The script is typical of late Second Temple period. Below the pentagram another inscription reads: "Peace, peace, amen." During the Byzantine period monks lived in the caves and inscribed crosses and Syriac and Greek inscriptions in red paint on the rock walls and on the sides of the cistern and the *miqveh*. These were noticed already in 1928 by M. Marcoff and D. Chitty. This complex was reexamined in 1978 by a team of scholars on behalf of the École Biblique et Archéologique Français in Jerusalem, who had published a plan and the Syriac inscriptions on the plastered wall of the *miqveh*—a verse from *Psalm* 29.3 repeating three times: "The voice of the Lord is upon the waters." The three Greek inscriptions accompanied by crosses read: IC XC; IC XC NI KA; and IC XC *Basileue*.

The western group of caves consisted of four systems, one above the other toward the top of the cliff, interconnected by a tunnel and rock-hewn steps. The water collection system served all four systems of caves. Its plastered rock-cut channel collected runoff from the cliff, which was then directed to the cisterns as it descended from level to level. Typical shards from the time of of the Bar Kokhba Revolt were found in this group of caves. Other finds from this period, including five bronze coins, were found in el-Ji Cave, the largest cave on the southern bank of the wadi (Eshel, 1997).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Eshel, H. "Jerusalem No More." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 23.6 (1997), 48, 73.

Finkelstein, I., ed. *Archaeological Survey of the Hill Country of Benjamin* (sites no. 232, 543, 544). Jerusalem, 1993.

Halloun, M., and R. Rubin. "Palestinian Syriac Inscription from 'En Sueinit'." *Liber Annuus* 31 (1981), 291–298, pls. 59–62.

Hirschfeld, Y. "List of Byzantine Monasteries in the Judean Desert." In *Christian Archaeology in the Holy Land: New Discoveries [Archaeological Essays in Honour of Virgilio C. Corbo ofm]*, edited by G. C. Bottini, L. DiSegni, and E. Alliata, pp. 44–45. Jerusalem, 1990.

Patrich, J. "Hiding Caves and Jewish Inscriptions on the Cliffs of Nahal Michmas" (in Hebrew). *Eretz Israel* (Avigad Volume) 18 (1985), 153–166, pls. 24–27.

Patrich, J. "Inscriptions araméennes juives dans les grottes d'el Aleiliyat, Wadi Suweinit." *Revue biblique* 92 (1985), 265–273.

Patrich, J. "Chronique Archéologique: Refuges juifs dans les gorges du Wadi Mukhamas." *Revue biblique* 96 (1989), pp. 235–239, pl. XV.

Patrich, J. "Hideouts in the Judean Wilderness." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 15.5 (1989), 32–42.

Patrich, J., and R. Rubin. "Les grottes de el-Aleiliyat et la laure de Saint Firmin." *Revue biblique* 91 (1984), 379–387.

JOSEPH PATRICH

MIDRASHIM. The term *midrash* in the context of early rabbinic literature has three levels of meaning: the activity of interpretive study of Hebrew scriptures, the discrete exegetical results of such study, and the literary collections (*midrashim*) of such exegeses. Within the last

level, it is common first to distinguish chronologically between the collections. The earliest ones, containing Midrashic traditions attributed to the tannaitic sages (c.70–220 CE), are referred to as tannaitic *midrashim* or *midreshei halakhah* ("legal *midrashim*"). Both terms are somewhat imprecise, since these collections in their present form are most likely the products of amoraic redactors of the mid- to late-third century CE and their contents are both halakhic (legal) and aggadic (narrative/hortatory), depending on the mix of law and narrative in the biblical books upon which they comment. The biblical books covered, but not necessarily completely, by these collections are *Exodus* (by the *midrash Mekhilta*), *Leviticus* (*Sifra*), and *Numbers* and *Deuteronomy* (*Sifrei*), with evidence of there having been two recensions of each collection, only one of which in most cases is fully preserved, the other requiring reconstruction.

In the later Midrashic commentaries of the amoraic period (third through fifth centuries CE), a further distinction is drawn between those that take the form of running expository commentaries following the order of the biblical books (the Pentateuch and the Five Scrolls, but not the Prophets), and those that are more thematically and homiletically structured around the opening verses of weekly or festival scriptural lections. Among the latter, particular scholarly attention has been paid to the rhetorical artistry of the *mashal* ("parable") and the *petiḥta'* ("proem"). But this distinction between expository and homiletical collections should not be drawn too sharply, as nascent homiletical structures can be found in the earlier (tannaitic) collections as well.

As to language, both early and late Midrashic collections of the rabbinic period are written in rabbinic Hebrew, but the later (amoraic) collections contain a higher admixture of Palestinian Aramaic and aramaized Hebrew, in all cases with a liberal peppering of Greek and Latin loanwords. While these *midrashim* are all collective, edited anthologies rather than authored or pseudepigraphic compositions, their constituent traditions are frequently (more so in the amoraic collections) attributed to named rabbinic sages, the veracity of such attributions being difficult to determine with certainty.

Although the extant collections of rabbinic *midrash* all date in their present form to the third century CE and later, it is generally assumed that they transmit earlier traditions, deriving not only from earlier rabbinic generations, but from prerabbinic antecedents of Second Temple times. Until the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the evidence for such prerabbinic Jewish scriptural interpretation was limited largely to writings preserved in Greek and other non-Semitic languages, and transmitted, with varying degrees of tampering, by later Christian denominations. The extent to which such writings could be iden-

tified with specific Jewish social groups was extremely limited. Even the Hebrew word *midrash*, in its rabbinic sense of biblical interpretation, was unknown in prerabbinic Jewish sources. Thus, it was difficult to judge whether, or to what extent, rabbinic *midrash*'s own claims for great antiquity (extending ultimately to Moses at Mount Sinai) had any basis in fact. In the area of Jewish law, did the rabbinically preserved legal exegeses that derived rabbinic legal theory and practice from scriptural verses represent scriptural justifications of received legal traditions, originally transmitted nonexegetically, or the very methods by which Jewish law developed in the Second Temple period? In other words, was Jewish law of Second Temple times taught and transmitted through or independently of Midrashic interpretation? While the discovery and publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls and related literature have not fully answered these questions, they have revolutionized the way in which they are approached.

To begin with, the Hebrew word *midrash* appears some eight times in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Rule of the Community from Qumran Cave 1, hereafter, 1QRule of the Community, 1QS vi.24, viii.15, viii.26; Florilegium, 4Q174 1.14; 4Q269 (verso); Damascus Document, CD xx.6; Damascus Document³, 4Q266 5.i.17 (restored), 11.20; Damascus Document^c, 4Q270 7.ii.15), in five cases of which it is followed by the word *torah*. However, in such usages often it is not clear whether the word *midrash* has the specific connotation of scriptural exegesis or the more general sense of study. The same ambiguity pertains in the Dead Sea Scrolls to the use of the verb *lidrosh* in conjunction with a text or body of laws.

With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, many exegetical traditions, formerly known only from early rabbinic *midrash*, are now known to have circulated in late Second Temple times, minimally within the Qumran community and related groups, but probably more broadly. This sharing of exegetical traditions is as true for legal as for nonlegal understandings of scripture. Less certain is whether or to what extent these shared traditions are the products of direct or indirect contact between the Qumran sectaries and the Pharisees or the later rabbis, independent exegesis by the two groups, or a broader, more commonly shared body of tradition upon which both drew.

When we examine the variety of literary forms in which the two communities collected and transmitted their exegetical traditions, there are striking differences as well as similarities to be noted. For example, we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls some of our earliest known running scriptural commentaries, in the form of the *pesharim* to biblical books of the Prophets and *Psalms*. [*See* Pesharim.] These tend to decode in sequence the terms of the biblical verses in specific reference to events, personalities, or groups in the life and history of the Qumran community, much like the interpretation of a dream, thereby affirming that the prophetic predictions have been or will shortly be actualized in the community. The term *pesher* and its form bear striking resemblance to the later rabbinic exegetical form and cognate term *petirah*. However, there are significant differences between the two. Rabbinic *midrash* often decodes an indeterminate scriptural verse or phrase, but not just from the Prophets, so as to refer intertextually to a specific biblical figure or event. Furthermore, it commonly provides a series of such decodings, each referring to a different referent or set of referents. Thus, rabbinic *midrash* commonly adduces a multiple of intrascriptural decoding possibilities, whereas the Qumran *pesher* commonly gives a single extrascriptural one. Finally, the rabbinic *petirah*, like rabbinic *midrash* in general, achieves its results through the exegetical juxtaposition of verses from different parts of the Hebrew scriptures, while the continuous *pesharim* refer only to the base verse being commented upon. However, intertextual interpretation is displayed in the several noncontinuous, or thematic, *pesher* or *pesher*-like interpretations in the Damascus Document (e.g., CD vi.2–11, vii.9–viii.2) and the Florilegium. Similarly, the thematic stringing together of scriptural verses from diverse locations (rabbinic *harizah*) is evidenced in Catena^{a-b} (4Q177, 182). All these Qumran forms, however, lack the dialogical rhetoric of rabbinic *midrash* (for example, question and answer, the rhetorical raising of alternative exegetical possibilities to be disproved) and the attribution of particular interpretations to named authorities.

Although Qumran texts evidence, besides the *pesher* terminology, stock terms for scriptural citation (e.g., *asher katuv/amar*; "as it is written/said") similar to those in rabbinic *midrash*, the frequency of actual scriptural citation is far less in Dead Sea Scroll interpretation than in rabbinic *midrash*. In some cases, especially in Miqtsat Ma'asei ha-Torah (MMT^{a-e}, 4Q394–399), what follows such seeming citation terminology cannot be identified with any known biblical verse but rather represents a biblical paraphrase or common biblical idea. [*See* Miqtsat Ma'asei ha-Torah.] Much more commonly, and especially in legal texts such as Temple Scroll^a (11Q19) and the Damascus Document, the Dead Sea Scrolls present the results of the community's (or its leadership's) exegetical activity in nonexegetical, paraphrastic form (referred to by some as "rewritten Bible"). [*See* Rewritten Bible.] Thus, as in early rabbinic literature where laws are taught both exegetically (*midrash*) and nonexegetically (Mishnah), both forms can be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but with a larger preponderance of the latter. So, while the Dead Sea Scrolls contain many antecedents to rab-

binic exegetical traditions, the fact that the exegetical underpinnings of those antecedents are expressed more implicitly than explicitly makes the search for antecedents to specific rabbinic hermeneutical methods rather difficult and the results minimal. Unlike early rabbinic literature, there is no evidence among the Dead Sea Scrolls for the explicit articulation of the hermeneutical rules that govern exegesis.

Being aware of these differences and limitations, it is important to acknowledge significant similarities between the two communities' employment of scriptural exegesis in relation to their respective social and ideological self-understandings. For both communities, the ritualized activity of interpretive study of scriptures was a central religious activity that defined the community and socialized its members to its ethos and place within the larger sacred history of Israel. In both cases, the scrutiny of scripture required close attention to the particulars of scriptural language in its smallest details, wherein lay deeper levels of meaning to be uncovered. For both communities, such highly engaged activity of *midrash* was not simply a utility for deriving or justifying their laws and teachings. Rather, it was a form of intensive religious expression and experience in itself, veritably a form of worship, a locus for experiencing the divine presence in their midst. Socially, such study strengthened the bonds of religious community (whether conceived at Qumran as *yaḥad* or among the rabbinic sages as *ḥavurah*). As expressed by the Damascus Document (CD xx.10–13), the community inhabited a *beit Torah* ("house/place of Torah"), in which their continual *midrash ha-Torah* ("study/interpretation of Torah") provided the medium for ongoing revelation along a divinely ordained path to redemption (1QS viii.12–16). Similar understandings of *talmud Torah* ("study of Torah") inform early rabbinic self-understandings of how to know and experience God's presence and will in the present while awaiting final (albeit deferred) redemption.

Both communities had a twofold diet of study, however differently denoted and transmitted: for the rabbis, written and oral Torah (Miqra' and Mishnah); for the Qumran sectaries, that which was revealed (*nigleh*) to all Israel (the commonly held "Torah of Moses," by various names) and that which was hidden (*nistar*) from the rest of Israel but revealed to them alone (the community's "statutes," by various names). For both groups, scriptural interpretation was a way of interlinking the two bodies of revelation to one another, thereby engaging them as one.

Yet, once again, acknowledgment of these socially functional similarities between rabbinic *midrash* and Qumran exegetical activity should not distract us from their no less significant differences. The Qumran twofold study curriculum draws no performative distinction, as

does rabbinic *midrash*, between "written" and "oral" components. Rabbinic *midrash* stresses that both forms of Torah were revealed through Moses to the whole Israelite people at Mount Sinai, even as the unfolding of the oral Torah was to be continuous throughout subsequent generations. By contrast, Qumran writings suggest that what had previously been hidden (and continued to be hidden from the rest of Israel) was disclosed to the community of the renewed covenant alone, in the period after the destruction of the First Temple, beginning with the Teacher of Righteousness and continuing through the succeeding generations of the community under the guidance of its inspired teachers. While both communities sought to uncover fuller and deeper meanings of the Hebrew scriptures through scriptural study and interpretation, they related this activity to the larger body of Israel and its sacred history quite differently. In the case of rabbinic *midrash*, scripture's progressively uncovered meanings are thought to have been present, at least potentially, already at Mount Sinai and to have been revealed, at least ideally, to all Israel from Mount Sinai on. Among the Qumran sectaries, those meanings were a newly revealed dispensation to the community of the renewed covenant alone at the onset of the End of Days.

[*See also* Interpretation of Scriptures.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baumgarten, Joseph. "The Unwritten Law in the Pre-Rabbinic Period." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 3 (1972), 7–29. Contrasts the rabbinic emphasis on the oral nature of rabbinic teaching with the relative absence of such a doctrine among the rabbinic antecedents, especially as evidenced in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Bernstein, Moshe J. "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-Citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Pesher Technique." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994), 30–70.

Bernstein, Moshe J. "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT." In *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein, pp. 29–51. Atlanta, 1996. Considers the nature and forms of scriptural interpretation in the recently published Miqtsat Ma'asei ha-Torah.

Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 29. Sheffield, 1985. In chapter 1, analogies are drawn between early rabbinic *midrash* and Qumran exegesis.

Brownlee, William H. "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectarians of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Biblical Archaeologist* 14 (1951), 54–76.

Campbell, Jonathan G. *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 228. Berlin, 1995. Limits examination of scriptural exegesis in the Damascus Document to its hortatory, nonlegal sections.

Dimant, Devorah. "The Hebrew Bible in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Torah Quotations in the *Damascus Document*." In *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, edited by Michael Fishbane, Emanuel Tov, and Weston W. Fields, pp. 113–122 (Hebrew section). Winona Lake, Ind., 1992. Argues that explicit legal *midrash* in the Damascus Document is specifically employed for sectarian rules

that are at polemical odds with those of other groups (e.g., the Pharisees).

Fishbane, Michael. "The Qumran-Pesher and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics." In *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 97–114. Jerusalem, 1977.

Fishbane, Michael. "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran." In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Chritianity*, edited by Martin Jan Mulder, pp. 339–377. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section Two: The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and Talmud, 1. Assen, 1988. Provides an excellent overview.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." In *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, pp. 3–58. Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study, 5. Missoula, Mont., 1974. Originally published in *New Testament Studies* 7 (1960–1961), 297–333. Detailed study of the terminology of scriptural citation in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Fraade, Steven D. *From Tradition to Commentary: Torah and Its Interpretation in the Midrash Sifre to Deuteronomy.* Albany, N.Y., 1991. See, especially, chapter 1, for a comparison of rabbinic and Qumran forms of scriptural commentary, and chapter 3, for the social role of midrashic interpretation in the self-understanding of the rabbinic sages.

Fraade, Steven D. "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993), 46–49. Discusses the place of scriptural study and interpretation in the Qumran community, with comparisons to rabbinic *midrash*.

Fraade, Steven D. "Looking for Legal Midrash at Qumran." In *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Michael E. Stone and Esther Chazon, pp. 59–79. Leiden, 1998. Discusses the relative absence of explicit legal *midrash* in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books.* Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 8. Washington, D.C., 1979.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran.* Philadelphia and Jerusalem, 1994. See, especially, chapters 13–14 for an excellent survey of scriptural interpretation and the *pesharim* among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Silberman, Lou H. "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher (1 QpHab)." *Revue de Qumrân* 3 (1961), 323–364.

Swanson, Dwight D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT.* Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 14. Leiden, 1995.

Vermes, Geza. "Bible Interpretation at Qumran." In *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies. Vol. 20: Yigael Yadin Memorial Volume*, edited by Amnon Ben-Tor, Jonas C. Greenfield, and Abraham Malamat, pp. 184–191. Jerusalem, 1989.

Vermes, Geza. "Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34 (1989), 493–508.

STEVEN D. FRAADE

MILIK, JÓZEF T.

MILIK, JÓZEF T. (1922–), Franco-Polish Orientalist and editor of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Born on 24 March 1922 in Seroczyn, Poland, Milik studied at the Boleslaw Prus Lyceum in Siedlce and then at the Major Seminary of Płock and Warsaw. In 1944 he began his studies of ancient and modern languages at the Catholic Institute of Lublin. From 1946 to 1951 he studied at the Pontifical Oriental Institute and Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome.

In 1950 Milik published a series of scholarly notes on the spelling, phonetic, and textual variants of the biblical manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls, in particular Isaiah[a] and [b] from Cave 1 at Qumran (1QIsa[a–b]). In 1951, he was one of the first to publish a translation, in Latin, of the Rule of the Community from Cave 1 at Qumran (1QS), of which he later published the text in volume 1 of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Oxford, 1955). He identified one fragment as belonging either to the end of *1 Enoch* or to the beginning of *Noah*; in fact it was the largest fragment of a work that, in the *editio princeps*, by Milik himself, is called Noah (1Q19).

These scholarly studies attracted the notice of Roland de Vaux, director of the École Biblique et Archéologique Française, president of the Trustees of the Palestine Archeological Museum and codirector of the excavations of Cave 1 and Khirbet Qumran. De Vaux invited Milik to Jerusalem to participate in the study of the hundreds of manuscript fragments from Cave 1. In 1952 Milik worked with Dominique Barthélemy in organizing, distributing, and classifying manuscript fragments found in Cave 1 during the excavations or purchased on the antiquities market.

In 1952 Cave 3 was discovered by the team of Roland de Vaux, to which Milik belonged. This increased Milik's on-site work and complemented his work as an epigraphist. He took part in excavating Cave 4 and unearthed hundreds of fragments. He also took part in the discovery of Cave 5 and excavating Caves 5 and 6, while workers from the University of Louvain excavated the nearby site at Khirbet Mird. [*See* Mird, Khirbet.]

Naturalized as a French citizen, Milik was admitted as a researcher to the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris, an institution of which he was a member until his retirement in 1987. At first detached to work in Jerusalem, other researchers later joined him, working on an international and interdenominational team recruited by de Vaux. But all concurred that Milik was the most active, quick, and effective member in the work of grouping, classifying, and deciphering the fragments. He was the scholar who developed the universally accepted system of *sigla*, by which the manuscripts are cited (Barthélemy and Milik, 1955, pp. 46–48). De Vaux made him the pillar of the team and entrusted to him the publication of the fragmentary and extremely difficult manuscripts from the caves of Wadi Murabba'at. [*See* Murabba'at, Wadi, *article on* Written Material.] (Benoit, Milik, and de Vaux, 1961).

Milik deciphered the hitherto unknown Aramaic cur-