The book contains nine papers delivered at the conference named in the subtitle with one additional invited essay by F.M. Cross. In a short introduction the editors summarize the papers, and the essays follow without being subdivided into sections or by topic. The first two deal with messianism, the next six with a variety of textual and thematic subjects, and the last two with recent technological advances.

The two papers on messianism were contributed by F.M. Cross and F. García Martínez. Cross's essay ("Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse [4Q246]") provides a defence of the view that "a consistent doctrine of only two messiahs—one of Aaron and one of Israel—is evident throughout the sectarian Qumran literature" (2). While he covers a number of texts, he treats 4Q246 in more detail by supplying the Aramaic text, his suggestions for restoration, a translation, and explanatory notes. Against Milik, he thinks that the messianic titles "Son of God" and "Son of the Most High" are applied to a positive character. The Hebrew forms ה'ג and נו in an Aramaic text make it "most implausible that they be applied to any but an Israelite king" (12). If they were parts of titles claimed by a pagan king as Milik thinks, the Aramaic forms ה'ג and נו would have been employed. Despite Cross's arguments, it is difficult to dissociate the text from the pattern in the Book of Daniel in which the last world power rules and its king makes blasphemous claims before the triumph of the holy ones. That triumph occurs in 4Q246 after the section containing the titles in question. García Martínez’s paper, besides including a lengthy bibliography of recent studies on Qumran messianism (n. 4, pp. 15-17), concentrates on two problems. The first is the character whom he calls a heavenly messiah in 11QMelchizedek and in 4Q246. The one in 4Q246 is "an eschatological liberator of angelic (or nonhuman) nature, a figure similar in functions to those which 11QMelch ascribes to Melchizedek...." (27). The individual in the two texts is heavenly and human at the same time; he is an almost divinized messiah, a being like the son of man. The second problem he addresses is the messianic character of the eschatological prophet. In his
understanding, the eschatological interpreter of the law is the eschatological prophet, the messianic prophet. Whatever one thinks of the Son of God/Son of the Most High in 4Q246, it is not obvious that he should be correlated with Melchizedek. Moreover, it is more likely that “interpreter of the law” is one of the titles given to the priestly messiah than that it is an epithet for the eschatological prophet.

The next six essays furnish the reader with analyses of other sorts of topics in Qumran studies. E. Tov (“Scribal Markings in the Texts from the Judean Desert”) provides a catalog of the instances in which eight different kinds of scribal markings are found in the manuscripts. As he makes clear in a number of cases, the precise function of the markings often is not apparent, although conjectures may be offered and comparisons drawn with practices of Greek scribes. It is very useful to have the data set forth so comprehensively, but Tov also thinks that the markings may be part of a larger picture: they are “almost exclusively limited to the texts written according to the Qumran scribal practice” (70; see also p. 42). He supplies 17 figures that illustrate the shape of the signs as they appear in the texts. E. Ulrich (“Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text”) proposes that “the main lines in the picture of the history of the biblical text are formed by the deliberate activity of a series of creative scribes who produced new or multiple literary editions of the books of the Bible” (88). He clarifies what is meant by the notion of variant literary editions and deals with the place of individual variant readings and orthographic differences in the process of evaluating relations between manuscripts. In contrast to a widely held view, Ulrich properly argues that llQPsd is a variant literary edition of the Psalter and that its use of the paleo-Hebrew script for the tetragrammaton does not mark it as non-biblical. D. Parry (“4QSama and the Tetragrammaton”) examines the occurrences of the name הָיָּדָר in the first Samuel manuscript from cave 4 in comparison with the MT and the LXX. He finds that 4QSamaa agrees with the LXX twelve times against the MT, one time with the MT against the LXX; also there are four cases in which 4QSamaa is independent. The MT prefers to use הָיָּדָר rather than הָיָּדָר.

T. Elgvin contributes a paper on “Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation according to Sapiential Work A.” He argues that “Sap. Work A represents a bridge between the apocalyptic Enoch literature and the clearly defined sectarian community” (164). He begins with general comments about the work and the places where eschatological themes (e.g., בְּּדִיוּ הָרִים, division of history into periods) are treated. In the sapiential work a lay leader addresses the enlightened members of his community on everyday matters but also on the hope of the righteous and the fact that knowledge of God’s secrets (which are revealed to the elect) offers perspective on day-to-day matters (129). The community behind the text is not as hierarchical as the yahad and predates it. The sapiential text he dates to ca. 160-130 BCE and believes it is from the wider Essene movement. It illustrates the strong contacts between scribal and