

POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS FEATURES OF GEORGIAN-PERSIAN DOCUMENTS¹

ქართულ-სპარსული ისტორიული საბუთების პოლიტიკური, სოციალური და რელიგიური მახასიათებლები

KHATUNA BAINDURASHVILI

Scholar of K. Kekelidze National Center of Manuscripts of Georgia

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University PHD Student

ORCID: 0000-0003-3832-9365

baindurashvilikhatuna@yahoo.com

+995 595567499

Abstract

For thorough study of Iran-Georgian relationships in 16th – 17th centuries research of Georgian-Persian historical documents is of particular interest. These historical documents provide valuable data about social, administrative and state institutes in Georgia.

Georgian-Persian historical documents describe dynamically the political, social and religious processes that have taken place in Eastern Georgia due to intervention of Safavid Iran in 16th-17th centuries. Studying of the separate segments of diplomatic monuments – interrelations between Georgian and Persian texts provide precise illustration of Georgian reality and specific nature of political, social and religious relations between Iran and Georgia.

Research of Georgian-Persian bilingual deeds clearly shows attempts of Iran to intervene into Georgian landholding system and its substitution with Iranian-Moslem one; invocatio of Georgian kings and the legends on their Persian seals clearly demonstrate the political and religious influence to which they were subjected as a result of Safavid censorship. Based on all these, we can imagine specific nature of operation of Georgian samdivan-mtsignobro (secretariat-chancellery), see the movement of the documents from their composition to their entry into legal force and the term of their effectiveness.

Studying of the seals on Persian and Georgian texts of diplomatic monuments allowed identification of important chancellery officials participating in issuance of Georgian-Persian documents, as well as in their consideration and approval.

Georgian texts of bilingual documents, with their contents and structure, were entirely based on Georgian traditions of paperwork while the Persian texts complied with Iranian requirements. Iranian diplomatic formulas were adapted to Georgian reality.

Georgian-Persian historical deeds provide unbiased description of severe reality resulting from religious and political power of Iran in Eastern Georgia; and Georgians had to fight for maintaining their state, national and religious identity.

Keywords: Georgia, Iran, Diplomacy, Islam

¹ Article was prepared within the scopes of grant funded by Shota Rustaveli National Scientific Fund of Georgia (FR 17-554 Documentary Sources (Deeds, Epigraphic Inscriptions, Colophons) in the First half of 17th c. (1600-1662) about the Kings of Kartli and Kakheti (research and publication of sources)

ხათუნა ბაინდურაშვილი

კ. კეკელიძის საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული
ცენტრის მეცნიერი თანამშრომელი
ივ. ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის თბილისის
სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის დოქტორანტი
ORCID: 0000-0003-3832-9365
baindurashvilikhhatuna@yahoo.com
+995 595567499

აბსტრაქტი

XVI-XVII სს. ირან-საქართველოს ურთიერთობის საფუძვლიანი შესწავლისთვის განსაკუთრებით საინტერესოა ამ პერიოდის ქართულ-სპარსული ისტორიული საბუთების კვლევა. ეს ისტორიული საბუთები საყურადღებო ცნობებს გვაწვდის ქართული სოციალური, ადმინისტრაციული და სახელმწიფო ინსტიტუტების შესახებ.

ქართულ-სპარსული ისტორიული საბუთები დინამიკაში ასახავს იმ პოლიტიკურ, სოციალურ და რელიგიურ პროცესებს, რომელსაც სეფიანთა ირანის ჩარევით ადგილი ჰქონდა XVI-XVII სს. აღმოსავლეთ საქართველოში. დიპლომატიკური ძეგლების ცალკეული სემანტიკის შესწავლა – ქართული და სპარსული ტექსტების ურთიერთმიმართება კარგად წარმოაჩენს ქართულ რეალობას და ირან-საქართველოს პოლიტიკური, სოციალური და რელიგიური ურთიერთობების სპეციფიკას.

ქართულ-სპარსული ორენოვანი საბუთების კვლევა საშუალებას გვამძლევს დავინახოთ ირანის მიერ ქართული მიწისმფლობელობის სისტემაში ჩარევისა და მისი ირანულ-მუსლიმურით შეცვლის მცდელობა; ქართველ მეფეთა ინვოკაციები და მათ სპარსულ ბეჭდებზე არსებული ლეგენდები ცხადად გვიჩვენებს იმ პოლიტიკურ და რელიგიურ გავლენებს, რომელსაც ისინი სეფიანთა ცენტრის შედეგად განიცდიდნენ. ყოველივე აქედან გამომდინარე, შეგვიძლია წარმოვიდგინოთ ქართული სამდივან-მწიგნობროს მუშაობის სპეციფიკა, საბუთის მოძრაობა მისი შედგენიდან კანონიერ ძალაში შესვლამდე და საბუთის მოქმედების ვადა.

დიპლომატიკური ძეგლების სპარსულ და ქართულ ტექსტებზე არსებულ ბეჭდებზე დაკვირვებით გამოიკვეთნენ ის მნიშვნელოვანი საკანცელარიო მოხელეები, რომლებიც ქართულ-სპარსული საბუთების შედგენაში და მათ განხილვა-დამტკიცებაში იღებდნენ მონაწილეობას.

ორენოვანი საბუთების ქართული ტექსტი თავისი შინაარსითა და აგებულებით მთლიანად ქართული საბუთის შედგენის ტრადიციას ემყარებოდა, ხოლო სპარსული ტექსტი – ირანულ საკანცელარიო მოთხოვნებს. ირანული დიპლომატიკური ფორმულები ადაპტირებულია ქართულ რეალობასთან.

ქართულ-სპარსული ისტორიული საბუთები დიდი ობიექტურებით ასახავს იმ მძიმე ვითარებას, რომელიც აღმოსავლეთ საქართველოში ირანის რელიგიური და პოლიტიკური მძლავრობის შედეგად იყო შექმნილი; და როგორ მძიმე რეალობაში უხდებოდათ ქართველებს ბრძოლა ეროვნული და რელიგიური იდენტობის შენარჩუნებისათვის.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: საქართველო, ირანი, დიპლომატიკა, ისლამი

Introduction

Studying of relations between Iran and Georgia in 16th – 17th centuries is of particular interest. Research of Georgian-Persian historical documents of the above period allows thorough studying of diverse relationships between Eastern Georgia and Safavid Iran. These historical documents provide information about social, administrative and state institutes. Georgian diplomatic monuments describe domestic and international situation of the country.

Goal of our research is studying of social, political, religious and legal aspects of Georgian-Persian diplomatic monuments of 16th - 17th centuries: relation of Persian texts of the documents with Georgian national system – characteristics of substance of “Georgian Tiul”, categories of tiuldar and their rights and obligations, specific characteristics of the samdivanmtsignobro (secretariat-chancellery), movement of the document before its entry into legal force and term of effectiveness of the documents; clarification and analysis of the specific nature of Georgian-Iranian political and social relationships against the background of observation and study of the diplomatic clauses in Persian texts of bilingual Georgian-Persian documents.

Methodology

Research of bilingual documents is based on formulary, textological, comparative and critical analysis methods

Results

Studying of diplomatic segments of Persian parts in Georgian-Persian historical deeds and chancellery markings thereon (seals, endorsements) allowed tracing of the “deed’s movement” – full legal procedure from writing to legal enactment:

1. Preparing of Georgian text of the deed by royal secretary (mdivanmtsignobari);
2. Translation of Georgian text into Persian with due regard of Iranian diplomatic standards;
3. Registration of the deed in special registry of chancellery;
4. After consideration of the deed, affixing Persian chancellery seals and making relevant Persian chancellery endorsements (بنظر رسید – “Considered”, ثبت شد – “Registered”, // “Attested”);
5. Approval of Georgian part of the deed with Georgian royal seal;
6. Approval of Persian part of the deed with Persian royal seal.

Thus, research of Georgian-Persian historical documents showed that introduction of Iranian specifics into Georgian paperwork served to efforts of Safavid state to include Eastern Georgia into Iranian administrative system.

Georgian-Persian bilingual deeds demonstrate the attempts of Iran to intervene into Georgian system of landholding and its transformation into Iranian-Moslem one; invocations of Georgian kings and legends on their Persian seals clearly demonstrate the political and religious influence to which they were subject from censorship of Safavids; we can imagine specific nature of Georgian secretariat, its procedural steps – movement of the deeds from writing to legal enactment and term of effectiveness of the deeds; Georgian text was dominating diplomatic part of Georgian-Persian deeds.

Studying of the seals on Persian and Georgian texts of historical deeds allowed identification of the chancellery officials participating in composition of Georgian-Persian deeds and their consideration and approval.

Georgian-Persian diplomatic monuments provide unbiased description of severe

Discussion

Numerous researches of bilingual Georgian-Persian documents were conducted to elucidate sociopolitical, diplomatic and linguistic issues [Puturidze, 1955:IV-XIV; Dundua, 1984; Abashidze, 1973: 63-80; Petrushevski, 1949: 213-215] and their main purpose was clarification of the social function of these documents – open or implied information in the source and their comparison with the historical reality.

Since early 16th century Iran had been making attempts of liquidation of the kingdoms of Kartli and Kakheti as independent political units and their transformation into the ordinary provinces of Iran. [Baindurashvili, 2019(a):205-2019] By the end of 16th century Safavid Iran achieved the position where it approved the representatives of Bagrationi dynasty as kings of Kartli and Kakheti provided that they adopted Islam. In 1578, Svimon I, released from Alamut prison had to adopt Shiite Tradition. [Guchua, Svanidze, 1974:129] Shah of Iran, Mohammad Khodabanda (1578-1587) granted to Svimon the title of “Brother” and returned him back to Kartli. Iran desired him to drive out the Ottomans, excessively active in Caucasus [Puturidze, 1969:28].

Subordination of Svimon I to Safavid Iran impacted operation of the royal council – from 80s of 16th century, in Kartli commenced introduction of Qizilbash style paperwork and clear example of this is appearing of Georgian-Persian historical deeds, implying approaching of Georgian paperwork with Iranian standards.

Up to 40s of 17th century Georgian and Persian parts of bilingual deeds were written on different pages. Persian text maintained some kind of independence of contents and it looked like absolutely complete legal document [Abashidze, 1974:75]. Nevertheless, both texts of the deed comprised single diplomatic item. In 40s of 17th century the bilingual deeds have changed, with respect of both, contents and form. Persian part now was the summary of Georgian part and it was placed above Georgian text [Abashidze, 1974:75-76 Abuladze, Giunashvili, 2011:18].

Architectonics of Persian parts of bilingual deeds corresponds to the traditions of Safavid paperwork requirements. Appearance of the deed, structure of each segment, calligraphy and terminology fully corresponds to Iranian diplomatics [Abashidze, 1974:64] Its architectonics is represented as follows: *Invocatio* (reference to God), mentioning of the forefathers, introductory formula, legal aspects of the deal – document issuer and addressee; key issue of the document – purpose of issuance, legal contents of the deal, issue of the object, protection of the legal relationships expressed by the key issue [Abuladze, Giunashvili, 2011:16].

Georgian-Persian historical deeds have diverse contents: these include deeds of granting of the serfs and properties, granting of Tarkhan’s privileges, various offices and other documents. The deeds of granting of serfs and estates are of particular interest. They clearly depict political relationships between Georgia and Iran [Puturidze, 1955:VII].

For Georgian and Iranian-Qizilbash ruling stratum the basis for granting of estate was faithful service of the specific person (or persons) to Georgian king and shah of Iran. And for this, the subjects received the land as “deserved award” from their suzerains [Gabashvili, 1958:274].

Persian parts of Georgian-Persian historical deeds were mostly the deeds of granting, implying granting of the land (estate) – main object of feudal property.

Calligraphic hands of the Persian parts of Georgian-Persian deeds is Shekasteh, Nastaliq and Shekasteh-Nastaliq. Shekasteh was used most frequently.

Persian texts of Georgian-Persian historical deeds have two types of dating – in *Disposito*, under the influence of Safavid office traditions, to denote the year, routinely they used Mongol astronomic calendar

and the date in the end of document was located after Sanctio and it was according to Hegira calendar [Dundua, 1984:61].

Persian part of the deeds issued in the period of reign of Svimon I differs, to some extent, from the structure of the bilingual deeds of the later period. The deed commenced with the word “now”- در بنوقت - rarely - امر علی شد - high order was issued and پروانچه است - order. This means that the document is of نشان عالیشان category – “high mark”, [Puturidze, 1955:1-2] protocol, order, ordinance is not specified in the beginning of the text and it is mentioned in the text end. Further, in late 80s, the document category regularly appears in the beginning of the text, such as “Amre Ali” – امر عالی – High Order, “Parvanche” – پروانچه است [Puturidze, 1955:49-51] only deed issued in 1591 by Alexander II, King of Kakheti begins with the formula – حکم عالی شد – High order is issued [Puturidze, 1955:43-45].

Persian invocatio of Georgian kings are of particular interest. Invocatio is the document preamble, composed of religious-political elements mentioned the source of power – god and full name and legal status of the bearer of this power – issuer of the deed and this status was granted to him by shah of Iran. In the deeds of Svimon I, togra written with singur contains invocation [Puturidze, 1955:19-21, 32-34, 36-38] and its full formulation is – “هو الله محمود في كل فعال ابو المنصور [سلطان محمود خان] ميرزا سوزم” – “He [is] God praised in all his deeds. Abul Mansut Sultan Mahmud-Khan Mirza. My word” [Puturidze, 1955:12]. Invocatio closely reflects historical reality and underlines the double standard existing in Georgian-Iranian political relationships. Svimon I, mentioed in Georgian reality as Georgian king, in one of significant segments of Persian text of the deeds issued by him (Invocatio) has to recognize official status granted by Safavids and mention himself not as king but as prince – Mirza. Invocatio also cotains full Moslem name of Svimon I – Abul Mansur Sultan Mahmud-Khan.

From 1586, on bilingual deeds of Svimon I appeared Persian registration postscripts: بنظر رسید – considered, and ثبت شد – “approved” // “recorded”, قلمی شد – written [Puturidze, 1955:24-32, 36-38]. they are located under the registration seals.

One of the key signs of entry into legal force of the document is the seal affixed by the issuer on it. [Javakhishvili, 1926:69] Clear example of political dependence of Svimon I on shah of Iran is the legend of his Persian seal affixed on the document of 1588. Large round Persian seal of Georgian king bears lettering: “Knows incomparable god that Svimon, with his soul, is the ghulam of shah”. Regarding that the Persian chancellery seals of the period of Svimon’s reign are illegible due to high degree of damage, names of the chancellery officers present in that period at Georgian royal court by the order of Shah of Iran are unknown to us.

Following Moslem king of Kartli appointed by Shah Abbas I was Bagrat VII – Bagrat-Khan (1616-1619), mentioned by Georgians with hatred and mocking the master of Sabaratiano and they did not obey to him [Kaukhchishvili, 1973:428]. bilingual deeds issued by him have not survived or they are unknown to the scientists until now.

After decease of Bagrat in 1619, Shah Abbas granted power of ruling of Kartli to Bagrat-Khan’s minor son Svimon II (Svimon-Khan – 1619-1630) and assigned Giorgi Saakadze as his regent (vekil) [Puturidze, 1969:115; Zhizhiashvili, 2017:10-11].

There were somewhat different rules of approval of Georgian-Persian deeds in early 17th century. In 1608-1625, in the period of reign of King Luarsab and Simon-Khan there were issued Georgian deeds that, after signature of the king, bore Persian seal and Persian registration seal of the same king (some of them bear one and some – two seals) [Kartvelishvili, Baidurashvili, Gelashvili, Gogladze, Shaorshadze, Jofua, 2019:80-84, 87-88, 90-91, 94-95, 100-103, 115-116, 127-128, 176-179]. Absence of Persian texts in

Georgian deeds makes us offer that at Georgian royal court there was no servant who had competence of translation of Georgian text and was granted authority of its approval by shah of Iran.

Legend of the seal of Svimon II can be read on Georgian deed of granting of 1624. (GNCM, Hd 3056) In the end of the text there is affixed Simon's small octagonal Persian seal with lettering: – “Simon, slave of king of the truth” On the verso of deed (survived after restoration) at the registration postscript: “This order shall end this way” (Kartvelishvili, Baindurashvili, Gelashvili, Gogladze, Shaorshadze, Jojua, 2019:181) – there is affixed pear-shaped Persian registration seal with the legend – غلام شاه كیخسرو “Shah's slave Kaikhosro”.

Only a copy of the first Georgian-Persian deed of Svimon II maintained has survived. It is dated with 1626. In the end of its Persian text there is a Persian postscript: „محل مهر شاه عباس” – “Place of seal of Shah Abbas” – there is a mistake made when it was rewritten later as shahs of Iran did not affix their seals on Georgian-Persian bilingual deeds.

Persian seal and Persian registration seal are affixed on Georgian-Persian deed of Svimon II of 1627. There can be read the lettering of the other Persian seal of King Svimon: غلام شاه عباس سمیون – Svimon, ghulam of shah. There is also affixed hexagonal Persian registration seal with the legend – غلام شاه عباس علیقلی – Alikuli, ghulam of Shah Abbas. The same seal is affixed below Georgian registration postscript – “This Order shall end in this way” [Kartvelishvili, Baindurashvili, Gelashvili, Gogladze, Shaorshadze, Jojua, 2019:213-214]. In this period (1608-1625) the deeds had no registration postscripts and Georgian registration postscript was attested by king's Persian seal.

The above mentioned Kaikhosro (supposedly this was royal steward Kaikhosro Baratashvili) [Kldiashvili, Surguladze, Tsagareishvili, Jandieri, 1991:446] and, very likely, Alikuli were Georgian persons authorized representatives of shah of Iran, who were good in Persian, as they were entitled to translate and attest the documents issued by Georgian kings. We can suppose that they had the position of mustoufi as well. Both chancellery servants and King of Kartli, Svimon II (and Svimon I as well) had the status of ghulam, this means that they were among the ghulams (personal guards) of shah.

It is interesting, what has caused stopping of translation of Georgian documents into Persian in period 1608-1625. This could be explained by domestic and foreign political situation of Safavid Iran. Since 1590 Shah Abbas I conducted reforms in the country and since 1603, in different periods, Iran fought with Ottomans, Portugal and Eastern Georgia [Katsitadze, 2009:406-420]. It is likely that in this situation Iran did not pay much attention to the paperwork and rules of attesting Georgian deeds were restricted to Persian seals of Georgian kings and chancellery servants.

Georgian-Persian deeds show that since reign of Svimon I event Persian text was subject to control of Georgian king and this is evidenced by the seal of Georgian king affixed to Persian text [Gabashvili, 1958:282].

Supposedly, Persian seals of Georgian kings were produced in Iran and the legend thereon was confirmed and permitted by shah [Baindurashvili, 2019 b:17].

Preamble of the deeds – divine and political will

“Shah of Iran has only formally appropriated Georgian feudal lands” [Apakidze, Berdzenishvili, Melikishvili, Meskhia, Ratiani, Chitaia, Khachapuridze, 1956:295]. Georgian historical deeds of early 17th century show that Safavid Iran intervenes into management of Georgian landholding system. Shah Abbas I issues orders to Georgian king and on the basis of this order king of Kartli is obliged to approve or resume ownership of the properties for one or another Georgian nobleman close to shah. [GNA, 1450-19/98]

Divine and political will expressed in the preamble of deeds precisely reflect political situation between Eastern Georgia and Safavid Iran. In Georgian deeds issued by Bagrat-Khan and Svimon-Khan there are diplomatic formulas (“With the will and help of god and khans of Shah Abbas”, [GNA, 1448-252] “by the grace of god and order of Shah Abbas”, [GNCM. Ad- 973] “by god’s order and grace of Shah Abbas” [GNA 1448-1261], where the existing political relationships are described with some kind of synthesis of divine and political will. Irrespective of Moslem religion of Georgian kings, the divine will is expressed from Christian position and the main figurant of the political will is Shah Abbas I of Iran. He is also named as guarantor of legality of the deed.

In the sanctio of Georgian historical deed there is also merged Christian and Moslem formula, according to which, who violates the clauses of the deed – “...Wrath of Father, Son and Holy Spirit and all saints and blissful Shah Abbas” [GNA, 1450-37/190].

This one segment of Georgian diplomatics of early 17th century clearly shows the process of how Georgian noblemen attempted to present shah of Iran as their patron, “guarantor” of their property and “superior protector”. And all these underline reduction of the powers of Georgian king and decentralization process.

In addition, in the curse part of Georgian deed of 1629, the propagator of Islam is mentioned in a very negative context and violator of the deed conditions is declared as his equal, doomed to end up in hell ... Let him become the ally of Mahmad from Sanana and sink to the bottom of hell [Kartvelishvili, Baidurashvili, Gelashvili, Gogladze, Shaorshadze, Jojua, 2019:237].

Tiul

Persian texts of Georgian-Persian historical deeds are interesting and notable for their social contents. From the end of 16th century, issuance of bilingual deeds under the Safavid political influence in Georgian paperwork was associated with the fight for Georgian lands from the side of Iran. [Gabashvili, 1958:307] Strained political relationships between Georgians and Safavids resulted in introduction into Georgian diplomatics such social terms as tiul, tiuldar, soiurghal, raiat (meaning peasant). These terms were strange and unacceptable for Georgian landholding system.

According to Moslem law, the supreme owner of the land is the state [Gabashvili, 1958:161]. In 17-18th centuries, in Iran, there were two types of tiul: first – tiul was transferred to a person as compensation for certain office and he was entitled to take advantage of it for the period when he held such office. The other type of tiul was granted to a person as deserved award for the service to the state [Petrushevski, 1949:199-201]. According to Iranian tradition, tiul implied the right to collect the rents and taxes, in full or in part, from certain area, rather than the right to rule the land, people living there and irrigation network [Petrushevski, 1949:184-221; Gabashvili, 1958:278].

Persian texts of Georgian-Persian historical deeds and Persian documents (hokms and firmans) issued to Georgian feudal lords contain such strange and unacceptable terms used in Moslem landholding as “heritable tiul” (تبول موروثی), [Petrushevski, 1949:213-215], “permanent tiul” (تبول ابدی), “heritable mulk” (ملك موروثی). [Puturidze, 1955:80-81] This terminological discord with Georgian feudal institutes is explained as impossibility of expressing characteristics of Georgian feudal relationships in Persian, absence of concept “estate” in Persian language and consciousness has conditioned introduction of the above technical terms in Iranian-Qizilbash diplomaics, [Gabashvili, 1958:276-277,287] and Georgian historiography shares this position [Puturidze, 1955:X; Abashidze, 1974:67; Gabashvili, 1937:22].

Due to dramatic content difference between tiul and estate it was necessary to add to “tiul” the signs characteristic for Georgian landholding, such as fiscal, administrative and judicial impermeability and right to bequeath [Abashidze, 1974:67; Petrushevski, 1949:213-215].

According to Persian texts of deeds issued by Svimon I, heirloom was transferred to the feudal lord as tiul [Puturidze, 1955:10] In 20-30s of 17th century tiul was mentioned without any definition [Abashidze, 1974:68] Hereditary estate mentioned in Georgian text of the deed issued by Svimon II is translated in Persian text as “tiul and hereditary estate” – تيول و املاك موروثی. [Puturidze, 1955:66] “Heritage” mentioned in Georgian text of the deed issue by Rostom-Khan in 1635 was translated into Persian as “estate and tiul” (ملکی و تيولی) [Puturidze, 1955:123]. Hence, the logical conclusion is that the “estate” was given to Georgian feudal lords as the remuneration for their office. I.e. there was the trend of replacing estate with tiul.

Term mulk (estate) was not used in Persian text, in our opinion, absolutely intentionally (or it is used very rarely). It is interesting, why term “estate” was not calqued instead like in case of noblemen. This means that those who wrote Persian text intentionally avoided use of the term showing hereditary nature of the land. With time, possibly, such attributives as “permanent”, “inheritable” could be removed and as a result, there would be oriental - Moslem “tiul”.

As reasonably mentioned V. Puturidze, use of term “tiul” to denote estate and “raiat” – to denote peasant, demonstrated the attempt of changing Georgian landholding order with Moslem-Qizilbash one by Iran [Puturidze, 1955:IX]. Studying of the deeds showed that Iran made attempts to transform “estate” to tiul.

Tiuldar categories:

According to Georgian-Persian grant deeds, there were two categories of tiuldars: first category had authority to consider and make decision for “any judicial case” within the area subordinated to him – tiul [Puturidze, 1955:17-21] (both, civil and criminal cases are implied). The other category had no authority to consider the criminal cases. The deeds particularly emphasize that tiuldar considers all cases with the exclusion of criminal ones [Puturidze, 1955:4-9].

With respect of distinguishing legal relations between the parties, accurate specifications of the obligations characteristic for the Persian texts of deeds is of particular significance and interest. Law specifies the obligations of tiuldar to the state (law) and peasants.

Issuer of the deed in the disposition section of each grant deed strictly specified the primary obligations of tiuldar, such as fairness and care about entrusted people. Documents clearly show that the central government tended to protect population from tiuldar’s arbitrariness. Grantee was entitled to collect the taxes set by the state in the tiul territory.

Disposition component of the deed obligated the peasants to obey tiuldar. This requirement was also applicable to local administrative officials – meliks and kedkhods [Puturidze, 1955:32-34, 36-38].

Entry of the deed into legal force was attested by the royal seal. This rule is presented by the following diplomatic formula: چون نشان عالی [الی] بمهر و خط مبارک مزین و موشح گردد اعتماد نمایند “when the high sign is equipped and decorated with the blessed seal and writing – obey it” [Puturidze, 1955:36-38]. Diplomatically, “writing” means the official endorsement depicting “movement” of the deed before its entry into legal force,

تا نشان بمهر عالی مزین نکرده اعتماد ننمایند - “until [this] sign is not equipped with the high seal, do not accept it” [Puturidze, 1955:17-18].

“High seal” and “blessed seal” means the seal of Georgian king.

Term of effectiveness of the deed:

Each deed was renewed each time when a new king was enthroned [Berdzenishvili, 1937:22; Gabashvili, 1958:281-282]. The king re-approved legality of the grant deed issued by his predecessor in the period of his reign as well. Though, Georgian-Persian diplomatic materials show that there was a legal norm according to which the government was entitled to demand annual renovation of the deed. In the sanction of Persian text in Georgian-Persian deeds there was the formula stated for mustoufi “not to demand new order and sign every year” [Puturidze, 1955:34-38] and this guaranteed “many-year” nature of the property registries.

In Georgian paperwork mustoufi was particularly significant. Deeds made special emphasis on his duties and strictly required fulfillment of them. All deeds state that mustoufi’s obligation was to register the documents in the special royal registration log and not to allow any changes of the text [Puturidze, 1955:4-6, 24-34, 36-38].

“On the basis of written in Georgian”

Irrespective of attempts from the side of Safavids to intervene into Georgian domestic relationships and for this purpose, initially introduce terminological changes in the diplomatic monuments, the main segment of Georgian-Persian deeds was still was Georgian text, detailing terms and conditions of granting. Persian parts of bilingual deeds were totally built on and depended on “written in Georgian” and Georgian legislation (Dasturmalali of Georgia) and this was reflected in the disposition component of Persian part [Puturidze, 1955:XI, 4-6, 24-34, 36-38; Gabashvili, 1958:275; Abashidze, 1974:69, 72, 76].

King Rostom

In 1632, Shah of Iran, Safi I granted to Rostom-Khan, representative of Bagrationi dynasty the title of vali and assigned him to rule Kartli (1632-1658) [Berdzenishvili, Javakhishvili, Janashia, 1948:347-348; Surguladze, 1952:117-120; Apakidze, Berdzenishvili, Melikishvili, Meskhia, Ratiani, Chitaia, Khachapuridze, 1956:295-256; Abashidze, 2017: 181-188; Berdzenishvili et al., 1958:299].

Attitude of Georgian narrative sources towards Rostom is mostly negative. In the period of his reign Persian-Moslem lifestyle was spread in feudal society of Kartli. [Kaukhchishvili, 1959:424] Rostom’s reign in Kartli was characterized with popularization of Shiite tradition [Baindurashvili, 2005:153]. though officially Christianity was not prohibited [Berdzenishvili, Javakhishvili, Janashia, 1948:348]. Negative attitude to Rostom can be seen in the document of Teimuraz I where he called his rival “Khosro Saracen”. [Kartvelishvili, Baindurashvili, Gelashvili, Gogladze, Shaorshadze, Jojua, 2019:301].

In Georgian-Persian deeds in the period of King Rostom’s reign there can be clearly seen Moslem-Shiite formulas introduced in Georgian paperwork and this very interesting for describing of his religious policies. In this respect, particularly interesting is Rostom-Khan’s Georgian domed seal. Its legend, in 1633-1637 was as follows: “I, dust under the feet of Khan, King Rostom approve”, and since 1637, in the arch, empty before, above kantsili there appeared word – الله – Allah and to the legend of the seal there was added: “الله (Allah) I, dust under the feet of Khan, King Rostom approve” [Puturidze, 1955:139-141]. (While deeds of Simon I were written “by grace of God”, deeds of convert Moslems Bagrat and Simon Khan were written “by grace of Shah Abbas”, and Rostom is “the dust under the feet of Khan”). This fact shows that since 1937, Rostom found himself more safe and stable in Kartli and only after this added to his Georgian seal, above Christ’s monogram the word “Allah” thus underlining his religious policies. [Baindurashvili, 2019 (b):19] Legend of Rostom’s quadrangular seal was - همت سلطان صفی شاه زمین و زمان داد لطف بنده را رستم خسرو - [Puturidze, 1955:85-88] – “Lord of the country and rime, generous Shah Safi shed his grace on me, نشان

his slave and named me, Khosro as Rostom”. In this stanza both names of King Rostom – Khosro and Rostom were mentioned. Here we learn also that this was Shah Safi, who gave to Khosro Bagrationi, born and brought up in Iran, name Rostom, i.e. hero.

Invocatio:

Full Moslem name of Rostom-Khan was recorded in invocation of the deed issued by him in 1642 – ابو هو الغنى و العالى الغازى سلطان رستم خان ميرزا سوزم – He (God) is the richest, superior! Abul-Ghazi Sultan Rostem-Khan Mirza. My word [Puturidze, 1955:171-173]. In this case as well, Georgian king follows the Iranian standards and calls himself Mirza, i.e. prince.

Invocation of the deed of estate granting issued by Rostom in 1933 is of interest – لاله و محمد رسول و – “Allah and disciple Mohammad and Ali.” [Puturidze, 1955:94-96] It should be noted that Shiite invocatio of such type presented as triad is the only one among the bilingual documents that have survived up to present and it is the symbol of Shiite ideology of Safavids [Baindurashvili, 2019 (b):19].

It should be emphasized that in the Persian part of King Rostom’s deeds the divine will is expressed very simply. Mostly it is represented in single word – هو – “He (God)” and very rarely – هو الغنى العالى – He (God) is the richest and superior [Puturidze, 1955:169-171].

Legends of Rostom-Khan’s seals are mostly the theological formula, implying that primarily, issuance of the deed was attributed to god. Office seals of such type mostly appeared from 1636, with the following contents: oval seal with the legend – افوض امرى الى الله – “I entrust my case to Allah”. Below is postscript: بنظر رسيد – “Considered” [Puturidze, 1955:155-157], - “O, supporter of the weak” (Puturidze, 1955:88), يا صاحب العصر و الزمان - “O, possessor of the age and time.” Under the seal there is postscript: قلمى شد – “Written” [Puturidze, 1955:198-200, 224-226].

In 1649 a new registration seal appeared with the legend: از حسب امر الله سعلوه – “According to the presented order,” with the subscribe under it: بنظر رسيد – “Considered”; the deeds of 1650-1652 bear the same seal [Puturidze, 1955:211-213, 221-224]. From 1643, in the upper left corner there appear new endorsement stating that the text of Georgian deed was translated into Persian – “He (God). Order [written] in Moslem alphabet” [Puturidze, 1955:182-186].

Personal seals:

Legend of the seal affixed to the deed of 1633 [Puturidze, 1955:97] غلام رستم خان منوچهر – Rostom-Khan’s Gholam Manuchar” describes relation of Manuchar to Rostom. In this case Rostom is his suzerain, though soon, since 1634, legend of Manuchar’s seal was replaced with purely Shiite formulation. On the Persian quadrangular seal appeared lettering: خاك قدم على منوچهر – “Dust under Ali’s feet, Manuchar”. Supposedly, this change was caused by the influence of Iranian censorship. Under Manuchar’s seal there is endorsement: بنظر رسيد “Considered.” This endorsement shows that Manuchar is a significant figure at royal chancellery. He considered the documents and after this the documents were attested. Manuchar attests all Rostom’s documents.

In the middle of Georgian text of the deed issued by Rostom [GNCM. Ad-597] there is oval Persian seal of average size affixed upside down, with the lettering: خاك پاى على منوچهر – “Manuchar, dust under Ali’s feet”. The text is written above the seal and we can propose that at first the seal was affixed on the paper and further there was written the text of the deed.

In document (copy) of 1634, in the end, the rewriter has placed in the squares: 1. “Place of seal of Rostom-Khan” (in the left square) and 2. “Place of Mustoufi’s seal” [Puturidze, 1955:110-112]. showing that mustoufi’s seal was affixed alongside with the king’s seal.

On the deeds of 1640 there is an oval seal with the legend: عبده عليقلى – “Slave [of God] Alikuli.” Below is: ثبت شد – “Recorded // formalized // approved” [Puturidze, 1955:142-146, 152-157]. Mostly, under Alikuli’s seal there is endorsement ثبت شد – approved // formalized.

Consequently, we can offer that Alikuli was a significant figure at royal chancellery. Possibly he was chancellery mustoufi [Surguladze, 1952:379-383; Abuladze, Abuladze, Baidurashvili, Kekelia, Kldiashvili, Surguladze, Tsagareishvili, 2017:259] (mordar was in charge of affixing royal seal), as the deeds were attested with his seal. Seal of Alikuli was affixed to the deed of 1656 as well [Puturidze, 1955:261-263].

On the deeds of 1643, under Persian quadrangular seal of Alikuli (with the lettering عبده عليقلى – “His [God’s] slave Alikuli”) there is registration endorsement قلمى شد – “written”. [Puturidze, 1955:175-180] Consequently, in this case, we can offer that Alikuli has written Persian text of the deed (translator) and not attested it, as this was in the previous case. In 1656 seal of the new servant of royal chancellery has appeared. The deed bears quadrangular Persian seal with lettering „بنده شاه ولايت گرگين” [Puturidze, 1955:259-261] – “Slave of the king of the world, Giorgi” (//Gorgin). Supposedly elliptic Persian seal with the complicated lettering containing the name „گرگين” – (Gorgin) Giorgi) belongs to him as well. [Puturidze, 1955:281-284].

Persian registration endorsements, with their significance in paperwork, should be presented in the following sequence: 1. قلمى شد – “written”. Later, from 1643, Persian endorsement of the same content was added –...[قلمى شده بود]. – “He (God). Order [was written] in Moslem alphabet.” 2. بنظر رسيد – “Considered”, and 3. ثبت شد – “Recorded // formalized (supposedly, this endorsement belongs to mustoufi). Certainly, these postscripts were made after affixing of relevant seals by the holders of these seals.

Studying of diplomatic segments of Persian parts in Georgian-Persian historical deeds and chancellery markings thereon (seals, endorsements) allowed tracing of the “deed’s movement” – full legal procedure from writing to legal enactment.

There were identified the following steps:

1. Preparing of Georgian text of the deed by royal secretary (mdivanmtsignobari);
2. Translation of Georgian text into Persian with due regard of Iranian diplomatic standards;
3. Registration of the deed in special registry of chancellery;
4. After consideration of the deed, affixing Persian chancellery seals and making relevant Persian chancellery endorsements (بنظر رسيد – “Considered”, ثبت شد – “Registered”, // “Attested”);
5. Approval of Georgian part of the deed with Georgian royal seal;
6. Approval of Persian part of the deed with Persian royal seal.

Conclusion

Thus, research of Georgian-Persian historical documents showed that introduction of Iranian specifics into Georgian paperwork served to efforts of Safavid state to include Eastern Georgia into Iranian administrative system.

Georgian-Persian bilingual deeds demonstrate the attempts of Iran to intervene into Georgian system of landholding and its transformation into Iranian-Moslem one; invocatio of Georgian kings and legends on

their Persian seals clearly demonstrate the political and religious influence to which they were subject from censorship of Safavids; we can imagine specific nature of Georgian secretariat, its procedural steps – movement of the deeds from writing to legal enactment and term of effectiveness of the deeds; Georgian text was dominating diplomatic part of Georgian-Persian deeds.

Studying of the seals on Persian and Georgian texts of historical deeds allowed identification of the chancellery officials participating in composition of Georgian-Persian deeds and their consideration and approval.

Georgian-Persian diplomatic monuments provide unbiased description of severe reality wherein Georgians had to fight for maintaining their state, national and religious identity.

References

- abashidze, t'. (1974). orenovani sabut'ebis sparsuli nats'ilebis diplomat'ik'uri t'aviseburebani. *mats'ne, ist'oriis, arqeologiis, etnograpiisa da khelovnebis ist'oriis seria*, 2. tb.: gamomts'emloba „mets'niereba“ (აბაშიძე, თ. (1974). ორენოვანი საბუთების სპარსული ნაწილების დიპლომატიკური თავისებურებანი. *მაცნე. ისტორიის, არქეოლოგიის, ეთნოგრაფიის და ხელოვნების ისტორიის სერია*. 2. თბ.: მეცნიერება).
- abashidze, t'. (2017). samsghvdeloebis sakhelze gatsemuli kartul-sparsuli sabutebi, *akhlo aghmosavleti da sakart'velo*, tb.: ilias sakhelmtsipo universitetis gamomtsemloba (აბაშიძე, თ. (2017) სამღვდელოების სახელზე გაცემული ქართულ-სპარსული საბუთები. *ახლო აღმოსავლეთი და საქართველო*. X. თბ.: ილიას სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის გამომცემლობა).
- abuladze, t. abuladze, ts. baindurashvili, kh. k'ek'elia, v. k'ldiashvili, d. surguladze, m. tsagareishvili, e. (2017). *tsentraluri da adgilobrivi samokheleo ts'qoba shua sauk'uneebis sakartveloshi, (entsik'lop'ediuri leksik'oni)*. tb.: k'.k'ek'elidzis sakhelobis sakartvelos khelnats'erta erovnuli tsent'ri (აბულაძე, თ. აბულაძე, ც. ბაინდურაშვილი, ხ. კეკელია, ვ. კლდიაშვილი, დ. სურგულაძე, მ. ცაგარეიშვილი, ე. (2017). *ცენტრალური და ადგილობრივი სამოხელეო წყობა შუა საუკუნეების საქართველოში (ენციკლოპედიური ლექსიკონი)*. თბ: კ. კეკელიძის სახელობის საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრი).
- abuladze, t. giunashvili, e. (2011). sakartvelos sp'arsuli da kartul-sp'arsuli ist'oriuli sabutebi: lingvist'ur-pilologiuri k'vlevis aspekt'ebi, *enatmetsnierebis sakitkhebi*, t'b.: tbilisis universitetis gamomtsemloba (აბულაძე, თ. გიუნაშვილი, ე. (2011) საქართველოს სპარსული და ქართულ-სპარსული ისტორიული საბუთები: ლინგვისტურ-ფილოლოგიური კვლევის ასპექტები. *ენათმეცნიერების საკითხები*. თბ.: თბილისის უნივერსიტეტის გამომცემლობა).
- apakidze, a. berdzenishvili, n. (mtavari redaktori), melikishvili, g. meskhia, sh. rat'iani, p'. khach'ap'uridze, g. (1956). *sakartvelos ist'oria*, I.tb.: sakartvelos ssp metsnierebata ak'ademiis gamomtsemloba (აფაქიძე, ა. ბერძენიშვილი, ნ. (მთავარი რედაქტორი). მელიქიშვილი, გ. მესხია, შ. რატიანი, პ. ჩიტაია, გ. ხაჭაპურიძე, გ. (1956). *საქართველოს ისტორია*. I. თბ.: საქართველოს სსრ მეცნიერებათა აკადემიის გამომცემლობა).
- baindurashvili, kh. shiizmi tbilisshi (VII-XVIII ss) (2005). *ist'oriul-etnograpii sht'udiebi*. IX. tb.: memat'iane (ბაინდურაშვილი, ხ. (2005) შიიზმი თბილისში (VII-XVIII სს), *ისტორიულ-ეთნოგრაფიული შტუდიები*. IX. თბ.: მემატაიანე).

- baindurashvili, kh. (2019 a). *iranis administ'ratsiuli p'olitik'a da aghmosavlet sakartvelo (XVII-XVIII ss). mravaltavi*, 26. თბ.: k'k'ek'elidzis sakhelobis sakartvelos khelnats'erta erovnuli tsent'ri (ბაინდურაშვილი, ხ. (2019 ა) ირანის ადმინისტრაციული პოლიტიკა და აღმოსავლეთ საქართველო (XVII-XVIII სს.) *მრავალთავი*. 26. თბ.: კ. კეკელიძის სახელობის საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრი).
- baindurashvili, kh. (2019 b). *Iranis religiuri p'olit'ik'a aghmosavlet sakartvelos mimart da shiit'uri islami XVI-XVII sauk'uneebis tbilisshi, kart'uli ts'qarotmtsodneoba*, XXI. თბ.: universali (ბაინდურაშვილი, ხ. (2019 ბ) ირანის რელიგიური პოლიტიკა აღმოსავლეთ საქართველოს მიმართ და შიიტური ისლამი XVI-XVII საუკუნეების თბილისში. *ქართული წყაროთმცოდნეობა*. XXI. თბ.: უნივერსალი).
- berdzenishvili, n. (1937). *peodaluri urtiertobidan XV sauk'uneshi. masalebi sakartvelosa da k'avk'asiis ist'oriisatvis*, t'pilisi: sakartvelos ssrk' metsnierebata ak'ademiis sakartvelos pilialis gamomtsemloba (ბერძენიშვილი, ნ. (1937). *გეოდალური ურთიერთობიდან XV საუკუნეში. მასალები საქართველოსა და კავკასიის ისტორიისათვის*. I. ტფილისი: საქართველოს სსრკ მეცნიერებათა აკადემიის საქართველოს ფილიალის გამომცემლობა).
- berdzenishvili, n. javakhishvili, iv. janashia, s. (1948). *sakartvelos ist'oria. nats'ili I. mesame shests'orebul-shevsebuli gamotsema*. თბ.: sakhelgami (ბერძენიშვილი, ნ. ჯავახიშვილი, ივ. ჯანაშია, ს. (1948). *საქართველოს ისტორია*. ნაწილი I მესამე შესწორებულ-შევისებული გამოცემა. თბ.: სახელგამი).
- berdzenishvili, n. dondua, v. dumbadze, m. melikishvili, g. rat'iani, p. (1958). *sakartvelos ist'oria. (udzvelesi droidan XIX sauk'unis dasasrulamde)*. I. თბ.: sabch'ota sakartvelo (ბერძენიშვილი, ნ. დონდუა, ვ. დუმბაძე, მ. მელიქიშვილი, გ. მესხია, შ. რატიანი, პ. (1958). *საქართველოს ისტორია*. (უძველესი დროიდან XIX საუკუნის დასასრულამდე). I. თბ.: საბჭოთა საქართველო).
- gabashvili, v. (1958). *kartuli peodaluri ts'qobileba XVI-XVII sauk'uneebshi*. თბ.: sakartvelos ssr metsnierebata ak'ademiis gamomtsemloba (გაბაშვილი, ვ. (1958). *ქართული გეოდალური წყობილება XVI-XVII საუკუნეებში*. თბ.: საქართველოს სსრ მეცნიერებათა აკადემიის გამომცემლობა).
- guchua, v. svanidze, m. (1973). *kartlis brdzola osmalebis ts'inaagmdeg svimon is metaurobit. samtskhe-saatabagos dap'qroba. sakartvelos ist'oriis nark'vevebi*. IV. თბ.: sabch'ota sakartvelo (გუჩუა, ვ. სვანიძე, მ. ქართლის ბრძოლა ოსმალების წინააღმდეგ სვიმონ I-ის მეთაურობით. სამცხე-საათაბაგოს დაპყრობა. *საქართველოს ისტორიის ნარკვევები*. IV. თბ.: საბჭოთა საქართველო).
- dundua, n. (1984). *kartul-sparsuli (orenovani) istoriuli sabutebi (XVI-XVIII ss)*. t'ekst'i daadgina, targmani, k'oment'ari, leksik'oni da sadzieblebi daurto n. dundua. თბ.: metsniereba (დუნდუა, ნ. (1984). *ქართულ-სპარსული (ორენოვანი) ისტორიული საბუთები (XVI-XVIII სს)*. ტექსტი დაადგინა, თარგმანი, კომენტარი, ლექსიკონი და საძიებლები დაურთო ნუგზარ დუნდუამ. თბ.: მეცნიერება).
- k'atsit'adze, d. (2009). *iranis ist'oria*. III-XVIII ss. თბ.: horosi XXI (კაციტაძე, დ. (2009). *ირანის ისტორია*. III-XVIII სს. თბ.: ჰოროსი XXI).
- k'ldiashvili, d. surguladze, m. tsagareishvili, e. jandieri, g. (1991). *pirta anot'irebuli leksik'oni*. ss. ist'oriuli sabutebis mikhedvit. I. თბ.: metsniereba (კლდიაშვილი, დ. სურგულაძე, მ. ცაგარეიშვილი, ე. ჯანდიერი, გ. (1991). *პირთა ანოტირებული ლექსიკონი. XI-XVII სს*. ისტორიული საბუთების მიხედვით. I. თბ.: მეცნიერება).

- zhizhiashvili, o. *kartlis mepe svimon II*. tb.: art'anuji (ქიქიაშვილი, ო. (2017). *ქართლის მეფე სვიმონ II*. თბ.: არტანუჯი).
- surguladze, iv. *sakartvelosa da samartlis ist'oriisatvis*. I. tb.: tbilisis universitetis gamomtsemloba (სურგულაძე, 1952: ივ. სურგულაძე, ივ. (1952). *საქართველოს სახელმწიფო და სამართლის ისტორიისათვის*. I. თბ.: თბილისის უნივერსიტეტის გამომცემლობა)
- puturidze, v. (1955). *kartul-sparsuli istoriuli sabutebi*. t'ekst'i daadgina, targmani da sadzieblebi daurto v. puturidzem. tb.: sakartvelos sss metsnierebata ak'ademiis gamomtsemloba (ფუთურიძე, ვ. (1955). *ქართულ-სპარსული ისტორიული საბუთები*. ტექსტი დაადგინა, თარგმანი და შენიშვნები დაურთო ვ. ფუთურიძემ. თბ.: საქართველოს სსრ მეცნიერებათა აკადემიის გამომცემლობა).
- puturidze, v. (1969). *iskander munshis tsnobebi sakartvelos shesakheb*. t'ekst'i kartuli targmanita da shesavliturt gamostsa v. puturidzem. tb.: metsniereba (ფუთურიძე, ვ. (1969). *ისქანდერ მუნშის ცობები საქართველოს შესახებ*. სპარსული ტექსტი ქართული თარგმანითა და შესავალითურთ გამოსცა ვლადიმერ ფუთურიძემ. თბ.: მეცნიერება).
- kartvelishvili, t. (proekt'is sametsniero khelmdzghvani). baidurashvili, kh. gelashvili, i. gogoladze, t. shaorshadze, m. jojua, t. surguladze, m.(redakt'ori). (2019). *dok'ument'uri ts'qaroebi* (sigelebi, epigrapik'uli tsdzeglebi, khelnats'erta k'oloponebi) sauk'unis nakhevrts kartlisa da k'akhetis meppebis (giorgi X, luarsab II, bagrat' VII, svimon II, telmuraz I) shesakheb. (ts'qaroebis publik'atsia da gamokvleva). I. tb.: natlismtsemeli (ქართველიშვილი, თ. (პროექტის სამეცნიერო ხელმძღვანელი) ბაინდურაშვილი, ხ. გელაშვილი, ი. გოგოლაძე, თ. შაორშაძე, მ. ჯოჯუა, თ. სურგულაძე, მ. (რედ.). (2019). *დოკუმენტური წყაროები* (სიგელები, ეპიგრაფიკული ძეგლები, ხელნაწერთა კოლოფონები) XVII საუკუნის I ნახევრის ქართლისა და კახეთის მეფეების (გიორგი X, ლუარსაბ II, ბაგრატ VII, სვიმონ II, თეიმურაზ I) შესახებ (წყაროების პუბლიკაცია და გამოკვლევა). I. თბ.: ნათლისმცემელი).
- qaukhchishvili, s. (1973). *bat'onishvili vakhust'l,aghts'era sameposa sakartvelosa, kartlis tskhovreba*. IV. t'ekst'i dadgenili qvela dziritadi khelnats'eris mikhedvit s. qaukhchishvilis mier. tb.: sabch'ota sakartvelo (ყაუხჩიშვილი, ს. (1973). *ბატონიშვილი ვახუშტი. აღწერა სამეფოსა საქართველოსა. ქართლის ცხოვრება. IV*. ტექსტი დადგენილი ყველა ძირითადი ხელნაწერის მიხედვით ს. ყაუხჩიშვილის მიერ. თბ.: საბჭოთა საქართველო).
- qaukhchishvili, s. (1959). *akhali kartlis tskhovreba*. mesame t'ekst'i. kartlis tskhovreba. II. t'ekst'i dadgenili qvela dziritadi khelnats'eris mikhedvit s. qaukhchishvilis mier. tb.: sabch'ota sakartvelo (ყაუხჩიშვილი, ს. (1959). *ახალი ქართლის ცხოვრება*. მესამე ტექსტი. ქართლის ცხოვრება. ტექსტი დადგენილი ყველა ძირითადი ხელნაწერის მიხედვით ს. ყაუხჩიშვილის მიერ. II. თბ.: საბჭოთა საქართველო).
- javakhishvili, iv. (1926). *kart'uli sigelta-mtsodneoba anu dip'lomat'ik'a*. t'pilisi: t'pilisis universitetis gamotsema (ივ. ჯავახიშვილი, ივ. (1926) *ქართული სიგელთა-მცოდნეობა ანუ დიპლომატიკა*. ტფილისი: ტფილისის უნივერსიტეტის გამოცემა).
- sakartvelos erovnuli arkivi*. 1450-19/98 (*საქართველოს ეროვნული არქივი // GNA* (სეა) 1450-19/98).
- sakartvelos erovnuli arkivi*. 1448-252. (*საქართველოს ეროვნული არქივი // GNA* (სეა) 1448-252).
- sakartvelos erovnuli arkivi*. 1448-1261 (*საქართველოს ეროვნული არქივი // GNA* (სეა) 1448-1261).
28. *sakartvelos erovnuli arkivi*. 1450-37/190 (*საქართველოს ეროვნული არქივი // GNA* (სეა) 1450-37/190).
- sakartvelos khelnats'erta erovnuli tsent'ri*. Ad-973 (*საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრი // (GNCM) ხეც Ad-973*).

sakartvelos khelnats'erta erovnuli tsent'ri Hd-3056 (საქართველოს ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრი // GNCSM (ხეც) Hd-3056).

Петрушевский, Т. П. (1949). *Очерки по истории феодальных отношений в Армении и Азербайджане в XVI - начале XIX вв.*, Ленинград. Изд-во ЛГУ (Петрушевский, Т. П. (1949) Очерки по истории феодальных отношений в Армении и Азербайджане в XVI – начале XIX вв., Ленинград, Изд-во ЛГУ) (Petrushevski, 1959: T.P. Petrushevski, *Essays in the history of feudal relationships in Armenia and Azerbaijan in 16th – early 19th centuries*, Leningrad, Publish. LGU (In Russian).