



**HAL**  
open science

## **Magnetic signal prospecting in a former Achaemenid ‘palace’: the example of Gumbati (Georgia)**

Julien Thiesson, Sébastien Gondet, Jörg Fassbinder, Florian Becker, Marion Scheiblecker, Sandra Ostner, Mandana Parsi, Solène Bourgeois Espéron, Kai Kaniuth

### ► **To cite this version:**

Julien Thiesson, Sébastien Gondet, Jörg Fassbinder, Florian Becker, Marion Scheiblecker, et al.. Magnetic signal prospecting in a former Achaemenid ‘palace’: the example of Gumbati (Georgia). 13th International Conference on Archaeological Prospection, Aug 2019, Siglo, Ireland. pp.193-196. <halshs-02420170>

**HAL Id: halshs-02420170**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02420170v1>**

Submitted on 6 Jan 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.


L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

# NEW GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROSPECTION

13<sup>TH</sup> INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROSPECTION  
28 AUGUST - 1 SEPTEMBER 2019  
SLIGO - IRELAND



Edited by James Bonsall



# **NEW GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROSPECTION**

**13<sup>TH</sup> INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROSPECTION  
28 AUGUST - 1 SEPTEMBER 2019  
SLIGO - IRELAND**

**Edited by James Bonsall**



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD  
Summertown Pavilion  
18-24 Middle Way  
Summertown  
Oxford OX2 7LG

[www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

ISBN 978-1-78969-306-5  
ISBN 978-1-78969-307-2 (e-Pdf)

DOI 10.32028/9781789693072

© the individual authors and Archaeopress 2019

Cover images:

- Top Left: Earth resistance data from a circular ditched monument SL014-209041-, Carrowmore Megalithic Cemetery, Co. Sligo.
- Top right: Electromagnetic induction survey of a fulacht fia, monument SL008-205----, Coney Island, Co. Sligo. Photograph: Ciarán Davis
- Bottom left: Megalithic Passage Tomb, monument SL014-209006-, Carrowmore Megalithic Cemetery, Co. Sligo
- Bottom right: Court Tomb, monument SL015-050----, Deerpark, Co. Sligo



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website [www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

# Contents

<b>The 13th ICAP and the Importance of Archaeological Prospection in Ireland.....</b>	<b>8</b>
James Bonsall	
<b>13th International Conference on Archaeological Prospection: Organisation Committee.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>13th International Conference on Archaeological Prospection: Scientific Committee.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Part One – Archaeological Prospection in Europe.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Harbours from Antiquity to the Middle Ages: a Geophysical Panorama .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Wolfgang Rabbel, Dennis Wilken, Tina Wunderlich, Annika Fediuk, Michaela Schwardt, Daniel Köhn, Clemens Mohr, SPP 1630 Working Groups	
<b>High-resolution underwater archaeological prospection of Upper Austrian pile dwellings and lakes using multi-beam and sediment sonar .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Immo Trinks, Wolfgang Neubauer, Timothy Taylor, Mario Wallner, Klaus Löcker, Jutta Leskovar	
<b>Ground-penetrating radar study of the Asaviec 2 archaeological site, Belarus .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Alina Tšugai-Tsyruļnikova, Jüri Plado, Maxim Charniauski, Irina Khrustaleva, Aivar Kriiska	
<b>The Challenge of Urban Archaeological Geophysics: the Example of Grand’Place in Brussels, Belgium.....</b>	<b>27</b>
Michel Dabas, François Blary, Gianluca Catanzariti, Paulo Charruadas, Sébastien Flageul, Benjamin Van Nieuwenhoeve, Philippe Sosnowska, Alain Tabbagh	
<b>The Good, the Bad and the Ugly (Data): 100-year Discussion over Roman Fort in Herzegovina solved with shards of information .....</b>	<b>32</b>
Michal Pisz, Tomasz Dziurdzik	
<b>Geophysical surveys of Eneolithic ditch enclosures in central Bohemia.....</b>	<b>36</b>
Roman Křivánek	
<b>The application of the geophysical method in forested highland terrains of Bohemia.....</b>	<b>40</b>
Roman Křivánek	
<b>Non-destructive survey of early medieval ramparts in the Czech Republic and Slovakia .....</b>	<b>45</b>
Peter Milo, Igor Murín, Michaela Prišťáková, Tomáš Tencer, Michal Vágner	
<b>Looking for military remains of the Battle of Gergovia: Benefits of a towed multi-frequency EMI survey .....</b>	<b>47</b>
François-Xavier Simon, Guillaume Hulin, Yann Deberge, Marion Dacko	
<b>First 3D reconstruction of the palaeoenvironment at the Mesolithic site of Duvensee, Germany, using geophysics and geoarchaeology.....</b>	<b>51</b>
Erica Corradini, Dennis Wilken, Marco Zanon, Daniel Groß, Harald Lübke, Diana Panning, Katharina Rusch, Rebekka Mecking, Ercan Erkul, Natalie Pickartz, Ingo Feeser, Wolfgang Rabbel	
<b>Interaction of geophysical prospection, archaeological excavation and historical sources to reconstruct a medieval monastery in Southern Bavaria.....</b>	<b>54</b>
Roland Linck, Florian Becker, Mario Hölzl	

<b>The sunken trade centre of Rungholt – Geophysical investigations in the German North Frisian Wadden Sea .....</b>	<b>58</b>
Michaela Schwardt, Dennis Wilken, Hanna Hadler, Annika Fediuk, Tina Wunderlich, Andreas Vött, Wolfgang Rabbel	
<b>3-D Resistivity Imaging of Rock-Cut Chamber Tombs: the case of the Mycenaean Cemetery in Prosilio, Greece .....</b>	<b>62</b>
Nikos Papadopoulos, Dimitris Oikonomou, Gianluca Cantoro, Nikos Andronikidis, Apostolos Sarris	
<b>Manifestation of the urban design of ancient cities in northern Greece by archaeological prospection .....</b>	<b>66</b>
Gregory N. Tsokas, Panagiotis Tsourlos, George Vargemezis	
<b>Ground-Penetrating radar (GPR) for non-destructive testing of monument walls .....</b>	<b>69</b>
Gregory Tsokas, Nectaria Diamanti, Dimitrios Angelis, Panagiotis Tsourlos, George Vargemezis	
<b>From Roman Villas to 19th century gardens: case studies of geophysical surveys for built heritage in Hungary .....</b>	<b>73</b>
László Nagy	
<b>Hidden Depths and Empty Spaces: the contribution of archaeological prospection to the study of early medieval Ireland .....</b>	<b>75</b>
Susan Curran	
<b>Visualizing the Village: A Comparative Assessment of Remote Sensing Methods on Inishark, Co. Galway, Ireland .....</b>	<b>78</b>
Sean Field, Ian Kuijt	
<b>Unusual monuments, Unusual molecules: geochemical processes at work in County Limerick, Ireland .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Newgrange, New Monuments and New Perspectives.....</b>	<b>85</b>
Joanna Leigh, Geraldine Stout, Matthew Stout	
<b>Microgravimetry for cavity detection—an example from pilot measurements on Newgrange passage tomb (Brú na Bóinne World Heritage Site, Ireland) .....</b>	<b>87</b>
Roman Pasteka, Pavol Zahorec, Juraj Papco, Conor Brady, Kevin Barton	
<b>When the Norsemen return: Complementary GPR surveys at the Viking Age site of Woodstown, County Waterford, Ireland .....</b>	<b>91</b>
Petra Schneidhofer	
<b>Revisiting the Segesta and the Monreale Survey Sites - The Benefits and Possibilities of Digitising Analog Archaeological Spatial Data.....</b>	<b>96</b>
Doris Jetzinger, Christopher Sevara	
<b>Integrating geophysical and geoarchaeological surveys for the reconstruction of a Roman Port infrastructure: the Claudian Harbour at Portus .....</b>	<b>99</b>
Stephen Kay, Elena Pomar, Simon Keay, Kristian Strutt, Stoil Chapkanski, Jean-Philippe Goiran	
<b>Extensive Geophysical Investigations to study the Archaeological Site of Norba (Norma, Central Italy) .....</b>	<b>104</b>
Salvatore Piro, Stefania Quilici Gigli, Enrico Papale, Daniela Zamuner	
<b>Innovating Archaeological Investigations in Mediterranean Landscapes: Contributions from the Prospecting Boundaries Project .....</b>	<b>107</b>

Christopher Sevara, Michael Doneus, Erich Draganits, Roderick B. Salisbury, Cipriano Frazzetta, Doris Jetzinger, Sheba-Celina Schilk, Sebastiano Tusa

<b>Looking for Etruscan harbours: geophysical survey of the ancient site of Pyrgi .....</b>	<b>111</b>
Quentin Vitale, Christophe Benech, Jean-Philippe Goiran	
<b>Investigating a tumulus in the Etruscan necropolis of Banditaccia – Applying multiple non-invasive prospection methods on a World Heritage Site.....</b>	<b>115</b>
Mario Wallner, Immo Trinks, Ingrid Schlögel, Alois Hinterleitner, Hannes Schiel, Tanja Trausmuth, Fabio Colivicchi, Maurizio Forte, Wolfgang Neubauer	
<b>Prospecting Mesolithic buried landscapes and sites. Two case studies from two different types of landscapes in the southern Netherlands .....</b>	<b>119</b>
Eelco Rensink	
<b>"Where animals were equal to humans". Surprising results of complementary geophysical survey on gallows in Lower Silesia (Poland).....</b>	<b>121</b>
Michał Pisz, Magdalena Majorek, Bartosz Świątkowski, Daniel Wojtucki, Karolina Wojtucka, Krzysztof Narloch	
<b>Back to the roots. Remote sensing techniques for rediscovering the Chalcolithic eponymous settlement of Cucuteni culture, Romania .....</b>	<b>125</b>
Andrei Asandulesei, Felix-Adrian Tencariu, Radu-Ştefan Balaur, Mihaela Asandulesei	
<b>Understanding the Anomaly: Multi-Method Geoscientific Research Applied on a Roman Fort in Pojejena .....</b>	<b>129</b>
Michał Pisz, Radosław Mieszkowski, Emil Jęczmienowski	
<b>Geophysical and archaeological research of the baroque church of Saint Nicolas in Kovarce, Slovakia.....</b>	<b>133</b>
Mário Bielich, Ján Tirpák	
<b>Outlining the karst: ERT and GPR surveys to detect karstic morphologies in the Sierra de Atapuerca sites (Burgos, Spain).....</b>	<b>136</b>
Lucía Bermejo Albarrán, Ana Isabel Ortega, Roger Guérin, Lawrence Conyers, Josep M. Parés, Isidoro Campaña, José María Bermúdez de Castro, Eudald Carbonell	
<b>Archaeological feedback of a GPR survey at Labeagako Santa Maria (Navarre): confirmation of survey interpretation and few more surprises.....</b>	<b>139</b>
Ekhiñe Garcia-Garcia, Roger Sala, Alexandre Duró, Helena Ortiz-Quintana, Rosario Mateo, Javier Nuin	
<b>Multi method investigation of submerged features at Semblister, Shetland .....</b>	<b>143</b>
Claire Christie, Michael Stratiagos, Benjamin Jennings	
<b>The Archaeology of 20th Century Sports and Leisure: topophilia, interiography and texture</b>	<b>148</b>
Chris Gaffney, Tom Sparrow, Alex Corkum, Helen McCreary, Chrys Harris, Jason Wood	
<b>A New Look at Old County Number Records: Geophysical Reassessment of Scheduled Roman Villas .....</b>	<b>150</b>
Neil Linford, Paul Linford, Andrew Payne	
<b>The influence of buried archaeology on equine locomotion: results from the Burghley Horse trials cross country course .....</b>	<b>154</b>
Neil Linford, Russell Mackechnie-Guire	
<b>When finding nothing is interesting .....</b>	<b>157</b>
Kris Lockyear	

<b>Co-creation and archaeological prospection: LoCATE – The Local Community Archaeological Training and Equipment Project.....</b>	<b>161</b>
Kate Welham, James Brown, Paul Cheetham, Mike Gill, Lawrence Shaw	
<b>Part Two – Archaeological Prospection in Africa .....</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Old Plans versus Geophysical Surveys: the case study of Gurob (Fayum, Egypt) .....</b>	<b>165</b>
Lionel Darras, Tomasz Herbich, Marine Yoyotte	
<b>Geophysical surveying in Egypt and Sudan: periodical report for 2017–2018 .....</b>	<b>169</b>
Tomasz Herbich, Robert Ryndziewicz	
<b>3-D Electrical Resistivity Tomography in an Urban Environment: the case of Shallalat Gardens, Alexandria, Egypt .....</b>	<b>173</b>
Nikos Papadopoulos, Dimitris Oikonomou, Nasos Argyriou, George Kritikakis, Calliope Limneos Papakosta	
<b>Going back to Medamud: Excavation feedback on processing, interpretation and planning. ....</b>	<b>177</b>
Julien Thiesson, Félix Relats Montserrat	
<b>Magnetic prospection close to the magnetic equator: Case studies in the Tigray plateau of Aksum and Yeha, Ethiopia .....</b>	<b>180</b>
Sandra Ostner, Jörg W.E. Fassbinder, Mandana Parsi, Iris Gerlach, Sarah Japp	
<b>Surveying Kushite sites in Sudan: town and cemetery in Kawa .....</b>	<b>184</b>
Tomasz Herbich, Robert Ryndziewicz	
<b>Archaeo–geophysical prospection of forts in the North Omdurman (Sudan).....</b>	<b>188</b>
Robert Ryndziewicz, Mariusz Drzewiecki	
<b>Part Three – Archaeological Prospection in Asia.....</b>	<b>192</b>
<b>Magnetic signal prospecting in a former Achaemenid ‘palace’: the example of Gumbati (Georgia) .....</b>	<b>193</b>
Julien Thiesson, Sébastien Gondet, Jörg W.E. Fassbinder, Florian Becker, Marion Scheiblecker, Sandra Ostner, Mandana Parsi, Solène Bourgeois Espéron, Kai Kaniuth	
<b>Venice in the desert: Archaeological geophysics on the world’s oldest metropolis Uruk-Warka, the city of King Gilgamesh (Iraq) .....</b>	<b>197</b>
Jörg Fassbinder, Sandra Ostner, Marion Scheiblecker, Mandana Parsi, Margarete van Ess	
<b>Ancient Charax Spasinou (Iraq) – Interpreting a multi-phase city based on magnetometer survey data .....</b>	<b>201</b>
Lena Lambers, Jörg Faßbinder, Stuart Campbell, Stefan Hauser	
<b>Revealing the Hidden Structure of the Ancient City Ur (Iraq) with Electrical Resistivity Tomography .....</b>	<b>206</b>
Mandana Parsi, Jörg Fassbinder, Nikos Papadopoulos, Marion Scheiblecker, Sandra Ostner	
<b>Geophysical survey of single phase archaeological sites: Magnetometry in Wadi Shamlu, Kurdistan, Northern Iraq.....</b>	<b>209</b>
Marion Scheiblecker, Simone Mühl, Jörg Faßbinder	
<b>Conclusions from Twenty Years of Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT) Surveys in Israel for Archaeological Prospection.....</b>	<b>214</b>
Paul Bauman, Alastair McClymont, Eric Johnson, Richard Freund, Randy Shinduke	

<b>Restoring burial mounds damaged by disasters — Contribution of archaeological prospection to collect information at the <i>Idera</i> burial mound, Japan .....</b>	<b>216</b>
Akihiro Kaneda, Hiroshi Yamaguchi	
<b>UAV-based Airborne Laser Scanning in densely vegetated areas: Detecting Sue pottery kilns in Nakadake Sanroku, Japan .....</b>	<b>220</b>
Michael Doneus, Maria Shinoto, Irmela Herzog, Naoko Nakamura, Hideyuki Haijima, Tomokazu Ōnishi, Shōhei Kita'ichi, Baoquan Song	
<b>Interpreting GPR data from Jaffna Fort, Northern Sri Lanka, using historic maps and new excavations .....</b>	<b>224</b>
Armin Schmidt, Prishanta Gunawardhana, Christopher Davis, Duncan Hale, Robin Coningham, P. Pushparatnam, Richie Villis, Mark Woolston-Houshold, Mark Manuel	
<b>Common interpretation of induced polarization tomography (IPT) results with other geophysical methods in an archaeological site .....</b>	<b>228</b>
Meriç Aziz Berge, Mahmut Göktuğ Drahor, Caner Öztürk, Atilla Ongar	
<b>Comparison of excavation results with GPR and magnetic gradiometer surveys at a workshop area in Şapinuwa, Central Anatolia/Turkey .....</b>	<b>232</b>
Mahmut Göktuğ Drahor, Caner Öztürk, Meriç Aziz Berge, Aygül Süel, Atilla Ongar, Sedef Ayyıldız, Semih Gerçek, Murat Aydın	
<b>Archaeological interpretation of the prospection data from Ephesos .....</b>	<b>236</b>
Jasmin Scheifinger	
<b>Part Four – Archaeological Prospection in Australasia.....</b>	<b>241</b>
<b>Multiple processing and interpretation methods of a complex 3-D GPR dataset: An example from northern Australia.....</b>	<b>242</b>
Lawrence Conyers	
<b>Urupa - burial grounds - and remote sensing in Aotearoa (New Zealand) .....</b>	<b>247</b>
Hans-Dieter Bader	
<b>Part Five – Archaeological Prospection in North America .....</b>	<b>249</b>
<b>Village Life in the Middle Ohio Valley, USA: Geophysical Survey and Anomaly Testing.....</b>	<b>250</b>
Jarrod Burks	
<b>Geophysical Evidence for the Timing, Pace, and Complexity of Construction at the Poverty Point World Heritage Site, Louisiana, USA.....</b>	<b>254</b>
Michael Hargrave, R. Berle Clay, Diana Greenlee, Rinita Dalan	
<b>The Origins of the West Plaza Rise at the Poverty Point World Heritage Site, Louisiana, USA.....</b>	<b>259</b>
Rinita Dalan, Diana Greenlee, Michael L. Hargrave, R. Berle Clay, Thurman Allen, George Holley	
<b>GPR Investigations in Earthlodges of the Northern Plains, USA.....</b>	<b>264</b>
Kenneth L. Kvamme	

<b>Part Six – Technical Aspects of Data Acquisition, Analysis, Processing and Visualisation .....</b>	<b>267</b>
<b>Drone radar: A new survey approach for Archaeological Prospection? .....</b>	<b>268</b>
Roland Linck, Alen Kaltak	
<b>The limits of a blob: geophysically informed automatic extraction of magnetometer anomalies .....</b>	<b>272</b>
Armin Schmidt	
<b>Quantification of Daub Masses based on Magnetic Prospection Data.....</b>	<b>274</b>
Natalie Pickartz, Robert Hofmann, Stefan Dreibrodt, Knut Rassmann, Liudmyla Shatilo, René Ohlrau, Dennis Wilken, Wolfgang Rabbel	
<b>Applying Magnetic Depth Estimation Techniques to Archaeo-geophysics .....</b>	<b>279</b>
Jeremy G. Menzer	
<b>Modelling the layer between topsoil and subsoil using magnetic prospection data .....</b>	<b>282</b>
Alois Hinterleitner, Ralf Totschnig, Klaus Löcker, Hannes Schiel, Bendeguz Tobias	
<b>Pathways to prediction: quantifying the impact of soil moisture variations on electric and electromagnetic contrast.....</b>	<b>286</b>
Philippe De Smedt, Daan Hanssens	
<b>A 3D imaging procedure for subsurface magnetic susceptibility: application to the basaltic foundations of a Gallo-Roman villa in Auvergne, France.....</b>	<b>289</b>
Julien Guillemoteau, Francois-Xavier Simon, Bertrand Dousteysier, Marion Dacko, Guillaume Hulin, Jens Tronicke	
<b>WuMapPy an open-source software for geophysical prospection data processing: 2019 milestone .....</b>	<b>293</b>
Quentin Vitale, Lionel Darras, Christophe Benech, Julien Thiesson	
<b>Automated segmentation of archaeo-geophysical images by convolutional neural networks .....</b>	<b>296</b>
Melda Küçükdemirci, Apostolos Sarris	
<b>Rise of the Machines: Improving the identification of possible graves in GPR data with interactive survey guidance and machine learning .....</b>	<b>300</b>
Ashely Green, Paul Cheetham	
<b>Automated detection and analysis of diffraction hyperbolas in ground-penetrating radar data .....</b>	<b>305</b>
Lieven Verdonck	
<b>Novel volume visualisation of GPR data inspired by medical applications.....</b>	<b>309</b>
Wolfgang Neubauer, Alexander Bornik, Mario Wallner, Geert Verhoeven	
<b>Strategies for the optimization of 3-D electrical resistivity tomography data using the Jacobian matrix .....</b>	<b>313</b>
Kleanthis Simyrdanis, Nikos Papadopoulos	
<b>Processing Strategies for 3-D Marine Dynamic Electrical Resistivity Tomography Data .....</b>	<b>317</b>
Dimitrios Oikonomou, Nikos Papadopoulos, Kleanthis Simyrdanis, Gianluca Cantoro, Julien Beck, Meng Heng Loke	

<b>Improving the lithological significance of shear wave tomograms through coring and pressure correction.....</b>	<b>322</b>
Dennis Wilken, Wolfgang Rabbel, Tina Wunderlich, Martina Karle	
<b>Aerial thermal imaging from UAV in archaeology, a case study: the abandoned medieval town of Montecorvino (Foggia, Italy).....</b>	<b>326</b>
Luca d'Altilia	
<b>Multi-spectral, multi-temporal survey in the American Midwest.....</b>	<b>328</b>
Helen McCreary, Jarrod Burks, Alex Corkum, Chris Gaffney, Andy Wilson	
<b>Evaluating the capability of a SUAS mounted multispectral sensor for the mapping of archaeological resources in an alluvial landscape .....</b>	<b>331</b>
Nicholas Crabb, Matthew Brolly, Niall Burnside, Andy Howard, Robin Jackson, Chris Carey	
<b>Beneath the Stains of Time: The physiochemical prospection of multiperiod sites in southern Britain - a geophysics approach to geochemistry? .....</b>	<b>335</b>
Paul Cheetham	
<b>Three-dimensional modelling of petroglyphs of South Siberia .....</b>	<b>337</b>
Vladislav Kazakov, Vasily Kovalev, Kair Zhumadilov, Lyudmila Lbova, Aleksandr Simukhin	
 <b>Part Seven – Improving our Legacy: Reviewing the Key Outcomes of Archaeological Prospection Data .....</b>	 <b>339</b>
<b>Introducing the ‘Soil science &amp; Archaeo-Geophysics Alliance’ (SAGA): a new interdisciplinary network in archaeo-geophysics.....</b>	<b>340</b>
Carmen Cuenca-Garcia, Kayt Armstrong, Apostolos Sarris, Philippe De Smedt, Clare Wilson, Elina Aidona, Anne Roseveare, Martin Roseveare, Petra Schneidhofer, Jörg Faßbinder, Ian Moffat, Marion Scheiblecker, Abir Jrad, Martijn van Leusen, Kelsey Lowe, and SAGA's Management Committee	
<b>Laying the geophysical groundwork: <i>in situ</i> measurements as a framework for strategizing archaeological prospection .....</b>	<b>344</b>
Philippe De Smedt, Ynse Declercq, Daan Hanssens, Wouter B. Verschoof-van der Vaart, Tom Hamburg, Walter Laan, Pieter Lalloo, Frédéric Cruz, Karsten Lambers	
<b>Review strategies for archaeological prospection, incorporating excavation and research ...</b>	<b>345</b>
Cian Hogan	
<b>Methodological framework to automatically compare large-scale magnetometry measurements with excavation datasets .....</b>	<b>349</b>
Gábor Mesterházy	
<b>Archaeological guidelines for geophysical survey in the urban environment.....</b>	<b>353</b>
Guglielmo Strapazon, Dimitrios Oikonomou, Evan Alevizos, Kleantes Simyrdanis, Melda Küçükdemirci, Apostolos Sarris	
<b>Addressing archaeological research questions using geophysical surveys – a landscape case study.....</b>	<b>355</b>
Jakob Kainz	
<b>Up-skilling and Up-scaling: the realities of adapting to the challenges of the current environment in British commercial geophysics .....</b>	<b>359</b>
Chrys Harris	



# Magnetic signal prospecting in a former Achaemenid ‘palace’: the example of Gumbati (Georgia)

Julien Thiesson<sup>1</sup>, Sébastien Gondet<sup>2</sup>, Jörg W.E. Fassbinder<sup>3</sup>, Florian Becker<sup>3</sup>, Marion Scheiblecker<sup>3</sup>, Sandra Ostner<sup>3</sup>, Mandana Parsi<sup>3</sup>, Solène Bourgeois Espéron<sup>4</sup>, Kai Kaniuth<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Umr 7619 Metis Sorbonne Université, Paris, France, <sup>2</sup>UMR 5133 Archéorient (Univ Lyon, CNRS/Lyon 2 University), Lyon, France, <sup>3</sup>Geophysics Department Ludwig-Maximilians-University München, München, Germany, <sup>4</sup>Polytech Sorbonne, Sorbonne Université, Paris, France, <sup>5</sup>Institut für Vorderasiatische Archäologie Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany

## The Gumbati site

The archaeological site of Gumbati is located on the right bank of the Alazani River in the Kakheti region, Georgia. Excavations in the 1990s (Knauß 2000: 119-130) revealed parts of a rectangular building made with mudbrick walls of 2m width on average. Its southern extension is almost 40m in length. Stone column bases, typical of an Achaemenid royal style well-known from ancient Persia, were found around the building. Because of its architectural characteristics, it was interpreted as the remains of one of the administrative complexes controlling the Transcaucasus, the northernmost province of the Achaemenid Empire (mid-6th/mid-4th century BC).

## Project framework and purposes

In July 2018, archaeological investigations were resumed at Gumbati within the frame of a German-French joint project named “Paradise” and funded from 2017 to 2020 by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) and the *Agence National de la Recherche* (ANR). Its main goal is to produce comparable datasets regarding the spatial organization of several Achaemenid centers of power located in central Iran and in the Caucasus. As these sites were created within planned landscapes, covering dozens of hectares and encompassing spacious gardens, residences and administrative buildings, an improved understanding of their layout depends on complementary surveys. Consequently, one of the main tasks implemented is to develop suitable geophysical approaches for these sites. Since they are of a complex archaeological nature, combining mudbrick architectural remains and lighter garden infrastructures such as flow channels, we focus on combined magnetic and electromagnetic methods. Also, since all sites are located in intensively farmed regions, we aim to evaluate whether a deeper study of the soil magnetic properties would enable us to map the different sectors of the site, e.g. gardened and inhabited areas, despite surveying within landscapes of destruction.

## Implementing geophysics at Gumbati

### *Devices used*

In order to comprehensively evaluate the magnetic signal of soils of the surroundings, we used magnetometry and EMI prospecting.

The magnetic anomaly map was obtained by using and processing data from three devices made available by the Munich University Geophysics Department:

- Förster Ferex Gradiometer in the so-called “quadro-sensor” configuration (Foerster Ferex 4.032 Datalogger with four CON650 probes). The probes were mounted on a frame and carried in zigzag mode, 40cm above the ground.
- Scintrex Smartmag Sm4G-special Cesium-magnetometer applied as total field magnetometer, in a so-called “duo-sensor” configuration.
- Geometrics G-858 MagMapper Cesium-magnetometer applied as total field magnetometer, in a so-called “duo-sensor” configuration.

The EMI maps were produced using a GF Instruments CMD-Mini Explorer made available by the University Lyon 2/CNRS Archéorient lab. Measurements were recorded in both horizontal coplanar/vertical dipole (HCP/VD) and vertical coplanar mode/horizontal dipole (VCP/HD) configurations. It provides in-phase and apparent electrical conductivity maps for three different transmitter-receiver (Tx-Rx) distances of 0.32m, 0.71m and 1.18 m.

### Survey strategy

The main target of the first 2018 geophysical prospection campaign at Gumbati was to obtain more information on archaeological remains in the vicinity of the partially excavated building. The trenches that brought to light architectural features were located in cultivated fields southwest of a large farmstead built in Soviet times. Consequently we mainly focused the magnetic survey on that area. A grid of 40m by 40m squares was staked out on the field over an area of about 5.5ha. The southern part covered the refilled trenches of the former excavation. The prospection was accomplished using all three magnetometer instruments for different parts in order to evaluate their efficiency in that particular context. The Ferex gradiometer was used for the two eastern and southern 40m rows. The two cesium magnetometers were alternatively used on the northwestern part.

Once the magnetograms were edited, we selected an area where we implemented the EMI survey. This area shows remarkably discrete features combined with more continuous soil magnetic property variations. By surveying it with the EMI device, we aimed to test the capability of this method to describe accurately both types of anomalies (geometries and/or magnetic properties). The whole area was surveyed twice with the EMI, at first in HCP mode, then in VCP mode, collecting 12 datasets in all. The probe was held as close as possible to the surface. Regular measurements were taken on a reference point in order to correct the drift.

### Results


Here, for brevity, we focus principally on the magnetic signal of the site, rather than a large treatise on the entire set of 12 EMI apparent properties maps.

#### *Magnetic map*

The magnetogram (Fig. 1) shows that the site is poorly preserved. The excavators had already stressed the impact of repeated ploughings on the architectural remains. In the northern part, a number of roundish dark anomalies can be interpreted as signatures of pits. The linear features, pointing to the existence of mudbrick walls, are only just visible in the center of the image. These faint lines, oriented approximately at a 45° angle from north, may belong to building remains such as the ones excavated. However this direction is also parallel to the actual ploughing and field limits. Further analysis is therefore needed to ascertain the interpretation. In the southern part of the surveyed area, the magnetogram shows blurry features possibly caused by the filling of the old trenches.

#### *EMI and transformed magnetic anomaly map*

The magnetic signal can be described as the whole set of parameters which could be measured in prospecting. It includes the magnetic field anomaly (total or gradient), the magnetic susceptibility (measured by EMI devices) and ideally the magnetic viscosity. Presently, only the first two parameters were measured. The magnetic map (Fig. 2a), and its conversion as a susceptibility layer (Desvignes and Tabbagh 1995: 122-132) (Fig. 2b), may be compared to apparent magnetic properties using EMI (Fig. 2c). The general trends are the same. However, since the EMI is characterized by a less spatially resolved sampling interval than the magnetometry, some discrepancies appear. We cannot evaluate if these discrepancies are linked to the spatial sampling, measurement errors or the difference between the total and the induced magnetization. The next step will be to use the processing described by Benech *et al.* (2016: 103-112) for inverting the data to a magnetic susceptibility model to be transformed in to a magnetic anomaly. If the discrepancies are confirmed, some sampling and trench testing could be useful to understand its origins.



LMU Archaeological Geophysics Gumbati with outline of the EM-survey of the French team;  
 Magnetic data Fassbinder/Becker/Ostner/Parsi/Scheiblecker 2018  
 Cesium total field magnetometer Scintrex SMG-4 special and  
 Förster Ferex 4032 with 4 CON650 probes, sampling density  $0.1 \times 0.5$  m interpolated to  $0.25 \times 0.25$  m;  
 Satellite image Digital Globe (2018) WV2 scene 12JUL28081042-S2AS-058132672010\_01 from 12.07.2012  
 Map: Florian Becker 2019, coordinate system: WGS84 UTM 38N

 Outline of EM-survey

Fig. 1. Results of the magnetic prospection on Gumbati (scale: white/-10nT to black/+10nT).




Fig. 2. (a) Extract of the magnetic anomaly map, (b) map of the pseudo-apparent magnetic susceptibility map computed from the magnetic anomaly map, (c) the apparent magnetic susceptibility map obtained from the in-phase measurement of the VCP Tx-Rx =1.18m channel.

## Conclusion

The magnetic signal of the archaeological remains at the site of Gumbati was investigated. Magnetic and EMI survey results are generally in good accordance. The discrepancies between the pseudo-susceptibility map and the apparent susceptibility map could evidence the presence of material bearing remnant magnetization. However, the uncertainties linked to the EMI map lead us to process the data further and we will compute an inverted susceptibility model. If differences are confirmed, then it might be worthwhile to combine the survey with a complete magnetic description of soil samples that would help us to clarify their origins.

## References

Benech, C., Dabas, M., Simon, F-X., Tabbagh, A. and Thiesson, J. 2016. Interpretation of shallow electromagnetic instruments resistivity and magnetic susceptibility measurements using rapid 1D/3D inversion. *Geophysics*. 81(2). 103–112.

Desvignes, G. and Tabbagh, A. 1995. Simultaneous interpretation of magnetic and electromagnetic prospecting for characterization of magnetic features. *Archaeological Prospection*. 2. 129–139.

Knauß, F.S. 2000. Der "Palast" von Gumbati und die Rolle der Achaimeniden im transkaukasischen Iberien. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan*. 32. 119–130.