NATHAN LAMONTAGNE

The Song of Deborah in the Septuagint

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
2. Reihe

Edited by
Konrad Schmid (Zürich) · Mark S. Smith (Princeton)
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen) · Andrew Teeter (Harvard)

110

Nathan LaMontagne

The Song of Deborah
in the Septuagint

Nathan LaMontagne, born 1983; 2003 B.S. in Information Sciences and Technology; 2007 MA in Theology; 2013 PhD in Biblical Studies; currently independent researcher near Washington, D.C.
orcid.org/0000-0003-2891-726X

To Francis Gignac, SJ,
of happy memory, who was never willing to accept less
than the best of what I was capable.

Preface

A good piece of advice I received as a graduate student on publishing was the warning that dissertations do not make good books, because "A good book is thesis driven; a dissertation is research driven." While this is good advice in general, it is important to recognize the work that is frequently done in dissertations as valuable and necessary work that needs to be done in the field of Biblical Studies. I hope that this revised work makes a contribution to that end.

My great thanks go out to Dr. Robert Miller II of The Catholic University of America, who has been tirelessly putting my name and my work forward for consideration by scholars, and to Dr. Mark Smith of Princeton Theological Seminary, who was gracious enough to recommend my work for publication.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*
BHQ	*Biblia Hebraica Quinta*
GKC	Wilhelm Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910).
HALOT	Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, trans. M. E. J. Richardson (Boston: Brill, 2001).
IBHS	Michael O'Connor and Bruce Waltke, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990).
LSJ	Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
MT	Masoretic Text
NJBC	Raymond Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Roland Murphy, eds., *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990).
OG	Old Greek

Abbreviations of secondary sources are taken from The Catholic Biblical Association's guide for contributors (https://catholicbiblical.org/publications-/cbq/cbq-instructions), with remaining series and journal abbreviations taken from *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014. https://www.sbl-site.org/publications/sblhandbookofstyle.aspx).

Introduction

The Song of Deborah has received much attention throughout the history of biblical studies and accordingly has also been the subject of some controversy. Many have written about the composition of the Song, or its date and Sitz im Leben, or its relationship to the narrative of Deborah in chap. 4 of Judges. There are discussions on how historically reliable the Song and the narrative of Deborah are, and how one should interpret the data of archaeology in light of the text, and vice versa. There is still much that is unclear and much still to learn, and there are almost as many ways of approaching the text as there are scholars who wish to study it. These questions are not easily answered, but they are crucial questions that illuminate the meaning of the text.

This study aims to explore some of the aspects and nuances in the Song of Deborah during the period of Second Temple Judaism. Whereas most scholarship in the Song has focused on its meaning in Hebrew and its place in the context of ancient Near Eastern literature, I intend to focus on the original Old Greek (OG) translation of the Song of Deborah and its meaning in the context of Greek thought and literature in its probable setting of Alexandria. The translation that was produced by the Greek-speaking Jews demonstrates an understanding of the Song that is different from the way that the Hebrew is understood today, and it is the task of this study to highlight this and to explore the meaning of the Greek text.

This project involves several divergent approaches that support one another in building a picture of how the text was read and understood in its Greek context. My first task here is to create a best approximation of the OG. This is not insignificant, since the LXX manuscripts of Judges are vastly different, demonstrate a history of revision that spans many centuries and editorial philosophies, and blend examples of readings from various traditions without distinction. Once a critical text is established, I will examine the quality of the translation and attempt to uncover some of the reasons the original translator(s) made the lexical and grammatical choices that they did. Such an analysis depends heavily on understanding how the translator read his Hebrew text, and this, in turn, depends on my own ability to understand the problems of the Hebrew text. Once the analysis of the text is complete, I will translate the Greek text and explore the meaning of it. Most importantly, I will also relate the themes of the

Song of Deborah to similar themes within Greek literature or in other books of the LXX. This study will be devoted to examining the Song of Deborah in the LXX and its meaning in the context of Hellenistic, Greek-speaking Judaism.

Chapter One is a thorough examination of the long history of scholarship on the Song of Deborah. As modern scholarship has increased the pace of publication of good scholarly works, review of works from the last thirty years may be somewhat abbreviated. In Chapter Two I will examine the Greek texts of Judges and determine the most authentic ancient text. Once this text is established, I will examine in Chapter Three the translational style and particular characteristics of the Greek translation. In Chapter Four I will analyze and describe the poetic style of the translation in order to explicate and hopefully add to the study of poetry in the LXX. In Chapter Five I will address the meaning of the Song of Deborah in light of the influences that Hellenism exercised on Judaism during the probable period in which the translation was made and draw conclusions from the data that have been presented.

Chapter One

The History of Scholarship on the Song of Deborah

1.1 Early Christian and Jewish (Premodern)

Origen is the earliest Christian writer to address Judges; he gave a set of nine homilies on the book. Origen's interpretation is primarily allegorical: Sisera represents the animalistic person, one who is completely unspiritual (*Hom. in Jud.* 4)[1]; Deborah, "Bee," represents the word of God, in as much as she is a prophet and that the words of God are "sweeter than honey" (Ps 18 [LXX 19]:11); Barak, whose name Origen translates "flash," represents the unenlightened Israel, who had a glimpse of God but has subsequently forgotten it – thus, according to Origen, Israel, like Barak, will be led to victory (i.e., salvation) by another, namely, the Christian Church; Jael, Origen identifies as the Church, the one who secured the victory by destroying the unenlightened philosophy of the world (Sisera).[2] Origen emphasizes that Jael pierced him through his jaw, an interpretation which is found in the LXX but not in the MT. In general though, Origen only expounds on the narrative section and does not deal specifically with the Song of Deborah as a separate piece.

Ambrose (*Concerning Widows*, 8.43–51) holds up Deborah as an exemplary widow and analyzes the situation in much the same allegorical way as Origen, treating the victory achieved by Jael as a prefiguring of the Gentile Christian Church's adoption into the children of God.[3] Ambrose reflects a traditional belief (found also in Origen) that Deborah is a widow and Barak is her son, although these are stated neither in the Hebrew nor in the Greek text. It is because of this that Ambrose uses these figures as a model for the care of widows and the duty of children to parents.

Theodoret of Cyr treats Judges only briefly in his *Questions on the Octateuch* but has some significant remarks on the meaning of the Greek. Concerning Deborah and the Song of Deborah, he uses it only to demonstrate the basic equality of men and women in service to God, so that although the Church

---

[1] Origen, *Origen: Homilies on Judges*, trans. Elizabeth Ann Dively Lauro, FC 119 (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 4.

[2] Ibid., 5.

[3] Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., *St. Ambrose: Selected Works and Letters*, NPNF 2nd Series X (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1896).

might observe one practice (segregation of women) God can and does still use women beyond the Church's specific order. It is important to note that Theodoret uses a manuscript similar to the Codex Alexandrinus (A), which necessitates that he explain the difficulties with the text and especially translate the Hebrew words which the A translator merely transliterated. Theodoret seems to derive the meaning of these words from his knowledge of Aramaic, although he is almost certainly relying on a tradition of interpretation which comes before him.[4]

Augustine also comments briefly on the Deborah cycle (Judges 4 and 5), devoting five questions to it in his *Quaestionum de Iudicibus*.[5] These questions focus on the interpretation of difficult phrases, of which there are several in the Song especially. Augustine's questions demonstrate a knowledge of a particular Greek text, and in his exegesis he uses transposition (hyperbata) to make sense of the difficult phrases in vv. 7 and 8 of the Song. Augustine, like Theodoret, is using a manuscript of the Alexandrian text-type of Judges, which necessitates that he explain some of the labored Greek.

Procopius of Gaza also produced a commentary on Judges. The commentary is line by line and is rather extensive; however, as Otto Bardenhewer notes, Procopius' work is a catena composed of extracts from the works of Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cyril of Alexandria.[6] Even if this is the case, there does not appear to survive in the modern era a Greek text of any of these Fathers' work on Judges. It is therefore reasonable to treat Procopius' catena work here as the only surviving instance of a more ancient commentary of unknown authorship. Bardenhewer further speculates that Procopius' catena forms the basis for the Catena of Nicephorus in the 18th century. In it the author(s) discusses not only the meaning of the text projected forward onto Christ but also the meaning of the text in itself (a style similar to that of Cyril of Alexandria). In addition, he notes certain places where Aquila, Symmachus, or Theodotian have different readings than the text that he is using (both Basil and Gregory of Nyssa produced works on Origen's Hexapla). His text is neither of the Alexandrian nor the Vatican type; this will be explored further in Chapter Two.[7] Of all the writers before him, his work is the most detailed and extensive.

---

[4] Theodoret of Cyrus, *Questions on the Octateuch*, trans. Robert C. Hill, vol. 2, 2 vols., LEC 2 (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 327–31.

[5] *Sancti Aureli Augustini Quaestionum in Heptateuchum*, ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 28, 1895, 449–506, esp. 465–67.

[6] Otto Bardenhewer, *Patrology: The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church*, trans. Thomas J. Shahan, 2nd ed. (Freiburg im Breisgau: B. Herder, 1908), 542.

[7] This is when compared to the published edition of Judges in volume two of Alan E. Brooke and Norman McLean, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint.*, vol. 2, 4 vols. (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Rashi, Don Isaac Abravanel, and the other Jewish writers have their own interesting and sometimes unique interpretations, but these are based on the Targumic interpretation (in some cases) and ultimately on the Hebrew. Their contributions have been analyzed by the scholars of the previous century and so their work does not need to be explored here.[8]

Writers who came later than the Church Fathers, at least in the West, exclusively rely on the Vulgate translation of Jerome, which had become normative for Western Christianity. In the East, commentators generally stick to allegorical readings of Scripture which, although they have great spiritual value, contain little that illuminates either the history of the text or its meaning for its original context. In fact, after the close of what is considered the age of the Fathers (A.D. 749, at the death of St. John of Damascus), there is little scholarship that will lend aid to understanding either the Hebrew or the Greek of the Song of Deborah.

This remained true until after the Reformation. It was a key aspect of Martin Luther's reform that Bibles ought to be translated from texts as original as possible. As a result, Protestant scholars, and even to some extent Catholic scholars, revived interest in the Hebrew text and, to a lesser extent, the Greek texts which are their earliest translations.

Protestants focused mainly on the Hebrew manuscripts and on the analogical value of the text, using them especially for sermonizing. Sebastian Münster, and later Jan Drusius (the pen name of Johannes van den Dreische), do little more than explain the meaning of the Hebrew words (a relatively new idea) and make parallels to other passages of Scripture which had hitherto been unrecognized because of the abrogation of the Hebrew Bible.[9] Münster offers an occasional alternate interpretation, and Drusius makes use of the medieval Jewish commentators and Targum Jonathan, but they add little thereby to the overall discussion.

Catholic commentators remained with the Vulgate until the promulgation of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Providentisimus Dei* in 1893. By this time, the modern era of biblical scholarship is well under way among Protestants.

---

[8] See, for instance, the introduction of George F. Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, ICC 7 (New York: Charles Scribner, 1895). Modern scholarship has been more interested in the works of the Medieval Jewish commentators (who worked from the Hebrew) than of early Christian commentators (who worked from the Greek) and so their insights have been incorporated already in much modern research. See especially Avraham Fishelis and Shmuel Fishelis, *Judges: A New Translation: Translation of Text, Rashi and Other Commentaries*, ed. A. J. Rosenberg (New York: Judaica Press, 1983), 34–47.

[9] Sebastian Münster, *Hebraica Biblia, Latina planeque noua*, vol. 1 (Basileae, 1546), 471–74.; Jan Drusius, *Ad Loca Difficiliora Josuae, Iudicum, Sam. Commentarius Liber* (Fredericus Heynsius, 1618), 204–12.

1.2 Modern

Modern scholarship on the Song of Deborah can be divided rather neatly into two categories: those works which focus on the Hebrew of the Song and those which focus on the Greek. Since this work intends to explain the relationship of the Greek to the Hebrew as well as the meaning of the Greek in context, it is important to include works on both versions. Furthermore, modern works treat one or more of these essential subjects: the text of the Song, the historical setting of the Song, the poetic style or meter of the Song, and its meaning and function with regard to the rest of the book of Judges.

1.2.1 Works on the Hebrew

1.2.1.1 Text of the Song

Most older commentators believed that the Song was a unified composition, to the extent that it is an implied assumption in their work. In more recent years it has become more common to find scholars asserting that it is a compilation of several once independent items, a theory put forward by Heinrich Ewald and found frequently today.[10] In response to this, several scholars have emerged to defend its traditionally held unity.[11]

Numerous also are those commentators who have sought to wrest meaning from the Song of Deborah by emending the text where it seems to be corrupt or unintelligible. Since such instances abound in the Song of Deborah, there has been no lack of suggestions that repoint the consonants, revise the existing consonants, or divide the words differently; most who undertake such a task use all three tactics. It would be a Sisyphean exercise to attempt to collate all

---

[10] Heinrich Ewald, *The History of Israel*, trans. Russel Martineau, vol. 2, 4 vols. (London: Longman, Green & Co., 1869), 350–54. See also David Heinrich Müller, "The Structure of the Song of Deborah," *AJT* 2 (1898): 110–15; Artur Weiser, "Das Deboralied: Eine gattungs- und traditionsgeschichtliche Studie," *ZAW* 71 (1959): 67–97; Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah: A Discussion," *Bib* 42 (1961): 61–76; Peter R. Ackroyd, "The Composition of the Song of Deborah," *VT* 2 (1952): 160–62; Andrew D. H. Mayes, "The Historical Context of the Battle against Sisera," *VT* 19 (1969): 353–60; J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges*, trans. John Bowden, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981); Barnabas Lindars, *Judges 1–5: A New Translation*, ed. Andrew D. H. Mayes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995); Carolyn Pressler, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*, Westminster Bible Companion (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002).

[11] See for instance Paulus Cassel, *The Book of Judges*, ed. Johann P. Lange, trans. Peter H. Steenstra, Commentary on the Holy Scriptures 4 (New York: Charles Scribner, 1872); Moore, *Exegetical Commentary*; Gillis Gerleman, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Stylistics," *VT* 1 (1951): 168–80; Alexander Globe, "The Literary Structure and Unity of the Song of Deborah," *JBL* 93 (1974): 493–512; Michael D. Coogan, "A Structural and Literary Analysis of the Song of Deborah," *CBQ* 40 (1978): 143–66; Mark A. Vincent, "The Song of Deborah: A Structural and Literary Consideration," *SJOT* 91 (2000): 63–82.

of these suggestions, as each new commentator who brings his or her own new theories and methods to the discussion seems only to make the matter more turgid. Thomas McDaniel's recently self-published work has an extensive discussion of the topic, an almost complete analysis of suggestions of previous commentators as well his own additions to the field.[12]

The present work will not attempt to collate all of the suggested emendations with regard to the Hebrew; it will be enough to collate and discuss the possible variations of the Greek and discuss the emendations of the Hebrew only where they are relevant to the understanding of the Greek.

1.2.1.2 Historical Setting

The scholarly discussion about the historical veracity of the Song of Deborah contains two issues: how old the Song is and what relation it bears to the narrative section of chapter 4. That the Song of Deborah is among the most, if not the most, ancient pieces of work in the Hebrew Bible is still the dominant opinion among scholars.[13] However, there are a number who disagree.[14] Determining the age of the Song is not a simple task, and several factors may be involved in dating it. However, I tend to agree with Alberto Soggin and others that dating the text "can only be done on the basis of objective elements, such as the study

---

[12] Thomas F. McDaniel, "The Song of Deborah: Poetry in Dialect," PDF document, 2003, http://tmcdaniel.palmerseminary.edu/Deborah.pdf.

[13] See for instance Cassel, *The Book of Judges*; Moore, *Exegetical Commentary*; Charles F. Burney, *The Book of Judges* (London: Rivingtons, 1920); William F. Albright, "Earliest Forms of Hebrew Verse," *JPOS* 2 (1922): 69–86; Antonin Causse, *Les plus vieux Chants de la Bible*, Ètudes d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses 14 (Paris: F. Alcan, 1926); William F. Albright, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology," *BASOR* 62 (1936): 26–31; Hans-Peter Müller, "Der Aufbau Des Deboraliedes," *VT* 16 (1966): 446–59; Peter C. Craigie, "The Song of Deborah and the Epic of Tikulti-Ninurta," *JBL* 88 (1969): 253–65; Mayes, "Historical Context"; Baruch Halpern, "The Resourceful Israelite Historian: The Song of Deborah and Israelite Historiography," *HTR* 76 (1983): 379–401; Lawrence E. Stager, "Archaeology, Ecology, and Social History: Background Themes to the Song of Deborah," in *Congress Volume: Jerusalem, 1986* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 224–26; Geoffrey P. Miller, "The Song of Deborah: A Legal-Economic Analysis," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 144 (1996): 2293–2320. Recently, Charles Echols has offered a rather complete analysis of the evidence presented and an extensive discussion on its merits in *Tell Me, O Muse: The Song of Deborah (Judges 5) in the Light of Heroic Poetry*, JSOTSup 487 (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), which is a revision of his dissertation, "The Eclipse of God in the Song of Deborah: The Role of YHWH in Light of Heroic Poetry" (D.Phil. diss., University of Cambridge, 2005). He concludes that the Song is, indeed, probably of a very early composition.

[14] See Ackroyd, "Composition"; Gösta W. Ahlström, "Judges 5:20 f. and History," *JNES* 36 (1977): 287–88; Soggin, *Judges*; Michael Waltisberg, "Zum Alter der Sprache des Deboraliedes Ri 5," *ZAH* 12 (1999): 218–32. The evidence presented in these works and many others is analyzed by Echols, *Tell Me, O Muse*, 44–61.

of the language used and the references in the text itself."[15] Mark Smith also
has an extended discussion on the date of the Song, incorporating both linguistic elements and cultural features of the composition to date it primarily as a
tenth century work given an introduction by a later editor.[16] Nevertheless, the
problem of analyzing even these data is that on the one hand a composition
with older language may have been edited by later copyists to make it more
intelligible, and on the other hand a later composition may have been originally
composed with archaic linguistic elements, a common feature of Hebrew poetry (and indeed of poetry in general). This work will not engage in a discussion
of the merits of the arguments, and as far as the actual date of the Song is
concerned I shall adopt an opinion with which the majority of scholars will
agree: its composition began no earlier than 1100 B.C. and achieved a final
form no later than 800 B.C.

The matter of the historicity of the Song and its connection with chap. 4 (and
its historicity) is a discussion almost as complex as that of the text of the Song.
Before the modern age, it was assumed that both the narrative and the Song
were historical accounts and could be treated as such. Even through the modern
era, William Albright used them as guides for interpreting the archaeological
data of the areas around Taanach and Megiddo.[17] As research and excavations
in the area progressed, however, it became more and more difficult to reconcile
the events in Judges 4 and 5 with any particular historical activity, so that modern archaeological reconstructions of the period have ceased to rely on either
account for more than corroborative evidence.[18]

The connection between the accounts of Judges 4 and 5 is also in question.
Generally, it was the case that commentators treated them as separate accounts
of a single event and differed because (a) they were told by different people
(Deborah writing the Song, the historian writing the narrative), and (b) they
were of different genres and so preserved different aspects of the event.[19] It is
more common now to find commentators argue for direct dependence between

---

[15] Soggin, *Judges*, 80.

[16] Mark S. Smith, Poetic Heroes: Literary Commemorations of Warriors and Warrior
Culture in the Early Biblical World (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 211–33.

[17] Albright, "Song of Deborah"; Robert M. Engberg and William F. Albright, "Historical
Analysis of Archaeological Evidence: Megiddo and the Song of Deborah," *BASOR* 78
(1940): 4–9.

[18] Ahlström, "Judges 5:20"; Soggin, *Judges*; Volkmar Fritz, "Conquest or Settlement?
The Early Iron Age in Palestine," *BA* (1987): 84–100; J. David Schloen, "Caravans, Kenites,
and Cassus Belli: Enmity and Alliance in the Song of Deborah," *CBQ* 55 (1993): 18–38.

[19] For this view, which is sometimes explicit and sometimes not, see especially Ernst
Bertheau, *Das Buch der Richter und Rut* (Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1845);
Carl Friedrich Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Joshua, Judges Ruth*, Biblical Commentary on the
Old Testament 4 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1869); Cassel, *The Book of Judges*; George A.
Cooke, *The History and Song of Deborah: Judges IV and V* (Oxford: Horace Hart, 1892);
Karl Budde, *Das Buch Der Richter*, KHC 7 (Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1897).

them, in so far as one was composed on the basis of the other, which necessitates an explanation of how the differences arose.[20] That the two accounts are in some way related bears import on the discussion here but the direction of influence does not; the Greek translator almost certainly would have treated the two texts as a unit and used one to interpret the other. In this regard, the Greek text of the Song may be understood more clearly in light of the narrative.

1.2.1.3 Poetics

The way that Hebrew poetry is understood is still very much debated, and the way it was analyzed by the Greek translator can be understood only if we can describe all the ways in which the Hebrew poetry can be analyzed. The structure of the Song is analyzed by most scholars only so far as stanzas, thus dividing the Song into exegetical units. These divisions are usually made along thematic lines, but matters of textual parallelism do influence those demarcations. Those who are interested in the specific poetic features frequently discuss parallelism in the song; some also analyze the poetry by syllable counts or other metrical devices.

Robert Lowth's work on Hebrew poetry is one of the earliest works that analyze the Hebrew text as a work of poetry and is a good place to begin discussion of the Song of Deborah.[21] Lowth's work divides the Song into three parts: the exordium (vv. 1–5), the recital of circumstances (vv. 6–23), and the finale (vv. 24–31).[22] Lowth does not deal specifically with the internal difficulties of the poem or the problematic language but does note that the recital has "many difficulties which impair the beauty of the composition." He also asserts the unity of the composition, despite its wide range of subjects. Although many later commentators also focus only on the divisions of the song

---

[20] On one side, there are those who argue that the narrative account was derived from the Song: Bertheau, *Richter und Rut*; Moore, *Exegetical Commentary*; Eugen Täubler, *Biblische Studien: Die Epoche der Richter* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1958); Weiser, "Das Deboralied"; Giovanni Garbini, "Il Cantico di Debora," *La parola del passato* 178 (1978): 5–31; Halpern, "Israelite Historian"; Heinz-Dieter Neef, *Deboraerzählung und Deboralied: Studien zu Jdc 4,1–5,31*, Biblisch-theologische Studien 49 (Neukirch–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2002); Pressler, *Judges*. Note especially the works of Garbini and Halpern who both gave detailed theories on how the narrative is derived directly from the Song through interpretation without recourse to another source. Halpern, "Israelite Historian," 396., notes: "In sum, Judges 4 seems to present a prime example of an Israelite historian interpreting a source, and having a bad day at it." On the other side, only a very few argue that the Song is based on the narrative; Ahlström ("Judges 5:20")., the most notable, does not argue this specifically but he does feel that the narrative is historically superior and the Song's composition is anterior to that of the narrative.

[21] Robert Lowth, *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, ed. J. D. Michaelis, trans. G. Gregory (London: J. T. Buckingham, 1815).

[22] Ibid., 391–400.

into stanzas, it is not necessary to detail here how each writer made divisions. There are, however, more traditional poetic devices by which the Song may be analyzed.

Poetic parallelism is still considered the dominant feature of Hebrew poetry, and much poetic analysis begins with describing the parallelistic devices. A number of scholars have restricted themselves only to this type of analysis, usually for the sake of expediency. Cassel looks for parallelism in alliteration throughout the poem and takes pains to try to reproduce some of that alliteration in his translation.[23] Moore's analysis interprets one line in light of the line to which it is parallel and points out words and phrases which parallel each other.[24] Gerleman examines in detail what he calls "broken, monotonous parallelism," although a more precise term might be "repetitive parallelism."[25] Alan Hauser, building on Gerleman's work, adds parataxis as a poetic device.[26] After this, most analysts began to focus on parallelism in the Song not because it was expedient but because much doubt had been cast on the ability of metric analysis to produce favorable results. In particular, the focus on parallelism is used to determine the proper structure of the Song, that is, what are its own natural divisions, a task which is deceptively difficult. Vincent, for instance, who examines the Song in terms of its parallelistic tendencies, notes:

> The most serious problem with the use of metrical criteria to support a structural analysis of a poem from the Hebrew Bible is that the metrical system of Hebrew poetry is still subject to great uncertainty and heated debate. It has not even been agreed what we should be counting (whether stresses, syllables, or syntactic features, for instance).[27]

Following this in Vincent's article is a critique of Michael Coogan's metrical analysis (of which more below) which, although one of the best of the metrical studies, is one among many such analyses. Vincent's critique, *mutatis mutandis*, may be applied to any of them. Vincent's own analysis relies on parallel passages to determine the structural schema of the Song. Pierre Auffret offers an analysis of the Song from the standpoint of parallelism and finds in it a chiastic arrangement.[28]

As noted, for many years of modern scholarship it was in vogue to analyze Hebrew poetry according to metrical criteria. The majority of scholars who commented on the Song of Deborah did so by laying the Song out into a metrical schema in which its syllables or stresses could be counted. Berthau was perhaps the first writer to do so, organizing the Song by a meter which counts

---

[23] Cassel, *The Book of Judges*, 89–108.

[24] Moore, *Exegetical Commentary*, 127–73.

[25] Gerleman, "Stylistics," 176.

[26] Alan J. Hauser, "Judges 5: Parataxis in Hebrew Poetry," *JBL* 99 (1980): 23–41.

[27] Vincent, "Literary Consideration," 67.

[28] Pierre Auffret, "En ce jour-là Debora et Baraq chantèrent: Étude structurelle de Jg 5, 2–31," SJOT 16 (2002): 113–50.

Index of Scripture References

Old Testament

Subject Index