Chapter 2

Grammatical aspects of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*

A s indicated in Chapter 1, this investigation focusses on the syntactic distribution of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* with the ultimate aim of determining the exact scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. In BH grammars a chapter at most is usually dedicated to the negative and only a basic outline is given. Although existing grammars do survey the morphological forms of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, they lack sufficient exposition of the syntactic distribution and scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. The objective of this chapter is to describe certain grammatical aspects of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, for example its morphological varieties. To determine the distribution and scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, it is deemed necessary to begin with a brief morphological exposition[8] of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. This will include a brief survey of the different lexical categories that are combined with the negative לֹא *lōʾ*.

---

8   Crystal (1985: 200) defines *morphology* and *morphological analysis* respectively as in (1) and (2).
     (1)   "Morphology refers to the branch of grammar which studies the structure or forms of words, primarily through the use of the morpheme construct. It is traditionally distinguished from syntax, which deals with the rules governing the combination of words in sentences."
     (2)   "Morphological analysis may take various forms. One approach is to make a distributional study of the morphemes and morphemic variants occurring in words."

Section 2.1 will focus on the morphological varieties of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* and will provide an indication of the different lexical categories that are likely to be combined with the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. This exposition will form the basis for the discussion of the syntactic distribution and scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. In section 2.2 the use of the *maqqēf* to join the negative לֹא *lōʾ* to subsequent categories are discussed. This is followed in 2.3 by a discussion on the *ketib/qere* phenomenon. In section 2.4 a brief discussion on the grammatical aspects of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in BH dictionaries and BH grammars is included.

2.1 Morphological aspects of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*

This survey on the morphological aspects sets out to answer, amongst other things, the questions in (3).

(3) (a) What are the different morphological forms and occurrences of לֹא *lōʾ?*

(b) Are cases encountered of לֹא *lōʾ* combining with different affixes (prefixes and suffixes)?

(c) With which lexical categories does לֹא *lōʾ* combine?

The different morphological forms as well as the different affixes with which the negative לֹא *lōʾ* are combined need to be determined as these will play a vital role on the syntactic level in terms of the distribution and exact scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. In BH two varieties of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* are encountered: לֹא *lōʾ* and לוֹא *lôʾ*. It remains an open question whether there is a difference in meaning, distribution and usage of these two forms. For the purposes of this investigation it is considered necessary to deter-mine whether the two forms of the negative, לֹא *lōʾ* and לוֹא *lôʾ*, contribute in any significant manner to a better understanding of the distribution and ultimately, the scope of the negative.

Firstly, to determine any difference in meaning and distribution between the two varieties of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, one has to look into

Hebrew orthography (spelling).[9] According to Tov (1992: 221) orthography (spelling) is the realization in writing of the spoken word and, accordingly, it is possible to represent a specific word in different spellings. Morag (1972: 61) proposes that an analysis of a vocalisation system[10] – like that of an orthographical system – is, in fact, simply an attempt at reconstructing the phonemic analysis which was carried out by the system's inventors. Van der Merwe *et al* (1999: 31) explain the occurrence of such double forms as in (4).

(4)   In some instances a vowel may be represented by two different forms simultaneously. This is due to the fact that vowel signs were added to the text only after it had been fixed in consonants and vowel indicators. In some words a vowel indicator was used to refer to a particular vowel even before the Masoretic vocalisation.[11] During the vocalisation another vowel sign referring to the same vowel was added to the vowel indicator. When a vowel sign is combined with a vowel indicator in this way, one speaks of the 'full mode of writing' or *scriptio plena.* If the vowel is written without a vowel indicator, one speaks of the defective (short) mode of writing or *scriptio defectiva.* There is no difference in the pronunciation of the two modes of writing.

9   Deist (1978: 21) states that anyone engaged in compiling a grammar of Classical Hebrew is obliged to investigate certain phenomena with great care, among them certain spelling practices (all too often mistakenly passed off as "mere scribal errors") and certain textual and grammatical changes which may have been introduced by later redactors for the sake of grammatical simplicity.

10 Cf Khan's (1996) discussion on the Tiberian vocalisation system which he differentiates from the original Tiberian Hebrew pronunciation, which the vocalisation was designed to represent.

11 When the system of vocalisation evolved, Hebrew, in its written form served as a literary vehicle, but orally its existence at that time was primarily that of a liturgical language – a language in which texts, mostly sacred ones, were taught and recited. In a language of this nature, the vocalization systems, came to perpetuate in a written form certain linguistic entities which, before the invention of the signs, had been carried over from generation to generation by oral tradition alone (Morag 1972: 65). In the later stages of the development of Hebrew vocalisation increasing importance was attached to preserving the *correct pronunciation* and to represent it, as far as possible, in the system of signs (Morag 1972: 66). Morag (1972: 73) acknowledges the interdependence of the vocalisation system and the system of accents. The vocalisation signs can sometimes be properly interpreted only with the help of the accents.

Morag (1972: 10) maintains that the *scriptio plena* was a significant step toward making the reading of any North West Semitic text less dependent on the reader's interpretation, which was sometimes necessarily subjective. Kittel *et al* (1989: 351) add that this difference in spelling is sometimes used for approximate dating of material, because *scriptio plena* spellings were used more frequently in later times. Tov (1992: 221) points out that many words are written in different ways within the same language at different periods, or in concurrent dialects, without any difference in meaning. He maintains that, as the following English words are spelled differently in Britain (favour, specialise) and the United States (favor, specialize) without difference in meaning, there is also no difference in meaning between the Hebrew לֹא *lō'* and לוֹא *lô'*. With reference to this discussion, it is agreed that there is on phonological level a difference between the negative לֹא *lō'* and לוֹא *lô'* (they are indeed spelled differently).[12] It may very well be, as suggested by Kittel *et al* (1989: 351), that the *scriptio plena* form could indeed be an indication of the historiography of the different texts in which these two varieties are found, but as this research does not focus on the historiography of the negative לֹא *lō'* and לוֹא *lô'*, this will be put aside as a matter for further research.

No difference in syntactic distribution between the negative לֹא *lō'* and לוֹא *lô'* could be found. Both varieties are found in the same syntactic setting. Consider the two examples in (5) and (6).

(5)   Gen 6[3]

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לֹא־יָדוֹן רוּחִי בָאָדָם לְעֹלָם
wayyō'mer yahweh lō'-yādôn rûḥî bā'ādām l'ᵉōlām
And-said-he lord not-will-remain-he spirit-my on-mankind for-ever
Then the Lord said, "My spirit will not remain with mankind for ever ...[13]

---

12 The assumption is that the orthography to a certain extent reflects the phonology.

13 In all examples to follow the proposed translation is an adaptation of the NIV. The proposed translations are adapted to illustrate specific concepts and constructions. Hence, these translations should not be seen as functional or dynamic English translations of the original (however, in many cases they are). The proposed (adapted) translations will therefore deviate, to some extent, from normally acceptable English translation.

(6)   2 Kgs 5[17]

> כִּי לוֹא־יַעֲשֶׂה עוֹד עַבְדְּךָ עֹלָה וָזֶבַח לֵאלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים כִּי אִם־לַיהוָה:
> *kî lô'-ya'ªśeh 'ôd 'abd°kā 'ōlâ wāzebaḥ l°lōhîm 'ªḥērîm kî*
> *'im-layahweh*
> for not-will-make-he again servant-your burnt-offering and-sacrifice
> to-gods other but-to-the-lord …
> *"… for your servant will never again make burnt offerings and*
> *sacrifices to another god but the Lord …"*

The above two examples (5) and (6) exhibit both the negative לֹא *lō'* and
לוֹא *lô'* preceding an imperfect verb third person masculine singular.
Both negatives precede the imperfect verb with the latter followed by
the subject. From these two examples it is evident that on syntactic level
there is no difference between the *defectiva* and *plena* ways of writing
in terms of the two negative forms. All available grammars make no
distinction at all on syntactic level between the *scriptio defectiva* and
scriptio plena forms. The grammars provide a random exposition of the
negative לֹא *lō'* / לוֹא *lô'*. König (1897: 472) discusses the negation of
verbal clauses with the negative under discussion, and indicates its form
as ל(וֹ)א *l(ô)'*. He provides no argumentation for a semantic difference or
difference in distribution between these two forms. Given that grammars
randomly describe the occurrence of לֹא *lō'* / לוֹא *lô'*, it seems legitimate
to infer that the differences between these two forms lie solely on phono-
logical level. The form לֹא *lō'* will therefore be considered as the *scriptio
defectiva* and the form לוֹא *lô'* as the *scriptio plena*. As this investigation
does not focus on the phonological aspects, any phonological differences
between these two forms will not be considered.

In BHS 5 188[14] occurrences of the negative לֹא *lō'* are to be found
in 3 967 verses (cf Addendum A). These 5 188 occurrences cover all the

---

14 According to Waltke & O'Connor (1990: 660) לֹא *lō'* occurs 5 200 times. According
    to Clines (1998: 60) לֹא *lō'* with the meaning of *no(t)* occurs 5 196 times in the Masoretic
    Text of the Hebrew Bible, 173 times in Ben Sira and 1092 times in the Dead Sea
    Scrolls. לֹא *lō'* with the meaning of *indeed* occurs 27 times in the Masoretic Text.
    These 27 cases will be briefly referred to in Chapter 7. As already stated, this study
    focusses only on the Masoretic Text of BHS.
    Mitchel (1984: 1.A-B) maintains that the negative לֹא *lō'* with the meaning of *no, not*
    occurs 4 973 times.

occurrences of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, irrespective of the form, the affixes with which it is combined or the combination of adjacent syntactic categories. Of these 5 188 occurrences, 3 323 cases in 2 767 verses comprise the *bare* form – with no affixes – of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. Examples are also encountered where the negative לֹא *lōʾ* should not be considered as a negative in the usual sense of the word. Consider the example in (7).

(7)   2 Sam 17[27]

> וַיְהִי כְּבוֹא דָוִד מַחֲנָיְמָה וְשֹׁבִי בֶן־נָחָשׁ מֵרַבַּת בְּנֵי־עַמּוֹן וּמָכִיר בֶּן־עַמִּיאֵל
> מִלֹּא דְבָר וּבַרְזִלַּי הַגִּלְעָדִי מֵרֹגְלִים:
>
> *wayhî kᵉbôʾ dāwid maḥᵃnāyᵉmâ wᵉšōbî ben-nāḥāš mērabbat bᵉnê-
> ʿammôn ûmākîr ben-ʿammîʾēl millōʾ dᵉbār ûbarzillay haggilʿādî
> mērōgᵉlîm*
>
> and-it-was as-to-come david mahanaim and-shobi son-of-nahash from-rabbah sons-of-ammon and-makir son-of-ammiel from-lo debar and-barzillai the-giledaite from-rogelim ...
>
> *When David came to Mahanaim, Shobi son of Nahash from Rabbah of the Ammonites, and Makir son of Ammiel from Lo Debar, and Barzillai the Giledaite from Rogelim ...*

According to Brown *et al* (1979: 520) לֹא דְבָר *lōʾ dᵉbār* is a proper name of a town in Gilead. The second example is עַמִּי לֹא *lōʾ ʿammî* in Hos 1[9] where עַמִּי לֹא *lōʾ ʿammî* is a proper name, the symbolic name of a son of Hosea. The third example is רֻחָמָה לֹא *lōʾ ruḥāmâ* in Hos 1[6,8] and 2[25] where רֻחָמָה לֹא *lōʾ ruḥāmâ* is a proper name, the symbolic name of a daughter of Hosea.

Of the negative לוֹא *lôʾ*, the full mode of writing (*scriptio plena*) of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, 28 occurrences in 28 verses are to be found. The following table (8) presents an exposition of the defective and full form of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*.

19

(8)

Morphological form	Distribution	Text example
לֹא *lōʾ* [...][15]	5 188 cases in 3 967 verses (cf Addendum A)	These 5 188 cases comprise all the morphological forms listed below.
לוֹא *lôʾ*	28 cases in 28 verses.[16] (cf Addendum B)	These 28 cases include the bare form without any prefixes.
לֹא *lōʾ*	3 323 cases of the bare form in 2 767 verses (cf Addendum C)	(a) Gen 4⁵ וְאֶל־קַיִן וְאֶל־מִנְחָתוֹ לֹא שָׁעָה *wᵉʾel-qayin wᵉʾel-minḥātô lōʾ šāʿâ* ... but-on-cain and-on-offering-his not looked-(with favour)-he *... but on Cain and his offering he did not look with favour.*
לוֹא *lôʾ*	28 cases in 28 verses (cf Addendum B)	(b) Gen 31³⁵ וַתֹּאמֶר אֶל־אָבִיהָ אַל־יִחַר בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנִי כִּי לוֹא אוּכַל לָקוּם מִפָּנֶיךָ *wattōʾmer ʾel-ʾābîhā ʾal-yiḥar bᵉʿênê ʾᵃdōnî kî lôʾ ʾûkal lāqûm mippāneykā* and-said-she to-father-her not-let-be-wrong-it in-eyes-of-lord-my that not can-I to-stand before-face-your *And she said to her father, "Let it not be wrong in the eyes of my lord, that I cannot stand up in your presence; ...*

---

15 The brackets [...] indicate any possible particle joined to the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. The result of this search has shown that prefixes may be joined immediately to the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, but no cases are encountered of suffixes immediately joined to the preceding negative.

16 Brown *et al* (1979: 518), Koehler *et al* (1974: 486) and Holladay (1971: 170) maintain that the form לוֹא *lôʾ* occurs 35 times. If one considers the 28 cases of לוֹא *lôʾ*, the 6 cases of בְּלוֹא *bᵉlô* and the single case of כְלוֹא *kᵉlô*, then it adds up to a total of 35 cases.

Morpho-logical form	Distribution	Text example
וְלֹא *wᵉlōʾ*	1 598 cases in 1 383 verses (cf Addendum D)	(c) Num 12[8] פֶּה אֶל־פֶּה אֲדַבֶּר־בּוֹ וּמַרְאֶה וְלֹא בְחִידֹת *peh ʾel-peh ʾadabber-bô ûmarʾeh wᵉlōʾ bᵉḥîdōt* mouth to-mouth speak-I-in-him and-(in)-sight and-not in-riddles *With him I speak face to face, clearly and not in riddles; …*
וְלוֹא *wᵉlôʾ*	0 cases	
בְּלֹא *bᵉlōʾ*	25 cases in 22 verses (cf Addendum E)	(d) Num 35[22] וְאִם־בְּפֶתַע בְּלֹא־אֵיבָה הֲדָפוֹ *wᵉʾim-bᵉpetaʿ bᵉlōʾ-ʾêbâ hᵃdāfô* and-if-in-instant with-not-enmity shoves-him … *But if without enmity someone suddenly pushes another …*
בְּלוֹא *bᵉlôʾ*	6 cases in 4 verses (cf Addendum E)	(e) Eccles 10[11] אִם־יִשֹּׁךְ הַנָּחָשׁ בְּלוֹא־לָחַשׁ *ʾim-yiššōk hannāḥāš bᵉlôʾ-lāḥaš* if-bites-he the-snake with-not-charming … *If a snake bites before it is charmed …*
שֶׁלֹּא *šelōʾ*	4 cases in 4 verses (cf Addendum F)	(f) Ps 124[6] בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה שֶׁלֹּא נְתָנָנוּ טֶרֶף לְשִׁנֵּיהֶם: *bārûk yahweh šellōʾ nᵉtānānû ṭeref lᵉšinnêhem* praise-be lord who-not has-given-he-us prey for-teeth-their *Praise be to the Lord, who has not given us as prey to their teeth.*
שֶׁלּוֹא *šelôʾ*	0 cases	

Morpho-logical form	Distribution	Text example
כְּלֹא $k^el\bar{o}$ʾ	0 cases	
כְּלוֹא $k^el\hat{o}$ʾ	1 case	(g) Obad 1[16] וְשָׁתוּ וְלָעוּ וְהָיוּ כְלוֹא הָיוּ $w^e\check{s}\bar{a}t\hat{u}$ $w^el\bar{a}'\hat{u}$ $w^eh\bar{a}y\hat{u}$ $k^el\hat{o}$ʾ $h\bar{a}y\hat{u}$ and-will-drink-they and-drink-they [lit. drink noisily or slurp] and-will-be-they as-not had-been-they *… they will drink and drink and be as if they had never been.*
לְלֹא $l^el\bar{o}$ʾ	10 cases in 8 verses (cf Addendum G)	(h) Job 26[3] מַה־יָּעַצְתָּ לְלֹא חָכְמָה mah-$yy\bar{a}'a\d{s}t\bar{a}$ $l^el\bar{o}$ʾ $\d{h}okm\hat{a}$ how-have-advised-you for-not wise (unwise/foolish) *What advice you have offered to one without wisdom!*
לְלוֹא $l^el\hat{o}$ʾ	0 cases	
הֲלֹא[17] $h^al\bar{o}$ʾ	127 cases in 125 verses (cf Addendum H)	(i) Gen 27[36] וַיֹּאמַר הֲלֹא־אָצַלְתָּ לִי בְרָכָה: $wayy\bar{o}'mar$ $h^al\bar{o}$ʾ-$'\bar{a}\d{s}alt\bar{a}$ $l\hat{i}$ $b^er\bar{a}k\hat{a}$ and-said-he QM[18]-not-laid-aside-you for-me blessing *Then he asked, "Haven't you reserved any blessing for me?"*
הֲלוֹא $h^al\hat{o}$ʾ	147 cases in 139 verses (cf Addendum I)	(j) 1 Sam 9[20] הֲלוֹא לְךָ וּלְכֹל בֵּית אָבִיךָ: $h^al\hat{o}$ʾ $l^ek\bar{a}$ $\hat{u}l^ek\bar{o}l$ $b\hat{e}t$ $'\bar{a}b\hat{i}k\bar{a}$ QM-not to-you and-to-all house-of father-your *Is it not to you and to all your father's family?*

---

17 Brongers (1981: 177), in his article on the Biblical particle $h^al\bar{o}$ʾ/$h^al\hat{o}$ʾ, states that in some books of the Old Testament a certain preference for the use of either the *scriptio plena* or *scriptio defectiva* is obvious. Brongers states that a reason for this cannot be given, the less since in some books both forms are used and in some books for the greater part one of the two forms prevails.

To summarise, section 2.1 has provided a morphological analysis of the negative לֹא *lō'*, the defective mode of writing and לוֹא *lô'*, the full mode of writing. Each occurrence was illustrated with a text example. It was indicated that the morphological forms of the negative לֹא *lō'* / לוֹא *lô'* as in (9) are to be found.

(9)   (a)   לֹא *lō'*, וְלֹא *wᵉlō'*, בְלֹא *bᵉlō'*, כְּלֹא *kᵉlō'*, לְלֹא *lᵉlō'*, הֲלֹא *hᵃlō'*

        (b)   לוֹא *lô'*, בְלוֹא *bᵉlô'*, כְּלוֹא *kᵉlô'*, הֲלוֹא *hᵃlô'*

2.2   The *maqqēf*

Before proceeding with a discussion on the *ketib/qere* readings, the following discussion will refer briefly to another grammatical aspect pertaining to the use of the negative לֹא *lō'* – the *maqqēf*.[19] Numerous cases are encountered of the negative לֹא *lō'* / לוֹא *lô'* joined to the subsequent categories by means of a *maqqēf*, as well as cases lacking the *maqqēf*. Waltke & O'Connor (1990: 64) add that these morphemes (short words) are joined by the loss of accentuation or *proclisis* (leaning forward, *viz* of one word on another); the word that loses its accent is said to be proclitic.[20] Another question to be answered is whether there is a difference in meaning between the cases joined by means of the *maqqēf* and those lacking it. One very interesting example of the *maqqēf*, as recorded by Yeivin (1969: 116) is found in Is 57[12]. Yeivin states that the editors of BHS painstakingly proofread their edition to ensure its complete agreement with the Masoretic text. Scores, if not hundreds, of errors that crept into BHK have been rectified. One such a rectification occurs in Is 57[12] where

---

18 Question marker.

19 The *maqqēf* is a mark that looks like a hyphen and joins two or more words together into a single accentual unit (Kittel *et al* 1989: 368).

20 Waltke & O'Connor (1990: 220) in their discussion on the preposition bring to light a salient point on the use of the *maqqēf*. They maintain that prepositions tend to combine formally with the expressions that they govern. This tendency is evident in the inseparable character of בְּ *bᵉ*, כְּ *kᵉ*, לְ *lᵉ*, and in the frequent use of the *maqqēf* to bind independent prepositions to the words they govern. If the *maqqēf* combines prepositions formally to the expressions that they govern, what light will this fact shed on the combination of the negative to the subsequent word by means of the *maqqēf*? This matter is still in need of further research.

וְלֹא־ *wᵉlōʾ-* in BHK was rectified to וְלֹא *wᵉlōʾ*, with the *maqqēf* considered superfluous. However, it seems that the presence and absence of the *maqqēf* make no difference in the meaning/interpretation. To the extent of this research, it should merely be noted that several examples are found of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* joined to a subsequent lexical category by means of the *maqqēf* and several are found without it. This usage is phonological and does not pertain to the syntactic level.

2.3   *Ketib/qere* readings

Before proceeding with a discussion on the grammatical aspects of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in available BH dictionaries and BH grammars, a brief reference to the problem regarding the *ketib/qere*[21] readings is necessary. These occurrences refer to problematic readings of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* / לֹא *lôʾ*. The data searches revealed some examples where uncertainty exists regarding the rendering of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in the text. Some 20 examples are found where the rendering of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is proposed to be super-seded by other readings. The following example in (10) will illustrate, in connection with textual criticism,[22] the problematic aspects of the *ketib*

---

21 In instances where the consonantal text was felt to be unsatisfactory or where textual variants were deemed to be worthy of preservation, the Masoretes (who were bound not to alter the consonantal text) provided the consonants of the word to be read in the margin (Scott 1987: 11). These variant readings in the margin form part of the Masorah Parva consisting of a veritable library of information about the Hebrew text in its formative period (Kelley 1989: xi). The variant form in the margin is called the *qere* reading (from קְרֵי *qᵉrê* – to be read) and the corresponding written form in the text is referred to as the *ketib* (from כְּתָב *kᵉtîb* – written). The *qere* reading was normally preferred to the *ketib* reading. The vocalisation of the *qere* reading in the margin was placed below the *ketib* form in the text. Joüon & Muraoka (1991: 72) state that the *ketib/qere* is always concerned with the consonantal text. It represents two variants of the consonantal text. Very often the *qere* gives a reading preferable to that of the *ketib*, but they maintain that there are cases where the *ketib* is as good as or even better than the *qere*. A very important fact to be considered in terms of the *ketib/qere* is that changes may come about in texts in various ways. First, the spelling used in a given text may be updated from time to time as current orthography changes. Second, a text that is being copied by hand may, only too understandably, be corrupted by scribal errors. Third, and more important, later scribes or editors (redactors) of a text are liable to introduce changes, not only in the author's spelling, but also in his punctuation and his grammatical usage (Deist 1978: 19).

22 Deist (1978: 11) defines textual criticism as "first, the evaluation of the accuracy of transmitted texts on the basis of other copies of them and, second, the possible

and *qere* readings. The other 19 cases exhibit problems of the same nature and Ex 21[8] will only serve as an example (cf Addendum J).

(10)   Ex 21[8]

> אִם־רָעָה בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנֶיהָ אֲשֶׁר־לֹא יְעָדָהּ וְהֶפְדָּהּ
>
> *'im-rāʿâ bᵉʿênê ᵃᵃdōneyhā ᵃᵃšer-lōʾ yᵉʿādāh wᵉhefdāh*
>
> if-misery in-eyes-of master-her which-not [for himself[23]] has-designated-he-her (and)-then-let-be-ransomed-he-her
>
> *If there is misery in the eyes of her master who has not selected her [for himself], then he must let her be redeemed.[24]*

The *qere* reading proposes לוֹ *lô* (preposition לְ *lᵉ* with pronominal suffix 3rd masculine singular) instead of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. The text-critical apparatus of BHS provides the following: the Septuagint, Targum and Vulgate follow the *qere* reading. In other words, these three manuscripts accept the proposal to read as the *qere*, changing the negative to the preposition with the pronominal suffix third person masculine singular. If this proposal is accepted, then a possible translation will be as in (11).

(11)   *If there is misery in the eyes of her master who has designated her for himself, then he must let her be ransomed.*

A decision whether to keep the *ketib* or to change according to the *qere* is not an easy task. As the *ketib/qere* does not directly pertain to the objective of this research, these are considered open-ended problems that still need further research. The objective was merely to set this problematic phenomenon on the table, indicating that there are some 20 examples of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* where uncertainty exists as to whether it is indeed the form לֹא *lōʾ* or another form as suggested by the *qere* reading.

restoration of assumed 'original manuscripts' on this same basis". The most probable original text of the Hebrew Bible can thus only be obtained as the result of a highly complex operation which involves careful comparison of ancient texts as well as intense study of linguistic problems. Only when these tasks have been undertaken to the full limit of possibility are we entitled to assert with any confidence what the Hebrew Bible says, or what we believe it to say. If we would understand the Hebrew Bible, it must be through text-critical study and philological research (Thomas 1967: 4).

23 [for himself] is the *qere* reading.

24 The NIV has a footnote to this verse: Or *master so that he does not choose her*. Hence, it seems that the NIV has considered both readings as possibilities.

2.4 The grammatical aspects of the negative לֹא *lō'* in BH dictionaries and grammars

Having discussed the morphological aspects of the negative לֹא *lō'*, the following discussion will set out to provide a brief exposition on grammatical aspects regarding the negative לֹא *lō'* in current BH dictionaries and grammars. The objective is not to provide exhaustive discussions on syntactic expositions of the negative לֹא *lō'* in BH dictionaries and grammars, but simply to provide a basis as point of departure for the syntactic discussions to follow.

2.4.1 Hebrew dictionaries

BH dictionaries convey, besides morphological information, a large amount of syntactic and semantic information. On morphological level BH dictionaries convey a great deal of information on the negative לֹא *lō'*, regarding the different forms of the negative לֹא *lō'*, as well as the different categories with which the negative לֹא *lō'* is likely to combine. The focus here is not on the morphological or semantic side of the negative לֹא *lō'*, but on the proposals made in BH dictionaries regarding the syntax of the negative לֹא *lō'*. The following Hebrew dictionaries will be utilised in this research: *Gesenius' Hebrew dictionary*; the *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew dictionary*, the *Koehler-Baumgartner dictionary*, and *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* by David Clines.[25] When discussing the distribution of the negative לֹא *lō'* in the above BH dictionaries, the following very important question asked by Naudé (1985: 11) should be kept in mind: he asks whether the semantic entries of traditional BH lexicons define meaning in terms of differentiating semantic components or whether it is merely a list with philological data, cases of usage, references, entries according to syntactic features and translation equivalents.

---

25 Holladay's *Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon* will also briefly be utilised in this research, and therefore will not be discussed in detail in this section.

(a)   Gesenius

One of the oldest Hebrew dictionaries is the one by Heinrich Friedrich Wilhelm Gesenius, of which the first edition was published around 1810. Long after his death in 1842, many revisions, translations, and reprints of this work continued to appear. Although it can no longer be considered fully up-to-date, it contains a treasury of information, including cognates from related languages and references to other scholarly publications (De Blois 2000: 13). In terms of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* Gesenius' dictionary differentiates between the use of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* as simply expressing a negative and cases where it is prefixed, amongst others, to nouns and adjectives. It merely lists examples of these, but does not describe the scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in such examples. This dictionary then proceeds with a listing of the different prefixes that occur with the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. In all these cases translation equivalents for certain categories are provided. The questions that arise are, firstly, whether the minimum contribution of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is considered in these examples, and secondly, whether the syntactic distribution and scope of the particles preceding the negative לֹא *lōʾ* itself are considered. On syntactic level both the negative לֹא *lōʾ* and these varieties of particles will have a certain scope over the following clause. Different translation equivalents are put on the table, but the question is whether these translation equivalents are indeed correct and whether they express the minimum contribution of both the negative לֹא *lōʾ* and the preceding particles.

(b)   Brown-Driver-Briggs

Another well-known dictionary is the one by Brown, Driver, and Briggs, of which the first part was published in 1891 and the remainder completed in 1906. Their work was written in English and based on Robinson's translation into English of Gesenius' dictionary, published in 1854. The editorial team incorporated many of the discoveries in the fields of archaeology and philology that had been made in the second half of the nineteenth century in their lexicon. Later editions of Gesenius' dictionary also contain much of that information (De Blois 2000: 13). As Muraoka (1995: 87) puts it, "BDB and the 17th edition of Gesenius are still very much alive." Chisholm (1998: 14) adds that the classic dictionary of Brown, Driver, and Briggs (BDB) remains a standard tool for Old Testament exegesis because of its breadth of coverage, and thorough categorization of usage. BDB has many commendable features, although the interpreter must also

be aware of its limitations and weaknesses, primarily due to its age (BDB was published in 1907):

- BDB's treatment of Semitic cognates is woefully outdated and unreliable in many places. This is of particular concern in the study of rare words, where data from the cognate languages are of special importance.

- The English glosses given in BDB are sometimes archaic and out-dated, and, if utilized uncritically, can be misleading and inaccurate.

- BDB often fails to recognise the existence of homonymic roots, many of which have been isolated by more recent linguistic research.

- The bibliographical data included in BDB's discussions are frequently outdated and, practically speaking, inaccessible.

- BDB's arrangement of all words according to their root derivation is helpful in the respect that all words derived from a root appear together, facilitating semantic analysis of derivatives, but problematic in that one must be informed about such morphological phenomena as *nun assimilation*, and so forth, to be able to find some words.

In terms of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* BDB differentiates between the use of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in predication and non-predication. In its use in predication, examples are provided of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* preceding the verb, indicating that it nearly always occurs with a verb. Then it proceeds to state that the negative לֹא *lōʾ* always properly negates the word immediately following it. Thus, in a verbal sentence where this is not the verb, some special stress rests upon the word. Firstly, the scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is not considered. Maintaining that the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, in predication, properly negates the word immediately following, whether it be a verb or any other category, and then discussing in the following section the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in non-predication, indicating that the negative לֹא *lōʾ* precedes, amongst other things, adjectives, nouns, and so forth, is contradictory. The question arises as to why there is this division between the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in predication and non-predication. It seems in this dictionary that the underlying implication regarding the negative לֹא *lōʾ*

in predication, is that of sentence-negation, whereas in non-predication, it is constituent-negation. The negative לֹא *lōʾ* in cases of predication should have been only those cases where the negative לֹא *lōʾ* precedes the verb expressing sentence-negation. The second division must then deal with the negative לֹא *lōʾ* preceding nouns, adjectives, and so forth, with the clear implication that the latter should be considered as constituent-negation. Another division made by this dictionary is the negative לֹא *lōʾ* with prefixes. Again, the question arises whether the translation possibilities offered indeed exhibit the minimum contribution of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in terms of these different categories.

(c)   Koehler-Baumgartner
About half a century after the publication of BDB, in 1953, Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner published the first edition of their *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. This edition was bilingual in that it provided glosses in both German and English. Two years after the death of Koehler, in 1958, a second edition appeared. This was actually an unaltered reprint of the first edition, together with a supplement from the hand of Baumgartner, which contained a German-Hebrew and a German-Aramaic glossary, together with a list of corrections and additions to the first edition and some other information. The first volume of the third edition to this impressive dictionary appeared in 1967. Unfortunately, however, in this edition the approach of using bilingual glosses was abandoned. The need arose, therefore, for a separate English edition, of which the first volume appeared in 1993. Unlike BDB, this dictionary was not based on the one by Gesenius. Since Koehler and Baumgartner's work is much more recent than the aforementioned dictionaries, it can be considered far more up-to-date. As far as its organisation is concerned, however, this dictionary is not significantly different from the one by Gesenius. It differs from BDB in that all entries have been listed alphabetically, with the result that it is easier to find a particular entry in this dictionary. In spite of its disadvantages, KB is a useful dictionary that provides the user with a large quantity of valuable information. From a lexicographical point of view, however, this dictionary does not have much more to offer than BDB (De Blois 2000: 15).

In terms of the negative לֹא *lō’* it also differentiates the usual neg-ation of a verb (in a statement). Furthermore, it differentiates the negation of a single word in a sentence. In a separate section it discusses the negation of substantives and in yet another section the negation of single concepts. Again, the question arises regarding the relevance of such divisions. If the syntactic distribution is considered it will be evident that the latter two divisions, *i e* the negative לֹא *lō’* preceding substantives and the proposed single concepts both pertain to constituent-negation. Hence, a division should have been made between sentence-negation and constituent-negation proper. In the first part of the discussion on the negative לֹא *lō’* preceding the verb, sentence-negation is implied. The negation of substantives and single concepts should be discussed in a single section dealing with constituent-negation, and not separate sections as is the case in this dic-tionary. Again the criticism is that the syntactic distribution and scope of the negative is not properly considered in the division of the cases of use of the negative. As in the other dictionaries it also differentiates the occur-rences of the negative לֹא *lō’* preceded by different particles with different translation equivalents. Evidently, it is clear that this dictionary does not properly consider the syntactic distribution and scope of the negative לֹא *lō’* when demarcating the different cases of usage of the negative לֹא *lō’*.

(d)   Clines

The first volume of *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (DCH) edited by David J A Clines was published in 1993. At present four volumes have already been published, and up to now the letters א *’* to ל *l* have been covered. According to the preface, this dictionary "marks an important departure from the tradition of Hebrew lexicography" (Clines 1993: 7). One of the ways in which it is said to differ from other Hebrew dictionaries is that it "designates and defines a phase of the language as Classical Hebrew" (Clines 1993: 14). This dictionary is said to cover all Hebrew texts from the period prior to approximately 200 CE. In addition to the Hebrew Old Testament it covers the following texts: (1) Ben Sira, (2) the Qumran manuscripts and related texts, and (3) inscriptions and other occasional texts. Clines (1990: 73) conjectures that the most characteristic features of the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* result from its general orientation to the principles of modern linguistics. There is a stress – inasmuch as this is possible within the framework of a *Wörterbuch* – on the relationship of words within phrases and sentences.

As far as its organisation is concerned, this dictionary has followed the same method as Koehler-Baumgartner: all words have been listed alphabetically. It also provides the user with the number of occurrences of each *lemma* in the four different bodies of text listed above. This information is followed by the part of speech and a gloss that helps the user identify the *lemma*. Then all morphological forms of the *lemma* are listed, followed by its semantic analysis, its syntagmatic analysis, and its paradigmatic analysis (synonyms, antonyms, and so forth). Finally, a number of related entries is given. Another important feature of this dictionary is that it makes an effort to keep semantic, syntagmatic, and paradigmatic information apart. It is a well-organised dictionary containing a treasury of information. It also deserves praise for the fact that – in most cases – all references in which a particular word occurs have been listed. In addition, the wide range of texts that are covered is unprecedented. This dictionary also seems to be considerably more reluctant to suggest emendations of the Hebrew text than KB.

This dictionary, however, has a number of disadvantages. Unfortunately, a structural semantic analysis of Classical Hebrew is missing. Therefore the semantic analysis for each particular entry contains a large subjective element (Clines 1993: 19). On this same page the author of the introduction even states

> that our perception of senses is often dependent on the semantic structure
> of the English language. That is how it must be, and should be, of course,
> in an interlingual dictionary.

Muraoka (1995: 91) correctly labels this as "a most extraordinary and dogmatic statement." This statement may hold some truth for a Bible translator who wants to translate the Hebrew Bible into English, but is hard to accept for someone who wants to do translation work in any other language and needs a dictionary in the English language in order to understand what the Hebrew text says. A Hebrew dictionary is meant to teach one something about the meaning in Hebrew and too much emphasis on the semantic structure of the English language may prevent us from really understanding what goes on in Hebrew. Only a structural semantic analysis of Hebrew can help one to understand what the language is trying to communicate and only on the basis of such an analysis will one be able to determine which semantic domains are relevant to the language. Therefore, in

spite of what the introduction says, the compilers of this dictionary have not used the insights provided by modern lexicography to the fullest extent.

Another problem – related to the one described in the previous para-graph – lies in the fact that the meaning of each individual (sub)entry is described in the form of one or more glosses rather than a clear definition. This makes it much more difficult to get a clear overview of the different senses that one particular entry may have. As a result of this, this dictionary looks more like other dictionaries than may have been necessary (De Blois 2000: 16).

Finally, one could ask oneself the question as to whether this dictionary perhaps contains an overload of information. Is it really neces-sary to list all different verbs that have the word *ab* "father" as subject, all verbs that have it as object, as well as the types of verbless clauses in which it occurs? Nowadays we have computer programmes that provide us with information of that nature if we really want it. What are the semantic benefits of knowing all the passages where Moses is the subject of *agaz* "to hold, seize, grasp" rather than Jacob or David? A dictionary should not be an exhaustive encyclopaedia containing all available information about a particular word, but should limit itself to the information that is relevant from a semantic point of view (De Blois 2000: 16).

A brief overview of the treatment of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in DCH has brought certain matters to light. The divisions made by DCH are completely syntactic in nature. It sets out to describe the syntactic en-vironment in which the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is found. It divides the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in terms of the different categories it precedes, such as the perfect verb, the imperfect verb, the participle, infinitives, verbless clauses and those cases where the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is *not* followed by either verbs or verbless clauses. The latter of course includes cases like nouns, adjectives, and so forth. From a syntactic perspective such a division is of course extremely relevant. However, under sub-headings within each of the above divisions, it sets out to discuss, for instance, the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in questions with a listing of all the different question particles that precede the negative לֹא *lōʾ*; or the negative לֹא *lōʾ* preceding the imperfect verb in conditional clauses. The subdivisions are then made in terms of the categories preceding the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. The relevance of such divisions,

particularly from a syntactic perspective, is questionable. It never arrives at conclusions regarding the scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, before the imperfect, for example. The focus, it seems, is much stronger on the negative לֹא *lōʾ* preceding the imperfect in questions, but then the subdivision is in terms of the interrogatives preceding the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. The relevance of discussing the negative לֹא *lōʾ* preceding the imperfect in questions is unclear, if these questions are introduced by interrogatives, having their own contribution of interrogativeness and *scope* in the clause. After all, it is questionable as to whether the negative לֹא *lōʾ* contributes at all to the expression of the question. Furthermore, in other respects, where it discusses, for example, the negative לֹא *lōʾ* preceding the participle, it merely lists a number of examples of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* preceding participles, but does not justify itself in terms of the scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in such cases, let alone the semantic contribution of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in such syntactic settings. It merely provides a listing of several occurrences together with translation equivalents of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. Valuable information on the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is included in this dictionary but, from a syntactic perspective, this information should be judged critically in terms of its relevance for determining the distribution of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* and determining its scope over the clause or word to follow.

2.4.2 BH grammars

The last decade saw an explosion in the publication of introductory BH grammars of which Van der Merwe (to be published: 1) lists the following: Kittel *et al* 1989, Kelly 1992, Martin 1993, Gibson 1994, Bartelmus 1994, Seow 1995, Borneman 1998, Dobson 1999, Bartelt 2000, Hostetter 2000 and Simon & Motzkin 2000. These grammars are only a small representation of all BH grammars currently available. It is not the objective of this section to discuss the syntactic aspects of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* as expounded in all available grammars. Firstly, such an endeavour falls outside the scope of this research and secondly, it would be a time and space-consuming task. When discussing BH grammars it is often difficult to predict which grammar will cover a particular problematic issue. Biblical grammarians are similar to lexicographers: they are descriptive, using the biblical text, ancient translations and other languages as evidence in constructing their grammatical principles. Keeping in mind that all BH grammars should be used critically, a choice has been made to utilise

the following grammars in this discussion:[26] Gesenius' *Hebrew grammar*, Friedrich Eduard König's *Historisch-komparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache* (1897), Waltke & O'Connor's *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew syntax* (1990) and Joüon & Muraoka's *A grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (1991).

(a)   Gesenius' *Hebrew grammar*

Van der Merwe *et al* (1999: 19) maintains that the grammar of Wilhelm Gesenius still remains one of the most highly esteemed and authoritative BH grammars. It appeared for the first time in 1807 and there have been 28 subsequent editions. Emile Kautzsch produced the last seven and in 1910 Arthur Cowley produced an English version. Naudé (1996a: 23-24)[27] adds that even though Gesenius' grammar contains a section under the heading *Syntax*, this part actually focuses on semantics. The third part of Gesenius' Grammar is dedicated to *Syntax* under which the sentence in general is discussed, followed by *Special kinds of sentences* under which *Negative sentences* are discussed. The chapter on negative sentences covers six pages in which all the different negative sentences are discussed, with two pages dedicated to the negative לֹא *lō'*. It is considered inadequate to discuss the syntactic nature, distribution and scope of the negative לֹא *lō'* in BH. It is evident that a mere two pages can only set out to list the syntactic distribution of the negative לֹא *lō'*, and would not be able to adequately discuss the syntactic richness of the negative לֹא *lō'* in different syntactic settings. However, it should be mentioned that Gesenius' grammar does make a distinction between the negative לֹא *lō'* as a clausal negative (sentence-negation) and an item negative (constituent-negation). Though it is stated that verbal clauses are regularly negated by the negative לֹא *lō'*, it is indicated that noun clauses are rarely negated by לֹא *lō'*, except the use of לֹא *lō'* with single words. It seems then that this grammar indicates a difference between the scope of the negative לֹא *lō'* in verbal clauses and its use before single nouns and noun clauses. It states that the occurrences of the negative לֹא *lō'* preceding these noun clauses always in-

---

26 In the syntactic discussions to follow in chapters 4 to 7, where applicable, references will also be made to other BH grammars.

27 For a historical overview of the study of syntax, see Naudé (1996a: 17-35). The author provides an overview of the syntactic developments and indicates some of the insufficiencies of syntax expositions in grammars. However, this overview also covers only a confined number of pages.

cludes a certain emphasis, since the scope of the negation falls upon a particular word, rather than upon the whole phrase. The grammar continues to state that the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, as a rule, comes immediately before the verb, but is sometimes separated from it, frequently to bring into special prominence another word which follows (Cowley 1910: 479). This seems contradictory. Does this statement imply that the scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* still lies on this *separated* verb, as the negative לֹא *lōʾ* now imme-diately precedes other elements in these cases, such as in Job 22[7], where the negative לֹא *lōʾ* precedes a noun. Another point of criticism against this grammar is that, when discussing the use of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* with single words, it simply lists such single words with translation equivalents, but does not systematize these categories in terms of nouns, adjectives, and so forth.

(b)   Friedrich Eduard König's *Historisch-komparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache*

Naudé (2000a: 105) also refers to the exhaustive syntax on Hebrew published by Friedrich Eduard König, namely his *Historisch-komparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache*, in which he sets himself the task of de-scribing the syntax of BH in such a way as to clarify its relationship with common Semitic syntax. Despite the fact that König in his work *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache* relied heavily on the work of Gesenius, he nevertheless took an independent route by going back to the Jewish scholar, David Kimchi. He questioned several of the theories established by Gesenius. In particular, he did this by approaching Hebrew with a classical model (Fensham 1973: 5).

König also identifies the occurrence of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* with the verbal forms stating that the verbal form is the bearer of the negative. However, he also indicates that the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is sometimes placed before other categories. An interesting point is raised by König (1897: 476) where he states that the negative לֹא *lōʾ* sometimes negates several statements following each other. He divides this type of negation into two groups:

- those cases where several co-ordinate statements are negated;
- cases where subordinate clauses are negated.

However, despite this division, he does not justify himself in terms of the scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in such examples, as he merely lists a number of text occurrences.

(c)   Waltke & O'Connor's *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew syntax*
Of some use is Waltke & O'Connor's *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990). However, at over seven hundred pages, this book is hardly an introduction. It is useful in that it attempts to apply modern linguistic theory to BH. It contains a very helpful *Glossary* and is well-indexed (Brettler 2001).

Whereas other grammars discuss the different negatives in BH in a single chapter or a single section of a chapter, this grammar sets out to discuss the negative לֹא *lōʾ* throughout the whole grammar. Unfortunately, no single chapter or section of a chapter discusses all the negative particles as a unit. In order to get an overall picture of the syntax of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, one needs to browse through the whole grammar, which, to a certain extent, is obstructive. This grammar does describe the distribution of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, but this discussion is inadequate as it refers briefly to some of the categories in which the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is likely to be found. In essence, it merely describes some of the cases of use of the negative; it avers, for instance, that the infinitive absolute is usually not negated. A negative particle, where needed, is normally placed before the finite verb (Waltke & O'Connor 1990: 583). However, it mererly lists this case of usage of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, without justifying itself in terms of the syntax and exact scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* in such an occurrence. In one instance it merely provides a translation equivalent for the case where the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is combined with the preposition בְּ *bᵉ*. In another instance it states that the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is used to negate the relative participle, providing one example, but does not describe the syntactic use of the negative in such cases. The grammar makes the distinction between the negative לֹא *lōʾ* as a clausal adverb and an item adverb. By clausal adverb is meant that the negative negates the entire clause following it (in this research this is referred to as sentence-negation), whereas the negative as an item adverb implies that it is only negating the category which follows upon it immediately (constituent-negation). Despite this distinction, it does not justify itself in terms of the variety of ways it can be used as clausal and item adverbs. Furthermore, this distinction between

clausal and item adverbs is not always correct. In one case it contends that the negative לֹא *lōʾ* precedes a verb, proposing that it is clausal negation, while in another it states that the negative לֹא *lōʾ* precedes the verb, but that לֹא *lōʾ* negates the adverb following on the verb. Hence, this distinction between clausal and item negation is not always clear-cut.

In conclusion, it should be stated that a drawback of Waltke & O'Connor (1990) is the fact that the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, and to some extent, the negative in general, is not discussed in a single chapter. Furthermore, it merely lists a number of uses of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*, without giving proper consideration to the syntactic distribution of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. A positive remark on this grammar is the distinction that is drawn between clausal and item negation. However, the latter distinction is only referred to and the syntactic richness thereof is not expounded.

(d)   Joüon & Muraoka's *A grammar of Biblical Hebrew*
Another useful BH reference grammar in English is Joüon & Muraoka's *A grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (1991). It is not quite as detailed as Gesenius, but is often easier to follow, and is more up to date (Brettler 2001). Part three of Joüon & Muraoka (1991) is dedicated to syntax. Chapter 160 is devoted to a discussion of the negative clause covering all BH negatives in eight pages. Again the question might be asked regarding the adequacy of this discussion in dealing with the syntactic richness of the negative. A mere two pages is dedicated to the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. This grammar also sets out with a discussion of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* usually found in the environment of verbal clauses. It also makes the distinction that לֹא *lōʾ* is sometimes used in verbless clauses, particularly when there is a measure of emphasis or when the negation relates to a word other than the predicate (Joüon & Muraoka 1991: 602). In contrast to Gesenius, for example, this grammar provides a list of the different verbless predicates that the negative לֹא *lōʾ* precedes and does not simply list them randomly. However, this list is not complete. The grammar also makes the distinction that the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is found preceding isolated nouns. Hence, one gets the feeling that a distinction is made between sentence- and constituent-negation, but again it is only (indirectly) assumed and no explicit distinction is made between these two types of negation. Again, several nuances of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* are suggested, but

syntactically the peculiarities are not discussed and the grammar does not adequately describe the scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*.

2.5   Conclusion

The objective of this chapter was to provide a brief survey on the grammatical aspects of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. Section 2.1 expounded the occurrence of the defective and full mode of writing: לֹא *lōʾ* and לוֹא *lôʾ*. It was concluded that there is, on syntactic level, no difference between these two forms. This discussion was followed by an exposition of the number of occurrences of the negative forms לֹא *lōʾ* and לוֹא *lôʾ*, which also included an exposition of the different particles with which לֹא *lōʾ* and לוֹא *lôʾ* are likely to be combined. Section 2.3 briefly referred to the issue regarding the *ketib/qere* readings of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. The objective of the latter was not to provide a detailed discussion on the *ketib/qere,* but merely to provide an introduction to the issue regarding these occurrences of the negative לֹא *lōʾ*.

The brief discussion on BH dictionaries and BH grammars has shed light on the inadequacy of the syntax of the negative, and specifically the negative לֹא *lōʾ*. It is evident, with some exceptions, that the syntactic analyses of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* are inadequate and incomplete as far as describing the distribution and scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* is concerned. In view of the inadequacy of these analyses, and specifically the fact that most BH dictionaries and grammars refrain from describing the syntactic richness of this negative element, the rest of this research will examine whether recent advances in generative syntax might provide the devices for describing the distribution and scope of the negative לֹא *lōʾ* more adequately. To this end, Chapter 3 will give a brief overview of the relevant theoretical devices postulated within the framework of Minimalist Syntax.