

Concept of System and Structure in Georgian Linguistics

Abstract: In the eastern and western Georgian speeches, the change of **structural** elements (in most cases) does not give us possibility to talk about **systemic** differences. Accordingly, there are no linguistic ground for the theory of existence of three or four Kartvelian language systems. There are no proofs to consider Megrelian-Laz or Svanetian languages as **independent language systems, there is no ground to prove that those speeches are out of Common Kartvelian system from systemic** (and **structural**) perspective.

Keywords: Worldview, Vocative, Mother-in-law, Dedamtili, Diantili, Damtire, Dimtil, Father-in-law, Mamamtili, Muantili, Mtiri, Mimtil.

Many interesting works were granted to Kartvelology due to historical-comparative method and its main tool, sound correspondence during last centuries. At the same time, in the assumption raised in the 50s of XIX century, that the language is the worldview was unacceptable for the Bolshevik Ideology, as 1. There was no people in it and 2. It was created in the capitalistic world.

Soviet linguistics put forward the factors of comprehension, communication while explaining the purpose of the language and forgot the process of generating an opinion by linguistic system corresponding to the “worldview”. As a result, for Mari, Deters, Schuchadt... if any Karvelian oral speech was different by any component from the Literary Language, it was declared as an independent linguistic unit and linguistic system data were left without attention. It was how the concept of Kartvelian languages was established, which is false “theory” from the beginning¹.

¹ **Remark:** In 1910 Niko Marr published its “Grammatical analysis of Chanian language”, which is the example of talented superficiality. He had not the linguistic work by I. Kipidze “Megrelian Grammar” with the texts and dictionary, which was published in 1914. Regardless this fact, N. Marr makes a decision that Chanian (Lazian) is a

Any living and non-living formation in the world consists of two components, such as the **system** of composition and the **structural material** it is made from. For illustration different types of examples are applied. What is a stone made of and what is the ground for being so firm? What are the components it is made of and which are the components of the tree and how those components are linked to each other? And finally, on one hands, the anatomic parts of the human and on other hands the interaction between those parts. To summarize, the system and structure are not distinguished, what is the reason of many inaccuracy in case of qualification of the linguistic material.

It can be referred to many linguistic examples to demonstrate the different meaning of the systemic and structural concepts, morphemic-syntactic element, which was included in the list of the cases by Akaki Shanidze by the name of “vocative case”. It is not the part of the sentence and is not able to establish the syntactic relationship with any other parts of the sentence. Accordingly, it cannot be the example of the changing form of the noun and can not be included in the list of the cases. Varlam Topuria had a critical opinion about it. It is interesting, that Megrelian-Lazian and Svanetian speeches have no “Vocative case”. It **structural** the root, as for systemic point of view, gives form of the addressing, it is separated from a sentence.

Morphological example – The categories of demonstration and orientation in the literary language and eastern speeches are presented by the three-member’ structure of “it” (ეს, ეგ, ის). Megrelian speech preserved the root, two-member form - თუნა, თონა (Currently, there is the process of developing third member - თუნა, ეთონა, თონა.) All Kartvelian speech meets the **system requirement** similarly. They create **structural** elements. It shall be noted that, there is a systemic unity of the demonstrative pronoun form changing and at the same time, difference of the structure. The literary language has presents substitutive roots during changing of the form (ის, მან...), while Megrelian speech preserves the forms with one root (თონა, თოქ, თის).

separate language. After that in the 60s of the last century, some of the linguists shared the opinion of N. Marr by neglecting of system issues and turned three-member’ Kartvelian language family into four-member one without any ground.

Vocabulary gives many examples for demonstrating interrelationship between the system and structure. From the vocabulary related to the kinship the following formation looks quite interesting, **დედამთილი, დიანთილი, დამთირე, დიმთილ; მამამთილი, მუანთილი, მთირი, მიმთილ**. There is full similarity in terms of the **word-formation by a system**, all the forms is based on two-rooting. Lazian **Mtiria** is an exception, which is simplified due to Turkish influence. According to the Structure, there are different opinion on **Mtir** and **Mtil** forms (see, Kipshidze, Chikobava, Fenkhi, Sarjveladze); It can be assumed that I. **Kipshidze** though that **მთირი (>მთილი)** element is originated from **თირუს** which sounded like true (comp. Chikobava 1938: 39). The meaning of terms supports to it **დიანთილი, დამთირე . . . „the substitute of a mother”**. **Structural changes** have the phonetical character, what is easy to explain. Such terms have double meaning in the Megrelian-Lazian and Svanetian speeches - **დიანთილი** and **დინთილია... is used as mother-in-law and father-in-law**. As for the system **სიდედრი, სიმამრი** were formed later. The initial forms are preserved in Megrelian-Lazian-Svanetian. Compare with “Vefkhistkaosani”, where spirit and smell has the same form “Suli”, which is preserved in Megrelian speech, like **შური** what means both spirit and smell.

One more fact needs to be considered, as it is known realization of the linguistic systems takes place into two forms, by the **written** and **oral** speech. It is very rare that any of them caused the systemic changes. Systemic elements are changed in the oral speech. In addition, all the forms of the oral speech is based on the respective geographical (residential) environment, the phonetic rules which is characterized or accustomed to it. Svanetian, Khevsurian, Tushetian speeches are good examples for it, as they are characterized by removal of the final vowel from the word due to strong stress on preceding vowel.

References

H. Fenrich, Z. Sarjveladze, the Etymological Dictionary of Kartvelian Languages, 2000.

I. Kipshidze, Selected Works, 994.

Arn. Chikobava, Chanian-Megrelian-Georgian Comparative Dictionary, 1938.

