

**Suggested Citation:** Pettegrew, David K. “Investigations at Ano Vayia and Revisits, 2003.”  
EKAS Field Reports. Ancient Corinth: The Eastern Korinthia Archaeological Survey, 2003.

# **EKAS Study Season Final Report, 2003**

David K. Pettegrew

2003

## **Overview**

Bill Caraher and I spent the first two weeks of the field season (June 1-15) working on the GIS and database data. The results of this analysis were less conclusive than they were experimental. Bill has written up a report about this work.

Between June 16-18, we completed three days of field work with Joe Rife at Kenchreai. Bill Caraher has written up a report for the work we completed there.

During the final week and a half, we worked on two small projects: work at Ano Vayia and revisiting discovery units from 1999-2001.

## **Ano Vayia Units**

During June 2003, 20 units were surveyed on and around the classical structure at Ano Vayia. These were numbered 7601-7619. The extensive unit # 6524 was reserved for material in the general area and was a kind of SIA for the hilltop; the unit # 6524 was given to the area when Bill Caraher discovered this site in the 2001 field season.

During the 2003 season, a small team of 4 surveyors walked transects to the north, west, and south (a cliff bounds the east side) of the house, with the idea of surveying everything within about 60 meters of the structure. Generally, an impressionistic, but preliminary analysis of the densities suggests that artifacts concentrate within a 20 meter radius of the structure, especially in the rooms themselves and the area directly to the south. Artifacts quickly drop off outside of this radius. DUs 7607 and 7609 had no artifacts.

The survey methodology we used followed normal EKAS collection strategy: 10 meter intervals, chronotype collection, and data collection according to the EKAS forms. The collected information has been entered into our copies of the EKAS access database. Only survey units 7614-7616, the units constituting the farmstead structure itself, were not surveyed intensively; rather, we walked around each of these units and collected representative pieces.

Tim Gregory read the pottery and is entering it into the EKAS Finds DB. Preliminary analysis of the pottery would suggest a strong Archaic-Classical component with light signatures of Late Roman and Early Modern.

In addition to this information, Anthoula Vassiliades did a profile scale drawing of the standing western wall, and Bill Caraher and I documented the wall lengths and thicknesses. A general outline of this structure was mapped with a total station in 2002, but was not documented otherwise.

## Revisits

During the 2003 season, we revisited 20 areas from previous seasons that corresponded to previously assigned discovery units. We took GPS points for the areas we revisited and correlated these with the DU shape files on the GIS. Because the areas that we walked in 2003 did not always correspond exactly to the boundaries of the discovery units, we issued new numbers for revisited units, using 8000 series numbers: 8000-8019.

We targeted units for revisits for three different reasons:

1. Most of our units were targeted in order to refine our chronologies for Roman, Medieval, and the Modern periods.
  - a. On the one hand, we queried units with significant Roman and Medieval components *and* a predominance of broadly-diagnostic pottery (Ceramic Age, Ancient Historic, etc...). The idea of this was to attempt to identify some of the coarse and cooking wares that may not have been identified finely in the past.
  - b. We also targeted areas with 5 or more pieces of Roman (ER, ROM, LR) semi-fine and fine ware, but pieces that were only broadly dated to the 700 year long Roman period. We hoped that we might refine our Roman chronologies of these areas. Essentially we were looking for highly diagnostic pieces that could tie the use of the area to narrow spans of time (fewer than 200 years).
  - c. We also revisited the area in the churchyard of Ayios Athanasios (Revisit Unit 8019) because little / no pottery had been found in this area that dated to the period of the use of the church.
2. We re-walked one unit (8016) that was covered with weeds in 2001 but has recently been converted into a vineyard.
3. In one unit (8017), we revisited an area in Kenchreai that had produced a numerous, diverse artifact assemblage in the 2000 season which were placed in bags that were stolen before they were read. It was thought that we might glean information now that was lost then.

For most of the twenty units, a Revisit involved spacing out across the area and walking at more intensive 5 to 8 meter intervals; units were walked in a zigzag manner, wandering right and left and covering several meters of space on both sides of the walker. The idea of this was to look at the area more intensively than was normal for EKAS methodology, and to locate particular kinds of pottery in areas where we knew they should exist (based on the finds data for the original survey).

We collected representative pieces of fine and coarse / ck wares but tried to bring back no more than 15 pieces of pottery / unit. For units 8001 and 8003, no artifacts were brought back. We did not bring back material such as black glaze, Combed Ware, Spirally Grooved, marble revetment, obsidian, and others because we could identify those in the field and we noted this

material on our forms. We created a Revisit and Extensive Form to record descriptions of the areas and procedure. These forms are entirely descriptive and we have not yet decided whether / how they will be integrated within the EKAS database structure that we created. The forms were photocopied and the originals left in the library at Ancient Corinth.

Tim Gregory read all of the pottery; based on what he has said, we have collected some very diagnostic pottery. Gregory is entering this new information in the finds database.