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. Inchichyan.

Saint-Martin wrote: "La province de Daik’h Swmng w2hmnh (Taik province - A.D.) était située au nord-est de la haute Arménie, au nord de la province d’Ararad (i.e. Ayrarat - A. D.), à l’ouest de celle de Koukar-k’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.),...

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

---

1 Չամչյան Ս., Պատմութիւն տանն Արծրունեաց։ Քննական բնագիրը, առաջաբանը և ծանոթագրությունները Մ. Հ. Դարբինյան-Մելիքյանի, Երևան, 2006, էջ 372.
2 Marie Brosset stated that the plural form of the name (indicated in the Armenian primary sources) of the region of Swm (Tayk) situated in the upper basin of the Tchorokh River corresponds to Taovcoi mentioned by Xenophon (Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l’antiquité jusqu’au XIXe 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 Tiglatpalas\(\text{ar}\) I (1115-1077 BC) and Sal\(\text{man}\)asar III (858-824 BC) who invaded the Armenian Highland. The kings of Nairi countries (in Assyrian: \(\text{māṭāṭi}\) (pl) \(\text{Nairi}\)), being 23 in number on one occasion and 60 on another, including the king of the Daiaeni country, came out against Tiglatpalas\(\text{ar}\) I.\(^6\) While deciphering the

\(^5\) Collection d’historiens arméniens, traduits par M. Brosset, t. I, St.-Pétersbourg, 1874, p. 236, com. 1. See also Даниелян Э. Л., Историко-географические комментарии М. Броссе к его переводам армянских источников, Филиалы влашпфертческих, Ч., Բրուսեր Յուկտամադ, 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., Խորագույն Հայք, Երևան, 1978, էջ 11-12, 34). About the Ishkhan church built (653 и 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 ранневизантовской 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, “\(Χώρα\) δὲ ἐλευθὴρα \(τη\) ἁρμενικα...”, 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 Ταρχών” (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 Diaus 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.

I (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 “МАНЗХЕКЕРТ КАИ ЕΣΩ ΙΒΗΡΙΑΣ” Михаиле в связи с восточной политикой Василия II (976-1025 гг.), Πισοπισό-ρωμιοπρωτό-κηνήστενο, 1, 2000, τριάδι, 8).


9 According to A. H. Sayce, I - “Determinative prefix of an individual” (Sayce A. H., op. cit., p. 422; cf. I “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 (“Mur-ši-li LUGAL.GAL LUGAL KUR Ha-at-ťi 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 erelı..., 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 mDiaueḫ iniedi 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 (“ἰουσίλιον θην, Пірпілійця /{{$cc boilerplate}}}}). But N. Harutyunyan noted “LUGAL-nu ‘king’ - the Urartian adequacy of a heterogram—with a phonetic complement nu: “iɛɾnu-ɛɾnu (cf. iɛɾnu-tuḫi “kingdom”). The synonym of the Urartian word er(i)el in the same meaning” (see Аругтунян Н. В., Корпус урартских клинообразных надписей, Ереван, 2001, стр. 420, 448, further ЮК), Having identified the forms of the names of Dayaeni and Diau(e)ḫe 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 [ἴονοι θην, 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. <dfn>, h. I, ιουσίλιω, 1971, τριάδι, 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” (Қапанчян Գր. 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). According to G. Melikishvili, the determinative for a person (m) of the Assyrian cuneiform writing indicates the meaning of the determinative for ethnonyms in the Urartian inscriptions. He came to such a conclusion contrary to the views of I. Meshchaninov and A. Sayce in accordance with which “there is the Urartian equivalent of Assyrian Uraŋu in the word ururdani mentioned in an inscription of Sarduri II.” G. Melikishvili considered the use of the determinative AMÊLU before the word of ururdani as a reason for that conclusion. As he noted, the determinative AMÊLU “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 – amêlu in the lists of the Uraratan cuneiform signs compiled by A. Sayce and I. Meshchaninov 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.” 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 ץ, 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. (lbd.); … māt Nairi (CAD, 1980, vol. 11, part 1, p. 254, 2006, vol. 18, p. 154-155), «Նաիրի երկիր» (ՀԺՊ, էջ 283)] and could not be interpreted as “tribes”.

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 refered 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).
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 לועיררدني 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 (LÛ)” (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 “לועיררدني” it translates “ururdains” and, on the other hand, in the vocabulary, following the opinion of F. König, considered it possible that the לועיררدني 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 $\equiv \gamma$ as “people”, and the determinative $\equiv \mu$ as “man”.\(^{19}\) A. Sayce indicated the cuneiform sign -$\equiv \gamma$ [language,\(^{20}\) 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 ground\(^{22}\).

According to N. Adontz, the proper nouns ending in -$\equiv \eta$, which are used as objects, “get adjective form”\(^{23}\) or are used as apposition, e.g. $Eria\equiv \eta$ini ebani - $Eriakhian country$. Therefore, “the patronymic names Dia\equiv \eta(e)\equiv \eta$, Abelian(e)\equiv \eta, $Eri\equiv \eta$ ending in -$\equiv \eta$ are also used as geographical terms”\(^{24}\). At the same time, N. Adontz has considered -$\equiv \eta$\(^{25}\) as “an ethnic suffix”, which “... occurs in many names in the south, the buffer zone between Urartu and Assyria, such as Kutmu-\equiv \eta$, Bab-\equiv \eta... The most important tribes in the north of Urartu, which were hostile to the hegemony of Tushpa’s lords, were called Diaue-\equiv \eta, $Eria\equiv \eta$, Abilian-\equiv \eta and so forth”\(^{26}\).

According to G. Melikishvili, the -$\equiv \eta(e)(ni)$ 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 $m$Dia\equiv \eta(e)\equiv \eta$\(^{28}\),

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


\(^{22}\) N. Harutyunyan also identifies Dayaeni with Diaukhi (Арутюнян Н. В., Топонимика Урарту, Ереван, 1985, стр. 70-71). He also noted: “$m$ - a determinant 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. $m$Abilian and KURAbiliani (КУКН, с. 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 (“”). 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 “-\equiv \eta” of the French original text (Adontz N., op. cit., p. 271).

\(^{26}\) Ibid., p. 271.

\(^{27}\) ԱԳՆ, с. 51.
mAbelian/eṭi, mEriṭi, mErikuṭi, mIganeṭi, the determinative iflower (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)ṭi 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 .Dialu(e)ṭi in the form of “Tai(uki)”. He suggested that the local form was Diauṭi (Daiōṭi) and even Daiuki (Daiokī) (Меликишвили Г.А., Диаухи, 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 Araphka) archives, with Daia(e)ni .Dialu(e)ṭi is of an occasional nature. According to G. Melikishvili’s reservation, -bha and (i/a,u)ni sufexes 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., Диаухи, стр. 30). There were also expressed other opinions about Dayaeni with Diau(e)ṭi. According to H. Karagyozyan, there is a need, known in a traditional reading Diauekhi to decipher Teyavekhe (“Te-i-a-ú-e-ṭe”). As a result of the linguistic examination of the toponyms kURDayaeni and mTeiaueṭe he concluded: “The supposed paralell kURDayaenu-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 mTeiaueṭe > 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 ( Christie, V., Urartu, 1978, 6, 1, 94: Կարագյոզյան Հ., Սեպագիր աղբյուրների Դայաենու երկիրը, ԼՀԳ, 1978, 6, էջ 71, 94: Կարագյոզյան Հ., Հայկական լեռնաշխարհը սեպագիր աղբյուրներում։ Սեպագիր տեղանուններ, հ. 1, էջ 1, 1998, էջ 187-188). Assuming the identification of Daiaeni with Diau(e)ṭi, 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 have been the same as a people encountered by Xenophon in the late fourth century B.C. under the name of Taóχοι” (Barnett R. D., The Cambridge Ancient History, Urartu, Vol. 3, 2008, p. 330, com. 123). The identification of Daiaeni with Diau(e)ṭi (=Taik) is a dominant notion in the present historiography.

29 УКН, стр. 51-52. Based on the viewpoint of G. Melikishvili that mDiau(e)ṭi is an ethnonym by its origin (УКН, c. 424) and identifying Dayaeni with Diau(e)ṭi, 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 kURIga(ni), kUR or mIšqigulu in G. Melikishvili’s book. He deciphers the “-I-ga-ni-e-ṭi as an “iganian” (УКН, 155C52, c. 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 Išqiguljhe; he read kUR Išqiguljhe without the determinative m “(the country of) Išqiguljhe” in genitive case, see KУКН, стр. 331, 511). According to G. Melikishvili”’s reading: LUGAL mIšqiguljhe “the king of Išqiguljhe” (УКН, 286, стр. 348, 432).
I. Dyakonov pointed out that, for instance, "KUREria ḫe31 is usually transferred as a noun, "Eriak ḫi", meanwhile it is an adjective, "Erian"; cf. Analogic adjectives KURÚeliku(-i)ñe and KURÚeliku(-i)ẖé, etc.; cf. also URÚmelı์ałẖé - ‘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, -ẖi, as in the Assyrian (“Dayaeni”), as well as in Urartian (“Diauekhi”) and Greek (TaóḫOL)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 -ẖə: “This suffix forms adjectives of appurtenance used with geographical or tribal names (nisbe): Abiliane=ẖə ebana “the country of Abiliani” (tribal/personal name), Diaue=ẖə “the Diauean [king].” Without parallel in Hurrian is its usage in patronyms: Argište=ẖə “the son of Argišti,” Išpuine=ẖə, Minua=ẖə, Rusa=ẖə, Sardure=ẖə. It forms adjectives and nouns (i) after u: egur=u=ẖə/hu “clean, pure” (in a cultic sense), tar-a-i-ú-ẖə “?” (cf. taraya “strong”); (ii) after i (→ e): qar-me-ẖə “?,” ter=i=ẖə “plantation” (ter-

31 Shirak, a region of the Ayrarat province.
32 Дьяконов И.М., Урартские письма и документы, Москва-Ленинград, 1963, стр. 30.
33 Based on the view of H. Hübschmann about the identification of TaóΧΟЛ with Swųp (Hübschmann H., Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen, Strasburg, 1904, S. 276-277), E. Herzfeld identified Daiaeni-Diaue-TaóΧΟЛ-Swułp (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 TaóΧΟЛ of the Greek historians and medieval region of Taik is beyond question” (Пиотровский 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 ṭ (t) in Armenian, Diau(e)ẖi – Swųp (Taik) (Քարքինչյալ Ս. Պ., Ղաղամբարյան Ղաղամբարյան, Երևան, 1987, § 430) and “the Urartian attributive suffix ḫi/e that often occurs in the toponyms, and is expressed by ք (q) in Greek (cf. Diau bais TaóΧΟЛ) could be perceived by Armenians as an equivalent to the plural-forming ք (q) and be expressed through it - Abili廉洁 UrtanaSułp (Abegheank), Diau(e)ẖi-Swułp (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 TaóΧΟЛ (UKH, стр. 424; Меликшвили 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 ethonyms 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 Taoks was Georgified (or more precisely, turned into Chans); and later, this area was a place of the Armenian-Chan intensive contacts” (Дьяконов И. М., Предистория 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: babana (babanα “mountainous region”)35. Thus, -

Thus, in the Biainian/Araratian (Urartian) inscriptions we have (with the cuneiform
determinative sign Š (m) for male personal names and the suffix -
hə (-hə- indicating
appurtenance) on the one hand mIšpuine=ḫe, “Ishpuin-ian (the son of Ishpuini)”,
mMinua=ḫa, “Minu-ian (the son of Minua/Menua)”, mArgište=ḫe, “Argisht-ian (the son of
Argishte/Argishti), etc., and on the other hand mKURAbeliane=ḫe, “Abeliane-ian/ of Abeliane”,
mDiaue=ḫe, “Diaou(e)-ian/ of Diaou (e)”, and others, which does not imply that the latter ones
are tribal names.

A notion of ւայցիք (Taiecik/Taikians - inhabitants of Taik, cf. Թայիչ), 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) - «Մաթերերգիս, Սպերացիք, և Մանաղայքն, և Դարանաղայքն, և որքեր Եկեղեաց գաւառէ ... և Կարնացիք, և Տայեցիք, և Բասենացիք ... Շիրակացիք ...»39 ("Sperians..., and Mananaghians, and

35 Wilhelm G., Urartian, - 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 Urartian the formation of the geographical names from
personal names by means of the suffix - հա combined with the plural word ending in the definite absolutive case:
Rusa-ի/е-ne-la (“Rusakhinele (city)”), Argište-ի/е-ne-la (“Argishtikhinele (city)”). She considers it possible
that in such a way, but without the article (sing. -ն, pl. -ն-ա) was formed in the Urartian language the suffix
denoting geographical or ethnic appurtenance (հա/սհա), which is etymologically in line with the Hurrian
nomina actoris morphological unit (e.g., (Meliṭе-ա/ե) -“Melitenean”; (Koma-խա-ե)-“Komakhian”) (Խաչիկյան
37 S. Ayvazyan offered “…the king (family) Diaueian” considering “Diaue the direct form of the name
(Այվազյան Ս., Ուրարտերեն-հայերեն, Երևան, 2008, էջ 135, 225-226), instead of the translation of the
phrase LUGÁL=Diaueji by G. Melikishvili: “the lord of Diauekhi” (УКН, 3612-13, с. 158). Meanwhile, according
to M. Salvini’s translation of the, “Diaueji means “the tribe of Diaue” (“la tribu del Diaù”) (Salvini M., Corpus
38 Մովսէս Խորենացի, էջ 114, 331: Սեբէոս, Պատմութիւն։ Աշխատ. Գ.Վ. Աբգարյանի, Երևան, 1979, էջ 165: Stepanos Syunetsi (died in 735)
mentioned also Taik while enumerating the dialects [“գռուպթավը և գՍաբերը և գՔարաֆինը և գՔերերը,
Հայոց, գՄերահու և գՄարգավանքը” (“Korchian and Taikian and Khatian 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)] (“Գրավարութիւն Բերպահուկի,” see Արաբաս Յ.Ա., Պատմութիւն Հայոց, Բերպահուկ և Հայաստանի տեսարանը, 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 basis. 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 Diaeni in the Assyrian sources and Diaueḫi in the Urartian sources... later, here was the ancient Georgian province of Tao (Taik of the ancient Armenian sources), the name of which, certainly reaches the name of Daiaeni (or Daiani) - Diau(e)ḫi- Taovcoi”.

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)ḫi 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.”

40 Меликишвили Г., К истории древней Грузии, Тбилиси, 1959, с. 170-171.
41 Contrary to such an opinion, e.g., P. Muradyan preserve the Armenian toponyms (Tayk, Kgharjik, Javakhk, Tregghk, Artahan, Sper, Kars, Karin, Nakhijevan, Gagharkuneats 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., Диаухи, с. 26-42. G. Melikishvili indicated the works of Xenophon and Sophaenetus as the primary sources. There is a need to note that Xenophon did not use the word ἔθνος - “tribe” when mentioning Taovcoi and others, as we can see from the following sentence: «Καὶ Καρδαύχους καὶ Ταοῦχους καὶ Χαλδαίους κἀπερ βασιλεῖς οὐχ ἐπιφόρουσα δύνατα καὶ μάλα φοβέρους ὅμως πολεμίου ἐκτραμάεθα διὰ τὸ ἀνάγκην εἶναι λαμβάνειν τὰ ἐπιτήδεα, ἐπεὶ ἀγοραν ὡς παρεῖχον» (Xenophon, Anabasis, IV.4.18; 7.1-2, V.5.17). Stephani Byzantii (the 6th c.) mentioned Taôkäh, indicating «Σοφαϊνετος ἐν τῇ ἀναβασις φησί» as a primary source (Stephani Byzantii Εβραίκων quae supersunt, edicit Antonius Westermann, Lipsiae, 1839, p. 268). It is supposed that “Sophaenetus 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 Sophaenetus, Classical Quarterly, 23, 1929, pp. 38-39). Stephans 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, Hashtean, Angeghtun and Balahovit in Western Armenia (Ադոնց Н., օր. էջ., էջ. 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 falsified presentation of these territories as “the south-western regions of historic Georgia” now continues in the Georgian historiography and cartography.

Whereas, the reality is that Virk (Iβηρία) was to the north of Armenia, according to the ancient Greek and early medieval Armenian primary sources. As follows from “Ashkharhatsuits” by Movses Khorenatsi and the continuer of his work, Anania Shirakatsi, Taik was the fourteenth province (ashkhar) 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 northeast. According to “Ashkharhatsuits” «Աշխարհ Վիրք, իբերիա ամբողջություն, իբերի Տարածությունը ու Զարգարված, իբերա գծանցանց ազգե-
ություն, ու իբերա գծանցանց ազգե-ություն)»49 (“The Virk (Iberia) country extending to the east from Eger to Sarmatia at the Caucasus and to the border of Aluank 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 Մաժաքայ և զՊոնտացիս և զԵգերացիս դառնայ զհիւսիսեաւ առ ստորոտովն Պարխարայ ընդ մէջ Տայոց զկողմանով»46 (The country of proper Aluank).
Likewise, the reports of Pavstos Byzand 52, Eghishe 53, Ghazar Parpetsi 54, Sebeos 55, Hovhan Mamikonyan 56, Ghevond 57, Movses Kaghankatvatsi 58 and Hovhannes Draskhanakertsi 59 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 authorities 60.

The following information about the position and regions of Taik province is presented in the "Ashkharhatsuits": «Չորեքտասներորդ աշխարհ Տայք առերի կայ Գուգարաց, ամրոցօք և բերդօք կառուցեալ, և ունի գավառս ութ Գուց» 61 ("The fourteenth [province of Great Armenia] Taik is near Gugark, holding strongholds and fortresses built, and having eight regions, Kogh is on..."

---

51. 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 (Movses Khorenatsi, 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 (-op. cit., p. 222).

52. Фавстос Бузанд, стр. 58, 76, 137, 273:

53. Եղիշե, Վասն Վարդան և Հայոց պատերազմի, աշխատ. Ե.ՏԵր-Մինասեան և Ստ. Մալխասեան, Տփղիս, 1957, стр. 28, 127:

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

55. Սարհան, стр. 144, 146 165-169, 175:

56. Սեբեոս, стр. 144, 146, 165-169, 175:


61. Երեմյան Ս., Հայաստանը ըստ “Աշխարհացոյց”-ի, стр. 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) (Մատչիկ, էջ 144).
63 Ibid. Sebeos indicated the village Ishkhan in Taik as the birthplace of the Catholicos Nerses III the Builder (641-661) (Մատչիկ, էջ 165, also see Ուրբանու, Ալյուշե ան, Երևան, 1913, հ. Ս, էջ 730).
64 Մատչիկ, էջ 146: