

Problem of the Qualification of Georgian Verse

Apollon Silagadze

Academy Member, I. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

ABSTRACT. A scheme adopted in general metric typology is analysed in the paper with a view to qualifying Georgian versification. Attention is paid to one element of the prosodic system, i.e. the boundary between words, which usually is not taken into consideration while classifying versifications. There exists an opinion that theoretically such a system of verse is admissible, in which the presented boundary is actualized by power, like, e.g. stress in the accentual system, and it represents a permanent versificative-rhythmic boundary with the function of a factor creating the system. It is concluded that a system is realized in Georgian verse in which the structures of units (and their hierarchy) are created by the boundary (and its hierarchy). At the same time, at a certain, earlier stage of development of Georgian verse syllabic (or similar to it) phase is assumed. This statement is advanced in the context of syllabic stage, postulated for the common Indo-European verse, and a view is expressed on the universal nature of syllabic system, as an initial stage.
© 2009 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.

Key words: *versification, metric typology, Georgian verse, syllabic system, rhythmic boundary.*

1. When discussing Georgian verse in the specialist literature (especially if a paper is not specially devoted to the problem of typological qualification) so far the old situation is still reflected when it is regarded that: a) the inner nature of Georgian verse is not defined unequivocally; b) Georgian verse may be either syllabic or syllabic-accentual.

The main reason of this situation evidently is relying peremptorily on the four-element scheme widespread in the relatively metric typology, according to which, a verse must be either syllabic, accentual (dynamic, qualitative, syllabic-accentual), metric (durative, quantitative), or tonic. This is a universal scheme indeed and it is accepted as the initial and fundamental one, in spite of the existence of some interpretations and specifications, - e.g.: reducing to three types [1: 361], or division of the four types into two groups, of which in the first the syllabic system is represented, and in the second – all the rest [2: 140].

At the same time, it is necessary to take into account the following circumstance of principle [see: 3: 114-115].

The existence of such an established four-element qualification scheme should not always mean that any versification, namely, Georgian, must necessarily belong to one of its elements, - the theoretical possibility should not be ruled out that some specific system may not fall within any typological group, or may fall within it so conventionally that features characteristic of this group cannot be applied to it a priori.

Therefore the method of study should not be acceptable when by negative arguments the possibility of assigning the given versification to some system is denied, and, as a result, it is assigned to some other one from the same table. In any case, for instance, the following way of defining the nature of Georgian verse is not methodologically correct: if we prove that Georgian verse is not syllabic, this means automatically that it is syllabic-accentual, and vice versa, if the syllabic-accentual nature of Georgian verse is ruled out, this is sufficient to argue that Georgian verse is syllabic. The main point in this case is that a third possibility remains untried: Georgian verse may be neither syllabic nor syl-

labic-accentual (also: neither metric nor tonic) – it may be of an original nature and may be based on such a suprasegmental element of the phonological system on which none of the four systems is based.

2. The present typological qualification of versification, naturally, is unequivocally linked with an element of the prosodic system of the given language – suprasegmental, functional phoneme, which creates the formative factor of the versification system. At the same time, apparently, in the versification two parts may be conventionally singled out, one of which, fixed, is determined by the prosodic basis of the language, and the other, mobile and variable, is linked with extra-linguistic factors of literary, social, cultural character, etc. [3: 49-55].

A linguistic suprasegmental element, actualized in the given versification system, is no longer a linguistic element – functionally it is an element forming the rhythmic organization of verse, i.e. member of another system. In fact this time the following picture is formed: in a completed verse-rhythmic section in question (line, or a unit of a lower level), which at the same time is the given section of the linguistic structure, the linguistic suprasegmental element is represented at certain positions and in certain amount so that neither positions nor amount is defined, but a part of these positions and amounts is constant – a linguistic element found only in this position acquires the significance of the rhythmic factor. In other words: during the selection of the linguistic material (words) the given prosodic element must be represented invariably (necessarily) at one or several certain places, whereas its presence-absence at other positions is facultative.

Such an element, having the verse-rhythmic function, should form the minimum rhythmic unit, as a regular structure, by the repetition of which or its combination with other rhythmic structures, a rhythmic section of all other levels, including extremely completed ones, is obtained. Such a unit (or verse line) forms opposition with at least one such unit (or verse line) of the same level which by all its features is identical with the first one, except for the position (or positions) of the prosodic element, which has turned into a verse-rhythmic factor. This circumstance is one more, additional argument that the prosodic element in question is a structural factor of the rhythmic organization of verse (the first argument is that in the given language it, as a suprasegmental phoneme, is phonologically relevant).

Accordingly, if in a versification system the structural factor is, for instance, stress (already not linguistic, but verse ictus), then the rhythmic structure of the

given syllabic length should be opposed by other structure of the same or approximately the same length, which has rhythmic stress at a different place, i.e. has other arrangement of rhythmic stresses. If we continue discussion on the example of a versification of other type (this time, that based on feet), for the same reason we cannot have, say, dactyl, unless amphibrach or anapaest or both are found in the system next to it.

All the above-mentioned concerns the first part of versification - the stable, invariable part. It is determined by the prosodic system of the language, which offers to the versification in question the prosodic element as the verse-rhythmic factor, and the general principle of the system and basic rules for structures of units, their joining, etc. are based on it as well – so that their removal or essential change results in a non-rhythmic text, or other versification system (if such is conceivable). On the other hand, within the limits of the stability (invariability) of the general principle and basic laws, there are no invariable real verse forms, variants of stanza compositions, rhythm and rhyming kinds, etc. Accordingly, it should be concluded that there is also the other, variable and mobile part of the system, which is determined by extra-linguistic phenomena in the form of the cultural-literary environment, poetic style, general tendencies of development, external influences, individual factors, etc.

3. If the versification type is defined by the prosodic basis of the language, then naturally the question arises as to whether the widespread four-class scheme takes into account all possibilities of prosody.

In the process of typological qualification of versification systems, the syllable (number of syllables) and the following suprasegmental characteristics acting in it (or a combination made up of it) are taken into consideration:

a) Strength. In this case the opposition of strong (stressed) and weak (unstressed) syllables is actualized in verse, which forms their structurally valuable arrangement. This is accentual verse. There is also syllabic-accentual verse, in which the same opposition creates the structural factor, plus (in the form of an excessive phenomenon) – isosyllabism.

b) Length. The structural factor is the opposition of long and short syllables based on the vowel length, - metric versification.

c) Pitch. Classes of tones based on the rising-falling (melody) of the basic tone form the structurally relevant opposition of syllables, - tonic versification.

d) In languages where the above-listed features are not of a phonological value, the verse organization is

based on the factor of the number of syllables, - this time constructions with a fixed syllabic length are obtained (and arranged evenly or in a combined way), which as a rule are also divided into stable sections; this is syllabic versification.

However, when creating the general appearance of each given linguistic expression, firstly, its constituents (including syllables) make up a united whole, secondly, this time (except the syllable prolongation, intensification, etc.) one more phenomenon is significant – delimitation (in the first place, that of words on the level of their final and first syllables); accordingly, suprasegmental phonemes also have the function of indicating this phenomenon (which is connected with one more function – indicating the number of units).

First of all, this is pause, to which attention was paid in structural linguistics from the very beginning [4: 14].

More precisely, we are dealing with the phenomenon of the boundary between words, also between morphemes constituting words as well as between word-combinations, which has the structural function; it is always possible to find minimal pairs for illustration: Eng. night rate: nitrate [5: 41]; Rus. Подругу вели: подруг увели [6: 349]; Geo. ღაწვერა ქვითა: ღაწვერაქვითა. This time there is an articulation pause between two adjacent sounds in the form of the so-called open transition. This is a phenomenon of phonological value [7: 224-226; for the Georgian language, see: 8: 44-50], which along with pause, as the juncture phoneme in this case, is formed by stress and rhythm as well.

Whatever the phonetic nature of this phenomenon and its qualification may be, the main point in this case is that functionally we are dealing with a structural boundary, where the pause and other accompanying characteristics differentiate speech units, including units of the high level, primarily words.

If we pass to the verse-rhythmic organization system, on this level the linguistic details proper (phonetic, etc.) no longer are of importance. The main thing is that such a linguistic phenomenon, word boundary, exists, and its marking in general may be linked with pause, as a linguistic (virtual or realized) element.

It cannot be said that this factor is disregarded in verse analysis, - cf. caesura (rhythmical pause, metric pause, etc.), which always coincides with the word-boundary; but in any case it has an auxiliary function, in particular, - it is a means of dividing a line having a certain structure (this boundary in a versification of any type always appears at the end of the line, as the com-

pleted rhythmic section too). On the other hand, the following picture may also be conceived theoretically: the word-boundary, represented in a verse system, is actualized with such a force, as e.g. stress in accentual verse, and it has the feature of regulating, creating rhythm, i.e. represents a constant rhythmic boundary with the verse-rhythmic function.

4. Such a system of versification seems to be quite real, - such a situation is found in Georgian verse, the qualification of which as syllabic verse may be only conventional.

In Georgian: a) a verse unit (line, etc.) is represented not by, e.g., a 7-syllable structure, but 5+2 and 4+3, of which each has its constant verse boundary (formed on the basis of the constant word-boundary) and its own structure, and each creates an independent meter. b) In the construction of the meter, 5+2 and 4+3 are not adjacent (in the form of lines or other units); c) at the same time, 5+2 is compatible with and may be adjacent to such structures as 5+5, 5+4, 5+3, 5+1, 5+0 (i.e. structures which have the same boundary after 5 syllables), and 4+3 – with structures such as 4+4, 4+2, 4+1, 4+0 (i.e. structures having the same boundary after 4 syllables).

Finally, the same 5+2 creates independently (i.e. by its repetition) a meter, the form of which is defined not by that it is a 7-syllable one (as it too independently creates the meter 4+3, the form of which is not defined by the fact that it is a 7-syllable one), but by the fact that it has its structural feature – the boundary after five syllables. At the same time, 5+2 forms another meter by the neighborhood of 5+5, which has other syllabic length (containing 10 and not 7 syllables), but the same boundary after 5 syllables: 5+2 creates another meter with 5+4, as well as with 5+3, 5+1 and 5+0, which also have other syllabic lengths, but the same boundary after 5 syllables; 5+2 forms some other meters simultaneously together with several above-listed structures, which have the boundary after 5 syllables (the same is the case with 4+4 which will not create verse structures together with a structure where the boundary is after 5 syllables, but will create together with those where the boundary is after 4 syllables).

All this means that in Georgian verse the syllabic length does not create rhythmic structures, nor is the meter structure based on it (by repetition of isosyllabic sections or by the regular alternation of different syllabic lengths). In Georgian we do not find, e.g. a 7-syllable line, such a line should be: either 5+2, which is an independent structure (marked for the system) and an independent meter basis; or 4+3, which is also an independent structure and an independent meter basis

(or 3+3+1, which is also an independent structure and an independent meter basis).

Finally, if we discuss again the 5+2 structure, it is not 7 syllables, it is 5 syllables plus 2 syllables; if we discuss the 5+5 structure, this is 5 syllables plus 5, etc. In all instances the structure is created by 5+X, i.e. not the number of syllables, but the rhythmic boundary after 5.

When the meter is built, at the time of joining line structures we shall have: either the repetition of the 5+2 structure – one meter, or the repetition of the 5+5 structure – another meter (in both cases – isosyllabic structure), and so on. At the same time we shall have the simultaneous participation of lines 5+2, 5+5, etc. in the construction of other meters. This means that the equality of the number of syllables (the isosyllabism principle) may be facultatively represented in a meter, and may be not, but in all instances it occurs so that the constant rhythmic boundary (its place) must be necessarily preserved.

In Georgian the reasoning about isosyllabism may be only conventional: the meter based on the repetition of the same 5+2 structure (line) is not structurally an isosyllabic 7-syllable meter, as we have some other meter, resulting from the repetition of the 4+3 structure, which is not a 7-syllable meter either (there is also 3+3+1, not being a 7-syllable structure either).

All the above-described is a simplified picture of the Georgian versification system [see: 3], in which the minimal rhythmic unit (in my terminology, binomial) is of a binary construction and its structural form is determined by the rhythmic boundary between two segments (binary units form a hierarchy, respectively, the rhythmic boundary also has a hierarchic character; in more detail see: 3; *ibid.* see on rules of building structures and other laws). The system of this unit (minimal rhythmic unit) consists of three classes:

I	II	III
5+5	4+4	3+3
5+4	4+3	3+2
5+3	4+2	3+1
5+2	4+1	3+0
5+1	4+0	
5+0		

The general formula is $n+k$, where $n \geq k$ (taking into account the fact, that each binomial, along with its main form, has an alternant, in which the rhythmic boundary is moved back, left with two syllables, the full variant of the formula will be:

$$n+k \Leftrightarrow (n \geq 2) + (k+2),$$

where $n \geq k$,

$$n=3, 4, 5; k=0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).$$

On the basis of the first class the following meters are formed: a) 5+5 (repetition of this structure), 5+4 (repetition of this structure), etc.; b) 5+5 and any structure from the same class (regular combination of structures), 5+4 and any structure from the same class, and so on.; c) 5+5 and several structures from the same class, 5+4 and several structures from the same class, etc. The principle of the formation of meters on the basis of the second and the third classes is the same.

At the time of the realization of this system we shall not obtain a meter which will be marked as a certain number of syllables. Some 8-syllable structure (line or unit of other level), is in fact either 5+3, 4+4 or 3+3+2, and each structure is an independent meter; some 10 syllables are either 5+5, 4+4+2, or 3+3+3+1, etc.

Structures of units (and their hierarchy) and verse meters are created by the rhythmic boundary (and its hierarchy). The rhythmic boundary is formed by the constant position of the word-boundary in the conditions of the facultative existence of other word-boundaries (rhythmic boundary, of any hierarchic level, coincides with the linguistic word-boundary, but every word-boundary is not a rhythmic boundary). The rhythmic boundary of the given unit is the constant factor between two members of the unit, which on the level of this unit, as a binary form, singles out and forms its two constituents, and on the level of the entire system, as the unity of hierarchically related units, joins these two constituents and forms the given binary unit, by singling it out in the hierarchy of units. In other words, the function of the rhythmic boundary is not division, but identification of two constituents and their unification into one binary unit. The numbers of syllables, obtained at this time, are entirely dependent on the factor of the rhythmic boundary (isosyllabism is an external feature, which, if realized, represents the phenomenon of the rhythmic excess; and from the positions of the structure, we have isomorphism, created by one and the same rhythmic boundary, which is represented even in the case when there is no external isosyllabism); also: the configuration of stresses, having in the verse a certain auxiliary function [in more detail see: 9: 12-18], depends entirely on the factor of the rhythmic boundary. (Naturally, more than one characteristics can always be found in the verse, but one main, constant structural feature identified; 10: 173).

A versification of this type may be qualified only as follows: a versification based on the factor of the rhythmic boundary. Such a versification cannot find its place in the typological scheme where there is the syllabic type.

Let us take one, relatively new classification [2: 140-141], where two principal classes of verse meters are represented (type of meter, as the basis of the versification type): 1. Pure-syllabic meter: only the number of syllables is regulated in syntactic structures – words, columns, sentences (syllabic versification). 2. Syllabic-prosodic meter: certain prosodic characteristics and their positions are actualized (plus, to a certain extent, the quantitative arrangement of syllables); here three subclasses are included, already discussed above: durative meter, dynamic meter and tonic meter (and three respective versification types).

In this classification the place of Georgian verse is in the second class and here it will create a fourth type: the meter, based on the structural actualization of the word-boundary, as a prosodic factor, and the versification, which contains meters of this variety.

5. Proceeding from the above, first of all, such reasoning should be ruled out when one or another meter of Georgian verse is described as a line made up of a certain number of syllables, e.g. 10-syllable verse, or 8-syllable verse, or 16-syllable *shairi*, etc.

In Georgian we have not an 8-syllable line, and respectively, 8-syllable meter (8-syllable verse), but the following miscellaneous, totally autonomous lines and meters: 5+3, 4+4, (3+0) + (3+2);

not 10-syllable, but miscellaneous: 5+5, (4+0) + (4+2), (4+1) + (4+1), (3+3) + (3+2);

not 7-syllable, but miscellaneous: 5+2, 4+3, (3+0) + (3+1);

not 6-syllable, but miscellaneous: 5+1, 4+2, 3+3;

not 9-syllable, but miscellaneous:

5+4, (4+0) + (4+1), (3+3) + (3+0);

not 11-syllable, but miscellaneous: 6+5, (5+0) + (5+1), (4+2) + (4+1), (4+0) + (4+3), (3+3) + (3+2);

not 12-syllable, but miscellaneous: 6+6, (5+1) + (5+1), (5+0) + (5+2), (4+3) + (4+1), (4+2) + (4+2), (4+0) + (4+4), (3+3) + (3+3);

not 13-syllable, but miscellaneous: (5+3) + (5+0), (5+2) + (5+1), (4+3) + (4+2), (4+4) + (4+1);

not 14-syllable, but miscellaneous: (5+2) + (5+2), (5+3) + (5+1), (4+3) + (4+3), (4+4) + (4+2), (5+4) + (5+0);

not 15-syllable, but miscellaneous: (5+3) + (5+2), (4+4) + (4+3), (5+5) + (5+0);

not 16-syllable, but miscellaneous: (5+3) + (5+3), (4+4) + (4+4), (5+5) + (5+1), etc. – the list being incomplete.

6. One cannot rule out assuming the syllabic stage as the initial point at some previous phase of develop-

ment for Georgian verse, if discussed by the interpretation offered above.

In general, analysis gives grounds to establish regular stages of diachrony of Georgian verse, which in its turn, makes it possible to reconstruct the first stage, preceding the stages known to us, in which in rhythmic units of Georgian verse the principle of the division by the rhythmic boundary into two equal constituents ($n=k$) was at work. Before this stage the existence of such a pre-stage is admissible where a completed section of a certain length (line) is not segmented into sections of a lower level – constituents [see: 11: 658]. From this state, resembling the syllabic system, it is quite natural to imagine the regular development towards the state, named above as the initial stage, and then – to the state, described above in the form of the system. In particular, a gradual transition is quite real, when division (into two) in an isosyllabic (or approximately equal) rhythmic construction acquires a regular character, its position becomes firm, and the unit constituents become regulated, which as a result imparts the structural function to the boundary and makes irrelevant the number of syllables.

The syllabic system is postulated for the common Indo-European verse as well [after A. Meillet's well-known work – 12; on the system see 13: 839-842]. If we pose the same question concerning the regularity of the further development and transformation here too, then it has to be explained how states of all kinds – syllabic, quantitative, accentual, i.e. typologically totally different systems resulted from one and the same common state [14: 19]. Although this problem is analysed on the level of all the Indo-European groups – Western, Central, Eastern, it cannot be said that the resulting picture is clear. Furthermore, a clear picture cannot be obtained for every specific case due to the existence of objective difficulties: the oldest texts belong already to those periods when different systems are at work with the completed (fully developed) form in each given language. Accordingly, not only the common Indo-European state is postulated but the common character is hypothetical for the groups of languages. And what is more, old forms are hypothetical for specific languages, e.g.: for the ancient Greek language; within the common scheme the path of development of German verse is uncertain, etc.

However, in general, the syllabic theory seems to be acceptable but with the following explanation: practically it is inconceivable to prove its reality so that to reconstruct the specific path of development for each language with the demonstration of concrete, basic trans-

formations. On the other hand, this is of no importance for the solution of the question, as the following general thesis must evidently be accepted: any state may result from the syllabic state. I shall offer only two illustrative arguments: a) the syllabic character of verse does not imply precisely preserved isosyllabism, - for example, dropping or addition of a syllable may also be found in syllabic systems having a completed, full-fledged form;

b) the factor of the number of syllables participates to a greater or lesser extent in a system of any type, regardless of whether it is a structural or auxiliary factor.

Then the following universal thesis may be formulated: the syllabic type of verse (or similar to it in principle) is the only type which may be imagined for any case as the initial hypothetical system, from which any system known today is obtained as a derivative.

ენათმეცნიერება

ქართული ლექსის კვალიფიკაციის საკითხი

ა. სილაგაძე

აკადემიის წევრი, ი. ჯავახიშვილის სახ. თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი

სტატიაში, ზოგადლექსმცოდნეობითი პრობლემების ფონზე, დასმულია ქართული ლექსის ტიპოლოგიური კვალიფიკაციის საკითხი.

1. მოცემული ლექსთწყობის სახეს განსაზღვრავს მოცემული ენის პროსოდიული ბაზა. ამ თეზისზე დაყრდნობით, მეტრიკულ ტიპოლოგიაში ლექსთწყობათა ოთხი ძირითადი ტიპია წარმოდგენილი. ბუნებრივია დაისვას კითხვა: ეს ოთხკლასიანი სქემა ასახავს თუ არა პროსოდიის ყველა შესაძლებლობას?

ვერსიფიკაციური სისტემების ტიპოლოგიური კვალიფიციერებისას გათვალისწინებულია მარცვალთა (მარცვალთა რაოდენობა) და მასში (ან მისგან შექმნილ კომბინაციებში) მოქმედი ძირითადი სუპრასემანტიკული მახასიათებლები: სიძლიერე, სიგრძე, სიმაღლე. მაგრამ ყოველი ენობრივი გამონათქვამის საერთო სახის შექმნისას, ჯერ ერთი, მისი შემადგენლები (მათ შორის მარცვლები) შეერთებულ მთელს ქმნიან, მეორეც, ამ დროს მნიშვნელობის მქონეა კიდევ ერთი მოვლენა – გამიჯვნა (პირველ რიგში, სიტყვებისა მათი ბოლო და პირველი მარცვლების დონეზე); შესაბამისად, სუპრასემანტიკულ ფონემებს ამ მოვლენის აღნიშვნის ფუნქცია აქვთ.

პირველ რიგში ეს არის პაუზა. უფრო ზუსტად, ლაპარაკია გასაყარის (boundary) მოვლენაზე სიტყვებს შორის, ასევე – სიტყვათა შემადგენელ მორფემებს შორის, ასევე – შესიტყვებებს შორის, რასაც სტრუქტურული ფუნქცია აქვს. ამ დროს ორ მეზობელ ბგერას შორის საარტიკულაციო შესვენებაა ე. წ. ღია გადასასვლელის (open transition) სახით, რომელსაც, როგორც ფონოლოგიური ღირებულების მქონე ფაქტორს, პაუზასთან (როგორც ამ შემთხვევაში მიჯნის ფონემასთან – juncture phoneme) ერთად ქმნის მახვილიც და რიტმიც. როგორც უნდა იყოს ამ მოვლენის ფონეტიკური ბუნება და მისი კვალიფიკაცია, მთავარი ამ შემთხვევაში ისაა, რომ ფუნქციურად ჩვენ საქმე გვაქვს სტრუქტურულ გასაყართან, როდესაც პაუზა და სხვა თანმხლები მახასიათებლები ახდენენ ენობრივ ერთეულთა, მათ შორის მაღალი დონის ერთეულთა, პირველ რიგში სიტყვათა, დიფერენცირებას.

საკუთრივ სალექსო-რიტმული ორგანიზაციის სისტემის დონეზე ლინგვისტურ დეტალებს (ფონეტიკური ხასიათისა) აღარ აქვთ მნიშვნელობა, — მთავარია, რომ არსებობს ასეთი მოვლენა, სიტყვათგასაყარი, და ზოგადად მისი აღნიშვნა შეიძლება დაუკავშიროთ პაუზას როგორც ენობრივ (ვირტუალურ თუ რეალურ) ელემენტს.

ამ შემთხვევაში თეორიულად ადვილი წარმოსადგენია სურათი, როდესაც სიტყვათგასაყარი, რეპრეზენტირებული ვერსიფიკაციულ სისტემაში, აქტუალიზებულია ისეთი ძალით, როგორც, ვთქვათ, მახვილი აქცენტურ ლექსში, და აქვს რიტმის შექმნის თვისება, ე. ი. წარმოადგენს მუდმივ რიტმულ გასაყარს სალექსო-რიტმული ფუნქციით.

2. ლექსთწყობის ასეთი სისტემა სრულიად რეალურია, - ასეთი ვითარება გვაქვს ქართულ ლექსში, რომლის კვალიფიცირება სილაბურ ლექსად მხოლოდ პირობითად შეიძლება.

ქართულში სალექსო ერთეულს (სტრიქონი და სხვ.) წარმოადგენს არა მარცვალთა მოცემული რაოდენობისგან (მაგ., 7) შემდგარი ოდენობა, არამედ ბინარული აგებულება – ორწევრედი (მაგ., 5+2 ან 4+3); ამ დროს მარცვალთა ერთი და იმავე რაოდენობის შემცველი ორწევრედები ერთმანეთისგან პრინციპულად განსხვავდებიან იმით, რომ თითოეულს აქვს თავისი მუდმივი რიტმული გასაყარი (შექმნილი მუდმივი სიტყვათგასაყარის ბაზაზე), ეს გასაყარი აგებს დამოუკიდებელ სტრუქტურებს, ხოლო საბოლოოდ თითოეული მათგანი ქმნის დამოუკიდებელ მეტრს; ამავე დროს, თუ საქმე გვაქვს სხვადასხვა სიგრძის სტრიქონების კომბინაციით მეტრის აგებასთან, ერთმანეთთან შეთავსებადია მხოლოდ ისეთი სტრიქონები (ბინარული აგებულებები), რომელთაც ერთი და იგივე რიტმული გასაყარი აქვთ.

შესაბამისად: 1) რომელიმე 5+2, ეს არის დამოუკიდებელი მეტრი (თავისი გამეორებით აგებული), რომლის სახე განსაზღვრულია არა იმით, რომ იგი 7-მარცვლიანია, არამედ იმით, რომ მას აქვს თავისი სტრუქტურული ნიშანი – გასაყარი 5 მარცვლის შემდეგ. ამიტომვე რომელიმე 4+3, რომელიც ასევე 7-მარცვლიანია, არის დამოუკიდებელი მეტრი, რადგანაც მასში გასაყარი სხვა ადგილზეა – 4 მარცვლის შემდეგ. 2) ე.წ. ჰეტერომეტრულ აგებულებებში იგივე 5+2 ემეზობლება მხოლოდ ისეთ ორწევრედს, რომელსაც (აქვს რა სხვა სილაბური სიგრძე) აქვს იგივე რიტმული გასაყარი 5 მარცვლის შემდეგ (5+5, 5+4 და ა. შ.); ხოლო იგივე 4+3 შედის კომბინაციაში მხოლოდ ისეთ აგებულებებთან, რომელთაც გასაყარი 4 მარცვლის შემდეგ აქვთ (4+4, 4+2 და ა. შ.)

ის, რაც ითქვა, არის გამარტყვებული სურათი ქართული ლექსთწყობის სისტემისა, რომელშიც მინიმალური რიტმული ერთეულია ორწევრედი. ორწევრედის სისტემა სამი კლასისგან შედგება: I. 5+5, 5+4, 5+3, 5+2, 5+1, 5+0; II. 4+4, 4+3, 4+2, 4+1, 4+0; III. 3+3, 3+2, 3+1, 3+0. საერთო ფორმულა: $n+k$, სადაც $n \geq k$.

ამ სისტემის რეალიზაციისას ჩვენ ვერ მივიღებთ მეტრს, რომელიც მარკირებული იქნება როგორც სილაბთა გარკვეული რაოდენობა. რომელიმე 8-მარცვლიანი ოდენობა სინამდვილეში არის ან 5+3, ან 4+4, ან 3+3+2 სტრუქტურა; რომელიმე 10-მარცვლიანი არის ან 5+5, ან 4+4+2, ან 3+3+3+1 სტრუქტურა და ა.შ.

ერთეულთა სტრუქტურებს (და მათ იერარქიას) ქმნის რიტმული გასაყარი (და მისი იერარქია).

ამ ტიპის ლექსთწყობის კვალიფიკაცია მხოლოდ ასე შეიძლება: ლექსთწყობა, დამყარებული რიტმული გასაყარის ფაქტორზე. თუ ავიღებთ ლექსთწყობათა იმ კლასიფიკაციას, რომელშიც წარმოდგენილია ოთხი ტიპი, გაერთიანებული ორ პრინციპულ კლასში (1. სილაბური ლექსთწყობა; 2. სილაბურ-პროსოდიული ლექსთწყობა: დურაციული, დინამიკური, ტონური), ქართული ლექსის ადგილი მეორე კლასშია, სადაც იგი შექმნის მეოთხე ტიპს: მეტრი, რომელიც სიტყვათგასაყარის, როგორც პროსოდიული ფაქტორის, სალექსო აქტუალიზებაზეა დამყარებული, და ლექსთწყობა, რომელიც ამ სახის მეტრებს შეიცავს.

3. ამ ინტერპრეტაციით განხილული ქართული ლექსისთვის არ გამოირიცხება განვითარების რაღაც წინა საფეხურზე ამოსავლად ვიგულისხმობთ სილაბური სტადია. სილაბური სისტემა პოსტულირებულია საერთო ინდოევროპული ლექსისთვისაც.

როგორც ჩანს, შეიძლება ჩამოვყალიბოთ შემდეგი დებულება უნივერსალური ხასიათისა: ლექსის სილაბური ტიპი (ან პრინციპულად მისი მსგავსი) არის ერთადერთი ტიპი, რომელიც შეიძლება წარმოვიდგინოთ ყველანაირი შემთხვევისთვის როგორც ამოსავალი ჰიპოთეტური სისტემა, რომლიდანაც, როგორც დერივატი, მიიღება დღეს ცნობილი ნებისმიერი სისტემა.

REFERENCES

1. R. Jakobson (1966), Linguistics and Poetics. In: Style in Language, ed. by Thomas Sebeok, Cambridge: Massachusetts.
2. J. Lotz (1966), Metric Typology. In: Style in Language.
3. A. Silagadze (1987), On Principles of Verse Analysis, Tbilisi (in Georgian and Russian).
4. Z. S. Harris (1951), Methods in Structural Linguistics. The University of Chicago Press.
5. H. E. Gleason (1956), An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, New York.
6. O. S. Akhmanova (1966), Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov, Moskva (in Russian).

7. G. L. Trager and B. Bloch (1941), The Syllabic Phonemes of the English Language, 17.
8. G. Tsereteli (1973), Meter and Rhyme in Vepkhistqaosani, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
9. A. Silagadze (1986), On the Question of Stress in Georgian Verse. In: *Matsne*, Language and Literature Series, 4 (in Georgian).
10. K. Taranovski (1966), Osnovnye zadachi statisticheskogo izucheniya slavyanskogo stikha. In: Poetics. Poetyka. Ī řyòèèà, II, The Hague-Paris-Warszawa (in Russian).
11. A. A. Silagadze (1989), Gruzinskaya versifikaciya v svete problem obshchei metrcheskoi tipologii: Trudy Akademii Nauk Gruzii, 133, ¹ 3 (in Russian).
12. A. Meillet (1923), Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs, Paris.
13. Th. V. Gamkrelidze, *Vyach. Vs. Ivanov* (1984), Indoevropeskii yazyk i indoevropetsy, vol. II, Tbilisi (in Russian).
14. A. Silagadze (1997), The Old Georgian Verse and the Problem of the Oldest Stage of Georgian Poetry, Tbilisi (in Georgian).

Received August, 2009