

## IVANE JAVAKHISHVILI AND THE CAUCASUS STUDY

*R. V. Metreveli*

*National Academy of Sciences. Tbilisi, Georgia*  
science-almanac@mail.ru

Outstanding Georgian public figure Ivane Javakhishvili was a highly miscellaneous scientist. He left rather rich heritage and was a founder of a new stage in historical studies development. Ivane Javakhishvili could raise Georgian historiography to the level of world science of his time. Ivane Javakhishvili as a true scientist considered Georgia history to be studied against the background of Caucasian and world history and required to reflect the role of Georgian people in the process of historical development. The scientist was sure that historical way of Georgian people was closely connected with history of other people and considered that the real perception of our history was possible on the ground of deep research of historical background. Study of Caucasian people history, their life and living conditions and also history of country, material culture, linguistic affinity or distinctness – is an essential condition without which research of Georgia history is unconceivable.

Key words: history, Georgia, Ivane Javakhishvili, territory, language, linguistics.

Ivane Javakhishvili created a miscellaneous and broad source studies base. Besides narrative sources he attached supreme importance to artefacts and also to archaeological, ethnographical, folk materials and language peculiarities. He studied in detail existent sources of Georgia history in Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Armenian and other languages, that is why Ivane Javakhishvili was an author of considerable writings in the sphere of source studies and Caucasian people history. In the result of his tireless, hard scientific work Ivane Javakhishvili created and made history of Georgian nation, economical history of Georgia, history of Georgian justice, history of Georgian music, historical geography of Georgia, history of Georgian historical literature as a property of the society; he researched and was able to implicate branch historical disciplines into scientific frames (palaeography, numismatics and etc.). The scientist brought a significant contribution in the case of Caucasian people history study. In the researches Ivane Javakhishvili occasionally touched upon questions on Caucasian Albania history. He analyses these questions in the unified Caucasian context, in connexion with Georgia boundaries and also with social and political questions.

And that is why an interest of Ivane Javakhishvili to Caucasian Albania is clear and justified. This was one the most primordial and earliest class government on the east of Caucasus. It covered the territory from the small highland Caucasioni, i.e. from the lower streambed of rivers Araxa and Kury to the north-east section of Caucasioni crest and from Caspian Sea before lowers of Iori-Alazani, to boundaries of Iberian kingdom. In Georgian sources it is mentioned in the form of “Alvaniya”. A plural population lived there: the Albanians, Gargariets, Gelas, Legy, Geras, Sugi and others. Albanian Language refers to Ibero-Caucasian group of languages. The moon was a supreme divinity for Albanians according to their pantheistic, pagan idea. Ivane Javakhishvili pays significant attention to this and considers the moon cult to be always important for Caucasian population. In antique period the west part of Albania came under the influence of Iberia politics and culture. Catholicos managed autocephaly of Albanian Christian church. It is important to mention that Albanian literature was created in V century. Since VII-VIII centuries the west Albania (Gereti, Shavikho) entered into the composition of Georgian prince Archila possession (the first part of VIIIc.). Thereafter Gereti practically was a Georgian principality and was managed by representatives of Bagration dynasty. In XII century after the Seljuks invasion one significant part of Albanian population came to Kakhetiya population and the rest part migrated to the other people of Caucasus (the Dagestani, the Armenians of Nagorny Karabakh, the Azerbaijani).

Ivane Javakhishvili gives the Strabon reference about the Albanians confession and considers their views to be definitely similar with the famous Kakhetian St. George. “St. George takes the

place of an ancient supreme divinity of Georgian-moon paganism in the consciousness of Georgian people” [2, p. 90]. Greek geographer and historian Strabon points to the fact that the “Albanians worshiped the Sun, Zeus and the Moon as a God”. Ivane Javakhishvili points at the fact that one part of Albania was populated by the Georgians. The scientist considers that the cathedral which according to Strabonis is situated on the boundary of Iberia possibly could be in Kakhetiya”.

Ivane Javakhishvili compares in detail the holiday of Tetri Giorgoba with the reference of Strabon and sees a remarkable resemblance in it and emphasizes that this tradition has not changed during XIX centuries. The scientist mentions the Georgians-Christian, the Armenians and the Albanians in several contexts. Ivane Javakhishvili in his creative work gives a great attention to the questions of history and life of the North Caucasian people. The scientist analyzed a lot of questions connected with Caucasian languages in his major work “The original nature and relationship of Georgian and Caucasian languages”. The mentioned monography was conceived by author as an introduction in history of the Georgian people.

Ivane Javakhishvili first of all was a historian and he analysed linguistic questions resting on researches of the other scientists. But soon the scientist ascertained himself that a lot of things required a deeper research, that’s why he tackled the problem with diligence. Ivane Javakhishvili wrote: “First of all consideration of problems; analysis of the language material gave me a chance to see such an ancient property of Georgian language structure, existence of which in the Georgian language I could not imagine... It turned out that very often we did not suspect about presence of roots where they actually were. Consequently, such situation was formed in the North-Caucasian languages where grammatical gender was absent as in Georgian so in Kartvelian languages” [5, p. 12-13]. Ivane Javakhishvili achieved significant results in the language problems research. He demurely noticed that these questions were dictated by necessity to find out and resolve historical problems.

Ivane Javakhishvili in details studied the existent literature about Georgian-Kartvelian, so called Caucasian languages. Multilingualism of Caucasian people was known since the old days. Greek and Roman historians paid attention to this fact. This phenomenon was also well known for Georgian historians. The famous Vaxhushti Bagrationi knew this phenomenon pretty well. Anton Catholicos considerably contributed to research of Georgian and Caucasian languages. Georgian grammar composed by Italian Mario Majo printed in 1643 in Rome did not avoid observation of Ivane Javakhishvili. Resting on Georgian-Italian dictionary published in Rome in 1629 (it was the first printed Georgian book), outstanding philosopher Leibnitz expressed about affinity of Georgian and Greek language. Professor A. Tsagareli thought that an attempt of the scientists who did not know the Georgian Language did not give considerable results [4]. Marii Therein Brosse who perfectly could speak Georgian language and used sources in an excellent way showed up among European scientists. Ivane Javakhishvili marked that Brosse and Bopp considered the Georgian language to be Indo-European, Max Muller – a distant degenerated relative of Turanian language group, but Klaport, Pott, Lepsiur, Fr.Muller and Shpigel considered the Georgian to be a separate language [4, p.5].

At the end of XVIII century Johann Anton Gyuldenshtedt composed a shorter dictionary of Georgian, Mingrel, Svan and Chan words. Klaport during his travel over the Caucasus and Georgia gathered the same language material and published in the form of dictionary in German Language (Anhang zur Reise in Kaukasus und Georgien 1812-14), and also in French language. The writing of G.Rozen about Laz language was published in 1884 “Uber das Mingrelische, Suanische und Abchasische” about Mingrel, Svan and Abkhazian languages. Contribution of M. Brosse in the field of scientific Kartvelology and problems connected with it, in particular, in the sphere of Caucasian studies is invaluable. Actually he was the first person who implemented European science in Caucasus and Georgia in particular. The Georgian-Armenian department was founded under his direction in the St. Petersburg University. From the linguistic point of view the development of Kartvelology and Caucasian studies is connected with the name of Alexander Tsagareli. He published an extremely interesting research “Relative review of Caucasian languages Iberian group morphology” which appeared to be a certain contribution in research of this problem [27].

In study of Georgian and Kartvelian languages Ivane Javakhishvili attaches a significance importance to the works of German linguist Hugo Shukhard (Graz). Ivane Javakhishvili thought that Shukhard significantly contributed to the research of Kartvelology and the general Caucasian studies. Therewith the scientist was upset by the fact that very soon his German colleague lost an interest to research of Caucasian languages and respectively to this sphere [5, p. 9]. According to Ivane Javakhishvili (and it's really like this) the rise of Caucasian (and in particular Georgian) linguistics is connected with activity of N. Marr. In 1888 he published an essay "Nature and property of Georgian language" ("Iveria" №86). In 1908 research of N. Marr "The basic tables to the grammar of an Ancient-Georgian language with a preliminary report about Georgian and Semitic connection" was published (publishing department of Oriental languages out of series). According to conclusion of Ivane Javakhishvili N. Marr "raised a level of Georgian and Armenian philology to the level of west-European" [5, p. 9]. Ivane Javakhishvili noticed that N. Marr began actively study Caucasian languages. N. Marr published an essay "Japhetic origin of Abkhazian connection terms". N. Marr also dedicated some other essays to Abkhazian language, and then he began studying Dagestan languages and significantly contributed to this matter.

Ivane Javakhishvili particularly marked the role of above mentioned Guldenshtadt in the study of the North Caucasian (including nonliterate) languages. Guldenshtadt published "Glossary for comparison of widespread Caucasian languages". The first place is taken by Kartvelian languages (Georgian, Mingrel, Svan), the second – Chechen, Ingush, (Gligsk) and Tushinsk (Tsovsk) dialects; the third – Lak and dialects related to it, Charsk Avar and Dido; the fourth, fifth, sixth - Kazikumukhsk, Andean and Akushsk, the seventh, eighth – Kabardian and Abkhazian languages; there Abkhazian is called as "Abassk".

Despite some mistakes Ivane Javakhishvili highly appreciated labour of Guldenshtadt. It is remarkable that German scientist (as the Georgians) uses the term "Kisti" as a general name for the Chechens and their country he calls as Kisteti. Along with it he notices that different tribes inhabiting Chechnia- Kisteti speak different dialects, but all of them indisputably descended from one general language and that are people of different tribes can understand each other.

Ivane Javakhishvili marked that Leonty Lule (French man, executive in Russia) who had composed Russian-Circassian dictionary showed helplessness in grammatical part, but at the same time Ivane Javakhishvili positively appreciated his articles on ethnography concerning the North Caucasian people. These are: 1. "The general view to the countries occupied by the Circassians (the Adygeis), the Abkhazians (Azega) and other mountain people who are contiguous with them". 2. "About Natuhazhts, Shapsugs, Abadzekhs". 3. "Faiths, religious ceremonies and prejudices of the Circassians". 4. Institutions and folk-customs of Shapsugs and Natuhazhts"<sup>1</sup>.

Ivane Javakhishvili paid attention to the monography of Shifner "Versuh uder das Awarische" (an effort of Avar language) [30]. He also highly appreciated activity of baron P. Uslar in the sphere of Caucasian languages research (in particular the experience of comparative study of these languages and revelation of their peculiarities) and considered it as a new step forward. After Uslar L.Lopatinsky who published the Kabardian legends, "Brief Kabardian grammar" and Russian-Kabardian dictionary reanimated interest to Caucasian people and languages lost in some degree [25].

Ivane Javakhishvili expressed a high opinion according to works of German scientist A. Dir: Udi grammar [13], Grammatical essay about Tabasaran language [8], Brief grammatical essay about Andean language [9], Aghul language [7], Archibulsk language [7], materials for study of Ando-Dido group of languages and dialects [10], Rutulurisk language [11], Tsakhur language [12], Ubihs language [29].

After considering results of Caucasian study linguistic sphere historical development research Ivane Javakhishvili again touched the contribution of N.Marr in linguistics and showed the transformation which was experienced by considerations and views of the scientist that was reflected on his works, in 1916 he came to the point: Caucasian languages research gave a chance to emphasize

---

<sup>1</sup> L.Lule published these four letters in 1927

the fourth peculiar linguistic family, Japhetic which has no connection with Ariaeuropean family nor with Turkish family but it has blood relationships with a Semitic family of these languages. This relationship is so close that the founder of this theory, the author of real lines originally and during the long time practically up to 1910, supposed that Somatic languages with Japhetic and Hamitic languages comprised only three branches in the general linguistic family. Perhaps it will be so in course of time, but presently the structure of Japhetic languages has enlarged so much that one should divide them in two large branches and unite them in one independent family – Japhetic” [20, p. 11-12].

In 1922 N.Marr erected a proposition about that “...Among numerous languages of Caucasus there are tribal and national languages from the point of view of their social importance...Georgian language...national language...this is a language of the Caucasian community on the significant territory of Caucasus... the big part of the Ossetians on the south slope of the Caucasian mountains, the famous layers of Abkhazian people, all settled Armenians inside Georgia and also some part of the Lezgins and mainly Dido and the Turks speak Georgian...” [21, p. 13-14].

Ivane Javakhishvili scrupulously contemplated learning of N. Marr, his attempts of Caucasian languages study and drew conclusion that original structure and affinity of Georgian, Kartvelian and Caucasian languages and also the problem of their origin stayed undecided [5, p. 76]. Considering mistaken belief of N. Marr about Semitic relationship of Kartvelian languages, Japhetic theory, in particular, the right direction of research was complicated.

The great merit in Caucasian research development belongs to Tbilisi state university named after Ivane Javakhishvili where study of Georgian and Kartvelian languages and also, besides Caucasian languages and culture, study of close Oriental languages began after the date of foundation. This was a creative work of Ioseb Kipshidze, Akaki Shanidze and Giorgi Akhvediani. Hereafter, Arnold Chikobava, Varlam Topuria and Simon Janashia joined them. Ivane Javakhishvili emphasized especially active development of Caucasian studies in 30-es. From this side the research of the professor L. Zhirkov about Avar [14], Dargulsk [15] and other Caucasian languages [16] is considered to be interesting. The scientist also paid attention to the works on Caucasian studies of A. Genko, A. Shor, I. Zarubin, R. Mikeilan, R. Blaikhshtainer, Franz Tsorel, Gerhard Deeters, René Lafont, Hans Vogt, N. Troubetzkaya, I. Korst [5]. Thanks to his significant researches Ivane Javakhishvili takes an especial place in the development of scientific Armenology. From the very beginning Ivane Javakhishvili attached a huge importance to the Armenian sources as for studying of Caucasus history in general so specifically for the history of Georgia. The scientist considered Georgia and Armenia as a unified historico-cultural world and saw the general regularity in socio-economic development of the West Europe and Transcaucasia.

The book of Ivane Javakhishvili “Political system of an ancient Georgia and ancient Armenia” (SBR,1905) attracted a special attention. Thank to the new research methods and received results the labor appeared to be a greatly significant contribution to the case of the scientific research of ancient Armenia general development. The mentioned essay served as an impact for the following studying of government and legal history of Armenia [26].

On the ground of critical analysis of sources which were at the disposal of the scientist (primarily Armenian sources) the significance of separate terms of government and law was determined, ancient Armenian universities were explored and matched with similar universities of other (neighboring) countries. Ivane Javakhishvili successively proves the process of primordial structure institutions reformation in public institutions by the example of process “tanuter” development. In the famous period this post was devoided of democratic content characterized for patrimonial structure, selectiveness was abrogated and seniority system in family was also broken. And even people for these positions were appointed by the tzar. Actually tanuters (leaders of the family line) turned into rulers of certain political and territorial units. We deal with the changing of social character which conditioned turning of tanuter into ivshkhan (prince) or turning of a senior into prince [6].

It is remarkable that on the 18<sup>th</sup> of November 1902 Ivane Javakhishvili read the lecture where resting on the sources he contested untrue views to the history of Armenia, in particular the point of view about insufficient degree of an ancient society development of East in general and of Armenia

in particular. The scientist demonstrated the high level of Armenian society development. Actually this thesis was reflected in work “Political system of ancient Georgia and ancient Armenia” of Ivane Javakhishvili. Professor N.Marr highly appreciated this work: “Question formulation purely scientific deserves attention: G. Javakhov absolutely ignores the national prejudices, raises a question not only out of national, but also out of traditionally-scientific ideas. One cannot greet one of the extremely significant consequences of such really scientific case position, and mainly joint study of Armenian and Georgian materials...” [16] The meaning of Ivane Javakhishvili research was especially marked by Armenian historians [19, 22]. One should mention the high estimation of Russian historian professor A. Novoseltsev: “Merit of Ivane Javakhishvili in this early, but still famous book was establishment of potential relation of Transcaucasia social system as in antiquity so in early Middle Ages with social system of European countries. An effort of general regularities revelation in socioeconomic development of Europe and Transcaucasia is also interesting” [23, p.22].

Ivane Javakhishvili as a privatdocent of Armenian-Georgian department of Oriental languages faculty of St. Petersburg University (1902-1917) read a special course on Armenology along with Georgian history disciplines: “City organization of Anasi according to the inscriptions” [24]. Ivane Javakhishvili extracted and prepared Georgian inscription of 1288 for print on the south wall of the Georgian church in Anasi. In summer 1911 Ivane Javakhishvili purposely visited diggings in Anasi which were led by N.Marr (A. Vruir, N. Sychev, N. Okunev, S. Poltaratsky and G. Gapatsyants collaborated with him). In the Tbilisi University scientist also read the special course “Ancient Armenian historical literature” (was published as a separate book in 1935). Ivane Javakhishvili more than once was a reviewer and opponent of dissertations in the sphere of Armenology which were defended in the St. Petersburg University<sup>1</sup>. Every review and performance of Ivane Javakhishvili was important for Armenological sciences.

The work of Ivane Javakhishvili “One page of peasant movement in ancient Armenia” published in 1922 (later its Armenian translation of L. Meliksed-Bega was published in 1936) was reflected in the essay of Armenian historian Stephen Orbeliani “The history of Sivnieti”, where a row of primary materials reflecting Armenia domestic position of X century which nobody knew till that time was described. Resting on this source Ivane Javakhishvili reconstructed examples of political and internally-political fight of Armenia in X century. The scientist showed that there we deal with from on one side a furious struggle between spiritual and secular feudal lords; on the other side both these layers lead fight with peasants. The reason of this fight was economical that actually determined relations of different social layers [19, p. 50].

Some questions of Armenian history were analyzed in the essay of Ivane Javakhishvili “History of social fight in Georgia in IX-XIII centuries”, where instances of fights between Anasi church individuals and population (parishioners) were represented on the back of derived things in Georgia. The reason of fight was also economical – church payment increase.

On the whole one should say that the results of general Caucasian and particularly Armenian studies researches are clearly seen in scientist fundamental investigations. He conscientiously and scrupulously researched Armenian sources – Movses Khorenatsi, Lazarus Parpetsi, M. Kalankatvatsi, Agathangelosi, John Dsaskhanakertetsi, Ukhtanesi, Stefanoz Taronatsi, Mateos Urhaetsi, Vardani, Steph noza Orbelyan and others. They became the objects of critical investigation of Ivane Javakhishvili, the results of which are widely used for different problems investigation. The contribution of scientist to ancient Armenian historical literature studying is huge [1]. Ivane Javakhishvili critically explored Armenian martyrological memorials and gave them the corresponding mark es-

---

<sup>1</sup> Ter-Movsesian M. The history of Bible translation to Armenian language. St. Petersburg, 1902; Khalatyants G. Armenian arcashidi in “the history of Armenia” of Moses Khorenskogo. Moscow, 1903; Alonts N. Armenia under the epoch of Justinian St. Petersburg, 1908; Meliksed-Bega L. Adviseres of the North Armenians and their personality in connexion with questions of Armenian-Georgian relations (an attempt of historic-literary). Tbilisi, 1928; Garibyan A. Unknown dialects of Armenian language. Erevan, 1940.

pecially when the question was about Christianity spreading in Transcaucasia and also Georgian and Armenian alphabets. The deep analysis of historical literature led the scientist to conclusion that hagiographical memorials did not remain their original appearance; with the course of time the changing of political situation conditioned the alteration of their content. This corresponded to the society interest that was really reflected in these pieces of work.

The real picture of the past was represented in the work of Ivane Javakhishvili "History of church abruption between Georgia and Armenia in early XV century" [18]. The scientist studied prerequisites of the church conflict existing in political life of Armenia, paid attention to its development and brought to light the reason of its emergence. Ivane Javakhishvili considered political orientation as basic reason of the church conflict. Dogmatic and national sides of the conflict were comparatively insignificant. The scientist considered this abruption "to be depended on the fact of Georgia adjoining to the Eastern, Persian church tradition and learning or to the West, Greek-Roman Christianity" [3, p.424]. Ivane Javakhishvili studying the Georgian economical history contemplated the problems of the whole Caucasus; he studied Armenian terms connected with agriculture; researched Georgian arable terms in comparison with arable terms of the other countries (generally of Caucasus); he paid a special attention to arable tools of the Armenians living in Transcaucasia and Osmania, he gave the analysis of arable tool terms of the Armenians and "the Tatars". On the ground of sources studying Ivane Javakhishvili characterized winegrowing of Armenia and also difference in sort titles of grapes of the Armenians and the Turks and represented classification of these titles.

Questions about historical geography of Armenia were also included into science focus of interest. The point of view of L. Inchichiani, L. Alishini, I. Markvart and A. Manandyan in this direction was already known. In 1919 Ivane Javakhishvili published the research "Georgian boundaries studied from historical and modern points of view", where the scientist touched problems of historical geography. Speaking about the south boundary Ivane Javakhishvili noted that Georgia played for Armenia "the role of government-protector and refuge" (p. 23-34); the scientist concentrated his attention on migration character of the Armenians in XVIII-XIX centuries. (p. 29-32). Speaking about the south-eastern boundaries Ivane Javakhishvili touched upon subjects: "Palakatsio or Abotsi and this line boundary of Georgia" (p. 35-36); the population Tao-Ispiri in an ancient time and in VIII-XII centuries (p. 36-37); "migration of the Armenians in Meskhet-Javakheti" (p.39-42, 44-45) and etc.

We again refer to N. Marr: "It is clearly and valuable that G. Javakhov brings together the events of Armenian and Georgian social life, vividly demonstrates utility and involuntarily originated from this necessity of Armenian and Georgian past conjoint research, essentially representing only separate stages or concurrent flows of the same history" [16, 17].

As we can see, Ivane Javakhishvili contributed to the development of the scientific Armenology and enlargement of Caucasian studies research area. Ivane Javakhishvili taking stocks of the executed work on Caucasian studies research noticed that a large sum of material was gathered and a significant number of this direction researches just impressed. The scientist set a goal to solve the problem of an original nature and affinity of Georgian and Caucasian languages. Ivane Javakhishvili pretty well understood that affinity of languages was confirmed not only with identical structure and similarity but also understood that uniqueness of word roots should be recorded there. On the ground of regular sound combination the scientist meant phonetic change of lexical fund in this or that language, in particular the environment when acquisition of each separate word descended from neighboring, political and culturally dominating unrelated and allogenic nations. This from its side moves away roots of daughter languages from each other. We should mention that Ivane Javakhishvili considered impossible that daughter languages in lexical fund had no general root stock, on the basis of it the scientist along with the questions of grammatically-structural affinity of Georgian and Caucasian languages analyzed their lexical affinity. Ivane Javakhishvili divided Caucasian languages into three groups: 1. North West Group (Abkhazian, Ubykh, Adygei or Circassian and Kabardian languages; 2. Chechen, Ingush or Kisti (Nor.Caucasus), Tsovska or Batsi (in Georgia); 3. Gelsky or lagsky i.e. language of leks (gilgvi, gligvi).

The first group of languages he called Sindsk (in this way the Greek geographers called the north-west tribes), the second – gilgursk, the third – legursk [3, p. 96-97]. Ivane Javakhishvili analysed all the basic questions of an original structure of Kartvelian and Sindo-Gilgo-legur Albanian languages. The sound structure of Kartvelian and Caucasian languages, the morphology basic problems of Caucasian and Georgian-Kartvelian languages, the question about gender grammatical category in Georgian and Caucasian languages, the question about gender grammatical category according to the works of ancient Georgian translators and scientists, the general Georgian and Kartvelian languages (Mingrelian, Chan, Svan) numerals; Kartvelian-Sindi-gilgsky, Leko-Albanian pronouns, lexical affinity of Kartvelian-Gilgo-Sindo-Leko-Albanian languages and etc. In the result of research and analysis of pretty large scientific material Ivane Javakhishvili arrived at a following conclusion:

1. The original structure of Georgian-Kartvelian and Sindsk languages so as Gilgo-Leko-Albanian languages greatly changed in the course of time (therewith the scientist drew conclusion that the original structure of these languages and roots of an ancient lexical fund appeared to be obviously related). 2. In the course of centuries political, economical, cultural and social changes were very strong and this process distanced the daughter languages so that this independence of languages outwardly turned them into remote groups. 3. Distant relatives of the Georgians, Sindo-Gilgo-Leko-Albanians were blood fraternal tribes and till the certain time besides the daughter language they had general culture [3, p. 622]. Ivane Javakhishvili emphasized that an original affinity of Georgian-Sindo-Gilgo-Leko-Albanians was confirmed not only with linguistic analysis but with an ancient historico-geographical and ethnological data.

On account of different circumstances fraternal nations and tribes moved away from each other, economical, political and cultural factors contributed to this. According to Ivane Javakhishvili and in pursuance of general language qualities the Georgian phenomenon to which not only Georgian, but also Mingrelo-Chan- Svan languages had entered was the brightest of all. The circumstance that these languages had equally lost their gender categories, but their structure and morphological elements remained led the scientist to the thought that these phenomena (alterations) occurred simultaneously [3, p. 623].

Ivane Javakhishvili marked two stages in history of Georgian and Kartvelian languages development. The first (ancient) stage was determined at the period when grammatical gender categories appeared to be basic characteristic properties of language. The second stage originated at the period when grammatical gender categories disappeared and the new face of Georgian and Kartvelian languages was determined. Also as during language building, detachment of Georgian and Kartvelian languages happened on account of occurred alterations and other factors. Sindsk and Gilgo-Leko-Albanian languages detached at the same way [2, p. 623].

Conclusions of Ivane Javakhishvili are very valuable so far as connection of Caucasian people, affinity of their languages points to that political and cultural way which according to the scientist they have already passed. We should particularly mention a substantial contribution which belongs to Ivane Javakhishvili in the case of Caucasian people history research. One can distinctively see it in his works. The scientist paid a special attention to mutual relations of the Georgians and Armenians, Georgians and Albanians, Georgians and North-Caucasian people in the past. The scientist drew important conclusions therewith he actually promoted his scientific Caucasus studies – research of Caucasus history. After Ivane Javakhishvili Caucasus studies experienced the new further development, and this is an interesting process by itself. The question about Caucasian languages study or the research of Caucasus historical past is a progressive process.

Nowadays fruitful work on Caucasian studies as on science development, so as to promotion of it to higher stage is conducted in all countries of Caucasus. The number of scientists grew up, also collective works and interesting achievements appeared. Exactly against this background one can see the rich scientific heritage of the greatest scientist and public figure, one of founders of the scientific Caucasian studies Ivane Javakhishvili.

## References

1. Javakhishvili I. Ancient Armenian historical writing system. Tbilisi, 1935.
2. Javakhishvili I. The history of the Georgian nation. Collected edition in 12 volumes. Vol.1. Tbilisi, 1979.
3. Javakhishvili I. History of the Georgian language. Vol. 1. Tbilisi, 1979.
4. Javakhishvili I. On the grammatical structure of the Georgian language. St. Petersburg, 1873.
5. Javakhishvili I. Original nature and kindred of Georgian and Caucasus languages. Tbilisi, 1937.
6. Javakhov I. A. Political system of ancient Georgia and ancient Armenia. St. Petersburg, 1905.
7. Dirr. A. The Aghul language. CMDLTC. Vol. XXXVII. Tiflis, 1907.
8. Dirr. A. Grammar review of the Tabasaran language. CMDLTC. Vol. XXXV. Tiflis, 1906.
9. Dirr. A. Brief grammar review of the Andi language. CMDLTC. Vol. XXXVII. Tiflis, 1906.
10. Dirr. A. Materials for the study of languages and dialects of Andi-didoic group. CMDLTC. Vol. XL. Tiflis, 1909.
11. Dirr. A. The Rutul language. CMDLTC. Vol. XLII. Tiflis, 1912.
12. Dirr. A. The Tsakhur language. CMDLTC. Vol. XLIII. Tiflis, 1913.
13. Dirr. A. Udi grammar. CMDLTC. Vol. XXXIII. Tiflis, 1904.
14. Zhirkov L. The grammar of Avar language: The works of research subdivision of the North-Caucasian languages under the institute of orientalism. M., 1924.
15. Zhirkov L. Grammar of the Dargwa language. M., 1926.
16. The journal of national education Ministry. St. Petersburg, 1905. №5.
17. Eremyan S.T. Integrity of fates and culture and political community of the peoples of Transcaucasia in IX-XIII century // Caucasus and Byzantine. Vol.1. Erevan, 1979.
18. The news of Imperial Academy of sciences. St. Petersburg, 1908.
19. Maisuradze G. Ivane Javakhishvili – researcher of Armenian history. Matsne, 1976. №2.
20. Marr N. Caucasian studies and Abkhazian language // Journal of Ministry of national education, 1916.
21. Marr N. To the education of the modern Georgian language. Petrograd, 1922.
22. Meliksed-Beg L. Javakhishvili I. and Armenia study // Works of the Institute of AS of Georgia. Vol.3. Tbilisi, 1958.
23. Novoseltsev A.P. Ways of feudalism development. M., 1872.
24. Review of sciences teaching at the faculty of Oriental languages St. Petersburg University in the autumn semester of 1910 and spring semester of 1911. St. Petersburg, 1910.
25. Sourcebook for description of locality and tribes of Caucasus. № 12. Tiflisi, 1891.
26. Sukiasyan A.G. Socio-political system and law of Armenia under the early feudalism empire. Erevan, 1963.
27. Tsagareli A.A. Comparative review of Caucasian languages of Iberian group morphology. St.Petersburg, 1873.
28. The languages of Dagestan and their study. The news of the general investigation and study of Azerbaijan, M., 1927.
29. Adolf Dirr. Die Sprache der Ubichen // Caucasia.1927. № 4.
30. Memoires de l' Akademie imperiale des sciences de St-Petersburg. VII-e serie. Eome V. № 8.

---

*April, 19, 2015*