aramäischen Briefe in Esra 5. 6. 7 erkannt." (col. 1850). This position is based entirely on the contents of the documents which to Nöldeke contain material ". . . die in einem echten Dekret undenkbar wären." (col. 1851). The material in question is the reference to the subdivisions of the Jewish clergy, tax exemptions for the same, cultic terms and expressions such as *nīhōhīn* (6:10) and *šakkēn šmēh tammāh* (6:12).

Nöldeke next takes exception to Ezra 4:11-16, 4:17-22 in "dass die Ausführung eines regulär erlassenen Dekrets des Cyrus hätte verhindert werden können, ist höchst unwahrscheinlich." (col. 1852). Nöldeke failed here, however, to note carefully the text since the documents in Ezra 4 concern the city walls, not the temple, which was the

subject of Cyrus' edict. Nöldeke's final position concerning the ED is this: "Nun macht mich aber der schon oben besprochene Schluss des Esra-briefes, der ganz die Tendenz des Chronisten und seine Ausdrucksweise hat, sehr geneigt, ihm auch die Verfasserschaft der anderen falschen Briefe zuzuschreiben, also das ganze Stück 4,8—6,18." (col. 1852).

It must be noted that Nöldeke, in this review, never once refers to any extra-Biblical evidence in discussing the question of the authenticity of the ED! His sole argument is that it is "unthinkable" or "improbable" that authentic documents would contain what he objects to.

Schaeder, H. H. *Iranische Beiträge I.*
Halle: Niemeyer Verlag, 1930.

Schaeder's treatment of the ED, as documents, is limited to those contained in Ezra 4-6 and forms but a small part of the whole work. Elsewhere he discusses מפרש as a technical term of the Achaemenid administration, relating it to the later MP *uzvārišn*:

Suchen wir von diesem wahren historischen Sachverhalt aus den technischen Begriff des *uzvārtan* bzw. *uzvārišn* zu verstehen, so werden wir zu der Vermutung gedrängt, dass hier mit 'Erklärung' eben das gemeint ist, was wir als ursprüngliche Bedeutung von *mṗāraš* festgestellt haben. Die 'Erklärung' oder 'Interpretation' bestand also darin, dass man aramäische Worte beim Lesen unmittelbar ins Persische umsetzte. Das mittelpersische *uzvārtan* kann dann nichts anderes sein als eine Lehnübersetzung eben desselben Verbalbegriffes, der in dem aramäischen *mṗāraš* enthalten ist. (p. 10).

Schaeder also discusses the linguistic and orthographic development of Imperial Aramaic and the Iranian element in Imperial Aramaic. From the former he concludes that ". . . insofern die *Einheitlichkeit des Reichs-aramäischen* deutlicher geworden und die Behauptung, die Urkunden in Esra müssten schon deswegen unecht sein, weil ihre Sprache jünger sei als die der fest ins 5. Jh. datierten EP, als unhaltbar erkannt ist." (p. 55).

While related aspects of the documents are treated throughout

these chapters, it is only in chapter 2, "Die Komposition von Esra 4—6" (pp. 14-27), that they are treated as documents. As the chapter title indicates, Schaeder's concern is the composition of Ezra 4-6, or more specifically the Aramaic section 4:(7)8-6:18. Schaeder's thesis is that the entire section makes up a single published document—that of the Tabeel mentioned in 4:7. "Die ganze Frage der Komposition von Kapitel 4 hängt an der Interpretation von v. 7 . . ." (p. 15)—and also Schaeder's thesis concerning this Aramaic section. Schaeder holds that since in v. 7 Tabeel is mentioned, in connection with others, as author of a document to Artaxerxes, and since a notice is given concerning the language and script of that document, and since a document does in fact follow, then the only logical conclusion is that the document which follows is that of Tabeel. Moreover, since what follows is not the expected introductory matter of Tabeel's letter but the beginning of another document, that of the Samaritan officials to Artaxerxes, then this document must have been part of Tabeel's.

The problem thus raised is how to comprehend a letter which contains a denunciation of the Jews by the Samaritan authorities to Artaxerxes followed by the king's unfavourable decision against the Jews and in which, further on, there is reference to the time of Darius in which documents are cited to prove similar accusations against the Jews but which were overruled by Darius on the basis of a decree of Cyrus, the founder of the empire.

Die Antwort kann nur dahin lauten, dass das Schreiben des Tab'el und seiner Kollegen eine Gegenaktion von jüdischer Seite gegen die Denunziation der Beamten von Samaria bedeutet. Es stellt eine ausführliche Denkschrift an Artaxerxes dar, die zunächst den vorangegangenen Schriftwechsel und die für die Juden ungünstige Entscheidung wörtlich resumiert, um diese dann im Hinblick auf frühere positive Entscheidungen des Kyros und Dareios als unbegründet zu erweisen. (p. 17).

Thus understood the document provided the Chronicler with three pieces of evidence for his historical work: 1) the edict of Cyrus, 2) the correspondence concerning the temple-building under Darius, and 3) the correspondence concerning the wall-building under Artaxerxes.

This source as used by the Chronicler has, for the most part, been reliably copied over, though not without some minor retouching by the Chronicler. Tabeel's document necessarily drew a moral from the documents collected, but it did not suit the Chronicler's purpose, who simply set it aside where it ends in his historical work and took up his source for the activities of Ezra.

deVaux, R. "Les Decrets de Cyrus et de Darius sur la Reconstruction du Temple," *RB* 46:29-57, 1937.¹

deVaux takes up the criticisms raised against the decrees of Cyrus and Darius recorded in the Aramaic section of Ezra 5:1-6:18. These criticisms are of two kinds: 1) historical—"it is unbelievable that the Persian court should have taken such measures in favor of Jerusalem"; and 2) literary—"the style of these documents betrays the hand of a Jewish author." (p. 64).

Concerning the historical problem the basic issue is religious, not the personal religion of the Persian kings but their religious policy towards their subjects. On the basis of numerous contemporary inscriptions such as the Cyrus Cylinder, the Nabonidus Chronicle, inscribed bricks from Uruk and Ur, the inscription of Uzaḥor, Demotic and Aramaic

¹Reprinted in *Bible et Orient*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1967; and in English as "The Decrees of Cyrus and Darius on the Rebuilding of the Temple," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Trans. by D. McHugh. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1972. pp. 63-96. The author has used the English version.

Papyri, etc. deVaux concludes that

The religious policies of the first Persian kings are sufficiently illustrated by these documents, especially in view of their diverse origins. Everywhere, whether it be in Asia Minor, Egypt, or Babylonia, they respected and even encouraged local customs so long as they did not run contrary to public order. (p. 77).

Furthermore, the religious policy of Cyrus and Darius, as known, not only does not exclude the possibility of their granting such decrees as are recorded in Ezra 5:1-6:18, but the contemporary evidence and Greek tradition ". . . are in perfect harmony with such measures." (p. 79).

Under literary problems deVaux first considers Schaefer's theory that the entire Aramaic section is taken from a letter of Tabeel. While recognizing its possibility and noting that it does solve some of the problems of this section, he raises three questions, though not considering them to be conclusive proof against the theory. First of all, the edicts of Cyrus and Darius concerned the temple while Tabeel's appeal concerned the city walls, the former being unlikely support for the building of the latter. Secondly, Nehemiah makes no mention of this appeal and evidence when he seeks permission to rebuild the city walls (Neh. 2:1-8). Thirdly, the most serious objection is that the Chronicler failed to provide ". . . the logical thread which linked the various elements together and made the whole thing intelligible." (p. 82).

Linguistically some maintain that the Aramaic of Ezra contains traits that mark it later than the Elephantine Papyri. However, referring to the works of Schaefer (see above p. 9) and Messina (*MB* 2:69-103, 1934), deVaux states, "They have effectively proved that the alleged differences between biblical Aramaic and that of Elephantine amounts [*sic*] to nothing more than a modernization of the *orthography* and the introduction of some colloquial forms but that the *language* is fundamen-

tally the same as that of the papyri." (p. 83). A similar example of such modernizing is the Gadates Inscription: "When the people of Magnesia on the Meander were recopying, under the Roman empire, the letter of Darius to Gadata, they adapted it to contemporary usage and left only a few traces of the original Ionian dialect." (p. 84). A final linguistic factor is that Aramaic was used as the official language of the Achaemenid Empire in its western provinces, though not exclusively.

A third area of objections to the authenticity of the edicts is based on an internal examination of the texts in which it is maintained that ". . . the edicts are presented in a manner which renders them suspect and that their content and style belies [*sic*] their supposed origin." (p. 88). deVaux then lists seven principal arguments which go back to the old objections of Wellhausen, Koster and Graetz and are renewed by Torrey, Batten and Holscher (p. 88, n. 96). Drawing essentially from the same sources used to refute the historical objections (see above) deVaux concludes, "The documents contained in Ezra 6, . . . are exactly in accordance with the religious policy of both Cyrus and Darius, and the form in which they have come down to us justifies the belief that we have them in almost the same condition as they were when they left the Achaemenid chancellery." (p. 94).

While maintaining the genuineness of the documents in Ezra 6, deVaux doubts that of the edict of Cyrus in Ezra 1. Noting the elements in favour of its genuineness and those against it, he passes it off as a matter "of little consequence" since it adds nothing to the edicts in Ezra 6.

Bickerman, E. J. "The Edict of Cyrus in Ezra 1," *JBL* 65:249-75, 1946.

Bickerman sets forth the problem and his proposed solution in the following manner:

There are in Ezra two ordinances of Cyrus concerning the Return from the Captivity: one in Hebrew (Ezra 1:2-4), the other in Aramaic (Ezra 6:3-5). Some scholars regard both instruments as two versions of the same royal edict; but, since a comparison of the two texts discloses very great differences, they conclude that one at least of the two ordinances cannot be authentic. Critics who accept as genuine the Aramaic transcripts of the Persian records in Ezra, except the Hebrew Edict of Cyrus, which has few defenders; and, following Torrey, some regard the Aramaic instrument as unreliable. As a matter of fact, this deductive reasoning is deceiving because it is based on a fallacy of presumption. An examination of the formulae of both documents show [*sic*] that they are not two variants of the same record but two independent records concerning the same case. (pp. 249-50).

These "two independent records" are technically two different types of documents: the Aramaic edict (Ezra 6:3-5) is a "memorandum" and the Hebrew edict (Ezra 1:2-4) is a "proclamation." Of the former Bickerman states,

This is an order in the form of an impersonal enactment. Such a minute recorded a single decision, given orally at a cabinet meeting or pursuant to a report presented for consideration. . . . the Aramaic term for it was . . . *dīarōnâ* (דכרונה, Ezra 6:2), that is "Memorandum." (p. 250).

Concerning Ezra 1:2-4, a proclamation, he says, "Oral announcement of some matter which the authority desired to make known to the population was the usual method of publication in the Ancient World." (p. 252).

The difference in the languages of the two documents is due to "this difference between official correspondence and official verbal announcement . . ." (p. 252-3).

Thus, there were (at least) two orders of Cyrus relevant to the Return from Captivity; a royal proclamation addressed to the Jews and published by the heralds everywhere in many languages, including Hebrew (Ezra 1), and on the other hand, a *Memorandum* to the royal treasurer, in Aramaic, which was not made public at this time. (p. 253).

Thus establishing the authenticity of Cyrus' edict, Bickerman then takes up a number of criticisms raised against it. The title "King of Persia," held to be anachronistic, is shown to be possible historically; and the title given to the God of the Jews is necessarily that used by the Jews themselves, as illustrated by the same practice with other peoples such as the Babylonians. The problem of v. 4 as translated, "and whoever is left . . . let the men of his place help him," is solved by referring all the pronominal suffixes to the subject of the first sentence, i.e., the returning Jew, giving this translation: "Who is there among you of all His people? . . . Let him go up to Jerusalem . . . and every one who remains, in any place where he may sojourn, let them—the men of his place—assist him . . ." (p. 260). Cyrus' designation of the Jews as גרים is considered to be very unlikely by some scholars, but Bickerman notes that "among the ancients, a resident alien and his descendants preserved his original nationality indefinitely, unless he was admitted among the citizens." (p. 261).

These mistakes of critics Bickerman considers to be ". . . subordinated to their basic error." (p. 262), which here is that they consider the edict of Cyrus to be a special favour granted only to the Jews. Rather, Bickerman shows that the edict of Cyrus is only one example of a general policy extending to all subject peoples. Furthermore, it was an act which legitimized Cyrus as the deputy of the God of Jerusalem. In this connection the criticism that Cyrus would not have acknowledged the God of the Jews and his oracles is negated by noting the numerous cases of this practice by Persian kings in Egypt and Greece cited by Herodotus.

Finally, Bickerman returns to the examination of the edict in

Ezra 1 from the diplomatic viewpoint, noting its bipartite structure. It begins with an introductory clause in the third person, just as the Behistun Inscription and other proclamations. Next is the communication proper, set in the first person of the present and in which the herald identifies himself with the giver of the message. Notice is also given that the message was given in writing, as in several other proclamations in the Old Testament. Bickerman finds no exact parallels to this edict in Mesopotamia, Egypt or Greece, but only in the Roman *edictum*.

Grosheide, H. H. "Twee Edicten van Cyrus ten Gunste van de Joden," *GTT* 54:1-12, 1954.

Grosheide begins by briefly noting the then current debate concerning the authenticity of the two documents in question—Ezra 1:2-4 (A) and 6:3-5 (B). He deals mostly with the historical aspects of the documents, and except for a few general remarks on pp. 10-11 he ignores the question of their epistolary style. Within this compass he notes numerous objections raised against the authenticity of the two edicts and marshals the evidence that supports their authenticity. He concentrates particularly on Ezra 1:2-4 because its authenticity is most questioned by scholars (pp. 1, 6-7). Grosheide concludes with a discussion of the debate over the date of the return from exile, 537 or 520 B.C., or if there even was a return from exile. He concludes that there was a return and dates it in 537 B.C. Concerning the two edicts of Cyrus, Grosheide concludes:

. . . Ezra 6:3-5 is een edict van Cyrus, dat de eerder toegestane tempelbouw te Jeruzalem nader regelt. Ezra 1:2-4 is een edict van Cyrus, dat aan de Joden verlof geeft naar hun land terug te keren en de tempel te Jeruzalem te herbouwen. Wij zullen dit edict dus hebben te dateren voor B., dat in de zomer van 538 is gegeven. Wij achten het waarschijnlijk, dat A. uitgevaardigd is, toen Cyrus nog in Babel was, dus in het voorjaar van 538. (p. 12).

Zerkavod, M "Die persischen Koenigserlasse zugunsten der Zionsrueckwanderer," *El Ha'ayin* 37:1-21, 1962.

This is a study of the legal and political implications of the documents dealt with: Ezra 1:2-4, 6:3-5, 6:6-12, and 7:12-26. Zerkavod's purpose is that "wir wollen hier den Inhalt dieser Urkunden genauer ueberpruefen nach ihrer rechtlichen und politischen Bedeutung." (p. 1). He places Ezra 1:2-4 in the context of Isaiah's prophecies of the rise and establishment of Cyrus, king of Persia (pp. 1-2). By noting the similar context and claims surrounding the Cyrus Cylinder he rightly observes, "In Wirklichkeit, allen Indizien nach, die wir besitzen, blieb Cyrus sein Leben lang ein Heide, der zu seinen Untertanen in ihrer Sprache und nach ihrem Sinne sprach, wie es in der diplomatischen Sphaere ueblich war." (p. 2). Concerning the edicts of Cyrus, Zerkavod notes that there are two themes: "Die Erlaubnis zur Rueckkehr nach Jerusalem und die Erlaubnis zum Wiederaufbau des Tempels." (p. 5). Politically Cyrus' edicts are seen as having limited significance in intention.

Man kann zusammenfassend sagen, dass der Erlass des Cyrus keine Privilegien enthaelt, die aus dem Rahmen der Tempelautonomie fallen. Die Rueckkehr aus Babylon, die fuer unser Volk eine eminente politische Bedeutung hatte, wurde offiziell als nicht mehr als eine Begleiterscheinung zum Tempelbau betrachtet.

Darius' edict, on the other hand, makes specific political concessions, granting the Jewish elders full authority concerning local matters. "Darum stellt dieses Dokument eine weitere wichtige Phase in der Entwicklung der Provinz Juda dar, die von nun an nicht nur eine religioese Koerperschaft sondern auch eine politische Einheit bildet." (p. 11).

Artaxerxes' edict is seen as going beyond those of Cyrus and Darius by granting extensive legal and political power to one man--Ezra.

. . . der Koenig den Esra unter anderem zum Tempelinspektor (Negid Bet Elohim) ernannte. Darueber hinaus gibt er als der koenigliche Gesandte mit dem Recht, seine Repraesentationsauslagen aus dem koeniglichen Schatz zu beziehen. Aber die eminente und besondere Stellung des Esra . . . wurde Esra zum obersten Richter aller Juden, die in der Satrapie Abar Nahara wohnten, ernannt und gleichzeitig festgesetzt, dass das Gesetz der Tora fuer sie koenigliches Gesetz sei, . . . (pp. 15-6)

Zerkavod sees these grants of authority being extended beyond the bounds of Judah proper, both geographically and as regards future generations of Jews.

Ben Zvi, I. "Cyrus King of Persia and His Edict to the Exiles," *Et Ha'ayin* 39:33-9, 1964.

The edict under consideration here is Ezra 1:2-4. Ben Zvi is content just to set the edict in the general context of Cyrus' similar grants to other nations. He begins by referring to Isaiah's prophecies concerning Cyrus. Then he notes the close relationship of Israel and Iran from ancient to modern times. The significance of Cyrus' edict is that it granted Israel autonomy by which the nation was able to develop politically and spiritually. This general theme is all that Ben Zvi considers and only superficially, at that.

Galling, K. "Die Proklamation des Kyros in Esra 1," *Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964. pp. 61-77.

". . . schuf der Chronist gegen Ende des 4. Jh.s in den Chronikbüchern und in dem auf verschiedenen Unterlagen beruhenden Buche Esra eine 'Heilige Geschichte Jerusalems', die mit den Tagen Davids begann und bis zum 'Kirchentag' unter Esra reichte." (p. 61). According to Galling the "Unterlagen" Ezra 1:2-4 was composed by the Chronicler in the creation of his "Heilige Geschichte Jerusalems."

That this document is in Hebrew rather than the customary Aramaic of official Persian documents has no bearing on the question of its authenticity. Rather, "die Frage der Echtheit der Proklamation kann nur an Form und Inhalt geklärt werden." (p. 67).

Concerning the form, Galling asserts that it is a "Proklamation" but argues that the Chronicler in composing Ezra 1:2-4 was only imitating the style of a "Proklamation." (pp. 71-3). However, evidence for this assertion is lacking, as is a discussion of the form of contemporary proclamations. Furthermore, he maintains that the phrase *הוא אלהים אשר* *בירושלם* in v. 3 and the required subsidies for the Jews from the Babylonians and free-will gift in v. 4 were modelled after Artaxerxes' rescript to Ezra (pp. 73, 75, & 76), which is not a proclamation!

For Galling, various phrases also reveal the hand of the Chronicler, e.g., the name Yahweh in v. 2, so that the contents also demonstrate the non-authentic nature of this proclamation. The purpose of the Chronicler in composing this proclamation was that

. . . verknüpft der Chronist--rund 200 Jahre nach der Exilswende-- Restitutionsedikt und Rückkehr der Aufgerufenen, die "im ersten Jahre des Kyros", von Stiftungen der Babylonier getragen, den Weg in die Heimat antraten. Von solcher Sicht aus formulierte der Chronist die Proklamation des Kyros. (p. 77).

Views Held Concerning the Ezra Documents

Essentially there are two views held concerning the ED: 1) that they are forgeries and therefore worthless for historical purposes, and 2) that they are authentic and therefore valuable for historical purposes. Batten observes that ". . . it does not seem possible to group the documents and formulate a single conclusion which will cover them all. They must be treated separately." (*ICC:EN*, p. 19). This has not been fully appreciated by many scholars and consequently some have sim-

ply taken them all together and rendered an evaluation on all the documents as if they were one. However, this has been a minor cause of the rejection or acceptance of the authenticity of the ED. Most scholars have recognized and accepted the principle voiced by Batten and many accept some of the documents as being authentic while holding others to be forgeries.¹

Forgeries

Wellhausen,² Torrey,³ and Pfeiffer⁴ are representative of those who regard all of the ED to be forged and worthless. Torrey gives the most thorough and succinct criticism:

Here are documents which from their wording cannot possibly be regarded as true copies of genuine originals; written in a dialect which belongs to a time much later than the one which they profess to represent; containing no facts or materials not obtainable in the Greek period, and unsupported by any tradition from the Persian period; found in the most untrustworthy of all Hebrew histories; themselves written with a manifest tendency; and finding their only close parallels in numerous writings of about the same time which are acknowledged to be inventions The theory of their authenticity, in any sense whatever, has evidently not a leg to stand on. (*ES*, pp. 156-7).

These are the arguments in general that are raised against the ED, and they have been the bulwark of this viewpoint for over a century.

On the other hand, there are some scholars who accept the authenticity of most of the ED but reject that of others. The ED most rejected by scholars is Ezra 1:2-4. The position concerning Ezra 1:2-4 is this:

¹For this reason the writer has not attempted to catalogue scholars under the views held of the ED. This may appear impressive but it hardly validates one position or the other. What this writer has found instructive has been to note whether a scholar's opinion is based on the evidence of primary sources or secondary arguments.

²Wellhausen, *NGWG*, 1895. See also his *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 7th ed., p. 155.

³Torrey, *ES*.

⁴Pfeiffer, *IOT*.

There are in Ezra two ordinances of Cyrus concerning the Return from the Captivity; one in Hebrew (Ezra 1:2-4), the other in Aramaic (Ezra 6:3-5). Some scholars regard both instruments as two versions of the same royal edict; but, since a comparison of the two texts discloses very great differences, they conclude that one at least of the two ordinances cannot be authentic. Critics who accept as genuine the Aramaic transcripts of the Persian records in Ezra, except the Hebrew Edict of Cyrus, which has few defenders; . . .¹

Meyer² and deVaux³ are representative of this position, while Batten,⁴ holding the same view of the two documents, concludes that the Hebrew version (Ezra 1:2-4) is the authentic and the Aramaic version (Ezra 6:3-5) the false.

Authentic

A problem immediately arises in attempting to assess this view of the ED. By the term *authentic*, and its synonyms, scholars do not mean verbal authenticity but substantial authenticity. As will be seen, the term *substantial* varies in meaning from one scholar to the next, for it is the case that the ED have been incorporated into a history and have been transmitted with that history, and so we do not have the original autographs as we do of the non-Biblical documents.⁵ The question naturally arises as to whether the ED have been accurately incorporated and transmitted, or whether they have been edited or changed, and if so, how much. This is the very point at which scholars disagree. The usual approach to this problem is for a scholar to state his adherence to this view in a general way and then separately take up any objections to specific details which he might have. This being the case, and considering the vagueness of many scholars on this issue, the writer has not at-

¹Bickerman, *JBL* 65:249-50, 1946. ²Meyer, *EJ*, p. 49.

³deVaux, *BANE*, pp. 94-6. ⁴Batten, *ICC:EN*, pp. 60-1.

⁵See below pp. 181ff.

tempted to sort out the various positions of those who hold to this view. It seems sufficient here simply to present the general position taken and to defer the objections to specific details in the ED to the chapter dealing with criticisms of the documents (chapter 8).

Eissfeldt gives a fairly representative statement: "Valuable historical sources are . . . to be seen in the . . . Aramaic documents in Ezra . . . at least genuine so far as their basic material is concerned."¹ Albright appears to take a clearer and stronger stand, but the reader is still left with uncertainty as to what he really means, since he does not discuss the matter: "Thanks to the Elephantine archives and to other new documents in Aramaic, combined with objective use of other ancient sources, virtually all concrete objections to the substantial (I do not say 'verbal') authenticity of the Edict of Cyrus and the Aramaic edicts in Ezra have been disproved."² That such concluding statements can be misleading is illustrated by that of E. Meyer: ". . . die Aechtheit der im Buche Ezra überlieferten aramäischen Dokumente gegen alle Einwände erwiesen, . . ."³ This statement is unqualified, but a careful reading of Meyer's book reveals that he has qualified his position by accepting the possibilities of additions and deletions (whether perceptible or not). A case in point is part of Ezra 6:12 which he considers to be a later addition (p. 51). Therefore, it is imperative that the reader be aware of the qualifications held regarding the authenticity of the ED.

¹Eissfeldt, *OTI*, p. 555. Eissfeldt did not take a position regarding the authenticity of Ezra 1:2-4.

²Albright, *Marx*, p. 64. ³Meyer, *EJ*, p. 70.

Current Consensus

The prevailing view among scholars today is that the ED are substantially authentic documents. This was the prevailing view when Torrey wrote his *Ezra Studies* in 1910, and his observation then is still valid today even though he believed that in time his own viewpoint would prevail (p. XXX):

The view prevailing among the most advanced scholars, then, for some time past, has been that these Aramaic documents are very valuable, though many have believed them to have been more or less altered from their original form by Jewish editors. Recently, however, the view has gained wide acceptance . . . that we have here true copies of the original records themselves, . . .

This increased confidence in the "genuineness" of the Ezra documents is due chiefly to E. Meyer's *Entstehung des Judenthums* (1896), . . . (pp. 143-4).¹

Weaknesses of Previous Studies

The one outstanding weakness of most discussions of the ED has been their reliance on secondary sources rather than on primary sources. This is particularly true of commentaries, introductions, histories of Israel and general studies of the Persian period, but it is also common in specific studies of the ED. While this weakness is most evident in the discussions of the style of the documents, it is also very evident in the discussions of their contents.

Discussions of Style

This feature of the ED has received the least attention of any aspect of the documents from scholars and is easily the weakest point in the study of the documents. In spite of the increasing amount of con-

¹Meyer excepts Ezra 1:2-4, attributing it to the Chronicler. Eissfeldt, *OTI*, p. 556, and Grosheide, *GTT* 54:1, 1954, also credit Meyer for the increased confidence in the ED. Cf. Widengren, *POTT*, p. 323 and n. 34.

temporary Aramaic documents that have become available since 1906,¹ there has yet to appear, to the writer's knowledge, a study of the form, or style, of official Achaemenid correspondence.² Style has generally not been given a separate and distinct place in the study of the ED. Rather, there has been a tendency to confuse form with content or at the least a failure to maintain a clear distinction between the two. For example, Driver states, "It [the Chronicler's Aramaic source] certainly appears to have been a thoroughly trustworthy document . . . , though the edicts contained in it, so far as their *form* is concerned, are open to the suspicion of having been coloured by their transmission through Jewish hands."³ But when discussing the Jewish colouring of the documents he treats their contents, not their style.

A second approach to style that illustrates this failure in the study of the ED is that made by Torrey. In a section entitled "A Literary Habit of Ancient Narrators"⁴ Torrey discusses the literary device of adding direct citations of speeches, letters, and decrees to a narrative in order to enliven it and make it more effective. Here he compares the ED with the documents in the Greek Additions to Esther which, unlike the MT, gives them ". . . verbatim and in full, with date, superscription, and all, in the same way as in the book of Ezra."⁵ Likewise the two

¹See above p. 2, n. 1.

²However, Aramaic epistolography itself is being studied and the SBL study group on ancient epistolography has compiled a preliminary *Handbook of Early Aramaic Letters*. Whitehead's unpublished thesis on Aramaic epistolography is available on microfilm. See Fitzmyer, *JBL* 93: 202, nn. 2-3, 1974. Whether the SBL project will consider Persian correspondence separately from Aramaic epistolography, though, remains to be seen.

³Driver, *LOT*, p. 549.

⁴Torrey, *ES*, pp. 145-50. ⁵*Ibid.*, p. 146.

letters of Ptolemy Philopater in III Maccabees, "both of these are in the regular epistolary form, like the letters in Ezra."¹ Further, in discussing the tendency of the documents Torrey comes to the same conclusion:

During the Greek period, . . . The Dispersion, which had assumed great proportions even in the Persian period, now threatened to put a speedy end to the national existence. . . . It is no wonder that the zealous Jews of Jerusalem did what they could to stem the tide, and to establish beyond all question the supremacy of the mother church. It was this impulse, primarily, which produced the whole "history" which the Chronicler wrote, and which gave the motive for composing these Persian documents and many others of the same kind. They are an eminently characteristic product of the Greek period.²

Now, three times Torrey compares and equates the form of the ED with the form of the documents from the Greek period but never once compares the *actual* forms or styles of the two sets of documents!³

A third failure in respect to the style of the ED has been in not distinguishing between the several types of documents in Ezra—proclamation, memorandum, letter, decree, and report. This has had most unfortunate results which is best illustrated by briefly noting a common treatment of the two edicts of Cyrus in Ezra: "There is another version of this edict [Ezra 1:2-4] in 6:3-5, claiming to be a copy of an original found at Ecbatana. The two Vrss. differ materially. . . . Both Vrss. profess to be original, but one or both must be wrong."⁴ As we have seen, Bickerman emphasized the distinction of these two (see above pp. 14-15).

¹*Ibid.*, p. 147.

²*Ibid.*, p. 153. See chapter 4 on Greek epistolary style.

³See Galling, *SGIPZ*, pp. 61-77 for a similar treatment.

⁴Batten, *ICC:EN*, p. 60.

Discussion of Contents

The emphasis of nearly all of the discussions of the ED has been placed on the contents of the documents with the question, are they historically credible? Their weakness has been in the lack of attention to, or inadequate use of, the available facts of Achaemenid history. Even so eminent an historian as E. Meyer failed occasionally in this respect as when he states, "Aber gänzlich unmöglich ist, dass Darius in einem officiellen Dokument die Fortdauer der persischen Herrschaft in Frage stellt und von Königen und Völkern redet, die in Zukunft seinen Befehl rückgängig machen könnten."¹ All scholars recognize that the ED contain Jewish religious ideas, but some have cited these as evidence against their authenticity, or at the least these expressions are considered to be spurious. "But these objections have lost their force by reason of the recognition which was originally made by Eduard Meyer and further elaborated by Schaeder, that the Persian government clearly had Jews as advisers"²

Description of this Study

Purpose.—The purpose of this study is to provide a thorough and comprehensive analysis of all seven ED with special emphasis on the style of official Achaemenid documents which they purport to be. Furthermore, it is the purpose of this study to consider all the arguments for and against the authenticity of the ED in order to test their validity against the increasing knowledge of Achaemenid rule. By thus con-

¹Meyer, *EJ*, p. 51. Darius, in his Behistun Inscription expresses the same matter. See below p. 223.

²Eissfeldt, *OTI*, p. 556. For the parallel situation with the Babylonians see Harmatta, *AA* 19:217-31, 1971.

centrating on both the actual style of official Achaemenid documents and the known policies and history of Achaemenid kings, it is intended to set the study of the ED upon a wider and more solid base than has previously been done, upon which they can be tested objectively against established historical results.

Limitations.—The primary concern of this study is the documents in the book of Ezra which emanate from the Persian chancellery. The documents in question are Ezra 1:2-4, 6:2b-5, 5:7-17, 6:2b-12, 4:11-16, 4:17-22, and 7:12-26.¹ These documents have an obvious and distinct entity which permits the investigator to lift them out of their context without danger of distorting them in any way. Their context gives us what is desired of all historical documents—a history which gives them greater meaning and understanding. Because they are contextually complete the narrative in which they are found can and will be excluded generally, since it is the documents themselves *as documents* that are being studied.

Method of Approach.—This writer adopts the principle that a document should be accepted for what it claims to be until evidence to the contrary is brought forth.² Therefore, the ED have been placed on an equal basis alongside the non-Biblical Persian documents. In regard to style, the procedure has been to take each stylistic feature and to compare its use and form in the documents. A second approach to the style of the ED has been to compare it with the style of official Greek

¹This is their chronological order. However, it is possible that 7:12-26 precedes 4:11-6 and 4:17-22, depending on whether or not the group of returnees referred to in 4:11-6 is that of Ezra and his party.

²Meyer, *EJ*, pp. 3-4.

documents since some scholars date the ED to the Greek period. It seems reasonable to assume that if the ED were written in the Greek period they would reflect Greek usage. Of particular value in this respect are the Greek Additions to Esther which contain two documents apparently written in the Greek period but attributed to 'Αρταξέρξης (MT אַחשׁוּרְשׁוּרִים)—3:13a-g, 8:12a-x.

The historical context of the ED will be discussed specifically in chapter 7. The contents of the ED will be covered throughout the study as a whole and hence will not require specific treatment. However, the contents will be discussed most fully in chapter 8 on the criticisms raised against the ED. Chapters 5 and 6 on "The Question of Persian Influence on Aramaic" and "Archives and Archive Administration" respectively will add materially to the matter of the style and contents of the ED.

The Documents Used in this Study

This study is based on thirty-nine documents which are presented and briefly described here. For each is given the king in whose reign it was written, an identifying label, its date (when known), its general contents, its language, and in the case of the non-Biblical texts the place of discovery. These are all official or semi-official documents emanating from the chancellery, government officers or community leaders.

It should be noted at the outset that there is one basic difference between the ED and the non-Biblical documents: those in Ezra are all either addressed to the king or from the king, while the non-Biblical documents are rarely correspondence to or from the king.¹

¹There are three exceptions: the Gadates Inscription, Hdt. 5. 24, and Thuc. i. 129. 3. Fort. 6764 and AP 21 are orders given in the

From the Reign of Cyrus II, 559-530 B.C.

Ezra 1:2-4.—Written in the first year of Cyrus (as king of Babylon), 539/8 B.C., it authorizes the Jews to return to Jerusalem in order to rebuild the temple. It is written in Hebrew.

Ezra 6:2b-5.—Written in the first year of Cyrus (as king of Babylon), 539/8 B.C., it orders the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple, stipulating its specifications, and orders the return of the temple utensils. It is written in Aramaic.

From the Reign of Darius I, 522-486 B.C.

Ezra 5:7-17.—It is not dated but external evidence—*Ezra 5:1-5* and *Haggai 1*—shows us that it was written in Darius' second year, 520 B.C. It is a report from Tattenai, 𐤠𐤏𐤍 of West-Euphrates, and his companions to Darius of their investigation of the renewed building of the Jerusalem temple. Because the Jewish builders cite an edict of Cyrus for their authorization to build, Tattenai requests verification and a ruling from Darius. This document is in Aramaic.

Ezra 6:2b-12.—This was written presumably in 520 or 519 B.C. as it is Darius' reply to Tattenai and his colleagues. It upheld Cyrus' authorization and added the provision of royal funding for the project, specifically providing for the costs of the cultic sacrifices. It is in Aramaic.

*Fort. 6764.*¹—It is dated in the sixteenth year of Darius,

name of the king.

¹Cameron, *JNES* 1:214-8, 1942. (For the change of tablet number from Fort. 6754, cited by Cameron, to Fort. 6764 see Hallock, *PFT*, p. 3, n. 8.)

506 B.C., by Cameron, but Hallock dates it tentatively in the nineteenth year, 503 B.C.¹ It is an order from Darius saying, "100 sheep from my estate (are) to be issued to Irtašduna the princess." Irtasduna was Darius' daughter. It is an Elamite tablet from Persepolis.

*Pherendates A.*²—It is dated to Darius' thirtieth year, 492 B.C. It is a papyrus from Pherendates, satrap of Egypt, to the Khnum-priests at Elephantine concerning the appointment of priests whose qualification for office was dependent on their meeting the requirements stipulated by an order of Darius himself. It is written in Demotic and was found at Elephantine in the temple archive.

Pherendates B.—This document is dated but the date is incomplete. However, reference in the text to the fourth month (Pharmuthi) of the thirtieth year as having passed and the fact that this document is dated to the first month (Thoth) of the 3[] year make it certain that it was written the following year, 491 B.C. It is addressed to Pherendates from the Khnum-priests of Elephantine who are reporting the changeover of "Lesonis-Priests," from Pete-Khnum to his successor whom they have chosen. It is in Demotic and was found at Elephantine in the temple archive.

Pherendates C.—It is dated in the thirty-sixth year of Darius, 486 B.C., and contains the report from an Egyptian Khnum-em-akhet to

¹Hallock, *PFT*, p. 52, n. 48. The resolution of this date in no way affects this study.

²The documents of Pherendates' correspondence, A, B, and C, were published by Spiegelberg in *SPAW* 39:604-22, 1928. (Pherendates C was first published by Spiegelberg in *Festschrift für James Loeb*. Munich: Bruckman, 1930. pp. 95-102. This festschrift was scheduled to appear before 1928.)

Pherendates concerning a shipment of grain. It is in Demotic and was found in the Fayūm, according to the dealer. However, it is unquestionably connected with Elephantine both in script and contents (see pp. 95-6 of original publication cited on p. 30, n. 2).

*PF 2071.*¹—It is not dated. The text seems to be a complaint arising from the disobedience of certain officials of the estate of Uštana. It is not clear who the document is to or from. It is written in Elamite and comes from Persepolis.

*Gadates Inscription.*²—It is not dated and is a document from Darius to a certain "Gadates" praising his agricultural endeavours but rebuking his negligence in maintaining the religious policy of the king as regards the sacred gardeners of Apollo. The document is in Greek and was found near Magnesia on the Meander. It is a Roman copy.

Herodotus 5. 24.—This document is not dated. It is a letter to Histiaeus from Darius who requests the presence of the former that he may be duly rewarded for services rendered.³ It is written in Greek.

From the Reign of Xerxes, 486-465 B.C.

*Thucydides i. 129. 3.*⁴—This document is not dated. It is from Xerxes to Pausanius, commander of the allied forces of Greece, who had

¹Hallock, *PFT*, pp. 641-2. "PF 2071, the only letter with more than one addressee, is lengthy, obscure and ill-preserved." (p. 53).

²Cousin and Deschamps, *BCH* 13:529-42, 1889.

³Herodotus, *The Histories*, 4 vols., trans. by A. D. Godley. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. Press, 1931-1963. (Loeb Classical Library)

⁴Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 4 vols., trans. by C. F. Smith. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. Press, 1935. (Loeb Classical Library) For a discussion see Clmstead, *AJSL* 49:154-61, 1935.

secretly returned to the Persian king certain of his relatives whom he had captured when freeing Byzantium from Persian control, c. 479 B.C., and who also promised to make all the Greeks vassals of the Persian king. Xerxes thanks Pausanius for his favour and offers aid to him to carry out his promise. It is written in Greek.

From the Reign of Artaxerxes I, 465-424 B.C.

Ezra 4:11-16.—This document is not dated, but if the recently returned Jews mentioned were Ezra and his group, then it will have been written some time after 458 B.C. It is an accusation made by Rehum and his colleagues against the Jews who had recently come from the king to Jerusalem and who were repairing the walls. They state that if the walls are finished the Jews will revolt. It is in Aramaic.

Ezra 4:17-22.—It is not dated but comes shortly after *Ezra 4:11-16*. It is the reply of Artaxerxes I to the accusation made by Rehum and his colleagues. The king had investigated Jerusalem's past history, as suggested by Rehum, and finding that Jerusalem had been a power to reckon with in the past, ordered the work to be stopped until further notice. It is in Aramaic.

Ezra 7:12-26.—This document is not dated but it was given to Ezra by Artaxerxes when the former returned to Jerusalem in 458 B.C. It gave Ezra permission to lead a group of his countrymen back to Jerusalem. It further granted funds, private and public, to be taken with them for the temple service and exemption from taxation for those in the service of the temple. Finally Ezra was authorized to appoint judges for the administration of the law of his God and the law of the king. It is written in Aramaic.

AP 17.—It is dated in the thirty-seventh year, 428 B.C. "It is a letter addressed to a high official (no doubt Arsames) and perhaps relates to the accounts for the collection and distribution of corn (as rations) . . ."¹ It is in Aramaic and comes from Elephantine.

From the Reign of Darius II, 423-404 B.C.

There are twenty-one documents, all in Aramaic, from the reign of Darius II. Eight of these documents are to be found in Cowley, *AP*, and the rest are the thirteen documents published by Driver, *AD*.

AP 21.—It is dated in the fifth year, 418 B.C. This is the so-called "Passover Papyrus." It is addressed to Yedoniah and his colleagues, the Jewish garrison, and is from one Hananiah from an unknown location. It contains instructions from Darius II to Arsham to keep the feast of Unleavened Bread (and perhaps the Passover).

AP 26.—It is dated in the twelfth year, 411 B.C. It is an order from Arsham to Wahprimahi to have a boat repaired.

AP 27.—It is not dated; however, the incident referred to in the document occurred in the fourteenth year, 409 B.C., the year Arsham left Egypt to see the king. It is a petition from the Jewish garrison at Elephantine to an unnamed official. They charge the priests of the god Khnub and Waidrang, the local פרתוך, with wrecking the fortress of Yeb and request an investigation and compensation.

AP 30.—It is dated in the seventeenth year, 406 B.C. It is from Yedoniah and his colleagues, the priests in Yeb, to Bigvai, the פחה

¹Cowley, *AP*, p. 53.

of Judah. They request Bigvai to influence Arsham and to send letters of recommendation so that Arsham will grant them permission to rebuild the temple which was destroyed by the priests of the god Khnub and Waidrang, the local פרחור, in the fourteenth year, 409 B.C.¹ AP 27, referring to the same trouble, may be the letter mentioned in line 18.

AP 32.—This document is not dated. It is Bigvai's reply to the petition of Yedoniah and his colleagues (AP 30). They are to speak to Arsham about rebuilding their temple.

AP 33.—It is not dated, and it is from Yedoniah and four other men from Yeb to an unnamed official relating to the rebuilding of the temple of YHW in Yeb.

AP 37.—This document is not dated. It is addressed to מראי by one whose name is missing but who refers to himself as עבדכ[ם]. "A well-written piece, but the ends of all the lines are lost, and it is difficult to establish their connexion. . . . The letter reports to the heads of the community some cause of complaint against the Egyptians, in which Arsames had given a decision. . . . It was sent to Yeb from some other place, possible Thebes (see l. 6)."²

¹See Sprengling, *AJT* 21:436, 1917. There is a duplicate of this document, AP 31. "It has been torn lengthwise down the middle, so that the ends of all the lines are missing. The writing, though not good, is better than that of no. 30, and it has fewer mistakes. In some places it helps to elucidate no. 30." (Cowley, *AP*, p. 119) Considering the nature of this petition it seems plausible that the document was copied over several times until one was satisfactory to the senders for their purpose (So Cowley, *AP*, p. 111). On the question of whether a bribe is being offered or not in lines 28-9 (and in AP 33, line 13) see Vogelstein, *JQR* 33:89-92, 1942/3.

²Cowley, *AP*, pp. 132-3.

AP 38.—It is not dated and is "a letter from Ma'uziah at Abydos to the heads of the community at Yeb, stating that he had been helped by Zeho and Hor who are now going to Yeb and deserve to be well treated."¹

AD 1-13.—The Driver documents need to be discussed collectively before being discussed individually. First of all, none of these documents are dated—this eliminates needless repetition. Secondly, their place of origin is uncertain and this matter is best handled collectively. Only four documents give any information concerning their place of origin. 1) AD 9 concerns a sculptor, a servant of Arsham, who has been brought to Susa and who will be sent to Egypt. His work, when finished, is to be brought to Susa. 2) AD 10 gives instructions from Arsham, prompted by a complaint of Warōhī, to Ḥatu-bâstī, Warōhī's officer, to collect the rent of Warōhī's estate in Egypt and to bring it and the treasure ordered by Arsham to Babylon. 3) In AD 11 ". . . Warōhī writes direct to Neḥtiḥūr, telling him that he has complained *נחנח* 'here' to 'Aršam [cf. AD 10] of his failure to dispatch his revenues to him and urging him to send them to him at Babylon, adding also an order to one of his officers to bring them personally to him at Babylon."² 4) AD 12 from a Warfish to Neḥtiḥūr mentions a letter from Arsham being delivered in Babylon to Psamshek. It is certain that Arsham was in Babylon when documents AD 10 and AD 11 were written. AD 9 indicates that Arsham is at Susa while AD 12 shows that he wasn't in Babylon—perhaps at Susa? From Elephantine two papyri, AP 27 and AP 30, state that Arsham had left Egypt to go to the king. From this information Driver concludes

. . . 'Aršam may have spent part of the three years out of Egypt at Susa and must have been for part of them at Babylon; but from which

¹*Ibid.*, p. 135. ²Driver, *AD*², p. 10.

place each individual letter may have been posted cannot be said unless the letter itself provides the necessary evidence to settle the question.

In default of evidence the rest of the letters may be presumed to have been dispatched from one or other of these places, but there is always the chance of their having come from other centres of administration where the senders may have been staying or stationed.¹

Now the documents may be described individually.

AD 1 is an instruction from Arsham to Artawont in Egypt for him to discharge certain personnel from Egypt to be sent to Arsham.

AD 2 is an instruction from Arsham to Artawont in Egypt for him to transfer a grant to Ah-ḥapi, one of Arsham's officers, made by the king and Arsham, to his son Psamshek who had succeeded him.

AD 3 is from Arsham to Artawont in Egypt giving Psamshek permission to punish certain slaves.

AD 4 is from Arsham to Armapiya in Egypt ordering him and his troops to obey Psamshek.

AD 5 is from Arsham to Artahont in Egypt requesting his help in securing the release of certain of his slaves in Egypt.²

AD 6, from Arsham to several officers in Babylonia and Syria, instructs them to provide supplies and rations for his officer Neḥtiḥūr who is travelling to Egypt

AD 7 is from Arsham to Neḥtiḥūr in Egypt concerning the care of Arsham's estate in Egypt during the current unrest in Egypt.

¹*Ibid.*, pp. 11-2. Driver disqualifies AD 1 for evidence in this matter because the reading of נבאל in the summary of contents is too uncertain (p. 10, n. 3). Two other factors indicate the eastern provenience of their origin: 1) they are written on leather instead of papyrus, and 2) they are distinctly representative of official Eastern Aramaic (Kutscher, "Aramaic," *CTL*, Vol. VI, pp. 347-412, especially pp. 361-72).

²*Ibid.*, p. 15 suggests that Artawont and Artahont are the same person.

AD 8 is from Arsham to Neḥtiḥūr in Egypt ordering him to investigate the claim of Petosiri concerning his father's farm and to restore it to Petosiri if the claim is valid.

AD 9, from Arsham to Neḥtiḥūr in Egypt, orders him to provide for Ḥinzani, his sculptor being sent from Susa, and to bring his finished work to Arsham.

AD 10, from Arsham to Neḥtiḥūr in Egypt, orders him to instruct Ḥatu-bâstī, Warōhī's officer, to collect the rent of Warōhī's estate and to bring it and the treasure ordered by Arsham to him at Babylon.

AD 11 is from Warōhī in Babylon to Neḥtiḥūr in Egypt informing him that he has complained to Arsham concerning the negligence of Ḥatu-bâstī concerning the rent of his estate and orders him to "apply pressure" on Ḥatu-bâstī to bring the rent to him at Babylon.

AD 12 is from Warfish to Neḥtiḥūr in Egypt informing him that Maspat, Warōhī's officer, has placed the following complaints against him: failure to deliver certain men to Maspat, theft of goods from the estate of Warfish, assault of his lady's staff, and theft of their property. He is to restore all stolen property or else a further complaint may bring punishment.

AD 13 is a receipt for goods received by Artahay from Neḥtiḥūr.

From the Reign of Artaxerxes II, 404-359 B.C.

BMAP 13.—It is dated only to the day and month, fifth of Epiphi, of the year in which the event mentioned in the letter occurred, which is known from other sources to be 399 B.C.

The letter may have been written at Thebes, Abydos, or even at Memphis. Its writer, however, is an Elephantine resident, Shewa b. Zekariah, who is reporting to "my lord Yislah" the significant political change that has taken place [the death (?) of Amyrtacus and the accession of Nepherites I], while at the same time

referring also to business matters.¹

From the Reign of Artaxerxes III, 359-338 B.C.

Xanthos Trilingual.—The decree was given in the first year of Artaxerxes III, 358 B.C. This inscription is inscribed in Lycian, Greek and Aramaic. The Lycian and Greek texts propose the institution of a cult for two deities. The Aramaic text is the authorization for the establishment of the cult by Pixodaros, satrap of Xanthos. It further delineates the provisions for the maintenance of the cult.²

¹Kraeling, *BMAP*, p. 283.

²Dupont-Sommer, *CRAI* 74:132-49, 1974, discusses the Aramaic text. For the Lycian and Greek texts see Metzger, pp. 82-93, and Laroche, pp. 115-25. See also Millard, *BH* 11:84-91, 1975.

CHAPTER II

TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND LEXICAL STUDY

As stated in the introduction (see above p. 26) the emphasis of this thesis is on the style and historical context of the ED. Two important areas that must be limited in scope to accommodate this emphasis are textual criticism and the lexical material, both areas being thesis topics in themselves.¹

Textual Criticism

The Hebrew text of Ezra on the whole has been preserved fairly well,² and this is particularly true of the texts of the ED judging from three printed Hebrew Bibles.³ The majority of variant readings in the texts and those given in the critical apparatuses have to do with orthography and vocalization or pronunciation. The orthography of some phonemes changed with the passage of time, and since we only have late MSS for Ezra they reflect a certain modernization in spelling.⁴ However, already in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Aramaic was undergoing a

¹On the former see Bewer, *TBE*.

²See Rudolph, *HAT:EN*, pp. xixff., and Meyers, *AB:EN*, pp. lxiiiif.

³Hooght, *BH*², Slotki, *SBB:DEN*, and Kittel, *BH*³. All variants noted are taken from these texts and their critical apparatuses.

⁴deVaux, *BANE*, p. 83. See Kitchen, *NPBD*, p. 50, for a convenient chart of the letters in question.

change in the orthography of the phoneme *d*.¹ This change is attested both at Persepolis and Elephantine, e.g., ARTP 44. 3 has both דנה and זי; and AP 30. 20, ועזנה^ד, a marginal correction or notation that suggests the assimilation of ד to ז.²

The printed Hebrew Bibles also vary in pronunciation. Examples in the ED are Ezra 4:19 where BH² has בַּקְרוּ and BH³ has בְּקָרוּ, and Ezra 6:6 where BH² has רְחִיקִין and BH³ has רַחִיקִין.

All the Masoretes, from first to last, were essentially preservers and recorders of the pronunciation of Hebrew as they heard it. If the Ben Ashers vocalized וּלְשָׁרְתוֹ, and the Ben Naphtalis וּלְשָׁרְתוֹ, then those were the pronunciations current in their circles. . . . In all these instances, one pronunciation was employed in some circles, the other in other circles; and all these pronunciations are equally traditional and correct and "masoretic," and provide no authority to anyone to exclude the one in favor of the other.³

The variants in the consonantal texts are few and with one exception are such that they do not significantly affect the meaning or understanding of the text. Here we shall treat separately the variants found in the Hebrew MSS from those suggested by the LXX MSS.⁴

Hebrew MSS

Ezra 4:12 וְשׁוּרֵי אֲשַׁכְּלִלוּ. — Qere וְשׁוּרֵי אֲשַׁכְּלִלוּ. The Qere is to be preferred since the words are obviously divided wrongly, as can be seen by their proper division in 4:13 and 16.

¹On the interchange of *d/z* in Median and OP at this same period see Gershevitch, *BSOAS* 33:83ff., 1970.

²Bowman, *ARTP*, pp. 63 and 115, and Cowley, *AP*, p. 117.

³Orlinsky, "Prolegomenon to Ginsburg," *IM-CEHB*, pp. xxxii-xxxiii. The same situation exists in English and probably most languages.

⁴See above p. 39, n. 3. For the Syriac version see Hawley, *PVE*.

Ezra 4:13 חַפְּחָא.—Baer¹ and Ginsburg² read חַפְּחָא on the basis of a number of MSS and are followed by a number of scholars.³ However, the majority of scholars and all modern printed Bibles read חַפְּחָא. The latter, strangely, do not even mention the other reading! Since there are MSS that read חַפְּחָא, and since the etymology and meaning of the word favour חַפְּחָא,⁴ the writer is inclined to favour the reading חַפְּחָא himself though realizing that this position is far from proven.

Ezra 5:17 הָיָה.—A multitude of MSS read הָיָה. The far demonstrative pronoun occurs also at 5:8 and at 4:13, 15, 16; 6:7, 8, and 12, which supports its use here. It is to be noted that the problem here is geographical—where was Tattenai when he dictated the letter, in Jerusalem or back at his chancellery? The context of the document as well as הָיָה favour the latter (see under LXX MSS).

Ezra 6:3 בִּית־אֱלֹהִים בִּירוּשָׁלַם.—A few MSS have בִּית־אֱלֹהִים after אֱלֹהִים. This phrase occurs elsewhere both with and without בִּית־אֱלֹהִים,⁵ hence it is not necessary to change the text here (see under LXX MSS).

Ezra 7:22 מֵאָה מִשַׁח מִתִּיבָה.—No MSS variants are given. There are four commodities listed here, and the order of the other three gives the commodity before the unit of measure, e.g., כֶּסֶף כִּכְרִיךְ מֵאָה. It is prob-

¹Baer, *DEN*, pp. 102-3.

²Ginsburg, *The Writings*, p. 691. Cf. Kennicott, *VTH*.

³E.g., Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 40:733, 1886, and *DLZ* 26:1852, 1924; Torrey, *ES*, p. 175; and Bewer, *TBE*, p. 53.

⁴For which see below pp. 46-9.

⁵With: 5:16, 6:12, 7:16 & 17; without: 5:17. On בִּית־אֱלֹהִים phrases see below pp. 151-2.

able then that the same order should be followed regarding the *חש*, but since the meaning of the phrase is clear, and since there are no divergent MSS, it can be accepted as original even if technically incorrect.

LXX MSS¹

Ezra 4:13 & 16 שוריה.—2 Esdras reads *τεύχη αὐτῆς (=שוריה)* at both verses. 1 Esdras 2:14 has *τα τεύχη*, and 1 Esdras 2:18, *ταύτης τεύχη*. Both readings are acceptable grammatically and contextually. That at *Ezra 4:13* some MSS have final *κ* rather than final *η* favours the reading in the Aramaic.

Ezra 4:16 _____.—1 Esdras reflects *כען* at the beginning of the verse, *νῦν οὖν*, 2:18. 2 Esdras follows the Aramaic text. *כען* is not required here, and the MT does not need emending (see pp. 96-8 on the use of *כען* in letters and Table 8, p. 135).

Ezra 5:10 ש.—2 Esdras has a plural instead of a singular, *ὀνόματα*, which seems to fit the context better than the singular. Alternatively, the singular here may be considered distributive.²

Ezra 5:14 די בכל.—This phrase occurs twice and both times 2 Esdras reads *ναδν/οῦ τοῦ βασιλέως*. 1 Esdras 6:17 has *ἐν τῇ ἑατοῦ ναῶ* for the first occurrence and *ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν Βαβυλωνί* for the second occurrence. These do not improve the text but rather show an interpretative aspect of the LXX.

Ezra 5:17 חח.—Both 2 Esdras and 1 Esdras 6:20 omit the equiv-

¹The LXX text used is Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta*.

²Rudolph, *HAT:EN*.

alent of תמה. However, this use of תמה belongs to the style of Achaemenid correspondence.¹

Ezra 5:17 ךך.—1 Esdras 6:21 reflects ךך, but 2 Esdras, ךך (see above under Hebrew MSS).

Ezra 6:3 ביהא בירושלם.—1 Esdras 6:23 inserts the equivalent of ךך after ביהא (see above under Hebrew MSS).

Ezra 6:4 ךך.—1 Esdras 6:24 agrees with the Aramaic, but 2 Esdras has εἶς (=ךך), apparently in keeping with the specification of three courses of stone. Ginsburg² considers the ך to be a mistake for ך. Architecturally, either would be suitable.³

Ezra 6:5 ךך.—Both 2 Esdras and 1 Esdras 6:25 change the second person active to the third person passive. However, this is a זכרוןה which calls for the reading in the Aramaic text (see pp. 86-8).

Ezra 6:7 ךך פח.—1 Esdras 6:26 expands to τὸν παῖδα τοῦ Κυρίου Ζοροβαβελ. Since the פח is not named in the letter, the translator took it upon himself to name him.⁴

Ezra 7:12 ךך גמ.—1 Esdras 8:9 has χάριεν (=שלם), while 2 Esdras translates literally by τετέλεσται. The meaning of ךך גמ in this context is itself uncertain.⁵

¹See below p. 162. ²Ginsburg, *IMCEHB*, pp. 293-4.

³See reference on p. 133, n. a.

⁴On the basis of *Ezra* 5:7-17 it is unlikely that Zerubbabel was governor at this time. See the commentaries, etc., on the roles of Zerubbabel and Sheshbazzar.

⁵See Rudolph, *HAT:EN*, and the discussion by Rinaldi, *Bibbia et*

Ezra 7:19 אלה ירושלם.—1 Esdras 8:17 expands this to τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ σου τοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ, which does occur frequently in the ED. Its occurrence elsewhere is probably the source of its addition here, but it does not fit here because the temple vessels are being presented *before* (קדם) "the God of Jerusalem."

Ezra 7:25 דת.—2 Esdras and 1 Esdras 8:23 both have the singular here, νόμον. This change to the singular may be due to the singular in v. 26, although דת occurs twice there.

With the exceptions of the division of שוריא שכללו, *Ezra* 4:12, and the reading of אפתם/אפתם, *Ezra* 4:13, the variant readings reflect either the tendency to hypercorrection, though inconsistently, or an insufficient knowledge of the context of the ED. To illustrate the former is the "correction" from the construct state to the יד phrase, and the latter, the epistolary character was not fully understood. It would appear from this that the LXX translators were unfamiliar with the language and epistolary character of the ED.¹

Lexical Study

Any discussion of the lexical material in the ED must take into account the fact that they were all originally composed by different writers² from different Persian chancelleries over a period of eighty years. The lexical material will be discussed under three headings: 1) loanwords, 2) synonyms, and 3) distribution. Some of the vocabulary

Oriente 3:85, 1961.

¹See further chapter 4, pp. 126ff., especially pp. 139-41 below.

²On scribal practice in letter writing see under "Subscripts," pp. 115ff.

is treated at length elsewhere and except where necessary, the reader is referred to those discussions rather than repeating them here. Also, for convenience, all of the lexical material is given in an appendix at the end of this thesis.

Loanwords

The foreign words in the ED come from one of three languages: 1) Persian, 2) Akkadian, or 3) Hebrew. The greatest number come from Akkadian, and the smallest number, from Hebrew. The origin of several of the foreign words is uncertain, e.g., אֲשֶׁרֶן may or may not be Persian, בְּלִי may or may not be Akkadian, and בְּלוּ may be Persian or Akkadian. The Persian loanwords will be treated as fully as possible because the sources and discussions are so scattered. Rosenthal's *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (pp. 58-9) briefly discusses all of the Persian loanwords, but there is no documentation. As in chapter 5 on "The Question of Persian Influence on Aramaic," the writer's aim here is to gather the sources and to provide a bibliography. The Akkadian loanwords will not need such extended treatment thanks to Kaufman's *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* which covers all of those in the ED¹ and to which the reader is referred. Likewise, the Hebrew loanwords do not require special treatment because they appear consonantally the same in both Hebrew and Aramaic, and the standard lexicons will prove sufficient for them.

Persian Loanwords

Persian loanwords occur in all of the ED except those issued during the reign of Cyrus, Ezra 1:2-4 and 6:2b-5. The former is explained by the fact that it is in Hebrew, to be read to and by Hebrew-

¹See also Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 57.

speaking people so that Persian words would not have been understood. The latter is brief and addressed directly to a non-Persian, Sheshbazzar.¹ It does, however, contain a few Persianisms (see below, pp. 167ff.). The majority of Persian loanwords are from the sphere of political and legal administration.

אֲדַרְזָא² *diligently*.—The etymology is uncertain, Rosenthal³ suggests OP **drazdā*. אֲדַרְזָא and אֲסַפְרָנָא are synonyms (see next entry and below p. 58).

אֲסַפְרָנָא⁴ *exactly, completely*.—אֲסַפְרָנָא is derived from OP **asprnā*⁵ which also occurs as a loanword in Elamite, *ušparnašpe*.⁶ אֲסַפְרָנָא is a synonym of אֲדַרְזָא (see previous entry).

אֲפַרְסָכִי⁷ *investigator*.—A title derived from OP **frasaka*.⁸

אֲפַתָּא⁹ *treasury, revenue*.—This word is beset with problems. In the first place the word itself is uncertain. Many MSS have אֲפַתָּא rather than אֲפַתָּא.¹⁰ Secondly, the etymology of the word is uncertain, whether

¹Cf. Ezra 6:5 with 5:14-5. ²Ezra 7:23.

³Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59. See Nober, *BZ NF* 1:134-8, 1957.

⁴Ezra 5:8, 6:8, 12-3, 7:17, 21 & 26. Also in AD 10. 4, and KAI 263 (=KAC 20).

⁵Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59. See Driver, *AD*, p. 76, and earlier Ellenbogen, *FWOT*, pp. 33-4.

⁶Hallock, *PFT*, p. 771. Cf. Cameron, *JNES* 17:173-4, 1958.

⁷Ezra 6:6. Also at 5:6, and compare similar titles at 4:9.

⁸Eilers, *IBKU*, pp. 5ff., and Porten, *AE*, pp. 53-4. ⁹Ezra 4:13.

¹⁰See above p. 41. See also Rudolph, *HAT:EN*, p. 58; Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 40:733, 1886; Schultze, *ZDMG* 39:47-51, 1885; Meyer, *EJ*, p. 24; Tisdall, *JQR NS* 2:369-70, 1911/12, and Hawley, *CEPE*, p. 38.

אפתם or אפתם is accepted as being correct. Thirdly, it is not certain whether the word should be taken as a substantive or as an adverb. Finally, the syntax of the phrase in which it occurs is somewhat ambiguous and it has not always been satisfactorily dealt with. The phrase is וּאִפְתָּם מַלְכִים תְּהַנְזֹק The verb is active, a hafe! impf. 3FS (or 2MS?). Meyer (*EJ*, p. 24) points out that one expects a passive or third plural.

Modern editors generally have accepted the reading אפתם. In fact, *BH*² and *BH*³ do not even give a hint of a different spelling! It is only from the commentators that this is learned, and several do prefer אפתם over אפתם (see above p. 46, n. 10). The following suggestions are made toward a solution of the problems without claiming that they are the only possible ones. The context of the phrase in question has largely been ignored, which is unfortunate, because it eliminates some of the ambiguity and provides a better basis for interpreting the word. In this document, Ezra 4:11-16, there are two very similar sentences which can be considered parallel statements, verses 13 and 16. Verse 13 sets forth the initial charge of the writers, and verse 16 summarizes or concludes the charges. Juxtaposing these two verses and then noting verse 22 of Artaxerxes' answer will clarify the issue at hand.

כען ידיע להוא למלכא די הן קריתא דך תתבנא ושוריא ישתכללון	4:13
מהודעין אנחנה למלכא די הן קריתא דך תתבנא ושוריא ישתכללון	4:16
מנדה בלו והלך לא ינתנון ואפתם מלכים תהנזק:	4:13
לקבל דנה חלק בעבר נהוא לא איתי לך:	4:16
למה ישגא חבלא להנזקת מלכין:	4:22

Now it seems clear that אפתם (4:13) is parallel with חלק (4:16) and that אפתם is used in place of מנדה בלו והלך. Thus the issue raised is that of the loss of revenue and, consequently, control over the province (cf. v. 15 in this letter and v. 20 in Artaxerxes' answer). Artaxerxes, in

his reply, sums up both points in the one word חבל "damage" (v. 22). The etymology still remains uncertain although some suggestions can be eliminated. Schultze¹ added a third possible spelling, אפתן, for which he suggested an OP *apadan*. But this can be discarded because OP *apadan* occurs in BH (Dan. 11:45) and IA in the form אפדן (see *DISO*). For אפתח Schultze suggested OP *apataram* "ferner" or *aparam* "nachher," and for the reading אפתח he suggested a modern Persian word پلوس which does not have any bearing here. Scheftelowitz,² followed by Albright,³ took אפתח from Iranian *pathma*, "treasuries." Meyer (*EJ*, p. 24) preferred the reading אפתח from Iranian *afsos*, "revenue." Tisdall⁴ suggested OP **apatauma*, "ancestor," but it does not fit the context very well. Rudolph⁵ feels אפתח should be taken as an adverb rather than as a substantive and follows Schaefer⁶ in taking it from OP **apatam-am*, "in the end, finally." Driver⁷ derived it from Akk. *appitti ma*, "suddenly." However, the Akk. word itself is of uncertain meaning. Torrey⁸ saw in אפתח a Greek word, proposing either ἐπιταξίς, "taxation," or ἐπίθεσις, "impost" (on this proposal see below p. 133). Against Rudolph the writer believes that the context is better satisfied by a substantive than by an adverb.⁹ As seen above, אפתח/אפתח is used to refer to the revenue of the province

¹Schultze, *ZDMG* 39:47-51, 1885. Schultze did not commit himself to any one of his suggested etymologies.

²Scheftelowitz, *AAT*, pp. 79-80. ³Albright, *JBL* 40:114-5, 1921.

⁴Tisdall, *JQR* NS 2:369-70, 1911/12. ⁵Rudolph, *HAT:EN*, pp. 38-9.

⁶Schaefer, *IB*, p. 74. Also accepted by Bowman, *IB*, Vol. III, p. 603.

⁷Driver, *JTS* 33:364-5, 1930/31. ⁸Torrey, *ES*, p. 175.

⁹This would eliminate the suggested Akk. etymologies and the Persian etymologies of adverbs.

due the Persian kings. The subject of the verb (תהנוק) is either קריה or, more probably, the taxes (collectively since the verb is singular), the loss of which will not only negatively affect the royal treasury but also Persian control over this part of the province (vs. 15-6). Alternatively the verb could be taken as a 2MS with the king as subject, not as an accusation but as the consequences of his failure to stop the work of the Jews. The context would be satisfied either way.

אשרן¹ *material, equipment, furnishings*.—The etymology of אשרן now seems fairly well established. While Rosenthal² hesitantly suggests OP **āčarna*, Gershevitch³ has no question about this derivation and notes that it was also borrowed in Elamite, *hazarna*. The exact meaning of אשרן also remains uncertain, although the general meaning given above has been accepted generally⁴ and seems certain in light of its occurrences in Elamite.

אשתדור⁵ *insurrection*.—Until recently this word has been taken as an infinitive of the Hithpa' 'al of שדר.⁶ Rosenthal⁷ suggests a possible OP derivation from **ā(x)šti-drauga*, "breach of peace."

¹Ezra 5:9. Also (5:3); AP 26. 5, 9, 21; 27. 18; 30. 11 & BMAP 3. 23.

²Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59.

³Gershevitch, *TPS* (1969) 170-1. So Hallock, *PFT*, p. 696.

⁴See Tuland, *JNES* 17:171-3, 1958, and Mowinckel, *ST* 19:130-5, 1965. Mowinckel stresses the point that the word refers mainly to material of wood, and rightly so. See below p. 134.

⁵Ezra 4:15, 4:19. ⁶See *BDB*, *KB*, and Rudolph, *HAT:EN*.

⁷Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59. See p. 45 where he questions the older view.

גזבר¹ *treasurer*.—This is from OP **ganzabara*² which is also borrowed in Elamite, *kanzabara*.³ The first occurrence (and only to date) of the spelling with *n* in Aramaic is in the ritual texts from Persepolis.⁴ Elsewhere it is גז/גזבר (see the lexicons).

גונז⁵ *treasures, treasury*.—גונז is derived from OP **ganza*⁶ and also occurs in Elamite, *kanzam*.⁷ The context determines the meaning.⁸

דח⁹ *law*.—דח is derived from OP *dāta*¹⁰ which also occurs in Elamite, *dattam*¹¹; Akk., *dat*¹²; and BH, דח.¹³

מלך מלכיא¹⁴ *king of kings*.—This is a loan translation of OP *xšāyadīya xšāyadīy*.¹⁵

נשתון¹⁶ *report, order, document*.—נשתון is derived from OP **ni-*

¹Ezra 7:12. גזבר in Dan. 3:2f. Also in BH at Ezra 1:8.

²Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 58. See Bowman, *ARTP*, p. 73 and pp. 28ff.

³Hallock, *PFT*, p. 708. ⁴See Bowman, *ARTP*, p. 73.

⁵Ezra 5:17, 7:20, AP 26. 4, 13, AD 10. 5. Also at Ezra 6:1 (see below p. 188, n. 3), in BH at Est. 3:9, 4:7, and at AP 69B. 3.

⁶Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 58. ⁷Hallock, *PFT*, p. 709.

⁸On its usage see below pp. 61-3.

⁹Ezra 7:12, 14, 21, 25, 26, 26, & Xanthos Trilingual, l. 19. Also in Dan. and Est., see *KB*.

¹⁰Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 58. ¹¹Hallock, *PFT*, p. 681.

¹²Olmstead, *HPE*, pp. 119-20. ¹³Ezra 8:36 and frequently in Est.

¹⁴Ezra 7:12.

¹⁵Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59. Cf. Wesendonk, *Stuđies Pavry*, pp. 488-90.

¹⁶Ezra 4:18, AP 17. 3. Also, Ezra 5:5, 4:23, and in BH at Ezra 4:7 & 7:11. It later occurs in the Asoka Inscription from Taxila (3rd.

štā-van,¹ the root of which is *stā*, "to set, stand."² "Its causative stem *nishtāya* occurs in the Achaem. Inscriptions, meaning 'to cause to stand in,' and then 'to enjoin, appoint, command.'"³ Rosenthal's (*GBA*) fuller definition "written order" is unnecessary in the light of AP 17.3, הנשחון כתיב, and Ezra 4:7, הנשחון כחוב.

פחגם⁴ *message*.—פחגם is derived from OP **pati-gāma*⁵ and also occurs in Elamite, *pattikamaš*.⁶

שרשו⁷ *corporal punishment*.—שרשו comes from OP **sraušya*.⁸

Akkadian Loanwords

Akkadian loanwords occur in all of the ED except in Ezra 1:2-4 and are mostly from the sphere of architecture and political-legal administration. See Kaufman's *The Akkadian Influence on Aramaic*⁹ for details.

century B.C.), הונשחון, the הו being a prefix meaning "good," see KAC #54 and KAI #273.

¹Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59. ²Kent, *OP*², p. 210.

³Tisdall, *JQR* NS 2:366, 1911/12 (also in *JTVI* 53:226, 1921). Cf. Kent, *OP*², p. 210.

⁴Ezra 5:11, 6:11, AD 4. 3, & 7. 9. Also at Ezra 5:7, 4:17, Dan. 3:16, 4:14, and in BH in Eccl. 8:11 and Est. 1:20.

⁵Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59.

⁶Hallock, *PFT*, p. 743. Cf. Cameron, *JNES* 17:162, 1958.

⁷Ezra 7:26 & AD 3. 6, 7.

⁸Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59, also pars. 19 and 57. Cf. Rundgren, *VT* 7:400-04, 1957.

⁹Unless otherwise noted, all Akk. etymologies are from Kaufman, *AIA*, and can be found easily enough by checking his index of North West Semitic words. Hence, only additional references will be cited.

ש¹ *foundation*.—Derived from Akk. *uššu*.²

היכל³ *temple, palace*.—Derived either from Akk. *ekaḫlu* or Sumerian *hegal* at an early date.

הלך⁴ *tax, duty*.—Derived from Akk. *ilku*, it only occurs in the combination *מנדה בלו והלך*. *מנדה* is also Akk., and *בלו*, either Akk. or Pers. (see below).

קם⁵ *raise up*.—A derived verb from Akk. *zaqīpu*, "stake," although Kaufman questions it in BA.

zaqīpu, "stake"—Syr. *zqyp'*, "cross," BT and Targ. Hagiog. *zgypt*, *zyqp'*, "stake," "gallows," Mand. *zyqp'*, "pillory," and derived verbs in the sense to "impale," "hang," or "crucify" in BA (?), CPA, Syr., BT, and Targ. Hagiog. This particular usage of this otherwise cognate root almost certainly derives from the Assyrians and their notorious practice of impalement. (*AIA*, p. 112).

Rosenthal⁶ does not include it under his discussion of Akkadian loan-words, nor is it so designated in *DISO*.

חט⁷ *meaning uncertain* (see below p. 69).—חט is possibly derived from Akk. *hātu*, "to search out." "Possibly in the meaning 'to examine' in Ezra 4:12 *yhytw*; compare the use of the Akkadian with *temennu*, 'foundation' (*CAD*, Vol. H, pp. 160b, 161a)."⁸

¹Ezra 4:12, 5:16, & 6:3.

²See Smith, *Essays Presented to Hertz*, pp. 385ff.

³Ezra 4:14, 5:14, 14, 14, 15, 6:5, 5. See "Synonyms" under חט.

⁴Ezra 4:13, 4:20, 7:24, & AD 8. 5. See *DISO* and Vattioni, *Aug.* 10:493-532, 1970.

⁵Ezra 6:11. ⁶Rosenthal, *GBA*, pp. 57-8, but cf. *KB*.

⁷Ezra 4:12.

⁸Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 55. See Driver, *JTS* 33:364, 1930/1, and

חשח¹ *need*.—Also חשחו (Ezra 7:20) derived from the Akk. root *hašāhu*, "to need."

טעט² *order, command, edict*.—טעט is cognate with Akk. *temu*, and it is only the meaning "order, decree" that is borrowed from Akk.

כנת³ *colleague*.—Derived from Akk. *kinattu*.

מנדה⁴ *tribute*.—Derived from Akk. *maddattu*. (Cf. הלך and בלו.)

נדבך⁵ *course*.—Derived from Akk. *nadbāku, nadabāku*.

נכס⁶ *property, wealth*.—Derived from Akk. *nikassu*.

טבל⁷ *carry*.—Apparently derived from Akk. *zabālu*. Rosenthal⁸ notes that this may be a šapel form of יבל.

פחה⁹ *governor*.—Derived from Akk. *pīhatu*.

Hebrew Loanwords

There are four Hebrew loanwords, all from the sphere of religion. They all occur in Aramaic in the same form as they occur in Hebrew.¹⁰ All occur in reference to the Jewish cult at Jerusalem.

Smith, *Essays Presented to Hertz*, pp. 393-5. Cf. *KB* and Rosenthal, *GBA*, par. 178.

¹Ezra 6:9. ²See *KB*. ³Ezra 4:17 & 6:6.

⁴Ezra 4:13, 4:20, 6:8 & 7:24. ⁵Ezra 6:4, 4.

⁶Ezra 6:8 & 7:26. See synonyms under נגז, p. 61.

⁷Ezra 6:3.

⁸Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 49, par. 130. On the šapel see Kaufman, *ATA*, pp. 123-4.

⁹Ezra 5:14, 6:6 & 7. See below p. 199. ¹⁰See *BDB* and *KB*.

לוי *Levite* (Ezra 7:13 & 24)

מנחה *offering* (Ezra 7:17)

ניחוח *incense* (Ezra 6:10)

נתין *Temple-servant* (Ezra 7:24)

Loanwords of Uncertain Origin

There are four words whose derivation is too uncertain to place in the categories above. בלו and בעל טעם may be Akk. or Pers., and נולו and עבר נהרה may or may not be Akk.

בלו¹ *tax*.—In the ED בלו always occurs in the combination, מנדה בלו. Since הלך and מנדה are well-known Akk. words (see above), בלו is usually considered to be derived from Akk. *biltu*.²

It should be noted, however, that the three terms never occur together in Akkadian. Although *biltu* and *maddattu* are common together in NA, the BA group seems to be a reflex of the threefold list of Persian taxes represented in LB by the forms *ilku*, *bāru*, and *nadi/anātu*, the middle term being a loanword from Old Persian **bhara*. It is thus conceivable that *blw* is a corruption of the latter term rather than Akk. *biltu*.³

בעל טעם *chancellor, bureaucrat*.—This title is attributed to both Old Persian and Akkadian. בעל טעם has also been considered to be a military term and thus has been equated with OP *framatar*.⁴ However, the activity of Rehum is not military in nature nor is that of Anani, the בעל טעם of AP 26.⁵ More recently the title has been connected with OP

¹Ezra 4:13, 4:20 & 7:24. Possibly Padua 2. 3, and Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris* II pp. 238-9.

²Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 58, and *KB*.

³Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 44. See also Eilers, *OLZ* 37:96, 1934.

⁴Scheftelowitz, *AAT*, Vol. I, p. 64; *BDB*, p. 1085.

⁵See Driver, *AD*², p. 18, for the possible connection between

**framānakara* which Schaefer has recognized from its use in AP 26 to be a bureaucratic title rather than a military title.¹ However, Porten shows that this connection is unlikely, also on the basis of AP 26, where the chancellor is writing to an Egyptian official concerning actions taken by the **framānakara*, a title rendered in Aramaic as פִּרְמָנָכָרְיָא (ll. 4 and 8).² Alternatively, Akkadian *bēl tēmi* is considered to be the source of Aramaic בַּעַל טַעַם.³ This has been questioned by Kaufman who translates בַּעַל טַעַם as "commander" and states, "The expression *bēl tēmi* does occur in Akkadian . . . , but it refers to someone who delivers orders as an intermediary, not to someone who makes them."⁴ However, "commander" is not a satisfactory interpretation of the Aramaic title, as seen above; a chancellor was in such a position that he was both an intermediary and one who made orders, depending on the ranks of those with whom he was dealing. In summary, בַּעַל טַעַם is more likely to have been borrowed from

this title and the phrase יָדַע טַעַמָּא זָנָה. Cf. Segert, *Ar.Or.* 24:396, 1956, and Porten, *AE*, pp. 55-6. The latter also points out that the offices of chancellor and scribe could be held by the same individual.

¹Schaefer, *IB*, p. 67. Bowman, *IB*, Vol. III, pp. 599-600, following Herzfeld, *ZW*, Vol. I, p. 171, equates בַּעַל טַעַם with OP **farman-kara*, apparently an older, or different, vocalization of **framānakara*. See particularly the following note.

²Porten, *AE*, p. 56, n. 108. See also Bowman, *AJSL* 58:302-13, 1941. The title occurs here at 302 A, l. ". . . their function in the shipbuilding papyrus [AP 26] was that of ordnance officers who inspected equipment and ordered repairs." (p. 306). In Elamite **framānakara* appears as *pirramanakurraš* and means "foreman" (Hallock, *PFT*, p. 744. Cf. Cameron, *PTT*, p. 43.).

³Schaefer, *IB*, p. 67. Cf. Bowman, *IB*, Vol. III, pp. 599-600. Both scholars consider Akkadian to be its source and at the same time to be equivalent of OP **framānakara*.

⁴Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 109, n. 390. He considers *šakin tēmi* to be the Neo-Assyrian equivalent of BA בַּעַל טַעַם.

Akkadian than from Old Persian.¹ Regardless of its origin, the title designates a high government official, a "bureaucrat" who was attached to the courts of satraps and governors.²

𐎠𐎢𐎡³ *ruins, refuse-heap*.—𐎠𐎢𐎡 is of uncertain origin. Rosenthal⁴ says that Akk. may be the source but does not offer an etymology. Rudolph⁵ bases his translation, "Trümmerhaufen" (heap of ruins) on Akk. *nawālu*, "zerstören," but this word is not in the Akkadian dictionary (see *CAD* and *AHW*). Alternatively he suggests that Aramaic 𐤍𐤏𐤍 would give a similar meaning "Misthaufen" (manure-pile). Kaufman⁶ lists *nwł* in his index of North West Semitic words but does not include BA 𐎠𐎢𐎡 in his discussion of Akk. *nālu*, *niālu*. Torrey,⁷ following the LXX renderings,⁸ considered it to be "Syro-Palestinian" 𐤍𐤏𐤍, corresponding to Arabic *nw/ył*, "to take, obtain." In the same year Nöldeke⁹ compared the Syriac *nawwel* with Arabic *nw/ył* in discussing the Talmudic word 𐤍𐤏𐤍.

¹However, on the analogy of OP *xšaçaṣpavan* which was rendered in Aramaic both by transliteration 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍, and a second term, 𐤍𐤏𐤍; the same could hold true for OP **framānakara*. See p. 199 below.

²A parallel title is found at Mari, *bēl tērtim*, "bureaucrat." A document quoted by Sasson reads in part: "If a bureaucrat does not give orders for a few days, would the position not be neglected?" (*Iraq* 34: 62-3, 1972). See ARM i. 61. 29.

³Ezra 6:11. Also in Dan. 2:5 & 3:29.

⁴Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59. Cf. *BDB* and *KB*.

⁵Rudolph, *HAT:EN*, p. 58. ⁶Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 75.

⁷Torrey, *ES*, p. 85, n. 25. Cf. *ZA* 26:81, 1912.

⁸1E 6:31: τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ εἶναι βασιλικά. 2E 6:11: ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πουηθήσεται. Cf. the LXX at Dan. 2:5 & 3:29.

⁹Nöldeke, *NBSS*, p. 216. Torrey accepted this and went further to repeat his connection of BA 𐎠𐎢𐎡 with "Syro-Palestinian" 𐤍𐤏𐤍. See *ZA* 26:81, 1912. Cf. Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 75, n. 226.

This suggestion would give the meaning "confiscate." While the LXX translator(s) undoubtedly interpreted נולו in this way, the Aramaic text as it stands does not lend itself to this interpretation, since a piece of wood was to be taken from the house, upon which the owner was to be impaled. However, this is not an insurmountable objection and the interpretation "confiscation" is plausible.

עבר נהרה *West-Euphrates*.--Kosenthal¹ takes this as a loan translation from Akkadian *eber nāri*. von Soden, however, has the opposite view, that it is ". . . ein babylonisiertes reichsaram. 'āḇar nahrā, . . ." ² Kaufman³ appears to agree with von Soden since the term is not included in his study.

Synonyms

The primary concern here will be the use of synonyms in the ED themselves. Occurrences of these synonyms in the narrative contexts of the ED and in other Imperial Aramaic texts will be noted. It is important to keep in mind the diversity of the ED, both in authorship and in time of composition (see above p. 44). This in itself accounts for most of the use of synonyms, as few of these synonyms were used by the same writers.

אדין: כען, כענת, כעת.—All these synonyms are discussed elsewhere⁴ and it will suffice here to note their synonymous usage. All these words are used as introductory terms in correspondence and to mark changes of the subject. אחר is used similarly in non-Biblical texts

¹Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 58. ²von Soden, *Or* 35:8, 1966.

³Kaufman, *AIA*. ⁴אדין, p. 144; כען, etc., pp. 96-8.

(see below pp. 144-5).

אדרזדא: אספרן.—This pair of synonyms are Persian loanwords (see above p. 46) and do not occur frequently in the published Aramaic texts. אדרזדא occurs only once, Ezra 7:23. אספרן occurs nine times, seven times in the ED¹ and twice in non-Biblical texts.² אדרזדא is used in the same context as אספרן in its five occurrences meaning "diligently."³ In three passages it means "full, total,"⁴ and in Ezra 7:17 it means "exactly," or "solely" (*NEB*).

חסין, an Aramaic synonym, occurs only in AD 4. 3, and 7. 2, 4, 6 & 9, and has the same kind of context as the OP synonyms. We observe that these synonyms occur very frequently with the verb in the Hithpa''al.⁵

אזל: אתה, הלך, סלק.—All these synonyms are intransitive verbs of motion.⁶ They all refer to the movement of people, in particular the Jews in groups⁷ or individual officials.⁸ אזל in Ezra 5:8 refers to Tattenai's inspection trip to the province of Judah; in Ezra 5:15 it refers to Cyrus' order to Sheshbazzar "to go" to Jerusalem in an official

¹Ezra 5:8; 6:8, 12, 13; 7:17, 21 & 26.

²AD 10. 4, KAI #263 (Abydos lion weight).

³Ezra 5:8; 6:12, 13; 7:12 & 26.

⁴Ezra 6:8, AD 10. 4, and KAI #263.

⁵The synonyms are connected with the Hithp. as follows: אדרזדא, Ezra 7:23; אספרן, Ezra 5:8, 6:8, 12, & 7:21; חסין, AD 4. 3, & 7. 9.

⁶אזל "go" Ezra 5:8 & 15

אתה "come" Ezra 4:12 Ezra 5:16

הלך "go" Ezra 6:5, 7:13 & 13

סלק "go/come up" Ezra 4:12

⁷Ezra 4:12, 12, & 7:13, 13.

⁸Ezra 5:8, 15, 16, & 6:5.

capacity, as reported by the Jews. אָתָּה in Ezra 4:12 refers to a group of Jews who had come up from the king and "had come" to Jerusalem; in Ezra 5:16 it refers to Sheshbazzar's arrival in Jerusalem. הָלַךְ is also used of both an individual and of a group of people: in Ezra 6:5 Sheshbazzar is ordered to "go" to Jerusalem, a direct order of Cyrus (see below pp. 86-8); in Ezra 7:13 it is used twice by Artaxerxes in granting the Jews permission to "go" to Jerusalem with Ezra. סָלַק in Ezra 4:12 refers to a group of Jews who have "come up" from Artaxerxes. Each word occurs in a distinct point of reference: אָזַל and הָלַךְ mean "to go" away from--to, with אָזַל providing the perfect and imperative and הָלַךְ the imperfect; אָתָּה means "to come" to—away from; סָלַק means "to ascend."

אָנַשׁ: גִּבּוּר.—Both words mean "man." אָנַשׁ is used of the men of West-Euphrates, Ezra 4:11, and of men generally, Ezra 6:11.¹ גִּבּוּר, on the other hand, refers specifically and only to Jews (Ezra 4:21, 5:10, & 6:8). However, outside of the Jewish context of the ED, גִּבּוּר is used in Imperial Aramaic in the same general sense of אָנַשׁ. For example, it occurs as a gloss on Elamite tablets for *kurtaš*, "workers"² and for men generally at Elephantine as in AP 13. 8, 11, etc.

אֲסוּר: גִּלְהָ, מוֹת, עֲנַשׁ, שְׂרָשִׁי.—All these words refer to political sentences meted out for disobedience to the king. All but גִּלְהָ occur only in Ezra 7:26. גִּלְהָ occurs in Ezra 5:12 in reference to Nebuchadnezzar having taken Judah into "exile" to Babylon. Since all of the other terms occur together, they will be given in the order in which they oc-

¹אָנַשׁ in Ezra 1:4 (Hebrew) may thus be considered to include non-Jews as well as Jews. Just as אָנַשׁ in 4:11 & 6:8 may include Jews as well as non-Jews.

²Hallock, *PFT*, p. 717.

cur. The entire verse is quoted here in order to provide the context:
 וכל-די-לא-להוא-עבד-דתא-די-אלהך-ודתא-די-מלכא-אספרנא-דינה-להוא-מתעבד-מנה-הן
 :למות-הן-לשרשו-הן-לענש-נכסין-ולאסורין:
 שרשי (death), (corporal punishment—a Persian word, see p. 51), ענש (fine), and אסור
 (imprisonment). While death is the severest sentence, the severity of
 other sentences is subject to a considerable range and therefore may or
 may not reflect any particular order.

אשתדור: מרד.—אשתדור occurs first in the letter of Rehum and
 his colleagues who report to Artaxerxes that in the past Jerusalem has
 been a powerful city and that she has been guilty of "rebellion" (Ezra
 4:15). Its second occurrence (Ezra 4:19) is in Artaxerxes' reply in
 which he repeats the information because it had been verified in the ar-
 chives.¹ Artaxerxes' reply, however, adds a synonym to מרד—אשתדור. If
 Rosenthal is correct in suggesting that אשתדור is an OP loanword (see
 p. 49), then the addition of מרד may be a gloss. But this is unlikely
 since Rehum and his colleagues had used אשתדור themselves. It probably
 reflects the exaggeration of Rehum's letter and was added to emphasize
 the charge in Artaxerxes' answer.

היכל: ביה.—These two words are used synonymously in two dif-
 ferent meanings: 1) "temple" and 2) "palace."² In their meaning "tem-
 ple," two temples are referred to in the ED—the Jerusalem temple and

¹On the practice of quoting or repeating information in Persian
 correspondence, see below pp. 101ff.

²ביה also occurs with the meanings: "treasury," גנזיא-די-מלכא,
 Ezra 5:17 & 7:20; and "private house," Ezra 6:11.

the temple of Babylon. בית always refers to the Jerusalem temple,¹ and היכל, to both.² בית usually occurs in the construct with a qualifying noun, here אלה (God), but where it stands alone the context makes its meaning clear. היכל, on the other hand, usually stands alone where it is qualified by a relative clause giving the geographical locality of the temple referred to. Twice it occurs in the genitive (Ezra 5:14) referring to the temple of Babylon—היכלא די בבבל.

In the meaning "palace" each word occurs once. In Ezra 6:4 בית מלכא is a reference to Cyrus' palace, and in Ezra 4:14 היכל refers to Artaxerxes' palace. However, in neither instance is the palace to be understood literally. In Ezra 6:4 it is the source of funds for the building of the temple--:ונפקתא מן-בית מלכא תחיהב:.³ In Ezra 4:14 Rehum and his colleagues are pledging their loyalty to the king--:כען-כל-קבל די-מלח היכלא מלחנא.

להן.--These two co-ordinating conjunctions meaning "but" occur only once in the ED.⁴ ברם is rare,⁵ while להן is fairly common in Imperial Aramaic. להן is used frequently to introduce a new subject.⁶

גנז.—גנז, "treasury, treasure," is a Persian loanword

¹Ezra 5:8-9, 11-7; 6:3. 5; 6:7, 8, 12; 7:16, 17, 19, 20, 23 & 24.

²Jerusalem: Ezra 5:14, 15; 6:5. Babylon: Ezra 5:14.

³However, it can not be ruled out that the palace housed the treasury.

⁴ברם, Ezra 5:13; להן, Ezra 5:12.

⁵It occurs four times in Daniel (see *KB*) and once elsewhere (see *DISO*).

⁶See *DISO*.

(see above p. 50) occurring twice in the ED,¹ three times in BH,² and five times in other Imperial Aramaic texts.³ AD 10. 5 is the only occurrence of גנז in the sense of "treasure" and the only case in which it overlaps with נכס in meaning. 1 Chr. 28:11 refers to the "storerooms" or "treasuries" of the Jerusalem temple. All of the other occurrences of גנז refer to the royal or state "treasuries."⁴ While גנז can stand alone to mean (royal) "treasury," as in AP 26. 4, 13, it more frequently is in a genitive construction with מלך: most fully בית גנזיא די מלכא (Ezra 5:17, cf. 7:20), and simply גנזי המלך (Est. 3:9, 4:7).

נכס, "goods, possessions, wealth" is an Akk. loanword (see above p. 53) occurring twice in the ED, Ezra 6:8 & 7:26, five times in BH (see *KB*), and forty-four times in other Imperial Aramaic texts (see *DISO*). The wide meaning of נכס is seen in Josh. 22:8 where it includes מקנה, כסף, נחשת, זהב, כסף, ברזל, שלמות taken as spoils of war. In Ezra 7:26 נכס is in construct with ענש, "fine," one of the punishments listed there (see above pp. 59f.). In Ezra 6:8 it occurs in the phrase נכסי מלכא and may well mean "royal treasury" since it includes the מדה עבר תורה. On the other hand, it may mean no more than "royal funds." One occurrence of נכס outside the ED deserves special mention. There is an Aramaic fragment of DB I. 65, in which נכס is used to include three different OP words. The Old Persian reads, *abicariš : gaiθāmcā : maniyamcā . . .*, "the pastures and the herds, the household slaves . . ." ⁵ In the light of Josh. 22:8 and the fact that the Aramaic version is throughout much

¹Ezra 5:17 & 7:20. ²Est. 3:9, 4:7, 1 Chr. 28:11 (גנזר).

³Ezra 6:1, AP 26. 4 & 13, 69B, and AD 10. 5.

⁴AP 69B is too fragmentary to determine its use of גנז.

⁵Kent, *OP*², pp. 118 and 120.

shorter than the Old Persian version, it seems more likely that נכס includes all three OP words rather than being an exact equivalent of one—*maniya*—as suggested by Gray.¹

Ezra 1:2-4, a Hebrew proclamation, uses רכוש, "possessions, goods," where נכס could have been used.²

דין: שפט.—Both verbs occur only in Ezra 7:25 and as participles meaning "judges." Since the noun דין, "judge," also occurs in this verse it is best to consider the whole verse: ואת עזרא כחכמת אלהך די ואת בני מני שפטין ודינין די להון דאנין לכל עמה די בעבר נהרה לכל ידעי דתי : בידך מני שפטין ודינין די להון דאנין לכל עמה די בעבר נהרה לכל ידעי דתי : אלהך ודי לא ידע תהודעון: 1 Esdras 8:23 reads "judges" in both places, κριτὰς καὶ δουλκαστάς, but 2 Esdras 7:25 reads γραμματεῦς (scribes) καὶ κριτὰς. Batten is certainly correct in saying, "It is hard to say whether Ⓔ is right or merely trying to avoid a tautology, since the two Aram. words both mean *judges* and cannot be distinguished."³ It is noteworthy that both דינין and שפטין are included in דאנין in Ezra 7:25. The situation at Elephantine is equally ambiguous.

Uncertainty also remains regarding the difference, if any, between "judges," "royal judges," and "judges of the province." The "judges" may simply have been the "royal judges" "appointed in the province of Tshetres" (cf. C 27:9), for when reference was made to the head of a court, the person bore a Persian name—Damidata—indicating royal appointment. According to Herodotus, the "royal judges" were "picked men" who had life tenure, . . . In practice, the king

¹Gray, *JAOS* 33:282, 1913. Gray sought to define *maniya* on the basis of נכס in the Aramaic version. Fortunately, the meaning of *kurtaš*, "worker," the El. translation of *maniya* here, is now known and נכס/*maniya* cannot now be equated. See Hallock, *PFT*, p. 717, and Gershevitch, *AM NS* 2:139-42, 1951.

²Ezra 1:2-4 does not contain any loanwords. It served as a propaganda piece to gain the favour of the Jews, hence the "purity" of the language.

³Batten, *ICC:EN*, p. 316. Cf. Rudolph, *HAT:EN*, p. 75, and North, *Volterra Festschrift*, p. 385.

would delegate the power of appointment. Ezra, for example, was authorized by Artaxerxes to appoint judges for the Jews in Trans-Euphrates, applying both Torah law and "the law of the king" (Ez. 7:25f).¹

דכרון: דכרון, כתב, נשתון, ספר.—These synonyms all refer to instruments for the recording of, or the sending of, written communications. דכרון (and דכרון)² means "memorandum" in the ED and in other official Imperial Aramaic texts. It occurs alone referring to a single "memorandum" as in AP 32. 1, and it occurs with other terms referring to collections of "memoranda" as in Ezra 6:2 where it heads a document found in a מגלה and in Ezra 4:15 in the phrase, בספר דכרוניא. The collections of "memoranda" constitute archives, for which see chapter 6, pp. 170ff. Other meanings of דכרון (דכרון) will be found in the lexicons but they do not apply here. כתב occurs only in Ezra 7:22 of the ED in the sense of "prescription," literally "writing." Elsewhere during this period כתב means "document"³ as at Esther 8:8, 13. נשתון means "document" (see above p. 50) and always occurs in the context of official writings.⁴ ספר in its one occurrence in the ED, Ezra 4:15, means "book." Elsewhere in IA and in BH it means "letter," "document," or "deed."⁵

Three other synonyms from the narrative context of the ED are relevant here since they are used to describe them. אגרה, "letter," is

¹Porten, *AE*, p. 49. Cf. the appointment of priests illustrated by Pher. A and B (see p. 30 above).

²See below pp. 86-8.

³See Lewy, *HUCA* 25:175, n. 24, 1954. Cf. *DISO*.

⁴Ezra 4:18, AP 17. 3, and Ezra 4:7, 23, 5:5, 7:11. See pp. 92f.

⁵See *KB* and *DISO* and Millard, *Iraq* 34:137, 1972.

the most common Aramaic word for "letter" in IA;¹ מגלה, "roll," occurs in Ezra 6:2 wherein was contained Ezra 6:2b-5, a דכרוֹן; פרשגן, "copy," occurs frequently to distinguish between original documents and copies.²

זקף: נשא.—זקף, literally "raise up,"³ occurs only in Ezra 6:11. It is possibly an Akk. loanword bearing the meaning "impale."⁴ נשא, on the other hand, is the common Aramaic word for "lift up, raise."⁵

חבל: חרב, מגר, נזק, סתר.—These words are not exact synonyms, but they all are verbs denoting "destruction, injury." חבל, חרב and סתר occur in three different documents in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. חבל occurs in Ezra 6:12 in Darius' curse against anyone who would "destroy" the Jerusalem temple. חרב occurs in Ezra 4:15 where Rehum and his colleagues give the reason for Jerusalem having "been laid waste" in times past. סתר occurs on the lips of the Jews who explain to Tattenai why their temple had been "demolished" by Nebuchadnezzar, Ezra 5:12.

The two remaining synonyms refer to the "injury" of people. מגר is used by Darius in his curse when he calls on the God of Jerusalem to "overthrow" any king or people who would alter his edict in order to destroy the Jerusalem temple, Ezra 6:12. נזק occurs in the exchange of letters between Rehum and his colleagues and Artaxerxes. Rehum asserts that Jerusalem had "damaged" kings and provinces in the past, and that if the city is rebuilt, kings (מלכים) will again "be injured," Ezra 4:13

¹See below pp. 85-6.

²See below pp. 181ff.

³Its literal meaning "raise up" is attested by its two occurrences in BH: Ps. 145:14, 146:8; see Rudolph, *HAT:EN*, p. 58. It occurs in this sense also in Pahlavi, see *DISO*.

⁴See above p. 52.

⁵In the ED at Ezra 4:19 & 5:15.

and 15. Artaxerxes' reply instructs Rehum and his colleagues to take precautions that will prevent injury to kings (מלכין), Ezra 4:22.

חבל: נוולו.—These synonyms are nominal counterparts to some of the above verbs denoting "destruction, injury." חבל occurs in Ezra 4:22 referring to the possible "damage" that might cause injury to kings (מלכין). נוולו occurs in Darius' curse (Ezra 6:11) against anyone who would attempt to destroy the Jerusalem temple. It calls for that person's house to be made a "ruins" for such desecration.¹

טעם: פתגם, מאמר.—These synonyms occur in the ED with the meanings "message, order, edict." טעם, "order, edict," occurs most frequently² and usually occurs with שים in the phrase, "issue an order."³ מאמר, "order," occurs only once, Ezra 6:9, in reference to the needs expressed by the Jerusalem priests for their cultic services.⁴ פתגם, "message, report,"⁵ is also used in the sense of "order" in Ezra 4:17 and is parallel with טעם in Ezra 6:6-12 (see pp. 93 f).

להב: נתן.—These synonyms for "give" are distinguished by their occurrences in separate forms. להב supplies the perfect and imperative forms, and נתן supplies the imperfect and infinitive forms.⁶ נתן is always used in the sense of "to pay,"⁷ while להב is used in its literal

¹Cf. 2K 10:27, and see above, pp. 56f.

²Ezra 4:19, 21, 5:9, 13, 17, 6:3, 6:8, 11, 12, 7:12, 21, 23; also at 5:5 & 6:1. See *DISO* for occurrences in other IA texts.

³See below, pp. 88 ff. ⁴Cf. מאמר in Est. 1:15.

⁵Ezra 4:17, 5:11, 6:11; also 5:7.

⁶Rosenthal, *GBA*, pp. 118, 129. Cf. *KB*.

⁷Ezra 4:13, 7:20, 20.

sense, "to give,"¹ and also in the sense of "to pay."² On the problem of the phrase, *להב אשיא*, in Ezra 5:16 see pp. 153, 70, and 218f. below.

לחב: *שכך*.—These are common Semitic words with the meaning "to dwell." *לחב* developed this meaning from its literal meaning "to sit" (see *KB*). Each word occurs only once in the ED, *שכך* in Ezra 6:12 referring to God causing his name "to dwell" at Jerusalem (cf. BMAP 12. 2 and pp. 214 and 222 below). *לחב* occurs in Ezra 4:17 referring to local officials "dwelling" in Samaria (cf. Ezra 4:10).

כתל: *שור*.—Neither of these synonyms for "wall" are common words. In the ED *כתל*³ occurs only at Ezra 5:8, and *שור*,⁴ only at Ezra 4:12, 13 & 16. Against *KB*, Kaufman⁵ considers *כתל* to be a native Aramaic word. *כתל* also appears to be more a technical term than a general word for wall like *שור*.

The *kutlaiya*, in which the pebbles and beams were placed, is generally translated "wall;" but in Daniél v, 5, it is used of the core of the wall and apparently excludes the plaster. So in Ezra v, 8, also, it means a core of mud or mud brick; then the pebbles and beams are facing. The wording of the Aramaic text clearly indicates that the *kutlaiya* was distinct from, not made of, the wood and stones.⁶

עלם: *קדמה*.—These two synonyms are used to denote distant past time. *עלם* occurs twice in the phrase *מן יומת עלם*⁷ in reference to the military and political power of Jerusalem. *קדמה* occurs in the phrase

¹Ezra 5:12, 14, 6:9, 7:19. ²Ezra 4:20, 6:4, 6:8.

³Elsewhere: Dan. 5:5, Cant. 2:9, and once in Palmyrene, see *DISO*.

⁴Elsewhere: AP 27. 5, 6, and four times in BH, see *KB*.

⁵Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 65. ⁶Smith, *PEQ* 65:8, 1941.

⁷Ezra 4:15, 4:19. Its occurrence in Ezra 4:19 is a repetition from Ezra 4:15.

מקדמת דנה שנין שגיאן, Ezra 5:11, in reference to the time when the Jerusalem temple was first built.

רב: שגיא, תקיף.—These synonyms have the common meaning, "great, greatness." רב occurs in reference to the "great" God at Jerusalem, Ezra 5:8, and of a "great" king (unnamed) of Jerusalem, Ezra 5:11.¹ שגיא² refers to "many" years in Ezra 5:11. תקיף refers to "mighty, powerful" kings who have ruled over Jerusalem, Ezra 4:20.

שכלל: שלם.—These two synonyms mean "to finish, complete." In the ED both are used in reference to building activities in every case but one.³ שכלל is used in reference to the city walls, Ezra 4:12, 13, 16; in reference to building materials (אשרן), Ezra 5:9;⁴ and in reference to the Jerusalem temple, Ezra 5:11.⁵ שלם refers to the completion of the Jerusalem temple, Ezra 5:16. Now Ezra 5:11-6 is a reported statement of the Jews, and we find that they use both words in the same contexts. There is no apparent reason for the use of synonyms rather than the use of the same word.⁶

בלו: הלך, מנדה.—These three words for taxes are not truly syn-

¹The context clearly implies Solomon.

²The verb שגא also occurs in the ED—Ezra 4:22.

³שלם in Ezra 7:19 is used idiomatically in the phrase ומאניא ושלם קדם אלה ירושלם:

⁴The phrase in which it occurs here is used almost verbatim by the editor of the book at 5:3. On אשרן see above p. 49.

⁵Also at Ezra 6:14.

⁶On the form of שכלל and the question of its origin see Rosenthal, *GBA*, and Kaufman, *AIA*, pp. 104, 123-4.

onymous, but they always occur together in the ED¹ except at Ezra 6:8 where מנדה occurs alone. They are all also foreign loanwords (see above). The same three words occur in Late Babylonian in reference to the threefold list of Persian taxes,² and this may well be the case here. Meyer makes the following distinctions: "Da מנדה sicher der Geldtribut . . . , הלך "Wegsteuer" oder "Zoll" ist, kann בלו nur die Naturalabgabe sein."³

בנה: חוט, יהב, סבל.—This final group of words is added here at the end because, while not strictly synonymous, they are usually translated as if they were, and the situation of these words needs clarification. In the first place, the meaning of some of these words is still uncertain. However, because they are related around the central idea of building, they will be discussed here for the sake of completeness and to clarify some of the problems.

בנה, "to build," is not a problem; its meaning and use are clear. It is the basic word around which the others are related. בנה is also a key word in the ED because one of the primary issues of the documents is the rebuilding of the temple and city walls of Jerusalem.⁴

חוט is of uncertain origin and meaning as evidenced by the refusal of *KB* to commit itself to any of the suggested etymologies and meanings. Meanings suggested include "join together" > "repair," "lay,"

¹Ezra 4:13, 4:20 & 7:24. ²Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 44.

³Meyer, *EJ*, p. 24. See Henning, *Or.* 4:291-3, 1935.

⁴Ezra 5:7-17, 6:2b-5, & 6:6-12 deal with the building of the temple and Ezra 4:12-6 & 4:17-22 deal with the building of the city walls. Thus five of the seven ED have to do primarily with building.

and "inspect."¹ Any one of these would suit the passage, Ezra 4:12, but there is insufficient evidence to settle the matter.

יָהַב, "to give" has created a problem at Ezra 5:16 where it has usually been translated "to lay a foundation." This use of יָהַב is not attested elsewhere,² and a more probable meaning is closer at hand. Elsewhere in the ED יָהַב is used in the sense of "to pay, furnish, provide" (see above, p. 66). יָהַב in Ezra 5:16 is used in this sense of "provide, authorize" in the same way that נָתַן is used of Solomon "giving" the temple, as recorded in 1K 6:6.³

סָבַל, "to carry" occurs in Ezra 6:3 in reference to the foundations of the temple. *KB* suggests "preserve" the foundations, while Rosenthal (*GBA*) suggests "laid" the foundations. The etymology of the word and its meaning, though, still remain uncertain.⁴

That the four words are related around the central idea of "building" is certain. Beyond that, however, uncertainty remains. Therefore, caution must be exercised in interpreting the latter three words until further evidence is brought forward.

Distribution

Here the statistics from appendix 2 will be summarized. There the following items are given in clear graphic form: 1) the Aramaic and

¹See *KB*, p. 1074 for references. Note also Smith, *Essays Presented to Hertz*, pp. 393-4; and Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 55, which in 1974 still expresses uncertainty in the matter. See above, p. 52.

²Gelston, *VT* 16:234, 1966.

³See Andersen, *ABR* 6:12-3, 1958. The inconsistent rendering of the two similar phrases occurs in the *NEB*, *JB*, *ZB*, *NASB* and *RSV*.

⁴So Rosenthal, *GBA*, par. 130, and Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 111. See above, p. 53.

Hebrew words, 2) their English equivalents, 3) their distribution in the ED, 4) notation of foreign words, 5) areas from which some of the vocabulary comes, and 6) additional material in notes at the end of the appendix. The distribution of the total vocabulary throughout the ED is most easily and clearly illustrated in table form. The length of the documents, measured in lines,¹ is added here to make the statistics more complete.

TABLE 1
LEXICAL DISTRIBUTION IN THE EZRA DOCUMENTS

Document	# of Lines	# of Vocabulary ^a	Approx. % of Total Vocabulary
1:2-4	6.5	43	16
6:2b-5	7	44	16
5:7-17	22	99	37.5
6:6-12	14	79	30
4:11-16	12	62	23.5
4:17-22	8	59	22.5
7:12-26	26.5	112	42.5

^aRepetition of words within each document is not counted.

Next to consider is the distribution of the vocabulary among the categories (n. a, above, will continue to apply) considered to be of significance. These will be discussed in the order in which they are noted in appendix 2.

*Loanwords.*²—Altogether there are thirty-two loanwords, or about 12% of the total vocabulary.³ The Persian loanwords occur in all of the

¹Based on BH³.

²See pp. 45 above. On Persianisms see below pp. 167ff.

³PLW—13 or *ca.* 5%, ALW—15 or *ca.* 5.5%, HLW—4 or *ca.* 1.5%.

ED except Ezra 1:2-4 and 6:2b-5 (see above pp. 45-6); the Akkadian loanwords occur in all of the ED except in Ezra 1:2-4; and the Hebrew loanwords occur only in Ezra 6:6-12 and 7:12-26. The Persian loanwords are mainly from the political-legal realm and epistolary terms. Akkadian loanwords are mainly from the political-legal and architectural spheres. The Hebrew loanwords are all religious terms.

Proper names.—There are twenty-one proper names or about 8% of the total vocabulary. Of these, thirteen are personal names (about 5% of the total vocabulary) and eight are geographical names (about 3% of the total vocabulary). Six of the names are Persian, all personal names except one, פֶּרֶס. The other fifteen names are Semitic, mostly Hebrew, with some being Akkadian.

Epistolary terms.—There are fourteen epistolary terms or about 5% of the total vocabulary. They are fairly evenly distributed throughout the ED except in Ezra 1:2-4 (none) and Ezra 6:2b-5 (one). These are mainly terms that classify the documents or are part of the stylistic features of Achaemenid correspondence.¹

Political-legal terms.—There are twenty-five political-legal terms, about 10% of the total vocabulary. They are fairly evenly distributed throughout the ED. About one-third of these terms are official titles; the rest pertain to the administration of the provinces and of the royal law.

*Religious terms.*²—There are twenty-seven religious terms, about

¹See chapter 3, pp. 74ff.

²This category includes not only religious technical terms, but

10% of the total vocabulary. Most of these terms are concentrated in Ezra 6:6-12 and 7:12-26, both of which deal extensively with the cultic service in Jerusalem.

Architectural terms.—There are ten architectural terms or about 3.5% of the total vocabulary. These terms are concentrated in Ezra 6:2b-5 and 5:7-17, which are concerned in detail with the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple. About one-third of these terms are Akkadian loanwords.

Economic terms.—There are six economic terms, about 2% of the total vocabulary. Half of these terms are words for "tax."

Weights and measures.—There are four terms denoting weights and measures or about 1.5% of the total vocabulary. Except מנא in Ezra 6:2b-5, these all occur only in Ezra 7:12-26 and are measures of capacity.

also general words used in a strictly religious sense in the ED, e.g., the commodities used in the cultic service.

CHAPTER III

THE STYLE OF THE DOCUMENTS

In order to determine the style of these documents the writer has charted them according to the specific features they contain. Previous studies of the ED have not dealt thoroughly with their style, especially as they compare with contemporary non-Biblical documents.¹ In fact, the only thorough treatment of the style of the ED has been that of Bickerman, although it is limited to only two of them.²

It is the purpose of this chapter to present the results of a comparison of all relevant documents available with regard to their specific stylistic features in order to establish the pattern(s) of their style. To the writer's knowledge this is the first comprehensive study of the style of the ED or even of official Achaemenid correspondence.

Personal Address

In discussing AP 21 Porten has succinctly summed up the matter of personal addresses in the Aramaic documents of the Persian chancellery thus:

. . . "To my brothers . . . your brother" is an address between companions or equals. Contrast the address of a subordinate to a superior, "To Artaxerxes the king: your servants, the men of the Trans-Euphrates" (Ez. 4:11), "To our lord Bagohi, governor of Judah: your servants Jedaniah and his colleagues" (C 30:1//31:1); or of a superior to a subordinate, "From Arsames to Wahprimahî" (C 26:1).³

¹See pp. 23-5. ²Bickerman, *JBL* 65:249-75, 1946 (See pp. 14-6).

³Porten, *AE*, p. 311.

While this is a very accurate description, it only applies in general, because as with other elements of style, there are several variations from the usual forms. However, Porten's description will serve advantageously as a framework from within which to present the personal addresses of the documents in this study.

Personal address between companions or equals.—The personal address in this case refers to both the addressor and the addressee as אָח, "brother," and the only example among the documents in this study is AP 21. Here Hananiah is conveying a message of Darius II to Yedoniah and his colleagues at Elephantine.¹

Personal address of a subordinate to a superior.—The usual personal address here is "to X (name and/or title) from Y (name) your servant."² In this category of correspondents variations in the form of the personal address exist which show that this element of epistolary style was not standardized. Other forms are לְדַרְיוֹשׁ מֶלֶכָא with no mention of the addressor (Ezra 5:7-17); עֲבָדִיךָ (followed by five names) with no mention of the addressee (AP 33); ". . . the priests of the great Khnum . . . to Pherendates, to whom Egypt is entrusted." (Pherendates B); "Khnum-em-Akhet . . . to (his lordship) Pherendates." (Pherendates C).

Personal address of a superior to a subordinate.—The most frequent form of the personal address here is simply "from X to Y." However, the documents in this category fall into two distinct groups—

¹Cf. Cowley, AP 40-42 for this form of address in private letters. E.g., Y אָחוּךְ X אָחִי, AP 40.

²So Ezra 4:11-16, AP 30, 37, 38. On AP 38 see below, p. 82. AP 17 is fragmentary, but Cowley has restored the address thus: אָל] עֲבָדִיךָ [אַרְשָׁ] [מֵרְאוֹן] (the names of the "servants" follow).

those from officials and those from kings—and their practice differs accordingly. The documents from officials do not include titles, either of the addressor or of the addressee, while the documents from kings do include the titles both of the addressor and of the addressee. Thus all of Arsham's correspondence (and of his associates) begins, $\text{Y } \text{על } \text{X } \text{ן}$,¹ whereas Ezra 7:12-26 begins, $\text{ארתחשטתא מלך מלכיא לעזרא כהנא ספר דתא די}$,² Ezra 4:17-22 only mentions the addressee, which is probably due to the editor of the book. The Elamite tablets from Persepolis usually employ the opening formula ". . . '(To) PN speak, PN₂ spoke the saying."³ This is the formula found in earlier Elamite documents as well.⁴ This formula is either a parallel development to that found in Babylonia or a borrowing from it. "The earliest regular form of letter introduction in Babylonia, 'Thus says X, to Y speak', implies . . . a conveying of orders, which began with an oral message sent by a personal messenger."⁵

In summary, it has been shown that while there is a definite form of personal address used by each category of correspondents, the only uniformity is that found in the documents of a single official's office—here Arsham, satrap of Egypt—whereas variations are found among different officials. Thus it can be concluded that this aspect of the

¹AP 26, AD 1-13. See Driver's comments, *AD*², pp. 41-2. The Xanthos Trilingual lacks the $\text{Y } \text{על } \text{X } \text{ן}$, but it is not addressed to an individual.

²Similarly: Gadates Insc.— $\text{βασιλευς βασιλέων Δαρειδος ὁ Ὑστίασπεω Γαδάται δοῦλω}$; Thucydides i. 129. 3— $\text{βασιλευς Ξερξης Πανσανύα}$. Pherendates A (and B) reads "Pherendates, to whom Egypt has been entrusted, . . ." but this is not a title, though perhaps a substitute. An exception is Hdt. 5. 24, where Darius' title is given but not the title of Histiaeus.

³Hallock, *PFT*, p. 50. ⁴*Ibid.* ⁵Waterman, *RCAE*, Vol. 4, p. 4.

epistolary style, as others, did not become rigidly standardized.

Salutation

Two factors appear to determine the presence or absence of a salutation in the documents: 1) the relative official position of the correspondents and 2) the nature of the subject raised in the document. As regards the form taken by the salutations, the second consideration (2) appears to have more influence than the first (1). These are the two most significant factors, although without the complete historical contexts of the documents the possibility of other factors cannot be ruled out entirely. The documents are nearly evenly divided between those with salutations (15) and those without (22).¹ For convenience, the relevant information will be set forth in three tables.

From Table 2 it can be seen that, with but two exceptions (Ezra 4:11-16 and AP 33), the documents without salutations are from superiors to subordinates, and materially they are nearly all commands. From this it can be concluded that officials when issuing orders to subordinates usually omit a salutation. However, there are several documents which are orders from superiors to subordinates which do include a salutation (see Table 3), and so it is to be noted that the correspondents of the documents without salutations are mostly from very high offices—the king or a satrap—while the recipients are comparatively minor officials.² Thus there are two basic reasons for the absence of a saluta-

¹AP 27 is missing lines at the beginning which may have had a salutation and so must be dismissed in this discussion. Ezra 7:12-26 is doubtful in this respect because of the uncertainty of the meaning of גמיר (see above p. 43, n. 5).

²Though Ezra 4:17-22 fits this category it does include a salutation, but note its brevity: שלם.

TABLE 2

DOCUMENTS WITHOUT A SALUTATION

Document	Addressor	Addressee	Nature of Document
Ezra 1:2-4	King	. . .	Decree
Ezra 6:2b-5	King	. . .	Decree
Ezra 6:6-12	King	הנה	Decree
Fort. 6764	?	Cattle Chief	Order
Pherendates A	Satrap	Priests	Order
PF 2071	?	?	Order
Gadates Insc.	King	δούλω	Reprimand
Herodotus 5. 24	King	Ruler of Miletus	Summons
Thuc. i. 129. 3	King	Spartan Commander	. . .
AP 26	Satrap	?	Order
AP 32	הנה	Community Leaders	. . .
AD 4	Satrap	?	Order
AD 6	Satrap	פקיד	Order
AD 7	Satrap	פקיד	Order
AD 8	Satrap	פקיד	Order
AD 9	Satrap	פקיד	Order
AD 10	Satrap	פקיד	Order
AD 11	בר גיתא	פקיד	Order
AD 12	?	פקיד	Order & Reprimand
Ezra 4:11-16	בעל טעם	King	Report
AP 33	עבד	מרא	Petition
Xanthos Trilingual	Satrap	Citizens of Orna	Decree

TABLE 3

DOCUMENTS WITH A SALUTATION

Document	Addressor	Addressee	Nature of Document
From Superior to Subordinate			
Ezra 4:17-22	King	בעל טעם	Order
AD 1	Satrap	?	Orders
AD 2	Satrap	?	Orders
AD 3	Satrap	?	Orders
AD 5	Satrap	?	Orders
AD 13	?	פקיד	Commendation
From Subordinate to Superior			
Ezra 5:7-17	פחה	King	Report
Pherendates B	Priests	Satrap	Report
Pherendates C	?	Satrap	Report/Request
AP 17	עבד	Satrap?	Report
AP 30	Community Leaders	פחה	Petition
Relationship of Correspondents Uncertain			
AP 21	אח	אח	Order from the King
AP 37	עבד	מרא	Complaint
AP 38	עבד	מרא	Letter of Recommendation
BMAP 13	עבד	מרא	Report

TABLE 4

SALUTATION FORMULAS

Document	Salutation
From Superior to Subordinate	
Ezra 4:17-22	שלם
AD 1	שלם [] שלם תמה קדמיר []
AD 2	שלם ושררת שגיא []
AD 3	שלם ושררת שגיא הושרת לך ^a
AD 5	שלם ושררת שגיא הושרת ל[ך] וכעת בזנה קדמי שלח אף תמה קדמ[י]ך שלם יהוי
AD 13	שלם ושררת שגיא הושרת לך
From Subordinate to Superior	
Ezra 5:7-17	שלמא כלא
Pherendates B	"We bless Pherendates before Khnum, the great god. May Khnum prolong his life."
Pherendates C	"May Phrê prolong his life."
AP 17	שלם מראן אלהיא [ב] כל עדן
AP 30	שלם מראן אלה שמיא ישאל שגיא בכל עדן ולרחמן ישימנך קדם דריוהוש מלכא ובני ביתא יתיר מן זי כען חד אלף וחין אריכון ינתן לך וחדה ושריר הוי בכל עדן
Relationship of Correspondents Uncertain	
AP 21	שלם אחי אלהיא []
AP 37	[] ישאלו בכל עדן
AP 38	שלם מרא[י] ו[] לרחמן תהוו קדם אלה שמיא
BMAP 13	שלם מראי אלהיא כלא [] שגיא בכל עדן

^aDriver suggests a Persian origin for this greeting formula, AD², p. 44. See below p. 160.

tion in these documents: the distance between the positions of the correspondents and the dictatorial nature of the documents.¹

The documents with a salutation are evenly divided between those from superiors to subordinates and those from subordinates to superiors. The documents from subordinates need only to be considered to be following the universal practice of properly greeting one's superior.² On the other hand, the presence of a salutation in the documents from a superior seems to reflect a deference to an official who, though a subordinate, has some influence or power that needs to be reckoned with, or simply politeness. This can be seen more clearly in the formulas of salutations, and the whole matter of the presence of salutations can be more fruitfully discussed in connection with the actual examples.

As can be seen from Table 4, there is no uniform formula that can be considered to be standard, but rather there is a basic formula upon which others were built, suitable to a given situation. In the Aramaic documents שלם is the only element common to all of the salutations, in one case being the entire salutation (Ezra 4:17-22), and from it two general formulas developed. At Elephantine the general formula is אלה שמיא/אלהיא ישאל/ישאלו שגיא בכל ערן (title) שלם (in the AP and

¹Regarding the two exceptions (Ezra 4:11-16, AP 33) the writer has been unable to determine any specific reasons for the omission of salutations, although in the case of Ezra 4:11-16 it may reflect the weakness of Artaxerxes I who was easily influenced and badgered by courtiers and officials, or more probably, it may be due to the editor's treatment of this document.

²Compare the Elamite tablets written by subordinates to superiors which use the greeting formula, "May god and king become your širi!" See Hallock, *PFT*, p. 757. Širi appears to carry the same connotations as the Semitic שלם; see Gershevitch, *TPS* (1969), p. 183. See also Hinz, *Or.* 39:435, 1970, for a discussion of this greeting formula.

BMAP documents).¹ In the AD documents (from Babylon and Susa? see above pp. 35-6) the formula varies in two ways: 1) the divine benevolence is not invoked and 2) the title of the addressee is not given.

The formulas range from the simple ܡܠܫ of Ezra 4:17-22 to the very lengthy one of AP 30 (see Table 4) with a wide variety in between. Four of the documents with salutations are simply reports from subordinates to superiors and use, more or less, just the general formula noted in the previous paragraph. Ezra 5:7-17 from the ܡܢܗ of Judah to Darius simply uses the phrase ܫܠܡܐ ܟܠܐ . The other two documents from subordinates to superiors are not reports, but requests, and the formulas of their salutations are significantly more polite. AP 38 is "a letter from Ma'uziah at Abydos to the heads of the community at Yeb, stating that he had been helped by Zeho and Hor who are now going to Yeb and deserve to be well treated."² The tone of the letter is such that the reader gets the impression that Ma'uziah is an equal of the addressees, even though he addresses them as ܡܪܝܐ and refers to himself as their ܥܒܪ . Indeed, in AP 37, Ma'uziah is addressed, with these same men he addresses in AP 38, as ܡܪܝܐ by one who refers to himself as their ܥܒܪ ! This leads to the conclusion that the more-than-sufficient greeting in AP 38 is due not primarily to the positions of the correspondents, but more to the nature of the subject raised, namely, a request for a favour. Even more illustrative of this point is the request in AP 30 from Yedoniah, leader of the community at Elephantine, and his colleagues to

¹The salutations of Pherendates B and C express the same sentiments. See Table 4, p. 80. It is also to be noted that many of the salutations in the Aramaic documents are incomplete due to their fragmentary condition.

²Cowley, *AP*, p. 135.

Bagoas, בגואס of Judah. "Bagoas, however, has apparently no official function, as far as this case is concerned. He is one of several men in high position who are merely asked to use their influence in favor of the Jews; anyhow, it is neither in his power nor within his duties to decide the controversy."¹ Such a request naturally calls for the utmost courtesy and diplomacy, and it is not only the salutation that expresses this, but the whole letter which is obviously written with this in mind.²

It is particularly instructive to compare the two groups of documents from Arsham. As seen (above) in his documents addressed to his officers (לְקַדְשָׁי) he does not show any deference to them and omits salutations (AD 4, 6-10, and AP 26). However, when he

. . . notifies 'Artawont of a concession or asks him to authorize it or else . . . asks him to see that an order is carried out; the tone is perhaps that rather of a request than of a command, courteous if peremptory. . . . A similar style is adopted by 'Aršam in addressing 'Artahont; and the form of his request is softened by adding הֵן עָלַיךְ כֹּחַ . . .³

Fortunately much of the historical situation is known. Arsham had left Egypt to go to the king, and as a result certain Egyptians had rebelled (AP 27). It is in this situation that Arsham corresponds with his subordinates in order to administer his estate and affairs in Egypt. In this correspondence he obviously considers some of his officials to be

¹Vogelstein, *JQR* 33:90, 1942/3. Note the precatory tone of his answer (AP 32) and that it is not an "order" as Cowley states (nor is Bagoas superior to Arsham as he also states) *AP*, p. 123. See also Sprengling, *AJT* 21:436, 1917.

²Not as Kraeling suggests, *BMAP*, p. 287, "Polite phrases should be shorter here [*BMAP* 13] than in AP 30, for Yislah is no Bagoas!" If it were simply or primarily the rank of the addressee that brought forth lengthy salutations the satraps and kings should have received the greatest ones, but since they do not it is seen that this factor is secondary. Cf. Porten, *AE*, p. 48.

³Driver, *AD*², p. 15. Documents AD 1-3, & 5.

of no great import and so summarily issues them orders, while others obviously enjoy a greater position and consequently are addressed courteously. The deference shown to the latter, however, as noted earlier, cannot be attributed simply to their position. A fourth factor is introduced in connection with the correspondence of Arsham: the geographical distance between the correspondents: ". . . for it was one thing for the king to give such an order, but quite another matter to get the satrap of a distant province to carry it out."¹ In our case it is only the satrap issuing orders, and since some Egyptians were rebelling during his absence, he necessarily needed to be careful in his correspondence and give respect where due.

In conclusion it can be said that the presence or absence of a salutation depends primarily on two factors: 1) the relative positions of the correspondents and 2) the nature of the subject of the document. The formula used in a given document depends primarily on the same two factors but in reverse order. Other factors also played a part, such as the personal character of the correspondents, the geographical distance between them, and the particular historical situation.

Terms Used for the Classification of the Documents

The classifications discussed in this section are the specific terms used in the documents themselves which speak of the type of document each is.² The documents differ in this feature in two ways: 1) not all of them have a specifying term, and 2) some of the documents have

¹Batten, *ICC:EN*, p. 146.

²The writer of Ezra uses descriptive terms in reference to his documents but these will be discussed separately. See below pp. 181ff.

more than one term. This second point occurs in two ways: 1) a document uses two terms to designate itself, as in Ezra 6:6-12; or 2) a document uses one term of itself, but another document referring to it uses another term, as Cyrus', Ezra 6:2b-5, referred to by that of Tattenai, Ezra 5:7-17. The terms used are אגרה, דכרן, טעם, גשחון, and פתגם.¹

Each term will be discussed according to the following outline: A) Biblical examples, B) Non-Biblical examples, C) Comments, and D) Summary.

אגרה

A) *Biblical examples.*—None.

B) *Non-Biblical examples.*—BMAP 13 closes with the statement, [א] 5 לאפף כתיב אגרה ז. אגרה means "letter," and Shewa, the writer of this one, is sending it to Yislah to inform him of the recent accession of a new king and also to discuss some business matters. In the body of his letter Shewa used the term אגרה in the phrase [רתיל] אג. The restoration of [רתיל] אג is certain since the same phrase occurs in the only other text in which the author uses אגרה to specify it: כזי אגרה, "When this letter reaches you" (AP 42. 7).² This letter, which is in very poor condition, appears to be a business letter.

C) *Comments.*—That an אגרה was an instrument for correspondence can be seen in the common phrase of the two letters in (B) above, using מטא, and in the fact that over half of the occurrences of the term אגרה in the Bible and in the Aramaic texts occur in connection with the verb

¹See chapter 2 for additional treatments of these terms.

²Cf. AP 38. 10, "He said to me: Send a letter first(?)." Presumably AP 38 is the letter and the term is אגרת.

שלח, "send."¹ The contents and subject matters of these letters vary considerably.

D) *Summary*.—There are only two documents which are designated by the term אגרה; both are papyri from Elephantine. אגרה was an instrument for correspondence.

ז/דכרון

A) *Biblical examples*.—The document of Cyrus cited in Ezra 6:2b-5 was in a מגלה found in מדינתה די במדי כבירתא after an unsuccessful search in the גנזיא די ספריא די גנזיא at Babylon.² The document opens with the word דכרונה, i.e., "memorandum."

This is an order in the form of an impersonal enactment. Such a minute recorded a single decision, given orally at a cabinet meeting or pursuant to a report presented for consideration. Accordingly, the record was put down on a separate piece of writing material and being a separate piece in the file had its own heading.³

Technically, Ezra 6:2b-5 is a formal document consisting of four dis-

¹2 Chr. 30:1, 6; Ezra 4:11; 5:6; Neh. 6:5, 19; AP 30. 7, 18, 19, 24, 29; 38. 10; 40. 3; AD 10. 2. In the documents being studied, "letter" is the only meaning and use of the term אגרה. However, in other documents it has the meaning "deed, document, or contract," for which see Jean-Hoftijzer, *DISO*, p. 4. אגרה is found in Akkadian as *egertu* and is also used to denote both a "letter" and a "deed, document, or contract," though the latter usage is rare. For discussions of Akkadian *egertu* see A. R. Millard, *Iraq* 34:137, 1972, and references cited there.

²Ezra 6:1-2. In the document prompting this search (Ezra 5:7-17) request was made to search in the מלכא די גנזיא די מלכא at Babylon. Apparently Tattenai was not sure of the exact location of the document and so referred to it generally, while the author of Ezra recorded the precise place that was searched. deVaux, *BANE*, p. 89. (See Junge, *Klio*. 33:30, 1940, for a discussion of archives being kept in the treasury.)

³Bickerman, *JBL* 65:250, 1946. Perhaps it is possible that the original of this document being a מגלה served as a duplicate for a clay tablet. There is evidence for this practice at Persepolis though it is insufficient to more than suggest the possibility. See Cameron, *PTT*, pp. 26ff, and *JNES* 17:163, 1958. Also see Bickerman, *Aeg.* 13:353, 1933, and Meyer, *EJ*, pp. 47-8.

tinct parts: 1) heading—דכרונה, 2) date—בשנת חדה לכורש מלכא, 3) summary—כורש מלכא שם טעם בית אלהא בירושלם, and 4) text. There are no other דכרן recorded in the Bible, but there are several references made concerning them. One is in the document of Rehum (Ezra 4:11-16, v. 15) where he and his colleagues suggest to Artaxerxes I that he make a search בספר דכרניא די אבהונך concerning Jerusalem. In Esther 6:1 we read בלילה ההוא נדדה שנת המלך ויאמר להביא את ספר הזכרנות דברי הימים ויהיו נקראים לפני המלך: In the ספר הזכרנות דברי הימים we are told (v. 2) what one of the entries was—that Mordecai, upon hearing of a plot of two of the king's guards to assassinate him, revealed the plot to the king.¹ Two other possible (or probable) references to "memoranda" are 1) Exodus 17:14 where יהוה commands Moses to כתב זאת זכרון בספר ושים ביהוה; and 2) Malachi 3:16 uses the phrase ויכתב ספר זכרון לפניו, the subject being יהוה. But זכרון here may be a more general use of the word signifying "memorial, remembrance," etc., as the translations show.

B) Non-Biblical examples.—The only comparable Aramaic text fitting the description of a זכרון given by Bickerman is AP 32. Its opening word is זכרון, just as Ezra 6:2b-5, and is the reply of Bagoas to the petition of Yedoniah and his colleagues who had requested his influence in their gaining permission to rebuild the temple of יהו at Elephantine (AP 30). Four Elephantine papyri recording lists or inventories use זכרון as a heading.² In one, AP 63. 10-12, זכרון is followed by על plus a name. The same construction is found in an Aramaic journal page: לזכרון

¹Cf. Esther 2:22-3. For the Persian practice of recording benefactors of the king see Hdt., vii. 100; viii. 85. 90. 91.

²Cowley, *AP*, Nos. 61, 62, 63, & 68.

[על בגפר [ן ב/ר] פר אתה בבית ספינתא ל[ם] "for a memorandum concerning Bagaphernes son of He went into the boathouse to [inspect a boat?]."¹

C) Comments.—In both Cyrus' document and Bagoas' the recipient received the order directly and personally. Cyrus' order ends by saying אלהא ותחת בביתו, "and *you* shall deposit [them] in the house of God" (Ezra 6:5, italics mine). Bagoas' reply begins זכרון זל בגוהי ודליה אמרו לי זכרון, "Memorandum of Bagoas and Delaiah. They said to me, Memorandum:" (AP 32. 1-2). The first זכרון is the formal heading of the document, and the second זכרון was used by Bagoas and Delaiah to begin their dictation —אמרו לי זכרון.²

D) Summary.—זכרון in our texts means "memorandum," and from the examples we have it can be seen that there are two kinds or uses of זכרון: 1) a heading for a list, inventory or record of business conducted, and 2) a heading for an order initiating or recording administrative action.³

טעם

A) Biblical examples.—The term טעם in the texts under consideration means "command, order, or decree." Ezra 6:2b-5, in addition to its designation זכרונה, is called a טעם three times. The first time is

¹Bowman, *AJSL* 58:302-13, 1941 (p. 303, B. 4). Cowley considered this construction to be unusual (*AP*, p. 168). This more complete passage not only gives another example of it, it also demonstrates its use. It seems that the construction is used when referring to an action done by the person named when recording it.

²Cf. Driver, *AD*², p. 92 and n. 1. (Against Cowley's translation, *AP*, pp. 222-3.)

³It should be noted that זכרון in *AJSL* 58:302f. (p. 303, B. 4) does not "initiate" administrative action as stated by Bickerman (*JBL* 65:250-1) but rather records what has been done.

in the document itself: כורש מלכא שם טעם: (v. 3). The other two references to Ezra 6:2b-5 as a טעם are in the document of Tattenai, נחה of West-Euphrates, to Darius which prompted the investigation resulting in the discovery of Cyrus' טעם. Tattenai had requested from the Jewish leaders who were rebuilding the Jerusalem temple their authorization (טעם) for the project. Their answer was בשנת וודה לכורש מלכא די בבבל: כורש מלכא שם טעם ביה אלהא דנה לבנא: Tattenai then requested of Darius an investigation of the archives to confirm whether or not Cyrus actually did issue such a טעם. The content of Ezra 6:2b-5 is a טעם, while its form is a דכרונה (see above).

Darius issued a טעם to have the archives searched for a טעם of Cyrus (Ezra 6:1-2) granting permission to the Jews to rebuild their temple. The טעם was found and Darius upheld it, issuing a טעם to Tattenai and his colleagues to give of the taxes of their province toward the work (Ezra 6:6-12).¹ Also by טעם Darius states the punishment to be meted out upon anyone who attempts to change his edict. (v. 11).

Artaxerxes I issued two "orders" in the document that he gave to Ezra, Ezra 7:12-26. The first is a טעם giving the people of Israel in his kingdom who were willing permission to return to Jerusalem with Ezra (v. 13). The second טעם (v. 21) is to the treasurers of West-Euphrates ordering them to give, within specified limits, money and goods for the cult of the God of Ezra. These two "orders" constitute the major portion of this document, and the whole subject of the document is summed

¹Whether Cyrus' טעם (Ezra 6:2b-5) was a part of Darius' טעם is uncertain though the writer considers it probable. טעם at the beginning of v. 6 requires a narrative before it and if not Cyrus' טעם then something to the same effect, because Darius' first words (vs. 6-7) stem from it. However, the juxtaposition may be the work of the writer of Ezra. (See pp. 104f. below.)

up in Artaxerxes' words: כל די מן טעם אלה שמיא יתעבך אררודא לבית אלה :טעם אלה שמיא די למה לכוא קצף על מלכות מלכא ובנוהלי: (v. 23).

Three other edicts (טעם) are recorded in the Bible, all in Daniel: 1) 3:4-6, a decree issued by Nebuchadnezzar, orders everyone to bow down to his golden idol at the proper signal. It is given in the form of a proclamation¹ but is called a טעם by certain כשדאים (v. 10); 2) 3:29 is a טעם of Nebuchadnezzar forbidding any blasphemy against the God of Shadrack, Meshack, and Abed-nego; and 3) 6:26-8 is a טעם issued by a Darius commanding all peoples to honour the God of Daniel. Other decrees (טעם) are referred to in the Bible but are not recorded, although the substance is given.²

B) Non-Biblical examples.—AP 26 is an order from Arsham, satrap of Egypt, to have a boat repaired. This document illustrates the procedure of administrative action and is worth noting.

The procedure seems to be as follows: the men in charge of the boat reported to Mithradates . . . through Psamsineith, one of their number, that the boat was in need of repair. Mithradates reported to Arsames, who sent an order to Wahprimahi, an Egyptian apparently holding some local office. This is the purport of ll. 1-3. The order (ll. 3-6) is that whereas a specification of the necessary repairs had been required . . . and sent to the Treasury officials, these should now inspect the boat and do the repairs if necessary. Ll. 6-9 state that they did inspect it, found the specification correct, and that the chief of the ship's carpenters considered the repairs necessary. The specification is then recited (ll. 10-22). . . . In ll. 22, 23 Arsames orders Wahprimahi to have the work carried out accordingly.³

טעם is used four times in reference to this document (ll. 22, 23 [twice], and 25).

¹On proclamations see below pp. 185f.

²Jonah 3:7, Daniel 4:3, and Ezra 4:19, 21.

³Cowley, *AP*, p. 88. (The procedure can be seen in the correspondence of Tattenai and Darius—see above under A) Biblical examples.)

AD 4, and 6-10, orders from Arsham during his absence from Egypt, all close with the formula, χ ידע טעמא זנה γ ספרא, "X is cognizant of this order; Y is the clerk."¹ While these are clear-cut "orders" from Arsham to various lesser officials, AD 1 and 3 are to Artawont, and AD 5 is to Artahont, who are regarded more highly by Arsham.

The high rank of 'Artawont is indicated by the courteous form of address which 'Aršam adopts towards him; further, 'Aršam uses his own title of בר בליתא in the address of his letters to 'Artawont, and he does not adopt such a tone nor use his title in writing to anyone else in this correspondence except 'Artahont. In these letters 'Aršam either notifies 'Artawont of a concession or asks him to authorize it or else asks him to see that an order is carried out; the tone is perhaps that rather of a request than of a command, courteous if peremptory. . . . A similar style is adopted by 'Aršam in addressing 'Artahont; and the form of his request is softened by adding η ן עליך כוה טב 'if it so please thee' . . .²

The phrase used in AD 1 and 3 is η נה שם טעם, and in AD 5 it is η ן כען η נה טב. כוה טב מנך יחשם טעם עליך.

C) *Comment.*—The verb used with η ט to express the idea of "issuing, giving" a "command, order" is always η ט. In Daniel 3:12 and 6:14 the phrase is used in the sense of "pay regards to," literally "take note of the decree." In both cases the negative is used, and the *NEB* translates, "have taken no notice of your command" (3:12) and "has ignored the ordinance issued" (6:14).

η ט is also part of a compound term— η טל η ט—designating a "chief government official"³ of the Achaemenid court.

¹These are the only Aramaic documents to date that use this formula. However, it is common in the Elamite tablets from Persepolis; see below pp. 115ff.

²Driver, *AD*², p. 15 (Driver goes on to discuss the possible identification of Artawont and Artahont. The evidence, he states, is inconclusive and so the question remains open.)

³*KB*, p. 1097. See above pp. 54ff.

D) *Summary.*—טעם designates a document as being a "command, order, or decree" and can come from a king, in the name of the king by a lesser official, or directly from a lesser official. שים is the verb used to "issue" an order.

נשתון

A) *Biblical examples.*—Artaxerxes I begins a document (Ezra 4:17-22) with the following statement: שלם וכעה נשתונא די שלחתון עלינא מפרש קרי קדמי. The נשתון referred to was from Rehum (בעל טעם) and his colleagues (Ezra 4:11-16) making a complaint against some Jews who had recently come to Jerusalem from the king and who had begun to rebuild the city walls. נשתון is a term of Persian origin meaning "official document." The document was sent (שלח), and at least in this case נשתון refers to an instrument of correspondence. However, the formalities of other documents are missing, which is particularly noticeable since it was sent to the king. There is no greeting, beginning with עבדיך אנש עבר נהיה וכעה ידיע להוא למלכא. The document is a factual report of the situation (though negative and exaggerated) stating that an investigation in the archives would substantiate the charges, and here one misses the polite request of Tattenai to Darius in Ezra 5:7-17, not to mention that of Arsham to Artawont and Artahont in AD 1, 3 and 5. This is the only Biblical document officially designated by this term.

B) *Non-Biblical examples.*—The only non-Biblical occurrence of this term¹ to date is in AP 17. 3, and it refers to a document given to the writer of AP 17, not to AP 17 itself. The condition of AP 17 is too

¹In the third century B.C. it occurs in an inscription of Asoka as הונשתון; see above p. 50, n. 16.

damaged to determine with any certainty the reference and contents of this נשחון, but there is enough remaining to suggest that it was perhaps a receipt for either the contributions made or the payment made for the contributions (1. 2).

C) Comments.—It is best to postpone any comments on this term until the use of it by the writer of Ezra in introducing several of the documents in his narrative has been treated (see below pp. 187ff.).

D) Summary.—נשחון is a Persian loanword meaning "official document," and the only example officially so designated is a very curt report by the official Rehum (בעל טעם) to Artaxerxes.

פתגם

A) Biblical examples.—The only document using this term is Ezra 6:6-12. In v. 8 Darius states, ומני שים טעם, and referring to the טעם in v. 11 he says, ומני שים טעם די כל אנש די יהשנא פתגמא דנה. פתגם means "word, message" and in this document takes on the sense of "decree" since it is parallel with טעם.¹

B) Non-Biblical examples.—None.

C) Comments.—This is a Persian loanword, and the writer of Ezra also uses it in reference to some of the documents in his narrative which will be treated separately (see below pp. 187ff.).

D) Summary.—פתגם means "word, message," and in the only example in which it refers to a document it is parallel with טעם and so means

¹Esther 1:19-20 shows the same usage where פתגם is used as a synonym for דבר מלכות and דת. See also Segert, *Ar.Or.* 24:390, 1956, and p. 66 above.

"decree."

Introductory Terms

Following the personal address and salutation the writers of almost all of the documents being studied use one of three expressions to inform the addressee that the subject proper of the letter is to follow. In the Aramaic documents they are 1) כן אמר, 2) ידיע יהוי/להוא _____ ל, or 3) כען (כענת, כענת).¹ These phrases also serve to introduce subsequent changes in the subject or phases of the subject, and therefore some documents use a phrase more than once or more than one phrase.

כן אמר

This phrase is always used in its literal sense, "thus says," and introduces direct discourse. The documents frequently begin with direct discourse which may be one of two kinds: 1) the speech of the addressor or 2) the speech of a third party. There are only two examples of the first kind: AP 33, כן אמרן _____ עבדיך and Ezra 1:2 (in Hebrew) כה אמר. These are also the only two examples in which כן אמר serves to introduce the beginning of the subject proper. The second kind of direct speech, that of a different party, is either a report or a complaint that has been made to the addressor of the document. The addressor simply incorporates it into his document, apparently to provide the addressee with the basis of his decision, which is then followed by an order given in the form of direct discourse.² In Ezra 5:9

¹The main discussion will concern the Aramaic documents; the non-Aramaic documents will be referred to where they are parallel to the Aramaic documents.

²AP 26. 2. 3. 9. 22; AD 3. 2. 6; 4. 1. 2; 8. 1. 3; 10. 1. 4; 12. 1. 3. Similarly Pherendates C, where the subject of the letter is in the form of a direct conversation between the addressor and a third

and AP 30. 4 & 22, כן אמר simply introduces direct discourse of the addressors, which makes up part of the subject of the document.¹ Most of the non-Aramaic documents use the equivalent of "thus says" to introduce the main subject.²

לְדַע יְהוּי/לְהוּא לְ

This phrase is only used twice to introduce the beginning of the subject proper, and both documents are official reports, following an investigation, made to the king (Ezra 5:7-17, 4:11-16).⁴ The other occurrences of this phrase are in two of the documents of Arsham, satrap of Egypt, where he uses it to "inform" the addressees that their conduct has been reported to him, and that if they do not mend their ways, they will be called to account (AD 4. 3, 7. 8). In AP 27. 10 the writers suggest to the addressee, whose identity is unknown, "If inquiry by made . . . it will be made *known* to . . ." (לְדַע [דַע] לְ). Hence it appears that this phrase may be a technical phrase used in connection with investigations and reports, although the examples are not numerous, and thus this suggestion is tentative. In the documents under investigation

party. The inclusion of such reports, etc., would also have served as a safeguard for the addressor if questioned later.

¹Note also the similar expression in Ezra 5:11: וְכִנְיָא פְתַגְמָא הַתִּיבֹנָא לְמַמְר.

²Hdt. 5. 24, Thuc. i. 129. 3, Gadates Insc., PF 2071, Fort. 6764, Pherendates A. This is also the usual phrase of introduction in the OP inscriptions, and begins every paragraph of Darius' Behistun Inscription (Kent, *OP*²). There it precedes the name of the writer, *ṣātiy* : *Dārayavauš* ; *xšāyāṣiya*.

³On this form see Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 54, par. 168.

⁴Rehum and his colleagues (4:11-16) emphasize the point of informing the king by using the expression four times: vs. 12, 13, 14, & 16. This phrase also occurs frequently in the documents in Daniel, see above, p. 90.

this is the only phrase used to express this idea.¹

כען (כענת, כעת)

This is by far the most frequently used term (often preceded by the conjunction ו) to introduce the body of the letter and subsequent changes in the subject. כענת ". . . belongs to the epistolary style; in MT always c. ו at the end of a sentence a. therefore formerly taken as "etc.", but just as כען to be connected with what follows, introducing the real object of the letter. . . ." ² "In the Hermopolis letters the term occurs virtually as a punctuation mark, recurring several times in each of the letters." ³ כעת is the form most frequently used and כענת the form least frequently used, although there is no difference either in the meaning or in the use of the three forms, different ones being found in the same documents. ⁴ וכען is paralleled in Elamite letters,

¹This may reflect Old Persian usage. See Kent, *OP*², pp. 173-4, and discussion by Szemerényi in *Die Sprache* 12:202-5, 1966. See also Bowman, *IB*, Vol. III, pp. 601-2. See further p. 152 below.

²*KB*, p. 1086. See C. R. Brown, *Hebraica* 1:251, 1885; Torrey, *JBL* 16:166-8, 1897.

³Porten, *AE*, p. 312. See Bresciani and Kamil, *LAH*. Letter 1, for example, has the term seven times in fourteen lines. Cf. Driver, *AD*², p. 45.

⁴ Ezra	AP	AD
כען 5:17 6:6 4:13,14 4:21	27.6 30.4.22 (32.21) 37.7 38.5	3.5 5.8 7.3.5
כעת 4:17	17.2.3 21.3.4 26.1.22 (31.3) 38.3	3.6 4.1.2 5.1.2 7.1 8.1.3 9.1 10.1.4 11.1.2 12.1.3 12.1.3.6.9 13.1
כענת 7:12 4:10,11	37.2	

The LXX renders these terms most frequently by $\nu\upsilon\nu$, see below p. 135 and Hdt. 5. 24 uses this term too. On the limited use of ארין and אחר for this purpose see below pp. 144-5.

although it is not as prevalent there as in the Aramaic letters. The Elamite equivalent is $\bar{a}k$ (a-ak) om and occurs in PF 1792, 2071 (see below p. 105, n. 1) and Fort. 6764.¹ This is most likely due to the similarity of content of this document to that of the Aramaic letters'. The other Elamite letters differ substantially, being mostly straightforward orders for the disbursement of commodities.

Frequently כך אמר and כען/כעת are compounded to make the phrase כען/כעת כך אמר .² The use of the phrase is the same as when the two are used alone. Two characteristics of this compound are that the conjunction ו is never attached to it, and it only introduces subsequent changes in the subject of the document, never the beginning of the body of the letter.

There are only four documents that do not follow this practice: Ezra 6:2b-5, AP 32, Pherendates B, and the Xanthos Trilingual. The first two are זכרן (see above p. 86ff.). Pherendates B is from Egyptian priests who are not a part of the Persian bureaucracy, so perhaps this accounts for its absence. The Xanthos Trilingual does not contain any of the introductory terms common to the rest of the documents. This omission is strange, but perhaps it reflects some local influence and its non-epistolary character.

In conclusion, it has been seen that official documents of the Persian chancellery generally (with only three exceptions) introduce the

¹"Tell Harrēna the cattle chief, Parnaka spoke as follows: Darius the king ordered me, saying: '100 sheep from my estate (are) to be issued to Irtašduna the princess.' And now Parnaka says: 'As Darius the king ordered me, so I am ordering you: now you (are) to issue 100 sheep to Irtašduna the princess, as was ordered by the king.' . . ."
Hallock, *PFT*, p. 52.

²AP 26. 22, 30. 4, 22; AD 3. 6, 4. 2, 8. 3, 10. 4, & 12. 3.
Similarly Fort. 6764.

beginning of the subject matter with one of three phrases, and that subsequent changes in the subject are likewise introduced by the same phrases.

Formulation of Requests

The formulation of requests in the documents studied is one stylistic feature that became fairly fixed in form, although there are some minor departures from the pattern. The pattern is $\text{הן על } \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \text{ טב}$ with the verb usually in the hithpa''al or equivalent stem. The person to whom the request is being made is not named but is usually referred to by the honorific title מרא . Because the pattern is so consistent, all the occurrences are listed in Table 5, including significant divergences.

Ezra 5:7-17.—Instead of the honorific title מרא , the actual title of the addressee, מלך , is used (cf. also *Ezra 4:11-16* below).

AP 27.—What is noteworthy here is not the form of the request but its frequent repetition. This has led Cowley to conclude ". . . that the person addressed must have been of exalted rank." (*AP*, p. 102). But this is not necessarily so, since the title מרא not only refers to such officials as Arsham, satrap of Egypt, and Bigvai, נחה of Judah, but also to the community heads of Elephantine (*AP* 37, 38).¹ Rather, the repetition should be regarded as an attempt on the part of the addressors to flatter the addressee in order to enhance their chance of gaining a favourable decision.

¹In these documents, *AP* 37 & 38, these community leaders address one another by the title מרא ! See further Salutations, pp. 77ff.

TABLE 5

FORMULATION OF REQUESTS

Document	Formulation
Ezra 5:7-17. 17	וכען הן על מלכא טב יתבקר
AP 27. 19	[וכעון ה]ן על מראן שגיא עש[ק יזדכר]
21	[הן על מ]ראן טב יתשים
22	הן על מ[ראן טב ישתלח]
AP 30. 23	הן על מראן טב את עשת
AP 33. 7	הן מראן [ירח]מן
AD 3. 5	כען הן על מראי טב ישתלח
AD 10. 2	הן על מראי לם כות טב אגרת מן מראי תשתלח
Ezra 4:11-16. 14-15	על זנה שלחנא והודענא למלכא די יבקר . . . ותהשכח . . . ותנדע
AP 27. 8-10	הן אזד יתעכד מן . . . יתי[דע] למראן
AD 8. 2-3	[כען הב] לי כגה זי פמון אבי אתעשת לי ינתנו לי אהחטן

AP 33.—Here the expression is completely different in wording, although the meaning remains the same. It is noteworthy that Yedoniah, one of the addressors, is also one of the addressors of *AP 30* where the usual formula is used, and that both documents apparently refer to the same matter and possibly are addressed to the same person. Perhaps the difference is due to different scribes.

AD 5.—Here the request is not to a superior but to a high subordinate, or at the most an equal. At any rate, Artahont is addressed by *ly* with a pronominal suffix (עליך) and not the customary מרא! There is also the addition of the adverb כות, but it does not alter the meaning. The only other occurrence of כות in this formula is in *AD 10*.

AD 10.—As in AD 5, the adverb כִּנּוּחַ¹ is added, and as Driver notes, it ". . . is not essential to the sense . . ." (AD², p. 75). An emphatic particle וַל, "indeed," is also included.²

In these nine formulations there is only one real variant form of request as far as the wording is concerned, AP 33, although the meaning is the same.³ Hence it can be concluded that this was the proper way to frame a request. However, in the light of the following it may be better to say that this was the proper way to frame a request when one wished to be polite or diplomatic, for whatever reason. There are now three "requests" to be discussed, which for some unknown reason are framed not only in completely different terminology but also in a completely different tone.

Ezra 4:11-16 is from Rehum, בְּעַל טַעַם, and his colleagues to Artaxerxes the king. The obvious intention of the letter is to obtain a royal enactment against the building activity in Jerusalem, and at this point in the letter Rehum presses the king for an investigation into the records to verify his accusations. Considering that the king is being addressed, the letter as a whole, at least superficially, appears rather rash if not downright impudent. However, even though the tone of the letter appears out of order, comparison with the other documents here perhaps shows that at this point the manner of expression is really not out of order. AP 27, though using different terminology, expresses the

¹On כִּנּוּחַ reflecting OP *avaṅā* see below pp. 153f.

²In AD 3 and 10 it should be noted the request is part of a quoted document sent to Arsham and incorporated into his reply and not a request made by him to subordinates.

³Pherendates C expresses the same idea: "If it please your lordship, let it be." (l. 12).

same point in question in a similar manner. In AD 8 the polite or diplomatic formulation could be expected even more to be found rather than the "forward" tone of the expression that is used.¹ Considering the success of Ezra 4:11-16 and AD 8, it seems that this manner of expression was not out of place when used by a subordinate.²

One other formulation of a request needs mentioning: "עדן הוה" is abrupt and strange, but can only mean 'it is time to.' No doubt a translation of the Egyptian idiom *sp pw*, introducing a request &c."³ In the documents being studied it occurs only at AP 26. 3 and 9. The only other occurrence of this phrase that this writer has found is at AP 28. 13, a private document assigning slaves to new owners.

In conclusion, it can be said that there are two acceptable ways of phrasing a request: 1) a polite or diplomatic form to the effect, "If it please your lordship," and 2) a straightforward, "If this matter be investigated/considered, then." The latter may simply be a stronger form of request due to the nature of the request or because it is being asked a second time.

Quotations

Fourteen of the documents studied contain at least one quotation. In almost every instance the quotation is used to state or support the case of the addressor, whether he be a subordinate using this means as a basis for requesting a specific decision from his superior,

¹Driver comments, "The context requires something like כען . . . or כען יהוי לי or כען יהוה לי or perhaps rather כען הוה לי . . ." (AD², p. 69).

²The comment on p. 100, n. 2, above, applies also to AD 8.

³Cowley, AP, p. 92.

or a senior officer employing the quotation as the grounds or authority for the decision he has made or the order he has given. Where the quotation is used to state or support the case of the addressor, the quotation usually consists of two parts: 1) the report, complaint, or order that serves as the basis for the resulting decision and 2) the decision requested or ordered by the person being quoted, although this is frequently not stated since the implication is obvious.¹ Since the formulations are essentially the same in all the Aramaic documents, the occurrences are listed in Table 6 and the significant points discussed below.²

Ezra 5:7-17.—Tattenai and his colleagues are reporting to Darius their investigation of the activity of the Jews, and virtually the whole report is a quotation. The distinctive feature here is that it is given in the form of a conversation: "We asked them . . . they answered us saying . . ." Then follows the statement of the purpose of the letter, introduced by the usual transitional term *nyb*.³ A similar use of the conversational style is contained in Pherendates C: "Oser-wêr made me stand before Pherendates, by saying . . . then I said to him . . ." The purpose of the letter is then given.

AP 30.—These two quotations make up a minute part of the case

¹Where the words of the addressor to the addressee are given in the form of direct speech they are not included, quotations here being limited to those made by the addressor of himself or someone else. This practice goes back at least to the Hammurapi dynasty; see Oppenheim, *AM*, p. 277.

²The non-Aramaic texts use essentially the same style and so will be brought in where appropriate.

³The author of *Ezra*, in introducing this document, uses the same style and even the same questions (5:3-4)! The elders, as quoted, summarize the document *Ezra* 6:2b-5. It will be seen that paraphrasing and summarizing were also common practice.

TABLE 6

FORMULATION OF QUOTATIONS

Document	Formulation
From Subordinates to Superiors	
Ezra 5:7-17. 9	אדין שאלנא לשביא אלך כנמא אמרנא להם: _____
11	וכנמא פתגמא התיבונא לממר: _____ וכעת
AP 30. 5-6	X המונית עם Y היה לם: _____ אחר
7-8	X אגרת שלח על Y לאמר: _____ אחר
From Superiors to Subordinates	
Ezra 6:2b-12. 6	כען _____
AP 26. 1-2	[כזי שלח] עליך X לם: _____
2-3	X כן אמרו: _____ [על זנה שלחת לם:]
6. 9	על זנה שלחן ו [כן אמרו X:] _____ יכן אמרו:
22	כעת X כן אמר: _____
32. 1-2	X אמרו לי: _____
38. 9-10	הו אמר לי _____
AD 3. 2. 6	X בזנה כן אמר: _____ כעת Y [כן] אמר
4. 1. 2	X שלח עלי כן אמר: _____ כעת Y כן אמר
8. 1. 3	X שלח עלי כן אמר: _____ כעת Y כן אמר
10. 1. 4	X בזנה כן אמר לי: _____ כעת Y כן אמר
12. 1. 3	X שלח עלי כן אמר: _____ כעת Y כן אמר
5. 6	אף קבילה שלח עליך: _____ כעת
8. 9	אף X שלח _____ כעת

being presented by the addressors, which is unusual in these documents.

However, this is not an official letter, though it is of an official character,¹ and therefore it doesn't require exact official usage. A

¹Sprengling, *AJT* 21:434, 1917.

verb is lacking in the first quote, but the context is clear nevertheless. It is to be noted that the first quotation is from an oral source, the second from a written source, and that both are formulated in the same way. This is typical throughout the documents.

Ezra 6:2b-12.—The author of Ezra has evidently omitted the beginning of Darius' edict since there is no introductory material. However, the introduction that he gives to it may well have been taken from the document itself. We are informed that Darius טעם ובקרו בנליה (6:1). In the reply of Artaxerxes to Rehum, *Ezra 4:17-22*, the same information and the same phrasing are used in the document itself: ומני שים טעם ובקרו והשכחו (v. 19). Nevertheless, regarding quotations the document follows the regular pattern: the evidence, here quoted from a written source (vs. 2b-5), followed by the decision.¹

AP 26.—This document is an order to repair a boat, which is authorized by Arsham on the basis of a number of reports—revealing the administrative bureaucracy of the satrapy—which he quotes or summarizes. Unfortunately the text is badly damaged, but Cowley's restoration at least provides the general sense. Various officials are involved, some designated only by name, but the sequence is not certain although the document as a whole follows the larger pattern of the evidence followed by the decision.² The same state of affairs exists with *PF 2071*—it is a badly damaged text, yet it is clear that it records a number of quota-

¹It is possible that the author of Ezra, in omitting the beginning of Darius' edict, has juxtaposed these two documents himself and that Darius may simply have stated that the claim of the Jews was found to be true and his decision was to renew aid to the Jews. This is the way Artaxerxes handled a similar situation, *Ezra 4:17-22*.

²Sprengling, *AJT* 21:429, 1917.

tions involving several different parties, all of which are used as the basis for the decision of the addressor.¹ In contrast, Fort. 6764 is a well-preserved text, and its style also reveals similar bureaucratic practice, though in this case at Persepolis. The formulation, though different, is essentially the same as in the Aramaic documents: "Tell Harrēna the cattle chief, Parnaka spoke as follows: Darius the king ordered me, saying: . . . And now Parnaka says: . . ." (see above p. 97, n. 1)

AP 32.—Here the scribe has apparently written verbatim as the addressors have dictated orally to him. The usual bipartite pattern is not used because of the nature of "memoranda" (see above pp. 86ff.). However, details are repeated from AP 30.²

AP 38.—Like AP 30, this is not an official letter, though official in character, and the writers give a brief quotation to explain why the letter has been sent.

AD 3, 4, 8, and 10.—The AD documents show most clearly all the features involved with quoted material. In AD 3 and 10 oral communica-

¹"Tell and his companion(s),na spoke as follows: Šumama, the of the *ratiš* (people) who (are at) Attam, at the estate of Uštana, (and) at the 'palace(?)' of Miriya, sent me a report, saying: 'The *ratiš* (people) who (are) at the estate of Uštana the king entrusted (?) to me. Now their(?) officials(?), when I tell them the *haruyam*(?) of the king, do not heed(?), (but) speak(?), saying: "Miriya advised(?) us, saying: 'Do not do what Šumama tells(?) you!'" Now they [*sic*] are telling them the *haruyam*(?) of the king, (but) they are not doing(?) it.' And now Miriya reports(?) (lit. 'says a report[?]'): 'The king did entrust the *ratiš* officials(?) at the estate of Uštana to Šumama. It was told me (that?) they are not(?) applying pressure.' Now do you apply extreme pressure to the officials(?), whom Šumama places upon(?) the report. . . ." (Haddock, *PFT*, p. 642).

²Cf. Pherendates A & B, the Xanthos Trilingual, Ezra 4:11-16, and 4:17-22.

tion is reported, while in AD 4 and 8 written communication is, both formulated in the same way. The quoted material is always the source of the evidence and is immediately followed by the decision of the addressor, introduced by כַּעַן (see above, pp. 96f.). The decision itself is also phrased as direct speech introduced by the same formulation: כַּן אָמַר. It is worth noting as well that the decision is usually a paraphrase of the evidence cited.¹

AD 12.—The only difference here from the other AD documents is that three separate complaints are dealt with. Each could have been a separate letter, but it was apparently more practical to combine them since they were all against the same person.

In sum, the regular formulation of quotations in the Aramaic documents is basically כַּן אָמַר X,² with whatever additional information as may be needed to tell how the information came to the writer's attention, followed by either a request for a decision when from a subordinate, or the decision made when from a superior.

There are also several instances where quotations could have been used but were not. The alternative to quoting was either to refer simply to a source, always written ones in our documents, or to paraphrase or summarize it. As an example of the former, in Pherendates A Pherendates only refers to an edict of Darius as his authority to regulate a particular matter concerning the Khnum priesthood. This is most unusual in the documents studied since it is the only case where a supe-

¹deVaux, *BANE*, pp. 88-9. See Millard, *BH* 11:89, 1975.

²This formulation also occurs in PF 1792: "Tell Harrēna, Parnaka spoke as follows: . . ." (Hallock, *PFT*, p. 488. Cf. above p. 105 for Fort. 6764 and n. 1 for PF 2071.).

rior, in answer to a subordinate, does not at least give a summary or paraphrase of the cited source. However, specific points from the edict are mentioned, though not in the usual formulation. Perhaps this is due to Egyptian influence or a further concession to soften the impact of Persian rule.¹ On the other hand, Pixodaros, satrap of Xanthos, seems to have authorized the establishment of a cult without first referring the matter to the king. At least his decree makes no mention of royal authority.² The second alternative to quoting is far more common than the first. AD 7 is a particularly good example, since it comes from Arsham's office, which usually does use the quotation formula.³ The formulation here is . . . וּכְעַן חָנָה כֵּן שָׁמִיעַ לִי כֹזֵי (1. 3). The addressee, Nehtihur, is first informed how his predecessor had behaved in a similar situation, and now in contrast Arsham has heard that other officers are taking care of their lord's property but that he, Nehtihur, is not. This is a second warning⁴ to Nehtihur and is concluded by a threat of punishment, and its introduction differs as well: . . . כֵּן יִדְרִיעַ יְהוּי לְךָ (1. 8).

These different ways of presenting evidence from sources further

¹Spiegelberg, *SPAW* 39:604, 1928. AP 17 also just refers to a document, but here the writers are simply acknowledging its receipt. On the other hand, cf. the same procedure attested in Elamite letters. PF 1795: "Tell Yamakšedda the 'wine carrier,' Parnaka spoke as follows: 200 *marriš* (of) wine (is) to be issued to Irtašduna the princess. It was ordered by the king. . . ." (Hallock, *PFT*, p. 490). See also PF 1827, 1829 and 1856. Contrast the style of Fort. 6764, above p. 97, n. 1, which follows the full quotation pattern.

²Dupont-Sommer, *CRAI* 74:132-49, 1974.

³Further examples are AD 1, 2, & 11; Gadates Inscription; and Ezra 4:17-22.

⁴Probably the reason for the change here, repetition of the reports being unnecessary!

demonstrate the variety of the epistolary style of the Achaemenid administration. As regards quotations, the AD letters again offer unrivalled information. AD 7, 8, and 10, which were discussed in this section, all bear a subscript in which Rasht is the רֹשֵׁת . The רֹשֵׁת in AD 7, however, is different from that in AD 8 and 10 which have the same רֹשֵׁת . But in the light of our discussion on subscripts (see below pp. 115ff.) showing the uncertainty concerning the production of documents, it seems best to the present writer to posit only the general principle that much freedom was practiced in the production of documents without delineating those named who were involved.

One further matter presents itself in connection with quotations, and that is the suggestion that the Aramaic section of Ezra, 4:(7)8-6:18, is a single document.¹ The theory is that Tabeel and his colleagues are writing a counter argument against the Samaritan officials, and that their case is based on the documents which make up the major portion of this section. First it is to be noted that 4:7 only informs us of the language and script of the document which is to follow, and that there is nothing in this verse itself to suggest that it is about to cite *another* document. However, it was seen that Cyrus' edict contained in Darius' also lacks the introductory formula. Furthermore, what actually follows is an introduction to the document of Rehum and his colleagues by the author of Ezra, vs. 8-11a, and then the introductory formula of their document itself. That the former is not an introduction to Rehum's letter from the hand of Tabeel seems certain when it is compared to the

¹Schaeder, *IB*, pp. 17ff. Schaeder appears to have been the last person to espouse this theory. Myers, *AB:E-N*, 1965, doesn't even mention it. Hence, the discussion here is limited to Tabeel's supposed use of documents. A discussion of the theory on other grounds can be found in deVaux, *BANE*, pp. 81ff.

introduction and formulation of quotations in our documents. Furthermore, and most telling, is the fact that quotations in our documents *never* include any of the introductory elements, nor any of the concluding elements! Rather, quotations simply include the heart of the matter, the barest essentials to state the case being presented. Finally, the documents always give a reason for their quoting of sources, either as a part of the quotation, or subsequently by stating the resultant action desired or taken. This Aramaic section is totally lacking in this feature.

In summary, it has been shown that quotations are usually introduced by the formula, מִן כִּי X , and can be from either a written or an oral source. Quotations usually make up the major part of the document and provide the evidence for the matter being raised. Two alternatives to quoting directly are used: 1) simply referring to a source and 2) paraphrasing or summarizing the source, the latter being the more frequent of the two. Since quotations are usually limited to presenting the bare essentials of the case, it is possible that sources formulated as quotations may be no more than paraphrases or summaries. However, since we do not have copies of the sources quoted, this cannot be proved either way. This stylistic feature has given an additional reason for concluding that the Aramaic section of Ezra, 4:(7)8-6:18, is very unlikely to have formed a single complete document, containing verbatim numerous documents in a style completely at variance with this feature of Achaemenid correspondence.

Dates

While the documents treated in this study are of various sources and materials—Egypt, Judah, Babylon, Persia; papyrus, parchment, clay—

a statement made by Driver concerning dates in the papyri has a generally valid application to the documents being considered.

None of the letters in the present collection bears a date. This omission is remarkable; for, whereas the ten letters here from 'Aršam share this peculiarity, the only other extant letter from him is dated. Further, it contradicts the practice of the authors or scribes of other contemporary documents from Egypt. Thus the papyri frequently bear dates, but an examination of them shows that the practice tends to vary with the nature of the contents. Thus purely legal texts commonly begin with the date in the opening line, and none apparently omits it. The date of official letters when given is appended at the end, but it may be omitted; one private letter is perhaps dated, but most of these are so badly damaged that the presence or absence of a date cannot be proved. Persian thus follows Neo-Babylonian [*sic*] practice, whereby legal tablets commonly and letters only very rarely are dated.¹

Ten of the thirty-nine documents being studied contain dates expressed in one of the four ways shown in Table 7 below.

TABLE 7
FORMULATION OF DATES

Formula	Document
Day, Month, Year	Pherendates A, B, C; AP 17, 26, 30
Day, Month	BMAP 13
Month, Year	Fort. 6764, Xanthos Trilingual
Year	Ezra 6:2b-5

Day, Month, Year.—The correspondence of Pherendates has in common with each other, besides the use of this same formula, the absence of the name of the king in whose reign they were written. Pherendates A refers to "jenem Befehl des Königs Darius,"² but that this was not the

¹Driver, *AD*², p. 8.

²Spiegelberg, *SPAW* 39:606, 1928, 11. 5, 7.

reason for omitting the king's name in the date formula can be concluded from the following facts: 1) Pherendates B and C do not mention the king's name anywhere else in their letters, nor in their date formula; 2) by contrast, AP 30 mentions the name of the king both in the main text of the letter and in the date formula. All the Elephantine contracts using this formula include the name of the king in their dates.

Day, Month.--Shewa b. Zekariah, the writer of BMAP 13, makes reference to the recent accession of Nephertites in the month Epiphi, and when he comes to date his letter he simply writes [א] 5 לאפף כתיב אגרוחי ז (1. 8). The unofficial nature of this document may account for the absence of the year in the date, or as frequently happened at the accession of a new king, there was uncertainty as to who was the real successor.¹ In this case, the situation would have been complicated by the fact that Egypt was in the midst of throwing off the Persian yoke.

Month, Year.--Nearly all of the Persepolis treasury tablets contain ". . . a notation of the month and year during which the service designated had been performed . . . ,"² and Fort. 6764 contains the usual formula. Further, none of the tablets published in *PTT*, or previously, contain the name of the king in whose reign they were written except Nos. 4 and 5 in *PTT*. However, these two tablets are not dated.³ The Aramaic decree of the Xanthos Trilingual is dated to the month of Siwan in the first year of Artaxerxes.

¹Neuffer, "The Accession of Artaxerxes I," *AUSS* 6:74-5, 84-7, 1968.

²Cameron, *PTT*, p. 32. Cf. Hallock, *PFT*, pp. 74ff. ³*Ibid.*

Year.¹—Unlike the other dated documents, Ezra 6:2b-5 is dated at the beginning rather than at the end. The name of the king who made the edict is given twice in the document, one being in the date formula, *בשנת חדה לכורש מלכא*. As noted earlier (see above, p. 87), the date is preceded by a formal heading and followed by a summary before the main text is given, hence the position of the date. This formal outline would facilitate the use of the archives, this one being in the form of a *מגלה*, just as many modern files are kept according to subject matter and date.

The only conclusion that can be drawn concerning the date formulas used, based on the examples at hand, is that the full date formula (day, month, year) was the standard formula and that the other three are deviations from it for the reasons given in each case. In addition it can be noted that all the documents using the full date formula are from Egypt. BMAP 13 is also from Egypt, but as noted it was written during particularly troubled times and was an unofficial letter. Fort. 6764 and Ezra 6:2b-5, using different formulas, come from Persepolis and Ec-batana respectively, the locations of the central Persian government, while the Xanthos Trilingual comes from Asia Minor. No principle can be established to account for the presence or absence of the reigning king's name in the formula.

Now that the dated documents have been examined individually some general observations can be made concerning the presence or absence of a date. Four factors will be discussed that appear to offer some explanation: 1) the form of the document, 2) the subject matter, 3) the

¹The Aramaic ritual texts from Persepolis are dated only to the year. See Bowman, *ARTP*, pp. 56ff.

relationship between the addressor and the addressee, and 4) the difference between originals and copies.

The form of the document.—All of the documents included in this study are in the form of letters with the exception of Ezra 1:2-4, 6:2b-5, AP 32, and the Xanthos Trilingual. Since all of the documents (except four) are of the same form, this factor can only be used to compile the ratio of the distribution of dates, which is ten documents with dates and twenty-nine without dates. In addition, nothing can be based on the memoranda because one is dated and one is not. Therefore, this factor cannot be used in determining the reasons for the presence or absence of dates.

The subject matter.—There is nothing exceptional in the subject matter of the dated documents when compared with the undated ones. They all, dated and undated, have to do with either the administration of government affairs or the affairs of the estates of Persian officials granted to them by the king, some being orders, some reports, others complaints, requests, etc. Therefore, the subject matter of the documents does not provide any reasons for the presence or absence of dates.

The relationship between the addressor and the addressee.—The memoranda, Ezra 6:2b-5 and AP 32, can be dispensed with at the outset because they are not instruments of correspondence.¹ The letters are all correspondence between the king and his officials or between different officials. None of the correspondence between the king and his officials is dated, thus all the dated letters are those between offi-

¹See above, pp. 86ff.

cials.¹ Balancing this fact is the preponderance of undated letters between officials—twenty of the twenty-nine undated letters. In addition, there are seven undated letters between the king and his officials, and as far as this writer is aware, there is no example of a single dated letter between a Persian king and his officials. Therefore, it can be concluded that official correspondence was only dated, and then only rarely, when it was just between officials.²

*The difference between originals and copies.*³—The dated documents are evenly divided in this respect, there being five originals and five copies, thus this factor is neutral as to the question of why some documents are dated and others are not. The statistics based on all the documents are 1) of the eight documents clearly originals only five are dated; and 2) of the twelve documents clearly copies only five are dated.

The foregoing discussion brings the writer to the conclusion that the existence of an underlying principle or standard rule for the inclusion or exclusion of a date in official Persian documents cannot be established. The evidence, with the caution of note 2 below in mind, does however indicate that the Persian kings did not date their *correspondence*, whereas their officials when corresponding among themselves sometimes did. Thus we can go a step further than Driver (*AD*², p. 52)

¹Fort. 6764, however, cites an order of the king as the immediate authority for the order being given (ll. 1-4, see p. 97, n. 1). AP 21, undated, can also be noted in this connection.

²However, certain reservations must be held since the Gadates Inscription is incomplete and the document preserved in Thucydides is not the original copy. It must also be kept in mind that thirty-nine documents from about two centuries of rule is meager evidence by any standard.

³On this problem see below, pp. 183ff.

and state that no other reason accounts for the presence or absence of a date in official Persian documents than the apparent preference of the official and/or scribe involved.

Subscripts

This feature of the epistolary style is found in only about one-third (11) of the documents studied, and with just two exceptions they are from very high officials to subordinates containing straightforward orders. The subscript serves as a record of the person or persons responsible for the production of the document and does not refer to the addressor or addressee (except Pherendates C where the addressor and the writer are the same person). The documents without subscripts simply come to the end of the subject and stop.¹

It is both interesting and instructive to note that the formula used—"X wrote (the text), Y communicated its message"—is that found repeatedly in the economic tablets discovered at Persepolis (see below), especially since it is found in two languages other than the Elamite of the Persepolis tablets—Aramaic and Demotic. Hence, it appears that the formula and the use of the subscript in the Aramaic and Demotic documents stem from Persepolis, i.e., from Achaemenid administrative practice. In this regard it is also worth noting that scribes throughout the empire were usually Persian, or there was at least a Persian scribe in the various chancelleries.²

¹Ezra 1:2-4, 6:2b-5, 5:7-17, 6:6-12, Hdt. 5. 24, Thuc. i. 129. 3, Ezra 7:12-26, 4:11-16, 4:17-22, AP 21, 27, 30, 32, 33, 37, 38, AD 1-3, 5, 11-13, BMAP 13, and the Xanthos Trilingual. Three documents are either fragmentary or broken at this point and so are excluded from consideration: Gadates Inscription, PF 2071, AP 17.

²Hdt. 3. 128. See below, pp. 202ff.

The interpretation of the formula has changed considerably over the years as can be seen in the translations of the subscript in Fort. 6764. In its initial publication, Cameron tentatively translated it thus: "Napi(r)-sukka inscribed (the tablet), after it had been translated(?); Maraza executed it."¹ Hallock now translates it: "Ansukka wrote (the text). Marazza communicated its message." (*PFT*, p. 52). This change and the current understanding of the meaning of the subscript can best be explained by quoting from Hallock's discussion of subscripts in *PFT*.

The full form of the subscript appears . . . in PF 1819:14-19:
m.Hintamukka tallišta pattikamaš m.Kamezza lišta dumme m.Hitibelmar dušta, "Hintamukka wrote (the text). The message Kamezza delivered. The *dumme* he received from Hitibel." Frequently the second or third statement is omitted; both are omitted in two of the letters . . .

The interpretation of the subscript formula hinges particularly on the meaning of *dumme*. Analysis as *du-* "to receive," plus "abstract" ending *-me* could reasonably yield the meaning "receipt." But does the meaning "receipt" make sense in this context? If *dumme* meant "receipt," the second and third statements in the subscript of PF 1819 (see above) would naturally be understood to imply that Kamezza delivered the letter (to the addressee) and received a receipt from Hitibel, representing the addressee. But Hitibel cannot represent the addressee; he occurs in the same role in twelve letters sent from Ziššawiš to various addressees, and he must, therefore, like Hintamukka and Kamezza, be attached to the addressor. If Kamezza delivered the letter, it is hardly conceivable that he would receive a receipt from another person in his own agency. And that is not the end of our difficulties. We should have to explain why such statements (evidently to be translated in past tense, though they would imply future action) came to be attached to the document, . . .

It therefore seems necessary to discard the meaning "receipt" for *dumme* and to seek a different interpretation of the subscript. If the second and third statements do not concern the delivery of the letter, presumably they concern its production. In that case,

¹Cameron, *JNES* 1:216, 1942. In *PTT*, pp. 96-7 (1948) Cameron discussed the phrase but was unable to improve upon it. However, in 1958 he corrected his translation: ". . . *be-ti-ka-maš*, for which a meaning such as 'after it had been translated' was sought, is to be read *bat-ti-ka-maš* and identified with Old Persian *patigāna-*, Aramaic *patgam*, 'message, report'; the full phrase in which this word appears should obviously be translated, 'N wrote (the document), NN delivered the message (and) obtained a receipt from NNN.'" (*JNES* 17:162, 1958).

it should be the scribe to whom "Kamezza delivered (communicated) the message" (i.e. dictated the text?). The *dumme* which Kamezza received from Hitibel could be "instructions," "information," or an "order." If so, *dumme* probably does not derive from *du-*, "to receive." It is perhaps to be analyzed as *dam* (or *dumma*) plus *-e*, "its." . . .

That two intermediaries stood between Ziššawiš and his scribe need occasion no surprise. Ziššawiš was a high official, and the personal dictation of routine letters may well have been beneath his dignity; he merely said to Hitibel: "Take care of this!"; Hitibel then worked out the details, and Kamezza told the scribe how to word the letter.¹

This seems to be the case in the Aramaic documents as well. It is significant that as in the Persepolis tablets, so in the Aramaic documents, subscripts appear only in the documents of very high officials. All of the Aramaic documents with subscripts are from Arsham, satrap of Egypt. The formula in AD 4, and 6-10 is always χ ידע טעמא זנה י ספרא and Driver translates, ". . . is cognizant of this order, . . . is the clerk." Driver explains the first statement, that ". . . it probably means not merely that the person so described is aware of the order but that he attests it or is charged with issuing it and perhaps also with seeing to the execution of it." (*AD*², p. 18). This person was the chancellor who ". . . was attached to the entourage of the satrap or governor and entrusted with the administration of much routine business. He and the Scribe would handle most of the official correspondence and at the conclusion of letters to be dispatched he would either sign his name, indicating his title (C 26:23), or note that he was 'cognizant of this order' . . ." ² A variant formula appears in Arsham's order to Wahpri-mahi (AP 26. 23): ענני ספרא בעל [טע]ם נבועקב כתב, "Anani the scribe

¹Hallock, *PFT*, pp. 51-2. (See also p. 116, n. 1 above.)

²Porten, *AE*, pp. 55-6. Cf. Meyer, *SPAW* 22:1036, 1911.

(and) Chancellor. Nabuaqab wrote (it)."¹ A previous satrap of Egypt, Pherendates, apparently uses the same subscript formula in Pherendates A, written in Demotic: "let it be known to you that Iebr . . . who knows this . . . is he who has written this letter. Written by Apries . . ."² One other discussion of subscripts is worth noting, since it speaks specifically of the Aramaic documents in question and adds a few points not yet mentioned:

Letters [AD] 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 were written by Rašt; or were they? All the signature says is that χ ידיע טעמא זנה רשת ספרא, "X attests this order (?); Rašt is the scribe." This subscription is added only to the letters of Aršam to underlings in Egypt. It is *not* added to the letters of Aršam to Artawant/Artahant, who is obviously a high official if not a prince; nor is it added to letters [AD] 11-13, which presumably are letters from subordinates of Aršam to Nehtihûr, an official in Egypt. . . . Letters from Aršam to subordinates in Egypt . . . are given an official air by adding the names of an attestant (?) and a scribe to the subscription. Does this mean that Aršam wrote his own letters to Artawant and had a scribe write them to the subordinates? I suspect that neither Aršam nor "the scribe" wrote the letters. "Rašt is the scribe" of both letters six and seven but the handwriting is hardly the same. . . . The ספר "scribe" was not just a كاتب "writer" but was one who had mastered the art of translation and style as well. He was an official in the Achaemenian bureaucracy, in this case in the chancery of Aršam.³

¹Translation by Porten, *AE*, p. 56. Cowley, *AP*, p. 91, translated, "'Anani, the secretary, drafted the order. Nabu'aqab wrote (it).'" Porten's translation is to be preferred since $\text{נַבְּלַ \text{עַבְּ}}$ is an official title as clearly seen in the case of Rehum, Ezra 4:8, 9, & 17. On $\text{נַבְּלַ \text{עַבְּ}}$ as a title see pp. 54f. above.

²Porten, *AE*, p. 56. The translation is credited to Professor G. Hughes, Oriental Institute, U. of Chicago. Concerning the subscript Porten comments that "the conclusion of the demotic letter is unique and although a word or two is obscure and not yet translatable, the impression remains that the ending of this text parallels in style the ending of the Aramaic document [AP 26]." (p. 56). This translation varies considerably from Spiegelberg who first published the text—"Jebr . . . ist Schreiber des Königs.—Geschreiben von Weh-eb-Rê . . ." (*SPAW* [1928] p. 606). The present writer is not qualified to judge the relative merits of these two translations, but both are consistent with contemporary examples.

³Frye, *HJAS* 18:459, 1955. Cf. Whitehead, *EAE*, pp. 16-7, 26-7.

The only other documents studied with subscripts are Pherendates B and C, both from subordinates to superiors. In both cases only one person is mentioned, the one who wrote the document. In the case of Pherendates B the document is from a college of priests at Elephantine. Pherendates C, on the other hand, is from Khnum-em-akhet who is both the addressor and the writer of the letter. In both cases, then, the documents come from independent sources, that is, not connected with any government chancellery. Perhaps, in these documents the statement, "X has written," should be more properly considered a signature rather than as a subscript in the technical sense. At any rate its purpose is the same and may simply have been copied from the official practice, since they were corresponding with government officials.

To summarize, subscripts are notices appended at the end of some of the documents of very high officials recording the name of the person or persons involved in the composition of the document. Occurrence only in documents of very high officials is due to the fact that they, as government officials, maintained an office or chancellery in which there were scribes to whom the drafting of documents was delegated. It is particularly to be noted that Persian scribes held a prominent position in the chancelleries. The full subscript formula is "X wrote (the text), Y has communicated its message, Z has received the order"; and as at Persepolis, the apparent source of the practice and formula, there is no rigid practice either in the wording of the formula or in the use of a subscript at all. Two documents independent of government chancelleries, written to high officials, are signed by the writers simply, "X has written." The subscripts are used in documents of three unrelated languages—Elamite, Aramaic, and Demotic—yet they show great similarity

both in form and in meaning.

Summary of Contents

This stylistic feature is found only in the documents from the chancellery of Arsham, satrap of Egypt. Summaries are common to many types of literature. In legal deeds they are called endorsements, and "the 'endorsement' appearing on the outside of the roll is usually a memorandum enabling the owner of a number of sealed rolls to know what each is about."¹ Likewise literary texts:

Already among the tablets in pictorial writing found at Fara there was a sign list, on the reverse of which there was a large drawing bearing relation to the face of the tablet. It is supposed that the drawing was intended to indicate the contents of the tablet. Evidently it is a precursor of the later colophon. On later tablets the text proper was followed—in the case of the literary tablets—by a *colophon*, giving various information: the title of the tablet was indicated (i.e. its first line) and, in cases of the tablet belonging to a series of several tablets, also the first line of the following tablet, the catch-line. Where the tablets constituted a series, the colophon of each tablet indicated the name of the series (the first line of the first tablet) and the number of the tablet in the series.²

Similarly, the Arsham documents—which were still rolled up when found—contained summaries of their contents, but on the outside of the roll.³ In each case the summary was begun with *by*, "concerning." One of the better-preserved summaries is that of AD 10, which will serve to illustrate the matter in these documents: על הגדרתי לחתובסתי כזי לאתי כבאל, "Concerning my notification to *Hatu-bâstī* that he come [to me] at

¹Kraeling, *BMAP*, p. 150. ²Weitemeyer, *Libri* 6:226, 1955/6.

³AD 1-5, 7, 9, 10 & 12. Its absence in AD 8, 11 & 13 is due to damage suffered by the texts (so Driver, *AD*², pp. 66-7, 78 and 84, respectively). AD 6 does not have one because as a passport to be carried it did not need it (Driver, *AD*², p. 56). AP 26 may have had a summary, but the document is broken off at this point.

Babylon."¹

Pherendates B and C require mention here because each document states on the outside that it is a "Copy of a report," and this notice, or perhaps summary, exactly duplicates the opening lines of the documents: "Copy of a report of the Priests of the great Khnum, who is Lord of Yeb, to Pherendates, to whom Egypt is entrusted." (Pherendates B). Moreover, this notice is first made in the address, and so served either the dual purpose of summary and address, or simply the address. The latter is more likely for two reasons: 1) the information is all given as a single item, and 2) the contents are not actually summarized.

In the light of the above one other document needs to be discussed in this connection, Ezra 4:11-16, which is introduced by the author of Ezra with a great deal of information not contained in the document itself. It seems likely that most of this information would have to have come from the outside of the document, i.e., the address and a notice or summary of contents.²

The difficulty of this introductory material is seen in Schaeder's treatment of it, where he rightly sets forth the problem but to this writer offers an erroneous solution.

Die Sätze v. 8-11 bereiten Schwierigkeiten. Sie enthalten die Überschrift des Briefes der beiden samaritanischen Beamten Rhūm und Šimšai an Artaxerxes, aber mit merkwürdigen Wiederholungen und Doubletten. V. 8 ist klar: "Rhūm, der 'Befehlerteiler', und Šimšai, der Sekretär, haben einen Brief geschrieben wider Jerusalem an Artaxerxes, den König, folgendermassen". Das ist in der Tat die Einführung des Schreibens, wie wir sie in der Denkschrift voraussetzen haben, und auf die nun, wie in 5, 6, die Formel folgen müsste: "dies ist die Kopie des Briefes, den sie an ihn sandten", darauf dann die Überschrift des Briefes (Adressat, Absender und Grussformel). Aber all dies finden wir erst in v. 11 und zwar die Überschrift in der auffällig stark gekürzten Form: "an Artaxerxes, den König. Deine Knechte, die Leute von Syrien. Und nun:". Daraus folgt zwingend,

¹Driver, *AD*², p. 33.

²So Meyer, *EJ*, pp. 25-6.

dass v. 11 unmittelbar an v. 8 anschliesst. Damit ist aber auch die richtige Erklärung für die dazwischenstehenden vv. 9/10 an die Hand gegeben. . . . Das ist nichts anderes als die ausführliche Aufzählung der Absender am Kopf des Briefes, die in v. 11 weggekürzt ist. Mit anderen Worten: v. 9/10 ist ein Nachtrag zu v. 11, der aber offenbar nicht an der richtigen Stelle eingefügt ist.¹

Schaeder's fundamental error is his assumption that this document was incorporated into another document, that of Tabeel, so that he has confused this particular section.² The present writer considers the difficulty of this passage to be due to the author of Ezra who included this information in his historical work. Relevant to this section of the study is the duplication of the introductory remark concerning the contents: v. 8 רחום בעל טעם ושמשל ספרא כתבו אגרה חדה על ירושלם לארתחשתא, and v. 11 דנה פרשגן אגרתא די שלחו עלוהי That both statements are editorial is certain because the verbs are active and in the third person. In v. 8 the phrase רחום חדה על ירושלם or על ירושלם may have been taken verbatim from a summary or notice of contents and edited to fit into the author's introduction of the document. However, while these phrases have a certain affinity with the summaries discussed above, it would be going beyond the evidence to assert more than just that. On the other hand, v. 11a appears to be clearly editorial throughout, although there are examples of documents referring to themselves as copies (Pherendates B and C). That the names were obtained from an address on the document is likely because they do not occur in the document itself, and the outside of the document is the place where the author of Ezra can be assumed to have found them. While it is common for the material in the address to be repeated in the body of the

¹Schaeder, *IB*, p. 22.

²For a discussion of Schaeder's view see above, pp. 108-9. See also deVaux, *BANE*, pp. 81-2.

letter, there are examples where this is not the case. For instance, sometimes titles are not repeated in the document: Arsham's in AD 5 and Nehtihur's in AD 12 and 13. In AD 3 the address informs us that the addressee is in Egypt, but this is not repeated in the letter, even though this particular information often is, as in AD 5, 7, and elsewhere.

In conclusion, summaries are common to various types of literature, e.g., legal documents and literary works, and their appearance on official administrative documents is not surprising, especially since it is of such practical value. The only clear examples in the documents being studied are those from the chancellery of Arsham, and the formula is always the same—*by* plus the summary. Two documents, Pherendates B and C, combine a notice of the contents, that it is a report, with the address. The introductory matter to Ezra 4:11-16 can plausibly be attributed to this source since it has close affinities with addresses and is not found in the document itself.

Address

As in other stylistic features, there is variation both in the occurrence and the form of the addresses. Since documents of papyrus or leather were rolled up and folded, the placement of the address on the outside was accomplished by either writing it at the bottom of the recto, with a gap between it and the end of the document, or by writing it on the verso. Just over half of the documents, twenty, have addresses. While most of the documents that omit it are not meant to be correspondence¹ or are not the actual documents but copies edited for

¹Fort. 6764, PF 2071, AP 32, AD 6, and Xanthos Trilingual.

historical works,¹ these two factors do not explain every omission of an address. It is not apparent why some documents omit the address.²

While the address formulas are all very simple and brief, there are distinctive differences between them. All of the documents from Arsham and his office use the same formula—"From (מן) X, to (על) Y"³—except AP 26 which though broken away here begins its address with מן [] ארשם זי ג. Equally simple though quite different is the formula used in the other Aramaic documents—"To X, Y";⁴ the order of addressor/addressee is reversed, and the addressee is not introduced by על. Completely different are the formulas used in the Pherendates correspondence. Pherendates B and C, both reports to Pherendates, satrap of Egypt, use the same formula: "Copy of the report of X to Pherendates."⁵ Pherendates A, an order from Pherendates to the priests of Khnum at Elephantine is addressed ". . . to X through/by means of Pherendates." The implication seems to be that Pherendates is not acting on his own initiative but is an intermediary, and in light of the two references to an edict of king Darius (ll. 5 and 7) this is probably the case.

To summarize, it is to be noted that since some of the documents are not intended to be correspondence, these quite naturally do not have addresses. Another reason for the omission of an address from the documents being studied is that some of them have been copied into larger historical works, and therefore material not essential to the histori-

¹Gadates Inscription, Herodotus 5. 24, all of the ED, and Thucydides i. 129. 3.

²AP 17, 27, 30, and 33. ³AD 1-5 and 7-13.

⁴AP 21, 33, BMAP 13, and probably AP 37 which is incomplete.

⁵On this phrase serving a dual purpose see above, p. 121.

an's purpose has been omitted. These are the two major reasons for the omission of an address; however, there may be other reasons which are not apparent. The formulas used vary in several ways and, as with other stylistic features, appear to be simply the preference of the individual or individuals involved.

In conclusion, ten stylistic features which occur in Achaemenid correspondence have been isolated. Not all ten occur in every letter, but these are the features one can look for. For the sake of clarity these have been listed in outline form with their most common forms given below.

I. Personal Address

- A. Between companions or equals: "To my brothers . . . your brother"
- B. Of subordinate to superior: "To X (name and/or title) from Y (name) your servant"
- C. Of superior to subordinate: "From X to Y"

II. Salutation

- A. Of superior to subordinate: שלם ושררת שגיא הושרה לך
- B. Of subordinate to superior: "We bless Pherendates before Khnum, the great god. May Khnum prolong his life."

III. Terms Used for the Classification of Documents

- A. אגרה
- B. זדכון/ז
- C. טעם
- D. נשתון
- E. פתגם
- F. None

IV. Introductory Terms

- A. כן אמר
- B. ידיע יהוי/להוא ל
- C. כעת (כעת, כען)

V. Formulation of Requests: טב _____ הן על with following verb usually in hithpa'al.

VI. Quotations: X שלח עלי כן אמר: _____ כעת Y כן אמר

VII. Dates

- A. Day, Month, Year
- B. Day, Month
- C. Month, Year
- D. Year

VIII. Subscripts: "X wrote the text; Y communicated its message"

IX. Summary of Contents: _____ על

X. Address

- A. "From X to Y"
- B. "To X, Y"
- C. "Copy of the report of X to Y"

CHAPTER IV

THE STYLE OF OFFICIAL GREEK CORRESPONDENCE

Since some scholars¹ have placed the writing of the book of Ezra in the Greek period, it has been considered worthwhile to include a brief discussion of official Greek correspondence. If this position is valid, especially if the ED can be shown to be forged documents from the Greek period as some have maintained,² then it can be deemed probable that these documents will contain Greek influences and characteristics.³ Also to be considered in this chapter are First and Second Esdras and two apparent Persian documents in the Greek Additions to Esther, the latter having no counterpart in the MT of Esther.

The emphasis in this chapter will be on the epistolary style of official Greek correspondence. The purpose here will be to show any contrasts in the styles of Achaemenid and Greek official correspondence.

Style of Official Greek Correspondence

At first . . . when the vast and unforeseen conquests of Alexander had placed under Macedonian control regions many times larger and more complex than the home-land, there was in existence no familiar bureaucratic organization which could be taken over to fit the new requirements. In Asia much was borrowed from the institutions of Achaemenian Persia, in Egypt the administration of the nomes continued on the same general principles as for centuries before under native and foreign rule, but in both lands much had to be added that

¹Batten, *ICC:EN*.

²Torrey, *ES*.

³For the similar question of Greek influence on the Aramaic of Daniel see Yamauchi, *NPOT*, pp. 170-200, 1970, and Coxon, *GUOST* 25:24-40, 1973/4.

was new. This slow process of organization is reflected in the gradual evolution of a technical terminology of court and administration.¹

This historical situation also existed with the advent of the Persian Empire and for both empires accounts for some of the variances found in the style of their correspondence. Thus in Persia as in Greece much was borrowed and adapted from conquered peoples, and with what was new ". . . the technical developed only gradually out of the non-technical, the official out of the private."²

Schalit has succinctly described the form of private Greek letters:

The private letter, as is known, is constructed along these lines: it begins with the name of the writer, followed by the name of the addressee in the dative, accompanied by a word of greeting; next comes a formula which usually consists of two elements: one a polite inquiry about the health and sometimes the general welfare of the recipient, and the other a statement about the writer's own health. Then follows the main body of the letter, that is, a discussion of its topic. The conclusion usually consists of wishes for good health. Generally, though not always, the letter ends with the date.

The official letter developed out of the private letter and, when addressed to an individual, did not essentially differ from it in form.³

This is the basic structure of official Greek correspondence. Stylistic devices, etc., will be treated in the discussion of specific documents that follows.

Persian Documents Preserved in non-Biblical Greek

There are three documents that come under consideration here.

Two of them have been preserved by Greek historians: Herodotus 5. 24

¹Welles, *RCHP*, p. xxxvii. ²*Ibid.*, p. xlii.

³Schalit, *JQR* 50:292-3, 1960. For a full detailed discussion of the formal and stylistic elements of official Greek correspondence, see Welles, *RCHP*.

and Thucydides i. 129. 3. The third, the Gadates Inscription, has been preserved on stone from the Roman period.¹

Herodotus 5. 24.—

Ἱστιαῖε, βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος τάδε λέγει. ἐγὼ φροντίζων εὐρίσκω ἐμοῦ τε καὶ τοῦσι ἐμοῦσι πρήγμασι εἶναι οὐδενα σεῦ ἄνδρα εὐνοέστερον. τοῦτο δὲ οὐ λόγῳισι ἀλλ' ἔργοισι οἶδα μαθῶν. νῦν ᾧν, ἐπινοέω γὰρ πρήγματα μεγάλα κατεργάσασθαι, ἀπύκεό μοι πάντως, ἕνα τοι αὐτὰ υπερθεῶμαι.

O Histiaeus, king Darius says thus: "My thoughts can show me no man who is a truer friend to me and mine; not words but deeds have proved this to me. Now therefore let nothing hinder you from coming to me, that I may disclose to you great purposes which I have in mind."²

It can readily be seen that this document lacks the characteristics of official Greek correspondence quoted above. The writer is not named first, there is no greeting, no inquiry concerning the addressee's health, or concluding wishes for good health. In contrast, the document corresponds well with official Achaemenid correspondence. There is the characteristic "thus says" found in Old Persian inscriptions³ and in the Aramaic documents. The use of νῦν as an introductory/transitional expression is characteristic of Achaemenid correspondence but completely foreign to Greek letters (see above, pp. 94ff.). Thus the style suggests that this document is an authentic specimen of official Achaemenid correspondence. It is to be noted that Herodotus apparently had access to official Persian documents: Hdt. 3. 89-97, 5. 52-3. 57.⁴

¹For bibliography of these documents see above, pp. 31-2.

²*Herodotus* (Loeb Classical Library).

³Kent, *OP*².

⁴How and Welles, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, Vol. I, p. 27. (See below, p. 183.)

Gadates Inscription.—

Β]ασιλεὺς [β]ασιλέων Δαρεῦος ὁ Ὑστάσπεω Γαδάται δούλωι τάδε λεγε[ι']
 Πυνθάνυμαί σε τῶν ἐμῶν ἐπεταγμάτων οὐ κατὰ πάντα πει[θ]αρχεῖν. Ὅτι
 μεν γα[ρ τ]ὴν ἐμὴν ἐκπονεῦ[ς γῆ]ν, τοὺς πέραν Εὐ[φ]ράτου καρποὺς ἐπ[ι]
 τ]ὰ κάτω τῆς Ἀσίας μέ[ρη] καταφυτεύων, ἐπαί[ν]ω σὴν πρόθεσιν καὶ
 δ]ιὰ ταῦτά σοι κείσεται μεγάλη χάρις ἐν βασι[λ]έως οἴκωι. Ὅτι δὲ
 τὴν ὑπὲρ θεῶν μου διάθε[σ]ιν ἀφανίζεις, δώσω σοι μὴ μεταβαλομένωι
 πεῦραν ἡδικ[ημέ]νου θε[ο]μοῦ· φυτουργοὺς γὰρ [ἰ]εροῦς Ἀπόλλωνος φό-
 ρον ἔπρασσε καὶ χώραν [σ]καπανεύειν βέβηλον ἐπ[ι]τάσσε, ἀγνοῶν ἐμῶν
 προγόνων εἰς τὸν θεὸν [ν]οῦν, ὃς Πέρσας εἶπε . . .

King of Kings Darius, son of Hystaspes, to his servant [. . .]

Gadates thus says: I hear that you are not in all things obeying my orders; for in that you are cultivating my land, introducing food-crops from beyond Euphrates [. . .] into lower Asia, I commend your policy, and for this great credit will be given to you in the house of the king. But in that you are causing my intentions on behalf of the gods to be forgotten, I shall give you, if you do not change your course, cause to know that I am angered; for you have levied tribute from the sacred gardeners of Apollo, and ordered them to dig unhallowed soil, not knowing my feelings towards the god, who spoke all truth to the Persians, and . . .¹

The address follows the Greek pattern—first the writer followed by the addressee in the dative—but this is also a pattern found in Achaemenid correspondence (see pp. 74ff.). The rest of the document, however, compares favourably only with Achaemenid correspondence.

Les caractères sont du commencement de l'époque impériale; mais, malgré les cinq siècles qui séparent la date de l'envoi et celle de la copie que nous possédons, l'authenticité de cette lettre ne peut être mise en doute. Ce n'est pas un résumé, plus ou moins exact, comme le document de Tralles daté par les noms du roi Artaxerxès et du satrape Idrieus. Ici nous avons la lettre même de Darius, recopiée longtemps après; l'authenticité ressort et de l'emploi de formules propres aux rois de Perse, et de constructions peu grecques, et du ton général du document.²

Thucydides i. 129. 3.—

Ἔσθ' ὡς λέγει βασιλεὺς Εἰρήνης Πausανία· καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν οὓς μοι πέραν θαλάσσης ἐκ βυζαντίου ἔσωσας κείσεται σοι εὐεργεσία ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ οἴκῳ ἐς αἰεὶ ἀνάγραφτος, καὶ τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς ἀπο σοῦ ἀρέσκομαι.

¹Burn, *PG*, p. 114. (Greek text from Cousin and Deschamps, *BCH* 13:529-42, 1889.)

²Cousin and Deschamps, *BCH* 13:532, 1889. See also Meyer, *EJ*, pp. 19-21.

καὶ σε μήτε νύξ μήθ' ἡμέρα ἐπισχέτω ὥστε ἀνεῖναι πράσσειν τι ὧν ἐμοῦ ὑπιοχνεῖ, μηδὲ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου δαπάνη κεκώλυσο μηδὲ στρατιᾶς πλήθει, εἴ ποὺ δεῦ παραγιγνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μετ' Ἀρταβάζον ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ. ὄν σοι ἔπεμψα, πρᾶσσε θαρσῶν καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ τὰ σὺ οἴη κάλλιστα καὶ ἄριστα ἔξει ἀμφοτέρους.

Thus saith King Xerxes to Pausanias: Because of the men whom you have saved for me across [the] sea, from Byzantium, there shall be laid up for you favor in our house, forever recorded, and with your words I am well pleased. And let neither night nor day hinder you from taking care to accomplish anything of what you have promised me, neither for expense of gold and silver let them be hindered, nor for size of Army, wherever they should be at hand, but with Artabazus, a good man, whom I have sent you, boldly execute my affairs and yours, whatever is finest and best for both.¹

Again, the form of official Greek correspondence is lacking. The address is patterned after Achaemenid royal inscriptions rather than official Achaemenid correspondence. The difference between the two is the position of *ḡātiy* (Gk. λέγει). In the inscriptions *ḡātiy* precedes the name of the writer, whereas in correspondence *ἡκ* (Gk. λέγει) follows the names of the writer and addressee.²

The general contents of these three documents also exemplify Achaemenid practice and rule. The expression "let _____ not hinder you" in Hdt. 5. 24 and Thuc. i. 129. 3 has its counterpart in Ezra 6:8. The titles of Darius and Xerxes are consistent with those found in Achaemenid inscriptions and correspondence. The Persian king's concern for agriculture is amply attested by contemporary Greek historians, notably Xenophon, *Economics* 4. 20-4. The practice of Persian kings writing down the meritorious deeds of their citizens and subjects is well known.³ Achaemenid concern for and support of their subject's cults and cult

¹Olmstead, *AJSL* 49:157, 1933.

²Cf. for example, XPa 3. 11, XPb 3. 21, etc., Kent, *OP*². For correspondence see above, pp. 74ff.

³Hdt. 3. 138-40, 5. 11, 8. 85, 9. 107; Esther 2:19ff and 6.

personnel is well attested¹ though not recognized in some modern circles.²

Thus these examples of official Achaemenid correspondence have been preserved by Greeks in Greek, yet preserving official Achaemenid style. The style and elements characteristic of official Greek correspondence are completely lacking. The contents generally concern matters of a sort familiar from the other Achaemenid correspondence. Hence these documents can be accepted as being genuine and valuable sources for Achaemenid rule.³

*Persian Documents in the Greek Versions
of the Old Testament*

This discussion will be limited to the following two groups of documents: 1) those in First and Second Esdras, two different versions of Ezra, and 2) those in the Greek Additions to Esther.⁴ The primary concern here is the relationship of the form of the documents in Greek dress with that of the documents in the MT.

1 & 2 Esdras

The forms taken by these two versions are completely different from each other. Second Esdras is a literal translation of Ezra while First Esdras is generally paraphrastic or freely translated, omitting

¹Cf. Cyrus Cylinder, see Berger, *ZA* 64:199-201, 1975; Pherendates A and B; the ED. See chapter 7 below.

²E.g., Batten, *ICC:EN*, pp. 60-1; Pfeiffer, *IOT*, p. 824; Torrey, *ES*, pp. 154-5.

³For a parallel example of a Greek translation of a foreign document see Bickerman, *TPAPS* 75:87-102, 1944.

⁴The Septuagint text used is A. Rahlfs' ed., *Septuaginta*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1935.

and adding materials, and only occasionally literal. Hence, in both versions the form the ED take in Greek is of little value for the purposes of this study.

Their main value, therefore, lies in their being translations of the Hellenistic period, for it is during this period that some scholars maintain that Ezra was written.¹ It has been shown elsewhere (chapter 3) that the ED as preserved in the MT conform perfectly to the style of official Achaemenid correspondence. In style they are completely free of Greek influences. This brings the issue to a discussion of the vocabulary of the ED. The Aramaic (and Hebrew) of the ED has been treated elsewhere (see chapter 2). The point of interest here is the success or lack of success of the translators in turning the Aramaic, and Hebrew in the case of Ezra 1:2-4, of the ED into Greek. It will be suggested at this point that greater success can be expected the closer the Aramaic stands to the time of its translators and less success the greater the time span between the two.²

The Aramaic (and Hebrew) vocabulary selected for Table 8 is given in alphabetical order followed by their equivalents in First and Second Esdras. An asterisk (*) next to the Greek equivalents indicates a mistranslation. It has not been deemed necessary to go into detail on the degree of mistranslation. It is sufficient to point out where the translator has not understood the vocabulary of his text. Because the translators of First and Second Esdras have translated so differently, the former freely, the latter literally, their results cannot properly

¹Notably Torrey, *ES*.

²Cf. Albright, *HUCA* 23 Pt. 1:1-4, 1950/1, for a discussion of the similar problem of dating the Psalms during the Hellenistic period. Also see above, p. 126, n. 3.

be compared.

TABLE 8
LXX RENDERINGS OF ED VOCABULARY

MT		1 Esdras	2 Esdras
5:8	^a ללג נבא	6:8 *λίθων ξυστῶν πολυτελῶν	*λίθοις ἐκλεκτοῦς
6:4		6:24 *λιθίνων ξυστῶν	*λίθινοι κραταιοῖ
7:23	אטיגתא	8:21 ἐπιμελῶς	*προσέχετε
5:8	^b אנפרא	6:9 σπουδῆς	*ἐπιδέξιον
6:8		6:28 ἐπιμελῶς	ἐπιμελῶς
6:12		6:33 ἐπιμελῶς	ἐπιμελῶς
7:17		8:15 _____	ἐτοίμως
7:21		8:20 ἐπιμελῶς	ἐτοίμως
7:26		8:24 ἐπιμελῶς	ἐτοίμως
6:6	^c אניכספרא	6:26 ?ἀποτεταγμένους	Αφασαχαῖου
4:13	^d אנפרא	2:15 _____	*τοῦτο
4:11	^e אנששנהא	2:13 Ἀρταξέρση	Ἀρθασασθα

^aOnly ללג is mistranslated. Cf. Smith, *PEQ* 67:5-17, 1941; Thomson, *PEQ* 92:57-63, 1960; and Bowman, *DHS*, pp. 64-74, 1965.

^bThe omission of a word cannot necessarily be attributed to a failure by the translator to recognize the word, especially in 1 Esdras. אנפרא also occurs in Ezra 6:13. 2 Esdras correctly renders it by ἐπιμελῶς and 1 Esdras 7:1 omits it. See Ellenbogen, *FWOT*, p. 33.

^cEzra 5:6: 2Esdras 5:6 Αφασαχαῖου; 1 Esdras 6:7 ἡγεμόνες. The exact meaning of the title אניכספרא itself is somewhat uncertain. See above p. 46. Cf. also Ezra 4:9 אניכספרא: 2E 4:9 Αφασαθαχαῖου, 1E 2:11 _____; אניפרא: 2E Αφασαῖου, 1E 2:11 _____. The meanings of the last two words are also uncertain.

^dTorrey sees in this word, reading אנפרא, either the Greek ἐπίταξις or ἐπίθεσις, *ES*, p. 175. If this is so and the original documents were composed during the Greek period as Torrey argues, then why or how did the translator of 2E fail to recognize it? Cf. Rudolph, *EN*, p. 39, and above pp. 46-49.

^eSo throughout the rest of Ezra; 2 Esdras transliterates and 1 Esdras translates using the Greek spelling.

TABLE 8—Continued

MT		1E	2E
7:12	κθωηηηκ	8:9 Αρταξέρξης	Αρθασασθα
7:21		8:19 Αρταξέρξης	Αρθασασθα
4:12	^f ψκ	2:14 *ναον	θεμέλιος
5:16		6:19 θεμέλιος	θεμέλιος
6:3		6:23 *πυρὸς	ἔπαρμα
5:9	^g ηηκ	6:10 *ἔργα	χορηγίαν
	יב	(See ηηη)	
4:17	^h ουβ βεβ	2:19 γράφοντι τα προσ- πίπτοντα καὶ Βεελτεέμω	Βααλαμ
7:21	גבג	8:19 γαζοφύλαξι	γάζαυς
7:12	ⁱ γηη	8:9 ?χαίρειν	?τετέλεσται ὁ λόγος
5:17	^j גבג	6:20 βασιλικοῦς βιβλιοφυλακίους	γάξης
7:20		8:18 βασιλικοῦ γαζοφυλακίου	γάξης
1:4	ג ^k ג	2:4 *ὄλκοῦσιν	παρκεεῖ
6:2	גגגג	6:22 ὑπεμνημάτιστο	ὑκόμνημα

^fSee Smith, *Essays Presented to Hertz*, pp. 393-4. On ἔπαρμα see Caird, *JTS* NS 19, 473, 1968.

^gEzra 5:3 ηηκ: 2E 5:3 χορηγίαν, 1E 6:4 στέγην ταύτην καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα ἐπιτελεῖτε. See further p. 49 above.

^hουβ βεβ Ezra 4:8: 2E Βααλαμ, 1E 2:12 *καὶ Βεελτέεμος
Ezra 4:9: 2E Βααλαμ, 1E 2:13 ὁ τὰ προσπίπτοντα
Twice 1 Esdras, 2:12, 19, took ουβ βεβ to be a personal name. Its translations of the title, 1E 2:13, 19, have to be considered reasonable correspondences. See above, pp. 54ff.

ⁱThe meaning of γηη is uncertain in this context.

^jEzra 6:1 גבג: 2E 6:1 γάξα, 1E 6:22 βασιλικοῦς βιβλιοφυλακίους.

^kFor a thorough study of the translation of ג in the Septuagint see Andrews, *JBL* 66:15-51, 1947.

TABLE 8—Continued

MT	1E	2E
	דכרן	
4:15	ספר דכרניא	βιβλίῳ ὑπομνηματισμοῦ
4:15	ספר דכרניא	ὑπομνηματισμοῦς
	הלך	(See מנדח)
7:24	זמר	ἄδουσιν
4:16	קלק	*εἰρήνη
	עמט	(See מטט טיש)
	כען	
4:13	כען	νῦν
4:14	כען	*καὶ
4:21	כען	*καὶ νῦν
5:16	כען	νῦν
5:17	וכען	καὶ νῦν
6:6	כען	νῦν
	^l כענת, כענת	
4:11	וכענת	καὶ νῦν
7:12	וכענת	*καὶ ἡ ἀπόκρισις
4:17	וכעת	*καὶ φησιν
	^m מדינה	
4:15	מלכין ומדנן	βασιλεῖς καὶ πόλεις
5:8	ליהוד מדינתא	Ἰουδαίαν χώραν
7:16	מדינת בבל	χώρα βαβυλῶνος
	ⁿ מנדה	

^lEzra 4:10 וכענת: 2E 4:10 _____, 1E 2:12 combines Ezra 4:7-10 in such a way that it is impossible to know if וכענת is rendered or not.

^mEzra 6:2 במדי מדינתא: 2E 6:2 Μηδων πόλεως, 1E 6:22 Μηδία χώρα.

ⁿמנדה was recognized and correctly translated but הלך and הלך caused problems for the translators.

TABLE 8—Continued

	MT	1E	2E
4:13	מנדה בלו והלך	2:15 φορολογίαν	*φόροι . . . δώσουσιν
4:20	ומדה בלו והלך	2:22 καὶ φορολογοῦν- τες	*φόροι πλήρεις καὶ μέρος
6:8	מדת	6:28 φορολογίας	φόρων
7:24	מנדה בלו והלך	8:22 *φορολογία . . . ἐπιβολῆ	φόρος
6:10	נִחְוֹן ^o נכס	6:30 *σπονδαὶ	εὐδύας
6:8	נכסי מלכא	6:27 _____	ὑπαρχόντων βασιλέως
7:26	ענש נכסין	8:24 ἀργυρικῆ ζημίᾳ	ζημίαν τοῦ βίου
4:18	נשתון ^p	2:20 τὴν ἐπιστολήν	*ὁ φορολόγος
7:24	נותין	8:22 ἕεροδούλοις	ναθινύμ
4:17	ספר ^q	2:19 γραμματεῖ	γραμματέα
7:12		8:9 *ἀναγνώστη	γραμματεῖ
7:21		8:19 *ἀναγνώστης	γραμματεῖς
4:11	עבר נהרה ^r	2:13 Κοίλη Συρία καὶ Φοινίκη	πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ

^oSee Torrey, *ES*, p. 78.

	P MT	1E	2E
4:7	הנשתון	2:12 _____	*φορολόγος
4:23	נשתונא	2:25 γραφέντων	*φορολόγος
5:5	נשתונא	6:6 *προσφωνηθήναι	*φορολόγω
7:11	הנשתון	8:8 γραφέντος προστάγ- ματος	διατάγματος

^qEzra 4:8, 9 ספר: 1 & 2 Esdras γραμματεῖς.

	r MT	1E	2E
4:10	עבר נהרה	2:12 *τοὺς ἄλλους τόπ- οις	περαν τοῦ ποταμοῦ
5:6		6:7 Συρίας καὶ Φοινί- κης	πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ

TABLE 8—Continued

MT		1E	2E
4:16		2:18 Κούλην Συρίαν καὶ Φοινύκην	
4:17		2:19 Συρία καὶ Φοινύκη	πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ
4:20		2:22 Κούλην Συρίαν καὶ Φοινύκην	τῆς ἐσπέρας τοῦ ποταμοῦ
6:6		6:26 Συρίας καὶ Φοινύ- κης	πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ
6:6		6:26 Συρία καὶ Φοινύκη	πέρα τοῦ ποταμοῦ
6:8		6:28 Κούλης Συρίας καὶ Φοινύκης	πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ
7:21		8:19 Συρίας καὶ Φοινύ- κης	πέρα τοῦ ποταμοῦ
7:25		8:23 ὅλη Συρία καὶ Φοι- νύκη	πέρα τοῦ ποταμοῦ
4:14	הרר	2:16 *τοιοῦτο	ἀσχημοσύνην
5:14	^S הפ	6:17 ἐπάρχῳ	*τῷ θησαυροφύλακι
6:6		6:26 ἐπάρχῳ	ἑπαρχοι
6:7		6:26 ἑπαρχον	ἀφηγοῦμενοι
7:24	הלל בלתי הלל	8:22 ?πραγματικοῦς τοῦ ἕροῦ	λειτουργοῦς οἴκου θεοῦ
7:19	הלל בלתי הלל	8:17 *εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν τοῦ ἕροῦ τοῦ θεοῦ σου	εἰς λειτουργίαν οἴκου θεοῦ
5:6		6:7 Συρία καὶ Φοινύκη	πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ
6:13		7:1 Κάλης Συρίας καὶ Φοινύκης	πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ

Hervey, *Expositor* 4th Series 8:62, 1893, was undoubtedly correct in considering "Coele Syria & Phoenicia" a modernization on הַרְרָה רַגַּל. See Shalit, *SH* 1:64-77, 1954, and Rainey, *AJBA* 1:51-78, 1969.

^SEzra 5:6, 6:13 הפ: 1 & 2 Esdras ἑπαρχος. 2E 5:14 seems to take הפ as part of the title הפ, rendering the phrase by τῷ θησαυροφύλακι τῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ θησαυροῦ.

TABLE 8—Continued

MT		1E	2E
	^t פתגמ		
5:11	פתגמ התיבונא	6:12 ἀπεκρίθησαν	ῥῆμα ἀπεκρίθησαν
6:11	פתגמ	6:31 ?τῶν προσγεγραμμένων	τὸ ῥῆμα
7:17	^u קנה	8:14 *συναχθῆναι	*ἔνταξον
4:18	^v קרא	2:20 ἀνέγνω	*ἐκλήθη
5:9	^w שב	6:10 πρεσβυτέρων	πρεσβυτέρους
6:7		6:26 πρεσβυτέρους	πρεσβύτεροι
6:8		6:27 *αἰχμαλωσίας	πρεσβυτέρων
	שם םעו		
4:19	שם םעו	2:21 ἐπέταξα	ἐτέθη γνώμη
4:21	שמו םעו	2:23 ἐπέταξα	θέτε γνώμην
4:21	שמת םעו	2:23 _____	τῆς γνώμης _____
5:9	מן שם לכם םעו	6:10 τύπος ὑμῶν προστάξαντος	τις ἔθηκεν ὑμῶν γνώμην
5:13	שם םעו	6:16 *ἔγραψεν	ἔθετο γνώμην
5:17	שם םעו	6:21 _____ γνώμης	ἐτέθη γνώμη
6:3	שם םעו	6:23 προσέταξεν	ἔθηκεν γνώμην
6:8	שם םעו	6:27 ἐπέταξα	ἐτέθη γνώμη
6:11	שם םעו	6:31 προσέταξεν	ἐτέθη γνώμη
6:12	שמ םעו	6:33 δεδογμάτῃα	ἔθηκα γνώμην
7:13	שם םעו	8:10 προσέταξα	ἐτέθη γνώμη
7:21	שם םעו	8:19 προσέταξα	ἔθηκα γνώμην

^t פתגמ Ezra 4:17: 2E _____, 1E 2:19 ἀντέγραψεν
Ezra 5:17: 2E ῥῆσιν, 1E 6:7-8 _____

^u 2 Esdras mistranslates the entire phrase here: חנה לך כל הנה כפסך קנה כפסך: καὶ πᾶν προσπορευομενον, τοῦτον ἐτούμωσ ἔνταξον ἐν βιβλίω τούτῳ. . . . See Batten, *ICC:EN*, p. 315.

^v Ezra 4:23 קרא: 2E 4:23 ἀνέγνω, 1E 2:25 ἀναγνωσθέντων. Note that קרא is passive in both texts but translated as a passive only at 1E 2:25.

^w Ezra 5:5 שב: 2E 5:5 *αἰχμαλωσίαν, 1E 6:5 πρεσβύτεροι.

TABLE 8—Continued

MT		1E	2E
7:23	טעם אלה	8:21 *θεοῦ νόμον	γνώμη θεοῦ
4:12	שור	2:14 *ἀγορᾶς	τεύχη
4:13		2:15 τεύχη	τεύχη
	שלם		
4:17	שלם	2:20 _____	εἰρήνην
5:7	שלמא כלא	6:8 *χαίρειν . πάντα	εἰρήνην πᾶσα
7:25	שפט	8:23 κριτᾶς	*γραμματεῖς
7:26	שרשו	8:24 *τιμωρῖα	*παλδεῖαν

In conclusion, the form the ED take in First and Second Esdras are of little value for the purposes of this study, for the former completely disregards the forms of the original while the latter follows them slavishly. The value of First and Second Esdras lies in their being translations of the Hellenistic period. If the translators had had no difficulty with their material then this would lend weight to the argument that Ezra was a late composition of the Hellenistic period. However, it has been shown that this was not the case. The limited vocabulary tabulated shows that First Esdras mistranslates 22% and Second Esdras 20%. Furthermore, some stylistic features of Achaemenid epistolary were also not recognized by the translators who omitted or changed these features (see above, pp. 42-4). This is sufficient to show that the translators were not very familiar with this material.¹ Therefore, the evidence gained from this source indicates that the ED

¹In the surrounding contexts of the ED the translators also had difficulty with the following: בירחא, מגלה, & פרשגן. Cf. Tisdall, *JTVI* 53:243-45, 1921.

were more likely to have been composed in the Persian period, as their Persian style, numerous Persian loanwords, and other Persian influences attest.¹

Greek Additions to Esther

Two of the Greek Additions to Esther are relevant to this study. They are Additions B and E whose texts are 3:13a-g and 8:12a-x respectively. They are generally accepted as being ". . . too florid and rhetorical in character to be anything but Greek in origin. . . ." ² Gregg states that "any retranslation of these rhetorical and florid pieces into Hebrew [or Aramaic] would be impossible. . . ." ³ It is to be noted that these Additions have no counterpart in the MT of Esther. These two Additions supply in full two documents merely referred to and given in summary; see Esther 3:12ff. and 8:8ff.

The edicts in the Greek Esther (and in III Maccabees) introduce a new feature in Jewish historiography: the presentation of the views of both conflicting parties. There is nothing similar in the Ancient Near East. . . . The Greek author always gave the other side a hearing.⁴

Bickerman elaborates on this feature of the Greek Additions to Esther.

Two edicts of Artaxerxes in the Greek Esther . . . are composed symmetrically: a blast against the Jews is answered by a counter-blast against Haman. This correlation explains the divergence between the headings. The first document begins as follows: "The great king Artaxerxes . . . says thus." This is the traditional form of a Persian edict which everybody knew from Herodotus and Thucydides [*sic*]. The second document is couched in the form of Hellenistic "letters patent": "The great king Artaxerxes . . . greetings." The variation is intentional: writing against the Jews,

¹This conclusion is supported by the results gained from the study of textual criticism (see above, pp. 42-4).

²Moore, *AB:Esther*, pp. lxiii-lxiv. Cf. Moore, *JBL* 92:383-5, 1973, and Gregg, *APOT*, Vol. I, pp. 665-84. Martin supports this position on the basis of syntactical features, *JBL* 94:65-72, 1975.

³Gregg, *APOT*, Vol. I, p. 666. ⁴Bickerman, *PAJR* 20:121, 1951.

the king uses the style of the Persian despot. Intervening in behalf of the Jews, he employs polite language of Hellenistic chancelleries. . . .¹

Even a cursory comparison of Additions B and E with the ED shows the great contrast between them. The former are Greek in style while the latter are Persian in style. Not only are Additions B and E Greek in style, their context reflects the influence of Greek historiography. This too is in contrast to the ED which are free of this feature. These are influences that one would expect of documents composed in the Hellenistic period as Additions B and E apparently were.² That the ED are completely free of these features speaks for their pre-Hellenistic origin.

¹*Ibid.*, p. 119. Bickerman correctly limits his remarks here to the headings of the documents. The heading of Addition B is the only part of the edict that reflects Persian style and even that is not true to form. The traditional form is τὰδε λέγει (see above, p. 130, n. 2), but here the form has been changed to τὰδε γράφει (3:13a). The reason for the change is not apparent.

²See above, p. 140, n. 2.

CHAPTER V

THE QUESTION OF PERSIAN INFLUENCE ON ARAMAIC

The purpose of this chapter is to gather together into one place all of the features in Imperial Aramaic of the sixth to fourth centuries B.C. that are attributed to Persian influence. Excepted are words of Persian origin taken into Aramaic. A further limitation must be placed on the influence of Persian after the Achaemenid period, as Bowman has done,¹ because it is not directly relevant to the documents being considered. This subject has not been dealt with by anyone either exhaustively or extensively. This is not surprising since expertise in two diverse languages, Old Persian (or Old Iranian generally) and Aramaic, is required for such an undertaking. The writer's contribution to this subject is therefore limited to the gathering and synthesizing of what has already been done.

There is another complication which has not been adequately treated by scholars discussing this subject. That is the fact that the Persians took over administrations using different languages which continued to be used by them, notably Elamite, Median and Neo-Babylonian, as well as Aramaic.² Old Persian, as attested, was used only in offi-

¹Bowman, *ARTP*, pp. 41, 66. Likewise Benveniste, *JA* 242:305, n. 1, 1954: "Ceci est impliqué par la note de Driver, *ad loc.*, mais la référence à phl. . . crée un anachronisme." On the other hand, MP usage may reflect an earlier development not otherwise attested.

²Kent, *OP²*, p. 8, notes Median influence on OP. Cf. Frye, *HP*, pp. 77-8, 94ff.

cial inscriptions and on seals. For the daily administration of the empire these other languages were used, Aramaic being the principle one. There was also a "hierarchy" of scribes, from ". . . one who had mastered the art of translation and style . . ." ¹ to the one who could only write his native language. It is to be noted that to the chancellery of each satrap and each provincial governor a royal (Persian) scribe was attached.² Hallock has shown that two intermediaries could stand between the "translator" and the writer.³ Thus as many as five persons could be involved in the production of a letter from the addressor to a translator/stylist and eventually to the one who actually did the writing. The languages involved could also be multiple. While all letters would not have passed through such complications, there are various stages and difficulties possible in communicating in a multilingual empire.⁴

Finally, Whitehead has made a significant, though often unheeded, word of caution:

. . . because we have such a limited corpus of texts in Ancient Aramaic and Old Persian, it is often difficult to determine if a particular meaning of a given Aramaic word is, in fact, not idiomatic Aramaic. Even if "un-Aramaic," it is difficult in many cases to determine the source of influence. Thus, while a number of possible calques have been suggested, few can be unquestionably substantiated.⁵

¹Frye, *HJAS* 18:459, 1955. See also J. Lewy, *HUCA* 25:188ff., 1954, and Nober, *BZ NF* 1:134-5, 1957.

²Hdt. 3. 128. Cf. Porten, *AE*, pp. 51-2.

³Hallock, *PFT*, pp. 51-2. See above, pp. 115ff.

⁴On this problem see pp. 202ff. ⁵Whitehead, *EAE*, pp. 248-9.

Supposed Examples of Persian Influence

1. אַדִּין.¹—Boyd has conveniently summarized the use of this word;

בְּאִדִּין, a temporal adverb . . . strictly "at then" or "at that time," is used interchangeably in Ezra and Daniel with the simple אַדִּין as a connective particle expressing sequence of time. In every case except one [Dan. 7:11] it is placed first in the clause, and everywhere except in that one case it seems to refer to the time of the action described in the verse immediately preceding. . . . בְּאִדִּין may be fairly regarded as a somewhat loose connective, expressive of temporal sequence, combined perhaps in this case with a notion of inferential resumption, such as the English "then" or "so then" conveys—a usage to which כֵּעַן in [Ezra] vi. 6 may be regarded as analogous, "now" or "now therefore" . . .²

The compound בְּאִדִּין is not attested in Imperial Aramaic outside of Biblical Aramaic (see *DISO*). It is noteworthy that the only occurrence of אַדִּין in the ED, 5:16, is not compounded with ב, although בְּאִדִּין does occur in the Aramaic narrative sections. It would appear that אַדִּין was used sparingly in place of אַחַר and כֵּעַן in official Achaemenid correspondence though more frequently in popular and legal documents.³

2. אַחַר.—This adverb does not occur frequently in Aramaic.⁴ It is used to begin a new sentence, "afterward, in the future"; to continue a sentence, "then"; and to introduce the apodosis, "then."⁵ In the Behistun Inscription it corresponds to *arki* of the Akkadian, and *pasāva* of the Old Persian version. Hence, "it is probably due to the influence of the O.-Pers. *pasāva* which is frequently used to continue the narration in the inscription at Bisitūn; . . ."⁶

¹Ezra 5:16, AD 5. 6, 7. 1. ²Boyd, *PRR* 11:272-3, 1900.

³See Driver, *AD*², p. 100 and *DISO*. Also see under אַחַר for Persian influence.

⁴Kutscher, *JAOS* 74:241, 1954. See *DISO* and *KB*.

⁵Kraeling, *BMAP*, pp. 262-3.

⁶Driver, *AD*², p. 50, where he also notes its continued use in

The similar use of אַרְיִן is to be noted (see above). אַרְיִן does not differ essentially in meaning from אַחַר. Illustrative of this is Cowley's restoration at Ahikar 53 where his note reads "[חַר]א probably, or [אַרְיִן]א." (AP, p. 232). Another comparison can be made with כַּעַן (כַּעַתָּה, כַּעַנָּה). "אחַר 'später, alsdann' . . . 'nun' (cf. eng. 'after all') gebraucht als eine Verstärkungs- oder Übergangsformel, wie aram. וְכַעַתָּה und BH וְעַתָּה. Oft fängt ein neuer Satz mit diesem Wort an."¹ Of the three, כַּעַן is the most frequent and appears to be the only one that became a stylistic feature of Achaemenid correspondence (see above, pp. 96ff).

3. אִישׁ.²—"Clearly אִישׁ in Aram. texts is not a Hebraism, since it is found in the earliest inscriptions . . . ; its wide diffusion in the Pers. period . . . , especially in an indefinite sense, is probably further attested by its use as an ideogram for the M.-Pers. *kas* 'anyone' . . ."³ Old Persian *martiya*, "man," occurs frequently in an indefinite sense⁴ and may have aided the "wide diffusion" of אִישׁ in an indefinite sense.

Pahlavi, *pas* the offspring of OP *pasā*. So Kutschner, JAOS 74:241, 1954. See Nyberg, *Hilfsbuch des Pehlevi*, Vol. II, pp. 171-2. Donner and Röllig, KAI, Vol. II, p. 307, seem not to be aware of these discussions: "Man wird mit der Möglichkeit rechnen müssen, dass dieser im Aram. ungewöhnliche Gebrauch auf den Einfluss lyd. Sprachdenkens zurückgeht. Eine entfernte Parallele ist die Übersetzung von altpers. *pasāva* durch akkad. *arḫi* 'hinterher' (im Nachsatz) in der Behistūn-Inschrift pers. I, 33= akkad. 14 u. ö."

¹Koopman, AC, Teil I, p. 165. See also Whitehead, EAE, p. 249.

²See DISO.

³Driver, AD², p. 55. See Fitzmyer, AIS, I C 21, II B 16. Cf. Kaufman, AIA, p. 78, n. 243.

⁴Kent, OP².

4. אִתִּי.¹—This word, meaning "there is," often seems to occur unnecessarily as at AP 27. 4, where Cowley remarks (p. 101)

אִתִּי seems to cause an unnecessary asyndeton, 'there is a part . . . they destroyed (it)'. The construction is probably borrowed from Persian, cf. the Behistun insc. i. 13 end, *didâ Nisâya nâma . . . avadašim avâjanam*, '(there is) a province N. by name . . . there I killed him', and very frequently.

But an OP equivalent of "there is" is lacking in this passage and elsewhere, and Cowley has had to supply it in the translation, hence the parenthesis.² Possibly the Aramaic scribes supplied verbally what the OP implied syntactically.³ There is one OP inscription that does seem to parallel אִתִּי in AP 27. 4: "In XPh 30 *astiy* 'there is' seems to have been used illogically for *āha* 'there was'."⁴ The latter reads *astiy : atar : aitā (31) : dahyāva : tyaiy : upariy : nipištā : a (32) yauda;* ". . . there is among these countries which are inscribed above (one which) was in commotion."⁵

Muraoka⁶ considers this use of אִתִּי to be a means of expressing emphasis, as exemplified in Ezra 5:17 הָן אִתִּי דִּי מִן כּוֹרֶשׁ מִלְכָּא שִׁים טַעַם,

¹Ezra 4:16, 5:17, AP 27. 4, AD 5. 2, 8. 1, Xanthos Trilingual, 1. 10. Also see *DISO* and *KB* for אִתִּי in other usages.

²Kent, *OP²*, p. 120, renders it "a district by name Nisaya, in Media—there I slew him."

³This seems to be a real possibility in light of the situation where Persian scribes were involved as the highest officers in the secretariat and who dictated letters to their subordinates who were generally bilingual natives. See above, pp. 115ff., and below, pp. 202ff.

⁴Kent, *OP²*, p. 90.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 151. DB 4. 46f. ". . . and of me much else was done [*astiy kartam*]; . . ." and 51f. ". . . by them was not done [*astiy kartam*] . . ." Both have *astiy* "there is" with a past passive participle but the construction is not parallel to that in XPh 30 or the Aramaic passages.

⁶Muraoka, *EBH*, pp. 60-1. See also Coxon, *VT* 26:400-9, 1976.

"whether a decree really was issued by Cyrus the king."¹ This emphatic use of אִתִּי Muraoka attributes to Akkadian influence based on the use of *ibašši*, "it is certain, certainly."² It seems clear that in some cases אִתִּי does express emphasis, as in Ezra 5:17 and possibly AP 27. 4, and Akkadian *ibašši* may well be its source. On the other hand, אִתִּי in some cases does appear to be unnecessary and is not easily explained as a particle of emphasis. For example, in the Xanthos Trilingual, l. 10, וְאִתִּי בִי (11) זִי בְעֵלִי [א] וְרָן יִהְיוּ "and there is property which the citizens of Orna will give." When אִתִּי is used to express emphasis, the object being emphasized has usually been mentioned prior to its occurrence (likewise with Akkadian *ibašši*). This is not the case in the Xanthos Trilingual.

Thus it seems more likely that the emphatic use of אִתִּי reflects Akkadian influence (*ibašši*) than it does Old Persian influence (*astiy*) (but see above, p. 146, n. 3). Furthermore, אִתִּי at this time was in a period of transition, developing into a simple copula.³ Hence its use may have occasioned some confusion for the scribes.

5. אֱלֹהִיא.⁴—Eilers has suggested that אֱלֹהִי (= OP *bag*, "god," pl. *bagan*, "gods") is used in the sense of "royal majesty."⁵ Driver adopted this suggestion at AD 13. 2. "The probability, however, must be borne in mind that אֱלֹהִיא may here mean 'his majesty,' when וְלֹאֲרַעֲם will

¹This is not a question as stated by Muraoka, p. 61. Cf. Dan. 2:26 which is clearly a question.

²For example: "my brother should indeed send orders that they should release them"; "certainly they have already left from here (en route) to Elam." Cited in *CAD*, Vol. B, p. 155.

³Muraoka, *EBH*, p. 61. ⁴AD 13. 2. 5, F. 5.

⁵Eilers, *AFO* 17:335, 1954-6.

correspond to מלכא ומני [מ] (DL 2 I); . . ."¹ However, *baga* in the sense suggested is not attested in Old Persian. Furthermore, the pronoun "his" is lacking here. It is also to be noted that the king is not involved in the matter of AD 13 as he is in AD 2. Whitehead seems to be correct, therefore, in asserting that ". . . there is no reason to doubt that 'lhy' refers to the heavenly gods."²

6. אריך.³—Scheftelowitz saw in this word Old Persian *āriyaka*, "eines Ariers würdig, ehrenwert, würdig."⁴ However, *ariya* with the suffix *-ka* is not attested in Old Persian. An older view held that ארן, the root of אריך, weakened from ערך.⁵ אריך seems to mean "fitting, proper," or the like.

7. אתור.—This spelling of Assyria with ת instead of ש occurs only in Ahiqar.

The name of Assyria is written אתור (as later in the Targums), not אשור as in the Sinjirli inscriptions. This is not because the papyrus is 300 years later than the Sinjirli texts but because it follows the Persian form Athura."⁶

Alternatively, it could be an occurrence of the shift ש > ת as in חקל from שקל.

8. ביין.⁷—This preposition usually means "between" in Aramaic as

¹Driver, *AD*², p. 85. (See Driver also at p. 101.)

²Whitehead, *EAE*, pp. 249-50.

³Ezra 4:14.

⁴Scheftelowitz, *AAT*, Vol. I, p. 79. But cf. #36 below.

⁵*BDB*, p. 1082. *BDB* rejects this older view in favour of Scheftelowitz's.

⁶Cowley, *AP*, p. 205.

⁷AD 1. 2, 2. 2, 5. 5. Also Ah 40, BMAP 3. 20, and 11. 7.

in Daniel 7:5, 8, its only occurrences in Biblical Aramaic. However, there are a few examples where it means "in" or "among" (see n. 7, p. 148 above). Driver considers this to be a Persian calque on the basis of the use of בין as an ideogram in Pahlavi for *andar*, "in, within, among, between."¹ However, Old Persian *atar* (i.e., *aⁿtar*) does not have the meaning "between" but only "within, among."² Furthermore, Kutscher has shown that the idiom exists in Demotic and Akkadian.³ On the other hand, it is noteworthy that this use of בין in Aramaic is attested only during the Achaemenid period.⁴

9. בִּירָה .⁵—This is an Akkadian loanword (*bîrtu*) describing a fortified city. It does not occur in Aramaic prior to the Achaemenid period, and afterwards only in the meaning "temple" in Nabataean.⁶ בִּירָה occurs in the Behistun Inscription to translate Old Persian *didā*, "stronghold."⁷

¹Driver, *AD*², p. 39. But see strictures in introduction concerning Pahlavi (Middle Persian) above, p. 142.

²Kent, *OP*², p. 166.

³Kutscher, *JAOS* 74:241-2, 1954. Also Millard, *Iraq* 34:133, 1972.

⁴The inscription of Carpentras also seems to have this usage of בין , KAC 49. 4 and KAI 269.4. On the use of בין with the meaning "whether" see KAI 30. 4 and Lev. 27:12.

⁵AP 27. 5, 30. 8, AD 5. 7, and Xanthos Trilingual, l. 3. Also in the introduction to Ezra 6:2b-12: 6:2a.

⁶*DISO*. Further see Bowman, *ARTP*. It also occurs in the Sardis bilingual inscription, see KAC 46 and KAI 260. It occurs once in BA, Ezra 6:2, and several times in BH of the Persian period. See Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 44.

⁷AP, Beh. 1. 2, DB 2. 39. See Levine, *JAOS* 92:72, 1972.

10. *בַּעַל טַעַם*.¹—Scheftelowitz has suggested that this title ". . . die wörtliche Übersetzung vom ap: framātar 'Befehlshaber' ist, framānā 'der Befehl' und das Suff.: tar hat die Bedeutung von *בַּעַל* 'Herr', . . ."² However, this etymology for *framātar* is not supported by Kent, and *framātar* always refers to the Persian king in the Old Persian inscriptions.³ Schaeder suggests ". . . dass *framānākara* die pers. Wiedergabe von reichsaram. *b'ēl t'ēm* bzw. von dessen Vorbild, akk. *bēl tēmi*, darstellt."⁴

11. *בֶּר בֵּיתָא*.⁵—Literally "son of the house," this expression has been attributed to Persian influence by Driver:

. . . a literal translation of a Pers. expression designating a member of the royal family . . . The underlying Iran. word is the O.-Iran. **visō puθra*, which is preserved in the Av. *visō puθra* 'the son of the house, prince' . . . The Aram. *בֶּר בֵּיתָא* continued in use as an ideogram in Pahl. and Parth. texts meaning 'prince of the royal house' . . .⁶

Kaufman⁷ on the basis of Eilers' study⁸ attributes *בֶּר בֵּיתָא* and its Akkadian equivalent to Persian influence. However, *בֶּר בֵּיתָא* and its parallels are attested throughout the languages of the ancient Near East.⁹ For example, *בֶּר מַלְךְ* occurs in the Old Testament and in Hebrew seals;

¹Ezra 4:17 and AP 26. 33. Also Ezra 4:8, 9.

²Scheftelowitz, *AAT*, Vol. I, p. 64. ³Kent, *OP*², p. 198.

⁴Schaeder, *IB*, p. 67. This title is discussed more fully on pp. 54ff. above.

⁵AD 2. 1, 3. 1, 5. 1, 10. 1, AP 30. 3 (*בְּנֵי בֵּיתָא*).

⁶Driver, *AD*², pp. 40-1. Further, Benveniste, *TNPIA*, pp. 22-6, and *CTL*, Vol. VI, p. 24; and Gershevitch, *SCO* 2:208, 1969, and *BSOAS* 33: 88, 1970.

⁷Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 70. ⁸Eilers, *A Locust's Leg*, pp. 55-63.

⁹See Brin, *AION* 19:433-65, 1969, and Heltzer, *AION* 21:183-98, 1971.

"son of the king" is a title found in Egyptian texts; *māri šarrim* occurs at Mari; *mār šarri* occurs in Akkadian texts found at Ugarit and El-Amarna; and *mār šarri u mār ekalli* occurs in a Hittite contract.¹

12. *לך ין* . . . *לך ין*.²—"If it seem good" is a characteristic deferential statement used in correspondence of the Persian period when subordinates ventured to make suggestions or petitions to their superiors."³ Benveniste suggests an underlying Old Persian **yadiy šuvām anašā kāma*, "s'il te plaît ainsi, si tel est ton bon plaisir."⁴ But this phrase is unattested in Old Persian, and the phrase may be originally Aramaic.⁵

13. *ן* (*ן*) Phrases.⁶—The first occurrences of the genitive use of *ן* are in Mesopotamian Aramaic, where they are direct translations of Akkadian *ša*,⁷ and possible Akkadian influence is suggested by Kaddari.⁸ However,

The intimate relationship between relative and genitive constructions in all of the Semitic languages suggests that both of these uses of the so-called determinative pronoun *đū/šū* were known in Proto-Semitic; accordingly, the absence of the genitive expansion in Old Aramaic must be taken to indicate only its comparative rarity in that dialect.⁹

"Against Akkadian origin and arguing for inner Aramaic development are

¹These titles are all listed and discussed in Brin, *AION* 19:433-65, 1969.

²See pp. 98ff. above for references and further discussion.

³Bowman, *IB*, Vol. 3, p. 613.

⁴Benveniste, *JA* 242:305, 1954. Followed by Driver, *AD²*, p. 55.

⁵Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 250. ⁶See Lexicons for references.

⁷Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 130. ⁸Kaddari, *PICSS* (1969), p. 104.

⁹Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 130.

the following: 1) the presence of a genitive particle in . . . Ugaritic; 2) the possibility, at least, of Aramaic influence on Akkadian."¹ Yet the widespread use of genitive ן in Mesopotamian texts and in the Aramaic version of the Behistun Inscription speaks for Akkadian influence on at least the rapid development of this feature in Aramaic.²

"Similar constructions existed, however, in Old Persian, so that Persian influence may have supported the development of these constructions whether their origin lay in an inner Aramaic development or resulted from Akkadian influence."³ In support of this is the evidence which Kaddari's study shows.

There are two factors which determine the variations of proportion between const. st. and $z\bar{i}$ ($d\bar{i}$)-phrases. . . . Chronologically, the later the document, the greater the number of $z\bar{i}$ ($d\bar{i}$)-phrases in it; and stylistically, the closer the language to the official one, the more $z\bar{i}$ ($d\bar{i}$)-phrases it contains.⁴

14. $\text{לֹא יִדְעַתְּ לִמְלֶכְךָ}$.⁵—"Be it known to the king is appropriate for the report of royal informants and may have been a standard formula for introducing such reports."⁶ Benveniste's suggestion that it is a calque from Persian⁷ is accepted by Driver.⁸ Kutschera, on the other hand, suggests a reinvestigation here in the light of the $q\bar{t}y\bar{l}$ l-

¹Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 265, n. 2. Against Aramaic influence on Akkadian is the extreme rarity of this feature in Old Aramaic; see Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 131.

²Kaufman, *AIA*, pp. 130-1.

³Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 265.

⁴Kaddari, *PICSS* (1969), p. 103. Illustrative of this is $\text{לֹא יִדְעַתְּ לִמְלֶכְךָ}$ in Ezra 6:5 (under Cyrus) which becomes $\text{לֹא יִדְעַתְּ לִמְלֶכְךָ}$ in Ezra 5:14 (under Darius). But also $\text{לֹא יִדְעַתְּ לִמְלֶכְךָ}$ and $\text{לֹא יִדְעַתְּ לִמְלֶכְךָ}$ in Ezra 5:12 and 13 respectively.

⁵See above, p. 95 for references and further discussion.

⁶Bowman, *IB*, Vol. III, p. 601. ⁷Benveniste, *JA* 242:305, 1954.

⁸*AD*², p. 66.

syntagm.¹

15. יהב.²—In Ezra 5:16 the expression אשיא יהב is usually rendered, "laid the foundation." ". . . while . . . יהב can mean 'set, put, lay', no other examples are adduced of its use in the particular sense of laying foundations, . . ."³ Persian influence has been suggested here on the basis of Old Persian *dâ*⁴ which has the meaning "give" and "make." However, in Old Persian ¹*da-* "give" and ²*da-* "make" are separate words from two different roots: PIE **do* "give" and PIE **dhe* "put" > "make, create."⁵ These two roots are distinct in Old Persian, having different forms in their conjugations, and would not have been confused (see below, under #28), nor would there be confusion in translating the two words. Furthermore, note the same use of נתן in 1 Kings 6:6 (see above, p. 70).

16. כוה.⁶—In AD 5 and 10 the adverb כוה "so, thus" is added to the phrase טב . . . על הן which, as Driver remarks, ". . . is not essential to the sense. . . ." (AD², p. 55). This may reflect the same unnecessary use of Old Persian *avaθā*, e.g., DSf. -*Auramazdām* : *avaθā* : *kāma* : *āha*, "Unto Ahuramazda thus was the desire"; DSj. -*AMm* : *kāma* : *āha* : *avaθā*, "(but) as was Ahuramazda's desire."⁷ It is to be noted

¹Kutscher, *PICSS* (1969), p. 142, and below, pp. 165f.

²Ezra 5:16. Also AP 81. 111, and Ah 170.

³Gelston, *VT* 16:234, 1966.

⁴Guthe and Batten, *SBOT:EN*, p. 63, who also state that Babylonian *nadānu* has the same sense in the trilingual inscriptions. Both points are accepted by Bowman, *IB*, Vol. III, p. 613.

⁵Kent, *OP*, p. 188. **do* can also mean "take," Benveniste, *PGL*, pp. 271-80.

⁶AD 5. 8, and 10. 2. ⁷Kent, *OP*².

that AD 5 and 10 were composed not in Egypt but in Babylon or Susa.¹

17. כִּנְתָּ.²—While כִּנְתָּ is an Akkadian loanword, *kinātī*, *kinattu*, it owes its use in Aramaic to Persian influence. It first occurs in Imperial Aramaic and is equivalent to Elamite *akkayaš*, a loanword from Old Persian **haxxay*, meaning "colleagues, companions."³ The terms refer to ". . . the associates of a definite person who belong to the same occupational group or professional body."⁴ This reflects Persian administrative practice whereby officials always appear in groups.⁵

18. לִפְתִּי.⁶—Bowman considers this to be a hybrid combination of the Aramaic preposition לִ and the Old Persian preposition *patiy*.⁷ That this suggestion is uncertain Bowman readily admits. In the first place, its meaning is uncertain and לִפְתִּי itself is actually unknown. Secondly, Old Persian *patiy* in the sense required by Bowman—"for, equivalence"—is not attested.⁸ However, if Degen's interpretation⁹ is accepted, that

¹Driver, *AP*², pp. 10-2.

²Ezra 4:17 and 6:6. See *DISO*. Also 4:7, 9, 17, 23, 5:3, 6, and 6:13.

³Hallock, *PFT*, p. 665. On the Elam. and OP terms see Harmatta, *ActOr* 5:195-203, 1955.

⁴Harmatta, *ActOr* 5:203, 1955.

⁵Porten, *AE*, pp. 46-7. כִּנְתָּ is almost always followed by the name of the class of officials being referred to: דִּינִיָּא, "judges"; אֲזֻזְרִיָּא, "heralds"; סְפָרִי, "scribes, accountants"; פְּרִמְנִכְרִיָּא, "foremen"; כַּהֲנִיָּא, "priests"; הַמְרִכְרִיָּא, "accountants"; אֲפִרְסְכִיָּא, meaning uncertain. See Myers, *AB:EN*, p. 42. Twice כִּנְתָּ refers to slaves, AD 3 and 5, and two times to soldiers, Ah 56, 67.

⁶ARTP 43. 4 and 114. 3. ⁷Bowman, *ARTP*, p. 41, n. 36 and p. 113.

⁸Kent, *OP*², pp. 87, 194. Avestan *paiti*, which Bowman alludes to, is too late for consideration.

⁹Degen, *BO* 31:126, 1974.

פתי is simply "width, breadth" and אצבען should be read אצבען, "finger," thus being a measurement (cf. AP 26. 18-20), then the question of Persian influence here can be discarded.

19. מן קדמן.¹—Benveniste notes that מן קדמן, used adverbially in the sense of "from of old, long ago" (i.e., "formerly"), corresponds to Old Persian *hačā paruviyata* (DB 1. 7. 8. 45).² But that this expression is a Persian calque in Aramaic is not likely, since it occurs in this usage already in the eighth century B.C. in the Aramaic inscription of Panammuwa II.³

20. חצן.⁴—Benveniste has suggested that חצן may be a loan translation from Old Persian *ham-taxš*, "work with, effect."⁵ Driver⁶ and Whitehead both reject the suggestion, the latter noting that *ham-taxš* is not used as a relative verb as is חצן.⁷

21. γ and η weakened to \aleph , η or zero.⁸—

As is well known, /' / and /h / weakened in *ATB* [Aramaic of the Talmud of Babli] and in *M* [Mandaic] and apparently were reduced to /', h / (or zero). The same can be observed in the *A* [Aramaic] logograms of Pehlevi. The reason obviously is the *Ak* [Akkadian] and *P* [Persian] substrata, respectively, to which these phonemes were alien. This

¹Ezra 5:11, AP 32. 5. Cf. AD 5. 9, 7. 1. 5, 8. 6, and 9. 2.

²Benveniste, *JA* 242:305, 1954.

³KAI 215. 9 and KAC 11. 9. It also occurs frequently in BH, see *KB*.

⁴AD 7. 4. 5, 11. 3, 13. 1. Also Beh. 60 and Dan. 6:4.

⁵Benveniste, *JA* 242:305, 1954. For the OP see Kent, *OP*², pp. 185-6.

⁶*AD*², p. 65.

⁷Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 251.

⁸ $\gamma > \aleph$: Ezra 5:8, 6:4, 11, BH $\gamma \gamma > \aleph \aleph$; 4:14 ארין (?), see above. $\eta > \aleph$: *ATB* ארין/הו, see index p. 193 and discussion pp. 96-7.

process is bound to happen wherever Semites and non-Semitic peoples establish contact.¹

This process can be pushed back even further to the Achaemenid period as evidenced by the Bahadırli Inscription from Asia Minor² and the Aramaic ritual texts from Persepolis.³

22. עבד לנפש.⁴—This phrase is used in the sense of "to make one's own," and Benveniste states that ". . . est un calque de v. p. (h)uvāipašiyam akunauš 'id',"⁵ which occurs in DB 1. 47. This has been accepted by Driver,⁶ Rundgren⁷ and Kutscher.⁸ Yaron points out the possibility that this Persian calque also passed into Demotic.⁹

23. עבד על.¹⁰—In the expression עבד על גיתא זילי Driver compares עבד על, "made over to, attached to," with the analogous עבד לנפש and has suggested the former also may be due to Iranian influence.¹¹

24. עבד + *abstract noun*.¹²—There are two expressions in which

¹Kutscher, *CTL*, Vol. VI, p. 373.

²KAI 278, dated by Donner and Rollig in the fifth to the fourth centuries B.C., while Kutscher (see n. 1 above) dates it in the fourth to the third centuries B.C. Naveh supports Kutscher's date, *DAS*, pp. 57f. (also pp. ix-x).

³See above, p. 155, n. 8. On this topic see Greenfield, *HUCA* 29:214, 1958, and *JAOS* 82:290-2, 1962.

⁴AP 30. 12-3, and AD 12. 6. Also AP 7. 6, and Dupont-Sommer, *CRAI* (1966), pp. 44-58.

⁵Benveniste, *JA* 242:305, 1954. ⁶*AD*², p. 83. ⁷*VT* 7:400, 1957.

⁸*CTL*, Vol. VI, pp. 363 and 387.

⁹Yaron, *JNES* 20:128, 1961. Also Kutscher, *CTL*, Vol. VI, p. 387.

¹⁰AD 7. 3. ¹¹Driver, *AD*², p. 64. See Whitehead, *EAE*, pp. 251-2.

¹²Ezra 4:15, 19; 6:26; AD 3. 6. 7-8; 4. 3-4; and 7. 9-10. Also AP 14. 3.

the abstract nouns are Persian loanwords. They are *וּגַסַּת פְּתִיגָם יִתְעַבֵּד לָךְ*, "and you will be reprimanded," AD 4. 3-4, and 7. 9-10; and *סְרוּשִׁיתָא* "punishment shall be done to them," AD 3. 6. 7-8. Rundgren, in discussing the meaning of *שְׂרָשׁוּ* in the expression *דִּינָה* *הֵן לְשִׂרְשׁוּ* (Ezra 7:26), connects the use of *עֲבָד* here with *לְנַפְשׁ* (see above) and sees in it a Persian calque.¹ His conclusion states that

In Ezra vii 26 wird zwar nur die Phrase *dīnā 'abād* gebraucht, aber in dem oben zitierten Briefe aus Ägypten [AD 3. 5-7] begegnet die Wendung *serōšītā 'abād*. Es dürfte sich auch hier um eine *Lehnübersetzung* handeln, denn eben das avestische *sraošyā* verbindet sich mit *kar-* "machen" = *'abād*²

Whitehead grants this possibility ". . . at least when used with *srwšyt'*."³ However, *עֲבָד* plus abstract nouns also occurs in the Sefire inscriptions,⁴ which suggests a possible Aramaic origin of the construction.⁵ A more certain Persian calque is *עֲבָד* plus *קָרַב* going back to Old Persian *hamaxanān kar*.⁶

25. *לְ* for *אֶל*.—The preposition *אֶל* "to" is common in Hebrew but rare in Aramaic. On the other hand, *לְ* is common in both languages and comes to take the place of *אֶל* in Aramaic, retaining its original mean-

¹Rundgren, *VT* 7:400, 1957.

²*Ibid.*, p. 404. But the Avestan evidence is late.

³Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 252.

⁴I C 4-5, II B 2, 3. 22. See Fitzmyer, *AIS*, pp. 73-4.

⁵Non-Persian nouns also appear in this usage. *דִּינָה*, Ezra 7:26, AP 14. 3; *אֲשַׁדּוּר*, Ezra 4:15, 19. *אֲשַׁדּוּר* may be Persian, see p. 49 above.

⁶Naveh and Shaked, *Or* 42:452, 1973. Found only in the Beh. Insc. and Dan. 7:21. Cf. von Soden, *Or* 37:264, 1968. Naveh and Shaked also suggest here that *עֲבָד* + *אֲשַׁכַּר* may be analogous. On *אֲשַׁכַּר* see Kaufman, *AIA*, pp. 59, 161.

ings while adding the sense of "to."¹ Driver states, in regards to the Arsham correspondence, "The substitution of 𐤁 for 𐤁𐤀, which is the norm in Eg. letters, is here due to Iran. influence, since 𐤁 is still used as an ideogram for 𐤀 'to' in Pahl. texts . . ."² But Whitehead is certainly correct in rejecting Driver's suggestion and attributing the change to an inner Aramaic development, especially since 𐤁 in the sense of "to" is already attested in Old Aramaic—Sefire III. 14ff.³

26. 𐤆𐤁𐤀.⁴—Driver notes the semantic development of 𐤆𐤁𐤀 from "wish" to "affair" and the parallel developments in Akkadian (*ṣibātu*) and Syriac *ṣbwt*.⁵ He further notes the similar development in Biblical Hebrew חפץ, and that 𐤆𐤁𐤀 is used as an ideogram in Pahlavi for *hīr*.⁶ Eilers points out the similar development of Middle Persian *xvāstak*.⁷ However, the Iranian parallels suggested here are all later developments, and the Old Persian equivalent of 𐤆𐤁𐤀, *vašna* does not show a similar development.⁸

27. 𐤒𐤒.⁹—Driver notes the parallel use of 𐤒𐤒 in the sense of *apud* in the Arsham letters with the later Pahlavi and Parthian systems of writing.¹⁰ However, 𐤒𐤒 in the sense of *apud* occurs already in Old

¹See *DISO* and *KB*.

²Driver, *AD*², p. 42. Again, Pahlavi evidence is late.

³*DISO* and Fitzmyer, *AIS*. In the latter, reference is made to the parallel Hebrew phrase with 𐤁 in Is. 45:17 and Jer. 3:16.

⁴AE 4. 2. Also Dan. 6:18. ⁵Driver, *AD*², p. 49.

⁶*Ibid.* ⁷Eilers, *AFO* 17:335, 1954-6.

⁸Kent, *OP*² ⁹Ezra 4:18, 7:14, 19; AD 1. 1; ARTP, *passim*.

¹⁰Driver, *AD*², p. 38.

Aramaic,¹ and Iranian influence need not be considered its source.

28. שׁוּם.²—The basic meaning of שׁוּם is "place, lay" but it is used with the following meanings: "to make, produce, and give."

Scheftelowitz has suggested Persian influence for this development.

Im alteran: dā sind zwei ursprünglich ganz verschiedene Verba zusammengefallen, nämlich ai: dhā "setzen, schaffen, erzeugen" und dā "geben", so dass ap, abktr: "setzen, schaffen, erzeugen, geben" heisst. Alle diese Bedeutungen nahm in der Perserzeit auch das hebr. aram.: שׁוּם das ursprünglich "setzen" heisst, an, wie שׁוּם טַעַם "einen Befehl geben" . . .³

The homonymic *dā*, however, is not homonymous in the forms attested in the inscriptions, and the two roots remained separate rather than converging as stated by Scheftelowitz.⁴ Furthermore, these meanings of שׁוּם are attested in Aramaic prior to the Persian period—שׁוּם עָדִי, "conclude, make a treaty," Sefire I B 6.⁵

29. שׁ Persian case ending.—Old Persian noun stems ending in *-i* or *-u* take š in the nominative singular. An example of this case ending in Aramaic occurs in the name אַרְיִוּוּן which is spelled with and without final שׁ.⁶

30. שׁאל.⁷—Benveniste suggests that in the Arsham letters the

¹In the Sefire Inscription, see Fitzmyer, *AIS*.

²*Passim*, see *KB* and *DISO*.

³Scheftelowitz, *AAT*, Vol. I, pp. 64-5.

⁴See Kent, *OP*², p. 188. On the problem of homonyms see Barr, *Comp. Phil.*, pp. 125ff.

⁵See Fitzmyer, *AIS*.

⁶Bowman, *ARTP*, pp. 81, 96-7, 112. On its entry into Elamite see Cameron, *JNES* 32:48, 1973, and Hallock, *PFT*, pp. 9-10.

⁷AD 4. 3, 7. 9, and 12. 8.

Aramaic is a calque from Old Persian *fras*, meaning not only "question, interrogate" but also "punish."¹ Driver notes the possibility of Benveniste's suggestion, but observes that in the case of AD 4. 3 and 7. 9 ". . . punishment is unlikely to precede reprimand . . . whatever the case may be elsewhere (cp. DL 12 8)."²

31. שלם ושררה שגיא הושרת לך.³—Driver⁴ suggests that this greeting formula is of Persian origin, referring to Rosenthal, who, however, refers to a later development:

die mitteliran. Formel: ŠLM wdrwstjh wr'mšn wKL' prhwjh "Wohlergehen und Gesundheit und Frohsinn und alies Glück," die in dieser und ähnlicher Gestalt mehrfach in den aus Ägypten stammenden Papyri des anfangenden 7 Jahr's. n. Chr. erscheint . . ., ist gewiss als genuin iranisch anzusprechen und ein direkter Nachfahr der über 1000 Jahre vorher in aram. Sprache auftretenden Formel.⁵

Kutscher notes that this formula is paralleled exactly in the letters of the Neo-Babylonian and the Late Babylonian periods.⁶ Whitehead also questions its Iranian origin but on the basis of its alliteration, since "if the formula were originally Old Persian and translated into Aramaic, such extended alliteration would be striking indeed."⁷

32. שמה, *naming phrase*.⁸—"It is a feature of OP style, that at the first mention of a person (other than of the ruling king) or of a

¹Benveniste, *JA* 242:304-5, 1954. Cf. Kent, *OP*², p. 198 (*fra*9).

²Driver, *AD*², p. 50. See Rundgren, *ZAW* 70:214-5, 1958.

³See pp. 77ff. above for references. ⁴*AD*², pp. 44-5.

⁵Rosenthal, *AF*, p. 27, n. 3.

⁶Kutscher, *CTL*, Vol. VI, p. 364. So Rosenthal, see n. 5 above.

⁷Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 254.

⁸Ezra 5:14. See *DISO*, and Bowman, *ARTP*, index.

place (other than of a governmental province) the name of that person or place should be followed by *nāma* or *nāmā* ["name"] . . .¹ This feature is attested only in the Aramaic of the Achaemenid period.² But it is also known in Akkadian and Egyptian which leaves its origin uncertain.³

A more complex phrase is found in the Aramaic ritual texts from Persepolis.

At times the name of the celebrant is followed by the Aramaic *šmh*, "his name" which reproduces the Old Persian *nāma*, "by name." This, like the unit stroke, is used only with the celebrant and never with the officials. When both the *šmh* and the unit stroke are found with the name of the celebrant, the usage is a calque for the Old Persian expression *l martiya . . . nāma*, "l man, . . . by name."⁴

33. *Casus Pendens*.⁵—Kent considers this construction to be anacoluthic in Old Persian.⁶ Hahn, however, has attempted to show that it is native to Old Persian and is parallel to the Indo-European and Indo-Hittite relative clause.⁷ As Whitehead says, if Hahn is correct then

¹Kent, *OP*², p. 97. Cf. Hahn, *JAOS* 85:48, 1965.

²Kutscher, *JAOS* 74:241, 1954. Cf. Kutscher, *CTL*, Vol. VI, p. 392.

³Whitehead, *EAE*, pp. 254-5. Cf. Kutscher, n. 2 above, and *PICSS* (1969), p. 133. Also Kent, *OP*², p. 98, and Driver, *AD*², p. 99.

⁴Bowman, *ARTP*, p. 34. *nmw*, however, should be rendered "by name" in keeping with *OP*, as indeed Bowman does in *ARTP*.

⁵Ezra 5:17, AD 3. 7-8, 8. 4, 9. 1-2, 10. 1-2, 13. 3, AP 26. 10-13. "The grammatical form of substantive and modifiers placed in front of the main clause has been variously termed front-extrapolation, nominative (or some other case) absolute, casus pendens, anacoluthic nominative phrase or appositive." (Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 268).

⁶Kent, *OP*², p. 99. According to Whitehead, *EAE*, pp. 268, Benveniste attributes its occurrence in *OP* to Aramaic influence: "C'est sur des phrases araméennes que le rédacteur perse a pris modèle." (*Grammaire du vieux-perse*, p. 180).

⁷Hahn, *JAOS* 85:48-58, 1965. Cf. Whitehead, *EAE*, pp. 268-9.

the construction may well be due to Persian influence.¹ On the other hand, there are two clear examples of *cosus pendens* in the Sefire Inscription, although they lack the demonstrative pronoun of the Imperial Aramaic and Old Persian.² "When naming expressions of localities are placed in front, an adverb of place is used in the main clause."³ Whatever its origin, ". . . at issue is the striking 'resumptive' use of the demonstrative pronoun . . ."⁴

34. *Definite article, omission of.*—There are several examples of an omission of the definite article where one is expected in the Aramaic ritual texts from Persepolis, which Bowman attributes to Persian influence since Old Persian does not have a definite article.⁵

35. *Demonstratives, repetition of.*⁶—In Old Persian the demonstratives are ". . . either a pronoun referring to a previously mentioned substantive, or an adjective immediately followed by its substantive, . . ."⁷ Whitehead remarks that ". . . the use of the demonstrative pronoun *zk(y)* after personal names and . . . that a translation such as 'that PN' is not idiomatic English. The same repetitive use of the

¹See p. 161, n. 6, above.

²3. 7-9 and 19-21. See Fitzmyer, *AIS*. The same appears to be the case in BH, see Kautzsch, *Grammar*, par. 143.

³Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 268. Cf. Segert, *ArOr* 24:397, 1956.

⁴*Ibid.* Cf. Kutschner, *CTL*, Vol. VI, pp. 391-2, and Muraoka, *JSS* 11:166-7, 1966.

⁵Bowman, *ARTP*, pp. 67, 69. For OP see Kent, *OP²*, p. 85, §262.

⁶Ezra 4:13, 15, 16; 4:19, 21; 5:8, 9, 16, 17; 6:7, 8, 12; AD 3. 6-7; 5. 7. 9; 6. 6; 8. 5; AP 30. 6. 9. 10. 12-4. 16. 17. 22. 23. 27; and Xanthos Trilingual, 1. 19.

⁷Kent, *OP²*, p. 85.

demonstrative is found in the Old Persian inscriptions."¹ This was noted long ago regarding Biblical Aramaic, ". . . der ständige Gebrauch des pronomens ܐܝܢ f. ܐܝܢ pl. ܐܝܢܐ 'jener', um auf eine vorhergenannte Person oder Sache hinzuweisen, dem Sprachgebrauch der persischen Inschriften entspricht."² It is to be noted, though, that in Old Persian the demonstrative precedes the substantive but in Aramaic it follows the substantive. Against the Persian origin of this use of the demonstrative is its occurrence in Biblical Hebrew, though it is relatively rare: e.g., *זֶה מֹשֶׁה*, Exodus 32:1, 23; *זֶה סִינַי*, Judges 5:5, Psalms 68:9; *לִוְיִתָּן זֶה*, Psalms 104:26.³ But the marked increase in its use in Imperial Aramaic may well be due to Persian influence.

36. *-ka*, Persian suffix.⁴—"Noun and adjective stems with suffix *-ka-* are adjectives which may assume substantival meanings."⁵ With but one possible exception (see n. 4 below) all of the Aramaic examples are place names.

37. *-na*, Persian suffix.⁶—This suffix is used to indicate place, among other uses, in Old Persian,⁷ and Bowman suggests a possible occurrence of it in Aramaic.

¹Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 269. ²Meyer, *EJ*, p. 29.

³See *BDB*, pp. 260-1, and Kautzsch, *Grammar*, pars. 136, 138g.

⁴AD 5. 5, AP 26. 9. 22, 33. 6. Also Ezra 4:9, AP 24. 33, and 67. 3. 1. Ezra 4:14? (see *אֲרִיךְ* above).

⁵Kent, *OP²*, p. 51. Cf. Meyers, *EJ*, pp. 35-6, and Eilers, *IBKU*, p. 40. Others give the form as *-akan* or *-kn*: Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 261-2; Cowley, *AF*, p. 82, following Sachau; Naveh, *WO* 6:45, n. 21, 1971. But this writer has not been able to find the latter forms in OP. The *n* undoubtedly is an Aramaic addition. Cf. Benveniste, *TNPJA*, pp. 13ff.

⁶ARTP 77. 2. ⁷Kent, *OP²*, p. 51.

Instead of the expected *byrt'*, the spelling is *byrtn*. The final letter is not the expected 'aleph of the determinate state but clearly and definitely the letter -n. It might be a simple error, but it could possibly be an attempt to form a Persianized hybrid by affixing the Persian element -na which indicates place, as in such words as *aydna: āyadanā*, "sanctuaries," and *varānam*, "citadel."¹

38. *Passivum Majestatis*.²—

As is well known, the early Semitic languages are generally disinclined to use the passive construction whenever the *agens* is known. . . .

It is, therefore, very remarkable that, in Biblical Aramaic, as well as in the Aramaic documents found in Egypt, the passive is used even when the *agens* is known, the *agens* being introduced by the preposition 𐤍, . . .

This construction, while very widespread, is, at the same time, restricted to a particular context. It is found only in direct speech where the *agens* is a king or a very high-ranking person, or in a narrative when speaking either about a deity or about the king or about a high-ranking person.³

Kutscher points out that this construction does not occur in other Aramaic dialects and that its use in Old Persian and Aramaic increases in the course of time.⁴

39. *Plene spelling with 𐤌 in medial position*.—J. Friedrich has attributed this feature in Aramaic dialects to Persian influence.⁵ However, according to Kutscher, Friedrich's arguments would only carry weight if it could be shown "1) that this development could not have occurred independently in A; and 2) that it does not occur prior to the

¹Bowman, *ARTP*, p. 141; cf. p. 66, n. 33.

²Ezra 4:19, 21; 5:17; 6:8, 11, 12; 7:13, 14, 21; AD 2. 1. 3; 5. 8; 8. 5; 10. 1. 2. 5; AP 21. 3; 26. 6; 27. 8. 9; 30. 24.

³Kutscher, *PICSS* (1969), pp. 148-9.

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 149, 151. Cf. Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 133, n. 98.

⁵Friedrich, *Or* 26:37-42, 1957.

P domination."¹ Both of these premises have been proved wrong by M. Tsevat who establishes that "(1) the *aleph* as a vowel letter has been in use since the fourteenth century. (2) It occurs in medium as well as in final position."² Kutscher notes the possibility that Persian may have accelerated a process already begun in Aramaic (see n. 1 below).

40. QTYL L- *Syntagm.*³—This construction has an exact parallel in Old Persian:

īma tya manā kartam—this is what was done by me; *manā* is genitive/dative of *adam*—I, and equals the Aramaic *lī*; *kartam* is a passive participle (nominative masculine singular) of the verb *kar*—do, make, build, and equals 'abīd—done, in Aramaic; therefore, the phrase *manā kartam* corresponds precisely to 'abīd lī. In Old Persian, this syntagm is employed as a present perfect . . .⁴

Kutscher states that this construction is not attested before the Persian conquest,⁵ and that

From the fragmentary Aramaic version of the Behistun Inscription, we learn that the construction was non-existent in Aramaic at the beginning of the Persian presence. The translation of *manā kartam* survives in three places, and in each is represented by the Semitic perfect *qatal* ('bdt). Had the construction 'byd l- existed in Aramaic at that time, it is hardly conceivable that it would not have been used by the Aramaic translator of the inscription as the counterpart of *manā kartam*.⁶

This construction was long considered to be a passive, but Benveniste has shown that this interpretation is erroneous.

. . . the Indo-European languages for a long time had only the expression *est mihi aliquid* to express the possessive relationship,

¹Kutscher, *CTL*, Vol. VI, p. 373.

²M. Tsevat, *JBMV*, p. 88. Tsevat does not mention Friedrich's article, rather he argues with Cross and Freedman, *EHO*, 1952.

³AD 7. 3. Also Pad.1. 6 recto (l. 4 verso?), see Fitzmyer, *JNES* 21:15-24, 1962; Esther 5:12 and Neh. 6:1.

⁴Kutscher, *PICSS* (1969), p. 135.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 136.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 137.

and that the verb "to have" is a recent acquisition in all of them.

The explanation of the perfect arises from this observation. We have two exactly superimposable expressions, one possessive, **manā puṣṣa astiy*, and the other in the perfect, *manā krtam astiy*. This complete parallelism reveals the meaning of the Persian perfect, which is *possessive*. For just as *manā puṣṣa astiy* 'mihi filius est' is equivalent to 'habeo filium,' so *manā krtam astiy* is to be understood as 'mihi factum est,' equivalent to 'habeo factum.' The similarity of the expressions appears as soon as one superimposes them:

**manā puṣṣa astiy* 'mihi filius est' = 'habeo filium';

manā krtam astiy 'mihi factum est' = 'habeo factum.'

The interpretation of the Persian perfect has been transformed. It is an *active* perfect of *possessive* expression, . . .¹

Likewise the Aramaic construction is an active perfect of possessive expression.²

41. *Word order*.—In normal Semitic word order the verb usually precedes the subject. In Imperial Aramaic, however, the subject before the verb is the dominant order.³ This change has usually been attributed to Akkadian influence.⁴ Bowman questions this, pointing out that ". . . the order in Old Aramaic, which might be expected to show such influence, places the verb first."⁵ Also, since Old Persian syntax usually places the subject before the verb, Bowman suggests Persian influence for the change.⁶ Finally,

Kaufman has noted that the free word order of Mesopotamian Aramaic was no doubt the result of Akkadian influence which was at this time

¹Benveniste, *PGL*, pp. 155-6.

²Kutscher, *CTL*, Vol. VI, p. 377. Cf. Kaufman, *AIA*, p. 133, n. 98.

³Baumgartner, *ZAW* 45:128ff., 1927, gives the following picture for BA: Daniel 120 : 80; Ezra 30 : 15.

⁴E.g., Bauer and Leander, *GBA*, p. 332; Kutscher, *IOS* 1:109, 1971; and Kitchen, *NPBD*, p. 76.

⁵Bowman, *ARTP*, p. 69, n. 47.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 33, n. 3. For OP see Kent, *OP²*, p. 96.

characterized not by classical Akkadian order but by a free word order. This then would be step one in the change from one dominant order (verb initial) to another (verb final). Persian word order, unlike contemporary Akkadian word order was not free; the dominant order was SOV. Under Persian influence, step two, the dominant order of Aramaic became SOV.¹

Conclusions

An analysis of the occurrences of these Persianisms in the ED shows that Ezra 5:7-17 and 6:6-12, letters to and from Darius, contain by far the greatest number. This is especially true if the totals are limited to those of certain probability. The following table will demonstrate the distribution.² Only the Persianisms that are attested, or allegedly so, in the ED are included here. Column A gives the total number of Persianisms, certain and questionable ones, that occur in each of the ED, and column B gives the total number of only the certain Persianisms that occur in each of the documents. The questionable Persianisms are marked by a question mark (?). Now, the most important fact to notice here is that Ezra 5:7-17 contains more than twice as many certain Persianisms, and Ezra 6:6-12 contains nearly twice as many certain Persianisms, as the three documents written some sixty years later under Artaxerxes I, Ezra 4:11-16, 4:17-22, and 7:12-26. It is also noteworthy that Ezra 5:7-17, written *to* Darius, contains almost twice as many certain Persianisms as Ezra 6:6-12, written *from* Darius. The writer suggests that this was due to the newness of the use of Aramaic by Persian scribes under Darius.³ This can be seen already under Cyrus in Ezra 6:

¹Whitehead, *EAE*, p. 266. Cf. Kaufman, *AIA*, pp. 132-3.

²Naturally, some Persianisms are widespread such as #13 יר phrases and #41 Word order. Others would require a specific context in order to be used, e.g., #32 שמה, naming phrase.

³Darius reorganized the administration and Persian scribes were

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF PERSIANISMS
IN THE EZRA DOCUMENTS

Persianisms: identified by par. Nos.	From the Reign of						
	Cyrus		Darius		Artaxerxes		
	1:2-4	6:2-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-6	4:17-22	7:12-26
1			X				
4 (?)			X				
6 (?)					X		
10 (?)						X	
12			X				
13		X	X		X		X
14 (?)			X		X		
15 (?)			X				
17				X			
19 (?)			X				
21		X	X	X			
24 (?)					X	X	X
25 (?)			X		X	X	X
27 (?)						X	X
28		X	X	X		X	X
32			X				
33 (?)			X				
35 (?)			X	X	X	X	
38			X	X		X	X
41		X	X	X	X	X	X
Totals A	0	4	15	6	7	8	7
Totals B	0	3	7	4	2	2	3

2-5 which has a relatively large number of Persianisms considering its brevity. These Persianisms, and Persian loanwords, were used purposefully as reading aids for the bilingual scribes unaccustomed to the use of Aramaic. But by the time of Artaxerxes the scribes would have been accustomed to using Aramaic, and the artificial use of Persianisms would

stationed throughout the empire, see below, p. 205.

no longer be necessary. Nevertheless, as with certain loanwords, some Persianisms would have been accepted into the language at least for the duration of Persian rule. The same situation has been illustrated in the use of Old Persian by Elamite scribes at the beginning of Darius' reign.¹

In conclusion, in addition to Persian loanwords, Imperial Aramaic can be seen to have been greatly influenced by the Persian language. The ED themselves contain nearly one half of the Persianisms that have been suggested by various scholars. These Persianisms, of which at least seven² do not occur later than Imperial Aramaic, added to the occurrences of Persian loanwords should dispel any lingering doubts concerning the authenticity of the Aramaic documents of the period generally and the ED in particular, covering as they do loan translations, syntax, phonology and morphology.

¹Cameron, *JNES* 32:51-3, 1973, and Gershevitch, ed., *EPT*, editor's preface. See below, pp. 207ff. where this is discussed more fully.

²Nos. 1, 2, 8, 9, 17, 32, and 38. It would not be feasible to attempt to find all of these Persianisms in later documents, especially Persian suffixes where all of the literature would have to be read. Thus, at this stage, it is sufficient to point out that a number of these features did not last beyond Persian rule—at least not in the literature that has been recovered. Hence, while future discoveries may require adjustments in conclusions drawn, the evidence is sufficient at this point to support the position that the Aramaic Documents of the period are to be considered authentic.

CHAPTER VI

ARCHIVES AND ARCHIVE ADMINISTRATION

The appearance of official documents in the book of Ezra calls for an investigation into the author's source for his materials. With but one exception, 6:2b-5, the author of Ezra does not disclose this source. Suggestions only may be made therefore from what information the author does give, from the documents themselves, and from the known practices of Persian administration. This takes us directly into the consideration of archives and archive-keeping. First we have considered modern archive administration in order to understand archives as an institution. This has been necessitated by our incomplete knowledge of archival administration in the Ancient Near East. Then modern archival practices and principles have been projected back to the Persians and their predecessors to determine from archaeological and inscriptional evidence their counterparts in the Ancient Near East. Because of the paucity of evidence from Achaemenid remains the major evidence for archive administration has had to be taken from their predecessors.

The bearing of archive administration on the ED centers on three issues: 1) the question of where and how the author of Ezra had access to official Achaemenid documents; 2) the author's introductions of his documents, especially the terms used to designate the types of documents; and 3) the reliability of the archival practices attested in the ED and by the author of Ezra when compared with known contemporary sources.

Modern Archive Administration

In 1956 Weitemeyer took up the debate of ". . . whether a distinction was made between libraries and archives . . ." ¹ in the Ancient Near East. His conclusion was an affirmative and he made the following distinction:

. . . a distinction between library (bibliothèque) and archive must be considered practical, seeing that they differ essentially in their functions. An archive consists of a collection of documents drawn up and used in some administrative, legal or economic process and forming part of the same; a collection of letters may also come under this heading. An archive may belong to an institution (temple or palace) as well as to private individuals. While the archive contains documents recording phenomena of material life, the library holds products of the mental activity of man: a library is a collection of works (religious, literary, mathematical, legal, philological, etc.) gathered with a view to immediate or later use by the group of persons served by the library. ²

This is an important distinction, and while Weitemeyer's definition of archives is correct, it lacks an essential point. Hence a more technical definition of archives must be used:

a document which may be said to belong to the class of Archives is one which *was drawn up or used in the course of an administrative or executive transaction (whether public or private) of which itself formed a part; and subsequently preserved in their own custody for their own information by the person or persons responsible for that transaction and their legitimate successors.* ³

The essential point added here is that archival materials are preserved for the use of those responsible for the transactions recorded therein and are not open to the general public as are library collections.

With this definition of archives in mind, attention can now turn

¹Weitemeyer, *Libri* 6:217-38, 1956, p. 219. ²*Ibid.*, p. 218.

³Jenkinson, *MAA*², p. 11. Compare the definition of Muller, et al: "An archival collection is the whole of the written documents, drawings and printed matter, officially received or produced by an administrative body or one of its officials, in so far as these documents were intended to remain in the custody of that body or of that official." (*MADA*², p. 13).

to the types of documents which make up an archive. The administrator

. . . starts a collection of archives . . . by preserving the *originals* of written instructions or information he has *received*; *copies* of similar documents which he has *issued*; and memoranda (a diary as it were) of his own *proceedings*. All Archives must necessarily fall into these three groups—documents which come into an office, (copies of) documents which go out; and documents that do neither, which circulate within it.¹

Some basic principles that govern the organization of archival material can be considered briefly.

Speaking . . . , of the generality of Archives we may say that from an original collection not arranged upon any particular principle there will very soon be separated off such classes as by reason of their numbers or the fact that they are frequently required for reference are judged worthy of the dignity of a separate file.²

Other principles for separation are subject matter and form, the latter ". . . being understood in the sense both of physical shape and of diplomatic conception."³ ". . . The physical nature of the writing medium is the fundamental element that determines the genesis, the organization, and the preservation of archival material."⁴

One final aspect of archive-keeping is the matter of the custody of archival materials.

We need do no more here than to draw the obvious inference that once Archives are in his keeping the Archivist must allow no access, or possibility of access, to them in any circumstances, except under the personal supervision of himself or his deputy; supervision including his or his deputy's personal presence without intermission. It is equally clear that in no circumstances may any marking or alteration of a document (alteration including any change whatever, in its relation to other documents) be made by any one save an Archive official.⁵

Accordingly the matters to look for when our attention turns to archives in the Ancient Near East and their bearing on the ED are firstly, archives are distinct from libraries, maintained for the use of

¹*Ibid.*, p. 23. Cf. Wesendonk, *LO* 49:6, 1932. ²*Ibid.*, p. 25.

³*Ibid.*, p. 26. ⁴Posner, *AAW*, p. 18. ⁵Jenkinson, *MAA*², p. 83.

those who are responsible for their contents; secondly, three types of documents make up archives, those that come into it, copies of those that go out from it, and those that circulate within it; thirdly, the basic principles that govern the organization of archival materials—their number, frequency of use, subject matter and form; and finally, archive administration requires strict custody of the documents.

Archives in the Ancient Near East

The distinction between archives and libraries in the Ancient Near East has long been debated,¹ and a brief summary of the current consensus is in order here. Once archives and libraries became fully developed institutions² there were at least two areas in which they were distinct.

Content.—Archive documents are primarily the records of the administration of an organization, be it an individual estate or a world empire. Library documents, on the other hand, are primarily literary products of the mental activity of man (see above, p. 171). This is not to deny a certain overlapping in the two types.³

Arrangement.—A certain similarity of arrangement existed because of the similarity of storage methods and of the common nature of the writing medium. Nevertheless,

There was indeed a particular library technique, manifesting itself in the gathering into series of tablets dealing with the same subject, in colophon inscriptions serving library purposes, and in the

¹For the literature see Posner, *AAW*, pp. 12ff.

²On the stages of the development of these two institutions see especially Weitemeyer, *Libri* 6:217-38, 1956.

³Posner, *AAW*, pp. 26ff.

different catalogues. . . . As archive tablets were arranged according to their nature and date, a distinction between the two kinds of techniques must be said to have been made in practice at any rate.¹

Further attesting this difference in arrangement are the labels of the collections, ". . . the archive labels indicate the nature and the period of origin of the documents; the library labels give the name of the series."²

In spite of these areas of distinction between archives and libraries, confusion does exist since archives often contain literary texts that one would expect to be in a library rather than in an archive. The southwest archives at Ugarit, for example, contained a number of religious texts.³ Apparently this was the only archive room to have an oven for firing tablets, and perhaps these had been brought for this purpose. On the other hand, religious texts very often had political significance, and kings especially resorted to omens etc. before making important decisions. Ashurbanipal wrote a letter to one of his officials ordering him to collect such tablets for the palace.⁴ Specifically mentioned are all of the series relating to war, series of entering the palace spells, and various other omen texts, etc. Some of the literary texts found in the southwest archives at Ugarit are also of this nature.⁵ Thus there are logical explanations for the presence of liter-

¹Weitemeyer, *Libri* 6:233, 1956. Libraries very early began to inventory their collections in catalogues. For the earliest known such catalogue see Kramer, *HBS*, pp. 217ff., and on catalogues generally see Thompson, *AL*, pp. 4-8. Archives apparently did not make such inventories.

²*Ibid.*, p. 234.

³*Ugaritica* IV, p. 91.

⁴Waterman, *RCAE*, Pt. IV, pp. 213-5. Also in Thompson, *LBL*, pp. 2-5

⁵*PRU*, V. Cf. Gordon, *UT*, p. 279.

ary texts in archives, but until a thorough study of archives is made these must remain tentative and the whole matter left open.

A problem immediately arises in regard to archives from the Ancient Near East. First, many of the archives were plundered and destroyed in wars in antiquity, some intentionally and some accidentally. Second, early excavators failed to appreciate archives as an institution, thus they were plundered again.¹ As a result few archives have been recovered in the state in which they were first organized, thus disrupting the context of innumerable documents. The importance of this point for the modern scholar is aptly stated by Jenkinson:

. . . no archivist . . . could possibly allow full Archive value to documents which have been violently torn from the connexion in which they were originally preserved, a connexion which in nine cases out of ten is important, if not vital, for the full understanding of their significance.²

Weitemeyer demonstrates three stages in the development of archives in the Ancient Near East. It will be sufficient here just to note the stages. The first stage is the use of already existing store-rooms for storage of archive documents. The second stage is the separation of archival materials from store-rooms, i.e., archives become an independent institution. The third stage is the separation of current accounts from old accounts.³ This third stage is true of historical documents as well as economic documents as illustrated by the archives at Mari.

In the large archive three basket labels were found which had been dated in Hammurabi's 33rd year (the year after Hammurabi's capture of the town). The labels stated the contents of the tablet baskets to be letters from the servants of Shamshi-Adad and Zimrilim respec-

¹Posner, *AAW*, p. 6, who also notes that this is changing, pp. 6-7 and especially pp. 11ff.

²Jenkinson, *MAA*², p. 42. ³Weitemeyer, *Libri* 6:220-23, 1956.

tively. As neither of the kings was in power any more at the time when the labels were written, this is in fact an example of filing of historical documents.¹

The archival organization of Ugarit has been preserved in its original state and offers an excellent example of archive administration in the Ancient Near East.² Posner has conveniently summarized the archaeological evidence which need only be given here in outline form.

The following administrative and record-keeping installations have been identified so far:

1. *The Archives West*. The office of receipt of the treasurer in charge of the provinces exclusive of the capital was located . . . to the left of the main entrance of the palace so that taxpayers could make their payments without entering the building. . . .

2. *The Archives East* was housed at the very opposite end of the palace. . . . Its premises were easily accessible for persons coming from the interior of the city and understandably so because here, it appears, were centralized records pertaining to matters financial and legal of the capital and the countryside immediately surrounding it. . . .

3. *The Central Archives*, ". . . in which there were preserved the property records of an entire kingdom and in which were recorded . . . the changes resulting from purchases, exchanges, wills, and gifts that occurred in the real and movable property holdings . . . of the entirety of the citizens of Ugarit." . . .

4. *The Archives South*, . . . had records in Akkadian cuneiform script that had to do with relations with the Hittite lands to the north. . . .

5. In the *Archives Southwest*³ . . . records in the alphabetical script of Ugarit prevailed . . . the Archives Southwest seems to have had a special task that distinguished it from the other archival offices in the palace and gave it some of the functions of a central expediting unit. . . . it appears to have been charged with operating the oven for firing tablets. . . . only the Archives Southwest had an oven of this kind. . . . since there were found copies or translations into Ugaritic alphabetical cuneiform of documents the originals of which must have been in Babylonian, the clerks of Archives Southwest may have been assigned the duty of

¹*Ibid.*, p. 223. Cf. Oppenheim, *AM*, p. 278, and Schmidt, *Persepolis*, I, p. 174.

²Schaeffer, *PRU* III, p. xi.

³Schaeffer notes that this archive also contained a "private library," "Ainsi semble se confirmer l'hypothèse précédemment formulée que des Ugaritiens dévots avaient conservé dans leurs maisons ou offices des textes religieux en cunéiformes, comme nous détenons aujourd'hui une Bible, un livre de prières ou un missel . . ." (*Ugaritica* IV, p. 75).

translating messages from abroad that the royal government wanted to have available in the native language.

6. *The Archives of the Little Palace*. . . . the tablets in Babylonian cuneiform appear to stem from an administration that had to do with the import and export of goods in bulk, activities based on the ports to the south of Ugarit. . . .¹

To illustrate the continuity of archives under successive empires attention is drawn to the Eanna temple in Uruk where "the archives building, erected in the Neo-Babylonian era and rebuilt under the Achaemenids, yielded economic records of the period from Sargon II of Assyria to Darius II of Persia."² Mention can also be made of the situation of Mari when it was captured by Babylon, whereby the latter attempted to preserve the archives of the former under a semblance of order.³ Further at Mari, Jennings⁴ has been able to demonstrate the principal locations of the various archives, e.g., the diplomatic archive, the economic archive, judicial archive, etc. This despite the disarray of many of the tablets due to the conquest of Mari by Babylonia and their further disruption by the excavators and translators and publishers. The re-establishment of the archives is based on the texts themselves, archaeological evidence, and the main distribution of the tablets. Unfortunately, a central archives of the Achaemenids has not yet been uncovered. However, records of Persian officials have been discovered

¹Posner, *AAW*, pp. 32-5.

²*Ibid.*, p. 54. Cf. Ezra 4:11-6 and 4:17-22.

³Sasson, *Iraq* 34:55, 1972. See pp. 175-6 above, and Posner, *AAW*, p. 270.

⁴"Administrative Organization in the Mari Palace" (unpublished paper, 1974), p. 4 and appendix II.

throughout the Ancient Near East. From Susa¹ and Persepolis² come several thousand Elamite tablets pertaining to the administration of the empire. Most are economic records but correspondence and decrees are also known. From Egypt³ come Aramaic records on papyrus and leather from the Persian military post at Elephantine and from the administration of the estate of the Persian satrap Arsham.

A final aspect of archive administration to be considered is the matter of custody. Fortunately there is ample written evidence detailing the matter of custody of archives in the Ancient Near East. First it should be noted that the very nature of clay tablets secured the inviolability of their contents, although the same cannot be said of other writing materials, e.g., parchment and papyrus (unless sealed with a clay bulla).⁴ But our primary concern here is the custody of archives as an institution. Sasson has conveniently collected three documents illustrating archive-keeping in general and their custody in particular.⁵ It will be sufficient here to quote these documents verbatim with a few additional comments.

ARM X:12.—

Tell my lord thus (speaks) Šib/ptu, your handmaid. The palace is fine. My lord had written as follows: "I have just now sent to you Yassur-Addu; send along with him *ebbū*-officials, and from where he will show them the tablets' location, have them take (them) for me and have these tablets placed before you until my arrival to you."

¹Olmstead, *HPE*, pp. 69f.

²Schmidt, *Persepolis*, I & II. See also Cameron, *PTT*, and Hallock, *PFT*.

³Cowley, *AP*, and Driver, *AD*².

⁴Chiera, *TWC*, pp. 71-2. Cf. Dougherty, *JAOS* 48:109-35, 1928.

⁵Sasson, *Iraq* 34:55-67, 1972.

Now, in accordance to what my lord wrote, with this man I sent Mukannišum, Šubnalû and UD-ḫi-ri-iš-ḫi.BAD. Yassur-Addu showed the *ebbū*-officials, whom I have sent along with him, one (store)-house in the workshop that was under Etel-pi-šarrim's supervision. They opened the door of the (store)-house to which he pointed, (a door) which was sealed by Igmilum of the "secretariat," (and) took out two baskets, together with their sealings; these baskets having been sealed by Etel-pi-šarrim. These baskets are placed before me until the arrival of my lord, and the door which they opened, I sealed with my (own) seal.¹

The process of custody can be clarified by considering the steps in reverse order. First the tablets in question were placed in a basket and sealed by Etel-pi-šarrim. Then in the presence of Yassur-Addu the baskets were placed in a storehouse in a workshop under the former's supervision. Finally a third official was sent to seal the door to this room. Now the tablets are being called for. The king sends Yassur-Addu who has knowledge of their location and orders the assistance of some *ebbū*-officials. The queen assigns three such persons. The storeroom is located, the seal broken, the baskets removed and put into the care of the queen, and the door resealed with the queen's own seal.²

From the time the tablet was inscribed until the moment the king reread it, at least eight officials were involved, from all levels of the administration. This is so, it is here suggested, as much to insure proper security as to compensate for the illiteracy of officials and the almost haphazard storage of inscribed tablets.³

Sasson makes an important observation when he notes that Šubnalû, one of the *ebbū*-officials named here, was one of a group of officials who served at Mari under Assyrian rule and under the Lin-dynasty restoration. This, ". . . demonstrating a continuity of administration despite the most vicious hostilities."⁴

¹*Ibid.*, p. 58.

²*Ibid.*, p. 63.

³*Ibid.* On the literacy of officials see p. 204 below.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 60. Cf. Olmstead, *HPE*, p. 87.

ARM X:82—

Tell my Star thus (speaks) Inib-šina. In accordance to the letter which you sent, I opened the archive room which had been sealed by you (while) Mukannišum and Ṭabat-šarrussu were standing by. Igmilum pointed out the baskets to those who were acquainted with them. They took out, with their own hands, the baskets (concerned) with the totality of the census. I have sent to you the seals of . . .¹

In these first two documents Mukannišum was an active official in the administration of the archives at Mari. In the final document, however, he is its author, thus an archive official himself speaks of the activities of his profession.

ARM XIII:14.—

Tell my lord: thus (speaks) Mukannišum, your servant. My lord had written concerning the tablets, sealed by Sammetar, dealing with the (field)-soldiers who belonged to the *wedû* and the body-guards . . . of the district. In accordance with my lord's message, Inib-šunu opened the storeroom . . . , and the tablets concerned with the census. . . . When . . . Igmilum . . . showed to us the baskets (containing) the tablets which were concerned with the district(s) which had been sealed by Sammetar, Ṭabat-šarrussu and myself took them out with our own hands. According to what my lord wrote (to me), I did not unseal any basket. I have (only) taken out two baskets and sent them to my lord. . . .²

In summary, it has not seemed necessary to attempt a point by point comparison between modern and ancient archives. It is sufficient to present archives as an institution and then to demonstrate that the basic features of modern archives were operative in their ancient counterparts, a point appreciated by at least one modern archivist.³

¹*Ibid.*, p. 63-4.

²*Ibid.*, p. 65. A late Babylonian letter from the time between Nabonidus and Darius, though not as clearly, also illustrates archival custody and its problems. "The tablets were put away in the house (or in a box), and the door was sealed thereon, but he did not report that the door was opened. The people were saying that it was open . . . letters. . . ." (Thompson, *LBL*, No. 87).

³Jenkinson, *MAA*², pp. 23ff., especially p. 30.

While the organization of archives in the Ancient Near East may not be considered efficient or adequate by modern standards, it has been shown that the ancient archivists developed an adequate system for their own purposes. Well before the Achaemenid period archives had become a highly specialized institution. Already in the period of the Third dynasty of Ur archive technique had reached its culmination.¹ They enjoyed an independent status, developed an adequate filing system and an administrative bureaucracy. Custody of archives was enhanced by the continuity of administration even under successive empires.

Archives and the Ezra Documents

It is certain that the originals of the ED were preserved in archives. However, they are now known to us as historical documents and not archival documents, as are Herodotus 5. 24 and Thucydides i. 129, to be discussed here, and as such present a special situation.

The historian, coming afterwards, may examine, interpret, analyse, and arrange them for the purpose of his treatise: they themselves state no opinion, voice no conjecture; they are simply written memorials, authenticated by the fact of their official preservation, of events which actually occurred and of which they themselves formed a part.²

Hence historical documents lack the strict authentication of archival documents. But this is no warrant to reject them out of hand. For example, Torrey virtually denies the possibility of the incorporation of official documents in the works of ancient historians.³ To the writer's mind Torrey has overstated the case, and his resort to the well-

¹Weitemeyer, *Libri* 6:223, 1956. Cf. Schneider, *Or* 9:1-16, 1940.

²Jenkinson, *MAA*², pp. 3-4. The question of the historian's reliability in the use of his documents will be deduced from this study as a whole and will not receive special attention here.

³Torrey, *ES*, p. 148.

known statement of Thucydides hardly supports his previous suppositions:

As to the speeches that were made by different men . . . it has been difficult to recall with strict accuracy the words actually spoken. . . . Therefore the speeches are given in the language in which, as it seemed to me, the several speakers would express, on the subjects under consideration, the sentiments most befitting the occasion, though at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said.¹

While this statement only mentions speeches, Torrey would extend it to written documents as well. "As for drawing a line of distinction, as regards this free use, between the spoken oration, which presumably *was not* preserved in writing, and the official document, which presumably *was* preserved somewhere, we may be sure that no one of these ancient writers did anything of the kind."² This may or may not be the case, but in regard to written documents each ought to be judged on its own merits, for it has been shown that written documents were preserved for long periods of time (see above, p. 177).

In light of this issue and what has been said of archives and archive-keeping above, the question naturally arises of how these historians would have had access to official documents, presumably kept in archives, access to which required authorization. The historian Ctesias claims to have had access to the βασιλικαῦς ἀναγραφαῖς, "royal archives," and to the βασιλικῶν δελφιδερῶν, "royal parchments."³ Since he was a physician at the court of Artaxerxes II and there enjoyed considerable influence, these claims need not be rejected. On the other hand, Herodotus and Thucydides were not in such suitable circumstances. Yet, besides

¹Thucydides i. 22.

²Torrey, *ES*, p. 149. (See his discussion of this issue, pp. 145-50.)

³Gilmore, *FPK*, p. 72, par. 23, and p. 98, par. 30. (Diodorus II. 22. 32.)

the letter of Darius in 5. 24, Herodotus gives other information which indicates that he had access to official archives.¹ But it should be noted that the royal archives were not the only source for official documents. Archives ranged from those of the king down through lesser officials to the private individual. Herodotus and Thucydides may well have resorted to one of these lesser archives, even possibly to those of the men who were recipients of the documents they quote. But this is the most that can be said of these two Greek historians regarding this matter since neither of them offer any direct information on this issue.

When we turn to the historian who wrote the book of Ezra, we are at first confronted with his anonymity. If the author is Ezra as maintained by Albright² and Ezra was a Persian official as argued by Schaeder³ then there is no problem concerning his access to official documents. But neither of these claims are certain and both have been contested;⁴ indeed there is no consensus of opinion on either point. Nonetheless, the author of Ezra does show considerable knowledge of archival administration, as will be seen. The archive that the author of Ezra used, assuming that he did use one, was possibly that of the province of West-Euphrates (at the highest level) but more likely that of Jerusalem itself. This is indicated by the historian's careful, and accurate, distinction between originals and copies of official documents: he had copies (פרשגן) of all official documents sent from the province

¹See p. 128 above. Cf. Olmstead, *HPE*, pp. 237 & 299.

²Albright, *JBL* 40:104-24, 1921.

³Schaeder, *ES*. See also p. 223 below.

⁴On the authorship of Ezra see the Commentaries and Introductions to the O.T. and for Ezra's position see North, *Volterra Festschrift*, Vol. VI, pp. 377-404. See also below, p. 225.

of West-Euphrates and originals of all official documents sent to officials in that province. Ezra 4:17-22 is introduced as an original document, but at v. 23 it is stated that a copy of this letter was read to Rehum and his colleagues to whom it was sent. It is noteworthy that the document quoted is not actually called a copy (פרשגן). It would appear that the letter was sent first directly to the provincial satrap who then issued a copy to Rehum and his colleagues.¹ Similar circumstances surround Ezra 7:12-26. This is called a copy yet it was a letter given directly to Ezra and the original would be expected. The solution to this situation is found at Ezra 8:36: ויתנו את דתי המלך לאחשדרפני המלך ופתוח עבר הנהר. The original was delivered to the satraps and governors who would then issue copies to their subordinates. From this it can be concluded with certainty that the author of Ezra was in the province of West-Euphrates when he obtained his documents.²

Through the introductions to their documents these historians provide additional information regarding archival administration. The principal gain is the terms used to classify the documents. Xerxes' letter to Pausanius (Thuc. i. 129) was in answer to a missive from the latter. It was sent by Artabazus who was on his way to begin his new appointment as satrap of Dascylium. Thucydides introduces the letter thus: καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν διέπεμψεν. ἀντενεγέγραπτο δὲ τὰδε, ". . . and transmitted the letter. And this reply of the King ran as follows."³

¹This is further attested by the context in v. 23: אָדָּן מִן־דָּן . . . , "Now, *after* a copy of the letter was read," see p. 187 below.

²In addition to general probability, a Jerusalem archive is further suggested by the many lists in Ezra and Nehemiah concerning matters of local import.

³Thucydides i. 129.

Following the letter Thucydides refers to it as τὰ γράμματα, "letter, document" (1. 130).² Herodotus simply notes that a courier was sent and adds nothing relevant to the subject at hand.

The author of Ezra introduces his documents in greater detail than either Thucydides or Herodotus. His careful distinction between copies and originals noted above is noteworthy and demonstrates the care of this historian in the compilation of his narrative.² The terms used by the author to classify his documents are handled best by taking each document separately.³

Ezra 1:2-4.—This is an oral proclamation (קול) that was also issued in מכתב, "writing" (Ezra 1:1). Being a public announcement it is in the language of the people who were to receive it, in this case for the Jews—Hebrew.⁴ "The Persian law acknowledged validity of ordinances brought into force by oral promulgation."⁵ For example, Pseudo-Smerdis sent heralds throughout the empire to proclaim to the troops that they were no longer to take orders from Cambyses but from Smerdis. Cambyses upon hearing of the proclamation made in his camp did not question its validity but only whether the herald had received it personally from Smerdis or from one of his officials (Hdt. 3. 62). Parallel to Juda-

¹Thucydides refers to Pausanias' letter by both ἐπιστολή and γραφή (1. 128).

²It should be noted that the documents themselves do not contain the notation that they are copies, a practice attested by Pherendates B and C.

³For a discussion of classifying terms in the documents themselves see pp. 84ff. above.

⁴Cf. Esther 3:12 and 8:9.

⁵Bickerman, *JBL* 65:252, 1946. On the מכתב see pp. 273-4 and 1 Chr. 30:1-6.

ism's restoration by royal proclamation was Zoroastrianism's introduction by a government act—" . . . the 'frasastiš [proclamation] through dātā [law].'"¹

Ezra 6:2b-5.—This document is said to have been found in a מגלה, "roll" (*Ezra 6:2*, see pp. 86-7 above). This is additional evidence attesting the use of parchment and/or papyrus by the Persians,² a writing medium well attested from Assyrian and Babylonian times.³

Ezra 5:7-17.—This document is termed a פִּרְשָׁגִין אֲגִרָה (Ezra 5:6). פִּרְשָׁגִין is a Persian loanword meaning "copy."⁴ This is the copy kept by Tattenai for his records, the original having been sent to Darius. אֲגִרָה, "letter," describes the type of document Tattenai sent (on אֲגִרָה see pp. 85-6 above).

Ezra 6:5-12.—This document is not separately introduced and may well include 6:2b-5, making a whole of 6:2b-12 (see p. 104 above). If this is the case, it will be obvious that the introduction to 6:2b-5 does not include 6:6-12. If this is not the case, then the author has simply juxtaposed these two documents omitting an introduction for the latter (see p. 104 above).

Ezra 4:11-16.—In *Ezra 4* the author makes reference to three

¹Herzfeld, *ZW*, Vol. I, p. 174. See also Xerxes' Daiva Inscription, Kent, *OP*², pp. 150ff.

²Cameron, *PPT*, pp. 25ff, and *JNES* 17:163, 1958, and Hallock, *PPT*, p. 4. Cf. Ctesias (above, p. 182).

³Dougherty, *JAOS* 48:109-35, 1928.

⁴In Hebrew it appears as פִּרְשָׁגִין, Est. 3:14, 4:8, and 8:13; see *KB* and Rosenthal, *GBA*, p. 59. In some MSS the Aramaic פִּרְשָׁגִין is written as Hebrew פִּרְשָׁגִין, see Kennicott, *VTH*.

documents that were sent to the royal court, although he does not record the first two. That referred to in 4:6 was a שטוח, "accusation," against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem to Xerxes. That in 4:7 was a נשתון, "official document," sent to Artaxerxes. Ezra 4:8 follows this style of reference to a letter sent to the royal court. Here it is stated that Rehum and his colleagues had written אגרה חדה, "a letter," against Jerusalem to Artaxerxes. After naming the supporters of the letter the author of Ezra then actually introduces the letter itself: דנה פרשגן אגרתא, v. 11 (on the terms see p. 186 above).

Ezra 4:17-22.—This document is introduced as פתגמא שלח . . . פתגמ, v. 17. פתגם, "message, report," here can mean "order," as shown on p. 93 above. Following the letter we are informed that a פרשגן נשתונא (v. 23) of (not from¹) Artaxerxes was read before Rehum and his colleagues (on נשתון see p. 92).

Ezra 7:12-26.—This document is introduced as a פרשגן הנשתון, v. 11, and was given to Ezra himself.² (On פרשגן see above, and for נשתון see p. 92 above).

A final contribution of the ED to archival administration is the terms for archives and their locations. This information comes as a result of the requests of two officials in West-Euphrates. In Ezra 5:7-17 Tattenai requests that a search be made in מלכא די מלכא . . . (v. 17) for a decree of Cyrus that was made some sixteen years previously. In Ezra 4:11-16 Rehum requests that a search be made in ספר דכרניא . . . (v. 15) for an account of the earlier history of Jerusalem. The thoroughness with which these investigations were car-

¹נשתונא די ארומחשתא. See also p. 184 above. ²See p. 184 above.

ried out is seen in the fact that the information was sought, in spite of the fact that considerable time had passed since the events' occurrences and that in the case of Cyrus' edict two separate archives had to be searched, one at Babylon and one at Ecbatana (Ezra 6:1-2). It is to be noted that the kings involved, Darius and Artaxerxes, both initiated the searches by a royal edict, *נצו*,¹ and this undoubtedly accounts for the thoroughness and success of the investigations. This also further attests the efficiency and continuity of archival administration in the Ancient Near East.

While the archive became an independent institution, it apparently did not receive a separate title. Official state archives appear to have been almost always connected with state storerooms or treasuries and consequently were referred to by the same titles.² This is also the situation reflected in the ED. Tattenai refers to the "royal treasury" (*בית גנזיא די מלכא*). The author of Ezra, in reporting the search for Cyrus' edict, speaks of looking "in the archives (lit. "house of books") where the treasuries were kept" (*בבית ספריא די גנזיא מהחתיך*), Ezra 6:1.³ Rehum, on the other hand, refers not to the building containing archives but rather to the documents in the archives, "in the book of memoranda"

¹Ezra 6:1 and 4:19 respectively. Cf. above pp. 178-80, and Porten, *AE*, p. 55. See Schaeder, *VFWU* (1940/1), p. 28, and Cameron, *PTT*, pp. 105-6.

²See the documents quoted above, pp. 178-80, and Sasson, *Iraq* 34:66, 1972. Cf. Junge, *Klio* 33(NF 15):30, 1940

³*גנז* and *ספר* do not need to be transposed to make sense as stated by Torrey, *ES*, p. 192. It only needs to be understood that the author is hereby specifying that the archive searched was that connected with the treasury. It is suggested here that *גנזיא* may be an abbreviation for the full *גנזיא די מלכא* which occurs in Ezra 5:17. For the analogous situation in the EP and in the texts from Persepolis see Porten, *AE*, p. 60 and n. 120. See also Rudolph, *HAT:EN*, Batten, *ICC:EN*, and Myers, *AB:EN*.

(בספר דכרנליא).¹

Regarding archives and archival administration as reflected in the ED and by the author of Ezra, there is every indication that here is a reliable source of information on the subject.² Here an accurate distinction between originals and copies of documents is made, and the use of terms for documents is consistent with contemporary usage. While the means of the author of Ezra in obtaining his official documents is not given by him, sufficient clues have been found to propose the suggestion that local archives³ were his source. The continuity of archives amply attested from contemporary sources is also reflected in the ED. The various terms/titles for archives and their association with treasuries is also consistent with contemporary sources.

¹Cf. Esther 6:1.

²See Wesendonk, *LO* 49:6-7, 1932; Posner, *AAW*, pp. 29, 125-6.

³Zerkabod suggests the Temple archive, *Ez Ha'ayin* 37:8, 1962.

CHAPTER VII

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE EZRA DOCUMENTS

This chapter will centre on three areas that will provide the historical background and context of the ED. This is necessary because the ED have been preserved in an historical narrative¹ which is both brief and incomplete and as a consequence have often been brought into question historically.² The areas to be covered are 1) Achaemenid administration, which was the source of the ED; 2) Achaemenid religious policies, the main subject of the ED; and 3) the language problem of the Achaemenid Empire. Since the ED all come under the time period from Cyrus II, the Great, to Artaxerxes I,³ these reigns will provide the main time framework for discussion.

Achaemenid Administration

The Persian Empire began when Cyrus overthrew his Median overlord Astyages in 550 B.C.

Media ceased to be an independent nation and became the first satrapy, Mada. Nevertheless, the close relationship between Persians and Medes was never forgotten. Plundered Ecbatana remained a favorite royal residence. Medes were honored equally with Persians; they were employed in high office and were chosen to lead Persian armies. Foreigners spoke regularly of the Medes and Per-

¹See chapter 6, p. 181.

²See chapter 1.

³For the issues in the debate over the date of Ezra see Rowley, *Servant*², pp. 137-68. For the placing of Ezra in the reign of Artaxerxes I see Scott, *ET* 58:263-7, 1946/7, and recently Tuland, *ABNS* 12:47-62, 1974, and Cross, *JBL* 94:4-18, 1975.

sians; when they used a single term, it was "the Mede."¹ His next major campaign was against Croesus of Lydia, an ally of Media, whom he defeated in 547 B.C. After securing his eastern border Cyrus turned towards Babylonia which he conquered in 539 B.C. It is with the conquest of Babylonia that we gain a broad picture of Persian attitudes and policies towards their subjects, and that Israel became a part of the Persian Empire. "Cyrus . . . adopted in principle the organization first devised by the Assyrians, who replaced the states they had conquered by formal provinces."² Cyrus probably took it over from the Babylonians and he also borrowed practices from Media, and while borrowing from both of these states he also introduced new features into his empire.³

Cyrus has been remembered for his clemency toward those he conquered. Astyages, Croesus, and Nabonidus were honoured by Cyrus and maintained at royal expense.⁴ Greek tradition relates that Cyrus used conquered rulers as advisors in the administration of their former kingdoms.⁵ "The stories of the invariably merciful treatment of conquered kings by Cyrus are propaganda material in the legends, and also testimony to a new conscience in international affairs, for no conqueror

¹Olmstead, *HPE*, p. 37. Cf. Ghirshman, *Iran*, p. 129, and *Persia: Immortal Kingdom*, p. 29.

²*Ibid.*, p. 59.

³Frye, *HP*, pp. 85, 94. It is probable that the Assyrian provincial system became known to Cyrus through his conquest of Media, which had previously conquered Assyria.

⁴Mallowan, *Iran* 10:12-3, 1971. While some believe that Nabonidus was spared, e.g., Smith, *Isaiah*, pp. 48f, 157, n. 151, and Ghirshman, *Iran*, pp. 131-2, Mallowan accepts the record of Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* vii. 5. 29. 30, that Cyrus put Nabonidus to death, *Iran* 10:12-3, 1971.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 12. Cf. Hdt. 3. 15.

would previously have desired such a reputation."¹ Cambyses and Darius both followed this policy; the former while in Babylon retained the administrators from the time of Nabonidus and also his predecessor's palace dignitaries.² After conquering Egypt, Cambyses treated Psammenitus well and subsequently executed him only because he plotted revolt.³ Darius executed those who rebelled against him at his accession, but when conquering new territories he followed his predecessors' policy of clemency; thus many Greek rulers were given high offices in his empire.⁴ Darius' policy in this regard is given in his own words: "The man who cooperated with my house, him I rewarded well; whoso did injury, him I punished well."⁵

Another aspect of Persian foreign policy that is worth noting is that they attempted to temper their conquest by arms by speaking in terms of ". . . the principle of inheritance, as against the principle of force, as the basis of royal power."⁶ This is evidenced in the titulary adopted by Cyrus and his successors in connection with their various subjects.

The simple style of Cyrus was undoubtedly a reflection of Elamite royal custom and recalls the curt inscription at Choga Zanbil, 13th century B.C., which simply names the founder as "I Untash-Gal". None of the inscriptions at Pasargadae describe the monarch as "King of Kings". Nor do they refer to his paternity, only to the name of the clan, Achaemenian, . . .⁷

In contrast with this is the titulary of the Cyrus Cylinder:

¹Smith, *Isaiah*, p. 36, 1944, according to Mallowan, *Iran* 10:13, 1971.

²Olmstead, *HPE*, pp. 86-7. ³Hdt. 3. 15.

⁴Olmstead. *HPE*, pp. 151ff. ⁵DB 63. See Kent, *CP*², p. 132.

⁶Atkinson, *JAOS* 76:177, 1956. Cf. Ghirshman, *Iran*, pp. 142-4.

⁷Mallowan, *Iran* 10:2, 1971. Cf. Diakonoff, *IMV*, p. 100.

Ich, Kyros, der König des (Welt-)Alls, der grosse König, der mächtige König, der König von Babel, der König des Landes Sumer und Akkad, der König der vier (Welt-)Ufer, der Sohn des Kambyzes, des grossen Königs, des Königs von Anšan, der Enkel des Kyros, des grossen Königs, des Königs von Anšan, der Urenkel des Teispes, des grossen Königs, des Königs von Anšan, ewiger Same des Königstums, dessen Regierung Bēl(Marduk) und Nabû liebten, zur Erfreung ihres Herzens seine Königsherrschaft wünschten, . . .¹

"In this way Cyrus characteristically and with diplomatic astuteness assimilated the acceptable style of titulary to which Babylonia, heir of Sumerian kingship, had by long tradition been accustomed."² Cambyses' claim to legitimacy as king of Egypt is evidenced on a sarcophagus dedicated by him.

Horus, Sam-Towi; King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Meswet-rē'; Son of Rē', Cambyses, may he live forever! He dedicated his monument to his father, Apis-Osiris : a great coffin of granite which the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Meswet-rē', Son of Rē', Cambyses, made, who is given all life, all continuance and dominion (?), all health, all gladness, glorious as King of Upper and Lower Egypt, for ever.³

Darius, on the other hand, reversed this policy. After his defeat of Gaumata, Darius asserts his kingship of the *whole* empire in these terms: ". . . I slew him. I took the kingdom from him."⁴ A stele from Egypt records, "Saith Darius the King: I am a Persian; from Persia I seized Egypt; . . ."⁵ This in Egyptian hieroglyphics too!

¹Berger, *ZA* 64:197, 199, 1975. See also Pritchard, *ANET*², p. 316. For the Babylonian literary pattern of the Cyrus Cylinder and that being the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal rather than Neo-Babylonian inscriptions, see Harmatta, *AA* 19:217-31, 1971.

²Mallowan, *Iran* 10:10, 1971. Cf. Nylander, *OS* 16:165, n. 50, 1967: ". . . In Babylonia Cyrus wisely adapted himself to the traditions and the protocolar use of the Babylonian kingdom, thereby stressing his legitimacy as 'King of lands' and Marduk's own choice. . . ." See also Widengren, *POTT*, p. 319, and Lewy, *HUCA* 19:480, 1946.

³Gunn, *ASAE* 26:85-6, 1926. Cf. Atkinson, *JACS* 76:167-77, 1956, who shows that Cambyses also adopted the Egyptian dating system and concluded a Persian-Egyptian marriage-alliance which claimed Egypt for Persia by dowry.

⁴DB 13, Kent, *OP*², p. 120. ⁵DZc, *Ibid.*, p. 147.

Thus Darius made no real attempt, if any, to conceal his taking of the empire by force of arms. Furthermore, Darius' father and grandfather were both living when he "took the kingdom," and while he lists them in his lineage, he could not claim kingship through them because they had not been kings before him.¹ His wide publication of this information further attests his lack of concern for hereditary claims, except for his ties with the Achaemenian house.² "The royal titulary of Darius in Egypt, which seems to conform to earlier Egyptian usage, must therefore be regarded as purely formal, inherited from Cambyses and earlier Pharaohs, without bearing upon his claims to legitimacy."³

Xerxes made a similar change in Babylon apparently as a result of a revolt or revolts in his fourth and fifth years.

In all the documents from the accession year through the first three months of the first year Xerxes' title is "King of Babylon, King of the Lands," . . . In the fifth month of the first year came word . . . that the title was to be changed. . . . Thereafter, through the fourth month of the fourth year, the title is always "King of Persia, Media, King of Babylon and the Lands" . . . With the fifth year . . . "King of Babylon" is dropped from the royal titulary and is never again used throughout the balance of Xerxes' reign or in any of his successors'. The chief *Persian* title, "King of the Lands," though used earlier in Babylonia, now became standard.⁴

The province of West-Euphrates was separated from Babylonia and made an independent satrapy, while Babylonia lost its identity through incorporation with Assyria.⁵

The known organization and administration of the Persian Empire is that of Darius and his successors.⁶ Darius appears to have greatly

¹DB 2, Kent, *OP*², p. 119. Cf. the Cyrus Cylinder passage cited on p. 193 above.

²DB 70, *Ibid.*, p. 132.

³Atkinson, *JOAS* 76:177, 1956.

⁴Cameron, *AJSL* 58:323-4, 1941. ⁵Olmstead, *HPE*, p. 237.

⁶Frye, *HP*, p. 99. Cf. Ghirshman, *Iran*, pp. 140ff.

reorganized the empire following the suppression of the revolts of the provinces at his accession.¹ In principle Darius set three independent officials, responsible directly to the king, over each province or satrapy. This provided checks ". . . upon the absolute exercise of authority by any single individual and also guarded against unlawful usurpation."² "An outstanding characteristic of Persian officialdom was that the presiding individual in every department of government had a group of 'colleagues' who shared in the responsibility of decisions and actions."³ The king also had other means of controlling officials throughout the empire. Olmstead quotes a Babylonian document that refers to the monthly visit of the "king's messenger." These were "inspectors" sent by the king to investigate the affairs and activities of the states' administrators. They were independent and when necessary had their own armed force.⁴ It is also clear that from very early times kings developed a "secret service" by which they were kept informed of activities and persons throughout their empires. In the Persian period such persons were known as "eyes" and "ears" of the king.⁵ To aid these inspectors and the movement of the king's army a network of roads was

¹The satrapal lists will need to be re-examined in light of Cameron's recent study showing that the lists of "satrapies" of the Persian kings are in reality lists of *peoples* incorporated into the empire (*JNES* 32:47-56, 1973). However, this does not appear to affect the administration of the satrapies as currently understood. Cf. Widengren, *POTT*, p. 336.

²Porten, *AE*, p. 47.

³Kraeling, *BMAP*, p. 33. Cf. Porten, *AE*, pp. 46-7.

⁴Olmstead, *HPE*, p. 71. Cf. Ghirshman, *Iran*, p. 144; Waterman, *RCAE*, Vol. IV, pp. 22-3; and Crown, *JESHO* 17:254ff., 1974.

⁵See Oppenheim, *JAOS* 88:173-80, 1968. Cf. Schaefer, *AWG* 10:3-24, 1954; and Frye, *HP*, p. 102.

established and an efficient postal service was maintained, following in the Assyrian tradition.¹ The king was also ". . . the supreme judge, a last court of appeal."² While non-Persians appear frequently in high offices, it is clear that from the time of Darius on, the highest offices became increasingly the possession of Persians.³ "Small Persian colonies were to be found everywhere in the empire for Persian officers, troops, judges and other officials were sent to the farthest reaches of the state to serve the ruler."⁴

Darius made significant legal and economic changes that affected the whole empire.

One of the texts on the reverse side of the "demotic chronicle" tells us that in 519 Darius sent a message to the satrap of Egypt ordering "that the wise men be assembled . . . from among the warriors, the priests and the scribes of Egypt so that they may set down in writing the ancient laws of Egypt." And there is specific mention of "the law of the Pharaoh, *of the temples* and of the people."⁵

Darius also proclaimed at this time, ". . . by the favor of Ahuramazda these countries showed respect toward my law; as was said to them by me, thus was it done."⁶ "Early in 519, still in this same official second year, we find the lawbook already in use among the Babylonians: 'According to the king's law they shall make good' is substituted for the usual

¹Frye, *HP*, pp. 102-3.

²*Ibid.*, p. 107.

³Ghirshman, *Iran*, pp. 142, 195. Cf. Olmstead, *HFE*, pp. 291, 298.

⁴Frye, *HP*, pp. 107-8.

⁵deVaux, *BANE*, p. 74. Cf. *Diod*, i. 95. 4-5. See also Reich, *Mizraim* 1:178-85, 1933.

⁶DB 8, Kent, *OP*², p. 119; also DNa 23 and DNb 58 in same. Cf. PF 1980. 31, "Then . . . were brought in, in (accordance with) the former law." in Hallock, *PFT*.

guaranty by the seller in a document recording a slave sale."¹

Bemerkenswert ist in diesem Zusammenhang noch etwas anderes: Es hat niemals ein allgemeines Reichsgesetzbuch unter den Achämeniden gegeben, aber es gab offizielle Gesetzbücher der verschiedenen staatlich anerkannten Religionsgemeinschaften.²

Economic changes included the standardization of weights and measures and coinage.³ On the basis of these measures Darius instituted a new tax system, ". . . each satrapy paying a fixed yearly amount in unminted gold or silver, and each vassal state paying a fixed tribute, usually in kind rather than precious metals."⁴

Satrapal organization was a model of the central government.

Each satrapy was

. . . under a satrap This high official had with him a secretary or chancellor, whose duty was to watch the acts of the satrap and to report to the court. . . . The command of the troops was in the hands of a general The citadels of the towns had a special governor (. . . fort commandant).⁵

Satrapas were like minor kings with their own courts. As long as they remained loyal to the king they enjoyed almost unlimited power. "The satrap had to supervise the collection of taxes and administer the general economic, legal and political affairs of his satrapy."⁶

While the chancellor was a check on the satrap, he also per-

¹Olmstead, *HPE*, p. 119. Cf. Olmstead, *AJSL* 51:247-9, 1935. Noteworthy is the emergence of a new word for law—*OP data* borrowed in Akkadian and Aramaic, see above, p. 50.

²Mayer, *BZ NF* 12:7, 1968. See the next section of this chapter and Frye, *HP*, pp. 104f.

³Olmstead, *HPE*, pp. 185-91. Cf. Porten, *AE*, pp. 62ff.

⁴Frye, *HP*, p. 106.

⁵Huart, *APIC*, p. 74. Cf. Olmstead, *HPE*, p. 59, and Ghirshman, *Iran*, p. 144.

⁶Frye, *HP*, p. 107. Cf. Huart, *APIC*, p. 76.

formed an administrative function in the satrapal bureaucracy. "This Chancellor was attached to the entourage of the satrap or governor and entrusted with the administration of much routine business. He and the Scribe would handle most of the official correspondence . . ." ¹ The Aramaic title of the chancellor is *בַּעַל טַעַם*, "master or holder of a (royal) decree." ² Some have equated the *בַּעַל טַעַם* with the annual investigators mentioned above, ³ but Rehum, *בַּעַל טַעַם* in Samaria, was residing there, as were his colleagues, not sent there on this occasion. ⁴

"The satrapy was divided into smaller provinces and such provinces into districts. The loose terminology used, however, makes it difficult to survey in detail the administrative division of the empire." ⁵ The difficulty is increased by the ambiguity that exists with many titles. What Waterman has said of the Assyrian Empire in this connection is equally true of the Persian Empire.

There is no clear evidence . . . to show that a given title either limited the range of services that an official might legitimately perform or prevented another from fulfilling the functions ordinarily associated with this title, so far as administrative activities were concerned. The offices of state are thus neither sharply defined nor rigidly interpreted, but on the contrary show great flexibility both of definition and of jurisdiction. The reasons are not far to seek. First, there were no hereditary positions, although there were tendencies in that direction Second, all official positions were in the gift of the ruling mon-

¹Porten, *AE*, p. 55.

²Bowman, *IB*, Vol. III, p. 599, following Herzfeld, *ZN*, Vol. I, p. 171. On the origin of this title see above, pp. 54-6.

³*Ibid.*, pp. 599-600. The rendering of this title by "reporter" in 1E 2:13, 19 is offset by the transliteration of it in v. 12 and even in v. 19! See p. 134 above. Gesenius, *HWB*¹², also rendered it *Berichtstatter*, p. 864.

⁴Ezra 4:10, 17. Cf. Torrey, *ES*, p. 171.

⁵Widengren, *POTT*, p. 336. Cf. Kraeling, *BMAP*, pp. 33-4, and Porten, *AE*, pp. 28ff.

arch and likewise continuance in office as well as promotion was a matter of royal favor. Third, the . . . Empire itself was in a somewhat fluid state, expanding in certain directions and contracting in others, with war as an almost constant factor, and with revolts of conquered peoples and foreign inroads requiring constant attention and emergency action. Any administrative officer might be called upon to organize and lead troops, to defend his district or conduct punitive expeditions, to collect taxes and tribute, to repair temples, canals, and bridges, and at any time might be expected to carry out a special behest of the king.¹

Furthermore, persons of considerably different rank could bear the same title. Thus *hnp* can designate both a "governor" and a "satrap."² The same ambiguity exists with the title *hnpqr*, "officer," found most frequently in the correspondence of Arsham.³

Achaemenid Religious Policies

That Cyrus set the precedent in this area and was followed purposefully by his successors is attested by Darius' recognition of his policy as stated in the Gadates Inscription where he refers to ". . . the intention of my ancestors towards the god who told the Persians . . ."⁴ The rest of the inscription is lost, but since Cambyses never entered Asia Minor, Darius can only be referring to Cyrus.⁵ One of the first acts of Cyrus after capturing Babylon was to restore all the gods

¹Waterman, *RCAE*, Vol. IV, p. 22.

²Kraeling, *BMAP*, p. 35. Cf. Eilers, *IBKU*, p. 36; and Ackroyd, *ER*, p. 144, n. 27. Bowman makes the observation that titles ". . . sometimes deteriorated and became ambiguous with overuse, as the titles *pahâtu* and *satrap* show. Even while the title *segar* could still refer to an important official, it too was sometimes degraded to signify simply 'foreman.'" (*ARTP*, p. 26). Cf. Hallock, *EPT*, p. 24. On the title *šaknu* see Henshaw, *JAOS* 87:517-25, 1967, and 88:461-83, 1968.

³*Ibid.*, pp. 33-4. Cf. Driver, *AD*². On the terminology used by Greek writers in reference to Achaemenid administrators see Bivar, *NC* (1961), p. 122f.

⁴Smith, *Isaiah*, p. 41, 1944.

⁵Meyer, *EJ*, p. 21. Cf. Ezra 6:1-12.

to their own cities, which Nabonidus had brought to Babylon.

Von [. . .] . . . , Assur und Susa, Akkad, Ešnunna-land, Zanban, Mēturnu, Dēr bis zum Gebiet des Guti'umlandes, die Kultstätt[ten jense]its des Tigris, deren Wohnstatt seit früher(er Zeit) aufgegeben war, (deren) Götter, die in ihnen gewohnt hatten, brachte ich an ihren Ort zurück und liess sie eine ewige Wohnstatt aufschlagen. Alle ihre Menschen holte ich zusammen und brachte sie zurück zu ihren Wohnorten, und die Götter des Landes Sumer und Akkad, die Nabonid zum Zorn des Herrn der Götter (sc. Marduk) nach Babylon hineingebracht hatte, liess ich auf Geheiss Marduks, des grossen Herrn, in Wohlergehen in ihren Gemächern eine Wohnstätte der Herzensfreude bewohnen.¹

In this same proclamation Cyrus states that Marduk had given him the victory over his enemies. In another inscription Cyrus gives this credit to the god Sin: "Sin [the moon-god], the illuminator of heaven and earth, with his favourable sign delivered into my hands the four quarters of the world, and I returned the gods to their shrines."² In yet another inscription it is, "The great gods have delivered all the lands into my hand. . . ."³ Frye notes that "although his inscriptions are in Akkadian for local consumption, one misses any mention of his own gods in them, so characteristic of older conquerors in the Near East."⁴ At Pasargadae ". . . at [the] east and west gates, he chose Assyrian or Urartian forms of protective deities. In this way, it may be that we see here in pictorial form . . . traces of the religious tolerance which we know as characteristic of Cyrus the Great, . . ."⁵

¹Cyrus Cylinder, Berger, *ZA* 64:199, 201, 1975. Cf. Olmstead, *HPE*, pp. 51ff.

²Gadd and Legrain, *UET:I,RI*, No. 307. ³*Ibid.*, No. 194.

⁴Frye, *HP*, p. 82. Cf. Kenyon, *BA*, p. 141: "Evidently Cyrus's concession to the Jews was not an isolated act. It was part of a policy of conciliation of his new subjects by showing favour to their religions. An act which, isolated, might seem strange, and the historical truth of which has been questioned, is now shown to fall into its natural place as part of a rational policy." See also Slotki, *SBB:DEN*, p. 112.

⁵Barnett, *MUSJ* 45:422, 1969.

Cambyses' behaviour in Egypt is much maligned in Greek sources,¹ but archaeological evidence presents a much more favourable and objective picture.

He consulted the oracles and visited the sanctuaries. An inscription of a priest of Sais named Uzahor contains precious details. . . . We are told in the inscription that . . . Uzahor was able to ingratiate himself into favor, so that Cambyses entrusted to him the composition of his royal name and under his guidance visited the sanctuaries of Neith, Osiris, Ra and Anmon. In the temple of Neith, he prostrated himself before the goddess, offered a sacrifice, and established a foundation in perpetuity. Some people who had no right to be there had settled down within the sacred enclosure of the temple; he made them leave, conducted a ceremony of purification for the holy place, and restored it to its former glory. The revenues assigned to the cult were maintained and the ceremonies were thereafter to be celebrated in the traditional way.²

The reputed slaying of an Apis-bull by Cambyses is refuted by the discovery of the sarcophagus for it bearing the dedicatory inscription of Cambyses himself.³

Darius' policy towards the religions of the empire is set down in the Behistun Inscription in his own words:

The kingdom which had been taken away from our family, that I put in its place; I reestablished it on its foundation. As before, so I made the sanctuaries which Gaumata the Magian destroyed. I restored to the people the pastures and the herds, the household slaves and the houses which Gaumata the Magian took away from them. I reestablished the people on its foundation, both Persia and Media and the other provinces.⁴

In Egypt Darius repaired the sanctuary of Ptah at Memphis and ordered a temple at the oasis of el-Khargah to be restored. For an example of this in Asia Minor one needs only to refer to the Gadates Inscription

¹E.g., Hdt. 3. 27-9.

²deVaux, *BANE*, p. 71. On the Uzahor Insc. see Posener, *PDPE*; Olmstead, *HPE*, pp. 89ff.; and Atkinson, *JAOS* 76:170-1, 1956.

³Gunn, *ASAE* 26:85-6, 1926. Cf. Atkinson, *JAOS* 76:170-1, 1956.

⁴DB 14, Kent, *OF²*, p. 120. On the personal religion of the Achaemenids see Gershevitch, *JNES* 23:12-38, 1964.

included in this study.¹ The gods of the foreign workmen at Persepolis received commodities from the Persepolis treasury equally with the Persian Ahuramazda.² Darius' legal reforms included the realm of religion. This is attested by Pherendates A and B which refer to an edict of Darius regulating requirements for leadership of the Khnum priesthood.⁴

In sum, "Persia was tolerant of the various ethnic religions but insisted that their cults should be well organized under responsible leadership and that religion should never mask plans for rebellion."⁴ That this religious policy was continued by later Achaemenid kings is attested by AP 21 wherein Darius II writes to the Jews at Elephantine concerning the keeping of the feast of Unleavened Bread.

The Achaemenids and the Language Problem

Stretching from India in the east across Anatolia to Greece and south to Egypt, the administration of the empire was faced with the problem of a multitude of languages. Fortunately for Persia some of the empires that she had conquered had already faced this problem, though not on such a scale. The Assyrians and Babylonians provided the Persians with a ready-made system for dealing with a multitude of languages. What was required was the skill of bilingualism. This could be accomplished in one of two ways.

One way was to make use of the native tongues of the various

¹deVaux, *BANE*, pp. 75-7.

²Hallock, *PFT*, pp. 5, 18-9, and *passim*.

³On the Pherendates documents see p. 30 above, and on Darius' legal reforms see pp. 194ff. above.

⁴Olmstead, *HPE*, p. 304. Cf. deVaux, *BANE*, p. 77; and Grosheide, *GTT* 54:4, 1954.

language groups. Either an official of the ruling nation could learn one or more languages of the subject peoples, or the subjects would learn the language of the ruling people, or both. This method can be illustrated from the military affairs of eighth and seventh century Assyria.

There are indications that difference of language presented some difficulty when prisoners and deserters were to be questioned. . . . But Assyria had men for the job. Thus Sargon is told: "The king my lord knows that Ishtar-Babilia is a master of language (*bel lishani*). I have sent him from the city of Tikrish . . . ; he formed this opinion and reported it to us." And King Esarhaddon, in a letter to his men on the borders of Mannai, directs that when a fugitive from the Mannai has a tale to tell, a scribe of the Mannai shall stand by "to write it down from his lips".¹

A second way was to make use of an intermediary language. That Aramaic played such a role already under the Assyrians and Babylonians has long been known.² Probably the best known reference to this is that recorded in 2 Kings 18:17-37.

Undoubtedly, both methods go back to early trade contacts. People have always faced and been able to overcome language barriers, and given enough contact, a "trade" language or *lingua franca* will be created, this whether only two languages are involved or whether a third, intermediary language is used. The characteristics of such languages are succinctly stated by Weinreich:

In the highly hybridized makeshift trade languages, most obligatory categories expressed by bound morphemes are well known to be abandoned. These tongues have by and large been formed from structurally very different languages; the failure to perceive non-explicit grammatical categories has therefore been widespread on both sides. Also considering that trade tongues begin with a very sketchy learning of both second languages, and that only the bare essentials of existence are given expression in the hybrid form, the

¹Fish, *BJRL* 26:295-6, 1942. Waterman, *RCAE*, Vol. I, No. 342; cf. No. 434.

²Dougherty, *JAOS* 48:109-35, 1928.

necessity for observing grammatical distinctions is so reduced that free and non-obligatory forms suffice as means of expressing them.¹

While owing a debt to those commercial agents who developed bilingual skills sufficient for their needs, the demands on the bilingual to meet the needs of an empire's administration certainly became greater. It is also certain that there were then, as there are today, various skills and degrees of competency required and attained in the scribal profession.

An important circumstance of the Achaemenid administration is the apparent illiteracy of most officials including the kings. A number of texts state that its contents were read to or before the king or other official. Darius says this of himself:

Saith Darius the King: By the favor of Ahuramazda this is the inscription which I made. Besides, it was in Aryan, and on clay tablets and on parchment it was composed. . . . And it was inscribed and was read off before me. Afterwards this inscription I sent off everywhere among the provinces.²

However, that such statements need not necessarily imply illiteracy on the part of these officials is seen by the same statement being used in reference to a chancellor and a scribe. Rehum, a chancellor, and Shimshai, a scribe, had a letter from Artaxerxes read before them—Ezra 4:23. This seems to be a case where two officials capable of reading preferred to have a letter read to them rather than to read it themselves, perhaps partly as a matter of etiquette since as high officials they employed secretaries. More probably it was simply a practical way of expediting the message to all concerned and also making it a matter

¹Weinreich, *LC*, p. 43. For an example of this in Aramaic see Naveh, *WO* 6:45, 1971.

²DB 70, Kent, *OP*², p. 132. Cf. Esther 6:1 concerning Xerxes and Ezra 4:18 concerning Artaxerxes. See Schaeder, *IB*, pp. 5, 13; and Lewy, *HUCA* 25:170, 1954. See also below, p. 209.

of public knowledge. While Herodotus states that royal scribes attended all governors (3. 128), Landsberger has shown that in the Ancient Near East scribes rarely moved up the administrative ladder.¹ Hence it is unlikely that officials ever attained the level of literacy attained by scribes. Another factor that should be kept in mind regarding the Persian period is that officials were largely corresponding in a language not their own (see below). It should also be mentioned here that a distinction must be made between speaking, and reading and writing. It is possible for a person to be bilingual in speech while at the same time to be unable to read and write his second language or even his native language. The opposite is also true in that a person can be able to read and write in a second language but not be able to speak or understand the other language when it is spoken. With these preliminaries and background, attention can now be turned to the handling of the language problem by the Achaemenid administration.

First, there is ample evidence to show that the Achaemenid administration was able to communicate in a large number of different languages and that throughout the empire, not just at a highly centralized capital.

Found among the Persepolis Fortification documents there was one brief communication written in Greek, . . . there was "one piece in the Phrygian letters and language" In all probability neither of the two latter texts was written at Persepolis—but surely someone had to read them; the Greek document is dated in the month of Tebet, and so may come from some area where the common Semitic calendar was in use, but the Phrygian inscription was written where the OP calendar at least was in force, since (a fact seemingly hitherto unrecognized) it is dated in the OP month ṚAṚNAMAKA!²

From Xanthos comes a trilingual inscription in Greek, Lycian and Ara-

¹Landsberger, *CI*, p. 99. Cf. Sasson, *Iraq* 34:56, 1972.

²Cameron, *JNES* 32:52-3, 1973.

maic, obviously all three languages being recognized as legitimate for official communications.¹ Herodotus mentions interpreters (οἱ ἑρμηνεῖς) in connection with a Greek brought before Darius at Susa, who claimed to be a benefactor of the king (3. 140).² Demotic was used officially in Egypt as attested by the Pherendates correspondence (see pp. 30-1 above).³ Now in light of the Persepolis Fortification tablets, Old Persian takes its place alongside of the other languages used in the administration of the empire.⁴ Hitherto, only a few seals bearing monolingual Old Persian inscriptions were known, but

. . . there are now, from the Persepolis Fortifications, a substantial number of seal legends with an inscription in OP exclusively, and the specific need to obtain . . . [the owners'] identification is brilliantly illustrated by at least two documents originating with Pharnaces in which appears this comment regarding his own seal inscribed with a monolingual Aramaic legend: "The seal that formerly was mine has been replaced (?); this seal is now mine that has been applied to this tablet." In the latter case, someone surely had to be able to read and write Aramaic, and the same must have been true also for those sealings bearing an OP inscription only.⁵

Gershevitch observes that many of the Persepolis tablets were inscribed elsewhere than at Persepolis, and this allows ". . . the inference that scribes writing in Elamite or Aramaic were available wherever in Persia

¹Metzger, Laroche, Dupont-Sommer, *CRAI* 74:82-93, 115-25, 132-49, 1974. See A. R. Millard, *BH* 11:84-91, 1975, for a popular account.

²See the remarks of Meyer, *EJ*, p. 20, and deVaux, *BANE*, p. 84, concerning the Gadates Inscription.

³Darius' codification of the laws of Egypt was written in Aramaic and Demotic. Spiegelberg, *SDC*, p. 31; and Reich, *Mizraim* 1:180, 1933.

⁴Previously OP has been considered limited to only royal inscriptions, particularly monuments, and hence not requiring any great number of scribes able to read and write it. E.g., Gershevitch, *EP*, pp. 2-4; and Widengren, *POTT*, p. 339.

⁵Cameron, *JNES* 32:54, 1973. Cf. Hallock, *PFT*. Identical seal impressions have been found in Asia Minor; see Balkan, *Anatolia* 4:123-8, 1959.

there happened to be a government office or a supply station."¹ It also seems clear from the above that Old Persian-writing scribes may also have been available throughout the empire. Two Fortification tablets mention Persians serving as scribes or training to become scribes.² Babylonian scribes are frequently mentioned in the Fortification tablets, often with the specification "on parchment," that is to say, writing Aramaic.³ There also had to be many scribes bilingual in Elamite and Old Persian, since most of the Persepolis officials were Persian and the majority of the economic tablets are in Elamite. Cameron concurs with Gershevitch ". . . that many of the Elamite scribes could read back to Persian officials the orders they received in the OP language and wrote down in Elamite, in part because those documents had been written with a copious number of OP loanwords."⁴ The book of Esther relates three occasions on which an official edict was sent throughout the empire ". . . to each province according to its script [כתב] and to every people according to their language [לשון]." (1:22, 3:12, 8:9).⁵ This writer suggests the probability that the references to script and language in these passages refer to the practice of oral and written promulgation of

¹Gershevitch, *EP*, p. 4.

²PF 871 and 1137. See Hallock, *PFT*, p. 30. Whether these Persian scribes were learning to read and write OP is unknown and the number of OP-writing scribes must remain problematic until further evidence is forthcoming.

³Hallock, *PFT*. ⁴Cameron, *JNES* 32:51, 1973.

⁵That this discussion is not superfluous can be seen from the evaluations of these passages in Esther by some modern scholars. Dommershausen writes concerning 3:12, "Es ist nicht anzunehmen dass Xerxes in sämtlichen Schriften und Sprachen seines Reiches die Briefe ausfertigen liess, das ist Hyperbel das Erzählers." He adds in n. 70, "Im übrigen wissen wir, dass das sogenannte Reichsaramäisch als Diplomatensprache im Achämenidenreich sehr verbreitet war." *Die Estherrolle*, p. 35. Likewise Anderson, *IB*, Vol. III, concerning 1:22. See p. 185 above.

official edicts (see p. 185 above), the former to provide the widest distribution and the latter to provide a permanent account of the edict.

Further, we may be reasonably assured that someone had to interpret for the Indians travelling home from Susa who stopped off at Persepolis, and for the Ionians who are known to have been in residence there, just as, at Susa, someone had to be able to give orders to—and perhaps to read and write for—the Carians and Ionians who brought cedar timbers from Babylon to that capital, the Egyptians who, along with the Medes, worked there as goldsmiths, the Sardians who worked there as woodworkers, and the Babylonians who worked there as brickmakers.¹

It is also to be noted that Darius' codification of Egyptian laws was recorded in both Demotic and Aramaic,² and his Behistun Inscription in Elamite, Akkadian and Old Persian circulated in at least an Akkadian and an Aramaic version.³

This brings us to a consideration of the second approach to the language problem, the use of a third, intermediary language which in this case is Aramaic. The advantages of a single common second language among scribes rather than a multitude of second languages are obvious.

It was under the Persians that Aramaic reached its zenith as a world language. Its extended employment . . . was based on the broad foundation of usage already established in the Assyro-Babylonian age. As a means of writing, Aramaic was carried wherever the influence of Persia went. From Abydos on the Hellespont to the most remote frontier of Egypt, Aramaic has been found. There is witness of it from the Caucasus Mountains in the north to the midst of the Syrian desert and eastward through Kurdistan and the Zagros district to Afghanistan and India.⁴

The advantages of Aramaic are easily illustrated by its use in passports. There are over 300 travel texts from Persepolis which record the

¹Cameron, *JNES* 32:52, 1973. On the workmen at Susa see DSf., Kent, *OP*², pp. 142-4. On interpreters see p. 203 above.

²Reich, *Mizraim* 1:180, 1933; and Spiegelberg, *SDC*, p. 31.

³Cowley, *AP*, pp. 248ff.

⁴Bowman, *ARTP*, p. 16. Cf. Bowman, *JNES* 7:65-90, 1948; and Wesendonk, *LO* 49:1-10, 1932.

disbursement of rations to travellers. The origins and destinations of these travellers are to and from the farthest reaches of the empire.¹

The travel-ration texts report the daily operations of a highly developed system of travel, transport, and communication.

The travel-ration texts also, by their very existence, imply an elaborate system for the transfer of credits. The texts were inscribed at the supply station and sent to Persepolis. There, evidently, the commodities dispensed were credited to the account of the supplier and debited to the account of the official who had provided the travelers with a "sealed document" (*halmi*) or "authorization" (*miyatukkam*). . . . Although the authorizing documents are mentioned again and again, our texts include no actual document of this nature.²

However, such a "passport" or "authorization" has been preserved among the Arsham documents as AD 6, used in this study (see above, p. 36). It is for an officer of Arsham who is returning to Egypt from either Susa or Babylon. Being in Aramaic and addressed to various officials of different nationalities, it is obvious that scribes capable of reading Aramaic were expected to be present at the various supply stations. Since, as noted above on pages 204-5, most officials appear to have been illiterate, the following procedure can be pictured when Aramaic was used:

Macht man sich diesen einfachen Sachverhalt klar, so wird man zu dem Schluss geführt, dass der achämenidische Kanzleiverkehr einerseits auf Einsprachigkeit des Schriftwesens, andererseits auf Mehrsprachigkeit der Schreiber gestellt war. Sie mussten imstande sein, aus Angaben oder Diktaten, die ihnen auf Persisch oder in irgendeiner Provinzialsprache gegeben wurden, unmittelbar ein aramäisches Schriftstück zu konzipieren und umgekehrt ein solches Schriftstück unmittelbar, 'vom Blatt weg', in die Sprache des Adressaten zu übersetzen.³

By this procedure Persians could communicate officially and privately with each other and with foreigners without themselves having to learn

¹Hallock, *PFT*, pp. 40ff.

²*Ibid.*, p. 6.

³Schaeder, *IB*, pp. 5-6. Accepted by Kutschera, *CTL*, Vol. VI, pp. 398-9, who notes a modern example of this procedure. See also Widengren, *POTT*, pp. 340-1; and Porten, *AE*, p. 57. See pp. 167ff. above.

to read or write.¹ The extent of the use of Aramaic in Egypt, outside the Aramaic speaking communities, is seen in the fact that Persian names were taken into Egyptian through their Aramaic forms.² Aramaic was also used extensively at Persepolis. Besides the Aramaic glosses on the Treasury and Fortification tablets,³ there are over 150 utensils with Aramaic inscriptions only, apparently used for religious purposes,⁴ and also over 300 clay tablets ". . . incised or written in ink or both . . ." ⁵ in Aramaic exclusively.

¹Gershevitch, *EP*, p. 3. For examples see AP 26, and Papyrus Berol. 23000, as edited by Naveh and Shaked, *JAOS* 91:379-82, 1971.

²Bürchardt, *ZAS* 49:78-80, 1911.

³Cameron, *PTT*, and Hallock, *PFT*.

⁴Bowman, *ARTP*. Cf. Levine, *JAOS* 92:70-9, 1972, and Naveh and Shaked, *Or* 42:445-57, 1973.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 19. Cf. Cameron, *JNES* 32:52, n. 31, 1973; and Hallock, *Or* 42:320-3, 1973. For a clay tablet inscribed completely in Aramaic already during Assyrian times see Millard, *Iraq* 34:131, 1972, and references.

CHAPTER VIII

INTERNAL EXAMINATION OF THE EZRA DOCUMENTS

Thus far the ED have been examined primarily from the perspective of external evidence. The lexical stock, epistolary style, and historical context have all been evaluated. The purpose of this chapter is to evaluate the contents of the ED on the basis of known historical evidence by presenting specific issues concerning the ED that have been debated in scholarly circles. It seems superfluous to discuss matters generally known and accepted. For ease of reference the issues will be taken in the order in which they occur in the texts.

Ezra 1:2, There is no address.—This document is a proclamation and not a letter. Darius' Behistun Inscription, a proclamation, also lacks an address.¹ On the other hand, v. 3 makes it clear that the proclamation is addressed to those whose God is Yahweh, the God of Israel, i. e., the Jews.²

Ezra 1:2, The title "King of Persia."—This title occurs in the ED only in 1:2-4. Its frequent occurrence³ in the surrounding narratives has raised a separate question, that of the date of the narrative as distinct from the documents themselves.⁴ Recent commentators have

¹Kent, *OP*², pp. 116ff. ²Bickerman, *JBL* 65:253 and n. 26, 1946.

³Ezra 1:1, 8; 3:7; 4:3, 5, 7, 24; 6:14; 7:1; (9:9).

⁴Driver, *LOT*, p. 545. Cf. Gray, *ET* 25:245-51, 1914.

accepted the validity of the title being used in the Persian period, not just a later title of the Greek period, primarily on the basis of its occurrence in the Nabonidus Chronicle.¹ However, this is not the only occurrence of the title in the Persian period. It occurs in other Babylonian documents and in the writings of Greek historians of the Persian period.² For example, "Xerxes, king of Persia" occurs in a tablet published by Oppert;³ "Cambyses, king of Persia" occurs in Herodotus 3. 21; and the title "king of the Persians" occurs in Xenophon vii. 1. 33.

Ezra 1:2, Cyrus' claim that Yahweh had given him universal dominion.—

The belief in the universal dominion of the supreme god . . . changed the formula of homage, but left intact its content. A new ruler received the investiture of a world empire from each universal god simultaneously, and established his relations to each god separately as before. Having entered Babylon, Cyrus announced that the Babylonian god Marduk had "appointed him to lordship over the whole world." But at Ur, the Persian king proclaimed that "the great gods" of this city "had delivered all the lands into my hand," while in the temple of Sin it was this moon-god who had established Cyrus' dominion over "the four quarters" of the earth. Later, in a hieroglyphic text, Darius I acknowledged that "the double Nile" had given him "all the countries," the list of which included Persia herself. On the other hand, in Persia, the Achaemenidians naturally gave credit to Ahura-Mazda for their success. But in each case there is always the correlation between the appointment of the ruler by a god as his vicar and the latter's care for the worship of his god.⁴

Furthermore, Cyrus went against the practice of other Ancient Near Eastern rulers by not mentioning his own god in inscriptions in local lan-

¹So Batten, *ICC:EN*; Rudolph, *HAT:EN*; and Myers, *AB:EN*. For the Nabonidus Chronicle see Grayson, *ABC*; and Pritchard, *ANET*², pp. 305-7.

²A list of the titles of Persian kings was compiled by R. D. Wilson, "Titles of the Persian Kings," G. Weil, ed., *Festschrift Eduard Sachau*, pp. 179-207, 1915, and revised with a discussion added in *PTR* 15:90-145, 1917.

³Oppert, *Mélanges de arch. égypt et ass.* 1:23, 1873.

⁴Bickerman, *JBL* 65:264-5, 1946.

guages meant for local consumption.¹ It is to be noted that the Jews at Elephantine used the name יָהוּ, "Yaho/u," in their correspondence with officials as well as with friends and relatives, e.g., AP 30.

Ezra 1:2, 3, The expression, "Jerusalem, which is in Judah."—

This appears to be a mark of bureaucratic style since it occurs frequently in official documents. In the Fortification Tablets from Persepolis, for example, PF 1790 ends, "The sealed document was delivered (at) Tamukkan (in the district) of Ranmesa."² Darius' Behistun Inscription repeatedly uses this style of reference: "A fortress by name Sikayauvati, a district by name Nisaya, in Media . . ." (DB 1. 58-9); "When he arrived in Media, a town by name Maru, in Media . . ." (DB 2. 22-3).³ The formula is even used of people and objects, such as temples: "X the treasurer who is in Arachosia" (ARTP 9. 4);⁴ "the priests who are in Yeb the fortress" (AP 30. 1); and "The temple of Ya'u the God, which is in the fortress of Yeb" (AP 30. 6).⁵ Herodotus mentions an "Ecbatana in Syria" as well as an "Ecbatana in Media," both in reference to an oracle concerning the death of Cambyses who had confused the two places (3. 62. 64). The formula also occurs in Ezra 6:2, "Ecbatana which is in the province of Media."

Die genaue Bestimmung Jerusalems: "welches in Jehuda ist", - ein fuer die Juden selbstverstaendlicher und ueberfluessiger Anhang, doch wichtig fuer die persischen Staatsbeamten, die vielleicht nie etwas von der Existenz Jerusalems gehoert hatten, als sie das Edikt

¹Frye, *HP*, p. 82, and see above pp. 199ff.

²See also PF 1857 and 2070.

³Kent, *OP*², p. 118, 120. See also DB 2. 9. 27-8, 3. 51-2, etc.

⁴See Bowman, *ARTP*, p. 82, n. 74.

⁵See also AP 6. 4, BMAP 2. 2, 12. 2, and Xanthos Trilingual. 3-5.

formulierten - weist auf das Bestehen formeller Exaktheit auf.¹

Ezra 1:3, The expression, "May his God be with him."—The expression of good wishes is a standard part of correspondence and occurs in many forms throughout the correspondence and messages of the Ancient Near East.²

*Ezra 1:3, The expression, "The God of Israel."*³—The author (or authors) of Ezra uses the expression himself so that its use by Cyrus (and Artaxerxes, Ezra 7:15) should not be considered out of place.

"... The Persian administration necessarily styled the deities of the subject peoples in agreement with the phraseology used by the latter."⁴ This is attested in the Pherendates correspondence.⁵ The title "God of Heaven" also occurs in the ED and in the Elephantine papyri.⁶

Ezra 1:3, The expression, "The God who is in Jerusalem."—A similar expression is "the house of the God which is in Jerusalem," which occurs in the next verse.⁷ Both formulations are common in the Elephantine papyri.⁸ While for the former the statement, "It is not a geograph-

¹Zerkavod, *El Ha'ayin* 37:2, 1962.

²On salutations see above, pp. 77ff. Also Thompson, *LBL*, p. xvi. For Assyrian and Babylonian greetings see Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen*, 1967.

³Also at Ezra 5:1, 6:14, and 7:15.

⁴Bickerman, *JBL* 65:256, 1946. ⁵See above, p. 30, n. 3.

⁶Ezra 5:11, 12; 6:9, 10; 7:12, 21, 23. For the papyri see *DISO*.

⁷Also in Ezra 5:14; 6:12; 7:15, 17.

⁸"The God who is in _____": AP 6. 4, BMAP 1. 2, 9. 2, 12. 2, etc. "The house of the God which is in _____": AP 30. 6, also LAH 2. 1, 3. 1, etc. See Fitzmyer, *JNES* 21:17, 1962.

ical indication but a theological conviction, and expresses the close relationship between the God and the city which is the center of His cult,"¹ perhaps overstates the case, nevertheless it gives the theological context of the expression for the native. However, for a foreign king or official it may have been no more than a geographical reference.²

Ezra 1:4, The returning Jews were to be subsidized by the Babylonians.—First, it must be stated that the text does not mention the Babylonians, and the interpretation that they are implied is not at all certain. The text reads, וכל הנשאר מכל המקומות אשר הוא גר שם ינשאורו אנשי מקומו. Grosheide is certainly correct when he observes "Voorts bedende men, dat de Joden in Babel veelal in kolonies bij elkaar woonden, 2 : 59 (plaatsen met Hebreeuwse en Aramese namen!), Ezech. 3 : 15, verg. Ezra 8 : 17."³ Thus the supporting neighbours would be Jews who were not returning. Similarly, Bickerman notes that a Carian settlement in Nippur established in the sixth century B.C. still existed in the fourth century B.C.,⁴ showing that such communities continued.

Ezra 1:4, The use of the term גר, "Alien."—"Among the ancients, a resident alien and his descendants preserved his original nationality indefinitely, unless he was admitted among the citizens."⁵ The colonies established in Palestine by Ashurbanipal retained their original nation-

¹Japhet, *VT* 18:368, 1968.

²The Xanthos Trilingual refers to the addressee as the satrap who is in Karka and Termila, ll. 3-5

³Grosheide, *GIT* 54:10, 1954.

⁴Bickerman, *ELM*, p. 5 (see further pp. 4-7). Cf. Meissner, *SPAW* 49:6-26, 1938.

⁵Bickerman, *JBL* 65:261, 1946.

alities, Ezra 4:9-10. Likewise the Jewish colonists at Elephantine, who were there at least as early as Cambyses (AP 30. 13), were still known as Jews in the time of Darius II, a century later.¹

Ezra 1:4, The use of נדבה, "free-will offering," a technical cultic term.—See at Ezra 6:9-10, The cultic references.

Ezra 1:2-4, The document is in Hebrew rather than Aramaic, the diplomatic language.—It has been shown elsewhere that communication in the Persian empire was made in many languages—Elamite, Phrygian, Demotic and Akkadian—not only in Aramaic, see above, pp. 202ff.

Ezra 1:2-4, Its comparison with Ezra 6:2b-5.—

Now the common opinion that we have two versions of the same edict in chap. 1 and chap. 6 does not represent the facts correctly, because chap. 1 gives a formal public edict which was proclaimed all through the kingdom, while chap. 6 gives a memorandum of an official action which was to serve as direction for the royal officials.²

The proclamation, 1:2-4, grants the Jews certain privileges in connection with their return to Judah, while the memorandum, 6:2b-5, is ". . . a specification of the limits of the expenditure to be permitted from the royal purse."³ It is this distinction of purpose that explains the different matters emphasized in each—the permission to return to Judah in 1:2-4 and the details concerning the temple in 6:2b-5.

Ezra 4:15, The expression, בטפר דכרניא די אבהתך.—The issue at stake here is the implication that the affairs of Judah and Babylon a

¹For additional examples see previous note. On the term גר see Kellerman, *TDOT*, Vol II, pp. 439ff.

²Bewer, *AJT* 19:113, 1915. Cf. Bickerman, *JBL* 65:249ff., 1946.

³Smith, *Essays Presented to Hertz*, p. 392.

century and a half earlier were preserved in Persian records. However, it has been shown above that archival materials were preserved by conquering states,¹ therefore that the Persians would have preserved such records is not at all unlikely. In fact, Berossus in the third century B.C. made use of the Babylonian Chronicle which covered the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, Persian and Greek periods.²

Ezra 4:11-16, The local officials turned to the king rather than to the satrap.—The administrative system established by Darius contained a means of checks and balances on officials. While the satrap enjoyed almost unlimited power, there were officials at his court who were responsible directly to the king. Such was the office held by Rehum, רֵחֻם (see above, pp. 54ff.).

Ezra 4:20, The description of Jerusalem in its former power.—No king of Israel is named here or in Rehum's letter (4:11-16). It is useless to speculate on who was meant but, as is well known, several kings of Israel and Judah are mentioned in Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions. That this exchange of correspondence between Rehum and Artaxerxes exaggerates the situation seems certain and is not without parallels in the letters of the period.³

Ezra 4:21, The statement, עָרָא מִנִּי טַעְמָא יְחֻשְׁמָ.—This statement merely marks the order as being provisional. It should go without say-

¹See chapter 6 above, pp. 170ff.

²See Drews, *Iraq* 37:39-55, 1975.

³Oppenheim, *LM*, pp. 132-4, #76; Hdt. 5. 23; Waterman, *RCAE*, Pt. 2, pp. 364-5, #1241.

ing that such provisions are part and parcel of any administration.¹

Ezra 5:8, The expression, "the great God."—This appellation also occurs in the Elamite tablets, e.g., PF 353 and 354.

Ezra 5:12-14, The spelling of the name Nebuchadnezzar, נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר.—There are two spellings of the name Nebuchadnezzar that have created a problem: נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר/נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר. The latter spelling, with ר in רֶצַּר-, is the Akkadian spelling, while the former spelling, with נ in נֶצַּר-, is apparently a late spelling of the Hellenistic period. However, both spellings occur in Jeremiah, even both spellings in the same chapter—29. The נ spelling also occurs in 2 Kings 24, 25.² In modern circles it seems to have been overlooked that in Daniel where the נ spelling occurs there are MSS that have the ר spelling.³ On the other hand, Berger has shown that there is an inner Hebrew transition of ר > נ and that there are other Akkadian names in the Old Testament that also have passed through this transition.⁴

Ezra 5:15, The expression, "the temple which is in Jerusalem."—See under same at 1:2, 3, and 1:3.

Ezra 5:16, The statement that Sheshbazzar laid the foundation of the temple.—Elsewhere it is said that Zerubbabel laid the foundation of

¹Illustrative examples of fluctuation in administration and precautions taken to handle changes are AP 26, AD 1, 8, PF 1858.

²The spelling of the name in BA is always with נ (in Ezra at 6:5). See *BDB* for lists of occurrences of the two spellings.

³Kennicott, *VTH*; Ginsburg, *The Writings*.

⁴Berger, *ZA* 64:219-34, 1975, especially pp. 227ff.

the temple.¹ The issue revolves around the interpretation of the verbs translated "laid the foundation." In Ezra 5:16 it is (אשליא) ליהב, and in Zechariah 4:9 ליהב. It is sufficient to point out here that ליהב is better understood in the sense of "administer."² Thus Sheshbazzar is involved in the work as the official representative of the king, while Zerubbabel is the local authority in charge of the actual work.³

Ezra 5:17, The occurrence of תמה in the phrase תמה די בבבל.— This has been shown to be a mark of bureaucratic style, see above, pp. 42-3 and 162-3.

*Ezra 6:3, Cyrus refers to 538 B.C. as his first year.—*The actual writing of a document and the form it took was the work of the secretariat not of the king himself. Even high officials in the secretariat delegated such work to lesser officials (see pp. 115ff. above). Therefore, it is not Cyrus who calls 538 B.C. his first year. Since 538 B.C. was Cyrus' first year as king of Babylon, the date formula would indicate that the secretariat handling this matter was made up of Babylonian scribes. That native personnel entered the service of the Persian kings is well known (see chapter 7 above), and the Persepolis Fortification tablets specifically mention Babylonian scribes.⁴

*Ezra 6:3, The measurements of the temple.—*Since such edifices served a dual purpose, its primary purpose and as part of the city's defences, and since the expenses were to come out of the royal treasury,

¹Zech. 4:9, cf. Ezra 3:8, 10. ²See above, pp. 70 and 153.

³Two like officials were needed for an Assyrian building project also, see Waterman, *RCAE*, #471.

⁴E.g., PF 1947.

it is only natural that Cyrus should stipulate certain specifications (see p. 216, n. 3, above). An Assyrian king was equally involved in a building project.¹ Darius also recorded certain measurements of a palace that he had built in Susa.²

*Ezra 6:4, The method of building—*נרובכין די אבן גלל תלתא ונדבך—*די אע חרת*.—This type of construction has now been found to be a very common one used in the Ancient Near East.³ It was also the method of construction used for Solomon's temple (1 Kings 6:36, 7:12). Excavations have uncovered its use in Syria, the Aegean, Anatolia, and Babylonia. In Palestine itself it was used at Megiddo and Jericho.⁴ Time-wise it was used from Neolithic times down to the Iron Age.⁵

*Ezra 6:4, The building funds to come out of the royal treasury.*⁶—Contemporary records are replete with examples of state funding and support of various local cults (see above, pp. 201-2).

*Ezra 6:5, The preservation of the temple vessels captured by Nebuchadnezzar.*⁷—The Cyrus Cylinder records the same situation regarding numerous temples from which Nabonidus removed idols and to which

¹Waterman, *RCAE*, #471.

²DSf, Kent, *OP*², pp. 142-4. See Waterman, *RCAE*, Vol. I, #457, for another text containing building measurements. Cf. Cook, *AJT* 19:363, 1915.

³Smith, *PEQ* 67:5-17, 1941; and Thomson, *PEQ* 92:57-63, 1960.

⁴Thomson, *PEQ* 92:60, 1960. ⁵*Ibid.*

⁶Cf. Ezra 6:6-12, 7:12-26. These two edicts further specify that royal funds were to come out of the taxes of the local province.

⁷These vessels are also mentioned in Daniel 5.

Cyrus returned them.¹

Ezra 6:5, Nebuchadnezzar.—See at Ezra 5:12-14.

Ezra 6:2b-5, Was the edict of Cyrus carried out?—This issue stems from an apparent contradiction in the accounts between Ezra and Haggai and Zechariah. Haggai and Zechariah are silent regarding any earlier edict concerning a return or building activity. It is assumed that they would have mentioned it if such an edict existed, but since they do not, their silence is regarded as tacit proof that no such edict was issued.² However, arguments from silence are hardly convincing, and the Ezra narrative explicitly states that the edict and the proclamation (1:2-4) were carried out (Ezra 1:5-3:13). Ezra 2 contains a list of those who returned under Cyrus (repeated in Nehemiah 7). Furthermore, the edict of Cyrus recorded in Ezra 6:2b-5 was brought to light at the time when Haggai and Zechariah were stirring up the people to renew the work!³ Finally, Batten is surely correct when he says that the matter has no bearing on the authenticity of the edict ". . . for it was one thing for the king to give such an order, but quite another matter to get the satrap of a distant province to carry it out."⁴

Ezra 6:2b-5, Its comparison with Ezra 5:13-15.—

The resemblances are: 5:8^b and 6:4^a; 5:13-15^a and 6:3^a,5; 5:15^b and 6:7^b. They will cause no surprise to anyone who is familiar with the epistolary style of the ancient East. . . . *All* the

¹Berger, *ZA* 64:192-234, 1975; and Pritchard, *ANET*², pp. 315ff. Cf. DSe, Kent, *OP*², pp. 141-2.

²Pfeiffer, *IOT*, p. 821. Cf. Curtis, *Essays to Briggs*, pp. 33-40.

³Ezra 5:1-6:2a.

⁴Batten, *ICC:EN*, p. 146. Cf. Grosheide, *GTT* 54:5, 1954.

elements of Bagoas' reply are borrowed from the petition of the Jews of Elephantine.¹

Ezra 6:9-10, The cultic references.—Several documents in this study contain similar cultic references,² and Persian interest in the religious affairs of their subjects is well-attested.³ Ezra 1:4 and 7:12ff. also contain terms and details of the Jewish cult.

Ezra 6:10, Prayers for the king and his sons.—Cyrus requests prayers for himself in the Cyrus Cylinder.⁴ Herodotus says that among the Persians, worshipers must also pray for the king when they pray for themselves (1. 132). A bridge inscription from the fifth century B.C. requests blessings from travellers for the Persian official responsible for its erection, and for his sons.⁵

Ezra 6:12, The expression, אלהא די שכך שמה וזמה.—A similar expression occurs at Ezra 7:15 and Nehemiah 1:9. The reader is referred to the discussion of the phrase "the God who is in Jerusalem," Ezra 1:3. That this idea of a god's or person's name dwelling at a place is not peculiar to the Jews or strictly Deuteronomistic as attested by its occurrence in the El-Amarna tablets: *a-mur šarri^{tī} ša-ka-an šum-šu i-na mât ú-ru-sa-lim^{ki} a-na da-ri-iš*, "Siehe, der König hat gesetzt seinem Namen im Lande von Urusalim auf ewig."⁶

¹deVaux, *BANE*, pp. 88-9. Cf. Bowman, *IB*, Vol. III, p. 614. On quotations in letters see above, pp. 101ff.

²See above, pp. 28ff. ³See above, pp. 199ff.

⁴Pritchard, *ANET*², p. 316. ⁵Henning, *AM NS* 4:101, 1954.

⁶Knudtzon, *EAT*, Vol. I, #287. 60-1. Cf. #288. 5, for a similar expression. See Wenham, *TB* 22:112ff., 1971, for other ANE parallels.

Ezra 6:12, Darius refers to the possibility of opposition to his edict.—Darius' own inscriptions consider the possibility of opposition to his rule. In DPd he says, "Upon this country may there not come an army, nor famine, nor the Lie; . . ." ¹ In DNa he says, "Me may Ahuramazda protect from harm, and my royal house, and this land: . . . O man, that which is the command of Ahuramazda, let this not seem repugnant to thee; do not leave the right path; do not rise in rebellion!" ²

Ezra 7:12, Ezra is called a scribe.—The issue seems to have been caused by the confusion between "scribe" understood as a secretary, clerk, etc., and "Scribe" understood in the later Jewish sense of a member of the institution of the Soferim. While the latter is first mentioned in Ecclesiasticus (38:24-39:11), ". . . a history must be assumed to bring it to the stage on which we find it there." ³ Moore places the beginning of later Judaism in the Persian period, and since ". . . Ezra appears in the name and character of a Scribe, . . ." ⁴ he may well have been a precursor of the Soferim as Jewish tradition holds. On the other hand, Crown ⁵ has shown that the title *šōfer* can refer to a "messenger" as well as to a scribe. If this is the case with Ezra, then his position in relationship to the Persian government and to Judah can be seen in another light. See above, p. 183.

Ezra 7:15, The expression, "the God of Israel, whose dwelling is

¹Kent, *OP*², p. 136.

²*Ibid.*, p. 138.

³Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 41.

⁴*Ibid.*, and see his discussion pp. 37ff.

⁵Crown, *VT* 24:366-70, 1974. See also Crown, *JESHO* 17:244-71, 1974.

in Jerusalem.—See on the same at Ezra 1:3 and 6:12.

Ezra 7:21-4, This section is addressed to the treasurers of West-Euphrates.—There are a number of examples of Ancient Near Eastern letters in which a single letter had messages or instructions for someone other than the addressee. LBL 39 instructs the addressee to forward a message to a third party; the message is quoted. LBL 139 informs the addressee that the addressor has sent a separate letter to a third party, and the content of that letter is quoted. The Asshur Ostrakon ends with a message to a third party.¹ Oppenheim cites a number of Amarna letters addressed to the king that contain a separate message to the royal scribe.² AD 6 is a passport that is addressed to seven officers in seven cities between Babylon or Susa and Egypt.

Ezra 7:24, The tax-exemption granted to the clergy.—We need look no farther than the Gadates Inscription in which Gadates is reprimanded for collecting taxes from the sacred gardeners of Apollo (see above, p. 31).

Ezra 7:25, The acknowledgment of the divine wisdom of Ezra.—The expression, כַּחֲכַמַת אֱלֹהֵי דִי בִיִּדְךָ, ". . . does not mean, according to the priests' inspired discretion, as Esd. implies, but according to the written law-book which he carries and to which he must conform, . . ."³ This is expressly stated in v. 14, בְּדַת אֱלֹהֵי דִי בִיִּדְךָ.

¹Donner and Rollig, *KAI*, #233, = Koopmans, *KAC*, #14.

²Oppenheim, *Studies to Landsberger*, pp. 253ff.

³Batten, *ICC:EN*, p. 313. Cf. Rudolph, *HAT:EN*, p. 74. Wisdom is often parallel to law in late Jewish literature, especially with the law of Moses as in Ecclesiasticus 24:1-23.

Ezra 7:12-26, The enumeration of the Jewish clergy and other cultic references.—See at *Ezra 6:9-10*, the cultic references.

Ezra 7:12-26, The extent of Ezra's authority.—Whatever Ezra's position in relation to the Persian government,¹ the powers granted him are not without parallel. For example, Asoka's Rock Edict V grants basically the same authority to officials throughout his kingdom, also to regulate religious affairs.²

In conclusion, this chapter has applied the information and evidence gained from the previous chapters to the criticisms that have been raised against the authenticity of the ED. These criticisms are based on the historical, linguistic, administrative and religious practices of the Achaemenids. The results of this chapter show that the criticisms reflect an inadequate knowledge of Persian practices. By applying the evidence concerning Persian bureaucratic and epistolary style, Persian religious and administrative practices and the contemporary linguistic situation that is now available, all of these criticisms against the authenticity of the ED lose their force.

¹See above, p. 183, and Myers, *AB:EN*, pp. 60-1.

²Nikam and McKeon, *EA*, pp. 58-9. Cf. Kosambi, *JESHO* 2:204-6, 1959.

CONCLUSIONS

The Ezra Documents have been examined as documents within the general framework of three areas: 1) lexical, 2) epistolary style, and 3) historical context. There is considerable overlapping in these areas, but they are distinctive nonetheless. The major emphasis of this thesis is on the epistolary style of the ED and their historical context. The principal question regarding the ED concerns their historical credibility, i.e., are the ED authentic Achaemenid documents as they purport to be? This question has been debated for nearly a century but has received little serious attention as witnessed by a mere dozen studies devoted strictly to the ED as documents (see chapter 1). This also reflects the general lack of interest in this period of Israel's history.

Lexical

The vocabulary of the ED is the standard vocabulary of Imperial Aramaic of the sixth to fifth centuries B.C., as a simple comparison of *BDB* or *KB* with *DISO* will show. This is clearly evident regarding the Persian loanwords in the ED. Of the eleven Persian loanwords in the ED eight are attested in contemporary Aramaic documents. The same situation exists regarding the Akkadian loanwords in the ED where seven of the twelve occur in contemporary Aramaic documents. Thus the conclusion reached by Davis in 1908 (see above, p. 5) remains valid: ". . . the diction of the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther exhibits such traces of the Persian influence as properly belong to contemporary documents within the bounds of the Persian empire and concerning imperial affairs."

The occurrences of synonyms illustrate the range of the lexical stock. No conclusions can be based on them because the ED were written by different scribes from different places over a period of about eighty years. Therefore, it can be concluded that as far as the lexical material is concerned the ED can be considered authentic Persian documents.

Epistolary Style

The ED have been examined in connection with Persian and Greek epistolary style; with the former because they purport to be Persian documents, and with the latter because some scholars have claimed a Hellenistic origin for them. Unlike the style of official Greek correspondence the style of official Persian correspondence has yet to receive a separate and thorough study. Consequently the style of official Persian correspondence had to be established. The writer did this by charting all the stylistic features of Achaemenid correspondence discernible from the thirty-nine documents used in this study. There are ten epistolary features found in official Persian correspondence though not in every individual document. The bulk of these documents are decrees, reports and memoranda. In each of these three classes or types of letters the ED reflect the style of their contemporary counterparts. Thus all ten features of Achaemenid epistolary style are present, or absent, just as in the non-Biblical documents. Especially noteworthy in this respect is the direct address to recipients of memoranda. In Ezra 6:2b-5 scholars have been troubled with the closing statement, וּבְיַת אֱלֹהִים, "and *you* shall deposit (them) in the house of God." That the second person active is correct, and is not to be changed to the third person passive as both 1 and 2 Esdras do, is shown by a similar memorandum, AP 32, which begins אָמְרוּ לִי, "they said to *me*." Thus memoranda

were sometimes direct and personal communications to their recipients.

While most stylistic features attained a certain set formula, none became rigidly stereotyped. Thus within general patterns a great variety exists in the epistolary style of Achaemenid correspondence. This is true not only of the formulas of the stylistic features but also of their presence or absence in individual letters. For example, the dates of the documents occur in four different formulas, but less than a third of the documents contain a date (see above, p. 110). For easy reference the ten stylistic features of Achaemenid correspondence are given in outline form on p. 125 above.

The style of official Greek correspondence is completely different from the style of official Achaemenid correspondence. That there can be no confusion between the two styles can be clearly seen by comparing the outlines of the two styles given on pp. 125 and 127 above. There are three Persian documents preserved only in Greek that have been included in this study (Hdt. 5. 24, Thuc. i. 129, and the Gadates Insc.). Each has been preserved in its Persian style as evidenced by their strict adherence to Persian epistolary style and their complete lack of Greek stylistic features. The Gadates Inscription is particularly exemplary of this since it was copied down to Roman times without losing its distinctively Persian character.

In addition to the style of official Greek correspondence itself the LXX offers further information. The LXX evidence is twofold: firstly, there are the LXX renderings of the ED, found in two separate versions, 1 & 2 Esdras; secondly, there are two Greek Additions to the Book of Esther, B & E, which do not have a counterpart in the Hebrew Esther. The LXX renderings of the ED are of no value as far as episto-

lary style is concerned because both 1 & 2 Esdras copy the MT of Ezra. Their value lies in their being translations from the Hellenistic period of purportedly Persian documents. In this regard it is demonstrably clear that the translators were unfamiliar with the language and style of the ED. Both 1 & 2 Esdras mistranslate twenty percent (20%) of the vocabulary listed in Table 8 (pp. 133ff.). Furthermore, specific features of Achaemenid epistolary and bureaucratic style were also unrecognized by the translators who omitted or changed them as they saw fit (see above, pp. 42ff.). Additions B and E, however, offer a completely different picture. They are not translations from a Semitic original. They were apparently produced during the Hellenistic period to fill the void in the Masoretic Esther which referred to such edicts but did not write them out. But other than one erroneous attempt to reflect Persian style (see above, p. 141, n. 1) Additions B and E are totally Greek in style. Consequently, they are examples of what the ED should look like if they were products of a late Hellenistic Greek author, or authors.

Thus the epistolary style of the ED is demonstrably Persian, being thoroughly compatible with that of Achaemenid correspondence of the sixth to fourth centuries B.C. The inability of the LXX translators to recognize the language and style of the ED and the patently Greek composition of the Greek Additions B and E to Esther amply demonstrate that the ED can hardly be considered forgeries of the Hellenistic period.

Historical Context

It is in this area that most of the scholarly debates over the ED have taken place. Therefore, as wide a field as possible has been investigated in response to the obvious general lack of information concerning Persian rule. Three areas have been approached. Firstly, the

study of the influence of Persian on Aramaic has demonstrated the linguistic aspect of the cultural influence of Persians on their subjects. Secondly, the discussion of the institution and administration of archives has demonstrated a vital but seriously neglected aspect of the administrative machinery of the Achaemenids. Thirdly, a broader historical context surveyed illustrates the administrative practices, the religious policies and the handling of the language problems facing the Achaemenids.

The use of Aramaic as a *lingua franca* was made by the Persians following the practice of their predecessors, the Babylonians and before them, the Assyrians. Because of the great reliance on Aramaic for communications by the Persians the language was naturally affected by the language of its users. Forty-one supposed examples of such Persian influence on Aramaic have been brought together. These Persianisms cover loan translations, syntax, phonology, and morphology. Twenty of these Persianisms occur in the ED, which is sufficient to demonstrate the homogeneity of Biblical Aramaic with Imperial Aramaic of the Achaemenid period. This conclusion is not materially affected by the fact that only eight of these twenty Persianisms are certain (with our present knowledge) since four of them do not occur later than the Achaemenid period. Thus, combining the evidence of the lexical material with the evidence of Persian influence on Aramaic, the ED are demonstrably contemporary with the Aramaic documents of the Achaemenid period, as regards their linguistic character.

Modern archives can trace their origins and development back to their counterparts in the Ancient Near East. It has been shown from written sources that archive administration in the Ancient Near East

became well-developed and observed the strictness of rule governing modern archives. The relevance of archive administration revolves around two issues: 1) the acquisition of official documents by the author of Ezra, and 2) the author's portrayal of archival practices. Other authors of antiquity give evidence of having had access to official documents, so it is not surprising that the author of Ezra apparently had such access. The author of Ezra does not explain where he obtained his documents, but his careful distinction between copies and originals assures us that they were obtained from an archive in the province of West-Euphrates. For it is the nature of archives that they contain copies of documents issued from and original documents received into it. This is the classification the author of Ezra makes of the ED: those sent from the province of West-Euphrates are classified as copies and those received in the province of West-Euphrates are classified as originals. Two possible archive locations are the capital of West-Euphrates (probably Damascus) or Jerusalem, capital of the province of Judah. The portrayal of archival practices in the Ezra narrative revolves around the terms used for archives and their general locations. Official archives were almost always connected with state storerooms or treasuries and were referred to by the same names. Consistent with this terminology and association are both the ED and their narrative context. Thus Ezra 5:7-17 refers to the *בית גוזיא די מלכא*, "royal treasury," and Ezra 6:2 mentions *בבית ספריא די גוזיא*, "in the archives (lit. 'house of books') of the treasury/treasures."

Cyrus set a general policy of rule at once contrastive from that of his predecessors and which was to become characteristic of the Achaemenid Empire. He treated his subjects, even conquered rulers, with

leniency, restoring exiled people to their homelands, rebuilding ruined temples and re-establishing cults throughout his empire. It is within this general policy that the permission for the Jews to return to Judah and to rebuild their temple must be viewed. The provincial administration depicted in the ED is in keeping with that pictured in non-Biblical sources like the combination of native and Persian officials, and that they always appear in groups, as for example, Tattenai, Shethar-Bozenai and their colleagues in Ezra 5:7-17. Also the titles of officials found in the ED are those found in Achaemenid sources, e.g., *בַּעַל טַעַם*, *חַתָּה* and *אֶפְרַסְכִּי*.

The religious policies of the Achaemenids is well-attested throughout their empire. In Babylonia Cyrus credits his success to the chief god of various cities, e.g., Marduk and Sin. In Egypt Cambyses and Darius paid homage to several Egyptian gods. The Pherendates correspondence further illustrates Darius' involvement in the religious affairs of his subjects (see above, p. 30). In Asia Minor the Gadates Inscription and the Xanthos Trilingual amply attest the religious policies of the Persians. In Persia itself the gods of the foreign workmen received commodities from the Persepolis treasury equally with the Persian Ahuramazda. Therefore, the religious concessions granted the Jews by the ED are to be understood as a part of a general religious policy of the ruling Persians.

The Persians used two methods in dealing with the language problem facing them because of the multi-lingual nature of their empire. One method was to make use of the individual native languages. This is exemplified by the numerous documents in the languages of nations from Egypt to Asia Minor, e.g., Egyptian, Lycian, Greek, and Elamite. The

second method of communication was by the use of Aramaic as a third intermediary language that could be used throughout the empire. Aramaic texts of the Persian period have been found in Egypt, Asia Minor, Persia, and India. Thus Ezra 1:2-4, written in Hebrew, fits in with Persian practice as well as the rest of the ED which are in Aramaic.

The results of this study are twofold, in keeping with the purpose set forth in the introduction (see above, pp. 26-7). The analysis of the epistolary style and character of official Achaemenid correspondence has demonstrated that the ED can be considered authentic Persian documents, as far as style goes. Since specific matters in the ED have been questioned as well as their general character the writer has compiled all the specific questions raised concerning the authenticity of the ED. These questions have been dealt with together by referring to the evidence assembled in the study and to additional evidence where necessary. The result has been that all of the questions raised concerning the authenticity of the ED are answered in the positive in the light of our present state of knowledge of Achaemenid Persia. The study of the historical context of the ED in matters both general and specific has demonstrated that the ED can be considered authentic Persian documents, as far as history is concerned.

The final conclusion drawn by the writer is that linguistically, stylistically, and historically the ED correspond perfectly to the non-Biblical documents of the Achaemenid period. Hence the ED can be considered part and parcel of the Achaemenid period as they purport to be and can be used as valuable historical sources for that period.

APPENDIX I

THE WRITER'S TRANSLATION OF THE EZRA DOCUMENTS

Ezra 1:2-4

Thus says Cyrus king of Persia: All the kingdoms of the earth has Yahweh, the God of heaven, given to me and he has appointed me to build him a temple in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Whoever among you from all his people his God be with him and go up to Jerusalem which is in Judah and build the temple of Yahweh, the God of Israel; he is the God who is in Jerusalem. Now whoever remains from all the places where he is sojourning, let the men of his place assist the returnee with silver, gold, goods and cattle and with the free-will offering for the temple of God which is in Jerusalem.

Ezra 4:11-16¹

To Artaxerxes the king, your servants the men of West-Euphrates.

Now let it be known to the king that the Jews who have come up from your presence to us have arrived in Jerusalem and they are rebuilding the rebellious and evil city even finishing the walls and repairing/ inspecting (?) the lower foundations. Now let it be known to the king that if that city is rebuilt and its walls completed, tribute, tax and duty will not be paid and it will hurt the royal revenue. Now because we are in your service and this outrage against the king it is not fit-

¹The ED are here given in the order in which they occur, rather than in their chronological order.

ting for us to see, because of this we have sent and disclosed the matter to the king that search might be made in the record books of your fathers. There you will discover in the record books and you will learn that that city is a rebellious city and damaging to kings and provinces and revolt has occurred within it from times past, therefore that city was laid waste. We inform the king that if that city is rebuilt and its walls completed then this district in West-Euphrates will no longer be yours.

Ezra 4:17-22

To Rehum the chancellor and Shimshai the scribe and the rest of their colleagues living in Samaria and elsewhere in West-Euphrates: Peace. Now the letter that you sent to us has been clearly read before me and I gave orders and search was made and it was found that that city from times past has raised itself up against kings and rebellion and revolt have occurred within it. Powerful kings have been over Jerusalem and governed all West-Euphrates and tribute, tax and duty have been paid to them. Therefore, order those men to stop and that city is not to be rebuilt until an order from me is given. Be careful of negligence in acting concerning this matter lest damage increase to the royal detriment.

Ezra 5:7-17

To Darius the king, greetings.

Let it be known to the king that we went to the province of Judah, to the temple of the great God. It is being built with stones and timber is being set in the walls, and that work is being done diligently and progressing in their hands. Now we asked those elders and we

said to them, "Who gave you a permit to build this temple and to supply this building material?" We also asked them their names in order to inform you and that the names of their leaders might be recorded. And thus they answered us saying, "We are the servants of the God of heaven and earth and we are building the temple which was built and finished many years ago by a great king of Israel. But because our fathers provoked the God of heaven to anger he gave them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, the Chaldean, and this temple was demolished and the people deported to Babylon. Then in the first year of Cyrus, the king of Babylon, Cyrus the king gave an order to rebuild this house of God. Also the silver and gold articles of the house of God which Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which is in Jerusalem and brought to the temple of Babylon, Cyrus the king took them out of the temple of Babylon and gave them to one named Sheshbazzar whom he had made governor. And he said to him, 'Take these articles, go, deposit them in the temple that is in Jerusalem and let the house of God be rebuilt upon its place.' Then that Sheshbazzar came and made provisions for the lower foundations of the house of God which is in Jerusalem; and from then until now it has been under construction but it is not yet finished." So now, if it pleases the king let search be made in the royal archives there in Babylon to see if there is a permit from Cyrus the king to build that house of God in Jerusalem. Let the decision of the king concerning this be sent to us.

Ezra 6:2b-5

Memorandum: In the first year of Cyrus the king, Cyrus the king issued an order. The house of God in Jerusalem: let the temple be rebuilt as a place where sacrifices may be offered and its lower founda-

tions may be carried. Its height may be sixty cubits and its breadth sixty cubits with three courses of stone and a new course of timber; and the expense is to be paid out of the royal treasury. Also let the silver and gold articles of the house of God which Nebuchadnezzar removed from the temple in Jerusalem and brought to Babylon be returned, so take them to their place in the temple in Jerusalem, and you are to deposit them in the house of God.

Ezra 6:6-12

Now, Tattenai, governor of West-Euphrates, Shethar-bozenai and their colleagues the investigators who are in West-Euphrates: stay away from there! Leave the work on that house of God alone and let the governor and elders of the Jews build that house of God upon its place. In addition, I issue an order as to what you are to do for those Jewish elders for the building of that house of God. From the resources of the king, of the taxes of West-Euphrates, the full cost is to be given to those men—and it is not to stop! Whatever is needed—calves, rams, lambs for burnt-offerings for the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine, anointing oil—as the priests in Jerusalem request, they are to be provided for them daily without fail. Thereby they may offer incense to the God of heaven and pray for the lives of the king and his sons. I also order that any man who changes this edict, a timber is to be pulled from his house, and he is to be impaled upon it, and his house is to be made a ruins. May the God who has caused his name to dwell there overthrow any king or people who violates this order, to destroy that house of God in Jerusalem. I, Darius, have issued the order: do it diligently.

Ezra 7:12-26

Artaxerxes, king of kings, to Ezra the priest, scribe of the law of the God of heaven, greetings.

Now, I issue an order that all of the people of Israel and their priests and Levites in my kingdom who want to go to Jerusalem with you may go. You are being sent from before the king and his seven advisers to enquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem with the law of your God which is in your possession. Take the silver and gold the king and his advisers have freely given to the God of Israel whose dwelling is in Jerusalem, also all of the silver and gold which you find throughout the province of Babylon with the free-will offering of the people and the priests given freely for the house of their God which is in Jerusalem. Because of this you shall buy specifically with this silver bulls, rams, lambs, offerings, libations, and you shall offer them upon the altar of the house of your God which is in Jerusalem. Whatever seems proper to you and your brethren to do with the rest of the silver and the gold do according to the will of your God. The articles which are given to you for the service of your God's temple place before the God of Jerusalem. The remaining needs of your God's temple which befalls you to provide will be furnished from the royal treasury. I, Artaxerxes the king, issue an order to all the treasurers in West-Euphrates that anything which Ezra, the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven asks you shall do it exactly; up to one hundred talents of silver, one hundred kors of wheat, one hundred baths of wine, one hundred baths of anointing oil and salt without limit. All that from the command of the God of heaven do diligently for the house of the God of heaven, lest there be anger against the kingdom of the king and his sons. You are also to

know that it is illegal to impose tribute, tax or duty upon any of the priests, Levites, singers, door-keepers, Nethinim, or servants of this temple. And as for you, Ezra, according to the wisdom of your God which is in your hand appoint justices and magistrates to be judges for everyone in West-Euphrates, for all who know the law of your God and those who do not know it, you are to teach them. And anyone who does not fully keep the law of your God and the law of the king, judgment is to be executed against him, either death, corporal punishment, fine or imprisonment.

APPENDIX II

THE VOCABULARY OF THE EZRA DOCUMENTS

Aramaic & Hebrew Words	English Equivalents	1:2-4	6:2b-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-16	4:17-22	7:12-26	Persian Loanwords	Akkadian Loanwords	Hebrew Loanwords	Proper Names	Geographical Names	Epistolary Terms	Political-Legal Terms	Religious Terms	Architectural Terms	Economic Terms	Weights & Measures
		אב	father			x		x											
^a אבן	stone		x	x															
אדין	then			x										x					
אדרזדא	diligently							x	x					x					
אזל	go			x															
אח	brother							x											
איתי	there is			x		x													
אלה	God		x	x	x			x								x			
אלה	these			x															
אלהים	God	x														x			
אלך	those			x	x		x												
אמה	cubit		x																x
אמר	say	x		x															
אמר	lamb				x			x								x			
אנה	I				x			x											
אנוש	man	x																	
אנחנה	we			x		x													
אנש	man				x	x													

^aThis occurs only in the compound אבן גלל, see above, p. 133, n. a.

Aramaic & Hebrew Words	English Equivalents	1:2-4	6:2b-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-16	4:17-22	7:12-26	P. L.	A. L.	H. L.	P. N.	G. N.	E. T.	P.-L. T.	R. T.	A. T.	E. T.	W. & M.
אנתה	you							x											
אסור	imprisonment							x							x				
אספרנא	exactly			x	x			x	x					x					
אע	wood		x	x	x												x		
אף	also		x	x															
אפרטכיל	investigator				x				x						x				
אפתם	treasury					x			x										
אריך	proper					x													
ארע	earth			x															
ארץ	earth	x																	
^b ארתחששתא	Artaxerxes					x		x				x							
אש	lower foundation		x	x		x				x							x		
אשר	who, which	x						x											
אשרן	building materials			x					x								x		
אשתדור	revolt					x	x		?										
את	sign of accusative	x																	
אתה	come, go			x		x													
אתר	place		x	x	x														
ב	in	x	x	x		x	x	x											
באיש	bad					x													
בבל	Babylon		x	x				x					x						
בהמה	cattle	x																	
בטל	cease				x		x												
בית	house	x	x	x	x			x									x		
^c בלו	tax					x	x	x	?	?								x	
בנה	build	x	x	x	x	x	x										x		
^d בעל טעם	chancellor						x		?	?					x				

^b Artaxerxes has two spellings: ארתחששתא, 4:11, also at 4:7, 8; and ארתחשסתא, 7:12, 21, also at 7:11.

^c See above, p. 54.

^d See above, pp. 54ff.

Aramaic & Hebrew Words	English Equivalents	1:2-4	6:2b-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-16	4:17-22	7:12-26	P. L.	A. L.	H. L.	P. N.	G. N.	E. T.	P.-L. T.	R. T.	A. T.	E. T.	W. & M.
		בקר	seek			x		x	x	x									
בר	son					x		x											
ברם	yet			x															
בת	bath							x											x
גבר	man			x	x		x												
גו	interior					x													
גזבר	treasurer							x	x						x				
גלה	take into exile			x											x				
^e גלל	rolling		x	x															
^f גמר	finish							x					x						
גנז	treasure			x				x	x									x	
גר	alien	x													x				
דבח	sacrifice		x													x			
דבח	sacrifice		x													x			
דהב	gold		x	x				x											
די	relative pronoun, conj.		x	x	x	x	x	x											
דין	judge							x							x				
דין	judgement							x							x				
דין	judge							x							x				
דך	that			x	x	x	x												
דכר	ram					x		x								x			
דכרונה	memorandum		x											x					
דכרון	memorandum					x								x					
דנה	this			x	x	x	x	x											
^g דריוש	Darius			x	x							x							
דח	law							x	x						x				

^eSee above, p. , n. a.^fSee above, pp. 43, 77.^gSpelled as in the early inscriptions designating Darius I, as opposed to the later spelling of Darius II and III--דריוש with ה. See Cowley, *AP*, p. 1; Kitchen, *NPBD*, p. 59; and Frye, *HP*, p. 97.

Aramaic & Hebrew Words	English Equivalents	1:2-4	6:2b-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-16	4:17-22	7:12-26	P. L.	A. L.	H. L.	P. N.	G. N.	E. T.	P.-L. T.	R. T.	A. T.	E. T.	W. & M.
ה	definite article	x																	
הוא	he	x		x															
הוה	be			x	x	x	x	x											
היה	be	x																	
היכל	temple, palace		x	x		x				x							x		
הלך	go		x					x											
הלך	tax					x	x	x		x								x	
המו	they			x				x											
הן	if			x		x		x											
ו	conjunction	x	x	x	x	x	x	x											
זהב	gold	x																	
זהיר	cautious						x												
זמר	musician							x								x			
זקף	raise up				x					x									
חבל	destroy				x														
חבל	damage						x												
חד	one		x	x															
חדת	new		x																
^h חוט	(uncertain)					x				?									
חזה	see					x													
חי	life				x														
חכמה	wisdom							x								x			
חלק	portion					x													
חמר	wine				x			x								x			
חנטה	wheat, corn				x			x								x			
חרב	be laid waste					x													
חשה	need				x					x									
חשו	need							x		x									
טב	good			x															

^hSee above, p. 52.

Aramaic & Hebrew Words	English Equivalent	1:2-4	6:2b-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-16	4:17-22	7:12-26	P. L.	A. L.	H. L.	P. N.	G. N.	E. T.	P.-L. T.	R. T.	A. T.	E. T.	W. & M.
ⁱ טעם	order		x	x	x		x	x							x				
לבל	bring		x	x				x											
יד	hand			x	x			x											
ידע	know			x		x		x											
להב	give		x	x	x		x	x											
יהוד	Judah			x				x					x						
יהודה	Judah	x											x						
יהודי	Jew				x	x						x							
יהוה	Yahweh	x										x				x			
יום	day				x	x	x												
יטב	good							x											
יעט	counsellor							x							x				
ירושלם	Jerusalem	x	x	x	x	x	x	x					x						
ישראל	Israel	x		x				x					x						
יתב	dwell						x												
כ	like			x	x			x											
כה	thus, now, here	x																	
כהן	priest				x			x								x			
כורש	Cyrus	x	x	x								x							
ככר	talent							x											x
כל	all	x		x	x	x	x	x											
כנמה	thus			x															
כנה	colleague				x		x			x					x				
כסף	silver	x	x	x				x											
כען	now			x	x	x	x							x					
כעת, לענת, כעת	now					x	x	x						x					
כר	kor							x											x
כשדלי	Chaldean			x								x							
כתב	write			x										x					

ⁱ See above, p. 53.

Aramaic & Hebrew Words	English Equivalents	1:2-4	6:2b-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-16	4:17-22	7:12-26	P. L.	A. L.	H. L.	P. N.	G. N.	E. T.	P.-L. T.	R. T.	A. T.	E. T.	W. & M.
כתב	writing							x						x					
כחל ^j	(core of) wall			x													x		
ל	to	x	x	x	x	x	x	x											
לא	negative			x	x	x	x	x											
להן	but			x															
לוי	Levite							x			x						x		
לון	near					x													
מאה	hundred							x											
מאמר	word				x										x				
מאן	vessel, articles			x	x			x									x		
מגר	overthrow				x														
מזבח	altar							x									x		
מדינה	province			x		x		x							x				
מה	what				x		x	x											
מות	death							x							x				
מחא	strike				x														
מי	who	x																	
מלח	eat salt					x													
מלח	salt				x	x		x							x	x			
מלך	king	x	x	x	x	x	x	x							x				
מלכו	kingdom, reign							x							x				
ממלכה	kingdom	x													x				
מן	who			x															
מן	from	x	x	x	x	x	x	x											
מדה, מדה	tribute				x	x	x	x		x									x
מנה	appoint							x											
מנחה	offering							x			x						x		
מקום	place	x																	
מרד	rebellion							x											

^jSee above, p. 67.

Aramaic & Hebrew Words	English Equivalents	1:2-4	6:2b-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-16	4:17-22	7:12-26	P. L.	A. L.	H. L.	P. N.	G. N.	E. T.	P.-L. T.	R. T.	A. T.	E. T.	W. & M.
מרד	rebellious					x													
משח	anointing oil				x			x								x			
משכן	dwelling							x											
נבוכדנצר	Nebuchadnezzar		x	x								x							
נדב	willing, spend							x											
נדבה	voluntary offering	x														x			
נוזר	course		x							x							x		
^k נולו	ruins				x					?									
נזק	damage					x	x												
נחת	come down		x	x															
ניחוח	incense				x						x					x			
נכס	wealth				x			x		x								x	
נסח	pull out				x														
נסך	libation							x											
נפל	fall							x											
נפק	go out		x	x															
נפקה	expense		x		x														
נשא	lift	x		x			x												
נשתון	(official) document						x		x					x					
נתין	temple servant							x			x					x			
נתן	give	x				x		x											
סבל	carry		x							x									
סלק	go/come up					x													
ספר	book					x								x					
ספר	secretary						x	x							x				
סתר	demolish			x															
עבד	do, make			x	x	x	x	x											
עבד	servant			x		x													
עבדיה	work			x	x														

^kSee above, pp. 56-7.

Aramaic & Hebrew Words	English Equivalents	1:2-4	6:2b-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-16	4:17-22	7:12-26	P. L.	A. L.	H. L.	P. N.	G. N.	E. T.	P.-L. T.	R. T.	A. T.	E. T.	W. & M.
^l עבר נהרה	West-Euphrates				x	x	x	x		?			x						
עד	unto, until		x				x	x											
עזרא	Ezra											x							
על	upon, to	x	x	x	x	x	x	x											
עלה	go up	x																	
עלוה	burnt-offering				x											x			
עלם	remote time, eternity					x	x												
עם	people	x	x	x				x											
עם	with	x						x											
ענש	fine							x											x
ערוה	nakedness					x													
^m פחה	governor		x	x					x						x				
פלח	serve							x								x			
פלחן	service							x								x			
פקד	appoint	x																	
פרס	Persia	x											x						
פרש	divide, explain						x												
פתגם	word		x	x		x			x					x					
פתי	breadth	x																	
צלה	pray				x											x			
צלה	make progress		x																
קבל	before					x		x											
קדם	before						x	x											
קדמה	formerly			x															
קנה	buy							x											
קצף	anger							x											
קרא	read							x											

^lThis translation is at the suggestion of the writer's supervisor, Mr. A. R. Millard.

^mSee above, p. 199.

Aramaic & Hebrew Words	English Equivalents	1:2-4	6:2b-5	5:7-17	6:6-12	4:11-16	4:17-22	7:12-26	P. L.	A. L.	H. L.	P. N.	G. N.	E. T.	P. L. T.	R. T.	A. T.	E. T.	W. & M.
שמים	heaven	x																	
שמין	heaven			x	x			x											
שמרין	Samaria						x						x						
שמשי	Shimshai						x					x							
שנה	change				x														
שנה	year		x	x															
שפט	judge							x							x				
שרשו	corporal punishment							x	x						x				
ששבצר	Sheshbazzar			x								x							
שתין	sixty		x																
שתר בוזנאי	Shethar-bozenai				x							x							
שוב	return		x	x															
שור	bull				x			x									x		
שלת	three		x																
שמה	there			x	x														
שקיף	strong						x												
שוע	door-keeper							x									x		
שחני	Tattenai				x							x							

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Ackroyd, P. R. *Exile and Restoration*. London: SCM Press, 1968.
- Anderson, B. W. "Esther." Buttrick, G. A., et al., eds. *The Interpreters Bible*. Vol. III. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- Baer, S. *Libri Danielis Ezrae et Nehemiae*. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1882.
- Barr, J. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Batten, L. W. *The International Critical Commentary: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913. Reprint, 1972.
- Bauer, H., and Leander, P. *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1927.
- Benveniste, E. *Problems in General Linguistics*. Translated by Mary E. Meek. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press, 1971. (Miami Linguistics Series Number 8) *Problèmes de Linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.
- _____. *Titres et Noms propres en iranien Ancien*. Paris: University of Paris, 1966.
- Bewer, J. A. *Der Text des Buches Ezra*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1922.
- Bickerman, E. *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees*. New York: Schocken Books, 1962.
- Bowman, R. A. *Aramaic Ritual Texts from Persepolis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- _____. "Ezra and Nehemiah." Buttrick, G. A., et al., eds. *The Interpreters Bible*. Vol. III. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- Bresciani, E., and Kamil, M. *Le Lettere Aramaiche de Hermopoli*. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1966.
- Brown, F., et al., eds. *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

- Buhl, F., Bearb. *Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. 12 Auflage. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1895.
- Burn, A. R. *Persia and the Greeks*. London: E. Arnold, 1962.
- Cameron, G. G. *Persepolis Treasury Tablets*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Chiera, E. *They Wrote on Clay*. Edited by G. G. Cameron. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Cowley, A. E., ed. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* London: Oxford University Press, 1923. Reprint, Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1967.
- Cross, F. M., Jr., and Freedman, D. N. *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1952.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. 12 Volumes. Translated by C. H. Oldfather and others. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1933-1967. (The Loeb Classical Library)
- Dommershausen, W. *Die Estherrolle: Stil und Ziel einer alttestamentlichen Schrift*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968.
- Donner, H., and Röllig, W., eds. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. 3 Volumes. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966-9.
- Driver, G. R., ed. *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954. Abridged and revised, 1957, 1965.
- Driver, S. R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. 9th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913.
- Eilers, W. *Iranische Beamtennamen in der keilschriftlichen Überlieferung*. Teil I. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1940.
- Eissfeldt, O. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Translated by P. R. Ackroyd. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1965.
- Ellenbogen, M. *Foreign Words in the Old Testament*. London: Luzac & Co., 1962.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.
- Frye, R. N. *The Heritage of Persia*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962.
- Gadd, C. J., and Legrain, L. *Ur Excavation Texts, I, Royal Inscriptions*. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

- Ghirshman, R. *Iran*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1954.
- _____, et al., eds. *Persia: The Immortal Kingdom*. New York: New York Graphic Society, 1971.
- Gilmore, J., ed. *The Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias*. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1888.
- Ginsburg, C. D. *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897. Reprint, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1966.
- _____. *The Writings: Diligently Revised According to the Massorah and the Early Editions with the Various Readings from MSS and the Ancient Versions*. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1926.
- Gordon, C. H. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.
- Grayson, A. K. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles. Texts from Cuneiform Sources*, 5. Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1975.
- Guthe, H., and Batten, L. W. *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament: Ezra and Nehemiah*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901.
- Hallock, R. T. *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Hawley, C. A. *A Critical Examination of the Peshitta Version of the Book of Ezra*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1922.
- Herodotus. *The Histories*. 4 Volumes. Translated by A. D. Godley. Cambridge, Massachusetts: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1931-1963. (The Loeb Classical Library)
- Herzfeld, E. *Zoroaster and His World*. 2 Volumes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947. Reprint, New York: Octagon Books, 1974.
- Hooght, E. van der, ed. *Biblia Hebraica*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1868.
- How, W. W., and Wells, J. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. 2 Volumes. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.
- Huart, C. *Ancient Persia and Iranian Civilization*. Translated by M. R. Dobie. London: Kegan Paul, 1927. Reprinted, New York: Barnes & Noble, Publishers, 1972.
- Jastrow, M., ed. *A Dictionary of the Targumin, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 Volumes. New York: Pardes Publishing House, Inc., 1950.
- Jean, C. F., and Hoftijzer, J. *Dictionnaire des inscriptions semitiques*

- de l'ouest*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- Jellicoe, S. *The Septuagint and Modern Studies*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Jenkinson, H. *A Manual of Archive Administration*. 2nd ed. London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Co. Ltd., 1937.
- Kaufman, S. *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Kautzsch, E., ed. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 2nd ed. Translated by A. E. Cowley. London: Oxford University Press, 1910.
- Kennicott, B. *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum; cum Variis Lectionibus*. 2 Volumes. Oxonii: Clarendoniano, 1776.
- Kent, R. G. *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. 2nd ed. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1953.
- Kenyon, F. *The Bible and Archaeology*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1940.
- Kittel, R., ed. *Biblia Hebraica*. 13th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1962.
- Knudtzon, J. A., ed. *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*. 2 Volumes. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1915. Reprint, Aalen: Otto Zeller, 1964.
- Koehler, L., and Baumgartner, W., eds. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.
- Koopman, J. J., ed. *Aramäische Chrestomathie*. 2 Volumes. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije oosten, 1962.
- Kraeling, C. H., and Adams, R. M., eds. *City Invincible: A Symposium on Urbanization and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Kraeling, E. G., ed. *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Kramer, S. N. *History Begins at Sumer*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.
- Lidzbarski, M. *Ephemeres für semitische Epigraphik*. 3 Volumes. Giessen: A. Töpelmann. 1902-15.
- Meillet, A., and Benveniste, E. *Grammaire du Vieux Perse*. 2nd ed. Paris: H. Champion, 1931.
- Meyer, E. *Die Entstehung des Judentums*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1896. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965.

- Moore, C. A. *The Anchor Bible: Esther*. Vol. VIIB. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1971.
- Moore, G. F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. 3 Volumes. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927, 1930.
- Muller, S. Fz., et al., eds. *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*. 2nd ed. Translated by A. H. Leavitt. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1940. Reissued, 1968.
- Muraoka, T. *Emphasis in Biblical Hebrew*. Oxford: Thornton, 1969.
- Myers, J. M. *The Anchor Bible: Ezra · Nehemiah*. Vol. XIV. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1965.
- Nikam, N. A., and McKeon, R., eds. *The Edicts of Asoka*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Nyberg, H. S. *Hilfsbuch des Pehlevi*. 2 Volumes. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells boktryckeri, 1928-31.
- Olmstead, A. T. *A History of the Persian Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Oppenheim, A. L. *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- _____. *Letters from Mesopotamia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
- Porten, B. *Archives from Elephantine*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.
- _____, and Greenfield, J. C., eds. *Jews of Elephantine and Arameans of Syene*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1974. (Dept. of the History of the Jewish People: Texts and Studies for Students No. 41)
- Posener, G. *La Première Domination Perse en Égypte*. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1936.
- Posner, E. *Archives in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Pritchard, J. B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
- Rahlf's, A., ed. *Septuaginta*. 2 Volumes. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1935.

- Rosenthal, F. *Die aramäische Forschung: seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1939. Reprint, 1964.
- _____. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963.
- Rudolph, W. *Handbuch zum Alten Testament: Esra und Nehemia samt 3 Esra*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949.
- Sachau, E. *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischer Militärkolonie zu Elephantine*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich's, 1911.
- Salonen, E. *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1967.
- Sayce, A. H., and Cowley, A. E., eds. *Aramaic Papyri Discovered at Assuan*. London: A. Moring, Ltd., 1906.
- Schaeder, H. H. *Esra der Schreiber*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1930.
- _____. *Iranische Beiträge. I*. Halle: Niemeyer Verlag, 1930. Reprint, Hildesheim, 1972.
- Schaeffer, C. F. A. *Mission de Ras Shamra. Tome XV. Ugaritica IV*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1962.
- _____, ed. *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit III. Mission de Ras Shamra. Vol. VI*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale et Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1955.
- Scheftelowitz, I. *Arisches im Alten Testament. I-II*. Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1901/1903.
- Schmidt, E. F. *Persepolis*. 3 Volumes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953-1970.
- Slotki, J. J. *Soncino Books of the Bible: Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah*. London: The Soncino Press, 1951.
- Smith, S. *Isaiah Chapters XL-LV. (The Schweich Lectures, 1940)* London: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- Spiegelberg, W. *Die Sogenannte Demotische Chronik*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1914.
- Thompson, J. W. *Ancient Libraries*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1940.
- Thompson, R. C. *Late Babylonian Letters*. London: Luzac and Co., 1906. Reprint, New York: AMS Press Inc., 1976.
- Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. 4 Volumes. Translated by C. F. Smith. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1935. (The Loeb Classical Library)

- Torrey, C. C. *Ezra Studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910. Reprint, New York: KTAV Publishing House Inc., 1970.
- Ungnad, A. *Aramäische Papyrus aus Elephantine. Kleine Ausgabe unter Zugrundelegung von E. Sachau's Erstausgabe*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich's, 1911.
- Waterman, L. *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire*. 4 Volumes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1930-1936.
- Weinreich, U. *Languages in Contact*. New York: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953. Reprint, The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1968.
- Welles, C. B. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1934.
- Weilhausen, J. *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*. 7th ed. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1914.
- Whitehead, J. D. *Early Aramaic Epistolography: The Arsames Correspondence*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1974.
- Xenophon. *Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*. Translated by E. C. Marchant. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923. (The Loeb Classical Library)

Articles

- Albright, W. F. "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm LXVIII)." *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 23 pt. 1:1-39, 1950/1.
- _____. "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 40:104-24, 1921.
- _____. "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat." *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, edited by S. Lieberman. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950, pp. 61-82.
- Andrews, D. K. "The Translation of Aramaic *DĪ* in the Greek Bibles." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 66:15-51, 1947.
- Atkinson, K. M. T. "The Legitimacy of Cambyses and Darius as Kings of Egypt." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 76:167-77, 1956.
- Balkan, K. "Inscribed Bullae from Dascyleion-Ergili." *Anatolia*, 4:123-8, 1959.
- Barnett, R. D. "Anath, Ba'al and Pasargadae." *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph*, 45:407-22, 1969.

- Baumgartner, W. "Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 45:81-133, 1927. Reprinted in *Zum Alten Testament und Seiner Umwelt* by W. Baumgartner, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959, pp. 68-123.
- Benveniste, E. "Eléments Perses en Araméen d'Égypte." *Journal Asiatique*, 242:297-310, 1954.
- _____. "Old Iranian." *Current Trends in Linguistics: Vol. VI Linguistics in South West Asia and North Africa*, edited by T. A. Sebeok, The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1970, pp. 9-25.
- Ben Zvi, I. "Cyrus King of Persia and His Edict to the Exiles." *El Ha'ayin*, 39:33-9, 1964.
- Berger, P.-R. "Der Kyros-Zylinder mit dem Zusatzfragment BIN II Nr 32 und die Akkadischen Personennamen im Danielbuch." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 64:192-234, 1975.
- Bewer, J. A. Review of *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*, by L. W. Batten, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913, in *American Journal of Theology*, 19:108-16, 1915.
- Bickerman, E. J. "The Edict of Cyrus in Ezra 1." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 65:249-75, 1946.
- _____. "Notes on the Greek Book of Esther." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 20:101-53, 1951.
- _____. "An Oath of Hannibal." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Society*, 75:87-102, 1944.
- _____. "Testificatio Actorum: Eine Untersuchung über antike Niederschriften 'zu Protokoll'." *Aegyptus*, 13:333-55, 1933.
- Bivar, A. D. H. "A 'Satrap' of Cyrus the Younger." *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1961, pp. 119-27.
- Bowman, R. A. "אָבָן גַּלְאִלּוּ—*aban galālu* (Ezra 5:8, 6:4)." *Doron: Hebrew Studies*, edited by J. Naamani, et al., New York: National Association of Professors of Hebrew in American Institutions of Higher Learning, 1965.
- _____. "An Aramaic Journal Page." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, 58:302-13, 1941.
- _____. "Arameans, Aramaic and the Bible." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 7:65-90, 1948.
- Boyd, J. O. "The Composition of the Book of Ezra." *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 11:261-97, 1900.
- _____. "The Documents of the Book of Ezra." *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 11:414-37, 1900.

- . "The Historicity of Ezra." *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 11:568-607, 1900.
- Brin, G. "The Title מלך (ה) בן and its Parallels." *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, 19:433-65, 1969.
- Brown, C. R. "Note on פָּעַן." *Hebraica*, 1:251, 1885.
- Burchardt, M. "Datierte Denkmäler der Berliner Sammlung aus der Achämenidenzeit." *Zeitschrift für die ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde*, 49:69-80, 1911.
- Caird, G. B. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. I." *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS 19:453-75, 1968.
- Cameron, G. G. "Darius and Xerxes in Babylonia." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, 58:314-25, 1941.
- . "Darius' Daughter and the Persepolis Inscriptions." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 1:214-8, 1942.
- . "Persepolis Treasury Tablets Old and New." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 17:161-76, 1958.
- . "The Persian Satrapies and Related Matters." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 32:47-56, 1973.
- Cook, S. A. "The Significance of the Elephantine Papyri for the History of Hebrew Religion." *American Journal of Theology*, 19:346-82, 1915.
- Cook, S. H. "I Esdras." *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, edited by R. H. Charles, 2 Volumes, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913. Reprint, 1963, Vol. I, pp. 1-58.
- Cousin, G, and Deschamps, G. "Lettre de Darius, Fils d'Hystaspes." *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 13:529-42, 1889; 14:646-8, 1890.
- Coxon, P. W. "Daniel III. 7: A Linguistic and Theological Problem." *Vetus Testamentum*, 26:400-9, 1976.
- . "Greek Loan-Words and Alleged Greek Loan Translations in the Book of Daniel." *Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions*, 25:24-40, 1973/4.
- Cross, F. M., Jr. "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 94:4-18, 1975.
- Crown, A. D. "Messengers and Scribes: The פָּעַן and מַלְאָךְ in the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum*, 24:366-70, 1974.
- . "Tidings and Instructions: How News Travelled in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the*

Orient, 17:244-71, 1974.

- Curtis, E. L. "The Return of the Jews under Cyrus." *Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects Presented to Charles Augustus Briggs on the Completion of His Seventieth Year*, New York: Scribners, 1911, pp. 33-40.
- Davis, J. D. "Persian Words and the Date of Old Testament Documents." *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, edited by R. F. Harper, et al., 2 Volumes, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908, Vol. I, pp. 271-84.
- Degen, R. Review of *Aramaic Ritual Texts from Persepolis*, by R. A. Bowman, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 31:124-7, 1974.
- Diakonoff, I. M. "The Origin of the 'Old Persian' Writing System and the Ancient Oriental Epigraphic and Annalistic Tradition." *W. B. Henning Memorial Volume*, edited by M. Boyce, and I. Gershevitch, London: Lund Humphries Publishers Ltd., 1970, pp. 98-124.
- Dougherty, R. P. "Writing Upon Parchment and Papyrus among the Babylonians and Assyrians." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 48:109-35, 1928.
- Drews, R. "The Babylonian Chronicles and Berossus." *Iraq*, 37:39-55, 1975.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. "Une Inscription araméenne inédite d'Epoque Perse trouvée a Daskyleion (Turquie)." *Comptes Rendus: Académie des Inscriptions and Belles Lettres*, (1966) 44-58.
- _____. "La Stéle Trilingue Récemment Decouverte au Létoon de Xanthos: Le Texte Araméen." *Comptes Rendus: Académie des Inscriptions and Belles Lettres*, (1974) 132-49.
- Eilers, W. "Die altiranische Vorform des Vāspuhr." *A Locust's Leg. Studies in Honour of S. H. Taqizadeh*, edited by W. B. Henning, and S. Yarshater, London: Lund, Humphries & Co. Ltd., 1962, pp. 55-63.
- _____. "Neue aramäische Urkunden aus Ägypten." *Archiv für Orientalforschung*, 17:322-35, 1954/6.
- _____. Review of *Babylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungs Urkunden aus der Zeit Alexanders und der Diadochen*, by Krückmann, Weimer, 1931, in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 37:89-100, 1934.
- Fish, T. "Letters from the War Front in Ancient Mesopotamia." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 26:287-306, 1942.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "The Padua Aramaic Papyrus Letters." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 21:15-24, 1962.

- _____. "Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 93:201-25, 1974.
- Friedrich, J. "Zur Bezeichnung des langen ā in den Schreibweisen des Aramäischen." *Orientalia*, 26:37-42, 1957.
- Frye, R. N. Review of *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.*, by G. R. Driver, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954, in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 18:456-61, 1955.
- Galling, K. "Die Proklamation des Kyros in Ezra 1." *Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964, pp. 61-77.
- Gelston, A. "The Foundations of the Second Temple." *Vetus Testamentum*, 16:232-5, 1966.
- Gershevitch, I. "Amber at Persepolis." *Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro Oblata*, 2:167-251, 1969.
- _____. "Iranian Nouns and Names in Elamite Garb." *Transactions of the Philological Society*, (1969) 165-200.
- _____. "Island-Bay and the Lion." *Bulletin of the Schools of Oriental and African Studies*, 33:82-91, 1970.
- _____. "Zoroaster's Own Contribution." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 23:12-38, 1964.
- Gray, G. B. "The Title 'King of Persia'." *The Expository Times*, 25:245-51, 1914.
- Gray, L. H. "Iranian Miscellanies: a) On the Aramaic Version of the Behistun Inscription." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 33:281-4, 1913.
- Greenfield, J. C. "Lexicographical Notes I." *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 29:203-28, 1958.
- _____. "Studies in Aramaic Lexicography, I." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 82:290-9, 1962.
- Gregg, J. A. F. "The Additions to Esther." *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, edited by R. H. Charles, 2 Volumes, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913. Reprint, 1963, Vol. I, pp. 665-84.
- Grosheide, H. H. "Twee Edicten van Cyrus ten Gunste van de Joden." *Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 54:1-12, 1954.
- Gunn, B. "The Inscribed Sarcophagi in the Serapeum." *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*, 25:82-91, 1926.
- Hahn, E. A. "An Alleged Anacoluthon in Old Persian." *Journal of the*

American Oriental Society, 85:48-58, 1965.

- Hallock, R. T. "The Evidence of the Persepolis Tablets." Prepublished chapter from *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. II, edited by I. Gershevitch, Cambridge: The Middle East Centre of the University of Cambridge, 1971.
- _____. "The Persepolis Fortification Archive." *Orientalia*, 42:320-3, 1973.
- Harmatta, J. "The Literary Patterns of the Babylonian Edict of Cyrus." *Acta Antiqua*, 19:217-31, 1971.
- _____. "An Old Persian Loanword in Elamite." *Acta Orientalia*, 5:195-203, 1955.
- Heltzer, M. "Some North-West Semitic Epigraphic Gleanings from the XI-VI Centuries B.C." *Annali dell 'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, 21:183-98, 1971.
- Henning, W. "Arabisch *ḥarāğ*." *Orientalia*, 4:291-3, 1935.
- _____. "The Inscription of Firuzabad." *Asia Major*, NS 4:98-102, 1954.
- Henshaw, R. A. "The office of *Šaknu* in Neo-Assyrian Times." I. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 87:517-25, 1967; II. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 88:461-83, 1968.
- Hervey, A. C. "The Chronology of Ezra IV. 6-23." *The Expositor*, 4th Series 8:50-63, 1893.
- Hinz, W. "Die elamischen Buchungstäfelchen der Darius-Zeit." *Orientalia*, 39:421-40.
- Japhet, S. "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew." *Vetus Testamentum*, 18:330-71, 1968.
- Jennings, J. E. "Administrative Organization in the Mari Palace: An Archaeological Study." 1974. (Unpublished paper)
- Junge, P. J. "Hazurapatis: zur Stellung des Chiliarehen der kgl. Leibgarde im Achämenidenstaat." *Klio*, 33:13-38, 1940.
- Kaddari, M. Z. "Construct State and *Dī*-Phrases in Imperial Aramaic." *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies*, (1969) 102-15.
- Kellerman, D. "גג." *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. J. Botterweck, and H. Ringgren, Vol. 2. Translated by J. T. Willis. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975, pp. 439-49.
- Kitchen, K. A. "The Aramaic of Daniel." *Notes on Some Problems in the*

- Book of Daniel*, edited by D. J. Wiseman, et al., London: The Tyndale Press, 1965.
- Kosambi, D. D. "Notes on the Kandahar Edict of Asoka." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 2:204-6, 1959.
- Kutscher, E. Y. "Aramaic." *Linguistics in South West Asia and North Africa*, Vol. VI of *Current Trends in Linguistics*, edited by T. A. Sebeok, The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1970, pp. 347-412.
- _____. "The Hermopolis Papyri." *Israel Oriental Society*, 1:103-19, 1971.
- _____. "New Aramaic Texts." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 74:233-48, 1954.
- _____. "Two 'Passive' Constructions in Aramaic in the Light of Persian." *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies*, (1969) 132-51.
- Laroche, E. "La Stéle Trilingue Récemment Decouverte au Létoon de Xanthos: La Texte Lycien." *Comptes Rendus: Académie des Inscriptions and Belles Lettres*, (1974) 115-25.
- Levine, B. A. "Aramaic Texts from Persepolis." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 92:70-9, 1972.
- Lewy, J. "The Late Assyro-Babylonian Cult of the Moon and its Culmination at the Time of Nabonidus." *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 19:405-89, 1946.
- _____. "The Problems Inherent in Section 70 of the Bisutun Inscription." *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 25:169-208, 1954.
- Mallowan, M. E. L. "Cyrus the Great (558-529 B.C.)." *Iron*, 10:1-17, 1972.
- Martin, R. A. "Syntax Criticism of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 94:65-72, 1975.
- Mayer, R. "Das achämenidische Weltreich und seine Bedeutung in der politischen und religiösen Geschichte des antiken Orients." *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 12:1-16, 1968.
- Meissner, B. "Die Achämenidenkönige und das Judentum." *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft: Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 49:6-26, 1938.
- Messina, G. "L'antico Arameo." *Miscellanea Biblica*, 2:69-103, 1934.
- Metzger, H. "La Stéle Trilingue Récemment Decouverte au Létoon de Xanthos: La Texte Grec." *Comptes Rendus: Académie des Inscriptions and Belles Lettres*, (1974) 82-93.

- Meyer, E. "Zu den aramäischen Papyri von Elephantine." *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft: Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 22:1026-53, 1911.
- Millard, A. R. "A Decree of a Persian Governor." *Buried History*, 11: 84-91, 1975.
- _____. "Some Aramaic Epigraphs." *Iraq*, 34:131-8, 1972.
- Moore, C. A. "On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 92:382-93, 1973.
- Muraoka, T. "Notes on the Syntax of Biblical Aramaic." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 11:151-67, 1966.
- Naveh, J. "The Aramaic Inscriptions on Boundary Stones in Armenia." *Die Welt des Orients*, 6:42-6, 1971.
- _____, and Shaked, S. "A Recently Published Aramaic Papyrus." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 91:379-82, 1971.
- _____, and Shaked, S. "Ritual Texts or Treasury Documents?" *Orientalia*, 42:445-57, 1973.
- Neuffer, J. "The Accession of Artaxerxes I." *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 6:60-87, 1968.
- Nober, P. "אֲרָמָאִי (Esdras VII. 23)." *Biblische Zeitschrift*, NF 1:134-8, 1957.
- Nöldeke, T. "Zur Frage der Geschichtlichkeit der Urkunden im Esra-Buch." *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 26:1849-56, 1924.
- _____. Review of *Prologomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament*, by F. Delitzsch, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1886, in *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 40:718-43, 1886.
- North, R. "Civil Authority in Ezra." *Studi in onore di Edoardo Voltera*, Vol. VI, edited by A. Giuffrè. Milan: University di Roma, 1971, pp. 377-404.
- Nylander, C. "Who Wrote the Inscriptions at Pasargadae?" *Orientalia Seucana*, 16:135-80, 1967.
- Olmstead, A. T. "Darius as Lawgiver." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, 51:247-9, 1935.
- _____. "A Persian Letter in Thucydides." *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, 49:154-61, 1933.
- Oppenheim, A. L. "The Eyes of the Lord." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 88:173-80, 1968.

- Rainey, A. F. "The Satrapy 'Beyond the River'." *The Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology*, 1:51-78, 1969.
- Reich, N. J. "The Codification of the Egyptian Laws by Darius and the Origin of the 'Demotic Chronicle'." *Mizraim*, 1:178-85, 1933.
- Rinaldi, G. "Note." *Bibbia et Oriente*, 3:85, 1961.
- Rowley, H. H. "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah." *Memorial Volume Ignace Goldziher*, edited by S. Löwinger, and J. Somogyi, Vol. I, Budapest, 1948, pp. 117-49. Reprinted in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*, by H. H. Rowley, 2nd ed., Oxford: B. Blackwell & Molt Ltd, 1965, pp. 137-68.
- Rundgren, F. "Über einen juristischen Terminus bei Esra 6:6." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 70:209-15, 1958.
- _____. "Zur Bedeutung von šršw, Esra vii. 26." *Vetus Testamentum*, 7:400-04, 1957.
- Sasson, J. M. "Some Comments on Archive Keeping at Mari." *Iraq*, 34:55-67, 1972.
- Schaeder, H. H. "Iranica: I. Das Auge des Königs." *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 3 Folge 10:3-24, 1934.
- _____. "Das persische Weltreich." *Vorträgen der Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität*, (1940/41) pp. 5-39.
- Schalit, A. "The Letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis Regarding the Establishment of Jewish Military Colonies in Phrygia and Lydia." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 50:289-318, 1960.
- _____. "Κοίλη Συρία from the Mid-Fourth Century to the Beginning of the Third Century B.C." *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 1:64-77, 1954.
- Schneider, N. "Die Urkundenbehälter von Ur III und ihre archivalische Systematik." *Orientalia*, 9:1-16, 1940.
- Scott, W. M. F. "Nehemiah-Ezra?" *The Expository Times*, 58:263-7, 1946/7.
- Segert, S. "Aramäische Studien, I." *Archiv Orientalni*, 24:383-403, 1956.
- Smith, S. "Foundations: Ezra iv, 12; v, 16; vi, 3." *Essays in Honour of the Very Rev. Dr. J. H. Hertz*, edited by I. Epstein, et al., London: Edward Goldston, 1944, pp. 385-96.
- _____. "Timber and Brick or Masonry Construction." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 67:5-17, 1941.
- von Soden, W. "Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und spät-

- babylonische Texten." *Orientalia*, 35:1-20, 1966, and 37:261-71, 1968.
- Spiegelberg, W. "Die demotischen Papyri Loeb der Universität München." *Festschrift für James Loeb*, München: Bruckman, 1930, pp. 95-102.
- . "Drei demotische Schreiben aus der Korrespondenz des Pherendates, des Satrapen Darius' I, mit den Chnum-Priestern von Elephantine." *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft: Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 39:604-22, 1928.
- Sprengling, M. "The Aramaic Papyri of Elephantine in English." *American Journal of Theology*, 21:411-52, 1917; 22:349-75, 1918.
- Szemerényi, O. "Iranica II." *Die Sprache*, 12:190-226, 1966.
- Thomson, H. C. "A Row of Cedar Beams." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 92:57-63, 1960.
- Tisdall, W. St. Clair. "The Aryan Words in the Old Testament." I, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, NS 1:335-9, 1910/11; II & III, *JQR*, NS 2: 213-9, 365-71, 1911/12; IV, *JQR*, NS 4:97-105, 1913.
- . "The Book of Daniel: Some Linguistic Evidence Regarding its Date." *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, 53:206-55, 1921.
- Torrey, C. C. "The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah." *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 2:1-65, 1896.
- . "Old Testament Notes: 1. The meaning of נְכֻנָּה , 2. The Missing Conclusion of Ezra 1." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 16: 166-70, 1897.
- Tsevat, M. "A Chapter on Old West Semitic Orthography." *The Joshua Bloch Memorial Volume*, edited by A. Berger, et al., New York: The New York Public Library, 1960, pp. 82-91.
- Tuland, C. G. "Ezra-Nehemiah or Nehemiah-Ezra?" *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 12:47-62, 1974.
- deVaux, R. "Les Decrets de Cyrus et de Darius sur la Reconstruction du Temple." *Revue Biblique*, 46:29-57, 1937. Reprinted in *Bible et Orient*, Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1967; and in English, "The Decrees of Cyrus and Darius on the Rebuilding of the Temple," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, translated by D. McHugh, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1972, pp. 63-96.
- Vogelstein, M. "Bakshish for Bagoas?" *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 33:89-92, 1942/3.
- Weidner, E. "Amts- und Privatarchive aus mittelassyrischer Zeit." *Vorderasiatische Studien Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Viktor Chris-*

tian, gewidmet von Kollegen und Schülern zum 70 Geburtstag,
 edited by K. Schubert, *et al.*, Wien: Verlag Notring der Wissen-
 schaftlichen Verbände Österreichs, 1956, pp. 111-8.

Weitemeyer, M. "Archive and Library Technique in Ancient Mesopotamia."
Libri, 6:217-38, 1956.

Wellhausen, J. "Die Rückkehr der Juden aus dem babylonischen Exil."
Nachrichten von der königliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu
Göttingen: Phil.-Hist. Klasse, (1895) pp. 166-86.

Wenham, J. "Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary." *Tyndale Bulletin*,
 22:103-18, 1971.

von Wesendonk, O. G. "The Title 'King of Kings'." *Oriental Studies in*
Honor of C. E. Pavry, London: Oxford University Press, 1933,
 pp. 488-90.

_____. "Über die Verwendung des aramäischen im Achämenidenreich."
Litterae Orientales, 49:1-10, 1932.

Widengren, G. "The Persians." *Peoples of Old Testament Times*, edited
 by D. J. Wiseman, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973, pp. 312-57.

Wilson, R. D. "The Title 'King of Persia' in the Scriptures." *Prince-*
ton Theological Review, 15:90-145, 1917.

_____. "Titles of the Persian Kings." *Festschrift Eduard Sachau zum*
siebzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern,
 edited by G. Weil, Berlin: Reimer, 1915, pp. 179-207.

Yamauchi, E. M. "The Greek Words in Daniel in the Light of Greek Influ-
 ence in the Near East." *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*,
 edited by J. B. Payne, Waco, Texas: Word Book Publishers, 1970,
 pp. 170-200.

Yaron, R. "Notes on Aramaic Papyri, II." *Journal of Near Eastern Stud-*
ies, 20:127-30, 1961.

Zerkabod, M. "Die persischen Koenigserlasse zugunsten der Zionsrueck-
 wanderer." *El Ha'ayin*, 37:1-21, 1962.