THE ARABIC TAFSIR TO THE SONG OF DEBORAH

YEHUDA RATZAHBI

I

In the year 1949 I published\(^1\) an Arabic translation to three haphtaroth from a Yemenite manuscript containing both the Hebrew text and the Aramaic Targum of the Former Prophets. The three haphtaroth are Wayyērā (2 Ki. 4:1–37), Ḥayyē Sārāh (1 Ki. 1:1–31) and Bešallah (Jud. 4:23–5:31). Five years later E.Z. Melamed\(^2\) published from a manuscript of haphtaroth in the British Museum (MS. Heb. Or. 11.116) the Arabic translation to the last haphtarāh, i.e. The Song of Deborah. Now the same translation has been published for a third time, by J. Shunary\(^3\) who used three additional sources.\(^4\) Neither of these editors was aware of my publication. Meanwhile, the fifteen years that have passed since my previous article have enabled me to add to my earlier findings. I now wish to make a contribution to the discussion which results from a lexicographical study of the Arabic vocabulary of Saadiah Gaon in his Bible translation.\(^5\)

The importance of the above translation chiefly derives from its attribution to Saadiah, an issue which has been discussed by M and Sh.

M deals at length with the features common to this translation and parts of the Bible known to have been translated by S, whereas Sh. appended to his article a list of differences between the language of the translation of the Song of Deborah and S's other translations. But neither has made an exhaustive study of the material. For the sake of brevity I shall omit matters that have already been mentioned by my predecessors, except where comments are called for.

---

1 *Sinai* 13 (5709–5710) 168–178. Owing to difficulties of communications during the War of Independence (1948–49) I did not receive the proofs of my article, which was printed in Jerusalem, and from this resulted a regrettably large number of misprints.


3 *Textus* 2 (1962) 77–86.

4 A MS of haphtaroth from the Genizah, in the possession of the University of Strasbourg, and two MSS of the Former Prophets in the British Museum (MSS. Heb. Or. 2371, 1474).

5 The following abbreviations will be employed: S = Saadiah Gaon; SD = Song of Deborah; M = E.Z. Melamed, *op. cit.*; Sh. = J. Shunary, *op. cit.*
First an important general observation: the text of S, as given in the Dérenbourg and other printed editions, is far from being critically established. Until we have an authoritative text, based on Genizah fragments and Yemenite manuscripts, it is impossible to draw definitive conclusions with regard to translations of doubtful origin and their attribution to S. This may be illustrated by an example taken from the first sentence of the translation on hand. יִכְנֶסְתּ הָאָלָלֹקָה (Jud. 4:23) is rendered here and in Jud. 5:1 יִכְנֶסְתּ הָבֵיָרָה (at that time), and not יִכְנֶסְתּ הָאָלָלֹקָה (on that day). This is rendition according to the sense, in perfect harmony with S’s translation method. A check of renderings of בֵיָרָה in Isaiah (ed. Dérenbourg) shows that in thirty instances it is translated יִכְנֶסְתּ הָאָלָלֹקָה, in one יִכְנֶסְתּ הָעַלָלֹקָה, and in nine יִכְנֶסְתּ הָאָלָלֹקָה. At times there are different translations in adjoining verses, and there are instances of disagreement between the manuscripts in the translation of the same verse. It would clearly be difficult to establish what S’s own translation was in each of these cases.

We shall therefore compare the translation of SD with the translations of parts of the Bible known to have been made by S, although, in the absence of an authoritative text for the latter, our conclusions will not be definitive. First we shall deal with the similarities. A minute examination shows that the translation of SD exhibits all the outstanding external features characteristic of S’s method in his tafsir:

1. Following the Aramaic Targum. Similarly 5:3: יִכְנֶסְתּ הָבֵיָרָה; 5:4: יִכְנֶסְתּ הָאָלָלֹקָה; 5:12: יִכְנֶסְתּ הָבֵיָרָה; 5:5: יִכְנֶסְתּ הָאָלָלֹקָה (at the time of thine appearance ... and thine revelation) — יִכְנֶסְתּ הָבֵיָרָה.

2. Use of roots similar in sound to the Hebrew roots. 5:6: יִכְנֶסְתּ הָאָלָלֹקָה.

6 In my study of S’s language I have observed that the Yemenite MSS are on the whole more accurate than the other sources. [A critical edition of S’s translation of Isaiah is being prepared by J. Shunary. The Editor.]
8 Is. 7:18.
10 Is. 7:20, 21. Similarly in MS. Yikya Alsheihkh, which was used by Sh., in 19:16, 18.
11 E.g. Ps. 146:4 — יִכְנֶסְתּ הָאָלָלֹקָה. MS B — יִכְנֶסְתּ הָאָלָלֹקָה.
12 In the present state of the text we shall follow the majority readings.
13 The examples in this and the following paragraphs will be confined to points not mentioned by M and Sh.
3. A tendency to additions, expansions and slight changes for the purpose of interpretation. 5:5: רְכַּבֶּהוּת הָעַדִּיטְרְיָה — הַהָעַדִּיטְרְיָה (and even more so Sinai) 15; 5:18: דְוַדֶּקְה — דְוַדֶּקְה דְּבִילֶס לֶחָיָה — דְּבִילֶס לֶחָיָה (there are men of Zebulun who ventured their lives); 5:15: אַבְרָהָם מָא דָּרְכָּהָם — גְּדוֹלָה — גְּדוֹלָה (too numerous for the heart to write); 5:17: אַמְּאָרְאָלֶגָּה בָּבַּרְוַה רָדָּרְיָה — שְׁפָּקֶף (as for the men of Gilead, they abode beyond Jordan); 5:19: לֵאמֶעְת אֶפֶלֶזֶת לְאֶפֶלֶזֶת — בָּאֵה מִלֵּיכָה — מִלֵּיכָה (when the kings came they fought against us); 5:25: לֵאמֶעְת אֶפֶלֶזֶת — מֵפַּי אֲלָפָה — מֵפַּי אֲלָפָה (when he asked her for water); 5:31: לָכְלַא אֵזֵאַר אֶפֶלֶזֶת אֲלָפָה — לָכְלַא אֵזֵאַר אֶפֶלֶזֶת אֲלָפָה (Thus may the remnant of Thy enemies perish, O Lord, and may those that love Thee rejoice like the rising of the sun in his might. And after this the land had rest forty years).

4. Avoidance of repetition. S does not usually translate identically words that are repeated in the text, 16 thus here — 4:24: דֶּשֶׁא אֶת מִקְרָא הָאָמָר בָּנָנָה: (until they defeated him), avoiding the repetition of “Jabin king of Canaan”. 5:16: לְפָּלְגֶנָא לֶחָיָה — לְפָּלְגֶנָא לְפָּלָגִים (for your divisions). Since Reuben has been mentioned in the previous verse, and is here directly addressed, the word “Reuben” 17 is omitted. 5:27: ...וַתַּהֲוַּה כָּמָה נְגֵרְיָתָה מַגָּל בָּאֵל בָּכָא — וַתַּהֲוַּה כָּמָה נְגֵרְיָתָה מַגָּל בָּאֵל בָּכָא (under her foot he staggered, fell down and lay senseless) without repeating “between her feet he staggered and fell” 18.

5. Linking of two sentences. 5:21–22: בֵּית קִשָּׁשׁ נְגֵרְיָתָה — בֵּית קִשָּׁשׁ נְגֵרְיָתָה (and when the brook of Kishon swept them away, ...then the hoofs of their horses struck). 19

6. Use of Persian words. S who lived in Mesopotamia in the last period of his life, employed in his translation a number of Persian terms which were in common use there. In the translation of SD one word of this sort is found:

14 The MSS used by M and Sh. read מָסָּל, but this is certainly an error. The form appears in Alfi’s Kitāb Jāmī’ al-Alfāz, 2, p. 344. line 75.
15 M hesitantly suggests emending מֵבָעָלָה to מֵבָעֲלָה. There are no grounds for this emendation, since the word מֵבָעֲלָה is frequently used in this meaning in the halakhah and in Responsa in the forms מֵבָעֲלָה, מֵבָעֲלָה, מֵבָעֲלָה (“the more so”). See I. Friedländer, Arabisch-Deutsches Lexikon (Frankfurt a.M. 1902) 24.
16 E.g. Ex. 25:33, 35. 17 M does not note the parallel in Job 20:17.
18 In (5:30) the translator felt the translation of the double phrase to be contrary to S’s system, and therefore added “or”, which is not in the text.
19 The translation should therefore be “and when”, not “and behold” as in Sh.’s rendering.
20 "silk fabric".
7. Translation of geographical names. It was S’s practice to render geographical names by the forms in common use in his time. Thus he translates
שבר erszren — מַנּוֹדָה(5:17); סְגַרְגָרָה — מִשְׁרָיָה(5:19); אֲרָוָרַה — מִשְׁרָיָה(5:19); אֶרְגָה (5:17) — מִשְׁרָיָה.

8. Expressions peculiar to S with regard to either meaning or form. 5:10: ייִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע — קָפָם — שִׁירֵים — קָפָם — שִׁירֵים(5:16); רֵדָה — מָרָת(5:17).


a) יִשְׁמַע does not mean as אַל. In the two verses 5:16 and 17, the interrogative לָא המֶה is translated יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע — לָא המֶה (Ye will not abide); יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע — לָא המֶה (shall not remain). M did indeed point out the parallel in Job 13:14, but it is noteworthy that S explicitly mentions this phenomenon in his commentary on Ps. 74:1, where he says: מי יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַע יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִשְׁמַה יִش
c) הָיִיתָם as מָן יִשְׂכָר. Similarly S translated Lev. 8:32: אֶתְמוֹלָתָם אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא - לְהַטְוָא בְּשֳׁרַהְלוֹתָה. 30

= 'and'. 5:15: שָׁמֵרֵם אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא - בִּןְגָּלָת אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא. 31

e) הבו indicating the direct object. 5:14: מִזְמָעַדַּת סֵפֶלָךְ - שָׁמֵרֵם בֵּיתָךְ. The translation presupposes the pointing שָׁמֵרֵם and takes ו as indicating the direct object. Similarly S translates וְאִיּוֹ הָאָרָם אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא (Lev. 4:23) by בִּןְגָּלָת אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא 32.

Thus far the similarities; the differences will be considered in what follows.

A crucial feature in this translation, as was already recognized by M and Sh., is the translation of בָּשֶׂם הָאָדָם (5:8) by אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא, contrary to the practice of S to translate שָׁמֵרֵם (gods) as מִזְמָעַדַּת. And indeed, S is careful to translate thus even when שָׁמֵרֵם is accompanied by an attribute which precludes the meaning "God", as in בָּשֶׂם הָאָדָם – אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא. 33 The translation of יְהוָה לְשׁוֹרֵם אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא (Deut. 32:17) by אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא may serve as an example of S’s care and precision in this respect. M, who has observed this feature, casts no doubt on the significance of the rendering although it is his only piece of evidence against S’s authorship of the translation, as against the plentiful evidence in favour. Sh., on the other hand, is inclined to doubt the significance of this item, relying on the reading of the Dérenbourg edition for Deut. 4:28: יְהוָה לְשׁוֹרֵם (צִינֵב אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא וְעַל אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא). However, as Sh. admits, the Dérenbourg edition stands alone against the readings of the other MSS, including the Yemenite MSS which are known to be accurate and very close to the original text of S, and all of

the בָּשֶׂם as expressing an oath: “And during this war in the gates, upon my soul, not a shield or a spear was seen in Israel.”

30 Cp. further Gen. 9:10: בָּשֶׂם בּוֹשָׁמַא Lev. 14:18: בּוֹשָׁמַא; Ex. 12:19: בּוֹשָׁמַא Lev. 25:52: בּוֹשָׁמַא; Prov. 9:5: בּוֹשָׁמַא; Lam. 3:30: בּוֹשָׁמַא; יְשַׁבְּבָע מַדְּעָרָה יְשַׁבְּבָע... בּוֹשָׁמַא; צִינֵב אֲבָלֶךָּבָּבָּא this feature has already been pointed out by Ibn Janaḥ in Sefer Hariqmah (ed. M. Wilenski, 84, line 9).
31 Ibn Janaḥ, op. cit. 88, line 23, explains this grammatical phenomenon as due to the fact that bet and waw have the same place of articulation.
32 Here we must mention another rendering of בָּשֶׂם in the translation of SD, viz. by בּוֹשָׁמַא which occurs in 5:13: יְשַׁבְּבָע... בּוֹשָׁמַא. Ibn Janaḥ (Sefer Hariqmah 85, line 8) mentions this use of bet and illustrates it from four Biblical texts: Lev. 4:23; 17:11; Is. 9:2; Neh. 2:12. S’s translations of the first three of these (the translation of Nehemiah is not extant) are indecisive, definite prepositions being required by the Arabic verbs in question. There is only one text in which S translates בָּשֶׂם: בּוֹשָׁמַא without change, viz. Is. 9:2: יְשַׁבְּבָע. The evidence of S’s translation is therefore inconclusive.
34 E.g. Deut. 13:8.
which read here משבתרי (gods) and that any other rendering is due to scribal error. This supposition is supported by the following evidence: One passage in the Pent. is rendered in all available printed editions, including Dérenbourg and the Yemenite Tag, in a manner contrary to S’s practice. This is Deut. 7:4: אלואים אפライ (Tag, printed ed.: PREFATORY). At first sight this rendering seems to corroborate Sh.’s view, but examination of the Yemenite Tag in a MS in my possession revealed the reading משבתרי (which is the reading of all the MSS of the translation of SD remains a valid argument against S’s authorship, unless one supposes it to be due to a scribal error.

Apart from this there are other instances, already detailed in Sh.’s article, of a lack of correspondence between this and S’s other translations. Two further cases are: 1) 4:24: הימים (they vanquished him), S normally translates ביה by the Arabic root ביה (destroy). 2) 5:16: אלאמרתי (which Alfasi interpreted as יאמרתי (the battle-lines)).

The following important point has so far gone unnoticed: the expression יסמע מי הדנהו ותחמה דקוח (5:26) is translated by (and pierced his jaw), taking רקוח as “his jaw”. None of the ancient commentators thus interpreted רקוח (T translates “temple”). But Josephus Flavius in his Ant. Jud. gives the following description of the killing of Sisera: “Then... Iale took an iron nail and drove it with a hammer through his mouth and jaw.” Here we have evidence for רקוח = jaw, going back to the period of the Second Temple. The translation of Cant. attributed to S, similarly renders Cant.4:3 כמשל הרומח רקוח by דנקך which is also David Alfasi’s gloss in his Agron. It is in this meaning that the word is used by the poets of the Spanish period.

What conclusions can be drawn from the foregoing discussion with regard to S’s authorship of the translation? M is convinced, in view of the common features pointed out by him, that S “translated the Book of Judges also, or at least the Song of Deborah”. The evidence to the contrary contained in the translation of אלאמרתי instead of by el является אלאמרתי by יאמרתי he disregards as standing alone against all other witnesses. However, he cau-

35 E.g. Num. 4:18; Deut. 12:29; 19:1; Is. 9:13; Ps. 101:8.
36 Kitab Jami' Al-Alfaz s.v. שומת, n. 96.
37 Ant. Jud. 5, 208 (Thackeray’s translation).
stitouly leaves open the question whether the translation of SD is the work of S himself or of one of his disciples. Sh. envisages two possibilities: either one of S’s students translated this chapter in the manner of his master, or S himself made the translation before the main period of his literary activity, and before his usage became fixed.

In spite of the many features common to this translation and S’s, one can hardly omit from consideration the general level of the translator’s achievement. S’s translation is notable for its acuteness, for the brilliant interpretations that constantly illuminate the text. Yet although SD gives considerable scope to the commentator, the reader seeks in vain for brilliant explanations such as are characteristic of S’s work. On the contrary, one encounters renderings which in their present form scarcely can be attributed to S. E.g.: 5:2: לֶהֶמּ אַבְנָסְפָּה אֲלָכָשׁוּ (when the revelations were revealed and discovered). The meaning is not clear. This is a mere literal rendering that follows S’s translation of other passages. The translator could have used the root חוֹר, as S does in rendering the similar expression יָרָה עִשְׁרִי (Prov. 29:18) which would have given good sense. This is, in fact, the interpretation of David Alfasi and Yehudah ben Bilaam.

Another example is the vague and obscure translation of the beginning of 5:27: נָאִי רַמָּה רָעִי which runs as follows: “Under her foot he staggered, fell down and fell asleep. This was his fall in his staggering that staggered under her foot. In the place where he staggered there he fell down despoiled.”

It can hardly be supposed, therefore, that the translation of SD is the work of S. Even Sh.’s supposition that S produced this translation before the main period of his work as a translator does not seem a likely one. All S’s work, from every period of his life, bears the stamp of his personality and greatness. The translation of SD has the external marks of S’s craftsmanship, but not its essential qualities. Nor is it likely that the translation indeed was made by S but later suffered at the hands of copyists, since the translation of the Pentateuch, which was in more frequent and wide-spread use than the hапhaitроh,

40 Num. 5:18; Ex. 32:25.
41 Kitāb Jāmī’ al-Alfāz 2, 484.
42 Commentary on the Book of Judges, ed. S.A. Poznanski (Frankfurt 1906) 12.
43 I am inclined to conjecture that the translation originally ran as follows: תַּחַת קִדְמָהָם יָרָה עִשְׁרִי נַחַזְוָה תַחַת חָוֵר נַחַזְוָה כְּפָרֵר פַּרְעֹה נַחַזְוָה. The words תַּחַת קִדְמָהָם יָרָה עִשְׁרִי נַחַזְוָה תַחַת חָוֵר נַחַזְוָה would then be merely a footnote on which found its way into the body of the text. S, as is well known, usually did not uniformly translate recurring expressions in the Biblical text (see above p. 213). The shortness of the Arabic translation, compared with the Biblical text and the Targum, caused the note to be erroneously included in the translation and to become part of it.
has preserved its Saadian character in spite of repeated copying. Thus we are forced to conclude that the translation before us is of the school of S, and was made by one of his disciples, or by someone else who was extremely well versed in S's method of translation, both in its lexicographical and in its interpretative aspects. It may even be that the translator received oral explanations from S himself, but his lesser stature is reflected in his failure to equal in his translation the superb achievement of Saadiah.

II

I append here some suggested corrections of explanations given by M and Sh.:

a) 5:11: מַעֲשֵׂה מֹדֶר הַאָלָמָתָו מִקְרוֹל מָחָטְבִים. M. derives מַעֲשֵׂה מֹדֶר מֵמַשְׁחַר מַשָּׁרַח and translates: “those who make a partition”. But מַעֲשֵׂה מֹדֶר (III. form) does not have the meaning “make a partition”. In any case, what is meant by “from the voice of those who make a partition”? I tend to explain S’s rendition as referring to “the voice of the enemies who hide behind fences and walls and terrify the Israelites who went to the water-holes to draw water”. This interpretation is supported by the explanation given in Kitāb al Usāl (MS. R): “and some explain מַעֲשֵׂה מֹדֶר... as referring to the enemy, of whom the inhabitants of the land who drew water from the wells were afraid, and who hid in the caves and behind the trees and the rocks and used them as fences.”

b) 5:14: הבָּשֵׂדִים מִנֶּה מְנַשֵּׁשׁ מַלְאֵךְ בַּנְיָמִין. M. should be translated: “and one of them from Benjamin etc.”, the reference being to King Saul (cp. TJ).

c) 5:16: אֲבַטְבַּרָה אֲלָכָלָב — חֶקֶר. M. gives the root as כַּפֵּר and points out the parallel in Job 36:26. In fact the root is כַּפֵּר in both cases.

d) 5:26: מִדְמַנְתָּה רָאָשׁ — מַחְקֶק רָאָשׁ. M. explains “made a mark.” The correct meaning is “split the head to the brain.”

e) 5:6: מִשְׁקָלֵהַת — מִשְׁקָלֵהַת. In this form, the word is meaningless. Sh. translated ‘unsteady’. I am inclined to amend מִשְׁקָלֵהַת in accordance with S’s translation מִשְׁקַלְּהוֹת (Ps. 125:5) — מִשְׂקַלְּהוֹת.

f) 5:10: אֲלָכָלָב — יִשְׁרֵי. This does not mean ‘those who are seated’ but “those who used to be seated”, since the פּוּאָל indicates habitual or intensive action.

g) 5:13: מְנַשֵּׁשׁ לִשְׁמַר שֵׁרְיָה אֲלָכָלָב. Sh. translates “At that time shall those expelled from among the nobles of the people obtain dominion.” The phrase should be rendered: “At that time shall the expelled obtain dominion.

44 This means the abandonment of one of the two hypotheses put forward in my article in Sīnā‘ 13 (5709–5710).

45 Kitāb al Usāl, ed. Neubauer, 242, n. 56.
over the nobles among the people.” The dative *lamed* here carries the meaning of the acc. 'et, as in 2 Sam. 3:30.46

h) 5:17: נאה, which is translated “usually” by Sh., should be “still”.

i) 5:19: נָדָרְךָ לֶאָמָה נָמָה מֹלֵד מֶנָּה נָנָה. Sh. points and translates “Then we fought them, the kings of Canaan” לָוַּאֲמִּין The pointing may be לָוַּאֲמִּין and נָנָה the subject: “Then the kings of Canaan fought us both”.

j) 5:20: מַן שַׁמִּיס נָלַּהְרוּ נַכְבָּרִים - מַן לְאָלָמָה לְאָרוּבָּה - יָאָרְבָּה יָאָרְבָּה. Sh. points יָאָרְבָּה יָאָרְבָּה and translates “From heaven the stars fought them”. But this does not agree with the accent (*etnahta*) on the word נָלַּהְרוּ. In my opinion the pointing should be יָאָרְבָּה יָאָרְבָּה making God the subject. This accords well with the accents.

46 See *Sefer Hariqmah*, ed. M. Wilenski, 49, line 16.