

On the adaptation of Georgian loanwords in the Hinuq language¹

Author: Nodar Ardoteli

TSU Arnold Chikobava Institute of Linguistics (Georgia), Doctor of Philological Sciences

Email: nodariardoteli@gmail.com

Abstract

The article discusses the Georgian loanwords in the Hinuq language and establishes the regular patterns governing these borrowings. It is shown that, historically, the languages (resp. the peoples) under investigation have been in close contact, which is clearly evidenced by both old and recent lexical borrowings. On the basis of a maximally broad consideration of data from the relevant languages and dialects, the study identifies the routes of borrowing and examines the issues of their structural-semantic adaptation. An attempt is made to establish the relative chronology of simple lexical borrowings, and the specific features of the structural-semantic adaptation of the corresponding words are demonstrated.

Keywords: areal linguistics, phonetic adaptation, borrowing, language contact

Introduction

The neighbourhood of the Dido peoples with the Georgian world goes back many centuries. This is especially true of the centuries-long neighbourhood and various close historical contacts between the Georgian population (the Kakhetians, the Tushs) and the Hinuqs, which are mirrored in their lexical interactions. Areal linguistic influences in the form of borrowings are attested, in general, in the Daghestanian languages and, in particular, in Hinuq. Clear evidence of this is provided by those linguistic elements which have entered in large numbers from Georgian into the Dido languages in general and are also distinctly observable in the language under investigation.

Some aspects of the borrowing and diffusion of lexical material from Georgian, as well as of its phonetic adaptation and semantic reinterpretation, are also known from the specialized literature (Chikobava 1987: 7–11; Gudava 1954: 701–708; Bokarev 1959: 113, 227; Khalilov 2004...).

Our present concern is, from the perspective of areal linguistics, to determine what kind of influence the historically attested language contacts have exerted, in general, on the lexical stock of Georgian and Hinuq. More specifically, alongside the lexical correspondences that have already been discussed in Caucasology, we ask whether it is possible to identify new borrowings and to offer their appropriate interpretation. In addition, it is of interest to establish the directions of borrowing and to clarify the etymologies. Furthermore, it is necessary to determine the relative chronology of simple lexical borrowings and to address the issues of their structural-semantic adaptation, which have not yet been studied in the languages under investigation. Taking all of the above into account, in discussing the borrowed lexicon we shall employ descriptive, contrastive, and historical-comparative methods. At the same time, a consistent consideration of the historical and ethnolinguistic aspects is essential.

It is clear that the analysis of the linguistic material at our disposal, combined with a comparison with the positions put forward in the specialist literature, makes it possible to establish certain regularities. In particular, six rules have been identified (Zviadauri [Ardoteli] 1997: 97; cf. Gudava 1954: 701). The corresponding lexical items in the languages under investigation are as follows:

1. The word comes from a foreign source: Geo. *kaṭa*, Hin. *keṭu* (cf. Russ. *koť*, Engl. *cat*, Germ. *die Katze*...) ‘cat’;
2. It appears to be of common genetic origin: Proto-Kartv. **ǰ’ar* ‘frost’ : Proto-Dagh. **c:or* ‘winter’, ‘cold’;
3. It has been borrowed from one language into another: Hin. *uži* ‘son’ > Georg. *važi* ‘id.’;

4. The similarity of word-forms is accidental: Lat. *tibi* (dat.), cf. Hin. *debe-z* (dat.) 'you';
5. The formal similarity is of sound-symbolic character: Geo. *qva-vi*, cf. Hin. *ɣva-di* 'crow';
6. It is the result of reverse borrowing: Av. *xinḵ* (pl. *xinḵal*) > Georg. *xinḵal-i* > Hin. *xinḵal* (cf. *xinḵ* 'roasted meat', *xoḵo* 'xinkhali, pelmeni') 'xinkhali' and so on.

Observing Georgian-Hinuq lexical meetings reveals a notable the abundance of Georgian loanwords, which is indicated in the specialized literature (Bokarev 1959: 113, 227). As for the number of words borrowed from the Hinuq language, it is relatively small. This should be conditioned by the following circumstances: a) the Hinuq language was mainly devoid of direct contact with Georgian, or such contact was sporadic; b) the patriarchal lifestyle, predominantly based on traditional forms of agriculture and livestockbreeding, conditioned a somewhat isolated life and contributed to the local population's disconnection from the outside world; c) intra-ethnic endogamous forms of marriage negatively affected relations with other peoples and slowed down the processes of lexical borrowing; d) the small population facilitated the limited scale of borrowings, etc.

Principal part

It turns out that the Hinuq language was largely connected to the source language through other Dido and Avar languages, therefore the number of loanwords in it is less compared to other Dido languages. Georgian loanwords appear to have entered Hinuq in three ways: a) through the Dido language, b) through the Avar language, and c) through direct contact between the languages under study.

(a) In the structure of borrowings mediated through the Dido language, we encounter features characteristic of that language, e. g.: *arxi* (cf. Dido 'id.') 'channel', *ḡḡ* (cf. Dido 'id.') 'homemade vodka, chacha', *žami* (cf. Dido 'id.') 'basin', *žanyi* (cf. Dido 'id.') 'hoar-frost, mist', *gutan* 1. 'plow', 2. 'ploughshare', *čiti* (cf. Dido 'id.', Av. *čit* 'id.') 'calico fabric', *tupi* (cf. Dido 'id.') 'gun'...

(b) In the vocabulary assimilated through the Avar, structural features and semantic nuances characteristic of that language become clearly visible, e.g.: *lavash* 'Georgian flatbread', *vakil* 'representative, delegate', *abasi* 'twenty-kopeck coin, abazi', *abdal* 'fool, simpleton', *buraw* 'borer, drill', *pandur* 'panduri (a Georgian musical instrument)', *žairan* 'gazelle', *loti* (cf. Av. 'id.') 'drunkard'...

(c) In the material directly borrowed from the source language, the nominative inflection mark is mainly preserved. As a rule, *ʒ* and *ǰ* are not found in the Hinuq language and they are replaced by the appropriate local order spirants (*ʒ* > *z*, *ǰ* > *ž*), e. g.: Geo. *zabri* > Hin. *zabru*, Geo. *žagi* > Hin. *žagi*. In addition, in some cases the noun may not be accompanied by a nominative mark at all, or may have a vowel stem, e.g.: *galavan* (cf. Av. *galan* 'id.') 'barrier, fence', *tupli//tupli* 'shoe', *žancil* 'antli', *ceḡe* 'kid', *čoḡxala* 'churchkhela' and so on.

It is possible that lexemes borrowed from Eastern languages (Arabic, Turkish...) have entered into Hinuq through the Georgian or Avar languages, as indicated by their structure: *iaray* (Av.)//*iarayi* (<Geo. < Türk.) 'weapon', *tup//tupi//tubi* (Geo. 'gun' < Türk. *top* 'shooter') 'rifle' and so on.

From the standpoint of relative chronology, some lexical items appear to be old borrowings, whereas others must belong to a later period. Establishing the chronology of borrowings in non-written languages is difficult, although certain hypotheses may be proposed. Those borrowings should be regarded as old which are connected with Christian terminology², with names of antiquated weapons or tools, or which denote various plants and animals, e. g.: *sagdari* 'church', *yurdeli* 'priest', *amin* 'amen, truly', *korḡoti* 'cracked maize groats', *iaray* 'weapon', *vazi* 'grape cluster', *toqi* 'hoe', *xirix* 'saw', *čaraki* 'pick', *zeḡu* 'mushroom', *šundi* 'cornelian cherry (Cornus mas)', *čanḡul* 'sloe', *ciḡe* 'kid', *mamalay* 'rooster'.

Borrowed vocabulary undergoes various kinds of changes in the recipient language, since it must conform to the structural properties of that language. The corresponding word-forms retain, to a greater or lesser extent, features of the source language, while also adapting themselves to the nature of the borrowing language. Taking all this into account, the lexical material borrowed from Georgian at different periods undergoes and displays the following types of changes and adaptations.

1. Phonotactic adaptation

The phonotactic rules of Hinuq differ, to a greater or lesser extent, from those of the closely related Dido languages (Lomtadze 1963: 18–27; Forker 2013: 34–38). Borrowed items exhibit the following phenomena:

a) In labialized clusters, the labial component *v* (*w*) is only rarely lost: *bebxi* (< Geo. *vepxvi*) ‘leopard’; *nesi* (< Geo. *nesvi*) ‘melon’, etc.

b) Unnatural consonant clusters undergo modification:

bḵ>bḵ: *jubka* (<Geo. *jubḵa*) ‘skirt’;

sx>xs: *maxsara* (<Geo. *masxara*) ‘joke, mockery’;

rcx > rtṣ: *parci* (< Geo. *parcxi*) ‘rake’.

c) Hiatus is resolved in intervocalic positions, or adjacent to vowels, by insertion of the sonorants *j* and *w*, or the spirant *ɔ*:

jaray/jarayi (< Geo. *iarayī*) ‘weapon’; *qawurma* ‘fried meat’;

begawul (< Geo. *bokaul-i*) 1. ‘village headman’, 2. ‘aul administrator’;

žamaɔat (< Geo. *žamaati*) ‘community’.

d) Consonant clusters in initial position may also be resolved by the addition of a vowel:

iṣtoli (< Geo. *stoli* < Russ. *стол* ‘id.’) ‘table’.

e) Unusual consonant sequences may be broken up by vowel insertion (*a*, *e*, *u*...): *ḵarameṭi* (< Geo. *ḵramiṭi*) ‘roof tile’; *nawuti* (< Georg. *navti*) ‘kerosene’; *ḵinili* (< Geo. *mḵnili*) ‘pickled cabbage (sauerkraut)’ and so on.

2. Phonetic adaptation

1) Vowel substitution, which is often conditioned by assimilatory or dissimilatory processes:

(a) *a > i*: *tuti* (<Geo. *tuta* ‘id.’) ‘mulberry’;

a > o: *otoxi* (<Geo. *otaxi* ‘id.’) ‘room’, *indovri* (<Geo. *indauri* ‘id.’) ‘turkey (the bird)’, *ḵoboj* (< Geo. *ḵabaj*) ‘overcoat’, etc.

(b) *e > a*: *abraṣun* (<Geo. *abreṣumi* ‘id.’) ‘silk’, *ḵaraki* (<Geo. *ḵerakvi* ‘id.’) ‘pick’, *ḵakmaj* (<Geo. *ḵekma* ‘id.’) ‘boot’, *naḵila/niḵila* (<Geo. *neḵa* ‘id.’) ‘the little finger’, *zajtun* (<Geo. *zeituni* ‘id.’) ‘olive’;

e > i: *vili* (< Geo. *veli*) ‘Georgia’, *gimu* (<Geo. *gemo* ‘id.’) ‘taste’, *ḵurbila* (<Geo. *ḵurbela* ‘id.’) ‘leech’;

e > o: *zozo* (<Geo. *zeṣvi* ‘id.’) ‘thorn tree’;

e > u: *ḵunuli* (<Geo. *ḵuneli* ‘id.’) ‘hawthorn’;

i > u: *kawu* (<Geo. *kavi*) ‘kavi (Gathering place in the village)’; *zabru* (<Geo. *zabri* ‘id.’) ‘funnel’; *ḵeḵu* (< Geo. *ḵiḵ*) ‘small tooth’, etc.

(d) *o > e*: *begavul* (<Geo. *bokauli* ‘id.’) ‘village headman’, *zeku* (<Geo. *soḵo* ‘id.’) ‘mushroom’;

o > u: *gatuqna* (<Geo. *gatoqna* ‘id.’) ‘to weed’, *gimu* (<Geo. *gemo* ‘id.’) ‘taste’, *kusa* (< Geo. *kosa* ‘id.’) ‘khosa (a beardless man)’, *tubi* (<Geo. *topi* ‘id.’) ‘gun’, *itu* (<Geo. *uto* ‘id.’) ‘iron’, *zeḵu* (<Geo. *soḵo* ‘id.’) ‘mushroom’, *jurḵa/ḵ jorya* (<Geo. *iorḵa* ‘id.’) ‘ambling horse’, etc.

(e) *u > a*: *pardala* (<Geo. *parduli* ‘id.’) ‘shed’, *ḵaḵaraki* (Geo. < *ḵuḵuraki* ‘id.’) ‘miserly person’;

u > o: *kobore* (< Khevs. *qumbura*) ‘bast fiber’; *poḵoḵi* (<Geo. *puḵeḵi* ‘id.’) ‘chaff’, etc.

2) In Georgian–Hinuq lexical borrowings, various consonantal changes are observed:

(a) Substitution:

p > b: Geo. *vepxvi* > Hin. *bebxi* ‘leopard’

b > m: Geo. *baṭi* > Hin. *maṭi* ‘goose’

k > g: Geo. *bokauli* > Hin. *begavul* ‘village headman’

g > k: Geo. *zeg* ‘the day after tomorrow’ > Hin. *zek* ‘tomorrow’

n > m: Geo. *zurna* > Hin. *zurma* ‘musical pipe’

ḵ > g: Geo. *ḵanapi* > Hin. *ganabi* ‘strong rope’, etc.

(b) Abruptivization:

d > ṭ: Geo. *ḵinda* > Hin. *ḵinṭa* ‘sock’

t > ṭ: Geo. *sastauli* > Hin. *sasṭuri* ‘pillow’

k > k̥: Geo. *koxi* > Hin. *koxi* ‘small house’, etc.

(c) Spirantization: Hinuq lacks voiced affricates, so in borrowed material the corresponding affricates are regularly replaced by appropriate fricatives (*ჭ* > *z*, *ჭ* > *ʒ*) (Lomtadze 1963: 40; Imnaishvili 1963: 36–37):

Geo. *bozi* > Hin. *bozi* ‘tree support’

Geo. *manzili* > Hin. *manzil* ‘interval’

Geo. *γanzili* > Hin. *γanzil* ‘ramsons (*Allium ursinum*)’

Geo. *ʒanyi* > Hin. *ʒanyi* ‘hoar-frost, mist’

Geo. *ʒeirani* > Hin. *ʒairan* ‘gazelle’, etc.

(d) Dezabruptivization:

t̥ > *t*: Geo. *ṭipi* > Hin. *tipi* ‘type of cap’

č > *c*: Geo. *kič* > Hin. *kicu* ‘tooth’, etc.

(e) Transposition:

Geo. *kekva* > Hin. *kekwa*//*kweka* ‘scratch’

Geo. *maxsara* > Hin. *maxsara* ‘joking, mockery’

Geo. *ḱramiṭi* > Hin. *ḱaramiṭi*//*ḱamarṭi* ‘tile’, etc.

3. Morphological adaptation

From the perspective of morphological integration and marking, particular attention is drawn to the properties of grammatical class, number, and case. The majority of nouns borrowed from Georgian belong to inanimate noun classes; therefore, unless human characteristics are transferred, they are generally assigned to the third and fourth classes. Illustrative examples:

Table 1

Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV
yurdeli ‘priest’	yebari ‘painter’	buryu ‘drill’	zeti ‘oil’
begavul ‘village headman’	zeḱerijomu ‘cowardly (human)’	yalaj ‘tin’	γanzil ‘ramsons (<i>Allium ursinum</i>)’
buḡa fig. ‘brave man’		buḡa ‘bull’	naḡaḡi ‘hand axe’

In Hinuq, Georgian loanwords in the plural generally take the suffix **-be**, and occasionally the stem vowel may be slightly reduced before it, e.g.: *ceḱe* ‘cicada’ → pl. *ceḱ-be*. As for case marking, borrowed nouns generally inflect analogously to native nouns.

4. Semantic transformation

According to semantic shift and reinterpretation, borrowed nouns generally undergo two types of changes: **a) Narrowing of the etymon’s meaning**, and **b) Broadening of the etymon’s meaning**, e. g.:

a) Narrowing: Geo. *ḡḡ* 1. ‘residual material’, 2. ‘alcoholic beverage’ → Hin. *ḡḡ* ‘homemade distilled spirit’; **b) Broadening:** Geo. *buryi* ‘drill’ → Hin. *buryu* 1. ‘drill’; 2. ‘screw’, etc.

Some lexical meanings are particularly interesting as they reveal semantic shift and reinterpretation, e. g.: Av. *xink-al* (Geo. pl. ‘*xinklebl*’) → Geo. *xinkali* → Hin. *xinkal* 1. ‘dumpling’, 2. ‘khinkhali’; Geo. *γip̃i* ‘paunch’ → Hin. *γip̃i* ‘slow, idle (person)’; Geo. *xarḡi* → Hin. *xarḡi*: 1. ‘wage’; 2. ‘expense, spending’; Geo. *čarxi* ‘lathe’ → Hin. *čarxi* ‘oilstone’, etc.

Conclusion

Thus, the vocabulary borrowed from Georgian into Hinuq generally preserves, to a greater or lesser extent, features of the source language while also reflecting the structural characteristics of the recipient language. The regularities of sound changes are clearly observable on the basis of phonotactic and phonetic analysis. With regard to morphological integration and marking, particular attention is drawn to the properties of grammatical class and number. As for case, borrowed nouns generally inflect analogously to native core nouns. According to semantic transformation, borrowed items mainly undergo two types of changes: a) narrowing of the etymon's meaning, b) broadening of the etymon's meaning.

¹ This study was carried out with the financial support of the Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (grant project: **FR-24-10850**).

² The adoption of Christian terminology is unlikely after the 14th century.

References

- Bokarev 1959:** Бокарев Евгений Алексеевич. Цезские (дидойские) языки Дагестана. Москва: Издательство АН СССР, 1959.
- Gudava 1954:** ტუგო გუდავა. ქართულ-ხუნძური ლექსიკური შეხვედრების შესახებ [Gudava, Togo. On Georgian–Avar Lexical Encounters]. სმამ. ტ. XV, N10, გვ. 701-708. თბილისი: 1954.
- Zviadaduri 1997:** ნოდარ ზვიადაური. ნახურ-დაღესტნურ ენათა ლექსიკა ქართული ენის მთის დიალექტებში [Zviadaduri, Nodar. Lexicon of Nakh-Daghestanian Languages in the Mountain Dialects of Georgian]: ეტიმოლოგიური ძიებანი, ტ. VI, გვ. 96-103. თბილისი: 'მეცნიერება', 1997
- Imnaishvili 1963:** Имнайшвили Давид Сильвестрович. Дидойский язык в сравнении с гинухским и хваршийским языками. Тбилиси: Издательство АН ГССР, 1963.
- Lomtadze 1963:** Ломтадзе Элизбар Андреевич. Гинухский диалект дидойского языка. Тбилиси: Издательство АН ГССР, 1963.
- Forker 2013:** Forker, Diana. A Grammar of Hinuq. Leipzig, 2013.
- Chikobava 1987:** არნოლდ ჩიქობავა. ახო და ვაჟი სიტყვების ეტიმოლოგიისათვის [Chikobava, Arnold. Akho and Vazhi in Etymological Research]: ეტიმოლოგიური ძიებანი, გვ. 7-11. თბილისი: 'მეცნიერება', 1987.
- Khalilov 2004:** Маджид Шарипович Халилов. Грузинско-дагестанские языковые контакты. Москва: Издательство 'Наука', 2004.