

Towards Understanding of the Georgian-Armenian Relations

Georgians and Armenians, the most ancient representatives of the Caucasian civilization, are connected through long history of relationship. The leaders of these nations have always comprehended the value of each other and did their best to strengthen the versatile connections, dictated by the course of their lives. It is significant that in the Middle Ages the Georgian historiography elaborated the theory of common origin of the Caucasian peoples. An original solution of this question how could the Caucasian people find common sense, one can find in the work of the famous Georgian historian - Leonti Mroveli. This was the phenomenon that Korneli Kekelidze meant, when he noted that: "the idea of brotherhood of the peoples of the Transcaucasia, particularly of Georgians and Armenians, was a progressive idea, which played an important beneficial role in the further history of these peoples."⁴⁴ The necessity of studying of the past of Georgia and Armenia in interconnection was first noted by famous Kartvelologist Mari Brosse. To enrich the basis of the Georgian historical documents, from the 1860s he started studying of the Armenian sources. As a result he translated and published 12 Armenian sources, studied in detail the old Armenian literature, the monuments of the Armenian material cultural, Armenian numismatics, sphragistics, etc., and afterwards held special researches in the field of these subjects. Generally, he dedicated last two decades of his life to investigation of the problems of Armenian studies. Such a deep education allowed him to examine substantially the historical relationships of Georgians and Armenians and, in the essays he paid a special attention to studying and analyzing of the materials gathered in the area of Akhpat-Sanaian and adjacent territories, which were the places of Armenian-Georgian meeting. Thus, academician Mari Brosse was

⁴⁴ K. Kekelidze, *Etudes from the History of Old Georgian Literature*, III, Tbilisi, 1955, 107

ns, the issue of religious unity or schism of Georgians and
ns considerably depended on whether Georgians would hold with
ern – Persian or western – Greco-Roman Christian religious
and ideology. In comparison with political orientation, dogmatic
nal elements of the conflict seemed to be a miner issue.⁴⁵

nt for conquest of Kartli in IX-X cc. gradually acquired common-
n significance. About involvement of the Armenian rulers into
Ivane Javakhishvili wrote: "If up to now only the Georgian rulers
each other, since this moment, the involvement of the Armenians
the boundaries and the scale of the fight. If previously the fight
osed to determine the Georgian sovereign, who would become the
Georgia, since now, the fight could determine who should become
of Georgia and Armenia, i.e. of the entire Caucasia. Kartli was the
he country and it was extremely important for the political future
f the rulers to conquer this place."⁴⁶

second quarter of the XIII c. when the Transcaucasia became the
permanent invasions of the nomad tribes, the qualitatively new
ted in the relationships between Georgia and Armenia, especially
V c. Torn apart from Georgia and placed within hostile
ent, Armenia becomes the part of various political unions of the
and that's why the pattern of social development so resembles to
ns of the foreign oppressors, without prospect to retain the
links with Georgia. But, at the same time, aggravated political
makes Armenia to restore the lost links with Georgia for the sake
onal interests. In accordance to the changed political conditions,
is of relationships established, developing in parallel with the
of the of the Georgian state. The leadership of Georgians in the
iberation becomes absolutely natural, at least due to the fact that
eriod Georgian is the only country in the South Caucasia able to

Javakhishvili, *The History of the Georgian Nation*, vol. I, Tbilisi, 1928, 355.

Javakhishvili, *The History of the Georgian Nation*, vol. II, Tbilisi, 1948, 48.