Plan 162: AD-AE-AF, 25-26-27 - Overview

No remains assignable to Stratum 5 could be traced in this area.

Stratum 4 may be represented by four rock-cut installations which were cut by later walls.

Stratum 3C is attested by a section of the casemate-like wall, and possibly by fragments of walls attached to it.

Stratum 3B is represented by sixteen storage bins and the offsetinset wall.

Rebuildings over the casemate-like wall may be either 3A or 3B.

Stratum 2 is attested only by a corner of a 4-Room building and the continued use of the offset-inset wall.

No remains of Stratum 1 were uncovered.

Evaluation -

This area was excavated in two seasons. A small part of AF25 was cleared in 1927. AD25-26-27 and AE-AF,26-27 were excavated in about the middle of the 1929 season. Parts of AF25, and AE-AF,24-25 were under rubble heaps and were left unexcavated. There is only one photograph, but it shows most of the installations in the E part of the area. The bins have top and bottom levels, but elevations on the offset-inset wall are few.

Storage Units: Bn 227, Bn 228, Bn 229, Bn 230, Bn 232, Bn 233, Bn 234,

<u>Plan 162</u> 799

Bn 235, Bn 236, Bn 237, Bn 238, Bn 239a, Bn 239b, Bn 240a Bn 240b, Bn 240c -

The walls of these installations are one stone wide. They range in preserved depth from ca. 1.35 m to 40 cm (two examples from the W side of the town were preserved to ca. 2.0 m deep); their diameters range from ca. 1.7 m to 80 cm, averaging 1.3 m. The maximum storage capacity would be ca. 43.2 cubic meters, or an average of ca. 2.7 cubic meters per bin. P 422 shows most of these installations.

The phasing of the bins is quite clear. They were constructed in the debris which was poured into the area between the 3C casemate-like wall and the 3B offset-inset wall. The bins cannot be earlier than 3B. The placement of Bn 229 is especially important. The plan shows that the E edge of this bin is built over part of the casemate-like wall. This shows that this bin, and by extension the other bins in the area, were not constructed while the casemate-like wall was still in use for defensive purposes. The bins were not built outside the 3C town, only to be enclosed later by the 3B town wall, contra Finkelstein. This also shows that the rebuild along this part of the casemate-like wall is probably of Stratum 3B.

Si 122, Si 123, Si 124, Si 125 and Associated Walls -

Like most of the features uncovered in the 1926 and 1927 seasons these features are not well-documented in the 1947 report, the site plans, photographs or Badè's diary, and so are difficult to describe.

Si 122 and Si 123 appear to be fairly large, ca. 1.2 m across,

⁹⁰⁶I. Finkelstein, <u>The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement</u> (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1988), 266-267.

<u>Plan 162</u> 800

though their depths are not known. They are roughly circular in plan. Si
124 and Si 125 are smaller, less than 1.0 m across. Like similar
installations to the N, these probably belong to Stratum 4. It appears
that walls of a now poorly preserved building were constructed over
these rock-cut installations. Due to their fragmentary condition it is
difficult to characterize the walls as specifically single- or doublestone work. They could be from any phase within Stratum 3.

Other Features -

Ci 231 is enclosed by a ca. 1.5 m thick wall which is preserved seven to nine courses high, ca. 2.0 m. Ci 231 is cut into the bedrock; from the top of its mouth it is ca. 6.5 deep. Its internal plan is very irregular, but the 1947 report describes it as roughly cylindrical. 907 Note that a niche was left in the 3B offset-inset wall to accommodate the cistern's mouth. This suggests that the cistern is earlier than 3B, but whether it was cut in 3C or 4 cannot be determined. This is further evidence that the pre-3B town extended beyond the limits of its wall. 908 Note also that the enclosing wall is not bonded into the offset-inset wall. Since the cistern is enclosed by such a thick wall, preserved to a great height, it may not have bee for use by those in the intramural area; perhaps its use was restricted to those manning the walls.

Rm 280 and Rm 227 relate directly to features in Plan 145 and are discussed there. Fragments of walls in AD25-26 are likely connected in some way to the bins, but their precise roles cannot be determined. Why a short section of single-stone wall connects Bn 240b to the casemate-like wall is also unclear.

⁹⁰⁷I, 129 n. 1.

⁹⁰⁸I, pp. 217, 230.

<u>Plan 162</u> 801

The Casemate-Like Wall -

Sections of this wall are visible in AD25-AF26. The portions of it in AF26 are below a later rebuild along the same line. The wall ranges in width from ca. 1.6 to 2.3 m The wall preserved here is part of the casemate-like wall's outer wall. There is no trace of the inner wall, and only a few fragments of what might have been the cross walls, though even these might well belong to later features. The date of the rebuild is problematic. It must be after the 3C casemate-like wall on which it is founded, and before Stratum 2 when the plan of the town changed radically. It must be 3B or 3A, but which is uncertain.

The Offset-Inset Wall -

Parts of two insets and one offset are preserved here. The wall ranges in width from ca. 4.2 to 4.7 m. The wall contains one tower which is ca. 9.0 m long on the interior face and ca. 10.0 m on the exterior; it has a width of ca. 6.9 m and is reinforced by a revetment/glacis which is from 2.4 to 2.9 m thick, for a total thickness of ca. 9.3 to 9.8 m. The tower was built separately from the wall sections to either side as shown by the straight seams at the points where the walls reach the tower. It seems more likely that the tower was built first, and that the walls were built to reach it, than the other way around. This plan does not show the tower's revetment/glacis extending N or S along the wall. However similar sections of revetment were found in AA26-AB27 on the N and AG27-28 on the S. Probably excavation did not reach low enough along the external face of the wall to test for the presence of this feature, but it seems likely that such additional defenses did exist here, and that the reconstruction on the published 1947 report is correct.