

სპეკალი

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის თბილისის
სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის ჰუმანიტარულ
მეცნიერებათა ფაკულტეტის რეცენზირებადი
ელექტრონული ბილინგვური სამეცნიერო ჟურნალი

ISSN 1987-8583

SPEKALI

Electronic Bilingual Scholarly Peer-Reviewed Journal of the Faculty of
Humanities at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

ISSN 1987-8583

2010

N1

Contents

1. Apolon Tabuashvili. Materials on the History of the Town of Tskhinvali.	3
2. Darejan Tvaltvadze. Georgian Written Sources on Cyril of Alexandria's Exegetical Catenae	15
3. Elene Medzmariashvili. Third Wave Georgian Immigrant Women in the USA: Problems of Americanization	25
4. Vakhtang Imnaishvili. Was it in 1928 that the data about Georgian manuscripts kept at the University of Graz became known in Georgia for the first time?	34
5. Zurab Papaskiri. On National, Political and Cultural Self-Identity of the Sharvashidze Princedom	41
6. Lia Akhaladze. The Culture of Writing in Medieval Abkhazia	51
7. Otar Gogolishvili. The Fight of the Anti-Soviet Parties Against the Bolshevik Power in Adjara (1921)	56
8. Konstantine Bregadze. Poetics of Grigol Robakidze's Novel	64
9. Maia Shukhoshvili. Structural and Compositional Organization of Plato's Sophists	71
10. Nana Gaprindashvili. Discourse of Socialist Realism and Some Peculiarities of Georgian Soviet Literature	82

Materials on the History of the Town of Tskhinvali

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/7

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Apolon Tabuashvili](#)

In the late feudal period Tskhinvali was referred to as one of the towns in the East Georgia. In the written sources the name of the town is presented in different ways: Krtskhinvali, Qrtskhinvali or Qtskhinvali, etc. All variations of the name of the town must be derived from the hornbeam which was widely spread in the Liakhvi gorge [Tsozniashvili, 1961: 13-14]. A French traveller Jan Sharden did not mention Tskhinvali as a town [see, Sharden, 1965]. We can state with confidence that in the second half of the 18th century Tskhinvali was already given the status of a [1]. The foreign travelers and observers visiting the Kingdom of Kartl-Kakheti referred to Tskhinvali as a town. In the demographic record dated from the 5th April, 1770 which was composed for passing to the representative of the Board of Russia's Foreign Affairs, Tskhinvali was named as town [Gamrekeli... 1973: 152][2]. Concerning the Tskhinvali population Vakhushti renders: "*It is mostly populated by Georgians, Armenians, and Jews*" [Vakhushti, 1941: 76]. According to Jacob Reinegs's data who was invited to the court of the Kingdom of Kartl-Kakheti in 1778-1781, in the villages of the Liakhvi gorge "there are lots of Jews the majority of whom reside in the town of Qsinvali or Krts[kh]invali" [Reinegs, 2002: 149]. In demographic record of 1770 it was mentioned: "There is the town of Qtskhinvali and it is populated by Orthodox Georgians, Armenians and Jewish migrants counted 700 households" [Gamrekeli... 1973: 152].

Detailed information concerning Tskhinvali population of the second half of the 18th century is presented in the document #1606 of Hd Fund kept at the National Centre of Manuscripts. This is rather big incomplete scroll which represents the census of Shida Kartli population including the town of Tskhinvali. While working on his book, the researcher of the history of Tskhinvali of the feudal period, Mikheil Tsozniashvili had the mentioned document at his disposal and even used it. However, he did not consider it necessary to publish the text. In our view, the publication of this extremely important document will be of interest for the researchers in the history of social, demographic, ethnic or local families of both Tskhinvali population and Shida Kartli, and a wide circle of readers[3]. As was mentioned the scroll in which the census of Tskhinvali population is included, is incomplete and, hence, the date of compilation is not indicated. M.Tsozniashvili dated the Book to the nineties of the 18th century. The author states that the surnames and names mentioned in the Book give the ground for this, although he does not specify them [Tsozniashvili, 1986: 193]. We consider that the proposed dating is not correct and needs revision. In this book a well known statesman of the 1770-1790s of the 18th century Otari Revazis-dze Amilakhvari is referred to as a *minbash* (head of 1000 men) and from the other part of the Book it appears that Otari Amilakhvari had the title of *amilakhvari* which means the right-wing commander. In the historical documents Otari is referred to as a *minbash* in the middle of the seventies and beginning of the eighties of the 18th century. Then he was appointed as a commander and took the honourable title of *Amilakhvari*[4]. From the written

sources it is evidenced that Otari had been *Amilakhvari* since 1786-1787. Hence, the census must have been taken before he was appointed a commander, approximately at the verge of the 1770-1780s of the 18th century. It is known that the census of the Kartli-Kakheti population was conducted in 1781 [Javakhishvili, 1967: 105-247; Takaishvili, 1951: 35][5] and the Book at our disposal must be dated namely from 1781.

The Book gives some information on economic history of the town: some persons are referred to by their profession. For example, Tamaz the *mechite* (cotton weaver), Masura the *mekvabe* (coppersmith), Gaspar the *mechakhmakhe* (locksmith), etc.

In accordance with the rules of that time, the Book contains the data not per head but per household and *tavi*[6] or the number of males. The Book provided with accurate information on the number of the town population. By that time Tskhinvali was populated by 130 households. This figure considerably yields the data of demographics from April 5, 1770, according to which the Tskhinvali population counted 700 households. Based on these data M. Tsotniashvili expressed an opinion as if after the year of 1770 during several years the Tskhinvali population abruptly reduced by 83.5% [Tsotniashvili, 1986: 197]. We consider this assumption is not valid. This is evidenced from the following facts: 1. All data provided by foreign travellers or Georgian sources indicate that Gori was the second-largest town in Kartli after Tbilisi which population according to the record of 1770 and some other sources did not exceed 500 households. Therefore there is little probability that Tskhinvali, which was referred to as a small town, had had more households (700) than Gori; 2. From 1770 till the beginning of 1780 there did not occur any disaster in Kartli that could have caused the reduction of at least the population of one town. Moreover, that this period for the Kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti is considered as calm and advanced period. It is true, according to Oman Kherkheulidze's narration, in 1772 the Akhalsikhe Pasha who came from Ottoman Turkey, captured around 600 inhabitants being outside of the Tskhinvali fortress [Kherkheulidze, 1984: 66] but even this fact cannot explain such an abrupt decrease of the population (by 83%). Moreover that captain Lvov in his report recorded only 300 people taken in captivity [Tsotniashvili, 1961: 62]. Besides this, Oman Kherkheulidze indicates that after negotiations Ottoman Sultan returned these captives back to the King Erekle. Therefore, the number of Tskhinvali population (700 households) presented in demographic record of 1770, is in question.

One of the publishers of this record V.Gamrekeli suggests: "...*Probably the households from the villages attached to Tskhinvali along the Liakhvi Gorge are also included into the total number of households*" [Gamrekeli, 1976:65]. The author proceeds from the argument that there is no separate mentioning of the Georgian population of Samachablo region and, naturally, it was implied in Tskhinvali population. We completely share this view and add that Ioane Batonishvili describes Tskhinvali and the gorges around it just in this way [Batonishvili, 1986: 40-41]. If we carefully observe the Census Book, it becomes clear that Tskhinvali population in this period was not only reduced but it had even been increased. Compact resettlement of the representatives of the merchants from the town of Ali [7] makes us suppose this. This points out to a kind of prevention carried by the royal court in order to increase the population of Tskhinvali. Also, there were registered 19 *tarkhani* or the household free from the

royal taxes. It is a known fact that the king Erekle II freed all migrants and these free peasants must have been just new settlers. In the seventies of the 18th century the status of a town granted to Tskhinvali by the King seems to be a result of all these measures.

The document provides us with accurate information on the number of the feudal lords and their serfs. The most of the serfs in the town were the property of the King. The owners of serfs were the Batonishvili, the Queen, the Machabeli, Amilakhvari, Kherkheulidze, Begtabegishvili, etc. It is also interesting to note that their serfs in Tskhinvali were not the common property of the mentioned feudal clans. They were in private property of various noblemen. This proves that common property had been broken by that time and peasants were redistributed to various families.

The Census Book accurately reflects the ethnic picture of town dwellers according to which there lived only Georgians, Armenians and representatives of the Jewish ethnos.

The National Centre of Manuscripts Hd - 1606. Census Book of the population of Shida Kartli. Dots are used as divisions. Tskhinvali is referred to as "Qtskhinvali". The abbreviation Ch. stands for Christ.

Ch. Qtskhinvali nobleman Unadze^[8] Mamuka, his son Tetia and Pavle household a, *tavi g*.

Ch. here nobleman Garsevanishvili Ivane household a, *tavi a*.

Here free peasants:

Ch. The elder of the family Muradashvili Stefane household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Shedanashvili Shoshia, priest Qristesia and Nonia household a, *tavi g*.

Ch. Here Ceradze priest Ioane, Gogia, Bejan, David, Qristesia, Sosia, Levan, Ninia, Andria, Toma household a, *tavi i*.

Ch. Tetia, the son of Maisuradze Bejan household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Maisuradze Khosro and Ninia household a, *tavi b*.

Ch. Here Chitiashvili Gogia the seller and his brother Berua household a, *tavi b*.

Ch. Here Masiashvili the monk, his brother Ivane and Gogia household a, *tavi g*.

Ch. Here Lomkatsashvili Gogia, his nephew Bejana household a, *tavi a*^[9].

Ch. Here Eliashvili Avtandil household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Gamchenashvili Darchia household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Oghanashvili Ter Moses household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Tseradze Tetia the landless peasant household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Unadze Gogia the landless peasant household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Khanuashvili Petre and Shermazan Topchi household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. Here Muradashvili Gabriel household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Unadze Mamuka's serf Seirishvili Gabriel household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Shedanishvili Shoshia's serf Gharibashvili Berika household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Also his serf the landless peasant Loma, Berika household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here His landless peasant Chagelishvili Sekhnia household a, *tavi* a.[\[10\]](#)

Here Qtskhinvali, the Batoni's[\[11\]](#) peasants on quitrent:

Ch. Khojashvili Khosro household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here monk Iaralashvili's brother Ter Melkiseti, Givi, Gabriel household a, *tavi* g.

Ch. Here Muradashvili Kazara, Ter Parsegha and Givi household a, *tavi* g.

Ch. Here Lalashvili Ghtisavara household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Iaralishvili Ioseb household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Okhanashvili Baghdasara, his brother Ter Stefana household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. Here Shadadgulashvili Ter Afriama, his brother Mosea household a, *tavi* g.

Ch. Here Markozashvili Bejan household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Khojashvili Ioseb [household a], *tavi* a

Ch. Here Hebrew Mamistvalashvili Mardikha, his cousin Abram household a, *tavi* b.[\[12\]](#)

Ch. Here Hebrew Mamistvalashvili landless peasant Abramia householder.

Ch. Here Hebrew Israilashvili Isrela and Suriela Bogano household a.

Ch. Tamarasheni Hebrew, the King's peasant on quitrent Davitashvili Maniokh, his brother Shalom and his son Elia household a.

Ch. Here Qtskhinvali Dzagia's serf purchased Gakhelidze Gogia household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Fris Queen's serf Mchedlidze Ninia, Mose, Katsia, Shio, household a, *tavi* d.

Ch. Here Ioseb Greek's serf Kobaladze monk's nephew Svimon household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Mtatsminda's serf tax-free peasant Baibukhisshvili Ivane and Petre household a, *tavi* b.

Here Qtskhinvali free peasants of feudal lords:

Ch. Kvanchakhadze Davit and Mosike household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. Here Kvanchakhadze Gabriel, his brother Iakob and Ioseb household a, *tavi* g.

Ch. Here Kvanchakhadze Svimon, his brother Ivan household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. Here Kevlashvili Bejan, his brother Gabriel household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. Here Bakuzanashvili Ivan, his brother Tetia household a, *tavi* b.

Here Tskhinvali Kherkheulidze's serves:

Ch. Kherkheulidze David's serf the son of Kanduashvili Givi household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. His serf Dalaqishvili Iese, his brother Petre and Zurab household a, *tavi* g.

Ch. Here his serf from Ali Kakuashvili Estate household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Kherkheulidze Aghatang's serf Chamovardnashvili Davit and his brother Sosia and Mamidjan and Elib household a, *tavi* d.

Here Qtskhinvali Farsadan Machabeli's serf:

Ch. Kasradze priest Ioseb and his cousin Giorgi and Tetia household a, *tavi* g.

Ch. Here his serf Champuridze Masura household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Berishvili Gogia, his nephew Davit household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. Here his serf Svimonashvili Gogia household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here his serf Eranashvili Faremuz landless peasant household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Serf Miselashvili Papuna household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here migrant Zazashvili Petre and Qites household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. Here Qtskhinvali his serf Nabichvrishvili Ioane household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here his serf Champuridze monk household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Nabichvrishvili Khosro household a, *tavi* a.

Here Qtskhinvali Machabeli Badurishvili Bardzim's serf:

Ch. Javakhishvili Bejan, household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here his serf Hebrew Khukhashvili Shapat and Elia household a.

Qtskhinvali Begtabegian's serf:

Ch. Sulkhan Mdivani's serf Makhniashvili Gabriel household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Sulkhan Mdivani's serf Makhniashvili monk household a.

Ch. Here Solomon Mdivani's serf Berenishvili Mose Sheudzlebeli household a.

Ch. Here Solomon Mdivani's serf Berunishvili Gogia household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here His serf Berunishvili Ivane and his brother Giorgi household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here His serf Nabakhteveli Jamierashvili Ghtisia household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here His serf Nabakhteveli Jamierashvili barber Otari household a, [*tavi a*].

Ch. Here Solomon Mdivani's serf from Ali Amiragashvili Osef household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Avtandil Mdivani's serf Kharshiladze Shio and Ninia household a, *tavi b*.

Here Tskhinvali Alelians:

Ch. Alelian Kulijanashvili) village elder Bagdasar and Svimon household a, *tavi b*.

Ch. Here Kulijanashvili)Batonjana, his serf Osef Anton household a, *tavi g*.

Ch. Here Papuashvili Gabriel household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Terpetrozashvili Moses, his brother Ter Mikel household a, *tavi b*.

Ch. Here Dotashvili Beri household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Merabashvili Merab, his brother Mose household a, *tavi b*.

Ch. Here Enakolopashvili Paata, his brother Zurab household a, *tavi b*.

Ch. Here Kulijanashvili Griqor his brother Sarqis household a, *tavi b*[\[13\]](#)

Ch. Here Janinashvili Avtandil household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Begalashvili Gogia and Gabriel household a, *tavi b*.

Ch. Here Rusinashvili Manuchar household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Satuashvili Akof household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Shaverdashvili Aruten household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Ter Arekelashvili Ter BaGdasar and Ter Ioan household a, *tavi b*.

Ch. Here Khojashvili Mamajana, his brother Aruten household a, *tavi b*.

Ch. Here Ter Simona's Arutenashvili Davit household a, *tavi a*.

Ch. Here Kichikashvili Berua household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Goginashvili Miqel and Arthur household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. Here The Hebrew Khakham, Binia household a.

Ch. Here The Hebrew Shaloma household a.

Ch. Here The Hebrew Gagul household a. [\[14\]](#)

Ch. Here Alelian Mamijanashvili Gabriel household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Alelian Khitarashvili Arutin household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Kulijanashvili) Iese Sheudzlebeli household a. [\[15\]](#)

Ch. Here Alelians Elene Batonishvili's serf Alkhazishvili Kaikhosro, his brother Katso household a, *tavi* b.

Qtskhinvali Otar Minbashi's serf:

Ch. Davitashvili Avetiqa's sons Davit, Kazara and Solomon household a, *tavi* g.

Ch. Here His serf landless peasant the gardener Berua household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here His serf landless peasant Mechite Tamaz household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here Qtskhinvali Amilakhvarishvili Givi's serf Kolelishvili Nacvali Iese household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. His serf Bochoridze Mamuka and Ivane household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. His serf Khanjalashvili Berua and Bagdua household a, *tavi* b.

Ch. **Qtskhinvali** Queen's serf Hebrew from Surami Eliashvili Abramia.

Ch. Qtskhinvali Hebrew Eliashvili Abram, Moshe and Danel from Akhaldaba household a.

Ch. Qtskhinvali Hebrew Imedishvili Abram, his brother Daniel from Akhaldaba household a.

Ch. Here Hebrew from Akhaldaba Manasher, Katsoba, his brother Abram and Iskhak, household a

Ch. Here Hebrew from Akhaldaba Khundiashvili Ioseb household a.

Ch. migrant commander *saxldxuc*'s (sakhldkhutsi) serf grocer Stefan, household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here migrant citizen Queen's serf Almakhanashvili Mikirtum household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here migrant from Tkviobi Tighveli Kavadze Gogi the of Batonishvili Giorgi's serf household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here migrant Bakmeli Bliadze Ivane household a, *tavi* a.

Ch. Here migrant Queen's serf shopkeeper Gogi, his brother-in-law the serf David household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant the serf of Batonishvili Giorgi bu[su]si Estate household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Hebrew Atenelashvili Elia and Moshia Batonishvili Giorgi household a, the serf of Batonishvili Iulon

Ch. Here migrant Anakhanum queen's serf Karakhanashvili Ohaneza household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant town dweller Golinashvili locksmith Gaspar household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant blacksmith Aslanashvili Burua and Khitara household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Echmiadzin serf Teghbazashvili Papa and his brother David household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Mukhranbatoni's serf Ghambarashvili Arutun and Berua household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here Tarkhnishvili Glakha's serf Amilashvili Grigor household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Tarkhnishvili Zaza's serf Gongladze Pavle household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant His own serf Papakerashvili Arutin's son Osepa and Gogia Tarkhnishvili

Ch. Here migrant Zurabishvili's serf Giorgishvili Berua Tarkhnishvili household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Iarali Eshikagha-bash's serf Rostevanashvili Gogia household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Tbileli's serf Metsiskvilishvili's Glakha and Otar Tarkhnishvili household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Iulon Batonishvili's serf Darchiashvili beri household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Giorgi Batonishvili's serf from Axalgori boilersmith Masura household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Natlismtsemli's serf Mosesashvili Qazara household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Kbila Grigorashvili's serf weaver Gogia household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Avtandil Kherkheulidze's serf Tsabadze Ivane household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Echmiadzin's serf Maranashvili Akop household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Kvatakhevi Ghvismshobli's serf Meurmishvili Petre household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant Brodzveli Kaikhosro his brother Saam household a, *tavi a.*

Ch. Here migrant David Okromchedlishvili's serf Metskhvarishvili Gogia household a, *tavi a* [16] [MS, Hd-1606].

[1] Tskhinvali was referred to as a town by Russian officials being in Georgia in 1769-1772: Lvov, Khvabelov [Tsagareli, 1891: 353, 428], member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Giuldenshtedt [Giuldenshtedt, 1964:267], German traveler Jakob Reinegs [Reinegs, 2002: 149], etc.

[2] There is a mistake in therecord issued by A.Khakhnashvili where instead of Tskhinvali Tsilkani is mentioned. Based on this publication I.Dolidze issued the record again in 1965. However, the same mistake is made there too [Dolidze, 1965: 420-422].

[3] Proceeding from the volume of the paper not complete text of the Book is published but only that part which contains the census of the town of Tskhinvali.

[4] The title of *Amilakhvari* had only the right-wing commanders who at the same time were "the heads of noble house". Other members of this noble house were referred to as Amilakhvarishvili. This rule was strictly observed and it was impossible to break it.

[5] In the 1770-1790's the censuses were conducted in 1774 [Takaishvili, 1907:407; 1951:5; Javakhishvili 1967:145,183], in 1781 [Javakhishvili, 1967:105-247; Takaishvili, 1951:5], in 1790 [Akopashvili, 1976:353], and in 1794 [Javakhishvili, 1918:36].

[6] In medieval Georgia the practical value of taking census was that it provided the data on levy taxes and men fit for military service and that is why registration operated only by households and men living in this household.

[7] The town of Ali was ruined in the 18th century and its population resettled in different towns of Kartli, including Tskhinvali.

[8] The census of Kartl-Kakheti feudal lords compiled in 1783 and loane Batonishvili's "Brief description of surnames of the Georgian nobility" name the feudal lord Uznadze, and loane Batonishvili indicates that the Uznadzes "reside in the Liakhvi gorge" [Dolidze, 1965: 486; Bagrationi, 1997:64]. So it is very likely that it is technical mistake made by a census taker and there must be written Uznadze, though in other places of the Book this feudal lord is referred to in the same way.

[9] This line is corrupted in the text.

[10] This line is corrupted and has the following inscription: "He left for Kakheti with family".

[11] "Batoni" means the King's serf.

[12] The symbol of *tavi* is corrupted.

[13] "His brother Sarkis" is erased in the text and hence the number of males or *tavi* after "b" is denoted with "a".

[14] The last two lines are corrupted in the text.

[15] The last three lines are written at the edge of the scroll. The first two lines in the text are corrupted.

[16] There is an inscription: "This is the man who took from Abiatar".

References

Akopashvili G. 1976	Jubilee volume devoted to I.Javakhishvili 100th Anniversary. On commandment in Georgian Kingdom. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Bagrationi Ioane 1986	Kartli-Kakheti Census. Text prepared, supply with bibliography by T.Enukidze and G.Bedoshvili. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Bagrationi Ioane 1997	Brief description of surnames of the Georgian nobility. Edited and published by Z.Katselashvili. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Gamrekeli V. 1976	The population of the East Georgia according to the census of 5th April 1770. Proceedings of the Georg.Acad.Sci. Philosophy, Psychology, Economics and Law Series. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Gamrekeli V., Tskitishvili Z. 1973	Demographic data of 5th April 1770. Proceedings of the Georg.Acad.Sci. History, Archeology, Ethnography and History of Art Series. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Giuldenshtedt 1964	Giuldenshtedt's travel to Georgia. Translated from German by G.Gelashvili. Georg. Acad. Sci. Volume I, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Dolidze I. 1965	Monuments of Georgian Law. Text prepared. Supplied with commentaries by I.Dolidze. Vol. II, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Vakhushti Batonishvili 1941	Census of the Kingdom of Georgia. Edited. by T.Lomouri and N.Berdzenishvili. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Takaishvili E. 1951	Statistical description of the Ksani Saeristavo. Coll.works of the Tbilisi State University. Vol.45, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Materials... 1907	Materials of Georgian statistical description in the 18th century. Edited and foreword by E.Takaishvili, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Reinegs J. 2002	Jacob Reinegs's traveling to Georgia. Translated from German, with introduction and bibliography by G.Gelashvili, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Sharden Zh. 1935	Traveling to Georgia. Translated from French by V.Barnov. Edited by Sh.Radiani. Tiflis.
Tsotniashvili M. 1986	The History of Tskhinvali (Tskhinvali in feudal epoch) Tskhinvali.
Tsotniashvili M. 1961	On the History of Tskhinvali. Staliniri (Tskhinvali)
Kherkheulidze O. 1984	The reign of the King Erekle II. Text prepared and supplied with glossary and comments by L.Mikiashvili, Tbilisi.
MS	(National Centre of Manuscripts) Hd-1606

Javakhishvili I. 1967	Monuments of Georgian economic history. Book I. Population Census Books of the East Georgia in the 18th century
Javakhishvili I. 1918	Towns, urban rules and life in Georgia in the 17th-18th centuries. J.Promete #1.
Tsagareli A. 1891	Charters and other historical documents of the 18th century related to Georgia. Vol.I, St.Petersburg (in Russian).

Georgian Written Sources on Cyril of Alexandria's Exegetical Catenae

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/10

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Darejan Tvaltvadze](#)

The study of ancient translations existing in the Georgian language is of great significance for investigation of Georgian literature as well as the literature of those countries a monument was translated from. Due to the fact that in the course of its centuries-old history Georgian literature had close relations with Byzantine literature, it can be said that at modern stage of the development of Byzantinology scholarly research of the number of issues of the Byzantine literature has become impossible without taking into consideration Georgian sources.

Old Georgian literature is of particular importance because it contains extremely interesting and valuable information related to Byzantine authors. From this viewpoint especially rich and significant material is provided by the eleventh-century Georgian translator Ephrem Mtsire in his colophons, comments "«mtargmnelis mozrakhuli" and footnotes in which besides the data on a single Byzantine author, there is reasoning on significant issues of the Christian Greek literature.

One of Ephrem's colophons, namely translator's commentary added to his own translation of the commentaries on Paul's epistles [Ath.18:235-238] and one epistle of Cyril of Alexandria named by the translator as a source to attest the facts mentioned in it [Ath.18:238-241; Ath.39:16v-17v] provides an important material for making some issues of the history of Christian exegetics more precise, namely, when and by whom the first exegetic collection, *catenae* (in Latin *catenae*, in Greek *seirá*) in which the commentaries on biblical books written by the Church Fathers are collected, was composed; on which sources did the compiler of this collection rely; what was the form and content of the first *catenae*; what further change did this collection undergo; which redaction did the Georgian translators have as an original and how important are the translations preserved in the Georgian language for the history of Byzantine literature in general and particularly, for the researchers of the literary heritage of Cyril of Alexandria.

As we mentioned above, Ephrem Mtsire's colophon is attached to his own translation of the commentaries on Paul's Epistles. The manuscript which has preserved the translator's colophons containing unique bibliographical information is dated from the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries and contains one part of the text of the commentaries on the epistles of Paul the Apostle [Danelia, 1982:315-318; Epistles of Paul ... 2003:310-352], namely, from the commentaries on the epistles to Hebrews - to the end [Ath.18:13-235] that is followed by translator's colophon [Ath.18:235-238], which has the following title in the manuscript: "The evidence based on the materials collected from numerous books concerning the creation of this manuscript".

The purpose of the colophon, as it is evident from the title, is as follows: with the help of God a translator should briefly announce as to *"how this book has been compiled on the basis of exhaustive commentaries"* [Ath.18:235]. But before touching upon the question as to who composed the short compiling collection and how, Ephrem starts consideration of the reasons which caused the abridgment of an exhaustive exegetical composition written by John Chrysostom in which the commentaries on each chapter of the Apostolic Books by paragraphs is followed by an extensive "homily" of John Chrysostom (*"John Chrysostom's commentaries include extensive chapters and preaching, and are divided into numerous books"* [Ath.18:235]). The Georgian scribe considers the volume of the text to be the reason of its division into several books and hence the difficulty in buying the book: *"Due to the division into numerous books poor men had difficulty of buying it"* [Ath.18:235]. In his opinion, this was the reason why it became vital to abridge the Epistle explanations written by John Chrysostom at dictation of Paul the Apostle himself. The Omniscient God cared for this too in advance and a concise commentary according to John Chrysostom's extensive commentaries had been compiled not by an ordinary man but by St. Cyril the Archbishop of Alexandria to which the Cyril added the commentaries picked from the reasoning of other Church Fathers and thus collected the commentaries written for interpretation of the Apostle's word in one volume.

While reasoning as to how and what method and with the use of which sources, Cyril created his compilatory work, Ephrem Mtsire relies on the primary source, namely the Epistle of Cyril of Alexandria (*"The reference to this is found in the Epistle of Great Cyril of Alexandria"*) [Ath.18:235], which has the following title in the manuscript *"The Epistle of our Church Father, Cyril the Archbishop of Alexandria, who made commentaries on all prophetic books and wrote many other books sent to the other Bishop who asked him to write short commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle"* [Ath.18:238-241;Ath.39:16v-17v]. According to the title, the addressee of this Epistle of Cyril, i.e. *"another Bishop"* seems to be the one who ordered short commentary on Apostolic which is also confirmed by bibliographic data preserved in Ephrem's colophon: according to Ephrem, *"a certain person asked Great Cyril to write short commentaries on the margins of the Acts of the Apostles in order to have the commentaries of Paul's Epistles in one book"* [Ath.18:236].

In his colophon the Georgian translator retells about the origin of the exegetic collection translated by him and names its compiler. While discussing this issue the source for Ephrem Mtsire is the above-mentioned Epistle of Cyril of Alexandria. According to Ephrem, *"Cyril praises him (i.e. the Bishop customer) for diligence and evidences that he picked from John Chrysostom short commentaries and added the comments of other church fathers found by him in their compositions"* [Ath.18:235]. Ephrem underlines that the comments selected on Paul's commentaries compiled by Cyril is not his original work: *"As we know from Greek, the commentaries on Paul's epistles written on the margins belong not to Cyril but, as it is said (by Cyril), in front of book, he just abridged the exhaustive commentaries written by Chrysostom and included them in this book"* [Ath.18:336]. This notice of Ephrem at the beginning of the Epistle of Cyril of Alexandria is based on the given discussion: the Archbishop of Alexandria appeals to his addressee: *"Greatly appreciating your diligence and strive for learning, blessed father, I obediently stepped up to thing that is difficult. Along with the epistles of St.Paul, I also decided (by your request) to write the commentaries on them to make it easier for the readers"*

to look them up quickly. The Holy Father, John Chrysostom commented on epistles of the Apostle Paul. Besides this, I have found the commentaries on several paragraphs written by Great Basil of Caesarea, St. Gregory the Theologian and St Athanasius and picked them from their compositions, added some comments written by me, and wrote short commentaries around the word of the Apostle [Ath. 18:238-239; Ath.39:16v].

It is clearly seen from this letter as to what kind of work has been done by Cyril. He compiled the commentaries on catena, i.e. the collection of commentaries on the epistles of St.Paul for which John Chrysostom's commentaries were used as main source, selected the commentaries scattered in various compositions written by Basil of Caesarea, Gregory the Theologian, Athanasius of Alexandria and on some of the paragraphs he made the commentaries himself. Cyril's collection represents not only the shortening of John Chrysostom's extensive commentaries, it is a work of compiling character, i.e. that kind of catena collection (in Greek seirá) in which the commentaries on the paragraphs of the Scripture written by various authors are collected.

The compilatory Collection compiled by Cyril appeared to be written according to the rules characteristic for exegetical catena: catena was placed in the middle of parchment paper and those of Chrysostom and other Fathers including Cyril's commentaries were on the margins. The paragraph for comment connected with special marks to the corresponding commentary. In Cyril's words, *"each rendered paragraph of St.Paul's epistles is supplied with corresponding number and I denoted the commentaries with the same numbers to make a search of commentary's relation to the word easier)[Ath. 18:239; Ath.39:16v].*

According to Ephrem, the commentaries composed by Cyril are written *"around the commented text": "Cyril wrote the commentaries around the text on the margins in order to avoid the break of the text of Paul's epistles and by means of figures and symbols make it possible to find corresponding commentaries quickly" [Ath. 18:236].*

According to Ephrem's colophon, Cyril also added names of the authors for explanation, only to John Chrysostom's commentaries because the *"majority of the commentaries were written by John Chrysostom, he (Cyril) did not add the name of the author but here and there where Athanasius, Basil, Gregory and his own commentaries were written, he added the names of the authors too [Ath. 18:236].* Here Ephrem makes interesting remark: *"None of them but John Chrysostom managed to write the commentaries on the epistles of St.Paul so consecutively, extensively and completely and for their explanations he added to them the commentaries found in other compositions [Ath.18:236].*

It is a well-known fact that Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus and Athanasius of Alexandria really did not provide complete commentaries of St.Paul's epistles. In their compositions we can find only the comments to separate paragraphs of the epistles. According to Ephrem, namely these commentaries appeared to be selected from the writings and attached to Chrysostom's commentaries by Cyril of Alexandria and thus the explanatory notes on Paul's epistles were written around the text, marginalia (Georg. "motkhvitad motserili", i.e. placed in the margins from the four sides of the text). In it the whole apostolic text is surrounded with the explanatory marginalia from the four sides written by the church fathers.

Unlike John Chrysostom's exhaustive or written in succession commentaries which is termed by Ephrem as **Commentaries on Paul**, Cyril's work which appeared to be written outside is treated by Ephrem as **Paul with Commentaries**: *"that is why it is called not Commentaries on Paul but Paul with Commentaries [Ath. 18:236].*

It is known that Ephrem Mtsire was very careful concerning the translation of the titles of the book in order to make sure that the compositions of similar title would not be mixed with each other [Tvaltvadze, 2009: 22-23]. Perhaps for the same reason, he attempts to choose different title to Catena Exegetical Collection compiled by Cyril that helps the reader to differentiate from John Chrysostom's commentaries interpreted consequently and extensively, subdivided into chapters and teachings.

According to Ephrem's note, **Paul with Commentaries** was compiled as one book. It is the singleness of this book that Georgian translator considers one of its advantages. In his view, *"It (exhaustive commentary) is better for its completeness and multiplicity of teachings but this (Paul with commentaries) is the best because short commentaries are compiled in one book [Ath. 18:237)].* In his view, a short commentary can display better the essence and meaning of a word, text because in exhaustive commentaries very few people can grasp "the scattered force of word" and here St. Cyril of Alexandria collected not only the commentaries taken from John Chrysostom exhaustive commentaries on the epistle of St. Paul and commentary on each paragraph of Paul's epistles scattered in the writings of Fathers, but he found the commentaries on some paragraphs in other writings of John Chrysostom himself and placed them in this book too. According to Ephrem, *"wherever the explanation of apostolic word is found, everything was compiled here by Cyril and the varieties of flowers formed a beautiful bouquet to supply the believers with fragrance for ages and ages. [Ath. 18:237]*

Evidently, according to the characteristic given in the Ephrem's colophon which is agreed with the epistle of Cyril himself, the "garemotserili", "motkhviti" commentary composed by Cyril, or Paul with Commentaries is obviously Catena Collection.

The earliest exegetic catena is ascribed to the sixth century writer, Procopius of Gaza [Krumbacher, 1897:210-216; Kekelidze 1973: 181-182]. According to Ephrem Mtsire's note, the first compiler of exegetical collection of catena character appears to have been Cyril of Alexandria who a century earlier than Procopius (Cyril dies in 444) compiled exegetical catena "Paul's Letters".

According to Ephrem, later editions of *Paul with Commentaries* compiled by Cyril also exist. In this work of his Ephrem also added the reasoning of the theologians of the following period after Cyril's death: *"Some wise figures (for commentaries collected in this book) added the commentaries of the Church Fathers who live after Cyril and the authors' names are written as they are in the reliable and selected Greek originals" [Ath. 18:237].* It is really known that after the 5th century more than one Church Father made commentaries on Paul's epistles. Suffice it to mention at least the commentaries on all 14 epistles compiled by John of Damascus in the 8th century or exegetical work of [Oecumenius Bishop of Trikka](#), created in the 10th century. After Cyril's death, their names are frequently found with the names of other Fathers in the text of Georgian translation of *Paul with Commentaries*.

According to Ephrem Mtsire, the thoughts of these Fathers after Cyril was included to that Greek manuscript of Paul's which was given to him by Greek Klim the Monk, from the Monastery of St.Symeon as an original.

Before getting down to translating the *Paul with Commentaries* into Georgian, Ephrem Mtsire, as usual, conducted deep and substantial preliminary work. He obtained and studied Greek manuscripts containing the commentaries on Paul's epistles and arrived to the conclusion that there existed: a) exhaustive John Chrysostom's *Commentaries on Paul*; b) on the basis of this work of John Chrysostom, the commentaries written on the margins compiled by Cyril of Alexandria *Paul with Commentaries* which also includes the commentaries of other Fathers and c) the redaction of *Paul with Commentaries* filled with commentaries made later which were chosen for valid translation and Greek originals of which were delivered to him, as Ephrem puts it, by Klim the Monk from St.Symeon Monastery "*the man of wisdom and of great assistance*" [Ath.18:238]. Of them the first is John Chrysostom's commentaries or *Commentaries on Paul* [PG.t.60-63], is the main source of catena commentaries written on the margins, compiled by Cyril of Alexandria or for *Paul with Commentaries* which has survived in Greek only in fragments. The fragments are available in Armenian, Syrian and Latin languages too [P.G.t.74,col.774-1026]. The redaction of the Greek text of *Paul with Commentaries* filled with the commentaries by the church figures, after Cyril's death has not been studied. Based on the data of Ephrem's colophon, today it can be said with confidence that this redaction has been preserved almost in complete form in Georgian translations by Ephrem Mtsire and Euthymius the Athonite. Euthymius the Athonite translated the beginning of the *Paul with Commentaries* (Cyril of Alexandria's epistle placed at the beginning of the Collection commentary to the first epistle to the Romans and Corinthians (up to 8,2 paragraph). The text of the translation has been kept in the manuscript Ath.39 (16v-102r) and Ephrem Mtsire corrected it and with the preciseness typical of him, translated up to the end the *Paul with Commentaries*. The translation by Ephrem Mtsire has not been preserved in any of the manuscripts in its complete form, but several manuscripts have been come down to us which fill each other and support a continuous form. Hence, it can be stated that the text of Georgian translation of exegetic catenae the *Paul with Commentaries* in the redaction revised in the 10th century compiled by Cyril of Alexandria has been kept in complete form. These manuscripts are: Q 1158 (XI century) which preserves the beginning of the *Paul with Commentaries*, epistle to the Romans and I epistle to the Corinthians; Jer.9(XI cent.) and A 390 (XI cent.) which contain almost similar text, commentaries on II epistle to Corinthians in full, commentaries on the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I Thessalonians. Besides this, A 390 keeps commentary on the epistles to II Thessalonians in full and to the Hebrews partially (up to 12, 15); Ath.18 (XV-XVI centuries) contains the texts and commentaries on the epistles to Hebrews (from 6, 11), to Timothy I and II, to Titus and Philemon. This manuscript is supplied with the colophon and iambus of the translator, Ephrem Mtsire and Cyril of Alexandria's epistle. Separate fragments of Ephrem's translation are kept at S 3656, H 2141, S 1172, S 1149, S 4812 and Q 831 manuscripts too [Kochlamazashvili. 1995: 27].

It is true, here and there both Georgian translations of the *Paul with Commentaries* lack a leaf or two, but it is obvious, even in the state it has come down to us, it is of great assistance to the scholars to restore the initial picture of the Greek original text of this composition. The

importance of those data for the history of Byzantine exegesis which we have in the colophon added to the comments on the epistles of Paul is also obvious. The data provided here by Ephrem testify Cyril of Alexandria's contribution to the interpretation of the *Acts of Apostles* and present him as one of the first compilers of exegetical catenae.

One more fact deserves attention. Besides the commentaries on the epistles of Paul, Ephrem also translated the *Commentaries of the Acts of Apostles and Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles* and compiled a kind of corpus of "Apostolic commentaries" which along with the above considered colophon was supplied with his own foreword [Jer.16,2r-4v], in which one more important evidence related to this issue is kept: *"The commentaries on the Acts of Apostles have been collected from numerous books but due to the lack of space there is no indication to the names of all authors. As is evidenced from the title, the majority of the commentaries belong to St. John Chrysostom and the commentaries of other Church Fathers selected by St. Cyril from numerous sources are inserted here and there"* [Jer.16:4r]. There is no doubt that St. Cyril mentioned here by Ephrem is Cyril of Alexandria who compiled selected translations of the *Acts of the Apostles* and again as a main source he appeared to use exhaustive commentaries of St. John Chrysostom and inserted them along with the commentaries of other Fathers in the same way as while compiling *Paul with commentaries*. The essence of Ephrem's words is clear: the exegetical catenae compiled by St. Cyril are again mentioned as Greek original text of commentaries on the *Acts of the Apostles* but, for some reason, this information is not taken into account while evaluating the work done by Ephrem in transferring the commentaries on the *Acts of the Apostles*. In connection with this K. Danelia notes: "It appears that Ephrem mainly used the commentaries of John Chrysostom (+407) and here and there he used Cyril of Alexandria's work (+444)" [Danelia, 1982:319]. The fact that Ephrem translated the composition compiled with John Chrysostom's commentaries and filled with the thoughts of other authors and indirectly John Chrysostom's exhaustive commentaries are well seen from the title of the book: *"The explanations selected from the vast commentaries made by our blessed Father, the John Chrysostom patriarch of Constantinople, John Chrysostom on the Acts of Apostles which is sometimes added with short commentaries of other Church Fathers"* [Jer.16:4r]. As is seen Cyril compiled not only the *Paul with Commentaries* but also *"Acts of Apostles with commentaries"* and *"Catholic Epistles with commentaries"* which were used by Ephrem Mtsire.

Several fragments of the translations of the *Acts of the Apostles* have come down to us under the name of Cyril [PG.t.74, col.758-774] and one or two pages from the translations of Jacob, I and II epistles of John and Juda [PG. t.74, col.1007-1036]. The full text of this exegetical work in Greek is not observed. We consider that the data kept in Ephrem's preface provide a solid ground to direct the study from this aspect. Although unlike the commentaries on Paul's epistles, Ephrem provides rather poor data concerning the history of compilation of commentaries on the *Acts of the Apostles*, he does not mention those authors whose comments were used by Cyril in compilation of the Catena Collection and it is unknown to us whether he had the catena filled by other authors after Cyril's death as an original or earlier redaction of this collection, but one thing is certain, while translating the commentaries on the *Acts of the Apostles* and *Catholic Epistles*, Ephrem has already used the selected Greek texts.

In our view, the comparison of the *Commentaries on the Apostles* translated by Ephrem Mtsire with Greek sources that is intended to be a subject of future study will give a valid answer to many questions which can be arisen in connection with this issue. The data kept in Ephrem's preface will be definitely a fine guide in this work.

This is conditioned by several factors: 1) Georgian language preserves such compositions of Byzantine literature Greek originals of which are no longer available and can be restored only with the help of Georgian translations; 2) Georgian literature keeps such data related to Byzantine writers which fill up a gap and throw light on the life and activity of these writers in a new aspect; 3) Georgian writing keeps information on the writers of whom nothing has ever been known in the history of Byzantine literature; 4) Some works of Byzantine literature transferred to Georgian literature in versions, are radically different from the original; 5) Georgians add to Byzantine literature more than one composition translated from Georgian, for example, *The Wisdom of Balavar*, *Abukura* and many others; 6) Georgians wrote original compositions in the Greek language too, for example, Euthymius Athonite wrote in Greek *The Way of Solitary Life* [Kekelidze, 1980:62-63].

«mtargmnelis mozrakhuli" according to Ephrem's preface is a term which compiles all kinds of commentaries made by a translator in different places of the manuscript of the translated composition: with marginal footnotes, the foreword placed at the beginning and the colophon supplied at the end of a book. [Tvaltvadze, 2009: 24-26].

Particularly, it concerns Greek original texts selected by Ephrem Mtsire for translation, their various redactions, the interrelationship of redactions, history of creating separate compositions, Greek dictionaries and book storages, compilation and design of Greek manuscripts, etc. [Tvaltvadze, 2009].

The text of the preface was published several times: first it was issued in 1988 [Tvaltvadze, 1988: 210-221; also see, *Epistles of Paul...* 2003: 300-302; [Tvaltvadze, 2009: 210-212].

It was published twice: first according to MS Ath.18 [Tvaltvadze, 1995:359-361], for the second time -according to the MSs Ath.39 and Ath18 publisher E.Kochlamazashvili [*Epistle of Paul...* 2003: 8-11].

Translation of the 5-th century Archbishop of Alexandria Cyril's compositions into Georgian appears to be started in the 8th - 9th centuries (We mean "The Treasure" which had already been translated in Grigol Khandzteli's time) and the last translation was made in the 18th century. In 1776, Philippe Kaitmazashvili and Anthony the Catholicos rendered from an Armenian source the Epistles and Lexicon of Cyril of Alexandria which are kept in the MSs A 266, A 618 [Kekelidze, 1957: 87-89].

At the beginning of the colophon Ephrem mentions that the primary source of the commentaries on the epistles of the Apostle Paul is John Chrysostom's interpretation written at Paul's dictation. To prove this he presents one data kept in "The Life of John Chrysostom" according to which John's disciple, Proclus had a vision as to how the Apostle himself was dictating to John Chrysostom the interpretation of his Epistles: "Paul stood behind him dictating and Chrysostom was writing it down [John Chrysostom ...1986:51-56].

In spite of the existence of concrete addressee, according to its purpose the Epistle of Cyril of Alexandria verified by Ephrem is an introductory letter which may appear to be placed at the beginning of exegetic work done by Cyril in the Greek original. Also, according to the data of Ephrem Mtsire's colophon, this Epistle was "written at the beginning". "This becomes known from the Epistle of Cyril of Alexandria which can be found at the beginning of this book [Ath.18:236]; the Epistle given at the beginning testifies this, underlines the author. Though in MS Ath. 18 this epistle is placed at the end and follows Ephrem's colophon, but it does not reflect the initial picture correctly which is evidenced from another Athonic manuscript [Ath.39,XI b.] in which the Epistle of Cyril starts the texts of translations of Paul's Epistles [Ath.39:16v-17v]. Here, too, Ephrem renders true information: the Epistle of Cyril of Alexandria was really written in front of book and fulfilled the function of introduction to a collection composed by Cyril.

Names of the following expositors are indicated in the text: Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, St. Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius of Alexandri, Severian of Gabala, Gennadius of Constantinople, Maximus the Confessor, Germanus of Constantinople, John of Damascus, Oecumenius and Cyril himself. Of them Cyril could use some of their commentaries (those of Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius of Caesarea, *Methodius of Patara*, Athanasius of Alexandria, Severian of Gabala), the rest of them worked and created after Cyril's death. It is clear that the appearance of their names in *Paul with Commentaries* was possible only after their later revision.

The word "motkhviti" is defined by Saba as "*motkhviti* means quadrangular" [Orbeliani Sul Khan-Saba, 1991:492; see also Abuladze 1973:264; Ezekiel... 1976: 315]. Thus, written on all four margins means quadrangular script.

It should be noted that in comparison with the Greek original of Cyril's *Paul with Commentaries*, the translation of it made by Ephrem is not "garemotserili" (quadrangular script) written on the four sides but "marlgatskobili" (commentaries written in succession). Ephrem, who was always in favor of exact translation of Greek original into Georgian and compilation of Georgian manuscripts according to Greek rules, in this case broke this principle by the instructions of his spiritual fathers - Saba Tukhareli and Anton Tbeli due to the fact that such kind of book was difficult for reading in churches and for rewriting and in the original around the interpreted paragraph commentaries written on the margins which linked to the text through special conventional symbols, wrote in sequence, one by one for the readers and scribes to be easier [Ath.18:237]. Ephrem states:"our monks considered it would be better".

The exhaustive commentaries on Paul's epistles were also composed by the 11th-century and later period ecclesiastical figures, namely Theophylact Bulgarian [PG.t.124-125] and Euthymius Zigaben [PG.t.128-129], but, evidently, their writings could not have appeared in the Greek text of the *Paul with Commentaries* which was used first by Euthymius the Atonite and then Ephrem Mtsire as an original. Probably, Georgian translators used the later redaction of the commentaries on all 14 epistles of Paul (the second half of the 10th century) written by Oecumenios (†995) that can be evidenced by frequent mentioning of the name of Oecumenius in the Georgian translated text.

The data on the translation of the beginning of "Commentaries on Paul" (commentaries on the epistle to the Romans and Corinthians and Cyril of Alexandria's epistle placed in front of book) by Euthymius the Athonite were provided by Ephrem Mtsire in his colophon: "*Our new golden-mouth started to translate from Greek, the source of translation and founder, Saint Father and church confessor, Euthymius Mtatsmindeli, who had translated the commentaries only on two epistles and little had been left to finish it but the reason of this is known only to God*" [Ath. 18:235].

The text of Euthymius the Athonite's translation was published by E.Kochlamazashvili [Paul's epistles ...2003: 8-215].

However, in Georgian scholarly literature an assumption has been expressed that Ephrem's translation is his original work, fulfilled on the basis of John Chrysostom. K.Kekelidze points out that this composition translated by Ephrem represents "Ephrem's work written according to John Chrysostom" [Kekelidze, 1980:257]; In I.Abuladze's view "Ephrem translated selectively John Chrysostom's commentaries" [Acts of Apostles... 1950:013]; and K.Danelia who specially studied the translation of commentaries on Paul's epistles made by Ephrem, considers that is familiar with John Chrysostom's commentaries (as well as of other theologians but he does not translate his compositions but renders his thoughts by taking notes [Danelia, 1982: 319-325]. A basis for this conclusion is the comparison of Georgian translation with the Greek text of John Chrysostom's *Commentaries on Paul* which would definitely help the scholars to reveal numerous essential differences. After revealing bibliographical data kept in Ephrem's colophon an issue may be regarded as solved. In this colophon, Ephrem directly indicates to the composition used by him as original and points out that he used the manuscript of later edition of catenic "Commentaries on Paul" compiled by Cyril of Alexandria. Ephrem did not do compilation himself (collected, took notes, etc.) but used such original in which such kind of work had already been done, moreover not by an ordinary human but by St.Cyril himself. From Ephrem's colophon it is well seen that this exegetical composition is not Ephrem's original work. In our view the data kept in the above mentioned Ephrem's colophon are suffice to consider the later edition of "Paul with Commentaries" by Cyril of Alexandria as the original of the text of Ephrem Mtsire's translation of the epistles of Paul kept in Georgian manuscripts. The follow-up study and investigation, comparison of Greek and Georgian texts should proceed just in this direction [Tvaltvadze, 1995; Epistles of Paul... 2003:294-299].

16 The Georgian translation of the commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles and Catholics Epistles was published by E.Kochlamazishvili [Commentary ...2000].

References

Acts of the
Apostles
1950

Acts of the Apostles. According to the Old manuscripts. Ed. By Ilia Abuladze. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).

Abuladze I.
1973

Dictionary of Old Georgian Language, Tbilisi. (in Georgian).

Danelia K. 1982	The Issues on the History of Georgian Writing. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Ezekiel 1976	Old Georgian Versions of Ezekiel Book. Text edited and supplied with preface commentaries by T.Tskitishvili, Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Commentaries ... 2000	Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles from the writings of John Chrysostom and other Holy Fathers translated by Ephrem Mtsire (Karichidze) I. Text prepared and supplied with preface by Ekvtime Kochlamazashvili, Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Tvaltvadze D. 1988	On one unknown colophon of Ephrem Mtsire. TSU Coll. works of Old Georgian language. 27 Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Tvaltvadze D. 1995	Old Georgian translations of the commentaries on Paul's epistle, Philological Studies, Vol.II Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Tvaltvadze D. 2009	Colophons of Ephrem Mtsire. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
John Chrysostom 1986	Old Georgian Translation of "The Life of John Chrysostom" and its peculiarities. According to the manuscripts of 986 years old. Text was prepared supplied with comments and lexicon by R.Gvaramia, Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Kekelidze K. 1957	Sketches from the History of Old Georgian Literature, Vol.V. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Kekelidze K. 1972	Sketches from the History of Old Georgian Literature, Vol.XI, Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Kekelidze K. 1980	The History of Old Georgian Literature. Vol. I. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Kochlamazashvili E. 1995	From the history of translation of Apostolic into Georgian language. Religion, N 10-11-12. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Orbeliani Sulkhana-Saba 1991	Georgian Dictionary. Vol.I. According to autographic records text was prepared, supplied with commentaries and indices by Illia Abuladze. (in Georgian).
Pauls' epistles... 2003	Commentaries on Paul's epistles selected from the compositions of John Chrysostom and other Holy Fathers translated by Euthymius of Mtatsmindeli. Text prepared and supplied with commentaries by Ekvtime Kochlamazashvili. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Krumbacher K. 1897	Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des öströmischen Reiches (57-1453), 2 vols. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft IX, 1). München.
PG	Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca

Third Wave Georgian Immigrant Women in the USA: Problems of Americanization.

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/6

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Elene Medzmariashvili](#)

The world migration processes always happened for a reason as they do today. Various kinds of conflicts, wars provoke masses of refugees and push people to migrate to neighboring or more distant countries from the conflict zones. Other political, social and economic problems, such as revolutions, economic crisis and many others, result in emigration.

The above mentioned issues were not foreign the 20th-century Georgia. For that very reason three waves of Georgian immigration to the North America have been recorded just in that century. Each of them had its own reasons. The composition of the emigrants differed in social, gender and age aspects, and in their level of education. Thus, immigrants of different waves differed in the quality of Americanization and the level of success they achieved in a new homeland.

. The goal of this paper is not to investigate the history of specific representatives of any of the waves of emigration. Georgian researchers G. Sharadze, R. Daushvili, R. Nishnianidze and others have produced such studies. I will try to give an answer to concrete questions: What is the degree of Americanization of Georgian immigrant women of the third wave? What impact do the age, education level, social status have on this process? What role does the Orthodoxy play in maintaining the national identity?

Unfortunately, the mentioned issues have not become the subject of special study of Georgian historiography if not one or two publications of the author of this paper which deal with the issues of Georgian immigrant women in the US [Medzmariashvili, 2008: 198-203] and American women's attitude to religion in general [Medzmariashvili, 2009: 185-189]. The American researchers are completely unfamiliar with the problem of Georgian immigrants and moreover, with women immigrants. Nowadays there are no works in the U.S. which study Georgian immigration, though plenty of works are dedicated to the general, theoretical issues of immigration and to the study of such numerous Diasporas as Jewish, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese and so on. Maybe this gap results from the fact that the number of Georgians in the U.S. was quite insignificant during the whole 20th century and that the Georgian immigrants who came from the Russian Empire and later from the USSR (after its collapse as well) were mostly regarded as Russians and not Georgians, whom the Americans didn't know at all for a long time.

Correspondingly, it is impossible to obtain some information concerning the issues under study in American special literature. The only official American primary source, that can help a scientist, interested in the statistics of immigrants in the U.S., is the annual statistical

collections of the Commerce Department, the U.S. Economics and Statistics Administration which provides the data about the number of Georgian immigrants in different years. [*Statistical Abstract...* 2000:10]. However illegal immigrants and the so-called green card holders are not registered. Due to this, to get the accurate data about the number of Georgians in the US is not possible available. There are no data about gender composition of immigrants as well. According to unofficial data it is known to us that females share among the immigrants has rapidly grown.

According to the mentioned statistical source, it is unknown the number of those Georgian immigrants who became the US citizens in 1981-1990 through the refugees act. To my mind their number is rather small. Presumably, they are mainly Georgian Jews and members of their families. It is also possible that part of them came to the US from the third countries. In the following years 1991-1996 American citizenship was obtained by 1834, in 1997 - by 425, in 1998 - by 100 persons [*Statistical Abstract...* 2000:10]. These figures are really insignificant if we take into account that 23 million of immigrants came to the US in 1965-2000 [Gerstle, 2001:275], or almost the same number (24 million) as it was in 1880-1920 [*U.S. Immigration...*, 2000].

We should bear in mind that among the immigrants gone from Georgia to the United States there were not only Georgians, but Armenians, Jews and the representatives of other nationalities inhabiting Georgia. The official American statistics determines the immigrants' number not according to the ethnos, but by the immigration country. This makes it complicated the establishment of the accurate number of Georgians immigrated to the US. Besides this, it is not excluded that those Georgians who appeared in the States from other countries, e.g. from Russia, are registered as the emigrants of those countries in yearbook. Among them must be Georgians forced to flee from Abkhazia who often have mixed families and appear to America mainly from Russia.

Thus, if we trust official statistics, in recent years the number of Georgian immigrants has gone down. But actually during the last decades the number of Georgians in the US has not declined, but on the contrary, has sharply grown. This growth, basically, comes from the number of illegal immigrants, who arrive in the country in different ways (for studies, temporal jobs, private or official visas, this or that program and so on.); they don't come back, and they don't have the US' citizenship. A similar tendency extends to other countries' immigrants too.

For example, according to the data of 1999, over 7 millions of Mexicans lived in the US, the citizenship had around 1.5 million, of 1.5 Philippians - half million; the majority of the Chinese, Vietnamese, Indians, Koreans and British, more than half of their total number have no American citizenship [*U.S. Immigration...* 2000:49]. As famous American scientist, Samuel Huntington says, in the 1990s illegal immigrants made up a quarter of the immigrants. [Huntington, 2005:182]. It is possible that these data by Huntington are not accurate but there are not enough reliable sources to prove the opposite. According to the data of the immigration service of the British government, around 30 million people entered illegally to the various countries of the world only in 2000. We have no data as to what is gender ratio of immigrants.

According to British Government's immigration department's data in 2000, in this or that country from the world's different regions 30 million came illegally [*Economist*, 24 June, 2000:63]. It is unknown to us what the gender correlation is.

In spite of the absence of necessary official statistical data by using concrete examples and with the help of interviews with immigrants it is possible figure out the problems that bother the women of the contemporary Georgian community. While working at the issues interested us, namely problem of Americanization and the role of Orthodoxy in keeping the identity of Georgian immigrants, we mainly used the materials obtained during interviewing Georgian immigrant women. Each conclusion contains generalization of numerous concrete examples.

Probably, the words that Alfred White, MA student from University of California wrote in his master theses in 1923 about Mexican immigrant women, is topical nowadays and can also be said about Georgian immigrant women: "The Americanization of the [Mexican] women is as important a part as that of the men. They are harder to reach but are more easily educated... The children of these foreigners are the advantages to America, not the naturalized foreigners. These are never 100% Americans, but the second generation may be. "Go after the women" and you save the second generation for America" [White, 1990:250].

In contemporary America, there are not special programs of Americanization, if we don't consider language courses that should take those, who want to get Green Card or those foreigners who already have it. Though, just knowing language is not enough. Nowadays, demands towards immigrants increased considerably and it is much more difficult to get the US citizenship than it was in the beginning of the 20th century. If earlier those who desired to get American citizenship had to prepare 100 test questions, from 2007 they have had 150 questions which mainly cover the US history, domestic and foreign policy, constitutional, federal and state structure, party system, composition of the contemporary American government, the symbols of America, local governmental bodies and its representatives in the legislative and executive organs, English grammar and orthography. Examination tax also increases. However, the stimulus to pass the exam is very high. Actually this exam can be considered the first step on the path of the immigrant's Americanization or more precisely familiarization acquaintance with American values.

As early as in the first decade of the 20th century, when illegal crossing of the US frontier by numerous neighboring Mexicans occurred, there were designed special programs aiming at Americanization of Mexican immigrants. However, the realization of this program faced lots of difficulties. Finally, an emphasis was made at Americanization of Chicanos born in America [Sanchez, 1990:250]. It is interesting to note that in the 1920's, establishing quotas on immigration from Asia and South and Eastern Europe was justified with, that assimilation of these "foreigners" coming from these regions of the world is difficult and because of that, they are undesirable guests. In their opinion they endangered "American living standards", and for the example they had Mexicans, as unreliable citizens for the democratic society [Reisler, 1976:151-169]. About Georgians generally, and especially about Georgian women, probably, no one can say so.

Naturally, it depends much on woman whom and how she will bring up: her children will be brought up on national traditions, whether a child will be grown up on national traditions, whether he will be defender and aware of the cultural values, or an American citizen, to whom the motherland of their ancestors is strange.

Because the quantity of the Georgians families in the U.S.A. is not so large and they, as a rule, don't live compactly, there is quite difficult for them to preserve their national identity. Especially in these conditions much is depended on women. Georgian families can be considered as separate institutions in American reality, which persistently resists the assimilation in the United States and tries to preserve their own cultural values, that for example, is not so difficult for Armenians, since they have Armenian schools, TV, radio, newspapers, and churches.

From this point of view, Armenians are in better state than Georgians because they have Armenian schools, newspapers, television and well organized community. This does not mean that Armenians are not assimilated. As a rule, such Americans are called "bicultural" and they are considered ordinary Americans. The majority of Georgian immigrants are such "bicultural" Americans, though less assimilated.

From the viewpoint of cultural assimilation it is of great importance as to which strata of society the immigrants belong to, what kind of traditions they carry, how patriotic they are, what roots they left in their homeland, how strong is their national self-consciousness, it is also essential to know what is the character of Georgian immigration in the U.S.A.

In order to find out the Georgian immigration character, we must know what was going on in Georgia in the end of the 20th century: destroyed economy, unstable political situation, the hardest social background. Therefore the number of Georgian immigrants in the US has grown greatly in the 1990s and it is called the third wave immigration of (the first wave comes to the twenties of the 20th century, the second - to the period after the Second World War). Due to hard social setting among the Georgians came to the USA the females whose purpose was to support their families at home prevailed. They either left their jobs or had to work at such a low income that it was not enough to maintain their children and husbands who were unemployed. Many of them had high education. The truth was that the Soviet diplomas appeared useless for them. Many did not know English and majority of them stayed illegal in the country which made their situation even tougher. The only way out for them was to agree on non prestigious, often humiliating work. They joined the ranks of housekeepers, babysitters and nurses for elderly, i.e. they found the jobs which are usually refused by Americans. The immigrant women were paid less for the mentioned jobs than Americans. Thanks to the miserable wages in the U.S.A., but solid ones in Georgia (around \$1000-2000), women could keep their families in tough times.

These women mainly employed in the big cities and of the US East cost and its surroundings. They lived in the families where they worked and, correspondingly, their environment was not diverse. For them these families represented small model of America. They spend the whole time there, they have no insurance policy or other benefits offered by the government to their citizens and by which America is so attractive for many people. They have no opportunity for

traveling to explore the country better. Correspondingly, Americanization of such category of female immigrants is rather hard. A great part of elderly immigrant women do not even try to share local values and dream on coming back to their country, though in the uncertain future.

The young immigrant females of this category manage to adapt more easily. They learn the language easier. Many of them do not attempt to go back to their homeland because the American way of life for them becomes more admissible than Georgian. First of all this concerns young women came to the States from Georgian regions. They love everything in America, including the "boyfriend" institution which is still alien in Georgia, moreover in its provinces. Some of them manage to create mixed Georgian-American families, and the children born in such families are already "mono cultural". Proceeding from the mothers' position, their Americanization is no problem at all. Frequently in such families the children do not know Georgian and identify themselves only as Americans. The mothers themselves become American citizens and the process of their integration into American society is simplified.

Many lonely young (sometimes elderly) Georgian women came to America dreaming about the creation of such a mixed family. They know well that in such case they get better chance to realize an American dream; security of property, respect for human rights which is declared in the Declaration of Independence of the USA and is an organic part of the American political culture, for Georgians getting American citizenship it becomes reality.

One more group of Georgian immigrant women constitutes those who appeared in the USA legally from the beginning and as a result of great efforts managed to find the job according to the profession. They managed to get American diploma and today they represent middle layer Americans. It is interesting to note that as a rule, the immigrant women of such category are rather Americanized but, despite this, one part of them does not lose Georgian national identity. They identify themselves both as Americans and Georgians. They belong to those American citizens who do not renounce the membership to their own ethnic group and are "bicultural". The American government leaves the possibility of choice to each citizen. As an American scholar writes, generally it is typical for Americans amicability to new comers because they personify everything good [Mann, 1987: 79], with their language, religion, traditions, music, dishes, etc. Otherwise they enrich American culture.

The children raised by such bicultural women as a rule, can speak Georgian, familiar with Georgian values but they do not wish to live in Georgia any more. It is already alien for them. As a rule, the immigrant women of this category have close ties with their homeland but they plan to return back only in a distant future in their old age. The children of some of them study at American universities and intend to continue their life in America. It is interesting to note that among the representatives of the third wave of immigrant women interviewed by me the number of this category of women was not small at all and made around 30% of all interviewed.

It should be also mentioned that for many Georgian women "the American life style" appeared rather admissible. More than one Georgian immigrant women try hard to "mix" among Americans but some of them fail to do it. It is true, the first generations of Georgian immigrants

and sometimes the second generations too, frequently preserve the national identity but at the same time they are distinguished with loyalty in relation to their new homeland. Although even today the majority of them identify themselves as Georgians but at the same time they are law-abiding citizens of the US. As other ethnic groups, Georgians are also well aware of their responsibilities in relation to the country that has given them the opportunity of new life.

One of the distinguishing features of immigrants is their religion. In my view, whether male or female every Georgian who lives in America if he/she is not an atheist or of other confession remains faithful to Orthodox Christianity. An American Georgian may forget the language, not have a firm connection with motherland but preserve the Christian belief; though it is also possible that due to certain objective reasons (lack of Orthodox churches and so on) fail to attend services. Perhaps, the same can be said about the Russians and Gregorian Armenians living there. And especially Jews [Smith,2001:807-808]. Proceeding from the religious belief, the Jews perceive themselves in a special way even in America. On the one hand, Judaism plays the central role in uniting the Jews and, on the other hand, distinguishes them from other nations.

Orthodox Christianity in such liberal country as the USA is, unites but does not separate. Frequently, it can unify the representatives of various ethnic background Orthodox Christians. The words said by an American researcher Wendy Brown [Brown, 2006:196] referring to Jews: If a Jew loses the Judaism, he can be considered ultimately assimilated. The same is true about Georgians: if a Georgian loses the Orthodoxy, he can also be considered assimilated.

The immigrants of the first wave, except the Catholics from the South Georgia and atheist socialist-democrats, must have been religious and, correspondingly, could have preserved the Orthodox Christianity better. The state of the second wave immigrants was quite different. They had lived in Georgia during the Soviet times and grew up as atheists. That is why their children were less religious. These people appeared in totally different, liberal, pluralistic environment where the attitude towards confessions was completely tolerant. Consequently, such conditions, on the one hand, encouraged their assimilation and, on the other hand, the full religious freedom gave them the possibility to retain Orthodoxy in the case of mixed families (if the spouses were Russians or the Ukrainians). Those who left the independent Georgia had special attitude to church. Many of the Georgian immigrant females of the third wave are religious which contributed to the increase of Orthodox Christians in the USA.

As the number of Georgian Orthodox churches in America is rather small a great part of Georgians attends Greek, Russian or Ukrainian churches. It is this Georgian parish that preserves its national identity best of all. From this viewpoint, religion, orthodoxy, is a kind of barrier on the way to Americanization. Historically it is known that the Orthodox Christianity has been a considerable means of preservation thorough the centuries.

If we survey the history of Georgians living in America, we will see that in the course of the whole 20th century part of the immigrants tried to preserve Orthodoxy. They celebrated religious holidays, invited known clerical men to this or that religious ritual. The same is done by the immigrants of today. Moreover, in accordance with their demand Georgian Patriarchate intends to open two new Orthodox churches.

Thus, from the viewpoint of preservation of national uniqueness of Georgian immigrants, their identity and consolidation, Orthodox Christianity plays the most significant role. Today this can be explained first of all by the fact that the church in Georgia is also the most important ideological means.

If an immigrant fails to adopt Americanization, i.e. political, social or cultural integration into American society, and has not enough proficiency in English, he will never become the representative of the upper layer of the society.

It is true that the boundaries are opening and the possibilities of immigration to other countries are increasing but for such small nation as Georgians the loss of their citizens is not desirable. If there are no such political, social-economic cataclysms in Georgia any more, the wave of immigrants will definitely decrease even to such desirable country as America the United States.

Those people who take the status of immigrant benefited with social and immigrant welfare. For political refugees and immigrants with low income study at colleges and universities is free of charge for 2 years. Moreover they get allowances. Study at public and special English language schools is also free of charge. The government makes an emphasis at education in order for the newcomers to master the professions. For example, by special program they can master the notary profession free of charge. The government gives them monthly assistance (\$1000) to the needy immigrant families. The government also helps the immigrants in jobs finding. But these jobs, as a rule, are not prestigious.

3 The majority identify themselves only as Americans.

References

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Medzmariashvili E.
2009 | Woman and Religion: on the USA example. "Research for Religious Studies. Georgia: religion and the present. #1-2. Tbilisi |
| Medzmariashvili E.
2008 | Problems of Georgian Immigrant Women in the USA. Issues of American Studies. V.Tbilisi. |
| Medzmariashvili E.
2006 | Georgian Diaspora in California. American literature and Georgian-American relations. Material of the III International Conference devoted to American Studies. Kutaisi, (in Georgian). |
| BBC News
2005 | March 5 |
| BBC News
2005 | Center for Immigration Studies, November 29. |
| Brown Wendy
2006 | Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire. Princeton, N.J. |
-

Camarota Steven A. 2007	Immigrants in the United States, 2007: A profile of America's Foreign-Born Population, November 2007, http://www.cis.org/immigrants_profile_2007
Camarota Steven A. 2008	How Many Americans? September 2008, http://www.cis.org/node/765
Gerstle Gary 2001	Immigration and Ethnicity in the American Century. Perspectives on Modern America. Making Sense of the Twentieth Century. Edited by Harvard Sitkoff, New York, Oxford.
Economist 2000	24 June, p.63.
Huntington Samuel P. 2005	Who Are We? America's Great Debate. London.
Immigration 2008	Online Debate Sponsored by the Los Angeles Times, http://www.cis.org/articles/2008/latdebate.html ;
Levitt Laura 2007	Impossible Assimilations, American Liberalism, and Jewish Difference: Revisiting Jewish Secularism. American Quarterly, Religion and Politics in the Contemporary United States, Edited by R. Marie Griffith and Melani McAlister, September 2007, Volume 59, Number 3.
Mann Arthur 1987	From Immigration to Acculturation. Making America. The Society and Culture of the United States. Edited by Luther S. Luedtke. Washington.
McGowan William 2008	The 1965 Immigration Reforms and The New York Times: Context, Coverage, and Long-Term Consequences, August 2008. http://www.cis.org/NYT_immigration_coverage
Reisler Mark 1976	By the Sweat of Their Brow: Mexican Immigrant Labor in the United States, 1900-1940. Westport, Conn.
Renshon Stanley 2007	Becoming American. The Hidden Core of the Immigration Debate, January 2007. http://www.cis.org/articles/2007/back107.html
Sanchez George J. 1990	"Go After the Women": Americanization and the Mexican Immigrant Woman, 1915-1929. Unequal Sisters. A Multicultural Reader in U.S. Women's History. Edited by Ellen Card DuBois and Vicki L.Ruiz. New York, London.
Smith Tony 2001	Ethnicity, Immigration, and the American National Community. February 2001, http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back201.html
Statistical... 2000	Statistical Abstract of the United States. The National Data Book. 120th Edition, Washington DC
Steinlight Stephen 2008	Ignoring Problems of Illegal Immigration Leads to Exploitation, August 2008, http://www.cis.org/node/759

U.S.
Immigration...
2000

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.
<http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/yearbook2000.pdf>.

White Alfred
1990

The A Perceptive Mass of Foreigners as Applied to Americanization, the Mexican Group. University of California, master's thesis, 1923, p.34-35.
Unequal Sisters. A Multicultural Reader in U.S. Women's History. Edited by Ellen Carol DuBouis and Vicki L. Ruiz. New York.

Was it in 1928 that the data about Georgian manuscripts kept at the University of Graz became known in Georgia for the first time?

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/4

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Vakhtang Imnaishvili](#)

Graz is the second-largest city in Austria. The University Library of Graz founded in the 16th century holds the ancient Georgian manuscripts. One of them dated to the 7th century - The Georgian Khanmet Lectionary is the pride of the Library as it is the oldest copy of the multilingual scripts placed on the shelves of the Library. These manuscripts have attracted attention of more than one Georgian or foreign scholars. The history of the old Georgian manuscripts is associated with the name of Hugo Schuchardt. Hugo Schuchardt (4.2.1842-21.4.1927) was an eminent Austrian linguist, well-known expert in the Romance languages, professor at the University of Graz, full member of the Vienna Academy of Sciences. The recognition of Schuchardt's scientific contribution is evidenced in the list of dignities: honoured with a special degree from the universities of Bologna, Budapest, and Oslo, member of Berlin, Munich, Rome, Amsterdam, Lisbon, Copenhagen, Krakow Academies of Sciences member of Jakarta society of arts and science, honourable member of various scientific institutes of San Sebastian, Moscow, Petersburg and other cities. By the way Hugo Schuchardt was a member of Georgian linguistic society too. The number of scholarly works published by Schuchardt is impressive: over 770 published items. It seems Hugo Schuchardt got interested in Georgian language in the eighties of the 19th century and established business relations with Georgian scholars, public men who supplied him with Georgian scholarly or other kind of literature on regular basis. Among Georgians acquainted with Schuchardt were Ilia Chavchavadze, Petre Melikishvili, Niko Marr, Aleksandre Tsagareli, Aleksandre Khakhanashvili, Filipe Gogichaishvili, David Karichashvili, Noe Zhordania, David Sarajishvili, Niko Ghoghoberidze, etc. They not only carried on a correspondence with Schuchardt but some of them personally met the eminent scholar while being in Europe.

Schuchardt published about 20 research works related to Georgian language. In one of his last letters he indicates that Georgian is a sympathetic and interesting language for him. It is this great sympathy and well expressed scholarly interest to the Georgian language that made Schuchardt save the ageless monuments of Georgian material culture that fell into bad hands of some dealers, and who knows what the future held for these already unbound and thieved book-cover witnesses of diligent activity of our celebrated ancestors in the remote Mount Sinai or Jerusalem, from redesign or in the worst case from the loss and kept them in his safe hands. After the long trading twists and turns Schuchardt purchased Georgian manuscripts on his own account and studied them and several months before his death left them in accord with his will to the University of Graz.

In scholarly literature an opinion has been established that Georgian scientific society learned about Georgian manuscripts kept at the University of Graz for the first time in 1929 when Akaki Shanidze published the paper "Georgian Manuscripts at Graz" in the Bulletin of the Tiflis University, IX volume, but a year earlier Hugo Schuchardt's extended work - *Mitteilungen aus georgische Handschriften* (The Notes from Georgian Manuscripts) in VIII volume of the same periodical was published. However, only few scholars could familiarize with this research written in German language as by that time in the circle of scholars Hugo Schuchardt got in touch with mainly French was spoken. In a private letter (2.9.1895) Arthur Leist gave Schuchardt advice that it would be better for a Graz professor to write in French to the Board of Society for the Spreading Literacy among Georgians because nobody could speak German there. If even in the Society for the Spreading Literacy among Georgians nobody knew German, it is not difficult to imagine how things go elsewhere.

The study of the old Georgian manuscripts kept at the Graz University seems to be started in 1928. In the following years there were published the researches of Akaki Shanidze, Grigol Peradze, Mikel Tarkhnishvili, etc. In the following years, researches of Akaki Shanidze, Grigol Peradze, Mikel Tarkhnishvili, etc. were published and separate texts were issued... Georgian society learned about the existence of Georgian manuscripts kept at the University Library of Graz. According to the widely spread opinion not a word had been said so far about these long-suffering manuscripts.

A. Shanidze was not the first whom Schuchardt told about Georgian manuscripts got into his hands and not only the above mentioned manuscripts were in the Georgian collection of Hugo Schuchardt's archive. There was also a fragment of completely unknown Georgian manuscript about which nobody in Georgia had ever heard from Schuchardt.

Both in Tbilisi and, by the way, in Moscow too at the end of the 19th century, i.e. 30 years before the Tbilisi readers familiarized with these manuscripts, it had already been known that Schuchardt possessed some old Georgian manuscripts. The history of these manuscripts is of particular interest.

Professor of the Petersburg University Aleksandre Tsagareli saw and described the old Georgian manuscripts now kept at Graz at the Sinai Monastery in 1883 and five years later he even published their description in the Catalogue of Sinai manuscripts [A. Tsagareli: 1888]. In 1902 Niko Marr and Ivane Javakhishvili could not find the manuscripts at this very place. Now it is hard to say with certainty as to when and by whom these manuscripts were taken from the monastery depository. Approximately by the end of 1894 a real war was broken for possession of these manuscripts, - writes an Austrian artist Alfonse Leopold Milikh, who seems to be one of the participants of this "war" and finally laid hands on Georgian manuscripts. In spite of the fact that he knew neither their content nor their real value, by his own words, only due to their outer attraction he ventured and snatched precious folios out of competitors' hands - it is very likely that he used to visit Egypt for years to purchase the antiques with the aim to make fortune through their selling (Beirut is also mentioned as one of the possible places of purchasing the manuscripts, but in my view it is named to cover up one's tracks).

Milikh was not going to sell the manuscripts immediately; he waited for two years and only in October of 1896 took the first steps for their selling. With this aim, he offered his collection, which included not only Georgian but also Slavic manuscripts, to the Court Library in Vienna. The director of the Library Heinrich von Zeisberg was an extremely cautious and honest man, and before purchasing the manuscripts, which he liked at a glance, decided to examine the contents of the MSS and establish their estimated value in the first place. At that time in Vienna the only expert of the Georgian language he was familiar with was Friedrich Müller, professor at the Vienna University and member of the Academy of Sciences who had already published his research related to the Georgian (On Conjugation of the Georgian Verb, 1868/69), and was planning to write a paper on the origination of the Georgian alphabet but for some reason he refrained from doing it and recommended Zeisberg to address Hugo Schuchardt residing in Graz who by that time had already published his first works about the Georgian language. Zeisberg took Müller's advice and asked Schuchardt to render assistance and after agreement he sent Schuchardt these four manuscripts held by him to Graz (current ##2058/1,2,3,4 MSS of the Library catalogue).

With the help of A. Tsagareli's catalogue Schuchardt established that the manuscripts got into his hands had been the legal property of St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai. When Zeisberg learned about this fact he asked Milikh to show him a document confirming the legality of possessing these manuscripts which Milikh certainly did not have. After this Zeisberg refused to purchase the manuscripts saying that he could not place the stolen manuscripts on the shelves of his library, for which the director was sharply criticized by a professor of the Vienna University Vatroslav Jagić who was running the faculty of Slavistics at the University. Jagić immediately appreciated the value of these manuscripts and without bargaining on price he purchased the Slavic manuscripts and added: "I can't comprehend the attitude of the director of the Court Library who refuses to purchase the manuscripts until he receives the document confirming their origin. Very few European libraries would have had present treasure if they had behaved in a similar way" (The letter addressed to Schuchardt, 26.12.1896). However, Zeisberg is not to be criticized because in his circle honesty and unspotted reputation were of high value.

Schuchardt, who kept the manuscripts in hand for a certain time and examined them well, took advantage of the opportunity. As Milikh had been threatened that Austrian ambassador to Egypt would be included to the investigation of the case, he got scared that they might take off the manuscripts and after long bargaining he considerably reduced the initial price and on January 12, 1896 sold the manuscripts for almost half price to Schuchardt and also added 3 separate pages for free (current ## 2058/6, 7). Later, he offered Schuchardt one more manuscript, a scroll, current #2058/5 and after long bargaining this scroll also fell in the hands of Graz professor.

By the way, at that time Hugo Schuchardt and Aleksandre Khakhanashvili planned to write a grammar of the Georgian language in German and carried on a lively correspondence, so they even had some outlines of the intended manual. However, for some reasons this endeavour seized for a long time and only at the beginning of the 20th century Schuchardt started thinking about the realization of this idea again (the idea itself belonged to Khakhanashvili and he intended to print the manual in Vienna). It might be supposed that it was these manuscripts that

made Schuchardt postpone the work at grammar. He was very fascinated by the acquired MSS and totally absorbed, researched the monuments from the viewpoint of the palaeography too, and when the need for corresponding sources and literature appeared, he addressed for assistance to Khakhanashvili and the Society for the Spreading Literacy among Georgians. Already on November 7, 1896 he sent a letter to the board of the Society for spreading literacy: "I am in a great hurry especially because I am working on Georgian sources: four Georgian manuscripts written on parchment have been sent to me. The letters are "khutsuri" (in "khutsuri") script. The manuscripts belong to the passed epochs: two of them are liturgical books, one is Davitni and another one the Life of St.Simon. I was asked to examine them and estimate their approximate value because they intend to buy them. It really puts me in an awkward position" (28.2.1897).

Next year, on February 28, he wrote to the board of the Society for the Spreading of Literacy among Georgians once more: "I am preparing the data on Georgian manuscripts which are at my disposal (three of them are written in Asomtavruli script). Do you have any liturgical books printed in Khutsuri available for me? You will do me a great favour if you send them to me. I would like to use them in my researches I've just reported about" (28.2.1897).

Prior to this, Schuchardt also informed Aleksandre Khakhanashvili in Moscow about the manuscripts. It is true, in Schuchardt's archive there is only one late letter and an extended fragment of the letter containing the exercises prepared for the intended grammar textbook, but in Tbilisi Schuchardt's letters have been found from which we can suppose what response was given to Schuchardt by Moscow professor: "Right now I am totally focused on Georgian manuscripts. The fact that these four manuscripts are really very old, as I've already written to you, would be evidenced to you when you get my written report. Among the manuscripts three are written in Asomtavruli, the second written in Nuskhuri dates from the 10th century. Later I asked two private persons one thick liturgical book written in "khutsuri" and one long script which from the beginning seemed to me some historical document, but then its barely readable title written in red disappointed me: «s~oÁ J~mis w~rvaÁ w~isa i~e oqropiris~Á» - the mess of John of the Goldenmouth!" (31.1.1897)

From this letter it is seen that Schuchardt had already informed Khakhanashvili about the manuscripts (but this letter can't be found anywhere). From Schuchardt's other letter it becomes obvious that he intended to finish the research on manuscripts by the end of the March 1897: "Currently I am totally focused on Georgian palaeography and hope that the first data from Georgian manuscripts (two photo typical tables) to prepare for publication before my departure to [Gota]." (6.3.1897). Schuchardt planned to visit his mother in Gota by the end of March which is referred to in the same letter: "By the end of this month I'm going to Gota."

Information about these manuscripts was known in Moscow Institute of Oriental Languages (the so called Lazarev Institute). Professor of the Armenian literature Gregor Khalatian wrote to Schuchardt: "From Vienna the Mkhitarists informed me that you have found Georgian Gospel which is the Palimpsest. If it is really dates from the 9th century, it is for sure the Armenian writing must be older, though our professor Khakhanashvili asserts that the Georgian writing cannot be earlier than 11th century the reason for which he finds in the shape of the Khutsesi

letters" (VII, 1897). The information that the Georgian-Armenian Palimpsest dated from the 9th century was probably spread by Schuchardt himself. As to the Georgian text it is not the Gospel but the Psalms. Currently it is dated to the first half of the 10th century (A. Shanidze).

The last letters concerning the manuscripts are dated to 1897. It is difficult to say what happened later. The fact is that there is no mentioning about them by Schuchardt anymore. Maybe he thought that he finished his research in March and the issue was settled. However, we should also note that on the text of the research sent by the author several days before his death (16.04.1927) to Akaki Shanidze, it is clearly written by the author - Unfinished!

Let us get acquainted with several fragments from Schuchardt's letter: "I took a vocation this semester because of poor health. Right now I am busy with two proof readings and one article which was designed long time ago (it concerns Romance) and as soon as I finish this work I hope to get at the Georgian language again and then I'd like to deal with my work on Georgian manuscripts which have been almost finished and I wish to have done with it at last" (27.12.1897).

In the same letter he complains: "You can't imagine how my working efficiency has been reduced. I can't do several jobs simultaneously any more and advance forward at a snail's pace".

"My desire is to treat within limits of possibilities, everything that has been published in Georgian or Russian concerning Georgian or Caucasian linguistics. Clearly our journals have no space for this; therefore I can take into account only those which publishing houses have Georgian print...In the middle of December I plan to go to Egypt for several months... After returning from Egypt, I am going to continue the work on Georgian grammar started long time ago if nothing interferes. In this work, the grammar manual that is held in the Asian Museum of Petersburg would be of great assistance to me" (23.11.1902). Here the manuscript of Georgian grammar by Mose Janashvili is meant (Mose Janashvili intended to publish Georgian grammar in Vienna with Schuchardt's assistance).

The most lovable language to Schuchardt was the Bask language. Besides this, he was fascinated by many other languages and not only languages - the everyday issues of various peoples, psychology, University politics, mystical language, fishing, mathematics, medicine, botany, geology, etymology, language geography, philosophy, lexicography, ethnography, history of culture, folklore... Once he asked Philippe Gogichaishvili about fishing equipment spread in Georgia and generally - the issues associated with fishing. Naturally, he could not be limited only with Georgian. So wide was the range of his research themes. However, from time to time he returned to Georgian. Last works related to Georgian are mostly reviews dated to 1904. After this, Schuchardt had no publications about Georgian. In 1912 scroll inspector of the Caucasian educational region Lev Lopatinski invited him to the International Congress held in Tbilisi, but it was already hard for Schuchardt to travel so far. In 1920 by the assistance of Richard Mekelain, A. Shanidze sent his doctoral theses to Graz. I have no evidence whether Schuchardt responded him or not, but when A. Shanidze sent him "Umlaut in Svan" and "Conjugation of Georgian verb" the response from Graz came. After this the correspondence between them started, but it was ceased because of Schuchardt's disease. In September of

1926 he lay in bed, but still sent letters to Tbilisi, first by himself and later when the disease progressed he dictated the letters. Schuchardt was thinking about his successor, who could continue his work. In the last days of his life he seemed to be thinking of Georgian language again. On April 18, 1927 he sent A. Shanidze his article and next day the last letter: "At last I can write something in detail. I was greatly concerned that I had to leave such sympathetic and interesting language for me as Georgian. Recently I have looked through my papers and found "the data about Georgian MSS" which as an evidence of my interest I mailed in a small registered parcel".

On 19th April he sent an open letter to Tbilisi needing some explanation related to the manuscripts. In the same day he lost consciousness and never came back to it, and thus he died two days later. This note was one of Schuchardt's last letters if not the last.

From the above mentioned it is obvious that the information on old Georgian manuscripts fell in Schuchardt's hands was known to the Society for the Spreading of Literacy among Georgians, professor A. Khakhanashvili in Moscow and also the scholars from the Lazarev Institute of Oriental languages. Moreover, the latter breaking all kind of scientific or moral ethics asked Schuchardt to borrow them Georgian-Armenian palimpsest saying that they themselves would study old Armenian text (the lower layer). This was rather tactless request. The truth is that Schuchardt was a scholar who could always say something even related to Armenian if the subject was interesting for him. He could speak about thirty languages so that up to the end of the 19th century he wrote letters to his colleagues and acquaintances with various language backgrounds in their native language and he was not going to give up what he had taken such pains to obtain. They are the very people who really knew about the existence of these MSS at the end of the century and I have the reliable documents confirming this. It is possible that Schuchardt could share the information about the existence of these manuscripts, and what's more, he was even proud of being the owner of the ancient manuscripts.

To sum up, Georgian manuscripts once belonged to St. Catherine Monastery on Sinai Mount in 1897 fell in Schuchardt's hands and several months later Graz professor already reported to his colleagues about the content of the texts survived in the manuscripts. Unfortunately, Schuchardt failed to bring the nearly finished research to end and therefore he didn't publish it. Probably we would have had far less information about MSS if 5 days prior to his death bedridden Schuchardt had not happened to find his incomplete research and immediately send to Tbilisi to Akaki Shanidze.

Who knows how many more unknown dusty pages are still kept in the archives of the researchers interested in Georgian that are waiting for caring hand with the patience of Job in order to be finally published.

The data presented in the paper are based on about 200 letters related to Georgia and Georgian language selected from around 1300 personal letters kept at Hugo Schuchardt's archive. I examined carefully this correspondence in depth during my scientific trips to Austria in 1976-76, 1983, 1990, 2000 and 2005-06.

This fact must be specially underlined because on similar occasions when Schuchardt's colleagues used to buy valuable manuscripts for their own use they all were state-paid.

As we see not everybody mastered French either. In connection with this an amusing incident can be recalled: in 1897 Schuchardt mailed his article (apparently, "On Geography and Statistics of Kartvelian/South Caucasian languages") in a small parcel from Graz to the Society for the Spreading Literacy among Georgians but it soon came back to him. Then Schuchardt addressed a letter to Tbilisi asking the board of the Society about the reason of this misunderstanding. The secretary of the Society D.Karichashvili apologized for whatever misunderstanding occurred: "Dear Mr. Schuchardt! In response to your letter... I have the honour to inform you the following: at the post office we have inquired about the reason of sending your parcel back and it appeared that the postman did not know French and therefore could not understand. Please, send us it again on this address" (5.11.1897).

Schuchardt's term

References

Tsagareli A. Monuments of Georgian Antiquities in the Holy Land and on Sinai: Orthodox Palestinian Collection, vol.IV, issue I, St.Petersburg. 1888

On National, Political and Cultural Self-Identity of the Sharvashidze Princedom

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/8

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Zurab Papaskiri](#)

Throughout the centuries the Sharvashidze princedom was at the head of Abkhazia, first having the status of *eristavi* (governor of a region) and later (from the 17th century) in the rank of the ruler. There is no consensus regarding the origination of this family and time of its promotion in historiography. The first representative of the Sharvashidze family - Dotaghod Sharvashidze (Eristavi of Abkhazia) - is mentioned (in connection with the events of the 1180's) in the composition *Istoriani da Azmani Sharavandedtani* ("*Histories and Praises of Crowned Monarchs*") [History... 1959: 33-34]. One part of the researchers consider that they must be the descendants of one of the representatives of the Shirvanshakh's court who was transferred by the King David Aghmashenebeli (David IV "the Builder") to Abkhazia after joining Anisi to Georgia [Brosse, 1895: 154; Gulia, 1925: 138, 208; Anchabadze, 1959: 192 Anchabadze, 2006: 72-80]. There also exists an opinion that the Sharvashidzes' ancestors played an active role within the Abkhazian *Saeristavo* (the administrative unit in Ancient Georgia) as far back as in the middle of the 11th century [Berdzenishvili, 1957]. Thus in the chronicle *Matiane Kartlisai* (*The Chronicle of Kartli*) there is mentioning of a certain Quabuleli Chachas-dze Otagho whose "*troops (by order of the king Bagrat IV - Z.P.) besieged the fortress of Anakopia ... Abkhazia*" [Chronicle ... 1955: 295]. In this case, attention was paid to the similarity of the name of *eristavi* (Sharvashidze) *D-otagho-d* who lived in the 12th century with the name of Quabuleli Chachas-dze Otagho on the base of which some researchers consider "Chachas-dze" to be the Georgian form of the surname - Chachba [Inal-ipa, 1976: 141].

In our view the similarity between "Chachas-dze" and "Chachba" seems quite admissible, although it is hard to imagine for us how "Chachas-dze"- "Chachba" can be associated with Sharvashidze. As has been justly pointed out by Z. Anchabadze, the Georgian forms of the family names of the Abkhaz noblemen are directly derived from corresponding Abkhazian surnames: Marshania-Amarshan, Inalishvili-Inal-ipa, Anchabadze-Achba, Dziapshishvili-Dziapshipa, Marghania-Maan, etc. As to the surname of Sharvashidze, this is an exception to the rule. The Abkhazian form of this surname has nothing to do with its Georgian form (Sharvashidze). In Z. Anchabadze's view, an old Georgian form of Sharvashidze-"Sharvash(i)s-dze" literally means "the son of Shi(a)rvanshakh" [Anchabadze, 1959: 194; Papaskiri, 1999:179].

The contemporary historical science has no definite answer concerning the origination of the Sharvashidze family, although it is quite evident that in the late Middle Ages they themselves unambiguously expressed their belongness to the Abkhaz-Apsua ethnos. However, this does not mean that the mentioned Sharvashidze princedom created its own Abkhazian national state in isolation from the Georgian national-political and cultural world. On the contrary, without any

doubt it can be stated that in spite of a certain estrangement caused by the intrusion of kindred tribes of Jiki-Abkhazs from the North Caucasia in the 16th-17th centuries and their expansion first within the boundaries of the Principality of Abkhazia and later more to the south, Abkhazia still remained an integral part of the united Georgian national, political and cultural world in the late medieval period, and the representatives of the Sharvashidze principedom unequivocally identified themselves with All Georgian social and political system.

Georgian national and political world of that period also identified the Sharvashidze family, the rulers of Abkhazia to be an integral part of Georgian national-political and cultural world. This fact is most vividly expressed by the 17-th century Georgian poet Peshangi Khitarishvili in his poem *Shakhnavaiani*. According to the poem one of the rulers of that day Abkhazia Solomon Sharvashidze declined to confront the King by backing the Odishi Queen Elene Gurieli [Peshangi, 1935: 73-74; Khorava, 1996: 104]. It is quite correctly noted in historiography that Solomon Sharvashidze considered Vakhtang V to be not only the King of Kartli, but the King of All Georgia and thus his suzerain [Khorava, 1996: 103; Papaskiri, 2004: 101].

Despite the fact that they had deviated from Christian way of life, the rulers of Abkhazia even at that time they respected the Catholicoses of "Abkhazia" (West Georgia) and considered them their spiritual fathers, even in the period when the residence of a Catholicoses of "Abkhazia" was transferred from Bichvinta to Gelati. This is clearly evidenced from the fragment of *Kvapu* Sharvashidze's oath book to Catholicos of "Abkhazia" David Nemsadze: "We, the prince *Kvapu* Sharvashidze and my brother and Kerekim, have written this oath book and grant it to You, the Catholicos David of North and Abkhazia ..." [Kakabadze, 1921: 88; Khorava 1996: 117; Papaskiri 2004: 106]. There have been preserved other "oath books" including "*Sapitsris Cigni*" which was presented to the "Abkhazian" Catholicos Grigol" (Grigol Lordkipanidze, - **Z.P.**) by the same *Kvapu* Sharvashidze and his son Avtandil.

In spite of turning to primitive state that actually caused the fall of cultural level of the region, Abkhazia still remained in the sphere of Georgian written culture and literacy. This is evidenced from the "oath books" and other official documents composed in Georgian language, which were issued from the administration of the Abkhazian ruler. These materials directly indicate that the only official language at that time in Abkhazia was Georgian. Even in the second half of the 18th century when the Ottoman Empire intensified the pressure on Abkhazia and forced some representatives of the Sharvashidze principedom to convert into Islam, Abkhazia was not isolated from the united Georgian national and cultural space. It is not accidental that the majority of Sharvashidzes principedom, including those converted into Islam by force (e.g. Rostom, Manuchar and Zurab Sharvashidze - second half of the 18th century), had traditional Georgian names. Moreover, Georgian names are found in the Ubikh tribes related to Abkhazians. For instance, in the first half of the 19th century the leaders of the Ubikhs were Levan Thanubaia - "Tsanba" in Megrelian transcription [The Acts... 1870: 426, 429, 953] and Zurab Khamish [The Acts... 1884: 505].

Despite certain peculiarities, the intrusion of Jiki-Abkhaz tribes initiated by the Sharvashidzes, and their settlement on the territory of historical Odishi must be regarded as feudal strife. The representatives of the Sharvashidze principedom when widening their lands at the expense of neighboring Samegrelo-Odishi territory, as was already mentioned above, did not think at all

about the creation of some Abkhaz-Apsua national-state formation separated from the united Georgian state and political system. Their major goal (as well as that of Megrelian Dadianis and Gurian Gurielis) was to advance on the inner political arena and get the leading positions in Georgian state and political space, i.e. the Sharvashidzes could not imagine themselves in isolation from the Georgian national-state and cultural-political world. On the contrary, the Sharvashidzes tried hard to occupy the Dadiani's place and even the throne of the Imeretian Kingdom at the earliest opportunity. This is clearly evidenced from Sorekh Sharvashidze's attempt to occupy a throne of the Odishi Principality at the beginning of the 1780's [Tamarashvili, 1902: 208; Khorava 1996: 114]. The fact that the representatives of the Sharvashidze's house were not going to stop at the Inguri River and even had planned to intrude into the central regions of Samegrelo is clearly seen from Kvapu Sharvashidze's actions. He crossed the Inguri River, occupied important strategic point of Rukhi and actually turned it into his residence [Khorava, 1996: 121]. It is known that Kvapu Sharvashidze died in Rukhi in 1704. It should be noted that Grigol Lordkipanidze, the Catholicos of "Abkhazia" (West Georgia), specially arrived from Gelati to perform the funeral ceremony and took the so-called *nishani* (special payment in favor of the church: personal belongings of the deceased, weapon, horse, lands) from the family of the dead [Georgian...1970: 670; Khorava, 1996:122].

Besides the above-mentioned Kvapu Shevashidze's "oath books", the epistolary heritage of Kelesh-bey Sharvashidze and his successors: Giorgi (Sapar-bey) Sharvashidze and Mikheil Sharvashidze as well as other official documents issued from their "chancellery", is the evidence of the fact that the representatives of the Sharvashidze principedom unconditionally identified themselves with Georgian cultural-political and state world. It is known for certain that these rulers led their official and nonofficial correspondence only in Georgian language. It should be mentioned that this fact is proved even by the officials of the Russian administration in the Caucasus. Namely, the Russian General Kotsebu being at Mikheil Sharvashidze's court stated: "in the family of the princes Sharvashidze the scripted language is Georgian" [Chkhetia, 1963: 154].

From this viewpoint we would like to single out the message written by the prince Kelesh-Bey Sharvashidze (dated from 20th May, 1806) to his nephew Sosran-beg in Georgian language. This letter arouses interest from different view points, but this time of special significance for us is the fact that it was composed in accordance with all norms of documents writing elaborated in medieval Georgia. Besides this, an attention should be paid that this happened not in Samurzakano region, which was more integrated with the rest Georgia, but in the so-called heart of Abkhazia, at the court of the ruler who was considered "true Muslim". This Abkhazia also lived in the conditions of the serfdom and feudal system ("rigi batonmqmobisa") which was universal for the whole Georgia. Despite certain "barbarism" of Abkhazia in the late Middle Ages which, as was already mentioned above, was caused by a new inrush of highland tribes, all this indicates that this region still was a part of Georgian feudal system and the official language of the principedom remained Georgian.

The all-Georgian national-state and cultural-political mentality of the Sharvashidzes principedom was most vividly manifested while composing the so-called "Pleading Points" (on taking the principedom of Abkhazia under the protectorate of the Russian Empire) composed in Georgian language by prince Giorgi (Saphar-Bey) Sharvashidze. It is justly noted in historiography that

there definitely was a political idea in the procedure of the preparation and presentation of the "Pleading Points" [Paichadze, 1999: 217]. In composing his document according to which Abkhazia tried to establish relations with Russia on official base in Georgian language, the ruler of Abkhazia clearly demonstrated to the Russian counterpart (and the whole world) that in the foreign relations the Principality of Abkhazia represented the Georgian national-state and cultural world at the beginning of the 19th century.

It should be noted that the representatives of the Sharvashidze family usually grounded their pleading concerning the entrance of the Principality of Abkhazia under the protection of the Russian Empire by historical obstacles. For example, this is what the head of Samurzakano - Manuchar Sharvashidze wrote to the General Pavle Tsitsianov in connection with this: **"Earlier I was subordinated to Grigol Dadiani** and by his order I signed the item presented by you ... as far as our country was... and we have no right [Acts... 1868: 536. Emphasized by me - **Z.P.**].

And finally, the most important argument that the Principality of Abkhazia considered clearly identified themselves as an integral part of common Georgian Orthodox Christian world is that the last leader of Abkhazia Mikheil Sharvashidze and his son - Giorgi Sharvashidze were buried in the Mokvi church and the epitaph on their grave is carved in old Georgian script Asomtavruli. It should be also mentioned that even after the abolishment of the Principality of Abkhazia (1864) by the Russian Empire the representatives of the Sharvashidze family always emphasized that they were Georgian noblemen.

While considering national-state, and cultural-political identification of the Sharvashidze principality one cannot help mentioning the activity of an outstanding representative of the Georgian literature of the 19th-20th centuries, publicist and public figure Giorgi Sharvashidze, the son and heir of Mikheil Sharvashidze, the last ruler of Abkhazia.

There is no doubt that Giorgi Sharvashidze was a tragic person. Being still young he appeared as a leader of a strong anti-Russian rebellion (Abkhazs uprising of 1866) because of which during the whole his life he suffered persecution by the regime of the Russian Empire. Being brought up according to the best traditions of the Georgian feudal aristocracy Giorgi Sharvashidze felt a roaring love and devotion both for his native Abkhazia and his big motherland - Georgia which he used to call Iveria since childhood. It is not questionable that he, first of all, regarded the entire Georgia and not Abkhazia proper as his native land. However, this does not allow us to question his and generally the Sharvashidze family belongness to Abkhazian ethnic world in the late medieval period. Giorgi Sharvashidze who historically and culturally was definitely Georgian, was well aware about his own Abkhazness. The vivid illustration of this is his poetic masterpiece *Varada* (an Abkhazian refrain) in which he emotionally expresses his wish not to be cut from his Abkhazian roots: "Oh, my God!/ Help me not to degrade/ And sometimes refrain/ My ancestors' *Varada*" [Sharvashidze A., 2006: 97].

As Academician Simon Janashia justly puts it, "Only on the ground of deep feeling and understanding of the uniqueness of the native environment could have grown such a masterpiece as it is Abkhazian song "Varada" coming from the depths of the soul, poetic embodiment of lyrical emotion" [Janashia, 1988: 22]. And this Abkhaz whole-heartedly loving his native Abkhazia was a brilliant expert of his own land and Abkhazian language [Janashia,

1988: 22] was at the same time a true son and patriot of his big motherland - Georgia and never missed an opportunity to stand steadily on Georgia's guard, protect its national and cultural values and give adequate response to those who expressed hostility to his big motherland. A good example of this is Giorgi Sharvashidze's letter to the editor of the German newspaper *Berliner Tageblatt* as a response to the published article by the correspondent Lorenz. In this article the journalist retold the readers about his trip to Gagra where he was invited by Prince Oldenburg. According to the journalist during the party "the representatives of the local elite who served the table" stole "the coat of one of the guests". Lorenz also wrote about Tbilisi with a kind of scorn noting that "there people and animals are in the same position". Giorgi Sharvashidze responded to this libel in the following way: "the people he (Lorenz - **Z.P**) referred to so scornfully have brilliant historical past ... Georgians are the knights taking part in crusading wars of the first advocates of Christianity, stood at the gates of the Caucasus not for the purpose of breaking into foreign lands and plunder other people's good, but to defend their fatherland, - to protect Christian culture and civil life... Georgians have the richest ancient epic literature which can be compared with world works ... in the hierarchy of Georgian kings and people the names of outstanding heroes and people of wisdom can be found." [Letter...1911; Lekishvili, 1975: 85-286].

It is clearly seen from this letter that for Giorgi Sharvashidze, Abkhazians and Abkhazia is an integral part of Georgia. It is a single cultural-political and state system. He is proud of this motherland common for Abkhazs and Georgians. That is why in 1917 when the contours of the revival of Georgian state appeared, Giorgi Sharvashidze wholeheartedly welcomed the beginning of a new epoch. In connection with this, of special interest is his letter published in the newspaper "*Sakartvelo*" (1917: 25-29 June): "Although our homeland Iveria has had all kinds of big cultural challenges but our past was built in such time that we have lost the path of national evolution. Yes, we can speak with confidence that if not bad fortune, today we would have been ahead of Europe... At a time when the conscious part of the fragmented Iver people stood arms folded at the graves of their former greatness, now suddenly the voice of justice and freedom! Georgia raises the alarm, cries hurray, hurray!" Against the background of such national awakening Giorgi Sharvashidze's heart is broken because other slogans are heard: "We do not want freedom, we do not look for the autonomy, all peoples in the world are united and we only want to provide benefits to the working people. To do this, take away the estates of the landlords and give it to peasants, down with titles and private ownership on land ... and thus the bright sun of national liberation and revival set down to earthly calculations" [Sharvashidze 1917; Sharvashidze A, 2006: 306-307]. Really one cannot but admire Giorgi Sharvashidze's inspiration in the spirit of Ilia Chavchavadze.

Giorgi Sharvashidze's national pain as of a fervent patriot of Georgia, loving his native land, always concerning about his country's fate, is remarkably rendered in his poem *Response to V.O.*, which was written in Batumi as a response to Vakhtang Orbeliani's verse - *Amer-Imers*. Because of the censorship, *Response to V.O* was not published in the newspaper *Droeba*. Giorgi Sharvashidze shared the patriotic pathos of his friend poet and with a heavy heart recalled the past when Georgia was powerful and unified⁶ [Lekishvili, 1975: 256-257].

Giorgi Sharvashidze was very upset that the feeling of unity had been lost among Georgians, the whole country was consumed with envy and strife from within: "Some small groups, diversity of ideas,/ Oh! where is the Georgian glory of older times!" [Lekishvili, 1975: 256-257].

Here for known reasons we withhold from detailed analysis of this remarkable poem written by Giorgi Sharvashidze, it is to be judged by experts. We only state that this poem can be put in rank with the most outstanding specimens of Georgian patriotic lyric.

Giorgi Sharvashidze's image as of Georgian public man, the man concerning about native Georgian literature, Georgian language is remarkably manifested in one more publication: *On the Georgian Language* [Sharvashidze, 1915]. In this article, he appears as an active defender of Georgian literary traditions. He strongly disapproves "of bad translation from foreign languages". In Giorgi Sharvashidze's opinion this expresses a tendency to the "degeneration of the native language" [Sharvashidze 1915; Janashia 1988:20]. He is also greatly concerned about an increased unsystematic use of foreign words in the Georgian language. In the author's view "one should borrow foreign words and terms only in extreme case when there is no equivalent in Georgian... it is necessary to try to enrich our language and not make it extinct" [Sharvashidze, 1915; Janashia, 1988: 20]. As is seen Giorgi Shervashidze's attitude to his native written language is very much like Ilia's.

In conclusion, while speaking about Giorgi Sharvashidze's national-state and cultural-political image one cannot help mentioning his speech at the so-called "gathering of the Abkhazs" on 8 November, 1917. This meeting organized by the Abkhazian nationalistic leaders with anti-Georgian attitude trampled down the centuries-old Georgian-Abkhazian historical cohabitation and linked the future of the Abkhaz people to the so-called "Union of the Caucasian Highlanders". The well-pronounced anti-Georgian pathos of the "gathering" and orientation caused a protest on the part of Georgian statesmen. As is mentioned by Mikheil Tarnava, known for his separatist attitudes, the meeting was attended by Akaki Chkhenkeli - a deputy of the Russian State Duma (IV), a representative of the "Ozakom" ("Special Transcaucasian Committee" - a supreme body of Russian Provisional Government in Transcaucasia) and other celebrated people among which was Giorgi Sharvashidze too.

Giorgi Sharvashidze addressed the participants of the "meeting" in the Abkhaz language, explained the essence of the recent developments in Russia, congratulated the approximation of the freedom and called to the friendship and collaboration with Georgian people: "You'd better follow your elder brothers, take joint actions and fight for gaining freedom and self-preservation. I know some of you may not like such view of mine as you are looking in the direction of Moscow and I am looking at Tbilisi. There is no other choice and has never been for Abkhazia but close connection with Georgia and be with her sharing her sorrows and joy". After this speech, being disappointed with anti-Georgian demarche of his brothers Giorgi Sharvashidze left the hall and never returned [Estrangement...1931; Chitaia, 2006: 125-126]. Three months later on 19 February, 1918 the entire Georgia was shocked by the news came from Sokhumi about the death of a great patriot.

Such unexpected death of a true pillar of Georgian-Abkhazian historical fraternity and unity, the last of the Mohicans of the Abkhazian elite - Giorgi Sharvashidze at the beginning of 1918 when newly appeared Abkhazian leaders tried hard to detach his native area from the rest of Georgia, was somehow a symbolic event. An ardent patriot of his great motherland - Georgia - because of true love and uncompromising position more than once provoked rage from the Russian authorities. His heart could not bear the disloyalty of his compatriots. It was quite evident that new Abkhaz leaders had totally different ideals. They could not and did not wish follow Giorgi Sharvashidze's path. It was not for this purpose that "mother Russia" brought them up. This fact did not passed unnoticed for the eminent representatives of the Georgian society of that time. This is what was said in Giorgi Sharvashidze's funeral speech by known Georgian public man Niko Tavdgiridze: "Those Abkhazs who were respected by foreigners because of you, for the freedom of whom you sacrificed all your glorious carrier, all your property, richness, did not even notice your arrival here... They did not benefit from your being here... To ignore you was a crime... What injustice, what an irony of fate: you have sacrificed all your celebrated energy... ...for the freedom of your small country Abkhazia, the only treasure that had value to you - and gathering your last strength as a Biblical Simon attracted to it but your beloved people Abkhazians did not response you, failed to appreciate you and followed the leaders brought up with Russian mentality against whom you were fighting and sacrificed all your happiness" [Theatre... 1918; Sharvashidze B., 2006: 39-40].

Such is our study of the national-state and cultural political self-identity of the Sharvashidzes principedom. Naturally, the material presented here cannot have a claim to study the given issue completely and thoroughly, but even from this it is obvious that the representatives of the Sharvashidzes family in the course of the Middle Ages and later (until the abolishing of the Abkhazian principality and later) unambiguously identified themselves with the united Georgian national-state and cultural-political world and represented an integral part of Georgian political elite.

The fragments from the Abkhazia ruler Sharvashidze's official and unofficial correspondence see [Papaskiri, 2004: 105-108, 120, 122, 126-127, 129-130, 166-170, 186].

See complete text [Sakhalkho... 1989]

The text of the "satxovari punktebi" was first composed at the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, then it was translated into Georgian and, as an original, was signed by Giorgi Sharvashidze and seal, also witnessed by Abkhazian noblemen, and together with the Russian text it was presented to the Russian government [Paichadze, 199: 217].

In connection with this, it is also not of less importance that the Russian Empire in every possible way promoted the so-called "historical obstacles and emphasized historical unity of Abkhazia and the rest of Georgia. This is clearly seen from the notification sent by General Pavle Tsitsianov to Count A.Vorontsov to St. Petersburg dated to 27 October, 1803 where he states that Kelesh-Bey Sharvashidze and his principality in the 15th century represented the province of Iveria [Acts... 1868: 463]. There was another Governor General Gudovich who emphasized Abkhazia's belongness to Georgia historically Georgian Christian world [Acts... 1869: 208-209].

From this viewpoint it is of particular importance Aleksandre Sharvashidze's known remark: "I am not Abkhazian but Georgian nobleman" [Berdzenishvili, 1990: 611].

This verse have been found and published by S. Lekishvili [Lekishvili, 1975: 256-257]

References

-
- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Anchabadze G.
2006 | On Origination of the Sharvashidze's Family. – Georgian History of Sources. XI, Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Berdzenishvili
N.
1990 | Issues of Georgian History. Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Berdzenishvili
N.
1957 | A Letter to an Editor. Literaturuli gazeti, 8.II.1957, #6, (in Georgian). |
| BrosseM.
1895 | Georgian History. Niko Lordkipanidze Publishing-house, part I, Tiflis, (in Georgian). |
| Estrangement...
1931 | Estrangement beginning (1917-1920). Newspaper Tetri Giorgi, Berlin, (in Georgian). |
| Tamarashvili M.
1902 | History of Catholicism among the Georgians. From the 13th Century to the 20th Century. Tiflis, (in Georgian). |
| Theatre...
1918 | J.: teatri da cxovreba (Theatre and Life), #10, 1918, (in Georgian). |
| Istoriani...
1959 | Istoriani da azmani sharavandediani. ("Histories and Praises of Crowned Monarchs"). Kartlis Tskhovreba (The Georgian Chronicle). Text verified according to all basic manuscripts by S. Kaukhchishvili, v. II, Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Kakabadze S.
1921 | Ecclesiastic documents of the West Georgia, part I, Tiflis, (in Georgian). |
| Lekishvili S.
1975 | Giorgi Sharvashidze. Documentary materials. In coll.works: Sakartvelos Moambe, #31-32, (in Georgian). |
| Chronicle...
1955 | Matiane Kartlisa (Chronicle of Kartli). Kartlis Tskhovreba (The Georgian Chronicle). Text verified according to all basic manuscripts by S. Kaukhchishvili, Vol. I, Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Papaskiri Z.
2004 | Studies in History of Present-day Abkhazia. Part I. From Ancient times till 1917. Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Peshangi
1935 | Peshangi. Shahnavaiani, Vol.I, Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Public...
1989 | Newspaper: saxalxo ganatleba (Public Education), 1989, 31 May. |
-

Georgian 1970	Monuments of Georgian Law. Prepared for publication by I. Dolidze, v. III, Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Sharvashidze G. 2006	Selected works in two volumes. Vol. I, Kutaisi.
Sharvashidze G. 2006	Selected works in two volumes, Vol. II, Kutaisi, (in Georgian).
Sharvashidze G. 1915	On Georgian language. Newspaper Sakartvelo (Georgia), #169
Sharvashidze G. 1917	Socialist realism and Georgia. Newspaper Sakartvelo (Georgia), 137-140
Chitaia.D. 2006	Abkhazian issue in the first republic of Georgia. Abkhaz People's Council in 1917-1921, Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Chkhetia Sh. 1963	On the History of the Principality of Abkhazia. 1853-1855. – Historical Bulletin, #15-16, Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Khorava B. 1996	Odishi-Abkhazian relations in the 15th-18th centuries. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Janashia S. 1988	Giorgi Sharvashidze. Cultural and historical sketches. Works, Vol. VI. Tbilisi
Acts... 1868	Acts collected by Caucasian Archeographical Commission. Ed. By A. Berger, v. II, Tiflis, (in Russian).
Acts... 1869	Acts collected by Caucasian Archeographical Commission. Ed. By A. Berger, v. III, Tiflis, (in Russian).
Acts... 1870	Acts collected by Caucasian Archeographical Commission. Ed. By A. Berger, v. IV, Tiflis, (in Russian).
Acts... 1884	Acts collected by Caucasian Archeographical Commission. Ed. By A. Berger, v. IX, part I. Tiflis, (in Russian).
Anchabadze Z. 1959	From the History of Medieval Abkhazia (VI-XVII centuries), Sokhumi, (in Russian).
Gulia D. 1925	History of Abkhazia, v. I, Tiflis, (in Russian).
Inal-Ipa Sh. 1976	Problems of Ethno-cultural history of Abkhazs. Sokhumi, (in Russian).
Paichadze G. 1999	Abkhazia as Part of the Russian Empire (1810-1917). Investigations in the history of Abkhazia/Georgia. Tbilisi, (in Russian).

Papaskiri Z. 1999	The Territory of Abkhazia in the 11-15th Centuries. Investigations in the history of Abkhazia/Georgia. Tbilisi, (in Russian).
Letter... 1911	The letter of His Serene Highness G. M. Sharvashidze sent by him to the Editorial board of the newspaper Berliner Tageblatt. – Newspaper Zakavkazskaya rech', #146.

The Culture of Writing in Medieval Abkhazia

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/5

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Lia Akhaladze](#)

Among cultural values created by mankind a central place is occupied by the culture of writing the origination and evolution of which often serves as a criterion for defining the place of a nation in the general system of civilizations.

To speak about the culture of writing in the medieval Abkhazia is impossible without consideration of those written sources which were created in this historical region of Georgia. Collecting the written monuments being at our disposal, the present research has restored the historical picture of the development of written culture in Abkhazia.

Along with the study and analysis of general theoretic issues of paleography, deciphering of old scripts and graphical structure, the sphere of the researchers' interests include those historical conditions which favored the origination and evolution of this significant achievement of civilization. General historical conditions of the origins and development of the world's writing systems have been singled out and specified. It appeared that the origin of writing in this or that country is linked with certain historical regularities. For example, the genesis of hieroglyphic, cuneiform or cuneiform syllabary scripts is connected with the origin of the statehood in old Egypt, Mesopotamia, Assyria, Babylon and Urartu. The origin and development of alphabetic writing in Phoenicians, Greek and Latin is bound up with the expansion of trade and economic interrelations and genesis of the state [D.Diringer, 1963; A.G.Lundin, 1982].

Another essential historical condition for the origination of the written language is that the fact of adopting Christianity as a state religion in a country. People who shared this belief created their own literacy and develop it. At the initial stage of the establishing Christianity the development of literacy and writing in national languages was dictated by historical necessity. Christianity favored the creation of a new writing system for the national language and translation of the Bible and other canonic books in these languages. This happened during the creation of Coptic, Gothic, old Armenian, old Slavic and other alphabets [Gamkrelidze, 1987:3; Gamkrelidze, 1990: 185]. In a word, among the historical regularities of the origin and development of the writing systems two necessary conditions are named. The first is the emergence of the state; the second is ideological aspect i.e. the proclamation of Christianity as a state religion. The scholars link the origination of the Georgian writing proper with two historical phenomena: the emergence of the state in Kartli and the announcement of Christianity as official religion. In both cases historical regularity of the origin of writing is not broken and both historical realities are acceptable to the science for the origins and development of Georgian alphabet.

How can the mentioned regularities be applied to historical realities of the origination of the Abkhazian Kingdom and Christianity in Abkhazia? If we trust the historiographical "sketches" published in separatist Sokhumi, then "The Kingdom of Abkhazians" created by the initiative of Leon II on the territory of Georgia in the nineties of the 8th century had neither political nor cultural links with the Georgian Kingdom. [Bgazba, Lakoba, 2006]. If it is so, then proceeding from the above mentioned, historical regularities adopted in historiography, "The Kingdom of Abkhazians" must have had all historical preconditions for the creation of the own alphabet. "The Kingdom of Abkhazians" which according to the Abkhazian historians conducted well-expressed anti-Byzantine policy must have started the struggle for the creation of the Abkhazian alphabet and, correspondingly, must have composed Abkhazian Christian literacy as it happened with ancient Armenians, Copts, Goths, Slaves and other Christian peoples.

In reality the history evolved in different way. When the Abkhazian kings started the struggle for enhancing the independence, in the first place they activated the ecclesiastical policy in several directions: 1. Disconnection of Western Georgia from the ecclesiastical dominance of Constantinople; 2. The struggle for the unification with Catholicosate of Mtskheta; 3. Expansion of the church building to the west and the establishment of new ecclesiastic centers.; 4. Struggle for Christianization of the neighboring North Caucasian peoples and protection of security of borders [Akhaldze, 2004: 56-64].

At that time Christianity as one of the most important means of spreading and development of national alphabet played an active role in the Kingdom of Abkhazians too. The key role of Christianity in the matter of unification of the country is manifested. The Kings of Abkhazians exactly repeated those ways of strengthening Christianity which were known to ancient Armenians, Goths, Copts and Slaves. They started active struggle for the establishment of Georgian language, scribes and writing in West Georgian (The Kingdom of Abkhazians) church which was clearly displayed in the written sources reflecting their activity that came down to us. It is interesting to note that all existed major historical sources relating to the Kingdom of Abkhazians and the Kings of Abkhazians are in Georgian and it is seen namely from this period (VIII-IX centuries) Georgian written sources on the territory of Western Georgia or the historical "Kingdom of Abkhazians". The Kings of Abkhazians tried to eliminate the Byzantine religious influence. They abolished Greek metropolitanates of the West Georgia and in their place the Abkhazian kings established new Georgian episcopates. It is thanks to the efforts and support of the "the Kings of Abkhazians" that Georgian language became the ecclesiastic language of the Western Georgia and the process of unification of West-Georgian church with Eastern Georgian autocephalous church was accelerated.

While studying the epigraphic culture existed during the Middle Ages on the territory of the present day Abkhazia, it is essential to consider those written monuments which have been found in this region. The material monuments preserved on the territory of present day Abkhazia as on the entire West Georgia (historical "Kingdom of Abkhazians") are represented in three languages: Georgian, Greek and Turkish. Greek and Turkish monuments have survived only as lapidary inscriptions. According to the data of a recognized researcher of Greek epigraphs in Georgia T.Kaukhchishvili on the territory of the present day Abkhazia as well as entire West Georgia the obtained Greek epigraphic monuments were mainly performed before the 9th century and they belong to that epoch when a part of Western Georgian church

(perhaps mainly along the sea coast - L.A) belonged to Constantinople domain yet. Of them around 22 Greek epigraphic monuments are from the present day Abkhazia [Kaukhchishvili, 2004: 59-79].

There are known six epigraphic monuments in Turkish of which the earliest is the inscription of a certain Mechmed dating from 1598. Besides this, there exist 18-th century inscriptions by Jirkhva and Chlous (Chala and also Mechmed Emin's inscription dated to 1785. The inscriptions done by BatalBei Marshania and Khasanbei Shervashidze dated to the 19th century [Bgazhba, 1967: 27].

The absolute majority of the written monuments of Abkhazia are Georgian. The samples of the medieval Georgian writing have been found in abundance on the territory of the present day Abkhazia. Among the written source there are both epigraphic monuments (inscriptions) and manuscripts performed on soft material. Many of them are epigraphic monuments. All in all there are recorded over 100 lapidary, mural and chased inscriptions [Akhaladze, 2005: 4]. Among written sources came down to us there are about 15 epigraphic monuments with the names of Abkhazian kings proper [Akhaladze, 2004: 56-64] and one historical chronicle - *Abkhazta Mepeta Divani* [Takaishvili, 1913: 46-54], which was considerably renewed during the reign of the first king of kings Bagrat II (978-1014).

The display of old epigraphic culture of contemporary Abkhazia is impossible without known icons from Bedia, Bijvinta, Tsebelda, Ilori and approximately 30 Georgian inscriptions inscribed on them [Chubinashvili, 1959: 22-25; 86-97; 98; 385; 530-532; 533;534; 543; 568; 593].

It is interesting to note that the majority of these epigraphic monuments which are made by the order of the "Kings of Abkhasz" or those in which they are mentioned are found beyond the boundaries of the present day Abkhazia, in other historical regions of Georgia (on the territory of the historical "Kingdom of Abkhazians") namely: Samegrelo, Kartli, Imereti and Javakheti). Of special importance is the fact that almost all inscriptions (total of 15) are made in Georgian Asomtavruli script and carved on the samples of Christian art: cathedrals and ecclesiastical items.

In historiography it is known that important sites of Georgian culture were functioning on the territory of Abkhazia: Mokvi, Bedia, Alori, Likhni, Tsebelda, Tsarche, etc., where in the course of centuries the centers of Georgian culture existed. Here of particular importance are book depositories where original Georgian compositions were written, spiritual literature was translated from Greek, and manuscripts were created. The following monuments of culture have come down to us: the unique Mokvi Gospels embellished with miniatures, Gulani from Bedi, Iadgar from Bijvinta, Mokvi omophorion, translation of Gospel by Giorgi Mtatsmindeli, Vardzia Gulani which due to the historic vicissitudes of fate appeared in Bedia and renovated there, etc. [Georgian... 2007:68, 70, 72]. All historical monuments mentioned above are remarkable specimens of Georgian writing and are inherent part of Georgian writing culture.

Georgian written sources obtained on the territory of the present day Abkhazia supply rich material both for historical-source study and paleographic research and from the viewpoint of study of the history of evolution of epigraphic culture. Three stages of the development of

Georgian writing are presented here: Asomtavruli, Nuskhakhutsuri and Mkhedruli. Of them Asomtavruli script in which a majority of the monuments of this historical region of Georgia are done, is mainly presented. The manuscripts are mainly performed in Nuskhakhutsuri script, although in separate cases Mkhedruli epigraphs are also found.

The fact is worth noting that study and comparison of Georgian epigraphic monuments of Abkhazia with writing specimens of other historical regions of Georgia from the viewpoint of historical-source study and paleography clearly shows advanced cultural and historical trends of this region. It appeared that this region was one of the first that responded to current changes in Georgian Asomtavruli script in the 10th-11th centuries, and also the process of formation of Mkhedruli from Nuskhuri. Moreover, the analysis of the Abkhazian epigraphic material evidences that in this region the foundation was laid to one of the remarkable trends of Georgian writing culture, particularly, calligraphy school of pointed-end style of script [Akhaldze, 2007: 32-40].

Not only in the Middle Ages but also in the 19th century in the north-western part of Georgia occupied by Russia - Abkhazia - under the policy of russification, the Abkhazians used Georgian literary language during official correspondence as well as Christian liturgy and cultural activity. The Georgian language was well spoken not only by the upper class but the greater part of the lower social strata too. Moreover, during the 19th century the Abkhazian nobility exercised the official correspondence with Russian authorities only in Georgian language and intelligentsia considered Georgian language and culture as their own native language [Gvantseladze, 2009: 209]. The mentioned facts are evidenced by numerous historical documents which are kept in Georgian as well as Russian historical sources, archives and acts.

As to the modern Abkhazian alphabet¹ it was created by known Abkhazian public man Dimitri Gulia in the 20th century on the basis of Russian graph [Bgazba, 1967: 60].

Thus, epigraphic monuments created on the territory of the present day Abkhazia in the Middle Ages prove that in writing culture of this region leading position was occupied by Georgian writing which is represented through three stages of its evolution: Asomtavruli, Nuskhakhutsuri and Mkhedruli. Also, all those calligraphic trends or schools which existed in any historical region of Georgia are evidenced. Hence, besides Georgian writing cultures any other culture, other writing system or even an attempt to substitute Georgian with any other writing system in the medieval Abkhazia has not been traced.

¹ It should be mentioned that the area of using Abkhazian alphabet is very small and it is mainly used among the narrow monoethnic socium due to the fact that in separatist Abkhazia there are two official languages: Russian and Abkhazian. Abkhazian is taught only in Abkhazian schools but only up to the third grade, and as to the state office work it officially proceeds in the Russian language.

References

- Akhaldze L. 2004. Inscriptions of Egris-Abkhazeti (“Abkhaz”) kings. Information Analysis Journal “Abkhazeti” I. (in Georgian).
-
- Akhaldze L. 2005. Abkhazian epigraphy as historical source. V.I. Lapidary and mural inscriptions. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
-
- Akhaldze L. 2007. Paleographic characteristics of Georgian writing in Abkhazian epigraphic monuments. Journal “Intercultural Communications” (kulturatashoriso komunikaciebi), #1. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
-
- Gamkrelidze T. 1987. Georgian Literacy. “Literary Georgia” (literaturuli sakartvelo). November 20. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
-
- Gamkrelidze T. 1990. Alphabetic Writing and the Old Georgian Script. A Typology and Provenience of Alphabetic Writing Systems”, under the editorship of A. Shanidze. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
-
- Gvantseladze T. 2009. Imperial Language policy in Abkhazia and its consequences. Collection: Conflicts existed in Georgia and Perspectives of Peace. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
-
- Takaishvili E. 1913. The so-called Abkhazian history of King Bagrat. Old Georgia. V.II. Tiflis. (in Georgian).
-
- Georgian... 2007. Georgian cultural heritage – Abkhazeti. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
-
- Kaukhchishvili T. 2004. Corps of Georgian Greek Inscriptions. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
-
- Bgazba O., Lakoba S. 2007. The History of Abkhazia from ancient times till present day. Tbilisi. (in Russian).
-
- Bgazba Kh. 1967. From the history of writing in Abkhazia. Tbilisi. (in Russian).
-
- Diringer D. 1982. Alphabet (translated from English). Moscow. (in Russian).
-
- Chubinashvili G. 1959. Georgian Chased Art. Illustrations. Tbilisi. (in Russian).

The Fight of the Anti-Soviet Parties Against the Bolshevik Power in Adjara (1921)

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/2

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Otar Gogolishvili](#)

On February 25, 1921 Georgian Revolutionary Committee issued special decree: "To grant an amnesty to all political parties, individuals, and groups who took an active part against the Soviet power and Georgian Communist Party" [Kacharava, 1958:182]. Georgian Soviet authorities addressed the government of the former Democratic Republic in the following way: "Subordinate the Georgian Soviet government that forgives its enemies for the past activities and is ready to act in the same way in relation to you" [Kacharava, 1958:191].

The same announcements were made by the Adjarian communists, but the anti-soviet parties and former government ignored this, they did not recognize the Soviet rule, did not wish to collaborate with them and went underground. They took the road of sabotage and counterrevolution. Thereafter, the Soviet power took severe measures against them. On April 29, the presidium of the communist party of Batumi district made a decision: "To remove immediately all those persons who stained Georgia and Adjara during Mensheviks rule" [ACSA, (Party Fund), f.1, rec.1, s.13, p.52]¹. Special commission was created in charge of dismissing the counter-revolutionaries from the Soviet institutions, factories and plants, cultural and educational institutions, etc.

First of all the mentioned decision was directed against democracy and multi-party system but at the same time favoured the introduction of one-party dictatorship. The commission was consisted of: the member of Adjara regional committee bureau - I.Pevtsov, member of revolutionary Committee - K.Sajaia and the representative of the presidium of central council of Adjara trade-unions. The Committee directed the work of the local party, Union of Youngsters and trade-union organizations, dismissal of the representatives of anti-Soviet parties and groups from factories and institutions and repressions against them by the Extraordinary Commission known as the Cheka. By that time there had been several anti-soviet political organizations and groups in Adjara. Of them the most influential was considered Georgian Social-Democratic Menshevik, National-Democratic, Social-Federalist, Socialist-Revolutionary, Kemalistic and other party organizations. Besides the Kemalistic organization the mentioned parties originated at the beginning of the 20th century. Apart from Communist and Kemalistic parties, almost all political organizations struggled for the independence of Georgia, restoration of statehood, bourgeois order and democratization. In conditions of antagonist class society their activities were directed to the national consolidation and establishment of universal values. Hence, it is natural that they totally opposed the socialist ideology and waged a relentless struggle against the principles of socialism. The programs of social-federalists and national-democrats were almost similar. They were united in one social-federalist party. At first the majority of the mentioned party members did not demand the independence of Georgia;

they wished to obtain national autonomy in the frames of the Russian Empire. Immediately after the party was formed radical faction appeared in it. They left the Federalist Party at the beginning of the century and formed national-democratic party which unambiguously announced that its main task is the struggle for Georgia's independence and sovereignty. The national-democratic party was actively supported by Ilia Chavchavadze who himself wrote the first program of the party. The idea of socialist-federalists about granting to Georgia the status of national autonomy was not liked by Memed Abashidze and in 1908 he left the party. His universal ideas went beyond the narrow frames of the party. His activity was directed to Georgia's independence and territorial integrity. It was due to this fact that he was elected to the bipartisan (super party) council formed on April 9, 1917 which played the role of the first Parliament in Georgia. He participated in the work of the first national Congress held on 19-24 November, 1917 as a representative of the Muslim Georgia. Memed Abashidze was elected to the national council (Parliament) and to the presidium consisted of 15 members [ACSA, (Party foundation), f.1, rec.1, p13, 104].

During the establishment of the Soviet power in its first years, the organizations of socialist-federalist and national-democratic parties in Adjara were comparatively small compared with Social-Democratic Menshevik party of Adjara. They were mainly concentrated in the administration of the Batumi institutions, factories, railway and naval ports. The socialist-federalist organization united about 300 members and national-democratic organization united around 330 members, but there was no unity among them. They split into the right and left. They issued periodicals: national-democratic newspaper - *Sakartvelo*, social-federalists newspaper - *Social-Federalist* [ACSA(Party Foundation), f.1, rec.1, p13, 104].

Unlike the right who met the establishment of the Soviet regime with hostility and demanded the restoration of the independent democratic republic of Georgia, the left announced loyal attitude. They could make a concession with the Soviet regime if the latter recognized the independence of Georgia and democratic principles and did not allow proletariat dictatorship, repressions in relation to the landlords and capitalists and did not inspire the class struggle. The left were totally opposed to any form of alliance of the Georgian Soviet Republic with other republics of the Transcaucasia, and autonomy to Adjara, South Ossetia and Abkhazia. The anarchists were not numerous and did not have any influence in Adjara. Around 50 anarchists scattered in Batumi had negative attitude to the Soviet power, proletariat dictatorship, principles of socialism and building, Transcaucasian Federation, the Soviet Union, creation of the Adjarian Autonomous Republic [ACSA(Party Foundation), f.1, rec.1, p.210, 442].

In Adjara there was comparatively large group of socialist-revolutionists (socialist revolutionary) who represented the left branch of the Russian Left SRs. At the beginning of the century in 1902 this party both in Russia and Georgia was formed from Narodniks. That is why the SRs had populist ideas and repeated those mistakes made by the Narodniks which eventually appeared fatal for this ideology.

The denouncement of capitalism as a social-political formation, the entering into socialism without passing capitalism, declaration of peasants as revolutionary class, the arrangement of socialist revolution and building of the socialism, the denial of working class as main force, recognition of the necessity of individual territory for entering the socialism, etc. This is

incomplete list of those attitudes which were shared by Left socialist-revolutionary party. The SRs together with Mensheviks in the very first days of bourgeois-democratic revolution were against assuming both central and local power in their hands.

Proceeding from their ideology, the Right SRs, met the establishment of the Soviet regime with hostility. Left SRs were comparatively moderate in relation to the Soviet Russia and agreed to enter the government. The Georgian Bolsheviks did not wish to collaborate with SRs. They actually did nothing to be close either with SRs or any other opposition party.

In Adjara the SRs as well as other anti-soviet parties were partially in legal state. They were mainly in Batumi institutions and factories and Army units (their number reached around 400), conducted anti-soviet propaganda and totally opposed the formation of the Transcaucasian Federation and the Union of the Soviet republics, against the autonomy in Ajara. They especially criticized the dictatorship of the proletariat. During the existence of the Georgian democratic republic, the SRs together with Mensheviks made severe resistance to communists. Georgian SRs declared that Georgia's entrance into Transcaucasian Federation and the USSR meant national and political death of Georgia [ACSA (Party Foundation), f.1, rec.1, p.283, 5].

The pro-Turkish Kemalist party formed in 1919 was considered numerous and strong political organization in Adjara. It bore the name of the first president of the Republic of Turkey - Kemal Ataturk. Along with the representatives of the Turkish national bourgeoisie, this party united the representatives of Aghabegs and Muslim part of population. The Kemalist party became especially active after the establishment of the Soviet power. Unlike other political organizations, the Adjarian organization of Kemalist party with the centre in Batumi had its groups not only in the boundary village of Meris but almost in every village and its party members used all means of propaganda and bribery, distributed arms among the population. The chairman of Adjarian Cheka wrote on 21 February, 1922 that only in one village, in Dghvani, the Kemalists brought to local population 1500 rifles of Russian and Turkish production. The Kemalists were especially numerous in DidAdjara, Skhalta and in the villages of the Riketi gorge, and overall in Adjara they had over 3000 members [SUICA, f.14, rec.1, part.1, p.976, 545].

The Kemalists foretold the Adjarian peasants that Bolsheviks would expropriate all valuable things from them and close the mosque; that in the nearest future the intrusion of the Kemal army was expected which liberated the whole population from the Bolshevik oppression. They called the peasants to boycott the Soviet regime. The Adjarian organization of the Kemalist party was against the creation of the Transcaucasian Federation and the USSR, and they wanted the autonomy for Adjara but under Turkey. The representatives of this organization tried to penetrate into the village communist committees, militia and other Soviet institutions. Whether it was by agitation or threatening they achieved that a great part of the village population took their side. In 1922 as a result of emergent measures conducted by the Soviet regime against the Kemalists (the imprisonment of the leaders and activists) their organization in Adjara became weak. By 1924 the Kemalists being convinced that they had not enough

power either to join Adjara to Turkey or to put end to the Soviet regime in Adjara, they ceased to exist [CAGNH², f.14, rec.1, part.1, p.976, 548]. The Bolsheviks convened their own congress at Prague

Among other political parties and organizations in Georgia the most numerous and organized was the Menshevik Social-Democratic Party. It is known that the history of this party and its Georgian organization similar to the Russian Social Democratic Bolsheviks party and its Georgian organization started from the II Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party in the summer of 1903. Thus, up to 1912 before the Bolsheviks convened their own congress at Prague, two factions of one party were in one organization - Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, among them - Georgian organizations. If Georgian organization (including Adjara) of the Bolshevik party in spite of formal creation of Georgian Communist party in May of 1920 remained one of the branches of Russian Communist party up to the end, Georgian Mensheviks together with the national-democratic, social-federalist and other parties struggled for Georgia's independence. After the October Revolution Georgian Mensheviks left Russian Social Democratic Menshevik party once and for all. They created an independent Georgian Social Democratic Menshevik party which united ten times more members than Bolsheviks party.

In May, 1924 the Third Congress of Georgian Communist party (Bolsheviks) was held. In the report of one of the leaders of this party B.Lominadze it is written: "Before the establishment of the Soviet power, the Menshevik Party involved around 130.000 members according to one source and according to another - 80.000, the other - 60.000" [CAGNH, f.14, rec.1, part.1, p.976, 562].

At the same time Georgian Social Democratic Menshevik Party had such strong, theoretically well grounded political leaders as: Karlo Chkheidze - the chairman of Petrograd council of labour deputies created in the days of February bourgeois-democratic revolution; Akaki Tsereteli - Minister of the Provisional Government; Evgeni Gegechkori - the chairman of Transcaucasia Commissariat; the head of the independent Georgia - Noe Zhordania, as well as Noe Ramishvili, Akaki Chkhenkeli and many others.

On March 17, 1921 the prominent public and political figures of the Menshevik party, generals, scientists, the government of Democratic Republic of Georgia, members of the Constituent Assembly, other leaders of anti-soviet apparatus set off at night from Batumi by 16 uploaded ships. New leaders placed themselves at the head of the national parties and acted according to the orders and directives from the leaders gone abroad in exile. The national parties pursued a policy of "undermining" the Soviet regime from within. In the last issue of the Menshevik newspaper *Ertoba* (The Unity) the members of the party got instructions to stay in Georgia, return to their work places, try to penetrate into all Soviet institutions, Red Army of Georgia and prepare the "explosion" during the return of the government of Democratic Republic of Georgia.

The leader of the Social-Democratic Menshevik party, Noe Zhordania when he announced that his government had been forced to flee into exile, appealed to all Georgians not to recognize the new Bolshevik government, disobey it and consider that the real government was temporarily absent from Georgia.

The Mensheviks' attitude to the establishment of the Soviet regime in Georgia was extremely hostile from the very onset. Under the slogan for Georgia's independence, Mensheviks strived for the united fight with anti-soviet parties by forming the coalition against Bolsheviks. In July, 1921 N.Zhordania wrote to his companions from abroad: "*Forget all disagreements which differ us from other parties. Bolsheviks must be driven away, as to the party disagreement, we can speak about it later*" [Tskvitaria, 1963:25]. In accordance with the instructions given by their leader N.Zhordania, Georgian Mensheviks at the beginning of 1922 started negotiations with the rest anti-soviet parties on the creation of such body which would coordinate the activity of separate parties, moreover that all these parties had one and the same goal -restoration of bourgeois Georgia's independence. In August, 1922 all anti-soviet parties except the Kemalists, worked up the Agreement consisted of 5 items:

1. The parties are united for the purpose of fighting for Georgia's independence with joint efforts.
2. In the event that Georgia's independence is restored, the Constituent Assembly will be held and both the government in exile and the one formed in the transitory period report on their activity.
3. At the meeting of the Constituent Assembly new government will be formed based on coalition principle and none of the party will have a right to occupy more than 1/3 seats.
4. To examine the activity of the previous government which has brought the country to collapse, equal representation committee is to be formed.
5. "The Committee of Independence of Georgia" will be elected on equal representation base after signing the mentioned Agreement [ACSA (Party Archive), f.1, rec.1, p.210, 498].

The agreement was signed and "The Committee of Independence of Georgia" was trying to throw down the Soviet regime for two years and with the same purpose the members of the former government, ministers and leaders of the anti-soviet parties continued their struggle abroad. Mensheviks in Paris, London, Geneva and other cities formed the aid committees for Georgia. Their leaders delivered reports on the situation in Georgia in various countries of Europe. One of the leaders of Menshevik party K.Chkheidze while delivering speech in Geneva he appealed to the government of the Great Britain not to give the Bolsheviks a loan. One of the leaders of Rightist faction of French socialist party, director of the newspaper *Humanite* in 1915-1918 Pier Renodel wrote to one of the prominent leaders of Mensheviks A.Tsereteli that French Socialists would try to be involved in Georgia's issues and support Georgian Social Democrats for better for worse [Tskitaria, 1963:32].

In Adjara as well as in the whole Georgia among other anti-soviet organizations the most numerous was the Adjarian organization of the Georgian Social Democratic Menshevik party which united about 5000 members. Only in June-July, 1921 over 700 Mensheviks were revealed by Adjarian Emergency Commission. All of them were employed in the Soviet institutions and carried anti-soviet activity (agitation, sabotage, provocation). These people had

connection with the Mensheviks underground and fulfilled their orders. The Mensheviks were almost in every plant, factory and institution. Most of them worked in the Batumi naval trade port, post and telegraph, customs, Soviet and its local bodies of national economy. Mensheviks were in militia and some district *revkom* (revolutionary committee). In Adjara their central office was located in Batumi railway depot. There were well organized Menshevik organizations in Chaobi, Souksuz, Bartskhana as well as some other villages (Makhinjauri, Mtsvane Kontskhi, Chakvi, Tsikhisdziri, Kobuleti).

The Mensheviks called the workers from factories and plants to fight against the Soviet regime. They demoralized the workers and called to rebel. For such propaganda on November 14, 1921 the vice-chairman of the regional committee of the Kintrishi district and the head of the home department of the same district were arrested, but managed to hide with accompanying militiaman [Tskitaria, 1963-46].

The greater part of Mensheviks was concentrated in Turkish town of Trabzon that was 250 km from Batumi. Georgian Mensheviks in Turkey had every day communication with Adjara Mensheviks, helped them in conduction of anti-soviet work. Mensheviks tried to make Adjara a meeting point for the former Menshevik government being abroad in exile and the Mensheviks remained in Georgia, but there was no unity in their party either. Long before the establishment of the Soviet Union, one part of the Social Democrats left the Menshevik party and announced opposition which in 1920 at the Conference of Social Democratic Party declared itself as an independent Social Democratic party. The oppositionists named themselves Skhivisti, and their printing periodical "Skhivi". The Skhivists also had their own organization in Adjara as well as in other regions of Georgia. With the purpose of mutual struggle against the Soviet regime, the Skhivists reunited with the Mensheviks again. Together with the Mensheviks they were totally opposed to the Transcaucasian Federation and Soviet regime but they did not opposed to the formation of the autonomy for Adjara and Abkhazia [ACSA (Party Foundation), f.1, rec.1, p.168, 68-71].

The Mensheviks and other anti-soviet parties chosen the road of counterrevolution in April-may of 1921 continued the anti-soviet activity. On their side the Bolsheviks also continued their struggle against them. First of all they decided to ban all underground organizations. The Presidium of the Batumi District Committee of the Georgian Communist Party devoted more than one meeting to the mentioned issue and concrete measures were elaborated. In December of the same year the Adjara District Committee adopted a decision on launching a wide scale campaign against the Mensheviks. The Bolsheviks banned Menshevik and other anti-soviet organizations in factories and plants, military points, institutions, etc.

On February 11, 1922 the Mensheviks called demonstration of Batumi students. In connection with this the Bolsheviks held meetings among workers, peasants, employees and the Red Army soldiers and warned the Mensheviks and other anti-soviet parties that they would not allow any actions against the Soviet authorities. In spite of this, in May the Mensheviks still made an attempt to organize the demonstration of workers and employees in Batumi. The decision of Adjara Bolsheviks concerning the conduction of repressions against Mensheviks and other anti-soviet parties who took the road of counterrevolution was not backed by the so-called "National Uklonists" (deviationists) faction of the Georgian CP/B/CC. Only since March,

1923 after the II Congress of the Georgian Communist Party of Bolsheviks when new Central Committee had been elected, the uncompromised fight against the anti-soviet parties started. At II Congress of Georgian Communist Party the following resolution was adopted: "*It is necessary to lead ferocious struggle against counterrevolutionary parties, namely the Menshevik Party*" [Tskitaria, 1963: 67]. In its turn the central Committee elected by the Congress issued the following directive: "*The repressions in relation to Mensheviks and other anti-soviet parties are to be intensified if they won't stop their propaganda against our party on national issues*" [Tskitaria, 1963: 68].

Following the instructions of the 12 Conference of the Russia's Communist Party, before carrying the repressions, Georgian Bolsheviks including Adjarian Bolshevik, decided to suggest them self-liquidation of party organizations and those who wish could enter the Communist Party. The publication of group applications started on leaving the anti-soviet parties. In the application published by the Mensheviks on April 13, 1923 in the newspaper *Trudovoy Batumi* we read: "*We, the undersigned, the members of the Georgian Menshevik Party consider that this party is the only one that protects the interest of the working people that the Menshevik Party won't deviate from the principles of socialism. After the establishment of the Soviet power in Georgia we have convinced that the Bolshevik Party is the only one that protects the working people. As to the Menshevik Party it proved during being at the head that it protected the interests of the exploiter classes. Therefore, we ultimately cease the link with Menshevik Party*". The application was signed by the former Mensheviks: A.Tsotsonava, A.Topuria, S.Chkheidze, N.Tavartkiladze, K.Moistsrapishvili, A.Kinkladze, B.Zomorov, etc. [ACSA (Party Foundation), f.1, rec.1, p.168, 121-128].

Such letters and applications were frequently published in the newspapers and of course, from the part of Communists it was done as a result of pressure but neither Mensheviks nor other anti-soviet parties made fool of themselves. They did these applications formally in order to escape the Bolsheviks repressions. In reality they went underground and prepared for armed revolt against the Soviet regime.

In August, 1923 under the Bolsheviks pressure a meeting of the former Mensheviks was held and a resolution on the dismissal of the Menshevik Party (including the Adjara organization) was adopted. The Adjara Menshevik organization the Union of Youngsters - Young Marxists was also proclaimed dismissed. In 1923 other anti-soviet parties and their local young organizations announced about the dismissal both in the whole Georgia and Adjara.

The leaders of the Committee of Independence of Georgia and anti-soviet parties gone underground acted in accordance with the instructions got from the emigrant government of Democratic Republic of Georgia and foreign organizations of the political parties. From them they got money, plans, recommendations and directives concerning the preparation of the uprising. Meanwhile the III Congress of the Georgian communist party held in May of 1924 stated: "*In the period under report the most vivid achievement of the Communist party must be considered that total liquidation of the anti-soviet frontier took place. The Mensheviks have been eventually overthrown. As to the former members of the Menshevik party, petty bourgeois*

intelligentsia the Menshevik underground tried to have at their back, stopped the membership with illegal organization and a wide-front turn to the Soviets occurs" [CAGNH, f.14, rec.1, part. 1,.976, p.584].

Proceeding from such false and superficial vision, the Congress pointed out to the Central Committee of the Party and all local party organizations: "*Now that major political issues have been solved successfully all efforts must be directed to the revival of the economy*" [SUICA, rec.1, part. 1, 976, p.586]. Three months later after the Congress under the leadership of the Mensheviks and other anti-soviet parties the uprising occurred in Georgia. Along with noblemen, former officers, traders, representatives of the church the peasants struggled too. This fact was recognized by I.V.Stalin himself. In October 1924 at the meeting of secretaries of the communist party rural nuclei he said that "*some local Mensheviks because of the poor connection with masses managed to involve the peasants in the uprising*" [Stalin, 1951: 308].

Due to the fact that in Adjara the Bolsheviks launched repressions two months earlier, imprisoned the leaders and activists of anti-soviet parties, the executives of the Batumi Military organization, the anti-soviet parties failed to organize the uprising in Adjara.

In August 1924 after the anti-soviet uprising which had been stifled in blood in Georgia including Adjara, all anti-soviet parties and organizations were eliminated by the Bolsheviks.

¹Adjarian Central State Archive

CAGNH -Central Archive of Georgian New History

References

Kacharava
1958

Soviet Georgia during in the period of revival the economy (1921-1925), Tbilisi. (in Georgian).

Stalin
1951

Collection. Vol.6. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).

Tskvitaria P.
1963

Sketches on the history of revolutionary movement in Adjara, part II, Batumi. (in Georgian).

(ACSA) Adjara Central State
Archive

(CAGNH) Central Archive of the
Georgia's New History

Poetics of Grigol Robakidze's Novels

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/3

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Study of Literature](#)
- [Konstantine Bregadze](#)

It is known that mythological discourse - mythological paradigms and mytho-poetic expressiveness create the basis of Grigol Robakidze's poetics. In this connection it is interesting to recall here the following statement formulated by Robakidze himself in the letter - "The origins of my creative works" (it should be noted that the letter itself is of conceptual character and can provide a key to the understanding of Robakidze's works):

The one who doesn't know much about symbol and mythos fails to appreciate properly my creative works. Here I mean a scholar, not a reader. Through immediate experience the reader can often understand better the work of art than the scholar equipped with scientific apparatus" [Robakidze's coll.works...1996: 81].

Proceeding from this, the poetics of Robakidze's novels is a priori based on the dialectical relationship between *the inner and the outer*. In particular, the historical-empirical reality reflected in the novel (the outer) implies in itself its metaphysical and mythical roots (the inner) and vice versa. The narrative aspect of the novel is marked by a permanent interchange of the *empirical and transcendental, physical and metaphysical, historical and mythical*; they develop into each other and are mutually consequential, making up a single dialectical whole, which in the texts of Robakidze's novels are first of all achieved by the poetic reception of mythical archetypes, i.e. through their own mythical tropology.

This correlation of *the inner and the outer* can be applied to the characters of the novel as well as to their interrelationships: they are empirical and at the same time mythical beings, the mythical and metaphysical self underlying their empirical and physical self. Mythical paradigms can be discerned beyond the empirical and daily relationships of the characters. For instance, an ordinary love story of the protagonists Tamaz Enguri and Nata in the novel *The Killed Soul* given in time and space must be at the same time understood as a mythical, out of time and space love story inasmuch as the tropological basis for their relations is, on the one hand, the mythical paradigms of Ishtar-Tammuz and, on the other hand, Adam-Eve [Janjibukhashvili, 2003: 133-139]. Here the poetic image of the beloved (Nata) appears already as a symbol of the transcendent paradisaical being and the love for her allegorically personifies a path of initiation through self-knowledge to the establishment of spiritual perfection and divine existence. Here it should be mentioned that Robakidze's mythical tropology is mainly based on Biblical, pre-Asian-Iranian and, of course, Georgian myth (see *The Snake Skin, The Killed Soul, Megi - a Georgian Maiden, The Call of the Goddess*, the fragment of the novel *Palestra*).

From the viewpoint of mythical archetypes in the novels of special significance is the remark made by Robakidze himself where he directly indicates about his own creative method, i.e. the correlation of *the inner* and *the outer*:

"My novel "Megi" is an attempt to personify the Colchian mythic woman Medea into a real maiden. Ivli is the same as Dali, Dali is the same as Ivli. Kavala is the same as Amordzhali Amorzhali is the same as Kavala" [Robakidze's Collection...1996:233; Bakradze, 1999: 103].

Thus, it can be said that the narrative aspect of Robakidze's novels is marked by a permanent interchange of the *empirical* and *transcendental*, *physical* and *metaphysical*, *historical* and *mythical*.

Therefore, it is not accidental that the *weltanschauung*, philosophy and aesthetics of Robakidze's novels are based on J.W. Goethe's teaching on *proto-phenomena* (Urphänomenlehre), on the one hand, and on F. Nietzsche's concept of *eternal return* (die ewige Wiederkehr), on the other hand (although the Nietzschean concept is fundamentally altered and interpreted anew exactly in the light of Goethe's concept of proto-phenomena), because these concepts of German philosophers implicitly imply mythophilosophical interpretation of being. In the essay "My Life" Robakidze writes:

"Goethe's teaching on proto-phenomena has become the basis for cognition of objects for me. Isn't the vision of reality in the dynamics of the process formation and wholeness and not in separate moments _ an ultimate goal of a writer (emphasized by me _ K.B.) and thinker? [...] Not an eternal return of an individual to itself but an eternal return to itself in n individual. Later this notion was applied in my novel "The Snake Skin" (and not only here but in all Robakidze's novels_ K.B.)" [Robakidze, 1994: 226, 228].

The same intention is developed in the essay *Urangst und Mythos* (Proto-Fear and Myth) from the collective works of ontological essays *Demon and Mythos* (Germ. 1935):

This kind of understanding of an eternal return seems quite incorrect (i.e. Nietzschean _K.B.): not an individual eternally returns to itself but the eternal returns to itself in the individual, i.e. proto-origin. It is the proto-mythos of all phenomena in this world. But how can this super-phenomenon be cognized? - Only through the contemplation. However, the gift of contemplating the objects through mythical vision has been long lost and mortally cold notions finally failed here. Fortunately, in this respect, one big exception still exists in the West: Goethe" [translated by the author of the article,- K.B.] [Robakidze, 1935:38].

Proceeding from this, the primary task of an interpreter is to assume as a basis of one's own hermeneutical interpretations in the texts of Robakidze's novels Goethe's teaching on proto-phenomena, namely and in the light of this theory Nietzsche's concept of eternal return interpreted by Robakidze so as to "avoid any kind of misunderstanding" if we borrow from F.Schalermaher. Namely, under "avoiding of misunderstanding" I mean the danger, some hermeneutic inaccuracy when Robakidze's creativity may be treated only as the so-called blood-and-soil literature (*Blut und Bodebdichtung*) due to the fact that one passage of Robakidze's life, namely for primitive interpretational approach his residence and creative activity in the years of 1933-1945 in Nazi Germany and novels published there in that period

(moreover that the majority of his works of that time were published in German) can appear quite sufficient to refer Robakidze's creativity to the so-called blood-and-soil literature. Obviously, in this case a true interpreter must dissociate oneself from time-space interpretation of Robakidze's texts: specifically I mean here the interpretation of Robakidze's texts from the perspective of other ideologised texts, whether they are critical or positive ideologised reviews of Robakidze's texts created either in Soviet reality or Nazi reality.

An interpreter can avoid such misunderstanding only if the method of hermeneutic circle is properly used and while interpreting Robakidze's novels, the initial point will be the principles of the above mentioned philosophical weltanschauung of Robakidze's creativity - the concepts of proto-phenomena and eternal return, moreover that Robakidze himself emphasized this over and over again:

"Goethe's teaching on proto-phenomena has become the basis for cognition of things for me. Isn't the vision of reality in the dynamics of the process formation and wholeness and not in separate moments _ an ultimate goal of a writer or thinker? [Robakidze, 1994: 226].

Hence, in Robakidze's novels mythical paradigms and mythical tropology (mythical discourse in general) is not a merely tropological-metaphorical embellishment but rather the inherent ontology of the verbal artistic texts. That's why the poetics of Robakidze's novels is based on mythical i.e. proto-phenomenal paradigms from the very beginning, so that these proto-phenomena be profoundly comprehended through the power of poetic logos. Such literary text is not a purely aesthetic phenomenon but a *living, magic* text, '*sacral*' in essence, rendering the eternal, endless hermeneutics of being, its proto-origins. Here, Robakidze's literary text is established as a certain *onto-text*, which is not a *text an sich*, like, for example, the post-modern fictional '*pure*' onto-text with no, or almost no reference to being and its proto-origins; on the contrary, Robakidze's ontotext refers to being and its proto-origins, becoming its inherent part, 'set' in it, integrated in it, and is itself manifested as being, through which the proto-phenomena of being can be comprehended alive.

Consequently, Robakidze's artistic objective is to animate metaphysical origins of being through his poetics and mythical tropology, and direct the reader's consciousness from the empirical reality to the mythical origins of being, causing permanent empirical exposure of the reader's consciousness to actual, live effect of the mythical, the proto-original. In his novels, Robakidze always attempts to make actual, live rendering of the material arrangement of being, its metaphysical-mythical fundamentals through his own tropology; he always tries to write '*live*'. Mythical paradigms and mythical archetypes perceived through Robakidze's own tropology, i.e. his mythical tropology serves as a literary method for these creative objectives and goals. As an example of all the above mentioned suffice it to mention at least the first chapter of *The Snake Skin* - "Ekbatana" or the second chapter of *The Killed Soul* - "The Eternal Feminine".

This original *sacrality* and *liveness* are characteristic of all of Robakidze's novels, which determine their reception as of certain onto-texts. In view of their mythical discourse and mythical-poetic tropology directed to the perception of ontological proto-origins of being through the prism of an actual historical-empirical reality, Robakidze's novels, I believe, are a different

type of modernist novel - *an ontological novel*. Such ontological novels are *Das Schlangenhemd* (*The Snake Skin* - Geo. 1926, Germ. 1928), *Megi - Ein georgisches Mädchen* (*Megi - A Georgian Maiden* - Germ. 1932), *Der Ruf der Göttin* (*The Call of the Goddess* - Germ. 1934), *Die Hüter des Grals* (*The Guard of the Graal* - Germ. 1937) and *Die gemordete Seele* (*The Killed Soul* - Germ. 1933, Geo. 1989).

The onto-texts of such type proceeding from their discourse a priori are distinguished by linguistic characteristics, namely by tending to magical poetic language. The specific feature of Robakidze's tropology is just magic of the word on the basis of which metaphysical proto-origins is comprehended through poetic logos, procure with poetic word. Here the magic of the word should be understood not metaphorically but principally in the literal sense. It is this magic of Robakidze's poetic language that was indicated by German author Rudolf Karmann in his article "The Portrait: Grigol Robakidze" who gave conceptually correct and exact definition to Robakidze's creative activity: "Mythical realism of Robakidze's Creationist" ("der mystische Realismus") [Karmann, 1963:652]:

"This is (i.e. mythic proto-phenomenal way of thinking, - K.B.) what distinguishes him, the Caucasian, from all modern western writers and thinkers. (...) [Robakidze] puts into words what is immortal and lives in us. This is magic. (...) Therefore, the word must cognize it (i.e. eternal or proto-origin,- K.B.). It is only in the East that the magic of a word has been preserved, only it managed to keep the inner force of a word" [Robakidze's Collection... 1996: 381-382: Karmann, 1963: 653).

Here I would again like to stress that metaphoric paradigms in Robakidze's novels do not have pure metaphoric loading. Hence, we should not consider them merely as tropological embellishment of the verbal artistic texts. Mythical and poetical concepts given in the text are not simple metaphorical signs but first of all their artistic function is an indication to the higher than empirical reality, metaphysical reality which in its turn conditions the perception of the plots and characters of the novels as symbolic-allegorical artistic semiotic signs. Proceeding from Robakidze's creative method, these mythical paradigms must be integrated by the reader himself from fictional time and space into really perceived empirical time and space on the basis of which the reader must perceive these mythical poetic concepts and empathize as an indispensable and actually existed part of being.

Thus, the reader should perceive in "live" mythical paradigms of the artistic texts, as a real, living entities. In my opinion, this is how we should understand the artistic function of mythical paradigms given in Robakidze's novels. And the aesthetic and ontological objective of Robakidze's creative methodology is to direct the reader's consciousness to the metaphysical fundamentals of being and share with the reader's transcendental and metaphysical reality which is more than empirical and physical reality.

Hence, from the viewpoint of tropology the mythical paradigms in the novels are used not as "traditional" tropic-metaphorical semiotic signs but they represent certain onto-textual living entity on the basis of which the text of Robakidze's novels is established as a "live" onto-text. It

is interesting to note that in the novel *The Killed Soul* the indication is given to this peculiarity of one's own creative method, namely in the passage when the author talks about Tamaz Enguri's verses:

"In the beginning a word was elemental; it had color, scent, metal voice. There was a breath of first creation in everything. Metaphor was not a beautiful comparison, it mirrored objects. Each picture was enveloped in ancient history as if Gilgamesh's lost particles had been found. There was woman's love _ live and mythical woman as Isida's love... but with immediate reality (emphasis mine, - K.B.) [The citation is given according to A.Kartozia's translation, -K.B.] [Robakidze, 1997: 431].

It is obvious here that in Robakidze's novels the "traditional" interpretation of trope is neglected, i.e. an outer embellishment of a text (metaphor) or as "conventional" symbolic allegorical semiotic poetic symbol. Here Robakidze offers his own tropology, tropological concept according to which poetic tropes simultaneously represent the outer symbols as well as the inner denomination. Thus, here we have an inherent wholeness of poetic symbol and poetic denomination. Here the sign doesn't mean an indication but denominator itself and vice versa, the denomination is not abstraction but the symbol itself. Consequently, in Robakidze' texts poetic symbol is not an indication to an object existed beyond or opinion beyond it (the inner logos) but the object itself, the reasoning itself (mirror of the object). Here Robakidze tries to present live poetic tropology in the texts of his novels: i.e. when metaphysical fundamentals of being on the basis of poetic symbol are rendered not indirectly but directly, according to Robakidze - "by the immediate reality" ("von unmittelbarer Wirklichkeit") which is termed by Karmann as *mythical realism*.

Thus, according to Robakidze, not poetic tropology should directly render metaphysical and transcendental relations and not the material arrangement, i.e. the poetic tropes themselves should be these metaphysical and transcendental entities, they themselves on the basis of mythical poetic language should turn into such entities.

This immediacy from aesthetic and ontotextual viewpoint implies real feeling of transcendentalism in a reader. And here, as was already mentioned above, Robakidze attributes an important role to poetic language, the magic of poetic word, magic in the literal sense and not metaphoric meaning. And through all this the text of Robakidze's novels is established as a certain sacral text. Particularly under sacral I mean such type of artistic text poetic discourse of which is also directed to the perception of metaphysical fundamentals of being, transcendentalism.

Robakidze himself perceived his own artistic texts as live, specific "sacral" texts where metaphysical origins of being is reflected and rendered with mythical realism, "immediate reality" on the basis of mythical tropology. From this viewpoint of special interest is the following Robakidze's statement which was rendered in the letter "The origins of my creative works":

"It is really very difficult to turn the selected object into a symbol. It is far difficult to make the event into myth. How can it be found whether the artist overcome the difficulty? It is very easy. Let us say, you are reading a novel where quite an ordinary story is narrated. When on the

reading you feel as if your own experience was narrated, there and at the same time _ and this is the principle thing _ when you can also feel as if the happening had already occurred somewhere and sometime _ know that the novel is mythical. Here is my concept. At my laboratory this concept is a method. [...] Do you know what the most visible products of this laboratory are? - *Londa, Kardu, The Snail Skin, Megi, Caucasian Novels, The Call of Goddess, The Guard of the Graal* " [Robakidze's Collection... 1996: 85].

Hence, in my opinion Robakidze establishes his creative method based on Goethe's method of cognition the phenomena of organic nature and then he applies this method to his aesthetics. Consequently, poetics of Robakidze's novels is based just on Goethe's cognitive-contemplating method elaborated by him in his natural studies: namely, while perceiving empirical separate plant at the same time inner perception of concrete plant the "ur-phenomenon" (Ur-Phänomen), the idea of a plant, the first plant (Urpflanze). Correspondingly, in empirical forms of separate phenomena of organic nature Goethe contemplated simultaneously the "ur-phenomenon" of these phenomena. [Metzler...2004: 442-443].

Therefore, it is not accidental that Robakidze in his ontological essay *The Urfear and Mythos* thoroughly considers Goethian scientific method of organic nature phenomena and proto-phenomena concept [Robakidze, 1935: 38-42].

"The concept of proto-plant has solved the most important problems at once. For the first time in the world history the whole being on the basis of image-natural perception ("built und natursitshtig") has been cognized by mythical reality. [...] The proto-plant is a mythical reality of a plant _ not a historical fact, single phenomenon, but cosmic which is manifested constantly. The proto-plant is sensual poetic image of a myth. [...] in this way the proto-origin is drowsy in each proto and the eternal is manifested in individual. And when the individual (das Einzelne) felt in itself the fertilized effect of the eternal (das Etsige) then it is a part of the eternal" [citation is translated by the author of the article,- K.B.] [Robakidze, 1935: 41, 42].

Therefore, in my view Goethian contemplation of the phenomena of organic nature and the method of cognition is further applied by Robakidze in his aesthetics and transforms this method into his own creative method and uses it as the basis for the poetics of his novels:

*"Goethe's teaching on proto-phenomena has become the basis for the knowing of the objects for me. The vision of the reality in the course of the formation of the process and the whole and not in separate moments - isn't it the highest purpose of a **writer** (emphasized by me, - K.B.) and the thinker?"* [Robakidze, 1994:226].

This creative method according to Robakidze's definition can be called a live featuring method of artistic knowing of the object for study with immediate reality. And this is not mimetic, naturalistic, impressionistic, expressionistic or even symbolistic reflection but ontological when actual, live rendering of transcendental-metaphysical proto-origins is given on the basis of poetic language and tropology, otherwise, when empirical and transcendental entities in artistic text are rendered simultaneously and as a whole part. It is here that the major feature of the poetics of Robakidze's novels is manifested.

Thus, in view of their mythical and ontological-philosophical discourse, tropological specificity and the unique creative method that can be called *a live featuring method*, the texts of Robakidze's novels become established as onto-texts that are not self-referential and hence *self-contained* facts like *texts an sich*, but feature metaphysical proto-origins of being *live* with the help of poetic tropology and poetic language: i.e. these are the texts that convey the hermeneutics of being. Hence, the texts of Robakidze's novels should be treated as a hermeneutic onto-text referring to the totality of being, simultaneously reflecting *the empirical* as well as *the transcendental*, *the historical* as well as *the mythical*, *the physical* as well as *the metaphysical*. Through mythical tropology, this type of texts features empirical reality and at the same time implies comprehension of its metaphysical roots. Thus, in Robakidze's novels the degree of fictionality is reduced to the minimum, the text of the novels goes beyond the fictionality of verbal artistic texts and is established as a '*live*', '*sacral*' text. Therefore, owing to this very peculiarity, Robakidze's novels, and especially *Das Schlangenhemd*, have established themselves as a new type of the novelistic genre - as *ontological novels*.

Here we should note that according to poetic language and tropology, the rate of magic Robakidze's novels, of course, differs from each other. For example, from this viewpoint *The Snake Skin*, which I consider the highest point of expression in Robakidze's artistic creative work, ranks over *The Killed Soul*.

References

Bakradze A. 1999	Kardu, or Grigol Robakidze's life and creative activity. "Lomisi". Tbilisi
Robakidze G. 1994	Sheriskhulni. v.2. Tbilisi.
Robakidze G. 1997	The Killed Soul (translated from German by A.Kartozia) Georgian prose. v.30. "Sakartvelo". Tbilisi.
Robakidze's coll.works ... 1996	Grigol Robakidze: Truth is everything to me." Tbilisi.
Janjibukhashvili M. 2003	The eternal feminine (according to Grigol Robakidze's novel "The Killed Soul") Sculpturing the white pride with your greatness. Coll.works devoted to Grigol Robakidze.
Karmann R. 1963	Das Porträt: Grigol Robakidse. Osteuropa. N 9.
Metzler... 2004	Goethes Metzler Lexikon. Stuttgart.
Robakidse Gr. 1935	Dämon und Mythos. Eine magische Bildfolge. Jena.

Structural and Compositional Organization of Plato's Sophist

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/9

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Study of Literature](#)
- [Maia Shukhoshvili](#)

The object of the present work is the study of structural and compositional organization of Plato's dialogue - *Sophist*. Generally, the selection of this issue is not accidental. The fact is that there is no uniform approach to Plato in today's science. Here I mean the consideration of Plato's writings in different planes. This is the essential and crucial question because if historical, cultural and literary context in which the author creates is not properly determined from the outset, further research might proceed in a wrong direction.

Hence, in my view, first we should determine as to what Plato's writings generally represent. It is a common belief among scholars that Plato made his first steps in literature in ancient Greece and considered as a paradigm for understanding of further changes in communication technologies.

It is of special importance to define whether Plato's philosophical dialogues represent a piece of literature or they manifest the stylistic forms typical of oral tradition which are mainly characteristic to Homeric epics.

I believe that even consideration of this dialogue is enough to evidence that Plato's creative activity is a kind of transitional stage of a big revolution occurred in Greek culture - transition from the unwritten to written tradition. It would be more precise to say that Platonic dialogues represent a kind of hybrid medium in which the oral forms of information storage are merged with written literary style.

While reading any of Plato's dialogues, one can have an impression that it is just a record of unwritten dialogues aiming to keep the information. The reason to doubt this is also Plato's known discourse in Letter VII that he never rendered his philosophy in a written form.

Let us put a question in the following way: What can be a criterion for determination whether the work belongs to oral or written tradition? In the early period of Greek literature the Homeric epics is regarded as an example of an ancient oral tradition. The main argument to prove that Homer's works are oral compositions written by a single creator is structural and compositional organization, namely, the principles of circle and parallel division. Such type of structural organization is noted at three levels: 1. Words and phrases; 2. Separate topics and episodes; 3. A whole text. If any discourse composition reveals the structure characteristic to these principles at least at one level, it is said that this text is claimed to be oral or traditional work. In other words, it is called "memory technique".

Let us see, how it goes with Plato. For this, we have applied the method of modern research - structural analysis. It should be mentioned that from this viewpoint Plato's heritage, namely an issue of compositional organization of his works has not been properly studied yet. However, while studying any artistic work, the most important thing is its architectonics and structure that is crucial for determination of its identity and artistic merit [Darchia, 1998:7].

Conventionally, Plato's dialogues are divided into two categories: whether the work has the form of direct representation of the dialogue or it is a dialogue narrated by a separate character. The following terms are used for their designation: reported, inverted "diegetic", narrated dialogue (in which the conversation rendered by an imaginary author is given) and direct dramatic dialogue in which the conversation is given immediately without an imaginary narrator. [Darchia, 1998:9].

Such classification of the structure of Plato's dialogues is certainly acceptable but it tends to categorize the works from the formal viewpoint and not an in-depth understanding of the compositions.

Here we present peculiarities of the composition of *Sophist* based on the analysis of its structure. Consequently, we will try to answer the following questions: Why did Plato use those principles of structural formation in his works and what was its aim?

Unlike the dialogues of the early and middle periods, the *Sophist* is less artistic and belongs to so-called dramatic dialogues. The action in it is almost absent. There is pure debate. And thus, we should consider the composition of a discussion and how philosophical ideas are advanced in the dialogue. As main structural unit we have singled out the definitions done by the *sophist* which as a whole create symmetrical structure of a dialogue and in its turn the specific symmetry is distinguished in each definition.

The discussion developed in the *Sophist* which creates the plot of the dialogue can be divided into separate passages:

- 1. Exposition (217a-218b).** The meeting of Socrates and Theodorus and definition of main topic of conversation. This is an introductory part and is the first structural unit of this dialogue. At the same time, it can be very important structural unit for the trilogy: "Sophist", "Statesman", and "Philosopher". Here we have description of interlocutors and selection of the method of discussion - the dialogue.
- 2. The definition of the angler (218b-221c).** This is somehow experimental definition, investigation of the simple (angler) issue, which will be a paradigm for further research of more difficult (sophist) issue.
- 3. The first definition of the sophist (221 c-223b).** The first definition of the sophist is built on the paradigm of the angler and shows the activities of the hunter.
- 4. The second definition of the sophist (223c-224d).** The second definition defines the sophist as merchant and is very small.

5. **The third definition of the sophist** (224d). The third definition, sophist - merchant is very small and somehow is only additional determination to the second definition.
6. **The fourth definition of the sophist** (224e-225d). The fourth definition of the sophist defines him as a disputant.
7. **The fifth definition of the sophist** (226a-231b). The fifth definition of the sophist is more extensive and characterizes the sophist as a teacher of false wisdom.
8. **Interlude** (231c-231e). Here we have a small rest during which summarization of the first part of this dialogue occurs and all definitions obtained by the sophist before are collected together.
9. **Dialectics and the communion of forms** (232a-260b). Here Plato needs the dialectics of being and not-being and critics of the forms of being. This structural unit is the most extensive and occupies more than the half of the dialogue.
10. **The sixth definition of the sophist** (260b-264d). This is the most exhaustive definition of the sophist and we have all points of activities of sophists. This definition is at the same time the conclusion of this dialogue.

Thus, we can get ten basic sections of a dialogue among which each has its own exposition where the issue arises from. Each section is associated with one another in some specific structural-symmetric aspect and creates the entire tectonics of the dialogue. At first we have a prologue that shows the main target of the dialogue that is accompanied with the series of definitions and it is obvious that they are easy for perception but vast in volume. This is followed by interlude and summarization of the results obtained from the previous discussion that itself is the way to pass from the easy issue onto more difficult one and afterwards the vastest and the most complicated perceptual section takes a start - that is a dialectics of *Being* and *Not-Being* and the communion of forms which ends with the last definition of the Sophist, serves at the same time as a conclusion of this dialogue. We can describe all the above-mentioned as follows:

A - exposition

B - asking a question

C - definition of the angler

B₁ - asking a question

C₁ - the first definition of the sophist

B₂ - asking a question

C₂ - the second definition of the sophist

B₃ - asking a question

C₃ - the third definition of the sophist

B₄ - asking a question

C₄ - the fourth definition of the sophist

B₅ - asking a question

C₅ - the fifth definition of the sophist

B₆ - asking a question

C₆ - dialectic of being and non-being

B₇ - asking a question

A₁ - the sixth definition of the sophist. Conclusion

Thus, conditionally we can single out three basic elements in a dialogue - A, B and C which rhythmic alternation makes harmony. Of these elements A is found only twice at the beginning and at the end, and it acts as reliable and integrating unit in a dialogue. Generally, the existence of A at the beginning and at the end of the dialogue is common for all works, or in other words it means the existence of exposition and conclusion. As to the elements B and C, there is relative connection between them, i.e. they are not identical but similar sections and they have structural and compositional correlations. We find element B eight times; it is the shortest but the most significant unit because it represents the special joint of the dialogue and acts as integrating unit of the different sections. As to the element C, it develops philosophical discussion and is found seven times; six times it acts as definition and for seventh time - dialectics of the existence and non-existence.

Consequently, we get the most interesting and original structure where the elements are distributed in such a way where the pairs are organizationally being repeated. The existence of element A at the beginning and at the end of the dialogue stipulates the circle symmetry of dialogue. And the rhythmical alternation of the elements B and C: B C B₁ C₁ B₂ C₂ B₃ C₃ B₄ C₄ B₅ C₅ B₆ C₆ B₇ - stipulates organizational principle of the "pair repetition".

We can say with confidence that there is a strict systematized and quite specific structural organisation throughout the work. Let us see what is going on in separate passages or episodes. As a result of the research, we can sum up that some particular interesting and original principles for organization are also participating here that structurally can be described as follows:

The definition of the angler

A - angler

B - acquisitive art

C - by capture

D - by hunting

E - by hunting living things

F - angling

G - by strike

H - with hooks

I - upwards

B - acquisitive art

C - by capture

D - by hunting

E - by hunting living things

F - angling

G - by strike

H - with hooks

I - upwards

A - angler

Based on the research, we conclude that in the first episode - the definition of the angler - shows an interesting structure. Namely, element A also exists at the beginning and at the end of the episode as it happened in the dialogue but with the difference that the element A in this case represents absolutely identical units and stands for an associable unit of the episode. The existence of this element at the beginning and at the end, stipulates trend to the circle composition but this is hampered by the rest elements placed between two A elements, which expose a structure typical for the parallel division, namely: B C D E F G H I B C D E F G H I. These elements also represent identical units and each of them is repeated twice in the text. So, we can say that we have a blend of circle and parallel divisions.

The first definition of the sophist

A - sophist

B - hunter

C - land hunting

D - hunting on domestic animals

E - art of persuasion

F - reward demand

G - privately

H - to give excellence (seeming education)

B - hunting

C - land hunting

D - hunting on domestic animals

E - _____

F - reward demand

G - _____

H - _____

A - sophistry

The second episode - the first definition of the sophist - like the whole dialogue and its first episode, repeats the existence of element A at the beginning and at the end where the element A again represents absolutely identical units and stands for a joinable unit of the episode. The existence of this element at the beginning and at the end, stipulates trend to the circle composition but the rest elements placed between two A elements are still the main drawbacks which expose a structure that is typical for the parallel division, namely: B C D E F G H B C D E F G H. Also, these elements are identical to each other and are repeated twice in the text. So, here in three cases we have omission of the element that is left out and destroys the harmonic structure for the episode and for the whole dialogue. However, we can say that we also have a mix of circle and parallel divisions.

The second definition of the sophist

A - acquisitive art

B - art of interchange

C - merchandising

D - with exchange

E - macro trading

F - with knowledge

G - sophist

G - sophist

A - acquisitive art

B - art of interchange

C - merchandising

D - _____

E - _____

F - with knowledge

The third episode - the second definition of the sophist - compared with two previous ones is shorter and structurally exposes more features and originality. Let us start with the point that here we have no associable element **A** at the beginning and at the end of the episode. This element participates in parallel division. So, we obtain the following structure: A B C D E F G G A B C D E F or from **A** including **F** we have the principles of parallel division, though two elements **D** and **E** are also omitted. The significant distinction is created by the element **G** that is met two times in succession within these two repetitions of the present parallel division. At first sight, it seems that the course of the episode will be continued in accordance with the principles of circle division but it is false, it doesn't happen this way. It should be mentioned that each element is identical and repeated twice in text. Also, we have the signs of circle and parallel divisions.

The fourth definition of the sophist

A - acquisitive art

B - debate

C - the art of war

D - discussion

E - controversy

F - eristics

G - sophist

G - sophist

F - eristics

E - controversy

D - discussion

C - the art of war

B - debate

A - acquisitive art

The fourth episode - the fourth definition of sophist - is well organized and exposes the principles of circle division that structurally can be expressed as follows: A B C D E F G G F E D C B A or each identical unit is repeated twice in text. There are no omissions and in whole, we have the structural organization of circle division.

The fifth definition of the sophist

A - sophist

B - distinction

C - purification

D - of soul

E - art of instruction

F - education

G - cross-questioning

B - art of separating

C - purification

D - purification of soul

E - art of instruction

F - education

G - disclosure

A - sophistry.

As to the fifth episode - the fifth definition of sophist - like in the first part, the existence of the element A at the beginning and end of the episode represents absolutely identical units and stands for an associable unit of the episode. The existence of this element at the beginning and at the end, stipulates trend to the circle composition but the rest of elements placed between two A elements are the main drawback which expose a structure characterised for parallel division, namely: B C D E F G B C D E F G. Also, these elements are identical units and each of them is repeated twice in the text. So, we may say with confidence that we have a blend of circle and parallel divisions.

The last definition of the sophist

- A - creative art
- B - human
- C - image
- D - semblance
- E - art of imitation
- F - based on opinion
- G - ironical imitation
- H - orator
- I - sophist
- H - _____
- G - ironical imitation
- F - based on opinion
- E - _____
- D - semblance
- C - image
- B - human
- A - _____

And the last sixth episode - the last definition of sophist - is also well-organized and exposes the principles of circle division that structurally can be expressed as follows: A B C D E F G H I H G F E D C B A or it means that each identical unit is repeated twice in text. So, we have omission of three elements and it should be mentioned here that it is the single case when element A is left out. In the wholeness, we have the structural organization of the circle division.

Thus, I have made an attempt to find out whether there is any symmetry in separate passages or words. It appeared that in six cases, the separate episodes got different from each other structural organization and original form. Four of them have a blend of circle and parallel divisions but in two cases - absolute circle division. It should be mentioned that slight omissions are found only in few cases, the parts that are left out. Generally, the elements are exactly fixed in the structural and entire system and create proper, well-organized and highly interesting structure.

So, the question arises: What is the reason for existence of omitted elements? Did Plato do this on purpose? Maybe he failed to find the right elements and fill them? Or suppose that these elements had been existed before but lost and they didn't come down to us? Answering these questions is not easy. Proceeding from the context, we cannot say that Plato didn't have desire to repeat some units and it was made deliberately. Also, we can't say that the author of genius style found it difficult to put some elements in the context in order to maintain the style of structural composition. Perhaps, we are dealing with a text with some part of it lost but it is also a doubtful point.

Why did Plato apply such style of structural and compositional organization in his artistic creation? I believe it is obvious that Plato was quite familiar with this style. It is stipulated by the specificity of a philosophical dialogue. One of Plato's goals is to create a sense of puzzlement in his readers and follow the discussion with him. In order to follow his dynamics and not to forget the conclusions, he highlights and emphasizes the point and that is why he repeats each element twice in structural organization of the episodes. First he repeated it for its distinction and the second time for emphasizing, to remind the readers. Thus, he managed to fulfil this intention through the above-mentioned principles of structural and compositional organization, in artistic form and structure. For a change, he chooses the principle of the "pair repetition" and circle and parallel division which made a great impact on readers. This is how Plato manages the transmission of a traditional form of oral communication - dialogue and its establishment in the genre of written dialogue. It was this style that caused his isolation from the sophists and he chose the true way characterized for philosophical discussion, discursion and writing.

Unfortunately, only several attempts of structural research into Plato's dialogues exist. In future it is necessary to consider compositional and structural peculiarities of this Platonic dialogue in relation to the principles of structural composition of other dialogues. This gives an opportunity to group Plato's dialogues in accordance with their structural and compositional principles. If we investigate Plato's dialogues through structural analysis, a new in-depth interpretation to his artistic creations becomes possible.

References

Darchia I. 1998	Plato's Phaedo (Literature, Philosophy, Mythology, Mystics). Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
<hr/>	
Dolidze N. 1999	Main Linguistic Tendencies in Ancient Philosophy and Plato's "Kratyl". Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
<hr/>	
Bluck R. S. 1975	Plato's Sophist. Manchester.
<hr/>	
Rosen S. 1983	Plato's Sophist. The Drama of Original and Image. London.
<hr/>	
Klein J. 1980	Plato's Trilogy, Thaetetus, the Sophist and the Statesman. Chicago.

Frede M. 1996 The literary form of the Sophist. Form and argument in late Plato. Oxford.

Heidegger M. 1997 Plato's Sophist. Bloomington.

Noburu N. 1999 The unity of Plato's Sophist. Between the Sophist and the Philosopher. Cambridge.

Discourse of Socialist Realism and Some Peculiarities of Georgian Soviet Literature

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/1

- ["Spekali" #1](#)
- [Study of Literature](#)
- [Nana Gaprindashvili](#)

The world history remembers numerous past civilizations which have been studied over the ages by the scholars specialized in various fields of research. Today, the Soviet era an integrated part of which Georgian Soviet literature resting on the principles of socialist realism had been, is already a "past civilization". It is a finished historical type which is characterized with its own specific features. According to the common view, we have long needed the in-depth analysis of the Georgian Soviet literature. The truth is that works of literary criticism rapidly become "obsolete". It is not surprising that from the vantage point of present day the studies in the Soviet apologetic literature are scientifically out of date and practically useless. When trying to evaluate the literature of socialist realism under the Soviet period, the post-Soviet literary criticism turns to be in a certain way radical with judgements so typical for the Soviet period. The only difference is that if earlier each and all were liked, now everything is frequently disapproved without distinction. Such antonymy of evaluation necessitates an up-to-date, unbiased study of the literature of socialist realism. There should be determined: what the true and false values of the epoch of socialist realism were; what was its art ideology; its experience and place in the context of the world literature is to be also evaluated from the vantage point of today; conceptual theoretical and historical analysis of the Soviet literature must be conducted; essential and necessary trends of its historical development must be revealed; both apologetic and nihilistic extremes during evaluation are to be overcome; the empirical material which helps us to make the problem more concrete and show the trend of universal importance should be obtained.

When it concerns class, party, ideological criteria of socialist realism, one cannot help mentioning that conjuncture versions of socialist realism laid the foundations of artistic works which conditioned the conflict shown in the work; the system of sociologicistic scheme of the characters. The writers became more and more like military units of fast response who in the shortest time had to respond the appeals of party and the Soviet government. Thus, for example, when the party declared the policy for industrialization and collectivization, the Soviet literature immediately started to reflect the ebullient enthusiasm of the time:

/The machine struggles and rotates/ there is a competition between the plants/ the Soviet industrialization is being created/ in our verses and poems/ [Georgian... 1984:50].

And again, the Party declared that the cotton culture would be developed in Georgia and literature quickly responded to this initiative:

/The cotton is tacking hopes in the fields / a sound rings out/ cotton, cotton, cotton/

[Chikovani, 1933: 258].

A company against the maze as "backward" agricultural culture was launched and there appeared K.Lortkipanidze's novel entitled "Down with Maize Republic" but as soon as "rehabilitation" of this culture occurred the title of the novel was also changed into "Kolkhetis Tsiskari".

Now the party declared great terror and the works of literature conducted the ideas and policy of the intensification of class struggle. The immorality of some writers had no limit. Poets glorified the KGB, death sentence:

/Hurrah to the G.P.U. - your verdict/ is written in a Bolshevik way/ As a political poet- / You must do your mission:/ all saboteurs of socialism/ must be sentenced to be shoot/ Hurrah to the G.P.U. - your verdict/ is written in a Bolshevik way/

[Naroushvili, 1931: 21].

Thus the subject of the art of socialist realism was not the life with all its diversity and dialectic contradictions but the existence of ideological law. Socialist realism, which was introduced not only the main but the only type of art, essentially represented a false form of realism, its profanation, pseudo realism.

Socialist realism had its own relation to traditions. The Soviet literary critics tried to create an illusion as if the writers of socialist realism were logical successors of their national literature. This view can be shared only partially because in the majority of cases it looked like negation of traditions rather than their continuation. This trend found its manifestation in the literature too. One of Alio Mirtskhulava's verses is called "The Leap forward to the Sun". The allegorical image of the sun meant the happy future of the mankind, communism which cradle had been rocked in the north, in the Daryal gorge. In author's view, only the "fast horses" can cope with the hardships which Communist society is to overcome, i.e. "desert environment, dark gorge", Nobody else can manage this, neither "Merani" (Pegasus), nor "Lurja horses" (blue horses):
/This desert environs/ this dark gorge/ neither Merani, nor Lurja horses can pass/ Go there!
Fast horses/ Let me pass the boundary/ / Go there! Let me pass the Daryal gates/

[Georgian... 1984:27]

The cited passage clearly shows the author's attitude to traditions and, in his view, which ideological and aesthetic experience is effective in communist epoch and which is unproductive and incapable. The poet clearly states that to achieve the Bolshevik goals classical heritage is not available, i.e. neither "Merani", nor "Lurja horses".

Any work of socialist realism, irrespective of the author and genre it belongs to, is to be oriented to the ultimate goal - communism. The whole work and the life of its protagonist was the portrayal of the realization of this Purpose. The events described in the work and characters may solve global issues or more modest tasks but even this modest task is to be organically combined with common purpose - building of communism and representation of reality in its "revolutionary development". Proceeding from all this, it is natural that the typical

feature of the work of socialist realism must be a happy ending, which in order to differentiate from the happy ending well known in literature and art can be termed as "socialist realist happy ending".

The socialist realist happy ending is an artistic reflection of "Marxist happy ending" which was proclaimed by the Communist Party. Proceeding from this teaching, a happy ending was considered only when the ultimate goal is achieved and the communism will be built. Besides this, there also exist comparatively modest, intermediate goals (winning in socialist contest, fulfilment of a five-year plan in three years, etc.). In a communist society the authorities do not care about the fate of a concrete person. Therefore, the ending of a work is not oriented at the fate of a protagonist. The fate of a protagonist is one's own personal tragedy and it is not essential for the aesthetics of socialist realism. Socialist realism had the same approach to a man as the Soviet regime for which a man had only static function. Hence, not the fate of a protagonist determines the "socialist realist happy ending" but the fate of a common goal, common cause. If the protagonist sacrifices life for this goal and its realization is not brought into question then everything is all right, there is a happy ending. However, if everything is under question, the aesthetics of socialist realism does not admit such case. For example, Rodion Korkia's 12-year-old protagonist was killed in the battle ("The Salt Cradle"). But the revolution triumphed and years later when his corpse was accidentally found it was buried with revolutionary honour and the young hero was even posthumously rewarded with a Red order: "He lay holding his gun. The hand was on the wounded heart. Blood had dried on his chest. The salt preserved his body so well that it looked as if the small soldier was asleep. What was his name? Who knows?! The cannons were roaring, when the coffin was carried. The children followed the coffin with flowers in their hands. The waves were softly rolling in as if they were rocking their son. The small horseman lay in his coffin with a rifle and Red Order was radiating in his blood dried chest," [Korkia, 1968: 13].

The works of socialist realism make emphasis on ideological aspect of the function of the title and realization of the happy ending. The creation of a cheerful optimistic way of life in actual reality of socialist realism becomes an additional and special function of the title. Proceeding from the basic method of socialist realism, any work of art was required to provide a depiction of bright future which must have been evidenced from the very title of a work. Although officially and theoretically this requirement was not fixed anywhere, but the writers themselves, proceeding from the total ideological and aesthetic system, arrived to this conclusion. Here are some typical titles of the works of socialist realism: "Down with Maize Republic" (K.Lortkipanidze), "Steps" (P.Chkhikvadze), "The Daybreak" (D.Shengelaia), "The Unbeaten Caucasus" (G.Abashidze), "The Mountains Awake" (E.Zedgenidze), "The Floors" (P.Chkhikvadze), "The Hero" (A.Chachibaia), "To New Georgia" ((A.Abasheli), "To Georgian Bolsheviks" (G.Leonidze), "To New Colchida" (I.Mosashvili), "The October Beacon" (Alio Mirtskhulava), "The Spring of Mankind" (Stefane Mkhargrdzeli), "The Crown of Mankind" (Kale Bobokhidze), "It was born as an Eternal Sun" (Teymuraz Jangulashvili), etc.

In the structure of a work of socialist realism with a happy ending from ideological viewpoint of special importance was also the ending of the work of art, the last monologue of a dying hero or words. It was just at the end of a work as it is in a speech delivered at the meeting loud proclamations were heard, the pictures of a happy future or the utopian pictures of communism

were depicted; the characters glorified "big" or "small" heroisms of the builders of communism; the dying hero used to say the final words from which the revolutionary and communist pathos was expressed. The small revolutionary protagonist from the above mentioned Rodion Korkia's novel is leaving this world with the following words:

"Hurrah! - heard from the trench. - Long live the Soviet Georgia! Ours are crying! - occurred to a small boy. - So we have won! Oh, if only I could stand up! I would meet Frunze... Then I would retell my Mom about this...

...Hurrah! - heard from the trench.

- Comrades, I cannot go out of the trench, can I? - and the tears rolled down his cheeks.

It was dawn in the sky.

- Hurrah! - heard from the trench.

The small soldier made a move once more, gave a sigh and exclaimed:

- Hurrah!

After this the salt soil embraced him and closed the mouth, the red morning came in the trench" [Korkia, 1968: 12].

In a majority of cases a happy ending in the socialist-realist works can be evaluated as "forced optimism". It is one of the major components of the literature of socialist realism where misfortune and troubles are either not shown or outweighed by positive elements. The socialist realist heroes and heroines were wonderful people with stainless reputation, but the scoundrels were as black as night. Another key element of socialist realism was a happy ending which must be one more evidence that socialist world was the best one among all possible worlds.

It should be mentioned that happy ending is not an exclusive finding of the socialist world. In modern world it is sometimes considered as an American phenomenon, though the roots of this type of utopia must be sought in the distant past which was reflected in the remarkable specimens of folklore. This is also evidenced from Georgian tales and especially their endings. Beginning from the 20th century Georgian cultural world had already had new type of a happy ending in the form of "socialist realist happy ending". If the tale characters are fighting against the devi, dragons, tailed old women... and win, the characters in socialist-realist works are fighting against those who opposed the ideology of Marxism and party, against the traces of the bourgeois past in its consciousness ... and win. In both cases this is perceived as a fight between good and evil. However, in the first case it is really the fight between good and evil but in another case it is an imitation of it.

On the path to an ultimate goal - communism, we can find numerous paradoxes in the Soviet reality: to be no boundaries in future, the Soviet regime was building new and new boundaries between the states; for all people be happy in future, the Soviet regime was brutal to thousands of people; in order for the labour be free in future, numerous people were forced to hard labour, etc. Works of socialist realism glorified this regime and tried to establish the overall happiness

and optimism. This attitude did not oppose the norms of socialist realism because all these hardships were obligatory to reach the "Purpose" and served a goal of achieving the communist happy ending.

The main differentiating feature of the concept of socialist-realist happy ending from the happy endings of other types and epochs is that it was oriented at Marxist doctrine and ultimate goal of the mankind, communism.

In the works of socialist realism, like in any other verbal composition the events can be depicted which happened in the past, happen in the present or will happen in the future. From this viewpoint the most productive and functionally loaded is the present. In the works of socialist realism the events are mainly happening in the present ("Kolkhetis Tsiskari", "Gvadi Bigva", etc.). The aesthetics of socialist realism **is practically most easily realized** in such works. Things are more complicated when a writer describes the remote past. One needs more effort to present the historical facts and events or invented stories in conformity with the method of socialist realism. In this case, its aim is to show the vector of world's history development as a movement for communism and find such moments in the world history which would strengthen its positions. Here of great assistance to the reader was also the criticism of Marxism which was seeking and it must be said that "found" the "progressive core" in historical personages, historical facts and events which make the mankind close to their dearest Purpose - communism even when mankind was not aware of communism.

The writers avoided describing communism as already happened fact. Of other numerous reasons for this perhaps the primary is subjective factor. The writers themselves may explain this fact as "communist modesty" as if the representation of communist overall happiness and upheaval was beyond their artistic imagination. But probably more important is the other thing: they could make a fatal mistake while presenting artistic description of communism and Party would never forgive them this.

The epoch of socialist realism has been ended. Georgian literature is not the voice of the communist party any more. It has returned its aesthetic function and the possibility of free creative development. New epoch has come. The culture of each epoch has its own concept for society and person, own paradigm. This paradigm greatly determines the life of the epoch which creates the invariant of the relationship of power, society and personality. The concept of a world and man is changed and improved from epoch to epoch. After socialist realism the culture of the post Soviet space is in search of a new paradigm.

1 G.P.U. is the same as OGPU (All-Union State Political Board), the KGB's predecessor.

References

Bakradze A. Taming of Writing. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
1990

Tsaroushvili F. Declaration of Political Poet. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
1931

Georgian... 1984	Fifteen-Volume Poetry, vol. 15. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Korkia R. 1968	A Salt Cradle. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Chikovani S. 1933	Poems (The First Book). Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Yu.Borev 2008,2009	Socialist realism: A Contemporary Glimpse. Moscow. (in Russian).
Getting rid of... 1990	Getting rid of Mirages. Socialist realism today. Moscow. (in Russian)
Socialist... 2000	Socialist realistic method. St. Petersburg. (in Russian)
Terts A. 1988	What is socialist realism? Paris. (in Russian).
Fedorov F. 1991	Socialist realism as a type of art. Daugavpils. (in Russian)