Mesopotamian Environmental Archaeology Database: phase I Iraq

M. Charles¹ and K. Dobney²

¹Department of Archaeology, University of Sheffield, Northgate House, West St. Sheffield S1 4ET ² Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, South Road, Durham, DH1 3 LE.

Introduction

The aim of the project is to produce an updateable electronic database of environmental archaeological (animal bone and plant remains) evidence for all archaeological sites in Iraq that have yielded such material. The database is a flexible and easily accessible resource which those working in the field can both use and contribute to as and when more data become available.

The project was divided into two phases (see below) and funding for the first phase, which is reported on here, has been provided by the British School of Archaeology in Iraq:

- Phase 1 is an updateable electronic database, available via the Web, of environmental archaeological evidence recorded in a semi-quantitative format (presence) from sites in Iraq.
- Phase 2 will add quantitative data for each site on a sample-by-sample basis and will assess the environmental archaeological record for Iraq in the light of recent developments in the fields of archaeobotany and archaeozoology.

<u>Phase 1. Preliminary database of environmental archaeological remains recovered from sites in Iraq</u> for all periods

Background to the project

Systematic recovery of environmental remains from archaeological sites in Iraq become a regular, though not uniform, component of archaeological excavation by the end of the 20th century. With the cessation of new excavation much of that material has now been analysed at least in a preliminary fashion. With the development of new techniques to address basic archaeological questions it is appropriate to produce a record of the work that has already been carried out and to assess work that has been undertaken in the fields of environmental archaeology and palaeoeconomy in the region, to make these data available to a wider audience and to suggest research priorities for the future.

Existing data reviews of archaeozoology for the Near East include Uerpmann (1986), Hours *et. al.* (1994 referred to here as ASPRO) and Anastasio (1995). They are limited, however, by their extent of recording (i.e. Hours *et. al.* and Anastasio *loc. cit.*) or by their specificity (e.g. Uerpmann *loc. cit.*, with data relating only to the presence of wild ungulates). To date, the main synthetic archaeobotanical review of data for the Near East has dealt only with the major crop plants for a limited number of sites (Miller 1991). Miller also maintains a bibliography of site reports on her web-site (Miller website) but does not present any data. Although useful pieces of work, none of the reviews mentioned have been produced with a view to data manipulationation or to updating as new sites, assemblages and data become available. Such a publication lends itself to presentation in electronic format, where datasets can be queried in a wide range of forms and distribution maps created depending on the requirements of the user. For an example of such an interactive use of environmental data, see Tomlinson and Hall (1996).

The phase of the database presented here is based on a review of published data and includes essential details of sites and their archaeobotanical and archaeozoological assemblages recorded in a semi-quantitative manner (the presence of major categories of remain) by period. The following sections provide keys to the data table contained in the database

MEAD Phase1 Explanation and keys to archaeobotanical tables

Description of tables

1) Site location

The name (ancient and modern) and geographic position (latitude and longitude) are given for the sites recorded in the database. Where available site name and its map reference have been taken from Roaf (1996)¹. Where these details are not available the information has been garnered from a range of sources including the original publication, other encyclopaedias etc. These sources are indicated in the table.

Key to site location - data contained in the site location table

column heading	explanation
site code	A 4 letter site code based on the first letters of the main part of the modern name. Generic prefixes such as, Abu, Tell and Umm have been left out. The exceptions to this occur where: - the main name is less than 4 letters long - in these cases the first letter of the preceding prefix is added at the beginning of the code (e.g. Tell ed-der becomes EDER) - sites have the same name – here a suffix has been added to separate the sites (e.g. Yar1 and Yar2 for Yarym Tepe I and II).
modern site name (following Roaf 1996)	commonly used modern name formatted after Roaf (1996) i.e. Pre-fix 1, Pre-fix 2, Main name.
modern site name (following ASPRO 1994)	commonly used modern name formatted after ASPRO (1994) i.e. Main name, Pre-fix1, Pre-fix 2.
ancient site name (following Postgate 1992)	commonly used ancient name based on Postgate (1992).
Name used in original report	the site name used for in the original report.
latitude and longitude	grid map references of the site (latitude and longitude).
map ref source	 source of map reference: Roaf = Roaf (1996) Postgate = Postgate (web site 2003) site = site report site estimate = site location based on estimates from maps.
biblio code	references related to site i.e. author name and suffix, year.

¹Tell Bazmosian, as named in the database, seems to equate to Bazmusiyan in Roaf (1996).

2) Bibliography

This table contains archaeobotanical reports used to generate the scores section of the database

Key to bibliography table - reference details for reports used in the plant database

column heading	explanation
biblio code	as in Table 1

full reference	full reference for report	
site code	as in Table 1	

3) Chronology

Each record in the database has been given an amalgamated period code. This is based on the dates used in the original report have been converted into an eleven point scale extending from 14,000 BC to AD 1900. The principal sources for the dates and names of the chronological periods are Postgate (1992) and ASPRO (1994), other sources used include Anonymous (1987) and Leick (1999).

Key to chronology - list of chronological periods used in the database

BC calib	Period name and dates	
14000 12000	Goometrie Vaheren, Moschahien, Zerzien	
	Geometric Kebaran, Moschabian - Zarzian	
12000-10200	Natufian, Late Zarzian	
10200-8800	Proto-Neolithic, Pre-Pottery Neolithic A (PPNA) - Khiamian, Sultanian - Harifian	
8800-7600	Early and Middle Pre-Pottery Neolithic B (PPNB)	
7600-6900	Late PPNB	
6900-6400	DFBW, Catal Huyuk, Umm Dabaghiyah, Sotto - Obeid 0	
6400-5800	Hassuna, Samarra - Halaf, Obeid 1	
5800-5400	Pottery Neolithic A (PNA) - Late Halaf, Obeid 2	
5400-5000	Pottery Neolithic B (PNB) - Obeid3	
5000-4500	Obeid 4; Ubaid	
4500-4000	Ubaid	
4000-3200	Uruk	
3200-3000	Jemdet Nasr	
3000-2750	Early Dynastic I	
2750-2600	Early Dynastic II	
2600-2350	Early Dynastic III	
2350-2150	Akkadian	
2150-2000	Ur III	
2000-1800	Isin Larsa	
1800-1600	Old Babylonian	
1600-1155	Kassite/Middle Babylonian/Middle Assyrian	
1000- AD 600	Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian/Parthian/Sasanian	
AD 7th-19 th cent	Islamic (600-1900 A.D.)	
	14000-12000 12000-10200 10200-8800 8800-7600 7600-6900 6900-6400 6400-5800 5800-5400 5400-5000 4500-4500 4500-4000 4000-3200 3200-3000 3000-2750 2750-2600 2600-2350 2350-2150 2150-2000 2000-1800 1800-1600 1600-1155 1000- AD 600	

4) Site scores - archaeobotany

Phase 1 of the database includes macro-fossil plant remains of fruits, seeds, grain and chaff. The commonest form of preservation of these remains in Iraq is by charring, though there was a substantial amount of early research by Hans Helbaek on the impressions of these remains preserved in pottery (Jacobsen, 1982). The plant remains have, for the 1st phase of the database, been grouped into broad categories (e.g. barley grain, barley rachis etc.). The presence of these categories is given by site, period and preservation type.

Phase 2 will involve a re-appraisal of the original identifications in the light of subsequent archaeobotanical work. It will also include other types of plant remain such as wood charcoal and pollen.

Key to site scores:

a. site and sample details

column heading	explanation	
site code	as above.	
biblio code	references related to site i.e. author name and suffix, year.	
amal per	amalgamation period - period assigned to samples based on ASPRO (1994).	
presv	preservation - type of preservation of plant material cpr = charred plant remains cpr/p = charred plant remains in plaster imp/p = imprint in pottery imp/m = imprint in mud.	
no. samp	total number of samples (per site/period/preservation type).	
divrs	number of categories of plant remain (per site/period/preservation type).	

b. categories of plant remain recorded

categories of plant remain	category in full	latin name (where appropriate)
cereal chaff		
barley rachis	barley rachis internode	Hordeum sativum
culm nodes	culm nodes	
f-t wheat rachis	free-threshing wheat rachis internode	Triticum aestivum/durum
gw glume bases	glume-wheat glume bases	Triticum monococcum/dicoccum /spelta
wheat indet rachis	wheat indeterminate rachis	Triticum sp.
cereal grain		
cereal indet grain	cereal indeterminate grain	
barley grain	barley grain	Hordeum sativum
f-t wheat grain	free-threshing wheat grain	Triticum aestivum/durum
gw grain	glume-wheat grain	Triticum monococcum/dicoccum /spelta
millet	millet	Panicum sp.
oat grain	oat grain	Avena sp.
wheat indet grain	wheat indeterminate grain	Triticum sp.

wild einkorn	wild einkorn	Triticum boeoticum
oil/nut & fruit		
caper	caper	Capparis spinosa
cucumber	cucumber	Cucumis sp.
date	date	Phoenix sp.
fig	fig	Ficus carica
grape	grape	Vitis sp.
hazelnut	hazelnut	Corylus sp.
olive	olive	Olea sp.
pear	pear	Pyrus sp.
pistachio	pistachio	Pistacia sp.
pomegranate	pomegranate	Punica sp.
flax/linseed	flax/linseed	Linum sp.
sesame	sesame	Sesamum sp.
pulses		
bitter vetch	bitter vetch	Vicia ervilia
celtic bean	celtic bean	Vicia faba
chickpea	chickpea	Cicer sp.
common pea	common pea	Pisum sp.
grass pea	grass pea	Lathryus sativus
lentil	lentil	Lens culinaris
other		
coriander	coriander	Coriandrum sp.
cumin	cumin	Cuminum cyminum
wild/weed	wild/weed	

Bibliography

- Anastasio, S. 1995. The archaeology of upper Mesopotamia: An analytical bibliography for the pre-. classical periods. (Subartu 1). Brepols
- Anonymous 1987. Excavations in Iraq, 1985-86. Iraq 49, 231-51.
- Hours, F., Aurenche, O., Cauvin, J., Cauvin, M.-C., Copeland, L. and Sanlaville, P. 1994. *Atlas des sites du Proche-Orient (14000-5700 BP)*. Vol. 24. *Travaux de la maison de l'Orient Méditerrannéen*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerrannéen.
- Jacobsen, T. 1982. Salinity and irrigation agriculture in antiquity: Diyala Basin archaeological projects: reports on essential results 1957-58. (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica, 14). Malibu: Undena.
- Leick, G. 1999. Who's who in the ancient Near East. Routledge, London
- Miller, N. 1991. The Near East. In *Progress in Old World Palaeoethnobotany*, Van Zeist, Wasylikowa and Behre (eds.). Balkema, Rotterdam pp. 133-61.
- Miller, N. website. http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~nmiller0/iraq.html
- Postgate, J. N. 1992. *Early Mesopotamia: society and economy at the dawn of history.* Routledge, London.
- Postgate, J. N. P. 2003 website http://users.ox.ac.uk/~wolf0126/
- Roaf, M. 1996. *Cultural atlas of Mesopotamia and the ancient Near East*. Andromeda Oxford Limited, Abingdon.
- Tomlinson, P. And Hall A. H. 1996. A review of the archaeological evidence for food plants from the British Isles: an example of the use of the Archaeobotanical Computer Database (ABCD). Internet Archaeology 1 (http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue1/tomlinson_toc.html).
- Uerpmann, H.P. 1987. *The Ancient Distribution of Ungulate Mammals in the Middle East* (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients: Reihe A (Naturwissenschaften) No. **27**). Wiesbaden: Dr.Ludwig Reichert Verlag.