

УДК 392.5

DOI: 10.24411/2713-2021-2020-00034

Ketevan Tsimintia

**PROHIBITIVE AND INHIBITIVE FACTORS OF MARRIAGE IN SAMEGRELO
(WESTERN GEORGIA)***

Social relationships, including marriage, were regulated by ecclesiastical and secular laws as well as by customs in Georgian society. Various kinds of prohibitions existed. Today majority of the customs are lost because of globalization. However, customs concerning marriage restrictions are relatively well preserved in people's memory. Different clans that do not marry each other were revealed by the ethnological research in historical-ethnographic region of Georgia — Samegrelo. Breaking marriage restriction by different socially related groups was strictly prohibited. Moreover, in some cases, clans or lineages which became relatives artificially had to follow the same strict rules of marriage prohibition. Different clans, lineages and patronymies studied by the ethnographic research conducted on the field, revealed the strength of the customs even today. The result of the research revealed, that prohibitive factors of marriage between different clans, lineages or patronymies were customary rules in Samegrelo, such are “*ginochama*”, serving to the same shrine, becoming relatives via Christianity and etc. However, marriage prohibition determined by Christianity affected only to minor lineages and patronymies rather than the big ones or clans. The memory of common origin is inhibitive factor of marriage, but not prohibitive similarly to the memory of past social inequality.

Key words: Marriage, Prohibition, Clans, Samegrelo, Relationships.

About the author: Ketevan Tsimintia, PhD Student, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University.

Contact information: 0179, Georgia, Tbilisi, Chavchavadze av. 1. Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University; e-mail: ketevan.tsimintia075@hum.tsu.edu.ge; ketitsimintia@gmail.com.

Кетеван Циминтия

**ЗАПРЕЩАЮЩИЕ И ПРЕПЯТСТВУЮЩИЕ ПРИЧИНЫ БРАКА В САМЕГРЕЛО
(ЗАПАДНАЯ ГРУЗИЯ)**

Социальные отношения, включая брак, регулировались в грузинском обществе церковными и светскими законами, а также обычаями. Существовали разного рода запреты. Сегодня большинство обычаев утрачено из-за глобализации. Однако обычаи, касающиеся брачных ограничений, относительно хорошо сохранились в памяти людей. Различные кланы, не состоящие в браке, были выявлены этнологическими исследованиями в историко-этнографическом регионе Грузии — Самегрело. Нарушение табу на брак различными социально связанными группами строго запрещено. Более того, в некоторых случаях кланы, ставшие родственниками искусственно, должны были соблюдать те же строгие правила брачного табу. Различные кланы, родословные и отчества, изученные этнографическими исследованиями, проведенными на местах, выявили силу обычаев даже сегодня. Результат исследования показал, что запретительные факторы брака между разными кланами были обычая в Самегрело, такие как «гиночама», служение одной святыне, становление

* The research was supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation (SRNSF) [Grant No. PHDF-18-653, Ethno-Historical Aspects Connected with Disappearing Surnames in Highland Samegrelo].

Статья поступила в номер 12 декабря 2020 г.

Принята к печати 26 декабря 2020 г.

родственниками через христианство и т.д. Однако табу на брак, установленное христианством, касалось только мелких, а не больших кланов. Память об общем происхождении является сдерживающим фактором для брака, но не запретительным, как память о прошлом социальном неравенстве.

Ключевые слова: брак, запрет, клан, Самегрело, отношения.

Сведения об авторе: Кетеван Циминтия, докторант, Тбилисский Государственный Университет им. И.А. Джавахишвили.

Контактная информация: 0179, Грузия, г. Тбилиси, пр. И. Чавчавадзе 1, Тбилисский Государственный Университет им. И.А. Джавахишвили; e-mail: ketevan.tsimintia075@hum.tsu.edu.ge; ketitsimintia@gmail.com.

Relationships are regulated by legal means and customs in a society. Clans as a group of people with kinship regulate their relations by these rules. Our main goal is to study relations inside clans, specifically in connection with prohibitive and inhibitive circumstances of marriage. The research will be based on a material recorded in Western Georgia, namely in Samegrelo.

Marriage prohibition (in some cases referred as marriage taboo) was an object of interest for several anthropologists worldwide. It is not widely popular topic however since patterns of marriage taboo especially determined by clan identity is common in different societies we decided to study worldwide examples in order to better address the case of Georgia. For example, Navaho/Navajo people were studied by Kenneth Morgan, Malkolm Carr, Katherine Spencer, Doriane Wooley. Societies in Marshall Islands were studied by Robert C. Kiste, Michael A. Rynkiewich. Those societies usually have a simple kinship and their marriage rules are relatively simple as well. All these societies have some forms of marriage prohibition which results in exogamy. Since these societies do not have complex kinship, marriage is prohibited between simple kin or clans. R. Kiste and M. Rynkiewich pointed out the definition of exogamy and explained how it was regulated by two Marshall Islands population: “By exogamy, we refer to a cultural norm that theoretically prohibits marriage between members of same social category. Marshallese, like members of many societies, make a distinction between two types of kin. There are kinsmen with whom sexual relation and marriage are prohibited; and kinsmen with whom sexual relations and marriage are permissible and preferred” (Kiste-Rynkiewich 1976: 209). M. Carr, K. Spencer and D. Wolley studied Navaho clans. They discussed the findings of earlier researchers concerning prohibitive factors of marriage and came to the conclusion that “prohibition against marriage existed among parallel cousins, who are recognized as siblings in the kinship terminology and with cross-cousins” (Carr-Spencer-Wolley 1939: 246). Kenneth Morgan based his conclusion on ethnographic evidences and assumed that “since the minor clans are involved in so few marriages the observation that few or no marriages occur within the group is not statistically significant (Morgan 1979: 159) Also he pointed out that “By collapsing across communities we would be assuming that certain major clans have no marriage exchanges between them because they are in the same group, when in fact the reason for “exogamy” is that the majority of the members are in separate communities”. (Morgan 1979: 159). Other forms of kinship were studied by Bernard Chapais. He noticed that complex, developed societies usually have relationships defined not only by biology, like it is in simple societies but by also by cultural categories (Chapais 2014: 751). It should be noted, that in Georgia we are dealing with complex society and kinship is more complex and it is interesting that the relations do not depend only on biology, cultural constructs also play an important role in formation of marriage prohibition. Here we can find marriage restrictions among not only consanguineal clans but also among people who do not have consanguineal relationships.

Different clans without blood relationship but with a marriage prohibition were discovered based on ethnographic research. Information was received directly with interviews. The reasons for marriage prohibition was studied based on secondary sources as well as with archival materials.

Marriage relationships in Georgia, as well as in other countries, were regulated by civil law and after conversion to Christianity, not only a civil law but an ecclesiastical law took also effect. At the same time, keeping customs was essential. Those were typically based on beliefs among people.

Since the definitions related to our research (**patronymy, clan, lineage**) became the subject of much debate among Georgian scholars, the reasoning for the use of each of them in connection with our issue should be specified.

Patronymy, lineage, “turi”, “dino”. Various opinions exist in scholarly literature concerning patronymy in Western Georgia. The term “patronymy” originates from the Latin word “pater” (father) and “nomen” (name). Patronymy is a term used to refer to unity of patrilineal relatives usually descending from one common eponymous ancestor or it may refer to relatives living close together on a specific territory. The term initially was coined to refer more primitive societies however its existence is attested in more complex societies also (Pershits, Trayde 1989: 133). As for Georgian reality, a researcher Aleksi Robakidze confirms the existence of the patronymy and he pointed out that the use of the term patronymy toward the Caucasian people needs to be used in a very specific way. In his opinion, patronymy is the unity of relatives which is not as big as a clan (all people with common surname) neither as small as a family (Robakidze 1993: 102). A researcher Nugzar Mgeladze studied the institute patronymy in Adjara. He insisted that several patronymic organizations — Gvari, Nogro, BidzaSviloba, Modzmianoba and Mamishviloba existed there, however this explanation seems not very satisfying (Mgeladze 2004: 100). S. Bakhia-Okruashvili specified what should be named as patronymy in Georgia. In her opinion, patronymy is a unity of relatives which remember their agnatic connection up to four or sometimes even five generations and they have specific obligations towards each other. The houses of different families are concentrated in one area close to the initial house of eponymous ancestor. Agricultural works are usually conducted in a form of collective labour and the families have the obligation to help each other. Usually, different forms of collective labour exist. Also, these families sometimes have a common holiday and celebrate it together. Real or rarely mythical eponymous serves as a basis of this social institute (Bakhia-Okruashvili 2007:15). We tend to identify that the relationship of relatives denominated as “**Turi**” in Samegrelo is the one which should be defined as patronymy. It is closely related to another term lineage. Patronymy usually refers to patrilineal descent while lineage can also be of matrilineal descent. Since only patrilineal lineage is attested in Western Georgia, the term patronymy can be used, however since more general term, lineage is more common in anthropological studies, we prefer to use this term. IN case of Western Georgia, this is to refer the unity of blood relatives with some social functions — “turi”. S Bakhia-Okruashvili agrees that “turi” is patronymy in fact (Bakhia-Okruashvili 1985:71), however D. Chitanava disagrees with her and thinks that the word “**dino**” is used to reflect patronymic relations (Chitanava 2002:324). Although, in our opinion, “dino” reflects the unity of relatives of a smaller scale.

Clan, “Gvari”. Clan is defined as “kin group used as an organizational device in many traditional societies. Membership in a clan is traditionally defined in terms of descent from a common ancestor. This descent is usually unilineal, or derived only through the male (patriclan) or the female (matriclan) line. Normally, but not always, the clans are exogamous, or out-marrying: marriage within the clan is forbidden and regarded as a form of incest. From a functional perspective, clans help to unify groups by cross-cutting other forms of social organization, such as the settlement, postmarital residence patterns, or age sets” (britannica.com: 1). Unlike patronymy

and lineage, clan usually refers to a bigger unity of people, which mostly are blood relatives and have a common surname. However, clan also has social functions, like labour organization and etc. Patronymy also have such functions but patronymy refers unity of people only up to five generations. Bigger unity of blood relatives with specific social organization and functions is not defined in scholarly literature. Representatives of one surname, for example Shengelia, which even do not remember their common ancestor and they might be very numerous (more than 8 000), have some common social functions, therefore their unity is supposed to be defined for the study of Georgian anthropology and in our opinion, clan may be the best definition for this. Therefore, we will use this term in connection with the unity of all people with the same surname and claim of common origin.

“Gamnarki”. There is also one smaller unity of blood relatives which should be defined. This is so-called “Gamnarki”. It is more tight social unit. According to Paata Tskhadaia, in the highland Samegrelo one lineage was divided into several “turi” and these smaller divisions were called “Gamnarki”. “Gamnarki” usually refers to blood relatives with a common ancestor up to three generations (Tskhadaia 1985:89).

Ivane Javakhishvili noted that young age, also blood relationships and spiritual kinship between couples always was considered to be an inhibitive circumstance of marriage in the historical Georgia (Javakhishvili 1984: 266). According to the laws of king Vakhtang VI (1711—1714, 1716—1723), insanity, or simply suspected mental health of bride was considered to be an inhibitive circumstance of marriage (Law of Vakhtang VI 1981: 250). Giorgi Nadareishvili, a researcher of Georgian law history noted that ecclesiastical law regulated marriage in the middle ages. Marriage prohibition was extended on seventh degree blood relative based on church teachings (Nadareishvili 1971: 67).

A Researcher Mzia Bekaia clarified relation types and pointed out that three types of relations existed in Georgia — blood relations (descent), in-law relationships (relatives of husband and wife) and artificial (baptism, wet nursing, becoming sworn brothers). First of all, marriage prohibition existed between the couples with the same family names (i.e. surname) (Bekaia 1981: 28). Ethnologist Illia Chkonია, who studied Mtiuleti region noted that the descent from the same ancestor was a major factor of marriage prohibition, which made marriage between couples with the same surnames impossible, even if they were territorially separated, i.e. lived in distant villages (Chkonია 1955: 19). Thus the reason of imposed exogamy outlined by Morgan (see above) does not fit with Georgian reality. Marriage was still prohibited strictly even if the clans lived in distant communities.

A researcher Nugzar Antelava came to the conclusion that exogamy was kept for seven generations for agnatic relations and for four generations for cognitive relations in the beginning of the 19th and the 20th century in Samegrelo (Antelava 2005: 35). According to interviews taken on ethnographic field we encountered a proverb which proves that a marriage prohibition existed for several generations in Samegrelo: “*ziskhir ziskhirs kodzirunsia, kiansia*” (*when blood meets blood it yells*).

Apart from exogamy, i.e. prohibition based on kinship or blood relations, other inhibitive circumstances of marriage also existed in historical Georgia. In the eastern highlands of Georgia marriage was banned between “*stsorferis*” and “*tsatsalis*” — they were the couples in love with the right of petting but not of marriage (Makalatia 1925: 3; Baliauri 1991: 33). Marriage between the inhabitants of the same village or between the ones who shared the shrine was also undesirable (Makalatia 1941: 260, Abakelia 1999: 305). Couple’s social status and religion was essential (Javakhishvili 1984: 266—269). They were supposed to be of the same religion (Code of Canon Law 1987: 330).

Marriage was banned between artificially related people. Marrying nanny's relatives was prohibited as well as marrying someone bound by an oath as brothers, sisters, fathers and mothers. Bound by oath (sworn persons) are called "*chapili*" in Megrelian language (Makalatia 1941: 260). Marriage was banned between families already related with another marriage, this kind of kinship was called "*kerdz-mojgiroba*" in Samegrelo (Antelava 2005: 35).

Another prohibitive factor of marriage is a verdict created by a customary law called "*ginochama*" (cursing on an icon). We encountered several occasions of marriage prohibition connected with this practice. Those usually were based on legends and the word used to identify a marriage prohibition is "*vashiners*" ("*shina*" — means to remember, -va is a particle for negation), which, word by word, means behavior that could not be mentioned, or is not remembered by anyone or is not allowed to do so. It is the same as "taboo" — forbidden thing (Sakhokia 1956: 72). Term "taboo" means prohibition created based on real or magical superstition (Jorjaneli 1977: 46). Under the term "*vashiners*" all the prohibited actions and subjects are included, that can harm a person or his/her family (Makalatia 1941: 335).

The study of marriage prohibition between clans, records of ethnographic material clarified that we are dealing with a relatively conservative society in modern situation. Memory of historical norms is quite strong in societies. This issue, mainly based on ethnographic materials, has not been covered in the scientific literature from this perspective. Since the era of globalization has changed ethnographic characteristics quite dramatically, we consider it urgent and obligatory to record the current reality, because in a few years with the change of the values we will be facing a completely different situation.

Different prohibitive and inhibitive circumstances of marriage were revealed in Samegrelo based on our research.

"*Ginochama*" (cursing on an icon) was one of the prohibitive circumstances of marriage. Cursing on an icon — "*ginochama*" is a folk law created over the centuries and established in practice. It was quite common among Megrelians. One of the outcome of the "*ginochama*" trial was the marriage prohibition. An example of such restriction is marriage prohibition between these couples of clans — Lukava and Mikava, Lukava and Gvinjilia, Abuladze and Molashkhia, Kvaratskhelia and Changelia, Arqania and Gogokhia, Arkania and Bulia, Kakachia and Shengelia.

A specific clan connection, namely a tie through praying ("*khvama*") with a specific kinship — "*gamnarki*" is the prohibitive factor of marriage. In case of a large families, one clan may have several "*gamnarki*" and the memory about lineage is limited approximately from four up to six generations. We observed an example of this in the village of Muzhava. Descendants of Bebelia Arqania's lineage ("*gamnarki*") which live here, do not marry representatives of Kakubava or Jobava's clan. According to the legend, while buying captives, two brothers of Kakubava family and one of Jobava family, were kidnapped from Samurzakano. Bebelia Arkania saved all three of them "with the help of Saint George". Survivors of the death from the clan of Kakubava and Jobava promised to the Cross of Saint George Church to sacrifice an ox every five years as a token of gratitude, and to celebrate this day with their savior Bebelia Arkania and his "*gamnarki*" / small lineage. Special prayer ("*khvama*") is usually held. The clan of Kakubava and Arkania offer a prayer of thanksgiving — "*dunapiri*" even today. Kakubavas, Jobavas and Arkanias, these three small lineages ("*gamnarki*") keep the holiday and exogamy rule even today. As we mentioned, connecting one clan to another with a special prayer "*khvama*" became the prohibitive factor of marriage over time.

Another prohibitive factor of marriage — serving to the same shrine is recorded in village Obuji, Tsalenjikha Municipality. Representatives of the clan of Phiphia¹ and Meskhia from this village, do not marry each other. According to ethnographic research, they swore and were serving the same shrine in Nojikhuri. There is similar example in the village of Jikhashkari. Its residents from the clan of Shengelia and Zarandia annually celebrate the holiday of their clans, called “*kejvaroba*” which usually is on the 3rd day after Easter. These two clans strictly keep the rule of exogamy.

Inhibitive but not prohibitive factor of marriage, is social inequality. This factor was studied on the example of two clans — Songulia and Shengelaia. The reason of marriage prohibition, supposedly, was the class inequality in the past. Based on ethnographic resources, the Songulias were Shengelia’s “*moinales*” — meaning they were the servants. According to field materials recorded by ethnologist Davit Chitanava, the reason for marriage inhibition between these clans is adoption as well (Chitanava 2020: 191).

One interesting custom is described by Italian missionary Arcangelo Lamberti who lived in Samegrelo in the 17th century. He did not mention any prohibitive rules of marriage, but the inhibitive factor was noted. A groom was obliged to bring precious gift to fiancée – the groom’s inheritance, which means that social situation was important in Samegrelo and it might serve as inhibitive factor of marriage (Lamberti 1938: 82).

Marriage taboo might also exist because of the memory of common origin. Clan of Samelia usually do not marry Melia clan. Reportedly, they are the Lazi. Three brothers fled from Lazeti. One of them went to Ochamchire (Apkhazia), two others moved to Samegrelo, to village Lia. Their original surname was Melia, but then they added -sa prefix and became Samelia. Clans of Ubilava, Vibliani and Ugulava, also Mindilaia and Bendeliani as well as Mantua and Matua, have the memory of common origin also. The memory of common origin is inhibitive factor of marriage but not prohibitive.

Prohibitive factors of marriage are not always remembered by clans but they really existed. A minor clan of Egia who live in the municipality of Tsalenjikha and they are represented with only 9 persons do not marry clan of Tvaltvadze. Exogamy is strictly protected by these clans. The ban is probably due to becoming relatives via baptism. According to archival materials, a nobleman, Teimuraz son of Ivane Tvaltvadze and a noblewoman Dulkhan, daughter of Kvikvinia Egia married each other on the 20th of July, 1880. Groomsmen were Ivane and Keramdukhu Egias (Georgia’s National Archive. Central Historical Archive. Stok 489. Rec. 6. Case # 999). However, in the following years, the Tvaltvadzes became relatives of Egia clan by baptism: *Nobleman Pavle, son of Vataia Egia and Natalia, daughter of Gabriel had a son named Gabriel on 29th of July, 1891 Godfather was Maqsime, son of Nikoloz Tvaltvadze* (Georgia’s National Archive. Central Historical Archive. Stok 489. Rec. 6. Case # 1478).

Archival data confirms the marriage exchange between the clans of Egia and Tvaltvadze, which means that they were not blood relatives, however, they became relatives by baptism. Christian religion puts spiritual ties above physical ones (Code of Canon Law 1987: 330). Marriage is strictly prohibited between these two clans despite ignorance of the real reason.

Similar occasion is recorded concerning the clans of Dzavabava and Phurtukhia. According to the narrators, “*Dzavabava will not marry Phurtukhia and Phurtukhia will not marry Dzavabava*. They say “*Purtukhiēp chqimianep rena*” (*Phurtukhias are our fellowmen*). Presumably, the exogamy between the clans of the Dzavabava and Phurukhia living in Medani is a result of Christian ties. The fact that they are connected with baptism can be retrieved from archive again: The register of

¹ Several lineages live in this village and they all are part of one clan.

marriage of Saint George Church in Jgali states that “On October 7, 1871, the peasant Uchana son of Gvadzi Phurtukhia and Mariam daughter of Makhu, got married. Groomsmen were Makhu and Pavle Phurtukhias, also Jabe Dzvabava and Totia Phurtukhia” (Georgia’s National Archive. Central Historical Archive. Stok 489. Rec. 6. Case # 771). Peasant Teimuraz, son of Shuko Dzvabava and Roda daughter of Kocha, got married on 7th November, 1871. Groomsmen were Pakhu Dzvabava and Pavle Phurtukhia (Georgia’s National Archive. Central Historical Archive. Stok 489. Rec. 6. Case # 771). In this case these two clans became relatives by being groomsmen to each other. Presumably the groomsmen would also baptize the children of the married couple and the relationship would be strengthened by baptism. Similar to clans of Egia and Tvaltvadze, the clans of Phurtukhia and Dzvabava have kept the marriage prohibition, but they do not remember the reason, which was retrieved by us from the archive.

The result of the research revealed, that prohibitive factors of marriage between different clans were customary rules in Samegrelo, such are “*ginochama*”, serving to the same shrine, becoming relatives via Christianity and etc. However, marriage taboo determined by Christianity affected only to minor clans rather than big clans. The memory of common origin is inhibitive factor of marriage, but not prohibitive similarly to the memory of past social inequality. The strength of protecting customary laws and Christian religion rules are revealed in the prohibition of marriage between clans not related with blood relations but with kinship.

References

- Abakelia, N. 1999. Saqortsino tses-chveulebebi samegreloshi (Marriage customs in Samegrelo). In: *Samegrelo Colchis Odishi (Studies of Archeology, Linguistics, History, Architecture and Ethnology)*. Tbilisi; Zugdidi: Intelekti (in Georgian).
- Antelava, N. 2005. *Tradiciuli saqortsino tses-chveulebebi samegreloshi (Traditional marriage customs in Samegrelo)*. Tbilisi: Tamila Tsagareishvili; Giorgi Gotsiridze (in Georgian).
- Bakhia-Okrushvili, S. 1985. *Svanuri “lamkhubi” anu “samkhubi” — patronimia (Lamkhubi or Samkhubi among the Svani — patronymy)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba (in Georgian).
- Bakhia-Okrushvili, S. 2007. Patronimiuli organizaciis struqtura da funqcia qartul etnologiashi (Structure and function of patronymic organization in Georgian ethnology). *Kavkasiis etnografiuli krebuli (Collection of Ethnographic works about Caucasus)* 10, 15—44 (in Georgian).
- Baliauri, N. 1991. *Stsorfroba khevsuretsi (“Stsorfroba” in Khevsureti)*. Tbilisi: Tbilisis Universitetis Gamomtsemloba (in Georgian).
- Bekaia, M. 1981. *Saojakho da sakortsino tradiciebis mnishvneloba tanamedrove qartuli ojakhis simtkicisatvis (The importance of family and marriage traditions for the strength of the modern Georgian family)*. Tbilisi: Metsniereba (in Georgian).
- britannica.com: 1: Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. “Clan”. Encyclopedia Britannica, 15 Jul. 2008. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/clan> (accessed 01.12.2020).
- Carr, M. Spencer, K., Wooley, D. 1939. Navaho Clans and Marriage at Pueblo Alto. Wiley on Behalf of the American Anthropological Association. *American Anthropologist*. Vol. 41. No. 2, 245—257.
- Chapais, B. 2014. Complex Kinship Patterns as Evolutionary Constructions, and the Origins of Sociocultural Universals. *The University of Chicago Press on behalf of Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. Current Anthropology*. Vol. 55. No. 6, 751—783.
- Chitanava, D. 2002. Patronimia da gvare samegreloshi (sofel yulish-karis masalebis mixedvit) (Patronymy and clan in Samegrelo according to the materials from Kuliskari). *Istoriul-etnografiuli shtudiebi (Studies in history and ethnography)* 5, 322—343 (in Georgian).
- Chitanava, D. 2020. *Kolkhuri gvarsakhelebis genezisi mrude sarkeshi (Genesis of Colchian surnames in a distorted mirror)*. Tbilisi: Qolor jgufi (in Georgian).
- Chkonia, I. 1955. *Qortsinebis instituti mtiuletsi (Marriage institute in Mtiuleti)*. Tbilisi: Saqartvelos SSR Metsierebata Akademiis Gamomtsemloba (in Georgian).
- Code of Canon Law (Didi Sjuliskanoni)*. 1987. Tbilisi: Saqartvelos Sapatriarqo (in Georgian).
- National Archives of Georgia. Central Historical Archive. Stock 489. Rec. 6. Case #999; #1478; #771.

- Javakhishvili, I. 1984. *Tkhzulebani tormet tomad (Works in Twelve Volume)*. Vol. VII. Tbilisi: Tbilisis Universitetis Gamomcemloba (in Georgian).
- Jorjaneli, K. 1977. *Evfemizmi da sityvis tabu (Euphemisms and the taboo of a speech)*. Tbilisi: Tbilisis Universitetis Gamomcemloba (in Georgian).
- Kiste, R.C., Rynkiewich, M.A. 1976. Incest and exogamy: A Comparative study of two Marshall Island Populations. *The Journal of the Polynesian society*. Vol. 85. No. 2, 209—226.
- Lamberti, A. 1938. *Samegrelos Aghtsera (Description of Samegrelo)*. Tbilisi: Pederacia (in Georgian).
- Law of Vakhtang VI. 1981. *Samartali Vakhtang Meeqvsisa (Law of Vakhtang VI)*. Tbilisi: Sabtchota Saqartvelo (in Georgian).
- Makalatia, S. 1925. *Pshauri tsatsloba da khevsuruli storfroba ("Tsatsloba" in Pshavi and "Storfroba" in Khevsureti)*. Tbilisi: S.M.U.S. Poligrtrecis Ganyofileba mesame Stamba (in Georgian).
- Makalatia, S. 1941. *Samegrelos istoria da etnografia (History and ethnography of Samegrelo)*. Tbilisi: Sakartvelos Mkharetmcodneobis Sazogadoeba (in Georgian).
- Mgeladze, N. 2004. *Acharuli nogro da gvare (Adjarian nogro and clan)*. Batumi: Gamomcemloba Achara (in Georgian).
- Morgan, K. 1979. Clan Groups and Clan Exogamy among the Navajo. *Journal of Anthropological Research*. Vol. 35. No.2, 157—169.
- Nadareishvili, G. 1971. *Kartuli samartlis istoriis narkvevi (Studies in Georgian law history)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba (in Georgian).
- Pershits, A.I., Trayde, D. (eds.). 1986. Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskkiye otnosheniya i sotsial'naya kul'tura (Socio-economic relations and social culture). In: Bromley, Yu.V., Shtrobakh, G. (eds.). *Svod etnograficheskikh ponyatiy i terminov (Collection of ethnographic definitions and terms)*. Iss. 1. Moscow: Nauka (in Russian).
- Robakidze, A.I. 1993. *Ocherki obchestvennogo bita svanov (Essays about social life of the Svani)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba (in Russian).
- Sakhokia, T. 1956. *Etnografiuli natserebi (Ethnographic Letters)*. Tbilisi: Sametsniero-Metoduri Kabinetis Gamomcemloba (in Georgian).
- Tskhadiaia, P. 1985. *Mtiani samegrelos toponimia (enatmecnieruli analizi) (Toponymy of the highland Samegrelo (linguistic analysis))*. Tbilisi: Tbilisis Universitetis Gamomcemloba (in Georgian).