

ON THE NATIONAL IDENTITY OF GEORGIANS

Gürcülerin Ulusal Kimliği Üzerine

Emzar KAKHIDZE*

ABSTRACT

Initial outlines of the Georgian cultural and civilizational identity were formed under the influence of the East, which did not become its organic part. Approximately the same was happened with the Classical world. The significance of the Oriental influence should not be forgotten either, which played the role of a certain equilibrant. All this found reflection in the Medieval times and even after during the appearance of Russia in the Caucasus. However, unlike Rome itself and especially Byzantium, relations with Moscow, despite the unification of the national organism, did not lead to the rise of the Georgian statehood. Another important issue is that Georgian élite is very far from the Georgian people, they do not realize, that close historical contacts with the Middle East, influence of the religion and the communal organization, superficial influence of the Classical civilization and a traditional way of life were the main features of Georgian society. These features, in many respects, have remained till today. Despite the deep influence of the western civilization in recent years, political and cultural features of Georgia still remained a post-Soviet style. Georgian society still finds it difficult to internalize the main postulates of democracy.

Keywords: Ancient Georgia, Classical era, Byzantine, Islamic worlds, Russia and west

ÖZET

Gürcü kültürel ve medeniyet kimliğinin ilk oluşum evreleri, Doğu'nun etkisi altında şekillenmiş, ancak bu etkiler onun organik bir parçası hâline gelmemiştir. Antik dünya ile de yaklaşık olarak aynı durum yaşanmıştır. Bir çeşit dengeleyici mekanizma görevi üstlenen Doğu etkisinin önemi de göz önünde bulundurulmalıdır. Bunların tamamı Orta Çağ'da ve daha sonra Rusya'nın Kafkasya'da ortaya çıkmasıyla birlikte de yankı uyandırmıştır. Ancak, Roma ve özellikle Bizans'ın aksine, ulusal yapının birleşmesine rağmen Moskova ile ilişkiler Gürcistan devletinin yükselişine yol açmamıştır. Bir diğer önemli konu ise modern Gürcü elitinin, Gürcü halkından çok uzak olmasıdır. Zira onlar, Orta Doğu ile yakın tarihsel temasların, dinin ve toplumsal örgütlenmenin etkisinin, Klasik medeniyetin yüzeysel etkisinin ve geleneksel yaşam biçiminin Gürcü toplumunun temel özelliklerini oluşturduğunu fark etmemişlerdir. Bu özellikler pek çok yönden günümüze kadar ulaşmıştır. Son yıllarda Batı uygarlığının derin etkisine rağmen, Gürcistan'ın siyasi ve kültürel özellikleri, Sovyet sonrası dönemin izlerini taşımaktadır. Gürcü toplumu hâlâ demokrasinin temel ilkelerini kavramakta zorluk çekmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Antik Gürcistan, Klasik dönem, Bizans, İslam dünyası, Rusya ve Batı

* Prof. Dr., Batumi State University, Faculty of Humanities, Department of History, Archaeology and Ethnology, e.kakhidze@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-1102-983X

Geliş Tarihi / Received: 5 April 2026
Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 18 May 2026
Yayın Tarihi / Published: 31 May 2026

Introduction

This topic, the essential issues of Georgian culture and civilization, their peculiarities, modern tensions and future perspectives already has discussed almost two decades ago to nowadays (one last one, see: Kakhidze et al., 2025, p. 259-270).

The importance of this has increased even more in light of recent events. It is clear that the world order is changing, and the old geostrategic maxims are no longer relevant.

In this regard, it is important to recall the views of the one of the founding fathers of both geopolitics and geostrategy Halford John Mackinder, who believed that the “Columbian era” of maritime dominance is coming to an end. The Heartland's geopolitical role will further increase with the development of the transcontinental railroad network, which will compete with the navies of maritime powers and could lead to continental supremacy over maritime ones (Mackinder, 1904, p. 429).

In this transactional period of contemporary history, the main burden falls on the three giants of Heartland and Outer Crescent of Eurasia: Russia, Turkey, and Iran. Based on past experience, it is clear that even local conflicts are extremely counterproductive. This allows the destructive forces of contemporary global politics, primarily the United States and Israel, to strengthen their dominance in the Middle East.

Naturally, along with the axis powers of Eurasia, great importance is given to the transactional ones, many of which serve as proxies of foreign powers in the region, thereby significantly harming to interests of Eurasia. Until recently, one such actor was Georgia, which, in fact, conduit for US interests in the southern Caucasus.

Despite its small size, Georgia, like other similar countries, can play an important role in the process of forming new centers of power. To this, they have thousands of years of experience in coexistence and relations with the above-mentioned countries of imperial experience, which they can successfully use in the interaction between them, that is, to play a transactional role in axial cooperation or disagreement processes.

Method

To better understand the depth of this experience, seems be correct a brief overview of Georgian history, more precisely, its main, landmark sections which are essentially the same, or to put it more properly, has a similar content of challenges.

Findings

At the very first stages of foundation, Georgian culture had already been influenced by Oriental world but it didn't take in essentials characteristic to Asian despotism. The same happened in connection with the Classical world (Kakhidze, 2005, p. 141-148; Kakhidze & Khalvashi, 2010, p. 5-6; Mamuladze & Kakhidze, 2009, p. 60-63).

It is interesting that the local population and the Greek colonists used to be in close contacts in eastern Black Sea area. Roman forts create significant contrast in relation with Greek settlements. Generally, the Romans “coldhearted” attitude with the locals can be observed in other frontier regions of the Empire as well (Ranovich, 1949, p. 3, 36, 110, 158, 208; Akurgal, 1985, p. 32-33; Devijver, 1986, p. 198, 201; Hopwood, 1986, p. 344).

However, unlike other Black Sea coasts, the Classical influence failed to change the cultural and civilizational matrix of the eastern Black Sea littoral. It is no coincidence that each colony, trading post or a fort, decline here along with the crises that arose in the metropolis. The same happened in the early Byzantine period, when enhanced local states moved almost all the church and military centers located along the coast to the interior of the country (Mamuladze et al., 2001, p. 45; Kakhidze, 2002b, p. 117; 2004, p. 51; 2008, p. 314-324; Kakhidze & Shalikadze, 2023, p. 68-79).

Nevertheless, long-standing relations with the Classical world have still had their influence: having fallen under the influence of a Roman empire, western and eastern parts of ancient Georgia: Lazica and Iberia made a huge civilizational breakthrough, contributed to the Christianization of our country and it is no coincidence that in the fourth-seventh centuries AD they made a civilizational choice between Byzantium and the East (Varshanidze & Kakhidze, 2013, p. 275-278).

The subsequent successes of Georgian statehood were determined precisely by this choice. The state model of High Middle Age Georgia, along with the own experience, was based on the Byzantine matrix, which was advanced in the Eastern Christian world of that time, and despite a number of failures, it worked successfully for three centuries.

The very fact of the existence of a counterweight to Byzantium, in the form of Persia and then the Caliphate, played a major role as well (Kakhidze, 2002a, p. 122-133).

The successful defense from the East along with increasing struggles against Byzantium helped lead to a process of unification of the Georgian statehood. The western Georgian Church broke away from Constantinople in the 10th century, instead recognizing the authority of the Catholicate of Mtskheta. The church language was changed from Greek to Georgian there too. The first king of unified Georgia, or Abkhazia and Iberia become Bagrat III, representative of Bagratids in 1008. In two years, he annexed the kingdom of Khakheti and Hereti to the east. Bagrat had a peaceful foreign policy, successfully avoiding conflicts with the Byzantines and nearby Muslim realms, even though some of Georgians territory, such as Tao and Tbilisi, remained in Byzantine and Arab control, respectively. By the 1060s, the Great Seljuk Empire, led by Alp Arslan, had replaced the Arabs as the main Muslim threat facing Georgia. The Seljuks appointed a new emir in Tbilisi, but after his death in 1080, the city was again ruled by its local elders. In 1121, David IV “the Builder” (1089-1125) defeated the Seljuks at the battle of Didgori, allowing him to enter Tbilisi the next year, and putting an end to almost 500 years of Muslim presence in Tbilisi. David IV suppressed dissent of feudal lords and centralized the power in his hands to effectively deal with foreign threats. To highlight his country's higher status, he became the first Georgian king to reject the highly respected titles bestowed by the Byzantium, Georgia’s longtime suzerain. David IV made particular emphasis on removing the vestiges of eastern influences, in favor of the traditional overtones. As part of this effort he founded the Gelati Monastery, a UNESCO World Heritage Site, which became an important center of scholarship in the Eastern Orthodox Christian world of that time. The successes of her predecessors were built upon by Queen Tamar (1184-1213), who became the first female ruler of Georgia in her own right and under whose leadership the Georgian state reached the zenith of power and prestige. She not only shielded much of her Empire from further Muslim expansion but successfully

pacified internal tensions, including a coup organized by her Russian husband Yury Bogolyubsky, prince of Novgorod. Additionally, she pursued policies that were considered very enlightened for her time period, such as abolishing state-sanctioned death penalty and torture. Among the remarkable events of Tamar's reign was the foundation of the empire of Trebizond on the Black Sea in 1204. The country's power had grown to such extent that in the later years of Tamar's rule, the Kingdom protected dozen of the Georgian monastic centers in the Holy Land, eight of which were listed in Jerusalem. Saladin's biographer Bahā' ad-Dīn ibn Šaddād reports that, after the Ayyubid conquest of Jerusalem in 1187, Tamar sent envoys to the sultan to request that the confiscated possessions of the Georgian monasteries in Jerusalem be returned (Bahā' ad-Dīn, 2022, p. 123). Saladin's response is not recorded, but the queen's efforts seem to have been successful. Jacques de Vitry, the Patriarch of Jerusalem at that time wrote that Georgians are very warlike and valiant in battle, being strong in body and powerful in the countless numbers of their warriors, they come on pilgrimage into the Holy City without paying tribute to anyone. With flourishing commercial centers under Georgia's control, industry and commerce brought new wealth to the country and Tamar's court. Tribute extracted from the neighbors and war booty added to the royal treasury. Tamar's reign also marked the continuation of artistic development. While her contemporary Georgian chronicles continued to enshrine Christian morality, the religious theme started to lose its earlier dominant position to the highly original secular literature. This trend culminated in an epic written by Shota Rustaveli - *The Knight in the Panther's Skin*. This poem celebrates the Medieval humanistic ideals.

The gradual decline of Georgia associates with nomadic invasions from Mongolia since 1220. The main reasons for the failure were time-consuming feudalism, imperial mediocrity, and enmity with neighboring Muslims. Georgia finally saw a period of revival under King George V the Brilliant (1299-1302 and 1318-1346). A far-sighted monarch, George V managed to play on the decline of the Ilkhanate, stopped paying tribute to the Mongols, restored the pre-1220 state borders of Georgia, and returned the Empire of Trebizond into Georgia's sphere of influence. Under him, Georgia established close international commercial ties, mainly with the Byzantine Empire and maritime republics of Genoa and Venice. George V also achieved the restoration of several Georgian monasteries in Jerusalem and gained free passage for Georgian pilgrims to the Holy Land. The widespread use of the Jerusalem cross in Medieval Georgia - an inspiration for the modern national flag of Georgia - is thought to date to the reign of George V.

The death of George V in 1346, the last of great kings of unified Georgia, precipitated an irreversible decline of the Kingdom. The following decades were marked by Black Death, which was spread by the nomads, as well as numerous invasions under the leadership of Timur in 1386-1403, who devastated the country's economy, population, and urban centers. After the fall of Byzantium (1453), Georgia fractured (1490) and turned into an isolated enclave, largely cut off from Christian Europe and surrounded by hostile Islamic neighbors: Persian and Ottoman empires which signed the Peace of Amasya in 1555, defining spheres of influence in Georgia, assigning western part to the Ottomans and eastern to the Persians. During the next 250 years as Persian and Ottoman subjects, various Georgian entities rose into rebellion, while at other times political

activity was nothing, and many kings and aristocrats fully accepted Eastern overlordship and converted to Islam as well.

After the destruction of Byzantium, the balance of forces has been lost and Oriental, this time Persian and Ottoman empires tried to incorporate again the lost borderland, periphery, especially since it was not perceived as an organic part of the opposing side. Therefore, the partial Islamization of the country is not a coincidence, but the result of an objective historical process (Varshanidze & Kakhidze, 2022, p. 247-248; Kakhidze et al., 2022, p. 215-225). This influence was well noted by William E.D. Allen, who explains the “harmonious relations” between the church and the state precisely by the influence of Islam (Allen, 2024, p. 270). In this regard, should not be forgotten the Byzantine experience as well. The Eastern element, along with Christianity and the heritage of antiquity, was undoubtedly one of its organic part.

By the 17th century, both eastern and western Georgia had sunk into poverty as the result of the constant warfare. The economy was so bad that barter replaced the use of money and the populations of the cities declined markedly (in detail, see: Chardin, 2018, p. 99). The various rulers in Georgia were thus often split between acknowledging Ottoman or Persian overlordship. The emergence of a third imperial power to the north, Christian Russia, made the latter an increasingly tempting choice.

King of Kartli and Kakheti Erekle II signed the Treaty of Georgievsk with Russia in 1783, according to which eastern Georgia got established as a protectorate of Russia, which guaranteed Georgia’s territorial integrity and the continuation of its reigning Bagratids in return for prerogatives in the conduct of Georgian foreign affairs. But when another Russo-Turkish War broke out in 1787, Erekle maintained diplomatic contacts with Ottoman liege Suleiman pasha from Akhaltsikhe and signed a separate treaty with him. This treaty was ratified by the sultan in the summer of 1787. Therefore, the Russians withdrew their troops from the region, leaving Erekle’s kingdom unprotected. In 1795, the new Persian shah, Agha Mohammed Khan Qajar, infuriated with the Treaty of Georgievsk, invaded the country and burnt the capital, Tbilisi, to the ground. After Erekle’s death in 1798, internal dynastic controversy broke out over the succession to the throne of Kartli and Kakheti and some of the rival candidates called on Russia to intervene and decide matters. On January 8, 1801, *Tsar* Paul I signed a decree on the incorporation of Kingdom of Kartli and Kakheti within the Russian Empire, which was confirmed by Alexander I on September 12, 1801. Russian General Carl Heinrich Knorring dethroned the Georgian heir David to the throne and deployed Russian military administration in May 1801. A part of the Georgian nobility did not accept the decree until April 1802 when General Knorring compassed the nobility in Tbilisi’s Sioni Cathedral and forced them to take an oath on the imperial crown of Russia. Those who disagreed were arrested temporarily. Russian troops defeated the Persian army led by Fath-Ali Shah Qajar who sought to regain full control over Georgia and Dagestan in the summer of 1805. The western Georgian kingdom of Imereti was also annexed in 1810. The autocephaly of the Georgian Church was abolished too in 1811.

Until 1878, as a result of numerous Russian wars against Ottomans, several formerly Georgian territories were annexed to the Russia. These areas now represent the considerable part of the territory of the present state of Georgia. Georgia was reunified

for the first time in centuries but had lost its independence. This resulted in “emasculatation” of its image in internal or external perceptions. Russian authorities systematically overlooked the nation’s origins and instead portrayed it as a vulnerable, feminine “orient” in need of imperial protection. Conversely, for Georgia the Golden Age forms an important part of its status as a once-powerful and ancient nation that maintained relations with Assyria, Urartu, Persia, Greece, Rome, Byzantium, Seljuk, Ottoman and other empires.

To summarize briefly: after the fifteenth century AD, Georgia, which could not come to terms with the end of David and the Byzantine model in general, practically remained behind world historical processes. Disintegration, constant civil wars or being under occupation are not the result of fate or bad luck, but of ignorance and falling out of historical time. And this has cruel and inevitable consequences, first of all, the gradual reduction of living space. The appearance of Russia in the Caucasus turned out to be tantamount to the revival of the old, Byzantine idea (Kakhidze & Varshanidze, 2010, p. 8-9; Varshanidze & Kakhidze, 2012, p. 290-291). If look at the events objectively, we will realize that a people who have lost their sense of historical time were unable to resist the temptation to free themselves from centuries-old enemies.

Discussion

However, unlike Rome itself and especially Byzantium, relations with Moscow, despite the unification of the nation, did not lead to the rise of the Georgian statehood. The main reasons for this are the smaller community of cultural and historical values with Russia, the specificity of the Russian state itself and, most importantly, the ineffectiveness of the “original” Georgian national idea.

However, two centuries of coexistence with Russia still proved fruitful. We should not forget that the almost completely forgotten Western wave invaded Georgia through Russia (Suny, 1989, p. 63-112). The symbol of this, one might say, second civilizational choice, undoubtedly became Ilia Chavchavadze. His murder points to the dualism of this idea, which, along with its progressive nature, also has a destructive beginning.

Such a destructive element is, for example, Bolshevism. This phenomenon was an inevitable “destiny” for Russia. The Golden Horde matrix chosen by Ivan the Terrible, despite Peter’s European reforms, broke apart and led Russia along a “special” path. The vast majority of scientists consider this a disastrous and unnatural step, but in our opinion, it was a step back, but the great leap towards the new millennium.

The Mongolian invasion has to be discussed in exactly the same way, which is, in fact, the forerunner to Modernity.

The modern stage in Georgia is determined by this dualism mentioned above. The path of the Bolshevism, or the current ruling classes, essentially repeats the disorganization and out- of-contextuality of the élites of antiquity, when the idea is imitated rather than creatively reworked. The only difference is that this has already taken on a nationwide character.

Systematic defeats experienced in long-term confrontation with external forces, structural failures of the country’s organization, and moral decline completely changed the psychology of Georgians, who once considered themselves the heirs of Byzantium.

Georgia has measured the role of a victim, saved by circumstances, another “friendly” power, or a hero.

With a today’s view, especially after the August 2008 and February 2022, it is clearly visible such frivolous business is permanent searching saving forces from the out.

Despite the deep influence of the Western civilization in recent years, political and cultural features of Georgia still remained a post-Soviet style (Corboy et al., 2008, 2009). Georgian society still finds it difficult to internalize the main characteristics of democracy: the freedom of conscience and creed.

As it usually happened before, the Western civilization never reached the main part of local population. In addition, Western education did not reflected on the essential habits of the upper strata of the Georgians as well. Sharply underlined strategic cooperation and confrontational policy to contenders of the USA in the region¹, pushes on thought, that former Georgian authorities as their far ancestors, basically, were interested in the personal power, and do not oriented on concrete values. They do not realized, that close historical contacts with the Middle East, influence of the religion and the communal organization, superficial influence of the West and a traditional way of life were the main features of Georgian society.

Conclusion

Let’s go back to Georgia. Recent decades in my country characterized by the decisive conflict not only with Russia, but against virtual Soviet Union, which still exist among the Georgians. The unique counterargument for this stage is modernization, but it is not realizable without belief in own forces. We had times more difficult resulted by the transforming into regional power in the 11th-14th centuries. But, in that times for the state building have been made use the more advanced for Orthodox world, Byzantine experience. Now times have changed, non-Western, but found on a broader basis modernization is the best practices, possibility of physical rescue of the regional countries for today.

REFERENCES

- Akurgal, E. (1985). *The ancient civilizations and ruins of Turkey*. Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Allen, W.E.D. (2024). *A history of the Georgian people: from the beginning down to the Russian conquest in the nineteenth century*. Routledge.
- Bahā' ad-Dīn, ibn Shaddād (2002). *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*. Translated by D.S. Richards. Ashgate Publishing.
- Chardin, Jean (2018). *Voyage at Persia and other eastern countries: information on*

¹ On my view, this policy very much reminds Roman, focused on strategic presence at region. Russia in this context “approaches” with Parthia which proceeding from the limited resources tried face Roman not directly, but in so-called buffer zones. The bright example of such strategic rivalry was Armenia. Romans who also could not throw sufficient resources in south Caucasus, tried to divide influence spheres in region, creating bases for assumed “a resolute throw” to the East. But this moment has not come. New, more organic power in the region, Persia taken the initiative and has passed in serious counterattack.

Georgia (Trans. V. Barnov). Sabas Tsignebi.

- Corboy, D., Courtney, W., & Yalowitz, K. (2008). Europe, not the US, can get Russia to behave. *The Christian Science Monitor*, November 7. <http://www.csmonitor.com/2008/1107/p09s01-coop.html>
- Corboy, D., Courtney, W., & Yalowitz, K. (2009). A wake-up call for Georgia, Ukraine – and the West. *The Christian Science Monitor*, June 10. <http://www.csmonitor.com/2009/0610/p09s02-coop.html>
- Devijver, H. (1986). Equestrian officers from the East. In P. Freeman & D. Kennedy (Eds), *The Defense of the Roman and Byzantine East* (pp. 109-226). BAR International Series.
- Hopwood, K. (1986). Towers, territory and terror: how the East was held. In P. Freeman & D. Kennedy (Eds), *The Defense of the Roman and Byzantine East* (pp. 343-356). BAR International Series.
- Kakhidze, E. (2002a). Byzantium and the south-eastern Black Sea area since the reign of Constantine the Great to the Era of Justinian I. *Ancient History: Journal of the Department of Ancient History*, 2, 112-134.
- Kakhidze, E. (2002b). Southeastern Black Sea area in the late Classical and early Byzantine periods: results of relationships with the Classical world. *Historical Bulletin*, 11, 106-117.
- Kakhidze, E. (2004). The Christianization of Georgia. In G. Erkunt & S. Mitchell (Eds.), *The Black Sea Region: Past, Present and Future. Proceedings of the International, Interdisciplinary Conference* (14-16 October 2004, Istanbul) (pp. 50-51). BIAA Monographs.
- Kakhidze, E. (2005). On the results of the Black Sea Greek colonization. Batumi State University.
- Kakhidze, E. (2008). Apsaros: A Roman fort in southwestern Georgia. In P.G. Bilde & J.H. Petersen (Eds.), *Meetings of Cultures in the Black Sea Region: Between Conflict and Coexistence* (pp. 303-332). Black Sea Studies.
- Kakhidze, E., İbrahimzade, K., & Varshanidze, N. (2023). Recent archaeological and new written evidence on the Ottoman fort of Gonio. *Pro Georgia. Journal of Kartvelological Studies*, 33, 215-226. <https://doi.org/10.61097/12301604/PG33/2023/169-188>
- Kakhidze, E., & Khalvashi, M. (2010). Georgian civilizational identity in antiquity. *Proceedings of the Scientific Conference Modern Problems of Identity and Dialogue of Cultures* (26 November 2010, Batumi) (pp. 5-6). Batumi State University.
- Kakhidze, E., Shalikadze, T. (2023). Signs of Roman acculturation at the vicinity of the fort of Apsarus. *Issues in Cultural History and Theory*, 37, 68-79.
- Kakhidze, E., Varshanidze, N., & Vardmanidze, J. (2025). On a retrospective and contemporary understanding of Georgian civilizational identity. *Pro Georgia*.

Journal of Kartvelological Studies, 35, 259-270.
<https://doi.org/10.61097/12301604/PG35/2025/171-182>

- Mackinder, H. J. (1904). The geographical pivot of history. *Geographical Journal*, 23, 421–437.
- Mamuladze, S., & Kakhidze, E. (2009). The Roman world and problems of acculturation of the southeastern Black Sea area. In B. Diasamidze (Ed.), *Sakartvelo da Msoflio* (pp. 60-66). Shota Rustavelis Sakhelmtzifo Universiteti.
- Mamuladze, S., Kakhidze, E., & Khalvashi, M. (2001). Die Romer in Sudwestgeorgien. *Georgica: Zeitschrift fur kultur, sprache und geschichte Georgiens und Kaukasiens*, 24, 35-46.
- Ranovich, A.B. (1949) Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire in the 1st-3rd centuries AD. USSR Academy Publishing House.
- Suny, R.G. (1994). *The making of the Georgian nation*. Indiana University Press.
- Varshanidze, N., & Kakhidze, E. (2012). The imperial vision of the demographic situation in Batumi in the last quarter of the 19th century and its modern analogies. In B. Diasamidze (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference Past and Modernity* (30-31 October 2010, Batumi) (pp. 287-292). Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University.
- Varshanidze, N., & Kakhidze, E. (2022). Some issues on national identity of Georgian Muslims. *Pro Georgia. Journal of Kartvelological Studies*, 32, 247-254.
- Varshanidze, N., & Kakhidze, E. (2013). Western Georgia in the 5th-6th centuries AD: a choice of civilizations between Byzantium and Persia. In G.R. Tsetskhladze, S. Atasoy, A. Avram, Ş. Dönmez & J. Hargrave (Eds.), *The Bosphorus: gateway between the ancient West and East (1st Millenium BC-5th Century AD)*. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Black Sea Antiquities* (14-18 September 2009, Istanbul) (pp. 275-278). Archaeopress.

Yayın Tarihi	31.05.2026
Hakem Sayısı	Ön İnceleme: (Editör-Yayın Kurulu Üyesi) İçerik İncelemesi: İki Dış Hakem
Değerlendirme	Çift Körleme
Benzerlik Taraması	%24
Etik Kurul Onayı	Etik kurul onayı gerekmemektedir.
Çıkar Çatışması	Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.
Finansal Destek	Finansal destek bulunmamaktadır.
Teşekkür	-
Atıf	Kakhidze, E. (2026). On the national identity of Georgians. <i>ARÜ Sanat Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi</i> , 1(1), 1-10.

Emzar KAKHIDZE - On the National Identity of Georgians

Publication Date	31.05.2026
Number of Reviewers	Preliminary Review: (Editor or Editorial Board Member) Content Review: Two External Reviewers
Evaluation	Double-Blind Review
Similarity Check	%24
Ethics Committee Approval	Ethics committee approval is not required.
Conflict of Interest	Conflict of interest not declared.
Financial Support	Financial support is not available.
Acknowledgment	-
Citation	Kakhidze, E. (2026). On the national identity of Georgians. <i>ARU Journal of Art History Studies</i> , 1(1), 1-10.