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Introduction

Grammatical type: n.f.

Occurrences: 3× HB (0/3/0); 0× Sir; 0× Qum; 0× Inscr. (Total: 3)
  Nebiim: 1 Sam 13:20 (2), 21 (1).
  Qumran: — (see B.1 below)

A.1 While the first occurrence of מַחֲרַשֶּׁת in 1 Sam 13:20 (מַחֲרַשֶּׁת, with pataḥ as the third vowel) is a form of *מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, the second occurrence (מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, with šērē as the third vowel) is a form of *מַחֲרֶשֶׁת. The Masoretic vocalization of 1 Sam 13:20-21 suggests that the second occurrence of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת is a form of the same noun as מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 13:21.¹ T supports the Masoretic vocalisation and translates the two forms with šērē by forms of the same noun (עֹשְׁפָּא, while it represents the single form with a pataḥ instead of the šērē with a form of a different noun (פרָשָׁא). However, most of the ancient versions treat the first occurrence of מַחֲרַשֶּׁת in 13:20 and מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 13:21 as forms of the same noun (see section 4). The latter option becomes more attractive as soon as one notices that the series of agricultural implements in 13:20 (מַחֲרַשּׁת, מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, מַחֲרַשׁ, מַחֲרַשׁ, מַחֲרַש׀, מַחֲרַשׁ) partially corresponds to the series in 13:21 (מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, מַחֲרֶשֶׁת)
A.2 Of course, the twofold occurrence of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in a single series of utensils (1 Sam 13:20) has raised questions. Since part of the utensils mentioned in 13:20 reoccur in the same order in 13:21 (כָּרְבֵּן, כָּרָבָן, אֵת), the latter verse was sometimes used as a basis for emending the text of 13:20. Julius Wellhausen assumed that the second מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, the fourth item of the list in 13:20, originally corresponded to הַדָּרְבָּן at the end of 13:21. He pointed to the fact that the ancient Greek and Syriac translations read forms of the same noun (LXX: δρέπανον, ‘sickle’; S: ṣēmē, ‘ox goad’) where MT reads מַחֲרֶשֶׁת (13:20) and מַחֲרֶשֶׁת (13:21).\(^3\) Wellhausen’s proposal to read מַחֲרֶשֶׁת at the end of 13:20 was taken over by many others.\(^4\) Other scholars, however, assumed that the reading τὸ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ, ‘his sickle’, goes back to Hebrew חֶרְמֵשׁ, since δρέπανον represents Hebrew חֶרְמֵשׁ, ‘sickle’, in Deut 16:9; 23:26 (=23:25LXX). These scholars regarded the reading מַחֲרֶשֶׁת as secondary.\(^5\)

Dominique Barthélemy argued that there is insufficient reason to replace מַחֲרֶשֶׁת by a different word on the basis of the readings of LXX and S. The earliest translators seem to have experienced the same problems with the Hebrew text as modern scholars. They translated the second occurrence of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת differently from the first. The translators of LXX and S decided to use a noun that they used also to render הַדָּרְבָּן, the last utensil mentioned in 13:21. Barthélemy maintained that the first and second מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 13:20 derive from two different nouns, מַחֲרֶשֶׁת and מַחֲרֶשֶׁת. The two nouns must have had different meanings, but neither the earliest translators nor modern scholars could retrieve exactly to what kind of sharp utensils the two terms initially referred.\(^6\) DCH shares Barthélemy’s suggestion that the two occurrences of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 13:20 refer to two different agricultural utensils and translates them as ‘plough’ and ‘goad’, respectively.\(^7\)

B.1 The sectarian composition Serekh ha-Yaḥad (Community Rule, ca. 100 BCE?) contains an enigmatic phrase: כָּרְבֵּן סָאֶם מַחֲרֶשׁ.\(^8\) The passage describes the characteristics of those who may not enter the community of the faithful. Although the interpretation of the phrase is disputed, it is clear that מַחֲרֶשׁ is not an alternative form of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת.\(^9\) It has been proposed to regard מַחֲרֶשׁ as a noun meaning ‘ploughing’.\(^10\) If סָאֶם is taken as equivalent to Aramaic סמיא, סומיא, ‘mud’, the whole phrase can be taken as a proverbial saying: ‘For in the mud of wickedness (is) his ploughing’.\(^11\)
1. Root and Comparative Material

A.1 Root: Both מַחֲרֵשָׁה and מַחֲרֶשֶׁת are commonly assumed to derive from הַרְשׁ, ‘to plough’, ‘to engrave’. These nouns have some Semitic cognates denoting an agricultural implement, as will be shown below. The Hebrew verb הַרְשׁ stems from proto-Semitic ḫrt̲ and has cognates in Ugaritic, Akkadian and many other Semitic languages (see below). It must be distinguished from הָרְשׁ, ‘to manufacture’, which stems from proto-Semitic ḫr̲š̲, just like Ugaritic ḫr̲š̲ and Phoenician ḫr̲š̲, ‘craftsman’, ‘artisan’. Contrary to Hebrew הָרְשׁ, ‘to plough’, ‘to engrave’, Hebrew מַחֲרֶשֶׁת refers to the work of the craftsman or artisan.

A.2 Akkadian: The Hebrew verb הָרְשׁ has a cognate in Akkadian erēšu, which means ‘to seed by drilling seed into a furrow by means of a seeder-plow, to cultivate or plant (a field)’. Among the derivatives of this verb are mērešu and mēreštu, which mean ‘cultivation’ or ‘cultivated land/field’. Derivatives relating to a utensil are not attested.

A.3 Ugaritic: The Ugaritic cognate of Hebrew הָרְשׁ is ḫrt̲ ‘to plough’. The Ugaritic noun mḥrt̲ (KTU 1.6:IV.3,14; 6.14:3) is usually interpreted as ‘ploughed field’. However, O. Loretz proposed to regard it as a nomen instrumenti denoting the ploughshare or the plough as a whole.

A.4 Arabic: The Arabic verb ḥarat̲a is a cognate of Hebrew הָרְשׁ and means ‘to plough, to cultivate’. The Arabic noun mḥrāt designates a plough. In Old South Arabian, however, mḥrt̲t refers to ploughed, cultivated land.

A.5 Ethiopic: The Ethiopic (Ge’ez) verb ḥarasa is a cognate of Hebrew הָרְשׁ and means ‘to plough’. The noun māḥras is translated as ‘ploughshare’ or as ‘plough’.

A.6 Postbiblical Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic: In the Mishnah, the Tosefta and the Talmudim, the word מַחֲרֵשָׁה is virtually always spelled with a yod as mater lectionis: מחרישה. The term occurs ca. 70 times and denotes the plough in its entirety.

Not surprisingly, the word occurs in a context relating to ploughing (חרשׁ qal). The implement is regarded as indispensable. The expression יִתְדָּשֶׁל מַחֲרֵשָׁה, literally ‘the pin of the plough’, denotes the sharp metal plough-point. The Tosefta refers to מַחֲרֵשָׁה דִּכְסֶפָּא, literally ‘plough-points’, that were attached to the plough’s חרב, ‘tail-piece, handle’. In the Babylonian Talmud, the expression מַחֲרֵשָׁה דִּכְסֶפָּא does not represent a plough, but a strigil made of שֶׁפֶם, ‘silver’. Such a strigil was used for scraping the skin; cf. the meaning ‘to engrave’ of the verb הָרְשׁ. In modern Hebrew the word מחרישה means ‘plough’. 
2. Formal Characteristics

A.1 מחרשת is a miqtaL form with a feminine termination.33

A.2 מחרשת is a maqtil form with a feminine termination. Many maqtil forms denote a utensil.34

3. Syntagmatics

A.1 In 1 Sam 13:20, מחרשת and מחרשת represent the first and fourth objects of the verb לַטְש, ‘to forge’, ‘to hammer’, ‘to sharpen’. The other objects are (2) מַחֲרֶשֶׁת and (3) מַחֲרֶשֶׁת (all marked by the accusative particle את). 1 Sam 13:21 indicates that the price for מחרשת as well as some other agricultural utensils was a פָּם. Apparently, the price was paid for either producing or repairing them (see below).

4. Ancient Versions

A.1 In the following survey, ‘201’ represents the first occurrence of מחרשת (MT: מחרשת) in 1 Sam 13:20, while ‘202’ represents the second occurrence (MT: מחרשת). ‘21’ represents the word מחרשת in 13:21.

a. Septuagint (LXX) and other Greek versions

θέριστρον, ‘reaping-hook’:35 201 (most manuscripts of LXX).
θεριστήριον, ‘reaping-hook’:36 201 (Antiochene text of LXX37).
θερίζειν, ‘to reap’, ‘to harvest’:38 201 (LXX).
ἀροτρον, ‘plough’:40 201 (Aq, Th41), 21 (Aq42).
ὕνις, ‘ploughshare’:43 201 (Sym44).
δρέπανον, ‘sickle’:45 202 (LXX).
δίκελλα, ‘two-pronged fork’:46 202 (Sym47).

b. Peshitta (s)

מַגָּל (magg’lā), ‘sickle’:48 201, 21.
מַסָּס (massāsā), ‘(ox) goad’:49 202.

c. Targum (t)

גָּשָׁף, ‘goad’, possibly also ‘ploughshare’:50 201.

d. Vulgate (v)

vomer, ‘ploughshare’:52 201, 21.
A.2 As the surveys show, the two occurrences of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/מַחֲרָשָׁה in 1 Sam 13:20 MT have two different counterparts in all the ancient translations. Aquila, s and v treat the first occurrence of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת (20) as a form of the same noun as מַחֲרָשָׁה (21) and translate the second form (20) differently. In LXX, the words representing מַחֲרֶשֶׁת (20) and מַחֲרָשָׁה (21) are derivatives from the same root. On the other hand, the translation of תי suggests that the second occurrence of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת (20) is a form of the same noun as מַחֲרָשָׁה (21). This corresponds with the Masoretic vocalization.

A.3 תי translates each of the implements mentioned in 1 Sam 13:20-21 consistently:

- מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/*מַחֲרָשָׁה is translated by פְּרָשָׁא (1x);
- אֵת is translated by סִכַּתפַּדְנָא (2x);
- קַרְדֹּם is translated by כּוּלְבָה (2x);
- מַחֲרֶשֶׁת is translated by עוּשְׁפָּא (2x);
- דָּרְבָן is translated by זַקְתָּא.

The fact that Hebrew אֵת was rendered as סִכַּתפַּדְנָא, 'plough-point' (→ תי), seems to suggest that מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/*מַחֲרָשָׁה was not interpreted as such. Therefore, it may be best to translate פְּרָשָׁא as 'goad'.

A.4 Most of the ancient translations assume that the first occurrence of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 1 Sam 13:20 represents an implement used for ploughing (Aq, Th, Sym, v, possibly תי). LXX and s, however, interpret the word as an implement used for harvesting. In the case of LXX there is reason to believe that the translators of 1 Samuel misinterpreted the verb חָרָשׁ as relating to harvesting instead of ploughing. The only verse in 1 Samuel in which the verb חָרָשׁ has the meaning ‘to plough’ is 8:12, where we find the phrase: וְלַחֲרֹשׁחֲרִישׁוֹוְלִקְצֹורֶקְצִירוֹ (MT), literally: ‘to plough the ploughing and to harvest the harvest’. Most manuscripts of the LXX render the phrase as καὶ θερίζειν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τρυγᾶν τρυγητὸν αὐτοῦ. Both θερίζειν θερισμὸν and τρυγᾶν τρυγητὸν can be translated as ‘to reap the harvest’, not as ‘to undertake the ploughing’.55

There is insufficient reason to suppose that the Greek translation of 1 Sam 8:12 goes back to a Hebrew text that differs from MT. The translation of the first occurrence of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/מַחֲרָשָׁה in 13:20 by βεριστρον, ‘reaping-hook’, and the rendering of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 13:21 by βεριστίν, ‘to harvest’, seem to be due to the same confusion regarding the meaning of חָרָשׁ and its derivatives. In the Antiochene text of LXX καὶ βεριστίν βερισμὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τρυγᾶν τρυγητὸν αὐτοῦ is preceded by καὶ áροτριάν τὴν αροτριάσιν αὐτοῦ ‘and to undertake the ploughing’.57 Apparently, the additional phrase was inserted to assimilate the LXX to the Hebrew text.58

In 1 Sam 8:12, s remains close to the Masoretic reading מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/מַחֲרָשָׁה לְהַרְשִׁזֵה לְכַפֶּר קִצְיָר (MT). In the case of 1 Sam 13:20-21, however, the reading of s (גִּלֵּד, ‘sickle’) seems to have been influenced by the Greek translation of the first מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/מַחֲרָשָׁה (13:20) by βεριστρον/βεριστήριον, ‘reaping-hook’. 
5. Lexical/Semantic Fields

A.1 The nouns *מַחֲרֵשָׁה* and *מַחֲרֶשֶׁת* are regarded as derivatives of the verb *חרשׁ*, ‘to plough’, ‘to engrave’. In the Hebrew Bible, the verb is used ten times for ploughing in a literal sense and four or five times for ploughing in a figurative sense. After a → יִלֶּךְ, ‘yoke’, was fasted over the necks of two animals and attached to the plough, the animals pulled (משׁך qal; Deut 21:3) the plough.

A.2 The nouns *מַחֲרֵשָׁה* and *מַחֲרֶשֶׁת* occur only in two lists of sharp utensils (1 Sam 13:20-21). The other items in the lists are → אָזֶן, → קַרְדֹּם, possibly שְׁלֹשׁ קִלְּשׁוֹן (→ קִלְּשׁוֹן), and → דָּרְבָן.

6. Exegesis

6.1 Literal Use

A.1 In view of the meaning of *חרשׁ*, ‘to plough’, ‘to engrave’, it is likely that one of the occurrences of *מַחֲרֵשָׁה* in the list of utensils in 1 Sam 13:20 denotes an implement used for ploughing. Most dictionaries interpret either *מַחֲרֶשֶׁת* or *מַחֲרֵשָׁה* as ‘ploughshare’. In the Mishnah, Tosefta and Talmudim, the noun *מַחֲרֵשָׁה* designates the entire plough, while the cognates in Arabic and Ethiopic (and possibly in Ugaritic) also denote a plough (see above).

Most of the ancient translations assume that the first item in the list of 13:20 represents a plough (Aq, Th), or its cutting part (Sym, v, possibly T'). Since the plough is one of the most important agricultural utensils, it is indeed not unlikely that it is represented by the first item in the list. In view of the evidence from the Mishnah, Tosefta and Talmudim, it is attractive to revocalize the first occurrence in 13:20 as מַחֲרֵשָׁתוֹ (with sērē) and to maintain the vocalization of the parallel item מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 13:21 (see above).

A.2 Ploughs were largely made of wood, as is shown by the burning of כְּלִיָּהַבָּקָר, ‘equipment of the oxen’, which had just been used for ploughing a field (1 Kgs 19:19-21), and the use of כְּלִיָּהַבָּקָר, ‘equipment of the oxen’, for its wood (אֶנְשָׁם; 2 Sam 24:22). However, 1 Sam 13:19-22 demonstrates that ploughs also comprised a sharp element made of metal, apparently the so-called ‘plough-point’. The latter passage records that in the time of Saul and Jonathan the Israelites were subject to rigid constraints. The Philistines maintained a monopoly that enabled them to dominate the Israelites and to prevent them from producing their own weapons. According to many scholars, the monopoly concerned the production and/or repair of iron implements. However, the MT does not say explicitly that the implements involved were made of iron. It reveals only that among the Israelites there was no חָרָשׁ, ‘craftsman’ (13:19), who produced (לטשׁ; 13:20) utensils for them. Only
the renderings of חָרָשׁ in LXX (τέκτων σιδήρου) and v (faber ferrarius) specify that the craftsmen concerned were iron smiths.\(^{67}\) Actually, archaeological evidence from consecutive centuries demonstrates that in ancient Israel implements of bronze and implements of iron were used in the same contexts. Bronze plough-points and iron plough-points were also excavated in the same excavation layers (see below). The suggestion of LXX and v that the Philistines maintained an iron monopoly is an attractive option, but the MT may imply that the Philistines forbade all metallurgical activities among the Israelites.\(^{68}\)

The structure of the ancient Israelite ploughs is not described in the Hebrew Bible or other contemporaneous sources. However, a reconstruction is possible on the basis of contemporaneous illustrations from Mesopotamia and Egypt and archaeological finds from Israel/Palestine (see below). Further, some terminological information can be found in the Mishnah, the Tosefta and the Talmudim, especially in m. Kelim 21:2.\(^{69}\) In the latter passage, the word מַחֲרֵשָׁה does not occur, but the following terms are used to denote elements of the plough: עֹל (‘yoke’), קַטְרֵב (‘cross-bar?’), עַיִן (‘collar-piece?’), עֲבוֹת (‘thick ropes?’), חֶרֶב (‘tail-piece’ or ‘handle’), ברד (‘knee-shaped beam’), גֵּל (‘handle’ or ‘cross-piece’), עֶגְלָה (metal ring), לְחָיַיִן (‘guides’), עֲרָיִין (‘plough-flanks’ or ‘mouldboards’). Unfortunately, it remains unclear to which elements of the plough some of the Hebrew terms refer.\(^{70}\) Also, it is dubious whether the ancient Israelite plough consisted of the same elements as the plough type to which this section of the Mishnah refers.

A.3 Philip King and Lawrence Stager give the following description of the way in which ploughing was performed in ancient Israel:

> Plowing prepared the ground for sowing in late October-November, after the first rain (גְּרֶה) had softened the earth. A field was plowed twice, once to loosen the crusty soil before the seed was broadcast, and then at right angles to the first plowing to cover the seed. The metal-tipped scratch plow did not turn over the soil the way a moldboard plow does but simply scratched a shallow furrow by breaking and loosening the soil.\(^{71}\)

Like the ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian ploughs, ancient Israelite ploughs were usually pulled by a pair (אָגוֹן) of oxen (כַּבֵּד: 1 Sam 11:7; 1 Kgs 19:21; Amos 6:12; Job 1:3, 14; 42:12). A female cow could also be use for ploughing, as is shown by the remark that in specific situations a cow that had not yet carried a yoke or pulled a plough was used (פָּרָה, ‘cow’: Num 19:2; 1 Sam 6:7; עגֶל, ‘heifer’: Deut 21:3; cf. Judg 14:18; Hos 10:11). Donkeys could also be used to work the land (cf. Isa 30:24: יָרוֹם, ‘male donkeys’), but it was forbidden to let an ox (שׁוֹר) and a donkey (חֲומָר) pull a plough together (Deut 22:10).\(^{72}\)
A.4 If the second occurrence of מָחרַשׁת in 1 Sam 13:20 is left unemended, only one of the two occurrences may be assumed to designate a plough(-point). A classical translation of the second occurrence is ‘mattock’. Stephen Cook supposed that the first of the near-homonyms derives from יָרַשׁ, ‘to plough, to engrave’, while the second derives from יָרַשׁ, ‘to manufacture’ (see above). According to Cook, the first noun clearly refers to a plough, while the second noun, which can be translated as ‘crafted/forged tool’, can best be interpreted as an equivalent of the parallel term יָרַשׁ, probably ‘goad’ (end of 13:21). However, the interpretation of the final item in the list of 13:20 remains uncertain, as Cook admits. Actually, the interpretation as a ‘goad’ is not attractive, since the presence of a metal point at the end of goads was not essential. The noun can still be seen as a derivative of יָרַשׁ and may refer to a tool that is used for ‘engraving’ the soil, wood, etc. The noun may represent a hoe (cf. *sarculum* in v), or a mattock, or an adze, etc. (cf. עֵנָשְׁפָּא in T,*). Dominique Barthélemy maintained the word, but decided to leave it untranslated.

B.1 Only rarely is none of the occurrences of מָחרַשׁת in 1 Sam 13:20-21 identified with a plough or an element of it.

6.2 Figurative Use
*Nihil.*

6.3 Pictorial Material

A.1 The lack of ancient pictures of ploughs from the Levant (Syria-Palestine) is compensated by images from Mesopotamia and Egypt. The ploughs are commonly depicted as drawn by two oxen. The images show two types of plough:

- Simple ploughs without a seed drill drawn by a pair of animals and guided by a single man, who may hold a stick or goad or whip to drive the animals. In such cases, the seeding was done after the first ploughing. The distinction between the two procedures is illustrated by images displaying a sower who works at some distance from the ploughman and his plough.

- Ploughs provided with a seed drill, drawn by a pair of animals and guided by a single man, who is assisted by another man, who takes care of the seeding process.

The depicted ploughing scenes are Mesopotamian or Egyptian, but there are good reasons to believe that the ploughs of the Israelites were quite similar to the ploughs on the images. In ancient Israel, ploughs were not yet provided with a seed drill and the sowing took place after the first ploughing of the ground. Therefore,
the Israelite ploughs were probably of the same type as the simpler ploughs of the Mesopotamians and Egyptians.

Figure 1: Egyptian plowing scene, burial chamber of Sennedjem, 13th century BCE

The ploughs of the Mesopotamian and Egyptian depictions have the following features in common:

- A wooden beam connects the plough with a yoke that was fastened over the necks of the pulling animals.
- The essential part of the plough is a wooden beam protruding forward in the direction of the animals, at the bottom of the plough. The beam may be curved and is provided with a sharp metal point that makes furrows in the ground.
- The plough includes a wooden handle or a pair of handles, serving to steer the plough. Usually, the steering handle is part of the same beam as the wood to which the plough-point was affixed.
Photographs from the early twentieth century show traditional ploughs with construction styles that hardly differed from the ancient Near Eastern structures.\textsuperscript{87} Recent film recordings show a way of ploughing that gives an impression of the ways in which ploughing was performed in the ancient Near East.\textsuperscript{88}

\textbf{Figure 2:} Plough shop in Beersheba, October 16, 1924
Universiteitsbibliotheek Utrecht, Collectie Vriezen

\section*{6.4 Archaeology}

\textbf{A.1} Of course, the wood of ancient Near Eastern ploughs has usually decomposed completely, but many metal plough-points have survived. The archaeological evidence from Israel/Palestine shows that in the twelfth century BCE bronze plough-points began to be replaced by iron plough-points, although the use of bronze plough-points appears to have continued for several centuries.\textsuperscript{89} Oded Borowski offers an excellent description of the excavated plough-points:

The plow-point was an elongated tool, 20-30 cm long, with a pointed tip for soil penetration. The other end was shaped like a pipe, ca. 8-10 cm wide. A wooden shaft, which was part of the plow-handle, was inserted into this end.\textsuperscript{90}
Nowadays, the designation ‘ploughshare’ is commonly used for the curved blade of the so-called mouldboard plough, which turns over the soil. It is confusing to denote the cutting element of the ancient Israelite scratch ploughs as ‘ploughshare’, since its form and function were quite different from the ploughshares of mouldboard ploughs. Therefore, Borowski’s designation as ‘plough-points’ is preferable.  

7. Conclusion

A.1 It is justified to interpret מַחֲרֵשָׁה/מַחֲרֶשֶׁת as a term denoting the ancient Israelite ‘plough’ or ‘plough-point’. In the Mishnah, Tosefta and Talmudim, the word מַחֲרֵשָׁה denotes the plough as a whole. It is possible that one of the occurrences of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/מַחֲרֵשָׁה in 1 Sam 13:20 also designates the entire plough, but it cannot be excluded that at this earlier stage it represented only the metal plough-point. If in 1 Sam 13:20 the first occurrence of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת represents a plough, the form must probably be revocalized as מַחֲרֶשֶׁת. The vocalization of the parallel term מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 13:21 can be retained and this form can be translated as ‘ploughs’ or ‘plough-points’. The reasons to replace the second occurrence of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 1 Sam 13:20 by a different word are debatable. If we leave the text unemended, it is not possible to identify the item with any certainty. The noun may denote a hoe, a mattock, an adze, or another implement.

Notes

1 ↑ If מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in 13:21 were a plural form of מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, the expected vocalisation in 13:21 would be מַחֲרֶשֶׁת (with qames). Cf. מַעֲרָכוֹת in Lev 24:6, מַאֲכָלוֹת in Prov 30:14, and the similar plural forms of other nouns mentioned in BL, 490 a.  

2 ↑ DCH V (מ-נ), 229-30. See also the discussion in 4.A.2 and 6.1.  

3 ↑ Wellhausen 1871: 84.  

4 ↑ See BHK1, BDB, 361, and the literature mentioned in Barthélemy, CTAT 1: 180.  

5 ↑ See BHK2/3, KBL, 515, Ges18, 661, and the literature mentioned in Barthélemy, CTAT 1: 180-81. In other contexts, ἀρθρισμὸν represents Hebrew מָקוֹם (with qames) and מַעֲרָכוֹת in Prov 30:14, and the similar plural forms of other nouns mentioned in BL, 490 a.  

6 ↑ Barthelemy, CTAT 1: 181. Similarly: Cook (1994), who retained the MT as the lectio difficilior.  

7 ↑ DCH V (מ-נ), 229-30.  

8 ↑ The reading is found in 1Q28/1QS iii:2 (Burrows 1951: Plate III; Charlesworth 1994: 12) and 4Q257/4QpapS iii:3-4 (DJD XXVI, 73, damaged).  

9 ↑ For unknown reasons, the noun מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in the Community Rule is mentioned under the lemma *מַחֲרֶשֶׁת/מַחֲרֶשֶׁת in Ges18, 661.
10 ↑ DJD XXVI, 76.
11 ↑ See Charlesworth 1994: 13 (with different translations in n. 44); DJD XXVI, 76-77. See also the lemma *מַחֲרָשׁ* in DCH V (ב), 229.
12 ↑ BDB, 361; KBL, 515; DCH V (ג-ד), 229; HALOT, 572.
13 ↑ For cognates of מַחֲרֶשׁ in Old Canaanite, Official Aramaic, Palmyrenean and Phoenician, see DNWSI, 407, 408.
14 ↑ Loewenstamm 1959: TDOT V 222-23. For מַחֲרֶשׁ, see Ges18, 402 (תְּחִשׁ תְּנֵשׁ נַגְיָחָה נַכְרִי), and the noun מַחֲרֶשׁ in 1 Kgs 7:14; cf. the noun מַחֲרֶשׁ, ‘craftsman’, ‘artisan’.
15 ↑ For Ugaritic ḫrs, ‘craftsman’, ‘artisan’, see WUS, 108; UT, 399 (#903); DULAT1, 370-71; DULAT3, 366; KWU, 47. For Phoenician ḫrs, ‘craftsman’, ‘artisan’, see DNWSI, 408.
18 ↑ WUS, 108-09; UT, 399 (#905); DULAT1, 371-72; DULAT3, 367; KWU, 47.
19 ↑ WUS, 108; DLU, 268; UG, 267; DULAT1, 537-38; DULAT3, 531.
20 ↑ Loretz 1993. After a discussion of the various translations, the interpretation as ‘plough(share)’ is rejected in Dietrich & Loretz 2005, 228-30 (בְּמֶחֱרַת in KTU 6.14:3 interpreted as ‘from the agricultural field’; cf. TUAT.NF 6: 86). KWU, 71, assumes the meaning ‘Ackerland’ (cultivated land) for the occurrences in KTU 1.6:IV.3,14, but prefers the translation ‘Pflug’ (plough) for the occurrence in KTU 6.14:3.
21 ↑ Lane, 541-542; Wehr, 166.
22 ↑ SD, 71; DOSA, 192.
23 ↑ CDG, 243.
24 ↑ In addition to the occurrences mentioned in the following notes, the word מַחֲרֵישה appears in m. Bava Batra 2:1, 12, 13; t. Shabbat 6:8; t. Bava Qamma 2:6; t. Bava Metzi’a 9:18; t. Bava Batra 1:2, 14; t. Kelim Bava Metzi’a 5:7; t. ‘Ohalot 15:13; b. Ta’anit 25b; b. Bava Qamma 30a; b. Bava Batra 17a, 18a, 19a, 26a, 27b, 82b; y. Pe’ah 2, 17a: 6, 19c; y. Kil’ayim 7, 55d; y. Bava Qamma 3, 3c; y. Bava Metzi’a 9, 12b (together with מַחֲרֶשֶׁה; cf. → קַרְדֹּם in 1 Sam 13:20-21); y. Bava Batra 2, 13ab; 7, 15c. In m. Shevi’it 5:6 and b. ‘Avodah Zarah 15b, reference is made to מַחֲרֵישה וּכָלֶכֶלֶיהָ, ‘the plough and all its implements’.
25 ↑ m. ‘Ohalot 17:1-3.
26 ↑ m. Shevi’it 3:7; t. Shevi’it 3:4; y. Shevi’it 3, 34bd; m. ‘Orlah 1:3; y. ‘Orlah 1, 60c.
27 ↑ According to m. Bava Metzi’a 9:13, a creditor who wants to take a pledge from a debtor may take a כַר, ‘pillow’, by day and must give it back by night (cf. Deut 24:12-13) and may take a מַחֲרֵישה by night and must return it by day. Apparently, the כַר and the מַחֲרֵישה were seen as essential. The rule is quoted in b. Bava Metzi’a 113a, y. Bava Metzi’a 9, 12a, and b. Temurah 6a.
28 ↑ m. Shabbat 17:4 quotes Rabbi Yose as saying that on the Shabbat ‘all utensils may be moved except for the large saw and the plough-point’ (כָּל הָכָלִים נְטָלִים חֵי מָמָשׁ הָגְדֵל יְהֹוָה שֶל מַחֲרֵישה). The saying occurs also in t. Shabbat 14:1; b. Shabbat 123b, 157a; b. ‘Eruvin 35a; y. Shabbat 17, 16a. Further, the expression יִרְדָּה יִרְדָה occurs also in b. ‘Eruvin 86a.
29 ↑ t. Kelim Bava Batra 1:7, which refers also to the עִין, ‘eye’, as an element that could be detached from the plough. In m. Kelim 21:2 the terms הָבָּחַר and עִין are also used for parts of the plough (see above).
According to Bava Metziʿa 113ab, Raba son of Rabbah interpreted the word מחרישה in m.Bava Metziʿa 9:13 (see above) as ‘strigil’, not as ‘plough’.

This form is proposed in BDB, 361; KBL, 515; HALOT, 572; Ges, 661.

This form is proposed in DCH V (ב-ג), 229.

This form is proposed in GELS, 328.

Adrados, DGE, 521; LEH, 62; GELS, 92.

Field 1875: 507.

Field 1875: 507-08.

Adrados, DGE, 1167; LEH, 121; GELS, 178.


Field 1875: 507-08.

Payne Smith, CSD, 285; Sokoloff, SLB, 793. SLB gives as a second translation ‘part of plow’.

Payne Smith, CSD, 250; Sokoloff, SLB, 709.

LSJ, 1849; Montanari, BDAG, 2184.

Field 1875: 507.

Field 1875: 508.

LEH, 204.

Field 1875: 507-08.

Adrados, DGE, 521; LEH, 62; GELS, 92.

Field 1875: 507.

Payne Smith, CSD, 250; Sokoloff, SLB, 793. SLB gives as a second translation ‘part of plow’.

LSJ, 1849; Montanari, BDAG, 2184.

Field 1875: 507.

Field 1875: 507-08.

Adrados, DGE, 1167; LEH, 121; GELS, 178.


Field 1875: 507-08.


Jastrow, DTT, 1059. WTM III, 711 (Hebr. פָּרָשָׁא): ‘der spitze Theil eines Instrumentes, welcher zum Bohren und Pfügen diente, der andere scharfe Theil dieses Instrumentes diente zum Holzspalten.’ According to m.Kelim 13:3, the → קרדום has an עושף ‘paring/chipping edge’ and a בֵּיתבִּקּוּ ‘splitting/chopping edge’.

Lewis & Short, LD, 2014; OLD, 2103.

OLD, 1691. Lewis & Short, LD, 1631, describe sarculum as ‘an implement for loosening the soil, weeding, etc., a light hoe.’

For the distinctive character of the transmitted LXX text of 1 Samuel, see Hugo 2015: 129-32; Hugo 2016: 222-23.

GELS, 328, 689. For the precise meaning of θερίζειν θερισμὸν and τρυγᾶν τρυγητὸν, see also Grillet & Lestienne 1997: 196-97.

Grillet and Lestienne (1997: 197) suggest that the Hebrew source used by the Greek translators read קרדום קורית קקורט instead of קרדום קורית קקורט ברכה בברכה (MT). See also DJD XVII, 59.
However, in addition to the deviating Greek rendering of מחרשה in 1 Sam 13:20-21, reference must be made to a fragment of 4Q51/4QSam showing the letters [ךלךش וחריש] at the expected position (DJD XVII, 58). The Greek translation seems to be due to confusion about the meaning of Hebrew חרש; see Wirth 2017: 5.


58 ↑ McCarter argues that the Antiochene text of LXX reflects the initial Hebrew reading (reconstructed as חלךש וחריש חרש ולחר). This leads to the artificial assumption that the shorter readings of MT and the rest of LXX are ‘haplographic, each in its own way’ (McCarter 1980: 155).

59 ↑ s reads (wmdbrwn dbrh wnhšdwn hšdī). The verb דבֹּר (dbr) is a common translation of Hebrew חריש with the meaning ‘to plough’ (see Deut 22:10; 1 Kgs 19:19, etc.), while שד (hšd) is a standard translation of the verb קצר (see 1 Sam 6:13; 2 Kgs 4:18; 19:29, etc.).

60 ↑ Deut 22:10; 1 Sam 8:12; 1 Kgs 19:19; Isa 28:24; Jer 26:18; Amos 6:12; 9:13; Mic 3:12; Job 1:14; Prov 20:4.

61 ↑ Judg 14:18, Hos 10:11, 13; Ps 129:3; Job 4:8.

62 ↑ For other terms used in connection with ploughing, see Borowski 1987: 48, 51-53.

63 ↑ Gesenius, TPC I, 530; BDB, 361; GB, 416; Zorell, 428; KBL, 515; DCH V (ב), 229; HALOT, 572; Ges15, 661.

64 ↑ Compare the rule in m. Bava Metzi’a 9:13 implying that a creditor may not take a מחרשה as a pledge during the day. See above.


66 ↑ The verb לטש means ‘to forge’, ‘to hammer’, ‘to sharpen’. 1 Sam 13:20-21 was often assumed to relate to the repair of metal implements (e.g., McCarter 1980: 232; Klein 1983: 128), but is likelier that the passage has their production in mind. See Stoebbe 1973: 254-55.

67 ↑ However, see also All bn מחרה ‘each iron implement’ in 1 Sam 13:21 T3.

68 ↑ McNutt 1990: 19, 144, 205, 238. Cf. also Dietrich 2015: 50.

69 ↑ In addition to m. Kelim 21:2, see the evidence discussed in 1.6.7. Kelim Bava Metzi’a 5:7 mentions a строк חֶרֶב, בֹּרֶךְ, יָצוּל, עֲרָיִין ‘hoop of the plough’. The בֹּרֶךְ, ‘knee of the plough’, is also mentioned in m. ‘Ohalot 17:1-3 and b. Ta’anit 25b.

70 ↑ For the disputed translation of the terms, see WTM: Jastrow, DTT; Dalman, ANHT; Krauss 1911: 172-73, 553-56; Danby 1933: 636; Bunte 1972: 372-75. A drawing in Albeck’s edition of the Hebrew text (1959: 93) shows which elements of the plough were assumed to be designated by the terms בֹּרֶךְ, בֹּרֶךְ, בֹּרֶךְ, עֲרָיִין and עֲרָיִין.

71 ↑ King & Stager 2001: 92 (cf. 88).

72 ↑ See also Borowski 1987: 52.

73 ↑ For emendation proposals and Barthélémy’s objections, see above.

74 ↑ Gesenius, TPC I, 530, translated one of the occurrences as verer, ‘ploughshare’, and the other as cultrum, ‘knife’, dens aratri, ‘plough-point’.

75 ↑ KJV, ASV, NJPS. In these translations, not only the final item of the list in 13:20 (MT: מחרשת) is translated as ‘mattick’, but the first item of the list in 13:21 (MT: מחרשה) is also translated as ‘mattocks’, undoubtedly because these forms have the š’rē vowel in common.
Mחרשׁה / מחרשׁת  

76 † Cook 1994. In *DCH*, where the first occurrence of מחרשׁה/מחרשׁת in 13:20 is translated as ‘ploughshare’, the second occurrence is also interpreted as ‘goad’ because of the parallelism with דָּרְבָן (*DCH* V (מ-ו), 229-30).

77 † Cook 1994: 252, 254, n. 11.

78 † See Stoebe 1973: 254.

79 † In NASB not only מחרשׁה/מחרשׁת at the end of 13:20 but also דָּרְבָן at the end of 13:21 is translated as ‘hoe’.

80 † Barthélemy, *CTAT* 1: 181.

81 † Fokkelman (1986: 45) identified the first occurrence of מחרשׁה/מחרשׁת in 1 Sam 13:20 with a scythe, probably due to LXX ἰθρίστρον. Like many others (see above), Fokkelman replaced the second occurrence in the same verse by חֶרְמֵשׁ, ‘sickle’.

82 † Wiggermann (1999: 189-90, 228) remarks that if one ox is depicted this must be due to artistic convention, ‘since one ox cannot pull a plough in a straight line’ (190). Differently: Borowski 1987: 51; Seidl 2003-2005: 514.

83 † Egyptian: Fig. 1 in the present article; *ANEP*, 25 (fig. 84), 27 (fig. 91), 37 (fig. 122); *BRL*², 255 (fig. 66/2); Borowski 1987: 53 (fig. 5), 58 (fig. 8), 60 (fig. 10); Mesopotamian: Wiggermann 1999: 228 (fig. 7a, 7b).

84 † Mesopotamian: Lambert 1979: 22-23, regarding Plate VII fig. 63; Wiggermann 1999: 228 (fig. 7c), 230 (fig. 9); Egyptian: Borowski 1987: 53 (fig. 5); Nicholson & Shaw 2000: 270 (fig. 11.2).

85 † Only Mesopotamian: *ANEP*, 25 (fig. 86, cf. 88); Borowski 1987: 55 (fig. 6; cf. 56 fig. 7); Wiggermann 1999: 228 (fig. 7d); Seidl 2003-2005, 514.

86 † Borowski 1987: 53-56. However, Borowski (47-48, 53-54) shows that also in Israel the relationship between ploughing and sowing was close, since ploughing was done for the sole purpose of sowing (cf. Isa 28:24).

87 † See Figure 2 and Dalman, *AuS* 2, plates 18-39. See also the discussion in Dalman, *AuS* 2, 64-115; Borowski 1987: 48; King & Stager 2001: 92.

88 † Several informative recordings have been uploaded on YouTube (e.g. from Egypt and India).

89 † For the gradual replacing of bronze implements by iron implements in Israel/Palestine during the twelfth to tenth centuries BCE, see McNutt 1990: 209-11.

90 † Borowski 1987, 51, with several drawings of plough-points (50-51, fig 3, 4) and a survey of the sites where they were discovered (49, 51). For a similar description as well as drawings of plough-points, see *BRL*², 255 (fig. 66/1). Excellent drawings of two iron plough-points excavated in Kinneret are offered in Fritz 1990: 366-67 (Plate 116). For a photo of an iron plough-point and other iron implements from Tel Mique-Ekron, see King & Stager 2001: 93.

91 † Cf. also Wright 1943: 35; Dietrich 2015: 28.
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