

**TIME-SPACE CHRONOTOPE FUNKTION IN THE POEM “BEDI
QARTLISA” BY NIKOLOZ BARATASHVILI**

**NIKOLOZ BARATASHVILI'NIN "BEDI KARTLISA" ADLI POEMİNDE
ZAMAN İLE MEKANSAL KRONOTOPUN İŞLEVI**

**ФУНКЦИЯ ПРОСТРАНСТВЕННО-ВРЕМЕННОГО ХРОНОТОПА В
ПОЭМЕ НИКОЛОЗА БАРАТАШВИЛИ «БЕДИ КАРТЛИСА»**

Tamar AKHALKATSI

ABSTRACT

The represented work discusses the function of the time-space chronotope in the poem “Bedi Kartlisa” by Nikoloz Baratashvili. Special attention is paid to the architectonics of the historical time -space represented in the poem. The poem can be discussed in the historical context. The time-space notion is concretized here. The author gives the thorough description of the environment in which the events happen. According the time and space phenomena, the poem represents a multi-dimensional lyrical piece of poetry. Here we meet all of the three kinds of space: action space, visible space and felt space. The main action space here is Kakheti region, the visible spaces Iran and the felt space is Russia. The category of space is represented by two dimensions in the poem: outer space layer and inner space layer. The outer, objective chronotope includes historical time-space which is divided in some space categories. The main focus is one concrete period in the reign of the king Erekle the Second, the year 1759. Due to this fact, the time given in the poem is compressed, the space including wider area. The author’s chronotope felt through the lyrics. The role of the author is important in the poem architecture. Its aim is to revive the time-space of the XVIII century’s Georgia – the facts, political situation, the role of the King. The author describes the events taking place in the space and through the lyrical composition he gives assessment to the positions of the main characters.

Key words: Baratashvili, time, space, chronotope, Georgia, Russia, Iran.

ÖZ

Makalede N. Barataşvili'nin “Bedi Kartlisa” poeminde zaman ile mekânsal kronotopun işlevi tetkik edilmekle birlikte tarihsel zaman ve mekân yapısına değinilmiştir. Poemde tarihi hikâyeler anlatıldığından dolayı araştırma tarihsel bağlamda yapılmıştır. Bu durumda zaman ile mekânın belli olduğu net bir şekilde anlaşılacaktır. Yazar, eylemin gerçekleştiği ortamı tamamen tasvir etmiştir. Zaman ve mekânsal bakış açıdan söz konusu poem çok boyutlu bir lirik şiirdir. İçinde mekânın hassas, hareketli ve görünür gibi her üç alan türü de yer almıştır. Asıl hareket alanı Kakheti'dir. Aynı mekâna İran'ın görsel ve mekânsal boyutu da dâhil edilmiştir. Hassas mekân olarak Rusya boyutu gösterilmiştir. Poemde mekânsal kategori, harici objektif alan ile dâhili sanal alan tabakası olarak ikiye ayrılmıştır.

Harici nesnel kronotop tarihsel zaman alanını kapsar ve birkaç mekânsal kategoriye bölünür. Poemin hikâye gelişiminin ana odağı Kral II. Erekle dönemine denk gelen 1759

* ORCID: 0000-0002-8578-3547 Akhalkatsi, T., PhD student of Humanitarian Faculty of Samtskhe-Javakheti State University, Akhaltsikhe, Georgia; (Tamar.akhalkatsi@mail.ru)

yılıdır. Bu yüzden poemdeki zaman dar, mekân ise genişir Burada, Kral Erekle ve Solomon ile Soppio gibi karakterlerin farklı yaklaşımlarından anlaşıldığına göre yalnız harici objektif mekânlar değil, iç sanal alanların çeşitli tabakaları da farklı ve birbirine zıttır. Anlatının ilk kısmında iç sanal tabakalar ortaktır, ikincisinde ise bölünüyor. Hikâyede yazarın kronotopi de bellidir. Bu kronotop lirik sapmalarla metnin arsa gelişiminde ortaya çıkar. Hikâyenin anlatı yapısında yazarın rolü de çok önemlidir. Okur, yazarın mevcudiyetini bütün anlatı boyunca hisseder. Yazarın amacı okura bütün 18. y.y. boyunca Gürcistan'ın zaman ve mekânı ile siyasi durumunu, kral ile halk arasındaki ilişkiyi anlatmaktır. Yazar Gürcistan coğrafyasında gelişen olayları tanıtır ve lirik döneçlik (İngl. apostasy) tarzıyla karakterlerin tutumlarını değerlendirir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Barataşvili, zaman, mekân, kronotop, Gürcistan, Rusya, İran.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье рассматривается функция пространственно-временного хронотопа в поэме Н. Бараташвили "Судьба Картли". В работе особое внимание уделено на архитектонике исторического времени и пространства. В поэме описываются исторические события, поэтому его исследование возможно лишь в исторических контекстах. Исходя из этого, время и пространство конкретны; автор подробно описывает ту среду, в которой происходит действие.

С пространственно-временной точки зрения поэма - это многомерное лирическое произведение со всеми тремя типами пространства: чувственным, деятельским и видимым пространством. Основное пространство действия - Кахетия, действие происходит в упомянутом пространственном ареале, в то же пространственное измерение входит видимое - иранское пространство и чувственное - российское пространство.

В поэме пространственная категория представлена в двух планах: внешним объектным пространством и внутренним виртуальным пространственным слоем. Внешний объективный хронотоп охватывает историческое пространство-время, которое делится на несколько пространственных категорий. Основным ориентиром развития сюжета поэмы является один конкретный период правления царя Ираклия II, конкретно 1759 год. Исходя из этого, время в поэме уплотнено, а пространство охватывает широкий ареал.

Здесь противопоставляются не только внешние объективные пространства, но и внутренние виртуальные пространственные слои, что видно из разных позиций царя Ираклия, Соломона и Софии. Внутренний виртуальный слой является общим в первой части повествования, а во второй части делится и здесь встречается авторский хронотоп, который возникает в сюжетном развитии текста.

Не менее важна Роль автора в сюжетной архитектонике поэмы, присутствие которого читатель ощущает на протяжении всей поэмы. Цель автора - оживить грузинское пространственно -временное бытё 18-го века, политическую ситуацию, взаимозависимость между царём и нацией. Автор описывает события в грузинском пространстве, а также оценивает позиции персонажей посредством лирического отступничества.

Ключевые слова: Бараташвили, время, пространство, хронотоп, Грузия, Россия, Иран.

Introduction

Time and space - they are the integral parts of the Universe. Every event takes place within the certain space and in the certain length of time. Discussions concerning time and space as existing in the Universe comes from the antic times and still is the object of great interest for the researchers and scientists in our days. Parallel to the real time and space there exist imaginative, artificial time and space too. The notions of time and space are inseparable "the object of perception is not considered only in time but also in space. The object of sensual perception is indispensably placed somewhere in the space and bears a wide variety of characteristic features" (jobava, 2011:123). Such interrelations between time and space were introduced into the literary science under the name of chronotope by M. Bakhtin: "We meet time-space chronotopes throughout literature, in almost every piece of literature

TIME-SPACE CHRONOTOPE FUNKCTION IN THE POEM “BEDI QARTLISA” BY NIKOLOZ BARATASHVILI

and art, they imply the space and time features and they are aggregated as an entity. The features of time are revealed in the space but the space is measured and conceived by means of time” (Бахтин, 1975: 101). It is impossible to imagine the plot of any piece of literature without certain space and time background. Throughout the development of Georgian literature one can meet some examples showing either the generalized time and space of the developing historical events, when the author does not point exactly the space and time of the events, or the examples where the authors transfer the historical facts into the other location of time and space basing on their own considerations. Despite the fact that the poem by Nikoloz Baratashvili “Bedi Kartlisa,” (word by word: “The fate of Georgia”, here Kartli, the name of one of the regions today, is used as the name for Georgia as a country) is based on the well known historical events it is a romantic poem, here the time and space are both concretized and coincide with the real examples of history, Thus, when analyzing this poem, it is especially important to discuss the time-space chronotope. Its function in this poem is just as critical as the historical events themselves and development of the plot.

Several articles can be found in Georgian scientific published works, in which the function of the time-space chronotope in the Georgian romantic era poetry is discussed but the poem by Nikoloz Baratashvili “Bedi Kartlisa” has not yet been discussed from this viewpoint. Our aim is to determine the functions of the historic time and space and the time-space chronotope given in the mentioned lyrical poem.

Methods

The research is based on the empiric as well as on theoretical methodology: observation, analysis and synthesis. Integrated usage of the mentioned methods allowed us to fully comprehend the problematic and make proper conclusions. In the process of research we used the cause-effect analysis which integrates all the above mentioned methods. Conducting the research work on the time-space issues found in the poem “Bedi Kartlisa,” first of all, needs the method of observation to be used.

Results

It is for the first time that the lyrical poem “Bedi Kartlisa” by N. Baratashvili has been surveyed in the context of the time-space chronotope;

The research showed that the development of the plot described in the poem concerns the special historical chronotope;

Several spaces are represented together in the poem but time space includes only one historical period;

The author’s chronotope is very important in the architecture of the poem.

4. Discussion

N. Baratashvili describes one episode from the history of Georgia in his poem - the reign period of the King Erekle II, at the background of the concrete time –space chronotope. When studying the lyrical piece of literature considering the time-space chronotope the important aspects of the given poem are revealed. Before we begin discussing the chronotope we shall define those three kinds of the space which are determined by L. Tsagareli: „There are three kinds of space which are sorted out in phenomenology, according the perception: felt space, action space and visible space. Such differentiation shows that perception of the space is always related with the person who perceives, with his feelings, actions and vision. It can be finally concluded that in the narrative text the author purposefully tries to deliver the action space in such way that to impose desirable impression on readers.” (tsagareli). In the poem by Baratashvili, we meet all the three kinds of space: the Kakheti region is a space of action, as the events take place in this area or this locality, then the visible space– Iran enters the same local space and there also occurs the felt space - Russia.

Studying the mentioned poem from the viewpoint of scientific interests can be carried through the historical context. Time and space are here concrete, the author thoroughly describes the areal where the events are happening. “The term **action space** is usually used when characterizing the space in the literature writings and it is often considered as creating the background for the actions which take place and for the main characters of the story. Action space is a necessary pre-condition for developing the narrative text. Action is impossible

without the space” (kikvidze, 2017:52). Space and time are both compressed in the poem “Bedi Kartlisa.” The chronotope does not go beyond the Georgian space here, namely, the areal of action is Krtsanisi valley and the time is the XVIII century (1795, Krtsanisi battle).

The poem “Bedi Kartlisa” is a multidimensional lyrical piece from the viewpoint of such phenomenon as the space. Not only outer objective spaces (Georgia, Iran and Russia) oppose each other but the inner virtual spaces are also different and opposed which is obvious when observing the opposed positions of the characters of the poem – king Erekle the second, his adviser Solomon and Solomon’s wife Sophio. The outer, objective chronotope contains the historic time-space which is represented through some layers and the author’s chronotope is also seen here. It occurs several times through the plot of the poem through lyrical digressions.

Three basic action spaces are represented in the poem – Georgian space, Iranian space and Russian space, though the actions in the poem take place only within Georgia. Time is concrete –the year of 1795; and as for the space, it is local. Two foreign spaces – Iran and Russia enter the local space. Kakheti is the action space.

The poem begins with the picture expressing the inner virtual space of the king Erekle through the artistic expression of his prayer. The prayer of the king had always been recognized as having great importance before the battle. Here the sensation of being above time and above space takes the place and it points to the divine origin of the king of Georgia, the monarch of the orthodox Christian country. The prayer is delivered by him in the camp, in the closed space; though during the battle the king is with his army, in the same space among his warriors, the space of the king when he prays is nevertheless separated due to his realities; his social status determines his different inner space. „Naturally, loneliness is the form of existence for king Erekle; he is always alone, physically and mentally because his function is taking care of his nations and this reality excludes his being among or within the representatives of the nation, he is with his nation and above it because he must take care for the country and the nation (Iomidze, 2014: 55). The special dimension of the king Erekle is much bigger in its scale. Thus the chronotope of the given poem is basically mentioned for him. After the prayers are done the king goes out from the closed space into open or active one. At the same time the narrative moves from the inner virtual layer to the outer, objective space which includes larger dimensions: the three space dimensions can be seen here: Georgia, Iran and Russia. The Georgian space is static in the first half of the poem. King Erekle and his army are in the military camp on the Krtsanisi valley, their action area does not go out this space. The space of Iran is dynamic intruding into the Georgian local space and holding the battle. At the background of Georgian orthodox Christian space here, in the poem, two foreign spaces namely Iranian as a real space and Russian as a felt space are introduced; thus two opposed religious spaces – Christian and Muslim are represented here. We can see two kinds of the Christian spaces here – inner (Georgian Orthodox Christian space) and outer (Russian Orthodox Christian space) and as for the Muslim space, it is trying to invade the Georgian space and is characterized in the poem as a furious conqueror (baratashvili, 1975:293).

The outer, objective space does not go beyond the Georgian space and the actions take place within it. The areal of the actions represents one concrete line which is segmented by time but its inner virtual side contains three layers: king Erekle’s space, Solomon’s space and Sophio’s space. Just here but separately the author’s space is also represented. When Iran, i.e. Muslim space intrudes into the Georgian space the all three layers of it are united but as soon as here comes Russian space, the mentioned space occurs in the different layers. The positions of the judge and king’s advisor Solomon and of his wife Sophio in this case do not coincide with the king Erekle’s position concerning transition of Georgia under Russia’s protectorate.

The battle takes place in the concrete field of space where the Georgian army won. From the beginning of the story the Georgian space is characterized by its bravery, unity, heroism.

Only two special movements are met here in the poem. First – movement from the Krtsanisi valley to the town, to establish a foothold in the fortress and the second – the king’s runaway to Mtiuleti region. In both cases the movement of king Erekle in the space is conditioned by the objective factors. His first space dynamics was caused by diminishing of his army. The Georgian warriors won but their losses were great and this forced the king to leave the battlefield and reinforce in the fortress. The next movement was caused by personal decision and this decision in its turn was caused by betrayal. When the full victory was very close, the Georgian warriors were in the town holding the fortress, and Agha-Makhmad Khan

TIME-SPACE CHRONOTOPE FUNKCTION IN THE POEM “BEDI QARTLISA” BY NIKOLOZ BARATASHVILI

was not able to defeat Georgian forces, everything changed to the worst because of betrayal. The Muslim warriors defeated the Georgians and conquered the Georgian space. Here the first chapter of the poem ends. The second chapter begins with the description of the surroundings of Aragvi River. The poet awakes the sensation of nature beauty in the readers. King Erekle and his judge Solomon are represented at the background of this idyllic picture. Here, through the discussion taking place between Erekle and Solomon, the poet shows that the fate of Georgia as a country is to be resolved. If in the first chapter the objective time and space played an important role, in the second chapter the inner virtual space and the future time analysis move to the first position. The second chapter is dedicated to the analysis and through the conversation it becomes clear that the visible space of Iran is replaced by the felt space of Russia. At that moment the inner integrity of the space breaks and is no longer integrated; the differentiation between the spaces reveals through the discussion carried between Erekle and Solomon and through their opposing positions. The king's position sharply differs from the positions of the judge and his wife. Assessment of the judgment of the characters in the poem is impossible without considering time and space. The main question is the complexity of the chronotope of the poem. This is a starting point for the researchers in assessing the rightness of the positions of the king and his judge. Only taking into consideration the situation given in the 18th century Georgia, can be found out the answer to the question whose position was right. Considering the time-space chronotope existing in the reality of the XVIII century many researchers are sure that the position of king Erekle was absolutely right. But Al. Kalandadze points: „The decision made by Erekle was realistic at the background of the situation of his times but on the other hand, the position of Solomon turned out absolutely right considering our contemporary time”. Thus, the king's decision was right to the request of that time, but can the same be said about Solomon's position towards his time? This is the main problem given in the poem, this is the question for thinking, doubting and searching for the poet himself. But it is evident that the author avoided to put this question sharply towards the situation existing in his times, though to find the answer to this question was apparently his aim. Considering such reality, the romanticism of the king's judge (adviser) Solomon which raised on the ground of the conflict between the desire and the reality. His position could not give concrete answer to the concrete question (kalandadze, 1972: 337). G. Abzianidze denotes that :Nikoloz Baratashvili is seen here as the principal defender of the idea of Georgia's independence which coincides with the position of Solomon Leonidze and creates his portrait with sympathy but he is sure that in the given situation king Erekle made the only right choice (abzianidze, 1955: 8).

It is known in the history that the 18th century Georgia lived one of its hardest times. The time-space chronotope here is described by the poem main character – king Erekle. This historical personage in the poem has an argument with his judge (adviser) Solomon Leonidze in the poem's narrative, when discussing the existed hard situation. The king says (**note:** here and in other instances like that the abstracts from the poem are rendered in simple prosaic interpretation):

“From now and forth, Mahmud Khan with his blood-thirsty nature will never leave us in peace, he is strong now and his strength will also provoke Dagestan; as for Turk Ottomans they are also waiting for their time; so numerous enemies will strike us” (baratashvili, 1975:300).

The situation taking its place in Georgian space is caused not only by the real dangers related to the outer aggressors. Based on his own political intuition and political insight the king understands that inner disorders, conflicts and betrayals will open way to the outer enemies waiting for the proper moment to fully occupy and divide Georgia. King Erekle is sure that in such situation can be solved only through uniting with Russia. The king's adviser Solomon Leonidze opposes Erekle and says that he does not consider this decision as the only way to improve the existing situation; at that moment, the king and his loyal adviser became personally opposed figures, their personal spaces do not coincide. The question arises: was Solomon Leonidze right when he disagreed and tried to persuade the king? The judge himself knows well about the sinister circumstances which the king has mentioned to him as strong arguments. He had been participating in all the events taking place in the existing spatial locality. Thus it is legitimate that Solomon puts the king's decision under question. His own

vision of the future is quite reasonable. He gives right evaluations about doubtful future of the country and the threats in connection with unifying Georgian and Russian spaces. He expressed his first reaction in the question form:

“Are you sure, my king, that Iberians (=Georgians) will live happily under Russian protection? To my mind the same confession cannot guarantee the proper relations if our cultural traditions are absolutely different; if now we hope that Russia’s strength will help us we don’t know how this strength will turn for us later” (baratashvili, 1975:302).

The opinion was expressed in the Georgian scientific literature about the positions of Solomon and his wife Sophio which different from Erekle’s position. According this opinion, Solomon Leonidze and Sophio as personages express unromantic opinions. The scale of their being and thinking differ from that of the king. And the difference first of all lies in the fact that their opinion is narrow in nature not able to rise higher above their personal feelings and specific sensitive interrelations. Tragic side of the situation is not felt by them but only brought from the outside” (Iomidze, 2014:55). We think that it is possible to share such assessment only toward the personage of Sophio because her attitude is based on pure female sensitive perceptions and as for Solomon’s position which opposes the king’s views it fully bases on the thoughts and political assessments, not feelings. From the first sight it can be thought that the positions of Sofio and Solomon coincide which is seen from Solomon’s words:

“You have surprised me, my King! I think that Irakli (=Erekle) knows that the Georgians do not care for hardness if they feel free at their home”(baratashvili, 1975: 303).

and in Sophio’s monologue

“is it so that captured nightingale sitting in cage can feel happy? and it is sure that when it is free, flying over the valleys, it sings happily” (baratashvili, 1975: 308).

Despite the common positions it will not be right to discuss Solomon’s and Sophio’s personages in the same space dimensions and this is so because of two reasons: first, the king would not share his decision and ask about the opinion from the person who would act only according his emotions and feelings. The king knew very well about the political knowledge and intuition of Solomon and considers him the trustful person; the second - the first address of Solomon to the King contains the same deep political considerations as had the king himself when making his decisions. But as it was have noticed, the space of the poem is mainly counting for the king and the future of Georgia is in his hands.

In the plot composition of the poem the role of the author is also important; readers feel his presence throughout the poem. The author’s aim is to revive the past for the readers, to show the picture of the XVIII century with its historical and political facts and events, the space and time existing at those times, attitudes between the king and the people. The author describes the historical events, and gives assessments of the historical personages from distance. In the Georgian scientific literature it remains disputable what is the positions of the author, to whose side are his feelings. But it should be said that some researchers do not think that the author only describes the historical events but he also gives his assessment. Ak. Gats'erelia thinks that :Nicoloz Baratashvili shows his sympathy towards Sophio, the wife of Solomon Leonidze. “He sympathizes Sophio and for him the freedom is above all, it is the most important condition for life and happiness” (gats'erelia, 1947:180). But some researchers think that “Nikoloz Baratashvili gives chance to express their opinions to the king Erekle and to his advisor Solomon Leonidze; he never tries to overload the literary piece with his own opinions. The dispute between the king and his advisor is delivered y the poet so objectively and trustfully that the he never tries to include his considerations here. The dispute itself is so realistic that it needs no personal opinions be represented here.” (ingoroqva, 1922: 329). The author’s time-space chronotope stand apart, its chronotope is separated from the chronotope of the plot. Despite this, the poet describes the time and space of the events in the poem that the reader has an impression that the author is immediate participator of the events. He gives the assessments of the events and positions so masterly that it is difficult to point out his position. Some scientists think that his position is mostly near to Sophio’s position is founded on the lyrical digression which follows the monologue of Sophio in the poem:

“Hey, our mothers, our women, God bless you! It would be brilliant if the present day women could be the same as you were, if they could have the souls such as you had. But the Northern wind had changed their hearts first of all” (baratashvili, 1975: 309).

By our assessment the author’s admiration is caused by heroic nature of Georgian woman of the times described in the poem, by their strong faith and gentle character and not by Sophio’s political orientation (position), because as we have already said, the poet gives

TIME-SPACE CHRONOTOPE FUNKCTION IN THE POEM “BEDI QARTLISA” BY NIKOLOZ BARATASHVILI

evaluation to the past from his own chronotope; he considers that his contemporary Georgian women changed their spirit and mind under the influence of “Northern”; unlike Sophio, who could not imagine her life without her homeland. It should also be noted that while evaluating the king Erekle the second, Baratashvili underlines his heroic spirit, brevity, love to the nation but says nothing about rightness of his historic decision. The poem goes to its final lines so that the poet does not mention the inner space diversion and opposition between Erekle and Solomon. Here the poet leaves the question about rightness without answer and description of inner space goes to its end. As we have already mentioned the outer objective space is replaced by the personal inner space layer in the second part of the poem. By the author’s lyrical digression, the virtual space-time layer ends and the narration moves again to objective space. The poet describes in tragic manner the space which is completely ruined by Agha Makhmad Khan:

“The palaces are ruined, every building is destroyed and our whole country burnt and degraded and everything around is perished” (Baratashvili, 1975: 310).

In the end, the author briefly describes the process of reviving and rebuilding the Georgian space, tells the story of Georgian space reviving and building, tells us just in some lines about military actions led by king Erekle, his victories and losses and how the Russian space (felt space) again rushes into the Georgian space by the will of king Erekle. Thus Baratashvili ends the story by virtual intersection (connection) of these spaces.

References

Abzianidze G. (1955). *Nik'oloz Baratashvilis Tskhovreba Da Shemokmedeba*. Sak. Ssr Metsn. Ak'ad. Gamomtsemloba, Tb. (Nikoloz Baratashvili - Life And Creative Work. Georgian Ssr Academic Publishers, Tb.).

Baratashvili N. (1975). *Kartuli P'oezia* (Shemdgeneli Tsaishvili S.). T. VI, Gamomtsemloba „Nak'aduli“, Tb. (Georgian Poetry (Compiled By S. Tsaishvili); Vol. VI, “Nakaduli” Publishing House, Tb.).

Бахтин М. М. (1975). Вопросы Литературы И Эстетики. *Исследования Разных Лем.* «Худож. Лит». М.

Gats'erelia A. (1947). *Nik'oloz Baratashvili* (Monograpia). Tbilisis Sakhelmts'ipo Universit'et'is Gamomtsemloba, Tb. (Nikoloz Baratashvili, Monograph. Tbilisi State University Publishing House. Tb.).

Ingoroqva P'. (1922). *Nik'oloz Baratashvili (Biograp'iuli Nark'vevebi)//Nik'oloz Baratashvili. Leksebi. Bedi Kartlisa. Ts'erilebi*. Gamomtsemloba „Tbilst'amba“, Tb. (Nikoloz Baratashvili. Biographical Essay. //Nikoloz Baratashvili. Poems. Bedi Kartlisa. Letters. “Tbilstamba” Publishing House, Tb.).

K'alandadze Al. (1972). *Lit'ereat'uruli Ts'erilebi*. Gamomtsemloba „Metsniereba“, Tb. (Literary Essays. “Metsniereba” Publishing House, Tb.).

K'ik'vidze Z. (2017). *Kronot'op'is Punksia Guram Dochanashvilis Romanshi „Lodi, Nasaqdrali*. Me-3 Saertashoriso K'onperentsiis „Tanamedrove Int'erdistsip'linarizmi Da Humanit'aruli Azrovneba“ Masalebi, , A. Ts'eretlis Sakhelmts'ipo Universit'et'is Gamomtsemloba, Kutaisi. (The 3d International Conference On Modern Inter-Disciplinarity And Humanitarian Thinking, Materials; Ak. Tsereteli Kutaisi State University Publishing House, Kutaisi.).

Lomidze T. (2014). *Kartuli Romant'izm'is P'oet'ik'a*. Ilias Sakhelmts'ipo Universit'et'is Gamomtsemloba, Tb. (Poetics Of Georgian Romanticism, Iliia State University Publishing House, Tb.).

Tsagareli L., *Narat'ologia*. www.levantsagareli.files-wordpress.com/2010/narattology-script-121.ge (Ts'vdomis Tarighi: 10. 10.2017). (Narratology www.levantsagareli.files-wordpress.com/2010/narattology-script-121.ge (Accessed: 10. 10.2017)).

Jobava R. (2011). *Memuarul-Ist'oriuli T'ekst'is Semiolingvist'uri Asp'ekt'ebi (M. Iursenaris „Adrianes Mogonebebis“ Sapudzvelze)*. Tbilisis Universit'et'is Gamomtsemloba, Tb. (Semiolingvistic Aspects Of Memorial-Historical Texts (Basing On “The Memoirs By

Tamar AKHALKATSI

Adriane Marguerite Yourcenar Basing On Memories Of Hadrian). Tbilisi State University Publishing House, Tb.).