

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

perhaps volume after volume. The wonder is, by what magic of patient labor, by what mystery of intellectual toil, these sentences are ever written. It is no matter of wonder, how they can ever be read, for we are sure that they are never subjected to this operation.

If there are other varieties than these which we have named we know them not. With this enumeration, we conclude our remarks. We have spoken freely, but we hope not unkindly, plainly and perhaps pointedly, but we trust not inconsiderately nor unfairly.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### THE STRUCTURE OF THE HEBREW SENTENCE.

THE subject named at the head of this Article should not be left wholly out of view, in a course of Hebrew instruction. Every biblical student should endeavor to ascertain and classify the principles which regulated the expressions of thought among the Hebrews. Without this, there can be no radical acquaintance with Hebrew syntax in general; and without it, even the meaning of the sacred writers cannot always be fully apprehended. If any one supposes that the Hebrew sentence is so simple as to afford no opportunity to exercise his powers of analysis; or that it is so stereotyped in form as to exclude any very striking exhibition of variety, he entertains probably the common opinion on the subject, but one which is not correct. As compared with those languages which carry the system of inflection to such an extent, for example, as do the Latin and the Greek, the Hebrew moves in this respect, it must be confessed, in a restricted sphere; its sentence is, certainly, both uniform and simple. But without possessing so much flexibility as we see there, it has still left to it a wide range of movement. The inquisitive scholar has opened to him here an interesting field of study; and, after performing the necessary preparatory work, he should advance to it and add to his other knowledge that which may be gained from extending his inquiries in this direction. In truth, the greater the uniformity which may distinguish a language in the construction of its sentences, the more important and significant must be any departure

from it, which may at any time appear. The cause of such a virtual resistance to the prevailing spirit of the language, must lie deeper in the thoughts and feelings of the writer, than where such variations belong rather to the outward forms of speech, and may be taken up by him, therefore, as a matter of accident or habit, and so be entirely unmeaning. This remark is especially true of the Hebrew. When a writer or speaker here deviates from the ordinary mode of expression which the laws of the language impose so rigidly upon him, it is because he is urged by a special impulse; he breaks over the external restraint in the impetuosity of his feelings; he makes not only his words but the very order of them expressive of the state of his mind; and, in order to enter into this, to sympathize with him, to catch the exact reflection of his thoughts, we must know the difference between the ordinary Hebrew style and that of earnest, impassioned discourse; we must be able to see what new meaning belongs to the new position; we must understand the laws of that subtle, mental emphasis which prescribed to the words their unwonted order, so that as we read we may fill our ears, as it were, with the very tones with which the old prophets spoke, and bring back again the looks and gestures which gave to their language such power over those whom they originally addressed.

Perhaps no writer has treated the subject adverted to above, so well as Ewald in the last edition of his Hebrew Grammar.<sup>1</sup> He has there allotted much more than the usual space to the consideration of this topic. His remarks extend over 130 pages of his work; and they deserve the careful and reiterated perusal of every one who would be master of this important branch of Hebrew syntax. The view also which Nordheimer has given of this subject in his Grammar, is replete with instruction. No system of rules, however, which another may compile, can supersede the necessity of personal observation and study. They may be of service, especially at first, in giving direction to inquiry; but will not answer even this purpose, unless constantly verified by the student for himself. In this way, possibly, the following summary of the principles which are to be observed in the construction of the simple Hebrew sentence, may not be without value to those who take an interest in such studies: It is drawn up chiefly in conformity with the views of Ewald, and rests, therefore, essen-

<sup>1</sup> Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache des alten Bundes, von Heinrich Ewald. Fünfte Ausgabe, 1844.

tially on his authority. It is *the simple sentence alone*, which is here the subject of consideration. The construction of the compound sentence with its various constituent parts, its modes of connection, its hypothetical and relative clauses, etc., forms a separate topic by itself, and is not here to be brought into view. We confine ourselves to the ground which lies before the student, on his first entrance into this general field of investigation.

The Hebrew language is inferior to the Arabic, in regard to susceptibility of inflexion; but it is not a little remarkable, that, with this inferiority, it exhibits a far greater freedom and facility of movement in the structure of its sentences. The order which words naturally assume in calm, unimpassioned discourse, the Hebrew also has in common with the Arabic; but it admits likewise of numerous deviations from this order, resulting from the excitement of strong emotion in the mind of the writer; and in the degree in which it possesses this quality, the Hebrew is distinguished above not only the Arabic, but all the other Semitic languages.

We will consider the Hebrew sentence, in the first place, in its ordinary form, where the words arrange themselves in conformity with the laws of dispassionate discourse.

Here we find that the affirmative or predicative term precedes the subject, because in most cases it contains the new or more important idea which the speaker would present. Thus, the affirmative stands first when it consists of an adjective, as צַדִּיקִים יְהוָה<sup>1</sup> *righteous (is) Jehovah*; and still more, if it consist of a verb, since a subject is in reality already involved in all the personal forms of the verb, especially the third; so that the more definitive substantive which follows, stands originally in apposition merely with this third person; as, אָמַר יְהוָה *it (there) spake Jehovah*. Where however in some infrequent cases, the predicate as well as the subject, is contained in a substantive, the former stands always after the subject, that this may not be doubtful; as, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים *Jehovah thy God is God*. See Deut. 4: 35, 39. 10: 17.

Another very common variety, even in the structure of simple sentences, is the position of the subject first, instead of the predicate;

<sup>1</sup> So Ewald punctuates the word, and writes *Jahve*. This singularity it is unnecessary to retain.

which is adopted particularly in the narrative or descriptive style, when the person or actor is held up as the principal figure, while the act itself and the progress of its development, fall more into the back ground of the picture. This occurs, especially if the actor state which is attributed to the person, be an abiding one; and hence, since the participle in Hebrew expresses so often the idea of permanence, this arrangement will be found employed very uniformly in connection with the participle. Thus in Ex. 12: 11, where the condition described is introduced with the words—*so shall ye eat the Passover*; מְחַנְּתֶם הַגְּבִירִים, *your loins girded*. See Judg. 15: 2. 1 Sam. 12: 17. 2 Sam. 3: 14. Hence עוד *still* and אֵין *it is not*, also יֵשׁ *it is* (the latter much more rarely), are specially appropriate to such sentences; Ex. 3: 2. 5: 16. 9: 2. In the construction of compound and relative sentences, the principle becomes still more important.

This position acquires special significance when the participle so placed, serves at the same time to mark definite relations of time. Thus, it may stand for the *relative present*, expressing an act which continues at the present moment, as, הִנֵּה אָחִיךָ מְצִיבָהּ, *behold thy brother is angry with thee*, Gen. 27: 42. Jer. 16: 12; or, for the *relative future*, which the speaker contemplating as very near or as altogether certain, views as actually present, as, אָמַרְתָּ אַתָּה תָמוּתְּ, *thou art about to die*, Jer. 28: 16. הִנֵּה אֲנִי בָּרִיא, *behold I am about to bring*, Gen. 6: 17. It may represent also the *relative praeter*, though in a simple sentence this is less common, in cases where the hearer is admonished by something in the connection, to transfer himself to some definite situation in the past, as in the relation of a dream: הִנֵּה אֲנִי עֹמֵד, *behold I (was) standing*, Gen. 41: 17, i. e. thought myself to be so during the dream narrated; or, in answer to an inquiry, what a person has done during some period. See Jer. 38: 26.

In this signification of the participle as a definite tense, the הִנֵּה *behold*, is placed before it merely for the sake of greater animation, especially at the commencement of a new clause. This particle has a tendency to draw the subject into close connection with itself; and where this is not expressed in a definite form, will even supply its place by the suffix pronoun. Yet this law is not so strict as not to be sometimes relaxed. It may occur without any subject, provided that this is suggested with sufficient distinctness by the context; as, הִנֵּה הוּא יוֹצֵר, *behold he (Jehovah already mentioned) formed*, Am. 7: 1, comp. v. 7. But when הִנֵּה does not form part of the expression, and the participle stands

merely for the simple present or future, it may then like the other verbal, temporal designations, be placed at the beginning.

In the ordinary arrangement of the sentence, the object follows the subject, this latter as already stated, following the verb. This succession of the words maintains itself with special strictness, when a sentence or clause has been introduced by a strongly conjunctive term, as, *וְ* *that or since*, or by a temporal specification, as, *וְכֵן* (Jer. 23: 27), or a word on which a particular emphasis is intended to rest. See Gen. 1: 1. If the verb in this situation be in the *Infinit. constr.* the position remains the same, and with so much the greater necessity. The noun in this case, which would be the subject of the verb if it were finite, comes next to the verb, and the object next to the subject; as, *וְיָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם מַיִם רַבִּים וַיַּשְׁקֵם אֶת הָאָרֶץ*, Gen. 13: 10. 29: 13. If there be more than one accusative dependent on the same verb, that which stands first in sense, usually stands first also in order; as, *וַיִּזְכְּרוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה וַיִּשְׁכַּח אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה* *they have caused my people to forget my name*, Jer. 23: 27. 2: 19. Ps. 25: 9.

Smaller words, subordinate qualifications prefer to stand between the stronger parts of the sentence, i. e. the predicate and subject, or where these two are united in one word, between the verb and its object; as *וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ לְךָ אֶת הָאָרֶץ* *I will give to thee the land*, *וְכֵן עָשִׂנוּ מָה* *what (how) have we done this?* In this way the *Infinit. constr.* may be separated even from its subject by a smaller intervening word, since the connection of such an *Infinit.* with the rest of the sentence is always less strict than that of an ordinary verb; as *וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת הַחֹקֶה*, Is. 20: 1. 5: 24. Gen. 4: 15. So also by a license of poetry at least, the participle and its object may be separated; as *וַיִּזְכְּרוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה* *who cast into the river the hook*, Is. 19: 8. A similar liberty appears often in the position of *כִּי*; and still more decidedly in such an order as *וַיִּזְכְּרוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה* for *וַיִּזְכְּרוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַזֶּה*, Jer. 10: 13, which seems to have been adopted for the purpose of rounding off the period. The collocation of *וְיָרַד*, Jer. 18: 13 can be referred only to the same cause; and some other similar transpositions are to be explained in like manner. But the later writers, it should be remarked, proceed much further in the use of this liberty than the earlier. This is particularly manifest in their insertion of the object sooner in the progress of the sentence, than the genuine Hebrew idiom would have allowed.

It is from a different principle, not that of an effort to secure smoothness of style, of which we have just spoken, but of conformity with the natural order of expression, that the adjective or

pronoun, when it has a qualificative force, must follow the substantive to which it belongs. In this case, as is well known, the article connects itself with the adjective or pronoun, if the noun have the article, or be rendered definite by any equivalent construction. The only proper exception to this usage, so far as regards the pronoun, is that of the simple demonstrative *זֶה*, which is sometimes placed before the definite noun; as *זֶה הָעָם* *this people*, *זֶה מֹשֶׁה* *this Moses*, (in the way of contempt, like *iste*.) Ex. 32: 1. Jos. 9: 12. Is. 23: 13. In the Arabic and Aramaean, however, this is the ordinary arrangement. Of the adjectives, *גָּבִיר* is not unfrequently placed first (Ps. 32: 10); and some instances of this occur in regard to *יָע* (Prov. 29: 6), and also *שָׁמַיִם* (Jer. 30: 15), which are to be considered undoubtedly as poetic, rather than as sanctioned by common practice.

The case is entirely different when an adjective acquires the signification of a noun. The substantive which controlled the position of the adjective, must now itself give place to the adjective in its character as a noun. This latter, as the more important word, claims the first position; and at the same time a forcible expression arises, which was properly at home only in the poetry of the language. Thus *כֹּחַ אֲדָמָה* *the strong of power*, *τὸ κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος*, i. e. very strong power, Is. 40: 26; *קְדוֹשׁ מְשׁוּבֹתָיִךְ* *the holy of thy abodes*, i. e. thy most holy abodes, Ps. 46: 5.

An adverb stands in like manner, according to the general rule, after its adjective; as *גָּדוֹל מְאֹד* *very great*. It has, however, on the whole, much greater freedom of position, and can easily precede the verb; as *גָּדוֹל מְאֹד נִשְׁבַּח* *greatly is he exalted*. This latter remark applies almost universally to the adverb of negation.

The question constantly presents itself, in framing a sentence in Hebrew, whether the article should be inserted or not in connection with nouns and other words which occupy the place of nouns. The decision of such questions depends obviously upon a proper view of the nature of this part of speech; and the topic is one, therefore, which belongs more appropriately to another branch of Hebrew Syntax. Two or three remarks merely, supplemental to the usual statements on the subject, will be sufficient for this place. In the poets the article is less frequent than elsewhere, since they express themselves with greater brevity than other writers. Yet they too differ among themselves in this respect, since they do not all affect the same abruptness of style. Such passages as Micah 7: 11 sq. show how far this peculiarity might be carried, in striving to secure boldness and compression of

speech by the omission of the article. Even out of poetry the same phenomena occasionally meets us, particularly in some of the later writers, who appear to have aimed at a studied brevity of expression. See Dan. 8: 13. 10: 1. Neh. 6: 10. Whether the article should be prefixed to proper names or not, will depend on their signification. If this be of the nature of an adjective, e. g. the *Jebusite*, the *Syrian*, the *Roman*, it would generally be employed. Yet here the Hebrew exhibits some fluctuation. It will be found perhaps that the older the term was in the language, the more liable it was to dispense with the article. So, too, proper names, which on their first appropriation to this use required the article, in order to make them specific, dropped it by degrees as the original import of such terms passed more and more out of view.

Closely allied to the article in its nature, is the definitive particle  $\text{רַא}$ , the correct application of which is not wholly free from difficulty in the formation of the Hebrew sentence. The general usage may be stated as follows. It is to be connected with the personal pronoun when this forms the object of a verb, but is hindered by some external difficulty from being attached as a suffix to the verb itself. Thus when emphasis requires the accusative of the pronoun before the verb, or in a separate form after it; as  $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַח אֱלֹהִים אֶתְּךָ וְיָמָדְךָ}$  *thee I slew*, Num. 22: 33. Jer. 7: 19. Again, this would occur when a verb has two objects, both of which are personal pronouns, since only one of them can be expressed by the suffix; as  $\text{וַיִּצְוֶה אֱלֹהִים אֶתְּךָ לֵבֶן אֶתְּךָ}$  *he caused me to see him*. So also with the Infinitive  $\text{וַיִּרְאוּ אֶתְּךָ אֶתְּךָ}$  *in their seeing him*. As to the connection of this particle with substantives, it may be remarked that they take it more especially if they precede the verb; but if they follow it, no certain rule can be prescribed. If the sign of the accusative be attached to them in this latter situation, however, it must be under the known condition that they are definite either from the nature of their meaning, or because they have the article or a following genitive or suffix pronoun. It may be added, that nouns which designate persons are much more prone to assume this particle, than those which refer to things. Hence certain words which are somewhat kindred in their character to the pronouns, as  $\text{לֵב}$ ,  $\text{אֶרֶץ}$ ,  $\text{אִישׁ}$  and some others, take  $\text{רַא}$  under the circumstances in which the pronouns would receive it. But here too the usual distinction must be made between poetry and prose. The use of this particle is much less common in the former than in the latter; and, in prose, some of the fluctuation which exists, is to be attributed, no doubt, to individual diversities of style.



The omission of the copula in many instances where it would be expressed in other languages by the verb of existence, is a peculiarity which must be observed in the construction of the Hebrew sentence. The verb *יָרַח*, in a strict point of view, is required only when the idea, of *becoming* or of *existing* in some definite past or future, as distinguished from the present, is intended to be conveyed. The statement of Gesenius (Gr. † 141) suggests too limited a view of its omission.

We have considered the elements of the Hebrew sentence in its ordinary state of repose. We will now examine it in the more unequal, disturbed condition into which it is thrown, when it represents the mind in its endeavors to express itself with emphasis and force. The degree in which the sentence deviates in this case from the ordinary arrangement, depends in part on the mental state of the individual himself, in part on the words which he employs.

If it be a slight emphasis which is intended, it is sufficient to change the ordinary position, merely so far as to place the subject or object first, in which case the verb then stands properly in the middle; as, *רָרִינִי לֹא שָׁקְבִי דָם* *our hands shed not blood, our eyes saw it not*, Deut. 21: 7. *אֲבָנִים שָׂחָקוּ מַיִם* *stones (even) the water wears away*, Job 14: 19. Infrequent and more poetic are the positions—object, subject, verb, 2 Kings 5: 13; subject, object, verb, Is. 13: 18. Zech. 10: 2. A substantive thus placed at the beginning is often repeated by means of its pronoun, whereby it is rendered still more emphatic; as, *בְּרִצְוֹ יִרְחַח וְיִבֵּא רִיחַ שָׁמַר* *the blessing of Jehovah, it makes rich*, Prov. 10: 22, 24. Is. 8: 14.

The principal noun, of which something is to be affirmed, stands often isolated at the beginning of the clause, inasmuch as the speaker views it as the most prominent word, and then afterwards repeats it in the place which it would regularly occupy in the sentence, by using the personal pronoun; as, *יְהוָהוּ יֹשֵׁב בַּשָּׁמַיִם בְּסֵאוֹ* *Jehovah—in heaven (not upon earth) is his throne*, Ps. 11: 4. Very seldom does such a substantive remain without such a resumption. To warrant this, the sequel of the sentence must give a complete sense by itself, and the connection be perfectly clear from the context. This happens only in the most excited discourse; as, *הַיּוֹם הַהוּא יִבְרַח הַיּוֹם* *far remote shall the day remove its limit*,<sup>1</sup> Micah 7: 11; *הַיּוֹדֹת יִפְסָחוּ* *the idols—all pass away*, Is. 2: 15, etc.

A special mode of giving prominence to the noun in a sentence

<sup>1</sup> The point to be illustrated here remains in the passage whether this translation of it be adopted or some other one. There is a difference of opinion in regard to the meaning.

consists in first awakening attention to it by means of a personal pronoun, and then after such a preparation introducing the object itself to which the pronoun refers. In the Aramaean this is very common; but in Hebrew prose it appears very seldom, and is confined almost exclusively to the older writings; as, *when she saw him the boy*, Ex. 2: 6. comp. Josh. 1: 2. Is. 17: 6. The case is different when a pronoun stands entirely alone without any accompanying substantive, being omitted because the speaker supposes that it will suggest itself from the obvious nature of the connection. Examples of this, though comparatively uncommon, may be found in any part of a discourse, as at the beginning in Ia. 13: 2, or in the progress of it, as Prov. 12: 6. 28: 2, etc.

The use of ה, in order to render a noun in the sentence emphatic, requires notice here. This particle has the peculiar power of pointing out an object as something not to be overlooked; and performs this office in a manner which we can scarcely represent in our language. We translate indeed in such cases by *in reference to, as regards*, Lat. *quoad*; but its force is to be given in the tone, rather than by words. Thus in the antique style of the decalogue, at the end of the sentence when nothing further is necessary to the completion of the sense, we have the expression appended *וְעַתָּה* as *relates to those who hate me*, Ex. 20: 6. Its object is to bring distinctly into view the class of persons against whom the threatening just uttered stands, as a summary and pointed repetition of the statement which has already been made. Comp. Deut. 34: 11 sq. ה may be placed in like manner at the beginning of a sentence with the same effect. Is. 32: 1. Ps. 16: 3. 17: 4. The later writers employ this construction with still more frequency, so as in fact to weaken the import of its original use. The emphatic application of this particle, therefore, should be distinguished from its office when it serves merely to denote the loose connection which we ordinarily express by our phrase *in relation to*, etc.

One of the strongest modes of giving emphasis to thought in Hebrew consists in the repetition of words. This is practised in various ways. It is very frequent, for example, in the case of the pronoun, which from its abbreviated form for the most part in the language, admits less easily of being distinguished by mere position. Thus the person of the verb is often made prominent by its repetition in the form of the pronoun; as, *וְאֶתְּמַר וְאֶתְּמַר* and *I only am escaped*, Job 1: 15. This idiom however, has been weakened in the later writers, who expand their sentences often to a

greater length, and use the pronoun for the sake of clearness rather than emphasis. Again, the pronominal suffixes may be attached to a noun which is followed at the same time, by the separate personal pronoun, on the same principle of making the specification more exact; as, *נַפְשׁוֹ רָאָה* lit. *his his soul*, i. e. *his own soul*, Micah 7: 3. See Num. 14: 32. Neh. 5: 2. Less frequent and in imitation rather of the Aramaean is the repetition of the pronoun in the dative; *לִי אֹיְבָיִךְ* *my own enemies*, Ps. 27: 2.

A substantive or adjective can be so easily distinguished by position, that this object is very seldom secured by repeating them, at the most only in discourse characterized by intense feeling. Indeclinable words, however, which were originally substantives, since their position in the sentence is less free, may acquire significance in this way; as, *רַב־וְיָבֵרְכֶנּוּ*, *בְּקִרְבֵּי קָדָשׁ*, etc. *very much, entirely because*, etc. Perhaps in a more strict analysis of such expressions as the above, the effect of the repetition should be considered as intensive rather than emphatic. It enlarges the idea, instead of merely fixing the mind upon it as one to be specially contemplated.

The verb, it has been already stated, may stand at the commencement of the sentence, even in its ordinary arrangement. Hence when the idea of this part of speech is to be made prominent, some other method must be employed. The one most commonly adopted is that of a repetition of the verb, not however in the same form, but in the *Inf. absol.* The emphasis to be expressed in this way may be various, according to the particular aspect under which the act of the verb is presented. It may be that of contrast, as when one mode of procedure is opposed to another; and hence this construction is common after adversative terms and particles. Thus the Hebrew said, *thou shalt not give it to me, but קָנִיתִּי בָּכֶם* *I will buy it*, 2 Sam. 24: 24. It may occur also without the adversative particle, as Ezek. 16: 4. Again, we find it often where some limitation is intended to be suggested, hence after *כִּי*, *only, as he was only gone out* (nothing but merely this), Gen. 27: 30. 44: 28. Judg. 7: 19; and even after *וְ* *and*, when the sense demands such a restriction, as Amos 3: 5. Further, in connection with questions when the act forms the principal point of the inquiry; as, *הֲיִשְׁרָפְךָ אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׁרָפְךָ* *shalt thou (even) rule?* Gen. 37: 8; and, in general, when an act is viewed as entirely certain; as, *אֲדָעִיךָ* *that thou shalt reign*, 1 Sam. 24: 21. Amos 5: 5; also of things past, Joel 1: 7. Jer. 20: 15, or even of opinions which one entertains with confidence; as, *אֲדַמְּךָ* *he*

will go forth, 2 Kings 5: 11. This construction occurs at the beginning of a narrative, in order to affirm the thing narrated with emphasis and certainty; as,  $\text{וַיֵּרְאוּ אֶת-יְהוָה}$  *we have seen*, Gen. 26: 28, and often in the utterance of earnest commands and threatenings, for which expression the *Infinitive absolute* alone is frequently employed. The participle as well as the finite verb, whether it have an active or intransitive sense, may acquire emphasis in the manner which has been described. The proper place for the Infinitive when thus used is at the commencement of the clause; and this right it asserts so tenaciously that even the negative adverb must recede and come in as an attendant of the finite verb, as  $\text{לֹא-יָמָּוּתְךָ אֲנִי אֶפְרָיִם}$  *we will not slay thee*, Judg. 15: 13. The exceptions to this remark are very few.

From such rhetorical repetitions of a word we are to distinguish the cases in which the repetition serves for the expression of a new idea, because the language has no other more concise or intelligible phraseology for such a purpose. An instance of this would be  $\text{וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיֵּלֶךְ}$  *upon the way, upon the way*, i. e. *ever on the way*, Deut. 2: 27,  $\text{שָׁנָה שָׁנָה}$  *year year*, i. e. *yearly*, etc.

The correct use of the negative particles is specially important in the formation of the Hebrew sentence. The general distinction between  $\text{לֹא}$  and  $\text{אֵין}$  is well known. Besides these, we have also  $\text{אֵין}$ ,  $\text{אֵין}$ ,  $\text{אֵין}$ ,  $\text{אֵין}$ , and still other negatives, which are not to be loosely interchanged for one another. Of these  $\text{אֵין}$  denies properly some simple word or idea of a proposition, and thus distinguishes itself from  $\text{לֹא}$  which denies the entire sentence. As it expresses no definite time, it may represent the verb of existence in any form.  $\text{אֵין}$  *besides, except*, resembles  $\text{לֹא}$  in its general character as qualificatory of an entire clause ( $\text{אֵין}$  attaches itself rather to a single word), but admits also of being connected with nouns and prepositions in a manner in which  $\text{לֹא}$  does not; and hence may occupy positions in the sentence from which that is excluded.  $\text{אֵין}$ , a contracted form of this particle, is confined to poetry and used in the same general way.  $\text{אֵין}$ , expresses a general limitation and places itself naturally at the head of the clause which it qualifies. To suppose an entirely arbitrary, indiscriminate interchange of these and similar terms in Hebrew, would be contrary to the universal analogies of language; but the feeling which is to guide one practically in marking such distinctions, can be formed only by the long continued study of the Hebrew writers; and by such study, as the masters in this kind of learning assure us, it may certainly be formed.