« Hasanlu Teppe ». *Elr* 12, fasc. 1, (2003), pp. 41-46.

Aurélie Daems

Édition électronique

URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/abstractairanica/3289>

ISSN : 1961-960X

Éditeur :

CNRS (UMR 7528 Mondes iraniens et indiens), Éditions de l'IFRI

Édition imprimée

Date de publication : 15 mai 2005

ISSN : 0240-8910

Référence électronique

Aurélie Daems, « « Hasanlu Teppe ». *Elr* 12, fasc. 1, (2003), pp. 41-46. », *Abstracta Iranica* [En ligne], Volume 26 | 2005, document 95, mis en ligne le 08 décembre 2005, consulté le 25 septembre 2020.
URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/abstractairanica/3289>

Ce document a été généré automatiquement le 25 septembre 2020.

Tous droits réservés

« Hasanlu Teppe ». *Elr* 12, fasc. 1, (2003), pp. 41-46.

Aurélie Daems

- 1 – « Hasanlu Teppe: i. Hasanlu Teppe », pp. 41-45: The excavator of the site, Robert Dyson, first gives us a short overview of geographical positioning and general outlook of the remains of the site. Although much reduced today due to modern agricultural activity, Hasanlu teppe remains the largest mound of all the surrounding mounds excavated so far for the Hasanlu project, which aimed at developing an archaeological sequence of the Qadar river valley during the sixties and which should be considered as one of the pioneering projects in the archaeology of the Azerbaidjan province of Iran. This resulted in the reconnaissance of a sequence stretching almost uninterrupted from the Late Neolithic to the Achaemenid – Early Parthian period. Without going into any architectural, sequential and other detail, mention is furthermore made of some extraordinary finds, such as the famous gold bowl.
- 2 – « Hasanlu Teppe: ii. The Golden Bowl », pp. 45-46: One of the most intriguing artefacts recovered from a 9th century B.C. context in Iran is the so-called golden bowl of Hasanlu teppe. Its means of manufacture, iconography and comparison with other contemporary objects have been discussed in length in the passed, as evidenced by the extended bibliography. Robert Dyson, field director at the time of its discovery, discusses the artefact again, putting attention to archaeological context and iconography. No new insights are proposed here, which is to be expected since the bowl has been the subject of many discussions since its discovery in the sixties. However, Dyson does inform us of some minor errors in earlier reports on the bowl, which are corrected a.o. here.

INDEX

Thèmes : 3.2.2. Pré-Achéménides et Achéménides

AUTEURS

AURÉLIE DAEMS

Université de Gent