

ՀՆԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

ARCHAEOLOGY

ARSEN BOBOKHYAN*

PhD in History

Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography NAS RA

arsenbobokhyan@yahoo.com

URBAN LANDSCAPES OF ANCIENT ARMENIA

Key words: the Armenian Highlands, early societies, settlement hierarchy, city, civilization, tradition, innovation.

Introduction

Ancient and Medieval Armenia was known for its rather lively urban life, the details of which have been reconstructed through a wealth of information provided by the Armenian and international historians and archaeological sources. However, prior to that, the cities in Armenia had passed a long and difficult way. Without comprehension of that process, it would not be possible to imagine the type of the Armenian town, the reasons for its coming about and development. It is sufficient to say that almost all the large cities/towns of ancient Armenia, and especially the capitals (e.g. Artashat, Dvin, Ani, Ani-Kamakh), were built on the places of earlier settlements, fortresses, and were of similar importance. Moreover, in both Ancient and Medieval Armenia, the topographic criteria for the selection of central settlements and the basic patterns of development were essentially related. In this sense, it is not accidental that Medieval Armenian historians linked the establishment of a number of urban centers (such as

* Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է 17.02.21, գրախոսվել է 25.02.21, ընդունվել է տպագրության 13.04.21:

Armavir) with the earliest patriarchal period. Below an attempt is made to trace the history of the formation of the Armenian city¹.

The deeper we go into history, the more difficult it becomes to decipher traits of human thinking and the more we understand the conditional nature of applying modern concepts to ancient social phenomena. The same pattern can be observed also in the case of the concept “city”. Trying to define it, we often use the shackles of modern thinking. Meanwhile, in contrast to our times, in ancient societies the difference between the city and other types of settlements was not clearly defined. Thus, the Mesopotamians, who actually “discovered” the city, were using the same term for both the city and the village (Sumer. URU, Akkad. *ālum*).

Scientific research also reveals conventionality in the definitions of an ancient city. If we try to differentiate the types of ancient inhabited landscapes (concentrated around valleys, mountains, oases, seas), the emergence and development of the city within each landscape could have taken different forms. In one of them the city could be formed on the basis of irrigated agriculture, in the other – on the basis of a temple or palace, in the third – based on trade, etc. However, despite the different modes, researchers try to figure out common criteria, according to which it would be possible to generalize the process of emergence of the earliest city. Accordingly, the city is defined in the relevant historical-cultural and socio-economic context, along with other criteria, the sum

¹ The issue of the emergence and development of the ancient town (for the theory cf. Oppenheim 1992; Herzog 1997) has received little coverage in the context of the Armenian Highlands. In addition to a few general works (Արեշյան, Ղաֆադարյան 1996; Массон 1997; Кушнарева 1997; Kushnareva 1997; cf. also Զարյան 1986ա; Զարյան 1986բ; Тер-Мартirosов 2009; Donabédian, Mutaftian 2010), certain questions of the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods (Джавахишвили 1973), Early Bronze Age (Սիմոնյան, Գնունի 2004; Arashian 2005; Գնունի 2010; Սիմոնյան 2012; Ավետիսյան 2012), Middle and Late Bronze as well as Early Iron Ages (Арешян 1978; Biscione et al. 2002; Badalyan, Avetisyan 2007; Smith et al. 2009; Ավետիսյան 2014) have been discussed. The issue was partially considered also in the context of cultural relations (Փիլիպոսյան 1998; Փիլիպոսյան 2004). The observations made in the context of Ancient and Medieval Armenia are very useful too (Առաքելյան 1958–1964; Периханян 1959; Манандян 1985; cf. Саркисян 1960; Կրկյաշարյան 1963; Կրկյաշարյան 1970).

This article presents results, which are grounded on Բոբոկյան 2000 and Bobokhyan 2008. For other reflections cf. Bobokhyan 2014; Բոբոկյան 2016.

For the location of archaeological sites mentioned in the text, see detailed maps in Kushnareva 1997; Biscione et al. 2002; Badalyan, Avetisyan 2007; Bobokhyan 2008; Smith et al. 2009.

of which is called “civilization”. Among them the monumental architecture, active economy and trade, separated crafts, the presence of the rudiments of writing and science, developed art, social inequality and the state are often mentioned. In this context, the city acts as an organized space with complex public relations, to be characterized by 1. a central position in the hierarchy of settlements, 2. construction with a regular plan, 3. citadel, 4. defense system, 5. palace, 6. temple, 7. cemetery outside the settlement, 8. central craft and agricultural organization, 9. social stratification, 10. active trade relations. Thus, the research of a city is a study of communication system of a society and a process that has various preconditions².

The Near East is the ancient heartland of the emergence of the city. In the context of Near Eastern archaeology the concepts of proto-city, early city and city are distinguished, according to the frequency of occurrence of the above-mentioned civilizational features. Although the Armenian Highlands had some connections with the Circum-Pontic culture world in the pre-Urartian period, the archaeological data outline the Near Eastern direction of its connections, which is the basis for implementing the Near Eastern model of the emergence and development of a city (especially the one typical of the mountainous societies of the Near East).

Before we describe the process of the formation of the city we consider it important to define the historical-geographical area of our research, the Armenian Highlands (further, the Highlands). Located around lakes Sevan, Van and Urmia, this area since earliest times has formed not only a geographical, but also a cultural unity, based on the common value system of its populations. Regardless of the peoples, who lived in this area, it showed unique patterns of development that were closer to the cultural world of the Caucasus on the one hand, and to the central and eastern regions of Asia Minor, northern Syria-Mesopotamia, and northwest Iran on the other. Recent studies indicate that the Highlands, during the Bronze and Iron Ages and possibly also earlier, could be divided into three cultural sub-zones: 1. the western, which included the Upper Euphrates basin (historical provinces Tsopk and Armenia Minor) and was characterized by active relations with Central and Eastern Asia Minor and Northern Syria, 2. The Southern, which included the regions south of Van

² For details cf. **Массон** 1989, 5–12.

(historical Aghdznik and Korduk provinces) and was characterized by connections in the direction of northern Mesopotamia, and 3. the central-northeastern, together with several sub-regions (historical Ayrarat, Upper Armenia, Vaspurakan, Mokq, Turuberan, Tayk, Syunik, Utik, Gugark, Artsakh, Paytakaran, Persarmenia), characterized by connections to the Caucasus³. Those three areas have been in active communication with each other, experiencing the emergence and development of the city in a unique way.

On the Threshold of Organized Society: the Proto-Urban Period

With the emergence of productive economy in the Neolithic period (ca. 9–6th millennia BC) early agricultural societies appeared, which reached a fairly high level of development in the Chalcolithic period (ca. 6–4th millennium BC), when the metal smelting was first done. Early agricultural societies were characterized by sedentism, emergence of architecture and crafts, as a result of which the rudiments of urban life began to appear.

The “Neolithic Revolution” started in the region of Fertile Crescent, the most important part of which formed the western and southern sub-zones of the Highlands⁴. In general, our region was located in the area of primeval cultivation of plants. Discoveries made in recent years indicate that already during the pre-Pottery Neolithic period, especially in the 9–8th millennia BC, a center was formed in the south-western sub-zone of the Highlands, characterized by a monumental mentality, a complex cultic and imagery system (Gobekli Tepe, Nevali Chori, Cafer Hoyuk, Hallan Chemi, Chayonu Tepesi). In this system the settlement Chayonu is especially important (the Upper Tigris valley) with a walled area of 3 ha. The high level of architecture is indicated by the presence of regular-formed structures. The presence of domestic animals, the organized religious system, and finally the first experience of copper mining indicate that we are dealing with one of the most developed areas of the Neolithic world. Some features of the Chayonu tradition, in particular the method of processing the stone tools, reach the territory of present-day Armenia (Kmlo, Gegharot).

In the 6th millennium BC the archaeological culture of Hajji Firuz spread in Urmia regions of the Highlands, which partly shows connections to the early stage

³ Bobokhyan 2008, 47–52.

⁴ For the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods in Armenia cf. Gasparyan, Arimura 2014; as well as Chataigner 1995; Badalyan et al. 2004.

of the Hassuna culture of northern Mesopotamia (Hajji Firuz, Yanik Tepe). Whereas in the 6–5th millennia BC, in the northern and central parts of the Highlands and the South Caucasus the Shulaveri-Shomutepe culture spread, being contemporary to the late Hassuna and to the Halaf cultures (Shulaveri Gora, Shomu Tepe, Gargalar Tepesi, Kghzyak Blur, Aratashen, Aknashen). In the second half of the 6th and the first half of the 5th millennia BC the Highlands was influenced by the Halaf and Ubaid cultures of northern Mesopotamia such as Aratashen and Sioni traditions, with settlements known in the basin of lake Van (Tilkitepe), Aghdznik (Girikihacian), Kharberd (Tulin Tepe), Urmia region (Yanik Tepe, Geoy Tepe), etc. At the end of Chalcolithic period, in the second half of the 5th and first half of the 4th millennia BC, the Areni-Godedzor tradition is characterized by growing complexity, relations to Syro-Mesopotamian (Late Ubaid, Uruk) and North Caucasian (Maikop) worlds, as well as by extractive copper metallurgy (Teghut, Areni, Nerkin Godedzor). The cultural sub-zones of the early agricultural period of the Highlands are characterized by artificial hill-settlements with mudbrick or clay round (mainly in the north), rectangular (mainly in the east and south) or round-rectangular (Halaf influenced sites) structures, as well as by active use of caves.

A number of features typical of the proto-city are documented in the depths of the early agricultural societies of the Highlands. The frequency of their occurrence is indicated below.

1. Despite the significant variations of the built-up areas of the settlements (from 0.25 to 3–4 ha, on average 1–1.5 ha) there is no typological difference or hierarchy among them. As a rule, the arrangement of a few small settlements on the banks of the river around one main settlement (which could accommodate up to 800 people, e.g. Shulaveri Gora) is conditioned by tribal affiliation.

2. In general, construction is chaotic. However, settlements like Chayonu are organized areas, where certain parts (residential and craft) are separated from each other. **Meanwhile, artisans' districts are absent in their classical sense.** In some settlements, at the end of the Chalcolithic period, there were dwellings with kilns (Alikemek Tepesi). There are living, kitchen and storage spaces inside the houses (Hajji Firuz, Yanik Tepe). Living areas are grouped around the central square of the settlement (Shulaveri Gora, Shomu Tepe, Imiris Gora). Densely built houses are separated from each other by narrow passages in the yards, free spaces are formed between the structures (Teghut, Tulin Tepe). At the end of the

Chalcolithic period, in the central part of some settlements, residential complexes were regularly located along the streets (Tulin Tepe).

3. The center of the settlement is not separated, citadels are not known.

4. The settlements are not fortified, but the artificial ditches around them could also be of defensive significance (Arukhlo, Masis Blur).

5–6. Monumental architecture is not known as such, but there are elements of appropriate thinking. Unique data on the origins of monumental religious buildings have recently appeared in the pre-Pottery Neolithic sites of the western and southern regions of the Highlands (Gobekli Tepe, Nevali Chori, Chayonu). Later, at the end of the Chalcolithic period, massive buildings are present that could be of public significance (Kultepe I, Tulin Tepe), and be interpreted as temples (Deghirmen-tepe).

7. The funerary architecture is not known as such (burials are inside the settlement, under the floors, in pits or jars), although since the late Chalcolithic a certain complication in burial rites and property management is observed (Kultepe I, Korucutepe, Shikahogh).

8. It is too early to talk about the existence of craft and agricultural centers, but the wells/storages of agricultural products (Chayonu, Hajji Firuz, Shulaveri Gora, Shomu Tepe, Aratashen, Teghut, Alikemek Tepesi) are known. During the Chalcolithic period metal-producing centers appear, revealing the whole process of production (Areni). Evidence for public construction works are the artificial ditches surrounding the settlements or located on edges, the primary purpose of which, however, was to accumulate water resources (Arukhlo, Shah Tepe, Masis Blur).

9. Social stratification is not observed yet. The seal impressions of the Mesopotamian type on the Chalcolithic pottery (Geoy Tepe, Norshuntepe, Arukhlo) may indicate the formation of the rudiments of social stratification.

10. In the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods there existed a rather active trade and cultural exchange, that was mainly directed to northern Syria and Mesopotamia as well as to the North Caucasus. The basis of trade in this period was the obsidian, later also metal, in which the Highlands is rich and from where it was exported in almost all directions.

Poleis in the Mountains: the First Early Urban Period

From the mid 4th millennium BC the Highlands entered a qualitatively new stage of development, the Early Bronze Age (ca. 35–24th centuries BC), with its Kura-Araxes cultural tradition⁵. It corresponds to the late Uruk, Jemdet-Nasrand Early Dynastic periods in Mesopotamia. However, while during the initial stage of the formation of the Kura-Araxes culture this tradition was typical of the central-northeastern regions of the Highlands, the northern Syrian-Mesopotamian influences were strong in the south-western regions. In particular during the third quarter of the 4th millennium BC, the influence of the Uruk IV (or Sumerian) culture is obvious in the sites of Tsopk (Tepecik, Arslantepe, Korucutepe, Norshuntepe), which was primarily the result of trade relations. There is an opinion, that Uruk merchants could have partially reached the central-northeastern zone as well. It is noteworthy, that in the middle of the 3rd millennium BC, when the Kura-Araxes tradition was declining in the central-northeastern regions of the Highlands, that culture was flourishing in Tsopk. Meanwhile, in the same period Hurrian city-states appeared in the south of Van, which were under the direct influence of the north Syrian-Mesopotamian centers (Tell Brak, Tell Leilan, Tell Mozan).

The Kura-Araxes social system, which existed for more than a millennium, with the center in Ararat valley, in the first half of the 3rd millennium BC occupied almost the entire Fertile Crescent, extending from the North Caucasus to Palestine and western Iran. The Kura-Araxes area was characterized by a sedentary economy with developed plough farming, cattle breeding and crafts. Metallurgy was especially advanced: the Kura-Araxes society used arsenic bronze, but already in the transitional period from the 4th to 3rd millennia BC specimens of tin bronze (Talin) appeared. Due to a new phase of social division of labor, the separation of crafts from agriculture began. Wheeled vehicles were in use. The Kura-Araxes settlements were spread in the valleys (artificial hills) and foothills (natural hills), they had round (mainly in the north) and rectangular (mainly in the south-west) dwellings. From the beginning of the 3rd millennium BC, the western and southern regions of the Highlands are mentioned in written Mesopotamian sources as the Upper Land and Subartu.

⁵ For the Early Bronze Age in Armenia cf. Kushnareva 1997; Badalyan, Avetisyan 2007; Badalyan 2014.

It is believed that the first elements of the early cities appeared during this very period. In particular:

1. A hierarchical system of settlements is formed on the principle of concentrating satellite settlements (6–10 on average, located at a distance of 2–8 km from each other) around the central settlement (Elar, Shengavit, Mokhrablur, Metsamor, Aygevan, Dvin, Akhtamir, Norshuntepe). Some centers rise about 50 meters above the surrounding (Elar). It is possible to distinguish small (1–1.5 ha), medium (3–5 ha), large (6–10 ha) (Dvin, Elar) and in exceptional cases up to 12 ha (Harich, Norshuntepe) settlements. It is supposed that Metsamor could cover an area of 30 ha outside the citadel (E. Khanzadyan). The outer city, however, had not formed in the Early Bronze Age yet. 200–300 people lived in small settlements, while in large ones - up to several thousand people.

2. Regular construction plan is present in settlements (Mokhrablur, Jrahovit, Shengavit, Harich, Norshuntepe). There are two principles of construction: arrangement of dwellings around a common center or square (Pulur/Sakyol, Kvatskhelebi) and grouping the houses on both sides of the street (Mokhrablur, Jrahovit, Agarak, Norshuntepe, Tepecik). Two-story houses appeared (Yanik Tepe, Tepecik, Norshuntepe, Jrahovit). **Formation of the artisans' districts in different parts of the same settlement was important (Shengavit, Amiranis Gora, Kultepe II).**

3. The appearance of citadel-type units (Metsamor, Harich, Elar, Shahlama II, Tagavoranist, Norshuntepe, Tulintepe) is noticeable.

4. Defense systems constructed of unbaked clay (Mokhrablur, Yanik Tepe, Shresh Blur, Kultepe II, Tepecik), or, probably, of large stone blocks (Shengavit, Elar, Tsovak, Dzianberd, Harich, Lchashen, Shahlama II and III – which, however, has yet to be proved by stratigraphic data) are also present. The walls made of unbaked clay sometimes have monumental nature, reaching a thickness of about 3 m (Adablur). In some settlements there are underground passages (Shengavit, Elar).

5. In the south-western parts of the Highlands palaces appear, located in the upper central part of the settlement (Arslantepe, Norshuntepe, Tepecik). The Norshuntepe palatial complex, which was larger in size than, for example, the Anatolian settlements Ahlatlibel or Karatash (while the fortified territory of a local prince reached the correspondent area of Troy II), emerged in the environment of direct relations with the Syrian-Mesopotamian cities.

6. Ritual-cultic structures/sanctuaries/temples, characterized by unique architecture and “ritual spaces” occupying large areas (the rock platform of Agarak is about 200 ha) are known (Mokhrablur, Shengavit, Jrahovit, Harich, Kosichoter, Talin, Korucutepe). They are located in or outside the settlement. Ritual platforms appear also in the system of cemeteries (Talin). The temple in the central square of Mokhrablur is separated from residential structures. It is a square building made of tuff stones, with an altar of about 4m on its top, of it made of one-piece basalt, comparable to the structure of Anatolian Beicesultan.

7. In the Early Bronze Age, a previously unknown type of monumental architecture – the funerary architecture with tomb structures and complex stone structures within them (Jrvezh, Tsaghkalanj, Talin, Mayisyan, Berkaber, Trialeti, Arslantepe) emerged. It is important to note that cemeteries were separated from the settlements.

8. Some settlements are craft centers: either metallurgical (Karnut, Garni, Jaghatsategh, Baba-Dervish, Khan Tepe) or pottery-making (Lorut, Velikent). Settlements specialized in metallurgy (Fioletovo, Margahovit) and exploitation of mines (Kajaran) are also known. The presence of grain wells, public storages and cellars indicates the emergence of agricultural centers (Yanik Tepe, Elar, Jrahovit, Shengavit, Baba Dervish, Arslantepe, Norshuntepe). Irrigation systems/reservoirs (Mokhrablur, Shengavit, Sghnakhner) are known around a number of central settlements. The presence of ditches (Norabats) is an evidence of large-scale public works.

9. Obvious social stratification is observed in the last stage of the existence of the Kura-Araxes culture (Norshuntepe palace). Until then, the tombs (the royal tomb of Arslantepe, the tombs of the priests of Kvatskhela and Amiranis Gora) provide little information on social stratification, at which, however, the seals could hint (Ozni, Norshuntepe), the houses built in different ways and with different property in them (Kultepe I, Shengavit), the existence of economic buildings and wells near the houses (Shengavit, Garni), temple-like structures (Mokhrablur), the use of labor during the construction of massive walls (Mokhrablur, Harich), as well as the presence of separate hoards (Yerevan, Arslantepe, Tulintepe).

10. Active trade and economic relations with neighboring regions are visible. The Highlands was rich in raw materials, especially in metal. A large export of metal is obvious to the north – to the southern Russian steppe zone. As for the

south, the Uruk trading colonies at the end of the 4th millennium BC were directed to the sources of raw materials in the western and southern regions of the Highlands. Tepecik was the center of Uruk traders in Tsopk, where Mesopotamian merchants controlled the export of raw materials. Finally, by expelling the Uruk people from the Highlands, the society of the Kura-Araxes culture created a unique trade and economic system in which Tsopk, where the centers of the Kura-Araxes communities (Pulur/Sakyol) and settlements with Syrian-Mesopotamian influence (Norshuntepe, Korucutepe) acted as intermediary spaces for the rest of the Highlands, played a particularly significant role. The gradual weakening of relations between the centers of Tsopk and the south-west, and the stimulation of contacts with central-north-eastern regions of the Highlands can be explained by the activation of trade. Reaching central-western Iran, the Kura-Araxes communities, in fact, occupied the main part of the Khorasan road. From the point of view of the development of urban life, the direct contacts of the Kura-Araxes people with the Syrian-Palestinian cultures, which were the centers of active urban life in the Early Bronze Age II–III, could be of significant importance. The Kura-Araxes trade system began to decline in the 25–24th centuries BC, along with strengthening of the famous northern Syrian city Ebla, which took control of important trade routes connecting Asia Minor to Egypt, one of the main highways of which passed through the western and southern regions of the Highlands. The invasions of King Naram-Sin of Akkad (second half of the 23th century BC) into the southern regions of the Highlands (where he left his inscription near the village of Pir Hussein, not far from Tigranakert) put an end to the Ebla monopoly and made the Upper Euphrates copper road accessible to Mesopotamia. The rise of the economic life in the Tsopk-Armenia Minor area in the second half of the 3rd millennium BC has been linked by some researchers with the establishment of the Akkadian trade system.

Decline and Revival: the Second Early Urban Period

The end of the 3rd millennium BC was a period of decline of urban life and settlements in the Near East due to the climate change and ethnic movements. Although at the beginning of the 2nd millennium BC (especially during its second quarter) the situation stabilized, however, cultural isolation remained typical of various areas. The Highlands did not stay away from this process. The economic crisis and the emergence of new ethnic groups completely changed the historical,

cultural and demographic environment of the Kura-Araxes culture. Many former urban settlements were replaced by cemeteries. The cultural traditions of the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 24–16th centuries BC) were formed due to the integration of indigenous and migrated tribes, that was characterized by a completely different social and political economy, dominated by cattle breeding. At the same time, a number of progressive innovations are observed, including the emergence of city-states, the widespread use of tin bronze, precious metal jewelry, and fast wheel, as well as the development of horse breeding⁶.

During transition from the Early to the Middle Bronze Age, the Kurgan cultures were spread in the Highlands, and then an obvious cultural diversity could be traced in the region. So, four related cultural groups of painted pottery were formed in the northern regions: Trialeti-Vanadzor, Sevan-Uzerlik, Karmir-Berd, Karmir-Vank. A local cultural center emerged in the Tsopk-Armenia Minor zone, where partial Syrian-Mesopotamian-Anatolian relations could be observed. Meanwhile, in the regions south of Van, there is a local cultural zone, which is characterized by connections with northern Syria and Mesopotamia, and partly with the regions of Van and Mush. The city-states of the Highlands are quite often mentioned in written Syrian-Mesopotamian sources (in the western zone – Tsupana, Degishana, Hahhum, in the southern zone - Nihria, Kadmuhi, Shinamu; the central regions are less mentioned - Shuhna by Erzurum, Apishal by Van, Ulivi by Mush, Zamua by Urmia).

There were only few settlements within the Highlands during the Middle Bronze Age, especially in its early stage. However, their number increased beginning from the mid 19th century BC (Middle Bronze Age II) and especially during the 17–16th centuries BC (Middle Bronze Age III). Tsopk and Armenia Minor (Korucutepe, Norshuntepe, Tepecik, Arslantepe), as well as Aghdznik-Korduk (Uch Tepe, Kenan Tepe, Giricano, Ziyaret Tepe) are represented mainly by artificial mounds. Cyclopean fortresses are spread in the foothills of the central and north-eastern sub-zone (Jaghatsategh, Beshtasheni, Harich, Karmir Berd, Karmir Vank, Garni, Metsamor, Elar, Lori Berd, Shish Blur, Lernakert, Voskevaz, Kari Dur, Shagat, Uyts, Sotk), while the artificial mounds are present in the steppe regions (Kultepe I and II of Nakhichevan, Shor Tepe, Garakyopek Tepesi,

⁶ For the Middle Bronze Age in Armenia cf. Kushnareva 1997; Ավետիսյան 2014; Badalyan, Avetisyan 2007.

Aygevan, Mukhanattapa, Uzerlik Tepe). This series of settlements continued in central Armenia as well (Sos Hoyuk, Nuretin, Sariveli (Karin), Hin Norgyugh, Van Havzasi, Karagunduz, Tilkitepe, Van Kale (Van), Atabindi (Aghri), Chaygeldi, Yilan Kale (Mush) and Haidar Kale (Khlat). Among them the settlements of Hin Norgyugh and Yilan Kale are particularly noteworthy, which in their plan have parallels with Lori Berd, Uzerliktepe, Kultepe II. Small-scale excavations in the above-mentioned settlements indicate few traces of habitation in them. In the rectangular dwellings with stone-based and mud brick walls, evidence of agriculture appears, however data indicating active urban life in the central-northeastern zone seem to be lacking. The centers of urban life (mainly in the second and third phases of the Middle Bronze Age) are especially obvious in the settlements of the Nakhichevan area, where evidence of Syrian-Anatolian architecture emerges (Kultepe II, Chalhan Kale): these sites were in active contact with Urmia region (Geoy Tepe, Yanik Tepe, Dinka Tepe, Havtavan Tepe, Kordlar Tepe) or Tsopk (Korucutepe, Imikushaghi). The mentioned settlements are as a rule small – 2–5 ha. Kultepe II occupies an area of 10 ha, has double-walled towers with buttresses and a citadel. There is also a continuous set of dwellings (Lori Berd). Thus, a question arises: to what extent do the late Middle Bronze Age settlements correspond to the concept of the city?

1. There must have been a certain hierarchy among the settlements, which, however, is not comparable to previous or subsequent periods. In this sense, the Kharberd valley stands out, where Korucutepe becomes the central settlement in the Middle Bronze Age, around which a number of other settlements are grouped.

2. There is also evidence of regular construction (Kultepe II, Chalhan Kale, **Korucutepe**), **including the presence of streets (Norshuntepe, Kultepe II)**. Artisans' districts are present in developed settlements (Kultepe II, Kenan Tepe, Tepecik). There are data on craftsmen living outside the citadel (Kultepe II).

3. Citadels were in the central part of the settlements, surrounded by a wall (Uzerlik Tepe, Kultepe II). There is a piece of evidence on the existence of external residential areas outside the walls (Kenan Tepe, Kultepe II, Shaghat I).

4. The settlements were protected either by cyclopean-like fortresses (Karmir Berd, Lori Berd, Shahlama I and II, Sotk 2) or by brick walls (Uzelik Tepe, Korucutepe, Imikushaghi). The settlements of Nakhichevan (Chalhan Kale) had defense systems similar to toothed walls.

5. Palatial complexes are not known (cf. nevertheless, the “large building” of Norshuntepe, or the “building with monumental walls” of Tepecik). However, cuneiform sources indicate the existence of palaces in the Upper Euphrates and Upper Tigris regions of the Highlands (Hahhum, Samuha, Tegarama, Nihria).

6. Temple-sanctuaries are known in some settlements (Kultepe II). The temple is mentioned in written sources in Korduk (Kurda). Tombs could also play the role of a sanctuary. Some elite tombs-kurgans have ritual roads (Trialeti, Karashamb), as in some ancient Near Eastern states. Ritual areas could consist of regular arrangement of menhirs (Zorats Karer) and megalithic sites (including vishaps) which appear in the context of settlements, cemeteries or free areas in the mountains.

7. The Middle Bronze Age monumental architecture is mainly represented by “royal” funerary structures. In the first stage of the Middle Bronze Age (Kurgancultures) there are 25–80 m diameter tombs of timbered construction (Joghaz, Martkopi, Bedeni). In the next stage (Trialeti-Vanadzor), the huge tombs (Trialeti, Lori) are evidence of monumental mentality, which could be 11–13 m high, 140 m in diameter and possess an inner chamber of up to 170 m². From burial structures “cities of the dead” (Zorats Karer, Ghirghi, Choratan) were formed, which are densely filled with tombs arranged along the passages.

8. There is some information on the existence of crafts, particularly metallurgical (Uzerlik Tepe, Kenan Tepe, Tepecik) and agricultural (Uzerlik Tepe, Tepecik, Imikushaghi) centers, as well as salt extraction (Duzdagh salt mine exploited by Kultepe II). Irrigation systems (from mountains to lowlands, like on Aragats and Geghama mountains), water pipes (Tepecik) are also known.

9. The Middle Bronze Age is a period of marked social inequality, with an influential elite trying to imitate the Syrian-Mesopotamian and Central Anatolian ruling circles, with obvious links to the elite of those zones (Trialeti and Karashamb silver goblets with typical features of ancient Near Eastern iconography). The human resources (up to 48,000 human-days) spent on the construction of the elite tombs (“royal tombs”) are not inferior to the resources spent on the construction of the temples of the early Mesopotamian cities, which testifies to the enormous power of the leaders.

10. The Middle Bronze Age was also a period of active trade and economic relations. The beginning of the 2nd millennium BC was marked by an organized trade between northern Mesopotamia (Assyria) and central Anatolia (Kanesh), in

which also the western and southern regions of the Highlands were participating. There were two types of trading settlements in that system. 1. *karum*, which was a market and was governed by a state or community body located outside the city itself; and 2. *wabartum*, which was a temporary residence of these merchants and governed by *karum*. Thus, the Mesopotamians introduced the structural elements of their city beyond Taurus (the Mesopotamian city was divided into three parts - the fortified city itself, the suburbs outside the wall, the merchant district – *karum*). The study of the Cappadocian trade mechanisms is important for us not only because a number of city-states of western and southern Armenia were or had *karums* (Durhumit, Nihria, Hahhum; the latter is compared to Norshuntepe) and *wabartums* (Samuha, Tuhpia), but also because the appearance of the Mesopotamians in Cappadocia and the Highlands greatly contributed to the development of new urban settlements. According to some authors, the Cappadocian trade system was the follower of the trade system established by the Kura-Araxes culture, but it was much more comprehensive. The people of Mesopotamia could create *karums* and *wabartums* also in the central-northeastern regions of the Highlands. However, the Kanesh texts do not mention the corresponding place names, which could indicate that these regions were indirectly involved in this trade. Here, at least, there were meeting places for merchants which could have distant similarities with *karum*. The prototype of such a meeting place was Kultepe II of Nakhichevan. Excavations have shown that merchants and artisans lived here outside the citadel, as in Kanesh. A similar situation is also recorded in Tepecik settlement of Tsopk. This comparison, in addition to the archaeological data (metal, pottery, iconography) testifying to the relevant connections, is also confirmed by the early Babylonian cylinder seal found in Nakhichevan and dated to the first quarter of the 2nd millennium BC. This seal could appear here from other regions of the Highlands, as such objects have been known in Tsopk (Imikushaghi) and Urmia region (Geoy tepe), which might have been important junctions in the Cappadocian trade system.

Emergence of Cities: the Urban Period

One of the most significant periods of urban life in the Near East was the Late Bronze Age (ca. 16–13th centuries BC), which was a period of political and cultural integration, following the “demographic explosion”. However, these global processes stopped in the Early Iron Age (ca. 12–9th centuries BC), when cultural

systems became more concise. Early Iron Age is often referred to as the “Dark Age” in the Near Eastern and Aegean archaeology, as it was probably a period of climate changes, the collapse of various cultural and political systems, new ethnic movements, the rise of “barbaric cultures” and the militarization of societies.

The Highlands has not escaped these developments. This is especially true in the western and southern regions, where there is an obvious gap between the Late Bronze and the Early Iron Ages⁷. Meanwhile, in the northeast, particularly in the present-day Armenia, in the Urmia Basin and the areas between Van and Mush, the rift between the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages is less pronounced. That is why we are discussing those two periods together. Crisis processes in this zone are observed only in the transition period between the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages (12th century BC), when a sharp demographic decline in population is observed (cemeteries of Artik, Karashamb, Lchashen), some settlements are destroyed or abandoned (Tsaghkahovit, Gegharot). However, in the 11th century BC a large increase in population again occurs (Aygeshat, Talin, Shamiram cemeteries) and centralization around large urban centers (Metsamor, Lchashen, Shamiram) is observed.

In the Late Bronze Age sedentary life became dominant again. Unprecedented economic growth is visible in all areas. The agricultural lifestyle is being restored in the lowlands, the mass craft production indicates the growth of a market economy. The chariot is widely used. Large settlements with a large number of population concentrated around it start to emerge. In the western (according to written sources, the land of Ishuwa) and southern (the lands of Alshe, Nihria) zones, mixed cultures consisting of Hurrian-Hittite and local elements are present, while in the central-northeastern zone (in the written sources – the lands of Hayasa, Etiuni) the Lchashen-Metsamor culture is predominant. Within the mentioned three zones, Hurrian influences predominate at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age, whereas in the mid of the Late Bronze Age, in the southern, central-northeastern sub-zones the Hurrian (Mitannian) and partly Babylonian (Kassite) influences are present, while in the western sub-zone, the Hittite influences are strong.

⁷ For the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age in Armenia cf. Ավետիսյան 2014; as well as Арешян 1974; Smith et al. 2009.

As for the Early Iron Age, during this period processes of cultural integration are observed in the Highlands. Similar to the Early Bronze Age, now all the three sub-zones, having demonstrated peculiar elements of development, are in lively interactions, forming a single cultural world, to be expressed first of all by the same gray-polished pottery, similar historical and cultural developments, the signals of which derive from the zone of spreading of Lchashen-Metsamor culture⁸. Unprecedented growth of fortress-settlements is noticeable. The society is essentially militarized, its power is represented by the military elite (especially expressed in “soldiers’ tombs”), which already possess the secret of the iron use. As a result of these processes, large state formations consisting of various sub-powers emerged, such as the principalities of Mushkians and Urumeans in the vicinity of Tsopk, Nairi in the south, and Etiuni in the central-northeastern regions. It was the further strengthening and development of these large unions that led to the emergence of the Urartian Kingdom at the end of the Early Iron Age.

Late Bronze and Early Iron Age settlements in the western and southern regions of the Highlands are represented mainly by artificial hills and are concentrated in the vicinity of Kharberd (Korucutepe, Norshuntepe, Pirot) and Tigranakert (Uch tepe, Giricano) valleys. As for the third zone, there are artificial hills (Dvin, Guzelova, Pulur, Dilkaya), but the most common type of settlements are **fortress-settlements (often called “cyclopean”), the number of which reaches several hundred**, which find their parallels with similar structures of the Aegean World and of Asia Minor. The range of cyclopean fortresses continues between Ararat, Mush and Van (Yurekkale, Panzkale, Aliler, Meidantepe). These fortresses are located as a rule in foothill zones, a few in lowlands (Metsamor, Aghin) and have a rational urban-defensive nature, due to which they have been preserved and developed both in the Urartian period and afterwards. They are built of large boulders, mostly without mortar. According to location features they can be

⁸ At the transition between the Late Bronze and the Early Iron Ages (mid of the 12th century BC) one can discern decrease of population in the territory of modern Armenia. However, from the 11th century BC a clear increase is evident. Everywhere this demographic growth is accompanied by the appearance of urban settlements such as Metsamor, Dvin, Shamiram. It is possible that the decrease in population mentioned above in certain regions is primarily the result of a migration (rural exodus) and a concentration in urban centres (Avetisyan, Badalyan 2007, 305).

classified into three main types: hill (Zolak, Vardadzor), plateau (Ashkala, Akhtamir) and mountainous promontory (Shish Blur, Ujan). They can have one (Topkar, Tufashen), two (Sarnaghbyur, Beshtasheni), three or more fortifications, when the citadel, the terraces and the residential districts (Akhtamir, Lanjaghbyur) are separated by particular walls. Fortresses usually have rectangular towers and one or two, in rare cases up to four (Shamkhor) entrances. Many have citadels (Nagharakhan, Sangar) and most importantly, residential areas outside the walls (Metsamor, Sarnaghbyur, Shirakavan, Tsaghkahovit, Yoncatepe).

In the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages we can speak of a real urban life. What are the main features of the urbanism during that period?

1. Each geographical sub-zone is characterized by an obvious hierarchy of settlements – fortresses with central and satellite settlements and their guard posts. From the point of view of defense, they are in an advantageous position in relation to each other, have a functional relation, are connected with the use of local resources and the exchange relations and form one or more socio-political commonalities. So, the investigations of the Armenian-American expedition in Tsaghkahovit valley on the northern slopes of Mount Aragats indicate that from the beginning of the Late Bronze Age the main settlements (Hnaberd, Tsaghkahovit, Gegharot and Aragatsi Berd) were synchronously populated, and around them a system of satellite settlements and cemeteries emerged. Some of them (Tsaghkahovit, Hnaberd) reach large scales (ca. 5000 tombs in 162 groups, on an area of 30 km²). These settlements had small fortresses (Hnaberd – 1.56 ha, Tsaghkahovit – 0.59 ha, Gegharot – 0.36 ha), but together with the settlement itself they occupied a larger area (Sahakaberd I – 30 ha, Hnaberd – 33.2 ha, Tsaghkahovit – 39.6 ha). Among them there were craft and religious centers (Gegharot)⁹.

The investigations carried out by the Armenian-Italian expedition in the southwestern part of the Sevan basin are supplemented by written sources. Thus, the construction of 28 fortified settlements in the region began in the pre-Urartian period and was already completed during the invasion of the Urartians. These settlements were concentrated around four units (Arkukini, Lueruni, Kamaniu, Tulikhu), the central settlements of which were Nagharakhan, Mtnadzor, Tsovak, Sangar fortresses. Closest to the idea of a city-state was the Kamaniu group with

⁹ Smith et al. 2009.

its central settlement Nagharakhan (15.5 ha), which was surrounded by five small (0.15 ha) fortresses and played the role of a unique “capital”. In the 8th century BC Urartian written sources in this area mention three types of political units: city-state (Tulikhu), tribal unions (Arkukini, Lueru, Kamaniu), confederation (Uduri-Etiuni), which included the above-mentioned tribal unions with their settlements. Accordingly, two types of settlements are mentioned. 1. URU – town, village, community (= Urartian *patari*, but used mainly for Tushpa and settlements built by the Urartians). At the beginning of the 8th century BC, 120 URU-s were captured by the Urartians on the south-western shore of Lake Sevan, including Tulikhu (Kra or later Sangar fortresses) and the city of the god Teisheba (Tsovinar fortress). 2. E.GAL – palace (economy), fortress, administrative center. In the Urartian written sources they are mainly fortresses without citadels (Tsovak, Bruti Berd in Sevan Basin), fortresses with external settlements, palaces in the settlement or fortress (Tsovinar). It is assumed that the E.GAL-s of Etiuni could be cities and the URU-s urban areas, which is slightly different in the Sevan Basin. A unit called *E.GAL agununi* also appears: fortified areas with additional fortresses, citadels (Nagharakhan, Sangar)¹⁰.

2–4. The central urban settlements have regular construction, divisions of districts, according to separate functional significance, as well as traces of monumental architecture.

For example, Lchashen Fortress, with its two citadels, 22 towers, 3.5 m wide walls, numerous structures, entrances, secret passages, was like a surface labyrinth. Together with the external settlement, it occupied an area of about 55 ha, spread over 15 hills, rising on 50–100 m above the surrounding area. The total length of the outer walls of the fortress and settlement was about 5000 m.

The town of Lazaravan occupied an area of about 35–40 ha, 1.5 ha of which was occupied by the citadel located in the center. It was protected by massive walls, which were in three rows on the southern side. It had ten rectangular towers with a front length of up to 17 m. Inside the citadel traces of monumental architecture are present, straight streets up to 6 m wide, with houses on both sides. There are special districts and squares connecting the streets.

¹⁰ Biscione et al. 2002.

The citadel of the Motkan fortress, about half a kilometer long, was divided into eight sections by latitudinal internal walls. It had fortified walls on the slopes and together with the settlement occupied an area of about 40 ha.

The pre-Urartian settlement of Karmir Blur, located by the Urartian city Teishebaini occupied about 40–50 ha and consisted of the complexes of dwellings, cemetery and a cyclopean fortress.

In the Early Iron Age, Metsamor occupied an area of about 200 ha, together with the citadel fortified by a cyclopean wall and residential districts adjacent to it. With its public, religious, economic, industrial (metallurgical) complexes and two cemeteries, it resembled a real city. During the Early Iron Age the massive fortress of Uyts, together with its surrounding settlement, occupied ca. 200 ha.

5. The mentioned powerful cities would surely have palatial complexes, of which few are known (Metsamor, Tsovinar, Yoncatepe). The Hittite sources mention palatial complexes in the western regions of the Highlands (Ishuwa).

6. There are temple-like complex sanctuaries within (Gegharot, Metsamor, Dvin, Shirakavan) and beyond (Byurakan, vishap stone platforms) the settlements. Hittite texts mention temples in Hayasa.

7. In the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages monumental funerary architecture (mainly tombs) is known with materials from different social strata (Lchashen, Lori Berd, Metsamor, Karagunduz). Although the elite continues to be buried with luxurious property, the Middle Bronze Age tradition of building large-scale tombs disappears, which indicates a completely different social and psychological **orientation of the political power. There is an impression that the “individualistic”** Middle Bronze Age society is becoming "state-centered".

8. There were craft, particularly metallurgical (Metsamor, Sotk, Dvin, Lchashen, Karmir Blur, Haghartsin, Gyumri, Gegharot, Shirakavan, Mtnadzor, Klor Dar) and agricultural (Dvin, Tsaghkahovit, Karmir Blur) centers. The tombs of craftsmen (Lchashen, Akhtala, Artik, Kanagegh) indicate the existence of deep subdivisions in crafts. Metal mines (Alaverdi, Akhtala, Sotk) are actively exploited. The fact of mass production (especially pottery) is remarkable. In a number of regions (slopes of Aragats and Geghama Mountains) large-scale irrigation systems are known, among which artificial lakes and canals, directly related to cyclopean fortresses, can be observed.

9. Social stratification is obvious. We can talk about the existence of different social strata (princes, priests, warriors, merchants, craftsmen). In written sources,

the rulers of Hayasa and Nairi are called “kings”. Moreover, if in the Late Bronze Age we deal with a theocratic power, in the Early Iron Age the dominance of the military elite can be observed (tombs of Lchashen, Lori Berd, Metsamor, the stelae of Hakkari).

10. The Late Bronze Age was a period of active trade and economic interaction between the Near Eastern civilizations, which is brilliantly expressed in written sources (e.g., the Amarna archive) and archaeological sources (such as the tomb of Tutankhamun, the shipwrecks of Uluburun and Gelidonia). Leveling processes are also observed in the mental perceptions of the Late Bronze Age people (the discovery of the “monotheism” in Akhenaten Egypt and among the Hebrews). As a result, a system of relations was formed, to be characterized by the elite exchange/trade, the state-controlled royal economy, the transformation of the palace into both the king's residence, and also into the storage-workshop and center of barter. Gold becomes a trade unit, Akkadian – an international language, horse and camel are established as means of transportation, (battle) chariot is used, sea and land roads are activated, the Aegean, Balkan and the Caucasian regions are actively involved in the Near Eastern cultural relations. These tendencies are also fully expressed in Armenia, with cultural elements, which more than ever speak of the existence of Mesopotamian, Syrian, Egyptian and Mycenaean contacts. Among them, the Mitannian seals (Artik, Lchashen, Kanagegh, Norshuntepe) found in Armenia, the seal of the Kassite king Kurigalzu I (end of the 15th century BC) with the Egyptian inscription (Metsamor), the weight-stone of the Kassite king Ulam Buriash (ca. 16–15th centuries BC) with cuneiform inscription (Metsamor), the scaraboid of the Egyptian King Thutmose III (edge of the 16–15th centuries BC) with an Egyptian inscription (Metsamor), the bitumen medallions with Elamite iconography (Verin Naver) (mid 2nd millennium BC), a bead with the cuneiform inscription of the Assyrian king Adadnirari I (edge of the 14–13th centuries BC) (Khojali).

As for the Early Iron Age, this period does not stand out for active trade and economic relations in the Near East. During this time span of cultural isolation, the connections of the Highlands were mainly directed to central-western Iran (Gilan, Talish, Mazandaran, Luristan). Moreover, those relations are noticeable in all spheres of material and spiritual culture (weapons, horse bit, pottery, burial rites, general patterns of development), which testify to the existence of the “Western Iranian-Armenian koine”.

Discussion

One of the most important questions is which version of the formation of the city and civilization is reflected in the Highlands, and which external or internal factors were more active during this process?

According to H. Manandyan, the reason for the emergence and development of the city in Ancient and Medieval Armenia, should be sought in disposition of settlements on trade routes and in the vicinity to the civilized world¹¹. Indeed, the Highlands, especially the areas of its western and southern regions, was in active contact with the advanced centers of urban life of the time. The nature of these relations can be understood in the context of the so-called “center-periphery” theory, according to which in the Ancient Near East there were mountainous regions rich in raw materials (Asia Minor, the Highlands, Iran, Pakistan, the Levant) and river valleys poor in raw materials, however, high in terms of socio-economic organization (Mesopotamia, Egypt, Indus valley). The criterion for the normalization of relations between these zones was the exchange, as a result of which the mountaineers became acquainted with the civilizational values, and the lowlanders acquired the necessary raw materials. In this sense, ancient Asia Minor, Armenia and Iran with Syria and Mesopotamia were in almost the same relationships as Europe with the Mediterranean.

As for the internal factor, recently V. Masson put forward a hypothesis of the “Caucasian way of civilization”¹². According to it, the early Caucasian societies were characterized by: 1. obvious social differences and unequal distribution of wealth, 2. the existence of a military elite that was the main accumulator of wealth and the organizer of the exploitation of human power, 3. settlements with large areas, but relatively few archaeological data: they did not form artificial mounds and were hierarchically concentrated around the fortresses, 4. investment of wealth and human resources mainly in the construction of burial structures (kurgans), during which the invested energy is comparable to the energy expended during the construction of the Mesopotamian temples. These processes led to the creation of a proto-urban society, which, however, did not develop into a classical city. It went along the “non-urban path of civilization”. This finds parallels, for example, in the ancient societies of Balkan Peninsula or Early Iron

¹¹ Манандян 1985, 7–229.

¹² Массон 1997, 124–133.

Age societies of Central Europe. This view is applicable to the earliest societies of the North Caucasus (of Maykop culture type), the South Caucasus and the Middle Bronze Age societies of the Highlands. In fact, the early agricultural societies of the Highlands, which acted from the Neolithic period until the end of the Early Bronze Age, were going mainly through the Near Eastern path of the urban life. There have been artificial mounds and large settlements with their internal infrastructure, typical of early urban societies since the Early Bronze Age. Irrigated agriculture played a certain role in the public life of the lowlands since the Chalcolithic period, especially in the Early Bronze Age. Although those processes are incomparable in size with the complex Mesopotamian social relations, the paths are distantly similar. However, by the end of the 3rd millennium BC, this process terminated for various internal and external reasons (climatic conditions, invasions of steppe tribes) and already in the Middle Bronze Age the dominance of the “Caucasian way” became visible. During the Late Bronze-Early Iron Ages, the above-mentioned Near Eastern and Caucasian ways seem to have an equal impact on the development of urban life. From the coexistence of these two ways, the version of the development of Urartian and later Armenian cities was formed.

The ways of internal development of the earliest societies of the Highlands were substantially different from those of Syria-Mesopotamia. The closest parallel to the process of city formation in the Highlands is to be found in the geographically and culturally close Hittite-Hurrian world¹³. Both the Hittite and the Hurrian societies were agricultural in their nature, concentrated in the valleys (where the developed urban communities were located) or in the mountains (where the tribe was the dominant organization). The Hurrian society consisted of related family communities, which had their own land resources and were ruled by the patriarch. Several kinship and non-kinship communities formed an organization called a settlement (Akkad. *ālum*). The settlements were grouped around one or more fortified centers, which can be conventionally called the “city”, and where the temple was located, together with the houses of the ruler. Here the council of elders met.

In the Hittite-Hurrian world, the significance of the temple and temple economy was especially emphasized, together with the worship of the Thunder

¹³ For details cf. Diakonoff 1984, 24–38.

god, on which the state ideology was based. The temple (resp. the “sacred area”) here, as in the Highlands, was to be the foundation on which city life could be built. As we have seen above, the ancient cities primarily served as agricultural communities, centers of craft and trade and, most importantly, ideological leadership centers. That is why the existence of a temple center was the most important impetus for the emergence of an urban settlement. This version is quite visible in Ancient Asia Minor and Armenia, and finds parallels with the ethnographic materials of the Caucasian mountain dwellers. In these areas, starting at least from the Hittite period (perhaps even earlier), the temples were 1. theocratic communities, 2. public places of worship, 3. royal places of worship¹⁴. The earliest and most common of these was the theocratic community, from which various political organizations later emerged. During the period of the decline of the tribal system and the formation of territorial communities in the agricultural zones, the organizational center and the cult center (i.e. the rural and temple communities) coincided. Most of the agricultural population was concentrated around the temples. The temples were not only sacred, but also economic centers for the local autonomous communities, engaged in production, creating material goods, and later in issuing coins. And it is no accident that many of them were on trade routes and were centers of exchange. The lands of the community were considered the property of the deity (i.e. of the temple), which embodied the idea of the unity of community. From the temple communities centered around the sanctuary, these units gradually grew into political organizations. Temples such as Gobekli Tepe in the Neolithic and Deghirmen Tepe in the Chalcolithic periods, Mokhrablur in the Early Bronze Age, Kultepe II in the Middle Bronze Age, Gegharot, Metsamor, Dvin in the Late Bronze – Early Iron Ages could be the centers of public life, around which the city gradually emerged. This tradition developed more in the Urartian period (Tushpa, Musasir, Kumenu) and continued also in the post-Urartian period (Astgh Blur, Salkar, Artsvaberd, Khortambots), and found its expression in the Armenian environment. It is enough to remember the existence of the temple-cities Ashtishat, Ani-Kamakh (Kumakha of the country Hayasa), Yeriza and finally the ancient capital of Armavir. In addition, the construction or relocation of the city in ancient Armenia was necessarily associated with the idea of relocation of the sanctuary there (Bagaran, Artashat).

¹⁴ **Периханян** 1959, 170–181.

Moreover, as in a number of ancient Near Eastern states, also in the Highlands, the sanctuaries could be located outside the settlements (Harich, Babadervish, Amiranis Gora, Byurakan, Salkar, Ashtarak), to which the ritual paths led. Thus, the Armenian version of the city emergence and development outlines the main features of the Hurrian and Hittite ways. These cultures entered the stage of urban life almost simultaneously with the Highlands (at the end of the 3rd millennium BC). However, if the rise in the urban life of the mentioned regions led to the emergence of a society of a Near Eastern type at the beginning of the 2nd millennium BC, then in the Highlands the same happened with the emergence of the Urartian state.

Finally, referring to the emergence of the Urartian city, it should be noted that the latter is closer to the model, which developed in the depths of the Hittite-Hurrian and Late Bronze-Early Iron Age cultures of Armenia than to the Syrian-Mesopotamian model. Although the Hittite-Hurrian, pre-Urartian and Urartian fortresses had the same function as the Mesopotamian city (administrative-religious center with large storage houses, a temple and a palace), however unlike the latter, a large population was not concentrated in them. In particular, the Urartian urban environment (asuni) consisted of a central fortress (E.GAL) surrounded by unprotected urban settlements (URU), irrigation canals, cultivated fields, and forests. Such an accumulation of population was more similar to pre-Urartian Armenia rather than to the Syrian-Mesopotamian environment. The lack of tepes also supports this opinion. Interestingly, the same situation prevails in the initial zone of formation of the Urartian kingdom, in the Van basin. In this regard, the Urartian fortresses can be considered the last stage of development of pre-Urartian fortresses, and the Urartian state – the continuation, development and the final result of the urban processes in pre-Urartian Armenia, influenced by the Assyrian administrative system¹⁵. In this sense, the pre-Urartian settlements, surviving through the Urartian period, formed the basis of the Armenian city.

Let us emphasize again, that the version of the development of the central settlement in pre-Urartian Armenia finds parallels first of all in the Hittite-Hurrian world. K. Hovhannisyan is restoring the same path in Hayasa (according to Hittite sources)¹⁶. Here, it is enough to remember Hattusa, which was located in a foothill

¹⁵ For such an approach cf. Biscione et al. 2002, 351–370. For Urartian state infrastructure cf. Zimansky 1985.

¹⁶ Հովհաննիսյան 1996, 95:

zone, and consisted of complexes of monumental architecture with few traces of population. It is noteworthy that evidence on this type of urban space is preserved also in Mesopotamian sources in face of *kirhu*. It was an area fortified by a citadel on a hill, with a palace and a temple, and beyond it spread the outer settlement, where the main population gathered. This was the sacred part of the common area and a kind of “city within a city”. An urban space of this nature was alien to the people of Mesopotamia. The latter used to call *kirhu* mainly the Hurrian cities of northern Syria and Mesopotamia (Chagar Bazar, Nuzi, Arrapha). According to the exact definition by L. Oppenheim, the people of Mesopotamia used the same term to describe the cities of Armenia¹⁷, which is fully confirmed by the above-mentioned archaeological studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Առաքելյան Բ. 1958–1964, Քաղաքները և արհեստները Հայաստանում IX–XIII դարերում, հ. 1–2, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., 376 և 320 էջ:

Ավետիսյան Պ.Ս. 2012, Հայկական լեռնաշխարհի հնամշակութային միջավայրի ձևափոխումների հիմնական միտումները վաղ բրոնզի դարում, Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես, N 2, էջ 3–19:

Ավետիսյան Պ.Ս. 2014, Հայկական լեռնաշխարհը մ.թ.ա. XXIV–IX դարերում (Սոցիալ-մշակութային ձևափոխումների դինամիկան ըստ հնագիտական տվյալների), Դոկտորական ատենախոսության գիտական զեկույց, Երևան, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ, 92 էջ:

Արեշյան Գ., Ղաֆադարյան Կ. 1996, Հայկական լեռնաշխարհի ճարտարապետությունը նախնադարյան համայնական հասարակարգի և պետական առաջին կազմավորումների ժամանակաշրջանում, Տիրացյան Գ. (խմբ.), Հայկական ճարտարապետության պատմություն, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., էջ 13–86:

Բոբոխյան Ա. 2000, Ծովքը հին առաջավորասիական առևտրա-մշակութային համակարգում (մ.թ.ա. III հազարամյակի վերջ – II հազարամյակի առաջին կես), Թեկնածուական ատենախոսության սեղմագիր, Երևան, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ, 22 էջ:

Բոբոխյան Ա. 2016, Կիրխու. ամրոց-բնակավայրի մի տեսակ Առաջավոր Ասիայի լեռնային շրջաններում և Հայկական լեռնաշխարհում, Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես, N 2, էջ 166–179:

Գնունի Ա.Վ. 2010, Հայաստանում քաղաքագոյացման հիմնահարցի շուրջ, Վեմ, N 4, էջ 89–111:

Ջարյան Ա. 1986ա, Քաղաքաշինություն, Հայկական սովետական հանրագիտարան, հ. 12, Երևան, «Հանրագիտարան» հրատ., էջ 391–393:

¹⁷ Oppenheim 1992, 131–132. For *kirhu* in details cf. **Բոբոխյան** 2016.

- Զարյան Ա.** 1986թ, Ակնարկներ հին և միջնադարյան Հայաստանի քաղաքաշինության պատմության, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., 198 էջ:
- Կրկյաշարյան Ս.** 1970, Հին Հայաստանի և Փոքր Ասիայի քաղաքների պատմության դրվագներ, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., 213 էջ:
- Կրկյաշարյան Ս.Մ.** 1963, Դիտողություններ հին հայկական տաճարային քաղաքների առաջացման մասին, Տեղեկագիր հասարակական գիտությունների, N 9, էջ 55–66:
- Հովհաննիսյան Կ.** 1996, Ուրարտական ճարտարապետություն, Տիրացյան Գ. (խմբ.), Հայկական ճարտարապետության պատմություն, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., էջ 87–199:
- Սիմոնյան Հ.** 2012, Շենգավիթ. շարքային բնակավայր, թե՛ վաղ քաղաք, Հուշարձան, N 8, էջ 5–53:
- Սիմոնյան Հ., Գնունի Ա.** 2004, Հայաստանի սոցիալ-քաղաքական իրավիճակը վաղ բրոնզի դարում (ըստ հնագիտական աղբյուրների), Դանիելյան Է. (խմբ.), Հայկական լեռնաշխարհը հայոց մշակույթի բնօրրան, Երևան, «Գիտություն», էջ 60–70:
- Փիլիպոսյան Ա.** 1998, Հայկական լեռնաշխարհի կնիքները հինարևելյան կնիքագործության համակարգում, Երևան, «Ջանգակ», 248 էջ:
- Փիլիպոսյան Ա.** 2004, Հայկական լեռնաշխարհը Մերձավոր Արևելքի պատմամշակութային փոխառնչությունների ոլորտում. մ.թ.ա. III–I հազարամյակներ, Դոկտորականատենախոսության սեղմագիր, Երևան, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ, 40 էջ:
- Аресян Г.Е.** 1974, О раннем этапе освоения железа в Армении и на Южном Кавказе, Историко-филологический журнал, N 2, с. 192–212.
- Аресян Г.Е.** 1978, Вопросы типологии населенных пунктов Армении позднего бронзового и раннего железного веков, Государственный музей искусства народов Востока, Научные сообщения, N 10, с. 91–108.
- Джавахишвили А.И.** 1973, Строительное дело и архитектура поселений Южного Кавказа V–III тыс. до н.э., Тбилиси, «Мецниереба», 399 с.
- Кушарева К.** 1997, Ранние комплексные общества Южного Кавказа, Массон В. (ред.), Древние общества Южного Кавказа в эпоху палеометалла (Ранние комплексные общества и вопросы трансформации), Санкт-Петербург, Академия наук, с. 11–43.
- Манандян А.** 1985, О торговле и городах Армении в связи с мировой торговлей древних времен, Научные труды, т. VI, Ереван, АН АССР, 385 с.
- Массон В.** 1989, Первые цивилизации, Москва, «Наука», 268 с.
- Массон В.** 1997, Кавказский путь к цивилизации: вопросы социокультурной интерпретации, Массон В. (ред.), Древние общества Южного Кавказа в эпоху палеометалла (Ранние комплексные общества и вопросы трансформации), Санкт-Петербург, Академия наук, с. 124–133.
- Периханян А.** 1959, Храмовые общества Малой Азии и Армении, Москва, «Восточная литература», 184 с.
- Саркисян Г.Х.** 1960, Тигранакерт: из истории древнеармянских городских общин, Москва, Восточная литература, 158 с.

- Тер-Мартirosов Ф.** 2009, Город: термин и городская структура в истории Армении, Архитектура и строительство, N 12, Ереван, с. 50–55.
- Areshian G.E. 2005, Early Bronze Age Settlements in the Ararat Valley and its Vicinity, *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan*, N 37, pp. 71–88.
- Badalyan R., Lombard P. Chataigner C., Avetisyan P. 2004, The Neolithic and Chalcolithic Phases in the Ararat Plain (Armenia): The View from Aratashen, in: A. Sagona (ed.), *A View from the Highlands – Archaeological Studies in Honour of Charles Burney*, *Ancient Near Eastern Studies*, N 12, Leuven, Peeters, pp. 399–420.
- Badalyan R.S., Avetisyan P.S. 2007, Bronze and Early Iron Age Archaeological Sites in Armenia: I. Mt. Aragats and Its Surrounding Region, *British Archaeological Reports, International Series 1697*, Oxford, Archaeopress, 319 p.
- Badalyan R.S. 2014, New Data on the Periodization and Chronology of the Kura-Araxes Culture in Armenia, *Paléorient*, N 40/2, pp. 71–92.
- Biscione R., Hmayakyan S., Parmegiani N. 2002, The North-Eastern Frontier: Urartians and Non-Urartians in the Sevan Lake Basin, I. The Southern Shores, *Documenta Asiana*, v. VII, Roma, Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà dell'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente, 474 p.
- Bobokhyan A. 2008, Kommunikation und Austausch im Hochland zwischen Kaukasus und Taurus, ca. 2500-1500 v. Chr., Bd. 1–2, *British Archaeological Reports, International Series 1853*, Oxford, Hedges, 674 S.
- Bobokhyan A. 2014, Reflections on Public Spaces and Markets as Social Centres in Early Caucasian Societies, *Caucasologic Papers*, N 6, Tbilisi, pp. 381–386.
- Conti A.M., Persiani C. 1993, Cultural Development in Eastern Anatolia in the Early Bronze Age, Frangipane M., Hauptmann H., Liverani M., Matthiae P., Mellink M. (ed.), *Between the Rivers and over the Mountains, Alba Palmieri dedicata*, Roma, La Sapienza, pp. 362–413.
- Chataigner C. 1995, *La Transcaucasie au Néolithique et au Chalcolithique*, *British Archaeological Reports International Series 634*, Oxford, Archaeopress, 240 p.
- Diakonoff I.M. 1984, *The Prehistory of the Armenian People*, Delmar-New York, Caravan Books, 241 p.
- Donabédian P., Mutaflan Cl. (éd.) 2010, *Les douze capitales d'Arménie*, Paris, Somogy, 303 p.
- Gasparyan B., Arimura M. (ed.) 2014, *Stone Age of Armenia: A Guide-Book to the Stone Age Archaeology in the Republic of Armenia*, Kanazawa, Kanazawa University, 369 p.
- Herzog H. 1997, *Archaeology of the City: Urban Planning in Ancient Israel and its Social Implications*, Tel Aviv, University Press, 290 p.
- Kushnareva K. 1997a, *The Southern Caucasus in Prehistory*, Pennsylvania, University Museum Press, 279 p.
- Oppenheim A.L. 1992, *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 445 p.
- Smith A.T., Badalyan R.S., Avetisyan P. 2009, *The Archaeology and Geography of Ancient Transcaucasian Societies*, v. 1: The Foundations of Research and Regional Survey in

the Tsaghkahovit Plain, Armenia, Oriental Institute Publications 134, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 410 p.

Zimansky P.E. 1985, Ecology and Empire: the Structure of the Urartian State, Studies on Ancient Oriental Civilizations 41, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 141 p.

ՀՆԱԳՈՒՅՆ ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՔԱՂԱՔԱՅԻՆ ՄԻՋԱՎԱՅՐԵՐԸ

ԲՈՐՈՒՅԱՆ Ա.

Ամփոփում

Քանալի բառեր՝ Հայկական լեռնաշխարհի, վաղ հասարակություններ, բնակավայրերի աստիճանակարգություն, քաղաք, քաղաքակրթություն, ավանդույթ, նորույթ:

Հին և միջնադարյան Հայաստանը հայտնի էր բավականին աշխույժ քաղաքային կյանքով: Սակայն, մինչ այդ, քաղաքները Հայաստանում անցել էին երկարատև ու բարդ մի ճանապարհի, որի իմաստավորումը հիմքեր կարող է ստեղծել բուն հայկական քաղաքի տեսակը, առաջացման և զարգացման դրդապատճառները հասկանալու համար:

Հնագիտական տեսանկյունից քաղաքը սահմանվում է որպես կազմակերպված տարածք, որին բնորոշ են 1. բնակավայրերի աստիճանակարգության մեջ կենտրոնական դիրք, 2. կանոնավոր հատակագծով կառուցապատում, 3. միջնաբերդ, 4. պաշտպանական համակարգ, 5. պալատ, 6. տաճար, 7. բնակավայրից դուրս գտնվող դամբարանադաշտ, 8. արհեստագործական և գյուղատնտեսական կենտրոն լինելու գործառույթ, 9. շերտավորում, 10. աշխույժ առևտուր: Այս իմաստով, քաղաքի հնագիտական ուսումնասիրությունը տվյալ հասարակության հաղորդակցական համակարգի հետազոտությունն է:

Ելնելով առկա տվյալներից՝ առաջարկվում է պայմանականորեն առանձնացնել նախաքաղաքի (նոր քարի և պղնձի դարեր, մ.թ.ա. IX – IV հազ. կես), վաղ քաղաքի (վաղ և միջին բրոնզի դարեր, մ.թ.ա. IV հազ. կես – II հազ. կես) և քաղաքի (ուշ բրոնզի և վաղ երկաթի դարեր, մ.թ.ա. II հազ. կես – I հազ. սկիզբ) գոյության փուլերը, որոնց սահմանման հիմքում ընկած է վերոհիշյալ տասն հատկանիշների հաճախականության տրամաբանական աճը:

Քննությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ քաղաքի և քաղաքակրթության ձևավորման հայաստանյան տարբերակն իր զուգահեռներն է գտնում Հին Արևելքի

լեռնային (խեթա-խոտիական ոճի) հասարակություններում, որտեղ հատկապես կարևորվում էր տաճարական տնտեսությունը և ամպրոպի աստվածության պաշտամունքը, որի վրա էլ հենվում էր պետական գաղափարախոսությունը: Տաճարը («սրբազան տարածքը») դառնում էր այն հիմքը, որի շուրջ աստիճանաբար ձևավորվում էր քաղաքային կյանքը: Նման միջավայրերը առաջին հերթին կատարում էին գյուղատնտեսական ինքնավար տարածքային համայնքի արհեստավորա-առևտրական կենտրոնի ու, որ շատ կարևոր է, գաղափարական առաջնորդի դեր: Իսկ տաճարներն այդ համայնքների սրբազան կենտրոնից աստիճանաբար վերածվում էին տնտեսական կենտրոնի՝ հողկոր գործունեությունից զատ զբաղվելով նաև արտադրությամբ և նյութական բարիքներ ստեղծելով:

ГОРОДСКИЕ ЛАНДШАФТЫ ДРЕВНЕЙШЕЙ АРМЕНИИ

БОБОХЯН А.

Резюме

Ключевые слова: Армянское нагорье, ранние общества, иерархия поселений, город, цивилизация, традиция, инновация.

Для древней и средневековой Армении была характерна довольно-таки оживленная городская жизнь. Однако, до этого, города Армении прошли длительный и сложный путь, осмысление которого может послужить основой для понимания типа коренного армянского города, причин его возникновения и развития.

С точки зрения археологии, город – это организованная территория, для которой характерны: 1. центральное положение в иерархии поселений; 2. застройка с систематической планировкой; 3. цитадель; 4. фортификационная система; 5. дворец; 6. храм; 7. некрополь вне поселения; 8. функция ремесленного и земледельческого центра; 9. стратификация общества; 10. активная торговля. В этом смысле археологическое изучение города являет собой исследование коммуникационной системы данного общества.

Исходя из имеющихся данных, можно предложить следующие этапы истории города: протогород (неолит и энеолит, IX – середина IV тыс. до н.э.), ранний город (эпоха ранней и средней бронзы, середина IV – середина II тыс. до н.э.) и город (поздняя бронза и раннее железо, середина II тыс. – начало I тыс. до н.э.), в основе определения которых лежит логический рост частоты вышеупомянутых десяти признаков.

Вариант развития города и цивилизации в Армении находит свои параллели в горных обществах Древнего Востока (хетто-хурритского стиля, где особенно важно значение храмового хозяйства и культа громовержца, на которых зиждется государственная идеология).

Храм («сакральное пространство») становится тем основанием, вокруг которого постепенно формируется городская жизнь. Подобная среда в первую очередь играла роль ремесленно-торгового центра земледельческой автономной территориальной общины и, что очень важно, роль идеологического лидера. Храмы же для данных общин постепенно трансформировались из сакрального центра в хозяйственный, в котором занимались, помимо духовной деятельности, также производством и созданием материальных благ.