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ABSTRACT

The focus of this study is the material culture from a repository in one of the burial caves of the monastery of St. Stephen in Jerusalem. An inventory of 202 items including pottery sherds, glass, fragments of clay oil lamps, jewelry, and a devotional object are presented herein. Viewed in concert with the che-

¹ Ps 2:9.
mical analyses, osteological evidence, and textual record, this rather sparse collection helps corroborate a Byzantine placement for the skeletal remains interred in repository 6 of cave complex 1 at St. Stephen’s monastery.

**INTRODUCTION**

Analysis of the skeletal remains from a burial cave of the Couvent Saint-Étienne/École Biblique et Archéologique Française began under the direction of the fourth author in 1995 as part of a biocultural reconstruction of life at the site during the Byzantine era (specifically, 5th-7th centuries). Numerous non-osteological items were retrieved in the course of exhuming the human remains. We present here a survey of the material culture from this ossilegium, with attention to those items which especially illumine date and context.

**BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

The **Historical Setting**

The burial cave complex under investigation is located in Jerusalem, on the grounds of the Couvent St. Étienne/École Biblique et Archéologique Française, approximately 250 meters north of the Damascus Gate and east of Nablus Road. The site is generally accepted as that of the 5th-7th century monastery of St. Stephen, whose church was built by Empress Eudocia beginning in 438 CE. In the words of one Byzantine

---

2 See S. SHERIDAN, “‘New Life The Dead Receive’: The Relationship between Human Remains and the Cultural Record for Byzantine St. Stephen’s,” *RB* 106 (1999), 574-611.

3 This determination was first argued formally by M.-J. LAGRANGE in *Saint Étienne et Son Sanctuaire a Jerusalem* (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1894), 139-55. An institution linked to the memory of St. Stephen is well attested in the literature of the Byzantine period, such as: JOHN RUBIER, *Petrus der Iberer: Ein Charakterbild zur Kirchen-und Sittengeschichte des Fünften Jah-
author. St. Stephen's was a “vast temenos,” a term which indicates the sacred precinct or enclosure around a temple. At its zenith, St. Stephen's stood for almost 100 years as one of the largest church com-

Fig. 1. - Schematic of burial complex 1 at St. Stephen's monastery. The finds discussed in this paper were exhumed from the repository between chambers 6 and 8, commingled with the human remains.

(Not drawn to scale, see G. Barkay and A. Kloner, 1986 for dimensions of the complex.)


Evagrius, Historia Ecclesiae 1:22 (PG 86:2433).
plexes in the Holy Land. Several authors of the period comment on both its size and beauty, including the patristic biographer Cyril of Scythopolis who claimed it could accommodate 10,000 monks in 516. Although Cyril’s figure should not be taken literally, he indicates a great number of persons gathered at the site.

The subject of the present study is the southernmost burial cave complex (# 1) on St. Étienne’s property (one of seven known burial sites in the temenos). Adjacent to the Garden Tomb, this crypt complex played an important part in the area’s history; the vicinity north of the Damascus Gate was an ancient necropolis in use from the Iron Age to the Byzantine period. While the *terminus a quo* for this particular

---


6. Cyril of Scythopolis (*Vita Sabaei s6*) describes the gathering as follows: “ ...the archbishop summoned all the monks to the holy city overnight, gathering them from all sides; those who counted the multitude announced that the total came to ten thousand monks. Since no church could hold so great a congregation, it was decided that all should assemble at the church of the holy protomartyr Stephen, which was capacious enough to receive the multitude....” *Cyril of Scythopolis: The Lives of the Monks of Palestine* (trans. R. Price; Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1991), 160-1.


complex was originally thought to be the Herodian period, the architecture of the complex and the craftsmanship with which the caves were hewn indicate that the earliest use of the burial caves occurred during Iron Age II. The latter view is the consensus of scholars today.

Like the previous study introducing the biocultural model, this article concentrates on material from one bone repository and its Byzantine usage. The repository in question lies below the right hand (southern) side burial bench of chamber 6, and is partially beneath the east portion of chamber 8 as well (Pl. IX). It will hereafter be referred to as repository 6. The approximate dimensions of the repository, which is not hewn as a perfect rectangle or square, are as follows: width, 2.03 m; length, 1.74 m; depth, 1.75 m.

The remains in repository 6 were excavated from 1995 through 1997, yielding approximately 15,000 human skeletal elements, 158 non-human animal remains, and 251 items of material culture. In June 1995 levels 1-3 were exhumed; in July 1996, levels 4-8, and in the final season (May-August 1997), levels 9-29. Very fine soil was found in the repository in addition to the bones, however, since the primary task of the project was the timely exhumation and examination of the osteological remains, the small amount of sifted dirt was not recorded. The non-osteological finds were discovered primarily in the 1996 and 1997 seasons (levels 4-29), especially toward the bottom of the repository.

---

9 One of the earliest Dominican assessments from Lagrange was that the tomb complex reflects most strongly the Herodian period (LAGRANGE, Saint Etienne et Son Sanctuaire à Jérusalem, 117). VINCENT and ABEIL (Jerusalem Nouvelle 4, 784) concurred in their assessment of the tomb's antiquity.

10 The third author and A. Kloner maintain that the crypt complex, in particular chamber 6, was in use during the eighth and seventh centuries BCE. G. BARKAY and A. KLONER, "The Northern Cemetery of Jerusalem in First Temple Times," Qadmoniot 8 (1975), 71-6 (Hebrew); "Burial Caves North of Damascus Gate," IEJ 26 (1976), 55-7; "Jerusalem Tombs from the Days of the First Temple," BAR 12 (1986), 22-39; BARKAY, "Burial Caves and Burial Practices in Judah in the Iron Age"; BARKAY, KLONER and MAZAR, “The Northern Necropolis of Jerusalem during the First Temple Period”; G. BARKAY, "A Late Bronze Age Egyptian Temple in Jerusalem?" IEJ 46 (1996), 23-43. Current research is being conducted by Jean-Sylvain Caillou under the direction of Prof. Jean-Baptiste Humbert, O.P. of the Ecole Biblique to further study the dating of the tombs.


12 Assisting in the exhumations were Jennifer Richte- meier (University of Colorado), Rebecca Sanders (University of Georgia), Richard Bantch, Kelley Coburnt Bantch (both of the University of Notre Dame), Anthony Schafer (University of Wisconsin), Sara Niebuhr (Indiana University), and Dr. Patrick Cronauer, OSB (St. Vincent's Archabbey) who also assisted in exhumations in the summer season of 1997.
Analysis of the human remains indicates that repository 6 primarily served a homogeneous community from the Byzantine period, perhaps a cadre of monks. Numerous mechanisms for dating the finds have been employed, including fluoride analysis, radiocarbon dating, consistency of antemeres (comparable left/right skeletal elements), and comparison of bone mineral preservation with that of equivalent Byzantine specimens.\textsuperscript{13} All analyses indicate a discrete group of individuals dating to the Byzantine occupation (mid 5\textsuperscript{th} through early 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries).\textsuperscript{14} Amid the human remains were found commingled objects of material culture whose description and dating are the subject of this paper.

Although the tomb complex was discovered more than a century ago, no one has yet systematically studied its material culture. The tomb complex was discovered in May of 1885 by Dominicans who had completed their purchase of the site the previous year. In 1885 and 1886 there appeared two separate, eyewitness accounts of the complex's exploration as directed by Father Matthew Lecomte. One of the most intriguing finds described by Baron Ludovic de Vaux is a metal box extricated from a pit cut in the floor of the entrance hall to the tomb complex.\textsuperscript{15} The box, said to be decorated on the exterior and corroded, was thought to contain the bones of birds; sadly the box vanished in the early years of the monastery and has never been recovered.\textsuperscript{16} De Vaux believed that the tombs had been entered and pillaged.\textsuperscript{17} Despite certain inconsistencies in description, de Vaux's two accounts prove accurate yet provide very little information about material culture found in the ancient tomb complex.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{13} The authors would like to thank Mr. Joe Zias for access to comparative collections at the Israel Antiquities Authority, Rockefeller Museum.

\textsuperscript{14} SHERRIHAN, "New Life The Dead Receive," 383.

\textsuperscript{15} L. DE VAUX, "Découvertes Récentes a Jérusalem," Revue Archéologique 7 (1886), 371-4; esp. 374.

\textsuperscript{16} De Vaux describes the box as a long metal coffin, decorated with wreaths and bearing the image of three naked infants holding hands; he judges the style to be Graeco-Judaic from the Herodian period. Two years later, however, de Vaux recalls the box somewhat differently; it is said to be a copper coffin that is completely corroded, and with a length no more than 50 cm. It is described as finely decorated with two crowns in wreaths of foliage and two figures holding an urn. L. DE VAUX, "Mémoire relatif aux Fouilles Entreprises par les R. P. Dominicans dans leur domaine de Saint-Étienne, près la porte de Damas, a Jérusalem," Revue Archéologique 12 (1888), 32-60, esp. 36. His second description is corroborated by Lagrange who speculates that the chest may have been the sarcophagus of a child, though he does not speak to its actual contents. LAGRANGE, Saint Étienne et Son Sanctuaire, 113.

\textsuperscript{17} DE VAUX, "Mémoire relatif aux Fouilles Entreprises," 37.

\textsuperscript{18} See note 16 above.
Less reliable is the account of Selah Merrill, whose hurried work in
the tomb complex led to marked inaccuracies. 19 Merrill too reported
virtually no finds of material culture from the repositories or the larger
tomb complex. In 1894, Lagrange published a more thorough report of
the Jerusalem burial chamber as part of Saint Étienne et son Sanctuaire
à Jérusalem. 20 The report includes data on material culture in the tomb
complex, although in his dating the tomb complex to Herodian times,
Lagrange did not introduce pottery or other material culture to support
his view. 21

Thirty-two years after the reports of Merrill, de Vaux and Lagrange,
Fathers Hugues Vincent and F.-M. Abel described the seven distinct
tombs or tomb complexes within the ancient temenos. The two Domi-
nicans based their work on the three earlier reports as well as the exca-
vation notes of Lecomte and his confrères, which unfortunately are no
longer available. 22 They designated the burial cave complex of the pre-
sent investigation as “le grand hypogée” or the large underground
chamber. Vincent and Abel stated that this complex was completely
empty at the time of the excavations except for the human remains
piled up in “ossuaries” (i.e. repositories). 23 Elsewhere Vincent and
Abel refer to these “ossuaries,” noting that they contain fine glass and
oil lamps bearing Jewish symbols among the human remains. 24 Fur-
thermore, Vincent and Abel mention some Christian lamps “of the most
simple type” found in that portion of the complex containing 11 Byzant-
tine period burial troughs. 25 Why do the authors mention these lamps

19 Merrill reports, for example, that the repositories are of identical length to the funeral
chambers under which they are located; in fact they are only two thirds as long as the cham-
bers. Moreover, they are not symetrically sided as his diagram depicts them. S. MERRILL,
“New Discoveries in Jerusalem,” PEF (1885), 222-8, esp. 226. Compare Merrill’s sketch of
the cave complex, illustrative of his misunderstanding of the cave’s proportions (224) to a
more accurate representation in VINCENT and ABEI; JÉRUSALEM NOUVELLE 4, 781.
20 LAGRANGE, SAINT ÉTIENNE ET SON SANCTUAIRE, 105-38.
21 LAGRANGE, SAINT ÉTIENNE ET SON SANCTUAIRE, 117.
22 Some of the original diaries have been lost. For those that do exist, the current archi-
vist for the École Biblique (Prof. Jean-Michel de Tarragon, OP) reports that the early mem-
ers of the Dominican community wrote thorough accounts of archaeological expeditions
around the Transjordan, however comments on excavations on the École grounds of
St. Étienne were not included in their entries.
23 VINCENT and ABEI, JÉRUSALEM NOUVELLE 4, 784. Additionally, they refer to the copper
casket (mentioned in note 16) which had by that time disappeared from the collection at
St. Étienne.
24 VINCENT and ABEI, JÉRUSALEM NOUVELLE 4, 784. Sadly, they do not elaborate on these
items.
25 VINCENT and ABEI, JÉRUSALEM NOUVELLE 4, 783-4.
and glass vessels if elsewhere they state that the cave complex was empty? Perhaps it is because these finds are quite negligible compared to items in nearby tombs within the temenos. Unfortunately, there exists no detailed record of even these scant finds by the original excavators of burial complex #1, nor do we know the current location of the glass vessels or lamps with either Jewish or Christian symbols.

Stratigraphy

While the bones and finds were exhumed systematically from the repository by layer, the stratigraphy of the site was compromised by numerous factors. First, the size of the majority of finds affected their location amid the bones. The small dimensions of most of the items resulted in their gravitating toward the bottom of the repository. Second, the very nature of the deposition of the bones influenced the location of the skeletal remains and burial goods on a continual basis. After decomposition of a body upon one of the burial benches in chamber 6 (see Pl. I), the bones and objects were collected and added to the repository, thereby dislocating prior remains and objects, which were probably pushed downward and back in the repository in the process.

26 A tomb beneath the entry to Eudocia’s basilica, the third tomb described by Vincent and Abel, contained a funeral bed with several skeletons, at whose feet was a glass vial. At the same site lay an individual skeleton partially intact with a spherical, long-necked vial interred nearby (Jerusalem Nouvelle 4, 778). Another tomb beneath the atrium had crosses etched in its walls and parts of an altar, a ciborium and molds for eucharistic bread (Jerusalem Nouvelle 4, 780). The other hypogée or burial complex in the temenos (grave complex no. 2), to the immediate southeast of the present-day basilica, contained a burial in which were found rusted nails and bits of wooden coffin, several large bones along with small bones and teeth, a metal buckle, two small vials of iridescent glass that were nearly intact, and two lamps decorated with crosses (Jerusalem Nouvelle 4, 786). Finally, another burial between the two cave complexes contained a glass vial that was broken and two oil lamps which Vincent reported to be of the Byzantine period although one contained an inscription in Arabic (Jerusalem Nouvelle 4, 788). Together, the finds from the other six tombs underscore the paucity of material culture from the burial complex under study in this investigation.

27 It is possible that some of the best finds were collected by the earliest excavators who, without recording the finds’ derivation within the temenos, placed the items in the École Biblique’s private collection. It also appears that dozens of oil lamps and perhaps other artifacts left the Jerusalem Monastery Collection in 1940 and came into the hands of a private collector. See R. ROSENTHAL and R. SWAN, Ancient Lamps in the Schloessinger Collection, Qedem 3 (1973), 102:412; 106:428, 431, and 432; 109:442; 114:160 and 468.

28 The largest sherd from the collection is 110 by 120 mm. Jointed with its base, it is designated inventory #1.
Third, fresh breaks in the pottery and the uneven collection of sherds suggest tampering with the repository’s contents over time. The lack of diagnostic sherds is striking, and the random collection of body sherds presents an incomplete record for the pottery; thus, some scenario involving the removal of burial goods is quite plausible. Looting, otherwise rough handling, and even the activities of earlier excavators may have resulted in disturbance, including the removal of objects. Conversely, one may hypothesize that the scant, non-osteological finds were transferred to repository 6, perhaps as coffins with human remains were brought there from without and their contents deposited. This scenario, however, is most unlikely in light of what the bones themselves indicate.

While the provenance of the material culture is in question, the human remains clearly indicate primary burials. Left and right sides of robust skeletal elements were preserved in comparable numbers, and agreement in numbers between various bones is likewise similar, indicating a discrete group of individuals interred therein (table 1). Further information about the excavation and analysis of the bones and pottery can be found in the original report.

Table 1. — Human Long Bone Antemeres Found in Repository 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>left</th>
<th>right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibula</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcaneus</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talus</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This is not a minimum number of individuals (MNI) count. For MNI for the St. Stephen’s collection, see Sheridan, “New Life the Dead Receive,” 525-7.

In the context of the Hellenistic period and the use of wooden coffins, one can refer to the work of Hachlili and Killebrew on Jewish Funerary Customs during the Second Temple Period, as well as the expedition of the Israeli team that excavated the caves in Nahal David. For the use of wooden coffins in the Byzantine period, see Avigad, *Beth She’arim: Report on the Excavations during 1953-1958* Vol. 3: Catacombs 12-23 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1976), 133.

It is important to note that the table does not represent a minimum number of individuals estimate, rather only the number of antemeres. A detailed description and MNI appear in Sheridan, “New Life the Dead Receive,” 585-7.
thermore, the presence of numerous small, friable elements such as hyoid bones, sesimoids, distal phalanges, and calcified thyroid cartilage further indicate the singular deposition of the remains. These bones are often not recovered in excavations, even with sifting. Their abundance at this site gives credence to the claim that the bones were likely moved no further than the burial benches above. However, tampering with the interred remains is strongly indicated given the broken state of most of the long bones, and the disarticulation of most crania.

Finally, stratigraphy has been compromised by modern intrusions in the repository, including non-human animal bones, the burial of an infant in the last quarter of the 20th century, and a variety of modern, non-osteological objects. There were 158 non-human animal bones found in repository 6, indicative of a wide range of domestic animals. None of the bones showed evidence of butchering, though some represented commonly consumed species including sheep, goat, cattle, pig, chicken, and partridge-like fowl. Non-food animal remains were more abundant, such as camel, horse, donkey, dog, cat, and rodent. The bones show minimal evidence of exposure to the elements, thus indicating their interment after only a year or two in the open.

One possibility for how the animal bones came to be in the repository is that these bones were deliberately brought there by humans because the repository was viewed as an appropriate place for bones of all sorts. The condition of some of the human remains, the anomalous collection of sherds and glass fragments, and the modern intrusions indicate that clearly the repository has not been preserved pristinely since Byzantine times. Hence, there is no true stratigraphy of the remains in the repository.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDS

A majority of the 251 items of material culture were retrieved from repository 6 during the 1996-97 season. Three items, included in this

31 Dr. Justin LeVey (University of Tennessee) conducted the faunal analysis.
32 Following each taxon is the number of elements of identifiable non-human animal remains found in repository 6: bos (cow) 20; camelus (camel) 20; canis (dog) 25; equis (horse, donkey) 14; felis (cat) 3; gallus (chicken) 4; ovis/cupra (sheep/goat) 18; phasianidae (partridge-like fowl) 1; rodent (rat) 6; sus (pig) 10.
**Iron Age**

72: Pl. XA, a; fig. 2. Partial base of a bowl. 25 mm x 36 mm, base of varying thickness (4 mm at center of base, 10 mm along the exterior); red to brick red interior; terra cotta to red exterior. White grit with basalt grit in the fabric.


Fig. 2. - #72.

66: Pl. XA, b, c; fig. 3. Handle attached to body sherd, possibly from a storage jar: 70 mm x 65 mm; thin (3 mm); interior and exterior light orange; gray core visible; double ridges and grits.


Fig. 3. - #66.
Hellenistic

71: Pl. XA, d; fig. 4. Rim of a bowl; 40 mm x 35 mm; very thin (2.5 mm); orange-red interior; exterior brown hue with decorative grooves (rouletting) bordering the rim and also along the bottom half of the sherd.

Fig. 4. - #71.

Early Roman

69: Pl. XA, e; fig. 5. Rim from a painted “Jerusalem” bowl; 40 mm x 35 mm; very thin (2 mm); orange and black painted design (agricultural or floral) on buff interior; exterior light brown to gray; 1st century CE.


Fig. 5. - #69.

Late Roman-Byzantine

59: Pl. XA, f. Body sherd of storage jar; 75 mm x 45 mm; thick (6 mm); light orange to light brown interior and light brown exterior with combing pattern in middle.

Parallels: S. Loffreda, Cafarnao II: La Ceramica (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1974), 50, C8:3-4; dated late Roman (4th-5th century); see also Cafarnao II, 55 and 57, D1:2-6; dated late Roman-Byzantine (4th-7th centuries) and Cafarnao II, 58, D1 and D2:3-4.
Byzantine

75: Pl. XA, g. Body sherd or possible lid of cooking pot; 60 mm x 40 mm; 5 mm thick; interior light brown; exterior light orange to light brown, very flat with fine combing toward center.

Byzantine-Early Arab

11: Pl. XA, h. Body sherd of cooking pot; 40 mm x 25 mm; thick (5 mm); terra cotta interior; tan exterior with combing.

Umayyad

6: Pl. XA, j; fig. 6. Section of base; 85 mm x 50 mm; thickness from 3 mm toward center to 6 mm toward outside; light orange to light brown interior; gray exterior.

![Fig. 6. - #6.](image)

Uncertain

1: Pl. XA, o; fig. 7. Partial base and body sherd from large storage jar; reconstructed from 2 sherds; joined 120 mm x 125 mm; thick (10 mm); light brown interior; light orange exterior.

![Fig. 7. - #1.](image)
Oil Lamps

Fifteen oil lamp fragments were excavated from late Roman, Byzantine, Umayyad, and Abbasid periods (table 3). A large number of nozzles and partial nozzles were recovered, along with one tongue handle from an early Arabic period lamp. Of the fifteen fragments, thirteen are described below. Oil lamp #219 was the best preserved after partial restoration (see below).

Table 3. – Description of Oil Lamps found in Cave Complex 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Diagram</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Dimensions (length x width)</th>
<th>Provenance location (year)</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>10 XBo</td>
<td>nozzle w/upper body</td>
<td>orange/terra cotta</td>
<td>45 x 40 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (96)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>12 XBe</td>
<td>partial nozzle</td>
<td>orange/brown</td>
<td>55 x 30 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>15 XBh</td>
<td>nozzle</td>
<td>buff/gray</td>
<td>25 x 15 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>15 XBi</td>
<td>ridges and discus</td>
<td>light orange/terra cotta</td>
<td>20 x 10 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>16 XBi1</td>
<td>tongue handle</td>
<td>gray</td>
<td>40 x 20 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>17 XBi1</td>
<td>shoulder reservoir</td>
<td>terra cotta</td>
<td>40 x 10 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>20 XBo</td>
<td>nozzle</td>
<td>brick red</td>
<td>20 x 15 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>13 XBi1</td>
<td>reservoir</td>
<td>terra cotta/light brown</td>
<td>80 x 25 mm</td>
<td>entrance hall (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>18 XBi1</td>
<td>base w/partial body</td>
<td>gray/dark gray</td>
<td>25 x 15 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>14 XBi1</td>
<td>base w/partial body</td>
<td>light brown/buff</td>
<td>50 x 25 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (96)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>8 XBa</td>
<td>ledge, ridges and discus</td>
<td>light orange/buff</td>
<td>30 x 10 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (96)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>10 XBi1</td>
<td>partial nozzle</td>
<td>terra cotta</td>
<td>10 x 15 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>9 XBi1</td>
<td>partial nozzle</td>
<td>light orange</td>
<td>10 x 10 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220a</td>
<td>11 XBi1</td>
<td>reservoir (bottom)</td>
<td>light buff/brown</td>
<td>35 x 25 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (96)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Late Roman

223: Pl. XB, a; fig. 8. Fragment of ledge, ridge and discus from Roman provincial discus lamp; 30 mm x 10 mm; light orange to buff.

229: Pl. XB, b; fig. 9. Fragment of the nozzle's underside; 30 mm x 20 mm; light orange.

Fig. 8. – #223.

Fig. 9. – #229.
Early Byzantine

212: Pl. XB, c; fig. 10. Nozzle with portion of upper body; 45 mm x 40 mm; orange to terra cotta; slipper shape; pattern or design evident, perhaps the intersection of τ-χ (an abbreviation for Jesus Christ, the iota the first initial of Ἰησοῦς and the chi the first initial of χριστοῦ) or, less plausibly, of a star. Burnt residue at wick hole.

229a: Pl. XB, d; fig. 11. Fragment from bottom of reservoir; 35 mm x 25 mm; light buff to brown: muted design (circular object or wreath?).

Late Byzantine

213: Pl. XB, e; fig. 12. Partial nozzle with portion of shoulder; 55 mm x 30 mm; orange to brown; circular stamp design and ridged inner ring. Burnt residue at wick hole.
Parallels: Rosenthal and Sivan, Ancient Lamps in the Schloessinger Collection, 101: 410; 3rd-4th century. This lamp comes from the Jerusa-
lem Dominican Monastery Collection. Also ROSenthal and SIVAN, Ancient Lamps in the Schloessinger Collection, 102:416. C. KENNEDY, "The Development of the Lamp in Palestine," Berytus 14 (1963), 67-116; esp. pl. XXV:628. The design is described as a wreath or circle (Kennedy, "The Development of the Lamp in Palestine," 81), alternatively, as a sun (M. SCHAAR Schloessinger, "Five Lamps with Fish Reliefs from Israel and Other Mediterranean Countries," IEJ 1 [1951], 92).

![Diagram](image1)

**Fig. 12. – #213.**

219: Pl. XB, f. g; fig. 13. Reservoir, not wholly intact; 80 mm x 25 mm; small fill hole (20 mm); terra cotta to light brown; molded as one complete vessel with no seam between top and bottom; node for handle is visible; bottom features radial design. Excavated during probe of depression in the entrance hall.


![Diagram](image2)

**Fig. 13. – #219.**
221: Pl. XB, h; fig. 14. Base and partial body; 50 mm x 25 mm; light brown to buff; fingerprints visible inside reservoir.

Late Byzantine-Umayyad

215: Pl. XB, i; fig. 15. Fragment including ridges and discus; 20 mm x 10 mm; light orange to terra cotta, with decoration of vertical lines running perpendicular to fill hole.

Umayyad

216: Pl. XB, j; fig. 16. Tongue handle; 40 mm x 20 mm; thick (10 mm); brick red interior and gray exterior.

Abbasid

217: Pl. XB, k: fig. 17. Fragment of shoulder, slightly concave, with part of the reservoir; 40 mm x 10 mm; terra cotta; decorated with slight outer ridge and wavy lines; fingerprints visible inside reservoir.

220: Pl. XB, m: fig. 18. Fragment including ledge, ridges and discus; 25 mm x 15 mm; gray to dark gray; delicate geometric pattern or stylized foliage; fingerprints visible inside reservoir.


![Fig. 17 - #217](image0)

![Fig. 18 - #220](image1)

Uncertain

214: Pl. XB, n: fig. 19. Front fragment of nozzle; 25 mm x 15 mm; buff to gray; slight residue at wick hole. Roman or later.

218: Pl. XB, o: fig. 20. Bottom half of a nozzle, mouth with residue; 20 mm x 15 mm; brick red; burnt residue at wick hole. Roman or later.

![Fig. 19 - #214](image2)

![Fig. 20 - #218](image3)
Glass

Thirty-nine fragments of glass vessels were exhumed, dating from the late Roman and Byzantine periods (table 4). Like the pottery collection, the glass is atypical in that diagnostic pieces are underrepresented, as though previously culled. Unfortunately, no vessel is sufficiently intact to warrant a proper morphological and typological study, thus not many parallels may be adduced. The analysis, therefore, has been based on color and composition rather than shape of the vessel. One glass bracelet, datable from the Byzantine to Ottoman periods, was also recovered.

Table 4. – Description of Glass found in Cave Complex 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Diagram</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>21 Xla</td>
<td>base of bowl</td>
<td>greenish tint</td>
<td>60x40 mm 75 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>27 Xll</td>
<td>bracelet</td>
<td>aqua blue</td>
<td>45x5 mm 60 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine/Ottoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>22 Xlb</td>
<td>rim of bowl</td>
<td>bluish tint</td>
<td>55x19 mm 140 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Xlx</td>
<td>bottle neck</td>
<td>bluish tint</td>
<td>25x40 mm -</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>23 Xlc</td>
<td>base of bottle</td>
<td>pale green</td>
<td>65x55 mm 80 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>24 Xld</td>
<td>base of cup</td>
<td>green tint</td>
<td>20x18 mm 42 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>25 XII</td>
<td>base of bottle/juglet</td>
<td>pale green</td>
<td>40x25 mm 50 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Xl6</td>
<td>window glass shard</td>
<td>translucent</td>
<td>15x10 mm -</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>26 Xlh</td>
<td>rim of bottle</td>
<td>green/blue</td>
<td>40x20 mm 40 mm</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* original vessel size based on artist's reconstruction

**Late Roman**

104: Pl. Xla; fig. 21. Base of small bowl; 75 mm diam (base); frag. 60 mm x 40 mm; \(^{34}\) blown glass, rather well made; greenish tint; transparent; 3rd-4th century. Parallel: D. BARAG, “Hanita Tomb XV: A Tomb of the Third and Early Fourth Century CE.” (Atiqot [ES] 13 (1978), 12, fig. 6:7.

![Diagram](image)

Fig. 21. – #104.

\(^{34}\) Dimensions given for all glass vessels are 1) the dimensions of the vessel based on the artist’s reconstruction; 2) size of the actual fragment.
106: Pl. Xlb; fig. 22. Rim of bowl; 140 mm diam; frag. 52 mm x 19 mm; blown glass; bluish tint; transparent.

Late Roman to Early Byzantine

108: Pl. Xlc; fig. 23. Concave base of a large bottle; 80 mm diam (base); frag. 65 mm x 65 mm; blown glass, very fine; pale green; transparent. Parallels: J. W. CROWFOOT and G. M. FITZGERALD, Excavations in the Tyropoeon Valley. Palestine Exploration Fund Annual, 1927 (1929), pl. XXI:8. 9. N. MAHOUY, “Rock Cut Tombs at El Jish,” QDAP 8 (1939), pl. XXXIII:1d.

110: Pl. Xld; fig. 24. Base of a cylindrical cup, with small portion of body; 42 mm diam (base); frag. 20 mm x 18 mm; thick especially at center; green tint; translucent; body is transparent. 4th century. Parallel: V. TZAFERIS, “Tombs in Western Galilee,” Atiqot 5 (1969), 74, fig. 2:7; pl. XVI:13.
Early Byzantine to Late Byzantine

107: Pl. XlIc. Fragment of bottle neck; frag. 25 mm x 40 mm; bluish tint.

115: Pl. XII; fig. 25. Concave base of a bottle or juglet; 50 mm diam (base); frag. 40 mm x 25 mm; pale green; slightly translucent. Could date to later in this period (i.e. 5th-7th centuries).

Fig. 25. - #115.

116: Pl. XIlg. Window glass sherd; 15 mm x 10 mm; thick; weathered; translucent.

129: Pl. XIIh; fig. 26. Rim of a cylindrical bottle; 40 mm diam; frag. 40 mm x 20 mm; green-blue, translucent.

Fig. 26. - #129.

Byzantine to Ottoman

105: Pl. XIi; fig. 27. Glass bracelet; inside diameter 60 mm, height 4 mm, width 5 mm; semi-circular, rounded; monochrome, aqua blue, translucent; no decoration; weathering across surface. In use from the early 3rd century and continued usage through most periods.  

---


Additional Material Culture

Numerous additional pieces of material culture were found commingled with the human remains in repository 6 (table 5). They include dozens of tessera, a cross, worked stone, nails probably of various function, carbonized wood, a lead plug, and obvious modern intrusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Diagram</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Repository</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82-85</td>
<td>XIXb+1</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>carbonized</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>XIXg</td>
<td>plug</td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>cylindrical w/holed</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>XIXd</td>
<td>spike</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>heavily corroded</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>XIXe</td>
<td>nail</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>slightly corroded</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>XIXf</td>
<td>spike</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>corroded</td>
<td>entrance hall (97)</td>
<td>Late Roman/Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142-196</td>
<td>XIXa</td>
<td>tessera</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>wormeent residue</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine/Islamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>XIXc</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>marble</td>
<td>imported</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>XIXb</td>
<td>cross</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>two layers, plated</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>Byzantine or modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>XIXk</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>hand-sawn, premodern</td>
<td>repository 6 (97)</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Tessera**

142-196: Planche XIIa. Fifty-four tessera from the Byzantine to early Arab periods. Hard limestone, many with cement residue. Average dimensions: white, width 18 mm, length 20 mm, thickness 16 mm; yellowed, width 13 mm, length 15 mm, thickness 8 mm.

**Devotional**

235: Pl. XIIb; fig. 28. Cross of very simple design; 30 mm x 25 mm; apparent hole through top for a loop; two layers, plaited; construction material is unidentifiable; perhaps attached to rosary. If the cross is not a modern intrusion, it probably dates to early in the Christian period.

---

**Worked Stone**

199: Pl. XIIc; fig. 29. Marble; 50 mm x 20 mm; architectural fragment or fragment from an altar or chancel screen. Byzantine.
Nails

Three nails/spikes possibly used in late Roman to Byzantine wooden coffins.

90 : Pl. XII d. Spike; 45 mm long with head 10 mm diam; heavily corroded iron.

91 : Pl. XII e. Nail; 90 mm long with head 10 mm diam; slightly corroded iron.

93 : Pl. XII f; fig. 30. Iron spike/nail; 115 mm long with head 20 mm in diam; corroded, tip broken during excavation. Excavated during probe of depression in the entrance hall.

---

Miscellaneous Metal

87 : Pl. XII g; fig. 31. Lead plug possibly used for repairing cracked pottery; 10 mm node; 25 mm length; Byzantine.

Wood

82-85 : Pl. XII h-j. 4 pieces of carbonized wood; largest piece is 25 mm x 10 mm.

250 : Pl. XII k. Pre-modern piece of wood; 52 mm x 28 mm; 8 mm thickness. Sawn by hand rather than machine.
Of the datable objects from repository 6, the majority fall within the late Roman and Byzantine range. There are a few earlier items, especially from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, just as there are later sherds from the early Arab, Ottoman and modern periods. The temporal range of the material culture is principally what one expects to find in a Byzantine burial cave. A large percentage of the finds are from the early Byzantine and late Byzantine periods, corresponding to the time when the monastic community at St. Stephen would have used the repository. The significant amount of finds from the late Roman period point to the site’s history prior to Eudocia’s church and signal the need for further research of the site in the 3rd-4th century. Conversely, items from the Umayyad and Abbadid periods testify to the monastery’s Nachleben, following Jerusalem’s destruction by the Persians in 614. We know that in 808 the site contained a small church that was home to two priests and 14 lepers. The other finds which are dated to Iron Age II, the Hellenistic period, the Ottoman period and to modern times, are anomalous and are best explained as debris in the repository.

In terms of the individual collections, the pottery finds represent the widest spectrum of periods, with sherds from Iron Age II through the Byzantine period, extending to the Turkish Ottoman period. The paucity of diagnostic sherds indicates that the collection may have been previously culled and its most important pieces removed. The non-diagnostic quality of the majority of sherds makes their dating largely conjectural.

The oil lamps form a less disparate collection from the late Roman, Byzantine, and early Arab periods. In two cases, the lamp is a fragment that precludes precise dating, but none of the collection predates the late Roman period. Moreover, every piece has a different pattern or design. With the exception of # 212’s iota-chi monogram for Jesus Christ, there is nothing uniquely Christian or religious about the motifs. The dearth of designs may be due to the fragmentary nature

36 LAGANGE, Saint Étienne et Son Sanctuaire, 83.
37 With a monastic community of the 5th-7th centuries, one would expect stronger evidence of Christian oil lamps, most typically the contemporary “inscribed” or “radial” oil lamps. The lamps of the 4th-mid-6th centuries are known as “small candlestick lamps,” or “small radiated lamps,” and are associated with the “Ain Yabrud” lamps; they feature radia-
of the collection, which consists largely of nozzles lacking the reservoirs upon which radials or inscriptions would be displayed.\textsuperscript{38}

With the glass, it is noteworthy that the vast majority of items date to the late Roman and into the Byzantine periods. No fragment postdates the Byzantine period; the Umayyad and subsequent periods are not represented in this collection of glass. Also no items predate the late Roman period. With the exception of vessels dating clearly to the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-4\textsuperscript{th} century, most of the glass corresponds to the period when the monastic community would have used the repository. In a burial context, one would expect to find more intact vessels, particularly those suited to personal use (i.e., unguentaria). The atypical nature of the glass collection again suggests pilfering of cultural remains from the repository.

The miscellaneous items do not constitute a distinct collection, but they merit evaluation as they shed light on the Byzantine burial context. The tesserae appear to come from the Byzantine to Early Arab periods, and the cross, if not a modern intrusion, likely dates to early in the Christian period. The nails recovered were quite plausibly used in late Roman to Byzantine wooden coffins. Finally, the resourceful use of lead plugs in the repair of pottery vessels was not unknown in the Byzantine period.

It remains to be answered conclusively how such a range of items dating primarily from the late Roman, Byzantine and early Arab periods came to rest in repository 6, and what the circumstances of their commingling with the bones were. In terms of the kinds of material culture retrieved from repository 6 and the temporal range represented by the finds, the collection corresponds generally to the context of a Byzantine burial cave but is not without anomalies. That is, one observes significant continuity and instances of discontinuity between the material culture and the Byzantine history of this locale.

ting lines around the fill hole. Lamps of the mid-6\textsuperscript{th}-late 7\textsuperscript{th}/early 8\textsuperscript{th} centuries, the “large candlestick lamps,” exhibit the motif of a palm branch or menorah, or alternatively, pious Greek inscriptions. (J. MAGNESS, Jerusalem Ceramic Chronology: Circa 200-800 C.E. [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993], 250-3).

\textsuperscript{38} An exception to this is #212, with the nozzle and a small portion of the upper body exhibiting something of a slipper shape. It is also possible to explain this lacuna with reference to the history of the site. Looting or previous excavation of the repository may have included the large scale removal of oil lamps, especially those well preserved with Christian motifs. This is suggested by the many well preserved oil lamps with explicitly Christian symbols, originally from the Jerusalem Dominican collection, now in private collections. See note 27.
It is not surprising to encounter a devotional object such as a cross, especially in a repository used by a monastic community. The presence of oil lamps, tesserae, wood and nails may also be expected in late Roman and Byzantine burial caves. Lamps, for example, are commonly found in burial contexts and there may have served several purposes during the time of the Byzantine monastics. The tessera may have been placed in repository 6 after originally being used in that distinctly Byzantine portion of the burial cave containing eleven burial troughs (see note 25). or they may have served a purpose elsewhere in the burial complex. The carbonized wood and nails may have derived from coffins, although nails were also sometimes used for incising ossuary inscriptions, securing a cover onto an ossuary, and/or enacting superstitious rituals. It is more difficult, however, to account for such a diverse collection of pottery sherds, including bits of a cooking pot, in a monastic repository. Of course, the random pottery sherds may have been brought by later visitors. It is possible, however, that the sherds, and notably those from cooking pots, were among the burial goods.

39 Lamps were often left in tombs in the Byzantine Period, either as part of burial ceremonies or as votives (A. CUTLER and T. E. GREGORY, “Lamps,” The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium 2, 1171-2). The rabbinic literature indicates that oil lamps had a central role in Jewish burial customs. They fulfilled at least three functions: lighting the dark interior of the tomb, honoring the memory of the deceased, and serving as a remedy against evil spirits. The Mishnah distinguishes between oil lamps for the living and those for the dead (mBer. 3:6); thus, an oil lamp went with a person from one’s earliest days to death and beyond (N. SASSMAN, Ornamented Jewish Oil Lamps: From the Destruction of the Second Temple through the Bar-Kokhba Revolt [Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1982], 4).


42 Other excavations of burial caves have encountered, for example, vases usually found in sedentary deposits, such as jars, bowls and kraters. Such items are inexplicable in terms of burial customs save for possible connection with the deceased. See, for example, G. AVNI
That no vessels from the collection were intact is reminiscent of broken or defective pottery playing a symbolic role in burials, as it apparently did in the early Roman period.  

Other of the miscellaneous items may have entered the repository as debris from the Byzantine monastery. It is reasonable to suppose that the marble architectural fragment came from an altar or chancel screen, and the window glass originated in the church built under the aegis of Eudocia. The Byzantine lead plug likewise may have come from a potter’s workshop elsewhere in the temenos. If the tessera did not originate in the burial complex, they may once have been part of a mosaic surface that served as part of a wine press or of another sort of work area (as the tessera appear to be most generic) located on the grounds.

In the end, the finds presented here make a modest contribution to our overall knowledge of the site in antiquity. The most salient result is indeed the temporal correspondence of the finds to the bones, imprecise but nonetheless significant data for the biocultural reconstruction of Byzantine life at this monastic site.


Hachlili and Killebrew note that many items in the tombs were defective (for example, pots with dents) at the time of their deposition. P. Bar-Adon hypothesizes that broken pottery had been purposefully included in burial contexts to symbolize death (“Another Settlement of the Judean Desert Sect at ‘Ain el-Ghuweir on the Dead Sea,” BASOR 227 (1977), 1-25, esp. 20-2.
XA. Pottery fragments found commingled with the skeletal remains in repository 6, burial complex 1 at St. Stephen’s monastery. Pictured fragments include: a) #72, partial base of bowl; b) #66, side view; and c) inferior view of handle attached to body sherd; d) #71, rim of bowl; e) #69, rim from painted “Jerusalem” bowl; f) #59, body sherd of storage jar; g) #75, body sherd or lid of cooking pot; h) #11, body sherd cooking pot; i) #2, possible lid of cooking pot; j) #6, base; k) #9, body sherd; l) #76, body sherd; m) #15, painted body sherd; n) #54, body sherd, and o) #1, partial base and body sherd from large storage jar.

XB. Oil lamp fragments found commingled with the skeletal remains from repository 6, burial complex 1 at St. Stephen’s monastery. Pictured fragments include: a) #223, ledge, ridge and discus of Roman provincial discus lamp; b) #229, fragment of nozzle underside; c) #212, nozzle and upper body portion of slipper shaped oil lamp; d) #229a, bottom of reservoir; e) #213, partial nozzle and shoulder, circular stamp design; f) #219, lower and g) upper views of partial reservoir; h) #221, base and partial body; i) #215, ridge and discus; j) #216, tongue handle; k) #217, superior and l) internal view of reservoir, note fingerprint on interior surface; m) #220, ledge, ridge and discus with geometric design or stylized foliage; n) #214, front of nozzle; and o) #218, nozzle with visible residue.
PLANCHES
Repository 6 and burial bench in burial complex 1 at St. Stephen's monastery. Note the headrest for the deceased. Bones were gathered from the burial bench above and placed in the repository below.
Glass fragments found commingled with the skeletal remains in repository 6, burial complex 1 at St. Stephen's monastery. Pictured fragments include:
a) #104, base of small bowl; b) #106, rim of bowl; c) #108, concave base of large bottle; d) #110, base of cylindrical cup with small portion of body; e) #107, fragment of bottle neck; f) #115, concave base of bottle or juglet; g) #116, window glass sherd; h) #129, rim of cylindrical bottle; i) #105, glass bracelet.
Additional pieces of material culture found commingled with the skeletal remains in repository 6, burial chamber at 1 St. Stephen’s monastery.

Pictured fragments include: a) #142-196, tessera (#152-81 shown); b) #235, cross of unknown material; c) #199, marble from chancel screen or altar; d) #90, iron spike; e) #91, iron nail; f) #93, iron spike/nail; g) #87, lead plug; h-j) pieces of carbonized wood; k) #250, pre-modern wood, sawn by hand.