Neli Makharadze (Tbilisi)

THE ARABISMS OF GREEK-GEORGIAN TRANSCRIPTIONAL MANUSCRIPT FROM LEBANON

The Greek-Georgian transcriptional manuscript from Lebanon became known to us from the list made in 1953 by Shalva Vardidze, the Georgian scholar and priest. Later the list was sent to Georgia as a contribution to the K.Kekelidze Institute of Manuscripts and is kept there as manuscript Q-1477. Sh. Vardidze discovered the original of the list under number 1272[1] in the book depository of the monastery of Our Saviour located in the mountains near the town Saidi. As the copyist notes, no one knows how the anonymous Georgian manuscript came into the monastery, according to Mr. Guram Chikovani, is of Jacobite-monophyzite confession. The manuscript dates back to 14th century, according to the paper by Sh.Vardidze himself and the head of the Beirut museum.

Lib-1272 is the orthodox liturgical collection of missals and prayer books, where Greek and Georgian passages take turns without repeating each other. Besides, the priest's and the deacon's text meant for the parish is Greek, transcribed in Georgian alphabet, while secret prayers and lections are Georgian. It is evident that the official language of those who recited the liturgy was Greek, while priesthood was Georgian.

The transcription of the Greek part of liturgy into Georgian alphabet has revealed phonetic and phonological peculiarities characteristic of the Greek papyri of Roman and Byzantine periods of Egypt[2] and those developed in the

---

[1] Hereinafter Lib – 1272
[2] See Fr. Th. Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, I, Phonology, Milano: Testi e documenti per lo studio dell ' antichita' IV. Kapsomenos, Stilianos G. Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, Heft 28.

conditions of long-term coexistence of the Greek-Coptian languages.[3] This, naturally, gives rise to the thought about the Egyptian origin of the archetype of Lebanese manuscript.

The manuscript is not the original. This is manifested first of all through such random cross-sections and junctions in the words and phrases that can be made by the copyist with a poor knowledge of the language. Secondly, it shows the layers of phonetic systems of Byzantine Greek and local phonetics belonging to different levels and circumstances, and influence of a foreign language, in addition. The manuscript is not paginated in a consecutive order. In accordance with Sh. Vardidze's pagination, it contains 145 pages written in Mkhedruli. About half of these are in Greek. Some final pages have been written in the other handwriting and on the other paper. In a word, it looks like that the manuscript "has travelled' in time and space before finding a shelter in the monastery of Our Saviour located in the mountains of Saidi. The manuscript should not belong to the period earlier than the 11th century because who has compiled the manuscript undoubtedly was using the Georgian Gospel, Apostolic, Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea in redaction of Giorgi Mtatsmindeli and was absolutely secure from the influence of the foreign language.

In the case of the transcribed text the question is posed from a different angle: the anonymous liturgist, in our opinion, uses the manuscript created by Georgians in the Coptian environment. On the basis of the linguistic data its origin can only be determined approximately, but it is hard to say where, in which monastery and for whom the Georgian priesthood served in "Coptic Greek" – whether it was the result of linguistic constraints based on the three language principle characteristic of the Eastern church or whether the parish was really Greek and Georgian. This is hardly probable after the 7-8th centuries when the Arabic expansion completely expelled Coptic, the native language of the local population, when the Christian churches and monasteries of Egypt were destroyed and monastery libraries were raided. The reign of Arabs and spread of Islam, like in many countries of the Mediterranean area, in the West and East, forced the Egyptian population to forget the native lan-

München, 1938. Mayser, Edwin. Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften, I, Laut-und Wortlehre, Leipzig, 1906, etc.

[3]   Еланская, А. И. Коптский язык, М. 1964. Till, Walter, C. Koptische Grammatik, Leipzig, 1955; Vergote, J. Grammaire copte, i. Introduction, phonétique et phonologie, Louvain, 1973; Ернштедт, П. В. Исследования по грамматике коптского языка, М. 1986. etc.

guage that has been preserved only by the Copts exiled from the native land and the Coptian Christian church.[4]

We have considered the results of Coptian-Greek interference found in the Lebanese manuscript in a special work,[5] while now we shall touch upon the peculiarities that are not reflected in the Greek material of the Byzantine period and appears sporadically in the borrowings or the foreign texts translated from Greek, including the Georgian translations. This is the pronunciation of γ in palatal position like of the Georgian ჟ [ž] as in: ჟელოვა [želova] – Γέλλοβα, პანაჟურელთაჲ [panažureltaj] – Πανηγυριστῶν, ვაჟინარი [va žinari] – βάγενι, βαγενάρι, აჟურა/აჟურაჲ [ažura/ažuraj] – ἀργύριον, ჟალია [žalia] – γιαλός and others in the Georgian manuscripts of the XI-XIII centuries.[6] Similar examples are mentioned by Al. Thumb from Armenian borrowings: mažistros (μάγιστρος – X cent), Diožjen (Διογέης, X cent), Žan – Γιάννης and others. It's difficult to say, he writes whether Armenian ž transmits Greek γ in the palatal position, but in Greek itself γ[j] > ž pronunciation really exists. I have noticed it in Mani in Pelopones.[7]

How is it reflected in Lib-1272:

It is evident from the data of the transcriptional materials that by the time it was created the spirantization process of voiced stop phonemes was completed. This is proved by the transmission of the sound expressed with β by ვ [v] or its omission in the intervocalic position.[8] Georgian is unable to reflect the pronunciation of δ of those times. But as for γ in front of back vowels and consonants the Georgian velar fricative ღ [γ] corresponds to it, while in intervocalic position it systematically disappears or merges with the following [i] vowel and is transmitted by one simple ი [i] as აიუ [aiu] – ἀγίου, პანაიას [panaias] – Παναγίας, ტრისაიონ [ṭrisaion] – Τρισάγιον, აიაზმოს [aiaz-mos] – ἀγιασμός, ღენ [lein] – λέγειν, ევლოიმენი [evloimeni] – εὐλογημένη, ომოლოისომენ [omoloisomen] – ὁμολογήσωμεν, მონოენესუ [monoenesu] - Μονογενοῦς σου, etc. in about 50 cases.

4   Хосроев А. Л., Четверухин А. С. Вводная статья, in: "Ернштедт, Исследования..., 3-51.
5   Махарадзе Н. А., Некоторые фонетические особенности греческо-грузинской транскрибиро-ванной рукописи из Ливана (XIV в.). Византийский временник, т. 47, М., 1986, 205-209.
6   see Makharadze N. A. Problems of Pronunciation of Byzantine Greek, Tbilisi, 1978, 48-49 (in Georg. language, summary in Russ).
7   Thumb, Albert. Die griechishen Lehnwörter im Armenischen: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Κοινή und des Mittelgriechischen: BZ 9 (1900), 407. idem, Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular: Grammar, Texts, Glossary, Chicago, 1964, 20.
8   e.g. ვასილია [vasilia] – βασιλεία, ევლავიას [evlavias] – εὐλαβεία, ფოვუ [povu] – φόβου, ევსეოს [evseos] – εὐσεβῶς, ანდილაუ [andilau] – ἀντιλαβοῦ (Lib – 1272) etc.

γ = ღ [γ]: აღათოს [aγatos] – ἀγαθός, აღაბი//აღაპი [aγabi//aγapi] – ἀγάπη, ღეღონდა [leγonda] – λέγοντα, მეღალუ [meγalu] – μεγάλου, ევლოღუმენ [evloγumen] – εὐλογοῦμεν, ანაღნომმა [anaγnozma] – ἀνάγνωσμα etc. The number of examples reaches 60. In γγ, γκ complexes voiced velar stop გ [g] is preserved: ანგელიკე [angelike] – ἀγγελικαῖς, ანანგის [anangis] – ἀνάγκης, ევანგელიე [evangelie] – Εὐαγγελίου etc.

In parallel to these in transcriptional materials certain peculiarity has been found which changes this picture to a certain extent. This intervocalic γ is transmitted by Georgian voiced palatal fricative ჟ [ž], in front of the [e] and [i] vowels. If this occurred in few cases, it would have different explanation, but the number of examples exceeds 40. The fact that often the same words are repeated does not change the common picture or make it more evidently expressed:

ანაჟენისი [anaženisi]	129[9]	ἀναγεννήση
აპოლოჟიან [apoložian]	oღ(26), კა(33), 78,102,132	ἀπολογίαν
აჟია [ažia]	68,69,125	ἀγία, ἀγίῳ
აჟიან [ažian]	კე(37), 101,128,132,136	ἀγίαν
აჟიასტენდონ [ažiasṭendon]	129	ἀγιασθέντων
აჟიესუ [ažiesu]	oთ(31), იჟიესუ [ižiesu]	ἀγίας σου
აჟიის [ažiis]	კჱ(34), 87	ἀγίοις
აჟიო [ažio]	68,100,130	ἀγίῳ
აჟიონ [ažion]	100, 129	ἄγιον
აჟიუ [ažiu]	102, 132	ἀγίου
მონოჟენის [monoženis]	კჳ (40)	Μονογενής
პალიჟენესიას [paliženesias]	125	παλιγγενεσίας
პროიჟიაზმენა [proižiazmena]	134	προηγιασμένα
	134	τὰ...Ἅγια τοῖς Ἁγίοις
აჟია ტის აჟიის [ažia ṭis ažiis]	oჳ (28), 87	φάγετε
ფაჟეთე [pažete]		etc.

In spite of the abundance of examples, we consider, that this is not the initial peculiarity of the transcribed material but is the result of the new environment the manuscript found itself in. Since Lib-1272 is from Lebanon, naturally Syria and Lebanon can be assumed as the new environment from

---

[9]   The pagination in Georgian alphabet starts only on the 13th page of the Lebanese manuscript and applies to ა (a) – მმ (mz). We are also giving the pages of the original counted by Sh. Vardidze that is noted in the new list. For the Greek text we are using @Ieratikovn ai} qeivai leitourgivai e[kdosi" th'" ajpostolikh'", diakoniva" th'" ejkklhsiva" th'" !Ellavdo" 1971.

where Arabic language expelled the Eastern dialect of Aramaic language – the local Syrian, like it did with the Coptian, and prevailed already from the VIII century.[10]

In the sound system of the Arabic dialect from Syria-Lebanon, as well as in the sound system of many contemporary Eastern Arabic dialects, the existence of reflex ž[11] of the common Arabic /ǧ/ or as of phoneme /ž/, or as of the phonetical version, is typical. But it becomes evident from the works of the medieval Arabic phoneticians (VIII-XIII) that the formation of disaffricatization of /ǧ / and formation of the voiced palatal is not the newly developed phonetic process for all regions. It was considered already by Sibawajhi (VIII cent.), Zamakhshari (XI cent.) and others.[12]

After the Koran language became the literary language, the observation of the purity of language in the Arabic world acquired the nature of religious fanaticism and the Arabic grammarians discussed not only the differences between the literary and colloquial languages, but in the phonetic system they even singled out the sounds the pronunciation of which was unacceptable in "the subtle speech". Besides the main 35 consonants in the language there were eight more consonants that in fact existed in the language and only two of them were compromised: ŝ similar to ǧ and s similar to z". According to Karl Vollers' identification, ŝ similar to ǧ is ž.[13] But there is a restriction here as well: ž is considered as an acceptable version like the reflex of S, received as a result of assimilative vocalization while as spirant version of ǧ, it is un-

---

[10] It has been preserved as the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Malula (Malūla). Церетели К. Г. Арамейский язык (Новоарамейский) in: Языки Азии и Африки, IV, 1, М. 1991, 233-238.

[11] It is characteristic of the dialects of Magrib- Morocco, Tunisia, Mauritania, South-Eastern Algeria . . . as well as of the dialects of Eastern Ethiopia, Cypress, Southern Messopotamia – Iraq, Khuzistan, Turkey… it appears rarely in the Arabic dialect of Egypt as well (mainly in the borrowings). Researchers often name it among "the new phonemes" along with p, v, ts, č: Шарбатов, Г. Ш. Арабский литературный язык, современные арабские диалетки и региональные обиходно-разговорные языки. in: Языки Азии..., 250-282. Старинин, В. П. Эфиопский язык, ibid, 331-337. See also Завадовский, Ю. Н. Арабские диалекты Магриба, М., 1962, 20-41: Van Ess, J.M.A. The spoken arabic of Iraq, London, 1956; Cowell, M. W. A Reference Grammar of Syrian Arabic, Washington, 1964; Bruce Ingham, The Dialect of Midān or "Marsh Arabs" (in: Proceedings of the Third International Conferance AÏDA, Malta, 2000), 125-135; Жордания А. Г. Сопоставительный анализ Восточно-арабских диалектов немагрибского типа (египетский, чадский и суданский диалекты), Автореферат докторской диссертации, Тб., 1999, 8-13; Baruch Podolsky, Historical Phonetics of Amharic, Tel-Aviv, 1991, 20. etc.

[12] J. Cantineau, Études de Linguistique Arabe, Paris, 1960, 63. Gobronidze M. G. The Main Arabic Phonetic Theories of the Middle Ages,, 1980, 28 (in Georgian language, summary in Russ).

[13] Gobronidze, The Arabic..., 28; K. Vollers, Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alter Arabien, Strassburg, 1906, 10.

acceptable. Hence, there are two possible ways for the formation of ŝ.[14] The discourse is about the peculiarity of Tamim, the Old Eastern Arabic dialect.

When arguing about the people speaking the Central Asian Qashqa-Daria dialect, Guram Chikovani draws attention the toponym Žīnāw (= Ǧynau) which is explained on the basis of the Syrian dialect and means "we have come" – žīnā. The scholar assumes from this and some other data, that the part of the ancestors of the Arabians from Jejnau could have originated from Syria. They presumably could have settled here in the VII-X centuries.[15]

The juxtaposition of the Arabic dialect of Egypt and literary Arabic created bilingualism (and in many cases tri-lingualism) for the population of Egypt and other conquered countries which has not been overcome as of yet. The degree of acquisition of literary language would naturally vary in accordance with the level of education and personal capabilities, but the colloquial language was common for all at least within the borders of a single region. They naturally influenced each other in the conversation of the bilingual people and this could be the reason for the existence of such parallel forms in the old Georgian manuscripts created in the Sinai and Palestine educational and monastery centers. E.g. აჴიოს [ağios] // აგიოს [agios], ევლოჯიტოს [euloǧ itos] and ევლოგიტოს [evlogitos].[16]

When we considered from this view-point the material from Sinai and Palestine, we explained the გ[g] equivalent for γ as the preservation of the tradition and the slowed process of the spirantization of voiced stops, which was at the same time expressed by β – ბ[b] equivalent in all the positions.[17] It should be underscored, that this process runs in the conditions of the Arabic bilingualism.[18]

The trace of this phenomenon can be registered in some cases from the Lebanese manuscript when in parallel of the transcriptional versions for γ we have გ [g] and ჯ [ǧ].

γ = გ[g], positions has no significance:

გის [gis]	61,116	γῆϛ
გრიგორუ [grigoru]	140,142	Γρηγορίου
ევანგელიონ [evangelion]	ꙥ(20)	Εὐαγγέλιον
ლოგონ [logon]	97	Λόγον

---

[14] Comp. Cantineau, Etudes . . .26; 56-54.
[15] Chikovani G, The Qashqa-Daria Arabic Dialect of Central Asia (Phonology, Grammar, Voca-bulary) Tbilisi, 2002, 30-31; 192-193 (in Georgian language, Summary in Engl.).
[16] Makharadze N. Problems... 46.
[17] Makharadze N. Problems... 27-28: აბუსოს [abusos] – ἄβυσσος, ასების [asebis] – ἀσεβεῖϛ, ბატოს [batos] – βάτος, ეპების [epebis] – ἐπέβης etc.
[18] Makharadze N. Problems... 53.

მეგა [mega]	8(19), 8(20), 67,68	μέγα
მეგალომარტიროს [megalomartiros]	141	μεγαλομαρτύρων
მეგალონ [megalon]	140	μεγάλων
მეგალოპრეპეს [megaloprepes] ო(21),	69,99,139	μεγαλοπρεπές
ორგის [orgis]	ინ(25)	ὀργὴς

γ = ჯ[ǧ] only in front of the [i] and [e] vowels:

დემიურჯისას [demiurǧisas]	139	δημιουργήσας
ევანჯელიონ [evanǧelion]	69	Εὐαγγέλιον
ორჯის//ორღის [orǧis//orɣis]	75, დ(14)	ὀργὴς
ჯორჯიუ [ǧorǧiu]	141	Γεωργίου

As for γ = ჲ[ž] pronunciation, we assume it is the conversational peculiarity of the Greek dialect spread in the territory of Syria and Lebanon, has systemic character and should not be considered as the peculiarity in just the Georgian manuscript accidentally reflected owing to the affect of local Arabic speech. It is noteworthy, that in Greek, as we saw, this phenomenon occurred only in the position acceptable for its phonetic structure, i.e. in front of [i] and [e] vowels. In other cases it can be explained by analogy or the sporadic manifestation in the individual speech although disaffrikatization of /ǧ/ phoneme and the development of its voiced fricative ž is the process typical for many languages and dialects.[19]

The peculiarity registered by Al. Thumb in 1900 in Pelopones have been approved by the later descriptions of the Greek dialects, but it is interesting, that ž consonant from the sequence γ +[i], γ +[e] seems least to be developed as a result of γ [j]>ž process. In Cypress and on some off-shore islands of Asia Minor the [ž] is the allophone of /z/ in the palatal position.[20] ζ+□j: μαζjà, ἔζjεν, μαζjώνω, βυζjà, ζjω > ζῶ...[21] In Pontian appears in the ä and ω pre-vowel position: τραπέζ´ > τραπέζα, τοποὺζ > τοπούζα... In the same

---

[19] Including the Kartvelian languages and dialects. The linguist A. Lomsadze gives a lot of such examples in his work: "Dezafrikatization (spirantization) in the Kartvelian languages: ჯ[ǧ] > ჲ[ž]". დაჟდა [dažda] <დაჯდა [dağda], დაჟერება [dažereba] < დაჯერება [dağereba] (Racha, Lechkhumi, Achara); გაჟანჟყალება [gažanžɣaleba] < გაჯანჯɣალება [gağanǧ-ɣaleba] (Gurian), ჟამ [žam] < ჯამი [ǧami] (Ingiloian), Svanian ჟეɣ [žeɣ] < ჯეɣ [ǧeɣ] etc. see in the collection "Arnold Chicobava – 100", Proceedings of the International symposium, 1998, 58-69 (in Georgian language).

[20] When describing the dialects the specialists transfer ž consonant with [ζ] transcription, while ǧ with [ντζ]. ντ=[d], ζ = [z].

[21] Χριστού Γ. Παντελίδου, Φωνητική των νεοελληνικών ιδιωμάτων Κύπρου, Δωδεκάνησου και Ικαρίας, Αθήναι. 1929, 8; 41. Κυριάκου Χατζηιωάννου, Γραμματική της ομιλουμένης κυπριακής διαλέκτου με ετυμολογικό προσάρτημα, Λευκωσία 1999, 9.

dialect σμ transfers into ζμ complex: κόζμα (κόσμος), δέζμα (δέσμ΄ = ἠδ-
ύσμος).[22]

In Tsakonian the sequence ρ+j is the point of departure: ρι>ρj>ζ:
ἔρια>ἔρja>ἔζα, κάρυα>κάρja>κάζα, μουλάρι>μουλάζι etc. Later the pro-
cess covered other positions as well: δρυμὺς> ζυμό [žumo].[23]

For today it is hard to determine whether these changes are the regular re-
sult of the phonetic processes running inside the dialects or of the age-long
coexistence and interference of foreign languages (Arabic, Turkish).[24] In any
case, in the presented data of the Lib-1272 manuscript can to a certain extent
be explained by the influence of the Arabic dialect of Syria and may point to
one local peculiarity of the Greek language spread in that region in the middle
ages.

---

[22] Δ. Η. Οικονομίδου, Γραμματική της ελληνικής διαλέκτου του Πόντου, Ακαδημία
Αθηνών. 1958, 95.

[23]
In Tsakonian υ=ου or ιου. Θανάση Π. Κωστάκη, Σύντομη γραμματική της τσακωνικής
διαλέκτου, Αθήνα, 1951, 33-34; 44.

[24] As the specialists point out, the Arabic dialect of the Cypress is connected with the Lebanese.
A. Lekiashvili, Arabic language, I, Tbilisi. 1977, 20-21 (in Georg. language).