Double Object Constructions in DSS Hebrew

The Case of ntn

Femke Siebesma-Mannens

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

f.p.siebesma-mannens@vu.nl

Abstract

In this article an overview is given of the verbal valence patterns of the verb נתן in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Four patterns are distinguished for this verb: 1. נתן + OBJECT *to produce*; 2. + נתן OBJECT + RECIPIENT *to give to*; 3. נתן + OBJECT + LOCATION *to place*; 4. נתן + OBJECT + 2ND OBJECT *to make into*. All occurrences of the verb in the DSS corpus used, consisting of 1QH_a, 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab, are discussed and divided into one of these patterns. This study shows that pattern 3 occurs most, followed by pattern 2, and that it can be argued that pattern 1 and 4 also occur in our DSS corpus, though the evidence is scarce. In some cases, translations, differing from the translations in the editions of the texts, are proposed that better reflect the verbal valence patterns used in the clause.

Keywords

Dead Sea Scrolls – verbal valence patterns – Qumran Hebrew – ntn

1 Introduction

The present article gives an overview of the various valence patterns of נתן in the Dead Sea Scrolls, as part of a larger study on the verbal valence patterns in the DSS.¹ This study aims to discover whether verbal valence patterns are a

1 This article is a revised version of the paper delivered under the same title at the 9th International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira. Abbreviations used in the article are: BH = Biblical Hebrew; DJD = Discoveries in the Judean Desert; DSS = Dead Sea Scrolls; ETCBC = Eep Talstra Centre for Bible and Computer; LBH = Late Biblical Hebrew; QH

helpful instrument in determining the nature of Qumran Hebrew. The study is centred around various groups of verbs, such as verbs of movement and double object verbs. The verb נתן falls into the latter category. Although the focus is on the double object pattern, all patterns of the verb will be discussed, since the simple patterns are important for understanding the more complicated ones. The patterns that occur in the DSS will be compared with the patterns of נתן occurring in other Hebrew texts available in the ETCBC database.²

2 Method and Terminology

The ETCBC database contains, besides the Hebrew and Aramaic Bible, several inscriptions, two rabbinic texts, four Dead Sea Scrolls, and several Syriac texts. All texts in the database are coded on the level of lexeme, word, phrase, clause, and textual hierarchy. The scrolls that are in the database—1QS, 1QM, 1QpHab, and 1QH^a—constitute the DSS corpus that is used in this study.

The computer program *val2csv*³ is used to obtain a csv file with the grammatical analysis of all clauses in which the verb occurs as it appears in the database. This dataset is the beginning of the actual research, for these data give only a rough overview of the patterns that occur. For a more precise analysis, the data have to be checked one by one, because the overview is needed for the interpretation of single cases, and vice versa. When the analysis is completed, the data in the database can be enriched with the valence data and corrected where necessary.

The concept of verbal valence is used to study and describe syntactic patterns. The term valence, or valency, is borrowed from chemistry, where it is used to indicate the capacity of an element to bond with other elements. In linguistics it refers to the ability of a verb to bond with specific elements in the clause.⁴ In analysing valence patterns, not only are the number of arguments

= Qumran Hebrew. English translations of the DSS are taken from the DJD edition for 1QH^a (Stegemann, Schuller, and Newsom, DJD 40) and *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* series, edited by James H. Charlesworth, for 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab. Where not specified, translations are my own.

2 <http://etcbc.nl>.

3 Developed by Ulrik Sandborg-Petersen for BH, and adapted by Constantijn Sikkels to be used for the DSS and other texts not in the Hebrew and Aramaic Bible.

4 The term valency was first introduced into linguistics by Charles Peirce in 1897 ("The Logic of Relatives," 170) and became a key concept in modern linguistics by the work of Lucien Tesnière (*Éléments de syntaxe structurale*, 214).

important, but also their lexical characteristics, and semantic roles. A specific significance of the verb requires a specific pattern of elements occurring with it.⁵

The terms used in this study are in accordance with the terms that are used in the ETCBC database. Therefore, the term *complement* is used for elements that belong to the pattern and are required for a specific significance, and *adjunct* for elements that do not influence the pattern or its significance. When numbers of occurrences of a pattern are mentioned, heavily damaged patterns are not counted, but only the patterns that can be determined with a large degree of certainty.

3 Four Patterns of נתן

According to this research, four patterns⁶ can be distinguished for the verb נתן in the DSS, which each have their own significance:

1. נתן + OBJECT *to produce*
2. נתן + OBJECT + RECIPIENT *to give to*
3. נתן + OBJECT + LOCATION *to place*
4. נתן + OBJECT + 2ND OBJECT *to make into*

3.1 Pattern 1 נתן + OBJECT

Pattern 1 [נתן + OBJECT] occurs about 200 times in the database in BH.⁷ An example:

(1) Joel 2:22

תאנה וגפן נתנו חילם
object predicate subject⁸

[Fig tree and vine]^{SUBJECT} [give]^{PREDICATE} [their wealth.]^{OBJECT}

5 Important studies on verbal valence in Biblical Hebrew include Malessa, *Untersuchungen zur verbalen Valenz*; Dyk, Glanz, and Oosting, "Analysing Valence Patterns in BH"; Glanz, Oosting, and Dyk, "Valence Patterns in BH"; Oosting and Dyk, "Valence Patterns of Motion Verbs."

6 The patterns are ordered in the way that suits the flow of the argument in this paper best, and not according to their importance or number of occurrences or the like.

7 Due to the restrictions in the coding of ellipsis in the present model of the database, it is not possible to give an exact number in this case.

8 The manner of glossing reflects the way the data are organized in the ETCBC database. Therefore, the conjunction on clause level is glossed separately, while conjunctions within phrases and prepositions are not.

This pattern has the meaning “to bring forth, to yield, to produce, to give.” It does not have a recipient, and, therefore, it will be regarded as a pattern separate from pattern 2 [נתן + OBJECT + RECIPIENT]. At first sight, our DSS corpus has one possible occurrence of this pattern, which is disputable, since the reading is partly due to the clause being damaged:

(2) 1QH^a 16:15

ו-יתן יב[ו]ל פרח עולם

object predicate-conjunction

[And so]^{CONJUNCTION} [he gives away]^{PREDICATE} [the yi[el]d of the eternal bloom.]^{OBJECT}⁹

If we would assume that the reading is correct, the translation “give away” in DJD is questionable, for similar patterns with this significance of the verb were not found in QH or BH. The pattern occurs once with the object יבול in BH:

(3) Zech 8:12

ו-הארץ תתן את-יבולה

object predicate subject-conjunction

[The earth]^{SUBJECT} [shall give]^{PREDICATE} [its produce.]^{OBJECT}

The meaning of נתן in this BH pattern is “give” in the sense of “to bring forth, to produce,” not in the sense of “give away.” However, this significance would not fit in the context of 1QH^a 16:15, which is rather negative.¹⁰ Since the reading is uncertain, and the usual interpretation of the pattern in the reconstruction is not felicitous, we must conclude that it remains unclear whether this is an example of pattern 1 in the DSS. The occurrence of pattern 1 in our DSS corpus is thus uncertain. However, another occurrence of נתן is worthy of discussion here, because of its similarity with pattern 1. This occurrence is found in 1QH^a 11:36.

(4) 1QH^a 11:36

ו-צבא השמים יתנו בקולם

complement predicate subject-conjunction

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [the host of heaven]^{SUBJECT} [raise]^{PREDICATE} [their voice.]^{COMPLEMENT}

⁹ The translation is from DJD 40:224.

¹⁰ The previous sentence reads, “For he sees without recognizing, and he considers without believing in the well of life.” Stegemann, Schuller, and Newsom, DJD 40:224.

In this clause, there is no regular direct object, but an argument with the preposition **ב**. This argument seems to function as the direct object, and, therefore, to belong to the core of the clause. It might be a different pattern, but it is more likely a formulaic expression. This specific pattern is then restricted to the entity **קול**, “voice.” This pattern of **נתן** with the argument **בקול** occurs also three times in the Hebrew Bible.¹¹ More often, BH has **נתן** with the object **קול**, which occurs 19 times, among which is Joel 4:16:

(5) Joel 4:16

ו-מירושלם יתן קולו

object predicate adjunct (SOURCE)-conjunction

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [from Jerusalem]^{SOURCE (AJ)} [He raises]^{PREDICATE} [his voice.]^{OBJECT}

The pattern of **נתן** with the object **קול** seems to have the same connotation as the pattern with the complement with the preposition **ב**, although we do not have enough data to completely exclude a slight difference in meaning between the two.

Two DSS patterns have been discussed under the heading of pattern 1. The first one, 1QH^a 16:15, is uncertain because it is damaged, and the second one, 1QH^a 11:36, is not a clear example of this pattern, because it has a prepositional phrase instead of a regular direct object, and is probably a formulaic expression. This means that there is no undisputed evidence for pattern 1 in the DSS corpus examined here, though its occurrence cannot be excluded absolutely.

3.2 Pattern 2 **נתן** + OBJECT + RECIPIENT

The second pattern is the pattern of **נתן** with an object and a recipient introduced by the preposition **ל**. This pattern occurs 5 times in the scrolls in the ETCBC database (table 1).

It is striking that in all these cases the object of **נתן** is non-material, for example:

(6) 1QH^a 18:29

ו-לבני אמתכה נתתה שכל

object predicate complement (RECIPIENT)-conjunction

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [to the children of your truth]^{RECIPIENT (CO)} [you have given]^{PREDICATE} [insight.]^{OBJECT}

¹¹ Ps 46:7; Ps 68:34; Jer 12:8.

TABLE 1 Occurrences of pattern 2 in the ETCBC database

Scroll	Number of occurrences	Place of occurrences
1QH ^a	3	10:9; 18:29; 19:30–31
1QM	1	14:6
1QpHab	—	—
1QS	1	4:18

In BH, the pattern occurs with material entities (7) as well as non-material ones (8):

- (7) Gen 25:34
- ו-יעקב

נתן

לעשו

complement (RECIPIENT) predicate subject-conjunction

לחם ונזד עדשים

object

[Then]^{CONJUNCTION} [Jacob]^{SUBJECT} [gave]^{PREDICATE} [Esau]^{RECIPIENT (CO)} [bread and pottage of lentils.]^{OBJECT}
- (8) Isa 42:8
- ו-כבודי

לאחר

לא־

אתן

predicate negation complement (RECIPIENT) object-conjunction

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [I will [not]^{NEGATION} give]^{PREDICATE}¹² [my glory]^{OBJECT} [to another.]^{RECIPIENT (CO)}

The absence of material entities for the object in this construction in our corpus is probably caused by the contents of the documents, and may, therefore, be coincidental. Material entities do occur in the DSS, however, in the Temple Scroll, as in 11QT 22:11–12.¹³ It should be noted, though, that 11QT is highly influenced by BH.

12 Here, the negation is in the translation in between two parts of the predicate. The way it is presented here does not mean that the negation is to be read as part of the predicate, but as interrupting the predicate.

13 See also 11QT 51:16.

TABLE 2 Occurrences of נתן + אל in BH

Hebrew corpus	Number of occurrences
BH: pre-exilic	26
BH: exilic	9
BH: post-exilic	2
BH all	37

- (9) 11QT 22:11–12
 ו-נתנו בני ישראל לזוה[נ]ים איל אחד כבש אחד
 object complement (RECIPIENT) subject predicate-conj
 [And]CONJUNCTION [the sons of Israel]SUBJECT [shall give]PREDICATE [to the
 priests]RECIPIENT (CO) [one ram and one lamb.]OBJECT

In BH also the preposition אל can be used to introduce the recipient with נתן:

- (10) Deut 10:4
 ו-יתנם יהוה אלי
 complement (RECIPIENT) subject object-predicate-conjunction
 [And]CONJUNCTION [the LORD]SUBJECT [gave]PREDICATE [them]OBJECT [to
 me.]RECIPIENT (CO)

This pattern with אל occurs 37 times. Table 2 shows the number of occurrences for each of the three phases in the conventional division of BH.¹⁴

The occurrences in post-exilic BH are found in Chronicles (1 Chr 21:5; 2 Chr 34:15) and are identical to the parallel passages in, respectively, Samuel (2 Sam 24:9) and Kings (2 Kgs 22:8). In the ETCBC database, נתן with a recipient introduced by אל was not found in the rabbinic and Qumran texts, though there is one occurrence in the inscriptions in the database:

- (11) Mesad Hashavyahu 1:13¹⁵
 ו-תת[ן] אל רח[מם]
 object complement (RECIPIENT) predicate-conjunction
 [So]CONJUNCTION [grant]PREDICATE [him]RECIPIENT (CO) [mercy.]OBJECT

14 As described in Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 1:11.

15 The text and translation are those of Smelik, *Writings from Ancient Israel*, 96.

TABLE 3 Occurrences of pattern 3 divided by scroll and preposition

Scroll	ב	על	בין	Total
1QH ^a	9 4:29; 5:36; 6:19–20; 8:29; 16:5–6; 17:10–11; 19:7–8; 20:15; 21:34	2 12:27; 18:24–25	– –	11
1QM	2 12:11; 19:3	– –	– –	2
1QpHab	5 5:4; 9:9–10; 10:3–4; 4:7– 8; 9:6–7 ¹⁶	– –	– –	5
1QS	2 2:5–6; 2:17	– –	1 4:17	3
All	18	2	1	21

However, this occurrence, even of the verb נתן itself, is very uncertain. If the suggested restoration of the text is correct, the occurrence of the pattern is interesting here, because it fits in the overall picture that the pattern might have been fallen into abeyance in the later stages of the language.

3.3 *Pattern 3 נתן + OBJECT + LOCATION*

Of all the patterns of נתן, the pattern with a locative complement in addition to the object occurs by far most often in the DSS.

The location can be introduced by various prepositions. The pattern with ב occurs most often and is found in all the scrolls in our corpus, while the pattern with על occurs only in 1QH^a, and the pattern with בין only in 1QS.

An example with ב can be found in 1QM 19:3:

(12) 1QM 19:3¹⁷

נתן ידכה בעורף אויבך

complement (LOCATION) object predicate

[Put]^{PREDICATE} [your hand]^{OBJECT} [upon the neck of your

enemies.]^{LOCATION (CO)}

16 1QpHab 4:7–8 and 9:6–7 are in the *niphal*, so the subject of these constructions has the same function as the object in the *qal*.

17 Another possible translation here is “Put your hand against the neck of your enemies,” as suggested to me by a reviewer.

Another occurrence of this pattern, 1QH^a 5:36, is noteworthy because of the translation in the DJD edition, which suggests that the pattern contains a recipient instead of a locative:¹⁸

(13) 1QH^a 5:36

	בִּי	אֲשֶׁר	נָתַתָּה	{רוּחַ}
	complement (LOCATION)	predicate	object	{referent} (a)
	complement (RECIPIENT)	predicate	object	{referent} (b)
(a)	[{the spirit}] ^{REFERENT}	[that] ^{OBJECT}	[you have placed] ^{PREDICATE}	
	[in me] ^{LOCATION (CO)}			
(b)	[{the spirit}] ^{REFERENT}	[that] ^{OBJECT}	[you have given] ^{PREDICATE}	
	[me] ^{RECIPIENT (CO)}			

Here, Newsom translated the preposition בִּי by “to” instead of “in,” and the verb by “give” instead of “put” or “place.” This same clause occurs at four other places in the 1QH^a. It is striking that in the first three occurrences (1QH^a 4:29; 5:36; 8:29) the verb נָתַן is translated by “given to” or “granted to.” It seems, then, as if it belongs to pattern 2 [נָתַן + OBJECT + RECIPIENT]. In the other two places at which the clause occurs in 1QH^a (1QH^a 20:15; 21:34), it is translated as in (13a), a translation that reflects pattern 3. This clause is thus not translated consistently in the DJD edition by Newsom, who seems to assume that multiple interpretations are valid for this one pattern.

However, there appears to be no compelling reason to regard this clause as an example of pattern 2. In no other place in the database is the בִּי-complement to be regarded as the recipient. In BH similar patterns occur as well, and are usually translated by “to put in”:¹⁹

(14) Ezek 37:6

	רוּחַ	בְּכֶם	וְנָתַתִּי
	object	complement (LOCATION)	predicate-conjunction
[And] ^{CONJUNCTION}	[I shall put] ^{PREDICATE}	[breath] ^{OBJECT}	[in you.] ^{LOCATION (CO)}

The way this pattern is used in BH demonstrates that pattern 3, with a location complement, is much more likely the only possible interpretation of the

18 The second translation, below. See Stegemann, Schuller, and Newsom, DJD 40:86.

19 Also the pattern [נָתַן + רוּחַ + עַל location], “to place the spirit upon,” occurs in BH at Num 11:29 and Isa 42:1. Theologically, God does not give his spirit to people to keep as a possession.

clause from 1QH^a. It may be noted, however, that semantically the two translations are similar.

Compare (15) with (6) above:

(15) 1QH^a 6:19–20

בִּינָה
בִּלְבַּב עַבְדְּךָ
הַנּוֹתֵן
 object complement (LOCATION) predicate
 [Who places]^{PREDICATE} [understanding]^{OBJECT} [in the heart of your servant.]^{LOCATION (CO) 20}

Compare also:

(16) Job 38:36

בִּינָה
לְשִׁכּוּי
נָתַן
מִי־
אוֹ
 object complement (RECIPIENT) predicate subject conjunction
 [Or]^{CONJUNCTION} [who]^{SUBJECT} [has given]^{PREDICATE} [understanding]^{OBJECT} [to the mind?]^{RECIPIENT (CO)}

The location identified in the constructions of 1QH^a 5:36 and the other four places in which this clause occurs is a human being, just like a recipient in the pattern of נָתַן with the ל־complement. It is, therefore, tempting to translate the two types of clauses similarly. The object “spirit,” however, is an immaterial entity that can be placed in human beings, so the pattern that underlies this construction should be considered pattern 3, and not pattern 2.

3.4 *Pattern 4* נָתַן + *OBJECT* + 2ND *OBJECT*

The fourth pattern is נָתַן with an object and a co-referential second object, which means that object one becomes object two, or object one becomes *as* object two. Semantically, both objects have the same referent. From BH it becomes clear that the second object can be realized in various ways: as a noun phrase, as a ל־complement, or as a כ־complement (make something like). For convenience and because of their similarity all three are called second object, but linguistically it would be better to use the terms resultative ל־complement and resultative כ־complement, for the arguments that are introduced by those prepositions.

In BH all three patterns occur:

²⁰ The translation is from DJD 40:95.

(17) Lev 26:31

ו-נתתי את־עריכם חרבה

2nd object object predicate-conjunction

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [I will make]^{PREDICATE} [your cities]^{OBJECT} [waste.]^{2ND OBJECT}

(18) Ezek 25:5

ו-נתתי את־רבה לנוה גמלים

complement (2ND OBJECT) object predicate-conjunction

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [I will make]^{PREDICATE} [Rabbah]^{OBJECT} [into a stable for camels.]^{2ND OBJECT (CO)}

(19) Jer 19:12

ו-לתת את־העיר הזאת כתפת

complement (2ND OBJECT) object predicate-conjunction

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [make]^{PREDICATE} [this city]^{OBJECT} [like Tophet.]^{2ND OBJECT (CO)}

In our DSS corpus, two clauses might qualify to fall into the category of the double object pattern of נתן: 1QS 11:7 and 1QH^a 15:13. However, in both passages the interpretation of the patterns is not straightforward. In both cases various interpretations are possible, among which the double object pattern (pattern 4) is one.

The first passage to be discussed is 1QH^a 15:13. The reading of this verse is problematic, since reading נתתי as a 1cs pf sg does not make much sense here.²¹ Consequently, several scholars have suggested that it should be read as נתתו, with a 3m sg suffix.²² However, since it is not clear to what this suffix would refer earlier in the text, I follow the interpretation proposed by DJD and many others, that this is an uncorrected scribal error and should be read נתתני.²³ The construction, though, remains the same, whether it has a 1cs sg suffix or a 3m sg suffix.

21 If this were to be correct, then how do we interpret אתה? What would be the direct object? What would be the function of the two ל-phrases?

22 Stegemann, Schuller, and Newsom (DJD 40:203) mention Sukenik, Holm-Nielsen, Maier, Dupont-Sommer. Due to the COVID-19 epidemic, I did not have access to a library in order to consult these works myself.

23 Stegemann, Schuller, and Newsom (DJD 40:203) refer to van der Woude, Jeremias, and Lohse.

(20) a. 1QH^a 15:13

ו-אתה אלי נתת-י לעפים

subject-cj interjection object-predicate complement (RECIPIENT)

לעצת קודש

adjunct (GOAL)

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [You,]^{SUBJECT} [o my God,]^{INTERJECTION} [have
given]^{PREDICATE} [me]^{OBJECT} [to the weary]^{RECIPIENT (CO)} [for a holy coun-
sel.]^{GOAL (AJ)} 24

b. 1QH^a 15:13

ו-אתה אלי נתת-י לעפים

subject-cj interjection object-predicate adjunct (BENEFICIARY)

לעצת קודש

complement (2ND OBJECT)

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [You,]^{SUBJECT} [o my God,]^{INTERJECTION} [have
made]^{PREDICATE} [me]^{OBJECT} [to become a holy counsel]^{BENEFICIARY (AJ)} [for
the weary.]^{2ND OBJECT (CO)}

It seems as if this clause has four constituents that belong to the core of the clause. Beside the null-subject and the object, both the argument לעפים and the argument לעצת קודש seem to qualify for a position in the core. However, since it is unlikely, if not impossible, that both a second object and a recipient complement occur in one clause, one of the two should be analysed as an adjunct; respectively, an adjunct of goal, and a beneficiary, and thus not belonging to the core constituents.²⁵ The underlying pattern in this clause is thus either pattern 2 [נתן + OBJECT + RECIPIENT] (20a) or pattern 4 [נתן + OBJECT + ל 2ND OBJECT] (20b).

The same is true for 1QS 11:7. This clause is interpreted differently by various translators and exegetes of the text:

24 The translation is from DJD 40:214.

25 See Luraghi and Pagodi (*Key Terms in Syntax*, 197), who write that, “[t]he existence of tetravalent verbs is disputed.” Tesnière (*Éléments de syntaxe structurale*, 258) states that “il semble bien qu’il n’existe dans aucune langue de forms verbales simples comportant plus de trois valences.” Gobbo and Benini (*Constructive Adpositional Grammars*, 236) state that “quadrivalent verbs are rare.” They give the example of transactional verbs like to buy and to sell, but in these cases, it is disputed if the construction is indeed tetravalent. Luraghi and Parodi argue that in such cases the verb is semantically tetravalent, but not syntactically. If tetravalent verbs exist, which is argued for some Caucasian languages, like Abkhaz, they occur rarely and “the language prefers to avoid them” (Hewitt, “Cases, Arguments, Verbs in Abkhaz,” 77).

1QS 11:7

לאשר בחר אל נתנם לאוחזת עולם

Those whom God has chosen he has set as an eternal possession.²⁶

Those whom God has chosen He has established as an eternal possession.²⁷

To them He has chosen, all these has He given—an eternal possession.²⁸

Aan degenen die God uitverkoren heeft, heeft hij ze tot een eeuwige bezitting gegeven.²⁹

Aan wie God uitverkoren heeft, heeft hij ze gegeven tot een eeuwig bezit.³⁰

Welche Gott erwählt hat, denen hat er sie zu ewigem Besitz gegeben.³¹

Charlesworth and Wernberg-Møller have approximately the same translation. They translate the verb with “set” and “establish,” which come close to, but are not the same as, the double object translation “make (to become).” They have interpreted the suffix ם as to refer to the לאשר-clause. It is, however, not clear how they interpret the ל of לאשר, which is problematic.³² Besides, it is more plausible that the gifts described in the previous lines (*fountain of righteousness, a well of strength, and a spring of glory*) will become an eternal possession, than the people God has chosen. Lohse, Goedhart, García Martínez and van der Woude, and the DSS Reader translate the verb with “give.” The לאשר-clause is in these translations part of the valence pattern of נתן; it is the recipient. The suffix ם refers to the gifts described in the previous lines. The second ל-phrase is then an adjunct of result.

26 Kimron and Charlesworth in Charlesworth et al., *Rule of the Community*.

27 Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline*, 38. Wernberg-Møller (*The Manual of Discipline*, 152) noted that “[t]he translation follows Delcor: *l'shr b'hr* is *casus pendens*, resumed by the suffix in *ntnm*; the continuation supports this interpretation, as does the phraseology of Gen. xvii 8, xlviii 4; Lev. xxv 34, on which our author is dependent. Many scholars regard the suffix in *ntnm* as referring to the gifts mentioned in the previous sentence (thus e.g. Brownlee).”

28 Parry and Tov, *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 33.

29 Goedhart, “De slothymne van het Manual of Discipline,” 155. “Vs. 9 bezingt voor wie de bron van gerechtigheid en het reservoir van kracht bestemd zijn (vs. 8a), nl. Voor degenen die God uitverkoren heeft.” (Verse 9 chants for those to whom the well of righteousness and the reservoir of power is ordained.)

30 García Martínez and van der Woude, *Rollen van de Dode Zee*, 206.

31 Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran*, 41.

32 It might be the case that they regard this an example of Aramaic influence, as noted by Goedhart, “De slothymne van het Manual of Discipline,” 156, “Het object zou dan, zoals in het aramees gebruikelijk is, door *le* worden aangeduid.” (the object would then, as is usual in Aramaic, be designated by *le*.)

This would then be the construction:

(21) a. 1QS 11:7

לאֲשֵׁר בָּחַר אֵל נָתַנָּם לְאוֹחוֹזֹת עוֹלָם

adjunct (RESULT) object-predicate complement (RECIPIENT)

[To those whom God has chosen,]^{RECIPIENT (CO)} [He has given]^{PREDICATE}

[these]^{OBJECT} [for an eternal possession.]^{RESULT (AJ)}

However, the possibility of the double object pattern might be considered here as well:

b. 1QS 11:7

לאֲשֵׁר בָּחַר אֵל נָתַנָּם לְאוֹחוֹזֹת עוֹלָם

complement (2ND OBJECT) object-predicate adjunct (BENEFICIARY)

[For those whom God has chosen,]^{BENEFICIARY (AJ)} [He has made]^{PREDICATE}

[these]^{OBJECT} [to become an eternal possession.]^{2ND OBJECT (CO)}

Just like 1QH^a 15:13, this clause has an argument that could be considered the second object, לְאוֹחוֹזֹת עוֹלָם, and an argument that could be considered the recipient, לְאוֹשֵׁר בָּחַר אֵל. However, since in most languages four arguments in the core is too much, a choice should be made between pattern 2 (21a), and pattern 4 (21b). In the cases of both 1QH^a 15:13 and 1QS 11:7 the question is which pattern is more prevalent and determinative for the clause. An in-depth study is needed to see whether or not the double object pattern is used in these verses.

4 Which Patterns Are Used in 1QS 11:7 and 1QH^a 15:13?

Similar patterns that have both a second object/goal argument and a recipient/beneficiary argument occur 98 times in the Hebrew Bible. After studying and comparing them, it has to be concluded that these occurrences should not all be interpreted in the same way. In some cases, pattern 2 underlies the clause, and in others pattern 4. This will be illustrated by three examples.

4.1 *Examples from Biblical Hebrew*

The first example comes from Gen 30:4.

(22) Gen 30:4

ו-תתן לו את-בִּלְהָה שפחתה

object complement (RECIPIENT) predicate-cj

לְאִשָּׁה

adjunct (GOAL)

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [she gave]^{PREDICATE} [him]^{RECIPIENT (CO)} [Bilhah her hand-
maid]^{OBJECT} [as a wife.]^{GOAL (AJ)}

This clause should be interpreted as an example of pattern 2, with an object and a recipient, and the fourth element being an adjunct of goal. Three arguments point in this direction. First, is the implausibility of the alternative, which would result in a translation like “And she made Bilhah her handmaid a wife for him.” In other passages (Exod 21:4; Judg 21:18), the verb נתן occurs with the object אִשָּׁה and a ל-complement (recipient), which are indisputably examples of pattern 2, “to give to,” and thus indicate that women were “given.”³³ A second argument for this interpretation is that לו cannot be removed, for it would be missed, which is an important quality of a complement. It is important to note here as well that the pattern נתן + OBJECT + לְאִשָּׁה is found nowhere in the Hebrew Bible without a recipient. A third argument is that לְאִשָּׁה comes last in the clause. This makes it somewhat less likely to belong to the core constituents of the clause, though this argument is not decisive.

The second example comes from Jer 26:6.

(23) Jer 26:6

ו-אֶת־הָעִיר הַזֹּאת אֶתְּ לְקַלְלָהּ

complement (2ND OBJECT) predicate object-conjunction

לְכָל גּוֹי הָאָרֶץ

adjunct (BENEFICIARY)

[And]^{CONJUNCTION} [I will make]^{PREDICATE} [this city]^{OBJECT} [a curse]^{2ND OBJECT (CO)} [to all the nations of the earth.]^{BENEFICIARY (AJ)}

It seems that in this case pattern 4 [נתן + OBJECT + ל 2ND OBJECT] is the main pattern. Several arguments support this interpretation. First, the argument “to

33 Also passages like Exod 20:17 indicate that women belonged to their husbands in ancient Israel.

all the nations of the earth” could be removed from the clause without making it ungrammatical. Second, the alternative interpretation, following pattern 2, seems unlikely, in which לַכָּל גּוֹיֵי הָאָרֶץ would be an adjunct of manner and לַכָּל גּוֹיֵי הָאָרֶץ the recipient. This would sound in a translation as “I will give this city as a curse to all the nations of the earth.” This does not make much sense, for the nations of the earth do not become the owner or controller of the city. A third strong argument lays in the first part of the verse: “And I make this house as Shiloh.” A similar pattern and significance—something is made into something else—might also be expected in the second part of the clause. A fourth, less strong, argument might be the order of the elements in the clause, though this is not decisive for various factors play a role in word order.

However, there might be an even easier solution for the analysis of this clause and similar cases, where the second object is followed by a beneficiary. The beneficiary can also be analysed as a specification of the second object and thus form one constituent together. In that case there is no fourth argument, and thus no problematic construction.

A third example from BH is more similar to 1QH^a 15:13, and is found in Jer 15:20:

(24) Jer 15:20

לַעֲמֵ הַזֶּה	וְנַתַּתִּיךְ
adjunct (BENEFICIARY)	object-predicate-conjunction (a)
complement (RECIPIENT)	object-predicate-conjunction (b)
	לְחֹמַת נְחֹשֶׁת בַּצֹּרָה
	complement (2 ND OBJECT) (a)
	adjunct (GOAL) (b)
(a) [And] ^{CONJUNCTION} [I will make] ^{PREDICATE} [you] ^{OBJECT} [to this	
people] ^{BENEFICIARY (AJ)} [a fortified wall of bronze.] ^{2ND OBJECT (CO)}	
(b) [And] ^{CONJUNCTION} [I will give] ^{PREDICATE} [you] ^{OBJECT} [to this	
people] ^{RECIPIENT (CO)} [as a fortified wall of bronze.] ^{GOAL (AJ)}	

This example is less clear than the previous two, because both interpretations (24a) and (24b) seem to be possible at first sight, though the arguments for (24a) seem to outweigh those for (24b). In the first place, it is unlikely that the people become the owners or controllers of Jeremiah, who is the second person singular in the clause. Secondly, the argument לַעֲמֵ הַזֶּה can be removed more easily from the clause than לְחֹמַת נְחֹשֶׁת בַּצֹּרָה without losing the core of the clause. However, this is dependent on the interpretation of the passage, and is thus not an especially strong argument. The argument of word order would in this case weaken this position, for it would indicate (24b). Word order, though,

is not decisive, as has been argued above. Especially in a poetic context, such as this of Jeremiah 15, the elements might be ordered in a less common way. The claim here is not that word order in poetry is bound to different rules than that in prose, but that the variation in the use of the allowable word order patterns in the language is larger in poetry than in prose.

Considering the arguments used to interpret the biblical passages, we will now turn back to the ambiguous patterns in the DSS.

4.2 1QS 11:7

In the case of 1QS 11:7, the first interpretation, pattern 2 (21a), is to be preferred. The first argument for this position is the contents of the arguments. The ׀ referring to the gifts mentioned in the previous lines is a good candidate to be the object of a clause of pattern 2, since these are gifts. The people God has chosen are the recipients of the gifts, so they become the owners. The information that these gifts will be eternal, is then optional.

A second argument is the order of the elements in the clause. לאשר בחר אל comes first, so it more likely belongs to the core of the clause than עולם לאווחזות, which comes at the end of the clause. Since 1QS is not a poetic text, it is more inclined to follow the more common word order pattern.

4.3 1QH^a 15:13

In the case of 1QH^a 15:13, word order would point to pattern 2 (20a), but just like in Jeremiah, the style is poetry, so this does not carry much weight in the scale. Therefore, the context has to be taken into account. The lines surrounding the clause with נתן read:

- 9 I thank you, Lord, that you have sustained me by your strength, [...]
 10 [...] You have made me strong [...]
 11 [...] You set me like a tower of strength [...]
 13 And you, O my God, have given me to the weary for holy counsel /
 And you, O my God, have made me a holy counsel for the weary.
 You have strengthened me in your covenant, and my tongue has become
 like (the tongues of) those taught by you.³⁴

The context is thus someone speaking in the first person, whom God has made strong and wise, and not about the weary who are in need of advice. Therefore, the stress is on the “I” who becomes a holy counsel, and not on the weary in

34 Stegemann, Schuller, and Newsom, DJD 40:214.

need of a counsel. The weary do not become the owners or controllers of the first person, and in this context the weary can be left out more easily than the holy counsel, without losing the core of the clause. So here pattern 4 is to be preferred.

It has thus been argued that in the case of 1QS 11:7 pattern 2 underlies the clause, and in the case of 1QH^a 15:13 pattern 4. Therefore, it might be possible that pattern 4 occurs in the DSS, but only one possible case is found, and this case is uncertain because it is based on the most probable reading of an assumed scribal error.

5 Conclusions

Four patterns have been discussed above for the verb נתן. For the DSS corpus dealt with in this article, pattern 3 [נתן + OBJECT + LOCATION] occurs most often. The pattern that comes second in terms of the number of occurrences is pattern 2 [נתן + OBJECT + RECIPIENT]. The occurrence of patterns 1 and 4 is less clear. In the case of pattern 1 [נתן + OBJECT], the one case that might belong to this pattern, 1QH^a 16:15, is too damaged to make any conclusive statements. The other, 1QH^a 11:36, is probably a formulaic expression. These examples do not demonstrate productivity of this pattern in the DSS, but its occurrence cannot be excluded either. In the case of pattern 4 [נתן + OBJECT + ל 2ND OBJECT], there is only one occurrence, 1QH^a 15:13, that possibly belongs in this category.

On the basis of these patterns, in some cases I have proposed translations that differ from the translations in existing editions of the texts. The proposed translations better reflect the valence pattern of נתן in the clause. A freer translation is sometimes possible, but it is important that the pattern is recognized by the translator.

The patterns that occur in the DSS have been compared with the patterns occurring in BH. This comparison helped to interpret the more complicated patterns in the DSS, and it showed that all patterns that occur in the DSS can be also found in the Hebrew Bible. Viewing things the other way around, realizations of patterns were found in BH that were absent from our DSS corpus. This might be attributed to the difference in the sizes of the corpora, but also by the genres of the texts or shifts in the Hebrew language. More research into a larger DSS corpus, and a larger number of verbs, might help to unravel which factors play a role in the differences that are found.

Acknowledgments

The research in this study was conducted as part of the PhD-project *Verbal Valence Patterns in the Dead Sea Scroll: Syntactic Variation and Linguistic Change*, which is funded by the Dutch Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). I thank Dr. Janet Dyk (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) for comments on the content of the article and corrections of the English language. I thank Prof. Dr. Wido van Peursen (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) for useful discussions and comments, and I thank Prof. Dr. Lourens de Vries (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) for the advice on the underlying linguistic theory and suggestions for relevant syntactic literature.

Bibliography

- Charlesworth, James H., Frank M. Cross, Jacob Milgrom, Elisha Qimron, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and R.E. Whitaker. *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louiseville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Dyk, Janet W., Oliver Glanz, and Reinoud Oosting. "Analysing valence patterns in Biblical Hebrew: theoretical questions and analytic frameworks." *JNSL* 40.1 (2014): 1–20.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and A.S. van der Woude. *De Rollen van de Dode Zee: Ingeleid en in het Nederlands vertaald*. 2 vols. Kampen: Kok; Tiel: Lannoo, 1994.
- Glanz, Oliver, Reinoud Oosting, and Janet W. Dyk. "Valence Patterns in Biblical Hebrew: Classical Philology and Linguistic Patterns." *JNSL* 41.2 (2015): 31–55.
- Gobbo, Federico, and Marco Benini. *Constructive Adpositional Grammars: Foundations of Constructive Linguistics*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.
- Goedhart, Hendrik. "De slothymne van het Manual of Discipline: A theological-exegetical study of 1QS X,9–XI,22." PhD diss., University of Rotterdam, 1965.
- Hewitt, George. "Cases, Arguments, Verbs in Abkhaz, Georgian and Mingrelian." Pages 75–104 in *Case and Grammatical Relations: Studies in Honor of Bernard Comrie*. Edited by Greville G. Corbett and Michael Noonan. Typological Studies in Language 81. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und deutsch*. München: Kösel, 1964.
- Luraghi, Sylvia, and Claudia Parodi. *Key Terms in Syntax and Syntactic Theory*. London: Bloomsbury, 2008.
- Malessa, Michael. *Untersuchungen zur verbalen Valenz im biblischen Hebräisch*. SSN 49. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006.

- Oosting, Reinoud, and Janet W. Dyk. "Valence Patterns of Motion Verbs: Syntax, Semantics, and Linguistic Variation." *JNSL* 43.1 (2017): 63–85.
- Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Volume 1: Texts Concerned with Religious Law, Exegetical Texts and Parabiblical Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Peirce, C.S. "The Logic of Relatives." *The Monist* 7.2 (1897): 161–217.
- Smelik, Klaas A.D. *Writings from Ancient Israel: A Handbook of Historical and Religious Documents*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.
- Stegemann, Hartmut, with Eileen Schuller and Carol Newsom. *1QHodayot^a: With Incorporation of 1QHodayot^b and 4QHodayot^{a,f}*. DJD 40. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009.
- Tesnière, Lucien. *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1959.
- Wernberg-Møller, P., ed. *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. Edited by J. van der Ploeg. STDJ 1. Leiden: Brill, 1957.
- Young, Ian, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd. *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. 2 vols. London: Equinox Pub, 2008.