

NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

As a manuscript

Dmitry Kosourov

**Byzantine-Georgian Political Relations in The Conditions of Formation of
The Kingdom of Georgia in The Second Half of 10th — 11th century**

Dissertation Summary for the purpose of obtaining
academic degree Doctor of Philosophy in History

Academic Supervisor:

Andrey Vinogradov

Doctor of Sciences

Moscow 2023

Degree of scientific development of the topic

Since the middle of the 20th century, the so-called idea of "oecumenism" has become the main theoretical concept in the study of the history of Byzantine foreign policy¹. According to this view, throughout Byzantine history a special "oecumenistic doctrine" lay at the foundation of the empire's foreign policy system. According to this principle, Byzantium alone of all the polities represented the entire "real" civilised Christian world (oecumene, *οἰκουμένη*), and the Byzantine emperor was the only legitimate head of the entire Christian world, vicegerent of God on earth and father to the rulers of all other Christian polities in the mystical "family of nations". The whole system of interaction between the empire and its foreign counterparts was built in accordance with this position: international treaties were perceived as gifts and favours from the emperor to his foreign "dignitary", which was secured, among other things, by granting the latter a Byzantine court title. Even cessions of their own territories in the view of Byzantine political thought were treated as temporary insignificant "omissions", and all the lands ever occupied by the empire were regarded as undisputed and perpetual possessions of the Byzantine emperor, which sooner or later would still return to their rightful owner.

¹ Franz Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt: ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Munich: Buch-Kunstverlag Ettal, 1953); George Ostrogorsky, "The Byzantine Emperor and the Hierarchical World Order," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 35, no. 84 (1956): 1–14; Dimitri Obolensky, "The principles and methods of Byzantine diplomacy," in *Actes du XIIIe congrès international d'études byzantines* 1, ed. George Ostrogorsky (Belgrade: Naučno delo, 1963), 45–61; Dimitri Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971); Helene Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VII–XV siècles* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966); Helene Ahrweiler, *L'idéologie politique de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1975); Pavel Kuzenkov, "Real'naya politika ili velikoderzhavnaya ideologiya? Vizantijskaya diplomatiya X v. po dannym traktatov Konstantina Bagryanorodnogo," in *Istoriya: dar i dolg: jubilejnyj sbornik v chest' A. V. Nazarenko*, ed. Nikolaj N. Lisovoj (Moscow: Imperatorskoe Pravoslavnoe Palestinskoe Obschestvo, 2010), 73–99; Anthony Kaldellis, "Did the Byzantine Empire Have "Ecumenical" or "Universal" Aspirations?," in *Ancient States and Infrastructural Power: Europe, Asia, and America*, ed. Clifford Ando and Seth Richardson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), 272–300.

In the focus of the described concept of "oecumenism", key studies have been conducted that consider virtually the entire geographical spectrum of the empire's counterparts: from the territory of medieval Western Europe² to the Arab-Turkic Islamic polities³ and Middle Eastern crusader states established in the eleventh and twelfth centuries⁴. This theoretical platform was also applied on considering Byzantine political relations with the Caucasus region: from attempts to show the importance of the region for the empire as a whole⁵, to the study of its political relations with specific polities — the Armenian states of the Bagratid and Artsruni dynasties⁶, the kingdom of Abkhazia⁷ and Alania⁸.

When studying the political relations between the Byzantine Empire and the Bagratid Kingdom of Georgia (formally established in 1008)⁹, the provisions of the concept of "oecumenism" were practically not used in historiography, although it would seem that there are all grounds for this. Thus, Byzantium owned the territory of the Tao region in the 6th–7th centuries and received legal rights to a part of the Klarjeti region in the first quarter of the 10th century, which allowed it, within the framework of the ideas of the

² Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt: ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze*.

³ Wolfgang Felix, *Byzanz und die islamische Welt im früheren 11. Jahrhundert* (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981).

⁴ Valerij Stepanenko, *Vizantiya v mezhdunarodnyh otnosheniyah na Blizhnem Vostoke (1071–1176)* (Sverdlovsk: Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo Universiteta, 1988).

⁵ Bernadette Martin-Hisard, "Constantinople et les archontes du Monde Caucasiens dans le Livre des Ceremonies, II, 48," *Travaux et Mémoires*, no. 13 (2000): 359–530; Zurab Papaskiri, "“Vizantijskoe Sodruzhestvo Nacij” i mezhdunarodnoe polozhenie gruzinskih politicheskikh obrazovanij v pervoj polovine X stoletiya," *Kavkaz i globalizaciya*, no. 3–4 (2011): 147–168; Stephen H. Rapp, *Caucasia and the Second Byzantine Commonwealth: Byzantinization in the Context of Regional Coherence* (Seattle: NCEEER, 2012); Andrej Vinogradov, "Vizantijskie podarki kavkazskim pravatelyam: dan' i poddanstvo," in *Na yazyke darov. Pravila simvolicheskoy kommunikacii v Evrope 1000–1700 gg.*, ed. Gerd Althoff and Mihail A. Bojcov (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2016), 40–54.

⁶ Karen Yuzbashyan, *Armyanskie gosudarstva epohi Bagratidov i Vizantiya IX–XI vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1988).

⁷ Andrej Vinogradov and Denis Beleckij, *Cerkovnaya arhitektura Abhazii v epohu Abhazskogo carstva. Konec VIII — X v.* (Moscow: Indrik, 2015), 17–88.

⁸ Andrej Vinogradov and Denis Beleckij, *Istoriya i iskusstvo hristianskoj Alanii* (Moscow: Taus, 2015), 10–43.

⁹ One of the key pillars of the Georgian kingdom was the Tao-Klarjeti Principalities in the southwestern Kartvelian lands, which were the ancestral domain of the reigning dynasty of the Georgian Bagratids, see Cyril Toumanoff, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1963), 437–498.

"oecumenistic doctrine", to start a struggle to reclaim "its" lost eastern regions under the Macedonian dynasty (867–1056), which included, among others, the lands of the Kartvelian principalities of Tao and Klarjeti. Contrary to this, in all known to me research literature, both Georgian¹⁰ and non-Georgian¹¹, with the constant undiminished interest to the topic of Byzantine-Georgian political relations of 10th–11th centuries, the thesis that Byzantium sought to annex the entire Kingdom of Georgia, like the annexation of the lands of Armenian Bagratid and Artsruni dynasties, is persistently presented and substantiated, which contradicts both the principles of the imperial "oecumenistic doctrine" and historical facts. Thus, my dissertation is devoted to the consideration of the Byzantine-Georgian political relations of the 10th–11th centuries, using and taking into account the main provisions of the Byzantine "oecumenistic doctrine".

The relevance of the research topic is determined by a number of factors. Firstly, the same topic of political relations between the Byzantine Empire and the Kingdom of Georgia in the period of 10th–11th centuries continues to attract the attention of a large number of scholars, both in Georgia and abroad. Nevertheless, the available works on this topic, in my opinion, have a number of significant shortcomings. For example, the mentioned works of Georgian historians are characterised by frequent lack of critical attitude to Georgian written sources and frequent neglect of texts in other languages,

¹⁰ Zurab Avalishvili, "La succession du curopalate David d'Iberie, dynaste de Tao," *Byzantion* 8, no. 1 (1933): 177–202; Vasilij Kopaliani, *Sakartvelosa da bizantiis politikuri urtiertoba 970–1070 clebshi* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1969); Mariam Lordkipanidze, *Istoriya Gruzii XI — nachalo XIII veka* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1974); Zurab Papaskiri, *Ot Davida do Davida. Iz istorii mezhdunarodnyh otnoshenij Gruzii. 70-e gody X — 80-e gody XI vv.* (Tbilisi: "ANI-XXI", 2001); Dzhaba Samushiya "Bagrat IV-is konstantinopolshi samcliani tkveoba da sakartvelo-bizantiis 1055 clis zavi," *Sakartvelos istoriis instituti: shromebi*, no. 2 (2011): 125–153.

¹¹ Valerij Stepanenko, "K datirovke polucheniya sana kuropalata Davidom II, Bagratidom Tao," *Trudy Tbilisskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, no. 227 (1982): 72–79; Rach'ya Bartikyan, "O carskom kuratore "Mancikert kai eso Iberias" Mihaile. V svyazi s vostochnoj politikoj Vasiliya II (976–1025 gg.)," *Istoriko-filologicheskij zhurnal*, no. 1 (2000): 130–149; Werner Seibt, "Byzantine Imperialism against Georgia in The Later 10th and 11th Centuries?," *Georgian Diplomacy*, no. 16 (2013): 103–114.

including, for example, almost constant neglect of the information of such an important Byzantine writer of the 11th century as Ioannes Scylitzes. A significant problem is also the frequent desire of Georgian historians to interpret the sources' information about political relations between Byzantium and the Kartvelian lands in an excessively "patriotic" manner, which sometimes leads to a complete distortion of the available facts and nationalistic myths that are harmful to science. The main thesis of these works is the interpretation of the whole history of Byzantine-Georgian political relations as a struggle of "young Georgian state" against "Byzantine imperial expansionism", which often directly contradicts the sources. Unfortunately, non-Georgian historians (although not adopting this "methodology" themselves) often fall under the "charm" of such interpretation of Byzantine-Georgian relations in the 10th–11th centuries, which clearly does not contribute to the scientific evaluation of the subject. Secondly, an even more significant problem is the reliance of Georgian historiography almost exclusively on written texts, while almost every year new sphragistic and epigraphic materials are constantly introduced into scientific circulation, which often capable of completely refute the information of narrative sources. Thirdly, despite the abundance of scientific works devoted to Byzantine-Georgian political relations of 10th–11th centuries, I am not aware of any fundamental works in which the Byzantine policy towards the Georgian kingdom would be considered through the prism of the imperial "oecumenistic doctrine" and the idea of the Kartvelian lands as a part of the "Byzantine Commonwealth". Thus, the constant emergence of new sources (including previously unused written texts) and the use of previously unused methods make it possible to study the history of Byzantine-Georgian political relations in the period 10th–11th centuries from a new perspective and on the basis of the entire corpus of available historical sources.

The object of the study is written Georgian, Byzantine, Armenian and Arabic texts, as well as other types of sources (Byzantine seals, Georgian temple epigraphy and architectural monuments), which contain information about Byzantine-Georgian relations in the 10th–11th centuries. **The subject of the study** is Byzantine-Georgian political relations in the conditions of the formation of the Kingdom of Georgia in the second half of the 10th–11th century.

The chronological framework of the study is defined by two important milestones in the relations between the two states. The beginning is defined by the time around 961, when after the death of the ruler of the Kartvelian principality of the South Tao, Adarnase V, his son David III came to power. With his active foreign policy he soon began to interfere intensively in the internal affairs of Byzantium, which caused a surge of contacts between the two polities. The chronological end of the work is the time around 1074, when the lands of the Byzantine theme of Iberia were transferred from its last administration, unable to defend them from Seljuk attacks, to the Georgian king George II, after which the Georgian kingdom began a reorientation in its foreign policy from extensive contacts with Byzantium to strengthening relations with the Seljukid state.

The goal of the study is to reconstruct the political relations between the Byzantine Empire and the Kartvelian lands during the unification and strengthening of the Kingdom of Georgia from the second half of the 10th century to the last quarter of the 11th century. To achieve the stated goal, it is necessary to solve the following tasks:

- 1) Find out what was the role and influence of Byzantium in the centripetal/centrifugal processes in the Kartvelian lands during their unification at the end of the 10th century, and in what way they were expressed.

2) Analyse how the Byzantine theme of Iberia (c. 1023-1074) functioned: what were its territorial boundaries and how they changed, what was the political and religious situation within the theme itself, what value it represented for both the imperial administration and the Georgian royal court.

3) Identify the importance of the Georgian kingdom for the foreign and international policy of the Byzantine Empire in the 10th–11th centuries and whether the "oecumenistic doctrine" of Byzantium popular in historiography is applicable to the Byzantine political relations with the Kartvelian lands.

The key **method** for achieving this goal is comparative historical analysis, which allows, on the basis of a variety of source material, to identify the common and the particular in historical events or phenomena, and to achieve an understanding of the different stages of historical processes. Traditional methods of studying medieval society (genealogical, geographical and prosopographical) play a major role in this work, as well as the method of textual analysis of sources containing information about Byzantine-Georgian political relations of the 10th–11th centuries.

Problem and novelty of the research

There is a lack of studies in the scientific literature in which the topic of political relations between the Byzantine Empire and the Kingdom of Georgia in the 10th–11th centuries would be considered taking into account all possible categories of historical sources on this issue (narrative texts, seals, inscriptions). Thus, the current state of the available historiography on the history of Byzantine-Georgian political relations of the 10th–11th centuries determines the scientific novelty of this research. It consists in the fact that political relations between Byzantium and Georgia from the second half of the 10th century to the end of the 11th century are analysed for the first time on the basis of the whole range of available historical sources. In addition, in the last two decades a lot of

new sphragistic¹², act¹³ and image¹⁴ sources were introduced into the scientific turnover, allowing to revise a number of established conclusions of the previous historiography about Byzantine-Georgian political relations of 10th–11th centuries, in particular, to clarify the biographies of Byzantine and Kartvelian figures of this period, the administrative structure of the border regions, religious and cultural interpenetration and many others.

Source base of the study

The study is based on sources from several categories.

The largest part consists of narrative sources — both Georgian and Byzantine, as well as other (Armenian and Arabic) texts. The basis of Georgian written texts are represented by works from the chronicle corpus "Kartlis Tskhovreba"¹⁵: "History of the Bagratids" (c. 1032), "Chronicle of Kartli" (late 11th century) and "History of the Bagratids" (mid-12th century). In addition to annalistic texts, in study were also used Georgian hagiographic sources, such as

¹² For example: Valerija Shandrovskaia, "Mihail Grammatik, kurator "Vnutrennej Iverii"," *Antichnaja drevnost' i srednie veka*, no. 38 (2008): 90–95; Valerij Stepanenko and Nikolaj Alekseenko, "Fema Iveriya v XI v. (po dannym sfragistiki)," *Antichnaja drevnost' i srednie veka*, no. 39 (2009): 234–241; Werner Seibt, "Das byzantinische Militärkommando "Iberia"," in *Scientific Paradigms. Studies in Honour of Professor Natela Vachnadze*, ed. George Tcheishvili (Tbilisi: St. Andrew the First-Called Georgian University of the Patriarchy of Georgia, 2009), 146–170; Andrej Vinogradov and Viktor Chkhaidze, "Pechat' Konstantina, syna protoproedra i eksusiokratora vsej Alanii (ok. 1065–1075 gg.)," *Antichnaja drevnost' i srednie veka*, no. 49 (2021): 115–134.

¹³ For example: Majya Karanadze, "Ahali kronologiuri cnoba bagvashta feodaluri sahlis shesaheb," *Mravaltavi: Philological and Historical Researches*, no. 22 (2007): 315–319; Bernadette Martin-Hisard, "Regards croisés du XIe siècle, byzantin et géorgien, sur Lip'arit' et sa famille," *Travaux et Mémoires*, no. 21/1 (2017): 399–450; Werner Seibt, "Die georgische Fürstenfamilie Lip'arit' / Liparites und Byzanz im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert," in *"Bagvashti" (samecniero krebuli)*, ed. Zaza Abashidze and Karaman Pagava (Tbilisi: Korneli Kekelidzis sahelobis sakartvelos helnacerta erovnuli centri, 2021), 141–156.

¹⁴ For example: Annegret Plontke-Lüning, *Frühchristliche Architektur in Kaukasien. Die Entwicklung der christlichen Sakralbaus in Lazika, Iberien, Armenien, Albanien und den Grenzregionen vom 4. bis zum 7. Jh.* (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007); Zaza Skhirtladze, "The Oldest Murals at Oshki Church. Byzantine Church Decoration and Georgian Art," *Eastern Christian Art*, no. 7 (2010): 97–134; Anna Zaharova and Svetlana Mal'ceva, "Materialy ekspedicii N. L. Okuneva (1917 g.) o freskah Parhali," in *Aktual'nye problemy teorii i istorii iskusstva: sbornik nauchnyh statej*, ed. Svetlana Mal'ceva, Ekaterina Stanyukovich-Denisova and Anna Zaharova (Saint-Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo SPbGU, 2017), 679–688.

¹⁵ Roin Metreveli, ed., *Kartlis Tskhovreba* (Tbilisi: Sakartvelos mecnierebata erovnuli akademiis gamocema, 2008).

"The Life of St. Gregory of Khandzta"¹⁶ by Giorgi Merchule (c. 951), "The Life of John and Euthymius"¹⁷ by George the Hagiorite (1042–1044), "The Life of Giorgi Mtatsmindeli"¹⁸ by George the Minor (late 11th century), as well as the Byzantine "The Life of Eugene of Trebizond"¹⁹ (14th century).

Byzantine written sources represent several texts — these are the works of Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus "On the Administration of the Empire"²⁰ (*De administrando imperio*, c. 951–952) and "On Ceremonies"²¹ (*De Ceremoniis*, c. 956–959), "Chronographia" by the Theophanes Continuatus²² (end of the 10th century), "Synopsis of Histories" by Ioannes Scylitzes²³ (end of the 11th century), "The History" by Michael Attaleiates²⁴ (end of the 11th century), "The Chronicle" by the Scylitzes Continuatus²⁵ (end of the 11th century) and "The Strategikon" by Kekaumenos²⁶ (end of the 11th century).

Armenian written sources are also of great value for my research, because they often contain information, which is not found in Georgian or Byzantine texts. The data of the following texts are used in our study: "Universal History" by Stepanos Taronetsi²⁷ (early 11th century), "The History: About the

¹⁶ Il'ya Abuladze, ed., *Dzveli kartuli agiografiuli literaturis dzeglebi. Cigni I (V–X ss.)* (Tbilisi: Sakartvelos SSR mecnierbata akademiis gamomcemloba, 1963), 248–319.

¹⁷ Il'ya Abuladze, ed., *Dzveli kartuli agiografiuli literaturis dzeglebi. Cigni II (XI–XV ss.)* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1967), 38–100.

¹⁸ Abuladze, *Dzveli kartuli agiografiuli literaturis dzeglebi. Cigni II (XI–XV ss.)*, 101–207.

¹⁹ Jan Olof Rosenqvist, *The Hagiographic Dossier of St Eugenios of Trebizond in Codex Athous Dionysiou 154* (Uppsala: University Press, 1996).

²⁰ Gennadij Litavrin and Anatolij Novosel'cev, ed., *Konstantin Bagryanorodnyj. Ob upravlenii imperiej* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991).

²¹ Johann Jakob Reiske, ed., *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris de ceremoniis aulae byzantinae libri duo. II. 48.* (Bonn: Impensis ed. Weberi, 1829–1830).

²² Immanuel Bekker, ed., *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus* (Bonn: Impensis ed. Weberi, 1838).

²³ Hans Thurn, ed., *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum* (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1973).

²⁴ Immanuel Bekker, ed., *Michaelis Attalioetae Historia* (Bonn: Impensis ed. Weberi, 1853).

²⁵ Eudoxou Th. Tsolakes, ed., *E synecheia tes chronographias tou Ioannou Skylitse* (Thessalonike : Etaireia Makedonikon Spoudon, 1968).

²⁶ Gennadij Litavrin, ed., *Kekavmen. Sovety i rasskazy: pouchenie vizantijskogo polkovodca XI veka* (Saint-Petersburg: Aletejya, 2003).

²⁷ Tim Greenwood, ed., *The Universal History of Step'anos Tarōnec'i: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

Sufferings Visited Upon by Foreign Peoples Living Around Us" by Aristakes Lastivertsi²⁸ (second half of the 11th century), "The Chronicle" by Matthew of Edessa²⁹ (mid-12th century) and "The Historical Compilation" by Vardan Areveltsi³⁰ (mid-13th century). As for the Arabic sources, my research cannot do without the information of the "Chronicle" of the Arabic-speaking Christian writer Yahya of Antioch (mid-11th century), available from the fundamental edition and translation by V. R. Rosen³¹ and fragments of "The Complete History" by the Kurdish historian of the first third of the 13th century Ibn al-Athir³². The popular in historiography identification of the "Varangian army", who participated in the Battle of Sasireti in 1046 with the retinue of Yngvar the Traveller, requires for our study an acquaintance with the Icelandic "Sagan om Ingvar Widtfarne och hans Son Swen"³³ of the 12th century.

The second group of sources consists of epigraphic materials — mainly inscriptions in temple complexes in the regions of Tao-Klarjeti³⁴ (modern north-eastern Turkey) and Abkhazia³⁵. These territories were the arena of lively Byzantine-Georgian contacts during the whole period of 10th–11th centuries, which certainly reflected both in the structure of the monuments themselves and in the inscriptions within them.

²⁸ Karen Yuzbashyan, ed., *Povestvovanie vardapeta Aristakesa Lastivertci* (Moscow: Nauka, 1968).

²⁹ Ara E. Dostourian, ed., *The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1993).

³⁰ Nikita Emin, ed., *Vseobshchaya istoriya Vardana Velikogo* (Moscow: Tipografiya Lazarevskogo instituta vostochnyh yazykov, 1861).

³¹ Viktor Rozen, ed., *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojca. Izvlecheniya iz letopisi Yah'i Antiohijskogo* (Saint-Petersburg: Tipografiya Akademii nauk, 1883).

³² Donald S. Richards, ed., *The Annals of the Saljuq Turks: Selections from al-Kamil fi'l-Ta'rikh of Ibn al-Athir* (London: Routledge, 2002).

³³ Galina Glazyrina, ed., *Saga ob Ingvare Puteshestvennike: Tekst. Pervod. Kommentarij* (Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura RAN, 2002).

³⁴ Published in: Ekvtime Takaishvili, *Arheologicheskaya ekspediciya 1917 g. v Yuzhnye provincii Gruzii* (Tbilisi: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Gruzinskoj SSR, 1952); Wachtang Djobadze, *Early Medieval Georgian Monasteries in Historic Tao, Klarjeti and Savseti* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992).

³⁵ Published in: Vinogradov and Beleckij, *Cerkovnaya arhitektura Abhazii v epohu Abhazskogo carstva. Konec VIII — X v.*

Another category of sources are legal acts. To this group, first of all, belong the documents of the Georgian Monastery of Iviron on Mount Athos³⁶, which make it possible to reveal in detail the activities of Georgian ecclesiastical and political figures on the territory of Byzantium, which, in particular, gives chance to learn much about the contacts between the Byzantines and Georgians in the 10th–11th centuries. Moreover, the synodic of the Monastery of Iviron published by Elene Metreveli³⁷ allows us to reconstruct the last years of life of many Georgian dignitaries of the 11th century in Iviron, in particular, representatives of the Baghuashi family. For the history of the Church of Constantinople an invaluable document is the list of ecclesiastical dioceses from the 9th to 15th centuries (*Notitiae Episcopatum*) published by Jean Darrouzes³⁸. The Byzantine "table of ranks", "Kletorologion of Philotheos"³⁹ (c. 899), is a list of Byzantine official ranks that took shape by the end of the 9th century. Besides it, the most important source for my work is the "Escorial Taktikon" or "Taktikon Oikonomides"⁴⁰, which already reflects the list of official ranks of the empire, functioning by the mid-970s. In addition, Byzantine legal monument of the 11th century, "The Will of Eustathios Boilas"⁴¹, contains a detailed description of the land property of the Byzantine nobleman in the east of the empire, presumably in the theme of Iberia. Another monument of Byzantine law, to which I turn in this research, is the "Typicon of the Petritsoni Monastery" (late of the 11th century) or "Typicon of Gregory

³⁶ Paul Peeters, "Un colophon georgien de Thornik le moine," *Analecta Bollandiana*, no. 50 (1932): 358–371; Jacques Lefort, ed., *Actes d'Iviron I: Des origines au milieu du XIe siècle* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1985); Jacques Lefort, ed., *Actes d'Iviron II: Du milieu du XIe siècle à 1204* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1990).

³⁷ Elene Metreveli, *Atonis kartvelta monastris saagape cigni* (Tbilisi: Skola, 1998).

³⁸ Jean Darrouzes, ed., *Notitiae Episcopatum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1981).

³⁹ John Bagnell Bury, *The Imperial administrative system in the ninth century; with a revised text of the Kletorologion of Philotheos* (London: Published for the British Academy by H. Frowde, 1911).

⁴⁰ Nicolas Oikonomides, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles* (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1972), 255–280.

⁴¹ Paul Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle Byzantin* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1977), 20–29.

Pakourianos"⁴², which allows us to reconstruct the biography of this major Byzantine political and military figure, who came from the Armenian-Georgian family of Tao-Klarjeti and was the last doux of the theme of Iberia.

In addition, a very important category of sources are sphragistic monuments, which make it possible to clarify numerous prosopographical details from the service of Byzantine and Georgian political figures (titulature, place and time of service, portraits on the samples of seals), which is very often more reliable evidence than information from written texts. My research uses seals from the catalogues and collections of Dumbarton Oaks⁴³, museums in Bulgaria⁴⁴ and which were found in archaeological excavations in Taman Peninsula⁴⁵.

Theoretical and practical significance of the work

The theoretical value of this dissertation research is expressed in the fact that for the first time in historical science the policy of Byzantium towards the Georgian kingdom in 10th–11th centuries is analysed using the provisions and conclusions of the concept of "oecumenistic doctrine" of Byzantium and the idea of the Kartvelian lands as a part of the "Byzantine Commonwealth". Thus, the present dissertation is an attempt to move away from the traditional and established historiographical conclusion about the unconditional expansionist aspiration of Byzantium to annex the entire territory of the developing Kingdom of Georgia in the 11th century.

For practical purposes, the materials of the dissertation and its conclusions can be used in the preparation of lecture courses, seminars and

⁴² Viada Arutyunova-Fidanyan, ed., *Tipik Grigoriya Pakuriana* (Erevan: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Armyanskoj SSR, 1978).

⁴³ Eric McGeer, John Nesbitt and Nicolas Oikonomides, eds., *Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art. Vol. 4: The East* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001).

⁴⁴ Ivan Iordanov, *Pechati na vizantijskata administraciya v Bolgariya (871–1118)* (Shumen: Universitetsko izdatelstvo Episkop Konstantin Preslavski, 2019).

⁴⁵ Viktor Chkhaidze, *Vizantijskie pechati iz Tamani* (Moscow: Institut arheologii Rossijskoj akademii nauk, 2015).

teaching aids devoted to the history of the Byzantine Empire and the Kingdom of Georgia.

Provisions for defense

1. The centre of the process of unification of the Kartvelian lands at the end of the 10th century was the Kingdom of Abkhazia, which from the end of the 9th century was under strong Byzantine influence and pursued a policy that met imperial interests, acting as an outpost of Byzantium in the South Caucasus, in exchange for the empire's recognition of its independent position, legitimisation of Abkhazian rulers by giving them Byzantine court titles and cultural support. The alternative to the Kingdom of Abkhazia in the process of unification of Georgia in this period were the princedoms of Tao-Klarjeti Bagratids, and especially the principality of Southern Tao headed by David III Kuropalates (961–1000). This ruler in contrast to the "pro-Byzantine" Abkhazian Kingdom from the very coming to power in 961 conducted an independent active domestic and foreign policy, including interfering in the Byzantine civil wars of the late 10th century. The ultimate goal of this policy of David Kuropalates was probably to create his own anti-Byzantine "imperial project", but the defeat of the rebellion of Bardas Phokas the Younger against the Byzantine emperor Basil II in 989 forced the ruler of Southern Tao to abandon this policy and recognise the supremacy of the empire.
2. On the basis of available sources we can say that Byzantium was interested in "unification" of Georgian lands around Bagrat III (978–1014) at the turn of 10th–11th centuries, as it met its strategic interests due to the desire of the empire to have a strong ally and "buffer" against the hostile South Caucasian Muslim dynasties of Marwanids and Rawadids. Bagrat III himself in his extremely pro-Byzantine policy

followed the political line of all Abkhazian kings since the end of 9th century, whose maternal descendant he was.

3. The Byzantine theme of Iberia, established around 1023 on the lands of the former possessions of David III Kuropalates in South Tao, was extended northwards for a short period of time to include other Kartvelian lands. The first such step, following an exchange of lands with the North Tao's aznaurs, was the creation of the kouratorikion of "Inner Iberia" (*Ἐσω Ἰβηριὰ*), which existed in the period around 1027-1030, and included at least the region of Bana. Then, as the analysis of the data of the Byzantine legal document of the middle of 11th century "The Will of Eustathios Boilas" shows, in the period from 1047 to 1053/1057 the theme of Iberia again included the lands of Northern Tao and a part of the territory of Klarjeti with the town of Artanuji, which was the target of Byzantine claims since the reign of Emperor Romanos I Lekapenos (920–944). However, it is extremely likely that Artanuji itself and the whole of Klarjeti during this ten-year period were ruled by some representatives from among the supporters of the Georgian vassal of the empire, duke (eristavi) of Kldekari Liparit Baghuashi, and the Byzantines themselves provided only military reinforcements on this territory.
4. The famous army of "Varangians" that took part in the Battle of Sasireti in 1046 between the Georgian king Bagrat IV (1027–1072) and the Kldekari eristavi of Liparit Baghuashi arrived from Byzantium with 3000 men together with Liparit's ally Demetre of Anacopia by sea to Anacopia and was stationed in Mingrelian Bashi, the owner of which Ivane Dadiani had already been a prisoner of Liparit for about a year. The sudden death of young Demetre immediately after his return to Georgia destroyed the anti-Bagrat coalition, which also included Kakhetians and Tashir-Dzoraget Armenians, as a result of which only 700 Varangians took part

in the Battle of Sasireti, probably partly even on the side of Bagrat IV, which confused the author of the "Chronicle of Kartli" who described the battle. If to assume origin of these "Varangians" from Constantinople Varangian guard then they certainly were not detachment of the Norwegian prince Harald Hardrada, and, at the same time, probably, were not Rus on ethnic origin.

5. During his independent rule, the Georgian king Bagrat IV made two forced embassies to Constantinople in 1047 and 1050-1052/1053 respectively. The first trip of the king was caused by the aggravation of the intra-Georgian conflict between Bagrat IV and Liparit Baghuashi after the Battle of Sasireti in 1046; according to its results, Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055), in return for the support of both sides of the eastern military campaigns of Byzantium, guaranteed the authority of Bagrat IV over Western and Eastern Georgia, while Liparit received under his control the South Kartvelian lands close to the empire, Meskheti. After the release of Liparit from Seljuk captivity through the mediation of the Byzantine emperor in 1049, Bagrat IV was forced to go on a second "trip"-exile to Constantinople for three years; at its conclusion, Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos restored the status quo under the treaty of 1047. As a condition of his return to Georgia, Bagrat IV was forced to recognise again the empire's territorial acquisitions in Northern Tao and Klarjeti, for which he received the high Byzantine title of *novelissimos*.
6. The organisation of church life on the territory of the theme of Iberia was assigned by Byzantium to the Antiochian Orthodox Church on the basis of an erroneous interpretation of the *Notitia Antiochena* of 570, as well as the fact of the past subordination of the Georgian Church to the Patriarchate of Antioch. Further territorial expansion of the empire to the

east, in the lands of the Armenian Bagratids, led by the 1050s to the creation of a clear ecclesiastical structure of the metropolis of Theodosiopolis with seven suffragans localised on the territory of the former Kingdom of Ani. The Orthodox church dioceses established on the territory of Northern Tao were declared "the property of the Patriarch of Antioch", which was a manifestation of the empire's reaction to the sharp ecclesiastical conflict between Antioch and Mtskheta over the confirmation of the autocephaly of the Georgian Church that broke out in the 50s of the 11th century.

7. "Oecumenistic" political doctrine of Byzantium with regard to the western part of the Kartvelian lands (in particular, the territory of Southern Tao) was finally formed following the Byzantine-Persian war of 572-591, and began to be implemented particularly consistently during the Macedonian Renaissance from the middle of the 10th century. The lands of South Tao with the city of Theodosiopolis, which once belonged to the Empire until the middle of the 7th century, and on which the administrative theme of Iberia was formed in the 11th century, were perceived in the political consciousness of the Byzantines as the property of the Empire that had returned to its true owner. The same applied to the administrative centre of Klarjeti, the fortress of Artanuji, which was handed over to Byzantium around 923, leading to the spread of the "oecumenistic doctrine" regarding its status as well. In its political relations with the Kingdom of Georgia in the period of 10th–11th centuries Byzantium always applied only a legitimist approach, claiming and fighting only for those lands to which the empire had any legal rights within the framework of the "oecumenistic doctrine". This conclusion refutes the generally accepted thesis of Georgian historiography about Byzantium's desire to capture the entire territory of the Georgian

Kingdom in the 11th century, which, allegedly, was prevented only by its defeat in the battle of Manzikert in 1071.

The work was accomplished at the Doctoral School of History, Faculty of Humanities, National Research University Higher School of Economics. Academic supervisor: A. Vinogradov, Doctor of Science, professor.

Degree of reliability and approbation of results

The reliability of the research is ensured by a wide range of sources introduced into circulation, as well as by the methodology of work with them.

Some provisions of this dissertation research were presented at 5 conferences, including 4 international ones:

1) International Conference “Georgia — Byzantium — Christian East” of the Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts (2017, Tbilisi). Report: “Bagrat III — Hidden Ally of Byzantine Empire?”.

2) The 22th All-Russian scientific session of Byzantine studies “Byzantine commonwealth: traditions and paradigm shift” at the Ural Federal University (2019, Yekaterinburg). Report: “Is Byzantium an opponent or a supporter of the unification of Georgia?”.

3) The 33th Readings in memory of corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Vladimir Pashuto “Eastern Europe in Antiquity and the Middle Ages” of the Institute of World History of the Russian Academy of Sciences (2021, Moscow). Report: “The religious situation in the Byzantine theme of Iberia: Pan-Roman practices and regional peculiarities”.

4) Online International Workshop “Armenia and Byzantium Without Borders III” of the Moving Byzantium Project (2021, Vienna). Report: “To the Question of the Armenian Origin of the Area “al-Khalidiyat” and Its Rulers in the Byzantine Civil Wars (Second Half of the 10th Century)”.

5) All-Russian Scientific Conference with International Participation “Modern Russian Medieval Studies” of the Institute of World History of the

Russian Academy of Sciences (2022, Moscow). Report: “Byzantium and Georgia in the 11th century: the problem of the border”.

Papers on the topic of the thesis were also presented at scholar seminars of the Centre for Medieval Studies of the National Research University Higher School of Economics in 2019–2022.

Structure and summary of the study

The dissertation consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion, a list of abbreviations, a list of sources and references. **The introduction** reveals the scientific significance of the topic, defines the purpose and objectives of the study, justifies the chronological framework of the work, provides a general characterisation of the sources and literature on the research topic, outlines the methods, approaches and the main provisions of the work.

The first chapter of the dissertation is devoted to Byzantine-Georgian political relations during the periods of rule of the Georgian rulers David III Kuropalates (961–1000) and Bagrat III (978–1014).

The first paragraph of this chapter is devoted to the study of the formation of the "oecumenistic doctrine" of Byzantium in relation to the Kartvelian lands in the period of the 4th–10th centuries. This model began to take shape at the end of the 6th century after Byzantium conquered the region of Tao, and finally established itself by the first quarter of the 10th century, after the transfer to the empire of part of the territory of the region of Klarjeti, including its administrative centre, the fortress of Artanuji. By the second half of the 10th century, the doctrine of "oecumenism" was limited only to these territories, not extending to Eastern Georgia (Kartli), which had long been considered part of the "Persian world". The Kartvelian rulers of Tao and Klarjeti, representatives of the local Bagratid dynasty, were perceived by the empire as "guardians of the Byzantine inheritance" and the main allies of the Romans in the struggle against the Arabs in this part of the oecumene. Despite

the difficult and often conflicting relations between Byzantium and the Tao-Klarjeti Bagratids, the local Tao prince had the very high Byzantine title of *kouropalates*, which emphasised the paramount importance of Tao-Klarjeti for Byzantium's eastern foreign policy.

The second paragraph deals with the problem of the beginning of the process of unification of the Kartvelian lands in the 970s. Contrary to the conclusion established in historiography about the dominant role of the Tao-Klarjeti principalities in this process, this paragraph proves the catalysing role of the Kingdom of Abkhazia in the history of unification, based on the structure of texts of "Kartlis Tskhovreba", information from Byzantine and Armenian sources, as well as historical facts that accompanied the unification of Kartvelian lands in the last quarter of the 10th century.

The third paragraph explores the "political ideology" of the Kingdom of Abkhazia and the principality of South Tao during the reign of David III Kuropalates. The key conclusions here lie in the fact of existence of a stable Abkhazian-Byzantine political union that functioned from the end of the 9th century and continued to exist throughout the 10th century. This alliance was opposed to the so-called "imperial project" of David III Kuropalates directed against Byzantium, clearly expressed both in the foreign and domestic policy pursued by the prince of Southern Tao and in the architectural monuments created during his reign, first of all, the Cathedral of Oshki.

The fourth paragraph of the first chapter of the thesis is devoted to establishing the dating of the receipt of the title of *kouropalates* by David III from the Byzantines. Contrary to the dates 978 and 990 accepted in the scientific literature, on the basis of manuscripts of the Iviron monastery and information from the "History of the Bagratids" we date this event to 983, as a deferred reward to the lord of Southern Tao for his help to the Byzantine government in suppressing the rebellion of Bardas Skleros in 978–979. The reason for the empire's long refusal to grant the title to David III was his

participation in 961 in the overthrow and death of his father, the kouropalates Adarnase, who was a staunch ally of Byzantium and its legitimate representative in the region.

In *the fifth paragraph*, the study of Byzantine-Georgian political relations 978–1014 is focused around the military conflict between David III Kuropalates and Bagrat III in 988. Here I come to the conclusion about strengthening of Abkhazian-Byzantine alliance during the reign of the first king of "united" Georgia Bagrat III, who came to the aid of the empire during the difficult period of rebellion of Bardas Phokas the Younger in 987–989, attacking his adoptive father David Kuropalates, who supported the rebellion. After this event the "imperial project" of the prince of Southern Tao was finally liquidated, while Bagrat III maintained allied relations with Byzantium until his death in 1014, which was not the case with any of the Georgian kings in the 11th century. Byzantium, for its part, supported the process of unification of the Kartvelian lands around Bagrat III, with the expectation of creating a stable buffer against the Muslim dynasties of Marwanids and Rawadids in the South Caucasus, which were hostile to the empire.

The sixth paragraph of the first chapter of the thesis is devoted to the identification of those mentioned in the "Chronicle" of Yahya of Antioch certain "sons of Bagrat, rulers of al-Khalidiat", who were allies of David III Kuropalates during the rebellion of Bardas Phokas the Younger in 987–989. Based on the information of Stepanos Taronetsi, Yahya of Antioch, and the same manuscripts of the Athonite Iviron Monastery, these "sons of Bagrat" are identified as patrikios Chortvanel and patrikios Bagrat, while their property, the region of "al-Khalidiat", is identified as southern Chaldia, bordering the possessions of David Kuropalat in Southern Tao.

The second chapter of the thesis is devoted to Byzantine-Georgian political relations during the reign of the Georgian king George I (1014–1027), the regency of Bagrat IV's mother, Mariam Artsruni (1027–1031), and the

beginning of the independent reign of king Bagrat IV (1027–1072) in 1031–1046, before his departure to Constantinople in 1047.

The first paragraph of this chapter examines the Byzantine-Georgian military conflict of 1014–1023. Here are investigated its preconditions, established the exact course of events and localisation of two battles during the war of 1021–1023, as well as its results in the form of territorial acquisitions of Byzantium in the Kartvelian lands of the "inheritance of David Kuropalates" and the establishment here the official Byzantine administration, the theme of Iberia around 1023.

The second paragraph investigates the continuation of the Byzantine-Georgian conflict from 1023 to 1030. This paragraph explores: 1) the history of Georgian king George I's participation in the rebellion of Nikephoros Komnenos against Emperor Constantine VIII (1025–1028) after the war in 1026, information about which is absent in Georgian written texts; 2) the problem of two marriages of King George I in connection with his foreign policy in the "Byzantine" and "Caucasian" directions; 3) localisation of the kouratorikion of "Inner Iberia", known from two Byzantine seals of Michael Kataphloron and Michael Grammatikos of the 1020s, in connection with the Georgian geographical terms of "Imier Tao" and "Amier Tao"; 4) The renewal of the military conflict with Byzantium by the regent Mariam Artsruni in 1028–1029, and the dating, circumstances and conditions of the peace treaty between Byzantium and the Kingdom of Georgia during the embassy of the Georgian queen to Constantinople, which I date to 1030.

The third paragraph examines Byzantine-Georgian political relations from 1030 to 1041. Several important events of Georgian and Byzantine history are analysed and transmitted on the basis of comparison of texts of "Chronicle of Kartli" and Byzantine chronicles: transfer of Anacopia fortress to Byzantium (1032/1033), capture by Bagrat IV of a part of Byzantine theme of Iberia, including probably the cathedral of Oshki (1035–1036), as well as Byzantine

military campaign of the domestic of the schools Constantine Paphlagonian against the Kingdom of Georgia (1040).

The fourth paragraph of the second chapter of the thesis is devoted to Byzantine-Georgian political relations from 1042 to 1046, i.e. from the beginning of the reign of Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055) to the Battle of Sasireti in 1046, and focuses mainly on Bagrat IV's confrontation with the Kldekar aristavi Liparit Baghuashi, and the Georgian king's struggle for the Armenian kingdom of Ani and the Black Sea ports of Anacopia and Khupati in 1044–1045. The discovered facts, in particular, the names of Georgian ambassadors captured by Byzantium's ally Liparit Baghuashi in Ani in 1045, allow to clarify later the belonging of the "Varangian army" participating in the Battle of Sasireti.

The fifth paragraph examines in detail the participation of the "Varangian army" in the Battle of Sasiret in 1046 in the context of the unfolding civil war between King Bagrat IV on the one hand, and Liparit Baghuashi and Bagrat IV's half-brother Demetre of Anacopia on the other, where Byzantium was also widely involved. An innovative hypothesis is put forward about the invitation of the "Varangian army" from Byzantium to Georgia by prince Demetre of Anacopia, while in the Battle of Sasireit a part of the "Varangians" fought probably on the side of King Bagrat IV against Liparit Baghuashi because of the sudden death of prince Demetre just before the battle. The "Varangians" themselves by their ethnic origin were definitely not natives of Kievan Rus, the statement about what is most popular in Georgian scientific literature. In addition, they certainly did not come from the detachment of the Norse prince Harald Hardrada and/or Yngvar the Traveller's retinue, but were probably from the Norman population of Southern Italy.

The third chapter of the thesis is devoted to the study of Byzantine-Georgian political relations from 1047 (the date of Bagrat IV's first embassy to

Byzantium) to 1074 (the liquidation of the Byzantine theme of Iberia on the lands of the Kartvelian Southern Tao).

The first paragraph analyses the history of Bagrat IV's embassies to Constantinople, their prerequisites, dating, course and consequences in the context of increasing confrontation between Bagrat IV and Byzantine ally Liparit Baghuashi inside the Kingdom of Georgia. Contrary to the viewpoint generally accepted in historiography about the existence of only a single embassy of Bagrat IV to Byzantium, which is dated 1054–1057, I come to the conclusion about the existence of two such embassies and date them 1047 and 1050–1052/3 respectively. In addition, this paragraph examines the conditions of participation of the two Georgian dignitaries in the eastern policy of Byzantium, the titles they received from the empire during this period, as well as the history of the independent rule of Liparit Baghuashi in Georgia during the three-year absence of Bagrat IV, together with a study of the circumstances of the crowning of Bagrat IV's son, George II, in 1051.

The second paragraph of the third chapter of the thesis is devoted to the consideration of the expansion of the territory of the theme of Iberia in the 40-50s of the 11th century in the context of the data of the "Will of Eustathios Boilas". Analysis of the information in the "Will" and their comparison with information from the "Chronicle of Kartli" allows us to conclude that in the period from 1047 to 1053/1057 the theme significantly expanded to the north, including the lands of Northern Tao and Klarjeti. The territory of the latter area, including its centre, the fortress of Artanuji, was the object of the empire's claims since the first quarter of the 10th century, which allows us to conclude that Byzantium implemented its "oecumenistic doctrine" with regard to the territory of Klarjeti already by the middle of the 11th century.

The third paragraph of this chapter deals with the religious situation in the theme of Iberia in the context of the problem of the subordination of the lands of the Empire to the Antiochian Orthodox Church, which was in conflict

with the Georgian Mtskheta Catholicate in the 1050s. The analysis of the information from the church list *Notitia Antiochena* (570) and the political situation between Byzantium and the Georgian kingdom that had developed by the middle of the 11th century shows that the ecclesiastical structure of the lands of Northern Tao that passed to the empire during this period was assigned to the Patriarchate of Antioch, which managed to create a full-fledged church structure there in a short period of time. The transfer of these lands under the omophorion of the Patriarch of Antioch was a manifestation of the empire's reaction to the heavy ecclesiastical conflict between Antioch and Mtskheta over the confirmation of the autocephaly of the Georgian Church that broke out in the 50s of the 11th century.

The fourth paragraph of the third chapter of the thesis explores Byzantine-Georgian political relations in 1059–1074. The study of these relations focuses mainly around the reorientation of the Georgian Kingdom in the 1060s in its foreign policy away from Byzantium towards closer cooperation with the Seljuk Turks who had strengthened in the region, and around the transfer/return of the lands of the Byzantine theme of Iberia to the Georgian king George II (1072–1089) in 1073/4. On the basis of analysis of the data of "Chronicle of Kartli" and another work from "Kartlis Tskhovreba", "History of the King of Kings David", I come to the conclusion that by the time of transfer of lands of the theme to Georgians its territory was no longer limited only to the region of Southern Tao, which confirms my previous observation about significant expansion of the theme with lands of Northern Tao and Klarjeti by the second half of the 11th century.

The conclusion summarises the results and outlines the prospects for further research. The main conclusion is made that the concept put forward in historiography about the existence of the so-called "oecumenistic" political doctrine in Byzantium is also applicable to the political relations of the empire with the Kingdom of Georgia in the second half of the 10th–11th century. This

position in relations with the Kartvelian lands was formed soon after the Byzantine-Persian war of 572–591 and especially consistently began to be realised during the Macedonian dynasty from the beginning of the 10th century. The object for the "expansionist" claims of the empire remained the territory of Southern Tao, which belonged to Byzantium at the end of the 6th century, and was permanently lost already from the beginning of the 7th century. In addition to this area, in the first quarter of the 10th century was added the territory of Klarjeti, briefly taken over by Emperor Romanos I Lekapenos, which is described in detail in the DAI. The main successes of the Byzantines' realisation of their "oecumenistic doctrine" in relation to the Kartvelian lands were the creation of the theme of Iberia on the lands of Southern Tao around 1023, as well as the inclusion of the territory of Northern Tao and Klarjeti into the theme in the period of 1047–1053/1057. At the same time, as in cases at other ends of the oecumene, as well as within the framework of its "Armenian policy", the Byzantine government gave its "expansion" a strict legitimist framework, legally formalising all "new" Kartvelian lands as acts of transfer of territories from their owners to the emperor, and not going beyond this framework. However, already from the middle of the 11th century with the beginning of the Seljuk expansion into eastern Asia Minor, the Byzantine policy in the "Georgian" direction with the idea of preserving lands that were "the property of the emperor" and their possible increase only with the help of "official", legitimist means began to experience serious difficulties due to constant conflicts with the Georgian rulers (who never abandoned the idea of returning the Kartvelian lands of Southern Tao under their control) and the inability to fully repel Seljuk attacks on Byzantine territory. After the Manzikert catastrophe of 1071 this policy finally collapsed, which was reflected in the rapid return of the Iberian theme lands under the control of the Georgian government by 1073/4. This seemingly temporary process, within the framework of the imperial official doctrine at that time, was perceived by the

Byzantines only as a temporary transfer of the emperor's lands under the protection of an imperial ally, but the difficult situation in the eastern policy of the empire, in the end, could not be changed. As a result, we conclude that the "oecumenistic doctrine" of Byzantium with regard to the Kartvelian lands extended only to the regions of Tao and Klarjeti, not covering the entire Kingdom of Georgia. This conclusion allows to refute the thesis generally accepted in historiography about the aspiration of Byzantium to annex the whole territory of Georgia in the period of the 10th–11th centuries.

List of author's main publications in the journals included in the list of highlevel journals, recommended by HSE, as well as indexed by Web of Science and Scopus:

1. Kosourov, Dmitry A. "Dva posol'stva Bagrata IV v Konstantinopol': datirovka, prichiny i posledstviia." [Two Embassies of Bagrat IV to Constantinople: Dating, Causes and Aftermath] *Izvestia. Ural Federal University Journal. Series 2: Humanities and Arts*, no. 1 (2021): 40–54.

2. Kosourov, Dmitry A. "Zaveshchanie Evstafiya Voily v kontekste vizantijsko-gruzinskih politicheskikh otnoshenij v XI veke." [The Will of Eustathios Boilas in the Context of Byzantine-Georgian Political Relations in the 11th Century] *Science journal of Volgograd State University. History. Area Studies. International Relations* 26, no. 6 (2021): 152–160.

3. Kosourov, Dmitry A. "K voprosu o cerkovnom statuse i religioznoj situacii v vizantijskoj feme Iveriya." [To the Question of the Church Status and Religious Situation in the Byzantine Theme Iberia] *Perm University Herald. History* 57, no. 2 (2022): 14–22.

In other editions:

1. Kosourov, Dmitry A. "K voprosu o datirovke polucheniya titula kuropalata pravitelem Tao-Klardzheti Davidom III." [To the Question of the

Date when David III the Ruler of Tao-Klarjeti Obtained the Title of Kouropalates] *Antichnaya drevnost' i srednie veka*, no. 46 (2018): 90–101.

2. Kosourov, Dmitry A. and Andrey Yu. Vinogradov “Kto ob"edinil Gruziju? David Kuropalat, Abhazskoe carstvo i Vizantijskaya imperiya.” [Who United Georgia? David III Kouropalates, the Kingdom of Abkhazia, and the Byzantine Empire] *Antichnaya drevnost' i srednie veka*, no. 47 (2019): 29–49.

3. Kosourov, Dmitry A. “K voprosu o napravleniyah vneshnej politiki Gruzinskogo carstva vo vtoroj polovine 20-h godov XI veka.” [To the Question About the Directions of Foreign Policy of the Georgian Kingdom in the Second Half of the 20s of the XI Century] *ByzantinoCaucasica*, no. 1 (2021): 121–132.