

One Way of Forming Hypotaxis in Zan

Author: Vianor Akhalaia

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Gori State University

Email: v.akhalaia@hotmail.com

Annotation

The examined material and the accompanying linguistic analysis—based on data from both dialects of the Zan language, Megrelian and Chan, and considered in relation to the other Kartvelian languages—allow us to formulate several general conclusions. In particular, the study traces aspects of the historical development of Kartvelian sentence structure from parataxis to the emergence of hypotaxis. Parataxis (coordination) is known to precede hypotaxis (subordination) historically, and scholarly literature correctly notes that at earlier stages complex sentences were non-hypotactic, with the relationship expressed solely through intonation. The subsequent stage is thought to involve the use of subjunctive and absolute constructions in hypotactic contexts, constructions still attested today in certain Daghestanian languages. Only later does the dependent clause become formally defined through pronominal and verbal markers. The long-standing view that all types of dependent clauses in Georgian originate from interrogative structures remains valid.

The findings presented in this study are significant primarily for understanding the early phases of hypotactic development in the Georgian languages, as well as for other Ibero-Caucasian languages, many of which lack fully developed subordinate clauses and preserve only incipient forms. In this regard, clarifying the situation in the Zan languages is especially valuable. Consequently, the issues discussed here are of broad linguistic and theoretical importance.

Key words: sentence, structure, Zan

In special literature it is indicated that "on early stage a complex sentence was conjunctionless or asyndetic, where interrelations were expressed only by intonation". (Top, 1965:7). On the following stage the intonation became marked. It is so in Zan where two interrogative particles –o (Megrelian), –l (Chan) sometimes appear as subordinative suffix. The particles –o in (Megrelian) sometimes serve as a conjunction –ni [-rom] (that). In such cases subordinate clause anticipates principal clause, ending in interrogative particle –o (Abesadze, 1963:18). The same phenomenon is observed in Chan.

First let's regard examples from Megrelian.

a) **A subordinate clause is followed by principal clause:** kars miožinu-o mudgareni kimkočaru (Khub, 311) "kars šexeda-a (=that looked), rayac mičerili akvs." Bošik ešeždo giožinu-o, kičinu ȝyabi (khub, 3424) "biči avida da šexeda-a (=rom šexeda), icon gogo". [The boy climbed and when looked, recognized a girl]. Ešmakemk gogonu-o, kalam tik agičkar (Megr., 1, p. 102) "ešmakebma štagagones-a (=rom štagagones) kalami iman agičkara" [the devils inspired you to take the pen]. Tina vardu-o, ma vogvilapen? (megr., II. P.130)". Is ar iquo-a (=ar iquo rom), me movaklevine? [Wasn't he that I made kill].

It seems -o particle form is found in another position with above-mentioned function:

B) **A subordinate clause is preceded by the principal clause.** Eper muk açažiru, čkimda kisxune-o tina? (Megr., I, p.91) "Iseti ra mogečvena, čems tavs arčie-a (=rom arčie is. [What have you seen that you prefer it than me]. Dia, koyo, demetxii, gvalo arto včkomunk-o? (megr., I, P.195) "bičos, koyo, damexsen, sul mtlad mčam-a [rom mčamo]? (=that you eat me)?" [Oh, leave me alone, the mosquito, you are eating me]. Mu ore, baba, koči xolo orkun-o? (Megr., II, p.74) "ra aris, baba, kaci kidev aklia-a (=rom aklia)? [What is it, father, that we are still short of a man]. E bošik uçuu: - kibe kuuyunia-a-v-o (Megr., II, p.14) "am bičma utxra: - kibe tu aqvso" [This boy asked if he had a ladder]. Mu reni, koičkun-o, ale-v-a? (Megr., II, p.138) "ra aris, tu ici, aleo ?" [Aleo, what is the matter, if you know?].

Particle-o from Megrelian corresponds to Old Georgian interrogative-a marker (Kipshidze, 1994:187) which is also found in Svan, e.g., merexi-a? [Are you aman?]. ([5,256]) This marker is not used in Modern Georgian, [Jorbenadze:1983] but it is found in Khevsurian, Tushian, Pshavian and is also marked by A. Shanidze us far back as in 1918 [8].

As to Gurian and Adjarian, according to K. Lomtadidze (Lomtadidze, 1946:337-345) the final vowel of the subordinate clause in final word is lengthened (Gurian rom dabrundebā... Acharian rom daacvenēn...). Analogue is found in Ingiloan (which historically must have been so) wher -a vowel which" ...can't be separated in this place as the lengthening of final vowel in Gurian-Acharian" (Lomtadidze, 1946:340) e.g. rom mobrunda-a... eum misulan-a, etc.

Thus, a conclusion is made that "in Gurian and Acharian -a must have been lost and on its basis the final vowel is lengthened. It seems as if -a represents affirmative-interrogative "ara" particle, or the part of the auxiliary verb „ara" in the function of determination (Lomtadidze, 1946:342). More reliable seems the supposition by which this -a is an interrogative particle, and in the mentioned dialects the lengthening of the final vowel expresses interrogation by intonation. "Such obstacle indicates to old tradition when simple sentences coexisted side by side and one of them i.e. the bearer of interrogation later transformed into independent sentence, a connection was elaborated in it, a note of interrogation was omitted and two sentences were joined by grammatical means – the process of subordination was finished" (Dzidziguri, 1973:448).

In Megrelian dialect of Zan along with oden-o forms of interrogative particle other subordinative particles are used, after which the function of -o together with interrogative to express subordination disappeared and in such caseit only expresses interrogation e.g. natrik kosȝ geurta-ni, mutun ȝingis vačarun-o, (Megr., I, p.39) "natvra rom kacs auxda, aravitar cignši ar ȝeria-

ə?” ...vešileben-o tik xolo memidinas -ni (Megr., II, p.162) “gana ar šeizleba-a, rom isic damekargos?” [Isn’t it possible, that he might be lost too?]. čkimi va mobay-ə du-o, šxvaši va mibziniko-ni (Kipsh., 115₁₇₋₁₈) “čemi ar meqoboda-ə, rom sxvisi ar mimematebina?” [Wasn’t it enough for myself not to add the others?], iša va gisxunan-o, dudi va diyorati-ni? (Kipsh., 116₃₋₄) “is ar girčevniat-ə tavi rom ar moitquilot?” [Isn’t it better for you not to deceive yourself?].

Thus the lengthening of the above mentioned vowel in Gurian and Acharian, preservation of interrogative particle -ə in Ingiloan, and reveal of this vowel corresponding to -o in the Megrelian dialect of Zan appear as reflection of united syntactic phenomena i.e. a united oldest means of expressing subordinate clause. Functionally such forms as rom [that], tu [if] are represented as predecessors of subordinate clause with conjunction.

Let’s regard Chan dialect of Zan. In Chan interrogative is formed by means of -l particle if interrogative sentence doesn’t contain interrogative word ([4], p.187). E.g. xoža, tokis pkveri kogipinen-i? (Chik., II, 9₂₇₋₂₈) “xoža, tokze pkvilis gapena šeizleba-ə?” [Khoja, can the flur be hanged on the rope?] Axmedi, mskveri doqvil-i-ma? (Chik., I, 96₂₃) “axmed, iremi mokali-ə-metki? [Akhmed, did you kill the deer?] ...oxorža ham čima lazuti amoešen-wife keep watch of corn in such a rain?] si xandya čumani bazariše va idi-l (Chik., II, 53₁₄) “šen dyes dilas bazarši ar caxvedi-ə?” [Didn’t you go to the market this morning?].

In interrogative words and other particles of Chan verbal forms side by side with -i- (j)-a endings -i-i(j)-ə can be found too, where -l standing between interrogative -i- and particle of the other word -(j)-ə appears as emphatic vowel (Kartozia, 1988:93): moxtes-i-a||moxtes-i-i-ə? “Have they come” ...ičinit-i-a||ičinit-i-i-ə? [Did you recognize?]

Interrogative particle -l in Chan, analogous to Megrelian -o, derives subordinate clause by “tu” (if), “rom” (that) conjunctions which can be transmitted into Georgian.

A principle clause is followed by subordinate clause, and sometimes is preceded by it: imuša rtus mextartu-i? (N. Marr, p.83) “gaemgzavrebi, rac ar unda moxdes-ə?” [Will you start all the same?]; ma qali memočkira gintur-i-a?! (Cik., I, 15₂₆) “čemtvis qeli gamogečra, gindoda-ə-o” (=rom gindodao) [Did you want to cut my throat?]; yeas mu boyodi, kogičkin-i-a? (Chik., II, 33); “imas ra uqavi, ici-a (i.e. “tu icio ?”) [what have you done with it if you know ?]. ɬonas gockenan “Kextu-i va xextu-i ? (Chik., II, 50₆) “qanas atvaliereben: “amovida-ə, ar amovida-ə, ar amovida-ə” (i.e. “tu amovida, tu ar amovida”) [They are watching the corn field if it grows or not].

Here again similar to interrogative from of -o particle in Megrelian, when in the words formed by -i particle appear other subordinate particles, -l particle expresses a kind of interrogation: si-a, ma-na giçume, va ognami-i-a? (Chik., II, 37₁₅) “šeno, me rom geubnebi, ar gesmis-a-o?! [Didn’t you hear when I’m speaking to you]; guguli nena var ogna-ša, mendulun-i?! (Chik., II, 127₉₋₁₀) “gugulis dažaxils (“sitqvas”) sanam ar gaignonebs, cava-a?! [Before you hear the nightingale call, will it go?!]; mažura kočis ucu-ki komoxtu-i-a? (Chik., II, 33₈) “meore kacs rom utxra movida-a-o? [When he told the another man, if he came?].

According to the illustrative material mentioned above the behaviour of the interrogative particle –o in Megrelian and in Chan is very similar. Both of them are able to build the construction equivalent to subordinative conjunctions “rom” [that] and “tu” [if].

But if –o naturally corresponds to interrogative –a particle in Georgian, and to –l in Chan such correspondence isn't observed in Georgian, although there is afunctional correspondence between them (Chikobava, 2008,193).

REFERENCES

1. Abesadze N. (1965) Collective works of TSU, 114, Tbilisi, (Georgian).
2. Topuria V. (1960) kartuli enis da literaturis sçavlebis sakitxebi skolaši. Tbilisi, (Georgian).
3. Kartozia G. (1988) Theses of X scientific session on dialectology. Tbilisi, (Georgian).
4. Kipshidze I. (1994) Gramatika mingrelskogo (iverskogo) yazyka. St.Petersburg.
5. Lomtavidze K. (1946) Iberian Caucasian Linguistics. Tbilisi, I.
6. Shanidze A. (1981) Kartuli enis strukturisa da istoriis sakitxebi. I, Tbilisi.
7. Chikobava A. (2008) Works, III čanuris gramatikuli analizi. Tbilisi, (Georgian).
8. Chikobava A. (1952) Introduction to Linguistics. Tbilisi.
9. Dzidziguri Sh. (1973) Kavşirebi kartul enaši. Tbilisi.
10. Jorbenadze B. (1988) The Kartvelian Languages and Dialects. Tbilisi.