



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](https://www.sciencedirect.com)

Journal of Pragmatics

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma)

# Accommodating loan verbs in Georgian: Observations and questions

Nino Amiridze

*Institute of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University, 13, Chavchavadze Avenue, 0179 Tbilisi, Georgia*

## ARTICLE INFO

*Article history:*  
Available online xxx

*Keywords:*  
Language contact  
Typology of verbal borrowings  
Preverb  
Georgian  
English  
Russian

## ABSTRACT

In this article I analyze techniques for how Georgian accommodates English loan verbs. The major role is played by preverbs, in particular, the preverb *da-*, which itself occupies a special role in the system of Georgian preverbs due to its high degree of grammaticalization. This technique, the use of preverb *da-*, is compared to the strategy Georgian employed to accommodate Russian verbs in the beginning of Georgian–Russian language contact.

It seems that the use of *da-* does not fit into the four major types of the typology of verbal borrowings of Wohlgemuth [Wohlgemuth, Jan, 2009. *A Typology of Verbal Borrowings*. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 211 [TiLSM]. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.] and, thus, falls into the unclassified “other types” category. At the end of the article, I indicate future research topics, among which is the study of highly grammaticalized morphemes as a possible systematic subcategory in the “other” class of the typology of verbal borrowings.

© 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

As languages across the globe engage in contact, they borrow various materials, depending on social factors such as attitudes towards the languages involved, the intensity and length of the contact, and structural factors such as the typological compatibility of donor and recipient languages. Among the borrowed material, verbs are universally accommodated at various stages of contact. Some core principles of verb borrowing have been described and categorized in the corresponding typology by Wohlgemuth (2009).

In this article I focus on one of the less-studied contact situations, Georgian–English language contact. So far, contact between these languages has caused some minor developments in function word and structural borrowings from English into Georgian, but no major influence on Georgian language structure can be observed. From the borrowing scale point of view (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Thomason, 2001), one may argue that this is a transitional period from casual contact at the first stage of borrowing, to slightly more intense contact, leading to the second stage of borrowing.

I report on observations on the formation of Georgian verb forms that have English material as a root. The formation uses the Georgian preverb *da-* to accommodate English loan verbs into Georgian. Interestingly, the same pattern can be observed

*E-mail address:* [nino.amiridze@gmail.com](mailto:nino.amiridze@gmail.com).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.02.008>  
0378-2166/© 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Please cite this article in press as: Amiridze, N., Accommodating loan verbs in Georgian: Observations and questions, Journal of Pragmatics (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.02.008>

in examples taken from the initial stages of Georgian–Russian language contact, which has a far longer contact history than that of Georgian with English. During the later stages of Georgian–Russian contact, other preverbs also appear with the same function in synthetic verb forms (for an overview of Georgian preverbs see Section 5.1). These observations, at one glance, might indicate that English loans could also use other preverb forms in the future, as contact becomes more intense and loans become more “Georgianized”. However, one needs more data from both Georgian–English and Georgian–Russian language contacts to make it a working hypothesis. Such a comparative study is important to analyze the source-language- versus target-language-specific ways of adapting foreign material in Georgian.

I discuss the use of the preverb *da-* as a loan verb accommodation technique based on various examples from Georgian online discussion forums, blogs and Facebook. The analysis suggests that the accommodation technique does not neatly fit into the four main classes of the typology of verbal borrowings (Wohlgemuth, 2009), leaving its place in the unclassified “other” group of the typology. Then an interesting question is whether similar techniques can be observed cross-linguistically and whether they can form a systematic substrategy within this group.

Answers to these questions require investigations which go beyond the scope of this article. Here, the goal is to bring the current state of the data analysis on preverb accommodation into focus, and formulate directions of further research on the topic. This analysis (which is at the beginning stages) contributes to studying two less-researched contact situations – Georgian–English and Georgian–Russian, to understanding the unclassified category of the typology of verbal borrowings, and to describing nativization techniques for foreign items in Georgian.

This article is organized as follows: In Section 2, I give a brief historic overview of Georgian–Russian and Georgian–English language contacts and characterize them from the point of view of borrowing scales (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Thomason, 2001). Section 3 discusses verb borrowing, reviewing relevant literature in the area. In Section 4, I analyze preverbs as loan verb accommodation techniques in Georgian using examples of English and Russian loan verbs, indicating a major role of the preverb *da-*. Section 5 gives a more detailed characterization of Georgian preverbs and discusses a special place of the preverb *da-* among them. Concluding remarks are given in Section 6.

The following abbreviations are used throughout the paper: 1/2/3 = 1st/2nd/3rd person; AOR = aorist; DAT = dative; EC = epenthetic consonant; INF = infinitive; INTR = intransitive; LVM = loan verb marker; NMLZ = nominalizer; NOM = nominative; O = object; PARTICLE = particle; PAST = past tense; PL = plural; PRV = pre-radical vowel; PV = preverb; S = subject; SG = singular; TAM = tense, aspect, modality; TS = thematic suffix; VBLZ = verbalizer.

## 2. Overview of Georgian–Russian and Georgian–English language contact

Due to Georgia’s geographical location in the Caucasus, coupled with its turbulent history, Georgian has been in contact with many languages, such as Greek, Persian, Arabic, Armenian, Anatolian Turkish and Ossetian, to name a few. In this article, my interest focuses on two contact situations: one, the relatively new relationship between English and Georgian, and, for comparison, the relatively old relationship with Russian. In this section I give a historical overview and brief analysis of these contact situations. This contextualization helps compare the Russian loan verb accommodation techniques in Georgian to the ways in which English verbs are borrowed in Georgian.

The choice of Russian for the comparison is motivated by the fact that in the last two centuries Russian is the language Georgian has been in the most intensive contact with. In addition, it is relatively easy to access data about the beginning of this contact, based on sources from the 19th century and first half of the 20th century.

A good basis for the analysis of language contact situations and borrowings is the *borrowing scale* of Thomason and Kaufman (1988), according to which the stronger the contact, the more contact-induced changes occur. Thomason has further elaborated on this in (Thomason, 2001). The reformulated scale consists of four stages:

**Stage 1. Casual contact.** Borrowers need not be fluent in the source language, and/or there are few bilinguals among borrowing-language speakers. Only lexical borrowing of content words (most often nouns, but also verbs, adjectives, and adverbs) takes place. No change to language structure.

**Stage 2. Slightly more intense contact.** Borrowers must be bilinguals, but they are probably a minority among borrowing-language speakers. Function words as well as content words are borrowed, still nonbasic vocabulary. Only minor structural borrowing takes place.

**Stage 3. More intense contact.** More bilinguals, attitudes and other social factors favoring borrowing. More function words as well as basic and nonbasic vocabulary is borrowed. Moderate structural borrowing (no major typological changes) happens.

**Stage 4. Intense contact.** Very extensive bilingualism among borrowing-language speakers, social factors strongly favoring borrowing. Continuing heavy lexical borrowing in all sections of the lexicon, heavy structural borrowing.

It is interesting to compare Georgian–Russian and Georgian–English language contacts from the perspective of this scale. The former has a longer history and the corresponding borrowing process went through more stages, while the latter is relatively new and less well studied.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Although it should be noted that also for the Georgian–Russian contact, there are not many works on grammatical borrowing, see, e.g. (Mikiashvili, 2000, 2003; Amiridze and Gurevich, 2006).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/7297236>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/7297236>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)