

Based on materials from Kamran Imanov's  
interview with the sites "day.az" and "trend.az"

**Hay-Armenians, striving to establish their  
place among historical peoples, do not  
d disdain revising the text Holy Scripture**

*(October 11, 2021)*

**The term "Armenia," whether a toponym or  
ethnonym, has no relation to the current  
armenians and was appropriated by them**

*(October 20, 2021)*

**Baku – 2023**

**Kamran Imanov,**

Chairman of the Board of the Intellectual Property Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

**Hay-Armenians, striving to establish their place among historical peoples, do not disdain revising the text Holy Scriptures and The term “Armenia,” whether a toponym or ethnonym, has no relation to the current armenians and was appropriated by them. Baku, 2023**

This brochure has been prepared based on the materials of an interview with Kamran Imanov, Chairman of the Board of the Intellectual Property Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan, given to the sites “day.az” and “trend.az” under the name **Hay-Armenians, striving to establish their place among historical peoples, do not disdain revising the text Holy Scriptures** (*October 11, 2021*) and **The term “Armenia,” whether a toponym or ethnonym, has no relation to the current armenians and was appropriated by them** (*October 20, 2021*)

<https://news.day.az/politics/1390199.html>,

<https://www.trend.az/azerbaijan/politics/3496671.html>;

<https://news.day.az/politics/1393985.html>,

<https://www.trend.az/azerbaijan/politics/3501047.html>

**© Intellectual Property Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan,  
2021, 2022, 2023**

**HAY-ARMENIANS, STRIVING TO  
ESTABLISH THEIR PLACE AMONG  
HISTORICAL PEOPLES, DO NOT DISDAIN  
REVISING THE TEXT HOLY SCRIPTURE**

*(October 11, 2021)*

*- Mr. Imanov, you have repeatedly revealed in speeches, books, and other print and electronic publications the motivations for Armenian plagiarism, calling them “the Armenian tradition of appropriating Azerbaijani cultural traditions.” Particular attention was paid to the painful Armenian mythomania, which flooded the world with fables...*

- The question you raised comes from the genesis of Armenian falsifications, i.e. fabrications and conjectures, forgeries and forgeries, as well as the closely related plagiarism traditions of appropriating someone else’s intellectual property. I would like to immediately emphasize that mythomania and intellectual theft, based on various mythologies, closely interact. If mythologems, thanks to far-fetched plots, inflate the greatness of the Hay-Armenians, replacing the non-existent with a false reality from the past and

at the same time contribute to the creation of new similar mythical “realities”, then the cultural thefts of material and intangible objects should serve as “evidence” of the reality of the Hay-Armenians mythologem.

That is why the centuries-old scheme of Armenian plagiarism and cultural theft of the heritage of neighbors is closely interconnected with historical phantoms and deliberate distortion of the history of the region, and all of them go back to the territorial claims of the “long-suffering” ethnic group.

*- Is it possible to give examples of historical cases?*

- Surely, you can. I will dwell on the Hay fakes about “great lands” and “lost territories”. But at the same time, I note that, as follows from the ancient Latin saying: “Every end depends on the beginning.” The lies and fabrications of ancient Armenian historians are now not only unconditionally accepted as truth, but are also overgrown with additions.

Starting with M. Khorensky, the “father of Armenian history,” who wrote the “History of the Hays,” later renamed for political purposes into the “History of the Armenians” and further into the “History of Armenia,” mythologies about the “lost territories of the long-suffering people” served as the revanchist basis for territorial claims to neighbors' lands. Nationalist illusions about the non-existent “Great Armenia”, or rather “great Armenia” in comparison with the lands of “little Armenia”, were inevitably accompanied by the formation of

their false history by appropriating the history of their neighbors.

As we have repeatedly pointed out, the Hay Armenians replace the history of the country with the history of the ethnic group for a reason. The reason here is not only the absence of a stable political concept of “Armenia” in the past as a state.

**The stable geographical concept of “Arminiyya” as an area of residence of many peoples in ancient times does not suit the Hay-Armenians in any way:**

if M. Khorensky’s “Armenia” was counted in units, then through the efforts of today’s Hay-Armenian historians they are listed in dozens, including “Eastern Armenia”, pompously called the “Etchmiadzin period of Armenian statehood” (as you understand, we are talking about the historical lands of Azerbaijan, where Armenian statehood is now embodied). That is why there is no “History of Armenia”, but there is a “History of the Hays”, there is a history not of autochthons, but the history of the territories of transit movement of allochthons - migrant aliens.

**I will give another example from M. Khorensky, who is unconditionally trusted by modern Armenian historians, namely the unprecedented fact of the revision of the Bible.** The “Table of Nations” from the Bible was changed through fraud to fit the false history presented by M. Khorensky.

It is well known that the Bible specifies the three sons of Noah - Shem, Ham and Japheth, and the tribe of Japheth, through Homer (Cimmerians) - the son of Japheth, goes to Torgom (Turki), one of whose brothers is Ashkenaz (Saki). Tiras (Thracians - Phrygians), being also the son of Japheth like Homer, is the uncle of Torkom.

**The father of Armenian (Hay) history, Moses Khorensky, being either offended or annoyed by the lack of references to historical Hays in the Bible, introduces two phantoms of Hayk and Armenak into the Armenian version and for this purpose “rearranges” Torgom, the son of Homer, in a row his grandchildren, replacing him with Tiras, who was, according to the Bible, the brother of Homer or the son of Japheth. Next, Torgom “gives birth” to the phantom Hayk (progenitor of Hays), and Hayk gives birth to Armenak (progenitor of the Armenians).**

**Please pay attention to the purpose of this fraud:**

Firstly, through Hayk and Armenak, the revision was supposed to ensure the continuity of the Hays and Armenians (as is known, modern Armenians still call themselves Hays today, but at the same time adapt the history of the geographical region of Arminiya and the confessional term “Armenians” to their fictitious history and legitimization of the appropriated ethnonym "Armen").

Secondly, using the authority of the Bible, they strive to show through Tiras their kinship with Homer and thereby “confirm” their joint arrival from the Balkans to Asia Minor.

Thirdly, the fictitious fact that Tiras is the brother of Ashkenaz (Saki) allows us to give rise to the following deception of Khorensky that the first king of the Hays was Skaordi (Saki by origin) and thereby provides an alibi for the fiction of the earlier Hay historian Koryun (V century AD), calling Hays "Askanazean," which translates as "from the clan of Ashkenaz."

Finally, fourthly, while maintaining kinship with the Frigs (Tiras), invent kinship with the Sakas (Ashkenaz) and the Turks (Torg), since the kingdom of Arshakuni (Lesser Arsacids) was "included" in the Hay-Armenian history according to "indications", or rather speculation another, earlier Hay historian Agafangel (III-IV centuries AD), who wrote that the Arshakuni (Arsacids) were from the Torgom (Turkic) clan.

**Thus, I ask you to focus on the fact that through forgeries, speculation, and lies about the history of other peoples, that is, infringing on their interests, the Hay-Armenians strive to establish their place among historical peoples and do not disdain revision of the text of Holy Scripture.**

These speculations began in the 7<sup>th</sup> - 9<sup>th</sup> centuries AD and "clarifications" continued until the 17<sup>th</sup> - 18<sup>th</sup> centuries AD. And here is what is written about M. Khorensky in the modern book "Armenian Medieval Literature", drafted by the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of Armenia and published by the publishing house "Sovetakan Grokh" in 1986:

“Showing civil courage and scientific sanity in the search for historical truth, the author [Khorensky] does not even consider the authority of the Bible to be unshakable... and the deeper and more carefully the ancient period of history is studied, the more facts are revealed confirming the scientific integrity of the “father of Armenian history.”

**Let me cite a blatant fact of plagiarism, which also goes back to M. Khorensky.**

Written back in the 5th century BC by the “Father of the history of nations” Herodotus the “History” has chapters from 100 to 103, that are devoted to the Media and the Massagetae. Experts claim that these historical data were based on folklore samples, or more precisely, on the legends of “Astyages” and “Tomyris”.

Introduced as the “father of Armenian history,” Moses Khorenatsy one millennium later, that is, in the 5th century AD (actually later), in his “History of Hays”, he described the same events, but gave them a different meaning and, first of all, presented them as a historical stage in the life of the Armenian people, which heroically resists neighboring peoples. Along with the similarity of the plot and the appropriation of the original form, bordering on plagiarism, a new meaning comes to the surface: supposedly we are talking about events that took place in the history of Armenia. The plot about Astyages is “crowned” with fictitious events and distorted by Armenian images. Along with the Dragon (Astyages), the Armenian king



Tigran and his sister are “inserted” into the plot. In relation to the legend of Tomiris, a similar falsification also takes place - the Massagetae, who were of Turkish origin, were replaced by other ethnic groups, and King Cyrus was replaced by the Armenian King Artashes, etc.

As a result, the legend about “Astyages” is falsified, Armenianized and on its basis the non-existent legend “Tigran” and Ajdahag” (“Dragon”) is created. The legend about Tomiris is subject to similar falsification and the legend “Artashes and Satenik” appears, and thus the well-known historical name of Tomiris is consigned to oblivion, the military strength of Armenia is inflated, and most importantly, through substitution, new legends that never took place are “created.”

In the book “Armenian Medieval Literature”, prepared by the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of Armenia and published in 1986 by the publishing house “Sovetakan Grokh”, to which we referred earlier, it is written: “...The most valuable examples of folk fantasy, ancient Armenian folklore works, or rather the legend “Tigran “and Ajdakhag”, as well as “Artashes and Satenik”, skillfully included by Moses Khorenatsi in his narrative (“History of the Hays”), give this work a unique beauty and original character.”

Let us give another example related to the famous Greek historian, commander and political figure Xenophon (V-IV centuries BC) and his work of the early antique period “Anabasis Cyrus”, where we meet the Turkic hydroformant -

the name of the river Arpa-su (and today many call it Arpa-river, which is the same thing, but in meaning means “Barley River”). This river flows through the territory of Western Azerbaijan, on the lands of the former Erivan Khanate, where the Republic of Armenia exists today. The name of the river in the form of “Arpasou” (Arpasu), presented by Xenophon, was changed by the Armenians in the 50s of the twentieth century to “Akhuryan”, which is a translation of the original name.

It is also known that there are two rivers in this region called Arpa-chai, which are tributaries of the Kura River, one of which is Arpa-su (present-day Akhuryan) or Arpa-chai, also known as “Small Arpa-chai or Western Arpa-chai” and which leaves Arpa-Gol, in Akhaltsikhe, and flowing through the western part of the former Erivan Khanate, divided it with the Kars vilayet of Turkey, i.e. was a border river. The second Arpa-chai or Eastern Arpa-su flows east of the first Arpa-su (Akhuryan). The information of Xenophon, who, as part of 10 thousand Greek mercenaries, walked the entire route followed by the Greeks, from Hellas to Mesopotamia along the southern slopes of Asia Minor, and the return route through the eastern and northern parts of Anatolia, is very valuable. The Hellenes passed through ancient Armenia, the Western Caucasus and the southern coast of the Black Sea, and it was in one of the episodes of this journey that Xenophon mentions Arpa-su, the localization of which exactly corresponds to the geographical

coordinates of the western Arpa-chai, located on the lands of the Scythians (Sakov ) and Khalibs (Tibaren or Gargars).

Thus, we are talking about a Turkic hydroformant, which is 2,5 thousand years old, and the question arises - why this fact is not sufficiently illuminated. The answer is very simple - according to the Armenian-Hay order, another falsification was fabricated, namely by the director of the Institute of Geology of the Academy of Sciences of Armenia, the chief geologist K.N. Paffengoltz in his work "On the Retreat Route of Ten Thousand," where Arpa-su is deliberately presented like the Chorokh River. Later, dozens of the world's largest cartographers and geographers spoke out against this falsification, of whom the most complete argument for exposing the fake was presented by the Greek scientist Jordanes Paradisopoulos. As we see, the Turkic hydronym on the territory of present-day Armenia is 2,5 thousand years old and there is not a single Armenian-Hai toponym on these lands that is at least 1 thousand years old.

Here is what the Armenian specialist R. Galchyan writes in his book "Azerbaijani Historical and Geographical Falsifications" in 2013: "... Greco-Roman Muslim and Christian travelers and historians in their works clearly and unequivocally prove that Armenians in the South Caucasus up to Lake Kaputan [southern Zangezur] people lived for at least 25 centuries." The question arises: who should we believe – past and present Armenian-Hai falsifiers or Xenophon? There is no doubt that

the answer is obvious. However, there is undoubtedly something else. Such fabrications and falsifications damage the dignity of the autochthons of this land - the Turks - Azerbaijanis, and this moral terror is aimed at misinforming world public opinion about the arrival of Armenians in the South Caucasus.

*- Can you give examples of falsification from the recent past on our lands that were not yet liberated from occupation?*

- It is possible, especially since the head of our state pointed out one of the falsifications - the insinuation and overall situation about the Azykh cave.

President Ilham Aliyev, speaking on October 9, 2021 to representatives of the public of the Khojavend region, noting the natural wealth and historical monuments on these lands with his characteristic wit, said: "The Armenians tried to Armenianize the Azykh cave. They reached such a point of absurdity that they declared: Armenians lived in the Azykh cave. You don't know whether to laugh or what else to do. It was Azerbaijani archaeologists who discovered the Azykh cave. They did a lot of research. The Armenians, simply for the sake of propaganda, brought scientists here from several countries and put on a show. They, one might say, caused great damage to the cave."

As is known, at one time, Azerbaijani scientists discovered and explored the site of an ancient man, the Azykhanthropus, in the Azykh cave. Attributing to themselves, as usual, ancient

origins, the aggressors renamed Azykh to Azokh (a paradox, since Azokh in Armenian means “sour grapes”) and sought to present Azykh to the world as “one of the primary centers of Armenian culture.” Azerbaijani scientists who studied the remains of Azykhanthropus attributed it to the Acheulean period, i.e. to the Early Paleolithic or to the period about 2 million years ago. But the aggressors claimed that the Armenian (Hay) ethnic group was formed precisely during the period of residence of the most ancient man. Obviously, such an absurdity certainly gives rise to another, and the Armenians, having continued illegal excavations on the territory, discovered a stone statue of a “Neanderthal woman”, moreover, in national Armenian attire. Moreover, near the “Armenian Neanderthal”, the remains of household items, Armenian national dishes and tools were allegedly discovered. Apparently, even if it was not possible to declare the Azykhanthropus discovered by Azerbaijani scientists to be a “hayostrop,” then a statue of a stone “Armenian Neanderthal,” especially in “Armenian national clothes,” might have worked. It is difficult to add anything to this, because it turns out that not only the Neanderthals were Hay Armenians, but they also managed to survive for several hundred thousand years in such a way that their national clothing, as well as household items, did not undergo changes.

To this we can add the discovery of the Institute of Archeology and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of

Armenia, whose director Pavel Avetisyan stated that on the border of Armenia with Turkey and Iran, 5,5 thousand-year-old charykh-shoes were discovered. According to the statement of the Armenian scientist, the found charykhs are practically not much different from the shoes worn by the great-grandfathers of the current Hay Armenians.

Another curiosity and insinuation is also associated with illegal archaeological excavations in the previously occupied Azerbaijani lands of Karabakh, where the “city of Great Tigran” was “revealed”, “confirming” the myth of “Great Armenia”. The media (Arminfo) reported this back in 2007. It is difficult for us to judge the greatness of Tigran II, who began with being a hostage to the Parthian kings of the Arsacids and ended with licking the boots of the Roman generals, especially the king of ethnically non-Hay origin, but, obviously, never founded Tigranakert in Karabakh and had nothing to do with Karabakh. The purpose of the fake is clear; they say Karabakh was part of the mythical “Great Armenia”. The fake was “supported” by additional information, namely, excavated Christian basilicas of the 5th-6th centuries AD, fragments of coverings, the entrance to the fortress walls and even its remains, found ceramics, remains of khachkars, etc. It is obvious that everything found, if it exists, was related to the material heritage of Caucasian Albania. Illegal excavations were carried out to extract evidence of the transit movement of Tigranakert from Asia Minor to the South Caucasus.

There are many examples of this kind, but in concluding the presentation I would like to say the following.

Armenian historical falsifications with the so-called “Eastern Armenia”, pursuing the goals of alienation and Armenianization of the original Azerbaijani lands of Karabakh, Zangezur and Nakhchivan, as well as far-fetched considerations that have grown into pseudo-historical opuses - concepts regarding the Hay origin of the territory of Western Azerbaijan, i.e. the former Erivan Khanate, where the statehood of Armenia is now embodied, are just relatively modern echoes of a large historical scam with the so-called “Western Armenia”, the territory of the present North-Eastern Anatolia of Turkey. At the center of this scam is the myth of the supposedly High-Armenian kingdom created in Anatolia, replicated in numerous publications and in different languages, which is based on the fabricated thesis of its continuity with the real-life Hittite and Urartian kingdoms that had no relation to the Hays. It is developed on the Hay-Armenian phantoms, which again had no relation to the Hays of the Artaxid and Orontid statehood, “miraculously” transforming into the “legendary “Great Armenia”, and at the same time – into the migration of the contrived Armenian statehood to the South Caucasus (“Eastern Armenia”).

The scam with the non-existent Armenian-Hay kingdom, demanding new victims, becomes completely unceremonious when the history and origin of the Parthian Arsacids and their

western dominion created by the rulers of this powerful empire - the state of the Lesser Arsacids (the Hay-Armenian kingdom of Arshakuni, as today's Armenians describe it) are appropriated). All these irrationalities, historical absurdities strung on top of each other, are committed, paradoxically, despite the Armenian sources, Georgian traditional information and, undoubtedly, descriptions in Turkic dastans, which have been repeatedly altered to fit a given mythologeme.

It would seem, what's special about all this?

After all, every nation has its own history and, moreover, can present it in the light in which it would like. There is also no doubt that the history of a people is shaped, as a rule, by its historians, and if they resort to falsifications and in this desired representation, history is perceived and accepted by a wide national audience, then what is reprehensible about this? But what? If such a story is “molded” by distorting the history of neighbors, encroaching on their ancestral lands, their material and intangible historical evidence of their past as an integral part of the future, then “historical tales” of this kind acquire a completely different meaning.

Praising and exalting one people, they humiliate others, exalting the deeds and virtues of representatives of one ethnic group, ascribing and appropriating things that are not inherent to them and not done by them, they deprive other peoples of their own history, and mock the historical memory of its participants.



“Appear, not be” - this motto of the Armenian people, which we remind you of, is directly opposite to the well-known truth “to appear who you want, you need to be it.”

- *We believe that there are enough examples and what conclusions follow from them?*

- The above examples are clear evidence of the Hay-Armenian commitment to one type of folklore, namely myth-making. This passion has almost been elevated to the rank of a national talent, be it the myth of the “Armenian genocide” or the “great Armenia”, or the “great Armenian culture”, the myth about the first center of civilization or the myth about the violation of the rights of Armenians in Azerbaijan. Of course, this is also a myth that the entire cultural heritage of the South Caucasus and, first of all, Azerbaijan goes back to the “reasonable Armenians.”

Such replication of lies is not accidental, because as Seneca the Younger said: “some lie to deceive, while others will lie because they themselves are deceived.”

Particularly in the mythological series should be highlighted the “distorted history of Nagorno-Karabakh” and the myth of the “invincibility of the Armenian army,” which took root in the minds of the Armenians over the past 30 years

and was dispelled to smithereens in 44 days. The arguments behind this myth about the “incredible” and even “existential” motivation and combat capability of the Hay-Armenians, coupled with the minefields and powerful concrete fortifications created in the mountains, supposedly called upon to defend the occupied Azerbaijani territories, also collapsed.

In short, there are countless Armenian myths. All of them, united by their purpose and practical purpose, fall under the category of political mythology.

Indeed, this is an obvious conclusion following from the High-Armenian myth-making. It is this mythology that links together the stereotypes of “great lands” and territorial claims to neighbors, “long-suffering” and “Armenian genocide” with the “exceptionalism” of Armenians; it is this mythology that sets the naturalness and, moreover, disguises itself as “legitimacy” of the appropriation of the cultural heritage of neighbors.

As a result, political mythology triumphs, defining the High-Armenian ethnic picture of the world and forming a unique awareness of external realities and mechanisms of behavior among the Armenian ethnos.

I must note another tragic feature and consequences of the Armenian penchant for myth-making. This is wonderfully stated by the famous Erich Feigl in his book “Armenian Mythomania” (2007). We present his thought almost in full: “It is difficult to imagine anything that could cause more damage

to the search for historical truth than mixing ancient legends with historical facts, and even worse - when they confuse one with the other. A similar mistake is made when politics and terrorism are confused. Too often, confusion of this kind occurs when groups (rarely peace-loving ones) united by common interests lay claim to their “historical homeland”.

**Such “historical demands” have always meant war, or at least terrorism, which is an ugly kind of war.**

*The right to sovereignty and independence is recognized as legitimate only if chosen by the majority, otherwise the generally recognized principles of democracy will be violated...”* (emphasis added).

So, according to the scientist, making demands on historical lands, and even more so on mythological, far-fetched demands, leads to war or terror. Infiltrating into the consciousness of the people, myths about “exclusivity” and “suffering” and thereby ambitions and claims in relation to other peoples, put a barrier to the alternative to natural normality, and the myth about the “special mission” denies international law as the cornerstone of the modern world order. The authorities and intellectual elite who support such mythologies themselves ultimately become victims and captives of these fabrications. The point is precisely that the consciously presented ideology of sober reason has difficulties

in replacing the picture of the world that has arisen unconsciously and is ingrained among the population. As a result, everyone finds themselves trapped in political folklore.

- *How, in your opinion, is the introduction of political folklore into the public consciousness?*

- We believe that this is connected with the collective memory of the ethnic group. It is known that one of the ways to form the collective memory of an ethnos is written historical narratives, which to one degree or another end up in the corresponding textbooks, encyclopedias and academic publications, turning into institutional (official) history. The template of the Hay-Armenian collective memory, instilled in the population, was based on the historical Armenian narratives of the past, starting with Khorensky, and Soviet and post-Soviet historiography, uncritically perceiving these historical opuses, continued the same line and this was replicated for centuries in the consciousness of the people in the form of the frame “surrounded and an ancient people tormented by enemies” with a “heroic, Christian past.” A significant role in pushing such perceptions into the public consciousness of the population belongs to the Armenian church and, as one of the largest modern specialists on the post-Soviet space E.M. Herzig writes in the work “Armenia and the Armenians” (London, 1996): “the narrative itself the template, being a product of mythological consciousness, tying

people to mythological images of the past, introduces a strongly mythological element into their worldview.”

This is exactly the situation, according to the cited scientist, regarding the mythologies that have been introduced into the collective memory of the Hay-Armenians for centuries. But what are the features and who is behind these mythological patterns, we can find out from the famous American specialist R.W. Tomson in a series of his studies on the historical narratives of the Armenian historians Agafangel, M. Khorensky and Yeghishe (Harvard University Press, 1976, 1978 , 1982). Firstly, as the famous scientist writes, all the authors of Armenian historical narratives are, as a rule, clergy, their works were commissioned by the church and preserved by the church. Secondly, historical descriptions of Armenians do not tell about the events themselves, but about their special selective reconstruction. And thirdly, they were written much later than the declared time of their writing and over the centuries, right up to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they were subject to changes and additions desired by the Hay-Armenians.

Probably for these reasons, the greatest historian of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Gibbon, wrote that the stories created in the bosom of the Armenian church often do not coincide with the data of modern historians.

I can add that the opinions of modern and past European authorities also coincide with the point of view of professional

Russian researchers. The prominent ethnologist V.A.Shnirelman writes about this in his monograph “Memory Wars,” emphasizing that modern Hay-Armenian historiography follows the narrative templates and mythological images of the “glorious past.” But the prominent Russian political scientist S.V.Lurie directly testifies that the political mythology of the Armenians “is part of the ethnic picture of the world, and, I emphasize, an unconscious picture and determines the way the ethnic group perceives external reality and the mechanisms of behavior of the ethnic group in relation to it” (S.V.Lurie, “Armenian political mythology and its influence on the formation of the foreign policy of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh”).

In such a situation, reasonable thoughts, such as those of the Armenian scientist, historian and Armenologist K. Patkanov from his work “Van inscriptions and their significance for Western Asia,” sounded back in 1875: “Armenians never played a special role in the history of mankind. This [Armenia] is not a political term, but the name of a geographical area in which separate settlements of Armenians are scattered. The Armenians have always been poor owners of the lands on which they lived, but they have always skillfully served the powerful, selling their loved ones...”, do not reach the addressee. Or, no less frank statement by Gevork Aslan, also a famous Armenian historian from his work “Armenia and the Armenians” from 1914: “The Armenians did not have

statehood. They are not bound by a sense of homeland and are not bound by political ties. “Armenian patriotism is connected only with the place of residence,” turns out to be an empty phrase.

*- How is the situation now, after our victory in the 44-day second Karabakh war?*

- Political folklore and a fictitious picture of the world, based on far-fetched theoretical theses on paper, fake-type falsifications that are far from the truth, numerous fake books and speeches, being designed for internal consumption, may work for a while, but sooner or later when faced with real life lead to bitter consequences.

**Myths are crumbling, the reality that gives birth to truth becomes obvious.**

I especially want to emphasize that the historical period we are experiencing is a period of debunking myths, a period of the triumph of truth and justice.

Our President Ilham Aliyev at a meeting with representatives of the public of the Jabrayil region on October 4, 2021, expressed these ideas in a best way: “We united and achieved our goal, restored historical justice. Look at the statements Armenia is making today. Not a trace remains of the mythology invented during these thirty years. Where is their “victorious” army? Where are the “invincible” Armenian

soldiers? The one who carried out dirty propaganda against us for thirty years, tried to humiliate the dignity of the Azerbaijani people, got his due, received a lesson. No one else in the world says a word about the “victorious Armenian soldiers,” because what kind of courage and heroism can we talk about in an army where there are ten thousand deserters? Nobody talks about the “invincible Armenian army.” There is no Armenian army. We destroyed it, destroyed it its roots. Destroyed all the equipment that they had accumulated for thirty years. Part of it is on display in our War Trophy Park. We destroyed its living force. This was done by the Azerbaijani people, who demonstrated their superiority.

So this mythology was put to an end. All other claims of Armenia against us must gradually come to an end. I said it, and I don't waste words. So far I have done everything I said I would do. Therefore, even after this, the Armenian society must correctly analyze the real situation. They should already give up mythology. They must abandon the chimera about “great Armenia”. They must abandon the mythical chimera of “Armenia from sea to sea.” They must and will renounce their territorial claims to Azerbaijan and Turkey. There is no other way. We'll make them do it."

Under the leadership of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief, President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, the Azerbaijani army returned lands of Karabakh, occupied by Armenian troops and actually outside the control of the Azerbaijani state. The



occupiers retreated before the force of arms, heroism and courage, patriotism and motivation of Azerbaijani soldiers and officers. Under the threat of complete destruction of manpower and equipment, the invaders were forced to capitulate by signing a statement according to which the remaining regions of lands not seized by military means were transferred to Azerbaijan.

Our great historical victory leads to the collapse of fiction. A clear example of this is the destruction of the myth of the “invincible Armenian army” by the brave Azerbaijani soldiers and officers under the leadership of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief. Along with this myth, the myth about the “Armenian motivation”, that is, about the manifestation of exceptional courage in “defending” the lands, was also dispelled. And finally, the myth “about a people ready for suffering, selfless and sacrificial” was dispelled, since the country’s army, numbering more than 10 thousand deserters, was unable to hold the occupied territories.

And here it would be appropriate to recall the June (2011) provocative “instruction” of the former President of Armenia Serzh Sargsyan, addressed to the elite of the Armenian young generation: “We (that is, the older generation) conquered Nagorno-Karabakh, and let the new generation conquer Agri Dag.” The aggressive and inflammatory nature of this statement, contrary to the norms of international law, implied a “resolution” for Armenia of the Karabakh territorial claims to

Azerbaijan, as well as “edification for their resolution” in relation to Turkey. This is a typical example of political folklore, passed on from generation to generation, in this case through the mouth of the then head of Armenia, and, as President Ilham Aliyev noted, “indicates that there is something missing in the heads of these people” and “they do not live in the real world, but in the dream world they created.” Prime Minister of Türkiye Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and the President of Azerbaijan quite rightly besieged the presumptuous Armenian leader, full of anger and hatred, showing him the place of an ant in comparison with an elephant.

At a press conference for representatives of local and foreign media on February 26, 2021, President of Azerbaijan Ilham Aliyev, noting the April war of 2016, said: “Today the former President of Armenia Sargsyan says that they won the war. A very unique victory when we found ourselves in their trenches. We raised the flag, removing their flag, and expelling them from the territory of Aghdara, Jabrayil and Fuzuli regions, returning to Boyuk Marjanli. This is how we lost, right?! Well great then! This is such an exemplary Armenian historiography, such a mythological Armenian science, including historical science, first of all. That’s why we slapped them in 2016.”

And quite rightly, on October 3, 2021, the President of Azerbaijan, speaking in the Tartar district, calling Serzhik Sargsyan a deserter and traitor, who has become a laughing stock in Armenia, emphasized: “The analysis of the war once

again shows that it was Serzhik Sargsyan and people like him who lost the war "

The destruction of these myths and confirmation of what has been said is seen not only in the leadership talent of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief, but also in the undoubted intellectual superiority, courage and determination of the leader of Azerbaijan Ilham Aliyev in comparison with the leaders of the defeated country, precisely in the fact that he is the true leader of the people and the winning country.

It is no coincidence, as the outstanding philosopher-educator J.-J. Rousseau said, that "there is nothing more dangerous than power in inept hands." Because such power does not serve the idea it embodies, but only its own interests and is therefore useless and unstable. Because, as life shows, the bitter consequences of the mistakes of such leaders affect the nation, and it is the nation that pays for them. History and reality testify to the special responsibility of the leader of the country, of which he is the bearer, since the fate of the nation entrusted to him rests on his shoulders. Therefore, to manage the country so that the nation moves forward requires timely, correctly made decisions, and this is the ability to choose, the ability to see the future, and this ability is born at the intersection of politics and law.

**The head of our state presented us the dignity of a victorious people, made us proud and happy for what we had attained.**

And, of course, the victory is a demonstration of the integrity and unity, patriotism and spiritual strength of the Azerbaijani nation. **Thus, numerous old and new Hay-Armenian myths are being destroyed, and even mono-ethnic state construction is unable to help the expelled occupiers.**

*- A new socio-political situation has emerged in the region, when Azerbaijan is pledging its efforts to restore the devastation left to us by the barbarian occupiers, and we are faced with the virtually destroyed material and cultural heritage of the Azerbaijani people, destroyed or completely erased Muslim and Turkic cultural monuments. On the returned lands there are many monuments and Christian culture as well - churches, monasteries, etc., attributed to the heritage of Caucasian Albania, whose inhabitants were one of the ancestors of the Azerbaijanis, and Azerbaijan is the successor to the lands of historical Albania. What do you say in this regard?*

- Azerbaijani statehood has at all times treated its Muslim and pre-Muslim heritage with care and respect, incl. Christian past, considering them the heritage of the Azerbaijani people. And in this regard, the Pharisaic lamentations about the alleged destruction of Christian monuments on our land cannot but cause surprise. But most of the evidence of the Christian past since Soviet times and, especially during the occupation period,

was subjected to redistribution and manipulation by Armenian falsifiers for the purpose of Armenianization.

With regard to Albanian Christian monuments, the historical truth does not boil down to the fact that Azerbaijanis do not want to preserve the monuments of their past, but, on the contrary, testifies to the systematic distortion of these monuments, the destruction of old inscriptions on them and the introduction of new ones, which should become “evidence” of their Armenian identity.

As always, Armenian scientists and politicians strive to appropriate the liberated ancestral Azerbaijani territories and, based on false sources, lies about historical Albanian lands are spreading throughout the world.

It is appropriate to respond to these claims with quotes of the Armenian author F. Ekozyants (F.P. Ekozyants. “Israel Ori. Pandora’s Box.” Book 1). As the author notes, we are talking “about the history of a hoax” and which is presented by Armenian researchers as a national liberation movement against the rule of the Safavids and subsequent states led by the adventurer I. Ori. The essence of the hoax is that here we are not talking about the liberation movement of the Armenian people, but about attracting the Karabakh meliks (I. Ori, the son of a melik) to their plans; moreover, there can be no talk of a liberation movement, since it has been turned into “national hero” I. Ori was a man who strived to achieve his private interests and personal goals.

This fiction, as Ekozyants writes, has its place among other falsifications. I quote the Armenian author: “Until the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the written history of the Armenian people was not rich and contained rare mentions of Armenia and the Armenians. These were mainly the works of European authors, far from both Armenia and the people who inhabited them. And the 18<sup>th</sup> century literally exploded with historical “discoveries” and **“recovered from oblivion numerous Armenian kingdoms, which no one had ever heard of before and which began to appear one after another through the efforts of an entire army of scribes, whose pens very soon sparkled in the vicinity of Noah’s Ark - the mythical cradle of human civilization”**.”

Ekozyants especially emphasizes that **“... I dare to remind you that all these sources appeared, or more precisely, were miraculously “discovered” precisely in the period from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries,” while in the 17<sup>th</sup> century no one knew about them!”** (emphasis added).

But who was the first to “enrich” Armenian history and, starting from when, was the era of falsification of Armenian history, filled with many mythologies, started?

The author writes that “by symbolic coincidence, the era of “enrichment” of the history of the Armenian people began the next year after the death of Israel Ori, which happened in 1711. In 1712, on the island of St. Lazarus, near Venice, **the Mekhitarist order began its activity, and a hundred years later,**

**only through its efforts, the history of Armenia and the Armenian people acquired thousands, tens of thousands of “ancient” manuscripts, gained “harmony” and was ready for to turn into science”** (emphasis added).

This means that at the initial stage this community, consisting of 12 fugitive monks, quickly acquired a printing house and a library, turned into a full-fledged monastic complex. Based on the first few books and manuscripts they brought with them, which in 1857 had already turned into thousands of “ancient manuscripts,” several monks, as Ekozyants mockingly notes, “miraculously surpassed ancient and medieval scholars in their knowledge.”

The fabrications and falsifications contained in the false manuscripts began to be used by the Armenians and their supporters, and among the first disseminators of lies was the famous Armenian publicist and translator G. Ezov, who, having obtained a number of unknown “new” documents from the archives of Europe and Russia, which were not published for the most part by anyone before him, turned in his book “The Relations of Peter the Great with the Armenian People” (St. Petersburg, 1898) the adventurer I. Ori into a brave national hero of the Armenian people who opposed the Muslims.

Thus, excluding several primary original texts, which were seriously edited and subjected to revision, the “history of the Armenian people” began to spread, turning into thousands of false “historical works” previously unknown to the world.

It should be especially noted that there were no originals of these false works in the Armenian language and there could not have been.

Here, putting aside the interesting and truthful thoughts of Ekozyants for a moment, let us turn to the work of another scientist of Armenian origin. We are talking about the most famous American Armenologist, professor at the University of Michigan and the University of Chicago, Ronald Grigor Suny, "Looking Toward Ararat. Armenia in Modern History", Indian University Press, 1993) (Ronald Grigor Suny, "Looking towards Ararat. Armenia in Modern History," Indiana University Press, 1993).

Speaking about the Mekhitarists in his book "A Look towards Ararat. Armenia in modern history," the scientist notes the special role of the clerical elite in the formation of Armenian history. He writes that "the work of the Mekhitarist monks was nothing more than the foundation, the laid foundation that contributed to the emergence of secular Armenian nationalism" and "in the subsequent development of the national tradition, new shades were given to the accents of the clergy, although writers constantly circled, returning to themes that took beginning in classical Armenian texts."

*- What topics are we talking about?*



- Syuni, with reference to another famous American scientist Robert Thompson, formulates the answer to this question as follows: "... Armenia, although a small country, is very ancient, where there were absolutely many deeds" (Moses Khorensky), its people were converted into Christianity before others and God's grace was shown to it (Agafangel), this is a people unshakable in their faith, faithful to their ancestral traditions and ready for "martyrdom for their sake (Egishe) ...". These three nationalist views belong to the fictitious Armenian theses we noted, formed by the chroniclers of Armenia.

*- Are there differences in the views of Armenian historians and conscientious Western scientists?*

- Undoubtedly, there is, and here we cannot help but dwell on the accusations of Armenian historians against Western scientists in connection with their alleged falsification of the history of Armenia, and at the same time the answers to these accusations given by Western historians.

Armenian historian Armen Ayvazyan in his book "Covering the History of Armenia in American Historiography (Critical Review)" accuses a number of well-known Western armenologists and Caucasus scholars, including Armenians by nationality, professors Ronald Grigor Suny, Robert Thompson, James Russell, Richard Hovhannisyan in the deliberate falsification of the history of Armenia.

His main argument is “to cast doubt, justified by modern history and science (read in the works of modern Armenian historians), the position that the Armenian Highlands was not the source of the formation of the Armenian people and, instead, an urgent resuscitation of the version rejected by science that the Armenians were newcomers.” Moreover, based on presentations by scientists from Azerbaijan and Turkey. It is noted that “Armenian culture in the works of the listed Western authors is presented as a continuation and borrowing of Byzantine, Assyrian, Arab and other cultures. Historical Armenia is presented as a decentralized weak country, turned into a manipulated means by the Iranian and Roman empires.” Thus, “the 5-thousand-year Armenian history is belittled, while the Armenian military forces during the period of the kingdoms of Hayasa, Urartu and Yervanduni [Orontids] numbered several tens of thousands, and in the era of Artashesids, Arshakuni and Bagratuni they numbered from 100 thousand to 200 thousands of warriors.”

This position was supported by academicians Hrachik Simonyan, Manvel Zulalyan and others. In response to this, at a conference on October 4-6, 2003 (Harvard, Cambridge and Massachusetts) on the topic “Rethinking Armenian Studies: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow”, a number of scientists, mainly from Western countries, gave significant answers to Hay-Armenian chauvinistic and nationalistic science. Thus,

professors Bardakchyan, Russell, Robert Hyseni noted that in Armenian studies of the Republic of Armenia

**“science, filled with xenophobia and ultranationalism, having become the leading trend, is leading towards self-destruction.”**

Professor George Burntian noted that “the basis of the Armenians’ claims to Western scientists is that “Armenian-American” researchers, with their research, damaging the Armenian claims to Karabakh, Cilicia, Nakhchivan, Ganja and Turkish Armenia, cast doubt on the subtle cultural issues, incl. adoption of Christianity by Armenia. Thus, the conscientious, painstaking scientific results of Western scientists are rejected without any basis.”

That is why Professor Robert Grigor Suny concludes his statements with the following thought: “Armenian scientists are mired in the quagmire of nationalist thinking.” The reasons for this, as a prominent scientist notes, “are a consequence of the nationalism that exists among Armenians in a convex form, the lack of roots and the replacement of historical knowledge with fiction.” “... These people, although usually proud of their historical past and heritage, have no idea about it.”

It is difficult to add anything to what has been said, and perhaps there is no need to do so. However, I would like to bring to light one fact that was once published in the Regnum news agency, and in this source of information, citing

information that criticized Western Armenologists, it was noted that “[Armenian] scientific thought in historiography is subject to intellectual aggression and , funded by the US State Department, is reflected in the distortion of the history of Armenia, dating back to ancient times.” This information followed from a joint statement by a number of Armenian historians, adopted at the international congress of Armenian scholars in Yerevan.

Thus, the approach of famous Western scientists who take an objective position, including scientists of Armenian origin, turned out to be unable to influence the Armenian studies science, which is in a nationalist swamp.

Therefore, the “New National Security Strategy of Armenia”, presented by Pashinyan, who feeds from this swamp of nationalism, as was quite correctly noted by the Assistant to the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan Hikmet Hajiyev, appears “like a fake history textbook”, and this document is full of further fabrications , adds grist to the mill of Armenian nationalism and is conveyed to the public.

*- Thank you for the interview, Kamran muallim, and what would you like to conclude this interview with?*

- And in conclusion, I would like to recall the wonderful words from the great Lev Gumilyov: “...Ethnic history is not an unlimited set of information “without beginning and end” (A.

Blok) and not just “anecdotes of bygone days (Pushkin)”, but a complex chain of causality investigative connections...” “At the individual level, lying is not only an asymmetrical stereotype of behavior, but also a way of influencing the environment, ethnic and landscape. At the population level, this is already massive disinformation in anti-systems affecting the social and cultural environment.”

I am convinced that Armenian myths, built on lies, are being debunked and will continue to be debunked. “After all, a dress,” as the great Spaniard Cervantes said, “both clothes and exposes.”

**THE TERM “ARMENIA,” WHETHER A  
TOPONYM OR ETHNONYM, HAS NO  
RELATION TO THE CURRENT ARMENIANS  
AND WAS APPROPRIATED BY THEM**

(October 20, 2021)

- *Mr. Imanov, what is “Armenia”, “Armenians”, what is the etymology and origin of these terms, what do they have to do with today’s Armenia and modern Armenians?*

- Recently, the head of state, speaking to representatives of the public of the Khojavend region on October 9, 2021, noting the significance and exceptional importance of the Hadrut operation, said that the Armenians, who created a fund called Hayastan, used it for multi-million dollar donations, and spent this money the former criminal leadership of Armenia at its own discretion.

Here is a quote from the speech of President Ilham Aliyev: “For those who do not know, I can say that Hayastan actually means Armenia. I don’t know why in English and Russian languages Hayastan is called Armenia, because Armenians call themselves Hays, and their country - "Hayastan, not Armenia. This is a matter for historians. I know the reason, but,

apparently, Azerbaijani historians should also carry out a more comprehensive study..."

Indeed, let us immediately point that if we exclude the false theses in the manipulation of the Bible in its Armenian edition, carried out by M. Khorensky and the subsequent revisions of his "History of the Hays", all the points of view available today regarding the terms "Armenia", "Armenians" have no relation to the present Hayastan (Armenia) and the Hay-Armenians.

**Based on the thoughts of President Ilham Aliyev, we consider it necessary to expose one of the main theses of Armenian historiography, which deliberately confuses the concept of the geographical area of residence of a number of peoples, called "Armenia" / "Armenia" with the name "Country of the Hays - Hayastan", based on through falsified artificial synonymy, identifying their political, ethnic and other history, thereby appropriating the past of the ancient region "Armenia / Armenia - Ərməniyyə" in favor of the Hay-Armenians.**

To substantiate this point of view, we have to, based on ancient texts and classical sources, consider the origin of the term Armenia / Armeniya, primary references about this in different sources, semantics, the semantic load of the term in

different historical periods, and also study the ethnic group or groups this term belongs to and what language was used by the ancient inhabitants of these lands. By doing so, we will be able to demonstrate that the appearance of this term has nothing to do with the current Hay-Armenians, that it was stolen and appropriated by them along with the history of the ethnic groups.

I'd like to note that today's Armenian historiography and numerous pseudo-scientific circles accuse us of the fact that only in connection with the creation of the ADR in 1918 (and even later) we began to be called Azerbaijanis, moreover, at the instigation of J. Stalin. Perhaps this is the idlest thesis of armagitprop, trying to appeal to our "immaturity" as a nation and alienation to the lands of the South Caucasus.

Not agreeing with this Hay-Armenian thesis in principle, we also would like to ask: no matter what ethnonyms-names are addressed to us, be it Azerbaijani Turks or Tatars, Caucasian Turks or simply Turks or Muslims - all these names express our origin, our roots, religion and area of residence, namely Turks (Tatars) from the Caucasus, Azerbaijan, Muslim Turks.

What about today's Armenians? Calling themselves Hays, they appropriated the name of other ethnic groups and, in particular, Armenian-Armeniyans. Unlike the Azerbaijanis, who live in their geographical area, in a country called Azerbaijan, and present the history of their country in institutional sources as the "History of Azerbaijan," modern Armenians, self-



referring to themselves as hays, maneuver in their historical documents both as hays and as Armenians, and their institutional history in one version or another is presented as “History of the Hays” or “History of the Armenian people”, thereby replacing the understanding of the country or the name of the geographical area of residence with their self-name or the acquired name of other ethnic groups. This approach, as we have repeatedly noted, comes from allochthonous migrants, and not from autochthonous inhabitants of a particular territory. This is a look at the history and modernity of those who, finding themselves on this or that land, define it, or at least claims to it, as primordial. Unlike us, the Azerbaijanis, at whom Hay-Armenian point claiming as if we have been appropriating someone else’s history, it is them, Hay-Armenians who stole the history of other peoples, continue to steal other people’s tangible and intangible cultural heritage, and by any available means and tools strive to present to the world what was stolen as own intellectual property.

*- Please also clarify the term Armenia / Armeniya, is it a toponym or an ethnonym?*

- Let’s start with the assigned name “Armenia / Armeniya”, namely with the earliest mentions in the sources of this term or its root part Armi / Arme / Er-me, Arim, etc., and let’s analyze what the term Armenia – Armeniya represents:

We come across the term "Arima" (Arima), starting from ancient Greek sources. Note that the Arimoi in Greek mythology are creatures, a country or place that is located underground and is associated with Typhon, the enemy of Zeus and other Olympian gods. **Homer (IX-VIII centuries BC)** in the Iliad refers to this place as the "bed of Typhon" in the country of the Arimoi.

Another ancient Greek poet **Hesiod (VIII-VII centuries BC)** in his work "Theogony" also places Typhon in Arima, and the later ancient Greek poet **Pindar (c. 470 BC)**, relying on the Cilician the origin of Typhon indicates that it was here that Typhon was killed by Zeus "among the Arimoi."

Based on this, the historian **Callisthenes (IV century BC)** located the land of the Arimoi in the mountains of Arimoi and Arima near the Kalika River, apparently near the Corycian cave.

The famous geographer **Strabo (c. 20 AD)**, dwelling on the possible locations of Homer's "Arimoi" and Hesiod's "Arima", also points out Cilicia ("Geography").

As is known, in ancient times the lands of Cilicia were one of the cradles of the Turanians by origin - the Old Testament Hattians. And it is no coincidence that many ancient scholars see a significant number of analogies in the ancient Greek myths about Typhon and the Hittite mythology about Ullikummi, believing that these myths originally belonged to the Hatti, and after their conquest by the Hittites, they entered the mythology of the latter, and then, adopted by the Greeks,

found reflection in Hesiod's "Theogony" and other Greek ancient monuments.

Most likely, it is no coincidence that on the lands of ancient Cilicia in the modern Turkish region of Karaman there still exists a city called Ermenek.

In the **Bisutun (Behistun) inscriptions (520 BC)**, the term Armenia (Armeniya) in the form of Armini is used in the meaning of "upper", "upper country", "high" and acts as a synonym for the name Urartu.

In the **Urartian inscriptions (7th century BC)** "Arme" is the eastern region, which is located in the upper reaches of the Euphrates and Tigris rivers. **In Hebrew, as well as cuneiform inscriptions of Assyria and Babylon, in the texts of ancient Persia and Greece**, the semantics of the name "Urartu" is also elevated to the meaning "upper", "high", "height", "upper land", "mountainous area", etc.

Note also that Strabo, placing the Arimoi along with Cilicia and in Syria, identified the Arimoi with the **Aramoeans of Syria, i.e., with the Arameans**. In his opinion, and with reference to the historian **Posidonius** (c. 2nd century BC), the Assyrian kings in their writings represented the Arimoi in exactly this way.

Modern historians and researchers, incl. The 19th-20th and 21st centuries, based on the historical information provided, have significantly expanded our knowledge in this area. Thus, Prof. **J. Campbell** (J. Campbell "The Hittites. Their Inscriptions and their History", Montreal, Toronto, 1890),

indicates that the root of the name “Armini” goes back to the name of the tribe Arima / Arimi | Erme (in Greek Arimai or Arimoi) and that the said tribe was part of the "peoples of Nairi", who were descendants of the ancient Turans of Hatti, named in the Bible as Ashteroth (Ashashtari). It was them that the ancient Egyptians called Mesopotamian Naharaim, and in Hebrew texts - as Aram Naharaim, while the Assyrians called them Nairi (Nairi). Herodotus considered them Sakas and called them Neuri (Neurs). In Italy they were Naharcer - part of the Etruscans, and in Spain - Navarra, they were associated with the people of Khubur-Subars or Sabirs / Savirs.

Another modern specialist, **Lane Fox**, in his work “Travelling Heroes: Greeks and Their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer”, London: Allen Lane, 2008, also associated the term Arima with the Hittite place names "Erimma and Arimmata".

In conclusion, we will present two striking examples that we encounter when studying the term “Armenia / Armeniya” and its root part (base) Armi / Arme / Erme; one of which leads us to the interpretation of texts found during archaeological excavations in Ebla, dating back at least 4 millennia earlier, i.e. to approximately 2300 BC, and the second - to the interpretation of one of the stories of a mythological nature, brought to us by Strabo and dating back at least 3 thousand years earlier, to the pre-Trojan era.

The collection “Ancient Ebla” was dedicated to the historical and cultural monuments of Ebla, an ancient city

discovered by the Italian archaeological mission in Syria and compiled by the Italian scientist, head of the Italian archaeological mission in Syria, prof. Paolo Matthie with the final article by Prof. I. Dyakonova. The archaeological finds found relate to the royal palace in Ebla - the end of the 3rd millennium BC. The materials in the collection cannot be ignored, since in some ancient texts the name "Ebla" is used in parallel with the name "Armanum".

Researcher P. Garelli in this collection "Ancient Ebla", under the general. ed. of I.M. Dyakonova, M., "Progress", 1985, notes that, unlike another specialist G. Pettinato, who believes that "Ar-mi" is a proper name and considers this noun to mean "city", and namely Ebla, i.e., we bury, proposes to understand by "Ar-mi<sup>ki</sup>" the people (city) of Ar-mi or the army, i.e., ethnonym.

Since there is no direct answer to the question of the location of the city of Ar-mi, but it is known that it is located close to the city of Ebla, the frequent parallel use of the names Ebla and Armi ("Ebla<sup>ki</sup> wa Ar-mi<sup>ki</sup>") **leads to the consideration of a similar parallelism in the inscriptions of the Akkadian king Naram-Suena: "Ar-ma-num<sup>ki</sup> and Eb-la<sup>ki</sup>", or in the form of "Ar-ma-nim и Eb-la<sup>ki</sup>".**

In this regard, the famous scientist I. Dyakonov in the article "The Significance of Ebla for History and Linguistics" notes that two kings of the Lower Mesopotamian dynasty of Akkad report "campaigns" against Ebla: "Sargon the Ancient

(2316-2261 BC) and Naram-Suen (Naramsin) (2236-2200 BC) and, apparently, it was Naram-Suen who completely destroyed “Ebla and Armanum” and destroyed the Eblaite kingdom around 2225 BC during his last King Ibbi-Zikir...” Ebla was restored around 2000 BC, but its population, according to I. Dyakonov, changed, the Amorite West Semitic and Hurrian languages and Ebla spread, playing a certain role during the first half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC, was once again destroyed and was never reborn. Dyakonov writes that the texts refer to Ebla of the Early Bronze Age, approximately 2500-2225 BC, when a “distinctive population” lived here, speaking the newly discovered Eblaite language. The Amorites, and especially the Hurrians, according to Dyakonov, lived here later. And here we especially emphasize one thought of I. Dyakonov with reference to G. J. Gelb (G. J. Gelb “Ebla and the Kish Civilization”, “La Lingua di Ebla”, Napoli, 1981): “... **The toponymy of the Eblaite texts is not Hurrian, not Sumerian and not Semitic [we might add, and not Indo-European], but points to some more ancient ethnic substrate, still completely mysterious.**”

I. Dyakonov emphasizes that “in some **pseudo-scientific circles**, the name of the city neighboring Ebla, Arm num, as well as the toponym (?) or ethnonym (?) “ar-miki”, often found in texts, aroused exceptional interest, and there is hope - is it possible to see Are the ancestors of the Armenians here?” With convincing arguments, I. Dyakonov proves that “**the**

**assumption of the existence of Armenians in Syria in the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium does not seem probable,” and the “myth of the Armenians” mentioned in Eblaite texts is “doomed to melt away just like the myth of the biblical cities.” Since “in the numerous personal names from Ebla, not a single toponymy contains even a hint of an Armenian or any other Indo-European linguistic element.” It is also known that “never during their history have the Armenians themselves called themselves this way.” The Persian and Greek term Armeniya “was created by the neighbors of the Hayk Armenians according to some toponym on the southern outskirts of their habitat” and “there is no reason why this toponym could not have existed here much earlier, millennia before the formation of the Armenian ethnos,” and consonance between the name of the ancient Syrian city of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium BC and the name given by foreigners to the Armenian people since the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC was accidental.**

“As for the ethnonym ar-mi<sup>ki</sup>..., it is more likely (as noted by I. Dyakonov) that it should be seen as the name of the inhabitants of the city of Armanum, or the well-known Semitic ethnonym armi, arami, arammi, which did not originally belong to the Arameans, i.e., to a certain group of Semites, attested from the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC... The fact is that the ethnonym Aramu (from where the possessive form arami, armi, etc.) is mentioned already in Amorite genealogies at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC, and also in the Bible as an

epithet of the ancestor of the ancient Jews, Arameans and Arabs and, apparently, meant “nomads” in general, since neither the Amorites, nor the Jews, nor the Arabs ever spoke that Semitic language, which is now called Aramaic in science.”

**This example convinces us that**

**the term Armenia / Armenia and, accordingly, Armanum, Armi, whether it is an ethnonym or a toponym (horonym), have no relation to the current Armenians and was appropriated by them, and the origin of the term is not connected, at least, with neither the Semites nor the Indo-Europeans.**

And here it would be appropriate to quote the wonderful thought of Prof. J. Campbell, who noted that **“the early history of Armenia and Persia were obtained thanks to Turanian documents and traditions.** Like most of the stories from Raja Tarangini (“History of the Kings of Kashmir”) is based on Turanian sources. Thanks to Turanian of which Asia Minor, not only Greek authors in the West could present their history, but many others also took it from the Illyrians, Etruscans, Celts due to the written traditions they preserved. In the oldest records preserved by Celtic and Scandinavian authors, it is these traditions that are incorporated more civilized Turanian peoples” (John Campbell “The Hittites. Their Inscriptions and their History”, 1890, in English, our translation).



Let me give you another example. The Hay-Armenians, who privatized the term “Armenians” and grabbed at any term based on the letter combination “Arm” as a straw leading to their antiquity, could not ignore the passage from Strabo’s “Geography”, which talks about Armen / Armenus (Here it would be appropriate to note, paradoxically, but according to the testimony of one of the Armenian academicians S.Ayvazyan, the word “armatura”, like all terms that have at their root the combination “arm”, is exclusively of Hay-Armenian origin). In the story narrated by Strabo, based on ancient Greek mythology, when the Argonauts were in search of the Golden Fleece and they were joined by a group of Thessalians led by Armen, Strabo writes: “According to legend, Jason, during his journey to Colchis, together with the Thessalian Armen, penetrated all the way to the Caspian Sea, and visited Iberia, Albania and most of Armenia and Media, as is proven by the sanctuary of Jason and some other monuments located there. **Armen, they say, came from Armenia**, one of the cities lying near Lake Bibeides between Thera and Larissa, his companions, as if “They would have populated Akilisena and Sisparitis as far as Kalakhana and Adiabena. **They say that the name of Armenia remains from the name of Armen.**” There is no doubt that the above passage from Strabo about Jason and Armen has a mythological and logical basis, but often myths reflect echoes and reminiscences of once existing events. As can be seen among the ancient authors of the Macedonian era,

there was an idea that the geographical name Armenia is a memory of the name of the Thessalian Armen and, therefore, it is to the heroes of the pre-Trojan era Jason and Armen that we owe this name. And here we see the ethnonymic basis of this term.

But it is also known from the source that in ancient Thessaly, inhabited by Pelasgians of Turanian origin, there was a city called Armenia / Ormenia, and it was through the territory of this toponym that a river called Araks, now called Penei, flowed.

So, the Thessalian Armen, the Thessalian city of Armenia, where the river Araks flowed and he and his companions called Araks a hydronym born in the mountains of Anatolia. As clearly follows from this mythological plot set forth by Strabo, neither he nor subsequent ancient authors associated the name "Armenia / Armeniya" with the Armenian ethnos (Armenians), much less with the current Armenian ethnos (Hay-Armenians).

**Thus, the appearance of the geographical term Armenia / Armeniya and its mention in ancient texts in no way agrees with the point of view of some modern historians that the Hay-Armenian ethnos and the Armenian language arose in connection with the appearance on the historical stage of the geographical names Armenia.**

And this was emphasized even by I. Dyakonov, who believed that “this point of view should be recognized as naive and in no way satisfactory” (I. M. Dyakonov “Prehistory of the Armenian People.” Yerevan, 1968).

Note that **the early Thessalians did not speak Greek. According to Herodotus, they spoke a Pelasgic language.** Herodotus, who spoke many languages of the Balkans and Asia Minor, did not understand the Pelasgian language and considered it “undoubtedly barbaric.” Herodotus wrote: “What language the Pelasgians spoke, I cannot say for sure. This can be judged by the present-day Pelasgians who live north of the Tyrsenians in the city of Creston (they were once neighbors of the tribe now called Dorians, and lived then in the country, now called Thessamiotis) and then according to those Pelasgians who founded Plakia and Scillacus on the Hellespont and turned out to be neighbors of the Athenians, as well as those other cities that were once Pelasgian and later changed their names. So, from this we can conclude that **the Pelasgians spoke a barbarian language.**”

Thus, Herodotus believed that the Thessalians spoke a Pelasgian language, alien, barbaric to the Hellenes, and many inhabitants of Greece, having Pelasgian origin, before Hellenization spoke this language of their own, the former name of Hellas is Pelasgia (Herodotus I, II). The same information was repeated by another ancient Greek author of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC Thucydides in his “History”, and Strabo in

“Geography” noted that “the Pelasgians were the most ancient of all the tribes that ruled in Greece. He emphasized the mobility and frequent migration of this tribe, just like the Roman author Plutarch in Comparative Lives. Romulus, noting the movement of the Pelasgians, emphasized that the city of Rome was founded and received its name from the Pelasgians “who went around almost the whole world.” Finally, many ancient authors reported that the Hellenes ousted the Pelasgians from Thessaly. The latter, having moved overseas to Italy, formed the Etruscan people, which the Romans called the Turks, and the Greeks called the Turchens. The Pelasgians who remained in Greece were assimilated. Herodotus believed that the last refuge of the Pelasgians was the island of Lemnos, where they remained in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC. The local stela with records of the Pelasgians allows us to completely reject the Indo-European idea of this language and, according to experts, establishes the relationship of this language with Etruscan and ethno-Cypriot (ethno-Cypriot).

**Summarizing the presented material, we state that Armen and his companions spoke the Pelasgian language of the Turanians and that the name “Armen” goes back to Turanian roots, therefore, about 3 thousand years ago, at least, speakers of the Turanian, proto-Turkic language were present in the region. Obviously,**

**this term had nothing to do with the Armenians.**

In conclusion, we will present an interesting thought from Prof. J. Campbell from a previously cited source. Campbell wrote that "the Turanians were the predecessors of the Arians and Semites in the lands of Asia Minor ... and it is therefore justified to search in the language of their representatives for the etymology of the most ancient terms, including personal names, geographical or mythological names within the Turanian empire."

**So, the presented links are enough to understand in what sense the term "Armenia / Armeniya" was used. This, on the one hand, is the name of a geographical area or toponym, or rather we bury it, and on the other hand, the name of an ethnic group or ethnonym. What unites them is that they have nothing to do with today's Armenia and the Hay-Armenians.**

- *What was the geographical area of Armenia / Armeniya?*

- Analyzing what semantic load the historical term Armenia / Armeniya carried, we will geographically outline the space to which this term was applied and find out who its

inhabitants were. These are the lands of Eastern Anatolia and this is the description given to them by a native of Kars (Eastern Anatolia), the famous Turkish historian Fakhraddin Kyrzioglu in one of his last works (joint) entitled “Türk Tarihinde Ermeniler” (“Armenians in the history of the Turks”), published in Ankara in 1995.

The lands bounded in the north by the Caucasus Range and the Black Sea, in the south by Kyzyl Ozen, Kerkuk and Sonchar-Dag in Syria, in the west by Malatya-Shukurov and the Asian Yrماغ, and in the east by lands up to the Caspian Sea were notable for the fact that that its river waters flowed into the four seas. It is for this reason that from ancient times and in various languages these lands were called “Yukarı-Eller” or “Yüksek-Ülke” (“Upper Lands” (regions) or “High Country”), i.e., land from which the waters flowed. As early as 1280 BC the lands in the north of the Greater Zab and the upper reaches of the Tigris, including the region near Lake Van, were described by the Assyrians in cuneiform texts in their Semitic language as Uru (high, yüksək) - Atru (country, ölkə), which in shortened form was represented as Ur-Artu (Ur-Artu). Or Urartu.

They, the Assyrians, also own a record in which they use as a geographical term the land that brings water to Assyria, the name Nairi (Nairi), i.e., Nehirler (Irmaklar) or “river, water” (Later they began to give Nairi a different meaning, namely “enemy”). A Turkish professor Shemseddin Günaltay (Ş. Günaltay “Yakın Şark II Anadolu”, Ankara, 1946) also wrote

about this. Somewhat later the name "R-R-T", i.e., without vowel, indicating these lands and which took place in earlier versions of the Bible, in the part "Genesis" (Genesis VIII, 4), was presented in later editions of the Bible already in vowel, i.e., with added vowels as "mountains of Ararat" or "Land of Ararat / countries of Ararat", as the resting place of Noah's ship, Noah's Ark.

They came from the southern steppes in the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC and the Aramaic Semites located on the lands of Diyarbakir began to call the northern lands of the upper reaches of the Tigris in their language as "Ar-Mina" / Har-Mina / Har-Min-yab, which in meaning also meant "Upper land / country" (here "Ar" = "high, upper", and "Mina" = "earth, country"). The same term was inherited by the Persians, who "adopted" Aramaic as a spoken language during their rule and applied this name to the peoples living at the sources of the Tigris and in the upper reaches of the Euphrates. This served as the basis for the inscription of King Darius I on the Behis-tun (Bisutun) rock in 515 BC. mention these lands in the form of Ar-Mina and Ar-Minia (geographically the current Elazig-Tunjeli segment). This was noted in their books: "Histoire Documentaire de l'Armenie des Ages du Paganisme" by the Armenian Catholic priest-historian Joseph Sandalgian (Rome, 1917, in French), as well as the French historian Rene Grousset, "Histoire de l'Armenie (des origins a 1071)", Paris, 1947, in French).

Later natives of Western Anatolia, the Ionians (ancient Greeks) **Hecataeus of Miletus (549-486 BC)** and Herodotus (484-425 BC), borrowing the Semitic geographical name (Armini, Armeniya) from the Persians, used the term “Armenya” (“Upper land, country”) in their works, and the inhabitants of this land were called “Armenioi” (Armenlər, Armenians, Armeniyans). And this became a tradition in subsequent Greek and Roman sources.

**As follows from the above, the terms “Yuxarı Ellər / High, Upper Land, Country”, “Urartu”, “Ar-mina / Ar-Minia”, “Armenya”, reflecting geographically approximately similar territory, also have a certain semantic identity, since they mean the same thing in different languages.**

Note that Herodotus called the east of Galis (Kyzylirmak) “Yukarı-Asiya” (Upper Asia), and the witness of the conquest of Constantinople (1453), the Byzantine Christobulus, held the same opinion, and in Xenophon’s “Anabasis” the campaign of the ten-thousanders was understood as hike to "Yukarı Eller" (Upper Lands).

We would like to note that

**“Armenya”, first of all, as a geographical term in certain historical periods meant both administrative division (the Herodotus era and the period of Achaemenid rule) and the religious affiliation of the inhabitants (the period of Christianity of its inhabitants).**



Academician Nikolai Marr, an expert on Grabar, explained the origin of the term “Armenya / Ermeni” by the division after the Council of Chalcedon in 451 of Christians into Orthodox (Orthodox) and Gregorians, as those who consumed pork and bred these animals and those who had it in prohibition, i.e. he believed that this term was used not in an ethnic, but in a geographical sense, and Armenians meant the same thing as the terms Anatolians, Balkans, Caucasians, Syrians expressed, in other words, it meant the inhabitants of the area of the geographical term “Armenya / Ermeni (Ermenli)”. It is unnecessary to remind that today’s Armenians, as before, call themselves Hayas and their country Hayastan.

Fakhraddin Kyrzioglu in the work we mentioned, with reference to the Armenian source - **Hrant Andreatsyan**, quite rightly notes that the hays adopted the name "Armenian / Ermeni" much later and it is not by chance that Armenian-Gregorian priests, such as Grigor from Ahlat, telling about Timur (events of 1393), calls Eastern Anatolia "Yukarı-Memleket" ("Upper Country"), or Grigor from Kemakh (west of Erzincan), mentioning the Jelairids, calls these lands "Yukarı Eyaletler" ("Upper Region"). In other words, Armenian authors have not yet used the term “Armenia”.

**The above clearly indicates that the term “Armeniya” was used primarily as a territorial-**

geographical concept, and also had a confessional meaning.

This term began to be used among the Hay-Armenians only in the Middle Ages, and this is precisely what the Armenian researcher F. Ekozyants points out in his work “Israel Ori. Pandora’s Box,” book 1.

- *As far as we know, the Hay-Armenians connect “their origins” not only with the Armenians, but also with the Arameans.*

- Indeed, some foreign researchers, for example, **St. Martin**, associated the term “Armini” with the word “Aram”, perhaps due to Strabo’s indication that the Armenians are related to the Semites, i.e., Arameans, Syrians and Arabs, as I mentioned above. And here it is important to find out who Strabo meant by the concept of “Armenians”: Armenian-Armenians living on the territory of Armenia, or High-Armenians. To this end, let’s take a look at the opinions of some scientists:

- I. Dyakonov: *“Hays never called themselves Armenians, Armenians”...*

- I. Chopin (*Russian Caucasian scholar of French origin*): *“Armenians and Hays are of different origins. It is difficult to understand that our scientists who study the history of Armenia, on the basis of which they allow themselves in all cases to*

*connect the history and name of the Hays and their homeland "Hayastan with the history of a completely different people and translate this word into Armenian. After all, it is clear that there is and cannot be anything in common between Armen, who came from the north of Japhetic origin, and the Hayks [hays] who came from the south of Semitic origin."*

I. Chopin believed that modern Hay-Armenians are a people who come from a mixture of Armenians, Parths, Hays and Jews, a people who have forgotten their roots and native self-name.

- N. Adonts (famous Armenian historian, book "Armenia in the Age of Justinian"): *"The Armenian nationality was formed from different not only tribal, but also racial elements."*

- N. Emin (Armenian author and translator): *"...The Gaikans [hai] are not Armenians but are a people of completely different origin."*

The point of view of I. Dyakonov, I. Chopin, N. Adonts, N.Emin convinces us that through the name Aram the Semitami could not have been the Armenian inhabitants of Armenia, but the Hay-Armenians.

It is known that the roots of the Hay-Armenian falsifications lead to M. Khorensky, and each subsequent falsification begins to acquire new lies. And it was with the "light hand" of this famous Hay-Armenian historian that the mythical images of the Hay ancestors were created, and the eponyms Aramaneak, Aramais, Aram and Hayk were included

in biblical stories. And it was M. Khorensky who noted that different peoples connected the country of the Hays with the name of Aram in the same way that the Greeks called them “Armenians”, the Persians and Syrians called them “Armeniks” (Book 1, Chapter 12).

However, history says that Aram is the head of a famous Semitic family. The Aramaic language served as a means of communication among the peoples of the Middle East and Mesopotamia; the New and Old Testaments were written in Aramaic.

This “innovation” of M. Khorensky led to the fact that the Hay-Armenians, who were Indo-Europeans, also wanted to become not only the ancient inhabitants of Armenia, a people of a completely different origin, but also Semites-Arameans.

All these historical truths did not have any special meaning for M. Khorensky, because at every opportunity he praised the “feats” of Aram, performed by him in the name of the “Hai people”. The fact that Aram appears in two guises - both as an eponym and as the leader of the High-Armenian people - is the result of the inventions of M. Khorensky.

**Thus, the Hay-Armenians, being Indo-Europeans, also want to become Armenian-Armenians and Semites-Arameans.**

**Why not use these reputable names? And it is absolutely no coincidence that modern Armenian historians and linguists**

**even write books on this topic (N. Mkrtychyan, “Semitic languages and Armenian”, Yerevan, 2005).**

*- What conclusions follow from what has been said?*

- Firstly, the inhabitants of ancient Armenia / Armeniya - Armenians or Armeniyans are not the current High-Armenians, but representing a collection of different tribes, they were called so due to their compact residence in this geographical area. Naturally, the name of the territory has nothing to do with present-day Hayastan/Armenia. Thus, the term Armenia/Armeniya and Armenian-Armenians have no relation to present-day Armenia and modern High-Armenians.

The languages that served for communication in this territory did not belong to the Hay-Armenians and were mainly the languages of the state entities that included Armenia as a geographical area.

Secondly, the lands of Armenia, located in Eastern Anatolia, have since ancient times been home to a number of autochthonous ethnic groups, such as the Hatti / Hittites, Hurrians, Subars, Alarodians-Urartians, and then the Cimmerians and Saks and other Turanian peoples - Chaldeans, Khalibians, taokov, etc. As for the Hays, from the moment of their appearance on these lands and subsequently, they never constituted a majority in the ethnic mass of Armenians and lived on the outskirts in the form of a small colony.

It would not hurt to recall here the opinion of one of the largest American Armenologists of Armenian origin, professor of political and social history at the University of Michigan, emeritus professor of political science at the University of Chicago Ronald Grigor Suni in his study "A View of Ararat: Armenia in New History" (Ronald Grigor Suni " Looking toward Ararat: Armenia in modern history"; Indiana University Press, 1993):

***"...Armenians are a special people because, firstly, they form a nation (or at least a nationality) living within another nation, and, secondly, they are a people who are often proud of their heritage, about which they have no idea..."***

***...For many [Armenians], pronounced (sharp) nationalism is a compensation for the lack of roots (rootlessness) and a substitute for historical knowledge."***

***"...From the point of view of basic culture and social structure - the two most important characteristics of the people, the differences between the indigenous Armenians and the current ones are much greater than any similarities."***

Thirdly, before coming to the territory of Armenia, the Hays, being under strong influence, were formed as an entity under the influence of the Arameans, who were Semites and called their ancestor Aram.

Fourthly, the term "Armi / Armi", dating back to the ancient Khatts, in the time of Herodotus carried the semantic load of a territorial-administrative unit of division, in the

Christian period it largely meant an ethnic massif made up of peoples who followed the Gregorian confession, and in the Middle Ages, when the bulk of the inhabitants of these lands, the Armenians, converted to Islam, the name “Armenia” was assigned to the Hays as an ethnonym.

Professor Syuni, describing the era of Trdat Arsacid, writes:

***“...Pre-modern Armenians considered themselves primarily a religious community, and much of what we consider a nationality today was contained in the religious identification of early times.”*** *Over the long years of Ottoman rule, religious identification was legitimized in the Armenian "millet" - a political formation through which the Armenians were ruled indirectly by the Sultan through the Armenian Patriarch in Istanbul. Rather than language or ethnicity, religion defined the people (millet) in the Ottoman Empire. In the Russian Empire, the Armenians were united into a single religious community under the religious and educational administration of the Catholicos in Etchmiadzin."*

Fifthly, the Hays, who privatized the ethnonym “Armenians” in the Middle Ages, pursued a number of goals: to appropriate the territory of the autochthons of these lands and falsify their history, turning it into the “History of the Hays”, which did not belong to them and also gained legitimacy in connection with the administrative reforms of Justinian in the

6<sup>th</sup> century and, from that time on, related the term “Armenia” to the current Hay-Armenians.

Regarding the language used during this period, it is no coincidence that the famous Armenian linguist E.G. Tumanyan wrote that “before the creation of Armenian writing, office work, as well as schooling and sermons in churches, were conducted in Syriac, Greek or Persian,” and Iranian there were so many borrowings that for a long time Armenian was considered part of the Iranian group and “gave reason ... to assume the Iranian origin of the Armenian language” (E.G. Tumanyan “Ancient Armenian language”, Ed., “Science”, M., 1971). And this point of view is about the use of Syriac, Greek and Persian in the period including the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD, is considered accepted in Armenian scientific circles.

*- So, what language was spoken in Armenia/Armeniyai?*

- We have repeatedly, based on sources, clearly shown that for a millennium there could be no rational of any Hay-Armenian statehood or language on the territory of Armenia.

Professor Suni, describing the era of Tigran, when for a very short time Armenia became a multinational empire and emphasizing that the institution of royal power was much weaker than ancient forms of social organizations, notes:

*"In no case should ancient Armenia be considered as a concept close to the national state in the modern sense. Here groups of principalities fought against each other, often*



*Armenian feudal lords entered into an alliance with non-Armenian forces and opposed their fellow Armenians. History of Arab patronage of the Bagratid family is also known as the closeness of the Mamikonyans with Byzantium..."*

Now let's give examples from the 5th century. BC, following Xenophon ("Anabasis"), from which the following conclusions can be drawn:

- In the so-called "Armenian kingdom" of the Orontids, where the satrap of Persian origin Orontes ruled and this territory ("Eastern Armenia") was subject to the Persian king, while the Carduks and their lands were independent, in the troops of Orontes there were Armenians (Armenians), Mards and the Chaldeans were mercenaries, i.e. The basis of the army was made up of regular Persian forces.

- As follows from the notes and comments of the translator of "Anabasis" M. Maksimova, "Armenians were the name of the union of tribes living in eastern and western Armenia," which "subsequently spread further to the east, uniting with the tribes living beyond Van and Urmia, and formed the Armenian kingdom."

Around the same time, the satrap of the Persian Empire Tiribaz ruled in western Armenia; this territory was also subject to the Persian king; in the Persian troops of Tiribaz, the mercenaries were representatives of the Khalib and Taokh tribes.

**The most important conclusion was that in both eastern and western Armenia the spoken language was Persian, and not some kind of High Armenian. And what is very important is that the villagers, starting with the village elders and ordinary villagers who were Armenians, communicated with the Greeks through their translators exclusively in Persian. It is most likely that during this period, Persian was the mother tongue of the majority of the Armenian population.**

**Next, moving in time about 5 centuries later, let us turn to Strabo ("Geography"), from what he wrote the following conclusions can be drawn:**

5 centuries after Xenophon, the commanders of Antiochus Seleucid Artaxius and Zariadrius expanded the territory of Armenia, where they ruled, and the Persian language of communication that had previously taken place in this territory was replaced by Aramaic. And again, there is no information about any Hay-Armenian language of communication, which confirms Xenophon's information about the absence of High-Armenian as a spoken language.

According to Strabo, the Syrians, Arabs and Armenians (Armenians), along with a common language, have similar features in their lifestyle, physical appearance and structure (here it should be noted that through the mythological name

Aram from Khorensky, according to Adonets, Emin, Chopin, kinship with the Semitic Arameans had nothing to do with the Armenians (Armenians) as a whole, but with the Hay-Armenian ethnic group).

**Having moved in time another 5 centuries, let us dwell on the works of Procopius of Caesarea (VI century AD, “On Buildings”).** The author, describing Armenia, especially dwells on the actions of the emperor (Byzantium) Justinian in Sophene and notes: “These are the ways in which he [the emperor] appeared as the savior of the **peoples of Armenia**, giving them security.” The foregoing allows us to conclude that even approximately 1000 years after the era of Xenophon, various peoples (tribes) lived on the territory of Armenia, as before, there is no information about the existence of the Hay-Armenian ethnic group as the titular nation. The above confirms the thesis about the name “Armenia” as a territorial-geographical concept, and completely refutes the far-fetched theses about the existence of Hay-Armenian kingdoms.

It should be noted that there are revelations from the Armenian figures themselves about the falsified Hay-Armenian kingdoms - the Yervantids, Arteshesids, Arsacids with the titular Hay-Armenian nation and a single spoken Hay-Armenian language.

Kerop Patkanov, a famous Armenian linguist-historian, in his work “Research on the dialects of the Armenian language” (St. Petersburg, 1869) pointed out that **“the various dialects**

**and dialects of the Armenian language** of our time are only modifications of one, **ancient, common to the entire Armenian language.**” **language nation, currently does not stand up to criticism.**”

The scientist drew attention to the fact that despite the numerous relocations of Armenians, Armenian settlers in new lands continued to use the same dialects that were common among the Armenians who remained in their native lands. This is what allowed K. Patkanov to make a very important conclusion about the existence of numerous dialects in the colloquial speech of Armenians from ancient times, supported by what was written in the 14<sup>th</sup> century famous Armenian writer Ioann Erzenkatsi about the presence of 8 dialects in different regions of Armenia at that time. In other words, the existing dialects of the Hay-Armenian language are by no means various distortions of some ancient literary language, but only “successors of the dialects of the Armenian tribes that existed from ancient times,” writes K. Patkanov. And then he continues: “We would hardly be mistaken if we say that the language of Khorensky and others of his contemporaries was not spoken.” The author proves the thesis that **“the modern folk dialects of the Armenians existed almost in the same form until the 5<sup>th</sup> century, when the first translators of Christian Armenia from the court language formed that conventional literary language,** which for the Armenians until the beginning

of this century [is in view of the 19<sup>th</sup> century] was the same as the Latin language of Europe of the Middle Ages."

The Armenian scientist admits that this "single" stillborn and contrived language, if it could ever have been spoken, "judging by the forms and relative completeness of the words, **no later than the Parthian dynasty in Armenia**, therefore, 150 years BC." It follows from this that if the Armenian author admits the hypothetical possibility of the existence of a single language, he relates it to the era before the establishment of the power of the Greater Arsacids on the territory of Armenia and the creation of Arsacid rule here.

Meanwhile, the point is not only that there was no common spoken language among the Hay-Armenians, but, first of all, that the geographical space called Armenia from the point of view of the inhabitants was an unmixed heterogeneous ethnic community, consisting of various tribes mainly of Asia Minor and Turkic (Turanian) origin, among which the High-Armenian tribes were represented in small numbers.

- *What tribes and peoples lived in Armenia / Armeniya?*

- To answer this question, let us turn to the description of the inhabitants of the territory of Armenia (Armeniya) of the era that preceded the Arsacid "kingdom" and partially affected it (late BC - early AD), which was presented by the famous Armenian author Joseph Sandalzhyan (J. Sandalgian) in his book "Histoire documentaire de l'Armenie des ages du

paganisme (1410 av.-305 apr. Y-C)”, which translated from the original French language sounds like “Documentary history of Armenia in the pagan era (1410 BC) AD-305 AD)”. The book was published in 1917 in Rome Imprimerie du Senat by the publishing house de Q.Bardi. As is clear from the title of the source, the historical narrative covers the time of pre-Christian Armenia, including the lands not only Eastern Anatolia (now called Western Armenia in Hay-Armenian sources), but also the so-called Eastern Anatolia and around it, which the Armenians still claim. The author presents a list of 13 tribes (peoples), and in this list most of which is of Turkic, Turanian origin.

We provide a list of these tribes and peoples, taking into account the comments of the famous Turkish historian, a native of the territory of Kars, i.e., lands in question, Fakhraddin Kyrzioglu (F. Kirzioğlu "Kars tarihi"):

- The Gogu tribes are the descendants of the legendary leader of the Sakas, Gogu, who lived in the northern part of the lands of Pitashkha, from which the names of the provinces of Gogaren / Gugark come from;

- The Saka tribes, who lived on the territory of Ganja-Karabakh and from whose name the name Sakasena comes;

- The Avors / Aors tribes who lived in the Maku region, who are also known as Avars, who later spread to the territory of Lake Goycha-gel / Alagez (Aragats), and from which the name Avaran comes.

- The Sirakov / Shirakov tribes, who lived along the river. Arpa-chai in Shiraken / Shuregel with its center in Shirawakan;
- The Averelyan tribes, which literally means “Eastern”, lived in Pasen;
- The Mard tribes, who lived in the area of Agrydag (Ararat) and Kzyl-ozen-Agzy and, most likely, gave the name to Mardin / Merdin;
- Tribes of the Parthians (Parthians), who created the state of the Lesser Arsacids (Arshakuni), including the descendants of the Arsacians (Arshakuni) and who came from the same ethnic root of the Suren-Pakhlavs, the descendants of Gregory the Illuminator, who brought Christianity;
- Kamsarakan tribes (beks), who came from the Karen-Pakhlava branch of the Arsacids, who came from Hamadan and settled in the southern and eastern parts of the Kars province (in 310-722 AD they were the rulers of Armenia);
- The Orbelian tribes (beks), who came with their army from Chenastan (East Turkestan) to Georgia and led the army here (commanders), who came from the Uch-Ok (Three Arrows) branch, who received patrimonial lands in Armenia, lived in Northern Pitashkha (Turanian-Turkic in origin);
- The Mamikonyan tribes (beks) - from the descendants of Mamyka and Gonak, who came from Chenastan (Eastern Turkestan), hereditarily led the command of the troops in 315-582. AD, national heroes, owners of patrimonial estates and were of Turkic-Hunnic origin;

- Vanand (Banand) tribes - came in 202 BC from the North Caucasus, settled in the flat area of Kars and hence the name “Balanglar (Ba-langlar)” and came from a branch of the Bulgar-Turks;

- Bulgar tribes - who came after the Vanands from the North Caucasus, settled in Bayburt-oba (territory called “Pariadres” in ancient times) and from whose ethnic name the name Barkar / Bal-kar comes, also Turks by origin;

- The Bagratuni tribes, who believed that they came from the ethnic roots of David, were the “crown-laying” and chief viziers, later one of the branches in 899-1001 were the kings of Abkhazia - Kartli, and the other branch (Gregorian) in 885-1064 rules in Ani.

**What can we say in connection with the list of inhabitants of Armenia given by Sandalzhiyan?** As we see, the bulk of the tribes are of Turanian or proto-Turkic origin. Despite the fact that the author considers the High-Armenians to be autochthons of Armenia, the given list clearly indicates that among the leading ones (namely, they are given) the Hay-Armenians are not listed. It is for this reason that Sandalzhiyan’s book was initially met with hostility by the Armenians. As Kyrzioglu notes, “since there was no place for the Hay-Armenians in Armenia, all the years after its publication until today, “Armenian chauvinistic circles remain silent about the existence of such a book, any copy that appears is destroyed,



just as the original copies were destroyed, and “in The bibliography never mentions the author's name.”

Along with this, it becomes obvious that Hays and Armenians are not synonymous ethnonyms. Apparently, the Hays were called Armenians in the Middle Ages, after the adoption of Islam by the bulk of the inhabitants of Armenia and a lot of lies about historical Armenia were perpetrated with the special support of the Mkhitarins - Hay monks who became Catholics and were debunked by F. Ekozyants.

I repeat that Seneca the Younger was right when he said that

“Some lie in order to deceive, while others will lie because they themselves are deceived.”

It seems that the more real information, scientific facts, the less hi the Armenian lie and those deceived by this lie.