

Latin Legal Terminology in the Monuments of Georgian Law

Author(s): Ekaterine Kobakhidze

Source: *Phasis. Greek and Roman Studies* 18 (2015): 130-144

ISSN: 1512-1046

E-ISSN: 2346-8459

Published by: The Institute of Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies of the Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48614/phasis.18.2015.130-144>

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

LATIN LEGAL TERMINOLOGY IN THE MONUMENTS OF GEORGIAN LAW (11th-21th CENTURIES)

EKATERINE KOBAKHIDZE

Abstract. The article focuses chiefly on the research of Latin legal terminology presented in written monuments of Georgian Law in the 11th-21st centuries. It describes the long history of endeavors to establish the existence of Latin legal terms in Georgian legal sources, how they were received during different epochs, the regularities of forming these terms in the Georgian language, their initial meanings and other noteworthy details that are important not only from a philological perspective but from a legal point of view. Despite the fact that Georgia was never under the ruling of the Roman Empire, and hence, — Latin legal terms never entered Georgian law directly from Roman law or from the Latin language, from as early as the 11th century these terms made a significant impact on the creation of Georgian legal terminology. Overall, they greatly contributed to approximating Georgian law to Western legal culture.

The article is based on the work carried out personally by the author in the framework of the interdisciplinary project *Latin Law Terminology* funded by the Rustaveli National Scientific Foundation in 2012-2014.¹ The project aimed at studying the meaning of Latin legal terms in Roman law, in

¹ The Head of the Project: Prof. Levan Aleksidze. Key Personell: Associate Prof. Iamze Gagua, Associate Prof. Ekaterine Kobakhidze, Assistant Prof. Nino Rukhadze, Dr. Maia Danelia.

modern Georgian legal acts and Georgian historical sources. Respectively, meaning of each Latin term covered within the project² is displayed in three paragraphs, the first is devoted to the meaning of the term in the Roman Law, the second – in modern Georgian legislation and the third – in Georgian historical monuments. The meanings of the Latin term in modern and historical legal sources of Georgia are corroborated by relevant citations. The following example can serve as illustration:

Candidatus [candida'tus, "clad in white"] candidate.

I – Aspirant to magistrate's position.

II – A person nominated to be elected or appointed in a state or a private organization. An employer is authorized to obtain information on the candidate, which the employer requires for making decision on his employment.³

III – "Whenever a Chief Priest or Archimandrite died, the Catholicos nominated a **candidate** and, if the king wished, would approve him" (*Law Pr. Dav.* 6, 8).

As seen from the example, the project mainly focused on the meanings and function of Latin legal terms in Roman law and the modern Georgian legislation, correspondingly its format did not envisage a systematic analysis of the cases of confirmed primary usage of Latin legal terms revealed in Georgian legal sources, which leads us to making considerable conclusions.

The present article serves the purpose of rectifying this flaw and shows a centuries-old history of endeavoring establishment of the existence of Latin legal terms in Georgian legal sources, the ways of their reception in different epochs, the regularities of forming these terms in the Georgian language, their initial meanings and many other noteworthy details that are important not only from a philological perspective but from a legal point of view.

We can tentatively divide Latin legal terminology, in terms of the chronology of establishment of their usage in Georgian legal sources, into the following groups:

² Discussion on selection of terms for the purposes of the work and their legal status is presented in Aleksidze, Gagua, Danelia, Kobakhidze and Rukhadze 2015.

³ Georgian Labor Code, 5th (1) Article (2010).

- A) The terms introduced in the 11th-12th centuries;
- B) The terminology first confirmed in the 18th-19th centuries;
- C) The legal terms first presented in the legal acts of the first Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918-1921);
- D) The legal terminology established during the Soviet period (1921-1989);
- E) The terms first confirmed in the post-Soviet and active legislation.

Let us briefly review the signs and tendencies characteristic of each of these periods.

A) THE TERMS INTRODUCED IN THE 11TH-12TH CENTURIES

It can be clearly stated, that Georgia's political and cultural development, which is characteristic of this period, equally touched upon all the important institutions of the state, including the legal institutions. It is in this epoch, when the so called Western tendencies, craving for European culture and receptions from the antiquity are on the increase, when Latin terminology first appears in the Georgian legal tradition. It is especially noteworthy that this process originates in the thick of Ecclesiastical law.

The presence of Latin legal terminology in the legal sources of this chronological period is proved in the translated monuments and their scholia as well as the original texts. The most noteworthy from these sources are: *The Deed of Protection* given by King Giorgi II to Shiomgvtimi Monastery, *The Typicon of Petritsoni Georgians' Monastery* (1084),⁴ *Writing of Monuments* for the Ruisi-Urbnisi Convention (1103),⁵ *The Nomocanon*,⁶ and *The Minor Nomocanon*.⁷

The list of some terms are provided below:

Latin	Georgian	Source	Meaning (in Georgian context)
Codicilli	kodiki	NC 142, 16	Adding the act of will
Codex	kodikoi	NC Sch. 137	Codex, the collection published under Justinian's leadership

⁴ The Monuments of Georgian Law 1965-1985.

⁵ The Monuments of Georgian Law 1965-1985.

⁶ Gabidzashvili et al. 1975.

⁷ Giunashvil, Gabidzashvili and Dolakidze 1972.

Latin	Georgian	Source	Meaning (in Georgian context)
Commonitorium	komonitori	NC 180,1	Reminding letter
Curator	kuratori	NC 180, 1,	Caretaker
Digesta	digestoni	NC Sch. 137	Digests, collection published by Justinian in 533
Domesticus	demestikosi/ demestlikosi	Typicon of Petritsoni	Ruler, helmsman
Famosus	famoi	NC 183.4	Libellous letter, slanderous information
Institutio	institutionni	NC Sch. 136	Institutions, manual of Legal Systematic Course published by Justinian in 533
Legatum	lighati	NC 137, 16	Addition to the Book of Will
Libellus	liveloni	NC 136	Superscription, signboard, official announcement
Mandator	mandaturi	Shiomgvimi- 1072	Organizer of ceremonies at Royal Court
Privatus	privati	NC 179, 4	Emperor's private property

The article does not allow us to present the contexts and citations of all the terms provided in the texts, which contain interesting material in many respects, but we would still like to draw the reader's attention to a number of cases.

The fact that the abovementioned terms are encountered for the first time in the Georgian legal realm is primarily proved by the argument that they are, as a rule, accompanied with rather detailed explanations in their sources. For example, the scholia of the *Nomocanon* explain not only meanings of the terms, but point out their etymology too: "Kodikoi is a Roman word and it is the name of the documents and laws promulgated by the Royal persons and clergy and is divided into separate books for their plentitude, the parts and the chapters of which are devoted to different issues"(NC Sch. 137); "*Digeston* is the name of a Roman book of the greatest sages like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and also the *Book of Civil Laws* and the

shortened version of a book with many parts, each part of which belongs to a separate person" (NC. Sch. 137).

The thing that the term "Roman" really denotes here Roman and Latin (and not Byzantine, as this is the case in some passages of the *Life of Kartli* as S. Khaukhchishvili explains in his dictionary)⁸ is proved from the very scholia of the *Nomocanon*, which clarifies that "These are the names of Roman, currently the civil books known among Greeks" – where from the chronological sequence – Roman – Greek – is clearly seen.

What is the way of borrowing these terms? At the first glance is quite evident that this Latin law terminology enters in Georgian from the Greek language. Let's compare the forms:

Georgian	Greek	Latin
„დიგესტონი“ [digestoni]	Διγέστων	Digesta
„ინსტიტუტიონი“ [institutioni]	Ινστιτουτίων	Institutio
„კომონიტორი“ [komonitori]	Κομμονιτώριον	commonitorium
„ლიველონი“ [liveloni]	Λίβελλον	Libellus

Worthy of note also is the way of reading the "B" as the "V" in the term "libellus" – "liveloni," which is characteristic of the Greek of Byzantine period. We have the analogous case in the terms: "privati" (πριβάτος) and "lighati" (λιγάτος) to which "G" into "gh" had been transferred. At the same time, the fact that some Latin legal terms borrowed through Greek are erroneously represented in Georgian as compared with Greek, is also important.

Having these two factors in mind we can assume that transfer of Latin legal terms from Greek into Georgian happened not in written way, but verbally.

We encounter partial confirmation of our point of view in I. Javakhishvili's explanation with regard to the term "kodikoi" provided in the *Nomocanon*. "The word is Latin" – he says, – "(codex). Codex represents a borrowed Greek form; it is probable that it is a verbally transferred word."⁹

⁸ Khaukhchishvili 1955, 417.

⁹ Javakhishvili 1984, VI, 30.

It is interesting that in the legal monuments of the 11th-12th centuries we encounter proper names connected with Roman law. These are:

1. Augustus, G. Julius Caesar Octavianus (“Avgvistos” *Writing of the Monument for Ruisi-Urbnisi Convention* (1103) (MGL, III, 125) – Octavian Augustus, initiator of a whole number of laws.
2. Iustinianus (“Iustiniane,” *Minor Nomocanon*, 18) – Iustinian I, person who strove for the revival of Roman law, with Hellenic and Christian tinge. The Codex, Digest, and Institutes have been put together under his orders.

I would like to specially dwell on the form “Avgvistos,” which Arsen Monk (of Ikalto), the author of the *Writing of the Monument*, used to evaluate David the Builder. Arsen Monk notes that king David was “aggrandizer of the owned (i.e. the authority and power, expander of the domain E. K.), (he was distinguished E. K.) as befits “Avgvistos” Caesar.” (*Writing of the Monument for Ruisi Urbnisi Convention* (1103) GML, III, 125).

It is noteworthy that “Avgvistos” and the adjectival form “Avgvistiani” derived from it are encountered as an epithet in the Georgian literature of this period a number of times. They are frequently used in *The Life of Kartli* to characterize Georgian sovereigns.¹⁰

This enables us to discuss the terms confirmed in the monuments of Georgian law in the general cultural context of that epoch. As an initial conclusion one can say that the Latin legal terminology confirmed in the Georgian legal monuments of the 11th-12th centuries is fully borrowed from Greek. It seems that some part of it has been received not in written, but in verbal form.

I think that this fact is totally natural, considering that the case concerns the Ecclesiastical law of the 11th-12th centuries the greater part of norms of which had been introduced via Greek language predominantly – orally. Naturally, this used to engender some imprecision, which was noted by Giorgi Mtatsmindeli in his time, who tried to stamp out this flaw by translating spiritual literature and promoting education.¹¹

¹⁰ www.classicaltradition.tsu.ge

¹¹ Kekelidze and Baramidze 1987, 99, 113.

B) THE 18TH-19TH CENTURIES

From the 12th century till the second half of the 18th century, against the background of Mongolian, Turkish and Persian domination, the link of Georgian law with European law had been weakening and, correspondingly, the inflow of Latin terms into Georgian legal space was hampered, or one can say – was totally ceased. Georgia's approximation to Russia opened up the door for the influx of a new wave of information on the European law and facilitated entry of Latin terms established in the European law into the legal monuments of Georgia.

I will provide a number of important examples.

1. Appellatio [apelatsia] (*Law Pr. Dav.* C. 2,23) – lodging of claim against the court verdict with the higher instance.¹²
2. Articulus [artikuli] (*The Tractate on Kartl-Kakheti Kingdom Entering Protectorate of Russia*) [GML, II, 478] – referring to the law, interim court decision.
3. Caeremonia [tseremonia], (*Decreeing on King Erekle's Burial Service* (1798) [GML, II, 534] – some event held ceremoniously and the rule of its staging.
4. Candidatus [kandidati] (*Law Pr. Dav.* 6.8) – a person nominated for election or appointment to a state or private organization.
5. Classis [klasi] (*Law Pr. Dav.* 238) – layer of population.
6. Collegium [koleghia] (*The Tractate on Kartl-Kakheti Kingdom Entering Protectorate of Russia* (1783) GML, II, 460] – a group of officials.
7. Deputatus [deputati] (*The Rule of Supreme Court of Megrelia* – 1856 [GML, VIII, 815] – a member of the state legislative or other representative body elected by population.
8. Generalis [ghenerali] (*Law Pr. Dav.* 144) – the highest military rank;
9. Gubernator [gubernatori] (*Law Pr. Dav.* C. 16) – governor, ruler.
10. Imperator [imperatorii] (*Solomon I's Book of Donations to the Mother of God of Kutaisi* (1777) [GML, VII, 429] – emperor, ruler.
11. Imperium [imperiisa, imperia] (*Law Pr. Dav.* C. 1) – empire, monarchy, which is headed by an emperor.

¹² Purtseladze 1964.

12. Investitura [investituris, investitura] (*The Tractate on Kartl-Kakheti Kingdom Entering Protectorate of Russia* (1783) GML, II, 464) – delegation of land or position, accompanied by a relevant ceremony during the middle ages.
13. Pensio [pentsiai] (*Law Pr. Dav.* 97) – monetary help.
14. Procurator [prokurori] (*Law Pr. Dav.* C, 8 (3)).
15. Senatus [senati] (*Law Pr. Dav.* 5).

As we see, the legal terminology of Latin provenance, which starts to appear in Georgian legal monuments on the verge of the 18th-19th centuries, mainly reflects those regulations and positions, which were established within the boundaries of Russian empire (in this period appear also: mediator, memoria, minister...). It is also evident, that because of this reason the Georgian terms are composed in accordance with Russian transcription and form, e.g.:

Latin	Russian	Georgian
Articulus	артикуль [artikul]	არტიკული [artikuli]
Caerimonia	церемония [tseremonija]	ცერემონია [tseremonia]
Candidatus	кандидат [kandidat]	კანდიდატი [kandidati]
Classis	класс [klas]	კლასი [klasi]
Imperium	империя [imperija]	იმპერია [imperia]

Unlike the previous period, the etymology of Latin legal terms in the Georgian legal monuments of this epoch, as a rule, is not pointed out. The only exception is the word appellation, which first appears in the source the *Book of Law of Prince David*, where it says: "The word appellation is French, which in our language means lodging a complaint in the supreme places" (*Law Pr. Dav.* C 2. 23). Coming out from the reality that the word "French" has a number of meanings in the lexis of that period (French, Catholic, foreign), this phrase, provided in the *Book of Law of Prince David*, can be understood in different ways. It is possible that here reference is made to the way the word "appellatio" entered the Russian language (from French appellation). But if we base ourselves on other meanings, it is not ruled out that "foreign," "Catholic" (i.e. Latin) origins of the word are meant here.

I am more in favor of the second version and, at the same time, note that Prince David, this highly erudite man, could not have thought that the word “appellatio” had French etymology. It is impossible to think that he did not know the fact that the term “appellatio” had already been established in Roman law and meant lodging a claim against the verdict reached by a magistrate or court with the body of higher instant.

Thus, at the turn of the 18th-19th centuries Georgian legal monuments clearly reflect the reality, which existed in the political life of the country. I would like to note that the *Book of Law of Prince David*, which sets as its goal harmonization of the Georgian law with the law of the civilized Western world of that time, even through Russian, could not be practically implemented. It, due to understandable reasons, became a theoretical work and unrealizable dream for the country, which had turned into a Russian colony and had not even managed to have the laws written in its native language till the 20th century.

At the same time this period became a preparatory stage in terms of working out the principles for formulating legal terms and, in our case, the Latin legal terminology in Georgian – this is substitution of *via Graeca* established in the 11th-12th centuries by new way of borrowing, *via Russica*, which first and foremost was predetermined by political reasons.

C) THE PERIOD OF THE FIRST GEORGIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC (1918-1921)

Despite the fact, that legal monuments of this period, due to well-known reasons, are very few, they still show a number of important Latin legal terms, among which:

1. Constitutio [konstitutsia] (Article VIII of the Constitution of Georgia)¹³ – Constitution, the main law of state having the supreme legal power.
2. Declaratio [deklaratsia] (The Act of Independence of Georgia, 1918, addendum V) – International act, which strengthens general principles and tasks of international relations.

The way of borrowing these terms is evidently through Russian again, as these terms newly introduced into Georgian law circulated much earlier in the 18th-19th century Georgian press, writing and at the same time, the

¹³ “The Constitution of Georgian Democratic Republic of 21 February, 1921.” In *The 26th May of 1918 Act of Georgian Independence, 21 February, 1921, Constitution of Georgian Democratic Republic*, edited with a preface by Giorgi Papuashvili. Batumi 2009.

way of forming them was clearly traditional – it repeated the previous period. It is quite natural that this tendency became stronger during the next period.

D) THE SOVIET PERIOD (1921-1919)

As distinct from the II part of the 19th century, the law of Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic, even though trapped in the Soviet legal space, existed in the national language but should be emphasized that it was mainly translated from the Russian language. The issue which interests us – importation of Latin terminology into the Soviet Georgian legal language, offers us important material. More than 100 terms of Latin origin enter Georgian law of this period, naturally from the Russian language sources and in traditional Russian mold. I will list a number of them: abortus [aborti], acceptus [aqtsepti], accreditatio [akreditatsia], alimentum [alimenti], assignatio [asignatsia], cassatio [kasatsia], certification [sertifikatsia], codification [kodifikatsia], compensation [kompensatsia], confiscation [konfiskatsia], convention [konventsia], demunicipalisatio [demunitsipalizatsia], denationalisatio [denatsionalizatsia], directivus [direqtiva], discriminatio [diskriminatsia], expertus [eqsperti], falsification [falsifikatsia], fictio [fiqtisia], instantia [instantsia], internationalis [internatsionaluri], interpellation [interpelatsia], iurisprudentia [iurisprudentsia], iustitia [iustitsia] and many others.

It is noteworthy, that for producing an adjectival form of the term Georgian suffixes are added to Latin base, which is done in analogy with Russian:

Latin	Russian	Georgian
Criminalis	Криминальный [kriminal-ni]	კრიმინალური [kriminal-uri]
Internationalis	Интернациональный [internatsional-ni]	ინტერნაციონალური [internacional-uri]
Commercialis	Коммерческий [kommerche-ski]	კომერციული [kommerci-uli]

Coming out from the fact that the majority of terms was already known for the pre-Soviet Russian legislation and the 18th-19th century Georgian society, the meaning of the terms, despite their appearance in the Geor-

gian legal space for the first time, has not been explained, unlike the previous period.

Only the terminology, newly appearing in the Soviet and through it the Georgian law, is accompanied with the relevant comments, e.g.:

- *Alimentum* [*alimentum*] (Georgian SSR Civil Law Procedural Code, 1924, Part II, Article X, 102) – “for the case, which concerns demanding means of livelihood (*alimony*) for wife in need and unable to work and for a child.”
- *Certificatio* [*sertifikatsia/sertifikati*] (Decree N120 of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian SSR – 1983, Chron. Col. III, 334)¹⁴ – “prohibit renting of houses and facilities to the holiday makers without the relevant permits (*certificates*) of the local resort bureaus.”
- *Confiscatio* [*confiscatsia*] (Decree N17, 6th April of 1921, Acts 1922-1978, 31)¹⁵ – “the land committees effect land seizure (*confiscation*).”
- *Expertus* [*expertum*] (Civil Procedural Code of Georgian SSR, 1922, Chapter 122) – “the court, on its own, or on the demand of one of the parties or due to the proving documents presented can carry out necessary checking action: inspect the place, invite knowledgeable persons (*experts*).”
- *Falsificatio* (*Med. Lat.*)¹⁶ [*Falsifikatsia*] (The Criminal Code of Georgian SSR, 1924, Article 196) – “falsification, changing of the appearance and the qualities of such things, which are sellable or usable by public, also selling of these things for cheating purposes.”
- *Actio* [*aktsia*] (The Civil Code of Georgian SSR, 1923, 322) – “shareholding collective is considered such a collective (*society*) [...] the capital of which is divided into an equal part of a definite number (*share*) and whose liabilities are paid for only by the *society* property.”

It is noteworthy that Latin legal terms introduced into the Georgian legal space during the Soviet epoch had played a great role in working out Georgian legal terminology; they paved the way for the general principles of formation of Latin terms during later period.

¹⁴ Chronological Collection of Georgian SSR Laws, of the Orders of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Government’s Decrees of Georgian SSR, Tbilisi, vol. I-VII, 1959-1978.

¹⁵ Collection of the Constitutional Acts of Georgian SSR 1921-1978, Tbilisi 1983.

¹⁶ It has been confirmed for the legal terminology created in Latin of middle centuries (Du Cange et al. 1954).

Based on these principles, Latin legal terms formed under the influence of Greek language at the first stage (11th-12th centuries), had finally become supplanted with the new forms imported from different languages, tailored to Russian mold.

E) ACTIVE LEGISLATION

At the backdrop of harmonization of Georgian legislation with the law of European countries Latin and Latinate terms are adopted apparently in the Russian mould. During this period the following terms were incorporated: *accessorius* [aqtsesoruli], *alumnus* [alumna], *amicus curiae* [amicus kurie], *beneficiarius* [benefitsiari], *bonitas/-tatis* [boniteti], *bonus* [bonusi], *compromissum* [kompromisi], *concessio* [kontsesia], *consensus* [konsensusi], *cooptatio* [kooptatsia], *delimitatio* [delimitatsia], *discretio* [diskretesia], *emancipatio* [emansipatsia], *emissio* [emisia], *fiducia* [fidutsiaruli], *fractio* [fraqtzia], *investor* [investori], *identification* [identifikatsia], *implementation* [implementatsia], *insignia* [insignia], etc.

Let's see the meanings of these terms in Georgian laws: *accessorius* [Aqtsesoruli]¹⁷ – “the right, which is connected with another right so, that it cannot even exist without it;” *alumnus* [alumni]¹⁸ – “a graduate of an educational program;” *amicus curiae* [amicus curie]¹⁹ – “friend of court;” *beneficiarius* [benefitsiari]²⁰ – “a person in whose favor the trusted property is managed, a person receiving benefit;” *bonitas* [boniteti] (Civil Code of Georgia, 1997, 874 (4) Paragraph) – “indicator of profitability of a bank account;” *bonus* [bonusi] (Georgian Law on the Rule of Issuing Concessions to Foreign Countries and Companies, 1994, 15th Article) – “the sum paid by investor on the basis of an agreement signed with the state;” *clausula* [klauzula] (Decision of the First Board of the Georgian Constitutional Court N1/3/136, 2002, Paragraph 12) – “legal guarantees given to foreign investors by the state;” *coalitio* [coalitsia] (Georgian Organic Law on the Elections to the Georgian Parliament, 1995, 21 (2) Paragraph) – “union of states, political parties;” *collisio* [collizia] (Georgian Law on International Private Law, 1998 32 (1) Paragraph) – “conflict, confrontation, clash;” *con-*

¹⁷ Civil Code of Georgia. 153 (1) Paragraph. 1997.

¹⁸ The Order of the Georgian Minister of Education and Science N184/6. 2011. (I) Paragraph.

¹⁹ Criminal Procedural Code of Georgia. 55 Clause. 2009.

²⁰ Georgian Organic Law on Georgian National Bank. 53 (1) (b) Paragraph. 1995.

sensus (consensus, Order of the President of Georgia N358, 1998 4th (15) Paragraph] – “rule of reaching a decision, during which the decision is considered reached, if none of the persons partaking of the decision making process comes out against the decision;” *lustratio* [*lustratsia*],”²¹ etc.

During this period, which is quite important, and this tendency becomes stronger in the 21st century, Latin legal terminology enters from the laws of Western countries in the forms established therein (mostly German and Anglo-Saxon law), which is a deviation from the monolingual picture existing during previous periods.

As an example we will provide a term “*Amicus Curiae*” [*amikus kurie*]; already during the Roman Law the term had a concrete function and it denoted the so called “Friend of the court.” This was a person, who on his own initiative offered the court information concerning laws and other aspects and by this he helped justice to be exercised during court cases.

This term was established in the active legislation in 2009, in the Criminal Procedural Code of Georgia (Paragraph 55), with the relevant explanation – “an interested person who is not a party to a criminal case under review, may, at least five days before a hearing on the merits of the case, submit to court in writing his/her own written opinion with regard to this case.”

What was the road that this term took before appearing in Georgian law? The term used in medieval Roman law in the 9th century first becomes established in English law and later emerges in the legislations of other European countries too.

Later “*Amicus Curiae*” appears in the Common law and today it is used by the European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the European Union. At the same time, it appears also in the rulings of the US Supreme Court.²² It is namely the European Court wherefrom this term was received.

CONCLUSION

Generally, on the basis of the study of the Latin legal terms incorporated into the active legislation I can conclude that while incorporating Latin legal terms into Georgian law, in comparison with the previous four peri-

²¹ Decision of Georgian Parliament about Creating the Provisional Commission for the Mechanism of Lustration. 1998.

²² United States Supreme Court Rule, 37 3 (a).

ods unveiled by us, disruption of the monolingual picture of borrowing has been underway, the avenues by which these terms are received have expanded and the way of their formation has changed too.

It is hard to say what direction Georgian law will take in the future in borrowing Latin-based legal terminology or to which avenue of reception it will attach primacy.

Though it is obvious that despite the fact that Georgia was never under the ruling of the Roman Empire, and that—based on concrete examples — Latin legal terms never entered Georgian law directly from Roman law or from the Latin language, from as early as the 11th century these terms had a significant impact on the creation of Georgian legal terminology. Overall, they greatly contributed to bringing Georgian law closer to Western legal culture.

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aleksidze, Levan, Iamze Gagua, Maia Danelia, Ekaterine Kobakhidze and Nino Rukhadze. 2015. *Latinuri iuridiuli Terminologia* [Latin Legal Terminology]. Tbilisi: Meridiani.

Du Cange, Charles du Fresne, Léopold Favre, Johann Christoph Adelung, Pierre Carpenter and Louis G. A. Henschel. 1954. *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*. Vol. I. Niort: L. Favre.

Gabidzashvili, Enriko et al., eds. 1975. *Didi sjuliskanoni* [The Nomocanon]. Tbilisi: Science.

Giunashvil, Elguja, Enriko Gabidzashvili and Manana Dolakidze, eds. 1972. *Mcire sjuliskanoni* [The Minor Nomocanon]. Tbilisi: Science.

Javakhishvili, Ivane. 1984. *Šhromebi* [Works]. Vol. VI. Tbilisi

Kekelidze, Korneli and Aleksandre Baramidze, eds. 1987. "Giorgi Mtsire. *Giorgi Mtacmindelis C'xovreba*" [Giorgi Mtsire, Life of Giorgi Mtatsmindeli]. In *Georgian Classical Literature II*. Tbilisi: Nakaduli.

Khaukhchishvili, Simon, ed. 1955. *K'art'lis c'xovreba* [The Life of Kartli]. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.

Purtseladze, David, ed. 1964. *Samart'ali Davit Batonišvilisa* [The Law of Prince David]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

The Monuments of Georgian Law [K'art'uli samart'lis dzeglebi]. 1965-1985. Edited by Isidore Dolidze. Vols. I and II. Tbilisi: Academy of Sciences of the Georgian Soviet Republic.