

Dear reader

This is an author produced version of an article published in *Journal of Northwest Semitic languages*. This article has been peer-reviewed and copy-edited but does not include the final publisher's layout including the journal pagination.

Citation for the published article:

Rechenmacher, Hans

l' and 'yn in nominal clauses

*Journal of Northwest Semitic languages*, 2003, Vol. 29: 67-85

Access to the published version may require subscription.

Published with permission from: Department of Ancient Studies at University of Stellenbosch

Thank you for supporting Green Open Access.

Your IxTheo team

*Hans Rechenmacher (University of Stellenbosch)*

## לֹא AND אֵין IN NOMINAL CLAUSES

### ABSTRACT

*lō(ʾ) and ʿēn both operate as negators in Biblical Hebrew nominal clauses. Their distribution has not been thoroughly investigated yet. In this article the author shows that the question of when lō(ʾ) and when ʿēn are used can be answered by differentiating the nominal clause types according to the morphological quality of the predicate and the determination degree of the subject.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The question of when *lō(ʾ)* and *ʿēn* operate as negators in Biblical Hebrew is usually answered as: *ʿēn* in sentence-negation and *lō(ʾ)* in special-negation, i.e. when negating a constituent or a word.<sup>1</sup>

Jacobs (1982:39-46) has used German<sup>2</sup> as an example to show that this traditional distinction is neither definitive, nor adequate in describing different sentences containing elements of negation. He distinguishes two types of negation: contrasting versus non-contrasting negation.

The sets of clauses with CN (Contrasting Negation) *versus* NCN (Non-Contrasting Negation) coincide extensively with the sets of the traditional

---

<sup>1</sup> Like Swiggers (1991:175), who differentiated between “full negation” and “restricted negation”. Cf. in this sense König III, §352m: A “Nominalprädicat” is seldom negated by *lō(ʾ)*, especially if the predicate only, and not the entire assertion, is negated. He lists more than twenty references, and immediately adds several contradictory examples, among them Job 28,14. Gesenius §152a talks of a certain emphasis in *lō(ʾ)*: the weight of the negation falls rather on a particular word, than on the entire sentence. Meyer §90,1 states: *lō(ʾ)* negates a single word, in contrast to *ʿēn*. According to Joüon §160b-c negation occurs by means of *lō(ʾ)* only if a certain emphasis is supplied, or if the negation refers to a word separate from the predicate. Brockelman §32 dispenses entirely with an explanation and only establishes that *ʿēn* appears more frequently in a nominal sentence than *lō(ʾ)*.

<sup>2</sup> His investigation has however a general linguistic character. The opposition contrasting *versus* non-contrasting negation is valid for all natural languages.

sentence negation *versus* special negation, but are not simply identical<sup>3</sup>.

The most important distinction between CN and NCN lies in the area of truth-functionality. Only NCN negates the truth-functional, i.e. only in the case of NCN does the falseness of the negating sentence follow out of the truth of the positive sentence, and *vice versa*.

- (a) *Max ist begabt* (Max is talented)  
 (b) *Max ist nicht begabt* = CN (Max is not talented)  
 (c) *Nicht MAX<sup>4</sup> ist begabt* = NCN (It is not Max who is talented)

If (a) is true, then (b) is false and *vice versa*. Things are a little different with (c). If (a) is true, then indeed it follows that (c) is false. However, the reverse does not apply, since from the fact that (a) is false, it does not follow that someone other than Max is smoking, which follows from (c) under normal circumstances.

CN can be detected by means of a test: In CN either a “but”-phrase or something equivalent, which can easily be transferred to a “but”-phrase, follows, or, where it is lacking, it is experienced as lacking, e.g. “It is not Max that is talented, but Peter” In contrast to this, in NCN an added “but”-phrase is unnecessary or disturbing.

With this clearly defined opposition CN *versus* NCN instead of varying vague traditional terms we shall now examine the distribution of *lō(?)* and *'ēn* as negators in Biblical Hebrew nominal clauses differentiated according to certain patterns.

The bipolar nominal clauses are classified according to the morphological structure of the predicate as shown in the following overview, which includes figures for the frequency of the representative types:<sup>5</sup>

Nominal clause I.1 predicate: determinate nominal phrase	2287
Nominal clause I.2 predicate: indeterminate nominal phrase	2015

<sup>3</sup> As for the relative small corpus of Biblical Hebrew nominal clauses they do coincide, as far as I observe. Regardless to that, the insufficient traditional terminology should be dismissed.

<sup>4</sup> Capital letters indicate intonatory prominence.

<sup>5</sup> Foundation is the electronic data bases of Wolfgang Richter in Munich. Nominal clauses I-IV (by *HYY* expanded nominal clauses and references from Sirach not counted) run to 15062. The transcription and sentence marking also derives from the Munich Data Bank, cf. further Richter (1991-1993).

Nominal clause II	predicate: prepositional phrase	5114
Nominal clause III	predicate: adjective	1461
Nominal clause IV	predicate: participle	4185

These morphological patterns correspond to semantic predicate types:

- I.1 Identification
- I.2 Classification
- II Relation (Localization, ascription<sup>6</sup> etc. according to the particular preposition)
- III Qualification
- IV Nominalization

## 2. NOMINAL CLAUSE I.1: IDENTIFICATION

References with *'ēn* are completely non-existent! Negation happens regardless of whether it is CN or NCN with *lō(')*. The concordance for the negative clauses of this type<sup>7</sup> is given below:

Gen 20,12b	<i>'ak lō(')</i> <i>bi[t]t 'imm=ī</i> (subject from 12a: <i>hi(w')</i> )
1Kgs 22,33b	<i>kī lō(')</i> <i>malk YŠR'L hū(')</i>
2Kgs 6,19b	<i>lō(')</i> <i>zā ha=dark</i>
2Kgs 6,19c	<i>w=lō(')</i> <i>zō(h) ha=īr</i>
Isa 55,8a	<i>kī lō(')</i> <i>maḥšābōt-ay=[y] maḥšābōt-ē=kim</i>
Isa 55,8b	<i>w=lō(')</i> <i>darākē=kim darak-ay=[y]</i>
Jer 2,11b	<i>w=him<sup>a</sup>(h) lō(')</i> <i>'ilō*him</i>
Ezek 21,31d	<i>zō(')t lō(')</i> <i>zō(')t</i>
Hos 1,9c	<i>kī 'attim lō(')</i> <i>'amm=ī</i>
Hos 2,1d	<i>lō(')</i> <i>'amm=ī 'attim</i>
Hos 2,4c	<i>kī hi(')</i> <i>lō(')</i> <i>'iš=ī</i>
Hos 2,4d	<i>w='anō*kī lō(')</i> <i>'iš-a=h</i>

In Gen 20,12b and 1Kgs 22,33b we have CN: *bi[t]t 'imm=ī* contrasts with *bi[t]t 'abi=[y]* in 12a and *malk YŠR'L* with *YHWŠPT*. Evidence of CN is missing in the remaining clauses. Tests with hypothetical “but”-phrases are failing. An instructive example for obvious NCN is Isa 55,8a: “For my thoughts are not your thoughts, but ...”. The intended statement is that the contents of [my thoughts] and [your thoughts] are not identical. There is no additional positive predication intended (for example, my thoughts are not your thoughts, **but the thoughts of my servant**). We see

<sup>6</sup> Ascription is the term that Jenni (2000:54) introduces to describe the semantic relation expressed by traditionally so called *Lamed possessivum*. A simple possessive relation, however, needs no preposition at all. It can be expressed simply by means of a construct relation. “Mit Lamed wird dagegen die Beziehung zwischen den beiden Größen nicht nur komplexiv vorausgesetzt, sondern präzisierend festgestellt und assertiert” (With Lamed however the relation between the two entities ist not only complexiv presupposed, but in a predicative way stated and asserted).

<sup>7</sup> All lists in this contribution are complete, unless otherwise indicated. The relevant concordance can be found in Rechenmacher (1997:27-80).

clearly from Isa 55,8a that *lō(ʾ)* in this type of clause really negates the clause and not a part of it. The proposition is without any doubt non-identity of [my thoughts] and [your thoughts], and not the identity of [my thoughts] and [not your thoughts].

### 3. NOMINAL CLAUSE 1.2: CLASSIFICATION

For this type we can also state that negation is operated through *lō(ʾ)* regardless of the question whether there is CN or NCN. The complete list of references follows:

Gen 42,34c	<i>kī lō(ʾ) m-raggiīm ʾattim</i>
Ex 4,10b	<i>lō(ʾ) ʾiš dābarīm ʾanō*kī gam mit=tīmōl gam miš=šilš-um</i>
Num 23,19a	<i>lō(ʾ) ʾiš ʾil (b) w.=y-kazzib</i>
Num 23,19c	<i>w.=bin ʾadam (d) w.=yitnah[h]im</i>
Deut 20,20b	<i>kī lō(ʾ) ʾiš maʾkal hū(ʾ)</i>
Deut 32,47a	<i>kī lō(ʾ) dabar rē*q hū(ʾ) mik=kim</i>
1Sam 15,29c	<i>kī lō(ʾ) ʾadam hū(ʾ) (cI) ʾ=hinnaḥim</i>
2Sam 18,20b	<i>lō(ʾ) ʾiš bišō*rā ʾattā ha=yōm ha=zā</i>
1Kgs 20,28g	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾilō*hē ʾimaqīm hū(ʾ)</i>
2Kgs 19,18b	<i>kī lō(ʾ) ʾilō*hīm him<sup>a</sup>(h)</i>
Isa 22,2a	<i>ḥālal-ay=k lō(ʾ) ḥālālē ḥarb</i>
Isa 22,2b	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) mē*tē milḥamā (subject from 2a ḥālal-ay=k)</i>
Isa 27,11b	<i>kī lō(ʾ) ʾam[m] bīnōt hū(ʾ)</i>
Isa 31,3b	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾil (subject from 3a MŠR-aym)</i>
Isa 31,3d	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) rūḥ (subject from 3c sūsē=him)</i>
Isa 37,19b	<i>kī lō(ʾ) ʾilō*hīm him<sup>a</sup>(h)</i>
Jer 2,11b	<i>w.=him<sup>a</sup>(h) lō(ʾ) ʾilō*hīm</i>
Jer 16,20b	<i>w.=him<sup>a</sup>(h) lō(ʾ) ʾilō*hīm</i>
Jer 23,23b	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾilō*hē mi[n]=raḥuq (subject from 23a ʾanī)</i>
Jer 51,5a	<i>kī lō(ʾ) ʾalman YŠRʾL w.=YHWDH mi[n]=ʾilō*h-a(y)=w mi[n]=YHWH šāba ʾōt</i>
Ezek 28,2h	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾil (subject from 2g ʾattā)</i>
Ezek 28,9d	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾil b.=yad m-ḥal[li]lē=ka (subject from 9c ʾattā)</i>
Hos 8,6c	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾilō*hīm hū(ʾ)</i>
Hos 11,9d	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾiš (subject from 9c ʾanō*kī)</i>
Am 5,18d	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾōr (subject from 18c hū(ʾ))</i>
Am 5,20b	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾōr (subject from 20c yōm YHWH)</i>
Am 7,14c	<i>lō(ʾ) nabī(ʾ) ʾanō*kī</i>
Am 7,14d	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) bin nabī(ʾ) ʾanō*kī</i>
Zech 13,5b	<i>lō(ʾ) nabī(ʾ) ʾanō*kī</i>
Ps 5,5a	<i>kī lō(ʾ) ʾil ḥapiš raš<sup>c</sup> ʾattā</i>
Ps 22,7b	<i>w.=lō(ʾ) ʾiš (subject from 7a ʾanō*kī)</i>
Job 36,4a	<i>kī ʾumn-am lō(ʾ) šaqr mill-ay=[y]</i>

Many of the references show CN. The contrasting element is found in the affiliated affirming clause, partially within an expanded sentence<sup>8</sup> with an elliptic subject. Hos 11,9c-d provides an example:

<sup>8</sup> An expanded sentence (“Erweiterter Satz”) is according to Irsigler (1993:84-96) a cluster of two clauses, one of them lacking subject or predicate (to be inferred from the affiliated complete one).

(c) *kī 'il 'anō\*ki* (d) *w=Iō(?) 'iš*

For clauses of this type CN is obvious<sup>9</sup>. Ex 4,10b serves as an example for NCN. A “but”-phrase as continuation would be experienced as disturbing. *'iš dābarīm* is certainly not to be contrasted. The intended proposition is not: “I do not belong to the X-class, but to the Y-class”. Only the non-belonging to the X-class is intended to be expressed, nothing more. *'ēn* occurs only exceptionally and in special cases as a negator in classifying nominal clauses, namely in elliptic complex sentences of exclusion and in the formation *'ēn dē*.<sup>10</sup> These clauses realize the NCN-type.

Thus, for the classifying as well as the identifying nominal clause *Iō(?)* is the regular negator regardless of CN/NCN.

#### 4. NOMINAL CLAUSE II: RELATION

Nominal clauses with a prepositional phrase as predicate occur very frequently. They represent approximately one third of all the nominal clauses. A first sub-classification results from the opposition “determinate versus indeterminate” regarding the subject.

##### 5.1. Determinate Subject

Gen 31,2b	(a ... <i>pānē LBN</i> ) <i>w=hinni(h) 'ēn-an=[h]u(w) 'imm=ō k=tīmōl šilš-u(w)m</i>
Gen 31,5c	(b ... <i>pānē 'abi=kin[n]</i> ) <i>kī 'ēn-an=[h]u(w) 'il-ay=[y] k=tīmō*l šilš-um</i>
Gen 37,29b	<i>w=hinni(h) 'ēn YWSP b=[h]a=bōl'jr</i>
Gen 44,26f	(fP <i>w='aḥī=nū ha=qatun</i> ) <i>'ēn-an=[h]u(w) 'itt-a=nū</i>
Gen 44,30b	(bP <i>w=ha=na r</i> ) <i>'ēn-an=[h]u(w) 'itt-a=nū</i>
Gen 44,34b	(bP <i>w=ha=na r</i> ) <i>'ēn-an=[h]u(w) 'itt=ī</i>
Ex 22,13d	<i>bá'al-a(y)=w 'ēn 'imm=ō</i>
Num 14,42b	<i>kī 'ēn YHWH b=qārb=kim</i>
Deut 1,42e	<i>kī 'ēn-an=nī b=qārb=kim</i>
Deut 28,32d	<i>w='ēn l='ē*I yad-i=ka</i> (subject: content 28,32a-c)
Deut 29,14b	<i>w='it[t] 'āšr 'ēn-an=[h]u(w) pō(h) 'imm-a=nū ha=yōm</i>
Deut 31,17g	<i>hā=Iō(?) 'al kī 'ēn 'ilō*h-ay=[y] b=qārb=ī</i>
Jdg 13,9d	<i>w=MNWH 'iš-a=h 'ēn 'imm-a=h</i>

<sup>9</sup> References with obvious or highly probable occurrence of CN are the following: Gen 42,34c; Deut 32,47a; 2Kgs 19,18b; Jes 22,2a.b; 31,3d; 37,19b; Jer 2,11b; 23,23b; Ezek 28,2h; 28,9d; Hos 8,6c; 11,9d; Am 5,20b; 7,14c.d; Zech 13,5b; Ps 5,5a.

<sup>10</sup> Complex sentences of exclusion are Gen 28,17d *'ēn zā* (e) *kī 'im bēt 'ilō\*hīm*; Jdg 7,14c *'ēn zō(?)t* (d) *biltī 'im ḥarb GD'WN bin YW'S 'iš YSR'L*; Neh 2,2d *'ēn zā* (e) *kī 'im ru'['] lib[b]*; the *'ēn*-clauses could also be analysed as unipolar. For the formation *'ēn dē* only the following double-reference is found: Jes 40,16a *w=LBNWN 'ēn dē* (aI) *ba'[']jir* (b) *w=ḥayyat=ō 'ēn dē 'ōlā*.

Jdg 16,15d	<i>w=libb=ka 'ēn 'itt=ī</i>
2Sam 3,22c	(cP <i>w='BNR</i> ) <i>'ēn-an=[h]u(w)</i> 'im[m] DWD <i>b=HBRWN</i>
Isa 34,12a	(aP <i>hur[r]ē=ha</i> ) <i>w='ēn šam[m]</i>
Jer 5,13b	<i>w=ha=dibbir 'ēn ba=him</i>
Jer 8,19b	<i>ha=YHWH 'ēn b=ŠYWN</i>
Jer 8,19c	<i>'im malk-a=h 'ēn b-a=h</i>
Jer 15,1c	<i>'ēn napš=ī 'il ha='am[m] ha=zā</i>
Jer 22,17a	<i>kī 'ēn 'ēnē=ka w=libb=ka (b) kī 'im 'al bāš 'i=ka ...</i>
Jer 38,9d	<i>kī 'ēn ha=lahm 'ōd b=[h]a=īr</i>
Jer 48,2a	<i>'ēn 'ōd tāhillat MW'B</i>
Ps 6,6a	<i>kī 'ēn b=[h]a=mawt zikr-i=ka</i>
Ps 38,11c	(cP <i>w='ōr 'ēn-ay=[y]</i> ) <i>gam him 'ēn 'itt=ī</i>
Ps 73,5a	<i>b='āmal 'ūnōš 'ēn-i=mō</i>
Job 6,13a	<i>ha='im 'ēn 'izrat=ī b=ī</i>
Job 28,14d	<i>'ēn 'immad=ī</i> (subject from 14b <i>hī(?)</i> )
Job 41,25a	<i>'ēn 'al 'apar mušl=ō</i>
Prov 5,17b	(16b <i>b=[h]a=rūhō*bōt palāgē maym</i> ) <i>w='ēn l=zārīm 'itt-a=k</i>
Prov 7,19a	<i>kī 'ēn ha='iš b=bēt=ō</i>
Neh 5,5e	<i>w='ēn l='ē*I yad-i=nū</i> (subject: content 5,5d)
2Chr 25,7c	<i>kī 'ēn YHWH 'im[m] YŠR'L kul[l] bānē 'PRYM</i>

For none of these clauses a correction-sentence is found, nor any hint of contrast. This type of nominal clause with *'ēn* consistently has NCN.

Let us now have a view on the clauses with *lō(?)*:

Ex 1,19b	<i>kī lō(?) k=[h]a=našīm ha=MŠR-ī*y*ō*t ha='BR-ī*y*ō*t</i>
Ex 16,8d	<i>lō(?) 'al-ē=nū tālū*n*ō*t-ē=kim</i>
Deut 30,12a	<i>lō(?) b=[h]a=šamaym hī(w')</i>
Deut 30,13a	<i>w=lō(?) mi[n]= 'ibr l=[h]a=yam[m] hī(w')</i>
Deut 32,31a	<i>kī lō(?) k=šūr-i=nū šūr-a=m</i>
2Sam 21,2c	<i>lō(?) mib=bānē YŠR'L him<sup>a</sup>(h)</i>
1Kgs 19,11g	<i>lō(?) b=[h]a=rūh YHWH</i>
1Kgs 19,11i	<i>lō(?) b=[h]a=ra 'š YHWH</i>
1Kgs 19,12b	<i>lō(?) b=[h]a='iš YHWH</i>
Isa 30,5b	<i>lō(?) l='izr</i> (subject from 5a 'am[m])
Isa 30,5c	<i>w=lō(?) (cI) l=hō 'īl</i> (subject from 5a 'am[m])
Jer 5,10e	<i>kī lō(w') l=YHWH him<sup>a</sup>(h)</i>
Jer 10,16a	<i>lō(?) k='il<sup>a</sup> hīlq Y'QB</i>
Jer 10,23b	<i>kī lō(?) l=[h]a='adam dark=ō lō(?) l='iš hō*lik</i> (bI) <i>w=hakīn 'at ša'd=ō</i>
Jer 51,19a	<i>lō(?) k='il<sup>a</sup> hīlq Y'QWB</i>
Hab 1,6bIR	(bI <i>la=rašt miškanōt</i> ) <i>lō(?) l=ō</i>
Zech 8,11a	<i>w='itt-a(h) lō(?) k=[h]a=yamīm ha=rī(')šō*nīm 'anī l=š(')ērīt ha='am[m] ha=zā</i>
Job 15,9d	<i>w=lō(?) 'imm-a=nū hū(?)</i>
Job 21,16a	<i>hin[n] lō(?) b=yad-a=m tūb-a=m</i>
Job 28,14b	<i>lō(?) b=ī hī(?)</i>
Prov 26,17aR	(a <i>maḥzīq b='uznē kalb 'ō*bir mit 'abbir 'al rīb</i> ) <i>lō(?) l=ō</i>
Koh 9,11c	<i>kī lō(?) l=[h]a=qallīm ha=mirōš</i>
Koh 9,11d	<i>w=lō(?) l=[h]a=gibbōrīm ha=miḥamā</i>
Est 4,16h	<i>'āšr lō(?) k=[h]a=dāt</i> (subject: content 16g)
Esr 10,13d	<i>w=ha=mālā(')kā lō(?) l=yōm 'āh<sup>a</sup>d</i>
Esr 10,13e	<i>w=lō(?) l=šīnaym</i> (subject from: 13d <i>ha=mālā(')kā</i> )
1Chr 21,17g	<i>w=b='amm=ka lō(?) l=maggipā</i> (subject from 17f)
1Chr 29,1d	<i>kī lō(?) l='adam ha=bīrā</i>
2Chr 20,15f	<i>kī lō(?) la=kim ha=miḥamā</i>

*lō(ʿ)* occurs immediately before the predicate, i.e. before the preposition. In contrast to the clauses with *ʿēn* we find no references with negator immediately before the subject. This position-boundness indicates that the following preposition phrase (or a part of it) is the focus of the negation.

Correction-sentences verify that:

Ex 16,8d	<i>lō(ʿ)</i> <i>ʿal-ē=nū tálū*n<sup>⊕</sup>ō*t-ē=kim</i>	(e) <i>kī ʿal YHWH</i>
2Sam 21,2c	<i>lō(ʿ)</i> <i>mib=bānē YŠRʿL him<sup>⊕</sup>a(h)</i>	(d) <i>kī ʿim miy=yatr ha=ʿMR-ī</i>
2Chr 20,15f	<i>kī lō(ʿ)</i> <i>la=kim ha=milhamā</i>	(g) <i>kī l=ʿilō*hīm</i>

The contrastive character can be proved in many other cases<sup>11</sup>. However, Job 28:14 and some other passages<sup>12</sup> provide difficulty:

14a <i>tihōm ʿamar</i>	14b <i>lō(ʿ)</i> <i>b=ī hī(ʿ)</i>
14c <i>w=yam[m] ʿamar</i>	14d <i>ʿēn ʿimmad=ī</i>

*lō(ʿ)* seems to be employed here instead of *ʿēn* only for stylistic reasons (variation).<sup>13</sup> Notwithstanding these NCN-examples with *lō(ʿ)* we can resume for nominal clause II with determinate subject that the regular negator for NCN is *ʿēn*, and for CN *lō(ʿ)*.

## 5.2. Indeterminate Subject

The *ʿēn* negated clauses of this type cannot be displayed here in a complete list due to limited space. The following table gives one example of each semantic subclass and notes the number of relative references<sup>14</sup>:

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Deut 30,14a with Deut 30,12a.13a. Further: Deut 32,32a-33b with 31a; Jer 5,11a with 10e (//51,19a); Jer 10,16b-c with 16a; Zech 8,12a-e with 11a; Koh 9,11h with 11c-d.

<sup>12</sup> Jer 10,23b does not contrast explicitly with a specific sentence, but the addressee implicitly completes the proposition “Not man [is disposing] his way” with something like “but you Lord alone!”. It is difficult to assume a contrastive meaning in Hab 1,6bIR and Prov 26,17aR, as well for Est 4,16. Job 15,9d and 21,16a can hardly be understood contrastively.

<sup>13</sup> König III,§352n cites this passage: The change between *lō(ʿ)* and *ʿēn* shows that *lō(ʿ)* can occur also in NS without the constituent following *lō(ʿ)* necessarily bearing "die Wucht des Accentus". Joüon §160c emphasizes the stylistic motive of avoiding double *ʿēn*.

<sup>14</sup> As sentence concordance the lists are displayed in Rechenmacher (1997:40f.46f.51.52.54). In detail the references are: [ascribing]: Gen 11,30b; 47,4c; Ex 22,1d; Lev 11,10aPR1; 22,13b; 25,31aR; Num 5,8a; 27,4b.8c.9a.10a.11a.17aR; 35,27c; Deut 12,12b; 14,10aR.27b.29b; 19,6f; 22,26b; 25,5c; Josh 18,7a; 22,25b.27c; Jdg 6,5c; 7,12b; 11,34d; 18,7g.28c; 1Sam 1,2e; 14,6e; 18,25c; 2Sam 12,3a; 18,18d.22g; 19,7b; 20,1e; 21,4b.4c; 1Kgs 22,17bR; 2Kgs 4,2f.14d; Jes 1,30bR; 2,7b.7d; 8,20aR; 9,6b; 27,4a; 40,28g; 45,9e; 48,22a; 50,10d; 55,1c; 57,21a; Jer



[ascribing]	Gen 11,30b	'ēn l-a=h walad	117
[localising]	Gen 37,24d	'ēn b=ō maym	96
[associating]	Gen 31,50c	'ēn 'iš 'imm-a=nū	12
[comparing]	Ex 8,6f	kī 'ēn k.=YHWH 'ilō*hē=nū	16
[excluding]	Deut 4,35c	(b hū(?) ha='ilō*hīm) 'ēn 'ōd mi[l]=l=badd=ō	23

The manifold problems of classification behind the construction of this table and its figures will not be discussed here<sup>15</sup>.

An important observation concerns the ellipse of the subject. In this regard the examples given in the table above are characteristic in as far as the subject is expressed with [ascribing], [localizing] and [associating], in contrast to [comparing] and [excluding], where it is lacking.

Two kinds of

---

8,17aR; 12,12c 14,19d; 26,16b; 30,13b; 39,10aR; 46,11d.23d; 49,1c.1d; Ezek38,11e; 42,6b; Hos 8,7cR; 10,3b; Joel 1,18c; Am 3,4b.5b; Nah 2,10c; 3,3f.19a; Zech 8,10c; Mal 1,10d; Ps 3,3b; 34,10b; 55,20d; 73,4a; 119,165b; 145,3c; 146,3aR; 147,5c; Job 20,21a; 22,5b; 26,6b; 31,19b; Prov 6,7; 25,28aR; 30,27a; Hl 8,8b; Koh 1,11a; 2,16a; 4,1d.1f.8c.8d.16a; 9,5d.6b; 10,11b; 12,1d; Lam 1,2c.9d.17b.21c; Est 2,7c; Neh 2,14b.20f; 1Chr 4,27b; 22,14b.16a; 2Chr 12,3a; 15,5a; 18,16bR; 35,3c; [localizing]: Gen 19,31c; 20,11c; 37,24d; 39,11c; 47,13a; Ex 12,30cR; 14,11b; Lev 13,21b.26b.31c; Num 5,13e; 19,2cR1.15aPR; Deut 32,28b; Jdg 14,3b.6c; 17,6a; 18,1a.10cR; 19,1b; 21,9b.25a; 1Sam 17,50d; 21,5c.10e; 24,12f; 30,4c; 1Kgs 3,18d; 5,20f; 8,9a; 22,1b.7b.48a; 2Kgs 1,3e.6h.16d; 3,11b; 5,15f; 7,5c.10e; Jes 1,6a; 3,7c.7d; 43,12d; 50,2f; 59,8b; Jer 8,13c.22a.22b.28bR; 38,6d; 48,38c; 49,7c; Ezek37,8e; Hos 4,1c.1d.1e; 8,8bR; Ob 1,7e; Mich 4,9b; Hab 2,19g; 3,17b.17f; Hag 2,17b; Zech 9,11aR; Ps 5,10a; 32,2aR2; 36,2b; 38,4a.4b.8b.15aR2; 135,17c; 139,4a; 144,14d; Job 18,19c; 21,33c; 24,7b; 32,5b; Prov 21,30a.30b.30c; Hl 4,7b; Koh 1,9g; 2,11d.24a; 3,12b; 5,3c.13c; 8,8b.8c; 9,10b; Dan 1,4vR1; 2Chr 5,10a; 18,6b; 20,12b; [associating]: Gen 31,50c; Deut 32,12b.39c; 1Sam 21,2e; Jes 63,3b; Jer 10,5g; Job 12,3c; Neh 2,12d; 2Chr 14,5c.10c; 19,7d; 20,6e; [comparing]: Ex 8,6f; 9,14c; Deut 33,26; 1Sam 2,2c; 10,24d; 21,10g; 2Sam 7,22b; 1Kgs 8,23b; Jer 10,6a.7c; Ps 86,8a.8b; Job 1,8c; 2,3c; 1Chr 17,20a; 2Chr 6,14b; [excluding]: Deut 4,35c.39d; 1Sam 2,2b; 2Sam 7,22c; 1Kgs 8,60b; 2Kgs 4,6e; Jes 23,10b; 43,11b; 44,6d.8g; 45,5b.5c.6d.14i.18j.21g.22d; 46,9c; Joel 2,27d; Ps 74,9b; 104,35b; Rut 4,4i; 1Chr 17,20b.

<sup>15</sup> For instance the question, if a sentence like Gen 37,24d is at all to be analyzed as bipolar and not as unipolar. For such questions cf. Rechenmacher (1997) 43f.

ellipse must be distinguished: in Deut 4,35c the subject of 35b (*'ilō\*ḥīm*) is operating for b and c, i.e. the ellipse is contextually solvable. This is not so in Ex 8,6f. No contextual unit can solve the ellipse here. For this kind of ellipse I use Richter's (1980, 23) term *Nullwert*. Out of the 16 references for [comparing] only three show expressed subject, out of the 23 references for [excluding] only ten. With [ascribing], [localizing] and [associating], subject-*Nullwerte* are rare exceptions<sup>16</sup>.

All the references allow the following judgement regarding the type of negation to be made: neither correction-sentences nor other contextual indicators are pointing to CN. We can therefore resume that for this type *'ēn* functions as regular negator for NCN.

Now we look at the corresponding references with *lō(')*, firstly those where the negation immediate precedes the predicate:

Ps 74,9c	(b <i>'ēn 'ōd nabī(')</i> ) <i>w.=lō(')</i> <i>'itt-a=nū yō*di'</i>
Prov 27,24a	<i>kī lō(')</i> <i>l.= 'ōlam ḥusn</i>
Koh 9,11e	<i>w.=gam lō(')</i> <i>l.= [h]a=ḥākamīm laḥm</i>
Koh 9,11f	<i>w.=gam lō(')</i> <i>l.= [h]a=nábō*nīm 'ušr</i>
Koh 9,11g	<i>w.=gam lō(')</i> <i>l.= [h]a=yō*di'īm ḥin[n]</i>
2Chr 30,26b	<i>kī mi[y]=yāmē ŠLMH bin DWYD malk YŠR'L lō(')</i> <i>ka=zō(')</i> <i>t b.=YRWŠLM</i>

It is remarkable that, besides the small number of overall references, [comparing] and [excluding] are completely absent. *Nullwert* for the subject we find only in 2Chr 30,26 (special case of formation with comparative adnominal), but this passage is text-critically problematic<sup>17</sup>. Again, Ps 74,9b.c can be seen as stylistic motivated variation (*'ēn* changes with *lō(')*). In Koh 9,11e-g (cf. 11h) we clearly have CN, and in Prov 27,24a CN is at least probable<sup>18</sup>. *lō(')* precedes the subject in the following instances:

Num 23,23a	<i>kī lō(')</i> <i>naḥš b.=Y'QB</i>
Num 23,23b	<i>w.=lō(')</i> <i>qasm b.=YŠR'L</i>
Deut 32,20fR	<i>lō(')</i> <i>'imū*n b-a=m</i>
2Sam 20,1f	<i>w.=lō(')</i> <i>nīḥlā la=nū b.=bin YŠY</i>
1Kgs 12,16e	<i>w.=lō(')</i> <i>nīḥlā b.=bin YŠY</i>
1Kgs 22,17d	<i>lō(')</i> <i>'ādō*nīm la='il'ā</i>
Isa 53,2c	<i>lō(')</i> <i>tu'r l=ō</i>
Isa 53,2d	<i>w.=lō(')</i> <i>hadar</i> (predicate from 2c)
Isa 53,2f	<i>w.=lō(')</i> <i>mar'ā</i> (predicate from 2c)

<sup>16</sup> *Nullwert* in only 6 of 225 references: Ex 22,2d; Dan 9,26b; 2Chr 5,10a; Job 12,3c; 2Chr 14,10c; 20,6c.

<sup>17</sup> Both the translations and some manuscripts insinuate *lō(')* *hayātā* as the correct reading, cf. BHS.

<sup>18</sup> A hypothetical phrase with the content “but only for a limited time” can be added meaningfully.

Isa 53,9d	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>mirmā b.=pī=w</i>
Jer 2,19f	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>paḥdat=ī 'il-ay=k</i>
Jer 10,14d	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>rūḥ b-a=m</i>
Jer 49,31c	$l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>dālataym w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'}) b.rīḥ l=ō</i>
Jer 51,17d	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>rūḥ b-a=m</i>
Am 5,20d	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>nugh l=ō</i>
Psa 22,3d	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>du(w)m(i)y<sup>⊕</sup>ā l=ī</i>
Psa 139,16d	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>'āḥ<sup>⊕</sup>ad ba=him</i> (Qere: $w.=l=ō$ )
Job 9,32a	$kī$ $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>'iš ka-mō*=nī</i> (aR) <i>'i'n-an=[h]u(w)</i>
Job 18,17b	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>šim l=ō</i> <i>'al pānē ḥūṣ</i>
Job 18,19a	$l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>nīm l=ō</i>
Job 18,19b	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>nakd b.=amm=ō</i>
Job 21,9b	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>šibt 'ilōḥ 'āl-ē=him</i>
Job 29,12b	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>'ō*zir l=ō</i>
Job 30,13c	$l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>'ō*zir la=mō</i>
Job 33,9d	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>'awō*n l=ī</i>
Job 36,26c	(cP <i>mispar šan-a(y)=w</i> ) $w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>ḥiqr</i>
Job 38,26vIR1	$l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>'iš</i> (predicate from IR2)
Job 38,26vIR2	$l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>'adam b=ō</i>
Prov 30,2b	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>bīnat 'adam l=ī</i>
2Chr 10,16d	$w.=l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>nīhlā b.=bin YŠY</i>
2Chr 18,16d	$l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ <i>'ādō*nīm la='il<sup>⊕</sup>ā</i>

Evidence for CN can not be found in any of the above listed cases<sup>19</sup>. Not only that correction-sentences are lacking, a hypothetical “but”-phrase is throughout experienced as disturbing. For instance, in 2Sam 20,1f “and (we have) no portion in the son of Jesse” we cannot presume *nīhlā* as being the focus of negation (??“but we have XY in him”). The traditional grammars, noting “emphasis” in these cases, are in this regard on the right track<sup>20</sup>.

Remarkable is the first position<sup>21</sup> of the formation  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$  + substantive, which cannot be found among the corresponding references with *'ēn*. The accent lies not on the nominal phrase following  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ , but on the entire formation<sup>22</sup>. In other words, the negation type involved is NCN.

<sup>19</sup> This is even true for the clauses in Isa 53,2, which in some sense contrast to 53,3, yet not with regard to the negated constituent, but with regard to the entire proposition. Thus,  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$  *tu'r l=ō* as expression for unsightliness is corresponding with *'iš mak'ō\*bōt* as expression for painfulness. Similarly, Am 5,20d, where the advancing 20a.b seems to insinuate a contrast, cannot be interpreted as contrastive, because 20c  $w.=apil$  (subject 20a: *yōm YHWH*) is contrasting only as proposition and not as constituent with the following 20d.

<sup>20</sup> The term is problematic for several reasons, cf. Van der Merwe (1990) 46f. I use the term here to avoid confusion with *focus of negation*.

<sup>21</sup> Save, of course, for the conjunctions  $w.=$  and  $kī$ .

<sup>22</sup> Form and function of these sentences remind of the wellknown feature of “general negation” within Arabic syntax, expressed by  $lā$  + substantive, where

Whether  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$  is chosen as negator only for reasons of emphasis is difficult to say. Stylistic motives also could play a part, for example:

2Sam 20,1e 'ēn la=nū ḥilq b.=DWD 1f w.=lō(⌘) niḥlā la=nū b.=bin YŠY  
 Job 18,19a lō(⌘) nīn l=ō(b) w.=lō(⌘) nakd b.=‘amm=ō 19c w.=‘ēn šarīd b.=māgūr-a(y)=w

In both cases we have variation between 'ēn and  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ . Furthermore, the phonetic sequence <lō-X-lō> seems to motivate the choice of the negator<sup>23</sup>.

We resume for nominal clause II that 'ēn is the regular negator for NCN. The occurrences of  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$  can be explained only partially with CN. Emphasis and stylistic reasons seem also to play a part. For the distribution of 'ēn versus  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$  the lack of  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ -references with *Nullwert* for the subject, especially for [comparing] and [excluding], is characteristic. The opposition 'ēn as non-existence particle (derived from **substantive**) versus  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$  as primary **particle** of negation forms the background for this phenomenon.

## 6. NOMINAL CLAUSE III: QUALIFICATION

For this type with adjective as predicate we also subclassify according to the degree of determination of the subject.

### 6.1. Determinate Subject

Gen 7,8aR1 (8a: ... min ha=bāhimā) 'āšr 'ēn-an=[h]a(h) tāhurā

---

the substantive stands in the accusative, singular (without article and nunation):  $l\bar{a}$  šā'ira miṭlu=hu “No poet is like him”;  $l\bar{a}$  darra darru=k “No reward be your reward” (examples from Fischer §367; Reckendorf §125). However, it should be kept in mind that in Hebrew there are examples with dual/plural-substantive after  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ , though rare: 1Kgs 22,17d par. 2Chr 18,6d; Jer 49,31c. Therefore, the features of Arabic general negation and the above-discussed Hebrew formation cannot be equated. It is to be noted that also in nominal clause II with 'ēn, dual/plural-substantives serve as subject (against Hartmann (1961) 229 Anm. 2: “Im AT gibt es keine Beispiele für Plural”): [ascribing]: Ex 22,1d; Num 27,10a; 1Sam 1,2e; 2Sam 19,7b; Jes 45,9e; 49,1c; Ezek 42,6b; Ps 55,20d; 73,4a; Hl 8,8b; 1Chr 4,27b [localizing]: Ex 14,11b; Jer 8,13c.

<sup>23</sup> Variation 'ēn /  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$ : 2Sam 20,1f; 1Kgs 22,17d; Job 18,19a-b; 2Chr 18,16d; phonetic sequence <lō-X-lō>: Jes 53,2c; Jer 49,31c; Am 5,20d; Job 18,17b; 18,19a; 29,12b. For Isa 53,2c it is striking that also the preceding verbal clause 9c shows “irregular” negation: in 'al  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$  ḥamas 'asā the position of the negation can neither be explained with the close relation between  $l\bar{o}(\text{'})$  and ḥamas (“for he has non-violence done”) nor with CN.

Gen 30,33cPR	(33cP: <i>kul[ʔ]</i> ) 'ášr 'ēn-an=[h]u(w) <i>naqud</i> <i>w=ʔalū(ʔ) b=[h]a=ʔizzīm w=ħūm b=[h]a=kásabīm</i>
Gen 39,9a	'ēn-an=[h]u(w) <i>gadu(w)l b=[h]a=bayt ha=zā mim-min<sup>o</sup>=ī</i>
Lev 13,4b	<i>w=ʔamuq 'ēn mar'-i=ha min ha=ʔōr</i>
Lev 13,21c	<i>w=šāpalā 'ēn-an=[h]a(h) min ha=ʔōr</i>
Lev 13,26c	<i>w=šāpalā 'ēn-an=[h]a(h) min ha=ʔōr</i>
Lev 13,31b	<i>w=ħinni(h) 'ēn mar'-i=hu(w) 'amuq min ha=ʔōr</i>
Lev 13,32d	<i>w=mar'ē(h) ha=natq 'amuq min ha=ʔōr</i>
Lev 13,34c	<i>w=mar'-i=hu(w) 'ēn-an=[h]u(w) 'amuq min ha=ʔōr</i>
1Kgs 21,15g	<i>kī 'ēn NBWT ḥay[ʔ]</i>
2Kgs 17,34b	'ēn-a=m <i>yāri'īm 'at YHWH</i>
Mal 1,8b	(8a: <i>w=kī taggī*šū-n 'iwwir (8a) l=zbuḥ) 'ēn ra[ʔ]</i>
Mal 1,8d	(8c: <i>w=kī taggīšū pišsiḥ w=ħō*lā) ra[ʔ]</i>
Koh 1,7b	(7bP: <i>w=ha=yam[m] 'ēn-an=[h]u(w) malē(ʔ)</i>
Koh 6,2b	<i>w='ēn-an=[h]u(w) ḥasir l=napš=ō mik=kul[ʔ]</i>
Koh 8,13bR	(13a: ... <i>l=[h]a=rašā(ʔ) 'ášr 'ēn-an=[h]u(w) yarē(ʔ) mil=l=panē 'ilō*ħīm</i>

All above listed instances are NCN. In Gen 7,8aRI the relative clause is substituting a determinate, negative adjective<sup>24</sup>. Both Mal references have the preceding clauses as subject. The references 1Kgs 21,15g; 2Kgs 17,34b; Koh 1,7b; 6,2b; 8,13bR have as predicates what W. Richter calls *Verbaladjektiv*. This type of adjective is built from *verba essendi* (traditional: intransitive verbs but not those of location or motion), verbs of affect, verbs of lack or fullness a.o. Functionally, the *Verbaladjektiv* therefore tends towards the participle. The respective clauses can subsequently be understood similarly to nominal clause IV, i.e. as nominalizing.<sup>25</sup>

The survey has shown that 'ēn as negator occurs frequently in nominal clause III with determinate subject. However, the references are at least partially functionally not pertinent (nominalization instead of qualification) or structurally special (substitute for *ha* + negation + adjective; clause as subject).

The *lō(ʔ)*-references are as follows:

Gen 7,2bR	'ášr <i>lō(ʔ) ṭáhurā hī(w')</i>
Gen 15,16b	<i>kī lō(ʔ) šalim 'áwō*n ha='MR-ī 'ad hinn-a-h</i>
Ex 18,17b	<i>lō(ʔ) ṭōb ha=dabar</i>
Deut 22,2a	<i>w='im lō(ʔ) qaru(w)b 'aḥī=ka 'il-ē=ka</i>

<sup>24</sup> In Hebrew a phrase like “the unclean beast” cannot be composed. There are no formations of the kind: *ha* + negation + adjective, i.e. the opposition in Gen 7,8a *min ha=bāhimā ha=ṭáhu(w)rā w=min ha=bāhimā* (aR1) 'ášr 'ēn-an=[h]a(h) *ṭáhurā* can be understood as “substitute” for *min ha=bāhimā ha=ṭáhu(w)rā w=min ha=bāhimā ha* + Negation + *ṭáhurā*, that cannot be composed in Hebrew.

<sup>25</sup> For the part of speech “Verbaladjektiv” cf. Richter (1978:174).

Deut 30,11a	<i>lō(?) niplē(?)t hī(w') mim-m[īk]=ka</i>
Deut 30,11b	<i>w.=lō(?) rāḥuqā hī(w')</i>
1Sam 2,24b	<i>kī lō(w') ṭōbā ha=šāmū*‘ā</i>
1Sam 20,26e	(26d <i>biltī ṭahu(w)r hū(?)</i> ) <i>kī lō(?) ṭahu(w)r</i>
1Sam 29,6g	<i>w.=b.=‘ēnē ha=sāranīm lō(?) ṭōb ‘attā</i>
1Kgs 7,31e	(31d <i>w.=misg.rō*t-ē=him m-rubba ‘ōt</i> ) <i>lō(?) ‘āgul<sup>⊕</sup>ōt</i>
1Kgs 19,4h	<i>kī lō(?) ṭōb ‘anō*kī mi[n]=‘ābō*t-ay=[y]</i>
Isa 65,2bR	(2b <i>ha=hō*likīm ha=dark</i> ) <i>lō(?) ṭōb</i>
Jer 4,22d	(c <i>banīm sākalīm him<sup>⊕</sup>a(h)</i> ) <i>w.=lō(?) nābōnīm him<sup>⊕</sup>a(h)</i>
Ezek 4,14b	<i>hinni(h) napš=ī lō(?) m-ṭumma ‘ā</i>
Ezek 18,18c	<i>w.=‘āšr lō(?) ṭōb</i> (18d <i>‘asā b.=tōk ‘amm-a(y)=w</i> )
Ps 78,37a	<i>w.=libb-a=m lō(?) nakōn ‘imm=ō</i>
Neh 5,9b	<i>lō(?) ṭōb ha=dabar</i>

Only for a very small part of the references we can assume CN. There is no case of correction-sentence.<sup>26</sup> Thus we cannot explain the use of *lō(?)* as contingent on CN. Another possible explanation would be: *lō(?)* + adjective is such a close morphosyntactical unit that *lō(?)* is part of the predicate. From adjective phrases like *bin lō(?) ḥakam* (Hos 13,13b)<sup>27</sup> we indeed see that *lō(?)* + adjective sometimes operates as a morphosyntactical unit. On the other hand we have already found that this unit does not have the quality of lexical structures such as the English adjective “unclean” (cf. footnote 25). The article cannot be added (there is no *ha* + negation + adjective).<sup>28</sup>

After all, especially considering that *lō(?)* was found to be also the regular negation independent of the question CN/NCN in nominal clause I, we can assume the same for nominal clause III with determinate subject.

## 6.2. Indeterminate Subject

First the list with *‘ēn*-references:

Gen 41,39b	<i>‘ēn nabōn w.=ḥakam ka-mō=ka</i>
1Sam 2,2a	<i>‘ēn qadu(w)š k.=YHWH</i>
1Sam 9,2e	<i>w.=‘ēn ‘iš mib=bānē YŠR’L ṭōb mim-min=[h]u(w)</i>
1Kgs 15,22b	<i>‘ēn naqī</i>
Isa 5,27a	<i>‘ēn ‘ayip</i> (predicate from 27b: <i>b=ō</i> )

<sup>26</sup> A contrast is constituted by *m-rubba ‘ōt* in 1Kgs 7,31d to 31e, further by *banīm sākalīm* in Jer 4,22c to 22d. In a broader sense (no contact position!) Deut 30,14a *kī qaru(w)b ‘il-ē=ka ha=dabar m(?)ōd* constitutes a contrast to 11a.b. Whether there is a contrast between Gen 7,2a and 2bR as Joüon §160b claims, is doubted. He states that Gen 7,2bR shows a certain emphasis in relation to 7,8aR1. 8aR1 (*‘ēn*-negated) would only list, however, in 7,2bR (*lō(?)*-negated) there would be a contrast, namely by the instruction to take seven *versus* two pairs.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. also *dark lō(?) ṭōb* (Ps 36,5b); *gōy lō(?) ḥasīd* (Ps 43,1b); *dark lō(?) ṭōb* (Prov 16,29b); *‘am[m] lō(?) ‘az[z]* (Prov 30,25a); *‘am[m] lō(?) ‘ašūm* (Prov 30,26a). Further cf. formations like (*kul[l] lō(?) ṭahu(w)r*) in 2Chr 30,17c.

<sup>28</sup> Note also that lexematic units like “unclean” can be negated again, cf. “The place is not unclean” *versus* ?? “The place is not not clean”.

Prov 8,8b	'ēn ba=him niptal w·= 'iqqiš
Hl 4,2b	w·=šakkū*lā 'ēn ba=him
Hl 6,6b	w·=šakkū*lā 'ēn ba=him
Koh 1,9g	w·='ēn kul[l] ḥadaš taḥt ha=šamš
Koh 2,24a	'ēn tōb b·=[h]a='adam (b) ša=yō(?)kil ...
Koh 3,12b	kī 'ēn tōb b-a=m (c) kī 'im (c11) l·=šmu(w)ḥ ...
Koh 7,20a	kī (aP) 'adam (a) 'ēn šaddīq b·=[h]a='arš
Koh 8,8a	'ēn 'adam šallīḥ b·=[h]a=rūḥ (a1) l·=klō(w') 'at ha=rūḥ

The analysis of the clauses (except 1Sam 9,2e) proceeds analogue to the elliptic clauses with 'ēn + participle (cf. later). The subject has *Nullwert*. These elliptic clauses can be replaced equivalently by clauses with an indefinite pronoun, for instance 'ēn naqī with 'ēn iš naqī. Koh 1,9g can function as an example for a complete sentence with an indefinite pronoun: 'ēn kul[l] ḥadaš could be replaced with 'ēn ḥadaš.

An indefinite pronoun as subject can be found in 1Sam 9,2e and Koh 1,9g. Although 'adam in Koh 7,20a and 8,8a is not an indefinite pronoun, it nevertheless serves a similar function. Only in the book of Proverbs<sup>29</sup>, we have references for nominal clause III with lō(?) and indeterminate subject. All are formed according to the following pattern: indeterminate nominal phrase + lō(?) + tōb.

Prov 17,7a	lō(?) nā(?)wā l·=nabal šapat yatr
Prov 19,2a	gam b·=lō(?) dī't napš lō(?) tōb
Prov 20,23b	w·=mō(?)z-nē mirmā lō(?) tōb
Prov 25,27a	'akō*1 dībš harbōt lō(?) tōb
Prov 28,21a	hakkir panīm lō(?) tōb

We find indications of CN neither for the clauses with 'ēn, nor for those with lō(?). Nevertheless the semantic difference is obvious: only the lō(?) negated clauses have a qualifying function, while those with 'ēn have as primary intention to express non-existence. Syntactically this is reflected by the fact that 'ēn-negated clauses have indefinite pronouns as subjects, respectively *Nullwert*.

## 7. NOMINAL CLAUSE IV: NOMINALIZATION

Nominal clause IV with a participle functioning as predicate plays a unique role among the nominal clauses. From a morphological point of view the nominal clause IV differs from the nominal clause III only as far

<sup>29</sup> Job 41,2a should at least be mentioned: Job 41,2a lō(?) 'akzar (b) kī yā'ūr-an=[h]u(w) (c) w·=mī hū(?) (cR) l·=pan-ay=[y] yityaššab. If 2a is to be understood "Nobody is (so) cruel, that he arouses him..." then it would indeed violate the rule that clauses with *Nullwert*, respectively indefinite pronouns as subject, are exclusively negated by 'ēn.

as the opposition adjective *versus* participle is concerned. Regarding the position of the constituents and the negation, nominal clause III and nominal clause IV are formed identically. In cases where the part of speech is doubtful (for instance passive participle > adjective) the transitions are fluid.

However, the function of nominal clause IV tends to that of the verbal clause: it partakes in the syntactic-semantic functions of the verb base<sup>30</sup> and can therefore be spoken of as a nominalized VS.

### 7.1. Determinate Subject

Gen 20,7e	<i>w:=’im ’ēn=ka mišīb</i>
Gen 39,23a	<i>’ēn šar[r] bēt ha=suhr rō*’ā ’at kul[l] m(á’)ū-mah b:=yad=ō</i>
Gen 43,5a	<i>w:=’im ’ēn=ka m-šallih</i>
Ex 3,2d	<i>(dP w:=ha=sánā) ’ēn-an=[h]u(w) ’uk<sup>⊕</sup>al</i>
Ex 5,10d	<i>’ēn-an=nī nō*’tin la=kim tabn etc.</i>

Altogether 66 references with *’ēn* must be recorded here.<sup>31</sup> Noteworthy is the nearly exclusive sequence of subject – predicate (with the exception of Koh 8,11a; 9,1c), as well as the high number (52) of pronominal subject affixed to *’ēn* respectively *’ēn-an*.<sup>32</sup>

*lō(’)*-negated clauses of this type are relatively rare. This is even more surprising, as one should expect that *lō(’)* as classical verb clause negator plays a special part in the field of nominal clause IV.

Num 35,23d	<i>w:=hū(’) lō(’) ’ōyib l=ō</i>
Num 35,23e	<i>w:=lō(’) m-baqqiš ra [’]at=ō</i>
Deut 4,42a	<i>w:=hū(’) lō(’) šō*nē(’) l=ō mit=tīmōl šilš-u(w)m</i>
Deut 19,4d	<i>w:=hū(’) lō(’) šō*nē(’) l=ō mit=tīmō*l šilš-um</i>
Deut 19,6g	<i>kī lō(’) šō*nē(’) hū(’) l=ō mit=tīmōl šilš-u(w)m</i>
Jos 20,5d	<i>w:=lō(’) šō*nē(’) hū(’) l=ō mit=tīmōl šilš-u(w)m</i>
2Sam 3,34a	<i>yad-i=ka lō(’) ’āsū*rōt</i>
Isa 33,1b	<i>w:=’attā lō(’) šadūd</i>

<sup>30</sup> Richter (1980) 86.

<sup>31</sup> Gen 20,7e; 39,23a; 43,5a; Ex 3,2d; 5,10d; 8,17a; 33,15b; Lev 11,4c.26b.26c; 14,21b; Deut 1,32; 4,12c.22b; 21,18b.20d; Jdg 3,25b; 12,3b; 1Sam 11,7dPe; 19,11c; 2Sam 19,8e; 1Kgs 21,5d; 12,8c; 17,26e.34c; Jes 1,15c; 7,16d.17a; Jer 11,14c; 14,12b.12d; 32,33c; 37,14c; 38,4d; 44,16a; Ezek3,7b; 8,12e; 9,9g; 20,39d; 33,32c; Mal 2,2g.9b; Ps 33,16a; Koh 4,17d; 5,11c; 8,7a.11a.16c; 9,1c.2d.5c; 16d; 11,5a.6c; Est 2,20a; 3,5b.8d.8e; 5,13a; 7,4d; Esr 3,13a; Neh 2,2c; 4,17aP.17a; 13,24b; 2Chr 18,7d.

<sup>32</sup> Only Neh 4,17a has an independent personal pronoun. The formation *’ēn* + independent personal pronoun obviously belongs to a later level of language. We can find it in Mishnaic and Qumranic literature; cf. Segal 138 and Carmignac (1974b) 410f. The latter cites two passages from the Damascus Scroll: V,6-7 (17) *’yn hm mbdyl* und XIII,3 *’yn hw’ bhwn*.



Ezek 22,24bR1	<i>lō(ʻ) m-tuh[h]arā hī(ʻ)</i>
Zef 3,5d	(c <i>b=[h]a=buqr b=[h]a=buqr mišpaṭ=ō yittin</i> ) <i>l=[h]a=ʻōr lō(ʻ) niʻdar</i>
Zech 14,18b	(a <i>w=ʻim mišpaḥt MŠR-aym lō(ʻ) tiʻlā</i> ) <i>w=lō(ʻ) bāʻā</i>
Ps 38,15a	<i>wa=ʻihy k=ʻiš (aR1) ʻāšr lō(ʻ) šō*miʻ (aR2) w=ʻēn b=pī=w tōkaḥōt</i>
Job 12,3b	<i>lō(ʻ) nō*pil ʻanō*kī mik=kim</i>
Job 13,2b	<i>lō(ʻ) nō*pil ʻanō*kī mik=kim</i>
Job 36,16bR	(a <i>w=ʻa[p]p hisīt=ka mip=pī šar[r]</i> ) (b <i>raḥb</i> ) <i>lō(ʻ) mūšaq taḥtē=ha</i>

The pronominal subject is predominating also in these clauses. The (independent) pronoun stands in front of or after the predicate. A contextually solvable ellipse of the subject is found in Num 35,23e (pronoun 23d), Zef 3,5d (*mišpaṭ=ō* 5c), Zech 14,18b (*mišpaḥt MŠR-aym* 18a), Job 36,16bR (pronoun 16a).

All the references represent NCN. *lō(ʻ)* is regularly positioned in front of the predicative participle. The semantic quality of the used participles is noteworthy: passive participles and participles of verbs of affect, which both tend towards the adjective, form the majority of the references.

### 7.2. Indeterminate Subject

The following list shows only those references with expressed subject. Those with *Nullwert* for the subject are far more.<sup>33</sup>

Ex 5,11d	<i>kī ʻēn nigraʻ mi[n]=ʻibō*dat=kim dabar</i>
Ex 5,16a	<i>tabn ʻēn nittan l=ʻabadē=ka</i>
Jdg 19,15d	<i>w=ʻēn ʻiš m.ʻassip ʻōt-a=m ha=bayt-a-h (dl) la=lūn</i>
Jdg 19,18f	<i>w=ʻēn ʻiš m.ʻassip ʻōt=ī ha=bayt-a-h</i>
1Sam 3,1c	<i>ʻēn ḥazōn nīpraš</i>
1Kgs 6,18c	<i>ʻēn ʻabn nīrʻā</i>
Isa 57,1b	<i>w=ʻēn ʻiš sām ʻal lib[b]</i>
Jer 4,29e	<i>w=ʻēn yōšib ba=hin[n] ʻiš</i>
Jer 8,6d	<i>ʻēn ʻiš ni[h]ḥam ʻal ra ʻ[ʻ]at=ō (dl) lē=(ʻ)mur</i>
Jer 12,11c	<i>kī ʻēn ʻiš sām ʻal lib[b]</i>

<sup>33</sup> Altogether 125, namely Gen 40,8c; 41,8f.15c.24c; Ex 22,9e; Lev 26,6c.17e.36e; Deut 22,27c; 28,26b.29e.31f.68d; 32,39h; Josh 6,1c.1d; Jdg 18,7d.28a; 19,28d; 1Sam 11,3d; 14,26c.39d; 22,8b.8c; 26,12c.12d.12e; 2Sam 14,6c; 15,3e; 22,42b; 1Kgs 18,26f.29d; 2Kgs 9,10b; 14,26d; Jes 1,31d; 5,27b.29f; 13,14b; 14,31e; 17,2c; 22,22c.22e; 34,10d; 41,26f.26g.26h.28d; 42,22e.22g; 43,13b; 47,10c.15d; 50,2d; 51,18a.18b; 59,4a.4b.16d; 60,15b; 63,5b.5d; 64,6a; 66,4d; Jer 4,4e; 7,33b; 9,21d; 10,20e; 13,19b; 14,16b; 16,19e; 21,12f; 30,10h.13a.17e; 44,2d; 46,27h; 49,5c; 50,32c; Ezek 7,14c; 34,6c.6d.28d; 39,26b; Hos 5,14f; 7,7d; Am 5,2d.6e; Mich 4,4b; 5,7e; Nah 2,9f.12d; 3,18c.13f; Ps 7,3c; 14,1g; 18,42b; 19,7c; 22,12c; 50,22c; 53,2e; 71,11d; 72,12b; 79,3b; 105,37b; 107,12c; 142,5c.5e; 144,14c; Job 2,13b; 5,4c; 10,7b; 11,3c.19b. 32,12b; Prov 1,24d; 28,1b; Lam 1,7b; 4,4c; 5,8b; Est 1,8b; Dan 8,4c.5c.27f; 11,16b.45c.

Dan 10,21b  $w\cdot = 'ēn \ 'āḥ^{⊕}ad \ mīḥazzīq \ 'imm=ī \ 'al \ 'il^{⊕}ā$   
 Neh 7,4d  $w\cdot = 'ēn \ bāt^{⊕}īm \ bānūyī^{*}m$   
 2Chr 9,20c  $'ēn \ kasp \ niḥšab \ b\cdot = yāmē \ ŠLMH \ l\cdot = m(\acute{a}')ū\text{-}mah$

The seven cases with indefinite pronoun (*dabar*,  $'īš$ ) as subject should be noted especially. Against the background of such complete structures we can understand the by far more frequent elliptic structures, as illustrated in the following example pair:

elliptic:  $'ēn + \text{participle} + (\dots)$

$w\cdot = 'ēn \ m\cdot \ 'assip$  (Jer 9,21d)

complete:  $'ēn + \text{indefinite pronoun} + \text{participle} + (\dots)$

$w\cdot = 'ēn \ 'īš \ m\cdot \ 'assip \dots$  (Jdg 19,18f)

As for the other nominal clause types, in which the subject is realized by an indeterminate nominal phrase, the negation of the whole proposition implies a non-existence-statement: “It is not true: Somebody collects...” implies “There is nobody, who collects...”.

The type of negation is throughout NCN.

$lō(?)$ -negated nominal clause IV with indeterminate subject is very rare.

1Kgs 10,21d (c  $'ēn \ kasp) \ lō(?) \ niḥšab \ b\cdot = yāmē \ ŠLMH \ l\cdot = m(\acute{a}')ū\text{-}mah$   
 Zef 3,5e  $w\cdot = lō(?) \ yōdi \ 'awwāl \ bušt$   
 Job 31,31c (b  $mī \ yittin) \ mib = bāsār = ō \ lō(?) \ nišba \ '$

The first and the third references show N-stem-participle, so that according to the consonant text alone, it could also be a suffix conjugation form. Furthermore, the syntax of both references is quite problematic. In Zef 3,5e  $'awwāl$  operates as subject. There is no indication for CN.

## 8. SUMMARY

The traditional answer to the question of when  $lō(?)$  and  $'ēn$  operate as negators in Biblical Hebrew, namely  $'ēn$  in sentence-negation and  $lō(?)$  in special-negation, i.e. when negating a constituent or a word, is insufficient. First of all the deficient terms sentence-negation and special-negation are to be replaced by non-contrasting negation (NCN) and contrasting negation (CN). After that it can be shown that the distribution of  $lō(?)$  and  $'ēn$  can not be adequately described without differentiating the nominal clause types according to the morphological quality of the predicate and the determination degree of the subject.

Nominal clause I.1 (predicate: determinate nominal phrase): There are no references with  $'ēn$ , but exclusively with  $lō(?)$ , i.e. nominal clause I.1 is independent of the negation-type negated by  $lō(?)$ .

Nominal clause I.2 (predicate: indeterminate nominal phrase): Also here *lō(ʿ)* seems to be the regular negator. *ʿēn* is only found in rare special references (complex sentences of exclusion, construct relation *dē* X).

Nominal clause II (predicate: prepositional phrase): *ʿēn* is the regular negator in NCN, both with indeterminate and determinate subject. *lō(ʿ)* is the regular negator in CN. We also find *lō(ʿ)* in NCN. In this regard, two aspects are important: stylistic variation (parallelism: *lō(ʿ)* versus *ʿēn*) and emphasis. In certain semantic classes as [comparing] and [excluding] the frequent ellipse of the subject (*Nullwert*) is noteworthy. In these cases only *ʿēn* occurs. This is certainly a characteristic phenomenon: *ʿēn* as non-existence particle (derived from substantive) versus *lō(ʿ)* as primary particle negation.

Nominal clause III (predicate: adjective): *lō(ʿ)* is the negator in the rare cases of CN. For NCN in clauses with determinate subject, *lō(ʿ)* serves as regular negator, although *ʿēn* is also to be found. In nominal clause III with indeterminate subject *ʿēn* is the regular negator. Frequently we find an elliptic subject (*Nullwert*) or indefinite pronoun, so that a non-existence proposition is implied. In these cases *lō(ʿ)* cannot be used as negator.

Nominal clause IV (predicate: participle): The regular negator of nominal clause IV is *ʿēn*. *lō(ʿ)* occurs nearly exclusively with participles that functionally tend towards the adjective (N-stem, verbs of affect). If the subject is an indeterminate nominal phrase, a non-existence proposition is implied (cf. also nominal clause II and nominal clause III). Frequently we find ellipse for the subject.

Thus the final conclusion is, whereas *ʿēn* operates in a nominal clause exclusively in non-contrasting negation, *lō(ʿ)* can operate in both types of negation: non-contrasting negation (NCN) as well as contrasting negation (CN). In the latter case *lō(ʿ)* immediately precedes the unit that is the focus of negation and that is eventually contrasted by the following correction-sentence.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brockelmann, C 1956. *Hebräische Syntax*, Neukirchen: Augustin.  
 Carmignac, J 1974. L'emploi de la négation *ʿyn* dans la Bible et à Qumran: *Revue de Qumran* 8, 407-413.  
 Fischer, W 1987. *Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz  
 Gesenius, W & Kautzsch, E 1896. *Hebräische Grammatik*, Leipzig: Vogel

- Hartmann, B 1961. "Es gibt keinen Gott außer Jahwe". Zur generellen Verneinung im Hebräischen: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 110, 229-235.
- Irsigler, H 1993. Großsatzformen im Althebräischen und die syntaktische Struktur der Inschrift des Königs Mescha von Moab, in: Irsigler, H (ed), *Syntax und Text. Beiträge zur 22. internationalen ökumenischen Hebräisch-Dozenten-Konferenz 1993 in Bamberg*, St. Ottilien: EOS, 81-121.
- Jacobs, J 1982. *Syntax und Semantik der Negation im Deutschen*, München: Fink.
- Jenni, E 2000. *Die hebräischen Präpositionen*. Band 3: Die Präposition Lamed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Joüon, P 1965. *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique*, Rom: Institut Biblique Pontifical.
- König, F E 1897. *Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, Leipzig: Hinrich.
- Meyer, R 1972. *Hebräische Grammatik*, Berlin: DeGruyter.
- Rechenmacher, H 1997. "Außer mir gibt es keinen Gott!" *Eine sprach- und literaturwissenschaftliche Studie zur Ausschließlichkeitsformel*, St. Ottilien: EOS.
- Reckendorf, H 1967. *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse im Arabischen*, Leiden: Brill.
- Richter, W 1978. *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik, Band I: Das Wort*, St. Ottilien: EOS.
- Richter, W 1980. *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik, Band III: Der Satz*, St. Ottilien: EOS.
- Richter, W 1991-1992. *Biblia Hebraica transcripta, BH<sup>f</sup>*, St. Ottilien: EOS.
- Segal, M H 1927. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Swiggers, P 1991. Nominal Sentence Negation in Biblical Hebrew: The Grammatical Status of 'yn, in: Jongeling, K (ed) *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax presented to Prof. J. Hoftijzer*, Leiden: Brill.
- Van der Merwe, C H J 1990. *The Old Hebrew particle gam. A syntactic-semantic description of gam in Gn-2Kg*, St. Ottilien: EOS.