

GEORGIJ A. KLIMOV: *Etymological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages*. Trends in Linguistics. Documentation 16. xiii + 504 pp. Berlin and New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

This attractive volume represents in English translation an updated version of the author's 1964 306-page similarly titled Russian original. Sadly, Klimov did not quite live to see his translation through to publication, but there can be little doubt that it will long serve as a fitting memorial to a distinguished all-round linguist who throughout his career made significant contributions to Caucasian (especially Kartvelian) studies, being a rarity among Russian (actually half-Russian, half-German) Caucasologists in having mastered both written and spoken Georgian. It is substantially the author's own English rendition that is here presented, and it largely reads most fluently; apart from an occasional lapse in morphology (e.g. 'secondarity' for 'secondary nature'; 'derivatory' for 'derivational'; addition of unnecessary suffix '-ic' in such phrases as 'present(ic)/aorist(ic) [tenses]'), the one recurring stylistic oddity is over-use of the impersonal active for impersonal passive construction (e.g. 'One has [= It has been] proposed that..'). American spellings tend to be used (though we have 'plough'), and glottalisation is marked by subscript dot -- when not directly quoting, I use the more normal apostrophe.

In 1990 the prolific (East) German Caucasologist Heinz Fähnrich (from Jena) and his Tbilisi collaborator (half-Georgian, half-Mingrelian) Zurab Sardzhveladze, a specialist in both Old Georgian and comparative kartvelology, produced their own 619-page 'Comparative Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages' in Georgian. A German translation (unavailable to the present reviewer) appeared in 1995. The latter pair acknowledge the importance of Klimov's contribution, whilst Klimov praises the insights of the rival title -- Klimov often used to lecture at Tbilisi's Pushkin Pedagogical Institute, where Sardzhveladze worked, and the two men were close friends with high mutual respect. It is natural, then, to draw comparisons between the two offerings, for the contents are not in one-to-one correspondence.

Kartvelian (or South Caucasian) is a close-knit, geographically compact language-family comprising Georgian, Svan, Mingrelian and Laz (or Ch'an) -- apart from Laz, most of whose speakers live in north-east Turkey, these languages are predominantly spoken within the borders of the Republic of Georgia, though Georgian is also spoken to some extent in Turkey. When p. xii of the preface asserts: 'The Kartvelian homeland seems to have been the Great Caucasus and the Little Caucasus', readers might muse on whether this has any implications for the homeland of the various North Caucasian peoples! Only between Mingrelian and Laz, which some prefer to treat as a single language called Zan (or, more tendentiously, Colchian), is there any degree of mutual intelligibility, whilst Svan is unarguably the most archaic. Klimov prefers the form

'Megrelia(n)' to 'Mingrelia(n)', although the medial -n- has been established for centuries in foreign references to the region and its language (Johannes de Galonifontibus was already writing 'Mengrelia' in his Latin travel-book of 1404). Use of 'Megrelian', based on the Georgian adjective *megrel-i* 'Mingrelian (of humans)', is reminiscent of recent moves to foist on English 'Beijing' for the perfectly serviceable 'Peking', and, if one is going to adopt this highly selective approach, one should logically move straight to the actual native term *margal-i* and introduce the neologism '*Margalian'. I do not recommend this. Since circa 1930 all Mingrelians (Svans and Laz) in Georgia have been 'encouraged' to think of themselves as ethnically 'Georgian'. One wonders, therefore, how welcome will be the exegesis (of ***kartwel-** 'Georgian') on p. 213: 'Together with **m-egr-el-* "Megrelian" the word indicates the presence of an important ethnic division as early as in the period of the Georgian-Zan unity' -- cf. the four Laz words quoted on p. 119: '*arti kortu, maẓira margali....* "one is a Georgian, the other, a Megrelian...."!'

The sound-changes that differentiate the daughter-languages are reasonably straightforward, and the sort of divergence manifested in Svan for the set 'snake' (viz. from Common Kartvelian construct ***gwel-** are derived: Georgian *gvel-*, Mingrelian *gver-*, Laz *mgver-*, Svan *hi ǰw-*, (*h*)*wi ǰ*, *u ǰ*) stands somewhat at the extreme of the established correspondences -- in fact, Fähnrich and Sardzhveladze object to the inclusion of the Svan variants as reflexes of this construct. And so, the small number of languages to be compared and the neatness of (most) proposed correspondences would render such an etymological dictionary suitable to be used as a pedagogical tool in the practice of comparative reconstruction, if accompanied by a full statement of the comparisons and sound-changes involved. The presentation here might have been somewhat more fullsome (cf. Fähnrich and Sardzhveladze), and readers may not appreciate having to consult an obscure 1959 (pp.26-7) publication in Georgian to discover the statement of 'Gamq[']relidze's Law' (p.x) -- viz. instead of yielding the anticipated Zan/Svan complexes *-ṣk/ṣg̣-*, reconstructed ***ṣ̌** produces Zan/Svan *-sk/ṣg-* when followed by either *-v-* or *-w-*.

Items shared between Svan and any sister-language are assumed to go back to the Common Kartvelian (CK) parent, whilst correspondences lacking a Svan cognate are categorised only as Georgian-Zan (GZ) -- Fähnrich and Sardzhveladze do not differentiate constructs so overtly. There is no mention of the hypothesis that within the as yet undifferentiated parent-language, there might have existed a western versus eastern dialectal division to account for cases where Svan and Laz-Mingrelian exhibit a parallelism to the exclusion of Georgian (as in the case of the regular correspondence just mentioned, namely: ***ṣ̌-** => Georgian *ṣ*, Laz-Mingrelian *ṣk-*, Svan *ṣg-*) -- for a discussion readers should consult K.H. Schmidt's 'On the reconstruction of Proto-Kartvelian' (*Bedi Kartlisa XXXVI*, 1978, 246-65), an article which does not figure in

Klimov's bibliography. Despite the convincing demonstration of the method's unreliability by Hans Vogt and Knut Bergsland ('On the validity of glottochronology' in *Current Anthropology*, 1962, 115-29), Klimov seems never to have lost his faith in the ability of glottochronology accurately to date language-splits, and he asseverates on p. ix that Georgian-Zan broke up 2,600 years ago, whereas Svan split off some 4,200 years ago. A note of caution surely needs to be added here.

In addition to his assigning meanings to the constructs and indicating both Armenian-Kartvelian shared items and possible links to Proto-Indo-European roots, Klimov further differentiates his dictionary from that of his rivals by stating: 'First and foremost, it is a dictionary of lexemes' (p. viii). I do not understand how this squares with the inclusion on the first page of the inflexional suffix (formant of adverbs, and the Adverbial case-desinence) ***-ad**, though it presumably explains why there are separate entries for items like: 1. root ***d(e)r-** 'bend, curve'; 2. stem ***dr-(e/i)k'** 'bend, curve; stoop', and 3. past participle ***drek'-il-** 'bent, curved', whereas Fähnrich and Sardzhveladze (in my view, rightly) place all such equivalences under a single construct (in this instance ***d(e)r-**). More difficult to explain is why some of Klimov's entries are absent from Fähnrich and Sardzhveladze (e.g. ***baq'w-** 'thigh, haunch'), and vice versa (e.g. ***baq-** '?type of gait'). Sometimes slightly different constructs are set up in the rival works (e.g. Klimov gives ***k'wi(r)c1x-** 'leg', whilst Fähnrich and Sardzhveladze reconstruct ***k'urc1x-**). The present work may contain about 1,400 (word-)entries, as against 954 in its 1964 predecessor, but these are, as indicated, somewhat artificially inflated totals.

When quoting from the (Old Georgian) Bible, Klimov seems to have chosen the King James authorised version as source for (most of) the English equivalents, though these translations do not always quite capture the precise meaning of the Georgian words actually quoted. It would have been helpful if the ms-source for Old Georgian Biblical citations had been given, for there is much variation. The formant **-un-**, often attested with onomatopœic roots, is regularly glossed merely as a (derivational/word-forming) suffix/affix; the first such instance is on p. 18 for ***brag-un-** 'crash, break', with which one may compare on p. 214 ***kd-un-** 'seduce' (itself to be compared with ***k(a)d-** 'err' on p. 211) -- surely these are all instantiations of the causative suffix presented on p. 195? I would also suggest that it is a by-form of this that we see in examples like ***bdw-in-** 'set fire' on p. 10 (cf. Klimov's own suggestion on p. 233).

Anyone unfamiliar with the (here Soviet) practice of presenting bibliographies that contain items written in different scripts may be puzzled by the layout of the Bibliography. A standard Georgian book will respectively group together all works in Georgian, Cyrillic, and finally Roman scripts. The same was obviously done here before the Georgian and Cyrillic items were transcribed into Roman. At this stage there should have been a reordering of all entries (now exclusively in Roman script)

according to the requirements of the Roman alphabetical ordering (as was done for the items cited from the various languages on pp. 398-504, though in the list of Proto-Kartvelian constructs on pp. 363-80 and, of course, in the main section of the work, the ordering of the Georgian alphabet is followed, with appropriate insertion of reconstructed proto-phonemes unattested directly in the daughter-languages).

Amongst the sources listed are the 'dictionaries' of Old Georgian by Ilia Abuladze (1973) and Z. Sardzhveladze (1995); neither in his preface nor in the bibliography does Klimov note that both these works include in their full titles the additional word *masalebi* 'materials', for there is no complete Old Georgian dictionary yet in existence. The other huge lacuna and serious drawback for anyone considering the preparation of a Kartvelian etymological dictionary is the absence of anything like a comprehensive dictionary for three of the four extant languages investigated (Laz, Mingrelian, Svan)! Wolfgang Feurstein is currently working on a Laz dictionary in Germany; P'avle Ch'araia's Mingrelian-Georgian word-list, composed in 1918 (and finally published in 1997, though copies have yet to reach the UK) was consulted, as was the lexicon appended by Ioseb Q'ipshidze to his 1914 Mingrelian grammar (reprinted in 1994), but Givi Eliava's 'Mingrelian-Georgian Dictionary (Materials)' (1997) and Bezhan K'ilanava's '900 Mingrelian Words' (1998) appeared too late. The Georgian Academy's Svan-Georgian dictionary, which was stated to be complete on file-cards as long ago as 1975-6, has still not seen the light of day, and neither this nor two published works (namely, Letas Palmaitis & Chato Gudjedjiani's 'Svan-English Dictionary' of 1985, which was edited by the present reviewer, and Arsen Lip'art'eliani's 'Svan-Georgian Dictionary (Cholurian Dialect)' of 1994) are mentioned. Only the first two (of the four) published collections of Svan prose-texts appear in the Sources; the 1939 edition of 'Svan Poetry' and the 1973 collection of 'Svan Proverbs' are unmentioned, as are T'ogo Gudava and Ap'olon Tsanova's 1975 and 1991 collections of Mingrelian poetry and prose, respectively. Surprising too is the failure to include Gudava's seminal 1964 Georgian article 'An example of regressive de-affricatisation in Zan (Mingrelian-Ch'an)' (in *Bulletin of the Georgian Academy of Sciences XXXIII.2*, 497-50) in the bibliography. Given the gaps (worrying for a number of reasons) in the documented lexical corpus, one cannot but wonder whether it might still not be rather premature even to essay the writing of a Kartvelian etymological dictionary. However, two such offerings exist (three, if one adds the index to K.H. Schmidt's 1962 'Studien zur Rekonstruktion des Lautstandes der südkaukasischen Grundsprache', the index to which, as Fähnrich and Sardzhveladze observe, is tantamount to a short etymological dictionary in its own right), and each makes a real contribution to the historical study of these languages. Though kartvelologists will want to possess both, I would, if pressed, have to state a preference for Fähnrich and Sardzhveladze's volume.

A number of specific points require comment: p.1: The suffix in Svan (*h*)*ad-ra* 'azalea' is stated to function 'as a derivational element usually in the names of plants and trees'. One could note the use of *-ra* in North West Caucasian Abkhaz to mark groupings/plantations of trees (cf. *a-l* 'alder' vs *a-l-ra* 'alder-plantation'); p.9 (*n*)*gar-* in Mingrelian means 'cry' (not 'tear'), and *i-b-gar-k* (p.10) is 'I cry'; p.34: Mingrelian *gi-tmu-v-a-gu-k* has to be intransitive and so must be translated as 'I grow accustomed to X'; p.35: under ***gul-** reference might be added to parallel N. Caucasian words for 'heart'; p.41: The form 'æ(*n*)-dæɣ^w' is quoted as Kabardian for 'elbow' -- the Russian-Kabardian dictionary, however, gives 'efrac^e', whereas the Russian-Adyghe (= Western Circassian) dictionary quotes 'ente^Æ'; p.114: Mingrelian *a-monkan-s* must be transitive 'makes X heavy'; p.119: Something has gone wrong in the reading of Ak'ak'i Shanidze's 1945 edition of the Gospels, for it is not John 17.10 *didebul var me* 'I am glorified' where a variant *men* exists, but the following verse, where ms. D offers this variant in *romelni momcen me(n)* 'whom thou gavest me'; p.134: For *iqo sazrdeli mata* the Mtskheta Bible has *mata sazrdelad*; p.149: In connection with the unexplained shift of ejective *p'*- to aspirated *p-* in the Zan words for 'butterfly' (*parpal(ia)*, *papralia*) it might be worth pointing out that in Abkhaz we find *a-parpal* ^ʃ(*J*); p.150: The first entry incorporates Georgian *pçk-en* 'chip off' and Svan *p.ĕ)çk-* 'to crack', whereas Palmaitis/Gudjedjiani give *p'ac'k'ēr* 'crack', *libč'k'we* 'split', *p'ānc'k'w* 'pinch', *lipānc'k'we* 'to pinch' -- is there not some confusion, for the Georgian Academy Dictionary gives *bc'k'ena* as a variant for *p'c'k'ena*, stated to be a west Georgian form for *čkmet'a* 'to pinch' (Mingrelian *c'k'it'onapa* vs *c'k'it'oni* 'a pinch')? p.153: For ***r-** it is stated that 'in the Zan languages the stem [= root] is preserved only in the derivative stem *or-*', though the standard Mingrelian 3rd person forms in the Present are *r-e(n)* 'X is' and *r-en-a(n)* 'they are'; p.154: I do not like the use of the term 'mutual version' for Mingrelian *oķo*, which I would call the 'reciprocal preverb'; p.162: When it is stated that 'since the vocalic shape of the cognates [of ***sal-**] is regularly differentiated they cannot derive from the Arm. *sal* "anvil"', is this somehow connected with the dating of Armenian-Kartvelian contacts to the 7th-6th centuries BC (p.227)? p.179: Mingrelian *ko-s'ū* 'X drank' vs *o-s'v-es* 'they drank' are quoted, whereas the usual forms are *ge-s'ū* vs *ge-s'v-es*; p.194: With reference to ***tqub-** 'twins' it might be appropriate to mention such reconstructions for the Common West Caucasian cardinal '2' as S. Nikolayev/S. Starostin's ***t'q:J^w**a; p.195 l.3: 'comparative' (not 'elative'), I feel; p.206: Old Georgian *ganapuvna* has to be transitive, and so the translation needs to reflect this by saying 'until it caused the whole to rise'; p.213: Noting that Svan for 'Tbilisi' is *Kärt-*, one could add that *Kart* is also how the Abkhazians refer to the capital of neighbouring Georgia; p.217: Georgian *kvisl-i* (Mingrelian *kvisil-i*) means 'brother-in-law' in the specific sense of 'wife's sister's husband'; p.295: Reference to an analogous construction in Abkhaz to the

expression for 'like' in Laz (viz. 'X seems well to Y' for 'Y likes X') must presumably be to the Abkhaz for 'love', 'X loves Y' being literally 'X sees Y well' (*sa-ra ba-ra bz ɟa b ɟz-ba-wa-ɟt* 'I love you (woman)'), for 'X likes Y' in Abkhaz is literally 'Y is warming to X's heart'; p.313: It is surely worth noting with reference to ***ɟiku-** 'tiny, wee' that Circassian for 'small' is *c' ɟw*'; p.317: The Georgian word for 'oak' (*muxa*) is usually deemed to be a loan from North East Caucasian; pp.331 & 338: I would have welcomed a reference to further reading for the allusion to a distinction in Mingrelian between transitive and intransitive masdars marked by a change of vowel (transitive *xiriḱua* vs intransitive *xiraḱua* 'warp in flames'; transitive *xviriḱua* vs intransitive *xviraḱua* 'pierce').

Corrigenda: p.viii l.4: Gamq'relidze-Mach'avariani 1982 is not amplified in the Bibliography; l.20: of the greatest; p.x l.21: past are also; p.xi l.1up: 1984, 1995; p.1 l.18: cropping; p.5 l.9up: oxolo; p.7 l.6up: in the Xevs; p.10 l.3up: insatiably; p.19 l.2: *burdyḱna*; p.22 l.2: *dat'ḱan*...and leaves sprout; l.12: send forth (the) bee(s); p.29 l.15: is characteristic of Svan; p.31 l.2up: a mount; p.38 l.9up: are also; p.39 l.7: The remaining cognates are; p.40 l.7: you do not see the plank; p.41 l.11up: in the neighbo(u)rhood; p.48 l.17: Kobalava; p.49 l.15up: Lafon 1934 is given as 1933 in the Bibliography (p.361); p.52 l.18: *s'eciros*; p.56 l.19: For an; p.64 l.12up: the elements shall pass away; II Peter...it has disappeared; p.67 l.1: *dotoles*; p.70 l.8up: equivalent is; p.78 l.13: ?1913.b; l.21: 1815.a 2; p.79 l.12: In the modern; p.80 l.16up: *camals*; p.82 l.17up: deictic; p.83 l.12up: has, as expected, been; p.85 l.1: two goblets of wine; l.15up: ?1994a; p.90 l.12: beak; l.10up: *s'ekecili*; p.98 l.8up: CK; p.101 l.2up: nip'; p.102 l.3up: For the modern...in the Pšav; p.103 l.7: 683) to; l.13up: Janashvili; p.106 l.5: branches become; p.108 l.6 (and elsewhere): ḱlonḱi; l.2up: idler; p.112 l.11: remains productive; p.113 l.4 (and elsewhere): today (not 'at present'); l.11up: calf survived; p.119 l.17up: *puri*; p.120 l.10up: King-water; p.123 ll.16/17: unripened; p.131 l.18up: taste; p.133 l.14up: *ḱkola-*; p.135 l.6: *xuala* 'destroy'; p.139 l.9up: ***ɟix-**; p.140 l.6up: us to suspect...shown to be typical...substantives'; p.141 l.9: *qurelsa*; p.145 l.10up: about two...about three; p.148 l.1up: *aymoḱpkureven*; p.149 l.1: 037.13; p.154 l.17up: (not); p.155 l.16: yonside; l.2up: rang; p.156 l.12: *le-rekw*; p.158 l.4: ablaut; p.159 l.6: put the clothes on him; p.160 l.2up: *sa-rcevel-a*; p.161 l.17: [it withereth] before all plants are watered; p.164 l.10: 411) compared; p.165 l.14up: in the language; p.168 l.11up & p.502: *a-s'ḱs'ra*; p.171 l.10: **sxl-t-**; p.179 l.15: *sumen*; p.184 l.8up: prothetic; p.186 l.12: *dasteno*; p.188 l.3: it swarmed; p.195 l.3up: slaughter); p.198 l.2: of stable; l.3: practically; p.202 l.1: initial *p*; p.203 l.6: cannot, in view of its final *l*, be; p.206 l.6up: semantics are; p.218 l.16up: make this; p.219 l.14up: initial; p.222 l.16up: you daubed me (with filth); p.234 l.17: serve; p.237

l.12up: to settled; p.238 l.18up: erase *o*;² p.247 l.2: metaphorical; p.250 l.3: in Georgian; l.15: preserved today only; l.9up: is due to; p.253 l.7: *šret-il-; p.255 l.16up: related to; p.261 l.10 & p.502: *a-cḥ ḥic*, *a-cḥ ḥi*;³ p.266 l.5: thumb-forefinger span; p.269 l.15up: pull you out; p.274 l.8 & p.330 l.8: Imeretian; p.291: šanašvili; p.292 l.6: unstable; p.301 l.16: weighed; p.305 l.3up: of the material; p.310 l.5: suspiciously; p.313 l.6up: rheum pus; p.320 l.5up: In the Zan; p.330 l.8up: Janashvili; p.333 l.11: drove; l.19: put shoes on them; p.334 l.9up: position; p.335 l.7: occur; l.18: retains the uvular; p.338 l.1up: is an; p.342 l.15: in meaning; p.344 l.1: sequence; l.7: spring up for me; p.346: Gudamaqrian; Okrib; Fer. = Fereidan(ian); p.347 l.18up: ed. K.; p.349 l.15: of the Caucasus; p.355 l.18: Georgian: Material; p.356 ll.9, 12, 17: этимологический...языка; l.22: грузинского; p.357 l.9up & p.358 l.4: картвельским; p.358 l.17: хрестоматию; p.359 l.17up: классов; p.360 l.2: Abxaz; p.362 l.2up: English.

GEORGE HEWITT