feld excavated above Ein Gedi, see Yizhar Hirschfeld, "A Settlement of Hermits above 'En Gedi," *Tel Aviv* 27 (2000): 103-55. For a different interpretation of Hirschfeld's site, see David Amit and Jodi Magness, "Not a Settlement of Hermits or Essenes: A Response to Y. Hirschfeld, A Settlement of Hermits above 'En Gedi," *Tel Aviv* 27 (2000): 273-85. For the burnt Torah scrolls from the Ein Gedi synagogue (with bibliographical references), see Dan Barag, "En-Gedi," in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* ed. Ephraim Stern (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993) 2:409.

CHAPTER 4

The Buildings and Occupation Phases of Qumran

A Description of Qumran and Its Chronology according to de Vaux

De Vaux divided the sectarian settlement at Qumran into three phases, which he termed "Period Ia," "Period Ib," and "Period II." A late Iron Age settlement preceded these periods, and they were followed by a brief phase of Roman occupation referred to by de Vaux as Period III. The "periods" were defined on the basis of stratigraphic and architectural evidence (in other words, they were based on discernable changes in the occupation levels and architecture). In approximate terms, de Vaux dated Period Ia to the third quarter of the 2nd century B.C.E. (roughly 130-100 B.C.E.), Period Ib from about 100 B.C.E. to 31 B.C.E., and Period II from 4-1 B.C.E. to 68 C.E. Here I present a brief description of the remains from each of these periods. We first follow de Vaux's chronology, and afterwards we shall review my revised chronology for the occupation phases. In later chapters we will examine many of the issues raised here in greater detail (such as the animal bone deposits, the water system, and the cemetery). In this discussion, I present some of the remains associated with the destruction of the site at the end of Period II under Period Ib. I have done this in cases where the features remained the same during both periods (for example, evidence for the wooden door in L4, which was burned in the destruction at the end of Period II, is described under Period Ib, since this room would have had a wooden door in Period Ib).

In all of the occupation periods, the buildings were constructed of rough (uncut) field stones held together by mud mortar. Some of the walls,

especially the partition walls inside the buildings, were made of mud brick. They were poorly preserved, having collapsed or reverted to mud over the course of the last 2000 years. The corners and areas around the windows and doors (thresholds, sills, lintels, posts) were constructed of cut stones to provide structural reinforcement. The interior walls of at least some of the rooms were covered with plain mud plaster, and the floors were usually of packed earth (and in a few cases were plastered or cobbled). Jars sunk into the floors of rooms were used for storage, mostly of food items such as grain. There is evidence for windows and built-in cupboards in some of the walls. A number of rooms in the settlement had a second-story level. The roofs were flat and were made of relatively short wooden beams (obtained locally from desert trees such as date palms and acacia) overlaid by layers of reeds, palm branches, and mud. When the settlement was destroyed by the Romans in 68 C.E., the wooden beams and thatch burned and the roofs collapsed onto the floors of the rooms. In a number of places, de Vaux found chunks of burnt mud from the roofs in which the reed impressions were still visible. The wooden doors also burned, as indicated by clusters of iron nails found lying on the floors next to some of the doorways. A burnt mat was found covering part of the floor in the "scriptorium" (L30; see below). The flat roofs created open terraces which could have been used for various purposes. The channels and pools of the elaborate hydraulic system were dug into the marl terrace and were covered with thick coats of plaster to prevent the water from seeping into the ground. Because the latest main occupation phase (Period II) is best preserved, it is often difficult to determine the plans and functions of rooms during the earlier phases (Periods Ia and Ib).

The description of the archaeological remains presented in this chapter lays the necessary groundwork for the discussions in the following chapters. Readers are encouraged to consult the relevant plans of the site and locate on the plans the locus numbers that are mentioned in the text. This will make it easier to follow the discussion (for a plan of the site showing all loci, see Fig. 5).

Iron Age

The site of Qumran was first inhabited during the late Iron Age (8th-7th centuries B.C.E.). De Vaux found that the foundations of some of the walls, which lay at a lower level than the others, were embedded in a layer of ash containing numerous sherds of late Iron Age date. Other finds from this phase included a jar handle stamped with the paleo-Hebrew inscription *lamelekh* ("[belonging] to the king"). De Vaux reconstructed the Iron Age settlement

as a rectangular building with a row of rooms along the east side of an open courtyard. An enclosure attached to the west side of the building contained a large round cistern (L110) that was filled by surface runoff. This cistern remained in use until the destruction of the sectarian settlement at the end of Period II (though in later phases it was fed by water channels connected to an aqueduct). The long wall running southwards from the southeast corner of the settlement to Wadi Qumran, which encloses the esplanade to the south of the site, belongs to this phase and remained in use until the end of Period II. De Vaux noted similarities between the layout of this settlement and Israelite strongholds in the Buqeia and Negev. He suggested that the destruction of this settlement occurred at the time of the fall of the kingdom of Judah (ca. 586 B.C.E.).

Period Ia (see Fig. 6)

The site of Qumran had been abandoned for several hundred years when it was occupied by a new population that established the sectarian settlement. According to de Vaux, this first occupation phase was modest in size and short-lived. Parts of the ruined Iron Age building were rebuilt and reoccupied. The round Iron Age cistern was cleared, and a new channel and decantation basin (L119) were built to supply it and two new rectangular pools (L117-L118) that were dug nearby. Surface runoff was collected from the area to the south by a small channel that fed L117. A room or enclosure (L101-L102) was built in this area. Rooms were constructed around the Iron Age cistern (L115, L116, L125, L126, L127) and to the north (L129, L133, L140, L141). De Vaux had difficulty distinguishing the remains of Period Ia in the eastern half of the settlement. Some of the walls in the area of the central courtyard were reused and the south wall of L34-L36 (on the south side of the courtyard) was constructed at this time. De Vaux attributed to this phase two side-by-side potters' kilns (L66) in the southeastern corner of this part of the site. They were covered by the steps leading down to a pool constructed during the next phase.

De Vaux had difficulty dating Period Ia because no coins were associated with this phase, and because the few potsherds he recovered were identical in type with those of the next phase. The fact that the end of Period Ia was not marked by a destruction makes it difficult to identify pottery associated with this phase. Because coins of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.E.) were plentiful in the next phase (Period Ib), de Vaux assumed that Period Ia must have begun before that time. He therefore dated Period Ia to the reign of John

Hyrcanus I (135-104 B.C.E.). Only one coin of John Hyrcanus and one of Judah Aristobulus (104-103 B.C.E.) were recovered in the excavations at Qumran.

Period Ib (see Fig. 7)

According to de Vaux, the sectarian settlement at Qumran acquired its definitive form when it expanded greatly in size during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus. In addition to the large number of coins of this king, six silver and five bronze Seleucid coins dating to the years around 130 B.C.E. were found in Period Ib contexts. The main entrance to the settlement was through a gate in an enclosure wall (south of L141) to the north of a square, two-story high tower (L9-L11) (see Fig. 10). Two more entrances to the site were located by the small stepped pool to the northwest (L138), and by L84 in the area of the potters' workshop on the eastern side of the settlement. The tower is preserved to the beginning of the second-story level. Its ground-floor rooms were used for storage (the ground-floor locus numbers in the tower are differentiated from the second-story rooms by the letter "A," for example L10A) (see Fig. 11). A staircase consisting of wooden steps winding around a square pillar occupied the southwest corner of the tower (L8; for another example of a spiral staircase see L35 below). This kind of staircase is mentioned in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls. For example, the houses in a new Jerusalem at the end of days were supposed to have spiral staircases to the second floor: "And a pillar is inside the staircase around which the stairs ri[se]" (5Q15 2.4; the New Jerusalem texts). Even the ideal temple described in the Temple Scroll was envisaged as having this kind of staircase: "You [shall make] a staircase north of the Temple, a square house. . . . (There shall be) a square column in its middle, in the center; its width four cubits on each side around which the stairs wind" (11QT^{a} 30.4-6). Staircases could also be built alongside a wall, turning a 180-degree angle at a landing midway up (examples are found in L13 and L113, as we shall see).

The location of the tower in the middle of the north side of the settlement indicates that it served as a watch tower. This is because, like today, most people approaching Qumran in antiquity would have come from the direction of Jerusalem and Jericho to the north. There was no entrance to the tower at the ground level. Instead, it was accessed at the second-story level by climbing the staircase in L13 to the south. This staircase consisted of a flight of stone steps attached to the south wall of L13. The steps rose towards the west wall of the room, where there was a landing. From there the steps turned 180 degrees and continued up along the north wall of the room, supported by the partition separating L13 from L12. At the top of the steps, a wooden gangway

or bridge leading north provided access to the tower at the second-story level. The staircase also provided access to the second-story rooms above L1, L2, and L30 (see below). Because the tower could only be entered at the second-story level, the staircase in its southwest corner provided access to the rooms at the ground-floor level. De Vaux noted that the isolation of the tower reflects the inhabitants' concern for security. It was separated from the rest of the settlement by two open spaces on the east (L18) and south (L12, L17), each of which were closed at the end by doors.

The tower guarded the main point of entry into the settlement. Those entering by way of the gate to the north of the tower or the gate by the stepped pool to the northwest (L138) proceeded south through another gate (L128) at the western foot of the tower. This gave access to a passage or corridor that divided the site into two main parts: an eastern sector dominated by the tower in the northwest corner (de Vaux called this sector the "main building"), and a western sector centered around the round Iron Age cistern (L110) (referred to by de Vaux as the "secondary building"). The eastern sector (main building) incorporated the remains of the Iron Age building and measured ca. 30 × 37 m. It consisted of rooms grouped around a central, open-air courtyard (L25, L37). The large room on the north side of the courtyard (L38-L41) was a kitchen in Period II, but its function in Period Ib is unknown. A doorway opened from this room into what de Vaux thought was an enclosed but unroofed courtyard to the north (L19, L27, on the east side of the tower). Other rooms were located on the east side of this conjectured courtyard (L40, L46).

During the first season (1951), de Vaux and Harding excavated a group of three rooms (L1, L2, L4) in the southeast corner of the main building (see Fig. 12). These were entered through corridors L12 and L13 to the south of the tower. The fact that the cobblestone floor in L1 and L2 continued beneath the wall and doorway that divided them indicates they were originally one room (L1). Cupboards were built into both sides of the wall separating these rooms (L1-L2 and L4). A low (20-cm. high) plastered bench encircling the interior of L4 suggests that it was used as an assembly room. Iron nails lying on the packed chalk floor of this room belonged to the wooden door in the north wall. Based on their placement and dimensions, de Vaux concluded that the door had been constructed of four wooden planks and was about 2.25 m. high. A small basin or niche built into the wall to the east of this doorway could be fed by a channel from the outer (north) side of the wall. De Vaux suggested that this was a receptacle through which members in closed sessions in the room could be served food or water without being disturbed. In addition to providing access to the tower, the staircase in L13 (mentioned above) led to a roof terrace above L4 and to the second-story rooms above L1, L2, and L30. Ac-

cording to de Vaux, during this phase L30 (the "scriptorium") had a large open bay window on its north side and could have been used as an assembly hall. A burned palm trunk found in the debris that filled L4 would have been placed in a posthole that was still visible in the middle of the plastered floor of the room. It supported the ceiling beams of the roof terrace above.

A group of small basins in the southeast corner of the central courtyard of the main building (L34) was emptied by a system of channels to the east (see Figs. 15-17). An intact cylindrical jar with a Hebrew name crudely painted in red on the shoulder was set into one of the basins. The jar's unusual double rim and the red paint coating its interior suggest that this was an installation for dyeing wool. To the east of the central courtyard and separated from it by a wall, a toilet was found (L51; see Chapter 6) (see Fig. 37). This room opened onto two adjacent stepped pools (L49, L50). The steps of L49 (designated L48) covered the potters' kilns of Period Ia (L66). De Vaux identified the area next to these pools (L52), which contained a stone basin and a large sump, as a "washing-place." A group of bronze and iron tools was stored nearby (L53, on the north side of L52; the tools are listed in Humbert and Chambon's volume under L52).

The long wall that abutted the outside of L51 continued south to Wadi Qumran and enclosed the esplanade. The triangular space between this long wall and the southeast corner of the main building was occupied by small storage rooms or workshops separated from each other by thin mud-brick partitions (L44, L45, L59-L61). A bronze jug and pottery vessels including two cylindrical jars were piled in L45, L59, and L61. The walls of L61 were of unbaked mud brick covered with mud plaster. A deep cupboard was built into the west wall. Three jars were embedded in the floor of L61, and two cylindrical plastered pits or silos were sunk into the floor against the south wall. A cylindrical jar embedded in the southwest corner of the room rested on a cylinder of unbaked earth that resembled a silo. A potters' workshop (L64 and L84) and a large stepped pool (L71) were located immediately to the south.

The potters' workshop included a shallow plastered basin fed by the main water channel in which the clay was washed (L75), a pit where the clay was left to mature (L70), a mixing-trough adjoining this pit, and a stone-lined pit for a potters' wheel just to the north (L65). Two circular kilns were located to the north of these installations just inside the long wall (L64, which is the larger of the two kilns, and L84) (see Fig. 18). Steps descending to the space between the kilns provided the potters with access to the furnace. This space was filled with ash and potsherds. An iron hook found on the steps was apparently used to stir the fire. The interior of each kiln was divided into an upper and lower chamber by a shelf pierced with flues. The hot air from a furnace in the lower chamber rose through the flues and fired the pots placed on the shelf. De Vaux noted that the openings of the two kilns faced each other, enabling the potters to take advantage of the prevailing north-south winds along the Dead Sea.

The largest room in the settlement (L77; measuring 22 m. long × 4.50 m. wide) is located to the south of the main building and functioned as an assembly hall (see Fig. 28). A circular paved area that de Vaux identified as a speaker's platform was found at the western end of the room. The adjacent pantry (L86 in Period Ib; divided into L86, L87, L89 in Period II) containing a store of over 1000 dishes indicates that L77 was also used as a communal dining room (see Figs. 29, 30). The walls and floor of L77 were plastered. During Period Ib, its floor sloped gently down from the western end to a doorway in the southeast wall, and from there rose slightly to the eastern end of the room. A water channel that opened through the doorway in the northwest wall (from L54) made it possible to wash the floor, with the water draining through the doorway in the southeast wall (to L98).

The rooms in the western sector (secondary building), which centered around the Iron Age cistern, included storerooms, industrial installations, and workshops. An open-air courtyard to the west of the round cistern (L111) gave access on the north and west to two rooms (L120 and L121) that were subdivided by thin partition walls and were apparently used for storage (see Fig. 32). L111 had a doorway opening south to L103, one in its north wall (leading into L120), and one in its west wall (leading into L121). The doorway in the west wall was flanked by two more doorways, in which cupboards were installed — the southern one facing into L121 and the northern one facing into L111. L123, a room at the northwest end of L120, and the exterior (west) wall of L121 were reinforced with stone revetment (buttressing) because of their position at the edge of the ravine. A hoard of silver Tyrian tetradrachmas was discovered buried beneath the floor of L120. L115 and L116 (constructed in Period Ia), which adjoined the channel feeding the round cistern, had a plastered floor and seems to have been used for some industry requiring water. L125 was also used as a workshop, and L126 was a storeroom. The functions of L100 (an open-air space adjoining the water channel to the south of the round cistern), L101 (opening to the north towards the round cistern), L102, and L104 during this phase are unknown (see Fig. 26). However, a large stone mortar found in association with the Period Ib floor in L105 suggests that some of these rooms were used for food preparation, like in Period II (perhaps only in the post–31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib; see below). De Vaux identified a long, narrow lean-to overlooking the ravine at the southwest edge of the site (L97) as a stable for pack animals.

The hydraulic system was greatly expanded in Period Ib. De Vaux described this elaborate water system as the most striking feature of Qumran. It remained in use with some modifications until the destruction of the sectarian settlement at the end of Period II. The water was brought by an aqueduct from Wadi Qumran, which flows into the Dead Sea at the foot of the southern end of the marl terrace on which the settlement sits. Wadi Qumran is a relatively small, dry river bed, with a waterfall just a few hundred yards behind and to the southwest of the site. The inhabitants dammed the pool at the foot of this waterfall. On rare occasions when flash floods filled the riverbed, the water would have risen behind the dam. From there it flowed into a channel (aqueduct) along the north bank of the wadi for a distance of some 750 yds. to the site. For much of its length, the channel is cut into limestone or marl. Its sides and bottom were coated with thick layers of plaster and it was covered with stone slabs. At one point the channel is cut as a square tunnel (about 3 ft. high and 2 ft. wide) through a rocky cliff (see Fig. 38). The channel is still visible for most of its length and can be followed by modern visitors to the waterfall by crawling on hands and knees through the tunnel along the way. Although visitors are understandably impressed by this feat of engineering, much grander hydraulic systems which were constructed using similar principles can be seen in the contemporary Hasmonean and Herodian desert palaces (such as Masada and Hyrcania).

Branches of the Qumran aqueduct wound through the settlement and supplied all of the pools, which could have been filled by a single flash flood. Decantation basins placed in front of each pool or group of pools served as settling tanks, catching the silt carried by the flood waters before it entered the pools. The aqueduct entered the settlement at its northwest corner, where there was a sluice-gate to break the rapid flow of the flood waters (L137). From here the water spread out into a broad, shallow decantation basin (L132, L137) adjoined by a small stepped pool (L138) (see Fig. 23). The pool was accessed by an open doorway near the point where the aqueduct entered the decantation basin, and probably also by means of a wooden bridge from the open courtyard to the east (L135). From the decantation basin the water flowed south through a channel, filling in succession the round Iron Age cistern (L110) and the two rectangular stepped pools nearby (L117 and L118, which were constructed in Period Ia) (see Fig. 31). Because the ground level had risen, the walls of the round cistern were raised and a decantation basin was installed to serve L117 and L118 (L119 *bis;* de Vaux sometimes used *bis* to indicate a subdivision of a locus). The decantation basin would have been covered with wooden planks, creating a bridge for foot traffic. Some of the overflow from these pools was carried off by a drainage channel that ran to

the north and under the walls of L125, L127, L129, L133, L134, L140, and L141 (de Vaux therefore assigned all of these loci to Period Ia, except for L134, which is not mentioned anywhere in association with Period Ia).

From the area of the round cistern, the main channel turned southeast and opened into another decantation basin (L83). The water flowed out from the west side of this basin into a large rectangular pool (L85, L91) and from the east side of the basin into the continuation of the channel. The channel then filled a large, stepped pool (L56, L58) between the main building and the dining hall/assembly room (L77) and continued along the northern side of this pool, crossing decantation basin L67 (two more small, narrow pools [L55, L57] lay along the southern side of L56, L58). When it reached the eastern end of this pool (L56, L58), the channel branched off in two directions. One branch supplied the stepped pools to the northeast (L49, L50; L48 designates the steps of pool L49). Another branch continued southward, through a breach in the southeast corner of the main building (an Iron Age wall) and into a small stepped pool (L68). From here the channel flowed through a basin serving the potters' workshop (L75; see above) into a final decantation basin (L69), before entering a large stepped pool at the southeast corner of the site (L71). The overflow was carried by gutters southwards onto the esplanade from the two large pools at the southeast and southwest corners of the settlement (L71 and L91).

As an aside, I note that in *Revue Biblique* 61 (1954): 211, de Vaux stated that L71 was constructed in Period II, after the earthquake of 31 B.C.E., when the channel that had filled L48-L49 was diverted to fill L71. But he did not mention this anywhere else, and L71 appears in the plans of Periods Ib and II in Humbert and Chambon's volume. I suspect that L71 was constructed after the earthquake, that is, in the post–31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib (a phase that de Vaux did not recognize; see below).

The sectarian settlement is characterized by the absence of private dwellings. Instead, many of the rooms appear to have been used as workshops (such as the potters' workshop) or for communal purposes (such as the dining room/assembly hall). Exactly where the community lived is debated. Some of the second-story rooms might have been used as sleeping quarters, but many of the inhabitants apparently occupied huts or tents around the site, as well as some of the caves (see below). In the open spaces between and around the buildings, sheep, goat, and cow bones were found carefully deposited under potsherds or inside pots (see Chapter 6).

According to de Vaux, the end of Period Ib was marked by an earthquake and a fire. The evidence for earthquake destruction was found throughout the settlement but is perhaps clearest in the case of one of the

pools (L48-L49), where the steps and floor had split and the eastern half had dropped about 50 cm. (see Fig. 39). This crack continues through the small pool just to the north and can be traced for some distance through L40 to the north and L72 to the south. In the pantry, the wooden shelves with the stacks of dishes (L86) collapsed onto the floor (see Fig. 30). Earthquake damage was also evident in the tower, where the lintel and ceiling of one of the rooms at the ground level (L10A) had collapsed. The northwest corner of the secondary building was damaged, as indicated by another earthquake crack running diagonally from southwest to northeast through L111, L115, L118, and L126. The western edge of the large decantation basin (L132) slid into the ravine below. This evidence indicates that the site was occupied when the earthquake occurred. Presumably any human or animal victims were removed and buried when the settlement was cleared and reoccupied after the earthquake. De Vaux noted that three of the tombs he excavated in the cemetery contained secondary burials of four individuals, who he speculated were earthquake victims.

The testimony of Flavius Josephus (*War* 1.370-80; *Ant.* 15.121-47) enabled de Vaux to date the earthquake to 31 B.C.E. In addition to the earthquake damage, a layer of ash that had blown across the site when the wood and reed roofs burned indicates there had been a fire. De Vaux concluded that the earthquake and fire were simultaneous, because it was the simplest solution, but admitted that there was no evidence to confirm this. Fires often accompanied earthquakes in antiquity, because the tremors overturned lighted oil lamps. He used the numismatic evidence to support his interpretation: only 10 identifiable coins of Herod were found, all of which came from mixed contexts of Period II, where they were associated with later coins. De Vaux noted that the Herodian coins were not dated, and cited a then-recent study assigning such coins to the period after 30 B.C.E. More recently, it has been suggested that Herod's undated bronze coins were minted after 37 B.C.E.

Period II (see Fig. 8)

According to de Vaux, the buildings damaged by the earthquake and fire were not repaired immediately. Because the water system ceased to be maintained, the site was flooded and silt accumulated to a depth of 75 cm. This silt overflowed the large decantation basin at the northwest corner of the site (L132) and spread into L130 up to the northern wall of the secondary building, growing progressively thinner towards the east. The sediment overlay the layer of ash from the fire, indicating that the period of abandonment was subsequent

to the fire (and leading de Vaux to suppose that the two events — earthquake and fire — were related).

Following this period of abandonment, the site was cleared and reoccupied by the same community that had left it, as indicated by the fact that the general plan remained the same and many of the buildings seem to have been used for the same purposes as before. Most of the rooms were cleared out and debris was dumped over the slopes of a ravine to the north of the site (where it was discovered in Trench A). Debris was also thrown outside the walls of the buildings, in heaps against the north and west walls of the secondary building (north of L120 and in L124), and in L130 in the main building. This process cleared out the objects that would have helped us to identify the function of these rooms during Period Ib. Some of the damaged structures in the settlement were strengthened, while others were left filled with collapse and abandoned. The store of more than 1000 dishes in the pantry (L86), which had fallen and broken in the earthquake, was left lying on the floor at the back of the room. This area (now designated L89) was sealed off by a low stone wall that incorporated the square pillar (pier) in the center of the room. A narrow area in front of it was enclosed by poor partition walls (L87) and the floor adjacent to the doorway leading into L77 was plastered (L86). The eastern and southern walls of L89 were buttressed on the exterior by a stone revetment. The northwest corner of the secondary building, which had begun to slide into the ravine, was buttressed, as were the inner faces of the east walls of the rooms at the northeast corner of the site (L6, L47).

The tower on the northern side of the site was reinforced by the addition of a sloping stone rampart (or "glacis") around the outside of its walls. On the northern and western sides (facing outside the settlement and along the entrance passage), the rampart is 4 m. high, but it is lower and thinner on the other two sides (facing in towards the settlement). The rampart blocked two narrow windows or light slits at the ground-floor level of the tower's north side (in L10A), and obstructed the open passages around the tower in L12, L17, and L18. Because of this, the doorway between L17 and L25 (the central courtyard of the main building) was narrowed. The ground-story room inside the tower with the collapsed ceiling (L10A) was abandoned, and the door connecting it with the next room (L28) was blocked. As an aside, I note that in Humbert and Chambon's volume, L28 is illustrated only in Periods Ia and Ib; it is replaced in Period II by L11. However, a coin of the Procurators under Nero is listed from L28, which means that this locus must have existed in Period II. Perhaps L28 represents the ground-floor level in Period II, and L11 is the second-story level. In Period Ib, the locus might be L28-L29 (instead of L28).

De Vaux relied on the numismatic evidence to date the beginning of Period II. Since only 10 identifiable coins of Herod the Great were found, all from mixed contexts, he assigned them to Period II. He reasoned that these coins could have continued in circulation after Herod's death. De Vaux therefore dated the beginning of Period II to the time of Herod's son and successor, Herod Archelaus, who ruled Judea, Idumaea, and Samaria from 4 B.C.E. to 6 C.E. He based this on several considerations. First, 16 coins of Archelaus were recovered, after which point the numismatic sequence of Period II continues without interruption to the First Jewish Revolt. Second, one of Archelaus's coins was found among the debris from the buildings. This debris was dumped by the returning inhabitants when they cleared and reoccupied the site at the beginning of Period II. The fact that the other coins in this deposit all date to Period Ib and do not include any coins of Herod the Great suggests that the reoccupation of the site was undertaken during Archelaus's reign. Finally, there is the evidence provided by a hoard of 561 silver coins from L120 (a room on the north side of the secondary building), which had been placed in three pots and buried under the floor. Most of these are Tyrian tetradrachmas (sheqels) from the period after 126 B.C.E., with the most recent coin in the hoard dating to 9/8 B.C.E. (and several earlier pieces countermarked in the same year). As de Vaux noted, this provides a *terminus post quem* of 9/8 B.C.E. for the burial of the hoard. Because in de Vaux's time there was thought to be a lacuna in the issues of Tyrian tetradrachmas from 9/8 B.C.E. to 1 B.C.E./1 C.E. (a gap which has since been filled), he dated the beginning of Period II to some time between 4 and 1 B.C.E. — that is, to early in the reign of Herod Archelaus. In other words, the presence of coins of Herod Archelaus provided de Vaux with a *terminus post quem* of 4 B.C.E., while the absence of Tyrian tetradrachmas of post–1 B.C.E. date in the hoard suggested a *terminus ante quem* for the beginning of Period II.

Aside from the strengthening or abandonment of the structures mentioned above, de Vaux noted that some minor modifications and changes were made to the rooms and the water system when the site was reoccupied in Period II. L1 in the southwest corner of the main building was divided into two rooms (L1, L2). A cylindrical jar covered by a limestone slab was sunk up to its rim in the floor in the northwest corner of L2. Two bronze coins lay nearby and two more were found in the earth that covered it. Three additional bronze coins were discovered on the floor of the room. Three are coins of Mattathias Antigonus (the identifications of two are tentative), and the others are coins of Herod Agrippa I or the Procurators. A similar discovery was made in L13, the corridor with the staircase through which L4 was entered. A niche in the north wall contained an oven with a chimney that was apparently constructed at the

end of Period II. It covered a group of three cylindrical jars, one of which had a broken base when it was installed. The oven and chimney postdated the installation of the jars and had no connection to them. Four bronze coins were found in the fill of the first jar, and there were three more coins inside the third jar. All of them are of Agrippa I and the Procurators.

A storeroom divided into three compartments was constructed in the northeast corner of the main building (L46), opening onto an enclosed courtyard (L27) that had a doorway by the northeast corner of the tower (L19). A new room was established in the central courtyard of the main building (L33). The large room on the north side of this courtyard (L38, L41) was used as a kitchen, as indicated by the ovens and hearths found in it. Two small jars which had their tops cut off were embedded up to their shoulders in the floor of L23, an open space on the southwest side of the central courtyard. A cooking pot containing animal bones was found in the southeast corner of this locus. The small basins on the south side of the courtyard (L34) were abandoned and covered over, and a staircase (L35) leading to a second-story level above L77 was installed in the southeast corner of the courtyard (see Fig. 15 and Chapter 6). The "washing place" to the east (L52) apparently continued to function, using water drawn from a channel nearby. However, the pools that had been split by the earthquake (L48, L49, L50) and the toilet to the north (L51) went out of use. This area seems to have become an open-air courtyard in Period II. Further to the southeast, the potters' workshop continued in use (L64, L84) with no significant modifications.

In the secondary building, the eastern wall of open-air courtyard L111 was doubled in thickness and it was now roofed over (see Fig. 32). A semicircular partition in the southwest corner of the room was filled with ash. The door in the south wall (leading to L103) and the two cupboards in its west wall were blocked. A couple of jars were embedded in the floor. The room to the north of L111 was divided by walls into two (L120 and L122-L123). A staircase installed in L113 (five stone steps of which were preserved) led to a dining room above these loci (see Fig. 31 and Chapter 6; in my opinion, the changes noted here to L111 and L113 occurred after the earthquake of 31 B.C.E.). Workshops were installed in many of the rooms in this sector in Period II. Two rooms (L105, L107) were added to the east side of the main building, in the middle of the passage that divided the site. One room contained a large baking oven (L105), inside which were fragments belonging to about 15 restorable pottery vessels (mostly plates and bowls) and a bronze bowl. A smaller oven was located to the south of the large one. Another oven was installed in the northeast corner of L109, next to the round Iron Age cistern. Silos with earthen walls were installed in L115 and L116.

A little to the north, a large furnace associated with a plastered platform was uncovered in L125. The presence of a drainage channel in the platform suggests that water was utilized for the industry in this room. A room to the south of the round Iron Age cistern contained a large mud-brick furnace that had been exposed to intense heat, with a smaller furnace next to it (L101) (see Fig. 26). A wooden cylinder covered with plaster of unknown use was set up on the pavement nearby. A mill for grinding grain was discovered a little farther to the south (L100). It contained a circular platform with a trough carved into its upper surface, on top of a stone pavement. The millstones that had been set on the platform were found nearby (L102, L104), where they were dumped during Period III.

After the earthquake, the roof of the dining room/assembly hall (L77) had to be rebuilt. Three square pillar (pier) bases were erected in a row on top of the Period Ib floor at the eastern end of the room, ending with a pilaster (square pillar) base abutting the east wall. The bases were made of mud brick covered with plaster. Wooden posts placed on these bases supported the ceiling beams. The door opening onto the southern esplanade was blocked and the water channel leading through the north doorway of the room was diverted. Because of this and because the floor was now leveled (with a step at its eastern end), the room could no longer be washed in the same way as before. The dining room was now moved to the second-story level of L77 (see Chapter 6).

The bay window on the north side of L30 (the "scriptorium") was blocked in Period II. A thick burnt mat was spread over the 2 m. of floor at the southern end of the room at the ground-floor level. The room was filled with the debris of the collapsed second-story level, which yielded the remains of a long, narrow, mud-brick table covered with plaster (about 16 ft. long and 16 in. wide and 20 in. high, narrowing at the base to a width of 7 in.). Fragments belonging to two smaller tables were also recovered. A low mud-brick bench covered with plaster was attached to the eastern wall of the room (see Fig. 13). The debris from this room also included the remains of a plastered platform or low table with a raised border and two cup-shaped depressions (which was placed against the north wall of the room) and two inkwells (one of pottery and the other of bronze). Another ceramic inkwell was found in an adjacent locus (L31) (see Fig. 14). One of the inkwells from L30 still contained the remains of dried ink.

De Vaux's interpretation of this room as a "scriptorium" (writing room) has been challenged because there is no evidence that scribes at this time wrote at a table while seated on a bench (instead they squatted or sat with the material on their laps). One alternative proposal (favored especially by advocates of

the villa theory) is that this room was a triclinium (dining room) in which the diners reclined on the benches, as was customary in the Greco-Roman world (see Fig. 36). However, since the benches are only 40 cm. wide, they are too narrow for reclining. In addition, inkwells are not common finds on archaeological excavations in Israel. For example, Nahman Avigad mentioned finding only two inkwells (both ceramic) in the Herodian-period houses he excavated in Jerusalem's Jewish Quarter. The discovery of three inkwells at Qumran suggests that some sort of writing activity took place in this room (L30), even if we do not understand exactly how the furniture was used.

The water system was also modified during Period II. The large decantation basin at the northwest corner of the site (L132) had silted up and was now used for depositing animal bones (see Chapter 6). It was replaced by a small basin by the sluice-gate (L137). A new channel was constructed from this basin along the eastern wall of the old basin (L132). The large pool to the south of the main building was divided into two (L56, L58).

A cemetery containing about 1100 graves is located 50 m. to the east of the site (see Figs. 46, 47). The tombs, which are arranged in neat rows along the top of the plateau, are marked by heaps of stones on the surface. All but one are oriented from north to south. Other tombs located at the edges of the cemetery or on low hills to the north, east, and south do not have the same regular alignment and orientation. The bodies were placed in a loculus or niche at the bottom of a rectangular cavity dug into the marl of the plateau (see Fig. 48). According to de Vaux, of the 43 graves he excavated, those in the main sector all contained adult male burials, whereas those in the extensions included women and children (see Chapter 8).

The Period II settlement suffered a violent destruction by fire, which de Vaux attributed to the Roman army at the time of the First Jewish Revolt. Except for the tower, which was protected by the rampart, the damage was evident throughout the settlement. The area to the south of the tower (L12, L13, L17) and the rooms in the main and secondary buildings were filled with the collapse of the walls and roofs to a depth of 1.10 to 1.50 m. Iron arrowheads found in the debris indicate that fighting occurred and that this destruction was caused by hostile human agents. These arrowheads, which have three barbed wingtips (to stick in the flesh) and a long tang that was inserted into a wooden shaft, represent the characteristic Roman type of arrowhead in the 1st century C.E.

De Vaux used the numismatic evidence and Josephus's testimony to pinpoint the date of the destruction to 68 C.E. Ninety-four coins of the First Revolt (all of bronze) were associated with Period II. Most of them come from two groups: a hoard of 39 coins that had been deposited in a cloth bag in

L103, and 33 coins that were found in a decantation basin (L83, mixed with other coins and debris that was dumped at the beginning of Period III). The latest coins date to Year Three of the revolt, 68/69 C.E. Since Josephus mentions that Vespasian occupied Jericho in June 68 C.E., de Vaux concluded that the Romans must have destroyed Qumran at that time. This marks the end of the sectarian settlement at Qumran.

Period III

Following the destruction in 68 C.E., Qumran seems to have been occupied by a small garrison of Roman soldiers who were probably members of the Tenth Legion. They inhabited only part of the main building, including the ground-story rooms of the tower which were still accessible. The soldiers dumped the debris that they cleared from these rooms to the north of the main building and in the cisterns to the south. The debris formed heaps in the northwest corner and against the east face of pool L58, covered the bottom of L56, filled the decantation basin L83, and blocked the steps (L85) leading into pool L91. The debris dumped in L83 included the 33 coins of the First Revolt mentioned above. The soldiers leveled the collapse that filled the rooms to the south of the tower and occupied L4, L13, and L30 (each of which was subdivided into smaller rooms). A large circular oven was installed in L14, a new locus above L13. The wall enclosing the northern side of the site (to the west of the tower) was doubled in width. A small room (L26) was constructed above the ashy destruction layer in courtyard L27 (inside the enclosure wall to the west of the tower). A mud-brick wall divided L36 on the south side of the central courtyard of the main building into two small rooms (L31, L22) which were entered from the outside (south). A jar embedded in the west wall of L22 contained poultry bones. A large wall erected in the middle of the central courtyard marked the eastern limit of the settlement in this phase. A poorly constructed wall with a large doorway (L43) marked the southern boundary of the settlement. In the areas to the south and east of the main building, the old potters' workshop (L84) was used to store lime, and two rooms were built above the stepped pool in L68 and in L72. An oven was installed against the north wall of L77.

The soldiers renovated a small part of the water system, using only one large cistern to the southeast which had suffered little damage (L71). This was filled by a new, poorly constructed channel that was connected with the old channel in the area of L100 (to the south of the round Iron Age cistern). This new channel was built along the south wall of L77 and over pool L91. To support the crossing of the channel, pool L91 was filled in with debris from the building and with earth from pits dug in the rooms nearby (L102, L104). The earth fill also came from a defensive ditch that was dug from the entrance to L91 towards the north, parallel with the western side of the main building. The settlement did not extend beyond this ditch, except for using the mill in L100. The numismatic evidence and historical considerations led de Vaux to suggest that this phase came to an end around the same time as Masada fell, in 73 or 74 C.E.

There also seems to have been some activity or small-scale occupation at Qumran at the time of the Second Jewish Revolt (Bar Kokhba Revolt; 132-135 C.E.). The main evidence consists of 10 coins found in a bowl buried under the floor of a room in the ground story of the tower (L29). A few late Roman and Byzantine coins recovered in the excavations were dropped by visitors or passers-by during the course of the centuries that followed. As an aside, I wonder whether a few potsherds described by de Vaux as "Islamic" instead represent Nabatean cream ware (a type of light-colored pottery that is frequently confused with a similar-looking early Islamic ware).

A Revised Chronology for Qumran

As we have seen, de Vaux distinguished three main periods of occupation in the sectarian settlement at Qumran, which he dated as follows: Period Ia, from ca. 130 to 100 B.C.E.; Period Ib, from ca. 100 B.C.E. to 31 B.C.E.; and Period II, from ca. 4-1 B.C.E. to 68 C.E. I have proposed a different chronology from de Vaux's for Periods Ia and Ib.

Period Ia

In my opinion, there is no clear or convincing evidence for de Vaux's Period Ia. De Vaux found no coins associated with Period Ia, and there were only a few potsherds which he could not distinguish in type from those of Period Ib. It is difficult to identify evidence for Period Ia because nearly all of the pottery that de Vaux published (and perhaps saved?) consists of whole (intact or restored) vessels, as opposed to potsherds. These whole vessels come from the destruction levels that mark the end of each occupation phase, when they were smashed and left lying on the floors and buried in the collapse. This means that this pottery dates to the end of each occupation phase. For this reason, it is difficult to determine exactly when the first sectarian occupation

phase (de Vaux's Period Ia) began. And because Period Ia (assuming it existed) did not end in a destruction but was marked instead by the expansion of the settlement, there are no assemblages of whole vessels associated with it. However, the fact that none of the pottery that de Vaux published from Qumran has to antedate the 1st century B.C.E. (only one storage jar he illustrated could be dated earlier) suggests to me that most of the architectural remains attributed to Period Ia belong to Period Ib (see below).

On the other hand, in a few places de Vaux distinguished architectural remains which he believed postdated the Iron Age but were covered by Period Ib structures. For example, two potters' kilns (L66) in the southeastern part of the settlement were covered by a stepped pool that was destroyed by the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. (L48-L49). The south wall of L34-L36, on the south side of the central courtyard in the main building, was discovered below the walls of L32 and L30. Also during this phase, a channel that supplied the round Israelite cistern (L110) with surface runoff was constructed under L115 and L116. De Vaux attributed these two rooms (L115 and L116) to Period Ia because their west wall was built up against the Iron Age wall of L114. Two more rectangular stepped pools (L117-L118) were constructed in this area during this phase. De Vaux also attributed to Period Ia two rooms to the north of pool L118 (L129, L133), as well as two rooms or enclosures further to the north (L140-L141), the walls of which were cut by a drainage channel of Period Ib.

As an aside, I note that in all of de Vaux's publications (the preliminary reports in the *Revue Biblique* and his book, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*), the establishment of the tower is associated with Period Ib. However, in Humbert and Chambon's volume, the tower appears on the plans of Period Ia. We must await the publication of future volumes in this series to understand why Humbert and Chambon assigned the initial construction of the tower to Period Ia.

As we shall see, de Vaux's Period Ib should be subdivided into a pre-31 and a post-31 B.C.E. phase. Most if not all of the architectural remains he attributed to Period Ia might belong to the pre-31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib, while his Period Ib certainly includes both pre-31 B.C.E. and post-31 B.C.E. remains. Perhaps some of the Period Ia remains should be assigned to the Iron Age, such as the kilns in L66, which represent a type of circular kiln with a central pillar that is attested in Palestine from the Bronze Age on. In the notes published by Humbert and Chambon, de Vaux tentatively assigned these kilns to the Iron Age. Only the final publication of all of the material from Qumran, including the pottery, coins, and stratigraphy, will make it possible to reconstruct and date these phases accurately.

If de Vaux's Period Ia exists, the currently available evidence suggests

that it should be dated to the early 1st century B.C.E. instead of to ca. 130-100 B.C.E. De Vaux placed the beginning of Period Ib no later than the reign of Alexander Jannaeus because he found 143 coins of that king. However, these only provide a *terminus post quem* for the beginning of the settlement, and, in fact, the coins of Alexander Jannaeus are known to have remained in circulation at least until the time of Herod the Great. This and the apparent absence of 2nd-century pottery types suggest that the sectarian settlement was established later than de Vaux thought. Based on the abundant finds and significant architecture associated with the first phase of Period Ib, which was destroyed in the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. (see below), it is reasonable to date the initial establishment of the sectarian settlement to the first half of the 1st century B.C.E. (that is, some time between 100-50 B.C.E.).

I suspect that de Vaux pushed the foundation date of the settlement somewhat earlier than the evidence warrants, not only because of the coins, but because the Damascus Document suggests that the sect's beginnings date to 390 years after the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the First Jewish Temple (Solomon's temple) in 586 B.C.E.:

> For when they were unfaithful and forsook Him, He hid His face from Israel and His sanctuary and delivered them up to the sword. But remembering the Covenant of the forefathers, He left a remnant to Israel and did not deliver it up to be destroyed. And in the age of wrath, three hundred and ninety years after He had given them into the hand of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, He visited them, and He caused a plant root to spring from Israel and Aaron to inherit His Land and to prosper on the good things of His earth. And they perceived their iniquity and recognized that they were guilty men, yet for twenty years they were like blind men groping for the way. And God observed their deeds, that they sought Him with a whole heart, and He raised for them a Teacher of Righteousness to guide them in the way of His heart. (CD 1.3-11)

If the 20 years that passed before the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness are added to the figure of 390 years, we arrive at a date ca. 175 B.C.E. If we add another 40 years for the period between the death of the Teacher and the dawn of the messianic era, we reach a total of 450 years after 586 B.C.E. — in other words, ca. 135 B.C.E. — which coincides with de Vaux's date for the establishment of the sectarian settlement at Qumran. Because many of the numbers mentioned in the above passage are symbolic or theological (for example, the number 40 clearly has biblical allusions, and 20 is half of 40), this reckoning cannot be taken too literally. Nevertheless, this chronology corre-

sponds roughly with the period when this sect seems to have formed — that is, around the mid-2nd century B.C.E. On the other hand, there is at present no good evidence for dating the establishment of the sectarian settlement at Qumran earlier than ca. 100 B.C.E.

Humbert has suggested that during Period Ia, Qumran was a nonsectarian, agricultural settlement *(villa rustica)* and that this occupation phase continued until the site was destroyed in 57 B.C.E. (by the Roman general/governor Gabinius) or in 31 B.C.E. (not by the earthquake, but during Herod's establishment of control over Jericho and the Dead Sea region). Could Qumran originally have been an agricultural settlement (or a fortress or other kind of nonsectarian settlement) that was later occupied by sectarians? I do not believe that the archaeological evidence supports such a possibility. This is because the presence of miqva'ot (ritual baths), the pantry containing more than 1000 dishes (L86), and possible evidence for animal bone deposits outside the buildings in pre-31 B.C.E. contexts indicate that the settlement was sectarian from the beginning (see Chapter 5).

Period Ib

According to de Vaux, Qumran lay in ruins and was unoccupied for about 30 years after the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. This period of abandonment ended when the site was reoccupied between 4 and 1 B.C.E. by the same community that had inhabited it 30 years earlier. Most scholars have accepted de Vaux's chronology, though many have grappled with the problems raised by the 30-year gap in occupation. For example, it does not make sense that an earthquake would have caused the community to abandon the site for 30 years. One might expect political turmoil or unstable social conditions to cause an abandonment, but not an earthquake. In fact, scholars have wondered why the community at Qumran (assuming they were Essenes) would have felt it necessary to abandon the site, since Josephus indicates that Herod the Great held the Essenes in high regard. Also, how is it that after such a long period the site was reoccupied by the same population with the buildings being put to the same use? And where did the community go for 30 years?

Because of these problems, some scholars have suggested that the earthquake and fire were not simultaneous. They have proposed that the settlement was burned during the turbulent period of the Parthian invasion and the reign of Mattathias Antigonus (the last Hasmonean king; 40-37 B.C.E.) and then abandoned. The site would have been ruined and empty when the earthquake struck in 31 B.C.E. De Vaux argued convincingly against this suggestion, which again fails to account for the whereabouts of this community during such a long gap in occupation.

I believe that a reconsideration of the archaeological evidence and especially the coins provides a solution to these problems. As I mentioned above, only 10 identifiable coins of Herod the Great were found at Qumran, all undated bronze issues from mixed levels. Because of their small number and mixed contexts, de Vaux associated these coins with the Period II settlement, claiming that they remained in circulation after Herod's death. In fact, Herod seems to have minted relatively few coins, and as we have seen, the coins of Alexander Jannaeus remained in circulation through Herod's reign. In addition, other coins dating to Herod's time were found at Qumran. They are among the silver coins found in the hoard from L120, most of which are Tyrian tetradrachmas dating from 126 to 9/8 B.C.E. More important, however, is the context of this hoard, which de Vaux described as follows: "These three pots [containing the coins] were buried *beneath* the level of Period II and *above* that of Period Ib" (my emphasis). De Vaux associated the hoard with the reoccupation of the site at the beginning of Period II, which means that the inhabitants buried the coins when they reoccupied the site between 4-1 B.C.E. However, de Vaux's description of the context makes it clear that the hoard could equally be associated with Period Ib, and common sense suggests this is the case. Hoards are often buried in times of trouble and can remain buried if the owner fails to return and retrieve the valuables. It is reasonable to assume that the hoard at Qumran was buried because of some impending danger or threat, and remained buried because the site was subsequently abandoned for some time. For whatever reason, the hoard was never retrieved even after the site was reoccupied.

The assignment of the hoard to Period Ib suggests a different chronological sequence for the settlement at Qumran. The site was not abandoned after the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. The inhabitants immediately repaired or strengthened many of the damaged buildings but did not bother to clear those beyond repair. So, for example, the badly damaged pools in L48-L50 were abandoned, and the pottery store in the pantry (L86) was left buried beneath the collapse. The settlement of Period Ib then continued without apparent interruption until 9/8 B.C.E. or some time thereafter. The coin hoard provides a *terminus post quem* of 9/8 B.C.E. for the abandonment of the site. The fact that the hoard was buried, combined with the presence of a layer of ash, suggests that the fire which destroyed the settlement should be attributed to human agents instead of to natural causes. In other words, in 9/8 B.C.E. or some time thereafter, Qumran suffered a deliberate, violent destruction. Such a destruction better accounts for the abandonment of the site by the inhabi-

tants. However, it was not the prolonged abandonment postulated by de Vaux. Instead, the site was abandoned in 9/8 B.C.E. or some time thereafter and reoccupied early in the reign of Herod Archelaus in 4 B.C.E. or shortly afterwards. On the basis of the presently available evidence, it is impossible to narrow the range any further. The fact that the water system fell into disrepair and silt covered the site (carried by the flash flood waters through the aqueduct) indicates that the abandonment lasted for at least one winter season. The site was abandoned for a period of one winter season to several years, within a range from 9/8 B.C.E. to some time early in the reign of Herod Archelaus. Since it is impossible to pinpoint the date, the causes leading to the destruction of the site must remain unknown, though it is tempting to associate them with the revolts and turmoil which erupted in Judea upon the death of Herod the Great in 4 B.C.E.

A short period of abandonment better accounts for the fact that the site was reoccupied and put to the same use as before by the same community. It also solves the problem of accounting for the whereabouts of this community for 30 years. When the inhabitants returned to the site, they cleared away the silt and destruction debris and dumped them in various places outside the settlement. As I mentioned, de Vaux used a coin of Herod Archelaus from one of these dumps as evidence for dating the reoccupation of the site to the beginning of that king's reign, which was in 4 B.C.E. He suggested that this coin was lost during the work of clearance. My revised chronological sequence means that de Vaux's Period Ib should be subdivided into a pre-31 and post-31 B.C.E. phase. De Vaux's description of the hoard's context suggests that its burial should be associated with the post-31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib, a phase that he did not recognize (the coins were buried "beneath the level of Period II and above that of Period Ib"). This revised sequence also means that some if not all of the remains de Vaux associated with Period Ia might belong to the pre-earthquake phase of Period Ib. The following diagram compares my revised chronology with that of de Vaux:

	de Vaux	*Magness*
Period Ia	ca. 130-100 B.C.E.	does not exist
Period Ib	ca. 100-31 B.C.E.	Pre-earthquake phase: from between 100-50 B.C.E. to 31 B.C.E. Post-earthquake phase: from 31 B.C.E. to 9/8 B.C.E. or some time thereafter (4 B.C.E.?)
Period II	4-1 B.C.E. to 68 C.E.	4-1 B.C.E. to 68 C.E.
Period III	68 C.E. to 73 or 74 C.E.	same

A few nicely cut architectural elements that were reused in Period III and II contexts were found in various places around the site: one column drum (a drum is part of the column shaft) in L6 (Period II or III); two column drums and one column base in L14 (Period III); a stone from a pier and a voussoir (a stone belonging to an arch or vault) in L19 (Period III); two column drums, several voussoirs, and a console (the springing stone of an arch) built into the base of the wall between L23 and 33 (in the central courtyard of the main building) (Period III); one column drum in L24 (Period III); a frieze fragment found just south of L34; a cornice block in L42 (Period III); one column drum and two large, nicely cut stone blocks at the bottom of pool L49 (Period II or the post-31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib?); one column drum in pool L56 (Period III); two column bases in L100; one column drum and a base in L102 (Period III?); and one column drum in L120 (Period III?) (see Fig. 27).

De Vaux suggested that some of these elements originated in a colonnade that stood on a stylobate (a low wall on which columns were placed) between L35 and L49 (see Chapter 6). Whether or not this is the case, all of these elements seem to have originated in structures that were destroyed by the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. (that is, they either originated in Period Ia, if it existed, or more likely, in the pre-31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib). This is suggested by the following considerations. First, de Vaux attributed the construction of a wall covering the stylobate to the period following the earthquake (his Period II). Second, three of the architectural pieces were found in L49, which went out of use after the earthquake. Because these elements were distributed throughout the site and their original location is unknown, it is impossible to determine whether they belonged to one or more structures. The fact that they include four column bases indicates that at least four columns originally stood in one or more locations around the site.

Where Did the Inhabitants of Qumran Live?

The question of where the inhabitants of Qumran lived is related to the interpretation of the site. For example, if Qumran was a villa or fort, the inhabitants would have lived inside the settlement. However, even those who accept de Vaux's interpretation of Qumran as a sectarian settlement do not agree on the location of the living quarters. Some scholars, including Humbert and Joseph Patrich, are convinced that the entire sectarian population resided inside the settlement. Because only a few rooms had second-story floors that could have been used as sleeping quarters, the population would have been small, with estimates ranging from 10-15 to 50-70 inhabitants. According to Patrich,

if members of the community had lived in tents, huts, or caves outside the site, we should find a network of constructed paths connecting them with the settlement. He has also argued that the caves are not suitable for the purposes of dwelling and that convincing evidence for the remains of huts and tents outside the site has not been found.

Other scholars believe that at least some members of the community lived in tents and huts around the site and in some of the caves. For example, Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel claim to have discovered the remains of tent encampments outside the settlement. They have noted that the presence of certain types of domestic pottery vessels (cooking pots, cups, plates, and bowls used for dining, storage jars, and oil lamps) inside some of the caves indicates that they served as dwellings, even if this occupation was seasonal or temporary in nature. Additional evidence of habitation comes from Cave 8, in which a *mezuzah* (a manuscript of biblical verses that is affixed to the doorpost of a Jewish home) was found; from Cave 10, which had a reed mat on the floor; and from Cave 17 (located just to the south of Cave 1, and not a scroll cave), which contained five wooden poles (two with forked ends). De Vaux believed that these poles belonged to a tent or hut that had been brought to the cave for safekeeping. Only the manmade caves cut into the marl terrace have yielded evidence for regular habitation. This is because they are much cooler and better ventilated than the natural caves and crevices in the hard limestone cliffs behind the site. Broshi and Eshel have excavated additional habitation caves (without scrolls) cut into the marl terrace to the north of Qumran, which were previously undetected because their soft marl walls and ceilings had collapsed. According to Broshi, the community at Qumran did not exceed 150-200 members. This is based on his estimate that the dining room (L77) could not hold more than 120-150 diners, keeping in mind that only full members were allowed to participate in the communal meals. This number accords better than lower estimates with the presence of over 1000 dining dishes in the pantry (L86).

In my opinion, few if any of the members of the community lived (that is, slept) inside the settlement. The rooms in the settlement seem to have been used mostly if not entirely for communal purposes: communal dining rooms and assembly rooms, kitchens, workshops, and industrial installations. On the other hand, the presence of certain domestic types of pottery indicates to me that some of the caves were inhabited, because no one carries cooking pots, dining dishes, and storage jars to a cave unless they are living there! Other members of the community must have lived in tents and huts around the site. Some of this habitation could have been seasonal — that is, perhaps some of the members lived at Qumran on a temporary basis.

I believe that De Vaux's observation regarding the nature of the settlement at Qumran is still accurate: "Khirbet Qumrân is not a village or a group of houses; it is the establishment of a community. We must be still more precise: this establishment was not designed as a community residence but rather for the carrying on of certain communal activities. The number of rooms which could have served as dwellings is restricted as compared with the sites designed for group activities to be pursued."

Bibliographical Notes

For reports on de Vaux's excavations, see the bibliographical notes to Chapter 1. The jar with the red dipinto is illustrated in de Vaux's preliminary report in *Revue Biblique* 61 (1954); also see Ze'ev Safrai and Hanan Eshel, "Economic Life," in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* 1:231. The red dipinto consists of the name "Yoḥanan Haṭla," apparently the name of one of the members of the community.

For a description of Qumran's water system, see Zwi Ilan and David Amit, "Die Wasserleitung nach Qumran," in *Wasser im Heiligen Land: Biblische Zeugnisse und archaologische Forschungen,* ed. Wiel Dierx and Gunther Garbrecht (Mainz: Philip von Zabern, 2001), 159-64.

For the suggestion that L30 was a dining room (triclinium) instead of a "scriptorium," see Pauline Donceel-Voûte, "'Coenaculum' — La salle a l'étage du *Locus* 30 à Khirbet Qumrân sur la Mer Morte," in *Res Orientales IV (Banquets d'Orient)* (1992): 61-84. Earlier scholars suggested that L30 was a dining room; see de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 29, n. 1. Ronny Reich has demonstrated that the benches from L30 are too narrow to have served as dining couches; "A Note on the Function of Room 30 (the 'Scriptorium') at Khirbet Qumrân," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46 (1995): 157-60. For a discussion of the "scriptorium" in L30 see Katharine Greenleaf Pedley, "The Library at Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 2 (1959-1960): 21-41; Bruce M. Metzger, "The Furniture in the Scriptorium at Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 1 (1958-59): 509-15. For the inkwells from Qumran and other sites, see Stephen Goranson, "Qumran: A Hub of Scribal Activity?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20/5 (1994): 36-39; for the inkwells from the Jewish Quarter see Nahman Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1983), 127.

For my redating of the end of Period Ib at Qumran, see Jodi Magness, "The Chronology of the Settlement at Qumran in the Herodian Period," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 58-65 (with bibliography; some additional references are provided here). Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz correctly noted that the archaeological evidence points to a date ca. 100 B.C.E. for the establish-

ment of the sectarian settlement at Qumran; see "Brèves remarques archéologiques concernant la chronologie des occupations essèniennes de Qoumrân," *Revue de Qumran* 12 (1986): 199-212; also see Philip R. Davies, "How Not to Do Archaeology: The Story of Qumran," *Biblical Archaeologist* 51 (1988): 203-7. For the suggestion that Qumran was not abandoned after the earthquake of 31 B.C.E., see David Flusser, "Qumran and the Famine during the Reign of Herod," *Israel Museum Journal* 6 (1987): 7-16. For Laperrousaz's views on the archaeology of Qumran, see *Qoumrân: L'Établissement essénien des bords de la Mer Morte: histoire et archéologie du site* (Paris: A. & J. Picard, 1976). For examples of the passage from CD 1.3-11 quoted here (describing the sect's beginnings) found in Cave 4 at Qumran, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII, The Damascus Document.* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 18 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 35 (4Q266), 120 (4Q268).

For the view that all of the members of the community lived inside the settlement at Qumran, see Joseph Patrich, "Did Extra-Mural Dwelling Quarters Exist at Qumran?" in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery,* 720-27. For the results of explorations conducted by Patrich in the caves near Qumran, see Patrich, "Khirbet Qumrân in Light of New Archaeological Explorations in the Qumran Caves," in Wise, Golb, Collins, and Pardee, *Methods of Investigation,* 73-95. In one cave Patrich discovered a juglet that might have contained balsam oil; "A Juglet Containing Balsam Oil (?) From a Cave Near Qumran," *Israel Exploration Journal* 39 (1989): 43-59. Zohar Amar has suggested that a red substance found by Vendyl Jones in a cave near Qumran (and identified by Jones as a component of the incense burned in the Jerusalem temple) represents ancient Hebrew *borit,* a lye that was produced at Qumran and used for cleansing purposes: Amar, "The Ash and the Red Material from Qumran," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5 (1998): 1-15. For residential caves in the marl terrace to the north of Qumran, see Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel, "Residential Caves at Qumran," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 6 (1999): 328-48. Broshi and Eshel believe that the community at Qumran lived in tents and huts around the site and in some of the surrounding caves; Broshi and Eshel, "How and Where Did the Qumranites Live?" in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues,* ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999), 266-73. According to Broshi's estimates, the community at Qumran numbered no more than 150-200 members; see Broshi, "The Archaeology of Qumran — A Reconsideration?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research,* ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 103-15 (see 113-14). The quote from the end of the chapter is from de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 10.

CHAPTER 5

What Do Pottery and Architecture Tell Us about Qumran?

The Pottery from Qumran

In this chapter and those that follow, we shall examine various aspects of the archaeology of Qumran and especially the peculiar features of the site: the toilet, a hoard of silver coins, the animal bone deposits, the water pools, and the cemetery. We begin this chapter by considering the pottery from Qumran, the most common and mundane of archaeological finds. The local pottery of Roman Palestine is often overlooked by archaeologists (or, at best, is dealt with as a by-product of the excavations), who prefer to focus their attention on monumental architecture, decorated mosaics, and inscriptions. This is perhaps understandable, given the plain appearance of the locally produced pottery in contrast with the masterpieces produced by the ancient Greek black- and red-figure vase painters. However, a careful study of the pottery from any archaeological site yields valuable information that is not provided by other kinds of remains. This is certainly true of the pottery from Qumran. In the second part of this chapter, we shall compare the architecture and pottery of Qumran with those of contemporary Judean palaces and villas. These comparisons support the interpretation of Qumran as a sectarian settlement.

Although the final report on de Vaux's excavations has not yet appeared, he published examples of most of the ceramic types represented at Qumran. These include cups, bowls, plates, kraters, cooking pots, jars, jugs, juglets, flasks, lids, and oil lamps. The pottery from the caves is identical with that from the site except that it is more limited in repertoire. The types of vessels found at Qumran reflect the activities carried out there. The inhabitants

drank out of the cups and ate from the plates and bowls. Kraters (deep bowls) were used for the mixing of wine and for serving food. Cooking pots were used for the preparation of food. Jugs, juglets, and flasks served as containers or servers for water, oil, and other liquids. Jars were used for the storage of goods such as grain, wine, and oil. Oil lamps illuminated the interiors of rooms and caves. The vessels from Qumran are made of smooth, well-levigated clay (that is, clay that was cleaned of pebbles and other large inclusions). They have relatively thin, hard-fired walls that sometimes produce a metallic sound when flicked with a finger. The cooking pots are made of a brittle, thin, brick-red colored clay that is typical of cooking vessels in Roman Palestine. Otherwise, most of the vessels from Qumran are made of a pink, light red, or gray clay, often with a whitish slip covering the exterior (a slip is a thin solution of clay mixed with water that was applied to the vessel before firing). The presence of a potters' workshop at Qumran indicates that at least some of the vessels were manufactured at the site.

The clay from which some of the Qumran vessels were manufactured has been subjected to neutron activation analysis (NAA) with surprising results. Some of the vessels are made of Jerusalem clay, while the others are made of a non-Jerusalem clay that is presumed to be local to Qumran (although there is no chemical evidence that the latter is indeed local to Qumran). Vessels made of the non-Jerusalem (presumably Qumran) clay include a cup and a bowl from the pottery annex (L86) next to the dining room in L77. Vessels made of Jerusalem clay include the ceramic inkwell from L30 (the "scriptorium"), the double-mouthed jar inscribed with a Hebrew name from L34 (the basins in the central courtyard of the main building), and cylindrical jars and lids from the caves.

Although about half of the vessels analyzed were of Jerusalem clay and the other half were of non-Jerusalem clay, the four cylindrical jars and three lids that were tested belong to the former group. In my opinion, the most reasonable explanation for these results is that the clay was brought from Jerusalem and used to manufacture the vessels at Qumran. This makes sense not only because no cylindrical jars have ever been found in Jerusalem, but because the cost of transporting finished vessels overland to Qumran (on pack animals) would have been prohibitively expensive. In contrast, transport on boats has always been less expensive and more efficient. In addition, vessels transported overland could have easily cracked or been broken before reaching their destination. This is especially true of large vessels such as jars. In antiquity, foodstuffs (such as oil, wine, and grain) were usually transported overland in skins and baskets and then emptied into jars for permanent storage at their final destination.

Ceramic vessels transported overland to Qumran would also have been in danger of incurring impurity along the way. Magen Broshi has noted that the presence of a potters' workshop throughout the existence of the sectarian settlement reflects the community's concern with purity. In other words, the inhabitants of Qumran manufactured much of their own pottery to ensure its purity. Similar concerns are expressed in the Mishnah tractate *Ḥagigah* (3:5), which states that the purity of clay vessels manufactured and brought to Jerusalem from areas beyond Modiin cannot be trusted: "From Modiin and inwards [toward Jerusalem, people] are deemed trustworthy in regard to the status of clay utensils. From Modiin and outwards, they are not deemed trustworthy. How so? A potter who sells pots — [if] there came within the border of Modiin [toward Jerusalem] that potter, those pots, and those purchasers — he is deemed trustworthy. [If] he went beyond the limit, he is not deemed trustworthy." Perhaps the Qumran community preferred Jerusalem clay because it was of higher quality. Frederick Zeuner's analyses indicated that sediments washed into the pools at Qumran and the Lisan marls found nearby would have been unsuitable for the manufacture of pottery. Neutron activation analysis has also indicated that the ceramic vessels from Qumran and Ein el-Ghuweir are made of unrelated clays (see Chapter 10).

Although much of the pottery found at Qumran was probably manufactured at the site, many of the vessel shapes resemble those found at contemporary Judean sites such as Herodium and Jerusalem. However, the vessels from Qumran differ in their fabric (clay) and surface treatment. For example, contemporary pottery from Jerusalem tends to be made of a light orange, light brown, or orange brown fabric. This is undoubtedly the result of different clay beds and firing processes than those used at Qumran. In addition, although some of the vessels from Jerusalem are covered with the kind of whitish slip that is common at Qumran, many have a drippy red, brown, or red brown paint or slip that is rare at Qumran.

The ceramic corpus (body of pottery) from Qumran displays a number of peculiarities, both in terms of the types that are present and the types that are absent. A number of types found at contemporary sites in Judea are rare or unattested at Qumran. Most conspicuous by their apparent absence from Qumran are imports. There are no published examples of Western Terra Sigillata, amphoras, or Roman mold-made oil lamps. Western Terra Sigillata is a fine, red-slipped tableware that was produced in Italy and Gaul (ancient France) in the 1st century C.E. *Terra sigillata,* which means "stamped clay" in Latin, takes its name from the potter's stamps sometimes found on the base of the vessel. Amphoras are large jars with pointed bases that were used for transporting wine, oil, grain, and fish sauce by ship around the Mediterra-

nean. Roman mold-made oil lamps of the 1st century have a round body that often bore figured decoration in relief on the discus (the top of the lamp). Because many of the Jewish inhabitants of Judea were offended by the figured images, they preferred to use undecorated, locally-made oil lamps.

Although they are not found in abundance, examples of Western Terra Sigillata, imported amphoras, and Roman mold-made oil lamps are attested at Herod's palaces at Herodian Jericho and Herodium, and in Jerusalem (including the site of Herod's palace in the modern Armenian Quarter, the Herodian-period Jewish villas in the Upper City or Western Hill [the modern Jewish Quarter], and the City of David). Amphoras containing Italian wine and imported fish sauce *(garum)* have even been discovered in Herod's palaces atop Masada.

According to Jewish law, the contents of imported amphoras (usually wine or oil) were considered impure (for purity and impurity in Judaism, see Chapter 7). Donald Ariel has noted that the number of stamped handles belonging to imported wine amphoras found in the City of David drops dramatically after about 150 B.C.E. Since this corresponds with the establishment of Hasmonean rule, Ariel has suggested this phenomenon might be due to the development of purity laws and their adoption among Jerusalem's population. On the other hand, the discovery of a group of Italian wine amphoras in one of the Herodian-period villas in Jerusalem's Jewish Quarter prompted Nahman Avigad (the excavator) to remark that "It would seem that there have always been more and less observant Jews." Amphoras have also been found at the site of Qasr el-Yahud (Khirbet Mazin), a Hasmonean anchorage to the south of Qumran, located at the point where the Kidron Valley empties into the Dead Sea (see map in Fig. 1).

Even more striking than the lack of imports is the apparent absence of Eastern Sigillata A (ESA) from the corpus at Qumran. Eastern Sigillata A is a fine, red-slipped table ware produced at sites in the eastern Mediterranean in the 1st century B.C.E. and 1st century C.E. It is much more common than Western Terra Sigillata at sites in Palestine. Examples are published from Herodian Jericho, Herodium, and Masada. Complete sets of Eastern Sigillata A dishes including plates, bowls, and jugs have been discovered in the Herodian houses in the Jewish Quarter (see Fig. 53). No examples of Eastern Sigillata A are published from Qumran, although Humbert reports that a few fragments were recovered. On the other hand, at least one group of bowls from Qumran appears to have been inspired by Eastern Sigillata A. These bowls are relatively broad and shallow and have strongly carinated (angular) walls. At the point of carination there is a sharp ridge, above which the wall rises vertically to the rim. The base is usually a disc. They are made of the local Qumran pink, light red, or gray ware, sometimes with a whitish slip. At Qumran all of the bowls of this type come from Period II contexts. They are clearly related in form to a type of Eastern Sigillata A that is dated from ca. 50-70 C.E. This means that the inhabitants (or at least the potters) at Qumran were not isolated from contemporary ceramic trends in Palestine and the eastern Mediterranean. However, they apparently preferred to manufacture and use their own versions of these types.

A type of local (Judean) fine ware that appears to be unattested at Qumran is "pseudo-Nabatean" ware (also called "Jerusalem painted bowls"; one example is published from Ein Feshkha, and Joseph Patrich mentions that two were found in Cave [FQ] 37). These are delicate, thin-walled bowls decorated on the interior with red, brown, or black painted floral designs (see Fig. 54). Scientific analyses have indicated that Jerusalem was the center for the production of this ware. Most of these bowls have been found at sites in Judea, including in Jerusalem's Jewish and Armenian Quarters, Herodian Jericho, Herodium, and Masada in contexts dating mainly to the 1st century C.E. Painted decoration is common on other types of 1st–century C.E. vessels from Jerusalem. The red or brown paint was usually applied unevenly with drips running over the rim or base. Sometimes it is found over a whitish slip that covers the entire vessel. The paint occurs on open forms (such as plates, cups, and bowls) and closed forms (such as jugs and juglets). It is also found on a number of vessels from Herodium, but seems to be much less common at Jericho. Drippy red or brown paint is also very rare at Qumran. Only one unguentarium (a small bottle used for perfume, scented oil, or other precious liquids) published by de Vaux has red slip or paint over the rim, and I saw one cookingware jug with splashes of red paint on the shoulder in storage at the Rockefeller Museum. A sherd described as Nabatean (presumably from a painted Nabatean bowl — that is, a kind of bowl with eggshell thin walls and red painted decoration) is mentioned in de Vaux's notes for L126 but it is not illustrated. An unguentarium with painted black lines and a fragment of a painted Nabatean bowl are published from Ein Feshkha.

The recent publication of pottery from contemporary sites along the Dead Sea, including Upper Herodium and Machaerus, but especially Ein ez-Zara and Ein Boqeq, places the Qumran corpus in a different light. Ein ez-Zara (ancient Callirrhoe) is the site of thermal springs on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea (in modern Jordan). A 1st-century C.E. villa uncovered at Ein ez-Zara is clearly inspired by the design of Herod's palaces, and the presence of stone vessels indicates that at least some of the inhabitants were Jewish (for more on this villa, see below). Ein Boqeq is a small oasis on the southwestern shore of the Dead Sea (south of Masada). The excavators identified a 1st–century C.E.

building at this site as an *officina,* due to the large number of industrial installations and workshops it contained. Interestingly, the only fine wares found at Ein ez-Zara consist of two small fragments of painted Nabatean bowls and two fragments of Eastern Sigillata. Only two Eastern Sigillata D bowls were found in association with the 1st–century C.E. occupation at Ein Boqeq. The rest of the fine pottery recovered consists of Nabatean wares (mostly painted Nabatean bowls, but including one red-slipped piece). This evidence indicates that, although imports such as amphoras and Eastern Sigillata A are represented at the palaces of Jericho, Herodium, and Machaerus, they are rare at other sites in the Dead Sea region. I believe this represents a regional phenomenon: due to the high cost of overland transport, only residents of the local palaces could afford to purchase fine dining dishes or amphoras containing expensive wine and other luxury foodstuffs.

Andrea Berlin has noted that, whereas fine, red-slipped table wares (Eastern Sigillata A) are found at Jewish sites in Galilee in the 1st century B.C.E., they disappear there during the 1st century C.E. She credits this to a deliberate rejection of Roman control and influence by the Jews of Galilee, an expression of solidarity with the traditional, unadorned Jewish lifestyle over against that of their Latinized Phoenician neighbors (who produced this pottery) and "the wealthy, display-oriented, Jewish aristocracy of Jerusalem." In contrast, evidence that some wealthy Jews of the northern coastal region adopted the customs of the Jerusalem aristocracy is provided by an early Roman farmhouse called Horvat ʿAqav at Ramat Hanadiv (near Caesarea). The presence of a miqveh (ritual bath) at this farmhouse indicates that the occupants were Jewish. The pottery they used includes Eastern Sigillata A, Eastern Terra Sigillata II (a type of Cypriot Sigillata), and Roman mold-made oil lamps with a decorated discus (including one with a griffin).

Altough I agree with Berlin's observation, the evidence from the villa at Ein ez-Zara suggests that, in contrast to the situation in Galilee, the absence of Eastern Sigillata A from sites in the Dead Sea region is due largely to economic and regional factors (that is, the high cost of overland transport from coastal ports and from Phoenicia). In the Dead Sea region, Eastern Sigillata A seems to be restricted almost entirely to palatial sites. In addition, whereas Eastern Sigillata A is found in Jewish towns in Galilee in 1st-century B.C.E. contexts but disappears during the 1st century C.E., it appears to be rare or unattested in Judea before the time of Herod the Great. For example, Rachel Bar-Nathan has noted that imported pottery including Eastern Sigillata A is either rare or unattested in the Hasmonean palaces at Jericho, appearing instead during the reign of Herod. In other words, beginning in the time of Herod the consumption of imported wine and other goods and the acquisition of fine, red-slipped table ware became markers of status among the ruling elite. These products were used by Herod and his associates and were adopted by the uppermost classes of Jerusalem society, including priestly families. Although the inhabitants of the villa at Ein ez-Zara adopted and imitated this lifestyle (as indicated by the design of the villa and its finely molded stucco decoration), the high cost of overland transport put the acquisition of imported wine and fine, red-slipped pottery beyond their reach. It is possible that the absence of imported pottery (including Eastern Sigillata A) at Qumran reflects a deliberate rejection of these products by the inhabitants. However, even if the community at Qumran had wanted to acquire these products, it is doubtful they could have afforded them.

Oil lamps also provide evidence for regionalism in pottery types. During Period II, the inhabitants of Qumran used a type of wheel-made oil lamp (sometimes called "Herodian oil lamps") that has a circular body and a short, splayed nozzle. These oil lamps are characteristic of Judea in the 1st century C.E. Examples were found in some of the scroll caves. However, another type of oil lamp is found at Qumran and in the caves during the post-31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib (that is, during Herod's reign). These lamps have a large circular body and a narrow, elongated nozzle (see Figs. 19, 21). In shape they resemble contemporary Hellenistic oil lamps (called "delphiniform lamps") but differ in having a plain, wheel-made body (instead of a decorated mold-made body). They also do not have the gray slip found on the Hellenistic oil lamps. Lamps of the same type as those from Qumran are published from Herodian Jericho and Masada, where they also seem to occur in contexts dating to the time of Herod the Great. These lamps therefore represent a regional type, although so far they have a very limited distribution. A similar lamp was found in the "Herodian Residence" in Jerusalem's Jewish Quarter (a house that was occupied during Herod's reign), though it differs from the Qumran examples in being mold-made and slipped.

The "Scroll Jars"

There is perhaps no more distinctive object associated with Qumran than the cylindrical jars that reportedly contained the first scrolls discovered in Cave 1 (and which are therefore sometimes called "scroll jars") (see Figs. 19, 21). According to one account of the initial discovery, when the bedouins first entered Cave 1, they discovered a row of these jars covered with bowl-shaped lids. Most of the jars were empty, but one contained three scrolls, two of which were wrapped in linen. Two of the intact jars removed from the cave by

the bedouins were purchased by Sukenik for the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. In February and March 1949, Harding and de Vaux conducted excavations in Cave 1. In addition to fragments of scrolls and linen, they recovered sherds representing at least 50 different cylindrical jars and the bowl-shaped lids that covered them. Two years later, Harding and de Vaux conducted the first season of excavations at Qumran. Sunk into the floor of one of the rooms (L2) they found an intact but empty cylindrical jar covered with a limestone slab. On the floor beside it was a coin of the Roman Procurators dated ca. 10 C.E. The excavators noted that the jar was identical with those found in Cave 1, and concluded, "We thus, even in the small area so far excavated, have a direct connection with the Scrolls."

The later seasons of excavations at the site and in the caves yielded many more examples of cylindrical jars. Some of the jars at the site were sunk into the floors and were covered with round stone slabs or plaques, like the one from L2. According to de Vaux, cylindrical jars were found in Period Ib and Period II contexts at Qumran. However, most of the published examples come from Period II contexts. Although cylindrical jars are represented in the post–31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib (that is, between 31 and ca. 9/8 B.C.E.), no examples are published from contexts that clearly antedate 31 B.C.E. A similar observation has been made by Rachel Bar-Nathan, who wrote an M.A. thesis on the pottery from Ehud Netzer's excavations in the Hasmonean and Herodian palaces at Jericho. Cylindrical jars first appear there in contexts dating to the reign of Herod the Great. The cylindrical jars from Jericho are categorized by Bar-Nathan as her Types 2b and 2c.

The chronology of the cylindrical jars (and their distribution outside Qumran) depends on how the type is defined. In his first report on Cave 1, de Vaux described these jars as follows: "Regarding the jars, the most constant type is a cylindrical vase that is about 60 cm. tall and only about 25 to 28 cm. in diameter. The base, very flattened, is carried on a thin disc and is slightly concave. There are no handles. The shoulder is well marked, sometimes sharply carinated, but it is always narrow, as all of the jars have a very large mouth, with a very low and plain vertical neck" (my translation from the French). Some of the cylindrical jars have four small horizontal ledge handles on the shoulder. These jars were covered with bowl-shaped lids, which de Vaux noted were designed to serve not as bowls but as lids for the cylindrical jars (see Fig. 20).

Not all of the jars described by de Vaux as cylindrical correspond with the above description. One variant differs in having a wider, bag-shaped body, sometimes with an everted (outturned) rim and/or two large, vertical ring handles on the sloping shoulder (see Fig. 22). De Vaux sometimes re-

ferred to these as "ovoid jars" or "large jars." Unlike the cylindrical jars, ovoid jars are attested in pre-31 B.C.E. contexts (as indicated by the presence of examples in L10A in the tower and the pantry in L86, both of which were destroyed in the earthquake of 31). In fact, de Vaux noted that ovoid jars are characteristic of Period Ib. This accords with Bar-Nathan's dating of this variant (her Type 2a) at Jericho to the Hasmonean (ca. 100-31 B.C.E.) and Herodian periods.

Cylindrical and ovoid jars are common at Qumran and in the nearby caves, but are rare or unattested at other sites in the region. The largest number of examples outside Qumran published to date comes from Herodian Jericho, though even there they do not seem to be common. Both the ovoid and cylindrical variants are represented at Jericho. Bar-Nathan also includes a small, handleless variant with an oval body (her Type 2d), but notes that it probably represents a different type. At Herodian Jericho, most of these jars (her Types 2a, b, c) come from an industrial area dating to the time of Herod, including a structure with miqva'ot (ritual baths). Four examples (three of Type 2a and one of Type 2b) were embedded in the wall of an adjacent storeroom. Another six examples of Bar-Nathan's Type 2d were found in a storeroom for liquids. Bowl-shaped lids are also attested at Herodian Jericho but are not common. One complete ovoid jar with a bowl-shaped lid was found in the corner of an entrance room to one of the Hasmonean twin palaces at Jericho.

A cylindrical jar was reportedly found in a 2nd-century C.E. tomb at Quailba (ancient Abila) in Jordan, although unfortunately it is not illustrated. Bar-Nathan mentions that examples of her Types 2a, 2b, and 2d were found in "Zealot" contexts at Masada (none is illustrated and they are otherwise unpublished). According to de Vaux, no examples of cylindrical jars were found at Ein Feshkha. However, using a broad definition of the type, one ovoid jar and one small cylindrical jar with an everted rim (close to Bar-Nathan's Type 2d) are illustrated from Ein Feshkha (see Fig. 22). Otherwise, no cylindrical jars and no bowl-shaped lids are attested from Ein Feshkha, and there are none from Ein el-Ghuweir. The only other examples of published ovoid jars consist of one from the 1st-century C.E. villa at Ein ez-Zara and another from Ein Boqeq.

To understand why these jars and their bowl-shaped lids are common at Qumran but virtually unattested elsewhere, we must compare them with the storage jars found at other sites in Judea in the 1st century B.C.E. and 1st century C.E. The latter are characterized by the following features: a broad, bag-shaped body with sloping, rounded shoulders that widens towards the bottom; a rounded or slightly pointed base; two vertical ring handles on the

shoulders; and a narrow, medium high to tall, vertical neck, often with a slightly everted or thickened rim (see Fig. 22). With minor variations, this remained the dominant type of storage jar in Palestine through the Byzantine period and later. Bag-shaped jars are not uncommon at Qumran, though no examples are published from the scroll caves. Bag-shaped jars are also attested at Ein Feshkha and they represent the only type of storage jar found at Ein el-Ghuweir.

The form of the bag-shaped jars reflects their function. The broad bodies and rounded bases indicate that these jars were used for storage in basements or storerooms. Bag-shaped jars were bulky and awkward to carry or transport, especially when they were full. They would have stood on soft, sandy or dirt floors or were placed on stands. Liquids and grain brought in other containers (such as skins) would have been emptied into the bag-shaped jars for storage. Their relatively tall, narrow necks helped prevent spillage (when tipping or pouring) and were easily corked or sealed. The ring handles on the shoulders were used to grasp the jars when pouring out their contents. In contrast, amphoras, which were used as transport containers (especially on ships), have cylindrical bodies, a pointed base, and large handles. This design enabled amphoras to be easily grasped and lifted (with one hand grasping a handle and the other the pointed base).

The cylindrical and ovoid jars differ fundamentally from the bag-shaped jars. Instead of a rounded base, the cylindrical and ovoid jars have a disc or ring base. Although the ovoid jars are bag-shaped, the body is wider at the top (towards the shoulder) than at the bottom (in contrast to bag-shaped jars). They either have small (pierced) ledge handles on the shoulder or no handles at all (except for the ovoid variant with ring handles on the shoulder). The cylindrical jars have a carinated shoulder. The most distinctive feature of these jars (aside from the cylindrical body) is their short neck and wide mouth. In other words, the cylindrical and ovoid jars are essentially holemouth jars (jars with a large opening). As de Vaux noted, the bowl-shaped lids were designed to be placed over the wide mouths of these jars, fitting snugly on the narrow ledge created by the carinated shoulder. Some of the bowls and jars have matching pierced ledge handles, which could be fastened together. The ring or disc bases enabled the cylindrical and ovoid jars to stand on their own and provided a stability that the bag-shaped jars with their rounded bases lacked. On the other hand, the very short necks and wide mouths of the cylindrical and ovoid jars would not have prevented spillage and could not easily have been sealed.

These differences can perhaps be understood in light of the purity regulations of the community at Qumran, especially those governing the storage

and pouring of food and drink (for more on sectarian purity concerns, see Chapter 7). The first relevant regulation appears in the Sabbath code in the Damascus Document (CD 11:9): "He shall not open a plastered vessel on the Sabbath." Lawrence Schiffman has noted that in antiquity jars were normally sealed with clay after filling. The clay would then harden, forming an airtight seal. To open the jar, the clay seal had to be broken. Zvi Gal has distinguished three types of ancient clay stoppers. Conical-shaped stoppers were apparently placed inside the jar's mouth. Since these did not hermetically seal the mouth, Gal has suggested that conical-shaped stoppers were used for jars containing olive oil. The second type of stopper is mushroom shaped. These were made during the sealing process by molding wet clay directly on top of the jar's mouth, hermetically sealing it. Gal believes this type of stopper was used for jars containing grain, which would have needed an airtight seal. The third type of stopper is doughnut shaped, with a hole in the center. These have often been identified as loom weights. Gal has suggested that this type was used for sealing wine jars. The sectarians apparently forbade the breaking of clay stoppers that sealed jars on the Sabbath. Clay stoppers would have been used to seal the narrow necks and mouths of bag-shaped jars. However, because of their wide mouths and short necks, cylindrical and ovoid jars could not have been sealed in this way. Instead, these jars were covered with stone slabs (especially when they were embedded in floors) or were fitted with bowl-shaped lids. In addition, some of the linen cloths from Cave 1 were used as jar covers. This feature of the cylindrical and ovoid jars allowed them to be opened on the Sabbath, thereby circumventing the Sabbath prohibition against the breaking of clay seals.

Another sectarian regulation might help explain the design of these jars. This regulation appears in 4QMMT *(Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah):* "And furthermore concerning the pouring (of liquids), we say that it contains no purity. And furthermore the pouring does not separate the impure {from the pure} for the poured liquid and that in the receptacle are alike, one liquid" (4QMMT B55-58). This passage means that when liquid is poured from a pure (upper) vessel into an impure (lower) vessel, the liquid stream links the two vessels and transmits impurity "upstream" to the pure (upper) vessel. This contrasts with the Pharisaic ruling that liquid does not impart impurity to the vessel from which it is poured. The Mishnah tractate *Yadayim* 4:7 describes the Sadducees objecting to the Pharisaic ruling: "Say Sadducees: We complain against you, Pharisees. For you declare clean an unbroken stream of liquid."

To empty a bag-shaped jar, it was necessary to grasp it by the handles, tilt it, and pour the contents out through the narrow opening. If the pure liq-

uid contents of such a jar were poured into an impure container, the jar and its contents would have been rendered impure according to the sectarian regulations. Although cylindrical and ovoid jars could have been picked up and their contents poured out, their wide mouths would have caused considerable spillage. Spillage could have been reduced by pouring the contents of the jar into a funnel, two examples of which are published from Qumran. However, the short necks and wide mouths of the cylindrical and ovoid jars allowed the contents to be scooped out using another utensil such as a cup, bowl, or dipper (interestingly, a dipper is published from Qumran). That this is the way these jars functioned is suggested by their ring and disc bases, which provided them with a stability that bag-shaped jars did not possess and prevented them from tipping over easily. Removing liquids from the cylindrical and ovoid jars with a cup or dipper circumvented the risk of contaminating the contents by pouring them into another vessel. This feature of their design also made it easy to remove the contents of cylindrical jars embedded in floors, a common phenomenon in the settlement at Qumran. In contrast, it would be almost impossible to empty the contents of a bag-shaped jar embedded in a floor. Finally, the wide mouths of these jars would have allowed their contents to be easily viewed and inspected.

Bar-Nathan correctly noted that the distribution of the cylindrical and ovoid jars indicates they represent a regional type. However, the fact that these jars are much more common at Qumran and the caves than at Jericho, combined with their virtual absence from Ein Feshkha and their complete absence from Ein el-Ghuweir, suggests that they are not simply a regional phenomenon. The community at Qumran obviously preferred the cylindrical and ovoid jars over the usual bag-shaped jars, apparently because of their unique concerns with purity. These jars therefore must have been used to store goods that had a high degree of purity, such as the pure food and drink of the sect, as well as scrolls (and perhaps other goods). Various scrolls document the sect's concern that no impurity come into contact with the pure (solid) food and drink (liquids). For this reason, new members were allowed to partake of the pure food only after more than a year had passed, and with the pure drink only after a second year (because liquids render foods susceptible to impurity, the regulations regarding drink were stricter). The relevant passage from the Community Rule (6:16-21) reads as follows: "And when he draws near to the council of the community he shall not come in contact with the pure food of the community . . . until he completes one full year. . . . Let him not come into contact with the liquid food of the community until he completes a second year. . . ." Members who had violated the penal code were denied access to and contact with the pure food and drink for various lengths

of time, depending on the infraction. Similarly, in 4QMMT (B64-65) we read, "And furthermore concerning the lepers, we s[ay that they shall not c]ome (into contact) with the sacred pure food. . . ."

I believe that not only were the cylindrical and ovoid jars preferred because of the sect's unique halakhic concerns, but because their distinctive shape came to signify contents having a high degree of purity. In other words, because their shape was easily identifiable, these jars served as markers to those who were allowed or denied contact with the pure food or drink (or other pure goods) of the sect. Distinctively shaped containers have been used throughout history to signal their contents. For example, in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, wine from different regions of the eastern Mediterranean was shipped in distinctively shaped amphoras. Even today, Coca-Cola bottles have a special shape that we all recognize.

It is difficult to determine whether the presence of cylindrical and ovoid jars at Herodian Jericho and Masada and their absence from Ein Feshkha and Ein el-Ghuweir reflects the presence or absence of sectarians. Perhaps these jars are found at Jericho and Masada because they are a regional type. On the other hand, the fact that at least some of the examples from Jericho were associated with bowl-shaped lids suggests a sectarian-like concern with purity. This means that the discovery of these jars at Jericho could attest to the presence of sectarians or a group with similar purity concerns. Similarly, the appearance of cylindrical and ovoid jars in contexts dating to the time of the First Jewish Revolt at Masada might support Yadin's suggestion that members of the Qumran community joined the rebels there after their own settlement fell to the Romans in 68 C.E. On the other hand, the absence of cylindrical and ovoid jars from Ein Feshkha and Ein el-Ghuweir does not prove that these settlements were nonsectarian or had no connections with Qumran, though this is a possibility (see Chapter 10). Instead, their absence indicates that the pure food and drink (and other pure goods) of the sect were not stored at these sites (perhaps because the communal meals were held at Qumran?).

The large numbers of cylindrical and ovoid jars found in the caves around Qumran indicates that the sectarians stored substantial provisions of pure food and drink (in addition to scrolls) in the caves. The presence of ovoid jars (which appeared before 31 B.C.E.), Hellenistic-type oil lamps (which date to the reign of Herod), and cylindrical jars and wheel-made ("Herodian") oil lamps (which date to the 1st century C.E.) in the caves demonstrates that these jars were deposited throughout Qumran's sectarian occupation (in the pre–31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib; the post–31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib; and Period II). Although some of the jars might have been placed in the caves for safekeeping on the eve of the destructions in ca. 9/8 B.C.E. and in

68 C.E., their large numbers and the presence of types that antedate 31 B.C.E. suggest this was an ongoing process. In other words, the sectarians apparently hoarded stores of pure food and drink in the caves on more than one occasion. On the other hand, it is not clear whether scrolls were similarly hoarded in the caves, or whether they were all deposited on the eve of Qumran's destruction in 68 C.E.

One text that might shed light on this phenomenon is 4Q274 3 ii, also designated 4QTohorot A because it deals with purity. Fragment 3, column ii reads as follows:

(2) . . . those whose impurity [extends over days]
(3) and any (vessel) which has a seal . . . [shall be unclean]
(4) for a more (scrupulously) pure person. Any herb [which has no]
(5) dew moisture on it may be eaten. If it is n[ot eaten, let him put it]
(6) into the water. For if one [were to put it on]
(7) the ground and [water] wetted it [when]
(8) the rain [falls] upon it, if an [unclean person] touches it, let him by no means [eat it]
(9) in the field during the period [of his purification]
(10) Any earthen vessel [into which a creeping thing] f[a]lls
(11) [whatever] is in it [becomes unclean any]
(12) liquid be[comes unclean]

This text reflects the sectarians' concern with the role of liquids as transmitters of impurity. As a consequence, food stored in open ceramic vessels in a house that is unclean (through the presence of a corpse, for example) becomes unclean. For the more scrupulous, even sealed vessels were not effective barriers against impurity. In addition, food that had been moistened with liquids was rendered susceptible to impurity, as indicated by a passage in the Temple Scroll: "If a man dies in your cities, the house in which the dead man has died shall be unclean for seven days. Whatever is in the house and whoever enters the house shall be unclean for seven days. Any food on which water has been poured shall be unclean, anything moistened shall be unclean. Earthenware vessels shall be unclean and whatever they contain shall be unclean for every clean man. The open (vessels) shall be unclean for every Israelite (with) whatever is moistened in them" (11QT[a] 49.5-10). 4Q274 indicates that even falling rain and dew could make food (or at least fruits and vegetables) susceptible to impurity. According to Joseph Baumgarten, "It is likely that Qumran exegesis considered fruits which had been wetted to be susceptible even after the moisture had dried."

These texts suggest that the community at Qumran hoarded stores of pure food and drink in the caves to guard against contact with impurity. This is because they considered even sealed vessels to be susceptible to impurity. This means that pure food and drink stored in sealed vessels in a house or building that became impure would have been rendered impure. Storing pure goods in caves (instead of in the settlement) reduced the risk of contamination through contact with impurity (such as corpse-impurity or other kinds of impurity). The dry conditions inside the caves — the same conditions that preserved the scrolls for 2000 years — also reduced the risk that moisture (such as rain or dew) would come into contact with and contaminate the pure food and drink. This accounts for the design of the bowl-shaped lids, which completely covered the mouths of the jars, fitting snugly over the neck and resting on the shoulder (see Fig. 20). Any moisture (such as rain, dew, bat or bird droppings) that happened to fall on cylindrical jars covered with these lids would have rolled down the sides of the jars and onto the ground. In other words, the lids were designed to prevent moisture from entering the jars. In fact, it could be that the use of bowl-shaped lids not only circumvented the Sabbath prohibition against breaking clay seals but developed out of the sectarians' concern with the transmission of impurity by moisture. As we noted above, bag-shaped jars were usually sealed with wet clay that was molded over the mouth and dried in place. The moisture in the wet clay would presumably have contaminated the contents of jars sealed in this way. Perhaps this is one of the reasons that the cylindrical and ovoid jars and bowl-shaped lids were preferred by the community at Qumran.

As Schiffman has noted, "To a great extent, the sect defined itself as a group maintaining the ritual purity of its food. . . . Indeed, the right to approach the pure food was a step in the process of being accepted as a full member of the sect. But the exclusion from the pure food [for those who violated the ordinances] is even more. It is a consequence of the belief that the offender will defile it, for to the sect, ritual impurity goes hand in hand with moral impurity." The design of the cylindrical and ovoid jars and bowl-shaped lids can be understood as a physical expression of the sect's concern with the purity of food and drink. The hoarding of food and drink in the caves was apparently due to the sectarians' desire to reduce the risk of contamination through contact with impurity and moisture, though some of these stores (and perhaps the scrolls) could have been deposited on the eve of the site's destruction in 68 C.E.

A pseudepigraphical work called the *Assumption of Moses* refers to storing scrolls in jars. At the beginning of the work, Moses tells Joshua that he is about to die, and delivers to him certain books of prophecies, which Joshua is

supposed to treat with cedar oil and store in jars in a place appointed by God: "And receive thou this writing that thou mayest know how to preserve the books which I shall deliver unto thee: and thou shalt set these in order and anoint them with oil of cedar and put them away in earthen vessels in the place which He made from the beginning of the creation of the world, that His name should be called upon until the day of repentance in the visitation wherewith the Lord will visit them in the consummation of the end of the days" (1:16-18). Although oil presumably would have been employed to soften and preserve the parchment, the use of the term "anoint" suggests a ritual aspect to its application.

What kind of "earthen vessels" were used to store these scrolls? As we have seen, the narrow openings of bag-shaped jars means they could not have held scrolls. Scrolls could have been placed in other vessels such as large cooking pots (although their globular bodies were not well suited for this purpose) or in broken amphoras or bag-shaped jars. However, the design of the ovoid and cylindrical jars makes them ideally suited for the storage of scrolls as described in the *Assumption of Moses*. The date of this composition (which might have undergone two redactions) is disputed, but the latest identifiable historical allusions suggest that it attained its final form between the years 4 B.C.E. and 48 C.E. Although scholars have noted that the work displays a number of affinities with the Qumran writings, such as a priestly stance and a peculiar eschatological outlook, its apparent absence among the Dead Sea Scrolls suggests that it is not an Essene composition. According to Emil Schürer, "The furthest one can go is to suggest that it derives from a writer sympathetic to Essene ideology."

Because ovoid and cylindrical jars are found mostly in the vicinity of Qumran, I believe it is likely that the author (or redactor) of the *Assumption of Moses* was familiar with and might even have been describing the sectarians' practice of storing scrolls in jars placed in caves. This is admittedly an argument from silence (based on the accident of preservation), since there are no analogous manuscript finds from other sites in Roman Palestine. On the other hand, scrolls from contemporary sites in the region (such as Masada and the Judean Desert caves occupied during the Bar Kokhba Revolt) were not found inside jars and were not associated with ovoid or cylindrical jars (although, as noted above, unpublished cylindrical jars are apparently represented at Masada). However, even at Qumran the only scrolls that were actually found inside jars are apparently those from Cave 1. Nevertheless, these examples provide our only archaeological evidence for the practice described in the *Assumption of Moses*.

There are other ancient reports of scrolls stored inside jars in caves near

Jericho. The early Christian scholar Origen (185-254 C.E.) mentioned that the sixth Greek version of the Psalms he presented in his Hexapla had been found in a jar near Jericho. In describing the same text, the church historian Eusebius (ca. 260-340 C.E.) added that a Greek version of the Psalms and other Greek and Hebrew manuscripts had been found in a jar at Jericho during the reign of Caracalla (*Ecclesiastical History* 6.16.1). In ca. 800 C.E., Timotheus I, the Nestorian patriarch of Seleucia, reported that books of the Old Testament had been found in a cave near Jericho. Of course, we do not know whether these manuscripts were related to the Dead Sea Scrolls. But the nature of the manuscripts (biblical scrolls), the references to locations "near Jericho," and the descriptions of scrolls deposited in jars stored in caves suggest these might represent earlier finds of Dead Sea Scrolls.

If the passage in the *Assumption of Moses* refers to the practice at Qumran, some of the scrolls could have been deposited in the caves before the destruction in 68 C.E. This means that the community at Qumran might have been storing or hoarding scrolls as well as pure food and drink in some of the caves over the course of many years. Jeremiah 32:13-14 indicates that storing scrolls in ceramic jars was an ancient practice going back to biblical times: "And I charged Baruch before them saying, Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Take these documents, this deed of purchase, both that which is sealed, and this open deed; and put them in an earthen vessel, that they may last for many days." This might explain why the community at Qumran, which showed a preference for other biblical Jewish practices such as dining while seated instead of reclining, adopted this practice. It also means that cylindrical jars might originally have been designed or adapted by the sect for the purpose of holding scrolls and then became the preferred containers for storing their pure food and drink as well.

The pottery from Qumran thus sheds a great deal of light on the character of the community. It suggests that the inhabitants practiced a deliberate and selective policy of isolation, manufacturing ceramic products to suit their special needs and concerns with purity. It is clear that they chose to manufacture and use undecorated pottery instead of fine wares. The large number of identical, undecorated plates, cups, and bowls found at Qumran contrasts sharply with contemporary assemblages at other sites in Judea, which are richer and more varied in terms of the types represented. Similar differences are apparent when we compare other aspects of the archaeology of Qumran with contemporary Judean sites.

Could Qumran Have Been a Country Villa?

Robert Donceel and Pauline Donceel-Voûte have suggested that Qumran was a *villa rustica* (a Roman country villa), not a sectarian settlement. In support of their interpretation, they have cited the "unexpected variety and richness of the objects" from Qumran. More recently, Yizhar Hirschfeld has suggested that Qumran was a "manor house," that is, a wealthy agricultural estate. And finally, according to Jean-Baptiste Humbert, de Vaux's Period Ia continued until the site was destroyed in 57 B.C.E. by Gabinius (a Roman governor of Palestine) or in 31 B.C.E. (during Herod's establishment of control over Jericho and the Dead Sea region). Humbert believes that during Period Ia Qumran functioned as a nonsectarian agricultural settlement. After that, it was taken over by the Essenes and became a cultic center with a permanent population of only 10-15 inhabitants.

However, comparisons between Qumran and contemporary villas in Palestine and elsewhere do not support any of these alternative interpretations. Before considering this evidence, it is important to remember that any comparisons we make should belong to the same period and geographical region — in other words, for Qumran, we need to consider sites in Roman Palestine in general, and especially sites in Judea in the 1st century B.C.E. and 1st century C.E. The more distant the comparisons are in time and space, the less likely they are to be valid. For example, there is no connection in time and space between the Egyptian and Mesoamerican pyramids which, despite their similar appearances, were used for very different purposes. It is also important to remember that for a comparison to be valid, there should be as many points of similarity as possible. In other words, if Qumran was a villa or manor house, it should have more than one or two features in common with contemporary Judean villas and manor houses. This means that we need to compare the layout and design, the interior decoration, and the pottery of Qumran with those of contemporary Judean villas.

For the purposes of comparison, we shall look at four groups of contemporary Judean palaces and villas: (1) the royal Hasmonean and Herodian palaces at Masada, Herodium, and Herodian Jericho; (2) the private, upper-class urban Jewish mansions of the Herodian period in Jerusalem's Jewish Quarter; (3) "Hilkiah's palace," a private, rural villa of the Herodian period in Idumaea; and (4) the recently-published early Roman villas at Horvat ʿEleq and Horvat ʿAqav at Ramat Hanadiv near Caesarea, and at Ein ez-Zara (ancient Callirrhoe) on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea. As we shall see, all of these palaces and villas share certain features that are not found at Qumran (whereas Qumran has certain features that are not found at other sites).

The most extensive remains of Hasmonean palaces have been uncovered by Ehud Netzer in his excavations at Jericho. These palaces typically have a central courtyard surrounded by rooms. A hall that probably functioned as a triclinium (a dining room or reception hall) opened on to the southern side of the courtyard. The opening to the courtyard was through two columns set between the side walls (an arrangement referred to as *in antis*), instead of through a doorway in a wall. This type of hall can be seen in the Hasmonean twin palaces at Jericho and at Masada in the core of the western palace and in Buildings 11, 12, and 13. Other features of the Hasmonean palaces in Jericho include swimming pools, gardens, an elaborate water-supply system, bathhouses, and miqva'ot (ritual baths). At least one building was furnished with stuccoed columns (that is, stone columns covered with molded plaster) in a Hellenized Doric (Greek) order. Remains of wall paintings (frescoes) and floor mosaics were found in several parts of the palace complex, including in one of the bathhouses. Netzer has described the characteristic features of Hasmonean architecture as including "irrigated royal estates, palaces with multiple swimming-pools, bathing facilities and gardens."

The typical features of Herod's palaces followed those of Roman villas. These include a main wing with a triclinium, a peristyle courtyard (that is, an open courtyard surrounded by columns that created a porch around the sides), a bathhouse, and dwelling rooms. The triclinium in Herod's palaces was a large hall with rows of columns surrounding three sides of the room's interior, and a wide entrance on the fourth side opening to the landscape or a courtyard. This type of hall can be seen in Herod's third palace at Jericho and in the circular palace-fortress at Upper Herodium. The triclinium on the lower terrace of the northern palace at Masada differs in having columns around all four sides of the interior. Circular "triclinium-type" halls are found on the middle terrace of Herod's northern palace at Masada and perhaps on the southern mound in Herod's third palace at Jericho. Peristyle courtyards in Herod's palaces typically had rows of columns around all four sides, with double ("heart-shaped") columns at the corners. The columns supported a roofed porch on all four sides, with an open air garden in the center. Peristyle courtyards with interior gardens can be seen in Herod's second and third palaces at Jericho, at Upper Herodium, and perhaps in a modified form on the upper terrace of the northern palace at Masada. Bathhouses or baths are found in all of Herod's palaces at Jericho, at Upper and Lower Herodium, and in the northern and western palaces at Masada. Herod's bathhouses were usually equipped with a Roman-style hypocaust system. In this system, the hot room (steam bath) of the bathhouse had a floor supported by rows of small columns made of bricks or stones (called *suspensura*) (see Fig.

49). The hot air from a furnace in an adjacent room circulated among these small columns and heated the floor. The hot air was also carried along the walls by pipes or flues. Steam was created by splashing water from tubs in the room onto the heated walls and floors. Some of Herod's bathhouses, for example the one in the western palace at Masada, had an older type of heating system with bathtubs containing heated water. Miqva'ot are found in Herod's third palace at Jericho and in the western and northern palaces at Masada.

The extended complexes of Herod's palaces included elaborate entertainment facilities such as large pools for swimming and boating, elaborate gardens, and water channels and installations. Large pools for swimming and boating are found at Lower Herodium and in all three Herodian palaces at Jericho. There is also at least one swimming pool at Masada. Elaborate gardens and landscaping are characteristic features of all of Herod's gardens. Perhaps the best example is the "sunken garden" in Herod's third palace at Jericho, but extensive gardens are found elsewhere in the Herodian palaces at Jericho as well as at Lower Herodium and Masada. Stucco, wall frescoes, floor mosaics, and floor tiles *(opus sectile)* decorated the interiors of all of Herod's palaces. Stucco was used to create imitation paneling on the walls (this is the First Pompeian Style), to create flutes covering column drums, to cover column capitals, and to imitate other architectural elements (for an example of stucco from Pompeii, see Fig. 50). The frescoes are in the same style (the Second Pompeian Style) as contemporary wall paintings found in Pompeii (see, for example, Fig. 51). In this style, imitation marble or colored stone panels were painted on the surface of the wall. The floor mosaics in Herod's palaces are made of small, black-and-white or colored stone cubes that create geometric or floral designs (see, for example, Fig. 52). The floor tiles were cut into geometric shapes such as triangles and laid in alternating colors (such as black and white) to form decorative patterns. Finally, Herod's palaces (as well as other projects he sponsored) often incorporated Roman architectural elements such as arches, vaults, and domes. In Rome, these curvilinear elements were constructed using brick and concrete. Herod usually used local cut stone for these elements (although he used Roman-type brickwork and imported concrete in his third palace at Jericho and at two other sites in Palestine). An intact masonry (stone) dome survives in the bathhouse at Upper Herodium and intact masonry vaults are found elsewhere at that site.

Although the palaces at Jericho, Herodium, and Masada are the best-known examples of Herod's palaces, these features are found in the other Herodian palace-fortresses around the Dead Sea. For example, frescoes, stucco, and tile floors were discovered at Cypros, which overlooks Herod's palace at Jericho. A peristyle courtyard with heart-shaped columns is visible

at Alexandrium-Sartaba in the Jordan Valley north of Jericho. A bathhouse complex has been uncovered at Machaerus on the eastern side of the Dead Sea (in modern Jordan). At Hyrcania, located just to the west of Qumran, rooms grouped around the central courtyard sit on a leveled area supported by masonry vaults. One of the open reservoirs at the foot of the western side of the site might have functioned as a swimming pool.

Scholars who believe that Qumran was a villa might argue that the parallels I have cited so far are not valid, since these sites were royal palaces. However, it is important to consider these parallels because elements of royal architecture and decoration were imitated and used (admittedly on a smaller or more modest scale) by the upper classes of Judean society — that is, by the wealthy members of society who resided in villas. The best examples of contemporary, private, upper-class Judean dwellings (villas) are the Herodian mansions in Jerusalem's Jewish Quarter. The excavator, Avigad, described these mansions as follows:

> Construction in the Upper City was dense, with the houses built quite close together; but the individual dwelling units were extensive, and inner courtyards lent them the character of luxury villas. These homes were richly ornamented with frescoes, stucco work, and mosaic floors, and were equipped with complex bathing facilities, as well as containing the luxury goods and artistic objects which signify a high standard of living. This, then, was an upper class quarter, where the noble families of Jerusalem lived, with the High Priest at their head. Here they built their homes in accordance with the dominant fashion of the Hellenistic-Roman period. It is generally assumed that the Jerusalemite nobility was of the Sadducee faction, whose members included the Hellenizers; the lower classes tended more to the Pharisee faction, which opposed foreign influences. Thus, it can be assumed that this quarter was occupied chiefly by Sadducees. Even so, there is no specific archaeological evidence here to indicate any laxity in their upholding of the traditional precepts of the Jewish religion. On the contrary, the finds indicate that the laws of ritual purity were strictly kept, as were the injunctions against statues and graven images.

This passage highlights two important points. First, the mansions in the Jewish Quarter were urban villas, not located in the countryside like Qumran. In other words, the mansions in the Jewish Quarter were not landed estates. They were built closely together because real estate was at a premium in Jerusalem. Second, these mansions belonged to the uppermost class of contemporary Judean society: the Sadducees. This class included the high priests. Al-

though the Sadducees had a reputation for being Hellenizers (that is, for adopting Greek and Roman culture), the finds from these mansions indicate that the residents strictly observed Jewish law (including purity laws).

Several large houses or parts of houses were uncovered by Avigad. A group of six contiguous or almost contiguous houses is located in the area he referred to as the Herodian Quarter. Another house, in the excavation's Area E, was built in the middle of the 1st century B.C.E. and destroyed at the beginning of the 1st century C.E. when a road was laid over it. This house contained the Hellenistic type lamp that I mentioned above. The "Burnt House," so-called because of the visible signs of fire which destroyed it in 70 C.E., is located in the excavation's Area B, to the north of the Herodian Quarter. In most cases, only the basement stories of the houses are preserved, which contained bathing and storage facilities. At least some of the food was kept in bag-shaped jars or in imported amphoras. Water was stored in cisterns hewn into the bedrock on which the houses were built. The bathing facilities included baths and miqva'ot. Many of the houses contained more than one miqveh, reflecting a concern with purity that we would expect of priestly residents (see Chapter 7). The bath rooms are adjacent to the miqva'ot, and were furnished with bathtubs and paved with colored geometric and floral mosaics. The houses had at least one story above the basement, at ground level, and some might have had a second story. Two of the houses (the "Palatial Mansion" and the "Southern House") are especially large and had an open-air central courtyard surrounded by rooms. One of the mansions (the "House of Columns") had a peristyle courtyard with heart-shaped columns at the corners. The columns were covered with fluted stucco, and two rooms adjacent to the courtyard were paved with floor tiles *(opus sectile)*. The interior decoration of these urban villas included architectural elements made of stucco (including stucco panels), floors paved with tiles or colored mosaics, and frescoes. In fact, the geometric and floral designs in the mosaic floors of these houses are so similar to those in Herod's palaces at Masada that they might have been executed by the same craftsmen or workshops (see Fig. 52). The frescoes include examples of the Second and Third Pompeian Styles (see Fig. 51). However, arches, domes, and vaults are uncommon, and there is no evidence of the use of concrete in these urban villas. Although they were equipped with private baths, these mansions did not have the Roman-type hypocaust system found in most of Herod's palaces. They also lack large swimming pools and landscaped gardens, not surprising in a densely populated urban setting. Thus, the mansions in the Jewish Quarter share some of the features characteristic of Herod's palaces, especially in terms of interior decoration.

If Qumran was a villa, one of the closest analogs should be a rural, Herodian-period villa at Khirbet el-Muraq, ca. 9 mi. west of Hebron. The site was excavated by Emanuel Damati in 1969, who called it "Hilkiah's palace" because of an inscribed stone plaque found in the excavations. This inscription and the presence of stone vessels indicate that the inhabitants were Jewish. The site is located in ancient Idumaea, the district to the south of Judea. Hilkiah's palace was constructed at the end of the 1st century B.C.E. and was destroyed at the time of the First Jewish Revolt against the Romans, probably during Vespasian's campaign to Idumaea in 68 C.E. (the same year Qumran was destroyed). It is situated on a hill some 500 meters above sea level, overlooking the lowlands (Shephelah) of Judea to the west. Important roads lead from the lowlands to the top of the mountain ridge just to the north and south of the site. The villa sat within a fortified enclosure with a square tower on its western side. The tower is constructed of large stones and its walls slope out towards the base. Rooms were ranged along the inner sides of the enclosure, surrounding a large peristyle courtyard. Storage rooms along the southern side of the enclosure were roofed with a barrel vault. Architectural fragments found in the excavations indicate that there was a second-story level. The walls of the villa were constructed uniformly of large stones, roughly square in shape, while ashlars (cut stones) with drafted margins were used for the facades, pilasters, columns, arches, and stylobates. The peristyle courtyard was surrounded by the living rooms of the villa. The unit on the south is described by Damati as the *oikos* or main room of the house, with a *prostas* or entrance room adjoining it to the east. The walls of the *prostas* were covered with stucco molded in geometric patterns. A large, elongated hall on the eastern side of the courtyard is identified as a triclinium. Its walls were decorated with elaborately molded stucco. Two square pillars built of ashlar masonry were located in the hall 4 meters to the north of its south wall. Small niches cut along the length of the southern corners of the pillars and in the walls opposite held wooden partitions that divided the hall into two unequal parts. The villa's bathhouse was located on the northern side of the peristyle courtyard. Its barrel-vaulted steam room was heated by a Roman-style hypocaust system. Remains of a mosaic floor were discovered in the bathhouse. The columns of the peristyle courtyard stood on a nicely cut stone stylobate that was raised slightly above the floor of the courtyard. The decorative elements found in the excavation included stuccoed architectural elements (such as molded panels), mosaic floors, Nabatean-style column capitals, Attic column and pilaster bases (that is, column and pilaster bases carved in a Greco-Roman style called "Attic"), and carved architrave blocks (stone elements belonging to the upper part of the walls).

More recently, the final report on excavations at the early Roman villa at Ein ez-Zara (ancient Callirrhoe) has been published. If Qumran was a villa, Ein ez-Zara should provide a close parallel because it is located by the Dead Sea and dates to the 1st century C.E. The remains at Ein ez-Zara include one building consisting of a large open courtyard surrounded by rooms ("Building A"), and an adjoining building with a plan that resembles the triclinium in Herod's third palace at Jericho. About 20 column drums with different diameters and several column bases made of local basalt were found in various spots around Building A. They apparently originated in a colonnaded courtyard in front of Building B. Unfortunately, little was preserved of these buildings above the foundation level due to reoccupation during the Byzantine period, the plundering of the site for material, the forces of erosion, and recent plowing. It is therefore not surprising that no mosaics or *opus sectile* floors were discovered, aside from one rose-colored paving stone. On the other hand, some finely-molded stucco fragments were recovered. Stone vessels and coins of the First Revolt suggest Jewish presence at the site. However, the only pool discovered shows no evidence of steps and had an outlet to drain the contents, indicating that it was not a miqveh. A comparison between Ein ez-Zara and Qumran reveals some fundamental differences. Unlike Qumran, Ein ez-Zara includes a building with a very large, open courtyard surrounded by a single range of rooms on all sides, and another building that is clearly modeled after the triclinia in Herod's palaces. Although the buildings were almost completely denuded, the stucco fragments suggest that the interiors were richly decorated. On the other hand, despite the evidence for Jewish presence at Ein ez-Zara, there are no miqva'ot.

How does the settlement at Qumran compare with the Hasmonean and Herodian palaces, the mansions in the Jewish Quarters, Hilkiah's palace, and the villa at Ein ez-Zara? In terms of layout and design, the settlement at Qumran has none of the features characteristic of the Hasmonean and Herodian palaces: the hall with two columns *in antis*, the colonnaded triclinium, the peristyle courtyard with garden, the bathhouses, and the large swimming pools and landscaped gardens. It did have an open-air courtyard without a peristyle around which rooms were grouped. Some of these rooms had a second-story level. The plan of the dining room at Qumran (L77) is similar to the triclinia in the Palatial Mansion in the Jewish Quarter and in Hilkiah's palace, though there is no interior decoration at Qumran.

The square towers at Qumran and Hilkiah's palace are also similar. Yizhar Hirschfeld has noted that the layout of the main building at Qumran, which is roughly square and has a fortified tower on the north side, resembles other manor houses in Herodian Palestine, including those at Ḥorvat ʿEleq at

Ramat Hanadiv, Qasr el-Leja in Samaria, and Rujm el-Hamiri southeast of Hebron. Hirschfeld also lists Aroer in the northern Negev, which is a settlement next to a fort, not a manor house or a villa. Based on these comparisons, he believes that Qumran was a manor house.

Hirschfeld and the Donceels have each suggested that the main building at Qumran was the *pars urbana*, that is, the residential part of the villa or manor house, while the surrounding areas and the secondary building were the *pars rustica* or industrial area. However, cooking areas and workshops were located inside the main building (for example, the kitchen in L38-L41 and a dyeing installation in L34), whereas a dining room was located above L111, L120, L121, L122 in the secondary building (see Chapter 6). The service rooms or workshops at other sites are usually segregated from the rest of the palace or villa. In Herod's western palace at Masada, for example, at least some of the service rooms were clustered in a separate wing designated the "Eastern Service Wing" and "Western Service Wing." At Jericho, an extensive area filled with workshops dating from the Hasmonean period to the first half of the 1st century C.E. was discovered some 150 meters to the north of Herod's third palace. At Qasr el-Leja (a rural manor house in Samaria), an oil press and possible workshops or storage rooms were located on the eastern side of the site, while the residential quarters were on the west. A workshop that occupied the basement story of a Herodian mansion called the "Burnt House" in Jerusalem's Jewish Quarter might have produced incense or spice for the use in the temple cult. The living rooms were located on the ground floor and upper story. A stone weight found in the "Burnt House," which is inscribed with the name "Bar Kathros," suggests that the owner belonged to that priestly family. Although Jerusalem was a manufacturing center for stone vessels, painted bowls, and glass ware, there is no evidence for their production in the Herodian mansions in the Jewish Quarter.

An examination of Hirschfeld's final report on his excavations of the fortified early Roman manor house at Ḥorvat ʿEleq reveals significant differences with Qumran. The square tower at Qumran is incorporated into the northern edge of the settlement, whereas a similar tower at Ḥorvat ʿEleq and the other buildings of the settlement are surrounded by a wall with projecting square towers that forms a roughly square, fortified enclosure. A bathhouse of Roman type belonging to the complex (located near a spring outside the enclosure) included a hot room heated by a hypocaust system, rooms with vaulted ceilings, colored marble revetment on the walls, and mosaic floors. Among the finds from Ḥorvat ʿEleq are imported amphoras (including a stamped Rhodian amphora handle of early Roman date), Pompeian red ware (a type of casserole imported from Italy), Roman mold-made discus lamps

(including one decorated with the figure of a woman), significant amounts of Eastern Sigillata A, and Cypriot Sigillata and Western Terra Sigillata (including one bowl decorated in relief with a mask and another with a horse). Three fragments of Eastern Sigillata A from Ḥorvat ʿEleq bear inscriptions in Greek that were incised on the vessels after firing. In contrast, no Greek inscriptions were discovered at Qumran.

Hirschfeld excavated another early Roman farmhouse at Ramat Hanadiv. This farmhouse, called Horvat ʿAqav, consists of a roughly square, fortified enclosure containing living quarters, storehouses, cisterns, and agricultural installations (winepresses, an olive press, and a threshing floor). The living quarters and storehouses were located on the eastern side of the enclosure, and the agricultural installations lay in the southwest corner of the enclosure, or outside it. According to Hirschfeld, "a high standard of construction is evident" from the ashlar (cut stone) construction and a finely worked heart-shaped column base. The buildings were covered with tiled roofs. At least some floors were paved with mosaics or with polished stone slabs. The living quarters were provided with one room that contained a built bathtub, and another with a miqveh. The presence of the latter, of course, indicates that the residents of this farmstead were Jewish. The ceramic assemblage includes examples of Eastern Sigillata A, another type of Eastern Sigillata, and Roman mold-made oil lamps with a decorated discus (including one with a griffin).

Despite the similarity between the square towers at Qumran and Horvat ʿEleq and the presence of a miqveh at Horvat ʿAqav, there are many significant differences between the Ramat Hanadiv sites and Qumran. The Ramat Hanadiv sites display a higher quality of construction with finely worked architectural elements: one Roman-type bathhouse with a hypocaust system and one built bathtub; rooms with vaulted ceilings; tiled roofs; colored marble revetment on the walls; mosaic and polished stone floors; and ceramic assemblages that include imports and Eastern Sigillata A, some decorated with figured images. The industrial and agricultural areas are segregated from the spaces with the living quarters. On the other hand, the Ramat Hanadiv sites lack the distinguishing features of Qumran, including the multiplicity of miqva'ot, the animal bone deposits, and the large adjacent cemetery.

The main problem with Hirschfeld's interpretation is that it is based entirely on a few morphological similarities (similarities in the architectural layout) between Qumran and contemporary manor houses, while ignoring all of the other evidence. This evidence includes differences in interior decoration and the pottery and other finds, as well as Qumran's peculiar features, such as the animal bone deposits, the large number of miqva'ot, and the adjacent cemetery — none of which is attested at the manor houses mentioned by Hirschfeld or at other contemporary Judean villas and palaces. In analogy, although the facades of many modern banks, train stations, and court houses are constructed in a Classical Greek style, these buildings do not function as Greek temples! Similarly, the presence of a tower and the discovery of arrowheads in the destruction level of 68 C.E. do not indicate that Qumran was a fort. We have seen, for example, that towers are found at manor houses around Roman Palestine, while the arrowheads found at Qumran are associated with the fighting that took place when the Romans conquered the site.

For archaeological interpretations to be valid, they must be based on a thorough consideration of all available evidence and on parallels with contemporary sites in the same geographical region. Of course, the settlement at Qumran shares some features of design with contemporary palaces and villas in Judea and elsewhere in Palestine, since the inhabitants expressed themselves in the architectural vocabulary of their environment. It would be anachronistic to expect the inhabitants of Qumran to build in a style that was completely different from contemporary architecture in Judea. However, these shared features, such as water systems, courtyards without peristyles, and large dining rooms, are too generic and utilitarian to support the identification of Qumran as a villa. To the contrary, it is the differences between Qumran and contemporary villas and manor houses that are significant.

As we have seen, the extensive water system is perhaps the most distinctive feature of Qumran. Elaborate water systems are characteristic of the Herodian palaces. The mansions in the Jewish Quarter contained water facilities in the basements. There was also a system of water channels at Hilkiah's palace, which carried rainwater from the roofs of the buildings to a cistern west of the villa. At Qasr el-Leja, a cistern in the courtyard and two outside of it were supplied with rainwater. However, there is at least one obvious and fundamental difference between the water system at Qumran and those found at the other sites. At Qumran, there are no clearly identifiable bathhouses or built bathtubs, only cisterns and pools, many of which were used as miqva'ot (see Chapter 7). The existence of an extensive water system at Qumran is significant because it indicates that the inhabitants possessed the technology necessary for constructing the kinds of swimming pools and baths found in contemporary villas, but did not do so.

The strongest argument against the identification of Qumran as a villa or manor house lies in the almost complete absence of interior decoration. As advocates of the villa and manor house interpretations have noted, a few architectural elements (such as column drums and bases and voussoir stones)

are found at Qumran. These elements apparently belong to one or more structures that stood somewhere in the settlement and were destroyed in the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. (see Chapter 4). In addition, two limestone tiles or flagstones were found in L2, four in L44, and one each in L4 (two fragments), L13, L19 (one fragment), L46 (one fragment), L59, and L61. It is not clear whether these represent *opus sectile* or are just flagstones (for stone tiles from Ein Feshkha, see Chapter 10). Still, the small number of these elements shows that interior decoration is almost completely absent at Qumran. There is no evidence at Qumran for stucco, frescoes, or mosaic floors. This accords well with the ceramic assemblage from Qumran, which yielded no examples of imported Western Terra Sigillata, amphoras, decorated Roman discus lamps, painted Jerusalem bowls, and almost no Eastern Sigillata A. In contrast, nicely-cut stones with dressed margins and frieze blocks with dentilated moldings (that is, blocks carved with rows of projecting teeth along the bottom edge — a decorative element characteristic of Classical architecture) have been discovered at the fortress at Rujm el-Bahr (at the northern end of the Dead Sea) and at the anchorage at Khirbet Mazin (south of Qumran). Frescoes with red and black painted bands were also found at Khirbet Mazin (as well as imported amphoras, as we have seen). On the other hand, just as the settlement at Qumran has a number of peculiar features (such as the animal bone deposits, the large number of miqva'ot, and the adjacent cemetery), its ceramic corpus includes types that are virtually unique to Qumran (such as the cylindrical jars). These comparisons with contemporary sites in Judea support the identification of Qumran as a sectarian settlement.

I hope that this chapter has clarified why the highly-publicized alternative interpretations of Qumran are not supported by the archaeological evidence. In the following chapters, we shall examine the peculiar features of Qumran in light of the information provided by the scrolls and our ancient sources.

Bibliographical Notes

For a comparison between the ceramic assemblage from Qumran and those from contemporary Judean sites, see Jodi Magness, "The Community at Qumran in Light of Its Pottery," in Michael O. Wise, N. Golb, John J. Collins, and Dennis G. Pardee, *Methods of Investigation,* 39-50. For a discussion of cylindrical jars within the context of sectarian halakhah, see Jodi Magness, "Why Scroll Jars?" in *A Festschrift in Honor of Eric M. Meyers,* ed. Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough (forthcoming). Both of these papers

contain references relevant to this chapter; some of the main references are repeated here with additional bibliography. For the Jerusalem painted bowl from Cave 37 near Qumran, see Joseph Patrich, "Khirbet Qumrân in Light of New Archaeological Explorations in the Qumran Caves," in Wise, Golb, Collins, and Pardee, *Methods of Investigation,* 73-95. For the pottery from Ehud Netzer's excavations at Herodian Jericho, see Rachel Bar-Nathan, *The Pottery of Jericho in the Hasmonean Period and the Time of Herod, and the Problem of the Transition from Hasmonean Pottery Types to Pottery Types of the Time of Herod* (M.A. thesis; Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology at the Hebrew University, 1988 [Hebrew]). For Eastern Sigillata A, see Kathleen Warner Slane, "The Fine Wares," in *Tel Anafa II/I: The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery,* ed. Andrea M. Berlin and Slane (Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum, 1997), 247-406; John W. Hayes, "Sigillata Orientale A (Eastern Sigillata A)," in *Enciclopedia dell'arte antica, classica e orientale, Atlante delle forme ceramiche 2: Ceramica fine romana nel Bacino Mediterraneo (tardo ellenismo e primo impero)* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1985), 3-48; Kathleen Warner Slane, J. Michael Elam, Michael D. Glascock, and Hector Neff, "Compositional Analysis of Eastern Sigillata A and Related Wares from Tel Anafa (Israel)," *Journal of Archaeological Science* 21 (1994): 51-64; Jan Gunneweg, Isadore Perlman, and Joseph Yellin, *The Provenience, Typology, and Chronology of Eastern Terra Sigillata.* Qedem 17 (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1983).

For Donald T. Ariel's discussion of stamped amphora handles from Jerusalem, see "Imported Greek Stamped Amphora Handles," in *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969-1982* 1: *Architecture and Stratigraphy: Areas A, W and X-2, Final Report,* ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 267-83 (including an Appendix on Amphoras and Ritual Purity); *Excavations at the City of David 1978-1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh* 2: *Imported Stamped Amphora Handles, Coins, Worked Bone and Ivory, and Glass.* Qedem 30 (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1990), esp. 25-28. Gerald Finkielsztejn has enthusiastically argued that the drop in the number of amphoras imported to Jerusalem in the Hasmonean period is due to the observance of purity laws among the population; see Finkielsztejn, "Hellenistic Jerusalem: The Evidence of the Rhodian Amphora Stamps," in Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies, *New Studies on Jerusalem: Proceedings of the Fifth Conference, December 23rd 1999,* ed. Avi Faust and Eyal Baruch (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1999), 21*-36*. For the Italian wine and imported fish sauce from Masada, see Hannah M. Cotton and Joseph Geiger, *Masada II: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Reports: The Latin and Greek Documents* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989), 140-58; Cotton, Omri Lernau, and Yuval

Goren, "Fish sauces from Herodian Masada," *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 9 (1996): 223-38. With the exception of the oil lamps, the rest of the pottery from Yadin's excavations at Masada has not yet been published.

For the 1st–century C.E. villa at Ein ez-Zara, see Christa Clamer, *Fouilles archéologiques de 'Ain ez-Zâra/Callirrhoé, villégiature hérodienne* (Beirut: Institut français d'archéologie du Proche-Orient, 1997) (the ovoid jar is illustrated in Pl. 12:15). For the excavations at Ein Boqeq, see Moshe Fischer, Mordechai Gichon, and Oren Tal, *'En Boqeq: Excavations in an Oasis on the Dead Sea, 2: The Officina, An Early Roman Building on the Dead Sea Shore* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2000) (the ovoid jar is illustrated there in Fig. 2.7:1). For the cylindrical jar from Abila, see Farah S. Ma'ayeh, "Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Jordan," *Annual of the Department of Antiquities in Jordan* 4-5 (1960): 114-16.

For the results of neutron activation analysis indicating that some of the Qumran pottery is made of Jerusalem clay, see Joseph Yellin, Magen Broshi, and Hanan Eshel, "Pottery of Qumran and Ein Ghuweir: The First Chemical Exploration of Provenience," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 321 (2001): 65-78. For a typology of clay jar stoppers, see Zvi Gal, "Loom Weights or Jar Stoppers?" *Israel Exploration Journal* 39 (1989): 281-83.

For Andrea M. Berlin's observation that the Jews of Galilee deliberately refrained from using Eastern Sigillata A, see "Romanization and Anti-Romanization in Pre-Revolt Galilee," in *The First Jewish Revolt: Archaeology, History, and Ideology,* ed. Berlin and J. Andrew Overman (New York: Routledge, 2002), 102-30; "The Death of Herod and the New Divide in Galilee," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, Philadelphia, 4 January 2002 (I am grateful to Berlin for providing me with a copy of this paper, and for her permission to cite it).

For the suggestion that after the Roman destruction of the settlement in 68 C.E. members of the Qumran community joined the group at Masada, see Yigael Yadin, *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (New York: Random House, 1966), 174; also see Emanuel Tov, "A Qumran Origin for the Masada Non-Biblical Texts?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7/1 (2000): 57-73.

For the sectarian halakhah regarding opening sealed vessels on the Sabbath, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975); also see Hannah K. Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 74-75. For discussions of sectarian halakhah regarding the purity of oil and other liquids, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31 (1980): 157-70; Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code* (Chico:

Scholars, 1983) (esp. 161-73); Baumgarten, "Liquids and Susceptibility to Defilement in New 4Q Texts," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994): 91-101; "Torohot," in *Qumran Cave 4 XXV, Halakhic Texts,* ed. Baumgarten et al. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 35* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 79-122; the passage from 4QTohorah cited here is from p. 108.

For the Assumption of Moses, see Robert H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* 2: *Pseudepigrapha* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 407-24; Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* rev. ed. 3/1, ed. Geza Vermès, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), 278-88.

For my discussion of the differences between Qumran and contemporary Judean villas, see Jodi Magness, "A Villa at Khirbet Qumrân?" *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1994): 397-419 (with bibliography; some of the main references are repeated here with additional bibliography); also see "Qumran: Not a Country Villa," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 22/6 (1996): 38-47, 72-73. For *villae rusticae* in Italy, see Roger C. Carrington, "Studies in the Campanian 'Villae Rusticae'," *Journal of Roman Studies* 21 (1931): 110-30. For recent studies of *villae rusticae,* see Roger Ling, "*Villae rusticae* at Boscoreale," *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 9 (1996): 344-50; also see Alfred Frazer, ed., *The Roman Villa: Villa Urbana.* First Williams Symposium on Classical Architecture (Philadelphia: University Museum, 1998). For the relevant publications of Yizhar Hirschfeld and Robert Donceel and Pauline Donceel-Voûte, see the bibliographical notes for Chapter 1. For Herod's palaces at Masada, see Ehud Netzer, *Masada III: The Yigael Yadin Excavations, 1963-1965 Final Reports: The Buildings, Stratigraphy and Architecture* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1991). For the Hasmonean and Herodian palaces at Jericho, see Ehud Netzer, *Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho: Final Reports of the 1973-1987 Excavations* 1: *Stratigraphy and Architecture* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2001). For the Hasmonean and Herodian desert palaces in general, see Netzer, *The Palaces of the Hasmoneans and Herod the Great* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2001); Yoram Tsafrir, "The Desert Fortresses of Judaea in the Second Temple Period," in *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 2, ed. L. I. Levine (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1982), 120-45. For the Herodian mansions in Jerusalem's Jewish Quarter, see Nahman Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem* (for the amphoras, see 79, 87-88). For the villa at Khirbet el-Muraq (Hilkiah's Palace), see Emanuel Damati, "Hilkiah's Palace," in *Between Hermon and Sinai, Memorial to Amnon,* ed. Magen Broshi (Jerusalem: Yedidim, 1977), 93-113 (Hebrew); "The Palace of Ḥilkiya," *Qadmoniot* 60 (1982): 117-21 (Hebrew). The results of Pesach Bar-Adon's excavations at Rujm el-Bahr and Khirbet Mazin (Qasr el-Yahud) are published in Hebrew with an

English summary: Pesach Bar-Adon, *Excavations in the Judean Desert.* 'Atiqot Hebrew series 9 (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1989), 3-14, 18-29.

The similarities between the layout of Qumran (especially the tower) and other sites such as Rujm el-Qasr were first noted by Shimon Ricklin, "When Did the Essenes Arrive at Qumran? — An Architectural Response," in *Studies in the Settlement of Judea: A Collection of Papers in Historical Geography* 1, ed. Ze'ev H. Erlich (Bnei Brak: Moriah, 1995), 263-66 (Hebrew). For the farmstead at Qasr el-Leja, see Shimon Dar, *Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria 800 B.C.E.–636 CE* (Oxford: BAR International Series 308[i], 1986), 10-12. For Yizhar Hirschfeld's report on his excavations at Ramat Hanadiv (including a chapter on the Hellenistic and Roman pottery by Naama Silberstein), see Hirschfeld, *Ramat Hanadiv Excavations: Final Report of the 1984-1998 Seasons* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000) (with a discussion of fortified manor houses of the Second Temple period, 684-720; for Qumran, see 716-17).

CHAPTER 6

Communal Meals, a Toilet, and Sacred Space at Qumran

Communal meals conducted by the sectarians are mentioned in the scrolls and are described by Josephus. In this chapter, we examine the archaeological evidence for communal meals at Qumran in light of these literary sources. This evidence includes the presence of dining rooms, dining dishes, and the enigmatic animal bone deposits. As we shall see, the distribution of animal bone deposits suggests that the layout of the settlement at Qumran reflects a sectarian concept of sacred space. Rooms associated with varying degrees of purity or impurity seem to have been arranged according to this concept. One of the most interesting installations in the settlement is a toilet in L51, which was apparently associated with impurity. For the concept of purity and impurity among the sectarians and in rabbinic Judaism, see Chapter 7. We begin this chapter by discussing the toilet, before considering the evidence for communal meals and sacred space at Qumran.

A Toilet at Qumran

De Vaux identified one of the installations he excavated as a toilet. This installation was located in L51, a large room on the eastern side of the main building to the north of the miqveh in L48-L49 (see Figs. 37, 39-41). A terracotta pipe set into a conical, mud-lined pit that was filled with thin layers of coarse, dirty earth was embedded in the floor of this room. In the photographs from de Vaux's excavations, the pipe can be seen set into the dried mud-lining of the pit. One way to confirm de Vaux's identification of this installation as a