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Introduction

Grammatical Type: n f.

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

There are clusters of occurrences of חֲנִית 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 חֲנִית in 1Sm 26.8 to בָּהֲנִית וּבָהֲנִיתוֹ. 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 בָּאֲחֹרַנִּית in 2Sm 2.23 thus, “lies backwards, 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 חֲנִית בְּאַחֲרֵי 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 אחריה (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 אחריה (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 אחריה 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 הָעֶצְנִי עֲדִינוֹ הוּא we should read עֹרֵרַהוּ אֶתֲחֲנִיתו. Luther is quoted in Keil (1875:383) as supporting the emendation of 2Sm 23.8 to עם עֲדִינוֹ הוּא עֹרֵר. 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 הוּא עֲדִינוֹ הוּא עֹרֵר (Ketiv), which he conjectures originally read הוּא עֲדִינוֹ הוּא עֹרֵר “der ist unsere Zierde, der ist unser Gewaltigster”. Wellhausen did not support the emendation of הוּא עֲדִינוֹ הוּא עֹרֵר to אֶתֲחֲנִיתוֹ עֹרֵר. 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 τήν 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 הוּא עֲדִינוֹ הוּא עֹרֵר (1Ch 11.11) “rather an easy emendation”. He added that this emendation, “is not supported by the LXX....Luc. αὐτὸς διεκόσµει τὴν διασκευήν, which Klo. thinks points to מַעֲצָדוֹ עֹרֵר (cf. 1 Ch. 12, 38), improved by Marquart into מַעֲצָדוֹ עֹרֵר מַעֲצִינוּ brandished his axe (Jer. 10, 3. Is 44, 12†): so Bu. Dh. tłum. עַעֲרַים עָרִצֵנוּי, also brandished his axe (Ass. hašinnu, axe; Eth. צים iron (the common word for it: Dillm. Lex. 623); Targ. מַעֲצָד מַעֲצִינוּי Jer. 10, 3. Is. 44, 12, and in Talm.: Syr. ḥṣinā axe (rare)...Either מַעֲצָד or מַעֲצִינוּ resembles more than חֲנִית הָעֶצְנִי does; and it is possible that one of these corrections is right.”

Thus, Wellhausen and Driver both object to the emendation with חֲנִית 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 with וְאֶתֲהַמָּגִינִים הַחֲנִיתוֹת for MT’s וְאֶתֲהַמָּגִינִים חֲנִיתוֹת.
B.1 BDB (333) incorrectly cites Klostermann as supporting the emendation of הַמֶּלֶחַ הַחֲנִית הַנְּה הִנֵּה to אֶתֲחֲנִיתוֹ עֹרֵר הוּא in 2Sm 23.8. He did not support the replacement of any Hebrew words by אֶתֲחֲנִיתוֹ עֹרֵר הוּא, but merely adds these words (see above).

Qere/Ketiv: 1Sm 26.22 Ketiv is: "behold the spear, O king," whereas the Qere is: "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 חֲנִית is a loan from Egyptianحنjt. 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 חנית 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 hanyak and hnyat.

A.2 Zorell (254) does not connect חֲנִית with Hebrew חָנָה, but he does compare Syr hnä “telum direxit alqo, aggressus est”. However, Brockelmann (243) connects Syr hnä with Hebrew חָנָה, but not with חֲנִית. Barth (1902:21), like Zorell connects חֲנִית with Syr hnä “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 חֲנִית 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 חֲנִית is thus also cognate with חָנָה ‘cell’ (333), and חָנוּת ‘encampment, camp’ (334). Along with חָנָה are classed Syr hnä ‘aim at, incline towards, reach’, the Zenjirli
construct מחנת ‘camp’, Arb ḥanā ‘bend, curve, bend down’, Akk mūnu, mēnu and teṅū ‘couch’, and Akk māniṭu ‘house’. Hoch (1994:229) derives חֲנִית from the Semitic root hny. 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 hinuta, which denotes an instrument containing, or consisting of copper, and thus possibly meaning “spear”. The Semitic words with the root hny 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 קַיִן with חֲנִית. On Ge’ez kwinaṭ, kwWnaṭ Leslau (1987:288) says that the connection with Hebrew חֲנִית is “unlikely”. “As for Heb. hānīt, it is considered an Egyptian (hnyt) 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 חֲנִיתֹתֵיהֶם. 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 §87k.

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 עץ, in which עץ 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 וית, 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 קָנִית is said to be קָנִית, for which see Exegesis.

In 1Sm 17.7 we have the phrase חֲנִית לַהֶבֶת "the point of his spear", while in Jb 39.23 we have חֲנִית לַהַב "the point of the spear". In 1QH 2.26 we have בְּרַקִּית לַהַב "point of a dart" is likened to a חֲנִית (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 בְּרַק קָנִית "flashing of a spear". Nah 3.3 is followed by 4QpNah 3+ 2.4 which has בְּרַק חֲנִית רַבָּק. In Nah 3.3 בְּרַק is in a loosely parallel construction to לַהַב. 1QM 6.2 has בְּרַק חֲנִית. These all seem to refer to the flashing part of a spear. This interpretation is supported explicitly by the combination חֲנִיתֶ רַבקְ לְנֹגַה "at the brightness of the flashing of your spear" in Hb 3.11.

In 2Sm 2.23 אֲחָר 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 ‘עָרֶר ‘brandish’ in 2Sm 23.18, 1Ch 11.11, 20. In 1Sm 18.11, 20.33 the Hiph of טול ‘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 וַיִּטֹּל from the root טָל, 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 לֶבֶת, and means “strike”. In Ps 35.3 חֲנִית is the object of the Hiph of נָכַר, 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, חֲנִית may refer to the action of drawing a חֲנִית out of the ground. In Ps 46.10 חֲנִית is the object of קִצָּה “cut in two” (BDB:893), and in Is 2.4
and Mc 4.3 it is the object of "beat" (BDB:510). The former verb probably particularly denotes an action carried out on the shaft of the חנית, and the latter verb particularly denotes an action carried out on the metal point of the חנית. Thus both parts may individually be denoted by חנית in certain contexts.

There are also more general verbs with which חנית is construed, though these give less semantic information about חנית. It is the object of '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 מחזיק 'holding’ 1QM 6.5. חנית 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 חדה חנית occurs, using the adjective “sharp” of a חנית. The whole item is qualified by this adjective, even though only the blade was sharp. In 1Sm 26.7 חנית is the subject with which the passive participle מְעוּכָה forms a predication. מְעוּכָה probably means “press, squeeze” (BDB:590). The spear was pressed into the ground.

B.1 [nil]

4. Versions

A.1 In the LXX חנית 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 חנית is translated by η λόγχη αὐτοῦ. λόγχη means “spear-head” (Liddell & Scott 1940:1059). In 2Kg 11.10 LXX uses σειροστής = σιροστής “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 חנית in the sing in MT is translated by the pl ὅπλα "arms, weapons, tools”. Similarly, in Ps 46(45).10, 57(56).5 חנית is translated by ὅπλον. In Ps 35(34).3 חנית is translated by ῥομφαλα, perhaps because of the verb ἀνατρέπει 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 “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 ύπερ and “sheath”, and thus ύπερ was understood to mean “he drew from a sheath”. The consequence of this would be that יְהוָה was interpreted as a sword. In 2Ch 23.9 no such reason can be found why יְהוָה is translated by μάχαιρα. These previous four references, three of which come from Chronicles, show some tendency to understand יְהוָה as “sword”. LXX Chronicles renders יְהוָה 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 יְהוָה as “spear” and rendering it as “sword”. LXX 2Sm 23.8 has the possible doublet Ἄδεινὼν ὁ Ασωναῖος, οὗτος ἐσπάσατο τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτοῦ, which might be thought to support a Vorlage with יְהוָה 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 יְהוָה. In Jb 39.23 the LXX is characteristically brief and there may be no equivalent of יְהוָה (though Hatch & Redpath 900, with little precision, give μάχαιρα as the equivalent of יְהוָה). The occurrence of יְהוָה in Sir 38.25 is also translated by δόρυ.

A.2 The minor Greek versions broadly support the meaning “spear” for יְהוָה. Reider and Turner (1966:278) give both δόρυ and λόγχη as Aq’s equivalent of יְהוָה. 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 swgly lwkyt’. In 1Sm 17.7 Sym translates שְלָטִים by αἰχήμα ‘spear’ or ‘point of a spear’.

Thd is less consistent than the other versions in rendering לַהֶבֶת. In Ps 57.5 is has the odd equivalent of τόξον ‘bow’, and in Ps 46.10 (Mercati 1958:79) the general translation of ὀπλον ‘weapon’. In 1Sm 17.7, along with Aq, it translates לַהֶבֶת 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 ὀμοίως τοῖς Ω, i.e. ὀπλον 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 Σάλτων, says that Jodas (= Jehoiada) gave the captains of hundreds δόρατα καὶ φαρέτρας. Presumably δόρατα corresponds to לַהֶבֶת.

A.3 In 19 places Pesh translates לַהֶבֶת using the word mwynyt (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 rwmh, and in 11 it uses nyzk. 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 rwmhwn 7a1 and 9l6 have nyzkyhwn, which may be the original reading, rwmhwn being an assimilation to the parallel passage in Is 2.4.

In one place (2Sm 2.23) the second occurrence of לַהֶבֶת is not translated in order to avoid repetition. 2Sm 23.7 probably represents לַהֶבֶת by närgä “securis, ascia” (R. Payne-Smith 1879-1901:2468).
In Ps 35.3 Pesh has šmwt spsyr’ “draw a sword” for MT’s חֲנִית. This parallels LXX’s ἔκχεον ῥομπαῖαν. Ellenbogen (1962:73) says that Pesh’s use of spsyr’ was “probably on the basis of LXX’s ῥομπαῖαν”. It is interesting in this connection that in 2Sm 23.18, 1Ch 11.11, 20 Pesh reads hw šmt rwmh’, using the same verb as in Ps 35.3. šmt is understood as “extraxit”, “eduxit”, “distrinxit” (Brockelmann:785). This shows the same understanding of Hebrew חֲנִית as was found in LXX Chronicles.

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

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

A.5 11QTgJob at Jb 39.23 reads: עלוה יתהל על שֵׁן וּכְרִיך סִワイン. The word שֵׁן (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 שֵׁן as an error for שֵׁן וּכְרִיך “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 lancea 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 חֲנִית 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 בֶּרֶב. It is also used as the equivalent of ῥόμφας 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 חֲנִית and רֹמַח 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. חָנָה docet.”

**5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s)**

**A.1** חֲנִית 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.

חֲנִית occurs most frequently in close proximity to חֶרֶב “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 א occurs between them. In Nah 3.3 we have the co-ordinated phrase חֲנִית וּבְרַק חֶרֶב לָהַב, where the words חֶרֶב and חֲנִית are both nomina recta after words with a similar semantic value. In Is 2.4, Mc 4.3 חֶרֶב (pl) is the A parallel to חֲנִית (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 חֲנִית and חֶרֶב חֲנִית precedes חֶרֶב. 1QH 5.10 has חֶרֶב as the A parallel to חֲנִית in a phrase highly reminiscent of Ps 57.5. 1QM 11.2 reads בהרב חֲנִית in a direct allusion to 1Sm 17.45, 47. 2QapProph has the same phrase.
Other connections occur between חנית and less frequently occurring words. For instance, חנית twice precedes כידו and is co-ordinated with it by Waw. כידו also serves a similar function to חנית when in 1QM 6.4-5 we read that the first battalion had מגן חנית, while the second had מגן כידו, along with הנוסח והנוסח המגנה (sing in 2Kg 11.10). In 2Ch 23.9 they are also given. Similarly in 1QM 6.5 (mentioned above) we have מגן חנית, of which חנית is the offensive weapon, and מגן the defensive piece of armour. In 1Ch 12.35 soldiers are armed חנית בציון. In Ps 57.5 חנית and חנית are co-ordinated by Waw, and in Hb 3.11 חנית תשרי occurs as the A parallel to חנית. In Ps 35.3 חנית is joined by Waw to חנית, 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 חנית occurs immediately preceding כפש. This may be in a construct-genitive relationship, in apposition, or merely as members of a list in asyndeton. See the entry on כפש II for details.

A.2 In 1Sm 17.7 and 2Sm 23.7 ברזל ‘iron’ occurs in the context of חנית. 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) חנית occurs in close connection with the word חלי ‘slain’. In Is 2.4, Mc 4.3 a time of peace is envisaged in which people will convert their חנית into a מזמורת “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 מזמורת into a רומח. This demonstrates some interchangeability between חנית and רומח, and suggests semantic overlap. In Sir 38.25 (Ms B) there is parallelism between חנית and מלם ממלכתי “ox-goad” (BDB:541), “Treibstecken” (HAL:562). מלם ממלכתי is used as an ad hoc weapon by Shamgar in Jdg 3.31. In Ps 57.5 שן is likened to a חנית, while in 1QH 5.10 the same image involving חנית is used but with teeth referred to by מלחמה (parallel to שניהם).
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 ב. 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 מִיַּד.

A.4 חֲנִית occurs more loosely with נִנְשָׁן ‘lean, support oneself’ (BDB:1043) 2Sm 1.6, and ‘deliver’ 1Sm 17.47. In Sir 38.25 (Ms B) there is a textual problem (see Exegesis) but חנית occurs in close connection with מֶ타פָּר and with a disputed word, probably מַרְעִיש. 

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 אֹרְגִים מְנוֹר that occurs with חֲנִית מֶנֶר אָרֶבֶנַּס 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 menör öregim, 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 רַמָח which is the spear, used mainly for thrusting.” The feature of the חֲנִית that particularly reminded the Israelites of a מֶנֶר אָרֶבֶנַּס 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 חניתות into מזמורות. 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 אַחֲרֵי 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 אַחֲרֵי, 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: מרדע חנית מתריע. However, Vattioni (1968:203) gives Ms B as: מהעיר חנית מתריע. This latter reading seems incorrect, and Lowe (1998) takes all the letters of מרדע as certain in Ms B, though with Smend he believes that the Ms itself may be corrupt. Smend (1906:347) says, “מרידע [ist wohl falsch, da חנית femin. ist, und der zitternde Spiess eine sonderbare Bezeichnung des Ochsenstachels wäre. Nach Gr.ὠν δ᾽ορτῶ κτερίου ist wohl מרדע (neuhebr.) zu lesen.” Di Lella (Skehan & Di Lella 1987:447) says, “MS B has bahâniṭ mēhâʾîr, ‘in wielding the lance,’” and compares 2Sm 23.8, 1Ch 11.11, 20. The vocalisation mēhâʾîr 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 עอรר, as both being from the root ערר, מתריע (neuhebr.) as being parallel with מלמד. Ges.-18 reads מרדע (372). HAL (320) sees חנית in Sir 38.25 as meaning “Ochsenstachel” and as being parallel with מלקד.

A.7 In 1QM 6.2 on the blade (לוהב) of a dart (זרק) is the inscription אלлегבורת חנית ברקת “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 הָרֶץ is written בָּלֵהוּת “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 (hanit) 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 הָלַב ‘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
אֹרְגִים, then חֲנִית certainly can denote a “javelin”. However, Yadin has exaggerated the extent to which חֲנִית denotes a missile; De Vaux is more moderate (1960:51). In 2Sm 23.21 and 1Ch 11.23 the חֲנִית was clearly supposed to be retained during combat. Saul’s use of a חֲנִית 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 חֲנִית as a missile is that in 1QM רֹמַח is clearly (from its dimensions) a large spear. However, one may question the extent to which חֲנִית and רֹמַח are in opposition in 1QM. The fact that a רֹמַח is never thrown may indicate that רֹמַח had a more restricted designation than חֲנִית, 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 חֲנִית. 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 רֹמַח. This attests an interchangeability between the terms חֲנִית and רֹמַח. Versional renderings also suggest semantic overlap between these two terms (see Versions of both entries). The LXX generally renders חֲנִית by δόρυ, as it does רֹמַח, though the LXX uses terms like λόγχη and σιροµάστης more frequently for רֹמַח than it does for חֲנִית. Pesh uses mwrmnt, rwmh and nyzk all fairly frequently for חֲנִית. Pesh generally uses the cognate rwmh to translate רֹמַח. Given that it also renders חֲנִית by rwmh, Pesh cannot be used to show major semantic opposition between חֲנִית and רֹמַח. The prevalent use of מְנוֹר in Tg to represent חֲנִית is not dissimilar to the way it renders רֹמַח, although רֹמַח is more often rendered by מְנוֹר than חֲנִית is. Both חֲנִית and רֹמַח are rendered in Vg by haste 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 רֹמַח 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 הָרֵק 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 spsyr, 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 ὀπλον 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]
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