

RECONSTRUCTING THE PAST: *JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES*

DOI.org/10.54414

Print ISSN 29595207

Online ISSN 29595215

Reconstructing the Past: Journal of Historical Studies is a double blind peer-reviewed journal, published quarterly in English by Western Caspian University Press. The journal focuses on the publication of original research papers, devoted to the various issues of Historical Studies, and accepts articles from authors all around the World. Being published quarterly, the journal takes issues of copyright infringement and plagiarism in publication very seriously.

Contacts

Address: 31 Istiglaliyyat, Baku 1001

Email: historical_studies@wcu.edu.az

Phone: (+99412) 492 74 18

© Western Caspian University

EDITOR-IN CHIEF:

Huseyn Baghirov (*Western Caspian University, Azerbaijan*)

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Nabil Al-Tikriti (University of Mary Washington, USA) *co-Editor*

Eva-Maria Auch (Humboldt University in Berlin, Germany)

Mikheil Bakhtadze (Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia)

Paulo Botta (Pontifical Catholic University of Argentina, Argentina)

Elio Brancaforte (Tulane University, USA)

Juan Signes Codoñer (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain)

Dali Kandelaki (Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia)

Nigar Maxwell (Freelance Researcher, UK)

Arailym S. Mussagaliyeva (Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan)

Sergiu Musteata ("Ion Creangă" State Pedagogical University, Moldova)

Pawel Olszewski (Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland)

Yaroslav Pylypchuk (National Pedagogical Drahomanov University, Ukraine)

Michael A. Reynolds (Princeton University, USA)

Irina Shingiryay (Oxford University, UK)

Jeremy Smith (Eastern Finland University, Finland) *co-Editor*

Yu Tachibana (Hokkaido University, Japan)

Ahmet Taşağıl (Yeditepe University, Turkey)

Lala Alyeva (Baku State University, Azerbaijan) *Deputy Editor-in Chief*

CONTENT:

Note from the Editor in Chief

Huseyn Baghirov.....4

Religion And Political Power In The Caucasian Albania Prior To And During The Arab Conquests

Lala Aghamirze Aliyeva5

The Cultural Identity Issues of The 19th Century Abkhazia

Lia Akhaladze19

The Trade Centers Of The Southern Black Sea Region And The International Trade Relations Of Azerbaijan Before The Ottoman Invasion

Almas Sabir Javadova.....29

Migrations of The Population Between South And North of Azerbaijan During The Tsarist Russian Colonial Rule

Salman Ibishov37

Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh: Thoughts and Struggle for The Republic

Dilgam Ahmadov52

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES.....65

Note from the Editor in Chief

We are happy to inform everyone who pursues to publish their research papers, written in an impartial manner and analyzes the historical past without political bias.

Reconstructing the Past: Journal of Historical Studies aims to foster recovering historical past without fear or favor, based not only on the historical methods and methodology, but also on an interdisciplinary approach.

Our purpose is for provide a forum for scientific research without political overtones.

Kind regards,

Professor Huseyn Baghirov

Founder of the Western Caspian University

RELIGION AND POLITICAL POWER IN THE CAUCASIAN ALBANIA PRIOR TO AND DURING THE ARAB CONQUESTS**Lala Aghamirze Aliyeva**

Associate Professor, Baku State University

Baku, Azerbaijan

lalaaliyeva@bsu.edu.az

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4831-6915

<http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/PFYV4062>

Abstract: This paper examines the impact of 7th century political and military developments in the region on the position of the Caucasian Albanian Church.

Holding a weak position among the common people, who preserved ancient traditions, the Caucasian Albanian Church proved unable to maintain its position after the Arab conquest, which created new political conditions. Prior to and during the Arab conquest the struggle between dyophysitism and monophysitism created uncertainty and weakened the status of Christianity in the region. Studies show that the Caucasian Albanian Church was an adherent of monothelism and maintained close ties with Byzantium and the Georgian Orthodox Church throughout most of the Mihranid dynasty's reign. However, with the strengthening of the Arab Caliphate during Umayyad rule, the political situation changed and the Armenian Church, holding good relations with the Caliphate, achieved the subordination of the Caucasian Albanian Church.

The study reveals a number of reasons for the weakening and subordination of the Albanian Church to the Armenian.

Keywords: *Caucasian Albanian Church, Mihranids, Armenian Catholicosate, Arab Conquest, Spread of Islam*

INTRODUCTION

The main goal of this research is to examine the religious processes that took place in the early Medieval Eastern Caucasus, primarily in the territories of today's Azerbaijan Republic. This was a turbulent and changeable time, when domination of one religion was gradually replaced by another. In turn, this process impacted the identity of the local population, creating the conditions for long term assimilation and ethnic consolidation.

Many studies confirm relations between religion and identity. Among them, Pamela King suggests that ideological, social, and spiritual contexts, generated by religion, provide a distinct setting for identity exploration [King P.E. (2003): 197]. Religious processes, with accompanying social, political and cultural characteristics, influenced the identity of the Christian population of Caucasian Albania following the spread of Islam in the region.

Aiming to study the processes that took place in the Caucasian Albanian church on the eve of and during the initial period of the Arab conquests, which coincides with the reign of the Mihranid dynasty, a number of primary sources prove relevant. It should be noted that many issues of Caucasian Albanian studies, as well as the history of the Albanian Church and the Arab conquest, have been widely studied by modern

historiography. The latest publication on Caucasian Albanian studies, an edited volume recently released by De Gruyter, *Caucasian Albania: An International Handbook*, despite some chapters with politicized overtones, contains very valuable research. Noteworthy to mention is Jasmine Dum-Tragut's chapter, "One or two? On Christological and Hierarchical Disputes and the Development of the "Church of Albania" (4th–8th centuries)" [Dum-Tragut (2023): 285-331]. Her research concludes that the Church of Albania was in Christological and Hierarchical dependence of the Armenian Church. At the same time, the author agrees that in the post-Chalcedonian period all churches of the South Caucasus, including the Albanian one, developed more ethnic and independent characteristics, and the period from the 6th to 8th centuries is considered the main period of discord and separatism in the South Caucasian Churches [Dum-Tragut (2023); 286-287]. Although the purpose of this paper is not to study the status of the Albanian Church during the period of the Arab conquests, it can definitely be stated that at least on the eve of the liquidation of independence in 705, the Caucasian Albanian Church was not in a state of dependence on the Armenian Church. Otherwise, why would the Armenian Catholicos complain about the Albanian Church to the Caliph Abd-al-Malik and accuse it of being connected with Byzantium, the enemy of the Caliphate.

Without denying or minimizing the influence of the Armenian Church in Georgia and Albania, debates around this issue can be summarized as follows: one side assesses the state of affairs in the 6th to 8th centuries as "discord and separatism", while another side sees it as a struggle for the independent existence of the Albanian church.

A Brief overview on the Establishment of Mihranid Ruling Power in The Caucasian Albania

The existence of the Apostolic Christian Church in Caucasian Albania, which gained an official religious status from the reign of Urnayr, a representative of the Arsacid dynasty, is confirmed on the basis on "The History of The Caucasian Albanians" by Movses of Kalankatuyk [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 7-8]. However, following the Arab invasion, the Albanian church failed to maintain its position. External factors, especially the Arab invasion under the banner of Islam and the new social and political conditions brought by it, should be noted. Moreover, the processes taking place within the Albanian Christian Church, such as uncertainty regarding how to choose between the two main doctrines of Christianity at that time, dyophysitism and monophysitism, also played an important role. When we compare this church with its neighbors, we see that, at the end of a long process the majority of Armenians chose the Monophysite doctrine of Christianity, and in the case of Georgians, the Dyophysite.

For additional details one should examine certain issues related to the Mihranid dynasty, the period of their semi-independent rule, their origin, and the issues of the territory they ruled. If Mihran, the founder of the dynasty, took possession of the Gardman province with a letter, sent by the Sassanian ruler Khosrow, this event could not have happened before the 6th century, regardless of whether it was Khosrow I or II, because Moses of Kalankatuyk's *The History of The Caucasian Albanians* does not specify whether it was Khosrow I or Khosrow II [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 108]. However, the same source shows that Mihran's grandson Vardan the Brave, the ruler of Gardman, was one of the nobles who participated in the Church Assembly of Aguyen in 488 [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 54]. Thus, the Mihranids were already the rulers of the Gardman

province in the 5th century, and Moses of Kalankatuyk likely confused the Sassanid rulers. Farida Mammadova attributes Mihranid rule over the Gardman province to the 5th century. She writes that this area began to play an important role in the political life of Albania in the 5th to 8th centuries, after the Mihranid dynasty was established and came to power [Мамедова, Ф. (2005): 261].

In the sources, the establishment of Mihranid power, initially in a vassal status dependent on the Sassanids, by Varaz-Grigor Mihranid, is suggested as the year 628 [Бунияттов, З. (1965): 52; Еремян С. (1939): 130] or 630 [Мамедова, Ф. (2005): 357]. Presumably, around the same period the dynasty extended its power throughout most of Albania, not only the Gardman province. Given Cyril Toumanoff's research on the subject, the date indicated by Ziya Bunyadov, 628 CE, seems more appropriate. Cyril Toumanoff notes that following the accession of the Khosrowid dynasty of Mihranid origin over Georgia in 627, other branches of the dynasty were soon brought to rule over the Gogarene and Gardman, other Caucasian thrones [Toumanoff, Cyril (1969): 22; Toumanoff, Cyril (1963): 83].

Thus, sources and studies support the idea that all three dynasties came to power in the Caucasus with a slight difference in time. After Sheroy, the heir who had the right to continue power, was taken to Syria by the Arabs in 705 [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 191], the Albanian principality, a semi-independent state, fell [Мамедова, Ф. (2005): 173]. To clarify the specific time, it should be noted that Justinian II, the Byzantine emperor, who was overthrown in 695 as a result of a coup, restored his power on August 21, 705 [The chronicle of Theophanes Confessor (1997): 522], and thus once again achieved a strengthening of Byzantium. Moreover, the Umayyad caliph Abdul-Malik died of cholera on October 5, 705. It is clear that these two events were preceded by the end of the Mihranid dynasty. It should be noted that the dynasty retained the right to manage its possessions for a longer period of time, according to Moses of Kalankatuyk, until about 821/2 [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 213-214], and the end of the dynasty was put with the assassination of Varaz-Trdat II, the last representative of the Mihranid dynasty [The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsest of Mt. Sinai (2008): XIX]. Thus, this study mainly considers the changes that took place in the Albanian church and its environment in the historically short chronological framework of 628-705. This time coincides with the beginning of the Arab conquests, and by the 8th century the power of the Arab Caliphate was completely established in almost the entire territory of the Eastern Caucasus. As is known, in the early days of the Caliphate, Islamisation of the local population did not take place on a massive scale. Therefore, Christianity and other local religious beliefs were preserved for a very long time. The purpose of this article is to consider the Albanian Church and the overall position of Christianity within the region during this period.

As mentioned above, sources emphasize that of all three peoples, branches of one family, the Mihranid dynasty, ruled Albanians, Georgians and Armenians. [Toumanoff, Cyril (1963): 83]. In addition, Moses of Kalankatuyk repeatedly underlined that the Mihranids were of Arsacid origin and related to the Sassanids, called Mihran a blood relative of Khosrow [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 108], and for Varaz-Grigor he used the expression "Varaz-Grigor, the ruler of Albania, a nobleman from the Arsacids" [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 109]. The Danish orientalist Arthur Christensen, on the basis of Sassanian written sources, concluded that the Mihranids of Parthian origin were one of the seven

noble families that ruled Sassanian Iran [Christensen, Arthur (1944): 102]. Considering that the Arsacids and Sassanids were genealogically separate dynasties, the information of Moses of Kalankatuyk may appear ambivalent. However, the information should not be considered contradictory, since the Sassanids always established family ties with the Arsacids. In any case, like the Khosrowids in the Caucasian Iberia, the Mihranids of Albania were not a local dynasty in origin.

As for the location of the Gardman province that was possessed by the Mihranids, it is likely that its territory was the same territory where *Qal'at al-Gardman*, mentioned in Arabic sources, was located [Vəlixanlı N. (2016): 212]. Of course, we must distinguish between the territory of this province and the semi-independent principality, ruled by the Mihranid dynasty since 628. Apparently, the appearance of parallel toponyms in the territories of Shamkir and Shirvan, where the river Girdmanchay flows, is connected with the rule of one dynasty and inhabited by the same tribes. It was not by chance that Moses of Kalankatuyk, describing Viro, liberated by the Sassanid ruler Kavad in 628, named him “Catholicos of the great Albanian principality (dominion)” [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 93]. In other words, during this period, the dynasty extended its power beyond the boundaries of one province unequivocally.

Caucasian Albanian Church between Monophysitism and Dyophysitism. Strengthening Monothelitism

The Byzantine Empire clearly used Christianity as a political instrument for gaining hegemony in the Caucasus, aiming to completely eliminate or reduce the influence of its rivals, the Sassanids, and later the Arab Caliphate. However, Juan Signes Codoñer writes that in the 7th and 8th centuries Byzantium launched no new missions among these neighboring nations [Codoñer (2014): 152]. From this we can conclude that the state itself, without clerics, played the role of missionary work.

In 608/609 the Georgian Church broke off relations with the Monophysite Armenian Church, preferring to follow the Chalcedonian teaching adopted in Constantinople. Icons that were not accepted by the Armenian Church were warmly received in the Georgian lands, and Byzantium allowed the Georgian monastery of Iviron to be founded on Mount Athos [Hewsen Robert H. and Salvatico Christopher C (2001): 92]. As for the Sassanids, they were not limited to forcing the spread of Zoroastrianism against Byzantine influence. The Sassanian emperors also took advantage of the feud between Christian teachings. In accordance with the Sassanid policy of separating the traditional Caucasian countries from Byzantium, Khosrow II gathered Christians subject to his empire to the famous Ctesiphon Church Council in 614, and here, in opposition to the doctrine of dyophysitism in Byzantium, the churches under Sassanid rule officially recognized monophysitism as their main teaching [Мамедова Ф. (2005): 361]. In the chapter "The piety of the Christian wife of King Khosrow, Queen Shirin" in the "History" by Sebeos, Khosrow's decree on the issue is reproduced. It states: "Let no infidel dare to accept Christianity, and let no Christian accept blasphemy. On the contrary, let each follow the religion of his father. Whoever does not keep the faith of his fathers, he who rebels against his religion will be killed" [Sebeos (1999): IV]. Khosrow II's edict defined the dyophysitism, espoused by rival Byzantium, as "godlessness".

Having achieved an advantage during their war with the Sassanids, Byzantium, in order to strengthen their positions in the Caucasus, persuaded local nobles to accept Christianity. Varaz-Grigor, a representative of the Mihranid dynasty, who had previously worshiped the Zoroastrian religion, converted to Christianity and became the prince of Albania. As already mentioned, Vardan the Brave took part in the Aguen Church Assembly [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 54], which means that the dynasty had already converted to Christianity. This confusion was clearly removed by Cyril Toumanoff. He shows that the Albanian Mihranid family most likely converted to Mazdaism at the end of the 5th century, as did the Mihranids of Gogarene [Toumanoff, Cyril (1963): 476]. Following the end of the Arsacid dynasty in Albania at the beginning of the 6th century, the region was under the rule of Sassanid governors [Мамедова Ф. (2005): 208, 357]. The provincial rulers of Gardman took advantage of their kinship with the Sassanids and became even stronger under their rule. Since the Mihranids already had a strong influence over one province of Albania, at the beginning of the 7th century they were able to extend their power to other Albanian lands. The history of this dynasty shows that they were willing to re-convert to Christianity in order to maintain their prestige.

In “The Life of Vakhtang Gorgasal” by Juansher Juansheriani, which is included to the Georgian chronicles “Kartlis Tskhovreba”, it is mentioned that the Byzantine emperor Heraclius in 627, during the reign of Georgian ruler Stepanos, took Tbilisi and killed him [Kartlis Tskhovreba (2014): 77]. Another Georgian chronicle, “The Life and Story of Bagrationi” by Sumbat Davitidze, shows that the Byzantine emperor Heraclius, who marched against Tbilisi, later met Varaz-Gageli / Varaz-Grigoli in Gardabani (identified with the Gardman province) [Hewsen and Salvatico (2001): 102; Мамедова (2005): 109]. The source writes, “Heraclius came to Gardabani to see Varaz Gageli, and camped in a place called Khuzasheni. He converted Varaz Gageli and all his people to Christianity and began to build a church that would surpass anything that had been built before him. From there he went to Berduchi and camped in the center of the village. Heraclius erected a stone cross, laid the foundation of the Church of St. Mary, and crowned it with a dome.” [Kartlis Tskhovreba (2014): 212]. From this we can conclude that Varaz-Grigor was baptized by the Byzantine emperor Heraclius and brought to the throne of Albania as a ruler. This information from the Georgian chronicle contradicts the local Albanian source, since Moses of Kalankatuyk states that Varaz-Grigor was baptized by the Catholicos of Viro. [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 109]. It is unreasonable for him to be baptized twice, as this is contrary to the traditions of the Christian religion. It is no coincidence that Dowsett translated it as “was consecrated” instead of “baptized”. This contradiction can be explained by the fact that most likely Varaz Grigor first accepted the dyophysitism of Byzantium, and then Viro led him into monophysitism.

As it is also known that after the Council of Chalcedon in 451, Christianity was already divided into two main doctrines, the Chalcedonian dyophysitism and the anti-Chalcedonian monophysitism and miaphysitism. These doctrines further were divided into different religious and philosophical streams. There are also some streams that take a conciliatory position between the two doctrines, such as monoenergism and monothelitism. During the period when monoenergism became a political instrument for the Byzantine Empire, Varaz-Grigor could be baptized by the emperor to the Chalcedonian dyophysitism and monoenergism, and later change to monophysitism.

Strengthened after their victory over Sassanian Iran, Byzantium tried to use new trends as a means of uniting the Christian church. Therefore, the transition from one teaching to another was a characteristic feature of that period. Walter E. Kaegi notes that Heraclius convened a synod in Theodosiopolis in 633, and personally participating in it, united the Armenian Church with the monothelism one [Kaegi, Walter E. (1995): 181]. There is an inconsistency here. In fact, Heraclius led the Armenian Church to the Chalcedonian doctrine [Hovorun C. Will (2008): 53-102]. The reason for the discrepancy is the omission of a small piece of information. Namely, after "Ecthesis", the letter of the Byzantine emperor Heraclius, in 638, monothelism began to be used as an official religious teaching. Until then, in the religious policy of the Byzantine Empire, one can speak of monoenergism [Meyendorff (1999): 36].

Although reliable research indicates that Viro was a Chalcedonian [The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsest of Mt. Sinai (2008): XIX], it is not possible to unambiguously conclude that he was a Chalcedonian dyophysite or, conversely, an anti-Chalcedonian monophysite. If the Byzantine emperor Heraclius and the Albanian Catholicos Viro were both Chalcedonians, then it is not logical to think that Varaz-Grigor was baptized twice. It could be assumed that Catholicos Viro belonged, most likely, to the anti-Chalcedonian monophysite doctrine.

It should be noted that two facts are recorded in the sources. First, during the advance of the Byzantine army, Heraclius, who defeated the Sassanids, went to the South Caucasus and met with the local nobility, including Varaz-Grigor [Kartlis Tskhovreba (2014): 212; Rayfield (2012): 52]. Secondly, Viro [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 93], freed from prison by the son of Khosrow and returning to his country, converted a representative of the influential noble dynasty Varaz-Grigor to Christianity in order to restore local rule against the backdrop of political events [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 109]. According to Ziya Bunyadov, this event took place in Ctesiphon in 627 [Буниятов З. (1965): 41]. Taking into account that these two events can be considered historical reality, however the question in what year they occurred remains controversial. For example, the first event, the baptism of Varaz-Grigor by Heraclius can be dated earlier than 627, during his offensive in 624, when Heraclius retreated with booty and captives to the Caucasian Albania [Zuckerman, Constantine (2002): 190-191]. Assuming this, then the second event could have occurred after the conclusion of peace by the belligerents. That is, Viro, returning to his homeland in 628, consecrated Varaz-Grigor to monophysitism, since the country again found itself in the bosom of Sassanian Iran.

It can be concluded that Varaz-Grigor had to lean towards the victorious Byzantines until it became clear which empire Caucasian Albania would belong to on the basis of the pending Byzantine-Sassanian treaty and adopted the doctrine of Christianity compatible with the policy of Heraclius, Chalcedonian dyophysitism. However, the peace treaty concluded in 629 [Sebeos (1999): XXV] returned Albania to the sphere of influence of the Sassanids. Under such conditions, the return of the Mihranids to the policy of rapprochement with the Sassanids was inevitable. It was at this time that Catholicos Viro led Varaz-Grigor to monophysitism. This alliance prompted the Mihranids to support the Sassanids at the start of the Arab invasions.

It follows from this that, firstly, in the Sassanian-Byzantine rivalry for hegemony in the Caucasus, and then the Caliphate-Byzantine conflict that came to replace it, religion was used as a means of influence in politics, and secondly that the changes associated

with it determined the fate of Albanian statehood, as well as the religious and ethnic identities of Albanians.

Looking over the changes in religious theories, associated with the political events of that time, it can be seen that soon after the emergence of Christianity, starting from the 2nd-3rd centuries, there were disagreements between the Antiochian and Alexandrian schools about the human and divine nature of Jesus Christ. The Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451 resulted in the two schools becoming competing doctrines. After their victory over the Sassanids, the Byzantine emperor Heraclius conquered a number of territories in the Near and Middle East. These areas were dominated by anti-Chalcedonian monophysites, miaphysites and the Nestorian doctrine, which recognized the dual nature of Jesus, but differed from dyophysitism. In such a situation, monothelitism seemed to many, especially the then emperor Heraclius and prominent clergy of that time, to offer a compromise position between the Chalcedonian and the anti-Chalcedonian doctrines [Daniel J. Sahas (2022): 152].

Having decisively defeated the Sassanid empire, Heraclius, first of all sought to establish confessional peace in the Christian world through the formula *Mia theandrike energia* or monoenergism, which concretized the dual divine-human nature of Christ as a single energy unity of the Chalcedonians. But the monoenergism formula faced serious opposition, prompting Heraclius to announce a new formula for the unity of Christ in 638. In the same year, the emperor signed the “Ecthesis”, confirming the formula that in Christ there are not two different wills, but only one will. Monothelitism, which recognizes the dual divine-human nature of Christ, is based on the idea that the will of Jesus and the will of the Father are one. Even Nestor accepted the unity of will in Christ [Pannenberg (2011): 293]. That is, monothelitism could be attractive to the Nestorians as well. Thus, the Byzantine Empire began to use the doctrine of monothelitism, which claimed to create unity in the Christian world. The Byzantine emperors, who tried to subjugate the peoples of the Near and Middle East not only by military means, but also by religion, continued this policy after Heraclius.

As a matter of course, during the formation of Christian doctrines and in a changing political environment, Christian theologians continued religious discourse, putting forward new ideas, and causing new tensions and disagreements. First, supporters of dyothelitism, that is, the idea that Jesus Christ has two separate wills, just as He has a dual human-divine essence, argue that monothelitism is unfounded. After the initial condemnation of monothelitism in Rome in 649, the final victory of dyothelitism was won only at the Council of Constantinople in 681. By this time, the monophysite lands had already been taken from Byzantium; Palestine and Syria were conquered by the Arabs in 638, and Egypt in 641. Now, instead of making peace with the Monophysites, Constantinople had to seek peace with Rome [Pannenberg (2011): 294].

Christian theologians constantly discussed monothelitism in order to discredit it as a church doctrine. Maximus the Confessor, one of the closest clerics of Emperor Heraclius, considered both monoenergism and monothelitism to be a betrayal of the decision of the Council of Chalcedon that Christ was fully human. Because if there is no real person without having will and “movement”, so without will Jesus cannot have human nature [Meyendorff (1999): 38]. Finally, the IV Ecumenical Church Assembly gathered for its first meeting on November 7, 680 and ended its meetings, of which there were eighteen,

on September 16, 681. Although this meeting ended the religious doctrine of Monothelitism, adherents of this doctrine remained active for a long time.

Monothelitism did not immediately give way to the new teaching in all Christian communities. When the Fourth Universal Council of Constantinople took place, Pope Agatho sent a letter to Constantine IV, urging him to continue monothelitism. This letter is interesting for two reasons. First, it is clear behind the front lines that Byzantium used religion as a political tool. In his letter, he emphasized the ability of divine power to subordinate the barbarian peoples to the empire and faith [The Letter of Agatho (1955)]. Agathon's correspondence urged Constantine IV and the clergy to expect divine help while observing proper teaching and behavior, despite the military defeats of recent decades [Kaegi, Walter E. (1995): 219]. The second problem was that various Christian communities, who were followers of Pope Agatho and tried to defend themselves as an independent church after 681, continued to adhere to the doctrine of monothelitism.

In a word, Christian religious teachings and the Byzantine Empire, which turned them into a political instrument, influenced political events in the Near and Middle East, as well as in the Caucasus during the wars, waged with both the Sassanids and the Arab Caliphate, the new rival of Byzantium. Against this background, the position taken by Varaz-Grigor, in his transition from one teaching of Christianity to another, is an exemplary one.

The question of what doctrine of Christianity adhered to by Javanshir, who succeeded his father on the throne, is one of the issues worthy of attention. Interestingly, the years of his reign (638-680) coincide with the period (638-681) when Byzantium turned monothelitism into a political tool. The Albanian prince Javanshir Mihranid was, of course, one of the followers of this teaching, and, logically, the church under his patronage also supported monothelitism. Unlike the Albanian Church, the Armenian Miaphysite Church in 653, headed by Theodore Rashtuni, preferred the policy of cooperation with the Arabs rather than with Byzantium [Sebeos (1999): 164]. In contrast to the information of Sebeos that the Georgian and Albanian rulers had followed him [Sebeos (1999): XXXV], Moses of Kalankatuyk states that, contrary to the advice of his father, Javanshir entered into a fraternal alliance with the Byzantine emperor against the Caliphate and met with him personally after receiving a positive answer to his letter [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 115-118]. Later, the source mentions the Albanian patriarch Ukhtanes, who was happy that Javanshir brought the holy cross, donated by the emperor, and the church built in Gardman [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 119]. Although the author of the pro-monophysite influence does not give here any information about the Christian teaching of Ukhtanes or the church, it is clear that in this case we can talk about the Chalcedonian doctrine of the dyophysites and the teaching of monothelitism supported by Byzantium.

After Javanshir's meeting with Caliph Mu'awiyah I, it seems that there was no change in the teaching of the church. After returning from a meeting with the caliph, Javanshir visited the church he built in Gardman and gave instructions on its decoration [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 126]. Most importantly, the positions of Byzantine supporters in his palace and in the Church remained strong, and their dissatisfaction with his cooperation with the caliphate resulted in the assassination of Javanshir [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 142-144].

Jasmine Dum-Tragut does not confirm or deny the connection of the Albanian Church with monothelitism, referring to the insufficiency of written sources [Jasmine

Dum-Tragut (2023): 311]. However Moses of Kalankatuyk, a reliable source on the topic, describes how and when Javanshir received the cross from the emperor and how the Armenian noblemen reacted to this [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 118]. Paying attention to all this, it can be confidently asserted that during the reign of Javanshir Mihranid, the Albanian Church followed monothelism.

The Albanian Church during the reign of Varaz-Trdat I. The End of the Independent Church

There are grounds to assert that Varaz-Trdat I, the successor of Javanshir, pursued the same religious policy for a long time. According to Theophanes the Confessor, the Umayyad caliph Abd al-Malik asked the Byzantine emperor to renew the agreement that had been signed with Muawiyah I, in 686/7. However, despite the agreement, Emperor Justinian II sent the Byzantine commander Leontius with his army against the Arabs, and Iberia, Albania, Bukaniya (Mugan) and Midia (present Iranian Azerbaijan _L.A.) were subordinated to him. He imposed tribute on these countries and sent a large sum of money to the emperor [The chronicle of Theophanes Confessor (1997): 503]. So, Byzantium became more active in the region and created favorable conditions for dyophysitism.

During the reign of Javanshir and Varaz-Trdat I, the Albanian Church had extensive ties with the Georgian Dyophysites. Firstly, it is not by chance that the palimpsest found in the church of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, turned out to be composed of the Nuskhuri Georgian script of the 10th century as the superior text and the Albanian script as the inferior text [The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsest of Mt. Sinai. (2008): XXI]. Thanks to extensive connections with the Caucasian-Albanian Church, the Albanian Bible could naturally be transferred to the Georgian Church. In addition, many ancient Georgian words passed into old Udi, the church language of Caucasian Albania. For example, the ancient Georgian “akvseba” (Easter) as “akhsiba” in old Udi, “madli” (grace) as “madil”, “savrdzeli” (throne) as “sa’ourzel”, and “sakhe” (picture) as the same. A number of Greek terms also entered the ancient Udi language through the Georgian language [Rayfield (2012): 41].

It is appropriate to consider the international situation that had developed by the end of the 7th century. The Albanian ruler Javanshir (638-680) regulated relations with the caliphate, while maintaining his internal independence; he undoubtedly supported the independence of the Caucasian-Albanian Church. According to J. Dowsett, the Albanian ruler Javanshir was killed between September 680 and June 681 [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 138]. Most of his nephew Varaz-Trdat I's reign (680-705), who came to power after him, fell during the period of the second civil war (680-692) in the Umayyad Caliphate, which was called the "second fitna". This period is characterized by the political dominance of Byzantium in the region and the frequently allied Khazar Khaganate.

Asoghik of Taron in his "World History" writes that in the third year of the reign of Justinian II, he sent his army to Armenia, and that at that time 25 regions were destroyed, and 8000 families were sold into slavery [Asoghik of Taron (2017): II, 2]. He further states that in the fourth year of Justinian's reign, in 689, he himself led a campaign in the South Caucasus, dividing his army into three parts and sending it to Georgia, Albania and Armenia [Asoghik of Taron (2017): 166]. As a result of a successful campaign, Justinian II, calling the rulers of these countries, took some of them prisoner, and took the children

of others as hostages. Some of them he awarded and appointed as principles in their countries. The source writes that he appointed Nerseh Kamsarakan, lord of Shirak, to Armenia, and Varazdat (Varaz-Trdat I) to Albania as the Exarch, second in rank after the emperor, and appointed an army of 30,000 to support these rulers, and himself returned to Constantinople [Asoghik of Taron (2017): 167]. It is not difficult to determine the dyophysite religious policy of Varaz-Trdat I, who was appointed exarch by the Byzantine emperor and kept troops for his protection. At that time, the Albanian Church seems quite independent and following dyophysite teaching, different from the Armenian Miaphysite Church, and yet inclined towards Monothelitism. The political dependence of the country on Byzantium and its ally the Khazar Khanate reached the highest point when Varaz-Trdat I and his sons, who visited Constantinople, were arrested [Dowsett J. F. (1961): III, 12]. This event apparently coincided with the coup d'état of 695 by Leonitius, the general who deposed Justinian II, temporarily seized power, and presumably Leonitius imprisoned Varaz-Trdat I. Leontius was deposed by Apsimar in 698, who came to power under the name of Tiberius III (698-705). Although he freed Varaz-Trdat in 699, his sons remained hostages in Constantinople for another 12 years. As for their release, it was not Justinian II who restored his power, but Philippicos Bardanes, the next emperor of Byzantium, who came to power in November 711 [Asoghik of Taron (2017): 167].

Since the focus of the study is on processes related to religion, it is necessary to briefly dwell on whether the Khazar Khaganate had religious relations with Albania. The Khazar Khanate did not use religion as a political tool in the region either before or after the adoption of Judaism as their official religion by Obadiah in 790. However, the Albanians, according to the description of Moses of Kalankatuyk, tried to introduce Christianity among the Khazars. Adding a religious coloration to the Khazar-Albanian relations, Moses of Kalankatuyk emphasizes that the Albanian Bishop Israel converted the Khazars to the faith. The title of chapter 42 in Book II of his work already conveys this message: "The consultation of the great prince of the Huns Ilituer with his nobles in order that the bishop Israel might remain with them to establish a patriarchal see there" [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 166]. Moses of Kalankatuyk describes that after meeting with the Albanian Bishop Israel, the prince of the Huns, Ilituer, equipped and prepared the *il-tigin* of Khorasan and *Chat'n Khazr* from among the chieftains of their country to follow holy Israel as ambassadors of goodwill. [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 168]. The content of the letter they brought to the Albanian ruler was as follows: "Greetings to you, holy lord Eliazar, the great patriarch of Albania, and our beloved brother Varaz-Trdat, the sovereign prince of Albania ... we recognized our creator and found peace." [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 168]. It is interesting that during the meeting, emphasizing faith in one God, the phrase is used, as if the Khazars want to spread Christianity to the whole world: "Let us take as our model all the lands believing in this faith, and the great kingdom of the Romans." [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 167]. This part of the chapter glorifies the faith of the Romans, the Byzantine Empire. It is also a sign that the Caucasian Albanian Church had the same church as the Roman-Byzantine Empire at that time.

Let us turn to some Byzantine and Eastern sources to clarify information about the Khazars' desire to convert to Christianity under the influence of the Bishop of Israel and make a political tool out of this. Of these, the Byzantine monk and chronicler Theophanes the Confessor (c. 758-818) gave consistent information on the period and topic under study in his *Chronicle* [The chronicle of Theophanes Confessor (1997)]. Given that

Theophanes served at the court of the Byzantine Emperor Leo IV the Khazar before becoming a monk, he is undoubtedly a reliable source on the subject. So, Leo IV was actually the son of Chichak, the daughter of the Khazar Khagan Bihar. Another source is the chronicle of Theophilus of Edessa, an astrologer at the Abbasid court in Iraq in the second half of the 8th century, which lacks materials on the church and Christianity, but gives a tense political picture of that period [Hoyland Robert G. (2011)]. Also, Agapius or Mahbub ibn Qustantin, who was the bishop of the city of Manbij in Northern Syria, and his work "*Kitab al-Unwan*", completed in Arabic in 940, is one of the reliable sources for 630-750 years [Agapius (Mahboub) de Menbidj (1909)]. These sources point to the campaigns of the Khazar Khaganate to the Caucasus, including Albania, either as an ally of Byzantium or as a rival of the Caliphate, and they are consistent with similar information in the "History of Albanians". However, the adoption of Christianity by the Khazars and its transformation into a political instrument like Byzantium, such information is absent in them. It is also true that there were attempts to spread Christianity among the Khazars, who still were followers of the Tangri cult. [Golden P. (2007): 135] Moses seems to have described one such attempt.

Monothelitism, a conciliatory doctrine, was replaced completely by the dyophysite teaching during Nerses-Bakur, who succeeded Elizar as Catholicos of Albania. In this regard, Moses of Kalankatuyk, an opponent of dyophysitism, accuses the Albanian Catholic Nerses Bakur and Spram, the wife of Varaz-Trdat I, of a conspiratorial deal. Nerses Bakur, bishop of Gardman promised Spram, the queen of Albania, who followed the same "heresy", that 'If you will proclaim me catholicos of Albania, I will convert all Albania to Chalcedonism. She listened to him and conferred with the bishops and nobles of Albania, and all agreed unanimously to grant her request. [Dowsett J. F. (1961): 189-190]. The author of the "History of Albania" in Book III calls them "antichrist", meaning dyophysitism, which he was opposed to. During this period, fluctuations in the choice of religious doctrine and political strife between the prince Shero and the queen Spram led to the weakening of the state and the church, and allowed the Armenian Church to take advantage of this weakness. The Armenian Catholicos Elia was finally able to carry out his efforts to subdue the Albanian Church using the power of the Caliphate. Elia, in his letter to the Caliph Abd al-Malik (685-705), where he accused the Albanian Catholicos in betrayal to the Caliph, stating: "[the] catholicos of Albania has come to an agreement with the emperor of Greece, mentions him in his prayers and forces the land to adopt his faith and unite with him. [Dowsett J. F. (1961): III, 5]. And the Caliph's response was, of course, positive. Thereby, Elia achieved subordination of the Albanian Church to the Armenian one, and also created pretext for the annulment of the internal independence of the Albanian state.

As for the further position of the Albanian Church, it, like the Georgian Church, was often set to struggle against the Armenian Church, which was considered by the latter as a form of separatism and heresy. A very interesting statement on this subject was made by Robert Hewsen, an American scholar of Armenian origin. He writes that if it were not for the Armenian Church, which suppressed this step with the help of the Arabs in 705, the Albanian church and palace would have followed the path of the Georgians and adopted Chalcedonian Christianity. [Hewsen Robert H. and Salvatico Christopher C (2001): 92]. The Albanians found themselves in a desperate situation due to the invasion

of the Arabs and the break of the Armenian Church's connection with Byzantium, and its joining the Caliphate.

After the new Byzantine-Caliphate conflict that began in 705, the balance of political forces in the South Caucasus was very changeable and divided into two different camps: 1) Varaz-Bakur, Arshushu, Varazo and, in general, the pro-Byzantine forces, which included most of the Kartli nobility, as well as part of Albania; 2) Armenian *ishkhan*, Albanian *ishkhan* and pro-Arab forces, which include most of the secular and religious figures of these two countries. Here, the pro-Byzantine forces supported the dyophysite orientation, while the pro-Arab forces supported the Monophysite doctrine, and therefore the political struggle had a pronounced religious content [Tavadze L. (2020): 71].

The Manzikert or Manaskert Council of 726, convened by the Armenian Catholicos John of Odzun or Jovannes Ojnetsi, was an important step for the Armenian Monophysite Church, which completely separated its paths from the Dyophysite Church. Michael the Syrian, the Syriac philosopher, in his "Chronicle" in the twentieth chapter of book 9, lists the bishops who participated in the Church Council. We do not see among them the names of Albanian clerics [Chronicle of Michael the Great (2013): XI, 20]. However, N. Adonts, in his work "Armenia in the Age of Justinian" included Bishop of Gardman in the list of bishops participating in the Council [Адонц Н. (1908): 339]. Anyway, a very difficult period began for the Caucasian Albanian Church. This created favorable conditions for the Islamic religion, which spread and strengthened as a result of the Arab invasions.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Albanian Church, during the turbulent period of the late 6th and early 7th centuries, had to change its position several times in relation to religious teachings. The inconsistency in belonging to one or another doctrine of Christianity was aggravated by the desire of powerful empires in the region to use religion for hegemony in the region and also by the attempts of the Armenian Church to completely subjugate the Albanian one. Christianity could not continue to be the main religion of the Eastern Caucasus in such conditions and later lost its position to the Islamic religion, spread as a result of the Arab invasions. Only the Udi people, the ethno-linguistic group and the Christian minority in the Republic of Azerbaijan, have been able to preserve their cultural and religious identity to this day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Адонц Н. (1908) *Армения в эпоху Юстиниана: Политическое состояние на основе нахарарского строя* [Armenia in the era of Justinian: Political state based on the Nakharar system]. Спб., типография Императорской Академии наук, 1908, 526 pages
2. Agapius (Mahboub) de Menbidj (1909). *Kitab al- Unwan*. Histoire universelle. Editte et tradute en Francaise par A.A. Vasiliev. Premis D'Imprimer, 135 pp.
3. Asoghik of Taron (2017). *The Universal History of Step'anos Tarōnec'i*. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by Tim Greenwood. Oxford University Press, 375 pages

4. Буниятов, Зия (1965). *Азербайджан В VII-IX вв.* [Azerbaijan in VII-IX centuries]. Издательство Академии Наук Азербайджанской ССР, Баку, 402 pages
5. Christensen, Arthur (1944). *L'Iran sous les Sassanides* [Iran under the Sassanids]. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 260 pages
6. *Chronicle of Michael the Great, Patriarch of the Syrians* (2013). Sources of the Armenian Tradition. Long Branch, N.J., 378 pages
7. *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsest of Mt. Sinai.* (2008) Edited by J. Gippert, W. Schulze, Zaza Aleksidze, J. Mahe. Volume I-II, Brepols n.v. Turnhout. (portfolios): 530 pages
8. *The chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern history, A.D. 284-813.* (1997) Translated with introduction and commentary by Cyril Mango and Roger Scott with the assistance of Geoffrey Greatrex. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 845 pages
9. Codoñer, Juan Signes (2014). New Alphabets For The Christian Nations: Frontier Strategies In The Byzantine Commonwealth Between The 4th And 10th Centuries. In: *New Perspectives on Late Antiquity in the Eastern Roman Empire.* Edited by Edited by Ana de Francisco Heredero, David Hernández de la Fuente and Susana Torres Prieto. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 117-162
10. Daniel J. Sahas (2022). *Byzantium and Islam; Collected Studies on Byzantine-Muslim Encounters.* Published by Brill, 550 pages
11. Dowsett J. F. (1961) *The History of The Caucasian Albanians by Movses Dasxurançi.* Translated by C. J. F. Dowsett. London, Oxford University Press. New York Toronto, 252 pages
12. Dum-Tragut, Jasmine (2023). One or two? On Christological and Hierarchical Disputes and the Development of the “Church of Albania” (4th–8th centuries). *Caucasian Albania: An International Handbook.* Edited by Jost Gippert and Jasmine Dum-Tragut. Berlin/Boston; Published by Walter de Gruyter GmbH, pp.285-331 DOI <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110794687>
13. Еремян С. (1939), Моисей Каланкатуйский о посольстве албанского князя Вараз Трдата к хазарскому хакану. [Moses of Kalankatuik about the embassy of the Albanian prince Varaz Trdat to the Khazar khakan] *Записки Института Востоковедения АН ССР*, Vol. VII, pp. 130-155
14. Golden, Peter (2007). The conversion of the Khazars to Judaism. In: *The World of Khazars.* Publisher: Brill, pp. 123–162, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004160422.i-460.22>
15. Hewsen Robert H. and Salvatico Christopher C (2001). *Armenia: a historical atlas.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 341 pages
16. Hovorun C. Will (2008). Action and Freedom. *Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century.* Chapter 2. Leiden, Brill, 2008, pp. 53–102
17. Hoyland Robert G. (2011) *Theophilus of Edessa's Chronicle and the Circulation of Historical Knowledge in Late Antiquity and Early Islam.* Translated by Robert G. Hoyland. Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 368 pages
18. Kaegi, Walter E. (1995) *Byzantium and the Early Islamic Conquests.* Cambridge University Press, 313 pages

19. *Kartlis Tskhovreba* (2014). A History of Georgia. ARTANUJI Publishing, Tbilisi, 444 pages
20. King P.E. (2003) Religion and Identity: The Role of Ideological, Social, and Spiritual Contexts. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7:3, 197-204, DOI: 10.1207/S1532480XADS0703_11
21. The Letter of Agatho (1955), Pope of Old Rome, To The Emperor, Addressed to the Sixth Council. In the book: *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church*, trans H. R. Percival, in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd Series, ed. P. Schaff and H. Wace, (repr. Grand Rapids MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1955), XIV, 324-353
22. Мамедова, Фарида (2005). *Кавказская Албания и Албаны* [The Caucasian Albania and Albanians]. Баку, ЦИКА, 818 стр.
23. Meyendorff, John (1999). *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. 2nd edition. Fordham University Press, 243 pages
24. Pannenberg, Wolfhard (2011). *Jesus: God and Man*. Stanley J. Grenz (Preface), D. A. Priebe (Translator), L. L. Wilkins (Translator). SCM Press, 432 pages
25. Rayfield, Donald (2012). *Edge of empires: a history of Georgia*. London, Reaktion Books, 481 pages
26. Sebeos (1999). *The Armenian History*, by R. W. Thomson (Translator), James Howard-Johnston (Translator). Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 456 pages
27. Toumanoff, Cyril (1969). Chronology of the early kings of Iberia. *Traditio*, Published by: Fordham University, Vol. 25, pp. 1-33
28. Toumanoff, Cyril (1963). *Studies in Christian Caucasian History*. Washington, Georgetown University Press, pp. 605
29. Tavadze, Leri (2020). Saqartvelo VIII sauknesi: politikuri istoria [Georgia in the VIII century: Political History] (In Georgian). Tbilisi, Publishing House "Universal", 301 pages
30. Vəlixanlı Nailə. (2016) *Azərbaycan VII-XII əsrlərdə: tarix, mənbələr, şərhlər* [Azerbaijan in VII-XII centuries: history, sources, comments]. Bakı, 480 pages
31. Zuckerman, Constantine (2002). Heraclius in 625. *Revue des études Byzantines*, Année 2002, 60, pp. 189-197

THE CULTURAL IDENTITY ISSUES OF THE 19TH CENTURY ABKHAZIA**Lia Akhaladze**Doctor of History, Associate Professor
Sokhumi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

ORCID 0000 – 0003 – 4478 - 4989

liaahaladze@sou.edu.ge<http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/CLHI5910>

Abstract: The cultural values of the nation, traditions, symbols, folklore, myths and legends, constitute the collective memory of this society. These values, created by educational and cultural centers, express the leading aspirations of the nation that created them and play a special role in shaping the identity of nations.

The cultural identity of the population of Abkhazia rested on centuries-old traditions of Georgian-Abkhaz historical coexistence. This determined the fact that Abkhazia had remained a part of the all-Georgian cultural and historical universe. Since the end of the 17th century, when local Christian cultural and educational centers were liquidated in Abkhazia, cultural life in Abkhazia was supported only by the church centers of the Principality of Samegrelo (Odishi). Throughout the 19th century, the House of the Abkhaz principals was the center of the cultural life of Abkhazia. Even after the abolition of the Abkhaz principality (1864), representatives of the former ruling dynasty and people close to them determined the main aspects of social and cultural life. Above this, the history of the cultural life of Abkhazia of the 19th and early 20th centuries knows many prominent Georgians and Abkhazians, who great contributed to the creation of the cultural identity.

The history of the cultural life of Abkhazia in the 19th and early 20th centuries reflects the main aspirations and characteristics of the cultural identity of the Abkhazian population: the establishment of new educational and cultural centers, close ties and cooperation with the progressive society of Tbilisi.

Keywords: *Cultural Identity, Abkhazia, Georgians, Abkhazians, Abkhazian Script, Georgian Theological Schools of Abkhazia.*

The famous identity theorist Anthony David Smith considers ethnic and national identities as models of cultural identity. In turn, cultural identity is the basis of ethnic and national identity. [Smith, Anthony D. (2010): 85-93] Cultural values of this or that nation are traditions, symbols, folklore, myths and legends, in which the collective memory of this society is reflected. The values created by the educational and cultural centers, which express the leading aspirations of the nation that created it, play a special role in the formation of the identity of nations.

From the end of the 17th century, when the local Christian cultural and educational centers were dismantled in Abkhazia and the area was emptied of clergymen, there was virtually no cultural and educational activity here. From that time on, only the ecclesiastical centers of Samegrelo (Odishi) Princedom were maintaining the cultural life

in Abkhazia. They were teaching the residents from Abkhazia (Abkhazs and Georgians) literacy, scripture, geography, astronomy, arithmetic, hagiography, hymnography, etc. It was based on centuries-old traditions of Georgian-Abkhaz historical coexistence, which, despite the pressure from the highlanders and the strengthening of Ottoman influence, was not completely eradicated. This determined the fact that Abkhazia had remained a part of the all-Georgian cultural and historical universe. This is evidenced by the written sources left by the Principals of Abkhazia, Abkhaz and Georgian nobility, and the representatives of the lower social circles: The official documents, letters, donations, complaints and rulings, tombstone epitaphs, etc. All of them are written in Georgian. There were also some family schools and also an ecclesiastical school near the Ilori Church, where Georgian literacy and other fields of literature were taught. [Lia Akhaladze (2021): 202-210]

Throughout the 19th century, the house of Abkhazia's principals was the center of the cultural life in Abkhazia. Even after the abolition of the Abkhazian Principedom (1864), the representatives of the former ruling house and persons closely related to them were determining the main aspects of social and cultural life. The activities of *Giorgi (Safar-Bey) Sharvashidze, Mikheil Sharvashidze, Constantine Sharvashidze, Giorgi Sharvashidze, Solomon Zvamba, Dimitri Machavariani*, and clergymen such as *Ioané Ioseliani, Alexandre Okropiridze, Gabriel Kikodze, Ambrosi Khelaia, Kyrion Sadzaglishvili, Ivané Gegia*, and others should be especially mentioned. It is known that in 1810 the archpriest of the Zugdidi temple and the court priest of the Abkhaz principality Ioané Ioseliani officially tried to open a religious school in the village of Likhni, the center of the Abkhaz principality, with the support of Giorgi (Safar Bey) Sharvashidze, a representative of the House of Abkhaz princes. [ACAC (1875): 850-851] This was the first attempt to establish an ecclesiastical school in Abkhazia.

The transformation of Sokhumi into the cultural and educational center of Abkhazia began in the mid-19th century, after the foundation of the first Ecclesiastical and secular schools. Giorgi (Safar-bey) Sharvashidze's children, Mikheil, Constantine and Alexander, had a good Georgian education which was ensured by their mother *Tamar Dadiani* (sister *Grigol Dadiani*, the Samegrelo Principal). This tradition was carried on by the family of Mikheil, whose spouse was Alexandra (Tsutsa) Dadiani, a representative of the side branch of the Samegrelo Princely House and the granddaughter of Niko Dadiani, known as the Great Niko.

Georgian was the main language of culture and education in 19th century Abkhazia. This is validated by the Russian scholars and travellers of the first half of the 19th century. [Seleznyov (1847): 206] Their works contain a lot of information about artifacts decorated with Georgian *Asomtavruli inscriptions* in the 19th century Abkhazia. As an illustration, Georgian inscriptions are on the icons commissioned by Mikheil Sharvashidze in 1829 and 1848, and donated to the Likhuni (Likhni) Temple. It should be noted that the correspondence of Mikheil Sharvashidze with the Russian authorities and family members was conducted in Georgian. Letters of the Principal's family members were also written in an exemplary Georgian. Simon Janashia, observing the form and style of Mikheil Sharvashidze's correspondence, concludes that "such function of the Georgian language was the result of the centuries-old cultural and historical development of the country of Abkhazia". [Janashia (1988): 35] Besides the official documents and epistolary legacy of Giorgi (Safar Bey) Sharvashidze and Mikheil

Sharvashidze, the Russian General Kotzebue confirms the widespread use of the Georgian language at Mikheil Sharvashidze's court: "Georgian was the written language used by the family of the Princes Sharvashidze". [Papaskiri (2010); Papaskiri (2016): 412] On top, it should be also mentioned that Mikheil Sharvashidze, the last prince of Abkhazia, and his wife Alexandra Dadiani's the tombstone epitaphs in the Mokvi Cathedral are crafted in Georgian Asomtavruli script. [Bgazhba Kh. (1967): 32-33; Silogava (2004): 298-301] Also in Georgian are the tombstone epitaphs of nobleman Mikheil Marshania in the same temple [Bgazhba Kh. (1967): 31; Silogava (2004): 302-303] and diverse tombstone epitaphs of Gali Municipality. Among the latter, the tomb epitaphs of the noblewoman Salome Anchabadze and her husband Kiazio Emkhvari deserve special attention. [Akhaldze (2006): 208-212]

Also noteworthy is Constantine Sharvashidze, the younger brother of Mikheil Sharvashidze. Although Constantine Sharvashidze was educated in the Corps of Pages in St. Petersburg, he was close to the Georgian aristocratic circles and shared their views. This is evidenced by his participation in the conspiracy of 1832 with the aim of restoring the state independence of Georgia. [Potto (1894): 25-26] As it is seen from the testimony of one of the conspirators, Constantine Sharvashidze enjoyed great authority among them. He was talking ecstatically about freedom and claimed that he "could mount an uprising in Abkhazia, and clear Abkhazia from the Russians with two thousand Abkhazs." In addition, it is believed that he planned to send to Tbilisi in the first days of the uprising, according to some sources, 300 armed Abkhazians, and according to other sources. [Gozalishvili (1970): 363-364] Because of his participation in the 1832 conspiracy, Constantine Sharvashidze was banished from Georgia [ACAC (1847): 410] and was allowed to return only from 1858 (he lived mainly in Kutaisi and Tbilisi). This period is associated with his active involvement in the process of creating the first Abkhazian alphabet.

It is known that Abkhazian was a spoken language. The Russian government decided to create an Abkhazian script in the 1860s. The creation of the Abkhazian script is connected with the name of General Peter von Uslar, who composed the Abkhazian alphabet on the basis of Cyrillic script in 1862. [Gvantseladze T. (2009): 11] The same year, the Society for the Restoration of Orthodox Christianity in the Caucasus set up in Tbilisi a special commission headed by General Ivan Bartolomeito compile the first textbook of the Abkhazian alphabet for Abkhazian parish schools. The members of the commission were the well-known Georgian historian *Dimitri Purtseladze*, who at that time was in charge of the affairs of the Society for the Restoration of Orthodox Christianity, and *Vladimir Trirogov*, the Special Representative of the Caucasus Viceroy, graduate of the Faculty of Oriental Studies at St. Petersburg University and an expert in Oriental languages. Moreover, residents of Abkhazia, such as Priest Ioané Gegia, officer Georgy Kurtsikidze and Simeon Eshba took an active part in the creation of the alphabet. Beside this, the Abkhaz text was first reviewed and corrected by Constantine Sharvashidze in 1863, and then by Grigol Sharvashidze in 1864. Thus, this text was twice revised and corrected. According to their suggestion, the Bzipi pronunciation of the Abkhazian language, which was used in the book at first, was changed to the common Abkhazian pronunciation. [Gvantseladze T. (2012)]

The creation of the Cyrillic-based Abkhazian alphabet by P. von Uslar was highly criticized. It was believed that Georgian graphics better reflected the phonemes of

Abkhazian sounds. [Charaia, Petre (1907)] This fact was acknowledged by Peter von Uslar himself [Gamakharia and Gogia (1997): 353]. Uslar stated: “The Georgian alphabet system can be taken as the basis of a common alphabet for all Caucasian languages that are not written languages yet; But if we borrow from Georgians not only the alphabet system, but also the outline of the letters, we will unintentionally create difficulties, which will be even more noticeable as the Russian literacy spreads more in the Caucasus” [Uslar (1887): 48-49].

Even the Abkhaz nationalists believed that the Russian Empire was trying to separate the Abkhazs from the kindred peoples. [Ashkhatsava (1925): 37-38] The Abkhazian script was created solely for political reasons and aimed both the isolation of the Abkhazs from the Georgian cultural universe and the preparation of their Russification through the use of Russian graphics and the Russian language. [Gvantseladze (2009): 212] Although at that time this alphabet could not be used properly, and neither the Abkhazian primary school nor the Abkhazian literature could be established on its basis, this fact gave some expectations to the Abkhaz community that they would have their own script and via this, opportunity to develop new spheres of culture.

Georgian missionaries of the Georgian Exarchate played a special role in the cultural life of Abkhazia and in the survival of the Abkhaz ethnos in general. Their activities contributed to the institutional development of education and culture in Abkhazia. The establishment of the first educational and cultural institutions is connected with their names. The first was the Okumi Parish School, which was opened for the children of nobles by *David Machavariani*, a graduate of the Tbilisi Theological Seminary, in 1851. Soon the gifted children of peasants also were able to join the school. There was a library near Okumi school, which was opened by Ivané Gegia with his own funds. [Sakhokia (1985): 333-335]

It is alleged that the Okumi School for a long time was the only one among the schools and parochial schools of the Orthodox Christian Restoration Society in the Caucasus. [Dudko (1956): 3] However, there is evidence that other unofficial schools were already operated in Abkhazia, namely, in Likhni and Ilori, before 1851-1852. [Gamakharia (2006): 67; Dudko (1956): 20] In accordance to the archival sources, the Georgian Exarch awarded Bishop Alexandre Okropiridze on May 8, 1852 for establishing a school for the children in Ilori. The documents show that the pupils were ready to enter the 2nd grade in 1852 and their achievements had been already substantial. Based on the documents, we can presume that the Ilori school started its functioning no earlier than 1850 and no later than May 1851 [CHAG: 18] As for the Likhni ecclesiastical school, it was officially established on September 25, 1852 and subordinated to Alexandre Okropiridze, the supervisor of the Abkhazian Theological School. The Russian scholar A. Dudko also mentions the establishment of schools at churches and monasteries in Abkhazia, namely in Bedia, Saberio, Dikhazurga, and Gudava. [Dudko (1956): 20]

In a short time new schools started to operate in Samurzakano and Abkhazia. For example, there were 11 schools in Samurzakano (Okumi, Dikhazurga, Bedia, Gudava, Tagiloni, I and II Saberio, Barghebi, Nabakevi, Chuburkhindji, Pakhulani) by 1868. Bishop Alexandre Okropiridze donated 200 rubles from his own salary to the Ilori school, which as well continued its functioning [Gamakharia (2005): 457]

In 1863, a school for highlanders was opened in Sokhumi, calculated for 20 boys,

consisted of 15 places for the children of the Abkhaz nobles and 5 places for the children of Russian officials. The education would last four years. [Gulia (1962): 140] For years, the school superintendent was *Constantine Machavariani* (son of *David Machavariani*, the founder of the Okumi School). The Sokhumi Highlanders' School was the largest educational institution in Abkhazia. [Tarba (1964): 10]

According to the material published in the newspaper "Kavkaz" on 1 June 1866, the local Russian administration established the women's school in Sokhumi on 3 March 1866. There, among others, were enrolled five Abkhazs.. [Papaskiri (2004): 216-217] In 1870, the second women's school for the Abkhaz girls – a Progymnasium – had been opened in Sokhumi. [Dudko (1956): 40] The establishment of the Highlanders' School and the women's Progymnasium only for the children of the Abkhaz and Russian civil servants, unequivocally indicates the imperial goal to divide the local community and gradually establish its own foothold for the full domination in the region.

By 1917, there were about 79 schools in Abkhazia with 3,407 students. [Dudko (1956): 309-328]. The foundation of the Sokhumi branch of the Society for the Propagation of Literacy among Georgians considerably contributed to the institutional development of education in Abkhazia. The idea of creating a Sokhumi branch arose during the stay of Ilya Chavchavadze in Abkhazia. *Ilia Chavchavadze* was invited to Gagra by Duke *Alexander von Oldenburg* and he arrived there in May of 1903. From there *Ilia Chavchavadze* went to Sokhumi. On May 24 he was warmly welcomed by the Georgian society of Sokhumi (by the initiative of *Tedo Sakhokia*) in *Alexander Sharvashidze's* house. [Gelenava (2011): 370] Interestingly, it was after *Ilia Chavchavadze's* toast at the official dinner that one of the young guests asked him, as chairman of the Society for the Propagation of Literacy Among Georgians, to petition for the opening of a branch of this society in Sokhumi. Nonetheless, the Branch establishment, as well as opening the school took couple years. This idea was brought to life in 1909 when *Niko Tavdgiridze*, one of the well-known public figures, wrote the petition on behalf of the Sokhumi Georgians. Ultimately, in 1910, the Sokhumi branch of the Society for the Propagation of Literacy among Georgians was established. Among its functioning members were such public figures as *Antimoz Jugheli*, *Niko Tavdgiridze*, *Sachino Ioseliani*, *Niko Janashia*, and remarkably, *Mariam Dadiani-Anchabadze*, a female activist, was Chairman of the Board. [Kvaratskhelia (2009): 41] The number of members grew to 355 in 1913. Soon the branch had its own schools in Sokhumi, Gudauta, and Gali. There were also small schools in the villages. Of particular note is the founding of the People's University in 1911 on the initiative of the population of Sokhumi, which in the first instance had about 40 students. At this university, classes lasted 5 days a week, and it is noteworthy that Georgian literacy is taught here. [Newspaper Sakhalkho Gazeti (1911)]

One of the prominent figures in the cultural and educational life of Abkhazia at the turn of the 20th century was *Niko Janashia*. Succeeding establishment of the society's Sokhumi branch, at the request of the board, *Niko Janashia* was invited as a teacher of the Georgian school and he started working there from 1910 until his death. Along with other public figures, such as *Antimoz Jugheli*, *Alexandre Sharvashidze*, and *Andria Chochua*, he made a great contribution to the creation of a seminary in Abkhazia. The four-year seminary was open on 1 July 1915 and from 1917 it was supervised by *Alexandre Giorgobiani*, a graduate of Moscow University. [Gelenava (2000): 38-40]

Studying the history of the culture of Abkhazia of this period, it is necessary to mention prominent Georgian and Abkhaz public figures. Among them who greatly influenced the cultural life of the region we should single out *Giorgi Sharvashidze*, the son of the last Principal of Abkhazia *Mikhail Sharvashidze* and the heir to the throne. Giorgi Sharvashidze, with his works and activities as a poet, playwright, novelist, essayist, and theatre critic, was an integral part of the all-Georgian culture. He referred to Georgia as “our homeland Iveria” and considered Abkhazia as an organic part of this Iveria (Georgia). Shalva Inal-ipa, the well-known Abkhaz scholar, correctly stated that he “was striving to restore the historical unity of two kindred peoples – Georgians and Abkhazs.” [Inal-ipa (1973): 8]

Giorgi Sharvashidze had a special relationship with the newly formed community of theatre-lovers in Abkhazia, which later became the basis for the establishment of a drama theatre. Theatrical performances began in Sokhumi in the 1880s and the Sokhumi theatrical circle started managing the first performances. Thus, Sokhumi drew attention of not only the Abkhaz, but also of the Georgian theatrical community in general. Soon the drama group was formed in Sokhumi. Its inspirers were ladies from the Sharvashidze and the Anchabadze families: *Mariam*, *Aghati*, and *Terezia Sharvashidze*, and *Mariam (Masho) Dadiani-Anchabadze*. At first, the income from the theatrical performances was used for charity. The money was spent on schools and hospitals, or given to the poor and students. In 1885, the Sokhumi theatre-lovers society performed the first play in Georgian before the audience. From 1886, *Lado Meskhishvili* began his collaboration with the Sokhumi theatre-lovers society. He had special relations with the Sokhumi Theatre. [Paghava (1941)]

In 1894, “*The Georgian Koro*” (“*The Georgian Choir*”), the first professional ensemble of the Georgian song (founded on November 15, 1886), successfully conducted its performances in Sokhumi. It was led by Czech singer *Ioseb Ratil (Navratil)*, the lead singer of Tbilisi Opera and Ballet Theatre, who was immensely in love with Georgian folk song. In 1897, *Alexandre Kavsadze*, the famous choirmaster, visited Sokhumi and performed with great success on the stage of the Sokhumi Theatre. [Newspape Iveria (1897)]

Sokhumi and Sokhumi Drama Theatre are closely connected with the name of *Shalva Dadiani*, the famous Georgian writer, playwright, and a theatrical figure. His active theatrical activities and acting career began in Sokhumi. Since 1912, Shalva Dadiani managed to establish a semi-professional theater in Sokhumi. There were several professional actors including *Elo Andronikashvili*, *Vaso Agulishvili*, later *Evelina Tsutsunava* and *David Kobakhidze* in the Georgian troupe. The troupe diligently colluded with *Dzuku Lolua’s* choir.

Accompanying with the Georgian theatre, the Abkhazian theatre was also created in the 1910s. On the initiative of Dimitri Gulia, in 1918, an Abkhazian literary-dramatic circle was established in Sokhumi, headed by Anton Shakaia. The first Abkhazian-language performance under the direction of local theatre-lover Platon Shakril was held in Ochamchire in 1918. [Georgian Soviet Encyclopaedia (1985)] When talking about the formation and development of theatrical art in Abkhazia, it is impossible not to recall the first Abkhazian professional artist *Alexandre Sharvashidze*. He was educated at the Moscow Higher School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture. He was a graphic artist, painter, scenographer, and art critic and theorist. He worked in St. Petersburg and Paris

Theatres. In 1918 he returned to Sokhumi and as a theatre artist he also contributed to the development of theatrical art in Abkhazia. In 1918, at the initiative of A. Sharvashidze, a children's art studio was opened in the building of the Sokhumi Women's Gymnasium, where he gave drawing lessons. [Shervashidze (1961)] He was invited to Europe in 1920 and has lived in Europe since 1921, but he donated about 500 works to the museums of Tbilisi and Sokhumi in 1958. [Shervashidze-Chachba, 2011]

It noteworthy to mention that *Solomon Zvanba*, an Abkhaz military man, scientist and ethnographer, had a great influence on the formation and development of modern Abkhaz culture. He was educated in St. Petersburg and served in the Honorable Regiment. He spent seven years in Russia and then enlisted in the Black Sea Coast Guard Battalion. Solomon Zvanba knew well the life and traditions of the Abkhazs. It is confirmed by his ethnographic works. [Zvanba (1982); Dzidzaria (1979): 45-47] It should be also noted that Solomon Zvanba was the first scholar who considered the Abkhazs to be culturally and historically separate from the rest of Georgia. He was the first Abkhaz scholar whose scientific work and cultural identity were entirely associated with the Russian cultural universe.

Dimitri Gulia, who started his public activities at the end of the 19th century, has a special contribution to the formation of Abkhaz culture and Abkhaz national values. He was educated at the Highlanders' school in Sokhumi and the Teaching Seminary in Gori. Dimitri Gulia as a scholar, poet, writer, and public figure was greatly influenced by Georgian public opinion. He collaborated with Tbilisi State University, where he was invited to teach Abkhazian language. In 1892, Dimitri Gulia, together with Constantine Machavariani, adapted the alphabet created by P. von Uslar to match the sounds of the Abkhazian language and published the new Cyrillic-based Abkhazian alphabet. In 1909 Andria Chochua compiled and published the textbook based on the revised Abkhazian alphabet in Tbilisi. In 1912, two important collections of Dimitri Gulia's poems, based on the Abkhaz folklore, were published in this script in Tbilisi. Moreover, in Tbilisi, his ballad "The Love Letter" was printed in 1913. Therefore, the foundations of Abkhazian culture, literature and poetry, closely related to Georgian literature and culture, were gradually laid. [Akhaldze (2021): 208-209]

Dimitri Gulia is also associated with "Apsni," the first newspaper in Abkhazian language, which was published on 27 February 1919. With the support of Georgian friends, the Abkhazian type was formed in Tbilisi and brought to Sokhumi by *Andria Chochua*. The newspaper's editorial office was in the building of the Sokhumi Teaching Seminary. In total, until February 12, 1921, when the publication of "Apsni" was discontinued, 35 issues were published. As Dimitri Gulia wrote, the newspaper was closed temporarily. [Gulia D. (1925): 22] although, in fact, this was the first repressive step of the Soviet government against the Abkhaz national culture.

At the turn of the 20th century, musical institutions were also established in Abkhazia. In 1904, following the initiative of *Mariam Dadiani-Anchabadze* and the board of the Sokhumi branch of the Society for the Spreading of Literacy among Georgians, Georgian musician, singer, and choirmaster *Dzuku Lolua* moved to Sokhumi. Upon arrival, he immediately established a reading room "Dioscuria", gathered up to eighty singers and formed a choir. In the repertoire of the choir, special attention was paid to Abkhaz songs, along with Georgian ones, which were collected during Dz. Lolua's village-by-village walk. He recorded them on a phonograph, performed them on stage, and preserved them

for eternity, therefore becoming the first collector and recorder of Abkhazian folk songs. [Lolua (2015)]

A new stage in the development of musical art in Abkhazia started during the Democratic Republic of Georgia. Zakaria Chkhikvadze, the famous Georgian choirmaster and teacher, by the instructions of the Georgian Music Society established a branch of the Music Society in Sokhumi, namely the Abkhazo-Georgian Music Society of Sokhumi, on 23 April 1919. [Akhaldze (2021): 210] In fact, it was the first philharmonic society in Sokhumi whose chairman became *Astamur Inalipa*.

David Chkotua, a representative of aristocratic circles, is another prominent Abkhaz whose work developed in the natural cultural and historical way of the Abkhaz people. Being a member of the younger generation of Georgian 1860s movement, he participated in the Georgian National Liberation movement. David Chkotua was also a columnist, talented journalist, tireless propagandist of education, and great scholar. In his scientific and journalistic letters, various topical issues of Georgian linguistics, literature, education, ethnography and geology are considered. He was one of the first to start a discussion about the national and global significance of Rustaveli's immortal poem. Despite the tragic and unfair fate, David Chkotua, through his journalistic and scientific activities, had a profound influence on Rustavelology and the history of Georgian national culture as a whole.

The history of the cultural life of Abkhazia in the 19th and early 20th centuries reflects the main aspirations and characteristics of the cultural identity population of the Abkhazia : the establishment of new educational and cultural centers, close ties and cooperation with the advanced society of Tbilisi, The appearance of new professional staff in the official arena.

The history of the cultural life of Abkhazia in the 19th and early 20th centuries knows many outstanding people whose work and social activities deserve special study. There are people whose contributions to various spheres of public life are invaluable. It should be noted that not only men, but also women played an important role in shaping the cultural identity of Abkhazia during the period under study. Among them such outstanding women as *Mariam Sharvashidze*, *Aghati Sharvashidze*, *Tereza Sharvashidze*, *Mariam (Masho) Dadiani-Anchabadze*, and others were the people who created the cultural image of Abkhazia of that period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- АСАС (1875). *Акты, собранные Кавказскою археографической комиссиею*. [Acts collected by the Caucasian Archaeographic Commission] Издан под редакцией председателя комиссии Ад. Берже, т. VI, ч. II. Тифлис: Типография Главного Управления Наместника Кавказского, 950 pages
- Akhaldze, Lia (2021). The Cultural life in Abkhazia in 1801-1917. In the book: *Why Abkhazia is Georgia, A True History*. Tbilisi, Sokhumi State University, pp. 202-210
- Akhaldze, Lia (2006). One More Inscription from Abkhazia. – *Historical Researches, VIII-IX. Annual of Abkhazian Organization of Georgian Historical Society* by EkvtimeTakaishvili. Tbilisi, (in Georgian), pp. 208- 212
- Ashkhatsava, S.M. (1925) Пути развития абхазской истории [The ways of development of the Abkhaz history]. Издание Наркомпроса Абхазии, 47 pages

- Vgzhba Kh. (1967). X. C. Бгажба. *Из истории письменности в Абхазии*. [On the History of Abkhazian Script]. Издательство “Мецниереба”. Тбилиси, (<https://yadi.sk/i/-cFRKsreuz7r3>)
- CHAG: *Central Historical Archive of Georgia*. Collection 493, Case 96
- Charaia, Petre (1907). About the Abkhazian alphabet. - *Isari, Georgian daily literary-political newspaper*. No 282, (in Georgian)
- Dudko, A.P. (1956) Из истории дореволюционной школы в Абхазии (1851—1917 гг.) [From the history of the pre-revolutionary school in Abkhazia (1851-1917)]. Sukhumi: Abgiza, 331 pages
- Dzidzaria, G.A. (1979) *Формирование дореволюционной абхазской интеллигенции* [Formation of the pre-revolutionary Abkhaz intelligentsia]. Сухуми: издательство «Алашара», 354 pages
- Gamakharia, Jemal and Gogia, Badri (1997). Абхазия – историческая область Грузии [Abkhazia- Historical Province of Georgia], Тбилиси: Издательство «Агдгома», 893 pages
- Gamakharia, Jemal (2006) St. High Priest Alexander (Okropiridze) and Abkhazia. The collection compiled, research and commentaries by Jemal Gamakharia. Tbilisi, (in Georgian) 232 pages
- Gamakharia, Jemal (2005). Abkhazia and Orthodoxy. Tbilisi, (in Georgian). Publishing Center: Lika, 1009 pages
- Gelenava, Irakli (2000) From the history of the establishment of the Sokhumi Teaching Seminary. *Journal of "Abkhazian News"*, No 4. Tbilisi, (in Georgian), pp. 38-40
- Gelenava, Irakli (2011). Abkhazia from 1881 till February of 1917 – *Essays from the History of Georgia. Abkhazia from Ancient Times till the Present Days*. Tbilisi, 2011. (in Geo).p 370.
- *Georgian Soviet Encyclopaedia* (1985). Vol. 9. Tbilisi, 1985 (in Georgian), p. 503
- Gozalishvili, Giorgi (1970). *1832 conspiracy*. Т. 2. Materials (Testimonies of Conspirators), Comments. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Merani,” 1970 (in Georgian), 655 pages
- Gulia D. (1925) *История Абхазии* [History of Abkhazia]. Т. I. Издание Наркомпроса С.С.Р. Абхазии. 3-я типография, Полиграфтреста ВСНХ Грузии. Тифлис, 341 pages
- Gulia D. (1962) *История горской школы* [History of the Mountain School] – Сочинения, т. IV. Сухуми, «Алашара», 140 pages
- Gvantseladze, Teimuraz (2009) Imperial Linguistic Policy in Abkhazia and its results. *Conflicts in Georgia and Prospects for Peace*. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Kalamus,” (in Georgian), pp.167-172.
- Gvantseladze, Teimuraz (2012). The Abkhazian Language and the Georgian Graphics. –*Spekali*. Electronic Bilingual Scholarly Peer-Reviewed Journal of the Faculty of Humanities at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, №5, 2012 (<http://www.spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/5/44/>)
- Inal-ipa, Shalva (1973) *Abkhazian literature yesterday and today*. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Ganatleba” (in Georgian), 126 pages

- Janashia, Simon (1988). Giorgi Sharvashidze. Cultural and Historical Essay. – *Works*. Vol. VI. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Metsniereba” (in Georgian), pp 5-72
- Kvaratskhelia, Boris (2009). *Niko Janashia's Cultural, Educational, Social and Political activities*. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Universali” (in Georgian), pp.53-56.
- Lolua, Dzuku (2015). A Little on the Folk Song and Chant. – *Chronicle of Georgian Chants in the Periodicals of 1861-1921*. Tbilisi (in Georgian)
- *Newspape: Iveria*, 1897, №122
- *Newspaper Sakhalkho Gazeti*, 1911, №440
- Paghava, Akaki (1941) Lado Meskhishvili. *Journal Theatre*, No5, (in Georgian)
- Papaskiri, Zurab (2004). *Studies in History of Present-Day Abkhazia*. Part I. From Ancient Times till 1917. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Meridiani”, (in Georgian), pp. 216-217.
- Papaskiri, Zurab (2010). On National, Political and Cultural Self-Identity of the Sharvashidze Princedom. – *Spekali*. Electronic Bilingual Scholarly Peer-Reviewed Journal of the Faculty of Humanities at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, №1, 2010 (<http://www.spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/1/8/>).
- Papaskiri, Zurab (2016). *Georgia. Historical Past and Present*. Collection of Works. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Meridiani” (in Georgian), 644 pages
- Potto V.A. (1894) *История 44-го Драгунского нижегородского полка*. [History of the 44th Dragoon Regiment of Nijni-Novgorod] Т. IV. Санкт-Петербург, Типо-лит. Р. Голике, 228 pages
- Seleznyov (1847) М. Селезнев. *Руководство к познанию Кавказа*. [Guide to the knowledge of the Caucasus] Кн. II. Санкт-Петербург, 1847. 304 pages
- Silogava, Valeri (2004). *Epigraphy of Abkhazia and Samegrelo*. Tbilisi: Artanuji Publishing, (in Georgian)
- Smith, Anthony D. (2010). *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. 2nd edition. Cambridge, Polity Press, 220 pages
- Sakhokia, Tedo (1985). *Travels (Guria, Adjara, Samurzakano, Abkhazia)*. Batumi: Publishing House “Sabchota Achara” (in Georgian), 414 pages
- Shervashidze, L.A. (1961) *Изобразительное искусство в Абхазии за 40 лет Советской власти* [Fine arts in Abkhazia during 40 years of Soviet power.]. – *Труды Абхазского института языка, литературы и истории имени Д. И. Гулиа*, XXXII. Издательство Академии наук Грузинской ССР, pp. 77-94
- Shervashidze-Chachba R. A. (2011) Статьи, очерки, обзоры. Ставрополь, (http://apsnyteka.org/183shervashidze_chachba_r_a.html)
- Tarba, V.G. (1964) *К 100-летию Сухумской абхазской школы* [To the 100th anniversary of the Sukhum Abkhaz school]. Сухуми: Издательство «Алашара», 80 pages
- Uslar P. K. (1887) *Этнография Кавказа. Языкознание. Абхазский язык*. [Ethnography of the Caucasus. Linguistics. Abkhaz language] Тифлис, Тип. Канц. градонач. Гражд. частью на Кавказе, 196 pages
- Zvanba, S.T. (1982). *Абхазские этнографические этюды* [Abkhazian ethnographic sketches]. Составитель, автор биографо-библиографического очерка в ответственный редактор Г. А. Дзидзария. Сухуми: Издательство «Алашара», 357 pages

THE TRADE CENTERS OF THE SOUTHERN BLACK SEA REGION AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE RELATIONS OF AZERBAIJAN BEFORE THE OTTOMAN INVASION

Almas Sabir Javadova

Associate Professor, History Department

Baku State University, Azerbaijan

almas.cavadova.66@mail.ru

ORCID NO -0000-0002-5161-2424

<http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/AGBH3437>

Abstract: Till the 1450s, the Ottoman Empire had no serious influence on the Black Sea coast yet. The Republics of Genoa and Venice, special trade colonies of on the shores of the Black Sea, were more active in commercial activities. The main trade Genoese colony was the city of Kaffa, located in the Crimea. In the middle of the 15th century, European merchants tried to buy raw silk, imported from Azerbaijan, in the main trading centers of Genoa, Constantinople, and the Southern Black Sea region. The raw silk, imported from Gilan, Astrabad, Lahijan and Mazandaran, was bought by European merchants as a high-quality raw material in the listed trading centers.

In the second half of the 15th century, the advance of the Ottoman empire to the west and the subsequent conquest of important trade centers in the Black Sea, Mediterranean and Aegean seas, where they traded with European countries, dealt a blow to the silk trade of Azerbaijan.

Keywords: *Genoese colonies, Kaffa, Silk, Talaman Silk, the Baku Sea, International Trade*

INTRODUCTION

In the middle of the 15th century, European merchants of Genoa, Constantinople, Kaffa and other major trading centers of the Southern Black Sea region strived to buy more raw silk imported from Azerbaijan. In these trade centers, the raw silk, imported from Gilan, Astrabad, Talysh, Lahijan and Mazandaran, was purchased by European merchants as a high-quality raw material. In the materials of the Italian archives, some information about the process of buying and selling raw silk, imported to the Black Sea markets from Azerbaijan, deserves attention. The trade activities of these centers in the 13th-15th centuries were reflected in the *Codice documents* published and stored in the Genoa archive. [Vigna, Amedeo (1874)]. Although indirectly, these documents show that starting from the 1400s, there have been permanent trade relations between Azerbaijan and the trade centers of the Southern Black Sea region. The Eastern goods, such as raw silk, precious stones, iron, spices and others, were delivered to Tabriz through Qazvin and Sultaniya, and from there to the Black Sea coast and Kaffa. It is noted that at that time Kaffa was one of the main trade centers supplying Europe with the Eastern goods.

In the 15th century, due to the rapid development of the silk industry in Italian cities, the need for Azerbaijani silk increased significantly [Мусрафаев Ш.М. (1994): 132-134]. For the regular supply of these industrial enterprises with raw materials, there were

trading organizations of Venetian and Florentine merchants and their permanent representative offices, which were engaged only in the purchase and shipment of silk to Europe.

The Place of the Kaffa in the International Trade Relations of Azerbaijan

In Constantinople, there were trading colonies of merchants from Florence and Catalonia back in the 1430s [Шитиков М.М. (1965): 127]. These merchants lived in Bursa, Trabzon, Kaffa and in other cities, and were active in the silk trade. Bursa functioned, first of all, as a famous center of trade for the oriental goods in this trade.

Trade in oriental goods took place between Constantinople and Kaffa, moreover, at the end of the 13th and beginning of the 14th centuries, Kaffa had trade relations with the Middle Eastern and Central Eurasian countries, including Azerbaijan. And this period, highly developed trade prevailed in the region. However, in the late 14th - early 15th centuries, the occupation of Azak, the Golden Horde city in the delta of Don near the Azov Sea, by Emir Timur, heavily devastated the settlement and cut off the northern road connecting Kaffa with the Volga region, Azerbaijan, Central Asia, China and India [Чиперис А.М. (1974): 175].

In accordance to the Codice documents, constant trade relations existed between Kaffa and Azerbaijan since the 15th century [Vigna, Amedeo (1874): 567–886]. Main products of international trade, such as raw silk, spices, precious stones and metal, even iron, and other oriental goods were delivered to Tabriz through Qazvin, Sultaniye, from there by the Black Sea to Kaffa [Чиперис А.М. (1974): 183]. It is noted that at that time Kaffa was one of the main trading centers that supplied Europe with the oriental goods.

Some aspects of the issue, the trading activities of Kaffa and other trading ports of the Black Sea of this period, were studied by the Turkish researcher Selahattin Tansel. Describing the activities of the Black Sea ports in the 15th century, Tansel notes that Kaffa was a city where different peoples converged and traded [Tansel (1953): 272]. Back in 1261, under the Treaty of Nymphaeum between Genoa and Byzantium, the Genoese founded number colonies in the important areas of the Black Sea, including Kaffa, and took full control of trade in these areas. Under this treaty, the Genoese received the right to freely sail and trade in the Black Sea [Чиперис А.М. (1974): 182]. Although the foundation of Kaffa has no direct connection with the Treaty of Nymphaeum, it had a serious impact on the expansion of the Genoese colonies. It should be noted that the exact time of the founding of Kaffa is unknown; the first mentions of Kaffa date back to 1289 and 1290. It can be concluded that by this time a Genoese colony already existed on the site of the former Theodosius of Miletus [Batou J. and H. Szljajfer. (2009): 101].

The Codice documents prove that Genoese merchants played an important role in Kaffa's trade relations with the Caspian Sea and the Caucasus [Чиперис А.М. (1974): 172]. In accordance to the dairies of European travelers and merchants from Genoa and Venice trade in the Caspian Sea and in various trade centers of Azerbaijan. They note that merchants from Genoa and Venice come here (meaning the city of Sultania - A.J.) to buy silk. Christian merchants from Kaffa and Trebizond, as well as Turkish and Syrian merchants, annually came to the city of Sultania for goods [Путешественники об Азербайджане (1961): 58]. In this regard, it worthy to mention Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo's remarks: This city, Tabriz, conducts great trade and brings great income to its

sovereign. In addition, most of the silk, brought there, is produced in Gilan, a land located near the Baku Sea, where a lot of silk is produced every year. This Gilan silk goes to Damascus, to the land of Syria, to Turkey, to Kaffa and to many other places. They also bring here silk, which is made in the land of Shamakhi; this is a land where a lot of silk is made, and even Genoese and Venetian merchants come there for silk [Клавихо, Руи Гонсалес (1990): 178].

Even after the Ottoman occupation, the silk trade of Venetian merchants continued in the trading centers of the Southern Black Sea region. The Venetian merchants supplied European markets with a variety of oriental goods through trade in the important Black Sea trading centers. This trade was handled by Giacomo Badoer, the special representative of the Venetian merchants for the Black Sea trade centers. Badoer's representative in Kaffa was Andrea da Calais [Шитиков М.М. (1965): 134].

According to the Turkish historian Ismail Hakki Uzuncharshili, silk was an important raw material exported from Anatolia to Istanbul and European markets at the end of the 14th century. Italian merchants who traded with eastern countries from the Black Sea arranged the warehouses in the Black Sea trade centers and in Istanbul, conducting an active trade with eastern countries [I.H. Uzunçarşılı (1988): 250-254].

Numerous colonies of Western merchants existed in the Black and Mediterranean trade centers, where they were widely engaged in commercial activities. During this period, Italian merchants played a leading role in the foreign trade of Byzantium. Basically, various raw materials were imported from the Balkans, Asia Minor, the Northern Black Sea region, as well as from the eastern countries, including Azerbaijan. However, after the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans, its role in the trade relations with the West was significantly weakened. It is noteworthy that in the book of accounts of Giovanni Piccamiglio, a Genoese merchant who was engaged in eastern trade in 1456-1459, there is very little information about the trade activities during this period of Constantinople, Kaffa, Tana, and with the countries of the East. Russian researcher Mikhail Shitikov notes that Giovanni Piccamiglio had active trade relations with such trade centers as Cairo, Beirut and Alexandria [Шитиков М.М. (1962): 49]. He also indicates that Piccamiglio's income for the three and half years was only 1 percent [Шитиков М.М. (1969): 99], which shows that the income of Italian merchants had decreased by this time. Another researcher of the issue, Yaqub Makhmudov, notes that after the capture of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles by the Ottoman Empire, which connected the Mediterranean Sea with the Black Sea, Aleppo, Beirut, Damascus and other Central Asian cities were the most convenient places for Azerbaijani merchants to contact the Venetians. As the trade with Europeans through the Black Sea became more complicated, the role of these Central Asian cities in the international trade relations of Azerbaijan increased [Махмудов Я.М. (2011): 115].

In the first half of the 15th century, the Venetian colonies in Constantinople became more active. This colony was under control of the bailo, who was appointed by the Republic of Venice for 2 years. He received a salary of 1000 ducats a year. The bailo of Trabzon (*Trapezus*) received 500 ducats, the bailo of Negroponte received 700 ducats, and the bailo Coron and Modon received 400 ducats. These bays were mainly engaged in trade [Шитиков (1965): 58].

The treaties signed between Venice and Byzantium in 1406, 1412, 1418, 1423, 1431, 1436, 1442, 1447 and 1450 respectively confirmed the trade privileges of the Venetians.

The articles of these treaties granted the Venetian merchants the right to the trade without paying customs duties; free entry and exit; providing housing for merchants and traders, etc. These privileges allowed Venetian merchants to have a certain advantage in the trading markets of Constantinople, compared to other European and Eastern merchants. Along with the Venetian merchants, Genoese merchants also actively conducted the eastern trade. The Italian archives, including the "Trade Book" by the Venetian merchant Giacomo Badoer, show that the Genoese merchants were more closely connected with the eastern markets than the Venetian merchants. Filippo de Giacomo, a Genoese merchant, who traded with Badoer and the Da Capri brothers, bought oriental goods, mainly raw silk, wax, leather, honey and spices [Шитиков (1965): 60]. These facts are further evidence that Genoese merchants brought oriental goods, bought in the markets of Bursa, Kaffa and Adrianople to Constantinople, where they sold them to the Western merchants.

And there is also the "Book of the Massaria of Kafa 1441–1442", as an account book, where, in addition to news of a political nature, it contains a large amount of information of economic nature. This document contains the earliest evidence of that time, also containing numerous data on various aspects of economic life Kaffa. [Джанов А.В. (2021): 308]. Being one of the most valuable sources for the study of history on the Northern Black Sea region in the second half of the 14th - the third quarter of the 15th centuries, these are the accounting books of the treasury of Kaffa (books of the Massaria of Kaffa). Back in 1855, Michele Giuseppe Canale compiled the first brief review of the collection of books of the massaria of Kaffa from the fund of the St. George bank in Genoa and used them in his work on the history of the Genoese presence in the East and the Black Sea. Some excerpts from books Massaria of Kaffa were published by Nicolae Iorga at the end of the 19th century. For more than a hundred years, these publications have served as the most important source for the reconstruction of relations between the Genoese Kaffa and neighboring states: the Golden Horde, the Crimean Khanate, the Principality of Theodoro, Moldova, the Trebizond and Ottoman empires. [Джанов А.В. (2019): 81]

In the autumn of 1453, the authorities of the Republic of Genoa transferred their trading posts in the Overseas (Oltremare), including Kaffa, to the bank of St. George (Casa di San Giorgio). Some of the previous period financial documentations of Kaffa were transferred to the bank, and in the future almost all the documents flow between Genoa and Kaffa were accumulated in the archive. This diverse documentation, after many ups and downs, merged into collection of the State Archives of Genoa (Archivio di Stato di Genova) as a special fund "The St. George House of Shopping and Bank" (La Casa delle compere e dei banchi di San Giorgio). A grand corpus of Genoese documents related to the Crimea, mainly for the period 1453–1475, was identified in this fund and published in three huge volumes back in the 19th century by the Genoese archivist Amedeo Vigna. Most of them came from the bank's fund. It was, of course, not the last discovery in the archive of documents related to the Black Sea. However, it must be said that Vigny's "Codice" is still promising a source of information on the history of the Black Sea basin and the South East Europe in the XIII-XV centuries. [Джанов А.В. (2019): 79]

From the above mentioned data on this issue, we can conclude that in the trading centers of the Black and Mediterranean coasts, where the eastern and western trade was

carried out, Venice, Genoa and, to some extent, other European merchants played an important role. Along with Venetian merchants, Genoese merchants also actively traded in the markets of Constantinople. And among the silk producers, with whom European merchants traded through Kaffa, were masters from Azerbaijan. I.H. Uzuncharshili notes the role of such European states as Venice, Genoa, Florence, Dubrovnik, Ragusa among the countries with the closest economic ties with the trading markets of the Ottoman Empire in the 14th-15th centuries [Uzunçarşılı İ.H. (1940): 149].

Trade centers of the Southern Black Sea Region and Azerbaijan the Second Half of the 15th century

The trade centers of the Black and Mediterranean Seas played an important role in Azerbaijan's silk trade with the Ottoman Empire and Europe. Turkish researcher Kemal Karpat notes that during the reign of Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror, Turkish-Muslim merchants replaced Italian merchants in the Aegean and Black Sea trade. He notes the fact that the state received a large income from this trade. Available documents show that the Turks were in the first place in the field of trade during this period [Karpat K. (1988): 298]. However, referring to Italian authors, Sergey Karpov notes that the Venetian silk trade in the trade centers of the Southern Black Sea region, including Samsun and Sinop, continued after the conquest of these territories by the Ottomans [Карпов С.П. (1990): 118]. This became one of the main issues raised by Abdullah Al-Ahsan. He notes that, despite all these wars, Venice and other Italian cities were able to continue their trading activity. He points out that in the 1500s the volume of trade in these regions increased slightly compared to the 1400s. Al-Ahsan also notes that the conquest of Constantinople changed trade relations between Europe and the Ottoman Empire and other Eastern states [Ahsen A. (1997): 207]. In fact, these conquests led, on the one hand, to the dominance of Ottoman merchants in the main trading centers on the Black Sea and Mediterranean coasts, and on the other hand, to limiting the trade of Azerbaijani merchants in the trading centers of this region. Thus, dominance over the above regions led to significant changes in the commercial life of the Ottoman state.

Silk, produced in the cities of Azerbaijan, was of great interest to Italian merchants. It is not coincidental that Ambrogio Contarini, the ambassador of the Republic of Venice in Tabriz, who visited the palace of Uzun Hassan, describes the Shamakhi silk in his "Viaggio al signor Usun Hassan". He writes that on November 1, 1475, we arrived in the city of Shamakhi. Silk, prepared in this city, known to us under the name of Talaman Silk, and, in addition, various silk fabrics, made here, for the most part are smooth and not too good; Shamakhi is not as large as Tabriz, but, in my opinion, in all respects it is much better and more plentiful with all sorts of supplies. [Контарини Амброджо (1836): 78]

In general, the silk trade, especially with Azerbaijan, was of great importance for the Ottoman Empire as well. Kemal Karpat notes that silk imported from Azerbaijan was an important raw material for domestic and foreign trade. Active trade in this product was carried out in Amasya, Bilecik, Bursa, Diyarbakir, Mardin and Aleppo. Silk from the Caspian coastal regions of Azerbaijan was the most sought after commodity of Western merchants in the Ottoman markets [Karpat K. (1988): 308].

As it is known, during the considered period, there was no a single centralized state in Italy. Italy was going through a period of deep political fragmentation. The economy

of the developed Italian city-republics was based not on the domestic market, but on the foreign markets, especially on the eastern trade. The issue of ownership of the eastern markets, as well as the Black and Mediterranean trading rows, abounding in the oriental goods, caused internal dissatisfaction among the Italian republics. The tensions between Venice, Genoa, Florence and Pisa are mainly characterized by the dominance of the Venetian Republic in the eastern trade and over the important trading centers of the time. Genoa, Florence and other city-states made various attempts to exclude Venice from the Eastern trade and restore their former dominance. Conflicts between the Ottoman Empire and Venice gave impetus to the plan of other Italian city-states against Venice. [Cavadova A.S. (2017): 73]. Genoa even helped Sultan Mehmet II during the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 in order to exclude Venice from eastern trade and gain an advantage in this area. In return, Mehmet II granted the Republic of Genoa the privileges of ensuring free trade here and the inviolability of its property [Orhonlu C. (1984): 24].

Under an agreement of the Ottoman Empire with Pisa and Florence in 1460, these states enjoyed the privilege of free trade in Ottoman territory and the establishment of an embassy in Istanbul [Orhonlu C. (1984): 26]. Taking advantage of the conflict between Venice and the Ottoman Empire, the Florentine ambassador in Istanbul managed to drive the Venetians out of the city, and the Florentine merchants settled in the Venetian shopping center. The conquest of Bosnia by the Ottoman Empire posed a serious threat to the Adriatic provinces of Venice, which led to closer cooperation between Florence and Genoa and the Ottoman Empire against Venice in the Venetian-Ottoman war (1463-1479) [Махмудов Я.М. (2011): 130]. Later, however, Venice, like Genoa and Florence, received the same trading privileges.

Speaking about the role of Istanbul in trade between East and West, R. Mantran writes that Istanbul was an important center of trade from the Black Sea to Azerbaijan and Central Asia. After the conquest of Istanbul, the Turks took over the Black Sea trade and transferred the right of trade to Genoa, Florence, and then Venice. [Mantran R. (1987): 1435].

In the second half of the 15th century, the advance of the Ottoman state to the west and the subsequent conquest of important trade centers in the Black, Mediterranean and Aegean seas, where they traded with European countries, dealt a blow to the silk trade of Azerbaijan. The obstruction of the Euro-Asian trade by the Ottoman state, or rather the restriction of trade with Europeans in the Ottoman markets, also affected the interests of Azerbaijan. The customs policy of the Ottoman Empire dealt a heavy blow to the silk trade of Azerbaijani merchants with Europeans. Such measures, first of all, were aimed at preventing the export of raw silk from the countries of the East, especially Azerbaijan, to the European countries from the Ottoman markets. The Ottoman state, in order to gain advantages in trade with the East and provide the growing silk industry with raw materials, sought to conquer Eastern Anatolia and, thus, establish its control over the silk route of Tabriz-Aleppo, Tabriz-Bursa [İnalçik H. (1988): 300].

CONCLUSION

The Ottoman Empire, starting from the middle of the 15th century, captured the last centers of the caravan routes going from the interior of Asia to the shores of the Black and Mediterranean Seas. At the same time, after the opening of the sea route to India, the trade in spices between Asian and European countries was transferred to Portugal, and

Azerbaijan's international trade relations were again hit. After the capture of Ormuz by Portugal in 1515, Azerbaijan lost access to the Indian Ocean.

REFERENCES:

- Ahsen A. (1997) İstanbul fethinin islam dünyası ve Avrupa arasındaki ticaret ve ekonomik ilişkilere etkisi [The impact of the conquest of Istanbul on trade and economic relations between the Islamic world and Europe] // Materials of International Conquest of Istanbul conference 30-31 May 1 June, 1997, p. 204-211
- Batou J. and H. Szlajfer. (2009). Chapter Four. Kaffa. The Genoese Colony In The Crimea And The Eastern Question (1453–1475). In: Western Europe, Eastern Europe and World Development 13th-18th Centuries. Publisher: Brill, pp. 101–132, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004179172.i-438.11>
- Cavadova A.S. (2017). Azərbaycanın beynəlxalq ticarət əlaqələri.(XV əsrin II yarısı-XVII əsrin əvvəlləri) [International trade relations of Azerbaijan. (II half of XV century - beginning of XVII century)]. Bakı: Avropa nəşriyyatı, 249 pages
- İnalçık H. (1988) Osmanlılar [the Ottomans] // İslam ansiklopedisi: 12 ciltde Ottomans //, XI c., İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, p. 286-321
- Karpat K. (1988) Fatih devri [Fatih era] // İslam ansiklopedisi: 12 ciltde, II c., İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Press, p. 298-308
- Карпов С.П. (1990) Итальянские морские республики и Южное Причерноморье в XIII-XV вв. Проблемы торговли [Italian maritime republics and the Southern Black Sea region in the XIII-XV centuries. Trade problems] М., Издательство МГУ. 336 pages
- Клавихо, Руи Гонсалес (1990) Дневник путешествия в Самарканд ко двору Тимура (1403-1460) [Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo. Diary of a journey to Samarkand to the court of Timur (1403-1460)]. Москва, Наука, 217 pages
- Контарини, Амброджо (1836). Путешествие в Персию. [Ambrojo Contarini. Travel to Persia]. Публикация ЖЧВВУЗ, восточная литература.
- Махмудов Я.М. (2011) Взаимоотношения государств Аккоюнлу и Сефевидов с западноевропейскими странами. [Relations between the states of Akkoynlu and Safavids with Western European countries]. Selected works, volume III, Bakı: Təhsil publication, pp. 25-393.
- Mantran R. (1987) XVI ve XVII yüzyıllarında Osmanlı imparatorluğu ve Asya ticareti [Ottoman empire and trade in Asia in the XVI and XVII centuries]// TTK Belleteni, vol LI, issue 201, pp.1433-1445
- Мустафаев Ш.М. (1994) Восточная Анатолия от Аккоюнлу до Османской империи [Eastern Anatolia from Akkoynlu to the Ottoman Empire]. Москва: Восточная литература, 224 pages
- Orhonlu C. (1984) Osmanlı imparatorluğunda şehircilik ve ulaşım üzerine araştırmalar. [Research on urbanism and transportation in the Ottoman Empire.] İzmir: Ticaret Matbaacılık TAŞ, 157 pages
- Джанов А.В. Каффа, Крымское ханство и османы в 1454–1456 гг. (по данным книг массарии Каффы).[Kaffa, the Crimean Khanate and the Ottomans in 1454–1456 (according to the books of the Massaria of Kaffa)] // Сугдейський збірник. Вип. 2 (VIII). Київ. 2019 с 79-374

- Олександр Джанов Книга массаріі Кафи 1441-1442 pp.[“Book of the Massaria of Kafa 1441–1442”], *Ucrainica Mediaevalia*, Вип. 4, Київ. 2021, pp.308-376
- Путешественники об Азербайджане (1961) [Travelers about Azerbaijan]. Сост. З.И. Ямпольский; под ред. Э.М. Шахмалиева. Баку: AN Az. SSR, v.1, 297 p.
- Шитиков М.М. (1965). Венецианское купечество в I половине XV в. его торговых сношениях с Византией [The Venetian merchants' trade relations with Byzantium in the first half of the 15th century] // Ученые записки МГПИЛ, № 237, с. 85-137
- Шитиков М.М. (1962) Константинополь и Венецианская торговля в I половине XV в. по данным книги счетов Джакомо Бадера (Деловые круги Константинополя) / Византийский временник, М.: Наука, Т. XXX, 48 pages
- Шитиков М. М. (1969) Коммерческое страхование в Константинополе и приморских городах Италии в XV в. [Commercial insurance in Constantinople and the coastal cities of Italy in the 15th century] / М. М. Шитиков // *Античная древность и средние века*. — Свердловск— Вып. 6. — С. 91-103
- Tansel S. (1953). Fatih Sultan Mehmedin Osmanlı kaynaklarına göre siyasi ve askeri fealiyyeti [The political and military activity of Fatih Sultan Mehmed according to Ottoman sources]. Ankara: TTK Press, 356 p.
- Uzunçarşılı İ.H. (1940) Marmara və Karadenizin birleşdirilmesi hakkında [On the unification of Marmara and Black Sea] // TTK Belleten, issue 14-15, pp. 149-175
- Uzunçarşılı İ.H. (1988) Anadolu beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu devletleri. Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 297 pages
- Чиперис А.М. (1974). Торговля Каффы XIII-XV вв. [The Trade of Kaffa in the 13th- 15th centuries]. In: Феодальная Таврика. Киев: Наукова Думка, p.174-189
- Vigna, Amedeo (1874). Codice diplomatico delle colonie tauro-liguri durante la signoria dell'Ufficio di S. Giorgio (MCCCCLIII-MCCCCLXXV) ordinato ed illustrato dal socio p. Amedeo Vigna. Tomo primo, Tip. del R. I. dei Sordo-Muti, pp. XV, 981

MIGRATIONS OF THE POPULATION BETWEEN SOUTH AND NORTH OF AZERBAIJAN DURING THE TSARIST RUSSIAN COLONIAL RULE**Salman Ibishov**

Western Caspian University, Azerbaijan

salman.ibishov@wcu.edu.az<http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/IFJX3090>

Abstract: This article analyzes the historical demographic situation of Shahsevan clans who migrated between the Ardabil, Garadag and Mughan regions of Azerbaijan from the end of the sixteenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century in connection with the farming of pastures (nomadic livestock) during the Russian colonial rule. The mechanical movement of the population is examined in the context of the khanate period before the Russian occupation. And the seasonal migrations of the Shahsevan tribes from the south to the north of Azerbaijan was studied in the time frame of 1828-1885 and 1885-1917, and their role in the moral integrity of Azerbaijan, divided between Tsarist Russia and Iran, also in the struggle against the colonial authorities was indicated. It is not a coincidence that exactly on December 27, 1885, after the Shahsevans were massacred by the Russian border troops while crossing the Araz River, and the migrations of the Shahsevans who migrated from the Ardabil-Savalan regions to the Mughan plain were stopped. Further the Russian Empire, which gained a wide field of action in Mughan, began to move the tens of thousands of Russian peasant to Mughan until 1917. In this sense the article introduces the directions and essence of the colonial policy of Tsarist Russia based on the works of the founders of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic.

Keywords: *Mechanical movement of population, Migration, Shahsevans, Mughan, Russian Empire, Seyid Abdulqasim Nabati*

INTRODUCTION

The subject of the study is the movement of the Turkic-Muslim population of Southern Azerbaijan (northern Iran) to the north of Araz River, captured by the Tsarist Russia after the Gulistan and the Turkmenchay treaties. Here, the focus of the study is on the mechanical movement of a part of the Turko-Muslim population of South Azerbaijan, referred to in the historical literature as *Kasbkars, Hemshers or Hemsheherlis, Shahsevans*, and this historical process is studied in the context of the colonial policy of Tsarist Russia.

The main subject of the study focuses on the Shahsevans who are described as thieves and robbers in the Russian-language sources, who "kill for 30 kopecks and swear for 2 kopecks" [Огранович (1870): 73]. The movement of the population between the south and the north parts of Azerbaijan and the "problem of Shahsevan" was studied by the 19th century Russian authors I. Ogranovich [Огранович И.А. (1870)], E. Markov [Марков Е. Л. (1887)], P. Butkov [Бутков П.Г. (1869)], M. Avdeev [Авдеев М. (1927)] and in the 20th century by Azerbaijani researchers such as Jahangir Zeynaloglu

[Zeynalöglu C. (1992)], H. Dalili [Dəlili H.Ə. (1974)] and K. Shukurov [Шукуров К.К. (1984); Şükürov K. (1997)].

Russian authors present Shahsevans as terrible, law-abiding tribes and provide extensive information about their number, movement, and ethnography. Undoubtedly, the most fundamental research on Shahsevans was conducted by the British researcher Richard Tapper [Tapper R. (2004)]. He is the author of an encyclopedic study on the social and political history of the Shahsevans. In Azerbaijani historiography, the “problem of Shahsevans” has been studied many times. J. Zeynaloglu, H. Dalili, K. Shukurov conducted research on the ethnic identity of Shahsevans, political activities, migrations, legal and political arrangements between Qajar Iran and Russia during the Russian invasions.

Unlike previous studies, this research draws attention to the sayings and folklore examples, also the poems of the 19th century Azerbaijani poet Seyyid Abdulgasim Nabati [Nəbati S.Ə. (1968)], which have not been considered as primary sources for the study until now. As a first hand source for the study, they are, being expression of the discontent of the Shahsevans with the Tsarist colonial rule, the main primary source for the scrutiny on the issue. This research confirms that the historical truth is not reflected in the documents of the Russian authorities. For this reason it was necessary to pay attention to the local folklore, as well as to the works of Seyyid Abdulgasim Nabati, reflecting the aspirations of the people in connection with the events of the time under study. As a result of the Russian occupation, the Turkic-Elat population of Azerbaijan, who lived a nomadic lifestyle, suffered seriously from this invasion. Despite the concerted repressions of Russia and the Qajarid Iran, the Shahsevans repeatedly broke the borders and freely moved from the south to the north of Araz River, defying all legal prohibitions. On December 25, 1885, the Russian border troops committed a real massacre against Shahsevans, and this bloody incident went down in history and was preserved among the population in the saying "*top qoymadı*" (the cannon did not let in). Thus the historical connection with Mughan, which lasted for centuries, was temporarily interrupted. It was during this period that the old sayings and folklore about the Araz River, a symbol of the integrity of Azerbaijan, expressing nostalgia and separation began to emerge:

<i>Araz gəldi yan axdı</i>	Araz came and flowed
<i>Dibindən min can axdı</i>	A thousand souls flowed from the bottom
<i>Vətən sarı baxanda</i>	Looking towards the homeland
<i>Ürəyimdən qan axdı</i>	My heart bled

<i>Arazı ayırdılar</i>	They separated the Araz
<i>Qan ilə doyardular</i>	Fed it with blood
<i>Mən səndən ayrılmazdım</i>	I would not leave you
<i>Zor ilə ayırdılar</i>	They separated us forcibly

[Əliyeva V.Z. (2016): 46]

General Overview on the Population Transfer During the Khanates of Azerbaijan and the Russian Colonial Policy in the Subsequent Period

For comparison, we should say that the internal migration of the population in Azerbaijan took place during the khanate period and was significantly different from the period of Russian colonial rule. Since there was no fixed border between the khanates that arose on the territory of Azerbaijan, the mechanical movement of the population was intensive. Political fragmentation was not accompanied by strong border restrictions. For example, although the enmity between the Quba and Shamakhi khanates, which arose in the historical territory of Shirvan, on the political level, prevented the development of population relations, the relations based on deep historical roots continued during the khanate period. A certain part of the population of Dilmanli, Hajimanli, Baskal, Chagan, Kocheri Khalilli, Talabi, Kalva, Sor-Sor, Nugadi, Khanali, Tirjan and many other villages of the Shamakhi Khanate came from the Quba Khanate. [Ibishov S. (2018): 225] During that period, the people who left the territory of one khan and accepted the authority of another khan were given accommodations and temporarily exempted from taxes. Information about this has been kept in the sources. In the statistical document describing the population of Shamakhi province in 1820, the people coming to the Shamakhi khanate from the Quba and Karabakh khanates were included in the list of social classes exempted from taxes and obligations. [Ibishov S. (2018): 226]

Part of the population who settled in the territory of Quba Khanate with the permission of Fatali Khan came from the south Azerbaijan, namely from Ardabil, Garadagh, Mughan and other regions. The archive documents contain information about the arrival of Turkic people to the Quba Khanate under the leadership of Shahsevan Muhammad Tavabi Khan. Shahsevans founded Bayandurlu, Chakhmagli, Hisun, Hajili, Kharmandali, Ustacli, Laman, Garadagli and other villages. There were certain reasons for the relocation of the Shahsevans by Huseynali Khan and later by Fatali Khan. Thus, Khan of Quba wanted to use the warlike Shahsevan tribes as a military force, and in the same time he wanted to increase population of Shabran, Mushkur (now Khachmaz district) and Bermek districts, which was previously subjected to demographic upheaval and serious destruction during the rebellion against the Safavid dynasty led by Haji Davud and Surkhai Khan and Russian invasions in 1723-1735. It is no coincidence that the relocated population was settled in those districts. [Ibishov S. (2018): 200]

Azerbaijani emigration groups in Turkey, which were formed after the invasion of the ADR by the Soviet Russia, had their own scientific approaches to the philosophy of the Tsarist Russian colonial regime. Jahangir Zeynaloglu writes that from the day Tsarist Russia occupied Azerbaijan until its fall, it did not stop doing whatever was necessary to extinguish the nationality of the Turks. Calling the Turks of Azerbaijan "Tatars", they tried to create a third nation that has no relation to either Turkey or Iran [Zeynaloglu (1992): 104]

The founders of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, who created history themselves, made unique scientific considerations about the history of the khanates and the true nature of the Russian occupation in their works. M.B. Mammadzade described the nature of the Russian invasion that the ruling elites that could play a more or less important role in the life of the nation were eliminated, the khans and their armies were destroyed, the noblemen who had no social and political rights were reduced to the status

of door-slaves, the peasants were subjected to the slave regime. [Məmmədzadə M.B. (1992): 17]

M.A. Rasulzade, characterizing the colonial period, stated "our people, who lost their political rights, completely tasted the pain of conviction". [Rəsulzadə (1990): 16]. According to Russian officials, people experiencing the "sorrow of condemnation" had to not only speak Russian, but also even think in that language.

Fikret Bagirov writes that the Mughan plain, which covers a part of Eastern Transcaucasia, the historical region within the borders of Araz and Kura Rivers, Bolgarchay and Iran, was the area chosen by the Russian colonialists to settle the Russian-speaking population. Before the settlement of the Russian peasants, the entire population of the Mughan plain mainly settled on the banks and basins of the Kura and Araz rivers, in about 26 villages, and consisted of the indigenous people. At the beginning of the 20th century, the main place of resettlement of the Russian peasants in Mughan was Javad district. According to research of 1916, 55 Russian settlements and 21 villages (consisting of Russian orthodox peasants), 3620 families, and a total of 21094 people were resettled in Mughan (mainly in Javad district) in 1902-1916. [Багиров (2009): 7] This historical fact is also confirmed in other sources. "According to the information given by A. Brilinsky in the period around 1915, it is noted that 53 Russian settlements were built in Mughan, and according to the agricultural census of 1917, 54 settlements were built". [Багиров (2009): 28] N. Shavrov also expresses his opinion on the resettlement of non-Russian peoples in Transcaucasia by tsarist Russia. In the introduction of the book, he writes that after the Armenian and Georgian uprising that suddenly flared up in the Caucasus in 1905-1906, it became clear that in order to prevent Transcaucasia from breaking away from us (Russia) in the future, it is necessary to increase the number of Russian-born population in this land, so that Russians should not be less than half of the population of this place.

Clarifying the main goals of Russia's colonial policy, M.A. Rasulzade shows the main directions of colonial policy and writes: "In order to Russify Azerbaijani population, Tsarism came from two fronts. On the one hand, it controlled the ulema and mullahs who controlled the people's sentiments and religion to its control, and on the other hand, it forced the people to study in Russian (ushkol) schools, not allowing for national education. However, even though the people were politically defeated, they did not want to be destroyed morally. At the same time, M.A. Rasulzade draws attention to the historical roots and the reasons that prevented the national renaissance and states that these Turks (Azerbaijani Turks - S.I.) live on both sides of the Aras River, which divides Azerbaijan into two parts and when they were an independent state partially connected to Iran in one way or another, they lived not as a condemned nation, but as a ruler. Because the Turks have been the ruling class of Iran since centuries. The people of Azerbaijan did not realize that they were condemned by their own race, not by others, and they were morally convicted of another greediness. They were gradually Persianized (becoming Persian – S.I). Khawass (upper class) was educated in Farsi, was brought up in Farsi, thought like a Persian, and was satisfied that they were truly Iranian. The class of ulama, who had control over the people's posture and belief, and like the *khawass* (nobles) dominating their spirituality, had the same spirit, the same education, and the same mentality. It was quite natural that the

Azerbaijani khawass grown up in this land, which gave the Persian literature masters such as Nizami, Khagani, and Mahsati, melted before the Saadi language, which Suleyman the Magnificent almost accepted, and despised Turks and Turkic language. M.A. Rasulzadeh, who is particularly sensitive to his mother tongue, continues: "The Turkish khawass, which surrendered in front of Iran's bright and hellish literature and its strong spirituality, which was nurtured thanks to that literature, would have a great impact on the public. Turkic language was announced language of lower class and peasants, and Persian became formal and literary language, as a result a strange nation appeared: a nation who spoke in other language, wrote in another! This is the case of Southern Azerbaijan beyond the Araz River. Everyone there speaks Turkic, but when it comes to writing, it is Farsi. Although khawass is not aware of this wrong pledge is a dead end, the lower class is not so indifferent. The people made an elemental response to this unnatural state. The Turkic people rebelled against the rejection of their nationality, which no one cared about from khawass. [Rəsulzadə (1990): 14] The literature created by the people, *ashiqs*, poets and intellectuals who came out among people would be the pioneers of this struggle. The thinker who paid attention to the teaching in the Persian language in schools and madrasahs for centuries does not forget the teachers of the Russian colonial period and writes that khawass was wrong again. "Mirza", who once worshipped the romanticism of Ferdowsi, the deep wisdom of Sadi, and the delicious ghazals of Hafiz, this time turned to "Uchitel" (Teacher in Russian_ S.I.) who adored Lermontov's spirit flying in the mountains, Pushkin's speech flowing like water, and Tolstoy's messianic philosophy. M.A. Rasulzade continued to emphasize that "Years passed, there was a "mirza" on one side, and "uchitel" on the other side. They often disagreed. The russified "uchitel", like the Persianized "mirza", often could not understand the meaning of the people's heart. Finally, many hurdles were overcome. After unethical struggles against schools and madrasahs, "uchitel" understood the purpose that it is both important (necessary) and useful to teach Sadi and Tolstoy to the Turkic people and familiarize Turks with them. But at the same time, the Turk cannot be deprived of his own Sadi and Tolstoy." [Rəsulzadə (1990): 17] It is necessary to note that in his works he repeatedly commented on the severe consequences of the Russian occupation. M.A. Rasulzadeh wrote: "The Russian administration did not bring a high economic and political culture to these newly conquered countries. By destroying independent and semi-independent khanates, the tsarist government erased every memory of past independence". [Muradaliyeva (2005): 226-234] It is important to note that "as a result of the Russian occupation, not only the surname of the people was denied, but also the use of the name of the country - the term of "Azerbaijan" in official state documents was canceled and later it was removed from the maps. Only on May 28, 1918, the name Azerbaijan was approved by the Democratic Republic as a state concept. M.A. Rasulzadeh noted during his lectures in Istanbul in 1925: "Calling the Muslims in the Russian administration "Turks" is now a won cause. Not only the word "Turk", but also the name "Azerbaijan" was acquired. [Muradaliyeva (2005): 228]

The Migration of Population Between the South and the North of Azerbaijan During the Tsarist Russian Occupation

Historical data collected by I. Ogranovich [Огранович (1870)], V.I. Markov, and M. Avdeev [Авдеев (1927)] can be specially mentioned among the primary sources of migration of population between the South and North of Azerbaijan during the Russian invasion, as they contain a lot of official data. Important scientific materials related to our topic are presented in the works of R. Tapper, K. Shukurov [Şükürov (1984; 1997)], H. Dalili and Sh. Taghiyeva [Tağiyeva (1964; 1969)] and other researchers. It should be noted that long before the 16th century, the land of Mughan was the winter pasture of the ancient Turkic tribes. Authors such as V. Markov, P.G. Butkov, I. Ogranovich, K. M. Avdeev, C. Zeynaloglu, H.A. Dalili have dedicated valuable works about the origin and appearance of the Shahsevans in the history.

During the reign of Shah Abbas I (1587-1629), another military unit was created thanks to Shahsevans. It should be noted that this word appeared as a historical concept in the 1570s (those who wanted Ismayil II, the son of Shah Tahmasib, to be released from prison and become king, called themselves Shahsevans (Shah Lovers – S.I) for the first time). Later, various Turkic (and few non-Turkic) youths received "Shahsevanship" from the shah and entered his service. [Azərbaycan tarixi (1996): 407]

During the reign of Shah Abbas I, a large group of Karabakh and Shirvan Turks (almost fifteen thousand families) were moved to Mazandaran [Dəlili (1973): 28] R. Tapper states that until the reign of Shah Abbas, the Qizilbash Ustajli tribes were in power in Ardabil-Shirvan region, but after the death of Murshudgulu Khan Ustajli in 1588-1589, Shah Abbas disbanded this tribe. Some of the pastures belonged to Ustajli joined the Shamli tribe, and later the Karamanli and Jagirlu tribes also received "Shahsevanship" and joined them. After the Ustajlis, the Tekali tribe ruled Mughan until Shah Abbas disbanded them in 1596-1597. [Tapper (2004): 138] Thus, as a result of the "destroying" of the powerful Qizilbash tribes, the groups separated from them were given "Shahsevanship" and brought into administration, and "in addition to the name Shahsevan, they were also given the right to own pastures in Mughan and Ardabil." Analyzing the works of P.G. Butkov, V.I. Markov, K.E. Bosworth, Jahangir Zeynaloglu and other historians, H.A. Dalili, who conducted research on Shahsevans, comes to the following conclusion: "Russian historian P.G. Butkov and Jahangir Zeynaloglu claim that Shahsevans were formed from tribes that migrated from Turkey. According to V. I. Markov, that tribe was brought by Asian Turks who immigrated to Iran in the 16th century [Dəlili (1974): 23-30]. I.P. Petrushevski suggests that due to the Jalalid uprising and the civil war in Turkey, the remnants of a number of tribes moved to Azerbaijan (the Safavid state) and called themselves Shahsevan. According to the first sources, the Shahsevan tribe was comprised of semi-nomadic population of Azerbaijan, including Afshar, Qajar, Javanshir (Thirty-two), and oymaks and branches separated from the other Turkic tribes [Dəlili (1974): 26]. The prominent Azerbaijani historian J. Zeynaloglu wrote in his fundamental work "Concise History of Azerbaijan" published in 1924: "During the time of Shah Abbas, for unknown reasons, Shahsevans immigrated under leadership of Yunus Pasha to Iran from Anatolia in three thousand tents, and due to the Shah's struggle, most of them settled in Azerbaijan and around Ardabil. Yunus Pasha's grandsons named Sarukhan Bey, Bidali Bey, Khoja Bey and his subject Gurd Bey also had servants named Polad Bey Demirchali and Guzat Bey. Their clans were known by the names

of their lords. It is true that there are more than 32 clans among themselves [Zeynaloglu (1923): 68]. J. Zeynaloglu notes that Badir Khan, one of the grandsons of Yunus Pasha, was an influential person during the reign of Nadir Shah, and writes that after his death, the Shahsevans were divided into two parts - Meshkin and Ardabil under leadership of Kichik Khan and Nazareli Khan. He also presents names of the pastures one by one in Ardabil and Meshkin. In this way, the unions of the Afshar, Qajar, Javanshir, Otuziki, Bayat and other tribes were formed in the new period represented by the name of Shahsevan. They are mainly named after the leaders of cattle herding tribes. The names of the heads of these clans later became ethno-toponyms in history. According to the authors, such as H.A. Dalili, who claim that the Shahsevans were formed from the tribes that immigrated to Azerbaijan from abroad, and the first initiative in the creation of that tribe was made by the grandsons of Yunus Bey, led by Sarkhan Bey, and their pastures- *oymags*. It can be assumed that Sarkhan Bey and his brothers (Goja Bey and Bidali Bey) were the pioneers of the groups that accepted “*Shahsevanship*” together with their clans. However, it is wrong to describe them as foreign tribes. Because the semi-nomadic tribe belonging to Sarkhan Bey and named after him (Sarkhanbeylis) is a branch of Afshar tribe, one of the famous tribes of Azerbaijan. [Dəlili (1974): 26] "When the Shahsevan tribe was formed, sometimes the whole tribe with several branches, and sometimes several branches from different tribes were included in its composition. For example, the Shahsevan divisions named Sarikhanbeyli and Inanli (Shahsevan tribes, in the works of Iranian authors) are not separate tribes, but only branches belonging to the Afshar clan. [Dəlili (1974): 27] We should also mention that the branches that separated from different tribes and accepted “*Shahsevanship*” did not remain as single tribes until the end. Over time, they already became larger and were fragmented into parts bearing the names of newly emerging influential gentlemen (beys – S.I). Referring to the first sources, V. Markov gave clear and specific information about the fragmentations that occurred from time to time between different branches that formed the Shahsevan tribe. According to the author, the branch (Beydali Beylis) belonging to Beydali Bey, one of Yunsur Pasha's grandsons, was later divided into parts bearing the names of Mastali Beylis, Karagasim Beylis, Alibaba Beylis, and Nowruzlu Beylis. In South Azerbaijan, the total number of camels, horses, donkeys and cattle belonging to the them around Khalkhal, Garadag, Meshkin, Ardabil and Giziluzen rivers was 111-120 thousand, and the number of sheep and lambs was 1 million 898 thousand 700 with 300 per herd. After the conclusion of the Treaty of Turkmenchay, with the consent of the highest circles, a special agreement was reached between the authorities of the Caucasus commandership and Iran (the state of Qajaria - S.I.) in 1831 regarding the use of Mughan plains as a winter camp for the Shahsevans. According to this agreement, they were allowed to move to Mughan by paying 2,000 rubles to the Russian embassy located in Tabriz. However, after a certain period of time, there were disputes between our people and Shahsevans over the winter camps, which resulted in many deaths. [Огранович: (1870): 73] The Shahsevans lived in Ardabil was headed by Jafar Khan. The British researcher R. Tapper has more fundamentally investigated the genesis, geography, ethnography, and turbulent history of the "Shahsevans" in Azerbaijan. He mentions in his work “Frontier nomads of Iran: a political and social history of the Shahsevan” that Shahsevan is the name of nomadic

cattle-breeder tribes located in various regions in the northwest of Iran, especially Mughan and Ardabil in the south of Azerbaijan, as well as in the regions between Zanzan and Tehran. Belonging to the Shia branch of Islam as a religion, the Shahsevans, who speak Azerbaijani Turkic, in the century we live in, have been engaged in various forms of settled agriculture, but have traditionally led a nomadic lifestyle. [Tapper (2004): 57] The Shahsevan confederation was shaped by continuous uprisings from the end of the 16th century to the beginning of the 18th century, when Nadir Shah recaptured Ardabil and Mughan from the Ottomans and Russians and appointed a khan to the Shahsevan tribes living in this region. Khan's entourage was known as Shahsevan beys and governors of Ardabil, but they immediately divided the confederation into two regions connected with Ardabil and Meshkin. [Tapper (2004): 57] As it is known, Nadir Shah marched through Ardabil to Mughan and Shirvan in August 1734, and in the same year, Khan of Shahsevans Ali Gulu Khan (father of Sari Khan Beyli Babir Khan, who later became Ardabil Khan) was exiled to Herat and later killed. M. Kazim writes that in 1734-1735, Nadir drove out 60,000 kashkai, Shahsevan, and Afshar families from Azerbaijan and settled them in the cities of Khorasan. [Tapper (2004): 179] Apparently, Nadir, who was preparing for the "election" of the shah, exiled the local population for security reasons. After Nadir Shah was killed, some of them returned. "Durrani Ahmad Shah's historian Ahmad Al-Huseini tells that 3,000-4,000 families of "Shahsevan and Bakhtiari tribes" sent to Herat by Nadir returned to their native lands after his death. [Tapper (2004): 180] It is mentioned in sources that Nadir Shah Avshar relocated the Shahsevans in different parts of the empire. James Morier writes, "Nadir spread the Shahsevans all around Iran. Zeynalabdin Shirvani's information belonging to the 1831 is the same - "Now, there are different tribes of the Shahsevans. They live in Mughan, Azerbaijan, Iraq and Iran and in different regions of Kabul and Kashmir. As a result, one of the four men who killed Nadir in Khorasan in 1747, was bey of Shahsevan Musa bey. [Tapper (2004): 180] During the time of the khanates, the Shahsevan, who were the main political elite of the Mughan Ardabil, Meshkin, faced serious difficulties in the 19th century. Shahsevans' winter quarters in Mughan plain were occupied by Russia.

It should be noted that the problem of movement of the Shahsevans between Russia and Qajarid Iran and its management had not long been resolved between the two countries. Sukurov writes about this issue that movement population from Iran (Southern Azerbaijan – S.I) towards Southern Caucasia was canonical to Article 14 of Turkmenchay treaty (opposite was not considered) [Şükürov (1997): 13]. However, this substance was often violated, and the actions taken by the tsarist administrative bodies in the 30s and 40s in this area did not give any result. Finally, on July 3, 1844, a new convention was signed between the two countries on the movement of population. [Şükürov (1997): 45]. In the preamble of this convention signed between Russia and Iran is said that population moving between border provinces of the two states frequently violated and abused laws.

Shukurov writes that ten famines were registered in Iran between 1866-1904. The most horrific of them are 1869-1872. In those years 1.5 million people died. This event brought terrible misery to South Azerbaijan. Russia's General Consul in Tabriz reports about this event in the information about October 21, 1872. Hunger, bad harvest, poverty was the main reason of the influx of the population, *kasbkarlig* (moving of people to work in Northern Azerbaijan - S.I). The population faced disasters such as hunger, natural

disaster, epidemic, high prices. The plague, drought, followed by severe winter of 1871-1872 years severely damaged population (they had to face starvation and death). [Шыкыпов (1984): 13] Russian officer, who witnessed the events, writes about this terrible event: "The Shahsevans keep in their mind especially two events. The first one is the year of 1859, when Mughan plain was covered with snow for a month, and the Kura river was covered with ice, as a result, all the property of the Shahsevans were lost. They called this year "The year all sheep died", "The Year which massacred." Another one was 1871-1872 years that 3/1 of the Shahsevan were bankrupt, most of them died because of cold and part of them became victims of the plague. During this period, part of the Shahsevans, running from cold and disease, headed different regions of Azerbaijan. Part of the Shahsevans scattered in various villages of Lankaran, Javad, Shamakhi and Shusha. Thus, we believe that this is one of the main reasons for the establishment of ethno-toponyms in the Mughan and also in other areas of Azerbaijan. "There are villages in some regions of Azerbaijan related to Shahsevans, Baydili in Bilasuvar, Yeddi Oymaq in Masalli, Sarikhanli in Imishli, Udulu in Hajigabul, Sarikhanbeyli in Sabirabad, Chomushchu in Saatli and etc". Currently, descendants of the Shahsevans live in some villages of Saatli – like Mirjalal, Nabatgishlag and others. In Sarkhanli village of Sabirabad region, descendants of Gojabaylis (Khojabayids) can be seen. The village of Sarkhanbeyli and others in Imishli region are not exception in this point of view. Our surveys among the population in these villages proving this once again. According to the census data of 1831, there were villages of Garagashli, Gurd, Sarvan, Garakhanli, Kangarli, Alpaut, Ilkhici, Shahsevan in Khanchoban district of Shirvan province. In the census data of 1831, between villages in the Goshun district of Shirvan province Gurd Village is also mentioned. We can prolong list of villages related to the Shahsevans. The geographical status of Mughan region has been a guarantee of national integrity of Azerbaijan. The study of toponyms and ethno-toponyms here sheds light on the heroism of the Mughan population in the protection of the spiritual integrity of the Azerbaijani people and its genetics. Throughout history, Mughan has played a bridge between the southern and northern Azerbaijan. During the khanate period, resistance of population of Mughan to political disorder became more prominent. During the unification of Azerbaijani khanates in the 18th century, Javad khans' support to Fatali Khan is an obvious proof of this. In 1784, the khans of Mughan were with Fatali khan in the campaign of Ardabil and Meshkin. Back in 1749, the raids of Ahmad khan and Hidayat khan in 1778, accompanied by destructions in Javad, forced the khans of Javad to be with Fatali khan. Mughan Turks played an important role in Fatali khan's resettlement policy. During the Russian invasion, Mughan, Ardabil, Sarab, Garadag, etc. regions, which built an ethno-spiritual bridge between the south and the north, are presented under the name of Shahsevan (Gilicli, Tekali, Bayandurlu, Boyat, Afshar, Qajar, Oguz, Turkmen, Oymagli). It is necessary to mention *kasbkar* (the poor migrated from the South to the North of Azerbaijan in search of work) movement during migration of the population in that period. At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the number of people who came from the other side of Araz to the oil fields of Baku and Caucasian cities reached an average of 200 thousand people. [Rəhimli (2009): 25] They were the cheapest labor force and worked in the hardest, menial jobs of the Oil industry. However, we believe that a more important factor was the activity of the Shahsevans in Mughan.

The population of villages related to Shahsevans such as Poladli, Udulu, which were part of Gobustan district of Shirvan province, as well as among the villages of Shabran district of Guba province such as Birinchi Ilkhichi, İkinci Ilkhichi, Sarvan, Garadagli, Jagatay, Bayandurlu and Chakhmagli, were recorded in the cameral census of 1831. According to the cameral census of 1831, the villages of Gurdkend, Sarvan, Ilkhichi, Shahsevan can be found among the villages of Khanchoban district of Shirvan province [ARDTA, fund 24, list 1, folder 328].

The convention of 1844 could not clarify the problem; on the contrary, it started larger debates. As it is known from history, the Shahsevans, ignoring these laws, moved freely between the South and the North of Azerbaijan. It should be noted that the bureaucratic obstacles did not allow the convention to be fully implemented and realized. Taking into consideration the scientific importance of I.A. Ogranovich's article entitled "Information about Shahsevan" published in the collection of "Caucasian Calendar" in 1870 in the history of Mughan [Огранович (1870)] it is one of the main source for the issue. Describing these tribes he states that the Khojabeyli people are secretly Sunnis, while the rest of the nomads (meaning Shahsevans) are Shiites. Two tribal beys - Ali Jafarkhan in Ardabil and Ali Farzi Khan in Meshkin are leading the Shahsevans. The Shahsevans obey the shah. However, Iranian laws do not limit the life and property of nomads. Shahsevans bury their dead in the Imamzade tomb in Meshgin, in the Imamzade Baba Samit cemetery near the village of Galagayin in Mughan, and near the Imam Shah Safi tomb in Ardabil. Literacy and education of Shahsevans is at the lowest level. Not even one person per 1100 people is literate. Many beys do not know how to read or write. One of the commendable aspects is their hospitality. Among the many communities of Shahsevans, only the Udulu, Bandali and Demirchili tribes differ in their cultural level. Most of them do not engage in theft and robbery, they do not make false promises, most of them have been on Hajj pilgrimage. The rest of the tribal communities are famous for lying, stealing, and robbery. They do not spare either their own or others. Trade, crafts and other industrial skills are not known to them, and none of them do anything other than cattle breeding, theft or robbery. As a general way of life, Shahsevans kill for 30 kopecks and swear for 2 kopecks [Огранович (1870): 84].

I. Ogranovich describes Shahsevans' tribal structure and writes that the aforementioned Shahsevan tribes are currently divided between two Elbeys (tribe leaders - S.I), Farzi Khan Ata Khan Oghlu and Jafar Khan Nazar Ali Khan Oghlu, and are under their control. The tribes subordinate to Farzi Khan, the first governor, are: 1) Khojabeyli; 2) Bandalibayli 3) Demirchili; 4) Sarikhanbeyli; 5) Novruzalibeyli; 6) Sarvanli; 7) Chilovdarli; 8) Talish-Mikayilli; 9) Kahramanbeyli (binalar); 10) Mughanli. The Shahsevan tribes subordinated to Jafar Khan Nazareli Khan oghlu, the second elbeyi, are: 1) Poladli; 2) Irzabeyli; 3) Jahan Khanimli; 4) Beybaghli; 5) Gomushchu. In general, in the source, the number of *alachiks* (tents – S.I) included in Shahsevan lands (tribes) reaches 12,450, so if we consider each *alachik* as 6 people on average, it is determined that the population of both sexes is 74,700 people. [Огранович (1870): 71]]

It should be noted that Ogranovich's statistical information about the Shahsevians is based on a collection of documents entitled "List of settlements in the Caucasus region (Baku province) of the Russian Empire" published under the guidance of N. Zeidlich in 1870. N. Zeidlich compiled this statistical information according to the cameral census of 1859-1863. In that document was displayed, 300 yards in Poladli, 300 yards in Bandali,

100 yards in Riza Beyli, 150 yards in Khamutlu-Poladli, 300 yards in Sarkhan Beyli, 150 yards in Jahan Khanumli, and 100 yards in Novruzali Beyli-Bala Beyli. [Списки населенных мест Российской империи (1870): 83]

M. Avdeev's information about the Shahsevans is also of scientific interest. In accordance to this information, the centuries-long traditional connection of the Shahsevans from winter quarters of Mughan was cut off on December 27, 1885, and the remaining part of them in the north moved to a sedentary life and mingled with the local Turkic population. Such a situation continued in Mughan until the beginning of 1918. From the beginning of 1918, the situation suddenly changed. The sedentary agricultural population of Mughan moved to the North Caucasus (here we are talking about the Russian peasants who previously were transferred to Mughan - S.I.). As a result of the bloody actions in March of 1918, purely sedentary farming Turkic settlements (Soltanabad, Narimanovka, Cholpi, Efendikend) were built in the vicinity of the Russian settlements in the areas close to the water canals near the former Russian villages in Mughan [Авдеев (1927): 22]. On the other hand, the former winter settlements began to turn into agricultural settlements. However, this process was not widespread. Mughan continued to be widely used as a winter quarter by neighboring Turkic villages. It should be noted that the 4 villages we mentioned above - Soltanabad, Efendikend, Cholpi, Narimanovka - and other settlements in the north of Mughan were occupied by both the local population and those from Iran (kasbkars who were subjects of Tehran, Iran - the basis of the agricultural labor force of Transcaucasia). Thus, the centuries-long connection of Shahsevans with the Mughan winter quarters came to an end. The people who remained in this area, the population engaged in nomadic animal husbandry, began to change their appearance and lifestyle by the time and turned into a sedentary agricultural people. According to M. Avdeev, the last attempt of the Shahsevans to move to the Mughan plain coincided with the revolutions of 1917. During the revolutions of 1917 (February-October), when the borders (Iran and Russian Empire) were freed, the Iranian Shahsevans, who took advantage of the situation, entered the Mughan plain on a large scale. Even after the by December 27, 1885 shooting to "cleanse" Mughan from Shahsevans, who had serious problems with the Iranian state, preferred to stay in Mughan and come under the rule of Russia, rather than return to Iran and face the threat of death. Avdeev writes that the last time Shahsevan came to Mughan coincided with the period of confusion caused by the revolutions of 1917. At that time, the emptying of the borders created a vacuum due to the escape of settlers (Russians), and as a result, Iranian settlers entered the plain in large numbers. However, this movement of Shahsevans was stopped by the Iranian authorities, although not forever. During this period, the more dangerous tribes (Shahsevans) in Iran were neutralized and their leaders exiled. Control of Shahsevan tribes has been strengthened. After the closure of the Mughan Plain to the Shahsevans, the protection of the security of the local sedentary population and the nomadic population coming to the Transcaucasia was strengthened. [Авдеев (1927): 22] As mentioned, the Turkish settlements in Mughan were built on the banks of the river, and the Russian population was built on the edge of the ditches. This situation of settlement continued until the beginning of 1918.

In the middle of 1920, the detachment attacked the nearby 2nd cavalry regiment of the 28th division of the XI Red Army, together with other detachments numbering up to 5000 under the leadership of Cherkaz Khan, Ayaz Khan and Hazi Khan, who came to his aid

from the other side of Araz. According to the information of the intelligence agencies of the Soviet army in December 1920, the detachments of Sarı Khan and Ayaz Khan still maintained their organization. Their group had 300 people with bayonets and 2 machine guns. These groups operate as separate groups, crossing the Araz River at the moment of danger, finding shelter in the territory of Iran, and then suddenly attacking the Soviet units again. The center of the group was Tazakend. The struggle against the Soviets in Mughan became so widespread that in August-September 1920, the activities of the local Soviet authorities were terminated in many villages in the Garadonlu region. In those months, several attempts were made to eliminate the rebel groups in the region, but these attempts did not give results. In the summer of 1920, the Kura navy was created to fight the rebels and protect the border with Iran. In the middle of August 1920, Sarı Khan Shirvanli's group crossed the border and attacked the militia groups in the Garadonlu district and caused them to lose a lot of people. [İbişov (2020): 489] Let's pay attention to the examples of spiritual culture that the Shahsevans gave to Azerbaijan. H. Baykara notes: "The situation (literary, cultural and educational environment) in the territories of Azerbaijan under rule of Iran was the same as in Caucasian Azerbaijan. Although these two countries were ethnically united. After the occupation of Caucasian Azerbaijan by the Russians, great differences have arisen between the two countries, in the literary, economic and social point of view. In the period when the policy of Russification was widespread in the 19th century, the emergence of examples of oral folk literature in the spirit of free development in Azerbaijani Turkish and the creation of a divan in the Turkish language is admirable. One example of this can be the work of Iran Azerbaijani Seyyid Abulgasim Nabati during this period. He wrote most of his poems under the pseudonym "Nabati" and a few under the pseudonym "Khan Chobani" [Nəbati (1968): 3] Prominent researcher-literary critic Salman Mumtaz gave a lot of space to A. Nabati in his fundamental work "Sources of Azerbaijani literature". He writes: "Nabati, who knows Turkish, Persian and Arabic languages perfectly, has a detailed knowledge of Eastern history and Eastern music, is one of the profoundly knowledgeable and scholarly poets of his time. Nabati had two separate divans in Turkish (Azerbaijani) and Persian. Salman Mumtaz presents Bahlul Bohjat's article about Nabati: "Nabati is no longer a khan shepherd. His cattle were lost in taxes, and even his beloved dog ran away because there were no cattle" [Mümtaş (1986): 409].

Nabati wrote against this situation:

*Basar it hayana getdi, hanı fışqırıq sədəsi,
Nə gəlibdi Xançobanə ki, bu qış Muğanə gəlməz?*

Where is livestock guardian dogs, and the sound of crackling
What did happen to Khan Choban, that he did not come to Mughan?

[Nabati (1968): 30]

As we mentioned earlier, Mughan played the role of a historical-geographical bridge between the South and the North of Azerbaijan in all periods of history. S.A. Nabati is also an intellectual representative of the Turkish villages that used the Mughan plain as a wintering place for centuries. It doesn't matter which part of Mughan the poet is from, the main thing is that the great poet was able to contribute to the living of our national and moral values during the occupation regime. He wrote and created in Turkish and showed

the tragic result of the Russian occupation. Nabati's poem, presented above, is a clear example of how even shepherds fled as a result of the policy of the hated colonialists. Nabati's divan in the Turkish language in the 19th century is a rebellion against the state, which turned the Russian language into one of the main means of Russification through Russian schools and "intellectuals".

CONCLUSION

As a result, it should be emphasized that during the Tsarist Russian colonial period, the mechanical movement of the population from the south of Azerbaijan to the north of Azerbaijan served the territorial integrity of the country, the moral integrity of the people and became part of the history of the struggle against the colonial policy of the Russian Empire. From the 16th century to the beginning of the 20th century, the main part of the life of the warlike Shahsevan tribes was related to Mughan. In the article, the works of authors such as R. Tapper and Markov, Ogranovich, Avdeev, who are of special importance on the subject of Shahsevan and Mughan, were studied and a few important parts of their works were included. Thus, until the beginning of the 20th century, the Tarakama elat (nomads – S.I) population, known as "Shahsevans" and consisting of mainly various Oghuz-Turkmen clans, used Mughan as a winter quarter. They founded many places and villages in Mughan. After the Russian invasion, their traditional way of life was attacked. The tumultuous course of history has led to the spread of Shahsevans to the most diverse regions of Azerbaijan. Thus, many sedentary settlements connected with them were founded: Polad-Togay, Udulu, Mughanli, Sarkhanli, Sarikhanbeyli, Chomushchulu, Bidali, Novruzlu, Beydili, Sarvanli, Khojabeyliler, Poladlilar, Demirchililer, Gurdar, Zargarliler, Bandalibeyliler, Novruzalibeyliler, etc. The successors of these tribes live currently in the districts of Imishli, Saatli, Sabirabad, Hajigabul, Salyan, Bilasuvar, Jalilabad, etc. There are many historical traces of the Shahsevan tribes in Mughan. They can be observed both in the toponyms and in the ethnography of the population currently living here. Among the population, there are those from Demirchili, Khojabeyli, Sarkhanbeyli, Poladli, Gomushchuli, Udulu, Bandalibeyli, Novruzalibeyli and other Shahsevan tribes. As the most important fact of the colonial policy of the Russian Empire, the country was divided into two, the territorial unity was broken, and the policy of Russification and Christianization was carried out in Northern Azerbaijan. The new migrations of Shahsevans who did not recognize this policy and fought against the invasion throughout the 19th century and used the Mughan plain as a winter quarter had a great historical significance in the fight against Russian rule. Intensive resettlement of Russians in Mughan began after the shooting of Shahsevan in 1885. We believe that the migrations of Shahsevans in Mughan from 1828 to December 27, 1885 had a positive effect on the preservation of the values and moral integrity of the Azerbaijani people. In the Mughan region, although Russians were intensively resettled later, as a result of the brave activity of the Shahsevan tribal union, there was no serious change in the ethno-demographic and moral condition of the Azerbaijani population. Currently, there is neither a toponym nor an ethnonym of the 55 Russian settlements in Mughan, as all Russian toponyms were changed to the local ones.

The traces of Shahsevans who actively participated in historical processes in Mughan for a long time (from the 17th century to the end of the 19th century) have remained

today in toponyms, ethno-toponyms and culture. The activities of the Mughan Shahsevans and Abulgasim Nabati's divan in the Turkic language played a certain role in the preservation of Azerbaijani Turkic language. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Pahlavi regime in Iran and the Soviet regime in the USSR carried out political repressions against Shahsevans in the same form. Their free lifestyle was changed and they were taken into custody as ordinary criminals.

REFERENCES:

1. *ARDTA- Azərbaycan Respublikasının Dövlət Tarix Arxivi* [National Historical Archive of The Azerbaijan Republic] Fund 24, List 1, Folder 328
2. Авдеев М. (1927). *Мугань и Салаянская степь. Население- землепользование- водное хозяйство (обследование. 1925. г.)* [Mugan and the Salyan steppe. Population - land use - water management. Survey 1925]. Баку, Типография “Красный Восток”, 136 pages
3. *Azərbaycan tarixi* (1996) [History of Azerbaijan] (S.S. Əliyarlının redaktəsi ilə), Bakı, Azərbaycan nəşriyyatı, 868 pages
4. Bakıxanov A.Q. (1991) *Gülüstan i-İrəm* [Heavenly Rose Garden by Bakikhanov] Bakı, Az.SSR EA Nəşriyyatı, 153 pages
5. Baykara H. (2018) *Azərbaycanda yeniləşmə hərəkəti- XIX əsr* [Renewal movement in Azerbaijan - 19th century] Bakı, Kitab Klubu, 242 pages
6. Багиров Ф.Э. (2009). *Переселенческая политика царизма в Азербайджане. 1830-1914 гг.* [The resettlement policy of tsarism in Azerbaijan in 1830-1914] Москва. М. Маросейка, 704 pages
7. Бутков П.Г. (1869) *Материалы для новой истории, Кавказа, с 1722 по 1803 год* [Materials for a new history, the Caucasus, from 1722 to 1803]/П. Г. Бутков Ч. 2, Санкт-Петербург, 602 pages
8. Dəlili H.Ə. (1974) *Şahsevən tayfası və onun Azərbaycanın siyasi həyatındakı mövqeyi haqqında.* [About the Shahsevan tribe and its position in the political life of Azerbaijan.] *Azərbaycan SSR EA-nın Xəbərləri (tarix,fəlsəfə və hüquq seriyası)*, Bakı, №3 pp. 23-30.
9. Əliyeva V.Z. (2016) *XIX-XX əsrlərdə Muğanda mənəvi mədəniyyət: tarix üzrə fəls. d-ru dissertasiyası.* [Spiritual culture in Mughan in the 19th-20th centuries. Thesis for PhD in History]. AMEA, Arxeologiya və Etnoqrafiya İn-tu.-Baku, 172 pages
10. İbişov S. (2018). *Şimal-Şərqi Azərbaycan əhalisi (XVIII əsrin II yarısı XIX əsrin 30-cu illəri)* [The population of North-Eastern Azerbaijan (second half of the 18th century, 30s of the 19th century)], Bakı. Gənclik. 352 pages
11. İbişov S. (2020). *Muğan (Cavad bölgəsi): əhalisi, tarixi coğrafiyası və toponimləri* [Mughan (Javad region): population, historical geography and toponyms]. Bakı, Gənclik, 526 pages
12. Марков Е. Л. (1887) *Очерки Кавказа: картины Кавказской жизни, природы и истории* [Sketches of the Caucasus: pictures of Caucasian life, nature and history]. Санкт-Петербург: Москва т-во М.О.Вольф, 693 pages
13. Məmmədzadə M.B. (1992). *Milli Azərbaycan Hərəkəti* [M.B. Mammadzadeh. National Azerbaijan Movement]. Bakı, Nicat nəşriyyatı, 246 pages
14. Muradəliyeva E.B. (2005) *Azərbaycan milli şüurunun qatlarında Rusiya işğalı*

- [Russian occupation in the layers of Azerbaijani national consciousness] *Məhəmməd Əmin Rəsulzadə və ictimai-siyasi ideallar*. Khazar University Press pp. 226-234
15. Mümtaz, S. (1986). *Azərbaycan ədəbiyyatının qaynaqları* [Sources of Azerbaijani literature], Bakı, Yazıçı, 440 pages
 16. Nəbati S.Ə. (1968) *Seçilmiş şeirləri*. [Selected poems] Bakı, Elm, 222 pages
 17. Огранович И.А. (1870) Сведения о шахсевенах [Information about the Shahsevans] // *Кавказский календарь на 1871*. Тифлис: Типография главного управления наместника кавказского; Part III, pp, 68-84
 18. Rəhimli Ə. (2009). *Mübarizə burulğanlarında keçən ömür: Seyid Cəfər Pişəvəri* [A life spent in the eddies of struggle: Seyyed Jafar Pishawari]. Bakı, Nurlar NPM, 400 pages
 19. Rəsulzadə M.Ə. (1990). *Azərbaycan Cümhuriyyəti*. [Republic of Azerbaijan] Bakı. Elm, 116 pages
 20. Списки населенных мест Российской империи (1870). [List of the settlements in the Russian Empire] По Кавказскому краю. Вып. 65: Бакинская губерния: по сведениям 1859 по 1864 год/сост. и изд. Кавказ. стат. ком. при Гл. управл. наместника Кавказского; обраб. Н. Зейдлием. Тифлис, 258 pages
 21. Шавров Н.Н. (1909) *Мугань оборудование ея орошения и водных путей* [Mugan equipment for irrigation and waterways], Санкт-Петербург, Типография Усманова, 144 pages
 22. Шукуров К.К. (1984). *Отходничество в Закавказье из Южного Азербайджана (второй треть XIX в.- 1905 г.)* [Otkhodnichestvo in the Transcaucasia from South Azerbaijan (second third of the 19th century - 1905)] Автореферат. Баку. 45 pages
 23. Şükürov K. (1997) XIX-XX yüzillərdə Azərbaycanın Güneyi və Quzeyi arasında əhalinin miqrasiyası (hüquqi- siyasi məsələlər) [Population migration between the South and the North of Azerbaijan in the XIX-XX centuries (legal-political issues)] *Araz jurnalı*, yanvar-mart, №1 (2), pp. 44-47
 24. Şükürov K.K. (2006) *Türkmənçay-1828. Tarixi xronika* [Turkmenchay 1828: The Historical Chronicle] Bakı, Çasıoğluç 188 pages
 25. Tağıyeva Ş. (1964) *XIX əsrin sonu və XX əsrin əvvəllərində İranda torpaq mülkiyyəti formaları və tor-paqdan istifadə qaydaları*. [Forms of land ownership and land use rules in Iran at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century.] Bakı. Azərbaycan SSR Elmlər Akademiyası Nəşriyyatı, 208 pages
 26. Tağıyeva Ş.Ə. (1969). *XIX əsrin sonu və XX əsrin əvvəllərində İran kəndlilərinin vəziyyəti*. [The situation of Iranian peasants at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.] Bakı. Elm Nəşriyyatıç 198 pages
 27. Tapper R. (2004) *İranın Sınır Bölgələrində Göçəbələr* [Frontier Nomads of Iran] İstanbul, İmge Kitabevi, 699 pages
 28. Zeynalıoğlu C. (1992). *Müxtəsər Azərbaycan tarixi* [Brief History of Azerbaijan] Bakı, Dövlət Kitab Palatası, 144 pages

**MAMMAD EMIN RASULZADEH* : THOUGHTS AND STRUGGLE
FOR THE REPUBLIC****Dilgam Ahmadov**

Istanbul University, Turkey

ORCID: 0000-0002-9406-1327

dilgamahmadov@gmail.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/KIGP7876>

Abstract: The Azerbaijani socio-political figure, head of Azerbaijan National Council and Musavat Party, Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh, has played a significant role in developing the national liberation movements and as well as realization of its concept in the South Caucasian region in the early 1900s. Especially during the First World War and after the collapse of the Tsarist Russian Empire, as a party leader and an editor of the newspaper, he did important work towards to be met the demands of the nations of the South Caucasus and the Muslims of Russia from the request of autonomy to the implementation of the independent state. After the Soviet Russian occupation of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh continued his activities in Europe and wrote his thoughts about republicanism ideology in his published books and articles. This article studies such ideas as republicanism, musavatism and solidarism in the activities and works of Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh.

Keywords: *Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh, The Republic of Azerbaijan, Republicanism, Musavatism, Solidarism, Azerbaijanism*

INTRODUCTION

Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh, the head of the Azerbaijan National Council, which announced the independence of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic in 1918 and the leader of the Musavat Party, established in 1911, was a political figure and an editor of newspaper, who played a crucial role in the gaining of independence in Azerbaijan and the development of the ideas of republicanism. Establishing various press agencies and political organizations in Azerbaijan, Iran, Turkey, and several European countries, Rasulzadeh provided a detailed description of ideas and values of republicanism in his works while he was in Azerbaijan, as well as during his political emigration period.

Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh was born in 1884 in Baku, Azerbaijan, in his very young age, in 1903 he established the Association of Azerbaijani Young Revolutionaries (*Azərbaycanlı Gənc İnkilabçılar Dərnəyi*). The same year his first article was published in the newspaper “*Şərqi-Rus*” (“Eastern Russia”) in Tbilisi. In 1904, Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh participated in the formation of the “Hummat” Social-Democratic Organization, a branch of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDFP), which

* There are several English transliterations of the name and surname Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh, such as Mamed Emin Rasulzade, Mammad Amin Rasulzade, Mehmet Emin Rasulzade, Muhammad Amin Rasulzade and etc.

was the first Turkic Party in the Caucasus. In parallel, Rasulzadeh founded the newspaper "Hummat" for this party. Interestingly, those years, he had a close relationship with Josef Stalin, who carried out political activity in the Caucasus. Expanding his activities in the press in 1906, Rasulzadeh cooperated with several newspapers such as "Irshad", "Tekamul", "Devet-Qoch", "Yoldash", and "Tereqqi". He also took place in the public organizations, founded in Baku. In 1907, Rasulzadeh became head of the Cultural-Educational Society "Nicat", members of which, were primarily famous public figures of the period. In 1909, due to socio-political activities, Rasulzadeh had to leave the country for Iran and in Tehran, where he published a newspaper named "İrani-Nov" (New Iran). In 1910, together with a group of Iranian intellectuals who studied in Europe, Rasulzadeh established Iranian Democratic Party. From that moment on, he maintained close relations with the Iranian revolutionaries. In 1911, fleeing persecution, Rasulzade left for Turkey. He built relations with Young Turks and cooperated with "Turkish Hearths" organization and its gazette "Türk yurdu" [Yaqublu (2013): 17-22].

Rasulzadeh closely followed the processes in the Caucasus. After establishment of the "Musavat"* Party in 1911, soon he could return back to the country, as in 1913 the Tsar pardoned him. Rasulzadeh cooperated with various numbers of the press, and in 1914, he became chief editor of the "İqbal" newspaper. With the start of the First World War, Rasulzadeh became more active and struggled to get various freedoms for the nation, he belonged to. In 1915, he founded the leading press of the Muslims of the South Caucasus, the "Açıq söz" (Open Word) newspaper and became its chief editor. Rasulzadeh made a speech at the Congress of Caucasian Muslims in 1917, where he brought up the idea of giving territorial autonomy to the Muslims. The idea of territorial autonomy put forward by Rasulzadeh was accepted by a majority at the All-Russian Muslim Congress, held in Moscow in the same year.

After the collapse of the Russian Empire, Rasulzadeh was a leader of the Musavat fraction in the Transcaucasian Seim that was established in the South Caucasus, and he expressed the importance of the idea of liberation of the South Caucasus's nations from Russian Imperial colonialism. Following Georgian separation from the Transcaucasian Seim on 27th May 1918, the Muslim members of the Seim founded Azerbaijani National Council. Rasulzadeh was elected the head of this organization. The Azerbaijan National Council adopted the Declaration of Independence of Azerbaijan in six paragraphs on 28th May 1918. The Republic of Azerbaijan signed its first international agreement with the Ottoman Turkey on 4th June 1918. On behalf of the Republic of Azerbaijan, this agreement was signed by Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh and Mahammad Hasan Hajinsky. Azerbaijan National Council established the first parliament of the Muslim East on 7th December 1918. M.E. Rasulzadeh made the first speech in the parliament. The majority of the parliament consisted of the "Musavat" Party members, whose leader was Rasulzadeh [Swietochowski, (2010): 144-145].

During the first republic period, Rasulzadeh was the head of the National Council of Azerbaijan and the leader of the Musavat Party. The prominent members of the government were from his party.

Starting from 1920, after the Soviet Russian invasion of Azerbaijan, Rasulzadeh's life of emigration has begun. Until his death in 1955 in Turkey, he functioned in different

* *Müsavat* means *equality* or *parity*.

political organizations and newspapers. During emigration, Rasулzadeh founded the Azerbaijan National Center. In addition, he continued to be the leader of the “Musavat” Party. Also, he participated in the Promethean movement supported by the Poland government. During his emigration life in Turkey, Poland, France, Germany, and Romania, Rasулzadeh had managed independent and anti-Bolshevik press, such as “*Yeni Qafqasya*”, “*Odlu yurd*”, “*İstiqlal*”, “*Qurtuluş*”, “*Azərbaycan*”. [Bala, (1953): 4-10].

Socio-political, as well as ideological and theoretical views of Muhammad Emin Rasулzade were studied by Aydin Balayev and Faig Alekperov. In his work titled “Muhammad Emin Rasулzade's worldview” Faig Alekperov explored the socio-political and philosophical views of Rasулzade, the ideas of socialism and democracy [Ələkbərov, F. (2007)]. Studying Rasулzadeh's ideas of solidarity, he calls them the last period of his views on the social democratic principles. However, the author did not give a detailed explanation of the idea of solidarity presented by Rasулzade as his final point of view in his work, and did not conduct a comparative analysis. Aydin Balayev in his book, “Mamed Emin Rasулzade: 1884-1955”, concerned Rasулzadeh's views on Azerbaijanism, commented on the period of transition from Turkism to Azerbaijanism [Aydın Balayev (2012)]. Aydin Balayev also touched the issues of national-state structure before the Russian revolution of 1917 and during the republic in the article “Mamed Emin Rasулzadeh and the establishment of the Azerbaijani state and nation in the early twentieth century” (Caucasus Survey, 2015). However, in my opinion, even though a republic was created in Azerbaijan during the period under study, we still cannot say that the stage of nationalization has been fully completed. Therefore, Rasулzade continued his work during exile, on the one hand, through the Musavat party, and on the other hand, strengthening the ideology of Azerbaijanism, he tried to accept a distinctive Azerbaijani identity among the already separated Turkic peoples. Therefore, this study is an attempt to give a special place to the Azerbaijanism issue.

Formation of the Freedom Ideas in Rasулzadeh’s works

The national enlightenment period of Azerbaijan started with playwright and philosopher Mirza Fatali Akhundzade in the 19th century and began to take on a political nature after the Russian defeat by Japan in 1905. The revolution of 1905 in Russia had its effect on the South Caucasus as well. A lot of newspapers and public organizations were founded by the Azerbaijani intellectuals, who used moderation, created by the Tsar’s October Manifesto of 1905. The newspapers, such as “Heyat” and “Irshad” were the leading power of this movement. In this period, along with Ahmad Bey Aghaoghlu, Ali Bey Huseynzade, and Alimardan Bey Topchubashov, young activists, such as Mammad Emin Rasулzadeh, started to come forward. Seized the opportunity of the moderation period Rasулzadeh gradually put forward his thoughts regarding freedom through the press.

In 1903, despite the censorship of the colonial rule Rasулzadeh published his first article in Tbilisi, where he emphasized the importance of the freedom of the press. In the article “Freedom of the Press” that Rasулzadeh penned in Iran in 1911, he stated that the cultural development of every country depends on the development of its literature, and the political situation of every nation depends on its freedom of the press. Therefore, if the press of the nation and country is free and happy, then that nation and country are happy and free. [Rasулzadeh (2011): 69].

According to Rasulzadeh, the press is free when the presswork is about totally free for writing, distributing, and delivering human thoughts. Underlining significance of press freedom, he writes that freedom of the press is the main pillar of the freedom of the human, because it is a main power of the mind and thinking. Its existence is based on knowledge and patience. Exert pressure on the press or its eliminating is equal to removing the power of the knowledge. [Rasulzadeh (2001): 78-79].

For Rasulzadeh to go against freedom of the press is aggression against human freedom. In Rasulzadeh's opinion, censorship is the main factor in the emergence of doubts, implementation of political oppression and hiding essential cases [Rasulzadeh (2001): 80].

Living in the Caucasus, Iran and Ottoman Empire, Rasulzadeh mentioned lack of freedom of Eastern women and their life under various pressures. In the article "Women in Turkey", he wrote: "Nations constructed based on family slavery and family tyranny never can fight with nations which formed on family freedom and family happiness. If a woman is powerless and without rights, half of the nation will be paralyzed" [Rasulzadeh (2001): 247].

The start of constitutive movements in the Ottoman Empire and Iran, the victory of this idea in Turkey, and then the beginning of the First World War was a reason to put forward the idea of national independence by Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh. In 1914, Rasulzadeh, in a series of articles in the Journal "*Dirilik*" (Vivacity), openly wrote about the term "millet" (nation). According to Rasulzadeh nation is the structured product of the aggregate of common language, traditions and ethic codes, common shared history and religious belief. For him, the central pillar of the term nation is the language [Rasulzadeh (2001): 468].

Thus, until the revolution of 1917, Rasulzadeh defended fundamental human rights through the press.

The Revolution of February 1917. From Autonomy to the Nation-state

The liberation movements in the Russian Empire with the February Revolution of 1917 reached their logical conclusion. Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh did not mention national self-government (political self-identification) until this revolution; however, he wrote regarding various types of freedom. On the other hand, different thoughts prevailed among Muslims of the Russian Empire. While the opportune moment for demanding a nation-state appeared after the February Revolution, which resulted in the overthrow of the monarchy. In this case, Rasulzadeh played an essential role in Azerbaijan and other regions of Russia populated by Muslims. So, The First Congress of Caucasian Muslims was held on 15-20 April 1917 in Baku. Different political forces were represented at the Congress. Rasulzadeh, for the first time, put forward the demand for national territorial autonomy for Azerbaijanis guided by the right of nations to self-determination. Despite the opposition of the Islamists and different socialist groups, the large majority adopted Rasulzadeh's proposal. The final Resolution of the Congress stated: "establishment of a democratic republic on a federative basis is the most suitable form of the Russian state that ensures the interests of the Muslim nations" [Balayev (2015): 136-149].

Unlike the *federalists* represented by Rasulzadeh, the *unitarists* thought that the Muslim peoples should have national-cultural autonomy within the centralized Russian state. This dichotomy, which was the main agenda of Russian Muslim intellectuals, has

found its logical solution. Thus, Rasulzadeh made a speech at the First All-Russian Congress of Muslims held in Moscow on 1-11 May 1917, and justified that it was a time for the demand for unity of the nation, not religion. Rejecting Islamic approach to the concept of nation, he stated that sometimes it is said that Islam is a nation itself. It is said that Islam makes Muslims a nation despite Christianity, because when you ask any Turk, “Who are you?” and “From which nation you are?” they will reply - Muslim. Noting this theory as wrong one, he continued and insisted that there is always a sense of nationality, which is equal to lineage. Like other religions, Islam also connects its followers. However, this connection is not a nationality but internationality. This internationality has created Islamic culture, as it created Christian culture. However, it does not mean that all Muslims are united in the nation. As there is no Christian nation, there is no Muslim nation as well” [Balayev (2015): 136–149].

At the plenary session of the Congress on 7 May 1917, the Resolution, prepared by Rasulzadeh, was adopted by the majority of votes (446 votes in favour, 271 votes against). [Swietochowski, (2010):92]

Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh detailed the characters of the period at a conference given to members of the Musavat Party in 1920. According to his writing, there were two ideas among Russian Muslims at the time: national-local autonomy and federation, a political entity based on cultural autonomy. Socialists and Islamists were among those who supported the idea of Russian Muslim political unity. Although they were willing to accept the concept of limited autonomy, they refused to mention the words nation and locality under any circumstances. The Islamists were pleased with Russia's political freedom and tied the country's 30 million Muslims under a single spiritual authority. They were also content with a single national assembly to deal with national and cultural issues. They believed that if the Turks, who remained in Russia carried out their national and cultural affairs through their assembly and administration, they would consolidate their national existence faster and develop further in their relations. According to them, the federation will separate them from each other and changes the ways of progress and development [Rasulzadeh (2022): 36-37].

From the Pan-Islamist point of view, it seems correct that all Muslims in Russia should be administrated from a single political centre. However, Rasulzadeh justified the impossibility of managing Muslims and Turks living in a wide geographical area in the Russian Empire from one centre. Therefore, according to him, Muslims in Russian Empire should acquire local autonomy in their regions and develop this way. Thus, in his essay, Rasulzadeh explaining the thoughts of the federalists wrote that according to them, great Russia had to reckon with nationality as the main idea of the time. Nevertheless, nationality cannot be ensured only by managing cultural issues. The nationality needed to manifest itself in the form of a government. For this, Russia should form national-local autonomies. The Turks of Russian Empire also should consist of various autonomies, not as a single entity. Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Bashkortostan, Kyrgyzstan, Crimea and others should be autonomous states. While these Turk autonomies remain free in their internal issues, they could form a federation and alliance in general issues with all Russian autonomies in religious and national issues with the Turk and Muslim autonomies. This idea, which in a short time conquered all the Turks of Russia, arose firstly in the Caucasus. [Rasulzadeh (2022): 37-38].

At that time, the Musavat Party and the “Açıq söz” newspaper presented the concept of autonomy in Baku. At the same time, the *Türk Federalist Firqəsi* [Turk Federalists Group] supported it in Ganja, where national forces were concentrated. As a result, these two parties merged in 1917, and Rasulzadeh was elected the chairman of the united party. M.E. Rasulzadeh rightly considered the victory at the Moscow Congress his own and considered the Moscow Congress, as indeed a magnificent and historic meeting, where there were up to a thousand representatives. All people, all classes, and all genders of the Turks of Russia were represented here. He wrote that in this magnificent assembly, he was honoured to defend the theory of national-cultural autonomy, which constitutes the ideal of the Turkish people- independence” [Rasulzadehh (2022): 39].

At the Congress of the Musavat party held at the end of 1917, Rasulzadeh clearly expressed the demand for Azerbaijan's autonomy.

The victory of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the capture of Baku by the Bolsheviks, the massacres done in and around Baku in March of 1918, and the failure of the Seim, legislative body, created by the peoples of the South Caucasus, has entirely changed the existing conditions. Due to this, at the 22nd meeting of the Transcaucasia Seim on 9 April 1918, Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh openly demanded freedom for all the South Caucasus, insisting that Transcaucasian democracy must defend itself, preserve all of the revolution's achievements, benefit from the blessings of the great Russian revolution and great democratic principles, and not sacrifice these achievements to Russia, which has only brought us retardation. Transcaucasia should be independent. This independence becomes a requirement. It is vital to declare independence for the peoples of Transcaucasia to live together and enjoy the benefits of freedom provided by the revolution. Transcaucasia is in a situation only comparable to childbirth. Transcaucasia goes through all of the pangs of childbirth, and now it gives birth, and we should not be afraid of this pain and suffering. Transcaucasia's independence must be accepted honestly, not fearfully, for the baby's health. Claiming the need for a declaration of independence, Rasulzade stated: ”Suppose we declare our independence honestly rather than fearfully. In that case, I believe it will be the best adhesive that unites the peoples of the Transcaucasia. In the conditions of friendly cooperation and friendly coexistence, the Transcaucasian democracy will receive blessings that will give it strength and energy to protect its freedom from all threats.” [Rasulzadeh (2014): 43-44].

As a result, the South Caucasus Federative Republic was established on 22 April 1918. However, this short-living republic soon ceased to exist. With Georgia leaving the Transcaucasian Seim on 26 May 1918, three independent republics in the South Caucasus declared their independence. The Azerbaijani members represented in the Sejm, founded the Azerbaijan National Council, and Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh was elected its chairman. On 28 May 1918, the National Council of Azerbaijan adopted the Declaration of Independence and created Azerbaijan Democratic Republic.

Describing this period, Aydin Balayev rightly wrote that at the beginning of the 20th century, the Azerbaijani Turks faced a difficult choice - to join the Ottoman-Turkish nation or embark on the path of forming a private national identity. In such a situation, national forces, led by M.A. Rasulzadeh unambiguously preferred the second option. [Balaev (2015): 136–149]. It should be noted that these forces were united around the Musavat faction headed by Rasulzade. Although the annexationist movement “*ilhaqçılar*” tried to gain an advantage when the Ottoman army was in Azerbaijan, the

concept of the nation state won thanks to the decisive position of people like Muhammad Amin Rasulzade, Nasib Bey Yusifbeyli (the second Prime Minister of the Republic of Azerbaijan).

Democratic Values and Their Interpretation by M.E. Rasulzadeh

The Declaration of Independence of Azerbaijan declared on 28 May 1918, was the final result of the Azerbaijan National Movement. This six-article Declaration outlines the most basic liberties and the underpinnings of republican thoughts. The fourth article of the Declaration is particularly significant: “the Azerbaijan People’s Republic guarantees political rights and citizenship to all citizens living within its borders, regardless of nationality, madhab, class, religion, or gender” [Huseynov (2014): 7].

M.E. Rasulzadeh raised the issue of citizenship and minorities in an opening speech to the Parliament of Azerbaijan on 7 December 1918, Rasulzadeh stated that the parliament represented all ethnic groups living in the country, since all nationalities, classes and members of various ideologies are introduced in it, this assembly can fully represent our Motherland. [Azərbaycan, Volume III (2021): 145]. That is why, in the continuation of his speech, Rasulzadeh noted that Azerbaijan was freed from Russian colonialism and do not have any problems with the Russian nation. He said that we have no hatred or enmity for the Russian people. The Russia that we are concerned about is the Russian Tsarism and Russian tyranny. Our hatred towards Russia does not imply hatred towards the Russian people, who are suffering under Russian oppression. Russia, in our perspective, is the official Russia that oppresses nations and refuses to give them their rights. A nation must be independent and free, and once freed, to create alliances with other nations as they wanted. [Azərbaycan, Volume III (2021): 145]

On 10 December 1918, at the second session of the Parliament, Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh touched the issue of citizenship and minorities in the country again. He said that other nations living within the country would also have all the rights. Azerbaijani Turks, who have tasted the pain of conviction, will not create a convicted nation. The Republic of Azerbaijan does not separate its children into stepchildren or one's own. Armenians, Russians, Jews, Georgians, Germans, Poles and other minority nationalities, along with remaining citizens of Azerbaijan, must have national-cultural autonomy and manage their life, religion, nationality and culture by themselves. [Azərbaycan, Volume III (2021): 145]

As the leader of the Musavat Party, Rasulzadeh met with representatives of ethnic groups living in the country. In 1919, Rasulzadeh visited Quba district of Azerbaijan, where he met with the religious leader of Jewish people, and told them that they have the same rights as Muslims in the newly established state: “Along with other nations, you (Jewish people), individually and as a nation may rest assured to live in peace, tranquillity and comfort in our Muslim and Turk state!” [Rasulzadeh (2014): 421].

The issue of class, gender, and religious equality was concerned in November 1918, by Rasulzadeh, in his appeal, entitled “To all people of Azerbaijan”, stated that, regardless of madhabs or ethnic affiliation, all the citizens of Azerbaijan have the same rights: “All citizens of Azerbaijan, regardless of nationality or madhabs, are children of one motherland. Therefore, they must help each other to build their life in a common homeland and in reaching their happiness together” [Azerbaijan, Volume II (2021): 523].

In addition to Azerbaijanis, Armenians, Russians, Poles, Jews, and Germans were also represented in the Parliament of Azerbaijan, which was opened shortly after this appeal. Furthermore, the Musavat Party also played an essential role in implementing other freedoms in the parliament. The Parliament of Azerbaijan approved the “Statute of the Constituent Assembly of the Republic of Azerbaijan” on 21 June 1919. According to the Statute, all citizens of Azerbaijan who reached their 20s, regardless of gender, race, nationality, and religion, have a right to vote. This Statute is the historical document that defined the most democratic election rights in Azerbaijan and all Muslim East regions. It clearly could be seen that women also had a right to vote in accordance with the Statute.

According to Rasulzadeh, the main principles of classic democracy were stated in the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Azerbaijan: “Great ideas such as authority belong to the people, the form of government will necessarily be a republic, the rule of class and groups will not be allowed by following of equality principle among citizens, and also thought, religious and philosophical life will have complete freedom are clearly and decisively mentioned here” [Rasulzade M.E. (1933): 2].

For Rasulzadeh, the formation of the Republic of Azerbaijan is the final stage of the Azerbaijani people in transition from the Umma period to a Nation-State. Announcing the Declaration on 28 May 1918 Azerbaijan National Council determined the political existence of the Azerbaijani nation. The word “Azerbaijan” developed from a geographical, ethnographic and linguistic word to a political existence. Rasulzadeh explained the main principles of the newly established state. The Republic of Azerbaijan as a state owes its existence to the nationality principles and freedom ideas that dominated our century and are inextricably linked with its history. The movement that declared Azerbaijan's independence was, above all, a democracy and freedom movement. In Azerbaijan, nationalism takes on a democratic essence. [Rasulzade (1933): 2].

Rasulzadeh believed that to build and establish a genuinely democratic government, people must be actively involved in governance issues. In his opinion, the existence of the National Council and the applicable situation in the Azerbaijani parliament was the accurate realization parliamentary system. Rasulzadeh describing the peculiarity in the Azerbaijani parliament he pointed out that all segments of the population were represented, regardless of class, stratum, nationality and religion. [Rasulzade (1933): 2].

Rasulzadeh’s views on Musavatism, Republicanism and Azerbaijanism

Mammad Emin Rasulzadeh's perspective on republicanism is based on the Musavatism system of thought. Rasulzadeh named his party *Musavat*, which means “equality”, in accordance with his ideals. Rasulzadeh defined Musavatism in this way: “Musavatism is the national liberation struggle based on fundamentals of national democracy and republic with the principles of freedom, property and social solidarity” [Rasulzade (1933): 1].

In the conference speech, given by Rasulzadeh in 1920, he elucidated his ideology regarding the social situation in Azerbaijan he stated that Azerbaijan is a country of small estates. Because of this, the Azerbaijani people cannot follow the social trends denying property principles. The movement of the Islamic Union that imagined all Islamic nations as one society and as Ummah and denied nationality cannot take root here. This thought is an out-dated ideology for Azerbaijan. According to Rasulzadeh, in the country, bidding farewell to the epoch of feudalism and entering an epoch of vast industry and commerce, the strongest party is the party that follows the national-democratic professional path. The

name of this party may not be “Musavat”, but it is necessary to be a Musavatist party”. [Rasulzade (2022): 61].

Rasulzadeh accepted the party's new program in 1936, during the Musavat Congress in Warsaw, taking into account changing situations. In the same year, the Musavat party's 25th anniversary and conference took place, where the party adopted new program principles. In its statement, the party substantiated this by the fact that the program, adopted at the second conference, held in Baku in 1919, needed to be updated due to the impact of the extraordinary events that arose during this period in the national and international spheres, therefore, the foundation of the party program was changed. The new program was announced in 16 articles. [Yeni Program Esasları (1936): 9]. The most important issue here is that the party takes solidarity as its basis. The signing of the Caucasian Confederation Pact in 1934 was the main international event, which was signed on behalf of Azerbaijan by Muhammad Amin Rasulzade and Alimardan bey Topchubashi. [Kafkasya Konfederasyonu. Vesikalar ve Materyallar, (1937): 7]. Based on the new program, issues of confederation were also included. In fact, it can be unequivocally said that Rasulzadeh's support for the idea of a Caucasian Union came from the idea of solidarism.

The new program defines Musavatism, claiming that Musavatism is Azerbaijani patriotism connected to the great Turkic culture, embraces national, cultural, and humanitarian values, and is dedicated to the ideals of freedom, republic, and independence. Musavatism is based on national unity and solidarity and opposes all forms of class and clan rule. [Yeni Program Esasları (1936): 9].

Individuals in Musavatism, which accepts the principle of solidarism, are citizens with equal and full legal rights and will enjoy political, religious, and intellectual freedoms. The property right is the fundament of Musavatism. Rasulzadeh elaborated that liberalism and communism are not unique to Azerbaijani society. Neither individual liberty nor the tyranny of capitalist anarchy that formed from the absoluteness of private property, not communism's servitude, which transforms people from themselves into enslaved people and machines. Neither absolute liberalism nor absolute collectivism. In that case, solidarism compiles both. [Rasulzadeh M.E. (1937): 10].

Rasulzadeh proposed partial conditions regarding absolute freedom and property in the solidarism system. He stated that in solidarism, the principles of freedom, personal initiative and property are the basis of modern culture. However, at the same time, the state is not an assigned observer entity that is indifferent to the relationships and struggles among individuals, classes and groups, as in absolute liberalism. In this system, freedom and property are not absolute but conditional. The condition is for the common benefit and the health of the state and the nation. Individual, group, or class freedom is framed by the conditions of not breaching the highest interests and collective freedom. In solidarism, the state is the nation's representative and the regulator of societal relations. [Rasulzadeh M.E. (1937): 10].

According to the solidarism concept of Rasulzadeh, the state regulates ultra-liberal attacks that hurt common benefits without jeopardizing freedom and the development of liberty and property. In his opinion, liberalism, like communism, is immensely cosmopolitan, whereas solidarism is national. Liberalism finds the essence of culture in the creative egoism of the individual, whereas communism sees the soul of culture in the egoism of the class. However, solidarism says culture is a harmony between individual

egoism and societal interests. Individuals of the nation that form moral unity with cultural and historical heritage should limit their ambitions and benefits to save the interest of the whole. Representative of all interests is a state. [Rasulzadeh M.E. (1937): 10-11].

According to Faig Alekperov, after a long political and ideological search, Rasulzade was able to find how to reconcile the social problem with the national one. At the same time, he completely united the national and public cause, and the idea of solidarity became the completion and the last stage of Rasulzadeh's worldview. [Ələkbərov, (2007): 178].

The idea of solidarism presented by Rasulzadeh arose as a result of the discussions that started in the West from the 19th century. There is no doubt that these on-going discussions in France and Germany have an impact on Azerbaijani musavatists. For example, it is possible to say that Rasulzadeh was inspired by the solidarist thoughts of Heinrich Pesch, one of the representatives of the German Catholic ethicist of the Solidarist School. Heinrich Pesch presented solidarism as a third way, different from liberalism and socialism, and showed the border between individual freedom and common welfare. The solidarism presented by Pesch is separated from both the principle of individual freedom and the principle of collectivization; its formula is based on moral, not violence.

Pesch viewed solidarism as a logical extension of Catholic social teaching. However, he used philosophical principles derived from natural law and believed that solidarism should be available to all people of good will. According to him, solidarism (solidarity) existed on four different levels. First, thanks to God, there should be solidarity among all people, second, solidarity among family members, thirdly, solidarity among the citizens of one state and finally, solidarity among the members of a common professional group (including management, workers, and various firms in the industry). [Pesch (1998): 69-70].

These thoughts were reflected in the above-mentioned New Program Principles adopted by the Musavat party in 1936. However the solidarism represented by Pesch developed social issues against the backdrop of the Catholic Church and in accordance with Catholic morality, so, it went through a different historical path, while the meaning of solidarism for the Musavat party has its own aspects. It is no coincidence that Karim Oder, the former chairman of the party, in his article "Solidarism in the Musavat Ideology" writes that the Musavatists were not satisfied with taking the idea of solidarism from the Western world, they strengthened this thesis with some principles arising from the peculiarities of Azerbaijan and the results of modern social law. [Oder (1966): 7] When we look at the "New Program", the concept of national solidarism (*milli tasanüd*) is taken to a higher level, and it is supposed to revive common institutions within the Caucasian Confederation, due to the commonality of geography. And the same collaboration with the Turkic peoples due to common culture and historical past. A kind of solidarity was valued not within the borders of Azerbaijan, but within the framework of the concepts of common prosperity and unity in the region.

It is no coincidence that Rasulzade included the study of the Caucasus in the articles related to education in the "New Program Principles". It was noted that education in Azerbaijan, which will be freed from the Soviet occupation, will serve the national unity of citizens, and will be formed on the basis of modern sciences and human values along

with national history and culture. The main theses of the program on education based on solidarity are:

- All citizens, male and female, have equal rights in education.
- The first education will be general, compulsory and free.
- Sufficient specialized schools will be opened.
- Art will be given importance.
- Neighboring Caucasian languages will be taught in certain schools along with Caucasian studies. [Yeni Program Esasları (1936): 11].

The program also includes important issues related to workers' rights. Some of them are as follows:

- working day up to 8 hours ;
- Social insurance;
- Freedom of trade unions;
- Mandatory arbitration to resolve disputes between employees and employers;
- Legal recognition of collective agreements;
- Presence of representatives on behalf of labor organizations in state enterprises dealing with labor protection and public insurance;
- Support for employees to educate themselves in the field of educational and cultural life. [Yeni Program Esasları (1936): 11].

Mammad Emin Rasolzadeh summarized and named the process of transition from geographical Azerbaijan to political Azerbaijan, where Musavatism was the main power, as Azerbaijanism. Rasolzadeh and the Musavat Party did not support the idea of the unity of Muslims and Turks of the Russian Empire nor merging with the Ottoman Empire, which had close historical and cultural ties with Azerbaijan. Instead, he supported the concept of creating Azerbaijan as a separate independent state in both periods: during the demand for autonomy and the thoughts of independence. Rasolzadeh explained Azerbaijanism in his works and affirm that Azerbaijanism means the struggle for independence. That struggle for independence means the triumphal procession of the nation to become a state, which is the most prominent institution in history; Azerbaijanism is a noble struggle for the liberation of a nation of the great Turkic race; Azerbaijanism, at the same time, a trend of freedom and culture, whose main essence is populism and national authority; The political representative of Azerbaijanism is the Musavat Party [Rasolzade (1934b): 68-69].

Mammad Emin Rasolzadeh linked Azerbaijan's national movement to local history and mentioned that it formed as a result of European liberation movements. He described the nature of the Azerbaijani national movement in this way: "In terms of ideological origin, the Azerbaijan national movement is a movement that combined the national liberation concepts of the East with the cultural and democratic tendencies of the West." [Rasolzade (1934a): 163]. In his opinion, thanks to the disclosure of social forces and the accession of individuals to the social movement in the past, the national movement in Azerbaijan took on European outlines earlier than in any other Muslim country of the East. [Ibid: 163].

Rasolzadeh stated in his speech to Azerbaijan's Parliament that the newly established state is founded on the parliamentary system, despite the absence of a constitution. He said that although Azerbaijan's Constitution has not yet been drafted, we have embraced the parliamentary system as a fundamental component of our Constitution. And

Azerbaijan can easily apply the laws of Britain and other countries that adopted a parliamentary system. A member of parliament represents a nation that requires being independent. If a member of parliament is a government officer, he can never talk freely. There is tyranny in a country without a parliament. [Azərbaycan, Volume IV (2022): 302-303].

CONCLUSION

Mammad Emin Rasolzadeh, both in socio-political and press activities, put against Tsarist colonialism and the thought of Bolshevism after the occupation, the concept of republicanism, Musavatism and a more generalized ideology, Azerbaijanism. Rasolzadeh, who supported the transition process from *Ummah* to the nation in the regions, where Muslims lived in Russia and the South Caucasus, understood that along with gaining independence, it is essential to rule emerging states based on modern values. As the leader of the Musavat Party and the chairman of the National Council of Azerbaijan, he, as a defender, continuously put forward the concept of republicanism and Musavatism, based on social justice, and a parliamentary system, which symbolizes unity among citizens of Azerbaijan. Also, he raised those issues in the organizations and the press he founded during his exile. Rasolzadeh understood the period of nationalization, which came to the South Caucasus somewhat late, in a broader context, and has rendered important services in establishing a united Azerbaijani nation and the geographical region in which this nation lives. During the short-living Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, he also worked hard to establish national and democratic authority in the country. Forming a parliament with evolving representatives of ethnic minorities and factions with opposing viewpoints, where discussions were entirely free, is directly tied to his name.

REFERENCES:

- Aydın Balayev (2012). Məmməd Əmin Rəsulzadə: 1884-1955 [Mamed Emin Rasolzade: 1884-1955]. Bakı, Çıraq, 286 pages
- Aydın Balayev (2015). Mamed Emin Rasolzadeh and the establishment of the Azerbaijani state and nation in the early twentieth century. *Caucasus Survey*, Volume 3: Issue 2, Pages: 136–149
- *Azərbaycan qəzeti* [Newspaper Azerbaijan] (2021). Volume II. Transliteration by Gəncəli M., Ağaoğlu A. Bakı: ADA University. 600 pages
- *Azərbaycan qəzeti* [Newspaper Azerbaijan] (2021). Volume III. Transliteration by Gəncəli M., Ağaoğlu A. Bakı: ADA University. 600 pages
- *Azərbaycan qəzeti* [Newspaper Azerbaijan] (2021). Volume IV. Transliteration by Gəncəli M., Ağaoğlu A. Bakı: ADA University. 576 pages
- Bala, M. (1953). Azərbaycan Muhacirlik Matbuatının Otuz Yıllığı [30's Anniversary of the Azerbaijani Emigration Press] "Birleşik Kafkasya" [United Caucasia], 4-10. *İstiqlal: 1918-28 Mayıs-1919*. (2014). [Newspaper Istiqlal: 28 May 1918-1919] Editor Hüseynov, Ş. Bakı: Qanun. 255 pages
- Ələkbərov, F. (2007). *Məhəmməd Əmin Rəsulzadənin dünyagörüşü* [Muhammad Emin Rasolzade's worldview]. Bakı, Elm, 269 pages

- *Kafkasya Konfederasyonu. Vesikalar ve Materyallar.* (1937). Kafkasya Konfeder. Şurası Neşriyatı. 60 səh.
- Oder, K. (1966). Müsavat İdeolojisinde Solidarizm [Solidarism in Musavat Ideology]. "*Azərbaycan*", Şubat, 170, 6-16.
- Pesch, H. (1998). *Heinrich Pesch on Solidarist Economics: Excerpts from the Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie.* Translated by Rupert J Ederer. Lanham, MD: University Press of America. 316 pages.
- Resulzade, M. (1934a). Milli Azərbaycan Hareketinin Karakteri [Character of Azerbaijani Movement]. *Azərbaycan Yurt Bilgisi*, May, pp.163-166.
- Resulzade, M. (1934b). *Şefibeycilik.* [Shefibeyism] Istanbul. 72 pages
- Rəsulzadə, M. (2001). *Seçilmiş Əsərləri.* [Selected Works] Volume II. (Ed. Ş. Hüseyinov) Bakı, Azərbaycan: Şirvanəşr. 528 pages
- Rəsulzadə, M. (2014). *Seçilmiş Əsərləri* [Selected Works] Volume V. Bakı: Qanun. 564 pages
- Rəsulzadə, M. (2022). *Azərbaycan təşəkkülündə Müsavat.* [Musavat in Azerbaijani Thinking] Bakı: Çapar. 80 pages
- Resulzade, M. E. (1932). Yenilmeyen Bir Kuvvet. [Invincible Power] *İstiklal*, Mart 10, p.1
- Resulzade, M. E. (1933). Azərbaycan Cumhuriyeti Hakkında Bazı Kayıtlar.[Some Notes on Azerbaijan Republic]. *İstiklal*, Mayıs 28, pp. 1-2
- Resulzade, M. E. (1937). Bizim Sosyal Sistem: Milli Təsənüd.[Our Social System: National Solidarity] *Müsavat Bülteni*, Ocak, pp. 8-11
- Swietochowski, T. (2010). *Russian Azerbaijan, 1905–1920. The Shaping of a National Identity in a Muslim Community.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yaqublu, N. (2013). *Məhəmməd Əmin Rəsulzadə Ensiklopediyası.* [Encyclopedia of Muhammad Amin Rasulzade] Bakı, Kitab Klubu, 505 pages
- Yeni Program Esasları. (1936). [Principles of the New Program] *Müsavat Bülteni*, Eylül, pp. 9-11

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

No fee is charged from the authors during the submission, evaluation and publication process.

The article must be sent to email: historical_studies@wcu.edu.az

Article length: Between 5000 and 15000 words maximum, including notes and bibliography.

The text needs to be typed with Word software 1997-2003. Font: Times New Roman. Format: 12, Single Line spacing

Reference style: **APA** (<https://apastyle.apa.org/>)

Your article should be arranged in the following order:

TITLE

Author's First name and Last name

Institution, Country

Email address

ORCID#

Abstract: as least 100, up to 300 words

Keywords: at least 6, up to 10 words

The main body of the article can be divided into paragraphs and titled at the discretion of the author.

References throughout the text: Author's name year: page, between square brackets.
Ex: [Hubert (1986): 26]

Samples for Bibliography:

Whole authored book:

- Jackson, L. M. (2019). *The psychology of prejudice: From attitudes to social action* (2nd ed.). American Psychological Association.

Chapter in Edited Book:

- Kumpfer, K. (2009). Prevention. In P. Korsmeyer & H.R. Kranzler (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of drugs, alcohol & addictive behavior* (3rd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 270-278). Detroit, MI: Macmillan.

The Journal article reference:

- Grady, J. S., Her, M., Moreno, G., Perez, C., & Yelinek, J. (2019). Emotions in storybooks: A comparison of storybooks that represent ethnic and racial groups in the United States. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 8(3), 207–217.

Titles and names written in **non-Latin scripts** must be transliterated before translating and citing. For example:

- Najm, Y. (1966). *Al-qissah fi al-adab Al-Arabi al-hadith* [The novel in modern Arabic literature]. Beirut: Dar Al-Thaqafah.

NB1: Please, do not forget to indicate DOI of the publication in bibliography, if it is provided.

NB2: Please, do not forget to provide URL of Internet sources and date of last access (for example: (Last accessed: January 6, 2023))