

LEXICS

6.1. Svan shares the same fortune with the other Kartvelian languages: loan-words make the bulk of its lexical stock. In all Kartvelian languages various layers of borrowing may be ascertained: 1 – the prehistorical Near- and Middle-Eastern; 2 – the prehistorical Mediterranean; 3 – the historical Byzantine; 4 – the medieval Persian, Arabic and Turkish; 5 – the newest Slavic. During all these periods close contacts with the North-Caucasian languages have taken place as well as mutual borrowing as a result. Borrowing from Armenian seems to have taken place since the appearance of Armenian. While endeavouring to single out the basic Kartvelian word-stock, the investigator comes to the paradoxical conclusion that many roots assigned to the most archaic prehistorical epoch, show an enigmatical likeness to Indo-European roots. Nevertheless we are inclined to deny the Borealic ("Nostratic") character of this phenomenon because of the striking isomorphism between Kartvelian and Indo-European in phonology, root-structure, morphology and syntax reconstructed (Gamkrelidze–Machavariani, 1965, 1982; Gamkrelidze–Ivanov, 1984; Schmidt, 1965, 1969, 1979; Melikishvili, 1977, 1979, 1980₂, etc.). Thus Kartvelian seems to be younger than the hypothetical Borealic epoch. It may be considered the same Middle-Eastern product as pre-Anatolian Indo-European, i. e. as the other possible version of Indo-European. In this respect it would be interesting to distinguish roots, which are materially identical with Indo-European (and thus borrowing cannot be traced), and roots, which show deviations from the three-serial correspondences of stops and fricatives (Gamkrelidze–Ivanov, 1984) and thus may be treated as loans. E. g. the root for "earth" is *gəm* in Svan and *tiqa* in Georgian. The latter corresponds to Nesite *tekan*, Tokharian *tkam*, Greek metathetical *khthōn* from IE. **dheghom*. Nevertheless it must be regarded as loaned because of its voiceless *t*- which is expected to correspond to IE. **t(h)* (traditionally *t*) in accordance with the law of Gamkrelidze–Ivanov, but not to **d(h)*. On the other hand, Svan *gəm* cannot be so easily claimed to be a loan because of its *g*- well corresponding to IE. **g(h)* (traditionally **gh*) in the "Baltic" IE. **ghem*-. At the same time both roots demonstrate prehistorical Kartvelian–Indo-European contacts, and there are no means of defining more precisely the chronological priority of *gəm*.

6.2. In the preceding analysis we have mentioned more Kartvelian–Indo-European isoglosses. We have no aim to present an exhaustive list of these isoglosses here. It would do well to mention that almost all Kartvelian–Indo-European parallels

(hypothetical borrowings or not), including the identity of the perfect with *modus relativus*, are represented in historical Baltic. The latest theory of W. S c h m i d (1978), according to which Baltic must be placed in the centre of the model of division of the Indo-European linguistic community, and the theory of V. Т о п о р о в (1981), according to which Baltic is identical with Indo-European as its very type in time and space, enable us to reinterpret the Kartvelo-Indo-European problem as a Kartvelo-Baltic problem. Thus "Baltic" is understood in a broad sense as a reconstruction of Common Indo-European which appears to be identical with reconstructed Common Baltic, i. e. as "Baltic Indo-European". The historical limits of its continuity (in respect to the languages attested) may be set only "from above", i. e. by the 5th c. B. C. when the Baltic IE. "Centre" (i. e. its fragment, further conserved as peripheral Indo-European) had finally split into peripheral-western and central-eastern areas. It was the 5th—the 4th c. B. C. when Slavic separated from the "Centre", though it was no more the former integral centre but its peripheral-western area. Germanic and Aryan were the last to separate from the integral centre in the 3rd—the 2nd millennia B. C. At the end of the 3rd millennium B. C. Baltic appeared at the Baltic Sea while at the beginning of the 2nd millennium B. C. the split of Common Kartvelian took place. Thus the 1st half of the 3rd millennium B. C. seems to be the period of the possible passage of the Centre via the Caucasus from the South northwards and the period of the formation of Kartvelian. The total of the facts cannot deny the possibility of Kartvelian being one of the most ancient branches of Indo-European ("Baltic"), or: a branch of the forming variants of Indo-European, which underwent the same caucasization as Armenian in the subsequent and Ossetic in the newest times (cp. the Introduction of G. T s e r e t e l i to G a m ħ r e l i d z e—M a c h a v a r i a n i, 1965, 1982).

The very formation of the Kartvelian phenomenon demands special study. We should like to use the term genetic-contactive development, meaning the convergent origin of what may be called the prehistorical Caucasian variant of "Baltic Indo-European" and of what may be called "pure" "Baltic Indo-European". We see that the number of Kartvelian-Semitic isoglosses (similarly to Kartvelian-(North-)Caucasian ones) does not surpass the usual "nostratic" level, so that one may presume the existence of another kind of relations between affinity and non-affinity and between the familial and inter-familial (Borealic or "Nostratic") relationship, i. e. the existence of the "Kartvelo-Indo-European" kind of the genetic-contactive affinity.

In order to verify Baltic-Kartvelian isoglosses and their reflection in Svan one must distinguish between borrowings of various epochs and a possible relationship. The etymological research of the Common-Kartvelian lexics is still at the initial stage (K l i m o v, 1964), not speaking about the absence of the historical dictionaries of Georgian, Megrel and Svan. Thus, a great deal of Svan lexis representing apparent borrowings and being identical with the corresponding Georgian idioms, one cannot judge by the form of these words whether they were really Georgian since neither the original Georgian character of many of them may be claimed with any certainty nor their borrowing via Georgian and not directly from neighbouring

languages is clear. Therefore we restrict ourselves here only to several samples of the well-known Kartvelian lexis in Svan.

6.3.1. Up to recently no criterion has existed for the distinction between the ancient Indo-European loans in Kartvelian and the hypothetically common lexical heritage. The reinterpretation by T h. G a m k r e l i d z e and V. I v a n o v of Indo-European tenues as voiceless (with optional aspiration), mediae as voiceless glottalized and mediae aspiratae as voiced (with optional aspiration) has provided us with such a criterion. The traditional system and the reinterpreted system of Indo-European stops (cf. G a m k r e l i d z e, 1977) may be compared with Kartvelian stops in the following scheme (in each column Kartvelian precedes reinterpreted and the latter – traditional Indo-European):

(p=) p'	p'	(b)	b	b(h)	bh	(p=) ph	p(h)	p
(t=) t'	t'	d	d	d(h)	dh	(t=) th	t(h)	t
(k=) k'	{ k' k'w	{ g g ^w	{ g g ^w (h)	{ g(h) g ^w (h)	{ gh g ^w h	(k=) kh	{ k(h) k ^w (h)	{ k k ^w

Thus many known and often cited parallels (as Kartv. **gon-/gn-*, IE. **gen-/gnō-*, Kartv. **p̄ir-*, IE. **pr̄(H)/pro-*, etc.) cannot any longer be genetically compared and borrowing is to be established. In Svan it applies to such words as *muč̄wed* "breast" (IE. **kerd-*, Lith. *širdis* "heart"); *ṭebdi* < *ṭebedi* which together with Geor. *ṭp-il-* is a striking parallel to Lat. *tepidus*, Sl. *topl̄b* < IE. **tep-* "warm"; *daq-əl* "goat" (IE. **digh-*, Germ. *Ziege*); *ṭiṭ* "louse" (IE. **tel-/tl̄(H)?*), Lith. *tīlti* "to stop sounding", Russ. *tol̄ēti* "to rot", *tol̄'a* "rot" || *tl'a* "plant louse", etc.)*; *dīwo* (side by side with *dīna*) "maiden" (Sl. *děva*), *ḡwecen* (if not a germanism) "wheat" (Gothic *hwaitēs*, Lith. *kvier̄ys*), *gurna* (if not Ossetic!) "round stone" (Lith. *gūrna* "millstone", Sl., Skr., etc.), etc. Some of these correspondences (cf. *muč̄wed*, *ṭebdi*, *daqəl* belonging to the Common-Kartvelian word-stock) point out very archaic contacts. Besides, the sporadic voicing of the primarily glottalized consonant is not excluded in Kartvelian itself, e. g. does the initial *d-* in Svan *daq-*, Geor. *txa* < **dqa* not come from *f-* already in Common Kartvelian as e. g. the final *-d* in Geor. pl. *sxed-* from *-f*? Then the latter may be identified with IE. **sed(H)-* "to sit" with a "laryngeal". We are tempted to conjecture such voicing in the Kartvelian word for *c u c k o o*, i. e. *g* < **k̄* Svan U. B. *gego*, L. B. *gāgo* just in the same way corresponding to dialectal Lith. *gegū* as dialectal Georgian (Khevsurian, Tushin, Mokhevia) *guguta* corresponds to literary Lith. *gegūtė*. For all this the prototype **keka* may be assumed (whether onomatopoeic or not) for Kartvelo-"Baltic". While Geor. *qurbela* = Lith. *sūrbėlė* "leech" (A. S h a n i d z e's collation) or Geor. *dideba* "glory" = Lith. *didybė* "majesty" (here the Kartvelian suffix *-eba* well corresponds

*We reject the reconstruction **tlz₁-* for "louse", **asuz₁-* for "daughter" (borrowed from Urartian *sala?* Hurritian *šala*), *c₁oz₁-* for "wife". Z. S a r d j v e l a d z e (1980) compares Geor. *maḡl-* "worm" with *šloba* "to spoil" and further with Russ. *tl'a*, Czech *tliť*, etc. L. P a l m a i t i s came independently to a similar conclusion in 1976 though comparing *maḡl-* with Geor. *ṭil-* (=Svan *ṭiṭ*) and the latter with Russ. *tl'a* (cf. English and Lith. "louse" – Latv. "louse", "plant louse").

to Baltic **bhyā*) demonstrate the same curiosity, two evident Kartvelian-Baltic coincidences are of special interest. These are Geor. *did-* "big", possibly related to Svan *ɣɣəd* "big", and Svan *ɪra* "erit" equal to East-Baltic *didj-* "great", *ɪra* "est", "sunt".

6.3.2. The comparison of Geor. *did-* with Svan *ɣɣəd* decides the question about the Common-Kartvelian character of *did-*. No law of Svan palatalization **d̥ > ɣɣ* is known to us yet, therefore the following much more hypothetical comparison cannot be a grounding. Nevertheless it seems important to compare Kartv. **ɟ₁* with IE. **dh-* according to the hypothetical development "to suck(le)" → "son", "leech" and "milk" → "woman's breast", "female", "cow", namely Geor. *ɣe* "son" and Slav. *děte* "child", Latv. *dēls* "son", Lith.-Latv. *dēle* "leech" (< IE. **dhē-*); Geor. *s-ɣe*, Svan *la-ɣe* "milk", i. e. "suckling drink"; Geor. *ɣuɣu* "woman's breast"; Geor. *ɣu*, Svan. *ɣuwa* "female" and Skr. *dhenā* "cow" (< IE. **dhey-* // **dhē-*). If the comparison is correct, one of the sources for Kartv. **ɟ₁* seems to be **d(h)* obviously palatalized (i. e. **d̥*). Then the relic reflection of the similar kind of palatalization in Svan is to be seen in Kartvelian reduplicated **di-di* (the final *-i* later reinterpreted as a nominative inflection in Georgian) > Svan **d̥di* > **ɟ₁d̥-i* > **ɟ₁d̥* > *ɣɣəd*.

Geor. *did-* seems to be related to Geor. *diax* "yes" < *diay* = **dia* + PTC. *-ya* (cf. *diaya-c* "surely yes"). If the latter comes from an oath-word, such as Arabic *bi-llāh* = "English by God!", then one may treat **d̥di-* as the reduplication of **di(a)-* (i. e. **d̥di*) with the subsequent re-interpretation of the final *-i* as of the inflection *(-i)* of the common meaning "great", "majesty" and see here the borrowing of the archaic Indo-European religious term, namely of the well-known IE. **dy-/*dey-* "light", "sky" → "God". Thus the reduplication for expressing magnificence becomes clear. The immediate evidence of such etymology is the fact that Lith. *didis*, Latv. *dīšs* mean not "big", but "great", "majestic", while in the meaning of "big" Lithuanian uses the *-eja* derivative *didelis* though Latvian has a quite different word for it: *liēls*. Lith.-Latv. *dai-na* "folk-song" < **ritual hymn (with dancing)!* – cf. U r b u t i s, 1972) and Avestan *daē-nā* "religion" < **"majestic rituals"* are indubitable *n*-derivatives of the same root which have religious meaning and are directly parallel to Lat. *dī-v-īnus* "divine" (e. g. majestic ritual hymn or dance).

6.3.3.1. The word *ira*, on the contrary, seems to have been borrowed from Kartvelian by "Baltic Indo-European". The acute accent in Lith. *yrù* shows the nominal origin of this word from **yrá* while the nominal origin of all (not athematic) 3rd-person forms in Baltic is easy to prove. While they are not marked either in respect to person or to number, such archaic expressions as *nèrù kadà d̥irba* (the 3rd person instead of the infinitive *d̥irbtì*) "there is no working (time)" = "no time for work" = "to work", or *nèrù kas d̥aro* (the 3rd person instead of the infinitive *d̥arýti*) "there is no doing" = "to do", show the prehistorical nominal equivalence of the unmarked forms of the 3rd person. This equivalence is apparent in the *-ā*-stem nouns demonstrating the historical identity with the 3rd-person forms of the same stem, e. g. *klaūsò* "they(he) listen(s)" < **klaūsā* vs. *klaūsò* "ear", "hearing" < **klaūsā*. Both reconstructions, however, come from Balt. **klaūsā* because of the secondary character of the

circumflex tone in the ancient long syllables. Such nominal forms in the verbal system seem to be nothing else but a direct reflection of the archaic Indo-European masdar of the preinfinitive epoch. Its thematized form well corresponds to the most primitive type of the Georgian masdar as *cyla* "change", *çera* "writing", *çama* "eating" etc. The personal forms in Indo-European have developed on the basis of this masdar by adding to it the inertive- (verbs of the static series) or the fientive- (verbs of the fientive series) case pronominal forms.

Since the paradigmatical future is an innovation in Kartvelian as well as in Indo-European, one may relate the East-Baltic "masdar" praes. *ira* to the Svan FT. *ira*, treating *ř* in the latter as an intravertizer regularly used to form the future of medial verbs in Kartvelian (cf. 4.3.2.2.2.4). Thus one of the most archaic relics of the Balto-Kartvelian epoch seems to be found in Baltic side by side with the correspondence Balt. **didi-* – Kartv. **didi*. This reminds us of R. Gauthiot's conjecture connecting Lith. *yrù*, Latv. *ir* < Balt. **irù* with O. Armenian *ir* < **irù* "matter" which thus must belong to the same Balto-Kartvelian stock. The transparent semantical parallel to Arm. *ir* is a Lithuanian and Latvian expression Lith. *kas yr(a)?* Latv. *kas ir?* "What is the matter?"

The length of the initial *ř* in Svan and the corresponding length in Baltic as a reflection of the origin of the length remains the last question to be solved. Here we have to do with further reconstruction of Svan *ira* < Kartv. **Hira* and with the origin of the Kartvelian versionizers.

6.3.3.2. The "laryngeal" formants *h-*, *x-* < (conventionally) **H-* before the intravertizer *i-* are attested in O. Georgian haemet (e. g. *h-i-go* "was", *h-i-kmna* "became") and khanmet (*x-i-go*, *x-i-kmna*) texts and it is a mystery why these formants, identified with the indicator of the 3rd indirect person, have found themselves beside the intravertizer which is intelligible only in monovalent forms without any indirect object!

As M. Machavariani in her personal letter of 18.03.1982 has mentioned, the Kartvelian versionizers have been generalized from the case-inflexions of pronominal forms. The pronominal dative forms in *-i* coalesced with the corresponding verbal forms at the same time as the non-dative forms in *-a* did, i. e. the 1st pers. non-DAT. **ma* "I", "me", DAT. (**mai* >) **mī* "to me" or the 3rd pers. non-DAT. **Ha* "that", DAT. (**Hai* >) **Hī* "to that". After the coalescence of pronouns with verbal stems the case-meanings of the pronominal forms became perceived as the grammatical meanings of the verbal forms, the corresponding vocalism being reinterpreted as versionizer (e. g. "I", "me" vrs. "to me", etc.). Then the pronominal roots received the meaning of the personal formants (cf. **m-*, **H-*).

Verbs with the intravert personal formants may be agentive as well as patientive in Kartvelian and may have non-dative as well as dative meaning: **m(-a, -i)*, **g(-a, -i)*, **H(-a, -i)*. Verbs with the extravert personal formants are agentive only, the dative indicator being impossible in them: the 1st pers. **Hw(a)*, the 2nd pers. **H(a)* (sporadically without *(a)* after its abstraction according to the intravert personal formants). It means that only the extravert orientation was formerly expressed by

the extravert personal formants. Since after the generalization of the pronominal roots as personal formants the segment *T preserved its dative meaning, a possibility arose to use this *T for intravert orientation and as a substitute for (a) in the extravert series of personal formants: *Hw(a)- → *HwT and *H(a)- → *HT. This intraversionization meant the situation turning back to the communicant, i. e. it meant a reflexivization: "for myself", "for himself". Since the paradigm of the 3rd person follows that of the communicant persons, the bare *T remained to be used for the 3rd person and thus the syntagmatical opposition *HT- "for him" vrs. *T- "for himself" was to appear. Such opposition, however, in which the second member would have contained the bare (without root!) part of the former pronoun, had no precedent in the other (the 1st and the 2nd) persons. Therefore: 1) *HT- got the both meanings, i. e. "for him" and "for himself"; 2) little by little the meaning "for him" began to be expressed by the newer pattern which had already appeared purely phonetically. At first the 1st pers. *Hw- changed to *Hu- before consonants (*HwC- → *HuC-) and then the bare *H- became associated with *H(i)- of the 3rd person, the meaning "I for him" being consequently broadened including "he for him", i. e. *Hu- = "for him" in general. Up to now no distinction is made between "I for him" and "he for him", cf. Svan xo- and (O.) Geor. u- (the 1st pers. Geor. v-u- is a pure orthographical conventionality not corresponding to the pronunciation, nor to the O. Georgian orthography). In this way the extravertizer *u- has come into being in the 3rd person, the single person where it is possible and where it is synonymous to the formant *H-, cp. Geor. h- > s- in (mo-)s-dis = (mo-)/h-/u-dis "it happens to him". As for the intravert *HT-, its *H- became unmotivated and vanished leaving traces in the O. Georgian haemet and khanmet texts.

6.3.3.3. Svan ĩra "erit" < *Hĩra has preserved the archaic length of ĩ. In all the other instances in Kartvelian the shortness of u was generalized on i since the length of the latter appeared beyond the semantical oppositions of length and the quality of the versionizers was sufficient to be opposed.

*Hĩra having developed into a personal future form in Svan, in Baltic (IE. Centre) and Armenian it has been inherited from Balto-Kartvelian as an ā-stem masdar. As well as all other Indo-European masdars in Baltic, it has entered the conjugational system similarly to Svan though with the meaning of present, not future.

6.3.4. *Hĩra (because of the Kartvelian versionizer) and *didi (because of its obstruents) bearing witness to the primeval convergent contacts, a certain number of words cannot be defined easily as borrowings or common heritage because of the absence of obstruents in them. Thus Svan sgej "son" of the Common-Kartvelian root "to bear, be born" (Geor. šv-il-, Laz sk-ir- "child", i. e. "one born") is apparently identical with IE. *seu(H)- "to bear" (Balt., Gothic, Aryan sūnus "son", etc.); Svan zix (Geor. sixl-, Megr. zixir-) "blood" is identical with the heteroclitie IE. *HesHr "blood" (Latv. asins).

On the other hand, Svan gəm "earth" (see 6.1), li-dē-sgi "to put", li-lš-eni "to fasten", "to plant" demonstrate precise correspondences to Indo-European obstruents: li-dē-sgi (Geor. de- but Megr. dv-) is equal to IE. *dheH- "to put" (Lith. dėti "to put", etc.);

li-ʃ-eni (with Svan "satemization"! – see fn. to 2.2.3 and cp. Geor. *da-lag-eba* "to put in order", *da-rg-va*, Megr. *rg-uapa* "to plant") is equal to IE. **legh-* (Sl. *ležiti* "lies", *ložiti* "puts", Germ. *liegen, legen*, etc. Cf. also the lengthened root in Pr. *līse* [līze], Sl. *lězets* "crawls", etc.).

The common origin of the numerals "four" (IE. "eight") and "six" is obvious: Svan *w-ostx(w)* < **ostx* < **ofx(i)* < Kartv. **otx-* metathesially equals to IE. **ok-tō* (Lith. *aš-tuo-mi*, etc.);

Svan *usgw* < Kartv. **eks₁w* is equal to reduplicated (?) IE. **weks*.

6.3.5. The root for "seven" (in all probability from North-Semitic fem. for masc. **šib'at-* > Akkadian *sebet*) seems a borrowing as it is clear from the obstruents Kartv. *-d, -t* ≠ IE. *-t, -d*:

Svan *šgwid* < Kartv. **šwid-* vrs. IE. **sept-ŋ*.

Several Svan words represent later, though still archaic, borrowings. Some parallels with Armenian are of the greatest interest. Svan *čarni* "red" with the apparently reduced middle-syllable vowel between *r* and *n* with no doubt is Arm. *čarani* "red" (cf. the identical Lentekh *čarāni* and U. Svan *mačrana* "reddish" with *-a*). Svan *i* "and", "also", formally coinciding with Sl. *i* < **ei*, seems to be connected with Arm. *ew* "and", "also" < IE. **epi* already because of the same meaning [unlike the two separate words for "and" and "also" in Georgian: *da* (cf. Slavic) and *-ca* (cf. Sl. *že*, Baltic *-ga*, Skr. *ha*, etc.)]. The Svan quotative particle *eser* in all probability is Arm. IF. *asēr* "he, she uttered". In spite of the Georgian SF. *-jan*, Svan family names in *-ijān* curiously remind of Armenian family names in *-jan*. All this points to the southern origin of Svan and Svans and to their direct contacts with Armenians. There are more data about the subsequent migration of Svans to present Svania in the North via the Black-Sea lowland through present Megrelia (cf. the Svan for "sea" *juγwa*).

There is a vast layer of North-Caucasian lexis in Svan of the archaic as well as (mostly) of Moslem times. Side by side with the mediation of Georgian, it was the main way by which Arabic and Turkish words have penetrated into Svan, Georgian being also the main source of Greek and Persian lexis. The expression *šārwin ʃri* "he takes the matrimony sacrament", points to direct borrowing from ecclesiastical Greek (Georgians use *švaris čera*).

Georgian words are flooding Svan especially under the modern conditions of universal bilingualism and partial trilingualism.

We have not mentioned the well-known Kartvelian–Indo-European parallelism in pronominal roots which belongs to the "nostratic" level, i. e. much earlier (ca. the 9th millenium B. C.) than Kartvelo–Indo-European.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Grammatical and lexical data of Svan support the idea of the primitive Kartvelo–Indo-European closeness, exactly – of the Kartvelo–Baltic closeness as it is understood here. It seems significant that, while the identical goblin plots spread from the Caucasus up to Northern Europe, the very word for goblin in Baltic is *kaukas*, related to Got. *hauhs* "high" from which the Greek name of the mountain-range *Kaikasos* originates. And it is the mythologically personified mount with which Balt. *kaukas* is related (Торгов, 1980).