First Person and Second Person Markers as Representatives of a Case in a Verb Form

Nino Bagration-davitashvili

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University.

Email: nino.bagrationi@tsu.ge

2021

Nino Bagration-davitashvili

Ivane Javaksishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

First Person and Second Person Markers as Representatives of a Case in a Verb Form

ABSTRACT

There are many various opinions regarding the definition of the person category in the scientific literature. A. Shanidze defines person category in three aspects: "which person", "what kind of person" and "quantity" - how many persons are represented in one form of the verb. There are two types of markers in Georgian- v- order and m-.order. They are basically divided as follows: v –order markers mainly express the markers of the subjective person and the m- order markers – the markers of the objective person. There are many cases in the language when the objective person is expressed by the subjective person marker and the subjective person is expressed by the objective person markers. This is called inversion and the verbs of these types are called inversion verbs. It is very difficult to understand and study inversion for non-Georgian students. In Georgian Linguistic Literature it is known that there is internal relationship in formation of nouns and verbs. The interrogative pronoun (who) refers only to the human and what- to all others-animate and inanimate subjects. Perhaps the v- prefix was an ancient sign of expressing the category of human and it expressed the first person in the verb, because the first person can only be human and the action of the first person means only human. He is both – the initiator of the action and the speaker. The same form of the interrogative pronoun "Who" in Nominative and Ergatrive cases makes us think that v- prefix was the representative of the Nominative and Ergative cases in the verb form. As has been noted, in the Georgian language nouns linked to a verb create constructions. There are three constructions identified in a language (based on two-person verbs): nominative construction, ergative construction and dative construction. Constructions are built according to the basic person's cases forms (the term - basic person has been introduced by us, since the use of subjective and objective persons often cause confusion. We denote basic and non-basic person. Basic person is whom the action is mainly concerns, it either acts or is experiencing an action, is either an initiator, etc. A non-basic is a person who has a certain role in an action).

Keywords: *Category of person, Inversion, system, reprezentatives, case*

The grammar system of the Georgian language differs considerably from that of the Indo-European one. This complexity is due to polypersonal nature of a Georgian verb,

determining the cases of persons (nouns) linked to it as well as the identification of person markers that is non-uniform.

There is a subjective person and an objective person in every language. In Georgian, as has been mentioned above, they are represented by certain markers, in particular, subjective person is expressed by v- order markers, while objective person – by m- order markers. All of it would have been easy to understand if a subjective person was always expressed via subjective person markers and an objective person -- by an objective person markers. In Georgian this is not always the case. Often, person markers express opposite persons. This phenomenon, the change of the function of person markers is known as inversion, while these types of verbs are called inversion verbs. The understanding and the study of the matter of inversion is very difficult for non-Georgian-speaking students. Our goal is to simplify the material as much as possible to make it easy to remember and understand. Determining the cases of the nouns associated to a verb's form in Georgian is critical, as proper understanding of the content of a sentence depends on it. For example: Ninos mostsons Irakli/Nino likes Irakli. If we change cases of the names, we will get a different meaning of the sentence: Nino Mostsons Iraklis/Nino is liked by Irakli. Therefore, to pass along a sentence correctly it is important to determine precise cases of the nouns linked to a verb; it determines a proper formulation of semantics, as well as of a construction.

The definition of a person's category is paramount for analyzing the given matter. T. Gamkrelidze notes that a person's category is one of the universal semantic categories that find diverse manifestation in the linguistic system. It flows from an act of linguistic communication and expresses an attitude of the parties of the given act towards linguistic communication (Gamkrelidze, 2000).

A. Shanidze explains that a verb's person is a "form of a verb that shows either who is a speaker, or the person who is addressed by the speaker, or that who or what is neither a speaker and nor an addressee, rather, another person (Shanidze, 1980). Respectively, there is the first, second and third person in singular, as well as in plural. Here he means "which person", the author also determines "what kind of the person", i.e., what a person

is like from the perspective of performing an action: whether it is active or passive, subjective or objective, and he refers to this as a "what kind of a person", i.e., the state of a person. He notes that "in absolute majority of cases v- order markers still predominantly denote a subjective person, while m- order markers predominantly denote objective persons (Shanidze, 1980). And then, depending on the number of persons represented in one form, he establishes the number of persons. In the opinion of A. Shanidze, personal markers express "which person" (I, II, III) and "what kind of a person" (subjective-active, objective-passive). Questions arise concerning the latter.

Arn. Chikobava, in his fundamental work "The Problem of a Simple Sentence in Georgian", notes that "a person expressed by a personal marker is not always active. In the verbs such as: "vdrek" (I am bending), "vglej" (I am pulling), activity is evident, but in such verbs as: "vhkhedav" (I see), "vbrtskinav" (I shine), "vevedrebi" (I plead), etc. activity is extremely inconspicuous. While in such examples as: "var" (I am), "v-dga" (I am standing), "v-zi" (I am sitting), "v-kudebi" (I am dying), activity is out of question. Here there is only a state of I, I is absolutely inactive, lastly, in the examples, "vikvli" (I am being killed), "viguemebi" (I am being tormented), "vitanjvi" (I am suffering), I is actually not active; rather, it is passive and anguished as a result of another person's action. Not only is it inactive, in addition, it is subjected to action, it can be said (Chikobava, 1968).

Similarly, an actual object expressed by an objective person's m- prefix is not always subject of an action and not active. Examples: "mkavs" (I have), "maqus" (I possess), "msuris" (I want), "mnebavs" (I desire), "mina" (I wish), "mdzuls" (I hate). An author assigns to I an active attitude towards the outer world. In "mkavs" (I have), "maqus" (I possess) I is an owner and a master of something, while in the verbs "ganmitsesebia" (I have ordered), "damitseries" (I have written), "damimzadebies" (I have prepared)… I is as active as in the verbs "davtser" (I will write), "davamzadeb" (I will prepare)… Hence, the author presents I's role in a verb's form from complete passiveness to complete activeness. He assigns the same meanings as can be possessed by the forms with v- personal marker (Chikobava, 1968).

To overcome this opposition, the author introduces terms Real Subject and Real Object, morphological subject and morphological object.

A. Oniani deems it inappropriate to introduce the terms of real subject and real object in the morphological analysis of a person. Actually, real subject and real object imply v- and m- order. "There are no person markers that regularly express a real subject; similarly, there are no their opposite person markers that regularly express a real object." The author concludes that person markers do not create opposing forms denoting real subject and real object and in his opinion, the opposition that is not denoted by person markers cannot be subjected to morphological analysis.

The author is concerned by the following question: why the subjective person markers are alternated by precisely indirect-objective person markers (Oniani, 1978).

A. Oniani is of the opinion that if any of the morphological units express various grammemes (let's say, v- order mark expresses an active person) then it should be expressing this grammeme not only predominantly, but regularly, always, similar to that a first person marker always expresses a speaker, second person marker – always a listener, respectively, it will not serve as a basis for linguistic classification (Oniani, 1978).

He introduces the so-called neutral person to denote the cases when a person is neither active nor passive. He deems that it is not the function of person markers to express activeness or passiveness of a person, since v- order and m- order markers can equally express active as well as passive and neutral persons (Oniani, 1978).

The author introduces a neutral person for this very reason of presenting his opinion more clearly: a marker that expresses all members of the opposition – active, passive and neutral (or, both active and inactive) actually is not a marker of either of them. Therefore, morphological persons' activeness-passiveness, based on which subject and object are distinguished, are not defined by person markers, evidently, cannot be a determinant of "what kind of a person" and at the same time it cannot be subjected to morphological analysis (Oniani, 1978). Thus, v- and m- order markers have the same function with respect to the activeness-passiveness and they only express "which person".

A question arises – why are there two order markers in the language, if both of them have the same function and express only "which person"?

In our view, these two different systems of v-order and m- order are the most ancient, it gave rise to a certain opposition from the very beginning and was certainly justified. Otherwise, the language would have long eliminated one of them. It is worth noting also that this opposition is manifested in all Kartvelian languages; inversion, among others, which is expressed in Svanetian and Megrelian exactly like in Georgian. All of the above makes us think that that v- and m- orders are the ancient ones and they likely date back to the pre-Kartvelian period.

According to Arn. Chikobava, "a verb may not reflect a morphological makeup of a word combination, but it correctly shows a syntactic relationship of the parts of a syntagma," (Chikobava, 1968) he defines related pronouns, i.e., the cases of linked persons. A verb governs a noun in a case, while, in our opinion, an order of person markers are tied to a case. In particular, first and second person's markers. This is the most ancient scheme of a language manifestation that formed the basis for the construction.

As is known, Arn. Chikobava identified two semasological categories at the level of ancient Georgian – that of a human and of an object – "vin" (who) and "ra"(what) categories (Chikobava, 2008). In the opinion of an author, nouns in vin- category were denoted by one prefix (m-//v-) while a main marker for an object was s-, with its dialectic or phonetic variations (Chikobava, 1979).

Arn. Chikobava's opinion about the persons is important as well. He regards the distinguishing of the persons secondary. Before, only the classes, grammar classes – of a human and an object were distinguished in conjugation (Chikobava, 2008).

A. Arabuli says that there is an interesting convergence of S_1 v- marker with a 'vi-n' pronoun's fundamental element and of O_1's m- prefix with a me- (I) pronoun (Arabuli, 2011).

We share these views and think that v- and m- prefixes must have been most ancient markers denoting human category that expressed a first person in a verb. First person can only be a human; a first person's presence implies only a human being.

A question arises: if these morphemes had the same function – denoted a human category in the first person, even the more, they existed simultaneously and their alternation was not phonologically conditioned, they should have definitely had another basis for difference and the case was the very distinguishing element. We should also keep in mind that they formed different paradigms.

In our view, the mentioned markers did not express subjectiveness-objectiveness of persons in a verb; rather, they were representatives of certain cases in a verb's first and second person form, since in these persons pronouns without altered form were linked with a verb based on a case, and representatives, the so called person markers provided in a verb served this function.

As for the system of cases, a number of the researchers of the Kartvelian languages refer to the archaic nature of the Dative case as compared to other cases. Arn. Chikobava says "Three levels are identified in the formation of Georgian cases: one is possessive and dative, followed by ergative, and the most recent is nominative" (Chikobava, 1954). Apparently, dative had significant influence in the language from the very beginning which is still evident. For example, we can take first and second person's combinations, when m- or g-, representative of a noun in a dative case is denoted, it is never lost:

Me g-elaparakebi shen   (I am talking to you)

Shen m-elaparakebi me (You are talking to me)

In these specific combinations the expression or the lack of personal markers cannot be explained by means of active and inactive, subjective and objective concepts.

In our view, v- was representative of the nouns in a nominative and ergative cases, while m- was a representative of a noun presented in a dative case in a verb. Naturally, the ancient period of the development of the language is implied, when the understanding of a subject and object was not yet formed and the system of conjugation had not been developed yet.

Since v- prefix was a representative of nominative and ergative cases and m- prefix – of a dative case, they created certain constructions with a verb. In first and second person combinations, where pronouns were and are represented in an unchanged form,

expressing a case became necessary for organizing and comprehending a sentence. v- and m-, case representative took upon this function.

As for third person forms, they, as is known, were developed relatively late and they did not need case representatives, since pronoun linked to them changes by cases; as for person markers, over time they took the function of expressing numerous grammatical categories, among others, "what kind of a person". A. Shanidze, Arn. Chikobava, V. Topuria, Iv. Imnaishvili, and others (Shanidze, 1980, Chikobava, 1968 Topuria, Imnaishvili, 1996) have noted about the specificity of the production of third person markers. The forms of the third person continue the first and the second persons paradigms.

The difference in the expression of person markers, in particular, that first and second person markers are always prefixes and third person markers are suffixes except for an indirect object, speaks about their different origin, as noted by a number of scientists. As for an indirect object's marker, it seems to have developed later. It is a fact that it does not have the value in the language that is enjoyed by first and second person markers, which is evidenced by the contemporary Georgian as well. It is used only before plosives, otherwise is represented by zero allomorph; it may or may not be present. This excludes its indispensability, which is an indication that it effectively no longer has a grammatical function, since this function of opposing first and second person's forms is served well by a zero allomorph.

As has been noted, in the Georgian language nouns linked to a verb create constructions. There are three constructions identified in a language (based on two-person verbs): nominative construction, ergative construction and dative construction. Constructions are built according to the basic person's cases forms (the term - basic person has been introduced by us, since the use of subjective and objective persons often cause confusion. We denote basic and non-basic person. Basic person is whom the action is mainly concerns, it either acts or is experiencing an action, is either an initiator, etc. A non-basic is a person who has a certain role in an action). We must note that basic and

non-basic persons are never represented in the same case in the Georgian language. When a basic person is in the nominative case, non-basic person will always be in dative. Ergative construction envisages basic person in ergative and non-basic person in nominative, while dative construction – basic person in dative and non-basic person in nominative. Whenever another non-basic person is present in a verb, it will always be in a dative case. The Georgian language system is entirely based on the afore-mentioned constructions, thus, a learner sees the language as a whole in an organized, not a chaotic form; the mentioned constructions will help non-Georgian speaking students to find an easy way to understand the system of the Georgian language and, respectively, build sentences correctly.

Let us present constructions at the example of a bipersonal verb:

Nominative construction:

Basic person - Nominative case   *Me (kac-i) v-aketeb sachmel-s . (I am (the man) cooking a meal).*

Non-basic person - Dative case.   *Shen (kac-i) aketeb sachmel-s. (You are (the men) cooking a meal).*

                                             Is *(kac-i) aketebs sachmel-s. (He is (the men) cooking a meal).*

Dative construction

Basic person----- Dative case   *Me (kac-s) m-kavs dzaghl-i. (I (the men) have a dog).*

Non-basic person—Nominative case   *Shen (kac-s) g-kavs dzaghl-i. (You (the men) have a dog).*

                                            Mas *(kac-s) h-kavs dzaghl-i. (He (the men) has a dog).*

Ergative construction:

Basic person-----Ergative case   *Me (kac-ma) gavakete sachmeli. (I (the men) cooked a meal).*

Non-basic person- Nominative case   *Shen (kac-ma) gaakete sachmeli. (You (the men) cooked a meal).*

                                           Man *(kac-ma) gaaketa sachmeli. (He (the men) cooked a meal).*

References

Arabuli, A. (2011). ავთანდილ არაბული, თანამედროვე ქართული ენის მორფოლოგია, სალიტერატურო ენა. [Morphology of Modern Georgian Language, Literal Language], თბილისი, გამომცემლობა „მერიდიანი“. 2011.

Arabuli, A. (2016). ავთანდილ არაბული, ინვერსია: ახალი ქართული ენა: სალიტერატურო ენის მორფოლოგია. ["Inversion". *New Georgian Language: Morphology of Literal Language:Verb.*]; თბილისი, თსუ გამომცემლობა, 2016.

Chikobava, A. (1954). არნოლდ ჩიქობავა, მრავლობითის სუფიქსთა გენეზისისათვის ქართულში." [Genesis of Plural Suffixes in Georgian] *იკე, ტ.* 6 [Iberian-Caucasian Linguistic]. თბილისი, თსუ გამომცემლობა, 1954.

Chikobava, A. (1968). არნოლდ ჩიქობავა, *მარტივი წინადადების პრობლემა ქართულში.* [*Problem of Simple Sentence in Georgian.*] თბილისი, გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება", 1968.

Chikobava, A. (1979). არნოლდ ჩიქობავა, იბერიულ-კავკასიური ენათმეცნიერების შესავალი. [Introduction of Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics]. თბილისი, თსუ გამომცემლობა, 1979.

Chikobava, A. (2008). არნოლდ ჩიქობავა, ქართული ენის ზოგადი დახასიათება" [General Description of Georgian Language]. *ქართული ენის განმარტებითი ლექსიკონი, ტ. 1.* [*Explanatory Dictionary of Georgian Language* 1]; თბილისი, თსუ გამომცემლობა, 2008.

Gamkrelidze, T. (2000). თამაზ გამყრელიძე, რჩეული ქართველოლოგიური შრომები. [*Kartvelological Papers.*]; თბილისი, თსუ გამომცემლობა, 2000.

Imnaishvili I,. (1996).: ზმნა ძველ ქართულში 2 ნაწილადი; ნაწ. 1. [*Georgian Verb, 2 parts*]; მაინის ფრანკფურტი.

Machavariani, M. (1987). მაია მაჭავარიანი, ქცევის გრამატიკული კატეგორიის სემანტიკა. [*Semantics of Grammatical Category of Version.*]; თბილისი, გამომცემლობა „მეცნიერება", 1987.

Oniani, A. (1978). ალექსანდრე ონიანი, ქართველურ ენათა ისტორიული მორფოლოგიის

საკითხები. [*Issues of Historical Morphology of Kartvelian Languages.*] თბილისი,

გამომცემლობა „განათლება", 1978.

Shanidze, A. (1980). აკაკი შანიძე, ქართული ენის გრამატიკის საფუძვლები:

თხზულებანი, ტ. 3. [*Issues of Georgian Language,* v. 3.] თბილისი, თსუ

გამომცემლობა, 1980.