



THE FORTRESS OF ARAMUS: PRELIMINARY REPORT OF EXCAVATIONS IN 2004 AND 2005*

HAYK AVETISYAN, WILFRID ALLINGER-CSOLLICH

The archaeological expedition of Yerevan State University began in 1988 excavations of Aramus fortress located on the south-western edge of the village Aramus, District Kotayk, Republic of Armenia¹. Before these excavations the fortress has been partially investigated and described by the archaeologist E.V. Khanzadyan (1973)².

The site is situated on a terrain constituted of massive basalt rock hills. On a more than 70 m high range of hills, in direction from the east to the west, are situated the ruins of the former colossal fortress. The complex consists of two great parts – eastern and western. On the eastern part are located the upper and the lower acropolises.

The 20-30 m wide upper acropolis is a fortification system of rectangular plan, stretched on the axis from the east to the west and consisting of numerous constructional units. It is surrounded by a 2,1-5,5 m thick fortress wall with its buttresses and towers. The buttresses are 3-5-8 m long and stretch up to 1,05m forward from the fortress wall itself. On some places of the terrain the rocks are smoothed. To provide the hardness of the fortress walls, in some particular places were built one to three rows of stepped breast-walls. In the eastern and western frontal fortress walls of the upper acropolis were opened entrances fortified with lateral towers.

The lower acropolis is an organic continuation of the complex described above. This big, from the west to the east directed area, blends on the eastern part with the western entrance of the upper acropolis. The lower acropolis is in its lay-out of stretched-rectangular form and is situated ca. 20 m lower than the upper one. This complex is 30 m wide, and like the upper acropolis, is surrounded by the fortress walls which coincide with the common configuration of the terrain. It repeats the constructional details of the upper acropolis and in the central part of the western fortress wall has a powerful entrance, on the northern and southern sections of which have been constructed great angular towers.

The western part of the fortress is partially damaged. Being directed from the east to the west, it is divided from the lower acropolis with a 12m wide north-south directed street. This complex is surrounded by powerful basalt fortress walls, which have played probably the role of a “yard”.

The territory of the fortress, in harmony with the terrain, is divided into terraces, which, in particular on the northern and southern wings, are in 70-100m distance from each other. The terraces in their turn are fortified in different parts with the fortress walls, buttresses and towers preserved up to 2,5m. These buttresses are typical for some Urartian fortresses and settlements like Çavuştepe/Haykaber, Kayalı Dere, Argiştinili etc.³ Aramus, like other great Urartian fortresses, had a lower town, which however has only partially survived to our times.

The fortress walls, formed by two rows of huge basalt coarse stone blocks, have been built in dry masonry. The thickness of the walls coincides with the Urartian standards (between 2,1-5m, the preserved height is 2,5m). As basis for the fortress walls were used the smoothed protuberances of basalt rocks. To make the hardness of the walls more secure, the old masons have added on their basis

* Translated to English by BSc, MSc Sabina Kuntner. The Excavation Campaign Aramus is a joint project supported by Prof.Dr. Hayk Avetisyan, Yerevan State University, Armenia, and by Univ.-Doz. Dr. Wilfrid Allinger-Csollich, Univ.-Prof. Dr. Peter Haider, Univ.-Prof. Dr. Robert Rollinger, University of Innsbruck, Austria, and Univ.-Doz. Dr. Jasmin Dum-Tragut, University of Salzburg, Austria.

¹ For the main results of Armenian excavations cf. Avetisyan and Avetisyan 2006: 119-134.

² Khanzadyan 1979: 11.

³ Avetisyan 2001: 41.

breast - walls of one to three rows. Beside this breast - walls, also buttresses (3-8m long and 1-1,2m wide) and many quadrangular/rectangular towers (part of which are angular) were built.

Particular complexes and constructions of the fortress come into contact to each other through flat, stepped entries. In some parts of the acropolis, in the fortress walls, are definitely seen also entries or passes (“traps”) built with protective purposes. With their lay-out these are typical for the fortification system of the Van Kingdom.

In the year 2004 the archaeological expedition of the Yerevan State University, Armenia (directed by Dr. H. Avetisyan) and the University of Innsbruck, Austria (directed by Dr. W. Allinger-Csollich) renewed the excavations of Aramus. The preliminary reports of 2004 and 2005 international excavations of the site are to be presented in this article.

Preliminary Report of the First Armenian-Austrian Excavation at Aramus (2004) (by Walter Kuntner and Sandra Heinsch)

In the first campaign a 5, 20 x 41, 50 m width trench was opened in area A on the eastern and on the north-facing slope of the acropolis. The morphological features of this area are characterized by a plateau on top of the acropolis and by two terraces that run along the foothills of the acropolis and were defined as “*kleine Terrasse*” and “*große Terrasse*” (Fig. 1).

Fig. 1: Detail Aramus

Both the “*große Terrasse*” and the acropolis, previously described by Avetisyan⁴ and Smith and Kafadarian⁵, were each enclosed by a big stonewall, built by using the so-called “Kastenmauer” technique which suggests a contemporaneous uprising of both the complexes of the fortress, the acropolis and the “*große Terrasse*”, which is still unproven.

Until recently, investigations have considered the “*kleine Terrasse*” to be of little interest and have regularly omitted this feature from interpretations of the fortress⁶. In contrast, this study revealed the “*kleine Terrasse*” to be of relevance for the understanding of both the extension and the appearance of the fortress. In fact, there are many more walls of this kind scattered around the whole hill, suggesting that the slopes of the hill were part of the fortification system or as Avetisyan has suggested to be a rampart that runs to the eastern slope of the acropolis where an entrance is postulated⁷.

The main objective of the trench in area I was to enable, for the first time, the definition of a stratigraphic sequence. This, in turn, would allow relating the different stonewalls and ultimately obtain an absolute dating based on the ceramics found.

Upon removal of deposit d001, area I was divided into three parts through definition of surfaces s002-008 and s024 (Fig. 2). These surfaces stand in relation to the courses of stonewalls 2 to 5 and are located as follows: s002 on the plateau of the Acropolis, s004 north of wall 2 in the top half of the slope and s005- s008 and s024 in the lower half of the slope extending from upon the buttress of wall 3 in the south to the northern end of the trench.

Deposit d003, located between walls 1 and 2, was consistent with Avetisyan,⁸ who reports to constitute filling material of the acropolis’ “Kastenmauer”.

The northern extension of the trench was not investigated due to time constraints. Consequently, walls 4 and 5, which are located in this area, were omitted from both the stratigraphic

⁴ Avetisyan 2001: 37-38.

⁵ Smith, Kafadarian 1996: 35-36.

⁶ Avetisyan described the presence of some terraces inside the “acropolis” which find many parallels with other Urartian fortresses such as Çavuştepe/Haykaberde, Kayalı Dere, ArgiştıĖinili (Avetisyan 2001: 38), but did not mention the terraces occurring on the slopes.

⁷ Personal communication (September 2004 in Aramus/Armenia).

⁸ Personal communication (September 2004 in Aramus/Armenia).

sequence and the correlation with the other walls. Instead the excavation focused on the plateau and on the upper part of the slope. The results of the first campaign are summarized as follows:

Fig. 2: Area 1 s 002 - s 008 and s 024

The oldest wall (wall 3) is situated in the upper half of the slope under deposits d004 and d009, which are suggested to represent the ruins of a clay wall, which form the upper part of a fortification wall. On the other hand, wall 3 could have been also a terrace wall used to merely provide additional horizontal building surface as was confirmed to be the case with wall 2 (see below). Further research is needed to confirm either assumption.

The documentation trench DOST II was opened on the “*kleine Terrasse*” westward of the abutment. Here wall 6 was found and later associated with wall 3. However, this association has yet to be confirmed. It is also suggested that walls 3 and 6 belong to the oldest period, period III.

Wall 2 was built on the fallen ruins of wall 3. This marks the beginning of a new period, period II, which was divided into four phases (i.e. IIa, IIb, IIc and IId). Walls 2 and 12 were built during the oldest phase, phase IId (Fig. 3). Wall 12 was deepened from the surface s019 which lies on wall 3, indicating that wall 3 was still in use during this phase. The relation between wall 2 and wall 12 was grounded on the assumption that the latter enlarges the buttress of wall 3 to the same width of wall 2.

Fig. 3: area 1 - phase IId

Rooms R1 and R2 on the acropolis are representative of phases IIa, IIb and IIc (Fig. 4). R1 was built on the terrace formed by wall 2 and deposit d016, which was used as filling material. On the east profile there are two distinct destruction layers d011 and d012b (Fig. 5). Both layers were related to a reconstruction in R1, because wall 9 was built in phase IIa on deposit d012b and wall 10 was built in phase IIb on deposit d011. A further study is needed to define an association between the phases found in rooms R1 and R2 which is also marked by a destruction layer.

Fig. 4: Detail acropolis

The latest period, period I, was divided into two phases, Ia and Ib. Phase Ib is represented by wall 1. The construction of this wall resulted in the destruction of room R1 (Fig.4). Wall 1 was deepened from the surfaces s012a on the east profile (Fig. 5) and s021 on the west profile. Deposit d020 was filled at a later stage to form a horizontal layer over the ruins of the rooms, and marks the historical interface of period I. The ceramic of these deposits constituted additionally to Urartian pottery, material comparable to late Urartian/early Achaemenide pottery. Interestingly, this type of material was not found in the layers of the rooms. The last phase, phase Ia, is characterized by an abutment that grounds on surface s006 and which runs across wall 3 to the western corner of the buttress of wall 2. The buttress shows clear signs of soil creep and was supported by the abutment (Fig. 2). Further potsherds, possibly associated also with the late Urartian/early Achaemenide period, were found on surface s006 (Fig. 6.1), while deposit d006 held exclusively typical Urartian pottery (Fig. 6.2-4).

Fig. 5: Detail East Profile - Plateau and South Profile - DOST III

A remarkable result is the completion of a stratigraphic sequence, which can be divided into three main periods (I, II and III). The sequence represents the development of the settlement on the northern slope of the acropolis and on the acropolis itself.

The lack of information concerning wall 5 and the result about wall 1 need to be considered in the discussion of dating and associations between stonewalls, in particular with regard to the appearance of the fortress.

At present, it is not clear whether the fortress of Aramus was built in one step as a whole. Nor has it been confirmed whether the fortress dates exclusively to the Urartian period, or whether, as supported by the ceramic findings in d020 and on s006, it also dates to an earlier period.

Proposed future research addresses the need for more details on the transition from the Urartian to the Achaemenide period.

Moreover, further study plans to include investigations on the transition from the Early Iron Age to the Middle Iron Age (Urartian period). Among the Urartian pottery assemblage a large amount of material dating from the Early Iron Age was found in the great majority of deposits.

In conclusion, the proposed expedition is expected to provide insight into the relationship between the pottery formed in local tradition and the standard Urartian pottery. Likewise, recent findings such as of a Kura-Araxes potsherd from the deposit d011 in Room R1 suggest the existence of yet older layers, including the Early Bronze Age (Fig. 7.4).

Fig. 6. Aramus 2004. Area 1. Ceramic Extract. Ceramic of Middle and Late Iron Age of s006 (Fig. 6.1), d006 (Fig. 6.2-4) and d016 (Fig. 6.5-9). 1 middle-fine reddish gray clay minerally auxiliary. 2 middle-fine reddish-brown gray clay core minerally auxiliary. 3 coarse gray clay minerally auxiliary. 4 coarse reddish gray clay minerally auxiliary. 5 fine reddish-gray clay minerally auxiliary. 6 coarse gray clay gray-brown core polished minerally auxiliary. 7 middle coarse gray clay minerally auxiliary. 8 middle-fine reddish-brown clay minerally auxiliary. 9 coarse dark gray clay minerally auxiliary.

Fig. 7. Aramus 2004. Area 1. Ceramic Extract of d011. Kura-Araxes Ceramic with relief decor and ceramic of Middle Iron Age. 1 middle-fine red clay light gray core engobe minerally auxiliary. 2 middle fine dark red clay engobe minerally auxiliary. 3 middle coarse brown clay reddish-gray core minerally auxiliary. 4 fine gray clay brownish-gray core engobe. 5 fine light red clay, light gray core.

Fig. 8. Metal finds from area 1

Preliminary Report of the Second Armenian-Austrian Campaign of Excavation at Aramus – Area A (2005)

(by Walter Kuntner and Sandra Heinsch)

The excavation campaign Aramus 2005 continues the archaeological research in area A in the eastern acropolis of the fortress of Aramus. In 2004 a trench was opened measuring approximately 5 x 36 m in order to obtain a stratigraphic sequence between the acropolis area and the northern lower town (Fig. 9). Findings from the excavation campaign Aramus 2004 confirmed that the settlement of the acropolis encompassed several phases. The remains cover the Iron Age (1200-500 B.C.), and also suggest an Early Medieval occupation.⁹ Due to the relatively restricted size of the area investigated, there are aspects that remain unanswered. In particular, there are questions with regard to the stratigraphic relation between stonewalls in the slope and the acropolis area. Consequently, the findings provide a partial insight into the settlement patterns and inevitably affect the interpretation of the overall archaeological findings.

Further sampling was taken at three points within the excavation area established in 2004 namely, the documentation trench (Dokumentationsstellen) DOST II and IV and the so-called “acropolis trench” (Akropolis-Tiefschnitt). These records aimed primarily to provide answers to the stratigraphic questions. The acropolis trench served also to prepare for the excavation campaign 2006, that sees a general lowering of the acropolis area. The expansion of trench area A in 2005 aims to

⁹ Kuntner and Heinsch, Preliminary Report of the First Armenian-Austrian Excavation at Aramus, 2005 (in prep.).

investigate the coverage and morphology of the fortress on the north-east slope, as well as the settlement patterns in the acropolis area.

Fig. 9: The eastern acropolis of Aramus

This paper reports firstly, findings from the slope area (Part I) and secondly, findings from the acropolis area (Part II). Results from excavation campaigns 2004 and 2005 were combined. Periodisation results here presented are preliminary and dating was based on selected records only.

Part I. The Slope Area (Fig. 10)

The fortress wall of the northern lower town is primarily recognizable by a marked, stretched and about 2m wide relief mark, characterized by scattered stones and smaller random wall traits. In the 2004 trench, the fortress wall was defined as “Schalenmauer” (two stonewalls/casings surrounding a rubble core) and a Stretch of about 7 m of its surface was cleaned. The 2005 campaign provided further measurements of the fortress wall extending to the south-east. As recorded, the stones show a straight line pattern and therefore exclude the possibility of the fortress wall being connected to the stonewall M30 in the east slope as can be supposed by watching the plan proposed by Smith and Kafadarian¹⁰. In contrast, the fortress wall in the northern lower town connects to the stonewall M3. At this connection point the fortress wall of the lower town also connects with stonewall M13. Stonewall M13 in turn, forms an impressive bastion together with stonewall M30 (Fig. 10-11).

Fig. 10: The Slope Area

Fig. 11: Connection point between stonewall M13 and the fortress wall of the lower town (right)

On the east slope, between stonewall M3 and stonewall M30 stands stonewall M31. Cleaning of its surface revealed a 2.70 m wide projection. Based on the overall findings so far, it has not been possible to link stratigraphically stonewall M31 to the surrounding walls. Nevertheless, considering the parallel course of M31 to M3, the wall is preliminarily more closely associated with M3. With regards to this, the association between M3 and M31 shows similarities with the relation between M3 and M6 in DOST II.

Fig. 12: North façade of stonewall M13.

Fig. 13: Northeast edge of the bastion (stonewalls M13 and M30)

The documentation trench DOST II was opened in 2004 west of the abutment. It had the objective to analyze the stratigraphy above terrace I. This terrace is held by stonewall M4. This wall is visible only westwards outside the trench. Likewise, DOST II aimed at investigating the course of M4 to the east. However, terrace I flattens within the trench and given the limiting depth of less than 10 cm¹¹ no records could be taken. Unexpectedly, excavation works revealed stonewall M6, which runs eastwards below the abutment. Because a stratigraphic linking of M6 to M3 could not be completed in 2004, the excavations of 2005 aimed to gather more information on M6. A solid understanding of this stonewall is a major prerequisite for further excavations in the northern lower town. The documentation trench DOST II in the 2004 trench is going to be expanded east and southwards round the abutment and up to stonewall M3. The excavation methods applied are the same as used in the previous excavation campaign. The main objectives include the clarification of the course of M6 and its foundation level (which could not be exposed in 2004 due to massive basalt boulders), as well as

¹⁰ Smith, Kafadarian 1996: 35-36.

¹¹ Due to time limitations the analysis of samples from DOST II concerned mainly stratigraphical aspects and partly M6.

the analysis of the wall's function and stratigraphic position relative to M3 (Fig. 14). Additional objectives, which are, however, going to be of greater weight in the upcoming excavation campaign 2006, include stratigraphic sampling in relation to findings from the northern lower town.

Fig. 14: North façade of stonewall M6 in DOST II-2005.

Based on scattered stones that show through the surface outside the trench it is possible to follow the course of this stonewall up to the fortress wall of the northern lower town. The annex between these two walls remains, however, still to be exposed. Part of the course of M6 was further exposed in the southern expansion of DOST II. In comparison with the wall's transect in the west trench (exposed the previous year), the wall at this location is shifted by about 60 cm southwards.

The findings allow the reconstruction of a wall rebound below the abutment. Similarly, M3 is characterized by a 60 cm wide rebound at the same location. This, in turn, enables a comparison between the course of M6 and M3. While it is clear that there is a connection between the rebound of M3 and a 2.70 m wide buttress of the wall (exposed in 2004), it is necessary to analyze further the findings before being able to make a similar conclusion with regards to M6. Overall, the exposure of M6 comprises a height of 140 cm whereby its foundation horizon presently remains unexposed. This hinders a conclusive clarification of the stratigraphic relation between M6 and M3. Nevertheless, the stratigraphy on both, west and east profile in the area between M3 and M6 allows the definition of a communal interface defined as i019. This interface consists of: the southern façade of M6, the surfaces s055 and s053, the surface of basalt plate III and finally, the northern façade of M3.

In 2004, surface s053 was exposed from underneath SE 019 and along stonewall M3. In 2005 excavation works exposed the foundation horizon of M3 and revealed that it lies immediately on the basalt plate III. Additional findings from 2005 include SE 055 underneath SE 019. No direct connection between SE 053 and SE 055 could be determined because basalt plates I - III hindered further excavation. In contrast, comparison of material composition provides evidence of a correlation between these two layers. In particular, both layers are characterized by black ash stains and charcoal fragments.

There is a close association between SE 019 and the deposition of the basalt plates I and II. In fact, at the height of the lower edge of the basalt plate II there is a barely recognizable interface within SE 019 indicating that this could be an artificial deposit. During this time stonewalls M3 and M6 remained visible. However, it is unclear to what extent M6 was still used as part of the fortress system, for no stratigraphic correlation could be determined between the stone destruction layer SE 014 north of M6 and the area between stonewalls M3 and M6.

In summary, the findings from documentation trench DOST II indicate that M6 served as a terrace for stonewall M3 at least during their common interface¹². The area between measures approximately 2 m in width providing sufficient potential space for a battlement as suggested by a silhouette in the profiles reminiscent of a stonewall. As a result, that stonewall M6 was higher preserved than nowadays. Ultimately, the findings imply that differences in wall construction methodology (as defined by the choice of stone size and the way that these are built into the wall (Kuntner, in prep.) should not be used *a priori* as a historical indicator. In fact, the choice of methodology and accuracy used to construct the wall could also have been driven by functional necessities.

Findings from 2005 show that the foundation pit of stonewall M12 (exposed in 2004) as running along side M3, east of the buttress needs to be corrected from surface s019 to s013. The interface i013 stretches from M3 in the south, across the basalt plates I and II, and over the preserved

¹² As said before, the foundation level couldn't be reached. Thus an older *Nützungsphase* can not be excluded, during which the structure may have a different function, for example as an older fortress wall. The stonewall M3 shows very clearly how important it is to take into account a change of function in time.

top edge of M6 to its destruction layer SE 014. These findings identify a phase, where stonewall M6 was already a ruin and wholly covered, while stonewall M3 was still exposed and in use.

Similar functional unanswered questions as were found between stonewalls M6 and M3 also occur between stonewalls M3 and M2. The 2004 campaign did not provide sufficient evidence to determine whether M3 in fact, stood up as a fortress wall. The area between these stonewalls is analyzed and expands over an area of 3 m on the western slope and an area of 4 m on the east slope. Surface s010 is exposed in both areas. As recorded in the previous year, this surface is composed of a layer of hand-sized stones. It stretches across M3, then southwards and underneath M2. The excavation centered mainly on the search for mud bricks within SE 009, as initiated by findings of isolated straw-tempered fragments of mud bricks in the previous year. However, no additional findings in support of this view were found 2005 in the study area. In fact, SE 009 consisted of homogenous yellowish, sandy clay. Here, ceramic fragments from Early and Middle Iron age as well as from Early Bronze Age were found.

In the west slope expansion, stonewall M19 was exposed from below SE 009. M19 runs parallel to M2 and grounds on SE 010. The wall is composed of two rows of stones surrounding a core of small pebbles. Neither mud bricks nor any fragments were found at this location. Consequently, SE 009 appears to be an artificial deposit used when M2 was built. It was deposited on top of the fallen stonewall M19 and SE 010. Likewise, it suggests that the isolated mud brick remnants found in the deposit are remnants that were integrated secondarily.

Further, findings in the east profile of the western slope expansion, suggest a foundation pit for stonewall M2 deepened from s009. However, this view is based exclusively by findings from this area, as there is no further evidence to support a foundation pit along the remaining north-eastern course of the stonewall M2. This findings also support the interpretation of stonewall M3 as terrace, both as settlement area on which M19 was built and as support for the fill of SE 009 into which stonewall M2 was built.

On the other hand, evidence from DOST IV (deepened approximately 50 cm and expanded 3m westwards between the casings of the fortress wall in 2005) suggests that we are dealing with just one aspect of the purpose of stonewall M3. In fact, two *in situ* mud brick layers were found on stonewall M18 (exposed beneath stonewall M2). M18 has the same direction as M2 and M19. However, based on the difference in stone size as well as construction methodology, stonewall M18 can not be related to stonewall M19. On the other hand, there could be a functional relation to stonewall M3. The assumption is that the findings represent an inner and outer casing of an older 2 m wide fortress wall of the eastern Acropolis. This wall is in turn boosted by stonewall M6, as said before, maybe as a battlement. The likelihood of this scenario is, however, to be considered with regards to the rather restricted area covered by DOST IV. The M3 findings are consistent with the view that the structure could have served three functions: fortress wall – settlement area – terrace/support.

Results from DOST IV are relevant because of two main aspects. On one hand they explain the succession of the several stages of the fortress wall, and on the other hand they provide the only link between the stratigraphy of the slope area and the acropolis area. The proposed interpretation of the sequence of the fortress wall presented in 2004 was reviewed in light of the analysis of the profiles in DOST IV. The assumption in 2004 was that there were two different periods (period I and II) that can be summarized as follows. Period II includes only stonewall M2. This wall held the terrace on that room R1 was built. Period I instead represents the phase of the construction of M1 that formed, together with a new use of stonewall M2 the fortress wall. This period also includes the filling of the acropolis area by the SE 020. Stonewall M1 was deepened in the destruction layers of the rooms, SE 021 in room R2 and SE 012 in room R1.

The 2005 results clearly show that the fortress wall (M1 and M2) instead belongs to one period only, while covering two distinct phases. The older phase b saw the concurrent construction of both stonewalls as casings of the fortress wall filled by SE 003. With regards to M1 this is true for the eastern wall section east of the projection, deepened in the ruins of room R1 (i.e. SE 012), as well as for the remnants recorded in a line in the western extension of DOST IV. It follows that during the older phase the inner casing of the fortress wall (M1) doesn't consider the rebound of stonewall M2.

This finding is confirmed by a wall section on the southern slope of the acropolis showing the same characteristic.

In the younger phase a the inner casing (stonewall M1) was adapted by the rebound deepened in the destruction layer d021a of room R2 and finally boosted by an abutment running upward from the terrace I across the slope to the junction point. The eastern section of stonewall M1, starting approximately eastward of room R1 is also regarded as to belonging to this younger phase a. There are two reasons for this assumption. Firstly, the direction of the fortress wall deviates slightly to the south and is characterized by a joint on both casing - stonewall M1 and M2. Secondly, stonewall M1 lacks a foundation pit and instead runs across the stonewall M25, grounding on interface 1020.

In conclusion, the suggested periodisation of the fortress wall is going to be compared with the results of the acropolis area. As mentioned above, the results of stonewall M31 do not allow a chronological Integration and are therefore excluded. Although, the analogy to stonewall M6 in the DOST II serves as an approach, it lacks any stratigraphic observation. Stonewalls M14 and M30 are also excluded from the discussion as their chronological reference is limited to their relationship to stonewall M3. It is emphasized, that stonewall M3 remained in use during the whole period covered up to now. This hindered to draw definite conclusions. Further is necessary to add clarity to the findings gathered so far.

The fortress wall of the eastern acropolis of Aramus can be divided into four phases a-d. The oldest Phase d includes the so called "older fortress wall" formed by the stonewalls M3 and M18. In addition, the fortress wall has a terrace/battlement represented by stonewall M6. It remains unclear, whether the latter wall also belongs to an older phase or period. As indicated by the stonewall M19 grounding on the SE 010, phase c of the "older fortress wall" consisted only of the stony substructure used as a settlement area. Stonewall M12 too, belongs to this phase, although its purpose remains unclear. This correlation is based upon the Interpretation, that the layer SE 013 represent the debris of the mud brick superstructure of the "older fortress wall". However, the absence of any spur of mud bricks remains unexplained. Phase b and a finally cover the timeframe of the so called "younger fortress wall" described above.

Part 2. The Acropolis (Fig. 15)

The goals of research in the acropolis during the campaign of 2004 was to gain an overview of the stratigraphy. This resulted from the desire to gather as much information as possible about the settlement activity before the end of work. Therefore, the applied method concentrates on the documentation trench DOST III. The circumstance that the DOST III was set exactly in room R1 enable us to clarify the stratigraphy of this room (to some extent as seen in 2005), but otherwise affects negatively our understanding of the stratigraphy in the western part of the acropolis outside of room R1. As a consequence the stratigraphy could be analyzed only retrospectively in the west profile. The layers beneath the SE 020 were summarized and defined as SE 021, adjourning the final clarification for the campaign 2005; this means the detailed analysis of the layers forming the SE 021, both their relationship to the stonewalls M11, excavated only marginally, and M7 and M8 of room R1, as to the stratigraphy in the documentation trench DOST IV. The former aimed at the correlation of the structures within the acropolis. The only fact known at the beginning of the campaign Aramus 2005 was that both rooms R1 and R2 antedate SE 020. The latter instead attempted to link the stratigraphies of the acropolis and the slope area.

In 2005 afore mentioned stratigraphic questions were investigated anew in the acropolis trench and in the documentation trench DOST IV between stonewalls M1 and M2. In addition, the acropolis area was extended by 3,30 m westwards, concentrating on the analysis of the stonewall M11. On the other hand we extended our research activity in the acropolis area also to the east, enlarging the trench unto the fortress wall M1. The focus of this enlargement aimed at opening a larger surface in order to get more information about the architectural remains and thus about the settlement history to correlate with the periodisation of the fortress wall.

Fig. 15: Area A – acropolis

Part 2.1. The western extension of the acropolis

The periodisation of the settlement in the acropolis, based on the results of 2004 excavations, was confined to the eastern profile of room R1. This comprises one period divided into three phases. The use of room R2, as said before, could just be assigned generally to this period, but without any preciseness relating to the phases. The results of 2005 confute this periodisation totally, as room R1 was in use only in one phase within a continuous settlement period that covers the whole findings yet excavated in the acropolis. Moreover, it was ascertained that the SE 011 doesn't belong to the stratigraphic sequence of room R1, as interpreted in 2004 - when it was seen as the first destruction layer of this room - but instead marks the foundation horizon of that room. The SE 011 can be correlated with SE 049 westward of room R1, where it is covered by the SE 021. This means that the history of room R1 is just seizable through the layers d012a-c. The results of the excavation in room R1 are discussed afterwards in the context of the eastern acropolis extension. Before dealing with this aspect it is necessary to discuss the results of the western acropolis extension.

The stratigraphic clarification of the layers SE 021a-d confirmed both their importance for the understanding of the settlement activity and the correlation of the two areas, the slope and the acropolis. The two lower layers d021b-c stretch across the SE 049 and lay in the east on the stonewalls of room R1, while to the north they run beneath the fortress wall, where they can finally be correlated with the SE 016 in the foundation trench DOST IV.

The stonewall M11 was cleared over a length of 5 m and grounds upon the layer d021b. It has a thickness of about 1 m and is build like all other walls by two rows of stones surrounding a core of pebbles. The stones don't show any trace of trimming, but its size is comparable with those of stonewall M26 in the eastern extension (see below). The stonewall M11 forms the northeastern wall of room R2. The room can be entered from the east by a 75 cm wide door signalized also by an *in situ* laying door socket.

The stratigraphic situation of stonewall M11 shows clearly that the construction phase of room R2 postdates the building phase of room R1. If we consider the evidence that the fortress wall M1 was built only after the destruction of room R1, it could be argumented that room R2 also was built only thereafter.

But the stratigraphy in the DOST IV does not allow any exact conclusions since both the expansion of the SE 016 or rather d021b-c to the north as the stratigraphy – as represented in the west and east profile in this sector - are not fully understood. One reason is the difficulty to correlate the SE 049 in the acropolis area with any layer within the DOST IV. Moreover, there are also difficulties to delimit the layers within the DOST IV as much interferency disruptes the stratigraphic sequence due to the remodellings of the fortress walls.

The SE 016 in the west profile is characterized by two depressions or pits with corresponding fill. The earlier one can not be fixed with certainty since the interface is very vague and the material features of the fill are very similar to that of layer d021b/SE 016. The second one, on the other hand, can be definitely associated with the foundation pit of the fortress wall M2. Provided that there is an earlier depression, it would mean that room R2 antedates the construction of the “younger fortress wall” and possibly even of the stonewall M19 (phase c). This would assign both room R2 and R1 to phase d of the fortress wall periodisation, allowing moreover to divide this phase into two subphases d1 and d2. Just as well it is possible that only room R1 belongs to phase d, while room R2 belongs to phase c since the interface of the destruction layer SE 032 runs across the fortress wall M18 (phase d) and correlates with the surface s021b. Therefore, it is impossible to determine whether room R2 was built before or after the destruction of the fortress wall M18 (if this interpretation as such is true) or of stonewall M19.

If there is not an earlier depression, than both structures, room R2 and the fortress wall, belong to the same surface s021b. Consequently room R2 can antedate, postdate or even date to the same phase as the construction of the fortress wall phase b.

It is assumed that room R2 antedates phase b of the fortress wall since in 2004 a second *in situ* door socket was found in the acropolis lying on the surface s021b next to the room R1. It indicates that

both rooms must have been in use at least during a common timespan, as the functionality of this door socket is only given if the stonewall M7 was still standing. Thus it seems to us more plausible to arrange the foundation phase of room R2 between the destruction of room R1 and the construction of the fortress wall of the acropolis. This interpretation doesn't finally solve the question regarding the depressions/pits in SE 016. If we assume again the existence of an earlier depression, either a pit or something else, both rooms are to be assigned to phase d. If not, then room R1 can be correlated with phase c or d and room R2 between phase c and b. However, we interpret this finding, it is clear that room R2 was still in use during the whole phase b, since the destruction layer d021a of room R2 is lying on the fortress wall M1 and its surface marks the niveau of the foundation pit for the reconstruction of this wall in phase a.

Furthermore, the layer d021a covers the grave G2 inside of room R2. The grave G2 was not deepened, but instead installed on the surface s021b, meaning that it was visible on the surface and therefore postdates the use of that room. The skeleton is well preserved lying east-west on the back. Since just the lower part of the body was excavated, while the upper part runs in the west profile, it is not known in which direction the face is oriented. To judge from the basins skeleton, lying slightly on the right side, it can be supposed that the face is showing to the south. The extraction of DNA from the humeri of the skeletons in graves G2 and G1, the latter uncovered in 2004, was successful, allowing both the examination of human species as a radiocarbon dating of the graves.

Part 2.2. The eastern extension of the acropolis

The functional Interpretation of the SE 020 as filling and the interpretation of the surface s020 as the youngest period interface to be correlated with phase a of the fortress wall periodisation could be confirmed. Moreover, this surface marks also the foundation level of stonewall M26, exposed in sum about a length of 1.75 m. The wall runs in a southwestern direction perpendicular to the stonewall M1 and its thickness is between 80 and 90 cm. The stonewall is formed by two rows of ashlars, each measuring about 40 cm and laid in regular courses with displaced joints surrounding a core of smaller stones.

Beneath the SE 020 as well as the stonewalls M1 and M26 the stonewall M25 was found. It runs 3 m in width in east-west direction. The wall has a breadth of 80 cm and consists of two rows of stones surrounding a core of pebbles, but which, unlike wall M26, are not trimmed. In the west the stonewall M25 is bonded rectilinear with stonewall M17, and together form the northwestern edge of room R3. The corner of room R3 lies above the southeastern corner of room R1. Between stonewalls M25 and M17 the destruction layer of room R3 was cleared running underneath the stonewall M26.

The stonewall M25 is built directly above the stonewall M24, both having the same direction as the same construction technique. Westwards the stonewall M24 adjoins to the stonewall M21, by the bottom line of the former lying on its upper edge. The stonewall M24 postdates the walls of room R1 too, and can therefore be correlated with room R3, maybe representing an older phase of that room, and finally belonging to phase b of the fortress wall periodisation.

Room R1 is completely excavated. The SE 011 is not the first destruction layer of this room, as believed in 2004, but represents its foundation horizon. The increasing occurrence of Early Bronze Age remains - ceramic and lithic artefacts - in this layer and beneath in SE 049 suggests the existence of an older settlement period directly under the stonewalls of room R1.

The stratigraphic sequence in room R1 is therefore limited to SE 012. The subdivision of this stratigraphic unit into these three layers d012a-c, termed in 2004 in the east profile, can be confirmed. In 2005 each layer could be analyzed separately. The room is defined in the west by stonewall M7, to the south by stonewall M8, both already found in 2004 and the latter fully exposed in 2005, and to the east by stonewall M21. On the latter there were still remains of a clay plaster on the outside of the wall facing eastwards. The northern wall of room R1 was destroyed by stonewall M1. Consequently only the length of the room, which averages 5 m, could be measured. The stonewalls of room R1 are conserved all to the same height of approximately 60 cm and show all the same construction technique as the above mentioned stonewalls M24 and 25, although consisting of somewhat larger stones. Just the southeast corner shows traces of a larger destruction, caused by the building of room R3 described above. The thickness of the walls of room R1 is different in size. The thinnest wall M7 has a width of

approximately 80 cm, stonewall M21 of 90 cm and the thickest stonewall M8 of about 110 cm. At present it is not possible to explain this difference. It seems plausible that stonewall M8 represents the principal wall running east-west, while the stonewalls M7 and M21 were lateral walls, that formed the rooms aligned along the fortress wall of the acropolis (phase c/d).

In the east of room R1 an oven was found. It is swatted and burst, but lying *in situ* yet. The oven grounds on the surface s012c and is attached via a rear stone structure to the stonewall M21. The oven is preserved to a height of 60 cm and is built up in one piece of low burnt clay resembling the ceramic properties of the large pithois found in room R1 in 2004 (SE 017). The under range has a rectangular shape measuring 55 x 80 cm, while the upper range is of oval form with a diameter of 50 cm. Inside and at the bottom of the oven a 10 cm thick ash layer was found, from which a soil sample was taken. This layer is covered by parts broken from the oven as well as stones and fragments of mud bricks, originating from the destruction of the room walls. The destruction layer d012a covers the whole area of the room. The foundation level of the oven is superimposed by the ash layer d012b. It is preserved up to 5 cm around the oven and in the western part of the room along the stonewall M7, while in the middle of the room there are just a few black ash stains distinguishable.

Southward of the oven and along stonewall M21 a round, 30 cm big clay structure is preserved, followed by three more clay structures, but with rectangular shape with approximately 35 cm width running eastward along stonewall M8. The clay structures can be compared with the stonewall M9, uncovered in 2004, and which yielded the large pithois (SE 017) mentioned before. A soil sample was also taken of the clay structures so that interesting results concerning the aliments stored and prepared in this chamber can be expected. It can be taken for granted that this room was the kitchen.

In the eastern acropolis extension two more stonewalls, M15 and M16, were excavated. The walls run onto the stonewall M8 and are separated by a joint. Stonewall M15 is preserved very badly, consisting just of a course of stone. Stonewall M16, on the other hand, is better preserved, in sum three courses high, reaching the preserved upper edge of stonewall M8. It has a width of 50 cm. Between these stonewalls and under SE 020 the SE 048 was uncovered, characterized by ash linses and small fragments of charcoal. Beneath follows the SE 052. The latter runs across a 60 x 80 cm long, flat basalt plate, and its surface (s052) marks the foundation horizon of stonewall M15.

Eastwards of stonewall M21 a triangular and about 2 m width trench was deepened about 80 cm (trench acropolis-east-extension-I). Therein stonewall M22 was exposed protruding up to 10 cm beneath stonewall M21. Both walls run in the same direction, so that is by now unclear whether stonewall M22 represents an older phase of room R1 or an older period within the settlement sequence reminiscent of the findings in the SE 049. In the south the stonewall M22 is interrupted by a semi-circular stone subsidence and runs underneath the stonewall M24. Eastward it is linked with a stone pavement bounded by the stonewalls M32 and M23. Both stonewalls are constructed with two rows of hand-sized stones surrounding a core of pebbles. The top edges of these structures correspond with the preservation niveau of stonewall M22. To the north they run under the stonewall M1. The stone pavement is interrupted in the west by a pit containing an embedded, large pithoi with a diameter of 40 cm, where an obsidian sphere was found. The delimitation of the layers in this area was complicated by the homogeneity of the clay features and the narrowness of the trench, and therefore need further investigation to be fully understood.

Conclusion

The excavation in the eastern acropolis of Aramus shows a continuous settlement activity covering the Early and Middle Iron Age. The remains can be divided into 6 phases represented in Table I. The correlation of the results in the acropolis with the periodisation of the fortress wall is about to be fully solved, particularly with regard to the oldest structures R1 and R2 as even the structures in the trench acropolis-east-extension-I. This is due to the fact, that so far the only link between the stratigraphy of the slope and the acropolis area was confined to the DOST IV.

The preliminary correlation shown in Table I is primarily based upon two stratigraphic indicators. These are layer SE 020 and findings of the destruction of room R1 by the construction of the “younger” fortress wall in phase b. The final correlation of the phases c and d needs further

investigation. This will be only possible by the removal of the fortress wall in order to open a new trench in north-southern direction.

Fortress wall		Acropolis					
phase							phase
a	abutment restauration of M1 and					M26	1
SE 020 (filling)							
b	“younger” fortress wall (M1-M2)				R3 [M25- M17]		2
					[M24]		3
destr. of room R1							
c	“unfortified” settlement [M19]			R2 [M11]			4
d	“older” fortress wall (M3-M6)		R1				5
		R4					6

Table I: Preliminary Correlation

Fig. 16: 1 middle fine, outside and inside black clay, dark-brown core (10 YR 2/2)¹³ (d012a). 2 middle coarse, outside black (2,5 Y 2,5/1), inside dark grey clay (2,5 Y 3/1), dark grey core (10 YR 2/2) (d012). 3 coarse, dark red-brown clay (5 YR 3/3) (d012c). 4 fine, outside and inside reddish brown clay (5 YR 4/4), dark red-brown core (5 YR 3/2) (d012b). [1:4]

Fig. 17: d020 - acropolis east extension

1 middle fine, outside and inside red clay (2,5 YR 4/6), dark grey core (5 YR 3/1), burnished. 2 middle fine, outside and inside red clay (10 R 4/4), black core. 3 fine, black clay. 4 middle fine, outside reddish brown (5 YR 4/4), inside dark brown clay (7,5 YR 3/4), dark red-brown core. [1:4]

¹³ Cf. Munsell Soil Color Charts 2000.

Fig. 18: s020

1 middle fine, black clay, polished. 2. middle fine, outside brown (7,5 YR 5/4) and inside brown clay (7,5 YR 4/4), reddish brown core (5 YR 4/4). 3. middle fine, outside black, inside reddish brown (2,5 YR 4/4) clay, dark reddish brown core (2,5 YR 3/3). [1:4]

Fig. 19

Appendix 1: The Lithic Artefacts from Aramus Excavations 2005
(by Helga Marchart)

№	US/area	Typus	Material	Colour	Retouches	L [cm]
1	d002/slope east of footbridge	linear flake	linear flake	gray-brown	use retouch sinistro-lateral	1,4
2	d002?/slope	point	linear flake	black, patina	proximal area: fine retouch	3,6
3	d009/slope, west of footbridge FP 042	linear flake	linear flake	grayish-black, opaque, patina, dorsal/ventral sinter-incrustation	proximal area: edges by means of fine retouch slightly indented	2,4
4	d009/slope, west of footbridge FP039	microscraper	hornstone	red-brown, inclusions of fragmentary microfossils	distal area: partial retouch	2,4
5	d020/acropolis west	linear flake	linear flake	gray-brown, striated sinter incrustation, distal translucent	partial distal retouch	2,7
6	d020/acropolis west	linear flake	linear flake	black, partial patinated, dorsal sinter-incrustation	sinistro-lateral partially abrupt retouched	2,6
7	d020/acropolis west	linear flake	linear flake	gray-black, opaque, dorsal sinter-incrustation	sporadic sinistro-lateral retouch, partial dextro-lateral use retouch, edges rolled	2,5
8	SO 18/deep trench 2004 FP 067	linear flake	linear flake	black, translucent		3,3
9	d049/deep trench 2004 FP 057	linear flake	linear flake	gray-black, lateral translucent		2,0
10	grave 2	linear flake	linear flake	brown- transparent dorsal/ventral patina, sinter-incrustation		4,0
11	grave 3	linear flake	linear flake	black, opaque spots of sinter	distal area and sinistro-lateral edge retouch, edges rolled	2,0
12	gate wall, outside left	trimming flake	linear flake	gray-black, opaque, dorsal patina		4,2
13	d048/acropolis east extension	flake	linear flake	gray, opaque, ventral spots of sinter	sinistro-lateral: partial fine retouch	2,9
14	gate wall, outside left	trimming flake	linear flake	black, dorsal patina		4,2

Fig. 20

References

- Avetisyan H.G. 2001, Aragaci amrašinutyunə (The Fortification of Aragats), Yerevan (In Arm.).
 Avetisyan H.G. 2001, Aragac. Urartakan amroc'i pelumnerə (Aragats. Excavations of the Urartian Fortress), Yerevan (In Arm.).
 Avetisyan H.G., Avetisyan P.S. 2006, Araratyan dašti mšakuytə m.t'.a. XI-VI darerum (The Culture of Ararat-Valley in the 11-6th centuries BC), Yerevan (In Arm.).
 Khanzadyan E. 1979, Elar-Darani, Yerevan (In Arm.).

Smith A.T., K. Kafadarian 1996, New plans of Early Iron Age and Urartian Fortresses in Armenia: A Preliminary Report on the Ancient Landscapes Project, "Iran", XXXIV, 1996: 25-37.