The Rise and Fall and Revival of the Ibero-Caucasian Hypothesis

by Kevin Tuite, Professor of Anthropology at the Université de Montréal

Historiographia Linguistica Vol. 35:1/2 (2008), pp. 23–82

The Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis and the histography of Abkhazia

pp.53-65

8. *The Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis and the historiography of Abkhazia*

The preceding account of the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis is only part of the story. If, on the one hand, Marr and Čikobava were opposed by proponents of a uniformitarian, methodologically-rigorous and language-centered historical approach, on the other their work came under attack from historians seeking to reinterpret or even redraw the complex scenarios of contact, mixing and layering that both Marr and Čikobava regarded as characteristic of Caucasian ethnohistory. Among the presuppositions underlying criticism from this second camp are post-war Soviet ethnogenesis theory, which favored a simplistic superposition of territory, language, ethnos and nation; and the distinctive variety of 'hermeneutics of suspicion' which flourished in the Soviet intellectual ecosystem, and continues to thrive fifteen years after the break-up of the USSR. This section begins with a detour into medieval Georgian literary and historical studies, during which the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis will fade from view temporarily, to return later on, intertwined with the thread of Soviet and post-Soviet historiographic templates.

40. Klimov attributed the existence of apparently cognate lexemes in Indo-European and Kartvelian to intensive contacts between the two speech communities at various periods (Klimov 1984, 1994).

8.1 *P'avle Ingoroq'va, Giorgi Merčule, and the 'Life of Grigol of Xandzta'*

Less than a month after Čikobava's triumphant speech at the 1951 special session of the Academy of Sciences on Stalin's contribution to linguistics, a thick manuscript by the literary historian P'avle Ingoroq'va (1893–1990) was delivered to the printers, although it would not be published until three years later. At first glance, Ingoroq'va's tome purported to be a biography of the 10th-century Georgian ecclesiastic Giorgi Merčule, best known as the author of the 'Life of Grigol of Xandzta'.[41] The latter text was written in 951, and Ingoroq'va's *Giorgi Merčule* was intended to commemorate the 1000th anniversary of the 'Life of Grigol of Xandzta', a critical edition of which Ingoroq'va published in 1949. It was to have an impact far beyond the disciplinary frontiers of Georgian medieval literary studies, however, and continues to arouse passions over a half-century after its publication. Like Čikobava, Ingoroq'va singled out Marr for criticism in the pages of his book, but his angle of attack was radically different, and the consequences for Georgian historiography were far more problematic. Ingoroq'va's name is commonly invoked in debates over the historical relation between Abkhazia and Georgia, often by partisans of one side or the other who seem not to have read more than a few excerpts from Ingoroq'va's thousand-page monograph. In order to understand how this mid–20th-century biography of a mid–10th-century biographer became the cause and object of heated argument ever since its publication, I will discuss the importance of each of its three layers, as it were: Grigol and his times, the significance of Giorgi Merčule's hagiography of Grigol, and Ingoroq'va's objectives in writing a study of Giorgi.

According to his biographer, Grigol of Xandzta was born in 759 and died at the age of 102 in 861. Although born into a prominent East Georgian noble family, Grigol was drawn to a monastic vocation. Accompanied by three companions, the young Grigol left his home province, then under Arab domination, and traveled southwestward to what is now northeastern Turkey. Grigol explored the sparsely-settled district of K'larjeti, in search of a solitary locale where he could found a monastery. He chose the remote site of Xandzta, where he and his companions built a wooden church and a simple monastic compound. In the course of time Grigol of Xandzta became archimandrite of a coalition of a dozen monasteries in the region, which were founded by him or his disciples. Grigol's monastic career overlapped, and to an extent intersected, the reigns of three rulers who were

41. Full title: "The work and career of the worthy life of our holy and blessed father Grigol the Archimandrite, builder of Xandzta and Shat'berd, and with him the commemoration of many blessed fathers" (*Šromay da moɣuac'ebay ɣirsad cxorebisay c'midisa da neťarisa mamisa čuenisa grigolisi arkimandrit'isay, xanʒtisa da šat'berdisa aɣmašenebelisay, da mis tana qsenebay mravalta mamata neťartay*). The version consulted while writing this paper is that of Abuladze et al. (1963). "Merčule" is not the family name of the author but rather a title loosely translated "specialist in [ecclesiastical] law" or perhaps "theologian" (Ingoroq'va 1954: 17–28).

to play a critical role in the struggle for the liberation of western Transcaucasia from foreign (Arab and Byzantine) hegemony, and the eventual consolidation of the united Georgian kingdom under Bagrat' III in the early 11th century: Leon II (King of Abkhazia 786–798), Ashot' Kuropalates (King of Georgia 800–826) and his son and successor Bagrat' I (826–876). Although inheritor of the Iberian kingdom in eastern Georgia, Ashot' moved his residence to Art'anuji in K'larjeti after a series of defeats by the Arab armies. It was from here that he and his sons launched their long campaign to retake southern and eastern Georgia, and it was in K'larjeti that they took an interest in and contributed financially to Grigol's ecclesiastical work.

Composed ninety years after the death of its subject, the biography of Grigol of Xandzta fell into oblivion until the mid–19th century, when a Georgian scholar came across an 11th-century copy of Giorgi Merčule's text in the library of the Jerusalem Patriarchate. Marr examined the manuscript in 1902 and published a scholarly edition nine years later. Since World War II the 'Life of Grigol of Xandzta' has been issued in several critical editions, and, in abridged and annotated form, it has become a prominent component of the Old Georgian literary canon taught in schools.[42] The popularity of this work cannot be ascribed to its literary merits alone. In a list of key themes laid out for middle-school readers of the 'Life of Grigol of Xandzta', K'. Danelia included, alongside medieval church history and monastic life, 'the self-government (autocephaly) of the Georgian church, and the cultural and political integrity (*mtlianoba*) of Georgia' (Sarǰveladze et al. 1986: 135). With regard to the status of the Orthodox Church in Georgia, Giorgi Merčule described significant moves toward autonomy from the patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem, such as the securing of the right to consecrate holy oils locally rather than import them from Jerusalem. This would culminate in the removal of the Orthodox communities of western Transcaucasia — Lazica, Egrisi and Abkhazia — from subordination to Byzantium and their attachment to the Iberian Catholicosate in Mcxeta, just as the latter had earlier become autonomous from Antioch. As for the concept of Georgian national unity, while the 'Life of Grigol of Xandzta' certainly accorded important supporting roles to the kings of Iberia and Abkhazia, whose dynastic union in 1010 gave rise to the united Georgian kingdom of which the present-day Republic of Georgia considers itself the successor, it is in the domain of religion that the Georgian nation received its initial definition. In previous centuries, the proper name *Kartli* denoted a territory and feudal state in eastern Georgia, corresponding to the province still known

42. Notwithstanding the reform of the standard written language in the 19th century, even the earliest Georgian literary works are no more inaccessible to modern readers than, say, Chaucer or *Piers the Plowman* are to contemporary Anglophones.

under that name today. In words that many a Georgian schoolchild can recite from memory, Giorgi Merčule gave *Kartli* a vastly expanded denotation, as 'the spacious country within which the liturgy is celebrated and all prayers are performed in the Georgian language' ("kartlad priadi kueq'anay aɣiracxebis, romelsa-ca šina kartulita enita žami šeic'irvis da locvay q'oveli aɣesrulebis"), except for the Kyrie Eleison, which continued to be sung in Greek (Grig. Xandzt. §44). *Kartli,* and later *Sakartvelo* "the land of the Kartlians", became the name of a national community — Georgia — that now reached westward to the Black Sea coast.

This type of equation between religious affiliation and an identity one might call 'ethnic' is by no means rare, whether in Western Asia or elsewhere, and indeed 'Kartveli' continued to be in use among the Georgian population to refer to Orthodox Christians, whatever language they might speak, until the 17th century (Boeder 1994, 1998). It is very important to note that the territory where Georgian was in use as the liturgical language, especially after it replaced Greek in this function in the Abkhaz Kingdom and throughout western Georgia (a process already complete by the time the 'Life of Grigol of Xandzta' was composed; Ingoroq'va 1954: 221), comprised both the "Kingdom of the Georgians" (*kartvelta samepo*) ruled by Bagrat' I and his successors, and the "Kingdom of the Abkhazians" (*apxazta samepo*) ruled by Leon II and his successors, until both royal houses were united in the person of Bagrat' III (978–1014), who inherited the Georgian crown through his father and the Abkhazian crown through his mother.

As represented by Marr, as well as the historians Ivane Javaxišvili and Simon Janašia (1900–1947), the western provinces, which were the staging grounds for the consolidation of the Georgian kingdom, had complex histories of their own. In the introduction to his 1911 edition of the 'Life of Grigol of Xandzta', Marr characterized the history of K'larjeti as one of shifting linguistic, political and religious affiliations among the local population. The original inhabitants, in Marr's opinion, were "Tubal-Cain" (Laz-Mingrelian-speaking) tribes, which then were progressively Armenianized as Armenian hegemony extended over the region in the early medieval period. Beginning in the mid–8th century, the population of K'larjeti began taking on Georgian identity, initially due to the incursion of Georgian overlords, then subsequently through adoption of Georgian first as liturgical, then spoken language, a process aided by the Chalcedonian (i.e., Orthodox) religious affiliation of the K'larjetians. According to Marr, even in Giorgi Merčule's time Armenian remained in use as the mother tongue of a significant portion of the local inhabitants. As for Abkhazia, no one questioned the presence of ethnolinguistically Abkhazian tribes along the eastern Black Sea coast since ancient times, a belief reinforced by references in Pliny the Elder, Arrian and other Greek and Roman sources to tribes whose names contained the roots *Abasg-/Abask-* and *Apsil-/ Absil-* (cf. the modern ethnonyms *Abaza* and *Apsua*, the self-designation

of the Abkhazians).[43] Furthermore, Janašia (1940) found what he interpreted as evidence of an Abkhaz-Adyghean substrate both within the borders of modern-day Abkhazia and further south and east in what is now Georgian-speaking territory. Among the toponymic elements of Northwest Caucasian origin identified by Janašia were the suffixes *-ps-/-pš-*, meaning "water, river" and *-q'va* "valley". River names including these elements are found as far south as Guria (*Supsa*) and Ach'aria (*Ačq'va*). The hypothesis that Abkhaz-Adyghean speakers were among the ancient inhabitants of western Georgia received the support of Marr (1930) and Čikobava (1948: 263), and indeed is compatible with the supposition, expressed by Javaxišvili (1960: 401–417) and Kavtaradze (1985), that the remote linguistic ancestors of the Georgians came from further south. Beginning with the reign of Leon II in the late–8th century, the Abkhazian principality, a former vassal state of Byzantium, declared its independence, and embarked on what business writers would call a 'guppy-swallows-whale' merger. Beginning with Egrisi and Argveti, the whole of western Georgian was progressively incorporated into an expanded 'Kingdom of the Abkhazians' with its new capital in Kutaisi. After Bagrat' III inherited the thrones of both Abkhazia and (eastern) Georgia, the designation "King of the Abkhazians" was the first-named among the royal titles.[44] It would seem difficult to deny the involvement of ethnic Abkhazians in this process, even if they became a small minority in the expanded kingdom of which they were the titular nationality. The Abkhaz language was not used in writing at this time, but the epithet given to King Giorgi IV Lasha (reigned 1213–1223), son of Queen Tamar, provides a tantalizing indication of the presence of Abkhaz speakers at the royal court. According the *Kartlis cxovreba*, Lasha 'is translated 'enlightener of the world' in the language of the Apsars [= Abkhazians]' ("ganmanatlebelad soplisa itargmana apsarta enita").[45] If the historical evidence is taken cumulatively and at face value, the postulate that Abkhazian was spoken in at least the northern part of the territory now called Abkhazia for the past two millennia would be the null hypothesis. To argue otherwise would imply that the author has obtained new

43. For the classical references and attempts at identification with modern ethnolinguistic groups, see the *Real-Encyclopädie* entries on the "Abaskoi" (I: 20), "Apsilai" (II: 277) and "Heniochoi" (VIII: 259–279).

44. The official title of King Davit IV Aghmashenebeli (reigned 1089–1125) was as follows: "King of the Abkhazians, Georgians, Rans, K'axs and Armenians (*mepe apxazta, kartvelta, ranta, k'axta da somexta*), Sharvan-shah and Shah-in-shah and autocratic sovereign of all the East and West". The Rans and K'axs were inhabitants of two ancient provinces of eastern Georgia.

45. According to the most widely-accepted derivation, *laša* is related to Abkhaz *a-laśa* "light" (Charachidzé 1968: 679–680; Chirikba 1998: 44).

evidence, formulated a more elegant hypothesis, or been influenced by factors of a different nature.

Enter P'avle Ingoroq'va. Trained in St. Petersburg in the years preceding the Russian Revolution, Ingoroq'va returned to Georgia, where he was appointed to a position in the Manuscript Section of the Georgian National Museum. In the course of his uncommonly long career — Ingoroq'va died in 1990 at the age of 97 — he published important studies in the fields of medieval and 19th-century Georgian literature, paleography, poetics and hymnography. His scholarly approach to the Georgian literary classics was characterized by extensively-researched explorations into the biographies of the authors of these works, and the times and sociohistorical contexts in which they were composed. Long before the Giorgi Merčule study, Ingoroq'va wrote a lengthy essay on the early–13th century epic poem "The Knight in the Leopard's Skin" (*Vepxist'q'aosani*). This work has held the status of a national epic for centuries, and the poem's protagonists are commonly evoked as exemplars of virtues especially prized by the Georgian people, such as fidelity, valor, hospitality and eloquence. Little is known for certain about Shota Rustaveli — literally, Shota of Rustavi — the poem's self-proclaimed author, and the oldest textual traces of 'The Knight in the Leopard's Skin' are dated well over a century after its presumed composition during the reign of Queen Tamar, around the year 1200.

In 1917, Marr, who at the time was one of the foremost authorities on Old Georgian philology, stirred up a veritable scandal in Georgian intellectual circles when he published his claim that 'The Knight in the Leopard's Skin' was composed no earlier than the 14th-century, by a Muslim Georgian from the southern frontier province of Meskheti (Dzidziguri 1985: 63; Cherchi & Manning 2002). Marr's assertion was not as outlandish as it might seem: The main characters of 'The Knight in the Leopard's Skin' are depicted as being from Arabia or India, the poem's author presents the work as a translation from Persian, and specifically Christian references are conspicuously absent from the text. Needless to say, many of Marr's contemporaries found his identification of Georgia's greatest literary genius as a Muslim to be shocking and tantamount to blasphemy. Marr's essay appeared while Ingoroq'va was working on his own contribution to Rustaveli studies, a lengthy study eventually completed in 1922. Ingoroq'va did not attack Marr head-on, referring only once to the "unanticipated and incomprehensible" 1917 essay in a footnote (1963: 73), but his conclusions with regard to Rustaveli's identity represented a total rejection of Marr's arguments and a return to the traditional view, with a surprising amount of biographical detail added. Despite the paucity of hard evidence, Ingoroq'va not only placed the author at Queen Tamar's court, but went so far as to identify him with Shota III of the Hereti branch of the royal house of Bagrat'ion (Ingoroq'va 1963: 82–117), a claim few specialists would deem to

be more than thinly-supported speculation (Baramidze 1958: 32–45; K'ak'abadze 1966: 244–276).

Seen from the perspective of Ingoroq'va's earlier work, *Giorgi Merčule* looked to be cut from familiar cloth. This book abounds in detailed biographical and historical reconstructions that go far beyond the hypotheses most of his colleagues allowed themselves. But if in the earlier work Ingoroq'va insisted on the canonical Georgianness of Rustaveli in rebuttal to the more 'problematic' identity reconstructed by Marr, in his 1954 monograph it was the 'Georgianness' of the territories and populations featured in the 'Life of Grigol of Xandzta' that was in cause, and the gloves were off in his attacks on the writings of the by then long-deceased Marr.

To put it bluntly, Ingoroq'va's project in *Giorgi Merčule* consisted in the erasure of non-Georgians, or those whose Georgianness was perceived as problematic, from the historical record of Abkhazia and southwestern Georgia. To this purpose Ingoroq'va sought to demonstrate that key participants in the story of Georgian unification — the Bagrat'ion royal house, the population of K'larjeti, and the Abkhazians who lent their name to the kingdom that grew to encompass all of western Georgia — were to be identified as canonically "Georgian" all the way back to the dawn of history.

Marr's view, mentioned earlier, that the people of K'larjeti at the time of Grigol of Xandzta were Armenian speakers undergoing assimilation to Georgian identity on the basis of religion, was taken by Ingoroq'va to entail that Marr believed that 'the immediate setting of Grigol of Xandzta's activities, the province of K'larjeti, was not autochthonous Georgian land' ("ara iq'o dzireuli kartuli kveq'ana" [Ingoroq'va 1954: 409]). But in fact Marr did not deny the autochthonicity of the K'larjeti Georgians as such, but rather attributed to their ancestors a complex history of language shift and sociopolitical affiliation. Marr also underscored the critical role of religion in local conceptions of identity. For Ingoroq'va, however, hybridization of this kind had no place in the history of the territories that were to constitute the united Georgian kingdom of the 11th and 12th centuries. Marr was not merely mistaken in his interpretation of the evidence; in publishing such a claim Marr, 'it could be said, reached the summit of the distortion of historical truth' ("ist'oriuli č'ešmarit'ebis damaxinjebaši, šeidzleba itkvas, ertgvar mc'vervals miaɣc'ia" [1954: 404]). This is far from an isolated instance of such rhetoric: the terms "false" (*q'albi*), "distorted" (*damaxinjebuli*) and "erroneous" (*mcdari*) occur with disturbing frequency in the pages of *Giorgi Merčule.* The criticisms of Marr's linguistic theories going on at the same time, following Stalin's 1951 *Pravda* article, seem almost moderate by comparison.

A similar issue of hybridity had to be confronted with respect to the house of Bagrat'ion, branches of which ruled in both Georgia and Armenia. Since "many erroneous perspectives" had been expressed about their origins, Ingoroq'va

sought to set the record straight by demonstrating, with the support of onomastic etymologies of dubious quality, that the Armenian as well as Georgian branches of the Bagratids were of Georgian ancestry, descending from the Old Georgian Parnavazian dynasty (see Ingoroq'va 1954: 87–99).

The most controversial assertion made by Ingoroq'va in his 1954 book, judging by the reaction it provoked immediately after it was made known in print, and the debates it continues to set off over a half-century later, is the claim that the Abkhazians of medieval and ancient western Transcaucasia were not the same people as the contemporary Abkhazians, but rather a Georgian tribe speaking a Kartvelian language. In the author's words (p. 116):

> The territory of Abkhazia at the time of the foundation of the "Kingdom of the Abkhazians" [Ingoroq'va's scare quotes], that is, in the 8th century, was inhabited by Georgian tribes, and not only then, but throughout ancient history, Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The Abkhazians and other tribes dwelling in Abkhazia (Absilians, Misimians, Sanigians) were likewise purely Georgian tribes, of Georgian origin and speaking a Georgian [Kartvelian] dialect.

With this astonishing stroke of historical revisionism, Ingoroq'va resolved the (for him) paradoxical fact that the rulers of the 'Kingdom of the Abkhazians', as they incorporated the West Georgian territories, which hitherto had been under the hegemony of the Byzantine Empire, carried out 'a purely Georgian state policy' ("c'minda kartuli saxelmc'ipoebrivi p'oliť ik'is gaťareba" [Ingoroq'va 1954: 117]), including the replacement of Greek by Georgian as the state and liturgical language, followed by the unification of the West Georgian Orthodox dioceses with the Iberian Catholicosate in Mcxeta.

Ingoroq'va's arguments in support of his hypothesis have been picked over time and again by Georgian, Abkhazian and foreign scholars (Ančabadze 1964, 1976; Berdzenišvili 1990; Khoshtaria-Brosset 1997; Melikišvili 1959: 91), and I will not go over this debate here, except with respect to Ingoroq'va's deployment of linguistic arguments. Over forty pages of *Giorgi Merčule* are given over to the etymological analysis of toponyms from Abkhazia and adjacent territories (1954: 148–189). In this section Ingoroq'va took aim at Janašia's 1940 paper on Circassian (Northwest-Caucasian) morphemes in western Transcaucasia, including what is now Georgian-speaking territory. The hydronymic suffix *-ps-/-pš-* is attributed to a Kartvelian source, cognates of which appear in the (possibly onomatopetic) Common Kartvelian root **ps-* "urinate" and the obsolete Georgian lexemes *pša(n)-* "stream, spring" and *pšaťala* "slush". The alleged Circassian cognates cited by Janašia are written off as either borrowings from Georgian, or as derived from an ancestral form common to both language groups (Ingoroq'va 1954: 185). In the context of Ingoroq'va's argumentation, the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis was

employed as a device for waving aside evidence that other Caucasian speech communities might have ancient roots within the borders of the medieval Georgian kingdom. I do not know of any explicit reaction by Čikobava to Ingoroq'va's linguistic speculations, but evidence of his opinion can be inferred from Bgažba's (1964) descriptive grammar of an Abkhaz dialect, in which the traditional view of the Northwest-Caucasian origins of Abkhaz toponyms is presented with additional supporting data (1964: 252–269). Čikobava was the *redaktor* of Bgažba 1964, and he along with Ketevan Lomtatidze were singled out by the author for special thanks for their "valuable advice and help in the preparation" of the book for publication (1964: 7).

The appearance of Ingoroq'va (1954) opened a second front in the repudiation of Marrism, but whereas Čikobava and his school retained the broader historiographic approach advocated by Marr and his predecessors as far back as Klaproth, Ingoroq'va's work marked a distinct rupture with respect to the presuppositions underlying the reconstruction of the past. All three scholars — Marr, Čikobava and Ingoroq'va — could be charged with the methodological sin of assuming the correctness of the postulates they set out to prove, and then tailoring or selecting the data to fit. Marr's leading postulates changed throughout his career, mutating from the Semitic-Kartvelian hypothesis through Japhetic to four-element monogenesis and socioeconomic stadialism. Čikobava, like Javaxišvili before him, advocated the genetic unity of all indigenous Caucasian languages, plus a few isolates from the Near East and Mediterranean region, but refused to abandon the family-tree model of West-European historical linguistics, or speculate about genetic or stadial links between Ibero-Caucasian and Indo-European. Marr's linguistics and ethnology could be said to have been informed by Turgot's (1756) dictum that all peoples and all languages are the products of contact and mixture, but taken to an absurd extreme, even as they lacked the methodological caution and self-criticism that Turgot so emphatically advocated. Čikobava's program was closer in spirit to the 'historicism' of critics of the Neogrammarians, such as Curtius or Schuchardt, and retained the model of language mixture, although — as with the Ibero-Caucasian family — he did not extend it beyond the Caucasus. Indeed, Čikobava and his colleagues believed that extensive borrowing and structural influence among languages was a distinctive feature of the Caucasus throughout its history (Čikobava 1955, Lomtatidze 1955).

8.2 *Ingoroq'va's historiographic template*

Ingoroq'va's starting point and leading historiographic presupposition was not so much a methodological postulate as a *template*: an image of the nation as a simple and unnuanced superposition of territory, ethnos and language, with an unbroken existence going back to prehistory. It would appear likely that Ingoroq'va

drew upon some version of late Stalin-era Soviet ethnogenesis theory, applied homogenously across time and space within the borders of medieval Georgia, like the uniform coloring of national territories on a political map (cf. Gordadzé 2000). The appearance in print of *Giorgi Merčule* provoked heated responses by Abkhaz intellectuals and calls for the book to be withdrawn from circulation. The Communist authorities also stepped in and criticisms were made of Ingoroq'va and some of his supporters among the Georgian intelligentsia (Kholbaia et al. 1999: 19–21). But the effect on Georgian and Abkhazian historiography could not be so easily reversed. With few exceptions, the reconstruction of the ethnic and linguistic composition of ancient and medieval Abkhazia become a politicized topic, an arena in which competing claims for sovereignty over the contemporary Abkhaz ASSR were being played out.

Rebuttals to Ingoroq'va's reconstruction of an Abkhaz-free Abkhazia began to appear in print. Abkhaz historians noted that most of their Georgian colleagues likewise attributed Northwest-Caucasian linguistic affiliation to the ancient *Apsilae* and *Abasgoi* (e.g., Melikišvili 1959: 90). In addition, they argued that other Black-Sea coastal tribes ought to be identified as belonging to the same language group, despite the competing claims of Georgian scholars and the difficulty of establishing convincing etymologies of their ethnonyms. So, for example, Ančabadze (1964: 169–176, 1976: 26–48) and Inal-Ipa (1965: 90) equated the ancient *Sanigai* with the Northwest Caucasian Sadz tribe, rather than the Kartvelian-speaking Zans (Mingrelians) or Svans. In Inal-Ipa's view, the *Apsilae, Abasgoi, Misimianoi* and *Sanigai* were ancestors of the contemporary Abkhazians (1965: 90–94; cf. Chirikba 1998: 44–47). Most mainstream Georgian historians credited the ethnic Abkhazians with a long-standing presence in the territory, while insisting that they were never the only ethnic community residing in the territory that bears their name. The *Sanigai, Misimianoi* and other ancient tribes with etymologically non-transparent ethnonyms were claimed to represent autochthonous Kartvelian-speaking ethnic groups dwelling within the borders of what is now Abkhazia.[46] At the same time, Ančabadze's (1976) assertion that a distinctly Abkhazian national identity began to consolidate in the feudal period, and that Abkhaz-speakers played a leading role in the Abkhaz kingdom — even though Georgian was the state language and written medium — received sharp criticism from Georgian historians such as Berdzenišvili (1990: 590–591) and Khoshtaria-Brosset (1997: 69–82). In their view, the Abkhazians, like the Mingrelians, Svans and other West-Georgian populations, adopted the high culture and liturgical-literary language of

46. The ethnonym *Sanigai* was claimed by various authors to be cognate with *Zan* (i.e., Mingrelian) or *Svan*; according to Melikišvili (1959: 100), *Misimianoi* represented the Greek rendering of the Svan autoethnonym *mušwæn*.

Kartli (eastern Georgia), accompanied by the evolution of a common Georgian identity, at first among the elite, and later among other segments of the population. Among representatives of the Georgian scholarly establishment, representations of medieval and ancient Abkhazia took on the contours of an idealized image of the Abkhaz ASSR, in which the Abkhazians enjoy the status of titular nationality (but with Georgian neighbors as far back as can be told), and play an active role in the consolidation of the Georgian state of which they are an integral component.

8.3 *Critics and supporters of the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis in the Abkhazian history debate*

At first operating somewhat on the margins of the Georgian academic mainstream, but then becoming more visible in the waning years of the USSR and more recently, are attempts to continue Ingoroq'va's project of erasing problematic contributors to Georgian ethnogenesis, but with the support of updated argumentation. In the same work in which he criticized one of the key tenets of the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis, Aleksandre Oniani also took aim at Čikobava's (1948) and Šaradzenidze's (1955) analysis of Svan as a mixed language with Circassian substratal features (Oniani 1989: 264–299), Janašia's (1940) identification of Northwest Caucasian suffixes in western Georgian toponyms (Oniani 1989: 299–309), and Kartvelian morphemes claimed by Čikobava to have been borrowed from a Northwest Caucasian source (Oniani 1989: 309–318). In several respects, the concluding sections of Oniani (1989) read like a supplement to Ingoroq'va (1954). Not only are Ingoroq'va's toponymic analyses cited by Oniani in his critique of Janašia (Oniani 1989: 301–308), but continuity between the two monographs is evident in Oniani's choice of targets (Marr and Janašia, with the addition of Čikobava) and aversion to any hint of 'mixture' in the Kartvelian languages or Georgian toponymy. Oniani also pointed with alarm to the uptake of Čikobava's and Janašia's "mistaken" notions by Abkhaz historians (e.g., Inal-Ipa 1965: 56–57, 95–96, and more recently, Chirikba 1998: 43, Shamba 1998: 55–56). A more recent contribution to the neo-Ingoroq'vist literature is Gamq'relidze's 1991 etymological revisiting of the ethnonyms *Abkhaz-/Apxaz-* and *Abasg-/Abazg-*. Gamq'relidze argues that the latter root is not related to the Northwest Caucasian *Abaza*, but rather was derived from *Apxaz-* by metathesis due to Greek phonotactic constraints (cf. Put'k'aradze 2005: 138). As for the original reference of *Apxaz-*, "the ethno-cultural state of the Black Sea coast in the first centuries of our era guides us to the possibility of seeing in 'apxaz-'/'Abazgians' tribes of precisely a Western Georgian origin, who must have been close relatives of the Svan and Mingrelo-Laz tribes resident in ancient Colchis" (Gamq'relidze 381991b: 242). The derivation of *Abasg-* from *Apxaz-* is not phonologically implausible, but the claim that the group so designated by ancient writers spoke a Kartvelian language is no more warranted than Ingoroq'va's initial attempt. This new effort to reclaim the

ethnonym *Abxaz-/Apxaz-*, and thereby root the Kingdom of the Abkhazians in the ancient Georgian ethnolinguistic domain, is vigorously debated by Hewitt (1991), who apparently was so eager to have a go at Gamq'relidze's article that he took the trouble of publishing his own translation of it.

Both Oniani and Gamq'relidze were prominent critics of the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis, and partisans of the neogrammarian school of historical-comparative linguistics which Čikobava had repudiated. While I certainly do not maintain that a narrower, methodologically restrained approach to language reconstruction has necessary implications for ethnocultural historiography, in the writings of these two researchers the narrowed focus of their linguistic reconstructions, excluding all languages beyond the confines of the Kartvelian language family, parallels a similar exclusivity in their representation of ancient Georgian territory. It is as though their linguistic and national models were not built from the ground up, but rather hewn out of those of Čikobava, Marr and Janašia, then cleansed of extraneous elements.

Whereas the historiographic template favored by Oniani continues that of Ingoroq'va, calqued upon an idealization of the nation-state as a straightforward and unproblematic superposition of territory, language and ethnos, the template one detects in the writings of Zviad Gamsaxurdia and certain of his followers is that of a clan or extended family, with clear distinctions between members and outsiders, the latter cast in the roles of allies, enemies or guests (cf. Gordadzé 2001). Gamsaxurdia was an enthusiastic supporter of the Ibero-Caucasian concept in its most exuberant extension. Drawing freely from the writings of Marr, Javaxišvili, Čikobava and other sources, Gamsaxurdia (1939–1993) situated the remote ancestors of the Georgians in a wide-ranging community of peoples descended from the ancient 'Proto-Iberians'. Gamsaxurdia's Iberian family was for the most part coextensive with Marr's Japhetic grouping during his Mediterranean phase; among the speech communities claimed to belong were the Basques, Etruscans, Sumerians, Pelasgians and other ancient Near Eastern peoples (Gamsaxurdia 1990: 8–10). But Gamsaxurdia was neither a linguist nor a historian. As dissident activist and later first president of the independent Georgian Republic, Gamsaxurdia sought to endow his people with a national myth, in which their current geopolitical predicament was set in continuity with events of the remote past. For example, the Trojan War was represented by Gamsaxurdia as a confrontation between the Indo-European Hellenes and the 'proto-Georgian' Trojans (1990: 11), mirroring the oppositional stance of Georgia and the Caucasus to Russia and those western democracies supporting Russian hegemony in the former Soviet territo-

ries.[47] The other indigenous Caucasian peoples, by contrast, as Ibero-Caucasian speakers, were tantamount to kinfolk, and frequently addressed by Gamsaxurdia in such terms. His letters to the Chechens, Circassians and other North Caucasian peoples, written during his brief presidency in 1991, characteristically began 'dear sisters and brothers' (Gamsaxurdia 1994). Messages and speeches addressed to the Abkhazians, among whom a movement to separate from Georgia was already in full swing, contained particularly emphatic appeals to common origins. One such letter began with references to 'our common Colchian origins, the genetic kinship between our peoples and languages, our common history and common culture' (1994: 15). In response to a question about Abkhaz-Georgian relations, Gamsaxurdia reminded his listeners of the Ibero-Caucasian affiliation linking the two languages, then continued, 'but they [the Abkhazians] did not understand that and hence there is this ethnic conflict, even though their origin is truly Ibero-Caucasian. It is truly so. If they would only have the memory, the knowledge of their origins, they would never have stirred up such conflicts with a related people' (1990: 34–35). Gamsaxurdia's appeal for unity finds an echo in a recent treatment of Georgian-Abkhazian relations by Khoshtaria-Brosset (1997), who repeatedly invokes the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis as evidence of ancient kinship between the two peoples.[48]

47. In key respects Gamsaxurdia's imagined Iberians are the ideological twins of the late Marija Gimbutas' (1921–1994) 'Old Europeans', in that both are represented as ancient civilizations with cultures and indeed mind-sets sharply contrastive with those of the Indo-Europeans who eventually conquered most of their former homelands. Gamsaxurdia, for example, drew a distinction between the "clairvoyant" (*natelxilviti*) culture of the ancient Pelasgians and the "reasoning" (*azrovnebiti*) culture of the Greeks (1992: 12). One also notes striking parallels between Gamsaxurdia's conception of the organic unity of Ibero-Caucasian peoples and the 'Eurasianism' of Trubetzkoy and some of his Russian contemporaries (Sériot 1993). Both Gamsaxurdia and Trubetzkoy imagined a deeper unity among neighboring peoples that transcended religion and nationality, in which their respective nations — the Georgians and the Russians — played a leading role. Furthermore, their visions of unity were forged in opposition to the dominant civilizations that shared the Eurasian continent ('Romano-Germanic' Europe for Trubetzkoy, both Europe and Russia for Gamsaxurdia). Unlike Trubetzkoy, however, Gamsaxurdia also believed in the genetic and linguistic unity of the Ibero-Caucasians.

48. Consistent with their insistance on the organic unity of the Ibero-Caucasian peoples and languages is the stance of certain followers of Gamsaxurdia with respect to Mingrelian and Svan, which they classify as dialects rather than languages (Put'k'aradze 2001, 2002, 2003; Gvanceladze 2004). Since the speakers of these two Kartvelian languages identify themselves, and are identified, as Georgians at both official and informal levels, the designation of Mingrelian and Svan as separate languages is deemed a potential source of division within the very heart of the family. Attempts by the tsarist authorities to create a Mingrelian literary and even liturgical language, written in Cyrillic rather than Georgian script, reinforce the belief that a similar divide-and-

9. *The Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis today*

In his introduction to Gamq'relidze & Mač'avariani, C'ereteli (1965: 048–049) characterized Ibero-Caucasian as 'more a matter of faith than of knowledge; and however strong that faith might be, it cannot by mere force change the position on [genetic] relatedness'. Writing forty years later, Hewitt regarded the hypothesis as all but extinct: "Hardly any one today would claim the Kartvelian (South Caucasian) family to be genetically related to the North Caucasian languages" (2005: 140). As far as the linguistic community is concerned, Hewitt's assessment seems accurate. Except for a cluster of disciples of Čikobava and/or Gamsaxurdia who continue to invoke the concept of Ibero-Caucasian (Gvanceladze 2004; Puť'k'aradze 2005; several contributors to K'varacxelia & Šengelia 1998), and non-specialists who group the Caucasian languages together merely because they have no demonstrated affiliation with better-known language families, support for the genetic unity of the three groups of indigenous Caucasian languages has all but evaporated among linguists who work on these languages. The failure of the Tbilisi Ibero-Caucasianists to win widespread academic support for their proposal can be attributed, in large measure, to the absence of convincing evidence, especially in the form of sound correspondences or strong etymologies, and the lack of strong rebuttals to the arguments of sceptics. The inability of Čikobava to engage effectively with the work of such leading Kartvelologists as Klimov, Deeters, Gamq'relidze, Mač'avariani, and their supporters, led to a loss of credibility in the eyes of the scholarly community. Finally, all it took was a simple (and simplistic) critique by Oniani to bring the house of cards tumbling down, just as the Soviet Union itself was coming to an end.

In other historical disciplines, a significant split appeared between Georgian and Abkhazian scholars with respect to the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis in the years following the publication of Ingoroq'va's book. Whereas Georgian historians (Berdzenišvili 1990, Melikišvili 1959: 94), archaeologists (Džaparidze 1989: 384–7) and ethnologists (Čit'aia 1946, 1975) continued to assume the primordial unity of the indigenous Caucasian languages — and therefore peoples — in their writings on Georgian ethnogenesis, among Abkhazian scholars and those who share their position, Čikobava's hypothesis has for the most part met with skepticism (Ančabadze 1976: 17–18) or outright rejection (Voronov 1994; Chirikba 1998: 38). The insistent and repeated references to Ibero-Caucasian unity by Gamsaxurdia, Khoshtaria-Brosset and others in polemical works concerning the status of Abkhazia in the Georgian Republic doubtless fostered the impression that the Georgians would remain the senior partners in such an alliance.

conquer policy lurks behind more recent affirmations of Mingrelian and Svan linguistic distinctiveness (Gvanceladze et al. 2001; Japaridze et al. 2005).

Mirroring the almost exclusively Georgian support for the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis is the prominent role of Russians among the formulators and supporters of the North Caucasian language family. First proposed by Trubetzkoy, then elaborated by Nikolaev and Starostin, the proposal that Abkhaz-Adyghean and Nax-Daghestanian have a common ancestor, which they do not share with Kartvelian, has won wide support among the (largely Russian) community of long-range comparativists who advocated the Nostratic hypothesis. The existence of distinct North Caucasian and Kartvelian language (and ethnic) families is likewise presupposed in the recent encyclopedia of the ethnicities of the Russian Federation edited by Tiškov (1994: 24–37). If, on the one hand, "the idea of shared Ibero-Caucasian languages and Georgia's tribal-cum-cultural identity with selected autochthonous Caucasian nations" nourishes the political vision of a common front of both North and South Caucasian peoples against the geopolitical programs of Russia and/or the West (Jones 2004: 93; cf Law 1998: 177–179), the North Caucasian hypothesis draws a linguistic frontier running along the new international border separating the Russian Federation from the Republic of Georgia. One is reminded of Vogt's (1942: 244) remark, made in his initial, positive evaluation of Javaxišvili's Ibero-Caucasian proposal, that "[the Russian authorities] regardait souvent avec soupçon les savants du pays dont les études embrassaient le Caucase entier, craignant qu'ils ne favorisent par là la création d'une conscience nationale unie des peuples divisés du Caucase et une résistance plus efficace à la politique de russification".

Gamq'relidze (1971) once compared Čikobava to Georg Curtius (1820–1885), drawing upon the regrettably common stereotype of Curtius as a cranky reactionary unable to grasp the significance of the Neogrammarians' methodological innovations. The comparison might in fact be more apt than Gamq'relidze realized. Curtius, one of the leading Hellenists of his day and an important contributor to mid–19th-century historical linguistics, may well have been on the wrong side of the debate over Sanskrit vocalism, but his criticism of the Neogrammarians reflected the humanist, philological orientation of many linguists of his generation, who saw in the doctrine of the exceptionless sound-law an instrument too rigid and inflexible to accommodate the historical and social complexities of language change. Čikobava expressed similar criticisms, but in the background was the concern, voiced earlier by Marr and Javaxišvili, that a narrow, exclusivist focus on a single language family, such as Indo-European, could readily be coupled with national or civilizational bias.

Despite these warnings, both supporters and opponents of the Ibero-Caucasian concept were drawn into the historiographic paradigm shift that Ingoroq'va's book catalysed, or at least brought out into plain view. The debates involving Marr, Javaxišvili and Čikobava and their disciples were principally centered on issues relating to the process of reconstructing the past, even if the unity of the Cauca-

sian languages took on the character of preordained dogma, rather than falsifiable hypothesis, in the research practice of many Caucasologists. In the wake of *Giorgi Merčule,* the endpoint of historical reconstruction, the representation of a cultural or linguistic state of affairs in the past, came to the foreground as doublet of an idealized sociopolitical state of affairs in the future.[49]

Indo-European and Caucasian linguistics both emerged as domains of scientific inquiry in the late 18th century, but whereas the former was from the beginning almost exclusively practiced by scholars of Indo-European background, it was not until the mid–19th century that native speakers of Caucasian languages started to participate as researchers as well as informants. At the turn of the 20th century, Georgian scholars, led by Cagareli and Marr, rose to dominance in Kartvelology, and in subsequent decades native North Caucasian and Abkhazian researchers took up the work begun by Schiefner, Uslar and Dirr. The Soviet policy of indigenization of academic institutions certainly accelerated the process, but the Caucasian takeover of Caucasology was well underway in the late Tsarist period. For all intents and purposes, the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis is a product of this latter, indigenous-dominated phase.

Compared to the more than 200 years that Indo-European studies has been the affair of Indo-European-speaking scholars investigating one facet or another of their own family history, Caucasian studies has only had a century in which to experience the consequences of institutional research into the deep past of what is represented as the researcher's own ethnolinguistic community. The longer history of scholarship-abetted ethnocentrism in the Indo-European domain can doubtless help us to understand aspects of the present-day Georgian-Abkhaz *Historikerstreit*, but the lesson it teaches does not inspire unmitigated optimism (Tuite 2003). Even today, the leading Indo-European studies journal in the US is published by the extreme-right activist Roger Pearson, and the French Indo-Europeanist Jean Haudry is closely associated with the Front National. Perhaps the main factor which maintains the intellectual respectability of Indo-European studies — despite the Pearsons and Haudrys lurking behind the curtains — is the tradition of agonistic debate and hypercriticism. As long as each Gobineau finds an August Friedrich Pott (1856; cf. Tuite 2006), and, in the case of Caucasology, each Marr is confronted by a Čikobava, each Čikobava by a Mač'avariani, and so on, there is hope that the field will come out from the long shadow cast by the template-driven nationalist historiography of P'avle Ingoroq'va.

49. I draw upon George Orwell here, albeit without his lapidary succinctness.

REFERENCES

Abuladze, Ilia, chief ed. 1963. "Grigol xandztelis cxovreba [The Life of Grigol of Xandzta]". *Dzveli kartuli agiograpiuli lit'erat'uris dzeglebi, c'igni I (V–X ss.)*, 248–319. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Adelung, Friedrich. 1815. *Catherinens der Grossen Verdienste um die vergleichende Sprachkunde.* St. Petersburg: Friedrich Drechsler. (Repr., with an introd. by Harald Haarmann, Hamburg: Helmut Buske, 1976.)

Alekseev, M. E. 2002. "Kavkazovedčeskie issledovanija v Otdele kavkazskix jazykov Instituta Jazykoznanija RAN [Research on the Caucasus at the Department of Caucasian Languages of the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences]". *Kavkazovedenie* 1.102–119.

Ančabadze, Zurab V. 1964. *Istorija i kul´tura drevnej Abxazii.* Moscow: Nauka, Glavnaja redakcija vostočnoj literatury.

Ančabadze, Zurab V. 1976. *Očerki ètničeskoj istorii abxazskogo naroda [Notes on the ethnic history of the Abkhazian people].* Suxumi: Alašara.

Andɣuladze, Nodar. 1968. *k'lasovani da p'irovani uɣvlilebis ist'oriis zogi sak'itxi iberiul-k'avk'asiur enebši [Some questions concerning the history of class and person conjugation in the Ibero-Caucasian languages]*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Ardzinba, V. G., 1979. "Nekotorye sxodnye strukturnye priznaki xattskogo i abxazo-adygskix jazykov [Some related structural characteristics of the Hattic and Abkhaz-Adyghe languages]". *Peredneasiatskij Sbornik III: Istorija i filologija stran drevnego vostoka,* 26–37. Moscow: "Nauka".

Baramidze, Aleksandre. 1958. *šota rustaveli: monograpiuli nark'vevi [Shota Rustaveli: Monographic essay]*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Benes, Tuska. 2004. "Comparative Linguistics as Ethnology: In search of Indo-Germans in Central Asia, 1770–1830". *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24:2.117–132.

Bengtson, John. 1992. "The Dene-Caucasian Macrophylum". *Nostratic, Dene-Caucasian, Austric and Amerind* ed. by Vitaly Shevoroshkin, 334–341. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer.

Bengtson, John D. & Merritt Ruhlen. 1994. "Global Etymologies". *On the Origin of Languages: Studies in linguistic taxonomy*, 277–336. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Berdzenišvili, Nik'o. 1990. "šenišvnebni apxazetis ist'oriul ganvitarebaze [Notes on the historical development of Abkhazia]". *Sakartvelos ist'oriis sak'itxebi. masalebi sakartvelos ist'oriuli geograpiisatvis,* 588–621. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Bertrand, Frédéric. 2002. *L'anthropologie soviétique des années 20–30: Configuration d'une rupture.* Pessac: Presses universitaires de Bordeaux.

Bgažba (Bɣažºba), X. S. 1964. *Bzybskij dialekt abxazskogo jazyka. (Issledovanie i teksty)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Bodenstedt, Friedrich. 1848. *Die Völker des Kaukasus and ihre Freiheits-Kämpfe gegen die Russen.* Frankfurt am Main: Hermann Johann Kessler.

Boeder, Winfried. 1994. "Identität und Universalität: Volkssprache und Schriftsprache in den Ländern des alten christlichen Orients". *Georgica* 17.66–84.

Boeder, Winfried. 1998. "Sprache und Identität in der Geschichte der Georgier". *Georgien im Spiegel seiner Kultur und Geschichte: Zweites Deutsch-Georgisches Symposium* ed. by B. Schrade & T. Ahbe, 68–81. Berlin: Berliner Georgische Gesellschaft.

Bokarev, E. A. 1954. "Zadači sravitel´no-istoričeskogo izučenija kavkazskix jazykov [The tasks of historical-comparative research of the Caucasian languages]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 3.41–53.

Bokarev, E. A., K. V. Lomtatidze & Ju. D. Dešeriev, eds. 1967. *Jazyki narodov SSSR.* Vol. IV: *Iberijsko-kavkazskie jazyki.* Moscow: "Nauka".

Bomhard, Allan R. 1996. *Indo-European and the Nostratic Hypothesis.* Charleston, N.C.: Signum.

Bopp, Franz. 1846. "Über das Georgische in sprachverwandtschaftlicher Beziehung". *Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*; Phil.-hist. Klasse 1848.259–339.

Bopp, Franz. 1847[1842]. *Die kaukasischen Glieder des indoeuropäischen Stammes.* Berlin: Ferdinand Dümmler, 83 pp. ["Gelesen in der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften am 11. December 1842."]

Bopp, Franz. 1857, 1861. *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Send, armenischen, griechischen, lateinischen, litauischen, altslavischen, gothischen und deutschen.* Vols. II and III. Berlin: Ferdinand Dümmler.

Borbé, Tasso. 1974. "Einleitung: Zur Kritik an der Lehre Marr's". *Kritik der marxistischen Sprachtheorie N. Ja. Marr's* ed. by Tasso Borbé, 5–20. Kronberg /Taunus: Scriptor.

Bouda, Karl. 1949. *Baskisch-kaukasische Etymologien.* Heidelberg: CarlWinter.

Brosset, M. F., comp. and tr. 1858. *Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au commencement du XIXe siecle.* St. Pétersbourg: Académie Impériale des Sciences.

Č'araia, P. 1912. *Ob otnošenii abxazskago jazyka k jafetičeskim: Materialy po jafetičeskomy jazykoznaniju [On the relationship of the Abkhaz and Japhetic languages: Materials in Japhetic linguistics]*. Vol. IV. St. Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademija Nauk.

Catford, J. C. 1977. "Mountain of Tongues: The languages of the Caucasus". *Annual Reviews in Anthropology* 6.283–314.

Çelebi, Evliya. 1983. *Kniga putešestvija: izvlečenija iz sočinenija tureckogo putešestvennika XVII veka [The book of voyages: Excerpts from the works of a Turkish explorer of the 17th century]*. Vypusk III: *Zemli Zakavkaz´ja i sopredel´nyx oblastej Maloj Azii i Irana. Perevod s kommentarii.* Moscow: Akademija nauk SSSR. Institut narodov Azii.

C'ereteli, Giorgi. 1965. "Sonant'ebisa da ablaut'is teoriis gamo kartvelur enebši [About the theory of sonants and ablaut in the Kartvelian languages]". Foreword in Gamq'relidze & Mač'avariani 1965.09–051.

Charachidzé, Georges. 1968. *Le système religieux de la Géorgie païenne: Analyse structurale d'une civilisation.* Paris: Maspero.

Cherchi, Marcello & H. Paul Manning. 2002. *Disciplines and Nations: Niko Marr vs. his Georgian students at Tbilisi State University and the Japhetidology/Caucasology schism.* (= *Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies*, 1603.) Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Center for Russian & East European Studies.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1942. *saxelis pudzis udzvelesi agebuleba kartvelur enebši [The oldest structure of nominal stems in the Kartvelian languages]*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1945. *zogadi enatmecniereba, II. dziritadi p'roblemebi [General linguistics, Part II. Main problems]*. Tbilisi: St'alinis sax. Tbilisis saxelmc'ipo universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1946. *zogadi enatmecniereba, I. p'rop'edevt'ik'uli nac'ili [General linguistics, Part I. Pedagogical section]*. Tbilisi: Sakartvelos SSR saxelmc'ipo gamomcemloba.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1948. "Kartvel´skie jazyki, ix istoričeskij sostav i drevnij lingvističeskij oblik". *Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 2.255–275.

Čikobava, A. S. 1951. "Vystuplenie". *Sessija Otdelenij Obščestvennyx Nauk Akademii Nauk SSSR, posvjaščennaja godovščine opublikovanija genial´nogo proizvedenija I. V. Stalina 'Marksizm i voprosy jazikoznanija'. Sbornik materialov,* 168–171. Moscow: Akademija Nauk SSSR

Čikobava, Arnold. 1953a. "Gramaťik'uli k'las-k'aťegoria da zmnis uɣvlilebis zogi sak'itxi dzvelkartulši" [Grammatical class and some questions concerning verb conjugation in Old Georgian]. *Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 5.51–63.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1953b. "Eť'imologia dzveli kartuli ťerminebisa *bɣuari, samxari* [The etymology of the Old Georgian terms "bɣuari", "samxari" [south]]". *Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 5.65–71.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1954. "Mravalobitis supiksta genezisatvis kartulši [On the genesis of the Georgian plural suffixes]". *Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 6.67–76.

Čikobava, A. S. 1955a. "O dvux osnovnyx voprosax izučenija iberijsko-kavkazskix jazykov [On two basic problems in the study of the Ibero-Caucasian languages]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 6.66–92.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1955b. "P. Uslar i voprosy naučnogo izučenija gorskix iberijsko-kavkazskix jazykov [P. Uslar and the questions of the study of the highland Ibero-Caucasian languages]". *Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 7.461–471.

Čikobava (Tschikobawa), Arn. 1959. "Die ibero-kaukasischen Gebirgssprachen und der heutige Stand ihrer Erforschung in Georgien". *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientarum Hungaricae* 9:2.109–162.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1965. *iberiul-k'avk'asiur enata šesc'avlis ist'oria [The history of the study of the Ibero-Caucasian languages]*. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.

Čikobava, Arn. 1970. "K voprosy ob otnošenii kartvel´skix jazykov k indoevropejskim i severokavkazskim jazykam [On the relationship between the Kartvelian languages with the Indo-European and North-Caucasian languages]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1970:2.50–62.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1979. *iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecnierebis šesavali [Introduction to Ibero-Caucasian linguistics]*. Tbilisi: TSU gamomcemloba .

Čikobava, Arnold. 1985. "Kogda i kak èto bylo [When and how it happened]". *Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecnierebis c'elic'deuli* 12.9–52.

Čikobava, Arnold. 1989. "Kategorija grammatičeskix klassov v istorii kartvel´skix jazykov". *Kategorija grammatičeskix klassov v iberijsko-kavkazskix jazykax* ed. by K. V. Lomtatidze, 3–10. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Chirikba, Vjacheslav. 1998. "Origin of the Abkhazian People". *The Abkhazians: A handbook* ed. by B. George Hewitt, 37–47. London: St. Martin's Press.

Čit'aia, Giorgi. 2001 [1926]. "kartuli etnologia (1917–1926 [Georgian ethnology (1917–1926)]". *šromebi xut t'omad.* T'omi III: *XX s. kartuli etnograpia, savele-etnograpiuli dziebani, metodologia,* 21–32. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Čit'aia, Giorgi. 2000 [1946]. "šesavali sakartvelos etnograpiisatvis [Introduction to the ethnography of Georgia]. *šromebi xut t'omad. t'omi II. kartveli xalxis etnogenezi da k'ult'urul-ist'oriuli p'roblemebi,* 9–30. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Čit'aia, Giorgi. 2001 [1968]. "kartuli sabč'ota etnograpia (1930–1968 [Georgian Soviet ethnography (1930–1968)]". *šromebi xut t'omad. t'omi III. XX s. kartuli etnograpia, savele-etnograpiuli dziebani, metodologia,* 53–73. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Čit'aia, Giorgi. 2000 [1975]. "Ivane Javaxišvili da sakartvelos etnograpia [Ivane Javaxišvili and the ethnography of Georgia]". *šromebi xut t'omad. t'omi II. kartveli xalxis etnogenezi da k'ult'urul-ist'oriuli p'roblemebi,* 64–87. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Colarusso, John. 1989. "Proto-Northwest Caucasian (or How to crack a very hard nut)". *Non-Slavic languages of the USSR: Linguistic studies* ed. by Howard I. Aronson, 20–55. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Comrie, Bernard. 1981. *The Languages of the Soviet Union.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard, Winfried Boeder, George Hewitt & Helma van den Berg. 2003. "Caucasian languages". *Lingua* 115.1–193.

Deeters, Gerhard. 1926–1927. "Armenisch und Südkaukasisch: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Sprachmischung". *Caucasica* 3.1–37, 4.32–64.

Deeters, Gerhard. 1955. "Gab es Nominalklassen in allen kaukasischen Sprachen?" *Corolla Linguistica. Festschrift F. Sommer,* 26–33. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Diakonoff, Igor M. & Sergej A. Starostin 1986. *Hurro-Urartian as an East Caucasian Language.* München: Kitzinger.

Dirr, Adolf. 1928. *Einführung in das Studium der kaukasischen Sprachen, mit einer Sprachenkarte.* Leipzig: Verlag der Asia Major.

D'Istria, Dora. 1860. *Les femmes en Orient*. Vol. II: *La Russie.* Zurich: Meyer & Zeller.

Dodašvili, Rusudan. 1962. *Mari Brose: kartuli mc'erlobis mk'vlevari* [Marie Brosset: Scholar of Georgian literature]. Tbilisi: Sabč'ota Sakartvelo.

Dumézil, Georges. 1933a. *Introduction à la grammaire comparée des langues caucasiennes du nord.* Paris: Honoré Champion.

Dumézil, Georges. 1933b. *Recherches comparatives sur le verbe caucasien.* Paris: Honoré Champion.

Dumézil, Georges. 1937. "Morphologie comparée et phonétique comparée: à propos des langues caucasiennes du nord". *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 38.122–138.

Dunaevskaja, I. M. & D´jakonov, I. M. 1979. "Xattskij (protoxettskij) jazyk". *Jazyki Azii i Afriki,* III*: Jazyki drevnej perednej Azii (nesemitskie), Iberijsko-Kavkazskie jazyki, Paleoaziatskie jazyki* ed. by G. D. Sanžeev, 79–83. Moscow: "Nauka".

Džaparidze, Otar. 1989. *Na zare etnokul´turnoj istorii Kavkaza.* Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press.

Dzidziguri, Šota. 1985. *Nik'o Mari: kartuli k'ult'uris mk'vlevari [Niko Marr: Scholar of Georgian culture]*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba

Fähnrich, Heinz. 1991. "Kartwelisch-drawidische Sprachparallelen". *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 44:3.339–343.

Furnée, Edzard J. 1979. *Vorgriechisch-Kartvelisches: Studium zum ostmediterranen Subtrat nebst einem Versuch zu einer neuen pelasgischen Theorie*. Leuven: Peeters.

Furnée, Edzard J. 1982. *Beiträge zur georgischen Etymologie.* Faszikel 1: *Georgisch-vorgriechische, georgisch-vorromanische und georgisch-vorindogermanische Materialien.* Leuven: Peeters

Gabelentz, Hans Conon von der. 1861. "Über das Passivum: Eine sprachvergleichende Abhandlung". *Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften,* vol. VIII, 449–546. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

Gamq'relidze, T[amaz] and G[ivi] Mač'avariani. 1965. *sonant'ta sist'ema da ablaut'i kartvelur enebši: saerto-kartveluri st'rukt'uris t'ip'ologia [The system of sonants and ablaut in the Kartvelian languages: A typology of Common Kartvelian]*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba. [Annotated German translation by Winfried Boeder, *Sonantensystem und Ablaut in den Kartwelsprachen*. Tübingen: Günter Narr, 1982.]

Gamq'relidze, T. V. 1971. "Sovremennaja diaxroničeskaja lingvistika i kartvel´skie jazyki". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1971:2.19–30 (part I); 3.34–48 (part II).

Gamq'relidze, T. V. 1991a. "K probleme istoriko-ètimologičeskogo osmyslenija ètnonimii drevnej Kolxidy: K istorii termina *apxaz-//abazg-* [On the problem of the historico-etymological meaning of the ethnonyms of ancient Colchis: On the history of the term *abxaz-//abazg*]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1991:4.89–95.

Gamq'relidze, T. V. 1991b. "On the History of the Tribal Names of Ancient Colchis" *Revue des Études Géorgiennes et Caucasiennes* 6–7.237–245. [Translation by Brian George Hewitt.]

Gamsaxurdia, Zviad. 1990. *Sakartvelos sulieri missia*. Tbilisi: Ganatleba. [English translation: *The Spiritual Mission of Georgia. Tbilisi: Ganatleba, 1991.]*

Gamsaxurdia, Zviad. 1994. *ra aris čveni sicocxle? brʒola!* [What is our life? Struggle!]. Tbilisi: Aprasidze.

Gesner, Conrad. 1555. *Mithridates: De differentiis linguarum tum veterum tum quæ hodie apud diversas nationes in toto orbe terrarum in usu sunt.* Zürich: Froschoverus.

Gippert, Jost. 1992. "The Caucasian Language Material in Evliya Çelebi's *Travel Book*: A revision". *Caucasian Perspectives* ed. by Brian George Hewitt, 8–62. München: Lincom Europa.

Gordadzé, Thorniké. 2000. "Moral´no-ideologičeskie prepjastvija k uregulirovaniju gruzino-abxazskogo konflikta [The moral and ideological obstacles to the settlement of the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict]". *Aspekty gruzino-abxazskogo konflikta* 2.51–65. Irvine: University of California–Irvine.

Gordadzé, Thorniké. 2001. "La Géorgie et ses hôtes ingrats: Conflits politiques autour de l'autochtonie". *Critique Internationale* 10.161–176.

Gordeziani, Rismag. 1980. *et'rusk'uli da kartveluri.* Tbilisi: TSU Press.

Gordeziani, Rismag. 1985. *c'inaberdznuli da kartveluri.* Tbilisi: TSU Press.

Greenberg, Joseph. 2000. *Indo-European and Its Closest Relatives: The Eurasiatic language family.* Volume I*: Grammar*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Gudava, T'ogo. 1964. "Regresuli dezaprik'at'izaciis erti šemtxveva zanurši (megrul-č'anurši) [A case of regressive deaffricatization in Zan (Mingrelian-Laz)]". *Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Ak'ademiis Moambe* 33:2.497–503.

Güldenstädt, Johann Anton. 1787, 1791. *Reisen durch Russland und im Caucasischen Gebürge.* 2 vols. St. Petersburg: Kayserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Güldenstädt, Johann Anton. 1834. *Beschreibung der Kaukasischen Länder*. Aus seinen Papieren gänzlich ungearbeitet, verbessert herausgegeben und mit erklärenden Anmerkungen begleitet von Julius Klaproth. Berlin: Verlag der Stuhrschen Buchhandlung.

Gulya, Janos. 1974. "Some Eighteenth Century Antecedents of Nineteenth Century Linguistics: The discovery of Finno-Ugrian". *Studies in the History of Linguistics: Traditions and paradigms* ed. by Dell Hymes, 258–276. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gvanceladze, Teimuraz, Manana T'abidze, Revaz Šerozia, Revaz Č'ant'uria. 2001. "ɣvtismsaxurebisa da sasuliero ganatlebis ena, rogorc rusipik'at'oruli p'olit'ik'is ganxorcielebis sašualeba [The language of liturgy and religious instruction, as a means of carrying out a policy of Russification]". *Kartveluri memk'vidreoba* 5.89–116.

Gvanceladze, Teimuraz. 2004. "Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enata ojaxis šemadgenlobisatvis [On the composition of the Ibero-Caucasian language family]". *Kartveluri memk'vidreoba* 8.67–75.

Haßler, Gerda. 2004. "Typologie und Anthropologie bei Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro". Tintemann & Trabant, eds. 2004.89–100.

Hervás (y Panduro), Lorenzo. 1784. *Catalogo delle lingue conosciute, et notizia della loro affinità e diversità*. Cesena: Gregorio Biasini.

Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1787a. *Idea dell'Universo, vol. XX: Vocabolario poligloto, con prolegomeni sopra più di CL lingue. Dove sono scoperte nuove, ed utili all'Antica storia dell'uman genere, ed alla cognizione del meccanismo delle parole*. Cesena: Gregorio Biasini.

Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1787b. *Idea dell'Universo, vol. XXI: Saggio pratico delle lingue, con prolegomeni e una raccolta di orazioni dominicali in più di CCC lingue e dialetti*. Cesena: Gregorio Biasini.

Hewitt, B[rian] G[eorge]. 1981. "Caucasian Languages". Comrie, ed. 1981.196–237.

Hewitt, B. G. 1991. "The Valid and Non-valid Application of Philology to History". *Revue des Études Géorgiennes et Caucasiennes* 6/7.247–263.

Hewitt, B. G. 2005. "North West Caucasian". *Lingua* 115.91–145.

Imart, G. 1968. "Uslar et la phonologie". *Linguistique* 4:1.31–42.

Ingoroq'va, P'avle. 1954. *giorgi merčule: kartveli mc'erali meate sauk'unisa [Giorgi Merčule: A Georgian writer of the 10th century]*. Tbilisi: Sabč'ota mc'erali.

Ingoroq'va, P'avle. 1963. "rustveliani". *Txzulebata k'rebuli, I. t'omi,* 1–252. Tbilisi: Sabč'ota sakartvelo.

Jakovlev, N. F. 1949. "Izučenie jafetičeskix jazykov Severnogo Kavkaza za sovetskij period [Study of the Japhetic languages of the Northern Caucasus in the Soviet period]". *Jazyki Severnogo Kavkaza i Dagestana. Sbornik lingvističeskix issledovanij* ed. by I. I. Meščaninov & G. P. Serd´jučenko, 296–315. Moscow: Akademii nauk SSSR.

Janašia, Simon. 1940. "čerkezuli (adiɣeuri) element'i sakartvelos ťop'onimik'aši [The Circassian [Adyghe] element in the toponyms of Georgia]". *Mecnierebata ak'ademiis moambe* I:8.623–627. (Reprinted in his *Šromebi* III [1959]: 117–123.)

Janašia, Simon. 1942. "svanur-adiɣeuri enobrivi šexvedrebi [Svan-Adyghe linguistic contacts]". *ENIMK'-is moambe* 12.249–278. (Reprinted in his *Šromebi* III [1959]: 81–116.)

Japaridze, Metropolitan Anania et al. 2005. "'… an č'k'viani mt'eria, an ugnuri moq'vare': sakartvelos sap'at'riarkostan arsebuli kartuli enisa da k'ult'iris samecniero sabč'os ɣia c'erili ['He's either a clever enemy or a stupid friend': An open letter by the 'Scientific council on the Georgian language and culture' of the Patriarchate of Georgia]". Posted at mamuli.net, 5 December 2005.

Javaxišvili, Ivane. 1992 [1937]. *[kartveli eris ist'oriis šesavali, c'igni meore:] kartuli da k'avk'asiuri enebis tavdap'irveli buneba da natesaoba [(Introduction to the History of the Georgian People, Book II:) The original nature and relation of the Georgian and Caucasian languages]*. (= *Txzulebani*, 10.) Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Javaxišvili, Ivane. 1950. *kartveli eris ist'oriis šesavali, c'igni p'irveli: sakartvelos, k'avk'asiisa da maxlobeli aɣmosavletis ist'oriul-etnologiuri p'roblemebi [Introduction to the History of the Georgian People, Book I: Historical and ethnological problems concerning Georgia, the Caucasus and the Near East]*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Javaxišvili, Ivane. 1960. *Kartveli eris ist'oria [The history of the Georgian people]*. Volume I, 5th ed. Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press.

Jones, Stephen. 2004. "The Role of Cultural Paradigms in Georgian Foreign Policy". *Ideology and National Identity in Post-Communist Foreign Policies* ed. by Rick Fawn, 83–110. London: Frank Cass.

Kakabadze, S. S. 1955. "O tak nazyvaemyx 'xettsko-iberijskix' jazykax [On the so-called 'Hattic-Iberian' languages]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4.65–72.

K'ak'abadze, Sargis. 1966. *rustaveli da misi* vepxist'q'aosani [Rustaveli and his 'Knight in the Leopard's Skin']. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.

Kaltz. Barbara. 2004. "'Deutsche gründliche Kritik': Christian Jacob Kraus zu Pallas' *Vergleichendem Glossarium aller Sprachen*". Tintemann & Trabant, eds. 2004.181–197.

Karst, Joseph. 1931. *Origines Mediterraneae: Die vorgeschichtlichen Mittelmeervölker nach Ursprung, Schichtung und Verwandtschaft. Ethnologisch-linguistische Forschungen über Euskaldunak (Urbasken), Alarodier und Proto-Phrygen, Pyrenaeo-Kaukasier und Atlanto-Ligurer, West- und Ostiberer, Liguro-Leleger, Etrusker und Pelasger, Tyrrhener, Lyder und Hetiter.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Kavtaradze, Giorgi. 1985. *anatoliaši kartvelur t'omta gansaxlebis sak'itxisatvis [On the issue of the settlement of Georgian tribes in Anatolia]*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Kholbaia, Vakhtang, Raphiel Gelantia, David Latsuzbaia & Teimuraz Chakhrakia. 1999. *Labyrinth of Abkhazia*. Translated and adapted by Nana Japaridze-Chkoidze. Tbilisi: Parliament of Georgia. [Text available on-line at <http://www.abkhazia-georgia.parliament.ge/Publications/Georgian/labyrinth_of_abkhazia.htm>]

Khoshtaria-Brosset, Edisher. 1997. *History and Today: The Abkhazian problem in the light of conflict studies.* Tbilisi: International Center on Conflict & Negotiation.

K itogam. 1956. "K itogam diskussii o 'xettsko-iberijskom' jazykovom edinstve [On the results of the discussion on the 'Hattic-Iberian' linguistic unity]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1956:1.68–73.

Klaproth, Julius von. 1812, 1814a. *Reise in den Kaukasus and Georgien unternommen in den Jahren 1807 and 1808 auf Veranstaltung der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St. Petersburg. Enthaltend eine vollständige Beschreibung der kaukasischen Länder und ihrer Bewohner.* 2 vols. Halle & Berlin: Buchhandlung des Hallischen Waisenhauses.

Klaproth, Julius von. 1814b. *Kaukasische Sprachen. Anhang zur Reise in den Kaukasus und nach Georgien.* Halle & Berlin: Buchhandlung des Hallischen Waisenhauses.

Klaproth, Julius von. 1826. *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie.* Paris: Dondey-Dupré.

Klaproth, Julius von. 1827. *Tableau historique, géographique, ethnographique et politique du Caucase et des provinces limitrophes entre la Russie et la Perse.* Paris: Ponthieu et Cie.

Klaproth, Julius. 1831. *Asia polyglotta*. 2nd ed. Paris: Heideloff & Campe.

Klimov, G. A. 1964. *Etimologičeskij slovar´ kartvel´skix jazykov.* Moscow: "Nauka".

Klimov, G. A. 1968. "O gipoteza vnutrennogo rodstva kavkazskix jazykov [On the hypothesis of the inner kinship of the languages of the Caucasus]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1968:6.16–25.

Klimov, G. A. 1969. *Die kaukasische Sprachen*. Transl. by Winfried Boeder. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Klimov, G. A. 1970. "O vnešnix svjazjax kartvel´skix jazykov [On the external links of the Kartvelian languages]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1970:6.36–45.

Klimov, G. A. 1973. "Kavkazskie (iberijsko-kavkazskie) jazyki [Caucasian (Ibero-Caucasian) languages]". *Bol´šaja Sovetskaja Ènciklopedia,* 3rd ed., vol. XI, 121–122. Moscow: Naučnoe izdatel´stvo Bol´šaja Sovetskaja Ènciklopedia.

Klimov, G. A. 1984. "Opyt stratifikacii kartvel´skix indoevropeizmov [Explorations of the stratification of Kartvelian Indo-Europeanisms]". *Ètimologija* 1984.85–89.

Klimov, G. A. 1986a. *Vvedenie v kavkazskoe jazykoznanie.* Moscow: "Nauka".

Klimov, G. A. 1986b. "Problems of Caucasian areal linguistics". *Aspects of Language: Studies in honour of Mario Alinei*. Volume I: *Geolinguistics. Papers presented to Mario Alinei by his friends and colleagues of the Atlas Linguarum Europae on the occasion of his 60th birthday,* 123–131. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Klimov, G. A. 1991. "Some Thoughts on Indo-European-Kartvelian Relations". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 19.325–348.

Klimov, G. A. 1994. "Kartvelian Evidence for the Indo-European Laryngeal?". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 99.62–71.

Kuipers, Aert. 1963. "Caucasian". *Current Trends in Linguistics* ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, vol. I: *Soviet and East European Linguistics*, 315–344. The Hague: Mouton.

K'varacxelia, G. & V. Šengelia. 1998. *arnold čikobavas dabadebis 100 c'listavisadmi midzyvnili saertašoriso simp'oziumis masalebi* [Materials from an international symposium in honor of Arnold Čikobava's 100th anniversary]. Tbilisi: Kartuli ena.

Lafon, René. 1929. "Quelques rapprochements entre les langues caucasiques septentrionales et les langues kartvèles". *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 29.138–152.

Law, Vivien. 1998. "Language Myths and the Discourse of Nation-Building in Georgia". *Nation-Building in the Post-Soviet Borderlands: The politics of national identities* ed. by Graham Smith, Vivien Law, Andrew Wilson et al., 167–196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm von. 1989a [1768]. "Epistola ad Andream Acoluthum. Hanovera 10. Octobr. 1695". *Opera omnia, studio Ludovici Dutens, tomus sextus,* 138–140. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1989b [1768]. "Desiderata Circa Linguas Populorum, ad Dn. Podesta, Interpretem Caesareum Transmissa". *Opera omnia, studio Ludovici Dutens, tomus sextus,* 228–230. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Leont'i Mroveli. 1955. *Kartlis cxovreba, I. cxovreba kartvelta mepeta* [The Georgian Chronicles, I. The lives of the Georgian kings]. Ed. by Simon Q'auxčišvili. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Leščak, Oleg & Jurij Sitko. 2005. "Les considérations onto-gnoséologiques de Marr du point de vue de la méthodologie pragmatico-fonctionnelle". Sériot, ed. 2005a.177–198.

Lomtatidze, K. V. 1955. "Nekotorye voprosy iberijsko-kavkazskogo jazykoznanija [Some questions of Ibero-Caucasian linguistics]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4.73–82.

Lomtatidze, K. V., red. 1989. *Kategorija grammatičeskix klassov v iberijsko-kavkazskix jazykax.* Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Mač'avariani, Givi. 1966. "K tipologičeskoj xarakteristike obščekartvel´skogo jazyka-osnovy [On the typological characteristics of the Kartvelian protolanguage]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1966:1.1–9.

Machavariani, Givi. 1970. "The System of the Ancient Kartvelian Nominal Flection as Compared to those of the Mountain Caucasian and Indo-European Languages". *Theoretical problems of typology and the northern Eurasian languages* ed. by László Dezső & Petar Hajdu, 165–169. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Mač'avariani, Givi. 2002. *kartvelur enata šedarebiti gramat'ik'a [Comparative grammar of the Kartvelian languages]*. Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Manaster-Ramer, Alexis. 1995. "On 'Some Thoughts on Indo-European-Kartvelian Relations'". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 23.195–208.

Marr, N. Ja. 1908. "Predvaritel´noe soobščenie o rodstve gruzinskogo jazyka s semitičeskimi [Preliminary communication on the kinship of the Georgian language with Semitic]". Marr 1933.23–38.

Marr, N. Ja. 1910. *Grammatika čanskago (lazskago) jazyka [Grammar of the Chan (Laz) language]*. (= *Materialy po jafetičeskomy jazykoznaniju*, 2.) St. Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademija Nauk.

Marr, N. Ja. 1912. *K voprosu o položenii abxazskago jazyka sredi jafetičeskix [On the question of the place of the Abhhaz language within the Japhetic languages]*. (= *Materialy po jafetičeskom*, 5.) St. Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademija Nauk.

Marr, N. Ja. 1916. "Kavkazovedenie i abxazskij jazyk [Caucasian and the Abkhaz language]". Marr 1933.59–78.

Marr, N. Ja. 1920. "Jafetičeskij Kavkaz i tretij ètničeskij èlement v sozidanii Sredizemnomorskoj kul´tury [The Japhetic Caucasus and the third ethnic element in the creation of the Mediterranean culture]". Marr 1933.79–124.

Marr, N. Ja. 1927a. "Iz Pirinejskoj Gurii (K voprosy o metode) [From Pyrenean Guria (On the question of method)]". (= *Izvestija kavkazskogo istoriko-arxeologičeskogo instituta*, V.1–62.) Moscow.

Marr, N. Ja. 1927b. "Predislovie k *Jafetičeskomu Sborniku*, tom V [Foreword to the *Japhetic anthology*, vol. V]". Marr 1933.249–253.

Marr, N. Ja. 1930. "Abxazskij jazyk". *Literaturnaja Ènciklopedia* I, 18–23. Moscow: Izd. Kom. Akad.

Marr, N. Ja. 1931. "Jafetičeskie jazyki". *Bol´šaja Sovetskaja Ènciklopedia* LXV, 827–849. Moscow: Sovetskaja Ènciklopedia. [1st ed.]

Marr, N. Ja. 1933. *Izbrannye raboty*. Tom I: *Ètapy razvitija jafetičeskoj teorija*. Leningrad, Izdat. GAIMK.

Melikišvili, Giorgi. 1959. *K istorii drevnej Gruzii [On the history of Old Georgian]*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Müller, Friedrich. 1887. *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft*. III. Band: *Die Sprachen der lockenhaarigen Rassen*. Wien: Alfred Hölder.

Müller, F[riedrich] Max. 1854. *Suggestions for the Assistance of Officers in Learning the Languages of the Seat of War in the East*. London: Williams & Norgate.

Nazarov, Vladimir P. 1974. "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der kaukasischen Sprachen". *Kritik der marxistischen Sprachtheorie N. Ja. Marr's* ed. by Tasso Borbé, 21–61. Kronberg/Taunus: Scriptor.

Nichols, Johanna. 1986. "Head-Marking and Dependent-Marking Grammar". *Language* 62:1.56–119.

Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nichols, Johanna. 1997. "Nikolayev & Starostin's *North Caucasian Etymological Dictionary* and the Methodology of Long-Range Comparison". Paper presented at the 10th Conference on the Non-Slavic Languages of the ex-USSR (*NSL 10*), University of Chicago, 10 May 1997.

Nichols, Johanna. 2003. "The Nakh-Daghestanian Consonant Correspondences". *Current trends in Caucasian, East European, and Inner Asian linguistics: Papers in honor of Howard I. Aronson* ed. by Dee Ann Holisky & Kevin Tuite, 207–251. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nikolayev, S. L. & S. A. Starostin. 1994. *A North Caucasian Etymological Dictionary.* Moscow: Asterisk.

Nikol´skij, V. K. & N. F. Jakovlev. 1949. "Osnovnye položenija materialističeskogo učenija N. Ja. Marra o jazyke [Foundations of the materialistic teaching of N. Ja. Marr concerning language]". *Voprosy filosofii* 1.265–285.

Öhrig, Bruno. 2000. "Adolf Dirr (1867–1930): Ein Kaukasus-Forscher am Münchner Völkerkundemuseum". *Münchner Beiträge zur Völkerkunde* 6.199–234.

Oniani, Aleksandre. 1978. *kartvelur enata ist'oriuli morpologiis sak'itxebi* [Issues in Georgian historical morphology]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Oniani, A. L. 1985. "O grammatičeskoj kategorii klassa v kartvel´skix jazykax [On the grammatical category of class in the Kartvelian languages]". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1985:3.67–76.

Oniani, Aleksandre. 1989. *kartvelur enata šedarebiti gramat'ik'is sak'itxebi: saxelta morpologia [Issues in the comparative grammar of the Kartvelian languages: Nominal morphology]*. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.

Pedersen, Holger. 1983 [1916]. *A Glance at the History of Linguistics, with particular regard to the historical study of phonology.* Translated from the Danish by Caroline C. Henriksen; edited with an introduction by Konrad Koerner. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pictet, Adolphe. 1859. *Les origines indo-européennes, ou les Aryas primitifs: Essai de paléontologie linguistique.* Vol. I. Paris: Joël Cherbuliez.

Potocki, Jean. 1829. *Voyage dans les steppes d'Astrakhan et du Caucase.* Paris: Merlin.

Pott, August Friedrich. 1856. *Die Ungleichheit menschlicher Rassen hauptsächlich vom sprachwissenschaftlichen Standpunkte, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von des Grafen von Gobineau gleichnamigem Werke.* Lemgo & Detmold: Meyer.

Put'k'aradze, T'ariel. 2001. "ɣvtismsaxurebis ena "q'ovelta kartvelta" ertianobis gamsazɣvreli ert-erti mtavari pakt'ori. samc'ignobro enisa da dialekt'ta mimartebis sak'itxisatvis [The liturgical language as one of the chief defining elements of the unity of "All Georgians": On the question of the relation between a literary language and its dialects]". *Kartveluri memk'vidreoba* 5.227–241.

Put'k'aradze, T'ariel. 2002. "kartvelebi, zogadkartuli samc'ignobro ena da kartvelta dialekt'ebi [The Georgians, the Common-Georgian literary language and the Georgians' dialects]". *Kartveluri memk'vidreoba* 6.187–203.

Put'k'aradze, T'ariel. 2003. "monatesave enobriv erteulta k'valipik'aciis sak'itxisatvis tanamedrove mecnierebaši [On the question of the qualification of related linguistic units in contemporary science]". *Kartveluri memk'vidreoba* 7.206–227.

Put'k'aradze, T'ariel. 2005. *kartvelebi. ist'oriuli sacxovrisi, dedaena, dialekt'ebi. nac'ili I: krist'ianobamdeli ep'oka [The Georgians: Historical homeland, mother tongue, dialects. Part I: Pre-Christian period]*. Kutaisi: Kutaisi State University Dialectology Research Institute.

Rask, Rasmus. 1826. *Über das Alter und die Echtheit der Zend-Sprache und des Zend-Avesta, und Herstellung des Zend-Alphabets; nebst einer Übersicht des gesammten Sprachstammes*. Transl. by Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.

Rogava, Giorgi. 1952. "kartvelur enata ponet'ik'is ist'oriul-šedarebiti šesc'avlis dziritadi sak'itxebi [Basic issues in the historical-comparative study of the phonetics of the Kartvelian languages]". *Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 4.35–51.

Rogava, Giorgi. 1954. "iberiul-k'avk'asiur enata saerto k'utvnilebis *tesvis* aɣmnišvneli pudze [The common Ibero-Caucasian root meaning 'to sow']". *Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 6.51–53.

Sanžeev, G. D., ed. 1979. *Jazyki Azii i Afriki.* III: *Jazyki drevnej perednej Azii (nesemitskie), Iberijsko-Kavkazskie jazyki, Paleoaziatskie jazyki.* Moscow: "Nauka".

Šaradzenidze, Tinatin. 1955. "brunvata k'lasipik'aciisatvis svanurši [On the classification of Svan declension]". *Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 7.125–135

Sarǰveladze, Zurab, K'orneli Danelia & Elguǰa Giunašvili, eds. 1986. *Iak'ob Xucesi "Šušanik'is c'ameba", Giorgi Merčule "Grigol Xandztelis cxovreba", sask'olo gamocema gamocema ["The*

Martyrdom of Shushanik" by Iakob Xucesi, and "The Life of Grigol of Xandzta" by Giorgi Merchule. School edition]. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.

Schiefner, Anton. 1854. "Kurze Charakteristik der Thusch-Sprache". *Mélanges asiatiques tirés du Bulletin historico-philologique de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St-Pétersbourg* 2.402–426.

Schiefner, Anton. 1856. *Versuch über die Thusch-Sprache; oder, Die khistische Mundart in Thuschetien.* St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1962. *Studien zur Rekonstruktion des Lautstandes der südkaukasischen Grundsprache.* (= *Abhandlung für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 34:3), 1–160. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1896. "Über den passiven Charakter des Transitivs in den kaukasischen Sprachen". *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 133.1–91.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1912, 1914. "Zur methodischen Erforschung der Sprachverwandschaft (Nubisch und Baskisch)". *Revue Internationale des Etudes Basques* 6.267–281; 8.389–396.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 1987. Review of Diakonoff & Starostin (1986). *Kratylos* 32.154–159.

Schulze[-Fürhoff], Wolfgang. 1992. "Zur Entwicklungsdynamik morphosyntaktischer Subsysteme: Die ostkaukasische Klassenzeichen". *Caucasologie und mythologie comparée* ed. by Catherine Paris, 335–362. Louvain & Paris: Peeters.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 1997. Review of Nikolayev & Starostin (1994). *Diachronica* 14:1.149–161.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 1998. *Person, Klasse, Kongruenz. Fragmente einer Kategorialtypologie des einfachen Satzes in den ostkaukasischen Sprachen.* Band I: *Die Grundlagen.* München & Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 2001. "Die kaukasischen Sprachen". *La typologie des langues et les universaux linguistiques* ed. by Martin Haspelmath et al., Tome I, 1774–1796. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 2005. "Grammars for East Caucasian". *Anthropological Linguistics* 47.3: 321–352.

Sériot, Patrick. 1993. "La double vie de Troubetzkoy, ou la clôture des systèmes". *Le Gré des langues* 5.88–115. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Sériot, Patrick, ed. 2005a. *Un paradigme perdu: La linguistique marriste.* (= *Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique et des Sciences du Langage*, 20.) Lausanne: Université de Lausanne.

Sériot, Patrick. 2005b. "Si Vico avait lu Engels, il s'appellerait Nicolas Marr". Sériot, ed. 2005a.227–254.

Shamba, Giorgi. 1998. "On the Track of Abkhazia's Antiquity". *The Abkhazians: A handbook* ed. by B. G. Hewitt, 48–58. London: St. Martin's Press.

Slodzian, Monique. 2005. "Actualité de Marr, ou permanence de l'utopie". Sériot, ed. 2005a.271–293.

Smeets, Rieks. 1989. "On Hurro-Urartian as Eastern Caucasian language". *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 46.259–279.

Stalin, Joseph. 1972 [1951]. *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics.* Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

Strahlenberg, Philip Johan von. 1730. *Das Nord- und Östliche Theil von Europa und Asia, in so weit solches das gantze Russische Reich mit Sibirien und der grossen Tatarey in sich begriffet*. Stockholm: In Verlegung des Autoris.

Tintemann, Ute. 2004. "*Asia Polyglotta*: Zu den Sprachstudien von Julius Heinrich Klaproth". Tintemann & Trabant, eds. 2004.199–214.

Tintemann, Ute & Jürgen Trabant, eds. 2004. *Sprache und Sprachen in Berlin um 1800*. (= *Berliner Klassik — eine Grossstadtkultur um 1800*, 3.) Hannover-Laatzen: Wehrhahn.

Tiškov, V. A., chief ed. 1994. *Narody Rossij: Ènciklopedija.* Moscow: Naučnoe izdatel´stvo Bol´šaja Rossijskaja Ènciklopedia.

Trabant, Jürgen. 2004. "Mithridates in Berlin". Tintemann & Trabant, eds. 2004.141–159.

Trautmann, Thomas R. 1997. *Aryans and British India.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Trautmann, Thomas R. 2001. "The Whole History of Kinship Terminology in Three Chapters: Before [Lewis Henry] Morgan, Morgan, and after Morgan". *Anthropological Theory* 1:2.268–287.

Trubetzkoy, N. S. 1987 [1930]. "Severnokavkazskie slovarnye sopostavlenija". *Izbrannye trudy po filologii.* Moscow: Progress, 271–282. [Russian translation, with annotations by Sergej Starostin, of "Nordkaukasische Wortgleichungen", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 37:2: 79–92.]

Trubetzkoy, N. S. 1934. Review of Georges Dumézil, *Études comparatives sur les langues caucasiennes du Nord-Ouest* (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1932) and Dumézil (1933b). *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 10.629–635.

Tseretheli, M. 1913–1916. "Sumerian and Georgian: A study in comparative philology". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 45.783–821; 46.1–36; 47.255–288; 48.1–58.

Tuite, Kevin. 2003. "Explorations in the Ideological Infrastructure of Indo-European Studies". *Historiographia Linguistica* 30:1/2.205–217.

Tuite, Kevin. 2006. "Of Phonemes, Fossils and Webs of Meaning: The interpretation of language variation and change". *Language, Culture and Society: Key topics in linguistic anthropology* ed. by Christine Jourdan & Kevin Tuite, 229–256. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tuite, Kevin & Wolfgang Schulze. 1998. "A Case of Taboo-Motivated Lexical Replacement in the Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus". *Anthropological Linguistics* 40:3.363–383.

Turgot, Anne-Robert-Jacques. 1966 [1756]. "Étymologie". *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* ed. by Denis Diderot & Jean D'Alembert, vol. VI, 98–111. Stuttgart: Friedrich Frommann.

Uslar, P. K. 1888. *Ètnografija Kavkaza: Jazykoznanie,* II: *Čečenskij jazyk.* Tiflis: Upravlenie Kavkazskago Učebnago Okruga.

van den Berg, Helma. 2005. "The East Caucasian Language Family". *Lingua* 115.147–190.

Voegelin, C. F. & F. M. Voegelin. 1964. "Languages of the World: Ibero-Caucasian and Pidgin-Creole. Fascicle one". *Anthropological Linguistics* 6:8.1–39.

Vogt, Hans. 1932. "Les groupes nominaux en arménien et en géorgien anciens". *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 5.57–81.

Vogt, Hans. 1942. "La parenté des langues caucasiques". *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 12.242–257.

Vogt, Hans. 1955. "Le basque et les langues caucasiques". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 51.121–147.

Voronov, Ju. N. 1994. *Abkhazians — Who are they?* Sukhum: Abkhazian State University.

SUMMARY

The hypothesis that the three indigenous Caucasian language stocks (Abkhaz-Adyghean, Nakh-Daghestanian, and Kartvelian) are genetically related has little support at the present day among linguists specializing in these languages. Nonetheless, the so-called 'Ibero-Caucasian' hypothesis had strong institutional backing in Soviet Caucasology, especially in Georgia, and continues to be invoked in certain contemporary discourses of a political and identitarian nature. In this paper the history of the Ibero-Caucasian hypothesis will be presented against the background of research into the autochthonous languages of the North and South Caucasus, and also in connection with the historiographic debate over the relation of Abkhazia to Georgia.

RÉSUMÉ

L'hypothèse que les trois groupes de langues autochtones du Caucase (abkhaz-adyghéen, nakh-daghestanais, et kartvèle) soient génétiquement apparentés jouit à l'heure actuelle de très peu d'appui de la part des spécialistes des langues en question. Toutefois, l'hypothèse dite 'ibéro-caucasienne' avait autrefois presque le statut de dogme auprès des caucasologues en URSS, surtout en Géorgie, et au présent, elle refait surface dans des discours de nature politique et identitaire. L'histoire de l'hypothèse ibéro-caucasienne sera présentée dans le contexte des recherches sur les langues autochtones du Caucase du nord et du sud, et également par rapport au débat historiographique autour de la relation de l'Abkhazie à la Géorgie.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Heutzutage findet die Hypothese, derzufolge die drei kaukasishen Sprachgruppen (das Abchasisch-Adygheanische, das Nach-Daghestanische und das Kartwelische) miteinander verwandt seien, wenig Unterstützung seitens der Spezialisten dieser Sprachen. Dennoch erhält die so genannte 'ibero-kaukasische' Hypothese, die in der sowjetischen Kaukasologie, besonders in Georgien, starke institutionelle Unterstützung erhalten hatte, in gewissen politischen und identitäts-bezogenen Diskursen weiterhin Zuspruch. Im vorliegenden Aufsatz wird die Geschichte dieser ibero-kaukasischen Hypothese vor dem Hintergrund der Erforschung der autochthonischen Sprachen des Nord- und Südkaukasus nachgezeichnet, auch im Zusammenhang mit der historiographischen Diskusssion bezüglich des Verhältnisses zwischen Abkhasien und Georgien.