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MEDIEVAL GEORGIAN HISTORICAL LITERATURE  
(VIIth--XVth Centuries)  
BY PRINCE CYRIL TOUMANOFF

Georgia was, at the time of the Russian annexation at the beginning of the last century, the only country in Christendom whose socio-political and cultural development dated uninterruptedly from Classical times. Yet here are perhaps the only important history and culture that are almost totally unknown to the West. Needless to say, this lack of familiarity extends to the Georgian historical writings as well. However, whereas Georgian history and culture are simply little known, regarding the Georgian historical sources there exist also misunderstanding and misinformation. Nevertheless, the value of these sources and their importance, not only for the history of Caucasus, but generally for that of the Christian East, have now found universal recognition among

1 Preliminary Note on the Transcription of the Georgian Alphabet. The Georgian alphabet is perfectly adapted to the language. Every sound in Georgian is represented by a single letter of that alphabet. However, some Georgian sounds can be rendered into English only by a combination of letters; others can be only hinted at because English possesses no corresponding sounds. Thus two systems have been adopted in this study for rendering Georgian words into English. The one is that of literal transcription, the other, that of phonetic transcription or transliteration. According to the former, every single letter of the Georgian alphabet is made to correspond to a single letter of the English alphabet—often with diacritical marks. Literal transcription is used mainly in the notes. According to the other system, that of phonetic transcription or transliteration, Georgian sounds are—when necessary—expressed, or nearly expressed, by combinations of English letters. This system is used—chiefly for aesthetic reasons—in the English text of the study. Here are the two transcriptions of certain Georgian letters, first the literal then the phonetic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30th letter</th>
<th>20th letter</th>
<th>31st letter</th>
<th>32nd letter</th>
<th>33rd letter</th>
<th>34th letter</th>
<th>35th letter</th>
<th>36th letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;o&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;e&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;j&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;e&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;e&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;a&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;e&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;e&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= ts</td>
<td>= ch</td>
<td>= gh</td>
<td>= dz</td>
<td>= zh</td>
<td>= sh</td>
<td>= sh</td>
<td>= zh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p'</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= p</td>
<td>= p'</td>
<td>= q</td>
<td>= q</td>
<td>= s</td>
<td>= sh</td>
<td>= t</td>
<td>= t'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These transcriptions are likewise applied to the corresponding Russian, Armenian, Arabic, and Persian sounds. Except that the Russian equivalent of the 15th letter and the first letter in the transcription of the Russianiotated vowels is rendered by "i"; that the 20th letter of the Russian alphabet is rendered by "y"; and that the Armenian equivalent of the 20th Georgian letter is literally transcribed as "a"—As regards the geographical appellations, Greek-Latin equivalents are preferred to the less familiar autochthonous forms. In default of such equivalents, the names of larger territorial divisions (kingdoms, principalities, etc.) have been latinized, through the substitution of the suffix -ia for the corresponding Georgian territorial suffix -et'.
specialists. Therefore, a presentation of a systematic account, based on the latest research, of these monuments of Georgian historical literature, should be of interest to Western scholars. But no such presentation has, to our knowledge, ever been attempted. To do this is the aim of the present study.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

I

It will not be superfluous to prefix this study with a brief outline of the historical background reflected in the literature to be examined.

Georgia lies in the cis-Caucasian, northeasternmost corner of the Mediterranean world, the Caucasus mountains in the North protect it from the hyperborean steps beyond; from the Black Sea which bounds it in the West, connecting it more closely with the Mediterranean, it stretches forth towards the Caspian: but only once—at the apogee of Georgia's political power—has it reached its waters; and in the South it borders on Armenia, through which it is accessible from Iran in the Southeast and, still more so, from Asia Minor and Syria in the West and South. And it was from the Mediterranean Southwest that the various tribes whose fusion has produced the Georgian nation had come to settle in cis-Caucasia, forming, by the fourth century B.C., the Georgian State—destined to survive till the nineteenth century.

Three of these tribes had already at that time a millennial history. The Kashka (Kashe)—Collectians, Mushka (Mushka)—Bechians, and Tabul (Taba)—Tibareniens had made their appearance in history in Asian Minor at the period of its transition from the Hittite to the Assyrian overlordship. Two other important ethnic constituents of the Georgian nation, the Can—Son-Suazians and the Kart—Karduchians, though traceable to earlier periods, make their definitive appearance in post-Assyrian times.

It is important to bear in mind that, from the point of view of the Mediterranean World—geopolitically the correct one—Georgia lies in "cis-Caucasia"; the term "Trans-Caucasia" is due to the much later, and far less natural, point of view of the Russian Empire. From the beginning, cis-Caucasia was Asianic (of Asian Minor) and, therefore, Mediterranean, rather than Iranian, and still less anything else. The archaeological discoveries of 1936–1940 in the Calka region west of Tiflis have brought to light the existence, in about the fifteenth–fourteenth century B.C., of a highly developed Bronze-age civilization of Asianic, Proto-Hattian affinities in what is now central Georgia. Cf. P. Usakov, "The Hatti Problem:—On the Question of the Genesis and Interrelation of the Indo-European and Kartvelian Languages" (in Russian), Traite de l'Université Stéphane à Tbilissi (Tiflis), XVIII (1941), 93, 100, 111–112. Moreover, the Caspian—perhaps heirs to the Calka Culture—whom the Georgian tribes encountered upon their migration to cis-Caucasia, may have also been near-Proto-Hattian, cf. op. cit., pp. 99, 100.

The Kashka—of Proto-Hattian and Japhetite affinities and originating from the Marma coast—first appear in the Hittite records in the mid-fourteenth century B.C., a menace to the Hitite Empire from the Pontic regions. Instrumental in bringing about that empire's downfall in the twelfth century, the Kashka moved southwards and met the Assyrians: a part of them was repulsed and settled in Pontic Caucasus as the Rmites of the Greek records, another part formed a state in Cappadocia, vassal to the Assyrians in the eighth century. The Mushka—representing most probably the pre-Indo-European, Japhet...
With the establishment of the latter tribe in present-day Georgia, in the fourth century B.C., the migration of the Proto-Georgian tribes to Cis-Caucasia, begun by the Kashka-Coleians in the twelfth, was terminated. And by the time of the downfall of the Achaemenid Empire under the blows of Alexander, the Georgian tribes had appeared—after internal migrations and adjustments which resulted in transpositions of tribe- and place-names—forming two main geopolitical units: Western and Eastern Georgia.

Western or Pontic Georgia, in the basin of the river Phisis or Rioni, extended from the Black Sea eastwards to the system of mountains which separated it.
from its eastern counterpart. To the Hellenistic World it was known as Colchis, but the Georgians called it Egrisi.\textsuperscript{a}

Eastern Georgia lay in the basin of the river Cyrus or Kur, between the mountains of Likhi (Lxi), separating it from Colchis, and the Caspian kingdom of Albania.\textsuperscript{b} It was known to the Hellenistic world as Iberia\textsuperscript{c} and was inhabited by two principal peoples, the Meschians\textsuperscript{d} (Meski, Mushki-Moschians) and the Kartvelians (Kart-Cariduchians). The latter was the dominant element which gave its name, first, to the whole of Iberia: Kart'l'li and, then, to the whole of the Georgian lands: Sak'art'velo.

The independence of the Georgians from the Achaemenid suzerainty, resulting from the conquests of Alexander, and the establishment of the Kartvelian monarchy in Iberia mark the beginning of both the historical memory and the unbroken and organic socio-political and cultural development of the Georgian nation.

Risen from the debris of the Iranian Empire, Iberia and Colchis fell within the orbit of the Hellenistic world, two of whose important trade routes—connecting it with the East and North—traversed them. Colchis—possessed of great Euxine ports and, successively, a part of Mithridates' State, a Roman


\textsuperscript{a} The name Ḡārsh is derived from the Kaška-Colchi, the first Proto-Georgians to settle in Cis-Caucasia.

\textsuperscript{b} This name is due to an immigration to Pontic Georgia of the Tabal-Tibarini, cf. n. 6.


\textsuperscript{d} The word Kaška is derived from the root Tabal-Tibar- (Iber). The presence of the Tabal-Tibarini in Colchis must have given rise to its Georgian name of Egrisi, through the mutation Iber-Eger. Cf. A. Gugushvili, "Ethnographical and Historical Division of Georgia", \textit{Georgia}, I, 2 and 3 (1930), 53-71.

\textsuperscript{1} The name Marxa appears in the Byzantine chronicles (e.g., Cadresus, II [Bonn.], p. 572), and, since it seems preferable to replace, wherever possible, the local and less familiar forms by their Classical equivalents, the form Meschin(n) will be used throughout instead of Moschich(n), or Mesxet'i, Masxin(n).
client, a part of the Bosporan Kingdom, and again a client of Rome—was closely
bound with the Graeco-Roman world. Iberia, on the other hand—where the
Roman "friendship" imposed in 65 B.C. by Pompey, and the Hellenistic civilization
were counterbalanced by proximity of Iran and Armenia—developed an
organic and original national culture and polity. These, based on the old
Asiatic (Asia Minor)-Japhetite8 foundation, were merely buttressed by the
above rival influences.

The conversion of the Georgians to Christianity in the fourth century was
decisive in the shaping of their destiny. For, though culturally and politically
at equipoise between the Mediterranean and Iran, spiritually, they were to cling

8 The term "Japhetite" is due to the late Georgian Professor Nicholas Marr, and has
been used by him and his school at different stages of the development of their theory to
designate different things. The best English survey of Marr's theory (and its develop-
ment) will be found in A. Gugushvili, "Nicholas Marr and His Japhetic Theory", Geor-
gica, I, 1 (1935), 101-115. It is beyond the scope of this study to pass any judgment on the later
stages of this theory's development, which tend to see in the Japhetic languages no longer
an individualized group, but an epoch in the development of languages in general. All this
is, of course, beyond the possibilities of historical research, and the formulations of Marr's
school border on what one may term "Marxian metaphysics." That part of the theory,
however, which admits of verification by history and philology and which is based on strict
historical and philological research, is beyond all doubt of a very great value and
significance. It not only faces the fact of the existence, in the history of the Mediterranean
World, of a number of peoples whose languages are outside the Semitic, Hamitic, Indo-
European, or Uralo-Altaic complexes, but it also boldly recognizes an intrinsic relationship
between these languages (and peoples) and explains whatever affinities have been found
between some of them.

Western science has been continually confronted with the problem of a few languages
from the Pyrenees to the Caucasus and the Persian Gulf, such as Basque, Georgian, Sum-
rian, which could not be fitted into any recognized linguistic groups. Moreover, affinities
between various Caucasian, Asianic, and Aryan languages (such as Georgian, Mitannian,
Subarcan, Elamite, Sumerian, Xaladian, Xurrian, Proto-Hattian, Lydian, Persian, etc.), and
their distinctness from any other linguistic group have now been generally at-
tested (cf., e.g., Usakov, On the Quest. of the Genesis and Interr. of the Indo-Europ. and Kart.
Languages; George G. Cameron, History of Early Iran [Chicago, 1938] chapt. 1; Speiser,
Mesopotamian Origins [Philadelphia, 1930] etc.)

It is this distinct element that Marr has termed Japhetic. The name itself, to be sure,
is purely arbitrary. As "Japhetic", it was used to be synonymous with " Indo-European";
Marr chose it because, according to the Bible, Japheth was the father to Thubal and
Mosoch, who symbolize the two leading Proto-Georgian tribes (cf. Marr, Selected
Works, p. 23 n. 8). This linguistic group, which may represent likewise a cultural and ethnic
entity, appears to have been the earliest formative element in the culture of the Medi-
terranean world, which to this day bears its onomatopoeic traces (cf. Marr, op.cit.; Javaksi-
vili History, I-II; idem, Introduction à l'Hist. du peuple géorgien, II: "La structure originelle
et la parenté des langues géorgienne et caucasienne" [ in Georgien] [Tiflis, 1937], 3-91).

The most interesting of these onomatopoeic traces is perhaps the identity of the names of
Eastern Georgia and Spain; both Iberia (their inhabitants: Iberians) to the Classical world
(already Appian, M. A., XV, 101 [Loeb, 1932], 330/431, wandering at that homony-
mity), as well as the similarity of the names: Basque and Abasquian [A-Basqu-Mors] (the
Iberians of Spain and the Basques have been ascribed descent also from Thubal, cf. Pierre
to the Christian West and to stand, long after its Byzantine outpost had fallen, as the easternmost bulwark of Christendom.

Among the consequences of the conversion was the tightening of the Byzantine control over Pontic Georgia, which was now called Lazica. But to Iberia Christianity gave new strength to withstand the coming trials. During the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries—after the Lazic Wars and the "Eternal Treaty" of Justianian and Chosroes—the equipoise of Georgia between the Mediterranean and Iran was upset. Lazica, as has been said, submitted more to the Byzantines, but Iberia—her monarchy temporarily abolished—fell under the political control, first, of the Sassanian Empire and, then, of the Caliphate.10

The eighth and ninth centuries were marked by a weakening of both the Muslim and the Byzantine Empire and by the consequent re-establishment of the political equipoise between them in the Christian Caucasian countries of Armenia and Georgia. The regeneration of these, which followed, was headed in both cases by one of the most remarkable dynasties of Christendom—the Bagratids.11

The demesnes of the Georgian Bagratids—a branch of the ancient Armenian dynastic line—were situated on the Georgio-Armenian border, in Meschis, which, after the Persian domination of Iberia, had become the leading center of Georgian culture.12 By the eighth century, the Georgian Bagratids had acquired the title-office of Eriss'ari or Duke12a of Inner Iberia which carried with it the Byzantine dignity of Duke (in the sense of an "autonomous" khan of a "kingdom"). The name Eriss'ari is derived from the tribe-root San-Can, cf. Marr, Selected Works, p. 225; Allen, History, p. 25. As regards the name Lazi, the older view is that it represents the Suanian territorial prefix La and Zan, an equivalent of San-Can, Allen, p. 54, n. 4; Marr, however, finally came to the conclusion that the root Laz is a derivative of the tribe-root Laas-Bo(h), found in the names Pe-las-gi, Et-rus-ci, Las-gi, U-nas-tu (Umurtu), etc. (cf. op.cit., p. 170, n. 2, as well as pp. 110, 139, 225, 295, etc.)

Three main dynasties had hitherto reigned in Iberia: the Pharnabazids (IVth century B.C. to I st century A.D.), the Arsacid (a branch of the Armenian line, I st-IIIrd centuries), and the Chosroids (claiming to be a branch of the Sasanids, IIIrd-VIth centuries), who continued to reign in Iberia even after the official Persian-Byzantine abolition of kingship, in the sixth century, as presiding princes (Eriss'ari-M'azar or "Arch-Dukes") down to the eighth century; cf. Gugushvili, "The Chronological-Genealogical Table of the Kings of Georgia", Geor. I, 2 and 3 (1903), 109 ff; M. P. Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, II, 1 (St. Petersburg, 1860), "Tables généalogiques", 619 ff; Ferdinand Justi, Itinerarium Nomenclature (Marburg, 1896), "Stammbaum der Herrscher von Georgien", p. 404 ff.

On the Bagratids, cf. below, I, No. 4 and notes 29, 28.


11 The title Eriss'ari, a compound of Er [genitive: Erî] ("army", "people") and T'ari ("head"), is a functional equivalent of the Iranian office of Snavar, on the pattern of which it was purportedly instituted; of the Byzantine aprôfados in which sense it is often rendered by medieval Georgian authors; and a—semantic as well as functional—counterpart of the Germanic feudal term Herzog, i.e., "Duke"). Cf. Marr, Selected Works, p. 228 (for the Xaldo-Urmliian title Ir-Ta—"kinglet", "duke") ; N. Marr and M. Brière, La Langue géorgienne (Paris, 1931), p. 220; Allen, History, pp. 237-243; J. Karst, Corpus Juris Iberi-Caucasicci, I, Cede de Vakhtang VI, 2; Commentaire historique-comparatif (Strassburg, 1925), 203-204, 216, 218-210, 228-220, 238.

12 The hereditary and institutional history of the Bagratids is traced by Du Cange, Glossarium Bordeaux, IV, 363-364.

13 Pontic Georgia (the frontier of the Abasgian Empire. Cf. S. Iberia-Georgica, I, 12 and 13, "Monarchy" (in Russian-Georgian: Ap'ra) simultaneously with the Abkhazian (Ap'amis), the Iberian (Ap'ma), and the Bagradzr'ti in Georgia.)

14 Cf. Z. Avraam, Byzantium, VIII (1921), 115.

17 This term, deriving from the Greek Ebaqia (apparently derived from the root heq, "king") and which at that time included the Georgian lands, will be used in this forthcoming paper. Abaqia will stand for the Greek-Georgian Kingdom of Iberia.

18 The principal kingdom of Iberia, with the great city of Tiflis (in Armenian: Տիֆլիս), of the x muscles the name Kauk-Kauk [of Ti and thus, since the abolition of the kingdom in 888 Duke and Colonists (D.G.C.)

Thereafter—beginning with the Bagratids became an ally of the Church, the less that the rival was the regular alliance and a part for a Bagratid which the foundation of that of the Bagratids.

The period of the thirteenth century was by the formation of the great west comprised all the Georgia of eighty or suzerainty.
The Byzantine outpost had fallen, as the tightening of the Byzantine-called Lazica. But to Iberia coming trials. For during the Lazico Wars and the "Eternal poise of Georgien between the has been said, submitted more aporarily abolished—fell under e and, then, of the Caliphate, by a weakening of both the consequent re-establishment of Christian-Cauasian countries of which, followed, was headed ofines of Christendom—the

ranch of the ancient Armenian border, in Mesochia, which, the leading center of Georgian n Bagratids had acquired the trich carried with it the Byzantine the third century, when the tribe 

The name Can is derived from Allen, History, p. 25. As regards anian territorial prefix La and Zan, ever, finally came to the conclusion Rod, found in the names Pe-las-gi., 170, n. 2, as well as pp. 110, 129, a: the Pharmacazids (IVth century Armenian line, Ist-IIId centuries), sanids, IIId-VIIth centuries), who no-Byzantine abolishment of kingship, "mier-s or "Arch-Dukes") down to 1-Geographical Table of the Kings benet, Histoire de la.Georgie, II, 1 Ferdinand Justi, Iranianisches Namen-Georgien", p. 404 ff.

Fourth Badus from the Jerusalem 304. tines) ("army", "people") and T'ari of Sairon, on the pattern of which yian in which sense it is often yens as functional—counterpart Marr, Selected Works, p. 328 (for N. Marr and M. Briere, La Langue 243; J. Karm, Corpus Juris Ibero-historique-comparatif (Strasbourg,

tine dignity of Curopalates, and primacy among the princes who ruled Iberia since the abolition of kingship in the sixth century. The Bagratids had thus become the leading and most powerful of the Georgian princely houses, and in 888 Duke and Curopalates Adarnase III assumed the style of king.

Thereafter—like the Rurikids in Muscovy or the Capetians in France—the Bagratids became the champions of national unification, supported by the Church, the lesser nobility, and the rising merchant class. Their only serious rival was the royal house of Abasgia (former Colchis-Lazica), but a dynastic alliance and a palace revolution opportunely secured in 784 the Pontic throne for a Bagratid of Iberia, and in 1008 the two crowns were united. This laid the foundation for the apogee period of Georgian history, which may be termed that of the Bagratid Empire.

The period of the Bagratid Empire, which lasted from the tenth to the mid-thirteenth century, was marked by a threefold political development. First, by the formation of the United Kingdom of Georgia or Sack'art'velo which comprised all the Georgian lands. Secondly, by the extension of Georgian sovereignty or suzerainty over various non-Georgian territories to the South, East,
and North. And, finally, by the consolidation of the royal power and subdual of the unruly feudal nobility (which had grown especially powerful since the abolition of kingship in the sixth century).

Culturally, this period produced the Golden Age of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, marked by a splendid efflorescence of the arts, letters, and of the amenities of civilized existence, and grounded on economic prosperity.

Yet, before the energy of the Golden Age had been spent, a serious blow was dealt to the empire of the Bagratids by the Mongol invasion of the second quarter of the thirteenth century. With the connivance of the Mongols, the royal power was weakened and split between two rival claimants, who then (1258) split United Georgia between themselves. One seceded in Abasgia, now called Imeria, the other was reduced to Iberia and Kakhia (Kaxeti), while the recalcitrant feudalancy grew in power.

A reunification of Georgia, however, was effected, in the first half of the fourteenth century, by King George V the Illustrious; and the rulers of Abasgia-Imeria, deprived of kingship, were reduced to vassalage. Georgia again seemed to enter a golden era, when another—and this time fatal—blow was struck by the invasions of Tamerlane at the closing of the century. Moreover, the dynasty which had unified the country was now responsible for its disunion.

27 These territories included the former Armenian kingdoms of Ani, Kars, and Lori, and the Armenian principality of Siania; Muslim Arran (southern part of ancient Albania); and—as vassal states—the Muslim Caspian kingdom of Shirwan and the highlanders of Ost-f-Alania. In this connection one may also mention the important role of Georgia in the foundation of the Empire of Trebizond, which was given a due appreciation in a recent article by A. A. Vaasilev, "The Foundation of the Empire of Trebizond (1204-1229)", Speculum, XI (1936), 3-37; cf. also C. Toumanoff, "On the Relationship between the Founder of the Empire of Trebizond and the Georgian Queen Thamar", Speculum, XV (1940), 290-312.

28 The reigns of David II (1080–1123) and Queen Thamar (1184–1213), and the achievements of the poet Set'a Rust'aveli, the philosopher John Petrić, etc., are generally held as an apogee. For an example of the amenities of life, the recently (1936) investigated ruins of the North Armenian Castle of Anberd, of the Pahlavid family, typical of the epoch, with its hot-water tubes leading to the bathroom and heating the floors, may be cited; cf. Joseph Orbeli, in The Memorie of the Epoch of Rust'aveli (Leningrad, 1938), pp. 169-170 (in Russian).

29 George IV the Resplendent (1212–1223), the son of Queen Thamar and her Bagratid cousin-consort, was succeeded, in the minority of his son David, by his own sister Queen Rusudan (1223–1245) who, instead, had her own son, also David by name, proclaimed as his co-King (as David IV) in 1234. After the Mongol invasion of the same year, the two Davids found themselves in Quaraqurma, where the Great Khan finally desired to recognize both the lawful David V and the usurping David IV as co-Kings of Georgia, in 1236. Cf. Allen, History, pp. 109–120; Gugushvili, The Chron.-Genal. Table, pp. 123–124.

29 Imeria is a Latinization of Imert'i (Imverta is a piconism); the name is derived from the term Lix'-Inter or "Trans-Lixia" (the Lixi mountains separate the two Georgias), though some are inclined to derive it from the root Epur-Iber, cf. Gugushvili, Ethnor. and Hist. Division of Georgia, p. 69.

30 Thus, for instance, in 1208 Sargis I Jagni, Prince of Meschis, transferred his feudal allegiance from the King of Georgia to the Genghishid Ilkan of Persia, cf., e.g., Gugushvili, The Chron.-Genal. Table, pp. 125–126.
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of the royal power and subdual younger branches of the royal house received Abasgo-Imeria and Kakha in especially powerful since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, letters, and the arts. The invasion of the second quarter of the Mongols, the royal line, led, after 1204, to the loss of the Crown, and, after 1463, to a series of duchies seceded from the realm, each forming an independent principality.

The fifteenth century, with which the present survey of historical literature closes, was decisive in Georgian history. It could have been spent in consolidating the country to face the future trials, but, opened by the disaster of invasion, it was darkened by that of division. Thus, weakened by division, Georgia was unprepared for the resumed onslaught of Islam—led, since the sixteenth century, by Safawid Persia and the Ottoman Empire.

It remains to say, by way of an epilogue, that, unaided by other Christian powers, Georgia had, from time to time, to concede supremacy to one or the other—both of her foes, her existence ensured by their contention.

Despite the parlous political situation, there arose the Renaissance or Silver Age of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, marked particularly by a flowering of letters (poetry, history, law).

Furthermore, the dynastic union of Georgia-Iberia and Kakha, in the middle of the eighteenth century, brought about even a political and economic regeneration. The energetic kings of the Kakhian line, Teimuraz II (1744–1762) and Heraclius II (1762–1798), strove with little success—aided by Persia’s internal disorders and Turkey’s growing impotence—to organize a Pan-Caucasian state, containing various non-Georgian territories and peoples, and exercising primacy among the other Georgian states: Imeria and the principalties.

To strengthen his realm against a possible Persian menace, Heraclius II concluded in 1783 a treaty of alliance with Catherine the Great of Russia, whereby the Russian Empire guaranteed its protection to the Bagratid State in exchange for a recognition of suzerainty. But when Persia—under a new dynasty—subjected Georgia to a terror “total war”, in reprisal for the Russian alliance, no Russian help was obtainable. This dealt a mortal blow to the Pan-Caucasian state of Heraclius. His successor, the weak George XIII (1798–1800), found himself constrained to greater dependence on Russia, and, upon his death, it is to be remarked, however, that the senior, Iberian, line kept the prestige and pretensions of lawful Kings of Georgia, even after the partition.

These Eristavates, which then became Principalities—Mt’varavate, were (1) Moschia or Sameux, under the house of Jaqeli, (2) Guria, under that of Dadiani-Gurieli, (3) Mingrelia or Samegrelo (or Odjii), under that of Dadiani and later Nik’ovani-Dadiani, (4) Adjahia, under that of Sarsaki, and (5) Samnia (Svaneti), first under the house of Gelovani, then under that of Dadeisk’diani. The term Mt’varat (“Sovent Prince”) is derived, like P’vad’ (“Prince”), from P’vai (“Head”); it is used to render from Greek both the noun ἡγεμόνας and in compound words the prefix ἡγεμόν-; cf. Muri-Brière, La Langue géorgienne, p. 638; Allen, History, pp. 230 (his derivation of the term is unacceptable), 240; Karot, Corpus Juris Iur. Cauc., I, 203–204, 215, 216, 221 ff., 228 ff., 231, 232. 25 Such as Muslim and Armenian cities and princeps, Caucasian highlanders, etc.
profiting by a dispute over the succession, the Emperor Paul I ordered a military occupation of Georgia. The imperial manifestoes of January 18 and September 12, 1801 proclaimed the annexation of the Kingdom of Georgia by the Russian Empire. Imeria was annexed in 1810, and in 1867 the Prince of Mingrelia—the last Georgian state—abdicated in favor of the Emperor Alexander II. This ended the twenty-one centuries of Georgia's independent political existence.

II

Numerous Georgian writings cover the twenty-one centuries of the history of the Kingdom of Georgia. The history of the Georgian people, however, extends, as has been seen, over a much longer period—antedating the foundation of the State in the fourth century B.C., and surviving the loss of political independence in the last century. But the national historians hardly remember the first millennium of Georgian history, which has to be gleaned from foreign sources, whereas the vast historical literature of the nineteenth and the present centuries—treating of both contemporaneous and preceding events—no longer belongs organically to Georgian culture, but is rather part and parcel of the general Western scientific endeavor.

The extant Georgian historical writings were all compiled during the last eleven, out of the twenty-one, centuries of the Kingdom's existence. The scope of this study, however, is limited to the medieval historical literature only, i.e., to the writings compiled before the fifteenth century. Of these, only the earliest one, compiled by the seventh century, and the other two, one completed by the ninth and the other in the eleventh, deal with the preceding ten centuries of history, i.e., from the fourth century B.C. on.

Although we do not know at present what were the Georgian sources of these works, they unquestionably represent an extremely ancient written tradition. This tradition must have been written, for the simple reason that in no other way could the history of a millennium have been preserved, which, when recorded in the works of the seventh and succeeding centuries, received corroboration from foreign sources contemporaneous with the events described. We know, of course, that in general no works of Georgian literature of the pagan period have reached us. L'ancienne littérature pré-chrétienne ibérienne, says Karst, dont l'existence ne saurait être mise en doute, a disparu sans laisser de traces. The earliest literary monuments that have come down to us are a translation of the Gospels of the first half of the fifth century and the narrative of the martyrdom of St. Shushanik (Sushanik) the Princess, by Jacob the Priest, also of the fifth century. Also befallen to
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The sources to be examined here are seventeen in number. They are divided into two groups: those outside of, and those contained in The Georgian Annals (= K'artlis-Czowreba). Here is the list of them:

I. Sources outside The Georgian Annals:
1. The Conversion of Iberia, by Gregory the Deacon,
2. The History of the Kings, Bishops, and Catholici of Iberia,
3. The Down of the Kings, by Bagrat III, King of Georgia,
4. The History of the Bagratids, by Smbat, son of David,
5. The History of Queen Thamar, by Basil, Master of the Court,
6. The Chronicle of the Kings of Abania,
7. The History of the Kings Demetrius I, George III, Thamar, and George IV the Splendid,
8. The Khwarizmian Invasion of Georgia, by Abaseridze, Bishop of Tbil,
9. The Monument of the Dukes,

II. Sources contained in The Georgian Annals:
11. The History of the Kings of Iberia, by Leontius, Archbishop of Ruisi,
12. The History of King Vakhang Gorgasali, by Juansher Junasharian,
13. The Martyrdom of King Archil II, by Leontius of Ruisi,
14. The Chronicle of Iberia,
15. The History of the King of Kings,
16. The Histories and Eulogies of the Sovereigns,
17. The History of the Mongol Invasions.

THE SOURCES

I. SOURCES OUTSIDE THE GEORGIAN ANNLAS (VIIth–XVth Centuries)

1. THE CONVERSION OF IBERIA, BY GREGORY THE DEACON (VIIth century).—The compilation of this work and the floruit of Gregory the Deacon have been assigned by different authors to different periods—from the fourth to the ninth century; the seventh century, however, has come to be now generally regarded as the most probable date. This work was discovered—perhaps in an enlarged


1 Georgica: Mos'ceny K'art'isay by Grigol Diakoni.

redaction—in two separate and later Ms. collections: (1) *The Shatberdi Collection*, copied in 973 and discovered in 1885; and (2) *The Chelishi Collection*, dating from the fourteenth–fifteenth century and discovered in 1902–1903. The importance of the latter variant of *The Conversion of Iberia* is due to the fact that, in addition to some variation of detail, it replaces three of the four folios missing in the Shatberdi Variant, and has, moreover, passages not found in the latter. The Chelishi Variant, on the other hand, lacks—owing to the defective state of the Ms.—the initial part of *The Conversion*, with its list of the first twenty-eight kings of Iberia.

The *Conversion of Iberia* can be divided into four distinct parts representing, presumably, distinct groups of sources. These parts are: (1) an account of the legendary invasion of Iberia by Alexander the Great; of the immigration of the Kartvelians; and of the subsequent establishment of the Iberian monarchy; (2) a brief chronicle of the Kings of Iberia, from the fourth century B.C. to the fourth century A.D.; (3) the story of the Conversion itself; and (4) another brief chronicle of the kings, from the fourth century on.

The first part represents, in turn, two distinct groups of sources. The story of the invasion of Iberia by Alexander is, of course, based on Pseudo-Callisthenes; the author appears, moreover, to have had in his hands a Georgian version of the Alexander Romance. On the other hand, the chronicle must have drawn upon ancient local historical sources and traditions when he spoke of the immigration, in present-day Georgia, of the Kartvelians under Azo, the son of the king of their original homeland of *Aran(Arian)-K'art'li*; of the historical geography of Georgia of that period; and of the rise of the Iberian monarchy.

One cannot fail to notice the essential authenticity of the evidence of this text, and to postulate, therefore, the reliability and antiquity of its sources, when

---

3 E. T'aqi'isvili, *Three Historical Chronicles* (in Georgian), (Tiflis, 1890), pp. xviii–xx, xlv–lxxix; idem, "Description of the Ms., etc." (in Russian), *Shornik Matematicheskogo* (Collection of Materials) for the Description of the Localities and Peoples of Caucasus, XL (1900), 53–65.—*The Shatberdi Collection* is described on pp. 50–55; M. Jana'isvili, "K'art'lis-Okvarebi—Life of Georgia" (in Russian), *Shornik Matematicheskogo*, XXXV (1905), 135–136; Kekel'ip, *op. cit.*, pp. 67, 571; Karst, *op. cit.*, pp. 58, 64.—The name of the Collection is derived from the Abbey of Shatberdi on the Coroni (Chorokhi, classical Asapna) river, in the ancient province of Shavali (Savset'), where it was found.

4 T'aqi'isvili, *op. cit.*, *Shorn. Mat.*, XIII (1910), 44–47; Archimandrite Ambrose (Xelula), "The Čelbi Variant of *The Conversion of Iberia*" (in Georgian), *L'Ancienne Georgia, I* (1909), I–29.—The name of the Collection derives from the Abbey of Čelbi, in the former Duchy of Reja, where it was discovered.

5 T'aqi'isvili, *Shorn. Mat.*, XL, 47; XLI (1912), 57–58.


One considers the *Conversion of Iberia* to be a part of the Achaemenid chronicle and the establishment of the information in it was probably through Corduene Greeks and Kartvelians to migrate to the original site of the legend, and of the subsequent change in tradition.

Parts two and three, after the Conversion, are written by the insertions (19 and 3). They may be derived from a number of sources, while the third part of kings are written by the author in the context from the fourth century B.C. to the fourth century A.D., some sources of Ammianus Marcellinus, "Life of St. Eulalii", and the ancient treaties of friends between Vespasian and the kings of Iberia.

The third part of the text is a much amplification and after it, the works of Rufinus and Tzavare in Moreover, the Core of the text is taken from

---

* Cf. Gugdzedze
* Cf. Lehmdze

* Cf. T'aqi'isvili

---

60–67.
MEDIEVAL GEORGIAN HISTORICAL LITERATURE

one considers the actual connection between Alexander's conquests—especially of the Achaemenid Empire—and the subsequent independence of the Georgians and the establishment of the monarchy. Still another proof of the validity of the information contained in this work presents itself when one realizes that it was probably the formation of the Macedonian (Mygdonian) settlement in Corduene (Gordyene), after those conquests, that forced the Kartvelian-Caucasian to migrate to Georgia. This fact, moreover, may explain the origin of the legend of Alexander's invasion of the latter country, for a confusion between the original homeland of the Kartvelians (Corduene-Arian-Kartli) and their subsequent country (Iberia-Kartli) would only have been natural in later tradition.

Parts two and four—the two brief chronicles of the Iberian kings before and after the Conversion—must be regarded as really one chronicle broken in two by the insertion, in its chronological place, of the story of the Conversion (part 3). They must, furthermore, be regarded as based on one and the same group of sources, which must have been some ancient archival material. These lists of kings are very brief and chronologically defective, but their data find support in the contemporaneous foreign sources. Thus, e.g., of the thirty-seven kings from the fourth century B.C. to Vakhtang I Gorgasali (Gurgenes) in the sixth A.D., some sixteen are known to such sources as Tacitus, Appian, Dio Cassius, Ammianus Marcellinus, Aelius Spartianus, Procopius, the fifth-century Syrian Life of St. Peter the Iberian, and the Greek inscription of 75 A.D., found near the ancient Iberian capital of Mtskheta (Mcheta) and commemorating the treaty of friendship between King Mithridates II of Iberia and the Emperor Vespasian.

The third part of the compilation is the narrative of the Conversion itself, a much ampler and more detailed work than the two brief chronicles before and after it. It appears to be substantially a variation of the story at the basis of Rufinus' De conversione gentis Iberorum per captivam facta and resembles, moreover, that found in Moses of Khorene (Xorenaci). The whole of The Conversion of Iberia is saturated with Grecisms which may be taken to indicate that the composition of this work, at least in its original

11 Historia Ecclesiastica, I, x, in Migne, Patr. Lat., XXI, 480-489 (end of the fourth century).
12 Cf. T'qaliwilli, Sborn. Mat., XXVIII (1900), 104 n. 3; Karet, Litt. georg. chrét., pp. 60-67.
stages, can possibly be ascribed to a period anterior to the fifth century and the rise of a fully developed national feudal-eclesiastical literature.

The Conversion of Iberia is followed by a brief continuation of the last part (i.e., of the second chronicle of the kings), bringing it down to the ninth century, and, after it, by The Life of St. Nino—the Illuminatrix of Georgia—which is considered as an appendix to, or a second part of, The Conversion.

The first appendix is thus another brief chronicle of the Kings and Catholic of Iberia. It differs little in character from those lists of kings that precede it (parts 2 and 4). Like them, it must have been based—one may assume—on some archival material.

The second appendix, The Life of St. Nino the Illuminatrix of Georgia, is, like the story of the Conversion, substantially in accord with Rufinus and Moses of Khorene. The latter may have—as appears quite probable—used one of the earlier redactions of this Life, along with some other Georgian sources, for his History of Armenia. The final redaction of The Life of St. Nino belongs to the ninth century, though it purports to contain passages written by the Saint's companions in the fourth.

The Conversion of Iberia has been edited by the following:

1. E. S. Taqasvili (T‘aqisvili), in Three Historical Chronicles (Tiflis, 1890), and as A New Variant of the Life of St. Nino, or the Second Part of The Conversion of Iberia (Tiflis, 1891);
2. T. D. Zhordania (Zordania)—independently of, and more successfully than Taqasvili—in Chronicles and Other Materials for Georgian History, I (Tiflis, 1892), p. 11 ff.;
3. Taqasvili—in its final form based on the readings established by Zhordania, and with parallel Shatherdi and Chelishi texts—in "Description of the Mss., etc.,” Sbornik Materialov, XLI (1910), 48-96 and XLII (1912), 1-57;
4. I. Kipshidze (Kip‘šído)—in its small initial variant—in The Chrestomathy of Ancient Georgian Literature (Tiflis, 1918), p. 22 ff.; and

This chronicle was published, moreover, in a complete Russian translation—based on the readings established by Zhordania—by Taqasvili in “The Sources of the Georgian Life of St. Nino” in Studia bretanica.

2. The History of the Bagratid Dynasty.—This branch of the Bagratid family emerged from the fourth century. It was dispossessed in 973. With this parvenu tradition as a basis, it was published:

3. The Delegation to the Mongol khans.—This is a gloss in the Bagratid History, which the Bagratid princes succeeded to from their Iberian crown.

As The Life of the Sixth Century Church Fathers and served as a text for his Tevhart’‘a, Dosithea bequeathed it, and must have been covered by it, though in a copy discovered by me in the library.

"De l'état religieux en Géorgie," M. Tamarat in Dictionnaire de la langue géorgienne, with an English translation.

11 Janaššia, "On the Criticism of Moses of Xorose" (in Russian), Masalevi, 1937, vi, 462.

12 Taqasvili, Skorn. Mat., XXVIII, 63 n. 1, 104 n. 3, 60 n. 2.—An episode absent from this ninth-century version of the Life, but inserted in it about the twelfth century, must have been borrowed directly from Rufinus, ibid., p. 80 n. 3.


the fifth century and the 1 literature\(^2\). Tunation of the last part own to the ninth century, trix of Georgia—which is a Conversion. The Kings and Catholicists of kings that precede used—one may assume—luminatrix of Georgia, is, d with Rufinus and Moses to probable—used one of her Georgian sources, for Life of St. Nino belongs passages written by the following: torical Chronicles (Tiflis, or the Second Part of The and more successfully than Georgian History, I (Tiflis, lings established by Zhor- in "Description of the and XXII (1912), 1–57; —in The Chrestomathy of georgienne (Paris, 1931), ete Russian translation—aquashvili in "The Sources report of July 13, 1923 to the p. 129, n. 1; Melikset-Bekov, gument (op. cit., pp. 125–129) seventh century—because his according to Kekelie, in the t of Moses is still a matter of ed from Georgian sources, not me" (in Russian), Masalebi, 2.—An episode absent from ut the twelfth century, must of the Georgian Annals", Sbornik Materialov, XXVIII (1900), 1 ff.; and The Life of St. Nino was also published in an English translation by O. Wardrop in Studia biblica et ecclesiastica (Oxford, 1900), V, 1.

2. THE HISTORY OF THE KINGS, BISHOPS, AND CATHOLICS OF IBERIA\(^1\) (IXth century).—This is a short anonymous chronicle covering the history of Iberia from the fourth century B.C. to the ninth century of our era. The latter period, therefore, must be considered as the terminus a quo of its composition. It was discovered as part of the above-mentioned Shalverdii Collection copied in 973. With the exception of a few details, it represents the same historical tradition as that embodied in the preceding work. It has not, to our knowledge, been published\(^6\).

3. THE DIWAN OF THE KINGS,\(^7\) BY BAGRAT III, KING OF GEORGIA (d. 1014).—This is a genealogical treatise on the sovereigns of Abasgia, from the founder of the Archabed (Anč'abaje) dynasty in about the fifth century, to the author, the Bagratid who—through his mother Gurandukht of Abasgia—had in 978 succeeded to the Abasgian throne and in 1008 united the Abasgian to the Iberian crown.\(^8\) As The Life (i.e., History) of Abasgia, this work was mentioned in the eleventh-century Chronicle of Iberia (a part of The Georgian Annals, No. 14), and served as a source to the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheus, for his "Ιστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ πατριαρχεσάτων" (Bucharest, 1715). Dositheus had twice visited Georgia, at the end of the seventeenth century, and must have seen the work there\(^9\). The Diwan of the Kings was finally discovered by Professor Taqaishvili in an eighteenth-century collection of MSS., in a copy done by order of King Constantine I of Georgia (1405–1412) who had found it in the Royal Archives at Kutais. Taqaishvili published it in L'Ancienne.

\(^1\) The title of Catholicus (Καθολικός)—an abbreviation of the Greek for "Universal Delegate"—was taken by the Primates of Iberia, while they were under the jurisdiction (before the acquisition of autocephaly) of the Patriarch of Antioch, in the fourth-fifth century. Cf. R. Janin, "Géorgie" in Dictionnaire de Théol. Cath., VI (1924), 1251–1253; M. Tamarat, L'Eglise gorgienne (Rome, 1910); cf. Dom H. Lecleron, "Ratholikos" in Dictionnaire d'Archéol. Chrét. et de Liturgie, VIII (1929), 688–689.


\(^3\) Georgie: Diwani Mep'et'a.—The Persian loan-word (diwan) to the Georgian as well as the English vocabulary is retained in this work with all its original equivocal meaning: at once an "assembly", an "account", and a "book".


\(^5\) Janasvili, K'urt'lis-Czavreba, p. 121; Karat, Litt. géorg. chrét., p. 102; Brosset, Additions et éclaircissements à L'Histoire de la Gorgie (St. Petersburg, 1851), ix, 173–174; idem, "De l'état religieux et politique de la Gorgie jusqu'au XVIIe siècle", Bulletin scientifique, V (1839); D. Bak'raje, Articles on the History and Antiquities of Georgia (in Russian), (St. Petersburg, 1887), 1, 4–6; idem, The History of Georgia (in Georgian), (Tiflis, 1889), pp. 273–276.
4. **THE HISTORY OF THE BAGRATIDS**,31 **BY SUMBAT, SON OF DAVID** (c. 1030).—This History was written in the first half of the eleventh century by a man who may himself have belonged to the Georgian royal house of the Bagratids32. It shares one of its sources with one of the chronicles composing The Georgian Annals, namely *The Chronicle of Iberia*; and it was itself discovered as a separate source, in 1885, constituting a part of the so-called Queen Mary Ms. of the Annals. It was published by T'aqashvili in *Three Historical Chronicles* (Tiflis, 1890), and in his edition of the Queen Mary Variant: *K'art'lis Cxvreba, the Queen Mariam Variant* (Tiflis, 1906), pp. 392-361; as well as in a Russian translation, by the same, in “The Sources of the Georgian Annals”, *Sbornik Materialov*, XXVIII, 117-182.

Our historian has two principal aims before him: to proclaim the illustrious,

33 *Georgiche. Cxvreba da Uççeba Bagratanian'a, Čven K'art'rev'a Mep'et'asa: T'u Sadat' Moçipines Anas K'voganas Iqini, Anu Romli'I Žamilt'yan Upprios Mal' Mop'ha K'art'lias, veneli afgera Sumbat Jomnan Davit'iseman* (The History of, and Information regarding the Bagratidae, Our Georgian Kings: As to Whence They Came to This Land and Since What Time They Held the Kingship of Iberia, which is written by Sumbat, the son of David).
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if wholly legendary, Davidic origin of the Bagratid dynasty, and then to narrate
the history of the Bagratids as Kings of Iberia. And thus, though he begins his
History by tracing the genealogy of the Bagratids from Adam, through the
King-Prophet David, Sumbat covers the history of Georgia itself from the sixth
century only, to the year 1030. He is quite trustworthy from the end of the
eighth century onwards. For then, there is no longer any need to invent facts
in order to suit his deliberate purpose, namely that of creating a national epic
of the Bagratids, by tracing them from the King-Prophet through a preceding,
local Iberian dynasty and by concealing the historical fact of their non-Georgian,
Armenian origin; thereafter he begins to write simply good history.

In its deliberate avoidance to mention the foreign extraction of the dynasty
which had just unified Georgia, this work manifests the nascent nationalist
spirit of the newly-risen Georgian empire of the Bagratids.

For the history from the eighth century till Bagrat III, our author is largely
based on the now lost family chronicle of the collateral Bagratids who held in
appanage lands in Mesedia (Tao-Klarjeti); and from George I to the end, it is
largely the work of a contemporary witness. Other sources hitherto ascertained
of Sumbat are—besides the above-mentioned lost work and another source he
has in common with The Chronicle of Iberia: the Bible, especially Genesis V and St. Matthew I; The Conversion of Iberia; and, most probably, also Juan-
sh's History of King Vakhtang Gorgasali (part of The Georgian Annals, No.
12). The History of the Bagratids, in its reliable, historical part, offers much
valuable chronological information and is fully corroborated by the epigraphic

27 T'akvisiwili, Georgian Chronology, p. 23.
28 According to Sumbat, the Iberian Bagratids descended in direct male line from the
short-lived house of the Dukes of Klarjeti, founded by Guam I, one-time Curoplates of
Iberia (575–600). Sumbat makes this Guam a Bagratid and of the house of David.
Historically, however, the origins of the family of Guam are quite unknown, and the
Bagratids came to Iberia from Armenia, the country of their origin, not earlier than in the
eighth century. Of the sons of Asot II the Blind Bagratuni (Prince of Sper and Darunkh',
Prince-Patrician of Armenia [732–748, d. 761]), the older, Sumbat VII, continued the
Armenian line; and the younger, Vasil, Prince of Tana (c. 750–772), married to an
Iberian Charoid princess, founded the Iberian line. Vasil's son acquired great domains
in Georgia, and his grandson, Asot the Great, became Duke and Curoplates of Iberia.
Cf. Allen, History, pp. 377–378; T'akvisiwili, "Historical Materials" (in Georgian), L'An-
cienne Georgie, II (1911–1913), iii, 57; idem, Georgian Chronology, pp. 17–23; Marquart,
Streich's, "Der Ursprung der iberischen Bagratidien".

29 It may be noted, in this context, that the peculiarly Georgian version of the Davidic
claim of the Bagratids, found in Sumbat, appears to be as old really as the claim itself.
For, contemporaneously with the casual remark—the first in Armenian historical literature
—on the Davidic descent of the Armenian Bagratids, found in The Hist. of Armenia (cap.
8) of John Catholicus, the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogennitus expressed, in De admin-
istrando imperio (cap. 45), the Georgian, extra-Armenian version of the Davidic claim of the
Iberian Curoplates.

30 Javaksiwili, op.cit., p. 196.
31 T'akvisiwili, Georgian Chronology, p. 17; idem, Shorn. Mat., XXVIII, 42 n. 1, 117 n. 1
(p. 118), 120 n. 3, 124 n. 3, 134 n. 5.
5. THE HISTORY OF QUEEN THAMAR[^23], BY BASIL, THE MASTER OF THE COURT (c. 1210–1213).—This work was discovered by Professor I. Javakhishvili in 1923, as part of the so-called Eradzhevi Ms. of The Georgian Annals[^24], and is being at present edited by him. In the meantime, however, it has been translated into Russian by V. Dondua and published by him in The Monuments of the Epoch of Rustaveli[^25] as “Basili, the Historian of Queen Thamar”, pp. 33–75; the text, pp. 39–76.

This work begins, by way of introduction, with the reign of Thamar’s father George III (1156–1184) and then proceeds to describe her own reign (1184–1212). Javakhishvili has established that the date of the composition of this History was 1210–1213 and that its author was most probably the Master of the Court (Ezos-Mo’guiari) and Cross-Bearer (Juiris-Mama) of Thamar[^26]. He is known as the “Second Historian of Queen Thamar”, the first one being the anonymous author of The Histories and Eulogies of the Sovereigns (a part of The Georgian Annals, No. 16). The widely different character of Basili’s History makes it a valuable supplement to the ampler work of the Anonymus.

However, only the first part of this work (down to 1204–1206) has reached us, in a sixteenth–seventeenth-century Ms. The now lost second part has been replaced—in a Ms. copied c. 1731—by the corresponding part of The Histories and Eulogies, in the later, King Vakhtang VI Redaction of the Annals[^27]. It is, nevertheless, believed that, in revising the text—especially the latter part—of The Histories and Eulogies (as found in the earlier Queen Mary Recension), the compilers of the King Vakhtang Redaction interpolated it, in turn, passages from the now lost second part of Basili[^28].

[^24]: Georgie: Czavreb’a Me’p’el’-Me’p’is’a T’amarisa (The Life or History of the Queen of Queens Thamar) by Basili, Ezos-Mo’guiari. The Georgian royal title “King of Kings” or “Queen of Queens”: me’p’el’-me’p’e, adopted in 994 (cf. Ggugashvili, The Chron.-Gen.eal. Table, p. 122), is rendered here simply as “King” or “Queen”. For the absence of genders in Georgian titles, cf. below, n. 44.
[^28]: Javakhishvili, loc. cit.; Dondua, op. cit., pp. 35–36.—For the reductions of The Georgian Annals, cf. below, II A.
[^29]: Javakhishvili, op. cit., pp. 204–205.
On the other hand, the source used by that redaction for the amplification of the First Historian of Thamar may have been yet another work altogether—
that of a "Third Historian" of the great Queen. Now, a passage found in the
King Vakhtang Redaction of The Histories and Eulogies happens to be identical
with the citation which Anthony I, Catholicus of Iberia (1744–1788), gives in
his Grammar (first edition: 1753), as coming from a History of Thamar. And
this History, states the Catholicus, was written by the Queen's great contem-
porary, the poet Shota Rustaveli, who thus may well have been the hypothetical
Third Historian. Still, it is quite possible that the work and citation ascribed
to Rustaveli are nothing other than the History of Basil and a passage from its
now lost second part; but it may also very well be that the Second Historian
was not at all Basil but Shota. And yet one is tempted to ask whether the
ecclesiastic Basil was not, after all, identical with Shota of Rustavi who is
believed to have become a monk.

6. THE CHRONICLE OF THE KINGS OF ABASGIA (XIIIth century).—This is an
anonymous paschal chronicle which covers the history from the early Kings of
Abasgia to the thirteenth century, when it was completed. It was found,
however, in a fifteenth-century Ms. appended to a fifteenth-century euchologion,
and is brought down to the latter period. It lacks one folio at the beginning,
and another one—dealing with the end of the tenth century—in the middle.
Nevertheless, this source offers some valuable information and important
chronological data. It has not yet been published.

7. THE HISTORY OF THE KINGS DEMETRIUS I, GEORGE III, THAMAR, AND GEORGE
IV THE RESPLENDENT (XIIIth century).—This historical work was written by
an anonymous contemporary of King George IV the Resplendent (1212–1222),
the son of Queen Thamar, and has to deal chiefly with his reign. It covers,
nevertheless, by way of introduction, the reigns of his predecessors (1125–1212).
The connection of this work with the initial part of The History of the Mongol
Invasions (the last part of The Georgian Annals, No. 17) and with The Histories
and Eulogies of the Sovereigns, which deal, respectively, with the history of

24 I. Abuladze, "On the Question of the Historical Work of Šota Rustaveli" (in Russian),
Recueil Rouvshaveli (Tiflis, 1938), pp. 101–109.—The first redaction of Anthony I's Grammar
has not yet been published, ibidem, p. 103 n. 2.
26 Georgica: Asp'ast' Mep'et'a K'ronika.
27 Ms. No. 85 of the former Ecclesiastical Museum of Tiflis.
28 T. Žordania, Chronicles and Other Materials for Georgian History (in Georgian), I
(Tiflis, 1892), iv ff.
29 The Georgian equivalent of "Kings", Mep'e denotes a reigning monarch of royal rank,
whether man or woman. Like all the Georgian nouns, and adjectives, Mep'e has but
one form irrespective of genders; the wife of a king—as well as of a sovereign prince (M't'vare
or duke (Erts'vare)—is Dedop'ali; cf. Mər et Briča, La Ligue géorgienne, Nos. 72, 73
(p. 60), 40 (p. 39), 308 (p. 285), and pp. 83, 626.—Thamar was Queen-regnant, i.e., Mep'e;
his full title was Mep'e-Mep'e, i.e., "Queen of Queens"; and it is not correct to say that
Thamar was proclaimed King, after her father (cf., e.g., Allen, History, p. 103).
George IV and with that of his mother and his grandfather, is yet to be elucidated. It was discovered and published by Professor Javakhishvili in 1927.

8. THE KHWAIRIMIAN INVASION OF GEORGIA, BY ABUSERIDZE, BISHOP OF TBETI (XIIIth century).—The author, Abuseridze, Bishop of Tbeti (= Tbeli), of the dual house of Khikh-Achara (Xisa-Achara), lived in the thirteenth century. This—his only historical—work is a part of a large compilation entitled The Miracles of the Holy Arch-Martyr (m'tavarnoqamisa) George, the rest of which is devoted to purely ecclesiastical matters.

It treats of the invasion of Georgia by the Khwarizm-Shah Jalaladdin in the years 1225–1231, during the reign of George IV's sister Rusudan (1223–1245). The whole compilation was found in a thirteenth-century Ms. collection and was published by Zhordania in his Chronicles.

9. THE MONUMENT OF THE DUKES (XVth century).—This work is a family chronicle of the Dukes of Ksani, covering the history of their house from the sixth century, but more particularly from about 1220, to about 1400. This fifteenth-century compilation is based on various local paschal chronicles and other documents, especially on the Cartulary of the family abbey of Largvisti.

It was discovered in the first half of the last century by the Georgian antiquarian Megavinevit-Khutsesit-avgili in a parchment synaxarion and copied by him, but after his death the original was lost. The copy was published by Zhordania in his Chronicles, and in a French translation by Brosset in his Additions et éclaircissements à l'Histoire de la Géorgie.

Inexact in reporting some matters, especially those outside the immediate

10. THE HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF DOLGORUKOV, BY GEORGE IV, found in question is a large and comprehensive study, but a continuation of the History of the King Vitali by the King Vitali, written down the official one to which it is appended.

The First Chronicle, the History of Georgia, Volume XX, 468–371, 650–687.

The compendium, and, on a cloistered plan, distinct parts of the

George VII:
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12. "Theaas
13. Among the
14. These parts
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scope of family history, it is quite trustworthy in recording others, and some of its details often find corroboration in whatever diplomatic and epigraphic data have been published pertaining to the same matters. Its account of Timur's campaigns in Georgia is, upon the whole, in harmony with the following work and with Shanafadin's Zafar-Nâme.44

10. THE HISTORY OF THE INVASIONS OF TIMUR (c. 1424-1450?).—The source in question has to be extracted from the first of the two Continuations of The Georgian Annals. These Continuations are beyond the scope of the present study, but the first one, containing this source, must be examined here. The Continuations were compiled in the second half of the fourteenth century for the King Vakhtang VI Redaction of the Annals, with the purpose of bringing down the official history of Georgia from the beginning of the fourteenth century, at which point the Annals stop45.

The First Continuation was published by Taqaishvili in Annex II to K'art'lis-Caoureba, the Queen Mariam Variant, pp. 350-391, and by Brosset, both in the Georgian Histoire de la Géorgie, I, 2, 451-47646, and, in French, in Additions, xx, 468-371 (the opening part) and in the French Histoire de la Géorgie, I, 2, 650-68747.

The composite character of the First Continuation is patent at first glance, and, on a closer analysis, it will be found to consist of four loosely connected and distinct parts48. Of these, only the second part, The History of Bagrat V and George VII (1300-1405), or of the Invasions of Timur appears to be one of the

45 Taqaishvili, "Description of the Manus.," Shorn. Mat., XXXVI (1906), 109, 112-113, 91.
46 With the omission of the opening part = Taqaishvili ed., pp. 350-385.
47 Fuller bibliographical data will be found below, II A.
48 These parts are: (1) the History of David VII (1346-1360)—the opening part omitted by Brosset in the Georgian Hist. de la Géorgie; (2) that of Bagrat V and his son George VII (1360-1385-1405), or of the Invasions of Timur; (3) a short intermediary chronicle; and (4) the History of Alexander I and his successors (1412-1442-1453). Though the composite character of this compilation has been noticed, its four distinct parts have not been accounted for; this, the present author endeavors to do in an article on The Georgian Historiography and the Fifteenth-Century Bagratids, which he hopes to publish soon. Brosset was aware of only two parts, since he published the opening one (on the reign of David VII) separately. Taqaishvili, also, divides the Contin. I into two main parts: (1) the opening, Hist. of David VII, and (2) the part containing a History of Timur's invasions, based on an "unknown source"; the rest being based on various original documents (Shorn. Mat., XXXVI, 90-91). Janašvili considers only the Contin. II as a "Continuation of the Annals", and mentions of the Contin. I only part 2, as The History of the Invasions of Timur, which he recognizes as an original source (K'art'lis-Caoureba, pp. 125-128). Moreover, the preface to the Continuations, found in the so-called Janašvili Ma. of The Georgian Annals (of the mid-eighteenth century), above the following division of the Contin. I: (1) it omits the opening part (absent also from the text of the Ma.) and mentions (2) the History of Bagrat V and his successor and (3) that of Alexander and his successors (Taqaishvili, Shorn. Mat., XXXVI, 114-132). The combined evidence of these, added to the patent distinctness of the above-mentioned short intermediary chronicle, completes the above division of the Contin. I.
original primary sources merely preserved in the First Continuation. It has
definite indications of having been written by a contemporary who, also, quotes
from Persian sources.\textsuperscript{52} Thus this History appears to be a connecting link be-
tween the sources of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries and the Silver
Age productions\textsuperscript{53}. All this, apart from being accepted by Janashvili and
Karst,\textsuperscript{54} is in perfect harmony with Professor Tqacishvili's inference that "still
more unknown sources are hidden in the two Continuations";\textsuperscript{55} with the assertion
of the eighteenth-century Georgian historian, Prince Vakhshut, that history
had been written from the days of George the Illustrious (with whose reign the
Annals stop) to the epoch of the Partition (1490)\textsuperscript{56}; with the statement of the
Preface to the Continuations found in the Janashvili Ms. (eighteenth century),
that the History of Bagrat V and his successor was taken from "old books"\textsuperscript{57};
and finally with the announcement, made by the Commission in charge of the
King Vakhtang Redaction itself, that for the rectification and amplification of the
Annals various writings had been consulted.\textsuperscript{58}

Janashvili attempted to identify the "Persian sources"—referred to by the
anonymous author of this work in connection with the bravery of the Georgians
in withstand Timur—with the late fourteenth-century encyclopaedic work of
Shibabaddin al-Qalqashandhi. But, as Janashvili himself recognizes, Al-Qal-
qashandhi was not a Persian, but an Arab author; and, what is more important,
there is nothing in the passage from that author he cites\textsuperscript{59} to bear on the wars
of Timur in Georgia or the valor of the Georgians: it is merely an elaborate
and florid formula of ceremonial address employed by various Muslim sovereigns
towards the Kings of Georgia.\textsuperscript{60}

In the opinion of the present writer, the Persian source which the author of
this History has in mind must be the Zafar-Nama of Ali Yazdi Sharaqaddin, which
does deal extensively with Timur's campaigns in Georgia, and with which this
Georgian work displays a striking similarity.\textsuperscript{61} The Zafar-Nama was composed
in 1424–1425 and was based on the unpublished work of the same name written

\textsuperscript{52} Janashvili, op. cit., pp. 129–132; Karst, op. cit., p. 104.
\textsuperscript{53} I.e., between The Hist. of the Mongol Invasions (the last part of the Annals), The
Monument of the Dukes, and The Chron. of the Meschian Poolter and the works that come
after it.
\textsuperscript{54} Janasvili, loc. cit.; Karst, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{55} Tqacishvili, op. cit., p. 103.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibidem, p. 60.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibidem, pp. 114–132.
\textsuperscript{58} Cf. below, II A, n. 19.
\textsuperscript{59} Janashvili, op. cit., pp. 127–128, after W. von Tiesenhausen, in Zapisiki (Bulletin) of
p. 104.—For Al-Qalqashandhi, cf. C. Brockelman in The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II (1937),
690–700; his work was composed after 1387.
\textsuperscript{60} One of the titles thus accorded to the Kings of Georgia is "Supporter of the Pope"—
an interesting reminant of the pre-Crusadian days.
\textsuperscript{61} For the similarity between this History and the Zafar-Nama, cf. the text in Hist. de
la Géorgie, I, 2, 650 ff., with the outline of the latter work in V. Minorsky's article
"Tiflis" in The Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV (1934), 757 ff., and also Brossot, Additions, xxii,
"Expéditions de Timour en Géorgie".

by Nizamad.\textsuperscript{62} It is evident that The Historia
of the events described in
the Continuations
must derive
from
Persian
sources.

II. Sources

A. H. iii.

In the eleventh century, a Persian
history of the Kings of Iberia was
compiled in Shiraz by a certain
Zakhan, known as Tqacishvili, for
the Karmward, the Persian
ruler.\textsuperscript{63} This work reached us in
the form of the Persian
History of the Kings of Iberia,
Kart'lisay, i.e. the Kingdom of
Georgia: a work written by
various historians: n.\textsuperscript{64} Mkhitar of i\textsuperscript{65}—in the twelfth

\textsuperscript{62} Cf. Cl. H. iii, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{63} The first two words of the title of the first work that
was written in the Iberian Kingdom, which
is still preserved, is The History of
Georgia, written in the Persian
language. The

\textsuperscript{64} Published French translation.
\textsuperscript{65} Ibidem, p. XXXVI, 40.

\textsuperscript{60} Cf. Karst, d'Ant, II (St. Petersburg, 1890),
author to men of

\textsuperscript{61} Cf. Karst, d'Ant, II (St. Petersburg, 1890),
author to men of

\textsuperscript{62} Published French translation.
\textsuperscript{65} Ibidem, p.
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by Nizamaddin Shami, at the command of Timur, in 1401–1403. If it be true that The History of the Invasions of Timur was written by a contemporary of the events described, which took place in the last quarter of the fourteenth century, and that, moreover, its author had access to the Zafar-Nâme, then its composition must date from not earlier than 1424, and not later than, say, 1450.

II. Sources Contained in The Georgian Annals (XIII–XIVth Centuries)

A. History, Redactions, and Editions of The Georgian Annals

In the eleventh century Leontius, Archbishop of Ruisi (Leonti Mroveli) compiled his History of the Kings of Iberia and Martyrdom of King Arebild; to this was added Juansher's History of King Vakhtang Gorgasali; and thus there came to existence the corpus of historical writings known under the name, first, of K'art'ileta-Czoreba, and then, about a century later, of K'art'ile-Czoreba, which means "Life", i.e., History of the Iberians, or of Iberia. This body of chronographical material constitutes, as it were, the official corpus historicum of Georgi, or Georgian Royal Annals, and has been augmented, as time went on, by the incorporation of new historical material. It will be referred to in this study as The Georgian Annals.

By the middle of the twelfth century, two more works were added to the body of The Georgian Annals. To this, or the next century belongs also the Armenian adaptation of the then extant five parts of the Annals, which is known as The Armenian Chronicle or Chronique arménienne and which has reached us in a copy made between the years 1279 and 1311. At the same time, The Georgian Annals appear to have been drawn upon by various Armenian historians: notably, by Mikhitar the Priest (in Vardan's Universal History) and Mikhter of Ayyrivank (Ayyrivanei)—both probably via the Chronique arménienne—in the twelfth and the thirteenth century respectively; and by Stephen

---

40 Cf. Cl. Huart in The Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV, 318.

1 The first name, K'art'ileta-Czoreba, first appears in the text of the Annals, after The Martyrdom of King Arebild, and is derived, according to Professor Javaxislivi, from the first two words in the title of the initial work in the Annals. That is Leontius' History of the Kings of Iberia = Georgiæ: Czoreba K'art'ileta Mep'eta = Latina: Historia Iberorum Regum, which gave its name to the whole of the corpus: K'art'ileta Czoreba = Iberior Historia. The second name is probably due to the fourth work in the Annals—The Chronicle of Iberia (Matiand K'art'isyag)—whose original name seems to have been Czoreba K'art'ilyang, i.e., Historia Iberiae, and which must have given rise to the present form of the name of the Annals: K'art'ile-Czoreba. Cf. Javaxislivi, Anc. Geor. Hist. Writ., pp. 291–293. As has been noted above, K'arjli is rendered throughout this work as Iberia, and Sak'art'velo as Georgia.

1 Published in Armenian as The Abridged History of Georgia (Venice, 1884) and, in a French translation, by Brosset, Additions, pp. 1–61.

2 Ibidem, p. 61, n. 2; Žordania, Chronicles I, xx ii., xxix. T'auqislivli, Stor. Mat., XXXVI, 40.

3 Cf. Karst, Litt. geogr. chrét., p. 106; Bak'rnje, Articles, ii, 16–17; Brosset, Les Ruines d'Arménie, II (St. Petersburg, 1861), 169.—Mx't'ar Ayyrivanei, e.g., is the only Armenian author to mention the existence of a diarchy in Iberia, in the first and second centuries, which is directly due to his using the Georgian sources, cf. L. Mollkist-Bekov, "Armazi" (in Russian), Mesalebi, 1938, ii, 30.
Orbellian (d. 1304), whose acquaintance with their Georgian name (i.e., "The Life of Iberia") and use of names, titles, and expressions indicate his dependence on the Annals in the original Georgian. Finally two more works were incorporated in the Annals, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries respectively, thus completing the present composition of this corpus.

A document of 1546 mentions a copy of The Georgian Annals among the books in the Library of the Cathedral of Mtskheta. Another document—a register of books presented to the church at Bichvinta by the Catholicus of Abasgia, Euthymius Saqvaradize (1578–1605)—also mentions a copy of the Annals.

To the same period (sixteenth–seventeenth century) belongs the yet unpublished, so-called Queen Anne Ms. of the Annals themselves;7 whereas the earliest known Ms. of the Annals that has been published, that of Queen Mary, dates from the first half of the seventeenth century.

The Mongol invasions of the thirteenth century; the devastations of Timur at the end of the fourteenth and the opening of the fifteenth century; the numerous Ottoman and Persian wars; the Lesghian invades; and, finally, the civil strife of the unruly feudal nobility, dealt a serious blow to Georgian culture. Consequently, between the Golden Age, of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, and the nascent Silver Age, of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth, there lies the interstitial Era of Decline. Each invasion, each war was accompanied by a destruction of works of art and of literary monuments, resulting from the ruin and loot of private dwellings, castles, churches, and monasteries. It is Professor T'aq'aisvili's opinion that not one-hundredth of the literary monuments of the pre-Decline period has reached us.8 The sacred writings have, upon the whole, suffered less than the profane works, and have come down to us in far greater numbers: they have been either better protected by the remoteness and impregnability of some churches and monasteries (many of which possessed libraries of several thousand Ms.), or ransomed later—as a pious work—by the devout.9 And thus it is that the archetype, of the earliest published Ms. of The Georgian Annals (that of Queen Mary) as well as, ultimately, of all the other extant Ms., appears to have been the so-called Mtskheta Ms. which we find in 1546, preserved—among the sacred writings—in the Library of the Primaltal Cathedral at Mtskheta.10

1 The mention of the Annals is made in his History of the Orbellians, which constitutes the 6th chapter of his monumental History of Shuria; French transl. and parallel Armenian text, J. Saint-Martin, Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l’Arménie, II (Paris, 1819), 64; cf. Brasset, Additions, xvi, 260 and n. 1; 262 and n. 1.
2 T'aq'aisvili, "Description of the Ms.", Sborn. Mat. XXXVI, 69.
3 Javaq'asvili, A. A. Georg. Hist. Writ., II, 7.—The Queen of Georgia for whom the Ms. is named must be the consort of Bagrat VII (1164–1169), Anne, daughter of King Alexander II of Kakha, cf. Hist. de la Géorgie, II, 1, Add. ix "Tables générl.," i and ii.
4 T'aq'aisvili, op. cit., pp. 55, 108.
6 T'aq'aisvili, pp. 54, 59–60, 108-109. —It was believed for a long time that the Vatican Library had an old Ms. of the Annals (Brasset, Chronique géorgienne [Paris, 1831], p. xvi, n. 1; Bak'raje, Articles, ii, 15 n. 3), but apparently it was a copy of Vak'isi's History of Georgia, an ancient work discovered and published.
7 Mary Mingrelia (1578–1610), daughter of King James, married her first husband, Queen Mary of Mingrelia, in 1608, and (ibid., p. 84) was "the heroine of Georgian history."
8 The exact date of the Ms. has been lost, though of the above publications, the last four, and perhaps the first, were copied during this reign. It is therefore, in 1578–1580, and this is the date which Jan. 29) 1578 refers to.
9 Mexet'a Ch't'abu T'qaq'aisvili, op. cit., p. 37 ff.
10 T'aq'aisvili, op. cit., p. 37 ff.
11 Mary Mingrelia was the wife of the great Regent Levan Senidze, known as the "Second Regent," and was the mother of King James I of Georgia; see B. Avetisyan, "Regent Levan Senidze," in "Les origines de l'histoire géorgienne," in the Festschrift for Professor A. A. Georg. Hist. Writ., p. 103; "The affairs of Georgia from the death of King Bagrat V of Abkhzia to the reign of his grandson, King Levan Senidze," in the same, p. 110; "Regent Levan Senidze," in the "Festschrift for Professor A. A. Georg. Hist. Writ.," p. 114; and "The life and reign of King James I of Georgia," in the "same," p. 144; and Allen, Hist. xxxvii.
The Queen Mary Variant (= Q.M.) of the Annals was copied by order of the Queen of Georgia, Mary Dadiani of Mingrelia, sometime between the years 1638 and 1645. It was discovered in 1885 and published by T'ak'aisvili as Kartlis-Czovreba, the Queen Mariam Variant (Tiflis, 1906). It represented—until the recent discovery of the Queen Anne Ms.—the earliest known Georgian text of the Annals. The five opening works contained in this corpus have, of course, reached us in the above-mentioned Armenian adaptation of the twelfth century, but as for the two concluding works, the QM. and QA. (Queen Anne) Ms. are the earliest texts we have.

Both QM. and the unrevised part of another Ms. of The Georgian Annals, known as the Academy of Sciences Ms. and dating from 1700-1705, are based on the same Mtskheta Ms., and therefore repeat all the corrections and errors of their archetype—a legacy of the Era of Decline. Moreover, they stop at the beginning of the second reign of George V the Illustrious, the end of whose History is now missing from the Annals, i.e., about 1318.

It was with a view to correct the various corruptions of the text of The Georgian Annals and to clarify its obscure passages; to amplify it with numerous data drawn from other sources; and, finally, to continue it for the period after the beginning of the fourteenth century, that King Vakhtang VI then still

*Georgia,* and not of the Annals, cf. T'ak'aisvili, p. 59.—The connection between the recently discovered Queen Anne Ms. of the Annals and the Moxet's Archetype is yet to be established.

Mary (Mariam), d. 1689, was a daughter of Manuchar I Dadiani, reigning Prince of Mingrelia (1632-1641), by his second wife, Princess Thamar Jaqeli of Muschia. She was married successively to (1) Simon, Prince of Guria, 1631, (2) Rostom, King of Georgia, 1638, and (3) the latter's successor (and adopted son) King Vakhtang V, 1638; cf. Brosset, *Hist. de la Géorgie,* II, 1, Add. ix "Tables généalogiques," i, v, vi; T'ak'aisvili, p. 28 ff.—The exact date of the Ms. is unknown, because the last folio, which must have contained it, has been lost. But the nineteen mementoes throughout the Ms., by the hand of the copyist of the text, mention Mary, Queen of Georgia, by whose order this Ms. of the Annals was copied, and her first-born son, Prince Otia (Guriah); by Simoa of Guria. This work, therefore, must have been done between 1638, when Mary became Queen of Georgia, and (Jan. 26) 1645, when Prince Otia of Guria died. The date 1645, found on his tomb at the Moxet'a Cathedral, must be taken to refer to its creation and not to the Prince's death; T'ak'aisvili, pp. 20-34; Bak'raje, *Articles,* ii, 15-16.

* T'ak'aisvili, p. 41; Bak'raje, loc. cit.;—for a description of the Ms. itself, cf. T'ak'aisvili, p. 27 ff.

* Formerly Prince T'cimurz of Georgia's Ms.; ibidem, p. 46 ff.


* Ibidem, pp. 60-61, 63.

Regent—of Georgia appointed, about 1703–1705, a Commission of scholars for the revision of the Annals. All the MSS. of The Georgian Annals in the King Vakhtang (= KV) Redaction have the following preface:

Honorable and noble Georgians! Due to the circumstances of the times, The Life of Iberia [= the Annals] had been left unwritten. But Vakhtang the Fifth, son of Leo and nephew of the renowned George [XII], assembled learned men and collected, wherever he could find, the MSS. of The Life of Iberia, as well as the continuations of Mskhet, of Gelati, of numerous churches, and of many nobles. And they compared them; and what was corrupted, they rectified. They also found other works, they made excerpts from the Histories of the Armenians and the Persians; and in this wise they had it written down.

In the light of this preface the work of the KV. Commission of Revision becomes clear. It consisted of collecting all the available MSS. of The Georgian Annals (with the notable exception of QA. and QM.), collating them, rectifying obscure or corrupted passages, and, finally, amplifying the corpus with additions from other sources; chronographical, historiographical, documentary, Georgian and foreign. All the MSS. of the KV. Redaction can be divided into three groups representing the successive stages in the work of redaction, which was carried on by the Commission even after Vakhtang VI's departure from Georgia in 1724.

The date must be somewhere between Vakhtang’s ascension to the regency in 1703 (cf. Gugushvili, op. cit., p. 134) and the latest date—1705—assigned by T’aqaisvili to the Academy of Sciences Ms, which shows traces of the earliest stage of the KV. Redaction and whose latter part has remained untouched by it; cf. T’aqaisvili, pp. 108-109, 110.

Vakhtang was the fifth among the Bagratid kings of that name, but the sixth of that name among all the Kings of Iberia and Georgia: the first one being Vaxtang Gorgasaili, of the Chosroid dynasty, cf. Brosset, Hist. de la Géorgie, I, 1, n. 2.

Cf. T’aqaisvili, p. 38; Hist. de la Géorgie, I, 1, 15.—The earliest complete MS. of the KV. Redaction—that of the Rumjancev Museum—copied before 1705, has a somewhat different preface, in that Vakhtang VI speaks in the first person: all the other prefaces were probably composed by the Commission, T’aqaisvili, p. 10.

Cf. T’aqaisvili, pp. 72-114.—Bak’r’aje, Articles, ii, 11-20; Žordania, Chronicles, I, iv-xx; Janašvili, Kartlis-Czovreba, pp. 228-235, are inclined to deny the very existence of the KV. Redaction, and to attribute the tremendous task of the revision of the Annals, as well as the authorship of the above preface, to Prince T’emuranz, fourth son of the last King George XIII (b. June 3, 1782, d. Oct. 25, 1840). T’aqaisvili, pp. 41-54, 70-72, however, unanswerably refutes their arguments.

T’aqaisvili, p. 109 ff.—The Academy of Sciences, Ms., copied before 1705, was revised only in its opening part: from the middle of the reign of Thuman to the end it is almost identical with QM.—going back, as it does, together with QM., to the same archetype, ibid., p. 110. The latest Ms.—Prince P’alavandishvili’s—of the KV. Redaction dates from August, 1761, ibid., p. 113.—Here is a list of the chief variants of The Georgian Annals:—group I consists of the Ms. of the incomplete KV. Redaction; group II comprises the Ms. of the almost completed KV. Redaction, covering the whole of the Annals and showing most of the corrections and insertions; group III is composed of the Ms. of the complete KV. Redaction, with all the insertions and corrections, and including, moreover, the two Continuations of the Annals.—The Rumjancev Museum Ms. represents an intermediary, tran-
The various Mss. of the KV. Reduction of *The Georgian Annals* were collated by Marie-Félicité Brosset and published by him both in the original Georgian (in collaboration with David Chubinashvili) and in a French translation, the pre-KV. (QA. and QM.) Variants being as yet undiscovered. Brosset's publications are known under the following titles:

1. *Histoire de la Géorgie, depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIXe siècle, publiée en géorgien*, I.—Histoire ancienne, jusqu'en 1469 de J.C., 2 livraisons (St. Peters burg, 1849-1850); II.—Histoire moderne, depuis 1469 jusqu'en 1800 de J.C., publiée en géorgien par D. Tchoubinof (St. Petersburg, 1854). (= HGa.)

2. *Histoire de la Géorgie, etc., traduction du géorgien*, I.—Histoire ancienne, etc., 2 livraisons (St. Petersburg, 1849-1850); II.—Histoire moderne, etc., 2 livraisons (St. Petersburg, 1856-1857). (This French edition has hitherto referred to in this work as Hist. de la Géorgie, without any further specification, and it will be hereinafter referred to as HG1.)

Besides *The Georgian Annals* contained in vol. I of both HGa. and HG1., these publications also include the following works: (vol. I) The First Continuation and a part of The Second Continuation of the Annals; (vol. II) the rest of the latter work, and the historical writings of various Silver Age authors28, as well as numerous additions, chronological and genealogical tables, etc. Brosset also published the valuable *Additions et éclaircissements à l'Histoire de la Géorgie* (St. Petersburg, 1851) and *Introduction à l'Histoire de la Géorgie* (St. Petersburg, 1858).

*Messas' Archetype (1846)*

![Diagram of manuscript versions](attachment:image.png)

The diagram illustrates the relationships between the various manuscript versions of *The Georgian Annals*. The KV. Reduction (1703-1705) is at the center, with branches extending to various other versions and institutions:

- QA. (XVIIth c.)
- QM. (1849/1850)
- Academy of Sci. Mu. (1760/1761)
- Rumianov Mu. (1709)
- Eccler. Museum. (1709)
- Anne of Aragvi Mu. (1709)
- Mingrelia Mu. (1709/1761)
- Bagrat Mu. (1709/1761)
- Psalter Mu. (1709/1761)

Each branch represents a group of manuscripts, with different letters indicating the group:

- Group I: *KA*/*CA*/*BA*/*PA* (1709)
- Group II: *QA*/*QM*/*Academy*/*Rumianov* (1760)
- Group III: *VA*/*CM*/*EC*/*AN*/*MI*/*BG*/*PS* (1709/1761)

28 Vaxisti, Semoni Oxelij, Papuna Orbeliani, Oman Xerseuli, David and Bagrat of Georgia, and P'arsadan Giorgiiani.
HG was, furthermore, redacted by Professor N. Marc (as a stereotype copy with the same pagination, to p. 200 where it stops), as *Histoire de la Georue, etc., I, 1 (en partie). Rédaction faite par Nicolas Marr* (Petrograd, 1923).

B. Contents of The Georgian Annals

**THREE WORKS BY LEONTIUS, ARCHBISHOP OF RUSI (XIth century).—**The *floruit* of Leontius of Rusi (Leonti Moveli) was at first assigned, by modern historians, to the seventh century; but it has been definitely established that it must belong to the eleventh, about the years 1050-1080, to be exact. He must be considered identical with the "Archbishop Leontius of Rusi (Mvawepiskopos Leonti Movelo)" mentioned in the Athosite Ms. No. 61, of the eleventh-twelfth century, made known by Professor Marr.

Leontius appears to have been a man of culture, well-read in ecclesiastical as well as profane literature, in Georgian as well as in Greek, Persian, and Armenian.

(i) 11. The History of the Kings of Iberia: QM., pp. 1-116 = HG, pp. 15-144.—This ample work, composed before 1072, covers the history of the Georgians from the most ancient times to the fifth century of our era. It can be divided into three main parts—according to the groups of sources on which it is based, viz., (1) treating of the period between the Deluge and Alexander the Great; (2) dealing with the history from Alexander's legendary invasion of Iberia to the fifth century A.D.; and (3) giving the story of the Conversion of the Georgians, inserted—in its due chronological place—in the preceding part, thus dividing it in two.

The first part—from the Deluge to Alexander—represents, in turn, several groups of sources. It is influenced, it seems, by the Holy Scriptures, especially in its attempt to attach the local eponymous heroic genealogies to the *Tabula Populorum of Genesis X* as well as by early Christian, particularly Syriac literature. It, furthermore, displays indebtedness to the Khuaday-

1. Cf. above, I, n. 49.

Namag—the form—to which it belongs and possibly the first part of *Tabula Populorum*, embodies the significance, a people of Proto-Georgian.
N. Marr (as a stereotype copy ops), as Histoire de la Géorgie, Marr (Petrograd, 1923).
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Namagh—the Persian epic-historical "Royal Annals" in their pre-Firdousi form— to which it refers as The Life or History of Persia (Sparsta Czouveba)11, and possibly also to the Armenian historian Moses of Khorené.12 Finally, it embodies the ancient theogonic lore of the Georgian tribes, preserved in some ancient sources used by Leontius13. These ancient theogonies, contained in the first part of The History of the Kings of Iberia which otherwise is of little historical significance, are none of interest because they reflect the historical facts of the Proto-Georgian period.14

11 Kekelije, op. cit., p. 246; idem, The Literary Sources of Leonti Mrveli, pp. 38-41; Jamašvi, Kart'l's-Czouveba, pp. 165-203.—The Šak-Nehe of Firdousi appeared in 1011 and was translated into Georgian in the same century; the Xvndh'-Namaj was translated into Arabic in the eighth century, by Abdallah ibn al-Muqaffa' (cf. also, e.g., Ch. Hart, Literature arabe [Paris, 1912], pp. 211-212.).

12 QM., pp. 10, 11

13 Kekelije, Hist. Geor. Lit., pp. 215-246, and The Lit. Sources of L. M., pp. 30-36.—Kekelije, however, tends to exaggerate Leontius' indebtedness to Moses; thus, e.g., he considers that even the Georgian socio-political term Mwxanazl (ethnarch or pater-familias), mentioned in The Hist. of the Kings of Iberia, is Leontius' adaptation of the Armenian equivalent, Twnwêr, found, among other authors, in Moses. But Mwxanazl is one of the most ancient and autochthonous Georgian socio-political terms, traceable to the tribal times (cf. Javaxivili, History, I-II, 229-230; Allen, History, cap. xix, p. 221 ff.; Karat, Corpus Juris Ibero-Caucasici, I, 2, 245-246, 248, 251-222); it appears in Georgian literature already in the sixth-century Martyrology of St. Eustace of Mecet'a (M. Sabini, The Paradise of Georgia [in Georgian; St. Petersburg, 1882], p. 318; cf. A. Harnack and I. Dachiewshoff [Javaxivili], "Das Martyrium des heil. Eustathius von Meschetu", Sitzungs-berichte d.kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin [1901], p. 875 ff.); i.e., half a millennium earlier than Leontius; and, moreover, Moses himself has now been proved to have drawn upon Georgian sources (cf. S. N. Janalía, On the Criticism of Moses of Xorene, pp. 473-503).

14 Cf. Jamašvi, The Most Ancient National Reference to the Orig. Habitit of the Georgians, passim. Kekelije, Hist. Geor. Lit., 246, considers that Leontius must have had in his hands some ancient, pre-eighth-century Georgian source, because he not only displays an Armenophile tendency (such as, e.g., admitting the seniority of Haos, the eponymous patriarch of the Armenians, over his brother Kart'Is, from whom the Georgians claim descent, etc.), impossible in his age of fully grown Georgian nationalism (cf. Sunbat's History of the Bagratids, [No. 4])—but also because of his use of the term Egriši which disappeared with the establishment of the Kingdom of Abasang-Apxaz'at in the eighth century; cf. idem, The Lit. Sources of L.M., p. 55.—Leontius also makes references to The Book of Nimrod (Nebrot'Am) which may have belonged to the now lost pagan literature of Iberia, Karat, Lit. geor. chrét., p. 12 and n. 1; Jamašvi, op. cit., p. 13; but which, on the other hand, may or may not have been the piece of apocryphal literature discovered in 1900 by the latter author (in a seventeenth-century Ms., and published by him in Shorn. Mat., XXIX [1901] which bears the same name; cf. Kekelije, Hist. Geor. Lit., p. 248.

15 The coordination of the local heroic genealogies with the Tabula populorum of Genia cannot be regarded as a wholly artificial and historically groundless grafting of the local and different, on the newly-acquired Christian tradition, as is the case with younger peoples (as, e.g., the Slavs who traced themselves, through the Noricains, to the posterity of Japheth, cf. Samuel H. Cross, The Russian Primary Chronicle [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930], pp. 136-137). The Georgian tradition, on the contrary, appears to be both another and independent reflection of the same historical background as is reflected in the Bible, and only later coordinated with it. This is but natural in view of the geopolitics of the Proto-Georgian period. Thus, e.g., this tradition makes the various peoples of Cis-Caucasus descend from one
The third part of The History of the Kings is an adaptation of The Conversion of Iberia (No. 1) and its sequel, The Life of St. Nina, together with the story of Alexander's legendary invasion of Iberia. It draws, moreover, upon Agathangelus' History of the Conversion of Armenia and various other Georgian as well as Greek sources.

What is called here the second part consists really of two separately placed chronicles of the kings of Iberia. These correspond to the chronicles of the kings in The Conversion of Iberia and are placed, like them, one between the story of the invasion of Alexander and that of the Conversion (covering the period from the fourth century B.C. to the fourth A.D.); and the other following the Conversion story (from the fourth to the fifth century). The chronicles

of the king from the beginning as well as that of Iberia, for it will be shown in the sequel, therefore, that there is a close connection between these two elements, which in fact is community of both. The story of the conversion of Iberia, however, is not new, for it is based on the same as that of the conversion of Armenia, and with the exception of some minor detail given by the compiler, Dio Cassius.

(ii. 12. 49-54. 60)

JUANSEHEL

A note in the history of the Georgians [K'art'lis-Tbilis'i] (in the eighth century) has been made by the compiler, who may perhaps be the same with the one who compiled the Life of St. Nina. The compiler has given a number of names which have already appeared, and which is called, in his Chronicle, the Great History of Armenia.

16 Cf. above, p. 168.
of the kings given by Leontius, however, differ widely in content as well as size from the brief lists found in The Conversion of Iberia. Their sources must, therefore, be considered to lie elsewhere, although the essential similarities between the two sets of chronicles may, at the same time, indicate—besides the community of subject—also the ultimate community of origin of the sources of both. These must have been some ancient archival material. The Kings of Iberia, found in this work of Leontius, are—despite occasional variations—the same as those mentioned in The Conversion of Iberia, and receive, therefore, the same corroboration in the evidence of foreign sources contemporaneous with the events described. Furthermore—and this is significant—some of the detail given by Leontius has parallels in the works of such writers as Tacitus, Dio Cassius, etc.\(^\text{17}\)

(ii) 12. THE HISTORY OF KING VAKHTANG GORGASALI\(^{18}\), AScribed TO JUANsher JUANsherIANI (VIIth century): QM., pp. 117–211 = HG\(_I\), pp. 144–230.—A note in the text of both QA. and QM. states: "This book of the 'Life of Georgiа' [Kartvel't'a Czovreba = The Georgian Annals] until Vakhtang [fifth-sixth century]\(^{19}\) was written at different periods, but from King Vakhtang till now, it has been written by Juansher Juansheriani, the husband of the niece of St. Archil [II (735–786)]\(^{20}\), etc.\(^{21}\)

Concerning this work and its author, there exists among scholars a great divergence of opinion. The traditional view, represented by Jansavili and Karst, accepts the above notice at its face value, i.e., it regards this work as an eighth-century compilation by the above-mentioned Juansher.\(^{22}\) Zhordania, on the other hand, arguing from the wealth of detail in the description of Vakhtang Gorgasali's reign, considers this work as that of a contemporary and eyewitness.\(^{23}\) He consequently proposes to detach the latter part of this work, which deals with the post-Vakhantian period, and to consider it as one with Leontius Mroveli's Martyrid of King Archil II which follows.\(^{24}\) This is ob-

\(^{17}\) Cf. above, I, No. 1.

\(^{18}\) Cf. Jansavili's interesting (though far from exhaustive) attempt to present side by side parallel passages from the Georgian text and from Tacitus and Dio, op. cit., pp. 216–220; cf. Gorguje, Essays on Georgian History, passim.—For the whole work, cf. also Žordania, Chronicles, I, xxix–xxxiv.

\(^{19}\) Georgics: Czovreba Vakhtang Gorgasalii Mep'izii Tset'i, da lengonad T'zet Mis Didide da Gnt'ia Musurzii Mept'isa, Romeni Umetsi Sezaua Gan'k'ntsal Gano'nda Qose'i Mep'izii K'art'is netsa (The History of King Vakhtang Gorgasali's Parents, and then of That Great and God-Serving King Himself, Who Manifested Himself More Glorious than All the Other Kings of Iberia).


\(^{21}\) For the dates of Archil II, cf. below, No. iii/13.


\(^{23}\) Jansavili, K'art'is-Czovreba, p. 130; Karst, Litt. georg. chrê., p. 102.—However, because of their acceptance of the traditional and erroneous chronology of Archil II, these authors place Juansher half a century too early; cf. below.

\(^{24}\) Chronicles, I, xxxiv ff.

\(^{25}\) Ibidem, p. xxxv ff.
viously wrong because, in the first place, the image of Vakhtang, as compared with its historical prototype, is definitely too heroicized to be the work of a contemporary, and, in the second place, the author himself admits that a long interval separates him from Vakhtang—which would indeed be the case if he were a nephew-in-law of Vakhtang's eighth descendant, Archil II.

Finally, Javakhishvili has come to the conclusion that Juanisher is an author of the eleventh century, because in his work are mentioned The Life of St. John of Zedashe which was written by Arsenuis II, Catholicos of Iberia (955–980), and certain facts in the history of the Patzinsaks (Paçanik-s), such as their flight before the Turks after 1034, all of which took place between the ninth and the eleventh century. Kakabadze concurs with Javakhishvili in the dating of Juanisher. Whereas these two, like the more conservative scholars, treat Juanisher as an independent source, Kekelidze tends to regard his work, at least as we know it now, not as an independent source, but as a part of Leontius of Ruisi's History of the Kings. He bases his consideration on the apparent identity, in the two works, of style as well as of the source material.

Perhaps it will not be too hazardous to venture a reconciliation of all these divergent opinions. To be sure, the opinion of Kekelidze—a leading authority in the field of Georgian literature—that stylistically Leontius' History and The History of King Vakhtang Gorgasale are one, must be accepted. This, however, need in no way imply a denial of the existence of Juanisher as an original source, which existence has been recognized by other leading authorities. This may merely indicate that the History of Juanisher in its present form has reached us in the eleventh-century redaction of Leontius of Ruisi. If this is conceded, all the serious objections to the traditional belief that Juanisher was an eighth-century historian lose their ground, for the above-mentioned anachronisms may very well be due to interpolation, as has indeed been suggested by Zhordania—in this case by its eleventh-century redactor, Leontius.

Juanisher Juanisheriani, as The History of King Vakhtang Gorgasale informs us, was himself a prince of the same Chosroid dynasty to which belonged his hero

---

26 Chronicles, I, xxxv.
27 To question the authority of the notice in the text which ascribes the authorship of the work to Juanisher (as does Kekelije, op. cit., p. 243) is extremely dangerous; for it is precisely due to a similar notice in the same text that we owe the information on Leonti Moveli's authorship (QM., p. 211). If the notice on Juanisher is indeed misplaced (after Moveli's Martyrdom of Archil), so too is the notice on Moveli (after The Hist. of Vakhtang). But what matters is not the place of the notices in a text unified by one reductio, but their sense: the notice on Juanisher clearly ascribes to him The Hist. of Vakhtang, of all the other works; and that on Moveli ascribes to the latter The Hist. of the Kings and the story of St. Nino's conversion of Iberia (a part of it), as well as The Martyrdom of Archil. Prof. Javakhishvili, moreover, recognizes the authenticity and value of these notices, cf. Anc. Georg. Hist. Writ., pp. 189, 196, 198, 202 etc.

Vakhtang a woman married her in the same manner as the Mangiskas.

The History was divided into two parts, covering the life of the Persian kings down to the death of Chosroes II, and the second part, covering the life of the Persian kings from Chosroes II to the reign of Ieronymus,

The death of Juanisher is impossible to determine, but it is known that he was rather poor. He was a very popular polyhistor, and his works were translated into several languages.

---

21 QM., p. 211.
23 QM., p. 15.
24 Javakhishvili also ascribed the authorship of the work to Juanisher as well as to Moveli.
25 Cf., e.g., 1 I. The Catholic
26 Georgics: (Kartvelit'a (Iberians)).
27 Javakhishvili, I. The Catholic
Vakhtang and his own wife, a niece of St. Archil II of Iberia (736–786). He married her after 736 and received, in dowry, a dukedom comprising Tiflis, the Manglisi Valley, Mtioleli, and several other lands.

The History itself lacks both the beginning and the end. It can be divided into two parts: (1) the half-fabulous epic of King Vakhtang I Gorgasali itself, covering the fifth and the sixth century, and (2) the subsequent history of Iberia down to the eighth century. Both parts betray the author's indebtedness to the Persian sources. The figure of Vakhtang is modelled on that of Bahram Gor; and in the subsequent history, particularly of the sixth and seventh centuries, the author himself refers to the Persian historical material, which must have been the Khwaday-Nanagh.

This history, especially in its second part, is a valuable monument which supplies us with much chronological and historical information, fully corroborated by various Byzantine, Armenian, Iranian, and Muslim sources.

(iii) 13. THE MARTYRDOM OF KING ARCHIL II: QM., pp. 211–215 = HG1, pp. 250–256.—This is a short narrative of the martyrdom of St. Archil II, the second last Chosroid of Iberia; the date of its composition lies between 1072 and 1080.

The death of Archil II is one of the most problems in Georgian history, especially from the point of view of chronology. Upon closer examination, however, it will appear that the difficulties are due, not so much to the evidence of the sources, which supply us only with synchronisms, as to the application to these sources of the erroneous chronology set up by the eighteenth-century polyhistor Vakhusht.

According to Vakhusht’s arrangement, followed by Brosset, Bakradze, and

25 QM., p. 208 = HG1, p. 248; cf. QM., p. 215 = HG1, p. 255.
26 QM., p. 208 = HG1, p. 248.—Javakhishvil’s half-hearted attempt (op. cit., p. 180) to identify our Juanser with the monk Hilarion-Juanser, mentioned in an Athosite Ms. from the Iviron Monastery, is not convincing because he does not give the date, or even epoch, of the Ms. and also because the name Juanser alone is not sufficient for an identification, as it was rather popular in old Georgia (cf., e.g., Ferdinand Jueli, Iranisches Namenbuch, p. 123).
29 QM., p. 191 = HG1, p. 291.
30 Javakhishvil, op. cit., pp. 180, 190.—Juanser’s dependence on the Xvadity-Namag is also attested by the following facts: (1) the omission of all mention of Bahram Šobin’s expedition to Susiana and of his defeat, and the description of his revolt as starting from Rey immediately after his Turkish campaigns; (2) the omission of all mention regarding Chosroes II’s part in the murder of his father; and (3) the mention of Chosroes’ marriage to the daughter of the Emperor Maurice.
Janashvili, Archil succeeded his elder brother in 668 and was martyred in 718.\textsuperscript{42} M. Sabimin pushes the latter event to 744.\textsuperscript{42} Professor Javakhishvili believes its date to lie between 737 and 741.\textsuperscript{42} However, Marquart has correctly established it to be as late as 736.

An examination of this problem will bring out the essential reliability of the Georgian sources and their synchronisms, as opposed to the faulty chronology of Vakhusht-Brosset (with which they have, to some detriment of their prestige, become associated). According to Janashvili's History and to Leontius himself, Archil succeeded his brother soon after the invasion of Iberia by the Arab Murvan-Qru or Qru-Amira\textsuperscript{44}. According to both, fifty years later, another Arab, whom Leontius calls Chichum (Čičum) or Asim, put Archil to death.\textsuperscript{42} Now, Murvan-Qru is a composite figure in Georgian-Armenian historiography: a combination of Muhammad ibn Marwan, the Umayyad, and of his son Marwan ibn Muhammad, later the Caliph Marwan II (744–749). The former was remembered for his cruelty towards some Armenian princes, at Nakhevan in 705, and the latter, under the Caliph Hisham (724–743), waged war in Caucasian.\textsuperscript{44} And Janashvili, in fact, expressly states that it was the Caliph Hisham (Ešim) by whom Murvan-Qru was sent. On the other hand, Chichum, alias Asim, has been identified by Marquart with Khuzaima ibn Khažim, Viceroy of Armenia under the Caliph Musâ al-Hadi (785–786).\textsuperscript{45} And indeed, the eighth-century Armenian historian, Bishop Ghevond (Lévond), in his History of the Arab Wars in Armenia, records the execution of the Prince of Iberia by the Caliph Musâ.\textsuperscript{44}

Now, between the caliphate of Hisham (724–743) and that of Musâ (785–786), there had indeed elapsed half a century; and, more precisely still, between the opening of the Caucasian campaign of Marwan ibn Muhammad, in 736,\textsuperscript{44} and

\textsuperscript{42} Ibidem, p. 250.—Though they are referred to as Kings, by the legitimism of the later chroniclers, the last Chosroida did not enjoy that title, or the position it implies, in their lifetime. For kingship was abolished in Iberia by the Persians, and the fait accompli tacitly recognized by the Romans, in the "Eternal Treaty" of 532 (cf. Javashvili, History, pp. 193–197; Allen, History, pp. 377–378; Gugushvili, The Chron.-Geneal. Table, p. 115). The Chosroida—the lawful dynasty—were thereafter reduced to the position of a great noble house. This house, then, together with other feudal princes, exercised, under a Persian Viceroy (Marzban), an oligarchic rule over Iberia (cf. Javashvili, op. cit., pp. 213–220; Gugushvili, op. cit., pp. 115–117; Marquart, Osteur. u. osis. Streifzüge, pp. 431–433). What Arêt II did succeed to, after his brother, must have been merely his family principedom, and whatever political influence his house may have had in Iberia.

\textsuperscript{43} The Paradise of Georgia, p. 331.

\textsuperscript{44} History, II (Tifiš, 1914), 362–363.

\textsuperscript{45} QM., pp. 200, 213, 214.

\textsuperscript{46} Ibidem, pp. 211, 211–212.

\textsuperscript{47} Marquart, op. cit., p. 304 and n. 4, and ff., 305 n. 1; Minorsky, "Tiflis", The Encycl. of Islam, IV, 752–753.


\textsuperscript{49} Loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{50} Cf., e.g., Sir Wm. Muir, The Caliphate, Its Rise, Decline, and Fall (Edinburgh, 1915), p. 397;—the Caucasian-Khazar campaign of Marwân lasted 118–122 A.H.
the martyrdom of Archil II in 785/786, exactly fifty years—assigned by both Juansher and Leontius for his reign—had passed. 

This, we believe, establishes both the reliability of Leontius’ (as well as Juan

scher’s) work and the authentic chronology of Archil II.

(iv) 14. THE CHRONICLE OF IBERIA65 (c. 1072–1073): QM., pp. 216–277 =

HG[1], pp. 256–336.—The name of this work is not given in the corpus of The

Georgian Annals, but it admits of identification with the source referred to as

“the old Chronicle of Iberia” (jueli matianë k’art’lis’), by the author of The

History of the King of Kings, which follows it in the Annals. Its own name, however, may have been The History of Iberia (Czavreba K’art’lis’). About its anonymous author, we know only that he was an Iberian and a con

temporary of King Bagrat IV (1027–1072).66

Our chronicler mentions the loss of the Abasgian fortress of Anakopia to the

Byzantine Empire, in 1033, and then adds: “thereafter Anakopia has been lost to the Kings of Abasgian, to this day”.65 But, as we know from The History of the Kings of Kings, Bagrat IV’s successor George II recovered Anakopia from the Byzantines in 1074, after they had abandoned their eastern provinces, before the onslaught of the Seljuk.66 The date of the compilation of this chronicle, therefore, must lie between 1072, the date of the death of Bagrat IV which is described in it, and before 1074, the date of the taking of Anakopia; i.e., 1072/1073.

65 Georgics: Matianë K’art’lis’.


67 Ibidem, pp. 201–203; this name may have given rise to that of the Annals themselves,

cf. above, II A, n. 1.

68 Javaxisvili, op. cit., pp. 203–204.

69 QM., p. 267; cf. Cedrenus II (Donn.), 503, A.M. 9542.

70 QM., pp. 285, 281.—The QA. Ms., which has its folios confused, is based on corrupt texts and is, therefore, taken by itself not always of value; it further lacks the major part of the story of George II’s reign (= QM., pp. 278, 281–290, last line) and, consequently, also the story of the taking of Anakopia by that king. The Chronique armén., nevertheless, has preserved both, like the QM. Ms. and other Ms. of the Annals (Javaxisvili, op. cit., pp. 265–280). The above-cited remark of the author of The Chron. of Iberia proves that the story of the taking of Anakopia by George II forms an integral part of The Hist. of the King of Kings. This Javaxisvili indeed recognizes (op. cit., pp. 285–297, 213–214) and thus vitiates his own earlier statements to the effect that the story of George II is rather a part of The Chron. of Iberia (ibid., pp. 190, 200). This earlier opinion of Javaxisvili was based on the one fact that in QM. the title of the work “The Hist. of the King of Kings” is found on p. 281, and that nothing separates George II’s reign, begun on p. 277, from the preceding Chron. of Iberia. But then, likewise, nothing separates, in the QM. Ms., the latter work from The Martyrdom of Archil (p. 215)! On the other hand, as Javaxisvili himself admits, it is undeniable that both the story of George II and that of his son, the “King of Kings” David II, are one and the same narrative. Moreover, QM., p. 281, on which the title of its narrative is now found, is not the end of the reign of the one, nor the beginning of the reign of the other; that division is on p. 297. Thus, e.g., the taking of Anakopia is mentioned on p. 280, but the reasons for it, its political background, on p. 281.


[6]
This chronicle covers the period from the death of Archil II (780) to that of Bagrat IV (1072). In a style, clear and unaffected, it presents the purely political history of the growth of Georgia, from the end of the Muslim oppression to the beginning of the Bagratid Empire; the story grows fuller and richer in detail as it nears the author's own time. Its chronological data are invaluable, and its historical evidence finds corroboration in both the contemporaneous Georgian and foreign sources.

The sources upon which our historian has drawn must have included some chronicle of the Amirs of Tiflis, now lost, as well as other unknown Iberian and Meschian historical material; some chronography of Kakhia, which has not reached us; The Divan of the Kings (No. 3) and some other Abasgian sources; Leontius' History of the Kings of Iberia (No. 11); some hagiographical material known to us; and, finally—for the struggle of King George I with the Emperor Basil II—the source which he had in common with Sumbat, son of David.

(v) 15. The History of the King of Kings (c. 1123–1126): QM., pp. 277–335 = GG., pp. 366–381.—The anonymous author of this History is a contemporary and an eyewitness of the events he describes; he is, moreover, an intimate and an ardent admirer of David II as well as, probably, an ecclesiastic. The date of the composition of this History is the period of 1123–1126; the end having been added later, after David II's death in 1125.

The turbulent reign of George II (1072–1089) is treated as a preamble to the glorious reign of his son, the author's—and indeed the nation's—hero, David II the Builder (1089–1125). This, the principal part of our History, is practically

78] Ibidem, pp. 211–212.
80] Georgico: Csoloba Mep've-Mep'iani. The KV. Redaction has added Davit'is'i (David). As QM. gives no Christian name to the king in question, the full English equivalent of the Georgian royal title is given here; David II was indeed "King of Kings" par excellence in Georgian history.
81] Žordania, op. cit., pp. xiii–xvi; Janshavili, op. cit., pp. 121–123; Karst, op. cit., p. 103; Javakishvili, op. cit., pp. 214–215—the latter author is not so sure, p. 215, of the Anonymous' ecclesiastical state; though, no doubt, he is correct when he states that the work is not of an exclusively theological character; in fact Žordania exaggerates when he speaks, p. xlv, of the "theological imprint" borne by the work.
83] Although the historical tradition founded by Prince Vak'ash and followed by Brosset (e.g., GG., II, 1, Add. ix "Tables généaal."); i) makes David II succeed his father upon his death (in 1068, according to Vak'ash, cf. Žordania, op. cit., p. 323), The Hist. of the King of Kings, on the contrary, refers that George II himself elevated his son to the throne (QM., p. 257); and, moreover, both this work and the yet unedited Chronicle of the Kings of Abasgia (No. 3) (Žordania, inc. cit.) give 1089 as the date of David's accession. Now, The Hist. of the King of Kings does not mention the death of George II at all, and The Chron. of the Kings of Abasgia gives it sub anno 1112 (Žordania, op. cit., p. 239). This is supported by a
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number of documents, of the years 1080/1091 and 1103, in which King George is mentioned, either together with his son David or alone (Zordania, op. cit., pp. 234, 236, 240-241). Already Bosset, at a later date, arrived at the conclusion that George II reigned jointly with David II in the years 1080-1092 (Introduction à VIII, p. 114); it is now obvious that, in view of the misfortunes of his reign (cf. Q.M. pp. 277-287), George II ceded the crown to his son, but retained the royal title to his death: in other words became a co-King with him (Zordania, op. cit., pp. 240-241; E. A. Paxomov, "The Georgian Coins" [in Russian], Zapiski [Bulletin] of the Numismatic Division of the Imp. Russ. Archaeol. Society, I, iv [1910], 65 ff.). David II himself had become a co-King with his father some time before he became a King-regnant in 1089; a document of 1085 mentions: "Our Kings, George the King of Kings and Caesar [this Byzantine title was acquired, no doubt, because of the marriage of his sister with first, the Emperor Michael VII and, then, the Emperor Nicephorus III] and His Son David, King and Sebasteus" (Zordania, op. cit., pp. 292-293; Paxomov, loc. cit.). Thus the dates of the two kings are: George II, King-regnant 1072-1089, co-King 1089-1112; David II, co-King c. 1086-1089, King-regnant 1089-1136. 38

(vi) 16. THE HISTORIES AND EULOGIES OF THE SOVEREIGNS (XIIth century): QM., pp. 362-535 = HG', pp. 383-480.—This composition consists of two unequal parts: the first and smaller one deals with the reign of King George III (1156-1184), and the second and larger one treats of that of his celebrated daughter Queen Thamar (1184-1212). 40 Its anonymous author is known in the Georgian historiographical literature as the First Historian of Thamar, in contradistinction to the Second Historian, i.e., the Master of the Court Basil (No. 5), and is, like him, a contemporary and eyewitness of the events described. 41

The work of the Anonymous is at once simpler than that of Basil and different in character to it. Whereas Basil displays a courtier’s intimate knowledge of the Queen’s private life, the former appears to possess all a statesman’s appreciation of her political activity; yet while Basil produces, in simple words, an eyewitness’ account of a great reign, the Anonymous, with flowery rhetoric, builds an hero epic. 42 The Anonymous, in other words, has all the earmarks of an official panegyrist-historian; his style, moreover, is reminiscent of the royal letters patent of the period which were drawn up by the Grand Chancellors of the Realm. This led Zordania and Janašvili to surmise that the author of
this History might have been one of the contemporaneous Archbishops of Chqondidi, ex-officio Grand Chancellors of Georgia.99

The personage to whom the authorship, or only supervision, of this History may thus be ascribed, must have been the Archbishop-Chancellor Theodore, who held that function from 1205-1206 on.78

(vii) 17. The History of the Mongol Invasions71 (XIVth century): QM., pp. 536-785 = HG1, pp. 481-644.—This important historical work, the last in The Georgian Annals, was compiled in the fourteenth century by an anonymous Meschian chronographer.72 It can be divided into three main parts. Part one deals with what may be termed the pre-Mongol period, i.e., the reigns of George IV the Resplendent (1212-1223) and his sister Queen Rusudan (1223-1245); part two describes the period of the Mongol invasions and overlordship, covering the reigns of Rusudan, David IV (1250-1258), David V (1250-1269), Demetrius II the Devoted (1273-1289), Vakhtang II (1289-1292), David VI (1292-1299), George V (1299-1301), Vakhtang III (1301-1307), and George VI the Little (1307-1318); and part three treats of the period of restoration, beginning with the second reign of George V the Illustrious (1318-1346). Unfortunately, however, the very beginning of the History and its latter part, dealing with the second reign of George V, have been lost, and so has the name of our historian, who must have been a younger contemporary of that king.73

The author draws upon thirteenth-century sources; he cites the now lost Annals of the Abbey of St. Shio of Mghiame; and he is well versed in the Mongol language.74 Apart from merely political events—which are extremely well presented—the History contains also valuable information concerning the economic and social development of the country during that period. The author, moreover, displays great impartiality towards the enemy—the Mongols—and holds criticism of his sovereigns.75


70 Cf. Berjanišvili, op. cit., pp. 307-412.—Zordania, p. 1 f., tends to regard the Archbishop-Chancellor Anthony Gionia-T'aviage as the author of this work. But this prelate is for the last time mentioned in The Hist. and Eul. at the beginning of the first decade of the thirteenth century (Q.M., p. 488) before 1205, the earliest date of Theodore, and could not therefore have written this History, which is brought down to 1212.

71 This title is due to modern historiography: the Annals do not give this History any specific appellation.


75 Javaxišvili, op. cit., p. 1484.

(i) Princip. 1. QM. i.35 (or a certain apocryphal chronicle, (No. v/15) the entire History of the Georgian Chancellors (No. iv/14) B. has been treated throughout as a textbook, and thus causing these in its place.

2. KV. of the Eulogies of the Georgian Chancellors.

3. KV. in a geographical, or (b) into Javaxisvili, op. cit., pp. 42-45 = HG.

1 Some, as B. supposes T'achišvili, op. cit., p. 125, taken from text (repeats what op. cit., p. 98).

(2) a note in p. 55, taken as 1164; the correct date is 1264.

(3) a note in p. 61 = HG.

(4) The IXth century for the period of restoration (No. 15) in the Georgian Chronicles.

8 These in the year 1307-1308.

8 The first date in the tenth century in 1080-1084.

(3) a note in p. 83;
C. Appendix

(i) Principal Differences Between the QM. Variant and the KV. Reduction of The Georgian Annals

1. QM. includes: (a) before Leontius' History of the Kings of Iberia (No. i/11), certain apocryphal writings; and (b) between The History of the King of Kings (No. v/15) and The Histories and Eulogies of the Sovereigns (No. vi/16), the entire History of the Bagratids of Sumbat (No. 4). The Chronicle of Iberia (No. iv/14) had one source in common with Sumbat; nevertheless, the KV. Reduction dismembered Sumbat's History and interpolated passages from it throughout the Chronicle of Iberia (as well as Juašseri's History, No. ii/12), thus causing much unnecessary repetition.2

2. KV. omits whole passages of factual importance from The Histories and Eulogies of the Sovereigns, found in QM., pp. 362-364, 394-395, 474-476.3

3. KV. inserts, wholly or in part, various hagiographical, diplomatic, chronographical, and other materials: (a) into Leontius' History of the Kings of Iberia,4 (b) into Juašseri's History of King Vakhtang Gorgasali,5 (c) into The Chronicle of Iberia.6


2 T'ak'aisvili, op. cit., pp. 74-77; 107 and in Sborn. Mat., XXVIII, 117 n.1, 42 n.2, 124 n.1.

3 T'ak'aisvili, Sborn. Mat. XXXVI, 86-87.

4 These insertions are: (1) a detailed narrative of the translation of Our Lord's Tunic to Mecet'a, taken from The Life of St. Nino: HG5, I, 40-41 = HG7, 54-55. Mrovli is based on this text (cf. QM., pp. 78-82; HG5, I, 80 = HG7, pp. 106-107), so that this insertion merely repeats what is told later on in the same work (T'ak'aisvili, op. cit., pp. 81-82; cf. Karst, op. cit., p. 69 ff.);

5 A narrative of how Georgia became an appanage of Our Lady: HG5, I, 41 = HG7, p. 55, taken from The Metaphrase of St. Nino (by Arsenius the Monk [Arsen Beri, c. 1123-1154]; Kekelija, op. cit., pp. 314-321; and not by Arsenius of Iqalt'o [Iqalt'oeel], as supposed T'ak'aisvili, op. cit., pp. 83 n.1.) (T'ak'aisvili, p. 82);

6 A detailed narrative of the legendary apostolate of St. Andrew in Georgia: HG5, I, 42-45 = HG7, pp. 56-59, instead of the short notice in QM., p. 30 (T'ak'aisvili, p. 82; cf., Karst, p. 70 n.2; Javališvili, Kartlis-Czesreba, pp. 131-132);

7 The Life of Peter the Iberian, Bishop of Mayuma, translated from the Syriac into Georgian in the thirteenth century: it is found in various MSS. of the KV. Reduction in varying degrees of abbreviation: HG5, I, 102-103, not in HG7. (T'ak'aisvili, pp. 72-78; cf. Kekelija, pp. 353-355; Marr, "The Life of Peter the Iberian" [in Russian], The Orthodox Palestinian Collection, XVI, 2 [1890]).

8 These insertions are: (1) more fragments from The Metaphrase of St. Nino: HG5, I, 119, 140 = HG7, pp. 159, 200 n.4 (T'ak'aisvili, p. 85);


10 A notice on the Emperor Justinian's authorization to the Iberians to have their Catholicius chosen from among themselves: HG5, I, 154 n.4 = HG7, p. 203 n.6 (T'ak'aisvili, p. 80).
of Iberia, (d) into The History of the King of Kings, (e) into The Histories and Eulogies of the Sovereigns, and (f) into The History of the Mongol Invasions.

4. KV. inserts a new, rather short History of Demetrius I and David III between The History of the King of Kings and The Histories and Eulogies of the Sovereigns: HG*, I, 263–264 = HG¹, pp. 381–382. This work is not an original

| (4) | a fragment from The Life of St. Šte of Mqatle, one of the Syrian Fathers: HG*, I, 150 = HG¹, p. 212 (T‘aqaisvili, pp. 82–83); |
| (5) | a notice on the Second Council of Constantinople: HG*, I, 150 = HG¹, pp. 212–213 (T‘aqaisvili, p. 83); |
| (6) | fragments from Sumbat’s History of the Bagratids, concerning the Davide origin of the Bagratids: HG*, I, 161–163 = HG¹, pp. 216–220 (T‘aqaisvili in Shorn. Mat., XXVII, 12 n. 4, 124 n. 1); |
| (7) | notices concerning the closing of the Council of Aiquri (Moesiia) by the Emperor Hormelios, taken from The Metaphrase of St. Nino: HG*, I, 165 = HG¹, p. 225 (T‘aqaisvili in Shorn. Mat., XXXV, 83); |

These insertions are: (1) fragments from Sumbat’s History of the Bagratids: especially HG*, I, 108–200 = HG¹, pp. 282–285 (T‘aqaisvili, pp. 74–77 and in Shorn. Mat., XXVIII, 117 n. 1); (2) fragments from the treatise of Ephrem Minor on the reasons for Georgia’s conversion to Christianity, with some variations: HG*, I, 159, 163, 171–172 = HG¹, pp. 213, 220–230, 235–230 (T‘aqaisvili in Shorn. Mat. XXXVI, 77–79; cf. KekeliJe, pp. 239–283; Javakhisvili, Anc. Georg. Hist. Writ., pp. 145–160; Karst, pp. 30–31); (3) fragments from The Lives of Sts. John and Euthymius (by St. George the Hagiorite [Mt’asmindeli, d. 1006], cf. KekeliJe, pp. 212–280, esp. p. 232 ff.; Karst, pp. 24 ff., 88; Paul Peeters, S.J., “Histoires monastiques géorgiennes: i. Vie des SS. Jean et Euthyme”, Analecta Boll., XXXVI–XXXVII [1917–1919], 8–68): HG*, I, 206 = HG¹, p. 293 (T‘aqaisvili, op. cit., p. 79); (4) fragments from a charter of the time of Bagrat IV (1027–1072), with a reference to the Catholicos Melkizedek I: HG*, I, 212–213, 218, 220–231, 221–222 = HG¹, pp. 301–302 n. 1, 310–311, 313, 315–316 (T‘aqaisvili, p. 79); (5) fragments from The Life of St. George the Hagiorite, by his disciple George the Hieromonsk [Xuexonmonacon] (KekeliJe, pp. 257–258; Peeters, Hist. monast. georg., ii, 69–150; Karst, p. 28 ff.): HG*, I, 236–237, 229–230 = HG¹, pp. 324, 350–350 (T‘aqaisvili, pp. 73–80); (6) These insertions are some notices from contemporary documents: HG*, I, 241 = HG¹, p. 354, n. 2 (T‘aqaisvili, p. 80). These insertions are passages of a panegyric character (added in the notes to pp. 392–393 of T‘aqaisvili’s edition of QM.) as well as, in its latter part, passages taken either from the now lost second part of Basil’s History of Queen Thamar (No. 5), or from an unknown “Third Historian” of that Queen (T‘aqaisvili in Shorn. Mat., XXXVI, 86–87; cf. above, I, No. 5). These insertions are: (1) some added in the notes to pp. 392–394 of QM. (T‘aqaisvili, op. cit., p. 87); (2) a detailed narrative of the joint campaign of King Vaxtang III (1301–1307) and Qazin-Xin against the Sultan of Egypt, as we as a few details concerning the victory of Behk’n, Prince of Moesiia, over the Tatars, based on an unknown source: HG¹, pp. 629–637 = QM. notes to pp. 772–777 (T‘aqaisvili, pp. 84–85, 103).
source, but was compiled by the Commission in charge of the King Vakhtang Redaction, on the basis of the information about these two intermediary reigns that could be found at the end of the History of David II and at the beginning of that of George III. 19

5. Finally, KV. includes the two Continuations of The Georgian Annals, which cover the history of Georgia from George V the Illustrious to the year 1805. 20

(ii) Positive and Negative Sides of the KV. Redaction

The King Vakhtang Redaction (1) rectified nearly nine-tenths of the textual errors and confusion of the Mtskheta Archetype—a heritage of the Epoch of Decline—, but some of its “rectifications” are decidedly wrong; (2) it paraphrased and clarified some obscure passages, but omitted altogether others which, nevertheless, admitted of clarification; (3) it inserted the evidence of other sources into the text of the Annals, but without mentioning the provenance of the insertions and without a critical sense, thus causing contradictions, repetitions, anachronisms; (4) it supplied the text with more chronological data, but often incorrectly; and (5), by smoothing out the corpus scriptorum, which the Annals are, into a continuous History divided into “reigns”, it facilitated, perhaps, the handling of these, but also served to obscure in the eyes of many their veritable scientific significance as a body of valuable historical material. 21

The fact that The Georgian Annals came first to be known to the outside world in the KV. Redaction, as well as the above-mentioned Preface to that Recension, earned for them the appellation of “The Chronicle of King Vakhtang”. Given, moreover, a superficial acquaintance with this chronographical corpus, there was formed among some scholars of the early nineteenth century the erroneous opinion that the whole of the Annals was a mid-eighteenth-century production, or at least compilation, of King Vakhtang VI. This opinion reflected, quite naturally, very unfavorably on the estimation of The Georgian Annals as historical material. As, furthermore, other Georgian sources—except perhaps the eighteenth-century Chronique géorgienne—were still unknown to those scholars, they came to the conclusion that, before Vakhtang VI, there had been no written history in Georgia. This opinion regarding the Georgian historical sources in general and, in particular, the “authorship” of the Annals was shared, to a greater or less degree, by Klapproth, Saint-Martin, Dubois de Montpéroux, Pat-
kanov, Gren, etc., 14 and even by Brosset himself—that founder of modern Caucasiaology—until he became better acquainted with Georgian historical material. 15

However, by analysing the contents of the Annals, and by comparing their data with those of the Armenian, Byzantine, and Muslim sources, Brosset soon realized that The Georgian Annals had existed, since the early Middle Ages, as Annals and under the very same name, "The Life of Iberia." With the discovery of the twelfth-thirteenth-century Chronique arménienne—an adaptation of the first five parts of the Annals—that existence was proved beyond all doubt. 16 The subsequent discovery and publication of the Queen Mary Ms. of The Georgian Annals, almost a century older than the King Vakhthang Redaction; then, the discovery of the still earlier and as yet unpublished Queen Anne Ms.; further philological and historical analysis (such as comparison of the language of the Annals with that of various contemporaneous documents; examination of the inner evidence by which the epoch of various authors was established; and, finally, collation of those with other contemporaneous Georgian and foreign sources)—all these factors have now definitely dispelled the earlier erroneous notions regarding the Annals. Thus the true nature of this corpus, long obscured by the superimpositions of the King Vakhthang Redaction, has been finally brought to light.

Furthermore, the discovery and publication of numerous other chronographical works, not forming part of the Annals, but serving, in part, as sources for them, and of which the earliest dates from the seventh century, have fully rehabilitated the Georgian historiographical sources in general.

It may be added, in this context, that the historical work of Prince Vakhshut (d. 1772), Vakhthang VI's natural son, may to some extent have further contributed to the confusion about the Annals. Vakhshut, perhaps the best historian of the Silver Age and the greatest polyhistor in Georgian history, has left


15 T'umur'sviili in Sborn. Mat., XXXVI, pp. 42-44; Janashvili, K'artlis-Czerekeba, pp. 113, 117, 138-139, 238-239; idem, "The Evidence of the Georgian Chronicles and Historians Regarding North Caucasus and Russia" (in Russian), Sborn. Mat., XXII (1897), I, 1-5; Bak'raji, Artikleba, ii.; Jordania, Chronicles, I, 5 ff.; Tumanev, The Founder of the Emp. of Tbilisiand and Queen Thanam, p. 381 n. 2.—Kart, op. cit., pp. 105-118, despite all the evidence at his disposal, still uses the misleading expressions like: la chronique vakhthangienne, Annales dites de Vakhthang, l'oeuvre chronologique-annalistique de Vakhthang VI, etc.

16 Brosset, Introduction à l'HG., pp. xlv-xxvi; HG., I, 1, 260 n. 1; T'umur'sviili, op. cit., p. 38 ff.; Bak'raji, loc. cit.; Jordania, loc. cit.
two principal works. One of them is his *Geographical Description of Georgia* which “not only represented a great advance on any other material which had been written up to that date, but... may certainly be regarded as among the most competent and scientific productions of the time.”

The other is his monumental *History of Georgia* which was completed in 1744. This mid-eighteenth-century work, of which the first part is merely an adaptation of the Annals themselves, and whose very name *Sak'art'velos-Czovreba* is almost identical with theirs (*K'arl'lis-Czovreba*)—as is Vakhusht’s with that of his father Vakhtang to whom was ascribed the authorship of the Annals—, has very often been confused with them. And, as though further to increase the imbroglio, Brosset thought nothing of prefacing his edition of the King Vakhtang Recension of *The Georgian Annals* with the Introduction Vakhusht had written for his own *History*.

### III. Chronological List of the Sources and of Their Mss.

#### A. Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century of Date of Composition</th>
<th>Name and Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Period covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td><em>The Conversion of Iberia</em> (1),</td>
<td>Gregory the Deacon,</td>
<td>IV.B.C.—VII.A.D. (continued to IX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.?</td>
<td><em>The History of King Vakhtang Gorgasali</em> (12),</td>
<td>Juaasher Juaasheriani,</td>
<td>V.—VIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td><em>The History of the Kings, Bishops and Catholici of Iberia</em> (2),</td>
<td>Anonymus,</td>
<td>IV.B.C.—IX.A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3008/1014</td>
<td><em>The Divan of the Kings</em> (3),</td>
<td>Bagrat III of Georgia,</td>
<td>V.—XI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1090</td>
<td><em>The History of the Bagratids</em> (4),</td>
<td>Sumbat, son of David,</td>
<td>VIII.—XIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bef.1072</td>
<td><em>The History of the Kings of Iberia</em> (11),</td>
<td>Leontius of Ruisi,</td>
<td>IV.B.C.—V.A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072/1073</td>
<td><em>The Chronicle of Iberia</em> (14),</td>
<td>Anonymus,</td>
<td>780—1072.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073/1080</td>
<td><em>The Martyrdom of King Archil II</em> (13),</td>
<td>Leontius of Ruisi,</td>
<td>730—786.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123/1126</td>
<td><em>The History of the King of Kings</em> (18),</td>
<td>Anonymus,</td>
<td>1072—1126.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210/1213</td>
<td><em>The History of Queen Thamar</em> (3),</td>
<td>Basil, Master of the Court,</td>
<td>1150—c.1204.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td><em>The Chronicle of the Kings of Abasgia</em> (6),</td>
<td>Anonymus,</td>
<td>V.—XIII. (continued to XV.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

19 T`aqa`vi, p. 96.
20 HGI, I, 1, 1—13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century or Date of Composition</th>
<th>Name and Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Period covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1212/1223</td>
<td><em>The History of the Kings Demetrius I, George III, Thamar, and George IV the Resplendent</em> (7),</td>
<td>Anonymus,</td>
<td>1125–1223.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td><em>The Khwarizmian Invasion of Georgia</em> (8),</td>
<td>Abaseride of Tbeti,</td>
<td>1223–1231.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td><em>The History of the Mongol Invasions</em> (7),</td>
<td>Anonymus,</td>
<td>1212–1318.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td><em>The Monument of the Dukes</em> (9),</td>
<td>Anonymus,</td>
<td>VI-1220–1400.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Manuscripts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century or Date of earliest Ms.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contents (Nos. of Sources)</th>
<th>Century or Date of earliest Ms.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contents (Nos. of Sources)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>973</td>
<td><em>The Shatberdi Collection</em></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>XVI-XVII.</td>
<td><em>The QA. Variant of The Georgian Annals</em></td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279/1311</td>
<td><em>The Chronique arménienne: XII-XIIIth-century Armenian adaptation of</em></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV-XV.</td>
<td><em>The Cheflahi Collection</em></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1638/1645.</td>
<td><em>The QM. Variant of The Georgian Annals</em></td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XVIII.</td>
<td><em>The First Continuation of The Georgian Annals</em></td>
<td>(c.1780)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.(?</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV-XVI.</td>
<td><em>The Emadzhev Ms.</em></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Washington, D. C.*

---

**STUDIEN**

I. **Nominalis**


Wenn wir auch im zweiten Halfteren, die darunter sitzen wir eine der Stellung der Synagoge der Letzten.

Scola vel collecta ab Libertini, in alia C.

Damit dürfte auch das ist eben die Mitte des Wegesgetreutes.

2. Zweite Auflage.