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Chapter 2. Phase I: Late Chalcolithic period

Simone Nannucci

Until recently, the chronology of the fourth millennium BCE in the northern part of the ‘Greater Mesopotamia’ was highly problematic and debated, partly due to mistakes and misunderstandings about the stratigraphic sequences of the main sites of the region.

The academic literature showed a wide number of chronological schemes and labels, based essentially on the traditional synchronization of strata XIA-VIIIa of Gawra (with many internal differentiations) with the sequence ‘Early’, ‘Middle’ and ‘Late Uruk’ and ‘Jemdet Nasr’ of southern Mesopotamia (e.g., Porada 1965; Buchanan 1967; Forest 1983; Rothman 1988; von Widecke 1990). During the last decade of the twentieth century, many researchers have attempted a synchronization of the different regional chronologies on the basis of new data from modern stratigraphic excavations carried out in Syria and Turkey and the reconsideration of fundamental stratigraphic sequences like those of Gawra and Nineveh (e.g., Gut 1995; Trufelli 1997; Rova 1999-2000; Rothman 1988; 2002a).

Three conferences entirely or partly dedicated to this topic have been organized (Marro and Hauptmann 2000; Rothman 2001; Postgate 2002). In particular, the conference organized by Rothman (2001) at the School of American Research (SAR) in Santa Fe proposed a new periodization valid for the entire ‘Greater Mesopotamia’, widely accepted by the majority of scholars but often with some variations. On this occasion, many different definitions suitable for a basic chronologic terminology have been taken into account, and finally the label ‘Late Chalcolithic’ (LC) has been chosen for the entire period, with an internal division in five consecutive phases, from LC 1 (i.e., Post-‘Ubaid) to LC 5 (i.e., Late Uruk). This periodization has been made on the basis of the strong data obtained by the radiocarbon dating of many sites (Wright and Rupley 2001), in turn specified by the relative regional chronologies based on the synchronization of each sequence in reason of their material culture, in particular pottery and glyptics. Here we are going to use the SAR chronology and its periodization, combined with some elements from the chronology by Gut (Rothman 2002b):

---

1 About the Syro-Iraqi Jazirah, the reconsideration of the data from Nineveh’s Deep Sounding and its connection to the Gawra sequence allowed a remarkable improvement of the regional chronology. Gut proposed a division in two main periods, both divided into different phases: an early “Gawra” period (A and B) and a late “Uruk” period (A to D) (Gut 1995; 2002). The “Gawra” period should represent a pure “indigenous” period preceding the contact of northern sites with the “Uruk” southern Mesopotamia, while the following period was characterized by different scales of interaction between the northern “indigenous” and the southern “exogenous” elements.

2 Some different names were used to describe the phases of this period, with the result that the problem was still not clarified. “Uruk” could be the proper term when it was used to point the cultural phenomenon out, but on the other hand it could be misleading when used as a chronological marker. Also the term “Gawra” was clearly inadequate for the periodization in the northern regions of the “Greater Mesopotamia”.

3 Gut (2002: 22) does not agree about this sequence, because the regional and the sub-regional variety is not taken into account; moreover, the chronological meaning of the presence or the absence of certain phases in each site is not clear.

4 In any case the lower limit of the SAR periodization is not the same as Gut’s “Uruk” period, because the “Uruk D” phase (End Uruk) comprises the post-LC5 developments, dated between the last quarter of the fourth and the beginning of the third millennia BCE (Gut 2002: 22).
There is no unanimous agreement between the scholars about the absolute dating: within the proposed dating it is possible to detect some fluctuations consisting of one century or more (see: Schwartz 2001; Wright and Rupley 2001; Rothman 2002a; 2002b; Matthews 2003a; Brustolon and Rova 2007; McMahon and Oates 2007) (Tab. 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods Sar</th>
<th>Periods Gut</th>
<th>Southern Mesopotamia</th>
<th>Absolute dating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC 1</td>
<td>End-’Obed</td>
<td>Final ’Ubaid</td>
<td>4300-4150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4300-4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC 2</td>
<td>Gawra A-B</td>
<td>Early Uruk</td>
<td>4150-3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4200-3900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC 3</td>
<td>Uruk A (?)</td>
<td>Middle Uruk (early)</td>
<td>3800-3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3900-3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3800-3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3900-3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3700-3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC 4</td>
<td>Uruk B</td>
<td>Middle Uruk (late)</td>
<td>3500-3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3600-3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3600-3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3500-3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC 5</td>
<td>Uruk C</td>
<td>Late Uruk</td>
<td>3350-3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3300-3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3400-3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3300-3100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Chronology and periodization of the Late Chalcolithic period.

Stratigraphy and Architecture

The earliest phase of occupation at the site is dated to LC 3, located in Area B in the Outer Town. Unfortunately, the level is poorly preserved and has been disturbed by the course of the river and building activity, and is the reason why a large part of the evidence is absent. The excavations have shown the eroded remains of rows of bricks, most probably part of a wall or a bench (B0049), and a shallow pit filled with a thick layer of ashes (B0021, B0022, B0023)(Fig. 6.1). The large amount of cooking pottery associated with this evidence makes the interpretation of an area for cooking within a domestic context possible. Even though tools associated with craft production (i.e., four flint blades and a grinding stone (Pl. CXXVI: 1-2) were found in these layers, unfortunately the limited surface of the excavated area and its poor preservation does not provide further data for the reconstruction of this level (Laneri et al. 2006b: 158; 2008c: 178-179; 2009: 230).

Pottery Assemblage

Methodological criteria

This discussion takes into account part of the pottery recovered during the excavations of Phase I in Area B. A study of the ceramic material has been carried out during the 2005 and 2006 campaigns. It essentially consists of sherds presenting diagnostic features (i.e., complete forms, complete profiles and rim potsherds). However, since the largest part of the analyzed repertoire consists of sherds, the comparison with materials from other sites is difficult, especially when they consist of assemblages of complete vessels. As noted by Nissen (1970: 144), when the repertoire is mainly composed by sherds, the typology can be defined on the

5 The ceramic material ascribed to this level is present also in later deposits.
basis of few diagnostic features (i.e., rim form, decoration, etc.); on the other hand, complete vessels include a wide set of characteristics (i.e., rim form, complete profile section, base form, decorations, and other secondary elements such as handles, spouts, lugs etc.). Therefore, when a typology is thoroughly defined on the basis of sherds, there is a danger in distinguishing types on the basis of minimal variations in the rim shape or the neck angle; these variations usually do not correspond to the potter’s intention (McAdam and Mynors 1988: 44). Therefore in this repertoire it is also possible that types or different variants can be interpreted as variable examples of the same vessel shape.

Main classes and diagnostic forms from Phases LC 3 and LC 4

The main diagnostic class characterizing these two phases is the so-called Chaff-Faced Ware (CFW). This pottery production belongs to a wide horizon extending from the upper courses of the Tigris and Euphrates to the upper Khabur valley and the Jazirah in northern Iraq; CFW is characterized by buff greyish/brown coarse fabric whose section is often blackened due to incomplete oxidation. The most common diagnostic forms belonging to this class are the oblique-rimmed bowls - with a thickening more or less marked inside or outside, better known as Hammerhead Bowls - and the large deep carinated bowls, the so-called Casseroles. The study of ceramics found in stratigraphical contexts recently excavated has made it possible to distinguish between two variants for both classes, corresponding roughly to two subsequent phases during LC 3 and LC 4 (Pollock and Coursey 1995: 108-111; Pearce 2000: 116-118).

Regarding the Hammerhead Bowls, two variants have been identified: an ‘early’ form with a simple rim (i.e., the rim is more rounded and less defined compared to the later variant), characterizing LC 3 and probably the first part of the following phase,6 and a ‘mature’ variant with an enhanced rim (i.e., the rim presents a marked thickening both inside and outside) typical of LC 4.7

The same observations are possible for the Casseroles: an ‘early’ variant has been identified on the basis of the simple or slightly thickened rim, characteristic of the LC 3 and the beginning of LC 4,8 and a variant with an enhanced rim (i.e., the rim is significantly thickened) typical of LC 4.9

Other peculiar vessel forms of this assemblage are bowls with simple inverted rim and an almost rounded carination,10 generally in relatively fine ware; jars with internally grooved neck, present during the LC 3 (e.g., Hacınebi A) and then widespread in the following phase;11 and jars with short neck marked with a sharp angle on the interior12 that is also typical in LC 4 but are already recorded in LC 3 and in earlier phases.13

---

6 Attested, for example, at Brak HS1 6 (Felli 2003: fig. 4.17: 12), Leilan V (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 57: 2) and Hacınebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 6: a-b; 7: e).

7 Examples are found at Brak TW 14 (Oates and Oates 1993: fig. 52: 2), Leilan IV (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 52: 7) and Hacınebi B (Pearce 2000: fig. 9: a).

8 As suggested by its presence in the repertoire of Brak HS1 6 (Felli 2003: fig. 4.19: 7), Leilan V (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 59: 5) and Hacınebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 3: d).

9 As demonstrated by the examples at Brak TW 14 (Oates and Oates 1993: fig. 54: 69), Leilan IV (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 54: 2) and Hacınebi B (Pearce 2000: fig. 10: c).

10 Examples of this type are common in the central part of the fourth millennium BCE (LC 3 e LC 4). They appear at Hacınebi A (Pearce 2000: 117; fig. 6: d-e) and Leilan V e IV (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 53: 8, 10, 12; 60: 7). Similar types are also present during the late “Ubaid” period (e.g., Hammam et-Turkman IV - Akkermans 1988b: fig. 7: 90-93) and allow us to consider that their appearance can be dated to the first part of the fourth millennium BCE (i.e., LC 1 and LC 2).

11 This type is recorded both among coarse CFW and fine ware. It is present at Brak TW 16 (Oates and Oates 1993: fig. 51: 19; 53: 57), Leilan V (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 60: 5) and Hacınebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 4: c, f, g), as well as among the material record in the Iraqi Jazirah survey (Wilkinson and Tucker 1995: fig. 66: 10-11) and Hamoukar survey (Ur 2010: fig. B13: 7-9).

12 The inner part of the neck can be straight or concave, whereas the rim is usually thickened, although a wide number of morphological versions are recorded.

13 Documented at Brak HS1 (Felli 2003: fig. 4.20: 1-2, 15, fig. 4.23: 2), Leilan V-IV (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 54: 7, 8; fig. 60: 1-2), Hammam VB (Akkermans 1988b: fig. 10: 156-157) and Habınebi B2 (Pearce 2000: fig. 15: d-e).
Another diagnostic class datable to the LC 3 - probably in its early stage - is a middle-coarse, mainly vegetal-tempered ware with a homogeneously grey and slightly burnished surface, called “Uruk grey” ware. This class defines a pottery horizon recognized first by Gut (1995: 250-251; 292) as “Uruk A” phase, which marks the transition between the LC 2 and the period of larger distribution of the typical CFW assemblage during LC 3 and LC 4. Typical forms are the bowl with a slightly thickened and rounded rim and the hole-mouth jar with a slightly raised rim. The list of diagnostic types proposed by Gut (1995: 250-251; 261-262; 2002: 20) for her “Uruk A” on the basis of the evidence from the central part of the Ninevite 3 sequence is certainly incomplete, because for this phase only a small amount of ceramic was recovered and recorded by the excavators, with the exception of “Uruk grey” ware. Indeed “Uruk A” assemblage should be integrated with many LC 2 forms that were still in use (e.g., WFPs, bowls with internally bevelled rim, jars with internally hollowed rim and double-mouthed jars) and the other new CFW forms not taken into account by Gut. As already mentioned, a CFW assemblage very similar to that of the second part of the LC 3 is in use during the LC 4, although it compares with an increasing number of southern “Middle Uruk” types (e.g., Leilan IV, Hacınebi late B1 and B2). Some forms do not show significant variations compared to the previous ones (i.e., jars with internally grooved neck and jars with short neck marked with a sharp angle on the interior), although they look more typical for this phase, while others appear with their “mature” variants (i.e., Hammerhead Bowls and Casseroles with an enhanced rims).

Phase I pottery assemblage at Hirbemerdon Tepe

The pottery assemblage during Phase I is characterized by the prominent presence of CFW (Pl. CLXXX-VII). The largest part of diagnostic fragments is composed of medium-coarse or coarse ware rich in vegetal inclusions as well as mineral inclusions (i.e., grit, lime and mica) in different quantity and quality. The majority of coarse ware vessels are handmade and present a black cross-section. The surfaces often appear summarily smoothed and, in some cases, traces of scraping, probably made with flint or other sharp tools, are present. Vessels made with medium quality fabrics are often wheel-made or wheel finished and can present burnished or smoothed surfaces. Since the investigated surface and the amount of recovered ceramics is not so wide, it is not surprising that the presence of fine ware classes is low.

Among the recorded open forms are simple rim bowls with a curved profile (Pl. I: 2) and slightly carinated simple rim bowls (Pl. I: 3). These examples are made with medium quality fabrics with vegetal inclusions, although a few mineral and stone inclusions are also present. These types have similarities...
at Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 5: g), Hammam et-Turkman VB (Akkermans 1988a: pl. 104: 79) and Leilan IV (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 53: 3, 7). An additional similarity for the slightly carinated simple rim bowls comes from Pit 203 in Area C01 at Kurban VI (Algaze 1990: pl. 17: g). Bowls with internally bevelled rim (Pl. I: 8) can be compared with findings from Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 2: f-i), Giricano (Schachner 2002: fig. 44: h), Nineveh “Uruk (A)” (Gut 1995: Tafel 54: 810), Grai Resh IIA (Kepinski 2011: 1: 9), Leilan V (Schwartz 1988a: 58: 5-7), Brak CH B 9, 11 & TW (Fielden 1981: fig. 1: 33; Oates 1985: fig. 1: 5), Chagar Bazar (McMahon et al. 2001: fig. 3: i-k) and Hammam et-Turkman VB (Akkermans 1988a: pl. 104: 76-78). These bowls are typical in the LC 2 assemblage, but a large proportion of the examples are characterized by painted horizontal bands around the rim and blobs of paint. Some examples from Hirbemerdon are totally without decoration and realized with vegetal tempered fabrics in different qualities. Another type present at Hirbemerdon is represented by simple flat rim bowls that can be slightly inwardly bevelled (Pl. I: 5), which in the assemblage at Hacinebi A are assimilated to the Hammerhead Bowls type in their “early” variant (Pearce 2000: 117). This type is well-attested, sometimes with slightly different inclinations, at Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 7: f-g), Karatut (Schwartz 1988b: fig. 5: 1), Kurban VI (Algaze 1990: pl. 30: D, F), Grai Resh IIA (Kepinski 2011: 1: 4-6), Leilan V (Schwartz 1988a: 58: 1), Brak CH B & HS1 7-5 (Fielden 1981: fig. 1: 34; Felli 2003: fig. 4.17.3; 4.22.2), Chagar Bazar (McMahon et al. 2001: fig. 5: e; 3: i, m) and in ‘Amuq F (Braidwood and Braidwood 1960: fig. 174: 14). Another set of bowls with inside and/or outside slightly thickened and flattened rims similar to the last type and made with medium-coarse ware, can be considered as part of the wide category of the Hammerhead Bowls. These bowls are present in three groups: the shallow medium-sized Hammerhead Bowls with rounded flat rim (Pl. I: 4), the Hammerhead Bowls with simple flat to slightly rounded flat rim (Pl. I: 6) and the Hammerhead Bowls with in-turned thickened bevelled rim (Pl. I: 7). Bowls of the first group are recorded at Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 5: d), Kurban VI A-B (Algaze 1990: pl. 30: G), Nineveh -38 e -36 (Gut 1995: Tafel 57: 848, 850; 122: 1490 - Uruk Grau), Leilan V-IV (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 52: 13; fig. 58: 2), Brak HS1 4-3 (Felli 2003: fig. 4.24.20) and Chagar Bazar (McMahon et al. 2001: fig. 5: e). Bowls of the second group are present at Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 7: g, i), Karatut (Schwartz 1988b: fig. 5: 2), Kurban VI (Algaze 1990: pl. 22: H), Brak HS1 7-6/1 (Felli 2003: fig. 4.17.14; 4.21.16) and in ‘Amuq F (Braidwood and Braidwood 1960: fig. 174: 14). The last group of bowls has been recorded at Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 6: c; 7: i), Karatut (Schwartz 1988b: 5: 8), Kurban VI (Algaze 1990: pl. 17: J; 21: B), Nineveh (~63 Uruk) (Gut 1995: Tafel 119: S458), Leilan IV (Schwartz 1988a: 52: 11) and Brak HS1 5 (Felli 2003: fig. 4.22.8).

Among the bowls two small types can also be distinguished and are characterized by a medium-fine ware with a well mashed vegetal inclusions, tiny particles of lime and mica: a small shallow simple rim bowl (Pl. II: 11) and a small sinuous-sided bowl (Pl. II: 10). A comparison for this last type comes from Kurban VI (Algaze 1990: pl. 17: B). Regarding the open forms, simple rim dishes or simple rim shallow bowls are also recorded, made with different kinds of fabrics (Pl. I: 1; pl. II: 9), comparable with those from Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 2: b - c) and Kurban VI (Algaze 1990: pl. 17: c). Beakers are not so common. The only type identified, documented by two complete samples, is characterized by an S profile with a simple rim and a flat base (Pl. II: 12-13). This type can be accurately compared with a beaker from Giricano (Schachner 2002: fig. 45: j).

Among the closed forms, jars with an everted short neck and a simple rim are well attested. Unfortunately, samples with a complete profile have not been found, but rather many fragments of rounded carinated walls that allow for a comparison with the so-called Casseroles, particularly the type characterized by the internal junction with a bevelled angle (Pl. III: 18; pl. IV: 24; pl. V: 27). These samples can be compared with similar findings from many sites of the region, such as Giricano (Schachner 2002b: fig. 45: b), Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 3: b), Kurban VIA (Algaze 1990: pl. 25: I) and Brak HS1 6 (Felli 2003: fig. 4.20.14). A variation of this type presents an internal rounded junction and a slightly thinned rim (Pl. III: 19; pl. IV: 23; pl. V: 28-30, 32) and can be compared with samples from Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 3: d), Kurban VIA-B (Algaze 1990: pl. 36: G) and Hammam et-Turkman VB (Akkermans 1988a: fig. 108: 109). A sample of this type is the cannon-spouted jar with everted short neck and simple rim (Pl. VII: 43). Among the closed forms, other attested types are the jars with everted short necks with medium width mouth, sloping shoulder, and simple rim (Pl. III: 20; pl. IV: 21).
or flattened rim (Pl. VII: 40-41), that can be compared with samples from Kurban VI Pit 203 & VIA-B (Algaze 1990: pl. 18: E, H; 36: E) and Hammam et-Turkman VA (Akermans 1988a: fig. 103: 67). Among the jars with short necks and wide mouths there is also a characteristic storage jar with internal corrugations low on the interior of the neck (Pl. VII: 39). This type is recorded at Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 4: f), Leilan V (Schwartz 1988a: fig. 60: 5), Brak CH B, CH 10 & HS1 6 (Fielden 1981: fig. 2: 13-14; Oates J. 1985: fig. 1: 13; Felli 2003: fig. 4.20.16), Chagar Bazar (McMahon et al. 2001: fig. 5: k) and in ‘Amuq F (Braidwood and Braidwood 1960: fig. 176: 13). Among the jars with slightly everted short necks there is also a sample with narrow mouths and wide shoulder (Pl. VII: 44) that can be compared with the only other example from Kurban VI (Algaze 1990: pl. 39: A). The hole-mouth jars are represented by a single sample with a slightly raised rim characterized by a rather coarse grey fabric and a burnished surface, probably in “Uruk grey” ware (Pl. VIII: 49). A similar type is recorded from Hammam et-Turkman VB (Akermans 1988a: pl. 107: 101) and Nineveh Middle Ninevite 3 (Gut 2002: fig. 15: 9). Wide-short-necked jars with an internally angled and tapered rim (Pl. III: 17) are also present at Hirbemerdon Tepe and can be compared with those samples from Gericano (Schachner 2002b: fig. 45: c), Kurban VIA (Algaze 1990: pl. 25: F) and Hammam VB (Akermans 1988a: pl. 110: 123-124). The medium sized wide-necked jars with a short straight collar are a widely common type and recorded in three different variations: with a simple rim (Pl. III: 16; pl. VI: 33-34), with a flattened rim (Pl. II: 14; pl. V: 15; pl. IV: 22; pl. VI: 36) and with a flattened and slightly thickened rim on the outside (Pl. VI: 35, 37). These types can be compared with samples from the assemblages of Hacinebi A (Pearce 2000: fig. 3: c), Kurban Pit 203 & VIA-B (Algaze 1990: pl. 18: B, F-H; 36: I), Brak HS1 6 (Felli 2003: fig. 4.20.11) and Hammam et-Turkman VB (Akermans 1988a: fig. 110: 125). Similar to this type is the jar with a slightly everted neck, simple or flattened rim and a medium width mouth (Pl. IV: 25; pl. V: 26, 31; pl. VII: 42; pl. VIII: 45) comparable with findings from Gericano (Schachner 2002b: fig. 45: d), Kurban Pit 203 & VIA-B (Algaze 1990: pl. 18: E; 37: H), Brak HS1 6 (Felli 2003: fig. 4.20.7) and Hammam et-Turkman VB (Akermans 1988a: fig. 110: 126). A single example of a jar with a wide mouth, with an outwardly thickened and flattened rim and a sloping shoulder (Pl. VI: 38) can be compared with a finding from Hammam et-Turkman VB (Akermans 1988a: fig. 110: 123). Also attested by a single example is an irregularly shaped small basin with a simple rim, slightly inverted walls, a rounded carination and a flat base (Pl. VIII: 46). A particular type recorded at Hirbemerdon is a large tray with straight wall and a series of holes along the edge (Pl. VIII: 47). The shape is irregular and presents at least one side opening. The fabric contains chaff, mica, grits and small pebbles; this coarse ware is very irregular on the surface. This type can be assimilated to the mangals, a sort of brazier, widespread in the Late Chalcolithic sites of Transcaucasia (Gülçür and Marro 2012: 319). Another type consists of a sort of support with a vertical wall and at least one hole (Pl. VIII: 48), that can belong to the same category.

These materials from Hirbemerdon Tepe are a new corpus that enriches the ceramic types of the upper Tigris river region, and generally the knowledge of the Late Chalcolithic in the northern part of the

21 The discussion on the real use for these vessels is still ongoing. The perforation could be interpreted as holes made in order to fix a sort of a metallic grid or spit, but as already said there is no consensus among scholars about their use in direct contact with fire.

22 See the similarities with the sample from Ovçular (Gülçür and Marro 2012: fig. 11: 4).

23 Nowadays evidences ascribable to the Late Chalcolithic are quite numerous in the area of Ilisu Dam Reservoir. At Gericano the “Uruk grey” ware of the early part of the LC 3 is recorded (Schachner 2002b: 54), while at Kuriki and Kenan other contexts with similar indigenous repertoires, partially slightly later, are attested. At Kuriki pottery from the level IVB with its phases (IVB1, IVB2, IVB3, IVB4) in Area A, and probably from Level IV in Area B, roughly corresponds to the assemblage from Hirbemerdon, especially for the presence of the CFW and its characteristic diagnostic forms (Genç, Valentini and D’Agostino 2012: 469-471; Valentini 2012: 283). Kenan has instead provided a longer sequence. The Late Chalcolithic materials, found in different areas of the site, including hammerhead bowls and casseroles, has been variously dated between the second part of the LC 3 or LC 4 and the beginning of the LC 5 (Creekmore 2007: 95-96; Parker et al. 2008: 104; Parker and Foster 2009: 525-526, 530-531; fig. 6). Other sites such as Kavaşan (Koşbe, Körüğlu and Sağlamtümur 2004: 499-500; fig. 17) and Salaf (Ökse et al.)
“Greater Mesopotamia”. While the archaeological evidence is not so large in terms of excavated surfaces and associated ceramic materials, we can guess that the site was part of a regional system composed mainly by small rural settlements located near the course of the Tigris river and its tributaries. Although it is complicated assigning an assemblage to a precise phase when “Uruk” tradition artefacts - that are a good guarantee for dating - are not present, the close similarity with numerous assemblages of the Syrian-Iraqi Jazirah and southeastern Anatolia allows us to consider a dating for these materials and their location in a wider regional pattern (Tab. 3). The recorded diagnostic types - such as Hammerhead Bowls and Casseroles in their earliest variations, and jars with an everted internally grooved neck - match with the LC 3 assemblage. The presence of some bowls with internally bevelled rim and of the “Uruk grey” ware, and at the same time the absence of any southern “Uruk” material, causes us to lean towards a possible dating in the earliest part of LC 3 that corresponds to the period before the first contacts between the upper Tigris region and “Uruk” southern Mesopotamia.

2001: 623-637; fig. 8-9; Ökse and Görmüş 2013b: 135-136) have partly contemporary assemblages. Further downstream, along a tributary of the Tigris river, Başur has shown an abundant repertoire in CFW characterized by hammerhead bowls and casseroles (Sağlamtimur and Kalkan 2015: 60-61; fig. 6-8). Further south, in the plain area of Cizre-Silopi, a number of sites has provided Late Chalcolithic materials marked by the typical CFW repertoire (Algaze, Hammer and Parker 2012. 19-21; fig. 19: 5-9, 11-15).
### Upper Tigris River Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gut 1995</td>
<td>Post-Ubaid</td>
<td>“Gawra A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girica</td>
<td>“Gawra B”</td>
<td>“Uruk A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenan Tepe</td>
<td>“Uruk B”</td>
<td>“Uruk C”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South-eastern Anatolia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sakçe Gözü</td>
<td>IVa-b</td>
<td>IVc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassek Höyük</td>
<td>V ?</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaasüt Mevkii</td>
<td>VIB</td>
<td>VIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayaz Höyük</td>
<td>VIA</td>
<td>XXVII-XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsat</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B1 → B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arslantepe</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>← VII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Upper Euphrates River Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neşuntepe WH</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korucutepe</td>
<td>14-</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepecik</td>
<td>←</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tülintepe</td>
<td>←</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatmalı Kalecik</td>
<td>←</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çayboyu</td>
<td>←</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Northern Iraq

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tepe Gawra</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>XIA/XA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninive</td>
<td>X-IX</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpachiya</td>
<td>MM -59/-50</td>
<td>MM -45/-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qalinj/Agha</td>
<td>V-V</td>
<td>IV-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorgan Tepe</td>
<td>X ?</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 – Chronological sequence of the LC sites in northern Mesopotamia, southeastern Anatolia and Syria.
Hirbemerdon Tepe
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CATALOGUE
FIGURES
Architecture
Phases I, IIa, IIb, IIIa

6.1 — Ph. I pit with *in situ* material culture (Area B) viewed from east.
I. Pottery
**Notes to the Pottery Catalogue**

*Abbreviations used in the description of pottery:*

**Nr.**: Sherd number to identify drawing in plate;  
**HM no.**: Hirbemerdon Tepe inventory number;  
**Ware**: Pottery category;  
**Color**: Reference to the Munsell Soil Colour Charts 2000;  
**Fabric**: Lists sequence of inclusions from highest to lowest density.  

*Definition of pottery categories listed following HM chronological phases:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFW</td>
<td>Chaff-Faced Ware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase II A-B</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBW</td>
<td>Buff Burnished Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMW</td>
<td>Common Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Cooking Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td>Fine Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>Fingernail Incised Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>Karaz Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Metallic Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ninivite 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBW</td>
<td>Red Burnished Ware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase III A</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBW</td>
<td>Buff Burnished Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Cooking Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROB</td>
<td>Dark Rimmed Orange Bowls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td>Fine Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>Karaz Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWW</td>
<td>Red Brown Wash Ware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase III B</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMW</td>
<td>Common Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Cooking Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Gray Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>Khabur Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPW</td>
<td>Band Painted Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBWW</td>
<td>Red Brown Wash Ware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase III C</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBW</td>
<td>Buff Burnished Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMW</td>
<td>Common Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Cooking Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LKW</td>
<td>Late Khabur Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Nuzi Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>White Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB</td>
<td>Red Edged Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPW</td>
<td>Brown/Pink Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Cooking Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRW</td>
<td>Grooved Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Plain Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMW</td>
<td>Common Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLW</td>
<td>Glazed Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IW</td>
<td>Incised Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAW</td>
<td>Painted Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIW</td>
<td>Combed Incised Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COW</td>
<td>Common Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRW</td>
<td>Cream Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLW</td>
<td>Glazed Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenW</td>
<td>Green Common Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>HM no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>HM no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>HM no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>6672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II. Objects
Abbreviations used in the description of objects

Nr.: Object number to identify object in plate;
HM no.: Hirbemerdon Tepe inventory number;
Color: Reference to the Munsell Soil Colour Charts 2000. The full code is not listed;
Measures: Ht (height); Lg (length); Th (thickness); Wh (weight); D1 (diameter 1); D2 (diameter 2).

N.B. Due to lack of space, only object drawings are published when available, except for the most important Ph. III B ritual paraphernalia (i.e. 149, 187, 188, 191, 193), which include both photographs and drawings.

Photographs and drawings can be found in the online catalog.
## Phase I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>HM no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Ht</th>
<th>Lg</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>Wh</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>flint</td>
<td>light brown</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>flint</td>
<td>light brown</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>flint</td>
<td>light brown</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>flint</td>
<td>light brown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3027</td>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>basalt</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,7</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>Elliptical in shape. Mod-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>erately worn. Complete.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Ceramic typologies
Plate CLXXXVII

Phase I

Ware: CFW
Ware: CFW