

ARCHAEOLOGY OF ARMENIA
IN REGIONAL CONTEXT II
International Conference
dedicated to the 60th Anniversary
of the Institute of Archaeology
and Ethnography

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ
ՀՆԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ
ՏԱՐԱԾԱՆԴՐՁԱՆԱՅԻՆ
ՀԱՄԱՏԵՔՍՈՒՄ II
ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Հնագիտության
և ազգագրության ինստիտուտի
60-ամյակին նվիրված
միջազգային գիտաժողով



ARCHAEOLOGY OF ARMENIA IN REGIONAL CONTEXT II

International Conference dedicated
to the 60th Anniversary of the Institute
of Archaeology and Ethnography

Yerevan

9th–11th of July, 2019

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀՆԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ՏԱՐԱԾԱՆՐՁԱՆԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՄԱՏԵՔՍՈՒՄ II

ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Հնագիտության և ազգագրության ինստիտուտի
60-ամյակին նվիրված միջազգային գիտաժողով

Երևան

9–11 հուլիսի, 2019թ.

SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL
OF THE CONFERENCE

Pavel Avetisyan (Armenia)
Arsen Bobokhyan (Armenia)
Ian Lindsay (USA)
Ruben Badalyan (Armenia)
Lori Khatchadourian (USA)
Hayk Avetisyan (Armenia)
Roman Hovsepyan (Armenia)
Adam T. Smith (USA)
Boris Gasparian (Armenia)
Christine Chataigner (France)
Daniel Adler (USA)
Giusto Traina (France)
Grigor Areshian (Armenia)
Hamlet Petrosyan (Armenia)
Keith Wilkinson (USA)
Krzysztof Jakubiak (Poland)
Mitchell Rothman (USA)
Roberto Dan (Italy)
Sergey Korenevskiy (Russia)
Stéphane Deschamps (France)
Goderdzi Narimanishvili (Georgia)

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITTEE
OF THE CONFERENCE

Pavel Avetisyan
Roman Hovsepyan
Arsen Bobokhyan

Secretary: Mariam Amiryan

ԳԻՏԱԺՈՂՈՎԻ
ԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ ԽՈՐՀՈՒՐԴ

Պավել Ավետիսյան
Արսեն Բոբոխյան
Իեն Լինդսի (ԱՄՆ)
Ռուբեն Բադալյան
Լորի Խաչատուրյան (ԱՄՆ)
Հայկ Ավետիսյան
Ռոման Հովսեփյան
Ադամ Թ. Սմիթ (ԱՄՆ)
Բորիս Գասպարյան
Քրիստին Շատենյե (Ֆրանսիա)
Դանիել Ադլեր (ԱՄՆ)
Ջուստո Տրաինա (Ֆրանսիա)
Գրիգոր Արեշյան
Համլետ Պետրոսյան
Քեյթ Վիլքինսոն (ԱՄՆ)
Կրզիշտոֆ Յակոբյակ (Լեհաստան)
Միտչել Ռոթման (ԱՄՆ)
Ռոբերտո Դան (Իտալիա)
Սերգեյ Կորենևսկիյ (Ռուսաստան)
Շտեֆան Դեշան (Ֆրանսիա)
Գոդերգի Նարիմանիշվիլի (Վրաստան)

ԳԻՏԱԺՈՂՈՎԻ ԿԱԶՄԱԿԵՐՊՉԱԿԱՆ
ԽՈՐՀՈՒՐԴ

Պավել Ավետիսյան
Ռոման Հովսեփյան
Արսեն Բոբոխյան

Քարտուղար՝ Մարիամ Ամիրյան

CONFERENCE PROGRAM
ԳԻՏԱԺՈՂՈՎԻ ԾՐԱԳԻՐ

Conference venue:
Round hall of the Presidium of NAS RA
(24 Marshall Baghramian Ave., second floor)

Գիտաժողովի անցկացման վայրը՝
ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Նախագահության նիստերի կլոր դահլիճ
(Մարշալ Բաղրամյան պող., 24, երկրորդ հարկ)

9 July, Tuesday

Opening ceremony **09:30–10:00**

Welcome Speech

President of NAS RA, acad. *Radik Martirosyan*,

Acad. Secretary of the Division of Armenian Studies
and Social Sciences of NAS RA *Yuri Suvaryan*

Deputy Minister of Education, Science, Culture and Sports of RA
Narine Khachaturyan

Prof. of Cornell University, USA, *Adam T. Smith*

Prof. of Winchester University, UK, *Keith Wilkinson*

On the history of the Institute
of Archaeology and Ethnography **10:00–10:15**

Pavel Avetisyan, Arsen Bobokhyan

Remembrance words:
curriculum makers of the Institute **10:15–11:15**

*Mkrtich Zardaryan, Garegin Tumanyan, Irena Kalantaryan,
Avetis Grigoryan, Arsen Bobokhyan*

Coffee break **11:15–11:30**

Paleolithic – Initial occupation stages of the region

Keith Wilkinson, Boris Gasparyan

- 1 Pleistocene geomorphology and geology
of the Hrazdan Valley, Central Armenia:
linking volcanism and the Palaeolithic record **11:30–11:55**

*Jennifer Sherriff, Keith Wilkinson, Daniel Adler, Dmitri Arakelyan,
Emily Beverly, Simon Blockley, Boris Gasparyan, Darren Mark,
Khachatur Meliksetian, Samvel Nahapetyan, Katie Preece, Rhys Timms*

- 2 Geochemical evidence for the control
of fire by Middle Palaeolithic hominins **11:55–12:20**

*Alex Brittingham, Michael T. Hren, Gideon Hartman,
Keith N. Wilkinson, Carolina Mallol, Boris Gasparyan, Daniel S. Adler*

- 3 Niches that never been abandoned.
Study of the cave sites in the Republic of Armenia **12:20–12:45**

*Boris Gasparyan, Artur Petrosyan, Ariel Malinsky-Buller,
Phil Glauberman, Keith Wilkinson, Andrew Kandel, Makoto Arimura,
Roberto Dan, Dmitri Arakelyan, Samvel Nahapetyan, Anahit Khudaverdyan,
Ani Adigoyzalyan, Hayk Haydosyan, Hayk Azizbekyan, Daniel Adler*

- 4 Exploitation of Pleistocene landscapes and resources.
Main results of study of the Paleolithic open-air sites
in the Republic of Armenia **12:45–13:10**

*Boris Gasparyan, Keith Wilkinson, Andrew Kandel, Charles Egeland,
Ariel Malinsky-Buller, Phil Glauberman, Ellery Frahm, Artur Petrosyan, Samvel
Nahapetyan, Dmitri Arakelyan, Jennifer Sherrif, Daniel Adler*

Lunch **13:10–14:30**

Neolithic and Eneolithic (Chalcolithic)– Early agricultural and farming societies

Ruben Badalyan, Artur Petrosyan

- 5 A step forward to the neolitization. Early Holocene
sites of the Republic of Armenia **14:30–14:55**

*Artur Petrosyan, Makoto Arimura, Samvel Nahapetyan,
Dmitri Arakelyan, Boris Gasparyan*

- 6 The Late Neolithic culture of Armenia:
the first farmers in the Ararat valley **14:55–15:20**

*Ruben Badalyan, Armine Harutyunyan, Christine Chataigner,
Jaques Chabot, Adrian Bălăşescu, Roman Hovsepyan, Lilit Ter-Minasyan*

- 7 New light on the Late Neolithic communities of the
Ararat Plain: recent discoveries from Masis Blur **15:20–15:45**

*Kristine Martirosyan-Olshansky, Pavel Avetisyan, Gregory Areshian,
Roman Hovsepyan, Anneke Janzen, Adrian Bălăşescu, Varduhi Melikyan*

Coffee break **15:45–16:00**

- 8 Maikop-Novosvobodnenskaya community
of the Caucasus: chronology and variants **16:00–16:25**

Sergey N. Korenevsky

Discussions **16:25–17:00**

10 July, Wednesday

Early Bronze Age – Formation and spread of the Kura-Araxes Culture

Ashot Piliposyan, Adam T. Smith

- 9 ArAGATS 1998 – 2018. 20 years of investigations into Bronze and Iron Age sites in the Tsaghkahovit plain **10:00–10:25**
Ruben Badalyan, Adam T. Smith, Lori Khatchadourian, Ian Lindsay, Armine Harutyunyan, Alan F. Greene, Belinda Monahan, Roman Hovsepyan, Maureen Marshall, Lilit Ter-Minasyan
- 10 Main results of archaeological investigations in the Sotk region **10:25–10:50**
Arsen Bobokhyan, Rene Kunze, Khachatur Meliksetyan, Roman Hovsepyan, Mariam Amiryan
- 11 New perspectives on Kura-Araxes Shengavit **10:50–11:15**
Mitchell Rothman, Hakob Simonyan, Pam Crabtree, Jennifer Piro, Roman Hovsepyan

Coffee break **11:15–11:30**

- 12 Obsidian networks and emergent frontiers in the Early and Late Bronze Ages: a view from Project ArAGATS **11:30–11:55**
Adam T. Smith
- 13 The Tavush Archaeological Project **11:55–12:20**
Bérengère Perello, Ruben Badalyan, Levon Aghikyan, Karen Azatyan, Olivier Barge, Emmanuelle Régagnon

Middle Bronze Age – Societies with increasing mobility

Hakob Simonyan, Arsen Bobokhyan

- 14 The Vishaps of Karmir Sar: history of a sacred site on Mt. Aragats from the Chalcolithic period to present times **12:20–12:45**
Alessandra Gilibert, Arsen Bobokhyan, Pavol Hnila, Roman Hovsepyan, Harald von der Osten

- 15 The dynamics of socio-cultural transformations from the 20th–19th to the 8th–7th centuries BCE (based on the results of excavations at the Qarashamb necropolis) **12:45–13:10**

Pavel Avetisyan, Varduhi Melikyan, Artak Hakhverdyan, Hanna Chazin, Tatevik Harutyunyan

Lunch **13:10–14:30**

- 16 Symbols of power: the Verin Naver tomb I-B in Armenia (1610–1430 BCE) **14:30–14:55**

Hakob Simonyan

Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages – the period of cultural and political integration

Ian Lindsay, Mateusz Iskra

- 17 Project ArAGATS' Kasakh valley archaeological survey (KVAS) (2015–17): preliminary analysis of Paleolithic through Bronze Age settlement patterns **14:55–15:20**

Ian Lindsay, Karen Azatyan, Alan Greene, Arshaluys Mkrtchyan

- 18 Prehistoric threshing boards from Georgia **15:20–15:45**

Dimitri Narimanishvili

Coffee break **15:45–16:00**

- 19 The Metsamor Project. Preliminary observations after the six seasons of the field activity **16:00–16:25**

Krzysztof Jakubiak, Ashot Piliposyan, Artavazd Zakyan

- 20 The development of lower town in Metsamor through the second and first millennium BC. Results of pottery analysis **16:25–16:50**

Mateusz Iskra

- 21 The main stages of early agriculture in the territory of Republic of Armenia **16:50–17:15**

Roman Hovsepyan

Discussions **17:15–17:30**

11 July, Thursday

Kingdom of Van – The emergence of the Near Eastern administrative system in the region

Yervand Grekyan, Roberto Dan

22 The fortress of Aramus in its historical context **09:30–09:55**

Walter Kuntner, Sandra Heinsch, Hayk Avetisyan

23 The Armenian-Italian archaeological expedition to Kotayk (2013–2019) and Vayots Dzor (2016–2019): an overview of the results **09:55–10:20**

Artur Petrosyan, Roberto Dan, Priscilla Vitolo, Boris Gasparyan

24 New reflections on the organization of the Erebuni sanctuary **10:20–10:45**

Stéphane Deschamps, Miqayel Badalyan, François Fichet de Clairfontaine

25 Recent archaeological works in Oshakan **10:45–11:10**

Michael Herles, Hayk Avetisyan

Coffee break **11:10–11:30**

26 Preliminary results of the 2017–2018 archaeological excavations in Odzaberd **11:30–11:55**

Miqayel Badalyan, Arthur Mikayelyan, Hayk Kyureghyan, Roman Hovsepyan, Hasmik Simonyan, Samvel Nahapetyan, Arman Yeghiazaryan

27 The main results of the 2013–2018 survey of anthropomorphic stelae of Artsakh **11:55–12:20**

Nzhdeh Yeranyan

Classical epochs – The formation process of national states

Mkrtich Zardaryan, Lori Khatchadourian, Krzysztof Jakubiak

28 Jar burials of Tigranakert in Artsakh **12:20–12:45**

Hamlet Petrosyan, Vardges Safaryan, Inessa Karapetyan, Lyuba Kirakosyan, Ruben Vardanyan, Tatiana Vardanesova, Armine Gabrielyan

29 Ancient Armenian capital Armavir: the results of study 2009–2019 **12:45–13:10**

Inessa Karapetyan, Amina Kanetsyan, Lilit Minasyan, Ruzanna Palanjyan, Nvard Tiratsyan, Dianna Mirijanyan, Hasmik Hovhannisyanyan

Lunch	13:10–14:30
-------	--------------------

- 30 Excavations of Ancient Artashat in 2016–2018:
“Riverside district” **14:30–14:55**
*Mkrtich H. Zardaryan, Amina Kanetsyan,
Hayk Gyulamiryan, Suzanna Muradyan, Armenuhi Petrosyan*
- 31 A review of trepanations in Armenian
Highland with new cases **14:55–15:20**
Anahit Yu. Khudaverdyan
- 32 Public archaeology on the Tsaghkahovit Plain **15:20–15:45**
Lori Khatchadourian

Middle Ages – The emergence and development of Christian culture

Hamlet Petrosyan, Patrick Donabédian

- 33 Yereruyk, a site rich in enigmas and promises.
The Armenian-French archaeological mission
of LA3M in Armenia (2009–2016) **15:45–16:10**
Patrick Donabédian

Coffee break	16:10–16:30
--------------	--------------------

- 34 Dvin archaeological excavations (2009–2018) **16:30–16:55**
*Hamlet Petrosyan, Koryun Khafadaryan, Niura Hakobyan,
Frina Babayan, Aghavni Zhamkochyan, Gayane Kocharyan*
- 35 Making of the Silk Road in Vaiots Dzor: a light
archaeology of a medieval territory in Armenia **16:55–17:20**
Hamlet Petrosyan, Michele Nucciotti

<i>Discussion and Closing the conference</i>	17:20–18:20
--	--------------------

Gala Dinner	20:00–22:00
-------------	--------------------

12 July, Friday

Excursion	09:00–17:00
------------------	--------------------

Verin Naver,
“Metsamor” Historical-Archaeological Museum-Reserve,
Sardarapat, Armenian Ethnographic Museum.

9 հուլիսի, երեքշաբթի

Բացման արարողություն

09:30–10:00

Ողջույնի խոսք

ՀՀ ԳԱԱ նախագահ, ակադ. *Ռադիկ Մարտիրոսյան*

ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Հայագիտության և հասարակական գիտությունների բաժանմունքի ակադ. քարտուղար *Յուրի Մուվարյան*

ՀՀ ԿԳՄՍ փոխնախարար *Նարինե Խաչատրյան*

ԱՄՆ Քորնելի համալսարանի պրոֆ. *Ադամ Թ. Մմիրթ*

ՄԹ Վինչեսթերի համալսարանի պրոֆ. *Քեյթ Վիլքինսոն*

Հնագիտության և ազգագրության

ինստիտուտի պատմությունից

10:00–10:15

Ավետիսյան Պավել, Բորիսյան Արսեն

խոսք հիշատակի. ինստիտուտի

կենսագրության կերտողները

10:15–11:15

Չարդարյան Մկրտիչ, Թունանյան Գարեգին,

Քալանթարյան Իրենա, Գրիգորյան Ավետիս, Բորիսյան Արսեն

Սրճադադար

11:15–11:30

Պալեոլիթ. Տարածաշրջանի բնակեցման սկզբնափուլերը

Վիլքինսոն Քեյթ, Գասպարյան Բորիս

1 Հրազդանի կիրճի (կենտրոնական Հայաստան) պլեյստոցենյան դարաշրջանի գեոմորֆոլոգիան և աշխարհագրությունը.

համադրելով հրաբխականությունը

և պալեոլիթյան բնակեցումը

11:30–11:55

Շերիֆ Ջենիֆեր, Վիլքինսոն Քեյթ, Աղլեր Դանիել,

Առաքելյան Դմիտրի, Բավետլի Էմիլի, Բորջել Սայմոն,

Գասպարյան Բորիս, Մարկ Դարրեն, Մելիքսեյջան Խաչատուր,

Նահապետյան Սամվել, Փրիս Քեյթի, Թիմո Ռիս

2 Գեոքիմիական տվյալներ միջին պալեոլիթյան

մարդկանց կողմից կրակի վերահսկողության

վերաբերյալ

11:55–12:20

Բրիթթինգհեմ Ալեքս, Հրեն Թ. Մայքլ, Հարթմեն Գիդեոն,

Վիլքինսոն Քեյթ, Մալոլ Կարոլինա, Գասպարյան Բորիս, Աղլեր Դանիել

- 3 Մշտապես օգտագործված Էկոլոգիական խորշեր.
քարայրների ուսումնասիրությունը Հայաստանի
Հանրապետությունում **12:20–12:45**

*Գասպարյան Բորիս, Պետրոսյան Արթուր, Մալինսկի-Բուլլեր Արիել,
Գլաուբերման Ֆիլ, Վիլքինսոն Քեյթ, Քենդլ Էնդրյու, Արիմուրա Մակոտո,
Դան Ռոբերտո, Առաքելյան Դմիտրի, Նահապետյան Սամվել,
Խոդալվերդյան Անահիտ, Ադիգոզայան Անի, Հայրոսյան Հայկ,
Ազիզբեկյան Հայկ, Ադեր Դանիել*

- 4 Պլեյստոցենի լանդշաֆտների և ռեսուրսների շահագործումը.
Հայաստանի Հանրապետության պալեոլիթյան բացօթյա
կայանների և հնավայրերի ուսումնասիրության
հիմնական արդյունքները **12:45–13:10**

*Գասպարյան Բորիս, Վիլքինսոն Քեյթ, Քանդել Էնդրյու,
Էգելանդ Չարլզ, Մալինսկի-Բուլլեր Արիել, Գլաուբերման Ֆիլ,
Ֆրահմ Էլերի, Պետրոսյան Արթուր, Նահապետյան Սամվել,
Առաքելյան Դմիտրի, Շերիֆ Ջենիֆեր, Ադեր Դանիել*

ճաշ

13:10–14:30

Նեոլիթ և Էնեոլիթ. Վաղ երկրագործական հասարակություններ

Բաղալյան Ռուբեն, Պետրոսյան Արթուր

- 5 Քայլ դեպի նեոլիթյան հեղափոխություն.
Հայաստանի Հանրապետության վաղ հոլոցենի
հուշարձանները **14:30–14:55**

*Պետրոսյան Արթուր, Արիմուրա Մակոտո,
Նահապետյան Սամվել, Առաքելյան Դմիտրի, Գասպարյան Բորիս*

- 6 Հայաստանի ուշ նեոլիթյան մշակույթը. Արարատյան
դաշտի առաջին երկրագործները **14:55–15:20**

*Բաղալյան Ռուբեն, Հարությունյան Արմինե, Շատենյե Քրիստին, Շաքո Ժակ,
Բալաշեակու Ադրիան, Հովսեփյան Ռոման, Տեր-Մինասյան Լիլիթ*

- 7 Արարատյան դաշտի ուշ նեոլիթյան հասարակությունը
Նոր լույսի ներքո. վերջին բացահայտումները
Մասիս բլուրից **15:20–15:45**

*Մարտիրոսյան-Օլջանսկի Քրիստինե, Ավետիսյան Պավել,
Արեշյան Գրիգոր, Հովսեփյան Ռոման, Յանգեն Աննեկե,
Բալաշեակու Ադրիան, Մելիքյան Վարդուհի*

Ընդմիջում **15:45–16:00**

8 Կովկասի մայկոպ-նովոսվբոդնենսկայա հասարակությունը.
ժամանակագրությունը և տարբերակները **16:00–16:25**
Կորենևսկի Ն. Սերգեյ

Քննարկումներ **16:25–17:00**

10 հոկտիսի, չորեքշաբթի

**Վաղ բրոնզի դար. Կուր-արաքսյան մշակույթի
ձևավորումը և տարածումը**

Սմիթ Թ. Ադամ, Փիլիպոսյան Աշոտ

9 ArAGATS 1998–2018. Ծաղկահովիտի դաշտի
բրոնզի և երկաթի դարերի հնավայրերի
ուսումնասիրության 20 տարին **10:00–10:25**

*Բաղայան Ռուբեն, Սմիթ Թ. Ադամ., Խաչատրյան Լորի,
Լինդսի Իեն, Հարությունյան Արմինե, Գրին Ֆ. Այան, Մոնասհան Բեյլինդա,
Հովսեփյան Ռոման, Մարշալ Մորին, Տեր-Մինասյան Լիլիթ*

10 Սոթքի տարածաշրջանի հնագիտական
հետազոտությունների հիմնական
արդյունքները **10:25–10:50**

*Բորոխյան Արսեն, Կունցե Ռենե, Մելիքսեթյան Խաչատուր,
Հովսեփյան Ռոման, Ամիրջյան Մարիամ*

11 Կուր-արաքսյան ձեռագավիթի հետազոտության
նոր հեռանկարները **10:50–11:15**

*Ռոյթան Միթել, Միմոնյան Հակոբ, Քրաբոթի Փեմ,
Պիրո Ջեննիֆեր, Հովսեփյան Ռոման*

Սրճադադար **11:15–11:30**

12 Վանակատի տարածման ցանցը և առաջացման
սահմանները վաղ և ուշ բրոնզի դարերում.
ըստ ArAGATS ծրագրի հետազոտությունների **11:30–11:55**
Սմիթ Թ. Ադամ

13 «Տավուշ» հնագիտական ծրագիրը **11:55–12:20**
*Պերելլո Բերանժե, Բաղայան Ռուբեն, Աղիկյան Լևոն,
Ազատյան Կարեն, Բարզ Օլիվեր, Ռեզանյոն Էմանուել*

Միջին բրոնզի դար. մոբիլ հասարակություններ

Սիմոնյան Ջակոբ, Բոբոխյան Արսեն

- 14 Կարմիր սարի վիշապները. Արագած լեռան մի սրբավայրի պատմությունը պղնձի դարից մինչև մեր օրերը **12:20–12:45**
Ջիլիբերտ Ալեսանդրա, Բորոխյան Արսեն, Հնիլա Պավոյ, Հովսեփյան Ռոման, Ֆոն դեր Օպթեն Հարալդ

- 15 Սոցիալ-մշակութային միջավայրի ձևավոխումների դինամիկան մ.թ.ա. XX/XIX–VIII/VII դդ. (ըստ Քարաշամբի դամբարանադաշտի պեղումների արդյունքների) **12:45–13:10**
Ավետիսյան Պավել, Մելիքյան Վարդուհի, Հախավերդյան Արտակ, Չազին Հաննա, Հարությունյան Տաթևիկ

Ճաշ **13:10–14:30**

- 16 Իշխանության խորհրդանշաններ Վերին Նավերի I-B դամբարանից (Ք.ա. 1610–1430 թթ.) **14:30–14:55**
Հակոբ Սիմոնյան

Ուշ բրոնզի և վաղ երկաթի դարեր. մշակութային և քաղաքական սերտաճման դարաշրջանը

Լինդսի Իեն, Իսկրա Մատեուշ

- 17 ArAGATS ծրագրի՝ Քասախի հովտի հնագիտական հետազոտությունը (2015–2017 թթ.). քարի դարից մինչ բրոնզի դար ընկած ժամանակաշրջանի բնակավայրային համակարգի նախնական վերլուծությունը **14:55–15:20**
Լինդսի Իեն, Ազատյան Կարեն, Գրին Այան, Մկրտչյան Արշարույս

- 18 Նախապատմական կամեր Վրաստանից **15:20–15:45**
Նարինանիշվիլի Դիմիտրի

Ընդմիջում **15:45–16:00**

- 19 Մեծամոր ծրագիրը. դաշտային 6 սեզոնների գործունեության նախնական արդյունքները **16:00–16:25**
Յակուբյակ Կրզիշտոֆ, Փիլիպոսյան Աշոտ, Չաքյան Արտավազդ

- 20 Մեծամորի ներքին թաղամասի զարգացումը Զ.ա. I հազ. խեցեղենի անալիզների արդյունքները **16:25–16:50**
Իսկրա Մատենոշ
- 21 Վաղ երկրագործության զարգացման հիմնական փուլերը
Հայաստանի Հանրապետության տարածքում **16:50–17:15**
Հովսեփյան Ռոման
- Քննարկումներ* **17:15–17:30**

11 հոկտեմբեր, հինգշաբթի

Վանի թագավորություն.

Մերձավորարևելյան վարչական համակարգի առաջացումը տարածաշրջանում

Երվանդ Գրեկյան, Ռոբերտո Դան

- 22 Արամուսի ամրոցը պատմական համատեքստում **09:30–09:55**
Կունտներ Վալտեր, Հայնշ Մանդրա, Ավետիսյան Հայկ
- 23 Հայ-իտալական հնագիտական արշավախումբը
Կոտայքում (2013–2019 թթ.) և Վայոց ձորում
(2016–2019 թթ.). հետազոտությունների
հիմնական արդյունքները **09:55–10:20**
*Պետրոսյան Արթուր, Դան Ռոբերտո,
Վիտտոր Պրիշիլա, Գասպարյան Բորիս*
- 24 Նոր անդրադարձ Էրեբունու սրբարանի
առաջացման վերաբերյալ **10:20–10:45**
Դեշանյ Շտեֆան, Բադայան Միքայել, Ֆիշե դը Կլեֆֆոնտեն Ժրանսուա
- 25 Հնագիտական նոր հետազոտություններ
Օշականում **10:45–11:10**
Հերլես Միխայել, Ավետիսյան Հայկ

Սրճադահլիճ

11:10–11:30

26 Օձաբերդի 2017–2018 թթ. հնագիտական պեղումների նախնական արդյունքները **11:30–11:55**

Բաղայան Միքայել, Միքայելյան Արթուր, Կյուրեղյան Հայկ, Հովսեփյան Ռոման, Միմոնյան Հասմիկ, Նահապետյան Սամվել, Եղիազարյան Սամվել

27 Արցախի մարդակերպ կոթողների 2013–2018 թթ. հետազոտության հիմնական արդյունքները **11:55–12:20**

Երանյան Նժդեհ

Անտիկ և հելլենիստական դարաշրջաններ. Ազգային պետությունների ձևավորման գործընթացը

Խաչադուրյան Լորի, Չարդարյան Մկրտիչ, Յակուբյակ Կրզիշտոֆ

28 Արցախի Տիգրանակերտի կարասային թաղումները **12:20–12:45**

Պետրոսյան Համլետ, Սաֆարյան Վարդգես, Կարապետյան Բենեստ, Կիրակոսյան Լյուբա, Վարդանյան Ռուբեն, Վարդանեստվա Տադյաննա

29 Հին հայկական մայրաքաղաք Արմավիրը. 2009–2019 թթ. ուսումնասիրությունների արդյունքները **12:45–13:10**

Կարապետյան Բենեստ, Կանեցյան Ամինա, Մինասյան Լիլիթ

Ճաշ 13:10–14:30

30 Հին Արտաշատի 2016–2018 թթ. պեղումները. «Գետամերձ համալիր» **14:30–14:55**

Չարդարյան Մկրտիչ, Կանեցյան Ամինա, Գյուլամիրյան Հայկ, Մուրադյան Սյուզաննա, Պետրոսյան Արմենուհի

31 Հայկական լեռնաշխարհի հնագույն վիրահատական ձևերի վերլուծություն՝ ըստ Նորահայտ Նյութերի **14:55–15:20**

Խուդավերդյան Անահիտ

32 Հանրային հնագիտությունը ճաղկահովտի դաշտում **15:20–15:45**

Խաչադուրյան Լորի

Միջին դարեր. Քրիստոնեկան մշակույթի առաջացումն ու զարգացումը

Դոնաբեդիան Պատրիկ, Պետրոսյան Համլետ

- 33 Երերույք՝ զաղտնիքներով և խոստումներով հարուստ մի հնավայր. LA3M-ի հայ-ֆրանսիական հնագիտական աշխատանքները Հայաստանում **15:45–16:10**

Դոնաբեդիան Պատրիկ

Ընդմիջում **16:10–16:30**

- 34 Դվինի հնագիտական պեղումները (2009–2018 թթ.) **16:30–16:55**

Պետրոսյան Համլետ, Ղաֆադարյան Կորյուն, Հակոբյան Նյուրա, Բաբայան Ֆրինա, Ժամկոչյան Աղավնի, Բոչարյան Գայանե

- 35 Մետաքսի ճանապարհի վերակազմությունը Վայոց ձորում. Հայաստանի միջնադարի թեթև հնագիտությունը **16:55–17:20**

Պետրոսյան Համլետ, Նուշոտի Միքելե

Քննարկում և գիտաժողովի փակում **17:20–18:20**

Ճաշկերույթ **20:00–22:00**

12 հուլիսի, ուրբաթ

Էքսկուրսիա **09:00–17:00**

Վերին Նավեր,

«Մեծամոր» պատմահնագիտական արգելոց-թանգարան,

Սարդարապատ, Հայաստանի ազգագրության թանգարան:

ABSTRACTS OF THE PRESENTATIONS

1

Pleistocene geomorphology and geology
of the Hrazdan Valley, Central Armenia:
linking volcanism and the Palaeolithic record

Jennifer Sherriff (Department of Archaeology, Anthropology and Geography, University of Winchester, UK), *Keith Wilkinson, Daniel Adler, Dmitri Arakelyan, Emily Beverly, Simon Blockley, Boris Gasparyan, Darren Mark, Khachatur Meliksetian, Samvel Nahapetyan, Katie Preece, Rhys Timms*

The Southern Caucasus is a region of considerable interest in the study of Pleistocene hominin population dynamics and behaviour, with several Palaeolithic archaeological sites in the region, such as Dmanisi and Nor Geghi 1, attesting to its significance. However, a greater understanding of the chronology and nature of climatic and geomorphic changes in the region is needed to fully understand hominin settlement dynamics. The Hrazdan river valley, central Armenia, has the potential to offer such insights given its rich Palaeolithic record and complex history of Pleistocene infill as a result of alluvial, lacustrine, aeolian, and volcanic processes. Over several years, an international multidisciplinary team has undertaken extensive geomorphological and geological mapping and archaeological survey in the area. Using these data, in addition to published chronometric results, we present a stratigraphic framework hominin activity in the Hrazdan river valley during the Pleistocene. We demonstrate that the onset of Pleistocene volcanism in the Gegham Range to the immediate east of the Hrazdan river valley occurred around 700 ka BP, after which there were several eruptive phases lasting until 200 Ka. Interbedded with lava emplaced by these eruptions are alluvial and lacustrine sequences several of which have yielded Palaeolithic artefacts. Taken together these sequences suggest a cyclical model of infill whereby lava flow along the valley resulted in the blockage of the palaeo-Hrazdan river and lake formation in the lee of the lava dams. Breaching of these dams resulted in a shift to principally fluvial deposition, and the development of floodplain soils. Hominin populations exploited the floodplains at times when these phases coincided with interglacial and interstadial climates, but they also occupied the surrounding valley sides during the same warm, humid phases.

2

Geochemical evidence for the control of fire by Middle Palaeolithic hominins

Alex Brittingham (University of Connecticut, USA),
*Michael T. Hren, Gideon Hartman, Keith N. Wilkinson, Carolina Mallol,
Boris Gasparyan, Daniel S. Adler*

The use of fire played an important role in the social and technological development of the genus *Homo*. Most archaeologists agree that this was a multi-stage process, beginning with the exploitation of natural fires and ending with the ability to create fire from scratch. Some have argued that in the Middle Palaeolithic (MP) hominin fire use was limited by the presence of available fire in the local landscape. Here, we present a record of the abundance of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), organic compounds that are produced during the combustion of organic material, from Lusakert Cave, a MP site in Armenia. We find no correlation between the frequency of light PAHs, which are a major component of wildfire PAH emissions and are shown to disperse widely during fire events, and heavy PAHs, which are a major component of particulate emissions of burned wood. Instead, we find heavy PAHs correlate with MP artifact abundance at the site. Given that anthropogenic fire frequency correlates with occupation intensity rather than wildfire frequency, we argue that MP hominins were able to control fire and utilize it regardless of the variability of fires in the natural environment. Together with other studies on MP fire use, these results suggest that the ability of hominins to manipulate fire independent of exploitation of wildfires was spatially variable in the MP and may have developed multiple times in the genus *Homo*.

3

Niches that never been abandoned. Study of the cave sites in the Republic of Armenia

Boris Gasparyan (IAE, Armenia), *Artur Petrosyan, Ariel Malinsky-Buller,
Phil Glauberman, Keith Wilkinson, Andrew Kandel, Makoto Arimura,
Roberto Dan, Dmitri Arakelyan, Samvel Nahapetyan, Anahit Khudaverdyan,
Ani Adigyozyan, Hayk Haydosyan, Hayk Azizbekyan, Daniel Adler*

The archaeological study of cave sites in the Republic of Armenia in the last decades is showing their exploitation during very long time periods, spanning from the Lower Paleolithic until the High Middle Ages. Caves containing Lower and Middle Pleistocene sediments and artifacts are rare and been recently discovered

in the Arpa and Mastarahegheghat rivers valleys (Areni-2 and Dalarik-1). Caves exploited in Upper Pleistocene by Middle and Upper Paleolithic populations are spread in the Hrazdan (Yerevan-1 and Luskaert-1 and 2, Tsitsernakaberd-2), as well as in Vorotan rivers (Angeghakot-1, Aghitu-3 and 7) canyons, which originated in volcanic environments. Meanwhile, Hovk-1 cave, situated in the Aghstev River valley has a karstic origin. Majority of these natural shelters were used as long-term and short-term seasonal camps, the function of Hovk-1 is not finally clarified and some of the finds suggest possible cultic nature of the site.

Caves continue to play an important role along the entire Holocene. Cave sites containing Old and Early Holocene period sediments and exploited by Mesolithic and Neolithic populations also serve as seasonal camps (Apnagyugh-8 and Kuchak-1 in the Kasakh River canyon, Yenokavan-2 in the Aghstev river valley). In addition some of them has ritual function (Areni-2 in the Arpa River valley), as well as were used as sanctuaries, decorated with rock-paintings (Geghamavan-1, Kasakh River canyon, Agarakadzor-1 in the Arpa River valley). During the Middle Holocene small caves and rock-shelters host small communities of Chalcolithic hunter-gatherers (Barepat-1, Yenokavan-1 caves, Hovk-1 and 3 rock-shelters in the Aghstev River valley and its tributaries and Tsaghkahovit-1 on the north-eastern slopes of the Mt. Aragats). During the same period, especially in Late Chalcolithic phase karstic caves were important ritual spaces (Areni-1, as well as Zangakatun-1, Surenavan caves in the Ararat Depression).

Those unique ecological niches keep playing their economic function during the Late Holocene for the Bronze-Iron Age, Classical and Medieval populations. Moreover, ritual function of the caves was continuous and important in Urartians (Geghhovit), Hellenistic (Aghitu-3) and Medieval (Aghitu-7, Getahovit-2 and Yenokavan-2) societies, who used them as sanctuaries and burial spaces.

4

Exploitation of Pleistocene landscapes and resources. Main results of study of the Paleolithic open-air sites in the Republic of Armenia

Boris Gasparyan (IAE, Armenia), *Keith Wilkinson, Andrew Kandel, Charles Egeland, Ariel Malinsky-Buller, Phil Glauberman, Ellery Frahm, Artur Petrosyan, Samvel Nahapetyan, Dmitri Arakelyan, Jennifer Sherrif, Daniel Adler*

Development of the Pleistocene landscapes of the territory of the Republic of Armenia can be reconstructed as a very dynamic process, strongly affected by intensive volcanism, tectonic movements and glacial intervals. The Paleolithic

occupation of Armenia was strongly affected by this landscape dynamics which created favorable conditions and life supporting resources such as water bodies, raw materials sources as well as biologically rich environments for the early hunter-gatherers. During the last decades the growing body of record of the Paleolithic stratified open-air sites in Armenia (Haghtanak-3, Aghavnatun-1–3, Nor-Geghi-1, Alapars-1, Barozh-12, Bagratashen-1, Kalavan-1 and 2, Solak-1 and many others) and their study with modern analytical tools and methods allows doing multiple observations regarding the paleoenvironmental reconstructions, climate shifts, lithic raw material exploitations, analysis of technological organization and land use, toolstone provisioning and mobility, hunting strategies, improve the resolution of the Lower to Upper Pleistocene human occupational chronology, etc.

In general, study of the Paleolithic open-air sites of Armenia is distributing the following patterns: multiple and single occupations on different elevations (450 – 2500 masl), habitations across the water courses (lake shores and river terraces), exploitation of specific morphological elements of the landscape (wind protected hills), on site-artifact manufacture and recycling, technological homogeneity and long-existing traditions, long-distance transportations of obsidian and non-obsidian raw-materials and tools, combination of different resources availabilities, specific hunting strategies using seasonal migration corridors etc., showing that Pleistocene hunter-gatherers of Armenia were well adapted to the rugged and eco-geographically diverse local landscapes.

NEOLITHIC AND ENEOLITHIC (CHALCOLITHIC) – EARLY AGRICULTURAL AND FARMING SOCIETIES

5

A step forward to the Neolitization. Early Holocene sites of the Republic of Armenia

Artur Petrosyan (IAE, Armenia),

Makoto Arimura, Samvel Nahapetyan, Dmitri Arakelyan, Boris Gasparyan

Until recently the Early Holocene sites of Armenia were not known and discussions of the question of Neolitization in the territory of Armenia were based only on handful of Late Neolithic-Chalcolithic settlements excavated in the Ararat Plain. Intensive fieldwork activities implemented during last 20 years brought to the discovery of series of Old and Early Holocene sites in Armenia, distributed by stratified cave and rock-shelter as well as open-air sites and settlements around Mt. Aragats and the Vayots Dzor Region (Kuchak-1 rock-shelter and Gegharot-1 open-

air sites in the Aparan Depression, Apnagyugh-8 cave in the Kasakh River gorge, Lernagog-1 settlement in the Mastarageghat River valley, Areni-1 and Areni-2 caves in the Arpa River valley and others). In parallel the settlements of the Ararat Plain (Aknashen, Aratashen and Masis Blur) were also re-excavated and studied implementing modern archaeological methods and produced reliable chronometric dates spanning the time period between the end of the 7th and first half of the 6th Millennium BC (Middle Holocene).

Even though the excavations and study of the Early Holocene sites is pending and there is much left to do in this direction, the accumulated information allows looking at the process on Neolitization in Armenia from a new perspective. The data is allowing breaking the Early Holocene archaeological sequence into two chronological groups or steps. Group 1 or Step 1 with chronometric dates between 10.000 – 7300 Cal BC is distributed by seasonal hunting and habitation camps on higher elevations (between 1700–3200 masl) organized inside of the caves and rock-shelters in combination with artificial structures in front of them as well as short-term open-air activities. Some shifts in the economic lifeways (storage pits) and technological production of tools (so-called “apnagyugh” or “kmlo” tools) is obvious even though many similarities can be noticed with the lifestyle of the Upper Pleistocene hunter-gatherers. The chronometric dates for Group 2 or Step 2 span between 7300–6200 Cal BC, distributed by settlements located on the fringes of Mt. Aragats (Lernagog-1) and in the caves located in the Arpa River valley. Sites with ritual function also exist (Geghamavan-1 and Areni-2 caves). Lernagog-1 contains similar clay architecture with the settlements of the Ararat Plain, meanwhile the lithic productions still remains with the dominance of the “apnagyugh” tools. This is allowing to hypothesize that the origin of the Armenian early farming culture is local even though there is noticeable influence from the southern cultural centers. Unfortunately the questions of plant and animal domestication are still open and need additional research.

6

The Late Neolithic culture of Armenia: the first farmers in the Ararat valley

Ruben Badalyan (IAE, Armenia), *Armine Harutyunyan*, *Christine Chataigner*,
Jaques Chabot, *Adrian Bălăşescu*, *Roman Hovsepian*, *Lilit Ter-Minasyan*

The process of Neolithization of the territories north of the Araks River has so far been represented only by its final stage. The first permanent settlements in the Ararat plain are characterized by a fully established farming economy. They belong to the Late Neolithic “Aratashen-Shulaveri-Shomutepe” culture (6000–5250

BC), which occupied the alluvial valleys of the Araks and Kura rivers. Recent studies enable us to characterize the formation of this culture.

At Aknashen in the Ararat plain, the oldest Horizon VII (0.8–1.1 m thick) lies on a clay layer, which represents the bottom of the Paleoaraxes Lake. Horizon VII is covered by Horizon VI, a clay-peat horizon 20–30 cm thick, reflecting a short-term hiatus caused by lake transgression. Dating of the deepest stratum of Horizon VII is in progress; the results for the other strata indicate 6005–5800 cal BC.

The material culture of Horizon VII presents differences with that of the overlying horizons. The most significant difference is the complete absence of local pottery with mineral and vegetable inclusions and the presence of only painted Samarra-related and Transitional / Proto-Halaf sherds.

The obsidian industry of Horizon VII presents both similarities and differences with the material of the upper horizons. An ‘ad hoc’ flake industry and all the knapping techniques (indirect percussion, pressure with a crutch, pressure with a lever) used in the production of long regular blades have also been identified in Horizon VII. However, this level is distinctive in that it contains a significant quantity of bladelets/microblades, bullet cores and nuclei on pebbles, as well as microliths.

The sequence of Aknashen shows a striking degree of continuity in the shapes and manufacturing techniques of bone artifacts. Of chronological significance are the bipoints, edged tools made from rib shafts and scapulae. A number of unique small finds (stone stamp, tokens, etc.) also characterizes Horizon VII. Differences are observed too in the crops cultivated. With the same list of cultivated plants, the proportion of wheat to barley is 4:6 for Horizon VII, whereas it is 7:3 for Horizons VI–II.

Clearly, Horizon VII of Aknashen belongs to the formative stage of the “Aratashen-Shulaveri-Shomutepe” culture or to that immediately preceding it. Comparison of the above data with the material from the Kura basin sites shows the synchronicity and similarity of the processes of development of Late Neolithic culture in the Kura-Araks interfluvium.

7

New light on the Late Neolithic communities of the Ararat Plain: recent discoveries from Masis Blur

Kristine Martirosyan-Olshansky (UCLA Archaeology, USA),
Pavel Avetisyan, Gregory Areshian, Roman Hovsepyan, Anneke Janzen,
Adrian Bălăşescu, Varduhi Melikyan

Our understanding of the emergence of the first established farming communities at the beginning of the sixth millennium BC in the Southern Caucasus has been significantly advanced by recent research on the Late Neolithic period of the region. This presentation reports on the recent excavations at the Masis Blur Late Neolithic settlement, currently one of the oldest settled sites of the Ararat Plain (Armenia) providing evidence of sedentary cultures with the earliest forms of subsistence economy. Excavations confirmed the intensive exploitation of domesticated cereals and animals over a period of nearly one thousand years from ca. 6200 BC to 5300 cal. BC. Excavations yielded a rich material record comprised of a well-developed chipped stone and bone tool industries, grinding stones used processing both food and minerals, various incised stones, and objects of personal adornment. The excavated artifact assemblages are similar to those of the Aratashen-Shulaveri-Shomutepe culture with a small number of elements reminiscent of the Pottery Neolithic traditions of the Fertile Crescent, which is suggestive of cultural contacts during the earliest stages in the development of farming economies in the Ararat Plain.

8

Maikop-Novosvobodnenskaya community of the Caucasus: chronology and variants

Sergey N. Korenevsky (Institute of Archaeology RAS, Russia)

The accumulation of new material on the settlements and burials of the Maikop-Novosvobodnaia community confirms the validity of the allocation of its typological variants, such as Galyugaevo-Sereginskiy or Maikop, Psekupsky, Dolinsky and Novosvobodnensky (this group of graves comprise a horizon of tombs, as proposed by A.D. Rezepkin). Each of their variants, on the other hand, may also be considered as separate cultures, based on their distinct manner of formation. However, all variants have integral features that allow them to be considered together as a historical and cultural community.

New settlements have been excavated in the Black Sea zone of the Krasnodar region, such as the Natuhaevskiy settlements, the Chekon settlements, Tuzla-15, and Starotitarovsky settlement (Davudov). These monuments belong to the Psekupsky variant of the Maikop-Novosvobodnaya community. New data on these settlements come from large cultural layers of settlement up to 50 cm thick, reflecting the long duration of their use. Many pits have been found that can be interpreted as parts of domestic spaces. Many burials of people (evidenced by their disarticulated skeletal remains) were found in such pits. The finds of stone axes and chisels were recorded in the cultural layer. Evidence for the ritual abandonment of the Maikop buildings have been repeatedly noted (Korenevsky, Yudin, 2019).

According to the palynological analysis, the settlement of the Maikop tribes coincided with climatic changes in Ciscaucasia, characterized by a transition from arid conditions to more humid conditions. The final phase of the Maikop-Novosvobodnaia community, as already established, is associated with the end of the 4th millennium BC, possibly with the very beginning of the 3rd millennium BC. It took place in conditions of the growing climate change. But for the finale of the later period of the Maikop-Novosvobodnaia community, there was no indication of a decline in culture, possibly due to the specificity of the archaeological sources themselves.

In terms of their economic and cultural type, the tribes of the Maikop-Novosvobodnaia community were mobile-sedentary pastoralists and farmers. They reached the development of proto-civilization (proto-chief) in the early phase of pre-state society. Social differences were marked by the burial of elites with the symbols of wealth and power, such as weapons, gold, residues of feasting and objects of labor. Such symbolism suggests the significance of military affairs and oversight of craft production of woodworking, and organization of communal feasts to the prestige of elites. The real phase of the transition to civilization and the symbolism of a true military elite were still very far away.

EARLY BRONZE AGE—FORMATION AND SPREAD OF THE KURA-ARAXES CULTURE

9

ArAGATS 1998–2018. 20 years of investigations into Bronze and Iron Age sites in the Tsaghkahovit plain

Ruben Badalyan (IAE, Armenia), *Adam T. Smith, Lori Khatchadourian, Ian Lindsay, Armine Harutyunyan, Alan F. Greene, Belinda Monahan, Roman Hovsepyan, Maureen Marshall, Lilit Ter-Minasyan*

In 2018, the Armenian-American Archaeological Project ArAGATS—Archaeology and Geography of Ancient Transcaucasian Societies celebrated its 20th anniversary. This project, focused on the long-term study of Bronze and Iron Ages sites within a specific area, is currently one of the longest and most successful archaeological projects in Armenia. The results of large-scale and intensive work carried out by the expedition not only significantly expanded the baseline data for the archaeology of the Bronze and Iron Ages of Armenia and the South Caucasus, but the approach to research was in many respects fundamentally new to the ancient history of the entire region.

The main objective of the project is to study the social and economic processes that took place in the territory of Armenia in the 4th–1st millennium BC. Sites of the intermontane Tsaghkahovit plain at an altitude of 2000 m above sea level at the northern foot of the Aragats massif were chosen as a model. The priority task at the initial stage of the project was the compilation of a detailed archaeological map of the plain and establishing a chronology of sites. These works were carried out by systematic pedestrian reconnaissance and test excavations at selected fortifications and associated burial clusters. The results of the latter work shaped our research questions for the next phase of work, which entailed large-scale excavations at the fortresses of Gegharot and Tsaghkahovit. The combined results of survey and excavation made it possible to determine the principles of the settlement model in the Tsaghkahovit plain in the Bronze Age, to establish the size and configuration of settlements and burial grounds, and the spatial relationship between them.

Since 2014, the ArAGATS Project's field of activity has expanded to the south, incorporating also the Aparan plain. This work has been carried out according to a similar research strategy, including intensive pedestrian reconnaissance of both continuous territories, and focal research of the surroundings of sites, test excavations in newly discovered sites (Lusagyugh) and the systematic excavation of a multi-layered settlement and the cemetery of Aparani Berd (Aparan I). The

large-scale use of GIS technologies and the use of photogrammetry significantly increased the efficiency of exploration and excavation work.

As a result of the excavations, the main stages of settlement of the Tsaghkahovit plain during the Bronze and Iron Ages were identified. Due to the systematic collection of samples for radiocarbon analysis over a long period of time, the Gegharot and Tsaghkahovit series of dates are currently among the largest for sites not only in Armenia, but for the entire South Caucasus. Due to the reliable stratigraphic position of most of the samples and the large volume of the characteristic material associated with them, each of the sequences – EB, LB, and IA – has acquired regional significance. Large-scale systematic research in the field of paleolandscape, archeozoology and archeobotany, the archaeometric study of metal, ceramic, obsidian artifacts and the corresponding raw material base has provided a better understanding of the cultural and historical processes that took place in the South Caucasus during the 3rd–1st millennium BC.

10

Main results of archaeological investigations in the Sotk region

Arsen Bobokhyan (IAE, Armenia),

Rene Kunze, Khachatur Meliksetyan, Roman Hovsepyan, Mariam Amiryan

In 2010–2015 an expedition from the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, NAS RA, in collaboration with Hale University and the Institute of Geological Sciences, NAS RA, conducted archaeological investigations in the Sotk region, Gegharkunik province, Armenia. The goal of the expedition was to explore archaeological sites of the region in the context of ancient resource management.

Situated on an important strategic point of the homonymous mountain pass, Sotk connected the Southern and Eastern Caucasus. In addition, it is located in close proximity to one of the largest and best known goldmines of the Near East.

The expedition conducted survey at 43 sites, five of which were excavated – the settlements Sotk 1, Sotk 2, Norabak 1, as well as cemeteries in Norabak 1 and Sotk 10.

Investigations at Sotk 1 have shown that the site was inhabited during the Early (4–7th centuries) and in the High (13–14th centuries) Medieval periods.

Excavations of Sotk 2 demonstrated that the settlement was mainly inhabited since the Early Bronze Age (29–26th centuries BC). The second phase of habitation relates to the 18–15th centuries BC. Later it ceased to function as a settlement, but was used as a small burial ground. The site was reinhabited in the 12–9th centuries BC.

Excavations in the settlement Norabak 1 showed that it functioned during the Early Bronze, Late Bronze-Iron Ages and in the High Medieval period. The cemetery was situated by the settlement where four excavated tombs date to the 14–6th centuries BC.

Based on interdisciplinary work it was possible to reconstruct an agriculture and cattle breeding-based community that was actively engaged with metal and obsidian processing, benefitting from the rich metal mines and strategically important position of the area.

11

New perspectives on Kura-Araxes Shengavit

Mitchell Rothman (Widener University / Penn Museum, USA)

Hakob Simonyan, Pam Crabtree, Jennifer Piro, Roman Hovsepyan

Research on the Kura-Araxes cultural tradition has been accelerating in Armenia, other parts of its homeland zone, and in its migrant diaspora. As the heart of that homeland zone, Armenia has provided much material for modern analysts to work with. Armenian archaeologists representing the Institute of Archaeology have been particularly important in this regard. Shengavit in the city of Yerevan is one of the earliest examples of research on this topic, and it continues to draw scholarly attention through the work of Hakob Simonyan and mostly recently, the joint Armenian-American expedition, co-directed by Mitchell Rothman. The results of that co-operation will be an analytical volume and a web archive to enrich the literature and the data available to future archaeologists. This presentation includes a brief overview of recent research on the Kura-Araxes, and some of the perspectives that new research is providing on understanding how Shengavit defines the Kura-Araxes societal (economic and political organization) and cultural (social relations and rules, ideology, ritual, and symbol systems) evolution in the homeland. In that, the presentation intends to show how all the elements of political and economic organization and cultural tradition present a coherent picture of the Kura-Araxes in the homeland zone.

12

Obsidian networks and emergent frontiers in the Early and Late Bronze Ages: a view from Project ArAGATS

Adam T. Smith (Cornell University, USA)

This paper presents the preliminary results of an ongoing pXRF-based geochemical characterization study of almost 1000 obsidian pieces from Early and Late Bronze occupations in the Tsaghkahovit Plain of northwestern Armenia. The examined materials were recovered from residential, institutional, and mortuary contexts over the course of Project ArAGATS's 20 years of collaborative archaeological research. This investigation of prehistoric obsidians is concerned to define not only the presence or absence of different obsidian sources, but to also locate differential access to exchange networks within specific areas of the sites under examination. Did all households participate in the same material flows or is there evidence of differential participation? Did emergent institutions nurture some network pathways over others? And can we see the possible formation of frontiers in the shifting flows of obsidian into the region?

13

The Tavush Archaeological Project

Bérengère Perello (CNRS, France),

*Ruben Badalyan, Levon Aghikyan, Karen Azatyan, Olivier Barge,
Emmanuelle Régagnon*

An initial survey was carried out in 2018 in the Tavush province (north-eastern Armenia) by an interdisciplinary Franco-Armenian team in the frame of the “Mission Caucasus,” in financial partnership with the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Interdepartmental Public Institution Yvelines-Hauts-de-Seine.

The Tavush Archaeological Project (TAP) aims to:

- complete the archaeological map of this largely unknown region,
- trace the changes in settlement patterns, with special attention to the periods from the Neolithic to the Late Bronze Age
- acquire a better and more systematic understanding of the Tavush landscape, which had not been studied much until now.

In addition, by documenting and evaluating the condition of the sites and their characteristics, the project will contribute to the management and conservation of Armenian heritage.

The Tavush landscape is dominated by dense forest and a mountainous topography making it especially challenging to survey. We had to develop an ad hoc field methodology that was based on classical archaeological survey protocols, but had to be adapted to the specific environmental conditions of the area. Therefore, our project used a hybrid survey method, combining systematic extensive survey across the region with intensive study in selected areas. Extensive surveys have been conducted largely from France through preliminary work on satellite imagery and topographic maps. This first study made it possible to target areas of interest on which we conducted intensive prospecting during the Tavush mission.

In 2018, we decided to focus on areas with favorable topographic and environmental conditions. The surrounding areas of the rivers, and in particular the banks of the Aghstev, were given research priority.

During the 2018 field season, our team recorded 17 unregistered sites from the Bronze Age to the medieval period. We will pursue our survey in the Tavush region in the spring of 2019.

MIDDLE BRONZE AGE – SOCIETIES WITH INCREASING MOBILITY

14

The Vishaps of Karmir Sar: history of a sacred site on Mt. Aragats from the Chalcolithic period to present times

*Alessandra Gilibert, Arsen Bobokhyan (IAE, Armenia),
Pavol Hnila, Roman Hovsepyan, Harald von der Osten*

The site of Karmir Sar, located at 2850 m asl on the south slope of Mt. Aragats, is a 40-ha meadow studded with prehistoric monuments, including 11 vishaps, large-scale stelae decorated with animal reliefs characteristics of the region. Since 2012, the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography started an international cooperation with the Freie Universität of Berlin and the Ca' Foscari University of Venice with the aim of surveying and excavating the site and its surroundings, hitherto unknown to the scholarly community. In this paper, we offer an introduction to our ongoing work and an assessment of our results. During six years of scientific fieldwork, we opened nine excavation trenches, led an integrated georadar, geomagnetic and aerial survey, collected C14-data and archaeobotanical samples from stratigraphic contexts, performed pXRF-analyses on obsidian collections and built a GIS-based predictive landscape model. The coordinated study of the collected

evidence has opened up a window to a long-term history of human presence at the site, beginning in the Chalcolithic through the present in a non-linear way, alternating periods of intensive site use with gaps that appear to span centuries – the most significant hiatus occurring between c. 4000 and 2200 BCE. A specific focus on the vishaps has also revealed a complex religious ontology and a centuries-long history of engagement and re-contextualization with the monumental heritage, including episodes of image manipulation and iconoclastic behaviour beginning as early as the Middle Bronze Age and perhaps even before.

15

The dynamics of socio-cultural transformations from the 20th–19th to the 8th–7th centuries BC

(based on the results of excavations at the Karashamb necropolis)

Pavel Avetisyan (IAE, Armenia),

Varduhi Melikyan, Artak Hakhverdyan, Hanna Chazin, Tatevik Harutyunyan

In works summarizing the results of studies on archaeological cultures of Armenia, it is always emphasized that radical changes took place at different stages of Bronze-Iron Ages in the aspects of socio-cultural and economic life. As a rule, these problems have been valued and discussed in monographs and dissertations on regions distinguished by historical or geographical characteristics (Kura-Araxes interfluvium, Ararat valley, Shirak, Tavush, Syunik, etc.). At the same time, due to studies summarizing the findings of excavations at separate monuments (Metamor, Lori Berd, Shirakavan, Oshakan, etc.), the parameters of chronology and phase-division of Bronze-Iron Ages, as well as the forms and main features of monuments inherent to different archaeological cultures, have been articulated and validated. Nevertheless, issues related to the distinction and peculiarities of manifestation of local manifestations of transformations within the socio-cultural milieu of the Bronze-Iron Ages remain contentious to date. This problem can be solved especially through systematization and study of materials and data from monuments examined by large-scale excavations.

Remarkable tomb complexes that highlight these problems well have been excavated at the Karashamb necropolis. Indeed, in multilingual publications of the past decades, materials from the large tomb-hill at Karashamb are used as the most important evidence for the justification and documentation of changes that took place in the social landscape of the region in the 3rd–2nd millennia BC. The necropolis is one of those rare monuments that are represented by a large number of excavated burial structures inherent to successive phases of the Bronze-Iron Ages

and their respective archaeological cultures. This condition makes possible intra- and intergroup comparisons of archaeological realities, and enables discussions of observed similarities and differences in the context of a large number of data points in an uninterrupted archaeological sequence.

16

Symbols of power: the Verin Naver tomb I-B in Armenia (1610–1430 BCE)

Hakob Simonyan

(Scientific Research Center for the Historical and Cultural Heritage, Armenia)

The immense necropolis of Verin Naver, once covering over 100 ha, is situated 25 km west from Yerevan in Aragatsotn marz, on the southern slope of Mt. Aragats. The first kurgan (diameter 50 m, height 2 m) united two burials under one common kurgan. The sepulchral hall of the burial 1B together with the dromos is 17 m, and the cist, measured 10 m × 2.20–3.0 m, both cut in tufa of bright orange color.

On the place of the supposed chariot body two symmetrical bronze hoops were uncovered, which fixed the quivers to the front part of the body and where a large number of arrowheads (62) of red jasper, flint and transparent obsidian were discovered. In the northern part of the cist there was an elevated platform inclined to the south, where the ash from cremation fire was scattered. In the same place, hollow tubular details of the chariot beam were arranged in an arrow-shaped order. On either side horn-shaped details of the yoke were laid, with the reigns (reign separators) passing through the holes. Bronze bits were found a little lower. Between the horn-shaped details on the supposed place of the hoop a bronze figurine of a bird on an anchor-shaped base was uncovered. It is obvious to us from these elements that a complete chariot was placed in the burial.

Imported objects were uncovered in large numbers: polished beads from Babylon, seashells from the Persian Gulf, greenish obsidian from Mt. Nemrut, beads of purple garnet, nephrites from China. And above all, the most sensational finds were the round portraits of bitumen under the ash layer of the cremation fire. These are five medallion-disks and buckles of bitumen with relief portrayal of a human face in an ornamental frame of animal figures – rams and depictions of the tree of life. These rare finds have direct analogies in Middle Elam culture.

Another original find represents a stamp-seal of red jasper in the form of a truncated pyramid with a reach-through hole to hang. On the lower working part, a wonderful image of a horse grazing in the meadow is depicted with vegetation under its hooves.

LATE BRONZE AND EARLY IRON AGES – THE PERIOD OF CULTURAL AND POLITICAL INTEGRATION

17

Project ArAGATS' Kasakh valley archaeological survey (KVAS) (2015–17): preliminary analysis of Paleolithic through Bronze Age settlement patterns

Ian Lindsay (Purdue University, USA),

Karen Azatyan, Alan F. Greene, Arshaluys Mkrtchyan

Since the initial peopling of the region during the Paleolithic, the South Caucasus has witnessed multiple long-term shifts in settlement systems, social organization, and political life. Over the millennia, shifting patterns of settlement, subsistence, and sociopolitics through the Bronze Age have been rendered in distinct material culture traces with the onset of farming villages, complex mortuary rituals, and the proliferation of warfare and hilltop forts. Throughout this long history, local environments and human landscapes served as important material and social contexts through which processes of community (re)production unfolded. In this paper, we discuss results of the last three seasons of pedestrian survey and test excavations in the upper Kasakh River Valley in northwestern Armenia, which have broadened our understanding of changing land-use and settlement patterns between the Paleolithic and the close of the Bronze Age.

We also highlight several methodological innovations, including our paperless, cloud-based mobile GIS data collection system, which has aided in the speed and precision of survey. In addition to our move to digital data collection, the past several years have seen the project embrace increased use of drones in our fieldwork. This presentation will review our use of drone-based multi-spectral photogrammetric mapping, which aids in the documentation of residential, fortified, and mortuary landscape features and streamlines the creation of high-resolution orthophotos, DEMs, and contour maps.

Prehistoric threshing boards from Georgia

Dimitri Narimanishvili (Georgian National Museum)

Threshing boards represent one of the most ancient agricultural tools. In the territory of Georgia, remains of threshing boards are confirmed at settlements and cemeteries. The oldest threshing board stones known so far are known from a grave dated back to XV century BC found near the village of Tsaghvli, Shida Kartli.

Important evidence related to the social role of prehistoric threshing boards is their presence in graves. From the Late Bronze Age, threshing boards were used very intensely in a burial ritual by inhabitants in the South Caucasus. The customary use of the threshing board in practical, food-processing activity is confirmed even in the XX century.

Correspondence between threshing boards and burial ritual is confirmed elsewhere in the Near East, particularly in Syriac ethnographical record. As recently as the 1970's, the threshing board was considered a sacred tool in Syriac populations in Iraqi villages near Baghdad. This group also preserved the ritual of laying the deceased on a threshing board in a tent constructed on a threshing floor prior to burial. This provides a potentially interesting ethnographic analogy for interpreting prehistoric threshing boards excavated in Georgia. This also suggests possible connections between ancient Caucasian and ancient Near East populations, further supported by the mutual presence of sophisticated agricultural tools and shared farming culture. In any case, archaeological finds make it clear that active usage of threshing boards is characteristic of funerary ritual in Transcaucasia in prehistoric times.

The Metsamor Project.

Preliminary observations after the six seasons of the field activity

Krzysztof Jakubiak (Institute of Archaeology, University of Warsaw, Poland),
Ashot Piliposyan, Artavazd Zakyan

In 2013, the Armenian-Polish archaeological team restarted excavations in Metsamor, one of the most significant sites in the Aras valley. The project has been focused on the exploration and recognition of the so-called lower town, which was located there during the Early Iron Age period. That part of the site had never been excavated before. Previous archaeological projects, carried out many years ago, were concentrated on the excavations on the top of the hill, on the citadel, or on the necropolis situated near the ancient settlement. Thanks to the recent project, it

has been possible to clean up several architectural structures. The results gave us a chance to recognize and reconstruct the dynamics of change and cultural development of the local communities, just before and just after the Urartian conquest.

20

The development of lower town in Metsamor through the second and first millennium BC. Results of pottery analysis

Mateusz Iskra (Institute of Archaeology, University of Warsaw, Poland)

A diverse ceramic assemblage which has been recorded during six field seasons in the area of the so-called “lower town” at Metsamor make it possible to acquire a better understanding of the form and intensity of its habitation from Middle Bronze Age III to Iron III periods. Following quantitative and stratigraphic analysis, planigraphy and microscopic examinations of potsherds, it is possible to reconstruct the ceramic distribution as well as the nature of pottery deposition in each habitation stage. Preliminary results of these analyses show that intense household activity of the area can be detected only for relatively short periods, whereas for most of the time the eastern slope was used as a refuse dump for inhabitants of the fortress.

21

The main stages of early agriculture in the territory of Republic of Armenia

Roman Hovsepyan (IAE, Armenia)

This paper discusses similarities in the investigated prehistoric crop assemblages, and reconstructs the main stages of Neolithic–Iron Age (6th–1st millennia BC) agricultural developments in the territory of Armenia. The prehistoric agriculture of the territory of Armenia can be divided into 3 general stages (with several substages), which tentatively correspond chronologically with archaeological periods.

The 1st stage included the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods (6th – mid of 4th millennia BC). This stage is characterized by highly developed agriculture, emphasizing the cultivation of naked cereals (wheats and barley), though the production of pulses and oil-plants was also important. In the beginning of this stage, cultivation consisted mainly of naked wheats, naked and some hulled barleys, emmer,

lentil, bitter vetch and grape. In addition, there is evidence of the use and possible domestication and cultivation of two oil-producing crucifers, alyssum and camelina (Ararat valley). Then, at the end of this stage (Late Chalcolithic), which can be considered as a transitional period, the cultivation of naked cereals (bread wheat and naked barley) continued to predominate, but hulled barley cultivation started to rise and the cultivation of pulses (lentil and pea) started to fall.

The 2nd stage included the entire Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age (after the second half of 4th to the beginning of 1st millennia BC). It seems that agriculture moved to the secondary plan in this stage, and a pastoral economy was the main source for food production. The main and possibly only direction of agriculture from the Early Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age period was cereal cultivation. The main crops were naked bread wheats (common bread and club wheats) and hulled and naked barleys. There are extremely few records of grape and almost no records of pulses and oil-producing plants during this stage.

The 3rd stage began with the Van Kingdom (9th–6th centuries BC), when the cultivation of pulses restarted. Also, several crops which had been previously unknown or poorly known in the region (e.g. millets, sesame, rye, several fruits), were introduced into local agriculture. Viticulture and horticulture were highly developed during this stage.

KINGDOM OF VAN – THE EMERGENCE OF THE NEAR EASTERN ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM IN THE REGION

22

The fortress of Aramus in its historical context

Walter Kuntner (University of Innsbruck, Austria),
Sandra Heinsch, Hayk Avetisyan

Results of radiocarbon samples taken from the founding horizon of the fortress of Aramus, supported by the occurrence of LM-5 pottery fragments in the oldest occupation layers of the Central Fort, confirm the assignment of this stronghold to the Urartian king Argishti I; prior to archaeological data, chronologies of the fort relied on its proximity to the stone inscription at Elar. Far more important, however, is the historical contextualisation resulting from the identification of the hinterland of Aramus with the land Uluani mentioned in the Elar inscription. According to the so-called Horhor Annals of Argishti I at Van Kalesi, the conquest of Uluani is related to the first military advance of the kingdom of Biaini to Lake Sevan in 784 BCE. In this paper, we propose that the foundation of the fortress of

Aramus created the prerequisites for both the further expansion of the kingdom of Biaini to the southern shore of Lake Sevan in the 8th century BCE as well as for the establishment of Erebuni in 782 BCE by securing the water supply and storage capacity to irrigate its countryside. We also discuss the connection between the fortress of Aramus and the administrative centres at Arin Berd, and from the second quarter of the 7th century BCE at Karmir Blur, on the basis of the occupation sequence excavated in the Central Fort in 2013–2018. Noteworthy is the evidence for uninterrupted use of Aramus fortress into the 3rd century BCE, (paralleling the lifespan of Erebuni) and the results of building period Aramus III, calling for a re-evaluation of the date of the destruction of Karmir Blur into the 5th century BCE and the impact of the Achaemenid conquest of Urashtu/Armenia.

23

The Armenian-Italian archaeological expedition to Kotayk (2013–2019) and Vayots Dzor (2016–2019): an overview of the results

Artur Petrosyan, Roberto Dan (Sapienza University of Rome, Italy),
Priscilla Vitolo, Boris Gasparyan

This paper presents an overview of the activities conducted by the Armenian-Italian Archaeological Mission in two distinct regions of the Republic of Armenia, Kotayk and Vayots Dzor. The Kotayk Survey Project (KSP) started in 2013 with the aim of creating an archaeological map of the area, with a chronological range from the Palaeolithic to the Middle Ages. Currently 114 sites have been identified and documented. A series of archaeological excavations have been conducted in a number of sites, of which the most significant is certainly the investigations at Solak-1/Varsak, the first Urartian site identified in the upper Hrazdan Valley. Another important site is Meghradzor, where a small test trench has brought to light hundreds of fragments of Kura-Araxes II pottery.

The Vayots Dzor Project (VDP) started in 2016, with similar aims to those of the KSP. Currently 72 archaeological sites have been recognized and documented. Excavations have been conducted in a series of sites ranging in date from the Palaeolithic to the Middle Ages. In Areni-2 cave, important Palaeolithic, Neolithic and Late Chalcolithic layers have been discovered. The Tigranashen-1 settlement has revealed a unique multi-layered occupational deposit dating back to the Middle Bronze Age. Kyoshk-1, probably the most important Urartian administrative centre in the River Arpa area, preserves impressive remains of Iron Age architecture. The Yelpin-1 site, a huge rock outcrop that hosts a rock-cut complex and a necrop-

olis, had a long, almost uninterrupted, occupation from the Early Bronze Age to the Middle Ages. Gnishikadzor is an intriguing medieval complex located in the River Gnishik Valley on the road to Noravank Monastery. This paper includes a general description of these activities and some considerations of future strategies.

24

New reflections on the organization of the Erebuni sanctuary

Stéphane Deschamps (Direction régionale des affaires culturelles d'Ile-de-France),
Miqayel Badalyan, François Fichet de Clairfontaine

The very small number of sanctuaries or temples currently uncovered and studied across the ancient kingdom of Urartu calls for caution. A typological approach of these spaces, even if it can be attempted, is therefore a difficult exercise in the current state of research. The research carried out for several years in the fortress of Erebuni raises a number of questions on the modalities of organization of the religious complex: how many temples (two? three?) constitute this sacred area? What is the exact place of Haldi? How did Argishti organize this space, which we know today was more important and complex than we thought? In other words, how did he organize the sanctuary of Haldi in the main fortress of the Araxes plain after his conquest around 782 BC?

25

Recent archaeological works in Oshakan

Michael Herles

(Institut für Vorderasiatische Archäologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany),
Hayk Avetisyan

Oshakan is situated approximately 20km south-west of Yerevan and 8km south of the town of Ashtarak in Aragatsotn marz. The north-western part of the modern borough of Oshakan is grouped around a natural tuff stone hill called Didi Kond. This hill measures about 60ha and rises to 1121m asl. The modern cemetery of Oshakan is located west and south of the hill. In the middle of this graveyard there is a very small hill, today called Pokr Blur (“small hill”).

The Armenian-German collaborative project at Oshakan was initiated in 2012. A survey was conducted, and three extensive excavations were carried out between 2013 and 2015. They were done at the north-eastern slope of Didi Kond and at the nearby Pokr Blur.

During the excavations at Oshakan a total of 11 tombs were uncovered at the fringe of the already known necropolis. On the basis of the pottery found the tombs can be attributed to the Early Iron Age (Lchashen-Metsamor 4–5).

The hill of Pokr Blur is located at a strategically important place, where the plateau drops towards the gorge of the river Kasakh. This is the only possible place from which to safely walk up to Oshakan from the flood plain. Already during the survey in 2012, extensive material removal by means of an illegal backhoe cut was documented at Pokr Blur, which had damaged the southern slope and almost the entire interior of the hill. The three intact hill slopes feature circumferential walls. The walls consist of large basalt stones and are fairly smooth on the outer upper and lower sides. By means of a small test trench at the south-eastern foot of Pokr Blur, another wall was discovered that is of similar construction as the above-described wall. It corroborates the long-held assumption that this represents a fortification or terracing system.

26

Preliminary results of the 2017–2018 archaeological excavations in Odzaberd

Miqayel Badalyan (“Erebuni” Historico-Archaeological Museum-Reserve, Armenia),
Arthur Mikayelyan, Hayk Kyureghyan, Roman Hovsepyan, Hasmik Simonyan,
Samvel Nahapetyan, Arman Yeghiazaryan

Odzaberd is located on the south-eastern shore of Lake Sevan (Republic of Armenia). According to the cuneiform inscription situated on the north-west cliff of the fortress, here the Uartian monarch Rusa I built a fortress for the Storm God, Teišeba. The settlement consists of the citadel, the fortress, and the outer town.

In 2017–2018 the fieldwork was mainly focused on the eastern part of the fortress (areas D1, D2, E, G) and in the outer town (areas F, H). Based on our preliminary observations, structures and different occupation layers dating from the VIII/VII centuries B.C. to the Medieval period were fixed. In this respect, the late-Uartian structures with canonic architecture and 2 m-high walls uncovered in the northeastern part of the fortress are noteworthy.

In the western part of the outer town, semi-cyclopean fortification walls were unearthed.

In all probability, the above-mentioned structures date to post-Uartian period. Here, pithos burial and group burial, related to the Classical period, were fixed. They were attached to the walls.

During the excavations carried out from 2017–2018, late-Uartian and post-Uartian structures and layers were mainly unearthed.

It is supposed that during the post-Urartian period, the settlement was an important center in the region. In that period, the local imitation of pottery and mud-brick superstructure traditions are visible.

27

The main results of the 2013–2018 survey of anthropomorphic stelae of Artsakh

Nzhdeh Yeranyan (IAE, Armenia)

The anthropomorphic stelae of Artsakh are rectangular, flat, longitudinal plates. Both sides are sculpted, and emphasis is on the front, particularly the face and waist. The main axis of their creation is the human body, and the rest of the components are graphically and thoroughly valued as a result of their connection. These plates are divided into three parts by two horizontal grooves, pointing to three parts of the body. These stelae are about 30–60 cm wide, up to 2 m in length, 20–30 cm thick. All of the well-known monuments are made of limestone.

The observed monuments are widespread in the steppes of Artsakh, stretching about 30–40 km. These are scattered especially in the northeastern regions of the Artsakh (Nagorno-Karabakh) Republic, in the Martakert region and surrounding areas: in Nor Karmiravan, Tigranakert, as well as in Gjavurkala settlement and surrounding. Some stelae from this environment were transferred to the Artsakh state and Martakert historical and geological museums during the Soviet era, but some of them are still in the open field.

Although some of the monuments were known since the 1960s, their technical, illustrative, semantic, chronology and cultural issues remained undetermined.

In this report, we present the main results of the research carried out by the Artsakh Archeological Expedition of the Institute of Archeology and Ethnography of the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia, which started in 2013. As a result of the study, some of the previously known stelae were identified and new ones were discovered and investigated.

The total number of stelae exceeds 40, the majority of which are presented for the first time.

Jar burials of Tigranakert in Artsakh

Hamlet Petrosyan (IAE, Armenia),

Vardges Safaryan, Inessa Karapetyan, Lyuba Kirakosyan,

Ruben Vardanyan, Tatiana Vardanesova, Armine Gabrielyan

For more than a century, researchers have been investigating questions such as the origins of jar burials, their chronology and especially the issues related to their cultural and ethnic associations. These burials encompass a vast region in the late Hellenistic period, including the Transcaucasus, up to the Kura River, in some areas acquiring local peculiarities.

Hellenistic burial constructions in Artsakh and Utıq provide a variety of forms (a box, a stone box, an oversized cell, a basement, etc.), but at the end of the 1st century BC and in the beginning of the 1st century AD, jar burials became dominant. Taking into consideration the multi-ethnic character of Tigranakert, the research of antique burial buildings, their rituals and property is of particular importance.

The Hellenistic cemetery of Tigranakert has been scattered across the plain, about 1.5 km north-east of the city.

It was discovered and studied by excavations of one stone-box and six jar burials. One jar burial was excavated inside the Fortified quarter, not far from the northern wall. The image of Tigranakert's findings is rounded out by the burial materials excavated in the vast surroundings of the city and numerous sites of Artsakh.

Jars and burials do not have a strict orientation towards the four cardinal directions. Horizontally-positioned jars with different deviations are from north-west to south-east or vice versa from the north-east to the south-west.

The separate burial is composed of horizontally-disposed jar, a jug (*oynok-hoya*, faucet jug, flask, etc.) attached to the mouth or bottom of the jar; a materialization of the ritual that can be seen in steppe monuments of Artsakh and Utık to Kura River. The fragments of fire and grinding stones are also associated with the funeral ritual.

It is also worth mentioning among the jars of Tigranakert and Martakert, three burials whose shoulders are decorated with the well-organized and well-represented hunting scenes realized in red-brown paint.

The funeral offerings are represented by examples of personal weapons, various types of jewelry, including hangers and beads made from various stones,

glass, smalt, silver and gold. The burials of Tigranakert are characterized by an abundance of coins (mostly Parthian Mithridates III and Orodes II, 57–37 B. C., and the dragma is often put in the mouth of the deceased), and iron rings crowned by various glass gemstones. The images of the gems are closely related to the Greco-Roman world, which also shows the Hellenistic nature of Tigranakert.

29

Ancient Armenian capital of Armavir: the results of 2009–2019 investigations

Inessa Karapetyan (IAE, Armenia),

*Amina Kanetsyan, Lilit Minasyan, Ruzanna Palanjyan, Nvard Tiratsyan,
Dianna Mirijanyan, Hasmik Hovhannisyanyan*

In the last decade, the excavations of Armavir were carried out at the first section (trench) of the citadel, which includes the hilltop with its slopes and extends up to the first terrace.

1. Five meters below the northern edge of the hilltop bedrock, a sanctuary with rock-cut cremation shrine and three-stepped oblation altar was excavated, and the architectural structure and function of the sanctuary was assigned to the Urartian and Classical periods.

2. Having uncovered the 4.50 m layer of soil and stone covering the inner space of a medieval building on the hilltop, the interconnections between the medieval building, the newly found “Susi” temple of the Urartian supreme god Khaldi and its basement were clarified.

The following successive layers were excavated: a) remains of a military observation post re-built on the medieval building’s walls at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, b) under it was part of a late medieval room, built on the floor of the “Susi” temple, which had a mudbrick and soil layer spread in front, a layer with shards of post-Urartian and Hellenistic pottery d) inner walls of the medieval building, over which the main walls of a church built on the hilltop in 1869 were identified e) the court yard of the temple and the sacred space around it were cleaned.

3. It was determined that the medieval building on the hilltop was not a temple rebuilt many times; it had been a medieval castle with counterforts, formed in Armenian architecture in the 10th–12th centuries. Thus, it was revealed that the temple collapsed later. A new structure with corner counterforts was unearthed at a distance of 7.50 m from the temple façade. It had Urartian treatment of basalt stones, but joined with “swallow-tail” wooden pegs. Thus, it was finally confirmed that there had been a temple built in the Classical Era on the hilltop.

Excavations of Ancient Artashat in 2016–2018: “Riverside district”

Mkrtich H. Zardaryan (IAE, Armenia),

Amina Kanetsyan, Hayk Gyulamiryan, Suzanna Muradyan, Armenuhi Petrosyan

Archaeological excavations of Artashat, the capital of Classical Armenia, were initiated in 1970 and captured various sections of a large territory of the Upper (hills) and Lower (plain) city. Over the first three decades of investigations a certain opinion was formed on its multi-cultural layout, which was relatively generalized as an unequal balance of tradition and innovation, characteristic for an Eastern-Hellenistic capital. However, this opinion was somewhat swayed by the results of excavations started in 2003 to the present of the “Riverside District”, located on the left bank of Arax river.

The works performed during 2003–2014 had revealed structures and artefact collections (8-column structure, multi-section thermae with mosaics, chamber with murals, specific architectural details, sculptures, coins etc.), demonstrating the obvious impact of Roman culture and building technique. In conditions of partial exploration of these findings, some rather ungrounded theories were put forward formerly on the process of the formation and functioning of the district itself, as well as the history of the city in general.

The explorations of 2016–2018 were targeted at filling the gaps in archaeological research of the “Riverside District”, the correlation of its data with the materials from other areas of the site, and detection of the place and role of the district in the cultural and historical context of Classical Artashat. The existing archaeological evidence allows us to put forward the following preliminary generalizations:

- The foundation of the district is dated no earlier than the middle of the 1st century A.D. and is connected with the construction activities of Armenian king Tiridates I. The thesis introduced above regarding its construction in the 2nd century B.C. is not confirmed by the material evidence;
- It is possible that this district itself had formed the core of “Noroneia”, referenced by the Classical sources in their descriptions of the Roman mission of Tiridates I (66 A.D.);
- Judging from the dating of archaeological finds and simultaneously performed massive reconstructions, the district could have functioned as a center of Roman administration, appointed in Armenia by the emperors Trajan and Lucius Verus (in 114–116 and 160’s accordingly);
- A small temple-peripter, the remains of which are traced at the top of the

hill, located on the layout focus of the district, might have functioned as a sacrarium dedicated to Imperial cult. The interpretation of this construction as the temple-oracle of “Yerazmuyn” is in contradiction with the existing archaeological data and the narrative evidence on localization of the latter;

- Traces of at least two periods of partial destruction of the district and flood have been revealed;
- Along with the remarkable findings of the Classical period, traces of significant Middle age presence dated to the 13–15 centuries were revealed, which allows us to reconsider the chronological frames of site functioning.

31

A review of trepanations in Armenian Highland with new cases

Anahit Yu. Khudaverdyan

(IAE, Armenia)

In this study, trepanations in ancient Armenia are discussed from a historical perspective. Trepanation has garnered intense interest, because it represents an early form of cranial surgery practiced well before the advent of modern medicine. Trepanations were studied in respect to temporal and spatial distribution, sex and age distribution, techniques and reasons, completeness, healing and number of holes. Seventeen individuals from 12 different Armenian settlements are identified to have undergone trepanations. Only one operation was unfinished. Cranial trepanations in Armenia show a distribution from the Late Bronze Age to the 1st century BC – 3rd century AD. The largest majority of the individuals had single trepanation orifices while only three individuals were identified with two holes. The ages-at-death of trepanned individuals in Armenia all fall within an age range: 6–45. The predominant methods used were circular cutting, scraping, rectangular sawing – methods that proved highly successful with little ensuing infection. Scraping and rectangular sawing techniques first applied in the Late Bronze Age. Practitioners avoided certain areas of the cranium and employed methods that reduced the likelihood of damage to the cerebral meninges and venous sinuses.

In this study, we evaluate possible explanations for trepanation among groups living in Armenia. Theories about reasons for trepanation vary greatly as do the types of supporting evidence provided. Some literature suggests magical reasons such as the release of a demon or spirit, as well as medical reasons such

as a therapeutic cure for a cranial malady. More than half of the trepanations performed were due to cranial trauma. There are several examples of skulls that have both evidence of disease and were trepanned. It is possible, therefore, that the trepanation was performed to somehow treat or relieve the symptoms of disease. These diseases include, but are not limited to, mastoiditis, ear infection, or brain tumors.

32

Public archaeology on the Tsaghkahovit Plain

Lori Khatchadourian (Cornell University, USA)

Detachment from the present is an unviable position for the science of the past. Since its beginnings, the discipline of archaeology has been deeply embedded in the institutions and realities of the modern world. A concern with the discipline's condition of entanglement in modern publics and public institutions has intensified since the 1990s, and has given rise to two broad lines of inquiry: first, the relationship between archaeology and *politics*, or the state; and second, the relationship between archaeological practice and the *publics* amidst which it takes place. Politics and publics have moved from the margins to the mainstream of archaeological research, at least in the Anglo-American tradition.

Informed by these debates, in 2014 Project ArAGATS established the Aragats Foundation, a non-profit organization registered in both the United States and Armenia that serves as the public arm of our collaborative research initiative. In this paper, I present our approaches to engaged archaeology on the Tsaghkahovit plain, and the different ways in which *politics* and *publics* have shaped our efforts. Two initiatives of the Aragats Foundation will be discussed. The first, which can be described as “reactive engagement”, concerns our response to the erection of a cross on the summit of the Late Bronze and Iron Age fortress of Tsaghkahovit. The second, a case of “proactive engagement”, concerns two seasons of an archaeological summer camp for girls in Aparan and Gegharot. This paper addresses how these different forms of engagement both draw from and advance existing research in community archaeology and the politics of the past.

MIDDLE AGES—THE EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN CULTURE

33

Yereruyk, a site rich in enigmas and promise. The Armenian-French archaeological mission of LA3M in Armenia (2009–2016)

Patrick Donabédian

(Aix-Marseille Université / CNRS, France)

The aim of this presentation is to take stock of the investigations carried out from 2009 to 2016 on the early Christian and medieval site of Yereruyk, in the Shirak marz, in far north-western Armenia, by the LA3M laboratory of medieval archaeology (Aix Marseille University) in cooperation with the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography NAS RA, represented on site by the Regional Museum of Shirak.

The survey focused on the Yereruyk basilica, its dating, architecture, carved decor, its place in early Christian Armenia and links with Syria, as well as the hypothesis of a pre-Christian stratum. Attention was also given to the memorial area south of the church, with remains of monuments once supporting cross-topped stelae. The excavations in this zone have brought to light a cemetery, in which the examination of more than 70 graves yielded 27 dates obtained by radiocarbon analysis of human bones. It allowed the exploration of the hitherto poorly studied area of funerary archaeology in medieval Armenia, providing a first picture of the evolution of a Christian cemetery from late Antiquity almost to the 20th century.

Geomorphological and archaeological studies carried out on the remains of monuments located to the east of the basilica are providing a better understanding the function of these constructions and to approach their dating. The presentation reviews the results achieved by the mission, the questions raised by its investigations, some proposed answers, as well as the enigmas that still remain.

34

Dvin archaeological excavations (2009–2018)

Hamlet Petrosyan (IAE, Armenia), *Koryun Khafadaryan, Niura Hakobyan, Frina Babayan, Aghavni Zhamkoçhyan, Gayane Kocharyan*

Over the past 10 years, Dvin excavations have proceeded intermittently at the Citadel hilltop, Central Quarter, the Southern and Western slopes of the Citadel.

The exploration of Hellenistic Dvin was carried out at the top of the Citadel hill. It is situated in the neighborhood of the Arshakunyans Palace (4 A.D.) and

occupies a territory of about 800 square[?] meters. Based on architectural analysis and archaeological excavations, we can confidently state that the Hellenistic layer is under the medieval one, which dates back to the 4th–13th centuries.

The aim of the research in the Central Quarter is to define the stratigraphy of the St. Gregory Cathedral following its reconstruction periods. There is a strong likelihood that this church was built on the ruins of the pagan temple. A number of workshops having produced metal and pottery artifacts discovered in the Central Quarter.

The second main research achievement at the Central Quarter was the identification of the water supply system, which was cleaned and restored. An interesting picture was revealed in the neighborhood of the south tower. The stratigraphy at the site was the following: 9–8 century BC, 5–6 century AD, 11–13 century AD and 13–14 century AD. The excavations proved that the area was densely-populated and rebuilt in the 13–14 centuries. Our attention was focused on the huge building with 2.5m wide, plastered walls, the masonry of which is characterized by the use of raw worked basalt, sandstone, cobblestone and tufa. The south wall is completely uncovered and it has 42,3 meters, whereas the east wall measures 28 m and the west one 6 m in length. The function of this building is not clear yet. It might be a reservoir [storage room?], customs house or barracks.

The building discovered on the Citadel is exceptional in the history of Armenian archaeology. It has an eight-sided dome and niches made of bricks. The surface of the building is 3×4 square meters. The interior consists of stuccoes, plaster mould ornaments and light blue colored faience bowls. The function of this building is not yet known. We hope that further investigations will reveal the significance of the structure.

35

Making of the Silk Road in Vayots Dzor: a light archaeology of a medieval territory in Armenia

Hamlet Petrosyan, Michele Nucciotti (Università degli Studi di Firenze, Italy)

Between 2013 and 2018, a joint expedition of Yerevan State University and University of Florence, also supported by the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, carried out an extensive work of archaeological and architectural documentation and interpretation in Vayots Dzor, in order to highlight how the Silk Road interacted with local rural contexts in the area between the Selim pass and the western banks of the Arpa river.

The approach was highly cross-disciplinary, with teams of architects and geographers working together with the archaeologists in order to provide the rich-

est possible framework for interpreting landscape transformations in medieval Vayots Dzor, with a special focus on the Mongolian epoch.

The expedition was also instrumental for testing, for the first time in Armenia, the principles of Light Archaeology, based on non-destructive methods of archaeological analyses and architectural stratigraphy that have been successfully employed in Italy and the Mediterranean for interpreting medieval landscapes since the 1990s.

In cooperation with the Armenian national and local museums and cultural institutions, the Light approach was integrated with the documentation and interpretation of epigraphic, sculpted and written sources and, when possible, with ceramic materials from excavations conducted in the research area.

The outcomes of the project, which are still undergoing final interpretation, will lead to novel interpretations of the local history of Vayots Dzor in the context of a global Eurasian history, and to better assess the impact of long-range communication networks (such as the Silk Road) on rural areas. The latter subject, has been largely neglected by academic literature devoted to the Silk Road, where the primary focus has tended to be on urban settlements and cultural centers scattered along major trade routes between China and the Mediterranean.

