Introduction

Grammatical Type: n m?
Occurrences: Total 1x OT (Jb 41.21), 0x Sir, 0x Qum, 0x inscr.
Text Doubtful: none.
Qere/Ketiv: none.

1. Root and Comparative Material

A.1 To judge from Bochart’s claim (1663:785) “תותח fustem, ex Arabica lingua novè explicamus” he was the first to connect תותח with Arb wataḥa “fuste percutere”. This is cited as cognate by Schleusner (1822:215), Heiligstedt (1847:280), König (1910:539), and Ahituv (1968:974). Arb also possesses the cognate word mītah ‘club’. BDB (450) supports the connection of תותח with both Arb words, as do Zorell (894), Driver (1950:340), and HAL (1580 [“wahrscheinlich”]). Hirzel (1852:258) says, “nach der Etymologie: Keule (nicht: Hammer, LXX, Vulg., Luth., Zür. Uebers.).”

B.1 Barth (1894:294, n. 1) regarded תותח as a “Fremdwort aus assyr. tartahu ‘keule’”. However, as noted by BDB (450), this rests on a misreading of the cuneiform signs. Meissner (1931:195-96) argues that the word should be read kuttaḥu. Nevertheless, Ebeling (1933:33) has argued that even the pronunciation kuttaḥu is uncertain because of the well attested word šīltāḥu ‘arrow’ or ‘spear’. CAD records both kutāḥu ‘a lance’ (8:603) and šīltāḥu (šīltahū) ‘arrow’ (17-b:448-51). Driver (1950:339-40) discusses and rejects the supposed word *tartahū. He believes that this word was never supposed to be equivalent to תותח, but that תותח was believed to be a scribal error for the hypothetical Hebrew word *חתַּרְתָּ, the supposed equivalent of *tartahū. HAL (1580) rightly defends KB’s failure to mention *tartahū as a form possibly cognate with תותח.

Dhorme (1926:585) and Gordis (1978:489) cite Barth’s proposal favourably. Hartley (1988:529) says, “The meaning ‘javelin’ or ‘mace’ is assigned to MT tōṭāḥ on the basis of
Akk. tartahu, ‘shaft, club’ (Dhorme), or Arab. mitahat, ‘club’ (Rowley). Cf. G.R. Driver, *ETL* 26 (1950) 339-40.” Hartley seems to have misunderstood Driver. Gray (Driver & Gray 1921 Pt. 2:344) cites the Akk cognate as possible, but refers to Delitzsch (1896:630), which though containing the word tartahu makes no connection between it and Hebrew תותח.

Besides the non-existence of the supposed Akk cognate of תותח, questions had already been raised by 1910 about the equation of תותח with *tartahu*. König (1910:539) viewed the derivation of תותח from Assyrian tartahu as groundless and improbable. Even granted the existence of such an Akk word there would be enough problems phonetically to make any equation highly dubious.

**B.2** KB (1025) explain תותח as cognate with Arb watahha, with ה rather than ח, to which they assign the meaning “mit Knüppeln schlagen beat with cudgels”. This seems to be merely a typographic error, though it is not corrected in Koehler & Baumgartner (1958) and is cited by Van Selms (1983:205). The correct form with ח is used in HAL (1580).

### 2. Formal Characteristics

**A.1** The form תותח is in pause. Therefore Schleusner (1822:215) understood the word to be תותח in its basic, non-pausal form. If Arb wataha is cognate with תותח then we may, with Bochart (1663:785) and Olshausen (1861:§213), compare its formation with שבעות. It would then be a Root-a taqta:l. However, since its only occurrence is in pause consideration should also be given to the view that it is taqtal rather than taqta:l.

**B.1** Barth (1894:294) refused to connect תותח with other Hebrew words of the same external form, deriving it erroneously from Akk. See Root and Comparative Material B.1.

### 3. Syntagmatics

**A.1** In MT תותח is construed with the pl verb שבות ניח “they are considered”. It may therefore be that תותח is a distributive sing. Heiligstedt (1847:280-81) says of תותח “sensum collectivi habet, quare cum plurali verbi conjuncta est.” Hirzel (1852:258) says that תותח is “hier als Gattungsbegriff mit dem Plur. Construirt.”

**B.1** [nil]
4. Versions

A.1 The extant versions generally support the meaning “hammer” or “mallet”. LXX originally did not contain v. 21a. Thd, now standing in Hexaplaric LXX manuscripts (Dhorme 1926:585), reads: ὡς καλάµη ἐλογίσθησαν σφῦραί. Aq is attested as the same by Field (1875:79). Some manuscripts, e.g. Vaticanus have σφύρα for σφῦραί. σφύρα is accented in the editions of Walton, Swete and Tischendorf (see also HAL:1580) as σφορά pl of σφορόν ‘ankle’, as opposed to σφῦραί pl of σφῦρα ‘hammer’, ‘mallet’. These latter meanings can more easily be derived from MT. Schleusner (1822:215) and Gesenius (1835:644) read LXX as σφῦρα. Sym (reconstructed from SyHex 'yk qny' ḥṣyb’ lh 'rzpt’) reads: ὡς καλάµη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ σφῦρα.

A.2 Vg malleus supports the rendering of the Gk versions.

A.3 Tg’s reading נירגיָא ‘axes’ (Díez Merino 1984:163) supports identification with a hand-held weapon.

A.4 Jb 41.21a is absent from Pesh (Dhorme 1926:585), and not extant in 11QtgJob.

B.1 [nil]

5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s)

A.1 Offensive weapon.

B.1 [nil]

6. Exegesis

A.1 תותח is in parallel with כידוּנ, or with כידוּנ שֶמוּר. This may suggest a hand-held weapon, though the parallel need not be precise. Since the text says that תותח “is/are considered as stubble”, one may presume that something known for its solidity is being compared to something known for its weakness. This is a possible contextual indicator that a club is being referred to.

A.2 Clines (3:328a), on בּּדוּר, glosses תותח as “cudgel”.

3
B.1 HAL (1580) expresses disagreement with Fohrer (1963:526-27), alleging that he translates תותח by “Sichelschwert”. HAL maintains that both etymology and versional evidence argue against this “Sonderbedeutung”. However, Fohrer in fact agrees with HAL in translating תותח by “Keule”, and HAL has misread Fohrer (1963:526) where “Sichelschwert” is the translation not of תותח in Jb 41.21a, but of ידו in 21b.

7. Conclusion

The connection with Arb wataḥa seems plausible, and along with the testimony of the ancient versions points towards the meaning “club”, although another sort of hand-held weapon may be meant.
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