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Foreword

The Khirbet Qeiyafa Archaeological Project was conducted over a period of seven years, from 2007 to 2013. It was initiated with a two-week pilot season in the summer of 2007. Each subsequent summer, from 2008-2011, a six-week field season has been conducted each summer. One of the major problems with archaeological projects, in Israel as well as around the world, is the long delay in the publication of the excavated data and interpretations. As a result, other specialists in the field often wait and are unable to incorporate the new information from neighboring sites in the assessment of their own excavation results. This leads to isolationism and an inability to conduct comparative studies. We have decided on a different course of action. After the first two excavation seasons a final report was published, without waiting until the end of the project (Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. I [2009]). As we worked on a relatively small scale one volume was sufficient to include the entire relevant data.

At the end of the field work we began to organize the final excavation report for the other five excavation seasons, 2009–2013. So much data accumulated in these five seasons that we decided to organize the publication in several separate volumes. This present volume – Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 2 – deals with Areas B, C, D, and E, and reports on (1) an overview of the methodology, (2) descriptions of the database and survey work conducted at the site, (3) the field observations, (4) a detailed account of the stratigraphy, and (5) the architecture of the relevant areas. In addition, relevant aspects of dating are included, presenting the radiometric determinations, coins, a local group of pottery known as “Black Juglets” and Cypriot pottery.

Some argue that the fortified city of the early tenth century BCE should be affiliated with Iron IB. For this reason we included the “Black Juglets” and Cypriot pottery which are clear markers of Iron II.

The third volume (Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 3), which is in an advanced stage of preparation, will present the field data on the other excavated parts of the site, Areas A, F and W. This volume will include a final discussion of the relevant phases of occupation at Khirbet Qeiyafa: Late Chalcolithic, Middle Bronze Age, Iron Age IIA, Late Persian–Early Hellenistic, Late Second Temple, and Late Roman–Byzantine periods. Two of these periods have significant importance and are emphasized in the report: the Iron Age IIA and the Late Persian–Early Hellenistic period.

The fourth planned volume (Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 4), deals with aspects of art, cult, and epigraphy; reporting specifically on the discovery of three sanctuaries or cult rooms in Areas C and D. The fifth report volume (Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 5), will present the assemblage of ca. 600 coins uncovered at the site. The sixth report volume (Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 6), will present an analysis of the Iron Age IIA ceramic assemblage of the site. The last reports for the 2009–2013 excavation seasons (Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 7–8), will present the various find categories: metal objects, stone tools, animal bones and the like from all the areas. The meticulous study of these very rich assemblages will require much more time than the aspects presented in the earlier volumes. We see no reason to delay the presentation and final analysis of our findings, simply because other aspects are still under study. Thus we have organized the publication according to a simple principle: the first data which has been analyzed is published first. In this way, the number of the volumes will not affect the order of the publication.

The fieldwork, analysis of the data uncovered, and the publications all required extensive financial support, which was obtained by various foundations, organizations, and individuals, as specified in the acknowledgements. The editors would particularly like to express their deep appreciation to the supporting institutions that made this excavation possible: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Southern Adventist University, and the Israel Exploration Society. The Israel Antiquities Authority granted licenses for the project and assisted in the processing and storage of finds under the directorship of the late Shuka Dorfman. We appreciate the opportunity to further the understanding of the periods of history represented at Khirbet Qeiyafa. Finally, our gratitude is extended to the foundations, organizations, and individual supporters who understood the significance of this small but important site for the early history of Judah and the Kingdom of David. It was your generosity that enabled us to carry out the project from the beginning to the end.

Yosef Garfinkel, Saar Ganor, and Michael G. Hasel
2010 Excavation season: Southern Adventist University team.

2012 Excavation season: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem team.
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1.1. Introduction

Khirbet Qeiyafa is a 2.3 hectare site surrounded by massive fortifications of megalithic stones which still stand to a height of 2–3 m. It is located in the western part of the high Shephelah (Israel map grid 14603–12267), on the summit of a hill that borders the Elah Valley on the north. This is a key strategic geopolitical location in the biblical Kingdom of Judah, on the main road from Philistia and the Coastal Plain to Jerusalem and Hebron in the hill country. Two kilometers to the west lies Tell Zakariyyeh, commonly identified as biblical Azekah (Abel 1938:85; Na’aman 1974:30; Rainey 1983; Seger 1997: 243), and 2.5 km to the southeast is Khirbet Shuweikeh, commonly identified as biblical Socoh (Albright 1960:30–31; Aharoni 1967:300; Rainey 1983:7; Hasel 2009). Some 2.5 km to the northeast lies Tel Jarmuth (Miroschedji 1993a; 1993b). About 12 km west of Khirbet Qeiyafa is Tell es-Safi, where the central Philistine city of Gath was located. In the tenth and ninth centuries BCE, Gath was a prominent city-state, over 30 hectares in size (Maier 2008; 2012). It was the largest and the closest hostile political unit to Judah. From a geopolitical perspective, any central authority in Judah would have been forced to fortify and guard the passage in the Elah Valley before the fortification of peripheral sites like Lachish, Beersheba, or Arad.

It is interesting to note that near Khirbet Qeiyafa, which is located “between Socoh and Azekah,” is Ephes Dammim, the location of the famous battle between David and Goliath the Gittite (a man of Gath) according to the biblical tradition (1 Sam 17). A different biblical tradition relates this battle to Elhanan son of Ja’are-Oregim (2 Sam 21:19), but here too, the Philistine opponent mentioned is Goliath. Yet another biblical tradition describes a battle that took place at the similarly named Pas Dammim (1Chr 11:13). These traditions apparently reflect a historical memory of heavy military confrontations in the Elah Valley between the Kingdom of Gath and Judah in the late eleventh and early tenth centuries BCE (see the discussion by Adams 2009).

Even prior to excavation, visitors to Khirbet Qeiyafa could see a massive city wall, 2–3 m in height, encompassing the summit of the hill. The city wall demarcates an area of 2.3 hectares and its total length is 700 m. 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, some weighing 4–8 tons, while its upper part is built with medium-sized stones. At the western side of the site, the cyclopean city wall ends in a straight line; it continues after an interval of 10.5 m. Even before excavation, it could be deduced that this was where a city gate was located. The location of a similar gate has been deduced in the same way on the eastern side of the site.

At the summit of the hill are the massive remains of a rectangular building, a fortified Byzantine farm house. At its center is a large open courtyard where the bedrock, in part, is exposed to the surface. Here two ancient cisterns were cut in the bedrock, one of them was blocked with cement during the twentieth century CE. The courtyard is closed by casemates from the east, south and west and by a massive wall from the north. Three rooms on the southern wall were cleared out in the past, perhaps by one of the surveyors in the nineteenth century CE; however, we did not find any record for such activity. Alternatively, it is possible that the rooms were cleared by local villagers in the previous century or earlier. An interesting installation, square-shaped from the outside and circular on the inside, was constructed on the western side. Various
architectural elements are scattered around, including large threshold stones, well-cut stones and large stone weights.

Elsewhere on the site, stone walls of various sizes, rock-cut installations, caves and heaps of stones are visible. The evidence indicates that this is not a tell, a multi-layered mound with a thick accumulation of human activity, but a short-lived thin-accumulation ruin, many remains of which stand exposed to this very day.

The Khirbet Qeiyafa Archaeological Project was initiated in 2007. This was a trail season to examine the site, the periods of settlement, and the state of preservation of the archaeological materials and architecture. The season lasted two weeks with 12–15 people excavating the site in Areas A and B. The results were impressive and it was concluded that a long-term project would be worthwhile and valuable. In 2008 a longer season of six weeks with ca. 30 participants was conducted focusing on Areas B and C. Another week of field work was conducted in Spring, 2009, during which the western gate in Area B was further excavated and reconstructed. The results of these nine excavation weeks were summarized and published in our first excavation report, *Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 1* (Garfinkel and Ganor 2009).

The expedition work took place in six different excavation areas on the site, named A to F and the additional Area W located west of the fortified city. From season to season the exposed area was enlarged, so that by the end of the 2013 ca. 5,000 square meters were uncovered, ca. 25% of the size of the original site. Aerial photographs were taken

Figure 1.1: Map of the Kingdom of Judah.
at the end of each season to enable readers to follow the expansion of the excavated area. This large horizontal exposure was possible to achieve because the site has a shallow deposition of archaeological sediment, which ranges from 3 m in the deepest locations to not more the 0.5 m in the shallowest locations. The average depth is not more than 1.5 m. Thus, a working unit of one archaeologist and 3–4 volunteers could excavate a square of 5 x 5 m in 2–3 weeks, averaging two squares during one season.

1.2. Research Questions

The development and populating of towns and cities is a fascinating and multifaceted subject. Recent studies focusing on urban development worldwide, and in Israel in particular, devote attention to pre-planning, building technologies, social organization, division of labor, gender, public versus private enterprise, ideologies, and cosmological ideas. 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 stratigraphically complex 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 has received considerable attention as evidenced by the large number of studies on ancient Israel relating to this topic (Aharoni 1973a; Shiloh 1978; McClellan 1984; Kempinski 1992; Amiran and Goethert 1996). The social organization of cities, on the other hand, has received less attention (Singer-Avitz 1996; Faust 1999), and the question of how a city was actually built has often been ignored due to limited data. The excavations at Khirbet Qeiyafa now make it possible to study all three aspects.

Our main aim is to understand how the Iron Age fortress of Khirbet Qeiyafa was built and used by the ancient inhabitants of the site, by posing the following questions:

1. How was the city of Khirbet Qeiyafa physically constructed? What were the various stages of work and how were they organized in terms of raw materials used and division of labor?
2. What was the social organization of the com-
munity at Khirbet Qeiyafa? Was it more or less an egalitarian society, or a stratified society? These questions can only be answered once the analysis of the various find categories in the architectural units is completed. Then we will better understand the social organization of the community that inhabited the site.

3. How did the site function as a border city simultaneously facing Philistia and the road to Jerusalem? What architectural and other aspects point to its use as a military garrison or fortress to guard the road to the central hill-country? Or was this simply a settlement?

4. Related to this question is one about the nature of Khirbet Qeiyafa as a precursor to later city designs. What influence did this site have on later Judean city-planning? Is it possible to connect the building activities at this site with later urban developments? What are these developments?

5. Finally, how does this site relate to the historical questions of site identity and what was its political significance within the territory of early Judah? What role did the site play in the early development of the Monarchy and in the border tensions that developed between ancient Israel and Philistia?

1.3. The Archaeology of Large Horizontal Exposure and Stratigraphic Methods

One of the main archaeological problems when studying the organization of ancient sites 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 superimposed for millennia. In order to uncover the lower (earlier) layers, one must excavate through the upper (later) layers. The final result, after years of work, is a 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 often been discussed (Herzog 1997:12–16; Barker 1993: 79–88; Bunimovitz 2001:31; Faust 2005:302), but very few projects have adopted this approach due to the nature of the ancient Near Eastern *tell*. The history of the horizontal method of excavation can be divided into three phases:

**Phase 1 (1900s–1930s)**

In the early days of research, large areas were exposed at sites such as the upper strata at Megiddo, Beth Shean, and Gezer. The results of these early excavations were chaotic as there was very little stratigraphic control. In many cases components of various periods were combined into one layer by excavators, despite publications in that generation which emphasized the importance of careful stratigraphic excavation. In some cases the excavators of this generation did not show much interest in city planning or how the city was constructed.

**Phase 2 (1950s–1970s)**

During this period two distinct methods of excavation developed in Israel one by foreign expeditions and another by burgeoning local Israeli schools of archaeology at Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. Israelis under the influence of Y. Yadin at Hazor and Y. Aha-
roni (1973a; 1973b) at Beersheba developed the architectural method of excavation which emphasized large horizontal exposure. Balks were retained until architectural features were exposed and then removed in order to excavate entire architectural units. The large-scale excavations of Early Bronze Arad and Iron Age Beersheba thus exposed urban planning to a major extent (Shiloh 1978; Amiran and Ilan 1996:140–147). While some criticized the architectural method for its lack of stratigraphic control and attention to total retrieval (Dever 1973; 1980), the analysis of the finds in their domestic context allowed for the study of household and social organization in Beersheba and Arad (Singer-Avitz 1996; Ilan 2001).

During this same period, foreign expeditions to Samaria, Gezer, Jericho, and Jerusalem continued to use and further develop the Wheeler-Kenyon
method which focused on stratigraphic excavation and meticulous documentation. This method insisted on maintaining 5 x 5 m squares, producing top plans that recorded daily changes and developments, and more importantly, drawing detailed sections that recorded the stratigraphic history of each area. This became the methodology that continued in modified form in later expeditions to Ashkelon (Stager, Schloen, and Master, 2008a; 2008b; Master 2008; Stager, Master, Schloen 2011), Tel Miqne-Ekron (Mehl, Dothan, and Gitin 2006), Tel Zayit (Tappy et al. 2006; Tappy and McCarter 2010), the renewed excavations at Gezer, and extended to American projects in Jordan such as the Madaba Plains Project (Geraty et al. 1989; Herr et al. 1991; 1997; 2000; 2002). These excavations were also highly influenced by processual archaeology which emphasized a systemic and multidisciplinary approach to the archaeological record (see Dever 1981a; LaBianca 1990).

Phase 3 (1980s–2000s)
During this period a modified methodology developed in Israel that combined the best of the architectural method and the stratigraphic method (Mazar 1988:120–122; 2000). The modified methodology was best demonstrated at the excavations of Lachish, Beth Shean, Tel Rehov, Tell es-Safi, and Beth Shemesh. However, one of the remaining difficulties with the stratigraphic method was the large horizontal exposure of sites, and this proved to be the case at these excavations as well. Since 2007 Khirbet Qeiyafa is one of the only sites in Israel whose main research target is to obtain a plan of an Iron Age city (Garfinkel and Ganor 2008a; 2009a; Garfinkel, Ganor, Hasel and Stiebel 2009; Garfinkel, Stievert, Ganor, and Hasel 2012; Garfinkel, Ganor, and Hasel 2010; 2012a; 2012b; 2013). Khirbet Qeiyafa is an ideal site for large horizontal exposure for the following reasons:

1. The site 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 took place and bedrock was exposed in several areas.
2. The site is relatively small—2.3 hectares. Most sites are much larger in size: 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 a large percentage of the site in a relatively short period of time.
3. The archaeological sediment is rather shallow, not
more than 2 m at its deepest point along the outer edge of the city walls. In each excavated area, only two major building phases have been found making it possible to excavate large fills more quickly than at complex, stratified sites.

4. The Iron Age city was abandoned suddenly, 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.

As we have seen, during the first decades of archaeological investigation it was common to excavate large horizontal exposures. However, the poor stratigraphic and recording methods confused the data, mixing structures from various periods into one stratum. In more recent excavations, only small portions of sites have been excavated with much more attention to detail, 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 in an excellent state of preservation.

1.4. Methodological Aspects

There are various aspects to the methodology employed during the 2009–2011 seasons at Khirbet Qeiyafa that require some description in addition to the Expedition Aims and Methodology Chapter in Volume 1 (Garfinkel and Ganor 2009:19–24). In many ways, the excavations at Khirbet Qeiyafa have experimented with different methodologies in order to achieve its research goals.

1. Choosing the Site. Khirbet Qeiyafa was chosen because of its key location within the traditional territory ascribed to Judah, its relatively small size (2.3 hectares) with a short-lived occupation (two
main periods), thin accumulation (2 m maximum), and a rich Iron Age layer. These factors led to the conclusion that less time would be required to uncover and expose a meaningful sample of the Iron Age city than on a typical *tell* site from the same time period.

2. **Size of Horizontal Exposure.** Our aim is to uncover 15–20% of the site, which will produce a meaningful sample of the city wall, gates, domestic, and public buildings.

3. **Sampling Strategy.** Various parts of the site will be excavated, each including a number of dwellings in order to establish the homogeneity or distinction of occupation periods represented in different parts of the site.

4. **Timeframe for Field Project.** The field project is limited in time, with seven excavation seasons planned altogether (2007–2013).

5. **Excavation Method.** An overall grid of 5 x 5 m squares was imposed over the entire site. Areas of excavation were chosen based on the architectural features visible above the ground. Each square was supervised by a trained archaeologist and 3–4 volunteers. This high ratio of staff to volunteers ensured careful excavation and documentation. All collapsed sediments above floors were sifted in a 2 mm mesh in order to retrieve small finds such as seals, scarabs, beads, bone artifacts, and small metal objects. Micro-fauna bones (2–3 mm) were collected by wet sifting in a 1 mm mesh.

The excavation strategy employed varied by field during the 2009–2011 seasons. The Hebrew University excavations in Areas A–C and E emphasized a more architectural approach exposing entire architectural units within these areas. Excavations began with 5 x 5 m squares with half meter balks. Once architecture was exposed, balks were drawn and removed in order to follow the architecture. A longer half balk was maintained over four to five squares in order to maintain control. Locus sheets were kept that included a top plan, elevations and an area for description. The architect drew architectural features and sections for the areas excavated.

The Southern Adventist University excavations in Area D worked within the stratigraphic method with a similar commitment to wide horizontal expo-
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sure, retaining 5 x 5 m squares and one meter balks until bedrock was reached. The balks were necessary for four reasons: (1) maintaining the grid for the three-dimensional measurement of all features, architecture, and objects using a TopCon Total Station (see Chapter 2); (2) the daily digital production of top plans for each square with locus numbers and elevations using ArchGIS software (see Chapter 2: Survey Recording Techniques and GIS Referencing); (3) stratigraphic control; and (4) transporting buckets of dirt and stone to the dump area. Balks were systematically trimmed and maintained with sandbags. Once floors or bedrock were reached in the area, the balks were drawn, final photos were taken of all the balks and the square itself. The balks were then stratigraphically removed. By the end of the season, the architectural units were fully exposed, thus achieving the overall aim of the excavation. The team used digital recording. Data was entered on Asus netbook computers in each square on an electronic database system developed by Southern Adventist University’s School of Computing (see Chapter 3). At the end of the season locus sheets were printed, stratigraphic summaries prepared, and a complete notebook with a DVD of all digital photographs was submitted to the IAA. Volunteers were trained in each aspect of the recording techniques by square supervisors and use of the Total Station by the survey team.

6. Documentation. The careful documentation of the stratigraphic relationship of walls, usage of raw materials, and stone size has been instructive in the study of the city’s building process. Photographs were constantly taken as progress took place. Individual artifacts found in situ, balks, floors, and other architectural features were photographed. Aerial photos were taken at the end of each season. In Area D complete architectural reconstructions were achieved at the end of the season by the survey team.

7. Analysis of Finds. The artifacts were analyzed by typological classification and quantity during daily readings at camp. Petrographic analysis was conducted on the pottery assemblage, and the stone utensils are being sent for geological examination.

8. Household Archaeology. Quantitative and spatial analysis has been 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: pottery vessels, stone and metal objects as well as animal bones.

9. Spatial Analysis. The social structure of the

Figure 1.8: Khirbet Qeiyafa at the end of the 2010 season (view to the east).
Yosef Garfinkel, Saar Ganor, and Michael G. Hasel

The community that inhabited the site will be investigated and the various households compared. Unless the community is egalitarian, it would be 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. Conservation and Reconstruction. The conservation and reconstruction of the gates, walls, domestic structures, and other buildings excavated was a primary goal of the project. Two additional seasons (Spring 2008 and 2009) were conducted to reconstruct the gates. In addition, reconstruction took place during the excavation seasons 2010 to 2013 under the direction of conservator Orna Cohen and volunteers were assigned to assist her in this task.

11. Publication. In order to avoid a long delay in excavation reports, we are publishing a final report every two to three seasons (for the 2007–2008 seasons, see Garfinkel and Ganor 2009) as well as preliminary reports (Garfinkel and Ganor 2008; Garfinkel, Ganor, Hasel, Stiebel 2009; Farhi 2011; Garfinkel, Streit, Ganor, and Hasel 2012; Garfinkel, Ganor and Hasel 2010; 2011a; 2011b; 2012a; 2012b; 2013; Garfinkel and Kang 2012; Garfinkel and Mumcuoglu 2013).

1.5. Settlement History of Khirbet Qeiyafa

In the first excavation report a summary was presented of the site settlement history (Garfinkel and Ganor 2009:32–35). After five more excavation seasons, a few details may be added, but the general picture has not changed. Data collected to date, including coins and pottery collected on the surface and during excavations, indicates that Khirbet Qeiyafa was used in different ways during various periods. The sequence can be divided into six main phases or archaeological strata (Table 1.1). Needless to say, this description is based on the current data and further excavations may reveal additional phases that are still unknown.

Stratum I

An Ottoman Farm. The remains of this stratum include two houses, still standing near the highest point of the site, and a street leading between these houses into an opening in the city wall. Outside the city wall, there is a large platform (c. 15x17 m) with
two walls on the southern and northern sides. The area between these walls is filled with hundreds of thousands of fairly small stones. According to Davidovich’s (2009:38–43) observations, a system of shallow fences in the west, outside the city wall, also belongs to this period. The Ottoman period farm is more thoroughly analyzed in Chapter 12 of this volume.

**Stratum II**

Hasmonean and Late Roman–Early Byzantine Occupation. Pottery and coins uncovered on the site surface or topsoil indicate that the area was used for agricultural purposes for a long period, from the Late Hellenistic (Hasmonean) period to the Early Islamic era (see Chapter 14: The Coins). In the Early Islamic period a coin and a few early Islamic pottery sherds, including Khirbet el-Mafjar ware, were collected. The caves on the site, including the cave excavated in Area D, continued to be used during this period.

In the Early Roman period pottery was found on the site not associated with any debris or architecture. Within this longer span of activity two occupation levels were uncovered.

**IIa:** Late Roman–Early Byzantine: This phase is represented by a gate excavated in Area C, a large buildings excavated in Area A and the periphery wall still standing around the site (according to one director). A number of coins and extensive pottery in the topsoil and later debris layers attest to a major occupation. The caves on the site, including the cave excavated in Area D, continued to be used during this period.

**IIb:** Late Hellenistic (Hasmonean): This phase is represented by pottery fragments and coins collected on the site surface. In addition, two coins were found in the excavations of square R31, under nearly 1 m of sterile soil and immediately above the Early Hellenistic accumulation. This may indicate the stage when Area B remains were leveled and the outer construction of the western Iron Age gate was completely removed. In Area F a Late Hellenistic (Hasmonean) layer was also uncovered.

**Stratum III**

A Late Persian–Early Hellenistic Administrative Center: Three large buildings from this period were excavated, in Area C, in Area D and in Area F. Around these large buildings a few small houses were constructed. The settlement was surrounded by an enclosing wall that was built on top of the outer Iron Age casemate city wall. This phase is dated to 350–270 BCE based on coins (see Chapter

Figure 1.10: Khirbet Qeiyafa at the end of the 2012 season (view to the north).
14). Based on the floors in Building D200 and architectural considerations in all the buildings, there appear to be two clear phases of occupation. The late phase of occupation added secondary walls \textit{tabuns} and other installations in certain entrances.

**Stratum IV**  
An early Iron IIA city of 2.3 hectares in size. Radiometric dating and pottery date this city to c. 1020–980 BCE. The city is surrounded by a casemate wall, two gates and a belt of houses on its periphery. In the center of the site a large administrative building was built on the acropolis. Three sanctuary rooms were also found. Two near the gates of the city. This type of city planning is typical of the Judean Kingdom (Shiloh 1970, 1978) and has not been reported from the Kingdom of Israel. The site of Khirbet Qeiyafa is the earliest example of this urban concept.

**Stratum V**  
A Middle Bronze II phase, known by a few hundreds pottery sherds uncovered in fills in all the excavated areas, from A to F. Some of these were found below the Iron Age floors and in cavities in the natural bedrock, and some were found in fills and debris of the Iron Age and the Late Persian-Early Hellenistic period. No architecture can be related to this period. It seems that there was a small Middle Bronze Age village at Khirbet Qeiyafa, which still awaits discovery or may have been completely destroyed by the construction of Stratum IV.

The typical pottery includes cooking pots with a straight wall, horizontal plastic decoration and small holes near the rim. This type is usually characteristic of the earlier parts of the Middle Bronze Age, but sometimes appears toward the end of the period. Other pottery fragments include juglet handles, jug rims, jar rims and body sherds decorated with white slip and painted with lines of red and blue.

**Stratum VI**  
Late Chalcolithic remains, including pottery, flint and stone objects. No architecture can be related to this phase.

Limestone bedrock is found below the archaeological strata. The Iron Age walls in Areas A, B, C, D, and E are built directly on bedrock. There are occasional cavities, which are covered with a reddish clay sediment, known as \textit{terra rossa}. It seems that the Iron Age construction activities shaved away
any natural and human accumulation in order to construct walls directly on bedrock.

1.6. Conclusions
After seven excavations seasons at Khirbet Qeiyafa new archaeological data on the late Persian–Early Hellenistic and the Iron IIA periods were discovered in major architectural units and rich assemblages. The results and interpretation of the architecture and stratigraphy presented in this report provides a state-of-the-art understanding of this data in relationship to other archaeological research in Israel. The development of urban planning, site construction, and social organization in Judah, as well as the periphery, will only be some of the important aspects that the large horizontal exposure of Khirbet Qeiyafa has made possible. More significant will be the implications for the early history of Judah, early state formation, and the relationship of the architectural developments at Khirbet Qeiyafa with other archaeological sites in Judah in subsequent periods. The methodology employed during the 2007–2013 excavations were developed to answer these specific questions and are the foundation for the final report presented here and in the other projected volumes.

Table 1.1: Settlement history of Khirbet Qeiyafa.

<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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Islamic</td>
<td>Agricultural terraces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>Late Roman–Byzantine</td>
<td>Fortress and agricultural settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>Late Hellenistic (Hasmonean)</td>
<td>Debris, no architectural remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIa</td>
<td>Phase 2: Late Persian–Early Hellenistic</td>
<td>Fortress and administrative center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIb</td>
<td>Phase 1: Late Persian–Early Hellenistic</td>
<td>Fortress and administrative center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Early Iron Age IIA (1020–980 BCE)</td>
<td>Fortified city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Middle Bronze</td>
<td>Debris, no architectural remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Late Chalcolithic</td>
<td>Debris, no architectural remains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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