

## Team C Report

### Field Season:

18 May – 07 June, 2011

### Filed by:

Sylvia Deskaj (#5)

### Last edited on 3/15/2017 by:

Kailey Rocker (#14)

### Team Members and Roles

Name	#	Affiliation	Status/Occupation	Team Role
Sylvia Deskaj	5	Michigan State University	PhD candidate, Anthropology	Team leader
Ervin Kujtila	19	University of Tirana <i>As of 2017: Qendra e Studimeve Albanologjike</i>	MA student, Archaeology <i>PhD, Albanian Studies</i>	Field walker
Alketa Zejnati	21	University of Tirana	MA student, Archaeology	Field walker
Paulin Pushimaj	22	University of Tirana	MA student, Archaeology	Field walker
Anna Church	20	Millsaps College <i>As of 2017: Else School of Management, Millsaps</i>	BA, Classics <i>MBA</i>	Field walker
Michael Galaty	3	Millsaps College <i>As of 2017: University of Michigan; Museum of Anthropological Archaeology</i>	Professor, chair; <i>Professor, Director and Curator</i>	Visiting field walker
Ols Lafe	27	Ministry of Tourism, Culture, Youth and Sports <i>As of 2017: Aleksander Moisiu University</i>	Director of Cultural Heritage <i>Director</i>	Visiting field walker

### Methodological Notes:

All tracts were surveyed using standard Mediterranean survey methods. For each tract, surveyors walked at 15-meter intervals and counted all tile/brick, ceramics, and small finds. The last category – small finds – included, but was not limited to, lithics, iron tools, mill stones, beads, and glass. Field walkers were instructed to collect all small finds as well as a sample of the different ceramic fabrics counted that were larger than a thumb nail. Additionally, any diagnostic sherds, or those with notable markings, indentations, glaze, color, or shape, were also collected.

All land, including fields, hills, and terraces in the survey zone described below, was surveyed unless the landowner objected or the vegetation was so dense as to render survey impractical.

### **Team Objectives:**

The team had 2 main objectives:

- To identify potential sites from all periods for site collection and/or test pits in the Shtoj area
  - o To count material from all periods – Bronze Age, Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, Roman, Medieval, Post-Medieval, Modern, etc. – within the survey zone
  - o To collect small finds, diagnostic sherds, and a sample of the different ceramic fabrics from all periods within the survey zone
- To locate, map, and document all extant tumuli within the survey zone, as well as those previously destroyed by landowners and/or excavated by Aristotle Koka in the 1980s (see Koka 1990)
  - o To revisit all mapped tumuli in order to assess their current state of preservation and suitability for future excavation
  - o To input all collected data from this exercise in the Tumuli database.

### **Survey Zone:**

Team C surveyed the plains region, in areas roughly adjacent to survey zones Teams A, B, D, and E. The zone encompassed multiple areas: (1) the fields of Hysaj settlement (north of Team E's survey zone) and the fields of Kullaj, Dragoç, and Fshat i Ri settlements (east of Team E's survey zone); (2) fields to the northwest of the Kir River and southeast of the main road to Mes (south of Team A's survey zone); (3) fields to the east and northeast of Mes Bridge, along the eastern side of the Kir River; and (4) fields located along the southern banks of the Kir River (across from Team D's survey zone). (*See the 2017 Map of Dragoç with all survey zones*)

The area surveyed by Team C contained primarily fields, most of which were flat. Many of these fields were planted with cash crops such as tobacco, onions, maize, wheat, and beans and, as such, were fenced by their owners who had recently migrated from the surrounding hillside. Some of the fields were fallowed and planted with alfalfa. The tracts in this survey zone had an average visibility of **70.6%**.

### **Tracts, Sites, and Mounds:**

Team C surveyed a total of **267** tracts, covering a total of **1.26** square kilometers. The size of each tract varied depending on the natural characteristics and features of the landscape. Their average tract size was 0.47 hectares, with their largest tract recorded at 3.5 hectares and the smallest at 0.04.

Team C recovered a small-to-medium concentration of ceramic fragments from Tract **C-125**, located near tract **B-060**. According to the Pottery database, the **5** pieces kept were largely associated with the Archaic, Classical, and Roman periods.

Team C identified, and later documented, **13 prehistoric tumuli** within the survey zone, all of which were visible in Google Earth. These additional tumuli were located in fields adjacent to those with tumuli concentrations identified by Team A. Tumuli in Team C's zone were most likely undercounted as some tumuli have been destroyed during previous excavations or recently by landowners. The absence of

visible and/or known tumuli beyond these fields in Team A's and C's survey zone is of equal interest and should be investigated in the future.

All of the **13** tumuli were mapped, photographed, and described in detail over the course of a day at the end of the 2011 field season. **15.4%** of the tumuli were rated with an “**excellent**” state of preservation (**n=2**); **23.1%** with a “**good**” state of preservation (**n=3**); **15.4%** with a “**medium**” state of preservation (**n=2**); **15.4%** with a “**low**” state of preservation (**n=2**); and **30.8%** with a “**poor**” state of preservation (**n=4**). While there were some tumuli in relatively good shape, many had been damaged by building activities or removed by farmers to open up their fields or mined and sold by owners as soil. Of these 13 tumuli, Team C recommends **4** for rescue excavation during a later field season: **T-084, T-085, T-087, and T-090**.

### **Summary of Findings:**<sup>1</sup>

Regarding museum counts, Team C collected a total of **34** fine-textured; **73** coarse-textured; and **140** medium-textured, of which **45** were tile. The texture of **1** ceramic was labeled as “**little**.” Team C also collected **180** lithics (found under the “**lithic**” and “**tools**” categories); and **16** other small finds, falling under the categories of “**waste**,” “**bone**,” “**ceramic**,” “**metal**,” and “**other**.”<sup>2</sup>

#### *Ceramics:*

Team C collected **248** ceramics from Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, Roman, Medieval Byzantine, Late Medieval, Post Medieval, Early Modern, and Modern periods. **96** ceramics, or **38.7%**, were not identified with a period and labeled as “**Unkn**.” **4.4%** were associated with the Archaic to Hellenistic periods; **4.8%** with the Roman period; **29.8%** with the Medieval Byzantine and Late Medieval periods; and **25.8%** Post Medieval to Modern periods.

Team C's Archaic (**2** ceramics), Classical (**5** ceramics), and Hellenistic (**4** ceramics) finds were scattered throughout the survey zone. Notably, Tract **C-125**, located near tract **B-060**, contained both Archaic sherds in addition to **1** Roman and **2** Classical period sherds.

Team C's Roman finds (**12** ceramics) were located throughout the survey zone. Notably, **50%** of the Roman-period ceramics (**6** total) were found near each other in Tracts **C-169, 172, 174, 178, and 180**. These tracts were located in fields around the Church of Saint John (Kisha e Shen Gjinit) in Hysaj village.

The team's Medieval Byzantine (**72** ceramics) and Late Medieval (**2** ceramics) as well as Post Medieval (**16** ceramics), Early Modern (**37** ceramics) and Modern (**11** ceramics) finds were generally scattered throughout the survey zone. Notably, there was a heavy concentration of Post Medieval ceramics in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The number of collected material (such as ceramics or small finds) listed in this report corresponds with the number of entries in the ceramic and small finds databases. While entries are typically associated with **1** artifact, some entries are associated with **2** or more artifacts. For example, small ceramic pieces associated with the same period and/or located in the same tract might be labeled in the pottery database under **1** entry.

Additionally, all periods listed in the report represent the “start period” and do not reflect the “end period.”

<sup>2</sup> The total number of lithics (**180**) includes **1** small find collected during a tract revisit to **C-056** in 2012.

fields located along the southern banks of the Kir River and across from Team D's tracts. Early Modern finds were strongly represented throughout the zone, with the exception of the fields to the northwest of the Kir River and southeast of the main road to Mes as well as the fields directly west of Team A's survey zone. Finally, the Modern period was strongly represented in the fields of Hysaj settlement (north of Team E's survey zone) and the fields of Kullaj, Dragoç, and Fshat i Ri settlements (east of Team E's survey zone). This ceramic distribution is most likely due to the later occupation of the plains regions and continued presence of modern villages and agricultural production.

#### *Small Finds:*

Team C collected a total of **196** small finds from the Middle Paleolithic to Modern periods. **83.2%** of the material (**n=163**) was not identified with a period and either left blank or labeled "**UNK.**" **8.7%** was associated with the Middle Paleolithic to Upper Paleolithic periods (**n=17**); **1%** with the Mesolithic period (**n=2**); **2%** with the Iron Age (**n=4**); **0.5%** with the Archaic period (**n=1**); and **4.6%** with the Post-Medieval to Modern periods (**n=9**).

The different types of lithics identified – flakes, cores, blades, etc. – were categorized under two categories: "**lithic**" and "**tools**" (**n=180**) in the small finds database. The dated material was associated with the Middle Paleolithic (**n=10**); Upper Paleolithic (**n=7**); and Mesolithic (**n=2**) periods. Of note, **15.6%** of the lithics collected were typed as "**natural**" or "**non-cultural**" (**n=28**).

Regarding all other categories of small finds that were dated, the small finds from the Iron Age and Archaic period were different forms of waste material categorized as "**ceramic**," "**metal**," or "**waste**" – **4** pieces of iron slag and **1** piece of kiln waste, respectively. There were **2** metal objects dated to the Post Medieval period: a nail and a piece of agricultural equipment. Material from the Modern period included **6** metal objects, such as nails or wires, and **1** plastic button from a military uniform. Finally, of note, **1** bone fragment was identified in tract **C-046**; it was not associated with a period.

#### *Tumuli:*

The map of tumuli provides some identifiable location patterns. Tumuli appear to be clustered in one concentrated area. This cluster may indicate family or lineage groups.

#### **Works Cited:**

Koka, Aristotle. 1990. "Tuma 6 e Shtojit." *Iliria* 20 (1): 27-73.