

How to Cite:

Pilashvili, E. (2022). Attributive Clause in Georgian Language: Based on Guram Dochanashvili's novel "The First Garment". *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 6(S2), 534-540. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v6nS2.2175>

Attributive Clause in Georgian Language (Based on Guram Dochanashvili's novel "The First Garment")

Elene Pilashvili

Department of the Humanities Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University, Telavi, Georgia

Abstract---The given article discusses a complex sentence with an attributive clause in Guram Dochanashvili's novel "The First Garment". The attributive clause gives a broad explanation about an antecedent in the main clause and a complementizer that is related to it. Relative pronoun in the attributive clause agrees with the word (antecedent) in number and is declined according to a predicate in the subordinate clause. Attributive clause is related to a declinable word in main clause, such as noun, pronoun or infinitive. Position of subordinate clause is studied with its subordinators and complementizers in a complex sentence. In Guram Dochanashvili's novel, main and subordinate clauses are related to each other by: 1. subordinators: **rom** [that], **titkos** [as if; as though]; 2. relative pronouns: **vinc** [who], **rac** [that], **romelic** [which], **rogoric** [how], **ranairic** [what kind/type]; **ramdenic** [how many]; 3. relative adverbs: **sadac** [where], **saidanac** [from where] and **is**, **igi** [he/she/it], **iseti** [such s] are used as correlatives. Complementizers – **rom** [that] (from relative pronouns), **romelic** [which/that/who] (from relative pronoun) and **sadac** [where] (from relative adverbs) are frequently used to join main and subordinate clauses together. There are no writing deviations within this construction in the novel. It should be mentioned that the discussed construction is a sophisticated syntactic and stylistic means to convey ideas.

Keywords---attributive clause, hypotactic construction, main, subordinate, syntax.

To the research of Georgian sentence has a long history. It begins from Anton I grammar. From that time the peculiarities of Georgian sentence had permanently studied. The grammarians indicate that the sentence as the sentence as the objection, in different languages is created with different remedies. In general,

there are three remedies of expressing the sentence: **1. Affixes expressing the subordination; 2. Position of the words; 3. Intonation.**

Consequences from here, the main signs of the sentence are: organized connection, Predictability, semantic and intonation completeness, structural integrity (Britsyn et al., 2021). It is traditionally deemed, that according the structure the sentence is simple, with homogeneous parts and complex (Guram Dochanashvili, 1975). This last one is two kinds of: compound (Parataxic construction) and complex (Hypotactic construction). The principal and organizing center of these three kinds of sentences is the verb-predicate. It determines the structure and the construction of the sentence (Culicover & Jackendoff, 2006; Farooq et al., 2013). The principal or not-principal clauses of the sentence place around it (Geguchadze, 2005).

Hypotactic construction is made up of two clauses – main and subordinate, where “the main clause is dominant, independent and another is subordinate upon a main clause” (Kvatchadze, 1996). According to the syntactic function, there are different kinds of subordinate clauses. Their classification is based on sentence members. Syntactic function of subordinate clause is equated to the function of sentence member (Larson et al., 2006; McColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2002). Consequently, there were identified various types of the subordinate clauses: subjective clause, objective clause, attributive clause, adverbial clause, conditional clause, consecutive clause, concessive clause and others (Kaffashi et al., 2015). Though, there is no exact identification between the kinds of subordinate clauses and sentence members” (Kvatchadze, 1996).

The goal of our research is to study and analyze an attributive clause, one of the types of hypotactic constructions, in Guram Dochanashvili’s novels (Zhang & Fontaine, 2020; López-Couso & Méndez-Naya, 2015). The attributive clause is defined as follows: attributive clause serves as an attribute to a noun or a pronoun. This noun or pronoun is called the antecedent of the clause” (Kvatchadze, 1996).

The attributive clause gives a broad explanation about an antecedent in main clause. Relative pronoun in attributive clause agrees with the word (antecedent) in number and is declined according to a predicate in subordinate clause (Pustejovsky, 1991; Cinque, 2004). Declinable word in main clause, which can be expressed by a noun, a pronoun or an infinitive, is attributed by an attributive clause (Schmidt-Schauß & Smolka, 1991).

In Guram Dochanashvili’s novels, main and subordinate clauses are related to each other by: 1. subordinators: **rom** [that], **titkos** [as if; as though]; 2. relative pronouns: **vinc** [who], **rac** [that], **romelic** [which], **rogoric** [how], **ranairic** [what kind/type]; **ramdenic** [how many]; 3. relative adverbs: **sadac** [where], **saidanac** [from where] and **is, igi** [he/she/it], **iseti** [such as] are used as correlatives.

Generally, complex sentences include so-called pair words, a correlative word, which is in the main clause and a subordinator that locates in the subordinated one. These words join clauses together (Burchuladze, 2014). Correlative words do not alternate freely in the hypotactic construction. Their compatibility with a

subordinate clause is determined (Ertelishvili, 1962). It is interesting to observe these subordinating conjunctions in the novel of a modern, outstanding writer Guram Dochanashvili.

Attributive clause with subordinating conjunctions:

rom [that]:

“is kaci, kochlobit rom uakhlovdeboda, pataraobisas pekhebs hbanda” [“The man, that is approaching with a limp, washed him his feet”];

“im kakis shvilia, kargad rom ukravs” [“He is the son of that man, who plays well”].

“is sachmelits genatrebodes ikneba, ghorebs rom daukri” [“You may miss the meal, that are for pigs”].

“ai, iseti rameebi hkitkhet, rom daibnes” [“Ask him such questions, that will embarrass him”];

“raghats aris am mcenareshi iseti, rom tkhebi da ghorebi ar tchamen” [There is something special in the plant, that pigs and goats don’t eat them”]

“tu geguleba vinme iseti, chemsavit bevri ram rom icodes” [“If you know somebody, that knows as much as me”].

titkos [as if]:

“martla isetia, titkos gveli shevardao budeshi” [It looks so, as if a snake slipped in a nest”];

“iseti shtabetchdileba iko, titkos lamazad tovda” [“There was such an atmosphere, as if it snowed beautifully”].

In Georgian language, the following subordinators are engaged in attributive clauses: **tuki** [if], **sanam** [till/until] and **vitom** [as if], though they were not found in the novel.

Attributive clause with relative pronouns:

vinc [who]:

“is katsi shevartskhvine, vinc tqventan ertad kidev dalios” [Shame on the man, who will drink wine with again”];

“Manuelo kosta ert-erti iko im rcheul khuttagan, vinc shemdgom didi konoduseli gakhda” [“Manuelo Costa was one of the five prominent men, who became famous”];

“khis sanatsvlod im kacs uknevda, vinc daakcia da gaaubedura” [“She was beating the man, who destroyed and made her miserable”].

rac [that/whatever]:

rac ki tikhis churtcheli hkondat, garet gamozides da micaze daalages glekhebmā” [“All the pottery that they owned, the peasants took away and put on the land”].

romelic [which/that/who]:

“neba mometsit tsarmogidginot kmatsvili, romelic amoisvara” [“Let me present the adolescent, who got dirty”];

“gaotsebulma domenikom tvali gaakola orives da ver sheamchnia katsi, romelic saguldagulod akvirdeboda sakhlebs” [“An astonished Domeniko looked at them and didn’t notice the man, who was staring at the houses around”];

“mere orma shikrikma moikvana brdzeni karaveli, romelic chkuita da sazrianobit iko gantkmuli da khalkhis tsin daakena” [“then two handers took a

wise Karaveli, who was famous for his brightness and let him stood in front of the crowd”].

rogoric [as/like]:

“*da Dulio, **rogoric iko**, mosaghamovebulze shinidan gamovida*” [“And Dulio, as he was at home, went out from the house in the evening”];

“*nacionalur tansacmelshi gamotskobili, ighliashi amochrili kokhta djokhit, shinidan gamovida scored iseti, **rogoric iko***” [“he went out from the house dressed in national clothes, with a stick in hand, exactly **as he was at home**”];

“*iset mtchevrmetskvel kacac ki, **rogoric es tqvena khart**, djer ar ulaparaknia, ase kargad, ase brtckinvaled*” [“Even you, as an eloquent man, has never spoken so well, so brilliantly”].

ramdenic [as much as/as many as]:

“*ramdenic ginda, imdeni vilaparakot*”; [“We can talk as much as you like”];

“*idrove, iglove, **ramdenic ginda***” [“mourn as much as you want”];

“*ramdenic unda vechichino, is mainc iseti ikneba, **rogoric aris***” [“No matter how much I talk with him, he will still be same as he is now...”].

Attributive clause with relative adverbs:

sadac [where]:

“*is niadagi, **sadac mcnare-mtacebeli izrdeba**, cudia*” [The soil, where the carnivorous plants raise, is not suitable”];

“*ufro aeshala saghergheli, sophels miasherda, **sadac sachmeli unda eshova***” [“he became more eager and stared at the village, where he would have found some food”];

“*is kvekana tu ginakhavs, **sadac titkmis arapheri kharobs da sazrdostvis dghedagham shromoben***” [Have you ever seen the country, where there is almost impossible to raise something and people work all day and all night to get some food?”];

“*akhla ki, akhla ki a **is** kalaki gvedzakhis turme, **sadac sakutari tavis baton-patroni ikneba kvela***” [“and now.. and now, that country invites us, where everyone would be able to control his or her belongings”].

saidanc [where]:

“*khandakhan romelime chvengani uecrad gacherdeboda, adgilze shetrialdeboda, gachimuli kefit enartskheeboda micas da tavi gverdze gadauvardeboda, ghia tvalebs ki titkos **im** adgilebs aridebda, **saidanac es gasheshebuli isari isroles**, akhla, mkerdidan umotskalod rom amozrdoda*” [“Sometimes one of us suddenly stopped, turned and fell on the ground, and tried to avoid his widely opened eyes **from the places, where the arrow had been shot from**”].

Using attributive clauses with null complementizer is very rare in our study material; in complex sentences, though, the sequence of components in clauses without subordinators is determined– main clause is always followed by subordinate one. For example:

“*mere majashi **iseti** tkivili igrdzno, **tvalt daubnelda***” [“He felt such a terrible pain in the wrist, [that] it made him blind for a while”];

“***iseti** qali shegrto, **sheni motsonebuli***” [“I’ll help you marry the woman, you deserve”];

“*shen ki gaiqe da aim qvebtan **iseti** tsetskhli gaachaghe, **casa scvdebodes***” [“Now, run up to the stones and build the fire, [that] will reach the sky”];

“[mtskemsma] iseti zghartani gaadina, napirze darchenil bavshvebs mieshkhhepa tskali” [[The Shepherd] flopped so in the water, the children on the coast got splashed”];

“iseti kriala cheqmebi ecva, sul atinati gadasdioda” [“his boot were so clean and polished, they were shining”].

It should be mentioned that in Guram Dochanashvili’s novel, main and subordinate clauses are mostly joined to each other by using following complementizers: **rom** [that] (a subordinating conjunction), **romelic** [which/that] (a relative pronoun) and **sadac** [where] a relative adverb. As a complementizer, a relative pronoun and a relative adverb are regarded to be members of a sentence in a dependent clause and connect it to the main one. They are related to predicate in a subordinate clause. Besides, relative pronouns can also be related to any member in complex sentence, as they can be used in different grammatical cases. Based on the study, subordinating conjunction **romelic** [who] has turned out to be one of the most productive relative pronouns in Dochanashvili’s works, and it was mostly used by the plural-forming affix – ‘**eb**’:

“igi gastskeroda soflelebs, roml-eb-ic mdzimed adiodnen aghmartshi” [He looked at the residents of the village, who were walking up the hill with great difficulty”].

“droadro alersianad sheekhianeboda stumrebs, roml-eb-sac nakhevartsred shemoetskot skamebi da agizgizebul bukhartan thebodnen [from time to time to talked with the guests, who lined the chairs with fireplace”]. It should worth mentioning that the relative pronoun **romelic** [who/which] formed by plural-forming affixes - **nar**, **tan** [same as *with*] was not found in Dochanashvili’s novel.

In our study material, complementizer **romelic** [which/who] is used in all grammatical cases besides instrumental, adverbial and vocative ones. Relative pronouns can be found in the following grammatical cases:

In nominative case: *“me mkavda erti amkhanagi, romel-i-c amastanave khelovani iko”* [I had a friend, who was also an artist”]; *“jer ar gamougoniati iseti fuli, romel-i-c vinmesi ikos”* [No one has made the money yet, which belongs to any one”].

In ergative case: *“Kumeos ferma gadakhra da sheshinebuli ukurebda akhovan Mikelas, romel-m-ac kheli chamoartva da adgilze daabrana”* [Kumeo became pale and was looking at Mikela, who shook his hand and returned to his own place”. *“zizghit akhsendeboda juja Umberto, romel-m-ac oriode dghis ukan utkhra salami – gamarjoba”* [He remembered homuncular Umberto with great disdain, who greeted him two days before”].

In dative case: *“zogi mcenare, romel-s-ac sazrdo ar hkopnis, mtatseblad iktseva”* [Some plants, which/that has no enough nutrients, become carnivore”]. *“shemovida katsi, romel-s-a-ts tsina kbilebi ar hqonda”* [a man entered the room, who didn’t have from teeth”].

In genitive case: *“uceb Silvias miubruna, roml-is tsinashec aqamde zurgit idga”* [Suddenly she turned toward Silvia, who she was standing with her back turned with”]; *“da utseb laparakshi sruliad utskho khma chaeria, roml-is patronmac dzalian tsudad icoda gramatika”* [“And, suddenly an unfamiliar voice was heard in their conversation, whose owner didn’t know the grammar at all”].

In Guram Dochanashvili’s novel, besides correlatives, we find relativizer words in the main clause of a complex sentence. There is always have a syntactic relation to each other, for instance: **iset-i – rogor-c**, **iset-ma rogor-mac**, **iset-i**

romel-ic [in English - **so that; such as**] and many others. Syntactically, relativizer is related to two members of sentence: it agrees with the member of main clause it is related to and in grammatical case, it agrees with a sentence member, it is related to syntactically (Kvatchadze, 1996).

It is common that the position of subordinate clause is not determined in the hypotactic construction. Subordinate clause can be placed before or after the main clause, or it can be inserted in it (Kvatchadze, 1996). Based on our study material we can conclude that mostly, an adverbial clause follows the main one, or is inserted in it; though we have also found few examples, when the subordinate clause was followed by the main clause.

1. **Subordinate clause is followed by main clause:** *ramdenic ginda, imdeni vilaparakot* [We can talk as much as you like].
2. **Main clause is followed by a subordinate one:** *titi miabjina Duiliom Kumelios, romelic emaleboda* [Dumilio touched Kumelio, who was hiding]; *is kaci shevarckhvine, vints tqventan ertad kidev dalios* [Shame on the man, who will drink wine with you again];
3. **Subordinate clause is inserted in the main clause:** *tetrad motitkhnlili jambazi, romelsac axla, sibneleshi nacriferi dahkravda, mitsaze ijda* [“The clown painted in white, who had a grey color now, was sitting on the ground”]; *im adgilebshi, sada-c es namdvili ambavi mokhda, siskhlis agheba, es ugunuri cesi, aucileblobad da vazhkacobad itvleboda* [On the place, **where this real story happened**, the silliest tradition of blood feud, was considered legitimate and it was an expression of courage].

Based on the study material, in a complex sentence with an attributive clause, predicates in main and subordinate clauses agree with each other in the same grammatical tense (present, past or future), though, predicates can also be presented in different tenses. Thus, we can conclude that a complex sentence with an attributive clause is quite frequently used and consequently has an important role in Guram Dochanashvili’s novel. Complementizers – **rom** [that] (from relative pronouns), **romelic** [which/that/who] (from relative pronoun) and **sadac** [where] (from relative adverbs) are mostly used to join main and subordinate clauses together. There are no writing deviations within this construction in the novel. It should be mentioned that this construction is a sophisticated syntactic and stylistic means to convey ideas.

References

- Britsyn, V., Sukalenko, T., Ladyniak, N., Kaleniuk, S., & Zhelyazkova, V. (2021). Modern tendencies of development of norms of Ukrainian language. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 102-113. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1653>
- Burchuladze, T. (2014). *hipotaksis sakitkhebi kartulshi* [Some Tasks of Hypotaxis in Georgian]. Institute of Linguistics Publisher, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
- Cinque, G. (2004). Issues in adverbial syntax. *Lingua*, 114(6), 683-710. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(03\)00048-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(03)00048-2)

- Culicover, P. W., & Jackendoff, R. (2006). The simpler syntax hypothesis. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 10(9), 413-418.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.07.007>
- Dzidziguri, S. (1973). K'avširebi kartul enaši ('Conjunctions in Georgian').
- Ertelishvili, P. (1962). *rtuli tsinadadebis istoriisatvis kartulshi, I, hipotaksis sakitkhebi* [History of Complex sentence in Georgian, I, Hypotaxis], Tbilisi (in Georgian).
- Farooq, V., Van Klaveren, D., Steyerberg, E. W., Meliga, E., Vergouwe, Y., Chieffo, A., ... & Serruys, P. W. (2013). Anatomical and clinical characteristics to guide decision making between coronary artery bypass surgery and percutaneous coronary intervention for individual patients: development and validation of SYNTAX score II. *The Lancet*, 381(9867), 639-650.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)60108-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60108-7)
- Geguchadze, L. (2005). *mtskrivta shesadzlo shefardebisa da drota tanmimdevrobis sakitkhi hipotaksur konstruktshiashi* [screeves and tense correlation in hypotactic construction] Tbilisi (in Georgian).
- Guram Dochanashvili (1975). "The First Garment". Nakaduli Publishing, Tbilisi (in Georgian)
- Kaffashi, M., Gowhary, H., Jamalinesari, A., & Azizifar, A. (2015). A Contrastive Study of Relational attributive Clauses in Narrative Texts in English and Persian Based on. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 156-165.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.023>
- Kvachadze, L. (1996). *tanamedrove kartuli enis sintaksi* [Syntax of Modern Georgian]. Rubikoni, Tbilisi, 1996 (in Georgian).
- Larson, E. T., O'Malley, D. M., & Melloni Jr, R. H. (2006). Aggression and vasotocin are associated with dominant-subordinate relationships in zebrafish. *Behavioural brain research*, 167(1), 94-102.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2005.08.020>
- López-Couso, M. J., & Méndez-Naya, B. (2015). Secondary grammaticalization in clause combining: From adverbial subordination to complementation in English. *Language Sciences*, 47, 188-198.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2014.07.003>
- McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Anderson, R. D. (2002). Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance. *The leadership quarterly*, 13(5), 545-559. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00143-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00143-1)
- Pustejovsky, J. (1991). The syntax of event structure. *cognition*, 41(1-3), 47-81.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(91\)90032-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(91)90032-Y)
- Schmidt-Schauß, M., & Smolka, G. (1991). Attributive concept descriptions with complements. *Artificial intelligence*, 48(1), 1-26.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702\(91\)90078-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702(91)90078-X)
- Zhang, C., & Fontaine, L. (2020). A functional approach to OM-constructions. *Lingua*, 242, 102867.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102867>