
Complex Morphology and its Impact on Lexicology: the Kartvelian Case

Jost Gippert

Goethe University, Frankfurt / Main
e-mail: gippert@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Abstract

This paper deals with the impact of complex morphological structures on essential aspects of lexicology. On the basis of data from the Kartvelian (South-Caucasian) language family consisting of Georgian and its sister-languages, it discusses questions of how to lemmatize nominal and verbal word forms so that they can be arranged in a consistent and appropriate way in dictionaries and databases. The most prominent approaches that have been developed since the first attempt to provide a dictionary of Georgian (Paolini & Irbachi 1629) are analysed with a view to their applicability, usability, and conclusiveness.

Keywords: Kartvelian; Georgian; history of lexicography

1 Historical Outline of Kartvelian Lexicography

1.1 Together with its sister-languages, Svan (spoken in Northwest Georgia), Megrelian (spoken in West Georgia), and Laz (mostly spoken in Northeast Turkey),¹ Georgian constitutes the so-called South-Caucasian or Kartvelian language family, one of the three autochthonous language families in the Caucasus.² Among these languages, Georgian is peculiar in that it looks back on more than 1,500 years of uninterrupted literacy, thus exceeding languages like Russian or German by far. Roughly speaking, the history of written Georgian can be divided into three periods, Old Georgian extending from the 5th to the 12th century A.D., Middle Georgian from the 12th to the 18th century, and Modern Georgian since the 19th century;³ the periodization notwithstanding, the structure of the language has remained quite stable throughout time so that Old Georgian texts can still be understood by and large by modern speakers. In contrast to this, the Kartvelian sister languages, none of which has a written record of old, are incomprehensible for speakers of Georgian.

1.2 Astonishingly enough, there were no attempts to record Georgian lexicographically before the 17th century; at least no traces of earlier lexicographical work have survived. The first dictionary of Georgian was the *Dittionario Giorgiano e Italiano* published in 1629 “for the use of missionaries” in the Vatican by Stefano Paolini, who was supported by a Georgian nobleman named Niķipore Irubakize. The first extant dictionary compiled within Georgia was the monolingual *Leksiķoni kartuli* by Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani, who worked on it between the years 1685 and 1716; it was first printed as late as 1884. Before that, several other dictionaries of Georgian had been published abroad, viz. first, the small Russian-Georgian *Leksiķon* in Goderzij Firalov’s Georgian “Teach yourself”-book of St.

¹ The latter two languages are often subsumed under the term “Zan”.

² The question if there are genetical relations between these families or beyond cannot be discussed here.

³ A different approach assumes only two periods, Old and Modern Georgian.

Petersburg, 1820, and second, Julius Klaproth's Georgian-French *vocabulaire* contained in his grammar of Georgian of 1827, which was printed in Paris. In 1840, Davit Čubinašvili published, with the support of Marie-Félicité Brosset, the first Georgian-Russian-French dictionary in St. Petersburg, and a Russian-Georgian and a Georgian-Russian dictionary by the same author followed between 1846 and 1891. Two dictionaries had been compiled before by the latter author's uncle, Niğoloz Čubinašvili, in the first half of the 19th century, one Georgian-Russian and one Russian-Georgian; they were first printed more than 100 years later, in 1961 and 1971–73.

1.3 From the steadily increasing production of Georgian dictionaries in the 20th century, we may first mention Richard Meckelein's Georgian-German and German-Georgian *Wörterbücher* of 1928 and 1937–43. The most remarkable autochthonous project of lexicography was the “Explanatory dictionary of the Georgian language” initiated and redacted by Arnold Čikobava, with eight volumes appearing between 1950 and 1964 (plus a compressed one-volume edition in 1986).⁴ Another remarkable achievement was the three-volume Georgian-German *Wörterbuch* by Kita Tschenkéli, published in Zürich between 1965 and 1974, with its German-Georgian counterpart compiled by Yolanda Marchev following in 1999. And in 2006, a “Comprehensive Georgian-English Dictionary” in two volumes appeared in London, with Donald Rayfield being its editor-in-chief.

1.4 Lexicographical work on the other Kartvelian languages began with word lists provided by travellers to, and explorers of, the Caucasus in the 17th and 18th centuries. The first word list of Megrelian was noted down by the Ottoman Turk Evliya Çelebi in the second volume of his “Book of Travels” (*Seyahatname*) of about 1640; the list, written in Arabic letters fully equipped with vocalisation marks, contains about 40 words (beginning with the cardinal numbers from 1 to 11) plus 12 idiomatic phrases.⁵ The second word list of Megrelian was compiled by Johann Anton Güldenstädt, a scientist who explored the Caucasus in service of the Russian queen Catharine the Great between 1768 and 1775; his “Vocabularium”, published posthumously in 1791 (as a “Wörtersammlung” of “Georgianische Mundarten”),⁶ was used by subsequent authors like Peter Simon Pallas (1786–1789), George Ellis (1788), and Julius Klaproth (1814). The first comprehensive dictionary of Megrelian was the Megrelian-Russian *slovar'* compiled by Ioseb Kipšidze and published in his grammar of 1914 (pp. 191–424), followed by the Megrelian-Georgian *leksikoni* which Petre Čaraia had finished before 1918 but which was printed only in 1997, in the same year as Givi Eliava's “Materials”. The most outstanding dictionary of Megrelian so far is that by Otar Kažaia, which appeared in four volumes between 2001 and 2014; another comprehensive Megrelian-Georgian dictionary is that by Alio Kobalia (2010).

For Svan, lexicography begins with Güldenstädt's word list again. As the first dictionaries proper, we may mention the Svan-Russian *slovar'* by Ivane Nižaraže, which appeared as vol. 41 of the journal *Sbornik Materialov dlja opisanija męstnostej i plemen Kavkaza* in 1910. Some years before, by 1888, the author's uncle, Besarion Nižaraže, had finished his Georgian-Svan-Russian *leksikoni*, which was printed as late as 2007. Both these dictionaries concern the Upper-Bal dialect of Svan, as does the Svan-English dictionary by Chato Gudjedjiani and Letas Palmaitis published in 1985. In contrast to

⁴ Work on a new edition of the “Explanatory Dictionary” has been going on at the A. Chikobava Institute of Linguistics, Tbilisi, since 2008.

⁵ Cf. Gippert (1992: 38–52) for a full treatment of Evliya's account of Megrelian (and ib.: 29–37 for his account of Georgian).

⁶ In Güldenstädt (1791: 496–504).

this, the Lashkh dialect is represented in the Svan-Georgian-Russian dictionary by Karpez Dondua, which was compiled in the 1930ies but appeared only in 2001; the Svan-Georgian dictionary by Aslan Liparteluri of 1994 relates to the patois of Choluri. The big Svan-Georgian dictionary by Varlam Topuria and Maksime Kaldani, which was published in 2000, was the first attempt to provide a cross-dialect dictionary of the Svan language. A first morpheme dictionary of Upper Svan is at present in the press (Čantlaze et al. 2016).

For Laz, a first word list with French translations was published by Hračya Ačaryan (Adjarian) in his “Étude sur la langue laze” of 1897, followed by the Laz-Russian *slovar*’ in Nikolaj Marr’s grammar of 1910. Since the late 1990ies, an ever increasing number of Laz-Turkish dictionaries have appeared in Istanbul, and two Laz-Georgian ones were published in 2012 (by I. Asatiani) and 2013 (by A. Tandilava).

1.5 In the following pages, I shall outline the development of Kartvelian lexicography using the example of Georgian, with special emphasis on the principles of the lemmatisation of nouns and verbs that have been applied throughout history. Reference to the sister languages of Georgian will only be made sporadically; given the close structural similarity of the four languages, most of the observations that hold true for Georgian also hold for the other members of the family.

2 The Development of Georgian Lexicography

2.1 The *Dittionario Giorgiano e Italiano*

As was stated above, the first dictionary of Georgian ever published was the Georgian-Italian *Dittionario* compiled by Stefano Paolini, the director of the printing house of the *Sagra Congregazione de Propaganda Fide* in Rome,⁷ for the use of Catholic missionaries. The Georgian who assisted Paolini was the nobleman Niķipore (later Niķoloz) Irubakize-Čoloqašvili (ca. 1585-1657), who was educated in Italy (ca. 1600-1608) before becoming the court priest of king Teimuraz I of Kakhetia. After fleeing to Jerusalem during the attacks of Shah Abbas I in 1614, he sojourned in Italy again between 1626 and 1629 as a messenger of king Teimuraz to Pope Urban VIII; it was during this sojourn that he must have met Paolini.⁸ From 1632 on, he was the counsellor of king Levan II Dadiani of Megrelia. After another sojourn in Jerusalem, which he undertook between 1643 and 1649, he became the catholicos of Megrelia and Abkhazia by order of Levan II in 1656 or 1657. Captured by Vameq III, the ruler of Odishi, in 1657, he died in prison in 1658, remaining acknowledged as a wise man and philosopher by his contemporaries.⁹ An Italian Theatine missionary named Teramo-Cristoforo (de) Castelli, who visited Georgia from 1632 to 1654, drew a sketch of

⁷ Cf. Santoro & Streicher (2003: 121).

⁸ Cf. Tamarati (1902: 92-132), Aķopašvili (1977), and Bagrationi-Orsini & Tabagoua (1981 / 1983) as to Irubakidze’s sojourn in Rome and his correspondence with the papal see.

⁹ Two other Irubakize-Čoloqašvilis, the poet Garsevan (1520-1574) and one Baadur, are mentioned in commemorative notes (so-called *agapis*) in the Jerusalem manuscript no. 24 (cf. Metreveli 1962: 86b and 94a). – In the Tbilisi manuscript no. Q-180, a codex of 1882 containing the so-called *Dilariani* (cf. Laraze 1903), Niķoloz Čoloqašvili is named as the author in a note on fol. 1r. The epic is usually attributed to Peṭre Laraze (1770-1837), whose authorship was contested by M. Žanašvili (1907: 5). The work in question must be distinguished from the *Dilarget(iani)* mentioned in the 12th century epics (Shota Rustaveli etc.), whose author was Sargis Tmogveli (cf. the edition by Čičinaze 1897 / 1916).

Irubakidze, which has survived in his Travel Notes.¹⁰

Looking at the first two pages of the *Dittionario*, which was the first book printed with Georgian *mkhedruli* letters ever,¹¹ it becomes clear at once that it was compiled with no linguistically based lexicographical method, and with no sufficient knowledge of Georgian. Of the 45 entries contained on pp. 3–4, twelve consist of more than one word without indication of a word boundary, as in the case of *abaróga* “Ma che?” obviously representing Georgian *aba rağa* “look, come on”, *auadári* “Ammalarsi” representing *avad ari* “he/she is ill”, *auicházi* “Inhumano” reflecting *avi kaci* “evil man”, or *aklamouidès* “Adesso è venuto” equalling *axla movides* “now they have come”, with the pluralic verb substituted by a singular. Not only *avad ari* “he is ill” is wrongly translated by an infinitive, but also other finite forms like the 1st person future *áual* = *aval* “I will go up” by “Ascendere” or the 2nd person imperative *aighè* = *aigè* “take up!” by “Alzare”; and *ádi*, which can only mean Georgian *adi* “go up!”, is even rendered by the preposition “Di”. In some cases, the verbal form simply remains unclear; this is true, e.g., for *auandunòb* “Mormorare”, which must conceal something like the 1st person sg. future form *davduduneb* “I’ll murmur”, or *aghmozenebéli* “Biastemare”, which possibly reflects the present participle *aǵmgzenebeli* in the sense of “stimulating”. The two entries *auadafpamò* “Maltrattare” and *auadafparè* “Maltrattato” are likely to contain *avad* “badly” again, but can *avad davparo* “I will hide badly” and *avad davpare* “I hid badly” be meant here? *aklia* “Tristezza, Compassione” must represent *aklia* “he/she/it is missing”, if anything, and the case of *avanía* “Calunnia” remains unclear even if it might be derived from *avi* “bad”.¹²

In the nominal domain, too, there are some questionable entries. While *agmosaulétisa*, i.e., *aǵmosavletisa*, the gen.sg. of *aǵmosavleti* “East”, may still be translated as an adjective “Orientale”, *pzoduils*, i.e. *codvils*, the dat.sg of *(p)zodulli*,¹³ i.e. *codvili* “sinful, sinner”, is by no means restricted to female persons as the translation “Peccatrice” suggests. While *pzóla* “Guerra” clearly stands for *b(r)zola* “battle”,¹⁴ the form *pzóle* “Battaglia” remains defective, no matter whether it represents the plural *b(r)zolebi* or the (obsolete) verbal noun *b(r)zoleba* “joining battle” (p. 77). On the other hand,

¹⁰ Cf. Bellio (1884: 677), according to whom Castelli wrote down the following words on “Niceforo Isbarghi” (sic!): “Parlando della sua vita, egli ne racconta dei tratti in più luoghi così : Niceforo Isbarghi, membro della Casa Reale di Georgia, monaco basiliano, venne in Europa nel 1624 e pregò Urbano VIII papa di mandare missionari che rafforzassero o convertissero al cattolicesimo i popoli della Georgia e dei paesi finitimi. E il Pontefice spedì Pietro de Avitabile, Giacomo di Stefano, Giuseppe de Judica, Vincenzo Caraffa, napolitani, Pietro de Jardina e Cristoforo Castelli, palermitani.” As to Castelli’s inheritance cf. also Licini (1980 and 1985) and Chikhladze (2013).

¹¹ Cf. Gippert (2016) for the Georgian text specimens printed in *nuskhuri* letters in S. Schweigger’s account of his travel to Istanbul in 1579 (printed for the first time in 1608).

¹² The form given in the *Dittionario* appears once as such in the Middle Georgian adaptation of the Persian *Šāhnāme* epic (Kobize 1974: 141, verse 693d of the metrical version of the so-called Utrutian-Saamiani). Considering the context of the prose version of the text (ib.: 216), the meaning must be something like “destruction”. The stem *avan-* occurs elsewhere in the same text (143, v. 712b; 154: v. 808b), as an adjective meaning something like “refusing, hostile”. There is no connection with *avan-i* “mortar”, which, together with its variant *avang-i*, is a borrowing from Persian *āwang* “id.” (vs. *avani* “vessels”, which reflects Arabic *awānī*, plural of *inā’* ‘vessel, vase’).

¹³ The word appears two times, once with initial *p-* (p. 77) and once without (p. 118).

¹⁴ Note that the word appears two times in the *Dittionario* (p. 77), in identical spelling but with two different meanings: “Guerra” and “Combattere”.

the verbal noun *kitxva* “interrogation” is represented by both *chitka* and *chitkua*, with two different translations (“Interrogare” and “Domandare”); and of the two participles pertaining to it, *chitkuli* = *kitxuli* “questioned” and *chitkeli* = *mkitxveli* “reader”, only the former is discernible with no doubt, the initial *m* being left out in the latter (p. 125).

Many of the examples treated so far have already shown that the Latin transliteration applied in the *Dittionario* is far from being consistent. Apart from mere curiosities such as the unmotivated “prothesis” of a <p> in *pzoduili* ~ *codvili* and the like, there is systematic confusion e.g. in the case of velars: <k> may stand for the fricative /x/ as in *ákla* = *axla* “now”, aspirated /k/ as in *aklémi* = *aklemi* “camel”, glottalised /k/ as in *aklia* = *aklia* “is missing”, uvular /q/ as in *auisitkuà* = *avi siṭqva* “bad word”, or voiced /g/ as in *kazmedili* = *gaçmedili* “cleaned” (p. 41). On the other hand, all these five phonemes can also be represented by the digraph <ch>, as in *auicházi* = *avi kac̣i* “bad man” or *auasáchi* = *avazaḳi* “robber” with glottal /k/, *abáchi* = *aba aḳ* “look here!” with aspirated /k/, *kuerzchi* = *ḳvercx̣i* “egg” with the fricative /x/ (p. 47), *parsciamáchi* = *paršama(n)gi* “peacock” with voiced /g/ (p. 73), or *schidua* = *ṣqidva* “buying” with uvular /q/ (p. 92). A similar picture can be seen in the representation of dental spirants and affricates: written <z> may stand for the voiceless affricate /c/ as in *auicházi* = *avi kac̣i* “bad man” or *za* = *ca* “heaven” (p. 116), glottalised /ç/ as in *mrzàms* = *mrçams* “I believe” (p. 65) or *zábli* = *çabli* “chestnut” (p. 116), voiced /z/ as in *pzóla* = *b(r)zola* “battle” or *zaghi* = *ẓag̣li* “dog”, but also voiceless /s/ as in *zauarkzáli* = *savarcxali* “comb” (as an instrument of torture), voiced /z/ as in *zamtári* = *zamtari* “winter”, or /ž/ as in *zámi* = *žami* “time, hour” (p. 116). On the other hand, /c/ can also be represented by <tf> as in *kátfi* = *kac̣i* “man” (vs. *auicházi* = *avi kac̣i* “bad man”, see above) and by <tz> as in its derivative *katzobriui* = *kac̣obriṿi* “human”, etc. (p. 44). Note that the <z> in *pálamizo* “Spalmare” (p. 73) reflects no Georgian sound at all, the word form being the 1st person sg. present of the Greek verb *παλαμίζω* “I smear”.

From all this, we may conclude that the entries in the dictionary were not written down by a Georgian. Instead, they must have been noted in Latin script off-hand, applying rules of Italian spelling; this is suggested by the application of <ch> for velar sounds especially before high vowels as in the name of the Georgian “co-author”, Irubaki-ze, which is written *Irbachi* on the title page (this spelling led to erroneous renderings such as *irbaxi* or *erbaxi* in Georgian contexts later).¹⁵ To be more precise, we may assume that the Latin word forms were noted down from dictation, which implies typical acoustical errors such as the confusion of /f/ and /x/ in *fafeli* “Nome” representing *saxeli* “name”. The rendering in Georgian script can only have been added at the end, on the basis of correspondence rules given in the alphabet table; and this process appears to have been “randomised” to a certain degree. It is hardly imaginable that a learned person like Niķoloz-Niķipore Irubakize-Čoloqášvili might have accepted the result as being a usable “Dittionario” of Georgian; whether or not he ever

¹⁵ Cf., e.g., Tamarati (1902: 96) with the nominative form *ᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑ* = <erbaxi> and (ib.: 96, 106, 115, 122) the dative form *ᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑ* = <erbaxs>; in a similar way, M.-F. Brosset notes the name as *ᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑ* (nominative) = <erbaxi> in his preface to Čubinašvili (1840, see below). In the Latin letter of Nov. 18, 1628 by Pope Urban VIII to King Philipp of Spain translated into Georgian by Tamarati (1902: 96), Irubakize is named “Nicephorus Erbaci^{us} Monachus S. Basiliⁱ” (ib.: 614; similarly in another letter of Dec. 2, 1628: ib.: 615), while in Italian letters by the Sagra Congregazione de Propaganda Fide, the name is spelt *Herbaci* (ib.: 615) or *Erbaci* (ib.: 617, 623, 627). More recent Georgian authors prefer the spelling *ᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑ* = <irbaxi>; cf., e.g., Aķopašvili (1977), the website of the *National Parliament Library of Georgia* or the *Georgian Wikipedia*. Bagrationi-Orsini & Tabagoua (1981) have the spelling *Irbakhi* in French (and *ᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑᵑ* = <irbaxi> again in the Georgian version of their article, 1983). Cf. note 10 above as to the erroneous spelling *Isbarghi* in Bellio (1884: 677).

took it into account, is uncertain.

What remains worthwhile investigating, is the notation of word accents in the Latin transcripts, a phenomenon that cannot be studied in Georgian written sources themselves as Georgian does not have accent marks at its command.¹⁶ For our present purposes, however, it may suffice to summarise that the *Dittionario* is anything but systematic in the structure of lemmatic entries it contains. Nominals mostly appear in nominative forms, but genitives and datives are also met with, and *aduilid* is by no means a noun “Facilità” but the adverbial case form, *advilad*, of the adjective *advili* “easy”. Verbs are often listed in forms of a 1st person sg. present or future or 2nd person imperatives, but other 2nd and 3rd person forms occur as well, as in the cases of *chíuis* “Dolere”, which represents *(s)tkivis* “it hurts (him / her)” (p. 124), or *kzínos* “Sonnolenza” and *kzinébia* “Sonnolento”, which must stand for *gzinavs* “you (sg.) sleep” and the (evidential) perfect form *gzinebia* “you (must have) slept” (p. 49). The fact that both these verbs have an “indirect” construction, with the subject in the dative case and an object prefix in the corresponding verb forms, is one of the major problems encountered by any lexicographer of Georgian (and the other Kartvelian languages). The corresponding verbal nouns, *tkivili* “pain” and *zili* “sleep” are also contained (in the forms *chiuli*, p. 124, and *kzili*, p. 49), but the relationship remains obscure to anybody who does not master the Georgian grammar, given that they are no regular formations.

2.2 Klaproth’s *Vocabulaire*

Different from Paolini, (Heinrich) Julius von Klaproth in his *Vocabulaire géorgien-français* of 1827 provides the Georgian material in Georgian script only, with no Latin transcription, and in quite reliable form. This is not astonishing, given that the author was a well-trained linguist who had learned to deal with many Oriental languages (including Chinese), his “Asia polyglotta” of 1823 having remained famous to the present day. Nevertheless, there are certain shortcomings that can be noted off-hand again. First of all, it can easily be proven, even on the first two pages, that Klaproth used Paolini’s *Dittionario* as a source. It is true that there is no trace of two- or multiple word expressions such as *aba raga* “look, come on!” or *aba ak* “look here!” in it, but many errors and uncertain words are repeated as in the case of *advilid* “Facilité” (p. 1), which should be *advilad* “easily”, or *avisari* “Peste” (p. 2), which can hardly be anything but *avi dari* (or *avdari*) “bad weather” or *avi zari* “bad bell”.¹⁷ In some cases, Klaproth improves on his predecessor as in the case of *abrešumi* “Soie”, which was written with <o> in the *Dittionario*, and he even adds etymologies for clear borrowings as in the case of the latter word, which he equates with Persian *abrīšum*.¹⁸ However, among the many items Klaproth listed for the first time (e.g., *abedi* “tinder”, *abi* “pill”, or *agaraki* “field”), there are again some uncertain or untestified words such as *adeli*, name of a “measure of three feet four English inches”, i.e. ca. 1 m, which appears alongside the common term *adli* equalling the Russian “aršin” (or the English “yard”), a measure of about 71,12 cm (all p. 1). More alarming are new errors such as *avziki* “robber, thief” (p. 2), which should be *avazaki*; here, Paolini’s *auafáchi* is

¹⁶ Cf. Gippert (2016) as to S. Schweigger’s testimony of the Georgian word accent.

¹⁷ The instrumental *avi zarit* occurs in a poem by Lela Samniašvili but without the figurative meaning assumed here (მომსკდარი ტყვიის ექოებოთ, ავი ზაროთ რომ იფარება “with the echoes of bullets bursting out, which are concealed by a bad bell”).

¹⁸ Klaproth’s spelling of the Persian word (p. 1) remains odd; instead of ابرشيم, we should expect ابريشم. The Georgian word, which is attested since the 11th c., clearly reflects the older (Middle) Persian pronunciation *abrēšum*.

even more correct.

Verbs are mostly cited in a 1st person sg. present form as in the case of *avdivar* “I am mounting” appearing instead of Paolini’s 1st person future, *ával* = *aval* “I will mount”. Other subject persons are avoided, e.g. by adducing the participial formation *avadmġopi*, lit. “being ill” (p. 2), instead of Paolini’s 3rd sg. present form *auadári* = *avad ari* “he/she is ill”. Besides finite 1st person sg. forms, Klaproth amply registers verbal nouns, often in the adverbial case which may well be used to render (final) infinitives as in the case of *adgomad* “Se lever” ~ “(in order) to stand up” (p. 1); however, there is no concept discernible as to his preferences.

2.3 Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani

The first dictionary from Georgia that has survived is the *Kartuli leksikoni* by Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani, a nobleman who was born in South-East Georgia in 1658. Orbeliani, who was educated at the Royal court before becoming a monk in the monastery of Davit Gareža and travelling to Europe as a missionary for King Vaxtang VI, also authored the first Georgian translation of the Indian *Pañcatantra* (under the title *Kilila da Damana*, translated from a Persian model) and the famous “Book of Wisdom and Lies” (*Sibrzne sicruisa*), a collection of fables and tales from various Oriental sources. The work on his dictionary, which he styled a *Siġqvis ĵona*, i.e. “bunch of word(s)”, extended from 1685 to 1716¹⁹ and has manifested itself in a total of six handwritten redactions, which are well documented in the academic edition of 1966. From the author’s testament added to the *Leksikoni*,²⁰ it is clear that his work was meant to substitute a former *Siġqvis ĵona* compiled by King Vaxtang V (1618–1675), which had been lost in his days.²¹ We also learn that Orbeliani took a “smallish Armenian dictionary” as the model²² and that he gained his material from the Bible and other theological writings as well as philosophical texts.²³ As to his method, he explains how he dealt with words whose meaning was not clear to him,²⁴ and he states that he expected others to continue and

¹⁹ Cf. Bolkvadze (1999) as to the background of Orbeliani’s lexicographical work.

²⁰ “Anderĵnamagi”, printed in three versions in Orbeliani (1966: 31-35).

²¹ The passage in question (Orbeliani 1966: 31) translates: “I, Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani, have devoted much effort to this book in my youth, because a dictionary of the Georgian language was not found, because the one that King Vaxtang V named *Siġqvis ĵona* had disappeared in the course of time. And as this valuable book had been lost, the Georgian language became depraved at (everybody’s) will. The son of King Vaxtang, my uncle King George (IX, 1651-1709), ordered me to set my hands to it” (redaction Z; redactions A and Cab are considerably shorter).

²² In translation (Orbeliani 1966: 31): “And I discovered one smallish Armenian dictionary, which is named *Bargirk* ‘in their language, and I lay hands on its imitation and noted down as much as I could” (Z; A and Cab shorter again).

²³ In translation (Orbeliani 1966: 31-32): “Whatever I found in the books, in the theological writings and the prophets, I excerpted. Some (words) I excerpted from the profound books of the philosophers ... and I noted them down for ease (of use), so that (the people) might learn the Georgian language” (Z; A and Cab shorter again).

²⁴ In translation (Orbeliani 1966: 32-33): “Whatever I knew (the meaning of), I wrote down. And of some of the difficult words I did not know, which I had found in the profound books, I verified (the meaning) in other languages, and when I found detailed (meanings), I simply listed them together. If I could not find (the meaning), I did not write down arguable (guesses) but marked those words with a sign in red ink in the margin, so that the words might be found by searching in other writings where they might be written as well” (Z; A and

complete his work,²⁵ also by adding material from foreign languages like Greek, Latin, Armenian, Russian, and Arabic.²⁶

What Saba does not tell us, is the way how he organised his dictionary linguistically with respect to its lemmatic entries. This, however, becomes quite clear if we look at some of the words beginning with the letter *hae* = <h> on the last two pages (410–411) of the edition 1844. Here we find, first of all, nouns like *hruli* “snooze”, correctly cited from Ps. 131.4, with the appropriate definition *mcire ram zili*, i.e. “a somewhat short sleep”. For *hroartagi*, cited from III Kings (21.8), Saba gives no explanation but simply refers to the “script” (*cerilši naxe* = “look in the script”); in redaction D of his work, which was not consulted for the 1844 edition but is available via that of 1966, he explains that the word means a “letter by kings, totally unalterable” (*h. ars çigni mepeta mieri, çovladve moušleli*; p. 466), which is quite correct again; the best translation for the Iranian loanword would be “missive”.²⁷ For *horoli*, Saba refers to another word he regards as a synonym, viz. *moaba* which, as an Arabic word, denotes a “sedan chair”. In the academic edition of 1966, the lemma is given as *horli* with the same reference to *moaba* (redaction Z) or its variant *muaba* (AB), plus a textual reference to *iosipos*, which means the Georgian version of the *Antiquitates Iudaicae* by Flavius Josephus. A lemma *horoli* is also contained, but only as a variant of *oroli*, which in its turn is correctly taken to mean a “lance” or “spear” (*šubi*; 1965: 608). As a matter of fact, there are no two different words here, the *horli* taken from Flavius Josephus representing the (irregularly) syncopated stem of *horoli* in the instr. pl. form *horlebita* which appears in book 8, ch. 12 of the *Antiquitates*; and this does not denote a “sedan chair” but just a sort of “lance”, as the equivalent of Greek σ(ε)προμάστης.²⁸ Another faulty lemma is Saba’s *hroni*, misprinted as *honi* in the 1844 edition, which is listed with reference to the Life of George the Hagiorite (*giorgi mtaçmidelis cxovrebaši*) from the 11th century, with no definition given. What we do find in par. 74 of the *vita*, is the personal name Aaron in the nom.sg. form, spelt *hroni* in five of the eleven manuscripts available (vs. *aroni* in four others and *haroni*, in two).²⁹ A

Cab shorter again).

²⁵ In translation (Orbeliani 1966: 33): “If someone of you finds (one of) the strange words elsewhere, or the translation of a word, or excerpts them from writings, add them to these books. For I have left over many words, some unheard, some unseen in the writings, and some because of the loss or oblivion of manuscripts” (Z; A and Cab shorter again).

²⁶ In translation (Orbeliani 1966: 33): “As far as I could, I tried to excerpt from Greek, Latin, Armenian, Russian and Arabic books, but I omitted a lot because I do not know any language other than Georgian. So I noted down only what (people) told me to be correct in those languages or what somebody verified; what was not verified, I did not register. May you whom God granted wisdom and learnedness complete it!” (Z; A and Cab shorter again).

²⁷ Cf. Andronikašvili (1966: 367) and Gippert (1993: 267–268) as to the etymology.

²⁸ Flav.Jos. Ant.Jud. 8.12.1: ἀνδρῶν ὀπλισμένων θυρεὸν καὶ σιρομάστην ~ მამაკაცთაჲ, რომელნი აღჭურვილ იყვნეს ფართითა და ჰორლებითა “men who were armed with shield and lances” (Melikišvili 1988: 42, 8–9). The same syncopated genitive occurs, e.g., in the 10th c. Šaṭberd codex (Gigineišvili & Giunašvili 1979: 243, 26 and 244, 33) while non-syncopated *horolisa* appears, e.g., in the Mxeta Bible (I Reg. 17.7; II Reg. 21.19; Job 39.23; cf. Dočanašvili 1982: 63 / 132 and 1983: 146). As the latter text is late (it was redacted by Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani himself, cf. below), it seems clear that the syncopated form is older (cf. Marr 1901: LXII who notes the peculiarity by adding “(sic)”).

²⁹ Cf. Abulaze (1967: 177, 3 with n. 3): ხოლო მეფისა მიერ წარმოვლინებულ იყო არონი, ხოლო თვისისა მამისა მიერ ჰყვეს ნეტარი ბერი პეტრე... “But sent out by the king was Aron, and from his father’s side, he was accompanied by the blessed monk Petre ...”. Cf. Peeters (1917–19: 135 n. 5) as to the

similar case is likely to be hidden behind the lemma *hreumisi*, which Saba glosses *simiata mçerali*, i.e. “semiographer, short-hand writer”, with no textual reference. This, too, may represent a Biblical name, viz. that of a certain ‘Ραουμ or Rehum mentioned in the book of Esra Zorobabel (4.23), who pertained to the entourage of the Persian king Artaxerxes: in the so-called Mçxeta Bible (ms. A-51), which was redacted by Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani himself, the name appears in the gen.sg. form *areumis* that might have been mistaken for a nominal stem. This is all the more probable as in the given context, another person is mentioned who is styled a “writer”.³⁰ The last nominal entry, *hroκonomozi*, which denotes a “sort of artisan” or “official” (*moqele ram aris*) according to Saba, remains obscure. It is clear that it must represent a Greek term like οικονόμος “housekeeper, manager, administrator” or παρoικονόμος “subordinate administrator”, but the word-initial deformation would be hard to motivate in both cases.³¹

All remaining entries of our sample are verbs. Among them, there is but one verbal noun, viz. *hooba*, which Saba paraphrases as *ē(e)s tkma*, i.e., “saying yes”. The other eight lemmas represent finite forms, mostly pertaining to the present tense, with a 3rd person sg. subject and the initial *h-* representing a 3rd person object marker as in *hlamis* “he/she wishes (to do)”, *hmaṭs* “he/she/it exceeds”, or *hnaḱūtavs* “he/she chisels out”,³² but imperfect forms like *hlamoda* “he/she wished (to do)” or *hlocvida* “he/she prayed”,³³ and aorist forms such as *hnaṭra* “he/she intended” and *hrkua* “he/she told him/her” are also found.³⁴ Different from that, *hpo(v)o* “you’ll find” is a 2nd person sg. optative form, with *h-* being the subject person marker.³⁵ On the other hand, imperative forms abound at the beginning of the dictionary, among the words with initial *aa-* such as *aabi* “tie up!”, *aabnie* “shed it upon!”, or *aabrune* “send it back up!”, but two 2nd person sg. future forms such as *aadvileb* “you’ll simplify” or *aaveb* “you’ll make it vicious” are also included (1965: 40). Thus we can see that there is no real “system” behind Saba’s choice of entries, the mere occurrence of a given form being

identification of the “Aaron” in question. The edition referred to as “*atonis krebuli*” in Orbeliani (1966: 466 n. 4) has the reading *hroni* (Xaxanašvili & Žanašvili 1901: 330, 35); for the Vita of Giorgi, it is based upon manuscript no. A-170 of the K. Kekelidze National Centre of Manuscripts, Tbilisi. Beyond that, the spelling *hroni* appears three times in the so-called Bakar Bible (the first printed Georgian Bible, of 1743), in Ex. 4.28, Num. 20.6, and Deut. 9.20.

³⁰ აღმოკითხა წიგნი წიხანზე არეუმის და საის მწერალის და მონათა მათთა “he read the letter aloud before Rehum and [Sam]sai the writer and their servants” (ἀνέγνω ἐνώπιον Ραουμ καὶ Σαμσαι γραμματέως καὶ συνδούλων αὐτῶν); for the Georgian text cf. Dočanašvili (1982: 361).

³¹ Cf. Gippert (1993: 22–23) as to the interchange of *-os-i* and *-oz-i* in Greek loanwords. In Modern Georgian, the form *eκonomosi* is attested alongside *eκonomi* (Čikobava 1950–64: III, 1310; Rayfield 2006: I, 640).

³² For *hmaṭs*, Saba provides a correct attestation in I Cor. (15.41). *hlamis* occurs several times in the Middle Georgian adaptation of the Persian epic of Vīs and Ramīn, the so-called *Visramiani* (Gvaxaria & Todua 1962: 103, 12 etc.). Instead of *hnaḱūtavs*, I only find the preverbal equivalent *dahnaḱutavs* (~ Gk. μετασχηματίζει “changes the form”) in the Georgian version of the works of the Neoplatonian Ammonius Hermiae (Rapava 1983: 100, 32).

³³ For *hlocvida*, Saba correctly notes Lk. 3.18; *hlamoda* occurs, besides the *Visramiani*, once in Rustaveli’s “Knight in the Panther’s Skin” (verse 1531a).

³⁴ For *hnaṭra*, Saba correctly indicates the 6th chapter of Ioane Petrici’s Georgian commentary on Proclus Diadochus and Plato (Qauxčišvili 1937: 29, 34; also chap. 23, ib. 63, 15); *hrkua* abounds in Old Georgian (more than 12,000 attestations in the *Georgian National Corpus*).

³⁵ The edition 1884 has the spelling *hpovo*, vs. *hpoo*, in the academic edition; both forms are widely attested in Old Georgian. Saba’s reference to Prov. 5.4 is correct again; besides, *hpo(v)o* occurs, e.g., in Mt. 17.27.

decisive.

Summing up, we may state that Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani's *Leksiḡoni* is an enormous treasure of "rare" words, including both obsolete and foreign terms but also some "ghost words" that are due to misunderstandings of Biblical and other text passages.³⁶ At the same time, the *Leksiḡoni* stands out for the many textual attestations it documents. Concerning verbal forms, however, there is no linguistically based system discernible, finite forms of all types occurring side by side.

2.4 Goderzi Pirališvili (Goderzi Firalov)

Even though Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani spent his last years in Moscow, no attempt of his to correlate his lexicographical work with the Russian language has survived. As a matter of fact, it took more than half a century after his death for the first Russian-Georgian word list to be compiled and published, in form of a *Leksikon* added as the sixth part to the Georgian "Teach-yourself" book by Goderzi Firalov, i.e. Goderzi Pirališvili (1768-1823), who worked as a writer at the court of King Erekle II before he moved to St. Petersburg in 1801. Among the ca. 2,500 entries of his word list, there are astonishingly few verbs; e.g., of the 62 entries of words beginning with Russian П on p. 161, only 10 are verbal, all cited in the 1st person sg. present and translated into the corresponding Georgian form: *пляшу ~ vtamašob, vroḡav* "I play, dance", *ползу ~ vcoḡav* "I crawl", *полощу ~ gamovrecx* "I rinse out", *полю ~ vhmargli* "I weed", *порскаю ~ uḡev, anu usev* "I set (dogs) to attack", *порхаю ~ vprinam* "I fly", *порчу ~ vaxden* "I spoil", *порю ~ varḡvev* "I unstitch", *почиваю ~ mḡinavs* "I rest", *пою ~ vasmev* "I give to drink". It is clear from this sample that the list was not meant to represent a "basic" vocabulary, given that common verbs like *поднимать / поднять* "lift up, raise", *подобать* "benefit", or *получать / получить* "receive, obtain" are missing, let alone perfectives like *положить* "lay, put down".³⁷ At the same time, we may note that some of the Georgian equivalents are dialectal (e.g., *vprinam* "I fly" instead of *vprinav*)³⁸ while others represent the language of the time (e.g., *gamovrecx* "I rinse out" instead of *gamovrecxav*).³⁹ An investigation into the background of Pirališvili's word list would indeed be worthwhile.

2.5 Niḡoloz Čubinašvili (Nikolaj Čubinov)

By the time when Firalov's *Samoučitel'* was published, another learned Georgian, Niḡoloz Čubinašvili (1788-1845), was working on the first comprehensive Georgian-Russian dictionary (*Kartuli leksiḡoni rusuli targmaniturt*, i.e. "Georgian lexicon with Russian translation"), which he completed in 1825; it took until the year 1961 for this work to be printed. Ten years later, A. Ġlonḡi also published the second *opus magnum* of the same author, the "Complete Russian-Georgian

³⁶ Cf. the remarks as to *hreamisi* above; for another example cf. Gippert (1993: 45–46) as to *manali* "camp".

³⁷ The imperfective "partner" of *положить, класть*, is comprised in the 1st person sg. present form *кладу* on p. 150, in two entries with the meanings *vačḡob* "I arrange" and *vhḡodav* "I wound".

³⁸ For the present stem *-prinam-*, the *Georgian National Corpus* gives 17 attestations, 14 of them from the *Georgian Dialect Corpus*. Saba has the verbal noun *prinva* (1966: 200), which matches *-prinav-*,

³⁹ The (root) stem *-recx-* is not attested at all with *gamo-* "out" in the *Georgian National Corpus*, vs. 14 attestations of *gamo--recxav-*. Saba has the verbal noun *recxa* (besides *rcxa*), which matches the root stem, as well as several derivatives (Orbeliani 1966: 11); *gamo--recx-* is not contained, however. The 1st person sg. present form *gangrecx* "I wash off from you" appears in Ez. 16.9 in the Jerusalem Bible (11th c.), matched by *čargrecx* in the Gelati Bible (12th c.); the Ošḡi Bible (of 978 A.D.) has the aorist form *ganvrcxi* (cf. Kciḡišvili 1976: 49 with n. 10), in accordance with Gk. ἀπέπλυα.

Dictionary” compiled by Čubinov between 1825 and 1837 (Čubinašvili 1971–73).⁴⁰ Looking at the latter work, we will notice immediately that the author’s claim to be “complete” was not exaggerated: the 50 entries comprised on pp. 332–333 of vol. II match exactly the number of entries we find between *поднимать* “to lift up” and *подобно* “similarly” in the big dictionary of the Russian Academy published in six volumes in Sankt Petersburg between 1806 and 1822,⁴¹ which can therefore be regarded as Čubinašvili’s primary source.⁴² Nevertheless, there is a major difference between the monolingual Russian *Slovar’* and its adaptation by the Georgian scholar: while the former usually lists verbs in the form of (both imperfective and perfective) infinitives, the only exception in the given sample being the impersonal verb *подобаem* “it fits” registered in the 3rd person sg. present, Čubinašvili presents his verbs in 1st person singular present / future forms throughout, with the same exception. It is likely that this practice, which we already noted for Klaproth’s *Vocabulaire* and Firalov’s *Leksikon*, was due to an influence of the lexicography of the classical languages, Greek and Latin, where the 1st person sg. present was the traditional lemma form used. It should be added that the 1st person sg. forms are contained in the Academy Dictionary, too, as grammatical information given, together with other forms, under the infinitives; in Čubinašvili’s lexicon, we find the corresponding forms, including the infinitives, under the 1st person lemmas. There is one more thing that throws an interesting light on the relationship between Čubinašvili’s lexicon and the Russian *Slovar’*, viz. the textual attestations mentioned for many words, which are often identical as in the case of Jac. 2.3 and Ps. 109.1 noted for *подножие* ~ *kuarxlbeki* “footstool”. In some cases, Čubinašvili adds further attestations, such as Ps. 98.5 adduced under the same word. Interestingly enough, only the latter verse does contain the word *kuarxlbeki* (this is the older spelling), as an equivalent of Gk. ὑποπόδιον; in Jac. 2.3 and Ps. 109.1, the same Greek word is rendered by *kueše perqta* “under the feet” in the Georgian Bible instead. In contrast to this, the Russian (Church Slavonic) Bible does have *подножие* in both these verses, so that we may suspect that Čubinašvili did not even check the Georgian Bible when he imported the citations.

2.6 Davit Čubinašvili (David Čubinov)

A big step forward in the lexicography of Georgian was achieved by a nephew of Ničo Čubinašvili’s, Davit, who spent most of his life (1814–1891) in St. Petersburg. His Georgian-Russian-French dictionary of 1840 was not only the first three-language-dictionary of Georgian but also the first that was published with an explicit description of the lexicographical method applied in it. It was not the author himself, however, who provided that description but the French scholar Marie-Félicité Brosset, a true pioneer of Georgian studies who worked in Russia as a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences from 1838 to 1880. In his preface to Čubinašvili’s dictionary, he wrote.⁴³

⁴⁰ N. Čubinašvili died in 1845 after having visited Jerusalem; his short report on Georgian manuscripts in the Monastery of the Holy Cross (published posthumously in Cagareli 1894: 44–52) is dated May, 3–4, 1845.

⁴¹ Cf. *Slovar’* (1820: 1302–1306).

⁴² Cf. A. Ġlonṭi in Čubinašvili (1971: 9–10 / 17–18) as to other sources used by the author.

⁴³ In the original: “Voici la marche que l’auteur a cru devoir suivre. Comme la connaissance du nom-verbal, tenant lieu d’infinitif en géorgien, est indispensable pour arriver à celle du verbe, et que ce nom verbal est presque toujours l’expression la plus simple des radicaux, l’auteur a pris les noms-verbaux pour base de son classement, les a rangés alphabétiquement et mis sous chacun les verbes qui en dérivent. – Quant aux autres noms et aux adjectifs, primitifs ou dérivés du nom-verbal, il les a mis en leur place alphabétique; de sorte que ce dictionnaire participe à la fois de l’ordre par racines, seulement en ce qui concerne les verbes, et de celui par

This is the path the author felt obliged to follow. Given that it is indispensable to know the verbal noun, which substitutes the infinitive in Georgian, in order to understand the verb, and given that the verbal noun is nearly always best suited to demonstrate the root elements, he took the verbal nouns as the basis for his arrangement, ordered alphabetically and as the head entry of all verbal forms deriving from them. – Concerning other nouns and adjectives, be they primary or derived from verbal nouns, he listed them in alphabetic order. In this way, the dictionary exhibits both the arrangement by roots, in the case of verbs, and that by derivatives, for the rest. This method has the advantage that it involves less danger of omitting individual verbs that would otherwise have to be listed all under one letter, $\mathfrak{z} = \nu$, which is the prefix of the first person indicative. Having experienced the usefulness of the precognition of the root elements in Georgian myself, I realised that this method would also be useful for others, and even though it may temporarily be regarded as being less convenient than the arrangement preferred elsewhere, I encouraged the author to choose this procedure.

The actual method applied by Čubinašvili can easily be demonstrated by looking at the lemmas appearing on p. 31. Here we find, first of all, the verbal noun *aǵdgoma* “standing up”, classified as a *n[om d’]act[ion]*⁴⁴ and accompanied by the 1st person sg. future form of the intransitive verb *aǵvsdgebi* “I’ll stand up”, which is styled a *v[erbe] n[eutre]* and translated by the Russian and French infinitives “вставать” and “se lever”. As a separate lemma, we then see *aǵdgoma* listed a second time as a *n[om] s[ubstantif]* denoting the “resurrection”. Next we have the verbal noun *aǵduǵneba* with two finite forms pertaining to it, viz. the intransitive *avsduǵnebi* “I’ll boil up” and its transitive counterpart, the *v[erbe] a[ctif]* *aǵvaduǵeb* “I’ll bring to the boil”. The following lemma is a verbal noun again, viz. *aǵeba* “taking”, in its turn provided with two different transitive formations, viz. the “subjective” *aǵviǵeb* (with its newer orthographical variant *aviǵeb*) “I’ll take, accept for myself”, and the “neutral” *aǵvaǵeb* “I’ll open”. *aǵeba*, too, is listed a second time as a substantive denoting the “last day before Lent” (“dernier jour gras”), and the verbal noun is also contained in *aǵeb-micema* “commerce”, lit. “taking-(and)-giving”, and its participial derivate *aǵeb-mimcemi* “merchant”, lit. “take-giver”. The subsequent verbal noun is *aǵelveba*, as well furnished with two finite forms, the transitive *avaǵelveb* “I’ll undulate, agitate” and the intransitive-passive (styled a *v[erbe] r[éfléchi]*) *aǵelvdebis* “it’ll become agitated”. The first but last entry, *aǵviareba*, classified as a substantive “confession”, could have been treated as a verbal noun, too, given that finite forms such as *aǵviareb* “I’ll confess” do exist.⁴⁵ In contrast to this, the last lemma on the page, *aǵviredi*, is a pure nominal formation, with its meaning being given as “golden bridle”.

Thus, the plan outlined by M.-F. Brosset was accomplished, with the remarkable innovation that different diatheses (active, passive, reflexive, “neutral”) are included in a more or less systematic way,

dérivés pour le reste. Cette méthode avait l'avantage de laisser moins de chances pour oublier des verbes simples, qu'il aurait, d'ailleurs, fallu mettre tous sous une seule lettre, le \mathfrak{z} : w, préfixe de la première personne de l'indicatif. Ayant éprouvé par moi-même l'utilité de la connaissance préliminaire des radicaux géorgiens, j'ai pensé que cette méthode serait aussi avantageuse pour d'autres, et malgré l'inconfort momentanée qui en résulte et fait préférer généralement l'autre disposition, j'ai engagé l'auteur à suivre ce procédé.” (Brosset apud Čubinašvili 1840: 3–5).

⁴⁴ The abbreviation is missing in the list on p. 16 but explains itself.

⁴⁵ As a matter of fact, *aǵviareba* is secondary, with the 1st person prefix spread into the verbal noun by analogy; Old Georgian clearly shows that the 3rd person was *aǵiarebs* originally (attested, e.g., in the Sinai homiliary of 864, Šaniže 1959: 107, 8) alongside the 1st person *aǵviareb* (e.g. in the Legend of Barlaam and Josaphat, Abulaze 1957: 118, 15) both suggesting a verbal noun **aǵareba*, which was replaced by *aǵsaareba-* in Old Georgian.

partially including the so-called “versions” (“subjective, objective, neutral”). Not so innovative is Čubinašvili’s Georgian-Russian-French dictionary with respect to citations, which are mostly taken from the Bible as in Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani’s *Leksiḡoni*; they are not necessarily the same, however, and sometimes hard to verify.⁴⁶ A clear dependency from the latter work manifests itself in many rare and obsolete lemmas registered in Čubinašvili’s dictionary, including errors and ghost words. One such case is *aḡviredi*: with both its classification as a noun and its translation as a “golden bridle”, Davit Čubinašvili (as well as his uncle Niḡo before him)⁴⁷ obviously relies upon Saba’s lemma *aḡwredi*, which is given with the same meaning (*okros lagami*). What the Čubinašvilis do not quote, is the reference to the IIIrd book of Esdras (Zorobabel) we find in Saba’s lexicon; here, however, we see that *aḡwredi* is not an independent word but the second part of an exocentric compound *okro-aḡwredi*, which means “equipped with a bridle of gold”, with “gold” being represented by *okro-* and *aḡwr-ed-i* being an adjectival derivative of *aḡwr-i* “bridle”.⁴⁸ While *okro-aḡwredi* occurs a second time, in Euthymius the Athonite’s Georgian translation of the commentary of the Gospel of Matthew by John Chrysostom,⁴⁹ attestations of *aḡwredi* alone, which by itself would mean something like “equipped with a bridle”, seem not to exist.⁵⁰

2.7 Richard Meckelein

Such shortcomings notwithstanding, it was clearly Davit Čubinašvili with his three big dictionaries, Georgian-Russian-French, Russian-Georgian, and Georgian-Russian, who paved the way for the lexicographical work on Georgian in the 20th century, especially with the use of verbal nouns, also called *masdars*, as lemmatic entries as proposed by Brosset. This principle is clearly visible, e.g., in R. Meckelein’s Georgian-German and German-Georgian dictionaries of the 1920ies and 30ies. On pp. 23–24 of the former, we find the five verbal lemmas from *aḡdgoma* to *aḡviareba* we discussed above, all given as verbal nouns, with but one minor difference consisting in the replacement of *aḡduḡneba* by the younger variant *aḡduḡeba*. Different from Čubinašvili, however, Meckelein provides neither textual references nor finite verbal forms; instead we find past participles such as *aḡdgomili* “auferstanden” or *aḡebuli* “genommen”, and also a nominal derivative *aḡdegi* denoting the “last Sunday before Advent” (“Totensonntag”). Meckelein’s dependence from Čubinašvili (and, lastly, Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani) becomes nevertheless apparent by the inclusion of faulty lemmas like *aḡviredi* “Zaum mit goldenem Mundstück” (see above).

2.8 Arnold Čikobava

The verbal noun is also the basic lemmatic form for verbs in the “Explanatory Dictionary” initiated by Arnold Čikobava, which appeared in eight volumes between 1950 and 1964. Beyond that, the

⁴⁶ The citation for *aḡeba* given as “Ps. XXXVII, 7” may refer to Ps. 38.9 instead where we have *aḡvaḡe* “I opened”. The reference to “Gen. VIII, 9, 10” under *aḡdgoma* is not verifiable at all. For the latter word, Saba cites “6, 26 baruk”, which is correct (Baruch = Ep.Jer. 6.26).

⁴⁷ The Georgian-Russian dictionary (1961: s.v. *aḡviredi*) gives the meaning “raxṭi, okroti daperili da mortuli lagami”, i.e. “bridle, gold-plated and adorned”.

⁴⁸ III Esr. 3.6: აღსუან იგი საჯდარსა ოქრო-აღვრედსა “they placed him upon a mount with a golden bridle”.

⁴⁹ Chap. 53; Šaniḡe (1996–1999: III, 79 and 2014: II, 142).

⁵⁰ Another erroneous entry copied by Čubinašvili from Saba is *gošpelakṭni* “golden earring”; cf. Gippert (1993: 73–76).

dictionary abounds in lemmata that are headed by finite forms, in this case 3rd person sg. forms of either the present or the future tense. E.g., *aġeb-s* (I, col. 745) is a 3rd person sg. present form meaning “I open”; the fact that perfective forms of this verb take the preverb *ga-* is indicated by the 3rd person aorist and perfect forms $\lceil ga \rceil a\acute{g}o$ and $\lceil ga \rceil u\acute{g}ia$ subsumed under the lemma, with the preverb given in half brackets. The future form *ga-aġeb-s* is registered as well (under the letter *g*: II, 89), but as a separate lemma, with the same aorist and perfect forms added. In this way, there is hardly any danger for a given verbal formation to be omitted, including all combinations with preverbs and all diatheses and versions; this all the more true since participles like *aġdgomil-i* “resurrected” or *aġebul-i* “taken” are also listed (I, 745/747).⁵¹ Considering that the lemmas are plentifully illustrated with textual examples from Georgian literature beginning with 19th century authors like Ilia Čavčavaġe, and taking into account that dialectal terms are also comprised to a certain degree, the *Ganmartġebiti Leksiġoni* is with no doubt the most comprehensive dictionary of Modern Georgian that we possess. At the same time, it must be stated that it does not contain “obsolete” or “rare” words from the more distant past so that it cannot be used for medieval or even older texts.

2.9 Donald Rayfield

The basic principles of the *Ganmartġebiti leksiġoni* are also followed in the “Comprehensive Georgian-English Dictionary” that was published under the guidance of Donald Rayfield in two volumes in 2006. Here, too, the *masdar* is the main lemmatic entry form for verbs, and 3rd person singular present or future forms as well as participles are also registered systematically; the Georgian-English Dictionary thus opens the huge lexicographical treasury of A. Čikobava’s work for non-native speakers of Georgian. At the same time, there is a major difference in that Rayfield and his co-authors tried to cover the Georgian language diachronically, including lots of “obsolete” words from Middle and Old Georgian times, the latter mostly taken from I. Abulaġe’s “Materials of an Old Georgian dictionary” (1973) and its continuation by Z. Sarġvelaġe (1995).⁵² Even though it is not stated explicitly,⁵³ Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani’s *Leksiġoni* also left its traces in it, including some dubious or erroneous words; this is true, e.g., for the obscure “sedan chair” *horli* (see above) and its variant *horeli*,⁵⁴ which obviously arrived here via D. Čubinašvili’s dictionaries.⁵⁵ On the other hand, *aġviredi* is not perpetuated as such but only in the compound *okrosaġvired-i* “with a golden bridle”, which is a younger variant of *okro-aġwredi*.⁵⁶

Be that as it may, the Georgian-English Dictionary is well suited to illustrate the complexities of the Georgian verbal system once again. As in the *Ganmartġebiti Leksiġoni*, perfectivising preverbs are indicated by the addition of aorist and perfect forms below a 3rd singular present lemma form. This is the case, e.g., with *aġebs* “opens”, for which Rayfield provides *gaāġo* and *gaugia* (p. I, 122) just as Čikobava did (but without half brackets). In a case like *aġebinebs*, the causative of *aġebs*, a total of

⁵¹ The basic principles of the dictionary are outlined in Čikobava (1950–64: I, 011–013).

⁵² Both these dictionaries also use the *masdar* as the basis of lemmatic entries of verbs; finite forms are only listed if the verb in question has no verbal noun or for cross-references.

⁵³ For the principles adapted cf. Rayfield (2006: I, vii–xvi) in English and (ib.: xxi–xxxiii) in Georgian.

⁵⁴ Both words appear as separate lemmas in Rayfield (2006: II, 1727), the latter referring to the former.

⁵⁵ Čubinašvili (1840: 691 and 1887: 1778) has the one lemma *horeli*, *horli* with the meaning given as “palanquin” etc.

⁵⁶ Rayfield (2006: II, 1082); *okrosaġviredi* appears in III Esr. 3.6 in the Mxeta Bible (redacted by Orbeliani himself, see above; Dočanašvili 1982: 405), vs. *okroaġwredi* in the 10th c. Ošġi Bible (cf. Kurciġiġe 1970: 34).

six preverb combinations are given together with their different meanings, viz. *ga-aġebina* “has sth. opened”, but also *a-aġebina* “has sth. booked”, *amo-* “has sth. drawn”, *mi-* “has sth. admitted”, *še-* “has sth. painted”, and *çamo-* “makes sb. vomit sth.” (ib.). At the same time, the forms display the systematical interchange of version vowels within paradigms and beyond; note, e.g., the perfect form *ga-u-ġia* with “objective” version vowel vs. “neutral” *-a-* in the present *a-ġebs* and the aorist *ga-a-ġo*, or the “relative” version vowel *-e-* in the passive future and aorist forms *aġ-e-vseba* and *aġ-e-vso* “will be / was filled for sb.” which disappears in the perfect form *aġ--vsebia*. For the causative *aġebinebs*, the underlying (basic) verb is indicated as *a-i-ġebs*, with the “subjective” version vowel *-i-*, etc. And of course, irregularities and suppletivism in the formation of verbal paradigms had to be accounted for, too. E.g., the 3rd person future form *ava* as the lemmatic entry “he will go up” is provided together with the 1st and 2nd person forms *aval* and *axval*, as well as the 3rd person plural *avlen*, but also the three singular persons of the aorist, *avedi*, *axvedi* and *avida*, and the 3rd person perfect, *asula* (I, p. 23); except for *avlen*, all these forms are also indicated in the *Ganmartebiti Leksikoni*, which additionally lists the 1st and 2nd person perfect, *avsulvar* and *asulxar* (I, 143). The lemma *ava* is referred to from its more regular “by-form” *avals* (ib.), but not from *adis*, which is the 3rd person present form “he goes up” (I, 20); as the corresponding aorist and perfect forms show (*avida*, *axvedi*, *asula*), this is actually the suppletive present tense of *ava(ls)*, so that there is a notable lack of cross-reference here – again in agreement with the *Ganmartebiti Leksikoni*.

2.10 Kita Tschenkéli (Kıta [Peṭre] Čxenġeli)

The intension to avoid incoherencies like this may have been the reason for Kita Tschenkéli, a Georgian from Kutaisi who came to study in Germany in 1920 and spent most of his life in Hamburg and Zurich, to choose a totally different way of representing Georgian verbs. In his three-volume “Georgisch-deutsches Wörterbuch”, which appeared in fascicles between 1965 and 1974, this author does provide verbal nouns (styled “inf(initives)”) like *aġeba* “Einnahme, Erhebung ...” or *aġelveba* “Wogen, Brandung, Erregung ...” and participles such as (*aġelveb*)*uli* “bewegt, erregt ...” as lemmatic entries (p. I, 43–44), but by far not consistently and in a much less exhaustive way than the *Ganmartebiti Leksikoni* does. The major difference from the latter consists in the fact that Tschenkéli does not register finite forms of verbs as lemmas. Instead, his basic entry form is the abstract verbal root, under which all subparadigms of transitive (“T”), medial (“MV”), passive (“P”, “RP”), “indirect” (“IV”), and causative formations (“KT”) are subsumed, all indicated primarily by 1st person singular present and future forms together with the corresponding aorist and perfect forms and thus including all preverb combinations and versions, plus the relevant verbal nouns. This results in an extremely complex structure of entries, which sometimes extend over many pages as in the case of the root *ġ* (II, 1602–1609) underlying the verb noted as *aġebs* in Čikobava’s and Rayfields dictionaries.

First of all, this root is divided into two (*ġ¹* and *ġ²*, with the two distinct basic meanings of “open” and “take”). Under *ġ¹*, we first find a transitive verb in “neutral” version (“T¹”), *vāġeb*, which, in combinations with the preverbs *amo-*, *ga-*, *gamo-*, *da-*, *še-*, and *šemo-* in its perfective forms, carries meanings like “aufklappen”, “öffnen”, “offenbaren”, “aufsperrn”, “aufmachen”, or “halb aufmachen”. Next, Tschenkéli lists the transitive verb in “objective” version (“T³”), *vūġeb*, again with four preverb combinations (*ga-*, *da-*, *še-*, *šemo-*) and meanings such as “open sth. for sb.” (“etw. für jdn. öffnen”). Under the same root, we further find the causative (“KT”) *vāġebineb*, with five preverb combinations, and the passive in “relative” version (“RP”), *eġeba*, which only combines with *ga-*. Under *ġ²*, the first formation listed is the transitive verb in “subjective” version (“T²”),

viġeb, with a total of 12 preverb combinations and meanings like “aufnehmen, auf sich nehmen”, then another “objective” *vuġeb* (with 11 preverbs), the transitive verb in “superessive” version (“T⁵”), *vageb* (with preverb *a-*), another causative *vagebineb*, the passive with preradical *i-*, *iġeba*, the “relative” passive *eġeba*, the “relative” passive of the causative, (“RP¹ b”) *veġebinebi* “become the object of gossip” (“Gegenstand des Geredes/Klatsches w[erden]”), and the “indirect” verb (“IV¹”) *magebinebs* meaning something like “sth. makes me vomit”.

In the case of suppletivism, Tschenkéli’s solution consists in subsuming the root variants suppleting each other in a given (set of) verbal paradigm(s) under one main root entry. In the maximal case of the verb meaning “go”, this results in a total of nine roots being joined with *svl*, viz. *di³*, *val^l*, *va^l*, *vl^l*, *ved*, *vel^l*, *vid*, *s⁴*, and *ar^l* (II, 1219–1241). This permits to bring together under one heading present formations such as *a-vdivar* “I go up” with the future *a-val*, the aorist *a-vedi*, the perfect *a-vsulvar*, the pluperfect *a-vsuliqavi*, and corresponding forms of other persons such as the 3rd sg. present *a-dis*, the 3rd sg. aorist *a-vida*, or the 2nd sg. aorist *a-xvedi*; note that the main root form, *svl*, is only represented in verbal nouns such as *a-svla*.

2.10.1 Tschenkéli’s predecessors

There can be no doubt that Tschenkéli’s approach is linguistically well founded, and the detailed explanation of his method outlined in the introduction to the first volume of his *Wörterbuch* (pp. XI–XXXI) is certainly one of the most thorough analyses of the Georgian verbal morphology ever published. Nevertheless, it must be stated that Tschenkéli was by no means the inventor of the root-based analysis of the Kartvelian verbal system. As a matter of fact, a similar method was applied in the early dictionaries of both Laz and Megrelian, which appeared as appendices to the grammars by Nikolaj Marr (1910) and Ioseb Kipšize (1914), and it was certainly the former author who was responsible for this innovative solution. Looking back to M.-F. Brosset’s introduction to the Georgian-Russian-French dictionary by Davit Čubinašvili of 1840, we might suppose that the innovation was envisaged even some 70 years earlier, given that Brosset explicitly talks about “roots” and “radicals”; however, Brosset did not go so far as to suggest to take the root proper as the lemmatic entry form, as we have seen above. And even though it is likely that Marr did study Brosset’s works thoroughly, we may rather suspect that his preference for root-based entries derived from his preoccupation with Semitic languages such as Arabic or Hebrew, the lexicography of which has traditionally been based upon verbal roots. Whether or not Kita Tschenkéli met Marr in his youth, in Georgia or in Moscow, is unknown, and it is not very probable that he did, as his first object of study was law, not linguistics or philology; yet, he may well have become acquainted with Marrian ideas in the first 25 years of his life, between 1895 and 1920,⁵⁷ so that the assumption that his approach was lastly based upon Marr’s is anything but far-fetched.

2.10.2 Pondering pros and cons of the different approaches

The question remains which approach is better suited for the lexicographical representation of Georgian (and, correspondingly, the other Kartvelian languages). In my view, this depends a lot on the envisaged target group of users. Native speakers, who may look for definitions of meanings rather than grammatical information, will certainly prefer an approach which is less “analytical”, given that they will easily be able to derive verbal nouns from given finite forms, and they will not need much additional information as to the latter, maybe except for questions of normativity. In contrast to this,

⁵⁷ Tschenkeli, born 1895, studied law in Moscow from 1913 to 1917 before going to Germany in 1920.

non-native speakers, especially learners, may have difficulties in deriving verbal nouns while the extraction of an abstract root from given finite forms may be a simpler task; so they may prefer a root-based approach as the one applied by K. Tschenkéli. For linguists, too, the approach of analysing morphological structures in a given verbal form with a view to determine a root may be more adequate, while for non-linguists it may remain awkward. Thus, there is no clear preponderance for the one or the other approach, and we can simply be happy that we have access to the rich lexicon of Georgian in so different ways.

3 Outlook: The GNC Approach

In the 21st century, lexicology is undergoing notable changes due to the necessity of applying it in digital environments. With the emergence of big text corpora, the need to structure the data has made lemmatisation a primary task beyond lexicography proper, and this is also true for Georgian. In the project of the *Georgian National Corpus* (GNC), which is meant to cover the whole diachrony of written Georgian up to the present day, this task had to be envisaged right from the beginning, and the approach chosen is, so-to-say, a twofold one. Given that one of the main functions of a corpus is to provide search functions, it is clear that a form like *axval*, the 2nd person sg. future meaning “you will go up”, must be retrievable as such, which is easy to implement; within the 200 Mio. word forms contained in the GNC, a search for the form yields a total of 93 attestations from the 12th century on. However, for more sophisticated analyses, e.g. on the syntax of a given verb, it will be indispensable to be able to search for all the different tense, mood, aspect, and personal forms appearing in a given verbal paradigm altogether without having to enter all of them separately. In the GNC, this is provided by the verbal nouns, in the given case *asvla*, being linked as searchable lemmatic entries to every single finite form. At the same time, the morphological analysis is also provided, thus facilitating a search for the use of, e.g., 2nd person sg. forms independent of the verb they pertain to. Beyond that, the root analysis is also provided, thus admitting to search across the paradigms of all the individual verbal formations sharing this root, which in the given case is *svl[a]* / *v[a]l* (with the preverb *a-*). In this way, distinct forms like *axval* and its perfect tense equivalent, *asulxar*, are linked together via the same verbal noun, *asvla*, the same “head” root, *svl[a]*, and the same preverb, *a-*, all searchable in their own right, and the search for *asvla* as their “simple” common lemma yields a total of 13,040 attestations comprising forms so different as the 3rd person sg. aorist *avida*, the 3rd person pl. imperfect *adioden*, the 2nd person sg. imperative *adi*, or the 1st person sg. future *aval*. Searching for the root-based lemma *svl*, we even receive 871,001 hits, a figure that gives an idea of the diversity of formations sharing this root.

It is clear that the implementation of the underlying grammatical knowledge base cannot yet be 100% reliable, all the more since spelling errors in the corpus still exist. However, the GNC can and will be improved continuously, and the increasing number of linguistic investigations that are based upon it shows that the attempt to combine both the “verbal noun” and the “root” approach was well founded.

4 References

- Abulaze, I. (1957). *Balavarianis kartuli redakciebi*. Tbilisi: Mecnierebata Akademia.
 Abulaze, I. (red.) (1967). *Žveli kartuli agiograpiuli liŕaturis zeglebi*. II. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
 Abulaze, I. (1973). *Žveli kartuli enis leksikonu. Masalebi*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
 Adjarian [Ačāryan], H. (1897). Étude sur la langue laze. In *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*

- 10, pp. 145-160; 230-240; 364-401.
- Andronikašvili, M. (1966). *Narkvevebi iranul-kartuli enobrivi urtiertobidan / Studies in Iranian-Georgian Linguistic Contacts*. Tbilisi: Tbilisis Universiteti.
- Akopašvili, G. (1977). *Kartveli diplomați Niķoloz Ćoloķašvili – Niķipore Irbaxi (XVII s.): samecniero-popularuli narkvevi*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Asatiani, I. (2012). *Lazuri leksiķoni. Zmnuri zir-puķeebi*. A-H. Tbilisi: Arķanuķi.
- Bagrationi-Orsini, K. & Tabagoua, I. (1981). Une ambassade gėorgienne en Europe (Nicėfore Irbakhi). In *Bedi Kartlisa* 39, 139-152. Georgian version: Bagrationi-Orsini, K. & Ťabagoua, I. (1983). Kartuli □□elĉoba evropāši (Niķepore Irbaxi – XVII s.), In *Mravaltavi* 10, pp. 199-210.
- Bellio, V. (1884). La Georgia e la Mingreglia secondo un missionario italiano del secolo xvii. In *Bollettino della Societā Geografica Italiana* 21 / Ser. 2, 9, pp. 673-708 [plus figures after p. 740].
- Bolkvadze, T. (1999). The Georgian Dictionary by Sulĉhan-Saba Orbeliani (1658-1725). In S. Auroux, *History of Linguistics 1999: Selected papers from the Eighth International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences, 14–19 September 1999, Fontenay-St.Cloud, Amsterdam: Benjamins*, pp.142-152.
- Bucakliři, İ. A. & Uzunhasanoęlu, H. (1999). *Lazuri-Turkuli Nenapuna / Lazca-Türkĉe Sōzlik*. İstanbul: akyūzyayıncılık.
- Bucakliři, İ., Uzunhasanoęlu, H. & Aleksiva, İ. (2007). *Būyūk Lazca Sōzlik / Didi Lazuri Nenapuna*. İstanbul: Chiviyazıları.
- Cagareli, A. A. (1894). *Svėdėnija o pamjatnikax" gruzinskoj pis'mennosti*. I/3. Sanktpeterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk".
- Ćantlaze, I., Giķerti, I. [Gippert, J.] & Margiani-Subari, K. (2016). *Zemosvanuri morpemuli leksiķoni*. Tbilisi / Frankfurt (in the press).
- Ćaraia, P. (1997). *Megrul-kartuli leksiķoni*. Tbilisi: Peķagogiuri Universitetis Gamomcemloba.
- Chikhladze, M. (2013). Cristoforo Castelli's narration: between the word and image. *IFLA World Library and Information Congress: 79th IFLA General Conference and Assembly, 17-23 August 2013*, Singapore. Accessed at: <http://library.ifla.org/53/1/095-chikhladze-en.pdf> [25/06/2016]
- Ćiĉinaķe, Z. (1897). *Dilariani, kmnili XII saukuneři*. Ťpilisi: Ťaraķe; 2nd edition: *Dilariani Sargis Tmogvelisa*, Ťpilisi: Ganatleba 1916.
- Ćikobava, A. (red.) (1950–64). *Kartuli enis ganmarķebiti leksiķoni*. I-VIII. Tbilisi: Mecnierebata Aķademia. Online version accessible at: <http://www.ena.ge/explanatory-online> [25/06/2016]
- Ćikobava, A. (red.) (1986). *Kartuli enis ganmarķebiti leksiķoni. Erttomeuli*. Tbilisi: Mecnierebata Aķademia.
- Ćkiĉiřvili, T. (1976). *Ezeķielis ĉignis ķveli kartuli versiebi*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Ćubinařvili / Ćubinov / Tchoubinof, D. (1840). *Kartul-rusul-franciculi leksiķoni / Gruzinsko-russko-francuzskij slovar' / Dictionnaire gėorgien-russe-franĉais*. Sanktpeterburg: Imp. Akademija Nauk.
- Ćubinařvili / Ćubinov, D. (1846). *Rusul-kartuli leksiķoni*. Sanktpeterburg: Imp. Akademija Nauk. 2nd edition: 1886. 3rd edition: Tbilisi 1901.
- Ćubinařvili / Ćubinov, D. (1887–1891). *Kartul-rusuli leksiķoni / Gruzino-russkij slovar'*. Sanktpeterburg: Imp. Akademija Nauk.
- Ćubinařvili / Ćubinov, N. (1961). *Kartuli leksiķoni rusulis targmaniturt / Slovar' gruzinskogo jazyka s russkim perevodom* (red. A. Ćlonĉi). Tbilisi: Sabĉota Sakartvelo. Accessible at: <http://meskhi.net/lexicon/> [25/06/2016]
- Ćubinařvili / Ćubinov, N. (1971–1973). *Rusul-kartuli leksiķoni / Russko-gruzinskij slovar'* (red. A.

- Ġlonṡi). Tbilisi: Sabṡota Sakartvelo.
- Ĥxenṡeli, K. see Tschenkéli, K.
- Doċanašvili, E. (1982). *Mcxeturi xelnaċeri (Mepeta I, II, III, IV, Nešṡta I, II, Ezras I, II, III ċignebi)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Doċanašvili, E. (1983). *Mcxeturi xelnaċeri (Ṳobis, Ivditis, Esteris, Iobis ċignebi, Psalmuni, Igavta ċigni)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Dondua, K. (2001). *Svanur-kartul-rusuli leksikoni*. Tbilisi: Pedagogiuri Universiṡetis Gamomcemloba.
- Eliava, G. (1997). *Megrul-kartuli leksikoni (masalebi)*. Martvili / Tbilisi: Inṡelekti.
- Ellis, G. (1788). *Memoir of a map of the countries comprehended between the Black Sea and the Caspian*. London: Edwards.
- Erten, M. (2000). *Lazca-Türkċe – Türkċe-Lazca Sözlük / Lazuri-Turkuli – Turkuli-lazuri nenapuna*. İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar Yayinevi.
- Firalov / Pirališvili, G. (1820). *Samouċitel', soderžašċij v sebě grammatiku, razgovory, nrovouċeniċa i leksikon na rossijskom i gruzinskom jazykax*. St. Peterburg: Ioannesov.
- Georgian Dialect Corpus*. Accessed at: <http://gnc.gov.ge> [25/06/2016].
- Georgian National Corpus*. Accessed at: <http://gnc.gov.ge> [25/06/2016].
- Gigineišvili, B. & Giunašvili, E. (1979). *Šaṡberdis ċrebuli X sauċunisa*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Gippert, J. (1992). The Caucasian language material in Evliya Ĥelebi's 'Travel Book'. A Revision. In G. Hewitt (ed.), *Caucasian Perspectives*. Unterschleissheim / München: Lincom, pp. 8-62.
- Gippert, J. (1994). *Iranica Armeno-Iberica. Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Gippert, J. (2016). Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Kartvelsprachen. 2. Frühe Zeugnisse des georgischen Wortakzents. In I. Hauenschild, M. Kappler & B. Kellner-Heinkele (eds.), *Eine hundertblättrige Tulpe – Bir šadbarċ lāla. Festgabe für Claus Schönig*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, pp. 87-104.
- Gudjedċiani, Ch. & Palmaitis, L. (1985). *Svan-English Dictionary*. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books.
- Göldenstädt, A. (1791). *Reisen durch Rušland und im Caucasischen Gebürge* (ed. P.S. Pallas), II. Theil, St. Petersburg: Kays. Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Gvaxaria, A. & Todua, M. (1962). *Visramiani. The Old Georgian Translation of the Persian Poem Vis o Ramin*. Tbilisi: Mecnierebata Aċademia.
- Kažaia / Kajaia, O. (2001–2009). *Megrul-kartuli leksikoni / Megrelian-Georgian Dictionary*. 4 vols. Tbilisi: Neċeri.
- Kipšidze, I. (1914). *Grammatika mingrel'skago (iverskago) jazyka s xrestomatieju i slovarem*. S.-Peterburg: Imp. Akademija Nauk.
- Klaproth, J. (1827). *Vocabulaire et grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. Paris: Dondey-Dupré.
- Klaproth, J. (1814). *Kaukasische Sprachen. Anhang zur Reise in den Kaukasus und nach Georgien, Halle und Berlin*: Hallisches Waisenhaus.
- Klaproth, J. (1823). *Asia polyglotta*. Paris: Schubart.
- Kobalia, A. (2010). *Megruli leksikoni / Megrelian Dictionary*. Tbilisi: Artanuċi .
- Ķobizė, D. (1974). *Šahnames anu Mepeta ċignis kartuli versiebi / Shah-Nameh. Georgian Versions*, vol. III. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Kurċiċize, C. (1970). *Žveli aċtkmis apokripebis kartuli versiebi*. I. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Laraže, M. (1903). *Dilariani, txzuleba Peṡre Larazisa*, Ṳpilisi: Šaliċašvili.
- Licini, P. (1980). *Carteggio inedito di D. Cristoforo Castelli: chierico regolare, missionario in*

- Georgia e Mingrelia*. Milano: Politecnico (Ricerca sull' architettura georgiana, 21)
- Licini, P. (1985). Cristoforo Castelli e la sua missione in Georgia. In *Regnum Dei. Collectanea theatina* 41 / 3.
- Liparteluri, A. (1994). *Svanur-kartuli leksiķoni (Čoluruli ķilo)*. Tbilisi.
- Marchev, Y. (1999). *Deutsch-Georgisches Wörterbuch*. Freudenstadt: Kaukasus-Verlag.
- Marr, N. Ja. (1901). *Ippolit". Tolkovanie pėsni pėsnej*. S.-Peterburg: Imp. Universitet" (Teksty i razyskanija po armjano-gruzinskoj filologii, 3).
- Marr, N. Ja. (1910). *Grammatika č'anskago (lazskago) jazyka s xrestomatieju i slovarem*. S.-Peterburg: Imp. Akademija Nauk".
- Meckelein, R. (1928). *Georgisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Berlin / Leipzig: de Gruyter.
- Meckelein, R. (1937–1943): *Deutsch-georgisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin / Leipzig: de Gruyter.
- Melikišvili, N. (1988). *Ioseb Plaviosi, Motxrobani iudaebrivisa zuelsitquaobisani*. II. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Meřreveli, E. (1962). *Masalebi ierusalimis kartuli ķoloniis iřtoriisatvis (XI-XVII ss.)*. Tbilisi : Mecniereba.
- Niřaraze / Niřaradze, B. (2007). *Kartul-svanur-rusuli leksiķoni. Balszemouri dialekti / Gruzino-svansko-russkij slovar'. Verxnebal'skij dialekt*. Tbilisi: Universali.
- Niřaraze / Niřaradze, I. (1910). *Russko-svanskij slovar'*. In *Sbornik Materialov dlja opisanija mėsťnostej i plemen Kavkaza* 41 (priloženie).
- National Parliament Library of Georgia*. Accessed at: <http://www.nplg.gov.ge/emigrants/ka/00000126/> [25/06/2016].
- Orbeliani, S.-S. (1884). *Kartuli leksiķoni*. Rap. D. Eristvis redakťorobit. Tbilisi: Ķalandaze.
- Orbeliani, S.-S. (1965–1966). *Leksiķoni kartuli*. 2 vols. Tbilisi: Sabčota Sakartvelo.
- Pallas, P. S. (1786–1789). *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa / Sravniteljnye slovori vřex jazykov i narečij*. 2 vols. Sanktpeterburg: řnor.
- Paolini, St. & Irbachi, N. (1629). *Dittionario Giorgiano e Italiano*. Roma: Sagra Congregatione de Propaganda Fide.
- Peeters, P. (1917–1919). *Histoires monastiques géorgiennes*. In *Analecta Bollandiana* 36–37, pp. 5–317.
- Piraliřvili, G. see Firalov / Piraliřvili, G.
- Rapava, M. (1983). *Amonios Ermisis txzulebebi kartul mčerlobaři*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Rayfield, D. (ed.) (2006). *A Comprehensive Georgian-English Dictionary*. 2 vols. London: Garnett.
- Qauxčišvili, S. (1937). *Ioane Petricis řromebi. II: Ganmarťebay Proķlesatws Diadoxosisa da Platonurisa Pilosopiisatws*. Tbilisi: Tbilisis Saxelmčipo Universiťetis Gamomcemloba.
- řaniže, A. (1959). *Sinuri Mravaltavi 864 člisa*. Tbilisi: Saxelmčipo Universiťeti.
- řaniže, M. (red.) (1996–1999). *Čm. Ioane Okropiri, Targmanebay Mates saxarebisay*. 3 vols. Tbilisi: Bečđviti Siťqvis Ķombinaři. 2nd edition: 2 vols. Tbilisi: Betania 2014.
- Santoro, M. & Streicher, H. (2003). *Geschichte des Buchhandels in Italien*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sarřvelaze, Z. (1995). *řveli kartuli enis leksiķoni. Masalebi*. Tbilisi: Tbilisis Universiťeti.
- Slovar' (1820). *Slovar' Akademii Rossijskoj po azbučnomu porjadku raspoložennyj. Č. IV: O–P*. Sanktpeterburg: Imp. Akademija Nauk".
- Tamarati, M. (1902). *Iřtoria ķatoliķobisa kartvelta řoris / Histoire du catholicisme en Géorgie*, Tbilisi: Gamomcemloba Kartvelta Amxanagobisa.
- Tandilava, A. (2013). *Lazuri leksiķoni (lazuri nenapuna)*. Tbilisi: Saari.

Topuria, V. & Kaldani, M. (2000). *Svanuri leksiķoni / Svan dictionary*. Tbilisi: Kartuli ena.

Tschenkéli, K. (1965–1974). *Georgisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 3 vols. Zürich: Amirani.

Wikipedia. Accessed at: https://ka.wikipedia.org/wiki/ნოკოლოზ_ბოლოყაშვილი [25/06/2016]

Xaxanašvili, A. & Žanašvili, M. (1901). *Atonis iveriis monaštris 1074 ḡ. xelnaḡeri aḡapebit*. Tbilisi : Čarḡviani.

Žanašvili, M. (1907). Saištorio sabutebis šesḡavlis mdgomareoba čvenši da axlad aḡmočenili axali ‘Kartlis cxovreba’. In *Našromi* [1], pp. 3-14.