

תְּנִית

P.J. Williams
(revised 1998)

Introduction

Grammatical Type: n f.

Occurrences: Total 47x OT, 1x Sir (38.25), 7x Qum, 0x inscr.

There are clusters of occurrences of תְּנִית in the OT. 29 of the 47 occurrences are in 1Sm and 2Sm, and seven in 1Ch. The prevalence of the word in certain books is undoubtedly due to their military content.

Text Doubtful:

A.1 Krenkel (1882:310) emended **בַּחֲנִית וּבֶאֱרָץ** in 1Sm 26.8 to **בַּחֲנִיתוֹ בֶּאֱרָץ**. Nowack (1902:130), Ehrlich (1908-14, Vol. 3:259), Smith (1912:231), Driver (1913:206) and BHK follow Krenkel. Dhorme (1910:231) calls it “une heureuse conjecture”. BHS comments that two manuscripts omit the Waw and compares for this omission the Lucianic LXX, Tg and Vg.

A.2 Klostermann (1887:136) emended **בְּאַחֲרֵי הַחֲנִית** in 2Sm 2.23 thus, “lies **אַחֲרֵינִית**, d. h. ohne sich umzudrehen, mit dem Speere hinten aus stoßend, sodaß der Tod Asahels nicht als Mord, auch nicht als absichtl. Tötung in der Verteidigung erscheinen konnte. Der Speer verstand sich von selbst, aber ein späterer Leser hat den im folgenden vorausgesetzten ausdrückl. in dem Ende des Wortes erwähnt finden wollen, u. so ist dasselbe zu **בְּאַחֲרֵי הַחֲנִית** geworden, was man mit sachlicher u. sprachlicher Schwierigkeit = ‘mit dem hinteren Ende des Speeres’ deutet.” BHK registers Klostermann’s suggestion. Driver (1913:243) said, “It is doubtful both whether **אַחֲרֵי** (everywhere else a *prep.* or *conj.*) can mean the *hinder part* of a spear, and also whether the butt end of a spear would be sharp enough to pierce through a man: hence Klo. conjectured **אַחֲרֵינִית** (Gen. 9, 23 al.) *backwards* (i.e. driving the reversed spear backwards as he ran): so Sm. Now. Bu.” Anderson (1989:40) says, “The MT’s **אַחֲרֵי** is usually used as a *conj.* (‘after’) or as *prep.* (‘behind’), but here it serves as a substantive, meaning ‘end.’”

From a comparison of 2Sm 23.8 and 1Ch 11.11 MT it is evident that at least the text in Samuel has suffered during transmission, and it has therefore been proposed that in Samuel instead of **הוא עדינו העצני** we should read **הוא עורר אתחניתו** with 1Ch. Luther is quoted in Keil (1875:383) as supporting the emendation of 2Sm 23.8 to **הוא עורר אתחניתו**. The emendation is also supported by Thenius (1842:247), Keil (1875:383) and Anderson (1989:273). Klostermann (1887:249) adds the words “der schwang seinen Speer über” from Chronicles after the words **הוא עדינו העצנו** (Kativ), which he conjectures originally read **הוא ערצנו** “der ist unsere Zierde, der ist unser Gewaltigster”. Wellhausen did not support the emendation of **הוא עדינו העצנו** to **הוא עורר אתחניתו**. He said (1871:213), “Die LXX zu unserer Stelle stützt die Lesart der Chronik nicht; denn ἐξήγειρε τὸ δόρυ αὐτοῦ v. 18 beweist, dass ἐσπάσατο τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ v. 8 aus der LXX zur *Chronik* stammt. Bei der Tendenz der letzteren, die Archaismen zu vermeiden, wird man sich hüten müssen, einfach ihren Text auch für 2 Sam. zu adoptieren.” Driver supported the emendation originally (1890:280) but later (1913:364) though considering the phrase **הוא עדינו העצנו** “meaningless”, he called emendation to **הוא עורר אתחניתו** (1Ch 11.11) “rather an easy emendation”. He added that this emendation, “is not supported by the LXX....Luc. οὗτος διακόσμηι τὴν διασασυήν, which Klo. thinks points to **מערכם עדר** (cf. 1 Ch. 12, 38), improved by Marquart into **עַרְר מְעַצְדוֹ** *brandished his axe* (Jer. 10, 3. Is 44, 12†): so Bu. Dh. **עַרְר חֲצִינוֹ**, also *brandished his axe* (Ass. ḥašinnu, *axe*; Eth. *iron* (the common word for it: Dillm. *Lex.* 623); Targ. **חֲצִינָא = מעצד** Jer. 10, 3. Is. 44, 12, and in Talm.: Syr. ḥšīnā *axe* (rare)...Either **מעצדו** or **הצינו** resembles **העצנו** more than **חניתו** does; and it is possible that one of these corrections is right.”

Thus, Wellhausen and Driver both object to the emendation with **חנית** on the grounds that it is too easy.

BHS (cf. BHK) at 2Kg 11.10 notes that LXX, Pesh, Vg and one Hebrew manuscript have pl, as does the parallel in 2Ch 23.9.

BHK at 2Ch 23.9 prefers to read **החניתות ואֶת־הַמְּגִנִּים** for MT's **ואת המגנות** **החניתים**.

B.1 BDB (333) incorrectly cites Klostermann as supporting the emendation of *הוא עורר אֶת־חַנְיָתוֹ* to *הוא עדינו העצנו* in 2Sm 23.8. He did not support the replacement of any Hebrew words by *הוא עורר אֶת־חַנְיָתוֹ*, but merely adds these words (see above).

Qere/Ketiv: 1Sm 26.22 Ketiv is: *הִנֵּה הַחֲנִיָּת הַמֶּלֶךְ* “behold the spear, O king,” whereas the Qere is: *הִנֵּה חַנְיָת הַמֶּלֶךְ* “behold the spear of the king”. BHS says “mlt Mss ut Q cf Vrs”. Driver (1913:209) thinks that the Qere better suits the context, the He of the Ketiv having been accidentally repeated from *הנה*.

1. Root and Comparative Material

A.1 KB (315) following a suggestion registered in Ges. (224) says that *חַנְיָת* is a loan from Egyptian *ḥnjt*. This word is attested in Erman & Grapow (1957:110). If this etymology is correct the cognates cited by BDB below are illusory. Ellenbogen (1962:73) denies any Semitic etymology and following Koehler takes it as an Eg loan. Ahituv (1968:973), *HAL* (320) and Ges.-18 (372) support this derivation, the last also citing Calice (1936:718). In direct opposition to this view Galling (1966:159) said, “Das Wort *חַנְיָת* ist in Ägypten als Fremdwort bezeugt.” Hoch (1994:229) argues that the word has entered Eg from Semitic on the ground that it is only attested twice in Eg, and these occurrences are closely related. He gives the spellings as *ḥanyat* and *ḥnyat*.

A.2 Zorell (254) does not connect *חַנְיָת* with Hebrew *חָנָה*, but he does compare Syr *ḥnā* “telum direxit alqo, aggressus est”. However, Brockelmann (243) connects Syr *ḥnā* with Hebrew *חָנָה*, but not with *חַנְיָת*. Barth (1902:21), like Zorell connects *חַנְיָת* with Syr *ḥnā* “richtete”, which is distinguished from the root meaning “beugte, krümmte”. It is derived as a weapon that is “*gerichtete, geworfene*” at a target. “Die Wurzel ist aber für uns im Hebr. sonst nicht mehr nachweisbar; das Nomen ist vielleicht früh entlehnt.” BDB (333) categorises *חַנְיָת* as cognate with the verb *חָנָה*, which is glossed as meaning “decline, bend down, encamp”. A possible explanation given by BDB for the semantic link is that a spear is “flexible”. According to BDB *חַנְיָת* is thus also cognate with *חַנוּת* ‘cell’ (333), and *מַחֲנֶה* ‘encampment, camp’ (334). Along with *חָנָה* are classed Syr *ḥn*’ ‘aim at, incline towards, reach’, the Zenzirli

construct מַחֲנֶה ‘camp’, Arb ḥanā ‘bend, curve, bend down’, Akk mūnu, mēnu and tēnū ‘couch’, and Akk mānītu ‘house’. Hoch (1994:229) derives חֲנִית from the Semitic root ḥny. This root is manifested in BH חָנָה, Syr ḥnā, and Arb ḥnw, each of which is a verb with a meaning related to “incline”. Hoch also mentions an Ug word in Akk transcription ḥinuta, which denotes an instrument containing, or consisting of copper, and thus possibly meaning “spear”. The Semitic words with the root ḥny can only be cognate if the Eg word for “spear” has been loaned from Semitic, rather than into Semitic.

B.1 Dillmann (870) connected an Eth word with Hebrew חֲנִית. He also connected Arb qanāt and Hebrew קִנָּה with חֲנִית. On Ge’ez kwināt, kwWnāt Leslau (1987:288) says that the connection with Hebrew חֲנִית is “unlikely”. “As for Heb. ḥānīt, it is considered an Egyptian (ḥnyt) loanword (Buhl 244, Baumgartner 320).”

2. Formal Characteristics

A.1 If the derivation from Eg is correct then חֲנִית has no native Hebrew formal characteristics. It is attested in an unsuffixed pl form חֲנִיתִים, and in the suffixed pl forms חֲנִיתוֹתֵיהֶם or חֲנִיתֵיהֶם. The variation in the form of the pl and the fact that it rarely forms a pl (3 out of 47 biblical occurrences) may be due to its foreign origin. On the form of the pl see GK §87 *k*.

B.1 [nil]

3. Syntagmatics

A.1 Various indications of the composition of a חֲנִית are given in its syntagmatic relationships with other nouns. In 1Sm 17.7 (Qere), 2Sm 21.19, 23.7, 1Ch 20.5 we have the phrase חֲנִית עֵץ, in which עֵץ is normally understood to mean “shaft”. At any rate this is an indication that חֲנִית shafts were made of wood. In 1Sm 17.7 the Ketiv is קֶחַ, perhaps by scribal error. The LXX rendering here of κοντός as opposed to ξύλον in the other places may indicate that it read the Ketiv. In all these

references, except 2Sm 23.7 the עץ חנית is said to be במנזר ארגים, for which see Exegesis.

In 1Sm 17.7 we have the phrase לְהִבֵּת חֲנִיתוֹ “the point of his spear”, while in Jb 39.23 we have לְהֵב חֲנִית “the point of the spear”. In 1QH 2.26 we have ולהוב חנית, and in 1QM 6.2 a לוחב הזרק “point of a dart” is likened to a ברקת חנית (see below). These forms all seem to mean “head (of a spear)” or “flashing point”. Similarly in Nah 3.3 and Hb 3.11 we have בָּרַק חֲנִית “flashing of a spear”. Nah 3.3 is followed by 4QpNah 3+ 2.4 which has וברק חנית. In Nah 3.3 בָּרַק is in a loosely parallel construction to לְהֵב. 1QM 6.2 has ברקת חנית. These all seem to refer to the flashing part of a spear. This interpretation is supported explicitly by the combination בָּרַק חֲנִיתָ “at the brightness of the flashing of your spear” in Hb 3.11.

In 2Sm 2.23 אֶחָרִי occurs before חֲנִית. For a discussion of proposed emendations of this see the Introduction and for explanation of MT see Exegesis.

In 1Sm 26.16, 22 (Qere) חֲנִית is the nomen regens before הַמֶּלֶךְ.

A.2 חֲנִית is used as the object of the verb עוֹרֵר ‘brandish’ in 2Sm 23.18, 1Ch 11.11, 20. In 1Sm 18.11, 20.33 the Hiph of טוֹל ‘hurl’ governs חֲנִית, possibly suggesting that it was a thrown weapon (but see Conclusion). BDB (376), following other authorities, suggests that in 1Sm 18.11 we repoint to וַיִּטֵּל from the root נטל, so that the word means “and he took up”. The repointing, however, is unnecessary since the following verb וַיֹּאמֶר “and he thought” may express an action contemporaneous to the verb that precedes. The analogy of 1Sm 20.33 should make us cautious about repointing. In 1Sm 18.11, 19.10 (2x), 20.33, 26.8, 2Sm 2.23 חֲנִית occurs with the Hiph of the verb נָבַח, and means “strike”. In Ps 35.3 חֲנִית is the object of the Hiph of רוּק, which means “draw out” (“herausziehen” Fredriksson 1945:97), and in that meaning is normally used with חֶרֶב ‘sword’ as its object (Ex 15.9, Lv 26.33, Ezk 5.2, 12, 12.14, 28.7, 30.11). Davies (1998) suggests that if (as in 1Sm 26.7) a חֲנִית was regularly stuck in the ground, הִרַק may refer to the action of drawing a חֲנִית out of the ground. In Ps 46.10 חֲנִית is the object of קָצַץ “cut in two” (BDB:893), and in Is 2.4

and Mc 4.3 it is the object of **בָּתַת** “beat” (BDB:510). The former verb probably particularly denotes an action carried out on the shaft of the **הַנִּיט**, and the latter verb particularly denotes an action carried out on the metal point of the **הַנִּיט**. Thus both parts may individually be denoted by **הַנִּיט** in certain contexts.

There are also more general verbs with which **הַנִּיט** is construed, though these give less semantic information about **הַנִּיט**. It is the object of **עָשָׂה** ‘make’ 1Sm 13.19, **לָקַח** ‘take’ 1Sm 26.11, 12 (and v 22 by use of a pronominal suffix), **גָּזַל** ‘steal’ 2Sm 23.21, 1Ch 11.23, **נָתַן** ‘give’ 2Kg 11.10, 2Ch 23.9, and **מַחֲזִיק** ‘holding’ 1QM 6.5. **הַנִּיט** is also the joint subject of **נִמְצָא** ‘be found’ 1Sm 13.22, and **יָצָא** ‘go out’ 2Sm 2.23.

A.3 In 1QH 5.10 the phrase **חַנִּית חֲדָה** occurs, using the adjective “sharp” of a **חַנִּית**. The whole item is qualified by this adjective, even though only the blade was sharp. In 1Sm 26.7 **הַנִּיט** is the subject with which the passive participle **מְעוּכָה** forms a predication. **מָעַךְ** probably means “press, squeeze” (BDB:590). The spear was pressed into the ground.

B.1 [nil]

4. Versions

A.1 In the LXX **הַנִּיט** is generally rendered by **δόρυ** ‘(shaft of) spear’ (33x). In 1Ch 12.35 LXX uses a pl where MT has sing. Is 2.4 uses the word **ζιβύνη** = **σιβύνη** “*hunting spear*, and generally, *spear, pike*” (Liddell & Scott 1940:1596). In 1Sm 17.7 **לְהִבַּת הַנִּיטוֹ** is translated by **ἡ λόγχη αὐτοῦ**. **λόγχη** means “spear-head” (Liddell & Scott 1940:1059). In 2Kg 11.10 LXX uses **σειρομάστης** = **σιρομάστης** “barbed lance” (Liddell & Scott 1940:1600; Lust et al. 1996:423; Muraoka 1993:213) in the pl where MT has a sing though a pl sense seems required. In Nah 3.3 and Hb 3.11 **הַנִּיט** in the sing in MT is translated by the pl **ὄπλα** “arms, weapons, tools”. Similarly, in Ps 46(45).10, 57(56).5 **הַנִּיט** is translated by **ὄπλον**. In Ps 35(34).3 **הַנִּיט** is translated by **ρόμφαία**, perhaps because of the verb **הִרְקָה** that it follows. This verb is frequently used

for drawing a sword, and therefore the meaning ῥομφαία may have suggested itself to the translator. Ellenbogen (1962:73) calls it a “mistranslation”. Likewise, in 1Ch 11.11, 20 הוא עורר את חניתו 20 “he aroused his spear” is translated οὗτος ἐσπάσατο τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ “he drew his sword”. Perhaps some connection was formed in the translator’s mind between עורר and תער “sheath”, and thus עורר was understood to mean “he drew from a sheath”. עורר was understood by Pesh to mean “draw”. The consequence of this would be that חנית was interpreted as a sword. In 2Ch 23.9 no such reason can be found why חנית is translated by μάχαιρα. These previous four references, three of which come from Chronicles, show some tendency to understand חנית as “sword”. LXX Chronicles renders חנית by δόρυ five times, but since three of these renderings are in the same verse (1Ch 11.23) LXX Chronicles has equal numbers of verses rendering חנית as “spear” and rendering it as “sword”. LXX 2Sm 23.8 has the possible doublet Ἀδεινὼν ὁ Ἀσωναῖος, οὗτος ἐσπάσατο τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ, which might be thought to support a Vorlage with חנית on the analogy of 1Ch 11.11, 20. However, Driver (1913:364) says that this is derived from the LXX translation of Chronicles. Allen (1974a:125) with reference to LXX 1Ch 11.11 says, “The *kaige* text of II Rg. 23.8 copies Par here: contrast Rg. v 18”.

On two occasions (1Sm 18.10, 11) LXX has no equivalent of the verse in MT, though Codex Alexandrinus and other witnesses do render these verses and use δόρυ for both occurrences of חנית. In Jb 39.23 the LXX is characteristically brief and there may be no equivalent of חנית (though Hatch & Redpath 900, with little precision, give μάχαιρα as the equivalent of חנית). The occurrence of חנית in Sir 38.25 is also translated by δόρυ.

A.2 The minor Greek versions broadly support the meaning “spear” for חנית. Reider and Turner (1966:278) give both δόρυ and λόγχη as Aq’s equivalent of חנית. Aq renders by δόρυ in 1Sm 17.7 (second occurrence) and Ps 57.5, and according to Mercati (1958:79) also in Ps 46.10. The reading of καὶ γύμνωσον λόγχην is attributed to Aq along with Sym, Thd and Quinta in Ps 35.3, and the fact that the

attribution is joint raises some question about its reliability, particularly as this equivalence is not attested elsewhere for Aq.

Sym uses the pl of δόρυ in 2Kg 11.10 and Ps 57.5. In Jb 41.18 it uses λόγχη, and the pl of that word in Ps 46.10 (Mercati 1958:79). The joint reading of καὶ γύμνωσον λόγχην mentioned above for Ps 35.3, attributed to Aq, Sym, Thd and Quinta seems more certain for Sym due to the fact that the SyHex reads s wgly lwkyt³. In 1Sm 17.7 Sym translates תַּבָּחַלְתָּ תַּנִּיחַ by αἰχμή ‘spear’ or ‘point of a spear’.

Thd is less consistent than the other versions in rendering תַּנִּיחַ. In Ps 57.5 is has the odd equivalent of τόξον ‘bow’, and in Ps 46.10 (Mercati 1958:79) the general translation of ὄπλον ‘weapon’. In 1Sm 17.7, along with Aq, it translates תַּנִּיחַ תַּבָּחַלְתָּ by φλόξ δόρατος, while in Jb 39.23 and in the joint attribution at Ps 35.3 mentioned above it has λόγχη.

Quinta and Sexta are quoted as reading ὁμοίως τοῖς O, i.e. ὄπλον in Ps 57.5, while Quinta is quoted along with other authorities as reading καὶ γύμνωσον λόγχην in Ps 35.3.

Josephus *Antiquities* IX 7.2(148) based probably on 2Kg 11.10 מִטְּלָחֵי הַתַּנִּיחִים תַּנִּיחֵיהֶם says that Jodas (= Jehoiada) gave the captains of hundreds δόρατά τε καὶ φαρέτρας. Presumably δόρατα corresponds to תַּנִּיחַ.

A.3 In 19 places Pesh translates תַּנִּיחַ using the word mwrnyt³ (1Sm 21.9 is included in this count because it contains a reversal by Pesh in the order of paired items, as attested elsewhere in Pesh). In 14 places Pesh uses the word rwmh³, and in 11 it uses nyzk³. All three of these words are translated by Brockelmann by “hasta” (405, 427, 734), and seem to have the general meaning of “spear” or “lance”. In Mc 4.3 while most manuscripts have rwmhyhwn 7a1 and 9l6 have nyzkyhwn, which may be the original reading, rwmhyhwn being an assimilation to the parallel passage in Is 2.4.

In one place (2Sm 2.23) the second occurrence of תַּנִּיחַ is not translated in order to avoid repetition. 2Sm 23.7 probably represents תַּנִּיחַ by nārgā “*securis, ascia*” (R. Payne-Smith 1879-1901:2468).

In Ps 35.3 Pesh has šmwṭ spsyṛ’ “draw a sword” for MT’s וְהִרְקֵה חֲנִית. This parallels LXX’s ἔκχεον ῥομφαίαν. Ellenbogen (1962:73) says that Pesh’s use of spsyṛ’ was “probably on the basis of LXX’s ῥομφαία”. It is interesting in this connection that in 2Sm 23.18, 1Ch 11.11, 20 Pesh reads hw šmṭ rwmḥ’, using the same verb as in Ps 35.3. šmṭ is understood as “extraxit”, “eduxit”, “distrinxit” (Brockelmann:785). This shows the same understanding of Hebrew עוֹרֵר as was found in LXX Chronicles.

In 1Ch 12.35 Pesh has the plural of rwmḥ’ for MT’s singular. The use of rwmḥ’ to translate חֲנִית suggests that Pesh perceived a semantic overlap between חֲנִית and רֶמַח, which it regularly translates by rwmḥ’. Pesh Sir 38.25 omits any equivalent of חֲנִית.

A.4 TgPro uses מורניתא 31 times (cf Pesh mwrnyt’). In 2Sm 23.7 it paraphrases but uses both מורניתא and רומחא ‘spear’ in the pl. In 1Sm 13.19 it has רמחין, and in Hb 3.11 it paraphrases and has no direct individual equivalent of חֲנִית. Tg Job (Díez Merino 1984), Tg Ps (Díez Merino 1982), and Tg Chronicles use מורניתא for חֲנִית in all occurrences.

A.5 11QTgJob at Jb 39.23 reads: עלוהי יתלה שלט שגן ונוך וחרף סף. The word נוך (a word of Iranian origin; compare nyzk’, which occurs in Pesh) is translated by the original editors (van der Ploeg and van der Woude 1971) as “le javelot”. Sokoloff (1974:156) follows Greenfield and Shaked (1972:41) in seeing שגן ונוך as an error for ושגן נוך “and the blade of a lance” for which he compares Tg 1Sm 17.7. Borger (1977:104) also follows the emendation.

A.6 On 31 occasions חֲנִית is rendered by Vg using the word *hasta* ‘spear’. On 12 occasions it is rendered by Lat *lancea*, which has a similar meaning. That these can be mere stylistic variants of each other is shown in 1Ch 11.23 where the three occurrences of חֲנִית are rendered by *lancea*, *hasta* and *hasta* respectively. In 1Sm 18.11 the pronoun *eam* is used to translate חֲנִית. This refers back to *lanceam* in the previous verse (also translating חֲנִית), and is used to avoid repetition. Similarly, to avoid repetition when חֲנִית is mentioned twice in one verse it is not translated in its

second occurrence in 2Sm 2.23. In 2Sm 23.7 עץ הַנִּיט is translated by *ligno lanceato*, “lance-formed wood”. In Ps 35(34).3 Vg uses *gladium* ‘sword’, showing the same understanding as LXX and Pesh.

Vg iuxta LXX uses *arma* in Ps 45.10, 56.5 and *framea* in Ps 34.3. In the classical period *framea* meant “spear, javelin”, but it is used in Vg Zc 13.7 as an equivalent of הַרְב. It is also used as the equivalent of ῥομφαία in several places in the Psalterium iuxta LXX: 9.7, 17(16).13, 22(21).21 and 35(34).3. It should therefore be understood to mean “sword” (see also Fiebiger 1910:81-82. Vg of Sir 38.25 uses *iaculum* ‘dart, javelin’. In 2Kg 11.10 the Vg in common with other versions translated MT's sing by a pl.

The use in Vg of *hasta* and *lancea* shows that the Vg made little distinction between הַנִּיט and רֶמַח. רֶמַח in its 15 occurrences in the OT is translated by *hasta* seven times, and by *lancea* five times.

B.1 Commenting on the use of μάχαιρα by the LXX in 2Sm 23.9 Schleusner (1822, Vol. 2:416) says, “Sc. vox Hebr. olim latius patuit, ac *omnis generis arma, omne quod est acutum* significavit: i.q. etiam derivatio a rad. הִנָּה docet.”

5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s)

A.1 הַנִּיט is often found in close relationships with other weapons, or pieces of armour. This may be as part of a list, in parallelism, or in some other relationship.

הַנִּיט occurs most frequently in close proximity to הַרְב “sword” (ten biblical verses). In 1Sm 13.22, 17.45, 47 the two words are co-ordinated by Waw, while in 1Sm 13.19, 21.9 או occurs between them. In Nah 3.3 we have the co-ordinated phrase הַנִּיט וְהַרְב, where the words הַרְב and הַנִּיט are both nomina recta after words with a similar semantic value. In Is 2.4, Mc 4.3 הַרְב (pl) is the A parallel to הַנִּיט (pl) B parallel. A similar form of co-ordinated (but imperfect) parallelism occurs between the terms in Ps 57.5. Jb 41.18 has a looser connection of syntactic apposition. In eight of the ten pairings of הַרְב and הַנִּיט, הַרְב precedes הַנִּיט. 1QH 5.10 has הַרְב as the A parallel to הַנִּיט in a phrase highly reminiscent of Ps 57.5. 1QM 11.2 reads בַּחֶרֶב וְחַנִּית in a direct allusion to 1Sm 17.45, 47. 2QapProph has the same phrase.

Other connections occur between חַנִּית and less frequently occurring words. For instance, חַנִּית twice precedes כִּידוֹן and is co-ordinated with it by Waw. כִּידוֹן also serves a similar function to חַנִּית when in 1QM 6.4-5 we read that the first battalion had חַנִּית וּמִגֵּן, while the second had מִגֵּן וְכִידוֹן. In 2Kg 11.10, and in its parallel 2Ch 23.9 the captains of hundreds are given הַשְּׁלֵטִים, along with הַחַנִּיתִים (sing in 2Kg 11.10). In 2Ch 23.9 הַמְּגִנּוֹת are also given. Similarly in 1QM 6.5 (mentioned above) we have וּמִגֵּן חַנִּית, of which חַנִּית is the offensive weapon, and מִגֵּן the defensive piece of armour. In 1Ch 12.35 soldiers are armed בְּצַנָּה וְחַנִּית. In Ps 57.5 חַנִּית and חֲצִים are co-ordinated by Waw, and in Hb 3.11 חֲצִי occurs as the A parallel to חַנִּית. In Ps 35.3 חַנִּית is joined by Waw to סָגֵר, which Dahood (1965:210) understands on the basis of 1QM 5.7 to mean basically “socket of a javelin”, but in this instance by metonymy to denote “pike” or “javelin”.

In Jb 41.18 חַנִּית occurs immediately preceding מַסָּע. This may be in a construct-genitive relationship, in apposition, or merely as members of a list in asyndeton. See the entry on מַסָּע II for details.

A.2 In 1Sm 17.7 and 2Sm 23.7 בְּרִזְלֵי ‘iron’ occurs in the context of חַנִּית. This seems to refer to the blade in both cases. In 2Sm 23.18, 1Ch 11.11, 20, Nah 3.3 (and therefore 4QpNah 3+ 2.4) חַנִּית occurs in close connection with the word חָלַל ‘slain’. In Is 2.4, Mc 4.3 a time of peace is envisaged in which people will convert their חַנִּית into a מְזַמְרָה “pruning-knife” (BDB:275). In Jl 4.10 the proverb is inverted and it is said that for a time of war people will convert the מְזַמְרָה into a רֶמַח. This demonstrates some interchangeability between חַנִּית and רֶמַח, and suggests semantic overlap. In Sir 38.25 (Ms B) there is parallelism between חַנִּית and מְלִמַּד “ox-goad” (BDB:541), “Treibstecken” (HAL:562). מְלִמַּד הַבָּקָר is used as an *ad hoc* weapon by Shamgar in Jdg 3.31. In Ps 57.5 teeth (שִׁנָּיִם) are likened to חַנִּית, while in 1QH 5.10 the same image involving חַנִּית is used but with teeth referred to by מתלעותם (parallel to שִׁנָּיהֶם).

A.3 In 1Sm 13.22, 18.10, 19.9, 22.6, 2Sm 23.21, 1Ch 11.23 חֲנִית occurs with the word יָד preceded by בַּ. In 1Sm 18.10, 19.9, 22.6 the hand is Saul's. In two verses (2Sm 23.21, 1Ch 11.23) there also occurs the phrase מִיָּד.

A.4 חֲנִית occurs more loosely with נִשְׁעַן 'lean, support oneself' (BDB:1043) 2Sm 1.6, and הוֹשִׁיעַ 'deliver' 1Sm 17.47. In Sir 38.25 (Ms B) there is a textual problem (see Exegesis) but חֲנִית occurs in close connection with מִתְפַּאֵר and with a disputed word, probably מִרְעִיד.

B.1 [nil]

6. Exegesis

A.1 Baillet et al. (DJD 3:83) comment generally, "L'épée et la lance, armes typiques, sont souvent associées", referencing 1Sm 13.19, 22, 17.45, 21.9, Nah 3.3., Judith 6.6. (Lat and Syr). They say that they are characteristic of human means of defense as opposed to divine ones, and compare 1Sm 17.47 and 1QM 11.2.

A.2 The significance of the term מְנוֹר אֲרָגִים that occurs with חֲנִית used to be understood thus with Dalman (1937:112): "Um einen ungewöhnlich dicken Speer anschaulich zu machen, wird er 1. S. 17, 7, 2. S. 21, 19, 1. Chr. 11, 23; 20, 5 mit einem menōr oregīm, also einem Webergerät verglichen." Yadin (1955:68) argues that the relevant texts should be translated "and the staff of his javelin (was) like the weavers' heddle-rod". Of חֲנִית he says (1955:58), "This word should (in my opinion) be rendered as *javelin*, i.e. a missile weapon (cf. 1 Sam. xviii, 11) in contrast to the רֶמַח which is the spear, used mainly for thrusting." The feature of the חֲנִית that particularly reminded the Israelites of a מְנוֹר אֲרָגִים was the loop attached to the wood of the javelin by which the javelin was thrown with greater precision and force. Yadin's view is cited positively in De Vaux (1960:51), Ahituv (1968:973), McCarter (1980:292-93) and Klein (1983:176). Galling (1966:161) agrees with Yadin that in the description of Goliath the author is thinking of the "Weberstock", "aber darin unterscheidet sich meine Anschauung von der Yadins, dass *er* an die am Weberstock befindlichen fertigen Schlaufen denkt (die er auf *eine* in der Mitte des Schaftes reduziert), während ich der Ansicht bin, dass der Erzähler an den langen Faden des

Weberstockes denkt, der am Ende des Weberstockes befestigt wurde, bevor man die Schlaufenreihe herstellte.”

From the occurrence together of עץ and חנית in 1Sm 17.7, 2Sm 21.19, 23.7 and 1Ch 20.5 (Galling [1966:161], along with most other authorities, reads the Qere עץ in 1Sm 17.7 for Ketiv חץ) it appears that the shaft of a חנית was made of wood. However, in Is 2.4, (cf. Mc 4.3) it is said that people will beat חניתותיהם into מִזְמְרוֹת. The form of this pl, as in Mc 4.3, is unlike that in 2Ch 23.9 (חניתים), and Tregelles ([1857]:292) suggested that the fpl form denoted “spear heads”, while the mpl form was the pl of the word “in its common sense”. The distinction works for the passages concerned, but the sample is too small to establish any rule firmly. At any rate, if the derivation of חנית is from outside Hebrew, fluctuation in the form of the pl is not surprising.

A.3 Dalman observed (1939:332) that before the book of Jubilees there are no attestations in Palestine of the use of the spear in hunting. In the O.T. it is a weapon used against humans. Even in Jb 39.23 where the horse is depicted as being unafraid of the spear this is in the context of war between humans. In Jb 41.18 the חנית is said to be a useless weapon against Leviathan, the point being that no-one in their right mind would try to use a חנית against Leviathan.

A.4 In 2Sm 2.23 אֶחָרֵי occurs before חנית. For a discussion of proposed emendations of this see Introduction. Although unparalleled within BH, there is no intrinsic problem with the word אֶחָרֵי, which is normally a preposition, functioning as a noun, since the preposition may have originally developed from a noun. If this is allowed, then in this case Abner struck Asahel with the back part of the spear. Asahel was taken by surprise because Abner had not turned. Nunnally (1997:198) suggests that this text implies that the spear had a metal butt (as also in 1Sm 26.7).

A.5 Anderson (1989:266) translates 2Sm 23.7 “nor will any man touch them, except (with) an iron-tipped spear shaft.” He further says (1989:267) that the translation is literally “iron and the shaft of a spear”. This understands the iron in the passage to be the tip of the spear, thus the spear was made of two materials, the wooden shaft and the iron tip or blade.

A.6 For Sir 38.25b Ms B is quoted in Beentjes (1997:67) as: בחנית מרעיד ומתפאר. However, Vattioni (1968:203) gives Ms B as: ומתפאר בחנית מהעיר. This latter reading seems incorrect, and Lowe (1998) takes all the letters of מרעיד as certain in Ms B, though with Smend he believes that the Ms itself may be corrupt. Smend (1906:347) says, “[מרעיד] ist wohl falsch, da חנית femin. ist, und der zitternde Spiess eine sonderbare Bezeichnung des Ochsenstachels wäre. Nach Gr. ὄψ δ ῥατι κντροῦ ist wohl מרדע (neuhebr.) zu lesen.” Di Lella (Skehan & Di Lella 1987:447) says, “MS B has baḥānīt mēhā^ῥīr, ‘in wielding the lance,’” and compares 2Sm 23.8, 1Ch 11.11, 20. The vocalisation mēhā^ῥīr that he gives, however, means “from the city”, and with this meaning the syntax of any word including the element “from” would be extremely difficult to explain. Perhaps Di Lella is making some connection between the form מהעיר and BH עורר, as both being from the root עור. Ges.-18 reads בחנית מרעיד (372). HAL (320) sees חנית in Sir 38.25 as meaning “Ochsenstachel” and as being parallel with מלמד.

A.7 In 1QM 6.2 on the blade (לוהב) of a dart (זרק) is the inscription לגבורת אל ברקת חנית “flash of a lance to the might of God” (Yadin 1962:131). With reference therefore to חנית in 1QM Yadin says (1962:135), “The author does not describe the lance, but its mention in the inscription of the dart and the description of the spear (see below) prove that the lance, according to the scroll and also to the O.T., is a missile. The lance was apparently longer than the dart and in consequence its range was shorter. This may be assumed since a battalion ‘armed with lance and shield’ (vi, 5) is mentioned between the darts battalions and the battalion armed with the sword. The skirmishing units fight in the following order: the long range weapons first (slings, darts) and the short range (sword) last.” However, Yadin’s use of the word “prove” seems an overstatement. Since it is the blade (לוהב) of the dart that is compared with the flash (ברקת), i.e. flashing blade, of a חנית, it is possible that the comparison is only between the blades, or that in this case חנית only denotes the blade rather than the whole weapon, including shaft. The order of battalions according to the distance at which their weapon is used would still be preserved if חנית is understood to denote a weapon that is generally not thrown. In addition from the

context in 1QM 6.1-3 it should be pointed out that on the third זרק is written חרב שלהובת “blade of a sword” (1QM 6.3). It seems therefore that the inscriptions cannot be used to make inferences about the nature of weapons. It does, however, seem that in 1QM the חנית and רמח are distinguished, and are used by different battalions. Nunnally (1997:199) says, “At Qumran spear (ḥanīt) is sometimes used synonymously with javelin (1QM 6:2; 1QH 2:26) and sometimes appears antithetically to javelin (1QM 6:5).” It is unclear what is meant by this final reference. Ahituv (1968:970) classifies חנית as a weapon used at a distance.

A.8 Driver (1965:183) says that in 1QM חנית corresponds to the Roman *hasta*, whereas רמח corresponds to the *pilum* “a missile weapon nearly 7 feet long”. By contrast Yadin (1962:138-39) claims that it is the רמח in 1QM that has affinities with the Roman *hasta* (not the *pilum*), though it is slightly longer than the *hasta*.

B.1 [nil]

7. Art and Archaeology

A.1 For representations of lance-heads see BRL² (201) and see Yadin (1963:230, 238, 294) for pictures of Egyptian and Assyrian spears.

B.1 [nil]

8. Conclusion

A.1 The overwhelming evidence from usage and the versions indicates that חנית can be satisfactorily glossed as “spear”. The fact that different parts of a חנית are mentioned, such as the לֶהַב ‘point’ or the עֵץ ‘shaft’, indicates that חנית may denote the weapon as a whole. However, it is possible in texts such as Is 2.4 and Mc 4.3 that חנית specifically refers to the head of the spear, rather than to the whole. However, although it is clear that חנית can mean spear, the extent to which it must do so is open to question. Yadin has translated חנית as “javelin” (1955:58), or “lance” (1962:135) rather than “spear” since, according to him, it denotes a missile weapon, rather than a thrusting weapon. If Yadin, as seems likely, is correct concerning the meaning of

מִנּוֹר אֲרָגִים, then הַנֵּיִת certainly can denote a “javelin”. However, Yadin has exaggerated the extent to which הַנֵּיִת denotes a missile; De Vaux is more moderate (1960:51). In 2Sm 23.21 and 1Ch 11.23 the הַנֵּיִת was clearly supposed to be retained during combat. Saul’s use of a הַנֵּיִת as a missile can be better explained as the *ad hoc* use of a spear for throwing (Galling 1966:161), than as testimony that he always carried a javelin with him. Part of Yadin’s argument for regarding הַנֵּיִת as a missile is that in 1QM רֶמַח is clearly (from its dimensions) a large spear. However, one may question the extent to which הַנֵּיִת and רֶמַח are in opposition in 1QM. The fact that a רֶמַח is never thrown may indicate that רֶמַח had a more restricted designation than הַנֵּיִת, rather than that they are usually in semantic opposition. Of particular relevance here is the saying “they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning knives” (Is 2.4, Mc 4.3). In this sentence “spears” is represented by the pl of the word הַנֵּיִת. However, in the reversal of this saying in Jl 3.10 we read, “Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning knives into spears”, where “spears” is represented by the pl of the word רֶמַח. This attests an interchangeability between the terms הַנֵּיִת and רֶמַח. Versional renderings also suggest semantic overlap between these two terms (see Versions of both entries). The LXX generally renders הַנֵּיִת by δόρυ, as it does רֶמַח, though the LXX uses terms like λόγχη and σιρομάστης more frequently for רֶמַח than it does for הַנֵּיִת. Pesh uses mwrnyt³, rwmh³ and nyzk³ all fairly frequently for הַנֵּיִת. Pesh generally uses the cognate rwmh³ to translate רֶמַח. Given that it also renders הַנֵּיִת by rwmh³, Pesh cannot be used to show major semantic opposition between הַנֵּיִת and רֶמַח. The prevalent use of מורניתא in Tg to represent הַנֵּיִת, is not dissimilar to the way it renders רֶמַח, although רֶמַח is more often rendered by רומח than הַנֵּיִת is. Both הַנֵּיִת and רֶמַח are rendered in Vg by *hasta* and *lancea*. In each version some difference of distribution may be observed, and may indicate semantic distinctions. However, the overwhelming indication from the versions is that of considerable semantic overlap between the terms.

A.2 Eight of the fifteen BH occurrences of רִמָּה are pl, whereas only three of the 47 BH occurrences of חֲנִית are pl. It is possible that one lexeme was used more frequently to represent the pl, while the other was used more frequently to represent the sing, though neither of the lexemes was used in sing or pl exclusively.

A.3 In Ps 35.3 there is a peculiar use of the verb הִרִק with חֲנִית. If this verb means to “draw”, it is difficult to see how a “spear” can be denoted. However, LXX translates חֲנִית by ῥομφαία, Pesh by spsyr³, and Vg by *gladium*, all meaning “sword”. If חֲנִית could mean something like “straight blade” then it might be used to denote a plurality of weapons, primarily the spear, but also perhaps in the case of Ps 35.3 the dart, or javelin, which might be drawn from a holder. This might explain the way Paralipomena translates חֲנִית by “sword” on several occasions, or uses more general renderings such as ὄπλον in other cases. However, the versions are inconsistent in rendering a number of weapons, and it is simpler in these cases to suppose that the versions are wrong, and to seek an explanation for the equivalent they use in its own context.

B.1 [nil]

Bibliography

- Ahituv, S. 1968. Article כלי הנשק במקרא in *Encyclopaedia Biblica: Thesaurus Rerum Biblicarum Alphabetico Ordine Digestus* 5:970-76.
- Allen, L.C. 1974. *The Greek Chronicles. Part I: The Translator's Craft. Part II: Textual Criticism*. VTS 25, 27. Leiden.
- Anderson, A.A. 1989. *Commentary on 2 Samuel* (WBC). Dallas, Texas.
- Barth, J. 1902. *Wurzeluntersuchungen zum hebräischen und aramäischen Lexicon*. Leipzig.
- Beentjes, P.C. 1997. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. VTS 68. Leiden / New York / Köln.
- Borger, R. 1977. Hiob 39.23 nach dem Qumran-Targum. *VT* 27: 102-05.

- Calice, F., ed. H. Balcz. 1936. *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichung*. Beihefte zur Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes Hft. 1. Wien.
- Dahood, M. 1965. *Psalms I (AB)*. Garden City, New York.
- Dalman, G. 1937, 1939. *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina: Band 5: Webstoff, Spinnen, Weben, Kleidung. Band 6: Zeltleben, Vieh- und Milchwirtschaft, Jagd, Fischfang*. Gütersloh.
- Davies, G.I. 1998. Personal communication, 4.2.98.
- De Vaux, R. 1960. *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament II: Institutions Militaires, Institutions Religieuses*. Paris.
- Dhorme, P. 1910. *Les Livres de Samuel*. Paris.
- Diez Merino, L. 1982. *Targum de Salmos: Edición Príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil n. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora*. Madrid.
- _____. 1984. *Targum de Job: Edición Príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil n. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora*. Madrid.
- Driver, G.R. 1965. *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution*. Oxford.
- Driver, S.R. ¹1890, ²1913. *Notes on the Hebrew Text (and the Topography) of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford.
- Ehrlich, A.B. 1908-14. *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*. 7 vols. Leipzig.
- Ellenbogen, M. 1962. *Foreign Words in the Old Testament: Their Origin and Etymology*. London.
- Erman, A. & H. Grapow. 1957. *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache: 2. unveränderter Neudruck*. Vol. 3. Berlin.
- Facsimiles of the Fragments Hitherto Recovered of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew*. 1901. London.
- Fiebiger, [O.] 1910. Article *Framea* in Wissowa, G. & W. Kroll. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung: Dreizehnter Halbband: Fornax-Glykon*. Stuttgart:81-82.
- Fredriksson, H. 1945. *Jahwe als Krieger: Studien zum alttestamentlichen Gottesbild*. Lund.
- Galling, K. 1966. Goliath und seine Rüstung. VTS 15:150-69.
- Gardiner, E.N. 1907. Throwing the javelin. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 27:249-73.
- Greenfield, J.C. & S. Shaked. 1972. Three Iranian words in the targum of Job from Qumran. *ZDMG* 122:37-45.

- Hatch, E. & H.A. Redpath. 1897-1900. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. Oxford.
- Hoch, J.E. 1994. *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton.
- Keil, C.F. ²1875. *Die Bücher Samuels*. Leipzig.
- Klein, R.W. 1983. Commentary on *I Samuel* (WBC). Waco, Texas.
- Klostermann, A. 1887. *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*. Kurzgefaßter Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments. Nördlingen.
- Krenkel, M. 1882. Einige Emendationen zu den Büchern Samuels. *ZAW* 2:309-10.
- Leslau, W. 1987. *Comparative Dictionary of Geez*. Wiesbaden.
- Liddell, H.G. & R. Scott. ⁹1940. *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.
- Lowe, A.D. 1998. Personal communication, 19.2.98.
- Lust, J., E. Eynikel & K. Hauspie. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Part II: ΚΩ*. Stuttgart.
- McCarter Jr., P.K. 1980. Commentary on *I Samuel* (AB). Garden City, New York.
- Mercati, J. 1958. *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae: Pars Prima*. Rome.
- Muraoka, T. 1993. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)*. Louvain.
- Nowack, W. 1902. *Richter, Ruth u. Bücher Samuelis* (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament). Göttingen.
- Nunnally, W.E. 1997. Article 2851 הַנְּיָה in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 2, Carlisle:197-200.
- Payne-Smith, R. 1879-1901. *Thesaurus Syriacus*. Oxford.
- Reider, J. & N. Turner. 1966. *An Index to Aquila*. VTS 12. Leiden.
- Schleusner, J.H. 1822. *Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus: sive, Lexicon in LXX. et Reliquos Interpretes Graecos ac Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti*. Glasguae.
- Skehan, P.W. & A.A. Di Lella. 1987. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB). New York.
- Smend, R. 1906. *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*. Berlin.
- Smith, H.P. 1912. *The Books of Samuel* (ICC). Edinburgh.
- Sokoloff, M. 1974. *The Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI*. Jerusalem.

- Thenius, O. 1842. *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt* (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament). Leipzig.
- Tregelles, S.P. [1857]. *Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*. London.
- Vattioni, F. 1968. *Ecclesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca, latina e siriaca*. Napoli.
- Van der Ploeg, J.P.M. & A.S. van der Woude. 1971. *Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumran*. Leiden.
- Wellhausen, J. 1871. *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen.
- Yadin, Y. 1955. Goliath's javelin and the מנור ארגים. *PEQ* 86:58-69.
- _____. 1962. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. Oxford.
- _____. 1963. *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery*. London.