

A WOMAN'S RIGHT AND PROPERTY CONDITION AND THE ISSUE  
OF "PURCHASE MARRIAGE" IN THE POPULATION OF SOUTH GEORGIA  
(ANALYSIS USING MATHEMATICAL METHOD)

ქალი და სყიდვითი ქორწინების საკითხი სამხრეთ საქართველოს მოსახლეობაში  
(მათემატიკური მეთოდით გაანალიზებული)

TINA IVELASHVILI

Doktor of History, Professor of Samtskhe-Javakheti  
State University, Akhaltsikhe, Georgia  
ORCID:0000-0002-1964-1858  
tinaivelashvili@mail.ru  
+995599926479

**Abstract**

The article discusses the issue of whether there was a purchase marriage in Georgia. The analysis of the materials showed that we are not dealing with a marriage of convenience, but a woman with an expression of property status. The woman was part of her husband's family with her own property, which was an indicator of her independence. Purchasing marriage may have been a custom among certain peoples, but it is not obligatory to spread it to all peoples in search of paparazzi. The use of mathematical methods and analogues in the study of a separate issue of the humanities and social sciences allows us draw very interesting conclusions.

There is still a difference of opinion among researchers about the use of mathematical methods in the study of a particular issue of marriage. One part considers research with this method not desirable but necessary, while the other part considers it completely unacceptable. We even think that mathematical calculations allow us to disprove the frequency of separate randomness within a particular ethnos and the regularity of the reasons for its occurrence.

Using mathematical models, the article discusses and analyzes the issue of whether there was a purchasing marriage in Georgia. Research has shown that a woman entered her husband's family with her own independent property. This fact is an indicator of the rather high status of property and property of women in Georgia. The emergence of the purchasing element in individual people may indeed have taken place, but in the search for parallels it is not necessary to extend it to all people.

**Keywords:** A woman's Right, Property, Marriage.

**თინა იველაშვილი**

ისტორიის დოქტორი, სამცხე-ჯავახეთის სახელმწიფო  
უნივერსიტეტის პროფესორი, ახალციხე, საქართველო

ORCID:0000-0002-1964-1858

tinaivelashvili@mail.ru

+995599926479

**აბსტრაქტი**

სტატიაში განხილული და გაანალიზებულია საკითხი არსებობდა თუ არა საქართველოში ქალის სყიდვით ქორწინება. კვლევამ გვიჩვენა, რომ აქ საქმე გვაქვს არა სყიდვით ქორწინებასთან, არამედ ქმრის სახლში მის ქონებრივ უზრუნველყოფასთან. ქალი ქმრის ოჯახში დამოუკიდებელი - საკუთარი ქონებით (მნიშვნელობა არ ჰქონდა ეს ქონება მამის ოჯახიდან თუ ქმრის ოჯახიდან იყო გამოყოფილი) შედიოდა, რაც იმ დროისათვის მის უფლებრივ-ქონებრივი მდგომარეობის საკმაოდ მაღალი დონის მაჩვენებლად უნდა მივიჩნიოთ. სყიდვითი ელემენტების გაჩენას ცალკეულ ხალხში შესაძლებელია მართლაც ჰქონდა ადგილი, მაგრამ პარალელიზმის ძიებაში სავალდებულო არ არის ყველა ხალხზე გავავრცელოთ.

**საკვანძო სიტყვები:** ქალის უფლება, საკუთრება, ქორწინება.

**Introduction**

Until now, the prevailing opinion was that marital marriage was a universal phenomenon in Georgia (R. Kharadze, I. Chkonia, N. Machabeli, M. Bekali, V. Itonishvili, L. Melikishvili). New research has shown that we need to look at the issue from a different perspective

**Methods**

The research is based on relatively historical and complex methods. We analyzed the issue using its mathematical method in parallel. The combined study allowed us to draw completely opposite conclusions.

**Results**

The Analysis using mathematical method of written data and ethnographical materials showed us that there was not any purchase marriage in the population of South Georgia (and in whole Georgia.) A woman entered her husband's family having her own property. And we consider that it was a sign of a high level of right and property condition.

**Discussion**

To study a woman's right and property condition, it's important to find out if there was a purchase marriage in Georgia. There are different ideas about this issue among the Georgian researchers.

One part of them thought and still thinks that “a purchase marriage” was widely spread among Georgians. To prove it, they use old historical sources, general models, ethnographical materials from different parts of Georgia.

Let's first compare and then analyze existed written data and ethnographical material and discuss the issue.

” According to our tradition a bridegroom brings property to a bride and not a bride to a bridegroom. “I can't give a marriage portion to my daughter but I can support her with property”, appeals George Mefe (King) to the follower of Byzantine.

Iv. Javakhishvili writes that “according to the tradition, the very bridegroom was responsible to bring property to a bride and not to her family ( --- T.I.)” He highlights the fact in the novel - “ The Torture of Shushaniki “ and concludes that when a family conflict ended with a divorce, a husband took all the things back, he had brought to his wife.

According to Arkanjelo Lambert's estimation and references, a bridegroom had to pay for a bride. Iv. Javakhishvili supports his opinion and says that “urvadi “was a kind of payment paid for a bride. The trace of the same “urvadi” is seen in Iakob Khutsesi's reference.. According to Iv. Janakhishvili “this tradition was established in the time when to marry a woman was only be able by giving “urvadi” to her family “ (Javakhishvili, 1986: 214).

R.Kharadze studied above mentioned written data and ethnographical materials of Svaneti and concluded that “ the tradition in Svaneti gains more importance as the existence of “urvadi” is confirmed with the old Georgian historical sources”. “nakdanuri” and “natsulashi” was a payment given to a girl's parents from a boy's ones”. He shares Wilkeln's idea about establishing a purchase marring and says that kidnapping a woman was changed into paying a kind of payment. It was a definite payment for a woman paid by a kidnapper to a chaser to avoid from him. According to the written data and ethnological materials a kidnapping was not a spread means of marrying a woman. It was an unacceptable and additional way-out from the difficult situation. As a rule, relatives arranged a marriage and accordingly, kidnapping was breaking of the rule.

So, we don't accept the idea of connecting a purchase marriage to a kidnapping one. But if still there was a case of kidnapping, he should pay a fine. It was a ransom for a crime and not for a woman. And logically, a “purchase marriage” was impossible to become a tradition and spread widely in future.(Ivelashvili, 1999: 7).

Studying the ethnography of Khevi , V. Itonishvili shares Iv. Javakhishvili and R. Kharadze's opinion about existing a purchase marriage in Georgia (Ithonishvili, 1960: 211).

Having studied the materials in Adjara, M. Bekaia concludes that a great part of wedding traditions in this part of Georgia, was the remains of a purchase marriage. He gives the list of remains: obligation towards the family of a fiancée and obligatory presents to bring to a bride of course, prove the existence of a purchase marriage in Zemo Adjara ~ (Brqiaia, 1974: 127).

S. Chanturishvili admitted a purchase marriage in Georgia without analysis of existed written and ethnographic materials and indicated that on the base of XVII-XVIIIcc sources Iv. Javakhishvili saw the trace and reflection of “urvadi” in the material obligation of a husband towards his wife. i.e the remains of a purchase marriage are confirmed on the example of Highland of Georgia(Svaneti, Khevi). (Chanturishvili 1984: 166).

L Melikishvili thinks that in Pshavi “honor of the house” is the element of remains of a purchase marriage which is left in the woman's family. This tradition was forgotten long ago. In comparison of the other parts of Georgia, Pshavi kept very little about the tradition of a purchase marriage..Ethnographical material shows us that the property brought to the family as “honour of the house” was not used by a woman. It belonged to her father.”That's why, we

consider that the “honour of the house” was the element of remains of a purchase marriage” he mentions (Melikishvili, 1986: 151).

Let’s analyze the data of the written and ethnographic material and discuss the list of above mentioned traditions kept in the population of Georgia and see, if it is the remains of a purchase marriage or its reflection.

In all written documents discussed by Academician Iv. Javakhishvili, is highlighted that according to the Georgian traditions, a fiance takes property to his fiancée (and not to her family—T.I.) “And he sent to the woman as precious jewelry as he could.” (Javakhishvili, 1982: 134).

If a woman was an initiator of a divorce, a husband had a right to take back all the presents he had brought to her. It is shown in Varksen’s address to Iakob Khutsesi where he says: “Don’t leave my jewellery to her, as she is not my wife any more.. But if a man divorced, he should give his wife everything according to the list of a marriage portion. Besides, husband’s presents and “honour of the house” should also be left to the woman. And if a woman wanted to divorce, she should go away and leave her husband’s family without anything: “Honour of the house” and a marriage portion should be left to her husband. The above mentioned document is not of a Georgian origin but it worked in Georgia before Vakhtang’s Book of Law was established. The book is translated so well that it may be considered to be Georgian.

Above mentioned written sources show that the mentioned things or property, didn’t belong to a woman’s family. It was for a fiancée or a wife. Academician Iv. Javakhishvili writes: “It is obvious that these things were for a fiance or a wife. And the things brought by a fiance was not a ransom for a woman’s family but her property. In spite of this fact, acad. Iv. Javakhishvili considers that “uradi”- fiance’s presents brought to a fiancée is derived from “urvadi” (Javakhishvili, 1962: 274).

To our mind, the fact given in “The Torture of Shushaniki” doesn’t confirm the trace or reflection of “urvadi”. We think that it supported a woman with property. Neither “urvadi” nor a ransom is mentioned in the law documents of early Feudal Georgia. “But we have a lot of data about different presents. These documents made us think that “urvadi” didn’t exist in Georgia. (especially in the Lowlands of Georgia.) G. Nadareishvili fills these gaps with the notes of old Babilonian law and the travellers of Middle Ages and concludes that “a part of “urvadi” should have been in Lowlands of Georgia. (1974: 41). If we envisage the fact that “sheraqtumi” (a special kind of a marriage portion given to the daughter from her father’s family before marriage) was more than “tersatumi” (the price of a ransom of a fiancée) we’ll see that it was not the property to purchase a woman but to support her partially in the husband’s family. So, we can’t use this document to prove the existence of “urvadi” in Georgia. We can’t consider the presents from the fiance’ and his family, to be “urvadi” because they are different.

R. Kharadze speaks about the number of “nakdanuri” in Svaneti - one bull, the price of which reached to 25-30 maneti in old times. The woman had no share from the bull, it fully belonged to the family. As for “nachulashi”, it was equal to one naljomi field, a pair of bulls, and one cow. The price of a field was equal to one couple of bulls. The land taken from “nachulashi” was left only to a woman and it was her property.

According to the materials from Zemo Svaneti, a girl’s family sold the bulls taken from “nachulashi” and “nakdanuri”. With this money, a girl prepared things to take to her husband’s family. Besides this, she was given one cow, other domestic animals and some poultry. It belonged to her too. A girl was also given one naljomi field, and a couple of bulls. Generally, a girl’s family used that field but sometimes she took it as her property. In addition to this,

parents bought her a mattress, a trunk and a chaprast (a silver brouch). In Kvemo Svaneti "nachulashi" meant the price of bulls or money that was given to a girl. She was also given cattle and poultry as it was in Zemo Svaneti. "A girl took everything to her husband's family as her property" remarks R. Kharadze (Kharadze, 1939: 97).

Besides above mentioned things, a married woman should get all kinds of presents from her father's family, beginning from one maneti to a cow, a bull, and a horse every New Year. These facts were confirmed during our visit in Svaneti. At every feast a married daughter is invited to her father's family with her husband and children. If she has a poor husband but wealthy parents, the latter should provide them with clothes but if a husband could not support his family, his wife's parents should keep their daughter and her children. When cattle were killed in a woman's parents' family, a skin was given to her for bast sandals. It is worth mentioning that a married daughter had the same rights in her father's family as the other members. Besides, a family sent 4-6 litre vodka to the married daughter for Shrovetide every year. It should be mentioned that a crop field brought by girl's Mother was given to her daughter. It was called "letzeimi". If Mother had two daughters, the field was divided into two parts. The given material shows that it had nothing common with a purchase marriage or its reflection. But in spite of this, R. Kharadze concludes that "the tradition to pay "nachulashi" or "nakdanuri" for a woman is a developed stage of paying for a kidnapped woman. A marriage portion as a private property, was a part of urvadi" (Kharadze, 1939: 194).

The existed written data and ethnographic material show that in Svaneti a woman's family had to spend a lot to arrange a married daughter in her husband's family, to have her private property in her new family. As it is seen "nachulashi" (money, a bull or a field) was taken to a man's family by a woman as her private property. Besides, it was obligatory to give her cattle and poultry. After marriage, every New Year her father's family sent her a livestock. In Zemo Svaneti it was necessary to take "maka"- a basket. (It meant bread baked from 25 pood wheat flour, 16 pood barley vodka, five domestic animals) or "Pidi" (Kvemo Svaneti- one killed bull or a cow, one pood bread and one litre vodka) The family of a woman treated the guests from the man's family with it, it is shown that "nachulashi" and "nakdanuri" can't be considered to be a kind of ransom or remains of any kind. It was a woman's private property in her husband's family.

In the population of Racha-Lechkhumi, a boy's family brought only engagement things. The number of things and their value depended on economic power of the boy's family. As for the marriage portion, it contained various things. (dishes, mattresses and blankets, clothes, cattle, sheep, pigs.)

Before a wedding party, a fiance's family ought to send to the fiancee's family so called "sakortsino"- (It was a killed and cleaned whole pig, bed linen, wine and other products. According to one part of the narrators "sakortsino" was not a product but the money given to the fiancee during the engagement. (engagement things were not included in it).

The girl's family could not spend this money. The woman took it to her husband's family. A woman could lend her "sakortsino" and get a profit. With this profit., she bought clothes and other necessary things for her and her husband. Her husband's family gave nothing to a woman for such expences because she had already had "sakortsino". If a woman was not given "sakortsino", the husband's family was obliged to give a sum of money to the woman and her husband and children every year.

As some narrators say, instead of wedding presents (a killed pig, five pood wine, fifty bread), a fiance's family could send money to a fiancee's family. The family either bought products for the wedding or sent it with the woman to her husband's family.

According to the other material, they also sent domestic animals ( whose meat is eatable) and some food. In Samegrelo besides above mentioned items, it was a rule to send a cow, a bull and a sheep. Some researchers think that it was a ransom.

In Guria a boy's family brought wedding clothes to the engaged girl before a wedding party. Very often, a son-in-law bought clothes with the father-in-law's money after agreement. As for a woman's marriage portion, both families agreed on it beforehand. When a son-in-law and a daughter-in-law came back to the girl's father's house, they bought presents for the members of the family. Presents consisted of a piglet, turkeys, hens, khachapuri and a couple of cattle. Besides, a son-in-law brought a present for mother-in-law.

Besides a marriage portion every New Year, a father's family sent "archivi" - a piglet, a turkey, meat, khachapurebi to a married daughter. Its quantity was depended on the family. While the woman's parents were alive, they sent "archivi" - to their daughter every New Year.

M. Bekaia considers that the major part of the wedding traditions were remains. (ბეკაია მ. 1974: 22). We don't think that obligatory items which were bought by son-in-law to his fiancée was a remains of a purchase marriage. Because they were the items presented to a fiancée and father's family had no right to touch it. To our mind "mihri" was not a ransom (though the author thinks so) because as M. Bekaia points out 'mihri' was a part of a ra -nsam, a husband should pay to his wife and was considered to be a wife's marriage portion. It was the property given to the wife from her husband. In the case of divorce, a wife should be provided materially. "bashlughi" and "rasheveti" couldn't be a ransom either. According to M. Bekaia and field materials, as the majority of "bashlughi" takers prove, a half or the whole "bashlughi" was given back to a daughter as a marriage portion (Bekaia, 1974: 122-123).

It's worth thinking that like "mihri" the population of Adjara considered that "bashlughi" was not a ransom for a woman but an obligation of a fiancée to prepare a marriage portion. As we know a marriage portion in Adjara was a woman's private property and nobody could give it to anybody. And if we envisage that a cow, some other domestic animals, several pairs of mattresses and blankets, a trunk and other family things were compulsory elements of a marriage portion, then it will not be surprising that a part of "bashlughi" was left in a woman's father's family like a compensation.

In Samtskhe- Javalheti it was a tradition to bring things (wedding clothes, a bed cloth etc) to a fiancée.. It was also a tradition to bring "gadasatskveti" (drink and food) during the wedding. Wedding families agreed about the quantity of it beforehand. It was depended on the number of people from a fiancée's family. So, we don't see any reflection or remains of a purchase marriage there.

In different parts of East Georgia this issue is specific. In Kartli like Imereti, a boy's family sent "wedding" presents (wine, a pig or a sheep and a number of baked bread) to a woman's family on the wedding day. As it is seen from the written sources there was not any agreement between wedding families about it beforehand.

In Kakheti the situation was the same. But a boy's family took a sheep or a cow, some wine, cheese, bread and other products to a woman's family.

In Kartli and Kakheti above mentioned expenses couldn't be considered to be any kind of ransom or its light reflection. If we compare it with the marriage portion brought by a woman, we will see that the expenses were very little with the comparison of what the woman had brought. We think that in East Georgia (namely in Kartli and Kakheti) and in one part of West Georgia ( in Imereti). In a husband's family a woman was supported with the property given to her by her father's family.

In Tusheti a boy's parents treated residents of the girl's village with bread, vodka and one lump of sugar during the engagement. After wedding, a son-in-law should pay "saqaltano" to the bride's village during one year. It meant that when a son-in-law visited his wife's village, he should invite the villagers and treat them.

In Khevsureti two men from a boy's family visited a girl's family. They brought a wedding ring, some drink and three sheep with them. It was a boy's family's material obligation to a girl's family. They didn't give a marriage portion to a girl (they didn't know the term) but a woman took quite a lot of things with her (clothes, hand made family things, a cow with calves) It was her property and her husband and his family had no right to use it.

Georgian researchers think that to send "saxlis sanaxavi" (to see a house) was a reflection of a purchase marriage in Pshavi. A boy's family took some drink and cattle to the girl's family. It was used for a feast the next day. (The first day the table was laid with the food and drink brought from a girl's family) But if we envisage that a boy's family took about forty-sixty people, the food and drink (vodka, meat, bread, wine) they brought with them, was hardly enough for one feast. So, we can't consider it as a reflection of a purchase marriage.

But the property taken from her father's family was quite enough. D. Khizanishvili writes that in Pshavi a woman had her private property- "saTavno": money, sheep, a cow and other items) Nobody, even her husband, had no right to touch "saTavno" without a woman's permission. It belonged to her only (Khizanishvili, 1940: 120).

As Vazha-Pshavela writes, a woman had her property (either money or cattle). The presents brought to her by her relatives, can't be considered to be the remains of a purchase marriage because a woman should also give presents to other people in her husband's family. Such as: coloured socks, gloves or a handkerchief (Vaja Pshavela, 1987: 520).

In Mtiulet-Gudamakari a boy's family had to bring quite a lot of things. (saklavi, baked bread, vodka) to a girl's family for the engagement party according to the ethnographical materials and the written data.

If two sheep were enough for a big engagement party, its number doubled for a wedding party. From four sheep one was "sadedo" and it was prohibited to butcher it. It should be mentioned that a boy's family took cattle to butcher for a wedding party in a girl's family. The number of things to lay the table was settled beforehand.

According to one part of researchers, it was impossible to state the obligatory number of expenses spent on a big engagement. It depended on the wealth of the family. The same can be said about a wedding party. Georgian researchers discussed it and connected it to a purchase marriage in Mtiulet-Gudamakari.

I. Chkonia discusses a big engagement party and moral obligations connected to it and says that it has nothing common with the remains of a purchase marriage, though some presents are considered to be its new element. (ჭყონია ი. 1955: 137). We completely agree with them but it should be mentioned that we can look for purchase elements and not the remains in the wedding relations.

Khevi is very specific. They had a very strict tradition. A boy's family was obliged to take "urvadi" and food and drink to the girl's father's house. According to the written sources the period between an engagement and wedding meant several rules. Such as: "go as a fiance", "go to see", "visit to ask for a hand" and "prepare a wedding party"

During "go as a fiance" a boy's family was obliged to take vodka, bread and cheese to a girl's father's family. The quantity was defined according to the largeness of a girl's village. Besides, the fiance took "sasidedro" (a present for a mother-in-law) It was a cloth for a dress and a headscarf. V. Itonishvili thinks that it was a sign of a purchase marriage. The following stage was "go to see." Again, it was obligatory to take vodka, bread, kada (a kind of cake etc)

to a woman's father's house. The tradition of taking presents to a fiancée's family proves a purchase character of Mokhevuri wedding." says V. Itonishvili (Machabeli, 1976: 183).

It was also necessary to take presents to the family during "visit to ask for a hand". They gave "urvadi" and settled on the date of a wedding party.

As for urvadi, in Khevi they paid it giving cattle. But money, dishes, guns and sometimes a land was not an exception. The quantity of urvadi was defined according to the agreement. It is true that in Khevi a boy's family was strictly responsible to a girl's father's family, we couldn't consider it to be characteristic to a purchase marriage.

As V. Itonishvili writes urvadi, got from a fiancée was not the source of a marriage portion. The girl's family prepared it itself. So, a father's family tried to support a daughter with property in her husband's family. A girl's family tried to compensate it from her husband's family. It became a tradition later.

The source of this tradition comes from a girl's father's family's wish to support his daughter with her private property in her husband's family. This opinion is based on the way of living in Khevsureti. Every girl was given one or two cows in her childhood. These cattle and their increase and income belonged to a girl before she married. (she got married at the age of 20-25.) She bought clothes and other necessary items for herself. "saTavno" belongs to a woman and neither her husband, nor his family had a right to use it. (Meliqishvili. 1986: 173). Though, a fiancée's family had a material responsibility to a girl's father's family, they brought some presents and three sheep to them. It is a paradox but if we analyze the ethnographical materials and written data and compare them, we will get a very interesting result.

If there was a ransom in Georgia, it should be reflected in the law or ecclesiastic resolutions (there are plenty of them) and in the terminology. It is known that in places, where there was a purchase marriage, an unmarried brother-in-law got married to a widowed daughter-in-law. It was common, because a family paid a ransom for her. I. Atonishvili thought that a purchase marriage existed in Khevi. If it was so, then why Al. Kazbegi's widowed daughter (she was married to Dudarov who was Osetian) refused to marry her unmarried brother-in-law?

Above mentioned fact shows that the ransom for a woman in Khevi was not a tradition but it was adopted from the neighbouring people as a result of close relations (especially a wedding). Residents of Khevi adopted this tradition but levirati was unacceptable for them from moral-ethical-psychological norms of the Georgian people. That's why Al. Kazbegi's daughter from her national, moral and ethnical norms, committed suicide and didn't marry her brother-in-law.

Let's make a mathematical model of above discussed issue. Social, political, economical, religious, moral, ethical, psychological etc probability factors may support a purchase marriage.  $n$  is equal to eight. Only two factors, social and economical, established the elements of a purchase marriage in separate parts of Georgia. The number of real probability  $- \underline{n}$  is two.

According to a formula of probability

$$P(A) = \frac{m}{n} = \frac{2}{8} = 0,25$$

$P(A)$  is probability of A event, in the case when the probability is equal to 1 it is natural right, if it is equal to 0, its existence is impossible and if it is more than 0 but less than 1, the event is not natural



In our case  $P(A)$  is equal to 0.25. It shows that a purchase marriage as a characteristic event for the Georgian people was not natural. **Maybe, the elements of a purchase marriage appeared later but it didn't become a natural event.**

When we discuss about right and property condition of a woman, we can't pass by a marriage portion and satavno. Up today, a great majority of researchers discussed these two social events separately and made different conclusions. We think that these two events are the whole system and we consider to discuss it and not its separate components.

From the written sources, we see that in South Georgia (and in whole Georgia as well) a daughter had a definite right (with the other ones) on property with her brother from an early time. As Iv. Javakhishvili writes Georgian inheritance law gave a right to a daughter as well. In Grigol Khantsdzeli's Life we read that "the late parents left Zenon (a son) and his sister who was at home with him." Envisaging the last fact, Iv. Javakhishvili confirms that a daughter was given the right to property because she was not married. As it is seen, a married daughter or a sister had no right on property (Javakhishvili, 1986:164). Georgian researchers did a lot in studying a marriage portion institute. Their ideas about its genesis are given in their works.

R. Kharadze thinks that elements of a marriage portion is seen in a patriarchal family, it is developing according to the increase of private property. Great attention is given to the inheritance property. A marriage portion is a private property taken as a woman's share from the family but after reducing women's right, it became the property of a woman with a man and his family (Kharadze, 1955: 103)..

V. Itonishvili thinks that the existence of an early form of a marriage portion was in the community, but its developed form is given to the individual families (Itonishvili. 1960: 335).

N. Machabeli repeats the same and says: "Private property appears after destroying the Primitive Society, a marriage portion institute is a form of destroying a family community and the beginning of collectivity" (Machabeli, 1974: 83).

As for G. Nadareishvili, a marriage portion shows that a woman is not an item but a person. A marriage portion is a woman's personality in the outer world (Nadareishvili. 1974: 224).

Great attention should be paid to the social essence and explanation as the institute of a marriage portion is a very important fact in the discussion of right and property condition of a woman. The quantity and diversity of a marriage portion make us think that a woman in South Georgia was given quite a solid real estate from her father's family.

Making a marriage portion books, confirms that a married woman was given inheritance property from her father's family. As it is seen from the presented material this inheritance property was rather solid. The owner of this property was a woman and neither her husband nor his family could touch it. In the case of her death (if she didn't have children) the property was given back to a woman's family. But if she had children, the property was given to her children.

The law documents of the XIII-XVI cc showed the level of social and economical development of the population of Georgia. It also had a law of getting a land as a marriage portion. It should be mentioned that these documents refer only to the wealthy class of the society. As for peasants, they didn't have any right on the land. They couldn't give their married daughter any property especially a land in a marriage portion (Ivelashvili, 1999: 110).

A married woman was given "saTavno" (sheep, cattle) and some money with the marriage portion. A livestock was a part of "saTavno" for a great part of population. It may be a plot of arable land or a vineyard with cattle and money. The land was cultivated by married

girl's parents but the crop was sent to her family. The married woman used it as she wanted. Her husband's family and children had no right to use it.

There are different opinions about "saTavno" among researchers. One part of them considers it as an institute established on the early stage of a development of a family community. It belonged to a married woman, her children were her heirs. So, it became a part of a family property. Later, it became a marriage portion but was not a family property any more.

The second part of the researchers thinks that saTavno as a term and a tradition that accompanied a wedding party, was an institute which was established in the period of purchased capital. In the conclusion, we can say that "saTavno" with a marriage portion, was a reflection of a woman's right on a definite part of inheritance from her father's property.

The Analysis using mathematical method of written data and ethnographical materials showed us that there was not any purchase marriage in the population of South Georgia (and in whole Georgia.) A woman entered her husband's family having her own property. And we consider that it was a sign of a high level of right and property condition.

### Bibliography

- arkanjelo lambert'i, (1938). *samegrelos aghts'era*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“.  
(არქანჯელო ლამბერტი, (1938). *სამეგრელოს აღწერა*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- (bekaia, m. (1974). *dzveli da akhali sakorts'ino t'raditsiebi ach'arashi*. batumi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“.  
(ბეკაია, მ. (1974). *ძველი და ახალი საქორწინო ტრადიციები აჭარაში*. ბათუმი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- vazha pshavela, (1987). *tkhuzulebani*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“.  
(ვაჟა ფშაველა, (1987). *თხუზულებანი*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- iak'ob khutsesi, (1979). *ts'ameba ts'midisa shushanik'isa dedoplisa*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“.  
(იაკობ ხუცესი, (1979). *წამება წმიდისა შუშანიკისა დედოფლისა*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- ivelashvili, t. (1999). *sakorts'ino ts'es-chveulebani sakartveloshi*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „p'rogresi“.  
(იველაშვილი, თ. (1999). *საქორწინო წეს-ჩვეულებანი საქართველოში*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „პროგრესი“).
- ivelashvili, t. (2000). *matemat'ik'uri metodebis gamoqeneba etnografiul k'vlebebshi*. batumi. (იველაშვილი, თ. (2000). *მათემატიკური მეთოდების გამოყენება ეთნოგრაფიულ კვლევებში*. ბათუმი).
- itonishvili, v. (1960). *kartveli mtielta saojakho urtiertobis ist'oriidan*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“.  
(იტონიშვილი, ვ. (1960). *ქართველი მთიელთა საოჯახო ურთიერთობის ისტორიიდან*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- machabeli, n. (1976). *kartveli khalkhis saojakho urtiertobis ist'oriidan (mzitvis inst'it'ut'i aghmosavlet sakartveloshi)*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“.  
(მაჩაბელი, ნ. (1976). *ქართველი ხალხის საოჯახო ურთიერთობის ისტორიიდან (მზითვის ინსტიტუტი აღმოსავლეთ საქართველოში)*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- melikishvili, l. (1986). *t'raditsiuli da sakorts'ino ts'es-chveulebis st'rukt'uruli analizi*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“.  
(მელიქიშვილი, ლ. (1986). *ტრადიციული და*

- საქორწინო წეს-ჩვეულების სტრუქტურული ანალიზი. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- nadareishvili, g. (1974). *dzveli kartuli saojakho samartali*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“.  
(ნადარეიშვილი, გ. (1974). *ძველი ქართული საოჯახო სამართალი*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- nizharadze, n. (1965). *ist'oriul-etnograpiul nats'erebi*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“.  
(ნიჟარაძე, ნ. (1965). *ისტორიულ-ეთნოგრაფიულ ნაწერები*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- sakhok'ia, t. (1955). *etnograpiuli chanats'erebi*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“. (სახოკია, თ. (1955). *ეთნოგრაფიული ჩანაწერები*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- kartuli samartlis dzeglebi*, 1. (1963). tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“. (*ქართული სამართლის ძეგლები*, 1. (1963). თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- ch'ant'urishvili, s. (1984). *qopa da k'ult'ura V-X sauk'uneebis sakartveloshi*. tbilisi: gamomtsrmloba „metsniereba“. (ჭანტურიშვილი, ს. (1984). *ყოფა და კულტურა V-X საუკუნეების საქართველოში*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- ch'qonia, i. (1955). *korts'inebis inst'it'ut'i mtiuletshi*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“. (ჭყონია, ი. (1955). *ქორწინების ინსტიტუტი* მთიულეთში. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- kharadze, r. (1939). *didi ojakhis gadmonashtebi svanetshi*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“. (ხარაძე, რ. (1939). *დიდი ოჯახის გადმონაშთები სვანეთში*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- khizanishvili, n. (1940). *etnograpiuli nats'erebi*. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“. (ხიზანიშვილი, ნ. (1940). *ეთნოგრაფიული ნაწერები*. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- javakhishvili, i. (1986). *tkhuzulebani*. t'. V. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“. (ჯავახიშვილი, ი. (1986). *თხუზულებანი*. ტ. V. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).
- javakhishvili, i. (1982), *tkhuzulebani*. t'. VI. tbilisi: gamomtsemloba „metsniereba“. (ჯავახიშვილი, ი. (1982), *თხუზულებანი*. ტ. VI. თბილისი: გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება“).