

leads me to question somewhat the translator's decision not to include any of the prose-poems that appear in the *Wild Grass* collection. Although one complete English translation already exists of the slim volume (Xianyi Yang and Gladys Yang, 1976), in view of the present translator's aim to bring "a fuller understanding of [Lu Xun's] poetic achievements" (p. 8), it is unfortunate that he chose not to render those prose-poems, some of which, such as "Autumn Night" and "Dead Fire," are arguably among the most original and innovative works in the early phase of modern Chinese poetry. Furthermore, written between 1924 and 1926, the twenty-three prose-poems represent a crucial period in the life of Lu Xun as a writer, revealing the contradictions he grappled, and eventually came to terms, with—between hope and despair, desire and reality, action and vacillation. There is also a quantity of useful studies, especially since the early 1980s, both of that work as a whole and of individual poems.<sup>1</sup> By not including the *Wild Grass* compositions, the translator misses a good opportunity to give the reader a truly comprehensive view of Lu Xun as a poet.

Lu Xun's classical poems—mostly *jueju* and *lushi*—are rendered in rhymes. Although the rhyme scheme (probably inevitably) differs from that of the original, it is justified by the fact that at least it gives the reader a general sense of the rigor of the original form. In choosing to highlight this formal feature, however, the translator perhaps of necessity sacrifices other formal features, notably parallelism and, to some degree, the length of the line. Overall, I find the translations to be accurate and highly readable. In a few cases, the concern with rhyming seems to lead to a rendition that deviates a little too far from the original. For instance, the first poem in "Farewell to My Younger Brothers, March 1900" (p. 51) opens with the line "I've run about day after day to make a living, but in vain." "In vain" is not warranted by the original but is used probably for the sole purpose of rhyming with "pain" in the following line. Similarly, the words "a plight"—describing a lone fisherman in "Untitled" (p. 131)—are not found in the original but are added in the translation to rhyme with "night" in the following line. These few minor deviations

<sup>1</sup> For instance, Li Helin, *Lu Xun 'Ye cao' zhujie* 鲁迅野草注解, 2nd ed. (Shaaxi renmin chubanshe, 1981); Min Kangsheng, *Diyu bianyuan de xiaohua—Lu Xun sanwenshi chutan* 地獄邊緣的小花：魯迅散文詩初探 (Shaaxi renmin chubanshe, 1981); Shi Shangwen and Zheng Zhongqiang, *Yecao qianxi* 野草淺析 (Changjiang wenyi chubanshe, 1982); Sun Yushi, *Yecao yanjiu* 野草研究 (Zhongguo shihui kexue chubanshe, 1982); Li Guotao, *Yecao yishu tan* 野草藝術探 (Shanxi renmin chubanshe, 1982); Mau-sang Ng, "Symbols of Anxiety in *Wild Grass*," *Renditions* (Autumn 1986): 155–64; Xiong Bingming, "'Qiuye' de fenxi" 《秋夜》的分析, *Dangdai* 當代 (Taipei) 18 (Oct. 1987): 30–47.

in no way mar the quality of the translation, and there are too many examples of fine, even ingenious, translation to be cited here.

The book is a delight to read. The editor also deserves mention here for doing a fine editorial job.

MICHELLE YEH

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

---

*The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* By ELISHA QIMRON. Harvard Semitic Studies 29. Atlanta: SCHOLARS PRESS, 1986. Pp. 138.

Even though forty years have passed since the discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls (henceforth DSS), scholars of these documents generally have had to pursue their study without the aid of a systematic grammar. The lone exception to this state of affairs has been the doctoral thesis of E. Qimron, *Diqduq ha-Lashon ha-Ivrit shel Megillot Midbar Yehuda*, submitted to the Hebrew University in 1976. A limited number of copies of the dissertation were publicly sold in Jerusalem, and this reviewer was able to obtain one several years ago. However, because of this distribution system and because the work is written in Hebrew, many scholars have not been able to utilize Qimron's thesis during the past decade.

This problem now has been alleviated with the appearance of the volume under review. But this is not merely a translation into English; Qimron has reworked the dissertation substantially. Most importantly, he has incorporated the results of his study of significant new texts, especially the Temple Scroll (published by Y. Yadin), 4Q400–405 (the Shiroṭ 'Olat ha-Shabbat, published by C. A. Newsom), and 4QMMT (Miqṣat Ma'ase ha-Torah, currently being prepared for publication by J. Strugnell and E. Qimron). Moreover, Qimron has availed himself of secondary literature which has appeared in recent years. The result is a thoroughly up-to-date grammatical survey of the Hebrew of the DSS, covering mainly the non-biblical texts, but referring to the biblical manuscripts (especially IQIsa<sup>a</sup>) when appropriate.

There are other differences between the dissertation and the present monograph, which should be noted for the benefit of those with access to the former. In the dissertation, Qimron often included exhaustive lists of particular phenomena in DSS Hebrew. In the new version, the author contents himself with statistical information. For example, whereas the dissertation cited all 55 instances of the אקטל imperfect and all 18 occurrences of the אקטלה form, Qimron now simply states that the former occurs 70 times and the latter 19 times (§310.122) (the differences based obviously on the larger corpus of texts now being sampled).

In addition, some sections of the dissertation, which apparently were not considered important enough, were deleted in the book. I am not sure whether this was an authorial judgment or one imposed by the editor of the series, but here I must voice some dissent. One would assume, for example, that a discussion of the few apparent examples of III<sup>2</sup> verbs inflected as III<sup>1</sup> verbs (see §317.70 of the dissertation) would be deemed worthy of inclusion in any grammar covering any period or subdivision of the Hebrew language. The matter is indirectly discussed in the orthography section on the use of *he* and <sup>2</sup>*alef* as final vowel letters (§100.7), but a separate paragraph in the morphology section is warranted.

On the other hand, in the book one happily finds a fully developed chapter on syntax, which in the dissertation had been relegated to a short appendix, and a greatly expanded discussion of the DSS vocabulary. Qimron also made an excellent decision to retain the original paragraph numbers, so that scholars in possession of both works will have an easy time utilizing them simultaneously.

The aspects of the Hebrew of the DSS which receive the most attention are, not surprisingly, the interrelated problems of orthography and phonology. These chapters are exceptionally well presented, and any Hebraist interested in such thorny issues as the use of vowel letters, the use of digraphs, the weakening of the gutturals, the pronunciation of the *qu/l* pattern, accentuation, etc., will find Qimron's treatment most useful. Additional chapters treat the verb, the personal pronoun, the noun, and (as already mentioned) the syntax and the vocabulary. Generally Qimron's method is to present the essential data, to compare the Hebrew of the DSS with other Hebrew language traditions (Biblical [henceforth BH], Mishnaic, Samaritan, etc.), to give a survey of different interpretations where necessary, and to record his own opinion. All of this is accomplished clearly and concisely.

In what follows I add a few notes of correction and some ancillary comments.

P. 60: In the chart, I assume the first word listed in the far right-hand column should be ויקטלהו (not ויקטלהו).

P. 66: מלכות and סכלות are included in the list of "previously unattested abstract nouns with the suffix ות." As is well known, they both occur in the Bible, as Qimron correctly notes on pp. 92–93.

P. 67: With the exception of frequent references to Aramaic, Qimron does not enter into comparisons beyond the sphere of Hebrew. Accordingly, let me point out that the DSS plural לשוניים "tongues" (actually only the *status constructus/pronominalis* לשוני is attested) may explain Ugaritic *lšnm* in *UT* 1003:5. This form is variously explained as a dual (C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* [1967], 429) or as the singular with adverbial *-m* (J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* [1965], 174). In the light of the DSS usage, we may wish to consider *lšnm* the Ugaritic plural.

P. 70: The section on the periphrastic tense היה + participle (§400.01) should be expanded and/or subdivided. When this construction is used in the Bible and in the Mishna, it appears most commonly with the perfect of היה, less so with the imperfect, imperative, and infinitive. In the DSS, the vast majority of usages is with the imperfect (cf. Y. Yadin, *Megillat ha-Miqdash* [1977], I:30, where only one case with the perfect and about three dozen examples with the imperfect are listed). Qimron should have noted this, with some discussion or at least a call for further study.

———: Qimron omits any discussion of the particles, except where they bear on his treatment of the syntax. However, it would be of interest to note that the interchange of *bet* and *mem* known from BH appears in the DSS as well. See L. Schiffman, *Textus* 10 (1982): 37–43.

Finally, let me refer to Qimron's concluding chapter on the nature of DSS Hebrew. Ever since the Qumran texts were found four decades ago, scholars have been divided as to whether their language represents a revival of BH in Greco-Roman times replete with archaizing usages or whether it is a natural continuation of BH, especially late BH. Qimron opts for the latter approach, stating that DSS Hebrew "is not an imitation of BH but rather a continuation of it" (p. 116). The evidence clearly bears this out.

There is much to be gained from Qimron's monograph, which is sure to remain the standard grammar of DSS Hebrew for years to come.

GARY A. RENDBURG

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

---

*Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments.* By HANS-PETER STÄHLI. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 66. Freiburg, Schweiz: UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG; Göttingen: VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT, 1985. Pp. ix + 60.

This work developed out of a study on ancient synagogue art and rabbinic exegesis undertaken by the author in 1983–84. In seeking to account for the prominence of solar imagery within the context of the synagogue of Beth Alpha and elsewhere, the author was impressed by several allusions to solar elements within the yahwistic faith expressed in the Old Testament.

The book consists of discussions under eight separate headings, a bibliography and a textual index. The first section presents a brief case for solar imagery as characteristic of "orthodox," rather than sectarian, Judaism. Sections two and three deal with evidence for a solar cult in ancient Israel from the standpoint of both the history of scholarship (e.g., J. Morgenstern, J. Dus, and less extreme proponents like