



International Journal of
MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION

ISSN: (Print) ISSN 1987-9601

(Online) E ISSN 1512-3146

Journal homepage: <http://multilingualeducation.org/>

Subordinate clause with simple object hypotaxic constructions in Svan

Nato Shavreshiani

PhD in Philology
Arnold Chikobava Institute of Linguistics,
TSU; Researcher
Email: nataliashavreshiani@gmail.com

To cite this article: Nato Shavreshiani (2021) Subordinate clause with simple object
hypotaxic constructions in Svan:

International Journal of Multilingual Education, #19; pp. 8-15.

DOI: [10.22333/ijme.2021.19002](https://doi.org/10.22333/ijme.2021.19002)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.22333/ijme.2021.19002>

Nato Shavreshiani

*Arnold Chikobava Institute of Linguistics,
Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia*

The Subordinate Clause with Simple Object Hypotaxic Constructions in Svan¹

ABSTRACT

The paper presents such hypotactic constructions in Svan, where the subordinate clause is a simple object and plays the role of a simple object to any member of the principal clause, explains and clarifies the meaning of the simple object expressed by the pronoun. There is no comprehensive research on this issue in the scientific literature, where the data of all four dialects (Upper Bal, Lower Bal, Lentekhian, Lashkian) would be considered. In our study, samples of Cholur speech are also presented, which provides a basis for making quite interesting conclusions. Research has shown that in Svan there is a lot of evidence of subordinate clause with simple object complex sentences and no significant difference between dialects is observed. The results of our research are also important in terms of teaching Svan.

Keywords: Svan language, Syntax, Sentence, Construction

One group of subordinate clauses perform the syntactic function of some member, and therefore their classification and naming are identical to those members. It is in this group that subordinate clause with simple object is also considered. A subordinate clause is a simple object if it refers to and explains the simple object expressed by the pronoun in the principal clause and presents its broad version.

As it is known, simple (unmarked) object, like in Georgian, is found in four cases of Svan – in dative case, in genitive case, in instrumental case and in adverbial case (with or with no postposition), accordingly subordinate clause with simple object also explains unmarked object inserted in above mentioned cases, which is presented by pronoun in the principal clause.

Let us discuss the correlation words presented by both with and with no postposition taking into account the data of all Svan dialects, including the Cholur speech, since according to the latter, nothing has been said in the scientific literature on this issue:

ტუფ ო თხუიმ ეჩიშ ლ'ე, დერჟუა ჩუადგარი... tup i txwim ečiš l'ē, jerwāj

čwadgäri... (Shanidze, Kaldani & Chumburidze, 1978, 124) – “the skin and head are the one’s who kills”...

ალის ეჯნომ ჰედნის გუდ, ერე ჭინირ ლიყლეს ჩუ როქ ქუცე alis ežnoš qednix gud, ere činir liqlēs ču rok kuce... (Shanidze, Kaldani & Chumburidze, 1978, 180) – “they understand it by the fact that chianuri stops playing”...

ალ მაროლ მეჟარ ლგწხუაჟე ეჩოჟშ, ერ ნადარიბომ ოჯახ ქა ლახაცჷირ... al marol mewar lačxwawe ečowš, er nayariboš ožax ka laxcwir... (Shanidze, Kaldani & Chumburidze, 1978, 321) – “this man {was} very upset that he left his family because of poverty”...

ეჩაშდ ხუტეხელი ქიპარს, სი ერ სუიტრ ემგელჷრ დინარს ečašd xwetxēli kipars, si er switr emgəḷər zinars... (Lashkian, speaker O. Jankhoteli) – “I am looking for the threads for you have torn my sweater in the morning”...

ამდ ხოდროლ დესმა მაძენა, ლადი ერ მეყარ amd xodrōl desma majēna, ladi er meqar... (Cholur, speaker Ts. Kvastiani) – “I have not witnessed anything worse than this (“as this”) that happened to me today”...

We should also pay attention to the fact that in Svan there is simple object twice being in case and unmarked simple object, which is expressed by former genitive adverbial case with no postposition having the semantics of postposition თვის *tvis* – “for”, also sometimes the meaning of Georgian dative case with postposition -ზე *-ze* “on” is expressed by dative case with no postposition of simple object, which was also shown in the words indicating the principal clause:

ჯუინალ დჷრეჟსა მარე ერ იქუნაჟალნოლ, ეჩაშუდ ხეკუეს ახოჟიდანხ ბაპ ჯwinal dwrejsa mare er ikunawalnol, ečašed xeḷwes axoqidanx bap... (Topuria & Kaldani, 1967, 54) – “in ancient times, when a man was fighting with the death, a priest had to be brought for him”...

დარმომ იყდგდა ამდ ხოჩილს, ნად ერ ელყიდედ ლადი dārmoš iqdəde amd xočils, naj er elqided ladi... (Cholur, speaker T. Chegiani) – “no one could have bought better than this (“as this”) we had bought today”...

Sometimes in Lentekhian pronoun explaining the semantics of former genitive adverbial case simple object with no postposition has truncated the adverbial case mark, although in Georgian it expresses the meaning of the postposition *-თვის -tvis* “for”:

იმუა *imwāj* “what”; ხედუა/ხედ *xedwāj/xedi* “who/which”; იმნოუ *imnōwš* “with/by what”; იმნარდ *innardi* “for what”; იმდ/იმად *imdi/imäjd* “in what”... with different phonetic variants:

ალეს ეჯნოუ ბოშამ იჯრუ, დერბი ფიფა ერ შსუენე ლეთუ ტეტრისკა *ales ežnowš xošam ižräwi, jerbi pipa er äšçwene letwš tewriška...* (Shanidze, Kaldani & Chumburidze 1967, 73) – “he believes this more that he saw two shadows in dense forest at night”...

დერუა ზორს ხოჯდე, ეჩა ყორჟი ეჯა ჟი ხამზერი ეჯ მეზგემ ნშდობახენ *jerwāj zors xoqde, eča qōrži eža ži xamzəri ež mežgem näšdobaxen...* (Topuria, 1957, Shanidze, Kaldani&Chumburidze, 1978, 178) – “who brings him/her an offering, he/she will pray at the door of that family for the sake of peace”...

ეჯდარგნეა დარს ათბედუწლნისხ, დარ გუემდახუ ათხე ეჯარანკა *jars atbedwālñsx, jārī gwejmaxw atxēj...* (Cholur, speaker V. Xabuliani) – “whom they will let dare except for those, who still enmities us”...

ალ დინას ერითე შუტრლე, ხედუა მურყუმა შდურთეჟი ნესყა ცხემადს ქა *bñçda al dīnas ečīšte äçwīlē, xedwāj murq̄wma šdurteži nēsqa cxemäds ka xaqda...* (Shanidze, Kaldani&Chumburidze, 1978, 167) – “he/she will marry this girl to him (“to him”), who would shoot the arrow at the needle on the merlon of the tower” ...

As it is known, relative pronouns are form-changing words and therefore the relative pronouns presented in a subordinate clause with simple object are also confirmed in the form of different cases:

დარს ჩიგარ ხეგუნებლდა, ეჩაშხენეა იმჟი ხეხონოლ დაგრა?! *jarsī čigar xegwnēbāl̄da, ečāšxenka imži xexōnl̄ dagra?!...* (Cholur, speaker Ts. Kvastiani) – “to whom he/she attended carefully forever (“always”), how he/she deserved the death from him/her?!”...

ეჩქანლო დეშუაშდ ლეშხი ხადხ, ერ ჭიშხი ნაზიმდ ჟაცბურახ *ečkanyo ješwāšd lešx̄bi xād̄x, ečī čīšxi nazimd ž’acburax...* (Shanidze, Kaldani&Chumburidze, 1978, 138) – “then whom they had to sew for, they would cut it to the size of his foot”...

იმად მეკუედი, ეჯდ ასუასიპი *imäjd mekwedi, ežd aswasipi...* (Topuria&Kaldani, 1967, 224) – “what I want I will turn into it” ...

As it is known in Svan particles უა/უა *wāj/wāj*, ი/ი *j/i* (-tsa) give interrogative words the meaning of relativity, the cases of using of which vary according to dialects. The particle

ჟჷა **wāj** is most often confirmed in Upper Bal and Lentekhian and more or less frequently in other dialects, including Cholur. The particle **ō** is more productive in Lashkhian and Cholur.

The reviewed material showed that in relative words presented by different form of case the case mark mostly added to the particle ჟჷა **wāj** joined to stem (ჲერჟჷაბ **jerwājs** “whom/to whom”, ეშჟჷაბ **ešwājs** “whose”) and the particle **ō ī** is preceded by the case mark (ჲარსბ **jarsī** “whom/to whom“, ეშაბ **ješāī** “whose”...).

In Cholur we have cases in relative words with postposition, when despite the adjoining the particle ჟჷა **wāj** of relative pronoun, which precedes the postposition, at the end the particle **ō ī** is also added to it and we get double particle forms (ეშჟჷაბცახანბ **ešwājcaxanī** “with whom”, ჲერჟჷაბთჲბ **jerwājštēj** “to whom”, where the particle ჟჷა **wāj** without **ō ī** must have the advantage of expressing relativity. Such forms are typical for Cholur.

As for the subordinating conjunctions, in the constructions to be discussed in Georgian subordinating conjunction **თუ tu** – “if” is found, in Svan **ერე ere** “that” conjunction is predominant, although in Svan dialects (except Lower Bal) there are cases when the relative pronouns are accompanied by an indefinite particle **ენენ yen ghen** (with different phonetic variants), which would have a certain function.

This particle has different functions and semantics in Svan “...the main function, as it appeared from the analysis of various materials, is the command, to strengthen the command. It should also be noted that in most cases, even according to the context, it is difficult to understand the function of the analytical lexeme ” (Sagliani 2016, 261).

The particle ghen must also has a function of subordinating conjunction, as evidenced by the Cholur speech patterns, where in complex sentences the particle **ენენ yen ghen** at the same time is added to the interrogative and relative pronouns and have the semantics of **თუ tu** – “if” in both case:

თელ ლეთ გაგზადახ [ეჩეჲი], პასუხდ იმ/იმბ **ენენ** ხეჲუნახ მორაჲს tel lēt gagzədax [ečēži], pasuxd **im/imī yen** xēkwnax mōraws... (Cholur, speaker V. Xabuliani) – “they were talking unceasingly the whole night about {on that}, {if} what they would say to the mediator”...

გუმგჲურ მაჲ/მაბ **ენენ** ორბ, აშიშტ ლეჲგერგლიდ ეჩეჲნ gušgweur **maj/maī yen** īrix, ašišt lejgərglid ečēži ... (Cholur, speaker T. Khergiani) – “{if} what they are without us,

we will talk about it soon”...

ჟახას დემ ჯატული [ეჩა], დარ/დარღ დენ მინჯარ žaxas deš žaṭūli [eča], **jar/jarī yen minqār**... (Cholur, speaker J. Xabuliani) – “I can’t say the name, {if} who was with me”...

As for the other dialects, the situation is similar there, however, when checking with the respondents, when questioning, for example, in Lashkhian the understanding and semantics of the conjunction **თუ tu** – “if” is lost and the forms - **იმდღენ ხაშდბა imīyen xašdba/იმდ ხაშდბა imī xašdba** are explained by them in this way -“what he/she/it does” since the difference between them is no longer distinguishable by addition of **ghen**, however, it is noteworthy that in subordinate clause with simple object we have relative adverbs in subordinate clause accompanied by the particle **ghen**. It seems that it was **ghen** that had the function of subordinating conjunction of **თუ tu** – “if”, since in this case the relative adverbs could not be considered as member-conjunctions of the unmarked simple object:

ეჩრმ დესამა მიხ’ე, ისგუა ექსაშ, იმტაღენ ჯირო ეჩიშ dēsama mix’ē, isgwa kesāš, imwājyen žiri... (Shanidze&Topuria, 1939, 276) – “I do not know anything about it, eh, your purse, {if} where you have it”...

იმთღენ ხარ ლეზი, ეჩა მამ ხობალ imtēyen xār lēzi, eča mām xoxal... (Shanidze, Kaldani&Chumburidze, 1978, 283) – “he does not know {of that}, [if] where he has to go (“he has a way to go”)”...

There have been cases when the conjunction **ერე ere** “that” and relative adverbs or relative pronouns with **დენ yen ghen** are also found in subordinate clause, however in this case the function of the conjunction is clearly performed by **ერე ere**:

მახელტაჟარ ...უმხუარ ხემქარალხ, **ერე ხედღენ** ხომა ჯრდიად ადკუანნე ბეჩს maxeywažar... ušxwār xemkarālḥ, **ere xediyen** xošyen xoša žōdiad adḳwānne bečs... (Kaldani&Oniani, 1979, 141) –“young people are competing in that which one will throw the stone farther”...

გიგა მაგრაფს დესმა ხახლენა ეჩა, **ერე იმთღენ** ოთწურლახ მერბამდ მიჩა დი giga magraps desma xaxlēna eča, **ere imtējyen** oṭṭwīlax mērbāmd mica di... (Cholur, G. Zurabiani) –“aunt Magrap did not know anything about, that where they had married her mother for the second time”...

The tendency of dividing up of subordinating conjunctions and member-conjunction is very interesting. It should be noted that the means of connection create a homogeneous picture and can be found at the beginning or middle of the subordinate clause on both positions,

although the difference is that member-conjunctions are always presented and subordinating conjunction **ერე** can be missing, although it is assumed and easily restored:

ჩოლურ [ერ] კუბ ოხტაბახ, ეჩხაუტესგ'ესუდახ ჯიჯუარ čolir [er] kub oxṭābax, ečxāwtēsg'eswdax žižwar ... (Shanidze, Kaldani & Chumburidze, 1978, 106) – “in Cholur [that] they cut out the coffin, they put bones in”...

In going to be discussed complex sentences principal and subordinate clauses can be found as follows: principal+ subordinate; subordinate + principal and principal+ subordinate + correlation word:

აშხუნდო სორთმანს გუი ლოჰოდა, ერე მიჩა ფჰმლი მჰადარობჟიმდ ხოშა ლუწხუტატე ლემწრ ašxunyo sortmans gwi lohoda, ere mica pämlī mājdarobžišd xoša lučxwawe ləmār... (Topuria, 1957, 8) – “after a long time, Sortman noticed that his slave was more anxious during the starving time”...

ხედის ორე თეთრ ოთბაცე, ეჩაცხან ახცხენე ლობი ამნემდო xedisī ere tetr otbace, ečacxan axcxēne līzi amnēmdī... (Cholur, speaker G. Liparteliani) – “whom {that} he/she promised money, he/she preferred to go with him/her”...

ალე მაღ ლი, მი ერ გემ მაყა, ეჩაცხან ale maj li, mi er gem maqa, ečacxan... (Lashkian, The Svan Prose, volume IV 1979, 71) – “what it is, that I have a ship, (compared) with it”...

Conclusion

As the discussed material has shown, in the traditionally known dialects of Svan as well as in Cholur speech many subordinate clause with simple object complex sentence is confirmed. No significant difference is observed between the dialects, except the subordinate clause containing ghen particle, which has the semantics of the subordinating conjunction “if” in contrast to Upper Bal, Lentekhian and Lashkian (the particle mentioned in Lower Bal, as already mentioned, is not confirmed), where its function has been concealed over time.

NOTES:

1. The report was prepared in 2019 within the framework of the project (“Parataxic-hypotactic constructions in Svan YS-19-435”) funded by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia.

References

- Saghiani (2016). სვანური ენის სტრუქტურის საკითხები [On the Structure of the Svan Language]. Artanuji Publishing House. Tbilisi.
- Shanidze, A., Kaldani, M. & Chumburidze, Z. (1978). სვანური ენის ქრესტომათია [Svan language Chrestomathy]. Tbilisi. Tbilisi State University Publishing.
- Shanidze, A. & Topuria, V. (1939). სვანური პროზაული ტექსტები, პირველი ტომი, ბალსზემოური კილო [Svan prose texts, I: Upper Bal dialect]. Tbilisi. Publishing-House of the Georgian Academy of Sciences.
- Topuria, V. (1957). სვანური პროზაული ტექსტები, მეორე ტომი, ბალქსვემოური კილო [Svan prose texts, II: Lower Bal dialect]. Publishing-House of the Georgian Academy of Sciences.
- Topuria, V. & Kaldani, M. (1967). სვანური პროზაული ტექსტები, მესამე ტომი, ლენტეხური კილო [Svan prose texts, III: Lentekh dialect]. Publishing-House of the Georgian Academy of Sciences.
- Kaldani, M. & Oniani, A. (1979). სვანური პროზაული ტექსტები, მეოთხე ტომი, ლაშხური კილო [Svan prose texts, IV: Lashkh dialect]. Publishing-House of the Georgian Academy of Sciences.