

HEINZ FÄHNRI CH: *Grammatik der altgeorgischen Sprache* 269 pp. Hamburg, Buske Verlag, 1994.

Prior to the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989, Heinze Fährnich was known as perhaps the most prominent East German champion of Georgian studies, based at the Schiller University of Jena and with a string of publications to his credit including a short grammar of Modern Georgian in 1986 (viz. **Kurze Grammatik der georgischen Sprache**) in addition to being editor of the yearly German-language journal **Georgica**, which, with the appearance in 1990-91 of volume 13/14, was taken over by the University of Konstanz's publishing-house and, to judge by the content of volume 15, sadly deteriorated into an indiscriminating German mouthpiece for the excesses of Georgian nationalist propaganda. He had studied in Tbilisi under the founder of modern Georgian philology and one of the most distinguished students of Old Georgian, Ak'ak'i Shanidze, who died at the age of 100 in 1987. Shanidze's 187-page **Grammar of the Old Georgian Language** was published in Tbilisi in Georgian in 1976, and Fährnich was responsible for the translation of this work into German, which appeared, again in Tbilisi, in 1982. And Fährnich himself was the author of the 88-page summary of Old Georgian which appeared in volume 1 of **The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus** (edited by A.C. Harris) in 1991. One would, therefore, have expected a new grammar of Old Georgian from this particular source to have built on the earlier works with which he was associated, specifically by developing those areas of the grammar which either Shanidze or he himself had not had the opportunity to describe as fully as one would perhaps have wished in their respective earlier publications. Anyone approaching this volume with such an expectation will be severely disappointed.

After a short introduction, tabular presentation of the three versions of the script that Georgian has employed during the course of its venerable history together with transcription and the numerical values of the letters, as well as a brief overview of the structure of the grammar, Chapter 3 contains a useful 30-page discussion of the authors and main works to be found in the corpus of materials that have survived from the Old Georgian period (sc. 4-11 centuries). Chapter 4 is a 10-page presentation of the phonological structure: in passing, it is noted that initial rhotics are sometimes written with a secondarily developed aspiration, the character /h/ preceding the r: Presumably this is an example of Greek influence, for in Classical Greek all initial rhotics were aspirated; this possible link might have been mentioned. Similarly, is the occasional use of the Genitive with verbs of wishing, noted on p.186, due to the Greek construction with ἔπιθυμέω 'I desire (+ Genitive)'?

Chapter 5 is the longest section of the book (49-177), which, not surprisingly, is devoted to morphology, both verbal and non-verbal. Unusually word-formation is the first topic to be treated; all patterns, including the large number of circumfixes existing in the language, are illustrated, though in order to give the reader a firmer grip on the relevant relationships, I would have liked to have seen not only the resulting word-forms themselves (e.g. for the suffix *-iaṣ* *ḥmṣ-iaṣ* 'I'm married (of a woman)') but also the base from which such derivatives are produced (viz. *ḥmṣ* 'husband'). Declensional patterns are amply treated, as is the peculiarity of case-copying within the noun-phrase (e.g. *ḡṣ-ḡ / ḥaṣ-iaṣ-ḡ* = son-NOM[INACTIVE] man-GEN[ITIVE]-NOM 'son[NOM] of man' vs *ḡṣ-mṣṣ / ḥaṣ-iaṣ-mṣṣ* = son-ERG[ATIVE] man-GEN-ERG 'son[ERG] of man'), which is seen in an even more extreme form in *ḡḡḡḡḡ-iaṣ ḡḡḡ-iaṣ ḡḡḡ-iaṣ-iaṣ-iaṣ* = angel-GEN Lord-GEN heaven-GEN-GEN-GEN 'of the angel[GEN] of the Lord[GEN] of heaven[GEN]', though the Genitive is not always so reduplicated (e.g. *ḡḡḡ-mṣṣ ḡḡḡ-ḡḡ ḡḡḡḡḡ-ḡḡ-mṣṣ* = sound-ERG wing-GEN.PL[URAL] animal-GEN.PL-ERG 'the sound[ERG] of the wings of creatures'). On p.75 the existence of such pronouns as *ḡḡḡḡḡ* 'no-one (can/could)', based on the potential negative *ḡḡ* (vid. p.177), seems to be overlooked, as only neutral *ḡḡḡḡḡ* 'no-one' and prohibitional *ḡḡḡḡḡ* '(let) no-one' are mentioned. The final section (5.7) under morphology before the author passes on to the verb is devoted to the participle, which one would perhaps have expected to come AFTER the discussion of the finite forms of the verb, as is usually done in descriptions of Georgian (in Shanidze's grammar, for example). In the first paragraph of §5.7 it is stated that the Georgian verb has only three participles (viz. Active, Perfect Passive and Future Passive), whereas in the exemplification of the morphological patterns the fourth (Negative) participle is also described. Unlike the initial section on word-formation, in addition to the formants and some concrete examples the 3rd person singular of the relevant Present Indicative forms is also given, but I still think we need far fuller information on which sub-types of verbs follow which patterns.

As is well-known, the most complex feature of Georgian resides in the morphology of the verb, and this was equally true of the old language. In my opinion much more thought should have gone into the presentation of this section of the fifth chapter, which would have benefited from both a more judicious selection of examples and far more detailed descriptions of individual morphological features together with deviations from norms. My first criticism concerns the pronominal agreement-affixes, of which there are two sets depending upon the case and/or function of the cross-referenced NP (viz. subject vs direct object vs indirect object). Surely it is clearest for the reader/learner to have these set out in tabular form, and for the accompanying description to explain the distribution of each affix and, where

appropriate, its variant-realisation(s)? As with Shanidze, no table is provided, though the explanation of how 2nd person subjects and 3rd person objects are marked in the so-called *ḥammēti*, *ḥammēti* and *ḥam-narēti* texts (respectively: ‘with extra X’, ‘with extra h’, ‘with mixed s’) is helpful.

Verb-tables illustrating the conjugation for the various tense-mood-aspect paradigms (= ‘screeves’) begin, as usual, with the Root Verb (according the Fährnich, such verb are described as being without Present Stem Formant) meaning ‘write’ in the active voice. The basic form of the verb ‘write’ exists in what is technically known as the Neutral Version, which for this verb is indicated by the absence of a vowel immediately before the root but which, when the subject is acting in his own interests or on a part of his own body, turns into the Subjective Version through the insertion of the vowel *-i-* immediately before the root in the non-Perfect groups of screeves. Since no other changes to the paradigms follow from this substitution, there is really no point wasting valuable space laying out the full set of relevant paradigms just in order to demonstrate this Version. And yet this is precisely what is done with the second example-verb, namely ‘don, put on (clothing)’. There are some Root Verbs whose radical *a*-vowel changes to *-i-* in Series II (or Aorist group of) paradigms, and so it is helpful for the reader to have this patterning set out in full. Fährnich does indeed exemplify such patterning by taking the roots meaning ‘bend’ and ‘extinguish’, but these stand no fewer than 24 pages away from the above-mentioned root ‘don’. The reason, perhaps, is that a similar substitution is followed by roots ending in the sequences *-ax* and *-ax* and such roots are presented together with ‘bend’ and ‘extinguish’, but surely the best solution would have been to place all such roots immediately after ‘don’ at the start of the verb-tables?

When the direct object for transitive verbs in Series II screeves is in the plural and is marked by the Nominative plural ending *-i-* this plurality is given special recognition within the verb-form by using the post-radical exponent *-ax*: Shanidze gave both variants for such Series II paradigms for all the transitive verbs he exemplified, thus:

Aorist Indicative of ‘write’

<u>Singular Object</u>		<u>Plural Object</u>	
<i>ḥa-ḥ-ḥar-a</i>	I wrote it	<i>ḥa-ḥ-ḥar-ax</i>	I wrote them
<i>ḥa-s-ḥar-a</i>	you wrote it	<i>ḥa-s-ḥar-ax</i>	you wrote them
<i>ḥa-ḥar-a</i>	X wrote it	<i>ḥa-ḥar-i-ax</i>	X wrote them

აბ- <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i>	we wrote it	აბ- <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i>	we wrote them
აბ- <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i>	you(PL) wrote it	აბ- <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i>	you(PL) wrote them
აბ- <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i>	they wrote it	აბ- <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i> - <i>ა</i>	they wrote them

Fähnrich, on the other hand, only illustrates this for the root ‘kill’, which is the 14th verb illustrated. Also his statement that this marking occurs in the screeves of Series II (= Aorist group) and III (= Perfect group) is not strictly correct, since there is no such plural-marking in the Perfect itself, for in *მამ-მ-*ა*-*ა*-*ა*-*ა** ‘I have killed them’ the final *-ა* is simply the pronominal agreement-suffix agreeing with a 3rd person plural Nominative nominal, whereas in the Pluperfect *მამ-მ-*ა*-*ა*-*ა*-*ა*-*ა** ‘I had killed them’ in addition to such an agreement-affix (viz. *-ა*) we have the specific marker of plurality *-ა*. Verbs with Present Stem Formant *-ა* are the commonest in the language, and yet the section illustrating their conjugation starts with one that is somewhat exceptional insofar as it has no vowel in the root and then expands this root in the Aorist Indicative by inserting *-ა* when the subject is 1st or 2nd person -- surely one should start with regular patterns and come to the irregular ones at the end? With the verb ‘make’ exemplified on pp.96-97 an explanatory note as to why in Series I (= the Present group) the direct object is marked by the *ბ*-prefix (e.g. *ა-*ბ*-*ა*-*ა** ‘I make it’), whereas no such prefix is found in Series II (e.g. *ა-*ა*-*ა** ‘I made it’) would be helpful. The somewhat anomalous verbs ‘bless’ and ‘give’ (pp.98-101) should surely not have been placed before the more regular patterns as those for ‘whittle’, ‘regret’, ‘plough’, ‘kill’, ‘drink’, ‘don’, ‘bend’, ‘extinguish’, ‘throw away’, ‘select’, ‘spread over’, ‘listen to’, which follow them (pp.101-121)?

On p.122 Fähnrich comes to the Medial verbs, which, in my opinion, he infelicitously describes as Intransitive Active Verbs. For the preceding transitives readers will have become accustomed to the Imperfect Indicative being marked by no final vowel (e.g. *ა-*ბ*-*ა*-*ა** ‘I was whittling it’) vs the Iterative Imperfect marked by final *-ა* (e.g. *ა-*ბ*-*ა*-*ა*-*ა** ‘I habitually used to whittle it’) vs the Present Subjunctive marked by final *-ა* (e.g. *ა-*ბ*-*ა*-*ა*-*ა** ‘I shall be whittling it’). Now, however, (and again this will apply to the Intransitives) we have the Imperfect Indicative marked by *-ა* (e.g. *ა-*ბ*-*ა*-*ა*-*ა** ‘I was crying’) vs the Iterative Imperfect and Present Subjunctive combined in final *-ა* (e.g. *ა-*ბ*-*ა*-*ა*-*ა** ‘I habitually used to cry/shall be crying’). I think readers would appreciate having this specifically drawn to their attention, especially if they know that in Modern Georgian *ა-*ბ*-*ა*-*ა** is the Imperfect Indicative ‘I was crying’ whilst *ა-*ბ*-*ა*-*ა*-*ა** is the Present Subjunctive ‘I may be crying’.

The paradigms of two Medial roots are set out, the second being 'shriek, crow'. And readers will surely be confused to see that for 'cry' the screeves of Series II are formed with a preverb and the suffix *-v-*, whilst for 'shriek' there is neither preverb nor *-v-* suffix; equally puzzling must be that for 'cry' the screeves of Series III are formed by combining the past participle with the appropriate form of the copula (with Nom inative subject), whereas for the second root the phenomenon of Inversion occurs in Series III, producing forms with Dative subject and an agreement-marker for a 'dummy'-object in the Nominative case, which latter is the pattern found in Modern Georgian. No explanation is offered for what is going on here. Quite a lot could be said and should be said. Firstly we need to be told, as Shanidze pointed out in his monumental **Fundamentals of the Grammar of the Georgian Language**, that Medials seem not to have been widely used outside the Present Sub-Series (viz. Present Indicative, Present Subjunctive/Iterative Imperfect, and Imperfect Indicative) in Old Georgian. When they filled out their paradigms as the language subsequently developed, they borrowed non-Medial forms of the root. It is one such related paradigm that Fähnrich illustrates for 'cry' in Series II and III in the present volume, and as a consequence the forms in question should surely be translated as inceptives (e.g. *აქ-ს-ღრ-ვ-ღ* 'I began to cry' with, incidentally, Nom inative subject, as this is actually a simple intransitive form)? For 'shriek' we need to know that, whilst the Bible may attest the Aorist Indicative *კატამ-ი-ღრ-ა* 'the cock_{NOM} crowed', in Modern Georgian we would have the TRULY Medial morpho-syntax of *კატამ-მა-ი-ღრ-ა* 'the cock_{ERG} crowed'. Secondly, as Shanidze observed in his grammar of Old Georgian (p.135 in the Georgian version vs p.151 in Fähnrich's German translation), Old Georgian attests the variant-forms for the IIIrd Subjunctive of *ა-ღრ-ვ-ა* as given at this point by Fähnrich, and *ა-ღრ-მ-ვ-ა* as he gave on p.193 of his contribution on Old Georgian to **Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus 1**. Since the IIIrd Subjunctive is based on the Aorist Subjunctive of Series II, the presence of such forms in Old Georgian would presuppose the existence of the variant Aorist Indicatives *კატამ-მა-ი-ღრ-ა*/*ი-ღრ-ა* (the former of which is actually quoted by Fähnrich on p.185), from which we see that the 3rd person singular Aorist actually given in the verb-tables by Fähnrich, namely *ღრ-ა* cannot be a TRULY Medial formation either (see also p.185) -- it must be a now defunct intransitive form (hence with Nom inative subject) based on the same root.

In presenting the intransitive conjugations surely a reader would be justified in expecting the same order of presentation to be followed as for the transitive paradigms, but any such expectation is frustrated, for we begin with 'hide (intransitive)' -- 'hide from' (i.e. the same verb but with an indirect object added) is presented after the verb 'be blessed' intervenes. Shanidze again is clearly superior

when he presents alongside each other such monopersonal vs bipersonal intransitive pairs after the pattern:

da-v-i-mal-e I hid (*da-v-e*)

where one understands the bracketed abbreviation to be read as *da-v-e-mal-e* 'I hid from X'. As for the Series III forms set out on p.134 for the verb 'become silent' with indirect object attached, surely the suffixal inceptive marker *-v-* should not be present in any of the 18 forms quoted (just, indeed, as one should excise it from the parallel paradigms presented by Fähnrich in his contribution to **Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus 1**)?

Apart from the paradigms themselves, the reader is not told which type of verbs undergo root-expansion and with what vowel in which of their various screeves (e.g. *gva-v-a-ta-d* 'I warm X' vs *gva-v-a-ta-d'i* 'warmed X' vs *gva-v-ta-d* 'I warmed up' vs *gva-ta-d* 'X warmed up'). This is something I would want to have clearly set out, if I were learning the language.

As for the Indirect Verbs, why are no Series III forms offered for the root 'have (animate)' (p.160) or for the verb 'love' (p.164), whilst a full Series III is given for the root 'have (inanimate)' on p.161? A number of irregular verbs are included in the verb-tables, but many are left out, some of which occur in the examples in the chapter on syntax (such as *sa-vv-i-t-a* 'X is in a state of having heard' on p.209).

In view of the fact that the chapter on syntax is 35 pages in length (pp.179-214) compared with 19 in Shanidze's Georgian version (vs 24 in Fähnrich's translation), one may hope to find this new book's saving-grace in the extra details contained herein. Again, sadly, expectations are doomed. In general all examples should have been provided with morpheme-glosses in addition to a literary German translation, which would have helped with the analysis of verb-forms, especially those not explained individually in the chapter on morphology. Exemplification of the use of the various cases is adequate, though a number of (unanswered) questions arise, such as on p.189 why in the expression 'It is better for you to enter life one-eyed than to have two eyes and descend into hell' the verbal noun 'to have' is Dative (*sa-vv-i-t-a*) whilst that for 'to descend' is Adverbial (*sa-vv-i-t-a*). Three examples of causative verb-forms are given at the top of p.206, preceded at the base of p.205 by a brief description of the relevant morphology, which should have been included (with amplification) in the morphology-chapter. And Fähnrich's idea of how to describe complex sentences seems to be little more than to present a list of the relevant conjunctions together with a mere handful of illustrations. For example, under the

heading Conditional Clauses (p.211) we are told that five conjunctions are possible, but only four are illustrated -- there is no discussion of the difference between real and unreal conditions, nor are we informed as to how these two types are produced with reference to present, future and past time. As regards the notion of Subject Clause (e.g. 'That you are here surprises me'), Fähnrich confuses these nominal clauses with adjectival Relative Clauses, for he says (p.209): 'Subject Clauses are mostly introduced by relative pronouns (*რამელი, რამელიცა, რამელი-იგი, რამელი-აჲ*) and illustrates by taking the clause 'The one who created the sun and all living creatures cast his brilliance over heaven'. This same misunderstanding is revealed in the parallel section of Fähnrich's grammar of Modern Georgian.

Chapter 7 presents a selection of the Old Georgian vocabulary, divided into homonyms, synonyms, technical terminology, words with cognate forms (which are presented where known) in the three other Kartvelian languages (viz. Mingrelian, Laz, and Svan -- see also Fähnrich and Z. Sardzhveladze's **Etymological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages**, 1990, in Georgian), and loan-words from a variety of sources, though I would argue that a grammar of Old Georgian is not really the place to include the extremely tenuous hypothesis of a Sumerian-Georgian link as suggested by the final list of 94 items.

The book concludes with bibliography and index.

If one has the opportunity to produce a handsome volume, as this one technically is, it should not be wasted. Ak'ak'i Shanidze's own short introduction, which Fähnrich himself put into German, was an ideal replacement for F. Zornell's 1930 **Grammatik zur altgeorgischen Bibelübersetzung mit Textproben und Wörterverzeichnis** (Roman). There was and remains still a niche in the market for a comprehensive grammar of Old Georgian and, of course, a good Old Georgian Dictionary (none such exists even in Georgian -- I. Abuladze's 1973 book being only a posthumously published collection of his far-from-complete file-index).

Corrigenda

p.36 l.10: das Graphem; p.51 l.11up: dmanisi; p.140 l.14up: er denkt an mich (NOT ich denke an ihn); p.157 l.14: er hat mich (NOT ich habe ihn); p.163 l.12 (in plural): u-gwar-an; p.165 l.4: «ich winke ihm» in Roman type; p.167 l.17up: nugešinis-g-c-a; p.174 l.15: Präposition; p.193 l.7up: Gegenwart; p.194 ll.16-17up: the Iterative Aorist is said to denote a repeated, completed action in the past, but on p.200 one such example clearly has a gnomic (universal) sense and is so translated (viz. *გრამაქსი* 'trägt'); p.261 l.7: Grammatical.

B.G. Hewitt