

*Demology*

# Ivane Javakhishvili's Contribution to the Formation and Development of Demographic Science in Georgia

**Mzia Shelia**

*Faculty of Economics and Business, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia  
Institute of Demography and Sociology, Ilia State University, Tbilisi, Georgia*

(Presented by Academy Member Vazha Lordkipanidze)

The role of Ivane Javakhishvili (1876-1940), the great Georgian scholar, founder of many branches of history in our country and the first university in the Caucasus region in the formation of historical demography and demography as a science is immense. His contribution to the search, description, analysis and scientific evaluation of manuscripts on demography is great. Based on historical sources, Ivane Javakhishvili substantiated the traditional character of the periodical (once every 7 years) population census in Georgia, studied the specific goals of the population census, the sources of financial support for the census, substantiated the existence of the census programme and found the norms of legal punishment for criminals in case of incorrect population census applicable then; assessed the impact of wars on the displacement of the population of the region and, accordingly, on the demographic decline; He considered age as a demographic category and, based on the existing historical sources, clarified the terminology denoting the periodization of the human life cycle. He also showed the attitude of the Georgian society towards childbearing in the past. Despite the scarcity and fragmented nature of manuscripts on demography, it was Ivane Javakhishvili who first attempted to determine the number of population of Georgia in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Ivane Javakhishvili directly participated in the regulation of accounting of the natural movement of the modern population. In his archive material, a hitherto unknown document was found, in which a critical ethnodemographic analysis of the material of the 1926 general population census is provided. It provides a justification that the distorted accounting of the national structure of the population can lead the country to politically irremediable consequences. On the one hand, this is manifested in the distortion of territorial boundaries, and on the other hand, in the high social price of the new economic systems. His viewpoints are very relevant even today and should be taken into account when developing population census programmes. The archive of Ivane Javakhishvili contains a lot of material, which the great historian had no time to process and publish. Its study requires great attention from economists and demographers. Moreover, if we take into consideration the fact that in the first book of the economic history of Georgia, he also provides precious advice for improving the methodology of further research. © 2023 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.

demography, population, fertility, age, accounting

A more detailed study of Ivane Javakhishvili's archive allowed us to study some of the still unpublished materials and present them with our own interpretation together with other known materials.

The purpose of our paper is to study the direction of academician Ivane Javakhishvili's scientific work that is relatively less demonstrated. In particular, his role in the formation of historical demography and demography as a science in general is great. We were encouraged to write the paper by the works of Georgian economists and other scientists who worthily appreciate Ivane Javakhishvili's contribution to the creation and development of the economic history of Georgia [1-9].

## Results of the Research

According to many recognized scholars, the core of economic analysis is demographic analysis [10,11], but in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century this thesis was still not recognized in the economic academic world. Iv. Javakhishvili's "Economic History of Georgia" begins with a review of written manuscripts about demography. His merit is great both in finding these manuscripts and in their description, analysis and scientific assessment.

In his work "Population census and income books in Georgia", Ivane Javakhishvili, based on historical sources, provides a justification for the existence of the tradition of periodical (once in 7 years) population census in Georgia, indicates the specific goals of the population census (financial and military), the existence of the census programme and sources of financial support for the census. In particular, the population census was carried out not only according to property status, but also according to marital status, social status (rank), affiliation (the feudal lord a person belonged to), craft (profession) and territorial movement. For example, how many migrants or deported people were in certain individual populated areas. It is also

interesting that in the given work he assessed the impact of the war on the territorial movement of the population of the region (Sadrosho) and, accordingly, on the demographic decline [12]. In a word, the object of his study was the conditions of the population census, its regulations and rules.

Based on historical sources, Ivane Javakhishvili demonstrated that in feudal Georgia, the population census was carried out both in urban and rural areas. He places a special emphasis on the existence of periodicity of population censuses, which is of great importance for determining the dynamics of the country's socio-economic development. He notes that in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, in particular, in the years 1801-1802, as a programme of the cameral census conducted by Russia, an earlier Georgian original version was taken, then russified, and "the population was counted by means of the personnel of the Georgian state still preserved for that time". [13:44].

Based on the review of census records of the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries, Iv. Javakhishvili concludes that "Georgian statehood has properly organised demography to suit its needs" [13:43]. But he advises researchers to read the demographic sources correctly, take into account the goals and specifics of the population census at the time, and check the reliability of the available statistical information before making conclusions. However, he also provides us with the information that incorrect accounting of the population in Georgia was punished by law. In particular, if a feudal lord concealed a serf or a household and this fact was disclosed, this serf was taken from that feudal lord brought into the possession of another feudal lord, or remained as state property. The government's strict census policy appears to have kept the number of unregistered persons to a minimum.

Manuscripts about demography have often survived to this day in the form of fragments. Naturally, this fact makes impossible to determine the population of the entire region, but Iv. Javakhishvili manages to determine the time of

compilation of demographic sources, which at least allows estimating the number of population of a particular village or community in a given period. For example, Regarding the excerpt from the 1774 Tiflis census book, he notes that these “corrected and inserted notes illustrate the very work preliminarily performed for the 1781 census of the people residing in Tiflis.” The main text of the old census should be an excerpt of the 1774 book. After that, the utmost importance assigned to this manuscript should be clear: It allows the researcher to at least partially take into consideration the great change that occurred in the composition of the residents of Tiflis during the 7 years.” [14].

Against the background of the general overview of demographic manuscripts, this work of Ivane Javakhishvili is a kind of guide for future researchers, where it is clearly stated what work should be performed after reviewing the demographic manuscript, what sources should be paid attention to and what should be taken into account. Regrettably, on the part of Georgian researchers, many historical sources are still unexplored from a demographic point of view, even the reports of those foreign travellers who provide rich information about Georgia and the Caucasus.

The fragmentary nature of written demographic manuscripts makes it rather difficult to study the history of the demographic development of Georgia “Regrettably, on the one hand, the weakening of the national heartbeat and irresponsibility of Georgian society and, on the other hand, the policy of the Russian authorities to destroy and suppress the Georgian national culture, and finally, the complete indifference of the Russian authorities towards the proper local institutions contributed to the destruction of this great cultural treasure, Georgian demographic manuscripts. Most of them, which survived the invasion of the enemies of Georgia, perished in the 19<sup>th</sup> century due to the above-mentioned reasons. Thanks to such unforgivable carelessness and crimes, instead of the great volume of material that was left by the state of

Georgia to study our country's demography in the form of books of census of our people, which were systematically collected every seven years, only a small part of it has survived. The damage that it made to the culture and socio-economic history of Georgia is, certainly, irreparable” [13].

Despite this difficulty, Iv. Javakhishvili was the person who attempted, for the first time, to determine the number of the population of Georgia in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. According to his estimation based on the population census carried out by the Mongols in 1254, “there must have been at least 5 million inhabitants in the Kingdom of Georgia at that time. This number, of course, included not only Georgians, but also representatives of other nationalities who belonged to Georgia. It can be seen from these reports, how dense the population was in Georgia at that time, despite the fact that the country had already experienced the horrors of two invasions by Jalaaladdin and Genghis Khan, which resulted in a quite large number of casualties” [15]. This assessment of Ivane Javakhishvili means that at that time, at least 5 million people lived in the territory subordinated to Georgia.

The great historian did not overlook the attitude of the Georgian society towards the issue of childbearing. He observed the periodization of the life cycle and the age structure of the population in the historical sources. In particular, in the work “Human being in ancient Georgian writing and life” he notes that “it was impossible to imagine a greater misfortune than (a person) not having a child, with the memory of him eradicated, leaving no one behind to pray for his soul.” The second thing is that he might have suffered the same misfortune as the Mestumre Jikuri (a public official in the kingdom of Georgia), about whom it is said that “there was no one to bury him, for he had no child” [16].

Iv. Javakhishvili considers the age of a human being as a demographic category. Based on available historical sources, he clarifies the terminology that defines the periodization of the

human life cycle: “Human life was divided into two main parts. The first was called childhood (Krmoba), the second was called the age of maturity (Hasaki)... Hasaki was called the age of sexual maturity in Georgian that was 13 years for a woman and 15-16 years for a man [15]. From the 12<sup>th</sup> century, Krmoba was used to denote the age of youth. The above-mentioned two main parts of a person’s life- childhood and youth, were, in turn, divided into several parts, and each of them had its own name. In particular, Hasaki was divided into three parts according to the age of the person. The person of the first age was called a youth, of the second age- middle aged, and of the last age – “elder”... The advanced old age also had its own name, and a person of this age was called “blessed with longevity”.

In the same work, Iv. Javakhishvili notes that “unfortunately, in the ancient Georgian legal sources, there are no direct references to determine the age of adulthood” [16].

Ivane Javakhishvili has searched for materials about the spread of infectious diseases in Georgia, for example, about the black plague in Kakheti in 1723, in Mtskheta in 1799, about the problems of serfs and serfdom [16], health facilities, rational diet regime [16], wedding customs [16]; demographic structure in individual villages [17]. A separate analytical study on these issues is planned for the future. It is necessary to study his opinions on the demographic situation of Georgia, the system of population census system, etc. It is noteworthy that Ivane Javakhishvili always tried to have the centuries-old practice of population census taken into account in modern censuses. According to the information kept in the archive of academician A. Shanidze, on August 22, 1919, Iv. Javakhishvili was invited to the sitting of the Central Statistics Committee that was supposed to discuss the issue of processing the material of the 1917 city census, and registering the natural movement of the population. Furthermore, the issues of agriculture, school and sanitary statistics

should also be reviewed [18]. Ivane Javakhishvili was actively involved not only in organizing the demographic census, but also critically studied the materials of the modern population census, especially, from the ethnodemographic point of view. In this regard, one manuscript from his archive referring to the 1926 population census of Saingilo, Samtskhi and the analysis of the ethnodemographic structure of the population of the so-called South Ossetia is of much interest. As far as is known, this manuscript, so far, has not been referred to by any researcher exploring his works, and moreover, has not been discussed in detail. According to its content, it was written in 1933 or a little later.

In particular, relying on the source, “Administrative-territorial division of Georgia” in 1930. I. Javakhishvili notes that for the given period, 96,598 people lived in Samtskhe, the former Akhaltsikhe Mazra [Mazra- an administrative unit in the Soviet Union]. The average size of the household was 6 people, the share of Georgians was 71%, Armenians – 16%, Russians – 1.7%, Kurds – 3.3%. Tarakama – 5.3% and the rest – 2.6%. 35.4% of Georgians are Christians and the rest are Muslims. He notes that only 25% of Georgians speak Georgian and lists 18 Georgian-speaking villages: Svir, where 1126 people lived at that time, Boga (477 people), Murdo (368 people), Giorgitsminda (443 people), Chokhta (138 people), Persa (549 people), Tsokhtevi (300 people), Mugareti (425 people), Zikilia (949 people), Agara (90 people), Sakuneti (788 people), Indura (467 people), Kamza (608 people), Zemo Omora (1086 people), Ude (900 people), Vale (569 people), Klede (1129 people), Tsnisi (515 people). Total of 1802 households, 10937 individuals.

After that Iv. Javakhishvili writes: “Samtskhe, in general, has made a great contribution to Georgian culture, and it is heart-wrenching to witness its current situation: Shota Rustaveli's once flourishing hearth is fading and turned to ashes in front of our eyes today. Georgian Muslims residing

here are called Turks by the local authorities in the official language, i.e. they are not considered Georgians, but Turks; Even in the 1926 census, they are not included in the number of Georgians, but are outlined as a separate nationality under the name of Muslim- it is a non-existent nationality. ...One part of Georgian Muslims, 1802 households (a total of 10937 individuals) still speak Georgian today; They use this language as their family language; But despite this, Turkish schools are established for them everywhere and Georgian language is not even taught as a subject. Persons affiliated with the Musavat Party from Azerbaijan are also appointed there as teachers. In the years 1930-1931, the residents of the villages of Sviri, Murdo and Giorgitsminda, having seen the practical need for the Georgian language, went to Akhaltsikhe and asked the head of the education department of the district administration to open Georgian schools in their villages; The head of the department said: You are Turks and you have a Turkish school. You can have no Georgian school.” In general, Samtskhe, along with Javakheti (former Akhalkalaki Mazra) experienced a terrible reversal from its authorities from the very beginning, throughout the Soviet rule. Representatives of the Dashnak Party have taken many reins of government here, and they approach and do everything in an Armenian manner. Although many such persons have been replaced, but it still did not help”.

In the statistical analysis of the population of the so-called “South Ossetia” (Tskhinvali region), Ivane Javakhishvili critically evaluates the material of the 1926 census and notes that according to the census, the number of Georgians in this region is 23,460 people (4,120 households), although he assumes that more Georgians live there. He also notes that “Georgians getting in Ossetia are terribly oppressed in every way. In the Soviet territory, I think, none of the population is so disregarded and deprived of public rights, as the Georgians living in Ossetia (Tskhinvali region). During dekulakization

(dispossession of the kulaks), the Ossetians demonstrate a clearly oppressive attitude towards Georgians. Dekulakization took place in Ossetia in a manner that has never happened anywhere else. Instead of carrying out dekulakization, the Ossetian nationalists were, in fact, pursuing their own chauvinistic goals. They clearly persecuted Georgians. Then, after subjecting them to dekulakization, they left them with nothing but one set of bedding and the clothes they wore, thus, driving them out almost completely impoverished. In the end, many Armenians subject to dekulakization were sent back, while almost none of the Georgians was allowed to return. Georgian language is persecuted from Georgian villages. In the early days, taxes were collected only from Georgians, and then they obviously placed a greater burden on Georgian peasants. They opened schools for Ossetians, while they did so for Georgians rarely. There is no sign of culture-related development in Georgian villages...”

However, it is noteworthy that Ivane Javakhishvili focuses not only on the regions of Tskhinvali and Samtskhe, but also on Saingilo (former Zakatala district). He provides an analysis of the ethnic structure of the population of this region and notes that according to the 1926 census, the population of Saingilo, which, as he estimated, was 75,000, included 23,000 Georgians, 40,000 Lezghins and 2,000 Mughals. Among Georgians, 16,700 were Muslims, 65% of the entire Georgian population spoke Georgian, and only 35% had forgotten the Georgian language. He lists the villages where Georgian Christians lived, who, a total of 6300 people, certainly spoke Georgian: Kakhi, Alibeglo, Meshabashi, Koraghani, Kotuklo. The villages of those Georgian Muslims who spoke Georgian: Aliabad, Hengyan, Mosuli, Zagani, Tasmalo, Marsani, Ithitala (total of 11 thousand people), Georgian Muslims had forgotten the Georgian language in the following villages: Kandakhi, Kapanakhchi, Verkhviani, Lalapasha, Soskani, Shotavari (total of 5700 people). “To the

east of Saingilo, in its close proximity, - notes Iv. Javakhishvili - is a valley (western part of the former Nukhi Mazra), which is also inhabited by Georgian Muslims. 1200 households with 7000 individuals reside in the following villages: Zemo and Kvemo Ghanukhi, Tsablovani and Laiski. The latter have forgotten the Georgian language, but they have kept the family and patrimonial relationships and often visit the residents of Kakhi (Saingilo), especially those living in Kvemo Ghanukh". The total number of Georgian population in this region (Saingilo + the above-mentioned valley) was 30,000 people [19].

By analyzing the ethnic structure of individual Georgian regions of Georgia, Ivane Javakhishvili points out the shortcomings that accompanied the process of population census. In particular, assigning some part of the Georgian population as Muslims distorted the ethnic picture of the region, artificially reduced the share of Georgians in the population of the region that provided grounds for teaching in a non-Georgian language when planning social policy measures, in particular when developing educational policy. This provided certain persons with the prospect of appropriating Georgian territories. Ivane Javakhishvili actually demonstrated the importance of scientific processing of the population census programme, and the irreparable mistakes that can be made by the failure to do so. The scientific processing of the population census programme is a topical issue even in our days. Unfortunately, the 2024 population census programme has not been discussed by the academic community. This manuscript of a great scientist is the best example of not taking this into consideration. According to Ivane Javakhishvili's evaluation, the social price of Georgia's transition to a new social system in the 20s and 30s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was very high. We are still reaping the mistakes made a hundred years ago. We failed to take into account the lessons of history in the process of the new transformation of

society. We made the same mistakes in the 1990s and the social price of the new economic system became even higher, whereas the level of socio-economic adaptation of the society was extremely low. This served as a strong incentive for the process of intensive emigration that made Georgia a demographically dying country.

## Conclusion

Ivane Javakhishvili made an invaluable contribution to the scientific development of the historic demographic of Georgia. In particular, he collected and systematized written manuscripts on demography, scientifically substantiated the goals, periodicity, systematicity and sources of financial provision for population censuses in Georgia. He evaluated the census programmes, the difficulties of their implementation and the legal norms of responsibility of those performing the census. He scientifically determined the impact of wars on population decline. Based on the historical documentation, he showed the attitude of the population towards the issue of child-bearing and scientifically evaluated the influence of the ethno-demographic development of the population of Georgia on the country's political history and on the formation of territorial borders of the state.

The work was written within the framework of the state targeted programme. The author extends her thanks to the administration of the Faculty of Economics and Business of TSU for their support, to the employees of the State National Archive and Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts for their attentiveness and prompt assistance, to the Deputy Director of Ivane Javakhishvili University Museum, Director of Ivane Javakhishvili Center, Mr. David Sartania for Professional consultation.

## დემოლოგია

# ივანე ჯავახიშვილის ღვაწლი საქართველოში დემოგრაფიული მეცნიერების ფორმირებასა და განვითარებაში

## მ. შელია

*ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახ. თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი, ეკონომიკისა და ბიზნესის ფაკულტეტი, თბილისი, საქართველო*  
*ილიას სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი, დემოგრაფიისა და სოციოლოგიის ინსტიტუტი, თბილისი, საქართველო*

(წარმოდგენილია აკადემიის წევრის ვ. ლორთქიფანიძის მიერ)

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის როლი ისტორიული დემოგრაფიის და, ზოგადად, დემოგრაფიის, როგორც მეცნიერების ფორმირებაში განუზომელია. დიდია მისი წვლილი დემოგრაფიული წერილობითი ძეგლების მოძიებაში, აღწერა-ანალიზისა და მეცნიერულ შეფასებაში. ივანე ჯავახიშვილმა ისტორიულ წყაროებზე დაყრდნობით დაასაბუთა საქართველოში მოსახლეობის პერიოდული (7 წელში ერთხელ) აღწერის ტრადიციულობა, შეისწავლა მოსახლეობის აღწერის კონკრეტული მიზნები, ფინანსური უზრუნველყოფის წყაროები, დაასაბუთა აღწერის პროგრამის არსებობა და გამოავლინა მოსახლეობის არასწორი აღრიცხვის შემთხვევაში დამნაშავეთა სამართლებრივი სასჯელის მაშინდელი ნორმები; შეაფასა ომების გავლენა რეგიონის მოსახლეობის გადაადგილებაზე და, შესაბამისად, დემოგრაფიულ კლებაზე; ასაკი განიხილა, როგორც დემოგრაფიული კატეგორია და არსებულ ისტორიულ წყაროებზე დაყრდნობით დააზუსტა ადამიანის სასიცოცხლო ციკლის პერიოდიზაციის აღმნიშვნელი ტერმინოლოგია, გვიჩვენა როგორი იყო წარსულში ქართული საზოგადოების დამოკიდებულება შვილიანობისადმი. მიუხედავად დემოგრაფიული წერილობითი ძეგლების სიმწირისა და ფრაგმენტულობისა, მას ეკუთვნის საქართველოს მოსახლეობის რიცხოვნობის დადგენის პირველი მცდელობა მე-13 საუკუნეში. ივანე ჯავახიშვილი უშუალოდ მონაწილეობდა თანამედროვე მოსახლეობის ბუნებრივი მოძრაობის აღრიცხვის მოწესრიგებაში. მის საარქივო მასალაში აღმოჩნდა მკვლევართათვის მანამდე უცნობი დოკუმენტი, რომელშიც 1926 წლის მოსახლეობის საყოველთაო აღწერის მასალის კრიტიკული ეთნოდემოგრაფიული ანალიზია. მასში დასაბუთებულია, რომ მოსახლეობის ეროვნული სტრუქტურის დამახინჯებულმა აღრიცხვამ შეიძლება ქვეყანა პოლიტიკურად გამოუსწორებელ შედეგებამდე მიიყვანოს. ერთი მხრივ, ეს ვლინდება ტერიტორიული საზღვრების დამახინჯებაში, მეორე მხრივ, ახალი ეკონომიკური სისტემის მაღალ სოციალურ ფასში. მისი მოსაზრებები დღესაც მეტად აქტუალური და გასათვალისწინებელია მოსახლეობის აღრიცხვის პროგრამების შედგენისას. ივანე ჯავახიშვილის

არქივში დიდძალი მასალაა, რომლის გადამუშავება და გამოცემა დიდმა ისტორიკოსმა ვერ მოასწრო. მისი შესწავლა, ეკონომისტთა და დემოგრაფთა მხრიდან დიდ ყურადღებას მოითხოვს. მითუმეტეს, თუ იმასაც გავითვალისწინებთ, რომ საქართველოს ეკონომიკური ისტორიის პირველ წიგნში იგი შემდგომი კვლევის მეთოდოლოგიის გაუმჯობესებისათვის ფასდაუდებელ რჩევებსაც იძლევა.

## REFERENCES

1. Gugushvili P. (1973) Remembering the Academician Ivane Javakhishvili Collection „Economics“. 5: 374-391 (in Georgian).
2. Lordkipanidze V. (1918) Demology, 362p. Sachino. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
3. Meskhia Sh. (1976) Iv. Javakhishvili and Matters of Economic History of Georgia. Anniversary Collection dedicated to the centennial of Iv. Javakhishvili. Pp.12-21. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
4. Koridze D. (1976) Ivane Javakhishvili about the development of production resources in Georgia. Collection, VII. pp:125-134. „Economics“ (in Georgian).
5. Chantladze V. (1976) Iv. Javakhishvili about the public finances of Georgia. Collection, VII. pp:27-46. „Economics“ (in Georgian).
6. Silagadze A. Atanelashvili T. Silagadze N. (2018) At the origins of economic science. 152p. TSU publishing house. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
7. Kistauri Sh. (1996) Iv. Javakhishvili- researcher of the economic history of Georgia. 80p. „Samtavisi“ Tbilisi (in Georgian).
8. Tukhashvili M. (1996) Labour potential of Georgia: demographic problems. 84 p. TSU Publishing House. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
9. Kodua E. (2001) Sociological researches of Ivane Javakhishvili: Sociological analysis of rural areas, study of the problems of students. In the book: sociological and social-philosophical thoughts in Georgia in the first half of the 20th century, pp:331-351, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
10. Robert W. Fogel (1994) Economic growth, population theory, and physiology: the bearing of long-term processes on the making of economic policy. The American Economic Review pp. 369-395. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2118058>
11. Simon Kuznets (1973) Population, capital, and growth: Selected Essays. 356p. Norton.
12. Javakhishvili Iv. (1901) Population census and income books in Georgia. *Moambe Journal*, N 4. Sect. II. 1-17. [https://digitallibrary.tsu.ge/book/2021/disertaciebi/javakhishvili\\_xalxis\\_agweris\\_da\\_sh\\_emosavlis\\_davtari\\_saqartveloshi.pdf](https://digitallibrary.tsu.ge/book/2021/disertaciebi/javakhishvili_xalxis_agweris_da_sh_emosavlis_davtari_saqartveloshi.pdf) (in Georgian).
13. Javakhishvili Iv. (1930) Economic history of Georgia. Book one. „Georgian Book“. 84(3): 44,43,48 Tbilisi (in Georgian).
14. Javakhishvili. Iv. (1967) Manuscripts of economic history of Georgia. P.145. „Science“. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
15. Javakhishvili. Iv. (1966) History of Georgian Nation. Book 3. Soviet Georgia, p.343. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
16. Javakhishvili Iv. (1956) Human being in Georgian literature and life. In the book: matters of Georgian language and literature, pp.130-131. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
17. Archive of Ivane Javakhishvili, №642, 381, 383, 2498; 2499; 2872. 762-766, 2956, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
18. Archive of Akaki Shanidze, № 1793, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
19. Archive of Ivane Javakhishvili, №2956, Tbilisi (in Georgian).

*Received March, 2023*