

**LEVAN KOCHLAMAZASHVILI**

Linguistical institute of Arnold Chikobava,  
Georgia

Levan.Kochlamazashvili285@hum.tsu.edu.ge

## **ŽWAR- STEM IN GEORGIAN GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES**

It has already been argued about the importance of the geographical name for the history of the language, to what extent it reflects the diachronic changes carried out at different hierarchical levels, covered by another process advancing synchronously. The obtained result seems to lose the cause-and-effect connection with the previous situation; in any case, the transformation that occurred is not clearly visible. Such a character of the onomastic unit is probably caused by the historical change of the lexical fund, and the reason for this should be the disruption of the lexical-semantic value of this or that word (resp. root).

ŽWAR- STEM belongs to the number of units in the Georgian lexical fund that have partially lost their value during the course of history and show themselves less in modern written language or living speech. Along with accompanying phonetic processes, its lexicological leveling should have caused homonymy, probably induced by an external linguistic factor.

According to the definition of the Georgian language in the dictionary, one of the explanations of this polysemous base is: "The symbol of the Christian cult - a rod, on which another, shorter rod is perpendicularly strung...". The meaning of lateral contiguousness is also explained here, which is accompanied by both independent and component realization in the composite of different structures

The issue of establishing a different meaning for the cross-polysemous base in Georgian, not found in written language or dialects, is raised. Attention is drawn to the handle denoting 'zhur-i' or 'drop,' verified in the dictionary of the Georgian language. Presented here are the personal and masculine forms of the verb derived from it: 'zhur-av-s' and 'zhur-v-a,' which are interpreted as 'flow, circuit, drop-by-drop current.' The same word can be found in various Kilo-words: in Kakhuri, in Kvemo-imerul, in Kizikur. In the written language, the adjectival derivation of the verb named 'zhur-v-a' is also found: 'na-zhur-i' or 'flow, discharge, trickle (liquid, drop).'

According to the definition of the Georgian language, the meaning of the word 'zhavav' is also explained in the dictionary itself. The same root has the meaning of 'fallen tall grass' in Gurul Kilo. It is interesting to consider the relation the root 'jûar-' can have with the roots 'zhav-' on the one hand and 'zhur-' on the other hand.

Taking into account the above definitions of the words, it is permissible to assume that they are formed from a shared root into parallel roots. It seems that the homonymy of 'Jûar-Dziri,' as a lexicological process, appeared in ancient Georgian itself. Its other, hydrographic meaning should have been limited during the period of the promotion of Christianity. This should include the phonetic processes that changed the initial form of the root in many ways, and the lexicalization of the roots, reflected in the new Georgian written language and kilos, should have been a further process of the transformed root morphemes."

The component realization of the cross-stem is quite common in composite geographical names; For example, Gare-Jvar (Kartli), Gori-Jvar (Kartli), Vaki-Jvar (Guria), Vashli-Jvar (Tbilisi), Kekhi-Jvar (Kartli), Mariam-Jvar -i (Kakheti), Mtskheti(s)-jvar-i (Kartli), Mchad-i-jvar-i (Kartli), Tsikhes-jvar-i (Tori), Nizka-jvar-i (Okriba), Dvi-jvar -i (Kartli), Khei-jvar-i (<khevi-jvari<\*khevisjvari) (Zemo Imereti), Jvar-bosel (Tusheti), Jvar-i-Keti (Adjara), Jvar-i-s-gor-a (Lechkhumi ), Jvr-is-Khevi (Kartli)... Some of the listed toponyms definitely contain the root denoting the cross-religious cult, for example, Mtskheti(s) Jvari, but, I think, this circumstance should not be observed in all cases.

The issue of establishing a different meaning of the cross-polysemous base in Georgian, which is not found in the written language or dialects, is raised.

Attention is drawn to the handle denoting zhur-i "drop" verified in the dictionary of the Georgian language. Presented here are the personal and masculine forms of the verb derived from it: zhur-av-s, zhur-v-a, which is interpreted as "flow, circuit, drop-by-drop current". The same word can be found in various Kilo-words: in Kakhuri, in Kvemoimerul, in Kizikur... In the written language, the adjectival derivation of the verb named zhur-v-a is also found: na-zhur-i "flow, discharge, trickle (liquid, drop)".

According to the definition of the Georgian language, the meaning of the word zhavav is also explained in the dictionary itself. The same root has the meaning of "fallen tall grass" in Gurul Kilo.

It is interesting what relation the root jûar- can have with the roots zhav- on the one hand, and zhur- on the other hand.

Taking into account the above definitions of the words, it is permissible to assume that they are formed from a shared root into parallel roots. It seems that the homonymy of Jûar-Dziri, as a lexicological process, appeared in ancient Georgian itself, its other, hydrographic meaning should

have been limited during the period of the promotion of Christianity. This should include the phonetic processes that changed the initial form of the root in many ways, and the lexicalization of the roots, reflected in the new Georgian written language and kilos, should have been a further process of the transformed root morphemes.

Desafricatization has been implemented in Georgian more than once; traces of it can be found in some kilos, and it gained global significance in Ingilour, where the voiced affricates d and j were replaced by homogeneous spirants z and zh (for example, dog > Zaghl, Javri > Javr...). Considering this, I find it perfectly acceptable to transform the form Ж>ж in the anlaut of the root Жъар (джъар > \*жъар). The \*Zhûar- root of the transitive form is not found in Georgian. Its existence is probable in that synchronous section when, in one part of the area of Georgian spread, the âa/u sound alternation (\*жъар- > жур-) should have appeared in the inlaut, and the form жур-и was established. In the other part, a complete progressive assimilation of p > â in the auslaut (\*жъар > Zhûaû) had to be implemented, and Zhûaû-и (zhavav-и) was formed as a base.

Despite the phonetic change, the content of “drop” still preserves the roots zhur- and zhav-, according to written Georgian data. From the perspective of the change in the semantic field, Guri Kilo is interesting, where it became a source of attributive cognition of the subject and formed an independent lexical unit denoting tall grass.

Taking into account the semantic givenness of the existing bases, the content of jûar-base should be defined as the type of water flow of the volume of water characterizing the spring when it rises from the ground - continuous thin (narrow) flowing water. The stem and forms of the nominal verb derived from it are descriptive - zhur-av, zhur-v-a. It should have been the same ideographic concept related to water, such as a drop, a sip, a torrent, etc. As a result of diachronic changes, it became equal in content to drop, dew, leshkh, reflecting a sign of the wetness of the grass (in Guruli)...

In composite geographical names where the base Jûar- is found as a boundary component, it should be indicated the endocentric-attribute connection with the boundary: Kekh-i-Jûar-i, Mchad-i-Jûar-i, Vashl-i-Jûar-i, Vak-i(s)-Jûar-i are similar in content to toponyms like Tkhilistskaro (Kakheti), Mukhattskaro (Kartli), Kodi(s)tskaro (Kartli), Klidtskaro (Kartli), and others. Indeed, the names of these spaces are based on the description of the physical-geographic environment, and the source of the stream is located in the surroundings of the villages or the settlement is built on the arc of the canal.

One circumstance seems to favor the provision of Juar-fudze as a hydrographic lexical unit and its realization as a component in toponyms: i. In Kekelia's “inverse dictionary of geographical names of Lechkhumi,”

Tbi(s)keli // Jvarisqeli is given as a synonymous name for the same forest. The parallel use of delimiting stems in the toponym would be ambiguous in the case of “lake” and “cross (Christian cult object)” meaning, while the latter’s water-related ideographic sema adds more clarity to the synonymy.

The homonymic stem Jûar- exhibits a difference in contraction when appearing in proper geographical names. If it contains the content of a cult object, then it is contracted, as seen in names like Jvari Monastery or Servant of the Cross of Lashari. In contrast, when the ideographic semantics are related to water, it remains inflexible, as seen in examples like the population of the city of Jvari.

In the case of complex stems, the situation is not uniform. In the position of the boundary member-component of the definite composite, the homonymous pair is compressed, likely due to the polysyllabic nature of the word: Garejvari, Mchadijvari, Vashlijvari, Kheijvari. However, it differs in terms of bordering, taking into account the semantics — the one with hydrographic content is uncomplicated (cruciform), and the one of cultic origin is contractile (cross).

I consider the form chvar- to be a phonetic variation of the base jûar-, based on the sharpening of the anlautic consonant (Ж>ч), which is evident in the toponym Chvar-eb.

The geographical name Jur-e Kolkhuri (or Megruli) should be suitable for the same root, which, according to Tskhadaya, denotes the name of the gorge in the village of Zeda Lezha on the slope of Nagudu, from where the stream of Jure flows into Birgulam (Nakifu). He adds the definition to the reference of the location: “Jure, the same as Durre, i.e., ravine-like drop-in place; gap (phonetic process opposite to j → d process can be seen in Khujon → Khudon) in Kobalia: ‘Dure - hollow place’.

It is true that in Megrul, many samples of J>D desafrication can be found, but its implementation in the case of the Jur-e stem (> dure) is less expected. According to Rogava, ‘Shishina affricate j sounding in Megrul changes to d sound only in those cases when the root of the word contains any three deaf affricates - ч, ч, ц, ц, or deaf pre-linguistic spirants - s, ш’. It does not create a condition for the implementation of the phonetic law.

Even in Kolkhur, if we allow the deafening of the anlaut consonant (resp. sharpening), then it would not be wrong to discuss the root of the hydronym Chorokhi (Чор- <\*чъар- <\*джъар) in this context, especially since this root is found both in Chanur and Megrul.

It is strange that the roots tend to the lexical-semantic limitation both in Georgian and Chanuri-Megruli. The situation is further complicated by the abundance of phonetic processes, which turned out to be so versatile. In the case of this root, the classical character of “sibilants” sound corre-

spondence is not visible. What could have caused all this?

The archaic nature of diachronic changes is indicated by multiple transformations of the same root at different levels of the linguistic hierarchy. Considering that the same unit showed weakness in two language systems, it is possible that the basis of the process should have appeared during the period of their unity - in the base language itself: the transformation of the base probably started in the common Georgian language.

According to the sound correspondence rules of Georgian languages, the affricate [\*ʃ] derived from the common Georgian base-language gives an equivalent in Georgian /ʃ/, and in Chanur-Megrul /ძჳრ||ჯრ/. Taking this into account, we would expect equality: Kart. Jûar- : Colch. dzgur-// jgur-, but a similar root is not found in the latter. The implementation of identical phonetic processes leads us to consider that the change coincides with the chronological section of the root language, and the phonemes appearing in the root (ჰ, ზ, ყ) are secondary.

At the general Georgian chronological level, I assume the existence of this root in the form \*ʃâr-. Its transformation should have caused the depalatalization of the phoneme [\*ʃ], which is a globally active phonetic process seen in the base language. Traces of the change can also be observed in Georgian, but the erasure process is complete and is less reflected in the phonemic inventory.

The depalatalization of the [\*ʃ] sound was completed in two ways: by moving the articulation forward and back. The process was based on a complete narrowing of the resonant point. The sound originating from the middle row preserves the sound's main features, and the place of obstruction will initially match the characteristic quality (i.e., openness) that the bordering articulatory center allows. Such is the cleft both in the case of the anterior (back nuna) and posterior row (soft sasa). Therefore, the midlingual palatal was transformed into a voiced spirant on the one hand - by the prelingual - and on the other hand - by the backlingual.

Taking into account the Georgian articulatory basis, ზ was produced in the case of alveolar pre-production, and შ velar - in the case of post-production.

ჟ < \*ʃ > ჳ

If the replaceable vowel does not maintain its phonetic position, it leads to the alternation of the organs of speech during singing and partly - during speech recognition, which may result in a distorted articulation (defective phonation).

From the perspective of Georgian phonetic articulation base, the affricate «ჟ» occurs in the context of forward articulation, while the spirant «ღ» occurs in the context of backward articulation. ჟ <|| ჟ < \*ʃ > ჳ ||> ჳ

The insertion of \*juâr- in this line signifies the initiation of development

for S.-Georgian \*ʃuâr- as an unreplaceable lexicographic phenomenon in Georgian:

1. \*ღ>\*ჟ: \*ღჟარ- > \*ჟჟარ- ჟჟარ- „[უნწყვეტი წვრილად მდინე წყალი]“ || > ჟჟარ-

ჟურ- „ჟური“

2. \*ღ>\*ღ: \*ღჟარ- > \*ღღარ- ღღარ- „ნიაღვარი“  
\*ღუარ- || > ყჟარ- (?)  
ღორ- „ნიაღვარი“

In Georgian, the root ghûar- gives rise to the verb stem ghvar- meaning “to pour, spill” (gwr-i-s, da-e-ghvar-a; Masd. gwr-a) and the adverbial adjective da-gwr-il-i. This root is also present in geographical names like Na-Ghvar-ev-i (Adjara) and Ghvar-eb-i (Kartli).

In this root, there is a transformation ûa>o, leading to ghûar becoming ghor, which is reflected in some toponyms such as Ghoristavi (<Ghvaristavi), Ghornamkali // Ghorinamkali (<Ghvarnamkali), and others.

The change \*ღ>\*ღ>\*გ could have been possible at the level of the common Georgian base language, but the phonological position of the spirantoid [\*გ] must have been so weak that it is challenging to imagine how long the secondary გ would have survived as a sound while in the process of dephonologization. Perhaps გ>გ appeared to be sharpened, similar to how the J affricate should have transformed (გ>ღ) in the case of ღუარ- > ღუარ-.

The transformation of \*ღ > zh is evident in the South Georgian form \*ღუარ-. Derived from the Maghrul form zhûar-i, it denotes “dew, dew”. This root gives rise to the verb zhar-u, meaning “to break in the body, to cause dew, to burn,” and the derived form of the receiver zhar-il.

In Kolkhuri, the transformation of the form \*ღ > j should also be reflected, as indicated by the preserved root jur-e in Megrul: jur-e <\*ჟურ-ე < \*ღუარ-. Simultaneously, considering its abrupt correlate ყ as a phonetic variation of the affricate J, as assumed in the case of Georgian (ჟყარ- > ყყარ-), we might be dealing with the \*ღ>ჟ||>ყ process here as well. The root of the Colkhi hydronym khor-okh-i reflects this: \*Xყარ > \*jუარ- \*chûar-> rumor-. Taking into account the evidence from the Chanuri lexical fund, the etymological connection of the hydronym with the semantic field of “murky water” appears clearer than with the lexeme containing the content of “Avdrianism” in the Megrelian rumor.

In the common Georgian base-language, the palatal type [\*ჭ] did not only tend toward narrowness; the change should have developed in the opposite direction. As a result of the expansion of the resonant i, its vocalization should have taken place, likely equaling the vowel i of the previous row: \*ღ>i.

I believe that such a change in the South Georgian \*bûar- was also reflected in the root, which later appeared in Georgian as well. In this regard, the root of the hydronym yor-i is noteworthy, with its initial form likely matching the base language root: \*ǫûar- > \*yûar- > yor-.

Several factors need consideration, but they do not hinder the restoration of the root at the level of the common Georgian root-language.

The forms attested in the Kartvelian languages are close in phonetic-semantic structure.

Diachronic phonetic changes have been identified in the Georgian languages, and these processes share a similar nature.

Lexical-semantic leveling of the root is rooted in the base language, leading to an abundance of stem formations in the lexical fund of the Georgian languages.

The root likely served as an ideogram related to water, as evidenced by onomastics across the Georgian languages.

The assumption about the possible meaning of “continuous thin (narrow) flowing water” in Jûar-Fudze is supported by hydronyms found in the Georgian languages, such as yor-i in Georgian and chor-okh in Chaur-Megrul. These names likely originated from the knowledge of natives in the headwaters area.

Contrary to the assumed desafricization process (Ж>Ж) based on Georgian data, it is more accurate to consider the possibility of Africanization of the secondary Ж spirant (Ж>Ж) in the root cross- (<\*zhûar) found in geographical names.

It's noteworthy to observe the connection of the Armenian word for “water” (žur-) with forms derived from the root \*ǫûar- (jwar-) in the Georgian languages. Phonetically, the Maghrian jur-e (žur-e) form is very close, and semantically, Chanuri čor-ox-i (čor-ox-i) translates to “turbid water.” Its origin may be traced back to Armenian, with the possibility of assimilation from Kolkhuri.

The lexicological nature of the root, emphasized by its frequent realization in geographical names across the Georgian languages, suggests that it might have served a similar function in the Georgian language, producing onomastic units containing content related to water.

## REFERENCES:

- Abashidze Revaz, “For the Newcomer of Comparative Indo-European Studies in Georgian Languages.” II, Georgian Linguistic Congress, N3, Tbilisi, 2004, 3-9.
- Abashvili Vasil, Ingilo Dialect of the Georgian Language, Tbilisi, 2009.
- Tandilava Ali, Laz Lexicon, Tbilisi, 2013.
- Topuria Guram, “Etymology of ‘Chorokhi’” Materials of the XXXIII Scientific Session



- of the Institute of Linguistics (Theses), Tbilisi, 1977.
- Imnaishvili Grigol, Features of the Ingilo Dialect of the Georgian Language, Tbilisi, 1966.
- Kekeleia Igor, Inverse Lexicon of Lechkhumian Geographic Names, Tbilisi, 2018.
- Kochlamazashvili Levan, Phonetic Changes in Kizikuri, Materials of the XL Republican Dialectological Session, Tbilisi, 2020, 89-95.
- Machavariani Givi, General-Kartvelian Consonantism, Tbilisi, 1965.
- Menteshashvili Stefane, Kizikuri Lexicon, Tbilisi, 1943.
- Orbeliani Sulhan-Saba, Lexicon of Words, Tbilisi, 1949.
- Rogava Giorgi, A Singular Aspect of Deaffrication in Zanuri, Works of Tbilisi State University, XXXb-XXXIb, Tbilisi, 1947, 351-356.
- Sakhlitkhashvili Ushangi, Garekakhuri Lexicon, Tbilisi, 2003.
- Futkara-Shushana, Georgian Ethnicities, Tbilisi, 1993.
- KDK - Georgian Dialect Corpus ([www.corpora.co](http://www.corpora.co)).
- Georgian Explanatory Dictionary, Vol. V, Tbilisi, 1958.
- Georgian Explanatory Dictionary, Vol. VI, Tbilisi, 1960.
- Georgian Explanatory Dictionary, Vol. VIII, Tbilisi, 1964.
- Kobalia Alio, Megrelian Lexicon, Tbilisi, 2010.
- Chikobava Arnold, Works, Vol. IV, Tbilisi, 2008.
- Chukhua Merab, Comparative Lexicon of Georgian-Kilitian, Tbilisi, 2003.
- Chukhua Merab, Etymological Search of Georgian-Circassian-Abkhaz Lexicon, Tbilisi, 2017.
- Jorbenadze Besarion, Georgian Dialectology, Vol. 2, Tbilisi, 1998.
- Goniashvili Tinatin, On the History of a Sound in the Georgian Language, Institute of Linguistics, History and Material Culture of the Academy of Sciences, II, Tbilisi, 1937, 111-134.