

Relationship between the Kartvelian Roots * γ wn- ‘wine’ and * γ un - ‘creep, curve, twist’

By Rusudan Asatiani*, Marine Ivanishvili[±] & Ether Soselia[°]

*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 * γ 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 * γ un- denoting '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.*

Keywords: Kartvelian languages, Indo-European languages, Semitic languages, Comparative-Historical linguistics, Kartvelian ablaut patterns, the lexeme wine

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

* Associate Professor, Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia.

[±] Associate Professor, Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia.

[°] Associate Professor, Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia.

relate it to the verb-root* *uei-/* ui-* ‘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 **uei-* 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: **ɣwino-* (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 **ɣwino* ‘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 **uei-* ‘twist’. At the same time, within the limits of the Kartvelian languages it is difficult to determine the antiquity of the Kartvelian root **ɣwino-* ‘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 *ɣwino* is not included in H. Fähnrich & Z. Sarjveladze’s “Etymological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages” (Fähnrich and Sarjveladze 2000).

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

Tsotsanidze considers *ɣwino* as a two-morpheme lexeme, composed by the root *ɣwin-* 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*, *ɣer-o*, *žval-o*, etc.), which indicates that the *-o* suffix formation is an organic model for the Georgian language and *ɣwino* belongs to this category. Megrelian *ɣwin-i* corresponds to Georgian *ɣwin-o* (compare Georgian *c'q'ar-o* ‘spring, source’): Megr. *c'q'ar-i*. The corresponding lexeme in Svan is *ɣwin-al/ɣwin-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 * $\gamma vin-$ at the Common-Kartvelian level (being of the CVC structure) with $\gamma v-$ 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 $\gamma vin-o$, Megr./Laz $\gamma vin-i$, Svan $\gamma \hat{u}in-\hat{a}l$ ‘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 $\gamma vino$ based on the data of the Kartvelian languages.

Fähnrich restored the stem * $\gamma win-$ ‘wine’ on the basis of the following correspondences of Georgian $\gamma vin-o$ ‘wine’: Megr. $\gamma vin-i$ ‘wine’ : Laz $\gamma(v)in-i$ ‘wine’ : Svan $\gamma win-$ ($\gamma win-el/\gamma win-\hat{a}l$ ‘wine’) at the Common-Kartvelian level. In his opinion, linguistic and extra-linguistic factors show that $\gamma win-$ is the Kartvelian stem, in particular, the nominal form of the verbal stem * $\gamma un-$ ‘curve’; ‘twist, spin’ (Fähnrich 2002, pp. 35–36, 2007, p. 486).

H. Fähnrich has reconstructed the Common-Kartvelian stem * $\gamma un-$ on the basis of the following correspondence: Georg. $\gamma un-$ ($\gamma un-v-a$ ‘curve, curl, twine, spin’) : Megr. $\gamma un-$ ($\gamma un-u-a$ ‘curve, curl, twine, spin’), $\gamma un-k'-u-a$ ‘spin, curve’) : Laz $\gamma un-$ ($\gamma un-i$ ‘hive, etymolog. twist, winding’) : Svan $\gamma \hat{u}n-$ ($u-\gamma \hat{u}n-a$ ‘elbow’). The root $\gamma un-$ is often found in Old Georgian: *romel vals iyunal* (who goes his way bowed down, Baruch 2,18 (Jerusalem Bible); *myunared 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 * $\gamma un-/yul-$ (Fähnrich and Sarjveladze 2000, pp. 524–525; see also Lomtadze 1959). H. Fähnrich deems possible the relation of this root to $\gamma vino$ (Fähnrich 2007, p. 501;¹ for semantic parallels compare *grexi* - the name of one of the Georgian species of grape-vine (Javakhishvili 1986, Lekhiashvili 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 $C^{\circ}_1VC^{\circ}_2$, where C° can be either a plosive consonant or sonant (Melikishvili 1980).

There are three subtypes of the basic canonical form:

¹Machvariani (2006, pp. 128–130) and Khakhiashvili (2011) also suppose that the stem $\gamma vino$ has a verbal origin.

1. CVC
2. CVSC
3. CSVC

In the general formula, C can always be replaced by S (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984, pp. 216–217).

The root *yun-*, 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 **γûen-*. 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* (*yun-*).

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 **γûen-* 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 **γûin-* 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 (*-in*).

Thus, it is quite acceptable that the form **γvin-* was the stem of the Common-Kartvelian derived from the verb root *γun-* 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, Javakhishvili 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. **γwin->*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. *û*) 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 + *ɰ*] 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 *Κῦρος* ‘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 *Кыра*, Occidental *Kura*, etc.) are derived from the latter Old Greek form (Gamkrelidze 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)ini* > Armen. *gini* “wine” (like other stems, borrowed from Zan: Georg. *cxovar-i* : Chan. *čxur-i* : Armenian *ʷočxar-* “sheep”; Zan **šunž-* > **šuž-* : 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 ^{GI}*uldini* “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.

References

- Bardavelidze V (2006) *From the history of the ancient beliefs of the Georgians* (in Georgian). Tbilisi: Caucasian Publishing House.
- Bopp F (1847) *Die kaukasischen Glieder des indoeuropäischen Sprachstamms*. (The Caucasian members of the Indo-European language tribe). Gelesen in der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften am 11. Dec, 1842. Berlin: Diimmler.
- Charaia P (1918) *Megrelian-Georgian vocabulary* (in Georgian). Tbilisi: GPU publ.
- Chikobava A (1942) *The oldest structure of the name stem in Kartvelian languages* (in Georgian). Tbilisi: Acad. Publishing House.
- Fähnrich H (2002) *Kartwelische Wortschatzstudien*. (Kartvelian vocabulary studies). Jena: Friedrich-Schiller-Universität.
- Fähnrich H (2007) *Kartwelisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. (Kartvelian Etymological Dictionary). Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Fähnrich H, Sarjveladze Z. (2000) *Etymological dictionary of Kartvelian languages* (in Georgian). Tbilisi: TSU publ.
- Gabeskiria S (2015) On the base structure of “*γvino*” (Wine) and “*venax-*” (Vineyard). In *Proceedings of IV International Symposium of Linguist-Caucasiologists*. Tbilisi: TSU publ.
- Gamkrelidze T (2008) *Language and the linguistic sign*. Tbilisi: GNAS publ.
- Gamkrelidze T, Ivanov V (1984) *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans. A reconstruction and historical analysis of a proto-language and a proto-culture* (in Russian). Tbilisi: TSU publ.
- Gamkrelidze T, Machavariani G (1965) *The sonant system and ablaut in the Kartvelian languages. A typology of Proto-Kartvelian structure* (in Georgian). Tbilisi: mecniereba.
- Gamkrelidze T, Arabuli A, Asatiani R, Ivanishvili M, Soselia E (2016) Theoretic and methodological premises of the comparative-historical linguistics. In *Problems of the Comparative-Historical Study of Languages*, 5–36 (in Georgian). Tbilisi: Neker.

- Javakhishvili Iv (1986) *Economic history of Georgia. Writings in twelve volumes, Vol.V* (in Georgian). Tbilisi: GNAS publ.
- Khakhiashvili N (2011) The origin of the word “wine”. In *Proceedings of III International Symposium of Linguist-Caucasiologists*. Tbilisi: TSU publ.
- Klimov G (1964) *Etymological dictionary of the Kartvelian languages* (in Russian). Moscow: AN SSSR.
- Lekiasvili L (1972) *You are the vineyard*. Tbilisi: Nakaduli.
- Lomtadze K (1959) l/r alternation in the Kartvelian languages. In *Buletin of GNAS – I*. Tbilisi: GNAS publ.
- Machavariani N (2006) An attempt to study the etymology of the Georgian lexeme “wine”. In *Linguistic Research XXI, Georgian Language*. Tbilisi.
- Marr N (1915) *Japhetic names of trees and plants (Pluralia tantum) I-III* (in Russian). Sank-Petersburg: Nauka.
- Melikishvili G (1965) *On the ancient population of Georgia, the Caucasus, and the Near East (in Georgian)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Melikishvili I (1980) Root structure in Proto-Kartvelian and Proto-Indo-European. In *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 4, 60–70 (in Russian). Moscow: Nauka.
- Phruidze L (1974) *Viticulture and enology in Georgia I Racha* (in Georgian). Tbilisi: mecniereba.
- Pokorny J (1959) *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch 1*. (Indo-European etymological dictionary 1). Bern und München: Francke Verlag.
- Tsereteli G (2001) *The Semitic languages and their significance for the study of the history of Georgian culture* (in Georgian). Tbilisi: orientalist.
- Tsotsanidze G (2012) Vine, grapes, wine. In *Linguistics Issues* (in Georgian). Tbilisi: TSU publ.