

Table of Contents

Foreword	ix
List of Figures	xiii
I. Objectives of the Book and Introductory Considerations	1
1. Why this study, why archaeology and excavations at all?	3
1.1 Archaeologists excavate things and (re-)construct the history of humans based on objects: How does this work?	3
1.2 Why excavate ancient Kamid el-Loz, the archaeological site located in the middle of the today's village of Kamid el-Loz?	7
1.2.1 Ancient Kamid el-Loz – the biography of the archaeological site in brief	9
1.3 Archaeology uses a Three-Age System to talk about historical developments: What are the “Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages”?	11
1.4 Architecture: The most visible of all the artifacts: The focus of our work at Kamid el-Loz.	15
1.4.1 The built environment: A special category of “thing” for the living as well as for the dead	16
1.4.2 How can archaeologists integrate the different approaches to the meanings of architecture, i.e., find out what the people's needs, options, knowledge, and potentials were thousands of years ago?	17
2. The architecture of today's Kamid el-Loz: A case study for an appropriate procedure	19
2.1 How does a case study of a recent village's architecture help archaeologists to study the architecture of the past?	23
II. Stories and Histories of Kamid el-Loz	27
1. Early beginnings at Kamid el-Loz (EBA IV / MBA I c. 2000 B.C.)	29
1.1 The oldest pieces of evidence ...	30
1.2 How did we get this information?	30
1.3 Four soundings in the center of the tell – what are the material findings?	31
1.4 Four soundings in the center of the tell contained accumulated layers of soil, scanty architectural remains, and a multitude of pottery fragments. What do we learn from these rather sparse remains about the early settlers of Kamid el-Loz?	33
<i>Excursus: Broken pottery: Only waste, or another valuable source for understanding knowledge, habits and traditions?</i>	34

<i>Excursus: The earliest indications of settler activities found so far date to the Early Bronze Age IV / Middle Bronze Age I transition: How do archaeologists estimate the relative and absolute age of the cultural heritage?</i>	36
Conclusions: EB IV / MBA I – the oldest remains found so far, but not yet the remains from the earliest beginnings of Kamid el-Loz	37
2. Settlement activities continue, the actual cultural evidence changes: The early Middle Bronze Age (MBA I c. 2000 – 1750 B.C.)	39
2.1 The settler’s body of knowledge: Holding on to the old and at the same time exhibiting the new	42
Conclusions: The early beginnings – what information does the early material legacy reveal concerning the people of and the communal life at Kamid el-Loz?	45
3. Urban beginnings? What evidence is needed to classify Kamid el-Loz as urban during the second phase of the Middle Bronze Age (MBA II c. 1750 – 1550 / 1500 B.C.)?	47
3.1 Are there signs for urban life at Kamid el-Loz?	48
3.2 On what theoretical basis do archaeologists assign specific functions to specific buildings?	49
3.3 Ancient texts: A further valuable source for drafting assumptions	50
3.4 Practical application	51
3.4.1 A complex of houses labeled as residential area	51
3.4.2 Houses of unique type, size, and location – what do archaeologists associate with these features?	52
3.4.3 The extraordinary buildings of Kamid el-Loz: Why do we call the palace of Kamid el-Loz the “palace”?	52
3.4.4 The only immediate neighbor of the palace – its administrators?	54
3.4.5 The temple: What evidence do we have to assign religious functions to a monumental building at Kamid el-Loz?	54
3.5 A final remark	55
4. Urban beginnings – city 1: The evidence is still scarce and the development is diverse, but urban beginnings are undeniable for the Middle Bronze Age II period at Kamid el-Loz (MBA II c. 1750 – 1550 / 1500 B.C.)	57
4.1 The first urban development known at Kamid el-Loz is visible in the early MBA II material remains (beginning c. 1750 B.C.)	58
4.1.1 The story of the first known palace of Kamid el-Loz, dating to the early phase of the MBA II period and named Middle Bronze Age Palace 3 (MBP 3)	58

4.1.2	The administrative area, phase 2: Documented by another massive accumulation of burnt bricks, dating to the early phase of the Middle Bronze Age II	61
4.1.3	A further mass of burnt bricks: The earliest evidence for a temple (T 6 ?) dating to the early MBA II period?	62
4.1.4	Where did the people live in this early urban environment? (MBA II)	65
4.1.5	Communal buildings burnt, settlers' houses decayed: When did this all happen?	68
4.2	The first urban development came to an end: A reflection on the misfortune that hit the city and its people and the actions and reactions of the people to the fate they experienced	69
	Conclusions: Life in the first MBA II city of Kamid el-Loz	70
5.	The first anomie: The urban function of the early MBA II city of Kamid el-Loz (city 1) was interrupted, but the place as such was not forgotten	73
5.1	The former residential area in the north: When the settlers left their houses, did they also abandon their ancestors?	74
5.2	Squatters in the temple area? Or the continuation of cultic activities in devastated surroundings?	75
6.	City 2: The first anomie ended, resettlement began and the second Middle Bronze Age city of Kamid el-Loz developed	81
6.1	The re-colonization of the palace area and the building of palace MBP 2	83
6.1.1	The administrative area, phase 1: Resettlement began with repairing the burnt and damaged remains of the first MBA II city	87
6.1.1.1	The new administrative building of the second MBA II city of Kamid el-Loz	88
6.1.2	A new domicile for cultic concerns?	90
6.1.2.1	Is Building T 5, indeed a temple?	90
6.1.2.2	Is Building T 4 a temple? It's quite possible!	91
6.1.3	The housing estates of the 2 nd MBA II city were still (or again) located in the area west of the temple and at the northern edge of the site	96
6.1.3.1	Signs of residences in the west	96
6.1.3.2	Houses, a pathway, and a fortification: The settlers were back in the northern habitat	96
6.2	The second urban period in MBA II Kamid el-Loz started well but ended violently	104
6.3	A multifaceted series of events took place in city 2: When did each event – building, burning, rebuilding, and abandoning – occur?	105
	Conclusions: Life in the second MBA II city of Kamid el-Loz – according to the model and assumptions presented above	107

<i>Excursus: Abandonment and resettlement, people and processes</i>	110
1. Abandonment of the MBA II city 1 and resettling of the MBA II city 2 – what actually happens in these processes?	110
2. Who are the people who resettle a place?	111
3. How did the process of resettlement proceed at Kamid el-Loz? What do we “see” as archaeologists? What do we ask? What do we postulate?	112
7. A second anomie affected the city of Kamid el-Loz: Who had to bear the consequences?	115
7.1 The palace lost its aura, but not its ability to be utilized as a domicile	116
7.2 The administrative area: Used for domestic activities and transformed into a burial place	118
7.3 The temple T 4: Transformed into a secular area by the use of its ruins?	120
7.4 The residential areas: No attestation of activities in the northern area, but evidence for burying the deceased into the deteriorated architectural remains in the west	120
7.5 Life in devastated surroundings: How did the people deal with the situation?	122
7.5.1 The second anomie: Solutions found for survival	122
8. The third – and the last – city of Kamid el-Loz, then named <i>Kumidi</i>: Emerged at the onset of the Late Bronze Age and lasted until the end of the Late Bronze Age (LBA I – LBA II c. 1550/1500 B.C. – 1200 B.C.)	129
8.1 The story and history of the third and last city of Kamid el-Loz: 300 years of uninterrupted urban life, despite destructions, disastrous fires, and decay – a short preview	130
8.2 The first LBA palace, P 5, arose: A worldly elite was visibly back (LBA I c. 1550/1500 – 1400/1350 B.C.)	130
8.2.1 The former palace district had not lost its aura: The new palace P 5 was built on the burnt remains of its MBA forerunner	131
8.2.2 Metal processing was obviously an exclusive handicraft at that time: The only known workshop was located in the area of palace P 5	133
<i>Excursus: Some reflections concerning the needs of elites: The functions of palaces</i>	135
8.3 Palace P 4: A short overview over its utilization and building history, or, once again creating the new but keeping traditions alive as well! (Later LBA I c. 1550/1500 – 1400/1350 B.C.)	135
<i>Excursus: Maintaining the old and allowing the new: Some reflections on the interaction of the inhabitants of Kamid el-Loz with the local traditions and their new needs when rebuilding the palace!</i>	136
8.3.1 Palace P 4d – c – b – a: The silhouette of the building remained more or less the same, regardless of	

the modifications that the users carried out and that affected primarily the interior design of the palace	137
8.3.2 Palace P 4d – c – b – a: The interior design modifications	137
8.3.3 The construction of Palace P 4d: An extraordinary building among all the palaces of Kamid el-Loz	139
8.3.4 The so-called “Schatzhaus”: In the history of the palace buildings of Kamid el-Loz, it was a building with a unique construction method: It was not built on top of the older burnt remains but set up as an underground structure	139
8.3.5 The so-called “Schatzhaus”: A building with not only a unique location and construction method but also a unique function in the history of the palace buildings of Kamid el-Loz	142
8.3.5.1 The burials	142
8.3.5.2 The sequence of the funeral services and a first hint to the absolute age of the burials	144
8.3.6 Palace 4 d, the burials, and, after a certain time, a change in needs	144
8.3.6.1 The burial site damaged, the burials abandoned: The end of palace phase P 4d	145
8.3.7 The transition from palace phase P 4d to phase P 4c	146
8.3.8 After the blaze that damaged palace P 4c, the palace was rebuilt and its functions continued: Phases P 4b/P 4a	147
8.3.9 Palaces P 4c, P 4b, and P 4a were modified in form, differentiated in function, and singular unparalleled with regard to the finds: The cuneiform tablets of <i>Kumidi</i>	148
8.4 Palace P 3, or, more precisely, some walls perhaps forming an entrance (transitional LBA I / LBA II c. 1400/1350 B.C.)	151
8.5 Palaces P 2 / P 1: The end of the institution at the end of the Late Bronze Age (LBA II c. 1400/1350 – 1200 B.C.)	152
8.6 The Late Bronze Age palaces: An eventful story of four buildings and an institution	154
8.6.1 Continuity in times of change	155
8.6.2 Uniqueness in times of continuity and change	155
8.6.3 Continuity, uniqueness and change: Our questions concerning the story of the Late Bronze Age palaces of <i>Kumidi</i> are many	156
8.6.4 An outline of scenarios that might have caused the destructions and disasters, which the inhabitants of Kamid el-Loz had to face throughout the course of history	156
8.6.4.1 First steps for finding solutions	158
8.7 The building for cultic needs was reestablished, its traditional location was retained, but the temple’s form and type were new (LBA I – LBA II c. 1550/1500 – 1200 B.C.)	158

8.7.1	Temple T 3: A new building type emerges (LBA I c. 1550/1500 – 1400/1350 B.C.)	159
8.7.2	Temple T 2: Copying the old and at the same time creating the new: A double temple emerged (Transition LBA I / LBA II c. 1400/1350 B.C.)	161
8.7.3	The last temple building, T 1, was built: On the same spot, of same type, using the same techniques and building materials, and only slightly modified in form and size (LBA II c. 1400/1350 – 1200 B.C.)	164
8.7.4	The Late Bronze Age history of the temples: A short reflection on what happened at Kumidi	166
8.8	The settlers ensconced themselves in the new urban surroundings: Three living areas were built up	167
8.8.1	Living west of the temple district (LBA I – LBA II c. 1550/1500 – 1200 B.C.)	167
8.8.1.1	A very brief and concluding look at the intermixture of houses and the temple	171
8.8.2	Living north of the temple district (LBA I – LBA II c. 1550/1500 – 1200 B.C.)	172
8.8.3	Residing in the east of the city during the LBA II period (transition LBA I / LBA II c. 1400/1350 B.C. until the end LBA II c. 1200 B.C.)	174
8.8.3.1	Three residential areas: A short reflective summary	176
8.8.4	And at the very end, another still unsettled issue: Was the Late Bronze Age city of Kumidi fortified?	177
8.9	Late Bronze Age <i>Kumidi</i> : A long-lasting period of complex developments. How do we correlate the numerous intra-urban developments, or, what happened when?	178
8.9.1	Correlating building activities: A first attempt	178
	Conclusions: Life in Late Bronze Age Kumidi	181
9.	During the Iron Age, two processes characterized the development of Kamid el-Loz: Its new beginning as village site and, over the course of time, its alteration into a burial ground (IA I – III c. 1200 – 332 B.C.)	185
9.1	The new beginnings at Kamid el-Loz: The early Iron Age I (IA I c. 1200 – 1000 B.C.)	186
9.1.1	The new developments on the east slope: Iron Age I (IA I c. 1200 – 1000 B.C.)	187
9.1.2	The residential areas in the north and in the central part of the site: tradition and cultural innovation occurred side by side: Iron Age I (IA I c. 1200 – 1000 B.C.)	187
9.1.2.1	The northern area: Post-hole buildings and their functions	189
9.1.2.2	The central area: Breaks with the past in form and function distinguish the Iron Age I houses in this district from their Late Bronze Age II predecessors	189

9.1.3	The Iron Age beginnings at Kamid el-Loz: A first overview	190
9.1.3.1	The material heritage: First insights, first predications	190
9.1.4	The end of the first Iron Age settlement was brought about again by violence	191
9.2	After the burning, solutions as to how to live on in the burnt environment were found: Iron Age II (IA II c. 1000 – 539 B.C.)	192
9.2.1	The central area: A residential quarter with a varied history: Iron Age II (IA II c. 1000 – 539 B.C.)	193
9.2.2	The east slope during the Iron Age II period (IA II c. 1000 – 539 B.C.): An area solely for domestic work	195
9.3	A short study: First questions concerning roughly 600 years of rural life at Kamid el-Loz: Iron Age I and II (IA I – IA II c. 1200 – 539 B.C.)	197
	<i>Excursus: Post holes and zigzagging walls that do not form a coherent (or, for the today's observer, recognizable) ground plan</i>	198
9.4	Another major cultural change: The conversion of the former settlement area into a burial ground: Iron Age III (IA III c. 539 – 332 B.C.)	199
9.4.1	Kamid el-Loz: A good place for the dead, but where did the living live?	201
	Conclusions: The Iron Age – or, (nearly) everything changed at Kamid el-Loz ?	202
10.	The period of Hellenistic imperialism and domination of the Levant (Hellenistic period, c. 332 – 30 B.C.): Continuity and changes, the resumption of former habits as well as the adoption of innovations; the development of Kamid el-Loz remained multifarious	205
	<i>Excursus: Some reflections on the archaeological terminology applied to the Levantine developments</i>	206
10.1	The life of the dead: Continuity and change on the east slope	207
10.2	The life of the living: Indicators for another resettlement of Kamid el-Loz, this time during the period of Hellenistic imperialism	209
10.2.1	House no. 1, area III-a-12/13	210
	<i>Excursus: The written evidence from house no. 1; or, were the people of Kamid el-Loz literate at the time?</i>	211
10.2.2	House no. 2, area III-b/c-14/15	212
	Conclusions: New cultural developments: Influenced by a “foreign” power, by trade connections, or by local needs?	213
11.	Once again, was everything new at Kamid el-Loz when Roman Imperialism dominated the area? (Roman period, c. 30 B.C. – 300 A.D.)	217

11.1 The spatial design: a discontinuation of or a return to old customs or just the implementation of new needs and options, applied regardless of former customs and traditions ?	219
11.1.1 The east-slope: Reoccupied, restructured, and altered in function	220
11.1.2 The Roman <i>villa</i> : A courtyard house of Roman style	221
11.1.3 Some remarks on the outdoor activities on the east slope	223
11.2 House I, the workshop on the “Kuppe”	225
11.3 A very short review: What, then, characterized the “Roman period” area of the living on the east slope?	227
11.4 The life of the living and life of the dead: In direct contact on the east slope for the first time	228
Conclusions: Innovation and tradition at Kamid el-Loz during the period of Roman imperialism – and beyond	230
III. The Concerns of Archaeology	233
A summary and an outlook for the future	235
Bibliography	253
Chronological Chart	259