

Elene Pilashvili
PhD, Associate Professor at the Department of Humanities,
Iakob Gogebashvili State University, Georgia

Nunu Geldiashvili
PhD, Professor at the Department of Humanities,
Iakob Gogebashvili State University, Georgia

Shorena Tsignadze
PhD, Assistant Professor at the Department of Humanities,
Iakob Gogebashvili State University, Georgia

Some Peculiarities of Sentence Structure **(according to Georgian Sources)**

According to its syntactic function, there are several subordinate clauses. In the traditional grammar, the classification of subordinate clauses according to their functions is linked to sentence members. The syntactic function of the independent clause is equaled to that of the function of a sentence member. As a result, there are different kinds of subordinate clauses: noun, object, attribute, adverbial, result, conditional, concessive, etc. “However, there is not complete direct parallelism between the types of subordinate clauses and the clauses of complex sentence” [Kvachadze, 1996: 388].

It is a known fact that syntactic-semantic relations of complex sentence components is of a diverse nature. “To make them one whole unit there are different devices at work, such as intonation, conjunctions, relative words, correlative systems, sequence of sentences, verb tenses” [Kvachadze, 1996: 350-351].

Our aim is to study and explore hypotactic structure with conjunction *that (rom)* in the Georgian Language; to define the position of subordinate clause in this structure and show the parallel tense models in independent and subordinate clauses, with the focus on conjunctions.

Generally, a conjunction forms this or that subordinate clause. Thus, we have specific conjunctions. In this respect, the conjunction *that* (Georgian: *rom*) is completely free and takes part in almost all hypotactic structures.

In the Georgian language, hypotactic structures with the conjunction *that* have various functions. Consequently, we have the following clauses:

1. **Noun clause.** For instance: “It is great **that** we have not walked so much in vain” (Vazha-Pshavela, 1964: 77); *kidev kargi, rom am siarulma tkuilad ar chagviara*”
2. **Direct object clause.** For instance: “I noticed **that** this man is hardly alive” (Chavchavadze, 1985:257). *shevatkve, rom es katsi am qveknisa aghar aris*”.
3. **Indirect object clause.** E.g. “Kakheti region, deceived with vain promises and blinded by flattering, realized that it was facing a big trouble” (Tsereteli,1989:143). *sakenkit motkuebuli da alersit tvalakhveuli kakheti mikhvda, rom ubedurebashi iko chavardnili.*
4. **Simple object clause.** E. g. “Assure everybody of the fact **that** I have killed Bashi-achuki” (Tsereteli, 1989:172). *daartsmune kvela, rom bashi-achuki movkal-tko.*
5. **Attribute clause.** E.g. “There are so many people **that** are neither hungry, nor thirsty and still they rob others” (Vazha-Pshavela, 1964:43). *ramdenia imistana, rom aetsa shian, artsa stskurian da mainc kidev hkvleps kvelapers.*
6. **Adverbial clause of place.** E.g. “In the yard where (that) the huge walnut tree grows with its thick roots spread towards the road, I have been keeping a whole store of nuts in the hole” (Vazha-Pshavela,1964:169). *ezoshi rom didi kaklis khe dgas da szisken msxhvili pesvebi aqvs gadgmuli, iq erti ormo tkhili maqvs shenakhuli.*
Adverbial clause of time. E. g. “**That/ if** anyone had spoken to me at that moment, I would be upset” (Chavchavadze,1985:230). *im dros rom katss chemtvis khma gaets, metskineboda.*
Adverbial clause of manner. E. g. “It was exactly like a thirsty man longing for water, **that** I longed to hear his words” (Chavchavadze,1985:201). *stsores katss, rom tskali mostskurdeba, ise momtskurda imis sitkvenis gageba.*
Adverbial clause of reason. E. g. “I am glad **that** we could take away the marten from there in winter” (Vazha-Pshavela,1964:23). *mikharian imitom, rom ikidan zamtarshi kverna gamovikvanet.*
Adverbial clause of purpose. E.g. “During the nights of vigil they took turns in storytelling, **so that** nobody fell asleep” (Tsereteli,1989:49). *ghamis tevis dros dzili rom aravis shemogyparvoda, morigad zghaprebs ambobdnen.*
Adverbial clause of result. E.g. “They took off the overcoat he was wrapped in, dressing him into a white gown from head to heel, **so that** his face was no longer seen” (Chavchavadze, 1985:369). *parajashi gakhveuls gakhades paraja, gadaatsves tetra perangi tavidan pekhebamde, ise rom pirisakhe aghar uchanda.*
Adverbial clause of condition. E.g. “The game would fall off the cliff, provided **that** it had not been caught by dense bushes of azalea” (Vazha-Pshavela, 1964:75). *kldis tavze rom khshiri deka ar dakhvedroda, nanadirevi kldeze gadavardeboda.*
Adverbial clause of concession. E.g. “Even if he would get hungry earlier, he still would not eat” (Tsereteli, 1989:27). *adre rom mondomeboda sadili, maints ara schamda.*

It is known, that the position of subordinate clause in the hypotactic structure is not fixed. “There can be three cases: the subordinate clause is in pre-position, it is post-positioned or it is inserted in the independent clause” [Kvachadze, 1996:395].

1. **The subordinate clause is in the pre-position:** “*If he had given the money away, he would not have lost it altogether (Chavchavadze, 1985:214); rom gaetsa ki, imisi ikneboda. “The day that I was admitted to the lyceum, I was bewildered” (Tsereteli, 1989:54). Gimnaziashi rom shemikvanes, gavtsetsdi.*
2. **The subordinate clause is in the post-position:** “*I realized that the resolution of the case would occur here” (Chavchavadze, 1985:249). shevatkve, rom saqmis kvandzi aq ikhsneboda. “I told you that you would not be able to harm me” (Tsereteli, 1989:166). aki gitkhari, rom veras damakleb-metki.*
3. **The subordinate clause is inserted in the independent clause:**

“*The hillock, which (that) is covered by wood and has ravines on either side, is the place where my mom and I live” (Vazha-Pshavela, 1964:14). me da dedachemi, ager tkiani seri rom tsamotsolila da aqet-iqit khevebi chaudis, iqa vtskhovrobt.*

Sometimes, the parts of the subordinate clause are separated in the Georgian language. For instance: “*The better entertaining of the guests, it should be said, is nowhere to be found” (Tsereteli, 1989:156???) , uketesi maspindzloba, unda vtqvat, rom ar iqneba.*

The sequence of clauses in the hypotactic structure is very meaningful for defining the general co-relation between them. However, in most cases changing the positions of independent and subordinate clauses does not cause a major alteration in terms of syntactical co-relation. Thus, if we exchange the positions of independent and subordinate clauses, the subordination will not be altered. For instance: “*When (the minute that he hears the news) hearing the news about the victory, the King of Kartli will not say anything else either” (Tsereteli:126) gamarjvebas rom gaigebs, qartlis mepets agharas itkvis / The King of Kartli will not say anything else either, when (the minute that he hears the news) hearing the news about the victory. qartlis mepets agharas itkvis, gamarjvebas rom gaigebs.* It is evident that the difference is only in terms of the style variety and emotional expressiveness. If the sequence of clauses in the hypotactic structure is reversed, it will alter the expressiveness and emotional tone. Yet, in a number of cases, if we place the subordinate clause in pre-position, the link between the complex sentence clauses will be lost and the whole sentence will become meaningless.

In the Georgian language, the sequence of the complex sentence clauses is often rigid and we cannot break it. “In this respect, we should consider not only the type of the subordinate clause, but also its syntactic function and the type of the conjunction we use to join it to the independent clause” [Kvachadze, 1996: 396]. For instance, if we use the complex conjunctions like *so that, for the reason that, due to, on account of, in order to, so as to*, the subordinate clause is always in the post-position. For instance: “*The bee is number one among them, for the reason that it is not only working for man but it is a servant to God as well (Vazha-Pshavela, 1964:132) / amatshi upirvelesi putkaria, amitom rom marto katsis musha ki ar gakhlavst, ghytis mosamsakhurec aris*”. Subordinate clauses of purpose and reason, both comply with this rule; the independent clause is followed by the subordinate. E.g. “*From a very faraway place, the streaming river Aragvi was winding its way like a snake and at one place it hit one cliffy edge with all its might so that to*

groove a new path” (Tsereteli, 1989: 119); *tvalmiutsvdomeli sishoridan gvelivit moiklakneboda chukhchukha aragvi da ertgan kldovan kides gametebit ekhetqeboda, rom akhali gza gaekvlia.* “We have to burn lime, **so that** we could somehow repair the church” (Tsereteli, 1989: 124), *kiri gvaqvs dasaysvavi, rom sakdari shevaketot rogorme.* “The furious Khan is looking for an excuse **so that** he could devastate and uproot Kartli the same way as Kakheti (Tsereteli, 1989: 129) / *gamdzvinvarebuli keeni mizezs edzebs, rom kartlsats is dghe daakenos, rats kakhets.*

It is evident that all three cases occur in various hypotactic structures as we could prove through studying our sources. That is, the subordinate clause may occur **in the pre-position, in the post-position and is inserted in the independent clause.**

It is inevitable that parallel tense models in independent and subordinate clauses should be considered in relation to the word order in hypotactic structure with conjunction *that* (*rom*).

It is a known fact that “the rules through which words are joined with one another is of syntactic nature” [Ertelishvili, 1962:215]. Proceeding from this, we have to analyze how the verb-predicates are related in independent and subordinate clauses, with the focus on tenses. Here we have to take into consideration two moments. The first is as follows: “Verb tense in the independent clause agrees with several but not with all tenses in subordinate clauses. From all the possible tense combinations, some are more common, while others are rare. The second moment: each of the type of a complex sentence shows a different situation” [Geguchadze, 2005:6]. “Thus, description of these relations in the subordination of clauses should result in a certain pattern of interaction between the words [Ertelishvili, 1962:229].

In the Georgian language the conjunction *rom* (*that*) has such a wide range of syntactic properties, that its inter-relationship with verb is far from limited. It can agree with the predicate in various tenses. For instance: *rom* can freely agree with the present simple, the past continuous, the first conditional, the future simple, the past simple, the second conditional, the present perfect, the past perfect, used to.

According to our literary sources, the predicate of the independent clause of the various types of hypotactic structures, may be found in every tense. The same can be said about the predicate of the subordinate clause. In most cases both predicates those of independent and subordinate clauses co-relate in one and the same tense. Let us look at the following examples:

1. Present tenses: both predicates are in the simple present tense:

“Now I **can see that** even dropsy **can defeat me...**” (Tsereteli, 1989: 226); *exhla vatkob, rom tskalmankic mereva.*

2. Past tenses: both verb-predicates are in the past simple:

“The moment **that** my father **learned** about this, he **went** to the prince and **proposed for me**” (Chavchavadze, 1985: 199); *mamachemma rom sheitko esa, eaxla batonsa da chemi tavi stkhova.*

3. Future tenses:

both predicates are in the future simple tense:

“His vanity **will upset** him so much, **that** he **will fulfill** his threat” (Tsereteli, 1989:165); *mashin tavmokvareoba imdenad gaabrazebis, rom ecdeba mukaris asrulebas.*

One predicate is in the future simple and the other is the second conditional (in English it is the present simple with future meaning):

“I will give you such a magic potion, so that no bullet or weapon **harms** you” (Tsereteli, 1989:165); *iset jados mogtsem, rom vertis tkvia mogekaros da vertis rkineulma gachras.*

The predicates in the independent and the subordinate clauses co-relate in different tenses as well. Here are the examples:

1. The present simple in the independent and the past simple in the subordinate:

“Do you **think that** my beauty **saved** me today?” (Tsereteli, 1989:166); *shen ggonia, rom dghes chemma silamazem gadamarchina?*

2. The present simple in the independent and the future simple in the subordinate:

“It is certain, **that** [Persia] **will receive** the Kakhetian heroes flatteringly in a hypocrite way and **will give** them a red carpet treatment” (Tsereteli, 1989:179); *uechvelia, rom kakhetis gmirebs sapirperod pativit miighebs da didebit gamoistumrebs.*

3. The past continuous in the independent and the present simple in the subordinate:

“They **were saying that** his recovery **is** already **impossible**” (Tsereteli, 1989:172); *amboben, rom misi gamobruneba aghar sheidzleba.*

4. The past simple in the independent and the future-in-the-past simple in the subordinate:

“She **knew** only too well **that** her mother **would not give** bad advice” (Tsereteli, 210); *kargad itsoda, rom dedamisi cuds arapers urchevda.*

5. The future simple in the independent and the present simple in the subordinate:

“I **will tell** you this too, **that** hunting **is** a sin (Chavchavadze, 1985:186); *amasats getkvit, rom nadiroba tsodvaa.*

“If you **try** it once, then like me, you **will never be able to give it up**” (Tsereteli, 1989:156); *ertkhel rom sinjo, shents chemi ar ikos, mere khels veghar aigheb.*

We have proved that certain tense co-relative pairs in the hypotactic structure of the Georgian language, hitherto regarded as impossible in some specialized linguistic sources [Geguchadze:121] may still occur as confirmed by the sources analyzed by us. For instance:

When we have the First *Turmeobiti* (*suppositional*, in the Georgian grammar; corresponding to the present perfect simple tense of the English language) in the independent clause and the present continuous in the subordinate clause:

“The innocent man **has learnt that** he **is facing** the disaster and brought back home his cow (Tsereteli, 1989:207); *martals sheutkvia, vighupebio da moabghavla chreli dzrokha.*

When we have the First *Turmeobiti* (*suppositional*, in the Georgian grammar, corresponding to the present perfect simple tense of the English language) in the independent clause and the present conditional (here corresponding to the past continuous) in the subordinate clause:

“Has anyone heard that a man were travelling without any hat, bareheaded? (Tsereteli, 1989: 124); tavshishvela, uqudod rom katsi mogzaurobdes, gagonila?”

Having analyzed hypotactic structures with the conjunction *rom* (*that*), we can say, that varieties within the pair of tenses of the independent and the subordinate clauses is limited. It is mainly conditioned by the tense of the independent clause predicate.

Thus, in the Georgian language we have almost all kinds of hypotactic structures with the conjunction *rom* (with noun, object, attribute, adverbial clauses). The subordinate clause takes one of these three positions in relation to the independent clause: it is either in pre-position, or in post-position and finally, is inserted in the independent clause. Each type of the hypotactic structures with the conjunction *rom* manifests different patterns of the tense pairs. We have both cases; that of the similar verb tenses in both clauses and different verb tenses co-relation as well.

We believe, the co-relation of the tenses depends on the different types of subordination and consequently, it determines the positions of independent and subordinate clauses. Sometimes, the clauses can exchange positions, though these exchanges do not always result in structural and syntactic changes. We should also bear in mind that all the possible sequences of clauses of a complex sentence are not equally significant, neither structurally nor syntactically. The sequence of clauses mainly depends on the types of hypotactic structure, as well as on sentence context.

Index of Literature:

1. Burchuladze T. (2014). Hypotaxis in Georgian. The Institute of Linguistics Publishing, Tbilisi;
2. Chikadze R. (1995). Paratactic Structure of Sentence in Georgian. Tbilisi.
3. Dzidziguri Sh. (1973). Conjunctions in the Georgian Language. Tbilisi.
4. Ertelishvili P. (1962). For the History of Complex Sentence in Georgian. Hypotaxis;
5. Geguchadze L. (2005). Possible Co-relation of Tenses and Sequence of Tenses in Hypotactic Structure. Tbilisi;
6. Kvachadze L. (1996). Syntax of the Modern Georgian Language. *Rubikoni* Publishing. Tbilisi.

Literary Sources:

1. Chavchavadze I. (1985): Volume IV (Prose, Poetry, Letters). *Nakaduli* Publishing. Tbilisi.
2. Tsereteli A. (1989): Volume III of Selected Writings in Five Volumes. *Sabchota Sakartvelo* Publishing. Tbilisi.
3. Vazha-Pshavela (1964): Volume V of Complete Edition in Ten Volumes. *Sabchota Sakartvelo* Publishing. Tbilisi.

Elene Pilashvili, Nunu Geldiashvili, Shorena Tsignadze

Some Peculiarities of Sentence Structure (according to Georgian Sources)

Abstract

The article deals with the hypotactic structure with conjunction *that (rom)* in Georgian. In this structure, we studied the position of subordinate clause and showed models of predicate co-relation in independent and subordinate clauses with the focus on conjunctions. Through our analysis of the hypotactic structures with conjunction *rom*, we confirmed that we cannot have all possible pairs of time tenses in independent and subordinate clauses of a complex sentence. It is mainly determined by the tense the independent clause predicate is in.

Thus, in the Georgian language we have almost all kinds of hypotactic structures with the conjunction *rom* (with noun, object, attribute, adverbial clauses). The subordinate clause takes one of these three positions in relation to the independent clause: it is either in pre-position, or in post-position and finally, is inserted in the independent clause. Each type of the hypotactic structures with the conjunction *rom* manifests different patterns of the tense pairs. We have both cases; that of the similar verb tenses in both clauses and different verb tenses co-relation as well.

We believe, the co-relation of the tenses depends on the different types of subordination and consequently, it determines the positions of independent and subordinate clauses. Sometimes, the clauses can exchange positions, though these exchanges do not always result in structural and syntactic changes. We should also bear in mind that all the possible sequences of clauses of a complex sentence are not equally significant, neither structurally nor syntactically. The sequence of clauses mainly depends on the types of hypotactic structure, as well as on sentence context.

Keywords: Syntax, Sentence structure, A complex subjunctive sentence, Independent clause, Subordinate clause, Time Tense.