

## **Professor Givi Gamrekeli**

The present work is historiographical, and its purpose is to present (as far as possible) the life and work of the famous historian, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor Givi Gamrekeli (1932-2018) in his work. We will try to determine his place in Georgian historiography. This topic has not been yet well-studied in the historical scientific literature, and the present paper is, in fact, the first attempt to do so. It will help the Georgian society to create a general idea about his achievements in historical science. This is our goal.

\*\*\*

Givi Gamrekeli, professor at Tbilisi State University, doctor of historical sciences, was undoubtedly one of the most colorful and outstanding people among Georgian researchers of ancient world history. He was one of the best and most competent specialists in his field. An unusually erudite, highly educated, highly literate, cultured person. One of the last Mohicans of the indigenous Georgian intelligentsia. Today there are very few of them left or they are no longer there. They want to be careful; they go.

Professor Givi Gamrekeli made his contribution and tried as much as possible to advance the teaching, popularization, study and scientific research of ancient world history in Georgia. He was a wide-ranged, well versed in the history of the peoples of the ancient East, as well as in the history of ancient countries, ancient Greece and Rome. He was a very good lecturer and expert researcher. His lessons were always interesting. He demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the factual material, with an understanding of the supporting sources and research literature, further highlighting the importance of the fact. The lecture was pleasant to listen to.

In general, it should be said that he was not only a good specialist in ancient world history. First of all, he was a very educated, erudite, literate

person who perfectly knew not only ancient history, but also world history, world literature, art, theater, music. There were a lot of sports, first of all, chess and football. Excellent sports journalist, chess player. He played chess, he was a master. Participated in tournaments. The relationship with him was interesting both for students and his colleagues. Often it was equivalent to „ reading a book". That was the charm of the relationship with him.

\*\*\*

Let's take a brief look at his path, let's start with his biography. Givi Gamrekeli was born in Tbilisi on September 30, 1932. Father David Gamrekeli, Mother Nino Geldiashvili. Father was quite a picturesque figure. In 1918, he entered the Faculty of History, as it was called at first, and was the first graduate of the university. We do not know what the reason for this was, but he did not work in his specialty. As his daughter Tina recalls, he was a Russian language teacher. Mother, as Mrs. Tina recalled that she also graduated from the Faculty of Philosophy but did not work in her specialty. She was a housewife. Naturally, the question arises whether the family environment determined Mr. Givi's professional choice? °

Mr. Givi studied at the first secondary school in Tbilisi, after graduating from which he continued his studies at the Faculty of History at Tbilisi State University. He chose ancient world history as his narrow specialty.

His work can be conditionally divided into two periods. It clearly goes beyond purely academic frameworks and is based on a sharply defined political agenda. He was very significant for those historians who had to work in the Georgian historiography of the Soviet and post-Soviet period. 1. His work in the Georgian historiography of the Soviet period. 2. His activities in the post-Soviet period.

The 50s and 60s are interesting and, in our opinion, can be considered the age of finding one's own way in life. The beginning of the 70s, specifically the year 1970, should be seen as an important boundary within the first period of his work. We will draw attention to two circumstances. He started working at Tbilisi State University and defended his candidate's thesis. In fact, we are dealing with internal periodization of his work. It can be conditionally divided into two sub-periods: before the 70s and after the 70s. It ends in the early 90s and is still directly related to political cataclysms, namely the collapse of the Soviet Union. From here on, the second period of his activity begins, which can

be conditionally divided into two sub-periods. The watershed between them is, of course, the reform carried out in 2006, because of which he was completely unfairly removed from his beloved work. He could still be of much use and would do a lot of good work. The reason for his passivity at the end of his life lies right here. Its rich potential has not been used; we are dealing with age persecution. In the first stage, his main work was the candidate's thesis "Sallustius as a historian" and in the second stage his main work was the doctoral thesis "Ammianus Marcellinus as a historian and political thinker". We think it would be preferable if he published both these works. But for some reason he did not do so, why he did it is difficult to say. In our opinion, this step was not justified. To an important extent, we think, this explains why he left a much more modest mark in Georgian antiequality than it was.

In 1967-1969, he worked on an hourly basis for A.S. at the Pushkin Pedagogical Institute (now Ilya University), at the Department of World History. In 1969-1970, he was a teacher of the Department of History of Ancient Countries of Tbilisi State University, on an hourly basis. After the death of Professor Mate Aleksishvili, he was enrolled full time. He spent almost four decades at Tbilisi State University and left his mark as a lecturer and researcher-historian. In 1971-2004 he was a docent of the Department of History of Ancient Countries of Tbilisi State University, and in 2004-2006 he was a professor of the same department. (1)

On December 11, 1970, he defended his candidate's thesis on "Sallustius as a Historian".

On June 7, 1971, by the resolution of the Union Higher Attestation Commission, he was awarded the scientific degree of candidate of historical sciences, and a little later he was elected as a docent of the Department of History of Ancient Countries of Tbilisi State University. (1)

On April 2, 2004, he defended his doctoral thesis on "Amian Marcellinus as a historian and political thinker". He was awarded the scientific degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences and after a while he was elected as a professor of the Department of History of Ancient Countries of Tbilisi State University. (1)

Prof. Givi caller died on February 15, 2018. He was buried in the Kuki cemetery. He was an extremely decent, unselfish, honest person who did not touch any evil, who, thanks to the efforts of the totalitarian-Bolshevik regime, is gaining a foothold in the university and who was completely alien and unacceptable to the university internally.

Prof. Givi Gamrekeli left a clear mark in Georgian historiography and sports journalism.

\*\*\*

Professor Givi Gamrekel was a highly erudite historian. A wide-ranging researcher. The field of his scientific interests is wide. It covers topical issues of ancient Eastern countries and ancient history. Lectures, scientific-popular works and studies are based on his factual, material knowledge, but he was not a narrow fetologist, empiricist, historian. It is worth noting his interest in theoretical issues of history, knowledge of sources of ancient history and historiography. This made his poems more alive and livelier, and scientific-popular essays and studies had a solid face and became interesting for listeners and readers. As a historian, he was not easy and avoided difficulties. The study of the 9th century English historian, Professor Edward Freeman of Cambridge University, "The work of the historian can only be done without fear of hard work." (2.52) Professor Givi was one of them. Charles de Gaulle said: "Go, you will have no competitors there."

He knew well the peoples of the ancient Far East and the history of the ancient world, in particular ancient Greece and Rome. His narrow specialty was source knowledge and historiography of ancient history. Both of his dissertations, both the candidate's and the doctoral dissertation, are source-based and historiographic in nature. His popular scientific works belong to this field: on Lucian, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Tacitus, Polybius, Plutarch, Suetonius, Curtius Rufus. We consider the popular essay about the great German historian Theodor Mommsen to be one of the best. (1817-1903).

Let's start with his candidate thesis "Sallustius as a historian", which, as already said, should belong to the field of source studies and historiography. It is his main work in the Soviet period.

On December 11, 1970, he defended his candidate's thesis on "Sallustius as a historian". His scientific supervisor was Doctor of History, Prof. Mate Aleksishvili. Official opponents: Acad. Simon Kaukhchishvili and Assoc. Nato Kvezereli-Kopadze. (3)

We find it particularly painful that the thesis defense materials, which would have been our main source during the discussion of this topic and would have helped us in covering this problem in depth, could not be found either in the university or in the national archive, and there is a high probability that it is lost. Our immediate predecessors are the opponents of the dissertation work, who first tried to assess the absurdity of his work. Therefore, this material was an interesting source for us.

Writing a historiographic work is not an easy task, and if there was any illusion in this field, it was primarily an echo of the Soviet reality. Historiographical studies were often written according to a template scheme. What is close to Marxism is obviously very good and acceptable, while what is far from Marxism is naturally unacceptable and not suitable. During the Soviet period, historiographic work was often highly politicized and ideologized. In this case, it can be said that we can deal with a kind of happy exception.

A historiographical work should not have a narrative, description, character. Only conveying the views of the historian should not be enough, and it cannot give us a complete, comprehensive, idea of the historian's contribution to historical science. It should have an analytical charge, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the historian's views and explaining the reasons behind them. We are dealing with a scientific approach to the issue, which naturally has its pluses and minuses. This is the reality.

A historiographical work should not be apologetic in nature. It cannot be the praise of a historian. This is unacceptable. Such a historiographic work will be weak and will not be able to give us an adequate idea of the historian's contribution to historical science. This is one extreme. We should not go from one extreme to the other. It is not appropriate to refer to the work of the historian as a bad side of him/her, to raze it to the ground. This darkens the picture too much. It will create a distorted idea of the historian's contribution to historical science. Both extremes are unacceptable. We must try to find a middle way, to highlight both the light and the shadow, and try to explain their causes. This criterion tries to evaluate Prof. Sallust's contribution to Givi Gamrekeli's historical science.

He tries to avoid both extremes and to find a golden mean in evaluating Sallust as a historian. Emphasize the strengths and weaknesses of his views and try to explain as much as possible the reasons behind them. He shares the opinion expressed in the scientific literature and gives a positive assessment of Sallust as a historian. In fact, we are dealing with a scientific approach to the issue, which naturally has its strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, we do not consider it appropriate to evaluate or underestimate the Georgian historian's work, and it would be an easy way to go. As a young, budding researcher, he is trying to develop scientific research skills. Its rich scientific potential is clearly visible here. That should be the main thing.

The importance of the historiographic work is conditioned by the presentation of the views of the historian. This has a great significance. It depends a lot on this whether the historiographic research will be carried out or

not. Another advantage of his work should lie in this. He conveys the views of Sallust. After that, he tries to find out about her disappearance. His reasoning is based on a thorough knowledge of primary sources and research literature, both in Georgian, Russian and German languages, another positive side of his work can be seen.

Now let's turn specifically to his work "Salustius as a Historian". This is his candidate's thesis. First of all, let's start with the methodology, which received a lot of attention back then. Naturally, the question will be raised, what was his attitude towards Marxist-Leninist ideology? The issue is of principle and the quality of the work depends a lot on it. Such is the Soviet reality. At first glance, it seems as if the work should be written from the Soviet Marxist-Leninist positions, but the truth, we think, is much more complicated than it appears on the surface. Therefore, we consider it interesting and relevant to cover the issue from this point of view. The work, we think, fully met the principles of the Soviet methodology of that period.

Perhaps, it would be most impolite to consider his attitude to Marxism as loyal. Of course, this does not necessarily mean that the influence of Marxism is not felt in this work. This is not so. Obviously, he is forced to account for the prevailing Marxist-Leninist ideology, but, in our opinion, he does so sparingly and the compromises with Marxism are minimal, which we consider one of the main virtues of his discussion on this topic. Because of the minimal compromise with Marxism, it should not be advisable to judge it harshly, it would be easy to take the easy way and we consider it hypercritical.

(4)

In fact, it is about evaluating the creativity of the historian of the Soviet period. The issue is complex and multifaceted. It would be interesting to cover it in this regard. The apologetic assessment of the achievements of Soviet historiography, which dominated the Soviet years today, is naturally out of date, out of date, a bygone stage of historiography. We should not separate ourselves from one extreme to the other. Both extremes are unacceptable, it is clearly not worth it to obscure the difficult situation created in Soviet historiography. "It was our misfortune, not our crime," we think, would be more correct. The truth usually lies somewhere in the middle, but finding that middle ground will not be an easy task, as judges are subjective. Some people are overcome by sympathy, and others, on the contrary, by antipathy.

Let's start with the fact that he did not face any conjunctural problems that he could have easily solved and obtained the sought-after degree. This is not surprising, of course. It was not in his nature to walk the easy way. He took

hold of a serious scientific problem and processed it from the Marxist standpoint. We are dealing with a purely pragmatic, practical approach to the issue. A lot of people used to go this way. This is easy to understand and seemed like one of the realistic ways out of that extreme situation. In fact, the choice was between worse and worse. Georgian historiography bet on the latter. There was no wide choice. It was the right move. At the level of empiricism, factology, the progress of Georgian historiography of the Soviet period should be without any doubt, and it is obviously not appropriate to ignore it. The scientific approach to the issue remains in force, but it has taken on a one-sided character and has been caught in the mold of a narrowly dogmatic Marxist-Leninist ideology. This was no accident. Here the real situation was reflected. In the Soviet Union, there is a unification, Stalinization of historical science. This was manifested in the fact that the monopoly of one narrowly dogmatic Marxist-Leninist ideology is being established. The fading of Georgian historiography in the Soviet period from the theoretical and methodological point of view was an echo of this. For Soviet historiography, a different opinion was unacceptable, it was persecuted, it was immediately revealed as false. We think that the work of Givi Hamrekel "Sallustius as Historian" fits very well into this scheme. He chooses a serious scientific problem and tries to work it from a Marxist point of view.

The Roman historian Sallustius (86-35 BC) was one of the prominent representatives of the younger annals. Sallust's main work is "History", unfortunately it must be said that only its fragments have survived. It consists of five books and chronologically covers the period before Christ, 78-66 years of the 1st century. Sallust's letters to Gaius Julius Caesar are interesting. Only two letters have reached us.

These letters are significant and give us an idea of his political beliefs. Sallustius-Kalam wrote two more works that touch on the key issues of Roman history. "War of Jugurtha" and "Conspiracy of Catiline". (5)

It is given a double burden: source knowledge and historiography. Sallust's writings are an interesting source of Roman history of that period, which no researcher of that era can ignore. Its importance lies in the fact that it helps us to supplement data from other sources. This is the source knowledge side of Sallust's writings. At the same time, it should be said that his writings have a historiographic load, where he tries to assess the current problems and outstanding people of the Roman history of that era. Therefore, putting the issue in this context, "Sallustius as a historian" should be quite reasonable. Sallust's works are of great value, and his consideration should seem quite justified.

Let's briefly look at the content of the paper. It looks like this. It consists of four chapters, namely: Chapter One. Biography of Sallust. (3.1-4) Second chapter. Historians on Sallust (3.4-10) Chapter Three. Political situation in Rome until the end of the 2nd century BC and the beginning of the 1st century BC. (3.10-14) Chapter Four. Sallust as a historian. (3.14-22).

At the beginning of the work, naturally, the author, based on primary sources and various research literature, talks about Sallust's biography and shows considerable insight into this issue. This is obviously very good. It has a review character and has a purely cognitive load. It can be said that he did not cope with this culture-tragering mission. That was the main thing. A strict scientific criterion will not serve as a measure here. He faced a much more modest task, which he coped with well. (3.1-4) That was the main thing.

Prof. One of the interesting historiographical parts in Givi Gamrekeli's work is where he discusses the historiography of the issue. Historians can conditionally call him Sallust as a historian. How historians evaluate Sallust as a historian.

It is emphasized that in the assessment of Sallust as a historian, there was never unanimity among historians, and diametrically opposite opinions were expressed. This difference of opinion was already laid by the ancient authors and was later reflected in historiography. Some of them beat the gundruk and praise Sallust as a historian. Their main influencers were Suetonius and Seneca (father). the other on the contrary. They should not think highly of him as a historian and mention his name only in a negative context. This position was taken by the historian Titus Livius (3.4-5).

First of all, it should be noted that Sallust is not a narrow empiricist, a historian. His works are not a dry narration of facts, a simple transmission. It is not a simple pile of facts. Then it wouldn't be interesting. He reached out to comment on it. (3.1) The author emphasizes the value of the scientific information collected here, its source knowledge value, which complements information from other sources and helps the historian in the reconstruction of the past. Of course, this is not a small matter. At the same time, Sallust's reasoning has an evaluative weight, which gives it a historiographic charge. This allows us to try to find out what might have been Sallust's attitude towards the current issues and prominent people in Roman history. This is another interesting point of view.

The author shares the opinion spread in the historical-scientific literature that, from this point of view, Sallustius can be considered a student of Thucydides. (3.1.) This is one side of the coin. There is another side to the coin.



Did Sallust influence later Roman historiography? What was said, first of all, of course, concerns the famous Roman historian Publius Cornelius Tacitus. (55-120) (3.1,5)

Bringing up the question of Sallustius' worldview is interesting. In this regard, this problem, as the Georgian historian adds, is covered relatively weakly. He explains this by the fact that "mainly attention was paid to Sallust's political views, while the issue of his worldview appeared to us as a more peripheral topic. The author very cautiously leans towards the opinion that he considers Sallust to be a supporter of Stoicism. (3.26)

In his works, Sallust touches on and provides us with interesting information, he tries to evaluate such topical issues of Roman history as the Jugurtha War (113-105 BC), Catiline's Conspiracy (63-62 BC), Catiline (before BC 108-62), Cicero (106-43 BC), Gaius Julius Caesar (100-44 BC).

It is interesting how Sallust looked at history and what purpose he assigned to it. He, like the Roman historians, first of all, wrote from "a purely practical point of view. The main thing for them was not to determine the truth, but to influence political life." (3.12)

The author emphasizes that "Sallust, like all early Roman historians, wrote for practical purposes. It was not intended to establish historical truth. With his historical works he took part in political struggles" (3.12) In this sense, Sallust's writings on the Catiline conspiracy attract attention. "Such a trending work is Sallust's work on Catiline's conspiracy. where he aimed to settle the score for the nobility". (3.18). Such a negative attitude of Sallustius towards Catilina's conspiracy is, of course, not accidental, it did not arise from an empty soil, and its reasons, first, lie in Sallustius' worldview. This kind of approach is an echo of Sallust's negative attitude towards nobility. Criticism of nobility is the leitmotif of his work (3.19). Such is Sallust's addiction to Catiline's conspiracy (5. 6. 153-178, 178-191, 191-198. 7. 175-181, 8. 417-434).

As the author notes, I deal with the same situation in Sallust's second work on the Jugurtha War. He evaluates this work of Sallust more positively. Nevertheless, the author adds, we must admit that "the history of the Jugurtha war". It was created by the same methods as Catiline's conspiracy, although its tendency has become more moderate. (3.20)

It would be desirable if it was mentioned in the abstract that Prof. Giorgi Gozalishvili published in Georgian two letters of Caesar's contemporary Roman historian Sallustius to Caesar. Such an indifferent attitude towards this fact, we think, was not accidental and sounded like an echo of an indifferent attitude towards the Georgian context. The authenticity of these letters of Sallust

was doubted for a long time. The great German historian, one of the most competent researchers of Roman history, Theodore Mommsen appears as one of the main tone givers of such a skeptical attitude. The situation changed substantially at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries.

Mainly with the efforts of German historians, first of all, Robert Paulsen and Eduard Meyer, the truth was finally revealed. The dispute on this topic has ended. Modern science has no doubt that these two letters were indeed written by Sallust. (5. 181-182)

History is made by people. Especially prominent people. According to the English historian Arnold Toynbee, "this creative minority". Gaius Julius Caesar was undoubtedly one of the colorful figures among them. Therefore, perhaps, it would not be without interest to touch on Sallust's dependence on Caesar. Especially since they were contemporaries and knew each other well. A linear, positive or negative approach to Sallust's dependence on Caesar should not be correct and will never give us a complete, exhaustive, idea of the mentioned issue. The issue is complex and multifaceted. It should be noted that there is no unanimity among historians in assessing this issue. The polemical charge makes his discussion on this topic even more interesting. The famous German historian Theodor Mommsen, who was a great admirer of Caesar, sees Sallust as a supporter of Caesar. Our author fully shares this opinion of Mommsen, although he tries to specify some details. As he notes, Mommsen's point of view seems acceptable only for the first phase of Sallust's work. Later, Sallust's attitude towards Caesar's personality underwent a drastic change. What caused such a metamorphosis? The author emphasizes that his reasons lie primarily in Sallust's worldview. "Sallust criticizes the nobility and the senate, but he is not in favor of democracy either. He is very skeptical of the plebs. His ideal is city states. Disagreement with Caesar is a logical consequence of this. He urged Caesar to divide the functions between the senate and the people. Sallust attacks the early republic of Rome, which led to the prosperity of Rome. By that time, this was clearly an illusion, as the days of the Roman Republic were numbered." (3.13-21) Thus, as it turns out, the disagreement between Sallustius and Caesar was determined by political motives. which was reflected in Caesar's assessment.

"With Sallust, Roman historiography took a big step forward. His works are not a dry chronicle. His historical writings give a vivid picture of the political life of Rome. The author tries to prove that he stands above this struggle and that he is a non-partisan historian. Great skill and peculiar interpretation of historical facts allow Sallust to create the impression that he is

an objective historian, but this impression is misleading. Actually, we are dealing with trending papers." (3.22) This is how the Georgian historian summed up Sallust's work. It was the right approach. According to the English historian Richard Cobb, "a historian is not a cold-blooded clinician." (9.254)

We think it would have been desirable for him to have published his work Sallust as Historian as a separate book, but for some reason he did not do so, why he refrained from doing so is difficult to say. In our opinion, such a decision should not seem justified. To a significant extent, this explains why he left a much weaker trace in Georgian antilogy than it actually was.

Thus, Prof. Givi Gamrekel wrote an interesting work "Sallustius as a Historian", which does not belong to the field of empirics, factology, but has a theoretical character and appears as an organic component of source knowledge and historiography of ancient world history. Prof. In the form of Givi Gamrekel, we are dealing with one of the competent specialists in this field in Georgia, who left his mark in the field of teaching, studying and popularizing ancient world history source studies and historiography in Georgia. No Georgian researcher interested in this topic can ignore his work on Sallust. The work fully meets the requirements of Georgian historiography of the Soviet period and is an important acquisition of Georgian antilogy of that period. It should be quite reasonable that his work has attracted the attention of specialists, first of all, of course, the official opponents of Acad. Simon Kakhchishvili and Assoc.

Nata Kvezereli-Kopadze received a positive evaluation. This, of course, was the success of the young novice historian. We consider his work to be a positive side. 1. He shows considerable insight into the works of Sallust, which is, of course, not accidental and, first of all, is a logical result of empirical, factual, knowledge of the material. It is based on the rich literature on Sallust, both in Georgian, Russian and German, which enabled him to collect very interesting and diverse scientific information and try to understand it. He conveys the views of Sallust. This is of great importance from the point of view of scientific evaluation of his thought, otherwise this whole reasoning will fall down by the principle of dominoes. He is well acquainted with the eras of which Sallust wrote. This is obviously very good and a plus of his work. Great erudition and the ability of scientific analysis are combined and complement each other.

2. The work does not represent a complete narration of the facts. This is not a simple collection of facts. Such work is not interesting. He highlighted the strengths and weaknesses of Sallust's defenses and reduced as much information

as possible to explain them. It can avoid both differences. Apologizing or underestimating Sallust as a historian is unacceptable, as is a different attitude. His work represents an attempt at a middle ground. The approach of a scientist with research responsibilities naturally has its own characteristics and shortcomings. That is why it is not appropriate to praise his work or take an indifferent, skeptical position.

3. Because of Marxist stereotypes and stamps, his judgment is justified, it should not seem, it is physical and we consider it hypercritical. His attitude to Marxism can be considered loyal. In our opinion, the minimum compromise was caused by this, which seems to be a kind of happy exception in the background of the Georgian history of that period. This scientific freedom remains one of the main virtues of all works when working on historical facts, not to be limited, not to fall into some framework.

4. Our opinion, the news in the newspaper, can basically be two different: a. He will establish his own position. This is expressed by not sharing the point of view of one part of historians and agreeing with another part of historians, the difference is more precisely in this. Here we have to deal with related issues. b. He has his own opinion, observation, assumption. For example, we really believe that Sallust's worldview, which, as the author points out, was in the shadows and less developed.

5. This paper, in fact, presents the skills of scientific research to avoid equilibrium. It naturally has its strengths and weaknesses. Its scientific potential is well demonstrated here. That was the main thing. We should look at this work from this point of view.

\*\*\*

In the post-Soviet period, Prof. Givi Gamrekeli wrote a solid work "Amian Marceline as a historian and political thinker". We consider this to be his best work. This was his doctoral thesis, which he defended on April 2, 2004. Official opponents: Prof. Nana Khazaradze, Prof. Guram Lortkipanidze, Prof. Levan Gordezian.

Experts positively assess the main merit of this work. Unfortunately, it can be said that I am looking for a lot of traces of this interesting material, but nowhere did this material help us much in this in-depth coverage. The first, precisely, the opponents of the assessment of this paper have tried and are the main predecessors, they will appear. The defense materials are even more complete, comprehensive, they will create an idea of Avkargian in his work

"Amian Marceline as a historian and political thinker". Its significance, you think, should remain in this.

We have to touch one environment, which, as it seems, is not a loved one, is not considered small and has not been paid attention to. Of course, the work belongs to world history. This part of Dzeve and his generation may not be two, but it does not belong to empiricism, factology, field and, more theoretically, source knowledge and historiographical characteristics. That's why, probably, more prof. We assigned this work of Givi Gamrekeli to World History Source Studies and Historiography (07.00.04) and not to World History (07.00.03)

Prof. Givi Gamrekeli's work "Amiane Marceline as a historian and political thinker". Genetically congratulate the previous work "New Year's Historian", and it appears as a continuation of it. In one case, Roman historiography deals with the "Golden Age", and in the other, with the period of decline.

Of course, he defended his doctoral thesis earlier. It was completely within his grasp. What is the cause of such a long pause is difficult to say. Perhaps we should look for it in its human characteristics. Perhaps the scientific work hindered the fruitful work in sports journalism? It seems that he was trying to find the optimal combination of these two fields. Perhaps passivity was promoted by the non-concrete environment of those times?

Now it's time to move on to the discussion of the paper. Content with content. It consists of nine excellent chapters and conclusions. After getting to know him, a question naturally arises. This is an interesting topic, isn't it? Isn't it easier to unload it and sort it out more competently? In our opinion, such detailing should not be desirable. The reader's image is scattered, it is difficult to concentrate on this scientific study without considering more structures and specific features.

The list of issues discussed here is as follows. The introduction talks about the relevance of the topic, the purpose of the research, the scientific novelty of the work, and the practical importance of the work. The first chapter will deal with the historian's biography. The second chapter deals with the history of Rome before Julian Marcellinus. The third chapter is source knowledge. Antecedents and sources. The fourth chapter of the work deals with the very topical issue of Amiane Marcelliani's political views. Chapter Five Ammianus and Julian the Apostate, Chapter Six discusses the religious views of Ammianus. Later it is called the seventh chapter. About the environment. The eighth chapter is Amianian about the war between Rome and Persia and

Georgia. In the ninth chapter, the issue of Ammian Marcellini throughout the centuries is discussed. And finally, obviously, the conclusion.

First of all, it should be noted that he conveys the views of Ammian. This, of course, is very good, and is one of the main merits of his reasoning on this subject. This allows him to lead the discussion on the mentioned issue and make interesting conclusions. We are dealing with a scientific approach to the issue, which, naturally, has its strengths and weaknesses, and we do not consider it appropriate to evaluate his work on Amiens as an apologetic. This is another positive side of his discussion on this topic.

It tries to avoid both extremes. Apologetic assessment or underestimation of Ammian's views. This is obviously very good. His discussion on this topic, in our opinion, can be considered as an attempt to find a middle way. Of course, it does not represent the last instance of truth. It must not be right. Historical science does not grasp one truth. It would be equivalent to his death. These views can freely become the subject of scientific debate, which, by the way, the official opponents of the thesis have done. Unfortunately, we cannot get our hands on this material, and we have not been able to find any traces of it, at least not yet.

Amiane Marceliane's work is called "Deeds". It chronologically covers the period from 96 to 378. It consists of 31 books. The first 13 books have not reached us. The part that is published chronologically covers the period 358-378 years. He is quite a reliable source and pays a lot of attention not only to the description of events, but also to understanding and evaluation, which gives his discussion on this topic a historiographical weight. It is interesting to note that we will find information about the history of Georgia in the writings of Ammian Marceline. The Georgian author tries to find out two issues: how reliable is Ammian's writing and how he evaluates historical events and famous people.

First of all, he obviously tries to emphasize the relevance of scientific study of this problem. Here is what he wrote. "In one word, "Res Gastae" refers to such issues, the study of which is very relevant for modern science. At the same time, if we take into account the uniqueness of the work, its style, it becomes clear that the work of Ammianus Marcellinus, despite its one flaw (when 13 books are missing), will have many copies in the future, because he is a historian of such "permanent" great values as Sallust, Titus Livius and Tacitus" ( 10.4.)

After that, it is natural to discuss the purpose of listening to him. "The aim of the study is to present the place and significance of Roman history in the history of Roman literature. showing their direction with earlier historical

writers such as Sallust and Titus Livius, Tacitus and Suetonius. Third and Fourth Roman historical science declined. Almost nothing of value is created. The different Ammian Marceline spoke a new word and presented us as the heir to the dignity of the old historian. His work has been compared both to his early predecessors, for whom Amiens is a superior historian, and to his younger contemporaries. Also the advantage of Amiens here. When on this or that controversial issue, Ammian's position is justified here too" (10.4), he quite rightly emphasizes that Ammian Mareline was one of the historians of that era, how many creatives have a positive attitude towards him, you think, you feel.

A great place in the work is devoted to Marcel, a thinker and politician of this opinion. He shows considerable insight into this issue, which is a positive aspect of his reasoning on this topic. Its main point of departure is a thorough knowledge of Ammian's work. It should be so. This is obviously very good. "The optimism of the historian should be considered together with the analysis of the state of the Roman state. It combines the senatorial is the senatorial is the opinion of the part that threatens the event and can be corrected. It was completely unacceptable for Ammianus that Rome - the "sinful bastard" should perish. (10. 4-5) How well-founded was Ammian's optimism? "Of course, a writer of such power and erudition gave the Romans a certain hope, but his opinion, as it soon becomes clear, was not strengthened by anything. Ammianus remains unclear about the failure of the Roman Empire. (10.5) Such optimism, of course, does not appear in an empty place, and his words, first of all, are rooted in Amiens' worldview. One of the prominent representatives of the senatorial aristocracy of his official activity. (10.4)

For a long time it was learned that Ammianus was a mere imitator of Tus. In recent historiography, the opinion, which does not apply to the work of Ammianus, is usually with Epigonus, as it was before, as a worthy successor and successor of the work of Tacitus. It should be more correct. "The work presented in Amiens is different from other plants, although his work, which is chronologically but a continuation of the tacit, he is by no means an imitator of this great historian. He is rather a successor to Tacitus. With his clearly defined worldview, his own views on a number of different issues. (10.5). This, of course, is very good, and is another part of his reasoning on the subject.

He does not agree with Ammianus as a historian, he supports a different view and follows the achievements of European historiography.

"In our understanding, the Romans and the Greeks of Ammianoperia, where the Greeks are brought up among the equal partners of the Romans. Amian is hostile. When it comes to what Amian knows about Georgia, where

there are many noteworthy and interesting things, we must take into account the general attitude of the historian towards Georgia, which leads to his general wrong conclusion" (10.5). This excerpt can be conditionally divided into two parts. The first where emphasis is placed on the equal partnership of Romans and Greeks in the Roman Empire and the second, which deals primarily with the history of Georgia.

It is possible to generalize the Greek so that "the same and the Romans are equal partners" but the actual accentuation probably still requires great care and is controversial.

From Septimius Severus onwards, those pererators were barbarians. The army was also barbaric (11). It might have been for Amiens' preferred storage. As for the critical attitude towards Ammian's reports on Georgia, it is, without a doubt, full of rational grain, it should be completely and really stopped.

In the paper, in our opinion, one of the interesting historiographical parts. Where it is to trace the evolution where it is located in the historical scientific literature. In evaluating Amiens as a historian. It includes two distinct periods. The initial dominant was the consolidation of Amiens's contribution. This was manifested in the fact that he was acquired as an intellectual "vassal" of Tacitus. Along with this topic, different opinions are written in historical scientific literature, how many echoes were heard in Georgian historiography. This is often associated with the severity of the style of Ammianus, who wrote not in Greek, but in Latin, and they feel, therefore Ammianus' work remained neglected for a long time" (5. 272-273). The desired demand is to broaden the discussion in this regard, scientific discussion, which would give the coverage of this topic a polemical charge and, we think, become even more interesting, would enrich the content and bring profitable points. Unfortunately, the author goes completely different and ignores this topic in silence. We do not exclude the possibility that the author does not share this opinion. Then this, we think, should be accepted more transparently. In a word, this kind of approach not only left us with a feeling of helplessness and made us want to talk.

In the 20s of the 20th century, there was a sharp change in Amian's attitude. However, the apologist of Amiens as a historian is probably still. Great caution is required and may be excessive. All of this was greatly contributed to by the good passing technique of this merit, the merits of his writing, without a doubt. Nobody talks about his episode anymore. (10.6-7). "Every aspect of his work was investigated, the opinions of Roman history, the study of the historical position, it was recognized that Ammianus is not only a historian in



the first place, but also a critical writer who has the talent of artistic reflection of reality." (10.7) This is not surprising. In the ancient period, history appears as one of the varieties of word-cosmic literature, Quintilian's study "History is written not firmly, but always". The emphasis is not on the content, but on the very beautiful presentation. As we think, it is desirable to say a few words about what was done in Georgia, the vision of studying the work of Ammian. What was implemented and what needed to be done. If nothing was written on this issue in Georgian, this too should be written. We think everything is transparent. The Georgian context is always beneficial in terms of content, it would have enriched the interesting paper and added more elements to it.

The article talks about the biography of Ammian Marcellini. Due to the scarcity, the transfer of his biography was not at all an early task, as it may seem at first glance. This was an advantage.

It deals with the activities and key issues in the life of Ammian Marcellini. In fact, work with periodization and intraperiodization of history. Discussion from this point of view is interesting and relevant. The fact that 363 years, when Emperor Julian (361-363). This is where his military career ends. He travels and collects material for his upcoming book. The second such significant moment must appear to be the year 383, when he settled in Rome. As it is more secure. There is a high probability that the great historian was born in 330 and that in 400. (10.7-9). Here he did not say anything new and shared the opinion published in the historical scientific literature. to advance, not lagging behind modern historiography.

The author focuses on the period before Julian's rule. How did Ammian Marceline assess this passage? He dwells at length on two points. What was the attitude of Ammianus Marcellinus towards Emperor Constantine the Great (306-337) and his son Constantius (337-361). The issue is interesting and complex. The author thinks that Ammianus may have been too harsh towards Emperor Constantine, which could have been due to two circumstances. One of them is his religious policy, which was not supported in the circle in which the historian was moving, and Ammianus was more negative towards his son Constantius, which echoed the dissatisfaction of the pagan circles to which Ammianus belonged to the Christian monarch. (10.5) Despite all this, the dependence of Ammian Marcellinus on Constantius must be positive "according to Ammian Marcellinus, who saw some positive moments along with one or another weak side of this emperor. Constantius over the years in one way or another got rid of difficulties, preserved the integrity of the state and got rid of domestic difficulties as well. (10.12)

How did Amyane Marcellin look at history? What sources did he use in the process of working on this paper? To what extent was the source knowledge and historiography of the issue looked into? Ammani's attitude to theoretical issues should probably not seem uninteresting. We consider it interesting and relevant to discuss the issue from this point of view. We get the impression that Amaine's theoretical views in the dissertation can be considered relatively fainter, weaker. It would be desirable to give a little more attention and space to the coverage of this issue. This would further enrich his discussion in terms of content. It must be said that he seems to have a rather high opinion of history. He was considered a follower of pragmatic historiography and one of the prominent representatives, which was founded by the famous historian Thucydides. (460-396) he "understood history, on the one hand, as the development of events (*Res Gestae*), where people fought for power, influence in the state, and, on the other hand, the struggle of countries and states for primacy among themselves. Amyane Marceline was of the same opinion. He fully shared the following view of Thucydides. "My work, in which there is nothing fabulous, may be less attractive (to some), but if anyone wishes to study the reality of past events and the possibility of future events, it will be enough for me if he finds my work useful." (10.13)

Justice and objectivity were the main qualities of the historian Ammian Marcellinus. The non-objective position and bias of the historian seemed completely unimaginable. In his deep belief, "the historian who is silent about the events commits no less than a lie, who is the one who is not protected from writing". (12.20) In his deep belief, "Chronology is telling the truth, not showing off." According to David Imum, "The first quality of a historian is to be impartial." It is possible that Ammianus, of ancient authorship, well expressed the idea of a historian. History is a subjective science. Naturally, it will be presented. Was it as desirable as possible? It is possible that in this case, we are dealing with his theoretical-cognitive ideal. Discussion in this regard is desirable and would enrich this interesting paper. Did Ammianus view history as a dependent science? probably not. History has a scientific value. Author of many ancient authors, he emphasizes beautiful narrative in his historical work. There is a high probability that the history of other ancient authors perceived history as one of the varieties of literal literature. Of course, this does not diminish the importance of history in his eyes.

As a historian, Amiane is very informed and, as his biographers unanimously point out, including the Georgian author, as a historical source, he is completely reliable and trustworthy. This is the main point of Ammian's

writings. The importance of his work was precisely that. "Ammian used numerous sources, but he followed them blindly, examined them step by step, was critical, expressed his attitude. The main mainstay was still what lives in his own time on the painting. He also spoke with the participants and co-attendees of the great events of the historians. Their narration should be recorded and taken into account. Since he was no longer serving in the army, he was traveling according to a pre-planned plan. This makes Amien's reports believable." (10.16) Ammian's critical attitude to the sources, the statement, is not accidental, it does not appear on an empty surface (5.47-61. 13.159-17).

As a historian, he should have had a well-enhanced archival reference. "As a famous figure and writer, Amiens had access to the state archives, which no one could use so easily. He cites Constantius and the correspondence of Shapur II, giving a very high evaluation to Saarvo, which informs his words: "He who does not need to tell about everything in detail, he did not even know about it in the state archive." It is interesting that despite such assessment, the historian does not lose his characteristic caution and sense of objectivity. In particular, he does not trust the edicts of that Perator Constantius, because he praises himself excessively. Amiens makes extensive use of various archival documents, in particular those that are devoted to the trials dedicated to insulting the emperor." (10.15-16).

Another interesting and, most importantly, reliable source is the widely used Amian diaries. (10.16). Amiane is quite strong and deep in source knowledge, besides the memoirs, it is recognized as a reliable source, because the author will not be involved in its publication and writing them, other factors. (14)

It is worth noting that Amiens looked into the issues of historiography and this is another one of him as a historian. "It is difficult to name another Roman historian so familiar with ancient literature as Ammianus Marcellinus" (10.12) Ammianest must seem a little strange to the famous historian Tus Livius. (59 BC - Christmas 17). "Here the historian is not referring to Titus Livius. It is also noteworthy that Titus Livius, how many works Ammianus knows perfectly, is not named even once in the entire "History" (10.17).

Policy and security of Ammian Mareline and discussion of attitude towards Juliane the apostate Prof. Givi appears as part of Gamrekeli's work.

A few Ammian differences: The two parts comprise the first arrangement of Ammian's attachment to prominent figures of ancient Greece and Rome. How did Amyane evaluate their work? It is interesting and relevant,

and its promotion should be quite reasonable. After that, Amiens's political beliefs are discussed.

First of all, he must be tall, so that Ammianus, as a true Hellene, would achieve great honor and was taller than Alexander the Great (356-323 BC).

Ammianus must have had a very positive opinion of the famous Roman commander Scipio Aemilianus (185-129 BC) whose name is associated with a brilliant victory over Carthage in the Third Punic War. (149-146 B.C.) Ammianus was also greatly admired by the orator Cicero (106-43 B.C.) and the politician and commander Gnaeus Pompeius (106-48 B.C.) (10.17) Ammianus' dependence on Pompey seems excessive. Therefore, it would be desirable to expand the discussion in this direction more widely. This would add a polemical charge to the discussion of the issue and, we think, would be more interesting.

Attention is drawn to the indifferent attitude of Ammianus Marcellinus towards Gaius Julius Caesar. (BC 100-44) It is significant that Ammianus mentions Caesar's name three times in his writings. This, of course, is very little. Here the real situation was reflected. Caesar did not enjoy the sympathy of Amiens. He does not like Caesar's dictatorial aspirations." (10.17. 15.16)

Prof. Givi Gamrekeli emphasizes that Ammian Marcellinus should not show mercy to the first emperor Octavian Augustus (30 BC - 14 AD). "What is the attitude of Ammianus towards such an emperor as Augustus?" "The historian does not attack the emperor directly, but referring to one of his closest people as the aug of Cornelius Gallus, the governor of Egypt, seems to us to be an indirect accusation of Augustus." (10.17.16) It is interesting to note that "Amiens shows considerable kindness to all persons who did not favor the establishment of a dictatorship" (10.18).

As you can see, the attitude of Ammianus Marcellinus towards the emperors is clearly negative. Against this background, his view on the emperor Marcus Aurelius (161-180) and Julian the Apostate (361-363) appears as a kind of happy exception. Ammianus positively evaluates their work. In this case, Ammianus follows the tradition of "good emperors" in Roman historiography. (10.18) evaluates Caligula (37-41), Nero (54-68), Domitian (81-96), and Commodus (180-192) more negatively. (10.18) "Even when Ammianus praises this or that emperor, he always shows moderation in this respect. Nowhere is there any obvious attempt at slandering Khotbi, which we find in many historians. Let's say with the same Velius Paterculus or Valerius Maximus. Their praise of Tiberius is beyond all scope. Ammianus's moderation is noticeable even when he talks about his beloved Julian. (7.19) the main

advantage of Amiens as a historian is emphasized. on striving for objectivity. This is obviously very good.

He then moves on to discuss Amiens' political views. Amian Marceline is a monarchist. His political ideal is monarchy. "Amiane creates the ideal of the ruler, who has the character of being withdrawn and distant from life. The historian is in favor of such a strong monarchical system, which should be headed by a merciful, just, noble, educated monarch... A true ruler will not try to increase his personal property, he will restrain his passions, he will not be angry, the power of the emperor is such that he can overcome even a serious handicap for his owner. ". (10.19) As you can see, Ammian Marceline is too optimistic and is in captivity of illusions. "Of course, a writer of such power and erudition gave hope to a certain part of the Romans, but his opinions, as it soon became clear, were not strengthened by anything, the Roman Empire was on the verge of destruction - his real reasons remained unclear to Ammianus. This highly educated historian did not have the ability to foresee the future." (10.24)

Attention is drawn to Amian's attitude towards different social strata of society. The issue is interesting and relevant. It caused certain differences of opinion in Georgian historiography and diametrically opposite opinions were expressed. Some of them show an indifferent attitude towards the mentioned issue and seem skeptical. We cannot say as if "this person has little to say about the broad sections of the population". (5.272) This kind of pessimistic tone intentionally or unintentionally creates a darkened view of the mentioned issue. The author's approach to this problem seems relatively more realistic to us, we fully agree with him that Ammian's discussion on this topic is interesting and, undoubtedly, contains a rational grain of truth. He avoids a scientific dialogue with the Georgian historian, which, in our opinion, should not be correct. It is difficult to say what is the reason for such a move.

Let's start with the middle class, on the strength of which the glory and power of the Roman state depended a lot, and the decline of the middle class was accompanied by the weakening of the Roman Empire. caused a crisis. Amiane must have been well aware of the place and importance of the middle class. "In our opinion, Ammianus' views on the condition and role of the middle class are quite correct and are confirmed even by the fact that without a spineless middle class, which was no longer concerned with the interests of the state and only thought about everyday problems, the leadership of the empire could not maintain stability, neither in the West nor in the East, which soon had dire consequences for Rome." (10.21)

It seems that Amiane does not think highly of democracy. "Ammianus criticizes the lower strata of the Roman population no less harshly, the attitude of our historian to the plebs - that is, the attitude of the aristocracy, which was more worried about the fate of the state, and which believes that it is the corrupt crowd that will destroy it." (10.20)

Amian's attitude towards slaves is interesting. His position should be much more humane and progressive. First of all, it should be noted that he does not perceive the slave as a "talking tool". This was already a step forward. "The historian believes that the master has no right to take the life of a slave. He condemns the morals of the Persians, who are "so cruel that they even appropriated the right of life and death to slaves and the 'low castes'." In Rome, according to Seneca, there were similar rules, although this did not apply to the philosopher himself. He often drank and dined with his beloved slaves (those learned in philosophy, probably of Greek origin) at the table." (10.23) The specific gravity of slaves in late antiquity was not at all as great as Soviet historiography emphasized. "We share the opinion of those historians who believe that slaves played a relatively minor role at least for the last period of the Roman Empire." (10.23) was a completely correct approach.

As a military man, he was naturally worried about the decline in the Roman army. More and more often we see Germans in advanced positions. They replace the Romans. Ammianus was against the "pro-barbarism" of the Roman army, but he had little power to change anything. (10.22-23)

"The idealization of ancient Rome meant that nothing was actually done to prevent a new catastrophe. Amiane wrongly assessed the situation created in his time. He attached too much importance to the events of the past. His optimism would have been justified if the historian had some plan to avert the collapse, but this was beyond Amiens's strength." (10.25)

A brief overview of European historiography draws attention. He shows a lot of insight in this matter, which is another plus of his discussion on this topic. It refers to the controversy between the historian Grant and Jones on this issue. The Georgian Mklevari fully shares the historian Grant's point of view when it comes to the assessment of Amiens. Historian Jones expressed a diametrically opposite opinion on this matter. He is more critical of Ammianus' accounts and thinks that "the condition of the middle class in Rome could not have been so dire." Jones criticizes Ammian and is more inclined to the opinion that Ammian was obscuring the situation. The Georgian author, like Grant, does not think so. He tried to fix his position. This is obviously very good. In our opinion, it can be considered as one of the novelties of the work. (10.21)

"He is not able to fully understand the reasons for the fall of the state, and it can be said that he fed on illusions in many cases. He remained a Roman patriot who deeply experienced the decline of his beloved state." (10.25)

After that, he naturally dwells on the attitude of Ammianus Marcellinus towards the emperor Julian (361-363). Discussion of the topic has two sides. source knowledge and historiographical. How reliable is Ammianus' work as a source for Julian's work and how does he evaluate Julian's work? Both of these issues are interesting.

First of all, he emphasizes the source knowledge of the writings of Ammianus on Julian. It appears as a reliable source for the study of the history of this era, Julian's rule. This, of course, is its big plus. "Other historians also wrote a lot about Julian, some with hatred, some with admiration, but it is clear that the most noteworthy are the reports of Ammianus." (10.28) This was one side of the coin, source knowledge. There is another side to the coin. historiographical.

Amian, naturally, tries to understand and evaluate Julian's work. This reasoning of his is interesting and has a historiographic load. This is another new friend, Rakursya. From this point of view, the XXV book of Amiana attracts attention. Historians judge Ammian's attitude towards Julian according to this passage. The sympathy of Ammianus, obviously, did not arise on empty soil and is largely explained by the fact that "the main virtue of the emperor was the good conduct of military affairs." (10.26)

The next topical topic discussed in the work has a purely confessional meaning and aims to discuss the religious views of Ammian Marcellinus. The topic is serious and its clarification is of fundamental importance. It has a genetic connection with the political views of Ammian and appears to us as a continuation of it. "Amian, a pagan, does not even have a trace of fanaticism towards his own religion. On the contrary, an impression of his indifference can be created. The influence of Neoplatonism should be seen here. A noteworthy event of this transition period was that many did not break ties with paganism, but were not opponents of Christianity, but were eclectic, taking what they liked from one and the other religion. It seems that Amian belonged to the number of such people." (10.32)

Amian believes in fate, which, in his deep belief, fulfills the will of an almighty deity. He strictly separates the two commandments, fate and chance, and thinks that chance plays a great role in history. (10.33)

At the end of the work, three issues are discussed: "Amendment about the outside world" (10.33-35), "Amendment about the war between Rome and

Persia and Georgia" (10.35-39). And finally "Amiane Marceline throughout the ages". (10.39-40).

Let's start with the first "Amen about the outer world". As the title clearly shows, here we are talking about the relations of the Roman Empire with other countries. All the neighboring peoples of the Roman Empire can be said to be divided into two groups. "civilized Persians and all the rest, or barbarians." (10.33) Here he discusses many difficult and evil issues. "After describing many barbarian peoples or the civilized world opposing Rome, or after evaluating the possibilities, the author draws a completely fair conclusion that his state is in a very serious danger, while Ammianus does not even doubt that the Romans will emerge victorious in this battle." (10.35) The subsequent course of events made it convincingly clear that Amiens had what he wanted.

In this section of the subsequent work, we consider it the most interesting and it is associated with the history of Georgia. "The Battle of Amiens and Persia and About Georgia". In this context, the problem of Georgia, of course, was not accidental and, first of all, it was determined by purely pragmatic considerations. Ammian's reasoning has two sides, the source is theological and historiographical. How reliable Amiane's writings are as a historical source when studying the history of Georgia and how he assessed the current issues of Georgian history, about him. "Amiens takes a great interest in the countries involved in the endless affairs of Rome and Persia." Here, first of all, Armenia and Georgia should be defined." (100.35) In the writings of Amiens, we come across references to the history of ancient Georgia. "Regardless of individual errors, Amiane Marceline's reports are undoubtedly a valuable source for the study of the history of Georgia in the second half of IV". (10.39)

Scientific studies in the work are more diverse: 1. He carefully studied the sources and scientific literature, both in Georgian, Russian and German languages. The chapter gathers rich scientific information and draws interesting conclusions. This is mainly expressed by not sharing the views of one group of historians and supporting another group of mainstream historians who, according to him, are more relevant to the issue, perhaps even more appreciative. It is to establish its own position on this matter. This is obviously very good. It is one of the main virtues of a person detained for consideration of the case. Our opinion may be different, we may consider the approach as a kind of novelty of the work. 2. However, very little and little, but still there are some news, interesting findings, observations, assumptions, bypassing time, throwing away, it is not appropriate and cannot form an adequate idea about this work.



First of all, of course, we always consider: a. Non-standard approach of Amiens as a historian.

In his deep conviction, Ammianus was not a mere imitator of Tacitus, an epigone, as scholars have long held. He considers Ammianus's work a worthy continuation of Tacitus. This decision should be right and more visible. Such is his position. It does not lag behind and stands to announce the news and innovations that take place in this field in European historiography. This is another unit of work and it is not right to ignore it. b. He rather thinks that he should share that Amiens perceived the empire as the state of the Romans and Greeks and sees in them, first of all, equal partners, which in relation to the health of other peoples in this state, Amiens is very inferior to them. According to G., his opinion determined the attitude of Amiens towards Emperor Constantine the Great. He draws attention to two circumstances: the purely confessional side and the negative attitude of Amiens towards his son Constantius. (10.5)

It should be noted here that it would be desirable to publish both his candidate's and doctoral dissertations as a separate book, in the form of a monograph. But for some reason he did not do so. Why he refrained from doing so is hard to say. To a significant extent, this explains why he left a relatively more modest mark in Georgian antilogy than it actually was. Both these works of his. "Sallustius as a historian" and "Ammianus Marcellinus as a historian and political figure" are much less known to the general public and only a narrow circle of specialists is familiar with the matter. In the present paper, we have attempted to address this discrepancy and bring his contribution to the field to the general public. We make a very careful assumption that, it seems, he could not find the optimal variant of combining sports journalism and scientific research, and left a much more modest mark in Georgian antilogy than he actually managed. Did sports journalism turn out to be more of a priority? Of course, we do not categorically prove anything, this is just our cautious assumption.

\*\*\*

In 1991, his interesting book "Journey to Old Bookstores" was published. These were scientific-popular essays that had a purely cognitive load. He will tell Georgian society about old book stores in popular language. In fact, this is the history of libraries.

The small but meaningful book "Georgians who survived Genghis-Khan socialism" published in 2010 attracts attention. This book, of course, does not touch on the history of ancient countries. Here, if we can say so, he presents us in a completely different role and shows quite an insight into the history of the 20th century, specifically, the history of the Soviet Union, towards which his attitude is clearly negative. Which, by the way, is well revealed in the title of the book. It should be noted that this term belongs to the Russian emigrant writer Roman Gul. Obviously, a non-immigrant writer could not say that.

Another of his books, "Riddles of History", which was released in 2012, attracts attention and has a purely cognitive load. It has a scientific-popular character and aims to popularize history. Today, knowledge of history is at a rather low level. This book will help us to correct this gap. Its meaning lies in this.

It should be perfectly reasonable that in the promotion of the history of ancient countries, the emphasis is mainly on theoretical issues. On source knowledge and historiography of the history of ancient countries. In this sense, attention is drawn not only to his work on Sallust and Ammianus Marcellini, but also to scholarly popular reviews of other historians. Their list looks quite solid. Lucian, Thucydides, Herodotus, Tacitus, Xenophon, Polybius, Plutarch, Suetonius, Curtius Rufus. We consider his interesting article on the great German historian Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903) to be one of the best. We should single out his interesting scientific and popular work on one of the founders of the study of ancient world history in Georgia, Prof. about Alexander Tsereteli, which is also historiographical in nature.

Prof. Givi Gamrekeli was not only a competent specialist in his subject, but also an unusually erudite person: a wide-ranging historian, an excellent sports journalist, one of the last Mohicans of the indigenous Georgian intelligentsia.

## references

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University archive, personal file of Professor Givi Gamrekeli. N7485;

Ed. Frimen, Methods of studying history, M., 1905;

Г. Гамрекели, Саллюстии как историк-Автореферат дерессии на соискание ученой страница кандидата исторических наук, Тб., 1970;

M. Kalandadze, evaluation of Georgian historiography of the Soviet period, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. Faculty of Humanities. Institute of World History. Department of New and Recent History. VIII Conference. Tbilisi, 2015;

Greek and Roman historians. Tbilisi, 1998;

c. Gozalishvili, Chrestomathy of Ancient History, vol., 1951;

Al. Tsereteli, Ancient Rome, part two, Tbilisi, 1961;

c. Kavtaria, History of Rome, Part One, Vol., 2016;

About history, Vol., 2010;

c. Gamrekeli, Amiane Marceline, historian and political thinker, auto-abstract for obtaining the scientific degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences, Tbilisi, 2004;

L. Sanic, The Roman Empire, vol., 1984;

C. Koranashvili, Historian profession, volume, 1986;

F. Lomashvili, History of the Philosophy of History, Part One, Vol. 2003;

И. Биск, Курс лективные по строизведению новой и новейшей истории, Тамбов, 1971. В. Ропомаруов, S. Rafalchuk, O. Nikonov, Источниковедение новой и новейшей истории, М., 2012. И. Григорьева, Источниковедение по новой и новейшей истории, Стран Европы и Америка, М., 2017;

Plutarch, Selected Biographies, vol., 1975. А. Шахермайр, Александр Македонский, М., 1984. М. Aleksishvili, Alexander the Great, volume, 1950.

L. Sanik, Alexander the Great, book, 1984.

Of course, the great German historian Theodor Mommsen appears as the main tone of Caesar's glorification. see Т. Моммзен, История Рима, Т., 3. от смерти Суллы до битвы при Тапсе, М., 1941. p. 472-475 Historian Guillermo Ferrero developed a diametrically opposite point of view when evaluating Caesar's work. He considered it completely differently and saw in him an "adventurist". c. Ferrero, Julius Caesar, vol., 2016. L. Sanik, Caesariada, Tbilisi, 1989. М. Aleksishvili, Gaius Julius Caesar, book, 1961;