

TAIK IN THE ASSYRIAN AND BIAINIAN CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS, ANCIENT GREEK AND EARLY MEDIEVAL ARMENIAN SOURCES (THE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE 19th CENTURY FRENCH ARMENOLOGISTS)

Dumikyan A.V.

PhD in History

Antoine-Jean Saint-Martin and Marie Brosset gave importance to the fact that Taik was one of Armenia's provinces from the ancient times when studying the historical and political geography of Armenia in their researches and translations of Armenian medieval sources. They paid special attention to the geographical characteristics of the Taik province of Great Armenia, based on the information of the primary sources (especially "Ashkharatsuyts" - "The Geographic Atlas" of the 5th-7th cc.) as well as the works of M. Chamchyan and Gh. Inchichyan¹.

Saint-Martin wrote: "La province de Daik'h *Suyng wzhawrh* (Taik province - A.D.) était située au nord-est de la haute Arménie, au nord de la province d'Ararat (i.e. Ayrarat - A. D.), à l'ouest de celle de Koukark'h (Gugark - A.D.), à l'est du pays de Khaghtik'h et de celui des Lazes, et enfin au sud de la partie de la Colchide (Koghkis - A.D.) et de l'Ibérie (Virk - A.D.)..."².

Touching up the form *Tayastan* in the comments to his French translation of the "History of the Artsrunik House" by Tovma Artsruni (and Anonymous)³, Marie Brosset noted that it included the whole province of Tayk⁴. He noted that Iberians arrived there later, but not earlier than the 10th century since the regions listed in Tayk had been

¹ Չամչեանց Մ., Պատմութիւն Հայոց, հ. Ա, Վենետիկ, 1784, էջ 208: Ինճիճեան Դ., Աշխարհագրութիւն չորից մասանց աշխարհի, մաս Ա, հ. Ա, Վենետիկ, 1806, էջ 58:

² Saint-Martin A.-J., Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l'Arménie, Imprimerie Royale, t. I, Paris, 1818, p. 74. Concerning later times Saint-Martin noted: "La province de Daik'h, avant qu'elle eût été envahie par les Géorgiens, était partagée en huit petits cantons... La domination des Géorgiens a contribué puissamment à faire disparaître les anciennes dénominations qui y étaient en usage, et à y introduire les noms Géorgiens que nous trouvons sur nos cartes..." (Ibid., p. 76). Tayk consisted of the following districts according to "Ashkharatsuits": Kogh, Berdatspor, Partizatspor, Chakq, Boughkha, Vokaghe, Azordatspor, Arseatspor (Երեմյան Ս.Ս., Հայաստանը ըստ "Աշխարհացոյց"-ի, Երևան, 1963, էջ 110-111): *Boughkha* in the form of *Poukha* Saint Martin identified with Βόχας of Claudius Ptolemy (83-161) (Claudii Ptolemaei Geographia, vol. I, pars secunda, Parisiis, 1901, V.12.4, M. J. Saint-Martin, op. cit., t. I, p. 76).

³ Թովմա Արծրունի եւ Անանուն, Պատմութիւն տանն Արծրունեաց: Քննական բնագիրը, առաջաբանը և ծանոթագրությունները Մ. Հ. Դարբինյան-Մելիքյանի, Երևան, 2006, էջ 372:

⁴ Marie Brosset stated that the plural form of the name (indicated in the Armenian primary sources) of the region of *Suyg* (Tayk) situated in the upper basin of the Tchorokh River corresponds to Ταόχοι mentioned by Xenophon (Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIX^e siècle, traduite du géorgien par M. Brosset, St.-Petersbourg, 1858, p. VIII, cf. Հայ անունը ըստ Պ.Կրեչմերի, Հանդէս ամսօրեայ, 1933, 7-8, էջ 429 [a fragmentary translation into Armenian from the P. Kretschmer's article, see P. Kretschmer, Der nationale Name der Armenier, Anzeiger, 69, Jahrgang, 1932, Wien, 1933, S. 28-36].

inhabited by Armenians who have left numerous monuments and a lot of localities still bear the Armenian names (“les contrées énumérées ici ont été habitées par les Arméniens, qui y ont laissé de nombreux monuments, et qu’une foule de localités y portent encore des noms arméniens”)⁵.

The Assyrian and Biainian cuneiform inscriptions as well as the ancient and medieval sources have preserved evidences about Tayk.

Daiaeni (or Daiani), along with other toponyms, is mentioned in the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings Tiglatpalasar I (1115-1077 BC) and Salmanasar III (858-824 BC) who invaded the Armenian Highland. The kings of Nairi *countries* (in Assyrian: *mâtâti* (pl) *Nairi*), being 23 in number on one occasion and 60 on another, including the *king* of the Daiaeni *country*, came out against Tiglatpalasar I⁶. While deciphering the

⁵ Collection d'historiens arméniens, traduits par M. Brosset, t. I, St.-Petersbourg, 1874, p. 236, com. 1. See also Даниелян Э. Л., Историко-географические комментарии М. Броссе к его переводам армянских источников, Գիտական աշխատություններ, Վ. Բրյուսովի անվան պետական լեզվաբանական համալսարան, Պրակ առաջին, Երևան, 2002, էջ 126-131: Referring to the history of the 8th century and the preceding period, V. P. Stepanenko wrote that Tayk, constituting a part of Armenia, was the domain of the Mamikonyan family. He noted that the toponyms and the remains of architectural monuments preserved the traces of the Armenian past of Tayk, such as, for example, the temple of the settlement of Bana [Banak] (Vana) and the church of Ishkhan built in the village of the Armenian Catholicos Nerses III the Builder (641-661) and, which "could not be related to the Georgian tradition, because the Georgians appeared here at a later time. "Stepanenko criticized the Georgian authors (G. Chubinashvili, V. Beridze) who attribute them to "the Georgian architecture". In particular, he considers Bana "among the Armenian monuments from Ishkhan to Zvartnots." (Степаненко В. П., Чортванели, Торники и Тарониты в Византии (к вопросу о существовании т.н. тайкской ветви Торникянов), Античная древность и средние века, Екатеринбург, 1999, вып. 30, стр. 133-134, сн. 17). It is well known that the Banak's temple is an ancient Armenian monument and the Armenian church in the village of Ishkhan belongs to the series of monuments that have been created owing to the activities of Nerses the Builder (Մարության Տ., Խորհրդայն Հայք, Երևան, 1978, էջ 11-12, 34). About the Ishkhan church built (653 & 659) by Nerses III A.L. Yakobson wrote the following, G.N. Chubinashvili quite arbitrarily considers the temple as a Georgian one; V.V. Beridze is of the same opinion. The basis of this view is that the region of Tayk was a Georgian one. But it is well known that in the 7th century it was part of Armenia and inhabited by Armenians (Якобсон А. Л., Закономерности в развитии раннесредневековой архитектуры, Ленинград, 1983, стр. 138).

⁶ Annals of the Kings of Assyria. The cuneiform texts with translations, transliterations, etc., from the original documents in the British Museum edited by E. A. Wallis Budge and L. W. King, vol. I, London, 1902 col. IV, 82-83, 96-97, pp. 67- 68; col V, 9, 22, 29, pp. 69-71, Luckenbill D. D., Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia, Chicago, v. I, 1926, pp. 81, 82. In regard to the concept of "country", used in relation to the ancient cuneiform sources' information under question, it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that, for instance, the word *χώρα* in the ancient Greek has the meanings of a country, territory, region, etc. (Liddell H. G., Scott R., Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford, 1996, p. 2015). Describing Great Armenia, Claudius Ptolemy noted, "Χῶραι δὲ εἰσιν ἐν τῇ Ἀρμενίᾳ...", which is translated into Latin as follows "Regiones sunt Armeniae..." (Ptol., V.12. 4, p. 937). H. Bartikyan paid attention to such a fact in the Greek sources, noting: "The Armenian land (province) is transferred or translated *χώρα* in the Byzantine sources; for example, "Περὶ τῆς χώρας τοῦ Ταρῶν" (Constantine Porphyrogenitus. De administrando imperio, Greek

inscriptions of the kings Minua (Menua) (810-786 BC) and Argishti I (786-764 BC) of the Van (Ararat-Urartu) kingdom and mentioning Dayaeni (Daiaeni) (indicated in the Assyrian inscriptions) the British orientalist Archibald Henry Sayce expressed an opinion that Dayaeni corresponded to “the kingdom of a king with the name of Diau and his generations”⁷. Such was the opinion of N. Adontz, too, who denoted that most of the countries (Daiaeni, Abaeni, etc.) subjugated by Tiglatpalasar II (it should be Tiglatpalasar I - A. D.) were bearing “the patronymic (“les patronymiques”) names”⁸.

𐎶 (m) as a determinative for a male person⁹ is used with a form of the toponym [e.g. Diau(e)ḫe] accompanied by the heterograms LUGÁL (a king)¹⁰, KUR (a country) and

Text edited by Moravcsik Gy., Washington, 1967, p. 188) (see Бартикян Р., О царском кураторе “MANZHKEPT KAI EZΩ IBHPIAS” Михаиле в связи с восточной политикой Василия II (976-1025 гг.), Պատմա-քաղաքագրական հանդես, 1, 2000, էջ 131, ծան. 8).

⁷ Sayce A. H., The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van, The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (JRAS), London, 1882, pp. 399, 544, cf. Sandalgian J., Les inscriptions cunéiformes urartiques, Venise, 1900, p. 59.

⁸ Adontz N., Histoire d'Arménie, Les origines du X^e siècle au VI^e (av. J. C.), Paris, 1946, p. 220.

⁹ According to A. H. Sayce, 𐎶 - “Determinative prefix of an individual” (Sayce A. H., op. cit., p. 422; cf. 𐎶 “Personen”, “vor Männern” (König F. W., Handbuch der chaldischen Inschriften, Teil I, Graz, 1955, S. 212; Tafel 103). While illustrating the transliteration conventions in the case of the first line of the 10-year Annals of the Hittite king Mursili II (^mMur-ši-li LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR Ha-at-ti UR.SAG), it is noticed: “M designates the logogram used as a determinative for a male person, ‘Mursili’ and ‘Hatti’ are written syllabically, whereas the words for ‘king’, ‘great’, and ‘hero’ are Sumerian logograms, sometimes called Sumerograms, and are capitalized in the transliteration to distinguish them from the syllabically represented words” (Bryce T., The World of The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms: A Political and Military History, New York, 2012, p. 298).

¹⁰ According to Gr. Ghapantsyan, the term “king” had not the same content in cuneiform inscriptions and “the Urartian word ‘king’ was sounded not only as *ereli...*, but also originally meant ‘people’s chief’ and probably ‘tribal chief’”. He considered the first part of the word, *er-*, as “tribe, people”. According to another supposition of Gr. Ghapantsyan, “there was a second word with both the meaning of ‘king’ and the determinative LUGAL and... sounded as *nu* with the meaning of ‘king’”. Citing a line from the Khorkhor cuneiform inscription of Argishti I as an example [(“-uštadi ^mDiaueḫiniedi LUGÁL ^mDiaueḫi LUGAL-nu duubi” (col. I, 6), which he deciphered as follows “I rode against Diauian tribe, the king of Diau tribe I made of a king”]. Gr. Ghapantsyan assumed that this *nu* is used in the vassal sense (Ղափանցյան Գր., Ուրարտիականությունը, Երևան, 1940, էջ 84-85). But N. Harutyunyan noted “LUGÁL-nu ‘king’ - the Urartian adequacy of a heterogram—with a phonetic complement *nu*: *irnu-ernu (cf. i/ernu-tuḫi “kingdom”). The synonym of the Urartian word *er(i)eli* in the same meaning” (see Арутюнян Н. В., Корпус урартских клинообразных надписей, Ереван, 2001, стр. 420, 448, further КУКН). Having identified the forms of the names of Dayaeni and Diau(e)ḫi with Taik, Gr. Ghapantsyan in relation to the mention of 23 or 60 “countries” of Nairi by Tiglatpalasar I noted *tribes* and *chiefs of tribes* [Ղափանցյան Գր., op. cit., p. 84: cf. an interpretation of the information of Tukulti Ninurta I (c. 1244- c.1208 BC) in История древнего Востока, ч. II, Москва, 1988, стр. 102. ՀԺՊ, հ. I, Երևան, 1971, էջ 282)], and also remarking “of course it is about the number of *tribes* or *families*”, “the federation was headed by the king of the Dayaeni region” (Капанцян Гр. А., Историко-лингвистические работы, т. II, Е., 1975, стр. 86-92). But the *mātātu* of the Assyrian

URU (a town, a settlement) in the Biainian inscriptions (the heterograms are indicated as determinatives, too)¹¹.

According to G. Melikishvili, the determinative for a person 𐎶 (m) of the Assyrian cuneiform writing indicates the meaning of the determinative for ethnonyms in the Urartian inscriptions¹². He came to such a conclusion contrary to the views of I. Meshchaninov¹³ and A. Sayce in accordance with which “there is the Urartian equivalent of Assyrian *Urartu* in the word *ururdani* mentioned in an inscription of Sarduri II.”¹⁴. G. Melikishvili considered the use of the determinative AMĒLU¹⁵ before the word of *ururdani* as a reason for that conclusion. As he noted, the determinative AMĒLU “is put before the names of professions and tribes in the Assyrian cuneiform writing”. At the same time, he considered inadmissible the inclusion of the determinative 𐎶𐎶 – amêlu in the lists of the Urartian cuneiform signs compiled by A. Sayce¹⁶ and I. Meshchaninov¹⁷ as a determinative for tribal names, because “he failed to find a single case when this determinative would be before the name either of a people or a tribe.”¹⁸ But, the determinative, mentioned by G. Melikishvili, and “rarely applied in the Urartian writing”, which he considered to be identical with another Assyrian cuneiform sign 𐎶𐎶, does not have a meaning of determinative for tribal names in the studies of A. Sayce. The latter

inscriptions means “countries” [The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (further CAD), 1977, vol. 10, part 1, pp. 414-415 (sing. *mātu* s. fem. (Ibid.); ... *mât Nairi* (CAD, 1980, vol. 11, part 1, p. 254, 2006, vol. 18, p. 154-155), «𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶» (ՀԺՊ, էջ 283)] and could not be interpreted as “tribes”.

¹¹ Sayce A. H., op. cit., pp. 421-422. Cf. КУКН, стр. 408-410, 418-419, 424.

¹² Меликишвили Г.А., К вопросу о древнейшем очаге урартских племен, 1947, ВДИ, 4, (22), стр. 26, прим. 2.

¹³ I. Meshchaninov supposed that the term referred to “the Urartians” (Мещанинов И.И., Шураа и Урурдан в клинописных памятниках Ванского бассейна, Доклады Академии наук, Серия В, 1924, стр. 19-22).

¹⁴ A. Sayce read the word *Ururdani* as Ararat (Sayce A., Some New Vannic Inscriptions, JRAS, London, 1929, pp. 333, 335).

¹⁵ According to R. Labat, the determinative 𐎶𐎶 for *homme* (man) is put before the collective names of people (ethnic, names of occupations, etc.) - “Sumerian *lú*, Akkadian *amîl*” (see Labat R., Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne, Paris, 1952, pp. 26, 151, *huûn.*, Samuel A. B., Mercer, Introductory Assyrian Grammar, Dover, 2003, p. 12).

¹⁶ Sayce A., The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van, pp. 419-422.

¹⁷ Мещанинов И. И., Халдоведение, Б., 1927, стр. 74-75.

¹⁸ Меликишвили Г.А., К вопросу о древнейшем очаге урартских племен, стр. 26, прим. 2. In relation to ^{LÚ}*ururdani* G. Melikishvili noted “that it is the name of a certain category of people. In front of this word stands the determinative of professions, groups and categories of people (^{LÚ})” (Меликишвили Г.А., Урартские клинообразные надписи, Москва, 1960 (further УКН), стр. 288-289). Mentioning I. Meshchaninov's opinion, N. Harutyunyan concerning the abovementioned inscription of Sarduri II, on the one hand, deciphering “^{LÚ}*ururdani*” it translates “ururdains” and, on the other hand, in the vocabulary, following the opinion of F. König, considered it possible that the ^{LÚ}*ururdani* is a name of a profession (F. W. König, Handbuch der chaldischen Inschriften, II, Graz, 1957, see КУКН, стр. 247, 473).

has deciphered the determinative 𐎶𐎵 as “people”, and the determinative 𐎶𐎶𐎶 as “man”.¹⁹ A. Sayce indicated the cuneiform sign 𐎶𐎶²⁰ [language,²¹ tribe] to define the meaning *tribe*. Hence, the supposition of G. Melikishvili on making use of the determinative *m* for a male person in the Urartian inscriptions as a determinative for ethnonyms has not enough ground²².

According to N. Adontz, the proper nouns ending in *-hi*, which are used as objects, “get adjective form”²³ or are used as apposition, e.g. *Eriaḫini ebani* - *Eriakhian country*. Therefore, “the patronymic names Diaú(e)ḫi, Abiliani/eḫi, Eriaḫi ending in *-hi* are also used as geographical terms”²⁴. At the same time, N. Adontz has considered *-hi*²⁵ as “an ethnic suffix”, which “... occurs in many names in the south, the buffer zone between Urartu and Assyria, such as Kutmu-ḫi, Bab-ḫi... The most important tribes in the north of Urartu, which were hostile to the hegemony of Tushpa’s lords, were called Diaue-ḫi, Eria-ḫi, Abiliani-ḫi and so forth”²⁶.

According to G. Melikishvili, the *-ḫi/e(ni)* is a suffix of appurtenance, which “often occurs as an ending of ethnonyms that probably are comprehended as ‘a son of a such-and-such figure (an eponym-progenitor, a deity)’”²⁷. He suggested that in *ṁDiaú(e)ḫi*²⁸,

¹⁹ Sayce A., *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van*, pp. 421-422, also see Мещанинов И. И., *op. cit.*, pp. 74-75; Дзяконов И. М., *Урартские письма и документы*, 1963, Москва-Ленинград, стр. 99, 113; also see *amīlu* (CAD, 1968, vol. 1, part II, p. 48).

²⁰ Cf. Labat R., *op. cit.*, p. 55.

²¹ Sayce A., *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van*, p. 421. Cf. «language, special language or dialect, nationality, person or people speaking a (foreign) language» (CAD, 1973, vol. 9, p. 213).

²² N. Harutyunyan also identifies Dayaeni with Diaukhi (Арутюнян Н. В., *Топонимика Урарту*, Ереван, 1985, стр. 70-71). He also noted: “*m* - a determinative for ethnonyms. The same geographic name quite often is provided with a determinative as for “a tribe” (*m*), as well as for “a country” (KUR). Cf. *ṁAbiliani* and *KURAbiliani* (KYKH, c. 410). Concerning the index of “Geographical and Ethnic Denominations” in the Corpus published by N. Harutyunyan, M. Salvini noted: “The ethnic names are those of regions with the masculine personal determinative (*ṁ*). This is a mechanical subdivision which does not, however, resolve a difficult problem” (Salvini M., *About a New Corpus of Urartian Inscriptions*, SMEA, 43/2, 2001, p. 242).

²³ Adontz N., *op. cit.*, p. 260. The phrase “la forme adjective” of the text of N. Adontz is incorrectly translated into Armenian as “the genitive form”; at the same time the word “les patronymiques” is not translated (Ադոնց Ն., *Հայաստանի պատմություն*, Երևան, 1972, էջ 260).

²⁴ Adontz N., *op. cit.*, p. 260.

²⁵ It is “-ni” in the Armenian translation of N. Adontz’s work (Ադոնց Ն., *op. cit.*, p. 270) instead of correct “-hi” of the French original text (Adontz N., *op. cit.*, p. 271).

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 271.

²⁷ YKH, c. 51.

^mAbeliani/e_{hi}, ^mEria_{hi}, ^mEriku_{hi}, ^mIgane_{hi}, the determinative ^l (*m*) for a male person is an ethnic determinative²⁹. Similarly, almost all the toponyms mentioned in inscriptions with *m* as a determinative for a male person, G. Melikishvili regarded as ethnonyms³⁰, thus considering lots of geographical names as the names of tribes and tribal unions.

²⁸ G. Melikishvili supposed that ^mDiau(e)_{hi} is a Hurrian ethnonym, remarking that the Hurrian name “Taiuki”, mentioned in the Nuzi inscriptions, is perhaps just the prototype of the name Daia(e)ni || Diau(e)_{hi} in the form of “Tai(uki)”. He suggested that the local form was Daiu_{hi} (Daio_{hi}) and even Daiuki (Daioki) (Меликишвили Г.А., Дияухи, ВДИ, 1950, 4, стр. 30). But “Taiuki” is one of many Hurrian personal names (see Gelb I. J., Nuzi Personal Names, Chicago, 1943, pp. 144-145). The comparison of this personal name, preserved in the inscriptions of the Nuzi (located 15 miles south of Arapkha) archives, with Daia(e)ni || Diau(e)_{hi} is of an occasional nature. According to G. Melikishvili’s reservation, *-hi/ha* and *(i/a,u)ni* suffixes were in the local forms of the names (just in part of them, according to his opinion) and “weren’t appended by the Urartians”, having continued their further existence in the names of the Armenian regions (Меликишвили Г.А., Дияухи, стр. 30). There were also expressed other opinions about *Dayaeni* with *Diaue_{hi}*. According to H. Karagyozyan, there is a need, known in a traditional reading *Diauekhi* to decipher *Teyavekhe* (^mTe-i-a-ú-e-_{he}). As a result of the linguistic examination of the toponyms ^{KUR}Daiaeni and ^mTeiaue_{he} he concluded: “The supposed parallel ^{KUR}Daiaenu-Taik is not still possible to substantiate by any linguistic regularity; it is probably a consequence of a random likeness and vice versa - the transition ^mTeiaue_{he} > Taik is proved with great correctness corresponding to the Urartian-Armenian phonetic rules”. The researcher believed that it is necessary to differentiate the “countries” of *Dayaenu* and *Teyavekhe*, because *Dayaenu* mentioned in the Assyrian sources, is located in the basin of the Aratsani River and *Teyavekhe* in reality is Taik in the basin of the Tchorokh River (Կարապոյղյան Հ., Սեպագիր աղբյուրների Դայաենու երկիրը, ԼՀԳ, 1978, 6, էջ 71, 94: Կարապոյղյան Հ., Հայկական լեռնաշխարհը սեպագիր աղբյուրներում: Սեպագիր տեղանուններ, հ. 1, գիրք 1, Երևան, 1998, էջ 187-188). Assuming the identification of Daiaeni with Diau(e)_{hi}, A. Sagona set off other views as well (Sagona A. G., Archaeology at the North-East Anatolian Frontier, Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Supplement 14, Herent, 2004, p. 30, 34; the term of the “North-Eastern Anatolia” in the title of this article is applied incorrectly instead of the Armenian Highland). According to R. Barnett, “Some scholars, somewhat unconvincingly, identify Dayaenu with the kingdom later called Diaue(khi) by the Urartians, who may be the same as a people encountered by Xenophon in the late fourth century B.C. under the name of Ταόχοι” (Barnett R. D., The Cambridge Ancient History, Urartu, Vol. 3, 2008, p. 330, com. 123). The identification of Daiaeni with Diau(e)_{hi} (=Taik) is a dominant notion in the present historiography.

²⁹ УКН, стр. 51-52. Based on the viewpoint of G. Melikishvili that ^mDiau(e)_{hi} is an ethnonym by its origin (УКН, с. 424) and identifying Dayaeni with Diau(e)_{hi}, as well, M. Salvini pointed out that the kings of the Nairi “countries,” mentioned in the inscriptions of Tiglatpalasar I, were “tribal chiefs” (Salvini M., Geschichte und Kultur der Urartäer, Darmstadt, 1995, S. 22, 54).

³⁰ The names that make exceptions are ^m or ^{KUR}Iga(ni), ^{KUR} or ^mIšqigulu in G. Melikishvili’s book. He deciphers the ^ml-ga-ni-e-_{hi} as an “iganian” (УКН, 155C₅₂, с. 302, 430; cf. КУКН, стр. 509). N. Harutyunyan kept to the deciphering of F. König and P. Zimanski when regarding the question of the name of Išqigul_{he}; he read ^{KUR}Išqigul_{he} without the determinative *m* [(“the country of) Išqigul_{he}” in genitive case], see КУКН, стр. 331, 511). According to G. Melikishvili’s reading: LUGÁL ^mIšqigul_{he} “the king of Išqigul_{he}” (УКН, 286, стр. 348, 432).

I. Dyakonov pointed out that, for instance, “^{KUR}Eriaḫe³¹ is usually transferred as a noun, “Eriakhi”, meanwhile it is an adjective, “Erian”; cf. Analogic adjectives ^{KUR}Úeliku(-i)né and ^{KUR}Úeliku(-i)ḫé, etc.; cf. also ^{URU}melitēalḫé - ‘belonging to the Meliteans, the inhabitants of the city of Melitea’, but not ‘the city of ‘Melitealkhi’”³². Whereas he noted that “the name of the tribe, that lived” in the territory of Taik “has the Hurro-Urartian ending *-ini*, *-hi*, as in the Assyrian (“Dayaeni”), as well as in Urartian (“Diauekhi”) and Greek (Ταόχοι)³³ versions; and besides, the Greek transmission, which could hardly be traced back to the Urartian tradition, probably regenerates the self-name”³⁴.

G. Wilhelm noted: “In Hurrian grammar two types of derivational formations have been distinguished: one utilizes suffixes (*word-formation suffixes*) which directly follow the root (and root-complements), and the other utilizes suffixes (*derivational suffixes*) which follow the so-called thematic vowel.” Then he made the following note of the suffix *-ḫa*: “This suffix forms adjectives of appurtenance used with geographical or tribal names (*nisbe*): *Abiliane=ḫa ebanā* “the country of Abiliani” (tribal/personal name), *Diaue=ḫa* “the Diauean [king].” Without parallel in Hurrian is its usage in patronyms: *Argište=ḫa* “the son of Argišti,” *Išpuine=ḫa*, *Minua=ḫa*, *Rusa=ḫa*, *Sardure=ḫa*. It forms adjectives and nouns (i) after *u*: *egur=u= ḫa/hu* “clean, pure” (in a cultic sense), *tar-a-i-ú-ḫa* “?” (cf. *taraya* “strong”); (ii) after *i* (→ *e*): *qar-me-ḫa* “?”, *ter=i=ḫa* “plantation” (*ter-*

³¹ Shirak, a region of the Ayarat province.

³² Дьяконов И.М., Урартские письма и документы, Москва-Ленинград, 1963, стр. 30.

³³ Based on the view of H. Hubschmann about the identification of Ταόχοι with *Swjḫ* (Hubschmann H., Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen, Strasburg, 1904, S. 276-277), E. Herzfeld identified *Daiaeni-Diaue-Taóχοι-Swjḫ* (Herzfeld E., The Persian Empire, Studies in Geography and Ethnography of the Ancient Near East, Wiesbaden, 1968, pp. 116, 121). B. Piotrovski has pointed out, “The coherence of the Urartian name of the Diauekhi country (Dayani in Assyrian) with both Ταόχοι of the Greek historians and medieval region of Taik is beyond question” (Пiotровский Б. Б., Ванское царство (Урарту), Москва, 1959, стр. 31). G. Jahukyan noted in the table of “The general view of Urartian-Armenian phonetic parallels on the basis of coincidences of the most reliable proper and common names”, “the Urartian *d* is pronounced *ḫ* (t) in Armenian, *Diau(e)ḫi* – *Swjḫ* (Taik) (Ջահուկյան Գ. Բ., Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն, նախապրային շրջան, Երևան, 1987, էջ 430) and “the Urartian attributive suffix *ḫi/e* that often occurs in the toponyms, and is expressed by *χ* in Greek (cf. *Diauḫi-Taóχοι*) could be perceived by Armenians as an equivalent to the plural-forming *p* (q) and be expressed through it - *Abiliani/ehē*-Աբեղեանք (Abegheank), *Diau(e)ḫi-Swjḫ* (Taik), etc. (Ibid, p. 438). Some of the researchers bring the Georgian form “Tao” at first and then the name of Taik of the Armenian sources when comparing the mentions of the medieval primary sources with the name of Ταόχοι (УКН, стр. 424; Меликишвили Г.А., Диаухи, стр. 26-42; Sagona A. G., op. cit., p. 36). But it is well known that the mention of Taik in Armenian sources is more archaic and correct.

³⁴ I. Dyakonov arbitrarily concluded: “The alternation of *d*/*t* in the beginning of words is also typical for the Hurrian language. But the Hurrian ethnonyms could exist in this region also after losing of the Hurrian language by the local population, and it is not excluded that in the course of time the tribe of the Taokhs was Georgified (or more precisely, turned into Chans); and later, this area was a place of the Armenian-Chan intensive contacts” (Дьяконов И. М., Предыстория армянского народа, Ереван, 1968, стр. 16, сн. 15). The history of the Armenian province of Taik is falsified and misrepresented by such an interpretation.

“plant,” “establish”); and (iii) after *a*: *babanaḥə* (*babanə* “mountainous region”)³⁵. Thus, *-ḥe* (*-ḥi-*), being an adjective forming suffix of appurtenance in Biainian³⁶, the direct form of ^mDiau(e)=*ḥe* will be ^mDiau(e)³⁷.

Thus, in the Biainian/Araratian (Uartian) inscriptions we have (with the cuneiform determinative sign 𐎠 (m) for male personal names and the suffix *-ḥe*(*-ḥi-*) indicating appurtenance) on the one hand ^mIšpuine=*ḥe*, “Ishpuin-ian (the son of Ishpuini)”, ^mMinua=*ḥə*, “Minu-ian (the son of Minua/Menua)”, ^mArgište=*ḥe*, “Argisht-ian (the son of Argishte/Argishti), etc., and on the other hand ^m^{KUR}Abeliane=*ḥe*, “Abeliane-ian/ of Abeliane”, ^mDiaue=*ḥe*, “Diaou(e)-ian/ of Diaou (e)”, and others, which does not imply that the latter ones are tribal names.

A notion of *տայեցիք* (*Taieci/Taikians* - inhabitants of Taik, cf. *Ταίοχοι*), mentioned with the toponym Taik in the Armenian historical sources, is a toponymic name-form of the Armenian population of this area of Armenia but not a tribal name. It is seen from the mention of the Armenian population with the names of the other provinces (Gugark - Gugaratsi-Gugarians, Mokq-Mokqatsi-Mokqians, etc.)³⁸ and regions [Sper, Mananaghi, Daranaghi, Ekeghyats, Karin (the district of Karno), Bassen, Shirak, etc.]. The most evident testimonies of this are found in the work by Sebeos (the 7th century) - «*Մայեքացիքն..., և Մանաղայքն, և Դարանաղայքն, և որք յԵկեղեաց գաւառէ... և Կարնացիք, և Տայեցիք, և Բասենացիք... Շիրակացիք...*»³⁹ (“Sperians..., and Mananaghians, and

³⁵ Wilhelm G., Uartian, - see *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*. Edited by R. D. Woodard, Cambridge, 2008, Chapter 10, p. 111.

³⁶ M. Khachikyan noted that it was productive in Uartian the formation of the geographical names from personal names by means of the suffix *-ḥə* combined with the plural word ending in the definite absolutive case: *Rusa-ḥi/e-ne-lə* (“Rusakhinele (city)”), *Argište-ḥi/e-ne-lə* (“Argishtikhinele (city)”). She considers it possible that in such a way, but without the article (sing. *-nə*, pl. *nə-lə*) was formed in the Uartian language the suffix denoting geographical or ethnic appurtenance (*ḥalə/-ḥə*), which is etymologically in line with the Hurrian *nomina actoris* morphological unit (e.g., (Melitè-al-ḥə) – “Melitenean”; (Komahā-lḥə) – “Komakhian”) (Хачикян М. Л., Хурритский и урартский языки, Ереван, 1985, стр. 67-68).

³⁷ S. Ayvazyan offered “...the king (family) Diaueian” considering ^mDiaue the direct form of the name (Այվազյան Ս., Ուրարտերեն-հայերեն, Երևան, 2008, էջ 135, 225-226), instead of the translation of the phrase LUGÁL^mDiaueḥi by G. Melikishvili: “the lord of Diauekhi” (УКН, 36¹²⁻¹³, с. 158). Meanwhile, according to M. Salvini’s translation of the, ^mDiaueḥi means “the tribe of Diaue” (“la tribu del Diau”) (Salvini M., *Corpus dei testi Urartei*, vol. I, Roma, 2008, p. 190).

³⁸ Մովսես Խորենացի, էջ 114, 331:

³⁹ Սեբեոս, Պատմութիւն: Աշխատ. Գ.Վ. Աբգարյանի, Երևան, 1979, էջ 165: Stepanos Syunetsi (died in 735) mentioned also Taik while enumerating the dialects [“ԳԿորճայն եւ զՏայեցին եւ զԽութայինն եւ զՉորրորդ Հայեցին եւ զՍպերացին եւ զՍինին եւ զԱրցախայինն” (“Korchain and Taikian and Khutain and Fourth-Armenian and Sperian and Syuni and Artsakhian”)] of the Armenian language [*vostanik* (by the name of the Armenian royal residence - Vostan Hayots-Artashat; and then the capital city of Dvin)] (“Մեկնութիւն քերականին”, see Ադոնց Ն., Արուեստ Դիոնիսեայ Թերականի եւ հայ մեկնութիւնք նորին: Երկեր, հ. Գ, Երևան, 2008, էջ 187: Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. II, Երևան, 1984, էջ 437):

Daranaghians, and those of the Ekegheyats district... and Karinians, and Taikians, and Basenians...and Shirakians...”).

Having remarked, that the inhabitants of Hayasa, “located in the upper flow of the Euphrates River”, were the Armenian tribes in the middle of the 2nd millennium BC, G. Melikishvili mentioned, at the same time, the “Georgian tribes” as their “neighbours from early times,” but without any primary sources as a basis⁴⁰. Then he wrote that in the 12th century BC “in the territory of the historic Georgia’s south-western part was formed a large union of tribes...,” which “was called *Daiaeni* in the Assyrian sources and *Diauehi* in the Urartian sources... later, here was the ancient Georgian province of *Tao*⁴¹ (*Taik* of the ancient Armenian sources), the name of which, certainly reaches the name of *Daiaeni* (or *Daiani*) - *Diau(e)hi*-Ταόχοι”⁴².

Distorting the history and geography of the north-western areas of Armenia - Taik and the district of Karin (Erzrum) region of Upper Armenia, in such a way, he continued, “one has to look for the country of *Diau(e)hi* in the south-western regions of historic Georgia... According to the Assyrian and Urartian primary sources, the region of the present-day Erzrum city and the upper flow of the Western Euphrates River seems that had already entered *Diaukhi*”⁴³.

⁴⁰ Меликишвили Г., К истории древней Грузии, Тбилиси, 1959, с. 170-171.

⁴¹ Contrary to such an opinion, e.g., P. Muradyan preserved the Armenian toponyms (Tayk, Kgharjk, Javakhk, Treghk, Artahan, Sper, Kars, Karin, Nakhijevan, Gegharkuneats and Ararat mountains, Ayrarat, Ani, Baberd, Bagavan, Basen, Bjni, Gag, Gandzak, Garni, Dvin) in the Armenian translation of “The Georgian Chronicle” (see «Վրաց ժամանակագրություն» (1207-1318 թթ.): Թարգմանությունը հին վրացերենից, առաջաբանը և ծանոթագրությունները Պ. Մուրադյանի, Երևան, 1971, էջ 66, 88, 109, 124, 129-130, 169):

⁴² Меликишвили Г., К истории древней Грузии, стр. 176. Cf. УКН, стр. 424. Меликишвили Г., Дияухи, с. 26-42. G. Melikishvili indicated the works of Xenophon and Sophanetus as the primary sources. There is a need to note that Xenophon did not use the word *ἔθνος* - “tribe” when mentioning Ταόχοι and others, as we can see from the following sentence: «Καὶ Καρδούχους καὶ Ταόχους καὶ Χαλδαίους καίπερ βασιλέως οὐχ ὑπηκόους ὄντας καὶ μάλα φοβερούς ὅμως πολεμίους ἐκτησάμεθα διὰ τὸ ἀνάγκην εἶναι λαμβάνειν τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, ἐπεὶ ἀγορὰν οὐ παρέϊχον (Xenophon, *Anabasis*, IV.4.18; 7.1-2, V.5.17). Stephani Byzantii (the 6th c.) mentioned Ταόχοι, indicating «Σοφαίνετος ἐν τῇ ἀναβάσει φησί» as a primary source (Stephani Byzantii *Εθνικων quae supersunt*, edidit Antonius Westermann, Lipsiae, 1839, p. 268). It is supposed that “Sophanetos of Stymphalos is claimed to have written an *Anabasis* of his own - four paltry fragments survive - with Xenophon apparently appearing in a far less favourable light” (for details, see V. Azoulay, “Exchange and Entrapment: Mercenary Xenophon?” in “The Long March. Xenophon and the Ten Thousand”, ed. Fox, R. Lane, New Haven, 2004, pp. 289-304, cf. Gwynn A., Xenophon and Sophanetus, *Classical Quarterly*, 23, 1929, pp. 38-39). Stephaus of Byzantium mentioned the word *ἔθνος*, which was in use in the Byzantine official documents together with the term *gentes* in the meaning of “principalities” (“princely families”) in the period of Justinian I; these were the princely families of the proper Armenian districts of Andzit, Hashteanak, Angeghtun and Balahovit in Western Armenia (Адонц Н., *op. cit.*, p. 29).

⁴³ Меликишвили Г., К истории древней Грузии, стр. 176.

The distortion of the records on Taik as well as on Kgharjk, mentioned in the ancient and early medieval primary sources and the falsified⁴⁴ presentation of these territories as “the south-western regions of historic Georgia” now continues in the Georgian historiography and cartography⁴⁵.

Whereas, the reality is that Virk (Ιβηρία) was to the north of Armenia, according to the ancient Greek⁴⁶ and early medieval Armenian primary sources. As follows from “Ashkharhatsuits” by Movses Khorenatsi and the continuer of his work, Anania Shirakatsi⁴⁷, Taik was the fourteenth province (*ashkharh*) of Great Armenia and Kgharjk was a district situated in the western part of the thirteenth province of Great Armenia, Gugark. The springs of the Kur (Kura) River are in the village of *Kriakunk* of the Kogh district situated in the east of Taik, and then it flows through the districts of Gugark and makes the border with Virk in the northeast⁴⁸. According to “Ashkharhatsuits” «Աշխարհ Վիրք, յելից կալով Եգերայ, յերի Սարմատիոյ առ Կաւկասով, մինչեւ ցԱղուանից սահման, եւ մինչեւ ցՀայոց սահման՝ առ Կուր գետովն»⁴⁹ (“The Virk (Iberia) country extending to the east from Eger to Sarmatia at the Caucasus and to the border of Aluank⁵⁰ and to the border of Armenia along the River Kur”).

Describing the activities of the king Vagharshak, Movses Khorenatsi gives information on Taik. «Կարգէ զկողմանս Մաժարայ եւ զՊոնտացիս եւ զԵգերացիս. դառնայ զհիւսիսեալ առ ստորոտովն Պարխարայ ընդ մէջ Տայոց... գեղեցիկ իմն

⁴⁴ In the first volume of the book “History of Georgia”, edited by G. Melikishvili, the name Diau(e)ji is presented in the form of “Diaohi” and was again mentioned as an area, being situated as if in the “south-western part of ancient Georgia” and extending to the “present-day Erzurum city district”; at the same time, the Armenian toponyms Taik and Kgharjk have been used in a distorted form “Tao-Klarjeti” (История Грузии, т. I, Т., 1962, стр. 28-30, 129; К истории древней Грузии, с. 136, see also Матиане Картлиса (перевод, введение и примечания М. Д. Лордкипанидзе), Тбилиси, 1976, стр. 8; Рамишвили П., Социально-политическая история Грузии. Очерки истории стран Южного Кавказа, Мультиперспективный взгляд на историю, Ереван, 2009, стр. 75, 80.

⁴⁵ Атлас Грузинской ССР, Москва, 1964, стр. 245-250; Лордкипанидзе О., Наследие древней Грузии, Тбилиси, 1989, стр. 32; Бахтадзе М. А., Вачнадзе М., Гурули В., История Грузии (с древнейших времен до наших дней), 2000 (http://krotov.info/lib_sec/04_g/ruz/ia_kr2.htm),

⁴⁶ Strabo, XI 1.5-6, 2. 19-3.2, 14.2-4, Ptol., V.10.1; 11.3; 12.1.

⁴⁷ Դանիելյան Է. Լ., Հայաստանի քաղաքական պատմությունը և Հայ Առաքելական եկեղեցին, Երևան, 2000, էջ 37; Մուշեղյան Ա., Մովսես Խորենացու դարը, Երևան, 2007, էջ 111, 124:

⁴⁸ It is typical that relating to the activities of the Armenian General Mushegh Mamikonyan in the 60s of the 4th century, particularly, about the restoration of the boundaries of the kingdom of Great Armenia, Pavstos Byzand has noted: “Եւ զհին սահմանսն, որ յառաջուն էր լեալ յերկիրն Հայոց եւ ընդ երկիրն Վրաց, որ է ինքն մեծ գետն Կուր...” (Փաւստոսի Բիւզանդացոյ Պատմութիւն Հայոց, Երևան, 1987, էջ 216) (“And the ancient border that was earlier between the country of Armenia and the country of Virk (Iberia), it was the great River Kura itself...”).

⁴⁹ Երեմյան Ս., Հայաստանը ըստ “Աշխարհացոյց”-ի, էջ 104:

⁵⁰ On the left bank of the Kur River “գբուն աշխարին Աղուանից” (see Երեմյան Ս., Հայաստանը ըստ “Աշխարհացոյց”-ի, էջ 105) (“the country of proper Aluank”).

*կարգելով զերկիրն...*⁵¹ (“Organizing the sides of Mazhak and Pontus and Eger, turns to the north along the foot of Parkhar and in Taik... organizing beautifully the country”). Likewise, the reports of Pavstos Byzand⁵², Eghishe⁵³, Ghazar Parpetsi⁵⁴, Sebeos⁵⁵, Hovhan Mamikonyan⁵⁶, Ghevond⁵⁷, Movses Kaghankatvatsi⁵⁸ and Hovhannes Draskhanakertsi⁵⁹ show evidence that Taik was one of the provinces of the Armenian kingdom from the ancient times, as well as being the dominion of Armenian princely houses (Mamikonyans, Bagratunis) and Armenian church authorities⁶⁰.

The following information about the position and regions of Taik province is presented in the “Ashkharhatsuits”: «*Չորեքտասներորդ [աշխարհ] Տայք առ երի կայ Գուգարաց, ամրոցք եւ բերդօք կառուցեալ, եւ ունի զաւառս ութ. զԿող յելից կուսէ, յորմէ բղիւնն աղբիւրք գետոյն Կուրայ... ըստ մտից Կողայ՝ Բերդաց-փոր, Պարտիզաց-փոր, զՃակս... եւ ըստ հարաւոյ՝ զԲուղիսա, զՈքաղէ, զԱզորդաց-փոր իւրեանց գետակօք, որք յիրար անկեալ իջանեն ի Յոհ (Ճորոխ). որոց ըստ մտից Արսեաց-փոր առ Պարխար լերամբն, ընդ որ իջանէ Յոհ, զալով ի Սպերայ, անցանէ առ Թուխարս բերդով ի Կլարջս, եւ անտի յԵգր, ընդ Նիգալ, ընդ Սրուղ և ընդ Մրիստ զաւառս՝ ի Պոնտոս ծով ...*»⁶¹ (“The fourteenth [province of Great Armenia] Taik is near Gugark, holding strongholds and fortresses built, and having eight regions, Kogh is on

⁵¹ Մովսէս Խորենացի, էջ 108, 313. As the father of the Armenian historiography (patmahayr) states, King Vagharshak was the brother of the Parthian “Arshak the Great” (according to Sargsyan G. Kh., Mithridates I, 170-139 BC), during whose reign took place the expansion of the Parthian kingdom (Мовсес Хоренаци, История Армении, перев. с древнеарм. яз., введение и прим. Г. Саркисяна, Ереван, 1990, стр. 222, прим. 56). A. Musheghyan, having pointed out the standpoint of J. Markwart, sees “The king of Armenia Trdat I, the brother of the Parthian king Vagharsh I” in the person of traditional Vagharshak (Մուշեղյան Ա., op. cit., p. 222).

⁵² Փավստոս Բուզանդ, էջ 58, 76, 137, 273:

⁵³ Եղիշէ, Վասն Վարդանայ եւ Հայոց պատերազմին, աշխատ. Ե. Տէր-Մինասեան, Երևան, 1957, էջ 28, 127:

⁵⁴ Ղազարայ Փարպեցոյ Պատմութիւն Հայոց եւ Թուրք առ Վահան Մամիկոնեան, աշխատ. Գ. Տէր-Մկրտչեան եւ Ստ. Մալխասեան, Տփղիս, 1904, էջ 44, 73, 94, 110, 111, 121, 135:

⁵⁵ Սեբէոս, էջ 144, 146 165-169, 175:

⁵⁶ Յովհան Մամիկոնեան, Պատմութիւն Տարօնոյ: Աշխատ. և առաջաբանով Ա. Աբրահամյանի, Երևան, 1941, էջ 280:

⁵⁷ Պատմութիւն Ղետնդեայ, Ս. Պետերբուրգ, 1887, էջ 26, 123, 168:

⁵⁸ Մովսէս Կաղանկատուացի, Պատմութիւն Աղուանից աշխարհի, քննական բնագիրը և ներածությունը Վ. Առաքելյանի, Երևան, 1983, էջ 122:

⁵⁹ Յովհաննոս Կաթողիկոսի Դրասխանակերտցոյ, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, Թիֆլիս, 1912, էջ 68, 178, 185, 186:

⁶⁰ See Адоиц Н., op. cit., pp. 231, 309, 403. Յովհաննէսեան Մ., Հայաստանի բերդերը, Վենետիկ- Սբ. Ղազար, 1970, էջ 608: ՀԺՊ, հ. III, Երևան, 1976, էջ 35, 37, 48, 96, 107: Դանիելյան Է. Լ., Հայոց պատմական և քաղաքակրթական արժեհամակարգի պաշտպանության անհրաժեշտությունը, ԼՀԳ, 2010, 3, էջ 72, etc.

⁶¹ Երեմյան Ա., Հայաստանը ըստ “Աշխարհացոյց”-ի, էջ 110:

the eastern side, wherefrom the sources of the River Kur arise... from the west of Kogh are Berdatspor, Partizatspor, Chak... and to the south - Boughkha, Vokaghe, Azordatspor with their rivulets, which mingling with each other flow down to the Voh (Tchorokh) River, and to the west of them is Arseats-por [region] at the mountain of Parkhar, from where flows down the Voh and, coming from Sper, passes alongside the Tukhar castle to Kgharjk, and thence through the regions of Eger, Nigal, Mrugh and Mrit, debouches into the Black Sea”).

It is necessary to pay attention also to other records of Sebeos among the reports of the Armenian historians about Taik, as on the return of the prince Varaztirots Bagratuni from the Byzantine in 646⁶² (he returned and gained a foothold in Armenia, in Taik⁶³), as well as concerning an Arab invasion into Armenia (a troop of the caliphate plundering the province of Ayrarat reached Taik) and thence the marching to Iberia and proper Aluank⁶⁴.

Thus, the historical and geographic data of Armenian medieval sources give evidence to great importance of the province of Taik (in ancient times: *Daiaeni* of the Assyrian and Diau(e) of the Biainian cuneiform sources) in the Armenian political and cultural history because of its strategic position and deep-rooted statehood traditions in the Armenian Highland.

*Translated from Armenian
by V. M. Gharakhanyan*

⁶² In the fifth year of the reign of the Byzantine emperor Constantine II (Costas, Constans, 641-668) (Սեբեոս, էջ 144).

⁶³ Ibid. Sebeos indicated the village Ishkhan in Taik as the birthplace of the Catholicos Nerses III the Builder (641-661) (Սեբեոս, էջ 165, also see Մ. Օրմանեան, Ազգապատում, Կոստանդնուպոլիս, 1913, հ. Ա, էջ 730).

⁶⁴ Սեբեոս, էջ 146: