

FIRST HAYKIDES AND THE «HOUSE OF TORGOM» (an overview of tradition and new prospects)

Aram Kosyan

Institute of Oriental Studies of NAS RA

General remarks

The "*Torgomian*" hypothesis of the Armenian ethnogenesis contains a crucial phase of the history of the people and its earliest statehood, which until now remains one of the complicated problems in Armenological studies. The main obstacle in the study of the problem is the absence of authentic criterias while comparing different sources (written - cuneiform Hittite, Assyrian, Urartian, Hieroglyphic Luwian, Classical Greek, linguistic, archaeological, mythological, etc.). This concerns primarily the chronological and onomastic difficulties. The chronology of the ancient Near Eastern history which we gain from the classical and medieval authors, purely correlates with that of cuneiform and hieroglyphic Egyptian inscriptions. As to the onomastic data dealing with the *First Haykides* (= hereafter FH) which contains in the study of *Movses Khorenatsi*, one could find it impossible to trace their names in the onomasticon of the ancient oriental sources, concerning the Armenian Highland during the III-I millenniums BC.¹

In the Classical Armenian historiography, since the days of *Movses Khorenatsi*, *Hayk* was regarded as the "*son of Torgom*", and the Armenians - "*the people of Torgom*"². Nothing more about *Torgom* and the "*Torgomian era*" could find modern scholar in the medieval Armenian manuscripts, except the Biblical affiliation of the Armenian forefather; *Torgom* is regarded by *Khorenatsi* as the son of *Tiras*, grandson of *Gomer*. Unlike his "son" - *Hayk* and other *Haykides* (mostly FH, i.e. from *Aramaneak* to *Anushavan*), whose names were accompanied by narratives of certain historical events, obviously *Torgom*'s role is obscure. He is not even *nahapet* (eponymous forefather), because this function is secured for *Hayk*. *Torgom* did nothing for the Armenization of the Armenian Highland. The primary homeland of *Torgom* is also unknown.

¹ The current paper is an English translation of the part of the author's monograph published over 20 years ago in Armenian (Kosyan 1998a). Since then quite a large number of studies both by him and other scholars had appear dealing with the problem of early Armenian statehood, the historicity of the *Haykides* and related issues (Ohanyan 2002; Petrosyan 2002; 2003; 2006; 2007; 2008; 2009; Kosyan 2014; 2017; Tsakanyan 2017, etc.). Needless to say that despite the new data and studies very few points in the traditional treatment of the problem under discussion has been reached so far. With this in mind, the presentation of the old problem under new outlook seems justified.

² P'awstos Buzand: Introduction, III.13, V.30; Agat'angelos: 6, 776, 796; Levond: XXXIV, Hishatakaran. Here and elsewhere citations from the „History of Armenia“ of *Movses Khorenatsi* are given after the 1978 edition by R.W.Thomson. English translations of *Hovhannes Draskhanakerttsi* belongs to the author.

Undoubtedly, the "Torgomian" ancestorship of the Haykides was borrowed by the Classical Armenian authors from the Bible.³ Otherwise, Khorenatsi or one of the later historiographers could have been aware of some crucial points in this history.

Taking into account heavy western (The Upper Euphrates area) connections of the early Armenian history,⁴ scholars mostly, beginning from Fr.Delitzsch,⁵ were inclined to look for the "*House of Torgom*" beyond the Euphrates where since the early II millennium BC the city *Ta/egarama* (Assyrian *Tilgarimmu*) was referred to in cuneiform Assyrian and Hittite texts.⁶

According to H.Manandyan,⁷ the early Armenian tribes had migrated from Northern Balkans in the XII BC, settling down in the neighborhood of *Mount Argaeus* (modern *Erdjiyas Dagı*, between the triangle of Kayseri-Gürün-Malatya, six centuries later leaving this land for the sources of Halys-Kızılırmak and their second homeland - the Armenian Highland. The same approach was demonstrated by I.Diakonoff.⁸

Localizing the early Armenian ethnic element near the sources of the Upper Euphrates (Hayasa and Azzi of cuneiform Hittite inscriptions), Gr.Kapantsyan had put down a theory according to which the Armenian migration into Malatya-Tegarama-Kayseri was regarded as a gradual infiltration happened between the XII and VII c. BC, which was accumulated in the VII c. BC, under the Cimmerian pressure from the east and north-east.⁹

³ See, in particular, Sarkisyan 1992 and Kosyan 2005.

⁴ According to Khorenatsi, from here begins the migration of the Haykides to other regions of the Highland (the point of departure of *Aramaneak*, son of *Hayk*); in addition, here we find 1) two ethnic designations of the Armenians (*hay* and *armen*), 2) most of the Pre-Christian Armenian sanctuaries, 3) the royal cemetery of Armenian Arsakid kings (fortress of *Ani* in the *Daranafi* district), 4) the royal of treasury of Arsakid kings (fortress of *Bnabegh* in *Tsopk Shahuni*), etc.

⁵ Delitzsch 1881: 246 (apud Manandyan 1977: 16). The author proposed that the «*House of Torgom*» is to be associated with the Cimmerians.

⁶ The first reference to Tegarama comes from the "Cappadocian Tablets" (XIX-XVIII c. BC). This important city is regularly mentioned in the Hittite texts during the XVI-XIII c. BC (del Monte und Tischler 1978: 383f.; del Monte 1992: 154; Kosyan 2004: 92f.).

⁷ Manandyan 1977: 21. Here we shall mention only some earlier scholars whose ideas regarding the Armenian ethnogenesis mostly trace the Indo-European speaking ancestors of Armenians somewhere in Europe, before their advance to the Near East (through the Balkans – Tomaschek 1893: 5; Khalatyants 1910: 76; Markwart 1919: 5; 1928; the other possible route through the Caucasian passes actually was not seriously considered). The exact period of the Armenian migration is also debated. Some prefer the XII c. BC, others – the VII-VI c. BC. Gr.Kapantsyan's model is different; he localizes Armenian-speaking tribes in Hayasa (western, north-western part of the Armenian Highland), before their migrations first to the south, until Northern Mesopotamia (in the VII c. BC under the pressure of Cimmerians), then to the north and north-west (Kapantsyan 1948: 140ff.). The complete overview of all suggestions regarding the Armenian ethnogenesis see Petrosyan 2017: 142ff.

⁸ Diakonoff 1968: 199ff.; 1981: 51ff.; 1984: 22.

⁹ Kapantsyan 1948: 140ff.

S.Yeremyan, in contrary to most scholars, proposed that the Biblical «*Bet-Togarma*» does not correspond to Tegarama-Tilgarimmu, but rather to *Armenia Minoris* (earlier Hayasa of Hittite cuneiform sources, the same as the country of *Hate* of Urartian king Rusa II)¹⁰.

Resuming this brief summary of scholarly opinions regarding the localization of the "House of Torgom", one could guess that the land of the Haykides, before their migration to the east, was located in eastern Asia Minor, in the general area between modern Malatya and Kayseri. Hence, the chronology and original place of residence of the Armenian-speaking tribes in eastern Asia Minor before their migration is a question which requires appropriate explanation. Today two contradictory theories deal with the problem of the arrival of Armenians to their historical homeland (to the east of the Euphrates, that is to the Greater Armenia).

- 1) Until the XII c. BC the population of the Armenian Highland could not have been Armenian. The appearance of Proto-Armenian tribes here should be dated with the XII c. BC or even later.¹¹
- 2) The Indo-European (accordingly, Proto-Armenian) ethnic element was present in the Armenian Highland since the II millennium BC, if not earlier.¹² The population of Hayasa and Azzi could have been partly Proto-Armenian.¹³

In the course of excavations conducted at different sites of the Armenian Highland during the final decades of the XX century, has come up certain archaeological data in favor of the second view.¹⁴ The archaeological situation in the Armenian Highland at the close of the II millennium BC testifies upon certain ethnic and cultural shifts, but only within the Highland itself. A large-scaled migration from outside is still unrecorded for the XII-XI c. BC.

Those who support the idea, according to which Armenian-speaking ethnic groups were among the population of the II millennium BC Armenian Highland, had proposed their gradual migration (easy to say *infiltration*) towards other parts of the Highland after

¹⁰ Yeremyan 1968: 109. Most of modern Armenian historians, linguists and archaeologists use the anachronistic term "*Armenian*" (in regard to language, tribes, etc.) while discussing the earliest period of Armenian history, i.e. the ethnogenesis. It should be remembered that the earlier stages of the history of any nation is an extremely complicated process in which the bearers of different languages (more correctly, "dialects") have been participating, and actually the exact place of each of these ethnic groups hardly could be distinguished.

¹¹ Khalatyants 1910: 11; Markwart 1928: 211; Diakonoff 1968: 204ff.; Mallory 1989: 34f., etc. In 1950s S.Yeremyan had suggested the XIV-XIII c. BC (Yeremyan 1958: 59), but later he lowered that date to the XII c. BC (Yeremyan 1968: 91).

¹² Today the scholarship has at its disposal a considerable archaeological data to suppose the presence of Indo-Europeans in Asia Minor and the Armenian Highland as early as the III millennium BC (Winn 1981: 113ff.; Yakar 1981: 94ff.; Arechyan 1988: 84ff.; Burney 1993: 311ff.).

¹³ Kapantsyan 1947; Jahukyan 1987: 340f.; Sarkisyan 1988: 51f.

¹⁴ A brief review of the results of archaeological surveys and related problems see Kosyan 1996: 207ff.; 1997a: 177ff.; 1997b: 253ff.; 1999b: 160ff.

the XII c. BC, a process accumulated during the VIII-VI c. BC, when the Urartian Empire was running to its end. This theory¹⁵ could be presented as follows.

The migrations of Armenian-speaking tribes from Hayasa and Azzi (in the general area near the sources of the Euphrates)¹⁶ had taken place in the XII c. BC, during the disintegration of the Hittite Empire. It follows in two main directions: 1) to the south (Malatya, then the Taurus area until Northern Mesopotamia), 2) to the east and south-east (future Urartu). The earliest attestation of these migrations is that recorded in the texts of the Assyrian king Tiglathpileser I (1114-1077 BC) - *Mushku*, *Kashku-Apishlu* and *Urumu* tribes in the Upper Euphrates area.¹⁷ The "Torgomian" affiliation of Hayk, according to Gr.Kapantsyan, could have preserved memories of early Armenian migrations towards Malatya and to the west of it.¹⁸ Accordingly, the author had proposed that the Armenization of eastern Asia Minor could have been dated to a certain period after the XIIc. BC.

Later, in 1960-1980s the problem of the early Armenian presence in eastern Asia Minor was thoroughly discussed by I.M.Diakonoff. Holding the view dealing with the North Balkanic origin of the Mushki, the author thought that the early Armenian tribes ("Eastern Mushki") had migrated into eastern Asia Minor in the XII c. BC. Here they seized the power in the late VIII c. BC, during the decline of local Luwian kingdoms.¹⁹ Later, after the decline of Urartu and Assyria, this Armenian kingdom should have extended its territory to the east, including former *Arme-Shubria* and central Urartu.

Resuming, it must be stated that the Upper Euphrates area to the west of the river (Melid-Tegarama, later Armenia Minoris) should have played an extremely important role in the consolidation of Armenian people and statehood, in order to be commemorated in the Armenian national memory as the father of *nahapet* Hayk, the ancestor of Armenians. Therefore, the detailed study of ethnic and political history of this area is of utmost importance for the solution of the problem of the "House of Torgom". When and in which political context could the Armenian ethnic group come to power in western Upper Euphrates area (to the north of the Taurus range), and, second, which political entity of this region should be regarded as the prototype for the "House of

¹⁵ Manandyan 1977: 13ff.; Kapantsyan 1948: 154ff.

¹⁶ Today this important federation consisting of Hayasa and Azzi on the north-eastern boundaries of the Hittite Empire scholars are mostly looking in the general area to the north of the upper reaches of the Euphrates - 1) the *Kharshit* river valley up to modern *Giresun* (Diakonoff 1968: 81ff., n.16); 2) the valley of the *Tortum* river (Khachatryan 1971: 128ff.), 3) the valley of *Kelkit* river (ASVOA 4.3). For the complete review of proposed localizations see Kosyan 2004 and especially our latest studies (2013: 48ff.; 2015; 2016: 116ff).

¹⁷ Grayson 1976: 12ff.

¹⁸ Kapantsyan 1947: 140ff.

¹⁹ Diakonoff 1968: 180ff.; 1981: 50ff. According to early studies, the arrival of Armenian tribes into Eastern Asia Minor took place in the VIIIc. BC, in the context of Phrygian expansion; certain Gurdi who in the times of king Sennacherib of Assyria (704-681 BC) had created a kingdom in Tilgarimmu was considered as the leader of these Proto-Armenians (Forrer 1921: 80f.; Adontz 1972: 311).

Torgom"? Was this kingdom referred to in the contemporary cuneiform and other sources?

The present study consists mostly of preliminary suggestions due to the number and character of primary sources.

The Sources of Movses Khorenatsi

The problem of sources used by Movses Khorenatsi for compiling his "History of Armenia" was discussed thoroughly by most Armenologists since the XVIII century²⁰ and here we are not aimed to review them all. For the purposes of our study it will be of considerable interest to highlight some observations of the problem with the hope to be discussed in future.

Every scholar working in the field of the Armenian prehistory, is well acquainted with the debate concerning several crucial points of Khorenatsi's "History": 1) the date of its compilation (from the V to VIII century), 2) the problem of *Mar Abas Catina's* historicity, 3) obvious discrepancy between the Armenian king-list of Khorenatsi and that coming from Classical Greek and Roman authors, 4) the absence of the names of the FH in ancient Armenia (for example, *Hayk, Aram, Anushavan*), etc. Taking into account these difficulties, some Armenologists had undervalued the "History". It seems that these trends in Armenology are based primarily on obvious contradictory character of some passages of the "History".

Those who are easy to reject the historicity of Mar Abas should look upon motives leading Khorenatsi to falsify certain historical event, that is the episode dealing with the request of the Armenian king *Vagharshak* to his elder brother – the Parthian king *Arshak*. Every Iranist and even non-Iranist knows that there wasn't any Parthian king Arshak in the I century AD, when the Parthian Arsakids had managed to insert a branch of their dynasty in Armenia. On the other hand, we know that it was the Parthian king *Vagharsh* (*Vologez I* of Classical authors = Parthian *Balash*) who did this, and *Trdat I* (*Tiridates*) was the first Armenian Arsakid king²¹. How can it happen that Khorenatsi was unaware of this crucial historical event? It seems that the problem of Mar Abas could be clarified by the next proposal.

In a late Sassanian manuscript,²² which, unfortunately, was not referred to until today in Armenological literature, it is told about a Persian king *Balash* (i.e. Greek-Roman *Vologez*, Arm. *Vagharsh*) who had ordered to collect and study the history of all provinces of his vast empire. Undoubtedly, these records were centered in his capital city, certainly in the royal archive. Did Khorenatsi know about this undertaking of Balash-Vagharsh? In the case of a positive answer we should come to an assumption that he had ascribed this undertaking of the Parthian king to his Armenian colleague

²⁰ Emin 1881: 7ff.; Thomson 1978: 10ff.; Sarkisyan 1991: 12ff., Abeghyan and Haroutyunyan 1991: LXVff. (XIX - early XX century bibliography), etc.

²¹ For the history of this period see Bivar 1983: 79ff.

²² For reference to this manuscript Lewy 1949: 29; for comments regarding this text see Kosyan 2017.

and brother. And not this single one but rather presenting Armenian Vagharshak as a mighty king fighting in the west ("**History**", **Book 2, 3-7**).

The above-mentioned new source must be thoroughly studied in order to define real motives of Khorenatsi's methods of writing the history of Armenia. But it should be said that the Parthian royal archive probably possessed with documents concerning the earlier history of Armenia, and Mar Abas or some other person could have had access into this archive by the request of Trdat I. As to the documents of the Parthian archive, hardly one should propose them to contain even a concise study of the Armenian prehistory in its full sense. Being the political heirs to the Achaemenid Empire which, in its turn, that of Babylonia and Assyria in some sense, the royal archive in *Ekbatana* could have had even possessed with translations from cuneiform inscriptions; worth to mention studies carried by *Berosus* and *Ctesias*. For example, the so-called "Babylonian Chronicles", where the narrative of the Assyrian and Babylonian history includes even the Hellenistic period as well.²³ Here one can find several references to the principalities of the Armenian Highland made by the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian kings.²⁴

If one accepts the historicity of Mar Abas, then the next question is in order: what kind of information could have contained this source used by Khorenatsi:

- 1) Which principalities referred to by Mesopotamian sources could be regarded by Mar Abas as being Armenian?
- 2) Could Mar Abas compare the alien proper names with that coming up from native Armenian oral tradition?

These points are far from rhetorics and should be beared in mind in future studies.

THE HISTORICITY OF HAYKIDES AND THEIR LOCALIZATION

In the first book of the «History» Khorenatsi gives the names of 37 forefathers (*nahapets*) of the Armenians, from *Hayk* to *Parouyr Skayordi*. The first ten (from Hayk to Anoushavan) are said to have been originated directly from Hayk. After Anoushavan there happened an usurpation of power and the alien dynasty ruled here until *Skayordi*, who restored the authority of the Haykides, being the ally of the Median king *Varbakes* (= *Ciaxes*). Among these *nahapets* the first ten stood isolated, since they are associated with the Armenization of the considerable part of the Armenian Highland, i.e. the creation of a political organization.

Until recently all attempts to etymologize the names of the Haykides, as well as to look for their possible correspondences in the onomasticon of ancient Armenian Highland or in adjacent areas, especially the FH (from Hayk to Anoushavan), mostly appeared to be futile. Such names as *Hayk*, *Aram*, *Gegham*, *Anushavan*, *Ara*, etc. are not attested in the Classical Armenian and late medieval historiography and one should

²³ Grayson 1975.

²⁴ Diakonoff 1981: 34ff.

definitely state that these names were not current in the ancient and medieval Armenian society. The restoration of these names in the modern period are definitely a tribute to Khorenatsi and the rise of self-conscience in the XVIII-XIX centuries.

Still N.Emin had stated that the names of the Haykides are of mixed origins, where at least four languages are represented - Armenian (*Gegham, Harma, Anoushavan*), Iranian (*Tigran*), Semitic (*Aramaneak, Aramayis, Amasya*, etc.), and Greek (*Kardos = Ara*, son of *Ara*).²⁵ The same assumption was reached by G.Jahukyan.²⁶

How could be explained this situation? Even if one considers that the names of the FH were really Armenian, it will be very difficult to explain their absense for millennias, until modern times. The idea that these *nahapets* were Armenians bearing alien names (the situation well attested for the period of the Bagratides and Cilician Armenian dynasties - Rubenides, Hethoumides), is impossible, since we deal with forefathers who had to bear native names.

The studies carried still in 1990s by Armen Petrosyan²⁷ had opened new possibilities for this much-debated problem. Here it was demonstrated that the FH represented the primary Armenian pantheon of Indo-European origin, which existed before the secondary, Iranianized one. This important assumption is based on solid grounds, but needs some comments.

If one assumes that the relics of this ancient Armenian pantheon were preserved via the oral tradition to be fixed still in the times of Khorenatsi, then the next question is in order. While changing the names of Armenian *nahapets* and replacing them by divine names Khorenatsi must have possessed with the names of both. His tendency to hide the names of the former (*nahapets*) is open for discussion, hence we can only offer our tentative suggestion.

Actually, the names of the FH (maybe even some later ones) looked like alien, since they could have reached via Mar Abas, Classical authors (Abydenus, Cephalion, Olympiodorus, Eusebius, etc.), or the archives of Edessa and Ani (all these sources are referred to by Khorenatsi).²⁸ How could a person living at least one thousand years later choose among these contradictory data. Indeed, the Armenian oral tradition could have preserved the reminiscences of the early stages of the Armenian ethnos and political organization(s), i.e. the primary historical-geographical environment. With this in mind, Khorenatsi had to find corresponding data among external sources. At best he could have had one or two similarities if any then he had to choose between the two.²⁹ In the

²⁵ Emin 1884: 31f.

²⁶ Jahukyan 1981: 61ff.

²⁷ Petrosyan 1996; Petrosyan 1997. On mythological character of these names Abeghyan 1944: 19ff.

²⁸ The existence of these archives is doubted by some (Thomson 1978: 12f.) and accepted by others (Sarkisyan 1991: 15ff.).

²⁹ On the possibility of one such case see Kosyan 1998a: 55ff. (on the external similarity of the names of Phrygian king Gordias with Kurtis, king of Atuna [in Tabal], also legendary Ascanius, forefather of Phrygian

course of making the list of the Haykides Khorenatsi risked to create something non-Armenian (Armenian *nahapets* with non-Armenian names). We guess that he had found a much safer variant, that is Armenian *nahapets* with pre-Christian Armenian divine names (before their Iranization). That he had made use of external sources is easy to demonstrate through the next passage from the "History", which could be regarded as a key to our problem:

"So if you were to ask: 'Whence did we thus learn the names of our ancestors and the deeds of many of them?' I reply: 'From the ancient archives of the Chaldaeans, Assyrians, and Persians, since their names and deeds were entered on the royal acts as prefects and governors of our land appointed by them and as satraps' (Book 1, 21).

It is difficult to argue against the importance of this citation. If one proceeds from the position of formal logics, then the problem of the FH' historicity could be solved through the clearing of some points:

- 1) Localization of the FH.
- 2) Identification of the FH' neighbors.
- 3) The status of the FH' "Armenia".

According to Khorenatsi, already during Aramaneak, the son of Hayk, the Haykides possessed with a considerable part of the Armenian Highland. But even five generations later when Aram had conquered vast territories in the south (*Mount Zarasp* and "*Assyrian field*") and the west (Mazaka-Caesaria), "*Armenia*" still remains under the political influence of Assyria. The possibilities of postulating with such a "*great Armenia*" fails under the light of cuneiform sources antedating the Urartian Empire. That here the term "*Assyria*" has nothing to do with Urartu, seems doubtless.³⁰ The "*Armenia*" of the FH could have been one of the numerous and considerably small political entities located in the southern or western parts of the Armenian Highland who were under durative Assyrian control. The reference to Armavir (to the west of modern Yerevan) as the capital city of the Haykides (built by Aramayis, son of Aramaneak) should be regarded as a later reminiscence or a synchronous one along with other - western Haykides (on the alternative explanation of this problem see below).

king Midas with Askwis, author of the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription of *Şirzi*, in the region of Malatya; the name of the former reminds *Cardos* of Khorenatsi [the same as Ara, son of Ara]).

³⁰ Some arguments were brought in favor of Urartu: 1) the ascription of a canal in Van to Semiramis (recognized to be erected by Menua, king of Urartu), 2) the similarity of the name Aram to the name of Urartian king *A(r)rame/u*, 3) large-scaled conquests of the Urartian king Argishti I reminding one that made by Aram, etc. Though the existence of some Urartisms in the «History» are obvious, nevertheless, one shall remember that the Urartian statehood and that of the FH are typologically different, one being a developed "eastern monarchy", the second - only making its attempts to create a kingdom (this according to the «History»). If the "Armenia" of the FH was the same as Urartu, then indeed Khorenatsi would have been aware of it. The first crowned king of Armenia, according to Khorenatsi, was Parouyr, the 37th *nahapet*. See also Khachatryan 1980, where the "Armenia" of the FH is regarded as the neighbor of Urartu and under the names of several Haykides after Anushavan the author is inclined to look for the Urartian kings.

For the localization of the "*Primary Armenia*" the next observation will be useful.

Among the first six Haykides only Hayk and partly Aramaneak had contacted with Assyria (the rebellion and flight to the north + a battle in *Hayotsdzor*). The following four generations (Aramayis, Amasya, Gegham and Harma + related clans - Khor, Manavaz, Baz) were busy with settling down in different parts of the Highland; any account concerning their contacts with Assyria or other hostile country is missing. On the contrary, the next four generations have had relations with Assyria:

Aram - Ninos

Ara - Ninos+Semiramis

Ara (son of Ara Geghetsik) - Semiramis

Anushavan - Zameses+Ninuas

Again logically it could be assumed that after Aramaneak the "*Armenia*" was 1) either under Assyrian domination, loyal to its suzerain (hence, nothing "heroic" happened worth to be mentioned), or 2) was beyond its control (probably located too far to be subdued by the Assyrians).

Indeed, most probably, none of the above-mentioned Armenian *nahapets* could be regarded as real historical persons under the given names.

Before discussing the possibilities of determining the "*Armenia*" of the FH under the light of the above-mentioned criterias, one shall focus on one peculiarity of their activities.

Hayk and other FH, along with their different branches demonstrated great mobility. Thus, after his victory over Bel, Hayk had settled in Hark'. With the death of Hayk his son Aramaneak had moved to *Aragatsotn* (in modern Armenia), leaving his sons (Khor and Manavaz) in the Lake Van area. *Shara*, the son of Aramayis, had settled down in *Shirak* (in the north-west of modern Armenia), etc.

Scholars had mostly treated the mobility of the FH as an attempt of Khorenatsi to etymologize the names of Armenian *gavars* (provinces) and settlements.³¹ At the same time it was stated that among the FH the Hayk-Aramaneak section is a possible reflection of migrations of the Armenian tribes into different parts of the Highland.³² Indeed, the long march of Aramaneak from Hark' to Aragatsotn appears to be strange, as well as the far-reaching campaigns of the Armavir-dwelling Aram to Northern Mesopotamia and Central Anatolia.

Are the continuous migrations of several Haykides compatible with the postulation of a compact ethnic group and a corresponding political organization? The "History" doesn't even mention the existence of an authority of any *nahapet* over different branches of the Haykides. After Hayk, every *nahapet* ruled in the region where he dwells. This situation is easy to explain as a long-term continuous infiltration of the Armenian-speaking tribes into different parts of the Highland. Hence, the point of departure could be sought in the area where Khorenatsi locates Hayk, Aramaneak

³¹ On these most recently Sarkisyan 1998: 113ff.

³² Idem.

(before his departure to Aragatsotn) and Kadmos, the grandson of Hayk, that is in the southern and south-western parts of the Armenian Highland (the "*country of Ararat*" and *Kadmuhi* = the mountainous area to the south and south-west of Lake Van, Hark' = to the west of Lake Van). This is exactly the area affected by the Mushki migrations reported in the texts of Tiglathpileser I.³³ In Armenological literature the migrations of the Armenian-speaking tribes is thought to have been started from this area.³⁴ In general, the activities of the FH under the light of the above-mentioned considerations could be summarized as follows:

- 1) The hypothetic "*Armenia*" of the FH could not represent a compact political organization, including a considerable part of the Armenian Highland. It will be easy to treat this term as a conventional designation of several political entities once active within the boundaries of later "*Greater Armenia*" (most probably consisting of both Armenian and non-Armenian speaking population). At least some of them (i.e. northern ones) could not have contacts with Assyria.
- 2) The main peculiarity of the period of some of the FH should be regarded the political instability, reflected in wide migrations of peoples. Under the light of this point the existence of extensive political organizations in the Highland to that date should be excluded.

Which historical context could fit our information drawn by Khorenatsi for the period of the FH? That period should be characterized by 1) the absence of considerably big political organizations, 2) more or less durative Assyrian control over several political entities, 3) mobility of population.

If one looks for these conditions, then during the XIV-VII c. BC only two periods are in order: 1) late XIII-XII c. BC (the "XII century B.C. Near Eastern Crisis"), 2) late VIII-VII c. BC (the era of Cimmerian-Scythian migrations). Leaving the discussion of this problem for future studies, here we shall state only that, according to the genealogical tree of Khorenatsi, the "Torgomian era" is to be placed either slightly before the XII c. BC or in the IX-VIII c. BC. Do we have any clue to choose between these sections?

If the migrations of Hayk and his descendants originated from eastern Asia Minor (i.e. the "House of Torgom"), then we would have good written and archaeological background for their arrival in the area to the east of the Euphrates in the XII c. BC.³⁵ This migration could have been followed by later infiltration of this ethnic group into other parts of the Armenian Highland. It seems that this reconstruction of the Armenization of the Highland is in accordance with the account of Khorenatsi. Nevertheless, some difficulties makes such a treatment of the problem extremely difficult.

³³ On the itinerary of the campaigns of Tiglathpileser I see Haroutyunyan 1970: 29ff.

³⁴ S.Hmayakyan had supported the idea which brings the Armenians from the south and south-east in the times of Tiglathpileser I referring to some arguments (Hmayakyan 1992: 125ff.).

³⁵ Such a scenario was partly suggested still in 1940s by Gr.Kapantsyan (see above, n.7).

- 1) Though the XII c. BC Mushki migrations into the Upper Euphrates area were said to have originated from north-western parts of the Armenian Highland (Hayaša and Azzi of Hittite texts), the "Muški pottery" has its earlier parallels in the Transcaucasian "*Trialeti*" culture, that is in modern Armenia and Southern Georgia.³⁶ This could testify upon east-west migrations (or gradual infiltrations) before the XII c. BC.
- 2) If Hayk had migrated towards the east during the late XIII - early XII c. BC, then the activities of Aram in central Asia Minor would appear to be merely strange. How could this Aram campaign to the area of modern Kayseri, ruling somewhere in the Ararat Plain? Worth to mention that even among the mighty Urartian kings only Argišti I had operated in this distant region once in 783 BC.³⁷

Below we shall discuss the possibilities of an alternative treatment of events dealing with the migrations of the Haykides and the "House of Torgom".

THE HOUSE OF TORGOM: A HYPOTHESIS

The treatment of this problem rests on some considerations which needs further studies. Here we shall discuss those which will explain the obvious discrepancy between the account of Khorenatsi and other sources (both written and archaeological). Further on, the suggested treatment is going to prove that Khorenatsi had some genuine sources at his disposal, which, indeed, were used by him in accordance with his specific treatment of the Armenian history.

It seems that the "Torgomian era" in the Haykides' story should not be treated as the starting point. The "House of Torgom" could have been contemporary to the later Haykides. For such a treatment below we shall introduce some arguments which might create a considerable historical background for the Haykides' story and the early Armenian statehood as well.

GENERAL TIME SPAN OF THE FIRST HAYKIDES

Under the light of the above-mentioned links of the FH with the Upper Euphrates area here we shall discuss further possibilities in favor of our reconstruction.

Though the author of the "History" is trying to insert the FH into the line of Yaphet, where Hayk is regarded as the contemporary of Mesopotamian Nebrowt-Bel and Aram - to Hebrew Abraham and Mesopotamian Ninos (**Book 1.5**), hardly one could trust this artificial chronology. Late in the XVIII century M.Chamchyants, the author of the first general history of Armenia, in accordance with the genealogy offered by Khorenatsi,

³⁶ First recognized by V.Sevin (1991). For further studies on this problem see Bartl 2001; Köroğlu 2003 etc.

³⁷ Melikishvili 1960: No.127 II 5ff.; Haroutyunyan 2001: N.173 II.

suggested a puzzling chronology of the FH³⁸ tracing them from 2107 BC; his calculations appeared to be arbitrary (if not actually false) since an ancient document containing a complete list of the *nahapets* referred by him still remains unknown to scholarship. Today in Armenological literature is accepted a view according to which the conflict of Hayk with Bel as well as that of Aram with Barsham reflects the history of the Assyrian campaigns into different parts of the Armenian Highland during the second half of the II - early I millenniums B.C., each of them personalizing two Armenian-speaking tribes - *hay* and *armen*. Attempts to define more precise identifications had mainly failed due the lack of solid criterias which could be referred to while choosing between different sections of this durative period, not to say about the geographical area where this could happen. Let us briefly discuss some episodes dealing with the relations of the FH with Mesopotamian rulers.

The Clash Of Hayk With Bel. Though Hayk is said to live in Babylon under the authority of Bel (a collective name of any Mesopotamian king), obviously he and his kinsmen had come there from other place . Hardly Mesopotamia could be sought to have been the original place of the Armenian ethnos.³⁹ After the birth of his son Aramaneak and his flight to the north and then the battle with Bel in Hayotsdzor, Hayk had settled down in Hark'. It is said that Bel was killed in the battle against him.

As long as we know from Mesopotamian written data, the only Assyrian king who had campaigned in the north and found his end in the battlefield, was Sargon II.⁴⁰ Though Sargon had campaigned also into the Van area 9 years before, where Khorenatsi locates the battle of Hayk with Bel, this could be an interpolation, in order to locate the activities of Hayk in the Armenian Highland proper.

Ninos and Semiramis. According to Classical authors, medieval Armenian ones as well, Ninos and Semiramis are to be pushed to a remote past.

Still in 1950⁴¹ H.Lewy had introduced a genuine treatment of this problem, until now remaining unreferred by Armenologists. She assumed that two Semiramis should be distinguished, Semiramis proper (late IX c. BC), and the second one who lived in the VII c. BC. The latter - *Naqi'a*, the wife of Sennacherib and the mother of his successor Esarhaddon is said to have been famous for her building activities in Babylonia (second female ruler bearing the name *Nitokris* according to Herodotus (**Book 1. 185f.**)). As to Ninos, this name should be regarded as a toponymicon after the name of the last capital city of Assyria - Nineveh; it is well known that Sennacherib had removed the capital from Kalhu to Nineveh.

³⁸ Chamchyants 1985.

³⁹ For the Biblical motive of Hayk's primary homeland in Mesopotamia see Sarkisyan 1992: 27ff.

⁴⁰ See Kosyan 1999c; 2002b for the Assyrian sources and historical background of that campaign.

⁴¹ Lewy 1952: 264ff.

In this respect it is worth to note the dealings of Sennacherib with Tilgarimmu in 695B.C. and Gurdi, ruler of that city.⁴²

Aramayis. The IX century Armenian historiographer *Thovma Artsruni*, referring to the successors of Ninus and Semiramis, states the next: "*His seed has grown up until Senekerim (= Armenian form of Sennacherib) - the time of Hebrew Yezekiah and our Aramayis*".⁴³

The reigns of both Assyrian and Judaeen kings are well dated, Sennacherib - 704-681 BC, and Ezekiah - 726-698 BC. So, for Aramayis the late VIII-early VII c. BC is in order.

Aram. In his account of the deeds of Aram Khorenatsi brings stories about his activities conducted against *Nyukar Mades*, *Barsham* of Assyria and *Payapis Kaaleay*.

One could refer to solid written data in favor of the identification of the historical background of Aram in western parts of the Armenian Highland during the VII c. BC. For instance, during the first half of the VII c. BC the kingdom of Melid represented a political entity, which in alliance with the Anatolian Cimmerians headed by *Lygdamis* (those who had managed to capture Sardis, the Lydian capital, forcing Gyges to committ a suicide), was extremely active in its relations with Assyria (period of Esarhaddon and Aššurbanapal), Lydia, and in 630's possibly had encountered with the Scythians of Madius.⁴⁴ Thus, here we could assume that the personification of Assyria as Barsham, Lydia - Payapis Kaaleay, and Scythians - Nyukar Mades could have had taken place.⁴⁵

One more link of Aram with the late VIII-VII c. BC history of eastern Asia Minor could be sought regarding the reference of Khorenatsi:

"Moving to the west against First [Armenia] with forty thousand infantry and two thousand cavalry, he reached Cappadocia and a place now called Caesarea So as he was spending a long time in the west, there opposed him in battle the Titan Payapis Kaaleay who had seized the land between the two great seas - the Pontus and the ocean. Attacking him, [Aram] put him to flight and expelled him to an island of the Asian sea. He left over the country a certain Mshak of his own family with a thousand of his troops and returned to Armenia" (Book 1.14).

⁴² See Grayson – Novotny 2012: № 17 Col. V 1-8.

⁴³ Thovma Artsruni: 26.

⁴⁴ On political affairs under discussion Spalinger 1978: 400ff.

⁴⁵ On this problem Kosyan 1999a: 237ff. B.Haroutyunyan most recently had suggested the same chronological time span for Aram, but he assumes that the country of *Aram* is to be considered in the general area of Urartu, that is between Lakes Van and Urmiya, and *Aram* is no one else but Urartian king *Erimena* (second half of the VII c. BC)(Haroutyunyan 1998: 72ff.). Without discussing all details, one should bear in mind that none of the late Urartian kings could have experienced such power to campaign into central Asia Minor and against Assyria and Scythians. To that date Urartian state had entered the final phase of his existence, probably possessing with the extremely reduced territory.

This name is similar to the ethnonym of the Mushki and its occurrence along with the name of Aram in Cappadocia fits well the proposed Mushki migration into eastern Asia Minor and the historical situation here during the late Sargon II and Sennacherib (i.e. Kurtis of Atuna, who ruled in the area of Argaeus, and Gurdi of Kulumma, operating in Tilgarimmu).

These correspondences should be taken into account in future studies concerning the history of the Haykides' cycle.

The "Torgomian" version of the Armenian ethnogenesis is closely related to the native name of the Armenians (*hay*) and their country (*Hayk/Hayastan*) and that used by their neighbors (*armen* and *Armenia*). Both these terms geographically are related to the "Torgomian" area. Although some scholars in the past and now have concerns regarding the relationship between the ethnonym "*hay*" and the country-name Hayasa, as well as that of "*armen*" and the country-name Arme (and also Urme),⁴⁶ it should be stated that the western part of the Armenian Highland used to have extremely important place in the early Armenian statehood and culture.

Six from the attested eight sanctuaries of the pre-Christian Armenian pantheon, among them the chief god *Aramazd*, are reported by Armenian sources in this area.⁴⁷ Further, the royal cemetery of the Armenian Arsakid kings, as well as their royal treasury were also located here, in the fortress of *Ani-Kamakh* (*Kummaha* of Hittite texts, modern *Kemakh*),⁴⁸ one more treasury was located in the fortress of *Bnabegh* (Greek *Benabelion*), not far from Kamakh, in *Tsop'k Shahuni*.⁴⁹ It should be remembered that to this date the Ararat plain was the political center of the Greater Armenia (in the neighborhood of Yerevan).

These facts one might take as a proof for the western location of "*Primary Armenia*".

Indeed, this could not be taken as an argument for stating that the pre-Urartian population of the Upper Euphrates valley was predominantly Armenian. Here and elsewhere in our study we use the term „Armenian“ as an equivalent to the "*Proto-Armenian*". The Armenian people and Armenian language as such resulted from the process of consolidation, which was in progress during the existence of Urartu and much later, and in which different ethnic groups (both Indo-European and non-Indo-European) had participated. In this process, taking into account the continuity of the term "*hay*", some Hayasa-related ethnic group should have had experienced the political and cultural hegemony.

⁴⁶ See, for example, Diakonoff 1968: 211f.

⁴⁷ Most recently on the passages dealing with the early Armenian religious centers see Kosyan 2018: 60ff.

⁴⁸ Probably, Aramazd was worshipped in Kamakh-Ani still in the second millennium BC as ^dU URU Kummaha "Storm-god of Kummaha" of cuneiform Hittite texts (Kosyan 2004: 65f.).

⁴⁹ P'awstos Buzand, V.7.

The thesis about the multiethnic character of the Armenian ethnogenesis largely rests on two considerations:

1) The Armenian Highland is divided into several isolated regions due to the geographical (relief) and climatic conditions - the Ararat plain, the Van basin, mountainous area to the south of Lake Van, the Upper Euphrates region, etc. This factor should have had played a decisive role in the consolidation of any ethnic group during the III-I centuries BC.

2) The onomastic, toponymic and other written data (Mesopotamian, Hittite, Urartian, Achaemenid, etc.) dealing with different parts of the Armenian Highland, shows the multiethnic character of this vast area.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, it appears that the model of Khorenatsi according to which the FH are regarded to begin and finish the Armenization of the Armenian Highland, actually, hides another historical process. Trying to show that during the Haykides' era a considerable part of the Highland was already Armenian, he had included in the Haykides' genealogical tree representatives of several political entities (probably, also non-Armenian speaking components) and representing contemporary events in different chronological sections as well.

Evidently, Khorenatsi had made use of the Biblical model of the arrival of Hebrews into Israel, which in the late XIX century was treated by modern scholar as follows:

*"The history of most countries begins with an account of the arrival of a tribe or number of families from distance, and its settlement peaceably or forcibly among the weaker or less civilized inhabitants of whose yet earlier settlement no tradition remains".*⁵⁰

Thus, the "History of Armenia" appears to be an attempt to show that *"For although we are small country and very restricted in numbers, weak in power, and often subject to anothers rule, yet many manly deeds have been performed in our land worthy of being recorded in writing"* (**Book 1. 3**).

Postulating the movements of *Hayk* and his seed Khorenatsi was aimed to show that the vast area from Northern Mesopotamia to *Ararat Plain, Shirak, Sevan basin, Syunik*, etc. from the remote past had composed the fatherland of the Armenians. The people who dwells here before the arrival of the FH are regarded by Khorenatsi of being small in number, who had accepted the authority of the Haykides (**Book 1.10,12**).

What then about the route of the FH movements? Does it have any historical background? Remarkably, the area affected by these migrations leaves aside all north-west, west (to the west of the Euphrates) and the region limited with Lake Van and Lake Urmiya (the Urartian homeland).

⁵⁰ Sharpe 1890: 1

1) "*House of Kadmos*", "*Country of Ararat*" and *Taron* with *Hark*, indeed, are to be sought to have been the area where operated Hayk during his relations with Bel. This is the general area where during the XIIc.B.C. extensive ethnic movements are referred to by Assyrian texts.⁵¹ Here a considerable number of small principalities are recorded from the XII c. BC to VII c. BC in Assyrian and Urartian texts. This is also a region neighboring the Transeuphratian Melid in the west. If the Muški and other participants of the XII c. BC migrations have had Armenian components, then the oral tradition could have preserved memories of historical realities.

2) The movement of Aramaneak to Aragatsotn could have had historical grounds, with two possible treatments: a) migrations of some Armenian-speaking tribes to the north-east from their original place of residence in the south-west and west, or b) artificial inclusion of this area into the sphere of the Armenian ethnos and statehood (later historical reality).

Thus, we have at least three general areas of the FH activities - south-east (the Taurus region), north-east (Ararat Plain and surrounding regions - *Etiuni* of Urartian texts) and Transeuphratian area (the "*House of Torgom*" = Melid and Tabal of the late VIII – VII c. BC).⁵² Since the postulation of such an extensive area as being the homeland of the FH is out of question, the only possible solution, to our sense, could be represented as follows.

Khorenatsi had united several Armenian (or partly Armenian) and non-Armenian principalities into one, all of them being contemporary and, possibly, politically unrelated ones. The genealogy of the FH has nothing to do with the historical reality.

It seems also that in the framework of the FH account the VIII-VII c. BC events (the period of Sargon II - Sennacherib) have had a considerable place. From this small historical period Khorenatsi created a genealogy of the FH. The idea put down in 1960's by I.Diakonoff according to which just the Transeuphratian area was the center of the early Armenian statehood referred by Khorenatsi, appeared to have solid historical ground.

Thus, the historicity of the FH cycle appears to be based on true historical sources. Whether these had come up via the Classical authors, or from elsewhere, they deserve more cautious approach.

Obviously, Eastern Asia Minor was the area of Armenian-Phrygian continuous contacts referred to by Herodotus (**Book VII.73**). The eastern element of the population of the Sangarius Valley (Muški), possibly, residing in the Upper Euphrates area before the VIII c. BC, must have been if not Phrygian then of some related origins (i.e. Thracian).

The traditional theory dealing with the Balkanic origin of the Muški tribes should be abandoned in favor of eastern localization (Transcaucasian "*Trialeti*" culture of the Late Bronze Age). Most probably, "Muški" was a collective term designating numerous

⁵¹ See Kosyan 1999b: 157ff. for the Assyrian texts and secondary literature.

⁵² On the early state-formations of the Armenian Highland see Yeremyan 1971: 423ff.

related tribes who during the second half of the II millennium B.C. were gradually infiltrating into different areas of the Armenian Highland, a process accumulated during the "XII century B.C. Near Eastern Crisis". Whether these Muški were the bearers of Armenian language, or they represented another Indo-European language, close enough to Armenian to be easily assimilated by Armenians later, is a problem for future discussions. If the Muški tribes could be disassociated from the bearers of the Armenian language, then one might expect to identify the latter under the other ethnonym - Urumu (participants of the same migration in the Upper Euphrates area), whose name has long been associated with the region to the west of Lake Van - Urme. It would then seem possible to state that after Alzi and Purulumzi the Muški or, at least a single group of the Muški federation had left for the south, while Urumu (i.e. Proto-Armenians) had occupied the area between the Euphrates and Lake van (modern province of Mush and adjacent areas).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abeghyan M. 1944. History of Ancient Armenian Literature, Vol.1, Yerevan (In Arm.).
2. Abeghyan M. and Harouthiounyan S. 1991. Movses Khorenatsi. "The History of Armenia" (In Arm.).
3. Adjaryan H. 1944. Dictionary of Armenian Personal Names, Vol.2, Yerevan (In Arm.).
4. Adontz N. 1972. The History of Armenia, Yerevan (In Arm.).
5. Anatolian Iron Ages. 3. The Proceedings of the Third Iron Ages Colloquium held at Van, 6-12 August 1990 (A. Çilingiroğlu and D.H.French), London.
6. Arechyan G. 1988. An Indo-European Motive in the Mythology of the Kuro-Araxes Mesopotamia in the II Millennium B.C., VDI, 1988/4, 84-102 (In Russ.,).
7. Bartl K. 1994. Die frühe Eisenzeit in Ostanatolien und ihre Verbindungen zu den benachbarten Regionen, Baghdader Mitteilungen 25, 473-518.
8. Bartl K. 1995. Some Remarks on Early Iron Age in Eastern Anatolia, Anatolica XXI, 205-212.
9. Bartl K. 2001. Eastern Anatolia in the Early Iron Age, in Migration and Kulturtransfer: Der Wandel vorder und zentraasiatischer Kulturen im Umbruch von 2. zum 1. Vorchristlichen Jahrtausend. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums, Berlin 23. bis 26. November 1999 (Hrsg. R.Eichmann und H.Parzinger), Bonn, 383-410.
10. Bivar A.D.H. 1983. The Political History of Iran Under the Arsakids, In: The Cambridge History of Iran. Vol.3(1), Cambridge, 21-100.
11. Burney C.W. 1993. Arslantepe as a Gateway to the Highlands: a Note on Periods VIA-VID, in Between the Rivers and Mountains (eds. M.Frangipane et al.), Roma, 311-317.
12. Chamchyants M. 1985. History of Armenia. 3 vols, Yerevan (In Arm.).

13. Delitzsch Fr. 1881. Wo lag das Paradies?, Leipzig.
14. Del Monte G.F. 1992. Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Wiesbaden.
15. Del Monte G.F. und J.Tischler 1978. Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Wiesbaden
16. Diakonoff I.M. 1951. Assyrian-Babylonian Sources on the History of Urartu, VDI 2, 257-356; 3, 207-252, 4, 283-305 (In Russ.).
17. Diakonoff I.M. 1968. The Prehistory of the Armenian People, Yerevan.
18. Diakonoff I.M. 1981. Asia Minor and Armenia c.600 B.C. and the northern campaigns of Babylonian Kings, VDI, 1981/2, 34-64 (In Russ., Engl. summary).
19. Diakonoff I.M. 1984. The Pre-History of the Armenian People, Delmar/New York.
20. Diakonoff I.M. and Kashkai S.M. 1981. Geographical Names According to Urartian Texts (= RGTC 9), Wiesbaden.
21. Emin N.O. 1881. Movses Khorenatsi and Ancient Armenian Epos, Moscow (In Russ.).
22. Emin N.O. 1884. The Dynastic List of the Haykides in the History of Movses Khorenatsi and their Chronological Table by F.M.Chamchyan, Moscow (In Russ.).
23. Forrer E. 1921. Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches, Leipzig.
24. Garsoïan N.G. 1989. The Epic Histories (Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk'). Cambridge/Mass.
25. Garstang J. and Gurney O.R. 1959. The Geography of the Hittite Empire, London.
26. Grayson A.K. 1972-1976. Assyrian Royal inscriptions, vols. I-II, Wiesbaden.
27. Grayson A.K. 1975. Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles, Locust Valley/New York.
28. Grayson A. K., Novotny J. 2012. The Royal Inscriptions of Sennaherib, King of Assyria (704-681 BC), Part 1, The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period, vol. 3/2, Winona Lake.
29. Harouthyunyan B.A. 1998. On Some Problems of the Ancient History of Armenia, Armenian-Iranian Relations and Near East (VII-VIc.B.C.), Yerevan (In Arm.).
30. Harouthyunyan N.V. 1970. Biainili (Urartu), Yerevan (In Russ.).
31. Harouthyunyan N.V. 1985. Urartian Toponymics, Yerevan (In Russ.).
32. Harouthyunyan N.V. 2001. The Corpus of Urartian Cuneiform Inscriptions, Yerevan (In Russ.).
33. Otten S. et al. 1992 (ed.). Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp (eds. H.Otten, H.Ertem, E.Akurgal, A.Süel), Ankara.
34. Henrickson R.C. 1994. Continuity and Discontinuity in the Ceramic Tradition of
35. Gordion during the Iron Age, in Anatolian Iron Ages. 3, 95-129.
36. Hmayakyan S.G. 1992. The Legend of nahapet Hayk and the city of Kibsha in Nibur Mountains, JHP, 1992/1, 125-132 (In Arm.).
37. Jahukyan G.B. 1981. The Linguistic Origins of the Proper Names in the first book of Movses Khorenatsi's "A History of the Armenians", JHP, 1981/3, 48-63 (In Arm.).

38. Jahukyan G.B. 1987. History of Armenian Language. Preliterary Period, Yerevan (In Arm).
39. Kapantsyan Gr. 1948. Hayasa - the Cradle of Armenians, Yerevan (in Russ.).
40. Khachatryan V.N. 1971. Eastern provinces of the Hittite empire, Yerevan (In Russian).
41. Khachatryan V.N. 1980. Hayk' under the rule of Urartu, LHG 1980/6, 101-112 (In Arm).
42. Khalatyants Gr. 1910. The Outline of Armenian History, Moscow (in Russ.).
43. Kosyan A.V. 1984. The Late Hittite kingdom of Melid (according to Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions), LHG 6, 62-70 (In Arm.).
44. Kosyan A.V. 1991. Ethnic Movements in Asia Minor and Armenian Highland in the XIIc.B.C., JHP, 1991/1, 65-78 (In Arm., Engl. summary).
45. Kosyan A.V. 1994a. The Luwian Kingdoms of Asia Minor and Surrounding Regions in the XII-VIIIc.B.C., Yerevan (In Russ., Engl.summary).
46. Kosyan A.V. 1994b. Again About Ethnic Movements, JHP 1-2, 247-255 (In Arm., Engl. summary).
47. Kosyan A.V. 1996. The Problem of "Eastern" and "Western" Mushkians, JHP 1-2, 207-220 (In Arm., Engl. summary).
48. Kosyan A.V. 1997a. Išuwa (Tsop'k') in the XIII-XIIc.B.C., JHP, 1997/1, 277-292 (In Arm., Engl. summary).
49. Kosyan A.V. 1997b. The Mushki Problem Reconsidered, SMEA, Fasc.XXXIX/2, 253-266.
50. Kosyan A.V. 1998a. The "House of Torgom" (myth and reality), Yerevan (In Arm.).
51. Kosyan A.V. 1998b. Išuwa and Gordion in the XII-X centuries B.C.(a comparative study), JHP 3, 117-124 (In Arm., Engl. summary).
52. Kosyan A.V. 1999a. Aram Nahapet in Cappadocia, JHP 1, 237-259 (in Arm., Engl. summary).
53. Kosyan A.V. 1999b. The XII Century Near Eastern Crisis and the Armenian Highland, Yerevan (In Arm., Engl. summary).
54. Kosyan A.V. 1999c. Sargon II and the Countries of Eastern Asia Minor. - In: Countries and Peoples of the Near and Middle East (Institute of Oriental Studies), vol.XVIII, Yerevan, 219-229 (In Arm., Engl. summary).
55. Kosyan A.V. 2002b. Sargon II and Kurtis of Atuna: an Interpretation, in *Studia Linguarum*.3/1 (Fs.A.A.Korolev, eds. A.S.Kassian, A.V.Sidel'tsev), Moscow, 191-203.
56. Kosyan A.V. 2004. The Toponyms of the Armenian Highland, Yerevan (In Arm.).
57. Kosyan A.V. 2005. The Bible and the problem of the Armenian Ethnogenesis in the "History of Armenia" of Khorenatsi, in *Biblical Armenia* (ed. V.Barkhudaryan et al.), Yerevan, 146-150.
58. Kosyan A.V. 2013. From Van to the Euphrates, in *Haykazuns* (eds. V.Barkhudaryan et al.), Yerevan, 48-63.

59. Kosyan A.V. 2014. On one problem of the early Armenian statehood, Banber Hayagitutyan 2014, 1(4), 5-25 (in Arm.).
60. Kosyan A.V. 2015. Between Euphrates and Lake Van (on the Location of Hayasa and Azzi), in International Symposium on East Anatolia - South Caucasus Cultures (eds. M.İşıklı and B.Can), vol. I, 2015, Cambridge, 271-276.
61. Kosyan A.V. 2016. The XIC century BC Interstate treaties between the Hittite empire and Hayasa, Yerevan (IN Arm.).
62. Kosyan A.V. 2017. About the Historical Sources of Movses Khorenatsi's History, Fundamental Armenology 2017/2, 30-33.
63. Kosyan A.V. 2018. The Plain of Erznka in the II-I millenniums BC, Fundamental Armenology 1(7), 49-68.
64. Köroğlu K. 2003, The Transition from Bronze Age to Iron Ages in Eastern Anatolia, in Identifying Changes: the Transition from Bronze to Iron Ages in Anatolia and Neighbouring Regions. Proceedings of the International Workshop, Istanbul, November 8-9, 2002 (eds. B.Fisher, H.Genz, E.Jean, K.Köroğlu), Istanbul, 231-244.
65. Lanfranchi B. 1988. Sargon's Letter to Aššur-šarru-ušur: an Interpretation, SAAB. Bulletin II/1, 59-64.
66. Lanfranchi B. 1997. Consensus to Empire: Some Aspects of Sargon II's Foreign Policy, in Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten (= XXXIX^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Heidelberg 6.-10. Juli 1992 [Hrsg. H.Waetzoldt und H.Hauptmann]), Heidelberg, 81-87.
67. Levine L.D. 1976/77. Sargon's Eighth Campaign, in Mountains and Lowlands. Essays in the Archaeology of Greater Mesopotamia (ed. L.D.Levine and T.Cuyler Young), Malibu (= Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 7), 252-271.
68. Lewy H. 1949. The Babylonian Background of the Kay Kâûs Legend, ArOr XVII, 28-109.
69. Lewy H. 1952. Nitokris-Naqî'a, JNES XI, 264-286.
70. Mallory J.P. 1989. In Search of the Indo-Europeans, London.
71. Manandyan H. 1977. Works. 1, Yerevan (In Arm.).
72. Markwart J. 1919. Die Entstehung und Wiederherstellung der armenischen Nation, Berlin.
73. Markwart J. 1928. Le berceau des Arméniens, Revue des Études Arménienne VIII, fasc.2, 211-232.
74. Melikishvili G.A. 1960. Urartian Cuneiform Inscriptions, Moscow (In Russ.).
75. Ohanyan M. 2002. About the Tribal period of the History of the Armenians, JHP, 2002/1, 221-249.
76. Petrosyan A.E. 1996. The Myth of Aram in Armenian Tradition (PhD Theses), Yerevan: Institute of Literature (In Arm.).

77. Petrosyan A.E. 1997. The Myth of Aram in the Context of Indo-European Mythology and the Problem of Armenian Ethnogenesis, Yerevan (In Arm., Engl. summary).
78. Petrosyan A.E. 2002. Armenian Epic and Mythology, Yerevan (in Russian).
79. Petrosyan A.E. 2003. Problems of Armenian Ethnogenesis in the light of traditional data, JHP 2003/2, 189-224.
80. Petrosyan A.E. 2006. Problems of Armenian Ethnogenesis. Yerevan, 2006 (In Arm.).
81. Petrosyan A.E. 2007. The Problem of Identification of the Proto-Armenians: A Critical Review. Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies. Vol. 16, 2007, pp. 25-66.
82. Petrosyan A.E. 2008. The Forefather Hayk in the light of comparative mythology, in Gift from Heaven: Myth, Ritual, and History. Studies in Honour of Sargis Harutyunyan on his 80th Birthday (ed. A.Petrosyan), Yerevan, 10-18.
83. Petrosyan A.E. 2009. On the origins of the Armenian people. The problem of the identification of Proto-Armenians (critical review), Armenian bulletin 2/3-1, 66-102.
84. Petrosyan A. 2017. The Problem of Armenian Origins. Myth, History, Hypothesis, Yerevan.
85. Piotrowski B.B. 1960. The Kingdom of Van, Moscow (In Russ.).
86. Postgate J.N. 1973. Assyrian Texts and Fragments, Iraq XXXV, P.1, 13-36.
87. Sarkisyan G.Kh. 1988. The Urartian Empire and Armenians, in Urartu-Armenia, Yerevan, 47-126.
88. Sarkisyan G.Kh. 1991. History of Armenia of Movses Khorenatsi, Yerevan.
89. Sarkisyan G.Kh. 1992. Movses Khorenatsi's "History of Armenia" and the Cuneiform Sources, JHP 2-3, 27-50 (In Arm., Engl. summary).
90. Sevin V. 1991. The Early Iron Age in the Elâziğ Region and the Problem of the Mushkians, Anatolian Studies XLI, 87-97.
91. Sharpe S. 1890. The History of the Hebrew nation and its Literature, Edinburgh.
92. Spalinger A. 1978. The Date of the Death of Gyges and its Historical Implications, JAOS 98/4, 400-409.
93. Thomson R.W. 1978. Moses Khorenats'i. "History of Armenia" (Translation and Commentary), Cambridge/Mass.- London.
94. Tomaschek W. 1893. Die alten Thraker.I, Wien.
95. Tsakanyan R. 2017. The "House of Torgom" in Written Sources, in Oriental Studies in Armenia, vol. 3, Ancient and Medieval Armenia and his Neighbors (The Collection of papers in honour of academician Gagik Sargsyan on the occasion of his 90th birthday), 161-180.
96. Winn Sh.M.M. 1981. Burial Evidence and the Kurgan Culture in Eastern Anatolia c.3000 B.C.: an Interpretation, JIES 9, Nos.1/2, 113-118.
97. Yakar J. 1981. The Indo-Europeans and their Impact on Anatolian Cultural Development, JIES 9, Nos.1/2, 94-112.

98. Yeremyan S.T. 1958. The Tribal Union of Armenians in the Land of Arme-Shoopria, JHP, 1958/3, 59-74 (In Arm.).
99. Yeremyan S.T. 1968. The Campaigns of Cimmerian and Scythian tribes and the Struggle of Urartu and Assyria against nomads, JHP, 1968/2, 89-116 (In Arm.).
100. Yeremyan S.T. 1971. The End of the Armenian Ethnogenesis and the first Armenian state formations, in HZHP, vol. 1, Yerevan, 423-443 (In Arm.).

ARMENIAN TEXTS

Agat'angelos. Patmut'iwn Hayoc' ("The History of the Armenians"), Tiflis, 1909.

Hovhannes Draskhanakertsi. Patmut'iwn Hayoc' ("The History of the Armenians"), Tiflis, 1912.

Koriwn. Life of Mashtots ("Patmut'iwn varuts ew mahuan srboyn Mesropay vardapeti"), Tiflis, 1913.

Levond. Arshawank' Arabac' i Hayastanum ("The Arab Invasions into Armenia"), St.Petersburg, 1887.

P'awstos Buzand. Patmut'iwn Hayoc' ("History of the Armenians"), Tiflis, 1912.

Thovma Artsrouni. Patmut'iwn tann Mamikonian ("The History of Mamikonian House"), Tiflis, 1917.

ABBREVIATIONS

JHP - Journal of History and Philology (= Patma-banasirakan handes) (Yerevan).

LHG - Lraber Hasarakakan Gitutyunneri (Yerevan).

VDI - Vestnik Drevney Istorii (Moscow).