

Laqṭīl Infinitives: Yiph'il or Hiph'il?

Gary RENDSBURG

Readers of this journal will be familiar with the view of M. Dahood¹ and S. Segert² that infinitives such as *lašbt* "to destroy" in Amos 8:4 and *lašmīd* "to destroy" in Isa 23:11 are Hebrew Yiph'il forms. They base their argument on the fact that "In most [Phoenician] infinitives preceded by a one-consonant preposition no marker of Yip'il is visible"³, e.g., *lšbt* "to make quiet" in CIS 5510:3. Since the above Hebrew forms are similarly written, Dahood and Segert have made the connection.

While it is true that Yiph'il forms do appear in Biblical Hebrew (BH) occasionally, e.g., *yōda'ti* "I have ordered" in I Sam 21:3, and *yakkīrānū* "he recognized us" in Isa 63:16⁴, they are not so common as to account for the number of *laqṭīl* forms attested in MT. Along with the two aforementioned forms, *laqṭīl* infinitives occur as follows:

Exod 13:21	<i>lanḥōt</i>	"to lead"
Num 5:22	<i>lašbōt</i>	"to cause to swell"
	<i>lanpīl</i>	"to cause to sag"
Deut 1:33	<i>lar'ōt</i>	"to show"
Deut 26:12	<i>la'sēr</i>	"to tithe"
I Sam 2:33	<i>la'adib</i>	"to cause to languish"
II Sam 19:19	<i>la'abir</i>	"to transport"
II Kgs 19:25	<i>lahšōt</i> ⁵	"to lay waste"
Isa 3:8	<i>lamrōt</i>	"to provoke"
Isa 29:15	<i>lastir</i>	"to hide"
Jer 37:12	<i>lah'itq</i>	"to take one's share"
Jer 39:7	<i>lābi</i>	"to bring"

¹ M. Dahood, *Or* 46 (1977) 384, 467.

² S. Segert, *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic* (Munich 1976) 142.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ See C. H. Gordon, *JKF* 2 (1951) 50, 59. P. K. McCarter, *I Samuel* (Garden City, N.Y. 1980) 347, is incorrect when he states that MT *yōda'ti* "is unparalleled and offers no defensible translation". His emendation to *y'dty* "I have made an appointment" based on 40Sam^b is unnecessary. The reading *hkyrmw* (= *hikkīrānū*) in 1QIs^a (henceforth 1QIs) for MT *yakkīrānū* shows that the Qumranite scribe understood the verb to be a perfect. He simply substituted the more familiar Hiph'il form for the Yiph'il one. E. Y. Kutscher, *Ha-Lašon we-ha-Reqa' ha-Lešoni šel Megillat Yeša'yahu ha-Šelema^b mi-Megillot Yam ha-Melah* (Jerusalem 1959) 270, misunderstood this point when he included this entry in his list of examples where 1QIs uses the perfect where MT has the imperfect.

⁵ The parallel verse in Isa 37:26 reads *l'haš'ōt*, the standard Hiph'il infinitive with the middle root letter ' which is elided in II Kgs 19:25. As pointed, *lahšōt* is a *laqṭīl* infinitive of the root *hšh*, a secondary verb from *š'h*.

Psa 26:7	<i>lašmāʿ</i>	“to cause to hear”
Psa 78:17	<i>lamrôt</i>	“to rebel”
Prov 31:3	<i>lamḥôt</i>	“to destroy”
Qoh 5:5	<i>lahāʿiʿi</i>	“to cause to sin”
Dan 11:35	<i>lalbēn</i>	“to whiten”
II Chr 31:10	<i>lābīʿ</i>	“to bring”

Two *laqtīl* infinitives occur in the Kethiv, though they were altered in the Qere by the Masoretes:

II Sam 18:3	<i>l'zyr (= la'zīr)</i>	“to help” (Qere: <i>laʿazōr</i> [the Qal form])
II Kgs 9:15	<i>lgyd (= lāgīd)</i>	“to tell” (Qere: <i>lʿhaggīd</i> [the standard Hiphʿil form])

With the prefix *b* or *k* instead of *l*, the following *laqtīl* forms are attested:

Isa 33:1	<i>kannēlōt⁶</i>	“while bringing to an end”
Jer 27:20	<i>baglōt</i>	“when exiling”
Psa 73:20	<i>bāʿīr⁷</i>	“while arousing”
Neh 10:19	<i>baʿšēr</i>	“while tithing”

Thus there are 26 examples of *laqtīl* infinitives in MT. In order to determine the ratio of Hiphʿil perfect forms to Hiphʿil infinitive construct forms preceded by the prepositions *l*, *b*, *k*⁸, I randomly selected 12 verbs (some very common, some very rare, and some of medium occurrence) and by using a concordance achieved the following results:

verbal root	number of Hiphʿil perfect forms ⁹	number of Hiphʿil infinitive construct forms preceded by <i>l</i> , <i>b</i> , <i>k</i>
<i>'bd</i>	15	7
<i>'kl</i>	6	0
<i>bw'</i>	161	45
<i>glh</i>	23	6
<i>yš'</i> (<i>wš'</i>)	92	30
<i>kbd</i>	11	1
<i>šdq</i>	2	2
<i>qdš</i>	19	5
<i>r'h</i>	29	6
<i>rš'</i>	6	1
<i>škm</i>	6	0
<i>šlk</i>	29	2
totals:	399	105

⁶ For an explanation of the *dageš* in the *nūn* in this word, see below, note 10.

⁷ The entire verse reads *kaḥʾlōm mēhāqīš ʾadōnāy bāʿīr šalmām tibze^h*. M. Dahood, *Psalms II* (Garden City, N.Y. 1968) 193, vocalized *bʿyr šlmm* as *bʿīr šelāmīm* “in the city of phantoms”, but MT is to be retained. The verb *bāʿīr* “while arousing” is the perfect parallel complement to *mēhāqīš* “when awaking”. These two words are similarly paired in Hab 2:19, Psa 35:23, 44:24, 139:18, Job 14:12.

⁸ The purpose of this task will soon be apparent.

⁹ The reason that imperfect forms were not counted is simple: *yaqtīl*,

Since the ratio of Hiph'il perfects to Hiph'il infinitive constructs preceded by *l*, *b*, *k* is just under 4:1, if the above *laqṭîl* forms are to be analyzed as Yiph'il infinitives we would expect to find about 100 Yiph'il perfects in MT. Since this is *extremely* doubtful, we must look elsewhere to explain the 26 *laqṭîl* forms in MT. Simply stated, the *laqṭîl* forms are Hiph'il infinitives with elision of the *h*¹⁰, or to explain it another way, the infinitive is analogically patterned after the imperfect *yaqṭîl*¹¹.

Whereas only 26 *laqṭîl* forms are attested in BH, in Mishnaic Hebrew (MH) *laqṭîl* forms are common¹². The argument given above against *laqṭîl* forms in BH being Yiph'il infinitives gains added weight when the MH evidence is considered. Above, I estimated that the 26 *laqṭîl* infinitives in BH would assume about 100 Yiph'il perfects. If this is the situation in BH, how much more so is it in MH where we should expect to find even more Yiph'il perfects. But since there are *no* examples of Yiph'il perfects in MH¹³, it stands to reason that the *laqṭîl* forms are not Yiph'il infinitives. In short, both in BH and in MH, *laqṭîl* forms are Hiph'il infinitives.

Analogous to these Hiph'il infinitives with elided *h* are the various Niph'al infinitives with elided *h* in ancient Hebrew. Again, these *liqqāṭēl* forms may also be explained as being analogically based on the imperfect *yiqqāṭēl*. MT evidences the following instances of this formation:

Exod 10:3	<i>lē'ānōt</i>	"to humble oneself"	
Exod 34:24,	}	<i>lē'rā'ōt</i>	
Deut 31:11,			"to appear"
Isa 1:12			
Job 33:30	<i>lē'ōr</i>	"to enlighten"	

With the prefix *b* instead of *l*, the following *liqqāṭēl* forms are attested:

Ezek 26:15	<i>bēhārēg</i>	"when slaughtering"
Prov 24:17	<i>bikkāšēl</i>	"when stumbling"
Lam 2:11	<i>bē'āṭēp</i>	"when fainting"

The connection between the Hiph'il *laqṭîl* forms and the Niph'al *liqqāṭēl* forms becomes even more evident when we realize that in MH the Niph'al

taqṭîl, *'aqṭîl*, etc., do not reveal whether the preformative element is *h* or *y*. Imperatives would reveal a *h* or a *y*, but they are too uncommon to form a reliable conclusion.

¹⁰ The elided *h* may explain the *dageš* in the *nûn* of *kann'ōt* in Isa 33:1. For a similar phenomenon, see *labbat* (absolute **labbā^h* < *lehābā^h*) in Exod 3:2. The norm, however, is not to indicate the elided *h* by doubling the following consonant, thus, *baglōt* in Jer 27:20, *lašmīd* in Isa 23:11, etc., and the imperfect forms *yaqṭîl*, *taqṭîl*, etc.

¹¹ This is actually very common in BH, e.g., *lišmōr*/*yišmōr*, *lāqûm*/*yāqûm*, *ʾedabbēr*/*yedabbēr*.

¹² M. Z. Segal, *Diqduq Lešon ha-Mišna* (Tel-Aviv 1936) 120; M. H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford 1927) 68; K. Albrecht, *Neuhebräische Grammatik* (Munich 1913) 110; and S. Stern, *Das Verbum der Mischnahsprache* (Berlin 1888) 10.

¹³ Segal, *Diqduq* 120-122; Segal, *Grammar* 67-70. That Segal was on the lookout for causative conjugations other than Hiph'il is evidenced by his inclusion of various 'Aph'el, Šaph'el, and Šaph'el forms.

infinitive regularly appears as *liqqāṭēl*¹⁴. That is to say, in both instances what is "anomalous" in BH is regular in MH.

Related to these two forms is a third development. In BH, the infinitive construct with prefixed *l* of *pē-yōd* verbs in the Qal is of the paradigm *lāšebet* "to sit", and the infinitive construct with prefixed *l* of *pē-nūn* verbs is of the paradigm *lāgešet* "to approach" for verbs whose thematic vowel in the imperfect is *a*, e.g., *yiggaš*, or *linpōl* "to fall" for verbs whose thematic vowel in the imperfect is *o*, e.g., *yinpōl*. In MH, the infinitives of both classes are formed on the analogy of the imperfect, e.g., *lēlēd* "to bear" (cf. *yēlēd*), *līšan* "to sleep" (cf. *yīšan*), *liddōr* "to vow" (cf. *yiddōr*), *littēn* "to give" (cf. *yittēn*)¹⁵. Again, in BH the infinitive and the imperfect are formed from different models, but in MH the two are formed from the same model^{15a}.

We are not to assume, however, that the above data point to a chronological development of *l^hhaqtīl* > *laqtīl*, *l^hhiqqāṭēl* > *liqqāṭēl*, *lāšebet* > *lēšēb*¹⁶. Such a diachronic comparison would fail to take into consideration the evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). In Qumran Hebrew (QH), roughly contemporary with MH, the BH forms still predominate. My combing the concordance of K. G. Kuhn¹⁷ has resulted in the following statistics for the four major scrolls^{18 19}:

Hiph'il

Serek ha-Yahad	33	<i>l^hhaqtīl</i>
	1	<i>laqtīl</i> (namely <i>lqryb</i> in 8:9)
War Scroll	35	<i>l^hhaqtīl</i>
	0	<i>laqtīl</i>
Damascus Scroll	27	<i>l^hhaqtīl</i>
	2	<i>laqtīl</i> (namely <i>lby'</i> in 11:10 and <i>lsy'</i> in 1:16)
Hodayot	38	<i>l^hhaqtīl</i>
	3	<i>laqtīl</i> (namely <i>lšyb</i> in 12:20, <i>lhywt</i> in 8:36, and <i>lmys</i> in 11:18)

¹⁴ Segal, *Diqduq* 114; Segal, *Grammar* 58; Albrecht, 105; Stern, 11; A. Geiger, *Lehrbuch zur Sprache der Mischnah* (Breslau 1845) 44-45; H. L. Strack and C. Siegfried, *Lehrbuch der neuhebräischen Sprache* (Karlsruhe 1884) 74.

¹⁵ Segal, *Diqduq* 139; Segal, *Grammar* 78.

^{15a} Unlike the above Hiph'il and Niph'al forms, there are no examples of *lēlēd*, *līšan*, etc., in MT. But see Sir 30:20 where *lyrd* (= *lēvēd*) occurs.

¹⁶ Henceforth I shall use the root *yšb* (*wšb*) as a paradigm of all *pē-yōd* and *pē-nūn* Qal infinitives.

¹⁷ *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen 1960).

¹⁸ Only those forms which are clearly written and are not in need of restoration were counted. Also, to make my task easier I did not count the infinitives preceded by *b* or *k*. The sample with prefixed *l* is large enough so that this lacuna would not substantially affect the statistics presented.

¹⁹ The evidence from the Isaiah scroll adds nothing to the discussion. Where MT has *l^hhaḥ^ayōt* in Isa 57:15 (2 ×), 1QIs reads *lhywt* (= *lahyōt*) (2 ×), where MT has *l^hhašmī^a* in Isa 58:4, 1QIs reads *lšmy'* (= *lašmī^a*), and where MT has *l^hhaš'ōt* in Isa 37:26, 1QIs reads *lš'wwt* (= *laš'ōt*). On the other hand, where MT reads *lamrōt* in Isa 3:8, 1QIs has *lhmrvt* (= *l^hhamrvōt*), where MT reads *lastīr* in Isa 29:15, 1QIs has *lhstyr* (= *l^hastīr*), and where MT reads *lašmīd* in Isa 23:11, 1QIs has *lšmyd* (= *l^hasmīd*). In other words, four times where MT has the Hiph'il form with *h*, 1QIs has it with the *h* elided, and three times where MT has the Hiph'il form with the *h* elided, 1QIs has it with *h*. See Kutscher, *Ha-Lašon we-ha-Reqa'* 111, 265, 399. For the evidence from the Peshet Habakkuk, see below, note 37.

Niph'al

Serek ha-Yaḥad	13	<i>l'hiqqāṭēl</i>
	0	<i>liqqāṭēl</i>
War Scroll	7	<i>l'hiqqāṭēl</i>
	0	<i>liqqāṭēl</i>
Damascus Scroll	3	<i>l'hiqqāṭēl</i>
	0	<i>liqqāṭēl</i>
Hodayot	10	<i>l'hiqqāṭēl</i>
	1	<i>liqqāṭēl</i> (namely <i>ltm</i> in 17:25)

Qal of *pē-yōd* and *pē-nûn*

There are no instances of the MH forms; rather *ld't* "to know", *lš't* "to go out", *lšbt* "to sit", *lg't* "to touch", *lnpl* "to fall", *lš't* "to raise", and *ltt* "to give" are used.

The QH evidence is obviously quite different from the MH evidence. Although contemporary, the two dialects form the infinitive constructs preceded by *l*, *b*, *k* in two distinct ways. This dichotomy is explicable when we consider the diglossia²⁰ which existed in the Hebrew of Greco-Roman times. The colloquial Hebrew of the day was the dialect represented by MH and by the Hebrew of the Bar Kokhba letters and the literary Hebrew of that era was the dialect represented by QH. This statement is not only consonant with linguistic science — that is, the notion that people speak and write differently²¹ — but it also makes sense when we take note of the different corpora of literature. The DSS are true literary achievements and thus we expect to find these documents couched in written Hebrew. The Mishna, Tosefta, and Midrashim, on the other hand, were not even written originally, but are rather collections of legal sayings and interpretative talks of the early rabbis. Moreover, when these Tannaitic works were committed to writing, they were recorded in spoken Hebrew so that all, even the uneducated, could understand their contents. The number of scholars who have recognized the diglossia of Hebrew in Greco-Roman times is not great, but here may be singled out C. Rabin²², E. Y. Kutscher²³, J. Fellman²⁴, and S. J. Lieberman²⁵.

We may take this notion one step further and conclude that Hebrew diglossia existed in Biblical times as well. BH is undoubtedly a literary Hebrew²⁶, which certainly was not the spoken Hebrew of the day²⁷. Rather,

²⁰ For an introduction to diglossia, see C. A. Ferguson, "Diglossia", *Word* 15 (1959) 325-340.

²¹ See C. H. Woolbert, "Speaking and Writing — A Study of Differences", *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education* 8 (1922) 271-285.

²² C. Rabin, "The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew", in *Scripta Hierosolymitana IV (Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls)*, edited by C. Rabin and Y. Yadin (Jerusalem 1958) 152.

²³ E. Y. Kutscher, "Leṣon Hazal", in *Sefer Hanoch Yalon*, edited by S. Lieberman, et al. (Jerusalem 1963) 247-248.

²⁴ J. Fellman, "On 'Diglossia'", *Language Sciences* 8 (1975) 39.

²⁵ S. J. Lieberman, "Response to Professor Blau", in *Jewish Languages: Themes and Variations*, edited by H. H. Paper (Cambridge, Mass. 1978) 26.

²⁶ J. Blau, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Wiesbaden 1976) 1.

²⁷ See W. Chomsky, *Hebrew: The Eternal Language* (Philadelphia 1964) 161; E. Ullendorff, *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?* (Wiesbaden 1977) 11.

colloquial Hebrew in Biblical times was a dialect approximating MH. The evidence for this spoken idiom are all the so-called "Mishnaisms" which have found their way into MT. Far from being consciously or subconsciously introduced by scribes of the Greco-Roman era²⁸, these forms — of which literally hundreds exist — are evidence for the spoken Hebrew of Biblical times²⁹.

Thus I would explain the *laqtîl*, *liqqâtêl*, and *lēšēb* infinitives so common in MH and occasionally attested in BH and QH as characteristic of spoken Hebrew³⁰. Their counterparts, *l^hhaqtîl*, *l^hhiqqâtêl*, and *lāšebet*, may be considered the standard forms which were used in written Hebrew. Thus we find this latter group of infinitives predominating both in BH, the literary Hebrew of Biblical times, and in QH, the literary Hebrew of Greco-Roman times³¹. The occasional use of the spoken forms in BH and QH is to be explained by the spoken dialect exerting its influence on the written dialect. Colloquial usage infiltrates literary composition in every language with a written tradition. Indeed, the evidence for colloquial Arabic in early Islamic and pre-Islamic times is to be found in literary works³².

Finally, we should note that modern Israeli Hebrew exhibits the same diglossia, especially regarding *l^hhaqtîl* versus *laqtîl*. The former is used in literary Hebrew and in formal speeches such as parliamentary debates, lectures, and some radio and television programs³³. The spoken Hebrew of modern Israel, however, prefers the *laqtîl* form for the Hiph'il infinitive³⁴.

²⁸ See, for example, the explanation of 'anû in Jer 42:6 by G. R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls* (New York 1965) 429.

²⁹ See my *Evidence for a Spoken Hebrew in Biblical Times*, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation (New York 1980).

³⁰ The antiquity of spoken Hebrew may be indicated by the form *lēšēb* versus *lāšebet*. Segal, *Grammar* 78, noted that the former may in fact be older than the latter. The termination *-t* in the BH form already shows the effect of *Analogiebildung*, serving to increase the "bulk" of a biconsonantal root to the triconsonantal norm. This process is lacking in the MH form which exhibits the original biliteral character of the root.

³¹ Since QH is basically the same as BH (see, e.g., H. Yalon, *Megillot Midbar Yehuda^b: Divre Lašon* [Jerusalem 1967] 71), we may consider these two idioms one and the same dialect. Nevertheless, I continue to use the separate designations, QH and BH, if only to distinguish them chronologically.

³² See K. Vollers, *Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien* (Strassburg 1906); F. Corriente, "Marginalia on Arabic Diglossia and Evidence Thereof in the Kitāb al-Agāni", *JSS* 20 (1975) 38-61; and J. Blau, *A Grammar of Christian Arabic Based Mainly on South Palestinian Texts from the First Millennium*, 3 vols. (Louvain 1966-1967).

³³ The same may be noted for Arabic where the classical idiom is used in formal speaking occasions. See R. J. McCarthy and F. Raffouli, *Spoken Arabic of Baghdad*, Vol. I (Beirut 1964) xxv. This does nothing to lessen the argument for diglossia. Rather it points to the lack of total descriptiveness in the terms "written dialect" and "spoken dialect". Nevertheless, I continue to use them (at times interchangeably with "literary", "classical", or "standard" for the former and "colloquial" for the latter) because they have become commonplace in the scholarly literature.

³⁴ For other examples of spoken Israeli Hebrew, see H. Halkin, "Hebrew As She Is Spoke", *Commentary* 48:6 (December 1966) 55-60; and W. Weinberg, "Biblical Grammar/Israeli Grammar: Accepted and Unacceptable Changes", *Hebrew Abstracts* 15 (1974) 32-41.

Moreover, anyone familiar with the revival of the Hebrew language in the last hundred years will realize that these *laqṭîl* forms are not based on MH usage, but are rather a native development of this century. That is to say, there exists a *Drang* in spoken Hebrew, ancient and modern, for the Hiph'il infinitives to elide the *h* and to be based on the imperfect³⁵. This additional piece of evidence not only demonstrates the validity of considering the *laqṭîl* forms in BH characteristic of spoken Hebrew, but it also adds weight to the argument against their being Yiph'il infinitives, there being absolutely no Yiph'il forms in modern Hebrew.

To sum up:

1) Pure mathematics dictate that, contra Dahood and Segert, the 26 *laqṭîl* infinitives in MT are not Yiph'il forms. Were this the case, we would expect about 100 examples of Yiph'il perfects in MT.

2) The *laqṭîl* infinitives are merely Hiph'il forms where the *h* has been elided, or to explain it another way, the infinitive is formed by analogy on the basis of the imperfect *yaqṭîl*.

3) These *laqṭîl* forms are related to the *liqqāṭêl* Niph'al infinitives and the *lēšēb* Qal infinitives of *pê-yôd* and *pê-nûn* verbs. In all three cases, the infinitives are analogically based on the imperfects and it is in MH where they regularly occur³⁶.

4) These *laqṭîl*, *liqqāṭêl*, and *lēšēb* infinitives are characteristic of ancient spoken Hebrew. Written Hebrew, as represented by both BH and QH,

³⁵ The *liqqāṭêl* infinitives for the Niph'al are also employed by spoken Israeli Hebrew, though the written dialect continues to use *lihiqqāṭêl* forms. Again, I am sure that this is not based on MH, but is rather a development solely within modern Hebrew. The *lēšēb* forms, however, are not used in spoken Hebrew today; instead, *lāšebet* is used throughout modern Hebrew.

³⁶ Throughout this article, I have quoted only grammars of MH and have not referred to MSS of the Tannaitic works. How accurately Segal's and other grammars reflect these MSS vis-à-vis these infinitives is not easily determined. I have done a cursory survey of some Mishnaic MSS and have determined that the Qal infinitives of *pê-yôd* and *pê-nûn* verbs are always of the *lēšēb* type and that Niph'al infinitives are almost always *liqqāṭêl*. The evidence for the Hiph'il infinitives is less conclusive, but *laqṭîl* forms are common. (In all three instances, I naturally refer only to original Tannaitic material. When Scripture is quoted in these works, the standard BH forms are used). I posed this question to Professor Zeev Ben-Hayyim, head of the Academy of the Hebrew Language in Jerusalem, who is currently supervising the massive dictionary now being prepared by his organization. In a letter of 18 April 1980, he kindly wrote (in Hebrew): "In the project of the historical dictionary there is a complete concordance of all the Hebrew forms after the completion of the Bible until the end of the Tannaitic period, and it is founded on excellent manuscripts. A single copy rests in the project library. From it one could check all of the infinitival forms that are listed (and thus all other grammatical forms), but a search such as this would take considerable time." On the entire problem, see the comments by J. C. Greenfield, "The Small Caves of Qumran", *JAOS* 89 (1969) 136-138. One way to check the true nature of the infinitives under discussion is to refer to the Naḥal Hever and Wadi Murabba'at texts, but these forms are wanting in the limited corpus.

regularly uses the standard *l'haqṭil*, *l'hiqqāṭēl*, and *lāsebet* forms. On occasion, however, the colloquial forms infiltrated the literary dialect and thus they occur sporadically in BH and QH³⁷.

Dept. of Religious Studies
Canisius College
Buffalo, N.Y. 14208

³⁷ The Peshar Habakkuk uses the spoken forms throughout, viz., *lšhyt* in 4:13, *lhryb* in 6:8, *lwsyp* in 8:12, *lqym* in 10:10, *lwgy'* in 10:11, and *lkšyl* in 11:8 (all *laqṭil* infinitives). There are no Niph'al infinitives in the commentary, but see *lnšl* in 9:13 for MT *l'hinnāṣēl* in Hab 2:9. Qal infinitives of *pē-yōd* and *pē-nūn* verbs are not attested. Obviously, the author/scribe of this scroll used these forms much more than the authors/scribes of the other scrolls. This may be explained as an influence of spoken Hebrew on his composition, although the remainder of the scroll, like all of QH, is solidly literary Hebrew. Regardless, since I have demonstrated that these spoken forms are as ancient as the written forms, we may dismiss the statement by W. H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (Philadelphia 1959) 98, that "The contracted form in DSH [=QH] is late, and is therefore inferior to the archaic form of MT". Cf. also O. H. Lehmann, "Materials Concerning the Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls: I: Habakkuk", *PEQ* 83 (1951) 50.