



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Building Assyrian society: the case of the Tell Sabi Abyad Dunnu**

Lanjouw, T.J.R.

### **Citation**

Lanjouw, T. J. R. (2025, December 9). *Building Assyrian society: the case of the Tell Sabi Abyad Dunnu*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4285033>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4285033>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## Propositions

1. The *Dunnu* underwent multiple phases of alteration in which decay and restoration cannot be identified as the primary factors; the changes instead indicate functional or spatial reorganization. Debris layers reflect controlled demolition rather than spontaneous collapse.
2. The attribution of levels 6 and 5 to the reigns of Aššur-Iddin and Ilī Padā respectively is problematic, as the stratigraphic evidence of the *Dunnu* undermines the notion of a distinct stratigraphic and historical boundary between these two levels.
3. Despite the absence of a clearly defined stratigraphic boundary between levels 6 and 5, the cumulative architectural modifications nevertheless indicate a gradual process of increased access control and a potential shift in the overall character and function of the *Dunnu*.
4. The architecture of the *Dunnu* demonstrates strong control over construction, although the administrative level at which such control was exercised remains unclear. The influence of residents was limited, but may be visible in local interventions such as the placement of storage bins, bread ovens, and small modifications to walls or entrances of workshops.
5. The *Dunnu* probably featured an extensive system of access to and use of upper floors. The presence of stairwells and the absence of ground-floor windows support this interpretation.
6. A thorough macrostratigraphic examination of collapse layers, supported by microstratigraphic and petrographic analysis, holds great potential for reconstructing invisible parts of the architecture.
7. Archaeological interpretations should systematically employ uncertainty factors, as this best reflects the nature of archaeological data. What is common practice in virtual reconstruction should equally apply to the interpretation of soil layers and building remains.
8. Thorough knowledge of historical and prehistoric building techniques and decay processes is essential for correctly assessing building contexts. Such expertise, however, is largely absent from Dutch university curricula.
9. Besides offering a tool for visualisation of the past, 3D modelling is a form of experimental archaeology in which different reconstruction options are juxtaposed in order to arrive at the most plausible explanation of an archaeological feature.
10. In the study of premodern architecture, every reconstruction reflects the assumptions of the researcher as much as the intentions of the original builder.