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
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¹R. 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.

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

³In 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 (TH¹ and AH¹) and Babylonian (TH² and AH²).
The Hebrew of the Mishna belongs to TH¹ 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
TH¹ and not a Biblicized MH characteristic of the printed editions. A concise survey of this issue is

⁴C. Rabin, "The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew" (ScriHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958)
152–153.

⁵U. 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: Un-
iversity 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. In order to ferret out diachronic or LBH developments, the complementary controls of linguistic contrast and distribution are employed. Linguistic contrast displays the grammatical and lexical substitutions found in similar language contexts between sources of the same language of two or more periods. 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.

---


7These controls are consistently applied in the writings of A. Hurvitz. In addition to his many articles on LBH his major works are Běn Lăšôn Lēlēšôn (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, Lēšôn Miqrā’ Ülēšôn Hākāmīm (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’,” JANESCUC 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 hebräischen Buches Esther,” ZAW 55 (1937) 73-101. Also many references to “late” words in LBH sources in BDB, if carefully checked, are important clues.

8Among 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 are 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. ‘Illâ. The conditional conjunction ‘illâ, “if, though,” appears in Esth 7:4:10 “Now if (wê-‘illâ) we had only been . . .” It stands in diachronic contrast to EBH’s morpheme lâ (lå),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 ‘Illâ, however, occurs in Esther where lâ in this sense is prevalent in EBH prose, and it also appears once in exilic Ezekiel. Note the following occurrences:13 “If (lå) you had let them live” (Judg 8:19); “even if (wêlå, Q wêlå) I should receive” (2 Sam 18:12); “if (lå) 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 ‘illâ in post-exilic Esther where EBH exhibits lâ. Another line of evidence, and no doubt the more convincing in view of the low LBH incidence, is brought by the Mishna. Here ‘illâ (always spelled ‘illâ) has completely taken over the use of lâ. 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 (‘illâ) 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 lâ, which never occurs in the Mishna, had been dropped completely in favor of ‘illâ.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 šinnâ16 in prose17 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,” DDB 47; cf. also Driver, Introduction 475.

10‘Illâ 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 ‘illâ. 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, Kohelet—the Man and His World: A Study of Ecclesiastes (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, Lâšôn 160.

11Ben David, Lēšôn, 1. 62; Hurvitz, Lâšôn 160. Targum Jonathan renders lâ with ‘illâ in the EBH occurrences (except 2 Sam 18:12; cf. n. 13 below).


13Also in Judg 13:23; 2 Sam 19:7; perhaps also Gen 50:15; 1 Sam 14:30. Some suggest lâ in Ezek 14:15 should be read ʼō as in vv 17, 19; see BHS there; DDB 530.

14Elsewhere 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. ‘Abod. Zar. 4:7; m. Bek. 3:2(1); m. Ker. 6:5(3). This writer is unaware of any occurrences of ‘illâ in QL.

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

16Qal 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.

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

another, and in the exilic portion of 2 Kings and Jeremiah it means "change" of clothes: "And he transferred her (wayyēšannehā)" (Esth 2:9); "so he changed (wēšinnā) his prison clothes" (Jer 52:33); "so he changed (wēšinnā) 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 śinnā is infrequent, its usage is attested in post-Biblical sources. In QL:20 "to change (lēšannōt) the order of" (1QM 9:10); "changing (mešannīm) the deeds of God" (1QH 5:36); "they will not change (yēšannū) 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 (śinnā) his name" (m. Git. 8:5); "if he changed with respect to this" (m. Qinnim 1:1); "I have not changed (šannītī)" (m. Yad. 4:4[3]).

In conclusion, Piel śinnā in BH prose appears in later sources. Its sole occurrence in EBH (1 Sam 21:14) suggests that śinnā 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. 'Al-kākā. 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: bē-/lē-/‘al haddābār hazzeh:23 "I grant you concerning this matter (laddābār hazzeh) also" (Gen 19:21); "and he swore to him concerning this matter (‘al-haddābār hazzeh)" (24:9); "say no more to me concerning this matter (baddābār hazzeh)" (Deut 3:26).

In addition to Esther, ‘al kākā occurs in a letter from the Murabba‘at 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 lēkāk:25 "For concerning this you were created" (m. ‘Abot 2:9[8]); "I did not intend such a matter" (m. Menah. 13:4).

19The Targums translate hillēp with šanni in the above EBH references.

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

21Hillēp also regularly appears in the Mishna.

22Considered late by Driver, Introduction 484; Paton, Esther 63. Cf. Akkadian kktē and Amarna ktkā (KB 434).

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

24Milik 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.

25Segal, Grammar §294, 134. There are only three occurrences of kākā in the Mishna (m. Yebam. 12:3, 3; m. Šofta 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. Kašer haddabār lipnē. 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 kašer and the preposition lipnē 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 bē’ēnē.²⁶ Contrast the following EBH–LBH quotations: “The matter was agreeable (wayyišar) in his sight (bē’ēnāw)” (1 Sam 18:20); “and the matter seems proper (wēkāšēr) before (lipnē) the king” (Esth 8:5).

Kašer 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 (tikšār) 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 (wēhaksīrū)” (m. Ed. 7:3).

The lateness of lipnē in the expression under discussion can be demonstrated by a diachronic analysis of the related expression yāšab (haddābār) lipnē, “(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 yāšab (haddābār) bē’ēnē.²⁸ Compare the following EBH references with the contrasting LBH citations: “Now the matter was pleasing to (bē’ēnē) Pharaoh” (Gen 41:37); “and the matter was pleasing to (lipnē) Haman” (Esth 5:14); “it was pleasing to (bē’ēnē) Pharaoh” (Gen 45:16); “it was pleasing to (lipnē) the king” (Neh 2:6).

A comparison of these two expressions shows that where the preposition lipnē appears in Esther and Nehemiah, EBH has bē’ēnē and never lipnē. 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 (= lipnē) with reference to God.”²⁹ As such the extension, in this idiom, of lipnē 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 lipnē is used:³⁰ “[to] do what is good and right before (lēpānēkā)” (1QS 1:2). Note the 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.


²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ See 1QH 16:18; 17:24, where tōb bē’ēnēkā appears.
before (bê‘ênê) 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 kâsher haddâbâr lipnê. (1) The syntagmatically-semantically equivalent idioms in EBH have bê‘ênê 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 kâsher in this expression in Esther, as opposed to yâšar elsewhere in BH, combined with the frequent appearance of kâsher in Tannaitic Hebrew, suggest that the occurrence in Esther was a forerunner of its broader acceptance in later Hebrew.31

5. Qiyem ‘al-nepeš. This expression, which means “obligated oneself,” occurs once in BH: “They had obligated themselves (qiyyêmû ʿal-napsâm)” (Esth 9:31).

In contexts of “obligating oneself” in EBH, a similar but contrasting expression is used: leʾsôr ʿissâr ʿal-nepeš33 (“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 (wèyāqêm ʿal napṣô)” (IQS 5:8; cf. 5:10); “I obligated myself (hâqimôti ʿal napṣî)” (IQH 14:17); “the man will obligate himself (yâqîm . . . ʿal napṣô)” (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 (ʾâserâ . . . ʿal-napsâh)” (Num 30:11); “they obligated themselves (qiyyêmû ʿal-napsâm)” (Esth 9:31); “and he obligated himself (wèyāqêm ʿal napṣô)” (IQS 5:8).

Based on the linguistic contrast and distribution presented here it is apparent that the idiom qiyem 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


32See BDB 878; nepeš here is used as a reflexive pronoun, ibid., p. 660. Qiyem ʿal (without nepeš), having a similar sense, occurs in Esth 9:27, 31. On the late use of qiyem in the Piel in diachronic contrast to the Hiphil see Hurvitz, Lashon 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.

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

35De 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.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{37} Also, it is said to be “a far cry from the purity of Classical Hebrew.”\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{36}See nn. 6, 7.

\textsuperscript{37}Driver, Introduction 484.

\textsuperscript{38}Moore, Esther LIV.

\textsuperscript{39}J. Lyons, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1968) 42 (italics his).

\textsuperscript{40}“A synchronic fact is a relationship or opposition between two forms existing simultaneously”; J. Culler, Ferdinand de Saussure (Middlesex: Penguin, 1977) 37.

\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{42}Weinreich \textit{et al.}, "Theory" 184.