גַּרְזֶן

P. J. Williams

(revised 1998)

Introduction

Grammatical Type: n m.

Occurrences: Total 4x OT, 0x Sir, 1?x QumB (1QIsa[a] as MT Is 10.15), 3x inscr (Siloam inscr [D-4.116.2, 4 (2x) = RR-Jer(7):3]).

Text Doubtful:

A.1 [nil]

B.1 Clines (2:375) incorrectly twice gives Is 10.5 instead of Is 10.15 as an occurrence. Hobbs (1989:115) says that it occurs 14 times in the OT.

B.2 ואתנהו ביד איל גויים ויעל עליו בגרזן read by Cornill (1886:376) in Ezk 31.11. He justifies this contextually as follows (1886:377), "In v. 10 war die Höhe des Baumes geschildert, in v. 11[a], dass er in die Hand eines Völkergewaltigen gegeben worden, in v. 12 wird berichtet, dass er gefällt worden sei, man erwartet daher in 11[b] eine Handlung, welche das Fällen vorbereitet. Geht man von גרשׂ aus, so bietet sich als nicht all zu fern liegend גרזן dar..."

B.3 On 1Kg 6.7 Noth (1968:99) commented, "Das Nebeneinander von undeterminiertem מקבות und הגרזן mit Artikel ist eine Unebenheit. Man kann diesen Artikel 'streichen'...vielleicht erweist aber auch diese Unebenheit (ו)הגרזן als späteren Zusatz..."

Qere/Ketiv: none.

1. Root and Comparative Material

A.1 There are many forms both within Semitic and outside Semitic that are regarded by at least some authorities as cognate with גַּרְזֶן. KB (193) says that together the wide range of cognates "suggests common foreign origin". Ges.-18 (229) calls it a "Kulturwort". That an instrument like a גַּרְזֶן might be a transculturally desirable piece of technology would facilitate the movement of the word. The instability of the

consonantal form, as attested by variation in the form of the proposed cognates, may suggest an origin outside Semitic. At least some analogy may be found for such a wide geographical distribution of the term "axe" in the fact that Gk πέλεκυς 'axe' is compared with Sanskrit *paraśus* and is said to be a loan-word from Babylonian *pilaqqu* and Sum *balag* (Liddell & Scott 1940:1357, Lewy 1895:178). Beekes (1995:37), however, rejects the proposal that the Indo-European words are connected to Akkadian *pilakku*.

A.2 KB (193) quotes Akk *ḫaṣinu* "(l *ḫaṣṣinu*?)" as cognate. *HAL* (195) cites Akk *ḫaṣ(ṣ)innu* and Sum *ḫaṣi(nna)*. CAD (6:133) says that Akk *ḫaṣinnu* 'axe' appears from the Old Akk period on, and exists as an Akk loan-word in Sum and Hitt. *AHw* (332) and Renz (Vol. 1:186) state that Akk *ḫaṣinnu* and Hebrew גַּרְזֶן are cognate. *AHw* (followed by Ges.-18:229) also records the Old Sum form *ḫa-zi*, and the New Sum form *ḫa-zi-in/na*. These Sum words are also recorded as cognates of גַּרְזֶן by Renz (Vol. 1:186). Hoch (1994:304, n. 56) considers the connection between גַּרְזֶן and Akk *ḫaṣ(ṣ)innu* and Sum *ḫaṣi(nna)u* unconvincing.

A.3 If the above Akk cognate is accepted we must also accept Arm חֲצִינָא and Syr *ḫaṣṣinā* 'a small axe' (Payne-Smith 1903:154) as cognate. Brockelmann (251) registered Syr *ḫaṣṣinā* as "f. (N§84 ex acc. *ḫaṣinnu* > ar. *ḫaṣīn*, aeth. *ḫaṣīn*, arm. כאשׁדן" and takes it to mean "dolabra, securis" Renz (Vol. 1:186) registers Syr *ḫaṣṣinā* as cognate.

A.4 Gesenius (1835:302) considered the following Arb words as cognate: *karzin, kirzin, kirzīn, kirzam* and *kirzīm*, all of which denote the sort of axe used for felling trees. Of these Gesenius observes "quibusque prope accedit hebr. קַרְדֹּם". KB (193) and *HAL* (195) likewise compare Arb *karzan, karzam* and *kirzīm*. *AHw* (332), Ges.-18 (229) and Renz (Vol. 1:186) say that Arb *karzan* is the same word. See also on Mandaic below. Fränkel (1886:85) said, "So ist wohl auch das mir allerdings blos aus den Lexx. bekannte *krzn* 'Axt', entlehnt (vgl. גַּרְזֶן), trotzdem ich dafür kein aramäisches Äquivalent kenne." According to Fränkel, Jawhari attests *krzym*, and *krzyn* alongside *krzm* and *krzn*. Hoch (1994:304) considers the connection with Arb *krzn* unconvincing.

A.5 KB (193), *HAL* (195), *AHw* (332) and Renz (Vol. 1:186) cite Eg grDn as being the same word. Ges.-18 (229) says that Eg *grḏn* and *qrḏn* (= qa-ar-Di-na <

*garzin) are Canaanite loan-words. The hypothetical Canaanite *garzin(a) is reconstructed as equivalent to Eg qa-ar-ḏi-na by Albright (1934:58). Albright accepts the equation between the Eg word and גַּרְזֶן. Helck (1962:571, number 237) compares Hebrew גַּרְזֶן with Eg *qa-r-sí-na*. Westendorf (1965:466) mentions a possible etymology of a Copt word meaning "Messer, Schwert, Dolch, Degen", which would involve comparison with Hebrew גַּרְזֶן. Osing (1976:374-75) cites an Eg loan from Akk *ḫarṣinnu* [sic] with comparison to Hebrew גַּרְזֶן [sic]. Eg qa-r-ḏi₄-na is definitely linked with Heb גַּרְזֶן (Hoch 1994:304). Hoch (1994:304-05) gives other hieroglyphic spellings to the Eg word attested in the 18th-20th dynasties.

A.6 Ges.-18 (229) says that a possible *Grundform* is g/karsin, and references for this form Salonen (1952:8-9). There Salonen is arguing that Arb #a$In (like its Eth counterpart) arose from Arm #a$$InA, which in turn arose from Akk #a$$innu. He continues, "Die Urform des Wortes in der Substratsprache, aus der es entlehnt worden ist, muss etwa *k/garsin geheissen haben, da wir dasselbe Wort im Hebräischen, als ein auf anderem Wege als aus dem Akkadischen entlehntes Wort, in der Form garzen haben." Thus Salonen's view that the earliest form is *k/garsin rests almost entirely on Hebrew. From this hypothesis he surmises that "Im Akkadischen ist das ursprüngliche -r$- zu -$$- geworden. Das anlautende #- zeigt, dass ursprünglich k- stark spirant war, also: k'-." He further compares the Armenian form כאשׁדן."

A.7 Salonen (1952:8) quotes Armenian כאשׁדן as comparable to Hebrew גַּרְזֶן. Hübschmann (1895:307) cites Armenian כאשׁדן as equivalent to Syr X$yn' "dolabra, securis" and Arb #$yn "Axt".

A.8 Salonen (1952:8-9), with reference to the "axe" words says, "Die indogermanischen Wörter für 'Axt', speziell das griechische ἀξίνη, gehören wohl auch zu derselben Sippe, nicht aber als Lehnworte aus den semitischen Sprachen. Dabei ist im Griechischen das anlautende *k- > h- > 0* geworden." Ges.-18 (229) compares Lat *ascia*. HAL (195) mentions Gr ἀξίνη and Lat *ascia* as possibly connected with Hebrew גַּרְזֶן. If a link with Indo-European can be maintained then גַּרְזֶן is ultimately linked to English "axe" and German "Axt" etc. Regarding the theory

that ἀξίνη is a loan from Semitic Lewy (1895:178) comments "Die Vertretung von צ durch ξ statt σ oder höchstens ζ wäre beispiellos."

A.9 KB (193) quotes Berber *(ta)* gelzimt as cognate. Stumme (1912:127) says, "Aus *bárzel* besteht der wichtigste Teil des *amadir*, wie der der Axt, die berberisch *agelzim* heißt; in der Endung *im* dieses Wortes wird niemand eine hebräisch-phönizische maskuline Pluralendung suchen, sondern dasselbe wohl als eine Veränderung von *gárzen* oder einer diesem גַּרְזֶן ählich klingenden Form hinnehmen." Stumme is quoted with approval in Ges.-18 (229).

A.10 *HAL* (195) cites Ug #r$n as cognate. This view is in contrast with that of Gordon (*UT*:398, 405), who understands this word as a proper noun. The Ug word has been vocalised as #ura$ana (Schaeffer 1955:245). Salonen (1952:8) reads Ug #r$n as #ar$In, and believes it to be a distant cognate of גַּרְזֶן. Friedrich (1933:739) says that גַּרְזֶן, Ug #r$n, Arm #a$$InA and Akk #a$innu are "verschiedene Versuche...eine dem Semitischen fremdartige Lautfolge ungefähr wiederzugeben". Although there is no certainty that the Ug form #r$n is an axe, its morphology with r as second radical and # as first radical is the strongest indicator of an etymological link between words morphologically closer to grzn, and those morphologically closer to #$n (Davies 1997). Hoch (1994:304) considers Ug #r$n a personal name unconnected with Hebrew גַּרְזֶן.

A.11 Dietrich (1967:303) derives Mand qurnasa thus: "qurnasa < akk. #a$$innu (alt-neusum. #a-zi[in/na]) 'Axt' über *qurzana (von dieser Stufe aus sind mand.-pers. gurza, s.d., hebr. grzn und arab. karzan abgeleitet, vgl. neuäg. krDn) und *qursana mit Methathese von n und s." This analysis is quoted with approval by Ges.-18 (229).

A.12 Clines by arrows relates גַּרְזֶן to גרז I 'be cut off' in Ps 31.23 (2:375). It is probable that some relationship was felt at the synchronic level by speakers of the language. It may be that a similar (but diachronic) connection is drawn by Gesenius (1835:302) when he says of גַּרְזֶן that "Syllaba ־ֶן in fine adiecta quadrilittero formando inservit". Leslau (1958:15) states that the noun גַּרְזֶן "could be derived from" the once attested Hebrew verbal root גרז. Bons (1994:132-33) derives גַּרְזֶן from the triliteral root גרז. GK (§30 *q*) takes the Nun to be an expansion from a triliteral root, the

Seghol being a modification from an original short *a* (§85 *u*). Hoch (1994:304) gives גַּרְזֶן as connected with גרז.

A.13 Gesenius (1835:302) also considered words as cognate that have the second and third radicals in a different order, e.g. מַגְזֵרָה. Hoch (1994:304) similarly links גַּרְזֶן with other Semitic gzr words related to "cutting".

A.14 KB (193) suggest the following etymology, "גַּרְזֶן *if Hebrew*, גָּזַם (גזז, 'cutter') > *גַּרְזָם > *גַּרְזֶן > (*influenced by* בַּרְזֶל) גַּרְזֶן". However, the article in KB on balance seems to point against a Hebrew origin for the word.

B.1 Ges.-18 (229) compares with גַּרְזֶן Gr ἀζίνη 'axe', but this is almost certainly a misprint for ἀξίνη.

2. Formal Characteristics

A.1 גַּרְזֶן is a quadriliteral.

B.1 [nil]

3. Syntagmatics

A.1 In Dt 20.19 גַּרְזֶן is the object of the verb נָדַח '*impel* (i.e. *wield*)' (BDB:623). In Dt 19.5 we have the phrase וְנִדְּחָה יָדֹו בַּגַּרְזֶן meaning possibly "and his hand is thrust (i.e. 'swung') with the axe". נִדְּחָה is best analysed as a niph of the root נדח (BDB:623) since a piel of this root is not attested.

A.2 In the Siloam tunnel inscr the people who did the cutting are represented by the qal participle of the verb חצב (line 4, line 2 restored, cf. Davies 1991:68). In Is 10.15 the user of a גַּרְזֶן is likewise called a חֹצֵב. Actions contextually associated with a גַּרְזֶן are also represented by the verbs כרת qal 'cut' (Dt 19.5, 20.19), חטב qal 'cut wood' (Dt 19.5) and נכה hiph 'strike' (D-4.116.4).

A.3 In the first line of the Siloam inscr מנפם is usually restored (see Davies 1991:68) as a verb governing גרזן via the restored object marker את. This would be

the hiph of נוף 'swing, wield, wave' (BDB:631). Clines (2:375) records this restoration.

B.1 [nil]

4. Versions

a. LXX:

ἀξίνη (Dt 19.5, Is 10.15);

πέλεκυς (1Kg 6.7);

σίδηρον (Dt 20.19).

b. Aq:

πέλεκυς (Dt 20.19, probably);

πέλυξ (Dt 19.5, Is 10.15).

c. Pesh:

nrg' (Dt 19.5, 20.19 [5b1, 6h6, 9a1*fam*], Is 10.15);

przl' (Dt 20.19 [most manuscripts]);

mgzr' (1Kg 6.7).

d. Tg:

TgO ברזלא (Dt 19.5, 20.19);

TgPro חולילא 'chisel'? (1Kg 6.7, Is 10.15);

TgNeo, TgFrg (Klein 1980) סיקורא (< Lat *securis*) (Dt 19.5);

TgPsJ סיקוריא (Dt 19.5);

TgNeo כל מין דפרזל (Dt 20.19);

TgPsJ מן דפרזלא (Dt 20.19);

Samaritan Tg גרזל (Dt 19.5);

Samaritan Tg קצוץ (Dt 20.19).

e. Vg:

securis (always; pl in Dt 20.19).

A.1 By using πέλεκυς and πέλυξ, Aq has strongly differentiated גַּרְזֶן from קַרְדֹּם, which he translated by ἀξίνη. Since both ἀξίνη and πέλεκυς are used in the

LXX for גַּרְזֶן, it is unlikely that any firm semantic distinction between the two Hebrew words can be inferred on the basis of Aq.

A.2 In Dt 20.19 it is likely that TgNeo's reading of "any kind (מין) of iron" developed from an earlier reading of "instrument (מן) of iron" like TgPsJ.

A.3 In the Samaritan Tg the word גרזל may support some association between גַּרְזֶן and בַּרְזֶל. The word קצוץ is explained thus by Macuch (1982:248): "קצוץ Dt 20:19 qAO 'Axt'".

A.4 The fact that in Dt 20.19 LXX, Pesh and all Jewish targumic witnesses translate גַּרְזֶן by "iron" may represent an exegetical tradition, and indicate that גַּרְזֶן was associated with "iron".

B.1 McNamara (1997:102 note 11) comments that in Dt 19.5 TgNeo פרזלא renders Hebrew גַּרְזֶן. In fact in Dt 19.5 פרזלא translates Hebrew הַבַּרְזֶל.

5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s)

A.1 In Dt 19.5, 20.19 גַּרְזֶן occurs in close association with the word עֵץ, which it is being used to cut. In 1Kg 6.7 it occurs in the same context as אֶבֶן. Similarly in the Siloam inscr (line 3) צר 'rock' is the material being cut. In contrast, the word קַרְדֹּם is only attested with wood as its object. There may therefore be some semantic opposition between the two instruments, גַּרְזֶן being able to be used on a greater variety of materials.

A.2 In Dt 19.5 and 1Kg 6.7 בַּרְזֶל is mentioned with גַּרְזֶן. In MT to 1Kg 6.7 כָּל־כְּלִי בַרְזֶל is in apposition to גַּרְזֶן, suggesting that a גַּרְזֶן was made, at least partly, of iron.

A.3 In 1Kg 6.7 גַּרְזֶן occurs next to מַקָּבוֹת, pl of מַקֶּבֶת 'hammer' (BDB:666), as an instrument of a similar kind. The co-occurrence of a word for "hammer" and גַּרְזֶן in a context of finishing stone may suggest that in some contexts גַּרְזֶן could mean "chisel" or something similar (compare TgPro on 1Kg 6.7 and Is 10.15). In Is 10.15 הַגַּרְזֶן is the A parallel to הַמַּשּׂוֹר meaning the "saw" (BDB:673).

A.4 גַּרְזֶן is in the semantic field of tools. However, in wartime such a tool may be used as an offensive weapon. However, in contrast to קַרְדֹּם, there is no textual evidence for the use of a גַּרְזֶן in military contexts (Ahituv 1968:974, Hobbs 1989:115).

B.1 [nil]

6. Exegesis

A.1 It seems most probable that the iron referred to in Dt 19.5 is the blade of the גַּרְזֶן. Craigie (1976:266) understood Dt 19 to refer to an event when "two men go into the forest to cut wood and one is killed as a result of an accident due to a fault in his friend's axe". Compare also 2Kg 6.1-7 where the בַּרְזֶל falls into the water. The question is whether this refers to the loose blade or to the instrument as a whole.

A.2 Dalman (1935:5) said, "Als Werkzeug dient eine eiserne Axt (garzen) (5. M. 19,5; 20,19, Jes. 10,15), deren hebräische Bezeichnung (bei Onkelos aram. barzelA, Sa'adja ar. XadId, also 'Eisen') dem Späthebräischen fremd ist, während die zum Baumfällen Jerem. 46,22 gebrauchten qardummOt als ein Gerät mit zwei Schneiden wohl bekannt sind. Das wohl einschneidige ma'a$Ad (Jerem. 10,3) könnte sachlich garzen entsprechen; kaSSIl (Ps. 74,5) war wohl ein größeres Werkzeug und qardOm (Ps. 74,5) das gewaltigste."

B.1 [nil]

7. Conclusion

A.1 Overwhelming etymological and versional evidence supports the conclusion that גַּרְזֶן denotes an axe. Contextual and syntagmatic information also supports this conclusion. We know that a גַּרְזֶן was used for chopping wood (Dt 19.5, 20.19), for hewing stone (1Kg 6.7) and for tunnelling through rock (Siloam tunnel inscr). This is in contrast to the attestations of קַרְדֹּם, which in its five OT occurrences is only associated with the cutting of wood. Given the paucity of occurrences of both words, it is impossible to be certain that there was a semantic opposition between גַּרְזֶן

and קַרְדֹּם as regards the material they were used to cut. גַּרְזֶן is translated by Gesenius (1835:302) as "securis", by BDB (173) as "axe" and with reference to the Siloam tunnel inscr "pick" or "pick-axe", by KB (193) "Beil *axe*", "Steinhaue *pick*", by *HAL* (195) "Beil", "Steinhaue", and by Ges.-18 (229) "Axt", "Meißel", "Hacke" and "Picke". Clines (2:375) glosses the word as "axe - cutting instrument with blade or point of iron". This is further specified as "axe" in Dt 19.5, 20.19 and Is 10.5, "pickaxe" in the Siloam inscr, and "adze" in 1Kg 6.7.

A.2 There is a recurring association of גַּרְזֶן with iron. The fact that the forms גַּרְזֶן and בַּרְזֶל are very similar may have facilitated their association, or even their association may have facilitated the assimilation of their forms as noted in Root and Comparative Material A.14, though the two words undoubtedly possess separate etymologies. גַּרְזֶן and בַּרְזֶל are linked in Dt 19.5 and 1Kg 6.7. At Dt 20.19 LXX, most manuscripts of Pesh, and all Jewish targums translate גַּרְזֶן by "iron". At Dt 19.5 the Samaritan Tg form גרזל may be a mixture of גַּרְזֶן with בַּרְזֶל. The association with בַּרְזֶל is again in contrast to קַרְדֹּם, which is never contextually associated with iron, nor associated with iron in the versions.

A.3 A further contrast with קַרְדֹּם is that גַּרְזֶן is not attested in military contexts, whereas קַרְדֹּם is. This, however, may be due to the small number of attestations of both words.

A.4 Some of the oppositions between גַּרְזֶן and קַרְדֹּם noted above may be related. If, for instance, a גַּרְזֶן always had an iron head, and the קַרְדֹּם had a semantic opposition to גַּרְזֶן as regards its material composition (perhaps because it never used iron, or generally used bronze etc.), then this might explain the difference in their application. Both denote axes. However, only the harder material iron was used on stone or rock.

A.5 Another opposition between גַּרְזֶן and קַרְדֹּם is that גַּרְזֶן is not attested in pl, whereas four of the five attestations of קַרְדֹּם are in pl. It is possible that קַרְדֹּם supplied the pl of גַּרְזֶן. But this would be virtually incompatible with any semantic distinction between the two words, since they would have to be semantically very close for such a complementary distribution to arise.

B.1 [nil]

Bibliography

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

Albright, W.F. 1934. *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*. American Oriental Series 5, American Oriental Society. New Haven, Connecticut.

Beekes, R.S.P. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia.

Bons, E. 1994. *Psalm 31 - Rettung als Paradigma: Eine synchron-leserorientierte Analyse*. Frankfurt am Main.

Cornill, C.H. 1886. *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*. Leipzig.

Craigie, P.C. 1976. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. London / Sydney / Auckland / Toronto.

Dalman, G. 1935. *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina: Band 4: Brot, Öl und Wein*. Gütersloh.

Davies, G.I. 1991. *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions: Corpus and Concordance*. Cambridge.

_____. 1997. Personal communication, 17.12.97.

Dietrich, M. 1967. Zum mandäischen Wortschatz. *Bi Or* 24:290-305.

Fränkel, S. 1886. *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen*. Leiden.

Friedrich, J. 1933. Review of Hans Bauer. 1932. *Das Alphabet von Ras Schamra: Seine Entzifferung und seine Gestalt*. Halle. *OL 1933*:738-42.

Gesenius, W. 1835. *Thesaurus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti*. Lipsiae.

Helck, W. 1962. *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr*. Wiesbaden.

Hobbs, T.R. 1989. *A Time for War: A Study of Warfare in the Old Testament*. Wilmington, Delaware.

Hoch, J.E. 1994. *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton.

Hübschmann, H. 1895. *Armenische Grammatik: I. Theil Armenische Etymologie*. Leipzig.

Klein, M.L. 1980. *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources. Volume I: Texts, Indices and Introductory Essays*. Rome.

Leslau, W. 1958. *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon*. Berkeley / Los Angeles.

Lewy, H. 1895. *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen*. Berlin.

Liddell, H.G. & R. Scott. [9]1940. *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.

McNamara, M. 1997. *Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy*. The Aramaic Bible Volume 5A. Edinburgh.

Macuch, R. 1982. *Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch*. Berlin / New York.

Noth, M. 1968. *Königer* (BK). Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Osing, J. 1976. *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. Mainz am Rhein.

Payne-Smith, J. 1903. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford.

Salonen, A. 1952. Alte Substrat- und Kulturwörter im Arabischen. *StOr* 17(2).

Schaeffer, C.F.-A. 1955. *Mission de Ras Shamra Tome VI: Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit*. Paris.

Stumme, H. 1912. Gedanken über libysch-phönizische Anklänge. *ZA* 27:121-28.

Westendorf, W. 1965. *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*. Heidelberg.