

PROBLEMS OF ONE SURNAME AND ITS PROPERTY OWNERSHIP

Ucha Okropiridze

PhD in History, Chief Researcher at the Niko Berdzenishvili

Institute of Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

Email: ucha.okropiridze@bsu.edu.ge

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1696-0781>

Aslan Makhadze

Doctor of Economics,

Batumi State Maritime Academy

Email: a.makhadze@bsma.edu.ge

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2893-3724>

Abstract. The paper studies the history of one lineage (the Manelishvilis) and other owners associated with them. The boundaries of the estate of this surname under the Ottomans and subsequently, following the establishment of Russian dominance here. Discussed are the consequences of their migration to Russia along with Vakhtang VI, and the quite successful path traversed by them in their public endeavors and state military careers due to their loyalty in relation to the Russian state. A brief overview is provided of how their activity at the court of the Russian Empire developed over a rather prolonged period, and alongside this, what they achieved on their career and public arenas.

In parallel, their condition in their own homeland was investigated, where their unquestionable ownership, over a quite extensive territory of the land of the present-day Kobuleti Municipality, was confronted with artificial problems.

Following the extension of Russian dominance over the Batumi District, the issue of the uncontested ownership of lands confirmed during the Ottoman rule was rendered disputable, due to the violation of the 1879 Treaty of Istanbul by Russian officials themselves. The noted lineage, together with their other co-owners, had to prove their unquestionable ownership in court proceedings, and this at a time when the Russian administration and authorities acted on the unprincipled principal characteristic of them – "It belongs to you, yet it does not belong to you!" Therefore, these legal disputes concluded with not very great success for the plaintiffs. They restored ownership over only a portion of their lands.

In the arrival of this outcome, presumably, a role was played by the two military defeats suffered near the approaches to Tsikhisdziri in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878, in which the local Muslim Georgians played a decisive role.

The Russian government, taking all this into account, attempted to create such conditions in this region that its privileged upper class would not feel firmly established on their own land and water (homeland) and would not create unexpected, new problems for it.

Keywords: History of the surname, Manelishvilis, Russian Empire, career, life, public endeavor, privileged class, Tsikhisdziri.

Introduction. The history of one surname, the Manelishvilis, and the problems of their ownership within the history of the Ottoman and Russian Empires, contains highly interesting aspects, both from the viewpoint of their lifestyle and careerist success in the Russian Empire, as well as from the perspective of the mutual distrust and malevolent attitude manifested towards one another within the conquered territory of the

Russian Empire. Here we are dealing with two completely different circumstances that compel both the state and individuals to act using their own perceptions and conquering methods.

Methods. While working on the paper, the method of comparative and critical analysis was utilized, through which we attempted to disclose the content of the theme and directed the corresponding narrative.

In our region, during the period of the dominance of the Ottoman and Russian Empires, a number of distinguished surnames possessed their own estates (lands). Within the territory of the present-day Kobuleti Municipality, one such surname was represented by the Manvelishvili lineage, the material obtained about whom presents to us a highly interesting historical situation, both under Ottoman dominance and after the inclusion of this region within the Russian Empire. From the noted material, the spirit and interests of these empires are visible from the standpoint of pursuing their own goals in the given region, and by the character of the measures implemented by them associated with it, to realize their own imperial goals in the region; the goal in both cases was one – the consolidation and strengthening of their dominance in the region, whereas the measures and methods utilized for its realization differed. Different also was the attitude of the leaders of the Russian Empire toward the Georgians who arrived in Russia from Georgia and turned into loyal servants of Russia, and toward the representatives of the privileged class who remained on site, in their own homeland, which, naturally, the representatives of the lineage cited by us in the paper could not escape either. From the obtained material, it appears that "the Manvelishvilis (Manelishvili, Manvelov) are representatives of Georgian princes in Russia, a portion of whom migrated to Russia along with Vakhtang VI. They are by origin from Guria, where they continued to exist until the middle of the XIX century without titles (in Russia). In the Highest-approved list of the princely-noble families of Guria, the widow of Rodam Manvelishvili is mentioned, but her children are not mentioned with her. According to certain data, in Guria itself the Manvelishvilis belonged to the 'Didaznauri' [grand nobles], the highest category of the nobility, and by their position were close to the princes, but their confirmation in the princely dignity occurred only in the Russian branch.

The forefather of their lineage, Nikoloz Vakhushitis-dze Manvelov, is styled as a Prince of Guria in the August 1725 charter of Vakhtang VI... Following their distinction in the war against the Turks, they were received into the Russian service with the title of prince in 1738. On December 31, 1790, his widow, Princess Elene, daughter of Nikoloz, and his children—were ultimately recognized in the dignity of princes of the Russian Empire by the decree of the Senate of July 3, 1863, and by the Highest-approved State Council on August 13, 1863, by decree of the Senate they were entered into Part V of the genealogical book of noble lineages of the Poltava, and subsequently Ekaterinoslav Governorates. By the decisions of the Senate of April 2, 1869, and April 1, 1885, Princes Nikoloz, son of Nikoloz, and Aleksandre, son of Nikoloz Manvelov, were enrolled into this surname.

The lineage of the Princes Manvelov does not possess a Highest-approved coat of arms in Russia, but the depiction of their family coat of arms is known.

The representatives of this princely surname active in Russia achieved the highest career, both in the branches of military and civil service, and also merited numerous highest awards of the state, in contrast to the representatives of their namesakes who remained in Georgia, who here, on site, had to protect their own representative dignity and estates through a great struggle.

In the military service of Russia they achieved the highest rank of the generalität, while along with many elective civil positions they became Actual Privy Councillors of the Russian state, etc. Nikoloz Nikolozis-dze Manvelov – 1816–1889 (Lieutenant General), Aleksandre Nikolozis Manvelov (General of the Cavalry – Actual Privy Councillor, Honorary Curator) – [1824–1906].

Manvelov Nikoloz Nikolozis-dze, Major General from November 23, 1867, and Lieutenant General from September 4, 1884. In 1855, he received the Golden Weapon for 20 years of successful military service, in 1860 the Order of St. Anna 2nd Class, in 1879 the Order of St. Vladimir 3rd Class, etc.

Manvelov Aleksandre Nikolozis-dze, Russian military commander, General of the Cavalry, active Actual Privy Councillor, and Honorary Curator. On January 11, 1866, he received the next military rank of Major General, and on August 30, 1876, he received the rank of Lieutenant General.

Immediately upon the start of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878, A. N. Manvelov, as part of the 12th Army Corps, broke through toward the Danube via Iași and Bucharest and controlled a 60-kilometer section of this river with the troops of his division. He played a significant role during the crossing (forcing) of the Danube River and conducted important military operations on the territory of Bulgaria, and from there, together with the Russian troops, broke into Turkey, which he left only in 1879. For these military successes, A. N. Manvelov was decorated with the Order of St. Vladimir with Swords and the Golden Weapon for Bravery.

In 1881, A. N. Manvelov was decorated with the Order of the White Eagle. On August 30, 1885, he received the rank of General of the Cavalry and was enrolled in the army reserve, and subsequently retired. On August 1, 1887, he was appointed to His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancellery, in the Institutions of Empress Maria, and transitioned to the rank of Actual Privy Councillor. He was the curator of the St. Petersburg Eye Hospital, etc.

A. N. Manvelov owned estates with an area of 1,522 desiatinas in the Tambov Governorate... For successful service, he had received numerous orders, starting from the Orders of St. Stanislav 3rd, 2nd, and 1st Class and St. Anna, ending with the Order of Philip the Magnanimous of Hesse 1st Class (in total, 13 orders of the highest class).

The estate of the Manelishvilis who remained in their homeland is noted on the territory of the XVII-century Principality of Guria from the territories near the confluence of the Kintrishi and Dekhva rivers with the sea, to Nachishkrevi in the coastal area of Tsikhisdziri (present-day Buknari) and to the headwaters of the Dekhva River. As for what fate befell their ownership of these lands after the conquest of the mentioned region by Russia, it is narrated in the report dated September 30, 1882, No. 1538, of the Chief of the Kintrishi Subdivision of the Batumi District of the Caucasian Military District.

It states therein: "By this report, according to the submission for the Military Governor, His Excellency commanded to leave in the use of the Manel-Oglis (Manelishvilis) and Baak-Oglis (Bakuridzes) only those lands from among those to which they lay claim, which were in actual possession and are listed in the 4th paragraph of this report (by Ottoman legislation, which in this case the Russian government utilized, lands unplowed, unsown, and unused for 20 years transferred into the ownership of the State Treasury), while all the remaining land and forests shall be considered as treasury property and they shall be dealt with in accordance with the existing regulation on this matter, that is, be leased out temporarily."

For the purpose of better clarifying the circumstances of the case, let us familiarize ourselves more deeply with the content of the noted report.

Report to the Mr. Chief of the Batumi District. In response to the communication of September 23, No. 2200, I inform you: 1) that the boundaries vaguely noted in the document issued in 1772 in the name of Suleiman Manel-Ogli (meaning the document issued to Suleiman Beg in 1772 and confirmed by Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan), were indicated by his descendant, Ferad Manel-Ogli, in this manner: – from the current Nachishkrevi outpost, the boundary goes along the Shuaghele river (a tributary of the Dekhva river from the left side), passes through the place of Dekhvastavi (almost one verst higher than the Bobokvati mosque), to Mount Ekaldidi, then to the mountains of Khelispti, Kvakvertskha, and Skurda (near the village of Kvirike),

and thereafter, the boundary of the Manelishvilis' estate is first the Biasameti stream, which is also the boundary between the village of Bobokvati and the village of Kvirike. - Next, the Biasameti stream flows into the Kinkisha River. The Kinkisha River represents the boundary of the Manelishvilis' estate to the north (it is a tributary of the Kintrishi River). However, the estates of the Manelishvilis and others do not terminate to the west at the place where the Kinkisha River changes its direction of movement to join the Kintrishi. From this place, the Manelishvilis' estate continues toward the sea (toward the railway) up to the boundary of the Resul-Ogli land, near the railway bridge. Here ends the boundary of the Manelishvilis' estate to the north, and from here to the left begins the boundary of the Manelishvilis' and Bakuridzes' estate to the west, first to the Dekhva River, to the place of Churuk-Su, and after passing the Dekhva, to Nachishkreki. Before reaching the Dekhva, the western boundary of this estate is the railway, and from the Dekhva to Nachishkreki, the seashore. This space from the Kinkisha to the Nachishkreki outpost occupies approximately 8 versts; and from this outpost to the Skurda River – 9 versts, and it may consist of up to 8–10 thousand desiatinas of land; 2) to half of this plot, claim is laid by the Manel-Oglis: Khemur Manel-Ogli, Oman Ulfani, Khusein, and Aslan Manel-Ogli. The second half (25%–25%) of the named plot, on the basis of the designated documents, was transferred by the ancestors of the current Manel-Oglis to the lineage of the Zarali-Ogli (Mikeladze) and Baak-Ogli (Bakuridze), each of whom considers themselves a participant in the ownership of the noted estate. In addition, to the 12-donum (~1 desiatina) arable land at the place of Pirtskhalauri, claim was laid by Akhmed Sambash-Ogli (Lordkipanidze), who received the land as a gift from one of the Manel-Oglis. This lineage (Manel-Ogli), considering themselves the owners of such a large quantity of lands, distributed them also to other neighboring inhabitants, who, clearing the forests in places, prepared arable lands... 4) The official author of the report notes from the information gathered by him: In 1864, the government of Turkey settled about 60 families of Abkhazians displaced from Russia on the heights of Tsikhis-Dziri, who lived there until 1877 (that is, until the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878). They themselves prepared arable cornfields from the forest and for this paid the *ushur* [tithe] to the Turkish government and did not take it on lease from the lineage of the Manel-Oglis, due to which the latter even complained..." Out of these same lands, a portion has been given out as dowry for women married off from the lineage.

On the basis of this report, the Military Governor, His High Excellency, deigned to command that they leave in the use of the Manvel Ogli and Baak Ogli only those lands demanded by them which they actually utilized and are recorded in the 4th paragraph of the same report, while all the lands and along with them the forests shall be considered as treasury property and we shall act toward them in accordance with the issued regulation, that is, be leased out until a certain time (the first copy was presented to the Tbilisi Judicial Palace on October 19, 1900). According to the document, the Manelishvilis received only an insignificant portion of their rightful lands (as it turns out, an area of 202 desiatinas of land). Due to this unjust decision, they appealed and attempted to restore justice by a court decision. But their complaint on this matter was repeatedly rejected by the judicial authorities (Case No. 316, 1906, p. 1, Protocol of the session of the year 1906, September 18th day, Kutais District Court, in a public session, for the Civil Department, composed of Assistant Chairman: M. N. Nikolsky; Members of the court: U. M. Nivinsky, Assistant Justice of the Peace: R. I. Shashnov; Prosecutor: N. A. Tolpilo; Secretary: N. A. Akhvlediani).

...Such a situation "compelled them to appeal with a petition to the Mr. Minister for the return of the noted lands and the restoration of former rights upon them (Act of the year 1903, October 4 day)," which was signed by Ferad Agha Manel-Ogli and Ramiz Manel-Ogli, also the petitioners: Kemale Agha Manel-Ogli, Khusein Manel-Ogli, Qasum Qadi-Ogli, Dursun Zaral-Ogli, Rejeb Baak-Ogli, Osman Manel-Ogli. Forest guards (monitors), Suleiman Chkonja, present alongside was Prince Archil Grigoris-dze Abashidze, the elder of the village of Bobokvati, Assessor of the Land Colleague P. Lipinski.

But for the complete perception of the agrarian land policy implemented by the Russian Empire in the Batumi District and, in general, in Muslim Georgia, we saw it necessary to discuss more concrete material and its sequential analysis, which will well illustrate for us the goals and direction of the measures implemented here. For this, it is necessary to discuss more deeply and substantively the situation associated with these issues, which was created here by the active Russian judicial authorities. Therefore, we will have to present them widely in the paper and make corresponding conclusions based upon them.

Let us begin with the protocol of the session of the Civil Department of the Kutais Regional Court of May 24, 1906, which was directed by corresponding high-level officials. It states therein: "The judge, having opened the session, announced that the court began the hearing of the complaint of Ferat-Agha and Ramiz Agha, sons of Khusein Agha Manel-Ogli, Dursun Khusein Zaral-Ogli, and others against the Treasury, regarding the restoration of the actual ownership of the estate."

At the court session, on the side of the plaintiffs, appeared their attorney, – Sworn Attorney V. G. Machabeli, and explained to the member of the court A. A. Krasovsky regarding the noted case that the plaintiffs, as local residents of the village of Bobokvati of the Kintrishi Subdivision of the Batumi District, have for a long time, since the time of the Turkish dominance, owned and enjoyed the disputed plots. Their ownership and enjoyment was expressed in that they plowed the land for crops, utilized the plantings, the forest, and also used them as pastures. To those wishing, they gave it on rent for sowing and for clearing from the forest. Such ownership and enjoyment continued until March 1897. In this year, the Administration of State Property of the Kutais Governorate, in the person of its Batumian forester Markovich, the latter through his supervisors, took possession of the disputed plots, drove their tenants out from the plot, and forbade them from any enjoyment of this plot. Such illegal appropriation of the disputed plot alarmed Attorney Machabeli and compelled him to initiate the case, to perform the interrogation of witnesses on site regarding the disputed plots... The court approved the 1905 petition, and only an inspection and interrogation of witnesses took place. On the basis of the act of inspection, the court was convinced that the witness presented the disputed plot within the boundaries indicated in the complaint... All witnesses under oath... 21 men, uniformly testified that the disputed plot belonged to the Manvel-Oglis (Manvelishvilis), and their descendants owned and enjoyed it. They were the full owners of the crops, the shrubbery, and the forest, themselves enjoyed it, and leased out the lands. They themselves also widely utilized it for their own needs, alongside which they even sold it. The Treasury appropriated this plot through its supervisors, who drove out the plaintiffs and their tenants from the plot and forbade its enjoyment.

In this manner, the witnesses proved one undisputed fact: the ownership and enjoyment of the disputed plot by the plaintiffs, and on the other hand – the violation of this ownership and enjoyment on the part of the Treasury. The session took into consideration these circumstances (situations), which were necessary to clarify the case during the actual violation of ownership; therefore, Prince Machabeli demanded that they respect the demands of the plaintiffs and grant the right to demand from the Treasury compensation for damages due to its illegal ownership, and to charge the Treasury with the expenses incurred for the court proceedings, and to bring the decision into preliminary execution.

The Assistant Prosecutor considers it necessary to satisfy the complaint due to the noted circumstances. Regarding this session, the court resolved: "The publication of the resolution on this case shall be postponed until May 31." The person who presided over it will announce it publicly – it is noted in the protocol of the session.

As appears from the materials, the issue of the ownership of the seized estate was decided in the court in favor of their owners according to the testimonies of the 21 witnesses and others, but the State Treasury of Russia used all measures to annul it and to restore the ownership of the State Treasury upon it, which is

evidenced by the response of the Treasury of September 18 of the same year regarding the restoration of the violation of the ownership of the noted estate, which occurred precisely by the court resolution of May 24–31, 1906. It is noted therein that "the District Court demands that the above-noted court decision be considered inoperative (annulled) and we return the case to be considered from the beginning."

For the rejection of the presented complaint of the Treasury, I request you to consider the following circumstances listed below:

The plaintiffs attempt through the path of a complaint to restore the violated ownership and to extract from the ownership of the Treasury land plots with an area of tens of desiatinas. First and foremost, I request you to consider the opinion on the question: do they have the right to this complaint? I assert that the plaintiffs do not possess such a right. Even if we allow, even in the form of a supposition, that the fact of the plaintiffs' ownership is proven on the disputed plot, this ownership, as having arisen without the consent of its owner, the Treasury, cannot be considered as an existing legal complaint. That the ownership of the plaintiffs, if we temporarily allow its existence, was dependent upon the Treasury, which is proven by the following facts:

1. The plaintiffs do not deny, nor can they deny, the right of property of the Treasury on this disputed plot.

2. Undisputed is also the fact that the defendants belong to the dependent class population of the village of Bobokvati and carry out the enjoyment of the treasury land if, like other representatives of the same class of the society, in accordance with the demands of the village society, they perform the established obligation in favor of the Treasury, by which situation signs of independence on the ownership of the plaintiffs are excluded... (first it created the conditions itself, and then it argues according to them).

3. The disputed plot represents a forest. According to the Turkish legislation now active in the Batumi District, the forest space represents the unquestionable property of the Treasury.

4. Even if we allow, again in the form of a supposition, that the plaintiffs owned the disputed plot, their ownership could have arisen only by the right of "Arazi-Mirie" (limited ownership). Such a right excludes signs of independence of the plaintiffs from the Treasury of the existence of their independent ownership... even in the case of ownership, in such a situation, the restoration of ownership by means of a complaint is excluded. ...I request the Regional Court that the complaint about the actual ownership be rejected for the plaintiffs and they be sentenced to the expenses of the case proceedings in favor of the Treasury (Response to the Judgment in Absentia).

Such a continuation of the case, of course, did not satisfy the plaintiffs, and on May 2, 1907, the next session of the Kutais Regional Court was held again for the consideration of the noted complaint, which is a true example of the tendency of judicial proceedings widespread in the Russian Empire in the Caucasus and, namely, in the attitude toward the Batumi District. In its protocol, the following picture unfolds:

"The Chairman opened the session and announced that the court proceeded to the hearing of the case of the complaint of Ferat Agha and Ramiz Agha, sons of Khusein-Agha-Ogli Manel-Ogli, Dursun Khuseinov Zarat-Ogli, and others against the Treasury regarding the restoration of the violation of the actual estate ownership. At the court session appeared: the attorney of the plaintiff Manel-Oglis and others. Sworn Attorney Machabeli and the representative of the state administration from the Administration of Property of the Kutais Governorate, who presented the document of his authorization. During the reporting of the circumstances of the case to the member of the court Shaginov, Attorney Machabeli explained: First of all, before we begin evaluating the testimony of the witnesses of the Treasury, he considers it necessary to arrest the attention of the court on the questions and provisions that stem from the circumstances of this case. This will facilitate the court in its task in the decision of this case, in the understanding of satisfying the lawsuit

demands. The main and essential issue in this case consists in that by the fundamental principle of international law and paragraph 7 p. of the 1879 Treaty of Constantinople, the property (dispute) rights of the population united with Russia in the Batumi and Kars districts remain inviolable and unshakable. This view is carried out in the order issued for the Caucasus, to the army and to the Caucasus region, in the regulation of February 3, 1879, a copy of which was presented at the previous session by the Chief of the Administration of State Property and Lands himself. In paragraph 38 of the order, it is stated: until the clarification of the rights of land property in the Batumi and Kars districts, the land use of the local inhabitants shall remain in its present form. From here it is clear, no one has the right to violate those rights of property of the inhabitants of the Batumi and Kars districts, which they enjoyed during the time of the Turkish administration, until the land issue is decided in general in these districts. One of the widespread forms of landownership and enjoyment in the Batumi District was the right of "Arazi-Mirie," upon which right, as the representative of the Treasury stated in his "Response" (statement), the Manel Oglis also can possess. Now, the question is, in what consists the right of "Arazi-Mirie"? Was it, as the attorney of the Treasury explains, dependent on the Treasury, or did it represent an independent right that belongs only to the owner of the land? "Arazi-Mirie" was the right of permanent ownership and hereditary enjoyment, of land use. Although "Arazi-Mirie" in translation means state land, treasury land, but this name is explained by the Turkish theological view on property in general. By the doctrine of the Quran, everything belongs to God, and on earth, to his deputy the prophet – the Imam, the Sultan. Exactly in this manner the lands belong to the Sultan. But this is only a fiction, built on a religious foundation. By its content, "Arazi-Mirie" responds to our right of property. It possessed all the attributes of the right of property: the right of possession, the right of enjoyment, the right of disposal. It transitioned from generation to generation by inheritance, and no one could violate this right, except for the expropriation of state and public necessity. This right could also be [established] by the duration of possession, as is provided for in numerous documents in which it is noted that the land was acquired by long-time ownership. Behold, that is why "Arazi-Mirie" cannot be equated with our treasury lands, which find themselves in full dependence upon the Treasury. It can, in case of violation, be restored by a (social) class complaint, as this was justly recognized also by the Regional Court, allowing the interrogation of witnesses. As appears from the circumstances, the case of the ownership of the Manel-Oglis is of permanent hereditary ownership and enjoyment of the disputed plot until 1897. In 1897, the Administration of Property Management of the Kutais Governorate, in the person of its own forester Markovich and his supervisors, violated this ownership, drove the Manel-Oglis out from the plot, and did not allow the enjoyment of the noted estate by them. Such violation caused the initiation of this case. The local inspection, as well as the interrogation of the witnesses of the plaintiffs and the Treasury, established this violation. The Treasury for its part did not deny the ownership of the Manvel-Oglis over the disputed plot, according to the act of October 4, 1903, which was drawn up by the surveyor of the Land Administration Lipinski and pointed during the interrogation to his witnesses, 3 foresters (guards) of the Treasury. The act of October 1903 proves nothing. Talked about there is that upon the disputed plot, the claim of the Manel-Oglis is declared and along with them other assumed owners are listed as well. It turned out that all of them acquired their plots from the Manvel-Oglis. This circumstance clearly points that all the disputed plots belong to the Manel-Oglis by the right of "Arazi-Mirie." In the opposite case, how would he sell to Ali Beg Chijavadze, Giorgi Davidov, Colonel Solovtsov, Lyubovsky – portions of this plot. Nor did the witnesses of the Treasury say anything new. All of them proved the fact that from the year 1897 the disputed plots were protected by foresters, which the Manel-Oglis do not deny, that to their supervisors before protection they had heard that it belonged to the Manel-Oglis; that the Manel-Oglis attempted to enjoy the disputed plot and that they (the guards) opposed them in this – it is noted in the court protocol." And then it is stated right there:

"Consequently, the witnesses proved everything that the Manel-Oglis asserted. Because of all this, Prince Machabeli demanded that they respect the lawsuit demands, impose the expenses of the court case proceedings upon the Treasury, along with this he added that the report of 1882 cannot have any significance for the noted case, because, first – the Military Governor had no right whatsoever to dispose of the property of a private person, for this the Land Settlement Commission was appointed, which clarified and defined the right of the local population upon the land occupied by them, and, secondly, – these plots have no connection-relationship whatsoever with the disputed plot, here the issue takes place regarding the restoration of the violated ownership."

Here everything is as clear as day and the right of ownership of the Manel-Oglis should not cause any doubt. Along with this, at the court "the authorized Liuri explained that he attaches particular significance to the report,... from which it appears that conceded upon the plaintiffs was, and in 1882 recognized upon them was the right of possession of less than 75 desiatinas, this right was appropriately recognized by the Military Governor, so that the definition of the right on land was transferred to the administration, and if the plaintiffs remained dissatisfied with this decision, they should have appealed to the court. Then he himself explained that the disputed area was not included at all within the limits of the indicated 75 desiatinas and to establish this he demanded to perform a local inspection, and if the inspection encounters difficulties due to the vagueness of the boundaries, which is indicated in the report of 1882, then this must be proven by several local old residents: on the basis of this I request that the plaintiffs be refused the lawsuit.

The Assistant Prosecutor thought that the complaint must be satisfied.

After the consultation (negotiation) of the judges, the Mr. Chairman announced that the resolution around the case will be issued on May 16, at 12 o'clock of the day. Ultimately, regarding the decision of this court, it is noted that on May 2–16, 1907, having considered the circumstances of the case, having heard the explanations of the parties and the conclusion of the assistant prosecutor, the court protected the fact of possession itself, restored the ownership of the estate located in the village of Bobokvati of the Kintrishi section of the Batumi District by the plaintiffs and transferred it to the plaintiffs... the size of the estate (arable lands) is approximately 200 desiatinas, within the boundaries: – to the west – the road, by the name of Devrish-Pasha, to the north – the land of the heirs of Ali Beg Chijavadze, to the south – the lands of Lyubovsky and Solovtsov, the Jiati road and the Jiati stream, and to the east Shuaghele and Dekhva.

Right there it is indicated that in the report of 1882 of the Chief of the Kintrishi Subdivision it is noted that Khusein Zaral-Ogli (Mikeladze), who for that time found himself on the plot of Akhmed Zaral-Ogli, owned plots of arable land, which his grandfather received in the dowry of his wife – the Manel-Ogli woman... In the report of September 30, 1882 of the Chief of the Kintrishi Subdivision of the Batumi District of the Caucasian Military District as well (No. 1538) it is noted that "Rejeb Baak-Ogli and Gul Akhmed Baak-Ogli also own arable lands, which the grandfather received in the dowry of his wife." In the same document, yet another fact is narrated, of yet another disrespect by the local officials of the Russian Empire toward the Manel-Oglis and local ownership and an expression of arbitrariness toward them.

Here is the complete, direct translation of the exact text you provided, separated cleanly into the main narrative text and the literature/sources section as requested.

Utilizing the Ottoman legislation on the issue of local landownership, the Russian official notes: "...all the remaining space of land, to which claim is laid by the Manel-Oglis, Baak-Ogli, Zaral-Ogli is covered with forest and shrubbery, while the arable land plots listed in the 4th paragraph, except for a few of them, have not been worked since the start of the last war.

Informing your High Nobility of all the above-mentioned, I have the honor to state that the land, for the allocation of which agronomist Kochetov intercedes, is partly covered with forest, partly with shrubbery,

while the space free from them has not been worked since the start of the 1877 war, therefore I most humbly request you to inform me in writing whether or not to allocate the noted land to Mr. Kochetov, since he wishes precisely to take it on lease"... [K. V. O. Batumi Oblast, Chief of the Kintrishi Subdivision, "30" September 1882, No. 1538; October 25, 1906, copy from a copy; Report to the Mr. Chief of the Batumi District]. The entire trouble and court proceedings were caused by the following illegal and arbitrary resolution made on the noted document: "By this report, according to the submission for the Military Governor, His Excellency commanded: to leave in the use of the Manel-Oglis and Baak-Oglis only those lands from among those to which they lay claim, which were in their actual possession and are listed in the 4th paragraph of this report. While all the remaining land and forests shall be considered as treasury property and they shall be dealt with in accordance with the existing regulation on this matter, that is, be leased out until a certain time..." by which all paragraphs of the 1879 agreement concerning landownership and its utilization were violated and disregarded.

It is interesting what could have caused such a different policy and approach of the leaders of the Russian Empire toward the Manvelovs who migrated and were active in Russia, and the Manel-Oglis who remained in their own homeland.

We think that the loyalty of the Manvelovs who migrated to Russia and were active there, and their consciousness of faithful service to the Russian state, was the primary guarantee of success and career advancement for them, which the ruling circle of the Russian state saw well and even appreciated. In Georgia, however, certain distrust and suspicions must have been sown toward them. In the Russo-Turkish Wars of 1877–1878, precisely two rather significant military failures were suffered within the estate of the Manvel-Oglis, which were almost the only ones during this military campaign. Along with this, other prominent figures of this region did not show any particular sympathy or desire for submission toward the Russian military aggression either; on the contrary, it was precisely the military resolve of the Kobuleti inhabitants and their steadfastness that became the reason for Russia's undeniable defeat in this region. Therefore, after the establishment of Russian rule in this corner, it was probably deemed necessary to implement such measures here and create such an environment in which the local prominent figures would not feel firm and secure. For this reason, a war was declared against all their rights, and among them, the rights to landownership in the noted region.

References:

- V. Tsikhinsky, *Caucasian Armorial: Tavadi Lineages* (manuscript), Petrograd, 1922, p. 27.
- S. Dumin, P. Grebelsky, *Noble Lineages of the Russian Empire*, Likominvest publishing, vol. IV, Moscow, 1998, p. 171.
- [1824-6. 04-1906. 2. 04] 1. *Manvelovs*, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron*: in 86 vols. (82 vols. and 4 suppl.). – SPB., 1890–1907.
- [https://ru.wikipedia.org/W/index.php?title=Manvelov, Aleksandr Nikolaevich&oldid=123989427](https://ru.wikipedia.org/W/index.php?title=Manvelov,_Aleksandr_Nikolaevich&oldid=123989427).
- Commission of History, Archaeology, and Ethnology of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences, second, supplemented and revised edition, "Artanuji" Publishing House, Tbilisi, 2016, 2016:46.
- Manvelovs* – *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron*: in 86 vols. (82 vols. and 4 suppl.), SPB, 1790–1907.
- List of Generals-Adjutant of the Suite of His Majesty, Majors-General, Fliegel-Adjutants, and Generalität attached to the Person of His Majesty. Corrected to June 1* – SPB; Military Typography, 1875. - p. 194.
- Ismailov E.E., *Golden Weapon with the inscription "For Bravery". Lists of Cavaliers 1788–1913*, - M., 2007, p. 318.

TsGIA SPb. F. 19, op. 123, d. 18; Source:
[https://ru.Wikipedia.org/W/index.php?title=Manvelov, Aleksandr Nikolaevich&oldid=123989427](https://ru.Wikipedia.org/W/index.php?title=Manvelov,_Aleksandr_Nikolaevich&oldid=123989427)
 (Manelov Aleksandr Nikolaevich Wikipedia).

Report dated September 30, 1882, No. 1538, of the Chief of the Kintrishi Subdivision of the Batumi District of the Caucasian Military District.

Report to the Mr. Chief of the Batumi District on the communication of September 23, No. 2200.

K. V. O. Batumi Oblast, Chief of the Kintrishi Subdivision, November 30, 1882, No. 1538.

Case No. 316, 1906, p. 1, Protocol of the session of the year 1906, September 18th day, Kutais District Court, in a public session, for the Civil Department, Case No. M316 of 1906; year 1906 September 18th day, by decree of his Imperial Majesty, Kutais District Court, for the Civil Department, composed of: Assistant Chairman: M. N. Nikolsky; Members of the court: U. M. Nivinsky, Assistant Justice of the Peace: R. I. Shashnov.

Prosecutor: N. A. Tolpilo.

Secretary: N. A. Akhvlediani.

Protocol of the session of the Civil Department of the Kutais Regional Court of May 24, 1906.

Year 1906 Kutais district court... response to the Judgment in Absentia.

Protocol of the judicial session of the Kutais District Court for the civil department. Year 1907, May 2nd day.

Ministry of Justice of Georgia, Legal Entity of Public Law, National Archives of Georgia, Central Archive of Kutaisi, AA201301507203, archival notice, 08, 05. 2013, 17:57:09.

K. V. O. Batumi Oblast, Chief of the Kintrishi Subdivision, "30" September 1882, No. 1538; October 25, 1906, copy from a copy; Report to the Mr. Chief of the Batumi District.