POST-EXILIC HEBREW LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENTS IN ESTHER: A DIACHRONIC APPROACH

Ronald L. Bergey*

No consensus has been reached concerning the book of Esther's position in the linguistic milieu of post-exilic Biblical Hebrew (or Late Biblical Hebrew, LBH). Robert Polzin maintains that the language in Esther is archaized—that is, imitative of pre-exilic Biblical Hebrew (or Early Biblical Hebrew, EBH)— and that it differs considerably from Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah's non-memoir portions.[1] Carey Moore drew an opposite conclusion: "The Hebrew of Esther is most like that of the Chronicler."[2] Still another view is posited by Chaim Rabin: "In the somewhat later Book of Esther, we find that MH [Mishnaic Hebrew][3] has affected much more deeply the grammatical fabric, so much so that it is almost as correct to speak of a MH text with BH influence as of a BH text with MH influence."[4]

What this lack of consensus indicates is that the language in Esther—as is analogically the case in language in general—possesses linguistic hetero-geneity.[5] Overall the post-exilic composition, Esther, should be viewed as a composite of linguistic features diachronically shared in EBH and MH and elements synchronically typical of LBH. In other words, analyses of the language in Esther disclose that there are some grammatical and lexical

*Ronald Bergey is associate professor of Hebrew and Old Testament at Western Reformed Seminary in Tacoma, Washington.

[1]R. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (HSM 12; Missoula: Scholars, 1976) 74-75. Mention of recent criticism of Polzin's work is made in n. 7 below.

[2]C. Moore, *Esther* (AB 7B; Garden City: Doubleday, 1971) LVII. Moore's statement concerning "the Chronicler" includes Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.

[3]In this study MH refers to the Hebrew of the Mishna itself. Diachronic studies of MH in general demonstrate that one must distinguish Tannaitic Hebrew (TH) from Amoraic Hebrew (AH). Further-more, both are divided geolinguistically: Palestinian (TH[1] and AH[1]) and Babylonian (TH[2] and AH[2]). The Hebrew of the Mishna belongs to TH[1] and is dated from the second century B.C. to the second century A.D. All quotations are from the Kaufmann MS, considered to be a MS that actually reflects TH[1] and not a Biblicized MH characteristic of the printed editions. A concise survey of this issue is found in E. Y. Kutscher, "Hebrew Language, Mishnaic Hebrew," in *EncJud* (1971), 16. 1590-1607.

[4]C. Rabin, "The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew" (ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958) 152-153.

[5]U. Weinreich *et al.* state that it is "necessary to learn to see language—whether from a diachronic *or* synchronic vantage—as an object possessing orderly heterogeneity" ("A Theory of Language Change," in *Directions for Historical Linguistics* [ed. W. P. Lehman and Y. Malkiel; Austin: University of Texas, 1968] 100).

features that are shared with EBH, others that characterize LBH, and some that anticipate MH (i.e. Tannaitic Hebrew). This is not to say, however, that late linguistic elements in Esther are indiscernible from the earlier features.

The purpose of this paper is to present five LBH linguistic changes that appear in the book of Esther.[6] In order to ferret out diachronic or LBH developments, the complementary controls of linguistic contrast and distribution are employed.[7] Linguistic contrast displays the grammatical and lexical substitutions found in similar language contexts between sources of the same language of two or more periods.[8] Linguistic distribution probes the propensity of the substitution. By employment of these complementary controls the distinctions between EBH and LBH are disclosed and the degree of penetration in LBH, QL and MH is measured.

It is crucial that both the contrast and the distribution are established before any conclusion is drawn concerning whether a linguistic feature appearing in a late text is actually an historical development. If contrast, or substitution, is not established, a feature that occurs only in LBH—and one that EBH simply had no occasion to employ—may be erroneously described as a late language development. Also, failure to establish the substituted feature's distribution may lead to a language description of an element that is merely peculiar to a given source but that may not be a change characteristic of later Hebrew.

---

[6] See R. L. Bergey, "Late Linguistic Features in Esther," *JQR* 75 (1984) 66–78, where five other elements are presented. For a discussion of fifty-two linguistic changes in Esther see Bergey, *The Book of Esther's Place in the Linguistic Milieu of Post-Exilic Biblical Hebrew Prose: A Study in Late Biblical Hebrew* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1983).

[7] These controls are consistently applied in the writings of A. Hurvitz. In addition to his many articles on LBH his major works are *Bên Lāšôn Lĕlāšôn* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1972; see pp. 15–16 for his discussion of these methodological controls); *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* (CahRB 20; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1982). Other useful works include A. Ben David, *Lĕšôn Miqrā᾽ Ûlĕšôn Ḥăkāmîm* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1967 [1], 1971 [2]); Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*. A significant number of Polzin's conclusions as pertains to particular language elements have been challenged by G. Rendsburg, "Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P'," *JANESCU* 12 (1980) 65–80; Hurvitz, *Linguistic Study* 163–170. Earlier works useful in LBH studies are S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (9th ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1913) 473–475, 484–485, 506–508, 535–540, 553; M. Lohr, "Der Sprachgebrauch des Buches der Klagelieder," *ZAW* 14 (1894) 31–50; A. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autor der Chronik* (BZAW 16; Giessen: A. Topelmann, 1909); H. Striedl, "Untersuchungen zur Syntax und Stilistik des hebraischen Buches Esther," *ZAW* 55 (1937) 73–101. Also many references to "late" words in LBH sources in BDB, if carefully checked, are important clues.

[8] Among the BH prose sources the pre- and post-exilic distinction is sufficient for diachronic analyses. Happily there is a large measure of unanimity regarding pre- and post-exilic prose distinction. Nevertheless some sources defy certain dating (e.g. Ruth). Others will raise the issue of "P" and its date. Those who make this source distinction should realize that P cannot be dated, on linguistic grounds, to the post-exilic period. This was convincingly argued in three recent, independent studies: Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*; Hurvitz, *Linguistic Study*; J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology* I (Berkeley: University of California, 1970). Also see Z. Zevit, "Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 481–511. All conclusions in this study are based upon texts whose EBH–LBH chronology is firmly established. On the problem of periodization of Hebrew see S. J. Lieberman, "Response," in *Jewish Languages: Theme and Variation* (ed. H. H. Paper; Cambridge: Association for Jewish Studies, 1978) 21–28.

1. *Illû.* The conditional conjunction *ʾillû*, "if, though,"[9] appears in Esth 7:4:[10] "Now if (*wěʾillû*) we had only been. . . ." It stands in diachronic contrast to EBH's morpheme *lû* (*lûʾ*),[11] "if, though." Both forms are used in the conditional sense of "stating a case which has not been or is not likely to be realized."[12] *ʾIllû*, however, occurs in Esther where *lû* in this sense is prevalent in EBH prose, and it also appears once in exilic Ezekiel. Note the following occurrences:[13] "If (*lû*) you had let them live" (Judg 8:19); "even if (*wělûʾ*, Q *wělû*) I should receive" (2 Sam 18:12); "if (*lû*) I were to cause" (Ezek 14:15). The case for diachronic development as concerns these two conditional conjunctions does not merely rest upon the use of *ʾillû* in post-exilic Esther where EBH exhibits *lû*. Another line of evidence, and no doubt the more convincing in view of the low LBH incidence, is brought by the Mishna. Here *ʾillû* (always spelled *ʾîllû*) has completely taken over the use of *lû*. It is used in the Mishna about eighteen times in the protasis of the conditional clause in the sense referred to above. A few examples:[14] "If (*ʾîllû*) I myself had undertaken it" (*m. Ketub.* 13:5); "if I had known that" (*m. Ned.* 9:2); "if I were in the Sanhedrin" (*m. Mak.* 1:16[10]); "if it were a substitute" (*m. Bek.* 9:9[8]).

By the Tannaitic period it appears that *lû*, which never occurs in the Mishna, had been dropped completely in favor of *ʾîllû*.[15] As for the conjunction's appearance in Esther, it may be described as an LBH forerunner of its common employment in the later Hebrew of the Mishna.

2. *Šinnâ.* The Piel *šinnâ*[16] in prose[17] appears mainly in exilic and post-exilic sources.[18] *Šinnâ* in Esther has the sense "change" from one location to

[9]"Only in late Hebrew," BDB 47; cf. also Driver, *Introduction* 475.

[10]*ʾIllû* also occurs in Eccl 6:6, a composition whose date has both early and late proponents. If an early date is maintained, this in itself does not argue against a late designation for *ʾillû*. A linguistic feature that is regnant in a later period often appears in earlier language where it first competes with an already standard feature. In time the competing form may gain currency and in some cases replace the earlier one. On the language of Ecclesiastes see R. Gordis, *Koheleth—the Man and His World: A Study of Ecclessiastes* (3d ed.; New York: Schocken, 1973) 59–62. Cf. also L. B. Paton, *Esther* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908) 62; Moore, *Esther* 70; Hurvitz, *Lāšôn* 160.

[11]Ben David, *Lěšôn*, 1. 62; Hurvitz, *Lāšôn* 160. *Targum Jonathan* renders *lû* with *ʾillû* in the EBH occurrences (except 2 Sam 18:12; cf. n. 13 below).

[12]BDB 530; Keil, *Esther* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, reprint ed. 1973) 364.

[13]Also in Judg 13:23; 2 Sam 19:7; perhaps also Gen 50:15; 1 Sam 14:30. Some suggest *lû* in Ezek 14:15 should be read *ʾô* as in vv 17, 19; see *BHS* there; BDB 530.

[14]Elsewhere *m. Ketub.* 13:8, 9; *m. Ned.* 9:2, 4, 4, 5, 9, 9; *m. Nazir* 5:3; *m. Sanh.* 9:8(3), 8(3); *m. ʿAbod. Zar.* 4:7; *m. Bek.* 3:2(1); *m. Ker.* 6:5(3). This writer is unaware of any occurrences of *ʾillû* in QL.

[15]Segal lists *lû* as one of the conjunctions that MH at large lost, being replaced by *ʾillû* (*A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1927] §302, 146).

[16]Qal Mal 3:6; Lam 4:1; Ps 77:11; Prov 24:21; Esth 1:7; Hithpael 1 Kgs 14:2; Pual Eccl 8:1 and see n. 10.

[17]In poetry: Ps 34:1 (title); 89:35; Prov 31:5; Job 14:20; Jer 2:36.

[18]Once in EBH: 1 Sam 21:14. In Biblical Aramaic (BA) Dan 3:28; 4:13; 7:7.

another, and in the exilic portion of 2 Kings and Jeremiah it means "change" of clothes: "And he transferred her *(wayyĕšannehā)*" (Esth 2:9); "so he changed *(wĕšinnâ)* his prison clothes" (Jer 52:33); "so he changed *(wĕšinnā⁾)* his prison clothes" (2 Kgs 25:29). Elsewhere in BH "change" is signified by *hillēp* (Gen 41:14; 2 Sam 12:20).[19]

Although the LBH prose use of *šinnâ* is infrequent, its usage is attested in post-Biblical sources. In QL:[20] "to change *(lĕšannôt)* the order of" (1QM 9:10); "changing *(mĕšannîm)* the deeds of God" (1QH 5:36); "they will not change *(yĕšannû)* your words" (14:15).

Its emergence as a more commonly-used lexeme is evident in the Mishna where the Piel conjugation occurs about fifty times.[21] A few examples: "If he changed *(šinnâ)* his name" *(m. Giṭ.* 8:5); "if he changed with respect to this" *(m. Qinnim* 1:1); "I have not changed *(šannîtî)*" *(m. Yad.* 4:4[3]).

In conclusion, Piel *šinnâ* in BH prose appears in later sources. Its sole occurrence in EBH (1 Sam 21:14) suggests that *šinnâ* and *hillēp* were already competing in earlier BH with the latter being the dominant form. Its emergence in Esther and other LBH compositions is seen not only from its higher incidence in these later sources but from the total absence of *hillēp* as well. A more widespread usage is attested in post-Biblical sources, especially in the Mishna.

3. *ʿAl-kākâ.* This phrase, which means "concerning such matter,"[22] occurs in BH only in Esther 9:26: "what they had seen concerning this."

EBH has various expressions that are semantically similar: *bĕ-/lĕ-/ʿal haddābār hazzeh*:[23] "I grant you concerning this matter *(laddābār hazzeh)* also" (Gen 19:21); "and he swore to him concerning this matter *(ʿal-haddābār hazzeh)*" (24:9); "say no more to me concerning this matter *(baddābār hazzeh)*" (Deut 3:26).

In addition to Esther, *ʿal kākâ* occurs in a letter from the Murabbaʿat caves dated to ca. A.D. 132-135:[24] "And I convinced(?) you concerning this" (Mur 42:6).

In the Mishna "concerning such a matter" is expressed occasionally by the shortened form *lĕkāk*:[25] "For concerning this you were created" *(m. ʾAbot* 2:9[8]); "I did not intend such a matter" *(m. Menaḥ.* 13:4).

---

[19]The Targums translate *hillēp* with *šannî* in the above EBH references.

[20]Hiphil 1QS 3:16; 1QH 15:14; 4Q *184* i 15.

[21]*Hillēp* also regularly appears in the Mishna.

[22]Considered late by Driver, *Introduction* 484; Paton, *Esther* 63. Cf. Akkadian *kīkī* and Amarna *kīkā* (KB 434).

[23]Also see *ʿal dābār* in Num 25:18; 31:16; 2 Sam 18:5; *ʿal haddābār hazzeh* in 2 Sam 19:43; 1 Kgs 11:10; *ʿal haddābār* in Jer 7:22; 14:1; in BA cf. *ʿal dĕnâ* in Ezra 5:5, 17.

[24]Milik translates: "Et je t'aurais rendu compte de cet (achat), que tu ne dises pas (que c'est) par mépris" (DJD, 2. 157); see also Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies* (ed. Z. Ben-hayyim, A. Dotan and G. Sarfatti; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1977) 17.

[25]Segal, *Grammar* §294, 134. There are only three occurrences of *kākâ* in the Mishna (m. *Yebam.* 12:3, 3; m. *Soṭa* 9:6).

Thus Esther's idiom contrasts diachronically with semantically similar expressions employed in EBH. Its absence in EBH and appearance in Esther—as well as its occurrence in an early second-century A.D. letter—are converging lines of evidence that point to the expression's lateness.

4. *Kāšēr haddābār lipnê.* This expression, meaning "the matter is proper before," appears only in Esth 8:5. The phrase contains two elements that are characteristic of later Hebrew: the verb *kāšēr* and the preposition *lipnê* in syntagmatically and paradigmatically related expressions. The comparable expression found throughout BH (e.g. 2 Sam 17:4; Jer 40:4-5; 1 Chr 13:4; 2 Chr 30:4) is *yāšar haddābār bĕʿênê.*[26] Contrast the following EBH-LBH quotations: "The matter was agreeable (*wayyîšar*) in his sight (*bĕʿênâw*)" (1 Sam 18:20); "and the matter seems proper (*wĕkāšēr*) before (*lipnê*) the king" (Esth 8:5).

Kāšēr rarely occurs in BH (elsewhere in Eccl 10:10; 11:6).[27] It is, however, frequently used in the Mishna and once in Ben Sira: "If you are agreeable (*tikšar*) to him" (Sir [A] 13:4); "all the day is suitable (*kāšēr*) for the reading of the scroll" (*m. Meg.* 2:5; see also 2:7[6]); "sages . . . declared it valid (*wĕhakšîrû*)" (*m. ʿEd.* 7:3).

The lateness of *lipnê* in the expression under discussion can be demonstrated by a diachronic analysis of the related expression *yāṭab* (*haddābār*) *lipnê*, "(the matter) was pleasing to," which occurs twice in BH. Both usages are in LBH (Esth 5:14; Neh 2:6). The equivalent expression used in EBH is *yāṭab* (*haddābār*) *bĕʿênê.*[28] Compare the following EBH references with the contrasting LBH citations: "Now the matter was pleasing to (*bĕʿênê*) Pharaoh" (Gen 41:37); "and the matter was pleasing to (*lipnê*) Haman" (Esth 5:14); "it was pleasing to (*bĕʿênê*) Pharaoh" (Gen 45:16); "it was pleasing to (*lipnê*) the king" (Neh 2:6).

A comparison of these two expressions shows that where the preposition *lipnê* appears in Esther and Nehemiah, EBH has *bĕʿênê* and never *lipnê*. This change in prepositions, according to A. Hurvitz, "can be best understood in the light of the familiar practice of the Aramaic versions to employ the preposition *kdm* (= *lpnê*) with reference to God."[29] As such the extension, in this idiom, of *lipnê* to royalty (a king or a royal official)—as is the case in the two LBH occurrences—is not unexpected.

A few sources in QL have a related expression that is comparable to the one under discussion. Here also the preposition *lipnê* is used:[30] "[to] do what is good and right before (*lĕpānêkā*)" (1QS 1:2). Note the following diachronically contrasted (EBH-QL) expressions: "And you shall do what is right and good

---

[26]*Targum Jonathan* renders *yšr* (both verb and noun) with *kšr* (e.g. Judg 14:13; 1 Sam 18:20, 28; 2 Sam 17:4; 1 Kgs 9:12).

[27]"A late Hebrew word"; Gordis, *Koheleth* 333; see n. 10 above.

[28]Hurvitz, "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," *RQ* 5 (1965) 230.

[29]Ibid.

[30]See 1QH 16:18; 17:24, where *ṭôb bĕʿênêkā* appears.

before (*bĕʿênê*) the Lord" (Deut 6:18); "and you shall do what is right and good before (*lipnê*) the Lord" (Temple Scroll 63:8; see also 55:14; 59:17).

In conclusion, a pattern emerges that points to the lateness of the expression *kāšēr haddābār lipnê*. (1) The syntagmatically-semantically equivalent idioms in EBH have *bĕʿênê* rather than *lipnê*, which is found only in LBH (Esther and Nehemiah). Also, a comparable expression with *lipnê* appears in QL. (2) The use of *kāšēr* in this expression in Esther, as opposed to *yāšar* elsewhere in BH, combined with the frequent appearance of *kāšēr* in Tannaitic Hebrew, suggest that the occurrence in Esther was a forerunner of its broader acceptance in later Hebrew.[31]

5. *Qîyēm ʿal-nepeš*. This expression, which means "obligated oneself,"[32] occurs once in BH: "They had obligated themselves (*qîyĕmû ʿal-napšām*)" (Esth 9:31).

In contexts of "obligating oneself" in EBH, a similar but contrasting expression is used: *leʾsōr ʾissār ʿal-nepeš*[33] ("to obligate oneself with a binding obligation"; cf. e.g. Num 30:2; see also vv 4, 6, 8, 10).

QL, again in similar "obligatory" contexts to the above, uses language identical to Esther's:[34] "And he obligated himself (*wĕyāqēm ʿal napšô*)" (1QS 5:8; cf. 5:10); "I obligated myself (*hăqîmōtî ʿal napšî*)" (1QH 14:17); "the man will obligate himself (*yāqîm . . . ʿal napšô*)" (CD 16:1; see also 16:4, 7). Interestingly QL, even where the language and context are closely related to an EBH passage, avoids the expression found in pre-exilic BH and uses the one appearing in Esther. Compare the following: "She obligated herself (*ʾāsĕrâ . . . ʿal-napšāh*)" (Num 30:11); "they obligated themselves (*qîyĕmû ʿal-napšām*)" (Esth 9:31); "and he obligated himself (*wĕyāqēm ʿal napšô*)" (1QS 5:8).

Based on the linguistic contrast and distribution presented here it is apparent that the idiom *qîyēm ʿal-nepeš*, first found in Esther, is another late linguistic development.

CONCLUSIONS

1. *Language is conservative and not subject to rapid development.* However slow the change may be, the process is unceasing.[35] Thus on the surface BH appears to be grammatically and lexically synchronic. A diachronic probe

---

[31]See also Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (ed. R. Kutscher; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1982) §123 and §234, 83, 136.

[32]See BDB 878; *nepeš* here is used as a reflexive pronoun, ibid., p. 660. *Qîyēm ʿal* (without *nepeš*), having a similar sense, occurs in Esth 9:27, 31. On the late use of *qîyēm* in the Piel in diachronic contrast to the Hiphil see Hurvitz, *Lāšôn* 139–142; *Linguistic Study* 32–35; Bergey, *Book* 40–42.

[33]"Fig. of obligation of oath or vow (only Nu 30, P)," BDB 64. Concerning this expression Grey states: "Render: If any man . . . subjects himself to some pledge," *Numbers* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1903) 414. Noth translates "bind himself by a pledge," *Numbers* (OTL; London: SCM, 1968) 223. Elsewhere see Num 30:6, 8, 10, 12.

[34]Also see Temple Scroll 53:18, 19, 20. There are no Mishnaic occurrences of this expression.

[35]De Saussure noted that culture, political history—especially conquest and colonization—and institutions (e.g. church and school) are related to language change (*Cours de linguistique générale* [ed. T. de

viewed from the vantage points of contrast and distribution, however, presents another picture: EBH and LBH are markedly different. The five features treated here are but a handful of the hundreds of diachronic changes in LBH.[36]

2. *Linguistic change found in LBH should not be judged in a qualitative manner.* Unfortunately, writers past and present pejoratively view LBH changes when juxtaposed with the earlier "classical" Hebrew. It is maintained that the Hebrew in Esther "though superior to that of the Chronicler . . . exhibits much deterioration in syntax."[37] Also, it is said to be "a far cry from the purity of Classical Hebrew."[38] A corrective is supplied by John Lyons:

> It should be evident that there are no absolute standards of "purity" and "correctness" in language and that such terms can only be interpreted in relation to some standard selected in advance. . . . To assert that any linguistic form is "correct" or "incorrect" *because* it is at variance with some other form taken (explicitly or implicitly) as the standard is therefore tautological.[39]

3. *Some of the language elements presented above first appear in LBH.* They apparently penetrated the language in the post-exilic period. These elements competed with already-current features, sometimes gaining currency over older forms and at other times replacing them completely. As noted, other linguistic features treated here (and considered late) have antecedents in pre-exilic Hebrew. From the combined standpoints of increased incidence and distribution, however, they became prevalent in LBH or in later Hebrew (QL/MH) or both. It is clear, therefore, that certain diachronic changes can be traced back to competing synchronic features.[40] Concerning a parallel phenomenon in spoken language, Bynon writes:

> It is precisely this variation within a speech community which provides the key to the mechanism of language change. By acting as a living vehicle or medium for the retraction and promotion of competing forms, which will show themselves in retrospect as members of the successive grammars of the language, it makes change possible. This does not mean that all linguistic variation is necessarily associated with ongoing change but simply that any change which does take place assumes the presence of linguistic variation.[41]

Mauro; Paris; Payot, 1979] 40-41). In recent times sociological influences have been identified as sources of linguistic innovation: age, sex, social class, ethnic group, geographical region, etc.; J. K. Chambers and P. Trudgill, *Dialectology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1980) 167.

[36]See nn. 6, 7.

[37]Driver, *Introduction* 484.

[38]Moore, *Esther* LIV.

[39]J. Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1968) 42 (italics his).

[40]"A synchronic fact is a relationship or opposition between two forms existing simultaneously"; J. Culler, *Ferdinand de Saussure* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1977) 37.

[41]Bynon, *Historical Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1977) 198-199; see also p. 4.

The same process is observed in bidialectal speakers, or

> speakers with heterogeneous systems characterized by orderly differentiation. Change takes place (1) as a speaker learns an alternate form, (2) during the time that the two forms exist in contact within his competence, and (3) when one of the forms becomes obsolete.[42]

These observations may serve, together with the presentation of the five late linguistic features in Esther, to advance our understanding of LBH and to stimulate further diachronic EBH–LBH studies.

[42]Weinreich *et al.*, "Theory" 184.