The Birth of the Gods and the Origins of Agriculture

Jacques Cauvin has worked on the beginnings of the Neolithic in the Near East for twenty years, excavating key sites and developing new ideas to explain the hugely significant cultural, social and economic changes involved in the transformation of mobile hunter-gatherers into the first village societies and farmers in the world. This book is the confident synthesis of his mature understanding of the process that began around 14,000 years ago. Cauvin challenges the ecological and materialist interpretations, and argues for a quite different kind of understanding that is influenced by the ideas of structuralist archaeologists such as André Leroi-Gourhan and members of the French Annales school of historians. He defines the Neolithic Revolution as essentially a restructuring of the human mentality that is expressed in terms of new religious ideas and symbols. The survey ends around 9,000 years ago, when the developed religious ideology, the social practice of village life and the economy of mixed farming had become established throughout the Near East and east Mediterranean, and was already spreading powerfully into Europe.

Jacques Cauvin is Directeur de Recherches émérite of the CNRS. He is the founder of a CNRS-funded multidisciplinary research team that has worked at the Institut de Préhistoire Orientale at Jalâs for more than twenty years on the beginnings of sedentary village life and the origins of farming in the Near East.
JACQUES CAUVIN

The Birth of the Gods and the Origins of Agriculture

Translated by

TREVOR WATKINS
CONTENTS

List of plates vii
List of figures viii
Translator’s note xi
Foreword to the second French edition xiii
Foreword to the English edition xiv
Preface xv
Chronological table xvii

Introduction 1

Part I  THE ORIGINS OF AGRICULTURE 9
1 Natural environment and human cultures on the eve of the Neolithic 11
2 The first pre-agricultural villages: the Natufian 15
3 The Revolution in Symbols and the origins of Neolithic religion 22
4 The first farmers: the socio-cultural context 34
5 The first farmers: strategies of subsistence 51
6 Agriculture, population, society: an assessment 62
7 The Neolithic Revolution: a transformation of the mind 67

Part II  THE BEGINNINGS OF NEOLITHIC DIFFUSION 73
8 A geographical and chronological framework for the first stages of diffusion 75
9 The birth of a culture in the northern Levant and the neolithisation of Anatolia 78
10 Diffusion into the central and southern Levant 96
11 The evidence of symbolism in the southern Levant 105
12 The dynamics of a dominant culture 121
Contents vi

Part III THE GREAT EXODUS 135

13 The problem of diffusion in the Neolithic 137
14 The completion of the neolithic process in the ‘Levantine nucleus’ 143
15 The arrival of farmers on the Mediterranean littoral and in Cyprus 154
16 The sedentary peoples push east: the eastern Jezirah and the Syrian desert 171
17 Pastoral nomadism 189
18 Hypotheses for the spread of the Neolithic 199
Conclusion 207
Postscript 212

Notes 221
Bibliography 239
Index 255
PLATES

between pages 72 and 73

I  1 Natufian round house from Eynan-Mallaha, Israel. © Centre de recherche français de Jérusalem.  
   2 and 3 House and sanctuary at Nevali Çori, Turkey, PPNB. Photograph M. Schaeffer, with permission of H. Hauptmann.  
II 4 and 5 Polished stone vases of the PPNB at Cafer Höyük, Turkey. Malatya Museum. Photograph B. Bireaud, French archaeological mission at Cafer Höyük.  
III 6 Limestone bas-relief with three human figures, PPNB, Nevali Çori, Turkey. Urfa Museum. Photograph M. Schaeffer, with permission of H. Hauptmann.  
   7 An area at Khirokitia, Cyprus: at the centre, an access stair zig-zags up the face of the rampart. Photograph French archaeological mission at Khirokitia.  
VII 13 Skull coated with bitumen, PPNB, Nahal Hemar, Israel. Israel Museum, Jerusalem. Photograph N. Slapak, with permission of O. Bar-Yosef. Rights reserved.  
   15 Painted stone mask, PPNB, Nahal Hemar, Israel. Israel Museum, Jerusalem. Photograph N. Slapak, with permission of O. Bar-Yosef. Rights reserved.  
VIII 16 Hare and hedgehog in polished stone, final PPNB, Bouqras, Syria. Deir-ez-Zor. Photographs T. Waterbolk and M. van Loon, with permission of M. van Loon.
FIGURES

1 Maps of the present distribution of wild cereals. 6
2 Map of Natufian sites, 12,500–10,000 BC, 12,000–10,300 BP. 16
3 Art objects of the early Natufian in the southern Levant representing small ruminants. 18
4 Map of Khiamian sites with female and bull figurines, 10,000–9500 BC, 10,300–10,000 BP. 23
5 Khiamian industry from Mureybet (Syria). 24
6 Stone statuettes of the Khiamian culture from the tenth millennium BC. 26
7 Female statuettes in stone from the early Mureybetian period (Syria, end of the tenth millennium BC). 27
8 Female figurines in baked clay from the early Mureybetian period (Syria, end of the tenth millennium BC). 28
9 The mother goddess of Çatalhöyük (Turkey, seventh millennium BC). 30
10 Painted fresco from Çatalhöyük: bull and armed men (Turkey, seventh millennium BC). 31
11 Map of villages mentioned in the text belonging to the PPNA period, 9500–8300 BC, 10,000–9600 BP. 35
12 Sultanian industry (southern Levant, ninth millennium BC). 37
13 Schematic female figurine in baked clay from the Sultanian period at Netiv Hagdud (Israel), ninth millennium BC. 38
14 Aswadian flint industry (Damascus region, Syria, ninth millennium BC). 40
15 Isometric view and reconstruction of House XLVII from Mureybet III (Phase III A, Mureybetian, Syria). 42
16 The first rectangular structures on the middle Euphrates in the ninth millennium BC. 43
17 Flint weapons from Mureybet of the Mureybetian phase. 45
18 Objects of lightly baked clay for Mureybetian date. 46
19 Engraved signs and figures of Mureybetian date from Jerf el Ahmar. 47
20 Symbolic objects made in stone in the tradition of the Middle Euphrates. 49
21 Diagrammatic drawing of an ear of wild wheat. 53
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Praying figures from the Saharan Neolithic.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Map of villages referred to in the text, belonging to the early and middle PPNB, 8700–7500 BC, 9600–8600 BP.</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Weapons of early PPNB date from Mureybet.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Weapons of early PPNB date from Mureybet.</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Weapons from the PPNB of the Taurus.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Weapons from Nevali Çori (Turkey) of PPNB date.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Architecture from the PPNB of the Taurus.</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bone needles with eyes formed by incisions, in the middle Euphrates tradition.</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Taurus PPNB ‘Çayönü tools’.</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Two techniques for removing blades.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>PPNB figurines and pendant.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The diffusion of obsidian in the Near East between 14,000 and 7000 BC.</td>
<td>94–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>PPNB architecture from the southern Levant.</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Round houses of the basal PPNB level at Beidha (Jordan).</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Middle PPNB weapons from the southern Levant.</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Baked clay figurines from the southern Levant.</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Baked clay figurines of cattle from the southern Levantine PPNB.</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>South Levantine PPNB heads in bone and clay.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Plaster statues of the middle PPNB in the southern Levant.</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The pit of statues from the middle PPNB at ‘Ain Ghazal.</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Plaster statuette and skulls with modelled features from Ramad (Syria).</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Anthropomorphic deity mounted on a bull.</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Geometrical objects of Neolithic date.</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Map of late PPNB sites, differentiating nomadic sites (7500–7000 BC, 8600–8000 BP).</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Late PPNB weapons from Ramad (Syria).</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Late PPNB tools from Ramad (Syria).</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Late PPNB art from Ramad (Syria).</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Late PPNB house from Abu Hureyra (Syria).</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Map of final PPNB and pottery Hureyya sites in the Near East (7000–6300 BC, 8000–7600 BP), differentiating nomadic sites.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Flint arrow-heads from the ‘Early Neolithic’ of Byblos (Lebanon, seventh millennium BC).</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Flint daggers from the ‘Early Neolithic’ of Byblos (Lebanon).</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of figures

53 Ceremonial (?) axe in basalt from the ‘Early Neolithic’ of Byblos (Lebanon). 160
54 Examples of agglutinative architecture from central Anatolia. 163
55 Map of Neolithic sites in Cyprus in the seventh millennium BC. 166
56 Stone anthropomorphic figurines from Khirokitia (Cyprus). 168
57 Map of sites mentioned in the text from the Sinjar region of upper Mesopotamia. 172
58 Heads of raptors in stone from Nemrik (Sinjar, Iraq). 174
59 Chipped stone from Maghzaliyeh (Sinjar, late PPNB). 175
60 Late PPNB houses from Bouqras (Syria). 177
61 Polished stone vessels from the late and final PPNB periods in semi-arid Syria. 179
62 Isometric view and reconstruction view of a house of final PPNB date from El Kowm (Syrian desert). 181
63 Bull representations in bone from Bouqras (late PPNB, Syria). 184
64 Relief decoration on pottery from northern Iraq (seventh millennium BC). 185
65 Art of the seventh millennium BC in the arid zone. 186
66 Animals in polished stone from the semi-arid zone in Syria. 187
67 Tent enclosure used by contemporary nomads in the southern Sinai; stone structures used by Neolithic nomads from the Wadi Tbeik. 191
68 Weapons and tools from the nomadic final PPNB of Qdeir (Syria). 195
69 The Mureybetian architecture from one of the strata at Jerf el Ahmar. 213
70 Sculptured pillars of stone from Göbekli Tepe. 218
TRANSLATOR’S NOTE

The purpose of this English language edition of Jacques Cauvin’s book is to make it accessible to a wider international readership. While many of us will read an article or a short report in a language that is not our own, most of us, I am sure, balk at reading a whole book. I have known the work of Jacques Cauvin for a long time. I have been interested in very much the same field of research for many years, and it has been a pleasure and a gesture of homage to translate his important book. Jacques Cauvin’s work is always original, based on a vast knowledge, deeply thought, deeply felt and passionately written.

Which is better? To have a translation that is professionally done by someone who does not know the author’s subject at all intimately, or one that is written by an amateur translator who is fairly conversant with the sites, the technical literature, the ideas and the arguments? This translation is the latter. And since Jacques’ book is centrally concerned with a rereading of a great deal of detailed information in order to criticise many of the ideas of the rest of us and propose a case for some very individual ideas of his own, it seems to me to make sense that the translator should be sensitive to what the author is thinking and talking about, as much as the specific words that he uses.

I had the very great advantage of being able to discuss this translation with Darren Noyes, whose knowledge of French is much greater than mine will ever be. And finally, in a return visit to the Institut de Préhistoire Orientale at Jâlès in Ardèche, I was able to work through the translation with Jacques Cauvin himself, making final corrections, adjustments and additions to ensure that the text is exactly as he would wish it to be. Where the English translation departs from the French edition for the sake of clarity and readability in English, the reader can be assured that the author has read the translation with meticulous care and approved. He has also saved the translator from a number of errors and infelicities. I was particularly keen that Jacques should have the opportunity to take note of new information and important publications that had come into print since he revised the French edition (completed in 1996). Some of these new references and further pieces of relevant information have been put into place in the text. And Jacques has also added a Postscript (completed 13 November 1998) which summarises further considerations that have arisen since the French original was published.

The only liberties I have taken have been to substitute spellings for site names more usually seen in English language books than some of the francophone renderings of Arabic, and, very occasionally, to use an equivalent term rather than a literal
Translator's note

translation. There are many places in the text, where, as an archaeologist, I would have wanted to put things differently, but that amounts to taking a different view from Jacques Cauvin, which is not the translator’s job. I have also added a small number of references to publications more recent than the second French edition, where authors cited by Jacques Cauvin have published more up-to-date information or advances on the account of their own views.

One or two words in Jacques Cauvin’s vocabulary deserve comment. He uses the word neolithisation frequently to mean the process of becoming Neolithic, essentially beginning to cultivate crops and to herd animals, and the term ‘neolithisation’ is the practically unpronounceable English equivalent. Because Cauvin defines the Neolithic in terms of subsistence strategy, he is left with a period which is neither Palaeolithic (or Epi-palaeolithic for the last millennia of the Palaeolithic) nor yet Neolithic, because the Palaeolithic conventionally ends in step with the geological Pleistocene period. He therefore uses the term Mesolithic, as it is used in Britain and Europe, for the pre-agricultural times at the beginning of the Holocene period. Others use the term Mesolithic for the final millennia of the Pleistocene, because they consider the cultures equivalent to the European Mesolithic cultures of the early Holocene, but Cauvin observes the more usual convention of labelling these final Palaeolithic cultures Epi-palaeolithic. I have also chosen to use the spelling Çatalhöyük, the form preferred in Turkey and in use by the new Çatalhöyük Research Project, for the site more widely known in the archaeological literature as Çatal Hüyük. The site of ‘Ain Mallaha or Eynan, with an Arabic and a Hebrew name, always causes difficulties for those unfamiliar with it. Cauvin usually uses the Arabic name, but I think that the site is better known among English-speaking archaeologists as Eynan, and I have usually used that form.

Trevor Watkins
FOREWORD TO THE SECOND FRENCH EDITION

The present edition appeared only three years after the first. The framework of the book and its general conclusions have scarcely been modified. However, that a revised edition was already necessary is some measure of how ‘things change fast’ in Near Eastern prehistory and how excavations and discoveries continue to accumulate rapidly.

The main events since 1994 that bear on the Near Eastern Neolithic have been on the one hand the renewal of salvage excavations at aceramic Neolithic settlements on the Middle Euphrates in northern Syria, where another new dam was being built, and where Spanish, French and Franco-Syrian teams have worked; and on the other hand the discovery of a phase of occupation on the island of Cyprus several centuries earlier than the Khirokitia culture, previously thought to be the oldest occupation of the island, which is very important for the understanding of the diffusion of the Neolithic; and finally, the spectacular advances in research in Anatolia achieved by Turkish and German teams. These new facts have led us to overhaul certain chapters quite significantly, in particular chapters 4, 9 and especially 15. Otherwise, there are corrections of detail that have been made in response to suggestions that have been made to me.

I thank Thomas Mourier, the editor of CNRS Editions, for his understanding and his patience in the face of all the corrections and Jacqueline Traincat who took care of the finalisation of the text at our Institute of Near Eastern Prehistory, Jalès.

I also thank my colleagues Jean Guilaine, Miguel Molist, Eric Coqueugniot, Danielle Stordeur, Harald Hauptmann and Paul Sanlaville for having kept me regularly informed of the advances in their research and their still unpublished results.

Jacques Cauvin
Jalès, December 1996
FOREWORD TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

It is important to me that I have this opportunity to present this synthesis to anglophone readers, who are generally accustomed to an interpretation of prehistory that is more strictly socio-economic than this. Without seeking to bring into question the results that have been obtained by means of that perspective, I have tried by contrast to incorporate a cultural perspective on the Neolithic Revolution in the Near East that is concerned with the propensities of the human mind. This complementary component is important: it gives greater place in the transformation of the affairs of our species to human agency and to human cognitive and psychological dispositions. It may go some way to serving as a useful corrective to today's economic ‘fatalism’ which is the source of so much pessimism about the future.

When the second French edition was published in 1997, it was necessary to bring the book up to date, and this present edition requires some more up-dating. There are now many archaeologists working in the Near East, and their discoveries and most recent publications need to be included here. I have chosen the path of not modifying the text of the 1997 edition, excepting some new references here and there among the notes at the end of each chapter. The general bibliography has been augmented, and the most important advances in research during the last two or three years have been dealt with in a ‘Postscript’ at the end of the book. They have generally given support to the views I had expressed, and have required only a few corrections of detail to the essential thesis of this work.

I am particularly glad that this English edition has been translated by my colleague and friend Trevor Watkins. He also works on the recent prehistory of the Near East and is also concerned with the less material indications of the data that he recovers. He knows the subject treated here very well, and I have found agreement and confidence in the ability to discuss freely with him some of the French passages that are difficult to translate. He has my warm gratitude for his efficiency and patience.

Jacques Cauvin

Jalès, November 1998
Among the great turning points in human history, the one called the Neolithic Revolution is one of the most critical: it concerned the beginning of the first manipulations of the natural environment by our species, and it lies directly at the origins of our present power. The analysis of this metamorphosis, its circumstances and its causes, is therefore an indispensable first stage for those who are interested in how civilisation began. This event occurred first in the Near East, before radiating directly to other regions, or giving place to later imitations elsewhere.

This book is therefore first and foremost the synthesis of recent research on the Neolithic of the Near East. By ‘Near East’, a region whose extent fluctuates according to the author, I mean the territory designated by that name by UNESCO, that is to say the Levant (Syria, Lebanon, Israel and Jordan) and the Anatolian peninsula (Turkey).

The period covered is from about 12,000 to 6300 BC, when the transition of prehistoric communities of hunter-gatherers into the first farmers and the first herdsmen was effected in stages, earlier in this part of the world than anywhere else, together with technical and ideological changes which accompanied and sometimes preceded the process.

For readers already somewhat familiar with this subject, these dates will be a surprise: they will appear older than those which they have read elsewhere, including in my own work Les premiers villages de Syrie-Palestine, published in 1978. Prehistoric chronology relies on radiocarbon dates, which we now know need to be ‘calibrated’, that is, corrected as a function of the history of cosmic radiation and its variation (see the Chronological table, pp. xvii).

Now, the calibration tables have only recently extended to periods as ancient as the Near Eastern Neolithic: this synthesis is therefore the first to take account of this revision. I am grateful to Jacques Evin, director of the radiocarbon laboratory of the University of Lyon-I, for having made all the necessary corrections to my text.

Like any history, that of the Neolithic is first of all a narrative, but I wanted to set a theoretical discussion on this narrative, in so far as the events described have had an impact on the rest of human evolution and its significance right up to our form of civilisation today. It was Goëry Delacote, then the director of scientific and technical information at the CNRS, who encouraged me in 1989 to undertake this task of elucidation. I am deeply grateful for his confidence and his interest: this work would not have seen the light of day without him.

Marie-Claire Cauvin and Danielle Stordeur have helped me continually with their
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reading of what I have written, their corrections and their advice. I have been able
to take advantage of my friend Raymond Vogel with his extensive knowledge of phi-
losophy and epistemology to make sure of the theoretical background on which my
analyses of the archaeology were founded. I am also obliged to Patricia Anderson,
Olivier Aurenche, Nur Balkan-Atlı, Claude Boisson, Daniel Helmer, Jacobus
Roodenberg, Paul Sanlaville and George Wilcox, consulted on this or that part of
the work, for reducing the errors I committed. To all of them I express my gratitude.

Claudine Maréchal had the most sustained and irreplaceable task of rendering the
text on to personal computer and, having done that, making me aware of the basic
errors into which I had slipped. Her efforts in the finishing of the text and her knowl-
edge of Near Eastern prehistory have been invaluable. I owe the maps to Christine
Chataigner, and to Gérard Deraprahamian the rest of the illustrations, both the origi-
inals and those redrawn from elsewhere. They have my appreciation and gratitude.

Finally I thank my colleagues Ofer Bar-Yosef, Harald Hauptmann, Alain Le Brun,
Jean Perrot, Gary Rollefson, Maurits van Loon and François Valla who kindly
allowed me to reproduce photographs.
Calibrated dates and $^{14}$C dates

Since about 1950 it has been known that absolute dates may be proposed, based on the principle of the continuous decay of radiocarbon ($^{14}$C) that is contained in all organic matter. Little by little, after the death of the organism, this radioactive carbon is transformed into non-radioactive carbon ($^{12}$C). For a long time it was considered that the quantity of radioactive carbon in the atmosphere and absorbed by living organisms was constant, and therefore it was thought that the residual radioactivity of the samples measured in the laboratory could give a measure of absolute age, within a certain margin of error.

Dating methods such as dendrochronology have subsequently revealed that the flux of cosmic radiation that is the origin of the formation of radioactive carbon had varied over the millennia. This necessitates a calibration of the $^{14}$C dates to take account of these variations. This calibration has resulted in dates ‘BC’ that are absolutely exact, which is not the case for dates ‘BP’ (before present) and ‘bc’ (before Christ, but not calibrated). Until quite recently, the impossibility of calibrating by means of dendrochronology alone dates as ancient as those of the Neolithic of the Near East has made it necessary to retain a ‘traditional’ $^{14}$C chronology, that is, one that is not calibrated. This is the situation in all synthesizes of Near Eastern prehistory that have appeared until now.

A short while ago, thanks to the application of other methods, calibration became possible up to 20,000 years before the present. This synthesis is therefore the first to give true dates for the Near East for the period covered.

The chronological scheme established by the Maison de l’Orient

A collective enterprise has been under way since 1975 at the Maison de l’Orient in Lyons with the objective of offering an up-to-date synthesis of the evolution of the whole of the Near East from the time of the last hunter-gatherer communities of the Upper Palaeolithic period down to the emergence of urban civilisation. This enterprise has produced a scheme of chronological periods. These are of unequal length, and have been determined on the basis of archaeological and radiometric criteria. The early periods of this scheme each represent a stage in the process of neolithisation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Pottery Type</th>
<th>Other Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yarmuq</td>
<td>6000 BP</td>
<td>Early Nubian</td>
<td>Geometric Zecharian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jawaqin</td>
<td>6000 BP</td>
<td>Early Nubian</td>
<td>Geometric Zecharian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shuwayba</td>
<td>6000 BP</td>
<td>Early Nubian</td>
<td>Geometric Zecharian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Qesem</td>
<td>6000 BP</td>
<td>Early Nubian</td>
<td>Geometric Zecharian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amuq</td>
<td>6000 BP</td>
<td>Early Nubian</td>
<td>Geometric Zecharian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chalcolithic</td>
<td>6000 BP</td>
<td>Early Nubian</td>
<td>Geometric Zecharian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Notes:**
- Early Nubian: Predynastic pottery
- Geometric Zecharian: Late Neolithic to Early Bronze Age pottery

**Diagram Notes:**
- Layer 6: earliest pottery
- Layer 2: most common pottery
- Layer 3: less common pottery
- Layer 1: rare pottery