

upon the tyranny of the old church we may hear the voice of the mighty German manhood that has spoken, as we have said, from the days of Hermann to those of Luther, and kindled such love in Rothe's own parents for old Fritz and the great fight against the old Latin oppressors which is now seen to be the peculiar mark of modern history. In Rothe, scion as he was of the reign of Frederick the Great, German thought, perhaps unconsciously, communed at Rome with the mind of Seneca and Marcus Aurelius, the Caesars of the North held counsel with the Caesars of the capitol and the forum, and all the while the Eternal Spirit was calling them to Christ and the church in a way that eye hath not seen, but the new ages may show forth.

ARTICLE V.

THE USE OF לֹא WITH NEGATIVE PARTICLES.¹

BY REV. C. M. MEAD, PROFESSOR AT ANDOVER.

THE following is an attempt to ascertain the Hebrew *usus loquendi* in the matter of universal and partial negations. The subject is but lightly touched upon in the Hebrew grammars. E.g. Bush simply says, "The particles לֹא and אֵין (אֵין), *not*, when used with לֹא *all* denote a universal negation." Similarly, Kalisch, "In connection with לֹא the particle of negation has the meaning of *none, nothing*." Gesenius says, "In connection with לֹא, when the latter is not followed by the article and therefore means *any one, anything*, it [לֹא] expresses the Latin *nullus, none*. . . . But the case is different when לֹא is made definite, where it means *all, the whole*." Ewald

¹ The author was led to undertake this investigation by his studies in connection with the Revision of the Authorized Version of the Bible. It was begun in the assurance that little labor would be required in order to settle a question which as yet seems not to have been carefully examined. It must be frankly confessed that, while the labor has been immensely greater than was anticipated, the result is less satisfactory than was confidently hoped. But it is, to say the least, some satisfaction to have learned, in an effort to discover a law, that there is no law to be discovered.

says, "When לֹא in a negative clause has the meaning *omnis*, the two words present the notion of *nullus* But when לֹא signifies *totus*, this notion alone is denied." From Gesenius's statement one would gather the impression that, whenever in a negative clause לֹא has the article or is construed with a definite noun, the negation is partial. Ewald's statement, though similar, is more guarded, for he says that לֹא has sometimes the meaning of *omnis* even before a definite noun. How far either of these statements needs to be modified will appear after the passages in which לֹא is used with negatives have been collated and examined. Noldius, who is perhaps the only one who has heretofore undertaken to collect the passages in which this construction occurs, adduces only ninety-three. He gives no systematic analysis of them, however, merely dividing them into two classes, according as the negative precedes or follows לֹא, and specifying three passages as instances of partial negation. But of these, two (Deut. xviii. 1 and 1 Sam. xiv. 24) are as clear instances of universal negation as any others. It is hoped that the following list is nearly, if not quite, complete. In regard to the classification adopted, it may be said that it was assumed that, if there is any law according to which a negation can be determined to be partial or universal, it would be discovered by observing what position לֹא occupies in the sentence, and whether it is made definite by the article or by being joined with a definite noun. A different classification might perhaps have been better; but the analysis is so thorough that no different result could have been attained by any change in the method.

The translations of the Hebrew passages referred to are in general taken from the Authorized Version, but are often modified for accuracy's sake, or in order better to illustrate the special point under consideration. The figures in parenthesis are from the A. V.

לֹא WITH אֵל.

A. Propositions in which לֹא occurs in the subject.

I. As the subject of the verb.

1. In construct state with a definite noun or pronoun.

a. Preceding the verb. E.g. Num. xiv. 23, וְלֹא יִרְאוּ אֶת אֲשֶׁר יִרְאוּ
 "Neither shall any of them that provoked me see it." Here the negation is clearly universal. So also in Lev. ii. 11; Num. xxx. 6 (5); xxx. 13 (12); Deut. xvii. 13; Jer. ii. 24; Ezek. xviii. 22, 24; xxiii. 48; xxxiii. 13, 16; Ps. xxv. 3; Prov. ii. 19; iii. 15;

Dan. iv. 15 (18); 2 Chron. xxxv. 18. Here belongs, perhaps, also Hos. xii. 9 (8), a passage in which לֹא with אֵל certainly denotes a universal negation, though some, with A. V., take קְלִיגֵינִי as adverbial. There remains only 1 Chron. iv. 27, וְכָל מִשְׁפְּחֹתָם לֹא הִרְבּוּ, עַד־בְּנֵי יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ "Neither did all their family multiply like to the children of Judah." The statement has reference to the tribe of Simeon. The preceding part of the verse reads: "And Shimei had sixteen sons and six daughters; but his brethren [i.e. the rest of the Simeonites] had not many children." The meaning evidently is: The tribe of Simeon, as a whole, multiplied slowly, as compared with Judah. The language can hardly be pressed to mean that none of the Simeonites, besides Shimei, had large families. Yet, on the other hand, the negation cannot be called a partial one in the proper sense; i.e. we cannot understand the sentence to mean: Not all, though very many, of their family multiplied like the children of Judah.

b. Following the verb. E.g. 1 Sam. xiv. 24, וְלֹא טָעַם קָל־הָעָם לֶחֶם, "And none of the people tasted food." The negation is strictly universal. So in Deut. v. 14; 1 Sam. v. 5; 2 Sam. xix. 29 (28); Jer. xxxvi. 24; xliii. 4; Ps. xiv. 4; xxxiv. 23 (22); Prov. vi. 29; Lam. iv. 12. There is no doubt in any of these cases as to the universality of the negation; but, perhaps, Ps. xiv. 4 might be adduced under 2 (b) below, inasmuch as קְלִי־מַעֲלֵי אָדָם has no article. Yet I take the true meaning to be, "all of the workers of iniquity," the omission of the article being common in poetry. The same remark applies to Lam. iv. 12.—Gen. ix. 11 also belongs here, for קָל־בְּשָׂר, though without the article, yet being a collective noun, is virtually definite, like the English phrase "all flesh." But does לֹא־יִקָּרַח קָל־בְּשָׂר עוֹד mean, "No flesh shall be again cut off"? Hardly; but still less admissible is it to translate, "Not all flesh shall be cut off." Reference is made to the foregoing *universal* deluge, and it is declared that there shall not be another. Whether there will be a partial deluge is left undetermined. The case is similar to 1 Chron. iv. 27 above mentioned, under (a), and those to be mentioned under B. I. 2. b. and c.

2. In construct state with an indefinite noun.

a. Preceding the verb. E.g. Ex. xii. 48, יִכְלִי־עָרֵל לֹא־יֵאָכֵל בּוֹ, "And no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof." Universal negation. So in Ex. xii. 16, 43; Lev. vi. 23; xvi. 17; xvii. 12; xxii. 10, 13, 21; xxvii. 28, 29; 2 Sam. xviii. 13; 1 Kings vi. 7; Isa.

liv. 17; lix. 8; Ezek. xxviii. 3; xxxi. 8; xliv. 9; Prov. viii. 11; xx. 1; Dan. ii. 10, 35; iv. 6 (9); vi. 5 (4), 16 (15), 24 (23); viii. 4.

b. Following the verb. E.g. Ex. x. 15, וְלֹא-נִשְׁתָּרְפוּ קְלֵי-יָרֶקֶת, "And there remained not any green thing." Universal negation. So in Deut. xxix. 22 (23); Josh. xi. 11; 2 Kings xii. 14 (13); Jer. xxxii. 17; li. 43; Ezek. xii. 24; xxxi. 14 (*bis*); xliv. 21; Ps. lxxvi. 6 (5); cxv. 17; cxliii. 2; Prov. xii. 21; Dan. xii. 10; 2 Chron. xxxii. 15.

3. Qualified by a relative clause.

a. Preceding the verb. E.g. 2 Kings x. 19, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר-יִחְסַד לֹא יִחְיֶה, "Whosoever shall be wanting, he shall not live." Universal negation. So also Lev. xxi. 18, 21. In these two passages, however, we have the combination כֹּל-אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר; but the sense is the same.

b. Following the verb. E.g. Gen. xi. 6, לֹא-יִגְבָּר מִתְּהָם כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יִחְמוּ, לַעֲשׂוֹת "Nothing will be restrained from them which they have imagined to do." Universal negation. So Lev. xiv. 36.

II. Joined with a preposition, and qualifying the subject of the proposition. There are only two examples: 2 Chron. xxiii. 19, וְלֹא-יִבְרֵא טָמֵא לְכַלֵּי-דָבָר "And no one that is unclean in anything shall enter in." Universal negation. So Ex. ix. 4.

B. Propositions in which לֹא occurs in the predicate.

I. As the direct object of the verb.

1. Not construed with a noun or relative clause.

a. Without the article, and following the verb. The only example is Deut. viii. 9, לֹא-יִחְסַר לְךָ מִלֵּךְ "Thou shalt not lack anything in it." Universal negation.

b. With the article, and following the verb. Only in Ps. xlix. 18 (17), כִּי לֹא בְמֹתוֹ יִקַּח חֵסֶל, "For in his death he shall take none of it." Universal negation. The force of the article is not given in the A. V. rendering, "He shall carry nothing away." Reference is made to the wealth spoken of in the preceding verse, and the statement is that it is true of *the whole* of it that its possessor at death shall not take it with him.

2. In construct state with a definite noun or pronoun.

a. Preceding the verb. E.g. Job xxxiii. 13, לֹא יִתְּנֶה לְדַבְּרָיו "He giveth not account of any of his matters." Universal negation. So Ex. xv. 26; Deut. vii. 15; Josh. v. 5; xi. 13; Ezek. xviii. 11; Job xxxiv. 27. More doubtful is 1 Kings xi. 13, רַק אֲחִי-קִלְחֹמֶסֶלְכָה, לֹא אֶקְרַע "Howbeit, I will not rend away all the kingdom." The context reads: "The Lord said unto Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes,

which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant. Notwithstanding in thy days I will not do it for David thy father's sake; from the hand of thy son I will rend it. Howbeit I will not rend away all the kingdom; one tribe I will give to thy son for David my servant's sake, and for the sake of Jerusalem which I have chosen." This seems to be a clear case of partial negation: Not *all* the kingdom, yet all but one tribe. This must be maintained, although the closely parallel passage in xi. 34 (under *b*) cannot be interpreted in the same way.—Num. xxiii. 13, the passage (and perhaps the only genuine one) referred to by grammarians as illustrating the use of לֹא and לֹא־כֹל in a partial negation, is, without doubt, so to be regarded. Balak says to Balaam, "Come, I pray thee, with me unto another place, from whence thou mayest see them: thou shalt see but the utmost part of them, וְרָבִלִי לֹא תִרְאֶה, but the whole of him thou shalt not see."

b. Following the verb. The cases under this head are noticeably different from most others. E.g. Deut. xxxii. 27, טָרִיפוּ אֶת־יְהוָה וְרִיבוּ, "Lest they say, Our hand is high, and Jehovah hath not done all this." The case is similar to those in 1 Chron. iv. 27 and Gen. ix. 11, already spoken of. We cannot render, "Jehovah hath done *none* of this"; nor, on the other hand, is it meant to be affirmed that Jehovah hath done *some*, but not *all*, of this. It is simply the *negation* of an implied *universal affirmation*. One man is conceived to have affirmed, "Jehovah hath done all this." The other replies, "Jehovah hath *not* done all this"; whether he has done some or none, is left undetermined. The right impression is given by the rendering of the A. V. But it would be still more exact, as well as in accordance with the order of the Hebrew words, to read, "Not Jehovah hath done all this."—Very similar is Judg. xiii. 23, "Neither would he have showed us all these things." We *might* call this a universal negation, and render, "He would have showed us none of these things." But the process of thought is: He *has* showed us all these things; but if he had been pleased to kill us, he would *not* have showed them; and though one might infer that none would have been showed, yet this is not the prominent feature of the thought.—Num. xv. 22 and Lev. xxvi. 14 present a similar form of expression.—Probably Ps. lxxviii. 38, also, is to be interpreted in the same way: וְלֹא־תִקְצֵר וְלֹא־תִקְדָּח, "And he did not stir up all his wrath." The whole verse reads: "But he is compassionate; he forgiveth iniquity, and de-

stroyeth not; and many a time he turneth his anger away, and stirreth not up all his wrath." This *might* be taken as a partial negation: He stirreth up not *all* his wrath, but some of it. But the context strongly favors a different view. God's great compassion in forgiving sin is emphasized both before and afterwards. It would decidedly weaken the force of this passage to understand the writer to say merely that God's anger is stirred, indeed, but not the whole of it. Rather he means: God is merciful; he turns his anger away, and refrains from stirring up his wrath—all that wrath which is so terrible when roused.—Another example is Judg. iii. 1, "As many as had not known all the wars of Canaan." This is, perhaps, a universal negation, = "such as had known none of the wars of Canaan." Certainly it is not, properly speaking, a partial negation. It may, however, be explained like the foregoing.—So also Lam. ii. 2, "The Lord hath swallowed — he hath not pitied — all the habitations of Jacob." The negative clause, *לֹא רָחַם*, is here rather parenthetical or adverbial: "He hath swallowed without pity." The negation is, however, total, rather than partial.—1 Kings xi. 34, already alluded to, belongs here. What in vs. 11–13 is said to Solomon is in vs. 31–36 said to Jeroboam about Solomon. In vs. 31 it is said, "I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee." Then, after mention of the exception of one tribe, and the reason for the threat, it is added (vs. 34), *וְלֹא אֶקַח אֶת-מְלֶכֶת-בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיַּד-דָּוִד*, "And I will not take the whole kingdom out of his hand"; and in the following verses, "but I will take the kingdom out of his son's hand, and will give it unto thee, even ten tribes; and unto his son will I give one tribe." The first impression, perhaps, would be that the negation is partial = "not the whole, but only ten tribes." But the context, and the historic fact that *none* of the kingdom was taken from *Solomon*, lead us to a different conclusion. These allow, if they do not require, the rendering: "I will take none of the kingdom out of his hand; but I will make him prince all the days of his life for David my servant's sake." This would be verbally inconsistent with the statement in vs. 31, "I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon"; but so would a partial negation also, only in a less degree. The declaration in vs. 34 is a correction, or limitation, of the prior one, and must be interpreted according to the nature of the case. When we read, in vs. 34, "I will not take the whole kingdom out of his hand," and in vs. 35, "But I will take the king-

dom out of his son's hand," we are led to wonder why לֹא should be used in the first sentence at all. Omitting it, we can lay the stress, in the several clauses, where it seems to belong, on "his" and on "son's." But the use of לֹא can be justified in view of the concluding part of vs. 35, "and will give it unto thee, the ten tribes." For then the whole reads: "I will take, indeed, *none* of the kingdom out of his hand, . . . but out of his son's hand, and will give it to thee — not the whole of it, but the ten tribes already promised" (in vs. 31). Nevertheless, it is possible (and the analogy of the other passages just considered favors the attempt) to explain the sentence in the following way: In vs. 31 God threatens to take "the kingdom" out of Solomon's hand. In vs. 34 it is added, by way of limitation, that the kingdom should not be taken from Solomon himself, but (vs. 35) from his son. In vs. 31 and 35 we find simply the phrase "the kingdom." If, now, we take "the whole kingdom" as being equivalent to "the kingdom," no stress being laid on לֹא, then we may paraphrase thus: "I will rend the kingdom out of his hand, on account of the idolatries which have been introduced — this great kingdom over which he has ruled. Yet as to all this great kingdom, I will not take it out of his hand, but out of his son's hand." — There remains to be considered, under this head, only Gen. iii. 1, לֹא תֹאכַל מִכָּל עֵץ הַגַּן "Ye shall not eat of every [any] tree of the garden." This passage is rather difficult, for the reason that neither the context nor the nature of the case determines whether the negation is universal or partial. To be sure, God had not prohibited the use of *all* the trees of the garden; but then may not the serpent designedly have feigned to have heard that the prohibition was universal? So most commentators seem inclined to understand his question. But, as either translation ("any" or "every") makes good sense, we must, in our effort to determine the real meaning, be guided by grammatical analogy. Following the analogy of the use of לֹא with אֵל in general, we should have to pronounce the negation universal, and render, "Ye shall eat of no tree of the garden." But following the analogy of the examples in the class of cases now under consideration, we are led to question whether that would best reproduce the Hebrew. As we have seen, in all the instances (except, perhaps, 1 Kings xi. 34) in which לֹא in the accusative is construed with a definite noun (and here עֵץ is made definite by the article in אֵץ) and follows the verb, we find not a strictly universal negation, — still less a partial nega-

"Thou shalt do no work." Universal negation. So Ex. xx. 4; Deut. iv. 15; v. 8, 14; xiv. 3, 21; xx. 16; Josh. xi. 14; 2 Sam. xv. 11; 1 Kings xv. 29; Ps. xxxiv. 11 (10); Job xxxvii. 24; Dan. vi. 6 (5).

c. Preceding a finite verb and an infinitive. Only Dan. vi. 5 (4), וְכָל-עֵת וְשִׂחִיתָהּ לֹא-יִקְלִין לְחַשְׁבֹּתָהּ "But any occasion or fault they could not find." Universal negation.

4. Qualified by a relative clause.

a. Preceding the verb. E.g. Eccl. ii. 10, וְכָל אֲשֶׁר שָׁאַלְתִּי עֵינַי לֹא, אֶצְלַח בָּהֶם "And whatsoever mine eyes desired I kept not from them." Universal negation. So Lev. xxii. 20; Deut. xiv. 10; Jer. xxxii. 23. The latter passage *might* be rendered: "They have not done all that thou commandedst them to do," with the implication that they have done a part. But it is much more probable that the rendering of the A. V. ("nothing of all") is correct.

b. Following the verb. E.g. Ex. xx. 17, לֹא-תִחְמָד... כֹּל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ "Thou shalt not covet... anything that is thy neighbor's." Universal negation. So Deut. v. 18 (21). Perhaps Ezek. xiv. 23 may also be classed here: "Not without cause have I done all that I have done." But לֹא here directly modifies הָיָה, and neither כֹּל nor the verb.

II. As the indirect object of the verb.

1. Without a preposition.

a. In construct state with a definite noun or pronoun.

i. Preceding the verb. E.g. Isa. lxii. 6, כָּל-הַיּוֹם וְכָל-הַלַּיְלָה הָסִיר, לֹא יִחַשֵׁה "All the day and all the night continually they shall not keep silent." Universal negation. So Gen. viii. 22; Num. vi. 4, 5, 6; 1 Sam. xx. 31; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 33. Here, also, may be assigned Isa. vii. 25 and Ezra vii. 24, where כֹּל with its noun stands absolutely at the beginning of the sentence.

ii. Following the verb. E.g. Ex. xiv. 20, וְלֹא קָרַב זֶחַ אֶל-זֶה כָּל-הַלַּיְלָה "And the one came not near the other all the night." Universal negation. So 1 Sam. xiii. 22; xxv. 7; 1 Kings xv. 5; 2 Kings xv. 18; Jer. xxxv. 19.

iii. Following the verb and its direct object. E.g. Deut. xxiii. 7 (6) לֹא-תִדְרֹשׁ שָׁלוֹמָם וְטַבָּתָם כָּל-יְמֵיךָ "Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days." Universal negation. So 1 Sam. xxviii. 20; Prov. xxxi. 12 (the verb being understood with רָע לֹא). Here is to be specially noticed 1 Kings xi. 39, יִאֲזַח אֶת-זֶרְעוֹ, לֹא בְּלִי-חַיִּים "And I will for this afflict the seed of David, but not forever." This is clearly a partial negation, but differs from most other cases in that לֹא *immediately precedes* כֹּל.

iv. Following a finite verb with an infinitive and its object. E.g. Deut. xxii. 19, לֹא-יִדְבֹּק לְשִׁמְרָהּ כְּלִי-חַיִּי "He may not put her away all his days." Universal negation. So Deut. xxii. 29.

b. In construct state with an indefinite noun.

i. Following the verb and its object. E.g. Prov. vi. 35, לֹא-יִחַד עֵינָיו כְּלִי-בִקְרָה "He will regard no ransom." Universal negation. So Deut. xvi. 21; xxiii. 20 (19).

ii. Preceding the verb, and following the object of the verb. Only Lev. xvii. 14, דָּם כְּלִי-בִקְרָה לֹא הָאֵכְלוּ "Blood of any flesh ye shall not eat." Universal negation.

2. With a preposition.

a. Not construed with a noun or pronoun, and following the verb.

i. With the article. E.g. Jer. xiii. 7, לֹא הָיָאָה לְבֵל "It was profitable for nothing." Universal negation. So Jer. xiii. 10. The force of the article in these passages is not noticed by any of the commentators. *Without* the article the meaning unquestionably would be: "It was profitable for nothing." הַכֹּל means "the whole"; לְבֵל may mean "in respect to the whole." And we may render: "It was useless as to the whole of it"; i.e. it was wholly useless. Cf. the remark on Ps. xlix. 18, under B, I, 1, b.

ii. Without the article. Only Prov. xxx. 30, וְלֹא-יִשָּׁוֶה סְתָנִי-כֹל "And he turneth not away from any one." Universal negation.

b. In construct state with a definite noun or pronoun.

i. Preceding the verb. E.g. Job i. 22, בְּכָל-זֹאת לֹא-חָטָא אִיּוֹב "In all this Job sinned not." Universal negation. So Isa. v. 25; ix. 11 (12), 16 (17), 20 (21); x. 4; lxiii. 9 (c'thib); Jer. iii. 10; xlii. 5; Ps. lxxviii. 32; Job ii. 10; Neh. xiii. 6.

ii. Following the verb. E.g. 1 Sam. xiii. 19, וְהָיָה לֹא יִמְצָא וְהָיָה לֹא יִמְצָא "Now there was no smith found in all the land of Israel." Universal negation. So Exod. ix. 24; xiii. 7; xxxiv. 10; Lev. xviii. 26; Deut. ii. 37; xvi. 4; xviii. 1; xxviii. 14; 1 Sam. iii. 19; 2 Sam. xiv. 25; 2 Kings xiii. 11; xiv. 24; xxii. 20; Isa. xi. 9; lxxv. 25; Jer. lxxv. 20; Ezek. xiv. 11; xxxvii. 23; Zeph. iii. 11; Job xii. 9; xlii. 15; Dan. ix. 12; 1 Chron. xxix. 25; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 28.

iii. Following a finite verb and an infinitive. E.g. Gen. xlv. 1, וְלֹא-יָדָבֵק יוֹסֵף לְחַזְקוֹתָם לְכָל הַמְּצַדִּיקִים עִלָּיו "And Joseph could not refrain himself before all them that stood by him." Universal negation. So Ezek. xliv. 13. The other three cases under this head are instances of negation of a universal affirmation. E.g. 2 Kings x. 31,

“But Jehu took no heed to walk in the law of the Lord God of Israel with all his heart.” Not: He took no heed to walk in the law with *any* of his heart; nor: He took no heed to walk in the law with *all* his heart, though he did with a part of it. But: While he ought to have walked in the law with all his heart, he did *not* take heed to do so. Very similar are 2 Kings xxii. 13, and the parallel passage, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 21.

iv. Following a verb and its object. E.g. Ex. xxxv. 3 לֹא־חִבְּרִי אֵשׁ בְּכֵל מִשְׁבְּתֵיכֶם “Ye shall not kindle a fire in any of your dwellings.” Universal negation. So Gen. xli. 44; Lev. vii. 26; xi. 44; xxii. 25; Num. xiv. 11; 1 Kings viii. 16; Hos. vii. 10; 2 Chron. vi. 5. The remaining instances of this construction are rather to be called cases of negation of universal affirmation. E.g. Ezek. xvi. 43, “Thou shalt not commit this lewdness above all thine abominations.” So Num. xiv. 35; Judg. viii. 35.

v. Preceding a verb and its object. E.g. Ex. xi. 7, וְלֹא יִלְכַּד בְּנִי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יִחַרְךָ־עֵלֶב לְשׁוֹנֵי “But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue.” Universal negation. So Ezek. xvi. 22.

vi. Preceding the verb, and following its object. E.g. Eccl. vii. 28, וְאִשָּׁה בְּכָל־אֶמֶת לֹא מָצָאתִי “But a woman among all these have I not found.” Universal negation. So Lev. xi. 42.

c. In construct state with an indefinite noun.

i. Preceding the verb. E.g. Dan. xi. 37, וְעַל־עֲלֵאוֹתָהּ לֹא יִבִּין “And he will not regard any god.” Universal negation. So Lev. xii. 4; xviii. 6; xxi. 11.

ii. Following the verb. E.g. 1 Kings x. 20, לֹא־נִמְצָא כֵן “There was not the like made in any kingdom.” Universal negation. So Lev. xiii. 53; Ps. cxlvii. 20; Dan. iii. 28; 2 Chron. ix. 19.

iii. Following a verb and its direct object. E.g. Eccl. ii. 10, לֹא־מָנַחֵתִי אֶת־לִבִּי מִכָּל־שִׂמְחָה “I withheld not my heart from any joy.” Universal negation. So Gen. xli. 19; Deut. xxiii. 19 (18); Dan. ii. 10.

iv. Preceding a verb and its direct object. Only Lev. xviii. 23, וְבְכָל־בְּהֵמָה לֹא־תִתֵּן שְׂכָרְךָ “And thou shalt not bestow thy cohabitation upon any beast.” Universal negation.

v. Following a verb and its indirect object. E.g. Deut. xix. 15, לֹא־יָקוּם עַד אֶחָד מֵאִישׁ לְקַדְּמוֹ “One witness shall not rise up against

a man for any iniquity." Universal negation. So Deut. xxiv. 5; 2 Chron. viii. 15. .

vi. Following a verb, and preceding its direct object. Only 1 Sam. xxii. 15, לֹא יָדַע עֲבָדָהּ בְּכָל-יְאוֹמֵי הַיּוֹם, "Thy servant knew nothing of all this." Universal negation.

vii. Preceding the verb, and following its direct object. Only Lev. xi. 42, לֹא הֹלֵךְ עַל-זֵדֵיכֶם רְגֵלֵיכֶם ... עַד-עַל-מִרְבֵּה רְגֵלֵיכֶם ... לֹא הֹאֲכִילֶם "Whatsoever goeth upon the belly ... down to everything that hath many feet ... ye shall not eat." Universal negation.

d. Qualified by a relative clause.

i. Preceding the verb. E.g. Num. vi. 4, לֹא יֵאָכַל מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר הִצְטַח מִנֶּחֱמֶה לֵאמֹר "Of anything that is made of the vine he shall not eat." Universal negation. So Judg. xiii. 14.

ii. Following the verb. E.g. 1 Kings xv. 5, וְלֹא-סָר מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר צִוָּהוּ "And he turned aside from nothing that he commanded him." Universal negation. So Deut. ii. 37 (prep. and verb to be supplied); 1 Sam. xxv. 21. Perhaps, also, Jer. xlii. 21, though this may be called a negation of universal affirmation, as we certainly may designate the passage Deut. xii. 8, "Ye shall not do according to all that we are doing here to-day."

iii. Following a verb and its object. E.g. Lev. xx. 25, וְלֹא-הִטַּמְתֶּם אֶת-אֲדָמַתְכֶם לְכָל אֲשֶׁר תִּרְאֶה הָאָרֶץ "Ye shall not defile your souls ... by anything with which the ground creepeth." Universal negation. The only other passage belonging here is rather an instance of negation of universal affirmation, viz. Josh. i. 18, ... לֹא-יָשָׁר אֶת-אֲזְנוֹתָי יוֹמָתָה "Whosoever ... will not hear thy words in all that thou commandest him, he shall be put to death."

לֹא WITH אֵל.

The use of לֹא with אֵל is much less frequent. Adopting the same method of classification, we get the following result:

A. Sentences in which לֹא occurs in the subject. In all the cases in construct state with a definite noun or pronoun.

I. As nominative, following the verb. E.g. 2 Sam. xiii. 25, אֵל-נָנוּא לֹא-נֵלֵךְ "Let us not go, all of us." Negation of universal affirmation. Not: Let none of us go. Nor: Let only a part of us go. But: Do not ask us—so many as we are—to go, "lest we be chargeable unto thee." So Neh. ix. 32: "Let not all the trouble seem little to thee." Josh. vii. 3, however, is a case of

partial negation: "Let not all the people go up; let about two or three thousand go up."

II. As vocative, following the verb. Only Isa. xiv. 29, אֶל-תִּשְׂמְחוּ, תִּלְשֹׁחַ עִלְיָהּ "Rejoice not, Philistia, all of thee." Universal negation.

B. Sentences in which לֹא occurs in the predicate.

I. As the direct object of the verb.

1. In construct state with a definite noun or pronoun, and following the verb. E.g. Josh. vii. 3, אַתָּה-בְּלִי-חַיִּים, "Make not all the people to labor thither." Partial negation, as in the preceding sentence above mentioned. But Ps. ciii. 2 is a case of negation of universal affirmation: אֶל-תִּשְׁכַּחַי קִלְיוֹנָיו "Forget not all his benefits."

2. In construct state with an indefinite noun.

a. Preceding the verb. Only Judg. xiii. 14, וְכִל-טָמֵא אֶל-הָאֵל, "And let her eat no unclean thing." Universal negation.

b. Following the verb. E.g. Judg. xiii. 7, וְאֶל-הָאֵל כִּל-טָמֵא, "And eat no unclean thing." Universal negation. So Judg. xiii. 4; Ps. lix. 6 (5); cxix. 133.

3. Qualified by a relative clause, and following the verb. Only Num. xvi. 26, וְאֶל-חַנְּדָנֵי בְּכֵל-אֲשֶׁר לָהֶם, "And touch nothing of theirs." Universal negation.

II. As the indirect object of the verb, preceded by a preposition.

1. In construct state with a definite noun or pronoun.

a. Following the verb. E.g. Ex. xxxiv. 3, אִישׁ אֶל-יְרֵא בְּכָל-הָהָר, "Let not a man be seen in all the mountain." Universal negation. So Gen. xix. 17; Lev. xviii. 24; Jer. xviii. 18; Prov. iii. 31.

b. Following a verb and its object. E.g. Lev. xi. 43, אֶל-תִּשְׁקָצוּ, אֶת-נִפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם בְּכָל-הַחֲרָץ, "Ye shall not defile your souls with any creeping thing." Universal negation. So 1 Sam. xxii. 15.

c. Preceding a verb and its object. Only Ecclesiastes vii. 21, לֹא-תִשְׁמַע לְכָל-דְּבַר יְרֵבִי אֲשֶׁר יִרְבְּרוּ אֶל-תַּחַן לִבָּהּ, "Give no heed to all the words that they speak." As the subject of יִרְבְּרוּ is indefinite, the meaning can hardly be, "Give heed to none of the words that men speak"; for surely we ought to give heed to some things. The following clause, "lest thou hear thy servant curse thee," shows that the thought is: Do not pry into *everything* that is said, else you will hear too much. Hence this is a case of partial negation; possibly, however, negation of universal affirmation.

2. In construct state with an indefinite noun.

a. Preceding the verb. Only Jer. ix. 3 (4), וְלֹא-תִבְטְחוּ אֶל-אָחִיכֶם, "And trust ye not in any brother." Universal negation.

b. Following the verb. Only Lev. xvi. 2, וְאֵל-יָבֹא בְּכָל-עֵת אֶל-הַקֹּדֶשׁ, "And let him not enter at all times into the holy place." A clear case of partial negation, remarkable as the only one in which לֹא is joined with an *indefinite* noun.

לֹא WITH אֵין.

In all the cases in which לֹא is used in connection with אֵין the negation is universal. There is no need of presenting any classification of the passages. They are as follows: Gen. xxxix. 23; xlvii. 13; Ex. ix. 14; Num. xi. 6; Judg. xviii. 10; xix. 19; 1 Sam. x. 24; xiv. 39; 2 Sam. xii. 3; 2 Kings iv. 2; v. 15; Isa. li. 18 (*bis*); Jer. x. 7; xii. 12; Nah. ii. 10 (9); Hab. ii. 19; Prov. xiii. 7; Lam. i. 2; Eccl. i. 9; iv. 8, 16; vi. 2; ix. 6; Esth. v. 13; Dan. i. 4; 1 Chron. xvii. 20; xxiii. 26; 2 Chron. xxv. 7.

לֹא WITH לִבְלֹאִי.

Of this construction there are five cases.

A. לֹא as subject of the verb, in construct state with an indefinite noun, and following the verb. Only Gen. iv. 15, לִבְלֹאִי הַמִּצְוֶה-אֹתוֹ, קַל-מֵצַאֵי "That no one finding him should slay him." Universal negation.

B. לֹא as object of the verb.

I. As direct object.

1. Without a noun, with the article, and following the verb. Only Isa. lxxv. 8, לִבְלֹאִי הַשְׁתִּירָה חֹמֶל, "That I may not destroy the whole." This is a case of partial negation, or, possibly, of negation of universal affirmation.

2. In construct state with a definite noun, and following the verb. Only Lev. xxvi. 15, לִבְלֹאִי גְשׁוּרֵי אֶת-קַל-מִצְוֹתַי, "[And if ye shall despise my statutes, and if your soul abhor my judgments] so that ye will not do all my commandments." Negation of universal affirmation.

3. In construct state with an indefinite noun, and following the verb. Only Jer. xvii. 24, לִבְלֹאִי עֲשׂוּהוּ בָהּ קַל-מְלֹאכֶה, "To do no work therein." Universal negation.

II. As indirect object, in construct state with a definite noun, following the verb and its object. Only Jer. xxxv. 8, לִבְלֹאִי שָׁחֹת-יִרְוֶהוּ, קַל-יִשְׁתִּיבֵנו "Not to drink wine all our days." Universal negation.

כֵּל WITH אֵל.

Only one example : Isa. xxxiii. 20, וְכִדְהֻבְלָיו וְכִדְהֻבְקָוֵי "And none of the cords thereof shall be broken." Universal negation.

כֵּל WITH אֵלֵי.

Only one example : Dent. xxviii. 55, טֵבֵלֵי הַשָּׂאִירֵי-לוֹ כֵּל "Because nothing is left to him." Universal negation.

כֵּל WITH טָרָם.

Only Gen. ii. 5, but here twice : וְכָל שִׁיחַ הַשָּׂדֶה טָרָם הָיָה בְּאֶרֶץ "And no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up." Universal negation.

CONCLUSIONS.

1. It is not correct to regard every negation in which כֵּל occurs as either a strictly universal or a strictly partial one. There is a third kind of negation to which, in default of a better term, has been given the name, "negation of universal affirmation." Of the passages thus designated some *may* be called universal negations, and others, partial negations; for the line of distinction between this third kind and the two others is not sharply defined. Nevertheless, it is a real and legitimate distinction. It is true, that, in point of *fact*, every negative proposition must be either universal or partial; or, to put the matter more accurately, that which is denied of the subject is untrue either of the whole or of the part of the subject. But, as a matter of *affirmation*, the alternative is not so rigid. If a man should affirm that modern republicanism has all grown out of the discovery of the art of printing, another man might reply that it has *not* all grown out of that discovery; and this denial, thus stated, leaves us in doubt whether he believes that none, or simply not all, has had this origin; for a universal affirmation is equally denied by a partial or a universal negation. We recognize this ambiguity, when, in order to express a universal negation unmistakably, we do not say, "All *A* is not *B*," but, "No *A* is *B*." As we have seen, there are several clear cases of this sort of negation in the Old Testament. Respecting them the following points may be noted: (*a*) They *all* occur in sentences in which כֵּל is connected with a *definite* noun, or (what is equivalent) is defined by a relative clause. (*b*) They occur *chiefly* in sentences in which כֵּל is connected with the accusative *following* the verb. (*c*) In the class of sentences just named the negation of universal affirmation

predominates over the other two kinds of negation. (d) Yet there is *no* form of expression in which לֹא with לֹא may not express a universal negation. The conclusion must be that in many cases nothing but the connection, or (in the spoken language) the tone of the voice, can certainly indicate the nature of the negation.

2. This last remark may be applied especially to the instances of *partial* negation that occur. Two of the clearest cases are 1 Kings xi. 13 and Num. xxiii. 13 (B. I. 2. a). Yet, so far as the construction is concerned, there are seven other sentences precisely like these, in which, however, the negation is universal. Yet even here we may notice that לֹא with the noun or pronoun is in an emphatic position, so as to invite such an emphasis as to the ear might easily make a distinction between a partial and a universal negation. Give to לֹא in Num. xxiii. 13 the circumflex accent, and the negation is partial; give it the falling slide, and the negation is total. These two are the only unmistakable instances (with one exception to be noticed soon) of partial negations in sentences in which לֹא is found with לֹא. Some of the cases of negation of universal affirmation closely border upon these; as e.g. 2 Chron. xxix. 34 and Num. xi. 14 (B. I. 2. c). In connection with לֹא, however, though the whole number of examples is comparatively small, yet we find *three* cases (and perhaps four) of partial negation. But here, too, we fail to discern anything in the order of the words, or in their construction, which determines the distinction between the two kinds of negation. Josh. vii. 3 and Ps. ciii. 2 are just alike in respect of construction, but differ in the quality of the negation.

3. It is, however, quite clear that, *in general*, those grammarians are in the right who assert that there is a difference between the cases in which לֹא is made definite and those in which it is not. Yet even this proposition is to be limited on both sides. (a) While the cases of partial negation, or of negation of universal affirmation, are almost wholly to be found in the sentences in which לֹא is made definite, yet the majority even of these sentences are clear instances of universal negation. (b) There is one case of partial negation in a sentence in which לֹא is indefinite, viz. Lev. xvi. 2 (לֹא with לֹא B. II. 2).

4. It follows that the implication in Gesenius's statement is very misleading. While a truth underlies it, yet it would in fact be more accurate to stop with the general assertion, that לֹא with לֹא denotes a universal negation.

5. It follows also that Ewald's statement is inaccurate. E.g. in 1 Sam. xiv. 24 (A. I. 1. *b*), לֹל־יִצְחָק can mean nothing but "all the people," "the whole of the people." But here it is not asserted (as Noldius strangely affirms) that *not all* the people tasted food, but that *none* of them did so. So in Ps. xlix. 18 (B. I. 1. *b*), לֹל־יִצְחָק evidently means "the whole"; otherwise the article has no force. Or does Ewald mean to affirm that we may distinguish between "all the people" and "the whole people"? between "the whole" and "all of it"? But this is idle, or else the distinction between *omnis* and *totus* simply involves a begging of the question; i.e. when we *know* that the negation is partial, we say that לֹל means *totus*; otherwise we say that it means *omnis*. If Balak (Num. xxiii. 13) had wished to say, "Thou shalt see *none* of them," how else could he have expressed himself? And yet would not לֹל, in either case, of itself properly mean "the whole of them"?

6. Reasoning *a priori*, we might have anticipated that a partial negation in Hebrew would be most naturally and unmistakably expressed by placing לֹל immediately before לֹל, so that לֹל rather than the verb should be modified by it. Thus in English if we say, "Not all rich men are happy," we express a partial negation much more unequivocally than if we say, "All rich men are not happy." But there are no genuine instances of this position of the words in Hebrew. There are two passages, however, which at first sight seem to be such; but in each case the construction is elliptical. In 1 Kings xi. 39 (B. II. 1. *a*, iii) לֹל immediately precedes לֹל, and the negation is partial. This lends apparent confirmation to the hypothesis just stated. But in Ps. cxv. 17 (A. I. 2. *b*) we find a similar case, in which the negation is universal. The passage reads: לֹל־יִצְחָק וְלֹל־יִצְחָק וְלֹל־יִצְחָק לֹל־יִצְחָק "Not the dead praise Jehovah, and not all descenders [i.e. none who descend] into silence." Hardly any stress can be laid on the fact that in this sentence the noun is indefinite, whereas in 1 Kings xi. 39 the article is used. For evidently the phrase לֹל־יִצְחָק is equivalent to "all those who descend." These passages, therefore, furnish no support to the hypothesis in question. Yet, curiously enough, the hypothesis is confirmed by the closely analogous construction of לֹל with עֹלֵם. The same general rule holds respecting this case as respecting לֹל connected with לֹל. Ordinarily the negative with עֹלֵם (generally לֹל־עֹלֵם) means "never." In twenty-seven passages in which they are used together there is no doubt that this is the case. They are Ex.

xiv. 13; Judg. ii. 1; 1 Sam. iii. 14 (לא = לֹא); xx. 15; 2 Sam. xii. 10; Isa. xiv. 20; xxv. 2; xlv. 17; lxiii. 19; Jer. xxxi. 39 (40); xxxv. 6; Ezek. xxvi. 21; xxvii. 36; xxviii. 19; Joel ii. 2, 26, 27; Ps. xv. 5; xxx. 7 (6); xxxi. 2 (1); lv. 23 (22); lxxi. 1; civ. 5 (לֹא־עַד with לֹא); cxii. 6; cxix. 93; Prov. x. 30; Eccl. ix. 6. In these passages לֹא, for the most part, precedes the verb, and עַד follows it; in none of them does it immediately precede עַד. But there are four other passages in which לֹא immediately precedes עַד; and in all these the negation is *partial* = "not forever." They are Isa. lvii. 16; Ps. ciii. 9; Prov. xxvii. 24; Job vii. 16. There remain only three other examples of this combination; they belong, so far as the position of the words is concerned, to the same class with the twenty-seven; and as to one of them (Gen. vi. 3), there is nothing in the context to require us to render לֹא־עַד... לֹא here otherwise than "never." "My spirit will never hold sway in man," is the rendering most consonant with usage, and one which suits the connection. Jer. iii. 12 reads, לֹא אֶמְצֵא לְעֵינַי לֹא־עַד "I will not keep [anger] forever." Here the negation seems to be partial; but it may be taken as a reply to the question in verse 5, "Will he keep anger forever?" That is, it may be taken as a case of negation of universal affirmation. Lam. iii. 31 is the only other passage; and this seems to be a clear case of partial negation.—But the fact remains that, except in elliptical constructions, there are no examples of לֹא immediately preceded and qualified by עַד. And accordingly we are obliged to conclude that the Hebrew language exhibits no specific method of expressing a partial negation by the combination of negatives with עַד.

7. For convenience of reference we append a list of the passages, arranged in the order in which they occur in the Hebrew Bible, with an indication of the place where they are to be found in the foregoing classification. The abbreviation "p.n." stands for "partial negation"; "n.a." for "negation of universal affirmation." Passages not designated by either of these are instances of universal negation. It will be seen that, of the whole three hundred and twenty-six, there are only six unequivocal cases of partial negation, with a few others that may be so regarded. There are twenty-four cases of negation of universal affirmation, with a few others that may be so regarded. It must be said, however, in regard to some passages in which לֹא is connected with the *indirect* object, that it is somewhat difficult to determine whether they may be

properly included in the list. Such passages as Job xii. 9 and Hosea vii. 10 might perhaps as well have been omitted.

לֹב WITH לֹב.

Genesis.

iii. 1 (n.a.?), B. I. 2. b.
viii. 21 (n.a.), B. I. 2. c.
viii. 22, B. II. 1. a. i.
ix. 11 (n.a.), A. I. 1. b.
ix. 15 (n.a.), B. I. 2. c.
xi. 6 (n.a.), A. I. 8. b.
xii. 19, B. II. 2. c. iii.
xii. 44, B. II. 2. b. iv.
xiv. 1, B. II. 2. b. iii.

Exodus.

ix. 4, A. II.
ix. 24, B. II. 2. b. ii.
x. 15, A. I. 2. b.
xi. 7, B. II. 2. b. v.
xii. 16, A. I. 2. a.
xii. 20, B. I. 8. a.
xii. 48, A. I. 2. a.
xii. 48, A. I. 2. a.
xiii. 7, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xiv. 20, B. II. 1. a. ii.
xv. 26, B. I. 2. a.
xx. 4, B. I. 8. b.
xx. 10, B. I. 8. b.
xx. 17, B. I. 4. b.
xxii. 21 (22), B. I. 8. a.
xxxiv. 10, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xxxv. 8, B. II. 2. b. iv.

Leviticus.

ii. 11, A. I. 1. a.
ii. 11, B. I. 8. a.
iii. 17, B. I. 8. a.
vii. 23, A. I. 2. a.
vii. 23, B. I. 8. a.
vii. 26, B. I. 8. a.
vii. 26, B. II. 2. b. iv.
xi. 42, B. I. 8. a.
xi. 42, B. II. 2. b. vi.
xi. 42, B. II. 2. c. vii.
xi. 44, B. II. 2. b. iv.
xii. 4, B. II. 2. c. i.
xiii. 63, B. II. 2. c. ii.
xiv. 36, A. I. 8. b.
xvi. 17, A. I. 2. a.
xvi. 29, B. I. 8. a.
xvii. 12, A. I. 2. a.
xvii. 14, B. II. 1. b. ii.
xviii. 6, B. II. 2. c. i.
xviii. 23, B. II. 2. c. iv.
xviii. 28, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xx. 25, B. II. 2. d. iii.
xxi. 11, B. II. 2. c. i.
xxi. 18, A. I. 8. a.
xxi. 21, A. I. 8. a.
xxii. 10, A. I. 2. a.
xxii. 13, A. I. 2. a.
xxii. 20, B. I. 4. a.
xxii. 21, A. I. 2. a.
xxiii. 25, B. II. 2. b. iv.
xxiii. 8, B. I. 8. a.
xxiii. 7, B. I. 8. a.
xxiii. 8, B. I. 8. a.
xxiii. 21, B. I. 8. a.
xxiii. 25, B. I. 8. a.
xxiii. 28, B. I. 8. a.
xxiii. 31, B. I. 8. a.
xxiii. 35, B. I. 8. a.

xxiii. 36, B. I. 8. a.
xxvi. 14 (n.a.), B. I. 2. b.
xxvii. 28, A. I. 2. a.
xxvii. 29, A. I. 2. a.

Numbers.

vi. 8, B. I. 8. a.
vi. 4, B. II. 1. a. i.
vi. 4, B. II. 2. d. i.
vi. 5, B. II. 1. a. i.
vi. 6, B. II. 1. a. i.
vi. 8, B. II. 1. a. i.
xi. 14 (n.a.), B. I. 2. c.
xiv. 11, B. II. 2. b. iv.
xiv. 23, A. I. 1. a.
xiv. 35 (n.a.), B. II. 2. b. iv.
xv. 22 (n.a.), B. I. 2. b.
xxiii. 18 (p.n.), B. I. 2. a.
xxviii. 18, B. I. 8. a.
xxviii. 25, B. I. 8. a.
xxviii. 26, B. I. 8. a.
xxix. 1, B. I. 8. a.
xxix. 7, B. I. 8. a.
xxix. 12, B. I. 8. a.
xxix. 35, B. I. 8. a.
xxx. 6 (5), A. I. 1. a.
xxx. 18, (12), A. I. 1. a.

Deuteronomy.

ii. 87, B. II. 2. b. ii.
ii. 87, B. II. 2. d. ii.
iv. 15, B. I. 8. b.
v. 8, B. I. 8. b.
v. 14, A. I. 1. b.
v. 14, B. I. 8. b.
v. 18 (21), B. I. 4. b.
vii. 15, B. I. 2. a.
viii. 9, B. I. 1. a.
xii. 8 (n.a.), B. II. 2. d. ii.
xii. 17, B. I. 2. c.
xiv. 8, B. I. 8. b.
xiv. 10, B. I. 4. a.
xiv. 21, B. I. 8. b.
xvi. 4, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xvi. 21, B. II. 1. b. i.
xvii. 13, A. I. 1. a.
xviii. 1, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xix. 15, B. II. 2. c. v.
xx. 16, B. I. 8. b.
xxii. 19, B. II. 1. a. iv.
xxii. 29, B. II. 1. a. iv.
xxiii. 7 (6), B. II. 1. a. iii.
xxiii. 19 (18), B. II. 2. c. iii.
xxiii. 20 (19), B. II. 1. b. i.
xxiv. 5, B. II. 2. c. v.
xxviii. 14, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xxviii. 63 (n.a.), B. I. 2. c.
xxix. 22 (23), A. I. 2. b.
xxxii. 27 (n.a.), B. I. 2. b.

Joshua.

i. 18 (n.a.), B. II. 2. d. iii.
v. 5, B. I. 2. a.
xi. 11, A. I. 2. b.
xi. 18, B. I. 8. a.
xi. 14, B. I. 8. b.

Judges.

iii. 1 (n.a.), B. I. 2. b.
viii. 35 (n.a.), B. II. 2. b. iv.
xiii. 14, B. II. 2. d. i.
xiii. 23 (n.a.), B. I. 2. b.

1 Samuel.

iii. 19, B. II. 2. b. ii.
v. 5, A. I. 1. b.
xiii. 19, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xiii. 22, B. II. 1. a. ii.
xiv. 24, A. I. 1. b.
xx. 31, B. II. 1. a. i.
xxii. 15, B. II. 2. c. vi.
xxv. 7, B. II. 1. a. ii.
xxv. 21, B. II. 2. d. ii.
xxviii. 20, B. II. 1. a. iii.

2 Samuel.

xiv. 25, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xv. 11, B. I. 8. b.
xviii. 13, A. I. 2. a.
xix. 29 (23), A. I. 1. b.

1 Kings.

vi. 7, A. I. 2. a.
viii. 16, B. II. 2. b. iv.
x. 20, B. II. 2. c. ii.
xi. 18 (p.n.), B. I. 2. a.
xi. 34, (n.a.?), B. I. 2. b.
xi. 39 (p.n.), B. II. 1. a. iii.
xv. 5, B. II. 1. a. ii.
xv. 29, B. I. 8. b.

2 Kings.

x. 19, A. I. 8. a.
x. 31 (n.a.), B. II. 2. b. iii.
x. 14 (13), A. I. 2. b.
xiii. 11, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xiv. 24, B. II. 2. b. ii.
xv. 18, B. II. 1. a. ii.
xxii. 13 (n.a.), B. II. 2. b. iii.
xxii. 20, B. II. 2. b. ii.

Isaiah.

v. 26, B. II. 2. b. i.
vii. 25, B. II. 1. a. i.
ix. 11 (12), B. II. 2. b. i.
ix. 16 (17), B. II. 2. b. i.
ix. 20 (21), B. II. 2. b. i.
x. 4, B. II. 2. b. i.
xi. 9, B. II. 2. b. ii.
liv. 17, A. I. 2. a.
lix. 8, A. I. 2. a.
lxii. 6, B. II. 1. a. i.
lxiii. 9, B. II. 2. b. i.
lxv. 25, B. II. 2. b. ii.

Jeremiah.

ii. 24, A. I. 1. a.
iii. 10, B. I. 2. b. i.
xiii. 7, B. II. 2. a. i.
xiii. 10, B. II. 2. a. i.
xvii. 22, B. I. 8. a.
xxxii. 17, A. I. 2. b.
xxxiii. 23, B. I. 4. a.
xxxv. 19, B. II. 1. a. ii.
xxxvi. 24, A. I. 1. b.
xlii. 5, B. II. 2. b. i.
xlii. 21 (n.a.?), B. II. 2. d. ii.
xliii. 4, A. I. 1. b.
li. 43, A. I. 2. b.
lii. 20, B. II. 2. b. ii.

Ezekiel.

xii. 24, A. I. 2. b.

Ezekiel.

- xiv. 11, B. II. 2. b. ii.
 xiv. 23, B. I. 4. b.
 xvi. 22, B. II. 2. b. v.
 xvi. 43, (n.a.), B. II. 2. b. iv.
 xviii. 11, B. I. 2. a.
 xviii. 22, A. I. 1. a.
 xviii. 24, A. I. 1. a.
 xxiii. 48, A. I. 1. a.
 xxviii. 3, A. I. 2. a.
 xxxi. 8, A. I. 2. a.
 xxxi. 14 (bis), A. I. 2. b.
 xxxiii. 13, A. I. 1. a.
 xxxiii. 16, A. I. 1. a.
 xxxvii. 23, B. II. 2. b. ii.
 xli. 9, A. I. 2. a.
 xli. 13, B. II. 2. b. iii.
 xli. 21, A. I. 2. b.
 xli. 31, B. I. 3. a.

Hoea.

- vii. 10, B. II. 2. b. iv.
 xii. 9 (8), A. I. 1. a.

Zephaniah.

- iii. 11, B. II. 2. b. ii.

Psalms.

- xiv. 4, A. I. 1. b.
 xxv. 3, A. I. 1. a.
 xxxiv. 11, (10), B. I. 3. b.
 xxxiv. 23 (22), A. I. 1. b.
 xlix. 18 (17), B. I. 1. b.
 lxxvi. 6 (5), A. I. 2. b.
 lxxviii. 32, B. II. 2. b. i.
 lxxviii. 38 (n.a.), B. I. 2. b.
 cxv. 17, A. I. 2. b.
 cxliii. 2, A. I. 2. b.
 cxlvii. 20, B. II. 2. c. ii.

Proverbs.

- ii. 19, A. I. 1. a.
 iii. 15, A. I. 1. a.
 vi. 29, A. I. 1. b.
 vi. 35, B. II. 1. b. i.
 viii. 11, A. I. 2. a.
 xii. 21, A. I. 2. b.
 xx. 1, A. I. 2. a.
 xxx. 30, B. II. 2. a. ii.
 xxxi. 12, B. II. 1. a. iii.

Job.

- i. 22, B. II. 2. b. i.
 ii. 10, B. II. 2. b. i.
 xii. 9, B. II. 2. b. ii.
 xxxiii. 13, B. I. 2. a.
 xxxiv. 27, B. I. 2. a.
 xxxvii. 24, B. I. 3. b.
 xliii. 15, B. II. 2. b. ii.

Lamentations.

- ii. 2 (n.a.?), B. I. 2. b.
 iv. 12, A. I. 1. b.

Ecclesiastes.

- ii. 10, B. I. 4. a.
 ii. 10, B. II. 2. c. iii.
 vii. 28, B. II. 2. b. vi.

Daniel.

- ii. 10, A. I. 2. a.
 ii. 10, B. II. 2. c. iii.
 ii. 85, A. I. 2. a.
 iii. 28, B. II. 2. c. ii.
 iv. 6 (9), A. I. 2. a.
 iv. 15 (18), A. I. 1. a.
 vi. 5 (4), A. I. 2. a.
 vi. 5 (4), B. I. 2. c.
 vi. 6 (5), B. I. 3. b.
 vi. 16 (15), A. I. 2. a.
 vi. 24 (23), A. I. 2. a.
 viii. 4, A. I. 2. a.
 ix. 12, B. II. 2. b. ii.
 xi. 37, B. II. 2. c. i.
 xii. 10, A. I. 2. b.

Ezra.

- vii. 24, B. II. 1. a. i.

Nehemiah.

- xiii. 6, B. II. 2. b. i.

1 Chronicles.

- iv. 27 (n.a.), A. I. 1. a.
 xxix. 25, B. II. 2. b. ii.

2 Chronicles.

- vi. 5, B. II. 2. b. iv.
 viii. 15, B. II. 2. c. v.
 ix. 19, B. II. 2. c. ii.
 xxiii. 19, A. II.
 xxix. 84 (n.a.?), B. I. 2. c.
 xxxii. 15, A. I. 2. b.
 xxxiv. 21 (n.a.), B. II. 2. b. iii.
 xxxiv. 28, B. II. 2. b. ii.
 xxxiv. 33, B. II. 1. a. i.
 xxxv. 18, A. I. 1. a.

לֹא WITH לֹא.

- Gen. xix. 17, B. II. 1. a.
 Ex. xxxiv. 3, B. II. 1. a.
 Lev. xi. 43, B. II. 1. b.
 xvi. 2 (p.n.), B. II. 2. b.
 xviii. 24, B. II. 1. a.
 Num. xvi. 26, B. I. 3.
 Josh. vii. 8 (p.n.), A. I.
 vii. 8 (p.n.), B. I. 1.
 Judg. xiii. 4, B. I. 2. b.
 xiii. 7, B. I. 2. b.
 xiii. 14, B. I. 2. a.

- 1 Sam. xxii. 15, B. II. 1. b.
 2 Sam. xii. 25 (n.a.), A. I.
 Isa. xiv. 29, A. II.
 Jer. ix. 8 (4), B. II. 2. a.
 xviii. 18, B. II. 1. a.
 Ps. lxx. 6 (5), B. I. 2. b.
 ciii. 2 (n.a.), B. I. 1.
 cxix. 133, B. I. 2. b.
 Prov. iii. 31, B. II. 1. a.
 Eccl. vii. 21 (p.n.?), B. II. 1. e.
 Neh. ix. 33 (n.a.), A. I.

לֹא WITH לְבַלְלֵי.

- Gen. iv. 15, A.
 Lev. xxvi. 15 (n.a.), B. I. 2.
 Isa. lxxv. 8 (p.n.?), B. I. 1.
 Jer. xvii. 24, B. I. 8.
 xxxv. 8, B. II.

לֹא WITH אֵיךְ.

- Gen. xxxix. 23.
 xlvii. 13.
 Ex. ix. 14.
 Num. xi. 8.
 Judg. xviii. 10.
 xix. 19.

- 1 Sam. x. 24.
 xiv. 39.
 2 Sam. xii. 3.
 2 Kings iv. 2.
 v. 15.
 Isa. ii. 18 (bis).
 Jer. x. 7.
 xii. 12.
 Nah. ii. 10 (9).
 Hab. ii. 19.
 Prov. xiii. 7.
 Lam. i. 2.
 Eccl. i. 9.
 iv. 8, 16.
 vi. 2.
 ix. 6.
 Dan. i. 4.
 1 Chron. xvii. 20.
 xxiii. 23.
 2 Chron. xxv. 7.

לֹא WITH בְּלִי.

- Is. xxxiii. 20.

לֹא WITH תְּלִי.

- Deut. xxxviii. 55.

לֹא WITH תָּרַם.

- Gen. ii. 5 (bis).

NOTE.— Gen. iii. 1 (B. I. 2. b.), inasmuch as תְּלִי is not the direct object of תִּתְּנֵנִי, might perhaps more appropriately be classed under the division B. II. 2. b. ii. Similarly, Num. xvi. 26 (לֹא WITH לֹא B. I. 3.) might be put under B. II. But the verbs here have no other object, are practically transitive, and may be regarded as directly governing the nouns with which the prepositions are joined.