

**Proto-Kartvelian and Proto-Indo-European Plant-Names**  
**(the conifers: fir, fir (-tree), pine (-tree))**

**Marine Ivanishvili**

(G. Tsereteli Institute of Oriental Studies, GAS)

[m\\_ivanishvili@yahoo.com](mailto:m_ivanishvili@yahoo.com)

**Abstract**

“Sprachforschung, der ich anhängen und von der ich ausgehe, hat mich nie in der Weise befriedigen können, daß ich nicht immer gern von den Wörtern zu den Sachen gelangt wäre; ich wollte nicht bloß Häuser bauen, sondern auch darin wohnen”.

J. Grimm

The study of grammatical, phonological and lexical isoglosses among dialects of a proto-language makes it possible to establish extra-linguistic factors. This trend in linguistics is called “linguistic paleontology of culture”, since its object of investigation is not only proto-language but also the proto-culture of speakers; what is reconstructed is not so much the language itself as the extra-linguistic world reflected in the linguistic data (Gamkrelidze Th. 1990).

Reconstructing elements of the extra-linguistic world of daughter-language speakers in turn gives a clearer picture of the linguistic affinities among the daughter-languages and their development over time, i.e. of purely linguistic factors. This is particularly true of the semantic structure of languages, which simply cannot be studied in isolation from the external world that is reflected in the content plane of language.

The reconstructed forms and meanings may be grouped by lexico-semantic fields, which designate extra-linguistic classes such as animals, handicraft tools, and others. Such a proto-linguistic lexico-semantic system can give historical reality through typological comparison with the actual culture of the past and the present and especially by the archeological facts, in verifying a reconstructed culture and, particularly, its material side (Gamkrelidze T.V., Ivanov V.V., 1986).

Today it is widely agreed that “culture” does not consist of things, people, behaviour or emotions, but of the forms or organization of these things in the mind of people. How can the organization of “these things” in the mind of people be discovered? The best way of discovery lies in the area of the language, and that there is a whole battery of linguistic tests which can be put to use to reveal different aspects of the organization of the universe in the minds of people (Wierzbicka A., 1996).

The apparent discovery of ethnobiological universals and the ensuing debate have further stimulated interest in the conceptualization of plants and animals, and they are largely responsible for the key position of this conceptual domain in current anthropology.

At first sight, it seems that studying the corpus of plant names doesn't give us the possibility to reconstruct models such as we have for kinship or for colour-terms systems and that only this provides a history of language with facts, or it is useful only for the identification of biological units with their names. But exactly this kind of research fills our imagination and knowledge with the events of human cognitive mechanisms to clarify the nature of the human world through categorization and so on.

As it is known, the South Caucasus was the main importer and wide spreader of all achievements of the old oriental civilization since VI-V<sub>m</sub>. B. C. in the whole Caucasus. This fact was the reason of the oldest areal contacts of the Kartvelian languages with the Indo-Europeans, Semitic and Caucasus languages.

The results of researches Th. Gamkrelidze and G. Machavariani (1965), later Gamkrelidze – Ivanov's hypothesis (1984) about the Proto-Indo-European's living place in the Asia Minor near by the areal of spreading Kartvelian languages, in particular, immediately of the South Caucasus region, materially has confirmed by C. Renfrew's (1984) important archeological investigations, which has stimulated many famous linguists for further researchers in this direction. From this point valuable work is one of the latest investigation of G. Klimov (1994), where he tried to systematize and generalize the oldest Indo-European forms in Kartvelian languages.

There isn't scanty data which certificates about the Proto-Kartvelian and Proto-Indo-European speakers areal contacts, but now it's very difficult to separate the borrowed forms from the subtractive influence. To solve this problem the most important is the exact chronological stratification, which by its side must be based on the further elaborated questions of the relative chronology of the phonetic processes.

General criterion for the definition of the chronological level of Kartvelian Indo-Europeisms is the correspondence of expression plan of forms with the historical phonetic processes of Kartvelian languages and also the correspondence to its semantic meaning to the concepts and reality of the epoch.

The English Kartvelologist D. Reifield (1988) has written: "While the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European language, the dendrology and dendronims are as well elaborated, as phunging field. The work which was made by P. Friedrich (1970) and Th. Gamkrelidze (1989) for Indo-European languages when they have gathered tree-names, would be done for Caucasian languages too. . . "

Proto-Kartvelian arboreal system is more diverse than Proto-Indo-European. It's natural, if we foresee this sale of migration and connected to it ecological modifications, which was recalling the language forms changes, semantic removes and other innovations.

While investigating Proto-Kartvelian arboreal system, we exposed the new roots, made more precise the old one, revealed the borrowed forms on the proto-level and compare Proto-Kartvelian roots with the Proto-Indo-European and Caucasian data.

Reveal paleobotanical and in many case Proto linguistic isomorphism between the Proto-Kartvelian and other Proto systems shows the similarity and differences on the basis of which these languages may be considered (or not) as the same structural – typological (or genetic) classes.

Acad. G. Tsereteli already 40 years ago exactly defined such kind of problems and the ways to solve them too: first of all on the basis of historical-comparative method must be established the regular structural features for the languages of Caucasus and after this comparative-typological research – i.e. exposing the structural-typological similarities – differences not only with mountain Caucasus languages, but with the Indo-European languages of Caucasus – Armenian and Osetian, and also with the Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages of the Asia Minor. . . and establishing regular correspondence on the all levels of the language hierarchy: phonological, morphological, lexical etc (Tsereteli G. 1965). In this direction linguists, philologists, historians and archaeologists still have much to do.

We will try to consider this questions on the basis of the results of the historical-comparative investigations of Kartvelian languages by the example of the Proto-Kartvelian names of the conifers: fir, fir (-tree), pine (-tree).

**“All trees are oak-trees. . . except the pine-trees”**

John Barth

P. Friedrich by the combination of the linguistic, philological and botanical evidences reconstructed eighteen Proto-Indo-European arboreal units (Fridrich P., 1970, 153-154):

1. The birch, early PIE *\*bherHǵo-*, denoting *Betulus*, probably *pendula* but possibly also *pubescens* and *humilis*.

2. The Scotch pine, early PIE *\*pytw-*, *\*pw/yK-*, denoting *Pinus sylvestris* (and perhaps, in certain areas, other species of pine, and the silver fir (*Abies alba*) and the common or European spruce (*Picea excelsa*)).

3. The junipers and cedars, possibly a late PIE *\*el-w-n-* denoting various species of *Juniperus* and *Cedrus*.

4. The aspens and poplars, northern or late PIE \**osp-*, denoting *Populus*, mainly *tremula*, but possibly *nigra*, *alba*, and *canescens*.

5. The willows, early PIE \**wyt-*, and \**sVlyk-*, and perhaps \**wrb-*, denoting *Salix*, probably including *alba* and *vitellina*, and probably involving some dichotomy between the osiers as against the tree willows.

6. The apples, northern \**ǵbVl-* and southern \**maHlo-*, involving a dichotomy between wild and cultivated species or varieties of *Malum*.

7. The maples, PIE \**klen-* and late PIE \**akVrno-*, denoting species of *Acer*, probably including *campestris* and *platanoides*, and maybe *pseudoplatanoides*; both of the posited terms may go back to an early PIE \**kL-n-*.

8. The alders, PIE \**alyso-*, denoting *Alnus*, and possibly adapted to four regionally limited species: *barbata*, *incana*, *viridis*, and *glutinosa*.

9. The hazels, western \**kos(V)lo-*, denoting *Corylus*, mainly *avellana*, and probably other species such as *colurna* and *maxima*.

10. The nut (tree)s, PIE \**ar-* and western \**knw-*, the latter probably associated with the likewise western \**kos(V)lo-*, and used for the hazel (nut), whereas the former was presumably used in the east for various kinds of nut (tree), including the walnut (*Juglans regia*) and the chestnut (*Castanea sativa*).

11. The elms, PIE \**wǵ-* and western (or western-cum-Slavic) \**Vlmo-*, denoting *Ulmus*, and probably involving some subgeneric differentiation between *montana*, *laevis*, *campestris*, and even other species; the contrasting terms in Germanic probably entailed some perceived difference between two classes of elm.

12. The lindens, PIE \**lenTā-*, \**lēipā-* (both doubtful); the genus *Tilia* was ubiquitous physically and probably important technologically; it probably included early forms of *cordata*, *platyphyllos*, and possibly *tormentosa* and *dasystyla*.

13. The ashes, PIE \**os-*, denoting *Fraxinus excelsa* and probably some combination of *F. ornus*, *F. oxycarpa*, and *Sorbus aucuparia*.

14. The hornbeam, PIE *grōbh-*, denoting *Carpinus betulus* and possibly *C. orientalis* and *caucasica*.

15. The beeches, PIE \**bhāgo-*, denoting *Fagus*, probably *sylvatica Linnaeus* and *orientalis*, and possibly *sylvatica atro-purpurea*.

16. The cherries, the speculative and problematical early PIE \**K(e)rn-* may have denoted the cornel cherry (*Cornus mas*), the bird cherry (*Prunus padus*), and possibly other species of *Prunus* (the sour, cultivated, and *mahaleb species*).

17. The yews, PIE \**tVksō-* and early PIE \**eywo-* denoted *Taxus baccata*.

18. The oaks, PIE *\*ayg-*, *\*dorw-*, and *\*perk<sup>w</sup>-*, denoted *Quercus* in some sense, and may have been distributed among the three main species: *petraea*, *sessiliflora*, and *robur*; it is just as probable that *\*dorw-* originally meant "tree"; it is possible that other tree names (*\*g<sup>w</sup>elH-* and *\*grōbh-*) were originally applied to particular species of oak.

Among the reconstructed roots of Proto-Indo-European plant names by Th. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov – there are fourteen arboreal units, five roots denoting cultivated plants and corn, and three-bushes and moss (Gamkrelidze Th., Ivanov V., 1984, 613 – 664).

Proto-Indo-European trees:

1. The tree, the oak (*Quercus* L.), PIE: *\*t'e/oru-/t're/ou-*, the alternative stems of inactive class with the meanings: 'tree', 'wood', 'oak'; also 'hard', 'firm', 'powerful', 'healthy', 'trust', 'trusty'.

*\*p<sup>[h]</sup>erk<sup>[h]o</sup>u-* / *\*p<sup>[h]</sup>eru-*, the alternative stems of active class with the meanings: 'oak', 'forest' and never – 'wood'; also 'mountain', 'mountainous place', 'wooded place', 'rock', 'tree', later (3300-400 B. C.) 'pine-tree', 'pinery'.

The Proto-Indo-European name of the 'God of thunder' *\*p<sup>[h]</sup>er(k<sup>[h]o</sup>)u-n-* is also connected with above mentioned stems, and the Proto-Indo-European root for 'acorn' *\*k<sup>o</sup>elH-* is almost universally accepted by Indo-Europeanists.

2. The birch (*Betula* L.), PIE: *\*b<sup>[h]</sup>erHk'-*, v. 'light', v. 'shine' > n. 'light', n. 'shine' > 'the birch'; this removing in meaning is easily explainable from the birch barks' colour.

3. The beech (*Fagus silvatica* L.), PIE: *\*b<sup>[h]</sup>aHk'o-*, we can find many interesting sacramental meanings connected with that stem, because the smooth bark of beech was used as the material of writing. This fact is reflected in many corresponding words of Germanic and Slav languages.

4. The hornbeam (*Carpinus* L.), PIE: *\*(s)k'rōb<sup>[h]</sup>o-*, this name is derived from the verbal forms: 'scrabble', 'claw', 'draw', 'sketch' and gives the very valuable information about the oldest technology of writing of Proto-Indo-Europeans.

5. The ash (*Fraxinus* L.), PIE: *\*Hos-*, with possible *\*-k<sup>[h]</sup>-*, *\*-i-* and *\*-n-* suffixes.

6. The aspen (*Populus tremula* L.) (*Populus nigra* L.), PIE: *\*(H)osp<sup>[h]</sup>-*. Phonetical similarity between the *\*Hos-* 'the ash' and *\*(H)osp<sup>[h]</sup>-* 'the aspen' may be considered as the derived forms from the origin same root - *\*Hos-*.

7. The willow (*Salix* L.), PIE: *\*s̥(e)lik<sup>[h]</sup>-*, archaic form with labialized sybilant in anlaut. The branches of willow were used for braiding the baskets and other things, this fact explains the substitution the old names by the describing forms.

8. The yew (-tree) (*Taxus* L.), PIE: *\*e<sub>i</sub>-/\*o<sub>i</sub>-* (ablaut) substituted roots complicated with *\*-uo-*, *\*-k<sup>[h]</sup>o-* or *\*-o-* suffixes. The yew is evergreen tree, it grows amazingly long time (3000

years) and for these properties it is considered as the symbol of ‘life’, ‘restoration’, ‘immortality’ etc: in German, Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian cultures.

9. The conifers: fir (-tree) (*Picea L.*), silver fir, fir (-tree), (*Abies Mill*), pine (-tree) (*Pinus L.*), PIE:  $*p^{[h]}e\check{u}k^{[h]}/-/*p^{[h]}u\check{k}^{[h]}$  and  $*p^{[h]}it^{[h]}$ - (with different suffixes) (*Abies Mill, Pinus*).

To the same group of words are connected the roots  $*p^{[h]}e\check{u}/-/*p^{[h]}i-$  from which by the suffixes  $*-t^{[h]}$  and  $*-k^{[h]}$  and derived  $*p^{[h]}it^{[h]}$  ‘fir pine’ and  $*p^{[h]}ik^{[h]}$  ‘resin’ forms. Also attracts the attention formal likeness of the last form  $*p^{[h]}i-$   $k^{[h]}$ - to the Proto-Indo-European stems  $*p^{[h]}e\check{i}-k^{[h]}/-/*p^{[h]}i-k^{[h]}$ - ‘paint’, ‘colour’, ‘writing by colour’ (Pokorny J. 1959, 794).

There are also two Proto-European roots  $*ed^{[h]}lo-$  ‘coniferous tree’, ‘fire-tree’, ‘thorny’ and stems derived from the root  $*el-$ ; old Greek  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$  (< $el-\eta-t\acute{a}$ ), Armenian  $e\check{levin}$  ( $*el-e\check{u}$ ) ‘fir-tree’, ‘cedar’ etc (Acharian Gr. 1971, 18).

10. The alder (-tree) (*Alnus Gaertn*), PIE:  $*eliso-/ *aliso-$  and the older  $*\check{u}er-n-$  ‘the alder (-tree)’, ‘the poplar’, ‘beam’, ‘log’, ‘board’, ‘mast’, ‘chink’.

11. The hazel, nuts (*Corylus avellana L., Juglans regia L.*), PIE:  $*q^{[h]}ar-$  (Greek, Albanian, Balto-Slav language groups) and  $*k^{[h]}ne\check{u}-$  (Italo-Keltic-Germanic language groups). The first stem is more widespread and it is the older one and the other – relatively newer, to this last  $*k^{[h]}ne\check{u}$  ‘fruit of hazel’ or ‘nut’ is connected another different stem  $*k^{[h]}os(e)lo$  with the meaning ‘plant’, ‘forest of hazel’ or ‘nut’.

12. The apple (*Malus pumila Mill*), PIE:  $*\check{a}blu-$ ,  $*\check{a}b(a)lo-/ *aplu-$ ,  $*ap(a)la$  ‘the apple-tree’, ‘the apple’. Comparison of the Khet  $\check{s}am(a)lu$  - ‘the apple’ with the above considered group of old European words for ‘the apple-tree’, ‘the apple’ (Kelto-Baltic-Slav  $*\check{a}blu-$ , German  $*aplu-$ ) allows to consider them as derived from Proto-Indo-European stem  $*\check{s}amlu-$  ‘the apple’.

13. The cornel(-tree), the cherry (*Cornus mascula L.; Gerasus avium L.; Prunus cerasus; Cerasus vulgaris Mill.*), PIE:  $*k^{[h]}mo$  ‘the cornel (-tree)’, ‘the cherry’.

14. The mulberry (-tree) (*Morus L.*), PIE:  $*m\check{o}ro-$  ‘the mulbary-tree’, ‘the mulberry’, ‘the dewberry (plant, fruit). Possible etymology with  $*mer-$ ,  $*mor-$  ‘dark’, ‘black’ (Pokorny J., 1959: 734). For the plant dewberry there is another old word  $rubus < *u\check{r}d^{[h]}-o-s$  in Latin.

Cultivated plants and corn:

1. The vine, the vineyard (*Vitis*), PIE:  $*\check{u}e\check{i}n-o-\check{a}k-$  (Slav  $vinjaga$  – ‘the vine cane’) ‘the vine’, ‘the vineyard’ (comp.  $*\check{u}ei-/ *ui-$  ‘twist’, ‘braid’).

2. The grain, the barley (*Hordeum L.*), PEI:  $*Hat$ ;  $*ie\check{u}o-$ ,  $*\check{g}^{[h]}rd^{[h]}/ * \check{g}^{[h]}(e)rd^{[h]}$ - ‘the grain’, ‘the barley’.

3. The wheat (*Triticum L.*), PIE:  $*p^{[h]}\check{u}r-$  ‘the wheat’, the migratory term.

4. The millet, the rye, the oats (*Panicum miliuicum L.*; *Secale ce-reale L.*; *Avena L.*), PIE: \**mel*, \**urug<sup>[h]</sup>jo-* ‘the millet’, ‘the rye’ – these are relatively later derived stems.

5. The flax, the hemp (*Linium usitabissinum L.*; *Cannabis sativa L.*). PIE: \**lino-*, \**san-*, \**gan-/kan* ‘the flax’, ‘the hemp’, these are migratory terms with duplicate forms (with *s* and *g-*/*k* anlaut velars).

Bushes and moss:

1. The heather (*Erica*), PIE: \**uer-* ‘the heather’.

2. The rose (*Rosa*), PIE: \**urot’-*, \**urt’-* ‘the rose’, ‘the wild rose’.

3. The moss (*mūscus*), PIE: \**m(e)us-* ‘the moss’, comp. \**pu-tro-* < \**pū* ‘rot’.

To the given list should be added a very interesting reconstructed stem of the juniper (*Juniperus*), PIE: \**uei-(\*h<sub>2</sub>uei-)* ‘the juniper’. This Proto-Indo-European root has the exact phonetical and semantical correspondence with the Proto-Kartvelian root \**jüüü-*, \**jüi-* denoting the same plant. We think that the Proto-Indo-European stems: \**u(e/o)ino* – ‘wine’, \**uejn- ãk’-* (Slav *vinjaga-*) ‘vine’, ‘vineyard’, \**uei-(\*h<sub>2</sub>uei-)* ‘the juniper’ are borrowed from the Kartvelian languages, comp. Kartv. \**jüino-* ‘wine’, \**uen-ax-* ‘vine’, ‘vineyard’; \**jüü-*, \**jüi* ‘the juniper’, i.e. in the Proto-Indo-European the Proto-Kartvelian complex is simplifying: Kart. *jü* > IE *u*. Compare other examples: Kartv. \**tkaü-* ‘skin’, ‘leather’: IE \**koü*, Kartv. Mtkü-ar (the name of a river): IE \**Kü-r(a)* (see Gamkrelidze Th., 2000).

Reconstructed Proto-Kartvelian plant names are much diverse – more than eighty roots. Below we will present the comparative table of the Proto-Kartvelian and Proto-Indo-European plant-names:

**The Table of Proto-Kartvelian and Proto-Indo-European  
Plant Names**

Botanical Species	Kartvelian Stems	Indo-European Steams
<b>Trees</b>		
“The alder (-tree)” (Alnus Gaertn) («ольха»)	*txam-/*txm̥el-, “The alder (tree)”;	*eliso-/*aliso-, *ǵer-n-, “The alder (-tree)”;
“The apple” (Malus pumila Mill) («яблоня, яблоко»)	*wašl̥- “The apple”;	*ǵblu-, *ǵb(a)lo-/*aplu-, *ap(a)la-, *šam(a)lu-, “The apple”;
“The ash” (Fraxinus L.) («ясень»)	*ipn-, “The ash”;	*Hos-, “The ash" (In Greek and maybe in Albanian happened the transfer of meaning from `the ash" → ”to the beech", what recalled the range of semantic movings;
“The aspen” (Populus tremula L.) («асина») “The poplar” (Populus nigra L.) («тополь»)	*werxw-, “The aspen”, “The poplar”;	*(H)osp <sup>[h]</sup> -, “The aspen”, “The poplar”;
“The beech” (Fagus silvatica L.)(«бук»)	*çip-, „The beech”	*b <sup>[h]</sup> erHk̂o-, “The beech”;
“The birch” (Betula L.) («берёза»)	*ç <sub>1</sub> aqü -, “guilder rose”, “snow-ball-tree ”; («калина») “The birch”	*b <sup>[h]</sup> erHk̂-, “the birch”, “the skin of birch”, “the elm” also: “lights”, “shines”, “brights”.



<p>“The conifers”: “fir(-tree)”;  “silver fir”; “fir”; “pine (-tree)”  (Picea L.), (Abies Mill),  (Pinus L.)  («ель», «сосна», «пихта»)</p>	<p>*naγw-, “fir (-tree)”,  soč- “silver fir”,  pičw- “pine (-tree)”;</p>	<p>*p<sup>[h]</sup>euk<sup>[h]</sup>-/*p<sup>[h]</sup>uk<sup>[h]</sup>-,*p<sup>[h]</sup>it<sup>[h]</sup>-,  “silver fir”, “pine (-tree)”;  *ed<sup>[h]</sup>lo-, “the conifers”,  “fir (-tree)”;</p>
<p>“The cornel(-tree)”, “the cherry”  (Cornus mascula L.),  (Cerasus avium L.)  (Prunus cerasus; Cerasus vulgaris Mill.)  («кизил», «черешня, вишня»)</p>	<p>*šüind-/ *šind-,  “the cornel (-tree)”,    *bal-, “The cherry”;</p>	<p>*k<sup>[h]</sup>ṛno-, “The cornel (-tree)”,  “cherry”;</p>
<p>“the elm”  (Ulmus foliacea Gilib.)  («вяз», «ильм», «берест»)</p>	<p>*ca-, “The elm”;</p>	<p>*wŷg-, *Vlmo-, “The elm”;</p>
<p>“The hazel”, “nuts”  (Corylus avellana L.),  («ореховое дерево, орех»)</p>	<p>*txil-, “nut”;  *kaḳ-al-, “walnut”;</p>	<p>*k<sup>[h]</sup>os(e)lo-, “nut”,  “walnut” (plant),  *q<sup>[h]</sup>ar-, *k<sup>[h]</sup>neṭ-, (Fruit);</p>
<p>“The hornbeam”  (Carpinus L.)  («граб»)</p>	<p>*kṛcxeml̥-, “The hornbeam”,  “rcxila (modern Georgian)”;</p>	<p>*(s)k`rōb<sup>[h]</sup>o-“The hornbeam”;</p>
<p>“The lime(-tree),” “linden”  (Tilia) («липа»)</p>	<p>*γacω-, “The lime (-tree)”,  “linden”;</p>	<p>*lenta□-, *le□ipa□- “The lime (-tree)”, “Linden”  (doubtful stems);</p>
<p>“The maple” (Acer L.)  («клен»)</p>	<p>*ne-kerčx-a-, “The maple”;</p>	<p>*KL-n-, *klen-,  *akvrno-, “The maple”;</p>
<p>“The mulberry(-tree)”  (Morus L.)  («тутовое дерево»)</p>	<p>Tuta-, (bžol-(a) in dialects)  “the mulberry” (-tree);</p>	<p>*mōro-, *ṽrd<sup>[h]</sup>-o-s-  “the mulberry (-tree)”;</p>

<p>“The tree”, “the oak” (Quercus L.) («дереву», «дуб»)</p>	<p>*ɣ<sub>1</sub>el-, “tree”, “oak”; *c<sub>1</sub>-qan-, “oak”; muxa- in old and modern Georgian substituted stem “oak”; *kr̥qo- „r̥qo” – ‘acorn’ (in some dialects ‘oak’) («желудь»)</p>	<p>*tʰe/oru-, *tʰre/oru-, “tree”, “oak” (inact. cl.) *p<sup>[h]</sup>erk<sup>[h]</sup>u-/ *p<sup>[h]</sup>eru-, “oak”, “forest” (act. kl.); *ajk-, “oak” (substituted stem); *k̥elH- “acorn” (fruit); Comp. Ital. K̥erkus: Lat. quercus; Ven. Qarquēni;</p>
<p>“the willow” (Salix L.) («ива», «ветла»)</p>	<p>*ɣeç<sub>1</sub>n- “The willow”, “The white willow”;</p>	<p>*ʰs(e)lik- “The willow”, “The white willow”;</p>
<p>“The yew” (Taxus) («тис»)</p>	<p>*urtxel-, “The yew”;</p>	<p>*ej-/ *oj (with *-uo-, *-k<sup>[h]</sup>o-, *-o- suffixes) “the yew”;</p>
<p><b>Cultivated Plants and Corn</b></p>		
<p>“The flax”, “The hemp” (Linium usitatissimum L.), (Cannabis sativa L.) («лен», «конопля»)</p>	<p>*sel-, “The flax”; (*kan-, “The hemp” – migratory term);</p>	<p>*lino - “The flax”; *san-, *gan-/ *kan-, “The hemp”;</p>
<p>“The grain”, “the barley” (Hordeum L.) («зерно», «ячмень»)</p>	<p>qndur-, qadur-, “corn” (&lt;”pea”); (Old. Georg. krtil-, Moder. Georg. ker-; Megr. ker-; Svan. çəmin-/k̥er-) “The barley”;</p>	<p>*Hat’-, “corn” *jeuo-; *g<sup>[h]</sup>(e)rd<sup>[h]</sup>-/g<sup>[h]</sup>rcd<sup>[h]</sup>- “The burley”;</p>
<p>“The millet”, “The rye”, “The oats” (Panicum miliaceum L.); (Secale ce- reale L.); (Avena L.); («просо», «рожь», «овес»)</p>	<p>*Petü-, “Millet”; *_ (Georg. çüav -; Megr. çüe-; Svan. manäš-); *_ (Old. Georg. šüriva-/ šüriva-; Modern. Georg. šwria-; Svan. mäčičxu-, zəntx-) “The oats”;</p>	<p>*mel-, “Millet”; *yru<sup>[h]</sup>io - “The rye”; (Lat. auēna, Lit. aviža, Lat. àuza, Prus. wyse, Russ. овѣсь, Russ. овес “The oats”);</p>

“The pumpkin” (Cucurbita) («ТЫКВА»)	*aqar- “The sort of pumpkin”; *k̄wax “The pumpkin”- (dialect.); (Mod. Georg. gogra-, “gogra”);	*ga(r)gra-, “water vessel”, “churn of butter”, “oil press”;
“The vine”, “the vineyard” (Vitis) («ВИНОГРАДНАЯ ЛОЗА», «ВИНОГРАДНИК»)	*uenaq-, (“The vine”), “the vineyard”;	*uein-āk’ - (Slaw. vinjaga- “vine”);
“The wheat” (Triticum L.) («ПШЕНИЦА»)	*ipkl-, “The wheat”;	*p <sup>[h]</sup> ūr - “The wheat” (migratory term);
<b>Bushes and Moss</b>		
“The juniper” (Juniperus) («МОЖЖЕВЕЛЬНИК»)	*jūiü-, *jūi-, The juniper”;	*uei-(*h̄uei-) “The juniper”;
“The moss” (mūscus) («МОХ»)	*putk-, “The moss”, “blister”, “rash”, “drizzled”, “moistened”, Comp. *pu-, “boil”, “fermentation”; Georg. putur(o)- “rotten”, “dump, humid” (Modern Georg. xavs-, “The moss”);	*m(e)us-, “the moss”, “the plant of bog”, “Swamp, marsh”, “mould, moustiness”, «ПЛЕСЕНЬ»; Comp. *pū-tro- < *pū “rot” (Klimov G., 1994:145);

Let us see what picture we have for denoting ‘the conifers’ in comparable systems. In the botanical dictionary of Al. Makashvili there are gathered some informations about the conifers names from Kartvelian languages and dialects: *naḡvi* (*Picea*, *Picea orientalis* L.), Sb. elati, bl. rač. cvela, čan., megr. *nuzu*; svn. *nezvra*, γumir (Makashvili Al., 1961).

The conifers: fir (-tree) (*Picea* L.), silver fir (*Abies* Mill), pine (-tree) (*Pinus* L.) really are the ornaments of forests – high, elegant, evergreen, with broadly unwrapped coniferous

branches, reddish cones like the lighted candles. The reader of the Bible repeatedly meets the astonishing poetic comparisons connected with this wonderful lodger of the plants world.

The cedar (*Pinus cedrus L.*) is the symbol of famous, force, power, long life (regn. 4(2) 14,9; psalm: 91, 13; Ex. 21, 13; Ez. 17,3, 22 and farther 31,3 and farther).

It was the aromatic, expensive building material (regn. 2 (sam. 2) 7,2; par. 1. 7,2; regn. 3. 8,9; Ezdr. 3,7; regn. 3.6,9; 7,3 – 7; psalm. 1, 16; Ier. 22, 14), by it were made idols (Ex. 44, 14), it was used in shipbuilding for making moasts (Ez. 27,50), the oil of conifers was used for embalming (psalm. 4, 11), its resin, because of its severe smell – in some religious rituals (psalm. 4, 11; Os. 14, 7; Lev. 14, 4; num. 19, 6).

We have found many different roots of conifers in Old Georgian manuscripts: “მოსცა ძელი ნაძვსაჲ და მაშენებელნი ზღუდეთანი და ხურონი ძელისა, რათა უშენონ მას სახლი” M, I par. 14, 1; “გარდამოიღონ ნაძვსა ძელი ლიბანით” O, I Ez. 4, 48; “მე დამკვდრებულ ვარ სახლსა შინა ნაძვსახსა” M, I par. 17, 1; “მიძღუანე მე ძელი ნაძვსაჲ, ფიჭვ და ნაძვ- ლიბანით II par. 2, 8. ნაძოვანი – “კედრონი”; ნაძვებიანი ადგილი; “გამოვიდა მოწაფეთა მისთა თანა წიად ჰევსა მას ნაძოვანსა” DE, – “განვიდა მოწაფითურთ თვისთ წიად ჰევსა მას კედრონისახსა” C, I. 18, 1.

Sulkhan – Saba Orbeliani’s dictionary (XVII c., publ. 1928): *naḡu* (naḡvi ZABCbqDE) (tree) (+1, 16 canticum ZAB) ZABCDE. *elati* (tree) *naḡvi* ZABCD.

P. Charaia’s Megrelian – Georgian dictionary (1997): *nuzu* – fir (-tree), *nuzoni* – fir-wood.

V. Topuria, M. Kaldani, Svan Dictionary (2000): *nenz* (is, -ar) up. sv. botan. Silver fir, დწჷს ხომა ნენზ ხერიდ ხუღჷე (ბზ. 406) – დევს დიდი სოჭი თითისტარად აქვს, Deu has a big silver fir as a spindle. ცხეკისგა ხაგ ხომა ლადწლდ ღუმირ, ნენზ ი კვკვბ (Low. B. 70) – ტყეში მეტწილად არის ნაძვი, სოჭი და ფიჭვი, There are mainly fir, silver fir and pine in the forest.

On the base of the regular phonetical correspondence of the Kartvelian languages it is possible to reconstruct proto-Kartvelian stem *\*naḡu* - : Georg. *naḡu-nazu-i*; *naḡ-ov-an-i*; *naḡv-i* (moder. Georg.). megr. *naḡu-* /*nuzu-*, *nuḡu/nuzu* “fir-tree”; svn. *nezû- nezû-ra* “fir-tree”.

Megrelian *nuḡu-* (<*\*noḡu-*, o>u by the T. Gudava’s rule (1960, 119-120), *nuzu*<*nuḡu*, desafricatisation and svan. *nezû*.

Georgian and Megrelian data juxtaposed H. Vogt (1938), Svanian equivalent exposed B. Gigineishvili (1989), (Fährnich H., Sarjveladze S., 2000).

By H. Vogt, Georgian *naḡvi*, megrelian *nuzu* must be regarded as the Kartvelian – Caucasian word. The conifers are very widespread in Caucasus mountains. Batsbian *naḡv* and Udian *naḡw* – “fir (-tree)” are borrowed from Georgian.

Compare Georg. *piḡv*-i and similar forms in other Kartvelian languages with Mid. Greek  $\pi\iota\tau\upsilon\zeta$  ‘pine (-tree)’; Megr. *noḡ-r*; Svan. *taxra*; Batsb. from Georg. *piḡv-r*. In many Caucasian languages the meaning of this root literally is “lamp”, “candle tree”. (Klimov G., Khalilov M., 2003).

Besides the above mentioned materials, there is another interesting data connected with ‘the conifers’ in Svan language.

According to Arsen Onians’ “Trees and Plants Svan Names Dictionary” published in 1917 in Petrograd: *ḡumūr* lech. “pine or fir”; *ḡumūltra* lech. “pine tree or fir tree”.

*t axtra* lech. “male pine or fir”. *nezūra* lech. “female pine or fir”. *leḡmur* “where many pines and firs are”. *ḡumūri t iḡ*, *ḡumūri x ūem* ღუმურს ხოწიბ მურგუალ ღარი მუჯრდრა, ღუმური ღწმი ღი აღე. კდღს: ჳიმდბა (ღსგ.) “An oblong, roundish (penis) is hanging on it and this is firs’ seed (cone)”.

By V. Topuria and M. Kaldans’ Svan dictionary (2000): *ḡumir* (-mriš up. Svn., -mräl up. b., -mrär low. b., -iḡ, -äl Int.), *ḡomir* (-äḡ, -äl) up. b., *ḡumūr* (-al) lshkh. – fir. ღასḡბად ღუმრი ღიკცხე ḡნცხḡნḡს (up. b. 401) – “The brothers preferred to cut off the fir”. გოერგოღ ღომრწ ამხღდღი ჩḡყყḡრა (up. b. 314) – “George was lying on the branch of the fir”. ცხეკისგა ხაგ ღუმირ (low. b. 70) – “There is a fir in the forest”. ნწყი ღუმურს ხოḡღენი (lshkh. 24) – “Gum comes out of the fir”. ეხა ჳიქან ღის ღუმირღს ცხეკწრ (Int. 4) – “Above it there are fir forests diminutive *jumril*. – ეჯი კოტოღ ღუმრიღ ირი (poetry. 308) – “It should be a little fir”.

*nezū* (-iḡ, -är up. svn., Int., ar - lshkh). *zool* – *nezvi*. *nenz* (-iḡ, -är) up. svn., bot. – silver fir (see above).

*taxra* (-rāḡ, -rēl) lshkh., bot.1. male fir or pine. მუგḡად ტახრა ღუმურს ხოხაღ ი გḡგḡღს (lshkh. khor. 17) – “The male fir and pine also have the pretzel”. 2. Caucasian silver fir.

In K. Donduas “Svan-Georgian-Russian Dictionary”: *ḡumūr* -iḡ= (conifer plant (pine, fir, silver fir), *nezv(r)*, -iḡ, -ar – *nezvi* [fimale pig]. *nezvra* – pine; *t ax(r)* -iḡ, -ar – *t axi* [male pig].

*t axra* – fir.

In I. Nijaradzes’ dictionary: *ḡumir* - fir; *leḡmir* – fir – wood;

On the base of the analysis of given data we can suppose that  $\gamma um\bar{u}r // \gamma umir // \gamma omir$  stems in Svan should have been a common name for conifers. *nenz/nezûra* – “female pine, fir or silver fir”, *taxra* – “male pine, fir or silver fir”. If not the ending suffix-ra of plants in Svan, above given stems by form and meaning coincides “*nezvi*” and “*taxi*”, correspondingly denoting female and male pigs’ names.

We think that the accent on the lexical gender is the recall of the very ancient time when trees and among them the conifers were the objects of idolization. Compare the same picture of the distribution for the names of vine: *mamali rkaçiteli* “male rkaçiteli (sort of vine)”, *dedali rkaçideli*: “female rkaçiteli”, *unaqopo vazi* – “avrezi” (fruitless vine) Sb.

So, the Kartvelian roots of conifers saved the oldest memory of the period of mankind culture, which is lost now in many cases. Though, while arising the question about the borrowing roots from Indo-European in Kartvelian or vice versa, beside the pure linguistic facts such kind of philological and cultural evidences help us to choice more exact decision.

The similarity of the species of conifers is the reason of the names confusion and it troubles their precise reconstruction. To this confirms the typological data.

In the Proto-Indo-European for the names of conifers: fir (-tree) (*Picea L.*), Silver fir (*Abies Mill*), pine (-tree), (*Pipus L.*), namely for silver fir and pine are reconstructed the roots  $*p^{[h]}e\hat{u}k^{[h]}/*p^{[h]}u\hat{k}^{[h]}$  and  $*p^{[h]}it^{[h]}$ - (with different suffixes) (Gamkrelidze Th., Ivanov V., 1984, 631).

From the same  $*p^{[h]}e\hat{u}/*p^{[h]}i$ - root by the suffix  $*-k^{[h]}$  is derived another Proto-Indo-European root  $*p^{[h]}it^{[h]}$  “resin”.

The attention attracts formal likeness of  $*p^{[h]}i-k^{[h]}$  to the Proto-Indo-European verbal stems  $*p^{[h]}ei-k^{[h]}/*p^{[h]}i-k^{[h]}$ - “paint”, “color”, “writing by color” (Pokorny I., 1959, 794), what is easy to explain by using resin as a “black plant color” at first for the pictographic signs and pictures and later for writing too.

There are also two Proto-Indo-European roots  $*ed^{[h]}-lo-$  - “coniferous tree”, “fir-tree”, “thorny” and stems derived from the root  $*el-$ : old Greek  $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$  (<el- $\eta$ -tā), Armenian *elevin* ( $*el-e\check{u}$ ) “fir-tree”, “cedar” (Acharian Gr., 1971, 18) etc.

In H. Vogts opinion another Armenian root *noč-* which is considered as borrowed from Iranian, has its source from the Megrelian *nuz-*.

The different view was formulated by M. Andronikashvili: on one side from the old Persian (In the Akhamedian inscriptions) *nauča* (ina), Partian (arshakid) *nōč* (which is firmied in Armenian as *noč*), flow out the modern Persian forms:

نوژ [nūž], نج [nūg] and نوز [nūz]. And from the other side as it seems in the middle Persian (in sasanian) there were derived forms *nāž-ūk*, *nāz-ūk* by the suffix-*ūk*, which gave in modern Persian نازو [nāžū] and نازو [nāzū] forms. In M. Andronikashvili's idea Georgian *nāžū* - is based on the last one and Megrelian *nuzu* is borrowed from Georgian or from some Iranian dialects (Andronikashvili M., 1966, 347-348).

Different view is proposed by Th. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov. They supposed, that from the other Indo-European dialects phonetically isolated old Iranian form \* *nauča* – “fir-tree”, also Persian *nājū*, Oset. *næzy* forms are borrowed from the Kartvelian languages (Comp. Vogt H. 1938, 355).

If we assume the contrary way of borrowing it should have happened not later than the first half of II m. B.C.

We think that the oldest trace of lexical gender in Svan roots denoting “conifers”, also Kartvelian borrowed roots in Caucasian and Indo-European languages, confirm their acienty and strengthens Th. Gamkrelidze's opinion about the location of Proto-Kartvelians inhabit places in South Caucasus's central and West mountainous regions.

Thus, from the etymological and typological research of Kartvelian an Indo-European roots of “conifers” we can conclude:

- The ancient imaginations of trees adoration are connected to the Kartvelian roots of “conifers”.
- From all Indo-European dialects isolated stems – the old Iranian *nauča* and the later Persian *nājū*, also Osetian *næzy*, Batsb *načv* and Udian *načw...* are borrowed from Kartvelian languages.
- The Proto-Kartvelian and Proto-Indo-European roots of the common and separate species denoting “conifers” show the similar semantic distribution and removing of the meanings, i.e. is presented the same typological picture for these language families.

## References

1. *აბულაძე*, ძველი ქართული ენის ლექსიკონი, თბილისი 1973.
2. *ანდრონიკაშვილი*, ნარკვევები ირანულ-ქართული ენობრივი ურთიერთობიდან, I, თბილისი 1966.
3. *გამყრელიძე*, „კულტურის ეკოლოგია“, „ოჩხარი“, ჯ. რუხაძისადმი მიძღვნილი ეთნოლოგიური, ისტორიული და ფილოლოგიური ძიებანი“, „მემატიანე“ გვ. 113-115, თბილისი 2002.
4. *გამყრელიძე*, *გ. მაჭავარიანი*, სონანტთა სისტემა და აბლაუტი ქართველურ ენებში, თბილისი 1965.

- ბ. გივინეიშვილი, მასალები ქართული ენის ეტიმოლოგიური ლექსიკონისათვის; „მაცნე“ (ენისა და ლიტერატურის სერია) 2, თბილისი 1981.
- რ. გორდეზიანი, წინაპერძნული და ქართველური, თბილისი, 1985.
- ტ. გუდავა, თ. გამყრელიძე, თანხმოვანთა კომპლექსები მეგრულში, თსუ კრებული „აკაკი შანიძეს“, თბილისი 1981.
- კ. დონდუა, სვანურ-ქართულ-რუსული ლექსიკონი, სპუ, თბილისი 2001.
- ო. თედევი, მემცენარეობის ქართული ლექსიკა ოსურში, „მეცნიერება“ თბილისი 1975.
- გ. თოფურია, სვანური ენა I, ზმნა, სპი, ტფილისი 1931.  
ქართველურ ენათა სიტყვათწარმოებიდან, IV, ხომვანთავსართიანი სახელები; თსუ შრომები, XXXII თბილისი 1947.
- გ. თოფურია, მ. ქაღდანი, სვანური ლექსიკონი, „ქართული ენა“, თბილისი 2000.
- ა. მაყაშვილი, ბოტანიკური ლექსიკონი, თბილისი 1961.
- გ. მაჭავარიანი, მასალები პურეულის ლექსიკონისათვის შიგნით კახეთში, სტუდენტთა სამეცნიერო შრომების კრებული, თსუ, წიგნი V, გვ. 286-295 თბილისი 1950.
- გ. მელიქიშვილი, საქართველოს, კავკასიისა და მეზობელი აღმოსავლეთის უძველესი მოსახლეობის საკითხები, თბილისი 1965.
- ი. მელიქიშვილი, ქართველურ-ინდოევროპული გენეტიკური ურთიერთმიმართების საკითხისათვის, ენათმეცნიერების საკითხები, I, თბილისი 2002.
- არს. ონიანი, ხეებისა და მცენარეების სვანურ სახელთა ლექსიკონი, პეტროგრადი. (Сборник сванских названий деревьев и растений) Петроград 1917.
- სულხან-საბა ორბელიანი, ლექსიკონი ქართული, თბილისი 1928, 1949, 1993.
- პ. ფენრიხი, ზ. სარჯველაძე, ქართველურ ენათა ეტიმოლოგიური ლექსიკონი, სპუ, თბილისი 2000.
- პ. ფოქტი, ქართული ენის ფონემატური სტრუქტურა, თბილისი 1961.
- ო. ქაჯაია, მეგრულ-ქართული ლექსიკონი 1-3 ტომი, „ნეკერი“, თბილისი 2002.
- არნ. ჩიქობავა, ჭანურ-მეგრულ-ქართული შედარებითი ლექსიკონი, ტფილისი 1938.  
სახელის ფუძის უძველესი აგებულება ქართველურ ენებში, თბილისი 1942.
- პ. ჭარაია, მეგრულ-ქართული ლექსიკონი, სპუ, თბილისი 1997.
- ივ. ჯავახიშვილი, თხზულებანი თორმეტ ტომად, ტ. V, თბილისი 1986.
- Гамкрелидзе Т.В., Иванов В.В., Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы. Реконструкция историко-типологического анализа праязыка и пракультуры, т. I-II, Тбилиси 1984.



- Кутшидзе И.*, Грамматика мингрельского (Иверского) языка с хрестоматией и словарем. Материалы по яфетическому языкознанию, С.-Петербург 1914.
- Климов Г.А.*, Этимологический словарь картвельских языков, Москва. 1973, Дополнения к этимологическому словарю картвельских языков; Этимология 1974, Москва. 1964.
- Климов Г.А., Халилов М.Ш.*, Словарь кавказских языков. Восточная литература, Москва 2003.
- Март Н.Я.*, Яфетические названия деревьев и растений (pluralia tantum) I-III, ИАН, Санкт-Петербург. 1915.
- Нужарадзе И.И.*, Русско-сванский словарь, Тифлис 1910.
- Fahnrich H.*, 1984, 1985, 1987, 1991, Kartwelischer Wortschatz I-V: Georgica, 5, 7, 10, 13/14, Jena-Tbilissi, Konstanz, 1982.
- Friedrich P.*, Proto-Indo-European Trees, The University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London, 1970.
- Frisk H.*, Griechisches Etimologisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg, 1963.
- Gamkrelidze T. V.*, On linguistic paleontology of culture, Time Deph in Historical The Linguistics, edited by Colin Renfrew, April Me Mahon and Larry Trask; Me Donald Institute for Archeological Research, Papers in the prehistory of Language, 1999.
- Gigineischwili B.*, Etymologische Untersuchungen aus dem Bereich der Lexik der Kartvel Sprachen: Georgica 13/14, Konstanz, 1990/1991.
- Klimov G.*, Etimological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages, Berlin/New York, 1998.