

Landscape Archaeology of the Western Nile Delta

by Joshua R. Trampier

Wilbour Studies



Brown University

Department of Egyptology and Ancient Western Asian Studies

Ψ LOCKWOOD PRESS

LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY
OF THE WESTERN NILE DELTA



Wilbour Studies in Egypt and Ancient Western Asia

Series Editors

James P. Allen


John M. Steele

NUMBER 2

LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE WESTERN NILE DELTA

LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY
OF THE WESTERN NILE DELTA

by
JOSHUA R. TRAMPIER

 LOCKWOOD PRESS

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

Wilbour Studies in Egypt and Ancient Western Asia is a series of the Department of Egyptology & Ancient Western Asian Studies at Brown University, Box 1899, Wilbour Hall, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912.

PUBLISHED ON BEHALF OF BROWN UNIVERSITY BY
LOCKWOOD PRESS
PO Box 133289
Atlanta, GA 30333
www.lockwoodpress.com

© 2014 by Brown University. All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America

ISBN: 978-1-937040-17-8 (hardcover)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014934448

This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

For my parents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	xi
List of Figures	xiii
List of Tables	xix
Abbreviations	xxi
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Regional Survey, the Nile Delta Floodplain, and the Archaeological Site in Egypt	7
A Review of Mapping Egyptian Archaeological Sites—From Holes in the Ground to Lines in the Sand	7
Sites before Sites	10
Service des Antiquités, Egyptology, and Sites as Artifacts	12
A New Level of Detail	19
From AOI to <i>Kom</i> to Cultural Landscape	23
Conclusion	25
Chapter 2: Prior Research within the Cultural and Natural Landscape of the Western Delta	27
Prior Archaeological Research on Historical Settlement in the Southwestern Nile Delta	31
The Naukratis Project Survey	31
Kom el-Hisn	32
Kom Firin	34
Silvagou	37
Kom Dahab	37
Other <i>Koms</i> in the Southwestern Delta	38
Summary	39
Hydrology of the Southwestern Delta	40
Geological Sources on Western Delta Hydrology	40
Historical Sources on Western Delta Hydrology	42
Geomorphology	47
Diagnostic Features of Sedimentary Analysis	47
Previous Geological and Geomorphological Research	50
Conclusions	55

Chapter 3: Methodology for Investigating the Cultural and Natural Landscape of the Western Delta	57
Preliminary Research with Historical Cartography and Remote Sensing Data	58
Historical Cartography	58
Remote Sensing	65
Cultural Inventory	72
Methods	72
Results	78
Detailed Fieldwork and Study Season	80
Surface Topography	80
Surface Collection	82
Drill Coring	83
Sherd Analysis	84
Final Assimilation of Results	85
Density Maps and Period Index	85
Geomorphology, Hydrology, <i>kom</i> , and Site	86
Moving Forward	87
Chapter 4: Presentation and Spatial Analysis of Detailed Fieldwork	89
Kom el-Abqa'in (KABQ)	89
General Remarks	89
Topographic Data	91
Surface Collection Data	95
Geomorphological Data	104
Summary	107
Kom el-Ghuzz (KGHZ)—Kom el-Shimuli (KSHM)—Kom Hamrit (KHMR)	108
General Remarks	108
Topographic Data	109
Surface Collection Data	112
Kom el-Ghuzz	119
Kom el-Shimuli	124
Kom Hamrit	128
Distribution	131
Geomorphological Data	131
Summary	139
Kom Abu el-Tubul (KATU)—Kom Sheikh Said Ahmed (KSSA)—Kom Abu Ali (KABA)	140
General Remarks	140
Topographic Data	140
Surface Collection Data	141
Kom Abu Ali	146
Kom Abu el-Tubul	148
Kom Sheikh Said Ahmed	152
Distribution	156
Geomorphological Data	156
Summary	164
Kom Qamha (QMHA)—Kom el-Barud (KBAR)	165
General Remarks	165

Topographic Data	166
Surface Collection Daa	168
Kom Qamha	175
Kom el-Barud	178
Distribution	185
Geomorphological Data	185
Summary	192
Kom el-Hisn (KHSN)	193
General Remarks	193
Geomorphological Data	193
Conclusion	199
Chapter 5: Concluding Remarks	205
The Southwestern Delta	206
New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period	206
Late Dynastic	208
Ptolemaic	209
Roman	211
A Dynamic Western Delta Landscape	212
Regional Survey in the Nile Floodplain	217
The Nile Floodplain: Future Prospects	220
Appendix 1. List of <i>koms</i> and archaeological lands identified by the EES Delta Survey, EAIS, and CultNat Atlas illustrated in figures 3.1 and 3.2. Places are labeled with the toponym given in the original source, with the EES <i>kom</i> number, EAIS name, or CultNat number listed as appropriate.	223
Appendix 2. AOIs visited during the Fall 2007 cultural inventory (fig. 3.16). Preliminary dating of unsystematically collected surface sherds after Simony n.d. Recommendations for future work are coded as follows: CO = Core, CC = Ceramic Collection, TP = Topographic Survey, GP = Geophysical Survey, EX = Excavation. Y=Yes, N=No, P=Possible.	225
Appendix 3. List of collection units (CUs) identified by CUID. Information on AOI, visibility (expressed as % visible), main ground cover, surface salinity, count of sherds collected, weight of sherds collected, and density by count and weight is provided.	232
Appendix 4. Sums of period indices for each CU. The period index value is calculated by adding the (fractional) counts of diagnostics for each period. The total number of datable diagnostics in the CU is noted (Diag Count), as is the number of tentatively dated diagnostics (Tent Count) and diagnostics that overlap more than one period (Multi Count).	236
Appendix 5. Sums of period indices for all AOIs. Total counts by AOI of datable diagnostics, tentatively dated diagnostics, and multiple period diagnostics are shown.	239
Bibliography	241
Subject Index	253

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is the tangible outcome of an educational journey culminating in a doctoral degree at the University of Chicago. I am grateful to James Allen and the anonymous reviewers for providing the opportunity to revise my dissertation, “The Dynamic Landscape of the Western Nile Delta from the New Kingdom to the Late Roman Periods,” for the Wilbour Studies Monograph series. Billie Jean Collins and the team at Lockwood Press provided excellent editorial support through the production process.

Writing a book or a dissertation is a solitary act, but its research is the result of many conversations and a great deal of professional and personal support. I have been extremely fortunate to have had a supportive dissertation committee headed by Nadine Moeller, whose members also included Janet Johnson, Penelope Wilson, and Scott Branting. It is impossible to convey just how grateful I am to each of them for their outstanding comments that tightened and strengthened arguments in my prose, as well as their encouragement and continuing support of my professional life. Other faculty and staff at the Oriental Institute and elsewhere, particularly Peter Dorman, Robert Ritner, Foy Scalf, Paula Manzuk, John Sanders, and many others mentioned in the text guided me towards resources that enriched this writing. Stephen Quirke and two anonymous reviewers for *JEA* provided substantive comments on portions of the draft. All mistakes and over-interpretations are, of course, my responsibility. Moreover, the Mrs. Giles Whiting Foundation provided a generous fellowship for the write-up of the dissertation.

The field research on which this book is based was cultivated under the aegis of the Durham University mission to Sa el-Hagar, directed by Penelope Wilson. Without her patient guidance, logistical support, and willingness to be accommodating towards all of the ambiguities that such a project entails, it is safe to say this effort would not have gotten off the ground, and this book would not have been written. The Supreme Council of Antiquities and its Permanent Committee, then headed by Dr. Zahi Hawass, merit considerable thanks for permitting field research to be carried out in Spring and Fall 2007 and in Winter to Spring 2008. Dr. Magdy Ghandour, former Head of the SCA's Department of Foreign Missions, provided much needed direct support for administrative matters as they arose. The el-Gharbiya and el-Beheira province inspectorates and Inspectors Mr. Ashraf Abdulrahman, Mr. Mustafa Abou Hussein, and Mr. Yasser Mohammad Nada showed considerable support for and interest in this research, often providing tremendous help in negotiating the practicalities of working in Egypt; particular thanks go to Ms. Fatima Rageb Kamel. Mme. Amira Khattab of the American Research Center in Egypt (ARCE), Mme. Faten Saleh (EES), and Mr. Amir Hassan A. Hamid, (ARCE) each deserve medals for fielding my questions and urgent phone calls (usually on Friday morning) effectively and helpfully.

Financial support for project research was provided at various stages by a U.S. Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Fellowship awarded and administered by ARCE, a Nassef Sawiris Research

Fellowship, and grants from the Helen Rich Memorial Fund and the Edward L. Ryerson Fellowship in Archaeology at the University of Chicago. The committees of each of these fellowships have my heartfelt gratitude for their support of the vision of this research. Several members of the Durham University mission directly connected to this project—Aude Simony, Jennifer Starbird, and Willem Toonen—generously brought their good-natured enthusiasm and dedication to the often mundane tasks that fieldwork entails. The conclusions presented in the later chapters are based on unpublished reports produced by these three people in 2008 and 2009. Though minor details may have changed in the intervening years (the dating of a few sherds, for instance), their overall contributions are scientifically sound. It goes without saying that my conclusions framed against these reports are my own, faulty conclusions included. Mme. Umm Reda, Ms. Shaimaa, Mr. Mohammad Hawash, Mr. Ahmed Zaghoul, Mr. Fahmy Fahmy, Mr. Ahmed Fahmy, Mr. Salem, Mr. Sobhy, and Mr. Atef also helped a great deal and bore logistical challenges with good graces. Access to geospatial equipment and resources, such as the Leica total station, tablet PC, Survey of Egypt maps, Corona satellite imagery, was generously provided by the Center for Ancient Middle Eastern Landscapes (CAMEL), directed by Scott Branting.

Many others, too numerous to mention here, provided emotional support at various stages. Janet Johnson, Scott Branting, Peter Dorman, Gil Stein, Robert Ritner, and Elizabeth O'Connor Chandler provided much-needed professional guidance when circumstances took my research in a new direction.

Robert and Denise Trampier loved and believed in their son, and Mark Thorne understood the importance of “making it happen.” Lastly, Jennifer Starbird pondered when the time came, celebrated during times of joy, and walked with her husband, offering loving support every step of the way. For her and for all those mentioned here and mistakenly omitted, I am deeply thankful.

LIST OF FIGURES

INTRODUCTION

- Fig. 1. Locations of 239 projects active in Egypt in October 2010. 3

CHAPTER TWO

- Fig. 2.1. A map of the western Delta, showing the general courses of modern and ancient Nile branches (after Bietak 1975), the former extent of Lake Maryut (after British Survey of Egypt Alexandria 1:100,000 sheet [1939] and Warne and Stanley 1993), and the areas surveyed by Wilson (2009), Coulson and Leonard (1981), and this research effort. 28
- Fig. 2.2. Map of datable *koms* identified by Wilson showing phases of occupation from the New Kingdom to Roman periods relative to Warne and Stanley's reconstruction of Lake Maryut. 30
- Fig. 2.3. Kom Firin as visible on a Digital Globe Quickbird 2 satellite image (©2007 Google. ©2007 Europa Technologies). Hypothetical extents of temple *temenoi* (after Spencer 2006), selected find spots of dated remains from Spencer's excavation (after N. Spencer 2007, 2008) and the Naukratis survey (Coulson and Leonard 1982) are indicated, as are more recent agricultural field cuts into the mound. 35
- Fig. 2.4. Map of places examined by the Naukratis survey and other authors. Phases of occupation from the New Kingdom to Roman periods have been collated chiefly from Coulson and Leonard 1981, Kirby 1998, N. Spencer 2008, and other authors mentioned above. 39
- Fig. 2.5. Texture triangle classification of particle sizes and soil types (after Wikipedia 2007 and Wentworth 1922). Particle type is determined by average grain size, whereas soil type is a function of the mixture of soil particles in varying proportions. 48
- Fig. 2.6. Fluvial systems in plan and section view showing trends in sedimentological profile based on system type. (Based on an unpublished drawing by T. Törnqvist, used with his permission). 49
- Fig. 2.7. Cores of the Egyptian Geological Survey in the southwestern Delta. 51
- Fig. 2.8. Location of Wilson's coring transects in the southwestern Delta (used with permission of author, with sincere thanks to P. Wilson). 52

CHAPTER THREE

Fig. 3.1. Egypt Exploration Society-identified <i>koms</i> in the survey region labeled with EES numbers (see app. 1 for names).	59
Fig. 3.2. EAIS and CultNat-identified archaeological lands in the region surveyed, labeled with name (if from EAIS) or CultNat Atlas number (see app. 1).	60
Fig. 3.3. Reconstruction of historical geography from Ibn Said Maghrebi's map compared to schematic ancient hydrology.	62
Fig. 3.4. The western Delta on d'Anville's map of Egypt. Efrim (Kom Firin) is noted on the Canal de Bahiré. Map in public domain, digital copy obtained from the David Rumsey Map Collection, davidrumsey.com.	63
Fig. 3.5. Historical geography presented by the <i>Description de l'Égypte</i> (1828) in the survey area.	65
Fig. 3.6. Series of linear pools to the northwest of el-Dilingat on the Kafr el-Ziyat map sheet indicated with arrows.	66
Fig. 3.7. Historical hydrology from the Survey of Egypt sheets (1927). Linear pools in the northwest are argued to suggest relict channels predating the early nineteenth century.	66
Fig. 3.8. Example of a "Corona channel" near Kom Qamha, the light-gray sandy mound on the right. The channel matches up directly with ponds visible on the Survey of Egypt Kafr el-Ziyat map.	68
Fig. 3.9. The same "Corona channel" on the Survey of Egypt Kafr el-Ziyat map.	68
Fig. 3.10. Overview of western Delta SRTM data. Pixels show elevation value above or below sea level. Arrows indicate locally elevated sandy bodies that are the remains of silted-up water channels.	70
Fig. 3.11. Summary of inactive hydrology observed on remote sensing data and the <i>Description de l'Égypte</i> .	71
Fig. 3.12. Illustration of an "old center" of the town of modern Sa el-Hagar. It is suggested that this old center lies atop the bulk of the stratified remains of millennia of occupation.	73
Fig. 3.13. Towns with "old centers" plotted alongside channels detected on remote sensing and map imagery.	74
Fig. 3.14. Form used for the initial cultural inventory of the western Delta research area (front).	76
Fig. 3.15. Form used for the initial cultural inventory of the western Delta research area (back).	77
Fig. 3.16. AOIs visited for cultural inventory in Fall 2007, labeled with name or EES number (where applicable).	78
Fig. 3.17. Shoulder fragment of basalt statue found at Khirbeta.	79
Fig. 3.18. Ideal vs. actual placement of collection units (CUs) at Kom el-Ghuzz. Field conditions, such as mature or fragile crops, often prevented desired CU placement.	84

CHAPTER FOUR

Fig. 4.1. Study area of intensive survey in the southwestern Delta.	90
Fig. 4.2. Kom el-Abqa'in and surrounding territory on the Kafr el-Ziyat 1:100,000 sheet (1927).	91
Fig. 4.3. Kom el-Abqa'in as visible on a Corona satellite photo.	92
Fig. 4.4. Distinguishable features of Kom el-Abqa'in on a Quickbird-2 image. ©2007 Google. ©2007 Europa Technologies.	92
Fig. 4.5. DEM of the fort mound of Kom el-Abqa'in with 0.1 m contours. Higher elevations are blue with light contours, lower elevations are dark brown with dark contours.	93

Fig. 4.6. Slope raster generated from the DEM. Greater changes in elevation of adjacent pixels are shown as light grays and whites. In the west and northwest, one can see the high degree of slope change between the high enclosure wall and the exterior moat depression.	94
Fig. 4.7. Reconstructed architecture at Kom el-Abqa'in.	95
Fig. 4.8. 3D rendering of the contours and DEM in ArcScene, illustrating reconstructed features relative to topography. Vertical scale has been exaggerated 3x.	96
Fig. 4.9. Distribution of Collection Units (CUs) at Kom el-Abqa'in.	97
Fig. 4.10. Density plot of ceramics by count (sherd/100m ²).	98
Fig. 4.11. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m ²).	98
Fig. 4.12. Selection of amphorae, utility, and storage vessels from Kom el-Abqa'in (KABQ) (Simony n.d.).	100
Fig. 4.13. Selection of fine and table wares from Kom el-Abqa'in (KABQ) (Simony n.d.).	102
Fig. 4.14. Sum of all CU period indices, Kom el-Abqa'in.	103
Fig. 4.15. Period indices for the CUs at Kom el-Abqa'in. Bar heights scaled to example shown in legend (11 units per bar height).	104
Fig. 4.16. Corona channels in the hinterland of Kom el-Abqa'in and placement of cores to investigate the fortress mound and channels.	105
Fig. 4.17. Lithological profile of Kom el-Abqa'in (Toonen n.d.).	106
Fig. 4.18. Geogenetic profile of Kom el-Abqa'in, suggesting origin of sedimentary horizons (Toonen n.d.).	106
Fig. 4.19. Koms el-Ghuzz, (el-)Shimuli, and Hamrit on the Kafr el-Ziyat sheet Kom el-Ghuzz (KGHZ)—Kom el-Shimuli (KSHM)—Kom Hamrit (KHMR).	109
Fig. 4.20. Kom el-Ghuzz and Kom el-Shimuli on a Corona satellite photo.	110
Fig. 4.21. Kom el-Ghuzz and Kom el-Shimuli on a Quickbird-2 satellite image. ©2007 Google. ©2007 Digital Globe. ©2007 Europa Technologies.	110
Fig. 4.22. Selected modern elevations from the topographic surveys of Koms el-Ghuzz and el-Shimuli indicated on the 1970 Corona.	111
Fig. 4.23. Topographic rendering of Kom Hamrit.	112
Fig. 4.24. Distribution of Collection Units (CUs) at Koms el-Shimuli and Hamrit.	113
Fig. 4.25. Density plot of ceramics by count (sherd/100m ²).	114
Fig. 4.26. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m ²).	114
Fig. 4.27. Distribution of Collection Units (CUs) at Kom el-Ghuzz.	115
Fig. 4.28. Density plot of ceramics at Kom el-Ghuzz by count (sherd/100m ²).	116
Fig. 4.29. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m ²).	116
Fig. 4.30. Distribution of stone finds on the surface at Kom el-Ghuzz.	117
Fig. 4.31. Selection of amphorae and utility vessels from Kom el-Ghuzz (KGHZ) (Simony n.d.).	118
Fig. 4.32. Selection of utility and storage vessels from Kom el-Ghuzz (KGHZ) (Simony n.d.).	121
Fig. 4.33. Selection of cooking and other vessels from Kom el-Ghuzz (KGHZ) (Simony n.d.).	123
Fig. 4.34. Selection of amphorae, table, and fine wares from Kom el-Shimuli (KSHM) (Simony n.d.).	126
Fig. 4.35. Selection of utility, storage, and other vessels from Kom el-Shimuli (KSHM) (Simony n.d.).	127
Fig. 4.36. Selection of amphorae, table, utility, and storage vessels from Kom Hamrit (KHMR) (Simony n.d.).	130
Fig. 4.37. Sum of all CU period indices, Kom el-Shimuli.	132
Fig. 4.38. Sum of all CU period indices, Kom Hamrit.	132
Fig. 4.39. Sum of all CU period indices, Kom el-Ghuzz.	132

Fig. 4.40. Period indices for the CUs at Kom el-Ghuzz. Bar heights scaled to example shown in legend (29 units per bar height). Lines where drawn indicate placement of CU.	133
Fig. 4.41. Period indices for the CUs at Kom el-Shimuli. Bar heights scaled to example shown in legend (29 units per bar height). Lines where drawn indicate placement of CU.	133
Fig. 4.42. Period indices for the CUs at Kom Hamrit. Bar heights scaled to example shown in legend (29 units per bar height).	134
Fig. 4.43. Corona channels in the hinterlands of Koms el-Ghuzz, Hamrit, and el-Shimuli and placement of cores to investigate relict channels and paleoenvironment. Blue hatched areas are large pools on the 1927 Kafr el-Ziyat map.	135
Fig. 4.44. Lithological profile for the Kom Hamrit to Kom el-Ghuzz transect.	136
Fig. 4.45. Eastern face of Kom Hamrit. Note hoe marks from field cutting and different coloration of the upper light-brown anthropogenic soils and lower bright-yellow aeolian sand.	136
Fig. 4.46. Geogenetic profile of the transect between Kom el-Ghuzz and Kom Hamrit.	137
Fig. 4.47. Lithological profile of the transect around Kom el-Shimuli (Toonen n.d.).	138
Fig. 4.48. Geogenetic profile of the transect around Kom el-Shimuli (Toonen n.d.).	138
Fig. 4.49. Koms Abu Ali, Abu el-Tubul, Sheikh Said Ahmed, and Kom Hamrit on the Kafr el-Ziyat sheet (1927).	141
Fig. 4.50. Koms Abu Ali, Abu el-Tubul, Sheikh Said Ahmed, and Kom Hamrit as visible on a Corona satellite image.	142
Fig. 4.51. Distinguishable features of Koms Abu Ali and Sheikh Said Ahmed on a Quickbird-2 satellite image. ©2007 Google. ©2007 Digital Globe. ©2007 Europa Technologies.	142
Fig. 4.52. Topographic reconstruction of Koms Abu Ali, Abu el-Tubul, and Sh.S. Ahmed.	143
Fig. 4.53. Distribution of Collection Units (CUs) at Koms Abu Ali, Abu el-Tubul, and Sheikh Said Ahmed.	144
Fig. 4.54. Density plot of ceramics by count (sherd/100m ²).	145
Fig. 4.55. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m ²).	145
Fig. 4.56. Late Dynastic jar profiles found at Kom Abu el-Tubul (KATU.34 and KATU.35).	146
Fig. 4.57. Selection of amphorae, table, and fine wares from Kom Abu Ali (KABA) (Simony n.d.).	149
Fig. 4.58. Selection of utility and storage vessels from Kom Abu Ali (KABA) (Simony n.d.).	150
Fig. 4.59. Selection of amphorae, fine wares, utility, and storage vessels from Kom Abu el-Tubul (KATU) (Simony n.d.).	153
Fig. 4.60. Selection of amphorae, table, and fine wares from Kom Sheikh Said Ahmed (KSSA) (Simony n.d.).	157
Fig. 4.61. Selection of utility and storage vessels from Kom Sheikh Said Ahmed (KSSA) (Simony n.d.).	158
Fig. 4.62. Sum of all CU period indices, Kom Abu Ali.	159
Fig. 4.63. Period indices for the CUs at Koms Abu Ali, Abu el-Tubul, and Sheikh Said Ahmed. Bar heights scaled to example shown in legend (11 units per bar height).	159
Fig. 4.64. Sum of all CU period indices, Kom Abu el-Tubul.	160
Fig. 4.65. Sum of all CU period indices, Kom Sheikh Said Ahmed.	160
Fig. 4.66. Coring transects at Koms Abu Ali and Sheikh Said Ahmed relative to channels and desert.	160
Fig. 4.67. Lithological profile of Kom Abu Ali (Toonen n.d.).	161
Fig. 4.68. Geogenetic reconstruction of Kom Abu Ali (Toonen n.d.).	162
Fig. 4.69. Lithological profile of Kom Sheikh Said Ahmed transect (Toonen n.d.).	163
Fig. 4.70. Geogenetic reconstruction of Kom Sheikh Said Ahmed transect (Toonen n.d.).	164

Fig. 4.71. Koms el-Barud and Qamha and surrounding territory on the Kafr el-Ziyat sheet.	167
Fig. 4.72. Koms el-Barud and Qamha as visible on a Corona satellite photo.	167
Fig. 4.73. Distinguishable features of Koms el-Barud and Qamha on a Quickbird-2 image. ©2007 Google. ©2007 Digital Globe. ©2007 Europa Technologies.	168
Fig. 4.74. DEMs of Kom Qamha and el-Barud overlain with 0.1m contours.	169
Fig. 4.75. Slope rasters for these <i>koms</i> as generated from the DEM.	169
Fig. 4.76. Reconstructed architecture at Kom Qamha.	170
Fig. 4.77. Reconstructed architecture at Kom el-Barud.	170
Fig. 4.78. Pebble mosaic at Kom el-Barud.	171
Fig. 4.79 (left) and 4.80 (right). Red-brick walls on the surface of Kom el-Barud. Ruler is 2 m long in 4.80.	172
Fig. 4.81. Distribution of Collection Units (CUs) at Kom Qamha and Kom el-Barud.	173
Fig. 4.82. Distribution of slag pieces at Kom el-Barud.	174
Fig. 4.83. Pieces of metal slag found at Kom el-Barud.	174
Fig. 4.84. Density plot of ceramics at Kom Qamha (left) and Kom el-Barud (right) by count (sherd/100m ²).	176
Fig. 4.85. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m ²).	176
Fig. 4.86. Selection of amphorae, fine, and storage wares from Kom Qamha (QMHA) (Simony n.d.).	179
Fig. 4.87. Selection of cooking and kitchen wares from Kom Qamha (QMHA) (Simony n.d.).	180
Fig. 4.88. Selection of amphora, table, and fine wares from Kom el-Barud (KBAR) (Simony n.d.).	183
Fig. 4.89. Selection of fine ware, storage, and cooking vessels from Kom el-Barud (KBAR) (Simony n.d.).	184
Fig. 4.90. Sum of all CU period indices, Kom Qamha.	186
Fig. 4.91. Period indices for the CUs at Koms Qamha and el-Barud. Bar heights scaled to example shown in legend (29 units per bar height).	187
Fig. 4.92. Sum of all CU period indices, Kom el-Barud.	187
Fig. 4.93. Coring transects at Koms Qamha and el-Barud.	188
Fig. 4.94. Lithological profile of Kom Qamha (Toonen n.d.).	189
Fig. 4.95. Geogenetic reconstruction of Kom Qamha (Toonen n.d.).	190
Fig. 4.96. Lithological profile of Kom el-Barud (Toonen n.d.).	191
Fig. 4.97. Geogenetic reconstruction of Kom el-Barud (Toonen n.d.).	192
Fig. 4.98. Kom el-Hisn and surrounding territory on the Kafr el-Ziyat sheet.	195
Fig. 4.99. Kom el-Hisn as visible on a Corona satellite photo.	195
Fig. 4.100. Kom el-Hisn on a Quickbird-2 satellite image.	196
Fig. 4.101. North–south coring transect at Kom el-Hisn and core at Absum el-Sharqiya.	197
Fig. 4.102. Lithological profile of Kom el-Hisn (Toonen n.d.).	198
Fig. 4.103. Geogenetic profile of Kom el-Hisn (Toonen n.d.).	198
Fig. 4.104. Geogenetic reconstruction of Kom el-Hisn (Trampier, after Toonen n.d.).	200

CHAPTER FIVE

Fig. 5.1. Hypothetical reconstruction of New Kingdom and Third Intermediate-period settlements with the minimalist hydrology (see text) of the southwestern Delta. Numbers are referenced in text.	207
Fig. 5.2. Hypothetical reconstruction of Late Dynastic settlements with the minimalist hydrology of the southwestern Delta.	209

- Fig. 5.3. Hypothetical reconstruction of Ptolemaic settlements with minimalist hydrology of the southwestern Delta. 210
- Fig. 5.4. Hypothetical reconstruction of Roman settlements with minimalist hydrology of the southwestern Delta. 211
- Fig. 5.5. Hypothetical reconstruction of settlement and hydrology in the western Delta during the New Kingdom and Late Dynastic periods. Based on figs. 2.2, 2.4, 5.1, 5.2, and compiled observations of linear pools on Survey of Egypt maps and SRTM data. 214
- Fig. 5.6. Hypothetical reconstruction of settlement and hydrology in the western Delta during the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. Based on figs. 2.2, 2.4, 5.3, 5.4, and compiled observations of linear pools on Survey of Egypt maps and SRTM data. 216
- Fig. 5.7. Topography-derived impacts on northern Egypt from a 1–2 m rise in sea level. 220

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Periodization adopted for dating ceramics in this study (Grigoropoulos 2009).	29
Table 2.2. Nile systems development and impacts on the Delta.	41
Table 2.3. Summary of Nile Delta branches according to selected classical authors (after Ball 1942).	45
Table 3.1. Summary of cartographic sources consulted for historical toponyms and hydrology.	61
Table 3.2. Summary of remote sensing datasets consulted in this research.	67
Table 3.3. Information used to translate local grid coordinates to latitude-longitude coordinates.	82
Table 4.1. Descriptive statistics for ceramic densities of all CUs collected within the modern <i>kom</i> boundaries versus those within the Corona mound boundaries.	201
Table 4.2. Results of the independent sample, two-tailed t-test showing that no significant differences in ceramic densities existed within the <i>kom</i> area and within the Corona area. The t value is shown, as are the degrees of freedom (df) necessary for calculating significance (p).	202
Table 4.3. Descriptive statistics for ceramic densities for all CUs collected “on-site” versus those collected “off-site.”	202
Table 4.4. Results of the independent sample t-test showing significant differences ($p < .05$) in “on-site” and “off-site” ceramic density.	202
Table 4.5. Observed sizes of modern koms compared to mounds visible on Corona imagery and estimated site sizes based on the methods used in this study.	203

ABBREVIATIONS

AOI	archaeological Area of Interest
AfRSW	African Red Slip Ware
CU	Collection Unit
CypRSW	Cypriot Red Slip Ware
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
EAIS	Egyptian Antiquities Information Service
EAO	Egypt Antiquities Organization
EES	Egypt Exploration Society
EGSA	Egyptian General Survey Authority
EPto	Early Ptolemaic
ERo	Early Roman
ETM+	Enhanced Thematic Mapper
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GPMP	Giza Plateau Mapping Project
K.	<i>kom</i> (EES Delta Survey notation)
KABA	Kom Abu Ali
KABQ	Kom el-Abqa'in
KATU	Kom Abu el-Tubul
KBAR	Kom el-Barud
KGHZ	Kom el-Ghuzz
KHMR	Kom Hamrit
KHSN	Kom el-Hisn
KSHM	Kom el-Shimuli
KSSA	Kom Sheikh Said Ahmed
LDyn	Late Dynastic
LRA	Late Roman Amphora
LPto	Late Ptolemaic
LRo	Late Roman
masl	meters above sea level
mbs	meters belows surface
mbsl	meters below sea level
MSA	Ministry of State for Antiquities

MSS	Multispectral Scanner
NK	New Kingdom
OSL	optically stimulated luminescence
Φ	diameter in cm
Pto	Ptolemaic
QMHA	Kom Qamha
Ro	Roman
SCA	Supreme Council of Antiquities
SEGY	Survey of Egypt
SRTM	Shuttle Radar Topography Mission
TIP	Third Intermediate Period
TM	Thematic Mapper
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator
VES	Vertical Electrical Sounding
WB	Erman, A., and H. Grapow, eds. <i>Wörterbuch der Ägyptische Sprache</i> . Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926–1963.
WDLP	Western Delta Landscape Project