

## On the Descent of Grigol Bakurianisdze (the Son of Bakur)

Manana Sanadze

The University of Georgia

**A**ll the researchers, who have ever questioned Grigol Bakurianisdze's ethnicity – whether they consider it Georgian or Armenian – have unanimously agreed upon his origin from the province of Tao. Nobody has called into question that standpoint, which was first suggested by N. Marr. In fact, one cannot find any indications on his origin from Tao in the available sources. Having compared the sources with each other, we have come to the conclusion that Grigol belonged to the main branch of the reknowned Georgian royal family of Parnavaziani-Khosroviani (Sasanidz). When the kingship of Kartli had been abolished by persians in the middle of VI century, the family settled down in Kakheti. After one of its members, Nerse I, superseded Guaram the Young, the son of Stepanoz II of the Gorgasliani's Klarjeti branch, on the throne of Kartli's erismtavaris in the 570s, Kakheti still remained the Bakuriani's patrimonial domain. Nerse I and his sons – Stepanoz, Adarnase and Philip – are mentioned as the Bakuriani in the list of erismtavaris in Moktsevai Kartlisa. The Bakuriani were Kartli's erismtavaris till 780s inclusive, when Ashot Bagrationi deprived them of that honor at the end of the century. A Bakuriani, Grigol by name – in our opinion, the smallest son of Nerse II – had to relinquish his rights to the title of Erismtavari of Kartli and content oneself with the rights to his family domain, Kakheti, after a lost battle with Ashot the Kurapatat in the early 9th century. The revolted Donauri deprived Grigol's descendents of their sovereign rights to Kakheti in the early 830s. We suppose that Bakuriani were still considered the noblest feudal family of Kakheti after that, though the sources pass it over in silence. About two centuries later, a Bakuriani, Grigol's father, was serving to Giorgi I and, together with Prince Bagrat, went to Byzantium as a hostage of Emperor Basil. Information maintained in Petritsoni's Typikon gives us some reason to surmise that Grigol Bakurianisdze's brother-in-law (his sister's husband), Abas, was brother to King Aghsartan of Kakheti, which means Grigol's close filiation with the family of Kvirikiani – Armenian Bagratuni – ruling in Georgia at the time. We have also specially perused the last part of Moktsevai Kartlisa – the list of erismtavaris – in this connection. The reading of the defective, obscure text is suggested as follows: "Then Nerse the Great and his sons: Philip, and Stepanoz, and Adarnase, and Guaram the Great Bakuriani, and the son of Bal [gh] [a] dadi [Adarnase], and the sons of Adarnase: Stepanoz, and Ashot, and Guaram, the great Eristavis, lived." The brackets represent restored parts and in the word "Bal [gh] [a] dadi" the original "L" is restored as initial "GH." Confusion between "L" and "GH" is caused by the similarity of these two in Georgian-Nuskhuri (Minuscule) writings.

## გრიგოლ ბაკურიანის-ძის წარმომავლობის შესახებ

მანანა სანაძე

საქართველოს უნივერსიტეტი

**ყ**ველა მკვლევარი, ვინც კი გრიგოლ ბაკურიანის ძის ეთნიკურ წარმომავლობას შეხება, იმისდა მიუხედავად მიიჩნევდა მას ქართველად თუ სომეხად, ერთსულოვნად იზიარებდა თვალსაზრისს, მისი ტაოდან წარმომავლობის შესახებ, ეს თვალსაზრისი, რომელიც პირველად ნ. მარმა დაამკვიდრა, არავის სადაოდ არ გაუხდია. სინამდვილეში, წყაროებში არავითარი მითითება გრიგოლის ტაოდან წარმომავლობის შესახებ არ მოგვეპოვება. წყაროების ურთიერთშეჯერების შედეგად, მივედით დასკვნამდე, რომ გრიგოლი ცნობილი ქართული სამეფო საგვარეულოს გოვრგასლიან-ხოსროიანთა (სასანიანთა) მთავარ შტოს ბაკურიან/ბაკურიძეებს ეკუთვნოდა. ეს საგვარეულო VI ს-იმ შუა წლებში სპარსელების მიერ ქართლში მეფობის გაუქმების შემდეგ, კახეთში დაემკვიდრა. კახეთი ბაკურიანთა საგვარეულო დომენად დარჩა მას შემდეგაც, რაც მათმა წარმომადგენელმა ნერსე I-მა VII ს-ის 70-იან წლებში ქართლის ერისმთავრის ტახტზე გოვრგასლიან-ბივრიტიანთა კლარჯული შტოს წარმომადგენელი სტეფანოზ II-ის ვაჟი გუარამ ყრმა შეცვალა და ქართლის ერისმთავრის პატივის მიღებასთან ერთად კვლავც ქართლის მმართველ პირველ საგვარეულოდ იქცა. ნერსე I და მისი ვაჟები სტეფანოზი, ადარნასე, ფილიპე და გუარამი ბაკურეანებად არიან მოხსენიებული „მოქცევაი ქართლისაის“ ერისმთავართა ჩამონათვალში ბაკურიანები ქართლის ერისმთავრობას საუკუნეზე მეტ ხანს, VIII ს-ის 80-იანი წლების ჩათვლით ინარჩუნებდნენ, სანამ მათ ეს პატივი იმავე საუკუნის მიწურულში ამოტ ბაგრატიონმა არ წაართვა. IX საუკუნის დასაწყისში ბაკურიანთა საგვარეულოს წარმომადგენელი გრიგოლი, რომელიც, ჩვენი აზრით, ნერსე II-ის უძეცროსი ვაჟი იყო, ამოტ კურაპალატთან წაგებული ბრძოლის შემდეგ, იძულებული გახდა ქართლის ერისმთავრობაზე უარი ეთქვა და მხოლოდ საგვარეულო დომენში, კახეთში მთავრობას დასჯერებოდა. დაახლოებით IX საუკუნის 30-იან წლებში გრიგოლის შთამომავლებს კახეთის მთავრობა წანარმა დონაურებმა წაართვეს. ამის შემდეგაც ბაკურიანები, უნდა ვივარაუდოთ, კახეთის უმსხვილეს ფეოდალურ საგვარეულოდ რჩებოდნენ, თუმცა მათ შესახებ წყაროებში ცნობები აღარ მოგვეპოვება. თითქმის ორი საუკუნის შემდეგ ამ საგვარეულოს წარმომადგენელი გრიგოლის მამა ბაკურიანი იმყოფება გიორგი I-ის ამაღლებაში და უფლისწულ ბაგრატთან ერთად ბასილ კეისარს მძევლად მიჰყავს ბიზანტიაში. „პეტრიწონის ტიპიკონში“ დაცული ცნობა საფუძველს გვაძლევს ვივარაუდოთ, რომ გრიგოლ ბაკურიანის-ძის სიძე (დის ქმარი) აბასი იყო კახეთის მეფის აღსართანის ძმა. შესაბამისად, გრიგოლი ახლო ნათესაურ კავშირში იმყოფებოდა სომეხ ბაგრატუნთა საქართველოში მმართველ კვირიკიანთა საგვარეულოსთან. სტატიის მიხედვით, ციხეა შესწავლილი „მოქცევაი ქართლისაის“ ქრონიკის ბოლო ნაწილი—ერისმთავართა ჩამონათვალი და შემოთავაზებულია ტექსტის დაზიანებული და ამის შედეგად გაუგებარი ადგილის შემდეგი წაკითხვა: „... მერმე ნერსე დიდი და ძენი მისნი: ფილიპე, და სტეფანოზ, და ადარნასე, და გუარამ დიდი ბაკურეანი; და ძე ბა[ლ][ა]დადისი [ადარნასე], და ძენი ადარნერსესნი: სტეფანოზ, და ამოტ, და გუარამ. დიდ-დიდნი ერისთავნი ესთენ იყვნეს.“ ოთხკუთხა ფორჩხილებში მოცემულია აღდგენილი ადგილები, ხოლო სიტყვა „ბადადისი“ „დედნისეული“ „ლ“-ს ნაცვლად აღდგენილია პირვანდელი „ლ“. „ლ“ და „ლ“ არევა გამოწვეულია ქართულ-ნუსხურ დამწერლობაში ამ ორი ასოს მსგავსებით.

The descent of Grigol Bakurianisdze has been a disputable issue for scholars for a long time. Before the publication of the Greek edition of the Typicon of the Petritsoni Monastery there were only two notes on the descent of the Great Byzantine official of XI century. In her historical work "The Alexiad", Anna Comnenus – a Byzantine princess and historian the daughter of Caesar Alexius Comnenus - notes that Grigol "belongs to a noble Armenian family" (Komnina, A. 1965. p. 465; Georgica, VI, p. 60). In historical work Jamanakagrutiun – Chronicles, Mate Urkhaets, an Armenian historian, calls Grigol Bakurianisdze "Georgian by tribe" (Մարթնու Ռւրիսանցի, 1898. p.148). It should be pointed out that Anna Comnenus was born in December, 1083, while Grigol Bakurianisdze was killed in a fight with Pechenegs in 1086. In this circumstances, the princess and historian was not personally acquainted with Grigol Bakurianisdze. When the latter passed away, she was not even three years old. Apart from the Byzantine historians and public officials, from their imperial height, used to make mistakes in mentioning the nationality of people of non-Greek origin. We can put forward lots of examples illustrating this. As for Mate Urhaets, he was a younger contemporary of Grigol and was an Armenian at the same time. Undoubtedly, he would have known perfectly well whether a political figure of his epoch was Georgian or Armenian by tribe.

In 1888, in Leipzig, G. Museon published a new translation of the Greek version of the Typicon of the Petritsoni Monastery and in 1904, Luis Petit published the original of the translation (Louis Petit, Typicon de Gregoire Paeurianos ...). The published "original" was the XVIII century copy of the Petritsoni Monastery of the XIII century copy. However, it did give scholars an opportunity to get acquainted with the work. After the publication of the Greek version of the Typicon, the issue of the descent of Grigol Bakurianisdze seemed to be clarified when Grigol Bakurianisdze mentioned that he was "Georgian by origin" and in this way he called himself Georgian. This should have explained all issues and put an end to the debate over the descent of Grigol Bakurianisdze. However, N. Marr put forward a new vision of the issue. In his work "Аркауи Монгольское Название Христиан, В Связи с Вопросом Об Армянах-Халкедонитов", which was published in 1905, he stressed that Grigol Bakurianisdze may have called himself Georgian because he was Kalkedonit, the same as Aurtherodox by faith (Marr, N. 1906. p. 18-25). The fact is that the re-written copy of the Greek version says that the Typicon of the Petritsoni Monastery was written in Greek, Georgian and Armenian. Similarly, Grigol made his handwork in these languages: Greek, Georgian and Armenian. It's true, as a Byzantine official, Grigol was in charge of Armenian countries that were part of Byzantium for a significant period of his life; it was still unusual why he - Georgian by origin, as he puts it himself, created the

third Armenian version of the Typicon and why he signed it in Armenian. The above-given point of N. Mar seemed to explain the contradiction. That is why the version turned out viable. Since then, some scholars have considered Grigol to be Georgian (Protitch, A, 1923. p. 17; Honigmann, E. 1953. p. 222). Others believe he was Armenian (Grabar, A. 1922. pp. 121-122; Uspenski, 1948. p. 75; Hans Georg Beck, 1959. p. 218).

As it later turned out, the Petritsoni Monastery Typicon does not exist any more. The original seems to have been seriously damaged as early as XIII century. Therefore, the monks of the Monastery copied the Greek and the Georgian versions of it. These versions were stitched in the Koraisi Library on the Island of Kios. The discovery of a copy of the Georgian version brought more clarity into the research on the descent of Grigol Bakurianisdze. In the Georgian version of the Typicon, there is no indication of the existence of the Armenian version. In addition, the Georgian version is the one that has been preserved unchanged. It has been copied from the original of 1803 while the Greek text does contain changes (Shanidze, 1971. pp. 21-40 ). Akaki Shanidze, the publisher of the Georgian version considers that a information on the Armenian version of the Typicon and the Armenian sign of Grigol Bakurianisdze have been entered by the person who copied the Greek version. Seemingly, the copier did not know Georgian and considered the Georgian version to be Armenian (Shanidze, 1971. pp. 21-40 ).

Armenian historians P. Muradian (Muradian, 1968. pp. 103-118) and V. Arutinova-Fidanian (*Тупик Григория Пақуриана*, 1978) tried to substantiate the Armenian descent of Grigol Bakurianisdze. Georgian scholars A. Shanidze (Shanidze, 1979. pp. 173-180), G. Gozalashvili (Gozalashvili, 1970. pp. 167-192), L. Menabde (Menabde, 1980. pp. 253-276) and N. Lomouri (Lomouri, 1981. p. 16) prove that Grigol Bakurianidze was of Georgian descent. There is also a lack of unanimity among Russian and Western scholars. Some of them agree to the opinion of N. Mar and V. Arutinova-Fidanian and consider Grigol Bakurianisdze to be an Armenian Kalkedonit, while others believe that the words of Grigol Bakurianisdze “Georgian by origin” prove the Georgian descent of the latter.

All scholars, who have touched on the ethnicity of Grigol Bakurianisdze, no matter whether they considered him Armenian or Georgian, unanimously agreed that he was from Tao. This opinion, which was first introduced by N. Mar, has never been questioned. It is interesting to note that in reality in historical sources there is no indication on the descent of Grigol Bakurianisdze from Tao.

In the Typicon Grigol Bakurianisdze provides the following information on his descent:

“... In the Petritsoni Monastery that was described and proven by an order of me - Grigol, by the will of God, the Sevastros and Megas Domestikos of all the West, the desired son of Bakuriani - the Sovereign of Eristavis (the corresponding part of the Greek text reads: “the own son of blessed Bakuriani - the bright Eristavteristavi”) of the East and of Georgians... and the kin of my brother - the desired Abaz Magistratos” (Shanidze, p. 62 (2)).

“Fathers and brothers who live in the present Monastery, since we are Georgian by kindred, strong and brought up as fighters... “ (Shanidze, p. 61 (4))

“Since our blessed father passed away early and left us orphan little and not mature by age, our mother with whim distributed all that our father has gained, all his property and gave to other siblings - our sisters and left us portionless, without estates. Our sisters took all their portions and went to their husbands. The squandered all the property in strange parts and lost all”

Me too, with my servants and rudunebi, was looking for and a living place in Armenia, Georgia and sasarkinozeti and later in Greece. And I spent a long time this way. And all this - whatever I have gained and deserved, the honour of an official bestowed upon me - all that happened to me was God’s will and the merit of the prayers of my parents, as well as the long pains, troubles and bloodshed I have gone through” (Shanidze, p. 101 (8-9)).

“And went for three days to Msgepsi for Sepa: on one day -for my father Bakuriani, on another day - for the brother of my father Khosrovan, and on the third day - for the nephew of my father Bakuriani” (Shanidze, p. 116 (2)).

“Other gold ring indicated I were the sovereign of Prastins as I wished, my relatives and my servants, since they were Armenian by faith” (Shanidze, p. 123).

“Nuns of my Monastery are Georgian by family name” (Shanidze, p. 126 (3)).

“Those who entered the Fortress of Periton that was the possession of Abaz, the brother of Aghsartan, our relative by marriage...” (Shanidze, p. 71 (7)).

The quotations give us a clear picture of the following: 1. Grigol could distinguish between nationalities: by origin and by faith. 2. He refers to Armenians as to people related to him by faith, and not relatives. There must have been many people like this in Georgia of XI century, when a significant part of Kvemo Kartli was occupied by Armenians. It is obvious that the two-century Armenian rule in Georgia could not have passed without leaving a trace. Some noblemen from Kvemo Kartli would have converted to Monophysitism - the faith of Armenians. Apart from that, at the mentioned time Kakheti was ruled by the Kvirikian and we cannot exclude that Gagik the King of Kakheti and Aghsartan - his son, Armenians by father were also Monophysitists. The brother of Aghsartan and his close relatives must have been Monophysitists, too. In general, we have to make one point. “The Iberian community” of

Byzantium was never actually a part of Georgia, not counting relatively short historical periods. The Iberian community used to be a part of Byzantium. In such a case, if the population of this part was also Armenian, it is not clear why the Armenian speaking population of Byzantium had the Georgian-Kalkedonuri religious service and not the Greek-Kalkedonuri one.

The historians whose only proof of the Georgian descent of Grigol Bakurianisdze is his Kalkedonitoba, cannot actually illustrate even one case when a person with an undoubtedly Armenian descent calls himself "Georgian" because of Kalkedonitoba.

Armenian sources usually give the name of Duophysitists either to Kalkedonits or to people of Greek faith.

3. The quintessence of all the stated is that the Typicon of the Petritsoni Monastery does not seem to give any evidence on where Grigol descended from. All the scholars following N. Mar without an exception repeated the groundless version of N. Mar on the descent of Grigol from Tao - without giving the version any critical consideration. The list of the estates that Grigol owned, including the one in Tao, does not help us in any way determine his descent. It is quite clear from the information presented by Grigol that his mother had left his brother and himself "without an estate". The brothers started serving the Byzantine Caesar and got all their estates from the latter. Therefore, declaring that Grigol was from Tao, based on the fact that he had been given an estate there by Byzantine Caesar - would be absolutely groundless. There is an opinion, according to which Byzantine Caesars granted estates to those who served them in the motherlands of the latter. Firstly, this did not always happen and there are lots of cases illustrating this. In addition, what is the most important, whenever such a fact did occur, the territories where estates were granted were subordinated to Byzantium. It is clear that if Grigol were from, let's say, Kakheti or Kartli, Caesar would have been unable to grant him an estate here for the simple reason that those parts were not under his control. The fact that the Byzantine Caesar granted estates to Grigol in the Armenian and Georgian parts within the borders of Byzantium can only corroborate that the Caesar granted estates to people in places that were close to the motherlands of the latter, however under Byzantine control.

The only information that might be an attempt to confirm the descent of Grigol in Tao is the note of Kedrene (Skilitsa) on the father of Grigol. The Byzantine historian "David Kurapalate passed away and made the King (Caesar Basil implied) his heir and the owner of his possessions. When the latter went to Iberia, he ascertained the property left to him, assured Giorgi, the brother of the last Kurapalate and the ruler of internal Iberia, to be content with his estates and not invade those that did not belong to him. He concluded a truce with him, took his son captive and left for Phoenicia. He took with him

noblemen from Iberia, the highest ranking of them were Fevdat and Fers the Bakuriani ..." (Georgica, 1963. p. 46).

Later, while describing a war with Giorgi I, Kedrene notes: "as Giorgi, the sovereign of Abazgia violated the agreement concluded with the Romans, and invaded the Roman borders, the King launched a campaign against him with all his army... after that there was the second fight... Giorgi escaped to the mountains in Iberia. After a while, he conducted talks with the king (Caesar Basil), gave him some parts of the country that the latter wished for and concluded an armistice with him. He also sent his son Bagrat with him as a captive. The King conferred the title of Magistros upon Bagrat and sent him back" (Georgica, 1963. p. 46).

As we can see, Kedrene uses various sources to get information on the relations of the kings of Georgia (Bagrat III, Giorgi I) with Caesar Basil. Therefore, though he presents the story of Caesar Basil coming to Georgia twice: once while narrating the death of David Kurapalate in 1001 and the second time while describing a war with Giorgi I in 1021 – he makes an important mistake in while using the sources. The mistakes were caused by his superficial knowledge of the political situation in Georgia. From the two parts of the story of Kedrene mentioned above, the second narrates the developments of 1021, i.e. the story of captivation of Prince Bagrat, while the first episode is a mixture and blending of Caesar Basil's entrance of Georgia in 1001 and 1021. The episode narrates how Caesar came to Georgia owing to the death of David Kurapalate in 1021, and how Prince Bagrat the son of Giorgi was taken captive, which happened in 1022. Kedre blends the list of the distinguished people whom Caesar Basil took with him at different times. We believe that the Caesar took Prince Bagrat and Bakuriani at the same time and Fevdat and Fers - the sons of Jojik at a different time - twenty years before that, in 1001 when he first came to Georgia. It is clear the Fers was at Caesar's court long before Bagrat was taken captive. The fact that Fers was decapitated a little earlier before the developments, because of his participation in the uprising against Caesar.

Hence, out of the people listed above, the Caesar of Byzantium could only have taken with him Bakuriani, not brother Jojikisdze when he took Bagrat prisoner. The mentioning of the people together by Kadrene is the result of a mistake of Byzantine historians that we have mentioned above.

It is clear that Bactrian settled near Kghrene is the father of Grigol. Firstly, Grigol calls himself Bakurianisdze. Apart from this, Caesar conferred the title of a Petrikios on Bakuriani as well as Pevghate and Persi the Jojikidze. The title corresponds to the Georgian title "To the Head of Eristavis, the God". This is the title that Grigol refers to his father with. The chronology of devel-

opments here is matching. Bakuriani, who left Georgia with Prince Bagrat to serve Caesar, presumably came back to Georgia with the heir of the throne in 1025. Indeed, he should have had Grigol in 1026-1027. As we know, by 1083, the creation of the Petritsoni Typicon, Grigol calls himself old which makes us conjecture that he should not have been younger than 50 (Orbeliani, 1991. pp. 360-361). If we also consider that in 1086 he personally participated in a combat and got killed, we should suppose that he would not have been much older than 60. We will not probably be mistaken much if we say that Grigol was 58-60 when he died. Hence, at the time of creation of the Tipikoni, Grigol should have been 55-57 years old.

In this way, it is clear that Bakuriani, the son of Grigol was taken by Caesar Basil when the latter took Prince Bagrat captive. This is quiet natural. Giorgi I would not have his only son and heir go captive alone and would have sent a big retinue- compiled of representatives of the brightest families in Georgia - to accompany him. In this way, the information of Kadrne is useless in determining which part of Georgia Grigol was from. The information is only another proof of Grigol Bakurinisdze's belonging to one of the brightest families in Georgia. The fact that Caesar Basil took captives from South-Western Georgia does not give any information on the descent of the latter. There were hostilities in the place, truce talks and Caesar took captives from here, which, again, is quite normal. We should keep it in mind that Giorgi was supported by the whole army of Georgia in his fight. „Tsanarni and Shakni“ the same „Kakhni and Herni“ (Kartlis Tskhovreba, 1955. pp. 285,383) were among the fighters. In this way, the Tao descent of Grigol Bakurianisdze is not corroborated by historical sources.

There is some information on the origin of Grigol in the name of his father and the family name Bakuriani itself. Bakuriani means “the son of Bakur”. Such a formation of family names seems to be quite common in the Georgia of V-X centuries. Later it is replaced by adding the suffixes “dze” (son) and “shvili” (son, daughter). The formation of a family name with the suffix from the father's name is the only way in “Matiane Kartlisamdeli”, the oldest part of Kartlis Tskhovreba. We date this part back to no later than I half of VIII century. E. g. Juansher Juansherian, Agharsan Agharnersian, Nerse Nersian... Such a formation of family names is common in a relatively later period, too. E. g.: Marushian, Shavlian (Shavle-Savle)... The family name Areshian, mentioned by the historian of David the Builder, is notable in this respect. It comes from the name of a Heri nobleman – Aresh. The offspring of Aresh were Areshian and Baram. As we can see, we are facing an identical situation in this case. First, a family name comes from a name Aresh (like Bakuriani – from Bakur). Later, Bakuriani and Areshian become first names within the respec-



tive families. In this way, we have Areshian - a representative of the Areshian Family and Bakuriani – a representative of the Bakuriani family, i. e. Areshian Areshian, Bakuriani Bakuriani (the cousin of Grigol, the father of Grigol). Both these family names are later formed with “dze” and “shvili”. In Vakhusti’s work we come across these surnames in the forms of Areshidze and Bakurisdze.

In this way, Grigol belonged to a Georgian noble family Bakuriani-Bakurianisdze. What information has been preserved about this family? This family originated from the son of Vakhtang Gorgasali and the king following him Darchil/Archil II. This king of Kartli was the son of Vakhtang and his Persian wife Balandukht. This king of Kartli is commonly referred to as Dachi Ujarmeli in sources. Based on Kartlis Tskhovreba, the ruling of Kartli by Persians ended with the death of one of the descendants of King Dachi – Bakur. After that the sons of Bakur- a representative of this main branch of the Gorgasali-Parnavazi – settled in Kakheti and started off the Bakurianisdze, the same Bakuriani family (Kartlis Tskhovreba, 1955. pp. 217,225).

Nerse Bakurisdze - one of the representatives of this family – was the Erismtavari of Kartli in the 70-80s of VII century (Draskhanakerteli, 1937. p. 14; Sanadze, 2000. pp. 15-23). Nerse and his offspring are mentioned as Bakuriani in Moktsevai Kartlisai. We believe that right here is necessary to dwell on Nerse Bakurisdze – the same Bakuriani, i. e. the Nerse of Moktsevai Kartlisai. Z. Aleksidze identifies him with Nerse II (Alexidze, 2001. pp. 311-315) – the Erismtavari of Kartli of the time of Abo Tbileli, which is a mistake, of course. The fact that Nerse II had sons Philip and Agsharane is not enough for such identification.

All the people mentioned in the respective part of Moktsevai Kartlisai, including Aghsartan with his sons Ashot and Gurgen, belonged to the verge of VII-VIII centuries, the beginning of VIII century. As for the Nerse mentioned in Moktsevai Kartlisai, he is the grandfather of Nerse – the Erismtavari of Kartli of the period of Abo Tbileli – the father of his father Aghsartan (Sanadze, p. 21). The thing is that it was Nerse I, who had a son called Stepanoz, the same sovereign of Kartli Stepanoz III (710 – 738), the father of Mir and Archil (Sanadze, p. 21; Sanadze, (a); Sanadze (b); Saqartvelos Sapatrarko, 2001, p. 64 ). As for Nerse II, the Eristmavari of Kartli of the period of Abo Tbileli, Stepanoz (the same Stepanoz IV) was his niece and not his son.

Here we would like to bring clarity to one more issue. Based on Sumbat Davitisdze, son of David, Nerse and his offspring were considered Bagrationi, which is not true. Sumbath Davitisdze was three centuries away from the period of Nerse I and used Moktsevai Kartlisai in the respective part of his work. While using it, he made a mistake typical of an old Georgian chronicler. Namely, he considered the Eristavis coming one after another on the list to be fathers and sons. In reality, Moktsevai Kartlisai notes:

1. Shatberduli List: „... and after him the Eristavi was Guaram Kurapalate 6 and the younger Guaram 7 and after them Arshusha Kurapalate 8 and Varaz Bakur apai Patrikioz who converted the Garbanelni 9 and later Nerse [10] with his sons: Philipe 11, Stepanoz 12, Adarnese 13, Guaram 14 and Bakureani Ba[L]dadisi 15 and the sons of Adarnese: Stepanoz 16, and Ashot Kurapalate 17, and Guaram 18. These were the great Eristavis” (Zveli Kartuli Agiografia, I. p. 97).

2. Chelishuri List: „... and after him the Eristavi was Guaram Kurapalate 6 and the youngest Guaram 7 and after them Arshusha Kurapalate 8 and Varaz Bakur apai Patrikioz who converted the Garbanelni 9 and later Nerse [10] and his sons: Philipe 11, Stepanoz 12, Adarnese 13, Guaram 14 and Bakureani Badadisi and the sons of Adarnese Stepanoz 16, Ashot Kurapalate 17, and Guaram 18. These were the great Eristavis” (Zveli Kartuli Agiografia, I. p. 97).

3. Sina Manuscript: „... and after him the Eristavi was Guaram Kurapalate and the young Guaram and after them Arshusha Kurapalate and Varaz Bakur apai Patrikioz who converted the Garbanelni and then Nerse the Great and his sons: Philipe, and Stepanoz, and Adarnese, and Guaram the Great Bakureani, son of Ba[L]dadisi, and the sons of Adarnese Stepanoz, and Ashot Kurapalate, and Guaram. These were the great Eristavis” (Aleksidze, 2001. pp. 82-83).

If we compare the texts it will be obvious that: 1. the “Baldadisa and not “Badadisi” is a more correct form, since it was easier to miss a letter in writing than to add one (Compare, Bar(da)banelebi). 2. the form Baghdadisi is a distorted version of Bagh(a)dadi, the same Bag(a)dadisi that was later a basis for Bagrat-uni. 2. Baldadadisi misses Adarnese, i.e. the text has to be restored in the following way: „ ... and later Nerse the great with his sons: Philip, Stepanoz, Adarnese, and Guaram the Great Bakuriani and Bagh(a)dadisi (Adarnese) and the sons of Adarnese Stepanoz, and Ashot and Guaram. These were the great Eristavis” (Sanadze, May 15, 2003; Collected Works, May 27-30, 2003. pp. 31-34).

Hence, we deal with two families: Nerse and his son Bakuriani (the Nersiani of Kartlis Tskhovreba)(Kartlis Tskhovreba, I, p. 241) and the offspring Adarnese (the same Agharnersiani of Kartlis Tskhovreba) (Kartlis Tskhovreba, I, p. 242).

The Bakuriani: Nerse I, Stepanoz III, Mir, Archil, Juansher, Nerse II, Stepanoz IV (by mother’s line) are Georgian Erismtavaris almost by the end of VIII century. Before Ashot Kurapalate (the family of Bagration-Adarnersian) took away the position of Erismtavari from them. Kartlis Tskhovreba provides precise information when it mentions that after Stepanoz Erismtavari the Byzantine Caesar gave the title of Erismtavari to the Bakurisdze, i. e. the

Bakuriani. Yet, the chronicler makes one mistake. This fact happened not after Stepanoz II was Eristavi, not Stepanoz I. Nerse – not Adarnese - was the first Eristavi among the Bakuriani. And the Byzantine emperor to raise Nerse Bakuriani to the Eristavi throne was Constantine 668-685 and not Herecle (Sanadze, Kartli on the Biarders of VII VIII Centuries. p. 17).

Ashot, the son of Aghasran mentioned on the list of Erismtavaris of Moktsevai Kartlisai, is the father of the great Ashot Kurapalate (died in 826). It is a fact that the author of the Shatverduli collection of X century, mixed him with Ashot Kurapalate by mistake, and added “Kurapalate” to his name in the text.

Here we would like to briefly touch on the issue of Agharnersian, the same Baghaghad (Bagrationi). Kartlis Tsovreba contains the following data on the father of Ashot Kurapalate Adarnase: “At the time there came one sovereign (Erismtavari Archil is implied) who was a relative of David Prophet. His name was Agharsane. He was the nephew of Aghasrane the Blind, whose father was the relative of Bagratonian and whom the Greeks crowned as the Erismtavari of the Armenian parts. He was taken captive to Klarjeti and subjugated there together with the sons of Guaram Kurapalate” (Kartlis Tskhovreba, 1942. p. 154).

The inscription on one of the manuscripts discovered on Sina Mountain by the expedition of the Institute of Manuscripts provides enough information to understand the above-given text.

The inscription reads: “when the blessed and great mampali Aghasrane – the son of Stepanoz, the nephew of Dimitri, the nephew of the great Guram - passed away and his blessed wife – Queen Latavra, the daughter of Stepanoz, sister of Aghsartan the mother of Bagratuniani and Kurapalate passed away on the 2 of January after twenty years, was buried in Jvari, St Mary, by the portion of her daughter and son (Aleksidze, 2002. p. 23-36).

While comparing the texts we can see that Agharsane, the father of Ashot Kurapalate, was the grandson of Adarnese the Blind (Aleksidze, 2002. p. 23-36). If we look at the chronology, the Adarnese Blind will appear as living in VII-VII centuries, a contemporary of Nerse Bakurisdze and his sons mentioned in the Moktsevai: Stepanoz, Ashot and Guaram should have been the contemporaries of Mir and Archil – the sons of Stepanoz. To be more precise, Adarnese, the father of Ashot Kurapalate and grandson of Aghasran the Blind, was the young contemporary of Archil. As for the word “father” , he was father as used to refer to Adarnese the Blind, in this case it stands for the person who started the family, the forefather, and not a real father. The insertion of Murvan the Deaf belongs to a later time. Otherwise, the two parts convey the same information. The forefather of Agharsane the Blind, the

grandfather of Agharsane the father of Ashot, a grandfather or the father of the grandfather, one of the representatives of the Armenian Bagratuni by Moktsevai Kartlisai the son of Baghdad came to Kartli with the sons of Guaram Kurapalate, to be more precise, the sons of Guaram: the Erismtavari of Kartli Stepanoz, his brother Demetre and the son of Stepanoz Agharsane, who were representatives (Sanadze, 2002. 18-19. pp. 41) of Baghdad-Bivriant in their turn and became the relative of Stepanoz by making his son marry Latavra, the daughter of Stepanoz. In this way, two branches of Baghadats: the Georgian Bivritiani and Armenian Bagratuni – merged into one. If the text of Kartli Tskhovreba uses the word “father” in a generic sense, to mean a forefather, the inscription of the Sina Mountain Manuscript uses the word “mother” in the same sense.

The respective part of Kartlis Tskhovreba was wrongly interpreted by Vardan, an Armenian historian of XIII century. He changed Adarnase the Blind, whom he was not informed about, to Ashot the Blind, whom he knew from history. Since, according to Kartlis Tskhovreba, Adarnase was the nephew of the person whose name was changed to Ashot the Blind (the list of Anas). The historian considered Vasak to be his father, based on simple calculations. I.e. he carried out scientific research and established a fact (Areveltsi, 2002. pp. 103, 106). Many of the modern historians repeated the mistake of Vardan. After the publication of the inscription of the Sina Manuscript, it became clear that this opinion was groundless.

All the above mentioned explains the family conflict that took place when the Erismtavari of Kartli (the son and her or Archil Erismtavri) Juansher married Latavra (the daughter of Aghsarane Bagrationi). The thing is that this branch of the offspring of Baghdad did not belong to royal family of Kartli Khosroian-Parnavazian, the same Sasanian-Parnavazian. Such were: 1. only the offspring of Vakhtang Gorgasali: the Bakuriani from Kakheti, 2. the Bivritian-Gorgasalian, the same offspring of Guaram Kurapalate in Klarjeti; 3. the offspring of Rev the son of Mirian – the Revians in Kakheti, who we believe were the same Ruvistavi or Rustaveli (Sanadze, *Kartlis Eristavebi...*p. 31). Shota Rustaveli (Beradze, Sanadze, 2003. p. 191) should be from the same family and last – 4 the Perozian. As for the sons of Baghdad, who became the relatives of Erismtavari Stepanoz by marriage and whose relation with him could be defined as feudal dependence, no doubt their position was lower than that of the Bakuriani, who led even in the other Parnavazian royal branch as the representatives of the senior branch.

Let us come back to the family of the Bakuriani again. Grigol, the nobleman of Kakheti, who fought Ashot for Shida Kartli and the honour of the Erismtavari of Kartli - should have been Bakuriani. What does this assump-

tion give us? First, as it has already been mentioned that the Bakuriani are a Kakhetian branch of the Parnavazian-Khosroians. Nerse, being the Erismtavari of Kakheti, ascends the throne of Kakheti. It is a fact that Kakheti remains their domain in the later period, too. (Let us recall the control over Kakheti by Archil Erismtavari – the grandson of Nesre I, Juansher - the son of the latter and the following Erismtavari). Both sons of Nesre pass away during his lifetime: Adarnase (called after his grandfather) – 783 and Philim - 784 (called after his uncle) (Aleksidze, p. 314). Z Aleksidze, the publisher of the Sina Monuscrip inscription, considers (Aleksidze, p. 314) them both Erismtavaris, for some reason. Yet, according to the manuscript, if a scholar does not have additional information, the note cannot be relied upon. Just the opposite, it is clear that the brothers did not have the honour of Erismtavari. Al Mahdi (775-785), angry with Nerse, deprived the family of the latter of the title of Erismtavari and conferred the title on the representative of the same family Stepanoz. Stepanoz was not only the nephew of Nerse but also the son of his cousin, too. We believe so as we consider Gurge - his father, the Eristavt-eristavi to be the grandson of Nerse. Of course, it is hard to say for sure from which specific family of the Bakuriani, a Kakhetian nobleman Grigol comes from. We can only make a conjecture in this case, too: we believe that he was the younger son of Nerse. 1. This was the first name in the family - a person was called Grigol for the first time. If we recall that Nerse had children who had the name of their father and his brother, presumably he called his young son the name of his father-in-law. We know that the nephew of the wife of Nesre was Grigol (Grigol Khandzteli) which is an indication that the name of Grigol's father-in-law was Grigol. Which family did Nerse's wife belong to, if her father's name was Grigol? It is obvious that Nerse would only have married a royal person. We only know one royal family where there was a name Grigol. This is the Revian, the same Ruvistavian family (Kartlis Tskhovreba, I. p. 159). In this way, the name Grigol appears in the Bakuriani family from the Revian family and the first person to have this name is the young son of Nerse Grigol Bakuriani who, after his family lost the Erismtavari title, was the Kakheti principal in VIII-IX centuries.

Later Tsanari Donauris take power away from Bakuriani-Bakurianisdzes in Kakheti. The former had the title Chorepiskopos. After that, the history of the Bakuriani family is not known for the following two centuries. They appear in sources again in the retinue of King Giorgi. This is Bakuriani, the father of Grigol Bakurianisdze, whom we have already mentioned above.

As we remember Grigol's father passed away early and Grigol's mother left him and his brother Abaz without an estate – She had given all the estate to her daughters as dowry. The husband of one of the daughters, Abaz, was

the brother of Aghsartan, according to Grigol. It is clear in the respective part of the text that Aghsartan was a famous person. This part does not need further elucidation. The only person who would correspond to the description is Aghsartan - the King of Kakheti, the son of Gagik, and the grandson of David - the great king of Tashir-Dzorageti. If this assumption is right, the relatives of Grigol on his sister's side were the Kvirikian of Tashir-Dzorageti and Kakheti. This clarifies who the people, referred to by Grigol as his relatives "of Armenian faith", actually were. Here, we would like to remember one more note that Grigol Bakurianisdze provides about himself. "Me too, with my servants and rudunebi, was looking for a living place in Armenia, in Georgia and Sasarkinozeti (Muslim World) and later in Greece" (Shanidze, *Georgian Monastery in Bulgaria...* p. 101 (8-9)). As we can see Grigol served in Armenia and later in Georgia before serving in Greece, i. e. the Caesar of Byzantium. Which Armenia does he imply in this case? From 1021 the Kingdom of Vaspurakan was a part of Byzantium. Byzantium joined in the Kingdom of Shirak formally from 1041 and *de facto* from 1045 (after the captivation of Gagik). Thus, for a man born in about 1026-1027 the only Armenia (not counting the Kingdom of Vananda, which, however, is not referred to as Armenia by Georgian sources and hence, Georgian of the historical period in question) where a teenager of 17-18 could have started serving in 1043-1044 and also referred to Georgians as the Armenians of this Kingdom, could have been Shatir-Dzorageti. In reality, Gagik (1037 – 1058), the son of David Umitsatsklo (990 – 1048) ruled over the United Kingdom of Kakheti and Hereti at that time and it would not have been difficult for a representatives of the Kakhetian family to gain a good position and the due honour at the court of the father-king.

## References

Комнина, Аннаю. (1965). *Алексиада*. Вступительная статья, перевод, комментарий Я. Н. Любарского, М. р. 465.

Ломоури, Н. (1981). *К Истории Грузинского Петрицонского Монастыря*. Тб., р.16.

Марр, Н. (1906). *Аркауи, Монгольское Название Христиан в Связи с Вопросом об Армианах-халкедонитах*, ВВ, XII, 1-2, р. 18-25.

Грабар, А. (1922). *Болгарские Церкви-грабницы*, ИБАИ, I, pp. 121-122;

Успенски, Ф. (1948). *История Византийской Империи III*, М. -Л., р. 75. Hans Georg Beck. (1959). *Kirich und Theologische literatur im bizantinischen reich*, Munchen. p. 218.

Petit, L. (1904). *Typicon de Gregoire Paeurianos Pour le Monastere de*

Petrizos (Backovo) en Bulgaria, *Византийский Временник. Приложение к XI т. N 1.*

*Le Nouveau Manuscrit Georgien Sinaïtique N sin 50.* (2001). Edition en Fac-simile, Introduction par Z. Aleksidze, Traduite du georgien par J. P. Mahe, Corpus Christianorum orientaliū, vol. 586, subsidia tomus 108, Lovanii. pp.82-83.

Andre Protitch. (1923). *Guide a travers la Bulgaria Sofia.* p. 17; E. Honigmann. (1953). *Die Ostgrenze des bizantinischen Reiches,* Bruxelles. p. 222.

Мурадян П. М. (1968). К вопросу об Оценке Греческой и Грузинской Редакции „типика“ Григория Бакуриана, *Историко-филологический журнал, Ереван, №1.* pp. 103-118.

*Типик Григория Пакуриана,* (1978). введение, перевод и комментарий В.А. Арутюновой-Фиданян.

შანიძე ა. (1971). *ქართველთა მონასტერი ბულგარეთში და მისი ტიპიკონი.* თბილისი. pp. 21-40; 61, 61, 71, 101, 116, 123, 126.

შანიძე ა. (1979). პეტრიწონის მონასტრის მაშენებელი გრიგოლ ბაკურიანის ძე. *მნათობი N 1,* pp. 173-180

გოზალაშვილი გ. (1970). გრიგოლ ბაკურიანის-ძე. *მნათობი N 2.* pp. 167-192.

მენაბდე ლ. (1980). *ძველი ქართული მწერლობის ძეგლები. II.* თბილისი. pp. 253-276.

გეორგიკა. (1963). V p. 46; VI, p. 60.

ორბელიანი, სულხან-საბა. (1991). *ლექსიკონი ქართული,* I. თბილისი. pp. 360-361.

*ქართლის ცხოვრება.* (1955). თბილისი. p. 285, 383.

დრასხანაკრეტელი, იოანე. (1937). *სომხეთის ისტორია.* თარგმანი, შენიშვნები, საძიებელი - ილია აბულაძე. p. 14

სანაძე, მ. (2000). ქართლი VII-VIII საუკუნეების მიჯნაზე (პოლიტიკური ისტორიიდან). *მესხეთი (ისტორია და თანამედროვეობა),* ახალციხე. pp. 15-23;

ალექსიძე, ზ. (2001). აბო თბილელის მარტვილობის თარიღი და მასთან დაკავშირებული ქართლის ერისმთავართა ქრონოლოგია, *მრავალთავი. XIX.* გვ. 311-315.

ერისმთავარი მირი და არჩილი და “ქართლის ცხოვრება.” (2001). *საქართველოს საპატრიარქო. N 4.* p. 64

*ძველი ქართული აგიოგრაფია.* I. p. 97.

სანაძე, მ. (15 მაისი, 2003). “მოქცევაი ქართლისაი” ერთი ადგილის გაკვებისათვის საუნივერსიტეტო სამეცნიერო კონფერენციის თეზისები.

ქართლის ერისმთავრები VI-VIII საუკუნეებში. (2003, 27-30 მაისი) *ექვთიმე თაყაიშვილის ხსოვნისადმი მიძღვნილი სესიის მოკლე შინაარსები.* pp. 31-34.

*ქართლის ცხოვრება, I.* p. 241, 242.

სანაძე, მ. *ქართლი VII-VIII საუკუნეების მიჯნაზე.* p. 17.

ქართლის ცხოვრება, ანა დედოფლის ნუსხა. (1942). By Simon Kaukhishvili, Tbilisi, p.154.

ალექსიძე, ზ. (2002). უძველესი ცნობა ბაგრატიონთა დინასტიის შესახებ. *ისტორიული ფილოლოგიის კრებული*. თბილისი. pp. 6; 23-36.

სანაძე, მ. (2002). ბაგრატიონთა წარმოშობის საკითხისათვის (ლევნდა და სინამდვილე). ოთარ გიგინეიშვილის დაბადების 85 წლისადმი იძღვნილი სამეცნიერო კონფერენციის მასალები. pp. 18-19, II, p. 41. თბილისი.

არეველცი, ვარდან, *მსოფლიო ისტორია*. (2002). Translated from old Armenian by Nodar Shoshiashvili and Eka Kvachantiradze; Introduction, comments and search system by Eka Kvachantiradze. p. 103, 106.

სანადზე, მ. *ქართლის ერისმთავრები VII-VIII საუკუნეებში*. p. 31.

ბერაძე, თ., სანაძე, მ. (2003). საქართველოს ისტორია, I. *ანტიკური ხანა და შუა საუკუნეები*. p. 191.

ალექსიძე, ზ. აბო თბილელის მარტვილობის თარიღი. p. 314.

*ქართლის ცხოვრება*, I. p. 159.

Մաթեոս Ուրխաճեցի. (1898). “ժամանակագրութիւն,” *Վարդապետ*. p. 148.