Plan 176: AG-AH-AJ, 16-17-18 - Overview

No remains attributable to Strata 5 or 4 could be traced. This area may have been outside the settlements of those periods.

Stratum 3C is attested by a section of the outer wall of the casemate-like wall and parts of two rooms built against it.

Stratum 3B is represented by the offset-inset wall, three intramural storage bins and probably by a wall enclosing the bins on the W side, toward the offset-inset wall. Two drains which presumably ran through the offset-inset wall also probably belong to this period, though one may be a later replacement for the other.

Stratum 3A is probably attested by several fragmentary walls which were reused in Stratum 2. Only a few rooms built over the casemate-like wall could be delineated with certainty.

Stratum 2 probably reused some walls of Stratum 3, and the offsetinset wall continued in use. There are only two walls which were likely constructed at this time. A third wall which crosses over the drains may belong to this phase. Four rooms may be connected with a larger complex found in Plan 177.

Stratum 1 may be attested by one wall which is not aligned with any others in the areas, but this attribution is uncertain.

Evaluation -

The SE part of this area was excavated in 1927(AH-AJ,16-17-18); the N part in 1935 (AG16-17-18). There are few good photographs from the

1927 season. Most of the rooms from that campaign have bottom levels, and most of the walls have top levels, but there are no bottom levels for the walls to indicate how high they are preserved. The 1935 season is well-documented photographically, which is fortunate because the stratigraphy is quite complex. Most of the 1935 "features" do not have bottom levels, but the walls often have both bottom and top levels. Not all the rooms belonging to this area are on Plan 176. A number of features appear only in fig. 42 of the 1947 report, which is the excavator's interpretation of what belonged to their Level II. Finally, it should be noted that there are no elevations for any part of the offset-inset wall.

There are eight rooms on this plan which belong to buildings which extend far to the E into Plan 177. These rooms are therefore treated under that plan and not here. These include: Rm 85, Rm 86, Rm 88, Rm 89, Rm 91, Rm 92, Rm 417 and Rm 418. Only a few comments on these features will be made in this chapter. Rm 550 is discussed under Plan 160. The rooms marked Rm 401, Rm 402b, Rm 407, Rm 415 and Rm 419 probably belong with Building 159.07? and are dealt with under that plan.

This leaves few features to discuss under Plan 176, but these will be presented with a summation of the analysis of the remains around them. The phasing of the architecture is made more difficult by its fragmentary condition. <u>Building 159.07?</u> cuts across a variety of walls from all the sub-phases of Stratum 3. Still, the general history of the area seems clear enough. Since there are no complete buildings on this plan, the treatment will begin with the earliest remains and progress to the latest.

Stratum 3C Remains -

There are no remains in this area from Strata 5 or 4, the earliest features belong to Stratum 3C. This includes the outer wall of the casemate-like wall, Rm 550 of Building 160.07 (a 4-Room building) and Rm 418 of Building 177.01 (a 3-Room building). In the 1947 report these features appear on fig. 42. Elevations throughout this area are somewhat misleading. Some early remains are preserved quite high in places, even as high as some much later features. It is often only the photographs which show the true relations of the various walls. The best photograph for these early remains is P 1371. Just to the right of center the line of the outer wall of the casemate-like wall can be seen. It is obscured by later remains crossing over it. The relations to Rm 418 and Rm 550 are not clear on this photograph, but are understandable from the plan (see the discussion under Plan 160 and Plan 177).

Stratum 3B Remains -

The most substantial remains are those of the offset-inset wall. It contains here two offsets and three insets and ranges in width from ca. 3.8 to 4.3 m. At some time the wall as thickened to ca. 6 to 7 m by the addition of a later "skin" of masonry ca. 2 to 3 m thick. This extra masonry is built in part of the revetment of the tower in AK18. The published Survey Map shows that this "skin" extended to the NW another ca. 2.0 to 2.5 m, and assumes that it ran to the NW all along the outer face of the wall.

The drawing of the SE part of the plan (from the SE corner of AH17) was done in 1927. It was Bade's practice to have only the stone facing of the offset-inset wall drawn accurately. The area between the

⁹¹⁵W.F. Badè, <u>Excavations at Tell en-Nasbeh</u>, <u>1926 and 1927: A Preliminary Report</u>, Palestine Institute Publications No. 1. (Berkeley, 1928). 21.

two faces was done as a fill pattern. The 1927 pattern is less dense than that employed in 1935. Unfortunately no elevations are reported for the interior of the wall, or along either face. This is especially a problem when trying to determine the relationship of the wall to the drain in AG17.

After the offset-inset wall was constructed debris was poured in against it to "level up" the intramural space. This sloping debris is visible below the drain channel in P 1371. The intramural space in Plan 176 is filled with walls and installations from several strata. Bn 386, Bn 387 and Bn 388 are part of the series of intramural bins which run around the S half of the town. Walls of later structures cross, at least in part, all three bins. This is the clearest area on the site for examining the stratigraphic situation of this bin phenomenon. The bins, at the earliest, must be 3B. The earliest walls which cut over them are either 3A or 2. This indicates that the bins were in use from 3B to 3A, at least. P 1371 shows these bins. Bn 387 is especially clear and can be seen to be preserved to a great height, which is in line with the bottom and top elevations for these installations which indicate preserved heights between ca. 1.7 and 2.0 m. Originally they were probably a bit higher too. This has an important bearing on determining the storage capacity of the intramural area.

P 1371 and the plan show a ca. 1.0 m wide wall just W of these bins. It has a top level of 779.61 and a base of 777.49. It floats in the debris, and so cannot be a retaining wall. Similar walls, bordering intramural bins, are found to the NW and SE, along the W side of the town. The purpose of these walls is uncertain, but in this area at least they seem to be contemporary with the bins for they are cut by some of the same later features. Clearly they partition the bin area off from the rest of the intramural area. But whether they mark off the bins as

national, communal or private property cannot be determined.

P 1370 shows the N end of the 1.0 m wide wall. It and the plan show a narrower double-stone wall built over this bin enclosure wall. The narrower wall also crosses part of <u>Bn 388</u>. The plan also shows a wall with two pillars reaching the narrow wall. Unfortunately there are no photographs or levels for the pillar wall, and no levels for the narrow wall. The pillar wall forms the N wall to <u>Rm 402b</u>, which according to the plan had a paved floor. The floor was probably close to the bottom level of the ca. 80 cm wide stone basin, ca. 778.35. Although there is no corroborative photograph, it is likely that the floor, the pillar wall and the narrow wall are contemporary. The narrow wall may in turn be cut by the wall between <u>Rm 402b</u> and <u>Rm 401</u> which is only one course high (779.01-779.26). Possibly the row of five stones in <u>Rm 88</u> and <u>Rm 92</u> is a SE continuation of this wall.

A major question is the dating of the two drains. The N drain is in AF17 of Plan 159, but is presented here. The S drain runs through AF-AG17. The N drain has walls ca. 20 to 40 cm thick, the S drain's wall was up to ca. 1.0 m thick. One cap stone survives for the N drain, six for that on the S. Each seems to run through the line of the wall enclosing the bins. It is not clear if the drains cut the wall, if the gap was left intentionally by the builders of the wall, or if the wall is just not preserved at that point. Neither drain runs through the outer wall of the casemate-like wall.

Why two drains? Since the tell slopes down from S to N the drains were probably used to carry away runoff from the intramural space. Bins were not built in the N, probably because water collected there and would have ruined crops stored there. Perhaps the N drain was installed first and later replaced or supplemented by the S channel. P 1363, P

1367, P 1371 and P 1372 show the drains. These photographs, and the plan, give the impression that the two channels converge toward the W, but there is no sign whether the S drain cuts that to the N or not. P 1367 also shows a fragment of a plastered floor at least half a meter below the level of the N drain. The purpose of this floor and its extent are unknown. The photographs also show that the N drain is preserved at a lower elevation than that to the S, which might also indicate an earlier phasing for the N drain. P 805 shows the S drain reaching the offset-inset wall. However the plan gives no evidence of a drain channel through the wall. Presumably such a channel existed, but has not survived. The photograph also shows a wall of Stratum 3A or 2 built on top of the drain, showing that the drain(s?) must belong between 3B and 2. Since the drains do not extend E of the casemate-like wall it is reasonable to suppose that they were used to drain the intramural area itself. Nor do they appear to relate to Rm 402, Rm 408 or Rm 406 above them. This suggests a use limited to Stratum 3, 3B to 3A to be more precise.

Stratum 3A Remains -

Features belonging to this phase are more difficult to identify, primarily because of later Stratum 2 walls criss-crossing the area. Stratum 3A has been defined in other areas of the tell as modifications and/or expansions of 3C, often extending out into the available intramural space. These modifications tend to follow the orientation of the earlier town, which is different from Stratum 2 (and later) which has a mixture of orientations.

If the same model is applied in this area, the following rooms may belong to Stratum 3A. $\underline{\text{Rm 417}}$ is built over the casemate-like wall and is a direct continuation of the late phase of $\underline{\text{Rm 418}}$ (see P 1371). $\underline{\text{Rm 85}}$

and Rm 86 seem in turn to be additions to Rm 417. P 1214, P 1261, P 1262, P 1274 and P 1371 show parts of this area at various stages of excavation. What is striking is that only one or two courses survive for most of these rooms, a good indicator of their lateness. Rm 414 also belongs to this phase. The wall which separates Rm 85 and Rm 86 continues on between Rm 86 and Rm 92, suggesting that 3A construction existed there as well. In Plan 177 it is suggested that Rm 86, Rm 89, Rm 91 and Rm 92 may be parts of a complex of rooms extending to the SE as far as Rm 57 in AK19. This does not rule out the possibility of 3A structures SW of Rm 85 to Rm 86; these relatively shallow foundations could have been destroyed in the construction of the Stratum 2 rooms.

Rm 416, with its scrappy walls also probably belongs to this phase. Note that the line of the SW wall of this room basically continues through Rm 419, Rm 425 and Rm 428. And this wall is paralleled by the NE wall of Rm 416 which runs through the same three rooms. The wall partitioning Rm 419 from Rm 431 does not appear on the plan, but may be seen in P 1261. These two walls end at the wall against which Bn 367 in AF17 is built. The narrow wall between Rm 402b and Rm 407 follows roughly the same line, as does that between Rm 402 and Rm 408. It should also be noted that all these NW to SE walls are preserved to a lower height than those of the thicker walls running mainly NE to SW. The best example of this is in P 1261 which shows walls in AF17-18 (Plan 159).

Certainly none of the above discussion is conclusive proof that these walls belong to Stratum 3A. They may be flimsy cross walls within the thicker walled buildings. One may even combine these different models by suggesting that the walls under discussion were constructed in 3A and reused in the later buildings.

Stratum 2 and 1 Remains -

It is difficult to distinguish between remains from these two strata. The wall forming the N wall of Rm 401, Rm 419 and Rm 424 is a direct continuation of the S wall of Rm 429 in AF18 of Plan 160. Rm 429 has very deep (ca. 1.3 m) foundations on the E (see P 1355), which cut far into remains of 4-Room building Building 160.06 of Stratum 3. The wall between Rm 429 and Rm 431 is almost equally as deep (ca. 1.07 m). These rooms, Rm 429 and Rm 425, are on a different orientation than the Stratum 3 buildings and is quite substantial; these are both characteristics of Stratum 2 in other parts of the site. The N (and possibly the E) wall of Rm 415 is preserved to a height of ca. 76 cm and may be connected with Rm 429 and Rm 425. Note that the N wall of Rm 415 is parallel to the S wall of Rm 429 and Rm 425. If the N wall of Rm 401, Rm 424 and Rm 419 is accepted as an extension of Rm 429, and these then belong to Stratum 2 one would like to find a parallel wall to the N and a closing wall on the SW. Perhaps the NW walls of Rm 407 and Rm 402b, originally part of Stratum 3A buildings, were reused as foundations for the Stratum 2 building. The only preserved candidate for a closing wall on the SW is that running parallel to, and a meter from the offset-inset wall and over the drain (see P 805). However, the possibility that this wall belongs to 3A cannot be ruled out. Rm 423 seems to be a SE continuation of Rm 424, if so it may too belong to Building 159.07?. It is not clear if the double dotted line between these rooms indicates a reconstructed wall, or a wall for which the stones were not drawn in. In any event the two rooms were probably originally one space.

As mentioned above, and is discussed below in more detail in Plan 177, Rm 88, Rm 89, Rm 91 and Rm 92 may be part of a long complex of rooms belonging to Stratum 2.

Stratum 1 is even less certain. The wall between $\underline{\text{Rm 421}}$ and $\underline{\text{Rm 401}}$ does not seem to align with any other walls, unless the dotted lines

between Rm 423 and Rm 424 do mark a wall. It is difficult to decide if Rm 421, Rm 422 and Rm 423 are enclosed areas belonging to Stratum 2 or 1. The SE limits of Rm 422 and Rm 423 are not clearly defined; the walls there may be earlier walls having nothing to do with these spaces, be earlier walls in reuse in 2 or 1, or be shoddy late foundations. At some point a wall likely closed of the SW end of Rm 401, Rm 402a and Rm 402b; this wall is not extant, and so it is not clear if Rm 421 and Rm 422 could also have been enclosed by the presumed wall. Note that the spaces marked by these three rooms lies between Building 159.07? to the NW and Building 177.06 to the SE, both of Stratum 2, possibly 1. This space was thus likely in use at that time, but the remains are unclear. Possible walls of Stratum 1 were also traced in Plan 159 above.

The 1947 report considers Rm 89, Rm 91, Rm 421 and Rm 422 to be "late" because of their "location with respect to the major city plan", but without discussing the reasoning for this assignment. 916 The 1947 report also discusses at some length the ceramics from within, below and from within the walls of many rooms in Plan 159 and Plan 176, among these are Rm 414, Rm 416, Rm 423 and Rm 424 which according to that report's dating would belong to what is today the end of Iron II and the beginning of the Persian Period. 917

McClellan notes that Rm 401, Rm 402, Rm 414, Rm 415, Rm 416, Rm 423, Rm 424 and Rm 425 are fragments of later features. He suggests that these rooms were built after the casemate-like wall went out of use. 918 This is, in general in agreement with the conclusions reached in this chapter except that Rm 414 and Rm 416 here are considered to belong in

⁹¹⁶I, 183 n. 15.

⁹¹⁷I, 223-226.

^{918&}quot;Planning," pp. 55, 57.

3A, and may have continued in re-use into later periods. His comment that the "function and plan of the new architectural elements defy interpretation" aptly summarizes this area. 919

⁹¹⁹"Planning," 55.