

Towards the problem of borrowed compounds in the Georgian, Dido and Bezhita Languages¹

Author Nodar Ardoteli

Arnold Chikobava Institute of Linguistics (Georgia), Doctor of Philology

Email: nodariardoteli@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper presents the borrowing regularities of compounds and the components included in it in the Georgian, Dido and Bezhita languages. It is certain that historically the research languages (resp. peoples) had lexical contacts both with each other and with the external linguistic world, which is demonstrated by borrowings of appropriate components of the compounds both among these languages and from other source-languages. Taking into account the data of the studied languages and dialects as much as possible, three types of coordination compounds of nouns are distinguished in the article: (1) compounds obtained by composition of root names, the genesis of whose immediate constituents is known or considered to be root words; (2) hybrid compounds formed by original and borrowed lexemes, in which lexical units from the research languages or other linguistic sources are found as one of the components; (3) compounds composed of borrowed lexemes alone, which may have been assimilated from the source-language in the form of a compound, or were composed in the borrowing language. An attempt to determine the management of the compound members' borrowings is also discussed in the study.

Key words: Compound, Borrowing, Source-language, Subordinate compound

Introduction

Georgians have been neighbors of the bordering Caucasian Peoples since time immemorial, which is more or less known from special literature. This is especially true of the centuries-old neighborhoods and long linguistic contacts of the Kakhetians, Tousheens and Khevsours (resp. Pxovians) with the Dido people, which should have been properly reflected in the lexical treasures of the Georgian language in general and the mountain dialects in particular. Obviously, at present our interest is also to find out, what linguistic impact a priori linguistic contacts have had on the lexical stock of Georgian and Dido languages in general, and on its composite derivation in particular. Specifically, in addition to the lexical encounters already identified in Caucasology, is it possible to make composite borrowings and what are the peculiarities of such borrowings? Besides that, the issues of determining the direction of the loans of the direct components of the compounds and clarifying the etymology are also of interest. Adding urgency to this problem is the fact that despite the great interest in simple lexical borrowings (Javakhishvili 1937; Trubetskoi 1973; Chikobava 1953; 1987 ...; Klimov 1972 ...; Gudava 1954; Imnaishvili 1959; Mikailov 1979; 1999; Khalilov 2004 ...), the problem of borrowed compounds and corresponding structural-semantic adaptation in the study languages have not been properly studied.

Clearly, the opinions presented in the special literature and the linguistic material at our disposal allow us to draw certain conclusions when analyzing simple names. In particular, the discussion of lexical meetings mainly distinguishes six rules (Zviadauri [Ardoteli] 1997: 97; Cf. Gudava 1954: 701). Relevant verse:

1. Derived from another source-language: Geo. **kaṭa**, Did. **keṭu**, Bezh. **gedo** (cf. Rus. **кот**, Engl. **cat**) ‘a cat’;
2. Genetically common origin: General Kartv. ***z'ar** ‘frost’: General Dagh. ***c,or** ‘winter’, ‘cold’;
3. Assimilated from one language to another: Did. **uži** ‘son’ > Geo. **važi** ‘id.’;
4. Formal similarity is typological in nature: Lat. **tibi** (Dat.), cf. Did. **debe-r** (Dat.) ‘you’;
5. The onomatopoeitic vocabulary belongs to: Geo. **guguli**, Xevs. d. **guguṭa**, cf. Did. **gugu**, Bezh. **kukuṭo** ‘a cuckoo’;
6. The result of back borrowing is: Geo. **čqimi** // **čqima** (Saba) > Chech., Batsb. **čim** (‘id.’) > Xevs. d. **čima**, Tush. d. **čimī** ‘*Anthriscus sylvestris*’ (‘Perennial grass of the umbrella family ...’).

Numerous papers on simple nominal borrowings can be found in the special literature, although there are very few special papers on composite borrowings in the study languages. It is true that in some works individual composite borrowings may also appear, but this does not substantially change the situation. With all this in mind, I am currently discussing the substantial compounds borrowed from the study languages, which we use to describe **descriptive**, **comparative**, **contrastive**, and **typological** methods. In addition, it is necessary to take into account the linguocultural and ethnolinguistic aspects.

Principal part

When researching borrowed compounds, it is crucial to understand how composite borrowings differ from simple lexical borrowings. Closely related to this is the determination of the affiliation of a compound - a certain compound was borrowed from the source-language or the composition was performed in the borrowing language. In view of all this, it is noteworthy to show in the linguistic material what formal-semantic changes are experienced by the direct components of this or that compound, how their structural-semantic adaptation takes place and what is the chronological level of the data. Ultimately, such research should in some way facilitate the study of divergent and convergent changes in the respective languages as well. At the same time, it is important to establish a borrowing dominance ratio between certain groups of Ibero-Caucasian languages, in which the important role of the Georgian language is discussed. M. Khalilov especially mentions: *«Среди последних наиболее значительное место принадлежит грузинскому языку, длительные ареальные контакты которого с другими языками Закавказья и Северного Кавказа оставили в них многочисленные следы»* (Халилов 2004: 7).

Maximizing the specificity of compound word formation in the studied languages and dialects, coordination substantive compounds are mainly classified into three groups: (1) compounds derived from own nouns, the genesis of the direct constituents of which are usually known or considered to be potentially native lexemes; (2) hybrid compounds derived from native and borrowed lexemes (Хауген 1972: 352), in which lexical units from languages under research or other linguistic sources are found as one of the components; (3) Compounds composed only of borrowed lexemes, which may be assimilated

from the source-language as a compound, or as separate lexemes, which have been composed in the borrowing language.

Illustrative examples:

(1) a) Geo. **ded-mama**, Did. **eni-obiw**, Bezh. **ijo-abo** ‘parents’ (literally ‘mother-father’), b) Geo. **mšvild-isari**, Did. **čeru-čo**, Bezh. **čulu-ča’a** ‘bow and arrow’ (literally ‘bow-arrow’, ‘arrow-bow’), c) Geo. **col-kmari**, Did. **γ’ana-xediw**, Bezh. **aqo-beterhan** ‘husband and wife’ (bezh. literally ‘female-master’), d) Geo. **gul-mkerdi**, Did. **h>amo-roku²** ‘a chest’ (literally ‘heart-chest’, ‘chest-heart’)...

(2) a) Geo. **xaxv-niori**, Bezh. **naži-xayū** (< av. - geo.) ‘vegetables’ (literally ‘onion-garlic’, ‘garlic-onion’), b) Geo. **kvira-dye** (< greek - geo.), Did. **bazar-γudi** (< av. < turk. - did.), Bezh. **bazaj-wodo** (< av. < turk. - bezh.) ‘Sunday’, ‘trading day’ (literally ‘market-day’), c) Bezh. **qalmax-čuoα** (< av. < geo. – av.) ‘a trout’ (literally ‘trout-fish’), d) Did. **h>ajvan-posu/h>ajvan-γuro**, Bezh. **boči-häjman** (literally av. ‘a small cattle’ - arab. ‘a cattle’) ‘sheep-cattle’, and so on.

(3) a) Geo. **okro-vercxli**, Did. **ukru-mesed** (< av.-geo. < greek), Bezh. **mesed-okro// okko-mesed** (< geo. < greek - av.) ‘jewels’ (literally ‘gold-silver’, ‘silver-gold’), b) Geo. **sindis-namusi** (< greek - arab.), Did. **nič-namus** (< av. - arab.), Bezh. **nic-lamus** (see did.) ‘conscience’, ‘shame’, c) Did. **h>alți-piša**, Bezh. **h>älți-piša** ‘labor, work, craft’ (literally av. ‘work, activity’ – pers. ‘activity, craft’, d) Did. **bina-qaj** (< geo. - av.) ‘dwelling, tent’ (literally geo. ‘dwelling’ – av. ‘milling’, e) Geo. **top-iarayi** (< turk.), Did. **iaray-matah>** (< av. - turk.), Bezh. **topi-iaray** (< geo. < turk.) ‘weapons’ (literally did. ‘weapon-thing’ – bezh. ‘gun-arms’), f) Did. **yalbač**, Bezh. **yalbač** ‘a lion’ (literally ‘lion-wolf’), g) Bezh. **boži-boṗli** ‘faith, trust’ (< av. literally ‘faith-love’), etc.

Of the examples represented above, we are currently interested in only (2) and more (3) types of examples that provide direct immediate borrowed compounds and borrowed compounds Via different languages. From type (2) examples we turn our attention to a), c) and e). a) Geo. **xaxv-niori**, Bezh. **naži-xayū** ‘vegetables’ (literally ‘onion-garlic’, ‘garlic-onion’). The analytical compound Av. **raži** ‘garlic’) and the combination of the Geo. **xaxvi** (‘onion’) names appear to be formed in the Bezhita language.

c) In the example of **qalmax-čuoα** (< av. < geo. – av.) ‘a trout’ (literally ‘trout-fish’), the first component of the **trout** without a nominal run sign is noteworthy, suggesting a step in the Avar language. This compound must have originated in Avar language and then from the latter (presumably through the Antsukhi dialect) entered the Bezhita language in the same form. As for e) compound, Did. **bal’aj-ṗaq’** (literally ‘dagger-knife’), Bezh. **bal’aj-xeč** (literally ‘dagger-spear’, cf. Av. **xeč** ‘spear’) ‘sword-and-lance’, ‘shield-and-sword’ (literally ‘shield-sword’, ‘shield-spear’), this compound should have been formed in the borrowing language.

The most interesting at least (3) are compounds in which both components are borrowed directly or through another language. Of this type, a), b), e), f) are especially noteworthy. In particular, the remarkable compound of ‘jewelry’ in Georgian is a hybrid, since it is obtained by combining Greek and Georgian names (**okro-vercxli** < greek-geo.), which entered the Dido language by direct loans (Did.

ukru-micxir). We have a composition of names entered into the Bezhita language through Georgian and borrowed from Avar (Bezh. **okko-mesed** < **okro-mesed**), which seems to have originated on its own Bezhita basis (cf. Gigineishvili 2016: 159).

b) Did. **nič-namus**, Bezh. **nic-lamus** ‘avoidance’, ‘dignity’ (literally ‘shame-conscience’) from the Avar language (Av. **nič** ‘shame’ – Arab. **namus** ‘conscience’) is borrowed, which has undergone phonetic changes in the Dido languages: Avar **nič-lamus** > Did. **nič-namus** (l>n), Bezh. **nic-lamus** (č>c). In addition, the semantics of source-linguistic data are invariably preserved, indicating their late borrowing.

e) The compound containing Turkish noun **iaray** (‘weapon’) (Geo. **top-iarayi**, Did. **jaray-matah**), Bezh. **topi-iaray** ‘weapons’) seems to have been assimilated from Georgian, while the postpositional component of the Dido compound itself is borrowed from Avar, although it is probable that the whole compound is also of Avar origin.

f) The zoological term for the composite structure expressing ‘lion’, in general, in the Daghestanian languages, in particular, in the Dido languages (Did. **yalbač**, Bezh. **yalbač** ‘a lion’ literally ‘lion-wolf’) consists of the following components: the first part is suggested to be of **yal** Turkish origin (Turk. **jal** ‘a mane’), while the second part is Dagestanian itself and mentions a wolf (Haidakov 1973: 12; Abdullayev 2015: 51-52).

In the Dido languages of study, this compound appears to have been assimilated from Avar and preserved without desemantization. Interestingly, the first component of the analytical compound underwent some semantic change in Avar itself: Turk. ‘a mane’ > Av. ‘a plait’, ‘a tress’, ‘a long fur’. As it is known, **the lion** did not live in the area inhabited by the Avar (resp. Dido) people, associatively their ancestors likened the **lion** to their real predatory animal - **the wolf with mane** and created a compound in the language accordingly.

Particular attention is given to those compounds that combine borrowed words from only one language. In such cases, there are more possibilities for substantive compounds of a similar type to be borrowed in their original form, for example: bezh. **zob-rač**³⁸ (< av. **zob** ‘sky’ - **rač**³⁸ ‘earth’, ‘ground’) ‘universe’, geo. **atababadan** < **ata-babadan** (turk. **ata** ‘ancestor’ – **baba** ‘father’) ‘for a long time’ (literally ‘from father-grandfather’), cf. tab. **ata-bab-jir** (pl.), bud. **ata-baba**, ud. **ata-bava** ‘ancestors’, cf. azerb. **ata-baba** ‘id.’...

It is interesting to note that in compounds derived from nouns containing different classes, the class and number of the plural or principal component are usually reflected (Van den Berg 1994: 54). At the same time, the borrowed compound may change class, which seems to be related to the semantic reinterpretation of complex nouns in a foreign language reality, e.g.: Did. **raži-xinḳ** (IV class) < Av. **raži-xinḳ** ‘id.’ (III class) ‘garlic-khinkal’, Did. **kid-uži** ‘girl-son’ (Pl. I class), **kid-uži** (III class) ‘lady-bird’ (literally ‘girl-son’), and so on.

It is noteworthy that borrowed **subordinate compounds** are also confirmed in the study languages, which are largely similar to **coordinate compounds** in terms of distribution and borrowing characteristics. Typically, a relative borrowed compounds truncates the declinable marker of the first

component and coincides with the form (resp. stem) of nominative (cf. Khalilov 2004: 189-190), e.g.: Bezh. **leyi-čiri** (< **leyvis-čiri**) ‘chiri’, ‘dried fruit’, **zayli-ubani** (< **zaylis ubani** < **zaylis ubani**) ‘district name’ (literally ‘a district of dogs’), **abocala** (< ***abos cala** < ***abos cali** (literally ‘a piece of father’) ‘stepfather’, **dalak-čit** < **dalaki-čit** < **dalakis čit** (literally ‘a knife of barber’) ‘blunt knife’, etc.

Conclusion

Thus, the analysis of borrowed compounds reveals: a) In terms of composite loans, the interplay of the study languages is two-way, but not as tangible as the borrowing of lexical items. b) Similar to simple names, compounds borrowed from Georgian and Avar are more, complex names from Dagestani languages are relatively small. c) Hybrid compounds (2) are usually formed by combining different lexical borrowings and proper words, while borrowed compounds are based on compounds of assimilated nouns or as a source-language compounds. d) Separation of compounds formed in the source-language and borrowing language is done using comparative and contrastive methods - if the direct components of the proper compounds in the borrowing language are not confirmed as independent lexemes, then we are dealing with compounds of the source-language. In this case, the linguistic data of dialects and related languages must be taken into account. e) Statistically, we find out the dominance of loans among the study languages, in which the Georgian language has a leading role. Material borrowed from Eastern (Arabic, Turkish, Persian) and Classical (Greek) languages is also tangible. f) Similar to simple names, we have old, medium and new borrowed compounds, although it is extremely difficult to determine their relative chronology, due to the lack of literacy and written sources in some languages (Dido, Bezhita). Nevertheless, by determining the degree of adaptation of compounds, their distribution, and their adaptation to the appropriate historical epochs of the semantics of constituent names, it may also be possible to determine the chronology of loans.

¹ The Article was carried out by the financial support of Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (Grant Project № **FR-18-072**).

² M. Khalilov focuses on the Georgian calc of this compound [Khalilov 2004: 190]. This view should not reflect the truth, because a similar compound does not fit into the proper set of components, and it is noticeable in other Daghestani languages besides the Dido languages: Avar. **keren-raḳ**, Botl., Kar. **nixi-raḳwa**, Bagv. **nih-raḳwa** ‘chest-heart’, etc.