

# Vocabulary Denoting Hearing-Perception in Georgian Language

Ketevan Mirzakashvili

In any culture the auditory hearing-perception is rather important for every human being and its understanding even in cases when he/she does not use appropriate scientific terminology. However, the existence of terms in a language shows the actual approach with respect to this issue by this or that society. All people perceive and understand the surrounding world, it is important to determine how conscious is the process of understanding, which, in our opinion, should be clearly visible in language and words of expressive concept (until they are established as terms).

In all languages perception-cognition would have appeared later, but the concepts and their semantic scope should have been there at the very beginning of the languages, since hearing-understanding is universal phenomenon in both public and linguistic terms. Each living being either hears or does not hear, but how it hears is subjective and will carry us onto the next stage. Hearing does not necessary mean understanding and moreover perception-knowledge, correspondingly perception-cognition on the level of language may not be universal, and requires a proper examination.

This could be explained by the fact that human being easily keeps the necessary information in an oral form and overcomes by means of words the time distance... What we remember, sometimes do not correspond exactly with a precision to the facts, because memory stores information in the verbal form and words cannot always accurately reflect the situation [Gamkrelidze 2003:485].

We know that language is neither a photo nor copy of reality. To put it more precisely, each language is different, they are a different type of "Video-recording" of reality and, therefore, no language gives an ideal and adequate perception of the world.

Otherwise, every language has its own logic; all of them are correct, but radically different from each other, although subject to logic and reflecting the truth. Not only can language express the logic, but also seek linguistic aspects in logic, because language is a tool of thought.

If we bring the concept of aim-intention, then we will not talk about the universal structure, but about the universal task-target, which each language faces and that cannot be solved only through structural analysis.

Universalities and Universal approaches should be distinguished from one another. The universal conditions of speech process can be ascertained by the psychologists, or at least seek, but she/he will gain more profit if takes into account linguistic motivation. The variety of usage is a very striking fact and can be clearly seen while mastering a foreign language, when we unconsciously compare it to our mother tongue, and much of this is why are we surprised [Ramishvili, 1995:69-70].

In the searching or determining the meaning of any word outer factors should definitely be taken into consideration, which is revealed by the study of phrases and by the study of psychological analysis of human behaviour.

Also we should not forget the comparisons between concepts, because in different languages the notion might be included in certain area and may not necessarily coincide with the semantic meaning of the other language. Coincidence is guaranteed in the case of universal categories of words and phrase denoting international or scientific terms. In spoken language complete coincidence cannot occur.

The most difficult is to monitor communications or procession of information, which occurs every day, every moment. Regarding this issue a lot of research has been carried out, but a lot is still to be explored.

Different Scientists differently address this problem, but for the linguist it is determined what does this or that concept mean in different languages, which in itself includes what it means and what is its relation towards other words. To what extent does this obtained picture coincide with the picture of the other language. What means to be alike or maybe it should be called *different*. Here psychological-philosophical relations are rather important but for linguists this is not the main determining factor.

Scientific knowledge loses its importance if the question what this or that 'word' means is being posed and moreover if we start finding out what do people mean while using the word [Вежбицка, 1993: 187-189].

Cognition is the adequate reflection of objective reality in human consciousness (it is sensible and rational).

In the theory of cognitive psychology the major problem is the finding of the prerequisites of general survey that determine the possibility of objective knowledge. What is meant under objective knowledge and what conditions does it need to make it possible? The gnoseological side of the issue is that human consciousness is capable of understanding the universe. Theory of Cognition should be distinguished from ontological and cognitive psychology, which examines the process of cognition and cognitive acts in the course of an

individual's consciousness and does not apply the relation of acts to reality, i.e. the issue of truth and untruthfulness. The theory examines the contents of the knowledge of the truth - untruthfulness, in terms of its relation to the object [Вежбицка, 1996: 237-239].

The words that we are going to discuss right now, can be seen differently in different contexts, also noteworthy is the fourth function of prefixes in Georgian language, according to which the word changes its meaning. Therefore the concepts that are rather interesting for us have a great history, deep meaning and correspondingly many interpretations. The separation of perception and knowledge, in our opinion, are the most important, but separately - we could hardly separate the semantic field or evaluate it, so we decided to discuss few words together. This was also conditioned by the fact that in the explanatory vocabulary they are being explained through one another, and this does not ease our job, on the contrary hardens it. These words are: Understanding, Awareness, and Cognition;

Understand - 1. Learn, understand something through mind,-analyse, understand, and conceive. B) Find out, c) is the same as hear. 2. Viewpoint, interpretation, scientific understanding, materialist understanding of history.

Conceives, content of something, meaning of the essence, \_ cognate, master, understand (consciousness, conscious, unconscious) [Georgian... 1985:76], [Neiman 1961:71].

*Conceives* (Sheitsnobs) – cognates the content of something, meaning of the essence; \***tsan/tsn** (\***ცან-/ცნ-**) root in Georgian has many interpretations: notify (tsn-ob-a), scientist (me-tsn-ier-i), famous (tsn-ob-il-i). These words have changed their meaning over times but have always been rather productive. In Megrelian and Lazi to this root corresponds **chin-** (ჩინ-) and means knowledge, understanding, but in Lazi additionally comes the notion of notifying-cognition. Let us analyse other words as well: elucidate (in the essence, meaning of an event), 2. Is similar to acquaintance (cognate, understand, conceived, understandable, unknown) [Georgian... 1985:500]. As mentioned above, striking are the identical definitions. At this point, these words generalized mean one thing, and in some other context may replace one another. The word understand (გაგებია) has **-g-** (-გ-) root, to which lots of words are related: to build (a-g-eb-a), to win (mo-g-eb-a), to answer (mi-g-eb-a), to lose (tsa-g-eb-a), to spread (da-g-eb-a), to line (cha-g-eb-a), to be, to exist (h-g-ie-s) [Fenrich..., 2000:129-130]. This root is also very important and meaningful Megrelian and Lazi, also in Svan a couple of meanings can be found and they are important due to their unusual diversity. Their relation is doubtless, in Georgian-Zanian union this root was expanded by the **-eb** (-ებ) mark. It cannot be either argued or anticipated, and confirmed that this root was interesting for us from the very beginning, but over the times it acquired

hearing-acquisition-understanding and then gained a deeper meaning of cognition. Nowadays out of its meaning first in importance stands cognition and then hearing-acquisition-understanding and at least interpretation, which is connected with understanding, but through a much generalized meaning, in cases when and where society has a different point of view, we are talking about the peculiar perception of different issues. According to Saba, it has no importance for us and it means "arrangement or guess" [Orbeliani, 1966:126]; Guessing means proper understanding, but is not deprived of duality. It is interesting that these root through causative production can have double meaning (understood herself/himself, made someone understand).

*Understanding* is of an identical value if generalized, they contextual interchange can sometimes occur and sometimes not. Historically, this root restores in the form of **\*gan-/gen-/gn-(\*გან-/გენ-/გნ-)** [Feinrich..., 2000:135]. In Georgian we come across it in nouns as well as in verbs: thing (sa-gan-i); I understood (she-v-i-gen); to understand (she-gn-eb-a)... In Megrelian interesting for us is the main meaning: I understand, I guess (gin-/gn-v-i-gin-en-kh)... In Lazi the equivalent can be found: to guess (gn-o-gn-u), to hear, to perceive, to receive knowledge, to cognate to feel, to notice (o-gn-ap-u). It is noteworthy that such an equivalent in Svan has not been detected [Feinrich..., 2000:135]; Nevertheless, these root is related to such important meanings that its non-existence in Svan is absolutely impossible. According to Sulkhan Saba **cognition** is explained as "understands, learns through forms" and noted "conscious, consciously" which absolutely meets the definition of these concepts nowadays. It is noteworthy, that in Saba's Epoch all the words listed above had a certain notion of meaning cognition, but only this word meant proper *cognition* that related it to conscious (they have one and the same root). The synonyms of *awareness* are *cognate, perceived*; **consciousness** is explained as follows: 1. the ability of a human's mind to reflect reality and determine her/his own position towards the outer space 2. Conscious [Georgian... 1985:539].

It is interesting that in ancient Georgian denoting this term was another root, which can be also found in the etymological dictionary. This is \*rch (\*რჩ-) which is realized as follows: I obey (v-e-rch-i), obedient (mo-rch-il-i). These words are actively used nowadays as well, but with another meaning (verchi – now means a rival; and morchili – observer of laws). In Megrelian the equivalent of this root (**rchk-/რჩქ-**) means hearing: to hear (rchk-il-a), the listener (ma-rchk-il-e). All of this makes us think that the outlined root, in which semantic shift occurred over the time, at first meant *hearing*, but in Georgian it also acquired the meaning of harking. Although, this root is still active nowadays even though it has changed its meaning, but the **\*sem-/sm (\*სემ-/სმ-)** root is of identical meaning even today and in all four Kartvelian languages is being realized by the meaning of hearing, listening [Feinrich...,2000:390,398].

From each other, of course, must be separated **hear and hearken**, the first does not necessarily mean perception, though in some cases does not eliminate it, the other only means perception; it has two meanings: 1. awareness, understanding, guessing 2. heeding, taking [Georgian... 1985:494]. Sulxan Saba defined this form otherwise; it seems that separation of the meaning of our interest occurred later because of several reasons. Earlier this word meant denunciation. But Saba has some interesting facts concerned the word **hearing**: "Let's see perceptible – words, according to week we feel and we have five senses: the second is heating, sensitive vowels, and this, which is differentiated through witticism, lateness, and greatness"[Orbeliani, 1966]. This means that heeding is not meant here, it is not perceived in a way that interests us. This in itself suggests that this concept is not so wide to understand and use, because it depends on the understanding and intensity of its usage.

There is nothing new if we say that the language involves the relationship of humans with the subjects and is aware of the process of creating subjective consciousness. The differences between the languages are not only through expression, but also from the content point. The difference between the image perspectives does not represent an obstacle for the logics, and the difference between the languages in content they see as polysemy. Differently for polysemy within a language, where the direct and indirect meanings of the word are being separated, the different meaning equivalents of one and the same word in different languages cannot be regarded as polysemy [Ramishvili, 1995:80-81]. This factor should be taken into consideration with comparing semantic concepts of different linguistic spaces. The lexis denoting cognition (it can be well seen in phraseology) can be regarded as a universal lexical background for understanding the outlined world perception and it is rather interesting to examine this subject more thoroughly.

From the words denoting understanding interesting are - takes in mind, thinks, thinks of [Georgian... 1985:68], learns [Neiman, 1961:41]; This word means the very process of understanding, of how some kind of information comes into an individual mind, how she/he cognates it and thereafter analysis it, correspondingly becoming her/his own *idea*. According to Saba this word is very characteristically described: 'minded - created mind'[Orbeliani, 1966:318]; As the etymological dictionary defines its root has connection with lots of words, but neither of them is interesting for us as they have no significant meaning in any of the Kartvelian languages.

**\*khued-khud** (\*ხუედ-/ხუდ) is the oldest root and in Georgian many meanings are connected to it, which is not only due to prefixes: to share (khuedri), to meet (she-khuedr-a), too see (m-khued-a), etc [Fenrich..., 2000:697]. It has righteous compliance with in other Kartvelian languages as well: Megrelian - to share (khvad), to meet (v-khvad-k), to understand (me-b-khvad-i), in Lazi - to meet (o-khad-u). In Lazi and Svan languages it has only

the meaning of meeting and does not include anything more, also in ancient Georgian literary works this word is only used in a sense of meeting and not understanding. It can be said that at the beginning this words had another meaning, but according to Sul Khan Saba Orbeliani, along to other definitions the meaning of understanding, cognition, guessing is also implied to this word.

We tried to differentiate the verbal forms of cognition and hearing, although in certain cases it is difficult to separate them, because in some cases their linear understanding is impossible, no matter whether it is being used within a context or without. Understanding-cognition is a theme that should be separately researched, but in this case be tried to separate **hearing and understanding**.

Talk among people is not a mere act of communication, not an exchange of information concerning subject (situation), but mutual understanding, finding consensus, evaluation or discussion about the matter of subjects... and here language is not only a transporter of sounds but an anonymous form of collective interpretation.

If our attitude towards reality as pre-scientific basis, so the logical structure of a complete mastering period, by a few mediator linguistic actions, it is clear that this class action to identify the language, according to the first, is a linguistics affair, and if linguistic factors are confirmed in behaviour and culture forms its re-activation can occur through psychological experiment, than the hypothesis concerning the structural-energetic nature of meanings, theoretically and clearly can be confirmed by an experiment [Ramishvili, 1995:88-89].

Although today Communication is not merely put in a simple scheme of "stimulus- response", thought the associative sound-conductivity scheme still defines a notion of communication... Communication, first of all, means "understanding" of the very moment. "Understanding" depends on the semantic rules. It seems that "knowledge" of these rules essentially decides the linguistic ability of collective understanding of the proper subjects. Semantic rules are linked directly to the dissecting act of situation.

We can say that the situation suggests the existence of a universal psycholinguistic approach, showing that the semantics of the same words are often ambiguous and not just mean hearing, but also include the content of concepts denoting cognition and speech.

In the formation of Culture doctrines, linguistic, as an anonymous factor, on the one hand, and moments of "cognition" on the other should be differentiated. People come across such forms of culture, which she/he is aware to be the defining ones of that, the nation's cultural and spiritual mediums, but, in

addition, she/he also meets the form, which she/he does not see as a theoretical stance toward the world. This is a historically accumulated linguistic knowledge, structured over the years, and thus, more comprehensive and "binding", which is more durable than the works of certain individuals.

It can be argued, that the position created through language is not just a theoretical position with respect to the validity of the conscious position as the collective understanding of the interpretation of the language does not mean that the word "interpretation" itself.

We can summarize that for determining the importance it is necessary to define the environment. The meaning of it is made up of the situation in which a certain speaker speaks out this or that linguistic unit and the reaction created by it in the listener. Lexical meaning of the word, defined as mental creation which reflects reality, but it also fits unreal, which is the prerogative of the human imagination. Isolation from the word goes not directly to an object, but to the concept of the subject. These relations towards isolated words potentially exist and are realized only through communication process. A single word in the process of speech has nominal function [Kakitadze, 2005:38-40]. We tested the significance of the words nominally, conceptually and substantially, but that's an inexhaustible sphere to be analysed. In the meaning of the word lexical modality also plays an important role giving emotional and stylistic significance. These include the attitude of the speaker to the subject and matter, and under stylistic significance researchers mean the speaker's reference to the situation.

Nominal analysis of the lexical units, in our opinion, creates an interesting picture of a linguistic space, and their understanding of the context and the comparison with non-related languages lexical - semantic concepts, would make it an even more diverse.

## References

Gamkrelidze T., Kiknadze Z., Shaduri I., Shengelaiia N. 2003	Course in Theoretical linguistics. Tbilisi.
Kakitadze K. 2005	A Shift in Word Meaning in Georgian. Tbilisi
Neiman A. 1961	Dictionary of Synonyms. Tbilisi
Orbeliani SS. 1961	Georgian Dictionary. I-II. Tbilisi

Ramishvili G. 1995	The Substantial Difference of Language in terms of Linguistics and Cultural Theory. Tbilisi.
Fenrich H., Sarjvelidze Z. 2000	Etymological Dictionary of Kartvelian Languages. Tbilisi
Georgian... 1985	Explanatory dictionary of the Georgian language. One volume. Edited by Arn. Chikobava. Tbilisi
Вежбицка А. 1996	Обозначения цвета и универсалии зрительного восприятия - Язык. Культура. Познание. - москва. с. 231-291
Вежбицка А. 1993	Семантика, культура и познание: общечеловеческие понятия в культуроспецифичных контекстах Thesis. - Вып. 3. - москва. с. 185-206