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The history of the ancient Near East in the 12th–10th centuries BCE is still an unsolved riddle. At times the veil is lifted and tiny components of this elaborate puzzle glow in a new light. But many questions are as yet unanswered, and most details are still vague. Nevertheless, the broad outlines of this age are fairly well agreed by most scholars: the three superpowers Egypt, Hatti and Assyria gradually lost their hold and their influence in the area: first the Hittites, just after 1200 BCE, and a few dozens of years later, Egypt and Assyria. Historians generally concur that after the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243–1208 BCE), Assyria plunged into a prolonged decline, gradually losing its western territories to the Aramaean invaders. This process is clearly demonstrated by the ‘Chronicle of Tiglath-pileser I’ and by the ‘Broken Obelisk’ (see Zadok’s and Fales’s articles). The rare complete silence of the Assyrian annals between 1055 and 934 BCE is the best indication that the Assyrians, under immense pressure from the Aramaeans, retreated to their homeland and fought a protracted and bitter war of survival. Concurrently, there are good indications that the Egyptians forfeited their influence in Canaan (the Wenamun report; see Kahn’s and Stern’s articles). Most Canaanite city states gradually disappeared, and by the end of the 10th century BCE only few survived as independent city states, mainly on the Phoenician coast. The ‘newcomers’ (the Aramaeans, the Sea Peoples, the Israelites and the Transjordanian peoples) became the masters of the land from the Sinai Peninsula to the sources of the Tigris, and from the Amuq Plain to Assyria.

The studies presented in this book touch on diverse aspects of human activities (political, social, economic, and cultural), and refer to different parts of the ancient Near East: from Melid and Hanigalbat in the north to Egypt and Kush in the south and from Assyria and Babylonia in the East to the Kingdom of Taita and (southern) Philistia in the west. They do though center mainly on the Bible and the history of ancient Israel and its western and eastern neighbors, as compared with other ancient Near Eastern cultures. The papers present an extensive vista of views—from biblical and archaeological perspectives and indeed most of them were written from an interdisciplinary standpoint.

The Syro-Mesopotamian and Anatolian spheres are the subjects of papers by Livrerani (on Melid), Fales (on Ḫanigalbat), Zadok (on the Aramean diffusion into the Upper Jazira), Bloch (on the Assyrian-Babylonians conflicts during the reign of Aššur-rēša-iššu I), and Nielsen (on Nebuchadnezzar I’s wars to the east).

Outlooks on Egypt and her imperial holdings are presented by Theis and van der Veen (New Kingdom epigraphic finds in the Jerusalem area), Kahn (on the 19th and 20th Dynasties in Canaan), Zwickel (second paper on Egyptians and Philistines) and Sagrillo (Ṣīṣaq’s army).

The history of ancient Israel and its eastern neighbors is the focus of several papers. Galil and Hurowitz deal with various aspects of the Solomonic Temple. Haiman studied the phenomenon of the ‘Negev Fortresses’; and Jordan in Iron Age I and IIA is discussed by Herr. The papers by Dietrich, Garsiel, Avioz, Levin and van Bekkum analyze the composition, ideology and historicity of the books of

The *‘Sea Peoples’ phenomenon* is the topic of several papers. Various aspects of the Philistines are discussed by Dietrich (literary evidence for relations with David), Faust (identity vs. the Israelites), Maeir (excavations at Philistine Tell eṣ-Ṣāfi/Gath), Yasur-Landau (iconographic aspects of Philistines at Medinet Habu), and the second paper by Zwickel (Philistines vs. Egyptians). Old and new evidence on this issue in the Syro-Cilician sphere is the topic of Singer’s paper, and Stern discusses *‘Sea Peoples’* other than the Philistines in Canaan/Israel. Artzy’s paper rather emphasizes elements of continuity over the Bronze/Iron Age transition both in Canaan/Israel and in Cyprus.

*Several ideological and legal aspects of biblical vis-à-vis ancient Near Eastern texts* are the focus of papers by Achenbach (holy wars), Hess (value of human life), Koller (the term *kos*), and Jacobs (“*a life for a life*”).

*Scripts and literacy* in this time span are overviewed by Lemaire (the west Semitic sphere) and Millard.

We wish to express our deep thanks to all the scholars who have contributed to this volume, most of whom participated in the conference held at the University of Haifa. Others who were unable to attend that meeting—Reinhard Achenbach, Mario Fales, Richard Hess, Mario Liverani, John Nielsen, Itamar Singer, Christoffer Theis, Koert van Bekkum and Peter van der Veen—kindly accepted our invitation to publish their important studies in this volume. We also thank Dr. Kai A. Metzler for his editorial comments. Dr. Ruth Fidler and Mr. Murray Rosovsky improved the English style; Ms. Galit Rozov and Ms. Maya Mokady took care of the indices.
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I. Introduction

The development and populating of cities is a fascinating and multifaceted subject. Recent studies focusing on urban development worldwide particularly in Israel devote attention to pre-planning, building technologies, social organization, division of labor, gender, public versus private enterprise, ideologies, and cosmological ideas.1

The wealth of information gathered on these topics makes the excavation of ancient cities one of the most popular archaeological activities in the Near East. Most of the long-term field projects tend to concentrate on tell sites where multiple cities are superimposed one on top of the other. In these cases it is difficult to obtain a large horizontal exposure, limiting the excavator’s ability to understand how the city was (1) planned or spontaneously developed, (2) physically constructed, and (3) socially organized.

Urban planning receives considerable attention as evidenced by the large number of studies on ancient Israel relating to this topic. Based on careful analysis, Y. Shiloh found evidence of urban planning at four Iron Age cities: Tell Beit Shemesh, Tell en-Nasbeh, Tell Beit Mirsim, and Beersheba. The social organization of cities, on the other hand, has received less attention, and the question of how a city was actually built is often ignored due to limited data. Thanks to the excavations at Khirbet Qeiyafa, it is now possible to study all three aspects. It is our goal to continue to gather relevant information on each of these aspects in the coming seasons. This paper will present the data available so far, followed by a discussion of what remains to be found and analyzed.

As stated above, one of the main problems when studying the organization of ancient cities is the lack of a large horizontal exposure. Most of the archaeological activity in the Near East concentrates on large tell sites where Bronze and Iron Age cities were built. In a typical Near Eastern tell, 10 to 20 superimposed cities can be found. In order to uncover the lower (earlier) layers, one must dig through the upper (later) layers. The final result, after years of work, is the relatively small horizontal exposure of these cities. Thus, in most cases, it is not always possible to understand how these ancient cities were organized and what kind of urban pre-planning was involved. The need for a large horizontal exposure of sites in order to understand social organization has been discussed in numerous cases, but very few projects have adopted this approach.

II. Methodology

There are a number of methodological factors that guide our work at Khirbet Qeiyafa:

I. Choosing the Site

Khirbet Qeiyafa is a relatively small site (2.3 hectares) with a short-lived occupation (two main periods), thin accumulation (2m maximum), and a rich Iron Age layer.
Only a short time is needed to uncover a meaningful sample of the Iron Age city.

2. Size of Horizontal Exposure
Our aim is to uncover 25–30% of the site, which will produce a meaningful sample of the city wall, gates, dwellings, and public buildings.

3. Sampling Strategy
Various parts of the site will be excavated, each including a number of dwellings.

4. Timeframe for Field Project
The field project is limited in time, with eight to ten excavation seasons planned altogether.

5. Excavation Strategy
Complete architectural units are excavated. In each square (5x5 meters) there is an archaeologist with 3–4 volunteers. This high ratio of staff to volunteers ensures careful excavation and documentation. All collapsed sediments above floors are sifted in a 2mm mesh. This catches a large number of small finds such as seals, scarabs, beads, bone artifacts, and small metal objects. Micro-fauna bones (2–3mm) are collected by wet sifting in a 1mm mesh.

6. Documentation
The careful documentation of the stratigraphic relationship of walls, usage of raw materials, and stone size is instructive in the study of the city’s building process. Photographs are constantly taken as well as aerial photos at the end of each season.

7. Analysis of Finds
The artifacts are classified both by typology and quantity. Petrographic analysis is conducted on the pottery assemblage, and the stone utensils are analyzed by geological examination.

8. Household Archaeology
Quantitative and spatial analyses are carried out for each building in order to better understand how the structure was organized and what function it served. All finds will be examined: stone and pottery vessels, as well as metal objects. Our analysis also includes zoological samples (e.g., animal bones).

9. Spatial Analysis
In order to discover the social structure of the community that inhabited the site, the various households are compared. Unless the community is egalitarian, it is possible to identify three social classes: poor, middle class, and wealthy. The existence of a few long-distance imported items, like basalt and Cypriot vessels, would indicate such economic distinctions. Plotting these differences on a map will show if there were different neighborhoods in the city.

10. Publication
In the interest of avoiding a long delay in excavation reports, we are publishing a
final report every two to three seasons.\(^5\) A report for the 2009–2010 is now in preparation.

### III. The Archaeology of Large Horizontal Exposure

In order to understand how a city was planned, constructed, and socially organized, there is a need for a large horizontal exposure, an idea prized by many.\(^6\) However, it is rare to find long-term projects conducting a large horizontal excavation of one layer. The history of this method of excavation in Israel can be divided into three phases:

**Phase 1** (1920’s–1930’s): In the early days of research, large areas of cities were exposed, such as the upper strata at Megiddo or Beth Shean. The results of these early excavations were quite chaotic, as in many cases components of various periods were combined into one layer. Ironically, the excavators of this generation did not show much interest in city planning or how the city was constructed.

**Phase 2** (1960’s–1970’s): The large scale excavations of Early Bronze Arad and Iron Age Beersheba exposed urban planning.\(^7\) The analysis of the finds in their domestic context allowed for the study of household and social organization in Beersheba and Arad.

**Phase 3** (late 2000’s): Since 2007, Khirbet Qeiyafa is the only site in Israel whose main research target is to obtain a plan of an Iron Age city.\(^8\) After four seasons, c. 10% of the site has been excavated. We are planning four more excavation seasons in order to expose 25–30% of the site.

Khirbet Qeiyafa is an ideal site for large horizontal exposure: (1) It is a *khirbeh*, a ruined place in Arabic, with many walls and features exposed on the site’s surface. The entire city wall and two gates were visible before excavations; (2) It is relatively small—2.3 hectares. Most sites are much bigger: Megiddo, 6 hectares; Gezer, 10 hectares; Tell es-Safi, 30 hectares; Hazor, 80 hectares. The small size of Khirbet Qeiyafa makes it possible to excavate 25–30% of the city in just eight excavation seasons; (3) The archaeological sediment is rather shallow, not more than 2 meters at its deepest. In each excavated area, only two building phases have been found; (4) The Iron Age city was abandoned suddenly (earthquake or destruction?), as indicated by hundreds of pottery vessels and dozens of bronze and iron objects found on

---


the floors. These rich assemblages uncovered in each building give us a detailed look at the social composition of the city.

In the first decades of archaeological investigation it was common to conduct large horizontal exposures. However, the poor stratigraphic and recording methods confused the data mixing structures from various periods into one city. In more recent excavations, only small portions of sites have been excavated, again resulting in a lack of evidence for city planning. It is clear that if one wishes to understand urban planning, there is a need for a new methodology. This should involve the exploration of relatively small sites, which were occupied for a short period of time and not disturbed by later human activities. Khirbet Qeiyafa is a site which meets these qualifications: it is rather small, the main occupation is a one-phase Iron Age city which was built on bedrock, and it was later reoccupied only by a short-lived Hellenistic layer. In addition, the Iron Age city came to its end suddenly, leaving hundreds of pottery vessels, stone utensils, and metal artifacts on the floors of the houses.

Fig. 1: Map of the southern Levant and the location of Khirbet Qeiyafa

IV. The Case Study of Khirbet Qeiyafa

Khirbet Qeiyafa is located in central Israel, ca. 20 miles southwest of Jerusalem (Israel map grid 14603–12267), on the summit of a hill that borders the Elah Valley on the north (Fig. 1). Even prior to excavation, visitors to Khirbet Qeiyafa could see a massive city wall, 2–3m in height, encompassing the summit of the hill. The city wall demarcates an area of 2.3 hectares, and its total length is 700m (Figs. 2–3). Due to the local topography, only the external face of the wall is exposed, and the inner part is buried under archaeological remains. The base of the city wall is composed of cyclopean stones, weighing 4–8 tons, while its upper part is built with medium-sized stones. At the summit of the hill, one finds massive remains of a rectangular building (37x45m). Elsewhere on the site, one finds stone walls of various sizes, rock-cut installations, caves, and heaps of stones. Despite this intensive human activity, a
large part in the center of the site is exposed bedrock without any archaeological sediment. In addition to the fortified area on top of the hill, the slopes of Khirbet Qeiyafa are rich with ancient human activity. The most prominent of these is a shallow wall that encircles a large area. Various building activities, as well as isolated installations, are scattered in the area.

Fig. 2: A vertical aerial photograph of Khirbet Qeiyafa at the end of the 2007 season, before large scale excavations

The history of research of Khirbet Qeiyafa starts as early as the middle of the 19th century. The site was first mentioned by V. Guerin, a French traveler to the holy land,\(^{10}\) and later by the British survey of Western Palestine.\(^{11}\) In this early stage of research, no attempts were made to date the various remains. During most of the 20th century the site was neglected, and it is not referred to in the works of the leading scholars in the field of biblical historical geography, such as W. F. Albright, B. Mazar, Y. Aharoni, or Z. Kallai. In the 1980s, an extensive archaeological survey conducted in the region gives the first detailed description of the site,\(^{12}\) and so does another survey conducted in the early 2000s.\(^{13}\) These surveys indicate that pottery from various periods had been collected from the site’s surface (Early Bronze, Middle Bronze, Iron Age, Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine). The site aroused interest

---

\(^{10}\) V. Guerin, *Description géographique, historique et archéologique de la Palestine* (Paris, 1868), pp. 331–332.


in 2005 when S. Ganor noted impressive Iron Age structures under later remains. In the years 2007–2010, four seasons of excavations took place at the site on behalf of the Institute of Archaeology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. A number of preliminary reports were published by the expedition, as well as a final excavation report for the first two seasons. We suggested identifying Khirbet Qeiyafa with the biblical city of Sha’arayim, based on the location, chronology, and the Hebrew meaning of the name Sha’arayim—two gates.

Fig. 3: An aerial photo of Khirbet Qeiyafa at the end of the 2010 excavation season

15 Garfinkel and Ganor, op. cit. (note 9).
16 Idem, “Khirbet Qeiyafa: Sha’arayim”, JHS 8, Article 22. For other proposals see D. L. Adams “Between Socho and Azekah: The Role of the Elah Valley in Biblical History and the Identification of Khirbet Qeiyafa”, in Garfinkel and Ganor, op. cit. (note 5), pp. 47–66; and see also note 20, below.
Table 1: The settlement history of Khirbet Qeiyafa
at the end of the 2010 excavation season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type of occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ottoman</td>
<td>Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| II      | a. Early Islamic  
b. Byzantine  
c. Late Roman  
d. Early Roman  
e. Late Hellenistic (Hasmonean) | Agricultural terraces |
| III     | Late Persian-Early Hellenistic | Fortress |
| IV      | Early Iron Age IIA (early 10th century BCE) | Fortified city |
| V       | Middle Bronze II | Small village? |
| VI      | Late Chalcolithic | Small village? |

Table 1 presents the basic periods uncovered at the site, as was verified by the end of the 2010 excavation season. Evidence for human activities from various periods was noticed: Ottoman, Early Islamic, Byzantine, Late Roman, Early Roman, Late Hellenistic (Hasmonean), Late Persian-Early Hellenistic, Iron Age IIA, Middle Bronze Age II, and Late Chalcolithic. This long list of periods is somewhat misleading, as one gets the impression that Khirbet Qeiyafa was intensively occupied over millennia. However, large parts in the center of the site are exposed bedrock, and in most of the excavation areas, a thin layer of Late Persian-Early Hellenistic debris covers a massive Iron Age IIA layer sitting on bedrock. Thus, Khirbet Qeiyafa is mainly a one-period Iron Age IIA site (Fig. 4). Radiometric dating fixes the city’s Iron Age occupation to the second half of the eleventh and the beginning of the 10th century BCE (see next section). After ca. 600 years, the site was occupied again in the late Persian-early Hellenistic period, ca. 350–270 BCE. The dating of this later phase is secured by coins, local pottery, imported Attic pottery, and metal objects.17

As mentioned above, the Iron Age city in Khirbet Qeiyafa is clearly a Judean city, based on the following considerations:18 (1) The kind of city planning is typical to Judah and was not found in any Canaanite, Philistine site, or in the northern kingdom of Israel; (2) No pig bones were found, which are known in the nearby Philistine cities of Gath and Ezion;19 (3) In almost every house a pottery baking tray was found. These are very rare in Philistine sites; (4) The Khirbet Qeiyafa ostracon is

---

written in a Semitic language (Hebrew?)\textsuperscript{20} while an inscription uncovered at Tell es-Safi/Gath bears Indo-European names;\textsuperscript{21} (5) A new feature uncovered during the 2010 excavation season is a sanctuary. Currently we are preparing this unique building and its cultic paraphernalia for publication. No human or animal figures were found. This is in direct contrast to Philistine temples and cultic paraphernalia,\textsuperscript{22} or the Canaanite cult as was known in the region during the Late Bronze period.\textsuperscript{23}


\textsuperscript{22} A. Mazar, Excavations at Tell Qasile. Vol. 1. The Philistine Sanctuary: Architecture and Cult Objects (Qedem 12; Jerusalem, 1980); D. Ben-Shlomo, Philistine Iconography: A Wealth of Style and Symbolism (OBO 241; Fribourg, 2010).

Our main research interest is Layer IV, which represents an Iron Age city that was built on bedrock, existed for a relatively short period of time, and was suddenly destroyed. No superimposed floors, walls, or installations were found, which clearly indicates a rather short existence for this layer. So far six radiometric samples have been sent for analysis at Oxford University (Figs. 5–6). All samples were olive pits, ideal for dating because of their short lifespan. The results are presented in Table 2. When the six samples are put together, the calibrated average is 1021–975 BCE (59.2% probability) or 1050–971 BC (78.1% probability).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Lab No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Δ13C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qeiyafa 1b</td>
<td>B214</td>
<td>Olive pit</td>
<td>OxA-19589</td>
<td>2883±29</td>
<td>-22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qeiyafa 9</td>
<td>B383</td>
<td>Olive pit</td>
<td>OxA-22044</td>
<td>2858±33</td>
<td>-22.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qeiyafa 5</td>
<td>B284</td>
<td>Olive pit</td>
<td>OxA-19425</td>
<td>2851±31</td>
<td>-20.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qeiyafa 6</td>
<td>B232</td>
<td>Olive pit</td>
<td>OxA-19426</td>
<td>2837±29</td>
<td>-21.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qeiyafa 10</td>
<td>B383</td>
<td>Olive pit</td>
<td>OxA-22045</td>
<td>2830±30</td>
<td>-22.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qeiyafa 7</td>
<td>B277</td>
<td>Olive pit</td>
<td>OxA-19588</td>
<td>2799±31</td>
<td>-19.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Radiometric datings from the Iron Age IIA city of Khirbet Qeiyafa

Two recently published articles suggested that Khirbet Qeiyafa belongs in the very late Iron Age I period. Both articles would lead one to conclude that the Iron Age I should end at the third quarter of the 10th century BCE. Singer-Avitz writes:

---

Considerable continuity in pottery types makes it difficult to distinguish between the late Iron Age I and the early Iron Age IIA assemblages. Indeed, as is clear from Kang and Garfinkel's comparisons, most vessels of the Khirbet Qeiyafa assemblage are known in both ceramic phases. Dating such an assemblage can therefore be done only according to forms that appeared exclusively in one of these ceramic phases (emphasis original).

However, in three of her points, (1) the irregular hand burnish on red slip; (2) the deep, large, carinated kraters with an everted rim; and (3) the elongated storage jar with a rounded shoulder and a small flat base, Singer-Avitz fails to follow her own criteria.

Finkelstein and Piasetzky accept the radiometric datings of Khirbet Qeiyafa but do not average them. They argue for a long settlement sequence at the site, a lifespan of around 135 years from 1050–915 BCE. It is clear that their interpretation is not derived from the archaeological data, which indicate a very short occupation, but is intended to support their low chronology paradigm. In any case, it is not clear what Finkelstein and Piasetzky would like to achieve with their new interpretation. The main debate regarding the ‘low chronology’ focuses on when the transition to urbanism and state formation took place in Judah and Israel. Had Khirbet Qeiyafa not been destroyed, it would have been a city in the 9th and 8th centuries BCE as well. The end of Khirbet Qeiyafa has no bearing on the date of its construction toward the end of the 11th century BCE or early 10th century BCE.

---

25 Singer-Avitz, ibid., p. 79.
VI. The Urban Character of Khirbet Qeiyafa

By the end of the 2010 excavation season five areas had been examined (Areas A-E), and more than 10% of the Iron Age city had been uncovered (Table 3). The expedition excavated 100 meters of the city wall, two gates, a pillar building (small stable?), and 12 houses (Figs. 7–9). The urban planning of the site includes the casemate city wall and a belt of houses abutting the casemates and incorporating them as part of the construction. This is a typical feature of city planning in Judean cities of the 9th and 8th centuries BCE, and is also known at the cities of Beersheba, Tell Beit Mirsim, Tell en-Nasbeh, and Tell Beit-Shemesh.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excavation area</th>
<th>Exposure in m²</th>
<th>Length of city wall</th>
<th>Number of casemates</th>
<th>Number of gates</th>
<th>Number of buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>ca. 2,425</td>
<td>ca. 125</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Khirbet Qeiyafa excavation progress after four seasons, by excavation areas. Partly excavated architectural units are also counted.

Fig. 7: An aerial photo of Areas B and D at the end of the 2010 excavation season

27 Shiloh, *op. cit.* (note 2); Herzog, *op. cit.* (note 1).
Fig. 8: An aerial photo of Area C at the end of the 2010 excavation season

Fig. 9: An aerial photo of Area E at the end of the 2010 excavation season
Various aspects of the Iron Age city have been discussed in the literature: urban planning, economic and administrative function, social organization, and theology. A large number of components are associated with the physical character of a city: city wall, gates, gate piazza, public buildings, cultic activities, water supply, drainage of rain-water and sewage, dwellings, animal husbandry, and cemeteries. There are eight aspects relating to urban planning which were recognized at Khirbet Qeiyafa. Some of them are better known while others should be further investigated in coming seasons.

![Fig. 10: The casemate city wall of Khirbet Qeiyafa in Area C](image)

**I. City Wall**

At Khirbet Qeiyafa the entire circumference of the city wall is known: 700m (Figs. 4, 10). This is a casemate wall, 4m wide. The outer wall was built with megalithic stones, weighing 4–8 tons. The inner walls, as well as the walls dividing the casemates, were built with large stones, weighing 100–200kg. The length of the case-

---

mates is approximately 7m; thus, about 100 casemates were built around the city. In one case, in the fifth building east of the southern gate, instead of a regular casemate a larger and more massive structure was found. In this exact location, a natural pass leading from the Elah Valley to the site is best viewed. We believe this structure served as a watchtower, which was built on a strategic location.

Fig. 11: The western gate of Khirbet Qeiyafa (Area B) and the abutting casemate city wall. Note that the casemate openings are always located away from the gate.

2. Gates
Two gates were located and excavated: one on the west, in Area B; and the other on the south, in Area C (Figs. 11–13). The two gates are identical in plan and size. They are typical four-chamber gates with three massive piers on each side. The original threshold was still preserved in the western gate: a 3m long monolith, weighing ca. 8 tons. It was carved with a step to stop the gate doors on the exact opening line. In
Each gate a drainage canal for rain water or sewage was found at the left side when entering the city.

Fig. 12: The megalithic threshold in entrance of the gate of Area B (looking west)

Fig. 13: The southern gate of Khirbet Qeiyafa (Area C) and the abutting casemate city wall. Note that the casemate openings are always located away from the gate.
3. The Gate Piazza
Near each gate there was an open area inside the city that functioned as a gate piazza. In the western gate, it is located south of the gate and extends along the length of four casemates. Only the fifth casemate is associated with a building. The size of the piazza here is nearly 30m. In the southern gate, an open area is found west of the gate. Its size is not yet clear, as it has been only partially excavated. However, at the edge of the area, there are a few megalithic stones, which are usually part of the city wall. This might be an indication that a large public building, associated with the gate and the gate piazza, stood here.

The gate area was the major component of a biblical city. As the access way, everybody had to pass through the city gate. Thus, from a geographical point of view, it was the most crowded part of the city. Indeed, the word ‘gate’ appeared over 100 times in the Hebrew Bible. From these rich references, it is clear that the city gate has been associated with a variety of activities: defensive (inspecting the people entering the city), economic (market), religious (standing stones, high places, temples, prophetic messages), juristic (place of judging), and as a place for social gatherings. All these activities could not be carried out in the narrow gate itself and were probably organized in the gate piazza.

![Fig. 14: Pillar Building in Area C](image)

4. Public Buildings
In 2007 we uncovered a small part of a massive building with thick walls, nearly three times wider than the private buildings. Taking into consideration its strategic location and massive walls, it could have served as the residence of the city commander or another public function. Another public building was found in Area C as part of the fifth building east of the gate. Here a square structure was found with
three pillars and a basin, apparently a small stable (Fig. 14). This building resembles the typical architecture of public buildings in the Iron Age period. This pillared building was not built adjacent to a regular city wall casemate but abuts the larger and more massive watchtower, located over the natural pass leading from the Elah Valley to the site.

![Fig. 15: Dwellings abutting the city wall in Area C](image)

5. Dwellings
Adjacent to the city wall, simple dwellings were constructed, each building using one casemate as the back room of the building (Fig. 15). Each building is about 7x7–10m in size, so their overall area is between 50m² and 70m². The buildings are usually divided into three or four rooms. As there are two gates and two gate piazzas, about 90 dwellings were built in the city. In each excavated building rich assemblages of complete pottery vessels, stone utensils from various raw materials (limestone, basalt, flint, beach-rock), and metal tools (iron and bronze) were found on the floors. It is clear that the city came to its end in a sudden event. Comparatively, in the Hellenistic settlement, which was peacefully abandoned, the floors were left rather empty.

6. Drainage of Rainwater and Sewage
Already in the 2008 and 2009 seasons, we have recognized a drainage system in each of the city gates. A big surprise of the 2010 season was the discovery of four

---

drains located in private houses (Fig. 16). We hope to finish excavating these drains in the 2011 season to discover exactly how they were used.

Fig. 16: A drainage in a private dwelling in Area C
7. Cultic Activities
In 2010 we uncovered a small sanctuary in the seventh building east of the southern gate (Fig. 17). The finds include a bench, standing stones, a basalt altar, a basin, a libation vessel, a seal, and an Egyptian scarab. No human or animal effigies were found, in direct contrast to Philistine and Canaanite cultic places, which are characterized by rich cultic paraphernalia that include human and animal bones. This is the earliest sanctuary ever found in Judah and raises questions about the origin of the biblical ban on graven images. It is possible that in the gate piazza of Area D, another cultic building is located. In the last days of the 2010 season, the northern end of a new building was uncovered. It contained a bench, an architectural element not found in any of the 12 dwellings uncovered at the site except in the cultic building in Area C.

Fig. 17: The small sanctuary in Area C

8. Water Supply
So far, no special evidence for this activity has been found. It is possible that the only water source was the Elah River, a few hundred meters south of the site in the Elah Valley. Walking back and forth uphill from the city to the valley probably required 30–40 minutes to bring water.

VII. Urban Planning and the Construction of the City
The planning of Khirbet Qeiyafa includes a casemat city wall and a belt of houses abutting the casemates, incorporating them as part of the construction. This is a typical feature of urban planning in Judean cities of the 9th and 8th centuries BCE, and is known in the cities of Beersheba, Tell Beit Mirsim, Tell en-Nasbeh, and Tel
Beit-Shemesh, the earliest known example of this city plan, an indication that this pattern had already been developed in the early Iron Age IIA period. The level of planning also indicates an advanced level of social organization. A high level of standardization of the city plan in a number of sites is an argument for a central authority that planned and controlled the construction of these cities—i.e. a kingdom.

The question of how a city was actually constructed is usually ignored, because the data is often limited. In this section we argue that in the case of Khirbet Qeiyafa, it is possible to study how the city was physically constructed: the stages of work, the sources of raw materials, and the division of labor. Analysis of these aspects is still preliminary, so the points raised here should be understood as a working hypothesis rather than a final conclusion. It seems that the city was built in seven stages, some of them contemporaneous with each other. We would like to test this hypothesis by adding or removing stages, according to new field observations, especially collected for this hypothesis.

1. **Preparing the Area for Construction**

Construction began by removing sediments and exposing bedrock in a 20m beltway around the site. Later, the city wall and a row of houses were constructed along this strip.

2. **Supply of Building Materials**

The outer city wall was constructed of very large stones, sometimes 2–3m long and 4–8 tons in weight. Where did these large stones come from? The simplest answer is that they were quarried from inside the city and slid down the slope, just a few meters in each case. Thus, there was not one central quarry, but many ad hoc locations. Shiloh and Horowitz found that the quarries in the Hill Country were located at *nari* outcroppings on the mounds themselves or on their slopes. The natural bedrock of Khirbet Qeiyafa is indeed *nari*, and one quarry has already been found in Area B, within the city (Fig. 18). Here there is a concentration of large stones (1–1.5m long) cut from all four sides but not yet removed.

3. **Creating a Fortified Enclosure**

In what order were the different parts of the fortification and houses built? We suggest four stages, based on the order in which walls are abutting each other. The city gates were built first, starting with the elongated walls, and then the gate piers. In one case, on the western side of the southern gate, the front pier was constructed first. The outer casemate wall abuts the gates, so it was built after the gates. It seems that it was probably built as a free-standing wall, encircling the area of the planned city. It was probably built quickly, creating a fortified stronghold.

---

30 Shiloh, *op. cit.* (note 2); Herzog, *op. cit.* (note 1).
32 Shiloh and Horowitz, ibid.
4. Completing the Fortification System

The inner walls of the casemates, the walls parallel to the outer city wall, and the walls dividing the casemates from each other were built abutting the gates and the outer city wall, so they too were built after them. While megaliths were used for the outer wall, smaller stones were used for the inner casemates.

Based on the analysis of casemate openings, it seems that there were four main units working simultaneously on the construction of the site. Two working units started from each gate, one to the left and one to the right. From the gate in Area B, one working unit built the inner casemate toward the north and another toward the south. From the gate in Area C, one working unit built the inner casemate toward the west and another toward the east. The openings of the casemates in all four cases are in the corners farthest from the gate (see attached map below). These working units must have met somewhere along the city wall, raising a very interesting question: how were the casemate openings organized at the two meeting points? We would like to locate and excavate at least one of these meeting points. The test pit in Area E, opened on the east side of the site, indicates that up to this point, the construction was done by a group starting from the gate in Area C.

The location of the meeting point can tell us if the working units were equal in working capacity or not. If the meeting point is exactly between the two gates, both working units worked at the same speed. In the Iron Age period, we read of two such working units tunneling toward each other in the Silwan Tunnel inscription.

5. Public and Administrative Buildings

These structures are the least known, but there is some evidence for such buildings. In Area C a square building with pillars and a basin was found. This structure re-
seems the typical architecture of public buildings in the Iron Age period. In Area A the corner of a massive building was excavated, three times as thick as the common dwellings.

6. Dwellings
A peripheral belt of dwellings was built adjacent to and abutting the casemate city wall. Each building incorporates a casemate as its back room. Thus, household units could be constructed only after the city wall was completed. The walls of these buildings were constructed from small stones not larger than 50cm.

7. Building the Inner City
The central part of Khirbet Qeiyafa exposed bedrock. In this respect the site differs from Tell Beit Shemesh, Tell en-Nasbeh, Tell Beit Mirsim, and Beersheba, whose center indicates dense building activities. Khirbet Qeiyafa is also different from these sites by having only one Iron Age phase. Can it be suggested that Khirbet Qeiyafa was destroyed and frozen in an early phase of its existence, thus the center was never completed?34

![Fig. 19: Megalithic stones in the outer side of the city wall](image)

It seems that in the construction of the city three different levels of working skills were involved (see below). This can be deduced from the size of the stones and their location in the different architectural units. These differences may indicate division of labor, and perhaps gender as well.

1. Megalithic Stones
These are very large stones, about 2–3m in length and 4–8 tons in weight (Figs. 12, 19). The quarrying, transportation, and final placement of these huge stones required

33 Kochavi, op. cit. (note 30)
34 But see an opposite scenario proposed for Tell Beth Mirsim, Herzog, op.cit. (note 1), p. 244.
sophisticated technology and professional masons. These stones are found only in the gates and the outer wall of the city fortification. Professional stone masonry was developed in the later part of the Iron Age with elaborate ashlar masonry, masons’ marks, and well-carved capitals.35 The large stone operation, as found at Khirbet Qeiyafa, can be the background for these later developments.

2. Large stones
These are large stones, about 0.5–1m in length and a few hundred kilograms in weight (Fig. 20). The quarrying, transportation, and final placement of these stones required a few strong people but could have been done without sophisticated knowledge. These stones were used for the construction of the inner casemate wall.

Fig. 20: Large stones in the inner side of the city wall

35 Shiloh, op. cit. (note 31); I. Sharon, “Phoenician and Greek Ashlar Construction Techniques at Tel Dor, Israel”, BASOR 267 (1987), pp. 21–42.
3. Medium and Small Stones
These stones are less than 0.5m in length, and their weight is usually 20–30kg (Fig. 21). They can be collected and moved by the average person, including women and older children. These stones were used for the construction of the dwellings abutting the city wall. This may indicate that the buildings were built by individual families and were not part of the public, centrally organized construction of the city.

It is possible to suggest that professional workers were part of the central authority and that they were responsible for the construction of the outer city wall. Ordinary male adults, ad hoc forced labor, built the inner casemate city wall. Unlike the public operations, the belt of dwellings could have been built by the private families who later lived in the city. While the men were busy with the construction of the fortifications, the women and children could collect medium and small stones for building the private houses. A detailed classification of these stones, taking into account their size, weight, and shape, compared with their location and use, will enable a better understanding of labor division during the construction of the city.

VIII. Discussion
The site of Khirbet Qeiyafa presents a unique opportunity to study various aspects of an Iron Age city, which cannot be easily investigated in large, multilayered tell sites. Indeed, after only four seasons of excavations, Khirbet Qeiyafa has already contributed tremendously to questions relating to urban planning and to how the city was constructed.

The best way to appreciate the development presented in the planned city of Khirbet Qeiyafa is by contrasting it to the earlier Iron Age IB sites uncovered in the
region, the hill country, and the Beersheba valley. This earlier type of site was analyzed by Herzog, who described these settlements as an “enclosed settlement form of village which is characterized by the construction of dwellings encircling a central open area. This layout affords the settlement protection even without a free-standing system of fortifications. The center of the settlement served as a yard in which the herds were penned at night”. These sites do not exhibit public or communal building activities. Khirbet Qeiyafa, in contrast, was built in an organized, planned manner, with three levels of construction skill. The quarry, transportation, and placing of megalithic stones up to 8 tons in weight, clearly indicate engineering skill on a level never observed before in the Iron Age I.

If we are considering the city of Khirbet Qeiyafa in the larger social network, whether it is part of a system of competing city-states, like the Late Bronze Canaanite centers, or part of a territorial state, like the kingdoms of Judah or Israel, it is clear that Khirbet Qeiyafa fits the latter category better. The city’s physical components are well organized, in a distinct spatial pattern. Indeed, cities can be built and extended over time without pre-planning, but pre-planning indicates a higher level of social organization. If the same urban planning appeared in the same period over a larger territory, then this standardization can be taken into account as an indication for top-down planning by a central authority—i.e., a state. Indeed, the city plan of Khirbet Qeiyafa was used again in at least four additional cities: Tell Beit Shemesh, Tell en-Nasbeh, Tell Beit Mirsim, and Beersheba. This specific urban planning is typical to Judah and was not found in any Canaanite or Philistine site, or in the northern kingdom of Israel. The new data from the Iron Age IIA city of Khirbet Qeiyafa clearly indicate that the process of state formation and urbanization started in the biblical kingdom of Judah as early as the late 11th century BCE.

36 Herzog, op. cit. (note 1), p. 211.