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ABSTRACT. The general reason for the breakdown of the regular correspondences between the daughter-languages is considered to be the existence of unexplained lexical exceptions. It consists neither in the deficiency of the examples nor in the breach of the regularity. On the contrary, the reason for the breakdown of the regular correspondence is the “intersection” of linguistic and extralinguistic factors.

The study of grammatical, phonological and lexical isoglosses among dialects of a protolanguage makes it possible to establish extralinguistic factors. This trend in linguistics is called “the linguistic paleontology of culture” (Gamkrelidze, Th.V., 1999), since its object of investigation is not only the protolanguage but also the protoculture of its speakers. What is reconstructed is not so much the language itself as the extralinguistic world reflected in the linguistic data.

Reconstructing the elements of the extralinguistic world of the daughter-language speakers gives in turn a clearer picture of the linguistic affinities among the daughter-languages and their development over time, i.e. of the purely linguistic factors. This is particularly true of the semantic structure of the languages. The semantic structure simply cannot be studied in isolation from the external world that is reflected in the content plane of language.

This approach explains the lexical exceptions on the protolevel and gives an adequate semantic reconstruction of the archetypes. However, some problems arise in the case of “locked” language groups.

The paper presents the etymology and the reconstruction of the exceptions of the different roots of “oak” in the Kartvelian languages, which remain at first sight unexplained:


Interestingly, from the typological point of view there is a similar picture as to the semantic reconstruction of “oak” for the Proto-Indo-European languages, © 2008 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.
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A language system may be analyzed on the basis of different methodologies. The Comparative-historical method seems to be the classical one which has not lost its actuality to the present day.

The study of grammatical, phonological and lexical isoglosses among the dialects of a protolanguage makes it possible to establish extralinguistic factors. This trend in linguistics is called “linguistic paleontology of culture”, since its object of investigation is not only the protolanguage but also the protoculture of speakers. What is reconstructed is not so much the language itself as the extralinguistic world reflected in the linguistic data (Gamkrelidze Th.V., 1999).

Reconstructing elements of the extralinguistic world of the daughter-language speakers gives in turn a clearer picture of the linguistic affinities among the daughter-languages and their development in time, i.e. of purely linguistic factors. This is particularly true of the semantic structure of language. The semantic structure cannot be simply studied in isolation from the external world that is reflected in the content plane of language (Gamkrelidze Th.V., 1999).

The reconstructed forms and meanings may be grouped into lexical-semantic fields, which designate extralinguistic classes such as animals, handicraft tools and others. Such a protolinguistic lexical-semantic system can give historical reality through typological comparison with the actual culture of the past and the present and especially by archeological facts, in verifying a reconstructed culture and particularly, its material side (Gamkrelidze Th.V., Ivanov V.V., 1984; 1995).

Today it is widely agreed that “culture” doesn’t consist of things, people, behavior or emotions, but of the forms or organization of these things in the mind of people. How can the organization of “things” in the mind of people be discovered? The best way of discovery lies in the area of the language, and there is a whole battery of linguistic tests which can be put to use to reveal different aspects of the organization of the universe in the minds of people (Wierzbicka A., 1996).

Now scholars pay great attention to semantic problems and questions concerning language and thinking, “language Weltanschauung”, “things” constructions of the mind of people, “language intuition” and others, rise again; i.e. the way of investigation of the semantic level of language moves from formal linguistics to content researches.

We can get complete information about various aspects of given objects only through studying them cross-linguistically, on the basis of a comparison of different languages, which is used to solve not only linguistic but also cultural-anthropological issues.

The semantic and pragmatic levels of a language system are the most complex and complicated from the point of view of understanding. We can analyze them only on the basis of investigation of surface linguistic forms. Theoretically, different semantic interpretations of a language system can be achieved through the use of various algorithms. We must not forget that every language system builds its own world picture specifically and the strategies of structuring and algorithms defining the conceptualization processes are different for them. (Cf. color terms and corresponding various linguistic models of the color terms system).

Let us suppose a language system (L) and an α-element of it: L (α∈L) in a [t, t] time segment. If we denote the meaning of the α-element by m(α), theoretically there would be the following possible meaning-changes:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
L(t_1) \\
\alpha \\
\$ \\
m(\alpha)
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
L(t_2) \\
\alpha \quad \alpha \quad \alpha \quad \alpha \\
\$ \quad \$ \quad \$ \quad \$ \\
m(\alpha) \quad m(\alpha) \quad m(\alpha) \quad \$ \quad m(\alpha)
\end{array}
\]

Explanation of origins of the changes and clarification of their meanings are necessary premises to restore exact semantic reconstructions for each comparable language, including the Kartvelian languages. The above-stated facts define the importance of the topic.

The general reason of the breakdown of the regular correspondences between the daughter-languages is considered to be a result of the unexplained lexical exceptions. It implies neither deficiency of the examples nor the breach of regularity. On the contrary, the reason for the breakdown of the regular correspondences is the “intersection” of the linguistic and extralinguistic factors. In such cases, the existence of duplicate forms can be suggested that does not break the solidity of the protolanguage.

Reasons for the appearance of duplicate forms could be: stylistic variation, social stratification, influence of colloquial forms on the literary language, the compatibility of the data of protolanguages with the local language subgroups and so on. Comparative reconstructions also reveal examples when some roots with similar meanings are reconstructed.

In certain linguistic groups there usually exist stereotypes according to which one part of a word’s meaning is considered to be positive, while the other, nega-
tive. The differences in the development of meanings can be regarded as the origins of taboos and euphemisms in natural languages.

At first sight, it seems that an investigation of the corpus of plant names does not yield such interesting reconstructed systems as in the case of kinship or color-terms (Berlin B., Kay P., 1969; Soselia E., 1979); and it helps us to identify some biological units corresponding to their names. But it is precisely this kind of research that fills our imagination and knowledge about the events of human cognitive means to clarify the nature of the human world through categorization.

Tree names are somehow paradoxical. On the one hand, they are basic-semantic primitives, but, on the other hand, tree names, because of the peculiarities of their referents, are sensitive to ecological changes and migration processes of a speech community. P. Friedrich’s opinion about the Proto-Indo-European arboreal system may be extended to the whole corpus of plant names. Thus, plant names, their meanings and the botanical realities to which they correspond are assumed to constitute a set of interdependent systems. The nature of such systems can only be discovered and interpreted on the basis of conjoined approaches, or analytical systems (Friedrich P., 1970). The first approach is linguistic-phonological: morphological parameters constitute a linguistic system. The second is semantic approach: semantic features which define morphemes, words and sets of word-families constitute a semantic system. And the third approach is lexical: the reconstructed lexicon may relate to data and systems that are neither linguistic nor semantic (e.g., archaeological, palaeo-botanical data). Such kind of information constitutes an external system (see Friedrich P., 1970, 1–4).

The conjunctive approach seeks all relevant evidence to get complete information about the historical existence of the speakers, including the ecological environment (fauna, flora, geographical setting, climate) and human habitation and migration in the environment, as well as culture in the broadest sense (including both material and spiritual culture) (Gankrelidze Th.V., 1999).

Exact semantic reconstructions of the proto-forms calls for scrupulous etymological analysis of the reconstructed stems towards the proper lexical-semantic groups allowing to restore the initial meanings of the stems in the systems, to explain the word transitions from one lexical subsystem to another, etc.

Such an approach will permit us not only to account for the semantic changes, but to tentatively define the direction and way of the changes. To establish criteria for the verification of semantic changes is as necessary as those for the verification of phonetic changes. Phonetic reconstructions are based on ranges of phonemes corresponding to the comparable languages. Semantic reconstructions are difficult because there are diverse semantic nuances; the set of semantic positions is complex and their frequency is less than phonetic ones. Practically each phonetic usage of words is a separate semantic position and usually sufficient data is not available to build the ranges.

The simplest way in such investigations is to register the movements and deviations of similar meanings in different languages, which would help us to restore the exact proto-meanings.

G. Klimov, who gives a high appreciation of the “Etymological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages” by H. Fähnrich and S. Sarjveladze (Fähnrich H., Sarjveladze S., 1990; 1995; 2000) mentions: like every important research, this monograph clearly shows the range of problems of comparative study of Kartvelian languages and etymological investigations, the solution of which becomes more and more urgent.

First of all, we must mention the task of adequate semantic reconstruction of the archetypes. This task is complicated in conditions of closed language groups. It seems that inadequate attention to this aspect of reconstruction in Kartvelian studies prompted the authors to give up reconstruction of meaning. There is still a lot to be done in this sphere (Klimov G., 1993).

The foregoing theoretical discussion prompts the author to bring to light new roots of Proto-Kartvelian plant names, make a more precise analysis of old ones, to show the existence of borrowed forms on the proto-level, to compare the Proto-Kartvelian arboreal system with the Proto-Indo-European and Caucasian plant names data, showing their similarities and differences. All this makes possible classification of languages. They can (or cannot) be considered as entities of the same structural-typological (or genetic) classes.

“...The wide diffusion and the emotional intensity of ancient patterns of culture - not paralleled by those for any other tree - suggests that the oak was one of the underlying themes in PIE culture, as a basic life symbol and a root of myth and of sacrament. The oak was a nexus of symbolic articulation between the semantic system of the tree names and the cultural system of religious beliefs and ritual conserving the supernatural” (Friedrich P., 1970).

The “oak” and inhabitant pure soul is known in the West and in the East also (Frazer J.G., 1966). The cult of oak is widespread in the Caucasus too, especially in the Kartvelian traditions (Zavakhishvili I., 1986).
Lexical Exceptions in the Comparative Reconstruction of the Kartvelian Languages

Th. V. Gamkrelidze and V.V. Ivanov reconstructed two stems in Proto-Indo-European: I. *e/०००-०००*t/०००-००० with the meaning “tree, oak” and II. *p/०००-०००*er/०००-००० with the meaning “oak” (Gamkrelidze Th. V., Ivanov V., 1984). They analyzed these meanings on the basis of wide complexes of morphological correlations. The examples of taboos are given, which were realized either as a substitution of the roots with other new words or as a phonetically modified form of the same roots.


*ɔgɛl-root would have had another meaning “oak”, besides the meaning “tree”, which is presented as separated Svanian form: ʒihrəl ʒi[h]i[r]a. What is the reason of the differences of forms? Are they lexical exceptions? Let us analyze these roots beginning from the end:

1) -ra is the derivational suffix of plant names in Svan, i.e. Georg. cip-el-i: Megr. cip-ur-i: Laz. cip-ncip-cip-ur-i: Svan. cip-cip-ra “beech”, Georg. c, xila: Megr. c, xim-ur-i/ɛ, xem-ur-i: Svan. c, xim-ra/c, xwm-ra/c, xum “hornbeam” etc.

2) The last non-syllabic *[^1]l* (i.e. after vowels or syllabic sonant) in Svan, as a rule, gives the spirant [ʃ] (Gamkrelidze, Machavariani, 1965). Comp. Georg. cul-i: Svan. c, uš etc. In some cases *[^1]l* > ʃ-h, which may be lost (resp. substitute ə): Georg. cul-i: Svan (Išx.) gu<guh<gu “heart”.

3) Georg. e: Megr., Laz. a: Svan. e is the regular phonemic correspondence for the Kartvelian vowel system. However, sometimes other vowel correspondence can be found as well: For example: Georg. e: Megr., Laz. i: Svan. i. *nen-* Georg. en-a “language, tongue, word”: Megr. nin–nin-a “language, tongue, word”: Laz. nen-nin-a “language, tongue, word”: Svan. nin-nin-nin “language”; c, el- Georg. cel-cel-i: Megr. cil-cil-ɛ, cɛl- Laz. cil-mɛn: Svan. cil–ɛl–ɛl- intestine, gut etc.

4) Georg. ʒ: Megr. ʒ: Laz. ʒ: Svan. ʒ is the regular phonemic correspondence in the Kartvelian languages as well.

Thus, for the Proto-Kartvelian level *ɔgɛl-root is restored with “tree, oak” meaning on the basis of such correspondence: Georg. ʒel-i: Megr. ʒa: Laz. ʒa[n]jɔ[n]ja: Svan. ʒihrəl ʒi[r]a[r]a. I think that coexistence of different roots: *c, qan- and *ɔgɛl-root “tree, oak” is connected with an ancient human tradition of belief in trees (Cf. from the typological point of view a similar picture for the PIE languages).

It is very rare for plants and their fruits to have different names. This kind of exception occurs in Georgiian: muxa- “oak” and rko- “acorn”. In old Georgiian texts and modern dialects rko- ʃeko- “acorn” means not only fruit but also tree. G. Klimov has reconstructed ʃeko- archetype for the Georgian-Zanian unity (Klimov G.A., 1964). A. Shanidze has connected this root with the Indo-European (Latin) quercus “oak” (Shanidze A., 1947).

The roots muxa and rko are widespread in many Kartvelian toponyms: muxani, muxrani, didmuxa, rkon, xponidhi, xhrə etc. (Tschumburidze S., 1985). The root is borrowed from the Kartvelian into the Caspian languages: Avar. miγ “oak”, “acorn”, Darg. miγ “(Urakh.) migt(Akush.) Lak. məγ “tree” (ɛ-γmurx): Lezg. mjv: Tab. mjv: Rus. mjx: Tsakh, mjv: Ud. mjv (Gigineishvili B., 1977).

One important question rises: What is the etymology of muxa? From this point of view in the oldest Georgian lexicon of Sulukhan-Saba Orbéliani (17th c.) we can find some interesting verbal forms muxva, momuxva, damuxva “cut, suppress”. According to Saba’s explanation, everything which has bark type dismembered small parts is called muxa (Orbéliani S.-S., 1991). I think, this is the reason that the names of fruits with dismembered bars are:muxanesvi “sort of melon”; muxamssali “sort of pear”, muxamçvane “sort of apple” etc.

Typologically many plants are named according to their whole appearance, external features of leaves, and colors of fruits... So, the unexpected lexical form “muxa”, which has no phonemic corresponding roots in other Kartvelian languages, is substituted by a duplicate form, maybe recalled on the basis of taboo related to tree-beliefs, which through the centuries preserved the original aspects to the present day in Kartvelian folklore, legends, fairytales, architectural ornaments, songs...
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