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When in 1934, Robert BLEICHSTEINER published the Caucasian language specimina contained in the “travel book” of the 17th century Turkish writer Evliya Çelebi, 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 arabeische Alphabet, ohne weitere Unterscheidungszeichen, wie sie die islamischen Kaukasusvölker anwenden, die verwickelten, oft über 70 verschiedene Phoneme umfassenden Lautsysteme wiedergeben 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.

half a century earlier\(^3\), 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 manuscripts\(^4\). 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: \textit{lisān-i ʾacīb 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 (\textit{lisān-i Ṣadṣa-Abaza}, “language of the Sadṣa-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 \textbf{Georgian} (\textit{Ṣawṣad Gürćileriniğ lisānī}, “the language of the Ṣawṣat=Šavšeti – Georgians”) and the \textbf{Megrelian} (\textit{Megrel kavminiğ lisānları}, “the languages of the Megrel tribe”) specimen, on pag. 320a and 332b, respectively. The \textbf{Circassian} (\textit{lisān-i Čerākize-yi māmalūqa}, “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 PROVASI\(^5\) 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.


ian word or sentence in question are quoted for comparison; except for Ubykh, where G. 
DUMÉZIL’s study is used as a reference, this is normally R. BLEICHSTEINER’s interpre-
tation. 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 study. Especially the following rules should be kept in 
mind here: Arabic alif (١) is transcribed as a or ä, the mark of a-vocalization, fatha (‘), as 
e or á, Arabic yā (ي/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 Laz: 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 TEKİN & Gönül Alpay TEKİN, 14: 
Turkish sources XII), has just appeared (1991; the main titel is Turkish: Evliya Çelebi lügatı. Seyahat-
name’deki Yabancı kelimeler, Mahallî Ifadeler); on pages 121 sq., it contains a short account of Evliya’s 
Caucasian language materials.

8 Cf. e.g. S.S. ŽIKIA, “Evlia Çelebi lazebisa da lazuris ūsaxebs / Évlija Çelebi o lazax i lazskom jazyke”, 
in: Iberiul-kavkasiuri enatmecniereba / Iberiisko-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 ضَوْتُر ذهبت بلملك لأذُمَر كمشدوه، سنوكُدَكَر معلو: اولو
اول محلده هر کله خُتَائْلِ ف ایدوب بر تقرب ابله جانب سلامه جیقه

seyyāhlara bu gülne şutümları daxi bilmek ləzimdir kim kendüye sögdükleri ma'lūm olup
ol mağalde herkesle ḥüsni-ÿulfet edip bir taqrīb ile cânib-i selâmete 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.”

My thanks are due to Robert DANKOFF, Klaus KREISER and Semih TEGZCAN, 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:

In the phonological spelling, aspirated consonants are marked by 'c', glottalized ones by 'c'. Palatalization is marked by 'b', labialization by '°'. Vowel length is marked by ':'.

Word accent is only indicated, by 'b', 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 α may be assumed, are indicated by braces.

When other corrections are necessary, an asterisk is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>BLEICHSTEINER today</th>
<th>phonologically reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(bir)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ak’a akỳ’ ak’ê aqi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iki)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>'w-ba  'w-ba  'w(ê)b’a  w(ê)ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(üç)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>h-p’ê, h-p’ê  (ê)p’ê  (ê)p’ê b(a)  'f(ê)ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dört)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>p’s’ê-ba  p’s’ê-ba  p’s’ê-b(a)  b(ê)ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(beş)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>hyë-ba  hyë-ba  x(ê)b’a  xuba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today’s forms $z\circ ba$ “9” and $z\circ aba$ “10” have the same initial consonant, a labialized $\xi$; so Evliya’s $\xi$ 〈$z$〉 in the latter word must stand for a $\j$ 〈$\sharp$〉 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 *daamma* and *faṭha* additionally; but cp. the following two entries.

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 (Etnografija Kavkaza I, Tiflis 1887, p. 98) gave only today’s forms. Cp. the Ubykh and Megrelian numbers too.

gel ˈɔn ˈal “come” u-ˈaŋ yaːŋ w-ˈaː-i waˈ(e)y ˈɔː ˈæ Evliya’s ‘ayn written above the elif seems to be correct, because “to come”, inf. aːn–pa aːy-ra, contains the sound /aː/, written 〈aa〉 today, which is assumed to have developed by the loss of a voiced intervocalic pharyngal fricative similar to arab. ‘ayn. Cp. the spelling of the numeral aːˈba “eight” above. Note that the word لاا imāl “flexion” is written above the 〈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.

git ˈɔ ˈen “go” u-ˈca, u-ca ˈen(?) w(ə)-cˈa-i (?) ucˈ(e)y (?) ˈæ ˈen(?) I do not see a reason for a -i in this form (inf. “to go”: a–za–pá a-ˈca-rˈa), unless it be the “suffix of categoriality” as, more probably, in the following item. The form would have to be read as ucˈe-i or ucˈe-y (uːː–i) 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 wəʔa, i.e. ucˈ ‘a, with a palatal affricate,
for Evliya’s spelling; together with the suffixed -i, this would yield uc’ e-i as G. Hewitt states (letter dated 22.7.91; the grammar of the “Bzybskij dialekt abxazskogo jazyka” by X.S. Bgaza, Tbilisi 1964, is not available to me so far). Compare umçin “don’t go”, below. Note that there is a sukun above the final ی (y).

The vocalization mark above the ی (y) in this word seems rather to be a damma than a fatha, Evliya thus probably denoting the labial -t-

Compare uç(é)y, above. Bleichsteiner gives an -e- in the “Prohibitiv” instead of the radical -a-, but the Abkhaz Grammar (118) has the form ی-م-ق-ا-ن یم-ق-ا-ن for “не ходи” only. Evliya’s -i- is clear, however; possibly, there is an additional kasra below the ی (y). So this may rather be a variant as used in the Bzyb dialect again, where a form یم-ق-ا-ن یم-ق-e-ن is possible according to G. Hewitt (l.c.). — By the way, all imperative forms so far have a masculine agent indicated.

As against Evliya’s notation, which well represents today’s standard form, Bleichsteiner’s یارپ-خبا which he obviously owed to N. Mark’s Abkhaz dictionary (Abxazsko-russkij slovar’, Leningrad 1926, 71: یارپ-خبا “юноша”), is enlarged with a suffix -ba otherwise used in building family names, and derived from یارپ-ا “son” according to the Abkhaz grammar (47). Genko (l.c.) points to the Bzyb variant, یارف-ش, i.e. ’ارپ-ع’, once again to cope with Evliya’s ی (y).

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

According to my sources, یارپ-ع means both “жена” and “женщина”. — As for Evliya’s ی (y), Genko (l.c.) points to the Bzyb variant again, which ends in a
palatal -s ′; cp. ‘arp əs “boy”.

gitmem "I don’t go“ sə-k′və-č-am

In today’s literary Abkhaz, “I don’t go” would be səg (ə)-č-o-m in the present or sə-č-a-rə-m in the future, the latter may be from earlier *sə-č-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 –ku- –kอยาก(ə)-, meaning “up”, but the new dictionary (Abçuya бышәа жәәр / Slovar’ abxazskogo jazyka, I, Aкya / Suxumi 1986, 375) gives the transitive meaning “стонят откуда-н.” for á-кушара only (as well as MARR, 94: “отгонать”). The same holds true for a-кацара a-kac′ar’a “стонять” (Ажәар, 304 / MARR, 111). Perhaps we have here the element -g ′- “at all”, which is regularly found in negated forms in Abaza. The insertion of this element into a Bzyb negated present would produce sə-eg ′-č ′-w′a-m for “I’m not going”. Alternatively, we could note CHIRIKBA’s suggestion that, since the speakers of the Ashkharewa 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-тъ-цу-м sə-g ′-č′-ə-w-m for the present and сы-тъ-цу-рь-м sə-g ′-č′-ə-ῳ-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.

niçün gitmezsi oglan? ـنوجن كمزمسك اوغلاـن “Why don’t you go, boy?”

u-zə-m-ço-z-uejarpớzba uzымцоzi / -зээ ардыс

wə-zə-m-ç′-ə-w-a-zəy / -zəy’arp′əs uzumçoz[yjw]i(y)arp(ı)š اوزنوجوزوي آريس

Evliya’s -ziwiy seems to mean today’s interrogative suffix -зээ / -зээ for which cp. the Abkhaz grammar (120); Evliya’s -w- is not clear like this, as BLEICHSTEINER remarked (106: 22). For ‘arp əs see above.

ben bilirim ـن بليرم “I know” sara i-z-dər-vejt’

carpá izdýryeiet sar’a yə-z-d’ər-wa-yt’ sérá izdurwey(t)

According to the meaning (better: “I know it”), this must be a finite form which has the suffix -yt’ today. If Evliya’s spelling is correct, he either didn’t hear the final -t’ or it was not (yet) present; cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (106: 23) as well as GENKO, who explained the lack of a final -t’ (or, at least, its missing explosion) as a feature of the Bzyb dialect (l.c.). The non-finite equivalent of izdýryeit, as the present absolute
meaning “I knowing it ..” or the like, would be ʻizd-yrua  Był ć-y-d  y e-z-d er-wa today; there may be some confusion with the forms discussed in the third entry to follow too.

**sen ne bilirsi**  سن نه بيرسك  “what do you know?”  **uara i-u-dər-va**

We should expect one of the interrogative suffixes, -i,-ey, -zi,-ez, -zey, if this is really a question; according to G. H EWITT (l.c.), one way of saying “what do you know?” would be ˋwar-a yə-w-dər-wa (Ø)-z-a-k"wə-wə-y, lit. “that which you know, what is it?”. ʻyarə ʻyudîrya 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 im"ale is written above the first 〈f〉 in this entry again.

**cənim gözüm**  جامع كوزوم  “my soul my eye”  **u-xaçə si-p'sə**

The words in question seem to be a-ʻxaçə a-xaɛ’ə “face, mouth” and a-ʻbsə a-p'sə “soul”. ʻwxəç, then, could mean ухаэς w(ə)-xaɛ’ə “your face”, and fissi, y-ʻbsə w(ə)-p'sə, “your soul”. This would lead to a reading w(t)xəç (w)p’si. BLEICHSTEINER, who read уха́j kəs (106: 25), presumed u-xaçə as “für dich”, lit. “for (-ə) 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 〈ʃ〉.

**benim bildigim**  بنم بلديكم  “what I know”  **sara i-z-dər-va**

The expected form would be ʻizdîrya meaning either “(that) what I know” (this form called “participle” in Abkhaz grammar, “Relativform” by BLEICHSTEINER) or “I knowing it ..” (called “absolutive”), depending on the word accent; as G. H EWITT states (l.c.), we will have the former here, which is accented y-e-z-d er-wa. Note that Evliya writes an alif above the final 〈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 ʻizd-yrua ık ights ədər-wa-y.

**baga yeter**  باكة يتر  “(it) suffices me”  **sara i-sə-zəx-ejt’, i-sə-zx-ejt’**

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 ıṣızxənt yə-sə-zxə-wa-yt today. There is no need of reading an -a- in the ending, if the fatha 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-t' with verbs in -a-, but this is excluded here because the Abaza present form ысъыхан l y(ə)-sə-zχα-p’ “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 -t’ at all.

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

арс ыз-у-а-з-ує ж *арс изухээзи / -зен

aris izuh[у]waz[иw]ly

A word corresponding to Evliya’s aris is not attested in today’s dictionaries, but it would be the regular adverbial form built from арс arse “this (here)”; cf. already MARR, Dictionary 6 with ars || ars “такъ, сякъ”, and BLEICHSTEINER (107: 28). Today’s normal word for “so” would be as as. The verb form rather represents the present изухээези е yə-зə-w-hə-a-w’a-zəy / -zay (?) meaning “Why did you say it?”; for Evliya’s spelling cf. the fourth entry to follow. For the interrogative suffix see above.

sayıqlar mıskin “are you raving?” j-u-b-va-ma / j-u-b-va / j-u-b-va-zii (??)

According to BLEICHSTEINER, “das fragliche Verbum ist sicher a-bə-rə, ‘sehen’”, but this is a mere guess. G. HEWITT (l.c.) proposes to see a verbal complex w-ay-və-s-ма (уеивыма) here which looks as though it means “Did you pass beside each other?” (from а-ве-ра ‘а-ва-ра “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 апгата arpa pət’ara (cf. e.g. the Аурый-Апсагаата Жвар / Russko-abxazskij slovar’ by X.S. BGAŽBA, Akya / Suxumi 1964, 62 s.v. бредить).

ne sööyleiyorum “What am I saying?” i-s-hə-а-z-ує

This is most probably the present form ысъээзи / -зен y’ə-s-hə-a-wa-zəy / -zay ishwáz[иw]ly “What do I say?” as against the aorist ысъээзи / -зен yə-s-hə-a-z’əy “what did I say?” again; cp. the second entry to follow.
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.

This seems to be the present īyxā yʾ- w-ha-wa “(that) what you are saying” rather than the aorist āyxā yʾ- w-ha “(that) what you said”, as Evliya’s spelling with double ʿ after the ح (ḥ) 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 yʾ- w-ha-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 ح (ḥ) again.

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 ēydıyrwā ywd- yw-d-yit today; cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (107: 33).

While axá axʾa “but” and yapā warʾa “you” are clear, uqāxob should in my opinion rather be identified with y-xágoyn, wā-xʾaga-w-pʾ, “you are crazy, wicked” (from a-xāyə, a-xʾa, “сумасшедший”), than with BLEICHSTEINER’s aga .. u-q-ovpʾ “du bist ein Dummkopf” (108: 34), in spite of the unexpected spelling of the -g-. Note the combination of alif and ح (ḥ) in orá, again.

In the form noted here, the formula would mean “by God and men”, literally. ancā’a “God” is perfectly clear, awʾa- fits well with ayaa awa: “men, people” (plural of
ауафы awaᵗ "man, Mensch"; for -aa- see above), and -гъы .. -гъы -гʼ .. -гʼ is the
conjunction “as well .. as ..”. For the rest, this leaves r- as the marker of a third person
plural possessor (“their”), and -ни is seems to stand for the word -нас -нэс used in swear-
ing as noted in MARR’s dictionary (64; the word is kept distinct from a-nʼах = a-нышь
a-nʼәсь "лодка" and a-nʼут = a-нышь a-nʼәсь "земля" here); cf. also BLEICHSTEINER
(108: 35). According to the new dictionary (488: a-ныс a-nʼәс), this is a verb
(“акаң[арбăл]”) meaning “класться”; it constitutes idioms such as ажăлăр рнис
âξлăр рнэс “by the people!” exactly matching with what Evliya has here. The single
с (Ş) in the final position is a little bit exposed and is possibly intended as a correction
for the Ş (Ş), Evliya thus trying to cope with a palatal pronunciation of an -s ʼ as
denoted by MARRʼs -Ş. Note that аң ça “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
maxliqåtä as in DANKOFFʼs treatise (Glossary, 121).

bir şey bilmem vallahi
I know nothing, by God

akʼə sa-z-δar-om anc’ınэш
акъа суздыйраам, аң ça–рнис

akʼgʼə sa-z-δar-wа-m ancʼоа r-нэs ō(a(k)ги sizdir(w)am, анч(w)арнис
ағи сээлэг арэхис "шага";

âgi obviously represents ak-гъы, akʼ-gʼə, meaning “one (thing) even”; for суздыйраам
sa-z-δar-wа-m “I cannot know” see above. As for the formula anс(w)арнис, cp. the
preceding item; the faţha seems to belong to the ğ (ğ) (where it should belong)
rather than the ř (ř).

incitme bağa yazıпродir
“Donʼt hurt me, itʼs a shame”

usûxʼа sa-rəçʰovʼ
усмисын хучы裂缝хап (?)

wə-s-mʼэ-sə-n xüčʼə sərəçʰap (?) u(sm)sin quç(1) sirîşhâb (?) аөсинъ чои сирсêнб
If usin really stands for усмисын, wə-s-mʼэ-sə-n, “Donʼt hit me!” as G. HEWITT
proposes (l.c.), we have to assume that Evliyaʼs spelling usin is haplogographical; this is
in any case more probable than BLEICHSTEINERʼs usûxʼа “hilf mir”. sirîşhâb obviously
contains a–рыцха–, a-ɾəçʼha– “бедняга, несчастный”, which in connection with
хучы, xučʼə, “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 -oupʼ here; Evliyaʼs 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-pʼ. For
Abaza рыцхапная rəçʼha “бедняк, нищий” cf. the Abaza-russkij slovar’ / Абаза-урышив
“Am I saying anything?”

In the way indicated here, the sentence could mean something like “I (capâ) said (inc=χən) something (akîr) thus (yc)”; the latter word, which is proposed by G. Hewitt (l.c.), is the better choice as against ya-ak-ir 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 jîycıvun ya-s-h=ª-w-n.

By God, Abaza, I am hungry”

“I am going to eat pasta”

While çap- 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 ifurarım, “you will not eat it”, or, more probably, the interrogative ifurarıma, “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:
This is one of the words for “testicle(s)”, which are not present in today’s dictionaries, given to me as (a-)šęrggü (e)y e-w-f šęrggü yuf by G. Hewitt (l.c.) — the other is a-q°alt’as; according to him, this is a compound consisting of (a-)šęrg “penis” (cp. Marr’s dictionary, 89 with a-šęrg “id.”), and r-g°, lit. “their heart” (cp. a-γy a-g°a in the new dictionary, 169), which implies that the word for “penis” is “singular for plural” in Abkhaz. In Evliya’s šęrggü, 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 -a-fa-ra “to eat” belongs to those Abkhaz verbs which in the imperative lose their (unaccented) root vowel.

For this entry, too, the correct analysis is provided by G. Hewitt (l.c.). ŋan represents w-an “your mother”, Evliya’s -dis belonging to the following verbal form as the prefix complex of a first person singular agent (-s-) combined with a second person singular feminin patient (d-). The verb must be akşęrga a-k°əs-r’a as given in Marr’s dictionary with the meaning “coitus” (48: a-ksrə). This has to be preferred to a-kpá 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 дыску’ст də-s-k°əs-t’ “I fucked your mother” although we have to state a modal and temporal difference as against Evliya’s Turkish translation like this.
The phonological spelling follows the same principles as with Abkhaz. In addition, apical sibilants and affricates are marked by a dot above (e.g. ş) and pharyngealized consonants by a stroke above (e.g. ş) as in DUMÉZIL’s notation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkish meaning</th>
<th>DUMÉZIL phonolog.</th>
<th>reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(bir) 1 za (za) wā?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVASI (o.c., 310), expecting za as the normal form of the numeral “one” in Ubykh, assumes a misspelling with Arabic ⟨w⟩ instead of ⟨z⟩ as did BLEICHSTEINER (111: 1) and, implicitly, DUMÉZIL (59: 1). But note that in the numeral “eleven” too, a wāw appears.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iki) 2 t'qʷa t'qʷa t/u/q(w)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(üç) 3 ša ša ša</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dört) 4 p'z̥ p'H̥ pl̥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to DUMÉZIL (60: 6) this is the numeral for “six” in the instrumental, not in the oblique case as BLEICHSTEINER proposed (111: 6).

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 ubyxov (Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR, Otdelenie Gumanitarnyx Nauk, 1928), 239, BLEICHSTEINER (111: 11/12), and DUMÉZIL (60).

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.

DUMÉZIL (60: 16) was surely right in proposing that the normal word for “cheese”, fač ’e, 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 ’eža / fabz, both denoting “jus de fromage”. S. TEZCAN proposes to see some kind of haplography here, because the following word starts with a ç (č) as expected in fač ’e (personal communication).

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.
armud  آنثوذ  "pear"  x'a  x'a  xá  xá
üzüm  آنثوذ  "grape"  mədəʃ  mədəʃə  musuw  نژو
encir  آنثوذ  "fig"  la:x'máq  la:x'máq  láxmáq  لحمخ
kestâne  کنانه  "chestnut"  á-s'χα  š  x  ş  [e]şxu  أنسخو

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 š'x - in any case, for which compare the number “five” above. Note that the autograph has the expected š-letter.

tuz  طورز  "salt"  laq'á  laq'á  láqá  لأقه

That Evliya heard not a word for “salt” but laq 'a “stone” as BLEICHSTEINER (112: 22) proposed, remains probable. “Salt” is ʃ ʃ in Ubykh according to H. VOGT (Dictionnaire de la langue oubykh, Oslo 1963, 233 sq.).

gel  كل  "come"  wə.y.k'á  wə-y-k'á  weyká  ویکا

oṭur  اوطور  "sit"  wə.təš  wə-təšə  ut(w)ás  اوتاس

qalq  قادر  "get up"  wə.daτəş  wə-daτəşə  udaltuw  اودله تو

gitme  کمجه  "don’t go"  wə.m.k'á  wə-m-k'á  umká  اومکا

giderim  رم کبده  "I shall go"  sə.y.k'ö  sə-y-k'ö  siyk[á]wá  سيكوه

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.

nereye gidersin  نره به کدرسین  “Where are you going?”

sába  wə.y.k'á.n  s'á:ba  wə-y-k'á-n  sabuykan  ستوبکن

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.

işim var giderim  إشيم وار كده رم  “I have something to do, I am going”

sə-wə s.q'  á,γ, s(ə),k'ö  səwa s-q'a:-γ  sə-k' ə:o  s[á]wwu sqág s[í]kwá  سوو ساق سیکوه

This sentence has to be rendered as “j’ai une affaire, que je m’en aille” according to
DUMÉZIL (62: 29). Note that the first letter in the second word is a س (s) with a sukūn, matching the expected sound of an s-, rather than a ش (ṣ) as in the printed edition. The vocalization of the first word is strange, if it really represents Ubykh ʾswa.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bir qız getir} & \quad \text{“bring a girl”} \\
zā-pχ̱ādək° wə & \quad za-pχ̱ adək° wə \\
zābẖāduqwu & \quad \text{زَنَّة دَوْفُو}
\end{align*}
\]

For this sentence, which was omitted in the printed edition but was available through J. von Hammer’s, Evliya’s autograph exactly reveals the reading expected by BLEICHSTEINER (116: 37) as against GENKO’s (241, fn. 1). According to DUMÉZIL (65: 37), the imperative ə we means not “amène, getir” but “emmène, götür”.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qız bulmadım ammâ bir oğlan getirdim} & \quad \text{“I didn’t find a girl but I brought a boy”} \\
zā-pχ̱ādək° (a.)la.mət za-nāynš°-ʒayt’ (?) & \quad za-pχ̱ adək° la-mət ə za-nənə wə-χədə (?) \\
zābẖāduq[u]lām(ı)t zānām əxād & \quad \text{زَنَّة دَوْفُتْ زَنَّي اوْخَدُ}
\end{align*}
\]

This sentence, too, was omitted in the printed edition. DUMÉZIL translated it as “il n’y a pas de jeune fille, c’était un jeune homme” (65: 38); trying to cope with the spelling zeni for the word for “boy”, nayns°, he proposed that a pronunciation nəʾs° with a nasalized ā could be reflected here. As against this, Evliya’s autograph presents a clear reading with a double ə in the word. PROVASI reads it as “(nns’y), où ə (s) est écrit avec un long trait au lieu de la forme ʾ, ce qui est usuel dans les manuscrits” (313: 31). In my opinion, the position of the dot of the second ə makes this reading improbable; if we read د زانام instead, this can possibly reflect a stem nan’ə as assumed as the basis of nāynš° regarded as a compound by DUMÉZIL himself (66: ʾnan(n)-s° with -s° “petit”). As for the last word, Evliya’s əxād can hardly represent DUMÉZIL’s “copule suffixe d’identification”, ʒayt’, as PROVASI correctly states; as against his own proposal, a.z.γ°āwə.yt “je l’ai trouvé”, BLEICHSTEINER’s u-xad “kaufe!” (116: 38), to be corrected in wə.x°addā according to DUMÉZIL, is still very much nearer to Evliya’s spelling except for the final ə (d) bearing a sukūn. As for the sense of the sentence, seeming “étrange” to DUMÉZIL and PROVASI, we can compare one of Evliya’s Georgian phrases where “boys” are the object of “buying” too.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{gel eve gidelim} & \quad \text{“come let’s go home”} \\
s\text{-fa.γά š.kʾán.o [wə.y.kʾá]} & \quad \text{سَفَعَة سَكَحْوَة وَيْكَة}
\end{align*}
\]

As against DUMÉZIL’s interpretation, to be rendered as “allons chez-moi, viens” liter-
ally, we have to note that in Evliya’s spelling, the second word has an initial س ⟨ṣ⟩, 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 ج ⟨ğ⟩, not a ن ⟨n⟩. Compare the following entry too.

gideriz eve  
“We are going home”
š.k’á.nō šá-dak’a ?  š ‘-k ’-a-n-o: šá-dak ’a ?  sikánoğ suwká ?  
Here again, Evliya has a س ⟨ṣ⟩ instead of the ش ⟨š⟩ expected. DUMÉZIL’s šá-dak’a presupposes that Evliya erroneously wrote a و ⟨w⟩ instead of a د ⟨d⟩ which is not impossible; cf. PROVASI (314: 33) too.

ne avladınız  
“What did you hunt?”
ša-zø.γoáw.yt’ (PROVASI)  sa-zø.γoáw-yt’  sázxod  ستْ  حَوْدْ 
Both BLEICHSTEINER’s sa-ṣəx-đē “Was wird euch gehören?” (114 sq.: 32) and DUMÉZIL’s šəd.o šø.γə.ya, a Circassian sentence meaning “qu’êtes-vous devenus?” (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 avladınız 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 -γoaw- “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  
“We ate a pig”  xøa ẓ.γoáw.yt’ aš.ʃø.yt’  
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 ḡ- ⟨f⟩ instead of a َ ⟨g⟩- as PROVASI did (310: 35); compare the last Ubykh entry for this.

domuz semiz mi idi  
“Was the pig fat?”  a.w.f.a.mø.t šə-xøá ?  ؟  
Here again, BLEICHSTEINER’s (115 sq.: 34) and DUMÉZIL’s (64: 34) considerations are based upon a wrong Turkic equivalent: Instead of domuzumuz-mu 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 ل〈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 sukün above. Thus, the actual verb form, which seems to contain the negative infix -m-, remains unclear. The same holds true for the element ذا which can hardly represent a first person plural possessive marker سٌئ-, 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 سٌئ(y) as in the fourth entry to follow?

xərsẕ lä gideriz خرسزله كیدی رز \[\text{“We are going to do a theft”}\]

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 gitdiniz نریه کیدیز \[\text{“Where did you go?”}\]

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? — 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 vilayetine gitdik آریدلر ولايتینه کیدی \[\text{“We went to the country of the Arids”}\]

As against PROVASI (315 sq.: 39) who proposed that Evliya’s هئs could reflect the locative postposition -ya combined with the interrogative particle س, the present word may well represent Ubykh قس meaning “village” (cf. VOGT, Dictionnaire, 172) as an equivalent of Turkish vilayet. 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 س- must represent the second person plural prefix سو- in the first and the first person plural prefix سٌئ- in the
second one. The verbal ending, here written with two ds, the first with a sukun above, remains unclear; can it be a preterite in -yt' again? — The locality named here must be today’s Adler, which according to Evliya was neighbouring with the “Sadṣa”-Ubykh (on this, cf. already Genko, O jazyke ubyxov, 237 and Bleichsteiner, 125).

ne getirdiniz  
نه كرديرکر

“What did you bring?”

sa-y.zə.wə.yə-šə(y) (?)  sa-y-zə-wə-yə--š ə(y)  sāyuwzil ša  
ستورل شا

For this entry, Provasi’s proposal (316: 40) is convincing: The initial sa- reflects the interrogative particle “What?” again, the final ša reprents the enclitic interrogative particle š ə(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 ˙sı ˙gır getirdik  
بر صغر كرديرکر

“We brought one cow”

za-gə.əma (a.y.yə.yə.yt’  za-gə.əm’a y-yə-yə.yt’  jaqumá iywid  
زقه ازود

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-gə.əm’a, cf. Vogt, Dictionnaire, 129) and “we brought it” (a-y-yə- yə-yə.yt’, cf. Vogt, 216: yə-wə-).

neylediniz  
نله دیدکر

“What did you do?”

sa-y.sə.š ə.a.ná.yəl  sa-y-sə-š ə -yə’ ??  şayūjdil  
شوژدل

Provasi’s sa-y.sə.s ə.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 ʃ for the interrogative sa- here, which may be tolerated. If the verb in question is really yə-ʃ “to do” (cf. e.g Vogt, Dictionnaire, 215), the second person plural marker must be regarded as assimilated to the ʃ ə- (as against Vogt’s aysəš ə’an “vous faites”), the resulting sound being written with a ž (ž), which would be noteworthy at least. For the plural marker -na- represented by a d (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  
ییدکر

“We ate”  aʃfəyə’  a-ʃ ʃə-yə-yt’  isfıd  
اسفید

With Provasi (317: 43), this obviously represents the Ubykh verbal form a-ʃ ʃə-yə-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 ʃ ə (ʃ-) as against Provasi’s ʃ (ʃ) again.
In the phonological spelling, aspirated consonants are marked by ‘ʰ’, 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, ā is used for a fatha plus alif representing Georgian e, and ē for a fatha representing a high vowel; ā 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

\[
\text{bir} \quad 1 \quad \text{erṭi} \quad \text{erṭi} \quad \text{erṭi} \quad \text{i}
\]

As against BLEICHSTEINER (91: 1), the vocalization intended by Evliya was clearly not ā (alif-madda) or ɭ (alif with kasra) but ī (alif with fatha). The final -i of today’s nominative form is missing, anyway, unless it is indicated by the notation of imāl, lit. “flexion”, written below the ꜞ ꜙ (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 1977, 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?

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. ŽGENȚI (Guruli kilo / Gurijskij govor gruzinskogo jazyka, Tpilisi 1936, 58).

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

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

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

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 gruzinskym jazykax, Sovetskoe jazykoznanie 1936/2, 123, according to whom the manuscript Pertev Paşa 458 which he used has the wrong spelling bak, too. The (k) seems to have arisen out of the combination of lâm with sukân. — Note that the nominative -i is missing as in c’qal-. 
As BLEICHSTEINER correctly stated (91: 16), 'sxali is a dialectal variant of the word for “pear” in Georgian, the normal form being m sxali as in K. TSCHENKÉLI, Georgisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch, 2, 1970, 845; according to S. ŽGENȚI, the form is familiar to the Gurian dialect of West-Georgia once more (Guruli kilo, 247). — As in all words with a stem ending in -(a)l- so far, the nominative -i is missing here again.

This is a dialectal word, too; cf. TSCHENKÉLI, who quotes it for the Imereti, Raçıa and Leçxumi dialects (1, 575), or A. GLONȚI, according to whom it is Gurian, too (Kartul kilo-tkmata sitqvis kona, Tbilisi 1984, 285). — There seems to be no indication of a final -i in this form, either.

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

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, Raçian and Leçxumian; cf. GLONȚI’s dialect dictionary, 86. Evliya’s material is clearly exposed as Southwest Georgian, like this. Note that DŽIKIA’s manuscript has the expected й (126, l. 10 from below).

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

“Come boy let’s eat bread”
Bleichsteiner (93: 28) was right that čamos is a third person singular optative, “he ought to eat”; cf. Džikia, too, who translated the form as “пусты купает 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 ičamos “bread should be eaten”. — The kasra in aqi as rendering Georgian sɛ ak “here, hither” is unexpected unless we have a dialectal variant ak’i here which could have been influenced by Megrelian ak’i, ak’ə (W. Boeder’s proposal [l.c.]; for the Megrelian word cf. e.g. I. Kipšidze [Qipšiže], Grammatika mingrel’škago (iverskago jazyka s xrestomatieju i slovarem, S.-Peterburg 1914, 197 f.). Džikia’s manuscript seems to have a sukun, instead. But cp. the fourth entry to follow.

**otur oğlan**  
“sit boy”

**dadseq bičo**

dadseq dačedi must be a misprint for daced bičo in Džikia’s list (121: 29). The form without -i is a morphological variant within Georgian. Note that today’s standard form is dažek’(i) (with -k’- in analogy to -dek’(i) “stand”).

**validegi kelbler siksin**  
“May dogs fuck your mother”

**daqlma deda mot’nas (Deeters)**

dep(?)də dep(?)da dep(?)da dep(?)da (?)

**zag(l)ma deda mogit’q’nas (?)**

cagmá dédá moq(i)tn(a)ns (?)

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 cagma “dog” cf. Żgenti, Guruli kilo, 55; in any way, in the Georgian sentence, the “dog” is singular as is the verbal form.

**gitme yabana**  
“don’t go out”

**ar c’awides (hišam) ?**

Ar c’awides ak’idam (?)  
Ar sáwides xitnam (?)

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 xitam is better than BLEICHSTEINER’s hšam which was “unverständlich” to him; DŽIKIA read خسام, 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 šigidam “out from inside” or, rather, ak’idam “out from here” or ik’idam “out from there”. Possibly, Evliya’s x- is a reflex of the -k- 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 ağa ekmek yeyelim كل انا اكمك يه يلم “Come sir let’s eat bread”
ak’ bat’ono puri ě’amos آق بانون بوری جاموس
ak’ bat’ono p’uri ě’amos aq[i] patoni puri ě’amos آق پانون پوری جاموس

As above, Georgian a‘ ak’ “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 p’at’ron-i originally (a borrowing from a Romance language); in this case, the dissimilation of p’-t’- to b-t’- must have occurred later than Evliya’s time, at least dialectally, unless the p’- be due to Megrelian influence again as G. HEWITT presumes (letter dated 22.7.91; for Megrelian p’at’oni cf. e.g. KIPŠIDZE’s Grammar, 297). — For p’uri ě’amos, lit. “he should eat bread”, cf. above.

eydir ایدر “it is good” iri ئونَبَیر (??) rigzea (??) (r)ızéà (??)

In the form written in the manuscript, this can hardly be a Georgian word, not even a dialectal one; DŽIKIA, who rendered it as ای (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 ئونَبَیر rigzea, meaning “(it) is in order” which could lie behind Evliya’s spelling if his ۱ (alif) stands for a ر 〈t〉, if the final ی 〈i〉 can be read as an -a-vowel, and if Evliya’s ب 〈b〉 can represent the Georgian -g-. For the latter proposal, cp. the word xitam above if it means (a)kitgam. As it is, Evliya’s form strongly reminds one of the Abkhaz word for “good”, абзия a-bzia,
which we would expect in a finite form such as ი-ციოუ  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  “come don’t go”  ar c’awides

As for the final -i indicated in aqi, see above. Note that ar c’awides 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 ağa  “sit sir”  dažed, bat’ono

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 ნ 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 n ნ, again (126, l. 6 from below). For the p-, see above.

aga bir iki oglanım var durur alırmısın  “Sir, I have one or two boys, stay, will you buy?”  paton erti (! ...)

Bat’ono, erti ori bič’i mq’avs(s), dažed, iq’idos (?)

Bleichsteiner had the first two words only (95: 38); Džikia saw three single sentences here, the first one ending with erti, the second one with mq’avs. As for paton, the -n is clearly marked as final, this time, by a sukun 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 “Megrelished”) variant, too (see below). The -m surely belongs to the following verbal form, which, according to the context, should be mq’avs, “I have (with me)”, xar being a second person singular “you are” only; Džikia posited mq’avs, too (121: 37). If Evliya did mean mq’avs, he must have confused ჰ ჰ and რ რ 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 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 ğ (alif-madda) must be corrected into ğ (alif with kasra) and his ğayn should have a kasra too, no sukūn. As a different solution, we could think of Evliya’s ğ reflecting the Georgian negative particle, ar; the word would thus have to be interpreted as a question a(r) (iq’idos “won’t he (you?) buy”. In this case, Evliya must have omitted the r ( ğ with sukūn) as present in the third entry to follow. DŽIKIA did not try to identify the word (121: 38).

baqayım küçük mi  “Let me see, is he little”  ak’ im pat’aria

As against DŽIKIA who gave no solution for aqim (121: 39), BLEICHSTEINER may have been right in separating it into ak’ plus im, the first word being the adverb “here” (95: 39). im would be the oblique form of the demonstrative pronoun is, ıgi “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’i, the variant of standard Georgian ak’ we had in several sentences before, and the first person singular pronoun me, here being used as an equivalent of standard Georgian ěemt’vis “for me”; the sentence could thus mean “is he (too) little for me”. — The predicative adjective in the form Evliya spells it is p’at’ra- as against standard p’at’ara-, “small, little”; the “syncopated” form is listed in ĞLONȚI’S dialect dictionary (436), but not for Gurian. Note that Evliya clearly records a nominative ending -y before the short copula -a.

yoq büyükdür  “No, he is big”  didi aris

didi aris  didi aris  didi aris

There is no equivalent of Turkish yoq in this sentence, didi aris meaning “(he) is big”
simply.

almam “I won’t buy” ar ḥdos (?) ख़या 〈मा〉 ar iq’- ar (i)gidos 〈मा〉

The kasra written below the गयन 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 oglandr واللهي اي اوغلاندر “By God, he is a fine boy” /

This entry was omitted in BLEICHSTEINER’s treatise. tis medma most probably represents the common formula ग्विः 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 ङग(l)ma “dog”, above. Less probable is the formula ḡmerta ičis or, rather, ičis ḡmerta “God knows”, because the rendering of the affricate -č- by a 〈t〉 would be curious as well as the missing -r-. Other proposals are still less probable, take, e.g. ्ग्विः 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 fenādr ابي دکلدر فادر “He is not good, he is bad” k’arg(i) ar aris, glaḥa-a 〈मा〉

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 “horse” चेनि 〈व्ा्न्〉 cxeni 〈व्ा्न्〉

There is a clear sukūn above the final 〈n〉 in this word, excluding the expected nominative form cxeni.

qaṭir “mule” ʃori 〈व्ा्न्〉 ʃori 〈व्ा्न्〉 cori 〈व्ा्न्〉
If Evliya really meant a sentence “the dog is naughty” here, qudyan must represent the form k’udiania “he is naughty” (lit. “geschwänzt”, from k’udi “tail”), but there is no indication of either the nominative -i or the shortened copula, -a. Note that there is a composite zaglik’uda, lit. “dog’s tail”, in Georgian too, which denotes a bad person; cf. T. Saxokia, Kartuli xaṭovani siṭqva-tkmata, Tbilisi 1979, 833 sq. For Džikia, these were two entries, the second being the simple adjective k’udiani “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).
Today’s forms are given according to I. Kipšidze (Qipšiże), Grammatika mingrel’skago (iverskago) jazyka s xrestomatieju i slovarem, S.-Peterburg 1914 (Materialy po jafeticheskomy jazykoznaniju, 7.). The principles of the phonological spelling and of the “Turkicizing” transcription are the same as with Georgian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>BLEICHSTEINER</th>
<th>today</th>
<th>phonologically</th>
<th>reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(bir)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>arti</td>
<td>arti</td>
<td>arti</td>
<td>آربی</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iki)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>žiri</td>
<td>žiri</td>
<td>j(i)ri</td>
<td>ذري</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(üç)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>šumi (!)</td>
<td>sumi</td>
<td>sumi</td>
<td>سونو</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ُسُمى ُسُمى in the autograph. In the case of ERKERT’s notation (ُسُمى is put beside ُسُمى here), there may be doubts, too, as to whether it can be relied upon, because the older word-lists have only ُسُمى such as J. GÜLDENSTÄDT’s (cf. the edition of G. GELAŠVILI, Giuldenštadiis mogzuroba sakartveloši / Putešestvie Gjul’denštadta 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. ُضُمِي (and “ضُعَنِیش” ُضُمِي) as against Georgian Sami, but his ُض means just a word initial voiceless s-.

(dört) 4 َهَي ُهَوُو ُهَي ُهَوُو

(bes) 5 ُىَتْي ُىَتْي ُىَتْي ُىَتْي

(alti) 6 (امُشِی) ُهَدِی ُهَدِی (ا)پَیِشْکیُو

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 (= apxšvi) 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 apchšui 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 *ap’šxvi or, rather, ap’šk’vi. For S.S. DŽIKIA (Evlija Čelebi o mingrel’skom i gruzinskom jazykax, Sovetskoe jazykoznanie 1936,2, 113), the -k- was still unexplainable (“во всяком случае присутствие в этом слове ḫ теперь не объяснимо”).

(yedi) 7 ُشْکْوُی’ی ُشْکْوُی’ی ُشْکْوُی’ی [ی]شکیُتی

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.

(sekiz) 8 ُروُو ُروُو ُروُو ُروُو ُروُو

(doquz) 9 ُخُوُو ُخُوُو ُخُوُو ُخُوُو ُخُوُو

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 tschhora “9” with a final -a, but this is not
attested elsewhere.

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).

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, Me gr. *kobali* cannot be identified etymologically with Georgian *p’kvili* “flour” but rather with Georgian *xorballi* “wheat” (cf. Arn. ČIKOBAVA, Čanur-megrel-kartuli šedarebiti leksikoni, Tbilisi 1938, 175, quoting I. ĖAVAXIŚVILI). Cpr. KIPŠIDZE, who denotes *kobali* as “пшеница” as well as “пшеничный хлеб” (345), and GÜLDENSTÄDT who has Me gr. *xorballi* for “triticum” and *tschkom* 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 *pcur* “cow” and *p’uri* “bread”.

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

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’ori* 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.
Note that there is a clear indication of a final (nominative) -i in this word (as against the two preceding ones). — The initial ʾ (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-.

\textit{quṣaq} \quad \textit{“waistband”} \quad \textit{ortʾqʾapʾu}

Cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (99: 16) for an attempt to join Evliya’s spelling with the Megrelian word for “girdle”, ortʾqʾapʾu. 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 Meğr. do “and” contracted with the word initial o- as W. BOEDER proposes (l.c). If we can assume that Evliya changed the final (t) for a (p) and that the medial -t-u in the verbal root rtʾqʾ was lost due to a simplification of the consonant cluster -rtʾqʾ-, 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 -pʾu. 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 in the words “которые совсем не читаются или читаются, но представляют непонятный комплекс звуков”.

\textit{baš} \quad \textit{“head”} \quad \textit{dudi} \quad \textit{dišk’a} \quad \textit{dišk’a} \quad \textit{dišká}

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

\textit{köpek} \quad \textit{“dog”} \quad \textit{ţoğori} \quad \textit{ţoxo} \quad \textit{ţoxor(i)} \quad \textit{ţoxur}

There is no vocalization mark at all for the final (t) in this word.

\textit{şiţir} \quad \textit{“cattle”} \quad \textit{hoji} \quad \textit{bəb(ɔ)ʃ} \quad \textit{ç%x(o)u} \quad \textit{cʃ[ʃ]u/xu}

According to BLEICHSTEINER (99: 20), Evliya must have confused the punctuation marks of (c) and (x) in this word if he really meant bəxɔ xoţi “steer”. For the clearly indicated rounded vowel in the final position, we would have to assume an -u due to progressive assimilation to match with the -i expected. Much more probably, Evliya’s word is bəʃu, however, which means “kopr” according to KIPŠIDZE (368); KIPŠIDZE has the variants ęxuu for the Eastern (S= Senak-) and ęxou for the Western dialect (MZ= Sa-Murzakan / Zugdidi). For this equation cf. already DŽIKIA (115 and 128). GÜLDENSTÄDT has chodgi, already, for “bos” (308, fn. 14). ɂoxo would mean “name” in Megrelian (KIPŠIDZE, 416: имя); according to G. HEWITT
(letter dated 22.7.91) the dialect of Ocamčira has ʒoxo only as a verbal form meaning “X is called Y” (Georgian ʰhkvia), whereas for “name” it has the Georgian saxeli.

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 ʒˌgên (giin) in his manuscript (128).

For the unexpected initial ʿ 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 ʿ will rather be due to a simplification of a word initial consonant (cluster). Güldenstädt has ʒumi (311, fn. 4) which shows the reverse order of the vowels as against today’s form. Evliya’s spelling of the final ʒ with sukūn may mean today’s -mu rather than Güldenstädt’s -mi.

For the initial ʿ, see the preceding word. Megrelian cʿxeni, which is surely a borrowing from Georgian, is attested in Pallás’ 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.

As there is no variant like ʒaži attested anywhere, Evliya’s -a-, clearly indicated by alif plus fatha, is unexpected. Even Güldenstädt has Gedği alone (309, fn. 5), as well as Klaproth (Asia polyglotta, 119), who writes it Gedęki. The sukūn above the final ʒ (ʢ) is quite faint in the autograph.

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 ʒəxənə girini is not met with in Eastern Megrelia at all). Evliya must have confused š ⟨t⟩ and ʒ ⟨n⟩ here if we presume today’s form. The ʒäf written above the käf is perhaps meant to indicate a non-palatal pronunciation which
could point to the Western ə instead of the Eastern i. GÜLDENSTÄDT has Girin (308), as well as KLAPROTH (Asia polyglotta, 113).

Evliya’s form is nearer to the Laz equivalents of Megrelian t’uni’, viz. furi’ and mt’uri’, than to today’s Megrelian word itself. As the -n- is regarded as a secondary element in Megr. t’uni’ (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.

As against today’s form, Evliya’s qwal seems to represent an older stage as attested by Laz q’vali, which still has the initial q’, agreeing with Georgian q’veli. GÜLDENSTÄDT, too, has Kwali for “caseus” (310). For the rendering of today’s -va- by 〈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.

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).

BLEICHSTEINER’s proposal that this is Megrelian p’uč’i (= Georgian p’ic’i) meaning “oath” would be quite convincing if we could assume that Evliya asked for Dekr ziker, which is likely because of the following words (and, as DŽIKIA stated, because Evliya never asked abstract terms at all: 128), but that Dekr zikr was understood by his informants (in the sense of “invocation of God’s name”). That Evliya rendered the aspirated p’ as 〈f〉 would not be surprising. I do not see, however, that Megrelian p’uč’i can have the meaning of “penis”; as G. HEWITT (l.c.) reports, there is a Megr. p’uč’i 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 〈quc〉 and interprets this as Megrelian p’uč’i meaning “мужское яичко” (115, fn. 1; cf. KIPŠIDZE, 418, who gives the meaning “шулдятное яицо”, i.e. “testicle”). That Megrelian 〈quc〉 was heard as a q’ by Evliya is further suggested by the word for “cheese” above; the same holds true
for the rendering of -va- by ẓ (wāw with damma). As for the missing -i, we can cp. gāc(i) “pig” in any case.

ferc  فرح “vagina” čuri  čuri  čuri  čuri(i)  جون For the missing -i, cp. čoğor(i) above.

taşaq  طنق “testicles” / bęgo (?) 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”, ɣoxi “važ”, as discussed in the last but one entry, is less probable.

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

adam  آم “man” č’aš (Svan. ?) ɣoŋ ? c’ie ? čay ? جاي BLEICHSTEINER was right that there is no Megrelian word meaning “man” which would match with Evliya’s čay (100: 32). It is highly improbable, however, that Evliya heard the Svan word č’aš, here, because the same form is recorded several times in the same spelling in clear Megrelian sentences, later on. DŽIKIA (116) proposes Megrelian ɣoŋ c’ie, instead, which means “малчих” according to KIPŠIDZE (378) and which seems a better solution, though not without problems. Note that in contrast to the preceding item, čay is written with a sukūn above the final ی (y).

otur  اوطر “sit” doḥod ɣoḥo  doxodi  dâxod(i) داحود Cf. BLEICHSTEINER (100: 33) for the right analysis. Surprisingly, Evliya spells the first -o- with faṭha 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. HEEWITT (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.

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-ul meaning “you go over there” here, consisting of mele- “no ty стороны” (Kipsidze, 278 s.v. 2.me) and the second person singular present form ulə/u “you go” (Kipsidze’s root 2.l, 264). In this case, Bleichsteiner’s proposal (100: 34) that we have a reduced form of today’s prohibitive particle namə plus elaulə “geh nicht vorbei!” here could be disposed of. The identification of Evliya’s meləwli 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 ulə/u “you go” which would fit well with Evliya’s writing.

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 tina “that one” to əna “this one”, because of Evliya’s kasra below the ϕ (t); cf. Džikia, too (128). We can not exclude totally, however, that Evliya’s spelling means the Megrelian word for girl, ənəs c’ira, instead, the ə(n) being used erroneously for a r (t) and the ϕ (t) representing a c’, as in Evliya’s tis if this represents Georgian ic’is (cf. the Georgian specimen for this).

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’kəm-u “das was zu essen ist” here, instead, is not convincing either. A better candidate seems to be the form oč’komi 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** “come man” (waj ċai) ڇ° ڇ° ?? vai c’ie ?? way ċay وای جانی
For both words, see above. Note that there is a sukūn above the ی (y) in the latter word only, again.

**buraya** نورابا “hither” ašo morti ڇڇڇ ڇڇڇ ašr morti aš(i) mort(i) آن نورت
As against BLEICHSTEINER (101: 40) it seems easier to presume that Evliya’s āš represents Megr. ašr than ašo, both meaning “here, hither”; cp. the second entry to follow too, where the same word is written with a final ی (y). As for the imperative mort(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** “don’t go man” ([nə]mə elaula čai)
For both words, see above. Note that ċay has a sukūn above the ی (y) again.

**paṣa var gel baba** پاسه وار کل بانا “There is paṣa, come father”
ašr morti, wai mamaw ašr ڇڇڇڇڇڇڇڇڇڇڇڇ ڇڇڇ ڇڇڇ ڇڇڇ ڇڇڇ
ašo mort i, vai ?? mamaw ? aši *mor[i]t(i) way *mamaw آنی نورین وای ماماد
Cp. the last but one entry for the first two words. As for morti, it is obvious that Evliya confused ں (n) and ٸ (t) in the final position here; possibly, the kasra noted below the ۡ (r) stood below the final ٸ (t), originally. As for way, note that this word has a sukūn above the final ی (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 ڇ (d) being written for a ڇ (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 paṣa” at all (cf. already DŽIKIA, 116, fn.4).

gel ana دیاش وای کل آنا “come mother” wai dias! ڇ° ئ؟ ڇ؟ ئ؟ vai ?? dias ?? way diyas
diāns وای کل آنا
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 ڇ° vai is not attested anywhere else, however. DŽIKIA
seems to doubt the -s too, rendering Evliya’s entry as “waay ʁoɔ (?)”.

As against BLEICHSTEINER (101: 42) this will be the second person singular aorist = imperative ƣ́k’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 ƣ́k’om “das was zu essen ist” does exist in Megrelian at all, because KIPŠIDZE gives ƣ́k’omali as the deverbal noun in this sense only (391). If Evliya’s ƣ¢qom is the imperative form “eat!” instead, the nominative object arti ƣ́jí is exactly what we have to expect. Note that the word for “pig” is written with alif plus fatha again.

kelpler anaçi ve babaçi ve seni yef’allesin

“May dogs fuck your mother and your father and you” ƣògori (! ...)

ƣògor-k’ dia-sk’ani migiståxod(as) ??

cogor(k) diyaskan(i) migistå[y]xod(as) ??

BLEICHSTEINER (101: 43) treated only the first word of this sentence, ƣògori “dog”; DŽIKIA (117: 44) read it as ƣògor-k’ ƣògori 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 ƣògor-k’ -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 ƣògor-k’ “a dog” in the singular or ƣògor-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 (ƣògori / ƣògor-ep’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. ƣògor-k’ ƣògor-ep’-k’ ƣògoront-k’ do-r-xvam-es ‘God blessed you (Pl.)’ for expected ‘God bless you!’ = ƣògor-k’ ƣògor-ep’-k’ [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 böğ(−ɣ) 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-sk’ani, and “you”, si. Instead, I would prefer to see a complex of verbal prefixes here, such as, e.g., mi-gi-şa-. This could consist of the compound preverb mi-şa- 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 sk’an- “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 〈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 inverted complex, k’i-miša-, k’i- being a phonetic variant of the perfective particle k’o-as in k’i-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 mik’i-še-(g)i-xod(-u) “X fucked Y inside for you”, with mik’i “all around” (variant of muk’i “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 şigir*

دیلم حک سنی طاش ایله اوغلان سیگر

“I wish God would turn you to stone, boy steer” ᵏenî ᵔawi nacw(l)ad ᵐat’m a k’wa …(?)

This sentence was regarded as Georgian by BLEICHSTEINER, but his interpretation, which was obviously invoked by hatma identified with the Georgian ergative xal’-ma “the icon”, is quite improbable, at least because of the rendering of k’va “stone” by gfa
and because of the reading nac(w)lad “instead of” for “baywad”, which turns out to be the vocative bič’o “oh boy”, spelt as bič’u 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 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 t’ani, because there seems to be a second <t Instead of a N rather. DŽIKIA’s transcript of his manuscript has šati, even (125, l. 2 from below). — “I’d beg” would be p’txia, “to wish” would be -ndom- or -nat’- 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).

This sentence was omitted in BLEICHSTEINER’s treatise. DŽIKIA added the preceding two words as well as the following ažgvardi (?) 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 xoži “bull” for which see above; this reading can now be excluded, the autograph showing a clear to be read as cfuxu. 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

seni kesem

“i’ll cut you (?)”

va (n)gixodi wángi xodi?

sonki xoxidio

نتکی خویدی

ת”נ קסם

I’ll cut you (?)” / va (n)gixodi wángi xodi?
Kipṣidze’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 〈k〉, not to the 〈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, vonsk’, meaning “I (will) damage” (cf. Kipṣidze, 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 ñous 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.

This sentence was omitted in Bleichsteiner’s treatise too. Džiķia 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 girin = ñeñ(i) “donkey”, ğaç = estruction(i) “pig” and bič’o “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 ñowar and ñowar (if Evliya confused 〈d〉 and 〈r〉 here), but the difference as against the usual spelling ñowar deserves an explanation anyway, all the more since the remaining elements such as the ending -rib, the double ac- and the conjunctural ye are far from being clear either. My proposal is that ac- renders a colloquial form of the coordinate conjunction et’eši/ e ... et’eši/ e 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 mxodi “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/ø. — Several different solutions are possible; for example, ac- could represent the preverb ñiçə/ ə- ac/ə - meaning “forward” (“впереди, прочь”: Kipṣidze, Grammar, 0118), and the verb in question could be -xvad- “to meet” which, in comparison with Georgian -xedr-, may well have had a root final -r- earlier (*-xvadr-), matching with
Evliya’s notation.

gel adam yat gitme qoyun ekmek yeyelim
“come man lie down don’t go let’s eat sheep and bread”
wai çai, donjira [nu] midaula, šhuri, k’obali oč’k’omu

According to Džikia (113), دیچر a misspelling for دیچر. 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 “midaula” (= melawlt 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 sukun twice.

gel adam otur peynir ekmek yoğurd yeyelim
“come man sit let’s eat cheese bread yoghurt”
wai çai, (!!) ‘vali, k’obali, marc’weni oč’k’omu

For all words appearing here, see above. The verbal form will represent the second person singular imperative “eat”, again. Note that dâxodi “sit down”, which is missing in Bleichsteiner’s treatise, and qoli = ‘vali have a clearly indicated final -i, and that kobali “bread” is written with a پ(p) instead of a پ(b).

dön beri öp beni babanın başiyçün olsun
“Turn this way, kiss me, by your father’s head”
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, -k’oc- “to kiss”, has an -n- following the root when it has the preverb da- plus an objective version marker attached to it; the form da-mi-k’oc-n-e would mean “kiss (sc. feet) for me, kiss my (sc. feet) several times”. As Evliya wrote the second syllable with a fat ḷha 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)k’ar čongu(r) “Vater spiel die Zither” is far from being probable. DŽIKIA’s own proposal (128) was the Georgian blessing mama dagirˇces, 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 dagerçepegu. 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 儆 گمرچیوئن in Evliya’s notebook (for the 〈p〉 instead of a 〈b〉 cp. the preceding sentence); this subjunctive would fit as well with the given meaning. The final 〈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. Marácz / 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 -g-, cp. Evliya’s writing puroçŏgli of the Georgian word for “pomegranate”, broc’euli.
Circassian:

The phonological spelling follows the same principles as with Abkhaz. Kabardian forms are normally noted for single words only, and only if they differ from their Adyge equivalents. In addition to DANKOFF’s transcription of the vocalization marks, ʾē is used for a fatḥa representing a high vowel.

Turkish meaning BLEICHSTEINER today phonologically reading

(bir) 1 ẓə ẓə ẓə ẓə z

ẓə ẓə is the attributive form of the numeral “one” in Adyge and Kabardian. Evliya’s spelling could also represent the quantitative numeral ẓə ze “once”, cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (119: 3), but the vocalization of this and most of the following entries speaks in favour of the cardinal number.

(iki) 2 tʾu, tʾu tʾy tʾə t[ə]qu

Evliya’s spelling obviously represents an earlier or dialectal variant of today’s Adyge and Kabardian standard forms; cp., e.g., A.K. ŞAĞIROV, Ėtimologicheskij slovar’ adygskix (čerkeskix) jazykov, [II]: Π-I, Moskva 1977, 86 f. who notes mišadṣuy, i.e. tʾqʾwa, as the form of the Xakuča-dialect. Cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (119: 2), who quotes E(RCKERT’s) Abadzex and Şapsuğ-forms. There seems a second damma-mark of u-vocalization as expected by the authentic forms to be present above the q letter. —
“Twice” would be τιο / τλεγ, i.e. τ’ω / τ’ων.

“Three times” would be περ 3 τειτ.”

“Four times” would be πλάν p’τ’ε.

“Five times” would be πτφ ῥα nτε (τφρε / τχυφ / τεξρα / t[l]r[e] (?)

As BLEICHSTEINER pointed out, “έ” erinnert stark an š’. 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 χε xε.

“Seven times” would be βλά βλε.

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

“Nine times” would be βγγο / βγγυ βγο e which, again, seems to be excluded by Evliya’s spelling using dammas only.

“Ten times” would be ππντ p’σ’ε / ππντ p’σ’ε. Possibly, Evliya’s س (س) is a mis-spelling for ش (ش). The Turkish equivalent is clearly the numeral ١٠, not ٢٠ “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 اسم الله اس مع allāh ismi “der Name Gottes” following after this entry with no Circassian equivalent and states that “God” should be something like є lе. Possibly, Evliya meant the word πππ πππ “князь” here, which surely, notably in the expression табыу-уа-пши “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-etimologicheskij 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 the or the like between pısı and allah ismi.

ekmek “bread” чакъу / щакъу ё аq°э / š’aq°э čaqu

Today’s usual word for “bread” in Adyge is халыг°э.

su “water” п’sэ пэсы п’sэ p[1]st


If Evliya really wrote ین = 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 lъ in the written languages. This could be и-л il or ы-л ал, 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 ал. The spelling with тašd¯ıd ed lъ is noteworthy, but cf. the third and fourth entry to follow.

peynir “cheese” q’o(j) къуае / къьуе q°aje / q°e:j qoyе

xinzır “pig” q’о къо / къьуэ q°e / q°e qо

qoyun “sheep” mel мёл mel mel[l]

keçi “goat” п’чен пчэны / бжэн пч ’енэ / бжен p[1]çen[n]

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

qızı “lamb” šöne шъьнэ / щьнэ šöne / š ’öne sine

at “horse” šо шь шье šao š[l]y

ešek “donkey” šødө шьды / шьд š’ ödө / šød şđı


The -ге, 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 -е being written with fatha plus 〈h〉 in both cases. The first vowel in the word is clearly indicated as an a by fatha plus  alm, so that this might represent an older form of the word, viz. qadơr, still closer to Turkish qätür 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.
The form is not “verstümmelt” as BLEICHSTEINER meant (120: 23). Both the Adyge-Russian dictionary (Adygabz-em izehuf guczyNal' / Tolkovyj slovar' adygejskogo jazyka, Majkop 1960, 390) and the Kabardian-Russian dictionary (Kabardinsko-russkij slovar' / K'yebredj-Urys slovar'ny, Moskva 1957, 245) contain a word léu with the meaning “svin'ya, porosennok”, the Kabardian form being marked as obsolete (“ycem.”). 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 kyo-léu q’e-lew “pig-piglet”, cp. qo above.

bir tâ’amdir kim aqa abazalar şilxirçir dirler
“a food which the Abkhazians call şilxirçir”

Adyg. gëmël / gëymëlë g’ëmël / g’ëmële gomil გომილ

Except for the word for “mare”, ş’ëbzh / şëbzh, no part of this entry can be verified in the published dictionaries. BLEICHSTEINER’s proposal that “çha” has to be identified with ş’ëhë / şëhë “head” is not convincing. His assumption that the verbal prefixes point to a second person agent and that the ending -ç marks a preterite form is right, however. Note that the second alif in yuwakag is very faint.

yogurğ โยกรัต “yoghurt” š’e-ğep’çağ(e) (DEETERS) şegyepçiag / şe piça
š’e-ğep’çağ / še pc’a şe geleçag

From the Adyge and Kabardian forms given here (taken from the Russian-Adyge dictionary, Russko-adygejskij slovar’ / Urys-adyge gucchini, Moskva 1960, and the Russian-Kabardian dictionary, s.v. prostokvasha) it is clearly the first one which is represented by Evliya’s spelling. As against his own guesses, BLEICHSTEINER quoted D(DEETERS) for the right analysis: The form has to be divided into š’e “milk” and
gep’c’ag 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-гьэнцйагъ э-геп’c’ag 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 гьэ- гьэ-) 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”.

Note the regular sound correspondence between Adyge ы and Kabardian ы. Evliya’s form is clearly recognizable as a West Circassian once again.

getir कर “bring” (к’о) कъа ? qa ? qá
The Adyge Tolkovyj slovar’ (271) gives къа 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 къьякет qəсет (lit. “bring-to-me”), used as an equivalent of 3къа in the dictionary. BLEICHSTEINER erroneously thinks of the verb “to go” (confusing Turkish getir and gider).

nerede idин “where were you?”

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. КЕРБАШЕВА, Адыгабзэм играмматик / Grammatika adygejskogo jazyka, Krasnodar/Majkop 1966, 354 with examples such as .. тыде къьякъйгъ-а тэде къ’эгъ-а “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 -г to be expected in the preterite. As against today’s form of the verb “to be, to live”, Adyge ыыээн ы ’ээн, 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 ’ although some scholars think that the glottal stop here reflects an older ыI, i.e. q’; cp. ШАГИРОВ’S etymological dictionary, where dialectal forms are discussed too (2, 150).
In Evliya’s notation, the consonant of the verbal prefix -щы- -ш- seems to be indicated by 〈ш〉 plus fatha rather than by 〈ш〉 without vocalization.

evde idim “I was at home” t-un se-stāğ
tiunэ сыщыларъ / диуна сыщылаци f‘i-une sə-ş ’š’a-ğ / di-une sə-ş ’š’a-ş’
tiune siș(t)āq[t]

As against BLEICHSTEINER, the correct form for “our house” is not t’-une but тиуна, here clearly indicated by a kasra below the 〈т〉, because a house is an alienable possession. BLEICHSTEINER was right, however, in assuming that -st (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 -gua, i.e. -g < *-ge, as it is generally assumed in Adyge grammar, cf. ROGAeva / KERAševa, 181. By the way, we should expect the oblique case, тиунэм тиуны-m, for “in our house”, but the m seems to be missing.

(едепде) еşek филан etdim (domuz)

“(begging pardon) I fucked the donkey (pig)” šəd sa-p‘ic’-əğ шыды сыпэсыгъ
šədə sa-p’esə-ğ 

As шыды šədə “donkey” is clear, the final -s of šudis should be regarded as the verbal prefix belonging to the following verbal form, cf. already BLEICHSTEINER (121: 31). The verb itself, given as p‘ic’ by BLEICHSTEINER after TRUBETZKOY, cannot be verified in the published dictionaries. Starting from Evliya’s spelling, we could think of пис-ын p‘ēs-an “to sit (upon)” or пис-ын p’es-an “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 p’es’an, however. The form in question then must be сыпэсын(э) sa-p’esəg(e). Compare the fifth entry to follow, too. For the preterite suffix, cp. the preceding items; the vocalization mark seems to be a ˙damma, 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 -qо as the word for “pig”. BLEICHSTEINER’s explanation that this domuz represents the comment of a scribe cannot be maintained anymore.

xoş geldin “welcome” šə-fə-sap-šə
шУфэсапиşi (?) šə-fes-a-pš ‘ay ? šufasap[i]s(i) ?
For this entry, BLEICHSTEINER quoted TRUBETZKOY according to whom this is a complex šę-fə-sap-śə meaning “euch sei gutes Glück” and containing the second person plural marker šə, i.e. Adyge шъу- šə- (as against Kabardian фы- fə-). 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 фэсапцзы fesap’ś ‘i given in the dictionaries with приветствиye “greeting” as its Russian equivalent (cf. the Tolkovyj slovar’, 596); the Адъегъ-урыс гуцыйалъ / Adygejsko-russkij slovar’ by Ж.А. Шълукъо (ШАОВ, 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 насыпышьы nasapəəšə instead (given with the meaning “счастьливый” in the Tolkovyj slovar’, 420). This consists of the word for “luck”, насып nasəp, which is hardly anything else but Arabic naṣib “portion, (good) fortune”, and the postponed adjective шылы şə “good”. For фэсапцзы, we have to compare a second word meaning “привет, приветствие” instead, namely шыфəс səfəjes (to this word, my attention was drawn by W. БОЕДER [letter dated 17.9.91]; it is mentioned e.g. in the Tolkovyj slovar’, 663). This is clearly a compound consisting of шылы “good” and an element фəes identical with the first part of фэсапцзы. Although фəes is not attested as a single word anywhere — Adyge фəес meaning “fez” excludes itself, of course — we can suppose that it is a substantive; фэсапцзы may then represent a syntagma comparable to the expression табыу-я-пцзы “mercy, о 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 шифаşапис səfəjes represents a word шыфəфəсапцзы instead, containing not the simplex фəes but the compound шыфəфəес. As for Evliya’s entry, it is not clear whether he intended to write the last syllable as -pis or as -psi(y).

gidelim كيدم لم “let’s go” тəк’он тыкюн тə-kə-e-n т[u]qon نوقوزن نوقوزن Bleichsteiner was right in positing тəк’он as the first person plural of the second future of the root -къо- -kə- “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 ٢ <w). As no preverb -u- seems to exist in Circassian, this must be due to some kind of sporadic “umlaut” caused by the following -kə-; such “ anticipations” of labial vowels are often present in Evliya’s notations.
As against BLEICHSTEINER, the final -s of şedis 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 p’esən as G. HEWITT confirms (letter dated 11.9.91). şedo “donkey” has no plural marker so that a translation “one who fucks a donkey” would fit better for the Circassian sentence.

BLEICHSTEINER’s proposal to think of a word for “whore” is not convincing, all the more since for his šuošu, better gśas’e (guaš), only positive meanings such as “княжна, свекровь, супруга” are given in the dictionaries.

uyane is not the usual form of “your mother” in Adyge today; cp. the Tolkovyj slovar’ which gives ня 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 анə anə “mother” (Kabardian-Russian dictionary, 18). Maybe uyane reflects this form marked with the second person possessive prefix additionally. As for guda “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 yuwaq above, but with a first person singular agent prefix (s- / sı-) and in the present, not in the preterite. In this case, Evliya’s spelling with a kasra instead of a fatḥa in the root remains noteworthy.

BLEICHSTEINER was probably right in analyzing çına as s-şəna, i.e. с-цынə s-şəna meaning “do I fear” in a question. The first word, now to be read as şüfa instead of şğa, cannot be şha “head” but is rather the “versional” prefix фə fe combined with the
marker of a second person plural, にょ- し°-, thus meaning “for you” or, in the given context, “from you”. し must be さだ さど “what”, the し- being due to a (perseverating?) misspelling rather than a dialectal variant, cp. Kabardian さ, さり, too. The final verbal form is not completely clear. As for the root, this seems to be a variant of Adyge -Io- し°- “to speak”, namely a form like Xakuća くuble せ°en given in Šagi-rov’s etymological dictionary (2, 159). This would yield us -smuqag as a preterite form -s-mo-q°a-ג “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 さだ ざ fasmaқ’venəɾ 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 avraddu filən edeyim
"(begging pardon) I’ll fuck your wife” う-し® せ-ピ-'

Note that う-し® “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 ﬀ (p), cp. sewék above.

niçünün böyle yava söylersin xırsız
"Why are you swearing like this, thief?" さだ p’va つ egů すだ ふョクlya (?) つγü

カーデーア fe-we-q°-a (?) つ eg°α すだ fewqa つ egů

すだ さだ is a variant of すど “what” as above, enlarged with the interrogational -a. For fe-we-q°-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 つγü, 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 げた どqui にて はえ て

While うδδ “witch” and け て せ-“dog meat” are clear, the verbal form should be せ-δδ “eat”, possibly written as し 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 け, e.g. in a form け lessons δδ(δ) 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 bağa ye dersin

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

о ҳел уşhra, səd se o k’əsu’va

o хэл ошхы (?), сыд сэугүцьыагъа (?) we ḥe-l w-e-şxə, səd se-w-g°əš ‘a’a-ə-g-a (?)

we xel we şæd[t] s(e) wuq(u)s(a)xə (?)

The initial şæd is the second person singular pronoun, o = we, and has to be separated from xel = ḥel “dog meat” for which compare the last entry. weş must represent a verbal form meaning “you eat” in the present for which we should expect ошхы w-e-şxə “you are eating (it)”; as for the spelling of the root -шх- -şx-, cp. the last entry. The rest of the sentence is more problematical. If səd- represents the interrogative pronoun сыд(a) ʃæd(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 сыл сэугүцьыагъ-а ʃæd se-w-g°əš ‘a’a-ə-g-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 wəw in the second word should not be a fathā but a damma, giving it the sound of (w)u-, and the -s- with sukūn (س) should be a -š- (ش). The final xa seems to represent the preterite marker, してる - ş, plus the interrogative particle -a again. BLEICHSTEINER thinks of the other word for “speaking”, -Io-, which we had in fesmuqag and fewqa, above, but this leaves at least the -şs- unexplained.

niçün bağa puşt dersin

“Why do you call me a catamite?”

ʃeq-ʃa k’usa’va  сыд ? ?? къысэокъыя ? (?)  səd ? ?? qə-se-w-e-ɡ°a? (?)

sud usihh (?) quşew(u)qa

As against BLEICHSTEINER, usihh is not likely to be a reflex of шткъэ ssh “head” because the parallel he had found in shūfa above has to be dismissed. Instead, we have to look for a word for “catamite” here; can we think of Ыусыɣъэ- əşəğə “расположившийся”? The word final consonants seem to be a ligature -th- ١ rather than taš- ٢ which does not help. The verb can be -къыуэ- q°e- “to say” once again, as in fesmuqag and fewqa above, with an additional preverb къы- qə- “hither”, the whole verbal complex meaning something like “(why) do you say .. in my direction?”.