Linguistics

Pleonasm in the Morphology of Tsovatush Verb, Nakh Branch of the Iberian-Caucasian Language

Makvala Mikeladze

Teaching-Research Institute for Interdisciplinary Humanities, Telavi, Georgia

(Presented by Academy Member Avtandil Arabuli)

The paper deals with interesting case of double marking of the same grammatical category. The discussion refers to the pleonasm fixed in the verb category of the Tsovatush language as a result of the one-sided and centuries-long active influence of the Georgian language on the grammatical structure of the Tsovatush language. Historically, the Tsovatush language verb expressed not the relation of the subjective and objective persons to the first person, as it is in Georgian and many other languages, but the social value of the same persons, i.e. class. Two centuries ago, the cases of simultaneous expression of both class and relation to the first person of the subjective and objective persons were observed in the Tsovatush language verb. Clearly, due to the given novelty, the plural of the same subjective and objective persons was marked twice. The given case of grammatical pleonasm reveals the general patterns of interfering processes. It becomes clear that during prolonged and active bilingualism, the language under the influence is forced to fill in all the open places found in its own grammatical system in relation to the source language. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the borrowing language produces the formats required for the new grammatical category from its own lexical inventory. The fact that this process of borrowing in the Tsovatush language is not over yet clearly indicates the crucial role of the language elasticity threshold in the borrowing process. © *2021 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.*

Tsovatush language, cartvelology

The Tsovatush language belongs to the Nakh branch of the Iberian-Caucasian language family. Unlike other members of the same branch, the Chechen and Ingush languages, which occupy certain regions of the Caucasus, it has survived in only half of the village in the Republic of Georgia, Zemo Alvani, and is under strong Georgian cultural-sociological influence, which has been reflected by one-way Tsovatush-Georgian bilingualism in the field of language. Centuries cover the secret of the duration of the Tsovatush-Georgian bilingualism, and according to the facts of linguistic memory, its origin can be traced beyond our era. Centuries-old weak one-way bilingualism has been replaced by the one-way but active overbilingualism, which has put the Tsovatush language in real danger of shifting to Georgian.

According to Professor K. Gigashvili's recent socio-linguistic research, the Tsovatush language, which was once a widely spoken language that

survived in half of the village, is now considered to be the language of only 1558-member ethnic group. Only 95 of them speak their native language well, 803 do not know the language at all, and the rest understand the language one way or the other. Breakup between generations has begun [1].

It is known that "every bilingual situation is unique in its nature and absolute coincidence is excluded here. Nevertheless, each case of bilingualism reveals the general patterns of interferential processes and is interesting in terms of general linguistics, which is obviously due to the systemic nature of the language structures themselves." [2: 9].

In this case, the fact that both languages, Tsovatush and Georgian, which are in close contact, are members of the same genealogical family and the basic morphological scheme of relationship between name and verb is common for both of them. Despite this, over the course of centuries, Tsovatush language has developed different models of expressing certain morphological categories. It is interesting to note that today, in the face of highly developed bilingualism, the process of demolishing the differences in the expression of these common categories is driven by interference.

The importance given to the interrelationship of the structures of the languages in contact in this sense is known. It is assumed that the process of linguistic influence will proceed with less obstacles between such units, because, as B. Jorbenadze writes: "A related language is much more pervasive, rather than a distant language from this point of view" [3: 73].

In this respect, the category of person of the Tsovatush verb reveals interesting situation. This grammatical category is common for both – the source language, Georgian, and the borrowing language – Tsovatush, but the ways of expressing the mentioned shared category in these two languages are radically different.

Discussion

We will start with the situation of the Georgian language. In this language, the grammatical person of the verb denotes the identity of the subject or object in relation to the first person or speaker. Properly three persons are identified in the verb: I, II and III with their singular and plural forms.

According to the ergative construction, the mainstay of the Iberian-Caucasian language family, reflection of the subject and objec persons in the verb is obligatory, although the Georgian verb additionally shows the mark of the indirect object too. We have a different situation in Tsovatush language in terms that only subjective and objective persons are expressed in the verb with appropriate morphemes, and the persons are classified by the classmarks not according to their identity, but according to their social value.

It is believed that in certain time the noun class formed a morphological category in Georgian itself: "Grammatical classes of the human and thing were opposed to each other, expressed by special marks in nouns, on the one hand, and verbs and deverbal nouns, connected to the names, on the other hand" [4: 260]. There is no trace of such a division of subjects in the morphological system of the Georgian language: the proper affixes in the names are already dead and rethought.

In this respect, most of the Iberian-Caucasian languages, including Tsovatush, show a diametrically different situation. The events here went in the opposite direction: the initial grammatical classes of human and thing were not even abrogated, but their further differentiation and quantitative increase took place. Tsovatush was the first one in this regard, where the number of classes has reached eight today.

It is noteworthy that in this multiplity of grammatical classes of the Tsovatush language the same four formats of the given category figure, which is typical for other members of the same language family. These formats are: f. ა, b, d. The further division-distribution of the initial, two-part

general system of the grammatical classes directed based on the plural. Just this diverse correlation of the singular-plural marks has made it possible to increase the number of classes.

As we have already mentioned, today in the Tsovatush language, eight grammatical classes are distinguished by the contrast of the singular-plural forms of the verb. Two of them are made up by the male and female name classes, while the other six belong to the class of thin. We have:

a) Classes of human names:
I. Male class with prefixes: singular – ვ- (v-), plural – ბ- (b-); II. Female class (ი- დ-) (ი- d-)

b) Classes of things:
I (ი-ი); II (ბ-ბ)(b-b); III (დ-დ) (d-d); IV(ბ-დ) (b-d); V (ბ-ი) (b-ი); VI(დ-ი) (d-ი).

Class marks, as living formants, are no longer distinguished in Tsovatush nouns; They are attached to the verb agreed with the nouns, or the participle-adverb-infinitives and adjectives derived from it. The absence of person marks does not create a sense of inadequacy in terms of inteligibility in the Tsovatush verb, as with this function, as mandatory, it is always accompanied by the proper personal pronoun. Compare:

Georg.: ვ-ყვირი – 'I (I person) shout'
Tsovatush: ას ვ-უღჳ – 'I (I person, man) shout'

Despite the abovementioned, it has been more than two centuries since the mark of person appeared in the Tsovatush verb by intensive influence of Georgian: the forms with class and person marks, with the right of parallel using of the subject and object, stood beside the forms with class marks. The Tsovatush language has not borrowed the marks of person from Georgian. Here, the personal pronouns acquired this function, in other words, the marks of person connected to personal pronouns. This phenomenon seems to be a linguistic universal and it takes place in other languages as well [5: 156].

This process seems to have begun with the strict determination of the place of the personal pronouns adjusted to a verb form. If normally their position was free and they could hold a place both before and after the verb, now the following position to express the person has become mandatory. The personal pronouns, now placed in a firm position, lost their independence over time, lost their own stress, and became enclitic of the verb. The loss of their own stress and the becoming of part of the verb was followed by a series of phonetic changes, which caused their external distancing from the supporting forms and discharging from the independent semantic content. This ended an interesting process of transformation of pronouns as a morpheme. The marks of class are prefixes, and the marks of person were established as suffixes.

This novelty radically changed the morphology of the Tsovatush verb, because the mark of class fully maintained its function in parallel with the mark of person, newly brought in the language. This event charged the transitive verb - where the subject was expressed with the mark of class – with the pleonasm, double expression of the mark of the same subject person. We have:

I. Expression of the same subject person with the two different formants – with marks of class and person: ვ-უღე-ს ------- ,,კაცი-ვყვირი-მე" ('I, man, shout');

II. Double expression of plural of the same subject person with different formants: ბ-უღე-თხ ------------ ,,კაცები-ვყვირით-ჩვენ" ('We, men, shout').

We have an interesting situation in this regard in transitive verbs as well. If until now in such verbs only the direct object was expressed by the class mark, now the mark of the person acting in parallel expresses both the direct object and the subject. In such verbs, the exact same kind of double pleonasm is observed in relation to the direct object, as we have described in relation to the subject of the intransitive verb above. As for the subject of the transitive verb, there is no peculiarity with it, because here it is expressed only once or only in the mark of person.

Conclusion

We can conclude that in the given case of interference, several circumstances attract attention in terms of the regularities of foreign influence:

I. All kinds of interferent novelties serve to bring the borrower language closer to the source language;

II. The borrowing language fills in the blanks existing in its own grammatical system from the source language but does not lose the so-called "extra", i.e. what the source language does not have: a peculiar enrichment of the language takes place.

III. The Tsovatush language borrowed only the model of category of person identity and matched the formants to it from its own lexical inventory due to which the pressure was observed only on the thinking model, that is, in this case the impact is of an algebraic nature.

IV. Borrowing the person category started two centuries ago is only used in parallel regime with the class category, which proves that all borrowings in the language are carried out in accordance with the keeping the step-by-step principle of the limit of resilience.

ენათმეცნიერება

პლეონაზმი წოვათუშური ზმნის მორფოლოგიაში იბერიულ-კავკასიურ ენათა ნახური ჯგუფი

მ. მიქელაძე

ინტერდისციპლინური ჰუმანიტარიის სასწავლო-სამეცნიერო ინსტიტუტი, თელავი, საქართველო

(წარმოდგენილია აკადემიის წევრის ა. არაბულის მიერ)

სტატიაში განხილულია ერთი და იმავე გრამატიკული კატეგორიის ორმაგი აღნიშვნის საინ-ტერესო შემთხვევა. მსჯელობა ეხება წოვათუშური ენის ზმნის პირის კატეგორიის გამოხატვაში ფიქსირებულ პლეონაზმს, რაც ამ ენის გრამატიკულ წყობაზე ქართული ენის ცალმხრივსა და მრავალსაუკუნოვან აქტიურ ზეგავლენას მოჰყვა შედეგად. ისტორიულად წოვათუშური ენის ზმნაში გამოიხატებოდა სუბიექტური და ობიექტური პირების არა რომლობა, ანუ მიმართება პირველ პირთან, როგორც ეს ქართულშია და კიდევ ბევრ სხვა ენაში, არამედ აღინიშნებოდა იმავე პირთა სოციალური დიდებულება, ანუ კლასი. მთელი ორი საუკუნის წინ უკვე წოვათუშური ენის ზმნაში დაფიქსირდა სუბიექტური და ობიექტური პირების როგორც კლასის, ისე რომლობის ერთდროული გამოხატვის შემთხვევები. ცხადია, მოცემული სიახლის გამო ორგზის აღნიშნა იმავე სუბიექტური და ობიექტური პირების მრავლობითი რიცხვიც. გრამატიკული პლეონაზმის მოცემული შემთხვევა ავლენს ინტერფერენტულ პროცესთა ზოგად კანონზომიერებებს. ირკვევა, რომ ხანგრძლივი და აქტიური ბილინგვიზმის დროს გავლენის ქვეშ მყოფი ენა იძულებული ხდება შეავსოს წყარო ენასთან მიმართებით საკუთარ გრამატიკულ სისტემაში არსებული ყველა ცია ადგილი. აღნიშნულთან დაკავშირებით საყურადღებოა, რომ ახალი გრამატიკული კატეგორიისათვის საჭირო ფორმანტებს მსესხებელი ენა საკუთარი ლექსიკური ინვენტარიდან აჩარმოებს; ის გარემოება კი, რომ სესხების აღნიშნული პროცესი წოვათუშურ ენაში დღესაც არ არის ბოლომდე დამთავრებული, ცხადად მიუთითებს ენის დრეკადობის ზღვარის გადამწყვეტ როლზე სესხების პროცესში.

REFERENCES

1. Gigashvili K. (2014) The modern ethno-sociolinguistic profile of the Tsovatush people, Tbilisi.
2. MIkeladze M. (2008) Interferential processes in the Tsovatush Langugae, Tbilisi.
3. Jorbenadze B. (1989) The Georgian Dialectology, V. I, Tbilisi.
4. Chikobava A. (1942) About the problem of Ergative Construction in Caucasian Languages: *The bulletin of the Institute of Language, History and Material Culture, Named after N. Marr*, XII. Tbilisi.
5. Phanchvidze V. (1974) The Grammatical Analyses of the Udi Language, Tbilisi.

Received February, 2021