

სპეკალი

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის თბილისის
სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის ჰუმანიტარულ
მეცნიერებათა ფაკულტეტის რეცენზირებადი
ელექტრონული ბილინგვური სამეცნიერო ჟურნალი

ISSN 1987-8583

SPEKALI

Electronic Bilingual Scholarly Peer-Reviewed Journal of the Faculty of
Humanities at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

ISSN 1987-8583

2010

N2

Contents

1. Aleksander Boshishvili. On the “Building” Inscription of the Tsavkisi Church	3
2. Teimuraz Gvantseladze. Functioning of the Abkhazian Language in Education	8
3. Leri Tavadze. Frontier System of Georgia: Problems of the Northern Borders in Antiquity	15
4. Nestan Tchkhikvadze. Georgian Manuscripts in the European Depositories (National Library of France)	23
5. Nikoloz Silagadze. The Homeland Problem of Indo-European Language-Speaking Peoples	30
6. Khatuna Tumanishvili. Dialogue of Cultures: Stereotyped Models of Conceptual Thinking (On the Example of Arabic and Georgian Proverbs)	43
7. Merab Nachkebia. Metamorphoses of the Abkhazian Toponymy	52
8. Ramaz Kurdadze. Slang in the Context of Georgian-Russian Linguistic Relations	62
9. Sofie Mujiri. Indicators of Tension in Oral and Written Texts	71
10. Nana Khakhutaishvili. Georgian Problems of Russian Text: Linguoculturological Concepts in the Context of two Cultures	77

On the “Building” Inscription of the Tsavkisi Church

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/17

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Aleksander Boshishvili](#)

Tsavkisi is located in Didgori region of Tbilisi, on the slope of the south-eastern branch of Trialeti ridge, at the height of 900 m above sea level [Gigineishvili, 1987: 285]. According to the data of 2002 Tsavkisi is inhabited by 1199 permanent residents. [Georgian...2003:203]

The first mentioning of Tsavkisi in historical sources is found in the sacrifices book in Svetitskhoveli, when King Alexander renewed his sacrifices to Svetitskhoveli with "makhraghaja and khekordzi" [Materials, 1964:257; Chronicles, 1897: 195]. As is seen Svetitskhoveli had lost its influence because of Ottoman domination in Kartli. Later, in 1595 king Svimon (1556-1600) sacrificed Tsavkisi to Metekhi church. However, on May 7, 1677 Prince Levan and Giorgi renewed it again to Svetitskhoveli and sacrificed [Materials, 1964: 257; Kakabadze, 1913:53-54].

The mother of King Rostom (1633-1658) was from the village of Tsavkisi [Beri Egnatashvili, 1959].

From historical documents it is known that, Tsavkisi was a part of Satsitsiano . According to the Census of 1721 the landlords of Tsavkisi were Vakhtang V Shahnava's (1658-1675) „*Darbaiseli*” Utrud Tsitsishvili, Papuna Tsitsishvili (Sardlishvili) and Zaza Tsitsishvili (Sardlishvili). [Census...1907].

According to the Census book of 1781 village population of Tiflis environs the Tsavkisi landlords were Givi and Teimuraz Tsitsishvili. Tsavkisi was the land of Tsitsishvili residing below, that is why the migration of population to Tsavkisi often occurred from other villages of Lower Tsitsishvili (Nichbisi, Kintsvisi, Kvenaplazi, etc) [Tiflisi ...1967:165].

From the 18th century as a result of weakening the Tsitsishvili-s power a part of their lands passed into the hands of Melik Mamasakhlisi-s, Bebutashvili-s. In the Censor book conducted by Ioane Batonishvili at the beginning of the 19th century on the charts of the villages located the south of Tiflis "the town of Tsavkisi" is mentioned [Ioane Bagrationi, 1986:46]. In 1801 an act of the son of king Giorgi XII about Prince David`s serfs who were passed to the state treasury was issued. These serfs appeared to be taken by David for the landlord Givi Tsitsishvili. [ACAC, 1886: 302].

According to the censor conducted by the Russian Empire in 1804 Tsavkisi covered 302 dessiatina which is inhabited by only 10 peasant households; the landlords are Pharsadan, Zaza and Utrud Tsitsishvili-s [CHAG, case. 74: 43]. The process of taking off the serfs and their transfer to the State Treasury just started at that time. By all data the number of population must have been more. The possibility of making an error while recording the population of

Tsavkisi was easy as it is known that in 1781 there lived 16 households [Tiflis...1967: 165] and in 1817 - 27 households [CHAG, case. 477:27-28] . In the middle period the existence of only 9 households gives rise to doubt. At the same time it is not doubtful among the landlords the nobleman Babutashvili does not seem doubtful. It is known that by that time in the villages of Tbilisi environs - Tskneti and Tsavkisi, the lands of Tsitsishvili-s already belonged if not totally their great part to the Babutashili-s. Presumably, the landlords with the aim of reducing the taxes hid their serfs intentionally.

There are several churches in Tsavkisi which are mainly built in the late middle ages. The monument we are interested in is located in the cemetery. It is a small basilica church with tall sanctuary; has the porch from the west side. The church is built of stones. Georgian red brick was used in the construction. At the porch on both sides there were installed "khachkari" of which the left one, the bigger is grey and the right one the small is brown. During the restoration conducted at the end of the 20th century the stone crosses from the Tsavkisi church were taken off and currently they are placed inside the church.

Figure 1. Tsavkisi church, the view from the south-east.

In the southern wall a small grey stone is inserted with Armenian inscription performed in five line capital letters.

Figure 2. Plan and section of the Tsavkisi church.

Figure 3. Tsavkisi church, southern wall, Armenian inscription

Ի ԹՎԻՆ ՁԽԲ

ԵՍ ՏՐ ԱԻԵՏԻՍ ԹՇՆԱՍ

ՇԻՆԵՑԻ ԱՒ ԵԿՂԵՍԻ

ՏՐ ՅՍ ԸՆԿԱԼ ՁԵՌԱՑ

ԻՍՈՑ

The "construction" inscription is translated into Georgian as: In the year of 942 [+551+1493] I, Father Avetis priest, built this church. 'Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, please accept from my hands'.

The inscription was read by Professor Leon Melikset-Beg and he stated without doubt that this church was built by an Armenian priest Terter in 1493 [Leon Melikset-Beg, 1922: 100]. This view is shared by the majority of the scholars [Schmerling...1960: 67; Karapetyan, 1995].

Nothing is said about the inscription by Professor Paruir Muradyan in his well known work "Armenian Epigraphics of Georgia" [Muradyan, 1985].

Generally in Armenian historiography a purposive tendency of belongingness of Georgian churches to the Armenian is taking shape. In 1995 Samvel Karapetyan's book "Armenian churches in Georgia" [Karapetyan, 1995] appeared in Armenia. The map directory deals with the Armenian background of around 650 churches. Georgian historian Professor Bondo Arveladze considers in details the map-directory and makes an assumption about Tsavkisi church inscription that it must have been brought later [Arveladze, 1996:36].

Due to some reasons we cannot share the supposition of the Armenian scholars as if the Tsavkisi church was built by priest Terter in 1493. As was mentioned above Tsavkisi together with neighboring Shindisi was registered in Mtskheta church lands since the 14th century (probably even earlier, because in the charter of donation it is said about renovation). At the same time it was less included in the process of "Armenization" or Armenian settlement. Moreover, we can boldly state that unlike the neighboring villages Tsavkisi is the only village where the presence of Armenians is not traced till the 80-90s of the 18th century (until the lands of the nobleman Tsitsishvili gradually fell into Tbilisi Melik Mamasakhlisi-s or of Armenian background landlord Babutashvili-s hands). Babutashvili tried hard the "armenization" of Tsavkisi and other villages. However, after the establishment of the Russian administration in 1804, census Tsavkisi is still named as totally Georgian village. [ACAC, 1886: 461].

A question arises as to how the inscription and "khachkar" appeared in Georgian village of Tsavkisi.

It is a known fact that while migrating, the Armenians often take construction inscriptions from their sanctuaries, "stone crosses" and toponyms too. We can boldly state this on the example of today's Javakheti region.

The similar stone on which Armenian inscription was done, cannot be found locally and is not used in the construction of the church at all. It is noteworthy that there is no mentioning of either king or feudal (even Armenian) on this construction inscription, or when this inscription was done; the toponym *Tsavkisi* is not mentioned. All these facts cast doubt on and make us think that this inscription if it was not falsified later and really was done in 1493 must have been appeared in Tsavkisi at the end of the 18th century. It seems several households were settled in Tsavkisi with intention of "Armenization" in the 18th century and the migrants install in the wall of Georgian church the inscription and stone cross brought with them. However, as is seen they failed to settle there for along time and changed their residence again but their trace appeared to be left in the form of inscription and stone cross.

Thus, we can conclude that the inscription done in Armenian language in cemetery church of Tsavkisi was inserted later and there is no ground to claim that this is an Armenian church.

Satsitsiano - princehood of Tsitsishvili. The Tsitsishvilis were moved from Samtskhe. They were the owners of Phanaskerteli fortress in Tao. Due to the controversy with Atabeg Kvarqvare II (1451-1498) Zaza Phanaskerteli moved to Kartli. In the gorge of the river Dzama he founded the principedom. The Tsitsishvilis belonged to a big family numbers until they were

divided into the Upper and Lower branches. Tsavkisi belonged to the Lower Tsitsishvili Family. The Tsitsishvilis were king's commanders during the war. King's flag army was gathered from Satsitsiano villages.

The Babutashvili-s came into prominence in the 17th century when the king Rostom (1633-1658) granted to Khoja Bebuta lands in Tbilisi and position. After this Bebuta's children gradually advanced though they did not have feudal organization - *safavado* like other patrimonial. Before the establishment of the Russian administration (1801) they occupied the post of Tbilisi Melik or Melik-Mamasakhlisi.

Dessiatina - measure of land in old Russia, took effect before the introduction of metric system. One dessiatina equals 2400 sq. meters or 1.09 hectares).

Khachkari (Arm. Խաչքար means stone cross) is characteristic for Armenian architecture. A cross and carving are represented on the stele. The stone crosses are spread all over territory of Armenia: on the roads, on the churches. When changing the residing place the stone crosses are transferred to new residence.

Armenian inscription and Georgian translation are given according to the professor Leon Meliksed-Beg [see, Meliksed-Beg, 1922: 100].

For example, it was Tbilisi`s Melik Mamasakhlisi, landowner Darchia the son of Avetik Bebutashvili (1795-1801) who contributed much to the "Armenization" of the village Tskneti. After him this was continued by his servants.

References

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Arveladze B.
1996 | Are there "Armenian" or Georgian churches in Georgia? Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Census...
1907 | Materials of statistical description in the 18th century. Published by E.Takaishvili. Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Beri
Egnatashvili
1959 | The Life of Kartli. Text prepared by Simon Kaukhchishvili. Vol. II. Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Gigineishvili
G.
1987 | Tsavkisi. Georgian Soviet Encyclopedia. Vol. XI. Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Ioane
Bagrationi
1986 | Census of Kartli and Kakheti. Text prepared for publication and supplied with index by T.Enukidze and G.Bedoshvili. Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
| Kakabadze
S.
1913 | Historical Documents. IV. Tbilisi, (in Georgian). |
-

Materials... 1964	Materials of Georgian historical geography and toponyms. Book I (according to the 10th and 17th centuries documents). Prepared for publication by Z.Aleksidze and Sh.Burjanadze. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Melikset-Beg L. 1922	Armenian artifacts in Tiflis environs, Shavnabad-Telet-Tsavkisi// Bulletin of Gerogian Museum №1. Tiflis, (in Georgian).
Georgian... 2003	Main results of the first national general census of 2002 (rural population), vol.II. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Tiflisi... 1967	The census book of 1781of village around Tiflisi//I.Javakhishvili. Monuments of Georgia's economic history. Book I. Demographic monuments, the census books of the 18th century eastern Georgia. Tbilisi,(in Georgian).
Chronicles... 1897	Chronicles and other materials of Gerogian history and writing. Collected, chronologically arranged and explained by T. Zhordania. Vol.II. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Karapetyan S. 1995	„Armenian churches in Georgia“. Erevan. (in Armenian).
ACAC 1886	Acts collected by Caucassian Archeographical Commision. Published under the editorship of Ad.Berzhe (ACAC), Vol I, Tiflis. (in Russian).
Muradyan P. 1985	Armenian Epigraphics of Georgia, Kartli and Kakheti. Erevan,(in Russian).
Schmerling ... 1960	Schmerling R., Dolidze V., Barnaveli T. Tbilisi environs. Tbilisi, (in Russian).
CHAG	Central Historical Archive of Georgia, Fund №254, rec. №1, case № 74.
CHAG	Central Historical Archive of Georgia, Fund №254, rec №1, case №477.

Functioning of the Abkhazian Language in Education

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/20

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Teimuraz Gvantseladze](#)

The Abkhaz is a new "written language". The founder of the first Abkhazian alphabet was the Russian general and linguist Pyotr Uslar. Hitherto and after it (up to the twenties of the 20th century), Abkhazians had been using Georgian language in tuition.

Among the functional spheres of any written language one of the most important is education. However, the Abkhazian literary language in the course of its existence was not used at all in this sphere or its functioning was limited. Unfortunately, currently the utilization of the Abkhazian language in tuition is also restricted.

In 1810, when the Abkhazian principedom still maintained nominal independence, it was Georgian priest Ioane Ioseliani - personal spiritual mentor of the Abkhazian prince, who raised the issue of who put forward the issue of using the Abkhazian language in education. In accordance with his project, in a village of Likhni near the residence of the Abkhazian prince, seminary was planned to be opened where the Abkhazian children would have learned their mother tongue. The proposal was supported by the Abkhazian prince but the Russian authorities declined this initiative.

On May 30, 1851, the Holy Synod of the Russian church adopted a resolution on the establishment of the church school in Abkhazia. A month and a half earlier before the adoption of this resolution on April 15, the dean (director) of the educational institution was appointed Georgian hieromonk (later the overseer) Alexander Okropiridze who made an immense contribution to the promotion of Christianity among the Abkhazians and organization of spiritual education. The mentioned four-year school began functioning in the village of Likhni from 25 September, 1852. There was studied catechism, Russian language, Georgian language (civil and ecclesiastic), calligraphy in Russian, calligraphy in Georgian, Arithmetic, Russian Grammar, Georgian Grammar, chants, geography, and the exercises in the Abkhazian [Saint...2006: 11-17]. This was the first case in history to introduce the study of the Abkhazian language.

The list of the pupils enrolled in Likhni church school that was filled in by A.Okropiridze's hand dated January 27, 1853, has come down to us. From this document it becomes known that there were a total of 11 pupils in this school. In our opinion six pupils of them must have been of Abkhazian background: Spiridon Bzhania from Ilori, Tevdore Lakoba from Souksu (Likhni), David Marshania from Gup, Tevdore Lakoba (from Likhni), Mose Eshba from Jirkhva, David the son of Sosran Marghania (his birth place is not indicated but it is mentioned that he was "tatar", i.e. Muslim but Muslim Georgians did not reside in Abkhazia), Philippe Lakerbaia from Otkhara [Saint...2006: 70-71]. Among these children A.Okropiridze maintained S.Bzhania on his own

[Saint...2006: 68-69]. There exists a notice of May 29, 1867 concerning those eight pupils whose tuition fees were covered personally by A.Okropiridze. They appeared to be: Giorgi Marshania, Giorgi Eshba, Petre Iaskua, Petre Pilia, Petre Antia, Nestor Grigolia, David Gvilia, Grigol Teblia [Saint...2006:36, 141].

The church school of Likhni operated until October of 1855.

A.Okropiridze was an initiator of opening a school for Abkhazian children in the village of Ilori and also the head of this school for which he was awarded with so-called *samxreuli* on May 8, 1852 [Saint...2006:11]. Thanks to the special concern of the Bishop Alexander Okropiridze, the first Abkhazian Christian clergymen, well-known later, were brought up. They were Ivane (Ioane)Gegia, Ioane Argun, Petre Pilia and others [Saint...2006:36, 34]. Of them I.Gegia participated (1862) in the work of the Commission lead by general I.Bartholomei who composed the first Abkhaz alphabetical book.

The concrete material presented here testifies to the truth of the conclusion made by Georgian scholar J.Gamakharia: "It is not an overstatement to state that Bishop Alexander laid the foundation to the literacy among the Abkhazs" [Saint...2006:37]. Unfortunately, today the outstanding contribution made by this public man to the Abkhazs has been forgotten.

In 1862, the Commission was established in Tbilisi by the "Society for the Restoration of Orthodox Christianity in the Caucasus" to compose the first Abkhaz textbook for church schools. Russian general I. Bartholomei was appointed as Chair of the Commission and its members were: a Georgian D.Purtseladze and a Russian V.Trigorov. The Commission was assisted by Abkhazian public men: the above mentioned priest Ioane Gegia, warrant officer Giorgi Kurtsikidze, nobleman Simon Eshba. Abkhazian text material of the textbook composed by the Commission was checked and edited by Hasan Marghania, Konstantine the son of Giorgi Sharvashidze and Grigol, the son of Alexander Sharvashidze. The textbook was published in Tbilisi in 1865. The Abkhaz reading material in it was translated into Russian and Georgian languages [The History...1986: 12-13].

In 1866 in several parish schools of Abkhazian villages the education process was conducted in native language that naturally was a positive fact, but in 1884 "The Society for the Restoration of Orthodoxy in the Caucasus" banned the learning in Abkhazian language at all and introduced Russian as a language of tuition in the existed schools.

In the same 1866 in Tbilisi there was published "Brief History of Religion" for Abkhazian parish schools in which the text material was presented in Abkhazian and Russian languages. The Abkhazian translations were performed by Ioane Gegia, David the son of Kats Marghania and Giorgi Kurtsikidze [The History ...1986:14].

In 1892 in Tbilisi there was published the second textbook in Abkhazian language. Its authors were Dmitri Gulia - the future founder and classic of Abkhazian literature and his Georgian teacher Konstantine Machavariani. The book included the prayers translated from Russian, "Ten Commandments" and "Credo". In the preface it was indicated that the textbook was designed for the Abkhazian children to be fascinated with their mother tongue and make it easy for them to study Russian language [The History ...1986:14].

Of course, the opening of church and secular schools in the middle of the 19th century was also an important event because the Abkhazian children got an opportunity to receive an early schooling but in these schools instruction language was Russian and Abkhazian had only the function of auxiliary language - it had to help the thorough study of Russian. This function of the Abkhazian language is clearly seen in the preface of the above mentioned textbook compiled by D.Gulia and K.Machavariani. Besides this, to receive a full education in Abkhazian language was impossible due to the fact that there had been no literature in this language by that time which specimens could be used during the learning process. In addition to this, the authorities were not interested in the conduction of educational process in Abkhazian language at all. Moreover, tsarist Russia tried to accelerate the Russification of the Abkhazian people and this policy was conducted openly by the representatives of the government and its ideologists. For example, from the formation of the Abkhazian writing up to the tens of the twentieth century Abkhazian language was practically rarely used in tuition by P.Uslar. From 1864 when Russia finally conquered the Principality of Abkhazia, the Russian authorities themselves tried to organize the study in Abkhazian language and in 1865, a year after the issuing of the first Abkhazian textbook, parish schools were established in several Abkhazian villages for Abkhazian children where the language of instruction was Russian but Abkhazian was also taught.

In these schools the study of Abkhazian language was not of priority: based on the Russian script Abkhazian literary language was regarded as an adjuvant to study Russian. Besides this, the ideologues of Russification aimed at separation of Abkhazian people from Georgian cultural space (before this the Abkhazians studied Georgian in the families and used it in official paperwork, church service and cultural spheres). The Russian ideologists and authorities named several reasons due to which it was impossible to conduct educational process in Abkhazian language:

1. The organization of secular and ecclesiastic education was not possible because there were no academic books in this language;
2. The Abkhazians were not Georgians and therefore, it was inadmissible to continue the education and church service in Georgian language.
3. The Abkhazians had to study Russian so well as to finally forget their mother tongue and became Russified.

For example, one of the ideologists of Russification, Evgeni Veidenbaum wrote: "Abkhazian language which does not have script and literature of its own is, of course, doomed for disappearance in more or less near future. The question is as to which language can substitute it. It is obvious that it should be Russian not Georgian language that implants cultural ideas and terms in (Abkhazian) population. Therefore I believe that creation of Abkhazian language should be not a goal but means for weakening of demand for Georgian language through church and school and a weapon for its (Georgian) substitution by the state language (Russian)" [Gamakharia...1997:720].

E.Veidenbaum purposely did not attach any importance to the fact of existence of the Abkhazian script by that time. Besides this, he let slip that Abkhazians preserved the traditional demand for knowledge of Georgian language.

In such circumstances, it was an act of heroism on the part of those Abkhaz and Georgian public men who still tried to implement the teaching of Abkhazian language in the schools established with great efforts in the Abkhazian villages of the region. In this respect of particular importance is the contribution of the Abkhazian educationists: Toma Eshba who was considered to be the "grandfather of Abkhazian education", Dmitri Gulia, Andrei Chochua, Dmitri Marghania, Samson Chanba, Anton Chukbar, Simon Basaria, Nikolay Pateifha, etc., as well as their Georgian associates and companions: Konstantine Machavariani, Petre Charaia, Nikoloz Janashia, Mariam (Masho) Dadiani, etc. For example, Petre Charaia who was a brilliant linguist and author of remarkable researches devoted to the history and structure of Abkhazian and Georgian languages, on the issues of Abkhazian folklore and ethnology, throughout all his adult life taught Abkhazian and Georgian languages to Abkhazian children residing in the village of Eshkit.

In 1909, an Abkhazian educator, Andrei Chochua published, "Abkhazian alphabet" compiled on the basis of pedagogical principles developed by Iakob Gogebashvili, in which along with original Abkhazian children's texts several stories from "Ruskoe slovo" (Russian word) translated by I. Gogebashvili were introduced. The merit of this book was that it followed Iakob's pedagogical principles according to which, the study of mother tongue shouldn't be a minor thing, but mother tongue should help the pupils in perception of the world, inspire the wish to learn, creative ability, raise cultural level and foreign language must be learned only when the pupil have essential knowledge of mother tongue and the influence of foreign language would not interfere. This principle of Iakob contributes to the survival of linguistic and ethnic identity of the nation.

It is also worth mentioning that I. Gogebashvili concerned about the improvement of learning in Abkhazian language. He backed the proposal put forward by the Georgian bishop of Abkhazia Kirion (Sadzaglishvili) about the necessity to conduct study and divine service in Abkhazian language. In 1907, Iakob wrote about Abkhazian language: "As an independent language it indeed has a right to its own church service, its script and its own national literature". He called on Sukhumi Georgians to assist Abkhazian public figures in creation of school textbooks of the Abkhazian language and in case of difficulties with publication of such books, to send the texts to Tbilisi, where the Society for Spreading Literacy among the Georgians, member of the board of which was Gogebashvili, would pay for printing of those books [Gamakharia, 2005: 473-474]. We suppose that it was this proposal of I. Gogebashvili that inspired the Abkhazian educators and the response to this appeal must have been the publication of such book as "Abkhazian book for Abkhazian schools" compiled by a group of authors in Tbilisi in 1908, the title and content of which clearly indicated that the authors wanted to establish not Russian schools with elements of learning language as it had been before, but proper Abkhazian national schools.

It is irony of fate that today Abkhazian separatists tagged the bishop Kirion and I. Gogebashvili as the greatest "enemies of Abkhazians" and "assimilators". From the view point of spreading the Abkhazian language in educational sphere the most important event was the establishment of pedagogical seminary in Sokhumi and inviting D. Gulia in Abkhazia as a teacher. It's true in this seminary too Abkhazian language had the function of auxiliary discipline, but D. Gulia managed to excite the student's interest with native language, which was favored after the

restoration of Georgian independence, in 1919, the creation of Abkhazian literary circle which published the manuscript magazine "Sharpietsva" ("The Morning Star"). The future Abkhazian writers participated in the work of the circle and published their first novels: Iva Khogonia, Mushni Ahashba, Dzadz Darsalia, Mikha Lakrba, Shamil Khokerba, etc.[Abkhazian...1986: 45]. D.Gulia the editor of the first newspaper in Abkhazian language "Apsny" established in the same 1919 appealed to Abkhazian people to protect native language and receive good education in it [Abkhazian...1986: 43]. It seems he believed that in independent Georgia it would be possible to receive good education in Abkhazian language. Unfortunately Georgia soon had lost its independence and the soviet power was established.

If we want to show the soviet educational system objectively, we should recognize that the main achievement of the system was the eradication of mass illiteracy and making the secondary education compulsory, which raised the cultural level of population. However, we can't say the same in relation to the education in national languages. From this viewpoint the languages spread in the Soviet Union were divided onto several categories:

1. The only really privileged language was Russian, which knowledge was obligatory for each citizen irrespective of nationality. At Russian schools all over the country each subject was entirely studied only in Russian language (except one of the west European languages).
2. In the republics of the union the studies in the languages of the titular nations proceeded in schools of two categories: in national schools of some republics (Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Baltic republics) the language of study was titular nation languages and in the rest republics (for example, 5 countries of middle Asia) the schools were pseudo national and the primary education in them proceeded in national language and from the 5th grade the majority of the subjects except humanitarian subjects was taught in Russian;
3. The schools located in the places of compact settlement of national minorities and other autonomies were also named "national schools" but in them too the primary education was in national language and from the 5th grade the majority of the subjects except humanitarian subjects were taught in Russian.

The school in Abkhazia that is called Abkhazian till nowadays belonged to the third category. There Abkhazian students received education in native language only during the first four years of academic year and at high schools the language of study was Russian and a child was taught only Abkhazian language and literature in their native language. This means that actually the so-called Abkhazian school was Russian language school with the elements of study of native language that aimed at denationalization of the Abkhazians and Russification.

In Abkhazian separatist literature it is considered a terrible accusation to prove as if the government of the Soviet Georgia aimed at assimilation of the Abkhazians with Georgians and to reach this purpose in 1945 remade Abkhazian schools into Georgian schools and banned to study Abkhazian language and literature in them. This accusation distorts the reality. In reality things were quite different:

On January 24, 1938 the organizational bureau of the Central committee of the Communist Party adopted a resolution on reformation of the educational system. It was written in the resolution:

- a) To transform special national schools (German, Finnish, Polish, Lithuanian, Estonian, Greek, Izhorian, etc) into the soviet schools of ordinary type, also to abolish special national branches existed at ordinary soviet schools;
- b) ... it is necessary that the reorganization of special national schools be happen by means of their transferring the soviet textbooks of ordinary type and educational programs, to the language of relevant republic or by starting to teach in Russian language..."[Papaskiri,2003:19].

This resolution implied the transferring of learning in the so-called Abkhazian schools into Georgian language. As has been justly pointed out by the scholar D.Jojua, the then government of Georgian soviet republic was very cautious and delayed the reform of the so-called Abkhazian schools [Jojua,2007:327], but finally the step was done, because Moscow wouldn't tolerate this. It is also essential that from 1945 the study of Abkhazian language and literature in the so-called Abkhazian schools was not annulled, which is proved by the following facts:

1. The Abkhazian writer Bagrat Shinkuba recalls: "In that year [1945-T.G] I returned to Sokhumi, started to work at the Abkhazian institute. I researched the issue of the structure of the Abkhazian word, made remarks on putting stress in Abkhazian language. I started constant recording of Abkhazian folklore, participated in the compilation of selections from Abkhazian literature, wrote and publish the grammar for II and III grades" [Shinkuba, 1989: 540]. Of course, if in 1945 the study of Abkhazian language and literature was banned at schools neither compilation nor publication of school textbooks in Abkhazian language and selections of Abkhazian literature would be permissible. It should be also mentioned that Abkhazian writer studied in Tbilisi up to 1945, at post graduate of the Institute of Ethnography of the Georgian Academy of Sciences and later defended candidate dissertation on the structure of Abkhazian complex root words.

2. In 1947-1953 an Abkhazian poet Aleksei Dzhonua taught Abkhazian language and literature at the Sokhumi State Pedagogical Institute [Abkhazian...1986:260]. This fact also evidences that in the 1947-1953 there was a demand for training the teachers of Abkhazian language and literature, and thus, the study of this subject was not annulled.

3. From the fiftieth of the 20-th century till 1922 around 70 Abkhazian students studied at the Department of the Caucasian languages of the Faculty of Humanities at the Tbilisi State University, who attended the course of lectures in Abkhazian language delivered by the biggest expert of this language, academician Q. Lomtadze, under the leadership of whom the dissertation in linguistics was defended by the majority of Abkhazian linguists currently lived and worked (L.Chkadua, Sh.Aristava,V.Konjaria, S.Amichba, V.Amichba, Z.Avidzba, N.Arshba, E.Kilba, L.Hagba, A.Khetsia, etc.) If Abkhazian language was really banned in the fifties, then a question arises as to how the Abkhazian students and post graduate were delivered the course of lectures in this language.

Thus, it is obvious that separatist's statement on the prohibition of study Abkhazian language and literature at schools is not true. Actually from 1945 Georgian language substituted Russian study Abkhazian language and literature at schools remained at the same level as it had been up to 1945. In this respect the things didn't change after 1954 when Russian language returned its function in the so-called Abkhazian school.

Unfortunately, the state of teaching Abkhazian language and literature was improved neither in 1993 after the liberation of Abkhazian, nor in 2008 after the recognition of Abkhazia's "independence". In modern so-called Abkhazian schools the study in Abkhazian language operates in the first four grades and from the fifth grade all subjects except several Humanitarian subjects are taught again in Russian that endangers not only Abkhazian language, but the future identity of Abkhazian ethnos.

References

The History ... 1986	The History of Abkhazian literature. Book I.Sokhumi. (In Abkhazian).
Gamakharia J. 2005	Abkhazia and Orthodoxy (first century-1921).Tbilisi.
Papaskiri Z. 2003	Historical Studies. Vol.VI. Tbilisi (in Georgian). The myth about Georgian's try to disorder Abkhazian's individual ethnocultur
Shinkuba B. 1989	Compositions in four volumes. Vol.3. Sokhumi (in Abkhazian).
Jojua D. 2007	Abkhazia in the epoch of Soviet socialism. 1938-1990. Essays from the history of Georgia. Tbilisi (in Georgian)
Gamakharia J., Gogia B. 1997	Abkhazia- historical province of Georgia.Tbilisi (in Russian).
Saint... 2006	Saint Alexander (Okropiridze) the Bishop and Abkhazia. Investigation and commentary by J.Gamakharia. Tbilisi.

Frontier System of Georgia: Problems of the Northern Borders in Antiquity

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/12

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Leri Tavadze](#)

The defense system of Georgian borders has always faced serious political, social and economic challenges. In this respect of special importance are Georgia's northern borders. The purpose of this paper is to study the situation which existed in the ancient period on the northern border of present-day Georgia.

As far back as in proto-feudal epoch two basic economic systems had been formed on the territory of modern Georgia:

1. Colchis in the west which was mainly oriented to the Greek market;
2. East Iberian which due to the northern expansion (Scythians and earlier Cimmerians) connected the mentioned space and economically developed eastern world.

In case with Kartli/Iberia the northern expansion was to be neutralized by eastern technical means. The east with which Georgian economic space was actively connected was presented by Urartu, Mydia and Achaemenid Persian Kingdoms. Thus, the subject of our research is two economically independent spaces: northern borders of modern West and East Georgia.

In the epoch of proto-feudalism Likht-Imereti (West Georgia) was presented by Colchis political unit. As a result of expansion of the Southern Georgian ethnic element Koles (the same as Kolaxis/Koraxis) the upper mentioned space was united. The area of spreading Colchian axes shows the boundaries of Colchis political unit: in the west it is the Black Sea, in the east - Likhi ridge, in the north - main Caucasian ridge, in the south - Pontic and Lesser Caucasus ridges.

The data on the unsteadiness of the northern borders of the Colchis Kingdom are almost not found, although as it is supposed, at the mentioned borders the Svan tribes with tribal system lived which, as it is attested in the Greek-Roman sources had been subordinated to the Colchis King since older times. The mentioned region was presented with two principle provinces: Svaneti and Takveri. Later appeared Abkhazia .

The first serious menace from the north was followed by the Cimmerians incursion. The Cimmerians through Colchis-Meotida passing the Black Sea coast intruded around the twenties-thirties of the 8th century B.C, and put an end to the existence of the old Kingdom of Qolha [Georgian...1970:392-395].

Old Kolkha superstratum was soon substituted by Egri-Mingrelian population. The mentioned political unit was called Egrisi. The Egrisi Kingdom emerged on the ruins of the ancient Kolkha on the verge of the 7th and 6th centuries B.C., though it covered the territory of the present-day west Georgia. The mentioned space was economically strongly connected with the Hellenistic world; Georgian money called Colchian Tetri was in circulation. Politically Colchis was subjected to the influence of the Achaemenian Persia. The northern border was controlled by the Svans known as fighter tribes who were in subordination to Egrisi [Strabo, 1957: IX, 2, 19].

Great changes were caused by the appearance of Alexander the Great and collapse of the Persian Empire. At that time politically free Colchis thanks to the Greek settlements was economically closely integrated with the west. After the death of Alexander the Great (323 B.C.) big civil war started in his empire which lasted nearly 40 years. These wars changed political situation once more. The changes affect Colchis too. The controversy between Alexander's Diadochi: commanders Seleucus and Lysimachus appeared to be economically beneficial to the Caucasus. Later the Silk Road passed there.

The new Colchis Kingdom fell victim during the civil war in Macedonian Empire; it was conquered by the kingdom of Kartli. The local authorities - Skeptuchoi - subordinated to the king of Kartli and where their influence was not strong the process of settlement of the mountaineers started. Thus, at the northern frontier significant changes took place in the 3rd-1st centuries B.C. and on the mentioned territory (one part of Abkhazia and Sochi's adjacent area) Adige-Abkhaz tribes came from the North Caucasus: Aphshils, Abazgians, Achaeans, etc. settled. The ethnic picture significantly changed. The domination of Kartli and Skeptuchoi was substituted first by Pontus and later Roman protectorate was established.

In the 1st century A.D. on the territory of the west Georgia new political unit - Lazica emerged. Its superstratum was formed by the Laz tribe whose spoken language was Mengrelian and they considered themselves as legal successors of old Kolkha. The existence of Lazica did great service because it protected the northern-east boundary of the Roman Empire. Thus, the above mentioned tribes subjugated Lazica.

During the existence of the Kingdom of Lazica (during the 1st-7th centuries A.D.) no significant changes occurred on the northern frontier. The unification of Abazgia and Apshilia laid the foundation to the Abkhazian Kingdom. The conflict between Byzantium and Iran in the 6th century considerably affected Georgian section of the Great Silk Road but instead of it new road started functioning through Khazaria.

For the purpose of integration of Iberia and Colchis into their domain, the Sassanids built the key roadway between them. This road ties economically the territories situated in the east and west of Likhi Mountain that in future became one of the grounds for unification of Georgia [Broun, 1999:13-14].

Since the early Iron Age Kartli had created scattered space composed of quasi-states where according to the old renderings the so-called Mamasakhlisi was ruling. The mentioned political units later became constituent parts of the United Kingdom. They were: Javakheti (Zabakha), Odzrkhe (Widzerukhi), Hereti (Eriakhi), Kakheti, Kukheti, Uphlistzikhe (political centre of Shida

Kartli), Klardjeti, etc. Georgia's northern border was occupied by the tribes inhabited in mountains who were at the stage of tribal system: Dvalis, Tsanarians, Tushi, Pkhoveli, Didoeli, etc. The mentioned picture was changed after the intrusion of Cimmerians and Scythians in the 8th and 7th centuries B.C.

The northern passages were taken first by Cimmerians then Scythians. The Scythians incursions made the Cimmerians to abandon the lowlands and seek the shelter in the mountains located in the central part. The upper mentioned territory was occupied by Treri related to Cimmerian tribes and according to their name the central part of Kartli is called Trialeti [Georgia...1970:393].

The Scythians incursion had permanent character. It covered not only the land settled by Georgian tribes but a number of territories of the Near East. The Colchis Kingdom revived at the verge of 7th - 6th centuries again controls northern passages located in the west. Thus, from the 6th century onward Scythians mainly used Daryali and Derbent gates while moving from the North Caucasus to the South.

The expansion of Scythians lasted for three centuries. The influence of Achaemenids was also strong in Kartli, though this fact did not bring any changes in the northern border.

At the turn of the 4th-3rd centuries B.C., the Kingdom of Kartli was formed. The territories occupied by Scythians now were taken by monarch of Kartli. He also expanded his authority to the northern border. In spite of certain changes the subordination of the mountaineers by King, did not occur rapidly. This appeared to be rather long process. The rhythm of life in the mountains was determined by patrimonial societies which were arranged by communities but the communities themselves joined by *khevi* (minor region). Thus any kind of centralized structure which could conduct defense politics of the central government on the northern border was absent. The security of the border itself was connected with the security of the community which was exercised by the community itself.

During the same period a conflict sometimes started between neighboring communities or tribes. It could be of social-economic or domestic character. Confrontations of political type were not excluded. According to the Greek geographer Strabo, similar conflicts inside the country as well as between neighboring tribes or countries were settled down by the priestly caste of high priests (sometimes referred as Kurum by Georgian historiography). Concerning Strabo's classification this is the second class after the Royal family. Numerous researches have been devoted to the study of the second class. The upper mentioned social group represented clerical enclave of the country which had to combine secular functions too. Their duties were as follows: to administer justice between local communities or *khevi*, conduct religious rituals, sacrifices, establish diplomatic relations with neighboring world, etc. What should be the reason to administer diplomatic relation and justice with country's domestic (between the communities) or foreign neighbors by high priests? First of all, the promotion of high priests social group indicates their privileged position in the antique society. They formed the layer of servants of heathen Gods. The communities located close to the country's frontiers prayed on them. The high priests had the right to solve the disputes existed between the communities by swearing on the deity (later it was substituted by the icon), if needed they could

used the force, because, as we mentioned above, they represented the secular persons, who also had ecclesiastic functions too. From early feudal or late feudal Georgian reality we know about the existence of such institutions as *Khevisberi*, *Tavberi*, *Qorepiskopos*, etc. These posts were institutionally formed in the epoch of proto-feudalism. In the mountains this system lived longer and continued its existence even when in the lowlands it became the part of history. It should be also mentioned that in the mountains the tradition of the *khevisberi* in a certain form has been preserved until now and as throughout the earlier ages in the ritual process along with secular functions also combines duties.

Thus the settlement of the relations and conflicts both with neighboring tribes and between the communities in Kartli was exclusively the prerogative of so-called high priests. At the same time it was not obligatory for the high priests to be recruited only from heathen clerical persons, moreover with account of the traditions existed in the mountains it can be said that secular persons were responsible for the managing of relations with local population in the northern border who like the high priests combine their functions and performed religious rituals. They were the secular leaders of their own community or *khevi*.

On the verge of the 4th-3rd centuries B.C. the threat from the north was less expected and a conflict between the tribes or communities residing at the border created less danger to Armazi Acropolis. The highlanders at that time had considerable autonomy and the central power never got around to it.

The royal authority tried to settle the relations with the tribes living in the north by means of negotiations. The Georgian king Pharnavaz married the daughter of Dzurdukian nobleman. The next king of Kartli Saurmag used the Dzurdukians and highlanders against insurgent nobles. It was due to their assistance that Saurmag managed to return the royal throne and in exchange for their service, the King granted the lands to Dzurdukians in the north of Kartli [The Life of...1955:25-27].

According to the Georgian sources during the reign of King Mirian the situation was already messed up: "The Dzurduks forgot the friendship of Pharnavaz and Saurmag, and the inhabitants of Dzurduketi invaded Kakheti and Bazaleti of Georgia" [The Life of...1955:25-27]. King Mirian, however, built the Aragvi gates for which the builders used the heavy material of limestone. Later after the appearance of the Alans in the North Caucasus the mentioned fortress was called Daryali, the same as Darialani [The Life of...1955:25-27].

The same danger from the north made King Parnajom (the eighties-seventies of the 2nd century B.C.) build a fortress Zaden along with pagan idols with the same name at Mount of Zedazeni, on the right bank of the river Aragvi, at the northern approaches to Mtskheta [The Life of...1955:29]. The erection of the Zadeni fortress in case of fall of the Aragvi gate was necessary from the viewpoint of country's security purposes.

Thus, the fortification of the northern frontiers was conditioned by dangers coming from the tribes residing on the border area. The source names the Dzurdukian uprising, though there must have been more complex problem, namely, with highlanders' resistance faced by the central authority in the process of their integration.

The fortification of the northern borders in the mountains comparatively strengthened the King's power. The King had to control Zedazeni-Aragvi gates section on his own. In the same section there was located Jhinvali which protected Mtskheta from the north and the south - the fortification located on the Nakulbakevi territory [Bround, 1994:130]. The Aragvi gates acquired special importance when new tribes appeared by means of Sarmatians in the North Caucasus. There was no unity among the Sarmatian tribes. Among them the Alans and Siraks occupied special place [Phiphia, 2008: 38-39]. The settlement of the upper mentioned tribes on Kartli's north created danger not only to the Near East but to the Kingdom of Kartli itself. Thus, one of the reasons for creating Aragvi gates and its fortification which later was termed as Alanian gates or Daryali, must be associated with the appearance of Alanian nomadic tribes and strengthening of highlanders at the North of Iberia.

The power of Alans and Siraks was spread up to the present day Republic of Alan-Ossetia. They could not manage to migrate to the south of the Caucasus which can be explained by the strength of the Kingdom of Kartli. This obstacle was also conditioned by the fact that northern passages must have been fortified by the Georgians before Alanian penetration. In this case it was necessary to close two main directions - Aragvi and Dvaleti sides.

Unlike Aragvi gates (Daryali), the information on the fortification of the Dvaleti gates has not been found. It is evidenced from the source that there existed "big gate at Oss and two in Dvaleti" [Conversion ... 1963:94-95] that besides Daryali indicates the existence of the Mamisoni and Roki passes which had the self-defense function in the northern frontiers. Proceeding from the natural specifics, the defense of the mentioned crossroads presented no difficulty. The Dval tribe lived around the Dvaleti pass. Therefore, for their protection Dvals were responsible.

The appearance of the Alans menaced not only Kartli but the tribes settled on both sides of its northern border. Naturally, the appearance of the Sarmatians must have strengthened the control over the whole tribes being under the King's subordination. In this case the self-defense from Alanians was conditioned by mutual interest. The settlement of the Alans in the Northern Caucasus is dated from the 1st century B.C.

In spite of the strong military force the Sarmatians managed neither consolidation nor settlement in the south Caucasus. This fact made the Alans and Siraks arrange the inroads to the frontier lands of Iberia either in the service of the King of Kartli or in agreement with him. In the Greek-Roman sources of the 1st and 2nd centuries the Alans are mentioned as mercenaries of the King of Iberia. They raided the territories of the Roman Empire, Parthia, Armenia, Albania and other countries.

Thus, the fortification of the northern borders, the creation of Daryali and Dvaleti gates not only protected the central districts of Kartli from the invasion of highlanders and nomadic tribes but strengthened the King's control over the highlanders settled at the northern borders.

The 3rd century was marked with the reign of King Amazasp. With accession to the throne he had to struggle against the Alans. This proves the fact that the passages in the Caucasus at the verge of the 2nd-3rd centuries appeared to be fallen into the Alans' hands. The result of the

northern frontiers break was that the Alans struggled in the vicinity of Mtskheta. There was a danger of falling of the Iberian capital. King Amazaspir's active interference helped to avoid the Alanian threat but then with the assistance of his ally Armenian King marched to the Ossetia and returned the northern passes again. Amazasp's northern policy appeared successful but the eastern proved to be a failure. The King was defeated by his old allies Sassanids. Amazaspir's death was followed by the establishment of Persian domination [Sanadze, 2001:130].

The situation considerably changed in the north by the 4th century. A great part of the Alans as a result of the Huns pressure had to abandon their own settlements and migrate to the west, in direction of the Black Sea northern littoral. The Huns raids laid the foundation to the "Great Migration of Peoples". One part of the Alans settled in the south, on the mountainous area of the Caucasus where they assimilated with the local population that determined the ethnogenesis of the Ossetian people.

The threat from the side of the Alans was removed. Instead of this in the Northern Caucasus Turkish-speaking nomadic tribes Huns appeared. In response to reinforcement of Huns there were built the Derbent or Caspian gates named as Chor. Chor was built by the order of the Sassanid monarchs just to stop the Huns. The funds for the building Derbent gates must have been equally divided by Byzantine and Iranian rulers. After failing to get the promised amount, Shah used this fact as a reason to lead a campaign against the Eastern Roman Empire. According to Shah of Persia Kavadh's (488-531) statement the protection of the upper mentioned passage was equitable to the interest of both parties [Procopius, 1965: 58-60]. Albania appeared under Sassanid sovereignty and Georgian King Vakhtang after taking the Daryali gates and neutralizing the Huns and Ossetians settled to the north of it, was ranked as a Great King and the ruler of the Alans [Mitsishvili, 2003: 408-421].

Thus, the protection of the northern border in the 5th century was linked with the security of the two powerful empires in the Near East - Rome and Sassanid Persia.

Hence, it can be concluded that protection of the Caucasian watershed ridge passes which linked the Eurasian vast steppes with the advanced countries of the Near East was important not only for Georgian kingdoms but for neighboring empires of Rome (Byzantium) and Sassanid Iran. Thus, the issue of Georgia's northern borders was the focus of international attention in the ancient times like it is today.

Here we mean the epoch prior to feudalism.

On two economic spaces see: Dundua:1993; Dundua: 2003; Dundua: 1997.

About Colchis King see: Georgia's 1970; Lomouri, 1968

In connection with the mentioned question see: Inadze, 1999: 173-181; Dundua, 1997:268-273

In connection with the mentioned question see:: Georgia's ...1970: 500-507; Lomouri, 1955:19-20

The second [class] is of high priests who also concerns (besides court and military matters-L.T.) about law with neighbors" [Starbo, Geography, IX, 3, 6]

In foreign sources this pass is called Dari Alan, or Alanian gate which indicates that the building of the mentioned fortress must have been happened with the purpose of their prevention. In accounts Daryali is also referred to as Sarmatian gates or Iberina itself (see: A. Alemany. 6th century Alania: between Byzantium, Sassanian Iran and the Turkish World, Webfestschrift Marshak, 2003, p.2, ? 1)

In connection with the appearance of the Sarmates see: Lomouri, 1959; Georgian...2003

References

Dundua T. 1997	Colchis, Iberia and outer world (6th-4th centuries B.C.). Georgian Diplomacy. Vol.IV, Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Dundua T. 1993	Colchis, Iberia and Pontic Kingdom according to numismatic materials. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Inadze M. 1999	From the History of Colchis-Iran diplomatic relations (second half of the 6th century B.C.). Georgian Diplomacy. Vol.VI, Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Lomouri N. 1959	Relationship between Rome and Transcaucasian countries in the 1st century A.D. TSU works. Vol.77. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
History 2003	History of Georgian Diplomacy. Ed.: R.Metreveli. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
History 1963	Conversion of Kartli. Monuments of hagiographic literature. Book 1.(5th-10th centuries). Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Mitsishvili N. 2003	Great King Vakhtang Gorgasali. Georgian Diplomacy. Vol.X, Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Procopius of Caesarea 1965	De Bello Persico. Georgika. Vol.II. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Sanadze M. 2001	"The Life of Kartli" and ancient period of Georgian history (from Qartlos to Mirian). Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Georgian... 1970	Essays of Georgian History. Vol. I. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Strabo 1957	Geography. Translated by T.Kaukhchishvili. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Phiphia K. 2008	Parthia-Iberian Struggle for Armenia at the beginning of the 30s-50s of the 1st century. Historical studies. Vol.X-XI. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Georgian... 1975	Georgian Soviet Encyclopedia. Vol.I.Tbilisi. (in Georgian).

The Life... 1955	The Life of Georgian Kings. "The Life of Kartli". Vol.I.Tbilisi..
Aleman A. 2003	The 6th century Alania: between Byzantium, Sassanian Iran and the Turkish World. http://www.transoxiana.org/Eran/Articles/alemany.pdf
Dundua T. 1999	Georgia within the European Integration. Tbilisi.
Dundua T. 2003	Georgians and Roman Frontier Policy in the East. Tbilisi.
Bround D. 1994	Georgia in Antiquity: The History of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia 550 BC- AD 562. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
Bround D. 1999	Peaceful Caucasus: an ancient perspective. Caucasicca, Vol. 3, Tbilisi state university press. Tbilisi.

Georgian Manuscripts in the European Depositories (National Library of France)

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/11

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Nestan Tchkhikvadze](#)

Georgian manuscript tradition was not created in a closed space. Founded in the depth of Christianity it was closely connected with medieval eastern Christian space. Cultural and political interest brought Georgian scribes to historical Syria-Palestine as early as 5th century and later - to Byzantium, in the 10th and 11th centuries founded own Georgian monasteries at the Mount Athos (Ivion), Jerusalem (Monastery of the Cross) and Bachkovo (Petritsoni, in present-day Bulgaria) [Menabde, 1980]; it also provided the spread of Georgian manuscripts in big monastic centers of the Christian East. Even today these collections are kept at the Mt. Athos, Sinai and Greek patriarchate book depositories of Jerusalem. From the late Middle Ages great interest of the Europeans for the Christian East led to the appearance of the Georgian manuscripts in the old depositories of Europe of which one of the important scientific centre is the National Library of France.

In the National Library of France the first copy of Georgian manuscript book entered in the first half of the 18th century. Since that time this fund had been gradually filled by missionaries, political figures or private persons. Nowadays this collection hosts 32 entries, two of which are French manuscripts - catalogues compiled by Victor Langluas and Leon Feer while making an inventory in 1865 and 1897. Naturally, to conduct such kind of work was an extremely difficult task because the compilers had to date and establish the origin of cultural monuments practically unknown to them. It should be mentioned that great assistance in this matter was rendered by French expert in Georgian studies - Marie Brosset. Even today some entries of this collection are supplied with Brosset's interpretations to say nothing about scholarly publications of the monuments [Brosset, 1830, 113-128; 1833; 1834,1837] .

In 1908 the first short printed French catalogue appeared. Its compiler, French Armenologist Frederic Makler was based on already existed manuscript catalogues of the Collection, Brosset's notes and A.Khakhanashvili's descriptive data [Makler,1908, Khakhanashvili, 1898]. However, the catalogue failed to avoid inaccuracies especially when it concerned the issues of the essence, date and origin of those manuscripts which had not been scientifically studied and based only on the suppositions expressed by some scholars.

The first and the only scholarly description existed in Georgian language till now which regards the precise essence, date and historical and philological issues of another order belongs to Eqvtime Taqaishvili who published this work in 1933 in Paris [Taqaishvili, 1933][1]. This publication deals with 28 Georgian entries kept at the Library's funds. By this description Georgian scholarly society got acquainted with this collection. It became quite obvious that it contained rather significant item of Georgian manuscript books the study of which would

essentially fill the research results of not only old Georgian writing but generally, the history of Christian writing. Such opportunity has been given to Georgian historical and philological science since the seventies of the 20th century after the assistance of the residents of France Nino and Kalistrate Salias and under the leadership of Helen Metreveli, the director of the Institute of Manuscripts on the basis of agreement with the Library the Institute of Manuscripts (currently National Centre of Manuscripts) got the microfilms of all manuscripts from the Georgian fund of the National Library including those new fragments, particularly, 1 page of Lectionary and 4 pages of Ioane-Zosime's Aiadgari, (liturgical book) which entered the Library's funds bind as one manuscript since the second half of the 20th century. In the identification of these fragments special role is played by French Kartvelologist Bernard Outtier [Outtier, 1972; Outtier, 1984; Outtier 1973] who later found one more Georgian written leaf while working on the Armenian manuscript at the Library, dated it and defined its essence. This is a fragment of the 10th-century liturgical composition which currently represents the 31st entry of the collection. While working at the National Library H.Metreveli defined the meaning of this collection and set her mind on the necessity of its special study. Familiarization with its conclusions and tasks is possible on the basis of the material kept at the Archive Fund of the National Centre of Manuscripts [H.Metreveli's arch. NN 511-514]. After delivering the microfilms she herself led the scholarly research in this direction.

Eqvtime Taqaishvili's description and research results of Georgian scholars were known in France only for the narrow circle of Kartvelologists and because of a language barrier they were not accessible for a wide scholarly society. For this very reason it became necessary to compile new web catalogue in French language where the errors like Makler's would be corrected and both authentic results of manuscripts study and bibliography connected with each entry. On the basis of agreement between the National Library and National Centre of Manuscripts we were given an opportunity to work on the description and cataloging of the Georgian collection at the National Library of Paris in April-June of 2009 [3]. While doing this work we aimed at putting into the catalogue an accurate technical description of each manuscript, date and essence, supply with complete bibliography and remarks existed for today in order to present for a general public the research results obtained by Georgian historical-philological and foreign schools of Georgian studies, the meaning of a Georgian manuscript book as a phenomenon reflecting the dialogue of cultures. With account of the fact that the catalogue was designed for web page after the end of the work it was supplied with digital pictures of separate pages or fragments of the covers.

The conducted work made it possible to evaluate both the meaning of the collection and the state of its study. In the first place it should be mentioned that at first glance not numerous collection contains an extensive period of the history of Georgian manuscript - these books and fragments of spiritual and secular content of the 7th to 19th centuries give an opportunity to conduct wide complex investigation. This time we will single out several earlier manuscripts and fragments essential from the viewpoint of reglamentation of the ecclesiastic-monastic life of the Jerusalem period of Christian culture and study of earlier editions of the monuments.

Of particular attention is one leaf (16x14.5) of the 7th-century "Khanmeti" Lectionary which is a part of Geo.30. This fragment is a part of that oldest presumably of Palestinian origin Lectionary which was a part of the library of Georgian scriptorium at the Mt. Sinai since the 10th

century. As early as 1883 it was described by A. Tsagareli [Tsagareli, 1888]. At the end of the 19th century the manuscript contained 29 leaves. In the same epoch it seems to be taken from the Mt. Sinai in unbind state. The 27 leaves of the Lectionary except the first and last ones appeared in Austria, to Professor at the University of Graz Hugo Schuchardt [Schuchardt, 1928], who gave it together with other manuscripts to the University. A. Shanidze studied the Graz manuscript and published the text of the "Khanmeti" Lectionary [Shanidze, 1929:310-353; Shanidze, 1944]. Later it became known that the last leaf which has preserved the name of the 10th-century Sinai figure Ioane-Zosime's colophon, was kept in Great Britain, at the library of Selly Oak College [Pearson, 1954:43; Garitte, 1960:239-259], and the first leaf is kept in the National Library of France which, as was mentioned above, was identified and presented to scholarly society by B. Outtier [Outtier, 1972:393-402; Outtier, 1973:173-175]. By uniting the research results of the fragments kept at the three different centers abroad, it became possible to study textual and editorial peculiarities of concretely this earlier Lectionary as well as the ties existed between scriptoriums of Christian East and reveal their dependence on archaic. As the colophon existed on the leaf kept in Birmingham informs, the Lectionary was put into the book cover for the third time in 983 by the known Sinai scribe and editor Ioane-Zosime. This fact indicates that this earlier liturgical book of Jerusalem tradition even at the end of the 10th century when in Georgian liturgy the texts of Constantinople editions intensively introduced, represented a vital book. It is also interesting to note that the text had been subjected to language editing, tried to erase verb suffixes "kh" which was no longer in use, the text itself was not even scraped away as it usually occurred in scriptoriums in order to save writing material the sheets written earlier were reused for second writing. The texts of archaic redaction in the majority of cases are preserved in the lower layers of palimpsest.

It is on palimpsest leaves that the same Geo.30 is rewritten on four unevenly cut leaves of small size (15.4x13.3 cm), that Ioane-Zosime's "Iadgari" fragment - Recalling Barnaba . It should be mentioned that the lower layer of the palimpsest is Syrian. The text was identified by B. Outtier [Outtier, 1984:73-79]. The existence of Syrian-Georgian palimpsest evidences the collaboration between Georgian and Syrian spiritual persons which was quite natural in the life of medieval oriental scriptoriums. Despite the fact that Greek was an official language, this did not prevent from developing the literature in national languages even in such monastic centers which were under the influence of the Great Church of Constantinople. At close scrutiny of the history of medieval Christian writing, we can clearly see that in parallel with the unity in Orthodoxy in the countries of Christian East, national literary traditions start to develop which meet the requirement of a single church but at the same time they preserve the right of traditional choice. For that very reason today while studying the history of Christian culture and Byzantine thinking great importance is attached to the literary activity of those nations which in accordance with Constantinopolitan tradition of spiritual life and writing in conditions of unification did not give up and sink into oblivion the knowledge and culture gained from the depth of Christianity - historical Palestine. Such written traditions are Georgian, Syrian, Christian Arabic, Armenian, and Coptic. European orientalists were well aware this fact and directed their attention to Georgian studies.

Georgian collection of the National Library keeps one more very important manuscript of Jerusalem tradition. It is Geo.3 - known as Parisian Lectionary big volume (387 leaves) and format (page size: 36x25 cm), rewritten in Nuskhuri script, the 10-11th century manuscript. The book is not full, therefore main colophon not come down to us and correspondingly, the place of rewriting is unknown. On 237v scribe's Monazona's inscription is read in which she mentions spiritual father Stephane. According to E.Taqaishvili this must be a well-known figure of the second half of the 10th-century Stephane Sananoisdze-Chkondideli [Taqaishvili, 1933:262]. According to the data existed about Stephane Sananoisdze, the episcopo of Chkondidi who took care of Jerusalem Georgian books and monastery of the Cross [Kekelidze, 1980:178-179]. If we link this scribe with the name of Stephane Sananoisdze proper, it becomes quite natural for the Lectionary of Jerusalem tradition to be rewritten under spiritual guidance of such figure. No matter where it had been rewritten the book was intended for one of the monasteries of Georgia and it was stored there. An Italian inscription performed on the cover of the manuscript informs that the book was taken away in 1731 from Georgia by the Father of Kapucin missionaries. The book is dressed in the 16th century typical stamping skin cover. At present this extremely significant manuscript has been restored. For the purpose of investigation of Jerusalem ecclesiastical practice and calendar, the manuscript immediately became the focus of attentions of European scholars. In 1923 it was published by H.Goussen [Goussen, 1923]. Later Mikheil Tarkhnishvili together with other manuscripts of Georgian Lectionary published this most important liturgical monument [Tarkhnishvili, 1959-1960]. The manuscript of the National Library was also issued in Georgia [Georgian...1987; Georgian...1997].

For the study of special attitude towards Jerusalem tradition and cultural-political relations with Palestine one more Georgian manuscript - the Gospel Geo.28 from the National Library provides us with interesting material. This is a book embellished with the miniatures of Evangelists and performed in Nuskhuri script with the use of gold ink on high quality parchment. The name of a scribe is Mal Davitidze. Complete organization of the manuscript - making up the pages, proportional and equilibrium distribution of the lines and margins, the cover embellished with gold and silver, which according to the colophon (5v-6r) the Gospel had, makes it quite clear that this book had been specially ordered and fulfilled. This fact is not accidental because the colophons and inscriptions attached to it inform that the Gospel was rewritten in Georgia and donated to the Monastery of the Cross in Jerusalem with which Georgia and ecclesiastical persons of the Middle Ages had a close connection. Monastery of the Cross in Jerusalem was one of the most important manifestations of the medieval Georgian culture and state status in the Christian East. The concern about the monastery was not ceased even during the disintegration of the united Georgia and political hardships (14th-18th centuries). Landownership of the Monastery of the Cross established in the late Middle Ages financially supported the functioning of this important centre existed in Jerusalem [Khutsishvili, 2006] and the patronage and renovation of ecclesiastical antiquities kept in it was the concern of Georgian pilgrims came to the Holy land [Metreveli, 1962]. The Geo.28 also bears the trace of such concern. According to the colophons attached to 247r/v, the book cover of the 16th-century Gospel was updated by the Urbnisi archbishop Evlase and in the 18th century - by a certain Andria Vaznidze. According to paleographic features the manuscript is dated by E.Taqaishvili as the 13th century [Taqaishvili, 1933: 294] and H.Metreveli transfers the date of

its rewriting to the 12th century [Metreveli, 2007: 278]. We are not concerned here with the in-depth analysis of the mentioned issue; but only add that the paintings of the Gospel in many ways yield to the 12th century highly artistic miniature art of the Gospels. Two facts attract our attention: the first concerns with the scribe's inscription (231v) according to which Crusade clerks could use both Constantinopolitan and "Georgian" calendar. Generally the Jerusalem Law was mentioned in "Georgian" [Kekelidze, 1980-579]. Another noteworthy issue is the memorials attached to it by the Crusaders (246v). It should be noted that such memorials are added to one more manuscript from the Monastery of Cross (H1667) which is an expression of close relations between Georgians and the Roman Catholics in Jerusalem, namely the members of Templier Order [Metreveli, 1962:56].

Thus, this manuscript from the National Library provides interesting material for the study of history of European's activity in the Christian East.

This work by Taqaishvili is a bibliographic rarity. It was republished by G.Sharadze [Sharadze, 1980:236-296].

This is the only manuscript we do not have a microfilm. The description and text prepared by us is published in the journal "Mravaltavi", #23 of the National Centre of Manuscripts.

Electron catalogue compiled by us in French has been published on the web page of the National Library: <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf/cdc.html>

The text is identified by senior researcher of the National Centre of Manuscripts, Lili Khetsuriani who was studying Ioane-Zosime's literary activity in a course of years [Khetsuriani, 1968]. Ioane-Zosime's calendar was studied and published by Belgian Kartvelologist J.Garitte [Garitte, 1958].

Analogical cover of the same century on which ornament of Geo.3 is repeated is kept in the funds of the National Centre of Manuscripts (A 85).

Restoration works have been performed by Jak Sikri, the restorer of the National Library who presented his report on this theme in September, 2009 at the I International conference devoted to the Georgian manuscripts in the National Center of Manuscripts.

Colophon-inscriptions are published [Taqaishvili, 1933:294-295].

Colophon inscriptions are published [Taqaishvili, 1933:294-295].

Georgians activities in Jerusalem were finally finished in the 18th century [Shanidze, 1980:69-139].

The Archbishop Evlase updated several books in the Monastery of the Cross in the years 1570-1572 [Tsaqareli, 1988:64. 88-89, 168, 182].

As an example we present the Gospels of H 1667- Jruchi the second, Q 908- Gelati, A1335 - Vani

The texts of memorials are published [Taqaishvili, 1933:295; Metreveli, 2007:278-280].

References

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Taqaishvili E.
1933 | Georgian manuscripts in the National Library of Paris and the sign of 20 Georgian mystic writing. Paris, (In Georgian). |
| Kekelidze K.
1980 | History of the Old Georgian Literature. Vol.I. Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
| Menabde L.
1980 | The Centers of Old Georgian Writing, Part II. Tbilisi. (In Georgian) |
| Metreveli E.
2007 | One more manuscript from the monastery of the Cross for commemoration of the Crusaders. Philological and historical studies. 1. Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
| Utie B.
1973 | One page of Georgian Khanmeti Lectionary in Pariz.Proceedings.Series of language and Literature. I. (In Georgian). |
| Georgian...
1987 | Parizian manuscript of Georgian Lectionary (readings of the Old and New Testaments).Text prepared for publication by K.Danelia, S.Chkhenkeli and B.Shavishvili. Investigation and glossary supplied by Korneli Danelia. Vol.I, part I. Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
| Georgian ...
1997 | Parizian manuscript of Georgian Lectionary (readings of the Old and New Testaments).Text prepared for publication by K.Danelia, S.Chkhenkeli and B.Shavishvili. Investigation and glossary supplied by Korneli Danelia. Vol.I, part II. Tbilisi. (In georgien). |
| Shanidze A.
1929 | Georgian Manuscripts at Graz. Bulletin of the Tiflis University. Vol. IX. Tbilisi. |
| Shanidze A.
1944 | Khanmet Lectionary. Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
| Sharadze G.
1991 | Return. Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
| Khachidze L.
1987 | Ioane Minchkh'i's Poetry. Text was prepared for publication and supplied with investigation by Lela Khachidze. Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
| Khevsuriani L.
1968 | To the composition of Sin.34. Mravaltavi. IV.Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
| Khevsuriani L.
2001 | On autographic list of Giorgi Mtatsmindeli's version of Markhvani. Literary studies. XXII.Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
| Khutsishvili N.
2006 | Landownership of the Jerusalem Monastery of the Cross in Georgia. Artanuji. (In Georgian). |
-

Brosset M.F. 1830	Chronique géorgienne. Paris.
Brosset M.F. 1833	Mémoires inédits relatifs à l'histoire et à la langue géorgienne. Paris.
Brosset M.F. 1837	Éléments de la langue géorgienne. Paris.
Brosset M.F. 1884	Notice sur le Dictionnaire géorgien de Soukhhan-Saba Orbéliani. Journal Asiatique.
Garitte G 1958	Le calendrier palestino-géorgien du Sinaiticus 34 (X e siècle). Bruxelles.
Garitte G 1960	Les Feuilles géorgiennes de la collection Mingana à Selly Oak. Le Muséon, 73,3-4.
Gussen H. 1923.	Über georgische Drucke und Handschriften. Die Festordnung und den Heiligenkalender des altchristlichen Jerusalem betreffend, B. Kühlen, München-Cladbach.
Outtier B. 1972	Les Feuilles géorgiennes de Lectionnaire Hanmeti à Paris. Le Muséon, LXXXV, 3-4
Outtier B. 1984	« Notule sur les versions orientales de l'histoire Philothée (CPG 6221) in Antidoron, Hommage à Maurits Geerard pour célébrer l'achèvement de la Clavis Patrum Graecorum, I, Cultura, Wettem.
Pearson M. 1954	Oriental Manuscript Collection of Great Britain and Ireland.London.
Tarkhnychvili M. 1959-1960	L'église de Jérusalem (5-8e siècle), traduit et édité par Michel Tarkhnychvili, Corpus scriptorum christianorum, scriptorum ibérica, t.9,10,13-14, Louvain.
Tsagareli A. 1888	Archive Fond of the National Centre of Manuscripts. E.Metreveli's archive NN 511-514.

The Homeland Problem of Indo-European Language-Speaking Peoples

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/16

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Nikoloz Silagadze](#)

The acknowledgement of the genetic kinship of Indo-European languages in the past also implies the acknowledgement of the coexistence in conditions of a single language system of their or ancestor languages. Such linguistic system is termed Proto-Indo-European by linguists, and the areal of its proto spreading is called *Urheimat* (homeland). The latter traditionally implies the territory within which Proto-Indo-European linguistic unity was formed and existed for a certain period of time. As a rule, they try to link it with some archeological culture. Linguists, archeologists, historians and anthropologists of more than one generation tried to determine geographical location of the primordial habitat of Indo-Europeans. In spite of this, the discussion on this theme has had rather hypothetic character so far.

The problem of research of Indo-Europeans homeland, in our view should be divided into two parts. In the first place, we should determine its (i.e. homeland) geographical and chronological co-ordinates, and then - what historical reality is hidden under the linguistic notion Proto-Indo-European and what processes followed the spread of Indo-European languages on the Eurasian continent. The full discussion on both issues is impossible within the frames of one paper, therefore in this paper we only touch upon the first one.

The discussion on the areal of proto spreading of Indo-European languages should be started with listing of those criteria which are essential for the investigation of the problem. In this respect in our view the study done by J.Mellory and D.Adams seems to be reliable: "Encyclopedia of Indo-Europeans culture". However, we consider that certain theses require more clarity. J.Mellory and D.Adams single out 6 criteria [Encyclopedia...1997: 295-297]. In their view while seeking for Indo-European homeland we should bear in mind that:

1)The existence of homeland is less probable in historically a priori in the area of settlement of non Indo-European peoples. For example those of : **Tartessian, Iberian, Basque, Dvavidian, Munda, Elamite, Sumerians, Hattie** and etc.

2)We should take into consideration that the existence of Proto-Indo-European in the period earlier than Neolithic age is less probable, because in Proto-Indo-European linguistic system the achievements of "Neolithic revolution" are well expressed.

In our view this supposition requires certain clarity. Let us start with the designation that in modern Indo-European studies the chronology of Proto-European language is the subject of wide discussion. It is obvious that the conclusions drawn on the basis of **glotochronology** lead us to the dating of Indo-Europeans unity by the 5th -4th millennia B.C., have a number of

drawbacks. From this viewpoint there was an attempt to implement methodological innovations [Gray...2003: 435-438]. Despite this R.Dickson's remark concerning the fact that any date can be available for the period of Proto-Indo-European existence from 4000 up to 40000 B.C, is still in force today [Gray...2003: 436]. Thus, it may not be a mistake if we say that the arguments of chronological character while discussing the homeland of Indo-Europeans are of minor importance. It is not possible to state with preciseness that Proto-Indo-European reality had not been formed earlier than Neolithic Age. Due to the fact that theoretically it is quite possible that Indo-European has more or less well-expressed form as early as Mesolithic epoch and the achievements of "Neolithic revolution" be spread on it only at following stage. We should also recall that the importance of linguistic paleontology (or of that branch on which in this case D.Adams and J.Mellory are based on) has been evaluated in different ways so far. One part of the scholars holds this viewpoint but others totally oppose to it and do not hide sarcasm while speaking about it. In this case we consider that the "middle ground" is to be found due to the fact that complete negation of the "linguistic paleontology" means to give up the study of the issue of geographical location of Indo-European homeland. Indo-Europeanistics is a branch of linguistics first of all. If we share the opinion that Proto-Indo-European linguistic system restored by linguists fails to inform us about its geographical and historical environment at least in general, then generally there is no sense to consider it in historical context. In case of sharing such reasoning we consider it is necessary to bring other arguments of similar type (i.e. obtained by means of linguistic paleontology). Particularly, it is impossible to pass by T.Gamkrelidze and V.Ivanov's work "Indo-European Language and the Indo-Europeans" which from this viewpoint (i.e.reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European environment) represents one of the most complete research. In our view especially notable in it is a conclusion on apparent location and affinity with Kartvelian languages in cultural Ancient near east of the Indo-Europeans homeland [Gamkrelidze ...1984: 869-891]. The importance of such arguments as if the homeland must have been the region with mountain landscape [T.Gamkrelidze..1984:865-866] is not so big because the existence of separate words in this or that **proto-language** rarely means that these notions were characteristic only for the mentioned **proto-language**. The same can be said about the separate varieties of animals and plants on which the authors are focused on [Gamkrelidze...1984:465-686].

3) While speaking about the homeland it should be also taken into account the issue of interrelation of Indo-European linguistic groups. Namely: a) we should bear in mind that Anatolian languages had been separated from the single Indo-European space; b)Indo-Iranian, Greek and Armenian languages must have been isolated from other language groups in a certain period of time; c)separate unity was created by Germanic, Baltic and Slavic languages, Celtic and Italian manifested more affinity with Northern groups; d)position of Tocharic language is not quite clear but it cannot be considered to be close to Indo-Iranian;

4) The area of spreading of Indo-European languages must be linked to the area of horse domestication;

5)Linguistic schemes of spreading Indo-Europeans which as a rule accompany the hypotheses of their homeland must correspond to archeological reality. From this viewpoint the fact that methods of deciphering linguistic and ethnic processes on the basis of archeological artefacts are the subject of a wide discourse in archaeology cannot be a hindrance. Particularly, the

object of consideration is the question as to what is the cause of changes taking place in the depths of archeological cultures; whether the spread of the given artefact in a given region, also means the distribution of ethnic groups bearing it in the same region; what historical reality lies under the notion of archeological culture and whether it is possible to identify it with the notion of language or linguistic stock or not... These issues are of crucial importance while considering the problems of ethnogenesis but in our case (i.e. when we take as the object of study the issue of modern historical processes of geographical location of Indo-Europeans homeland and not the spreading of Indo-European languages in Eurasia) due to the fact that it is easy to reach an agreement there is not a necessity of its in-depth study because it is easy to reach a certain agreement on it. Particularly, we consider it to be quite logical if we acknowledge that the spread of a complex of archeological artifacts from one region into another between these two regions (at least on the level of intermediate regions) testifies to the cultural and economic ties. We would also like to note that it would be nice if we succeed in the identification of hypothetical language stocks (Aryan, Celtic, Tocharian, etc.) with separate archeological cultures because the existence of archeological culture in a significant historical period implies if not genetic kinship between human beings living in its depths, at least the intensive economic and cultural contacts. The existence of such contacts is a fertile ground for the genesis of separate isoglosses or entire language groups. The theory of homeland which does not take into account at least such aspects of archeological data, naturally, cannot be counted as reliable;

6) The theory of Indo-Europeans homeland must explain the issue of spreading in the area of its historical settlement of every Indo-European language group.

Before listing the hypotheses put forward about the Indo-Europeans homeland it is necessary to emphasize one more direction of currently popular research in Indo-European studies. We mean the data of physical anthropology and molecular genetics. At first sight it looks rather interesting to follow the process of Indo-Europeans expansion to Eurasia on the basis of biological data and not isogloss or archaeological artifacts which rarely give the opportunity of making definite conclusions. In this respect rather interesting studies belong to L. Cavalli-Sforza, A. Amorim, D. Ranz, etc. On the basis of the data of genetics there were attempts to compare the Kurgan hypothesis offered by M. Gimbutas and C. Renfrew's Anatolian theory of Europe "Indo-Europeanization" [Stone...2005: 125-127]. The studies concerning Europe's "Neolithization" are also of interest [Stone...2005: 86-97]. In spite of apparent reliability of similar researches, we consider the conclusions made in these works with certain restriction. The thing is that the observation of the regularities of the ethnic processes in the history of the Ancient world and Middle Ages makes us believe that the fact of total substitution of any A group by B group on X territory has not been proved. Even when linguistic and political landscape changed, the new element mostly represented "superstratum minority". There are numerous examples of it: the so-called "barbarian states" of the period after Roman empire, Turkish unities of eastern Europe, Sparta and Celtic societies. This is the reason that so many regions of Eurasia (if not all) from the standpoint of archaeology provide a picture of continuous development. This fact feeds the supporters of similar hypotheses on paleolithic continuity of homeland and north-European theories. This fact, in our view, will leave a noticeable trace on the data of physical anthropology and molecular genetics. Of course, it is hard to deny the

significance of these branches, when it concerns the upper Paleolithic and Mezolithic periods, but while considering the Neolithic age and its post period from this view point we need certain restriction. The search for genetic markers which would prove the spread of Indo-Europeans into Eurasia seems to be almost impossible task.

There have been expressed many suppositions on Indo-European's homeland. In majority of cases they differ from each other. At the modern stage only few of them are regarded seriously. Among them we can name the above mentioned theory of Paleolithic continuity (M.Alinei); the suppositions according to which the homeland is localized on the territory of the northern Europe (L.Kilian, A.Hausleri, M.Zvelebil); the Indian hypothesis also has its supporters (M.Vitzel, K.Eltst). This concepts are not popular at modern stage, however they are not totally denied. Far more supporters have **The Central Europe-Balkan homeland** (V.Sapronov, B.Gornung, I.Diakonov, L.Makkai, G.Devoto) and the supporters of its localization in **Ancient Near East**. Among **Ancient Near East hypotheses** most popular is C. Renfrew's Anatolian theory which links the name of Indo-Europeans with the spread of Neolithic economy (C. Renfrew, A.Dolgopolsky). Comparatively less attention is paid to Indo- Hittite (E. Sturtevant) and Gamkrelidze-Ivanov's conceptions. In spite of some similarities these hypotheses sharply differ from each other. Here we should take into account that in separate nuances Renfrew's theory along with **Central Europe-Balkan** hypotheses opposes to **Pontic-Caspian theory**. According to the latter Indo-Europeans homeland is regarded to be Volga-Uralic steppes and Indo-Europeans expansion to the west is regarded as a phenomenon of the Bronze Age. To Asia Minor and Balkan-Carpatic "camps" can be referred also, A. Sherratt with his so-called conception of "**secondary products revolution**". He considers the migration concept of Indo-Europeans from Volga-Uralic steppes to the west in early Bronze Age to be anachronism [Sherratt, 2003: 234]. The main supporters of Pontic-Caspian theory are M.Gimbutas, D. Anthony, J. Mallory etc. We can put close to them J. Nickols who with her so-called Sogdian hypothesis proposes important linguistic arguments in favor of the theory of migration of Indo-Europeans from the east to the west. All these theories have certain drawbacks. Traditionally, the discussion about them in Indo-European studies (mainly by the supporters of the opposite theory) occupies an important place. That is why in our view there is no necessity to continue this discussion. Some weaknesses of the above mentioned theories cannot be considered appropriate arguments for our discussion.

While discussing the issue of Proto-Indo-European language and its area of initial spreading attention is to be paid to the so-called **Nostratic theory**. According to it a lot of language families from Eurasian continent take beginning through from the larger **Proto-Nostratic**. There is no consensus in literature concerning the classification of Nostratic languages. However, Proto-Indo-European has been always considered its permanent member. The same can be said about Kartvelian and Uralic languages whereas the position of such language stocks as **Semitic, Elamite, Dravidian, Altaic, Afroaziatic** etc. is not clear. In modern linguistics there is not uniform attitude to Nostratic theory. Probably this is the reason that in Indo-European studies it has less attention. Despite this, we consider that its importance is rather considerable while discussing Indo-Europeans homeland . The point is that special affinity of the Indo-European, in our case Kartvelian and Uralian stocks at least means that the spreading area of

ancestor languages (speaking the languages of these families which probably anticipated their formation as independent language families), was close to each other. Perhaps this gives us the right to consider the territory existing between Kartvelian and Uralian language spaces the initial spreading area of Proto-Indo-Europeans.

Where could such space have been? In scholarly literature there is no single opinion regarding the formation of Kartvelian languages and its genetic ties. Although we have reason to suppose that the initial area of their spreading was not far from the **Caucasus** territory. If we take into account that south Iran and India were settled with other members of Nostratic stocks (**Elamite and Dravidians**) and Uralic environ and Central Asia probably were settled by Uralian and Altaics ancestors, it seems to be reasonable if south middle Asia and north Iran is considered to be such intermediate territory. In Mesolithic period this part of the area seems to be closely connected on the one hand, with Uralic environ [Matyuishin, 2003: 368-372], and on the other, with **Ancient near east**. These ties had not been weakened neither in Neolithic nor in Eneolithic periods. In this period three archeological cultures were formed: **Jeitun, Hissar, Keltiminar** [Yusupov, 1997:13-24]. In our case of special importance is Jeitun culture. All achievements of "**Neolithic revolution**" are well represented in it. Its ties with **near eastern** reality also bears intense character, at the same time it continues local Mesolithic traditions too. These circumstances in our view, allow us to state that the above formulated conclusions of the closeness of **ancient near eastern** world of the Indo-European's original homeland on the basis of linguistic paleontology agrees well with the **southern middle Asian** theory. The same can be said about the achievements of the "Neolithic revolution". It doesn't oppose (Southern Middle Asian theory) to the issues of Proto-Indo-Europeans chronology either.

The idea of linking Indo-Europeans with near eastern Neolithic reality is not new. However, we consider that from this view point the idea of **Southern Middle Asian** hypothesis has more arguments because: a) it doesn't cross historical area of a priori non Indo-European population of **near east**; b) within its frames as we will see below there can be made interesting conclusions on spreading of domestic horse in ancient **near east**; c) by means of it, the reconstruction of logical ways of its spreading on Indo-European language stocks in their historical homeland becomes reasonable.

It should be assumed that from geographical view point Tocharian languages moved only insignificantly. And Anatolians spreading in Ancient near east, in our view must be linked with **Kura-Araxes** archeological culture. Naturally at this stage in the genesis of **Kura-Araxes** culture the participation of the element came from south middle Asia and northern Iran cannot be considered as a proved fact, however, we consider that the emphasis on several circumstances from this view point could show interesting perspectives of the research. Particularly, 1) with the **Kura-Araxes** culture the Bronze Age starts in the Caucasus and the adjacent territory which is followed by significant cultural, economic and probably ethno-linguistic changes. Their trace is evident from archeological materials of the 4th millennium BC. Namely, significant inflow of peoples moved from the south Middle Asia towards Ural. In its turn the southern migrants assimilate the territory of the southern middle Asia which becomes the basis for the formation of Anau culture [Yusupov, 1997:24-26]. At the same time the monuments of **Leila depe's** style spread in Georgia and considerable inflow of population moved from the southern to the northern Caucasus, which caused the formation of Maykop

culture [Japaridze, 2003:277-278]. The **Kura-Araxes** tribes also spread quickly to the Caucasus, etc. We shouldn't forget the fact that it is just at that period that Sumerians emerged in the southern Mesopotamia. It is not excluded that their migration could be connected with the above mentioned events in any form. The spread of Indo-European (Anatolian) languages to the west, should be considered in this context (we should emphasize that at this stage our purpose is to determine as to which logical cultural and historical processes accompanied the spread of Indo-European languages to the west); 2) The existence of Hittites on the territory of the Asia minor is evidenced from the end of 3rd millennium B.C. The fall of the **Kura-Araxes** culture also coincides with this period. It looks like its population leaves its old settlement partly because of northern neighbors and partly because of worsening of the climatic conditions [Japaridze, 1998:170-174]. Just this fact becomes the reason of cultural genesis of Khirbet-Kerak in Syria. Certain mass migration towards Balkans is also supposed. Should we seek the historical ground for Anatolians spread in Asia Minor in the context of these events? 3) We should pay attention to the issue of spreading the domesticated horse in ancient Near East. Many archeologists consider that **Kura-Araxes** population was familiar with the horse at the time when they had not yet the opportunity to assimilate this element of culture as a result of link with the steppes [Japaridze, 1998: 108-109]. According to new data [Mashkour, 2003: 129-139] it also becomes obvious that domestic horse may spread on the territory of the northern Iran in the 4th millennium B.C or earlier period. It should be mentioned that in other regions of Ancient Near East we haven't found special materials. Let us recall the above mentioned traditional relations of the Middle Asia. We attach great importance to these relations in the process of the "Indo-Europeanization" of Europe. Also, let us recall the supposition according to which the domestication of the horse must have occurred in that environment in which the domesticated donkey was spread [Encyclopedia...2008: 441-442]. For us it is significant to mention that the most popular is the concept of domestication of horse in the steppes of the eastern Europe. Proceeding from the above mentioned, an interesting area of spreading the domesticated horse is manifested in the 4th millennium B.C, which approximates very much the territory perceived by us as Indo-European space; 4) It is of particular importance that the **Kura-Araxes** culture reveals weak relations with Ancient Near East (unlike the archeological cultures of its forerunner), whereas its northern neighbor Maykop culture seems to be rather advanced from this viewpoint. Can it be an argument of participation of non-local element in the creation of the **Kura-Araxes** culture? We should emphasize once more that the above mentioned discourse (on spread of Indo-European languages to the west) may only be a hypothesis.

In case of sharing Southern middle Asian hypothesis, obviously the issue of alternative explanation of spreading Indo-European languages in Europe is needed. From this view point, we consider it to be interesting to pay attention to the process of "Neolithization" of Uralic steppes. It has long been noted that in this part of the world the formation of production and development could happen from three possible centres: The Central Europe-Balkan, Caucasus and southern middle Asia [Kuzmina, 2003: 203]. In the period of Neolith and Eneolith the contacts from Caucasian steppes haven't been attested. We can't say the same about southern middle Asia. Despite the fact that while discussing the issues of Indo-European study, less attention is paid to this process, we can't help mentioning, that both Mesolithic, Neolithic and Eneolithic periods these regions (i.e. Uralic and southern middle Asia) were closely connected with each other. We should not forget either that domesticated sheep played a crucial role in

mastering of the steppes and formation of the Normadic culture there. The sheep as well as goats and cattle were not found in the Uralic steppes and its adjacent territories [Matyuishin, 2003: 375]. It is reasonable to suppose that it was spread there from Caspian, where one of the oldest environments of its domestication existed.

Of course, we don't wish to diminish the importance of the Central Europe-Balkan areas when speaking about the Volga-Uralic steppes. We simply mention that according to archeological data the formation of agriculture in Ural and its eastern part mainly occurred due to the influence of the southern Middle Asia. The spread of Indo-European languages, more precisely its non-Anatolian and non-Tocharian part in Europe is regarded by us as a result of ethnic and cultural diffusion in the mentioned direction. From this view point our attitude differs from the supporters of the Pontic-Caspian theories, who connect this process with those coming from the west. In our view such approach gives an interesting opportunity to interconnect archeological arguments offered by N. Danilenko [Danilenko, 1974] with the linguistic conclusions made by J. Nichols [Nichols, 1997; Nichols, 1998].

At the end we wish to state that the Pontic-Caspian theories in our view require a number of corrections. First of all, it concerns the distribution schemes of Indo-European stocks offered by them in Europe. Although it seems to us that they are closer to the truth while speaking about the issue of "Indo-Europeization" of Europe than Central Europe-Balkan, Anatolian and of course Northern European models.

Thus, we believe that the homeland of peoples speaking Indo-European languages was located on the territory of the southern Middle Asia and northern Iran. Here as early as Mesolithic period the process of the formation of Proto-Indo-European linguistic peculiarities may have started. This process must have been considerably accelerated by the spread of farming in this part of the world (i.e. Southern Middle Asia and northern Iran) and formation of Hisar and Jeitum like archeological cultures. The disintegration of Indo-European linguistic space may have started in the fifth and fourth millennia B.C. Its spread on the Eurasian continent proceeded in two directions. The spread of Anatolian languages to the west must have been linked with the formation of the Kura-Araxes culture, and then its disintegration in the second half of the third millennium B.C. Tocharian languages were not subjected to significant movement. Agriculture must be considered as a marker of Indo-Europeans expansion to Volga-Ural. According to the Pontic-Caspian theory there was located the Indo-Europeans's homeland which in our opinion, was the homeland only for "old-European" and wing of Aryo-Graeco-Armenian stock. In our view such reasoning does not break any of D. Adams and J. Melor's criteria mentioned. All linguistic arguments proposed by T. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov also remain in force. We believe that consideration of historical and theoretical issues (what historical reality lies behind the linguistic notion of "Proto-Indo-European"; in which form Indo-European language stocks were spread and how all this was reflected in archeological material) adds more significance to the proposed hypothesis in future.

According to the classification recognised in modern linguistics to the Indo-European family belong: Anatolian, Tocharic, Celtic, Italian, Germanic, Baltic, Slavic, Albanian, Greek, Armenian, Indo-Aryan, Iranian, Messapian, Illyric, Frigic, Thracian, Venetic groups [Mallory, 2006: 153]. In scholarly literature we can find the attempts to place here some so-called Mediterranean

languages [Gergiev, 1958: 87-104]. An assumption was also made on the Indo-European nature of the Kartvelian languages [Melikishvili, 2002: 40]. However, similar approaches cannot be considered by us as overall recognized.

³ In scholarly literature we can also find the attempts to determine the size of the estimated area of the homeland (Encyclopedia...1997: 290-291).

4 There are some assumptions in Indo-European studies which aim at presentation the issue in different light. We mean the concepts opposed to the genetic kinship of Indo-European languages [Demoule, 1991: 169-202], on the one hand and on the other, concepts directed against placing the proto spreading areal of "Proto-Indo-European" language into more or less local area [Alinei, 2000: 21-50]. In case of sharing similar approaches, we believe it is possible to face the necessity of consideration the problem of authenticity of the issue under study. However, the number of their supporters (i.e. similar concepts) and the reliability of their arguments have not yet given the ground for this.

The significance of this branch was especially increased in the second half of the 20th century.

In scholarly literature more bold hypotheses are also expressed. See [Gornung, 1964]. From this view point in Georgian linguistics the tendency of affiliation of Proto-Kartvelian and Proto-Indo-European languages to each other is popular.

It is interesting to note that comparatively seldom is found an assumption about the affinity between Kartvelian and Uralic.

Nothing to say about their distant genetic relatedness.

On the basis of approximately the same assumption B. Gornung seeks Indo-European's homeland in the central European region [Gornung, 1964].

We mean the period in which the spread of Nostratic languages is supposed.

From archeological point of view the territory of the northern Iran has not been fully studied. The same can be said about archeological monuments of Caucasian materials in the context of generalization of this part of the area.

On this issue see: [Danilenko, 1969:181; Eneolith...1982: 327-328].

We can have different position in relation to Volga environ.

We have emphasized once more that the purpose of this work is not interpretation of the issue in historical context.

On this issue see: [Silagadze, 2008: 14-19].

References

- | | |
|---|--|
| Gamkrelidze T., 2003
Kiknadze Z., Shaduri I.,
Shengelaia N.
2003 | Course in Theoretical Linguistics. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Losaberidze D.
1992 | On the issue of foreign environment of Kartvelian languages. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Makharadze Z.
1998 | Some Issues of Caucasian archeology of Eneolith-Early Bronze Age. Investigations 1. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Melikishvili G.
1965 | On the issue of the earliest population of Georgia, Caucasus and Near East. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Melikishvili G.
2002 | The theory of language contacts and the issue of Kartvelian-Indo-European genetic kinship. Ethnogenesis of Georgian people. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Melikishvili G.
1970 | Georgians and the issue of their origin. Sketches on the history of Georgia. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Silagadze N.
2008 | Problem of genesis of Halstate archaeological culture. Historical verticals. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Kurdiani M.
2000 | On the name of common Kartvelian. Meskheti. Akhaltsikhe. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Japaridze O.
2003 | At the origin of ethnogenesis of Georgian people. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Japaridze O.
1998 | On the ethnocultural history of Georgian tribes in the 3rd millenium B.C. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Alinei M.
2000 | An alternative model for the origins of European peoples and languages: the continuity theory, «Quaderni di Semantica» 21. |
| Ammerman, A., Cavalli-Sforza L.
1984 | The Neolithic Transition and the Genetics of Populations in Europe. N.J |
| Anthony D.
2007 | The Horse, The Wheel and Language. How Bronze-Age Riders From The Eurasian Steppes Shaped The Modern World. Oxford |
| Barker G.
1989 | Prehistoric Farming in Europe. Cambridge. |
| Bomhard A.
2008 | Recent Trends in Nostratic Comparative Linguistics Charleston, SC, USA (Presented by Academy Member Th.V. Gamkrelidze). Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad.Sci., vol.2, #4. |
| Bomhard A.
1996 | Indo-European and the Nostratic Hypothesis. Charleston. |
-

Cavalli-Sforza L. 1996	Genes Peoples et Langues. Paris.
Cameron C 1936	History of Early Iran. Chicago.
Cherratt A. 2003	The Horse and the Wheel: the Dialectics of Change in the Circum-Pontic Region and Adjacent Areas, 4500–1500 BC. pp233-253. Prehistoric steppe adaptation and the horse. Ed.by Levine M., Renfrew C., Boyle K.
Dixon R. 1997	The Rise and Fall of Languages. Cambridge.
Demoule J.-P. 1991	Realite des indo-europeens: Les diverses Apories du Modele Arborescent.Vol. 208. Paris.
Dolgopolsky A. 1989	The Nostratic Hypothesis and Linguistic Paleontology. Cambridge.
Dolgopolsky A. 1988	The Indo-European homeland and lexical contacts of Proto-Indo-European with other languages. Mediterranean Language Review 3:7–31.
Darden B. 2001	On the question of the Anatolian origin of Indo-Hittite. Greater Anatolia and The Indo-Hittite Language Family. Ed. Drews R.
Encyclopedia... 2008	Encyclopedia of Archaeology. Ed. Pearsall D. M. Vol 1.
Encyclopedia ... 1997	Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture Ed. Mallory J., Adams D. London Chicago
Gimbutas M. 1965	Bronze age Cultures inCentral and Eastern Europe. London.
Ghirshman R. 1954	Iran from the Earliest Times to the Islamic Conquest. Harmondsworth.
Hersfeld E. 1935	Archaeological History of Iran. London.
Ivanov V. 2007	The Indo-European Homeland in the Near East:New Evidence. Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad.Sci.. vol.175. #3.
Kerns J. 1985	Indo-European Prehistory. Cambridge
koryakova L., 2006	Epimakhov A. The Urals and Western Siberia in the Bronze and Iron Ages. Cambridge.
Kuzmina E. 2003	Origins of Pastoralism in the Eurasian Steppes. Prehistoric steppe adaptation and the horse. Ed.by Levine M., Renfrew C., Boyle K.

Gray R. , Atkinson Q. 2003	Language-tree divergence times support the Anatolian theory of Indo-European origin. pp 435-438. Nature. vol 426. November 2003.
Kilian L. 2000	De l'origine des Indo-Européens. Paris
Mallory J., Adams D. 2006	The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World. Oxford New York.
Mashkour M. 2003	Equids in the Northern Part of the Iranian Central Plateau from the Neolithic to Iron Age: New Zoogeographic Evidence. Prehistoric steppe adaptation and the horse. Ed.by Levine M., Renfrew C.,Boyle K.
Matyushin G. 2003	Problems of Inhabiting Central Eurasia: Mesolithic–Eneolithic Exploitation of the Central Eurasian Steppes . Prehistoric steppe adaptation and the horse. Ed.by Levine M., Renfrew C., Boyle K.
Meier-Brugger M. 2003	Indo-European Linguistics. Berlin New York.
Nickols J. 1992	Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time. Chicago
Nichols J. 1997	The Epicentre of the Indo-European Linguistic Spread. Archaeology and Language. Ed. R. Blench and M. Spriggs. London.
Nichols J. 1998	The Eurasian Spread Zone and the Indo-European Dispersal. Archaeology and Language. Ed. R. Blench and M. Spriggs. London.
Renfrew C. 2009	Prehistory. Making of Human Mind. New York.
Renfrew C. 1973	Before Civilization. New York.
Renfrew C. 1987	Archaeology and language. The puzzle of indo - European origins.
Mallory J. 1989	In search of the indo-Europeans: language, Archaeology and Myth. London.
Matasović R. 2009	A Reader in comparative indo-European Mythology. Zagreb.
Stone L, Lurquin P 2005	A Genetic and Cultural Odyssey. New York.
Sturtevant E. 1951	A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language. Yale.
The Oxford ... 1994	The Oxford Illustrated Prehistory of Europe. Ed. By Barry Cunliffe. Oxford New York.

West M. 2007	Indo-European Poetry and Myth. Oxford.
Zvelebil M. 2002	Indo-European origins and the agricultural transition in Europe. Journal of European Archaeology.
Avrusin D. 1977	Archeology of the USSR. Moscow. (in Russian).
Alekseev V. 1989	Historical anthropogenesis and ethnogenesis. Moscow. (in Russian).
Arutinov S. 1989	Peoples and Cultures. Moscow. (in Russian).
Gamkrelidze T. Ivanov V. 1984	Indo-European language and Indo-Europeans. Tbilisi. (in Russian).
Georgiev V. 1958	Studies on comparative-historical linguistics. Moscow. (in Russian).
Gordeziani R. 1975	Caucasus and problems of the oldest Mediterranean language and cultural relations. Tbilisi. (in Russian).
Gornung B. 1964	Formation of Indo-European verbal community. Moscow. (in Russian).
Danilenko B. 1969	Neolith of the Ukraine. Kiev. (in Russian).
Danilenko B. 1974	Eneolith of the Ukraine. Kiev. (in Russian).
Diakonov I. 1982	On the proto-homeland of the carriers of Indo-European dialects. Bulletin of the ancient history. 3. Moscow. (in Russian).
Diakonov I. 1989	Language contacts in the Caucasus and Near East. Caucasus and civilization of the ancient East. Ordjonikidze. (in Russian).
Klimov G. 1986	Introduction to the Caucasian linguistics. Moscow. (in Russian).
Masson B. 1964	Middle Asia and ancient Orient. Moscow, Leningrad. (in Russian).
Masson B. 1971	Settlement of Jeitun. Leningrad. (in Russian).
Mongait A. 1974	Archeology of the western Europe. Bronze and Iron Age. Moscow. (in Russian).
Safronov V. 1989	Indo-European homeland. Gorkii. (in Russian).
Khlopin I. 1963	Eneolith of the southern regions of the Middle Asia, part 1, Moscow-Leningrad. (in Russian).

Tsalkin V. 1970	Ancient domestic animals of the eastern Europe. Moscow. (in Russian).
Chaild G. 1949	Progress and Archeology. Moscow. (in Russian).
Eneolith... 1982	Eneolith of the USSR. Moscow..(in Russian).
Yusupov Kh. 1997	Pages in history of Turkmenistan. From ancient time to Arabs conquer. Moscow. (in Russian).

Dialogue of Cultures: Stereotyped Models of Conceptual Thinking (On the Example of Arabic and Georgian Proverbs)

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/19

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Khatuna Tumanishvili](#)

A proverb is known to be an inseparable part of the verbal folklore of a language collective, formed in the mould of the common "mental language" [Haskell, 1987: 264]. Accordingly, qualitatively (formally as well as semantically) it is a micro-model of the life and thinking of the area in which it was created and is functioning. Its basic loading is gaining insight into the general regularities of the world. It is the deep understanding of reality, which is embedded in the given "harmonious" consciousness - in the system of common national thinking. Naturally, each ethnos conveys it by an individual form. Thus, an in-depth study of proverbs (together with that of the language) implies the study of ethnic (everyday and mental) peculiarities of the people creating them, laws of thinking established in the given mental area, practically, ethnopsychology.

The indices registered by the use of statistical methods confirm that in the modern world there is a constant tendency towards speaking in metaphors, including proverbs. This is indicated by their intensive use in oral and written communications. Hence, at present, in accordance with the challenges of the new period (powerful cultural expansion), paremiology poses on the global level the question of the function of the proverb language in traditional and modern culture. Scholars attach great importance to the comparative study of the evidence of different cultures (along with the further study of national paremic collections), in order to obtain a united stock of international proverbs with their varied functions in different cultures. "Modern theoretical and empirical paremiology will undoubtedly lead human behavior and communication to new thinking...By the comparison of the results of study on the international level paremiologists can make their contribution to the global human commission which is based on well-tried, approved wisdom" [Mieder, 1996:2].

The above-mentioned demonstrates the urgency of the given topic and defines the object of the present study: interpretation of the proverb - a formula modeled as a certain concept in a given mentality - in the context of different cultures (Arabic/Georgian). The corpus of the proverbs regarded by us gives a clear idea of the national vision of historically and mentally radically different peoples. On the basis of similar approaches it becomes possible to identify different ethnocultures with this aspect (to define the ethnic individuality of each) and at the same time to establish the characteristics of globalization of cultures (the boundaries of similarities of cultures).

The abundance of proverbs and figurative expressions in classical Arabic and its dialects and their intensive use in the speech acts attracted the attention of foreign scholars long ago. In this respect, in the specialist literature, dealing with the study of ethnic peculiarities and customs of different Arab peoples on the basis of the study of proverbs, the special importance of proverbs in the Arabic everyday life and culture are stressed repeatedly [Buckhardt, 1972; Hanki, 1998]. In

the researches devoted to this aspect scholars unequivocally point out a constant striving of the Arabs for figurative speech and their specially "favourable" attitude to similar figural expressions. Sh. Webster shares the evaluation of H. Dickson, who as a result of the observation made as early as the beginning of the 20th century notes that an Arab constantly uses proverbs or expressions of one or another poet, and he obviously takes the same delight in this as he does at the time of narrating a story [Webster, 1986: 179].

Before moving to the basic part of the discussion of the problem under study on the basis of analysis of specific examples, it is necessary to interpret the semantic structure of this genre on theoretical level.

Proverb, as noted above, is a figurative saying, formed on the level of conceptual thinking in the consciousness of a given language collective and expressed in a stereotyped formula. It records figuratively the generalized wisdom formed as a result of historical experience. The knowledge embedded in proverbs is the resource of the rational of a given ethnos, its ethnopsychic basis, existing in the irrational form. That is why it is difficult to gain a deep insight into proverbs of a foreign language, to identify the relevant boundaries of the generalized meaning (sphere of use). This apparently is due to the specificity of the proverb structure, its structurally difficult semantic mechanism.

This circumstance is perhaps determined by the wide range of factors, which are undoubtedly involved in the creation of the formal and semantic plot of a proverb: the historical process of the formation of a given ethnos, social reality, consciousness, language, thinking, folklore proper, etc. These are social and spiritual aspects of human activity. And this sphere of research is quite objectively regarded as the most difficult one. All these factors participating in the proverb formation process at the time of actualization operate in a combined way and pass through the "collective subconscious" (K.G. Jung). It is beyond doubt that subconscious processes are much more complex phenomenon and distinguished by far more complex structure than conscious ones. Apparently, the interpretation of the multidimensional phenomenon of proverbs from the theoretical viewpoint, taking into account the above aspects listed, calls for a comprehensive approach of study.

According to the correct opinion existing in paremiological scholarly literature, such errors and simplification in the theory of literature, as "complete separation" of the content of a poetic work [Jacobson, 1981: 147] from its form, and respectively, disregard of the difficulties which result from the study of the content in isolation, have also found their negative reflection in the study of proverbs as paremies expressing the universal world outlook, common to all mankind.

G. Permiakov regards them to be the object of study of simultaneously three disciplines - language, logical philosophy and folklore. In the author's view, the unsuccessfulness of many paremiological studies was explained exactly by the fact that scholars did not resort to such a comprehensive method [Permiakov, 1970:8].

Paremiology practically unequivocally recognizes that the semantic structure of a proverb is made of basically thematic-logical combinations (however, approaches vary [Permiakov, 1970; Krikmann, 1998; Barley, 1984]). As a result of existing studies, the fundamental basis of

constructing proverbs is manifested: one sphere of experience gained about a certain phenomenon in the process of cognition of the world serves as the foundation of another one, by means of which the idea represented by a particular semantic form becomes generalized wisdom. In other words, its generalized logical-structural model is formed by the integrated operation of the surface and deep levels. It is not accidental that V.Allakhverdov, who studied the emotional aspects accompanying the process of perception of a literary work, refers to the proverb as "text with a double bottom" («текст с двойным дном») [Allakhverdov, 2001:126]. Upon each realization in a respective "situational niche", a metaphorical engine begins to work. The process of deciphering- grasping the generalized wisdom, occurring at this time, is based on the knowledge gained as a result of the observation of the world by a given ethnos. This process is realized on the basis of the logical relations between the given objects and phenomena, which is an established and accepted norm in the consciousness of a particular language community, in its thinking area.

But on the basis of the general foundation, it is necessary to identify in particular how, by what semantic rules the generalized plot of the proverb is constructed, deciphered and used; what semantic operations are involved at the time of the actualization in the subconscious of speech act participants.

In our view, to interpret the posed questions correctly, the semantic structure of a proverb should be considered in the synthesis of three basic dimensions. It simultaneously covers elements of **logical**, **verbal** and **conceptual** thinking. **Logical**, because it reflects logical relations between objects and phenomena existing in the universe; **verbal**, because it is a communicative unit and is essentially linked with speech; and **conceptual**, because the reasoning and conclusion given in it are based on conceptual operation.

Deciphering of a proverb (the more so if it is deeply metaphorical) in a speech act is a psychologically complex process of thinking. It is not accidental that when studying the psychological aspects observable in the process of the realization of communication acts, G.Milner tries to identify the imaginary interrelations existing between events and categories exactly on the basis of proverbs. In his view, proverbs may be compared to a mechanism, by means of which the consciousness builds large-scale units, as transition occurs from construction brick by brick to block construction - by means of semi-processed units [Milner, 1968: 34].

As is seen, while studying the semantic plot of a proverb, an approach should be determined with into account of semantics and pragmatics as well as the specificity of thinking and speech psychology.

S.Levinson, defining goals and objectives of the theory of pragmatics, regards study of the nature of metaphor as the prerogative and object of research of a pragmatist. In his view, a pragmatist should find out how a metaphorical expression is constructed and recognized, whereas the task of psycholinguistics and psychology is the creation of an analogy-based theory of thinking. Such an approach, in his opinion, will facilitate the approximation of the linguistic and extralinguistic spheres [Levinson, 1994].

Similar to other researchers, M.Rusieshvili correctly considers that this complexity of proverbs is caused by the complexity of metaphorical expressions proper, which is observable in the process of their decoding and is also reflected in contextual actualization [Rusieshvili, 1999: 35]. This opinion is acceptable for us. However, it should be stressed here that the proverb, even among other metaphorical expressions (e.g. riddle/proverbial saying), due to its specific semantic structure (by its pragmatic function, of course), belongs to much more complex, higher level units.

In the interpretation of the posed question the known term "association of notions (ideas)" (J.Locke) was useful. This concept implies the process on the basis of which psychological perceptions and notions associate with one another and form complex ideas of a wide meaning.

Bringing of the essence "hidden" in the proverb (idea of a wide meaning) to the surface, (which passes through the subconscious of the participants of a speech act at the time of the actualization), practically represents a psychologically "creative act". Its decoding is the process of giving sense occurring on the level of conceptual thinking. This process is based on the principle of synthetic thinking (combined operation of component elements). Complex subconscious operations, such as reflection of the logical relations between objects and phenomena existing in the universe, grasping the essence, generalization and abstraction, are involved comprehensively here. Unlike the surface (object) perception (practically, on its basis, though), it goes beyond the boundaries of visible, sensory reflection and is directed towards deeper cognition of reality. That is, it is a higher, abstracted form of knowing reality. Exactly by this feature a proverb differs from a spontaneously coined metaphor or a witty remark (as well as a riddle or a proverbial saying).

By means of every new representation of imagination obtained by the logical relations upon the actualization of a particular proverb in a new context, which is attained by new "semantic markers" acquired in a given case, in the subconscious of the participants of a speech act (having a common "mental language") the particular "sensory material" is activated, which is recorded by the given ethnos in the experience linked with this particular part of the model of the universe. At the time of the semantic operation based on analogy, "mental processing" of the perception data takes place, the separation (differentiation) of the essential - "a large-scale unit" (G.Milner) - from the non-essential occurs.

In order to illustrate the above reasoning, on the basis of given theoretical analysis, let us consider one semantic model. By the comparative-typological analysis of the Arabic and Georgian semantic parallels falling within it, let us identify what experience the given ethnoses rest on, i.e. by what semantic means, characteristic of each, the given approved wisdom of life - **"everyone finds his/her match"** - is created:

[koll ət-ʃujūr 'ala škâla(h) tá'a'] كلّ الطيور على أشكالها تقع

- Every bird couples with the same species.

გული გულს იცნობს; (lit.: "A heart recognizes another heart")

ფერი ფერსა, მადლი ღმერთსაო. (lit.: "Colour to colour, thanks to God")

[koll ʃanzara əlhā ɟaʃâ(h)] كلّ طنجرة لها عطاها

_§ ყველა ქოთანს თავის თავსახური აქვსო. (lit.: "Every pot has its lid")

[hásan 'aħō lahsên] حسن أخو لحسين

_ჰასანი ჰუსეინის ძმია. (lit.: "Hasan is Husein's brother")

§ რაცაღხანა, ისჩაღხანაო./აღხანასჩაღხანაარდაელევაო(lit.: "Alkhana and Chalkhana are the same")

თითომარიკელასთითომოსიკელაარდაელევაო(lit.: "Every Marikela has her Mosikela") *Every Jack has his Jill.*

ჭიანკაკალსჭიანიმუშტარიარდაელევაო(lit.: "Worm-eaten walnut has a "worm-eaten" buyer").

As is clear, in order to create a similar semantic model ("*everyone finds his/her match*"), both ethnoses offer identical as well as different metaphorical images. The information given on the surface level in each unit is the basis of the generalized meaning embedded on their deep level. It sometimes rests on the experience gained as a result of the observation (on the laws of nature, everyday objects, etc.) in the process of the cognition of the world, and in some cases - on the recording of proper names (sometimes historical persons). Each proverb united in the given semantic model, upon the actualization in a relevant context, expresses the identical concept coded in them, the wide meaning, by a different semantic colouring. In other words, the similar underlying meaning recorded in each on the implicit level has a different connotation (sometimes positive as well as negative, in other cases unequivocally positive or negative). Accordingly, the connotative range of the contexts, the situation niche, in which each of them are realized, are different.

Let us consider the first proverb of the above-given Arabic proverbs: "Every bird couples with the same species", where the recording of the meaning is concentrated on the similar birds species, the genetic code. At the time of the actualization in a context, by means of the information obtained on the explicit level, in the speakers' consciousness the knowledge on the regularities existing in nature is activated, namely, coupling of birds of one species. Against this background the sense-giving occurs: there are birds of different species in nature, distinguished by different features, conventionally, "good" and "bad", a "good" bird couples with a "good" one and a "bad" bird- with a "bad" one. On the basis of the indicated semantic operations, with the help of imaginary logical relations, through an association, the mentioned regular knowledge is put into practice and applied to a respective situation, which defines the decoding of the implicit meaning - grasping the essence, generalization and abstraction of the idea represented by a specific content: **everyone** ("*bad*" and "*good*") **finds his/her match**, *couples with his/her match*. This proverb has a double connotation. Depending on the context, it may be used with the positive (a "good" pair) as well as negative nuances (a "bad" pair).

As regards the semantic parallels of this proverb:

a) in *გულიგულსიცნობს* ("A heart recognizes another heart") the emphasis is on the heart i.e. inner life of people, the spiritual sphere. It is used with a negative or a positive connotation. b) *ფერიფერსა, მადლიღმერთსაო*. ("Colour to colour, thanks to God"), on the contrary, is oriented toward the physical (colour), outward appearance (perhaps, including spiritual similarity as well). It in most cases has a distinct positive connotation. A similar concept with the negative connotation is mostly expressed by the alternative variant - *რაცალხანა, ისჩალხანაო./ ალხანასჩალხანაარდაელევაო* ("Alkhana and Chalkhana are the same"). However, the variant (b) may also be realized with a negative colouring in some contexts: "*ფერიფერსაო, მადლიღმერთსაო*" _ ნათქვამია, *ფერიფერსშეხვდადაერთმანეთიშიფიფერეს. ესშეფერებაცოტასააქვსჩვენშიმიღებულისიყვარულად? კარგირამარისქართველიკაცი: ბედსაც დაუბედობასაცთანასწორადემორჩილებახოლმე*" (lit.: "Colour to colour, thanks to God", as the saying goes, colour met colour and they got accustomed to each other. Do not a lot of people regard this getting accustomed as love ? A good thing is a Georgian man: he equally obeys good and bad luck") [Chavchavadze, 1985:174].

In the illustrated examples the complete Arabic-Georgian (textual and semantic) parallels are recorded: "*ყველა ქოთანს თავის თავსახური აქვს*" ("Every pot has its lid"), in which attention is again focused on physical similarity and in both ethnoses is more often notable for a negative connotation (however, theoretically there is a potential of interpreting it, as a fact expressing a general regularity, with a double colouring). Obviously, in the Arabic consciousness its semantically negative connotation is caused by the realia given in the metaphorical image - the "building material". Namely, an Arab/Lebanese uses a *pot* (ṭánžara), (hence its *lid* (ḡaṭâ(h)) on an open hearth, as a result of which it is sooty, i.e. unsightly (it has a negative connotation). As regards the realization of the proverb in the Georgian consciousness in most cases with a negative function, it must be, on the one hand, due to the existence of its alternative parallel, mostly having a positive colouring *ფერიფერსა, მადლიღმერთსაო* ("Colour to colour, thanks to God"). On the other hand, the Russian exact counterpart *У каждого горшка своя крышка*, intensively found in Georgian speech, may also have a subconscious influence. The constituent segment *горшок* ("pot") in the Georgian consciousness has a negative seme (it is often associated with a chamber-pot).

The Arabic proverb *ჰასანი ჰუსეინის ძმია* ("Hasan is Husein's brother") seems especially interesting, which, by the observation of the present author, is used by the given ethnos with a negative loading. This must have a deep historical roots. Hasan and Husein, named in it, must be the sons of Ali ibn Abu Talib, the spiritual leader of the Shiites. Syria, as is known, is a country of Sunite Islam. Hence, on the basis of the religious conflict between Shiism and Sunism, the present proverb may have acquired a negative connotation for the Syrians.

It has numerous semantic analogies in Georgian: *რაცალხანა, ისჩალხანაო./ ალხანასჩალხანაარდაელევაო* ("Alkhana and Chalkhana are the same"), *თითომარიკელასთითომოსიკელაარდაელევაო* ("Every Marikela has her Mosikela") (in which love-affairs predominate), where connotative parallelism is recorded as well: at the time of its use a sharply ironic tone is observable, which is created by the language stylistics of the metaphor given on the surface level, in particular, by the use of familiar variants of names. As regards the last Georgian parallel *ჭიანჭაკალსჭიანიმუშტარიარდაელევაო* ("Worm-eaten walnut has a "worm-eaten" buyer"), its negative connotation is again manifested in the

metaphorical trope: the selection of syntagmas - ქიანკაკალი ("worm-eaten walnut") ქიანკაკალი ("worm-eaten" buyer") naturally gives it a negative colouring at the time of decoding.

As is obvious from the above examples, in this case images existing on the surface level of proverbs, upon the realization, become a factor considerably defining their semantic colouring. Accordingly, certain alternation of connotative parameters and intonation field of the text performance will take place at the time of citing in each specific situational context.

Proceeding from the above-mentioned, it may be concluded that the generalized - conceptual formula of a proverb is formed by the simultaneous operation of all the components involved in its creation, indicated above. Each of them are equally important. The objective reality reflected in it on the surface level (visibly) and deeply (non-visibly) cannot be considered as independent objects and phenomena. By means of logical relations they are a whole system of regularities being in a certain conceptual dependence. Therefore, it is possible to understand a proverb only by gaining an insight into these dependences, understanding the regularities existing in the historical reality of a given ethnos and study of the conceptual mentality recorded within the existing mentality.

The comparative study of Arabic and Georgian examples has demonstrated that the wisdom reflected in proverbs of these languages, based on the historical experience of each ethnos, is recorded from the viewpoint characteristic for them. At the same time, phenomena reflecting reality are categorized more or less differently within the boundaries of the mental vision of these nationalities. In order to record the same idea different ethnoses use, on the one hand, their own "building material" and, on the other - a similar one. This demonstrates once again that peoples of totally different languages, ethnoconsciousness and culture, against the background of sometimes similar, sometimes different *logical relations* between objects and phenomena existing in the given surroundings, record similar human ideas and in most cases use a *common system of conceptual thinking*. That is, they create *stereotyped models of conceptual thinking* on the basis of experience accumulated in the process of cognition of the universe. Scholars (among them Georgian researchers) quite correctly explain this phenomenon (along with other circumstances - borrowing, stock phrases) by stereotyped thinking, common to all mankind [M.Chikovani, 1986; M.Rusieshvili, 1999], common practical experience and wisdom [Qin, 1996].

At present, in the period of powerful cultural expansion, when it is so topical to speak about the dialogue of cultures and civilizations, exactly similar universal themes may be considered as one of its corner-stones. Such comparative study takes on special significance for bringing to light the everyday and mental specificity of radically different peoples as to their history and consciousness, their ethnopsychic picture, their different as well as similar world view.

In this case the urgency of the topic is also due to the fact that this is the first attempt to introduce a new topic into the Georgian Arabistics.

On the basis of the contextual study of Lybian proverbs, M.Abdelkafi draws the following conclusion: perhaps it will be right to state that the Arabs resort to proverbs more frequently, as compared with the majority of other nations [Abdelkafi, 1986: 7].

One thing is the literal translation of this, at a glance, simple proverbial sentence and the other one is understanding the main idea, implied on its deep level by the mental comprehension developed against the background of the historical experience of a given language community.

Noteworthy, this specificity in Arabic is even more observable due to the existence of bilingualism (problem of diglossia in Arabic). Sometimes in Classical Arabic and other dialects (in this case, Syrian) the pronunciation and sounding of even identical variants are so different that often it is not felt that they have anything in common. Therefore, greater difficulties are encountered here from the viewpoint of the study of proverb language.

Unlike proverbs, riddles/proverbial sayings are devoid of the ability of general reasoning. The "clue" to its semantic code is subordinated to the disclosure of a specific object (hence, object thinking). The proverb is a far more complex phenomenon. Its deep semantic code is oriented towards the recording of a generalized idea - wisdom (approved by a given language collective on the basis of historical experience) (it is subordinated to conceptual thinking). This finds reflection primarily in its pragmatic function: it judges, mocks, teaches...

The process of gaining insight into the essential (giving sense) occurring at the time of proverb deciphering is intended for adults, who are capable of thinking in concepts (e.g. in children, this process is represented only on the level of sensory perception, "object "thinking).

Arabic material is obtained and translated from the Arabic primary source, directly Syrian/Lebanese informants. Given proverbs were recorded with possible contexts, informants' comments and explanations, which was a necessary condition for understanding their deep semantics, connotation range and sphere of use of each of them - for identification of a relevant "situational niche".

Noteworthy, the explicit meaning of a proverb by its nature is fixed, i.e. static, whereas its implicit meaning is not fixed, i.e. dynamic. Of course, it does not go beyond the thematic boundaries, but its formation, on the one hand, is a matter of taste of participants of a speech act, and, on the other one, its formation is to a certain extent determined by a situational context, in which it is used.

References

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Rusieshvili M.
1999 | Functional Essence of the Proverb, Semantic Structure, Pragmatic Parameters (on the Basis of English and Georgian Material). PhD Thesis. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Chikovani M.
1986 | Questions of the History and Theory of Folk Art. Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Chavchavadze I.
1985 | "Is a Human a Man?!" Stories. vol. II, Tbilisi (in Georgian). |
| Abdelkafi M.
1968 | One Hundred Arabic Proverbs from Libya. Vernon and Yates. London. |
-

Buckhardt J. L. 1972	Arabic Proverbs or the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians. Curzon Press, 3rd ed., London.
Hanki J. 1998	Arabic Proverbs. New-York.
Haskell R. E. 1987	A Phenomonology of Metaphor: A precise study into metaphor and its cognitive movement through Semanic space. Cognition and Symbolic structure. Norwood.
Jakobson R. 1981	Subliminal Verbal Patterning in Poetry. Selected Writings. III. Mounton Publishers. The Hague-Paris-New-York.
Krikmann Ar. 1998	On the Relationships of the Rhetorical, Logical and Syntactic Planes in Estonian Proverbs. Source: Folklore: Electronic Journal of Foulklore, issue:6-8. on www.ceeol.com .
Levinson S. C. 1994	Pragmatics. CUP.1994.
Mieder W. 1996	Modern Paremiology in Retrospect and Prospect. Abstracts of Oral Presentations. The 1996 Tokyo International Proverb Forum. [http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/comm/steen/cogweb/Abstracts/TokyoForum_96.html]
Milner G. 1968	The Psychology of Communication. London.
Qin W. 1996	Racial Charasteristics of Proverb. The 1996 Tokyo International Proverb Forum. Ibid.
Webster Sh. K. 1986	Arabic Proverbs and Related Forms. "Proverbium". №3.
Allakhverdov V.M 2001	Psychology of Art. Essay on the Secret of Emotional Effect of a Literary Work. Publishing house DNK. Psikhologia I Kultura. St.Petersburg (in Russian).
Barley N. 1984	A Structural Approach to the Proverb and Maxim. Paremiological Studies. Moscow (in Russian).
Permiakov G.L. 1970	From Proverb to Fairy-Tale (Notes on General Theory of Cliché). Moscow, (in Russian).

Metamorphoses of the Abkhazian Toponymy

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/15

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Linguistics](#)
- [Merab Nachkebia](#)

Numerous issues concerning the history of present-day Abkhazia, the north-west province of Georgia, have not been thoroughly studied yet. There is no consensus among the scholars regarding such questions as ethnic composition of Abkhazian population in various historical epochs, original homeland of the Abkhazians (the Apsua) and their ethnogenesis.

From the beginning of the 19th century in Georgia being first in the grip of tsarist Russia and then of the soviet empire, the scholars (with few exceptions) due to various reasons reflected the political, ethocultural and psychological changes in this region throughout the centuries with half-truth to put it mildly. Falsification of the history of Georgian nation at the expense of limitation of the rights of local Georgians, political concessions to separatist-minded Abkhazians challenged the Georgian statehood, which eventually ended with one-sided recognition of Abkhazian independence from Russia's side.

In such circumstances both Abkhazian and Russian historians and politologists make active attempts to promote a distorted reality in the world as if this territory had been settled only by the Apsua, the indigenous population from the time immemorial while Georgians had never lived there.

Georgian scholars time and again responded to such claims, but due to various reasons proper assessment was not given. It is of topical importance (if not too late) to make final objective conclusions based on careful analysis of data from different branches of science and familiarize both "dual" Georgian scholars and international society with these materials.

Critical analysis of the works of foreign authors (since ancient times till now), the records of old Georgian chronicles, as well as researches conducted by the historians and linguists in the recent period testify to the fact that in the mentioned region "Before proper Abkhazians most of their modern territory was inhabited by Kartvelian population presented, on the one hand, by the Svan branch and, on the other, by Chan-Megrelian" [Janashia, 1958:15]. All data evidence that the original homeland of contemporary Abkhazians was to the north of the Caucasian ridge, in the mouth of the river Kuban, "and modern Abkhazians later in subsequent centuries are the Apsua migrated from the northern Caucasus" [Lortkipanidze, 1990].

Naturally the question arises as to what factors led to the migration of the tribes residing beyond the Caucasian ridge to the south Caucasus.

From the 15th century the strife of administrative units for separation becomes stronger which was accompanied by systematic intrusions of foreign enemies (Persians, Ottomans, north Caucasian tribes...). As a result of this a formerly strong monarchical state appeared to be

disintegrated, followed by physical destruction of the population and foreign tribes settled on their place. This process developed more quickly than usual in distant parts of the country, including Abkhazia, where strong ethnic flow from northern Caucasus rushed in the 16th century.

It is from this period of "creeping colonization" that the first settlements of the Abkhazians (the Apsua) in the environs of Bichvinta, the north-western part of present-day Abkhazia, are recorded; from this time on an increase of the Apsua population in the direction of the river Inguri occurred in several stages:

1) From the 20-30s of the 16th century up to the fifties of the 17th century the Apsua tribes occupied the territory up to the river Kodori. This bloody aggression to Georgian native land of Abkhazia was followed by massacre of the part of the population, distortion of religion, destruction and trouble, which is well seen in the records by foreign missionaries and travelers in Georgia, who witnessed all these events;

2) The conquest of Abkhazia by Apsua occurred in the second half of the 17th century too when they expanded their territory up to the river Ghalidzga. Clearly, the occupation of Kodori-Ghalidzga was also performed with the same brutality as in the first case;

3) The third period is dated by the end of the 17th century, when the Apsua transferred their border from the river Ghalidzga up to the river Inguri, which along with other factors was also favored by the death of the Odishi ruler, Levan II Dadiani [Gvantseladze, 2000:44].

Thus, the Abkhazian princes, with the assistance of either hired or volunteer northern Caucasians occupied the vast territory from the river Ghalidzga up to the Inguri and started raids beyond the Inguri too, which is evidenced from the letter sent to Italy by Patri Dzampi: "Levan Dadiani's death put an end to Megrelians welfare. Almost every year Megrelia was subjected to raids" [Tamarashvili, 1902:203].

An objective picture of the history of present-day Abkhazia is recorded not only by European travelers, the chronicles of catholic missionaries and Georgian sources but by the Abkhazian scholars too. In 1630 Italian missionary Jovani Juliani and Luka arrived to Abkhazia write that the "Abaca" tribe that was termed "Absne" came from the northern Caucasus; Arkanjelo Lamberti while travelling to Abkhazia-Samegrelo remarked: "The Abkhazians residing beyond the Kodori, with their peculiar language... under the name of Kolkheti is meant the country which is located between the Phazis and Kodori and which is termed Samegrelo today [Lamberti, 1938]. In the document of the 16th century it is indicated that after Gurieli's country up to Sokhumi there is the Dadianis domain [Abuladze, 1983:5].

The fact of the Abkhazs (Apsua) settlement is mentioned in Russian sources too. Thus, V.Tatischev recognized as the father of Russian history (1686-1750) wrote: "The northern part of Mingrelia which is called Abkhazos by the Turks and Kabardians, our ancients called it obezi ... Now thereof, most of the territory is populated by Kubans" [Tatishchev, 1967]. Another scholar A.Diachkov-Tarasov stated: "Abkhazians not always lived there, where now live ... They came from the north and pushed the Kartvelian tribes unless they stopped by the Inguri" [Diyachkov-Tarasov, 1905: 65].

On Italian maps of the 15th century at the mouth of the river Kelasuri, Megerelian port is indicated and on the map drawn up by an Italian Jacopo Gastaldi in 1561 Abkhazia, district of Apsua and the city of "Aqva" (the name of the present-day Sokhumi) is indicated in the northern Caucasus in the middle of the Kubani and contemporary Abkhazia is a part of Samegrelo [Gvantseladze, 2008:49]. The same conclusion is made from the records by foreign travelers and missionaries (Jovani Luka, Makari Antiokeli, Jan Sharden, Jacques Gamba, etc).

The river of Kodori as the border line of Abkhazia- Samegrelo up to the 17th century was not disputed by well known Abkhazian historian Z. Anchabadze: "The border line of the Principality of Abkhazia was the river Kodori. Abkhazian feudals struggled with the Dadianis in order to expand the borders of their principality, tried to occupy the land of Samegrelo on the left side of the river Kodori. The struggle proceeded with changeable success. Finally, at the end of 16th century the Shervashidzes moved the frontier of the principality to the south-east up to the river Inguri [Anchabadze, 1959].

The above mentioned and other sources clearly show the autochthony of Georgian tribes on the territory of the modern Abkhazia in opposition to the statements expressed by the Abkhazian separatist-minded researchers, who presented the history of the their own people as if Georgians lived in Abkhazia from the 19th century and the only aborigine and autochthon population is considered to be Abkhazians.

The falsification of the history of Abkhazia was especially stimulated in the soviet period. The Abkhazian historians distinguished with fixed ideas and biased way of thinking and the researchers from the Miklukho Maklai Institute of Ethnography in Moscow falsified the objective reality on purpose. It was disputed by Georgian scholars with half-truth due to various reasons; such approach stimulated the above mentioned scholars to consider the Abkhazians (Apsua) the only indigenous population but they tried to present the area of their settlement Samegrelo-Imereti, Guria and other adjacent territories. The object of their special concern was Samurzaqano for which they "based" on the so-called linguistic data; according to S. Inal-Ipa the density and well-expressed ethnic composition of the Abkhazian topo- and hydronimics from the mouth of the river Mdzimta...(Abkhazian uttermost northern part) almost up to the river Inguri... evidences that Abkhazian tribes represented main population of this territory [Inal-Ipa, 1976:381] and the weakening of Abkhazian toponyms in Samurzaqano is explained by the lateness of Georgian toponymic vocabulary (as middle ages), which was caused by the existence of the united Georgian feudal and monarchic state. This fact was also linked with mass migration of the Megrelian peasants escaped from the oppression and landlessness which in his view was caused by the change of geographical nomenclature as if the result of this was "comparatively late Georgian elements" in the Black Sea coast line. [Inal-Ipa, 1976:382].

Against the background of such historical reality the change of geographical names occurred and is occurring now in Abkhazia which has been paid less attention until recent years because each scientific argument caused acute response in Abkhazians; that is why by the backing of

some Russian "scholars" and direct participation in the historiography of Abkhazia the falsification and ignorance of reality took place on the basis of unacceptable methods of research.

The purpose of the present paper is to determine the time of Abkhazians (Apsua) migration to Abkhazia on the basis of linguistic (in this case toponymic) data and show how purposeful change of geographical names in different time periods occurred.

In Georgian studies there is only one or two works dealing with historical change of toponyms in Abkhazia; in this respect of particular attention is O.Mikiashvili's work [Mikiashvili, 2000]. In his view the intentional change of the toponyms started in the forties of the 20th century and the second stage of this process is considered the period after Stalin's death, i.e. the period of Khrushov's rule). It is also important to mention professor T.Gvantseladze's work in which five periods of toponym's change from 1864 to 1990 are distinguished [Gvantseladze, 2000].

In our view at the stages of change of Abkhazian toponyms the discourse must be started from the beginning of the 16th century, the period when in present-day uttermost north-west part of Abkhazia, in the environs of Bichvinta where the first cases of the Abkhazs settlement have been evidenced, there is also the first mentioning of two geographical names formed in accordance with the norms of the Abkhazian language - **aitarn-e** and **arukh-a**. Proceeding from historical sources and linguistic analysis of cartographical data, we consider that from this time on the seven stages should be singled out in historical change of toponyms in Abkhazia:

The first stage must be defined from the 16th century up to the first half of the sixties of the 19th century (till 1864 before the annulment of the principality of Abkhazia). This is spontaneous unplanned change of toponyms, which excluded the purposeful interference of other country;

The second stage covers the years between 1864 and 1918. As a result of exile the most part of the territory of Abkhazia was abandoned from population. To fill the gap the empire started to create the Russian, Ukrainian, Armenian, Greek, German, Bulgarian, Estonian settlements which led to the disappearance of Georgian and Abkhazian toponyms and their substitution with Russian geographical names proceeding in three directions:

a) As it is typical of the empire of any epoch, the majority of the names of geographical points was changed into the names of family members of the royal dynasty (in this case that of the Romanovs)

b) The second part was substituted by the surnames of the Russian generals, high officials or landlords;

c) A small group of toponyms reflected the names of religious representatives, the birth place of the settled colonists and etc. E.g:

1) In the place of the Abkhazians exiled in 1869 (modern part of the village Bagmarani of Gulripshi region) the settlement of Anatolian Greeks **Aleksandrovskoe//Aleksandrovka** was formed (to celebrate prince Aleksander's birth). To mark the birth of the son of Nikolos II Aleksii, the territory of the village Akhalsopeli of the region of Sokhumi was named Alekseevka.

In honor of empire's grand on Andrei Abkhazian village Apra was named **Andreevka**. To mark the marriage of the princess Olga the daughter of Tevdore Romanova to the Greek prince the Abkhazian village Barial settled with newcomers Greeks was named **Olginskoe**[Kvarchelia, 1985:39-41].

2) To perpetuate the surnames of the generals of the Russian army the following names appeared:

Pilenkovo instead of Tsandripshi (in honor of general Pilenko);

Evdokimovka (in honor of General Evdokimov);

The names of the villages **Ermolovka, Ermolovski** appeared to perpetuate the surname of General Ermolov;

Of the same type are **Vladimirovka, Vorontsovka, Zakharovka**, etc.

3) Russian names of other type: **Bogiavlenskoe, Troitskoe, Spasskoe, Vesioloe, Otradnoe, Grebeshok, Chernigovka, Poltavskoe**, etc.

4) The names indicating the native place of the settled colonists: **Estonka// Estonskoe, Naa-Armianskoe, Esheri-Armianskoe, Naidorp**.

In the list of the settlement points of Sokhumi district composed in 1914 of 213 large village names 33 villages were renamed into Russian or Russianized names. They are:

Baklanovka, Belorechensk, Vesioli, Petrovskoe, Aleksandrevskoe, Aleksandrevskoe Pervoe, Aleksandrovskoe Vtoroe, Andreevskoe, Vasilevka, Vorontsovka, Ivanovka, Mariinskoe, Matoskaia Sloboda, Mikhailovskoe, Naa-Armianskoe, Nikolaevo-Anastasievskoe, Novochernigovka, Olginskoe, Vladimirovka, Georgiovskoe, Dmitrovskoe, Ekaterinskoe, Konstantinovskoe, Pavlovskoe, Petrovskoe, Poltavskoe, Rojdestvenskoe, Spasovskoe, Starochernigovka, Estonskoe, Eshera-Armianskoe, Eshera-Abkhazskoe, Iurievskoe [Gvantseladze, 2000: 44-51].

The third stage of mass change of toponyms covers the period between the twenties and thirties of the 20th century and is of communist ideological character. In this period instead of historical names and toponyms established by czarism, mass appearance of artificial names associated with the surnames of the leaders of the Communist party and revolutionary concepts is observed all over the soviet union. Of course, Abkhazia was not exclusion in this respect. In this period the following toponyms were established: **Oktiabrskoe** Psirdzkha// instead of Psirdzkha, **Shumianovskoe//Shaumianovka** - (Tskubunarkhireiskoe), **Kultuchastok** -(Asabulei), **Konsovzokh**(Kacikta), **Lenino**(Reper), **Kominternskoe** (Kesianovka), **Miasnikovo//Miasnikovka** (Dali), **Svoboda** (Iashtkhva), **Treti Internatsional, Karl Marx** and **Lakoba** separated from the composition the village Eshera. In the forties the names of czarist period were substituted into Georgian as follows: Olginskoe =**Oktomberi**, Troitkoe=**Tsodniskari**, Anastasievka=**Ganakhleba**, Mikhailovskoe= **Shroma**, etc. The analysis shows that of the toponyms introduced by the communists in the twenties and forties only one is Abkhazian - Lakoba. As to the ideological Georgian names none of them has replaced any

Abkhazian toponyms, whereas the toponyms introduced in the czarist period as well as those Abkhazian names that survived from imperial linguistic policy (Psirckha, Asabulei, Kacikta, lashtkhva) were changed [Gvanttseladze, 2000:48].

The Kremlin was so enthusiastic with the policy of Russification that in spite of the acrimony to the dynasty of the Romanovs and army officials numerous names from the time of czarism were not annulled (the names of king's family members and generals of Russian army) in which their Russian background played its role.

The fourth stage of toponymic change comprises the period of forties and first half of the fifties of the 20th century. This period is distinguished with anti Georgian accusations from the side of separatists in relation to Georgian government as if its politics was directed to Georgianization of Abkhazian toponyms in order to wipe out the trace of Abkhazians. Moreover, Abkazian separatist literature put forward groundless accusations of Georgians in forced Georgianization of Abkhazians, in oppression of Abkhazian language and culture.

It is true much has been changed in 1940-1952 in Abkhazian toponyms as well as entire country, but it was not directed against the interests of Abkhazian population. However, Georgian government had done nothing to annul the accusation of the Abkhaz, on the contrary, this accusation was actually recognized.

In the 1943-1952 there were changed 109 toponyms in Abkhazia, of which only 10 geographical points are substituted with Georgian names [Mikiashvili, 2000:5-9]. They are: **Pishta, Ashitsra, Kalmuti, Mekhadiri, Abgaborta, Aguaa, Atishadu, Laganiaatkhu, Aradukva and Tsalamuri**. However, professor T.Gvanttseladze considers that only 6 toponyms of 10 of the named are definitely of Abkhazian origin, which etymology in Abkhazian language can be easily found due to their transparency. They are: Ashitsra, (Abkh. "willow stand"), a-bga-bar-ta (a spot to watch wolf, fox"), Atishadu ("big ravine"), Laganiaarkhu ("the hill of Laganian"), Aradukva ("big nut trees") but to find out the Abkhazian origin of the rest four is difficult. They might be of quite different origin [Gvanttseladze, 2000:49].

Proceeding from the above mentioned, a conclusion is made in scholarly literature, that the change of ten out of 109 Abkhazian toponyms into Georgian in Abkhazia between the years 1940-1954 cannot testify to the fact of abasement of Abkazian people, moreover, the former Abkhazian communist government strongly avoided to change Abkhazian toponyms. This is caused by the fact that main change occurred in Russian toponyms introduced during czarism and earlier toponyms in other languages.

Under the **fifth stage** of toponymic change we imply the period from the second half of the fifties up to the eighties of the 20th century. At that period a majority of Georgian toponyms was annulled and substituted with Abkhazian and Russian toponyms. The authorities with well expressed anti- Georgian policy even changed Georgian names of the epoch of czarism (!) for example:

" The village of Russian colonists **Chernigovka** established in the 19th century in the forties of the 20th century was renamed into **Kazbegi**, but in the fifties it was again renamed into Chernigovka and its Abkhazian name **Adzin(a)** was not restored;

The village of colonists **Alekseevka** in the forties of the 20th century was named Bagratistsikhe and in the fifties instead of Abkhazian **Agva** was again named **Alekseevka**.

The village **Alpiskoe** established in the 20th century was named **Alpuri**, and in the fifties again **Alpiiskoe**.

The same changes occurred in other cases too:

Armianskoe ushelie =Somkhuri ushelie= Armenianskoe ushelie;

Gruzinskoe ushelie= Sakartvelos ushelie= Gruzinskoe ushelie;

Serebriani= Silver=Serebriani;

Metelevka= Korianteli=Metelevka;

Vladimirovka= Kodori=Vladimirovka;

Pavlovskoe=Uravi=Pasvlovskoe;

Georgievskoe=Sagiorgo=Georgievskoe;

Estonka=Bagnasheni=Estonka;

Poltavo=Aleksandrevskoe= Kvemo Akhuti= Poltavo-Aleksandrevskoe... [Kvarchelia, 1985:39].

In the 1953-1967 the tendency of changing of Georgian toponyms in Abkhazian and especially in Russian increased. Among them there is none of suppressed Abkhazian toponyms. The reason is simple: they just did not exist. That is why to neutralize Georgian position the Abkhazians used Russian toponyms.

In the mentioned period they restored 20 toponyms at the expense of Georgian:

In Gagra -6: Alpiskoe, Otradnoe, Kholodnaia Rechka, Pitsunda, Orekhovo, Gruzinskoe Ushelie;

In Gudauta-7 : Vesiolovka, Armianskoe ushelie, Verkhni Mtsara, Anukhva Armianskaia, Nijni Mtsara, Vtoroi Arasadzikh, Atara Aemianskaia;

In Sokhumi- 7: Estonka, Serebrianoe, Verkhni Eshera, Verkhni Iashtkhva, Verkhni Apianchi, Vladimirovka, Nijni Iashtkhva.

Two Armenian toponyms were restored: one in Gagra (Psouskhevi// Demerchenc) and one in Ochamchire (Didi Agaraki//Arakich).

The four Russian toponyms were changed into Georgian: one in Gudauta (Novy Afon// **Akhali Atoni**) and three in Ochamchire (Vtoroi Arasadzikh// **Meore Arasadzikh**, Vtoroi Kopit// **Meore Kopit**, Pervi Kopit// **Pirveli Kopiti**). Thus there were lost 4 Russian toponyms. Three

Abkhazian toponyms were changed into Abkhazian. In Gagra: Ldzaani// **Lidzava**, in Ochamchire: Achandara// **Gup-Agu**, Akhutsa// **Gvada Akhutsa** . One Georgian toponym was changed with the same Georgian in Gulripshi: Kvemo Gulripshi was named **Gulripshi**.

In Gali region the toponyms were not changed in the mentioned period.

The sixth stage of toponymic change is characterized with peculiarities, which cover the period from the eighties of the 20th century up to 1992 (Abkhazian war). The rise of national movement in Georgia was confronted with Abkhazian separatism inspired by Russian empire which was also expressed in the fight against Georgian toponyms. The latter was always the subject of dispute between Abkhazians and Georgians. This is evidenced from germination of Abkhazian separatism during the rise of national movement in the country as far back as in the soviet period in the eighties of the past century in which the leaked information on mass change of Georgian toponyms played great role. Namely, the Abkhazian commission of the establishment of Abkhazian toponyms at the Abkhazian Supreme Soviet planned the toponymic war on the entire territory of Abkhazia which implied the remaking of the names of Georgian origin in correspondence with phonetic norms of Abkhazian language or establishment of Abkhazian names instead of them. However, the political developments in the country temporally stopped the intention of this commission and it assumed only the form of recommendations sent to the leaders of the regions of Abkhazia. Particularly, the circulation sent from Sokhumi to Gali region the village Mziuri (the former Tskhirogali) must be renamed **Shashikvara**, **Chuburkhinji**// **Akvalia**; the name of the village **Subeishi**, which was given to Achigvara in 18th century, by the recommendation of the commission must have been changed into **Achguara**; **Gali** with **Alekumkhara**, **Rep-Shesheleti** with **Akvarikea**, the village **Chkhortoli** with **Chkhuartal**, **Ghumurishi** with **Gumrish**, etc. In Samurdzaqano which historically has never been populated with Abkhazians (except for several Abkhazian families settled by the Sharvashidzes in medieval period), if such mass change was intended it is easy to imagine how things would have been in Ochamchire, Sokhumi, Gudauta, Tkvarcheli or Gagra zone. However, in Abkhazia they did not hesitate to change and annul Georgian names in this period too. The first step was taken in Sokhumi when the seaside street - Rustaveli avenue was divided and named Koghonia (cf., the fate was not favored to the great poet in other towns of Abkhazia too; namely, the main road in Gagra named after Shota Rustaveli was renamed into Demirj-lpa the Komsomol member) by Abkhazian separatists.

The final **seventh stage** of mass change of Georgian names, started after the 1992-1993 war inspired by Moscow and has continued till now. The changes were mainly directed in two ways: a) Georgian toponyms were renamed with other language toponyms; b) old names remained with certain transcriptional changes. The Sokhumi separatist regime tried by all means to erase the trace of Georgians settlement on the Abkhazian land. The anti-Georgian separatists have annulled not only Georgian toponyms but totally changed the Georgian toponyms of streets, rest houses, squares, different establishments, named after Georgian public men. They were substituted with Russian-Abkhazian toponyms, denoting the birth place of north Caucasian confederation participants of Georgian genocide, names in different languages. **However, it should be mentioned that the interests of Abkhazian people proper are less taken into account in new toponyms.**

As an example we take the resolution of May, 1994 adopted by the Supreme council of the so-called Abkhazian republic on renaming of settlement points in Gali region and transcriptional changes which is explained by the desire of "restoration of historical justice":

Gali= Gal, the village Agvavera= Aguaiuara, Akvareika=Akuareikua, Achigvara= Achguara, Gudava=Gudaa, Akvaga=Akuaga, Bargebi=Biargiap, Gumurishi=Gumrish, Lekumkhara=Alamkumkhara, Okumi=Uakum, Tsarche=Tsarcha, Tkhortoli=Tkhuartal, Shashikvara=Shashikuara... in parallel with this the names of those streets which carry Georgian names: **Sakartvelos street** was renamed by **Absni street**, **Baratashvili**=Kecba, **Tsalenjikha**= Arshba, **Rustaveli**= Leoni...

The mentioned changes also took place in Gali region where the absolute majority of people are Georgians even today. It is not difficult to imagine what situation is like in the depths of Abkhazia (which is not controlled even by international structures) where one or two preserved Georgian have to hide their Georgian background not to say about Georgian conversation. Currently the names of the streets in Abkhazian towns named after Georgian writers, artists, public men, irrespective of great merit of the majority of them have been totally changed. New names are of special attention in many aspects. Russian names or those denoting the origin of fighters of confederation against Georgia dominated there. To demonstrate the situation we present before war and after war names of Sokhumi streets:

Gumista=Slavs, Pilia=Alans, Orakhelashvili=Confederants, Tarkhnishvili= Imam=Shamil, Gelovani=Kabardo, Kukhaleishvili=Dagestan, Kdzidzaria=Adighians, The first turn of citrus = G.Ribinski, Adamia=Bashkireti, Bagrationi=Bigua, Baratashvili=Gumi, Gulia=Shotlandia Kazbegi=Chochua, Kvaratskhelia=Vavilov, Leselidze=Abazins, Marks= Inal-Ipa; Mataradze= Pate-Ipa; Miminoshvili= Ubikhs, Nagornaia= Artsakhi, Ninoshvili= Cherniavski.; Olimpiskaia=Karachaev; Orjonikidze=Voronov; Rustaveli= Mujahiri Sanapiro Svanidze=Soloviov, Tavadze= Ashkhvatsava; Tbilisi road=Kodori road; Prunze=Aidgilara; Tsereteli=Zvanba; Chavchavadze=Gulia; Shukura=Kazachia and etc... [Nachkebia, 2009:110].

Complex political process taking place in present-day Abkhazia which is mainly expressed in an attempt to eradicate the trace of Georgians settlement requires multifaceted observation, analysis and study because the goal and future intentions of the separatist government and its supporters are evident.

These names are mentioned in "Bichvinta ladgar" compiled under the name of Odishi ruler Mamia III Dadiani (1512-1573).

References

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Abuladze I.
1983 | Turkish sources on history of the first quarter of the 16th century. Turkish documents with Georgian translations research and remarks issued by Ts. Abuladze. Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
| Gvantseladze
T.
2000 | Mass change of toponyms in Abkhazia after 1864. Annual of Ibero-Caucasian linguistics. XXXIV. Tbilisi. (In Georgian). |
-

Gvantseladze T. 2008	The linguistic basis of Abkhazian ethnic history. (In Georgian).
Tamarashvili M. 1902	History of Catholicism among the Georgians. Tfilisi. (In Georgian).
Lamberti A. 1938	Description of Samegrelo. Second publication, preface edition and remarks by Levan Asatiani. Tbilisi. (In Georgian).
Lortkipanidze M. 1990	“They don’t know, if....” Literaturuli Sakartvelo. February 16. (In Georgian).
Mikiashvili O. 2000	From the history of Abkhazian toponyms. 1943-1953. Georgian legacy. Volume IV. Kutaisi. (In Georgian).
Nachkebia M. 2009	Linguistic situation in modern Abkhazia. Tbilisi. (In Georgian).
Janashia S. 1959	Tubal-Tabali, Tibareni, Iber. Col.Works.III.Tbilisi. (In Georgian).
Anchabadze Z. 1959	From the history of medieval Abkhazia (VI-XV) Sokhumi. (In Russian).
Diachkov-Tarasov A. 1905	Bzip Abkhazia. Proceedings of the Caucasian department of Russian geographical society (Ikorgo) 18. Tiflis. (In Russian).
Inal-Ipa Sh. 1976	Issues of ethno-cultural history of Abkhazia.Sokhumi. (In Russian).
Kvarchelia V. 1985	Oikonims of Abkhazia in the written monuments. Sokhumi. (In Russian).
Tatischev V. 1967	Coll. Works. Vol 1-2.Moscow. (In Russian).

Slang in the Context of Georgian-Russian Linguistic Relations

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/18

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Linguistics](#)
- [Ramaz Kurdadze](#)

One of the most special spheres of Georgian-Russian linguistic relationship is slang vocabulary. As a result of consideration scholarly literature along with the known Russian words many "new" Russian words have been revealed, although of not less interest is the fact that quite a number of Georgian words have been evidenced in Russian slang [Kurdadze, 2009]. The present paper deals with mutual relationship of borrowing the words. It is shown how Georgian jargon uses Russian lexical borrowings and vice versa, how new borrowings from Georgian are utilized in Russian jargon.

A great number of both Russian and etymologically non-Russian slang lexical units are found in Georgian jargon proceeding from the Russian language socium of Georgia. Some of them are rather transparent and at first glance present barbarism, though according to the specificity of their usage and spreading area they belong to slang. For example: zadni - "back" and from here: "dazadna", "went back"; "took the car back"; krisha - "roof" and from here: "guard", "protector"; strelka - "an arrow" and from here: "meeting", "date", etc. Some of slang units aren't so transparent in order to link their origin with Russian language and for determination of their origin special research is needed. In common dictionaries the origin of this or that Georgian slang word is indicated but not always, and sometimes not in sequence, irregularly.

Thus, for example, only from the "Big Georgian-English Dictionary" we learn that slang lexical unit **padagrevi**, which means "a present", comes from Russian but in the same dictionary nothing is said about the origin of **grevi** which also means "a present", also comes from Russian, and actually is a variant of **padagrevi**.

In Russian these words have the following definitions: **padagrev** has the meaning of financial assistance according to the dictionary of Russian slang issued in America and it also links it with the Russian verb form "**подогревать / подогреть**":

"ПОДОГРЕВ -а,м., *crim.* Financial support. See **подогревать**.

ПОДОГРЕВАТЬ / ПОДОГРЕТЬ, *crim.* To support with money (lit., to warm up). • *А на эти деньги подогреешь наших.* "Here's a contribution for the support of our boys".

ПОДОГРЕТЬ БРАТВУ, *idiom. crim.* To support imprisoned fellow criminals from a general fund. • *На то и есть общяк - подогреть братву.* "That's why we keep a general fund, to support our brothers in prison" [Shlyakhov. . . 1999].

In the dictionary of jargon issued in Russian these words have different meaning: "**ПОДОГРЕВ**, а, м, drags. Consumption of drags...; **ПОДОГРЕТЬ**, ею, еет, perfective aspect, smb. To give somebody something mainly drags in free"[Nikitina, 2003].

The word **grev** presented in the same dictionary has similar definitions: "**ГРЕВ**, а, м., 1. Material assistance to the members of a team in prison... 2. Drags, alcohol..."[Nikitina, 2003].

It is true in Russian dictionaries there is some difference in definition of these words, but still they can be united in the content of presenting something, given away something. These words have been established in Georgian with this meaning. Georgian jargon easily mastered both of these lexical units and derived from them verb forms: **ugreva**, **daupadagreva** - "he/she gave something as a present to him/her". For naming the first of them **ugreva** we are based on live speech and definition of **daupadagreva** is given from the dictionaries: "**daupadagreva**" - "he/she gave something as a present to him/her" (cf. "**grevi**" and "**padagrevi**") [Bregadze, 2005]; "**daupadagrevebs (daupadagreva, daupadagrevebia)** *Rus c will give smb smth (ingratiating present)*" [Big... 2006].

Thus, it becomes evident that Georgian slang word **grevi** is of Russian origin.

Naturally, it is impossible in the frames of one paper to reveal a complete corpus of vocabulary coming from Russian or other language in the Georgian slang. This is a time-consuming work; it will continue in future as well as the revealing, description and study of slang words in general will continue.

This time we will consider the origin of some Georgian jargon words to Russian. Such are: **ambali**: "**ambali** means "tall"[Bregadze,2005; Big... 2006].

The word "ambali" comes from Russian slang. According to the Dictionary of Russian slang issued in America it means a strong, thickset fellow, thug and muscleman. "**АМБАЛ**, -а, м.,neg. A strong, thickset fellow, thug, muscle-man. • *Муж у неё уж больно амбалистый*"Her husband is awfully brawny" [Shlyakhov. . . 1999];

Mandrazhi, samandrazho: "**mandrazhi** - excitement (of a sportsmen); **samandrazho** - dangerous (see "mandrazhi)" [Bregadze,2005]. This word also comes from Russian slang, cf.: "**МАНДРАЖИРОВАТЬ**, ую, ует, imperfective aspect. To be afraid of something..." [Nikitina, 2003];

Ramsebi, is found in plural form in the following expression: "**ramsebi ar agerios** don't confuse anything" [Bregadze,2005]. This word also comes from the Russian slang where it is also found in the plural form in different idioms:

"**РАМСЫ**, ов, pl.** **Раскидывать рамсы**. Tell something... ****Навести (развести) рамсы**. To learn about something, find out something...** **Попутать рамсы**.. Make a mistake" ... [Nikitina, 2003];

The word **Stosi** in Georgian is evidenced in the following expression: "**stosi mi(h)qavs** - is a leader, in the avant-garde" [Bregadze,2005]. It must also come from the word **stosi** found in the Russian jargon: "**СТОС**, а, м. - playing cards" ... [Nikitina, 2003];

Chmori: Along with the word **chmori** we present its noun and verb forms: "**chmori** - useless, coward, wasteful; **chmoriki** - is the same as **chmori**", but with Russian affectionate diminutive suffix (-ik); **daachmora** - "he/she oppressed him/her". (Cf. "chmori"); "**dachmorika** - "he/she oppressed him/her"; "he/she spiritually suppressed him/her" (cf. "chmori" and "chmoriki)" [Bregadze,2005].

This word also comes from the Russian slang, we present its Russian variants: "**ЧМО**, n. and m., neglect. 1. Man, morally squalid. ЧМО - a bad man / possible etymology - an abbreviation of "man, morally squalid". . . deabbr. ЧМО - "Man from the Moscow region. Originally used in the meaning of "hick". . . 2. Army. Degraded, the fallen soldiers in hazing of a new recruits by older soldiers. . ." [Nikitina, 2003; Shlyakhov. . . 1999].

In Russian it is also evidenced "chmok": "**ЧМОК**, [-а, m., youth, neg. A worthless or unpleasant person. • *Отойди отсюда, чмок, видеть тебя не хочу.* "Get out of here, you schmuck! I don't want to see your face" [Shlyakhov. . . 1999].

Other forms derived from this word are also found: "**ЧМОРИТЬ**, рю, рит, imperfective aspect, smb. "Scoff at smb., Ridicule smb." [Nikitina, 2003].

According to the Russian slang dictionary issued in US the meaning of this word is to make someone afraid: "**ЧМОРИТЬ/ЗАЧМОРИТЬ**, youth. To frighten, terrify. • *Рэкетеры его совсем зачморили, требуют деньги, грозятся избить.* "Those racketeers have got him completely terrorized with their demands for money and their threats of violence." [Shlyakhov. 1999].

There is also small difference in definitions of the Russian word "chmoshnik" according to the above mentioned dictionaries: "**ЧМОШНИК**", a, m. The same as ЧМО 1.ЧМО. ЧМОШНИК - morally depresses man..." [Nikitina, 2003]. According to the dictionary issued in the US "**ЧМОШНИК**, -а, m., youth, neg. An unpleasant, dirty person. • *Этот чмошник загадил всю квартиру.* "That slob has messed up the whole apartment" [Shlyakhov. . . 1999].

The word "**chmoshni**" is defined almost in the same way according to the mentioned dictionaries: "**ЧМОШНЫЙ**, ая, ое. Unpleasant, disgusting (about man)" [Nikitina...2003]. Cf.: "**ЧМОШНЫЙ**, ая, ое, ая, ое, neg. Unpleasant, dirty. • *Там у вас чмошня компашка, туда не пойду.* "Those friends of yours are such slobs, I wouldn't want to go to their place." [Shlyakhov. . . 1999].

The word **khaniga** also comes from Russian and has the same meaning in Georgian slang that in Russian: "**khanyga** - accustomed to drinking, degraded (the lower depths)" [Bregadze, 2005]. Cf.: "**ХАНЫГА**, -и, m., neg. A drunkard (cf. **хань**). • *Этот ханыга уже пьян с утра.* "That boozer has been drunk since this morning."

On its part in Russian khanyga is derived from the word "khan", which means a drink. "**ХАНЬ**, -и, f. A drink. • *Давай сначала сделаем, а потом будем хань глотать.* "Let's do the job first, and then we'll have ourselves a drink." [Shlyakhov. . . 1999].

In spite of a small number of the above mentioned examples, it is clear how much influence Russian society and its conversational speech have on the Georgian slang. The former soviet unity (an army, prison and former relations) determined the existence of common forms of jargon. We can't say that such relations have been totally ceased today. This is evidenced from jargon words entered into Georgian from the post soviet period. Namely, muzon (pl. muzons) - music, cf.: "muzon, a, m. music" [Nikitina, 2003].

Fanati - a strange man; the one who knows some issues thoroughly, a fan (of sport or music), cf.: "**ФАНАТ**, а, м. 1. Strange man . . . 2. Posit. Clever, thinker, erudite." [Никитина, 2003]. In the Dictionary of Russian slang issued in the US the other meaning of the word Fanati is also found, namely, a sport fan: "**ФАНАТ**, -а, м. A sports fan (from фанатик). • *Вчера фанаты устроили драку после матча.* "The fans got into a fistfight after yesterday's match" [Shlyakhov. . . 1999].

This is one layer of the Russian lexical flow in Georgian slang.

Now we want to provide those Georgian lexical units which have been confirmed in the Russian slang. Naturally, their existence is conditioned by those factors which were considered above.

Russian slang and scabrous expressions are rather diverse and distinctive. They have been long studied both in Russia and abroad. The interest of the Russian linguistic lexicological circles to the Russian slang is quite understandable but not of less importance is also the interest of other countries to this issue because slang manifests the nature and character of this or that nation openly, without disguise. The attitude of this or that people to other peoples is seen in the slang.

In the Russian slang of special attention is the fact as to how they refer to Georgians or how they address them. It has ironical color. This attitude is expressed by means of Georgian vocabulary. Such is a Georgian word katsi (a man) in the form of vocative case: katso. This example is taken from the dictionary of the Russian slang issued in the US. It is noteworthy that in this dictionary katsi is not correctly identified with the Georgian word "megobari" (a friend).

"**КАЦО**, м., indecl. A Georgian (from the Georgian word for friend). ♦ *Где этот кацо живёт?* "Where does that Georgian guy live?" [Shlyakhov. . . 1999].

It is interesting to note that a Caucasian is generally referred to with the Georgian word **khachapuri** (cheese-cake). In the Russian slang Georgian word **khachapuri** is represented with the Russian ending -ik - "**ХАЧАПУРИК**" and means a Caucasian. The compiler of the dictionary also gives other jargon words, namely, "**ХАЧА**", "**ХАЧЕК**", "**ХАЧИК**". Here it is also given such slang word as "**ХАЧЬЁ**, -я, cf., as collective noun for southerner, Caucasian" [Elistratov, 2008]. As is seen, the latter example is used in the meaning of collective noun and denoted southerner, Caucasian.

In this case actually two words are used to denote the southerner, Caucasian: one in Georgian "khachapuri" - "**ХАЧАПУРИК**" and another is an Armenian anthroponym "**ХАЧЕК**", "**ХАЧИК**" and it is possible collective name "**ХАЧЬЁ**", be connected with it. Though we consider that the

word "**ХАЧА**", used in the same meaning must be connected with the Georgian word *khachapuri*. It must be obtained by shortening of the word "ХАЧАПУРИК".

Georgian anthroponyms are also used for referring to a Georgian. For example affectionate diminutive forms of various Georgian names are used, e.g.: "**ГОГИЯ**, nom., ironic. Georgian. Elistratov, 94" [Nikitina, 2003]. While interpreting this lexical form it is written: humorous-ironic. The names: **Gogi, Givi, Vano** also have humorous effect.

Slang nickname of some Georgians who live and work in Russia or man of Georgian background are also created with humor, irony, to be more precise, mockingly. In this case sometimes Georgian word rhymed with the surname of this man is utilized:

"РКАЦТЕЛИ (Rkatsiteli), unchanged, m., hum.-ironic. Sculpture Zurab Tsereteli" (Record 1999) [Nikitina, 2003].

In connection with the sculpture Zurab Tsereteli other expressions are also noteworthy. Namely, "**ПЁТР ЦЕРЕТЕЛЕВИЧ**" is called a monument to Peter the great in Moscow whose author is Z. Tsereteli; "**ЦЕРЕТЕЛИЗАЦИЯ**" means that the monuments sculptured by Zurab Tsereteli are in abundance in Moscow. Of particular interest is illustrative interpretation of this slang which is done in a style of announcing "complete and unconditional capitulation". "**ЦЕРЕТЕЛИЗАЦИЯ**" - complete and unconditional Tseretelization of entire Moscow" [Elistratov, 2008].

In connection with the same lexical units the word "**ЗАРЖАВЕЛИ**" confirmed in the Russian language is of interest. It denotes a Georgian. In view of the lexicographer this word is obtained by the combination of the Georgian surname of Tsereteli type with the Russian verb form. The lexicographer does not mention the Russian verb though give a riddle which must be also found in slang language and according to its content the verb "**ЗАРЖАВЕТЬ**" (to rust) should be meant: "**ЗАРЖАВЕЛИ**" - Georgian. The assonance of the end of the typical Georgian, proper names (like "Tsereteli" etc.) and Russian verb forms, is played up; often used in the context of a riddle: "What will be a Georgian surname if the nails are put in the water?" [Elistratov, 2008].

Also by preserving the ending of Georgian surname **-dze** and play on words there was obtained "**МАРМЕЛАДЗЕ**", unchanged, m. **Valeri Marmeladze, with irony. The singer Valeri Meladze. I am a young man, 1997, #38 [Nikitina, 2003].

Russian jargonisms are often produced by the endings of Georgian surnames and Russian words, namely, **-dze** ending. For example, one of the words denoting one of the varieties of monkey - chimpanzee with the ending **-dze** denotes Georgian: "**ШИМПАНИДЗЕ** - Georgian" [Elistratov, 2008]. Also the compound word "**ЦЕЛКОЛОМ**", is found with the ending **-dze**, which directly means the breaker of the whole and in the slang this lexical unit denoting a Georgian, though generally it also has the meaning of ladies' man: "**ЦЕЛКОЛОМИДЗЕ** - 1.Georgian. 2. Ladies' man" [Elistratov, 2008].

Russian slang uses Georgian ending **-dze** in other cases too, namely, a silly man is denoted with the following lexical unit: "ТУПИДЗЕ". This slang unit is named along with the following jargon words: "ТУПАК", "ТУПАРЬ", "ТУПОК - stupid, silly man" [Elistratov, 2008]. The word vermouth, the name of the aromatized wine is found with **-dze** ending "ВЕРМУТИДЗЕ - vermouth" [Elistratov, 2008].

There is also found an example with **-dze** ending which denotes the laziness, unwillingness to do anything: "ВЛОМИНАДЗЕ - laziness, unwillingness" [Maklovski...1999]. It is true in interpretation of this example there is no mentioning of either Georgian or Caucasian, but according to the ending it is obvious that it is connected with the form **-dze** deriving Georgian surnames. It is also noteworthy that folkloric specimens are presented with this example referring to Georgians and the heroes of these folkloric specimens are Georgians, a certain Givi, Gogi and Vano. These personages are homosexuals. There are five folkloric specimens. We present only one as an example but it gives an idea as to how Georgian is presented in this dictionary:

"- Дети, разберите предложение: "Гоги и Гиви пошли мыться в баню".

- Здесь Гоги - подлежащее, Гиви - подлежащее, баня - местоимение, а помыться - предлог" [Maklovski. . . 1999].

Also in Russian slang the word "**МУДАШВИЛИ**" derived from the ending of the Georgian surnames **-shvili** is found in a negative meaning: "**МУДАШВИЛИ**" denotes imbecile, idiot. This word is rather widespread, it is found in two different dictionaries of the Russian slang.

"**МУДАШВИЛИ**, *m., indecl., joc.* A fool, an idiot (from **мудак** and typical Georgian surname formative **-швили**). ♦ *Что хочет этотмудашвили?* "What does that idiot want?" [Shlyakhov. . . 1999]; according to the other dictionary this word also denotes a fool, and a Caucasian: "**МУДАШВИЛИ** - simply a fool - in Caucasian performance. То же самое - **МУДАК, МУДИК, МУДИЛО, МУДОФЕР, МУДОТЯП, МУДОЕБ**" [Maklovski. . . 1999].

The first part of this word has many variants and according to these dictionaries it is connected with slang words: "**МУДА**", "**МУДЕ**" which are interpreted as male genital organs; its figurative meaning is the trifles of life [Kolesnikov...1996; Shlyakhov...1999].

It is noteworthy that in the Russian slang dictionary the Georgian short variant of Jacob Koba: "**КОБА** is Stalin's party nickname..." [Maklovski...1999]. By the way, this word is interpreted by slang word "**кликуха**" that means nickname [Shlyakhov...1999]. This example is taken from the dictionary of sexual slang. In our view the authors' intension was to show Stalin as a voluptuous person. That is why they purposefully consider **Koba** as slang and put this word in such dictionary. In Georgia it is well known that **Koba** is a pet name for Jacob and a nickname of Stalin's revolutionary period. And the authors of the Russian slang dictionary as we mentioned considered **Koba** as jargon and supplied this lexical unit with a long entry according to which Stalin is of Armenian background and is rather lecherous personality who is even accused of incest. Of course all this reflects negative attitude to Georgia and Georgians.

In Russian slang we can find other words with ironic meaning. It is so when the name of a popular American musical group "Bon Jovi" is changed on Georgian **Borjomi** (the name of the famous Georgian mineral water) which sounds close to it: "БОРЖОМИ, unchanged, hum. "American band Bon Jovi, very popular among girls of the whole Union (CIS). МС, 07.08.1992 + I am young, 1995, № 6; I am young, 1997, № 45 "[Nikitina. . . 2003].

Frequently Georgian words are used ironically with different meaning, namely, "tamada" (toastmaster) is called ridiculously a young woman who rules the roost at the table: "ТАМАДА - a maiden ruling the roost at the table. The same - МАССОВИК-ЗАТЕЙНИК (entertainer) [Maklovski...1999].

The ironical attitude towards Georgians and Caucasians is manifested in slang expressions created with Russian and other foreign languages, e.g. "**ДЖОРДЖИЯ-БЕНЦ, ДЖОРДЖИИ-БЕНЦ**" Caucasian, mainly Georgian firm in Moscow [Elistratov, 2008]; and Georgia is ironically referred to in the abbreviation "**FRG** (Federal Republic of Georgia)" [Elistratov, 2008] similar to German Federal Republic.

The same ironic meaning have some Russian words which denote Georgia or some of its regions: such is the word denoting Georgian tea "**ГРУЗИНКА** - Georgian tea" and set expression "Abkhazian bouquet", which in Russian slang denotes several venereal diseases in one person at once : "**БУКЕТ АБХАЗИИ** - " A bouquet of Abkhazia" - [Elistratov, 2008]. By the interpretation of the author of the dictionary this jargon word comes from the name of vintage wine - "**БУКЕТ АБХАЗИИ**".

The irony in regard to Georgians is seen not in separate Georgian or Russian words but in whole set expressions: "**МЫ, ГРУЗИНЫ, НАРОД ГОРЯЧИЙ, СЕМЕРО ОДНОГО НЕ БОИМСЯ**" (We, Georgians, are passionate people, seven against one) [Elistratov, 2008].

It should be mentioned that in the Russian slang several Georgian words are also found which do not reveal ironic attitude in relation to Georgians, namely: "**БАТОН**" which denotes father, senior, the leader. It is indicated that it might derived from Georgian "batono", vocative case of "batoni" (mister, gentleman; long loaf) though this word is not interpreted correctly, namely, it is translated into Russian as "отец" (father): "БАТОН - father, senior in rank, chief, distinguished man, leader. Perhaps from Georgian "batono" - Father "[Elistratov, 2008]. The word "baton" in Russian slang has other meanings too, namely: pretty woman, strange, friendless person: large bag, etc. These meaning are not linked with Georgian by the lexicographer and for us too it is hard in this case to link this lexical unit with Georgian "batoni".

An interesting situation is in connection with the word **Khanuma** (female name of one of the famous play's hero mach-maker, the play also is called "Khanuma") or **deida Khanuma** (aunt Khanuma) evidenced in Russian slang: namely, "**ХАНУМА** (or **ТЁТЯ ХАНУМ**) - **ХАНА**, the end, failure" [Elistratov, 2008]. These words have no connection with either with the play "Khanuma" or Georgia. According to the lexicographer's indication in this case by coincidence of "**ХАНУМА**" and other word "**ХАНА**" existed in the Russian slang we get these slang expressions. The word "**ХАНА**" means end, finish, fall and the name "**ХАНУМА**" was known in Russia from the Russian variant of the play "Khanuma" staged by G. Tovstonogov.

It should be noted that in the Russian slang we can find the interjections of Georgian origin such as: «**ВА**», «**ВАЙ**», «**ВАЙМЕ**», «**ВАХ**» which express both positive and negative emotions. The lexicographer remarks that they are derived from expressive exclamations of Caucasian people. As has justly pointed out by the lexicographer, the interjection "**ВА**" is the short variant for "**ВАЙ**": "**ВАЙ** usually expresses disapproval, rejection, bitterness, etc. " [Elistratov, 2008].

We only add that it is possible that such expressive exclamations besides Georgian be found in other expressions of Caucasian peoples as interjections but all these interjections are Georgian. This is well seen in the composition of the interjection «**ВАЙМЕ**» - **vaime**. It is composed of two parts: **vai** and **me**, the second part of which is the personal pronoun of the first person "me" in Georgian.

It is noteworthy that in the Russian slang with the meaning of the same interjections is also used the usual anthroponym "БАХТАНГ" which in lexicographer's view is a contaminated form: "**БАХТАНГ**" is the same as **ВАХ**. Contamination of **ВАХ** and proper Georg. name "**БАХТАНГ**" [Elistratov, 2008].

According to the presented material, it is evident that the Russian words in Georgian slang belong to various spheres of slang vocabulary. No ironic attitude is revealed in them in relation to the Russians and Russia. However, Georgian words evidenced in Russian slang mainly indicate ironic, derisive and scornful attitude to Georgians, Georgian reality and Georgia. Obviously, this does not mean that the examples given here reflect the attitude of the entire Russia to Georgians but in one part of the society, the user of this slang, such relation towards Georgians really exists. Though Georgian lexical units are also found in the Russian slang in which the ironic attitude towards Georgians and Georgia has not been revealed.

References

Bregadze L. 2005	Dictionary of Georgian Slang. Tbilisi.
Big . . . 2006	Big Georgian-English Dictionary in two volumes. Ed.: Donald Rayfield. London
Kurdadze R. 2009	On the Origin of some words in Georgian slang. The Annual of Philological studies. Tsakhnagi, 1, Tbilisi.
Elistratov B.S.. 2007	Explanatory Dictionary of Russian Slang. Moscow (in Russian).
Kolesnikov N.P., Kornilov E.A. 1996	Dictionary of Russian Slang and Colloquial Expressions in Russian literature (from N.S.Barkov and A.S.Pushkin till present) Rostov-on-the Don (in Russian).
Maklovsky T., Klyain M., Schuplov A. 1999	Jargon Encyclopedia of sexual party for children from 8 to 18. Scientific edition. (Gesture-1); Jargon Encyclopedia of sexual party for children from 8 to 80 and after. Scientific edition. (Gesture -2). Moscow (in Russian).

Nikitina T.G.
2003

Youth Slang Dictionary. St. Petersburg (in Russian).

Shlyakhov V.,
Adler E.
1999

Dictionary of Russian Slang & Colloquial Expressions.

Indicators of Tension in Oral and Written Texts

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/14

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Linguistics](#)
- [Sofie Mujiri](#)

Scholars traditionally linked the creation of the tension field with the hierarchic levels of the meaning of sentence elements (theme and rheme) and their suprasegmental characteristics [Amman, 1928: 3; Gabelentz, 1891: 357-358 Boost, 1964]. However, at the modern stage of the development of linguistics, it is no longer sufficient to study the tension field within a sentence. This phenomenon requires a considerable widening of the area of its study, i.e. its extrapolation in the textual dimension. Tension expressed by verbal and prosodic means in written and oral texts is closely related with the expression of the author's communicational intention, and accordingly, the information structure of these texts.

A **written text** is characterized by a *three-layer (architectonic, verbal, graphemic-graphic) bathysmatic field*. According to the dominance of the components of this field, an interpreter can single out aspects of text analysis: lexical, semantic, grammatical, derivational and graphemic-graphic. In ordinary texts all layers of the language are neutral. Each of them fulfils its function within the norm. As regards the so-called pointed texts, the agreement of layers of the bathysmatic field is disrupted in them, one or several of them dominate over the others [Purtseladze, 1998: 57-136]. In the **written texts** considered by the present author the tension field is pointed mostly by lexical-semantic and graphemic-graphic means, and in **oral texts** the function of the graphemic-graphic aspect of a written text **in an oral text** is fulfilled by prosody [Lyons, 1992: 24; Brinker, 1998: 47], which is a means of emphasizing communicationally significant segments of the text and an indicator of the boundaries of these segments. Prosodic signals are of crucial importance for adequate understanding of an oral text, correct decoding of the meaning as well as its reproduction.

In an oral text prosody, together with verbal means, serves the distribution of tension in communicationally significant elements: its cumulation and neutralization. *Prosody is a means of integration as well as delimitation of an oral text, an indicator of its semantics, tension and compositional structure* [Mujiri, 2006: 72-79, 115-188].

(#1)

Text is an object of, on the one hand, holistic and, on the other one, discretional study, as, on the one hand, it is integral and open, and, on the other one, it consists of discrete units, put together into a single whole. [Purtseladze, 1998: 17]. In order to identify regularities of distribution of tension with different degrees in the entire text and its segment, the present author carried out an auditory analysis, which included listening to the text by percipients, marking degrees of pauses and prosodic parameters (stress, pause and melody) and segmentation of the text on this basis.

The auditory analysis has demonstrated that discrete units of an oral text are pause groups, the unity of which creates the semantic and intonational context of the text. The articulation of a speaker physiologically and pragmatically defines division of an oral text by pauses into communicational-prosodic segments - pause groups, which represent naturally separated units of an oral text, determined by the articulation, found between two (short and long) pauses. In audio-visual texts reception of tension is mostly based on the correct perception and decoding of phonetic-phonological phenomena, prosodic parameters. The role of prosody as an indicator of tension is especially dominant in audio-visual texts, not containing words at all, the perception of which is mainly based on acoustic effects. An excellent example is the audio-visual poem "**schtzngrmm**" by an outstanding representative of "concrete poetry" Ernst Jandl, which consists only of graphemes (minuscules). In this acoustic poem the author attaches greater significance to sounds than words. Obviously, he shares the view of F.T. Marinetti, a precursor of concrete poetry and the founder of Italian Futurism, that *a word must be divided into resonant chords, noise, or transformed into an abstract expression of emotion and idea, as the acoustic aspect is a manifestation of the semantic one.*

In the 32 lines of this poem more than two hundred letters occur, which at first glance may appear as complete nonsense. But the author of the poem containing letters is E. Jandl, the creator of a quite successful rap-opera, a follower of French Symbolism and German Dadaism, who thinks that in a language not only sense units, but sounding material also plays a significant function. According to Jandl, units of the sound system of a language have a meaning as well as an aesthetic value. He is aware that a sound poem produces special impression on a listener, therefore, he released the poem "schtzngrmm" as a record too. Upon hearing the first lines of this poetic text one recognizes although not a quite pleasant, yet an entirely clear German word "Schützengraben" ("trench"). Jandl removed all vowels from this word and turned it into a skeleton of consonants. Evidently, by means of vowel losses he wishes to point to the human losses in a trench, and by reducing vowels, characteristic of everyday German speech - to the disorderly speech which may be heard at a similarly disorderly place - in a trench. The tension, introduced at the beginning of the poem by the word "Schützengraben", intensifies especially in the second half of the poem, in which displaced, prolonged, reduced, occlusive-plosive, fricative, hushing consonants follow one another. Their voicing allows decoding the author's intention: the noise sieved from the word "Schützengraben" narrates about a war, fizzling of artillery detonators and bombs. Consonant repetitions, prolongations and in the third line of the poem the consonant "t" repeated four times produce the echo of shooting. At the end of the poem tension reaches its climax, as the continuous sound of shooting: t-t-t-t... is finished by the last chord of the poem, which sounds as the German word "tot" ("death"). The tension ends with this word. The charm of the poem lies in the polysemy of the semantics of the word "Schützengraben" and the material of the language - sounding consonants. This creates tension, which is reflected by prosody. The emergence of the tension field in the poem is marked by graphemes of the weakly stresses thematic content, whereas the segment expressing the idea of the poem (war, destroying life) is reflected by strong prosodic organization: frequency of super-strong stresses, super-long pauses and extraordinary configurations of melody. The increase of the tension field in the poetic text is caused by the desire to guess the topical information, rheme/focus, as well as:

equivocal segments, "left open" for the reader's interpretation, parallel recurrence and contrast of voiceless, occlusive-plosive, fricative and sonorous consonants, which on the level of expression is reflected by maximums of prosodic parameters.

The audio-visual poem by Ernst Jandl "**lichtung**" has an ironic-merry connotation and dialogic colouring. The author as if is speaking to his addressee, conveys his message by semantic, phonological and acoustic elements and offers the reader/listener a creative interpretation of these poetic constructions.

In this small poetic text the source of the creation of tension is the parallel perception of the literal and figurative meanings of the poem. The poem is linked with the political reality of Germany and includes a wide range of hints. The title "lichtung" denotes a meadow, a bare place in a forest, and the stem of the word "licht" means "light". The change of the initial letter "l" of the title to "r" results in the word "Richtung" denoting "direction". At the time of hearing the poem all the three meanings of the title, deliberately formulated wrongly by the author, are activated. The comic effect in the poem is created not only by the ignoring of the linguistic postulate of sound distinctness, but by moving of minuscule consonants "l" and "r" to the right and to the left, which requires from the reader guessing the idea of the poem. At first glance, the author seems to offer the banal content: "What a mistake if some people think that the right and the left are impossible to confuse". However, taking into account the political situation of Germany at that time, the poem and its title can be interpreted in a different way. E.g. 1. The poem was published in 1966, when right-wing and left-wing parties got close and changed political directions; 2. Extremism has deplorable consequences, no matter whether these extremists share the right-wing or the left-wing ideology, etc. The lexically-phonetically represented title of the poem (lichtung) is "open" for any interpretation of the reader: from a forest meadow (lichtung) at light (licht) the direction of the road (richtung) is easier seen. The main point is which direction one chooses. Tension in the poem is introduced by the title having a contrast connotation (lichtung-richtung), the weakly stressed thematic element: "manche" and formal elements of rhythm and meters. Segments expressing the idea of the poem, in which the phonemic principle is broken, are represented prosodically: by super-strong stresses, extraordinary melody and super-long pauses.

(#2)

As in the above-mentioned as well as in other poems analyzed by the present author, which are not considered here due to the limited volume of the paper, tension field is closely linked with the triad of the functional perspective: theme → transmission ("transition") → rheme / focus are prosodically reflected on three levels: 1) within a pause group; 2) within a sentence and 3) at the text level. In the thematic pause group of the initial utterance of the poem tension is created, which is reflected by low prosodic parameters: zero or weak stress, equal or slightly rising melody. The cataphoric tone of the melody causes in the listener tense expectation of the following information. In the next, transmissive pause groups the degree of stress intensifies, the melody acquires a more rising direction

(#3)

and level to the final, focus pause group, before which almost always a pause occurs. Evidently, deictic tones of the melody and the pause, which are called *focus pause* by the present author, are found before a communicationally significant focus in order to prepare the listener in advance, to give him sufficient time for full-fledged perception of the significant (focus) information of the text. In the focus the maximum of the accents and melodic peaks reach the zenith. The gathering of the melody tones and their extraordinary configuration, as well as a super-long pause found after the focus, indicate the finishing of the tension field.

Different degrees of pause and stress parameters and melody configurations, in each utterance and in the entire text create a linear picture, extended in a wavy manner, in which each prosodic rising in a rheme/focus pause group is preceded by the low degree of prosodic parameters in thematic or transmissive segments, which is finally followed by the prosodic manifestation of the communicationally significant information, signaled by the focus. Every deviation from the norm of the functionality of prosodic means of a text (pause, stress and melody) is perceived as emphasizing of the idea of the text, manifestation of the communicationally significant element of the text, which is determined by the intention of the author of the text, the communicational-pragmatic purpose. (#3)

In the analysis of the written texts given below attention is focused on **tension expressed by verbal means**. Tension in the majority of the considered texts is created at the beginning of the text. E.g. The beginning of a story by Evelyn Schlag ("Rilke's Favorite Poem") causes in the listener tense expectation of the following information, as it is uncertain what the author has in mind, abandonment of a woman by a man or a metaphor linked with a life situation.

Millimeter für Millimeter verließ er sie. Sie konnte nicht glauben, dass er sich so von ihr lossagte. Seinem Drang vorwärts so in den Rücken fiel, ihn zurücklockte mit irgendwelchen für sie nicht hörbaren Versprechungen. Langsam, vorsichtig, wie um ihren Argwohn nicht zu wecken, zog er sich zurück, gab er ihr Terrain frei. Er stahl sich hinaus. Sie hatte ihm die ganze Zeit in die Augen gesehen, aber er untersrellte ihr eine schläfrige Wehrlosigkeit, tat so als habe er ihre Zustimmung, als wünsche auch sie, dass sie wieder nur aus sich allein bestehe. Es schien, als seien ihm die Argumente ausgegangen - er hatte in ihr gehämmert und gepocht, er hatte sie überschwemmt mit wortlosen Schwüren, und nun zog er sich zurück, um sich wieder zu sammeln...

(Schlag, 1995:7)

The means of creating tension in the text are: the use of a metaphor (Seinem Drang vorwärts in den Rücken fallen), ambiguous phrases (Argumente ausgegangen, gehämmert und gepocht, überschwemmt...) parentheses, cataphoric pronouns, represented one after another in sentences, different length of sentences, ellipses, etc., which serve to cumulate tension in a separate word, as well as in a sentence and the text.

The following text title "Abschied von der Grande Dame" evokes in the listener tense expectation and a question as to who the text may be about. Tension is increased at the beginning of the text by the cataphoric use of an anaphoric word (pronoun, definite article, etc.)

and the quite late naming of the "object of discussion", as a result of which in the listener interest and motivation intensifies to continue reading the text more attentively.

Abschied von der Grande Dame

Der Kaiser von Japan war entzückt von ihr, auch der Sultan von Brunei lobte ihre inneren Werte. Und Mick Jagger, John Travolta, Peter Ustinov und David Bowie waren von dem Charme der alternden, aber immer großartig aussehenden Dame fasziniert. Die Rede ist von „Queen Elizabeth 2“. Nein nicht von der englischen Königin, diesmal läuft ihr die „Grande Dame der Ozeane“ den aristokratischen Rang ab.

(Franziska Trost in *Sonntagsbeilage der Kronenzeitung*, 12.01.03, S. 44)

The journalist by the use of various lexical means creates in the listener false impression as if a high society lady is implied. Only upon hearing the end of the text one learns that not Elisabeth II but a ship is implied in the text.

The following text title: *Das große S im kleinen Österreich* contains a contrast, which leads to the creation of tension. The text begins with the pronoun "er", which also is in contrast relation with the words: *gute Österreicher* and *Zugereister*.. When reading the lexemes (*er kam, begleitet er*) it may be concluded that a person is implied, although the words linked with it (*Symbol, gefälscht*) evoke an association of an object. Upon reading the next sentence the addressee's expectation to get correct information again dashes, as already decease (*schöne Leich*) is mentioned. In the final part of the text the "object of discussion" is described metaphorically. Tension increases and is neutralized only after naming the rheme-focus word: *Schilling*:

Das große S im kleinen Österreich

Er war, wie so viele gute Österreicher, ein Zugereister. Er kam 1924, zur Zeit der Hyperinflation. Seither begleitet er die Geschichte und Geschicke der Republik. Er wurde zum Symbol des wirtschaftswunders, wurde nur selten gefälscht, und nun gibt es eine schöne Leich. Ein Nachruf auf den Schilling.

(Die Presse. Spectrum.7./8./9.Dez. 2001:1)

It is clear from the above-mentioned that the first part of the title is the theme of the text, which is also mentioned at the beginning of the text. The text theme, which governs the text, is entropic and requires from participants of communication specification, expression of a position, which creates tension before the introduction of the rheme / focus.

Thus, indicators of tension in written and oral texts are verbal and prosodic means. Verbal means for the creation of tension are: metaphor, equivocal perception of a word or a phrase, cataphoric pronouns, as well as parentheses, different length of sentences, etc. The appearance of tension at the beginning of a text is caused by the text title, containing a contrast, the cataphoric use of an anaphoric word and uncertainty who or what the "object of discussion" of the text is. Tension is reflected by prosodic parameters in the idea of the poem and segments linked with it, which require the author's specification or the reader's

interpretation. The intensification of tension and, accordingly, prosodic parameters, is also characteristic of: formal elements of rhythm and metrics, parallel recurrence, and contrast. Verbal and prosodic means creating tension simultaneously fulfill in a text delimitation and integration functions. They separate and at the same time connect text segments with different degrees of communicational significance and represent a guarantor of the text discreteness and coherence.

Sequence and methods of conducting auditory analysis are described in detail in the monograph (Mujiri, 2006: 98-115)

= weakly and strongly rising melody; = falling melody; = equal melody; x= super-short pause; | = short pause; || = long pause; ||| = super-long pause; /// = strong stress; // = medium stress; / = weak stress.

References

Purtseladze V. 1998	Text as a Written Manifestation of Language Activity (Parts One and Two), Samshoblo. Tbilisi
Mujiri S. 2006	The Prosodic Aspect of Informational Structure of a Text. Publishing house Universali. Tbilisi
Amman G. 1982	Die menschliche Rede. Sprachphilosophische Untersuchungen. Bd. II. Der Satz. Schauenburg
Boost K. 1964	Neue Untersuchungen zum Wesen und zur Struktur des deutschen Satzes. Der Satz als Spannungsfeld. (5. Nachdruck). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
Gabelentz G. 1891	Die Sprachwissenschaft. Ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse. Leipzig.
Lötscher A. 1983	Satzakzent und funktionale Satzperspektive im Deutschen. Max Niemeyer Verlag. Tübingen.
Lyons John 1992	Die Sprache. Verlag C.H.Beck. Auflage 4. München.
Wenzel P. 2001	Spannung in der Literatur: Grundformen, Ebenen, Phrasen. Borgmeier/Wenzel.
Döhl R.	Konkrete Literature http://www.stuttgarterschule.de/konkret1.htm
Schlag E. 1995	Unsichtbare Frauen. Salzburg, Residenz Verlag.
Fill A. 2007	Das Prinzip Spannung Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen

Georgian Problems of Russian Text: Linguoculturological Concepts in the Context of two Cultures

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/2/13

- ["Spekali" #2](#)
- [Study of Translation](#)
- [Nana Khakhutaishvili](#)

Translation is a significant precondition of communicational strategy of cultures - "to make foreign as one's own for a moment" because it provides intercultural communication on textual level.

As it is known, translation is one of the basic forms of language mediation. It reflects the peculiarities of the epoch, the process of both current and cyclical evolution of the society.

New elements of a foreign culture, cultural phenomena (beginning with everyday thinking including art) must be established with semiotic denotation and represent semiotic mechanism, designation and explicitly of which (rational explanation in translation process) are to be taken into account.

Complete equivalence in conditions of modern civilization is a necessary requirement; though an effort directed to reach complete equivalence often causes undesirable inverse effect. The elements of foreign, "intruded" culture and every nuance of nation's culture are reflected in its language. Any language is specific and unique because it reflects the world and man in this world in various ways. For example, it is almost impossible to translate the title of a well known book „Сестра моя жизнь" (sister is my life) by Russian Nobel prize laureate Boris Pasternak from Russian into related Czech language because „Жизнь" (life) in Czech is of masculine gender. Every people as a universal cultural concept have their own means of conceptualization of relation with the world. During the contact with a foreign culture the impossibility of understanding its symbolic essence because of the ignorance of the code of this culture.

Translation of the specimens of national culture gives vast material on for comparative culturological research and provides constructional dialogue of cultures. The cultural dialogue itself creates the conditions of parity approximation of cultural process. When they "come into collision" "interact", when the elements of foreign culture disintegrate, they either establish or in the course of time are subjected to archaism or change into more "fashionable" units according to the principle "Other times - other manners" [Khakhutaishvili, 2006:77].

Naturally it is impossible to make absolutely exact translation due to different pictures of world perception and different linguistic tissue. Conceptual reflection of different language, its utilization in a live, indirect relation or in a translation puts the previous picture of the world perception in a new situational position. That is why we can state the ontological ratio of any translation after the known conception of J.Derida's followers.

Study of the peculiarities of structural organization of lingvoconceptual phenomena (including translation process) gives the possibility of revealing the mechanisms of dominant strategies (what is first-priority: "culture and translation" or "culture of translation"). The preservation of specificity of migrant culture as the main scientific initial postulate presents the following: in the process of translation not the reality itself can be considered the object of transformation but the image, kind, ideal component of borrowing object, construct.

The scarcity of historical and culturalogical background, and ignoring of cultural /historical background appears to be the main reason of translation mistakes and a kind of "ploughing the sands" for a translator.

The language represents main defining concept of any language. Any translator who has studied the language of other culture also becomes a certain researcher and bearer of that culture. In Russian poetry we can often find Georgian lexical units. For example, several Georgian words are presented in E.Evtushenko ("in original language cloth") :

«Я тоскую по Тбилиси, по домам, чей срок на слом,

по лихому остромысляю-ну хотя бы за столом,

по Отару, по Тамазу, по «Давльот!», «Аллаверды!»,

по горбтому томату на лице у тамады...». [Georgia... 1977: 82]

Пузатые мараны по бокам

просили их похлопать ну хоть разик!.. [Georgia... 1977: 78]....

В рубахе пестрой и в шляпе войлочной

пил на базаре хванчкару. [Georgia... 1977: 81]

As a result of harmonization of ideas in translational space, in new linguistic and cultural dimension, in a new system the text of translation became the natural phenomenon as it is in the original .

Translation is also ambivalent by its nature. It appears as a result of self-actualization of two different languages. In other words, translation is a synthesis of two structures in which foreign and native must turn into one artistically identified unity. With the change of society the concepts also change: linguistic units (in our case - Georgian) sometimes are subjected to archaism in another cultural reality (environment).

Migration of culturological phenomena is a historical process. Nowadays such way of borrowing is regarded (including by us) as a business property of a new linguistic reality. The migration of words and notions from one language into another is called borrowing. The borrowing from other language units can be conventionally considered as a fact of language

impoverishment, as a kind of indicator of losing linguistic originality. When extralinguistic factors dominate, any nuance more over linguistic gain great importance. In this context it is borrowing that is considered as one of the attributes of new linguistic reality.

A good example of this is migration of names for Georgian wines from Georgian into Russian language. Georgia, its numerous realities and traditions are associated with winemaking. Georgian winemaking as a fact of culture has attracted the attention of travelers, businessmen of various generations since olden times. The imprints of wine leaves of ancient time on Georgia's territory, the jugs of the Bronze Age found in the tombs, as well as other archeological data, approve that Georgia is considered the native land of wild and cultural vine. During archeological excavations the weapons and facilities found on the territory of the country (stone press, wine squeezer, various dishes of vine,) evidence that winemaking was one of the leading branches of economic activity of Georgian people. In the 11th-12th centuries there existed high educational establishment, the Academy of Ikalto where along with theology, rhetoric, astronomy, and other subjects, winemaking was taught.

Familiarization with linguistic material associated with wine has led us to that logical conclusion that there is a remarkable world of word-formation, each word is the whole world, a part of history of culture it is special both by its content and sound. In Georgia the church wine is called *zedashe*; watery wine- *dgvip*, *joqo*, *sakharjo*, *shalamura*, *tskalkvintela*; waterless, pure wine -*shumi* and *armuji*; watery-middle wine; new wine- *machari*; secondary squeezed of chacha- *shamani*, *makhali*; children's weak wine- *tavankari*; kept for a long time-old wine; weak and unfortified - *gala* wine, etc. A question arises as to whether it is worth or possible to translate linguoconceptual phenomena.

Intercultural communication, as was mentioned above also implies the borrowing of realities. We should pay attention to unusual semantic correlation of linguoculturological concepts in a new linguistic space. When they fit new situation in some cases they lose their foreign face the subordinate to the principle: "serve those whose bread I am eating" (V.Dahl).

In the process of dialogue between language and culture for intrusion of one culture into another we come across paradoxical phenomena: in lexicographical publication the following title is fixed: "Tavkveri"- an Azerbaijani crop sort with feminine flowers, with black berries, gives table and dessert wines [Big....1953: 111] "Tavkveri" is the Georgian word and appears in other cultures from Georgian.

Georgia justly belongs to the country with the oldest winemaking culture and traditions. Therefore, it is not a surprise that Georgian words and terms associated with winemaking entered and established in the different languages and cultures.

As is seen, we deal with the "linguistic asymmetry" of world perception. In our case this means the survival ability of borrowing words and translated texts in the process of the culture's communication, its ability to continue the process of evolution, independent from the first source (original), to subordinate its principal semantic poly-interpretation to the situation, because as I.Lotman puts it, "Man has to live in culture as well as he lives in biosphere"[Khakhutaishvili, 2006: 111]

Georgian writers of the older generation are well known in Russia. However, the subsequent generation is less known for both wide public and literary circles. Politics, international conjuncture and market give the imperative form to the relations. The number of translated specimens is decreasing. Today there are far less translations from Georgian into Russian and from Russian into Georgian.

As is known in the process of translation the knowledge of cultural and national peculiarities of any people gives an opportunity to reduce the cultural shock to minimum. In the process of cultural contacts the optimization of interrelation algorithm occurs.

In the process of translation it is necessary to find that ideal to which the translator should tend. The translation should acquire that value which it had in its own culture. The unity of two cultures during intercultural communication is of equal value and significant for a translator in the process of translational activity.

If the text of an original does not "become obsolete", and the translation is already "inconsistent with an epoch", or is subjected to situation archaism there appears a necessity of new translation. But we underline once more that a translated text must preserve the value of original text. Translation must become suitable to the situation as a result of the harmonization of ideas in translational sphere, in new national and cultural dimension. The ground for such conclusion is given by rather vast illustrational material.

In connection with Russian media space and media material there is different situational background, where on the one hand, survival ability of original discourse and translational time create text-matrixes with maximally reduced linguistic characteristics and scars poetics and privileged reading about Georgia for modern readers who represent so-called ideological and political texts, on the other hand, there is constant interchange between these two intentions.

Such types of media texts, in which "Georgian problems" are presented proceeding from their discourse, are distinguished a priori. Their study gives an opportunity to observe lingvoculturalogical units of language, as to how they pass by their own culture and acquire the features of cultural mediator without loss of their own cultural identity. In our view this is rather simplified form of acculturation, gives an opportunity to consider monocultural self-identification, as an essential link in the formation of the process of intercultural competence during the translation of linguoculturological phenomena (in our case Georgian).

References

Big...
1953

Big Soviet Encyclopedia. Moscow.

Georgia ...
1977

Georgia in Russian Soviet Prose. If you sing about it. Tbilisi.

Khakhutaishvili
N.
2001

Mass Information and Affecting Texts// Language and Education. Coll. of scientific works. Veliky Novgorod.

Khakhutaishvili N. 2006	Some aspects of translation of the names of Georgian wine. Translation industry and informational support of foreign economic activity of enterprises. International scientific-practical conference. Proceedings. Perm.
Khakhutaishvili N. 2008	On the specificity of translation affecting text // Translation industry and informational support of foreign economic activity of enterprises. The Second International Scientific and Practical Conference. Proceedings. Perm
ino press 2010	ino press 4-05– 2010