



**General Topics :: Ester is a questionable book!!! maynotBauthentic**

**Ester is a questionable book!!! maynotBauthentic - posted by DoulosQuinn, on: 2008/9/3 1:14**

I have read many researchers, pretty exclusively Jewish historians who have challenged the authenticity of Ester, more draw great focus on the fact Mordecai's name is of Babylonian origin...but the story takes place in Assyria. but lots of contrary evidence that challenges its authority.

One thing that motivated this thread is the fact that Jews love this story, where GOD is in the "way background" making good things happen for Jews...but showing immediate retribution to their enemies...but HE is not even mentioned. What got me is that these Jewish Scholars...I mean trapped in the law Jew-centered Jew...would challenge its genuineness. It made me think that there is a question about it.

Then I started to think about the "evenly yoked" doctrine...a woman is suppose to win her husband through a quiet and submissive spirit and HE never changes.

Then I look around and see 40% of Christian women hook up with unbelievers hope to as the "queen" to change some unbeliever. I asked my wife what she thought (she is an arab that left Islam while living the desert of Saharah) she thinks it sounds great...but I wasn't satisfied.

WHAT SAY YOU?????????

**Re: Ester is a questionable book!!! maynotBauthentic - posted by boG (), on: 2008/9/3 2:50**

Quote:

-----Then I look around and see 40% of Christian women hook up with unbelievers hope to as the "queen" to change some unbeliever.  
-----

There is a HUGE difference between marrying an unbeliever and being forcefully taken to marry a King of a nation. That is really not what you would call a consensual agreement.

And the entire concept of "missionary dating" is utterly detestable and ungodly. It is lust of the flesh under the banner of evangelism.

Quote:

-----Then I started to think about the "evenly yoked" doctrine...a woman is suppose to win her husband through a quiet and submissive spirit and HE never changes.  
-----

The fact that "he never changes" is besides the point. It doesn't change that the woman must still obey the law of the Spirit of Christ.

Beyond that, I can't say anything concerning the historical authenticity of the book itself but I have never noticed anything Scripturally wrong with it.

**Re:, on: 2008/9/3 7:35**

I dont know that I can answer the authenticity of the book itself because I havent read what you have read. It seems that every time a part of the Bible is challenged... God finds a way to make the challengers look foolish and stupid.

I believe God preserved His Holy Word, and He would not allow a bogus book to be a part of it for over 3,000 years. It's as simple as that. **GOD** preserved the Book, not man.

And yes, there is a measure of faith involved in believing that His Word is holy and **preserved**.

Krispy

**Re: Ester is a questionable book!!! maynotBauthentic - posted by rowdy2 (), on: 2008/9/3 8:51**

Mor'decai

The Bible could not be any clearer

Mordecai The son of Jair, of the tribe of Benjamin.

Ester 2-

5. Now in Shushan the palace there was a certain Jew, whose name was Mordecai, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, a Benjamite;

6. Who had been carried away from Jerusalem with the captivity which had been carried away with Jeconiah king of Judah, whom Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon had carried away.

(Esther 2:5-6)

Where is the mystery? Read the Bible if you believe that it is the inspired word of God and your faith will be rewarded.

Eddie

**Re:, on: 2008/9/3 10:06**

Agree w/ rowdy

Krispy

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/9/4 10:45**

There is a whole lot more to be gleaned from Esther than what a casual reading of the book will convey.

Who was Haman? Check it out. Shall I tell you or do you want to do your own research? Maybe I will tell you and then you can go see if I am right.

Haman was a Agagite (Esther 3: 1). This means he was of the lineage of Agag. And who was Agag? He was the king of the Amalekites that King Saul was commanded to destroy but didn't (Samuel later chopped him to pieces). In any case it appears some of his family escaped and was later carried away to Babylon. Could it be possible that this family had nursed a hatred for Jews in all these years and now found a way to exterminate them for what was done to their nation many years ago? And if King Saul had been faithful in obeying the LORD it may not have come to this. And to add insult to injury, God used a young woman to bring about a release! (Don't tell me God does not have a sense of humor!)

Now, can't you tell I love this book?!!

Anyhow, there is more to this book than a casual reading will give. Study it from God's perspective and see what lessons you will learn.

Blessings,  
ginnyrose

**Re: Ester or Ishtar - posted by DoulosQuinn, on: 2008/9/4 23:28**

Yes I believe that GODs WORD is Inspired, and unchangable...look at how many Apocryphal books didn't make the cut..this is very assuring that men who feared GOD could discern what to keep and what to lose.

My only reservation is that at one time the Apostals themselves gave The HOLY Spirit a choice between two men to replace Judas, and they were following the WORD by faith, but Paul was GODs choice that they never would have known.

SO considering that the DEAD SEA SCROLLS DO NOT CONTAIN THIS book, seems to be adding weight to this claim, of "impostor Scripture"

**Re: - posted by DoulosQuinn, on: 2008/9/4 23:45**

Jair, and Shimeiare jewish names yes Mordecai is a Babylonian name...so if he was carried to Babylon as a captive, why is he in Assyria? It is a GLARING ERROR.

The DEAD SEA scrolls do not contain a copy of Ester AT ALL, but they do have a copy of Isaiah that PROVES that Isaia h wrote about Christ before HIS comming!!! Awesome.

I really think Ester is bogus. Though I've always liked it, I am trying to put my prejudice aside to facts, and I need more people who can critically examine this with me...not just a another bunch of sinners turned pastor chronee who like Morm ans "blindly defend" a faith which can not be supported.

my GOD says in Isaiah 41:20 to consider things to see that HE made them. I have no fear HIS truth is what is real.

Do you remember when timing of the captivity of Israel into Assyria? or the Babylonian captivity, did they transport slaves between each other?, were jews considered slaves or guests? Could a rich Jewish family move extended family to another kingdom? Does Jesus ever refer to Ester? Or any New test script?

Like I said before seeing the apostles error by choosing the wrong replacement for Judas by assuming the HOLY Spirit had to choose between two men, on a day of their choosing. For GODs predestined ruler of one of the tribes of Israel, who is the one of the Twelve of Jesus...not thirteen. Either Paul is GODs choice or hes not an apostle, I think he is, and its proof that godly men, who believe the WORD by faith...even at the right application can make incorrect assumptions, and GOD won't throw up a flag.

**Re: - posted by DoulosQuinn, on: 2008/9/4 23:49**

Eddie, THAT IS the point Mordecai is in Assyria, not Babylon. Its so clear I think you missed it.

**Re:, on: 2008/9/5 7:54**

Quote:

-----I really think Ester is bogus.

-----

Well, I dont agree. Sorry.

And using the apostles alleged "error" as an example of how a bogus book could have made it into the Cannon is to rely too much on human effort to preserve His Word when He promised as far back in Psalms that **HE** would preserve His Word.

If we question Esther... then next week we'll question Genesis... and then Mark... and then... etc etc. Eventually we'll doubt the entire Bible.

No, God preserved His Word. The Book of Esther is not bogus. To say there is an error in the Word of God is to say that God doesnt keep His promises. If He doesnt keep His promises then we have nothing.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2008/9/5 10:58**

By the way, I am not at all pleased that you came on here and possibly planted a seed of doubt in some people's heads about God's Word. You need to be very very careful about things like that.

Krispy

**Re: Ester is a questionable book!!! maynotBauthentic - posted by JRuth (), on: 2008/9/5 20:02**

The Bible is Gods Holy Word!!! How DARE you say that Ester is Bogus!!! I agree with Krispy, you should NOT have even mentioned this! Do you know how many young Christians read what people put on here? And what about the unsaved people who get on here to check things out? We, as Christians MUST be VERY,VERY careful what we post on here, you NEVER know who it might damage spiritually!!

~JRuth

**Re: Ester is a questionable book!!! maynotBauthentic - posted by rowdy2 (), on: 2008/9/5 20:04**

Reply to All

I don't recommend teachers very often but in the case of Ester I have grown to appreciate the book immensely after listening to.

EXPOSITORY STUDIES IN ESTHER  
by Ray C. Stedman

Available on SI

I found it to be as the author advertized, a great study of the working of The Holy Spirit.

Eddie

**Re: - posted by DoulosQuinn, on: 2009/1/31 16:59**

I was really shaken up about the Essians who preserved Isaiah word for word not bothering to include this book...it still concerns me for the first reasons I posted.

**Re: - posted by White\_Stone (), on: 2009/1/31 19:17**

Quote:  
----- . . . God preserved His Word. The Book of Esther is not bogus. To say there is an error in the Word of God is to say that God doesn't keep His promises. If He doesn't keep His promises then we have nothing.  
-----

Brother Krispy,

You are so correct. I believe the entire Bible is the inspired word of God. I, also, believe His hand guided those who assembled His words and passed them along to us. Thank God for the Bible, where would we be without it?

Kind regards,  
white stone

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/1/31 19:57**

I think there is wisdom on both sides of what people have been writing so far. I do not feel like breaking it all down technically. I will say though that I think it is good to test things. I believe that we are not called to blind faith but trust based on facts. I also sympathize with not having unbelief or hastily stating things.

I cannot thoroughly answer all of your questions on this book. I have heard things before. I have studied a somewhat good deal of Bibliology but not specifically Esther. I also was not able to immediately find any good thorough websites on the book in an apologetic or criticizing sense. If you know of any let me know so that I can look into it?

In short and part I can say of note that Purim the feast of lots is a strong Jewish tradition derived from Esther. I believe it was in effect during Jesus' time and there was no strong rebuke toward it that I have read. So if the tradition was in effect then the book was also probably canonical at that point and Jesus made no mention as to it not being scripture.

In the negative I don't believe that arguments such as God's name not being mentioned and so forth are valid but are a bit soft and incomplete. There is still much truth and harmonizing with the rest Scripture. I for one am persuaded that the Song of Songs is an inspired prophetic account foreshadowing Christ and his bride. I guess maybe I would say "if you can accept it". This is not mentioning the more technical issues.

I would say this that in the harder issues if we are not sure then I would think it not wise to say this and that is false. In many things we have to have an ear to hear. For instance many prophecies had double fulfillment's or John the Baptist was Elijah. A rational thinker may be thrown off by these things and never seen them. Would you hypothetically as an orthodox Jew think it false that God took on the form of a dove or that he was born of a woman.

I can say many other things like some that have been mentioned before. Like the comment that many have tested Scripture when all evidence seemed right and then out of no where proof was found over and over to expose it and back the scriptures. And I can say thing on the other hand that it is somewhat plausible to test things as you mentioned such as the Apocrypha and the legitimacy of those who canonized things. But, I will stop here.

Concluding, the study of Bibliology is a long arduous task but important but often the witness of the Spirit is most important and sometimes all one has like in the 3rd world or ect.

So, I would say if you are interested in this to get books on the Canon of the Bible by such men as F.F. Bruce or others.

It does not seem that there are many here on the SI forum that are students of higher criticism so I would maybe refer you to go to the carm.org forums for there seem to be many there that are well versed in these things. If you do let me know because I would like to see how the thread develops.

I don't really know all of the best resources as I also am interested in time to study Bibliology more thoroughly. I will mention one book that may deal with the topic. It is called "The Big Book of Bible Difficulties from Genesis to Revelation by Norman Geisler". He was one of Joe Holden's mentors and from what I recently read has started a seminary with him at CCBC but separately as Veritas Seminary and interesting will be having a conference soon on the inspiration of the Bible that I might attend if I am in town.

(<http://www.ask.com/bar?qnorman+giesler+books&page1&qsrc145&ab1&uhttp%3A%2F%2Fwww.amazon.com%2Fs%3Fie%3DUTF8%26search-type%3Dss%26index%3Dbooks%26field-author%3DNorman%2520L.%2520Geisler%26page%3D1>) Geisler Book

(<http://veritasseminary.com/edu/>) Conference and Seminary

(<http://www.ask.com/bar?qcarm&page1&qsrc145&ab2&uhttp%3A%2F%2Fwww.christiandiscussionforums.org%2F>) Carm Forum

**Re: Ester is a questionable book!!! maynotBauthentic - posted by graceamazed (), on: 2009/1/31 20:20**

Quote:  
-----What got me is that these Jewish Scholars...I mean trapped in the law Jew-centered Jew...would challenge its genuineness. It made me think that there is a question about it.  
-----

Perhaps you should also question the validity of Jesus as the Messiah, seeing as how the "trapped in the law Jew-centered Jews" of His day questioned and rejected Him as being the authentic Messiah.

Please continue to search out this issue for your own assurance, but I do not believe this is the proper forum for in-depth textual criticism discussions on this matter, seeing as how (as far as I know) no one in here is truly schooled in this field. Reality is, all we can do is quote those who have studied the matter and I'm sure that we'll find that not all of the "experts" will concur on their findings. So, in the end, you'll have to put your faith in one of them as being the authority on the issue, yet it will be just that, "faith" in that person's findings.

By the way, I praise God for "sinners turned preacher chronees", simple fishermen-type who aren't educated and who haven't received approval by the powers that be, but in whom it is evident "they have been with Jesus."

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/1/31 20:38**

Quote:  
-----WHAT SAY YOU?????????  
-----

Having spent a great deal of time studying in a Messianic Jewish Institute I can say that this topic did come up at least once. The fact that it was not found among the Dead Sea Scrolls tells us a lot and very little at the same time. The Essenes were not really main stream. They were a sect. I could offer several reasons why I think it was not there, but they are all speculation.

Many scribes copied by hand the book of Esther as they included it in their writings. Also keep in mind that there are various philosophies within Rabbinic Judaism today. It may surprise you that many so-called Rabbinic Jews are actually atheists? Art Katz has brought this out before. So definitely don't believe everything you read from Jewish Scholars.

I agree with Krispy here. We have to be very careful that we don't minister questions about the word of God. It has been said in history that the bible is an anvil that has worn out many of its hammers. Some scholars love to hash out subjects based upon some new or novel information they come across. Their beliefs change like the wind. It is best to recognize that God has preserved His word down through the years. It would be foolish to begin cutting anything out- even the smallest jot.

**Re: Ester is a questionable book!!! maynotBauthentic - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2009/1/31 23:00**

Quote:  
-----  
DoulosQuinn wrote:  
Mordecai's name is of Babylonian origin...but the story takes place in Assyria.  
-----

Takes place in Assyria?

Biblical history is not one of my strengths, but...

"...That in those days, when the king Ahasuerus sat on the throne of his kingdom, which was in Shushan the palace, in the third year of his reign he made a feast unto all his princes and his servants, the power of Persia and Media..." (Est. 1. 2).

Persia and Media, it says.

And Shushan the palace. Where was Shushan?

"In the third year of the reign of Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel... And I saw the vision; and it came to pass, when I was at Shusan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam..." (Dan. 8.1,2).

Belshazzar, one of the kings of Babylon.

And Elam, one of the provinces of the kingdom of Babylon.

Daniel was one of the captives Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon carried exile from Jerusalem to Babylon (Dan. 1.6). But in process of time, God raised up the Medes and the Persians to judge Babylon. They took the kingdom (in one night), and ruled in their stead (Dan. 5.30,31).

So it's actually very likely Mordecai would have had a Babylonian name. So did Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, the three Hebrews Nebuchadnezzar threw into the fiery furnace.

...But even apart from this, yes, granted, the Name of God is not given in the book of Esther. At least, the letter of His Name is not written.

But that Name is whispered again and again and again in the story, in the Spirit of that Name... if we have a listening ear, if we get our ear down low enough to hear Him.

...I notice from some of your other posts, Quinn, that you have a heart for God. I understand your concern about the book of Esther, it's not wrong to question things at times. We want to be sure about things. But watch out for those seeds of doubt, lest your faith be subverted. That hunger for God that's been planted in you, give it room to grow. And weed out the seeds of doubt. That's what doubts are. Weeds.

I always go by the following rule. When the word of God seems to be flawed, it's just a revelation that I am still in the place where I know "in part." It's not the word that is flawed. It's my understanding that's flawed.

That book, I will tell you... over the years, oh, what a book. Oh, what a book. And yet at times, what a weak and foolish book it is, or appears to be, at times, to the natural mind. But why should it not be so? "...Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men..."

(See also 1 Cor. 2.14.)

AD

**Re: , on: 2009/2/1 2:47**

To DoulosQuinn:

I also agree with what Krispy, RobertW, & ADisciple Graceamazed, White\_Stone, anonymity, JRuth, ginnyrose had to say on this. The Medes and the Persians defeated the Babylonians and set up the 2nd one world Government (with the direction and help of almighty God). The Medes and the Persians had an interesting way of sharing power in running the World. One year the King of the Medes ruled the World, and the next year, the King of the Persians ruled it.

Here is some information that might shed some light on this for you:

**Esther (Hebrew: [#1488](#);[#1462](#);[#1505](#);[#1456](#);[#1514](#);[#1461](#);[#1468](#);[#1512](#);; Standard Ester Tiberian --Est**

Esther (Esther), born Hadassah, is a queen of the Persian Empire in the Hebrew Bible, the queen of Ahasuerus (traditionally identified with Artaxerxes II), and heroine of the Biblical Book of Esther which is named after her. The name Esther comes from the Persian word "star".

As a result of Esther's intervention and influence, Mizrahi Jews lived in the Persian Empire for 2400 years thereafter. Esther's husband Ahasuerus followed in the footsteps of Cyrus the Great, in showing mercy to the Jews of Persia: Cyrus had decreed an end to the Babylonian captivity of the Jews upon his conquest of Babylon in 539 BC

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Esther>

Also of interest is that Persia of the Old Testament is Iran of today (same country with a different name).

Sincerely,

Walter

**Re: - posted by DoulosQuinn, on: 2009/2/1 3:12**

ADisciple, White\_Stone, Krispy:

I love The WORD, I believe it is HOLY and TRUE and GOD has spoken to me through it. I do not pursue seeds of doubt ...yet there was a day years ago after I was born again I started to take men's word about things of GOD which led me to doubt...I had to learn to test all things and hold fast to that which is good.

LORD thank you for showing this brother what I didn't see...I had forgotten that the Medes ruled from Babylon. At least this part is established.

RobertW:

I understand most of that is true, thanks for the insight. But these guys would bath before writing...obsessed with perfection...yes the added writings but I don't see them picking and choosing from time honored scriptures what to cut out.

graceamazed:

I have no doubt "Salvation I AM" YeshaYah or Jesus, came from heaven to earth in the flesh never broke any law...even the Sabbath law so I could be cleansed from my sin by HIS blood, that HE was forsaken by the Father to bear my eternal punishment.

by the way fishermen-type or blessed and a blessing when they honor GOD and don't fear men...or are rebuked successfully when they slip up (Gal 2:11-14) I am grieved over those that blindly follow the blind pretending to submit to GOD. (the only authority is the WORD/Christ)

anonymity:

Yes, yet Jesus even attended the Feast of dedication (Hanukkah) which was established to honor the bloody rebellion of the Maccabees (effort of the flesh) Still HE did not stamp any seal of approval...but maybe that is because HE knows our sanctification is not threatened by these pagan holiday's...(THIS IS what I was looking for in the thread,a little assurance that we have no need to fear)

rowdy2: I will listen to it



Re: - posted by DoulosQuinn, on: 2009/2/1 3:31

waltern:

Etymology is a valuable tool, thanks for the info

Star in Babylon what the queen of heaven the "super virgin who birthed Tamuz"...B-lined from Babylon even to Moham  
mad's demon inspired (what they latter called the "satanic verse of the Qu'ran" where the false prophet was tricked) acknowledge the diety of Al Uzzah & Al Lat the daughters of Allah (one is represented by the star above the moon)

I may just give up reading it,

"All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work."

I think I can receive that though the Law, The Prophets, the Gospels, & inspired letters apart from Ester.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/2/1 6:36

Quote:

-----RobertW: I understand most of that is true, thanks for the insight. But these guys would bath before writing...obsessed with perfection...yes the added writings but I don't see them picking and choosing from time honored scriptures what to cut out.  
-----

My point is that the Essenes was only one of four philosophies in Judaism in the first century. Understand also that only the Pharisees survived the first and second Jewish revolt. Some have tried to connect Christianity with the Essenes, but I would not agree at all. I also have theories as to why this is, primarily because the Essenes were a strict ascetic people, and certain brands of Christianity lean that way also confusing asceticism with holiness.

Several of the Disciples were actually part of or were very sympathetic towards the  
(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid1950>) The Jewish Freedom Movement, more popularly come to be known as The Zealots. The Pharisees survived this turmoil and started Rabbinic Judaism at Yavneh (Yabney or Jamnia depending on whose discussing). The Pharisees considered Esther as canonical, placing the book in one of the three sections of the Tanakh (Hebrew Bible) called the *Ketuvim* or Writings (Hagiographa).

So in short the book of Esther is found in Both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint. The Pharisees considered the Book of Esther canonical and Paul was a Pharisee. Remember that the Pharisees were essentially the evangelical Jews. The Essenes, by no means, spoke for the whole of Judaism any more than did the Sadducees.

Esther belongs in the Canon and has been in the Canon as long as many other Old Testament books. I would kindly suggest that you simply move to a different subject. there is no fruit or edification in this one. Primarily you run the risk of fighting against God.