

Achtung!

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe des Aufsatzes
“The Caucasian language material in Evliya Çelebi’s ‘Travel Book’. A Revision”
von Jost Gippert (1991).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Originalausgabe in
Caucasian Perspectives, ed. G. Hewitt, Unterschleissheim / München 1992, 8-62
zu entnehmen.

Attention!

This is a special internet edition of the article
“The Caucasian language material in Evliya Çelebi’s ‘Travel Book’. A Revision”
by Jost Gippert (1991).

It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the original edition in
Caucasian Perspectives, ed. G. Hewitt, Unterschleissheim / München 1992, 8-62.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved:

Jost Gippert, Frankfurt 2002-2011

The Caucasian language material
in Evliya Çelebi's "Travel book"
A Revision

Jost Gippert

When in 1934, Robert BLEICHSTEINER published the Caucasian language specimina contained in the "travel book" of the 17th century Turkish writer Evliya Çelebi¹, he was struck by the amount of reliability he found in Evliya's notations: "(Die Sprachproben) sind, von einzelnen Mißverständnissen abgesehen, und wenn man die falschen Punktierungen und Irrtümer der Kopisten abrechnet, außerordentlich gut, ja zuweilen mit einem gewissen phonetischen Geschick wiedergegeben, was der Auffassungsgabe und dem Eifer Evliyas ein hohes Zeugnis ausstellt. Man muß bedenken, wie schwer das arabische Alphabet, ohne weitere Unterscheidungszeichen, wie sie die islamischen Kaukasusvölker anwenden, die verwickelten, oft über 70 verschiedene Phoneme umfassenden Lautsysteme wiederzugeben imstande ist. Wenn trotzdem die Entzifferung der Sprachproben zum größten Teil geglückt ist, so muß man der ungewöhnlichen Begabung des türkischen Reisenden und Gelehrten schrankenlose Bewunderung zollen" (85).

BLEICHSTEINER's judgment must be seen under the aspect that the material he had to rely upon was far from being apt for a thorough linguistic analysis: As is widely accepted today, neither the first edition (by Ahmet CEVDET), published in Istanbul between 1896 and 1901², nor Joseph von HAMMER-PURGSTALL's translation, which had appeared

¹ "Die kaukasischen Sprachproben in Evliya Çelebi's Seyahetname", in: *Caucasica* 11, 84-126.

² Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahetname*, Vols. I-VI; Vols. VII-VIII were edited by Kilisli RİFAT and appeared in Istanbul 1928, Vols. IX-X ib. in 1935-1938.

half a century earlier³, offer a sufficient basis for detailed studies, both being based on late and incorrect manuscripts only. Now, however, we are in a happier position, since Evliya's original autograph has been identified in the so called Bağdat Köşkü series of Istanbul manuscripts⁴. On the basis of this autograph, a reconsideration of the Caucasian language material, which in the case of Abkhaz, Ubykh, Circassian, and Megrelian represents the oldest cohesive material available at all, suggests itself. Having Evliya's manuscript at hand, BLEICHSTEINER's judgment must, as we will see, not only be sustained but even reinforced. No longer having to face the "wrong punctuations and errors of the copyists", we are in the position to elucidate quite a lot of problematical words and phrases in the language specimens of interest to us here. In addition, even some new material can be adduced.

In the following treatise, Evliya's Caucasian material is arranged in the order he himself presents it: It starts with **Abkhaz** (in Evliya's words: *lisān-i 'acīb u garīb-i Abāza*, i.e. "the strange and peculiar language of the Abaza"; as is well known, Abkhaz was Evliya's mother's tongue) and **Ubykh** (*lisān-i Şadşa-Abaza*, "language of the Sadşa-Abaza"), both appearing in pag. 258b f. of manuscript Bağdat 304, within the second book of the Seyāhat-nāme. Later on in the same book, we find the **Georgian** (*Şawşad Gürcüleriniñ lisāni*, "the language of the Şawşat=Şavşeti – Georgians") and the **Megrelian** (*Megrel kavminiñ lisānları*, "the languages of the Megrel tribe") specimen, on pag. 320a and 332b, respectively. The **Circassian** (*lisān-i Çerākize-yi māmālūqa*, "language of the Mamluk-Circassians") specimen is contained in pag. 157b of the manuscript Bağdat 308 within the seventh book.

Of the five specimina, the Ubykh alone deserves no further exhaustive study, because it was the object of a detailed investigation by Elio PROVASI⁵ recently who did use the autograph manuscript (although he seems not to have recognized its actual value). It will be included here for the sake of completeness only.

For all five languages, Evliya's material will be presented in the following way: For all single entries, first the Turkish equivalent is given both in (Osmanist) transcription and in Evliya's original Arabic-Ottoman notation. Then, former interpretations of the Caucas-

³ "Narrative of Travels in Europe, Asia and Africa ... by Evliya Effendi", London 1846-1850.

⁴ Cf. F. KREUTEL, "Neues zur Evliya Çelebi Forschung", in: *Der Islam* 48, 1972, 269-298, esp. 274.

⁵ "Encore sur l'oubykh d'Evliyā Čelebi", in: *Annali (dell') Istituto Universitario Orientale (di) Napoli*, vol. 44, 1984, 307-317.

ian word or sentence in question are quoted for comparison; except for Ubykh, where G. DUMÉZIL's study is used as a reference⁶, this is normally R. BLEICHSTEINER's interpretation. Next, for all languages but Ubykh, an equivalent of Evliya's entry in today's "normal" language (and orthography) as well as a phonological interpretation is proposed. Every entry closes with Evliya's original notation of the words he heard, together with a "Turkicizing" transcription, which is intended as a means of linking the — most often ambiguous — Arabic notation with what can be assumed as its contents. In the transcription, I make use of the methodic principles as developed by R. DANKOFF for his "Evliya Çelebi Glossary" of "Unusual, Dialectal and Foreign Words in the Seyahat-name", the preparation of which gave rise to the present study⁷. Especially the following rules should be kept in mind here: Arabic *alif* (ا) is transcribed as *a* or *ä*, the mark of *a*-vocalization, *fatha* (َ), as *e* or *á*, Arabic *yā* (ي / ِ) and the mark of *i*-vocalization, *kasra* (ِ), as *i* or *é*, Arabic *wāw* (و) and the mark of *u*-vocalization, *damma* (ُ), as *o*, *u*, *ö*, or *ü*, according to the sounds they are likely to represent. For some of the languages, additional principles have turned out necessary; these are explained in the introduction to each treatise. Whenever a single entry deserves an explicite commentary, this is added immediately after it.

For all five specimina, the part of the manuscript containing it is presented here as a facsimile in order to allow for an examination of the readings. Note that in his second book, Evliya chose an interlinear arrangement for the foreign material and its Turkish translation (each pair of lines belonging together is marked by an additional brace, here), whereas the Circassian is arranged in a succeeding way (except for the numbers).

No attempts will be made here to deal with a four (half-)verse poem within Evliya's material that was formerly regarded as Laz⁸: The poem, contained in page 253a of the second volume of Evliya's book, occurs in a nearly identical shape in vol. 8 (336b) again, where it forms part of the specimen of the Trabzon Greek dialect, and there are only Greek elements to be detected in it; cf. DANKOFF's glossary (114) for this.

⁶ "L'oubykh d' Evliya Çelebi", in: *Journal Asiatique* 266, 1978, 57-66. PROVASI (l.c.) does not deal explicitly with all entries presented by Evliya.

⁷ The volume, published at the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations of Harvard University (*Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures*, ed. by Şinasi TEKIN & Gönül Alpay TEKIN, 14: Turkish sources XII), has just appeared (1991; the main title is *Turkish: Evliya Çelebi lügati. Seyahat-name'deki Yabancı kelimeler, Mahallî İfadeler*); on pages 121 sq., it contains a short account of Evliya's Caucasian language materials.

⁸ Cf. e.g. S.S. ŽIKIA, "Evliya Çelebi lazebisa da lazuris šesaxeb / Ėvlija Čelebi o lazax i lazskom jazyke", in: *Iberiuł-kavkasiuri enatmecniereba / Iberijsko-kavkazskoe jazykoznanie*, 6, 1954, 243-256.

Maybe some readers will find that the translation of Evliya's examples sounds a little bit too rough or straightforward at times; to them, we may quote as an apologia what Evliya felt necessary to state himself on behalf of his Megrelian material:

سياحله بوكونه شتوملر^۹ دخي بلمك لأزمدركم كندويه سوكدكلري معلو^۹ اولو^۹

اول محلده هر كسله حَسْنالفت ايدوپ بر تقريپ ايله جانب سلامتته چيقه

seyyāhlara bu gūne şutūmları daxı bilmek lāzımdır kim kendüye sögdükleri ma'lūm olup

ol maħalde herkesle hūsn-i ülfet édiip bir taqrīb ile cānib-i selāmete çıqa.

“Travellers must know such insultings too, so that they may understand what they were insulted with and may find safety from danger in a certain way by keeping friendly relations with everybody in this region.”⁹

My thanks are due to Robert DANKOFF, Klaus KREISER and Semih TEZCAN, who checked all readings and contributed many improvements, especially for the Turkic part, as well as Winfried BOEDER and George HEWITT, to whom I owe many ideas and corrections in the Caucasian part. It goes without saying, that all errors and shortcomings of the present study are mine.

⁹ Lines 30-31 within the Megrelian specimen (pag. 332b).

Abkhaz:

II: 258b, 11 لسان غريب و عجيب كباره

آق و با اخنيا يشنا خونبا زبا بزبا عبا زبا آق زوبا و باثوبا
 ۱۲ ۱۱ ۱۰ ۹ ۸ ۷ ۶ ۵ ۴ ۳ ۲
 و ايمانه اوچين اوستوي اوقيل اوچمين ازپيش سيجاب انخوش
 كلن كينت اوطور قالق كتمه اوغلان كيده رر عورت
 سيجام اوز مجوروت ازپيش سيره ازديروي اوره يودزوا و خاخ نسي
 كتم نچود كتمسك اوغلان بن بليروز سن نديرسك خاتم كوزوم
 سيره ازديروا سيرا سترقت ارش از حوه زوين و ازبوزوه اشوه برون
 بنم بالديكم ناكه يتر بويله نچين سونلرسك صايقلمين نه سويليم يوزر
 سيره استرديروم اوره يوهووه اوره يودزوه آفه اوره اوقه غنوب آچكيب
 بن بلسمر سند سويلدنك سن بلسك اما سنك عقالك يوقدر التميم
 اوچكيب ازنينس اكي سترديروم آچرنيش اوشن قونج سر شخت سيره آقرا اوشون
 و خلق حقتون بر شو بلهمر و التميم الجمده بكه ياز قدر يابن ز شيموي سويليم يوزر
 آچرنيش ايش امله سيشنوي سيجاب يضاظه يوزر ميم غويوف و انيش قوست
 و الله ابازه تر نم جدر كيده رر يضاظه يوزر طاشاغم يه انكر سيجم

In the phonological spelling, aspirated consonants are marked by °, glottalized ones by °. Palatalization is marked by ' , labialization by °. Vowel length is marked by :. Word accent is only indicated, by ' , where I am sure. Morpheme boundaries are represented by hyphens. In the “Turkicizing” transcription of Evliya’s notations, necessary additions (mostly of vocalizations) are given in parentheses, whereas necessary deletions (mostly of prothetic or epenthetic vowels and the like) are given in square brackets; notations of a vowel in a position where phonologically an ə may be assumed, are indicated by braces. When other corrections are necessary, an asterisk is used.

Turkish	meaning	BLEICHSTEINER	today	phonologically	reading	
(bir)	۱	1	акы	ak [°] ə	aqi	آق
(iki)	۲	2	қба	°(ə)b'a	w{ü}ba	و با
(üç)	۳	3	хца	(ə)xp [°] a	{i}xp [°] a ?	اخنيا
(dört)	۴	4	пшыба	p [°] š'(ə)b'a	b{i}şba	يشنا
(beş)	۵	5	хуба	x [°] (ə)b'a	xuba	خونا

(<i>altı</i>)	٦	6	<i>f-ba</i>	фбá	<i>f(ə)b'a</i>	<i>f{ɪ}ba</i>	فَبَا
(<i>yedi</i>)	٧	7	<i>bž'-ba</i>	бжьбá	<i>b(ə)ž' b'a</i>	<i>b{ɪ}zba</i>	بِزْبَا
(<i>sekiz</i>)	٨	8	<i>ā-ba</i>	аабá	<i>a:b'a</i>	<i>ába</i>	عَبَا
(<i>doquz</i>)	٩	9	<i>ž'v-ba</i>	жэбá	<i>ž'(ə)b'a</i>	<i>j{ɪ}ba</i>	ژَبَا
(<i>on</i>)	١٠	10	<i>žva-ba</i>	жэабá	<i>ž°ab'a</i>	<i>*ju(a)ba</i> ?	زَوْبَا

Today's forms *z°ba* “9” and *ž°aba* “10” have the same initial consonant, a labialized *ž*; so Evliya's ز ⟨z⟩ in the latter word must stand for a ژ ⟨ž⟩ as in the first one; cp. the following two entries too. If “10” had the medial *-a-* at his time already, he must have confused *ḍamma* and *fathā* additionally; but cp. the following two entries.

(<i>on bir</i>)	۱۱	11	<i>žvejza</i>	! жэ́и́за	<i>ž°aiza</i> !	[<i>aqɪ zu(a)ba</i>]	اَقِ زَوْبَا
(<i>on iki</i>)	۱۲	12	<i>žva°wa</i>	! жэ́а́џа	<i>ž°a°a</i> !	[<i>w{ü}ba ju(a)pa</i>]	وَبَاؤُپَا

As against today's forms, Evliya's Abkhaz numerals for “11” and “12” are arranged in reverse internal order, viz. “one-ten” and “two-ten” instead of “ten-and-one, ten-two”; cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (105: 11). I have no sources that indicate Evliya's combinations as possible variants; even Baron USLAR in the first Abkhaz Grammar (*Ėtnografija Kavkaza I*, Tiflis 1887, p. 98) gave only today's forms. Cp. the Ubykh and Megrelian numbers too.

<i>gel</i>	كَل	“come”	<i>u-āj</i>	уааи	<i>w-'a:-i</i>	<i>wā(e)y</i>	وَأَي
------------	-----	--------	-------------	------	----------------	---------------	-------

Evliya's *°ayn* written above the *elif* seems to be correct, because “to come”, inf. а́аи–ра *a:y-ra*, contains the sound /a:/, written ⟨aa⟩ today, which is assumed to have developed by the loss of a voiced intervocalic pharyngeal fricative similar to arab. *°ayn*. Cp. the spelling of the numeral *a:'ba* “eight” above. Note that the word *imāle* “flexion” is written above the *y* ⟨y⟩ in this entry which might indicate a higher articulation of the vowel denoted by the *kasra*; cp. the first Georgian entry for this. — The form given here is possibly contained in Evliya's Megrelian specimen, too, as a borrowing.

<i>git</i>	كَيْت	“go”	<i>u-ća, u-ca</i>	уцэи (?)	<i>w(ə)-c' a-i</i> (?)	<i>uç(é)y</i> (?)	اَوْچِي
------------	-------	------	-------------------	----------	------------------------	-------------------	---------

I do not see a reason for a *-i* in this form (inf. “to go”: а–ца–ра́ *a-c'a-r'a*), unless it be the “suffix of categoriality” as, more probably, in the following item. The form would have to be read as *uc'e-i* or *uc'e-y* (уце–и) in this case, the *kasra* perhaps denoting a close pronunciation of the *-e-*, which is due to an “umlaut” caused by the *-i* itself. A.N. GENKO (O jazyke Ubyxov; in: *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR, Otdelenie Gumanitarnyx Nauk*, 1928, 242) pointed to the Bzyb variant *wəʃa*, i.e. *uc' a*, with a palatal affricate,

for Evliya's spelling; together with the suffixed *-i*, this would yield *uc^ʿ 'e-i* as G. HEWITT states (letter dated 22.7.91; the grammar of the “Bzybskij dialekt abxazskogo jazyka” by X.S. BGAŽBA, Tbilisi 1964, is not available to me so far). Compare *umçin* “don't go”, below. Note that there is a *sukūn* above the final ي ⟨y⟩.

oṭur اوٲور “sit” *u-tʷə* утә́э–и *w(ə)-tʷa-i* *ut(u)wey* (?) اوٲوي

The vocalization mark above the ٲو ⟨tu⟩ in this word seems rather to be a *ḍamma* than a *fatha*, Evliya thus probably denoting the labial *-tʷ-*. In addition, the word *imāle* is noted above the ى ⟨y⟩ again; this might indicate the raised pronunciation of the root-internal *-a-* (cf. the infinitive а–тәа–р́а *a-tʷa-r'a*) as *-e-* due to the following *-i* which will be the so-called “суффикс категоричности”, cf. the *Grammatika abxazskogo jazyka*, Suxumi 1968, p. 117.

qalq قالق “get up” *u-gəl* угы́л *w(ə)-g'əl* *uql* اوٲل
gitme كِتْمَه “don't go” *u-m-č'an* умца́н *w(ə)-m-č'a-n* *umçin* (?) اوٲمچين

Compare *uç(é)y*, above. BLEICHSTEINER gives an *-ə-* in the “Prohibitiv” instead of the radical *-a-*, but the Abkhaz Grammar (118) has the form у–м–ца–н *u-m-č'a-n* for “не ходи” only. Evliya's *-i-* is clear, however; possibly, there is an additional *kasra* below the چ ⟨ç⟩. So this may rather be a variant as used in the Bzyb dialect again, where a form умц '́ын *u-m-č' 'ə-n* is possible according to G. HEWITT (l.c.). — By the way, all imperative forms so far have a **masculine** agent indicated.

oglan اوغلان “boy” *ərp'əzba* а́рпы́с *'arp'əs* *arp(ɪ)š* اَرپِش

As against Evliya's notation, which well represents today's standard form, BLEICHSTEINER's *ərp'əzba* which he obviously owed to N. MARR's Abkhaz dictionary (*Abxazsko-russkij slovar'*, Leningrad 1926, 71: à-rpəzba “юноша”), is enlarged with a suffix *-ba* otherwise used in building family names, and derived from а́рпа *arp'a* “son” according to the Abkhaz grammar (47). GENKO (l.c.) points to the Bzyb variant, *ərpəš*, i.e. *'arp'əs* ' , once again to cope with Evliya's ش ⟨š⟩.

giderim كِيْدِه رِم “I go” *sə-č'ap'* сца́п *sc'ap'* *s(ɪ)çab* سِيچاب

This is a future form, better translated as “I shall go”; cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (105: 19). Note that Evliya writes it with a final ب ⟨b⟩ instead of a پ ⟨p⟩.

'avret عَوْرَت “wife” *a-p'hvəs, a-p'hvəš* а́пхэ́ыс *ap'x'əs* *apxw(ɪ)š* اِبخوْشْ

According to my sources, а́пхэ́ыс *ap'x'əs* means both “жена” and “женщина”. — As for Evliya's ش ⟨š⟩, GENKO (l.c.) points to the Bzyb variant again, which ends in a

palatal $-s^{\text{h}}$; ср. *'arp^ə*s “boy”.

<i>gitmem</i>	كْتِمَم	“I don’t go”	<i>sə-k^və-ć-am</i>	
сыгыцуам (?)	<i>sə-g^{\text{h}}(ə)-c^e-w^a-m</i> (?)	<i>sik{u}ç(w)am</i> (?)		سِكِيَام

In today’s literary Abkhaz, “I don’t go” would be *сцом* *s(ə)-c^o-m* in the present or *сцарым* *s-c^a-rə-m* in the future, the latter may be from earlier **s-c^a-m*. As against these forms, Evliya’s entry contains an additional element *-ki-* which must be some kind of infix. BLEICHSTEINER (105: 21) obviously thought of $-кy-$ $-k^o(ə)-$, meaning “up”, but the new dictionary (Аџсуа бызшәа ажәар / Slovar’ abkhazskogo jazyka, I, Акъа / Suxumi 1986, 375) gives the transitive meaning “сгонять откуда-н.” for *á-кyцара* only (as well as MARR, 94: “отгонять”). The same holds true for *а-кацарá* *a-kac^ar^a* “угонять” (Ажәар, 304 / MARR, 111). Perhaps we have here the element $-g^{\text{h}}$ “at all”, which is regularly found in negated forms in Abaza. The insertion of this element into a Bzyb negated present would produce *s-eg^{\text{h}}-c^e-w^a-m* for “I’m not going”. Alternatively, we could note CHIRIKBA’s suggestion that, since the speakers of the Ashkharəwa dialect of Abaza were still resident in Abkhazia during Evliya’s time, this form could be Abaza. Today the same element appears in Abaza regularly in a reduced form to produce such corresponding words as *сы-гь-цу-м* *sə-g^{\text{h}}-c^e-w-m* for the present and *сы-гь-ца-рЫ-м* *sə-g^{\text{h}}-c^e-a-r^ə-m* for the first future; cf. A.N. GENKO, *Abazinskij jazyk*, Moskva 1955, 160 and K.V. LOMTATIDZE, *Abazinskij jazyk*, in: *Jazyki narodov SSSR*, 4, Moskva 1967, 136.

<i>niçün gitmezsiñ oğlan?</i>	نچون گنمزسك اوغلان	“Why don’t you go, boy?”	
<i>u-zə-m-ćo-z-uej arp^əz^ba</i>		УЗЫМЦОЗИ / -зѐи а́рпъыс	
<i>wə-zə-m-c^a-wa-zəy / -zay 'arp^ə</i> s	<i>uzumçoz[iw]iy arp(t)ç</i>		اۆزۈمچوزوي اَرپش

Evliya’s *-ziwiy* seems to mean today’s interrogative suffix *-зи -zəy / -зѐи -zay* for which ср. the Abkhaz grammar (120); Evliya’s *-w-* is not clear like this, as BLEICHSTEINER remarked (106: 22). For *'arp^ə*s see above.

<i>ben bilirim</i>	بِن بِليرِم	“I know”	<i>sara i-z-dər-vej^t</i>	
сарá изды́руеит	<i>sar^a yə-z-d^ər-wa-yt^o</i>	<i>sérá izdirwey(t)</i>		سِيرَه اِزْدِرْوِي

According to the meaning (better: “I know **it**”), this must be a finite form which has the suffix $-yt^o$ today. If Evliya’s spelling is correct, he either didn’t hear the final $-t^o$ or it was not (yet) present; cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (106: 23) as well as GENKO, who explained the lack of a final $-t^o$ (or, at least, its missing explosion) as a feature of the Bzyb dialect (l.c.). The non-finite equivalent of *изды́руеит*, as the present absolutive

meaning “I knowing it ..” or the like, would be издырыа *yə-z-d'ər-wa* today; there may be some confusion with the forms discussed in the third entry to follow too.

sen ne bilirsin سن نه بِلِرْسِنْ “what do you know?” *uara i-u-dər-va*
 ыарá иудырыа *war'a yə-w-d'ər-wa* *orá yudırva* اوره يودروا

We should expect one of the interrogative suffixes, -и -əy, -зи -zəy, -зеи -zəy, if this is really a question; according to G. HEWITT (l.c.), one way of saying “what do you know?” would be *war'a yə-w-d'ər-wa* (Ø)-z-a-k'ə-wə-y, lit. “that which you know, what is it?”. *ыарá иудырыа* alone would be the non-finite form again (“You knowing it ..” or “[that] what you know ..”). Cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (106: 24). — Note that the word *imāle* is written above the first ر ⟨r⟩ in this entry again.

cānum gözüüm جانِم كوزوم “my soul my eye” *u-xažə si-p'sə*
 ?? ?? *w{ɪ}xaç fissi* وخاچ فِسي

The words in question seem to be а-хақы́ *a-xač'*ə “face, mouth” and а-псы́ *a-p's'*ə “soul”. *wxaç*, then, could mean ухақы́ *w(ə)-xač'*ə “your face”, and *fissi*, у-псы́ *w(ə)-p's'*ə, “your soul”. This would lead to a reading *w(ɪ)xaç* (*wɪ*)*p'si*. BLEICHSTEINER, who read *uhaǰ ksi* (106: 25), presumed *u-xažə* as “für dich”, lit. “for (-žə) your head (*wə-xə*)”, and *sə-p'sə*, “my soul”, which seems to be more understandable, but it is hard to believe that Evliya denoted a *z* by چ ⟨ç⟩.

benim bildigim بنِم بَلْدِيكِم “what I know” *sara i-z-dər-va*
 ыарá ыздырыа *sar'a y'ə-z-dər-wa* *sérá izdırva* سيره اذدروا

The expected form would be издырыа meaning either “(that) what I know” (this form called “participle” in Abkhaz grammar, “Relativform” by BLEICHSTEINER) or “I knowing it ..” (called “absolute”), depending on the word accent; as G. HEWITT states (l.c.), we will have the former here, which is accented *y'ə-z-dər-wa*. Note that Evliya writes an *alif* above the final ь ⟨h⟩, surely in order to indicate an *-a*-sound; if he had heard an *-e*, the form could mean “What do I know?” as a question which would be издырыеи *yə-z-d'ər-wa-y*.

baña yeter باكه يتر “(it) suffices me” *sara i-sə-žx-ejt'*, *i-sə-zx-ejt'*
 ыарá ысызхеит *sar'a yə-sə-zxa-yt'* *sérá isızqe(y)t* سير اسزت

Evliya seems to have noted a so-called “aorist” form here which would have to be rendered as “it sufficed me”. The present would be ысызхоит *yə-sə-zxa-wa-yt'* today. There is no need of reading an *-a-* in the ending, if the *fatħa* can represent an *-e-*

standing for the diphthong *-ey-* as developed from */-ay-/*. If we had to read *-qát* instead, we could think of the Abaza equivalent of the Abkhaz aorist, ending in *-a-tʰ* with verbs in *-a-*, but this is excluded here because the Abaza present form йсызхъапI *y(ə)-sə-zɣa-pʰ* “it suffices me” (cf. e.g. the Russko-abazinskij slovar’ / Урышв-абаза словарь, Moskva 1956, 545 s.v. хватить) shows that the verb is “statical” in this language so that we cannot expect an aorist ending in *-tʰ* at all.

böyle niçin söylersin بويله نچن سويلرسك “Why do you talk like this?”

arś i-z-u-ḥʷa-z-uej *арис изухэ́зи / -зеи *arəys *yə-zə-w-ḥʷa-wʷa-zəy* / -zay (?)

aris izuḥ[u]waz[iw]iy

أرس إزوحوه زوي

A word corresponding to Evliya’s *aris* is not attested in today’s dictionaries, but it would be the regular adverbial form built from *ари arəy* “this (here)”; cf. already MARR, Dictionary 6 with *arş* || *ars* “такъ, сякъ”, and BLEICHSTEINER (107: 28). Today’s normal word for “so” would be *ас as*. The verb form rather represents the present изухэ́з(е)и *yə-zə-w-ḥʷa-wʷa-zʰ/əy* “Why do you say it?” than the aorist изухэ́зеи *yə-zə-w-ḥʷa-zʰ/əy* meaning “Why did you say it?”; for Evliya’s spelling cf. the fourth entry to follow. For the interrogative suffix see above.

şayıqlar mısın صايقلر ميسن “are you raving?” *j-u-b-va-ma* / *j-u-b-va* / *j-u-b-va-zii* (??)

??

??

wawbuzwá

واوئزوة

According to BLEICHSTEINER, “das fragliche Verbum ist sicher *a-bə-rà*, ‘sehen’”, but this is a mere guess. G. HEWITT (l.c.) proposes to see a verbal complex *w-ay-vʷə-s-ma* (уеивы́сма) here which looks as though it means “Did you pass beside each other?” (from *á-вс-ра* *ʷa-vəs-ra* “to pass by”), though this cannot be the case as the subject is singular; the reciprocal element *-ay-* is thus devoid of its basic meaning, and the form colloquially means “Are you mad?”. However, this is still quite distinct from what Evliya wrote. The actual Abkhaz verb meaning “to rave (sc. because of a fever or the like)” would be *апатара a-pʰatʰa-ra* (cf. e.g. the Аурыс-Апъсуатэ Жэар / Russko-abchazskij slovar’ by X.S. BGAŽBA, Акуа / Suxumi 1964, 62 s.v. бредить).

ne söyleyiyorum نه سئيله يي يورم “What am I saying?” *i-s-ḥʷa-z-uej*

исхэ́зи / -зеи

yʷə-s-ḥʷa-wa-zəy / -zay

işhwáz[iw]ey

إسحوه زوي

This is most probably the present form *исхэ́зи / -зеи yʷə-s-ḥʷa-wa-zʰ/əy* “What do I say?” as against the aorist *исхэ́зеи / -зеи yə-s-ḥʷa-zʰ/əy* “what did I say?” again; cp. the second entry to follow.

ben bilmem بن بلمم “I don’t know” *sara səz-dər-am*
 сарá исыздыруам *sar’a yə-sə-z-dər-wa-m* *sérá isızdır(w)am* سِرَه اِسْزِدِرَم

This is obviously the so-called “potentialis”, lit. “I cannot know this”, which according to G. HEWITT (l.c.) is the obligatory way of building negated forms of the verb “to know”. A *wāw* seems to be missing, but cp. the fifth entry to follow.

seniñ söylediğij سنك سويلديكك “what you say” *uara i-u-h^v-ua*
 уарá иу́хəо *war’a y’ə-w-ħ^oa-wa* *orá yuh[u]wa* اَوْرَه يُوْحُوْه

This seems to be the present *иу́хəо y’ə-w-ħ^oa-wa* “(that) what you are saying” rather than the aorist *иу́хəа yə-w-ħ^oa* “(that) what you said”, as Evliya’s spelling with double *و* <w> after the *ح* <h> indicates. According to G. HEWITT (l.c.), we may have a feature of the Bzyb dialect here again, where the present form is “contracted” to *y’ə-w-ħ^o-wa*. Having this at hand, we can assume a present form lying behind Evliya’s spellings in the last but one and last but three sentences too. Note that Evliya writes an *alif* above the final *و* <h> again.

sen bilirsij سن بلسك “you know” *uara i-u-dər-va*
 уарá иуды́руа *war’a yə-w-d’ər-wa* *orá yudırwá* اَوْرَه يُوْدِرُوْه

This, again, is more likely to be the non-finite form “you knowing it ..., as you know” or the “participle” “(that) what you know” than the finite present which would be *иудыруеит yə-w-dər-wa-yt’* today; cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (107: 33).

ammā seniñ ‘aqlıñ yoqdur اما سنك عقلك يو قدر “but you have no sense” *axà uara u-q-ovp’*
 axá уарá ухáгоуп *ax’a war’a wə-x’aga-w-p’* *aqá orá uqáxoub* آقَه اَوْرَه اَوْقَه خُوْب

While *axá ax’a* “but” and *уарá war’a* “you” are clear, *uqáxob* should in my opinion rather be identified with *у-хáгоуп, wə-x’aga-w-p’*, “you are crazy, wicked” (from *a-xáга, a-x’aga*, “сумасшедший”), than with BLEICHSTEINER’s *aga .. u-q-ovp’* “du bist ein Dummkopf” (108: 34), in spite of the unexpected spelling of the *-g-*. Note the combination of *alif* and *و* <h> in *orá*, again.

allāhum ve xalq haqqıyüçün اللهم و خلق حقچون “for the sake of my God and the people”

anc^va-g’ə a-òvə-g’ə a-d-nəś анцаггы ауааггы рныс
anc^oa-g’ə awa:-g’ə rnəs *anç(wa)gı aw^oagi [ı]rniş^o* آنچکي اوعکي ارنش^o

In the form noted here, the formula would mean “by God and men”, literally. *анцаá an^oa* “God” is perfectly clear, *aw^oa-* fits well with *ауаа awa:* “men, people” (plural of

ауауы *awa*^o “man, Mensch”; for *-aa-* see above), and *-гъы .. -гъы -g ʾə .. -g ʾə* is the conjunction “as well .. as ..”. For the rest, this leaves *r-* as the marker of a third person plural possessor (“their”), and *-niş* seems to stand for the word *-nəş -nəs* used in swearing as noted in MARR’s dictionary (64; the word is kept distinct from *a-nəş* = а-нЫШЬ *a-n’əş*^ʾ “лодка” and *a-nəş* = а-нЫШӘ *a-n’əš*^o “земля” here); cf. also BLEICHSTEINER (108: 35). According to the new dictionary (488: а-нЫС *a-n’əs*), this is a verb (“аҕац[арбá]”) meaning “клясться”; it constitutes idioms such as ажәлар рныс *až^olar rnəs* “by the people!” exactly matching with what Evliya has here. The single *س* ⟨s⟩ in the final position is a little bit exposed and is possibly intended as a correction for the *ش* ⟨š⟩, Evliya thus trying to cope with a palatal pronunciation of an *-s*^ʾ as denoted by MARR’s *-ş*. Note that анцәа “god” originally was a plurale tantum in Abkhaz, so that the plural possessive marker *-r-* is correct in the following entries too (cf. already GENKO, l.c.). — In the Turkish equivalent, we certainly read *xalq*, not *maxlūqāti* as in DANKOFF’s treatise (Glossary, 121).

bir şey bilmem vallāhi بر شيء بلمم واللّهي “I know nothing, by God”

ak^oə sə-z-d’ər-om anc^vinəs акгы сыздыруам, анцәа-рныс

ak^og ʾə sə-z-d’ər-wa-m anc^oa r-nəs á(k)gı sızdır(w)am, anç(w)arnış اگي سيزدرم آنچرنيش

ági obviously represents ак-гъы, *ak^o-g ʾə*, meaning “one (thing) even”; for *сыздыруам* *sə-z-d’ər-wa-m* “I cannot know” see above. As for the formula *anç(w)arnış*, cp. the preceding item; the *fathā* seems to belong to the *چ* ⟨ç⟩ (where it should belong) rather than the *ر* ⟨r⟩.

incitme baḡa yazıqdır انجتمه بکه ييزقدر “Don’t hurt me, it’s a shame”

usùx^va sə-rəçovp^o усмысын хучы срыцхап (?)

wə-s-m’ə-sə-n xuč^o ʾə sə-rəçhap (?) *u(sm)sin quç(t) sırışáb* (?) اوسن قوج سريشحب

If *usin* really stands for усмысын, *wə-s-m’ə-sə-n*, “Don’t hit me!”, as G. HEWITT proposes (l.c.), we have to assume that Evliya’s spelling *usin* is haplographical; this is in any case more probable than BLEICHSTEINER’s *usùx^va* “hif mir”. *sırışab* obviously contains а-рыцха-, *a-r’əçha-* “бедняга, несчастный”, which in connection with *хучы*, *xuč^o ʾə*, “small, little” could mean something like German “ich bin (doch) nur ein armer Schlucker”. With BLEICHSTEINER (108: 37), we should expect a present form ending in *-oup^o* here; Evliya’s spelling may represent a dialectal variant of the Abaza type instead, where the present of a static verb with a stem in *-a* ends in *-a-p^o*. For Abaza *рыцха* *rəçha* “бедняк, нищий” cf. the Abaza-russkij slovar’ / Абаза-урышв

ажвар by V.B. TUGOV, Moskva 1967, 327.

ya ben bir şey mi söyleyiorum يَا بَنُ بَرِّ شَيْمِي سَوِيلِي يورم “Am I saying anything?”
 sara ak^cre u-s-ħ^v-wan сарá акЫр ус исхэоН (?)
 sar^a ak^oar wəs yə-s-ħ^oa-w'a-n (?) sérá aqır [a]wis (i)shwon ? سِيرَه آفِرْأَوْسَحُون

In the way indicated here, the sentence could mean something like “I (сарá) said (ис-хэоН) something (акЫр) thus (ус)””; the latter word, which is proposed by G. HEWITT (l.c.), is the better choice as against ааѠс а:^oəs “aside” which would fit quite well with Evliya’s spelling. Note that there is neither a marker of interrogation nor one of negation, cp. BLEICHSTEINER’s translation “ich sprach beinahe zu dir”. Possibly, the assertive form could be used in interrogations without additional markers, exceptionally. For Evliya’s spelling of the verb in question, cp. the Abaza variant which would be ЫСХІВУН yə-s-ħ^oa-w-n.

vallāhi abaza qarnım açdır وَاللّٰهِي أَبَاذَه قَرْنِمِ آجَدِر “By God, Abaza, I am hungry”
 ancⁿineš ap^cśua amla səp^cśvojt^o анцэа–рныс, аҕсуа, аҗла сыҕсуеит
 anc^oa r-nəs, 'ap^cswa, 'amlá sə-p^cs(ə)-wa-yt^o
 anç(wa)rniş ap[ɪ]ş(wa) amlá sɪps{ɪ}w(e)y(t) آنچرَنِشْ آپِشْ آمَلَه سِشْوِي

For anç(wa)rniş, see above. “Abaza” should be аҕсуа, ap^cswa, which seems to be defective here if it is not simply apɪş reflecting аҕсы, ap^cs’ə, “soul” (or арҕыс ‘arp^cəs “lad” again, as G. HEWITT [l.c.] supposes). аҗла сыҕсуеит ‘amlá sə-p^cs(ə)-wa-yt^o means “I am dying (of) hunger”, literally; cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (109: 39).

giderim paşta yerim كِيده رم پَصْطَه يورم “I am going to eat paşta”
 səçap^o p^oasta jufvam сцап, паста иуфарым / -ма (?)
 s(ə)c^oap, pasta iufarəm / -ma (?) s{ɪ}çab, pástá yuf(a)rum(a) (?) سِچَاب پَصْطَه يُوْفَرِمْ

While сцап s-c^oap^o is clearly the future form “I shall go”, the second verbal form, yufirm, is hardly anything like “(in order) to eat”; the prefix -u- rather indicates a second person singular, which would lead to the negative иуфарым, iufarəm, “you will not eat it”, or, more probably, the interrogative иуфарыма, iufarəma, “will you eat it?”, although Evliya’s vocalization is not in favour of this solution. BLEICHSTEINER’s present form, jufvam, “du ißt (keine Pasta)” is less likely. — The following items were not known to BLEICHSTEINER:

<i>taşagım ye</i>	طشاغم يه	“Eat my testicles”	сбыргуы иуф
<i>s-g̃ə-r-g°(ə) yə-w-f</i>		<i>şığırǵu yuf</i>	صِفْرَغُو يُوْفْ

This is one of the words for “testicle(s)”, which are not present in today’s dictionaries, given to me as *(a-)g̃ə-r-g°(ə)* by G. HEWITT (l.c.) — the other is *a-q°alt’as*; according to him, this is a compound consisting of *(a-)g̃ə* “penis” (ср. MARR’s dictionary, 89 with *a-ğə* “id.”), and *r-g°ə*, lit. “their heart” (ср. а-губы *a-g°ə* in the new dictionary, 169), which implies that the word for “penis” is “singular for plural” in Abkhaz. In Evliya’s *şığırǵu*, we have the compound combined with a prefix *s-*, being the first person singular marker of inalienable possession what is what we expect with parts of the body. As for the imperative “eat (it/them)”, Evliya’s form is also correct, as G. HEWITT confirms, because *á-фа-ра* *’a-fa-ra* “to eat” belongs to those Abkhaz verbs which in the imperative lose their (unaccented) root vowel.

<i>anaŋi sikeyim</i>	انكي سيكيم	“Let me fuck your mother”	уан дыскуы́ст
<i>w-an də-s-k°əst</i>		<i>wan disqust</i>	واندِسْ قوست

For this entry, too, the correct analysis is provided by G. HEWITT (l.c.). *уан* represents *w-an* “your mother”, Evliya’s *-dts* belonging to the following verbal form as the prefix complex of a first person singular agent (*-s-*) combined with a second person singular feminine patient (*d-*). The verb must be *акырə* *a-k°əst-r’a* as given in MARR’s dictionary with the meaning “coitus” (48: *a-ksrə*). This has to be preferred to *а-кρά* *a-k°-r’a* which means “to hold, to grasp” generally, but which a secondary meaning “coire” is attributed to in the same dictionary (49). The form in question must be the aorist *дыскуы́ст* *də-s-k°əst* “I fucked your mother” although we have to state a modal and temporal difference as against Evliya’s Turkish translation like this.

Ubykh:

II: 258b, 26		لسان صدشده آبارَه											
		وَه نَوَقَا شَه پَلِي اَشُو قُون اِپَلِي اَوْغَا اِنْفِي زُو وَه زُو نَوَقَا زُو											
		۱۰	۱۱	۱۰	۹	۸	۷	۶	۵	۴	۳	۲	۱
		سَخَا غَه بَرِيب فَه جَه رَاه خَه مَسُوو لَحَقْ اَشَطُو نَقَه											
		اَكَمَك اَت صُو پِيئِر يُوغُوَرْد اَرْمُوذ اُو زُو ر اِنْبِر كَسْتَانَه طَلُو ز											
		وَيَكَه اَوْتَس اُو دَه شُو اَوْمَكَه سِيكُوَه سَبُو يَكِن سُوو شَقَم سِيكُوَه											
		كَل اُو طَلُو قَالِق كَمَه كِي دَه بَر مَرِيه كِي دَر سِن اِشَم وَا كِي دَه مَر											
		زَنْجَه دُو قَبُو زَنْجَه دُو قَلْبَت زَنْجِي اُو خَد تَسَاغَه سِيكُو وِيكَه سِيكَه نُو سُو كَه											
		بَر قِي زَكِي تَر قِي بُولَم اَمَا بَر اُو غَلان كَتَر م كَلَا وَه كِي دَه لِسَم كِي دَه بَر اَوَه											
		سَر خَسُوذ خُو رَغْتُوذ اَشْفِيذ اَر قَامِي ذَرَه خُو وِجِيلَه شَكُو مَر نَه لَه شَكَه عُدَد											
		نَه اَوْلَدِي كَر بَر دُو سُو زِي دَك دُو سُو سَمِي اِي دَم خَر سَر لِي غَه كِي دَه مَر ز مَرِيه كَتَر دِي كَر											
		اَر زَمَد خَسَن شَكَه عُدَد سَمُو زِل شَا ثَر قَه اَر زُوذ سَمُو زِل سَمُو زِل اِشْفِيذ											
		اَر دَر لَوَا يَنْتَه كَتَر دَك نَه كَتَر دِي كَر بَر صِفَر كَتَر دَك نِه لَه دِي كَر يَدَك											

The phonological spelling follows the same principles as with Abkhaz. In addition, apical sibilants and affricates are marked by a dot above (e.g. *š*) and pharyngealized consonants by a stroke above (e.g. *ḫ*) as in DUMÉZIL's notation.

Turkish	meaning	DUMÉZIL	phonolog.	reading	
(bir)	۱	1	za	(za) wá ?	زَه

PROVASI (o.c., 310), expecting *za* as the normal form of the numeral “one” in Ubykh, assumes a misspelling with Arabic و ⟨w⟩ instead of ز ⟨z⟩ as did BLEICHSTEINER (111: 1) and, implicitly, DUMÉZIL (59: 1). But note that in the numeral “eleven” too, a *wāw* appears.

(iki)	۲	2	<i>tʰqʰa</i>	<i>tʰqʰa</i>	<i>t{u}q(w)a</i>	نَقَا
(üç)	۳	3	<i>ša</i>	<i>ša</i>	<i>šá</i>	شَه

In this word, BLEICHSTEINER (111: 3) and DUMÉZIL (59: 3) had to cope with an internal *k* which is not present in the autograph at all; cf. PROVASI (312: 3.) too.

(dört)	۴	4	<i>pʰlʰə</i>	<i>pʰlʰə</i>	<i>pl</i>	پَلِي
--------	---	---	--------------	--------------	-----------	-------

(beṣ)	٥	5	š'χə	š'x'ə	[e]š(x)u	أَشْوُ
(altı)	٦	6	f.ōn(ə)	f'-ōnə	fon	فُونُ

According to DUMÉZIL (60: 6) this is the numeral for “six” in the instrumental, not in the oblique case as BLEICHSTEINER proposed (111: 6).

(yedi)	٧	7	blə	blə	[ɪ]plɪ	إِبْلِي
(sekiz)	٨	8	γ ^o a	γ ^o a	[u]g(w)a	اَوْغَا
(doquz)	٩	9	bγ'ə	bγ'ə	[ɪ]pɡɪ	إِبْغِي
(on)	١٠	10	ż ^o ə	ż ^o ə	zu	زُو
(on bir)	١١	11	(ż ^o ə-zə)	(ż ^o əzə)	[wázu]	وَهْ زُو
(on iki)	١٢	12	(ż ^o ə-ṫ ^o q̇ ^o a)	(ż ^o əṫ ^o q̇ ^o a)	[t{u}q(w)azu]	تَوْقازُو

As with Abkhaz (and Megrelian), Evliya's Ubykh numerals for 11 and 12 are arranged in reverse internal order, viz. “one-ten” and “two-ten” instead of “ten-one, ten-two”; cf. already A.N. GENKO, *O jazyke ubykhov* (Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR, Otdelenie Gumanitarnyx Nauk, 1928), 239, BLEICHSTEINER (111: 11/12), and DUMÉZIL (60).

ekmek اَكْمَك “bread” ?? ṡ^oəba ? ṡ^oəq̇^oá ? cax'.q̇^oá ? ?? sáxá سَخَا

Evliya's notation yields no new arguments for Deciding between the three words as considered by DUMÉZIL, meaning “bread”, “smear”, and some kind of “pie”, resp.

<i>et</i>	أَت	“meat”	γ'a	γ'a	gá	عَهْ
<i>su</i>	صُو	“water”	bzə	bzə	b{ɪ}zɪ	بِزِي
<i>peynir</i>	پَيْنِير	“cheese”	fa(č'ə) (?)	fa (?)	fá	فَهْ

DUMÉZIL (60: 16) was surely right in proposing that the normal word for “cheese”, *fač'ə*, is a compound, Evliya's *fa*, which is confirmed by the autograph now, representing the first member alone; cf. PROVASI (313: 16) who points to the doublet *fač'əbzə* / *fabzə*, both denoting “jus de fromage”. S. TEZCAN proposes to see some kind of haplography here, because the following word starts with a چ ⟨ç⟩ as expected in *fač'ə* (personal communication).

yogurd يُوغُورْد “yoghurt” č'a-ṫ^oa.(q)á ? č'ə-ṫ^oa(q)ʷa çá(t)wa'á چَهْ وَاهْ

In Evliya's notation, the *alif* seems to be added later. — For the structure of the Ubykh word to be analyzed as meaning “milk having become sour” as proposed by DUMÉZIL, compare the Circassian entry for “yoghurt” below.

<i>armud</i>	آرمود	“pear”	<i>x'a</i>	$\chi^{\prime}a$	<i>xá</i>	خَه
<i>üzüm</i>	اوزوم	“grape”	<i>məʃ˚ə</i>	<i>məʃ˚ə</i>	<i>musuw</i>	مُسُوْ
<i>encīr</i>	انجیر	“fig”	<i>laχ'-məq'˚</i>	<i>la:χ^{\prime}-m'əq^{\prime}</i>	<i>láxmáq</i>	لَحْمَقْ
<i>kestāne</i>	کستانه	“chestnut”	<i>á-š'χə</i>	$\check{s}^{\prime}x^{\prime}ə$	<i>[e]ʃxu</i>	أَشْحُوْ

That Evliya's *alif* reflects the definite article, *a-*, as BLEICHSTEINER (112: 21) and DUMÉZIL (61: 21) presumed, is hardly probable. In Evliya's notation, we should expect a prothetic vowel before a word-initial consonant cluster as $\check{s}^{\prime}x^{\prime}$ - in any case, for which compare the number “five” above. Note that the autograph has the expected \check{s} -letter.

<i>tuž</i>	طوز	“salt”	<i>laq'á ?</i>	<i>laq^{\prime}a</i>	<i>láqá</i>	لَقَه
------------	-----	--------	----------------	----------------------	-------------	-------

That Evliya heard not a word for “salt” but *laq^{\prime}a* “stone” as BLEICHSTEINER (112: 22) proposed, remains probable. “Salt” is $\check{z}^{\prime}ə$ in Ubykh according to H. VOGT (Dictionnaire de la langue oubykh, Oslo 1963, 233 sq.).

<i>gel</i>	كل	“come”	<i>wə.y.k'˚á</i>	<i>wə-y-k^{\prime}a</i>	<i>weyká</i>	وَيْكَه
<i>oṭur</i>	اوطور	“sit”	<i>wə.t˚ás</i>	<i>wə-t˚as</i>	<i>ut(w)ás</i>	اوتَس
<i>qalq</i>	قالق	“get up”	<i>wə.dat˚á</i>	<i>wə-dat˚ə</i>	<i>udátuw</i>	اودَه تُو
<i>gitme</i>	کتمه	“don't go”	<i>wə.m.k'˚á</i>	<i>wə-m-k^{\prime}a</i>	<i>umká</i>	اومَكَه
<i>giderim</i>	رم کیده	“I shall go”	<i>sə.y.k'˚ə</i>	<i>sə-y-k^{\prime}o:</i>	<i>sıyk[á]wá</i>	سِيكُوَه

If this is really a future form “que j'aille, je vais ou dois aller” matching the Turkic “aorist” as BLEICHSTEINER (113: 27) and DUMÉZIL (62: 27) proposed, we have to note Evliya's spelling of the final vowel with double *fatha* for which compare the second entry to follow.

<i>nereye gidersin</i>	نره یه کیدرسین	“Where are you going?”				
	<i>sába wə.y.k'˚á.n</i>	<i>s'a:ba wə-y-k^{\prime}a-n</i>	<i>sábuykan ?</i>			سَبُوِيكَن

According to BLEICHSTEINER (113: 28), DUMÉZIL (62: 28) and PROVASI (313: 28), this does not mean “where do you go?” but “why you come” as a non-finite form. In Evliya's writing, the first vocalization mark seems to be a *damma* as in the second syllable rather than a *kasra*, requiring a reading *subuykan*.

<i>işim var giderim</i>	اِشِم وار کیده رم	“I have something to do, I am going”				
	<i>s˚wa s-q' á.γ, s(ə).k'˚ə</i>	<i>s˚wa s-q' a:-γ sə-k^{\prime}o:</i>	<i>s[á]wuw sqág s{ı}kwá</i>			سَوُو سَقَّعْ سِكُوَه

This sentence has to be rendered as “j'ai une affaire, que je m'en aille” according to

ally, we have to note that in Evliya's spelling, the second word has an initial س ⟨s⟩, not ش ⟨š⟩, that the vocalization mark of its second letter is a *kasra*, not a *fatha*, and that its third letter is a clear چ ⟨č⟩, not a ن ⟨n⟩. Compare the following entry too.

gideriz eve كیده رز آواه "We are going home"
 š'.k'á.nō sá-dak'ʰa ? š' -k' ʰa-n-o: s'ə-dak ʰa ? sɪkánog suwká ? سِکَه نَوَغ سَوکَه

Here again, Evliya has a س ⟨s⟩ instead of the ش ⟨š⟩ expected. DUMÉZIL's *sá-dak'ʰa* presupposes that Evliya erroneously wrote a و ⟨w⟩ instead of a د ⟨d⟩ which is not impossible; cf. PROVASI (314: 33) too.

ne avladığınız نه اولدیڭیز "What did you hunt?"
 śa-z° .γ°áwə.yt° (PROVASI) sa-z°-γ°awə-yt° sázxod سَزْ خَوْدْ

Both BLEICHSTEINER's *sa-s'əx-ōt* "Was wird euch gehören?" (114 sq.: 32) and DUMÉZIL's *śad.o ś° .x°ə.γα*, a Circassian sentence meaning "qu'êtes-vous devenu?" (63 sq.: 32), were based upon the reading *ne oldunuz* "what did you become?" for the Turkic equivalent. As PROVASI correctly states (314: 34), we have to depart from the question *ne avladığınız* meaning "What did you hunt?" instead, to which the following entry represents a good answer. Evliya's notation *sázxod* may then reflect a second person plural preterite form, combined with the interrogative prefix *sa-* "what?", of the verb *-γ°aw-* "to find, trouver", which is contained in the following sentence, too, in the first person plural. With PROVASI, we have to realize, however, that Evliya's spelling of the verb is quite different in both sentences, and that the usual plural marking is missing.

bir domuz yedik بر دُوموز یدک "We ate a pig" x̄°a ž' .γ°áwə.yt° a.š' .fə.yt°
 x̄°a ž' -γ°awə-yt° a-š' -fə-yt° xo jgáwid áşfid خَوْزُ غَوْدُ آَشْفِدْ

As against BLEICHSTEINER (115: 33), DUMÉZIL (64: 33) was right in identifying two verbal forms in this sentence, which thus means "nous avons trouvé du cochon, nous l'avons mangé". The last but one letter may in my opinion well be read as a ڤ ⟨-f-⟩ instead of a ڭ ⟨-g-⟩ as PROVASI did (310: 35); compare the last Ubykh entry for this.

domuz semiz mi idi دوموز سمزمي ايدي "Was the pig fat?" a.w.f.a.mə.t ś'ə-x̄°á ? ?
 x̄°a ázqámud já xo اَزْقَامِدْ ژَهْ خَو

Here again, BLEICHSTEINER's (115 sq.: 34) and DUMÉZIL's (64: 34) considerations are based upon a wrong Turkic equivalent: Instead of *domuzumuz-mi yedi* meaning "did he eat our pig?", Evliya's question was whether "the pig was fat"; cf. already PROVASI (315: 36), who seems not to be sure about this, because for him, the third *m* is missing.

In any case, all assumptions that the verbal form to be seen here could belong to the root *f*- “to eat”, are unnecessary, all the more since the word contains a clear ق ⟨q⟩, not a ف ⟨f⟩. We cannot decide with certainty, however, whether the second letter is a ز ⟨z⟩ or a ر ⟨r⟩ with a *sukūn* above. Thus, the actual verb form, which seems to contain the negative infix *-m-*, remains unclear. The same holds true for the element *žá* which can hardly represent a first person plural possessive marker *š* ^ʿ *ʿ*-, because it is written with an undoubtful *fatha* above; besides, there is no need for a first person plural marker in this sentence at all. Should it reflect the interrogative particle *š* ^ʿ *a(y)* as in the fourth entry to follow?

xırsızlığa gideriz خرسیزلغه كیده رز “We are going to do a theft”
wəç:áy:la š^ʿ.k^ʷá.n.ō *wəç’a:yla š^ʿ-k^ʷa-n-o:* *wıç(á)ylá ş{ı}kánog* وچيله شكنوغ

According to DUMÉZIL, the exact meaning of this sentence would be “allons voler de nouveau, complètement, allons poursuivre et terminer le vol” (64 sq.: 35).

nereye gitdiñiz نريه كتيديڭز “Where did you go?”
ma:k^ʷa^ˆs[˚].k^ʷa.q^ʷá.na(-y) ?? *nálá ş{ı}kágádid* نه له شكه غدد

DUMÉZIL’s proposal is the attempt to reconstruct a sentence meaning “où êtes vous allés?” and thus matching the Turkic equivalent. As PROVASI states (315: 38), this is not further supported by Evliya’s autograph, because it shows a second د ⟨d⟩ as the final letter as against the ambiguous ه ⟨h⟩ of the printed edition; can this be a reflex of the preterite marker, *-yt^ʷ?* — The following four sentences have been omitted in the edited text, probably because in the autograph, they are divided from the rest by a page break; these sentences were dealt with by PROVASI for the first time.

Aridler vilāyetine gitdik آردلر ولايته كيديك “We went to the country of the Arids”
ard-γa-š s[˚](ə).k^ʷa.q^ʷa.n(a) *ard qāš’ə š^ʿ-k^ʷaq^ʷa-yt^ʷ (??)*
árd xás ş{ı}kágádd آرد خاش شكه غدد

As against PROVASI (315 sq.: 39) who proposed that Evliya’s ⟨h^{aš}⟩ could reflect the locative postposition *-γa* combined with the interrogative particle *š*, the present word may well represent Ubykh *qāš’ə* meaning “village” (cf. VOGT, Dictionnaire, 172) as an equivalent of Turkish *vilāyet*. Like this, the sentence need not be recognized as a question “êtes-vous allés à Ard” but may well be the reply to the preceding sentence. The verbal form may then be different from the one of the question before; as we have to assume different personal prefixes in both cases, Evliya’s *š*- must represent the second person plural prefix *s[˚]-* in the first and the first person plural prefix *š^ʿ-* in the

second one. The verbal ending, here written with two *ds*, the first with a *sukūn* above, remains unclear; can it be a preterite in *-yt'* again? — The locality named here must be today's Адлер, which according to Evliya was neighbouring with the “Sadşa”-Ubykh (on this, cf. already GENKO, *O jazyke ubyxov*, 237 and BLEICHSTEINER, 125).

ne getirdiñiz نه كترديكتر “What did you bring?”
sa-y.z° .wə.yλ-š' a(y) (?) sa--y-z°-wə-yt--š' a(y) *sáyuwzil şa* سَيُوْزِلْ شَا

For this entry, PROVASI's proposal (316: 40) is convincing: The initial *sa-* reflects the interrogative particle “What?” again, the final *şa* represents the enclitic interrogative particle *š' a(y)*, and the verbal form is a second person plural preterite of *yə-wə-* “to bring” (cf. VOGT, *Dictionnaire*, 216), the whole sentence meaning “qu'avez vous apporté?”. This is confirmed by the following sentence to be regarded as an answer to it.

bir şığır getirdik بر صِغِرْ كترديك “We brought one cow”
za-g°əma (a.)y.ž'.wə.yt' *za-g°əma' a y-ž' -wə-yt'* *jáqumá ijwid* زَقْمَه اِزْوَدْ

Here again, PROVASI's interpretation (316: 41) can be sustained, Evliya's notation exactly matching with what has to be expected for “one cow” (*za-g°əma' a*, cf. VOGT, *Dictionnaire*, 129) and “we brought it” (*a-y-ž' -wə-yt'*, cf. VOGT, 216: *yə-wə-*).

neylediñiz نيله ديكتر “What did you do?”
sa-y.s° .š' .a.ná.yλ *sa-y-s°-š' - -yt' ??* *şáyujdil* شَيُوْزْدِلْ

PROVASI's *sa-y.s° .s' .a.ná.yt'* “que faisiez-vous” fits exactly with the Turkic translation, but it bears some problems in comparison with Evliya's spelling, as the author himself states: First, Evliya wrote a clearly distinguishable ش (š) for the interrogative *sa-* here, which may be tolerated. If the verb in question is really *yə-š' -* “to do” (cf. e.g. VOGT, *Dictionnaire*, 215), the second person plural marker must be regarded as assimilated to the *š' -* (as against VOGT's *áys°š' an* “vous faites”), the resulting sound being written with a ژ (ž), which would be noteworthy at least. For the plural marker *-na-* represented by a د (d), PROVASI points to the same phenomenon in the last but four entry, which does not speak in favour of a mere misspelling; can we assume that Evliya heard a different morpheme in these cases?

yedik يَدِكْ “we ate” *aš'fəyt'* *a-š' -fə-yt'* *işfid* اِشْفِدْ

With PROVASI (317: 43), this obviously represents the Ubykh verbal form *a-š' -fə-yt'* meaning “we ate it”. Note that the initial *alif* has a *kasra*, not the *fatha* expected. The last but one letter may be the expected ف (-f-) as against PROVASI's گ (-g) again.

Georgian:

II: 320a, 20

لسان فصحته كور جي شوشاد آدمي زاد
 ارسنه اوربي سارم اوغوي هوت اكسيب شديف زواين ايجزاي اتري پوربي چيفال شجر
 ۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵ ۶ ۷ ۸ ۹ ۱۰
 غيبه نياك پنهان: قوواخ لغوي قور زنيب ايجلاب منسو بزوچوغولوي هر نو بوق
 شراب كراز آرمود نياق ايجير اوزوم فندق قاون نامر قريوز
 پزولوي قوقو قان آومود يچو پور جاموش دا جديجسو جاغنه زه نه موقناينس
 دود قنن قريب كداوغلان اككه يه يلم او طور اوغلان والده كو كبلد سگسن
 آيز سويدس غينا م آو پاتون پوربي جاموش ايزيب آومود آرسويدس دا جدي پاتون
 كتمه يابانه كل اغا اككه يه پلم ايدر كل كتمه او تر اغا
 پاتون آرت اوربي بچم خانز كا جدي آخوش آينم پشريه ديديع آرش آرخيدوس
 اغا برا ايكواو غلام وار نور الرمسين باقيم كوچوكي بوق بيوكمه السامر
 تس مدم ما تب بچيسا تاين آرش قلغنا چيوچين پوربي وريب جاغلو قودبان
 واللهواي اوغلاندر ايدكله فنا در آت قاطر اشك كوچوك سراماز

In the phonological spelling, aspirated consonants are marked by °, glottalized ones by °. Word accent is not indicated. In the “Turkicizing” transcription of Evliya’s notations, necessary additions (mostly of vocalizations) are given in round brackets, whereas necessary deletions (mostly of prothetic or epenthetic vowels and the like) are given in square brackets. In addition to DANKOFF’s transcription of the vocalization marks, *ä* is used for a *fatha* plus *alif* representing Georgian *e*, and *ë* for a *fatha* representing a high vowel; *â* is used for a *fatha* plus *alif* standing for a Georgian *o*. When other corrections are necessary, an asterisk is used.

Turkish	meaning	BLEICHSTEINER	today	phonologically	reading		
(bir)	۱	1	<i>erfi</i>	ერთი	<i>erfi</i>	<i>ert(i)</i>	أرت

As against BLEICHSTEINER (91: 1), the vocalization intended by Evliya was clearly not \bar{a} (*alif-madda*) or \dot{a} (*alif* with *kasra*) but \acute{a} (*alif* with *fatha*). The final *-i* of today’s nominative form is missing, anyway, unless it be indicated by the notation of *imāle*, lit. “flexion”, written below the ت <t>; the meaning of this word, a verbal noun of the Arabic root *māla* “to bend”, in grammatical literature is described as “giving to *fatha* a sound like that of *kasra*” (cf. e.g. F. STEINGASS, *Persian-English Dictionary*, London ⁶1977, 97 b). For the lack of a final *-i* in some of Evliya’s Georgian forms, Winfried

BOEDER (letter dated 17.9.91) thinks of a Megrelian influence. Could Evliya's informant for Georgian have been a Megrelian bilingual?

(iki)	۲	2	<i>ori</i>	ორი	<i>ori</i>	<i>ori</i>	اُورِي
(üç)	۳	3	<i>sami</i>	სამი	<i>sami</i>	<i>sami</i>	سَام
(dört)	۴	4	<i>oḥi</i>	ოთხი	<i>oḥi</i>	<i>otxi</i>	اوتْخِي
(beş)	۵	5	<i>ḥuḥi</i>	ხუთი	<i>xuḥi</i>	<i>ḥuti</i>	حُوت
(altı)	۶	6	<i>ek^cwsi</i>	ექვსი	<i>ek^cvsı</i>	<i>ek(w)si</i>	اَكْسِي
(yedi)	۷	7	<i>šwidi</i>	შვიდი	<i>švidi</i>	<i>şüdi</i>	شُدِي
(sekiz)	۸	8	<i>rvaj</i>	რვა(დ)	<i>rva(y)</i>	<i>r[u]way</i>	رُوَاي

Evliya's form clearly indicates a final consonantal -y as against today's standard form, *rva*; cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (91: 8). This is attested as a feature of the Gurian dialect (West-Georgia) by S. ŽGENTI (Guruli kılo / Gurijskij govor gruzinskogo jazyka, Tbilisi 1936, 58).

(doquz)	۹	9	<i>chraj</i>	ცხრა(დ)	<i>cxra(y)</i>	<i>ç[ɪ]xray</i>	چِخْرَاي
---------	---	---	--------------	---------	----------------	-----------------	----------

For the final -y, cf. the preceding item.

(on)	۱۰	10	<i>aḥi</i>	ათი	<i>aḥi</i>	<i>ati</i>	اَتِي
<i>ekmek</i>	اَكْمَك	“bread”	<i>p^uuri</i>	პური	<i>p^uuri</i>	<i>puri</i>	بُورِي
<i>şu</i>	صو	“water”	<i>c^oqali</i>	წყალი	<i>c^oq^oali</i>	<i>ç[ɪ]qal(i)</i>	چِيقَال

Note that there is no indication whatsoever of the nominative ending -i in Evliya's form.

<i>et</i>	اَت	“meat”	<i>ḥorci</i>	ხორცი	<i>xorc^ci</i>	<i>xorci</i>	خُرْج
-----------	-----	--------	--------------	-------	--------------------------	--------------	-------

In contrast to the preceding form, this one has a final -i indicated by a *kasra* below the ج (c).

<i>şarāb</i>	شَرَاب	“wine”	<i>ḡwino</i>	ღვინო	<i>ḡvino</i>	<i>ḡ(w)inā</i>	غِيْنَه
<i>kiraz</i>	كِرَاز	“cherry”	<i>bali</i>	ბალი	<i>bali</i>	<i>bal(i)</i>	بَال

BLEICHSTEINER (91: 15) was right in postulating *bal-* instead of the printed form *bak*; cf. already S.S. DŽIKIA, Ėvlija Čelebi o mingrel'skom i gruzinskom jazykax, Sovetskoe jazykoznanie 1936/2, 123, according to whom the manuscript Pertev Paşa 458 which he used has the wrong spelling باك *bak*, too. The ك (k) seems to have arisen out of the combination of *lām* with *sukūn*. — Note that the nominative -i is missing as in *c^oq^oal-*.

<i>armud</i>	اَرْمُوْد	“pear”	<i>p^cşhali</i>	ფსხალი	<i>p^csxali</i>	<i>p[ɪ]sxal(i)</i>	پِسْحَال
--------------	-----------	--------	---------------------------	--------	---------------------------	--------------------	----------

As BLEICHSTEINER correctly stated (91: 16), *p^hsxali* is a dialectal variant of the word for “pear” in Georgian, the normal form being *msxali* as in K. TSCHENKÉLI, *Georgisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 2, 1970, 845; according to S. ŽĠENTĪ, the form is familiar to the Gurian dialect of West-Georgia once more (*Guruli kġilo*, 247). — As in all words with a stem ending in *-(a)l-* so far, the nominative *-i* is missing here again.

qabaq قباق “gourd, pumpkin” *k^hwahi* კვახი *k^hvaxi* *q[u]wax(i)* قوواخ
This is a dialectal word, too; cf. TSCHENKÉLI, who quotes it for the Imereti, Rača and Lečxumi dialects (1, 575), or A. ĠLONĲI, according to whom it is Gurian, too (*Kartul kġilo-tkmata siťqvis kona*, Tbilisi ²1984, 285). — There seems to be no indication of a final *-i* in this form, either.

<i>encġr</i>	انجير	“fig”	<i>leġwi</i>	ლეღვი	<i>leġvi</i>	<i>leġüy</i>	لَغِي
<i>üzüm</i>	اوزوم	“grapes”	<i>qurđeni</i>	ყურძენი	<i>q^hurzeni</i>	<i>qurzeni</i>	قورزني
<i>findıq</i>	فندق	“hazelnut”	<i>t^hhili</i>	თხილი	<i>t^hxili</i>	<i>[i]txili</i>	اتخلي
<i>qavun</i>	قاون	“melon”	<i>neswi</i>	ნესვი	<i>nesvi</i>	<i>nes[u]w(i)</i>	نَسْو

Here again, there is no marking of a nominative *-i*. DŽIKIA read the word as *neswu* (120: 21).

<i>nār</i>	نار	“pomegranate”	<i>broc^heuli</i>	ბროწეული	<i>broc^heuli</i>	<i>p[u]roćö[ġ]uli</i>	پَرُوچُوغُولِي
<i>qarpuz</i>	زقربو	“watermelon”	<i>ħarbuszak^hi</i>	ხარბუზაკი	<i>xarbuszak^hi</i>	<i>xārbucāqi</i>	خَرْبُوچَقْ
<i>dud</i>	دُو	“mulberry”	<i>bžola</i>	ბჟოლი	<i>bžoli</i>	<i>p[ɪ]zoli</i>	پژُولِي

The form *bžoli* with a nominative in *-i* and a consonantal stem is Gurian and Ačarian as against BLEICHSTEINER’s *bžola* (92: 24) which is Imeretian, Račian and Lečxumian; cf. ĠLONĲI’s dialect dictionary, 86. Evliya’s material is clearly exposed as Southwest Georgian, like this. Note that DŽIKIA’s manuscript has the expected ز (ž) (126, 1. 10 from below).

<i>qız</i>	قز	“girl”	<i>gogo</i>	გოგო	<i>gogo</i>	<i>qoqo</i>	قُوْقُو
<i>qarı</i>	قري	“old woman”	<i>k^hali</i>	ქალი	<i>k^hali</i>	<i>qal(i)</i>	قَالْ

Again, the nominative *-i* is missing after a stem ending in *-al*.

<i>gel oġlan ekmek yeyelim</i>	كل اوġلان اكمك ييه يلم	“Come boy let’s eat bread”
<i>ak^h modi bić^ho p^huri ć^hamos (?)</i>	აკ მოდ(ი), ბიჭო, პური) ჭამოს	
<i>ak^h mod(i), bić^ho, p^hur(i) ć^hamos</i>	<i>aq[i] mod(i) bico pur(i) camos</i>	اقِ مودِ بچو پورِ چاموس

BLEICHSTEINER (93: 28) was right that *č'amos* is a third person singular optative, “he ought to eat”; cf. DŽIKIA, too, who translated the form as “пусть кушает хлеб” (120, fn. 2). Note that *p'ur* as the direct object has no nominative ending *-i* indicated; if it were present (as in the fourth entry to follow) one could think of a passive *p'uri ič'amos* “bread should be eaten”. — The *kasra* in *aqi* as rendering Georgian აჟ *ak^c* “here, hither” is unexpected unless we have a dialectal variant *ak^ci* here which could have been influenced by Megrelian *ak^ci*, *ak^cə* (W. BOEDER’s proposal [l.c.]; for the Megrelian word cf. e.g. I. KIPŠIDZE [QIPŠIZE], *Grammatika mingrel'skago (iverskago jazyka s xrestomatiju i slovarem*, S.-Peterburg 1914, 197 f.). DŽIKIA’s manuscript seems to have a *sukūn*, instead. But cp. the fourth entry to follow.

<i>oṭur oġlan</i>	اوطور اوغلان	“sit boy”	<i>daḷjed bič'o</i>
დაჯედ ბიჭო	<i>daḷjed bič'o</i>	<i>dacéd bico</i>	داجد بچو

დაჯედო *dač'edi* must be a misprint for დაჯედი *daḷjedi* in DŽIKIA’s list (121: 29). The form without *-i* is a morphological variant within Georgian. Note that today’s standard form is *daḷjek^c(i)* (with *-k^c*- in analogy to *-dek^c(i)* “stand”).

<i>vālideri kelbler siksin</i>	والده كي كبلر سِکسن	“May dogs fuck your mother”	
<i>ḍaġlma deda mot'qnas</i> (DEETERS)	ძაღ(ლ)მა დედა მოგიტყნას (?)		
<i>zaġ(l)ma deda mogit'q'nas</i> (?)	<i>caġmá dedá moq(i)t(q)[a]n(a)s</i> ?		جَعْمَه دَه دَه مَقْتَانِسْ

As against BLEICHSTEINER’s own analysis who took the sentence as two entries (93: 30-31), seeing in the last word an equivalent of *seksen* “80” instead of *siksin*, DEETERS’ solution as quoted by BLEICHSTEINER has to be preferred; cf. also DŽIKIA, 127. According to DEETERS, the verbal form is a third person singular optative and must be read as *mot'q'nas*. As BLEICHSTEINER assumed, in the context given here a form *mogit'q'nas* with a second person singular objective marker (“to you”) would fit better. Both proposals do not match completely, however, with Evliya’s spelling, esp. in his vocalizations. Taking his form as it is, we should expect it to be a third person singular of the Old Georgian iterative (ending: *-is*), meaning “the dog used to fuck your mother”, but this should have no *-a-* in the root, *-t'q'n-*, either. Maybe this is a dialectal variant not attested elsewhere. — For the missing *-l-* in *caġma* “dog” cf. ŽĠENŦI, *Guruli k̄ilo*, 55; in any way, in the Georgian sentence, the “dog” is singular as is the verbal form.

<i>gitme yabana</i>	گتْمه يابانه	“don’t go out”	<i>ar c'awides (ḥšam)</i> ?
არ წავიდეს აქიღამ (?)	<i>ar c'awides ak'idam</i> (?)	<i>ar sáwides xitnam</i> (?)	آر سَوَيْدَسْ خِتْنَامْ

BLEICHSTEINER (94: 32) was surely right in interpreting *ar sáwides* as *ar c'awides*, “he

should not go out”; DŽIKIA made the same proposal (121: 31). The last word, however, remains unclear, although the reading *xitnam* is better than BLEICHSTEINER’s *hšam* which was “unverständlich” to him; DŽIKIA read خَشَام, as well, and to him it was equally “непонятно” (123). Taking “out” as the sense to be looked for, we would expect one of the adverbs ending in *-dam* such as *šignidam* “out from inside” or, rather, *ak^čidam* “out from here” or *ik^čidam* “out from there”. Possibly, Evliya’s *x-* is a reflex of the *-k^č-* in one of the latter two words, the aspirated pronunciation being perceived as a spirantization. In any way, Evliya’s form would lack the first vowel, and the consonant cluster *-tn-* is not what we would expect as a transcription of the Georgian *-d-*. Maybe we have the reflex of an older variant of the forms here, which can be restored as **akit-gam(o)* and **ikit-gam(o)*, resp.

gel aġa ekmek yeyelim كل اغا اكمك يه يلم “Come sir let’s eat bread”

ak^č bat^oono puri č^oamos აქ ბატონო პური ჭამოს

ak^č bat^oono p^uri č^oamos *aq[ɪ] patoni puri čamos* آق پَانُونِ پُورِي چَامُوسْ

As above, Georgian აქ *ak^č* “here” has a final *-i* indicated. Instead of the expected vocative ending, *-o*, Evliya’s *patoni* clearly shows the nominative ending, *-i*; I have no indication that the substitution of the vocative by the nominative is regular in any Georgian dialect, but this may be due to Megrelian influence again as W. BOEDER proposes (l.c.). As for the first consonant in this word, note that Evliya’s *p-* may well represent the older form of the word which was *p²at²ron-i* originally (a borrowing from a Romance language); in this case, the dissimilation of *p²-t²-* to *b-t²-* must have occurred later than Evliya’s time, at least dialectally, unless the *p²-* be due to Megrelian influence again as G. HEWITT presumes (letter dated 22.7.91; for Megrelian *p²at²oni* cf. e.g. KIPŠIDZE’s Grammar, 297). — For *p^uri č^oamos*, lit. “he should eat bread”, cf. above.

eydir ايدر “it is good” *iri* როგზეა (??) *rigzea* (??) *(r)ibzèà* (?) اِبْرِي

In the form written in the manuscript, this can hardly be a Georgian word, not even a dialectal one; DŽIKIA, who rendered it as اِي (126, l. 6 from below), stated that this “one word or sentence allows for a decipherment neither in the Georgian text nor in its Turkish translation” (121, fn. 3). Given the spelling in the autograph and the meaning of Turkish *eydir*, we could think of როგზეა *rigzea*, meaning “(it) is in order” which could lie behind Evliya’s spelling if his ა (*alif*) stands for a რ ⟨r⟩, if the final ი ⟨i⟩ can be read as an *-a*-vowel, and if Evliya’s ბ ⟨b⟩ can represent the Georgian *-g-*. For the latter proposal, cp. the word *xitnam* above if it means *(a)kitgam*. As it is, Evliya’s form strongly reminds one of the Abkhaz word for “good”, აბзиа *a-bzia*,

which we would expect in a finite form such as и-бзиоуп *i-bzioup* ‘it is good’ to match with Evliya’s translation. Whether Evliya can have heard an Abkhaz word within the Georgian context is not clear to me. — R. DANKOFF (letter dated 3.7.91) wonders whether the Turkish word could be *eder* ‘he makes’, perhaps in the secondary sense of ‘he fucks’, instead of *eydir*; but this would not help for the Georgian word.

gel gitme كل كتمه “come don’t go” *ak^c mod(i), ar c^aawides*

აქ მოდ, არ წავიდეს *ak^c mod, ar c^aawides aq[i] mod(i), ar sáwides* آقِ مُودْ أَرْ سَوَيْدَسْ

As for the final *-i* indicated in *aqi*, see above. Note that *ar c^aawides* is a third person singular form ‘he should not go’, again; cf. also DŽIKIA who translated the clause as ‘иди сюда, пусть не уйдет!’ (121, fn. 4).

otur aga أوتور آغا “sit sir” *dažed, bat^oono*

დაჯედ, ბატონო *dažed bat^oono* *dacéd paton(o)* دَاچِدْ پَاتُونْ

Here, the word for ‘Sir’ seems to have no ending although we should expect the vocative *-o* again. If this is not due to Megrelian influence, it could be explained by a writing problem here, because the ن ⟨n⟩ itself did not fit into the line anymore, so that the vocalization marker might have been omitted; but cp. the next entry too. DŽIKIA’s manuscript seems to have a *kasra* below the ن ⟨n⟩, again (126, l. 6 from below). For the *p-*, see above.

aga bir iki oğlanım var durur alırmısın آغا بر ایکی اوغلانم وار دؤرر آلرْمِسِن

“Sir, I have one or two boys, stay, will you buy?” *paton ert (! ...)*

ბატონო, ერთი ორი ბიჭი მყავ(ს) დაჯედ იყიდოს (?)

bat^oono, erfⁱ ori bič^{’i} mq^aav(s), dažed, iq^{’idos} (?)

*paton(o) erti ori *bice mxav(s) dacéd *ig(i)dos (?)* پَاتُونْ اَرْتِ اَوْرِي بِيچْمْ حَاَنْ دَاچِدْ اَعْدُوْسْ

BLEICHSTEINER had the first two words only (95: 38); DŽIKIA saw three single sentences here, the first one ending with *erfi*, the second one with *mq^aavs*. As for *paton*, the *-n* is clearly marked as final, this time, by a *sukūn* again; so this may indeed be a (dialectal) variant of the vocative expected. The word for ‘boy’ should be *bič^{’i}* in the nominative, not *bič^{’e}*, but this may be a dialectal (or ‘Megrelized’) variant, too (see below). The *-m* surely belongs to the following verbal form, which, according to the context, should be *mq^aavs*, ‘I have (with me)’, *xar* being a second person singular ‘you are’ only; DŽIKIA posited *mq^aavs*, too (121: 37). If Evliya did mean *mq^aavs*, he must have confused و ⟨w⟩ and ر ⟨r⟩ in his notebook, which is easy to assume, and must

have omitted the final *-s* which is a general feature of today's colloquial speech as W. BOEDER underlines (l.c.). *dacid* might be the imperative *dažed* "sit down" once again (cp. DŽIKIA: 121, fn. 5), better transcribed as *dacéd* as in the preceding clause; it corresponds to the Turkic *durur*. The last word is problematical. If we assume the sense of "will you buy", we expect the verb *-q'id-* which means "to buy" as well as "to sell", depending on preverbs and "versions". The form that comes nearest to Evliya's spelling would be ოგოდღლს *iq'idos* which means "he should (or will) buy". If this is the form needed (for the third person, cp. some of the preceding sentences), Evliya's ἱ (*alif-madda*) must be corrected into ἰ (*alif* with *kasra*) and his *gayn* should have a *kasra* too, no *sukūn*. As a different solution, we could think of Evliya's ἱ reflecting the Georgian negative particle, *ar*; the word would thus have to be interpreted as a question *a(r) (i)q(i)dos* "won't he (you?) buy". In this case, Evliya must have omitted the *r* (ⵍ with *sukūn*) as present in the third entry to follow. DŽIKIA did not try to identify the word (121: 38).

baqayım küçük mi باقیم کوچکمی "Let me see, is he little" *ak^c im pat^aaria*
 აქ, იმ(ი) პატარა-ა *ak^c, im(e) p^aat^a(a)ray-a* *aq-im(e) pát(a)ráyá* أَقِيمِ بِتَرِيه

As against DŽIKIA who gave no solution for *aqim* (121: 39), BLEICHSTEINER may have been right in separating it into *ak^c* plus *im*, the first word being the adverb "here" (95: 39). *im* would be the oblique form of the demonstrative pronoun *is*, *igi* "that (one)" in standard Georgian, which is unexpected in a nominal sentence like "he is small" or "is he small", though. So it may rather represent an abbreviated form of the interjective *ime*, which TSCHENKELI notes as a Gurian word in his dictionary (1, 525), attesting it the meaning of "ei! nicht möglich! ja was!" in German. The whole sentence could be paraphrased as "here, (look,) how small he is!" like this. As a different solution, W. BOEDER (l.c.) proposes to separate *aqim* into *ak^ci*, the variant of standard Georgian *ak^c* we had in several sentences before, and the first person singular pronoun *me*, here being used as an equivalent of standard Georgian *č'emt^cvis* "for me"; the sentence could thus mean "is he (too) little for me". — The predicative adjective in the form Evliya spells it is *p^aat^ara-* as against standard *p^aat^aara-*, "small, little"; the "syncopated" form is listed in ĞLONŦI's dialect dictionary (436), but not for Gurian. Note that Evliya clearly records a nominative ending *-y* before the short copula *-a*.

yoq büyükdiir يوق بيوكدر "No, he is big" *didi aris*
 დიდი არის *didi aris* *didi aris* دِيْدِي اَرِسْ

There is no equivalent of Turkish *yoq* in this sentence, *didi aris* meaning "(he) is big"

simply.

almam ألمام “I won’t buy” *ar ḥdos* (?) არ იყიდოს *ar iq’i-* *ar (i)gidos* آر غِدُوسْ
dos

The *kasra* written below the *gayn* clearly excludes BLEICHSTEINER’s *ar ḥdos* “er soll nicht (ab)nehmen” which is improbable from a semantic point of view, too, as DŽIKIA stated (128). Instead, we should look for a form of the verb *q’id-* again. “I shan’t buy” would be *ar viq’ido*, which seems to exclude itself, however. As it is, *ar gidos* could represent *ar q’idos* “he should not sell” or, rather, *ar iq’idos* “he should not / won’t buy” as, perhaps, in the last but one entry; the latter form is preferred by DŽIKIA, too (122: 41).

vallāhi eyi oġlandır واللّٰهي اي اوغلاندر “By God, he is a fine boy” /
ღვთის მადლ(ლ)მა, კაი ბიჭე(ე)ა *gvf’is mad(l)ma, k’ai bič’e(y)a*
(ġw)tis mádma q(a)y b(i)ceya تِسْ مَدْمَا فِي بِيحْيَا

This entry was omitted in BLEICHSTEINER’s treatise. *tis medma* most probably represents the common formula *ġvtis madlma*, lit. “(by) God’s mercy”, the meaning of which is given as “bei Gott” in TSCHENKELI’s dictionary (I, 705); cf. DŽIKIA, too, for this solution (122: 42). For the missing *-l-* in *mad(l)ma*, cp. the notation of *zag(l)ma* “dog”, above. Less probable is the formula *ġmertma ic’is* or, rather, *ic’is ġmertma* “God knows”, because the rendering of the affricate *-c’-* by a ⟨t⟩ would be curious as well as the missing *-r-*. Other proposals are still less probable, take, e.g. *ġvtis dedama* “God’s mother” (in the ergative) which we should expect with a finite verb beside. *qy* is *k’ai*, the shortened form of *k’argi* “good” as in the following entry. Note that the word for “boy”, *bič’i*, has a stem in *-e* indicated once again, which speaks in favour of this being a dialectal variant.

eyi degildir fenādır ايي دكلدر فنادر “He is not good, he is bad” *k’arg(i) ar aris, glaxa-a*
კაი არ არის, გლახაა *k’ai ar aris, glaxa-a qai araris q[ɪ]laxa(a)* قَايِ آرَارِسْ قَلْحَا

As against BLEICHSTEINER (95: 42), the first word is the shortened *k’ai*, again, not the full stem *k’argi*; cf. already DŽIKIA, 128. Note that *glaxa-a* “he is poor, bad” has no nominative *-y* indicated as against *p’at’ra-y-a*, above.

at آت “horse” *čeni* ცხენი *c’xeni* *ç[ɪ]xén(i)* چِيخَنْ

There is a clear *sukūn* above the final ن ⟨n⟩ in this word, excluding the expected nominative form *cxeni*.

qaṭır قاطر “mule” *ĵori* ჯორი *žori* *çori* چُورِي

<i>eşek</i>	اشك	“donkey”	<i>wiri</i>	ვირი	<i>virī</i>	<i>wiri</i>	وړي
<i>köpek yaramaz</i>			كويك يراماز		“the dog is naughty”	<i>ḏaḡli kʷudiani</i>	
ძაღლი კუდიანია			<i>zagli kʷudiania</i>		<i>caḡli qudyan(ia)</i>		جاغلي قُوديان

If Evliya really meant a sentence “the dog is naughty” here, *qudyan* must represent the form *kʷudiania* “he is naughty” (lit. “geschwänzt”, from *kʷudi* “tail”), but there is no indication of either the nominative *-i* or the shortened copula, *-a*. Note that there is a composite *zaglikʷuda*, lit. “dog’s tail”, in Georgian too, which denotes a bad person; cf. T. SAKOḶIA, *Kartuli xaṭovani siṭṭva-tkmata*, Tbilisi ²1979, 833 sq. For DŽIKIA, these were two entries, the second being the simple adjective *kʷudiani* “хитрый, дурной” (122: 48). Note that in his Turkish translation, Evliya uses *köpek*, not *kelb*, here, which could point to the meaning of an invective as K. KREISER suggests (personal communication).

Megrelian:

II: 332b, 19 لسان اصطلاحات مال مرزبل لسان مکرل زلسیل
 دیار کورجستان اون بیی فرقه قوم مکت میلییه درجه لدا حسیب ونسیب کچننا حق باشو دادیان و شوشاد و
 کوربلو اما بونلک بسنده مکرل بس پایه زبلدور زبلدور قوم منوم مکرل الفاظ مخصوصه
 لری بومر اولآ آرتی ژری سومی اویچ خوتی پشکوی اشکوی زووو چوغوز و قی آرتوی
 ۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵ ۶ ۷ ۸ ۹ ۱۰ ۱۱
 کابل داغ فریز پوز اشخوری دزفات دودی دشکه چوغوز اشخو کیش اجن اینجین
 اشک آتش قلغان قیون قوشاق باش اودن کوبک صغیر بوزاغی غوز ات
 غاج کزیت توت قون مرغ وان فوج چوز خودی وای چای داخود ملازب تینه
 دوزور اشک آبی بیسز یغوزد ارکر فرج طساق کل آدم اوطور کیت قیر
 اوچتوم وای چایج آشسورت ملازلی چایج آشسورین وای مامادا وای دیاس ارتوغام اوچتوم
 یه نیلم کل آدم بوزایا کته آدم یا عطده دار کل بابا کل است بر دوسوزیه یلم
 بختوز دیاش گان میک شایغوزد حیاحره بکونه شتوم کرد خویلمک لازمه کم کندوبه سوکد کار بیعکرا اولو
 کللر آکی وایا کج دستری یه الله سر اول جمله هر کسه حسن الفت ایوب بر تقرب ایله جانب سلامت چیغه
 کتیب یاور پشور حاشمه غنغده غوز و چوخو و بکر خودی آچسور ادریب کرن یه غاج آچسور از نیسو
 دیلمر حق سنی حاشرا بسز اولان صغیر سویم سکدب لرا اشکوی دوسوزیه سکدب اولان
 وای چایج کلنیز ملازلی اشخوری کوبان اوچتوم وای چایج داخود قول کوبان مرغ قات اوچتوم
 کل آدم یا ط کته قیون آکک یه یلم کل آدم اوطور بیسز اشک یوغوزد به یلم
 مذموز وندی دامه قوجه مامادا اگر چیغوز دوز بری اوب بیسز باک با شگون اولسون

Today's forms are given according to I. KIPŠIDZE (QIPŠIZE), Grammatika mingrel'skago (iverskago) jazyka s xrestomatijeju i slovarem, S.-Peterburg 1914 (Materialy po jafetičeskomu jazykoznaniju, 7.). The principles of the phonological spelling and of the "Turkicizing" transcription are the same as with Georgian.

Turkish	meaning	BLEICHSTEINER	today	phonologically	reading	
(bir)	۱	1	arti	art'i	arti	آرتی
(iki)	۲	2	žiri	žiri	j(i)ri	ژری
(üç)	۳	3	šumi (!)	sumi	sumi	ی مسو

I. KIPŠIDZE (321) and BLEICHSTEINER (98: 3) quoted Evliya for the Megrelian number "three" in the form *šumi*, which would match well with R. VON ERCKERT's *šumi* (Die Sprachen des Kaukasischen Stammes, Wien 1985, Repr. Wiesbaden 1970, 23) with *š*- against today's *sumi* which might be influenced by Georgian *sami*. This cannot be main-

tained, given the clear reading *sumi* سومي in the autograph. In the case of ERCKERT's notation (*šumi* is put beside *sumi* here), there may be doubts, too, as to whether it can be relied upon, because the older word-lists have only *sumi* such as J. GÜLDENSTÄDT's (cf. the edition of G. GELAŠVILI, *Giuldenštedtis mogzauroba sakartveloši / Putešestvie Gjul'denštedta po Gruzii / Johannes Gueldenstaedtius, Peregrinatio Georgica, II*, Tbilisi 1964, 305), and J. VON KLAPROTH's (in: *Kaukasische Sprachen. Anhang zur Reise in den Kaukasus und nach Georgien. Halle u. Berlin 1814, 270*; quoted in G. ROSEN, *Über die Sprache der Lazen, Berlin 1845, 11*). In "Asia polyglotta" (Paris 1823, 122), KLAPROTH has Megr. *Šumi* (and "Šuanisch" *Šemi*) as against Georgian *Sami*, but his *š* means just a word initial voiceless *s*-.

(<i>dört</i>)	۴	4	<i>ofhi</i>	ოფხი	<i>ofxi</i>	<i>otxi</i>	اوتخ
(<i>beş</i>)	۵	5	<i>hufi</i>	ხუფი	<i>xufi</i>	<i>xuti</i>	خوتي
(<i>altı</i>)	۶	6	(<i>amšwi</i>)	ამშვი	<i>amšvi</i>	(<i>a</i>) <i>p[i]škuy</i>	پشكوي

Cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (98: 6) for a discussion of this word. That the *-k-* is not due to an influence of the following numeral but is an authentic feature, is indicated by the form *apch'schui* (= *apšvi*) given in the list of Megrelian numerals in KLAPROTH's "Kaukasische Sprachen", 270. KLAPROTH's Megrelian form is quoted as *apxhuui* in his own "Asia polyglotta" and as *apch'sui* in G. ROSEN's "Über die Sprache der Lazen", 11. GÜLDENSTÄDT, however, had today's *amschi* already (GELAŠVILI's edition, 305). Taking KLAPROTH's form as granted, we can interpret Evliya's *piškuy* as **apšxvi* or, rather, *apškvi*. For S.S. DŽIKIA (*Ėvlija Čelebi o mingrel'skom i gruzinskom jazykax, Sovetskoe jazykoznanie 1936,2, 113*), the *-k-* was still unexplainable ("во всяком случае присутствие в этом слове *к* теперь не объяснимо").

(<i>yedi</i>)	۷	7	<i>šk'wit'i</i>	შკვიტი	<i>šk'vit'i</i>	[<i>i</i>]š <i>küti</i>	اشكوتی
-----------------	---	---	-----------------	--------	-----------------	---------------------------	--------

This numeral is given as *schqwithi* in KLAPROTH's word-list (270) and as *šqwithi* in ROSEN's (11). Evliya's *i-* is a prothetic vowel provoked by the consonant cluster; cf. already DŽIKIA, 123, according to whom this is a normal feature of Turks starting to speak Megrelian (or Georgian). GÜLDENSTÄDT's *skwiti* (with *s-* instead of *sch-*: 305) may be an error.

(<i>sekiz</i>)	۸	8	<i>ruo</i>	რუო	<i>ruo</i>	<i>ruwo</i>	رُووُو
(<i>doquz</i>)	۹	9	<i>čhoro</i>	ჩხორო	<i>čxoro</i>	ç[o]ğor(o)	چُوغُوْر

There is a clear *sukūn* above the final *-r*, but the *-o* vocalism of today's form must be authentic. GÜLDENSTÄDT gives *rua* "8" and *tschchora* "9" with a final *-a*, but this is not

attested elsewhere.

(on)	ⴓ	10	wif ^o i	ვიფო	vif ^o i	w(i)ti	وتي
(on bir)	ⴓ	11	wif ^o aarf ^o i (!)	ვიფაართო	vif ^o a arf ^o i	[arf ^o i w(i)ti]	آرتي وزي

As BLEICHSTEINER pointed out (99: 11), Evliya notes the numbers 11 and 12 in Caucasian languages universally with reverse order of their elements. As for Megrelian, this “error” was first mentioned in KIPŠIDZE’s grammar (XXIII). GÜLDENSTÄDT had the “normal” form *witarti*, already (305).

<i>ekmek</i>	اڪمڪ	“bread”	<i>k^obal</i>	ქობალი	<i>k^obal</i>	<i>kobal(i) (?)</i>	كوبال (؟)
--------------	------	---------	-------------------------	--------	-------------------------	---------------------	-----------

This word is hardly legible in the autograph. If there is really no indication of a final *-i*, we can compare Evliya’s Georgian words with a stem in *-al*. Cf. KIPŠIDZE’s grammar, already, for a discussion of this word as attested in the published text of Evliya’s travel book (XXIV). As against BLEICHSTEINER, Megr. *kobali* cannot be identified etymologically with Georgian *p^kvili* “flour” but rather with Georgian *xorbali* “wheat” (cf. Arn. ČIKOVAVA, Čanur-megrul-kartuli šedarebiti leksiķoni, Tbilisi 1938, 175, quoting I. ŽAVAXIŠVILI). Ср. KIPŠIDZE, who denotes *kobali* as “пшеница” as well as “пшеничный хлѣбъ” (345), and GÜLDENSTÄDT who has Megr. *xorbali* for “triticum” and *tschkomi* for “bread” (309/310). Curiously, KLAPROTH notes *kobali* as the Megrelian word for “Kuh” in Asia polyglotta (117); this must be due to a confusion of Georgian *p^uuri* “cow” and *p^uuri* “bread”.

<i>āteş</i>	آتش	“fire”	<i>dačhiri</i>	დაჩხირი	<i>dačxiri</i>	<i>dacxir(i)</i>	دآخیر
-------------	-----	--------	----------------	---------	----------------	------------------	-------

In the autograph, Evliya seems to have corrected himself with respect to the medial *خ* ⟨x⟩, so that it is not completely clear whether there is a *kasra* below both the *ح* ⟨c⟩ and the *ر* ⟨r⟩ or whether there is one *kasra*, only. The final *ر* ⟨r⟩ seems to have a *sukūn*, too, which would exclude a nominative *-i*. GÜLDENSTÄDT has *datschehe* for “ignis”, but the lack of a final *-r* must be a mistake.

<i>qalqan</i>	قلقان	“shield”	<i>p^oori</i> (DEETERS)	ფორი ?	<i>p^oori ?</i>	<i>por(i)</i>	پور
---------------	-------	----------	-----------------------------------	--------	---------------------------	---------------	-----

Cf. BLEICHSTEINER (99: 14) for a discussion of this word. It is true that the regular sound equivalent of Georgian *pari* “shield” would be *p^oori* in Megrelian as DEETERS assumed, but this is unexpected in an Iranian loanword unless the Megrelian form be remodelled after the Georgian according to rules of interdialectal sound correspondances as W. BOEDER proposes (letter dated 17.9.91: “dialektale Umsetzungsregeln”). The word seems not to be attested in any one of the older sources.

<i>qoyun</i>	قيون	“sheep”	<i>šhuri</i>	შხური	<i>šxuri</i>	[u]šxuri	اشخوري
--------------	------	---------	--------------	-------	--------------	----------	--------

Note that there is a clear indication of a final (nominative) *-i* in this word (as against the two preceding ones). — The initial *ı* (*alif* with *damma*) seems to be a “turkicizing” prothetic vowel (to be read as *u-* for the sake of vowel harmony) to avoid the consonant cluster *šx-*.

<i>quşaq</i>	قوشاق	“waistband”	<i>ort^oq^oap^ou</i>
(ღო) ორჭყაფე (?)	(<i>do</i>) <i>ort^oq^oap^ou</i> (?)	* <i>dortqap(u)</i> (?)	دَرَقَات

Cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (99: 16) for an attempt to join Evliya’s spelling with the Megrelian word for “girdle”, *ort^oq^oap^ou*. The initial *d-* might be the remnant of an older form with a prefix *do-* building verbal nouns instead of today’s *o-* or, more probably, the reflex of Megr. *do* “and” contracted with the word initial *o-* as W. BOEDER proposes (l.c). If we can assume that Evliya changed the final *ت* ⟨t⟩ for a *پ* ⟨p⟩ and that the medial *-t^o-* in the verbal root *rt^oq^o* was lost due to a simplification of the consonant cluster *-rt^oq^o-*, we can well assume today’s form as lying behind Evliya’s *dorqat*. Note, that there is a clear *sukūn* above the final letter which is more easily explained if this represented *-p^ou*. We cannot exclude, however, that Evliya’s form stands for a different word such as, e.g., **durt(u)qi* or the like; cf. DŽIKIA (113), who grouped دَرَقَات in the words “которые совсем не читаются или читаются, но представляют непонятный комплекс звуков”.

<i>baş</i>	باش	“head”	<i>dudi</i>	დედი	<i>dudi</i>	<i>dudi</i>	دُودِي
<i>odun</i>	اودون	“wood”	<i>dišk^oa</i>	დიშქა	<i>dišk^oa</i>	<i>dišká</i>	دِشَكَة

This word is noted as *dischcha* in GÜLDENSTÄDT’s word-list (310: “lignum”).

<i>köpek</i>	كويك	“dog”	<i>joğori</i>	ჯოღორი	<i>joğori</i>	<i>çoğor(i)</i>	چُوغُور
--------------	------	-------	---------------	--------	---------------	-----------------	---------

There is no vocalization mark at all for the final *ر* ⟨r⟩ in this word.

<i>şıgır</i>	صغر	“cattle”	<i>hoji</i>	ხბ(ო)ე	<i>čx(o)u</i>	<i>c[u]xu</i>	جُوخُو
--------------	-----	----------	-------------	--------	---------------	---------------	--------

According to BLEICHSTEINER (99: 20), Evliya must have confused the punctuation marks of *ح* ⟨c⟩ and *خ* ⟨x⟩ in this word if he really meant ხბჯი *xoži* “steer”. For the clearly indicated rounded vowel in the final position, we would have to assume an *-ü* due to progressive assimilation to match with the *-i* expected. Much more probably, Evliya’s word is ხბე *čxu*, however, which means “корова” according to KIPŠIDZE (368); KIPŠIDZE has the variants *čxuu* for the Eastern (S= Senak-) and *čxou* for the Western dialect (MZ= Sa-Murzakan / Zugdidi). For this equation cf. already DŽIKIA (115 and 128). GÜLDENSTÄDT has *chodži*, already, for “bos” (308, fn. 14). ჯობი *žocho* would mean “name” in Megrelian (KIPŠIDZE, 416: имя); according to G. HEWITT

(letter dated 22.7.91) the dialect of Očamčira has *žo xo* only as a verbal form meaning “X is called Y” (Georgian *hkvia*), whereas for “name” it has the Georgian *saxeli*.

buzagi بوزاغي “calf” *geni, gini* გენი / გინი *geni / gini gin(i)* گِنِ
According to KIPŠIDZE, *geni* belongs to the Eastern dialect (S), while *gini* is the form noted in the West (MZ: 215). As Evliya normally denotes a *-i-* by *kasra*, he will have heard the latter one (but cp. the second entry to follow). GÜLDENSTÄDT has *geni* (308: “vitulus”) as well as KLAPROTH (*Kaukasische Sprachen*, 267). DŽIKIA read گِينِ <giin> in his manuscript (128).

tuz طوز “salt” *ḡimu* ჯიმო *ḡimu [i]cim(u)* اِجِمِ
For the unexpected initial ʾ *alif* cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (99: 22) and DŽIKIA (128). That this is a combination with *e* “that”, as BLEICHSTEINER presumed, is hardly believable; according to DŽIKIA, there is a *kasra* below the *alif* in his manuscript, which would render BLEICHSTEINER’s solution even less probable, but there is no *kasra* in the autograph. Anyhow, as in the following word, the initial ʾ will rather be due to a simplification of a word initial consonant (cluster). GÜLDENSTÄDT has *ḡumi* (311, fn. 4) which shows the reverse order of the vowels as against today’s form. Evliya’s spelling of the final م with *sukūn* may mean today’s *-mu* rather than GÜLDENSTÄDT’s *-mi*.

at ات “horse” *čʰeni* ცხენი *cʰxeni [i]çxen(i)* اِچْخِنِ
For the initial ʾ, see the preceding word. Megrelian *cʰxeni*, which is surely a borrowing from Georgian, is attested in PALLAS’ edition of GÜLDENSTÄDT’s word-list, but not in GÜLDENSTÄDT’s material itself, cf. GELAŠVILI’s edition, 308, fn. 15. KLAPROTH (*Asia polyglotta*, 118) has *Zcheni*.

domuz دَوْمُوز “pig” *ḡeḡi* ღეჯი *ḡeḡi ḡäc(i)* عَاجِ
As there is no variant like *ḡaḡi* attested anywhere, Evliya’s *-a-*, clearly indicated by *alif* plus *fatha*, is unexpected. Even GÜLDENSTÄDT has *Gedḡi* alone (309, fn. 5), as well as KLAPROTH (*Asia polyglotta*, 119), who writes it *Gedæci*. The *sukūn* above the final ج <ḡ> is quite faint in the autograph.

eḡek اَشْك “donkey” *girini, ḡarəni* გირინი / გერენი *girini / ḡarəni *gır(t)ni* كِرْتِ
Of the two forms as given in KIPŠIDZE’s grammar (218), the first one belongs to the Eastern dialect (S), the latter to the Western dialect (MZ), again (but cf. DŽIKIA, 112, according to whom გირინი *girini* is not met with in Eastern Megrelia at all). Evliya must have confused ت <t> and ن <n> here if we presume today’s form. The *qāf* written above the *kāf* is perhaps meant to indicate a non-palatal pronunciation which

could point to the Western *a* instead of the Eastern *i*. GÜLDENSTÄDT has *Girin* (308), as well as KLAPROTH (*Asia polyglotta*, 113).

ayi آيي “bear” *tʰuntʰi* თუნთი *tʰuntʰi* *tut(i)* نوت

Evliya’s form is nearer to the Laz equivalents of Megrelian *tʰuntʰi*, viz. *tʰutʰi* and *mtʰutʰi*, than to today’s Megrelian word itself. As the *-n-* is regarded as a secondary element in Megr. *tʰuntʰi* (and similar cases; cf., e.g., K.H. SCHMIDT, *Studien zur Rekonstruktion des Lautstandes der südkaukasischen Grundsprache*, Wiesbaden 1962, 89 sq.), Evliya may well have heard an older form.

peynir پيسر “cheese” *ʷali*, *ʷai* ცვალი, ცვაი *ʷali*, *ʷai* *qol(i)* قول

As against today’s form, Evliya’s *qwal* seems to represent an older stage as attested by Laz *qʷali*, which still has the initial *qʷ*, agreeing with Georgian *qʷeli*. GÜLDENSTÄDT, too, has *Kwali* for “caseus” (310). For the rendering of today’s *-va-* by *و* ⟨w⟩ with *damma*, cf. DŽIKIA (128), according to whom this must be read *qol*; is this a dialect variant? For the missing *-i*, cp. *kobal(i)* above.

yogurd يُغورد “sour milk” *marcʷeni*
 მარწვენი, მარწვინი *marcʷeni*, *marcʷini* *márcwän* مَرَجْوَان

Evliya’s vocalization is unexpected. PALLAS, in his edition of GÜLDENSTÄDT’s word-list, gives *Madsoni* as the Megrelian word for “lac coagulatum” but this is clearly the Georgian word; the same holds true for KLAPROTH’s *Mađoni* (*Asia*, 117).

zeker زكر “penis” *pʷuči* ფუჩი *pʷuči* *fuc(i)* فوج

BLEICHSTEINER’s proposal that this is Megrelian *pʷuči* (= Georgian *pʷicʰi*) meaning “oath” would be quite convincing if we could assume that Evliya asked FOR ذَكَر *zeker*, which is likely because of the following words (and, as DŽIKIA stated, because Evliya never asked abstract terms at all: 128), but that ذَكَر *ziker* was understood by his informants (in the sense of “invocation of God’s name”). That Evliya rendered the aspirated *pʷ* as *ف* ⟨f⟩ would not be surprising. I do not see, however, that Megrelian *pʷuči* can have the meaning of “penis”; as G. HEWITT (l.c.) reports, there is a Megr. *pʷuči* which “is used of a **girl**’s private parts when talking to children — i.e. it’s less suggestive than *čuri* [for which see the next entry]. But it can’t be used of a penis”. — A different solution is offered by DŽIKIA who reads the word as فوج ⟨quc⟩ and interprets this as Megrelian *važi* meaning “мужское яичко” (115, fn. 1; cf. KIPŠIDZE, 418, who gives the meaning “шулятное яйцо”, i.e. “testicle”). That Megrelian *ʷ* was heard as a *qʷ* by Evliya is further suggested by the word for “cheese” above; the same holds true

for the rendering of *-va-* by و (*wāw* with *ḍamma*). As for the missing *-i*, we can cp. *gäc(i)* “pig” in any case.

ferc فرج “vagina” *čuri* ჩური *č^huri* *çur(i)* چور
For the missing *-i*, cp. *çogor(i)* above.

taşaq طشاق “testicles” / ხოდო (?) *xodi* (?) *xodi* خودي
I cannot verify this word in the published material; BLEICHSTEINER omits it. It is possible, that Megrelian once possessed a word *xodi*, equivalent to Georgian *xvadi* “male (animal), male dog, stallion” etc.; cp. KIPŠIDZE (405) who notes a verbal root *xod-* meaning “coire” which he compares with Georgian *xvadi*, too. For DŽIKIA, it is just this verb in the imperative, equivalent to Latin “coi”, not a word for “testicles” (115, fn. 2); cp. several entries below for this. That Evliya’s *xodi* conceals a variant of the normal word for “testicle”, *ვაჯი* *važi*, as discussed in the last but one entry, is less probable.

gel كل “come” (*morf*i**) ვაო (?) *vai* (?) *way* واي
BLEICHSTEINER, in regarding *way* as an interjection, obviously thought of KIPŠIDZE’s ვაო! meaning “woe!” (“ой, о горе!”). Possibly, this is the Abkhaz word for “come”, *yaai wa:i*, borrowed into Megrelian as some kind of interjection, in this sense; cf. already DŽIKIA (115 and 123) for the same assumption.

adam آدم “man” *č^haš* (Svan. ?) ჳოჲ ? *c^hie* ? *çay* ? چاي
BLEICHSTEINER was right that there is no Megrelian word meaning “man” which would match with Evliya’s *çay* (100: 32). It is highly improbable, however, that Evliya heard the Svan word *č^häš*, here, because the same form is recorded several times in the same spelling in clear Megrelian sentences, later on. DŽIKIA (116) proposes Megrelian ჳოჲ *c^hie*, instead, which means “мальчик” according to KIPŠIDZE (378) and which seems a better solution, though not without problems. Note that in contrast to the preceding item, *çay* is written with a *sukūn* above the final ي ⟨y⟩.

oṭur اوطور “sit” *dohod* დობოდი *doxodi* *dāxod(i)* داخود
Cf. BLEICHSTEINER (100: 33) for the right analysis. Surprisingly, Evliya spells the first *-o-* with *fatha* plus *alif* (cf. already DŽIKIA, 124), which may be due to an influence of the frequent Georgian preverb *da-* equivalent to Megrelian *do-*. According to G. HEWITT (l.c.), this word is problematical in Megrelian “because of the association of *do-xod-i* with the meaning ‘fuck X!’”. This is why “the meaning ‘sit down!’ is usually represented by a doubling of the preverbs *do-do-xod(-i)* (assuming the polite *do-zož(-i)* is not used), though *do-xod(i)* can still mean ‘sit down!’.” Maybe, the “Georgianization”

of the preverb was another way to avoid the conflict.

git گت “go” *melaula* (?) მელეულა ? *meleula* ? *meläwli* مَلَاوْلِي

As against DANKOFF’s edition (Glossary, 122), the Turkish equivalent in the autograph is clearly *git* “go”, not the negative *gitme* “don’t go”. Like this, we could easily assume a verbal compound *mele-ula* meaning “you go over there” here, consisting of *mele-* “по ты сторону” (KIPŠIDZE, 278 s.v. 2.me) and the second person singular present form *ula/u* “you go” (KIPŠIDZE’s root 2.I, 264). In this case, BLEICHSTEINER’s proposal (100: 34) that we have a reduced form of today’s prohibitive particle *naṁa* plus *elaula* “geh nicht vorbei!” here could be disposed of. The identification of Evliya’s *meläwli* with the positive Turkish *git* is problematical, however, because the same Megrelian form corresponds to the negative *gitme* in two other sentences below. So we have to face the possibility that Evliya’s Turkish form was misunderstood as *gitme* by his informant and that his answer is a negative form anyhow. In this case, we can accept an explanation given by G. HEWITT (l.c.), according to whom the form represents a Megrelian *mele-* “over there” plus *va* “not” plus *ula/u* “you go” which would fit well with Evliya’s writing.

qiz قيز “girl” *t’ena* თინა *t’ina* *tina* تِينَة

BLEICHSTEINER’s proposal (100: 35) that this is not a word meaning “girl” but a demonstrative pronoun “diese” is quite convincing, although one should prefer *t’ina* “that one” to *t’ena* “this one”, because of Evliya’s *kasra* below the ت <t>; cf. DŽIKIA, too (128). We can not exclude totally, however, that Evliya’s spelling means the Megrelian word for girl, ცირა *c’ira*, instead, the ن <n> being used erroneously for a ر <r> and the ت <t> representing a *c’*, as in Evliya’s *tis* if this represents Georgian *ic’is* (cf. the Georgian specimen for this).

yeyelim يه يلم “let’s eat” *o-w-č’k’om-at’* ოჭკომ(ო) (?) *oč’k’om(i)* (?) *oçqom(i)* اَوْجَقَوْمْ

BLEICHSTEINER’s form (101: 36) would be the exact rendering of “let’s eat” in Megrelian, but he himself wonders whether this can be represented by Evliya’s spelling. His proposal that we have *o-č’k’om-u* “das was zu essen ist” here, instead, is not convincing either. A better candidate seems to be the form *oč’k’omi* which is the second person singular aorist “you ate” and which would be used as the imperative “eat!” as well; this solution is preferred in DŽIKIA (116, fn.2) too. The final *-i* might have been omitted in spelling as in many other Megrelian words listed here, or it was absent due to morphological variation comparable to the Georgian aorist; according to G. HEWITT (l.c.) such vowels are generally lost in the Megrelian dialect of Očamčira which speaks in

favour of the latter solution. Cp. the second entry to follow too.

gel adam كل آدم “come man” (*waj čai*) ვაი წიე ?? *vai c’ie ?? way çay* وَايِ چَايِ
For both words, see above. Note that there is a *sukūn* above the ي ⟨y⟩ in the latter word only, again.

buraya بُورَايَا “hither” *ašo morf’i* აშო მორთი *ašə morf’i aš(i) mort(i)* أَشْ مُورْتِ
As against BLEICHSTEINER (101: 40) it seems easier to presume that Evliya’s *aš* represents Megr. *ašə* than *ašo*, both meaning “here, hither”; cp. the second entry to follow too, where the same word is written with a final ي ⟨i⟩. As for the imperative *morf’i*, the final -i seems to be missing again, but cp. the second entry to follow. Note that the sentence means “come here”, not just “here, hither” (cp. DŽIKIA, 116, fn. 3).

gitme adam كْتْمِهْ آدَمِ “don’t go man” (*[nə]mə elaulə čai*)
(მელე-ვა-ულე წიე ??) *mele-va-ulə c’ie ??* *mélawlı çay* مَلَاوْلِي چَايِ
For both words, see above. Note that *çay* has a *sukūn* above the ي ⟨y⟩ again.

pašta var gel baba بِاصْتِهْ وَا رِ كَلِّ بَابَا “There is *pašta*, come father”
ašə morf’i, wai mamaw აშე მორთი, ვაი ? მამავ ?
ašə morf’i, vai ?? mamav ? *aşı *mor[i]t(i) way *mamaw* أَشِي مُورِنْ وَايِ مَامَادْ

Cp. the last but one entry for the first two words. As for *morf’i*, it is obvious that Evliya confused ن ⟨n⟩ and ت ⟨t⟩ in the final position here; possibly, the *kasra* noted below the ر ⟨r⟩ stood below the final ت ⟨t⟩, originally. As for *way*, note that this word has a *sukūn* above the final ي ⟨y⟩, this time. With respect to Evliya’s *mamad*, BLEICHSTEINER was right in stating that this must be the Georgian form of the word for “father”, *mama*, as against Megr. *muma* or *mua*, and that it must show a reflex of the Georgian vocative particle, -o/-v, the د ⟨d⟩ being written for a و ⟨w⟩, erroneously; cf. DŽIKIA (124) for the same assumption. Megrelian has no vocative of its own. Note that the sentence means “come here, come, father” and that there is no equivalent for “there is *pašta*” at all (cf. already DŽIKIA, 116, fn.4).

gel ana كَلِّ آنَا “come mother” *wai dias!* ვაი ? დიას ? *vai ? dias ? way diyas* دِيَّاسْ وَايِ
way has a *sukūn* here, once again. As for *dias*, this is not the expected form, the word for “mother” being *dia* (or *dida*) in the nominative. BLEICHSTEINER (101: 41) presumes that this is the dative case instead, provoked by *way* which he interprets as an interjection, the whole sentence meaning something like “weh, Mutter”. Such a syntactical behaviour of the interjection ვაი *vai* is not attested anywhere else, however. DŽIKIA

seems to doubt the *-s* too, rendering Evliya's entry as “*waay* და (?)”.

bir domuz yeyelim بر دُمُوز يه يلم “let's eat a pig” *art'i gēži oč'k'omu*

ართი ღეჯი ოჭკომ(ი) *art'i gēži oč'k'om(i)* *arti gäç(i) oçqom(i)* ارْتی غاچ اوچقُوم

As against BLEICHSTEINER (101: 42) this will be the second person singular aorist = imperative *oč'k'om(i)*, again, a sentence like “ein Schwein (ist) zu essen” hardly representing normal Kartvelian syntax; cf. DŽIKIA, again, for the right solution (116, fn. 5). Besides, I am not sure whether *oč'k'omu* “das was zu essen ist” does exist in Megrelian at all, because KIPŠIDZE gives *oč'k'omali* as the deverbal noun in this sense only (391). If Evliya's *oçqom* is the imperative form “eat!”, instead, the nominative object *art'i gēži* is exactly what we have to expect. Note that the word for “pig” is written with *alif* plus *fathā* again.

kelpler anarṭi ve babaṭi ve seni yef'allesin

كلپلر اناكي و باباكي و سني يفعله سين

“May dogs fuck your mother and your father and you”

žogori (! ...)

ჯღღორქ და–სქანი მიგიშახოდ(ას) ??

žogork' dia-sk'ani migišaxod(as) ??

coğor(k) diyaskan(i) migişay[xod(as) ??

جوغور دياس كان ميكي شاي خود

BLEICHSTEINER (101: 43) treated only the first word of this sentence, *žogori* “dog”; DŽIKIA (117: 44) read it as ჯღღორი დასქან მიქი.. *žogori diaskan miki..*, but did not try an explicit interpretation. Taking Evliya's translation as a basis, we can arrive at the following suggestions: The verb in question must be *-xod-* for which see above; this is obviously contained in Evliya's *خود -xod-*. In the modal sense of “May he do sth.!” we would expect a third person optative (= aorist subjunctive), which would be *xod-as*. The subject of this form must be in the ergative case, which would be *žogor-k'* “a dog” in the singular or *žogor-ep'-k'* “dogs” in the plural. The object “your mother” would have to be in the nominative, *dia-sk'ani*, which may well be preserved in Evliya's *diyaskan*. If the verbal form were not an optative but a subjunctive present (or future), it would have to be something like *xod-u/ən-das*; we would expect the “dog(s)” in the nominative then (*žogori* / *žogorep'i*) and “your mother” in the dative (*dias-sk'ans*). It is clear that this solution can be excluded. As it is not likely that Evliya could have overheard the optative ending *-as*, we have to think of a third possibility. This is offered by G. HEWITT (l.c.) and W. BOEDER (l.c.): As HEWITT states, “one sometimes finds the simple Aorist where you would expect a subjunctive expressing a wish, cf. ღორონთ–ქ და–რ–ხვამ–ეს [*goront'-k' do-r-xvam-es*] ‘God blessed you (Pl.)’ for expected ‘God bless you!’ = და–რ–ხვამ–ან [*do-r-xvam-an*]” (cf. KIPŠIDZE's grammar, 0139, § 146 and W.

BOEDER, “Über einige Anredeformen im Kaukasus”, in: *Georgica* 11, 1988, 12 for the same phenomenon). Like this, Evliya’s *xud* could be a third singular aorist ხოდ(–უ) *xod(u)* simply, the final *-u* being omitted as otherwise. — In any case, we are left with the two words *miki şay* which can hardly be identified with “your father”, *mua-skʻani*, and “you”, *si*. Instead, I would prefer to see a complex of verbal prefixes here, such as, e.g., *mi-gi-ša-*. This could consist of the compound preverb *mi-ša-* meaning “into the middle, in between” (cf. KIPŠIDZE’s grammar, 0120), and the objective marker of the second person, *-gi-*, “for you, to you”, which would be coreferential to the notion of *skʻan-* “your” here. There is a difficulty, however, in the fact that the normal order of the elements would be *miša-gi-*, but as KIPŠIDZE admits, objective markers “sometimes” (“иногда”) are met with in an intermediate position within compound preverbs too (Grammar, 0106, § 111 and 090, § 101, примечание). G. HEWITT (l.c.) makes two further objections to this analysis: first, the marker of the objective version would be pleonastic, when a possessive pronoun is present, and second, the *-g-* of the “would tend to disappear within a verb form, and, because of syncope in verbs, it is unlikely that *migišaxod(as)*, even if it ever existed, would have been so pronounced” (l.c.). A different solution would take Evliya’s ڭ ⟨y⟩ in *şay* as the marker of the so-called “subjective version”, meaning “for himself” as correlative to the subject of the action, which would exclude *-ki-* as an objective marker. In this case, I could only think of an inversed complex, *kʻi-miša-*, *kʻi-* being a phonetic variant of the perfective particle *kʻo-* as in *kʻi-miša-mi-bogi* “build a bridge for me in the middle” (KIPŠIDZE, Grammar, 0121, § 120). I wonder, however, whether the verb in question could have a subjective marker at all. G. HEWITT again thinks of the second person objective marker, *-gi-*, reduced to *-i-* within a complex *mikʻi-še-(g)i-xod(-u)* “X fucked Y inside for you”, with *mikʻi* “all around” (variant of *mukʻi* “кругом”, cf. KIPŠIDZE, 280 / 283), which would fit quite well with Evliya’s notation. The problem of the “pleonastic” objective marker persists like this, however.

dilerim haq seni taş eylesin oğlan şıgır

ديلرم حق سني طاش ايلسن اوغلان صير

“I wish God would turn you to stone, boy steer” *şeni tʻawi nacw(l)ad hatʻma kʻwa ...(?)*

ტანი ბიჭო, ქუათ მაცუაფუე, ბიჭო ჩხოე ? *tʻani bičʻo, kuaf maʻuapʻu, bičʻo čʻxou*

táni yawo (?) biçowo hatmá gáfá biçowo c[u]xu ?

تني يآوو بچوو حاتمہ غفہ جحو

This sentence was regarded as Georgian by BLEICHSTEINER, but his interpretation, which was obviously invoked by *hatma* identified with the Georgian ergative *xatʻma* “the icon”, is quite improbable, at least because of the rendering of *kʻva* “stone” by *gfa*

and because of the reading *nac(w)lad* “instead of” for “*baǰwad*”, which turns out to be the vocative *bič’o* “oh boy”, spelt as بِچَوَوُ by Evliya. Although this vocative is Georgian, the whole sentence may be Megrelian as was the case with *mamav* “oh father” above; but it remains hard to analyze even so. Starting from Evliya’s translation (note that we have *eylesin*, not *etsin* as in DANKOFF’s “Glossary”, 122), again, we may presume in حَاتْمَه عَفَه a combination of the word for stone, being *k’ua* in Megrelian as in Georgian, in the adverbial case (ending *-t’* with a vocalic stem), and the verbal form *ma’uap’u* < **maq’uap’u*, meaning “he/she/it will be as a stone for me” (for the adverbial case, cp. German “er wird **zu** Stein werden”). The second person singular would be *ma’uap’u-k’* “you will be for me” (for the verbal forms, cf. KIPŠIDZE’s grammar, 099). The third person would be right if the first word is *t’ani* “the body”, which has no equivalent in Evliya’s translation, however. The second word, *yawo* or the like, remains unclear in any case; we should expect something meaning “I’d beg God”. There is but little chance that Evliya’s first word represents *t’ini*, which means “right, righteous” in Megrelian and which could be a literal equivalent of Evliya’s *haq*. It is not certain even that we are right in reading تَنِي *táni*, because there seems to be a second ت <t> instead of a ن <n> rather. DŽIKIA’s transcript of his manuscript has شَتِي *šati*, even (125, l. 2 from below). — “I’d beg” would be *p’f’xia*, “to wish” would be *-ndom-* or *-nat’r-* in Megrelian, none of which seems to lie behind Evliya’s notation. — The last two words, clearly representing *bič’o* “oh, boy” and *čxou* “cow”, again, seem rather to belong to the following phrase, as DŽIKIA’s notation supposes (117: 45-46).

<i>seni kesem</i>	سنى كسم	“I’ll cut you (?)”	/
ვა (ბ)გიხოდო	<i>va (n)gixodi</i>	<i>wáangi xodi?</i>	وَنِكِي خَوْدِي

This sentence was omitted in BLEICHSTEINER’s treatise. DŽIKIA added the preceding two words as well as the following აჯღვადრი *aǰǰvardi* (?) but he did not give an interpretation of the whole phrase, translating only “парень, бык тебя ..”, “boy, a bull .. you”. There is a difference, however, in his reading because his second word is not *čxou* “cow” but ხოჯი *xoǰi* “bull” for which see above; this reading can now be excluded, the autograph showing a clear جُخُو to be read as *c[u]xu*. As for the following words, we may look for a verbal form of the root *-xod-*, again, as in the last but one sentence. We would come very near to Evliya’s spelling if we could presume *va gixodi* which would give the whole sentence a meaning of “boy, I did not fuck (your cow)”, *gi-* being the objective-possessive marker “for, to you”, again, and *va* being the regular negation particle. Evliya’s *-n-* would have to be a secondary phonetic element developed before the *-g-* in intervocalic position, a phenomenon, which is styled “frequent” in

KIPŠIDZE’s grammar (07: § 3f) but which I have not noted in a verbal complex like this, so far. Note that the *kasra* must belong to the κ ⟨k⟩, not to the η ⟨n⟩, if my solution is right. — A different analysis could interpret the first word as the verb *neba* “to damage” in the first person singular present, *vonək^c*, meaning “I (will) damage” (cf. KIPŠIDZE, 285, s.v. 2.n). As this verb is intransitive in Megrelian (a so-called relative passive), we should expect an indirect object in the dative, which would be *čxous* for “the cow”. This interpretation would leave *xudi* unexplained, however, unless it could be a noun meaning “membrum virile” or the like, as was proposed before. This solution seems to be excluded if the “cow” really belongs to the same sentence.

sikdiler eṣegimi domuzumu sikdi oĝlan سکدیلر اشکمی دۆمۆزومی سکدی اوĝلان

“They fucked my donkey, the boy fucked my pig” /

ეთეშა (მი)ხოდი გარანი ე?? ლეჯი ეთეშა ვხოდა ბიჭო ??

eʼešə (mi)xodi gəraṇi, e ?? gež(i) eʼešə vxoda, bičʼo

*açĝiwadi[ri] ĝırım(i) ye ĝäç(i) *açĝiwad bico*

آچغوادری کرین یه غاچ آچغوار بیجو

This sentence was omitted in BLEICHSTEINER’s treatise too. DŽIKIA attributed the first word to the preceding sentence; his interpretation was limited again: “осел или свинья ... парень”, “a donkey or a pig ... boy” (117: 47). This rules *ğirin* = *gəraṇ(i)* “donkey”, *ğaç* = *gež(i)* “pig” and *bičʼo* “boy” out. As the last word is in the (Georgian) vocative again, it cannot be the subject of the verbal form expected, which, according to Evliya’s translation, should contain the root *-xod-*, once more. This may be concealed behind the spellings *غواد* and *غوار* (if Evliya confused $\langle d \rangle$ and $\langle r \rangle$ here), but the difference as against the usual spelling *خود* deserves an explanation anyway, all the more since the remaining elements such as the ending *-ri*, the double *aç-* and the conjunctive *ye* are far from being clear either. My proposal is that *aç-* renders a colloquial form of the coordinate conjunction *eʼeši/ə ... eʼeši/ə* meaning “wie ... so ...”, “так ... как ...”, and that *ye* represents an element *e-* meaning “thus”. The whole sentence could mean “In the way you fucked (my) donkey, in this way I shall fuck (your) pig, boy”, if the first verbal form were an aorist *xodi* “you fucked” or *mixodi* “you fucked for me” and the second were an optative *vxoda* “I shall fuck” or *gixoda* “I shall fuck for you”. “They fucked for me” would be *mixodes*, and “he fucked for me”, *mixodu/ə*. — Several different solutions are possible; for example, *aç-* could represent the preverb აწ/ო/ – *acʼo/ə-* meaning “forward” (“впереди, прочь”: KIPŠIDZE, Grammar, 0118), and the verb in question could be *-xvad-* “to meet” which, in comparison with Georgian *-xvedr-*, may well have had a root final *-r-* earlier (**-xvadr-*), matching with

Evliya's notation.

gel adam yat gitme qoyun ekmek yeyelim كل آدم ياط كتمه قيون اكمك يه يلم

“come man lie down don't go let's eat sheep and bread”

wai čai, donžira [nu] midaulə, šhuri, k'obali oč'komu

ვაი წიე ? დინჯირ მელე—ვა—ულგ შხური ქობალი ოჭკომი

vai c'ie ? dinžir, mele-va-ulə, šxuri, k'obali oč'k'omi

way cay dën[e]cir mélawlı [u]š[e]xuri kobal(i) oçqom(i)

وَأَيَّ جَائِي دَنْجِرِ مِلَّوَلِي أَشْحُورِي كُوبَالُ أَوْجَقُومُ

According to DŽIKIA (113), دنجر is a misspelling for ديجر დიჯირ *dižir* “ложись”. As the ن ⟨n⟩ is perfectly clear in the autograph, this may rather be *dinžir*, which would be a second person singular aorist = imperative “lie down” too, although Evliya's vocalizations suggest the transitive *donžire* “lay (sb.) down”. BLEICHSTEINER's *donžira* would be the action noun “lying down”, which he seems to analyze as a complement of “*midaulə*” (= *melawlı* for which see above) “geh nicht”; but as in Georgian, this would be no normal syntax in Megrelian. The imperative is more probable because of the following entry too. For the other words, see above. Note that Evliya seems to have confused *fatha* and *sukūn* twice.

gel adam otur peynir ekmek yogurd yeyelim كل ادم اوطور پينر اكمك يوغورد يه يلم

“come man sit let's eat cheese bread yoghurt”

wai čai, (!) 'wali, k'obali, marc'weni oč'komu

ვაი წიე (?) დობოლი, ცვალი, ქობალი, მარწვენი ოჭკომ(ი)

wai c'ie (?) doxodi, 'wali, k'obali, marc'veni oč'kom(i).

way cay dāxodi qoli kopal(i) marcwän(i) oçqom(i) وَأَيَّ جَائِي دَاخُودِ قُولِ كُوبَالُ مَرْجُوانِ أَوْجَقُومُ

For all words appearing here, see above. The verbal form will represent the second person singular imperative “eat”, again. Note that *dāxodi* “sit down”, which is missing in BLEICHSTEINER's treatise, and *qoli* = 'wali have a clearly indicated final *-i*, and that *kobali* “bread” is written with a پ ⟨p⟩ instead of a ب ⟨b⟩.

dön beri öp beni babariñ başiyçün olsun دُون بَرِي وَپ بَنِي بَابَاكَ بَاشِيچُون السُون

“Turn this way, kiss me, by your father's head”

gadmobrunde / damikoce (!) mama(w), da(h)k³ar čongu(r)

გადმობრუნდე და მაკოცე, მამა დაგ(ი)რჩება-ო ??

gadmobrunde da mak³oc^e, mama dag(i)rč^eeba-o ??

*qádmobrundé damáqoçe mama *dagərçepá-(ğ)o ?*

قَدْمُوبْرُونْدِي دَامَه قَوَّجَه مَامَادَاكْرَچَپَغُو

As BLEICHSTEINER (102: 47-48) and DŽIKIA (124) correctly stated, this sentence is not Megrelian but Georgian. BLEICHSTEINER was right in identifying the first verb as *gadmobrunde* “turn this way”. The second part of the sentence, however, can hardly be *damikoce*, because the verb in question, *-k³oc^e-* “to kiss”, has an *-n-* following the root when it has the preverb *da-* plus an objective version marker attached to it; the form *damik³oc^e-n-e* would mean “kiss (sc. feet) for me, kiss my (sc. feet) several times”. As Evliya wrote the second syllable with a *fatha* plus *◌⟨h⟩*, not with a *kasra*, we should rather presume the vowel of the superessive version here. As the verb in this version does not take the preverb *da-*, this may be the conjunction *da* “and” instead as G. HEWITT suggests. — As for the third formula, DŽIKIA was right that BLEICHSTEINER’s interpretation *mama(w) da(h)k³ar čongu(r)* “Vater spiel die Zither” is far from being probable. DŽIKIA’s own proposal (128) was the Georgian blessing *mama dagirčes*, lit. “may (your) father be sustained for you”, which is convincing semantically in the given context. A crucial point remains, however, in Evliya’s spelling of the last word to be rendered as *dagerçepeğu*. One solution I see is that we have not an optative (= aorist subjunctive) here but a future subjunctive which would be *dag(i)rčebodes* and which might have been spelt دَاگِرْچِوَدَسْ in Evliya’s notebook (for the پ ⟨p⟩ instead of a ب ⟨b⟩ cp. the preceding sentence); this subjunctive would fit as well with the given meaning. The final س ⟨s⟩ would be missing in this case, anyhow. W. BOEDER (l.c) proposes to explain this by assuming that the person referred to by *mama* “father” is identical with the speaker so that the verbal form could be a first person singular *dagirčebode* “ich, dein Vater, möge dir erhalten bleiben” (for such cases, cf. his paper “Verbal person marking, noun phrase and word order in Georgian”, in: Configurationality, ed. L. MARÁ CZ / P. MUYSKEN, Dordrecht 1989, 178). — A second, perhaps more probable solution, would take the word in question as a third person singular future *dagirčeba* “he will be sustained for you”, additionally marked with a suffixal *-o* as a marker of indirect speech, the whole sentence thus meaning “.. kiss me (with the words) ‘your father will be sustained for you’”. For the hiatus between the final *-a* of the verbal form and the *-o*-marker rendered by *-ğ-*, cp. Evliya’s writing *puroçöguli* of the Georgian word for “pomegranate”, *broc³euli*.

“Twice” would be тІо / тІеу, i.e. *t^owe / t^eew*.

(üç) ۳ 3 śə щы ś^ʰə sı سي

“Three times” would be щэ *s^ʰe*.

(dört) ۴ 4 p^ʰλə плы p^ʰtə p[ɪ]l[h] پله

“Four times” would be плІэ *p^ʰt^e*.

(beş) ۵ 5 t^ʰfu тфы / тхуы t^ʰfə / t^ʰx^oə t[u]ffe (?) نَوْفَه

Here, Evliya’s material is clearly recognizable as Adyge (West-Circassian), not Kabardian, because of the regular correspondance between Adyge *f* and Kabardian *x^o*. — “Five times” would be тфэ / тхуэ *t^ʰfe / t^ʰx^oe*, which could be indicated by Evliya’s *-e* (*fathā* plus final *h*) if this is intended.

(altı) ۶ 6 ħə хы xə şı شِي

As BLEICHSTEINER pointed out, “ħ erinnert stark an ś”. He possibly thought of the characteristic sibilant of the Pashto language in Afghanistan, which is something between *f* and *χ*, too, and which is sometimes spelt as *-(k)kh-* as in the name of the language itself (*Pakkhto*). — “Six times” would be хэ *xe*.

(yedi) ۷ 7 blə блы blə b[ɪ]li بلي

“Seven times” would be блэ *ble*.

(sekiz) ۸ 8 i, jə и yə yı يي

“Eight times” should be *ye* in both written languages but the form is not contained in the dictionaries.

(doquz) ۹ 9 bġu бгъу / бгъуы bġ^oə b[u]ġu بُوغُو

“Nine times” would be бгъо / бгъуэ *bġ^oe* which, again, seems to be excluded by Evliya’s spelling using *dammas* only.

(on) ۱۰ 10 p^ʰs^ʰə пшІы / пщІы p^ʰs^ʰə / p^ʰs^ʰə^ʰə p[ɪ]sı پسي

“Ten times” would be пшІэ *p^ʰs^ʰe* / пщІэ *p^ʰs^ʰə^ʰe*. Possibly, Evliya’s س *⟨s⟩* is a misspelling for ش *⟨š⟩*. The Turkish equivalent is clearly the numeral ۱۰ “10”, not ۲۰ “20” as in DANKOFF’s treatise, the horizontal stroke not belonging to the first digit but to the Circassian word above as a *kasra*. — BLEICHSTEINER discusses the words الله اسمي *allāh ismi* “der Name Gottes” following after this entry with no Circassian equivalent and states that “God” should be something like *t^ʰħa*. Possibly, Evliya meant the word пщы *p^ʰs^ʰə^ʰ* “князь” here, which surely, notably in the expression табыу-уа-пщы “mercy, o

Lord”, could be used as an address of God, too (the expression as a whole was borrowed into Ossetic, cf. V.I. ABAEV, *Istoriko-étimologičeskij slovar’ osetinskogo jazyka*, 3, 1979, 219: *tabuafsi*. Compare Russian спаси-бо[г]). If Evliya meant this word, he could have added it to the numeral “10” because of its similar sounding. But note that there is enough space for a Circassian *t̃he* or the like between *pısu* and *allāh ismi*.

ekmek اکمک “bread” *čʼakʼo* КІакъу / щІакхъуэ *čʼʼaqʼə / šʼʼaqʼe* *çaqu* چاقو
Today’s usual word for “bread” in Adyge is хьалыгъу *ħaləgʼə*.

su صو “water” *pʳsə* ПСЫ *pʳsə* *p[ɪ]sɪ* يِيس
et ات “meat” *lə* И-Л ? Ы-Л ? *i-l ? ə-l ?* *il[l] ? ɪ[l] ?* اِل

If Evliya really wrote اِل = *ill* here (the reading is not sure), this must be a possessive form of the word for “meat”, the stem of which is simply лы *lə* in the written languages. This could be И-Л *il* or Ы-Л *əl*, both meaning “his, her, its meat”. The difference in both forms lies in the distinction of alienable and non-alienable possession. Preferably, Evliya’s form is the non-alienable Ы-Л *əl*. The spelling with *tašdīded l* is noteworthy, but cf. the third and fourth entry to follow.

peynir پينر “cheese” *qʼo(j)* КЪУае / КХЪУей *qʼaje / qʼe:j* *qoye* فَوِيه
xinzīr خنزير “pig” *qʼo* КЪО / КХЪУЭ *qʼe / qʼe* *qo* قُ
qoyun قيون “sheep” *mel* МЭЛ *mel* *mel[l]* مَل
keçi كچي “goat” *pʳçen* ПЧЭНЫ / БЖЭН *pʳʼenə / bžen* *p[i]çen[n]* پِچَن

The spelling with *-nn* reminds one of the double *l* in the preceding words.

quzu قوزو “lamb” *šəne* ШЪЫНЭ / ЩЫНЭ *šəne / šʼəne* *sine* سِنَه
at آت “horse” *šə* ШЫ *šə* *šɪ[y]* شِي
eşek اشك “donkey” *šədə* ЩЫДЫ / ШЫД *šʼədə / šəd* *şıdı* شِدِي
qāṭır قاطر “mule” *kadər ?* КЪЫДЫР-ХЭ ? *qədər-xe ?* *qadır-ğe* قَادِرْغَه

The *-ğe*, whose meaning was “unerfindlich” to BLEICHSTEINER, could be the plural morpheme *-xe*. As for the word-final vocalism, there is no difference in marking as against, e.g., *sine* “lamb”, the *-e* being written with *fatḥa* plus ◌⟨h⟩ in both cases. The first vowel in the word is clearly indicated as an *a* by *fatḥa* plus ◌⟨alif⟩, so that this might represent an older form of the word, viz. *qadər*, still closer to Turkish *qatır* which is assumed to be its original; cp. J. v. KLAPROTH’s “Kaukasische Sprachen”, 237, who notes *kadir* as a “Tat[ar]” loanword for Circassian.

küçük domuz دُوْمُوْزُ كُوْچُوكُ “piglet” *q'olou* лэу *lew lew* لَوُ

The form is not “verstümmelt” as BLEICHSTEINER meant (120: 23). Both the Adyge-Russian dictionary (Адыгабзэм изэхэф гуцылалъ / Tolkovyj slovar' adygejskogo jazyka, Majkop 1960, 390) and the Kabardian-Russian dictionary (Kabardinsko-russkij slovar' / Къэбэрдей-Урыс словарь, Moskva 1957, 245) contain a word лэу with the meaning “свинья, поросенок”, the Kabardian form being marked as obsolete (“уст.”). BLEICHSTEINER's Kabardian *q'olou*, which he obviously owed to L. LOPATINSKIJ's Russko-kabardinskij slovar' (Tiflis 1890, 123: *koloy*), is likely to be a compound къо-лэу *q°e-lew* “pig-piglet”, ср. *qo* above.

bir ta'āmdir kim aṇa abazalar ṣilxirçi dirler بر طعامدر کم آکه ابازلر شلخیرچی دیرلر

“a food which the Abkhazians call *ṣilxirci*”

gomil

ГЪОМЫЛ / ГЪУЭМЫЛЭ *g°eməl / g°eməle*

gomil

عُومِل

Adyg. гъомыл *g°eməl* is “пицца, продовольствие” in general as well as “дорожная пицца” in particular (Tolkovyj slovar', 71). Kabardian гъуэмилэ *g°eməle* is “провиант” according to the Russian-Kabardian dictionary (Russko-kabardinsko-čerkeskij slovar' / Урыс-къэбэрдей-шэрджэс словарь, Moskva 1955, 636; the form is missing in the Kabardian-Russian dictionary).

(*edepde*) *qıṣraq filān edeyim* ادېده قىصرق فلان ايده رم “(begging pardon) I'll fuck the mare”

ṣəbzə-ṣḥa juwakaḡ ?

ШЫБЗЫ / ШЫБЗ .. ?

ṣəbzə / ṣəbz ..

ṣıbzı çıxa yuwakaḡ

شېزې چىخا يُوواكَاغْ

Except for the word for “mare”, ШЫБЗЫ *ṣəbzə / ШЫБЗ ṣəbz*, no part of this entry can be verified in the published dictionaries. BLEICHSTEINER's proposal that “*çha*” has to be identified with ШЪХЪЭ *ṣ'ḥe / ЩХЪЭ ṣ'he* “head” is not convincing. His assumption that the verbal prefixes point to a second person agent and that the ending -*ḡ* marks a preterite form is right, however. Note that the second *alif* in *yuwakaḡ* is very faint.

yogurd يُوغُورْدُ “yoghurt” *ṣ'e-ḡep'çaḡ(e)* (DEETERS)

ЩЭГЪЭПЦІАГЪ / ШЭ ПЦІА

ṣ'e-ḡep'çaḡ / ṣe pç'a

ṣe ḡepçaḡ

شَعْبَ چَاغْ

From the Adyge and Kabardian forms given here (taken from the Russian-Adyge dictionary, Russko-adygejskij slovar' / Урыс-адыге гуцылалъ, Moskva 1960, and the Russian-Kabardian dictionary, s.v. простокваша) it is clearly the first one which is represented by Evliya's spelling. As against his own guesses, BLEICHSTEINER quoted DEETERS) for the right analysis: The form has to be divided into *ṣ'e* “milk” and

gep^cag as the participle form of a verb. The verb in question means “to let sth. become sour” and is given in the preterite form as Ы-ГЪЭПЦІАГЪ *a-gep^cag* in the Adyge-Russian dictionary (92); so what we have here is the preterite participle, not the present participle as with BLEICHSTEINER. The Kabardian form contains the same verb, albeit not in the causative (with Adyge prefix ГЪЭ- *ge-*) but as an intransitive “to become sour”; the meaning is “milk that has become sour” as against the Adyge “milk that has been let become sour”.

bal بال “honey” *šowu* шъоу / фо *š^oew / fo* *ʒo[w]u[w]* شَوُوْ

Note the regular sound correspondance between Adyge шъу *š^o* and Kabardian ф *f*. Evliya’s form is clearly recognizable as a West Circassian once again.

getir كَتِير “bring” (*k^o*) къа ? *qa* ? *qá* قَهْ

The Adyge *Tolkovuj slovar’* (271) gives къа *qa* not only as a verbal prefix meaning “hither” (сюда) but also as a separate word meaning “give!” (дай) which might be identical with the prefix, cp. German “her (damit)!”. The explicit form for “bring!” would be КЪЫСЭТ *qaset* (lit. “bring-to-me”), used as an equivalent of ²къа in the dictionary. BLEICHSTEINER erroneously thinks of the verb “to go” (confusing Turkish *getir* and *gider*).

nerede idiŋ نَرِه دِه ايدِكْ “where were you?” *f^oade u-šⁱaġ*

тыде ущыІагъ-а / дэнэ ущыІащ-а *f^oade wə-šⁱ ə^oa-ġ-a / dene wə-šⁱ ə^oa-šⁱ ə^o-a*

təd(e) uš(i)áqá (?)

تَدُوْشَقِيْ

In comparison with the following item, the verbal form present here seems to be vocalized in the way that there is a final *-a* which can easily be explained as the interrogative marker *-a* used in the literary Adyge language; cf. e.g. Г.В. РОГАВА / З.И. КІЭРЭЩЭ (KERAŠEVA), АДЫГАБЗЭМ ИГРАММАТИК / Grammatika adygejskogo jazyka, Krasnodar/Majkop 1966, 354 with examples such as .. тыде къэкъыгъ-а *tade qe-k^oəġ-a* “where did it (the snow) arise from” showing that this particle is even used in connection with interrogative pronouns such as тыдэ “where”. In the verbal form noted by Evliya, this would leave the *q* as a reflex of the verbal ending -гъ *-ġ* to be expected in the preterite. As against today’s form of the verb “to be, to live”, Adyge щыІэн *šⁱ ə^oen*, there seems to be no indication of the glottal stop forming the central consonant of the root. It is less probable that in Evliya’s form, the *q* could substitute the radical ^o although some scholars think that the glottal stop here reflects an older къІ, i.e. *q^o*; cp. ŠAGIROV’s etymological dictionary, where dialectal forms are discussed too (2, 150).

In Evliya's notation, the consonant of the verbal prefix -щы- -š^l seems to be indicated by س <s> plus *fatha* rather than by ش <š> without vocalization.

evde idim اوده ايديم "I was at home" *t-un se-si'aḡ*
 тиунэ сыщылаḡ / диунэ сыщылащ *tⁱ-une sə-š^l 'ə'a-ḡ / di-une sə-š^l 'ə'a-š^l*
tiwne siṣ(i)áq[ɪ] تونسي سقي

As against BLEICHSTEINER, the correct form for "our house" is not *tⁱ-une* but тиуне *tⁱ-une*, here clearly indicated by a *kasra* below the ت <t>, because a house is an alienable possession. BLEICHSTEINER was right, however, in assuming that -si (in his transcript, -se, which is not better) should be part of the following verbal form, viz. the first person singular prefix. For the spelling with *q*, cf. the preceding item as well as the following one. The final vowel mark could indicate the remainder of a former -e in the preterite suffix yielding -ḡ, i.e. -ḡ < *-ḡe, as it is generally assumed in Adyge grammar, cf. ROGAVA / KERAŠEVA, 181. By the way, we should expect the oblique case, тиунэм *tⁱune-m*, for "in our house", but the *m* seems to be missing.

(edepde) eṣek filān etdim (domuz) ادپده اشك فلان ائدم دؤموز
 "(begging pardon) I fucked the donkey (pig)" *šəd sə-pⁱc^o-əḡ* шыды сыпIэсыḡ
šəda sə-pⁱesə-ḡ *šidi spesiq[o]* شيدس پسيق

As шыды *šəda* "donkey" is clear, the final -s of *šidis* should be regarded as the verbal prefix belonging to the following verbal form, cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (121: 31). The verb itself, given as *pⁱc^o* by BLEICHSTEINER after TRUBETZKOY, cannot be verified in the published dictionaries. Starting from Evliya's spelling, we could think of пыс-ын *pⁱes-ən* "to sit (upon)" or пэс-ын *pⁱes-ən* "to sit (before)", both being used in a metaphorical way; cp. German "besteigen". According to G. HEWITT (letters dated 11.9. / 15.9.91), the actual verb is *pⁱes'ən*, however. The form in question then must be сы-пIэси-ḡ(ə) *sə-pⁱesəḡ(e)*. Compare the fifth entry to follow, too. For the preterite suffix, cp. the preceding items; the vocalization mark seems to be a *ḡamma*, here. — Note that Evliya adds the word *domuz* "pig" after his Turkish sentence; R. DANKOFF (letter dated 3.7.91) proposes that Evliya understood the final -ḡo as the word for "pig". BLEICHSTEINER's explanation that this *domuz* represents the comment of a scribe cannot be maintained anymore.

xoṣ geldij خوش كلدك "welcome" *š^və-fə-sap^c-šə*
 шIуфэсапши (?) *š^oə-fes-a-pš^l 'əy ?* *šüfaṣap[i]s(i) ?* شوفاشاپس

For this entry, BLEICHSTEINER quoted TRUBETZKOY according to whom this is a complex $\check{s}'\partial-f\partial-sap^c-s\partial$ meaning “euch sei gutes Glück” and containing the second person plural marker $\check{s}'\partial$, i.e. Adyge шъу- $\check{s}'\partial$ - (as against Kabardian фы- $f\partial$ -). Neither TRUBETZKOY’s translation nor the grammatical statement can be taken for granted, however. On the basis of today’s sources, we have to start from a word фэсапци $fesap^c\check{s}'i$ given in the dictionaries with приветствие “greeting” as its Russian equivalent (cf. the *Tolkovuj slovar'*, 596); the Адыгэ-урыс гущыпалъ / *Adygejsko-russkij slovar'* by Ж.А. ШЪАУКЪО (ŠAOV, Majkop 1975) translates it even with “добро пожаловать”, i.e. “welcome” (360). The question is, how this word has to be analyzed itself and whether it can be combined with a second person plural prefix as TRUBETZKOY proposed. I don’t see that it can mean something like “gutes Glück” as it is, which would be насыпышы $nas\partial p^c\check{s}'\partial$ instead (given with the meaning “счастливый” in the *Tolkovuj slovar'*, 420). This consists of the word for “luck”, насып $nas\partial p^c$, which is hardly anything else but Arabic *naṣīb* “portion, (good) fortune”, and the postponed adjective шы $\check{s}'\partial$ “good”. For фэсапци, we have to compare a second word meaning “привет, приветствие” instead, namely шыфэс $\check{s}'\partial fes$ (to this word, my attention was drawn by W. BOEDER [letter dated 17.9.91]; it is mentioned e.g. in the *Tolkovuj slovar'*, 663). This is clearly a compound consisting of шы “good” and an element *fes* identical with the first part of фэсапци. Although *fes* is not attested as a single word anywhere — Adyge фэс meaning “fez” excludes itself, of course — we can suppose that it is a substantive; фэсапци may then represent a syntagma comparable to the expression табыу-уа-пци “mercy, o Lord” as mentioned above. I wonder whether such a syntagma could combine with a second person plural marker, verbal or possessive, at all; in the latter case, we would even have to accept that the possession were inalienable. So I propose that Evliya’s *şüfaşapıs* represents a word шыфэсапци instead, containing not the simplex *fes* but the compound шыфэс. As for Evliya’s entry, it is not clear whether he intended to write the last syllable as پس *-pis* or as پسي *-psi(y)*.

gidelim كیده لم “let’s go” $t^{\check{s}}\partial k^{\circ}on$ ТЫКЮН $t^{\check{s}}\partial-k^{\circ}e-n$ $t[u]qon$ تَوْقُونْ

BLEICHSTEINER was right in positing $t^{\check{s}}\partial k^{\circ}on$ as the first person plural of the second future of the root -кЮ- $-k^{\circ}e-$ “to go”. There is but a minor problem in Evliya’s spelling of the first syllable where a *-u-*vowel is clearly indicated by *damma* plus $\text{و} \langle w \rangle$. As no preverb *-u-* seems to exist in Circassian, this must be due to some kind of sporadic “umlaut” caused by the following $-k^{\circ}o-$; such “anticipations” of labial vowels are often present in Evliya’s notations.

gitmem كتمم “I won’t go” *sə-kʰon-epʰ* сыкӀонэп *sə-kʰe-ne-pʰ* *sıqonep* سِي قُونَيْ
 (*edepde*) *eşek filān edici* أدیده آشك فلاڤ ادیچی “(begging pardon) one who fucks donkeys”
şad-čʰe pʰicʰe шыды зы-пӀэсы ? *şadə zə-pʰesə ?* *şıdı s(ı)-pesı ?* شِدِسْ پَسِي

As against BLEICHSTEINER, the final *-s* of *şıdı* is more easily explained as the prefix of a relative agent in a so called participle form, meaning “who (does sth.)”. This requires the verb to be transitive which is true for the verb *pʰesən* as G. HEWITT confirms (letter dated 11.9.91). *şadə* “donkey” has no plural marker so that a translation “one who fucks a donkey” would fit better for the Circassian sentence.

puşt پوشت “catamite” *g̃uaśā ?* ?? ?? *wəşt ?* واشت

BLEICHSTEINER’s proposal to think of a word for “whore” is not convincing, all the more since for his *g̃uaśā*, better *gʰaś ʿe* (гуашэ), only positive meanings such as “княжна, свекровь, сурпуга” are given in the dictionaries.

edebde vālideŋi filān edeyim أدبده والدكي فلان ايده يم
 “(begging pardon) I’ll fuck your mother” *u-jane gudə sə-wak* уянэ (?) гуды (?) сэ- (?)
wə-jane gudə s-e- (?) *uyane gudi sewék (?)* أويانه كُدِي سَوَك

uyane is not the usual form of “your mother” in Adyge today; cp. the Tolkovyj slovar’ which gives ны *nə* for “mother” (422), leading to ун *un* for “your mother”. But the same dictionary has ян *yan* for “his mother” (678), too, which might have been *yane* earlier; cp. Kabardian анэ *ane* “mother” (Kabardian-Russian dictionary, 18). Maybe *uyane* reflects this form marked with the second person possessive prefix additionally. As for *gudə* “cunnus” cf. TRUBETZKOY apud BLEICHSTEINER (123: 37); the form cannot be verified in today’s printed sources but appears in KLAPROTH’s “Kaukasische Sprachen” (236) in the form *gut*. *sewék* may represent the same verb as *yuwakag* above, but with a first person singular agent prefix (*s-* / *st-*) and in the present, not in the preterite. In this case, Evliya’s spelling with a *kasra* instead of a *fathā* in the root remains noteworthy.

senden qorqarmıym niçin söylemem سندن قورقارميم نيچن سويله مم
 “Should I fear you? Why shouldn’t I say?” *(u-)şħa s-şəna, səd kʰəsməʰva*
 шъуфэсшына, сыд фэсмыкъӀуагъ ? (?) *şʰə-fe-s-ş ʿən-a, səd fe-s-mə-qʰa-gʰ ? (?)*
şüfaçına şıd fesmuqağ (?) شَفَاچِنَا شِدْ فَسْمَقَاغْ

BLEICHSTEINER was probably right in analyzing *çına* as *s-şəna*, i.e. с-шына *s-ş ʿəna* meaning “do I fear” in a question. The first word, now to be read as *şüfa* instead of *şgā*, cannot be *şħa* “head” but is rather the “versional” prefix фэ *fe* combined with the

marker of a second person plural, шты- $\hat{s}^{\circ}\partial$ -, thus meaning “for you” or, in the given context, “from you”. $\check{s}id$ must be сыд $s\acute{a}d$ “what”, the \check{s} - being due to a (perseverating?) misspelling rather than a dialectal variant, cp. Kabardian сыт, $s\acute{a}t$, too. The final verbal form is not completely clear. As for the root, this seems to be a variant of Adyge -Io- $-^{\circ}e$ - “to speak”, namely a form like Хакуча кыӀуӕн $q^{\circ}en$ given in ŠAGIROV’s etymological dictionary (2, 159). This would yield us $-smuqag$ as a preterite form $-s-m\acute{a}-q^{\circ}a-g$ “I did not speak (it)”. fe - could be the “versional” prefix again, which in connection with the interrogative pronoun could have meant something like “what didn’t I speak it for”; but DEETERS (apud BLEICHSTEINER, 38) was right in expecting a participle construction like *ar s\acute{a}da z\acute{a}f\acute{a}sm\acute{a}k^cven\acute{a}r* for today, to be paraphrased as “what (is it) that I should not speak that for?” If the construction as proposed here was possible at Evliya’s times, we still keep missing the modal component.

edepde avradıñı fil\acute{a}n edeyim

أَدَيْدَه أَوْرَادِيكِي فَلَانَ اَيْدَه بِيَم

“(begging pardon) I’ll fuck your wife”

$u-\check{s}^{\circ}\acute{a}z s\acute{a}-p^{\circ}ic^{\circ}$

УШТЪУЗ СЭПІЭС ?

$w\acute{a}-\hat{s}^{\circ}\acute{a}z s-e-p^{\circ}es$?

(w)u \check{s} ız sepés ?

وُوشِزْ سَه بِيَسْ

Note that у-штыуз $w\acute{a}-\hat{s}^{\circ}\acute{a}z$ “your wife” has the marker of inalienable possession. For the verb which seems to be in the present tense here, see above; for the *kasra* written below the \check{p} ⟨p⟩, cp. *sewék* above.

niçün böyle yava söylersin xırsız

نِچُون بُوَيْلَه يَاوَه سَوَيْلِرْسِنْ خِرْسِيْشْ

“Why are you swearing like this, thief?”

$s\acute{a}da p^xva t^{\circ}e\check{g}u$

СЫДА ФЭОКЪІУА (?) ТЫГЪУ

$s\acute{a}d-a fe-we-q^{\circ}-a$ (?) $t^{\circ}e\check{g}^{\circ}\acute{a}$

$sida fewqa t\check{e}gu$

سِدَا فَوَقَاتَعُوْ

сыда $s\acute{a}da$ is a variant of сыд $s\acute{a}d$ “what” as above, enlarged with the interrogational $-a$. For $fe-we-q^{\circ}-a$ cp. *fesmuqag*, above; here, we expect a present form, second person singular agent, with a second interrogative particle attached, meaning “what do you speak for, thief” or, rather, “why do you say ‘thief’”. For uncomposed тыгъу $t^{\circ}e\check{g}^{\circ}\acute{a}$, the dictionaries give the meaning “воровство”, not “вор”; but ŠAGIROV in his etymological dictionary seems to consider “вор” as the original meaning. Maybe, this was still preserved in Evliya’s time.

cadı köpek eti ye جَادِي كُوَيْكِ اَتِي يَه

“Witch, eat dog meat”

$ude \check{h}el \check{s}h\acute{a}$

УДЫ, ХЪЭЛ(Ы) ШХЫ ?

$w\acute{a}d\acute{a}, \check{h}e-l(\acute{a}) \check{s}x\acute{a}$?

$ud\check{e} x\acute{e}l (l)\check{e}\check{s}$?

اَوْدَه حِلْ لَشْ

While улыды $w\acute{a}d\acute{a}$ “witch” and хъэл $\check{h}e-l(\acute{a})$ “dog meat” are clear, the verbal form should be ШХЫ $\check{s}x\acute{a}$ “eat”, possibly written as \check{s} only. Unless le - be a prefix or the like — the reading is not beyond doubt —, it could be due to some kind of liaison with the preceding хъэл, e.g. in a form $\check{h}el(\acute{a})\check{s}x(\acute{a})$ where the medial vowel could be the remnant of

the original final vowel of лы *lə* “meat” normally lost in composition. But cp. the following entry:

köpek etin sen yersin baḡa ye dersin

كوبك أتن سن یرسن بكا ینه درسین

“You eat the dog meat, you tell me to eat”

o ḡel ušḡa, sād se o kʷasuvā

о хьэл ошхы (?), сыд сәугушыҕаḡа (?) *we ḡe-l w-e-šxə, sād se-w-gʷəš ʿəʷa-ḡ-a* (?)

we xel weṣ sād[ɪ] s(e) wuḡ(u)ṣ(a)xa (?)

وَحَلْ وَشْ سَدِسْ وَعَسْتَحَا

The initial *و* *we* is the second person singular pronoun, *o* = *we*, and has to be separated from *xel* = *ḡel* “dog meat” for which compare the last entry. *weṣ* must represent a verbal form meaning “you eat” in the present for which we should expect *ошхы* *w-e-šxə* “you are eating (it)”; as for the spelling of the root *-шх-* *-šx-*, cp. the last entry. The rest of the sentence is more problematical. If *sed-* represents the interrogative pronoun *сыд(а)* *sād(a)* once again, as BLEICHSTEINER assumed, the following *-s* must belong to the following verbal complex as the first person singular prefix. According to the sense, this must be the oblique object marker, the subject of the verb being the second person singular. In the way proposed here, the whole complex would be *сыд сәугушыҕаḡа* *sād se-w-gʷəš ʿəʷa-ḡ-a*, i.e. “what (or: why) did you say (that) to me?” If this is correct, there are some different readings necessary: the *kasra* should not belong to the *-d-* but to the *-s*, whereas the *-d-* should have a *sukūn*, not the *s*. The vowel sign above the *wāw* in the second word should not be a *fatha* but a *ḍamma*, giving it the sound of *(w)u-*, and the *-s-* with *sukūn* (سْ) should be a *-š-* (شْ). The final *xa* seems to represent the preterite marker, *-ḡ* *-ḡ*, plus the interrogative particle *-a* again. BLEICHSTEINER thinks of the other word for “speaking”, *-Io-*, which we had in *fesmuqaḡ* and *fewqa*, above, but this leaves at least the *-ḡs-* unexplained.

niḡiün baḡa puṣt dersin

نيچون بكا پوُست درسین

“Why do you call me a catamite?”

sādə-šḡa kʷusaʷa

сыд ?? къысэокъуа? (?)

sād ?? qə-se-w-e-qʷəʷa (?)

sīd usiḡḡ (?) *quṣew(u)qa*

سیدُ اسحَ قُصَا وَقَا (!)

As against BLEICHSTEINER, *usiḡḡ* is not likely to be a reflex of *шъхьэ* *šḡe* “head” because the parallel he had found in *ṣūfa* above has to be dismissed. Instead, we have to look for a word for “catamite” here; can we think of *Иуыгъэ-ʷəsəḡe* “расположившийся”? The word final consonants seem to be a ligature *-th-* *تھ* rather than *taš-dīded* *-h-* *ح*, which does not help. The verb can be *-къуэ-* *-qʷə-* “to say” once again, as in *fesmuqaḡ* and *fewqa* above, with an additional preverb *къы-* *qə-* “hither”, the whole verbal complex meaning something like “(why) do you say .. in my direction?”.