

FIRST HAYKIDES AND THE “HOUSE OF TORGOM”

(Some comments on the problem)

Aram Kosyan

Doctor in History

Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS RA

aramkosyan@yahoo.com

DOI: 10.54503/1829-4618-2022.2(16)-57

„This Hayk, son of T'orgom, son of T'iras, son of Gomer, son of Yapheth, was ancestor of the Armenians, and these were his families and offspring and their land of habitation. And afterward they began, he says, to multiply and fill the land“ (Moses Khorenatsi, Book 1. 12)

Abstract

In the article is discussed the “*Torgomian*” hypothesis of the Armenian ethnogenesis in regard to which until now scholars could not arrive at consensus. The study of various sources (written - cuneiform Hittite, Assyrian, Urartian, Hieroglyphic Luwian, classical Greek, linguistic, archaeological, mythological, etc.) points on the historical context in the history of the Armenian Highland which could fit our information drawn by Khorenatsi for the period of the First Haykides. Definitely, that period should be characterized by 1) the absence of considerably big political organization in the Highland, 2) the absence of more or less durative Assyrian control over several political entities in the south, 3) mobility of population.

Keywords: “House of Torgom,” Hayk, Armenian ethnogenesis, Moses Khorenatsi, Primary Armenia

The problem

The “*Torgomian*” hypothesis of the Armenian ethnogenesis contains a crucial phase of the history of the people, which until now is curtailed by the absence of decisive criterias in the course of the comparison of 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 based upon the classical and medieval authors, purely correlates with that of cuneiform and hieroglyphic Egyptian inscriptions. As to the list of the the *First Haykides* (hereafter FH) which contains in Book 1 of Moses Khorenatsi’s history, hardly it is possible to trace their names in the onomasticon of ancient oriental sources, concerning the Armenian Highland during the III-I millenniums BC.

In the Classical Armenian historiography, since the days of Moses Khorenatsi, *Hayk* was regarded as the „*son of Torgom*“, and the Armenians – the „*people of Torgom*.“¹ Nothing more about *Torgom* and the „*Torgomian era*“ could be found in

¹ P'awstos Buzand 1912, Introduction, III.13, V.30; Agat'angelos 1909: 6, 776, 796; Ľevond 1887: XXXIV, Hishatakaran. Here and elsewhere citations from the „History of Armenia“ of Moses Khorenatsi are given after the 1978 edition by R.W.Thomson. English translations of Hovhannes Draskhanakerttsi belong to the author.

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 untraceable.

Undoubtedly, the “Torgomian” ancestorship of the Haykides was borrowed by Classical Armenian authors from the Bible. 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,² scholars mostly, beginning from Fr.Delitzsch,³ were inclined to look for the „*House of Torgom*“ beyond the Euphrates where since the early II millennium B.C. the city *Ta/egarama* (Assyrian *Tilgarimmu*) was referred to in cuneiform Hittite and Assyrian texts.⁴

According to H.Manandyan,⁵ the early Armenian tribes had migrated from Northern Balkans in the XII BC and settled down in the neighborhood of *Mount Argaeus* (modern *Erdjijas Dagı*, between the Kayseri-Gürün-Malatya triangle, and six centuries later had left this land for the sources of Halys-Kızılırmak and their second homeland - the Armenian Highland. This same approach was demonstrated by I.Diakonoff.⁶

Localizing the early Armenian ethnic element near the sources of the Upper Euphrates (Hayaša and Azzi of cuneiform Hittite texts), Gr.Kapantsyan had formulated a theory according to which the Armenian migration into Malatya-Tegarama-Kayseri was regarded as a gradual infiltration happened between the XII and VII centuries C, which was accumulated in the VII century BC, under the Cimmerian pressure from the east and north-east.⁷

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 Hayaša of Hittite cuneiform sources, the same as the land *Hate* mentioned by the Urartian king Rusa II).⁸

² According to Khorenatsi, from here begins the migration of 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) royal cemetery of Armenian Arsakid kings (the fortress of *Ani* in the *Daranati* district), 4) the royal treasury of Arsakids (the fortress of *Bnabegh* in *Tsopk Shahuni*), etc.

³ Delitzsch 1881: 246 (apud Manandyan 1977: 16). The author had proposed that the „*House of Torgom*“ is to be associated with the Cimmerians.

⁴ The first reference to Tegarama comes from the „Cappadocian Tablets“ (XX-XVIII centuries BC)(Lewy 1964: 195 n.3). This important city is regularly mentioned in the Hittite texts during the XVI-XIII centuries BC (Del Monte und Tischler 1978: 383-384; del Monte 1992: 154).

⁵ Manandyan 1977: 21f.

⁶ Diakonoff 1968: 199ff. ; 1984: 22; 1981: 51ff.

⁷ Kapantsyan 1947: 140ff.

⁸ Yeremyan 1968: 109. Most of modern Armenian historians, linguists and archaeologists, while discussing the earliest period of Armenian history, i.e. the ethnogenetic processes, use the anachronistic term „*Armenian*“ (in regard to language, tribes, etc.). It should be remembered that this stage of the history of any nation is an extremely complicated

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 time and original place of residence of the Armenian-speaking tribes in eastern Asia Minor before their migration need to be explained. Today two contradictory theories deal with the problem of the arrival of Armenians to their historical homeland (to the east of the Euphrates - Greater Armenia).

1) Until the XII century BC the population of the Armenian Highland could not have been Armenian. The appearance of Proto-Armenian tribes here should be dated to the XII century BC, and even later period.⁹

2) The Indo-European (accordingly, Proto-Armenian) ethnic element was present in the Armenian Highland since the II millennium BC, if not before that date.¹⁰ The population of Hayaša and Azzi could have been partly Proto-Armenian.¹¹

Most recently, due to excavations in different parts of the Armenian Highland, had come up certain archaeological data in favor of the second view.¹² 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. Any sizable migration šfrom outside is still unrecorded for the XII-XI century BC. Here it would be worth noting that the traditional view concerning the arrival of the so-called Mushki tribes in the western and south-western parts of the Armenian Highland could not stand anymore. The excavations conducted in various sites of the Upper Euphrates region (modern province of Elazig – *Norşuntepe*, *Korucutepe*, *Tülintepe*, etc),¹³ comes to reject the western affiliation of this ethnic element. Now it is generally accepted that this population which appears in the texts of Assyrian kings (Tiglathpileser I and Aššurbelala), were either migrants from the north-west (i.e. the territory of modern Republic of Armenia) or local population who during the XII century BC Near Eastern crisis had migrated to the south and south-west and reached Northern Mesopotamia.¹⁴

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

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.

⁹ Khalatyants 1910: 11; Markwart 1928: 211; Diakonoff 1968: 204ff.; Mallory 1989: 34-35, etc. In 1950s S.Eremyan had suggested the XIV-XIII centuries BC (Eremyan 1958: 59), but later lowered it for the XII century BC (Eremyan 1968b: 91).

¹⁰ Today the scholarship has in its disposal a considerable archaeological data to suppose the presence of Indo-Europeans in the Armenian Highland as early as the III millennium BC (Winn 1981: 113ff.; Yakar 1981: 94ff.; Arechyan 1988: 84ff.; Burney 1993: 311ff.).

¹¹ Kapantsyan 1947; Jahukyan 1987: 340-341; Sarkisyan 1988: 51-52.

¹² A brief review of the results of surveys and related problems see in Kosyan 1996; 1997a, etc.

¹³ Hauptmann 1969-1970; Van Loon 1975 (ed.); Whallon 1979; Burney 1980; Winn 1980; Conti and Persiani 1993; Bartl 1994 etc.

¹⁴ Burney 1980; Sevin 1991 (from Transcaucasia); Muller 1999: 142 (local population of Išuwa). For the discussion of the Mushki problem see Kosyan 2022 (with references to current views).

their gradual migration (easy to say infiltration) towards other parts of the Highland after the XII century BC, a process which was accumulated during the VIII-VI centuries BC, when the Urartian Empire was running to its end. This theory¹⁵ could be presented as follows.

The migrations of Armenian-speaking tribes from Hayaša and Azzi (in the general area near the sources of the Euphrates (maybe also in the plain of Erznka-Erzincan), presumably to the north of the river)¹⁶ took place in the XII century 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 III (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 should be dated to a certain period after the XII century BC.

Later, in 1960-1980's the problem of the early Armenian presence in eastern Asia Minor was thoroughly discussed by I.M.Diakonoff. Holding the view in regard to 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 century BC. Here they came to power in the late VIII century BC, during the decline of local Luwian kingdoms.¹⁹ Later, after the fall 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 self-confidence as the ancestor of Armenians, the father of *nahapet* Hayk. 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

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

¹⁶ Today scholars mostly look for the location of this important federation consisting of Hayaša and Azzi on the north-eastern boundaries of the Hittite Empire in the general area to the north of the upper reaches of the Euphrates - 1) the *Kharshit* valley up to modern *Giresun* (Diakonoff 1968: 81ff., n.16); 2) the valley of *Tortum* (Khachatryan 1971: 128ff.; idem 1998: 35), 3) the *Kelkit valley* (ASVOA 4.3): For complete review of proposed localizations see Kosyan 2004: 44-45, 48-50.

¹⁷ Grayson 1991: A.O.87.1 (p.14, 17), A.O.87.2 (p.33), A.O.87.4 (p.42)

¹⁸ Kapantsyan 1948: 140ff.

¹⁹ Diakonoff 1968: 180ff.; 1981: 50ff. According to early scholars, the arrival of Armenian tribes into Eastern Asia Minor have taken place in the VIII century BC, in the context of the Phrygian expansion; certain Gurdi who in the times of Sennacherib, king of Assyria had created a kingdom in Tilgarimmu was considered as the leader of these Proto-Armenians (Forrer 1921: 80-81; Adontz 1972: 311).

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

It should be emphasized that the problems mentioned above could be solved only through the complex study of the sources of Movses Khorenatsi.

The sources of Movses Khorenatsi

The problem of the 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 discuss all suggestions in detail. For the purposes of our study it will be of considerable interest to put some observations into 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 (between the V-VIII centuries AD), 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 FH's names in ancient Armenia (for example, *Hayk, Aram, Anushavan*), etc. Taking into account these difficulties, some Armenologists 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 took it easy to reject the historicity of Mar Abas should look upon motives which led Khorenatsi to falsify one historical event, that is the episode dealing with the request of the Armenian king *Vagharshak* to his elder brother - Parthian king *Arshak*. Every Iranist and even non-Iranist knows that there was not 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 king.²¹ 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 kept in his capital city.²³ Did Khorenatsi know about this undertaking of Balash-Vagharsh? In the case of a

²⁰ Emin 1881: 7ff.; Thomson 1978: 10ff.; Sarkisyan 1991: 12ff., etc.

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

²² For reference to this manuscript see Lewy 1949: 29.

²³ On this manuscript which reached us through the VIII-IX century Parthian text see Kosyan 2017.

positive answer we should come to an assumption that he had ascribed this undertaking of the Parthian king to his Armenian colleague 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 here it should be mentioned 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 to 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.²⁴ Here one can find several references to the principalities of the Armenian Highland made by the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian kings.²⁵

If one accepts the historicity of Mar Abas, then the question rises: 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 those coming up from native Armenian oral tradition?

These points are far from rhetoric accent and should be borne 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 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 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

²⁴ Grayson 1987.

²⁵ Diakonoff 1981: 34ff.

appeared to be fruitless. Such names as *Hayk*, *Aram*, *Gegham*, *Anushavan*, *Ara*, etc. are not attested to in Classical Armenian historiography and one should state that these names were not used in the Armenian society. The restoration of these names in the modern period should be regarded as a tribute to Khorenatsi and the rise of the national self-science in the XVIII-XIX centuries.

Still N.Emin had stated that the names of the Haykides are of mixed origins, where at least 4 languages are represented - Armenian (*Gegham*, *Harma*, *Anoushavan*), Iranian (*Tigran*), Semitic (*Aramaneak*, *Aramayis*, *Amasya*, etc.), and Greek (*Kardos* = *Ara* son of *Ara*)²⁶. The same assumption was reached by G.Jahukyan²⁷.

How should this situation be explained? Even if one considers that the names of the FH were really Armenian, it will be very difficult to explain why they are absent for many centuries, 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 highly impossible, since we deal with forefathers who had to bear native names.

Recent studies carried by Armen Petrosyan (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, Yerevan)²⁸ could open 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 should be in order. Changing the names of Armenian *nahapets* and replacing them by divine names Khorenatsi must have possessed the names of both. His tendency to hide the names of the former (*nahapets*) is open for discussion, hence we can only offer our preliminary attitude.

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, Olimpiodorus, Eusebius, etc.), or the archives of Edessa and Ani (all these sources are referred to by Khorenatsi).²⁹ How could a person who lives 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 not none, then he had to make a choice between the two (in one such case see below). Making the list of the Haykides

²⁶ Emin 1884: 31-32.

²⁷ Jahukyan 1981: 61ff.

²⁸ Petrosyan 1996; Petrosyan 1997 (reviewed by J.A.C.Greppin in „Annual of Armenian Linguistics“, vol.18, 1997); Petrosyan 2017: 27ff. (reviewed by A.Kosyan). On mythological character of these names see Abeghyan 1944: 19ff.

²⁹ The existence of these archives is doubted by some (Thomson 1978: 12-13) and accepted by others (Sarkisyan 1991: 15ff.).

Khorenatsi risked creating 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 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).

The importance of this passage is difficult to argue against. If one takes 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“.

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*“ failed 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 considerably small political entities of 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 other possible explanation of this problem see below).

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 different parts of the Highland; any account concerning

³⁰ Some arguments were brought in favor of Urartu: 1) the ascription of a canal near Van to Semiramis (recognized to be erected by Menua, king of Urartu), 2) the similarity of the name Aram with the name of Urartian king *A(r)rame/u*, 3) large-scaled conquests of the Urartian king Argishti I which reminds the deeds of 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 1998: 2ff., where the „Armenia“ of the FH was regarded as the neighbor of Urartu and the author thinks that under the names of several Haykides after Anoushavan were hidden the Urartian kings.

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*“ 1) either was under Assyrian domination, loyal to its suzerain (hence, nothing “heroic” happened worth to be mentioned), or 2) was beyond its control (probably was located too far to be subdued).

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. 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“ does not 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-termed continuous infiltration of the Armenian-speaking tribes into different parts of the Highland. Hence, the point of departure could be sought to have been in the area where Khorenatsi locates Hayk, Aramaneak (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 Ararad*“ 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.³² In Armenological literature the

³¹ On these most recently see Sarkisyan 1998: 113ff.

³² See above n.17.

migrations of the Armenian-speaking tribes is thought to have been started from this area.³³ In general, the activities of the FH under the light of the above-mentioned considerations could be resumed as follows:

1) The hypothetic „*Armenia*“ of the FH could not represent a compact political organization which includes 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 population. 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 organization, 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 centuries BC only two periods are in order: 1) late XIII-XII centuries BC (the „XII century BC Near Eastern Crisis“), 2) late VIII-VII centuries BC (the period of the 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 century BC or in the IX-VIII century 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 century BC. 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 make such a treatment of the problem highly unlikely.

1) Though the XII century 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 clear parallels in the Transcaucasian „*Trialeti*“ culture, that is in modern Armenia and Southern Georgia. This could point to the possibility of the east-west migrations (or gradual infiltration) before the XII century BC.

³³ Dr. S.Hmayakyan (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, NAS RA) had supported the idea of bringing the Armenians from the south and south-east in the times of Tiglathpileser I by means of some remarkable arguments (Hmayakyan 1992).

2) If Hayk had migrated towards the east during the late XIII - early XII century 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 if he ruled somewhere in the Ararat Plain? Worth to mention that even among the mighty Urartian kings only Argišti I had succeeded to operate here only once in 783 BC.³⁴

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Agat'angelos 1909. Patmut'iwn Hayoc' („History of the Armenians“), Tiflis (In Arm.).

Łevond 1887. Arshawank' Arabac' i Hayastanum ("The Arab Invasions into Armenia“), St.Petersburg (In Arm.).

P'awstos Buzand 1912. Patmut'iwn Hayoc' („History of the Armenians“), Tiflis (In Arm.).

STUDIES

Abeghyan 1944. The History of Ancient Armenian Literature, Vol.1, Yerevan, (In Arm.).

Adontz N. 1972. The History of Armenia. Yerevan (In Arm.).

Arechyan G. 1988. An Indo-European Motive in the Mythology of the Kuro-Araxes Mesopotamia in the II millennium BC, Vestnik Drevney Istorii 4, 84-102 (In Russian).

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.

Delitzsch Fr. 1881. Wo lag das Paradies?, Leipzig.

Del Monte J.F. 1992. Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Wiesbaden.

Del Monte J.F. und J.Tischler 1978. Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Wiesbaden, 1978.

Diakonoff I.M. 1968. The Prehistory of the Armenian People, Yerevan (In Russian)

Diakonoff I.M. 1981. Asia Minor and Armenia c.600 B.C. and the northern campaigns of Babylonian Kings, VDI 2, 34-64 (In Russian).

Diakonoff I.M. 1984. The Pre-History of the Armenian People, Delmar/New York.

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 Russian).

³⁴ Melikishvili 1960: No.127 II, 249; Harouthiounyan 2001: 173 II, 160ff.; Harutyunyan 1970: 203ff. (for the description of this campaign).

Eremyan S.T. 1968a. The Campaigns of Cimmerian and Scythian tribes and the Struggle of Urartu and Assyria against nomads, *Patmabanasirakan handes 2*, 89-116 (In Arm.).

Eremyan S.T. 1968b. The First Armenian State Formation (7th-6th centuries BC), *Patmabanasirakan handes 3*, 91-120 (In Arm.).

Forrer E. 1921. *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches*, Leipzig.

Grayson A.K. 1991, *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Assyrian Periods / Vol. 2, Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (1114-859 BC)*, Toronto-Buffalo-London.

Haruthyunyan N.V. 1970. *Biainili (Urartu)*, Yerevan (In Russian).

Haruthyunyan N.V. 2001. *The Corpus of Urartian Cuneiform Inscriptions*, Yerevan (In Russian).

Hmayakyan S.G. 1992. The Legend of nahapet Hayk and the city of Kibsha in Nibur Mountains, *Patmabanasirakan handes 1*, 125-132 (In Arm.).

Jahukyan G.B. 1981. The Linguistic Origins of the Proper Names in the first book of Movses Khorenatsi's "A History of the Armenians", *Patmabanasirakan handes 3*, 48-63 (In Arm.).

Jahukyan G.B. 1987. *History of Armenian Language. Preliterary Period*, Yerevan (In Arm.).

Kapantsyan Gr. 1948. *Hayasa - the Cradle of Armenians*, Yerevan (In Russian).

Khachatryan V.N. 1971. *Eastern Provinces of the Hittite Empire*, Yerevan (In Russian).

Khachatryan V.N. 1998. *Armenia in the XV-VII century BC*, Yerevan (In Arm.).

Khalatants Gr. 1910. *The Outline of Armenian History*, Moscow (In Russian).

Kosyan A.V. 1996. The Problem of "Eastern" and "Western" Mushkians, *Patmabanasirakan handes 1-2*, 207-220 (In Arm., Engl. summary).

Kosyan A.V. 1997a. *Išuwa (Tsop'k') in the XIII-XII c. BC*, *Patmabanasirakan handes 1*, 277-292 (In Arm., Engl. summary).

Kosyan A.V. 1997b. The Mushki Problem Reconsidered, *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici, Fasc.XXXIX/2*, 253-266.

Kosyan A.V. 2017. About the Historical Sources of Movses Khorenatsi's History, *Fundamental Armenology 2017/2*, 30-33.

Kosyan A.V. 2022. *Išuwa towards the End of the XIII century BC (on the problem of the Grooved ware)*, *Bulletin of the Institute of Oriental Studies II/2*, 25-35.

Lewy J. 1964. Notes on the Political Organization of Asia Minor at the time of the Old Assyrian Texts, *Orientalia 33, fasc.2-3*, 181-198.

Mallory J.P. 1989. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans*, London.

Manandyan H. 1977. *Studies. vo1.1*, Yerevan (In Arm.).

Markwart J. 1928. *Le berceau des Arméniens*, *Revue des Études Arménienne VIII, fasc.2*, 211-232.

Melikishvili G.A.1960. *Urartian Cuneiform Inscriptions*, Moscow (In Russian).

Petrosyan A.E. 1996. The Myth of Aram in Armenian Tradition (PhD Theses). Yerevan (In Arm.).

Petrosyan A.E. 1997. The Myth of Aram in the Context of Indo-European Mythology and the Problem of Armenian Ethnogenesis, Yerevan (In Arm.).

Sarkisyan G.Kh. 1988. The Urartian Empire and Armenians, in *Urartu-Armenia*, 47-126 (In Arm.).

Sarkisyan G.Kh. 1991. History of Armenia of Movses Khorenatsi, Yerevan (In Arm.).

Sarkisyan G.Kh. 1998. The Etymology of Proper Names in the History of Movses Khorenatsi, *Patmabanasirakan handes* 1-2, 113-128; 1998/3, 85-98 (In Arm., Engl. summary).

Thomson R. 1978. Moses Khorenats'i. "History of Armenia" (Translation and Commentary), Cambridge/Mass.- London.

Winn Sh.M.M. 1981. Burial Evidence and the Kurgan Culture in Eastern Anatolia c.3000 B.C.: an Interpretation, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 9/1/2, 113-118.

Yakar J. 1981. The Indo-Europeans and their Impact on Anatolian Cultural Development, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 9/1/2, 94-112.

The article was delivered on 24.08.2022, reviewed on 09.09.2022, accepted for publication on 10.11.2022.