

CONVERGENCE IN LANGUAGE-CHANGE: MORPHO-SYNTACTIC  
PATTERNS IN MINGRELIAN (AND LAZ)<sup>1</sup>

By GEORGE HEWITT  
*SOAS, University of London*

ABSTRACT

The paper examines two features of Mingrelian (a member of the Kartvelian, or South Caucasian, language-family): (i) the marking of subordinate clauses by either clause-final suffix *-n(i)/-i/* alone or this suffix + a full subordinating conjunction (or relative pronoun); (ii) the 'Conditional' forms in *-k'o(n(i))*, which are peculiar within Kartvelian to Mingrelian and its close sister Laz. Influence exerted long ago by the North West Caucasian language Abkhaz, whose speakers may be presumed to have been in close contact with the Zan ancestors of Laz-Mingrelians, it is claimed, might feasibly underlie these phenomena. The discussion finally touches upon consideration of the possible role played by parataxis in the development of some hypotactic constructions in the history of at least some languages, especially in light of a recent attempt to refute the notion that hypotaxis can be so derived.

Preface

Some particularities of hypotaxis and the formation of a set of verbal paradigms in the Caucasian language Mingrelian, whose best known cognate within the South Caucasian/Kartvelian family is, of course, Georgian, are re-examined. Whilst the basic data will be reasonably familiar to anyone who has looked at Mingrelian, the hypotheses to follow will, I trust, be new and take us beyond Mingrelian's immediate congeners.

Formation of complex sentences in the South Caucasian/Kartvelian family

Anyone with a background in Indo-European, when looking at the standard strategies for forming subordinate clauses in Georgian, is immediately struck by how familiar they seem. One is comforted to find free-standing and (usually) clause-initial conjunctions (or relative pronouns) in association with fully finite verbs, which will

---

<sup>1</sup>Part of the work on which this paper, read at a meeting of the Philological Society in Cambridge on Saturday 11th March 2000, is based was carried out during a sabbatical term I was able to spend in Tbilisi (Georgia) and Ochamchira (Abkhazia) in the final months of 1987 thanks to a British Academy exchange with the Georgian Academy of Sciences. In Tbilisi I had the good fortune to work with the Mingrelians: the late K'orneli Danelia, Rezo Sherozia, and Merab Chuxua; my informants over a number of years in Ochamchira were: P'ant'e and Ek'a Basilaia, Manana Gunia, and the late Neli T'orchua. It is with a deep sense of gratitude that I take this opportunity to mention them. As always, my thanks go to my wife, Zaira Khiba, for help with the Abkhaz data. The paper was improved thanks to helpful comments provided by two anonymous readers of the submitted draft; I hope they will agree that their suggestions have been adequately accommodated.

stand in either the indicative or the subjunctive mood depending on the requirements of the relevant construction and, in some cases, the time-reference involved. The major patterns for Georgian are sketched under item (1) (Some minor patterns, non-finite strategies, the wide use of reported speech, and indefinite clauses are ignored. See Hewitt (1987; 1995) for comprehensive discussions):

(1)

(a) Adjectival/Relative clauses:

vints ~ rats ~ romelits

who      which      who/which

(in the appropriate case and (for *romelits*) number + Indic<sup>2</sup>)

(b) Noun clauses:

rom (+ Indic)

that

(c) Adverbial clauses:

Time

'when':

rotca ~ rodesats (+ Indic)

when

'as soon as':

rogorts k'i ~ tu ara (+ Indic; the latter standing post-verbally)

as soon as

---

<sup>2</sup>The abbreviations employed in this paper are:

Absol = Absolutive

Acc = Accusative

Adv = Adverbial

Aor = Aorist

Condit = Conditional

Dat = Dative

Erg = Ergative

Fem = Feminine

Fin = Finite

Fut = Future

Gen = Genitive

IE = Indo-European

Imper = Imperative

Imperf = Imperfect

Indef = Indefinite

Indic = Indicative

Inf = Infinitive

Instr = Instrumental

Irr = Irrealis

Neg = Negative

Nom = Nominative

Non.Fin = Non-Finite

Perf = Perfect

Pers = Person

Pl = Plural

Plup = Pluperfect

Poss = Possessive

Pot = Potential

Pres = Present

Prev = Preverb

Ptc = Participle

Qu = Question

Quot = Quotative

Rel = Relative

Sing = Singular

Stat = Stative

Sub = Subordinator

Subj = Subjunctive

Super = Superessive

'after':

mas jemdeg rats ~ mas uk'an rats ~ mas aket rats ~ im droidan rats (+ Indic)  
after

'while, until, before':

sanam(de/dis) ~ vidre(mde/mdis) (+ Indic or Subj)  
while, until, before

Purpose:

rata ~ rom (+ Subj or Plup Indic)  
(in order) that

Result:

rom (+ Indic for actual results; + Subj or Plup Indic for potential results)  
that

Cause:

radgan(ats) ~ vinaidan ~ rak'i ~ raxan ~ imis gamo rom ~ imit'om rom (+ Indic)  
because, since, as

Manner:

rogorts ~ ragvaradats ~ ranairadats (+ Indic)  
as

Condition:

tu (+ Indic for real conditions) ~ rom (+ Subj or Plup Indic for unreal conditions)  
if

Concession:

tumts(a) (+ Indic) ~ miuxedavad imisa rom (+ Indic) ~ tund(a(ts)) (+ Subj or  
Plup Indic)  
although despite the fact that even if  
(Georgian)

Similar reliance on finite subordinate clauses is attested throughout the recorded history (spanning 15 centuries) of Georgian, and I know of no suggestion why this patterning (with variations, of course) should not be taken as characteristic of the Kartvelian family as a whole. Even if one accepts Winfried Boeder's recent contention: 'The frequent use in Old Georgian of the masdar, whose sphere of usage

has narrowed in modern Georgian..., we may, therefore, deem an archaism, which must be a mid-stage between the pre-historic state with nominalised complement clauses and the modern state with mostly subordinate clauses containing a finite verb' (1999.41-2), it would still be true that Georgian (?Kartvelian) has always behaved in an Indo-European manner, with a declinable verbal noun (masdar) whose Adverbial case-form functioned in the old language just like an IE infinitive (for the variation in case-marking of the infinitival object see Hewitt 1983). There is no hint in Kartvelian of a full clausal argument-structure accompanying the array of converbal forms (and even some masdars and infinitives) found elsewhere in the Caucasus, as in the following examples quoted from Haspelmath (1993) for Lezgi(an):

(2) (a)

Nabisat-a      witʃi-n      ktab              kʼel-iz      baʃlamiʃ-na  
 Nabisat-ERG self-GEN book-ABSOL read-INF start-AOR  
 'there began Nabisat's reading of her book = N. started to read her book'

(2) (b)

Sajran              ada              ikʼ      luhu-n.a-l              mähtel      xa-na  
 Sairan(.ABSOL) she(.ERG) so say-MASD-SUPER surprised be-AOR  
 'Sajran was surprised that she was talking like that'

(Lezgi(an))

I do, however, have to draw attention to a couple of features not immediately obvious from a simple listing of the basic Georgian data.

#### Further internal Georgian developments

The conjunction *rom* (often pronounced [rɔ]) already stands out in the list under (1) for its ability to mark a wide variety of clause-types. In fact, it is even commoner, for it can replace the standard conjunctions *rotsa~rodesats* 'when' and *radgan(ats)~vinaidan~rakʼi* 'because', appearing in such examples usually after the first constituent of the clause. It has a similar and exceedingly wide usage in relative clauses, especially in the spoken language; such relative structures tend to precede the head-noun, whereas those containing a full relative pronoun must follow their heads -- for details on Georgian relatives see Hewitt (1985; 1995). Some examples of these additional functions are given under (3), with the more specific construction in brackets (*ro(m)* = conjunctions *rotsa~radgan* and relative *romelits*, respectively).

(3) (a)

ʃen ro(m) axlosa xar,      ar meʃinia  
 you SUB near you.are not I.fear

'when/because you are near, I'm not afraid'

(= rotsa ~ radgan (etc) ]en axlosa xar)

(3) (b)

gu]in ro(m) mogetsi (is) ts'igni mit]vene  
yesterday SUB I.gave.it.to.you that book shew.it.to.me  
'shew me the book I gave you yesterday'

(= mit]vene (is) ts'igni, romelits gu]in mogetsi)

(Georgian)

This important modern general subordinator did not exist in Old Georgian, and its creation by erosion from *romel(i)* via *rome* can be charted in the texts -- the Old Georgian complementiser-role was filled by either *vitarmed* or *rametu*, which in origin were clearly both adverbial attachments to an introductory *verbum dicendi aut sentiendi*, meaning respectively 'in some such way' and 'something/somewhat thus'.

Though foreign to the literary language, we also have to observe a feature attested in some dialectal material, namely the insertion of *ro(m)* into a subordinate clause already fully characterised by its own conjunction/relative pronoun, as illustrated under (4), where, respectively, complex *sadats ro* stands for simplex *sadats*, *romelits rom* for *romelits*, and *rotsa ro* for *rotsa*:

(4) (a)

mivida ert adgilsa, sadats ro es xalxi miq'ams am γorsa  
X<sup>3</sup>.went one place.to where SUB this folk X.takes.Y this pig  
'he went to a place where this pig is taking this folk'

(Upper Imeretian<sup>4</sup>, Gigineishvili et al. 1961.442)

(4) (b)

untsrosi dzma varo, romelits rom ts'evides da aγar  
younger brother I.am.QUOTE who SUB X.is.to.go & no.more  
mevideso  
X.is.to.come.QUOTE

'I am the younger brother who is to go and not come back' (ibid.)

(4) (c)

---

<sup>3</sup>Where the Georgian verb indicates one or more 3rd person arguments, the letters X, Y, Z are used to indicate the presence of the relevant verbal index.

<sup>4</sup>For information, Upper Imeretian is spoken in the largest of Georgia's western provinces, whilst K'akheti(a) is Georgia's main region to the east of the central province of Kartli, where Tbilisi is located.

rotsa ro is kvabi gaaγes, im kalma mdzvali mdzvalze  
when SUB that pot they.opened.X that woman bone bone.on  
maaba

X.bound.Y.to.Z

'when they opened that pot, that woman attached bone to bone'

(Inner K'akhetian, *ibid.* 201)

The extent of this double characterisation of subordinate status across the dialects is not known, but the many pages whose scanning produced a mere four examples for just these two dialects plainly did not abound in them.

Significantly, whether used alone or alongside a regular conjunction/relative pronoun, *ro(m)* can never stand post-verbally and thus never appears clause-finally. The only conjunctive phrase in Georgian that can behave thus is *tu ara* 'as soon as', as indicated under (1).

### Subordination in Mingrelian

Mingrelian's home is traditionally defined as the western lowlands between the rivers Ingur and Tskhenis-ts'q'ali, bounded by Abkhazia, Svanetia (where the most divergent Kartvelian language, Svan, is spoken), and the Georgian-speaking provinces of Imereti and Guria, plus the Black Sea -- in the last 100 years Georgian has encroached from the east, just as Mingrelian has gained in the north-west at the expense of North West Caucasian Abkhaz. The only two Kartvelian languages which are at all mutually intelligible are Mingrelian and Laz, usually styled dialects of Zan in Georgia itself. Their ancestors once formed a continuum along a stretch of the Black Sea's eastern littoral before starting to be split by incoming Georgian speakers fleeing the Arabs' advance into central Georgia from the middle of the 7th century; apart from a few pockets along the Abkhazian & Georgian coast, Laz speakers today are confined to Turkey. Mingrelian (like Laz and Svan) is not a written language, though some communist texts and a large number of local papers and journals were published in it for about a decade from the late 1920s, a deliberately unpublicised fact of which even most Mingrelians are today quite unaware.

Before considering subordination, the following peculiarities need to be noted. As stated by native speaker T'ogo Gudava (1975 356): 'At the absolute end of a word a close vowel (i, ə, u) may be added after a consonant, and vice versa -- if a word ends in a close vowel (i, ə, u), this vowel may optionally be dropped'. Schwa can usually be interpreted as an allophone of /u/ (but see below for cases of its substituting for /i/). Examples (5)-(7) illustrate the addition of a supernumerary vowel (respectively /i, ə, u/, here bracketed) to consonant-final elements (one verb, two nouns):

(5)

meurs, meurs(i)<sup>5</sup> do keʃexvadu t'riali mindork  
 X.goes X.goes & X.met.Y broad meadow  
 'he goes [&] goes and came upon a broad meadow' (Danelia/Tsanava 1991.272)  
 (Mingrelian)

(6)

uk'ulafi dʒimas(ə) nodʒoxobue data  
 youngest brother X.is.called.Y Data  
 'the youngest brother is apparently called Data' (Q'ipshidze 1914 in Danelia/  
 Tsanava 1991. 266)  
 (Mingrelian)

(7)

ate k'otʃk(u) kek'aʔunu  
 this man X.followed.Y  
 'this man followed him' (Q'ipshidze 1914 in Danelia/Tsanava 1991.266)  
 (Mingrelian)

Examples (8)-(9) show the optional loss of a person-tense marking final /i/ or /u~ə/ respectively:

(8)

midaprt(i) 'I went'  
 (Mingrelian)

(9)

midart(u/ə) 'X went'  
 (Mingrelian)

Mingrelian (but not Laz) is also characterised by loss of final /-n/. In (10) the presence of final /-ia/, the speech-particle suffix, protects the underlined 3rd pers sg marker /-n/ in this Present indicative (*va- ʃir- ən-ia*):

(10)

tʃkəni rina mutuniʃa va-ʃir-ə-n-ia  
 our being for.nought X.does.not.count.QUOTE  
 '(saying) our existence counts for nought' (Q'ipshidze 1914 in Danelia/Tsanava  
 1991.260)

<sup>5</sup>The Georgian translation appended by the authors is: *midis, midis da ʃexvda t'riali mindori*, which indicates that they assign no particular function to the bracketed 'i' in the Mingrelian. Representations in the original Georgian script for all such examples in these footnotes may be found in the Appendix at the end of the article.

(Mingrelian)

But without such a suffix the example would read as in (11) (with *va- ʃir- ə(u)*):

(11) tʃkəni rina mutuniʃa va-ʃir-ə(u)

(Mingrelian)

Attention can now be turned to subordination in Mingrelian. Mingrelian's equivalent of Georgian *romel-i-ts* 'which one' is *namu-t(i)*. Both consist of the interrogative pronoun/adjective *romel-i = namu* 'which (one)?' + subordinating suffix *-ts = -t(i)*, suffixes which incidentally also serve as coordinators 'and, also, even' in their respective languages. And relative clauses, postposed to their heads, can be formed, as in Georgian, in the typically Indo-European fashion, exemplified by Dative *namu-su-ti* and Nominative *namu-ti* in (12) and (13), respectively:

(12)

k'otʃ-i tina re, namu-su-ti data dʒoxo<sup>6</sup>  
man-NOM than.one he.is who-DAT-SUB Data X.is.called.Y  
'the (real) man is he who is called Data' (ibid. 266)

(Mingrelian)

(13)

k'otʃ-i, namu-ti ʔurdʒeleptsə tʃ'q'ifəndə<sup>7</sup>  
man-NOM who.NOM-SUB rabbits.DAT X.was.herding.Y  
'the man who used to shepherd rabbits' (ibid. 268)

(Mingrelian)

Mingrelian also has a range of clause-initial subordinating conjunctions (some, like Georgian, incorporating the subordinating suffix *-t(i) = Geo. -ts*), that may be used without further complication -- *ond(ar)o~soiʃax* 'while', *mutʃ'ot(i)* 'as (soon as)', and *mu ʃams* 'when' in (14)-(16), respectively:

(14)

ond(ar)o~soiʃax voxet tak, tʃ'itʃ'e kimubʃuat<sup>8</sup>  
while we.sit here little let's.work  
'while we are sitting here, let's do a little work' (elicited)

(Mingrelian)

(15)

<sup>6</sup>In Georgian: *k'atsi is aris, romelsats data hkvia*.

<sup>7</sup> In Georgian: *k'atsi, romelits k'urd ʃlebs mts'q'emsavda*.

<sup>8</sup>In Georgian: *sanam/vidre vsxedvart ak, tsot'a vimuʃaot*.



mutʃ'ot kobdziri tina, daxe gebxangi<sup>9</sup>  
 as I.saw.X X almost I.became.unhinged  
 'as (soon as) I saw X, I almost went beserk' (elicited)

(Mingrelian)

(16)

muʒams kəmour, muʒebas dibtʃ'q'ant<sup>10</sup>  
 when X.comes work.DAT we'll.start.X  
 'when X comes, we'll start work' (elicited)

(Mingrelian)

I am at a loss to explain why Vamling/Tchantouria (1993:73) gloss the *-ti* of *mutʃ'oti* in one of their examples (cf. the first word of (15)) as INSTR[umental].

It is now time to consider the first oddity. It is impossible to reconstruct a common Kartvelian conditional marker (for either real or unreal protases). And interestingly, real conditions are marked in Mingrelian by clause-final (thus, generally verb-final) *-da*, which even follows cliticised speech-particles (elements that indicate a direct quote), as in (18):

(17)

kotʃ'vend(u/ə)-da, mindor(i) iʃolud(u/ə)<sup>11</sup>  
 it.was.raining-if field X.was.getting.wet  
 'if it was raining, the field was getting wet' (elicited)

(Mingrelian)

(18)

me tsxeni wamutʃia-da, duts dip'ilə  
 me horse you.didn't.give.X.to.me.QUOT-if self(.DAT) I'll.kill.X  
 iʃenia.QUOT<sup>12</sup>  
 still

'...saying, if you don't give me the horse, I'll still kill myself' (Xubua 1937 quoted  
 in Danelia/Tsanava 1991:258)

(Mingrelian)

Bearing in mind that *da* in Georgian is the coördinating conjunction, which in Mingrelian is *do* (manifesting the expected vowel-correspondence Geo. /a/ = Ming. /o/), I have argued (see Hewitt 1991) that the Mingrelian conditional suffix is best

<sup>9</sup>In Georgian: *rogorts k'i vnaxet igi, k'ina ʃam gavgi ʃli/gadavirie*.

<sup>10</sup>In Georgian: *rotsa/rodesats mova, muʃaobas davits'q'ebt*.

<sup>11</sup>In Georgian: *tu ts'vimda, mindori sveldeboda*.

<sup>12</sup>In Georgian: *me tu tsxeni ar mometsio, tavs movik'lav maintso*. This is Danelia/Tsanava's translation, from which we see that the protasis-marker *tu* does not have to take clause-initial position.

explained as a borrowing of the Georgian coördinator<sup>13</sup>, examples of which apparently performing a protasis-marking function can be found from any period of Georgian. The arbitrarily chosen illustration (19) happens to be from a 20th century collection of dialectal material -- 'You won't give it to him AND I shall no longer be your child' easily converts to 'If you don't...':

(19)

ar mǐjtsem                      da            me tkveni    ǰvili    aɣar            viknebio  
 not you'll.give.X.to.Y    and(=if) I    your    child no.longer    I'll.be.QUOT  
 'saying, if you don't give it to him, I shall no longer be your child' (Inner  
 K'akhetian, Gigineishvili et al. 1961.193)  
 (Georgian)

One can also point to the widespread use of Georgian *da* when an interrogative is repeated at the start of the reply, as in (20):

(20)

rodis ts'axvedi? rodis da, guǰin            ts'avedi  
 when you.went    when ?    yesterday I.went  
 'when did you go? If it's a question of when, I went yesterday'  
 (Georgian)

Via Mingrelian (one assumes), this conditional use of *da* has even passed into North West Caucasian Abkhaz, where the substitutability of *-za+r* 'if' for *-da* in *jəz'ban-da* proves that the suffix means 'if':

(21)

jəz'ban? jəz'ban-da (= jəz'ban-za+r)    jə-s-ta'xə-n<sup>14</sup>  
 why            why-?            (= why-if)            X-I-want-PAST  
 'why? If it's a question of why, I wanted to'  
 (Abkhaz)

It is convenient at this stage to ask what serves as complementiser in Mingrelian. The conventional answer is *nam(u/ ə)+da*. Consideration of the fact that *namu* = Geo. *romeli* 'which (one)?' (the source of today's complementiser *rom*), whilst *da* = 'if', logically suggests the following path of development for the complementiser: 'that' <= 'thus' <= 'if it's a question of what [sc. then somewhat as follows]'. It should be noted, however, that informants living either within or close to Abkhazia with whom I once

<sup>13</sup>This, I assume, to be somewhat different from Abesadze's guarded remark (1965.254): 'The possibility is not excluded that Mingrelian *da* (= [Georgian] *tu*) and *do* (= [Georgian] *da*) might be of a single origin.' On the other hand, Arnold Chikobava, a native Mingrelian, saw conjunction and protasis-marking *da* in Georgian as discrete entities (1936.185).

<sup>14</sup>In Mingrelian: *muǰeni? muǰen-da, mok'ond(u/ ə)*.

worked often used *mutʃ'o*, which is strictly the interrogative manner adverbial 'how?' (as in *mutʃ'o ret* 'How are you?'; cf. ex. (15) for the truly subordinate form with *-t(i)*) in seeming preference to *nam(u/ ə+da*. This extension of the manner-conjunction I have argued elsewhere (see Hewitt 1992a) to be the likely result of Abkhaz influence, for, lacking a pure complementiser, Abkhaz makes wide use in such a role of the particle *-s(ə)*, whose basic meaning is 'how, as'. The example in (22a) illustrates the complementiser-role, whilst that in (22b) shews the particle's basic force of manner:

(22) (a)

d-ʃə-tʃmaza+uə-z      s-ʼa+k<sup>W</sup>-ʃ<sup>W</sup>a-jtʼ  
 X-that-ill-NON.FIN.PAST I-it+on-fall-FIN.PAST  
 'I realised that (s)he was ill'

vs

(22) (b)

s-ʃə-qʼa-w      (a-)a.j+pʃ  
 I-how-be-NON.FIN.PRES (it-)like  
 'as I am'

(Abkhaz)

We can now proceed to note that all the subordinate clauses illustrated thus far for Mingrelian that incorporate a clause-initial subordinating adverb/pronoun may carry an additional marker of their subordinate status, and this is clause-final *-n(i)* (in which position it usually, but not necessarily, attaches to the verb), a pleonastic marking of subordinate status much commoner than the parallel structures quoted above for Georgian. Examples (23)-(25), with general subordinator underlined, illustrate the tautology in causal, relative and noun-complement clauses, respectively:

(23)

utsʼeis,      tiʃeni      naməda tʃʼitʃʼe rdə-ni<sup>15</sup>  
 they.said.X.to.Y for.the.reason that small he.was-SUB  
 'they said it to him because he was small' (Qʼipshidze in Danelia/Tsanava

1991.260)

(Mingrelian)

(24)

ordesə      ti      kʼata,      namunepkəti      ʃarasə      auxvadesə-ni<sup>16</sup>  
 they.were that folk who on.the.road they.bumped.into.X-SUB

<sup>15</sup>In Georgian: *utxres, imitʼom rom pʼatʼara iqʼo*.

<sup>16</sup>In Georgian: *iqʼvnen is xalxi, romlebits gzaze ʃemoxvda(t)*.

'the folk whom he/they had met on the road were (there)' (Q'ipshidze in  
Danelia/Tsanava 1991.268)  
(Mingrelian)

(25)

mitʃk(u/ə), nam(u/ə)da~mutʃ'o tak rek-ən<sup>17</sup>

I.know.X that here you.are-SUB

'I know that you are here' (elicited)

(Mingrelian)

It should be noted for (25) that, even when unprotected by a word-final vowel, the nasal does not undergo the expected deletion. Now, this clitic is also widely used (exactly like Georgian *rom*) as the sole marker of a clause's subordinate function and is naturally the strategy employed for colloquial pre-posed relatives, where no relative pronoun appears<sup>18</sup>. This marking of subordinate status solely by the clitic is exemplified in (26)-(28) for relative, manner and temporal clauses, respectively:

(26)

kotomi ʔwilu-ni (ti) osurs iptʃinenk<sup>19</sup>

chicken X.slew.Y-SUB that woman.DAT I.know.X

'I know the/(that) woman who killed the chicken' (elicited)

(Mingrelian)

(27)

irulu, vek'inudʒinu(u)-ni<sup>20</sup> teʃi<sup>21</sup>

X.ran.off X.did.not.look.back-SUB so

'X ran off without looking back' (Q'ipshidze in Danelia/Tsanava 1991.278)

(Mingrelian)

(28)

sadili ga(a)tu-ni, maxatʃkalk uts'u: tʃils<sup>22</sup>

lunch X.finished.Y-SUB peasant X.said.Y.to.Z wife.DAT

'when he'd finished lunch, the peasant said to his wife...' (ibid.)

(Mingrelian)

<sup>17</sup>In Georgian: *vitsi, rom aka xar*.

<sup>18</sup>I investigated the patterns of relativisation in Mingrelian in a Georgian article published in Tbilisi (see Hiuit'i [Hewitt] 1981).

<sup>19</sup>In Georgian: *katami ro(m) dak'la (im) kals vitsnob*.

<sup>20</sup>I have never heard long vowels from my Mingrelian informants and so bracket the second 'u' here.

<sup>21</sup>In Georgian: *gaitsa, uk'an ro(m) ar mouxedavs, ise*.

<sup>22</sup>In Georgian: *sadili ro(m) gaatava, glexma utxra tsols*.

There are, however, rivals to *-n(i)* as clause-final subordinator -- though I have made no count, it is my impression that *-n(i)* is by far the commonest allomorph. Q'ipshidze observed in 1914 (p. 289) that *-n(i)* could reduce to *-i*<sup>23</sup>, as indicated four times in (29)-(30):

(29)

ku(u)ts'i(i), mortas-əni/mortas-i<sup>24</sup>  
 say.X.to.Y X.is.to.come-SUB  
 'tell X to come!'

(Mingrelian)

(30)

mara ilad<sub>3</sub>ines-i, kodzires, bo<sub>3</sub>i a[esvirinants-i [...]  
 but they.looked.out.at.X-SUB they.saw.X lad X.stands.out.among.Y-SUB  
 'maras' tkuank-i, morenia<sup>25</sup>  
 but.DAT you.say.X-SUB what.is.it.QUOT  
 'but when they peered at him, they saw that the lad stands out among [the pigs].  
 [...] saying: what's the reason that you say "but"?' (Q'ipshidze in Danelia/Tsanava

1991.260)

(Mingrelian)

It so happens that I have no examples to hand of final '-u' fulfilling such a role, and so the presence of the underlined schwa in (31) raises the question of whether it should not perhaps here be treated as an allophone of /i/:

(31)

k'ot<sub>3</sub>i si ʔoperekə, ʔurd<sub>3</sub>eleptsə tʃ'q'i<sub>3</sub>ənk-ə<sup>26</sup>  
 man you you.evidently.are rabbits.DAT you.herd.X-SUB  
 'it appears that you are a (real) man insofar as you shepherd rabbits' (ibid. 268)

(Mingrelian)

<sup>23</sup>Q'ipshidze first quotes:

miod<sub>3</sub>inə/(u)-ni kodzirə/(u)  
 X.looked.atY-SUB X.saw.Y  
 'X looked and saw Y'

(Mingrelian)

He then simply says that the nasal may be dropped, leaving *-i* to merge with what precedes, which would produce *miod ʃni*. However, since *miod ʃni* is actually part of the Aorist Indicative paradigm for the root *-d ʃn-* and means 'you looked at Y/look at Y!', it is difficult to see how any subordinating sense could be preserved by dropping the nasal in this particular sequence.

<sup>24</sup>In Georgian: *utxari, ro(m) movides!*

<sup>25</sup>In Georgian: *magram ro(m) gahxedes, naxes, ro(m) bitʃ'i ʃuaʃi ixedeba... 'magram'-s ro(m) ambob, ra ariso?*

<sup>26</sup>In Georgian: *k'atsi ʃen q'opilxar, k'urd ʃlebs ro(m) mts'q'emsav.*

Sometimes it is unclear how to interpret the function of such vowels, as with the final *-i* (underlined) of *ibtxuati* in (32):

(32)

mok'ona osuro ibtxuat-i vitoᶑiri  
 we.want.X woman(=wife).ADV we.ask.for.X.AOR.SUBJ-?SUB 12  
 da-osurepi  
 sister-women

'we want to ask the hand in marriage of 12 women-sisters' (ibid. 268)

(Mingrelian)

If comparison is made with the Georgian equivalent (33), it is seen that *ro(m)* is optional where the Aorist Subjunctive (which is what represents the subordinate verb in both (32) and (33)) is dependent on the verb '(we) want', viz.

(33)

gvinda, (ro(m)) kalad (= tsolad) vitxovot  
 we.want.X that woman.ADV wife.ADV we.ask.for.X.AOR.SUBJ  
 tormet'i da-kalebi  
 12 sister-women

(Georgian)

This, then, leaves open the analysis of final *-i* in (32) as a subordinator or merely a euphonic post-consonantal word-final 'i' -- the verb-form in (32) could also be expressed as *ibtxuati/ ɛni*. It is my belief that the clue to post-verbal or clause-final indexing of subordination in Mingrelian might lie precisely in the conjunction of the two optionalities: (i) optional use of euphonic final 'i' and, to extrapolate from the situation in Georgian, (ii) optional presence of subordinator when the verb stands in the subjunctive. It should be recalled that Mingrelian in general seems not to like word-final 'n'. Now, it so happens that a 3rd person plural subject is co-indexed in a verb of subjunctive mood exclusively by such a final 'n', and, therefore, to protect it, it is regularly accompanied by an extra (and, thus, usually) final 'i'. Consider the underlined 'i' in (34):

(34)

tʃkin skualepi dzʏabi do bofʃik kiʔuani-i-da, tʃilo  
 our children girl & boy they.turn.out.to.be.AOR.SUBJ-if wife.ADV  
 do komondᶑo kimvortʃkinatia<sup>27</sup>  
 & husband.ADV let's.deem.X.AOR.SUBJ.QUOT

<sup>27</sup>In Georgian: *tʃveni ʃvilebi gogo da bitʃ'i tu iknen, tsolad da kmrad mivitʃnioto*. This Georgian translation and the Mingrelian original demonstrate that, though the protasis-markers in both languages

'saying, if it transpires that our children turn out to be a boy and a girl, let's deem them husband and wife' (Xubua 1937 in Danelia/Tsanava 1991.256)

(Mingrelian)

In (34) the relevant vowel cannot be interpreted as the subordinator, for in such protases this role can only be fulfilled by *-da*. Compare also (35):

(35)

p'idʒi kimetʃes                      artimaʒiras,              muti  
 oath    they.gave.X.to.Y    each.other.DAT    that.which  
 iʃuan-i                                      muʃmuʃi    xeluat-əni,  
 they.acquire.AOR.SUBJ(-?)    own              craftsmanship.INSTR-SUB  
 artimaʒirats'k'əma ʃkaʃa              gi(i)rtan-i<sup>28</sup>  
 between.each.other    in.middle    they.split.X.AOR.SUBJ-?SUB  
 'they swore to each other that whatever they should gain each by his own  
 craftsmanship they should split between them down the middle' (Q'ipshidze 1914  
 in Danelia/Tsanava 1991.264)

(Mingrelian)

I take the first underlined 'i' (in *iʃuani*) to be the euphonic protector of the subjunctive's otherwise final 'n' since this clause's pleonastic subordinate marker is found in the clause-final *- (əni* (on *xeluat əni*), whereas I regard the 'i' at the end of the quote (on *gi(i)rtani*) to be functioning as general subordinator applying to the entire oath<sup>29</sup>. I want, then, to propose that it is this combination of fluctuating presence vs absence of verb-final euphonic 'i', fluctuating presence vs absence of verb-final 'n', frequent coupling of 3rd pers plural subjunctive 'n' + 'i', and tolerance of the subjunctive mood in certain subordinate clauses with or without subordinator that together prompted the reinterpretation of *-n(i)*<sup>30</sup>, *-i*, or its variant *-ə* as general

---

are normally construed with the indicative, they may on occasions accompany a subjunctive. It seems to me that the nuance is captured in English by translating 'If it transpires that...'

<sup>28</sup>In Georgian: *sit'q'va* (= *p'iri*) *mistses ertmanets*, (rom) *rats k'i iʃovon tav-tavisi xelobit, ertmanetʃi ʃuaʃi gaq'on*. Danelia/Tsanava do not, in fact, insert any complementiser in their Georgian translation.

<sup>29</sup>I have only one example of 3rd person plural subjunctive ending *-n* being reinforced by the variant subordinator with nasal *-n(i)*, and even here there is the vowel *-i-* between the subjunctive nasal and the subordinator. The text in Xubua (1937.161) lacks the subordinator *-ni*, but the addition was elicited from an informant. The example reads:

osur(i)                      gatxinedani(-ni)                                      vara,    ma udʒguʃo  
 woman.NOM    you.PL.be.able.to.marry.X.FUT.SUBJ(-SUB)    or.not    I    better  
 maxiolen-ia  
 I'll.rejoice-QUOT  
 'saying: as soon as you are able to ask a woman's hand in marriage, the happier I'll be'

(Mingrelian)

The Georgian is: *kalis txovna ʃegedzlebodet tu ara, me uk'etesad gamexardebao*.

<sup>30</sup>N.B. that the *-n(i)* of *-ʃe+n(i)*, as in *mu-ʃe+n(i)* 'why?' and *ti-ʃe+n(i)* 'for X', is often called a postposition (Chikobava 1936.65; Vamling/Tchantouria 1993.83; Harris/Campbell 1995.292) -- no connection, as far as I am aware, has been postulated between this element and the general subordinator

subordinator in clauses where the sister-language Georgian happens to employ *ro(m)*. However, we need to ask whether there might not have been some stimulating force for (i) why Mingrelian happened to create a general subordinator in the first place and specifically in clause-final (usually verb-final) position, differently from the regular Kartvelian pattern, and (ii) why pleonastic marking of subordination should be much more widely attested in Mingrelian than elsewhere in Kartvelian. In Georgian *ro(m)* developed through phonetic attrition of an element that started life as (and in its full form retains) a clause-initial subordinating role; new subordinating functions were assigned as the shorter form became distinct from its source. Such a combination of changes seems quite understandable. I do not, however, see how Mingrelian's 'rom'-equivalents can be easily derived from any of the language's clause-initial subordinating items (*namut(i)* and *nam(u' əda* would be the only candidates), and, even if one were tempted to hypothesise a connection between either of these and *-n(i)*, the verb-/clause-final positioning of the suffix would remain problematic. I suggest that the solution lies in yet another aspect of the influence that the North West Caucasian language, Abkhaz, has plainly exercised during their long period of symbiosis on Mingrelian (and, indeed, on Mingrelian and Laz together)<sup>31</sup>.

The North West Caucasian family of languages, like North Caucasian languages in general, largely employ non-finite verb-forms as their translation-equivalents of what would typically be subordinate clauses characterised by a fully-fledged finite verb in languages of the Indo-European and Kartvelian families. Of the three main divisions of N.W. Caucasian (Circassian, the now extinct Ubykh, and Abkhaz), it is in this last that one finds the most sharply delineated morphological distinction between finite and non-finite forms:

---

under discussion. However, I must say that I know of no evidence to prove a postpositional origin for this element. Where complex case-endings exist in Kartvelian (and the component *-je* is the Ablative desinence), they usually combine two case-markers -- e.g. in Mingrelian *-(i) + ot* 'for' = Old Georgian *-(i)s + ad* we have Genitive followed by Adverbial. This might suggest that the origin of this *-n(i)* should perhaps be sought in the case-system.

<sup>31</sup>For Abkhazian loan-words in Mingrelian see Chirikba (1998)



## (36) Finite vs Non-finite tense-forms in Abkhaz

## Dynamic Group I Tenses

	'stand up'		'not stand up'	
	Finite (1st pers)	Non-finite (Relative)	Finite (1st pers)	Non-finite (Relative)
Present	s'gəlojt'	jə'gəlb	s'gəlbm	'jəmgəlb
Aorist	s'gəlejt'	jə'gəla	səm'gəlejt'	'jəmgəla
Future I	s'gəlap'	jə'gəlara/ə	s'gəlarəm	'jəmgəlara/ə
Future II	s'gəlaʃt'	jə'gəlaʃa	s'gəlaʃam	'jəmgəlaʃa
Perfect	s'gəlaxjejt'	jə'gəlaxjow = jə'gəlaxJa(ʃ)	səm'gəlaʃ(t')	'jəmgəlaxjow = 'jəmgəlaxJa(ʃ)

## Dynamic Group II Tenses

	'stand up'		'not stand up'	
	Finite (1st pers)	Non-finite (Relative)	Finite (1st pers)	Non-finite (Relative)
Imperfect	s'gəlbŋ	jə'gəlbz	s'gəlbməzt'	'jəmgəlbz
Past Indefinite	s'gəlan	jə'gəlaz	səm'gəlazt'	'jəmgəlaz
Conditional I	s'gəlarən	jə'gəlarəz	s'gəlarəməzt'	'jəmgəlarəz
Conditional II	s'gəlaʃan	jə'gəlaʃaz	s'gəlaʃaməzt'	'jəmgəlaʃaz
Pluperfect	s'gəlaxJan	jə'gəlaxJaz	səm'gəlaʃəzt'	'jəmgəlaxJaz

## Stative Pattern

	'be standing'		'not be standing'	
	Finite (1st pers)	Non-finite (Relative)	Finite (1st pers)	Non-finite (Relative)
Present	s'gəlowp'	jə'gəlow	s'gəlam	jə'gəlam
Past	s'gəlan	jə'gəlaz	s'gəlaməzt'	jə'gəlaməz

A glance at the tables in (36) reveals how the two types of verb (dynamic, stative) differ for all their tenses (whether affirmative or negative) between finite forms (here with 1st person singular subject *s-*) and their non-finite equivalents (here given in the form appropriate to a relative, with 1st person singular subject-prefix replaced by its relative equivalent *j ə* 'who'). What one notices immediately is that the shift from finite to non-finite in all cases but one (finite *s'g əlam* to non-finite *j əg əlam*) involves alteration to the morphology at the end of the verbal complex (accompanied perhaps by movement of negative affix and stress). Insofar as the relative affix replaces the normal finite agreement-affix (in these examples at the very start of the complex), one can speak of alteration earlier in the clause (specifically, in the pre-radical section of

the verbal complex). And when one examines how Abkhaz forms its translation-equivalents of English noun-clause complements and adverbial clauses of manner, cause (which involves a complement to a postposition), concession and time 'when'<sup>32</sup> and 'as soon as', or the object-clauses in such expressions as 'I know (i) where you live, (ii) whither you are going, (iii) whence you came, (iv) why they died', one finds a similar combination of subordinating affixes inserted in the pre-radical structure coupled with complex-final non-finite morphology, as shewn in the selections under (37) (cf. also (22)):

(37) (a)

a'bas d-axj-<sup>l</sup>tə<sup>w</sup>az<sup>w</sup>o s-a+<sup>l</sup>tə<sup>w</sup>ə-pxafojt'  
 thus X-that-talk.NON.FIN I-it+of-be.ashamed.FIN.PRES  
 'I'm ashamed that X is talking like this'

(Abkhaz)

(37) (b)

s-axj-<sup>l</sup>f<sup>w</sup>oz a-'zə sə-m-'tsejt'  
 I-that-be.afraid.NON.FIN.IMPERF it-for I-not-go.PAST  
 'I didn't go, because I was afraid'

(Abkhaz)

(37) (c)

'a-mra (ø-)<sup>g</sup>-<sup>l</sup>pxo-gJə xJtowp'  
 the-sun (it-)how-shine.NON.FIN.PRES-even it.is.cold  
 'although the sun is shining, it is cold'

(Abkhaz)

(37) (d)

d-a'nə-z-ba a-<sup>l</sup>f<sup>w</sup>q<sup>w</sup>'ə (ø-)<sup>l</sup>ə-s-tejt'  
 him/her-when-I-see.NON.FIN.AOR the-book (it-)her-I-give.FIN.AOR  
 'when I saw her, I gave her the book'<sup>33</sup>

(Abkhaz)

(37) (e)

də-<sup>g</sup>-<sup>l</sup>tsa-tə<sup>w</sup>qJ'a-z jə-'uəza d-aajt'  
 (s)he-how-go-just-NON.FIN.PAST his-friend (s)he-come.FIN.AOR

<sup>32</sup>Time 'after' combines a non-finite structure meaning 'when' followed by the postpositional phrase 'after it'.

<sup>33</sup>With '*a-ftaxh*' after it' inserted in second place the meaning is 'after I saw her..'

'as soon as he went, his friend came'

(Abkhaz)

(37) (f)

b-axjə-n'xo ~

b-axj'-tso =

you.FEM-where-live.NON.FIN.PRES you-where-go.NON.FIN.PRES

b-a'xjə+ndza-tso ~

b-a'xjə+ntW'-aa ~

you-whither-go.NON.FIN.PRES you.FEM-whence-come.NON.FIN.AOR

jə-zə-'psə-z

(ø-)z-'dər-wejt'

they-why-die-NON.FIN.PAST (it-)I-know-FIN.PRES

'I know (i) where you live, (ii) where = whither you are going, (iii) whence you came, (iv) why they died'

(Abkhaz)

The markers which, in conjunction with non-finite morphology, form the remaining subordinate expressions (of purpose, result, time 'while', 'since', 'before/until', condition and the expression 'as if') all stand exclusively at the end of the Abkhaz verbal complex. Nevertheless, I wish to propose that it is precisely in Abkhaz that we find a possible source for the Mingrelian features that are of interest because of their non-Kartvelian character. The double marking of subordination by (often early, i.e. pre-radical) insertion of a marker to specify the nature of the clause (or clause-equivalent) plus non-finite morphology shewn by a change at the end of the verbal complex is entirely natural for Abkhaz (and the sister-languages). Undeniably, there were moments in history when Abkhaz influence is likely to have extended well beyond the current south-eastern boundaries of Abkhazia<sup>34</sup>. And perhaps it was as a

<sup>34</sup>I myself have discussed a number of cases of possible Abkhaz influence on Mingrelian and *vice versa* (see Hewitt 1991, 1992a, 1992b, and Hiuit'i [Hewitt] 1988). There is undeniable evidence from the Soviet period (i.e. after the mass-migrations that took most of the native Abkhazian, and indeed North West Caucasian, population to Ottoman lands in the late 19th century) that it was then the norm for Mingrelian to be spoken as their second language by those Abkhazians living in close contact with Mingrelians (whereas knowledge of Abkhaz amongst the Mingrelians of Abkhazia seems to have been far less common). And we have evidence from the observations of (the half-Turkish half-Abkhazian) Evliya Chelebi in the 1640s for similar patterns of bilingualism among the Abkhazians living close to Mingrelia -- of the princely Chachba family he says: 'Amongst themselves they also speak in Mingrelian, for the country across the R. Phasis is Mingrelia in its entirety' (translated from the Georgian rendering of G. Puturidze (1971.100)). As Mingrelian advanced westwards in the wake of those 19th century migrations at the expense of Abkhaz at the latter's eastern fringe (specifically in the Gal District, earlier known as Samurzaq'ano), one might hypothesise that Abkhazians could have preserved features of their ancestral tongue as they became assimilated by the Mingrelians and adopted Mingrelian as their first language. However, though we have no direct contemporary testimony, it is not unreasonable to assume that the period of maximum Abkhazian influence throughout not only Mingrelia but even the whole of western Georgia will have been in the final two centuries of the 1st millennium (viz. during the period of the Abkhazian Kingdom -- see Hewitt 1993 for a convenient survey of the historical facts). At this stage, one might suppose, the greater likelihood would have been for (Laz-)Mingrelian's Zan ancestors to have adopted Abkhaz as their second language because of its prestigious status and to have calqued some Abkhaz features in their native Kartvelian tongue(s). It remains an open question as to whether, at an even earlier period, there might not even have been an Abkhazian (?North West Caucasian) substrate influencing (parts of Western) Kartvelian.

result of such influence that some reanalysis of the elements discussed above at the end of Mingrelian verb-forms occurred. To those with some knowledge of Abkhaz let me say that I have not forgotten to mention the possibly pertinent facts about the functioning of the Abkhaz Past Indefinite and Past Absolute -- see Hewitt 1979 for a discussion of how these forms are used. The former ends in *-n* and signifies 'X VERBed AND', the latter ends in *-n ə* and functions like the English past participle 'having VERBed', as demonstrated in (38):

(38)

də-<sup>h</sup>tsa-n ~                      də-<sup>h</sup>tsa-<sup>h</sup>nə                      a-<sup>h</sup>ɥnə  
 (s)he-go-FIN.PAST.INDEF (s)he-go-PAST.ABSOL the-house  
 (∅-)'aa-j-x<sup>w</sup>ejt'  
 (it-)PREV-he-buy.FIN.AOR  
 'he went and ~having gone, he bought the house'

(Abkhaz)

Comparison of the endings is clearly very reminiscent of the Mingrelian fluctuation between *-n* and *-ni* -- this example, indeed, is plainly very close in sense to (28), which could equally well be translated as 'the peasant finished lunch and ~having finished lunch the peasant said to his wife'. Whilst the form and function of these exceedingly frequent Abkhaz verb-types might have been additional factors in exerting the influence for which I am arguing, I would, of course, not wish to suggest that these actual morphs might themselves have been borrowed. From what I said by way of explanation earlier it is obvious that no such hypothesis is necessary. It is sufficient to think purely in terms of structure and function, much as the high number of preverbs in N.W. Caucasian (specifically Abkhaz) must have helped, as widely acknowledged, to foster the large inventories of such items developed (without overt borrowing) in both Mingrelian and Laz in contrast with the numbers of such elements in Georgian or Svan (see Hewitt Forthcoming for a survey of Kartvelian preverbs). The possibility of splitting the subordinating suffix from its verbal host and placing it clause-finally (as in (35)) must be assumed to be an internal Mingrelian development -- Abkhaz clauses are much more rigidly verb-final than is the case in Kartvelian, and so there is less opportunity for creating clause-final marking that is not at the same time verb-final.

How is the situation in Mingrelian reflected in Laz? To introduce direct quotation with *verba dicendi et sentiendi* Laz has borrowed *ot'i* from Greek and *-ki ~-tʃi* from Turkish (originally from Persian). (39) illustrates *-ki*:

(39)

oxordʒa muʃik komolis uts'u-ki -- ar xodʒepe  
 wife his.ERG husband.DAT X.said.Y.to.Z-that one(.pair.of) bulls.NOM  
 kododgi-ni  
 set.X.up.IMPER-?

'his wife told her husband to set up one pair of bulls' (Chikobava 1936.184)

(Laz)

Note in passing the mysterious final element *-ni* to end the quote. No source I have consulted for Laz mentions the presence of such a Mingrelian-type marker, but I do not see how else it can be interpreted here<sup>35</sup> -- obviously a question for future investigation.

However, the native element *na* is widely used as a general subordinator. It usually behaves like Georgian *ro(m)*, tucking itself, where possible, inside its clause, and (also in parallel with the Georgian marker) derives by phonetic reduction from the language's interrogative for 'which one?' (*namu*, as in Mingrelian). (40) shews it in relative function:

(40)

na moskidasen dobt'axumt<sup>36</sup>  
 SUB X.will.remain we'll.break.X  
 'we'll break off what remains' (Chikobava 1936.184)

(Laz)

We have argued that the genesis in Mingrelian of a general subordinating suffix might well have taken place under the influence of a language in which subordinate clauses as such are exceptional but where a non-finite verb-form, morphologically end-marked, serves instead. The verb-forms with which Mingrelian associates its suffix retain their finite morphology, and so the suffix does nothing more than indicate subordinate status of its clause. But in an appropriate linguistic milieu it would not be too great a step for a general subordinator to take on the role of (let's call it) pseudo-non-finite marker. Abkhaz has no case-system to speak of, and so, unlike its sister-languages, cannot add case-markers to its verbs' non-finite forms. But Laz has long been exposed to languages (Classical/Byzantine/(less relevantly Modern) Greek and Turkish) where non-finite verb-forms (specifically participles) can be case-marked -- examples (41) and (42) demonstrate the use of Dative and Genitive case-endings on Turkish and Ancient Greek participles, respectively:

(41)

<sup>35</sup>In Mingrelian this example would be: *ʃil(i) muʃik komond ʃ(i)s uts'u (namda/mutʃ'o): arti xod ʒepi kododgi-ni* = Georgian: *tsolma misma kmars utxra rom: erti xarebi daaq'ene*.

<sup>36</sup>In Georgian: *ro(m) dartʃeba (imas) movt'ext*.

elmayı gelene ver  
apple.ACC having.come.DAT give.IMPER

(Turkish)

=

Δός τὸ μῆλον τῷ ἐλθόντι<sup>37</sup>  
give.IMPER the apple.ACC the having.come.DAT

(Ancient Greek)

'give the apple to the one who came'

(42)

gelenin elmasını bana ver  
having.come.GEN apple.POSS.ACC me.DAT give.IMPER

(Turkish)

=

Δός μοι τὸ μῆλον τὸ τοῦ ἐλθόντος<sup>38</sup>  
give.IMPER me.DAT the apple.ACC the the having.come.GEN

(Ancient Greek)

'give me the apple of the one who came'

In light of this, consider Laz example (43):

(43)

na bigzality-pe-ǰi lazut'i hini dok'oborey  
SUB we.went-NOUN.PL-GEN maize.NOM they.ERG they.collected.X

'they collected the maize of those of us who went' (K'art'ozia 1970 Text 1, line 8)

(Laz)

Here a finite verb (Aorist Indicative with 1st person plural subject -- *bigzality(u)*) has attached to it the noun-pluraliser (-*pe-*) AND the genitive case-ending (-*ǰi*). To explain this, all we have to do is assume that the general subordinator has effectively become a pseudo-non-finite marker, thereby allowing what otherwise looks to be a full clause to carry the normal marker of nouns in the language. Commenting on this very example, which she quotes from Holisky (1991), Alice Harris (in Harris & Campbell 1995:292) suggests that the nominaliser here might actually be the vowel -*u-*, which

<sup>37</sup>The Modern Greek equivalent is Δώσε τὸ μῆλο σ' αὐτόν ποὺ ἦρθε (where we have a prepositionally governed anaphoric pronoun 'to the one' + relative clause 'that came', which is less helpful to the point at issue)

<sup>38</sup>In Modern Greek: Δώσε μου τὸ μῆλο αὐτοῦ ποὺ ἦρθε.

she links to a widely used verbal-noun formant in Laz(-Mingrelian). However, if we consult the original K'art'ozia article, we find in the second line of the short text containing citation (43) the following main-clause verb-form:

(44)

menda-f-t-i-tu

PREV-1st.Pers-come-AOR.PL

'we came'

(Laz)

This is nothing other than a finite verb ending in an optional *-u*. Indeed, K'art'ozia comments on this very peculiarity in his introduction, where he quotes Laz specialist Sergi Dzhikia's observation to the effect that in the Atina dialect verbs ending in *-t/s/n* can add a meaningless *-u*. This is plainly reminiscent (albeit on a more limited scale) of the observation from Gudava with which we began about optional end-vowels in Mingrelian. If the development of verb-/clause-final subordinator in Mingrelian is a natural development for the language's native material in the environment of its neighbour Abkhaz, the further extension of the parallel and similarly native item *na* in Laz to a pseudo-non-finite marker under the influence of Greek and Turkish is equally comprehensible.

But there is one final feature yet to examine in both Laz and Mingrelian. Laz also employs *na* clause-finally, in which role it functions as the marker of a protasis. In a real protasis such as (45) it is the equivalent of Mingrelian *-da*, which, as stated above, I regard as a specialised borrowing from Georgian of its coördinating conjunction:

(45)

jeti            ginon-na,      ma megtʃare<sup>39</sup>

place.NOM you.want.X-if I    I'll.give.X.to.you

'if you want a place, I'll give it to you' (Chikobava 1936.184)

(Laz)

I believe that Laz may also have borrowed Georgian *da*, altering it to *na* once the latter became so prevalent in subordinate clauses, but there is no way to prove this. However, the element is also used for unreal protases, as in (46), where we note that it is preceded by an element *-k'on-*, as yet unspecified:

(46)

---

<sup>39</sup>In Georgian: *tu adgili ginda, me mogtsem*.

aja furuniʃi nek'na akolendo t'u-k'on-na, k'ai t'u<sup>40</sup>  
 this oven-GEN door.NOM over.here it.was-2-if good it.was  
 'if this oven's door had been over here, it was (= would have been) good'  
 (ibid.151)

(Laz)

In Mingrelian unreal conditions referring to the present or future optionally contain *-n(i)* in association with Present, on the one hand, or Future or Aorist Subjunctive<sup>41</sup>, on the other, all three subjunctives being illustrated in (47):

(47) (a)

ase (ko)guraplende(n(i)) gak'vetils, dʒgir boʃi iʔidi  
 now you.learn.X.PRES.SUBJ<sup>42</sup> lesson.DAT good boy.NOM you.would.be  
 'if you were now learning your lesson, you'd be a good boy' (elicited)  
 (Mingrelian)

(47) (b)

nebas komutʃandasə(ni) ʔudes gamk'uortinuankia  
 permission.DAT X.give.Y.to.FUT.SUBJ(.if) house.DAT I'll.turn.X.round.  
 QUOT  
 'saying: if (s)he were to give me permission, I'll turn the house round' (Xubua  
 1937.215)  
 (Mingrelian)

(47) (c)

ma molaprte(ni) skants'k'əma, muʃa gəmgarine  
 I I'll.come.away.AOR.SUBJ(.if) with.you in.what X.will.help.you

<sup>40</sup>In Georgian: *am purnis k'ari aketk'en rom q'opiliq'o, k'ai iq'o*.

<sup>41</sup>Vamling/Tchantouria (1993.67) quote an example of *-n(i)* combined with the Future Indicative which they translate as a real condition:

lexi dosk'idu ts'amals kumuʋanki-n(i)  
 invalid.NOM X.will.recover medicine.DAT you'll.bring.X.to.Y-SUB  
 'the sick person will recover if you bring him medicine'

(Mingrelian)

On p.75 they observe that a temporal sense is also possible for this example ('..when you bring him medicine'). All the cases I have encountered of real future conditions in Mingrelian would demand *-da* (in place of *-n(i)*) here, for normatively the example as it stands should only have temporal force. Note also that the authors' gloss of the temporal subordinator *mudros ə ə* as 'at that time' (p.74) should, of course, read 'at which time'.

<sup>42</sup>Vamling/Tchantouria (1993.73) quote an example from Q'ipshidze (1914.425) containing a Present Subjunctive with *-ni* which they translate by the English preterite, viz.: *ʃoronti k'os kaak'etendasuni saʃverk muʃeni veeʔuu?* 'If God created man, why was there no relief?'. In fact, the translation should read as follows: 'If God were enriching man [sc. as an ongoing process], why was there no relief?'



'how will it benefit you, were I to come away with you?' (elicited)<sup>43</sup>

(Mingrelian)

But what do we find in the past? Consider the parallel triplets in (48) and (49):

(48)

ma skan sakmes vak'etendi-k'o(n(i))<sup>44</sup>, dʒgir(i) iʔuapud(u/ə)  
I.NOM your job.DAT I.was.doing.X-? good it.would.have.been

=

ma skani sakme vak'eti-k'o(n(i)), dʒgir(i) iʔuapud(u/ə)  
I.NOM your job.ACC I.did.X-? good it.would.have.been

=

ma skani sakme mik'etebud(u/ə)-k'o(n(i)), dʒgir(i) iʔuapud(u/ə)  
I.DAT your job.NOM I.had.done.X-? good it.would.have.been  
'if it had been me doing your job, it would have been good' (elicited)<sup>45</sup>

(Mingrelian)

or

(49)

ma ts'erils dobtʃ'arundi-k'o(n(i)), dʒgir(i) iʔuapud(u/ə)  
I.NOM letter.DAT I.would.have.written.X-? good it.would.have.been

=

ma ts'erili dobtʃ'ari-k'o(n(i)), dʒgir(i) iʔuapud(u/ə)  
I.NOM letter.ACC I.wrote.X-? good it.would.have.been

=

ma ts'erili dom(i)tʃ'arud(u/ə)-k'o(n(i)), dʒgir(i) iʔuapud(u/ə)  
I.DAT letter.NOM I.had.written.X-? good it.would.have.been  
'if I had written the letter, it would have been good' (elicited)<sup>46</sup>

(Mingrelian)

<sup>43</sup>In Georgian these examples are: *exla (ro(m)) sc'avlobde gak'vetils, k'argi bitʃ'i iknebodi. nebas (ro(m)) momtsemde, saxls movabrunebo. me (ro(m)) ts'amovide [entan, ra]i gamogadgeba?*

<sup>44</sup>Such forms combine with the Conditional (Georgian *xolmeobiti*) of the copula to form an imperfective Conditional, e.g.

dʒgir tsxovrebas mini maʔirsendu/ə-k'on iʔuapudua  
good life.DAT who.NOM X.was.deeming.me.worthy.of.Y-? X.would.be/have.been  
'asking: who would be/have been deeming me worthy of a good life?'

(Mingrelian)

The equivalent imperfective Future couples the Future Indicative of the copula with the Present Subjunctive (with or without *-n(i)*) of the lexical verb, e.g.

brel satʃukars mertʃandas(-ən) iʔi(i)  
many gift.DAT X.give.Y.to.you.PRES.SUBJ(-SUB) X.will.be  
'X will be giving you many gifts' (Xubua 1937.242)

(Mingrelian)

<sup>45</sup>In Georgian: *me [eni sakme rom mek'etebina, k'argi ikneboda.*

<sup>46</sup>In Georgian: *me ts'erili rom damets'era, k'argi ikneboda.*

Here we have an element *-k'o(n(i))* attached in (48) respectively to the Imperfect, preverbless Aorist, and preverbless Pluperfect Indicatives, in (49) respectively to the Conditional (Georgian *xolmeobiti*), preverbal Aorist, and preverbal Pluperfect Indicatives -- the three preverbal vs preverbless pairs here seem to be interchangeable, though the subtle question of aspectual distinctions would benefit from further study. What, then, is this element, which appears as *-k'on-* in Laz example (46), but as *-k'o* in Laz example (50) (Dumézil 1967.81)?

(50)

mts'k'upi var t'u-k'o hak var dobdgitut'i  
 darkness not it.was-? here not I.would.stay

'was it not dark, I should not stay here!' (Dumézil 1967 Text IX.85)

(Laz)

In his introduction Dumézil simply glosses *-k'o* as French 'si' = 'if' (i.e. the protasis-marker). As to the origin of the suffix in these special modal forms, which are quite unique to Laz-Mingrelian and which the Georgian tradition styles *p'irobiti*<sup>47</sup>, most commentators present it as existing in the allomorphic variation *-k'o(n)* and interpret it as a reduced form of what in Mingrelian appears as *o-k'o(-n)* 'X wants Y' (e.g. Chikobava 1936.140). As we see from (51):

---

<sup>47</sup>This would normally be translated as 'conditional'. However, as seen above, it has become the norm to use this English term for what in the Georgian tradition is named the *xolmeobiti* (i.e. the Future Indicative stem + the endings of the Imperfect).

(51)		Mingrelian	Svan	Laz	Georgian
	'I want X'	m-o-k'o(-n)	m-a-k'u	m-i-n-o-n	m-i-nd-a
	'you want X'	g-o-k'o(-n)	dzh-a-k'u	g-i-n-o-n	g-i-nd-a
	'X wants Y'	o-k'o(-n)	x-a-k'u	u-n-o-n	u-nd-a

In Laz this conjugation of 'want' is used suffixally with (partly) conjugating Aorist Subjunctive of the lexical verb in the Xopa dialect to form the equivalent of the Future Indicative; in Chxalurian the suffixal component remains in the 3rd person singular form, whilst the lexical verb conjugates fully; in Vic'e-Arkabulian, on the other hand, the fully conjugating Aorist Subjunctive takes as suffix a reduced form of the Present tense of the copula (as Marr observed -- 1910.53). All of this gives for the verb 'measure' the following patterns (Chikobava 1936.148):

(52) Laz Future Indicative Formations

	Vic'e-Arkabulian	Xopan	Chxalurian
'I'll measure X'	b-zum-a-re	b-zim-a-m-i-n-o-n	b-zim-a-u+n+o+n
'you'll measure X'	zum-a-re	zim-a-g-i-n-o-n	zim-a-u+n+o+n
'X'll measure Y'	zum-a-s-e(-re)	zim-a-s-u/i-n-o-n	zim-a-s-u+n+o+n
'we'll measure X'	b-zum-a-t-e(-re)	b-zim-a-m-i-n-o-n-an	b-zim-a-t-u+n+o+n
'you'll measure X'	zum-a-t-e(-re)	zim-a-g-i-n-o-n-an	zim-a-t-u+n+o+n
'they'll measure X'	zum-a-n-e(-n)	zim-a-s-u/i-n-o-n-an	zim-a-n-u+n+o+n

Marr (1910.53) and Q'ipshidze (1911.5) go on to speak of the Chxaltians having an alternative formation suffixing *-k'o* (Marr)/*-k'on* (Q'ipshidze) to the conjugated Aorist Indicative. This formation is presented by Chikobava exclusively as the IInd *p'irobiti* mood, which he translates just like the parallel coupling in Mingrelian illustrated in (48) and (49) above. The listing under (51) demonstrates that Mingrelian certainly employs the form *o-k'o(-n)* (with the usually deleted final *-n* being the Present Indicative 3rd person singular affix agreeing with the Nominative entity desired), whereas Laz uses a different root, closer to the Georgian. One might argue that the root of the verb 'want' was shifted in Laz after the suffix took on this modal force. But another problem is that Laz does not delete final *-n*, and yet the suffix *-k'o~k'on* seems to exist in both forms in both languages. The main difficulty, however, seems to me to be the juxtaposition of the suffix with base-forms in the indicative mood -- *t'u* in (46) and (50) is the Imperfect Indicative of the copula. The 3rd person singular form of the independent lexeme 'want' in both Mingrelian and Georgian has become fossilised as the marker of necessity/obligation, but, whether used in this latter sense or to signify 'want', the subordinate verb/clause follows the desiderative marker<sup>48</sup> and, with reference to future events, the coupling is with the Aorist Subjunctive<sup>49</sup>, as shewn in (53):

(53)

ok'o            midapрте(-ni)  
it's.necessary I.go.AOR.SUBJ(-SUB)<sup>50</sup>

(Mingrelian)

=

unda            ts'avide  
it's.necessary I.go.AOR.SUBJ

(Georgian)

<sup>48</sup>In Georgian this order is obligatory, and, when *unda* represents the fossilised marker of obligation, it functions as a kind of auxiliary prefix, forming such a tight bond with its dependent verb that no other material can split them. In Mingrelian, however, there is at least one example in Danelia/Tsanava (1991.272) with the order reversed:

ena ra[epi]            mindʒes            mevuʔone-o+k'o+n-ia  
this horses.GEN owner.DAT I.take.X.to.Y-necessary-QUOT  
'saying: I have to take this to the horses' owner'

(Mingrelian)

In Georgian: *es ra[ebis p'at'rons unda mivuaq'vanoo*. Note, however, that, regardless of the order of the elements in Mingrelian, the subjunctive remains essential.

<sup>49</sup>For present wishes the Present Subjunctive is used:

ok'o            btj'arunde(-ni)            ts'erils  
necessary I.be.writing.X.PRES.SUBJ(-SUB) letter.DAT  
'I should be writing a letter'

(Mingrelian)

In Georgian: *unda vts'erde ts'erils*.

<sup>50</sup>Not even the subordinating *ro(m)* is possible in Georgian, so close is the bond between auxiliary and subjunctive.

'I have to go'

But what happens when the wish/obligation relates to the past? Consider (54) (with Pluperfect Indicative alone in Georgian vs Pluperfect + underlined suffix(es) in Mingrelian):

(54)

ok'o                    midamrtumud-k'o(n(i))  
it's.necessary I.had.gone-?

(Mingrelian)

=

unda                    ts'avsuliq'avi  
it's.necessary I.had.gone

(Georgian)

'I had to go/should have gone'

A parallel pattern is found in past purpose-clauses, as shewn in (55):

(55)

midart(u/ə) tʃxom(i)    outʃ'opud(u/ə)-k'o(n(i))    (tiʃen(i))  
X.went            fish.NOM    X.had.caught.Y-?            for.it<sup>51</sup>

(Mingrelian)

=

ts'avida, rom~rata    tevzi            daetʃ'ira  
X.went    SUB            fish.NOM    X.had.caught.Y

(Georgian)

'X went (in order) to catch fish'

It may strike observers as odd that Georgian should require a subjunctive mood when such *irrealis* expressions relate to the present or future but an indicative in the past. The reason for this is that a specifically *irrealis*/potential particle (naturally coupled with the indicative mood) once functioned in Old Georgian but has been lost in the modern dialects, leaving the Pluperfect Indicative, which developed out of the Aorist Indicative, stranded in these constructions. The Old Georgian particle was *-mtsa*<sup>52</sup>, which looks as if it contains *-tsa* 'and, also, even', though the precise analysis remains annoyingly opaque. Examples (56a) and (56b) illustrate a past unreal condition and a past purpose clause, respectively:

<sup>51</sup>This is reminiscent of the optional use of the postpositional phrase *a-z ə* 'for it' after non-finite expressions of purpose, marked by *-r+* ზ in Abkhaz, though the construction is perhaps preferable with *tiʃen(i)* in Mingrelian.

<sup>52</sup>Still widely used in the set-expression *ts'q'eulimts iq'os* 'May X be damned!', but because its force is no longer properly understood, even here it is coupled with a verb in the subjunctive (the Aorist indicative here would be *iq'o*).

(56) (a)

uk'uetu-mts<sup>53</sup> itsoda saxlisa upalman... iŷwidzebda-mts<sup>a</sup>  
if-POT X.knew.Y house.GEN master.ERG X.was.awake.POT  
'if the master of the house had known, he would have remained awake' (K'iziria  
1969.151)  
(Old Georgian)

or

(56) (b)

mieaxla... rayta-mts<sup>a</sup> mohk'ueta tavi misi  
X.approached.Y that-POT X.cut.Z.off.Y head.NOM Y's  
'X approached Y in order to cut off his head' (ibid. 142)  
(Old Georgian)

Since Mingrelian incorporates the suffix of interest to us in subordinate clauses where Georgian too once placed its now obsolete potential/*irrealis* element (viz. unreal past protases and past purpose-clauses<sup>54</sup>), a natural question to ask is whether there might not be some functional relationship between the two -- formally they are quite distinct. Since the etymology of the Georgian particle is unclear, do other languages offer any clues as to what items can fulfil such a function? It so happens that Russian is a language which employs a similar particle, namely *b( ъ )*, illustrated in (57), whose origin is transparent:

(57)

esli b ъ upal, to nikogda b ъ ne vstal  
if IRR fell then already IRR not stood.up  
'if (I) had fallen, (I) would never again have stood up' (Turgenev, from Borrás &  
Christian 1963.239)  
(Russian)

In (57) *b ъ* is etymologically the 2nd/3rd person singular form of the simple past tense of the verb 'be' (Entwistle & Morison 1974.205; Matthews 1960.210), attested from the 13th century, though in Modern Russian this *irrealis*-marker no longer shows any copular usage. If, then, the copula is a possible source for the marker carrying the function of interest to us, we might further ask whether any copular link

<sup>53</sup>Note that it is protasis-marker *tu* (or at least a complex conjunction containing it) that couples with the irrealis particle and recall that example (46) has the Laz equivalent of Georgian *tu* (namely *-na*) also coupled with *-k'on*. This would lead one to expect a one-time association of *-k'o(n) + da* in Mingrelian.

<sup>54</sup>Mingrelian's development of a Conditional (formally identical to Georgian's *xolmeobiti* with the Imperfect Indicative endings attached to the Future Indicative tense) renders the presence of such a particle in the apodosis of unreal conditions superfluous.



is establishable for the Mingrelian(-Laz) suffix. Within Kartvelian there is none (to the best of my knowledge), but an affirmative response is feasible, if we do not restrict ourselves to the Kartvelian family but yet again cast our gaze into Abkhaz(-Abaza) grammar.

Extremely frequent in Abkhaz with negated verbs equating to English expressions 'without VERBing ~without having VERBed' is the suffix *-k<sup>w</sup>'a(n)*, as in (58), where we note an optional final nasal and that labialised consonant + open vowel in Abkhaz would be expected to correlate with plain consonant + 'o' in Kartvelian (cf. Abkhaz *aq<sup>w</sup>'a'raan*, borrowed from Georgian *q'orani* 'raven'), e.g.

(58)

ak<sup>'</sup>-<sup>l</sup>gJə (ø-)'sə-ma-m-k<sup>w</sup>'a(+n) ~ (Ø-)q'a-m-'ts'a-k<sup>w</sup>'a(+n)  
 one-even (it-)I-have-not-? (it-)PREV-not-do-?  
 s-aa-jt'  
 I-come-FIN.AOR  
 I came without anything ~ without having done anything'

(Abkhaz)

But from a semantic point of view this hardly seems to offer enlightenment. Consider, however, (59a) from Abkhaz and (59b) from the divergent Abaza dialect:

(59) (a)

ak<sup>'</sup>-<sup>l</sup>gJə (ø-)q'a-j-m-'ts'e-jt'. ak<sup>'</sup>-<sup>l</sup>gJə  
 one-even (it-)PREV-he-not-do-FIN.AOR one-even  
 (ø-)q'a-j-m-'ts'a-k<sup>w</sup>'a+nə-w dʒə+w+ʃ+t<sup>55</sup>  
 (it-)PREV-he-not-do-?-NON.FIN.PRES.STAT is.it.really.so  
 'he didn't do anything. Do you really think he did nothing?!' = 'Of course, he did!'

(Abkhaz)

cf.

(59) (b)

jə-b-dər-xə-w-ma papa jə-j-<sup>h</sup>wə-w+z  
 it-you.FEM-know-really-NON.FIN.PRES-QU dad which-he-say-NON.FIN.  
 IMPERF  
 -- jə-zə-m-dər-x-k<sup>w</sup>'a

<sup>55</sup>An alternative would be:

ak<sup>'</sup>-<sup>l</sup>gJə (ø-)q'a-j-m-'ts'e-jt'. ak<sup>'</sup>-<sup>l</sup>gJə (ø-)q'a-m-'ts'a-k<sup>w</sup>'a(+n)  
 one-even (it-)PREV-he-not-do-FIN.AOR one-even (it-)PREV-not-do-NON.FIN.AOR-?  
 jə-ʂ+<sup>pa</sup>-q'a-j-m-'ts'e-j  
 it-how-PREV-he-not-do-NON.FIN.AOR-QU

it-I-not-know-really-?

'do you know what dad said? Of course I do!' (Tabulova 1976.215)

(Abaza)

Here we have ways to rebut a negative assertion or the doubt implied in a question. The invariant Abkhaz particle indicating surprise at the end of (59a) suggests a connection with the verb 'a-dʒ(ə)-ʃa-ra 'suppose' (which governs a simple non-finite form of the verb for the object supposed -- just what we have in (∅-)q'a-j-m 'ts'a-k<sup>W</sup>'a+nə-w). The verb whose validity is being queried appears with the suffix of interest to us followed by -w, the marker of a stative verb in its non-finite present tense guise -- in Abaza (59b) the suffix attaches equally to a non-finite verb-form. I suggest that the most convincing way of assigning meanings to all the parts such that the required sense is obtained in the Abkhaz sequence (59a) is to interpret the sequence as in (59c) with a copular root:

(59) (c)

(∅.)q'a.j.m.'ts'a-k<sup>W</sup>'a+nə-w dʒə+w+ʃ+t  
his.not.having.done.it-be-ing is.it.really.supposable  
'is his not having done it really supposable?!

(Abkhaz)

A parallel analysis would then be assignable to the Abaza sequence. It so happens that a copular root -k<sup>W</sup>'(ə- does exist in Abkhaz, as in (60):

(60)

la+ra 'l-a+k<sup>W</sup>'ə-m  
she she-be-not.PRES.STAT  
'it isn't her'

(Abkhaz)

The shift of open to close vowel is by no means uncommon -- example (61) illustrates how Abkhaz developed the close from the proto-Abkhaz-Abaza open vowel, preserved in Abaza, in the nominal root 'head' (also illustrated is how the original voiceless uvular plosive, again preserved in Abaza, merged in Abkhaz with the voiceless back fricative):

(61) Proto-Abkhaz-Abaza: \*qa => Abkhaz: -xə (= Abaza: qa) 'head'

It is, thus, quite conceivable that this root might be cognate with the suffix under examination. Consider also a strange optional addition (underlined in (62)) with expressions of the type 'as X is/was VERBing':

(62)



tʃən-la d-rə-ga-rə-k<sup>W</sup>ə+nə-z,                      də-z-ba-'rə+n  
 day-by    him/her-they-take-if-?-NON.FIN.PAST    him/her-I-see-CONDIT  
 'if they'd taken him/her by day, I'd have seen him/her' (ibid. 169)

(T'ap'anta Abaza)

Whilst recognising that this hypothesis is more controversial than that advanced earlier, I nevertheless want to propose that it is again within Abkhaz(-Abaza) that we might have a source for a copular suffix (even down to its fluctuating nasal) that might have filtered into Laz-Mingrelian long ago (obviously before the split of these two closely related tongues that began in the 7th century) to take on the still important *irrealis*-marking function, once fulfilled in Georgian by the now obsolete suffix *-mtsā*. Whether *-k<sup>W</sup>ə(+n)* ever had a protasis-marking role in the standard Abkhaz dialects is unknown -- if the protasis-marker *-r* is indeed derived from the non-finite Future I (marked today by *-ra/ə*-- cf. (36), and see Lomtadze 1994:168; Hewitt 1987:94), it is not inconceivable that originally such forms were dependent on some other element, and a form of the copula might well have filled that slot before falling into obsolescence, but this is pure speculation in the present state of our knowledge. Whatever the origin of the optionality of the nasal component in Laz-Mingrelian's formally similar suffixes (and an analysis of the distribution of *-k'o* vs *-k'on* in Laz, where neither deletion of final 'n' nor the subordinating suffix *-n(i)* is supposed to exist, is clearly required), I get the distinct impression that (in Mingrelian at least) the *-n(i)* of *-k'o(n(i))* is actually being assigned the separate role of subordinating suffix (equivalent to Georgian *ro(m)*) that we discussed earlier. Its detachment from the verb (*koʃibdesik'o*) in the second conjoined subordinate clause and attachment to the clause-final noun (*dartʃeli*) in example (65) (from one of the locally published Mingrelian journals of the 1930s) surely tends to support this suggestion:

(65)

k'lasiuri nt'erepk            iridixaʃe            miant'es            k'olmeurneobas:  
 class-    enemies.NOM    from.all.sides    they.attacked.X    collective.farming.DAT  
 p'rovok'atsia, tʃ'uala, gentxapa, midavʌala do ʃxva tedʒgurepit  
 provocation    arson    assault    robbery    & other such.like.things.INST  
 tiʃeni, namda k'olmeurneoba            gak'urʌvapudesi-k'oni    do  
 for.it    that    collective-farming.NOM    they.had.destroyed.X-?    &  
 atenero gilatarajaʃalo    kuʃib(u)desi-k'o            dartʃeli-ni  
 thus    for.marauding    they.had.acquired.X-?    Darcheli-?  
 'class-enemies have attacked collective-farming from all sides: by provocation,  
 arson, assault, robbery and suchlike in order to destroy collective-farming and in

this way to acquire [our village of] Darcheli for marauding' (*k'olekt'ivi*]i *jarat* [By Way of the Collective] 1, 5 May 1932, p.2)

(Mingrelian)

However, the possibility of reduplicating this final component -- compare (66) and (67) with examples (54) and (55), respectively -- perhaps suggests some doubt amongst (at least some) speakers as to the precise force of *-ni* when combined with *-k'o* -- in my field-notes I have more cases of reduplicated *-n* alone than of the full *-ni*:  
(66)

ok'o midamrtumud-k'o(n(i(n(?i))))

'I had to go/should have gone'

(Mingrelian)

(67)

midart(u/ə) tʃxom(i) outʃ'opud(u/ə)-k'o(n(i(n(?i)))) (tiʃen(i))<sup>56</sup>

'X went (in order) to catch fish'

(Mingrelian)

### Digression

As is well known, some dialects of ancient Greek also had an *irrealis*-marker *ke(n)*. It has even been suggested that, if a disputed Mycenaean form similarly conveyed potentiality, then the proto-Greek putative demonstrative adverb (for there is no copular connection in the Greek) would be reconstructible as *\*q<sup>w</sup>e(n)/q<sup>w</sup>* <sup>17</sup> (Palmer 1995.68/285), a form whose full-grade is intriguingly reminiscent, structurally at least, of the Abkhaz-Abaza suffix and, both structurally and functionally, of the Laz-Mingrelian suffix. Whilst the eastern Black Sea coast was colonised by Greeks from the 8th century BC, the colonisers came from Miletus, where Ionian, a dialect with *an* in place of *ke(n)*, was spoken (Palmer 1995.81). And so, this superficial similarity looks like nothing more than mere coincidence.

### Conclusion

If the arguments advanced above prove to be correct, is there any wider lesson to be drawn other than that Abkhaz influence on Laz-Mingrelian will have been demonstrated to be even deeper than previously thought? The whole thrust of this presentation has been predicated on the belief that indications to a language's development might be found within the form and function of its native stock of elements and/or by taking into consideration the linguistic milieu in which it is/has been spoken (particularly where bi- and multi-lingualism have been the norm, as in the Caucasus) -- in the present instance the argument has been that both factors might have played a part in the genesis of the features examined. Misinterpretations and/or

---

<sup>56</sup>Such elicited examples with *-ni-n(i)* among my corpus all seem to occur only after *-k'o*, but again this may be no more than an accidental gap in the data.

reanalyses are undeniably significant factors in language-change, and it is surely legitimate to look to neighbouring and/or (one-time) dominant languages as sources of possible influence. When the question concerns reconstruction, is it proper to ignore possible clues in the form of the actual morphs themselves? I suggested above a (to my mind) entirely plausible chain of (re)interpretation to explain how Mingrelian *nam(u/ əda* 'that' might have acquired its complementiser-functions assuming it to be a coalescence of interrogative *namu* 'which (one)?' and protasis-marker *-da* 'if'. This, of course, touches upon the question of the relevance of parataxis to attempts at explaining the genesis of at least some types of hypotactic constructions in some languages, a possible path of development I have discussed with reference to the Caucasus more than once (see Hewitt 1984; 1987). Now, it so happens that, as a result of hypothesising along such lines, I stand accused by Harris and Campbell (1995:284) of committing what they style the 'Marker/Structure Fallacy':

'Notice that it is by no means necessary to assume that the structure in which a particular innovative grammatical element is found developed out of the structure in which that grammatical element originated. It is logically possible that one *word* simply developed from another, with little reference to context. It is also possible that structural marking that developed in one context was later *extended* to another. While the issue of whether the sources of markers logically imply the sources of structures is an empirical one, we shall refer to the *assumption* that they do as the Marker/Structure Fallacy.

'An example of the Marker/Structure Fallacy in recent work comes from Hewitt (1987:141-2, 260-1), where it is assumed without further evidence that a subordinate clause with marking otherwise found in questions in Georgian must have developed from an "independent interrogative clause"...

'The Parataxis Hypothesis is not supported by evidence from attested instances of the rise of the use of subordinators.' (Stresses original)

I suggested that Georgian's sole clause-final subordinating phrase *tu ara* 'as soon as' (cf. 1) might have taken on this meaning via progression from an expressive use of its original role in marking alternative questions (for the words literally mean 'or not', as in *ts'avida tu ara* 'Did X go or not?') to being grammaticalised as a fully-fledged formant of this type of temporal clause. In other words, my ascription to this particular type of subordinate structure of an origin in the paratactic use of the relevant question-marking strategy because the marking mechanism also functions interrogatively is denounced as fallacious. The details of how this or that language comes to express this or that type of subordination seem not overly to trouble my critics, for they seek to 'explain' widely attested parallelisms in structure between questions and dependent clauses merely by pointing to a global, shared semantic characteristic, namely 'speaker non-assertion'. Whether or not one accepts the validity of this claim, I fail to see how it 'explains' anything at all, for, if speaker non-assertion is the sole determining factor, should it not follow that any question-forming strategy

ought to be capable of marking any appropriate type of subordinate clause in the relevant language(s)? I am not aware that such unrestrained substitutability has been observed in such languages, and so one must conclude that, whatever the relevance of speaker non-assertion might be to the sort of constructional parallelisms under review, some other process must be at work behind this or that language's choice of this or that question-forming strategy to mark a particular type of subordinate structure. For the time being, therefore, I prefer to think that reinterpretation (specifically, the embedding) of an original paratactic sequence is by no means implausible. But it is not just that the Harris/Campbell proposal is lacking in explanatory adequacy -- their presentation is marred by some questionable interpretations of basic data (and not only Caucasian).

The late Nia Abesadze (1965.251-2) is cited (p.290) as source for the statement that the Mingrelian coördinator *do* 'and' can serve as a clause-final subordinator, as in (our) example (68):

(68)

baʧanak mutʃot ginirtu viti ts'anero do  
 child such become 10 year and

'as soon as the child turned ten...' (Xubua 1937.1), glosses by Harris(/Campbell p. 290)

(Mingrelian)

In fact, Abesadze made no such claim. What she actually wrote was that the coördinator may stand between subordinate and main clause in addition to the presence of an independent subordinator, a feature she observed to be attested throughout the Kartvelian family<sup>57</sup>. Here, as amply attested above, the subordinator is *much'ot* 'as (soon as)', for this would be the correct gloss (rather than 'such' -- Abesadze herself, it should be emphasised, correctly translated this conjunction on pp.240-1 as Georgian *rogorts (k'i)* 'as soon as'), just as the verb in (68) is actually 'became' (not 'become').

On p.295 the A-not-A question-forming strategy in Turkish is illustrated by (our) example (69):

(69)

kadın tarla-ya git-ti-mi git-me-di-mi  
 woman field-DAT go-PAST-QU go-NEG-PAST-QU

<sup>57</sup>One could also mention that the phenomenon was found in Ancient Greek and Old Armenian: cf. Iliad 1.477-8: ἤμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως, καὶ τότε ἔπειτ' ἀνάγοντο 'When the early-born Dawn appeared with rosy fingers, [and] then they set sail...'; *ibrew ekn emut i xoran andr, ew j ʕt'ris bazmec'aw* 'When he came [&] entered the tent there, [and] he sat down at the banquet' (Jensen 1959.197) -- the standard transcription for Old Armenian is used here.

'did the woman go to the field (or didn't she go)?'

(Turkish)

It is then asserted (p.297) that: 'The A-not-A structure of Turkish questions is also used to form temporal clauses with the meaning "as soon as", as in (our) example (70):

(70)

kadın tarla-ya gid-er git-me-z  
woman field-DAT go-AOR go-not-AOR  
'as soon as the woman went to the field..' [my glosses]

(Turkish)

In fact, Turkish does not use its question-forming strategy to build this type of subordinate clause, as proven by the absence in (70) of the question-forming suffix *-mi* -- it counter-poses affirmative vs negative so-called Aorists (which lack any person-affix); furthermore, the time-reference of (70) is determined by the tense of the main verb (i.e. under appropriate conditions, it could be future)<sup>58</sup>.

Having absolutely rejected any account of language-change that utilises the concept of parataxis, Harris and Campbell proceed to present (310-13) a concrete example of how a language with non-finite subordination might have developed a finite strategy, a not uncommon occurrence. The language chosen is North-East Caucasian Udi, and with an observation on this illustration the present Caucasian odyssey will close.

Contrasted with the participial relative structure ('dancing girl' = 'girl who danced') that typifies the whole language-family, as in (our) example (71), is the clausal neologism with relativiser and fully finite dependent verb, witnessed in (our) example (72):

(71)

---

<sup>58</sup>I am grateful to my colleagues Dr. Bengisu Rona and Laurent Mignon for analysis of these Turkish examples. A further slip in the presentation of the Georgian data in Harris and Campbell (1995) concerns the extension of the Georgian speech-particle *-o*, which is discussed on p.307 with reference to two examples. The first of these has the verb 'think' as introductory main verb for a direct quote, whereas the second, cited below, is stated only to imply the presence of such a verb:

sazedao ktsevis pormebl'i -en element'i ise xjirad gvevlineba, [rom  
superessive version in.forms -en element.NOM so often X.is.manifested.for.us that  
titkos igia mats'armoebeli-o]  
as.if that.is formant.NOM-QUOT

(Georgian)

'We encounter the element *-en* so often in forms of the superessive version that it is as though it were the formant'

What Harris, for she is the author of this particular chapter, overlooks is that the conjunction *titkos*, which can function here alone (i.e. without the subordinator *rom*), does itself incorporate what is in origin the 3rd person singular Aorist Subjunctive passive of the basic *verbum dicendi* of Georgian, whose root is *-tk(v)*- 'say', such that the speech-particle can in this example at least be made to depend directly on this verbal root.



azak'e xinärax gölöjpi  
 I.saw girl.DAT dance.PTC  
 'I saw the dancing girl = girl who danced'

(Udi)

vs

(72)

azak'e xinärax mat'in-te gölöj-ne-p-i  
 I.saw girl.DAT who-REL dance<sub>1</sub>-3rd.SING-dance<sub>2</sub>-PERF  
 'I saw the girl who danced'

(Udi)

And the 'explanation' proffered for this quite radical shift? Admittedly, the accompanying footnote (Ft. 37 on p. 429) states: 'There is circumstantial evidence that this development of finite relative clauses was influenced by Azeri, Armenian, and/or Georgian, each of them a language unrelated to Udi with which Udi has been in contact for long periods of time. If this is correct, it does not change the fact that the change in Udi required an internal mechanism...It is difficult or impossible to find any change in any language where the possibility of the influence of another language can be categorically excluded'. However, the internal mechanism proposed is simply (?simplistically) this: as a participle is classifiable as part-adjective/part-verb, the -- presumably any -- language is free to shift from non-finite participial phrase to full clause with finite verb! But what of the formant here glossed as 'relative'? Readers might, I feel, have appreciated being told that *-te* is the widely used Armenian conjunction (*e*)*t<sup>h</sup>e/t<sup>h</sup>e*:, whose privileges of occurrence (in Old Armenian) match those of Georgian *tu* (viz. 'that; if; or'). This borrowing is clearly described in his Udi grammar by Schulze (1982.202)<sup>59</sup>, who also points out that this import is widely associated with Udi's native stock of interrogatives to produce a range of new subordinating elements. Yet again, then, we seem to have a clear (hardly circumstantial) case of language-interference, which is surely the really interesting point here.

Before engaging in meaningful speculation about general trends, one surely has to unravel the developments in individual languages. Even this goal is unattainable unless investigations are predicated on accurate presentation of the data. I hope I may at least claim to have satisfied this basic *desideratum*, however persuasive the interpretation of these data may then be judged to be. Specifically, I have argued: (a) that the presence in Mingrelian of an atypical Kartvelian feature, namely verb- or clause-final marking of subordination (*-n(i)/-i/ ∅* either alone or tautologically

<sup>59</sup>I have myself mused (see Hewitt 1987.252) about this as a possible Armenian source for Georgian *tu*, which, as mentioned above, has no cognate-forms in the sister-languages.

indicating the subordinate status of the clause), could have arisen out of the reinterpretation of native Mingrelian morphological material under influence from neighbouring Abkhaz, where the phenomenon of suffixal marking of subordinate status is entirely characteristic of the North West Caucasian family, to which Abkhaz belongs; (b) that the *irrealis* verb-formant *-k'o(n(i))*, found only in Mingrelian and Laz within the Kartvelian family, might actually have derived from one of Abkhaz's copular roots, namely *-k<sup>w</sup>'* (argued to derive from *\*-k<sup>w</sup>'a*) 'be'; and, tangentially, (c) that parataxis remains a viable explanation for the development of certain types of subordinate structures, despite a recent attempt by Harris and Campbell utterly to reject this assumption, -- some deficiencies in the latter's analyses are pointed out, and the explanatory adequacy of their belief that 'speaker non-assertion' can alone account for why some languages assign subordinate-marking functions to interrogative strategies is questioned.

*NME Dept.,  
SOAS,  
Thornhaugh St.,  
Russell Sq.,  
London WC1H 0XG.  
E-mail: gh2@soas.ac.uk*

#### REFERENCES

- ABESADZE, NIA, 1965. 'hip'ot'aksis ts'evr-k'av]irebi da k'av]irebi megrul]i [Potential conjunctions and conjunctions of hypotaxis in Mingrelian]', *tbilisis saxelmts'ipo universit'et'is ]romebi*, **114** [Works of Tbilisi State University 114], 229-257.
- BOEDERI, VINPRID [Boeder, Winfried], 1999. 'damat'ebiti ts'inadadebebis k'av]irebi dzvel kartul]i [Conjunctions of complement clauses in Old Georgian]', *ivane d ]avaxi]vilis saxelobis tbilisis saxelmts'ipo universit'et'i, pilologiis pak'ult'et'i, enatmetsnierebis sak'itxebi*, **3** [The Ivane Dzhavakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Philology Faculty, Questions of Linguistics, 3], 28-44.
- BORRAS, F.M. and CHRISTIAN R.F., 1963. *Russian Syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- CHIKOBAVA, ARNOLD, 1936. *t]'anuris gramati'ik'uli analizi (t'ekst'ebiturt)* [Grammatical Analysis of Laz (with Texts)]. Tbilisi: Academy Press.
- CHIRIKBA, VJACHESLAV, 1998. 'K voprosu ob abxazskix zaimstvovanijax v megrel'skom jazyke [On the question of Abkhazian loans in the Mingrelian language]', *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, **4** [Questions of Linguistics, 4], 128-142.
- CHKADUA, LIDIJA, 1970. *Sistema vremen i osnovnyx modal'nyx obrazovanij v*

- abxazsko-abazinskix dialektax* [The System of Tenses and Basic Modal Formations in the Abkhaz-Abaza Dialects]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.
- DANELIA, K'ORNELI and TSANAVA, AP'OLON, 1991. *kartuli xalxuri sit'q'viereba. megruli t'ekst'ebi. II. z j̄ap'rebi da mtsire j̄anrebi* [Georgian Folk Literature. Mingrelian Texts. II. Stories and Minor Genres]. Tbilisi: University Press.
- DUMEZIL, GEORGES, 1967. *Documents anatoliens sur les langues et les traditions du Caucase, IV. Récits lazès (dialecte d'Arhavi)*. Paris: University Press.
- ENTWISTLE, W.J. and MORISON, W.A., 1974. *Russian and the Slavonic Languages*. London: Faber and Faber.
- GIGINEISHVILI, IVANE, TOPURIA, VARLAM, and KAVTARADZE, IVANE, 1961. *kartuli dialekt'ologia, I. dialekt'ta ganxilva. t'ekst'ebi. leksik'oni* [Georgian Dialectology. I. Survey of the Dialects. Texts. Dictionary]. Tbilisi: University Press.
- GUDAVA, T'OGO<sup>60</sup>, 1975. *kartuli xalxuri sit'q'viereba. megruli t'ekst'ebi, I. p'oezia* [Georgian Folk Literature. Mingrelian Texts. I. Poetry]. Tbilisi: University Press.
- HARRIS, ALICE C., 1991. 'Mingrelian', in A. C. Harris (ed.), *The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus. I. Kartvelian Languages*, 313-394.
- HARRIS, ALICE C. and CAMPBELL, LYLE, 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, **74**. Cambridge: CUP.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN, 1993. *A Grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1979. 'Aspects of verbal affixation in Abkhaz (Abzhui dialect)', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 211-238.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1983. 'Die Markierung des direkten Objektes des altgeorgischen 'Infinitivs'', *Georgica*, **5**, 18-23.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1984. 'Parataxis revisited (via the Caucasus)', in *General Linguistics*, **24.1**, 1-20.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1985. 'Bemerkungen zum georgischen Relativsatz', *Georgica*, **8**, 13-15.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1987. *The Typology of Subordination in Georgian and Abkhaz*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1991. 'Languages in contact: a Transcaucasian example', *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung*, **44.3**, 295-300.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1992a. 'Another case of the influence of Abkhaz on

---

<sup>60</sup>Ap'olon Tsanava was the unnamed co-author of this work (p.c. -- T'ogo Gudava).

- Mingrelian syntax?', in Catherine Paris (ed.) *Caucasologie et mythologie comparée*, Actes du Colloque international du CNRS -- IVe Colloque de Caucasologie (Sèvres, 27-29 juin, 1988), 405-409. Paris: Peeters.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1992b. 'Languages in contact in N. W. Georgia: fact or fiction?', in George Hewitt (ed.) *Caucasian Perspectives*, 244-258. Unterschleissheim: Lincom Europa.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1993. 'Abkhazia: a problem of identity and ownership', in *Central Asian Survey*, **12.3**, 267-323.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, 1995. *Georgian. A Structural-Reference Grammar*. London Oriental and African Language Library, **2**. Amsterdam: Benjamin.
- HEWITT, B. GEORGE, To appear. 'Kartvelian preverbs'.
- HIUIT'I, B. DՅORDՅ [Hewitt, B. George], 1981. 'Jeni]vnebi megruli mimartebiti ts'inadadebis ]esaxeb [Remarks on the Mingrelian relative clause]', *axalgazrda metsnierta sibt']'o*, ]romebi, **VII** [Union of Young Scholars, Works, VII], 73-93.
- HIUIT'I, B. DՅORDՅ [Hewitt, B. George], 1988. 'savsed q'opnis gamoxat'va ramdenime k'avk'asiur ena]i [The representation of 'being full' in some Caucasian languages]', *p'irveli saerta]oriso kartvelologiuri simp'oziumis masalebi* [Materials of the First International Symposium on Kartvelology], 119-127. German version 'Einige kaukasische Ausdrücke für "voll sein"' in *Georgica*, **11**, 22-23.
- HOLISKY, DEE ANN , 1995. 'Laz', in A. C. Harris (ed.), *The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus*, **I. Kartvelian Languages**, 395-472.
- JENSEN, HANS, 1959. *Altarmenische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag.
- K'ART'OZIA, GURAM, 1970. 'lazuri t'ekst'ebi [Laz texts]' *matsne*, **4**, 213-232.
- K'IZIRIA, ANT'ON, 1969. *rtuli ts'inadadebis ]edgeniloba dzvel kartul]i* [The Composition of the Complex Sentence in Old Georgian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- LOMTATIDZE, KETEVAN, 1944. *apxazuri enis t'ap'anturi dialekt'i (t'ekst'ebiturt)* [The T'ap'anta Dialect of the Abkhaz Language (with Texts)]. Tbilisi: Academy Press.
- LOMTATIDZE, KETEVAN and RAUF KLYCHEV, 1989. 'Abaza', in B.G. Hewitt (ed.), *The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus*, **2: North West Caucasus**, 89-154.
- MARR, NIKOLAJ, 1910. *Grammatika chanskogo (lazskogo) jazyka s" xrestomatieju i slovarem"* [Grammar of the Ch(')an (Laz) Language with Chrestomathy and Dictionary]. St. Petersburg: Academy Press.
- MATTHEWS, W.K., 1960. *Russian Historical Grammar*. London: Athlone Press.
- PALMER, LEONARD R., 1995. *The Greek Language*. Bristol: Booksprint.
- PUTURIDZE, GIORGI, 1971. *evlia t]elebis mogzaurobis ts'igni* [Evliya Chelebi's

- Book of Travel]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.
- Q'IPSHIDZE, IOSEB [Iosif Kipshidze], 1914. *Grammatika mingrel'skago (iverskago) jazyka s" xrestomatieju i slovarem"* [Grammar of the Mingrelian (Iverian) Language with Chrestomathy and Dictionary]. St. Petersburg: Academy Press. Reprinted Tbilisi 1994 as part of the author's *rt]euli txzulebani* [Selected Works], edited by the late K'orneli Danelia.
- Q'IPSHIDZE, IOSEB [Iosif Kipshidze], 1911. *Dopolnitel'nye svedenija o chanskom jazyke* [Supplementary Facts on the Laz Language]. St. Petersburg: Academy Press. Reprinted Tbilisi 1994 as part of the author's *rt]euli txzulebani* [Selected Works], edited by the late K'orneli Danelia.
- SCHULZE, WOLFGANG, 1982. *Die Sprache der Uden in Nord-Azerbajdzhan*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- TABULOVA, NUR'JA, 1976. *Grammatika abazinskogo jazyka. Fonetika i Morfologija* [Grammar of the Abaza Language. Phonetics and Morphology]. Cherkessk: Stavropol Book Publishing-house.
- VAMLING, KARINA, and TCHANTOURIA [Ch'ant'uria], REVAZ, 1993. 'On subordinate clauses in Mingrelian', in Kees Hengeveld (ed.), *Eurotyp Working Papers*, 5, *The Internal Structure of Adverbial Clauses*, 67-86.
- XUBUA, MAK'AR, 1937. *megruli t'ekst'ebi* [Mingrelian Texts]. Tbilisi: Academy Press.
- ZYX<sup>w</sup>BA, SERGEI, 1976. *Apswa Lak<sup>w</sup>'k<sup>w</sup>a* [Abkhazian Fairy-tales]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

## APPENDIX

### Georgian examples from the footnotes (as numbered) in the original script

5. მიდის, მიდის და შეხვდა ტრიალი მინდორი
6. კაცი ის არის, რომელსაც დათა ჰქვია
7. კაცი, რომელიც კურდღლებს მწყემსავდა
8. სანამ/ვიდრე ვსხედვართ აქ, ცოტა ვიმუშაოთ
9. როგორც კი ვნახეთ იგი, კინალამ გავვიყუდი/გადავირიე
10. როცა/როდესაც მოვა, მუშაობას დავიწყებთ
11. თუ წვიმდა, მინდორი სველდებოდა
12. მე თუ ცხენი არ მომეცო, თავს მოვიკლავ მაინცო
15. უთხრეს, იმიტომ რომ პატარა იყო
16. იყვნენ ის ხალხი, რომლებიც გზაზე შემოსვდა(თ)
17. ვიცი, რომ აქა ხარ
19. ქათამი რო(მ) დაკლა (იმ) ქალს ვიცნობ
21. გაიქცა, უკან რო(მ) არ მოუხედავს, ისე
22. სადილი რო(მ) გაათავა, გლეხმა უთხრა ცოლს
24. უთხარი, რო(მ) მოვიდეს!
25. მაგრამ რო(მ) გაჰხედეს, ნახეს, რო(მ) ბიჭი შუაში იხედება... 'მაგრამ'-ს რო(მ) ამბობ, რა არისო?
26. კაცი შენ ყოფილხარ, კურდღლებს რო(მ) მწყემსავ
27. ჩვენი შვილები გოგო და ბიჭი თუ იქნენ, ცოლად და ქმრად მივიჩნიოთო
28. სიტყვა (= პირი) მისცეს ერთმანეთს, (რომ) რაც კი იშოვონ თავ-თავისი ხელობით, ერთმანეთში შუაში გაყონ
29. ქალის თხოვნა შეგეძლებოდეთ თუ არა, მე უკეთესად გამეხარდებო
35. ცოლმა მისმა ქმარს უთხრა რომ: ერთი ხარები დააყენე
36. რო(მ) დარჩება (იმას) მოგტეხთ
39. თუ ადგილი გინდა, მე მოგცემ
40. ამ ფურნის კარი აქეთკენ რომ ყოფილიყო, კაი იყო
43. ეხლა (რო(მ)) სწავლობდე გაკვეთილს, კარგი ბიჭი იქნებოდი. ნებას (რო(მ)) მომცემდეს, სახლს მოვაბრუნებო. მე (რო(მ)) წამოვიდე შენთან, რაში გამოგადგება?
45. მე შენი საქმე რომ მეკეთებინა, კარგი იქნებოდა
46. მე წერილი რომ დამეწერა, კარგი იქნებოდა
48. ეს რაშების პატრონს უნდა მივუყვანო
49. უნდა გწერდე წერილს