

Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus
(vols. 1 and 2)
Corrigenda, Comments, and Related Issues

by
George Hewitt

In 1980 a group gathered in Leiden to discuss a project to publish 50-page descriptions of all the languages of the Caucasus. This was meant to be a rough equivalent in English to *Jazyki Narodov SSSR, Iberijsko-Kavkazskie Jazyki* (Moscow, 1967), with the essential difference that information on syntax, neglected in that earlier volume, would be given due weight. Present at the meeting were: J.A.C. Greppin (series editor), R. Smeets, D.M. Job, M. Van Esbroeck, A.C. Harris, and myself. Seventeen years later publication, sadly, remains incomplete, largely because of the usual difficulties associated with any joint-undertaking involving colleagues from the former Soviet Union.

The first volume to appear was No. 2, edited by myself and devoted to the North West Caucasian languages; it was published by Caravan Books in 1989. The second to appear was No. 1, edited by Alice C. Harris and devoted to the Kartvelian languages; it appeared in 1991. Third to appear was No. 4 Part 2, edited by Rieks Smeets and devoted to the three Nakh languages and to six minor Lezgian tongues; it appeared in 1994. The only review of any of these tomes that I have seen was of this last; it was by Martin Haspelmath in *Language* 72.1 (1996).

I myself have several observations to make on the South Caucasian volume, but I begin with some corrections to my own.

On p.23 Dr. Catherine Paris should have been described as being Director of Research at C.N.R.S. (Paris). In the Abaza text on p.27 the indefinite marker *-x'* is missing from the 2nd word in line 3; the accent is missing from the following words: *ə-kaysəjəq*, *(ə)-lə-taqə-t'ə*, *ʃ-ə-k'ə-ə-pixə-x'-t'*, *šə'nda*. In the phoneme-charts for both Abkhaz and Abaza on pp.42 & 94 the three lamino-apico alveolar affricates *ç*, *ç'*, *ç'* were omitted. On p.77 l.2 remove the alternative with *ʃ-ə'-z'* *təg'əq* for this protasis-form is not used in a future sense. On p.95 l.13: Consonant. On p.363 G. Charachidzé refers to an article of mine from 1986 but fails to include it in his bibliography, where it should appear as: 'The labialised sibilants of Ubykh (North West Caucasian)' in *Revue des Etudes Géorgiennes et Caucasiennes*, 2, 21-30.

The length of the Kartvelian volume (556 pages) is partly due to the superfluous use of the Georgian script when accompanied by transliteration in Harris' introductory Overview as well as in the chapters by Fähnrich on Old

Georgian, Aronson on Modern Georgian, Harris on Mingrelian, and, albeit intermittently, Schmidt on Svan.

On p.xii I think the following are more usual as Kartvelian dialect-names: Khevsurian (for Khevsur), Mokhebian (for Mokhe), Ingiloan (for Ingilo), Dzhavakhian (for Dzhavakh), Lechkhumian (for Lechkhum), Rach(ʿ)an (for Rachian), Zugdidi-Samurzaq(ʿ)anoan (for Zugdid-Samurzaqan), and Senak(ʿ)ian (for Senak).

In J.N. Birdsall's article on palæography the surname Kadzaia is met; this should read Kadzhaia.

Old Georgian (author H. Fähnrich)

p.164 l.8: suffix; l.17: perfective; in general does the term *Active Intransitive* (as on p.167) faithfully translate the original German, or was the original rather *Intransitive verbs of active (= non-passive) voice*? pp.177-169: was the paradigm for the verb *qivili* really so widespread in Old Georgian to warrant such a prominent place in the presentation of conjugational patterns? -- in particular, one should note the absence of the subjective version vowel in the IIrd Series, which in the oldest texts correlated with the form *q'iva* taking a NOMINATIVE subject (viz. *katami q'iva*), even though inversion is seen in the IIIrd Series! p.176: 'I became silent for X'; pp.177-178: surely the post-radical -n- should be absent from these IIIrd Series forms.

Georgian (author H.I. Aronson)

p.224 l.16up: the form is Future; p.226 l.1: *გამოაცხო* *gamoacxo* (from *გამოაცხოვ* *gamoacxva*); p.227 l.3: 'ploughs' is Georgian *კმაყი* *kmav* with masdar *კმავ* *kmava*, whereas *კმაყ* is masdar of *კმაყი* 'crumbles'; p.236 l.13: the postposition is *-მდე/-მდე* with the preceding *-ა* being the remnant of the Adverbial ending *-აჲ* hence *აქამდე*; p.239 l.7: primarily; p.241 l.16: add *აქამდე...აქამდე*; l.12up: add *ერთმანვე*; p.247: align headings correctly; l.10up: intransitive; p.248 l.11: would *აქამდე* really be preferred to *აქამდე* with such a non-human/inanimate object as 'books'?; align headings correctly; p.249 l.20 (et passim): occurring; p.250 l.3: *ა-ა-ა-ა-ა* does NOT mean 'stand up', which must be *ა-ა-ა-ა-ა* but rather means 'take up a standing position when already on your feet'; p.251 l.1up: conjunctive; p.252 l.6: 'I want'...'I can'; p.254 l.11: add *ა-ა-ა-ა-ა*; p.255 l.19: add *დასაქმებელი*; p.256 l.1: add *დასაქმებელი*; l.3: add *But NE მი-ა-ა-ა-ა-ა vs მი-ა-ა-ა-ა-ა*; l.15: the basic meaning of *ნაწილი* is 'building, structure'; some glosses seem to be missing from the middle of the page; p.257 l.9up (et passim): auxiliary; p.260 l.4: *ა-ა-ა-ა-ა*; p.262 l.5-6up: *vetrevinebi zvis talebs...v-e-tr-ev-in-eb-i zgv-is t'alg-eb-s*; p.266 l.13: Russia; p.272: the *ა-ა-ა* sequence in *მი-ა-ა-ა-ა-ა* is not

the norm for either written or spoken Georgian today; p.297 l.16up: ‘We were annoyed, but.’; l.7up: rac ‘rac’; l.6up: magram; l.5up: mtacebelt; l.2up: *მწიკრებელ*; p.280 ll.10-11: p.283 l.7up: surely this statement is the wrong way round insofar as *რამ*+ speech-particle is proscribed by prescriptivists, even though it is found in actual speech; p.284 l.5up: antecedent of the relative conjunction is generally put; p.287 l.7up: saxli; ll.1-2up: fourth (not second); p.288 l.1: 446; l.14: send; l.7up: should it not be gmirebisa (*გმირ-ებ-ისა*? And split xseneba gmirebisa; p.289: *ვიტა*, *სანათ* are synonymous; add *რამდაც* ‘even if’; p.290 l.9: coreferentiality; delete final 15 lines on this page plus first 4 lines of p.291; p.291 l.18: ‘election’ = *არჩევანი* (plural *არჩევნები*); l.14up: samermisodac, which means ‘for the future’; p.295 l.12: it may be worth pointing out that the agent is not absolutely ruled out when the Adverbial case of the Future Participle is used (e.g. *რეგულ მთავარ ბავად საკები ბრენთა მიერ* -- cf. Hewitt **The Typology of Subordination in Georgian and Abkhaz** p.43); p.296 l.6: ‘Is it really the case that the bad can’t be called bad, the evil evil without transgressing the value of man, without insulting man?’; l.13: daumqareblad; l.18: *დაუმყარებლად* p.297 ll.1-2: adura...a-dug-a (for adura...a-a-dug-a means ‘X got Y to start boiling’; ll.14-15up: damidgmevinebia...*და-მ-რ-დგ-მ-ე-მ-ა-ბ-რ-ა* (no *-რ-* is optional between the final vowels here); p.298 ll.2-3: if ‘mother’ here is the titular mother of the speaker, we might expect *dedastvis...დადა-ვ-რ-ის*; l.13: daqevlinebi; p.302 l.14up: Coreferential; p.304 ll.13-14: what is the source for justifying the sequence *moxval ōi* as a normal yes-no question strategy? p.305: delete lines 4 to 8, as they are repeated without motivation from p. 275 (Note 1); p.307 l.1up: *męqina* is the Aorist of this verb, as given on p.279; p.280: the proverb is misquoted here, as the relative clause should be negated and the whole finished off with the quotative particle to give *rac ar mergeba*, or *Remergebao* *რ-ა-ც არ მ-ე-რ-გ-ებ-ა არ რ-ე-მ-ე-რ-გ-ებ-ა-ც* ‘What’s not due [to] me will do me no good’; p.308 l.4up: the statement that ‘Verbs in a...-eb- form the pluperfect from the future stem with the suffix -in-’ will not suffice (cf. *(še)-k-eb-s => (še)-k-č-a => (še)-k-č* and NOT *(še)-k-eb-č* -- the point is that, if there is no vowel in the root, *-eb-* is absent from the IIIrd Series as a whole and *-ჩ-* is not used in the Pluperfect (there are still oddities: *მარტაბის* can be regular, giving *მარტაბისა/მარტაბისაჲ* or irregular, giving *მარტაბისა/მარტაბისაჲ*; p.310 l.7: *mgoneboda*; l.11up: *kharthwelische*.

Mingrelian (author A.C. Harris)

p.320 line 3up: *რამაჩ-რ-აჲ* p.321: list of preverbs needs to be filled out; p.322 l.1up: *გაჩინაქ-ბრენ* is the equivalent of Georgian *გათხულებს* and not *ამიხულებს* as suggested by the translation; p.324 l.6up: case-marker *-ჲ* p.325 l.4: ‘X will give

it to Y'; p.331 ex.4: 'X picked it up'; p.335 l.3: surely *-n-aq*; p.336 l.13up: *ma-(g)-it-rt-um-ul-ni* l.5up: 'X is sitting in it'; l.2up: 'evidently they were seated on it'; p.339 l.6: *g/it/it- -aq, q, t* p.345 l.3: The Imperfect Conditional is rather equivalent to Georgian VERBAL MASDAR+ *si iknabvda* and so the meaning of the cited form is rather *c'era-si iknabvda* 'X would be engaged in writing'; p.346 l.12up: *mt-v-laf-an-s* is not the Future of *laf-um-a* as stated; it is rather the equivalent of Georgian *mt-a-g'ap-a* the Medial Future will be either *kv-laf-um-s* or *laf-um-d-a-sa-n ni* l.1up: *sv-c'er-um-d-u* is Georgian *sv-c'er-d-a* 'X would write/would have written'; p.347 l.3: *sv-c'er-um-d-u-k'ni(n)* should be translated as an unreal, not a real, condition; p.349 l.1up: evidentials in *na*-generally relate to either transitive or intransitive (Classes 1 and 2) forms, so that the form here could also mean 'evidently it was being written'; p.352 ex.11: if Tuite's questioning of Uridia's data would result in the verb here changing to *v(a)-a-ni-t-a-n-a* I agree; p.356 ex.15 (et passim): 'yard' is *aza*; p.357 ex.18 (et passim): *svava* is a festival (usually wedding) rather than a holiday; l.14: to 'in all forms' add 'in Series I and II'; p.358 l.4: since the 4th Evidentials tend to be formed on the masdar, and since the masdar of 'cause to write' is *(sv)-k'er-ap-u-a* the 4th Evidential would be expected to be *na-c'er-ap-u-a* (however, the form here may be quoted from Gudava 1984, though this could not be checked as the Bibliography gives no source for this 1984 article); final paragraph: data from Deeters' *Das kharthwalische Verbum* could usefully be included here; Morphology lacks reference to the formation of bivalent intransitives in Series III; p.362 l.13: *staxt-s' k'ela* l.9up: *masi'-it-s* [sic] is Dative not Genitive; p.364 1st full paragraph: note the morpheme-boundaries are *it-s'-si'-ij* where *-si'* is the Genitive rather than a sequence of Emphatic+Genitive; p.370 ex. 53: children; p.374 ex.80: '(God) didn't create for me either wife or child'; p.376 ex.90: must become; p.377 ex.95: *na-si'* is Georgian *sa* 'thus'; ex.96: 'You are to help one another'; p.379 ex.107: since the verb here ends in the general subordinator *-q* the translation must be 'that/when/since I have nothing'; p.380 ex.113: *v'it-an-k'ni siacvda* 'pitied' not 'liked'; ex.115: *svav'i*; p.381 ex.116: *svaskvda* is Georgian *sv(ul)va't* hence 'it remained to them'; l.6: fitted; ex.117 *masvina* is Georgian *svavla* 'they sent X the message'; l.11: 'that he was to give his daughter to this king..'; l.12up: 'X decided' is normally *gvav'i-v'itij* though with the extra perfectivising preverb may also be *gvav'i-v'itij* p.382 ll.5-6: as *svavina* is Georgian *svavari* we need 'He has left us the instructions (sc. in his will)'; ex.122: *kvtaek'ina* is Georgian *svik'ava* 'X took hold of'; ex.125: *sa-k'i* p.383 ex.126: *svaskvda* l.13: 'will be angry..'; p.386 l.1up: 'I might buy corn'; p.387 l.12; 'used to have a child'; p.391 l.1up: Beiträge.

Laz (author D.A. Holisky)

pp.434 & 472: NATADZE; p.441 ll.3-4: me/mo here are preverbs; 2.6.4: these participles are NOT Futures but Past (passive) formations (see Nadareishvili IKE XIII p.182); 2.6.5 (et passim): privative; p.447 l.1up: who would have expected Class 2 intransitive verbs ever to have had inverted Series III forms? -- inversion with the verb of motion, as shewn in example 70b, is surely an innovation; p.450 l.14: constituents; 72c: m-i-xen-i-ya; p.452 76d: i-ǰib-e-n; p.453 79b: is it 'went' or 'came in'? p.456 l.1: g-i-c'um-e; 1.5: be-SG-IMPERF; 1.7up: day-after come...; p.459 l.4: ge=m-o-kt-am-s; 1.6: [what was mine] keeps me busy; 90f: The ruler said to X...; 1.2up: these complementisers are of Kartvelian, Turkish (ultimately Persian) and Greek provenance respectively; p.460 92a: the subject here of *ǰǰ* is Nominative, whereas in 78c it is Narrative -- is some comment required? p.461 l.9: precede; p.465 l.13: constituent; ex.102a: is it 'throw out' or 'pursue'?

Svan (author K-H. Schmidt)

p.480 l.2: garmonizaciq; p.485 l.4up: that room.to; p.487 l.13up: diphthongization; p.489 l.7up: There are; p.500 l.15: ǰ'd; p.503 l.12: since the literal Georgian version of *aṃnka ǰerxis puraǰeβd sga xóbx ? amitom zogs purebistvis βig ubiat*, it is unclear how the expression 'for the cows' fits the translation given here, which surely must be 'Therefore to some cows are bound...'; p.507 l.4: or /ø/; p.510 l.2: 'X begins for Y'; 1.2up: ed-ánúán *edǰanwan*; p.511 l.2: the form *ke:ǰtenanda* conceals 2 preverbs, one of which is omitted from the underlying morphemic presentation **ka-x-e-ten-a:n-da*, which should be **ka-an-x-e-ten-a:n-da* (cf. my **A Svan (Laǰx) Text 2** p.23 l.3 in *REGC* /of 1985) -- vid.

ǰ-x-ten-ǰn = da-e-bad-a, *a-x-ten-ǰn-s* = da-bad-eb-od-e-s; 1.13up: add /un/; 1.8up: **an-x-a-naq'un-e*; 1.6up: *x-a-mar-al-n-e*; 1.1up: the form cannot be Pluperfect, and so the translation should be 'And he would have made Jacob thirsty for water'; p.513 l.2up: surely the non-finite expression of purpose requires a Genitive rather than Nominative to express the object of a transitive verb; p.514 ll.6-9: in view of the statement on p.534 that «In contrast to Georgian instances of an Ergative in connection with intransitive verbs, the Ergative in Svan is bound to a transitive construction», is it the case that the verbs described here as 'intransitives' take a Nominative subject in the IIInd Series? Svan, like Georgian, does, of course, have verbs that **appear** to be intransitive and yet take an Ergative subject in Series II because they are fundamentally transitive forms (e.g. Laǰx *ǰǰǰǰǰ-ǰ ǰ'-ǰn-ǰk'ǰn-e* from my 1985 Svan text (p.17), which Oniani translated into Georgian by means of a Class 2 verb with the expected Nominative subject [*ǰǰǰǰǰ-ǰ ǰ-xr'-ǰ*], though there also exists the

Medial *ႁႃႃႃႃႃႃ ႃႃႃႃႃႃ ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* formed on the same root). The editor of **ILC 1** herself gives an example of an **apparent** intransitive with Ergative subject in Series II (*ႃႃႃႃႃႃ ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* ‘The man fought’, p.59), though she fails again to see the validity of Schmidt’s association of the Ergative with transitive forms in Series II. However, on p.534 Schmidt could have stressed that formally the verbs for ‘wake up’ in Georgian and Svan are quite different -- in Georgian *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* is transitive and thus takes the Ergative subject *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* whilst in Svan *ႃႃႃႃႃႃ ႃႃႃႃႃႃ* is intransitive Class 2 (cf. the Present *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*) and thus takes the Nominative *ႃႃႃႃႃႃ*; p.518 l.3up: ‘He roasted it’ ← **an-a-t’q’ab-i-a*; p.520 l.6: ‘he runs away from X’ = Georgian *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* whilst *ႃႃႃႃႃႃ* = Georgian *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*; p.521 l.6: ‘it has a cloth rolled around it’; p.522 l.4: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*; with reference to the agent alongside passive verbs, are the Instrumental and postposition *ႃႃႃႃႃႃ* presented in separate examples on pp.521 and 522 fully interchangeable? l.4up: ‘tied X for him’; p.523 l.13: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*; p.525 l.16: ‘.that I was building it for X’; p.526 l.16: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃ*; p.528 l.16: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* may be a Perfect from the structural point of view but is functionally a Present ‘he prefers’, just like its Georgian equivalent *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* and so its past tense is more of an Imperfect, which might explain the presence of the Imperfect ending *ႃႃႃ* l.13up: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* is not an active-voice form, as translated, but a relative passive ‘I had been cut for/on X’; l.9up: IIIrd Subjunctives never occur in contexts where the Conditional is an appropriate translation in English, and the verb in question (*ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*) is a relative not absolute passive, meaning ‘(I don’t recall) X growing old for/on Y’; p.529 l.3: if *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* is the logical direct object of ‘have’, why is it apparently Dative (the Nom = *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*); l.14: ‘As much maize as there is in Sasash.’; p.530 ll.6-9: the presentation of OPT[ative] in the same section as that dealing with Indicative and Subjunctive makes it look as though the way to express a wish (= Aorist or IIIrd Subjunctive) is about to be described, whereas the forms in question shew how the language produces a desiderative expression of the form ‘X has a hankering to VERB’; p.535 ll.1ff: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ* = ‘abundantly’ (Georgian *blomad*); p.536 bottom: in view of Svan’s undoubted preference for changing the persons of a quote to fit the main verb’s requirements while retaining the tenses of the original direct speech in accompaniment with the speech-particle (with or without the complementiser -- see my discussion in **Folia Slavica 5** 1982), could this 1917 example actually mean ‘He said sorrowfully that I would kill my God’? p.543 l.13up: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*; p.547 l.6up: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*; p.554 l.14: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*; l.5up: *ႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃႃ*.

In December 1995 my ‘Georgian: A Structural Reference Grammar’ was published by Benjamins. It consists of xviii+714 pages. It has been reviewed in

two and a half pages by Kevin Tuite of Montreal (1997). Apart from wasting (presumably) valuable space on my non-pc use of 'he' to refer to both sexes, he says this: 'In the preface Hewitt mentions that around the time he received the commission to write GSRG, «an unforeseen rift in my relations with Georgia» led to Georgian becoming «a virtual dead language» as far as he was concerned (p. xiii). This does not strike me as the most auspicious circumstance in which to write a reference grammar of a language that is very much alive. One annoying, but not particularly harmful, consequence is the 17-page introduction, in which the reader is treated to Hewitt's views on language and ethnic identity, and the linguistic policies of post-Soviet Georgia [...] I would have liked [...] less intrusion of a linguist's personal views on political and social questions'. In the Introduction I described the Kartvelian peoples as consisting of Georgians, Mingrelians, Laz and Svans. Since I have never shared the opinion that has become Georgian orthodoxy since only around 1930 that these peoples are correctly classified as 'Georgians' -- and the Laz, who live mainly in Turkey, quite adamantly do not share this category-confusion --, I see no reason why I should not have the right to state my own opinion in the Introduction to my own grammar, which is, after all, the section of the book designed to orientate readers within the socio-political context in which the language about to be described is spoken. Does Tuite suppose that only socio-political opinions that are viewed with favour by the speakers of a language are to be aired in grammars of that language? This strikes me as a decidedly odd way of approaching language-description. And, if he has a full complement of arguments to prove that my assessment of imposed ethnicity in the region is misguided, let him publish them so that the persuasiveness of his case can be judged by all interested parties. One unpromising pointer resides in the title of the one and only published volume that, as far as I am aware, the Canadian anthropologist has contributed to Kartvelology. The 148-page offering consists of texts with translations and boasts the title 'An Anthology of Georgian Folk Poetry' (Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994). Unsuspecting readers would conclude from this that the original texts represent the Georgian language exclusively, but they would be in error, for Svan and Mingrelian poems are also included. And yet, more encouragingly, in the article on the Svans he contributed to the 1994 'Encyclopedia of World Cultures' (vol. 6), Tuite does on p. 343 (col. 2) use the term 'Kartvelians' as a superordinate for all four of the South Caucasian/Kartvelian peoples, of which I whole-heartedly approve, when he writes: 'The Greek geographer Strabo...describes the Svans as fierce, warlike mountain people, ruled by a king and a council of 300 elders and capable of

fielding an army of 200,000. [This figure may be an exaggeration, or perhaps Strabo was including other Kartvelians under the designation «Svan»].

[N.B. The encyclopædia just mentioned incorporates a separate article on the Mingrelians, which owes its existence to my convincing the editorial board that, if the Laz and the Svans were to be graced with articles independently of the Georgians, then justice demanded that the Mingrelians should likewise not be treated under the heading 'Georgians', as planned. The resulting entry was compiled by Stephen Jones, partly on the basis of some rare materials from my personal library that he requested me to photocopy for the purpose. On p. 262 (col. 2) he correctly stresses that Mingrelian is 'not mutually intelligible with Georgian'.]

At the time I was asked to write the Benjamin grammar I had been working on Georgian for over 15 years. Regardless of my relations with Georgia and Georgian speakers at the time of the book's composition, I think that such a period of intensive study fully justified my acceptance of the commission, and the work should be judged for what it sets out to be, namely as accurate and complete a description of the standard Georgian literary language as I was/am capable of producing. I take issue below with Tuite's comments of a purely linguistic nature.

Aronson has also published a somewhat longer and more linguistically based review of this same grammar. Let me move onto my response by quoting his description of the demonstrative adjective *eg* (*mag*) on p. 238 of **ILC 1**, namely: 'eg¹, corresponding somewhat to Latin *iste*, is a marked form indicating something between «here» and «there»'. This corresponds to his comment on p. 122 of his *Georgian: A Reading Grammar* (1982) (a statement left untouched in the later corrected edition of 1990): '*eg* indicates a distance intermediate between that of *es* and *is*, somewhat similar to Latin *iste, ista, istud*'. For information, the definition offered in the standard Latin Dictionary of C.T. Lewis and C. Short for *iste* is: 'That (person or thing) near you (in place or thought), that of yours, that of which you speak or with which you are connected' -- on the basis of my familiarity with Georgian this seems to be a pretty accurate description of the range of the Georgian demonstrative in question, as in the following pretty unambiguous example:

mo-d'i ert-i mag šen lamaz c'iver-eb-š'i
PREV-come(IMPER) one-NOM that your lovely beard-PL-in
g-a-k'ac-w
you-VERSION-kiss-AOR.SUBJ[1st.pers.subject]

¹Actually there is a misprint here so that the text confusingly reads e.g.!

‘Come on, just let me plant one kiss on you in that lovely beard of yours!’

(D. Kʼdiashvili *samanishvili dedinacvali* ‘Samanishvili’s Stepmother’, p.128 in vol. 1 of the 1981 2-volume edition of his works).

Aronson’s two statements are significant in view of his latest criticism of my own description of this demonstrative, to wit: ‘There is a 3-way system of deixis applicable to the Georgian demonstratives, viz. **e+s** «this (by me)» vs **eg** «that (by you)» vs **i+s** «that (yonder)»’, as expressed on p. 58 of my 1995 book, to which Aronson responds thus: ‘Despite the traditional view, accepted by Hewitt, the «third demonstrative», *eg-mag* does not point toward the second person’ (1997). But since he does not vouchsafe to us any new definition, we are left none the wiser.

With reference to his comment: ‘Many things that one would expect to find in a reference grammar are missing or incompletely described. Examples include the use of the *-gʷ* infix with negators, the (most common) formation of the comparative with the positive degree of the adjective and a postpositional phrase in *-ze* «than», and the use of the old plural marker *-ni* with pronouns to mark persons (e.g., *samnieni* «all three [people]»’, I would reply as follows. It is difficult to know to which of Aronson’s two categories each of his examples belongs, the negatives containing the stated infix and meaning ‘(not) any longer’ are described (adequately, in my view) on pp. 67-68 and 81. The use of the positive grade of the adjective to mark comparatives when accompanied by the target marked by *-ze* is described (illustrated, and thus satisfactorily dealt with) on pp. 48-49 and 66. I think Aronson’s description of forms like *samnieni* as ‘*-ni* with pronouns to mark persons’ is somewhat infelicitous, for basically we are talking about cardinals (which are ADJECTIVES) marked by the emphatic particle *-ni* which combinations mean ‘all NUMERAL’, as noted on p. 90. However, even when these adjectives appear in apposition to a pronominal element marked within the verb (which is presumably what Aronson means), it is by no means obligatory to mark any plurality on the adjectives themselves, as indicated by such examples as:

er+ve-m *ga-(Ø)-i-xad-es* *čax-ab-i*
2-PARTICLE-ERG they.took.them.off cherkesska-PL-NOM

‘The two of them/They both took off their cherkesskas’

(D. Kʼdiashvili *samanishvili dedinacvali* ‘Samanishvili’s Stepmother’, p.129 in vol. 1 of the 1981 2-volume edition of his works) -- also possible are: *er-ma-ni*, *er+ve-t*, *er-ta-ve*

gza-ze sam-i-ve *čə-cviv-d-nen* *did arma-ši*
road-on 3-NOM-PART PREV-fall-PASS-they(AOR) big hole-in

'On the road they all three fell down into a big hole'

(Shura Oniani's Georgian translation of a Svan text as I presented it in *Redf Kartlisa* in 1983) -- also possible are: *sam-n-t've*, *sam-t've-n-i*

ese-n-i *sam-t've* *k'arg-i* *tvat'ad-i* *da* *t'an+ad-i*
this-PL-NOM 3-NOM-PART good pretty-NOM & attractive-NOM
t-g'v-nen

VERSION-be-they(AOR)

'All three of these were good to look at & seemly in body'

(Shura Oniani's Georgian translation of a Svan text as I presented it in *Redf Kartlisa* in 1983) -- also possible are: *sam-t've-n-i*, *sam-n-t've*

I, therefore, chose not to mention the possibility of marking that plurality pleonastically by adding the old plural markers (and, as indicated in the variants, two orderings are feasible: either Aronson's suggested *sam-t've-n-i/sam-t've-t* or *sam-n-t've/sam-ta-va*) -- plainly it would have been preferable to do so.

As regards his statement that, when saying an adjective complement may stand in the plural if the subject is plural, I neglected to add that this only obtains if the copula itself is plural, I accept that this restriction may well apply in cases where, in archaising vein, the old Nominative plural desinence *-n-i* is selected, but does Aronson wish to deny the possibility of associating a (modern) plural adjective with 3rd person singular copula, as in *ra lamaz-ab-t-a es g'vavit-ab-Ø* 'How beautiful these flowers are!'

Aronson expresses surprise that I make no mention of the preverb-root combination *še-xvd-* in my discussion of verbs with variable actant marking. This is true, but the alternative patterning IS alluded to in the book (on pp. 482-3). Cases like *haviv-ma da-t-jin-a* 'the child_{ERG} went to sleep' vs *haviv-a da-(Ø)-e-jin-a* 'the child_{DAT} went to sleep' indicate (sc. to the extent that one can meaningfully distinguish between them in the real world) *~X_{ERG}* (deliberately) went off to sleep' vs *~X_{DAT}* (accidentally) fell asleep'. With the preverb-root combination in question both verb-actants are actually present in the clause, and we have Nominative subject vs Dative indirect object in, for example: *magabr-ab-i še-(Ø)-xvd-nen art+man+et-a* 'the friends_{NOM} met (one another_{DAT})' vs Dative of the encounterer and Nominative of the entity encountered in: *am c'ign-ši še-m-xvd-a sa+int'eras+o magalit-t'in* 'in this book I_{DAT} came across an interesting example_{NOM}'. If the basic meaning of the preverb-root is 'meet', then the end-result for the verb's two arguments X and Y is the same regardless of the grammatical function assigned to each of them -- viz. they come together. With Nominative marking for the encounterer we perhaps have more active involvement on his part (such that an adherent of the Active

hypothesis for Georgian would naturally expect here, especially when the preverb *და-* replaces *სე-*; an ERGATIVE = ACTIVE subject-marking, whereas, of course, it is the Nominative case that is here obligatory in standard Georgian), whilst the Dative marking of the encounterer perhaps implies more passive involvement. Compare with the above the alternatives (with relevant nuances) seen in: *გოგონა-მ გვადაგვიანდა-ი და-ღ-ი/კარგ-ა* = girl|ERG key|NOM PREV-(it-)lose-she(AOR) vs *გოგონა-ს გვადაგვიანდა-ი და-ღ-ი/ე-კარგ-ა* = girl|DAT key|NOM PREV-(her-)IOV-lose-it(AORPASS), both of which equate (roughly) to English 'The girl lost the key'.

Aronson begins his review by comparing this grammar to Tschenkéli's *Einführung in die georgische Sprache* of 1958, which I regard as an odd comparison in view of the fact that Tschenkéli's two volumes form a practical grammar of Georgian, as does my other 1995 publication from Routledge *Georgian: A Learner's Grammar*; whereas the book Aronson is reviewing does not set out to be any such thing. His penultimate paragraph states: 'The volume begins with a tendentious, debatable, but largely irrelevant discussion of contemporary Georgian political and linguistic issues...'. This is not accurate, for the work begins with an introductory chapter (pp. 1-17), of which pp. 9-14 alone deal with the questions to which Aronson takes apparent exception. As I stated earlier in my response to Tuite, I think I have the right to say in the introduction to such a work what I as author feel to be relevant to a reader's understanding of the milieu in which the language under description is actually spoken. And, since the views expressed on those pages have been disseminated by me over recent years in a number of publications, I fully stand by them.

Aronson is, however, justified in commenting on the negative effect produced by the lack of a «real index» (though it might be noted that there is not a single page of index, either in German or Georgian, in the Tschenkéli volumes), and I hope to remedy this by producing just such an index for the Georgian roots as a separate mini-volume in due course. I think, however, that his remarks about the non-reference to the Set A and B affixes in the English index are rather petty. He says: '...on page 122 Hewitt refers to «Set A» affixes and «Set B» affixes, but does not indicate what these are. Turning to the index will not help. There are no entries for *affix(es)* or *Set A* or *Set B*. If one reads the relevant sentence on p. 122, one finds this: 'Given two sets of pronominal agreement-affixes, the subject usually selects its marker from Set A, whilst the object is shown by a Set B affix'. As the Set A and B affixes are clearly described as being subsumed within the overall category of pronominal agreement-affixes, I would expect the interested reader to have the presence of mind to look up *pronominal agreement*

აწილად which term, as Aronson notes, IS indexed, and, if he does so, he will be directed first to p. 128 where Set A and B affixes ARE fully explained.

Aronson objects that I make no mention of the fact that the proper (woman's) name *ქართველი* can be declined both as if the root were *ქარ-* and as if it were *ქარვ-*: I am afraid that not every abstruse detail of Georgian grammar could be accommodated in a volume that the publishers already thought over-long. Since the patterns for both types of declension are given, I assume that visitors to Georgia will soon learn for themselves what free variants exist and decide for themselves which pattern better fits this noun -- personally, I have always employed the second (for Aronson non-normative) paradigm.

Aronson queries the principles behind the selection (and thus inclusion?) of the texts and sample vocabularies with which the volume ends. The series' editors decided that sample texts should be included in these volumes, and the choice here depends on nothing more than author's privilege, just as Aronson was presumably free to choose the texts he did to adorn his own reading grammar, though I did have in mind what material would be incorporated in my Georgian Reader (SOAS, 1996), and the two selections are designed to complement each other. As for the choice behind the vocabularies, most people would conclude from a heading 'Sample Vocabularies' that the items were meant to do nothing more than give readers a convenient opportunity to familiarise themselves with some relevant semantic fields. As everyone knows, there are no recommendable English-Georgian dictionaries and, as someone who, unlike Aronson, has lived in Georgian-speaking areas of Georgia for over two years, I am well aware of the need that learners on the ground have for lexical items relating to kinship-terms or referring to body-parts and bodily functions.

Aronson also comments that there are some notable omissions from my bibliography. Since he is not specific, one can only guess what works he has in mind, but one suspects that at least two monographs on Georgian/Kartvelian by a certain former pupil of his might figure here. However, anyone familiar with my views on these two books, as presented in my reviews (1983, 1989), will surely understand why I would not choose to include them in a bibliography.

The length of my bibliography was also criticised by Tuite, who actually named the work which was the object of my 1989 critique as featuring an 'admirably comprehensive list of references'. The problem is that a long volume dealing with the history of all four Kartvelian languages and drawing on much illustrative material contained in already published volumes will of necessity possess a large reference-list. Had my own book fallen within this different genre, its references too would no doubt have been equally long. One should,

however, also recall the mere 2-page list of references/authors cited in Hans Vogt's 1971 reference-book 'Grammaire de la Langue Géorgienne'.

Tuite's central objection (sc. as far as his purely linguistic observations are concerned) is my treatment of Georgian grammar in terms of the traditional transitivity vs intransitivity split. Since, as he states, I have been arguing this approach in various outlets over some 10 years, I do not propose to recount the arguments here. I merely wish to stress that I do not find any alternative analysis yet proposed sufficiently convincing for me to reject the traditional view, and, if the consequence of this is that I stand charged of falling 'into the old trap of recapitulating diachrony in synchrony' or of having to resort to 'phantom arguments' in underlying structure, so be it. One of these 'phantoms' is 'the divine agent he sees lurking beneath superficially transitive wish formulae such as *neráʷ sul šentan manq'ipá* «may I be with you always», which Hewitt glosses «would that X [sc. God] might let me be with you all the time» (p. 447). (I studied these in the field myself, and none of the speakers I consulted ever invoked God, or any other extraterrestrial for that matter, as an explanation for the morphology). If these verbs are transitive, as they clearly are from the morphology, then this bivalent Aorist Indicative must be provided with a subject/agent at some level of analysis. To suggest that the verb be treated as some sort of intransitive with only the one argument, marked by *m*- (as implied by Tuite's own translation here), can only be sustained if one engages in some peculiar mental contortions, that may appeal to certain types of theory-orientated linguists, but which do little to convey the nature of the linguistic phenomenon under review. I see these examples as being somewhat equivalent to the English response to someone sneezing, namely 'Bless you!'. I cannot say that I have ever noticed anyone saying under such circumstances 'God bless you!', for the expression 'God bless (you)!' is rather heard, albeit rarely, as a formula for taking one's leave when the speaker is a firm believer. However, one can hardly deny that the full and original form of 'Bless you!' is indeed 'God bless you!' -- how else to explain the 3rd person singular form of the subjunctive mood of the verb in this standard expression? But, since most native English speakers are blissfully unaware that they are uttering such a subjunctive in this expression, they are no doubt quite unconscious that the verb-form is only explicable in terms of the 'presence' (but where exactly?) of the supreme deity as subject/agent. Any foreign investigator of this phenomenon would be unlikely to be offered any appeal to God as subject by the average native speaker informant, I would imagine. However, we need not rely on speculation, as attested data are available for the Georgian construction.

Firstly, let us observe the possibility of using the Aorist Indicative (normally describing a past event) to mark either (a) an intention to do something at once on the part of the speaker (the act is portrayed as already achieved), or (b) a wish:

c'ā-ved-#

PREV-go-AOR(1st.pers.subject)

'I'm off!' or 'I'm gone!' (literally 'I went')

[Ilia] gut-i m-t-c'ux-s, maia.. gut-i m-t-c'ux-s'
heart-NOM me-OV-be.troubled-it[PRES] M.

[Maia] gut-i šen-s mt'er-s še-(#)-ur-c'ux-s'
heart-NOM your-AGR foe-DAT PREV-(him-)OV-pained-become-it[AOR]

[Ilia] My heart is troubled, Maia, it is troubled! [Maia] May your enemy suffer pain in his heart! (lit. 'Your enemy's heart became troubled')

(D. K'ldiashvili *ubedvraša* 'Misfortune', p.46 in vol. 2 of the 1981 2-volume edition of his works).

The self-same piece illustrates a more normal wish (viz. expressed in the Aorist Subjunctive) with the very verb I used in my book, albeit in an Objective Versional form in the first example below. The point to note is the absence of any stated subject/agent (and there is none understood from the preceding interchange in the play):

imed+da+k'arg+ut-i mt'er-i (#)-g-i-m+q'+ap-s'
hope+lost-AGR foe-NOM (him-)you-OV-make.be-AORSUBJ-he

'May he (sc. God) make your enemy be devoid of hope!

(D. K'ldiashvili *ubedvraša* 'Misfortune', p.47 in vol. 2 of the 1981 2-volume edition of his works).

Now compare this with the sentence on the following page of the text used here:

g'mert-i da šen-i sa+bu+av-i k'arg-ad g-s-m+q'+ap-ab-s'
God-NOM & your-AGR shrine-NOM good-ADV you-NV-make.be-TS-

3rd.pers

'God and your shrine will keep you well = look after you!'

(D. K'ldiashvili *ubedvraša* 'Misfortune', p.48 in vol. 2 of the 1981 2-volume edition of his works).

Only one conclusion is surely possible: we are completely justified in taking the second example here as confirmation that in the preceding parallel expression it is precisely *g'mert-i* (in the Ergative case as it would there be, of course) which is understood and thus accounts for the verbal morphology. And a concrete example of the type of wish-formula I was discussing in the grammar with the

supreme divinity actually present in the clause is provided again by K'ldiašvili (even if the verb is different):

šan *g-a-dje+grjel-a* *upaš-maš*
you(NOM) you-NV-toast-he(AOR) Lord-ERG

'May the Lord toast you!' or 'May the Lord grant you long life!'

(D. K'ldiashvili *uḅat'raḅa* 'Misfortune', p.63 in vol. 2 of the 1981 2-volume edition of his works).

As for Tuite's final remark concerning my treatment of the principal aspectual oppositions marked by the Georgian verb 'once again falling into an oft-visited trap -- Hewitt projects the narrative-structuring use of aspect onto the event-types with which the aspectual categories are most commonly associated', I have absolutely no comment to make.

References

- Aronson, H.I. 1997. Review of B.G. Hewitt *Georgian: A Structural Reference Grammar*; in *Anthropological Linguistics*, 39.1, 166-168.
- Hewitt, B.G. 1983. Review-article on A.C. Harris 'Georgian Syntax: A Study in Relational Grammar', in *Lingua*, 59, 247-274.
- Hewitt, B.G. 1989. Review-article of A.C. Harris 'Syntax and Semantics 18. Diachronic Syntax: The Kartvelian Case', in *REGO*, 3, 173-213.
- Tuite, K. 1997. Review of B.G. Hewitt *Georgian: A Structural Reference Grammar*; in *Functions of Language*, 258-260.