modern translations are unjustified in using the title 'governor', but this is surely implicit in the verb דימת (appoint as overseer) rather than ממלך (make king). I also disagree on a number of matters relating to chronology, which are discussed in my forthcoming study of this subject. In my view, consideration of biblical and ancient Near-Eastern evidence points strongly to 587 B.C. rather than 586 B.C. as the date of the (second) Babylonian capture of Jerusalem. Or, to take another example, the idea that Pekah reigned over a rival Israelite kingdom in Galilee or Transjordan (p. 324) has no real basis other than as a chronological harmonization of his twenty-year reign-length, and this is really a schematic figure, like the ten-year reign-length ascribed to his predecessor, Pekahiah, in the Septuagint. The common notion that the phrase 'sleep with one's fathers' indicates a natural death (pp. 274, 301, 408) is at least questionable. The theory that Jehoram of Judah and Joram of Israel were the same person (pp. 280 ff.) is also improbable in my opinion. The statement that 'the Lucianic system of synchronisms for the Omride period does not include synchronisms for Jehoram and Ahaziah of Judah' (p. 281) is incorrect in Ahaziah's case; and the assertion that, according to the biblical account, Jehoram of Judah and Joram of Israel were both descended from Omri (p. 223) is also incorrect—Jehoram of Judah was married to a descendant of Omri. The identification of Tubail of Tyre with the Tabeel mentioned in Isaiah 7:6 (pp. 329, 343) is mistaken; Tubail is an Assyrian spelling of Ittobaal (Ethbaal). Finally, on p. 433, the statement that 'years were reckoned by reference to Jehoiachin's reign' during the exile should be corrected to say that years were reckoned with reference to Jehoiachin's exile.

In conclusion, this is an excellent textbook which is admirably suited for sixth-form and university study and deserves to be used widely. Can the authors be persuaded to follow it up with another on Israelite religion, to replace the outdated textbooks by H. Ringgren and G. Fohrer?

Oriental Institute, Oxford
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Teaching the ancient world is coming to depend increasingly upon source books containing selected and translated excerpts. This is not wholly a matter of regret and it is not due only to the limitations of our students and of our library resources. The development is linked with the move away, in the teaching of history and of thought, from a narrow text-based approach; with the emergence of new classes of documentary material which have transformed scholarship; and with the consequent possibilities of asking a broader range of questions, at all levels of study. The best source books, through their choices, their comments, their introductory material, their renderings and their overall conception of a subject, can themselves add a new dimension to enquiry. But wholly satisfactory volumes are few and far between, although, in the fields of Classical Studies with which I am most familiar, they are emerging at a steady rate.

If this first contribution to the new Oxford Centre series is to set the standard for the rest, then we can now look forward to a major advance in the teaching of Jewish Studies and of the subjects which touch upon it. The decision to print, in each case,
the texts in the original language, *together* with the translation, is much to be commended. The series promises to cover Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Latin and occasional Syriac material; students have had to be able to exploit the resources of a wide variety of libraries and to handle, often, forbidding or unwieldy volumes, to get a sight of such material, and to expect this of them becomes increasingly unrealistic.

It is something of a paradox that the only available context for the Qumran texts comes to us in literature written in Greek and Latin. Not only Philo and, first and foremost, Josephus, but also the younger Pliny and the Christian, Hippolytus, offer descriptions whose evaluation is of prime importance for any understanding of the Qumran sect. All the relevant passages are presented here, and the brief allusions in Synesius (from Dio of Prusa) and in the Church historian, Hegesippus, have not been forgotten. The translations are either fresh or carefully revised. The lay-out is elegant and clear. But what makes the volume really outstanding is the quality of commentary and explanation offered throughout.

The introduction, with ample primary documentation and bibliographical guidance, offers an invaluable summary of the essential statements about the Essenes in all the texts, with a concise but full comparison of the not always consistent evidence for Qumran practice in the same matters, and then a succinct analysis of the case for linking Qumran with the Essenes. Students can now work through some of these comparisons in greater detail with the help of another recently published volume: Todd S. Beall's *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 58; Cambridge University Press, 1988); but the essentials are given with a much surer touch in Vermes and Goodman, and the Josephus texts and translations are better presented. However, for prolonged study, the two volumes might well be used together. Within the body of Vermes and Goodman, each author is introduced and the importance of his account explained. The question of whether it is necessary to posit a common source lying behind Josephus and Hippolytus, and of whether, further, it is reasonable to look in the direction of Philo for this, is sensibly approached. Generous footnotes offer parallels and contrasts, and comment on obscurities and puzzles in both text and content in a well-balanced and helpful way. There is no doubt that advanced students (and even the occasional scholar?) will also benefit from introduction and notes alike.

In three small ways the volume might have been made easier to use: an alphabetical rather than a chronological bibliography, an index, and headings for each page indicating which source is reproduced on it would all have been welcome. There are very few inaccuracies, though on p. 39 *polloi* is misleadingly rendered as 'several' (124), while on p. 41 *epitropoi* are oddly presented as 'procurators' (135). I find myself puzzled as to how Philo's account of the Essenes might have been 'over-idealized', rather than just 'idealized' (p. 19).
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There is an oft-told tale of a famous scientist who gave a public lecture on