# תותח

# P.J. Williams (revised 1998)

#### Introduction

Grammatical Type: n m?

Occurrences: Total 1x OT (Jb 41.21), 0x Sir, 0x Qum, 0x inscr.

Text Doubtful: none.

Oere/Ketiv: none.

#### 1. Root and Comparative Material

A.1 To judge from Bochart's claim (1663:785) "חותה fustem, ex Arabica lingua novè explicamus" he was the first to connect חֹוְהוֹה 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 mitaḥat 'club'. BDB (450) supports the connection of חֹוְהַה 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 חַחְהַה as a "Fremdwort aus assyr. tartaḫu '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 kuttaḫu. Nevertheless, Ebeling (1933:33) has argued that even the pronunciation kuttaḫu is uncertain because of the well attested word šiltaḥḫu 'arrow' or 'spear'. CAD records both kutaḫu 'a lance' (8:603) and šiltaḥu (šiltaḥḫu) 'arrow' (17-b:448-51). Driver (1950:339-40) discusses and rejects the supposed word \*tartaḥḫu. He believes that this word was never supposed to be equivalent to naṇa, but that naṇa was believed to be a scribal error for the hypothetical Hebrew word \*naṇa, the supposed equivalent of \*tartaḥḥu. HAL (1580) rightly defends KB's failure to mention \*tartaḥu as a form possibly cognate with naṇa.

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 tôṭāḥ 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 nain. Besides the non-existence of the supposed Akk cognate of nain, questions had already been raised by 1910 about the equation of nain with \*tartahhu. König (1910:539) viewed the derivation of nain 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 אוֹתָּה as cognate with Arb wataḥa, with ḥ rather than ḫ, 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 ḥ is used in *HAL* (1580).

#### 2. Formal Characteristics

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

**B.1** Barth (1894:294) refused to connect חַּחָה 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 הַחָּה is construed with the pl verb נָּחְשָׁבוּ "they are considered". It may therefore be that הַחָּה is a distributive sing. Heiligstedt (1847:280-81) says of הַּחָה "sensum collectivi habet, quare cum plurali verbi conjuncta est." Hirzel (1852:258) says that הַּחָה 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 σφῦραι. Aq is attested as the same by Field (1875:79). Some manuscripts, e.g. Vaticanus have σφυρα for σφῦραι. σφυρα is accented in the editions of Walton, Swete and Tischendorf (see also *HAL*:1580) as σφυρά pl of σφυρόν 'ankle', as opposed to σφῦραι 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 σφύρα. Sym (reconstructed from SyHex 'yk qny' ḥšyb' lh 'rzpt') reads: ὡς καλάμη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ σφῦρα.

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

A.3 Tg's reading נְרְגַיָּא '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 בְּעשׁ בִּידוֹן is in parallel with בְּעשׁ בִּידוֹן, or with בְּעשׁ בִּידוֹן. This may suggest a hand-held weapon, though the parallel need not be precise. Since the text says that "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 חשב, glosses חוֹתָה as "cudgel".

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

#### 7. Conclusion

The connection with Arb wataha 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.

# **Bibliography**

Ahituv, S. 1968. Article במקרא Encyclopaedia Biblica: Thesaurus Rerum Biblicarum Alphabetico Ordine Digestus 5:970-76.

Barth, J. <sup>2</sup>1894. Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. Leipzig.

Bochart, S. 1663. Hierozoicon. Vol. 2. London.

Delitzsch, F. 1896. Assyrisches Handwörterbuch. Leipzig.

Dhorme, E. 1926. Le Livre de Job. Paris.

Díez Merino, L. 1984. *Targum de Job: Edición Príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil n. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora*. Madrid.

Driver, G.R. 1950. L'interprétation du Texte Masorétique à la lumière de la lexicographie hébraïque. *ETL* 26:337-53.

Driver, S.R. & G.B. Gray. 1921. The Book of *Job* (ICC). Edinburgh.

Ebeling, E. 1933. Aus den Archiven von Uruk und Assur. Aus fünf Jahrtausenden morgenländischer Kultur: Festschrift Max Freiherrn von Oppenheim zum 70. Geburtstage gewidmet von Freunden und Mitarbeitern. Berlin:27-36.

Field, F. 1875. Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt. Tomus II. Oxford.

Fohrer, G. 1963. Das Buch Hiob (KzAT). Gütersloh.

Gordis, R. 1978. The Book of Job. New York.

Hartley, J.E. 1988. *The Book of Job* (New International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids.

Heiligstedt, A. 1847. Commentarius Grammaticus Historicus Criticus in Jobum. Lipsiae.

- Hirzel, L. 1852. *Hiob* (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament). Zweite Lieferung. Leipzig.
- Koehler, L. & W. Baumgartner. 1958. Supplementum ad Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden.
- König, F.E. 1910. Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Leipzig.
- Meissner, B. 1931. Beiträge zum assyrischen Wörterbuch I. *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 47:145-236.
- Olshausen, J. 1861. Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache. Braunschweig.
- Schleusner, J.H. 1822. Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus: sive, Lexicon in LXX. et Reliquos Interpretes Graecos ac Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti. Vol. 3. Glasguae.
- Van Selms, A. 1983. *Job II* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament). Nijkerk.