

სპეკალი

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის თბილისის
სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის ჰუმანიტარულ
მეცნიერებათა ფაკულტეტის რეცენზირებადი
ელექტრონული ბილინგვური სამეცნიერო ჟურნალი

ISSN 1987-8583

SPEKALI

Electronic Bilingual Scholarly Peer-Reviewed Journal of the Faculty of
Humanities at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

ISSN 1987-8583

2011

N3

Contents

1. Vakhtang Licheli. Cultural and Trade Relations in Central Transcaucasia	3
2. Olga Petriashvili. The problem of Absurd in Literary Grotesque	14
3. Manana Tabidze. Tbilisi Dialect (history and the present)	22
4. Koba Okujava. Adyghe Variants of the Amirani Epic	31
5. Inga Sanikidze. Problem of Expression of Plural in relation to Complex Sentence of One Type (Which one or which ones?)	38
6. Tamar Chikhladze. On the Interaction of Dialogue and Monologue	45
7. Irina Gvelesiani. Terms Related to the “Trust” in Georgian, Russian and English Languages (according to “The Civil Code of Georgia”, “The Civil Code of Russian Federation” and “Montana Code”)	51
8. Eka Kvirkevelia. Codicotextual Analysis of the Gospel Manuscript (Ath.62) from Oshki on the example of Matthew’s Gospel	57
9. Lela Samushia. On Megrelian-Georgian Interferences	66
10. Natia Pipia. Beginning of the Migration of Mountaineers in the Western Georgia at the turn of the millennia	73

Cultural and Trade Relations in Central Transcaucasia

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/21

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Vakhtang Licheli](#)

The settlement and necropolis of Grakliani Hill are located in the Central Transcaucasia, in Georgia, on the territory of the village Igoeti in Kaspi region and Samtavisi, on the hill situated on the right bank of the river Lekhura near the Tbilisi- Senaki-Leselidze highway(pl.1). It occupies dominant position and appears between two small rivers - lekhura and Tortla. In connection with the widening of the highway in 2008, on the southern slope of the Hill archeological excavations which had extremely significant result, were conducted. Namely, both multilayer settlement and settlements of different periods have been revealed. The lower terrace on which the mentioned monuments appeared are dislocated at 680 m above sea level, though the upper undug terraces and the surface of the Hill the open space is upper and locates approximately within the range of 720-723 m.

The monuments found on the territory of the settlement and necropolis belong to different periods. Now the existed material gives stratigraphical picture presented below that can be made more precise relevant to the new findings.

1. Paleolithe.

This period has been identified by Professor G.Grigolia and is presented by great number of tools processed on cobblestones .

2.Eneolithe

To this period belong mainly stone weapon implements - axe, flint spearheads, bone pins. Several fragments of ceramics with low quality fabric were found in which it is clearly observed stubbly admixtures due to which they also could be defined as Eneolith.

3.Early Bronze Age

In the western part of the southern slope of the Grakliani Hill the necropolises of different periods have been revealed. The earliest among them is the tomb of the early Bronze period.

4.Late Bronze/Early Iron Age

This period is presented far better than the monument. It is evidenced both in settlement and necropolis. Chronologically it is the period from the 13th century BC to 900 years BC (pl.6).

5.Age of Developed Iron (8th-7th centuries BC)

Cult and resident constructions of this period as well as burials are proved.

6. 6th century BC

One dwelling house and one alter (arched) belong to this period.

7. 5th -4th centuries BC.

To this period belong "the western sanctuary" and only partially preserved buildings on the lower terrace.

8. 4th-3rd centuries BC

Numerous burials are presented there.

9. 3rd- 2nd centuries BC

Pottery of the so-called Samadlo type is evidenced in this period.

10. 2nd-1st centuries BC

In this period the end of human activity on the Grakliani Hill is evidenced. The remains of the upper sanctuary, probably supporting wall and burials.

Consideration of separate archeological monuments and graves' inventory

1. Monumental alter belongs to 1100- 900 BC. It appeared in the eastern section of the settlement. From the building in which it was set only the part of the northern wall was preserved. The building is of standard type - the imprints of massive tree logs arranged horizontally, closely to each other, the walls of which were plastered with thick mass of clay from inside and outside. Also, the floor was accurately pressed with clay layer under which the substructure prepared from clay and gravel was attested. It should be mentioned that in other buildings such processing of the floor is not found. The alter represents an imitation of the so-called "Khovle type" oven and it differs from ordinary ovens not only by sizes but also decorative elements. In the first place it is decoration of the eastern and western corners of the altar with semi-arches that is completely alien to ordinary ovens. From the southern side of the altar at the height of 10 cm from the floor level relief belt of 5 cm thick borders. This altar differs from ordinary oven by these two elements. Though from the east ash pit was placed which in its turn along the northern wall connected the platform. This was a platform designed for placing the offerings. There was placed light colored pottery of different size the earthenware of which is badly processed. The majority of this ceramics area is decorated on the shoulder. Such ceramics is alien to the end of 2nd millennium BC. It is interesting to note that among these offering forms there appeared cylindrical brown earthware which has two small size horizontal handles. One handled pot gives complex date which analogs are known in Kartli. Namely, such forms are found in the monuments dated by the years 1100-900 BC (e.g.#51 grave in Samtavro, Zemo Avchala grave) [Pitskhelauri, 1973: 65-68]. The altar was arranged in the north-western corner of the building. Its arrangement just in this spot, i.e. in the corner seems to be standard for bread baking ovens. For comparison we can take the ovens discovered during excavations in the houses of Treligorebi [Abramishvili, 1978: 12], Narekvavi

[Nikolaishvili..2007: 6-28], Samtavro and Khovle Gora, as well as the ovens found in comparatively later period Uplistsikhe - bambebi settlement, from the so-called Medaburi house [Khundadze, 1979:50-56].

2. Arched alter is a building of an open type which the wall is a main constructional part. It represents vertically installed logs plastered with clay. This wall is of Western direction. On the southern side of the wall clay arches are made. The alter is strongly damaged and because of this its complete reconstruction is difficult. It can be said with confidence that such two arches have really been preserved. In front of the central (?) arch small size pit (diameter 0.2 m) is dug in which small size pottery brought for sacrifice was laid. Also for sacrifice was brought cup placed in the west part of the wall (its fragment has been preserved). The bearer of the same function is small size double-cone one-handed vessel. The vessels of similar shape are known from Colchis (e.g. they are found in the grave I of the Ergeta III which dates back to the end of the 7th century BC or beginning of the 4th century) [Mikeladze, 1995:2-22]. Hence, the arched alter with this double-cone one-ear vessel must be dated on the verge of the VII-VI centuries. Though, here we should note that one-ear vessels as was shown above, are also found in the years 1100-900 BC but they do not have double-cone shape because of which in my opinion Grakliani double-cone vessel finds much in common with Ergeti pair and therefore I give preference to this date.

3. In the lower, II terrace part archeological complex was found ("western temple") which consists of three main sections. In each of them there is one cult and one store room connected with it (Tab.II,3). The pits for wooden columns which surround the entire complex have been preserved. Hence, they appear in one system of roofing and represent the unity of rather complicated design and elements bearing different function. The buildings are open to the south that indicates right calculation of the external conditions and optimal account of humidity and air. This fact represents rare occurrence of designing earlier totally unknown cult and economic buildings in the space chosen for implementation and then rare occurrence of idea realization in ancient Georgian architecture. The plan of rather complicated, separate buildings entering into the entire complex, type and all details of the interior decoration were worked out. The scheme of the interior design consists in the following: the main part of the building is represented by three sections oriented at N-S direction which inner space is divided into two parts; in each section the elements having the main functional loading are brought into the forefront:

- i) Podium;
- ii) Quadrangular, edged table diligently plastered with clay is put at the podium or set up close to it;
- iii) In front of the edged table it is arranged a circled pit which is cut in the floor. At the basement flat, oval stone is specially inserted (ritual hearth);
- iv) Bread-baking oven which sizes change in appropriate with the size of the building.

The rest space of the building is used in correspondence with those practical tasks that separate section has. For example, let us describe #1 section:

Its size makes 4.70X2.30 m. Here as well as in the mentioned two rooms there is a podium at the western wall with the size of 1X0.70X0.3 m. In the west side of the podium in the central part has deepening for putting sacrificed pottery (with diameter -0.25m) which is finished with stone pillow.

Edged table which is supposed to be intended for offerings is preserved to the north of the altar. At the northern wall of the hearth at 0.25 m from it the ritual hearth has been discovered at the basement of which the stone pillow is inserted; it is 0.30 m in diameter and 0.25 m in depth. The oven found in the north-eastern corner of the room has been preserved best of all among the oven survived on this monument. According to the mentioned oven it can be concluded that in the three buildings there must have been one type the so-called Khovle type, double layer and three department (fireplace, ash-pit and the section of the oven itself) oven. Apart from the ovens found in other monuments, these ovens have the mechanism for regulation of the temperature - these are fired clay bars to cover baking and fire section. In the centre of the closet fragmented pottery is discovered as a result of destruction of the roof.

The succession of the cobble-stone separates this building from the second one and limits the mentioned closet from the western part. Its sizes are 4.30X0.65 m. There is economic space between the cobble-stone laying and altar. As to the eastern side of the closet here is also proved the structure composed from big cobble- stones. The size of the preserved structure makes 2.30x1 m.

This complex of the buildings represents completely unique monument for the Transcaucasia. There two interesting details: as was mentioned at the entrance, on the left side, directly at the western wall there was set up podium plastered with clay in which round hollow of a small size (0.25 m) was also diligently prepared in the western part on the middle place. Its diligent preparation was expressed not only in exact localization but also in the fact that on the basement a flat stone of exactly hollow diameter was fixed. Such stable preparation seems to imply construction load, but in section II there appeared in the similar hollow in situ fixed jug with the same diameter that clearly indicates the cult character of this podium. It is noteworthy that podium of this type have chronologically too distant but functionally closest parallels with Eneolithic temples of Eridu where they are also set to the wall and represent an indispensable part of the interior [The Cambridge...1971:334]. The fact that all buildings are oriented to the east also deserves attention. Such orientation is easily explained by natural conditions. Here strong winds from the west or east constantly blow which makes totally impossible the opening of the buildings from the east. Due to this, it is true the porch of the ritual buildings did not look at the east or morning sun but instead of this, all the day long it was opened to the sun.

In the material artifacts found in Grakliani Hill there is distinguished imported or a group of items made by imitation of the imported. Their redistribution according to the place of production gives the following directions of relations:

- 1.Southern Mesopotamia. This direction is represented by two seals (Tab.4). The first of them, as was mentioned above, was found in monumental altar temple. This is a cylinder seal of light color, made of high quality clay which surface before fire clay has been diligently decorated with softly scratched lines. The lines create schematic image of triangles arranged in one row.

In the lower register well shaped chevrons are observed. At the top of the seal a cross is described and the base is a little bit cavity. The seal is pierced in the middle - it is evident that it has been pierced after putting the picture which contradicts the general rule of making seals. Thus, it is clear, that open-end hole on the seal is put later. The height of the seal is 5.2 cm, basement diameter - 2.8 cm and the diameter of the upper flatness is 1.6 cm. Professor N.Samsonia considers the seals of the group of Jemdet-Nasr IV to be direct analogy of the décor of this item. For the seals of the first part of this group analogous chevrons are characteristic [Samsonia, 2008:37; Collon, 1987: 13-22; Bollingen...1949:35]. Thus, it seems that Mesopotamian origin of this seal and its earlier date (3000 - 2800 BC; in Dominique Collon's view 3000-2334 BC) must not give rise to doubt. However, it needs special study in the future. As to the fact of its appearance in the temple late i.e. in 1100-900 BC, it can be easily explained. In the late temples the discovery of the earlier seals was a typical phenomenon for this period. Of course, it is extremely important to determine as to when this seal appeared from Mesopotamia on the territory of the modern Kartli - at the end of 4th millennium BC or later in 2nd millennium BC. At the stage it is difficult to say anything with confidence but unprecedented scales of almost synchronic Mtkvar-Araks culture give the possibility of all kind of suppositions. From the same point of view quite unusual is another seal which has circled handle is on the rectangular table. The item is made with sophisticated technique from light color, whitish sand stone. Its surface is so well done that high level of master's proficiency causes no doubt. The cut is deep, on the prints it is well seen radiated "temple of God" [Amiet, 1980:386-390]. The height of the seal is 3.2 cm, the height of the loop is 2.2 cm, the area of the photo flatness is 3.6x3.4 cm. This seal appeared in debris, destructed layer. Thus it can be dated only by means of the analogies. Such analogues are revealed in the materials in Jemdet-Nasr period and, relevantly, must belong to 3000-2800 BC. However, I'd like to mention here too that item is also subject of separate research. It is noteworthy that in the settlement a great number of local seals of the late Bronze Age, which surface is decorated in different ways, have been revealed. Among them is grey fabric seal (to which Professor N.Samsonia, who also treated Mesopotamian seals) on which lines/rays are spreading from the centre in four directions. It is an exact analogue of those archaic seals which are known from Mesopotamia in great amount. It is not excluded that just this seal is the earliest local imitation of Mesopotamian.

2. Chronologically following stage of the relations and other direction belongs to 8th-7th centuries BC. From the viewpoint of possible analogy with Colchida the fragment of terracotta figure - protoma, more precisely the head of an animal discovered in the layer of the 7th century BC is completely different (Tab.5, 1). Its exact identification is difficult but in my view it is a horse's head that has some stylized form. From this viewpoint of attention is its complete identity with one of the specimens of small plastic statuette in the collective grave in Colchis. It is horse on which the goddess is sitting [Mikeladze, 1995:20]. The statuettes of horses have not only style in common but also bridle indicating ring which runs over the nose. It is just because of this attribute I consider this figure to be the image of the horse. To my mind the figure of a horse found in Grakliani Hill is the only terracotta replica of Colchian horsewoman. Here I would like to mark that genesis of the images of horsewoman goddesses has been long a subject of discourse [Lortkipanidze, 2002: 183]. For example, a statuette found on the isle Samos the presumable site of preparation of bronze figure of a woman is considered from the

onset Colchis areal [Vojatzis, 1992: 259-279]. Really, beyond Colchis boundaries, to the east and south - in Anatolian district, none of the horsewoman figures have been attested that might indicate the fact that the existence of this figure on the island Samos is a result of relations with Colchis (though, it is also possible that these relations had not had systematic character yet). But in such case in my opinion, conceptual identity of one and the same figures discovered in the Caucasus and continent Greece is of importance. At the same time it is absolutely clear that the figure of the warrior woman was prepared in the workshop of different regions. In connection with this question it is to be emphasized the terracotta figure of horsewoman from Heraclea Museum (1450-1100 BC, Hall X) which as it seems is the earliest among the similar specimens. It is extremely significant from the viewpoint of genesis of these statuettes. I would like to touch upon cardinal scientific problems and, thus, all findings and interpretations have a special meaning. One of the findings linked with this theme might be a jug revealed on the Mzetamze necropolis which according to morphological features repeats east Georgian ceramics of the 8th-7th centuries BC, though its décor for Colchis and east Georgia of that time is totally unique and reveals parallels more with geometric period ceramic in Greece and Colchian axes. Here I mean Meandr's ornament that according to Whitley's researches belong to the number of those horizontal meanders that is found in the zone of pottery handle and has appeared since the 9th century BC [Whitley, 1991]. However, exactly the same in the late geometric II period (the end of the 8th century, the years 770-40 BC). From the same viewpoint of special interest is one more pottery from Mzetamze necropolis - a vessel which body is separated in frieze that is completely new both for Colchis and east Georgia ceramics and totally natural for Greece of geometrical period. It is interesting that vessel has triangles set up in friezes that especially wide spread in the production of Greek ceramics just of that period - 8th century BC. It should be also mentioned that meander appears just at that time in the eastern Anatolia (Konia areal) from where it could penetrate to the Caucasus easier. However, this supposition seems to be unacceptable due to a simple reason that on Mzetamze necropolis both items as well as "Scythian" arrowhead revealed there, has been found in the complex of well expressed Colchis artifacts. Due to this fact, in my view, they must have been appeared in Samtskhe. If we consider according to the contexts (and probably this is right way) it is possible that the proof of the same supposition is also zoomorphic pottery found in Treli hills which has analogs both in Greek world (e.g. Late Helladic C period pottery from Attic, Perat, Rhodes, etc) and in the east, must be considered not Greek but oriental influence due to the fact that they do not contain any western context and totally appear in local and oriental environment.

1. In the same context attention is also attracted by the fact that in spite of increasing Colchis elements, in the 8th - 7th centuries BC in the east and west of Colchis territory the spreading of such prestigious Colchis item as for example, it is a statuette of horsewoman. In the same way there are not seen terracote figures that already become typical for Colchis ritual monuments on the directly closed to Colchis territory [Nasidze, Licheli, 1990]. Therefore, certain skepticism naturally arises in connection with especial activation of strong Colchis initiative various directions. It is because of this fact that I also consider that these discoveries can be considered a sign of sporadic character of the earlier Greek-Colchis relations [Lortkipanidze, 2002, 190]. In my opinion that the findings which are made on the isle Samos

and linked with Colchis world must be considered just in this context. Namely, in my view, the logic and regularity of the emergence of these items on the island Samos must be made precise, otherwise whether they represent or not the indicator of a strong Colchis impulse.

In my opinion, this question is easily solved with account of the works conducted in recent years on the island Samos.

The archeological context of those motives the part of which is the statue of a horsewoman is as follows (the results of excavations conducted under H.Kyrieleis's leadership) [Kyrieleis, 1993: 125-153]: the remains of the sacrificed domestic animals (ox prevails then - of cow and sheep, goat and pig bones); the remains of unique wild animals (a fragment of Egyptian crocodile's head, the head and horn of African antelope); amazingly numerous terracone figures - the stems of pomegranate and poppy, their seeds and pinecones (which do not grow there); Egyptian statute of a lion made of elephant bone; two Babylon figures of a man; stylized models of the ships (which played certain role in the feasts devoted to Hera) and many others. Thus, it concerns imported items which were imported from Babylon, Phoenicia, Iran, Assyria, Urartu and Cyprus. But in this case it must be also emphasized: wooden chair with horse images; horse's front straps trapezoid form of oriental origin; great number of horse bronze equipment which has no analog in any Greek temples. On the basis of this too it is recognized that in archaic period Hera has specific feature - it is a protector deity of horses and warriors namely (sic!). Against this background the fact of discovering Colchis sculpture here is completely ordinary phenomenon - as well as other things appeared in the areal of Colchis culture it was sacrificed to Hera by a traveler or trader. But if we take into account one notable fact that from Aegean world to the east beyond Colchis - in Anatolian areal none of the bronze statutes of analogous horsewoman has been found, we must still consider that its emergence here is a result of direct link (maybe at least only one) with Colchis. At the same time its unique character evidences that it is too early to speak about some regular relation between Aegean world and Colchis. But in this case that obvious thematic identity which exists between the statutes found in continent Greece and Colchis remain to be explained. Although it is also obvious that as it has been already adopted in special literature in correspondence to this common concept the figure of horsewoman were produced in various regional workshops. Thus, discovery of Colchis statutes on the island Samos looks to be accidental from the viewpoint of Colchian -Aegean interrelations (though it is already a sign of certain common interests) but from the viewpoint of Heraion function it is completely logical.

More active relationship with Colchis seems to be in earlier antique and Hellenistic epoch. I give only several examples from the excavations of Grakliani Hill: in the first place it is silver earrings/pendants. Material of similar kind is typical for the inventory of Colchis necropolis of the 5th-3rd centuries BC, although in comparison with the Colchis one, several silver specimens of similar size have been also discovered on the territory of Samtskhe and Kvemo Kartli. Unlike these "depressed" forms Grakliani specimens are massive and almost of Colchian size. At the same time on Grakliani Hill it seems to have been preserved earrings/temple pendats property distinguished - putting into rich context. Though from technological point of view there is a difference - the items found in Grakliani Hill are made of silver spinned wire and the images of neither birds nor rosettes embellish it. Also the response to Colchis gold seems to me the discos like silver pendants of small size necklace which analogs are found in Sairkhe.

3. Interesting events developed in the Caucasus in the middle of I millennium that means the activation of Achaemenid Iran. I won't repeat the known suppositions concerning the unification of Kartvelian tribes (in Caucasus and to the south of it) satrapies and Achaemenid army [Hdt, III: 94]. Achaemenid activity is evident by discovering of such administrative centers of support as: dome [Knaus, 2001], Karajamirli [Babaiev.. 2007], Sari-Tepe, Drakhshanakerty, Arinberdi, Ervandashati [Ter-Martirosos, 2001, Kanetsyan, 2001]. There exists supposition that the builders of the Gumbati and other Achaemenid palaces were invited from Iran or Annatolia [Knaus, 2001], that seems quite logical because it is well known as to how rich and diverse central Caucasus with the products of Achaemenid Iran [Lortkipanidze, 2001: 28-71]. In the first place it is notable the painted ceramics of every day utilization (pl.7, 1) and jewelry. Of the Achaemenid findings from the Grakliani Hill of special attention are glass vessels (pl.2; burial 217). As is known, glass vessels are rarity in the Caucasus. Of those found in Georgia the date of the Pichvnary vessel (I group according to D.Barag) belongs to the quarter of the 5th century BC [Kakhidze, 2007: 109-117]. The pottery of the same type has been discovered in Vani. It dates back to the 5th century BC [Phuturidze, 1972: 111-135]. According to D.Barag classification, it also approximately dates to 5th or 4th centuries BC. The same dates are named by M.Pirtskhalava [Pirtskhalava, 1983: 79-86]. Other pottery found on the territory of Georgia (e.g.Enageti, Takhtidziri) dates mainly to 5th century BC or beginning of the 4th century. The vessel from the Grakliani Hill also belongs to I group of Barag classification and dates back to the second half of the 5th century [Barag, 1975:26-28]. It is well known that more obvious Achaemenid influence has been fixed in such monuments of Kartli as Tsikhia-Gora and Samadlo and in Colchis - Vani. The view on Achaemenid influence of the latter in the architecture of 4th-3rd centuries BC was expressed by me as early as 1991[Licheli, 1991]. From this viewpoint of particular importance was the fragment of limestone friz found in Vani on which relief image of a chariot and charioteer. On this architectural detail Achaemenid is the image of a chariot with "Bottoms"on the weels. The image of similar carriage is scratched on Darius's seal [Starr, 1977: 231]. Similar are the wheels of a golden carriage preserved in British Museum [Boardman, 2003: 191-238]; identical wheels has the carriage described on Apadana relief with two ponies [Littauer, 1979: 144-149]. This architectural detail that can be considered as a part of monumental structure of a frieze (the trace of the preserved paint indicates that frieze was painted) evidences that in Vani which was religious and administrative centre of Colchis in the course of centuries, preserve Achaemenid influence up to Hellenistic epoch. This part of a frieze is such synthesis of Greek and Achaemenid elements as at the beginning of the Hellenistic epoch must be (this frieze is interpreted as Eos image) [Lortkipanidze, 2002: 232-233]. At the same time, frieze and monumental wall revealed on the central terrace in Vani must indicate the existence of Achaemenid traditions in 4th-3rd centuries BC. The discovery of double protomian capitel on the central terrace in Vani has proved the supposition expressed by me [Lacheli, 2001:39].

From the viewpoint of interrelation with Achaemenid culture of interest are also golden, silver and bronze disc found in the burials of the Grakliani Hill with ornament of Achaemenid type (pl. 2) which are identical to the bases of Achaemenid cups by that ornament which seems to be spread in ancient Georgia (e.g. the cups of Akhagori treasure - 4th century BC) [Lortkipanidze, 2001: 28-71] and, generally, in various districts of the Black See coast and west Anatolia [Treister, 2007: 84-91].

4. The fourth direction of relation with the outer world according to the findings of the Grakliani Hill is manifested with Greek world/Anatolia which started with the emergence of bronze fibulas [Licheli, 1999] and continued with "Samadlo type" ceramics. The burial was dug in Grakliani Hill in which finger-ring with image of a figure appeared (very likely of "pan-musician" that probably is far close to the truth).

5. Also of interest is the finding of hieroglyphic written Egyptian scarab (pl.2) in burial #217 of Grakliani Hill because in that period (5th-4th century BC) they as is seen, are widely spread in the western Georgia and are also found in the east (e.g. the items found in Atskuri burial #04-4). At that time scarabs were used as beads; it is proved by their detection breast area of the deceased along with the beads. It is natural that this item as well as beautiful beads (pl. 2), are entered to the Caucasus as a result of activity of Greek tradesmen. The result of these relations is the fact of appearance on the Grakliani Hill items made at different times in different and quite distant regions.

Thus, the findings of Grakliani Hill clearly evidence that in the central section of the Transcaucasia due to its comparatively simple and convenient, and at the same time suitable for economic activity physico-geographical conditions, main direction of trade activity was concentrated followed by reciprocal process: such environment conditioned the existence of the settlement with rather active economic balance which has the tendency of approximation of the road to the settlement and on the other hand, for the existence of this settlement in certain chronological sections the existence of the same road became topical. The discovery of Mesopotamian seals cannot be accidental on Grakliani Hill. There is all reason to suggest that the temple complexes of the Late Bronze-Early Iron age different from each other were gathered here by chance, as well as building of the unique temple complex ("west temple") of the lower terrace; the fact of the decline of the settlement more than once and its rise again is quite obvious and this underlines the importance of this spot. All the above mentioned was caused only by geographical location. If this Hill had any sacral importance, the response to this question will be given by the result of future excavations. In any case due to the existence of the settlement in big chronological section and character of the artifacts researched there the settlement of Grakliani Hill and necropolis must be considered as etalon monument of the Central Caucasus.

Attached Document: <http://www.spekali.tsu.ge/uplfiles/licheli.pps>

References

Abramishvili R. 1978	Tbilisi Archeological Monuments Vol.I. Tbilisi (in Georgian)
Licheli V. 2001	Issues of Colchis and Iberia Culture. Tbilisi (in Georgian)
Licheli V. 1991	Old Georgia in the System of Hellenistic World. Theses of doctoral dissertation. Tbilisi (in Georgian).

Lortkipanidze O. 2002	Origins of Old Georgian Civilization. Tbilisi (in Georgian)
Nikolaishvili V., Gavasheli E. 2007	Archeological Monuments of Narekvavi. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Samsonia N. 2008	Glyptic of Old Babylonian period". Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Pirtskhalava M. 1983	Glassware. Vani VII. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Pitskhelauri K. 1973	The Main Issues of the History of Eastern Georgian Tribes (15th-7th cc. BC). Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Khindadze N. 1979	Hellenistic period from medaburi House Uplistikhe – Bambebi.Dzeglis Megobari #52. Tbilisi (in Georgian).
Amiet, P. 1980	La Gliptique Mesopotamienne Archaïque. Paris.
Babaiev, I., Gagoshidze, I. Knaus, F. 2007	An Achaemenid “Palace” at Qarajamirli (Azerbaijan), Preliminary Report on the Excavations in 2006, In: Achaemenid Culture and Local Traditions in Anatolia, Southern Caucasus and Iran. New Discoveries, Brill.
Barag, D.P. 1975	Rod-formed Kohl-tubes of the Mid - first Millennium BC. Journal of Glass Studies. N 17.
Boardman, J. 2003	Die Perser und Der Western.Mainz am Rhein. In Kulturgeschichte Der Antike Welt. Band 96.
Bollingen Series 1949	Corpus of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in North American collections. the XIV Pantheon Book.
Colloon, D. 1987	First Impressions. Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East. British Museum Press.
Edwards I.E.S., Gadd C.J., Hammond N.G.L 1971	The Cambridge ancient History Volume 1, Part 2. Herodotus III, 94.
Kakhidze, A. 2007	Iranian Glass Perfume Vessel from the Pichvnari Greek Cemetery of the Fifth Century BC. In Achaemenid Culture and Local Traditions in Anatolia Southern Caucasus and Iran. New Discoveries, Brill.
Kanetsyan, A. 2001	Urartian and Early Achaemenid Palaces in Armenia, In : The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium B.C. Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens
Knauss, F. 2001	Persian Rule in the North. Achaemenid Palaces on the Periphery of the Empire, In: The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC. Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens Vol.4.

Kyrieleis, H. 1993	The heraiion at Samos, In: Greek Sanctuaries. New approaches. N-Y.
Licheli, V. 1999	Phrygian fibulae in Transcaucasia: their diffusion route, In: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Archaeology and History of the Black Sea. Amsterdam.
Littauer M.A, Crouwel J.H, 1979	Wheeled vehicles and ridden animals in the Ancient Near East, Leiden/Koln. Brill.
Lortkipanidze, O. 2001	The "Akhalgori Hoard"-Attempt at dating and Historical interpretation. In: Dzebanani (The Journal of the Centre for Archaeological Studies), # 11. Tbilisi.
Mikeladse, T. 1995	Grosse Kollektive Grabgruben Der Fruhen Eisenzeit in Kolchis, In: Archäologischer Anzeiger. Berlin, New York.
Nasidz, H., Licheli ,V. 1990	L'aire de diffusion de la culture colchidienne, In: Le Pont-Euxin vu par les Grecs Symposium de Vani (Colchide) – septembre-octobre 1987. Paris.
Phuturidze ,R. Khoshtaria, N. Chkonia D 1972	Results of the excavations carried out in the north-eastern part of the Vani Settlement, In : Vani I. Tbilisi.
Starr, Ch. G. 1977	Greek and Persians in the fourth Century BC., Iranica Antiqua, vol. XII.
Ter-Martirossov, F. 2001	The Typology of the Colomnar Structures in Armenia in the Achaemenid Perod. In : The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC.Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens, 2001,Vol. 4.
Treister, M. Yu. 2007	The Toreutics of Colchis in the 5th – 4th cc BC Local Traditions, Outside Influence, Innovations In : Achaemenid Culture and Local Traditions in Anatolia, Southern Caucasus and Iran. New Discoveries. Brill.
Vojatzis, M. 1992	Votive Riders Seated Side-Saddle at Early Greek Sanctuaries, Annual of the British School of Archaeology at Athens. N 87.
Whitley, J. 1991	Style and Society in Dark Age Greece, Cambridge _ MOT 01

The problem of Absurd in Literary Grotesque

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/29

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Study of Literature](#)
- [Olga Petriashvili](#)

On the verge of the centuries along with great scientific and technical achievements in spiritual life of humankind numerous contradictions emerged. In connection with the crisis of the modern world Georgian literary critic G. Alkhazishvili remarks that there have been several decades as European culture experts have been trying to find a way out "of the impasse in which the disintegration of not only literary genres but that of logos continued for a long time with the belief that the reality appeared as a result of deconstruction would give the possibility to look further, but this distance was an apogee of crisis and the experience, desperate wait was provided by that necessity which I called sad crisis of a human being who has lost the human qualities" [Alkhazishvili, 2009:3]. The representation of the world crisis, acute reality in artistic-aesthetic forms has become topical for the artists. Modern culture experts recognize that to achieve this 20-th century art frequently addresses paradoxical-grotesque style which appears more adequate for expression of the wrongness of man's existence in this world rather than other established literary and aesthetic forms. A well-known Swiss writer Friedrich Dürrenmatt stated: „Our world has brought us to the grotesque exactly as to the atomic bomb" [Dürrenmatt, 1966:26]. And really, paradoxical grotesque as a special means of literary conventionality in modern historical conditions is acknowledged as one of the most acceptable forms.

While speaking about the features of modern literary grotesque, as a rule, it is mentioned that literary grotesque means unhidden, well-expressed demonstrative alogism, logical paradox. Also its necessary component must be counted contrast, travesty which is frequently expressed in predominantly determined mess of mutually contrasted binary pairs (e.g. real and fantastic, exciting and vulgar, tragic and comic, etc.).

Along with the above-mentioned the literary critics single out such features of grotesque as:

- Excessiveness, exaggeration, hyperbolization which sometimes takes cosmic scales or, on the contrary, is reduced to litote;
- Breaking of real proportions (of things, man, size of his body parts, etc.); sometimes breaking of the proportions takes caricatured form;
- The existence of concrete, fixed object of satirical mock; a reader should know it; without it grotesque as a satirical phantasmagoria will turn into ordinary work; e.g. in this way we can read intended for children Francois Rabelais' Gargantua and Pantagruel or adapted texts of Jonathan Swift's "Gulliver's Travels" in which the author's commentaries of concrete prototypes, political parties and about other social moments are taken off;
- The irony, wide range of mockery, beginning with its rough forms ending with refined, intellectual forms;

- Mystification, magic, representations of satanist and other magical forces;
- Parody which as a rule, exists independent of grotesque as a unique literary phenomenon;
- Fabulousness, parable, pamphlet, allegory but the existence of the mentioned elements does not condition the turning of the work of art into a fairy-tale, parable, pamphlet or allegory;
- Violation of compliance with between natural cause-effect relationships and cause and effect (insignificant cause may cause gigantic, catastrophic effects at a time when really serious, well-grounded reason may be followed insignificant results);
- The demonstration of a distant historical past or the same distant future, the use of unknown countries and worlds, dreams, drunkenness, allowance of phantasmagoric conventionality, zoomorphic metamorphosis, hypostasis (i.e. giving independent existence to this or that features, abstract notion, abstraction or idea);
- Linguistic peculiarity of literary grotesque which represents intellectual play of words (names, toponyms, names of institutions, humorous word order are used in it);
- Subtext which reaches comic effect by means of reminiscences, allusions, implicitness;
- Free grotesque composition; it subordinates no to exact logic but to the author's or his protagonists fantasy and self-will to such extent as grotesque phantasmagoria requires it.

None of the above-mentioned features of literary grotesque taken separately determines by itself the grotesqueness of the literary work. Only together in complex in diverse wholeness they can have a claim on grotesque. This means that it is the use of the above listed features a unique, anomalous, unnatural artistic world is created even when the author is not aware fully about literary grotesque theoretical laws.

Along with the above-mentioned in historical evolution of literary grotesque the inner logic is clearly seen - from antique "Dionysian laugh" to medieval, merry carnival laugh" and Renaissance "Rabelaisian laugh and later ironical and skeptical "Volterian laugh" which turned into merciless mocking "Shchedrin like laugh") and in the 20th century it was finished with black, tragic "Kafkian non-laugh".

In modern literary grotesque the "absurd literature" brought different intonation. It is the case when grotesque is merged not with satire as it is adopted in traditional classical literature but with absurd. Absurd grotesque represents new phenomenon in 20-th century literature. In the opinion of the founders and theoreticians in the actual reality terror, madness and death started to accompany everyday life; art had to reckon with this substantial state of the world. It is because of the above-mentioned that it become irrational, and grotesque - demonic. German literary critic Karl Simon announces: Fluctuation in relation to absurdity has been overcome, asylum entered freely and roughly into our world, that is around us every day and that loses logic and causal connection... Like hungry creatures we swallow the slogan which explains to us that modern physics has become "akausal" and listen to the stories about the inventors of atomic bomb " who have gone to the monasteries as well as the stories about film celebrities who have become Buddhists. We are fed up with positivistic century and rationalistic-optimistic progress stands before atomic bomb". Descartes publications are decreasing but Revold published the writings of mystics and yoghs. What has left for humor if not become irrational?

[Simon, 1958: 415]. Deep vital and spiritual catastrophes that the mankind faced with gave rise to "black humor when laugh leads us to fatigue" [Simon, 1958: 412]. That gradually turned into "infernal mockery" [Simon, 1958: 413].

Besides Karl Simon modern aesthetic theory of western grotesque has been enriched by German literary critic Wolfgang Kayser. The principle thing for Kayser is "something hostile, alien, inhuman: for him "...grotesque is the world which has become foreign" [Kayser, 1957: 136]. The author remarks that this is not only theoretical, literary conception W. Kayser analyses the 20-th century literary practice where in the works of Eugène Ionesco, Franz Kafka, John Updike and other writers the above-mentioned world is presented as reality. German author gives the opposition of grotesque and fairy-tale notable features and states that the world of the fairy-tale like grotesque one is unknown and unusual for the reader but it is not a world that is alien for him. As to grotesque, in it the native, dear environment unexpectedly becomes hostile, strange which is governed by supernatural force; the fate of people and the world depends on it. W.Kayser concludes that "on grotesque world it is a matter of fear of life and not fear of death" [Kayser, 1957: 137]. According to W. Kayser during transmission into grotesque a bitter laugh takes the features of evil mockery, cynical and finally Satanist laugh [Kayser, 1957: 137].

It must be mentioned that the notion of "absurd" is polysemantic and proceeding from the context is a bearer of different content. Several semantic meanings of the notion of "absurd" are presented below which is found in "absurd literature" and philosophical practice of existentialism:

1. Principle absurdity of a world in which man appears (Jean-Paul Sartre);
2. The absurdity of man's existence in real world (Albert Camus);
3. Subjective feeling of absurdity of man's existence in the world irrespective of the fact whether the world is absurd or not absurd;
4. Not absurd perception of the world's absurdity (i.e. "serene", "neutral");
5. Absurdity of concrete everyday situations, collisions, heartache that man can guess;
6. Initial absurdity of man's feelings which is linked with his inner constitution, temperament (for example, if merry sanguine sees the world through rose-colored spectacles, melancholic with pessimist attitude sees the world through black-colored spectacles) [Petriashvili, 2005:100].

Modern western scholars regard absurd as an initial state of the existence. It specially concerns literary grotesque which is mainly based on absurd - the absurdity of the world and the absurdity of man's existence in this world. And with it, even among existentialists there is essential difference in philosophical understanding of absurd. On the one hand, Jean-Paul Sartre states that "It is absurd that we are born, it is absurd that we die" [Sartre, 1946:631] but on the other hand, Albert Camus wrote an essay "The Rebel" [Camus, 1951] in which he appealed to a proud man to revolt against such absurd: "Absurd is neither in a man nor in the

world, it is in their mutual existence. Therefore, there is no more perfect sight for a man than the fight of the intellect against reality that is stronger than him... There is something unrepeatedly powerful in the discipline dictated by a talent to himself, strong will, in confrontation. Impoverish of the reality which by its inhumanity underlines man's greatness means impoverishment of a man himself" [Camus, 1990:51]. Albert Camus's example confirms that modern existentialism declare just man's "stoic approach" to the life in order for a man to lead dignified live in this not calm and alien world. Let us recall that all more or less known representative of existentialism fought actively in the world War II in the ranks of antifascist movement.

In the end, many different kinds of senselessness which is observed in the works of literary grotesque evidences that grotesque definitely relates to absurd and contains absurdity in itself, both as semantic, purposeful and formal, comic but not reduced to absurdity because absurd may also be non grotesque. The thing is that if we recognize that the world is completely or at least partially (its separate vital obstacles and situations) absurd by their nature then the literature of absurd appears correct, realistic reflection of this absurd reality. In such case the works of this kind won't be grotesque any more. Such thing can't happen! It does not happen this way!). Thus, absurdity in this or that dose and form characterizes grotesque, including literary grotesque but reduction of literary grotesque completely to absurd would be overstatement. Absurd and grotesque are brothers in blood but no twins. Their relatedness is particularly revealed in the fact that both of them contain paradoxical senselessness in their definition but in the "literature of absurd" this senselessness is considered metaphysical essence in existential understanding) and in literary grotesque this is only means of literary conventionality.

Proceeding from the above-mentioned, we can conclude that "absurd literature" which is on the proscenium of literary processes proceeding in west-European and other countries with European cultural orientation, is truly the bearer of literary grotesque feature. Although we should mention that in spite of the fact that grotesque and absurd cross each other, we can not speak about absolute coincidence. Bellow we present the analysis of the works selected by us which demonstrate that each grotesque is absurd but each absurd is not grotesque. To illustrate the mentioned supposition we address Franz Kafka.

Among with the creations by Kafka such as "The Castle" [Kafka A, 1991] and "The Metamorphosis" [Kafka B, 1991], only "metamorphose" can be regarded as grotesque because the protagonist of this novel - young man Gregor Samsa - found himself transformed into an insect. Of course, it is a fantasy and it is notable that all Peripetia are given in the work, which happened with protagonist as a result of metamorphoses, is constructed on the above-mentioned phantasmagoria. Gregor Samsa transformed into an insect by some mystic, unknown forces cannot find the sympathy from anywhere (even from the closest people). Turned into horrible insect he is suffering, being hated by everyone, experiences the loneliness. In Kafka's works as well as in the whole existential literature (which, in its turn, is based on the philosophy of existentialism) a man is destined to loneliness from the onset, which makes the absurdity of his meaningless life harder and stronger. Absurd like that and at the same time

grotesque composition (human has transformed into insect) gives Kafka the possibility to analyze the existed reality philosophically and artistic-conceptually and to ground general thesis: man is destined for suffering and on the whole all his existence is an absurd.

Unlike *Metamorphose* in other works by F.Kafka the rules of literary grotesque are not preserved and obviously we do not refer them to grotesque literature. For example, in the novel *The Castle* a land surveyor settles in a quiet village and in order to feel himself stable and safe he appeals to "the castle" authorities to get official permission to reside there. It is noteworthy that nobody requires from him this. The bureaucratic correspondence between the protagonist and "the castle" lasted for a long time. Finally five minutes prior to the land surveyor's death positive response from the Castle has come. It appears that the protagonist lived on legal basis lived only the last five minutes in his house. Clearly, the situation presented in the work is absurd but there is nothing grotesque (e.i. fantastic) in it: here there is another victim of bureaucracy - this wide spread social evil which has become the leading theme of literary works more than once. The situation presented in Kafka's work is of course absurd but there is not even mentioning to the grotesque [Petriashvili, 2005].

Each grotesque of the above-mentioned thesis is absurd but each absurd may not be grotesque one at all. Interesting illustration of it is Yuri Tynyanov's popular novella "*Lieutenant Kije*" (1928). The writer took as the basis for his novella the story happened during the reign of Russian Emperor Paul I. A clerical error on an official document of the Preobrajenski regiment results in the creation of a nonexistent officer, a Lieutenant Kizhe. According to the plot the phantom soldier was subsequently promoted all the way up beginning from the captain of the Preobrajenski regiment, then first captain and finally to colonel. He got married to Queen's maid of honor and had a child. The depicted situation is really absurd and that is why it gives rise to a logical question whether the above case is ironical anecdote made up by the officer or the real event. The analysis of the novel gives ground to conclude: even if it is really anecdote similar cases could have taken place in historical epoch described in the novel - in Russian Empire during the reign of Emperor Paul I. In this case the phantom "officer Kije" represents another victim of bureaucracy as wide spread social evil.

Similar situations are represented in Mikheil Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* too. The writer passed an interesting road from the first grotesque stories (e.g. *The Adventures of Chichikov*, *The Crimson Island*, *Diavoliada*, *The Fatal Eggs*, *The Heart of a Dog* in which ironical "Volterian laugh" clearly runs through) to those kind of works which are characterized above regarded "Kafkian non-laugh" (e.g. *The Master and Margarita*). Namely, according to overall recognition of literary critics M.Bulgakov's novel *The Heart of a Dog* is a classical literary grotesque because all those features which are typical to the genre of literary grotesque are characteristic to it. It should be also noted that while analyzing M.Bulgakov's belletristic as a rule the literary critics use the term "intellectual grotesque" because the plot of the mentioned works is frequently is based on literary reminiscence, allusion or literary personages are the representative of intellectual world (the writers, artists, doctors, professors...).

Satirical and phantasmagorical pictures are in abundance in *The Heart of a Dog*. For example, the novel starts with well-expressed phantasmagoric inner monologue of a dog in which it curses a dog's life in the twenties Moscow. In this monologues it is amazing the knowledge of

Moscow gossips, interesting trifles of life, ability to scrutinize, virtuosity of words. Of course the writer M. Bulgakov sees all these things but gives this in the form of a dog' monologue which in its turn represents phantasmagoria. In the monologue the dog is represented as clever creature, biting tongue and with sense of humor. It definitely causes sympathy and empathy. But it is also fact that "It is impossible!" - this is the most important condition of grotesque. Also grotesque phantasmagoria is the surgery done by professor Preobrajenski on Dog's brain: transplantation of the died drunker - Klim Chugunov's hypophysis. Mikhail Bulgakov a doctor by professions describes this surgery in details, in order to create in a reader an illusion of reality. The process of dog's humanization is described by professor Preobrajenski's assistant Dr. Bormenthal's diary which in its turn also represents a sample of grotesque. In the novel the writer gets the reader accustomed to phantasmagoric rules of intellectual game. As a result of which he is not surprised any more the humanized next life and adventures of Evgraf Evgrafovich Sharikov. In the scenes described in the finale of the work (Sharikov's transformation again into domestic dog that is happy living in Professor's house) much is exaggerated but this also completely meets the norms of literary grotesque.

As to *The Master and Margarita* this novel represents a brilliant specimen of literary grotesque, satirical phantasmagoria. The very first scene of the novel is grotesque in Moscow of the thirties where real devil Woland with his escort appears in order to arrange annual ball with the presence leadership of Queen (Margarita Nikolaevna in this case). In the mentioned episode the dialog between Berlioz (bearing the same name as great French composer that in its turn causes various grotesque absurdity) and poet Bezdomny (which means "homeless") ; then a discourse between Woland and Berlioz about Jesus Christ (transmission into myth and reality, Woland personally attended the crucifixion of Yeshua Ha-Notsri, or Jesus Christ, by Pontius Pilate) that is followed Woland's prediction of Berlioz's death (decapitated under tram wheels) and poet Bezdomny's future (he will be diagnosed as schizophrenia). In the following chapter of the novel the reader gets acquainted with the séance of black magic arranged by "Professor Woland" himself in the "variety theatre", becomes a witness of his escort "Focuses" #302 apartment, the Devil ball and so on. All this phantasmagoria continues up to the moment until "the evil forces" together with the master and Margarita do not leave Moscow. In the whole novel (except Jerusalem chapters where the writer is more restricted) Bulgakov uses satire and parody. Paradoxical situations described in the novel often alternate with absurd transferred to phantasmagoria. By means of irony and absurd the author criticizes certain events, facts and images but at the same time he advocates positive ideals. It is with phantasmagorical absurd form that the author denounces the reality of Stalin's totalitarian regime. Bulgakov's satirical phantasmagoria is directed against self-interest, egocentrism and other antihuman tendencies. At the same time the writer does not betray the traditions of Dante, Rabble and Swift: he criticizes in public his ideological, political and literary opponents (sometimes in open, clearly, and sometimes hidden, implicitly).

In recent years the question concerning the future of literary grotesque, satirical phantasmagoria is often put forward. It concerns just literary grotesque because in other branches of art (sculpture, painting, graphic, music, theatre, circus, etc.) grotesques is successfully used today too in order to reach expression and literary effect. As the practice of the 20th century shows the number of grotesque works in the above-mentioned branches of art

does not decrease but it increases. Especially it concerns circus (buffoonery, illusion), animated films (cartoons), modern computer technologies create such "virtual" phantasmagorias that sometimes exceed writer's or artist's fantasy.

As to the literary grotesque in this case two opposite trends emerged, of which one contributes to the preservation and development of literary grotesque, and another one - on the contrary. The hindering tendency is considered man's being kept informed in conditions of modern scientific-technical revolution. In such conditions grotesque phantasmagoria can barely surprise modern man: what the past generations considered as fantasy for contemporary man it is everyday event. Such situation may cause gradual death of literary grotesque. On the other hand, literary critics single out several factors which condition positive evolution of literary grotesque, of them we single out:

1. The necessity of satirical, grotesque criticism of injustice existed in the society (the list of social drawback is rather long and here we won't stay on it);
2. Merry (grotesque) "parting with the past" which is the most frequent and popular case of utilization of literary grotesque;
3. Grotesque anti-utopia as an opposite event of those unrealized illusions, social projects and utopias that too optimistically, idyllically picture the future of the humankind;
4. Literary grotesque as the most powerful means of artistic expression; a desire of unlimited fantasy, intellectual or verbal free game, etc.

With account of the fact that the above-mentioned fact always existed in the society and, probably, will exist, we can conclude that literary grotesque in its various manifestation (phantasmagoria, absurd, etc.) has plenty of life left and, as a special means of artistic conventionality, in modern historical conditions again remains one of the most acceptable form in literature.

References

Alkhazishvili G. Muzashvili N. 2009	Georgian Postmodern and Georgian Deconstruction http://www.lib.ge -7.03.2009
Camus A. 1951	L'homme révolté. Paris.
Dürenmatt F. 1966	Theater-Schriften und Reden. Zürich.
Kayser W. 1957	Das Groteske in Malerei und Dichtung.Hamburg.
Sartre J.-P. 1946	L'existentialisme est un humanisme. Paris.

Simon K. G. 1958	Das Absurde lacht sich tot. Akzente. № 5.
Camus A. 1990	L'homme révolté. Moscow (translated in Russian).
Kafka F. 1991	The Castle. Moscow (translated in Russian).
Kafka F. 1991	America Process. From the diaries. Moscow (translated in Russian).
Petriashvili O. 2005	Grotesque in 20th-century Russian literature. Tbilisi.

Tbilisi Dialect (history and the present)

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/26

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Linguistics](#)
- [Manana Tabidze](#)

Literary language is also called a written language by specialists because this term explains better an obligatory link with written tradition of standardized language. And ordinary people (including the literate society as well) often wrongly link the notion of literary language with geographical or urban marker and announce that literary language is close to the speech of a town, mainly capital city. It should be noted that among us, even among the linguists the issue of regarding Tbilisi speech as one Tbilisi dialect or social strata of the town (social dialect) and as to where Tbilisi speech must be placed on dialectological map (or its separate district or separate social group) is rather vague.

In Georgian reality unlike other towns of Georgia, the city of Tbilisi creates different social scheme and this is reflected in speech. This fact has its explanations: historically Tbilisi is Georgia's political and cultural centre that has been evolved on Georgia's historical and geographical cross-roads since old times and ethnographical and speech peculiarities of different corners of Georgia were reflected in its life. Although, according to modern thinking urban peculiarities have been acquired since the 19th century when it did not represent the capital of independent Georgian country any more and turned into administrative centre of one of the remote provinces of the Russian empire. Later the status of Tbilisi came to the forefront again.

Once Tbilisi was even announced the capital city of the short-lived Transcaucasian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. This created favorable conditions for attraction of the population not only from different parts of Georgia and Transcaucasia but also from the rest neighboring regions of the Soviet Union. In mechanical growth of Tbilisi in the period the Soviet period along with migration processes, a certain role was played by the merge of neighboring small towns and villages to the capital. This by itself did not give opportunity for the urban speech to evolve by one's own dynamics and constantly connected it with definite types of geographical dialects.

While speaking about city dialect one of the most important issues is the choice of terms. Namely, what terms are convenient for designation of city speech (or urban dialect) and its images. The cities along with common urban features also have their own individual character that causes the difference of social imagery. Social taste, cultural tradition, specific character of determining bases of economic priorities by elitist circles, widespread branches, cultural level, criminal situation, etc. significantly differ from each other not only the capital cities of various countries but even the cities within a country. Let us take on the one hand, reinforcement of Russian pronunciation well-expressed in the speech of Tbilisi elitist privileged intelligentsia (diphthongs "with intention of softening", stress, tendency of Caucasian softening

or Europeization and frequent use of Russian vocabulary and phraseology in Georgian speech up to the nineties, or the use of English accent or English inclusions by a new generation of elitist intelligentsia to prove one's priority since 1992 till present but, on the other hand, the tendency of English or American elitist intelligentsia to prove one's priority with the knowledge of English or high class identification sign thorough knowledge of official language is considered. In Soviet period in conditions of universal compulsory education the illiteracy did not actually exist, also, as a result of general educational system and organized managing of mass media from the viewpoint of speech there was not well-pronounced social differentiation of the society and therefore for soviet Tbilisi the number of notable speaking strata was far less than it is today, when social differentiation of the population and tendency of settlement of the city districts by social principle reinforced.

The notion of city speech is associated with the notion of the so-called "common speech" which, on the one hand, looks like geographical dialect as it is unstandardized and, on the other hand, it is similar to functional style as it is socially conditional.

The term "common speech" itself is not widespread in Georgian perhaps because the term "common" by its content is social rather than the same Russian **просторечие** or English slang. The Russian **просторечие** in linguistic encyclopedic dictionary is interpreted as "one of the forms of national language in dialectical, jargon speech and literary language. Together with popular dialects and jargon it constitutes non code sphere of all national speech communication – folk, **colloquial language**; has super dialectal character. Unlike dialects and jargon **просторечие** for bearers of national language is universally comprehensible"(cf. Fr. **La langue populaire, bas-language**, Czech everyday-spoken language", Italian **Dialetto regionale**) [Linguistic... 1990]. Other terms are also used, for example, "street language", "city jargon", etc. In Thesaurus of Georgian language the term "**vulgarism**" is used.

The diversity of the speech of town (city) does not yield the multiplicity of geographical dialects of the countries. In Irving Lewis Allen's solid work it is stated that in the speech of city can be singled out as many speech groups as there is social groups (Allen, 1993).

According to Zakaria Chichinadze during the reign of King Erekle Tbilisi underwent census four times both in households and per head. The data concerning the first census are not available. In 1769 the census was taken in Tbilisi for the second time by Paata Batonishvili (by this censor in 1769 the number of Tbilisi residents made 85 thousand..., but by households – 21 thousand households). The third census was taken in 1780. The census of Kartli-Kakheti-Tfilisi was taken. The census was led by Solomon Leonidze (in Kartli and Tbilisi) and Garsevan Chavchavadze (in Kakheti). The census was needed for the Russian-Georgian Treaty which was concluded between King Erekle and Empress Elizabeth. Georgian Jews in Tbilisi were recorded for the first time. The fourth census conducted David Rektor in 1790 by King Erekle's order. According to the data of this census the number of Tbilisi residents by that time appeared much less compared with the data of 1780. "During the fourth censor only 72 thousand households appeared in Tbilisi, 8 thousand less than in the old one. David Rektor remarks that the reason for this is that due to frequent wars and attacks the residents migrated

from Tbilisi to the villages. In 1790 Tbilisi population was: Georgians - 44 thousand, Armenians - 12 thousand, Jews - 5 thousand, Muslims - 10 thousand and 2-3 thousand others” [Chichinadze, 1917: 8].

Tbilisi of King Erekle’s time was divided into eight parts: 1) Kashveti district or the entire Mtatsminda and its environs; 2) garet district, with Kabakhi in it; 3) Gamjis kari; 4) Avanaant District including also Kala or Sololaki; 5) Avlabar or Isani; 6) Chughuret-Kukia (the boundaries from the east Isani , from the west beginning of Didube); 7) Vera and 8) Seidabadi.

In 1880 Oliver Wardrobe wrote about that time Tbilisi: “The population of Tbilisi makes 101.000. Here reside not only Georgians, but Russians too (civil officers and soldiers, Armenians (traders and money-lenders), Persians, Turks, few Europeans, namely Germans (colonists from Schavabia), French (tailors, hotel owners), etc.” [Wardrope, 2001:37].

Tbilisi as a capital city, almost always represented the centre of inner movement of Georgian population, though in the history of our country there were moments when Tbilisi was “closed” for the rest population, in such moments the function of cultural and economic centre was fulfilled by other town (e.g. Kutaisi, Geguti)... However, Tbilisi along with restoration of its political importance quickly returned the role of a social leader. The growth of the population of urban Tbilisi was especially observable after sovietization when the process of mechanical gain of population was obviously managed from outside (from the Soviet centre).

“Each district of old Tbilisi was mainly populated by people of the same nationality. The Persians, Jews, Armenians and partially the representatives of other nationalities had such quarters. The picture of this traditional settlement existed in the 19th century too. Some of such districts were created just at that time. A great part of Armenian bourgeoisie had settled in the rich quarter Sololaki since the middle of the past century but the poor strata of this nationality resided mainly in Avlabar.... In the eighties of the past century rather large districts of newly settled Georgians appeared on the other side of the railway – in Nadzaladevi [Tetvadze... 1989:132]. In the same book there is stated that for the eighties that “closeness” of such nationality based districts weakened because “wavelike” settlements of migrants was unequalled.

Despite this, since the fifties the settlement of the population from Georgian villages and towns mainly occurred in the then Lenin, Gldani, Orjonikidze and Saburtalo districts where 3/5 part of Tbilisi Georgian population resides and 26 Commissars and Worker districts where traditionally Armenians and Russians prevailed, new contingents of these nationalities was added; Georgians reside again in minority there.

Obviously, in the course of time the territory of Tbilisi and number of population (along with national and social composition) significantly changed. The distribution of resident population of Tbilisi according to the languages by the data from 1989 census [Georgian... 1991] is:

Nationality	Total of resident population	Of them native language find			
		<i>Language of own nationality</i>	Language of other nationality		
			Georgian	Russian	Other language
Total population	1 243 150	1 134 435	39 371	66 695	2 649
Georgian	820 753	816 718	–	3 614	421
Abkhaz	405	288	47	70	–
Ossete	33 138	18 860	11 829	2 339	110
Russian	124 825	122 683	1 986	–	156
Ukranian	16 086	6 842	491	8 697	36
Beloruss	2 148	878	60	1 197	13
Azerbaijan	17 968	15 128	913	1 855	72
Armenian	150 127	106 485	15 248	28 247	147
Turks	1 328	691	66	557	14
Jews	6 896	894	1 957	3 991	54
Georgian Jews	6 643	6 118	–	496	29
Aisor	2 752	1 283	586	841	42
Greeks	21 715	10 280	2 169	8 392	874
Kurds	30 299	22 759	3 308	3 819	413

It should be noted that by 1989 of non Georgians residing in Tbilisi Georgian as a second language was mastered fluently by 43 035 of 124 825 Russians, of 17 968 Azerbaijanians – only 7 330, of 150 127 Armenians – 63 615, of 6 896 Jews – 2 408.

By data of 2009 the population of Tbilisi made 1 106.700. It is stated that in recent years under the influence of developed events and migration of non Georgian population because of the accumulation of the displaced people the national composition of Tbilisi population has been significantly changed. Currently, more than 75% of Tbilisi residents are ethnic Georgians. Tbilisi is characterised with well-expressed everyday "commutation" migration. Here from 10 to 30 thousand people arrive for trade, work and education daily. The centre of the city and residential communities are populated most densely (25 thousand men/km²).

According to the data of 1997 by the Ministry of Refugees and Accommodation of Georgia the scheme of displaced persons – refugees – accommodation looks like: Gldani – 14 600; Saburtalo – 14 400; Isani – 11 800; Nadzaladevi – 11200; Didube – 9300; Samgori – 8200; Vake – 7700; Chughureti – 6400; Mtatsminda – 6300; Krtsanisi – 4200 [Gugushvili, 1998: 65]. The heterogeneity of national composition of the population and flows of displaced population moved up to the capital city because of recent political developments give no opportunity for stabilization of lingual situation in the city and makes impossible the "formation" of the so-called Tbilisi speech. It must be said that in not so distant past the peculiarities of Tbilisi dialect were expressed rather sharply.

Even after acquiring of contemporary urban features Tbilisi remained the centre of development and dissemination of Georgian literary language and personification of prestige, cultural authority of literary language for various regions of Georgia. Though in the course of the whole soviet period the tendency of regarding Tbiliseloba as a social category of a certain prestige that had a tint of communist snobism and for Georgians left beyond Tbilisi set up a barrier of inaccessibility for belonging to Tbilisi "elite". Such self-isolation was in need of a special frame and one of the edges of this frame was also speech. Tbilisi nomenclature elite that utilized in its business activity Russian and literary Georgian, in everyday life addressed "special speech" by which it emphasized not only its own common urban but intraregional identity and with this separated from other population. What peculiarities can be seen from this viewpoint?

Tbilisi was international city during the Russians domination that was also favored by the fact that Moscow granted Tbilisi the role of political centre in the Transcaucasus. In 1922 the number of Georgians in Tbilisi was 35.2%. Unlike the representatives of other nations the Armenian population dominated which made 34.9% [Daushvili, 1997:17]. Non Georgian population fit well to Russian dictate and feared the strengthening of Georgian statehood. That is why great majority of Tbilisi met loyally the Communist coup d'état. It was from them that the the most part of party and administrative workers was staffed in the first years of the Soviet power.

Thus, significant part of the Party nomenclature was not of Georgian orientation by self-consciousness and speech. This feature is to be taken into account while speaking about Tbilisi dialect. Rapid growth of Georgian population in Tbilisi started in the thirties when building of

factories and plants was widespread. In the year of 1939 the number of Georgians in Tbilisi was already increased by 44% [Daushvili, 1997:17]. The population of non Georgian orientation and with bad knowledge of Georgian naturally creates such variant of speech which does not look like traditional dialect of Georgian and as far as dialectal speech is also the way of self-identification the representatives of this certain category of Tbilisi residents "recognise" each other by language.

What social group was formed by the residents of Tbilisi from the twenties to the end of the thirties?

1) The majority of Tbilisi industries belonged to Armenian capitalists: Adelkhanov, Iaralov, Bozarjants, Empianjants, etc. They hired their countrymen willingly in their own enterprises, and that is why in Tbilisi factories (especially in leather-shoes enterprises) Armenian workers dominated. In these enterprises Armenian national and language situation dominated [Daushvili, 1997:131]. In 1939 the number of workers already reached 43.7% in Tbilisi population (226 755 men).

2) In the middle of the thirties too in Georgia, namely, Tbilisi, quite large groups of workers were illiterate in a number of labour collectives of enterprises.

3) In multinational collectives national problem was inevitably arisen: the issue of speaking language. Before the revolution this problem was solved in a simple way: the speaking language in the enterprise usually was the language of majority and the language of official relations was the language of the empire, i.e. Russian. In 1923 the state status of Georgian language was approved and its use in all state and commercial establishments became mandatory. The adopted resolution required Georgian to be operated in all establishments. This was timely and necessary resolution but its realization became to a certain extent difficult. The unsettled state of language issue could become the reason of international conflict. And this really happened [Daushvili, 1997:134].

- Beyond regional division of Tbilisi social ground were shaped: corruption based communists could not express their material and social priorities in open. Therefore, they satisfy their big financial opportunities through the settlement in central and, hence, historical districts. In these districts as is also seen from the above statistics, they had to live together with non Georgian population that did not speak Georgian and spoke with interference. The privileged class in order to provide the future of their children needed to finish the Russian schools that also implied intrusion into natural development of Georgian speech;
- The elite came from the regions to the city set up the task to fit with Tbilisi socium by all means and, so to say, "started to speak its language"; on this way they were hindered by speech trace brought with them from sound Georgian dialectical environment and the absence of language living together with alien ethnos. On the way of elitization of this category speech the external side of Tbilisi dialect is clearly seen, more easily picked up, and turning into "urban" the peculiarities brought from the region;

- On this way inside of the urban population social division happened: those who leave Georgian dialects and directly connect literary Georgian language and those who come from dialects or were born in Tbilisi, then linked with Tbilisi jargon and after this went into literary Georgian. Thus, several social dialects have been fixed in Tbilisi:

It should be mentioned during long time period the gain in Georgian population has been clearly expressed and the number of people speaking Georgian significantly increased. Tbilisi city has become the centre of strengthening Georgian literary language by its political and ideological course and by increasing of Georgian population too.

In Ioseb Grishashvili's "Kalakuri Dictionary" (City Vocabulary) one part of the given vocabulary does not represent old urban vocabulary, its significant part (20-25%) is the property of literary Georgian or geographical dialects (e.g. *abjari, azizi (ilia), berika, bozbashi, bolta, giauri, gulnamceca*, etc.); about 5% is actively used in jargon even today (*to, khoshi, chalichi, chautaka, chajiba, chagazile, shustri, shaakole, kurban, komarbazi, kamari, ksela, fetiani, sipta, siabandi (=ishkilbaz(ionbaz) damkhmare), poslika, ishta, roshva, jujva, jami (=uSno), pupuz (=sakme gaurigo, mere aighos da pupuz... pirshi chala gamogavlos*, etc); probably with the course of time about 10% transfer to literary language (e.g. *kachali, kiliki, psoni, petkhum, sika (=1.ghone, fulis gone; 2.bechedi), nokari, ringi (=feri, saghebavi; 2.zne, chveuleba; 3girseba)* [Grishashvili, 1997].

In Levan Bregadze's "Georgian Dictionary of Jargon" there are over 600 words which can be heard in the speech of a "true Tbilisi resident" every day: *azrzea, atesa, avarda, audo* (Grishashvili also has them), *"ambavshi parivs gcem", afuilebs, apsikheba, datira, daibrida, daiada, iazvoba, ibairama, tomari gaushva, svoi bichi, svido, svetobs, tufta, fraeri, firma, keshi, kaji, ksiva, shatalo* (hang about), *shantraba* (riffraff, – scoundrel's group), *chereschur, chrez dzma, chkua eketeba*, etc. [Bregadze, 1999]. The evaluation of language tendencies with these two dictionaries shows that in the interval between issue of the dictionaries the use of scabrous language and thieves' slang significantly increased.

The characterization of urban speech (in our case, that of Tbilisi) happens best of all in anecdotes in which the vocabulary considered to be most typical vocabulary and expressions are accentuated and it is felt that the emphasis on "true Tbiliseli" occurs by putting forward the outer features of Avlabari Georgian (we have already spoken on ethno-lingual orientation of Avlabari speech and book traditions).

While dealing with main tendency of "colloquial speech" attention should be paid to the orthoepy of colloquial speech. It is true the colloquial speech with peculiarities of its sound approximates literary language but it also contains a number of peculiarities that singles it out as a special orthoepic system. It is oral, speaking language. There is more physiological inertia in it and freedom from literary associations. Of these orthoepic peculiarities some characterise many dialects too. However, they are so common and do not contradict the tendencies of literary language. The forms of conversation, speed and discontinuity, reinforce physiological inertia of pronunciation. The following belong to them:

- Simplification of consonants group. E.g., *magram, mag/am; vinac/uinats; kargad/karka...*

- Omitting of the consonant: *zaan, karga*, etc.;
- Shortening of the syllables: *gamaketebina – gamaketina, gauutova – gautova*; in prefixes: *chakvinta – dayvinta, daubera – gaubera*...
- Dialectal accentuation of literary words. (*eh! Evishalot akhla!*)
- Transfer of a sound (*biznesmeni/bizmesmeni, reanimatsia/reaminatsia*);
- The change of the meaning of a lexical unit is especially frequent in urban jargon: *bnelebi (chamorchenilebi)*...
- The standard of a word is often changed and correspondingly new meaning or nuance of meaning appears: *daje* (and not: *dajeki*), *chamoeteri* (and not: *chamoetre, ro* (and not: *rom*)), *aravize* (and not *aravisze*), *jobia* (and not: *sjobia* or *umjobesia*)...
- The pronunciation of the foreign words with specific accent is considered as urban feature;
- Today's Tbilisloba also means to fit the scabrousness;

In the collective works of contemporary authors the claim to be a citizen is felt that is regarded by these authors as a breaking from traditional Georgian reality. They use non-natural forms, try not to use the figurativeness characteristic of dialects and the language of the Georgian classic literature. This can have three reasons: 1) they claim for total isolation from non-urban part of a common state space as a sign of being city dweller; 2) in order to fill themselves as bearers of urban symptoms, they need to immitate the foreign urban models or imagine themselves as a part of cosmopolitan urbanian space; 3) from the viewpoint of literary schools they belong to modern avant-garde or other trends characterised by emotional emptines, which is obviously reflected language too.

One of the characterisitic feature with contemporaries is a removal of lexical censorship resulting in striving to the scabrousness; the speech of a positive hero is usually not of positive connotation. The separation of social groups in Georgian reality and lingual characterization has been proceeding fragmentally so far.

It is also mentioned there that "The jews of that time Tbilisi were rich, as we said, they had two chapels in Tfilisi up to 1794, two caravanserais.. they occupied four streets in Tfilisi, beginning from Fetkhain district up to the Mtkvari. They all were exiled by Agha Mahammed Khan in 1795. The reason for this violence was that Georgian Jews travelled to Russia for trade too. This situation was percieved by Aha-Mahmed-Khan as hostile. The Jews hoped that he would not harm them because of their Jewish background and did not even migrate. After this impudence the number of Jews in Tbilisi abruptly decreased, at the time when Georgian Kingdom joined Russia just 20 Jewish households appered in Tbilisi, and they were poor" [Zakaria Chichinadze, Census of old Tbilisi and number of residents, newspaper *Sakartvelo* (#153-154), 1917, the article was reprinted in the newspaper "Georgian Book", #10, October, 2001, p.8].

According to the workshops and trade spots located in this district we can judge on the arrangement of speech strata of artisans' social layer (1.Sirage-khana – Avlabar or Isani area at the hill); 2) Jon-khana (leather artisans; hatters); 3) Kharaz-khana – in front of Sioni; 4) Kasab-khana – close to the square; 5)Zarapkhana district).

In the mentioned Book there is indication in relevant references that the name “Nadzaladevi” itself was given to this district because the settled here started without official permission from the city authorities.

References

Bregadze L. 1999	Dictionary of Georgian Slang. Tbilisi.
Grishashvili I. 1997	Georgian Dictionary. Tbilisi.
Gugushvili T. 1998	The problems of Georgia’s outer migrational-demographic problems. Tbilisi.
Daushvili A. 1997	Tbilisi - 1937. Tbilisi.
Tetvadze Sh., Tetvadze O. 1989	The Armenians in Georgia. Tbilisi, economical and geographical research. Tbilisi.
Georgian..... 1991	National composition of Georgian population. Statistical collection. Tbilisi.
Oliver Wardrobe 2001	The Kingdom of Georgia. Tbilisi (translated from the edition of 1977).
15 The Best..... 2002	The Best Georgian Novel 2001-2002. Tbilisi.
Chichinadze Z. 1917	Records of Old Tiflis and number of population. Newspaper "Sakartvelo" #153-154.
Karbelashvili P. 1917	Tbilisi during King Erekle. Newspaper "Sakartvelo" #153-154.
Ozhegov S. 2000	On Colloquial Language (to the question on city language) On Colloquial Language. Voprosy Yazykoznanania #5, 2000, Moscow.
Argutinskyi P. 1916	Population of Tiflis. Municipal Calendar for 1917. Tiflis.
Linguistic.... 1990	Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary Moscow.
Allen Irving Lewis 1993	The City in Slang, New York life and Popular Speech. New York, Oxford.

Adyghe Variants of the Amirani Epic

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/28

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Koba Okujava](#)

The cycle of "Amirani" occupies an important place in Georgian epic. According to its plot this rendering is of heroic character. Its main motif is the struggle with the oppressors. Amirani is a culture hero of Georgian people. He defeats the evil forces, eliminates the noxious plants, teaches the people the art of metal treatment, brings fire to the human race and lays the foundation for the family. The plot is rendered as fragmented verses, prose or prose mixed with verses.

The plot of "Amirani" contains the following episodes: 1. Miraculous birth of Amirani; 2. Fraternization with Badri and Usupi; 3. Hunting and visit of a strange tower; 4. Tsamtsumi's death; 5. Amirani defeats the devi Baqbaqi, 6. Learning about Qamari's story; setting off to kidnap Qamari; 8. The struggle with black whale; 9. An encounter with the Beauty in the tower; 10. The fragment of a bowl delivering a note; 11. The attack of Kaji king; 12. The fight and death of Badri and Usupi; 13. The fight between Amirani and Qamari's father; 14) Amirani's death and resurrection; 15) Amirani challenges his godfather 16. The enchaining to the Caucasus [Chikovani, 1965: 31].

In the Adyghe folklore Amirani's epic under the name of renowned enchained titan is presented only as an episode. The same legend in Georgian folklore, art, toponimics and, generally, onomastic struck roots deep. All this clarifies the way which is covered by Amirani's plot in the course of its centuries-old existence during its spreading both in related and distant peoples [Chikovani, 1965: 174].

As far as we know there have been two fixed Adyghe variants of the "Amirani". One belongs to the active member of the Russian Royal Odessa society, historian and archeologist- Jack-Victor-Edward Tebu D'Mariny, who in 1813 and 1818 travelled several times to Circassia. In 1823-1824 as a vice-consul of the Black Sea port of the Netherlands he again was in Circassia. His work "Journey to Circassia" contains numerous ethnographical materials on the people of Adyghe. An account recorded by Tebu D'Mariny is of the following content: There is a large ravine on the top of one of the mountains, perhaps Elbrus, from which the tickle and groan of the chains is heard. One Circassian managed to descend into this ravine and saw a giant enchained there to the cliff. The giant appealed to him: "Oh, you the resident of the earth, having come to see me, what is happening upstairs? Is the grass still green? Is there peace in the families? Are the wives loyal to their husbands? Do the young girls obey their mothers? Sons to their fathers? To the positive response the Giant says: Well, I still long to be here" [Taitbout de Marigny, 1974: 318].

The other Adyghe version of the "Amirani" belongs to the famous Circassian scholar Khan-Girey. Khan-Girey was the son of influential Circassian feudal, who was raised by one of the foremen. In accordance with father's will he was brought to Tbilisi to get education. From here he was sent to Petersburg, where he graduated Cadet Corps, and since 1829 he had been transferred to the Caucasus for business. An account about the enchained giant is included by him in the paper "Mythology of the Circassians" which was published after the revolution in the newspaper *Kavkaz* in 1846 posthumously (1842) in Russian language. According to the mentioned account the giant is enchained to the snowy peaks of the Elbruz for some offence. When he awakes he asks his guards in amazement: "Is the grass growing again on the earth? Are the sheep born again? The merciless guards reply that *lelkashi* is growing and the sheep are born again. Such reply makes the giant crazy and he tears the shackles. Because of his roaring the Earth trembled, his chains knocked against one other making thunderous noises, his heavy breathing is a wind storm, the streams running down the Elbrus were his bitter tears [Khan Girey, 1847].

In both texts which were recorded in the first half of the 19th century, the name of the hero is unknown. He is presented generally as the giant. This obstacle can have two explanations: the hero's name was forgotten by people in the course of time or the hero's name assimilated from the neighbors was unknown from the outset.

The place of enchainment in both variants is on the Elbrus, though it is not clear why and by whom the giant is punished.

It is known that in the Georgian version of the "Amiraniani" various points of the Caucasus are indicated as the place of the hero's punishment, including the Elbrus, between the Greatest Caucasus range. According to the Kakhétian rendering, Christ and Amirani climbed to the Elbrus to compete. God won and thus, Amirani has been enchained to the mount Elbrus till now. According to the Gurian version, Godfather offered Amirani to catch a bird in the competition. Amirani caught up with the bird on the Mount Elbrus and was staked [Chikovani, 1965:125].

Similar renderings comparatively extensive were known to the closest related to Adyghe people Kabardians. These renderings from the viewpoint of content to a certain degree fill the Adygian versions of the "Amiraniani". One of the variants was published by G.Liakhveli in 1884 in the newspaper *Droeba*. The legend has it that an old man is enchained to the Elbrus peak. The body is covered with white hair, the white moustache is up to the toes, the eyes are sparkling like fire. This old man appeared to be a great friend of Kabardian god Tha but when he wished to occupy his place, god Tha enchained him to the Elbrus forever. Every time the old man got up in the morning he used to ask the guards: "Are the sheep grow up again?" As soon as he got affirmative answer, he started his shackles roaring which caused thunderstorm, heavy breathing - windstorm, his moan - an earthquake shock, the streams running down the Elbrus were his bitter tears [Liakhveli, 1884].

According to the second Kabardian version published by L.Lopatinski in 1891 in the distant past one single-eyed giant dared to climb the goat's domain, on the Elbrus peak (Oshkha-Makho) where no human foot has trod yet. God Tha punished the giant for impudence and

enchained to the rock and put an eagle there that tears the giant's heart every day and does not give an opportunity to drink the immortal water running there [Lopatinski, 1891: 38].

Unlike the Adyghe versions, in Kabardian ones it is clearly seen as to what is the reason of giant's punishment - he wished to catch god Tha's peace, dared and climbed to his domain, at the top of the Elbrus.

By comparative analysis of the renderings spread between Georgians and other people of the Caucasus it becomes clear that Amirani at the first stage is the defender of mother's right, the interests of the hunting goddess of matriarchate time and the god who enchained him is the god of clouds, the exponent of Father's interests. In Georgia, after spreading of Christianity in the "Amirani" epic the enchained pagan god is changed into Christ God [Chikovani, 1965: 196].

God Tha mentioned in the Kabardian narrations was the great god in Adygh-Kabardian pagan pantheon. He was also called Thashhuo that word by word means great god. Since 15th century, more precisely after the Byzantine Empire ceased to exist, the united Georgian Kingdom was disintegrated and the Crimean Khanate became the vassal of the Ottoman Empire that played crucial role in spreading of Islam instead of Christianity in Adygeya and Kabarda but in them especially in the highlands Islam failed to spread broadly. Major part of people still remains pagan in essence. Their religion represented a kind of synthesis of paganism, Islam and Christianity where the pantheon of pagan gods was well expressed at the head of whom was God Tha [Okujava, 2005:20].

Oshkha-Makho or Elbrus is the untouched domain of God Tha. Mortal has no right to step in the domain of gods. Kabardians believed in sanctity of the Elbrus so strongly that for a long time nobody dared to ascend it. One of the renderings of the kabardin people represents a reflection of such kind of faith according to which Crimean Khan intruded to Kabarda dared not to ascend Elbrus because he heard a voice from the peak: "Stop, Khan, stop!" Kabardians believed that these words were pronounced by an old man enchained to the Elbrus rock [Lopatinski, 1891: 38].

Perhaps the reflection of this faith is represented by the narration about Attila according to which the leader of Huns came to the Mount Elbrus he was escaped from the land of Adygee. Since that time the Adyghe and Kabardians have called Elbrus Oshkhamakho that means "the mountain of happiness" [Nogmov, 1947: 44].

Thus, according to the Kabardian renderings the giant confronted the God Tha himself, the violator of his rights. Similar to Amirani's legend the reason of enchaining is disobedience to God. The giant decided to overthrow Tha's dominance, i.e. to intrude into his domain, the Elbrus peak that cost him a lot. In comparison with Amirani's adventure in Kabardian versions the hero's enchaining is motivated in different way. In Georgian narration Amirani like Biblical Jacob directly fights with the god, with his own physical force tries to subordinate him. The image of Amirani as a fighter seems to be mitigated in the Kabardian versions. The giant was punished because of the tradition that forbade him the ascending to the Elbrus. The fight for people's welfare is not seen here, the curbing of the invaders that in the plot of "Amirani" is put on the foreground. Thus the enchained giant of the Adyghe-Kabardian renderings is the same

Amirani only put in different situation and from the artistic viewpoint too formed in different way. In the latter the episode of enchaining means the faith in mountains sanctity. The "Amirani's narration in Kabardinis and moreover in Adyghees, has changed the face and linked to the local reality [Chikovani, 1965: 182].

The narrations on Amirani were also known to the Abkhazs. One of the variants was recorded by G.Liakhveli the content of which is as follows: Side by side with Amirani enchained to the Elbrus his horse is standing that gnaws the chains day and night. When a little is left to cut the chain completely a woman in black standing by touches the chain with her stick and it becomes full again [Liakhveli, 1884:].

Like Adyghe variants in Abkhazian narration of the "Amirani" epics the spot of enchainment is the Elbrus, the reason for punishment of the hero is not known and so on but from the viewpoint of the content the narrations about Abrskil spread among the Abkhazs are more extensive.

According to the narration in old times there lived an amazing maiden by her appearance and behavior in Abkhazia who made a vow not to marry, but in some miraculous way she conceived. She gave birth to a boy - Abrskil who was growing up in unusual way. Being of a week old he looked like one-year-old, when being one-year-old he looked like ten-year-old and ten-year-old as twenty-year-old. Abrskil had grown into the strong and brave young man who did not know what the fear was, in bravery he yielded to none.

At that time Abkhazia suffered foreign intrusions that often attacked the country, troubled the country, took away the cattle and captivated the people. When Abrskil grew up, he became great hope and hero of his people. The enemies became afraid of him, they did not dare to cross the mountains and the sea. Soon Abrskil's name and deeds became famous to far. Abkhazia became flourished, filed with abundance, people soothed, lived without fair, recovered.

Abrskil tried to do good for his native people, cared about them, mercilessly destructed evil and dark forces. He even rooted out the fern if he saw it because he thought it did harm to the crop.

Abrskil did not walk he rode the horse and could jump with his horse up from the seaside to the Ertzakh Mountain Elbrus.

His bravery and daring gradually made Abrskil proud and arrogant, he challenged God that he was as good as Him and that he could perform any act which God could do. God got angry because of this. First He tried to bring him, to reason with a kind word but Abrskil did not submit himself before God; he did not want even to mention God. When nothing came out of it in this way God told his apostles and told them to catch Abrskil and throw him to dungeon unless he did not submit himself before God. The apostles tried much but failed to catch him Finally, one devil by the advice of an old woman spread the raw turned out caw skins from the Elbrus to the seaside. At that time Abrskil was sleeping and they attacked him sleeping. Abrskil managed to escape jumping up to his horse and sprang from the seashore to the Elbrus but his shores slipped. Abrskil fell down from the horse into a deep gorge. Before he gathered his strength, the apostles surrounded him and seized him. By the advice of the devil old woman the apostles

brought Abrskil and his horse to a cave and tied up with large chain to an iron pillar separately. God told this old woman to watch the cave. Abrskil was chained without food and water, the old woman had pity to him and started to bring food for him because of which God became furious and turned the old woman into dog that according to the rendering was in the cave together with Abrskil and his horse.

Abrskil chained in the cave has been shaking this pillar without unceasingly for years. When he almost pulled it from the ground, a wagtailsat on the pillar. Abrskil, filled with anger struck at the bird with the hammer. The bird flew away and the hammer reached the pillar and drove it in, deeper than it was before. Abrskil is in this torment even today. According to some renderings, Abrskil many years later efforts manages to escape from the cave but because of being in the darkness for a long time he could not endure the light, became blind and got lost somewhere in the mountains [Zurba, 1988: 345].

There are known some versions of Abrskil legend which differ from each other more or less though the motive of challenging God and episodes connected with him have been preserved unchanged in them.

Thus, the legend about Abrskil is heroic epic of "Amiraniani" type. Unlike Abkhazian, as well as Tebu de Mariny and Khan Girey Adyghe versions published by G.Liakhveli the name of a hero is known, the reason of his punishment, etc. Besides this, the disobedient to God had been enchained not in the Elbrus but in a cave.

It should be noted that in different versions of the Amiraniani different mountain peaks of the Caucasus such as Elbrus, glacier are named as the place of enchainment, though often cave or den are named as such places. It is supposed that the motives of chaining to the cliff and placement in the cave are almost simultaneous and manifest themselves in the earlier stage of the formation of the epic. As far back as early antique period in old Greek sources there is evidence that in Georgia (Colchis) such versions of chained hero in which the place of punishment was indicated the mountain peak or a cave [Chikovani, 1965].

The legend about Abrskil seems to be typologically closest to the hero widespread in Megrelia and later almost forgotten - Berskuas. By all features Berskuas has a certain affinity with Abrskil. As an infant he was found lying in the basket by a childless hunter in the wild mountains and brought to the house. Berskua grew up fast and became the defender of his people. At the end according to one of the versions) of the narration he started to disobey the God, according to the second version - to St.Giorgi. He was punished by capturing in the cave from which even today his groan is heard sometimes.

The rendering about Abrskil in the eastern part of Abkhazia, namely, in Abzhua is spread. In the western part of Abkhazia it is not known. Thus, this epic is not general Abkhazian phenomenon. As is seen the plot of the rendering is borrowed from the west-Georgian version of heroic epos of the "Amiraniani" type and was created in the late Middle Ages. The name itself "Abrskil" is supposed to be borrowed from the Megrelian "Berskua" or its presumed versions "Berskil" one wide spread. [Antelava, 2006: 15].

Taitbout de Marigny in his "Journey" which according to the materials available for us the Adyghee report has been fixed for the first time on the giant chained to the Elbrouz, indicated that this narrations had a certain link with the legend about Prometheus. As is seen, for Taitbout de Marigny it was unknown Georgian legend about Amirani or he would have linked the Adyghe narration not with the myth about Prometheus but with Georgian "Amirani". It is from the "Amirani" epos that Adyghe narrations come from on the giant chained to the Elbrouz which is clearly evidenced from its comparison with similar Kabardian, as well as Abkhaz version and the fact that as a place of chaining as well as in various Georgian versions not generally Caucasian ridge but concrete mountain Elbrus is named.

Thus, the Adyghe narrations on the giant chained to the Elbrus comes from "Amirani" epics. The renderings are scarce, only the motif of chaining to the rock is preserved in them, the name of a hero is unknown, the reason of his punishment and other numerous important episodes. From the viewpoint of the content these renderings are most close to the Kabardian version of the "Amirani".

Finally, it should be mentioned that the existence of the oldest Georgian legend in Adyghe folklore even in a small portion clearly indicates the influence of Georgian culture on north-western Caucasus and evidences the existence of the oldest ethno-cultural ties between kindred Georgians and Adyghe people.

References

Antelava N. 2006	Abkhazian myths, rituals, symbols. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Zukhba S. 1988	Abkhazian folklore. Translated from Abkhazian by T.Gvantseladze and A.Arabuli. Tbilisi.
Liakhveli G. 1884	Caucasian Amirani. Droeba, 1884, #60.
Okujava K. 2005	Paganism of the Black Sea Coast. Adyghe. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Chikovani M. 1965	Georgian epos. Book II. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Lopatinskiy L. 1891	Kabardian legends, narrations and tales recorded in Russian. Collection of materials for description of places and tribes of the Caucasus, in X.II. Tiflis, (in Russian).
Nogmov Sh. 1947	The History of Adyghe People. Nalchik, (in Russian).
Taitbout de Marigny Zh. 1974	Voyages to Circassia. In.- Adyghe, kabardians and Circussians in the books of European writers in 18th-19th centuries. Edited and compiled by B.K.Gardanov. Nalchik (in Russian).

1847

Problem of Expression of Plural in relation to Complex Sentence of One Type (Which one or which ones?)

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/25

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Linguistics](#)
- [Inga Sanikidze](#)

In any language junction of separate groups (we mean those of the Parts of Speech) is the grammatical mean for revealing of the syntactic peculiarities. In the first turn it represents the independent linguistic rules within the concrete language and binds the semantic conjunction on the lexical-morphological levels. As far as the final goal of junction of words is formation of a sentence as a whole structure, the syntaxes of the sentence qualitatively is the quantity which determines the content of language and acquires the value of communicative-functional importance.

Georgian scholar L.Kvachadze states in "The Syntax of Modern Georgian Language": "Syntax defines which and what type of words go with each other and what is the meaning of the words in the sentence; it considers the sentence structure, its types and grammatical peculiarities typical to each of them and also those means with the help of which the matching of words in a sentence and in word-combinations is realized" [Kvachadze, 1966:4].

Main issue of our report deals with one problem of junction of words available in Georgian language, namely, depiction of plurality of subordinate junctions, i.e. expression of plural. This latter appears in complex subjunctive sentences. Today the Georgian Linguistics' opinion envisages at some extent the consideration of Leo Kvachadze in connection to the indicated issue. The scholar remarks: "Sometimes, though rarely, there is a case when two different words define the word-form: the first - according to the case, the second according to the number. An example of this is relative pronoun **which** (also what): this pronoun fulfills the role of subordinating conjuncture in a complex sentence: links the subordinate clause with the principle clause. In the declension it regards that word of the subordinate clause with which it is in syntactic bond but in the number -the word referring to the principle clause. For example, "mdinaris napirzed shavad mochanda aka-ik patara ciskvilebi, romlebsac ghamis ubralo qvebisagan dzlivs gamoarchevdit (Kazbegi) [Kvachadze, 1966:22].

Thus, the form of the relative pronoun, on the one hand, is defined by the number of the subject of the main clause („ciskvilebi") and, on the other hand, with the verb of the subordinate clause that governs the mentioned conjunction in the dative case („romlebsac... gamoarchevdit"). In scholarly literature it is noted that "parataxis, i.e. complex "composed" or complex sentence historically precedes the hypotax, i.e. compound sentence" and "the manifestation of relativity for certain words represents the function of secondary and, thus, future time" [Dondua, 1940: 329-330].

L.Kvachadze's textbook "Syntax of Modern Georgian Language" deals with the issue as to what form the juncture of the subordinate clause should have in case when it refers to the subject which agrees with the word (syntactically - determiner) denoting plural in the principle clause. It is said: "If the defining member of the principle clause has such member as an attribute the lexical meaning of which implies more than one (the numerals: two, three... many, numerous; pronouns: several, all ...), the defining member is in singular and the relative name is in plural" [Kvachadze, 1966:22].

We put the question in the following way: which lingual form will be correct in the following sentences:

1. "aivanze ijda **ramdenime aznauri, romelic** axalmortmeul xils miirtmevda".
2. "aivanze ijda **ramdenime aznauri, romlebic** axalmortmeul xils **miirtmevdnen**".

Due to the fact that the standards of modern Georgian literary language are not quite regulated in this respect, of above given examples the specialists of the Georgian language deem the second construction rightful:

In principle clause

Definition of indicator of plurality+ subject - in singular

In subordinate clause

Member-junctions: which/ such as -- in plural

At first glance in such syntactic construction there is really nothing that might significantly contradict the nature of Georgian language and syntactical formula almost established as a standard of Georgian literary language; but let us try to see all these contradictions that reveal themselves in such kind of sentences. Proceeding from the fact that "semantic and grammatical relations of the parts of complex sentence is diverse" [Kvachadze, 1966:319], in a majority of cases this diversity makes even more difficult to preserve grammatical balance in syntactic constructions of the sentence. In our case it will concern first of all that syntactic dependency which is called agreement and which on the basis of paired category tries to form semantic and grammatical chain in the sentence. In pair form of syntactical relation everything is clear: of two units of the word one is syntactically stronger than the second. Now, let us consider such kind of compound sentence from the viewpoint of agreement that contains attributive clause and requires junction: "**romelic**" (in plural -**romlebic**; or: **romelnic**). For example:

By the counter were standing three workers, who had hung down their heads and were not going to say the truth".

During the process of syntactic analysis of complex clause, in the first turn it should be taken into account that selection of syntactic pairs takes place separately on one party in principal clause, and on the other party in the subordinate clause. This idea, of course, considerably simplifies understanding of syntactic construction of the complex clause, but the case is that the syntactic contacts of the sentence and the understanding itself, in a wide sense of this grammar relation in a complex clause is never limited by only any sentence comprising it: neither - by the principal clause, nor - subordinate clause. And vice versa, these two ideas, two clauses coexist as one complete sentence with the aim that the complex clause could finally complete its logical-grammatical sequence. As a consequence, the area of dissemination of syntactic category is wider than - the syntagma (we think that the Georgian language is not essentially studied). The very such situation we'll deal with an attributive subordinate clause in case if the number of member-junction of this same subordinate clause is determined by the determinant-determined (i.e. by the independent members of the sentence) contemporarily (discretionally) and simultaneously on the number expressed semantically, lexically. In such a case we'll see that the verbs-predicates of subordinate clause will appear absolutely isolated from the principal clause both from semantic and grammar points of view.

If we examine syntactical pairs of the main clause (1. *By the counter were standing*"; 2. *"three workers"*; 3. *"the worker was standing"*) we will see that **the question of agreement of the subject and verb-predicate in number is solved depending as to what grammatical form has the agreed word** ("the worker"), in this case animated subject; and not according to the number of the subject i.e. *"three workers"*, their number is already plural). Thus, during the agreement the language does not count the forms expressing number at all (e.g. *"several people were talking"*, *"there are more than one means"*, and so forth). The state of Georgian literary language at synchronic level is so stable in spite of considerable influence of European languages in which the number of a subject is also changeable in descriptive derivatives and we have construction [yvela adamianebi], that from this viewpoint Georgian language does not face the danger of subsystem change at all. Georgian linguist A.Chikobava writes in one of his works: "Coordination is called such syntactic relation when the word ruled in something by another word, itself rules this word in something" and states that "the role of a verb in coordination is clear: we have characterized it as a centre of coordination; though the circumstance that division of a sentence into three groups is based on the difference of verbs, gives enough information on its role in a word-combination" [Chikobava, 1928: 268]. In the case when a word (big coordinate) connected with verb-predicate through coordination is morphologically non marked, name of zero form, logically and grammatically main coordinate is also in the singular ("**bevri specialist fikrobs**") but if big coordinate is rendered by grammatically marked form, the verb-predicate also changes the number ("**specialist-eb-i figrob-en...**").

Now, let us consider grammatical construction of subordinate clause and only then think how these two sentences are in conformity of language, namely its form and to what extent they represent grammatically balanced parts of the whole -complex sentence.

In case if the number of member-junction in subordinate clause is determined by the determinant-determined (i.e. by the independent members of the sentence) contemporarily (discretionally) and simultaneously on the number expressed semantically, lexically, we'll see

that the verb-predicates of subordinate clause will appear absolutely isolated from the principal clause both from semantic and grammatical points of view- here: "*chaekindrat*" and "*apirebdnen*" - both from semantic and grammatical viewpoints appear completely isolated from the main sentence. In the syntagms: 1. "romle**bsac** chaeqindrat: or: 2. "romle**bic** [ar] apirebd**nen**" the agreement in number does not break; but the thing is that in a complex sentence in spite of its complexity, does not represent a simple mixture of absolutely separated from each other sentences. The verb: "chaekindrat" and "apirebdnen" are in direct grammatical link with the subject "[three (sami)] workers (musha)" in the main clause. It appears that the correct variant must be recognized: "sam mushas chekindrat"; or: "sami musha [ar] apirbdnen"; and this reflects neither modern state of Georgian literary language, nor linguistic tendency. As was noted above, the mentioned phenomenon is characteristic to space of Indo-European languages; with the difference that in these languages the attributive as a word denoting plurality must have influenced the subject too and we would have a construction - [*three workers were standing* "sami mushebi idgnen"]. At the same time, in Georgian scholarly literature it is noted that: "when in a (principle) clause the determinant-determined is given even when the determinant follows the determined (basic norm of the old Georgian) and with it stands close to the relative pronoun, the addressing word is usually supposed the determined" and it is explained that: "correlation is of great importance for recognizing the addressing word: approximately addressing word is the one which has a correlate or equal word of relative pronoun in the main clause. This rule is essential for New Georgian too." [Dzidziguri, 1989: 244-245]. Proceeding from the above mentioned the addressing word which identical (correlated) language variant is morphologically represented by relative pronoun and syntactically by member-juncture, is an ordinary noun and not determinant word. The same situation is in Old Georgian. For example:

"mashin herode vitarca ixila, rametu moikica moguta matgan, ganrisxna friad da caravlina da mocyvda yvela yrmebi, romelni iyvnen betlems" [Matt. 2:16]/

or:

"[gankvirvebaman sheipyra] ... egretve iakob da ioane, dzeni zebedesni, romelni iyvnes ziarni simonisni" [Luke, 5:10].

While considering the complex sentences, the linguist F.Ertelishvili states: "Against the background of [this] semantic link of the sentences there is distinguished specific syntactic connection between the words which apart from other types of sentences is typical only for the complex sentences" and "subordinate clause that contains relative pronoun, connects the principle clause by means of relative pronoun. This pronoun is usually connected not generally to the principle clause but to any of its member - the addressing word. The relationship of this addressing word and relative pronoun gives a kind of syntactic relation between the words within the complex sentence" [Ertelishvili, 1963: 7]. It is a fact that during subordination with relative pronoun, it represents neither equal lexical unit of addressing word of only the principle clause nor member of subordinate clause. It is the most important connecting unit in semantic-grammatical course of the complex sentence and that is why F.Ertelishvili terms it the word expressing "double possessive" [Ertelishvili, 1963:19].

Proceeding from the above mentioned, it is clear what great significance grammatical form of member-junction has, how much depends on it, on the one hand, the structure of the principle clause and, on the other, subordinate clause. We consider that in New Georgian the plurality reflected in member-junction is not justified in all cases. Nobody argues that we deal with the category of number expressed morphologically in the member of a sentence, than the conjunction which is attributed to this member, should be in the same number. For example: "**The passengers who had been sitting at the border of the road were impatiently waiting for appearing of unknown person**"[*mgzavrebi, romlebic gzis piras chamomxsdariyvnen, moutmenlad moelodnen ucnobis gamochenas*].

As to the version considered above by us in which the number of the member-conjunction is not defined in grammatically simulated form (//morphologically marked) form, the situation is considerably complicated and it follows that if we match the predicate represented in the singular form with the subordinating conjunction (with relative pronoun), e.g. "mravali kartveli, romlebic... grdznobdned", the syntax of the complex sentence, as a whole (one totality) and we'll receive a completely unbalanced lingual flatness from the point of view of matching.

The question arises as to what is the way out of the current situation and what position the normative language must take when it concerns descriptive plurality and member-conjunction subordinated to it.

In our opinion, **first of all it should be envisaged: 1) A grammatical form of that word (in narrow sense) to which this junction is directed and 2) The syntactic interrelation of this same member with the main coordinates - verb-predicates - from the point of view of category of number.** The attempt that on the basis of the semantic data the category of number be reflected in the form of subordinating conjunction, considerably changes and violates the interrelations between the parts of complex sentence and makes disproportional structure of sequence (agreement) (we mean a wide understanding of this syntactic notion) within the whole sentence.

In addition to this, it appears that language rule acts differently when using the conjuncture "which". Particularly, in one case it obeys lexical level and the reflection of semantically rendered number occurs in the conjunction ("mravali sakitxi, romlebic...") and the second case it is not interested in lexically expressed number at all. We mean the subordination attached to the collective nouns. E.g.: "**xalxi, romelic** utyvad idga, adgilad dadzvras ar apirebda".

Another disputable issue can be L.Kvachadze's following statement: "If the addressing word is rendered by the connected words, the relative pronoun is in the plural number. E.g. "uxmod mihyvedoda biliks **kal-vazhi, romeltac** jerac carmoutkmeli sassiyvarulo sityvebi uyvaodad gulshi" (Gams.; [Kvachadze, 1966: 378].

It is absolutely unclear what principle of the agreement the scholar's opinion is based on because two-and more meanings equally connected composites require verb-predicate in the singular number and not in plural. It is correct: "**da-dzma** mxurvalad **loculobda**"; or: "**col-kmari** chapikrebuli **idga**. In the "Norms of Modern Georgian Language" it is directly determined that: "the composite in spite of its root composition represents one word; **both from morphological**

and syntactic viewpoints it fulfills the same role as a word containing simple or derived root, namely as a root entering in this composition. This fact is of a crucial importance from the viewpoint of solution of the problem of composites writing" [Modern ..., 1986:149].

In the case when equally connected composite is followed by subordinating conjuncture we again face the contradiction. Here it also appears that we will break the syntax of the whole sentence (complete form) and the basic coordinates of the principle and subordinate clauses which refer to one subject will be the indicator of different number. For example: "derepanshi **idga kal-vazhi, romlebic** gapacicebit **adevnebdnen** tvals yvela semomsvlels" (i.e. I - kal-vazhi idga; II. - kal-vazhi adevnednen).

In order to make it clear what ambiguous attitude exists today from the viewpoint of reflection plurality in the pronoun "which" (*romelic*), we present the schemes in which we make an attempt to define language levels:

I

Iseti shvili, romelic... = sing. - determined + sing. - conjunction

Iseti shvilebi, romlebic... + pl. - determined + pl. - conjunction

*** Morphological level of depiction the number is taken into account.**

II

Bevri shvili, romlebic... + sing. - determined + pl. - conjunction

*** Lexical level of depiction the number is taken into account.**

III

is xalxi, romelic... + sing. -determined + sing. - conjunction

*** Morphological level of the reflection the number is taken into account.**

IV

is kal-vazhi, romlebsac ... + sing. - determined +pl. -conjuncture

Neither morphological nor lexical levels are taken into account while depicting the plurality.

We think that the demurred issue needs the scientific positions of wide spectrum of the specialists by all means and establishing the final linguistic norm. Here it should be noted that for the solution of the mentioned issue the account of the data of artistic-literary style may be not useful because generally from the viewpoint of agreement rather big diversity is noted. For example, the universally spread standard that the word denoting the plural must be followed by

the determined member put in the singular, is often broken in literary style: "*kali da kaci, moxuci da krma, maghali da dabali, yvela ertad adidebdnen ghmerts da akebdnen gmirebs*" (Akaki "Bashi-Achuki").

The absolute majority of the standards spread today in the Modern Georgian literary language is based on important linguistic, grammatical principles characteristic to our language and aims at the establishment of linguistically correct forms. "Georgian literary language has centuries-old history and very rich traditions. It strictly preserves the forms originated in different epochs even today. The unification of the standards of such literary language is associated with the difficulties", - is written in the preface to the "Norms of the Modern Georgian literary language" [Norms of.. 1986:11]. Naturally, the attitude to the question put forward by us will be ambiguous. It is this nonuniformity that forces us to think once more on this theme and to establish the principle which further can be announced as a language standard on the basis of scholarly analysis.

References

-
- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| Dondua K.
1940 | On the relationship of the relative pronoun and correlative word in Old Georgian, Enimkis Moambe, vol.VI. Tbilisi. |
|-------------------|--|
-
- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Ertelishvili P.
1963 | On the history of complex sentence in Georgian. I (the issues of hypotaxis), Tbilisi |
|-------------------------|--|
-
- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Norms of...
1986 | Norms of the Modern Georgian literary language. Tbilisi. |
|---------------------|--|
-
- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Kvachadze
L.
1966 | Syntax of Modern Georgian Language. Tbilisi. |
|-------------------------|--|
-
- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Chikobava
A.
1928 | The problem of a simple sentence in Georgian. I. (Issue of subordination in Old Georgian). Tbilisi. |
|-------------------------|---|
-
- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Dzidziguri
Sh.
1989 | The problem of complex sentences in Georgian (on the principles of conjunction and connecting words), Tbilisi. |
|---------------------------|--|

On the Interaction of Dialogue and Monologue

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/22

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Study of Literature](#)
- [Tamar Chikhladze](#)

The modern novel has created a danger that people will grow out of the habit to read text with interest. However, they have manifested so many interesting peculiarities that fortunately this did not happen. One of such peculiarities we consider different interaction of the forms of language structure - dialogue and monologue, namely as to how the above mentioned forms alternate each other in a modern novel and why the boundaries between them disappear from time to time. It should be noted that this process often creates special concept of time - one of the dominant peculiarities of the modern novel upon which the structure of modernist and postmodernist literature is based.

In the 20th century novel acquired flexibility and developed perfectly developed such form of narration as it is "inner monologue" by mean of which new, complex, non homogeneous personages were created; new technical means, including variety of dialogue and monologue.

As is known, dialogue and monologue are the notions opposite to each other. They represent the means of language structure with the help of which the author makes his personages speak. In the work the author uses direct or indirect speech. It is just by redistribution of thee two types of speech that the author avoids boredom and monotony. The role of a dialogue can be counted to be fulfilled if the reader creates an illusion that the interlocutor addresses to another personage and it does not represent only a pretext of the speech *mise-en-scène*. Only in the case if there is no listener, the author himself appears in the role of a narrator (doer).

As is well known, the tradition of writing dialogues is as hard as that of a novel and epic (e.g. Homer's *Iliad*). There is more than one novel in literature written in the form of dialogue in which the inclusion of sentences simply is simply changed by mentioning the names of the speakers (e.g. Deni Didro's *Jacques the Fatalist*). The representatives of the so-called "new novel" write in the form of a dialogue. As an example we can name M.Duras's English *Lovely Woman* in which the alternation of the interlocutors is indicated only by dashes and typographic symbols: italics, Roman type.

Obviously in such types of literary works there is no room left for narrative discourse; it is completely regarded as a dialogized novel. In traditional novel the author can do commentary to the personages' views and thoughts. The rule of separating the interlocutors from each other by parenthesis is opposed by such writers as N.Sarot, R.Keno, etc.

The dialogues to a certain degree create mimet illusion. In traditional novel their consideration is possible in written transcription of really pronounced words. As to the monologue, it is based on well-expressed condition in which two cases are regarded:

1. In the first case a personage is speaking loudly; at that time the novel repeats the rule of a drama when a personage creates for himself thoughts and sensations and this talk in reality is intended for a viewer. The difference between the monologues in plays and novels actually does not exist but perhaps, proceeding from reality it is more artificial. It is due to the fact that while being alone we address only loudly pronounced monologues in the form of exclamations or short, broken phrases.

2. In the second case the personage does not express his thought loudly.

The use of the both mentioned cases is inevitable in the genre of novel. The novelist has an opportunity not only to describe isolated personage but also "penetrate" into his thoughts. Here we also deal with two cases: the first concerns "true" inner monologue when the novelist takes into account transcription of broken phrases which circle the course personage's consciousness; and the second one - inner speech which forms clearly built sentences pronounced loudly in the mind of a literary hero.

As we have already mentioned, monologue is a means of expressing personage's feelings and thought which in modern narrative literature the word "inner" was added. The latter has preserved the scene function in order to produce dramatization of consciousness at the moment of his "work" irrespective of the author.

The history of inner monologue has been started from the 19th century. Its boundaries and forms were successively changed depending on how scientific or ethic imagination on human psyche and self analysis evolved. However, the roots of modern literature and moreover inner monologue are far deeper.

The existence of inner speech in the novel is possible to be the sign that a creator, conditionally, creates the stream of consciousness with a logical and disintegrated structure or at the time of a limited and exception case, a character forms himself his own thoughts, for example, with foreseeing that he would tell in this or that situation.

The dialogical orientation makes the new and important artistic possibilities in a word and its particular prosaic artistic value in a novel. As to the inner dialogue, it has a subjective-psychological character and frequently occurs at random. The interlocutor expresses his thoughts in imperative mood so that addresses nobody. Such speech, in the literature, is often called a dissimulation that would be described as a dialogue with the imaginary interlocutor who is the representative of a public. The interlocutor is alone in the monologue and speaks with himself, he is the addressee of himself. There are cases when monologue takes the place in the middle of the dialogue. Such case is considered as "Apart" (separated talk).

Generally, a protagonist's inner monologue bears the trace of the author-narrator's view rather than direct speech in dialog. In inner monologue the author does not show personage's individuality any more in the way he did it in a dialogue. While showing the thoughts of the protagonist in inner monologue the author focuses on their essence and not their form. It is considered that intensive alteration of dialogue and monologue is used for rendering of man's subjective world and his tragism. And this is described with exceptional tension in modern novel.

Below we consider several concrete cases when the peculiarities of the interaction of a dialogue and monologue are manifested. It is known that the literature of "consciousness flow" is actually based on the technique of the inner monologue by which the "restoration" of the feelings occur or these feelings are "clothed" with words and take a certain form. Classic writers of the literature of "consciousness flow" James Joyce, William Faulkner, Virginia Woolf and others - the boundary between "other" word, author's remark and personage's inner monologues erased. Therefore the mentioned writers do not use the commas. At Joyce dialogue and monologue are "broken", externally dissociated associations and imaginations coexist side by side. Though, sometimes there can be found the link between certain logic and real plane in the content of the inner monologue. Here is one of the examples: The personage of Joyce's *Ulysses* (1921), Stiven is helping one of the students in solving the algebra problem during the lesson. The events proceeding in Stiven's consciousness, dialogue, inner monologue and author's words do not single out from each other by any signs:

" -Do you understand now? Can you work the second
for yourself?

-Yes, sir.

In long shaky strokes Sargent copied the data. [...] a faint hue of shame flickering behind his dull skin. Amor matris: subjective and objective genitive. With her weak blood and wheysour milk she had fed him and hid from sight of others his swaddling bands.

Like him was I, these sloping shoulders, this gracelessness. My childhood bends beside me. Too far [...] Mine is far and his secret as our eyes. Secrets, silent, stony sit in the dark palaces of both our hearts: secrets weary of their tyranny: tyrants, willing to be dethroned.

The sum was done" [Joyce, 1983:38

http://www.planetpdf.com/planetpdf/pdfs/free_ebooks/Ulysses_NT.pdf : p. 49].

As is seen in Stiven's inner speech imaginary pictures prevail over logically formed thoughts. Dialogue, monologue and author's words are mixed with each other. Manipulation of the narrator with punctuation marks from the viewpoint of comprehension of this or that episode provokes the reader's confusion.

Unlike Joyce, the 20-th century French woman-writer Collete uses the commas to avoid this confusion. Collete's well-known novel *Cheri* (1920) starts with the dialogue between Cheri and Leas. The ways of forming the dialogue attracts our attention. Here the speech of two personages is detached from each other by commas, then by dashes, then again with commas. The inner dialogues are included in them directly. The monologues are also found in the middle part of author's narration so that it does not single out by paragraphs.

The dialogues of the novel *La Chatte* (1960) either turn into inner monologues or questions, which remain unanswered and deepen misunderstanding between the speakers even more. Camila who had thrown her husband's beloved cat from the window, tries to justify herself and says that she wished the cat's death the same way as of a rival woman. Camila is scolding at

Alain that he has changed her for the cat and the cat is an animal. At these words quiet Alain ironically chuckles away that is followed by couple's mixed monologues and dialogues. They talk but continue to prove their own truth only in their minds, but they talk to each other totally senselessly:

" - Saha n'est pas ta rivale, dit Alain simplement.

«comment serait-elle ta rivale?» poursuivit-il en lui-même. "Tu ne peux avoir de rivales que dans l'impur...»

-- Je n'avais pas besoin d'une protestation aussi sérieuse, mon chéri" [Colette, 1960: 150].

The use of commas by the writer shows the reader that this sentence is not spoken in a loud voice. As the majority of Colette's inner monologues, Alain's phrases contain interrogative questions :

« Je veux bien admettre que Saha est une bête... Si elle en est vraiment une, qu'y a-t-il de supérieur à cette bête, et comment le ferais-je comprendre à Camille? Elle me fait rire, cette petite criminelle toute nette, tout indignée et vertueuse, qui prétend savoir ce que c'est qu'une bête..."[Colette, 1960: 156].

The inner discourse is the way by which men's spiritual attitude is manifested. The interconnection between dialogues and monologues appears as an essential condition of showing their thoughts. Using such method the woman-writer reaches such psychological heights that she can be compared with Stendhal or even Dostoevsky. Her novel is not loaded with any didacticism which could be left as a subject of confrontation of personages' voices. Here the narrator can also add his voice. From this viewpoint it is emphasised that the level of "dialogism" which attained by Colette's creativity. The art of constructing a dialogue which adds lightness to the narration unexpectedly provides interesting and essential information.

Colette's novel *The Vagrant* (Fr. - *Vagabonde* 1910) is, probably, the best specimen of novel-dialogue and novel-monologue simultaneously. Also, critics justly consider it a narcissus book by the level of characters, chronotope (time-space) and narrative technique as well as the depth of themes. This novel manifests the problem of the search for one's own self and finding oneself again. The name and surname of a woman protagonist, Rene Nere is the reflection of each other that produces an imitation of two images of narcissism. By the use of monologues and dialogues of the same intensity the relation with alter ego namely occurs. The writer unexpectedly gives monologue the form of a dialogue in which the consciousness of the character reflects the talk to another personage by association. In this case we probably deal with reminiscences as in Proust's works. In this novel, the use of numerous commas, hyphens or paragraphs shows that the writer's style is directed to dialogue that easily pass on inner monologues that are animated by the emphatic expressions such as oratorical question, description of one's own self (the woman-protagonist) in a mirror, double identity of `she` with `I`. Here is one episode:

"Trois ans de music-hall et de théâtre ne m'ont pas change, je suis toujours prête trop tôt. Dix heures trente-cinq... Si Je n'ouvre ce livre... qui traîne sur la tablette à fards, ou le Paris-Sport que l'habilleuse poitait du bout de mon crayon à sourcils, je vais me trouver seule avec moi-même, en face de cette conseillère maquillée qui me regarde, de l'autre côté de la glace, avec de profonds yeux... Elle a des pommettes vives, de la même couleur que les phlox des jardins, des lèvres d'un rouge noir, brillantes et comme vernies... Elle me regarde longtemps, et je sais qu'elle va parler... Elle va me dire: "Est-ce toi qui es là?.. Là, toute seule, dans cette cage aux murs blancs que des mains oisives, impatientes, prisonnières, ont écorchés d'initiales entrelacées, brodes de figures indecentes et naïves?.. Pourquoi es-tu là, toute seule? Et pourquoi pas ailleurs? » [Colette, 1910: 5-6].

This paragraph is rather intricate. The "deeply set eyes" develop sensitive-affected attitude and connotation of silence. The adjectives are literary rarely used earlier. Comparison of the colours creates expansion that holds us away from the description of the face and other impression and forms an opinion on the imaginary environment. The author's phrase is full with surprises. The straightforwardness is false. Form or idea is sought in the depth of the lost time that is characteristic for the genre of autobiography. One must take into consideration Colette's "quoted speech" and related forms placed into its commas called by Aothier "auronemes" [Aothier, 1997:69].

It is noteworthy that the writer rarely uses polysemic or polyphonic narration forms as unsubordinated direct and indirect speech. She does not address traditional indirect speech either. Colette's "others" are the same alter egos. The writer is interested in polyvalent relations that she restores together with "others" by means of fictitious dialogues.

French writer R.Keno is a master of poetization of language games; the intrigue created by him is not based on any real postulates any more. This or that event is unfolding in witty forms of dialogue. The writer's language masterly plays on all concrete levels of speech and sometimes adds lofty style to colloquial French.

The talk about specific writers will take us far. We restrict ourselves to the general analysis and state that phraseological course of the 20th-century writers is directed to a dialogue that at the same time can be a monologue. Monologue that fixes the motion of a soul, the nuances of inflection, increases the tension that the dialogue fails to do in full. It is of melodramatic tone. Dialogue cannot express spiritual attitude of a man. In case of inner monologues sometimes author's ordinary description takes place; sometimes - transfer of author's opinion to personage's viewpoint and often the viewpoint of the personage himself is shown, i.e. such kind of a sentence of syntactic organization that does not correspond either to outer beholder nor personage's perception.

Dialogues often transfer to such form of the inner monologue which are called "cited monologues". This is the manner of narration unfolded in associated-subjective present tense, rendered in the first person that is syntactically regulated but contains more than one sign characteristic to the inner speech of the stream of consciousness.

As we have already mentioned in modern novels psychological viewpoint comes to the foreground. The story is rendered by the author-narrator through the interchange of personage's dialogues and inner speech which are masterly matched to each other. The novelists are skilled to use equally objective and subjective methods of narration, `to say` and `to show`. Frequently, readers receive the direct speech of characters without a mediator, for this they are forced to find out the problems of characters' relations, to understand what and why are anything happening.

In today's books the phrases are long. The use of ligature style of question-answer is noted. The writers express the complexity of feelings through the complexity of form. The interaction of dialogue and monologue has a great affect on its *diegetic style and it is worth of reader's attention*.

References

Joyce J. 1983	Ullice. Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Authier B. 1997	Cahiers Colette # 19. Société des Amis de Colette
Berthelot F. 2001	Parole et dialogue dans le roman. Paris.
Colette 1960	La Chatte. Paris.
Colette 1910	La Vagabonde. Paris.
Dictionnaire... 1997	Dictionnaire des genres et notions littéraire. Albin Michel, Encyclopaedia Universalis. Paris
Guellouz S. 1990	Le Dialogue. Paris.
Maingueneau D. 1997	Pragmatique pour le discours littéraire. Paris.
Joyce J.	Ulysses. http://www.planetpdf.com/planetpdf/pdfs/free_ebooks/Ulysses_NT.pdf

Terms Related to the “Trust” in Georgian, Russian and English Languages (according to “The Civil Code of Georgia”, “The Civil Code of Russian Federation” and “Montana Code”)

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/23

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Linguistics](#)
- [Irina Gvelesiani](#)

The "**trust**" is characterized as an institution of Anglo-American law. Generally, it is irreplaceable in the cases "when the real owner of the property must be substituted by the nominal (trusted) owner for carrying out civil relationships" [The Commentary ... 2001:416].

The classical form of the institution of "**trust**" developed in the 14th century as a part of the Law of Equity. However, the legal relationships similar to the "**trust**" originated in Egypt and Japan (in 500 B.C.) and later they were implemented in Roman law (the 1st-3rd centuries A.D.) in the form of fiduciary relationships. Under a fiduciary contract: "one person (**principle**) transferred property to another (**fiduciary**) on the basis of a certain condition (**fidei fiduciae causa**), which obliged him(her) to use the property in accordance with the terms of the contract and to return it immediately after the emergence of the conditions specified in the contract" [Zambakhidze, 2000:59].

The institution of "**trust**" developed in England during the 12th and 13th centuries. It was known as "**uses**" (or "**use of land**"). The name of the institution specified its connection with the land ownership. At that time, land ownership in England was based on the feudal system. When a landowner (knight) left England to fight in the Crusades, he needed an "acting administrator" for his estate. The administrator was obliged to run the ownership and pay feudal dues. However, the owners would often return to find difficulties in returning their legal rights. The legal disputes between "acting administrators" and owners were resolved by the King. Later the King's power was transferred to the Lord Chancellor. In the 15th century the function of resolving the disputes was delegated to the Lord Chancellor's Court. The necessity of the creation of new legal norms emerged and the establishment of a new institution (which was later called a "**trust**") was facilitated.

Nowadays a "**trust**" is defined as an element of Anglo-American system of law (Common Law). It's worth mentioning, that the main essence of the institution of "**trust**" is the "**trust**" (with the meaning of "the firm belief in the reliability, truth or ability of someone or something"): the trust of the "owner", who entrusts his (her) property to the "**trustee**". "But a "**trust**" is not a legal category. It cannot be placed within "legal frames". The trusted relationships of the parties are defined by general forms of justice" [Zambakhidze,2000: 59].

Nowadays the institution of "**trust**" characterizes not only the system of Common law, but its different modifications are established in the laws of the countries with Continental Europe's legal system. Generally, the process of establishment is complex. Consisting of different stages, it can be treated as a component of the on-going process of the integration of legal systems of the world.

The given paper studies the institution of "**trust**" and terms related to it on the basis of the comparative analysis of Georgian, Russian (the law of Continental Europe) and American (Anglo-American law) legal systems. American law is presented by the Code of its leader state - Montana. It's worth mentioning, that the legislation adopted by the State of Montana is generally called "**The Uniform Probate Code**" (or "**Montana Code**") and is recognized by eighteen states of the U.S. (wholly, partially or with significant modifications).

Montana Code defines "**trust**" as a special form of ownership whereby one person (the owner) transfers property to another (**trustee**) and charges him(her) with the task of managing it. This type of transference causes the "split" of titles and obliges a trustee to manage the property only in accordance with the owner's instructions. Generally, the owner of the property is denoted by the term "**trustor**" (in the law of the United States, a **trustor** is also called a **settler** (a **settlor**), a **creator**, a **grantor** and a **donor**), while "**trustee**" means a "manager" or a "trusted owner" of the property. The ownership transferred on trust is denoted by the term "**trust property**", while its equitable owner is the so-called "**beneficiary**".

The term "**beneficiary**" originates from Latin word "**beneficium**" (**kindness, favor**). According to the general definition presented in the legal literature, it denotes a physical person or a legal entity, which receives money or other benefits from the "**benefactor**". The institution of trust considers a "**beneficiary**" as a beneficial (or equitable) owner of the trust property, which receives income or the property itself either immediately (as soon as the contract is created) or eventually" [[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Trust_law](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trust_law)].

The study of Montana Code reveals the more generalized meaning of the concept of "**beneficiary**". According to Article 72-1-103: a beneficiary is an individual, who receives the property under a special document, the so-called "**governing instrument**". The term "**governing instrument**" denotes: "a **deed**, a **will**, an **account with POD designation**, a **security registered in beneficiary form (TOD)**, etc." [<http://data.opi.state.mt.us/BILLS/2003>]. Accordingly, the category of "**beneficiaries**" is presented by: "**devisees**" (persons indicated in a "will", who receive movable or immovable property under its provisions), "**trust beneficiaries**" (persons who take benefit under **trust contract**), "**POD beneficiaries**" (beneficiaries of the account with POD designation, who receive it under a special form - an **account form**), "**TOD (transfer on death) beneficiaries**" (beneficiaries of the security registered in beneficiary form (TOD)) and etc.

The ownership can be transferred to a "**beneficiary**" during a testator's lifetime or after his death. Therefore, the law of the United States differentiates two main types of a "**trust**": an "**inter vivos trust**" (a trust contract created during the testator's lifetime) and a "**testamentary**

trust" (a trust created in an individual's will). An object of any type of trust relationship is the "**trust property**". It is usually presented by "**tangible property**" and "**intangible property**" (**non-material property**).

The institution of "**trust**" can be found in Georgian law. Articles 724-729 of "The Civil Code of Georgia" present the essence of "**trust**" and parties participating in trust relationships: a "**trustor**"(**sakutrebis mimndobi**) and a "**trustee**" (**mindobili mesakutre**). The property is entrusted by the "**trustor**" only during his (her) lifetime. Therefore, a "**trust contract**" (**sakutrebis mindobis khelshekruleba**) is created. Under this contract: "the principle (trustor) transfers the property to the trustee, who accepts and manages the property in compliance with the principle's interests" [The Civil ... 2002 :185]. Moreover, the specificity of the institution of "**trust**" presents the right of ownership in a "split" form: "some rights of the owner - the management and the disposition of the property - belong to one person (trustee), while other rights - receiving income and profit from the exploitation of the property - belong to another (trustor)" [The Commentary ... 2001: 417]. The motive of a „**trust contract**" can be the owner's wish to delegate the authority of management ("to get rid of " the load of management) in order to profit from the exploitation of the property . In any case, the property must be entrusted in accordance with the trustor's interest. This interest may imply making profit, increasing and maintaining the property and etc.

An object of any type of trust relationship is the "**trust property**" (**mindobili sakutreba**). It is usually presented by any sort of property: "**non-material property**" or "**intangible property**" (**aramaterialuri qonebrivisikete**) and "**things**"(**nivtebi**). A "**thing**" (**nivti**) may be "**movable**" (**modzravi**) or "**immovable**" (**udzravi**), while "**non-material property**" unites all those requirements and rights "which may be passed from one person to another or are intended for yielding a material profit to their owner, or entitling him (her) to demand anything from others" [The Civil ... 2002: 49]. The ownership is managed by the trustee at risk and expense of the "**trustor**". In terms with third persons a trustee enjoys the owner's rights. He (she) is even entitled to make any kind of deal. However, the trustee has no legal rights to sell the property unless the agreement between the parties provides otherwise.

Therefore, the institution of "**trust**" which is presented in the Civil Code of Georgia has specific features similar to Anglo-American "**trust**". The main difference lies in the fact, that trust relationships are created only during the trustor's lifetime (it means that Georgian law is not familiar with the concept of "**testamentary trust**" (**anderdzismieri trasti**)) and are carried out in behalf of the "**trustor**". Accordingly, the concept of "**trustor**" (**sakutrebis mimndobi**) is identified with the concept of "**beneficiary**" (**sargeblis mimgebi** or **benepiciari**).

The institution of "**trust**" which is presented in legal systems of the United States and Georgia differs significantly from the "**estate trust management**" established in Russian law. However, the contemporary legal literature considers "**estate trust management**" as a modification of a "**trust**".

It's worth mentioning, that in the 90s of the 20th century there was an attempt of implementation of Anglo-American "**trust**" in the legal system of Russian Federation. This attempt failed, because the principle of the "**trust**" was alien to the Russian type of civil law.

Hence, this legal institution played a significant role in the formation of "**estate trust management**" (**доверительное управление имуществом**) - a new institution of Russian law.

Nowadays the comparative analysis of the institutions of "**estate trust management**" and "**trust**" facilitates the complete separation and demarcation of these legal units. In contrast to the legal system of the United States (where the "**trust**" is regarded as an element of the Law of Obligation) Russian "**trust management**" belongs to the Property Law. The main peculiarity of this relationship excludes the "split" of rights. Accordingly, "during the process of management the equitable title of holding the property is not transferred to the manager and the interest of the trustor is more protected than during the period of trust relationship" [<http://slovari.yandex.ru/dict/jurid/article/jur1/jur-1759.htm>]. Furthermore, an "**estate trust management**" can be considered as a modification of a "**trust**", which was formed during the reception of this institution in the civil law countries of continental Europe.

"**The contract of estate trust management**" is created by two parties: an owner of the property (**учредитель управления**) and a manager of the property or a "**trustee**" (**доверительный управляющий**). The profit yielded from the actions carried out under the contract is transferred to the so-called "**выгодоприобретатель**" (**beneficiary**). The objects of the "**estate trust management**" are presented by: "enterprises and other material complexes, particular objects (real property), rights certified by non-documentary securities, exclusive rights and other property" [<http://www.russian-civil-code.com/PartII/SectionIV/Subsection/Chapter53.html>]. Money can be an object of the "**estate trust management**". Hence, it can be transferred only in cases provided for by the law.

The terms related to the "**estate trust management**" must be differentiated from the Russian terms denoting the institution of "**trust**". Generally, a "**trust contract**" is created by two parties: a "**trustor**" and a "**trustee**". The "**trustor**" is denoted by the terms "**учредитель траста**" or "**сеттлор**", while the "**trustee**" is represented by the word combination "**доверительный собственник**". The property transferred on trust is denoted by the term "**доверительная собственность**" (**trust property**). Its legal owners are "**выгодоприобретатели**" (**beneficiaries**). In the Russian language the word "**выгодоприобретатель**" is identified with the term "**бенефициарий**" (**beneficiary**). It's worth mentioning, that the Russian words "**сеттлор**" and "**бенефициарий**" derived from the English terms "**settlor**" (means the "**trustor**") and "**beneficiary**". However, all the above-mentioned emphasizes Anglo-American origin of the institution of "**trust**".

Furthermore, the comparative analysis of the contemporary legislations of Georgia, Russia and the United States of America revealed the similarities and differences of Georgian, Russian and English languages. The lexical units related to the institutions of "**estate trust management**" and "**trust**" were demarcated. Therefore, the following general regularities were singled out:

1. The "**estate trust management**" in comparison with the institution of "**trust**" "doesn't

belong to the Property Law. It is an institution of the Law of Obligation [Commentaries, 1995:232]. Its main peculiarity lies in the fact that during the process of management the equitable title of holding the property is not referred to the manager and the interest of the trustor is more protected. At the same time, an "**estate trust management**" is a modification of a "**trust**", which was formed during the reception of this institution in the civil law countries of continental Europe. From the above-mentioned systems of law, the institution of the "**estate trust management**" is presented only in the Russian legislation, while "**trust**" is an integral element of the legal systems of Georgia and the United States of America. In contrast to Montana Code, the Georgian legislation presents the institution of "**trust**" in the "more limited form". The main limitation lies in the fact, that trust relationships are carried out only during the trustor's lifetime. Furthermore, the Civil Code of Georgia doesn't operate with the concept of the "**testamentary trust**" (**anderdzismieri trasti**). The same can be said about the absence of the concept "**beneficiary**" (**benepiciari**), that causes the identification of the "**trustor**" (**sakutrebis mimndobi**) and the "**beneficiary**" (**sargeblis mimgebi piri** or the so-called **benepiciari** . Accordingly, the "**trust contract**" (**sakutrebis mindobis khelshekruleba**) created during the trustor's lifetime is "directed" towards making profit in the interest of the legal owner of the property.

2. The difference between the institutions of the "estate trust management" and the "trust" was reflected in the Russian terminological system (in contrast to the English lexical units). In the English version of "The Civil Code of the Russian Federation" "доверительноеуправлениеимуществом" (estate trust management) is denoted by the term "trust" (as well as "доверительнаясобственность"), while "учредительтраста"(trustor) is expressed by the word "settler" (as well as учредительуправления). These terminological coincidences exclude the possibility of demarcation of the following totally different concepts: the "estate trust management" and the "trust". Moreover, the Russian lexical units "сеттлор" and "бенефициарий" (which is also called "выгодоприобретатель"(beneficiary)), originated from the English terms "settlor" (trustor) and "beneficiary". Factually, all the above-mentioned emphasizes Anglo-American origin of the institution of "trust" and considers the "estate trust management" as a modification of the "trust", which was formed during the reception of this institution in the civil law countries of continental Europe.

Finally, it is worth mentioning, that the change of the state structure of Georgia and Russia (from socialism to capitalism) influenced the legal systems of both countries. New legal institutions were established and these processes facilitated the emergence of the so-called "empty gaps" - the unnamed elements of the system of concepts. However, the on-going process of integration of the legal systems of the world will facilitate the improvement of the terminological sphere.

References

Zambakhidze T. 2000	Trust (Historical Review).Samartali # 1. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
The Civil... 2000	The Civil Code of Georgia. Bona Kausa. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
The Commentary... 2002	The Commentary of the Civil Code of Georgia, book IV. Volume I. "Samartali". Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
The Contract... 2010	The Contract of the estate trust management. http://slovari.yandex.ru/dict/jurid/article/jur1/jur-1759.htm (in Russian).
Commentaries... 1995	Commentaries. Part I. CC RF for business owners. Moscow.
Montana... 2003	Montana Code 2003 http://data.opi.state.mt.us/BILLS/2003mta_toc/72htm
The Civil... 2010	Civil Code of Russian Federation http://www.russian-civil-code.com/PartII/SectionIV/SubsectionI/Chapter53.html
Trust... 2010	Trust Law. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trust_law

Codicotextual Analysis of the Gospel Manuscript (Ath.62) from Oshki on the example of Matthew's Gospel

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/27

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [eka kvirkvelia](#)

Old Georgian translations of the Gospel from the viewpoint of editing show rather mixed picture. The Gospel manuscript (Ath.62) from Oshki has attracted our attention by the fact that the trace of correction is observed on it. It was interesting to establish what redaction the primary and corrected text belong to and what relation they have to other redactions of the Four Gospels known for today.

The Gospel manuscript from Oshki is kept in the collection of the manuscripts at Iveron Monastery on Athos. Its photocopy and microfilm with number Ath.62 are kept at the National Centre of Manuscripts. The manuscript dates to the 11th century. For the first time it was described by Robert Blake. The description offered by Blake almost a century ago is very important from the viewpoint that the scholar had seen this manuscript directly, the opportunity of which we were deprived of. We can judge only with the help of the photocopy.

According to Blake's description the manuscript contains the text of Giorgi Mtatsmindeli's edition of the Gospels; it is written on the 11th-century grayish white, thick and already yellow parchment. The manuscript is not dated. It is supposed that the place of its creation is Athos. For writing there was used brownish ink of bad quality. On the first four pages of the manuscript in the columns the canons of Eusebius and the letter to Eusebius Carpianus are written. The arches are fulfilled with the colors of poor quality (brick-red, orange, blue, violet). The text is written with Nuskhuri script of average size inclined to the right, in two columns, the number of the lines is 19, paper size is 204x160, column size is 132x98, the space between the columns is 11 mm, the manuscript comprises 315 pages, covered with violet leather cover, the last page is torn off, the ornaments are absent. R.Blake supposes that the manuscript preserves the text corrected by Giorgi Mtatsnindeli according to the Greek original in order to create his own version of the Gospel. In his opinion, this could be the text of the Gospel edited by St.Euthymius [Blake, 1932:146].

According to the photo film Ir of the manuscript is empty. As an introduction to the text of the Gospels is written in the arches Eustathius law (1v-5v), the letter to Eusebius Carpianus (6r) and short description of each chapter of Matthew's Gospel (6v-8v). Besides this, there is later inscription on 6v in Mkhedruli script about a bookbinder, Makary Kartveli the monk ("The Gospel was bind by Georgian monk Makary"). At the beginning of the text the words: "First chapter, the Gospel of Mathew. Book of Origin", is done in Asomtavruli script and then it continues in Nuskhuri script.

The Oshki MS of the Four Gospels contains the Gospel of all four Evangelists:

1. 9r-91v - The Gospel of Matthew. At the end of the chapter there is an inscription: "The Gospel of Matthew was written in Jerusalem on the eighth year from the Resurrection according to Hebrew. On 41 year from the birth of Christ".
2. 92r-146v - The Gospel of Mark. The postscript: "The Gospel of Mark was written on the twelfth year from the Resurrection. It is read during Lent."
3. 147r-238v - The Gospel of Luke. The postscript: "The Gospel of Luke was written on the fifteenth year from the Resurrection."
4. 239r-296r - The Gospel of John. The postscript: "Saint John, the evangelist and theologian, have mercy on me, Diagon Ivane"]].

The back page is half torn. Probably, the manuscript had a colophon but it was damaged and has not come down to us. Each Gospel has introduction, short description of the chapters.

It is hard to judge about the manuscript according to the photo film. In spite of this, as a result of closer examination of the manuscript it has been revealed that two people were working at the manuscript, a scribe and an editor. The scribe writes the main, initial text, his Nuskhuri letters are thin and small, supposedly, done in light brown ink, and the editor corrects the main text, erases or adds in it the readings of other edition. His letters supposedly written in black ink are comparatively large, angular and inclined to the left (we have marked the text of the lower layer of the Oshki MS with conventional sign o[#], the secondary, corrected by an editor - with the mark o*).

At the beginning of the paragraphs and chapters large, Mtavruli oil letters are used. Of punctuation marks we often come across colons at the end of the sentences and three dots - at the end of the paragraphs. For indication of the end of the chapters special separation sign is used.

The editor of the manuscript in the main text introduces the changes of the following type:

1. He diligently scrapes and erases the word, in some cases even the whole sentence and writes new variant instead of it (Fig.1.).
2. Reduces body text: erases the letters, words, phrases, sometimes the whole paragraph and leaves the place empty (Fig.2).

Fig.1

Fig.2

3. In text part he adds the word, phrase or letter which he writes on the top of the line (Fig.3).

(Fig.3)

4. If it is possible, he changes the words by shifting the letters or displacement. For example: in text part the word **gesma** was written and the editor changed it with the word **gasmies**[Matt.5:21]; there was a word **daimarilos** and the editor wrote the word **sheimarilos** instead of it [Matt.5:13].

The question has, naturally, been raised as to: which edition the initial text contains, according to what it was corrected by another scribe or editor. Why did it become necessary? Which edition did he take as an original and whether he took into consideration Giorgi Mtatsmindeli's texts recognized as Vulgate.

Unfortunately we do not have an academic edition of Georgian translation of the Books of Gospel, in which the reading of all manuscripts would accumulate. The preparation of such kind of edition has been started by Professor Zurab Sarjveladze. Under his leadership there was created a group composed of E. Giunashvili, M.Machkhaneli, D.Tvaltvdze and S.Sarjveladze. They prepare academic edition of Georgian translation of Matthew and Mark Gospels. It is through the use of the material prepared by this group that we tried to restore the primary text of the Oshki manuscript.

We compared the initial text of the Oshki Gospel (o[#]) with Urbnisi (F), Palestine (G), Jruchi (D), Parkhli (E), Alaverdi Gospels. Of them the first two were issued by I.Imnaishvili [Georgian ...1979], and Jruchi and Parkhli Gospels were issued by A.Shanidze [Georgian ...1945], the changes introduced by an editor and different readings (o*) were compared to Vani (H), Ejmiadzin (I) and Gelati (K) Gospels. The latter was issued by I.Imnaishvili [Georgian... 1979].

The collation of the initial text (o[#]) of the Oshki Gospels MS with the text of Alaverdi (a) Gospel, Opizuri (DE) and the manuscripts containing the so-called Euthymius editions (FG) revealed an interesting picture: it completely coincides with the readings of Alaverdi (a) Gospels; o[#] is not identical to Opise (DE) edition. Also it does not coincide with the readings of Urbnisi and Palestine Gospels recognized as Euthymius Athonite (FG) redaction in spite of the fact that it often follows them. Each of that reading of the initial text of the Oshki Gospel similar to which there has not been found either in Jruch-Parkhli (DE) or Urbnis-Palestine (FG) Gospels coincided with the readings of Alaverdi (a) Gospels.

Below we give examples to evidence that the readings of o[#] and (a) oppose to DEFGHIK readings. E.g., in Alaverdi (a) and Oshki o[#]Gospels we have such reading: *vitara-igi acro ars bche da sachirvel gzai, romeli miyvanebs cxorebasa, da mciredni arian, mavalni mass shina* [Mth.7:14]. And in o*DEFGHIK instead of the phrase *mavalni mass shina* we have - "*romelni hpoeben mas*". We give two of many similar examples:

o[#]a:*vitarcakhilai esu eri mravali garemo misa, ubrdzana carsvlai nier kerdzo*; [Matt.8:18].

o*DEFGHIK:*caisvlai*

o[#]a:*da ukuetueshmaki eshmaksaganaskhams, tavsa tvissa ganevlta; ver mtkicears meupebai misi?* [Matt.12-26].

o*HIK: *vitara damtkicnes.*

DE: *vitar mtkice ars.*

o#a:*xolo ese natesavi verarait shesadzlebel arsgansvlad, garna locvita da markhvita [Matt.17-21].*

o*HIK:*ararait ganvals.*

DE - here this article is absent at all.

o#a:*xolo raita ara davabrkolnet igini, carvedzghuad da shtaagde samcheduri, da, romeli pirvelad aghmohdes tevzi, moighe da agughe piri misi da hpoo mis shoris satiri, moighe igi da miecmat shentvis da chemtvis [Matt. 17-27].*

o*HIK:*statiri.*

E: *sascori.*

D: *sasmeli.*

o#a:*rametu movida zde kacisai modziebat carcymedulisa [Matt. 18:11].*

o*HIK:*cxorebad.*

DE - this article is absent.

o#a:*hrqua mas: romelni mcnebani? Xolo iesu hrqua mas, raita ara kac-hkla, araimrusho, ara cili scamo[Matt.19:18].*

o*DEFGHIK:*vitarmed.*

o#a:*xolotquan zeda ara egre iqos, aramed, romelsa undes tquan shoris didqopai, iyos tqvenda msaxur [Matt.20:26].*

o*FGHIK:*iyavn.*

DE- this article is absent.

o#a:*vin arta amatganman yo nebai mamisa tvisisai? Hrques mas: pirvelman man. Hrqua mat iesu: amen getqv tquen, rametu mezuerenida medzavni cinagidzgodian tquen sasupevelsa catasa [Matt.21:31].*

o*DEFGHIK:*ghmrtisasa.*

The above examples prove that there are many different readings between the initial text (o#)of the Oshkian manuscript of the Gospel and other editions (DEFGHIK). As we have already mentioned the editor in some cases erases the letters, words, phrase, sometimes even the whole paragraph, and leaves the place empty. In spite of the fact that he diligently scratches out the text, in the majority of cases we still managed to restore the erased text and, as it turned out, the reading of the initial text of the Oshki Gospels (o#) are again identical to Alaverdi (a) Gospel. We give examples when we had different reading in the initial text similar

to which is not attested neither in Opiz nor in the so-called Euthymius. The editor of the Oshki Gospel has taken them off from the main text in order to keep it on one level with Giorgi Mtatsmindeli. For instance, in o[#] we had: *da iyvne tkuen modzulebul yoveltagan carmarttasaxelisa chemisatvis, xolo romelman daitminos igi sruliad, tsxovndes* [Matt. 10:22]. The editor erases the word **carmartta**. As it turned out none of other editions (o*DEFGHIK) have it and it is only found in Alaverdi (a) edition. Similar cases are frequently attested. For example:

o[#]a:*rametu romelsa akundes, mieces da miematos, da romelsa ara akundes, da romelsa ara akundes, da romelgha-igi hkopies, vitarmed akuis, mo-ve-egos mas* [Matt. 13:22].

o*DEFGHIK: - hkopies vitarmed.

o[#]a:*da hrqua monata tvista: ese ars iovane matlismcemeli, romeli me movkal, igi aghdgomil ars mkudretit, da mistvis ikmnebian dzalni ese mis tana* [Matt. 14:2].

o*DEFGHIK: - romeli me movkal.

o[#]a:*da sheipqresigi da ganiqvanes gareshe venaxisa mis da mokles da ganagdes igi* [Matt. 21:39].

o*HIK: -*da ganagdes igi*.

o[#]a: *amistvis getyvi tquen: migeghos tquengan sasupeveli ghmrtaisai da mieces natesavssa ucxosa, romelni yofdennayopsamissa* [Matt. 21:43].

o*DEFGHIK:*ucxosa*.

As is seen the editor, on the one hand, takes the words from the text, on the other, adds them, sometimes even the whole phrase in order to level the text with the edition of Giorgi Mtatsmindeli. In this case too the readings of the initial text (o[#]) of the Oshki Gospel and Alaverdi (a) coincide with each other. For example, one paragraph of the Oshki (o[#]) and Alaverdi (a) Gospel is read in this way: *uitar igi shevida saxlsaghmrtisasa da purni igi shesaciravtanishechamna, romeltai ara jer-iyo **chamad**, garna mgdelta xolo* [Matt. 12:4]. The editor added the word **chamadis** later: *misa arcamistanata mat* (o*FGDEHIK) and we get such variant of this paragraph: *uitar igi shevida saxlsa ghmrtaisasa da purni igi shesaciravtanishechamna, romeltai ara jer-iyo **chamad** missa arca mistanata mat, garna mgdelta xolo* [Matt. 12:4]. We have *misa arcamistanata mat* in Urbnisi (F), Palestine (G), Jruchi (D), Parkhli (E), Vani (H), Ejmiadzin (I) and Gelati (K) Gospels too. Similar examples:

o[#]a:*mravaltamrquan me mas dghesa shina: upalo, ara saxelita shenitavtsinatsarmetqvelebitada saxelita shenita eshmakni ganvassxenitda saxelita shenita dzalni mravalni vqmnenit?* [Matt. 7:22].

o*FDHIKDE: *upalo] + upalo*.

o[#]a:*xolo tquenni tavisatmanica ganracxilarian* [Matt. 10:30].

o*FGHIKDE:*tmanica]*+ yovelni.

o#a:*xolo iovanes rai esmnes sapyrobilesa shina sakmeni kristesni, miavlinna mocapeni*[Matt.11:2].

o*FGHIK:*mocapen]* + *tvisni*

DE:*misni.*

o#aDE:*xolo me getyvitkuen: koveli sityvaiuqmi, romelsa ityodiantkacni, micensityuaimistvis dghessa mas sajelisasa*[Matt.12:36].

o*FGHIK:*tkuen]* + *rametu.*

o#aDE:*da ubrdzana ersa mas dasxdomai tivasa zeda. Da moigho xutiigi puri da ori tevzi, aghixxilnazecad da akurtxa da miscapuri igi mocapetatvista, da mocapetamat miscesersa mas* [Matt.14:19].

o*FGHIK: *akurtxa]*+ *da gantexa.*

o#a:*miugo simon-petre da htqua mas: shen xar kriste dze ghrtisa* [Matt.16:13].

o*FGDEHIK: *ghrmtisa + tsxovelisai.*

This and other similar examples evidence that the initial text (o[#]) of the Oshki Gospel and the text of the Alaverdi (a) Gospels follow each other. The ground for this supposition is once more expressed by the fact that each reading of the initial text of the Oshki Gospel similar to which has not been found neither in Jruch-Parkhli (DE) nor Urbnis-Palestine (FG) Gospels, coincided with the readings of Alaverdi (a) Gospels.

In the majority of other texts the initial text (o[#]) of the Oshki Gospel manuscript follows the readings of the Opiz and so-called Euthymeus edition and the secondary follows that of Giorgi. Here are the relevant examples:

FG	DE	o#a	o*HIK
<i>Sada ars, axalshobili meupe huriata?</i> [Matt.2:2].	<i>axalshobili</i>	<i>axalshobili</i>	<i>romeli igi ishva</i>
<i>Rametu shengan gamivides mtavari</i> [Matt.2:6].	<i>mtavari</i>	<i>mtavari</i>	<i>cinamdzghuari</i>
<i>Da aghaghesh sapeseta matta</i> [Matt.2:11].	<i>sapeseta</i>	<i>sapeseta</i>	<i>saunjeta</i>

<i>Acadeac, rametu esred jer-ars aghsrulebad yoveli simartle [Matt.3:15].</i>	<i>jer-ars</i>	<i>jer-ars</i>	<i>shuienis chuenda</i>
<i>Carved chemgan martlukun, eshmako [Matt.3:15].</i>	<i>eshmako</i>	<i>eshmako</i>	<i>satana</i>
<i>Da romelni sxdes bnelsa da achrdilsa sikudilisata [Matt.4:16].</i>	<i>bnelsa</i>	<i>bnelsa</i>	<i>sopelsa</i>
<i>Da romelman hrquas dzmaa tvissa raka, romel ars sadzagel [Matt.5:22].</i>	<i>romel ars sadzagel</i>	<i>romel ars sadzagel</i>	–
<i>Ver gamoxvide mier, vidre ara misce dangisa kotori [Matt.:26].</i>	<i>dangisakotori</i>	<i>dangisakotori</i>	<i>Ukuanaiskneli kodrati</i>
<i>Hrqua saxlisa upalman exoismodzghuarsa tvissa [Matt.20:8].</i>	<i>saxlisaupalman</i>	<i>saxlisaupalman</i>	<i>Upalman savenapisaman</i>
<i>Dzal-gicashesunadasumeli, romeli chemda shesumad ars [Matt.20:8].</i>	<i>chemda shesumad ars</i>	<i>chemda shesumad ars</i>	<i>Mme megulebis shesmad</i>
<i>Da xvalisagan mo-rai-vidoda [Matt.21:18].</i>	<i>xvalisagan</i>	<i>xvalisagan</i>	<i>gantiad</i>
<i>Xolo mezuereeta da codvilta hrcmenamisi [Matt. 21:32].</i>	<i>codvilta</i>	<i>codvilta</i>	<i>medzavta</i>
<i>Xolo dghisa mistvis da jamisa aravin icis, arca angelozta cisata, arca dzeman [Matt.24:36].</i>	<i>arcadzeman</i>	<i>arcadzeman</i>	-
<i>Romel-igi ganmzadebul ars eshmakisaTvis da msaxurta mista [Matt.25:41].</i>	<i>msaxurta</i>	<i>msaxurta</i>	<i>angelozta</i>
<i>Mashin movida iesu mat tana dabasa [Matt.26:36].</i>	<i>dabasa</i>	<i>dabasa</i>	<i>adgilsa</i>

It is known that **Giorgi Mtatsmindeli** (1009-1065) with the purpose of getting Georgian translation closer to the Greek original three times returned to the text of Gospel. This fact has already been attested with arguments and therefore we do not stop on it here.

According to Darejan Tvaltvadze's research, in the Alaverdi Gospels rewritten in 1054 we maintain the intermediate stage of Giorgi Athonite's work at the final edition of Georgian translation when the text of Georgian translations had been compared with the Greek one by him only twice and the process of editing has not yet been finished. Hence, neither Vulgate text has final form because the third and final comparison as a result of which we have got the text recognized by Georgian church as vulgate has not yet been realized [Tvaltvadze, 2008: 12-20]. The same information is given by the scribe of the Alaverdi Gospels: "I have compared with Greek and Georgian Gospel twice. Neither numbers nor laws lack. I did not write the bibliography because the contents fulfill the same function. There's no need to double work. Besides this, the margins of the book would be overloaded. Please, excuse me" [Georgian...1986:212].

As was mentioned above the readings of the initial texts of the Oshki MS coincide with the readings of the Alaverdi Gospels and both contradict to Giorgi's edition. Hence comes logical conclusion that the body text (o[#]) of the Gospel of Oshki manuscript as well as the Alaverdi Gospels, represents the version obtained through double comparison with the Greek original. It should be mentioned that the Alaverdi Gospel (A-484) is not supplied with Giorgi Mtatsmindeli's known colophon. Neither Oshki MS (Ath.62) of the Gospel is supplied with it. This colophon was supplied by Giorgi Athonite to the final text after the comparison for the third time.

The corrections existed in the Oshki MS of the Gospel made us think whether it is done directly by Giorgi Mtatsmindeli. Moreover that it was rewritten on the Athos and dates by 10th century. However, close scrutinize on the manuscript evidence that this must not have been this way. The Oshki manuscript of the Gospel does not represent the so-called working version of the Athonite father. The scribe or editor knows well what exactly is to be corrected, what passage is to be replaced. He performs this job very carefully and accurately without intrusion into text. If this manuscript had been issued directly from Giorgi Mtatsmindeli we would have quite different situation. We would have been able to trace the process editing by St.Father.

As a result of textual study of the Oshki manuscript (Ath.62) of the Gospel we can conclude:

The initial text (o[#]) of the Gospel MS from Oshki and the text of the Alaverdi (a) Gospels follow each other. To our mind, they represent the version obtained by means of two-fold comparison with the Greek original of the Gospel by Giorgi Mtatsmindeli. The process of edition has not been finished yet. The comparison of the initial text (o[#]) of the Oshki Gospel MS with the Urbnisi (F), Palestine (G), Jruchi (D), Parkhli (E) Gospels evidences that it often follows it but is not identical to any of them. Each of these readings of the initial text (o[#]) of the Oshki Gospel MS which analog has not been found neither in Jruch-Parkhli (DE) nor Urbnis-Palestine (FG) Gospels, coincided with Alaverdi (a) readings of the Gospel.

The comparison of the second text of the Oshki Gospel MS with the texts of the Vani (H), Ejmiadzin (I) and Gelati (K) Gospels has proved that editor's corrections occurred already according to the final third comparison with the Greek original. Hence, the second text is identical to Giorgi's edition.

References

Tvaltvadze D. 2008	The text of which edition does the Alaverdi Gospel contain? "Religion", #1, 12-20.
Description ... 1986	Description of Georgian manuscripts collection of the former church museum (A). Vol. II1 under E.Metreveli's edition. Tbilisi.
Two Final... 1979	Two final editions of Georgian Gospels. Text edited and supplied with research Ivane Imnaishvili. Tbilisi.
Two Old Editions... 1945	Two Old Editions of Georgian Gospels according to three Shatberd Manuscripts (the years 897, 936 and 973). Issued by A.Shanidze. Tbilisi.
Robert P. Blake 1932	Catalogue des Manuscrits Georgiens de la Bibliothèque de la laure D' Iviron au mont antos, I, Paris, Librairie auguste picard, 82, Rue Bonaparte.

On Megrelian-Georgian Interferences

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/30

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Lela Samushia](#)

Language contact as the most important aspect of intercultural relations has rather long tradition of study though it should be mentioned that the results obtained in linguistics and related sciences in this respect are mainly reflected in Indo-European languages and again and again less is known in socio- and psycholinguistics of other regions of the world.

The language contact implies contact between various language groups. Hence generally it is the sphere in which comparison of linguistic, sociological, psychological, political pedagogical aspects occurs. Thus, linguistic study of this or that language cannot be limited by the study of a language as a closed system.

In the first place it is necessary to clear up those criteria according to which this or that phenomenon will be revealed and certain place will be given to it. In the book "Sprachen in Kontakt" issued in 1977, Weinreich differentiates the phenomena originated as a result of a contact, on the one hand, spoken speech and on the other, in the language as Lange [Weinreich, 1977:27-28]. Claus Zimmermann offered the following methods of differentiation:

- 1) The difference between short-term and long-term phenomena;
- 2) The differences between the phenomena when they deal with social side of a language, on the one hand, and on the other, its structure. In case of short-term phenomena which covers structural side of language, Zimmermann singles out two factors:
 - a) the mixture as a lower step of which he regards interference, the so-called code switching (change of speech code - transfer from one to another and vice versa) and transference;
 - b) simplification (Vereinfachung). It is the strategy through which communication is reached even during the existence of language barrier. The so-called "foreigner talk" represents simplified form of a language which is used by an individual speaking this language with a foreigner for communication [Zimmermann, 1992:50]. The language learned by this way is called a "broken language", as a rule [Ferguson, DeBose, 1977:108].

In the line with long-term phenomena in Zimmermann we can find lexical borrowings. There is no country in the world where interlanguage contacts have not been fixed. Even where there is no bilingual society the contact between the languages is being fixed in different ways (trade, diplomacy, tourism). The first *Lingua franca* was established as a result of brisk trade in the Mediterranean. There also exist data on Russian-Norwegian mixed language which is used by the fishers. The best examples of origination of languages as a result of language contacts are Pidgin and Creole .

Frequent mass movements, colonialization, and permanent fluidity of borders has established bilingualism or multilingualism in many countries. There exist the countries where several languages equal in rights are functioning side by side with official status (Switzerland, Luxemburg, Belgium, India, Canada, etc.) Hence, the society in these countries is bilingual or multilingual.

Of interest are language contacts inside one society when part of the society is bilingual and another part is not. Such obstacle has place when one language is dominant which is spoken by all members of the society and hence, communication operates in this language. At the same time one part of the society speaks additionally the other language which represents for it L1 [3]. Such facts take place on the example of Kartvelian languages or we have a dominant language - Georgian which is spoken by each individual residing in Georgia and belonging to Kartvelian group. At the same time the Svans and Megrelians speak other languages too, namely, Svans Svan language and Megrelians the Megrelian language.

When we mentioned the language contacts inside one society, we mean social groups being in close relation historically and genetically which are considered as one ethnos, share one culture and traditions which is reflected in every day life and activity of these peoples.

It is obvious even where bilingual society is absent (in the narrow sense of word), bilingualism has place to a certain degree. We mean the subsystems of a language:

- a) dialects;
- b) sociolects;
- c) language variations conditioned by time (language of one generation or epoch).

Proceeding from this a man speaking at least only one language appears to be bilingual or multilingual due to the fact that nobody speaks always in a similar way. In every language there exist dialects and sociolects. Therefore, it is quite natural that a Kakhetian for example, speaks Kakhetian dialect, Imeretian in Imeretian dialect etc. It is clear that different generations speak differently. From socio- and psycholinguistic viewpoint of special interest is transference or ability of an individual, to change speech code in accordance with the given social and cultural background.

This time our aim is to present the issues of interference on the example of two related languages which are in close relation to each other: Georgian and Megrelian. As initial will be contact of Megrelian language with Georgian western dialects: Kvemo Imeretian and Gurian. The fact is that certain Zanizms of certain kind are fixed in these dialects namely which has its logical explanation - permanent contact between languages conditioned geographically. From this viewpoint much has been written in Kartvelology and we do not touch upon the facts which have already been regarded many times // borrowings in vocabulary, as well as ergative constructions such as for example, *katsma movida*, *katma mokvda*) and only pay attention to several concrete morpho-syntactic interference.

In the speech of the people speaking Georgian with western dialects such verb forms are often occurred as: *minavala, naketeba, nakona* etc., that for literary Georgian is incorrect and unacceptable. The thing is that production of such form of a verb is characteristic to Megrelian language, namely these are the forms of the fourth series. There is no fourth series in literary Georgian and equivalent forms of the above mentioned verbs are produced analytically: *midioda turme, aketebda turme, konda turme*. It is also noteworthy that Megrelian is characterized with conjugation of auxiliary verbs, for example, *tasundas iuzapu* [tesavdes ikneba]; *chkumundas iuzapu*[chamdes ikneba]. Such production of a verb is alien for Georgian. Literary language forms such cases as: **albat(da) tesavs; albat(she)jams**, etc. And the forms in Georgian from Megrelian such as: **tesavdes ikneba; chamdes ikneba** represent the calque from the Megrelian; or as we see there where Megrelian uses the forms of Subjunctive mood, in Georgian there is Indicative (the indicative mood) and indicative forms are used. Generally, if we scrutinize closely, conjuncture (the conjunctive mood) and indicative forms are used in different aspect in Georgian and Megrelian. Before we give concrete examples, we remind that the most significant function of the conjunctive mood is the expression of the modality. It is in this way in universally numerous languages. Conjunctive mood is used for expression of real, possible or non real action. Hence, there exist following kind of conjuncture: of real, potential, unreal. Frequently this mood expresses action which indicates desire, wish. Here we already deal with optative or voluntatis function of the conjuncture. The use of conjunctive mood in this aspect is not alien for Kartvelian languages either. In subjunctive sentences the indicative mood is mostly used. For example, **neta movides, neta cavides, neta gaaketos**, etc. The similar picture is also shown in Megerelian: **note kumordas, note midartas, note gaaketas**. We see that in both cases (in Georgian as well as Megrelian) the second indicative is used. Generally the forms of conjuncture are built on morphological base of the relevant series. For instance, the indicative of the present is built on the basis of the constant (**aketebdes - akedebdas**), that of future - *xolmeobiti* (**gaaketebdes - gaaketebdas**), the subjunctive II - interruption (*gaaketos - gaaketas*), etc. Against the background of all this semantic differences still take place while using this or that form in Georgian and Megrelian. As an example we present the following sentence from the Megrelian: **fira komuchasu-ni, kochi ipek**. Georgian equivalent of this sentence is: **puli rom momca, kaci viknebi**. In both cases in subordinate clauses we have one and the same verb "mocema" (Megr. "mochama"). The difference between the verb forms themselves is in the sentences. In Megrelian the condition is expressed in subjunctive II and in Georgian - with broken. If we fit Georgian sentence to Megrelian pattern we will have the following: **puli rom momces, kaci viknebi**, that by itself has different loading, and it is not a semantic equivalent to Megrelian. If we proceed from the semantics of the verb itself, "mocema" is a transitive verb that required active subject and direct and indirect object. In case of our examples the semantic roles of a verb are reduced, i.e. there actually do not exist active subject that realizes the act of "micema". Neither Megrelian **komuchasu-ni**, nor Georgian **momca** do not imply the third person that gives something to the first person. Semantically these forms are equivalent to the verb "kona", i.e. the periphrase of the same is possible as: **puli rom mkondes, kaci viknebi (fara komighudasu-ni, kochi ipek)**. There is one more interesting detail - as soon as we introduce lexically marked active subject in Megrelian subordinate clause, the content of the sentence will change: **tok fara komuchasu-ni, kochi ipek**. Hence, the equivalent of this sentence is: **man fuli rom momces,**

kaci viknebi. Thus, as is seen, if for Georgian sentence the existence of lexically marked subject is irrelevant, in Megrelian the correct understanding of the sentence is based just on this.

For typological comparison we presented such an example in which during the use of analogical forms semantic difference had place between these languages. The observations show that for Megrelian the above construction is not the only one. For it Georgian pattern is also admissible: **puli rom momca, kaci viknebi - fara komuchu-ni, kochi ipek**. Generally, when the language knows several means of expressing something, one of them, naturally, is preferred. In Megrelian we deal just with such case -both constructions are right, but in oral speech the first is used more often, i.e. derived from conjunctive form. Hence, naturally, it is the first form that dominates in Megrelian over the second one and the speaker of this language can construct Georgian sentences that frequently cause semantic misunderstanding. Here we deal only with syntactic interference.

In case of bilinguals within one society Zimmerman singles out two aspects: collective and adscriptive bilingualism. Collective bilingualism implies that the main part of the society is equally bilingual and during the use of this or that language depends on social group, i.e., there exists group A that mainly utilizes on language and group B who is in favor of another language [Zimmerman, 1992:57]. This means that in the majority of cases the orientation to one language occurs consciously by socium in spite of the fact that it has competence in another language. Here we already deal with such phenomenon as linguistic identification. Generally, identification is one of the most important aspects in case of language contacts (between cultures). In special literature we deal with various levels of identification: ethnic identification, social identification, personal identification, etc. naturally, the notion of language identification is in connection with all above mentioned levels and moreover, it is very often identified with the notion of ethnic identification. In the first place, it is obligatory to make out as to what phenomena we are dealing with, whether it is inter-ethnic or intra-ethnic constellation. Clearly, that inside language variations too the moment of identification is also fixed and it is natural. To speak in a different way for an individual is a symbol according to which the identification of this person occurs in various aspects (ethnic, social, etc.).

Of above mentioned constellations (inter-ethnic or intra-ethnic) we emphasize the intra-ethnic constellation because in case of language contact inside one society the latter plays decisive role. At the same time, attention should be also paid to paralinguistic/prosodic level of the language and consider concrete suprasegmental element in the aspect of Megrel-Georgian language contact. This element is "**ra**" which in Megrelian fulfills the role of subordinating conjunction. In Georgian it has the function of coordinate conjunction. Yet, the element is "**ra**" is often found in Georgian and Megrelian as a particle when the question is followed by repeated asking. For example, *ra minda? Raminda da - sheni kargad yopna*. In Megrelian: *mure da, mudga rdas (ra aris da, rac ginda ikos)*. The linguist Iza Chantladze considers that from the onset "**ra**" represented a particle-conjunction in all Kartvelian languages and served prosodic requirements. It is interesting to note that repeated asking in the Svan is always formed by "**i**" conjunction. Hence, it is identical to Georgian "**ra**" particle-conjunction because at the same time the "**i**" element in Svan fulfills the function of "**da**" conjunction [Chantladze, 1998:214].

In Megrelian proper, the element "da" has also other prosodic loading, namely, it is often used in a sentence which contains request, plead and has an expressive character. Its Georgian equivalent in this case will be "ra" particle. For example, *ძოღართიდა, გობვებეჟე* (camodi, ra, gexvecebi); *ქიძერთიდა, ქიუნო* (nidi, ra, utxari). The embellishment of Georgian sentence with "da" element is frequently found in Megrelian speech. The expressive nuance of this particle is so strong that even during the change of speech code (when stitching from Megrelian to Georgian happens) the speaker preserves it in most cases. That is why such sentences are often found while speaking Georgian: **momitane, da; camodi da**, etc.,. Similar cases are especially frequent in children's speech: **deda, gamikete da sachmeli; momitane da puri**, etc.

In connection with the change of speech code the speech of passive bilinguals is interesting to note as to when and in which situation the use of this or that form occurs. In case of Megrelian-Georgian a passive bilingual we would term an individual for whom L1 is Georgian and Megrelian L2. According to observations the change of speech code happens rather quickly and the speech is counted on situation. For instance, the citizen of Tbilisi (with Megrelian backgrounds) who arrives to Samegrelo can easily include in his Georgian speech the peculiarities typical for Megrelian speech especially prosodic elements, including the above regarded "da". In this case, what are we dealing with? Can the similar thing be considered the change of individual's identification? Identification as a rule, and, thus, the notion "change of identification" appears contradictory. On the other hand, it is obvious that by changing the code it is at the prosodic level of the language that coding of individual's identification occurs.

Generally, the notion of identification in socio- and psycholinguistics has not been yet studied in full. Thus, making conclusions is rather difficult. One-sided approach would be incorrect. Each speaker, in spite of belonging to a certain socium is individual and, hence, the research of speech ultimately leads us to separate individual. It should be also taken into account the fact that a speech subordinate not only grammatical rules but it is at the same time is behavior. Hence, when it concerns the identification of an individual at prosodic level we should treat it in the aspect of the same behavior. As far as in such cases we deal not with transfer from one language proper to another but with concrete interference at prosodic level of the language, when the change of speech code does not occur in a narrow linguistic understanding (lexica and morpho-syntax do not change), in similar case it can be regarded at the level of diglossia that was published in 1959 in the journal *Word*. The author tries to describe special form of social multilingual where language variation H (high) opposes one or more variants L (low), or there exists one standard literary language and several language variations opposed to it. The mastering of H occurs through the artificial way (ordered) whereas L is a variation studied in a natural way. Ferguson offers the following interpretation of diglossia in the above mentioned work: "Diglossia is relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation" [Ferguson, 1959: 336].

According to Ferguson the most significant feature of diglossia is the redistribution of the functions for H and L. In some situations the use of only H happens in other situations L is paramount and it is natural. The speaker depending on situation chooses this or that language form by himself and the choice in the majority of cases is linked with symbolic meaning of the language. It is known that various languages vs variations or language forms have symbolic meaning loaded with different doses. In multilingual societies different language groups are found that are arranged with individuals speaking these languages and depending on what language carrier is an individual he belongs to this or that group occurs. Naturally, even inside of one language group the bilinguals are also found. In such case there occurs the construction of such pattern in their speech in which every language has functionally its own place. It is just such pattern that is found in case of Megrelian speaking individuals, i.e. actually we have one society and one communicative, dominant language (Georgian) spoken by all members of the society. At the same time there exist bilinguals as Megrelians and Svans. The above mentioned language pattern is constructed in their speech and both languages Georgian and Megrelian vs Georgian and Svan have their own functional loading. If in case of Georgian and Megrelian we use Ferguson's definitions, the literary Georgian appears the so-called H variant, and Megrelian is L variant because here it concerns functional levels of the languages in the aspect of sociolinguistics, and Megrelian actually has the function of a dialect in sociolinguistic aspect.

Obviously the above listed facts and events fail to reflect in full those peculiarities which manifest themselves as a result of permanent contact of these two languages. This paper is based on linguistic observations of bilingual author. Our purpose is to show at least partially these peculiarities and continue the work from this aspect in future that may solve many linguistic problems unsolved before.

This term was used before Zimmerman by Ferguson and de Bose [Ferguson, de Bose, 1977:103].

²Pidgin - the languages originated during colonial expansion mainly in the continents of Africa and America (on the basis of English, French, Spanish and Portuguese languages). Creol - developed stage of pidgin - functionally formed language.

Engl. Language 1(so-called primary language).

The fourth series also in the Svan and this probably explains the spread of similar forms in Rachian and Lechkhurian dialects of Georgian language

In some languages, for example in German this dialect has different function too. It is used for rendering of other's words.

In some languages, for example in German this dialect has different function too. It is used for rendering of other's words.

References

- Bußmann, H. 1990 Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft. Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag.
-
- Ferguson, Ch. 1959 Diglossia, Word, XV. 325-340.
-
- Ferguson, Ch. De Bose, E. 1977 Simplified Registers, Broken Language and Pidginization, in: Valdman, A. (ed.): Pidgin and Creole Linguistics, Bloomington: IndianaUniversity press, 99-125.
-
- Tandaschwili, M. 2001-2003 Lehrveranstaltungen: Sprachkontakt und Bilingualismus (Uni Frankfurt) file: <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/personal/manana/bilingual/index.htm>
-
- Kremnitz, G. 1994 Gesellschaftliche Mehrsprachigkeit. Wien: Braumüller.
-
- Kajaia O. 2001 Georgian-Megrelian Dictionary. Vol. I. Tbilisi.
-
- Schiffrin, D. 1994 Approaches to Discourse. Oxford: Blackwell.
-
- Chikobava A. 1936 Grammatical analysis of the Chan with texts. Tbilisi.
-
- Chantladze I. 1998 Georgian Studies. Vol. I. Tbilisi.
-
- Weinreich, U. 1977 Sprachen in Kontakt. Ergebnisse und Probleme der Zweisprachigkeitsforschung, mit einem Vorwort von André Martinet. Ed. und mit einem Nachwort zur deutschen Ausgabe versehen von A. de Vincenz, München: Beck.
-
- Zimmermann, K. 1992 Sprachkontakt und ethnische Identität und Identitätsbeschädigung. Aspekte der Assimilation der Otimí-Indianer an die hispanophone mexikanische Kultur. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert.

Beginning of the Migration of Mountaineers in the Western Georgia at the turn of the millennia

 spekali.tsu.ge/index.php/en/article/viewArticle/3/24

- ["Spekali" #3](#)
- [Georgian Studies](#)
- [Natia Pipia](#)

To reconstruct the process of ethnic changes happened in Georgia at the turn of the millennia, we should track the dynamics of migration of the mountaineers in the Western Georgia. In the first place we consider Strabo's (64 B.C. - 20 A.D.) information about ethnical situation and location of tribes in the Western Georgia.

Strabo's "Geography" is a source with several strata. Despite this, the author seems to be inclined to write about current situation of that time. According to Strabo to the north-west of Colchis, from Dioskurias (today -Sukhumi), there are settled Akhaioi, east of them Zigi, Heniokhi and Kerketi tribes. First, Strabo writes that after Kerkets' coast there is Akhaioi's coast - 500 stadia long, then Heniokhi coast - 1000 stadia long and coast of great Pitius till Dioskuria - 360 stadia. He took this information from Artemidor (2nd-1st cc. B.C.). Then he writes: "narrators of Mithridates' stories, who are more credible, say that at first there are Akhaioi, then Zigi, then Heniokhi, again Kerkets, then Moskhi and Kolkhi" [Strabo, 2, 14, Kaukhchishvili, 1957:120]. In our opinion, Strabo's conclusion is correct because this situation is more real in his contemporary times. Despite this, the author mentions Ptheiropags, Svans and other small tribes in the highlands, to the North of above-mentioned tribes [Strabo, 2, 14, Kaukhchishvili, 1957:120]. We see that ethnopolitical changes which took place mostly in the following century (or during the following generation) began. In the 2nd -1st cc. B.C. Jiks (Zigs) began inhabiting to the west of Heniokhi. It seems, that Sarmatian tribes appear from 2nd c. B.C. on the territory of modern Abkhazia because of the incursion of new waves of Sarmatian tribes in the 3rd -2nd cc. in the North Caucasus and in the South Ukraine. It is notable, that Scythian-Sarmatian type of weapon of the 3rd-2nd cc. is discovered in Eshera, near Sokhumi [Inadze, A, 1992:47-48].

Strabo's "small tribes near Caucasus" could be Apsiloi and Abasgi [Letodiani, 1991:6]. It means, that Strabo gives us information about *receptio* of highlanders coming soon in the times of junior contemporaries of Strabo.

Kolkhi (Colchians) lived from Dioskurias (Sokhumi) till Trapezunt (Trabzon) as mount Trapezunt is mentioned at the border of Tiberania and Kolkhida (Colchis) [Strabo, VII, 4, 3, 12 Kaukhchishvili, 1957:100]. According to Strabo, Kolkheti borders Heniokhi to the north-west, probably the border was at Pitius (Bichvinta) or to the west of it. Kolkheti bordered Caucasus to the north, the Black Sea to the west and Trapezunt to the south-west [S. Janashia, 1988:296].

Strabo mentions Kerkets near Heniokhi and Moskhi. S. Janashia thinks that it can be explained just if we locate them in the northern part of Caucasus [S. Janashia, 1988:302]. Besides this, Strabo mentions Apaits, former Kerkets, at the rocky mountain Skidise, near Sans and lesser Armenia. It seems, they lived on the middle part of the mountains, as Strabo writes that in the very highlands of Skidise lived Heptakomets [Strabo, XII, 3, 18, 12 Kaukhchishvili, 1957:203-204]. In M. Inadze's opinion, the appearance of Circassian population in the Chorokhi river inflow may be explained as migration of one Circassian tribe from north-western coasts of the Black Sea because the soil was barren [Inadze, B, 1992:162].

The existence of Circassian ethnical substratum in the south regions of Kolkheti seems real if we take into account toponyms connected with Adiygheian world, but we should restrain from making some audacious conclusions, we know that these toponyms are not attested in narrative sources, so we have no opportunity to check chronological frameworks of their origin.

Heptakomets of Strabo are the same of Xenophon's Skvitins. Skvitins - Shkvitins ("škvit" means "seven" in Mengrelian) are Heptakomets of the same inhabitants of seven villages. It seems, this is a union of seven inhabited villages, which ethnically belongs to Mengrelian-Chani tribes. Mosiniki and Bidzers lived near them too.

As to the inhabitation of Moskhi (Meskhi) on the territory of Abkhazia: Moskhi are mentioned in Abkhazia by Helanike of Mitilen (5th c. B.C.), Palephate of Abidos (4th c. B.C.) and historians in Mithridatic wars.

The river Parthenios where Palephate mentions Moskhi tribes is Koja-Irmak in Asia Minor. So, he mixes Moskhi tribes which inhabited Abkhazia with the Moskhi which lived in Asia Minor in the 6th c. B.C. The fact that Moskhi are mentioned to the north-west of Kerkets means that they lived not in the Abkhazian coast, but in hinterland, in the highlands [Inadze, B, 1992:162-163].

If we trust this historical tradition, we should locate Moskhis in the upper hinterland of modern Abkhazia in the 6th-1st cc. more than in the coastal part, therefore we could explain why Greek authors - Pseudo Skilaks of Kariand (4th c. B.C.), Artemidorus of Ephesus (3rd - 2nd cc B.C.) do not mention Moskhis among tribes, which inhabited from Old Pitius till Tuapse along the coast. Even Strabo does not mention them on the coasts of the Black Sea. Moskhi are attested in the highlands of north Kolkheti by Procopius of Caesarea in the 6th c. A.D. [Inadze, B, 1992:163].

So, we can assume that perhaps Moskhi tribes inhabited highlands of the northern Colchis. Tribes called Moskhi perhaps lived on the territory of Abkhazia, alongside Western-Georgian (Chani-Zani) and Svani population. It means, that the process of Moskhi migration had to begin before antique period (8th - 7th cc.). During this period Kartvelian tribes - Bidzeri, Katarzai moved from the east to the former center of Kulkha (Kolkha) kingdom and Iganiekhi-Heniokhi ethnical groups moved from Childir lake to eastern coast of the Black Sea [Inadze, C, 1992:19]. There is a connection between this migration and appearance of toponym "Mtskhetash" in north Colchis (Kolkheti), in Svaneti [Inadze, B, 1992:164].

It is notable, that the same kind of pottery was discovered in the Sokhumi, in upper Racha and inner Kartli, in Samtavro interment, in the archaeological monuments of 1st half of 1st millenium B.C. [Inadze, C, 1992:20].

Despite this information, N. Lomouri considers that Moskhi tribes never lived on the territory of modern Abkhazia [Lomouri, 1998:25]. In our opinion, even if we ignore the information given by logographers, we can not ignore Strabo's information, because his data are very accurate. We think that Moskhi of Procopius lived not in the north but in the south. In T. Mikeladze's opinion, Meskhi tribes lived in modern Racha and Lechkhumi in the first centuries [Mikeladze, 1974:22].

Ptheirophagi lived in the mountains of Abkhazia, by Strabo. It seems, they settled to the west part, more than Moskhi. It is notable, that Koraxi and Koli are not mentioned in the period of Strabo, earlier they inhabited territory between the river Bzybi and modern Sokhumi, coastal part as well as highlands. Koli must have lived in the lowlands of the Caucasus. We think that Koraxi lived mostly in the north-western part. In M. Inadze's opinion, "small tribes" of Herodotus [Herod. I, 203 Kaukhchishvili, 1975:111], should be Koli and Koraxi [Inadze, B, 1992:159]. Perhaps their name is not mentioned because Colchians name, who lived in the east of Dioskuria by Strabo, covered their names or perhaps they were assimilated by Heniokhi.

In the highlands near Trapezunt and Farnakia, Tibarani, Khalds and Sani lived by Strabo, which were called Makrons in the earlier periods. It seems, these tribes except Tibarani, lived in mountains to the west of the Apaits, Heptakomets, Mosiniki and Bidzeri.

Historians register fundamental changes on the territory of the Western Georgia after Strabo. From the historians of Mithridates Memnon is the first who mentions Sanigi and Lazi: "successors of Kleokhares seeing this... they sat on the boats and ran to the utmost east regions of Pontus; Sanigi and Lazi lived there"[Memnon, XVII, 54. 7, Kaukhchishvili, 1987:46].

As for Memnon, we do not know the chronology of his life for sure. Usually he is considered to have lived in 1st c. B.C. - 1st c. A.D. but as he mentions Sanigs and Lazi, some historians think that he should be junior contemporary of Strabo. In this case it seems that the very first who mentions Lazi and Sanigi is Pliny the elder.

In our opinion, Memnon describes earlier situation, than Pliny, because Pliny apart from Sanigi and Lazi mentions Apsiloi too. They lived on the small part of the coasts, but if they migrated for that period, they had to be mentioned between Sanigi and Lazi. So Memnon would mention Lazi and Apsiloi or Sanigi and Apsiloi. Besides this, it is possible that Lazi kingdom was perceived as united economical space and Sanigi kingdom as different economical and geographical region.

T. Kaukhchishvili thinks that Lazi of Memnon live near Dioskurias. In our opinion, Lazi influence was spread on Dioskurias, but it does not mean that they were not inhabited in the south of it too.

Pliny is the first who mentions Apsiloi in the neighborhood of Lazi and Sanigi near the rivers Astelephos (Kodori) and Khrisoroas (Kelasuri). Thus, Apsiloi must have inhabited Kodori (Tsebelda) gorge. Their territory was reached the fortress of Sebastopolis to the north-west and Svani country to the north-east. As for sea coast, Apsiloi should not have held big territory there [Arbolishvili, 2006:21-22].

In D. Muskhelishvili's opinion toponym which preserved the indication to border of Apsilia and Egrisi (Lazika) is mount Apshara, which is located on the dividing range of the upper parts of the rivers Enguri and the Ghalidzga [Muskhelishvili, 1977:118].

Some historians connect Tsebelda pottery of later antiquity with Apsiloi (2nd-6th cc.), because this pottery seems to be different from that of Tsebelda of early antiquity [Voronov, 1969:75]. We should note that the elements of Tsebelda culture genetically are in close relation with Colchian-Koban culture, and this indicates that ethno-cultural tradition of Colchian population continues [Todua, 2000:190].

The emergence of alien elements and meanwhile preserving Colchian traditions in Tsebelda culture is determined by existence of mixed population which consisted of Lazi and Apsiloi elements.

M. Inadze thinks that Circassian tribes Kerkets that lived in the inflow of Apsaros (Chorokhi) were assimilated with western-Georgian tribes soon but the testament of their Adygheian origin is preserved in the names of the river Apsaros and mythical character Apsirte. Apsiloi who lived in north Colchis, in Kodori gorge preserved their proper ethnical name much longer, besides, they existed as a separated ethnopolitical unit for centuries [Inadze, A, 1992:53].

We think that on the bases of Apsiloi tribes upper classes were fulfilled and because of this their name was preserved, this region, which was part of Lazika was called after them. This was a denomination of economic and perhaps political importance.

Ethnonym Apsiloi and name of the river Chorokhi "Apsaros, Apsari" in M. Inadze's opinion indicates, that in some regions of Colchis Adyghean ethnical groups existed not later than the 4th century B.C. Although she mentions that the names with the root "Aps" have Georgian-Zani suffixes (el-il, ar) and this is an indication that Adygheian tribes co-existed with Kartvelian population and during some period were surrounded by Kartvelian ethnical world. Apsiloi tribes were surrounded by Kartvelian tribes earlier than 1st c. A.D. as their ethnonym - Apsiloi appears in Greco-Roman writing with Georgian suffix [Inadze, B, 1992:162].

In our opinion, the origination of Apsiloi name with Kartvelian suffix is determined by existence of Mengrelian (perhaps Moskhi) elements in Apsilia. It is notable, that after Strabo ancient authors do not mention Moskhi tribes, they are replaced by Apsiloi as well as other tribes.

Later, the name of Apsiloi was spread on the territory of neighboring Sanigi principedom; at first they occupied its eastern part almost till Anakopia fortress (New Athos). It is attested as a part of Sanigi principedom in the 2nd c. A.D. and later became the city of Apsiloi [Inadze, B, 1992:171; Lomouri, 1998:40; Muskhelishvili, 1977:99].

Pliny mentions new tribes - "Sanigi" on the territory of Abkhazia in the 1st century A.D. For some period tribes with this ethnonym are mentioned as neighbors of Heniokhi, but later at the beginning of the 2nd c. the union of Heniokhi tribes which consisted of miscellaneous tribes as well as their name disappears in sources. Sanigi principedom replaced Heniokhi principedom. Territory of Sanigi principedom so as Heniokhi principedom included vast territory. Arryan tells, that Sebastopolos (today - Sokhumi) was located on their territory, and they reached even the river Akeunt (today - Shakhe) in the west. [Kaukhchishvili, 1965:159; Inadze, C, 1992:45].

Memnon mentions just Lazi and Sanigi while narrating about the events concerning Mithridates of Pontus. In M. Inadze's opinion it means, that these ethnical groups were the most important.

To N. Lomouri's mind Sanigi lived from Sokhumi to Gantiadi in the 1st - 2nd cc. [Lomouri, 1998:31], but Arryan indicates very clearly that the riv. Akeunt (Shakhe) is a border between Zilki and Sanigi [FI.Arr. PPE, 18, 11, Kechaghmadze, 1961:52].

In 2nd c. Sanigi held vast coastal territories from Sebastopolis till Akeunt (Shakhe), but in the 5th century they owned just part of that territory from the river Abaskos (Bzybi, Psou or Mdzimta) till Akeunt (Shakhe), and coastal line from Bzipi till New Athen (Anakopia) was part of the Abasgian political unit [Inadze, C, 1992:58].

It is notable, that the "Life of Kartli" ("Kartlis Tskhovreba") mentions Sanigi in connection with the events of 12th century [Life of Kartli, 1959:49]. In our opinion, since 6th century Sanigi were suppressed by other tribes lived in the highlands. Perhaps they lived in the northern parts of the Caucasus, it would explain the fact they are mentioned together with Kashags (Circassians). In 1st c. Tacitus (55-56 - after 117 A.D.) mentions Sedokhezi tribe [Tacit. III, 48, Latishev, 1938:315]. Sedokhezi, in our opinion lived at the mouth of the Enguri, as riv. Khobi of Tacitus is the same riv. Kobos of Arryan, i.e. Enguri. Arryan is the first who mentions Abasgi. "Abasgi are the neighbors of Apsiloi, Resmaga is the king of Abaski, he has received the throne from you too. Sanigi are the neighbors of Abaski, Sebastopolis is on their land" [FI.Arr. PPE, 11, 11, Kechaghmadze, 1961:43]. The river Abaskos (Psou, Bzybi or Mdzimta) at the influx to the sea, is on the territory of Sanigi. Perhaps Abasgi still inhabited the highlands and the river was named after the tribe living at the upper reaches. It seems, Abasgi inhabited the north of the Caucasus till 5th c. A.D. or perhaps at the upper course of the rivers Psou or Mdzimta, and just after this period migrated to the Black Sea coast [Gvantseladze, 1993:26-27].

Abasgi hardly reached Sebastopolis in the time of Arryan, but in the 5th century they lived up to the river Abaskos. Later, in Byzantine period, Abaski lived up to Nikopsia ("Old Lazika" of earlier sources, modern Negopsukho). So, they occupied the whole territory of Sanigi and became neighbors of Jiki. After this just two names remain on the north-east coasts of the Black Sea: Abasgia (Abkhazia) and Jikia (Jiketi) [Melikishvili, 1959:89].

It is difficult to say what kind of coalition was the union of Abasgi and Sanigi. We can not argue what was the language of these mixed tribes - Abasgi and Sanigi. Anyway, in our opinion Sanigi were not replaced totally by Abasgi, we think, that these two tribes, Sanigi from the lowlands and Abasgi from the highlands mixed and the name of Abasgi covered the name of Sanigi, perhaps, because of this very reason Apsilia became the name of neighboring state.

In P.Ingorokvas's opinion, main territory of Abkhazian tribes comprised the highlands of Abkhazia, which included these sectors: 1. middle and upper parts of riv. Bzipi, 2. upper part of riv. Psou, 3. middle and upper part of riv. Mdzimta. In early period, it seems, the center was in Mdzimta ravine and this was called Abaskhi - river of Abkhazians [Ingorokva, 1954:123].

Migration of main ethnical group of Abkhazians from the northern parts of the Caucasus must have happened till the 1st century A.D. A little later, migration of new waves of Abkhazian-Adigeian tribes strengthened positions of Abaski/Abasgi on this territory [Inadze B, 1992: 171-172].

Apsiloi and Abasgi in 2nd - 5th cc. A.D. lived between Sebastopolis and the riv. Abaskos. In 2nd c. this territory was part of the Sanigi principedom, which stretched from Sebastopolis up to riv. Akeunt (Shakhe). In later antiquity (not early than 2nd c.), Lazi tribes of Megrelian-Chani origin took this territory and banished Abkhazians to the north. It is possible, that south-western part of Abkhazian highlands was inhabited by Svani ethnical groups during this period [Anchabadze, 1976:38-40].

At first, N. Lomouri thought that Apsiloi and Abasgi inhabited coasts of the Black Sea from riv. Khobi up to Sebastopolis-Sokhumi and Sanigi lived from Sebastopolis up to riv. Akeunt (Shakhe) [Lomouri, 1968:10]. Part of Apsiloi perhaps lived to the east of the riv. Kodori in 5th - 6th cc. in Z. Papaskiri's opinion too [Papaskiri, 2004:27-28]. M. Gunba writes that Apsiloi occupied territory from Dioskurias (Sokhumi) up to the Enguri and their northern boundary was the riv. Gumista or the riv. Kelasur [Gunba, 1989:140]. Later, N. Lomouri changed his opinion about Abkhazian population in the region of Gali and in the left coast of the riv. Enguri: Apsiloi and Abasgi of Arryan are ancestors of modern Abkhazians but most distant south boundary of their inhabitation never reached the riv. Ghalidzga [Lomouri, 1996:79]. Abkhazian tribes never inhabited the territory of modern Gali region, even at the earliest stages of their history. Gali was always politically and ethnically part of Lazika (Egrisi). At the beginning of 5th c. as a result of gradual political strengthening of Lazika Kingdom, the boundary between Lazi and Apsiloi changed and was moved to the riv. Kodori, Lazi forced out Apsiloi and Apsiloi removed Abasgi [Lomouri, 1998:34, 40].

Perhaps the influence of Lazi (Egri) tribes grew on the north-west coast of riv. Rioni as Argveti was controlled by Kartli. This would hinder settlement of Abasgi between Apsiloi and Sanigi [Letodiani, 1991:9].

In our opinion, no ethnical movement took place, in this case, one political unit covered the name of another one, and population was mixed - Megrelian-Abkhazian, ethnically as well as linguistically since 1st - 2nd cc.

So, uniting of Abasgi with the west Georgian tribes Sanigi on the coasts of the Black Sea began not in the 5th - 7th centuries but in early period, although it is notable that part of Abasgi, especially who lived in mountains preserved their ethnicity and the fact that Procopius mentions Sanigi, not Zelki (Jiki) as western neighbors of Abasgi, indicates that the name of Abasgi covered the names of other tribes of Georgian ethnicity (Sanigi - i.e. Heniokhi of earlier period, Koraxi, Koli).

The boundary between Apsiloi and Abasgi became Trakea, which in historians' opinion was Anakopia (modern Akhali Atoni) on the riv. Gumista, or Gagra. Abasgi moved to the north before 5th c. They occupied territory between the rivers Gumista and Psou. Sanigi controlled just little coastal territory between Psou and Shakhe, across Shakhe lived Jiki [Lomouri, 1998:40; Muskhelishvili, 1977:99].

Later sources (Hippolytus of Rome, Eusebius of Caesarea, Procopius of Caesarea, Justinian, Agathias Scholasticus) do not know anything about Abasgi living on the coasts between Apsiloi and Sanigi up to Sebastopolis-Tskhum. Besides, there is no any source, which would indicate that Apsiloi and Abasgi totally replaced Sanigi. Sani-Sanigi did not move out from their place of inhabitation. In the 3rd - 4th centuries they still lived on the territory where Pliny and Ariane located them. The anonymous writer of the 5th century does not know any other ethnos from Sebastopolis up to Pitius except Sanigi and they were part of the Kolkheti (Lazika) Kingdom in the 5th century. Besides this, in D. Letodiani's opinion, if Apsiloi and Abasgi were neighbors on the coasts, then it would be natural that Byzantine forces would come (?) either on the territory of Apsiloi or Abasgi, not between them. They came on the territory of Sanigi. Procopius is the first who mentions Abasgi on the coasts of the sea, and locates them near Trakea (modern Gagra or Akhali Atoni). Hence, Abasgi migrated from the north Caucasus to the coasts of the Black Sea not early than the 5th century and from this period they inhabited the territory just in the region of modern Gagra or Akhali Atoni (Anakopia). Kartvelian tribes lived not only up to Shakhe, which bordered Sanigi and Jiki, but to the north-west of it [Letodiani, 1991:22-34]. Although, it is notable that toponym "Old Lazika" of Arryan indicates that, once, before Arryan's times, this whole territory up to Nikopsia (Negopsukho) was part of Lazi economic space.

References

Arbolishvili, L. 2006	“Naturalis Historia” of Pliny as the source for history of Colchis. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Anchabadze, Z. 1976	Proceedings in ethnical history of Abkhazian people, Sokhumi. (in Russian).
Gvantseladze, T. 1993	Again about ethnonym Apkhazi and its origin.// Georgian and foreign terminology of denominating “Georgia” and “Georgians”. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).
Todua, T. 2000	Some aspects of ethnopolitical history of the Black Sea Georgian coast according to archaeological monuments of 2nd-5th cc. A.D. // Historical proceedings, #3, Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Ingorokva, P. 1954	Giorgi Merchule, Tbilisi. (in Georgian language)
Inadze, M. 1992 A	Aspects of ethno political history of Ancient Abkhazia.// Matsne, history series, #2. (in Georgian)
Inadze, M. 1992 B	Ancient population Abkhazia. // Mnatobi, #2. (in Georgian language)

Inadze, M. 1992 C	Aspects of ethno political history of Ancient Abkhazia.// Matsne, history series, #1. (in Georgian)
Kechaghmadze, N. 1961	Flavius Arryan, Periplus Pontus Euxini, Tbilisi, (in Georgian)
Letodiani, D. 1991	Political aspects of relations between Abkhazia, Apsilia, Sanigeti and Egrisi (Lazika) in 4th – 8th cc. Tbilisi. (in Georgian language)
Lomouri, N. 1968	History of Egrisi Kingdom, Tbilisi. (in Georgian)
Lomouri, N. 1998	Aspects of ethno political history of Ancient Abkhazia. Tbilisi, (in Georgian)
Lomouri, N. 1996	Western Georgia in the political system of Rome in 2nd-3rd cc. A.D. // Georgian Diplomacy, annual, #6, (in Georgian)
Mikeladze, T. 1974	Proceedings in history of ancient population of Colchis and south-eastern Black Sea coasts. (2nd – 1st millennia B.C.) Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Muskhelishvili, D. 1977	Main aspects of historical geography of Georgia, I, Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Papaskiri, Z. 2004	Proceedings in history of modern Abkhazia, I, Tbilisi, (in Georgian).
Life of Kartli 1959	Life of Kartli (“Kartlis Tskhovreba”), text formed according to every main manuscript by S. Kauhchishvili, II, Tbilisi. (in Georgian)
Kauhchishvili, T. 1957	Geography of Strabo, Tbilisi. (in Georgian language)
Kauhchishvili, T. 1987	Greek authors about Georgia, VI, Tbilisi, (in Georgian language)
Kauhchishvili, S. 1965	Georgica, Byzantine sources about Georgia, II, Tbilisi. (in Georgian)
Janashia S. 1988	Historical geography of the Black Sea littoral. Coll.works.Vol. VI.Tbilisi (in Georgian)
Herodotus 1975	History, translated from ancient Greek, preface and index by T. Kauhchishvili, I, Tbilisi.
Voronov, I. 1969	Archaeological Map of Abkazia, Sokhumi, (in Russian).
Gunba,M. 1989	Abkhazia in the 1st millennium A.D. Sokhumi. (in Russian)
Latishev, V. 1938	Scuitica et Caucasica, Bulletin of Ancient History, #2. (in Russian)

Melikishvili, G. To the history of Ancient Georgia . Tbilisi, (in Russian language)
1959