



Unknown Sensational Episodes of Georgian Diplomacy of 90's of the 18th Century

Natsvaladze Mamuka

Sokhumi State University, Head of the Caucasus Civilization Research Department at the Institute of World Civilization, Tbilisi, Georgia

Abstract: The article refers to a fact hitherto unknown in historiography. In particular, the Ambassade sent to the Emperor of Austria by King Erekle II of Kartli-Kakheti in 1792, which had a certain goal - to resume diplomatic work on the model of European globalization prescribed by the Greek Project. The main outcome of the project was the neutralization of the Ottoman Empire and the redistribution the territory of the latter.

In 1783, the Treaty of Georgievsk was concluded between the Russian Empire and the Kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti. The Imperial Court of St. Petersburg undertook the obligation to protect the Georgian Kingdom from external threats. The Russian Empire did not fulfill this obligation and violated the Treaty twice in 1785 and 1787.

Nevertheless, we have a rather unusual reality according to Soviet and post-Soviet historiography, stating that Erekle II, who is carrying out the most important reforms to strengthen his country, remains a prisoner of the Treaty of Georgievsk after the betrayal of Russia and no longer reviews relations with European countries.

It is noteworthy that in Soviet and post-Soviet historiography the date of Erekle's last attempt to establish alliance with Europe is 1782. Therefore, the Ambassade of 1792, as well as another European Ambassade sent in 1795 revealed throughout our research, clearly indicate that Erekle II was not a hostage of the Treaty of Georgievsk and he considered a prominent Austrian Empire as an ally.

The article presents that the publication of Jacob Reinex's (agent of the Imperial Court of ST. Petersburg) book in 1793 is associated with the European Ambassade of 1792. Rienex incriminates Erekle II and states that he used to fight against the Austrian Empire on behalf of Prussian Army during his stay in Europe. This is the main message of this book. The Imperial Court of Russia uses the latter to make Erekle's European Ambassade unsuccessful.

Keywords: Greek Project; Ottoman Empire; Kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti; Erekle II; Catherine II; Joseph II, Friedrich II, Russian Empire; The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation.

Introduction

The history of Georgia of the XVIII century is still of particular interest to the society. The policy of Erekle II, political activities accompanying his reign, are still subject of various interpretations. The reason for this ambiguity is that the historiography of the Soviet period, guided by Stalinist directives, imposed a taboo on the objective study of the foreign policy of both Russia and the Soviet era. Consequently, numerous facts were distorted deliberately, historiography attempted to disguise the aggressive nature of foreign policy with the Soviet ideology and present it as the protection and liberation of Christian and Unchristian people.

A Particular censorship was directed towards the study of Russian history of the second half of the XVIII century and later period. Accordingly, important topics for the history of Georgia such as the

basic concept of Russian foreign policy of Catherine II and later period - the Greek Project, the foreign policy of Erekle II, the Treaty of Georgievsk, the conquest of Georgia by Russia and others ... were included in the list of prohibited issues.

This article is part of a monographic study of the Russian-Austrian plan for the rededication of Europe, known in history as the "Greek project". We carry out fundamental research in regard of the Greek Project, due to the special national-political importance of the issue. We have published the results of monographic research in the scientific conferences and publications in the different cities of the world. In particular, in Oxford [67], Cambridge [71; 75; 78], Paris [72], Melbourne [74], Moscow [70], Tokyo [73], Rome [66], Vienna [65], Warsaw [58; 59], Boston [57], San Francisco [61], Sheffield [60], Las Palmas [64], Tbilisi [62; 63; 76], Telavi [63; 68] Kutaisi [69; 77].

Goals and Objectives of the Study

The traces of Erekle II's European policy were completely eliminated as a result of the pressure of Soviet ideology and relations with Russia was presented as an alternative necessity for Georgia's physical survival. The present study is an attempt to overcome the established Soviet stigma.

The purpose of the present study is to establish following issues based on the analysis of the primary sources preserved in various European archives and international political processes of that time:

1. Whether Erekle II still remained a hostage of the Treaty of Georgievsk after Russia violated the terms of the Treaty in 1785 and 1787 as it is represented by Russian, Soviet and post-Soviet Georgian and Russian historiography.
2. Whether presenting Erekle II as a hostage of the Treaty of Georgievsk was a result of an artificial constructivism aimed at concealing the relation of Erekle with Europe.

Novelty of the study

The Ambassade sent to the Emperor of Austria by Erekle II in 1792 has been unknown in historiography hitherto. Accordingly, the issue of Georgia's relations with Europe after the Treaty of 1783 has not been studied before.

The results of our research were published in Warsaw and Tbilisi in 2020, which confirms that Erekle II sent an Ambassade to the Austrian Emperor in 1795. Consequently, the above presented study refutes the position established since the Soviet period, as if Erekle had the last attempt to have relation with Europe in 1782 and considered Russia as an only ally within the foreign policy.

The article presents another sensational fact - in 1792, the King of Kartli-Kakheti sent one more Ambassade to the Emperor of Austria. The latter is an evidence and a strong argument that Erekle II did not remain in captivity of the Treaty of Georgievsk and attempted to prevent the Russian aggression and expansion as well as to use the Political concept of the Imperial Court of St. Petersburg for strengthening the independence of the Caucasus.

It is also a novelty that Reinex's work, published in 1793, has not been associated with political processes of that period.

Research methods

We rely on the methodological principles of objectivity, historicism, determinism, alternativeness, reconstruction, developed in the theoretical studies by the following scientists: Charles-Victor Langlois, Charles Seignobos [47]; Robin George Collingwood [10]; Marc Léopold Benjamin Bloch [6]; Peter Lambert and Phillipp Schofield [48]; Abrams Lynn [1]; Brundage Anthony [5]; Gregory Ian, Ell Paul [21]; Hughes-Warrington [23]; Iggers George, Wang Qiang Edward [25]; Akira Iriye [26]; Kaldellis Anthony [38]; Koselleck Reinhart [39; 40]; Lukacs John [46]; Munro Doug, Reid John [56]; Quigley Carroll [88]; Raaflaub Kurt [92].

Sources

The referred correspondence of the King of Kartli-Kakheti and related records of Vienna Imperial Court Chancellery are preserved in the materials of Austrian State Archives (Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Haus-Hof-und Staatsarchiv, 1010 Wien, I, Minoritenplatz I) in different volumes, sorted by country (Russia, Sardinia, Venice, France, Persia), as well as in the archives of Vatican and Venice. Approximately forty letters on the topic of Georgia have been traced, but most of them are available in the form of Italian translation. The referred documents have been found and published by Ilia Tabaghua. The correspondence sent by Erekle was published by the scientist in Georgian and Italian languages [99, pp 77-185]

The most important part of this source is preserved in the State Archive of Austria Two letters were published by Mikheil Tamarashvili [98, p 402-404; 104], afterwards invaluable epistolary material was found in the archives of the Vatican, Vienna, Venice by Ilia Tabaghua, who attached these documents to a monograph published in 1979 [99].

Nino Doborjginidze published quite actual articles based on the Georgian materials recorded in the historical archive of Propaganda Fide in Vatican, general archive of Capuchins in Rome and archive of Theatines [11, p 235-244; 13, p 197-211].

British sources on Georgia are also important. They were published in two parts by Giorgi Kalandia [36; 37]. Giorgi Kalandia also published materials existing in British and Irish press on King Erekle [35].

The most important references for our research topic include the correspondence between Austrian Emperor Joseph II and Count Ludwig Kobenzl [30; 31], as well as the book on Erekle II, published in Flensburg and Leipzig in 1793, by Hermann Heinrichs, also known as Jakob Reinex [24].

Research Results

The study and analysis of Erekle's letters preserved in the European archives allows us to confirm sending the Ambassade to the Emperor of Austria in 1792 and after the devastation of Tbilisi in 1795 [62; 59]. Based on the available documentary material, only fragmentary, though conceptual features of the unknown Ambassade can be outlined at this stage. However, finding and obtaining complete information is a matter of future.

The issue of Erekle's relations to Austria was considered by Mikheil Tamarashvili [98], Ilia Tabaghua [99], Sargis Kakabadze [33], Iase Tsintsadze [100, pp 111-120]. The referred topic was also reviewed by Dimitri Shvelidze [93, pp 33-38], Giorgi Kalandia [36; 37; 38], Mikheil Samsonadze [95, p 230], Vakhtang Peradze [86, pp 89-90]. Nino Doborjginidze [11; 13] worked in different archives of Rome.

It is noteworthy that until the present moment none of the researchers has referred to the problem raised by us. Accordingly, the Ambassade sent to Austria by Erekle in 1795 is an unknown fact in historiography and the most important novelty.

Correspondence sent by Erekle have different addressees – Emperor of Austria, Kings of Prussia, France and Venice. The letters were brought to Vienna after the death of Patri Mauro Veronelli (sent to Austria) in the city of Berdychiv, Poland.

The Austrian Imperial Court pays special attention to the translation of these letters. It is obvious that Vienna has a thorough understanding of the role of Georgia as a strategic partner in the fight against the Ottoman Empire established as a system model in a form of "Greek Project" by the joint agreement of the Austrian and Russian Emperors in the 80-ies [91, pp 95-105]. Furthermore, it is also evident that the Imperial Court of Vienna seeks relations with Georgia for the full implementation of the Greek Project. Therefore, it considers the process of translating the letters sent by Erekle with great diligence and seriousness lasting more than a year.

It is quite an important detail that Wencel Kaunitz, a world-class diplomat whose name is associated with the diplomatic revolution of the Seven-Year-War, took care of translating the letters and

presenting them to the Emperor. The rapprochement of Austria and France, being enemies for centuries, is a result of the diplomatic work of Kaunitz [27, pp; 32-44; 53, pp 157-161].

It is noteworthy, that correspondence (approximately 40 letters) referring to Georgia and preserved in the archives of Vienna, Vatican and Venice [99, pp 105-107], actually contain the same topics. In particular:

- Beyond the problems posed in Erekle's letters there is a mysterious and urgent message of Erekle that Mauro Veronelli must report to Joseph II, the Emperor of Austria during his audience. No information is contained in the letters about the details that should be personally notified to the Emperor of Austria by Mauro Veronelli.
- Friendly relations with Austria is a traditional desire of the Kings of Georgia, ancestors of Erekle;
- Erekle requests financial support from Austria for hiring and training 2 regiments in the European manner;
- Kings of Georgia traditionally have favorable relations with Russia which always helps them. Consequently, Austrian-Georgian relations at the request of Erekle cannot bring dissonance in Russian-Georgian and Russian-Austrian relations.

It is important, that the letter of our interest published by Ilia Tabaghua with a number 22 (hereinafter referred as the Letter No.22), repeats only the first two paragraphs of topics of correspondence sent to Europe by Erekle II. It contains no information regarding the relationship with Russia or funding two regiments.

Furthermore, it contains certain facts and motives not mentioned in other letters. That is why the Letter No.22 rises many questions.

This letter actually differs from other correspondence of Erekle to the extent of its multifaceted content and emotional mood, composed in academic style and in full compliance with diplomatic etiquette, however prevailing of emotions is observed in the Letter No.22.

The most important detail is that unlike previous letters, this letter does not have a personified addressee, it has only a general reference - the Emperor of Austria. It is not specified which Emperor of Austria this message belongs to. It is also noteworthy that the letter of our interest has no date either. The Italian translation of Erekle's letter is preserved in the Archive of Vienna. However, Georgian original has not been found yet.

A variety of content layers is observed in this letter actually failing to coincide the date of writing the latter. The referred circumstance indicates that this Letter No.22 is not a single letter but a compilation of letters sent by Erekle in different times, prepared by the imperial chancellery specifically for the Emperor of Austria to thoroughly understand the problems related to Georgia.

At first glance, defining the date of writing the letter seems simple taking into consideration the well-known fact stated in the letter itself.

Erekle writes: „I sent Patri Domenico, living in Tbilisi, to Your Imperial Royal Majesty last year. He was accompanied by many servants and translators” [99, pp 106-107].

It is a confirmed fact that Erekle sent Patri Domenico to the Imperial Court of Vienna in 1781. Consequently, this letter should have been written in 1782 and taken to Vienna by Patri Mauro Veronelli. However, a number of content layers suggest that this is not a single letter, but a compilation of several letters composed at different times, since the facts indicated in it reflect the events happening after 1782.

The letter gives expression that its creation was preconditioned by an important event and the referred event took place after Erekle's first letter had already been written.

Here, the first doubt arises – Why Erekle II needed to send two letters to the same addressee at the same time and within one Ambassade that would notify the Emperor of Austria the same event in

different ways. If there was a need of any clarification, why it was not done within the mode of a single correspondence. Moreover, it could be easily done as in 1782 publications were sent from Tbilisi to Europe in Georgian and not their Italian translations.

Following issues rise the doubts in particular:

a) It is quite simple to date the correspondence sent to the Emperor of Austria; However, it is unclear how the letter contains a fact relating to an event taking place 13 years after it was written.

The following fragment (quotation) of the existing text - "These days East Royal Residence was completely destroyed" - clearly indicates that it refers to the tragedy of 1795. It is obvious that Erekle could not have written anything about it when composing this letter in 1782.

b) The fact that the letter starts with reprimand and reproach towards the Emperor of Austria also raises a question. It is undisputed that no relationship, neither human nor diplomatic, starts with a reprimand or reproach.

c) Erekle referring the Emperor of Austria as "Sultan". We can firmly state that Erekle would not have called the Emperor of Austria a "Sultan".

Besides these peculiar points, the letter contains two extremely important fragments not mentioned in the rest of the letters sent to Europe by Erekle.

1. Preparation of alliance agreement "reinforced by oath" with the Austrian Empire. This is a totally new segment in the Georgian History of 80-90-ies of XVIII century. It should be clarified when Erekle might have offered the Emperor of Austria a relationship "reinforced by oath" – in 1782 or in 1795.

2. The letter contains extremely important information about the first Ambassade sent by Erekle in 1781. It should be specifically noted that only this letter of Erekle contains information that Domenico, who was sent to Europe in 1781 did not go there alone and he was accompanied by a numerous retinue (quotation): "I sent Patri Domenico, living in Tbilisi, to Your Imperial Royal Majesty last year. He was accompanied by many servants and translators ... " [99, pp. 106-107].

Hereinafter, we will review each inappropriate issues separately.

The following fragment (quotation) - "These days East Royal Residence was completely devastated and all great and powerful wild enemies came against us. We lack necessary military weapon. Hand-to-hand fighting will be less helpful for us" - clearly indicates that the correspondence of Erekle II sent to the Emperor of Austria and published by Ilia Tabaghua as the Letter No.22 is not a single letter [99, p 107].

We would like to underline and explain that "complete destruction of East Royal Residence" is the event of a great significance and it would have been reflected in all letters of King Erekle due to its multifaceted importance. This kind of repetition is characteristic of the correspondence of Erekle - the same problem of similar content is repeated in different letters in various modes.

Otherwise, it is surprising that among Erekle's letters, the referred fact is mentioned only in the Letter No.22. It is of paramount importance to find out the exact city mentioned by Erekle as completely devastated.

The question is whether Erekle meant the fall of Constantinople on May 29, 1453. The massive devastation of the East Royal Residence is contextually much closer to that event. However, taking into consideration that Erekle points to the referred event as "taking place these days" the version related to Constantinople shall be completely ruled out.

For Georgians, the tragedy similar to the scales of Constantinople and mentioned in this letter, shall be dated by the 80-ies of XVIII century.

The fact of ruining the city that can be considered as East Royal Residence is not confirmed in the 80-ies of XVIII century. For this period, only the fact of large-scale devastation of Yerevan is mentioned in the sources initiated by Erekle himself.

Omar Kherkheulidze, chronicler of Erekle II gives following description of the event (quotation): “And in the year 1780 chronology 467 (Byzantine 532-year cycle), Khan of Yerevan Aslan Ali-Khan refused to give tribute... and King Erekle immediately ordered to gather Kartli-Kakheti army as well as the army of several thousands of Lezgians and went in August of the same year and stopped in the village of Shirabat, that is far from Yerevan about two house shell and the army started ruining Yerevan and no building was left apart from Yerevan and Etchmiadzin“ [34, pp. 69-70].

Naturally a question arises - to what extent a completely devastated Yerevan can be considered as “East Royal Residence”. This version shall be completely ruled out. On the one hand, Yerevan was not considered as “East Royal Residence” and on the other hand such large-scale punishment of this city was initiated by Erekle himself. Therefore the King of Kartli-Kakheti would neither have reproached anyone for ruining that city and nor have mentioned the referred fact in the letter sent to the Emperor of Austria. Moreover, Erekle would not have paid special attention to it.

We might also assume the version that Erekle is striving to draw a sharp tragic picture for Europe in order to give more argumentation and motivation for the realization of the idea of alliance. It should be noted that the tactics of this kind was sometimes used by the Kings of Georgia, especially Teimuraz I. However, this version and the manipulation of this type shall be also ruled out from Erekle’s side, since his thinking style and attitudes towards a foreign country were based on highly deliberate relationships and real arguments.

Besides, geostrategic importance of Georgia and interest towards the latter is so great that not understating it by the European states and not using the benevolence of Erekle and Georgian Royal Kingdoms clearly means refusing a really successful project.

There is one more factor – during Erekle’s time there was a large flow of Catholic missionaries in Georgia, that was an information agency transmitting real information to Europe. With such a properly maintained information infrastructure, it is obvious that Erekle would not have ventured on such an adventure, for the simple reason that he did not need it at all.

In this respect, we think to completely rule out the possibility that Erekle might mean the events of Yerevan while referring to the complete devastation of the “East Royal Residence” or that he might dramatize non-existent event.

This conclusion turns everything upside down. It is obvious that in the letter of 1782 Erekle could not have written anything about the events taking place 13 years later. Therefore, we should come to a conclusion that the referred fragment existing in the Italian text could not be Erekle’s letter written in 1782. That is a fragment of a later letter and should possibly mean the devastation of Tbilisi by Agha Mahmad-Khan in 1795.

It is also clear that "Devastation of the East Royal Residence" and the events of 1795, were quite painful for Erekle. Therefore, we must look for the origins of this letter, characterized with exaggerated emotional context, in Erekle’s mood depressed psychologically.

In order to find the explanation of this letter the only solution is to admit that this fragment was not written in 1782. It was written 13 years later when the East Royal Residence, Tbilisi, was devastated really and completely. On the whole this different layer proves that we refer not to a single letter, but to a compilation of at least three several letters written at different times, created by the Chancellery of the Austrian Imperial Court for the Emperor.

The existence of this compilation letter containing a fragment of 1795, is unequivocal proof that Erekle should have sent the third Ambassade to the Austrian Imperial Court.

Naturally, the question arises – what was the aim of a compilation document? We should explain that Austria was ruled in 1795 by a completely different emperor - Franz II, nephew of Joseph II, who was less familiar with the previous history of the issue. In order to make the new emperor of Austria understand the events well, according to the existing bureaucratic practice, the imperial chancellery

prepared a kind of compilation material, containing information on previous Austrian-Georgian relationships and description of the events of 1795 as well.

Accordingly, Letter No.22 obtained and published by Ilia Tabaghua is in fact a compilation of different letters. Our opinion is supported by the fact that the letter bears neither specific identity of the Austrian Emperor nor the date.

The existence of the letter as a compilation document composed of various correspondences is confirmed by another interesting point – Erekle calls the Emperor of Austria a “Sultan” in one section of a letter. This inaccuracy obviously comes from copying and we rule out the possibility of making such inaccuracy due to the importance of Ambassade and Erekle’s special attitude towards the event.

Erekle addresses the Emperor of Austria: „My Merciful and Perspicacious Sultan“. Similar text is contained in the Italian original - „Mio Clementissimo, osservandissimo Soldano“ [99, p 139]. We categorically rule out that one Christian ruler can call another Christian ruler a Sultan. This error might have been made by the compiler, though it cannot reduce the purpose of the compilation of letter. However, it also preserved the issues of the unknown letter addressed to an alien Muslim Ruler currently unfamiliar to us.

One more trace is also observed in the beginning of the letter, that contains a rather strange contextual and emotional layer (quotation): «In our agreement it is important for your servant to show sincerity, for no service from the side of your servant to the Imperial Service of Your Majesty will achieve its result, nor will it show distant defensive loyalty under the pretext of opposite arguments... May it never happen that our friendly mood and aspiration turn into a serious misunderstanding upon passing the time that will hamper our missioner performing the duties of a ‘Messenger’» [99, pp. 105-106].

The obvious tone of reprimand towards the Emperor in the beginning of Erekle’s letter is rather strange. Erekle clearly underlines the factor of loyalty. Obviously, something is happening from the part of the Austrian Royal Court, or the missionaries, or any other fact stipulating to raise this issue.

The psychological sub-text of this point can be used as confirmation that the referred letter could not have been the first one sent by Erekle to the Emperor of Austria. The reason is quite simple, it is impossible to initiate relationship between two countries or rulers with reprimand and reproach.

Such situations are ruled out even in simple human relationships. Moreover, no one starts relations with reprimands and reproaches on a diplomatic fields.

Erekle II is an exceptionally reserved politician. Therefore, within the frameworks of his deliberate and highly unemotional diplomatic relations, coming out from the interests of his nation, the clear reprimand not even an emotional tone observed in the letter sent to the Emperor of Austria is rather noticeable and quite strange.

This strange sub-text should obviously have some preconditions. It is interesting, what happened or became known to Erekle that caused the indignation of the latter and could not hide his emotions in the letter?

If we accept the fact that the letter was written in 1782, and it is a single, whole letter and not compilation, the question will remain unanswered, since Mauro Veronelli had not started travelling towards Vienna and there would have been no news moreover regarding the relationship of Austria and King of Kartli-Kakheti referring to the loyalty to certain principles. This relationship is not an established fact and naturally, it is impossible to measure it with any component at that stage.

Actually, it is incredible for every person to start relations in terms of such a reprimanding tone. This fact confirms once again that the referred fragment is not from the letter of 1782 and it is a part of the one reflecting the events of 1795 that should have been inserted by the compiler into the document prepared for the Emperor from the letter of the third Ambassade.

Complex study of Erekle’s letters, international political situation and relationship with Russia made us conclude that during the period 1782-1795 Erekle sent one more Ambassade to the Imperial Court

of Austria, where a “Persian Project” of Erekle should have been reviewed together with the “Greek Project”. Herein, we cannot rule out that this emotional letter results from Erekle’s negative mood towards Russia due to multiple Anti-Georgian performances. We mean certain facts: Attempt to liquidate Erekle II through Totleben and then oust of Erekle from the throne of Kartli-Kakheti by Captain Lvov [14, pp 35-59; 54] the insulting attitude of the Russian Imperial Court towards the ostensible ally, the official ambassador of Kartli-Kakheti [9, pp. 60-63], followed by the cascade of similar political adventures – assassinations of Prince Levan [80; 81; 103; 29, pp. 14-18; 8, pp. 255-262] and then of the Ambassadors sent to the Emperor of Austria [99, pp 79-126; 35, pp. 11-14; 86, pp. 84-89] rise of various adventurers at the Royal Court of Kartli-Kakheti, [94, pp. 108-112; 22, pp. 130-138; 20, pp 33-35] poisoning of the future king-Giorgi, [79, p. 15] concluding the Treaty of Georgievsk [18, pp. 23-33; 84, pp. 62-65; 55, pp. 109-120; 85, pp. 307-310] than violation of the referred treaty [19, pp. 18-20; 49, pp. 235-237]. The crown of this cascade of intrigues is the devastation of Tbilisi in 1795 by Agha Mahmud-Khan [51, pp. 90-92; 87, pp. 1-2; Muskhelishvili 52, pp. 379-382; 101, pp. 170-175], accordingly, Erekle has no desire to develop relations with Austria in a similar manner.

These are the sentiments of a heartbroken person who has been disappointed and actually faced the shortage of loyalty. This letter is a good example of the moral and psychological tensions that Erekle has to endure the traditional Russian anti-Georgian policy, the one he analyzes and knows in details.

It is not surprising, those psychological pessimistic sentiments were intensified after Russia failed to meet its obligations undertaken by the Treaty of Georgievsk. However, another question arises here - what does the Austrian emperor have to do if Russia does not fulfill its obligations? To what extent does this give grounds for Erekle to reprimand the Imperial Court of Vienna instead of Russia?

We think, there might have been some relations between Vienna and Tbilisi on the background of systematic ignorance of Georgian interests from the side of Russia. It is also obvious that within the common interests of the three states, Vienna could make some influence on St. Petersburg in favor of Georgia. With this reprimand, Erekle calls for Austrian Royal Court to take more active action, especially since it is obvious that the three states have concurrent goals and aspirations towards the Ottoman Empire, at least based on the official version [2, pp. 211-220; 15, pp. 357-365].

Conducted review of the fragment of the document we are interested in and presented arguments are further proof that the letter sent to the Emperor of Austria is a compilation, it reflects the psychological moods and sentiments of the events taking place in 1795 and could not have been written 1782 accordingly.

Letter No.22 contains one more issue proving its compilatory format. Erekle clearly understands that relations with the Austrian Empire should not be one-time, but "reinforced by oath."

It is obvious that Erekle prefers an alliance agreement “reinforced by oath” that can be the basis for further relations and therefore certain proposals of the alliance agreement shall be notified orally to the Emperor of Austria by Mauro Veronelli, ambassador of Erekle. The King of Kartli-Kakheti writes: “We have two motives in this section: the first is the request of Christianity; the second, if you deem it appropriate, it is necessary to make an oath to encourage our polite appearance in your highest residence for ever” [99, pp. 105-106].

However, there is another detail – as the Letter No.22 is a compilation of letters written by Erekle in different times, the possibility that Erekle might have offered Austria to establish relations “reinforced by an oath” cannot be ruled out. The real grounds for such decision existed in 1781-82 and later in 1795 as well. We think, the third Ambassade of Erekle to Vienna Imperial Court was prepared for that purpose.

It is a fact that issue of allied relations with Georgia remains actual for Austria trying to activate the available trump card of the "Holy Roman Empire". This bilateral interest is still obvious in spite of the Treaty of Georgievsk concluded between Erekle and Russia. This can be the explanation of the fact that Imperial Cour of Vienna holds a German translation of the Treaty of Georgievsk [99, pp. 158-

171]. Accordingly, during the subsequent period, the vector of political interests of Austria and Georgia should have been crossed clearly due to their identical directions.

Favorable conditions for such development of political events existed both during the Great French Revolution and after the invasion of Agha Mohammad Khan in Tbilisi, 1795.

The issue of the third Ambassade sent by Erekle¹ is extremely important. The available primary sources confirm that the diplomats sent by Erekle during the referred Ambassade managed to reach the place of destination unlike the previous ones - based on the analysis conducted regarding the failure of the two previous Ambassades, we cannot rule out that several diplomats were sent to Austria by Erekle during the third Ambassade.

Naturally, the question arises – when the third Ambassade was sent to Vienna by Erekle. If we take into account that Russia violated the Treaty of Georgievsk in 1787 when it withdrew troops from Georgia, the Royal Court of Kartli-Kakheti should have had a desire to restore relations with the Emperor of Austria the same year (1787). However, we think that due to poor communication Erekle would not have been able to immediately send an Ambassade to Europe, for which a proper political background was needed. Therefore, we believe that Erekle might have waited the development of events during the Russian-Turkish war of 1787-91, as the referred war should have manifested the necessity of the "Greek Project" for the Bagratians, as well as the Romanovs and the Habsburgs in an appropriate manner.

The evidence to determine the date of the third Ambassade is preserved in the so-called 22nd letter of Erekle sent to Europe, recorded in the archives of Vienna and published by the Professor Ilia Tabagua.

The addressee of the Ambassade sent by Erekle to Vienna in 1795 is the Emperor Frantz II. Erekle reproaches to the latter. Naturally, the reason for this reproach should be definitely sought in the actions of Franz II himself. Obviously, something happened that caused the indignation of Erekle. Allegedly the Emperor of Austria remained indifferent to the specific proposal of Erekle, the "Persian Project", which together with the Greek Project, solved the issue of security throughout the Caucasus in a systemic mode. We believe that neglect of this most important goal or indifference should be the basis of the unusual emotions of the King of Kartli-Kakheti.

We rule out categorically that Erekle reproached Franz II for the behavior of his predecessor, which cannot be explained by either diplomatic or human ethics or logic. Accordingly, it should be considered an established fact that the same emperor ruled Austria during both the fourth and second Ambassades of 1795.

Accordingly, it should be considered as an established fact that one and the same emperor ruled Austria during the fourth (1795) and third Ambassades. Hence, the addressee of Erekle must have been the same person during the two unknown Ambassades to Vienna.

As Emperor Franz II was the Emperor of Austria in 1795 [105; 50], he should be considered as the addressee of the third European Ambassade sent from Kartli-Kakheti. Considering that Franz II ascended the throne of the Austrian Empire on July 14, 1792, we have to assume that Erekle sent the third Ambassade to Austria after the referred date.

As for the upper limit of determining the date of the Ambassade, certain circumstances enable us to specify the date of the third ambassador accurately.

The book "A Brief History of Prince Erekle and the Modern State of Georgia", published in Germany in 1793, in Flensburg and Leipzig [24], the official publisher Herman Henrighs, attracted our attention. In the introduction of the book, the publisher indicates that the data about Erekle II was provided by Count Veck [24, pp. 7-8], also known as Elias Habeski.

¹ The numbering of the Ambassade is conditional, as we do not exclude the discovery of traces of other Georgian Ambassades while working in the archives of Rome and the Vatican

Both German and Georgian scientists believe that Elias Habeski is the pseudonym of Jacob Reinex. The same opinion is shared by Heinrich Rohbacher [89, p. 519], Dali Kandelaki and Ekatherine Reisner [45, p. 187], Giorgi Kavtaradze [43, p. 120; Kavtaradze 42, p. 1589], Giorgi Gelashvili [22, pp 53-62].

The character of Jacob Reinix, whose real name was Christian Rudolf Ellich, is carefully hidden throughout his life and is distinguished by the high degree of inspiration that he needs to perform various secret tasks. Therefore, Ellich uses several aliases and he is known with different names in Austria, the Ottoman Empire and Hungary.

Hence, several questions arise – what is the purpose of the book published about Erekle II in 1793? If Ieke, a person closely related to Erekle, guarantees the authenticity of the printed information about the King of Kartli, why he does not publish the work under the name of Reinex, the name he is known in Georgia; Whether the aim of Ieke is to popularize Georgia and Erekle II throughout Europe.

We have to specify in advance that the motivation of the book composed about Erekle and published in Germany by Ieke, alias Ellich and Reinex shall be reviewed within the context that Ieke is a confirmed agent of the Imperial Court of St. Petersburg; his way of life is to inspire and carry out the tasks of the Russian Empire. Accordingly, he tries to disguise himself under another pseudonym and introduces himself to the European community with the name of Ieke.

The fact is that Reinex needs this book for a specific purpose, its approach to the matter proves our assumption. In our opinion, Reinex cannot be unbiased when publishing a book about Erekle II. His goal is not to popularize Erekle and Georgia in Europe, as a number of scientists believe. If it were true, the confusing cascade of his own name and pseudonyms would not have become necessary for him and Reinex would not have hidden his famous pseudonym in Georgia. Obviously, he has a specific task, so he chooses several inspiration tactics. A very characteristic detail is that the book was published by Herman Henrigs. Though, the latter abdicates the responsibility for the content of this book and places the whole responsibility for the accuracy of the information provided about Erekle on a completely different person, in particular Ieke. Ieke is the same as Elias Habeski, in turn Elias Habeski is known in Georgia as Reinex. This four-layer inspiration raises reasonable doubts, in particular, whether the publication of this book is associated with the third Ambassade of Erekle sent to Vienna.

The first question emerges within the existing political situation - how reliable is the "Brief History of Prince Erekle and the Modern State of Georgia" published by Reinex in Leipzig? How much can we trust the facts presented in this book?

One of the interesting issues within our research is the period of Erekle II's visit to Germany. Pursuant to some data Erekle was in Germany in order to organize his kingdom in an European manner and plan the desired reforms for the development of the country. This is believed by a number of scientists. According to the researcher Giorgi Kavtaradze: "Although Ellich held various positions in different countries and was known under different pseudonyms, data regarding Erekle II's visit to Germany should still be considered authentic, as he was a contemporary of Erekle II, his personal doctor, friend and State Minister in the Kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti" [43, p. 121; 42, p. 1590].

In addition, the fact of Erekle II's visit to Germany was confirmed in the historiography of the Soviet era. The referred sources is used by the Armenian scientist Abgar Ioanisyán [28, pp. 254-255] in his study of the life and political activities of Joseph Emin. Mamia Dumbadze repeats the referred issue based on Ioanisyán's research [12, pp. 633]. The fact of Erekle II's visit to Germany is considered undoubtful by Elene Gogiashvili [16, p. 13; 17] and Shteff Khotivar-Iunger [44, p. 5].

We agree with the position of the aforementioned scientists and consider Erekle's stay in Germany as an indisputable fact. At the same time, we clarify that Ellich, alias Reinex, did not publish a book about Erekle in Germany in order to popularize the Georgian king. Obviously, the publication of this book should have a certain political context and a specific purpose.

We believe that the main message for publishing the referred book can be formed in one phrase. This is a phrase that from an appropriate point of view could overturn the plans of Erekle's diplomatic Ambassade in the Austrian Empire. It depends whether the Emperor of Austria would have had the opportunity to assess the benefits of diplomatic relations with the Georgian king from the point of view of Austrian state interests in a proper manner and not follow the rumors spread at the behest of St. Petersburg. Yet, what was the phrase that might have a significant effect on the European plans of Erekle. The thing is that according to Ellich's book, Erekle participated in the battles conducted against the Queen of Austria Maria Theresa during his stay in Germany. He was on the side of the King of Prussia Frederick the Great.

Here is the most important fragment from Ellich's book: His [Erekle's] behavior both in the garrison and in campaigns arranged by the King of Prussia [Frederick the Great] against Maria Theresa was so exemplary that he was put forward for a high rank and was finally appointed as a military leader of infantry by the King of Prussia. It is also highlighted that only after that the Georgian prince revealed his identity to the King, who did not hesitate to show respect and courtesy towards the latter. Erekle decided to return to the motherland after a while: After he had developed the reformation plan of the Kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti and waited for a favorable situation to implement it" [24, pp. 29-30].

This fragment is the most important message and precondition to publish the book of Reinex. The mutual interest of Austria and Kartli-Kakheti, their desire of relationship are absolutely unacceptable to the Imperial Court of Russia that is confirmed by Catherine through an official document. However, more important aspect is that the Habsburgs, the Imperial Court of Vienna, received certain information from Reinex that Erekle served in the Prussian army in his youth and fought against Maria Theresa, the Emperor of Austria. Taking into account the fact that Prussia is an archenemy of the Austrians, Erekle's activities in the camp of the enemy directed against the Austrians should be neither accepted without any emotions nor considered as an unimportant event. It should not be ruled out that the referred notification carried the psychological importance making effect on the final outcomes of the Ambassade.

A rather important detail is that Reinex took care to convey the aforementioned notification to the addressee in a filigree conspiracy manner. He uses the method of a four-fold conspiracy to disguise the true reason for this information. In parallel with the desired message, he gives compliments to Erekle unsparingly, proving the sympathy for the king of Kartli-Kakheti at first glance, though his main goal is to discredit Erekle and his father. Here is another extract from the composition of Rinex, equaling to the first message we have sited. In addition, it is also an important fragment for discrediting the Bagrationis: "Prince [Erekle], who was born with wisdom for great plans, judicious wisdom and insight, a shrewd mind and boundless curiosity, a strong build-up and good health, felt from an early age that he could not develop his talent, mind and courage in Georgia. His father [Teimuraz II] cared little about his education and preferred to spend his days in idleness and debauchery. Therefore, he decided to go to Europe and get all possible knowledge there. He paid attention to the systems of government of different nations and got acquainted with the several means to reinforce his throne. Then he devoted time to military affairs. Thus, the dissatisfied Prince left for Berlin incognito to obtain theoretical knowledge in this matter. He started service as an ordinary soldier in the Prussian school, which he considered to be the best, in order to acquire the duties necessary for a lower military rank" [24, p. 30].

The question is, why Rainex needed to discredit Teimuraz? Why did he call King Erekle's father idle and depraved? What sources did he rely on for such an assessment, whether the only convincing and trustworthy factor was that Reinex was an esteemed person at the throne of Erekle for a long time? And yet, what did he strive for and intend to achieve through describing King Teimuraz in that manner?

Erekle II's main message contains the idea that he supports and wants to take part in the implementation of the Greek Project. There is another important message that the "Persian Project"

should be considered and developed in parallel with the Greek Project. The "Persian Project" is the main security prevention for the measures taken as a result of the Greek Project.

According to Reinix, the Persian Project is developed by the idle and depraved Teimuraz. Accordingly, an unambiguous subtext is of paramount importance here - the position of an idle and depraved ruler should not be taken seriously.

It is noteworthy that this work allows us to assume not only the reason for the failure of Erekle's third Ambassade, but also to determine the date of the Ambassade itself. Taking into account that the book was published in 1793, the Ambassade should have taken place in July 1792 and 1793. As the book was not published immediately, we believe that the third Ambassade of Erekle should have been sent to Vienna at the end of 1792. An immediate publication of Renix's book, in order to prevent an Austrian-Georgian diplomatic alliance, was decided after sending the referred Ambassade.

It is also noteworthy that discrediting Bagratians to achieve their own goals is a tested and proved tactic of the Russian Empire. A similar method was used by the Imperial Court of St. Petersburg in 1779, when Alexander Amilakhvari's work "The History of Georgia" was published, where the author presents Erekle II in an insulting and degrading form [4]. The interests of the Imperial Court of Russia and Amilakhvari are intertwined in this book. Both of them – Amilakhvari and the Russian Empire have the same goal. The idea of writing the book was inspired by Grigory Potemkin. Amilakhvari dedicated this composition to Potemkin "according to the old tradition". Potemkin is an unofficial husband of the Empress Catherine II. In fact, he rules the kingdom. Thus, it is rather common that Amilakhvari's writings are highly politicized.

The most important thing is that the release date of the book - 1779 - was not randomly chosen. This is the date when a completely different Russian Empire starts, with completely different ambitions and legal mechanisms of European rank.

An international foundation was established in 1770, where the anti-Georgian sentiments of the Russian Empire were organically involved. According to the Treaty of Teschen 1779, Russia became a conciliatory judge within the international political area of Europe forcing its imperial goals. A number of events took place during this period: Reinex's arrival at the Royal Court of the Bagratians, assassination of Prince Levan, poisoning the second prince- the future King Giorgi, assassination of both ambassadors, Domenike and Mauro Veronelli, sent to Austria...Inciting Lezhghins against Erekle that was culminated by the Treaty of Georgievsk.

The Imperial Court of St. Petersburg is guided by an unprecedented example of inspiration even in this situation - In 1783, after signing the Treaty of Georgievsk, the book was banned at the request of Erekle and Alexander Amilakhvar was imprisoned in Vyborg prison. However, as it turns out, "Georgian History" was recalled once again by the Imperial Court of Russia twenty years later and republished in 1799.

We have found a rather original record in the list of library of Professor Davit Chubinashvili. The thing is that the number 274 here refers to Amilakhvar's "Georgian History", published in St. Petersburg in 1799. We have to note that the title is given completely and repeats the book version exactly. Number 275 refers to the same book, "Georgian History" of Amilakhvari, republished in St. Petersburg twenty years later, in 1799. The date of the second edition (1799), might have been considered a typographical error, since the first available edition was published twenty years earlier, in 1779. Such inaccuracy would have been quite natural, in particular when it refers to changing a single digit, but to our mind it is impossible, because in Chubinashvili's library, sorted thematically, both editions are numbered differently and are placed side by side (N274 and N275); furthermore, the names of the books are presented in a different manner. The first edition of 1779, number 274, with the full title (not only the title, but also date of birth and the portrait of Amilakhvari is presented on the first page) and the 1799 edition, number 275, with a short title, without any additional notes or information [102, p 147].

Hence, the question arises – what made the Imperial Court of Russia recall a composition written twenty years before, the author of which had been imprisoned in Vyborg prison by Russia itself.

The fact is that Alexander Amilakhvari wrote a very interesting letter in 1799 though without any addressee. It is a very interesting assessment of the policy of that time. Alexander Amilakhvari was not ruled by Russia, so the rulers of the Imperial Court guarded his every thought and notion.

It was Amilakhvari's thought that once again highlighted the aim of the composition – discretization of the Bagrationis. The Russian Imperial monster needed to discredit the Bagrationis once again – George XII, who ascended the throne after the death of Erekle, did not concede the title of King of Kartli-Kakheti voluntarily. Therefore, Russia responded to his stubbornness with such a discriminatory method. The continuation of this dirty ideological policy is that King George is referred as "Zakichamia" (a person eating young buffalo). George XII, the King, whose stubbornness did not allow the Imperial Court of Russia to present the annexation of Georgia as a voluntary accession, to our shame, still remains the object of ridicule and irony.

And this new wave of discretization starts in 1799, the year when Alexander Amilakhvari's composition was recalled and decided to be republished in order to force George renounce the throne voluntarily, not to make the idea of annexation, disguised by imperial legitimacy, doubtful.

The similar political background during the publication of Habesky's, Reinex's and Amilakhvari's books makes it obvious that the main customer in both cases is the Imperial Court of St. Petersburg. The latter opposes the relations between the Georgian Kingdom and the Emperor of Austria.

Another important question has to be clarified – whether a favorable international political background existed for the successful completion of the third diplomatic mission sent by Erekle to Vienna; whether Europe and Russia were ready for the redistribution of Europe and neutralization of the Ottomans.

In this regard, it is worth noting that since April 1783, after the conquest of the Crimea by Russia, a completely different perspective has emerged in terms of the implementation of the Greek Project. The conquest of Crimea definitely opened the sea route for the Russian Empire towards the Ottomans. This was the first necessary step. According to the Austrian diplomat Kobentzel, "it would lead to the destruction of the Ottoman Empire, the restoration of the Greek Empire and the creation of the Dacian Kingdom" [30, p.383]. This is how the Austrian ambassador to Russia explains his position in a letter dated March 9, 1783 sent to the Emperor of Austria Joseph II.

It is noteworthy that while reviewing the events of 1783 only the Crimean epic is clearly outlined in relation to the Greek Project. We believe that the Treaty of Georgievsk concluded between Kartli-Kakheti and Russia in July of the same year played an important role as well. It was a complete *carte blanche* for the Imperial Court of Russia. It could attack the Ottoman Empire from the ground with the support of the Caucasus and make the implementation of this grand project even more effective.

This is a completely different stage of action and requires special preparation. Accordingly, a kind of timeout seems an usual situation. Nothing seems to have been done in terms of political and military actions since 1783, but it was precisely a break, not a rejection of grand plans. As Count Ludwig von Kobentzl wrote to Emperor Joseph II on May 10, 1783, "the Empress abandoned the implementation of her grand plan temporarily and limited her aggressive plans to the annexation of the Crimea" [30, p. 409].

The political time-out continued until the end of 1786. On November 1, 1786, Kobentzl wrote to Joseph II: „At the moment, a war with the Turks is completely undesirable... It seems that there is an intention to wait for more favorable conditions in Europe for a greater war" [31, p. 79].

It is noteworthy, however, that the Imperial Court of St. Petersburg itself actively considered the possibility of military action against the Ottoman Empire. It can be proved by Catherine's letter sent to Potemkin on October 16, 1786. The Empress approves Potemkin's military plan against the Ottoman Empire and calls for its implementation [90, pp. 740-741].

The situation changed radically a few months later, when the initiators of the Greek Project Catherine II and Joseph II met again in early 1787 after a seven-year break. During this meeting, the issue of the continuation of the Greek Project was again on the agenda [31, p. 167].

The action takes place in the conquered Crimea, in the ancient capital of the Crimea, Bakhchisarai, after celebrating the birthday of Catherine II's grandson, Konstantin Pavlovich. The meeting was attended by Kobentzl, the Austrian ambassador in Russia, who expressed his impression: "I had the opportunity to make sure that the Empress is as great as ever... she was deeply conceived to carry out her grandiose plan" [31, p. 153].

The deployment of forces in the international arena was again in favor of Russia and Austria. According to Catherine, the new king of Prussia, Frederick William, did not resemble Frederick the Great and was so incompetent that he could not resist the project. France was rather concerned about financial problems, so its bribery was reviewed with the prospect of ceding Egypt to it. According to Kobentzel, Potemkin made these proposals to the ambassador of France, who also accompanied the Empress on her trip [31, p. 15]. This was confirmed by Catherine's Chancellor Peter Zavadovsky on July 15, 1787, when he wrote to Count Alexander Vorontsov: "It will be a good dainty for them" [3, p. 46]. It is noteworthy that in order to persuade the French, the Imperial Court of Russia considered the option of ceding Egypt, though they had no right over it.

The year 1793 was distinguished by the most complicated political processes in Europe. One of the most remarkable part of the French Revolution, the execution of King Louis XVI and Queen Marie Antoinette, was a political message uniting almost all European monarchs against the French Revolution. Austria, Prussia, England, the German Principalities, the Netherlands, Spain, Sardinia, Piedmont and Naples... were against France. Russia was in the coalition as well. In 1793, Russia and England signed a convention against France. Then, under the command of Catherine, the Russian army and navy went into military combat readiness. Meanwhile, the Imperial Court of Austria learned France's intention: use the Ottoman Empire being under the influence of the latter to confront Russia [7, p. 94].

Within this possible military conflict, several projects related to the course of Russian foreign policy were being developed at the Imperial Court of St. Petersburg. Among them was a war project with Turkey developed by Suvorov in early 1793, with an interesting title: "Plan to end a permanent war with the Ottomans." This plan was published in the beginning of 1793.

Here, the psychological factor played a decisive role in addition to the political one, since the modest outcome of the Treaty of Jassy 1791 did not satisfy the invincible commander. The Suvorov project of the war with Turkey is mentioned by a number of scientists. The scientist Blagodatskikh reviews this plan within the frameworks of the "Greek Project".

It is noteworthy that Suvorov was appointed as the commander of troops of Eekaterinoslav province in the Crimea in 1792, therefore, he was officially responsible for the security of the southern borders of the empire. As the researcher Blagodatskikh points out, he had information that Selim III intended to take revenge and the French instructors very actively helped him in realizing this desire [7, p. 95]. That is why Suvorov, in turn, planned preventive measures to avoid complications of events. The best defense for him was to attack. Suvorov's intention was known to Khrapovetski, State Secretary of Catherine II, who quoted the ironic phrase of V.S. Popov, the head of the Potemkin's chancellery: "Suvorov and Mordvinov are sleeping and dreaming that as soon as they enter Tsargrad with the fleet, the Turks will flee and 300,000 Greeks will remain - that's all the legacy of Konstantin Pavlovich" [32, p. 243].

It is noteworthy that Suvorov puts the Ground Forces on military combat readiness as soon as he was appointed commander-in-chief of the Southern Troops. Moreover, he took care to construct defensive fortifications in the Crimea and Transnistria. He was actively supported by Vice Admiral Mordvinov, who prepared the fleet for military operations.

It is also important that Suvorov and Vice Admiral of the Black Sea Fleet N.S. Mordvinov had the intention to conquer Constantinople in 1788 [82, p. 179; 96; 97; 41].

These were the real circumstances ensuring a particularly favorable background for the implementation of the Greek Project. Therefore, Erekle's desire to renew the diplomatic relations with

Austria was rather relevant and adequate respond to the events. The two unknown Ambassades sent to Austria in 1792 and 1795 by Erekle is important from the state point of view within the context of European political processes.

Herein, not a minor detail at all – in the letter Erekle underlines that his ancestors, Georgian kings, also aspired to relations with Austria, therefore his desire to have relations with the Imperial Court of Vienna is the fulfillment of their desires.

“In the past, our forefathers were eager and desirous to reach the glorious court of my enlightened and merciful Patron with a cherished request and make their wish come true, but they could find neither time nor occasion to do it because of a powerful Muslim Sect. And now, with help and support, we have found our own strength and will to express the desire and request of our forefathers...” [99, p. 106].

Conclusion

Thus, on the one hand, the compilation of Italian translation of various letters sent by Erekle II to the Emperor of Austria, and on the other hand, the political situation in Europe of that time, in particular, the combination of identical foreign policy goals of the Austrian Empire and the Georgian Kingdom prove following:

1. Erekle II sent two Ambassades to the Emperor of Austria in 1792 and 1795, after Russia violatet the terms of the Treaty of Georgievsk;
2. Unlike the secret goals of the previous two Ambassades sent to Europe in 1781 and 1782, the goal of the Ambassades of 1792 and 1795 is absolutely open and unequivocal - to take an oath and have a long term, business relationship with Austria and the Holy Roman Empire;
3. Two Ambassades sent by Erekle to the Emperor of Austria in 1792 and 1795 totally refute the idea existing in Soviet historiography, in particular, as if Erekle II considered Russia to be the only savior of Georgia;
4. Erekle tried to make the Kingdom an organic part of the European politics independently after Russia violated the terms of the Treaty of Georgievsk in 1785 and 1787;
5. Erekle attempted to strengthen relations with Austria within the framework of the "Greek Project" existing in the 70-80-ies of the XVIII century as the political interests of the latter coincided with Georgian ones;
6. The aim of the Ambassades (1792 and 1795) was to activate the Greek Project, as the model of Christian globalization, a prevention from the Muslim environment. According to the version of European redistribution developed by Erekle, the above stated goals could only be implemented in combination with the Greek and Persian Projects. The oath, alias the concluded treaty proposed to the Austrian Empire might have served the referred goal;
7. The Imperial Court of Austria was interested in having relations with the Kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti. Accordingly, the proposals of Erekle II were considered based on the compilation material prepared by the Chancellery of the Imperial Court;
8. The Emperor of Austria, who was also the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, tried to use the reserves of the nonfunctional religious and political segment of the "Holy Roman Empire". Therefore, Erekle's proposal was important to him.
9. The two unknown Ambassades sent to the Emperor of Austria by Erekle II indicates the necessity for a fundamental revision of the history of Georgian foreign policy for the second half of the XVIII century.

References

1. Abrams L. (2010) *Oral History Theory*, London: Routledge
2. Arneth (1869). *Joseph II und Katharina von Russland. Ihr Briefwechsel, hrsg. von Alfred, Ritter von Arneth*, Wien

3. Archive (1877). *Archive of Prince Vorontsov*. M. (12)
4. Amilakhvari (1779) *A Georgian story about the youth Prince Amilakhvari: With a brief addition of the history of the local land from the beginning to the present century, which Usim the Anatolian merchant tells his associates between different news Amilakhvari, A.D., 1750-1802 (Alexander Dmitrievich)*, St. Petersburg.
5. Brundage A. (2017) *Going to the Sources: A Guide to Historical Research and Writing*, 6th Edition. Wiley-Blackwell
6. Bloch M. (1952) *Apologie pour l'histoire ou métier d'historien*. Librairie Armand Colin, Paris
7. Blagodatskikh I.M.(1998) Suvorov's plan of 1793 offensive war with Turkey Age of Catherine II: *Russia and the Balkans*. M.: Nauka 94-101
8. Berdzenishvili N. (1973) Death of Levan Batonishvili. *Issues of Georgian history Nikoloz Berdzenishvili*. Tbilisi (6) 452-474
9. Buleishvili M (1987)) Kartli-Kakheti Embassy to Russia in 1772-1774 headed by Catholicos Anton and Leon Batonishvili (Royal Prince). *Issues of the History of Religion and Atheism in Georgia*. USSR Science Academy of Georgia; Simon Janashia Museum of Georgia Tbilisi 50-74
10. Collingwood R. (1993) *The Idea of History*. Rev. ed., edited and with a new introduction by J. van der Dussen, Clarendon Press, Oxford
11. Daborjginidze N. (2013) For Reconstruction of the Historical Memory, compilation of works: *“Zurab Kiknadze-80“*, Tbilisi, 234-257
12. Dumbadze M. (1973) The foreign and domestic situation of Kartl-Kakheti in the 18th century. In the 60s, *Essays on the History of Georgia*, Tbilisi, 1973 (4) 629-635
13. Daborjginidze N. (2019) European Projection of Erekle II and His Kingdom. *Cultural traces of Georgians in Germany*, Tbilisi, Ilia State University, 166-218
14. De Grailly De Fois (1985) *About Georgia*, translated from French, foreword, notes and tables and bibliography by Jumber Odisheli, “Metsniereba” (“Science”), Tbilisi
15. Griffiths D. (2013a) *Did Ekaterina the Great Have the «Greek Project» Ekaterina the Great and Her World: articles of various years*. (pp 349-368) M.: “Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie”
16. Gogiashvili E. (2008) An assessment of the ruler of a "distant country" in 18th-century German travel literature: Erekle II. *Meskheta: historical collection*. Tbilisi-Akhaltsekhel 11-18
17. Gogiashvili E. (2016) Two European authors of the 18th century about Heraclius the Second (Kurze Geschichte des Prinzen Heraclius und des gegenwärtigen Zustandes von Georgien Leipzig 1793). *Humanitarian Studies: Yearbook*. Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University Tbilisi: University (7) 275-322
18. Guruli V. (2013) *Treaty of Georgievsk (1783)* Tbilisi: “Universal”
19. Guruli V. (2013) Treaty of Georgievsk: Under the “Protection” by the Empire: from the Very Beginning the Russian Empire Was Determined Not to Fulfill the Terms of the Agreement, „*Istoriani*”: a historical-educational journal. Tbilisi (7) 17-22
20. Guruli V. (2015) Shady Enterprise of General Gottlob Tottleben in Georgia, *My World*, Foundation of Study of Strategies and International Relations of Georgia. Tbilisi, (10) 32-39
21. Gregory I., Ell Paul S. (2008) *Historical GIS: Technologies, Methodologies, and Scholarship*, Cambridge University Press
22. Gelashvili G. (2002) *Traveling Through Georgia. Jacob Reineggs*; Translation from German, introduction and bibliography by Gia Gelashvili. „Artanuji” publishing, Tbilisi
23. Hughes-Warrington M (2007) *Fifty Key Thinkers on History*, London: Routledge

24. Henrichs (1793). *Hermann Henrichs, Kurze Geschichte des Prinzen Heraclius und des gegenwärtigen Zustandes von Georgien*, Flensburg und Leipzig in der Kortenschen Buchhandlung
25. Iggers G., Wang Q. Edward (2013) *A Global History of Modern Historiography*, Routledge
26. Iriye A. (2012) *Global and Transnational History: The Past, Present, and Future*, New York: Palgrave Pivot
27. Ivonin Yu. I. (2007) Venzel Anton Kaunits. *Questions of history*. (4) 27-50
28. Ioannisyanyan A.R. (1945) *Joseph Emin*; Yerevan: Yerevan Publishing House. state un-ta (254-255)
29. Jambakur-Orbeliani A. (1914) *Lezgins Coming out of Dagestan and Other Stories*, Al. Jambakur-Orbeliani, patronymic Vakhtang, published by Sargis Kakabadze according to the autograph protected in the Society Spreading Literacy. Tfilisi
30. Joseph II (1901) - *Joseph II. und Graf Ludwig Cobenzl - ihr Briefwechsel 1. Bd 1780-1784*. Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften. Wien 1901
31. Joseph II (1901) *Joseph II. und Graf Ludwig Cobenzl - ihr Briefwechsel 2. Bd 1785-1790*. Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften. Wien 1901
32. Khrapovitsky A. V. (1901) *Diary of A.V. Khrapovitsky from January 18, 1782 to September 17, 1793*. Moscow
33. Kakabadze S. (1997) *History of Georgian People, 1783-1921*. Tbilisi, Nekeri
34. Kherkheulidze O. (1989) *Reign of Erekle II*. The text was prepared for publication with the research, dictionary and bibliography by Lela Mikiashvili. Tbilisi, Metsniereba
35. Kalandia G. (2017) *King Erekle in the English and Irish Press, the information was collected*, Tbilisi
36. Kalandia (2020) *British sources about Georgia Part I*. Georgian Art Palace Tb.
37. Kalandia (2020) *British sources about Georgia. Part II*. Georgian Art Palace Tb.
38. Kaldellis A. (2014) *A New Herodotos. Laonikos Chalkokondyles on the Ottoman Empire, the Fall of Byzantium, and the Emergence of the West*, Dumbarton Oaks
39. Koselleck R. (2004) *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, Columbia University Press
40. Koselleck R.(2002) *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press
41. Krupchenko I.A.(1980) V. Suvorov and military art. *Military history magazine* (10) 71-75
42. Kavtaradze G. (2017) From the History of Georgian-German Cultural and Political Relationship: Prince Erekle in Berlin. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, vol. 7 (12) 1587-1591
43. Kavtradze G. (2019) Cultural Traces of Georgians in Germany. *Historical Perspective, Cultural Traces of Georgians in Germany*, Tbilisi, Ilia District. University 109-165
44. Khotivari-Yungeri (2001) *Georgians in Berlin*, Tb. : Sat. House of Parliament Ilia Chavchavadze nation Bib-ka
45. Kandelaki D., Reisner E. (2008), Prince Erekle's life and a short history of today's Georgia, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University Faculty of Humanities *II scientific conference dedicated to the 120th anniversary of Shalva Nutsubidze*, proceedings, Tbilisi
46. Lukacs J. (2000) *Student's Guide to the Study of History*, ISI Books
47. Langlois C, Seignobos C. (1992) *Introduction aux études historiques*. Editions Kimé, Paris

48. Lambert P., Schofield P (2004) *Making History: An introduction to the history and practices of a discipline*. Routledge
49. Lobzhanidze G.A.(1989) Study from the History of Legal Relations between Russia and Georgia: [The Legal Status of the Treaty of Georgievsk and Making Georgia a Non-sovereign State, Unilateral Violation of the Agreement by Russia] “*Gantiadi*”. Kutaisi, 1989. (6) 232-237
50. Mikoletsky L (1997) Leopold II (1790 - 1792) *Schindling A., Ziegler W. Kaisers. Holy Roman Empire, Austria, Germany*. Rostov 333-345
51. Metreveli, R. (2018) Agha Mohammad Khan’s Ultimatum to King Erekle the II, *Matsne “Izvestia” = Proceedings*. Georgian National Academy of Science. The series of history, archeology, ethnology and the history of arts, Tbilisi, (2) 88-97
52. Muskhelishvili, D (2012). Agha Mohammad Khan Attacking Georgia: *The History of Georgia: From the Ancient Times to 2009* Tbilisi 375-385
53. Monastyreva L.Y. (2009) Kaunitz's reforms in the diplomatic service in Austria in the second half of the 18th century. *Bulletin of the Smolensk State University*. (4) 153-162.
54. Macharadze V. (1968) *Materials on the history of Russian-Georgian relations in the second half of the 18th century*. part. 2, Ambassador of Teimuraz II to Russia. Tbilisi: TSU
55. Macharadze, V. (2013) Three Treasures of the Treaty of Georgievsk: *Scientific-Public Journal*. Tbilisi, (1)
56. Munro D., Reid J. (2017) *Clio’s Lives: Biographies And Autobiographies Of Historians*, Acton: ANU Press,
57. Natsvaladze M. Georgia and the Secret Project for Redistribution Europe 70-80s of the 18th century, *LXXVI International Scientific Review of the Problems and Prospects of Modern Science and Education*, (p 38-46) Boston. USA. - 23 December, 2020
58. Natsvaladze M. Greek Project – Clue to the History of Georgia 50-90-ies of XVIII Century. *XXIII International Scientific and Practical Conference Social and Economic Aspects of Education in Modern Society*. (Vol.1, p. 38-43) November 25, 2020, Warsaw, Poland.
59. Natsvaladze M. (2020) Sensational Unknown Facts from Georgian Diplomacy of 90-ies of XVIII Century, *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. No 7(28) p.77-85
60. Natsvaladze M. Explanation of one conceptual subtext of a “Greek Project”, *XI International Conference. Science and Practice: a new level of integration in the modern world*, *Scope Academic House*, (p 164-168) September, 10 - November, 30, 2020, Sheffield, UK
61. Natsvaladze M. Capuchin Monks and the Russian Agents in Georgia in the 80s of the 18th Century, *Bridge to science: research works*. San Francisco, California, USA September 10- december 15 2020 p 154-159
62. Natsvaladze M (2020). Unknown Details of the 1795 Ambassadorial Mission of Georgia to Europe. *15th International Silk Road Virtual Conference. Conference Proseeding (Silk Road 2020)*, (P 218-228) Oct. 09-10, 2020, Tbilisi, Georgia.
63. Natsvaladze M. (2020) Unknown details of the confrontation between the special services at the Royal Court of Irakli II, *November 27-29, 2020, Tbilisi, Telavi, Technical University, Telavi State University, International scientific and educational conference dedicated to the 300th anniversary of the birth of Irakli II*, (Part 1, pp. 172-183) Tbilisi Telavi 2020,
64. Natsvaladze M. (2021) Unknown backstages of Georgian Diplomacy in the 80-ies of the XVIII Century, *European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements (EJHEA) Vol. 2 No. 1*, pp 84-91

65. Natsvaladze M. Russian Empire and Georgian-Austrian Diplomatic Relations in the 80s of the XVIII century. «*Humanities and Social Sciences in Europe: Achievements and Perspectives*». *Proceedings of the 7th International symposium* (pp 12-26) January 25, 2020. Premier Publishing s.r.o. Vienna. 2021.
66. Natsvaladze M. Unknown anatomy of Georgian diplomatic assassinations. Scientific Collection «InterConf», (42): *1st International Scientific and Practical Conference «Theory and Practice of Science: Key Aspects»* (623-645) February 19-20, 2021, Rome, Italy.
67. Natsvaladze M. The Caucasian Gambit of World Emperes and Erekle II, *Collection of scientific papers «ΑΟΓΟΣ» with Proceedings of the II International Scientific and Practical Conference* (Vol. 2, pp 161-176), Oxford, May 28, 2021.
68. Natsvaladze M. (2020) Georgian-Austrian Unknown Preludes to Georgievski's Treatise, *Collection of Scientific Papers, Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University № 1* (33) p. 31-43
69. Natsvaladze M (2020). Georgian Paradigms of the Greek Project, *Kartvelian Heritage XXIV*, Kutaisi, p. 124-139
70. Natsvaladze (2021) Russian Dramaturgy of the assassinations of the European ambassadors Erekle II. *Scientific journal* No. 4 (59), Moscow 29-41
71. Natsvaladze M. “Persian Project” – one part Erekle’s safe Caucasus model, *Collection of scientific papers «ΑΟΓΟΣ» with Proceedings of the I International Scientific and Practical Conference* (Vol. 4 pp. 82-91), Cambridge, March 19, 2021. Cambridge-Vinnytsia: P.C. Publishing House & European Scientific Platform, 2021.
72. Natsvaladze M. The seven years' war and Caucasian outline of the Greak Project. *Collection de papiers scientifiques «ΑΟΓΟΣ» avec des matériaux de la II conférence scientifique et pratique internationale* (Vol. 2, p 71-86), Paris, 1er octobre 2021. Paris-Vinnytsia: La Fedeltà & Plateforme scientifique européenne, 2021.
73. Natsvaladze M. Georgian-Austrian political variations of the 80-ies of the XVIII century. Scientific Collection «InterConf», (50): with the Proceedings of *the 8th International Scientific and Practical Conference «Scientific Horizon in The Context of Social Crises»* (April 11-12, 2021). Tokyo, Japan: Otsuki Press, 2021. p 351-363
74. Natsvaladze M. Paradigms for the State Security Model of Erekle II. Scientific Collection «InterConf», (53): with *the Proceedings of the 7th International Scientific and Practical Conference «International Forum: Problems and Scientific Solutions»* (April 25-26, 2021). Melbourne, Australia: CSIRO Publishing House, 2021. P. 322-342.
75. Natsvaladze M. Stalin against Engels - For the Historiography of the Greek Project. *Education and science of today: intersectoral issues and development of sciences: Collection of scientific papers «ΑΟΓΟΣ» with Proceedings of the II International Scientific and Practical Conference* (Vol. 2, p 110-124), Cambridge, October 29, 2021.
76. Natsvaladze M. For the interrelationship between the Seven Years' War and the Caucasian segment of the Greek project. *16th INTERNATIONAL SILK ROAD VIRTUAL CONFERENCE. Conference Proceedings. 16th International Silk Road Remote Conference*. October 14-15, 2021 Tbilisi, Georgia, pp. 244-263
77. Natsvaladze M. The Caucasian Gambit of World Empires and Erekle II. *Kartvelian Heritage XXV*, Kutaisi, 2021. pp.183-201
78. Natsvaladze M. Testament of Peter I – to identify the initiator of the forged document. *Education and science of today: intersectoral issues and development of sciences: Collection of scientific papers «ΑΟΓΟΣ» with Proceedings of the III International Scientific and Practical Conference*, Cambridge, May 20, 2022. p 329-345

79. Natsvaladze M. (2017) Was Giorgi the Twelfth Poisoned as per the Order of the Emperor's Royal Court of Russia, "Rezonansi", (01.05)
80. Natsvaladze M. (2017) Was Erekle II's son Levan poisoned by order of St. Petersburg? "Resonance" (01.06)
81. Natsvaladze M. (2017) Why did the Armenian Church need to spread the false version of the murder of Levan Batonishvili. "Resonance" (10. 06)
82. Plan (1914) A plan submitted by Count Suvorov for approval to Her Majesty the Russian Empress in 1795. *Russian Archive*, (6-7) 159-190
83. Paichadze G (1965) *Russian-Georgian relations in 1725-1735*. Academy of Sciences of the Georgian SSR, Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography. Tbilisi
84. Paichadze G. (1983) *Treaty of Georgievsk: 1783 Agreement on Eastern Georgia Entering Under Protection of Russia*. the text was prepared for publication, the introduction and comments were provided by Giorgi Paichadze; Tbilisi: "Metsniereba"
85. Papashvili M (2003) *Treaty of Georgievsk, This is Georgia*. Tbilisi 305-313
86. Peradze V (2006) From the History of Relations of Erekle the II with Austria, *Historical Verticals*. Tbilisi (1) 82-91
87. Potto, V. A. (1891) *Georgia and Its Historical Past: (Russians Entering Tfilisi in 1783 – Agha Mohammad Khan)*. Translation by P. Karbelashvili [P. Tskhiviloeli]. *Iveria*, (26.06. N133) .1-2
88. Quigley C. (1979) *The evolution of civilizations. An introduction to historical analysis*, Publisher: Liberty Fund Inc.
89. Rohrbacher H. (2008): *Georgien: Bibliographie des deutschsprachigen Schrifttums*, Wiesbaden, 2008
90. Russian archive (1865) Handwritten papers of the book. Potemkin-Tavrishesky (3) Reprint: 1866. 721–744
91. Ragsdale H. (1988) Evaluating the traditions od Russian agression: Catherine II and the Greek Project. *Slavonic and East Europeen Review*. L., Vol. 66. N 1;
92. Raaflaub K. (2010) *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*, Wiley-Blackwell,.
93. Shvelidze D. (2014) *Patronage and conquest of Georgia by Russia*, Tbilisi, Meridiani
94. Shvelidze D (2012) General Totleben in Georgia. Pro Georgia. *Journal of Kartvelological studies*. Center for east european studies- oriental institute-university of Warsaw. Warsaw (22) 107-117.
95. Samsonadze M. (1988) *The problem of the unification of Georgia and foreign orientation in the XVIII century*. Tbilisi, Soviet Georgia
96. Suvorov A. V. (1990) *Campaigns and battles in letters and notes*. M.: Military Publishing House
97. Suvorov A. V. (1952) *Documents. T. 3: 1791-1798*. M.: Military Publishing House
98. Tamarashvili M. (1902) *History of Catholicism among Georgians with the introduction and explanations of real documents from the XIII century to the XX century*. Tbilisi
99. Tabaghua I. (1979) *Georgia at the International Arena in the Second Half of the XVIII Century*, Tbilisi
100. Tsintsadze I. (1960) *Protective Treaty of 1783: Materials for the history of Russian-Georgian relations*, Tbilisi: Sabchota Sakartvelo
101. Tsintsadze I.(1969) *Agha Mohammad Khan Attacking Georgia (1795)*. Tbilisi: "Sabchota Sakartvelo" publishing

102. Tsagareli, A.A. (1894) *Information about the monuments of Georgian writing*. T 1, no. 3 St. Petersburg
103. Tukhashvili L. (1983) *Russia and the Socio-Political Movement in Eastern Georgia: The Second Half of the 18th Century*, Tbilisi. Science
104. Tamarashvili M. (1995) *Georgian Church from the Dawn to These Days*, “Kandeli”, Tbilisi
105. Ziegler W. (1997) Franz II (1792 - 1806). *Schindling A., Ziegler W. Kaisers. Holy Roman Empire, Austria, Germany*. Rostov 346-371