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Foreword to the Section “Field Reports”

Nicolò Marchetti, Francesca Cavaliere, Claudia D’Orazio, Gabriele Giacosa
and Eleonora Mariani

Field reports generally represent the largest relative share of papers at the ICAANE. Reassessments of old excavations fall in this category as well. In Bologna, 95 papers were presented in four parallel sessions and 49 of them are published here. They have been simply arranged according to the alphabetic order of first authors (with the exception of course of the keynote paper, opening this section). They attest to a diversity of agencies, methods, perspectives and urgencies which represent a singular asset of our field.

While new digital architectures of knowledge are about to deeply transform the ways of our scientific dissemination, these reports do supply in the meanwhile loads of new information on near eastern sites, as well as on neighbouring areas, which are all too often insufficiently considered in our discussions.
The Erbil Citadel Ceramic Corpus: A preliminary Analysis of the Main Productions and Their Relationships with Archaeological Stratigraphy

Luca Colliva* and Serenella Mancini**

Abstract
Since 2012, the High Commission for Erbil Citadel Revitalization (HCECR) and the Italian Archaeological Mission in Iraqi Kurdistan by Sapienza University of Rome (MAIKI) fruitfully cooperate for the study and enhancement of the Erbil Citadel. The paper presents the preliminary results of the HCECR-MAIKI study of the ceramic corpus found during the HCECR excavations at the Erbil Citadel from 2013 to 2015.

MAIKI – Italian Archaeological Mission in Iraqi Kurdistan
The Italian Archaeological Mission in Iraqi Kurdistan (MAIKI) BY the Department of Antiquities of Sapienza University of Rome, directed by Carlo Giovanni Cereti, was established in 2011 to study the historical, political, and cultural development of the Kurdish region in historical times.

MAIKI works in close collaboration with local institutions responsible for the conservation, management and enhancement of the cultural heritage of the autonomous region of Iraqi Kurdistan, such as the High Commission for the Erbil Citadel Revitalization (HCECR), the General Directorate of Antiquities of the Kurdish Regional Government (KRG) and the Directorates of Antiquities of Sulaymaniyah and Garmian. It currently conducts two main research projects: the first focuses on studying the Sasanian monument of Paikuli, and the second is dedicated to investigating and enhancing the Erbil Citadel (Cereti et al. 2012; Kamal et al. 2014; Bogdani, Colliva and Insom 2015; 2016; Bogdani and Colliva 2019; Cereti, Colliva and Terribili 2019; Cereti et al. 2019).

The Erbil Citadel and the Joint HCECR and MAIKI Activities
The Citadel of Erbil, with its 15 hectares of extension and about 30 meters in height, is the iconic centre of Iraqi Kurdistan’s modern capital. It is recognised as one of the most important archaeological sites in the region (Curtis 2005: 175, 189; Al Yaqoobi et al. 2015; Al Yaqoobi, Michelmore and Khasraw Tawfiq 2016) (Fig. 1). It is no coincidence that since 2014 the Citadel of Erbil has been included in the UNESCO World Heritage List.

The site now known as Erbil Citadel has been identified with the ancient Urbilum of cuneiform texts, the Arba’rā of Old Persian inscriptions, and the Arbêla of Greek sources.

---

1 *Alma Mater Studiorum - University of Bologna; **Sapienza University of Rome.
2 All the MAIKI activities are carried out thanks to the contribution of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Italian Development Cooperation and the continuous support of the Italian Embassy in Baghdad and the Italian Consulate in Erbil. MAIKI would also like to thank the International Association for Mediterranean and Oriental Studies (ISMEO) for its vital support.
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A significant urban centre – continuously inhabited until the last century – is also reported in cuneiform sources from the third millennium BC (Sourdel 1978; Curtis 2005; Novácek 2009; Hansman 2011; MacGinnis 2014; Cereti et al. 2013; Al Yaqoobi, Michelmore and Khasraw Tawfiq 2016).

At least six thousand years of settlement continuity, if confirmed by ongoing studies and future archaeological excavations, could provide essential data for understanding the anthropic development of the region.

MAIKI-HCECR’s current projects include a series of geophysical surveys to understand the archaeological stratigraphy of the site and the study of ceramic materials found during excavations carried out by HCECR between 2013 and 2015.

In 2015, a collaboration agreement was signed between MAIKI and HCECR for the joint study of the ceramic corpus found during the excavation that involved two distinct sectors of the Citadel: Area E, located west of the northern entrance (North Gate), and Area G, located east of the southern entrance (Main Gate) (Fig. 1a). Besides the present authors, Marco Galuppi and Aila Santi, from MAIKI, and Sangar Mohammed Abdullah, Chinar Faris Mohammed and Hezha Zayar Mohammed, from HCECR, took part in the project.3

The project aims to systematically cataloguing ceramic material, which counts more than 10,000 fragments and investigate its relations with the archaeological stratigraphy.

All the ceramic material has been examined, studied and stored according to stratigraphic criteria during six campaigns carried out so far. We concentrated on the study and cataloguing within a dedicated relational database of about 2,300 fragments considered diagnostic. Unfortunately, the postponement of some campaigns due to the issues following the 2017 independence referendum and the global pandemic has not yet allowed a complete study of the ceramic corpus. However, the preliminary results are already significant and highly promising.

The HCECR, which conducted the excavation with the advice of John MacGinnis and Mary Shepperson, provided us with all the raw stratigraphic data; this, together with the already published excavation reports (Al Yaqoobi et al. 2016; Al Yaqoobi, Shepperson and MacGinnis 2018), provided the necessary information from which to base this project. Our studies, far from revising the stratigraphy identified during the excavation, focused on updating the periodisation through the comparative analysis of the data obtained from the study of the ceramic material and stratigraphic contexts. Collected data allowed us to improve the periodisation and propose a date for the identified phases.

**Area E**

In Area E, a large section of the perimeter wall of the Citadel and some rooms located close to the wall were investigated. The section of the perimeter wall includes a circular tower and shows clear signs of reconstructions or expansions that identify different construction phases. This sector excavation saw the opening of a main trench (20 × 15 m) and a second trench (6 × 8 m) near the north-west corner of the previous one (Fig. 2). The investigated

---

3 The authors and the entire joint research team would like to thank the Director of MAIKI, Carlo G. Cereti, the Head of the HCECR, Nihad Latif Qoja, the former Head of the HCECR, Dara al Yaqqobi, and the Erbil Citadel Site Manager, Ranan Khasraw Tawfiq, for their continuous and invaluable assistance.
stratigraphy reached a depth of about eight metres, and the comparative study of the collected data allowed us to identify nine distinct archaeological phases.\(^4\)

Only two mud-brick walls belong to Phase 9 (SU155 and SU164),\(^5\) which correspond to the oldest remains, so far identified, of the perimeter wall of the Citadel. No ceramic fragment is associated with these stratigraphic units, and we have no data for the chronological attribution of this phase.

Phase 8 seems to correspond to rebuilding or repairing the perimeter wall, which is visible in the north-western extension of the excavation. Only one diagnostic ceramic fragment was found in the strata of Phase 8. However, its attribution to the Islamic period suggests coming from a different archaeological context. It is hypothesised that its presence is probably related to a foundation trench (or a pit) excavated during the construction activities characterising some of the later phases but not identified during the stratigraphic excavation (Table 1, Phase 8).

The ceramic material from the stratigraphic units of Phase 7 suggests dating to the Parthian or Sasanian period. C14 analyses performed on samples from SU141-153, an ash layer that extended over the entire area outside the perimeter wall, provided a date to the 1st-2nd century AD. However, the increasing number of turquoise monochrome glazed sherds, even opaque and the presence of sherds that can be attributed, not without doubt, to the Sasanian period and others certainly belonging to an Islamic horizon suggest a later date. Given this, it is perhaps possible to identify the ash layer SU141-153 as a levelling action that moved material from earlier periods or the remains of a fire that burnt wooden material from older structures.

Productions such as monochrome stonepaste ware, sgraffiato monochrome ware and moulded relief ware (Table 1, Phase 6) suggest a date between the 12th and 13th centuries AD for Phase 6. No layers clearly connected with the first Islamic period have been identified. It cannot be excluded that these layers have been partially or entirely removed, at least in this sector, by possible levelling actions connected with the subsequent construction phases. The construction of some minor structures leaning against the perimeter wall characterise Phase 5 (Table 1, Phase 5). Unfortunately, no ceramic material helpful in dating these structures has been found.

On the contrary, Phase 4 and Phase 3 are very rich in materials, mainly in the secondary deposition. The dating of some productions, particularly champlevé and lustreware, suggest a terminus post quem between the late 12th and 14th centuries AD (Table 1, Phase 4 and Phase 3), even if we must highlight the finding of one Ottoman clay pipe, probably due to the presence of undetected pits.

Although not yet completed, the study of the more recent phases, Phase 2 and Phase 1, again shows several materials clearly in a secondary deposition. Once again, the ceramic

\(^4\) The nine identified phases constitute an implementation of the three ‘major phases of fortification walls’ identified during the excavation (Al Yaqoobi, Shepperson and MacGinnis 2018: 451-455). Contrary to the sequence proposed by the reports published so far, the phases have an increasing number in our proposal, starting from the most recent one.

\(^5\) The acronym SU indicates the Stratigraphic Unit; the acronym SSU indicates the Structural Stratigraphic Units, while the acronym NSU indicates the Negative Stratigraphic Units. The authors have added negative stratigraphic units (NSU), not included in the original stratigraphic sequences of Area E and Area G, based on direct observation of the stratigraphy still visible to allow a more detailed articulation of the implemented stratigraphic sequence.
material can only provide a terminus post quem, but the data collected so far suggest a possible dating to the 13th-14th centuries AD (Table 1, Phase 2) for Phase 2.

No phase clearly datable to the 15th-17th century AD has been identified. We can not exclude that, once again, levelling actions connected to the perimeter wall reconstruction activities removed part of the archaeological stratigraphy.

For Phase 1, equivalent to the last part of the “Phase 3” identified by the archaeologists who carried out the excavation, the ceramic materials seem to confirm the dating to the 18th century AD already proposed in the excavation reports (Al Yaqoobi, Shepperson and MacGinnis 2018: 453-454). This dating is also confirmed by the finding of several Ottoman clay pipes.

**Area G**

In Area G, a section with a small portion of the perimeter wall of the Citadel exposed during the construction of the monumental gate built in the 1970s were investigated (Fig. 3). The study of the ceramic material and comparison with stratigraphic data led us to identify four archaeological phases.

Phase 4 and Phase 3 show two distinct events linked to the Citadel’s perimeter wall, and three structural, stratigraphic units have been identified (SSU206 and SSU209 for Phase 4 and SSU204 for Phase 3). However, none of the accumulation layers associated with them has been excavated. No archaeological material has provided valuable indications allowing the dating of these two phases (Table 2, Phase 4, Phase 3).

Phase 2 includes two accumulation layers (SU207 and SU208) leaning against the structures of the previous periods, perhaps to reinforce the perimeter wall of the Citadel. The nature of the two layers suggests a secondary deposition of ceramic material, whose dating can therefore only provide a terminus post quem for the chronological framing of the phase and advise, for Phase 2, a dating not before the 12th-13th century AD (Table 2, Phase 2).

Phase 1 consists of a series of accumulation layers (SU200, SU201, SU202, SU203, and SU205) that rest on Phase 2 layers. Also, for Phase 1, the contexts suggest a secondary deposition of the archaeological material and a subsequent terminus post quem for dating this phase. The identified pottery dates not earlier than the twelfth-fourth century AD (Table 2, Phase 1).

**The Ceramic Corpus of the Citadel of Erbil and Some of the Main Ceramic Productions of the Islamic Period**

The ceramic corpus of the Citadel of Erbil is consistent and heterogeneous. The pottery presents a wide range of productions covering a broad chronological span from the Hellenistic to the Ottoman period.

Considering these characteristics, it was necessary to adopt a classification system that would be ductile. All taxonomic, dimensional and qualitative aspects were considered to obtain a complete description of the sherds.

Approximately 10,000 sherds have been surveyed. The ceramic material attributable to the Islamic period is the most consistent and covers an extensive chronological span at least from 9th to 19th century AD.
We decided to focus on the ceramic material considered diagnostic, which corresponds to 17% of the total.\(^6\)

Although the study of the material is still in progress, some of the leading ceramic productions from the Islamic period have been identified and presented here.

**Unglazed pottery**

Unglazed pottery constitutes approximately 68% of the entire corpus attributable to the Islamic period.

We found mainly unglazed plain ware, unglazed ware with incised and carved decoration and unglazed ware with applied decoration.

From a morphological point of view, there are primarily medium-sized basins, jugs and jars mainly produced with fabrics ranging from medium-coarse to coarse.

So far, the fragmentary nature, the state of preservation, and the lack of significant comparisons with material from dated contexts in northern Mesopotamia do not allow for a precise chronological attribution for these productions. However, two remarkable productions belonging to this class are exceptions: unglazed relief ware and moulded relief ware.

**Unglazed relief ware**

Twelve fragments belonging to large jars proved to be of particular interest for their remarkable decorative richness.\(^7\) The decorations are made using various techniques, but the most attested are applied, modelled, and incised. The unglazed relief ware’s production area has yet to be identified. However, some scholars speculate that it may be in the Euphrates valley, in northern Syria and Iraq. The chronological attribution for this production dates back to the 12th-13th centuries AD (Reitlinger 1951; Riis, Poulsen and Hammershaimb 1957: nos. 844-846).

**Moulded relief ware**

A group of about 90 moulded relief ware fragments have been identified. All the fragments were produced with the characteristic modelling technique: mould-made and wheel made.

Except for one specimen, the fragmentary state of the material has not allowed a morphological study. However, it can be assumed that the fragments belonged to medium-sized jugs characterised by thin walls.

The decorative repertoire comprises geometrical, vegetal and epigraphic/pseudo-epigraphic motifs. The latter is well-executed: rounded and finished with care, especially given the size of the epigraphic motif, which is sometimes less than 2 cm in height.

Two items belonging to this production are particularly relevant: the first fragment bears a sphinx figure with the head surmounted by a crown (Fig. 4; Mancini 2020). The second fragment consists of the upper part of the body of a jug, probably with a handle, whose decoration shows a series of standing male figures (probably musicians, dancers or even cup-bearers) on an arabesque background. The figures are alternated with medallions consisting of a pearl band containing an epigraphic motif that encloses a bird’s stylised image. Many

---

\(^6\) We consider diagnostic all fragments that have at least one of the following characteristics: recognisable shape, decoration, traces of modelling technique, surface treatment or coating.

\(^7\) G. Reitlinger (1951) identified and studied this production for the first time.
scholars hypothesise that this type of decoration is probably inspired by precious metal objects produced between the 12th and 14th centuries AD (Baer 1989; Mancini 2020: 271).

Due to their decorative complexity, all the fragments of moulded relief ware found at the Citadel of Erbil can be dated to this same period. Moreover, it cannot be excluded that they were imported from the Syro-Mesopotamian area.

**Glazed Pottery Class**
The Islamic glazed pottery constitutes approximately 32% of the diagnostic material. Several wares are attested, covering a broad period between at least the 9th and the 19th centuries AD.

*Monochrome ware*
The *monochrome ware* is the most attested production and constitutes about 25% of the glazed class. The fragments have a transparent glaze, mainly green or turquoise. A yellow glaze is also attested, although in smaller quantities.

The morphological study revealed the presence mainly of open forms. This production is one of the most territorially widespread and covers a broad chronological span from the Parthian to the Islamic period. The continuity, not only technological but sometimes also morphological, further complicates the chronological identification of this production.

*Colour splashed ware*
Forty-three ceramic fragments belonging to the *colour splashed ware* have been identified, mainly produced with a medium compact light brown fabric, characterised by fine opaque white inclusions.

Under the transparent colourless glaze, all the sherds present a thick white slip. The splashes are mainly two-coloured (green and yellow); sometimes, brown splashes are also attested.

We mainly identified open forms with one exception: a fragment of a neck that preserves the rim and the attachment of a vertical ribbon handle probably belonging to a small jug.

*Sgraffiato monochrome ware and sgraffiato splashed ware*
We also identified fragments attributable to *sgraffiato monochrome ware* and *sgraffiato splashed ware* in the corpus. As for the *sgraffiato monochrome ware*, the monochrome green transparent glaze is the most attested, but there are also fragments with yellow transparent glaze. The *sgraffiato splashed ware* has colourless transparent glaze and polychrome splashed decoration, mainly green and yellow. Both wares were produced with a compact light brown fabric.

Only open forms are attested, especially bowls with thin, slightly everted rim and ring bases. The hypothesised date for this material starts from the 12th-13th centuries until the 14th century AD, when these productions seem to cease throughout Iraq, Iran and Central Asia (Kennet 2004; Nováček 2009).

*Lustreware*
Eleven fragments decorated with lustre paintings and produced with stonepaste have been found. Some sherds show a highly compact white stonepaste. A perfectly preserved thick opaque white glaze of remarkable quality covers most of the fragments. They also present
a monochrome yellow-gold painted decoration. Unfortunately, the size of the sherds did not allow for a morphological study.

Six sherds, characterised by a very porous stonepaste of a pink colour tending to grey, are presumably attributable to the Syrian area. In this case, the monochrome lustre painting combines with a cobalt blue painted decoration. Once again, it was impossible to conduct a morphological study, but most of the fragments appear to belong to open forms.

All the *lustreware* specimens from the Iranian and Syrian areas were probably imported to Erbil from the second half of the 12th century until the beginning of the 13th century AD.

*Raqqa ware*

Another production found in the Citadel of Erbil is the so-called *Raqqa ware*, attested, for the moment, by only one fragment. It was made with a porous light pinkish-grey stonepaste and shows a turquoise glaze with a monochrome black painted decoration. The fragment can be dated to the 12th-13th century AD (Porter 1981; Jenkins-Madina 2016).

*Underglaze black painted ware*

Particularly interesting is a group that presents the same decorative technique as the *Raqqa ware* sherd: a turquoise glaze with a monochrome black painted decoration, which, however, is applied on objects made of a brown clayey fabric characterised by a medium porosity with fine red and opaque white mineral inclusions. These fragments also present decorative motifs similar to those attested in the Syrian *Raqqa ware* and seem to imitate them (Fig. 5). The origin of this production, defined here as “underglaze black painted ware”, is still uncertain: similar objects have been found in various contexts of the Iranian and Syrian areas. They seem to cover a broad chronological span, approximately between the 14th and the 17th century AD or later (Priestman 2021: 147-148).

**Conclusions**

The study carried out so far on the ceramic corpus from the excavations conducted on the Erbil Citadel has made it possible to identify several significant productions attributable to a broad chronological span that extends at least from the Hellenistic to the Ottoman period. The corpus datable to the Islamic period is undoubtedly the most consistent. It shows a highly varied production overview, primarily characterised by material imported from Syria and the Iranian plateau.

Most of the stratigraphic units identified during the excavation of the Citadel Perimeter Wall in Areas E and G probably originated from levelling activities connected to the various construction phases of the structure. The nature of these archaeological contexts is also confirmed by the comparative study of the ceramic material, which, in most cases, can only provide a *terminus post quem* for the archaeological contexts of discovery since it is in an evident secondary deposition. Despite these problems and the preliminary stage of the research, the study carried out by the joint HCECR-MAIKI research group provided fundamental data for a more detailed articulation of the archaeological stratigraphy and dating of the different phases through comparison with identified ceramic productions (Tables 1-2).

The main imported ceramic productions are luxury items such as *Raqqa ware* and *lustreware* coming from the Syrian and Iranian areas. They show remarkable correlations with objects belonging to the same productions and found in the Mesopotamian region.
The presence of products from the Syrian area and the Iranian plateau confirms the importance of the site. It proves the existence of a commercial network that, at least since the Islamic period, connected Erbil with the bordering regions.

The scientific literature does not provide a complete panorama of ceramic production in this region. For this reason, and given the importance of the site, the project of study and analysis of the ceramic corpus of the Citadel carried out by the HCECR and MAIKI can be considered an important starting point and provide a considerable contribution to the understanding of the socio-economic and commercial dynamics of this region and its neighbouring territories. The quantity and quality of the ceramic materials found, the probable presence of local productions, testified by the discovery of two trivets and a kiln peg (Colliva and Mancini 2021: 153) and the proven commercial connections confirm the critical role of the Citadel of Erbil and its potential to become one of the leading sites for the study of ceramic production of the region.
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### Area E - Periodization and Main Ceramic Productions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Proposed Dating for the Phase</th>
<th>Main Identified Ceramic Productions</th>
<th>Proposed Dating for the Identified Ceramic Productions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ottoman Period</td>
<td>Colour splashed ware&lt;br&gt;Kiln peg&lt;br&gt;Monochrome green ware&lt;br&gt;Monochrome stonepaste ware&lt;br&gt;Monochrome turquoise ware&lt;br&gt;Moulded relief ware&lt;br&gt;Ottoman clay pipe&lt;br&gt;Ottoman painted ware?&lt;br&gt;Raqqa ware&lt;br&gt;Sasanian stamped ware&lt;br&gt;Sgraffiato monochrome ware&lt;br&gt;Sgraffiato splashed ware&lt;br&gt;Trivet&lt;br&gt;Underglaze black painted ware&lt;br&gt;Unglazed relief ware</td>
<td>9th–10th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;–&lt;br&gt;12th–14th cent AD&lt;br&gt;–&lt;br&gt;12th–13th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;Ottoman period&lt;br&gt;Ottoman period?&lt;br&gt;12th–13th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;12th–14th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;–&lt;br&gt;12th–17th cent. AD?&lt;br&gt;12th–13th cent. AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13th–14th cent. AD (Terminus post quem)</td>
<td>Colour splashed ware&lt;br&gt;Fishplate&lt;br&gt;Monochrome green ware&lt;br&gt;Monochrome turquoise ware&lt;br&gt;Moulded relief ware&lt;br&gt;Sgraffiato monochrome ware&lt;br&gt;Sgraffiato splashed ware&lt;br&gt;Trivet&lt;br&gt;Unglazed relief ware</td>
<td>9th–10th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;4th–1st cent. BC&lt;br&gt;–&lt;br&gt;–&lt;br&gt;12th–13th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;12th–14th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;12th–14th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;12th–13th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;–&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12th–14th cent. AD (Terminus post quem)</td>
<td>Colour splashed ware&lt;br&gt;Monochrome green ware&lt;br&gt;Monochrome stonepaste ware&lt;br&gt;Monochrome yellow ware&lt;br&gt;Moulded relief ware&lt;br&gt;Unglazed relief ware</td>
<td>9th–10th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;–&lt;br&gt;12th–14th cent AD&lt;br&gt;–&lt;br&gt;12th–13th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;12th–13th cent. AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12th–14th cent. AD (Terminus post quem)</td>
<td>Champlévé&lt;br&gt;Colour splashed ware&lt;br&gt;Fishplate&lt;br&gt;Lustrewear&lt;br&gt;Monochrome green ware&lt;br&gt;Monochrome stonepaste ware&lt;br&gt;Moulded relief ware&lt;br&gt;Unglazed relief ware&lt;br&gt;Sgraffiato monochrome ware&lt;br&gt;Sgraffiato splashed ware</td>
<td>12th–13th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;9th–10th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;4th–1st cent. BC&lt;br&gt;12th–14th cent AD&lt;br&gt;–&lt;br&gt;12th–14th cent AD&lt;br&gt;12th–13th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;12th–13th cent. AD&lt;br&gt;12th–14th cent AD&lt;br&gt;12th–14th cent AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Stratigraphic subdivision of Area E and main attested ceramic productions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Proposed Dating for the Phase</th>
<th>Main Identified Ceramic Productions</th>
<th>Proposed Dating for the Identified Ceramic Productions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12th–14th cent. AD (Terminus post quem)</td>
<td>Colour splashed ware, Lustreware, Monochrome green ware, Monochrome stonepaste ware, Monochrome turquoise ware, Moulded relief ware, Sasanian-Islamic Jar?, Sgraffiato monochrome ware, Sgraffiato splashed ware</td>
<td>9th–10th cent. AD, 12th–14th cent. AD, 12th–13th cent. AD, 7th–9th cent. AD, 12th–14th cent. AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12th–13th cent. AD (Terminus post quem)</td>
<td>Colour splashed ware? Moulded relief ware Sgraffiato splashed ware Unglazed ware with incised decoration</td>
<td>9th–10th cent. AD, 12th–13th cent. AD, 12th–14th cent. AD, 10th–13th cent. AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Stratigraphic subdivision of Area G and main attested ceramic productions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Proposed Dating for the Phase</th>
<th>Main Identified Ceramic Productions</th>
<th>Proposed Dating for the Identified Ceramic Productions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12th–13th cent. AD (Terminus post quem)</td>
<td>Monochrome green ware, Monochrome stonepaste ware, Monochrome turquoise ware, Moulded relief ware, Sgraffiato monochrome ware</td>
<td>12th–14th cent AD, 12th–13th cent. AD, 12th–14th cent AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sasanian Or Proto-Islamic Period</td>
<td>Fishplate, Impressed ware? Monochrome stonepaste ware, Monochrome turquoise ware, Moulded relief ware, Underglaze black painted ware</td>
<td>4th–1st cent. BC, Sasanian period, 12th–14th cent AD, 12th–13th cent. AD, 12th–17th cent. AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parthian–Sasanian Period?</td>
<td>Monochrome stonepaste ware</td>
<td>12th–14th cent AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area G - Periodization and Main Ceramic Productions
Fig. 1: The Citadel of Erbil:
  a) orthophoto of the Citadel with indication of the excavation areas (orthophoto L. Ebanista-MAIKI);
  b) view from the west (photo J. Bogdani-MAIKI)

Fig. 2: The excavations in Area E:
  a) the main trench;
  b) the western extension (photo L. Colliva-MAIKI)
Fig. 3: The excavations in Area G
(photo M. Galuppi-MAIKI)

Fig. 4: Fragment of moulded relief ware:
a) internal surface;
b) external surface with relief decoration (Photo by S. Mancini-MAIKI)
Fig. 5: Fragment of *underglaze black painted ware*:
a) internal surface with decoration painted in black under a turquoise glaze;
b) external surface (Photo by S. Mancini-MAIKI)