Oliver Reisner

Travelling between Two Worlds -
the Tergdaleulebi, their Identity Conflict and National Life

"Where is our nationality? We are under Russia. Now everything is destroyed, everything is changed. (…) In those days for evil or for good we belonged to ourselves, therefore, it was better. In those days the people were patriotic, their hearts were full of courage, men were men and women were women." a Georgian mountain dweller told a Georgian traveler in Ilia Chavchavadze's famous half-documentary "Notes of a Journey "[1], published in 1871. Chavchavadze, being one of the leading persons in the Georgian national movement described his feelings and anxieties before his return to Tbilisi in 1861 after studying abroad in St. Petersburg for four years. During the last stop in Vladikavkaz, a provincial town in Russia's North-Caucasian area, he recalls the final part of his journey home. [2]

In this paper I want to accompany this traveler, whose narrative gives a good impression of the change in the young nobility's identity in the process of becoming a national intelligentsia. This group of young Georgian intellectuals was attempting to modernize their fatherland, to lead it to 'national rebirth' and a 'new life'. Forming the nucleus of the Georgian nation they were also known as 'Tergdaleulebi', literally 'those, who have drunk the water from the river Terek'. The crossing of the river *Terek*, in Georgian *Tergi*, functions as a symbol of the geographical and cultural boundary between Russia and Georgia, which also became a mental boundary as the basis of a new national identity for those who crossed it returning from Russia. Therefore it also refers to the experience the previous generation of noble 'fathers' made while encountering Russia themselves for the first time some forty years earlier.[3]

By a close reading of the text I want to share their point of view and add some socio-historical information. However, I do not want to concentrate on social mobilization factors as a precondition for the change of identity here.[4]

Identity can be defined as a person's ability to experience and shape his life as a coherent or meaningful whole. It is caused by contact with other people or groups and it becomes complete when marked distinctions have arisen between them.[5] An identity crisis occurs when a break in a person's life history disrupts the perception of coherent totality, for example by entering a new environment with social aspirations or values and relations differing to a large extent from previous ones.[6]

As the title of this paper already implies, identities do not remain stable, unchanged entities. On the contrary, they change in form and function over time and differ in relation to their historical and spatial environments.[7] Every identity is an individual one. Based on personal experience it never merges totally with that of others, but develops within the framework of a distinct community's patterns of collective behavior and symbols. The individual moves within these defined structures and its finite limits.[8] My concern is: how do the dominant characteristics of individual identity change over time and within a certain community's shifting institutional settings?

The organizing principle of this paper will be that of "generations" as defined by the social scientist Karl Mannheim in the late 1920ies. A generation is connected by 1) a shared stratification of chronological and geographical traits (Generationenlagerung), 2) a coherence in the participation in a common fate (Generationenzusammenhang) and 3) the uniform perception of their experiences (Generationseinheit).[9]

Before returning to the above mentioned Tergdaleulebi, we will have to look at the first generation of Georgian noblemen born after Tsarist annexation of Eastern Georgia in 1801, who were trying to re-establish the lost Georgian monarchy in 1832. The third generation will represent the political groups developing in the 1880ies original Georgian parties after the turn of the century, the Marxist "third group" and Socialist-Federalist "young Iberians".

Change in the Georgian's world – socio–historical background of the Qazarmelebi in the 1830ies

What kind of identity and social situation did the Tergdaleulebi leave behind? Almost all of the students were of noble origin, from princely dynasties. These princes (tavadni) dominated social and political life in different Georgian regions, villages or valleys for centuries. They possessed sovereign power, set and controlled local values. Noble knights (aznaurni), peasants, Armenian traders and merchants, and Orthodox clergymen were their subordinated serfs. Since the hereditary nobility formed such a broad and powerful class (in 1897 they accounted for 5.3% of all Georgians), they could withstand the unifying monarchic force of the Bagratid dynasty in this mountainous country.[10]

The 1801 annexation of Georgia by Tsarist Russia was a turning point in Georgia's social development. Also Catherine the Greats' promise not to interfere with the legal status of the nobility was broken. The Bagratid mon-

archy was abolished; most of its members were exiled to Moscow and Petersburg, where they were compensated with high aristocratic ranks at court and subsidies. The Georgian Orthodox Church has been incorporated into the Russian Orthodox system of church administration, the Holy Synod.[11] As an absolutist state the Tsarist Empire attempted to introduce an impersonal bureaucratic administration, thus eroding the privileges the leading class of noble princes used to have in their autonomous regions. From now on the state tried to intervene directly into the affairs of its subjects by destroying all mediating institutions. Its attempts to replace feudal forms of administration by bureaucratic ones caused frictions between nobles and the Russian civil administrators, the *chinovniki*. Of low status and origin they came from Russia only to make their fortunes and careers. A vast number of Georgian complaints (*ditirambebi*) are showing this embarrassment against Russian administrators in their attitude towards the Georgian noble elite. The whole of the nobility were obliged to prove their noble origin by written documents, which rarely existed in a society based on oral history and personal honour. For decades they were kept in uncertainty about the acknowledgement of their noble status.[12] Eventually, some were driven to produce falsified documents. In addition, they lost political control of their territories to Tsarist state officials. However, even this alien state offered the nobility civil and military posts in state service, since loyal personnel possessing authority over the local population and knowledge of the local customs and languages were needed. Their task was to control, administrate and mediate between the autocracy and the regions of the Caucasus. The typical representatives of this younger noble generation were of Eastern Georgian aristocratic origin close to the Bagratid familiy. Instead of the Middle Eastern Persian traditions they were exposed to the European Russian culture and grew up in a Russian dominated setting. After finishing the Georgian Nobles or the Russian Artillery School they started their service in the Tsarist army at the age of 18. Participating in military operations against the Lesgians (1822, 1830), Qajar Iran (1826-27) and the Ottoman Empire (1828-29) they were promoted to the officer's ranks. Russian became their main language for conversation in the new noble salons of the upper nobility (like French in the salons of St Petersburg), who moved from the countryside to domiciles in Tbilisi. That was also the place where they came in close contact with romantic ideas of the Russian Decembrists, who were exiled to the "Southern Siberia" after 1825. The Russian playwright Alexander Griboedov married the daughter of a high ranking aristocrat.

The whole of the nobility were obliged to prove their noble origin by written documents, which rarely existed in a society based on oral history and

personal honor. For years they were kept in uncertainty about the acknowledgement of their noble status. Eventually, some were driven to produce falsified documents. On top of that, they lost political control of their estates to Tsarist state officials.

On the other hand, even this alien state offered civil and military posts in state service to the nobility, since loyal personnel possessing authority over the local population and knowledge of the local customs and languages were needed. Their task was to control, administrate and mediate between the autocracy and the regions of the Caucasus.

Through these developments the social system of Georgian particular feudalism ceased to exist. Not at once, but within the first fifty years of the 19th century it merged with the Russian system. The tensions between the loss of the Georgian nobility's accustomed status and career opportunities in the new state evoked contradictory reactions among the nobility. In many regions of both newly formed Georgian *gubernias* rebellions occurred which were led by the gentry, culminating in 1832 in an unsuccessful conspiracy in Tbilisi. Similarly, the number of aristocrats with European education, knowledge of Russian and posts in state service increased. They began to prefer urban life and became adherents of the expensive European aristocratic habits. In 1848 they declared themselves in the name of the whole nobility to be the Tsar's loyal servants.[13]

However only princes owning more than 100 serfs could afford a European life style - and that was a very small group of the mainly poor nobility - in 1860, about 50% (870) of the nobility owned less than 20 serfs and 90% (1.500) less than 100 serfs in Eastern Georgia. In Western Georgia the nobility was more numerous, but so were the poor as well. About 80% (3.776) owned less than 20 and 96% (4.600) less than 100 serfs.[14] Most of the princes had to share their peasants' hard fate, farming on their own small estates. While the poorest members of the nobility stayed in the country living in the traditional way, princely families with about 100 serfs like their aristocratic brothers also wanted to participate in a European way of life. With the expanding free market they demanded rising monetary instead of natural obligations from their serfs. Due to this, the relations of customary mutual obligations with their peasant serfs deteriorated. The peasants could not produce enough grain on their small land holdings for satisfying their lords' demands. The Georgian nobility was transformed at the expense of the peasantry, because the previous loss of political power was compensated with economic exploitation rights. These exploitation rights even survived the enserfment in Georgia (1865-71) and lasted as heavy 'temporal obligations' on the peasants

until the beginning of the 20th century. Nobility and peasantry were alienated from each other.

In addition, many princes had to mortgage their possessions to urban Armenian traders, who were freed from the Georgian kings' and princes' domination. They received a modern citizenship. The upwardly mobile urban Armenian merchants were most fitted for modern economy and profited most of all Transcaucasian ethnic groups from these changes. They became the Georgian nobility's competitors for political power and economic strength in the towns, and won in the end.[15]

Studying abroad

From the 1850s on many sons of impoverished princely families took the advantage of secular education offered by the Tsarist state. For that purpose, Tsarist Russia established schools for the nobility and awarded scholarships in order to recruit qualified state servants, who became part of the Russian *dvorianstvo*. Viceroy M. S. Vorontsov undertook especially successful measures in this direction while governing the country from 1845 to 1854.[16]

Brought up on their gentry's estates the young men were socialized within the traditional gentry' image and ethics, and within the whole network of social relations which revolved around traditional convictions and values. Then they started migrating in order to receive secular education. They attended primary schools in the district town next to their homes, changed to a grammar school in Tbilisi or Kutaisi and had to move from there to a university in Russia. All of the students shared the experiences of travelling and schooling. In this way these mobile 'migrants of secular education' met each other and formed their own small groups among the primarily Russian pupils at boarding schools or priests' seminaries. Also the approximately 30 Georgians who studied in St. Petersburg, in the early 1860s formed a Georgian Students' organization.[17]

Separated from home for several years, they received a second socialization by secular higher education at Russian universities, which provided a "fateful bridge between darkness and light" for them. The scientific benefits of the 'Enlightenment' made an impression on them and questioned their traditional beliefs. Georgian Orthodox religion, which provided the basic assumptions upon which their social and political institutions had been founded for centuries, now ceased to play its legitimizing role.

The students grew aware of the differences between the more effectively run Tsarist state and the prevailing traditionalism among the Georgian nobil-

ity. They were caught between two different sources of meaning, falling into a cleft of 'dual legitimation',[18] with a comparatively well-run state challenging the traditional religion-based Georgian culture. A return to the traditional way of life was not possible anymore after encountering Russia, its universities and higher education.

After having lost the Crimean war the new Tsar Alexander II was urged to modernize his empire to maintain its status as a European power. The necessity for reform brought into being a public in the Tsarist Empire that debated projects of reform for the first time.[19] In the early 1860's the Georgian students' participation in these debates exposed them to 'Western ideas' like national and social liberation. For instance, they were fascinated by Italy's national movement leaders Garibaldi and Mazzini. At the same time, many of them read Chernyshevsky and Hertsen, wrote patriotic poems about their far-away homes in addition to critical articles for Russian journals. They also demonstrated against autocracy, in 1861.[20]

There existed an ambivalent relationship to Russia. On the one hand they were impressed by the effectiveness of the autocratic state, and on the other they demanded the extension of participation rights. Niko Nikoladze, one of the radical democratic Georgian students, confessed in Hertsen's "Kolokol" (1865): "The ideal of the best organization of state and society will, in my opinion, be reached by us faster and earlier than anybody else on Russia's side (...) Connecting our fate with today's Russia, Georgia will attain the best conditions for its future organisation here than (...) under the protection of any other European country (not to mention its government), or even Turkey or Persia, something nobody in his right mind would ever have dreamt of."[21]

The Boundary between Russia and Georgia – onto the crossroads

While studying, most of the Georgians tried to adopt the new Imperial culture, which provided a career for them in Russia or in the military and civil administration of Caucasia, whereas poverty was rising at home. Also, the conflict between a religious world-view, which did not fit into their actual situation, and a more effective and scientific one was decided in favor of the modern version. Service to the autocratic state, chosen by most young Georgian princes, detached them from their loyalty to ancient norms and beliefs.

For that reason all Georgian students in Russia, named 'Tergdaleulebi', had a reputation for being 'good-for-nothing' and 'double faced' in the old nobility's opinion, because they turned away from Georgian soil and tradi-

tional customs. The older generation of princes disliked these young adherents to Russia.

The narrator of the "Traveler's notes" ironically comments on this low esteem, saying that the old generation could not name any plausible causes why it was bad 'to drink water from the Terek' (16).

On the contrary, he persuades his Georgian readers to study abroad, and that they can benefit from their newly-gained knowledge. A university course of study can be turned into the "seed-vessel of their whole lives", producing either a "wonderful grape" or "poor wild stock". Everything depends upon the young students, and to what purpose they apply their abilities.

In his "Traveler's Notes" Chavchavadze criticized the Russophiles (in Georgian 'rusetume'), likewise comparing them to the river Terek on the Russian side, where it has grown silent like a defeated lion after punishment or transfer to state service. A small group did not want to be assimilated absolutely by Russia and preferred the supremacy of Georgian culture. Consequently, the narrator of Chavchavadze's text questions himself as if on behalf of this group: "Where do I belong?" He confesses that "an absolute revolution took place in my head", the experience and impressions of Russia intermingled with the memories of the fatherland. "How do I meet my fatherland and how does it meet me?" he asks himself in a state of uncertainty like most of the returning border crossers.

At the last station on the Russian side of the Caucasus he meets a Russian officer, who behaves to him in a condescending and ignorant way. The officer is complaining about the Caucasian peoples' lack of enlightenment. He feels himself and Russia to be superior to the Georgians, because they are apparently obliged to bring Russian and Western culture to that peripheral region.

This was a very common feeling among the Russians, which served to justify the incorporation of Georgia and the whole Caucasus from 1801 onwards. But for many well educated Georgians it constituted a humiliating experience. They were forced to realize that their assimilation was limited, because they could not get rid of their origins.

"By skinning himself a Georgian doesn't become a Russian, but simply stays a skinned Georgian", as the historian Zurab Avalov described this experience in 1908.[22]

"Where is the other Georgia?"

Reaching Stepantsminda, the first Georgian village situated at the foot of the Kazbeg Mountain, the narrator became aware of the necessity for modernization. He prefers the river Terek with its unrestrained, rebellious and dynamic stream to the eternal, static beauty of a mountain peak. As a symbol for a newly risen movement for national enlightenment by the young student generation it testifies to the active desire to alter Georgia's development by changing the people's minds. This was the only way left to fill the gap which opened to the Tergdaleulebi a chance to escape their individual identity crisis. They revalued the term 'Tergdaleulebi' as a positive label for their reformers' group of Georgia, a project they called "Georgia's national re-birth". They justified their need for status as a guiding force by emphasizing their membership of modernized Georgian elite. In contrast to their "fathers", the dynastic princes, who still thought in noble rank patterns, they wanted to speak for their people.

In Stepantsminda the narrator meets the above mentioned mountain dweller, whom he does not recognize at first as a Georgian. Accompanying the narrator on horseback down to the next settlement, Pasanauri, this remote dweller informs him about the rural population's real situation. The poverty-stricken Georgian talks to him as an equal, tells him about the glorious past, when the united nation gathered in front of the Holy Trinity chapel in Stepantsminda. With these words Chavchavadze was producing a modern myth of a non-existent former national unity.

The mountain dweller states: "Nowadays the former unity has dissolved, greed and profit have overwhelmed us, and hostility and jealousy have penetrated our souls. […] Man has turned to himself, he only cares about himself. The people have fallen spiritually. The name Georgian has gone down. We have forgotten our laws and customs. We used to live our own lives, but what remains of us now? Everything is for sale today, meals and drinks, roads and forests, even the court and prayer... What is left of the former mountain dweller?" Georgians have become "isolated" from each other "like the links of a torn chain".

Thus it was not national unity that vanished, but the previous local village networks or the princes' unquestioned leading role. They were broken by the international laws of a free market, which urged people to leave their birthplace in order to find a job elsewhere. The small self-sufficient village community began to dissolve into greater entities, the Transcaucasian market and the bureaucratic Tsarist state. Neither could be controlled by individuals any more.

What was presumed to be the Georgian nation restored the previous local unity on a wider geographical range. Akaki Tsereteli, a poet and Tergdaleuli, expressed it like this:"a nation is the power, that lively bond between people." If this bond is missing, "everything human" would turn into "a fruitless abstraction". The Tergdaleulebi "were taking the first steps into a new life". A "new life" for them meant "to unify the Georgian people in a homogeneous, monolithic organism; their self-awareness has to be awakened and strengthened to get them closer to national and social freedom".[23]

The narrator disagrees with the mountain dweller about the question of how to recognize a Georgian, in so far as it depends on his clothing. "But you ought to be Georgian with your soul and not with your clothing..." he replied. The narrator is stressing the importance of consciously being a Georgian. Without any hope and belief in the national idea there would hardly be a new Georgia, no change of mentality. In the journal "Iveria" the Tergdaleulebi generation published their principles in May 1881 as follows:

"1. The return and restoration of the oppressed identity and its protection against all dangers;

 2. Everybody who is able to should join this movement and cooperate fraternally. All problems and affairs that are connected in our lives with us or others should be taken into consideration and submitted to our identity. Whether school, bank or theatre, everything should be determined by that. Whether a person is going to be chosen a marshal of the nobility, a banker or a teacher, it should be decided from that point of view;

 3. Young people should take great pains with their education. They should thoroughly study European sciences, gather European experiences and, so armed, push our country ahead."[24]

Attempting to fill the minds with Georgian national identity also means Europeanization with its promise of common welfare and equal citizenship. The Tergdaleulebi aimed at a culturally based renovation of the former noble identity, known as 'kartveloba'. As a modern national culture, this was to integrate the different regions and social classes into a standardized culture to provide a basis for a united Georgian nation. The Tergdaleulebi did not want to separate from the Tsarist state, because it protected Georgia against Persia and Turkey. However, they were asking for cultural autonomy as regards the use of their language.[25]

They were convinced that a moral revolution had to precede social and political changes. The purity of the past was held up as a mirror to their fellow men to make them see their 'glorious' future and as an indictment of their 'shameful' present. The faults of the present time had to be surpassed

by self-help through application of scientific thought to every sector of life and the collective self. Religion-based culture and tradition were to be totally reformed as a preparation for the 'urge' of continuous change in a 'new life'.

This was the beginning of a gradual, often unperceived and unintended secularization of a 'reformist' position in contrast to the above mentioned 'traditionalist' and 'assimilationist' positions. Their own community changed from being a carrier of religious tradition to a value per se, and was thus transformed into the subject of history. Georgian Orthodox belief became only one of the essential ingredients next to fatherland and language intended to distinguish their culture from the dominant Russian culture. A culturally based boundary with Russia already existed in their heads when they returned home. Thus in Georgia they actively started to make this idea work by giving a meaning to that boundary, for example by publishing the above mentioned "Traveller's notes".

This distinguishing process was accelerated by the growing contradictions in late Imperial Russia's development. The social as well as ethnic inequalities, which are very typical for early industrial development of the whole Tsarist empire undermined the pre-modern justification of Tsarism. Different new patterns of identity spread among the Tsar's subjects. Particularly strong administrative centralizing measures from the 1880's onwards alienated the young Georgian intelligentsia from Tsarist authority. A rising awareness of nationhood turned Tsarist officials into Russians as well.

Ilia Chavchavadze complained in a letter to a Russian in 1899: "They [the Russians] look at us, but they don't see us; they listen to us, but they don't understand us.[...] Only by loving our own country can we also love Russia [...] the love for our country also provides that fertile base on which our solidarity and loyalty is taking roots, growing and getting stronger." The Russian Je. L. Markov answered: "We Russians [...] must not forget that we are not conquerors that we are for them like brothers with equal rights, but not severe rulers."[26]

The 'Tergdaleulebi' formed the national movement's Phase B in Hroch's model.[27] The beginning can be dated back to 1861, when the Tergdaleulebi publicly spoke of them by that name in an aristocratic Georgian journal ('Tsiskari'). At first they relied on literary and journalistic work for their own newly-founded journals and newspapers. In 1875 a land bank was founded for the nobility to improve agricultural facilities, to prevent nobles from selling land to foreigners and to finance cultural activities.

Four years later Ilia Chavchavadze and others formed a 'Society for the spreading of literacy among Georgians', which was to promote private school teaching in Georgian. The Society published Georgian textbooks, bought old

Georgian manuscripts and produced programs for a Georgian secular educa-tion. The development of their membership gives some idea of the spread of national activists in Georgia. From 126 members in 1879 the numbers rose to 518 in 1896, and finally to 2.883 members in 1913.[28] In late Imperial Russia the Georgian national movement remained small, limited to mostly urban, educated people of noble origin.

The peasant mass of the Georgian agrarian society followed the Geor-gian Menshevist version of social-democracy. In 1919, Georgian Menshevists solved the acute social problems by a land reform in an independent Geor-gian republic.[29] The permanent control of state and administration bodies in a Soviet republic allowed the mass of Georgian peasants to abandon their identity as peasants for national citizenship and replace their sense of local territory by a love of national territory. The Tergdaleulebi failed to convince their compatriots' majority of the new national identity, but for the first time they shaped the modern Georgian nation's image. This image grew stronger in Soviet times until Georgia's independence in 1991.[30]

Notes:

1   All quotes will be given in brackets in the text and are taken from: Ilia Chavchavadze, "Notes of a Journey from Vladikavkaz to Tiflis", in: Ia Pop-khadze (ed.), *Ilia Chavchavadze Works. Translated by Marjory and Oliver Wardrop*, Tbilisi 1987, pp. 15-34, here p. 31. Marjory Wardrop translated this text whose manuscript (44 pages) and typescript (35 pages) was found in Oxford. Her translation was published for the first time. The Georgian original was published in: Ilia Tchavtchavadze, "mgzavris tserilebi. Vladika-vkasidam tpilisamde", in: ibid., *T'khzulebata sruli krebuli ots tomad. Tomi 2: mot'khrobebi. Piesebi* [Collected works in 20 volumes. Vol. 2, Tbilisi 1988, pp. 9-32. See in greater detail: O. Reisner, *Die Schule der georgischen Nation. Eine sozialhistorische Untersuchung der nationalen Bewegung in Georgien am Beispiel der „Gesellschaft zur Verbreitung der Lese- und Schreibkunde unter den Georgi-ern" (1850-1917)* [The School of the Georgian Nation. A Socio-Historical Inquiry of the National Movement in Georgia taking the "Society for the Spread of Literacy among Georgians"], Wiesbaden 2004.
2   For a linguistic analysis of the text see H. P. Manning, "Describing dialect and defining civilization in Ilia Chavchavadze' *mgzavris c'erilebi*", in: *Amirani* 7 (2002), pp. 97-126.

3   Oliver Reisner: "Grigol Orbeliani Discovering Russia: A Travel Account by a Member of the Georgian Upper Class from 1831-1832", in: Beate Eschment, Hans Harder (eds.): *Looking at the Coloniser. Cross-Cultural Perceptions in Central Asia and the Caucasus, Bengal, and Related Areas*, Würzburg 2004, pp. 47-62. About the literary genre of Georgian travelogues: Nat'ela Saghirashvili, *'mogzaurobani' XIX saukunis k'art'ul literature* ["Travelogues" in 19th Century Georgian Literature], Tbilisi 1989, pp. 58-62: Koba Kharadze, *XVII–XIX saukuneebis k'art'veli mogzaurebi* [Georgian travels from 17th to 19th Centuries], Tbilisi 1987.

4   For this purpose see my dissertation: *Die Schule der georgischen Nation. Eine sozialhistorische Untersuchung der nationalen Bewegung in Georgien am Beispiel der ‚Gesellschaft zur Verbreitung der Lese- und Schreibkunde unter den Georgiern' (1850-1917)* [The School of the Georgian Nation. A Socio-Historical Inquiry of the National Movement in Georgia taking the "Society for the Spread of Literacy among Georgians"].

5   Fr. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, Oslo et al. 1969, p. 9f.: "An empirical investigation of the character of ethnic boundaries (…) produces two discoveries which are hardly unexpected (...). First, it is clear that boundaries persist despite a flow of personnel across them. In other words, categorical ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of mobility, contact and information, but do entail social processes of exclusion and incorporation whereby discrete categories are maintained despite changing participation and membership in the course of individual life histories. Secondly, one finds that stable persisting, and often vitally important social relations are maintained across such boundaries, and are frequently based precisely on the dichotomized ethnic statuses. In other words, ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of social interaction and acceptance, but are quite to the contrary often the very foundation on which embracing social systems are built. Interaction in such a social system does not lead to its liquidation through change and acculturation; cultural differences can persist despite inter-ethnic contact and interdependence."

6   U. Haeberlin/E. Niklaus, *Identitätskrisen. Theorie und Anwendung am Beispiel des sozialen Aufstiegs durch Bildung*, Bern und Stuttgart 1978, p. 13; Fr. Heckmann, *Ethnische Minderheiten, Volk und Nation. Soziologie interethnischer Beziehungen*, Stuttgart 1992, esp. pp. 162-209.

7   Peter Sahlins resumes: "The definition of national identity does not depend on natural boundaries, nor is it defined by a nuclear component of social or cultural characteristics - an essential, primordial quality [...]. National identity is a socially constructed and continuous pro-

cess of defining 'friend' and 'enemy', a logical extension of the process of maintaining boundaries between 'us' and 'them' within more local communities. National identities constructed on the basis of such an oppositional structure do not depend on the existence of any objective linguistic or cultural differentiation but on the subjective experience of difference. In this sense, national identity, like ethnic or communal identity, is contingent and relational: it is defined by the social or territorial boundaries drawn to distinguish the collective self and its implicit negation, the other." Peter Sahlins, *Boundaries. The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees*, Berkeley and London 1989, p. 270f. See also: A. P. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, London 1985, esp. p. 115.

8   E. Balibar, „Die Nation-Form: Geschichte und Ideologie", in: ibid., Im. Wallerstein, *Rasse, Klasse, Nation. Ambivalente Identitäten*, Hamburg 1992; from the French original: *Race, Nation, Classe. Les identités ambiguës*, Paris 1988, p. 116.

9   K. Mannheim, „Das Problem der Generation". in: ibid.: *Wissenssoziologie. Auswahl aus dem Werk.* Ed..by K. H. Wolff, Neuwied 1964, pp. 509-522; originally published in: *Kölner Vierteljahreshefte für Soziologie* 7 (1928), S.157-185, S.309-330; Reprint in M. Kohli (ed.): *Soziologie des Lebenslaufs,* Neuwied 1978, S.38-53.

10   Roger G. Suny, *The Making of the Georgian Nation*, Stanford 1988, pp. 3-59; David Marshall Lang, *The Last Years of the Georgian Monarchy 1658-1832*, New York 1957, esp. pp. 187-204.

11   N. K. Gvosdev, *Imperial Policies and Perspectives Towards Georgia, 1760-1819,*, Houndmills, 2000, pp. 77-140; N. K. Gvosdev, The Russian Empire and the Georgian Orthodox Church in the first decades of Imperial rule, 1801-1830, in: *Central Asian Survey* 14 (1995) H.3, S. 407-423

12   D. I. Ismail-Zade, *Naselenie gorodov Zakavkazskogo kraja v XIX - nachale XX v. Istoriko-demograficheskij analiz*, Moskva1991, pp. 99-104, here p. 101; D. Gogoladze: *sakartvelos socialur-ek'onomiuri ganvitareba gvianpeodalus xanaši (saadgilomamulo urtiertoba) 1800-1864 ts.ts.* [Georgias' socio-economic development in the late feudal epoch. Gentry relationships 1800 - 1864], Tbilisi, 1971, 71-120; Lang, *The Last Years of the Georgian Monarchy 1658-1832*, pp. 267-284.

13   Stephan F. Jones, "Russian Imperial Administration and the Georgian Nobility: the Georgian Conspiracy of 1832", in: *Slavonic and East European Review*. Vol. 65 (1987), pp. 53-76; A. Kappeler, *Russland als Vielvölkerreich. Entstehung, Geschichte, Zerfall*, München 1992, pp. 141-149.

14   A. Surguladze, *Il'ia Chavchavadze – znamenosets natsional'no-osvoboditl'nogo dvizheniia v Gruzii*, Tbilisi 1987, p. 22.

15   B. Ischchanjan, *Nationaler Bestand, berufsmäßige Gruppierung und soziale Gliederung der kaukasischen Völker* Berlin & Leipzig 1914, p. 61.

16   L. H. Rhinelander, *The Incorporation of the Caucasus into the Russian Empire. The Case of Georgia 1801–1854*. Columbia, unpublished Ph.D., 1972 or in short ibid., "Russia's Imperial Policy: The Administration of the Caucasus in the First Half of the 19th Century", in: *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 17 (1975), No. 2-3, pp. 218-235.

17   A. Tsereteli, *Perezhitoe*, Moskva 1950, 2nd edition, p. 102. The Georgian poet's memoirs were written in 1899. Its first part is a very good illustration of that primary socialization. B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London 1983, especially Chapter 3.

18   A.D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism*, London 1971, Chapter 10: 'Dual Legitimation': The Matrix of Ethnic Nationalism, pp. 230-254.

19   D. Geyer, *Der russische Imperialismus. Studien über den Zusammenhang von innerer und auswärtiger Politik, 1860-1914*, Göttingen 1977, pp. 43-55.

20   P. K. Ratiani, *Gruzinskie shestidesiatniki v russkom osvoboditel'nom dvizhenii*, Tbilisi 1967.

21   Cited in G.A. Galoian, *Rossiia i narody Zakavkaz'ia. Ocherki politicheskoi istorii ikh vzaimootnoshenii s drevnikh vremen do pobedy Velikoi Oktiiabrskoi sotsialisticheskoi revoliutsii*, Moskva 1976, p. 292.

22   Z. Avalov, "Gruziny", in Kastelianskii (ed.), *Formy natsional'nogo dvizheniia*, p. 482. Oliver Reisner, "Zwischen Zarentreue und ethnischer Selbstvergewisserung: der 'Fall' Dimit'ri Qipiani und die Georgier (1885 - 1887) [Between Loyalty to the Tsar and Ethnic Self-Assertion: Dimitri Qipianis' Case]", in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 47 (1999), pp. 512-524.

23   *Ilia Tschawtschawadse 150*, Tbilisi 1987, p. 8 (booklet in honor of the 150th anniversary of his birth).

24   Cited and translated by the author from Akaki Bakradze, *Ilia Tschawtschawadse (1837–1907). Ein Lebensbild und eine Auswahl seiner Gedichte*, Bern 1993, pp. 22-23.

25   For more details see: G.S. Mamulia, "O politicheskom ideale Il'i Chavchavadze. Po neopublikovannym materialam iz arkhiva pisatelja", in: *Literaturnaia Gruziia* 1987, No. 10, pp. 55-87.

26   Cited by Galioan, *Rossiia i narody Zakavkaz'ia*, p. 285.

27   Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe. A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among*

the Smaller European Nations, Cambridge 1985, p. 23: "For greater clarity we shall designate the three above-mentioned fundamental phases of the national movement as Phase A (the period of scholarly interest), Phase B (the period of patriotic agitation) and Phase C (the rise of a mass national movement)."

28   T. Khundadze, *K'artvelt'a shoris tsera-kitkhvis gamavrtselebeli sazogadoeba*, Tbilissi 1958, p. 5 and S. Khutsishvili, Manat'obeli. K'artvelt'a shoris tsera-kitkhvis gamavrtselebeli sazogadoebis 100 tseli, Tbilisi 1980 or shorter: A. Ioseliani, "Reaktsiia 80-kh gg. i obshchestvennye sily Gruzii", in: *Ocherki istorii Gruzii v vos'mi tomakh. Vol. V: Gruziia v XIX veke*, Tbilisi 1990, pp. 434-441.

29   Cf. S. F. Jones, *Socialism in Georgian Colors. The European Road to Social Democracy 1883-1911*, Cambridge, Mass. 2005.

30   Cf. Roger G. Suny, *The Revenge of the Past. Nationalism, Revolution and the Collapse of the Soviet Union*, Stanford 1993.