Relationship between the Kartvelian Roots \( *\gamma\text{n}- 'wine' \) and \( *\gamma\text{un} - 'creep, curve, twist' \)
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Thomas Gamkrelidze & Viacheslav Ivanov’s fundamental work, based on lexical borrowings and structural-typological similarities of the Indo-European, Kartvelian, and Semitic Proto-Languages, confirms that the Georgians (Kartvelian tribes) together with the representatives of ancient civilizations (Indo-Europeans and Semites) historically belong to the same chronological stage. In this respect, the lexical units denoting ‘wine’ in the above-mentioned languages, being the subject of much research, seem very notable. The views on the Kartvelian origin of the respective stems are as old as that of considering the Kartvelian form as an Indo-European borrowing. Various viewpoints exist because the reasonable etymology of the stem has not been established based on Kartvelian data. The paper examines the Common-Kartvelian stem \( *\gamma\text{vin} - 'wine' \), reconstructed by the comparison of Georgian, Megrelian, Laz, and Svan (resp. Kartvelian languages) linguistic data. Taking into account that the root represents a regular form defined by the rules of Kartvelian ablaut alternations, it is possible to regard this form as a Kartvelian stem derived from the verb \( *\gamma\text{un} - 'creep, curve, twist' \), and not as an Indo-European borrowing, as it used to be accepted. Thus, another linguistic-typological parallel between Kartvelian and Indo-European languages has been revealed at the lexical level.
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Introduction

Reconstruction of the ancient spiritual and material culture of the ancestor people according to linguistic data is called the linguistic paleontology of culture. The common-language vocabulary reconstructed by means of the comparative-historical method, taking into consideration the universals of structural typology is the basis of the proto-language semantic vocabulary. The relationship of reconstructed words and word combinations with the corresponding denotations and definitions of their cultural-ecological and historical-geographical features makes it possible to talk about the culture of the common language-speaking people. By matching the latter with certain archaeological cultures we obtain information about the area of the original spread of the ancestor language and the migratory routes of speakers of the dialects derived from it. Restoring the picture of such migrations and the movement trajectory of dialects is, at the same time, the
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study of the ethnogenetic prehistory of peoples speaking the respective languages (Gamkrelidze et al. 2016).

According to Th. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov’s fundamental work, in terms of historical origin, the Georgians (the ancient Kartvelian tribes) together with the Indo-Europeans and Semites belong to the same chronological level and appear in Asia Minor among the peoples of the ancient civilization that is confirmed by lexical borrowings and structural-typological similarities of the Indo-European, Kartvelian and Semitic proto-language systems, explained supposedly by the areal proximity (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984, p. 647). In this respect, the lexical units denoting “wine” in the above-mentioned languages, being the subject of a lot of research, seem very notable (Figure 1). The views on the Kartvelian origin of the respective stems are as old as that of considering the Kartvelian form as the Indo-European borrowing (Bopp 1847, Marr 1915, Charaia 1918, Chikobava 1942, Melikishvili 1965, Javakhishvili 1986, Tsereteli 2001).

**Figure 1. The Map of Matches of the Word “Wine” in European Languages**
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Th. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov reconstruct in the common Indo-European the *ṷ(e/o)in-o- “wine” form, which, due to the wide area of its spread, is considered as a migratory term. In the authors’ opinion, the structure of the Common Indo-European word, denoting “wine”, is based on the ancient Indo-European rules of word production – according to the regular alternation of ablaut grades, on the basis of which it is possible to etymologize this stem, namely, to
relate it to the verb-root *yei-/* yi- ‘twist; wave, wind; braid, plait’ and to the archaic words derived from it (including ‘climbing plant’, ‘vine plant sprout’). The words coming from Indo-European *yei- root with vowel alternation have spread also in other languages: Old Egypt. wnš ‘fruit of plant’, ‘grape’, ‘wine’ (zero grade of ablaut of the Indo-European stem with the -š suffix); in the Semitic, the Indo-European stem is borrowed with o vowel (compare Semitic *Wajn ), this Indo-European nominal stem entered the Common-Kartvelian with zero grade of ablaut: *γwino- (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984, pp. 647–650).

Borrowing from either Egyptian or Semitic is less probable in Indo-European: in the area of spread of these languages, vines or vineyards grow less. It is quite possible to admit that in Indo-European *ywino ‘wine’ stem was borrowed from Kartvelian – viticulture, and winemaking are the oldest agricultural fields of Georgian tribes. According to archaeological data, for the Late Bronze Age, vine culture and viticulture were widely developed in Transcaucasus (Javakhishvili 1986, Phruidze 1974, Bardavelidze 2006). This is evidenced by the multitude of names of grape species in the Kartvelian languages, by the rich terminology related to the care of vines and vineyards, and by the ancient rites or monuments of material culture as well.

According to Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, the supposition of borrowing from Kartvelian to Indo-European would cause the transformation of the borrowed word in such a way in Indo-European that it would be necessary to rethink it and it would be difficult to find a connection with the Indo-European root *yei- ‘twist’. At the same time, within the limits of the Kartvelian languages it is difficult to determine the antiquity of the Kartvelian root *ywino- ‘wine’ and to relate it to derivative *wenaq- ‘vineyard’, which is considered to be a borrowed stem from Indo-European at the Georgian-Zan level. As mentioned above, according to the authors, despite the existence of ancient centers of viticulture and wine culture in the Transcaucasus, it seems that the original Kartvelian names were replaced by the borrowed stems (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984, pp. 649, 651; also, see Klimov 1964, p. 83, Fähnrich and Sarjveladze 2000, pp. 198–199).

The stem γwino is not included in H. Fähnrich & Z. Sarjveladze’s “Etymological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages” (Fähnrich and Sarjveladze 2000).

Klimov restores the archetype *ywino- on the Georgian-Zan level based on the following correspondences: Georg. γwino- ‘wine’: Megr. γwin-i: Chan. γ(w)in-i ‘wine’. He considers the Svan γwinel ‘wine’ as a Georgian borrowing, while he deems that the stem *γwin- ‘wine’ came to Kartvelian from Indo-European (Klimov 1964).

Tsotsanidze considers γvino as a two-morpheme lexeme, composed by the root γwin- and the stem formative suffix -o (Tsotsanidze 2012). He lists the stems, formed by the suffix -o (k’al-o, p’al-o, c’al-o, yer-o, ǯval-o, etc.), which indicates that the -o suffix formation is an organic model for the Georgian language and γvino belongs to this category. Megrelian γwin-i corresponds to Georgian γvin-o (compare Georgian c’q’ar-o (‘spring, source’): Megr. c’q’ar-i). The corresponding lexeme in Svan is γvin-al/γvin-el. G. Tsotsanidze concludes that in the Kartvelian languages the term denoting ‘wine’ is represented by the stems derived from the
common root by the different suffixes, and supposes the root morpheme *γvin- at the Common-Kartvelian level (being of the CVC structure) with γv- labial cluster having monophonematic value.

Earlier, in the work “The sonant system and ablaut in the Kartvelian languages. A typology of Proto-Kartvelian structure”, Th. Gamkrelidze and G. Machvariani consider the stems: Georgian γvin-o, Meq./Laz γvin-i, Svan γuín-āl ‘wine’ as a kind of violation of the ablaut relations between the root and suffix morphemes within the Common-Kartvelian nominal stems, in particular, as an example of later formation (Gamkrelidze and Machvariani 1965, pp. 281–282).

The diversity of the above-mentioned opinions, supposedly, is caused by the fact that it was not possible to etymologize the stem γvino based on the data of the Kartvelian languages.

Fähnrich restored the stem *γvin- ‘wine’ on the basis of the following correspondences of Georgian γvin-o ‘wine’: Meqgr. γvin-i ‘wine’ : Laz γ(v)in-i ‘wine’ : Svan γvin- (γvin-el/γvin-āl ‘wine’) at the Common-Kartvelian level. In his opinion, linguistic and extra-linguistic factors show that γvin- is the Kartvelian stem, in particular, the nominal form of the verbal stem *γun- ‘curve’; ‘twist, spin’ (Fähnrich 2002, pp. 35–36, 2007, p. 486).

H. Fähnrich has reconstructed the Common-Kartvelian stem *γun- on the basis of the following correspondence: Geogr. γun- (γun-v-a ‘curve, curl, twine, spin’) : Megr. γun- (γun-u-a ‘curve, curl, twine, spin’), γun-k’-u-a ‘spin, curve’) : Laz γun- (γun-i ‘hive, etymolog. twist, winding’) : Svan γun- (u-γun-a ‘elbow’). The root γun- is often found in Old Georgian: romel vals ǰunal (who goes his way bowed down, Baruch 2,18 (Jerusalen Bible); mjunured vidodis (was going bended), Isu Sirach 12,11 (Oshki Bible). Kartvelian data show regular phonemic correspondences (See Klimov 1964, pp. 22–23, Fähnrich 2007, p. 135). H. Fähnrich and Z. Sarjveladze have reconstructed the Common-Kartvelian root *γun-/γul- (Fähnrich and Sarjveladze 2000, pp. 524–525; see also Lomtatidze 1959). H. Fähnrich deems possible the relation of this root to γvino (Fähnrich 2007, p. 501;1 for semantic parallels compare grexi - the name of one of the Georgian species of grape-vine (Javakhishvili 1986, Lekiashvili 1972). And, in general, it should be noted that naming the plants typologically most often is determined by the names either of flower or of fruit.

Methodology: Canonical Form of the Common-Kartvelian Root and the Ablaut Rules

In Common-Kartvelian, as well as in Indo-European, the canonical form of the root is C°,VC°₂, where C° can be either a plosive consonant or sonant (Melikishvili 1980).

There are three subtypes of the basic canonical form:

---

1Machavariani (2006, pp. 128–130) and Khakhishvili (2011) also suppose that the stem γvino has a verbal origin.
In the general formula, C can always be replaced by S (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984, pp. 216–217).

The root γun-, which we are interested in, belongs to the 3rd subtype (according to the canonical form CSVS), but being the zero grade of ablaut. If we take into account that u is a reflex of syllabic allophone of the sonant */û/, we can deem that the full grade of ablaut of the corresponding root could be of the type *γûVn-, where V mostly is represented as a vowel, either e or a. As there are much more verb roots with the vowel e, more likely this could be *γüên-. In the zero grade of ablaut /û/ would turn out in the position between the consonants and would be represented as a syllabic allophone u (γun-).

Ablaut grade forms der-k'/dr-ek'/dr-k'/dr-ik' (represented correspondingly in the following forms of Old Georgian: še-v-der-k', v-dr-ek', še-dr-k'-a, v-dr-ik'-e), as it is known, are being restored also in Common-Kartvelian; the Old Georgian models of ablaut alternation accurately reflect the Common-Kartvelian models of ablaut alternation (Gamkrelidze and Machvariani 1965, p. 204). The mentioned forms are supposed by assuming a two-morpheme verb stem: on the one hand, the verb root *der-, on the other hand, the stem-forming suffix *-ek’. The mechanism of ablaut alternation (both in Common-Kartvelian and in Indo-European) is based on the monovocalism principle, which means that in the sequence {root+suffix/suffixes} only one morpheme can have full grade. The sequence *{der(root)+ek’} (suffix) in Common-Kartvelian is realized as follows:

- *der-k’ (root in the full grade of ablaut, suffix in the zero grade of ablaut);
- *dr-ek’ (root in the zero grade of ablaut, suffix in the full grade of ablaut);
- *dr-k’ (root in the zero grade of ablaut, suffix also in the zero grade of ablaut, due to the suffix -a in the full grade, the more one being added at the end of *dr-k’ sequence);
- *dr-ik’ (root in the zero grade of ablaut, suffix in the grade of reduction of ablaut (i in the Common-Kartvelian is reconstructed not as a vowel, but as a syllabic allophone of a sonant), due to the suffix -e in the full grade, the additional one being added at the end of the *dr-ik’ sequence).

Discussion

By the analogy of the above-mentioned ablaut regularities, we can consider the form *γüen- as a verb stem with two morphemes: on the one hand, the root *γû- (being the zero grade of the root γVû-), and, on the other hand, the suffix -en in the full grade. Accordingly, the stem *γüên- reconstructed at the Common-Kartvelian level, will be a regular form, determined by the mechanism of ablaut alternation, the complete analog of the stem dr-ik’, where the basic morpheme is in the zero grade of ablaut (γû-), and the suffix is in the grade of reduction (-en).
Thus, it is quite acceptable that the form *γvin- was the stem of the Common-Kartvelian derived from the verb root γυν- denoting ‘creep, curve, twist’ and not an Indo-European borrowing, as it was considered up to now. In general, while discussing the relationship between the Kartvelian and Indo-European names denoting ‘wine’ in terms of borrowings, more precisely, in terms of the direction of borrowings – from Kartvelian to Indo-European (Marr 1915, Jawakhishvili 1986, Melikishvili 1965, Tsereteli 2001), or vice-versa (Klimov 1964, Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984) – it is necessary to answer the main question:

What phonetical process is typologically more acceptable – simplification of the complex: γw>w (Kartv. *γvin-→Indo-Eur. *vin-), or complication of the root with #γ- in Kartvelian?

If we admit borrowing from Indo-European, then appearing of γ before w needs to be explained. Generally, the development of velars/uvulars (namely g) before v (resp. ū) is quite common (Chikobava 1942, pp. 124–161) and, thus, this direction of borrowing is acceptable.

However, borrowing of the γvin- from Kartvelian to Indo-European seems to be reasonable: Because in Proto-Indo-European fricative γ is not restored, simplification of the cluster, the initial phoneme of which is unusual for the language, is quite admissible in Indo-European. In addition, among the structural patterns of Indo-European roots, the only one root starting with [velar/uvular voiced + ū] cluster is reconstructed, and in Indo-European dialects also such roots are marked, and less common (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984, pp. 1119–1120). We think that simplification of a cluster by losing an initial element seems natural in Indo-European, since there are known many cases of such simplification (mostly that of harmonic clusters) when borrowing from Kartvelian to Indo-European, e.g.: Georg. t’q’av-: Megr. t’q’eb-: Laz t’q’eb- “leather”, and Greek k’ov- “leather”; Georg. mt’k’var-: Zan *(m)t’k’ur- ‘(river) Kura’, from which naturally is formed the Old Greek version of this hydronym: historical Greek Κύος ‘Kura’ is derived from the Zan root *(m)t’k’ur by means of *(t)k’→k’ (natural simplification of #mt’k’- cluster, unusual for Greek); in their turn, the names of the same river in different languages (Turkish-Azerbaijani Kur, Russian Кыырa, Occidental Kura, etc.) are derived from the latter Old Greek form (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 2008, pp. 175–176).

Thus, the γw- cluster was likely to be simplified in Indo-European and, according to the above-mentioned rule of cluster simplification, the initial consonant γ would be lost. With such an assumption, a different interpretation is possible of the Welsh form gwin-, the explanation of which requires additional argumentation within the frames of the Indo-European languages. Pokorny considers these lexemes (together with the Old Irish form fin-), according to the vowel, as borrowings from Latin (Pokorny 1959, p. 112). However, it is also possible to deem that those are the forms in zero grade of ablaut (as in Anatolian), and so, gwin- should be qualified as the properly ancient Celtic form (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984, p. 647). From such point of view, the Armenian gini- form turns out to be an archaic Indo-European form (cf. the opinion of Giorgi Tsereteli, who
regards the form *gini* “wine” in Armenian as a stem borrowed from Kartvelian and relates it with the Laz form (Tsereteli 2001, p. 9): Georg. *γvino* : Laz *γ(v)jini* > Armen. *gini* “wine” (like other stems, borrowed from Zan: Georg. *cxovar-i* : Chan. *cxur-i* : Armenian *w’očxar* “sheep”; Zan *šunj* > *šuǯ* : Armenian *šunč* “soul, spirit”; see Gamkrelidze, Machvariani 1965, pp. 149, 286–287). At the same time, such an assumption would explain more consistently the forms of some ancient languages containing initial velar/uvular (e.g., Urartian *Gświłdini* “vineyard”, see: Melikishvili 1965, p. 411, Gabeskiria 2015).

**Conclusion**

Thus, at this stage, based on the analysis of existing facts and material, both directions (borrowing from Kartvelian to Indo-European or vice versa) seem acceptable, and deciding in favor of either requires revealing new material and an integral comprehension of data from adjacent fields of linguistics.

Finally, we can conclude that one more linguistic-typological parallel was definitely revealed between the Kartvelian and Indo-European languages, this time at the lexical level.
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