

# 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](http://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 *koms* 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 *Description de l'Égypte* (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 *Description de l'Égypte*. 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 <sup>2</sup> ).	98
Fig. 4.11. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m <sup>2</sup> ).	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 <sup>2</sup> ).	114
Fig. 4.26. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m <sup>2</sup> ).	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 <sup>2</sup> ).	116
Fig. 4.29. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m <sup>2</sup> ).	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 <sup>2</sup> ).	145
Fig. 4.55. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m <sup>2</sup> ).	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 <sup>2</sup> ).	176
Fig. 4.85. Density plot of ceramics by weight (kg/100m <sup>2</sup> ).	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
$\Phi$	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

# APPENDIX 1

List of *koms* and archaeological lands identified by the EES Delta Survey,<sup>1</sup> EAIS,<sup>2</sup> and CultNat Atlas<sup>3</sup> illustrated in figures 3.1 and 3.2. Places are labeled with the toponym given in the original source, with the EES *kom* number, EAIS name, or CultNat number listed as appropriate.

Name	Source	Alt. ID	Name	Source	Alt. ID
Abu el-Zarazier	CultNat Atlas	100201	Kom Zekrii	CultNat Atlas	100257
Abu el-Tubul	CultNat Atlas	100202	Kom Ferien	CultNat Atlas	100260
el Shahedi	CultNat Atlas	100204	Kom Qarttas	CultNat Atlas	100262
el Kom el-Ahmer (iv)	CultNat Atlas	100206	Kom Qamheh	CultNat Atlas	100263
el Magadieb, Khaniezh	CultNat Atlas	100208	Kom el-Bikawiyyah	EAIS	Ezbet el-Jamal
Tell el-Abqa'ien	CultNat Atlas	100216			
Tell Saadya	CultNat Atlas	100220	Kom Haeh	EAIS	
Tell Umm el-Laben	CultNat Atlas	100224	Kom Zileiha	EAIS	Kom Zilikhah
Tell Khatmii	CultNat Atlas	100225			
Kadweh el-Zahab	CultNat Atlas	100229	Kortas, K.	EES Delta Survey	16
Kom Abu Ali	CultNat Atlas	100232	Geif, K.	EES Delta Survey	17
Kom el-Barod	CultNat Atlas	100233	Sidi Hineish	EES Delta Survey	18
Kom el-Baqareh	CultNat Atlas	100234	Dilingat, K.	EES Delta Survey	21
Kom el-Gebel	CultNat Atlas	100236	Abiad, El K. el-	EES Delta Survey	22
Kom el-Hasin	CultNat Atlas	100237	Kharaz	EES Delta Survey	23
Kom el-Haeh	CultNat Atlas	100239	Hisn, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	24
Kom el-Rekaweyeh	CultNat Atlas	100240	Zarqa, K. ez-	EES Delta Survey	25
Kom el-Zalat	CultNat Atlas	100241	Ibqa, T	EES Delta Survey	26
Kom el-Shamalii	CultNat Atlas	100243	Waqidi, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	27
Kom el-Sheikh Said Ahmed	CultNat Atlas	100244	Zuweida, K.	EES Delta Survey	28
Kom el-'ashrien	CultNat Atlas	100246	Sidi Ambar	EES Delta Survey	29
Kom el-Ghez	CultNat Atlas	100247	Ahmar, El K. el-	EES Delta Survey	30
Kom Ga'if	CultNat Atlas	100253	Hamada, K.	EES Delta Survey	31
Kom Hamrit	CultNat Atlas	100254	Maqadis, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	32
Kom Delingeh, Zalikhah	CultNat Atlas	100256	Sheikh Ibeid, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	36

1. Spencer 2006.

2. EAIS 2007b.

3. Center for Documentation of Cultural and Natural Heritage 2002.



Name	Source	Alt. ID	Name	Source	Alt. ID
Abu el Humar el Kebir, K.	EES Delta Survey	292	Kalabt Shafiq	EES Delta Survey	457
Abu el Humar es Saghir, K.	EES Delta Survey	293	Silvagou	EES Delta Survey	459
Firin, K.	EES Delta Survey	294	Dahab, K.	EES Delta Survey	591
Barud, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	295	Khatimi, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	602
Abqaein, T el-	EES Delta Survey	297	Umm el Laban, K.	EES Delta Survey	608
Baqar, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	298	Ghuzz, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	609
Ahmar, El K. el-	EES Delta Survey	440	Abu Ali	EES Delta Survey	629
Shimuli, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	442	Gebel, K. (Gilla?)	EES Delta Survey	630
Ahmar, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	443	Zalat, K. el-	EES Delta Survey	631
Saadiya, K. es-	EES Delta Survey	444	Sheikh Said Ahmed, K.	EES Delta Survey	632
Abu ez-Zarazir, T	EES Delta Survey	445	Ashrin, K.	EES Delta Survey	633
Tubul, K. et-	EES Delta Survey	446	Hamrit, K.	EES Delta Survey	638
Ityai el Barud	EES Delta Survey	456			

## 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.

EES										
Name	No.	Size (m)	Condition	Threats	Archaeology	CO	CC	TP	GP	EX
Kalabt Shafiq	457	210 x 345	Destroyed. Naukratis survey found EAO records of Ptolemaic cemetery here, but now this is a series of rice fields surrounding a marshy depression.	Irrelevant. Agricultural fields and groundwater have eliminated all traces of surface remains.	No visible archaeological remains.	Y	P	N	N	N
Kom Dahab	591	123 x 140	Small tell of 1 m height, leveled surface. Covered by halfa stands on west and south, central area open ground.	Moderate to high. Animal pens on north and east cutting into exposed mud-brick walls, possibly recently.	Visible mud-brick wall exposed on north face, extensive Ro sherds over visible mound despite systematic collection by Naukratis survey. Isolated pottery slag.	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Kom Firin	294	Not measured	Extensive <i>kom</i> under current exploration by Neal Spencer, British Museum.	Low. Erosion of standing mud-brick architecture.	West and east areas enclosed by mud-brick walls up to 5 m+ in height. Extensive lower town to north. Thick sherd carpet.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ruzzafa	n/a	400 x 130	1-m-high mound covered by modern cemetery with concrete superstructures.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	N	N	N	N	N
Silvagou	459	175 x 123	Nearly destroyed, modern cemetery covers most of 2-3 m high sandy mound. Open sandy depression enclosed on all sides by housing, animal pens, and cemetery.	High. Modern concrete cemetery visibly migrating south has covered over three-quarters of visible mound. Looting and/or excavation have left a series of broken pottery coffins and ceramics over the surface.	Fragmentary pottery coffins on surface.	P	N	N	P	Y
Biban	n/a	n/a	Visited the west edge of town, no visible ceramics, though town has old center and shows some mounding.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	Y	N	N	N	N

EES										
Name	No.	Size (m)	Condition	Threats	Archaeology	CO	CC	TP	GP	EX
Damatyuh	n/a	n/a	Modern town with no clear older surfaces. Old center, near possible channel.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	Y	N	N	N	N
Kom el-Dilingat	n/a	n/a	Open area which turned out to be trash dump.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains, though el-Dilingat would benefit from coring to determine depth of occupation.	Y	N	N	N	N
'Ezbet el-Jizawi (el Awamir)	n/a	105 x >10	Open level area adjacent to dried up fish pond. Few halfa and reed stands.	n/a	LRO ceramics, including AFRSW and LRA 1, found in material cast up from 1.5 m deep canal. Scattered non-diagnostic ceramics to northeast of canal in dried up fish pond.	Y	P	N	P	P
'Ezbet el-Naggat	n/a	166 x 181	Kom covered by modern cemetery. Walls and pottery protruding from east and west flanks. Little accessible because of cemetery	Moderate to High. Cemetery covers most and is expanding. Trash heaps on south migrating to cemetery boundaries. Soccer field to northwest.	Pro and/or Ro and later ceramics. Redbrick wall on east face of kom, and limestone and sandy mud-brick wall on west face.	Y	P	N	N	N
'Ezbet el-Wafa'iyya	n/a	n/a	Modern cemetery	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	N	N	N	N	N
Kafr Ziyada	n/a	n/a	Modern town with no clear older surfaces.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	N	N	N	N	N
Khirbeta	n/a	700 x 590	Central mound completely covered by modern housing, eastern mound (Tell Kurum) covered by modern graves.	n/a	Wastewater canal ditch in southeast of town east up Gascoigne (n.d.) found Pro, ERO, LRO ceramics. Granite and marble columns reused around Abu Hol mosque. Basalt statue fragment found in south side of town.	Y	Y	N	N	N

EES																		
Name	No.	Size (m)	Condition	Threats	Archaeology	CO	CC	TP	GP	EX								
Kom Abu Ali	629	125 x 130	Sandy tell shows some signs of extensive leveling.	Moderate. Tractor tracks across most of tell, may be actively leveled. Animal pens and field cutting on west. Eroding cut section on northwest.	Ro amphorae, ARSW sherd. Limestone wall oriented east-west with some red pigment on one face.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y								
Kom Abu el-Tubul	446	240 x 190	Decently preserved sandy tell 1–2 m in height with mostly open ground and halfa stands.	Moderate to High. Active pitting in site on north, southeast, and west—looting? Extensive animal pens on north, west, and southeast. Active field cutting in southwest.	Extensive Ro ceramics, could be earlier material. Some degraded mud brick in northeast. Some bone.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y								
Kom el-Ahmar #1	30	175 x 70	Modern cemetery and level fields with scattered ceramics throughout and around it.	Cemetery and modern fields are removing ceramics.	Numerous Ro–LRO (incl. LRA 1) amphora spikes visible in drainage ditch to south of cemetery and in spoil cast up from graves.	Y	Y	N	N	N								
Kom el-Ahmar #2	443	40 x 140	Leveled potato field with thick ceramics. Halfa field to west and fields to north and east show no signs of sherds.	Irrelevant. Mound is gone and ceramics highly localized. Could be dump for sherds removed from seabakh.	Numerous sherds in salty field, Ro–LRO (LRA 4).	Y	N	N	N	N								
Kom el-Barud	295	>600 x 305	Moderate mound of 2–3 m height covered in thick camelthorn and halfa. Visible variation in topography, some robbed-out walls leaving water-filled depressions.	Little to Moderate. Previous field cutting on north. No visible threats to main mound, although cemetery on southwest may migrate westward in coming years.	Extensive Ro sherds on main mound (263 x 400 m) but also to northwest to main NW–SE road. Redbrick, worked stone, some shell and degraded mud-brick buildings on main mound.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y								

EES										
Name	No.	Size (m)	Condition	Threats	Archaeology	CO	CC	TP	GP	EX
Kom el-Ghuzz	609	340 x 250 (est.)	Formerly moderate-sized tell now only a 80 x 30 m section preserved in northeast. Potato fields cover leveled main area of tell to SW.	High. Remaining bit of tell will likely be soon plowed under.	Ro sherds and CypRSW in preserved tell in northeast. Area of leveled tell to the southwest. Limestone fieldstone wall embedded in preserved portion of tell.	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Kom el-Gill (a.k.a Kom el-Gebel)	639	>228 x 301	Destroyed. Ceramic remains scattered across level open field.	Irrelevant. Agricultural fields have destroyed tell.	Few LRo sherds, including LRA 1 handles.	Y	P	N	N	N
Kom el-Hasil	n/a	320 x 350	Tell is entirely under modern settlement	n/a	No visible archaeological remains, though Ro (?) jar fragment	Y	N	N	N	N
Kom el-Hisin	24	631 x 578	Extensive tell, mostly open ground with sparse halfa in central area and several pools on the north and in center.	Moderate. Trash and animal pens encroaching on all sides. Town on south has built over exposed mud-brick walls in section.	Visible low topography of mud-brick walls in south.	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Kom el-Maqadis (Kom Kheniza)	32	236 x 280	Moderate sandy mound of 2-3 m height, mostly open ground with some modern tombs. East and northern faces show mud-brick (enclosure?) walls.	Moderate to High. Cemetery confined mostly to southern half, not dense but could fill out a great deal. Field cutting on north and east.	SCA "Greek" and "Predynastic" excavations visible in northwest (acc. to Ashraf Abdulrahman). Ro ceramics visible. Fallen redbrick chapel and several mud-brick structures visible, as is 70 cm diameter circular white-plastered structure.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kom el-Zarqa	25	n/a	Modern town with no clear older surfaces.	n/a	Few premodern sherds, nothing visibly older.	Y	N	N	N	N
Kom Haeh	n/a	162 x 83	1-2 m high mound covered by thick halfa grass and mud-brick/concrete tombs	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	Y	N	N	N	N

EES																		
Name	No.	Size (m)	Condition	Threats	Archaeology	CO	CC	TP	GP	EX								
Kom Hamrit	638	173 x 110	Small mound of 1-2 m height, mostly halfa covered. Shallow occupation of 0.5 m noted in section.	Moderate. Badly cut by fields especially on west side, animal pens on west too.	Stratified sherds in east section and visible on surface.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y								
Kom 'Ishrin	633	n/a	Leveled. Scant ceramic remains around edges of level rice field.	Irrelevant. Agricultural fields have destroyed mound and preserved ceramics only in field boundaries.	Large Nile Silt C basin, Ro.	Y	N	N	N	N								
Kom Kharaz	23	250 x 250?	Completely level lemon orchards within sandy fields.	n/a	Numerous sherds in fields and drainage ditches. LPto-LRo sherds. Noted as cemetery by Hamada and Farid.	Y	Y	N	N	N								
Kom Kortas	16	260 x 200	Surface has been systematically trenched by series of SCA 1.5 x 1.5 x 1 m units. Mostly covered with camelthorn and halfa.	High. Will be leased/deeded to el-Dilingat government to build a market according to Ashraf Abdurahman. Trash dumps along north side next to canal.	LPto-LRo sherds. Standing mud-brick and redbrick walls visible in SCA sections. Frequent bone, some worked limestone. SCA 2002-03 report shows brick kilns and a well.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y								
Kom Qamha	n/a	210 x 210	2-3 m high small mound covered with halfa and camelthorn. Notable variation in topography.	Moderate. Notable trash dumps on west and in middle, animal pens on east side. Road and field cutting on north and west.	Mostly Ro amphora spikes. Some bits of worked limestone in northeast. Stratified section in cut on west side.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y								
Kom Sheikh Said Ahmed	632	130 x 143	1-2 m high, sandy, mostly level mound with visible stratified remains, 50 percent covered with halfa.	Moderate to high. Trash mounds extensive in center south, encroachment by field cut sections along all edges. Animal pens on east.	Thick Ro ceramics in cut section and canal on north. Sherds and former mound probably extend west.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y								

EES										
Name	No.	Size (m)	Condition	Threats	Archaeology	CO	CC	TP	GP	EX
Kom el-Shimuli	442	105 x 91	Small tell of 1 m height nearly destroyed by fields. Thin halfa stands, undulating surface.	High. Extensive pens on east, west, south. Fields on west have already destroyed west half of tell, actively cutting into south.	Redbrick eroding out of section. Lump of pottery slag on west side, fist sized worked limestone fragments.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kom Zimran	n/a	un-measured	3 m high mound entirely built over by modern cemetery.	n/a	Two limestone tombstones found on west face of cemetery, elaborate raised relief inscription. Mud brick eroding from west profile. Pottery thick, possibly Ro.	Y	Y	N	N	N
Kom Zuweida	28	n/a	Modern fields. Might merit coring for its place name.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	Y	N	N	N	N
Magadieb	32	n/a	Level sandy peanut fields.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	N	N	N	N	N
Saft el-'Inhab	n/a	n/a	Modern town with no clear older surfaces.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains. Picked up two sherds, Ro-LRo (LRA?)	N	N	N	N	N
Sidi Ambar	29	n/a	Small mud-brick shrine in clearing by tree in middle of fields.	None visible.	Mud-brick shrine is ~1.8 m tall and 75 cm in diameter, base tapering to top. White plastered.	N	N	N	N	N
Sidi 'Isa	n/a	n/a	Modern cemetery	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	N	N	N	N	N
Tell Ibqa	n/a	n/a	Modern town with no clear older surfaces.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	N	N	N	N	N
Zawiyet Furaj	n/a	n/a	Modern town with no clear older surfaces.	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	N	N	N	N	N
Zawiyet Hamour	n/a	n/a	Modern cemetery	n/a	No visible archaeological remains.	N	N	N	N	N



## APPENDIX 3

List of collection units (CUs) identified by CU ID. 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.

CU	AOI	Vis.	Ground Cover	Salinity	Count	Weight (kg)	Count/100 m <sup>2</sup>	Kg/100 m <sup>2</sup>
100	KHMR	30	Straw	little	58	1.4	18	0.4
101	KHMR	20	Halfa grass	some	22	0.4	7	0.1
102	KHMR	90	Plowed earth	none	143	2.4	46	0.8
103	KHMR	70	Clover	none	37	0.7	12	0.2
104	KHMR	50	Straw	none	77	1.7	25	0.5
105	KHMR	75			0	0	0	0.0
106	KHMR	50	Weeds	some	4	0.1	1	0.0
107	KHMR	25	Clover	none	0	0	0	0.0
108	KHMR	25	Halfa grass	some	0	0	0	0.0
109	KHMR	75	Halfa grass	little	41	0.5	13	0.2
110	KHMR	50	Unknown crop	none	25	0.3	8	0.1
111	KSHM	50	Clover	none	115	3.8	37	1.2
112	KSHM	50	Clover	none	56	2.5	18	0.8
113	KSHM	50	Clover	none	19	1	6	0.3
114	KSHM	75	Weeds	some	17	1	5	0.3
115	KSHM	75	Weeds	some	34	3.5	11	1.1
116	KSHM	50	Weeds	some	38	2	12	0.6
117	KSHM	75	Weeds	some	58	4.5	18	1.4
118	KSHM	100	Plowed earth	none	44	1.7	14	0.5
119	KSHM	100	Plowed earth	none	17	3.2	5	1.0
120	KSHM	75	Clover	none	226	7.7	72	2.5
121	KSHM	95	Plowed earth	none	52	1.3	17	0.4
122	KSHM	70	Clover	none	53	1.5	17	0.5
123	KSHM	50	Clover	little	46	2.8	15	0.9
124	KSHM	50	Halfa grass	some	36	2.2	11	0.7
125	KATU	75	Halfa grass	none	2	0.2	1	0.1
126	KATU	100	Plowed earth	none	89	1.8	28	0.6
127	KATU	50	Halfa grass	some	26	1.9	8	0.6

CU	AOI	Vis.	Ground Cover	Salinity	Count	Weight (kg)	Count/100 m <sup>2</sup>	Kg/100 m <sup>2</sup>
128	KATU	75	Halfa grass	little	7	0.2	2	0.1
129	KATU	50	Halfa grass		2	0.1	1	0.0
130	KATU	75	Straw		34	1.4	11	0.4
131	KATU	90	Straw	none	175	6.6	56	2.1
132	KATU	75	Straw	some	8	0.2	3	0.1
133	KATU	50	Straw	little	18	1	6	0.3
134	KATU	75	Straw	little	21	0.9	7	0.3
135	KATU	50	Straw	much	35	1.8	11	0.6
136	KABA	100	Straw	little	400	11.1	127	3.5
137	KABA	75	Straw	little	125	4.2	40	1.3
138	KABA	75	Straw	little	94	3.4	30	1.1
139	KABA	100	Straw		39	0.8	12	0.3
140	KABA	100	Straw	little	75	3.5	24	1.1
141	KABA	100	Straw		120	3.5	38	1.1
142	KABA	100	Plowed earth	none	22	1	7	0.3
143	KABA	25	Clover	none	0	0	0	0.0
144	KABA	100	None	none	134	3.5	43	1.1
145	KABA	100	Clover	none	110	2.5	35	0.8
146	KABA	100	None	none	62	1.1	20	0.4
147	KABA	100	None	none	138	3	44	1.0
148	KSSA	75	Straw	some	155	5	49	1.6
149	KSSA	75	Straw	some	45	1	14	0.3
150	KSSA	75	Clover	some	377	11.6	120	3.7
151	KSSA	50	Plastic	none	108	8	108	8.0
152	KSSA	75	Plowed earth	none	500	11.5	159	3.7
153	KSSA	75	Plowed earth	none	349	7	111	2.2
154	KSSA	75	Plowed earth	none	954	22.4	304	7.1
155	KSSA	75	Plowed earth	little	1209	33.1	385	10.5
156	KGHZ	50	Straw	little	320	18	102	5.7
157	KGHZ	75	Straw	little	306	6.5	97	2.1
158	KGHZ	75	Plowed earth	none	150	6	48	1.9
159	KGHZ	75	Plowed earth	none	343	15	109	4.8
160	KGHZ	100	None	none	248	9	79	2.9
161	KGHZ	100	None	none	86	1.5	27	0.5
162	KGHZ	100	None	none	299	8	95	2.5
163	KGHZ	100	None	none	459	7	146	2.2
164	KGHZ	75	Weeds	none	465	8.5	148	2.7
165	KGHZ	50	Unknown crop	little	29	0.5	9	0.2
166	KGHZ	50	Salt	some	61	2	19	0.6

CU	AOI	Vis.	Ground Cover	Salinity	Count	Weight (kg)	Count/100 m <sup>2</sup>	Kg/100 m <sup>2</sup>
167	KHMR	75	Plowed earth	none	118	2	38	0.6
168	KHMR	75	Plowed earth	little	65	1	21	0.3
169	KHMR	75	Plowed earth	some	52	0.5	17	0.2
170	KHMR	50	Onion	none	89	1	28	0.3
171	KHMR	75	Plowed earth	some	91	1	29	0.3
172	KHMR	75	Plowed earth	none	21	0.5	7	0.2
173	KSHM	75	Plowed earth	little	88	2	28	0.6
174	KSHM	25	Clover	none	3	0.1	1	0.0
175	KSHM	50	Onion	none	38	0.5	12	0.2
176	KSHM	75	Plowed earth	none	59	0.8	19	0.3
177	KSHM	75	Onion	little	44	0.5	14	0.2
178	KSHM	75	Plowed earth	none	85	1	27	0.3
179	KSHM	75	Plowed earth	none	1447	36.3	461	11.6
180	QMHA	75	Halfa grass	none	506	11.5	161	3.7
181	QMHA	50	Halfa grass	none	404	9	129	2.9
182	QMHA	75	Plowed earth	none	99	1	32	0.3
183	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	31	0.5	31	0.5
184	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	354	8	354	8.0
185	QMHA	25	Clover	none	0	0	0	0.0
186	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	204	2.5	204	2.5
187	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	9	0.1	3	0.0
188	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	33	0.5	33	0.5
189	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	70	1	70	1.0
190	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	84	1	84	1.0
191	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	14	0.5	14	0.5
192	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	17	0.5	17	0.5
193	QMHA	50	Halfa grass	some	198	8	63	2.5
194	QMHA	50	Plastic	none	56	0.5	56	0.5
195	KBAR	50	Halfa grass	none	13	0.2	4	0.1
196	KBAR	50	Halfa grass	little	456	16.5	145	5.3
197	KBAR	75	Halfa grass	little	771	24.5	246	7.8
198	KBAR	75	Halfa grass	some	1264	46	403	14.6
199	KBAR	75	Plowed earth	none	353	7	112	2.2
200	KBAR	75	Plowed earth	none	690	19.5	220	6.2
201	KBAR	75	Salt	much	43	0.3	14	0.1
202	KBAR	75	Plowed earth	little	193	4.5	61	1.4
203	KBAR	75	Plowed earth	little	134	2	43	0.6
204	KABQ	75	Animal dung	much	423	8	135	2.5

CU	AOI	Vis.	Ground Cover	Salinity	Count	Weight (kg)	Count/100 m <sup>2</sup>	Kg/100 m <sup>2</sup>
205	KABQ	75	Plowed earth	none	36	0.5	11	0.2
206	KABQ	75	Weeds	none	47	1	15	0.3
207	KABQ	50	Halfa grass	some	67	3	21	1.0
208	KABQ	50	Halfa grass	some	41	0.5	13	0.2
209	KABQ	50	Plowed earth	some	162	4	52	1.3
210	KBAR	75	Plowed earth	little	317	3.5	101	1.1
211	KBAR	75	Plowed earth	little	178	1.5	57	0.5
212	KBAR	75	Plowed earth	none	98	1.5	31	0.5
213	KABQ	50	Leaves	none	75	1	24	0.3
214	KABQ	75	Weeds	some	355	13	113	4.1
215	KABQ	50	Salt	much	0	0	0	0.0

## 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).

CU	AOI	NK	TIP	LDyn	Pto	EPto	LPto	Ro	ERo	LRO	Diag Count	Tent Count	Multi Count
100	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
101	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
103	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
104	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
105	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	1	6	1	0
106	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
107	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
108	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
109	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
110	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
111	KSHM	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	5	0	2
112	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	0
113	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	0
114	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
115	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	3	0
116	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
117	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	4	0	0
118	KSHM	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	1	0	1
119	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
120	KSHM	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	8.5	6	1	9	2	1
121	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
122	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	3	0	0
123	KSHM	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	1	2	5	0	2
124	KSHM	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0
125	KATU	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
126	KATU	0	0	0.5	1.5	0	1	1	1	0	3	0	3
127	KATU	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	1
128	KATU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
129	KATU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
130	KATU	0	0	0	1.5	0	0.5	1	0.5	1	3	1	2
131	KATU	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	5	1	0

CU	AOI	NK	TIP	LDyn	Pto	EPto	LPto	Ro	ERo	LRO	Diag Count	Tent Count	Multi Count
132	KATU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
133	KATU	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3	1	0
134	KATU	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
135	KATU	0	0	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	7	1	2
136	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	17	17	0	0
137	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9.5	1	8	10	3	1
138	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	6	1	2
139	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	3	0	0
140	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	15	19	3	0
141	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5	0	7	7	1	1
142	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	5	0	0
143	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
144	KABA	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	6	7	1	0
145	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	6	1	0
146	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	1	0
147	KABA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	9	10	0	0
148	KSSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4	6	1	0
149	KSSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
150	KSSA	0	0	0	2	0	1	9	0	5	11	4	0
151	KSSA	0	0	0	1.5	0	1.5	16.5	3.5	7	18	4	3
152	KSSA	0	0	0	1.5	0	0.5	17.5	4.5	12	19	0	1
153	KSSA	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	1	5	9	0	2
154	KSSA	0	0	0	7	3.5	1.5	20	2	11	27	3	3
155	KSSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	8	5	18	2	0
156	KGHZ	0	0	0	15	0.5	8.5	11	5	2	26	4	7
157	KGHZ	0	0	0	2.5	0	1.5	2.5	2.5	0	5	0	3
158	KGHZ	0	0	0	4	0	1	4	1	1	8	4	2
159	KGHZ	1	0	0	11	3	5	11	6	4	23	4	8
160	KGHZ	0	0	1	10.5	4	2.5	3.5	2.5	0	16	1	6
161	KGHZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0
162	KGHZ	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.5	1	2	6	0	1
163	KGHZ	0	0	1	1.5	1	0.5	3.5	1.5	0	6	1	1
164	KGHZ	0	0	1.5	3.5	1	1	6.5	3	1	12	2	4
165	KGHZ	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
166	KGHZ	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	2.5	0.5	0	3	1	1
167	KHMR	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	3	1	2	4	0	2
168	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
169	KHMR	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0
170	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
171	KHMR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
172	KHMR	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	2
173	KSHM	0	0	0	1.5	1	0.5	5.5	1.5	4	7	0	1
174	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
175	KSHM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
176	KSHM	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	8.5	2.5	5	9	0	1



## 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.

AOI	NK	TIP	LDyn	Pto	EPto	LPto
KABA	0	0	0	1	0	0
KABQ	23	0	1	6	1	3
KATU	0	0	2	7.5	2	2.5
KBAR	0	0	0	24.5	4.5	15
KGHZ	1	0	5.5	50.5	10.5	20.5
KHMR	2	0	0	1.5	0	1.5
KSHM	0	0	0	11.5	1	7
KSSA	0	0	0	14	3.5	6.5
QMHA	0	0	0	31	7.5	9.5

AOI	Ro	ERo	LRo	Diag Count	Tent Count	Multi Count
KABA	89	2	83	92	11	4
KABQ	21.5	4	9	52	3	7
KATU	15	4.5	5	25	5	8
KBAR	166.5	59	68.5	192	28	26
KGHZ	49	23	10	108	18	33
KHMR	12	5	5	16	2	4
KSHM	77.5	32	38	89	11	13
KSSA	95	21	50	109	14	9
QMHA	56	22	19	88	23	13