

About Some Peculiarities of Syntactic Relations of the Principal Parts of the Sentence in Abazin Language

Sergei Pazov

Karachaevo-Cherkessk State University named after U.D. Aliev
E mail: pazov@rambler.ru, pazov@yandex.ru

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2s4p137

Abstract

In the modern Abazin language the names are not change by the cases, don't have the grammatical category of mood, and that's why the grammatical relations of the subject (and object along with it) and predicate are recorded with assistance of class-personal affixes. The subject, direct and indirect object and their corresponding indicators (subject, direct and indirect objects) coincide (conform) in the person, number and class in the absolute majority of cases. However, there are cases, when such stable, double-sided connection between the basic structure-forming parts of the sentence is violated. The article deals with description of these cases.

Keywords: Abazin language, sentence, predicate, object, class-personal formants.

1. Introduction

The words in the sentence structure express the notions related to the existing reality are recorded by the concrete affixes of different grammatical categories, which, in its turn, characterize their interrelations and connections in the certain syntactic structure. Consequently, they have the semantic, grammatical, and functional loading. "In order to become the part of sentence, - as the famous linguist V. M. Solntsev wrote, - the word must acquire the quality of the part of sentence. The members of the sentence serve as the constant parts of sentence, filled with variables – concrete words. In this sense the part of the sentence is a functional-structural part, belonging to the certain area of language – syntaxes" (Lomtadidze, 1977).

The different theories related to what the part of sentence is and which its status is inside communicative-predicate syntactic unit are known to the modern linguistic science. At determination of essence of the sentence part at all its differences the majority of researchers consider the functional constituent to be the main one – one and the same word in the sentence structure can be the subject, predicate and etc. in dependence on the syntactic function, which it performs in this concrete case.

Summarizing the existing basic syntactic provision on the issue of classification of the part of sentence, we can separate three conceptions: a) the conception of sentence unimodality, b) the conception of sentence bimodality, and c) the conception of sentence multimodality.

In the traditional Russian grammar of conception of sentence bimodality (presence of two principal parts of the sentence – subject and predicate) has been established (Vinogradov, 1954). This provision is basic one not only for Indo-European (particularly, Slavic) languages, on which material the theory about principal and subordinate part of the sentence was developed, but also Iberian-Caucasian, in particular Abkhazian-Adyghe, which normative grammars were developed on the basis of theory bimodality of simple sentence (Genko, 1955; Vinogradov, 1954).

2. Main Issue

The conception of sentence unimodality has two varieties. The first one says that "the subject is also the primary word in the sentence" (Espersen, 2002) and "remains absolute or independent determined and doesn't serve determinant to any other word" (Kartsevskii, 1928). F. F. Fortunatov defined the subject as an independent part of the word-combination according to meaning, and the predicate as an independent "part of the accomplished word-combination" (Fortunatov, 1956). A. A. Kholodovich, S. D. Katsnelson and etc. stuck to the opposite opinion. The latter one writes that "dominance" of the predicate is proved in the difference from the subject and that "in the meaningful aspect the verbal predicate is something bigger than the simple lexical meaning. When expressing the certain meaning, it at the same time contains the

model of future predicate" (Katsnelson, 1986).

In Abkhazian-Adyghe language study the unimodality conception of the sentence (in variant: only the predicate is the principal part of sentence) is met in the works of U. S. Zekokh (1987).

The syntactic theory, which gives status of the principal part of sentence not only to the subject and predicate, but to the object (mainly to the direct object, but in separate cases to the indirect one), can be considered to be opposition of sentence unimodality conception. This theory in some or other modifications is represented in the works of famous Caucasian linguists N. F. Yakovlev and D. A. Ashkhamaf (1941), Z. I. Kerasheva (1955), B. Kh. Balkarov (1987), R. N. Klychev (1987), Sh. K. Aristava (1982) and etc.

The difficulty of qualification of those or other parts of the sentence of both principal and subordinate parts of the sentence in Abkhazian-Adyghe languages is connected, first of all, with peculiarities of ergative construction and, consequently, with the nature and structure of the verb in these languages. In 30-s years of XX century prof. A. N. Genko, for the first time raising the issues of syntax of Abazin language, wrote that "two parts minimally enters into its content (the sentence – S. P.): the one, which expresses the subject representation or person and is named as the subject (constituent part) and the another, which expresses the representation of sign (or aggregate of sign), connected with the subject, is called the subject..." (Genko, 1955. p.190).

The parts of sentence in Abazin language have different characteristics according to its meaning, position taken in the sentence and ways (means) of expression.

It is known that in modern Abazin language the names are not changed by cases, have no grammatical mood category, and that's why the grammatical relations of subject, object and predicate are recorded with the help of class-personal affixes. Between the verbal predicate, on the one part, and subject (and also direct and indirect objects), on the other part, "there are the stable two-way relationships":

a) the person, class and number of verbal indicators of the grammatical subject and object depend on the person, class and number of the subjects, direct and indirect objects present in the sentence structure;

b) possibility of presence of the last ones (direct and indirect objects) in the sentence, in its turn, depends on the structure of the verbal predicate: if the direct and indirect object indicators are contained in it, they can be possessed in the sentence as its separate parts; if there are no direct or indirect object indicators in the verbal predicate, we can't have them in the sentence (Klychev, 1987). In the other words, the subject, direct or indirect object and their corresponding indicators (subject, direct and indirect objects) coincide (conform) in the person, number and class in the absolute majority of cases. The subject (and also objects), on the one part, determines the grammatical form of the predicate (the predicate conforms to the subject), on the other part, the nature of the verbal predicate determines the possibility of appearance of direct and indirect objects in the structure of the simple sentence. Such two-way syntactic relations of the basic parts of the sentence can be conditionally called coordination, as the grammatical form of the predicate doesn't coordinate with assistance of their class-personal formants in the person, form and number with the subject, direct or indirect objects, but also determines the possibility of appearance of the direct or indirect objects in the sentence structure. The sentence with one-personal verbal predicate never can have the object.

At the beginning of the XX century yet acad. A. S. Chikobava offered to call this "stable two-way connection" between the subject, objects and predicate as "coordination" (Chikobava, 1968), later this term was used by the other linguists too (Shanskii, 1981; Shvedova 1980).

The subject, direct and indirect object and their corresponding indicators (subject, direct and indirect objects) coincide (conform) in the person, number and class in the absolute majority of cases. However, there are cases, when such stable, well-disposed, and two-way connection between the basic structure-forming parts of the sentence (predicate, subject and object) is violated. The deviations from the general principles of the grammatical record of syntactic connection (or incomplete coordination) of the predicate with the subject and object are met in several cases.

1. The nominative range indicator (the subject of intransitive or direct object of intransitive verb) *j*- (3 p., sing, subst. class, and also 3 p., pl.) is not reflected in the structure of verbal predicate, if the sentence part stands directly before them (subject or direct object), to which the formant relates (Allen, 1956; Klychev, 1967; Lomtadze, 1977; Klychev, 1987). *Бага ъату ла машум!* "Where the fox is, the dog barks" (relatively: there is no smoke without fire). The predicate of the sentence (*ѡмашум!* "barks there (inside)") is one-personal intransitive dynamic finite verb. The subject indicator is the formant *ѡ* (3 p., sing, subst. cl.) in the absolute beginning of the word. However, in connection to the fact that the subject *ла* "dog", which indicator is the subjective formant *ѡ*-, stands directly before the predicate, this class-personal affix is missed. The verbal predicate in this sentence has the view of impersonal in the proper form.

Саби дзыѡвнам, саби хьыччабыжь глазѡвнымглауа атдзы насыѡдан! "There is no happiness in the house, where there is no child, and where the child's laugh is not heard". The predicate *ѡнасыѡдан!* "unhappy, has not happiness" is one-personal intransitive stative verb. The subjective formant *ѡ*- (3 p., sing, subst. cl.) stands at the

beginning of the word, and the subject *атдзы* «house, family, family clan» stands in the position before the predicate, in connection to which the class-personal indicator *j-* is omitted.

Ачуан гъажьын ахъарна гланайаухтл. "The cauldron rolled ahead and found its lid" (relatively: a little bird is content with a little nest). The sentence predicate (*й)эла-на-йаухтл* "found" is two-personal transitive dynamic finite verb. The indicator of the direct object *j-* (3 p., sing, subst. cl.) takes the place in the absolute beginning of the word. The direct object *ахъарна* "lid" stands directly before the predicate, that's why its formant *j-* positionally falls out.

Ауи раса баца ауыкълэрылхтл "He chosen long switch from the nut-tree". In this sentence the predicate is expressed by already three-personal transitive dynamic verb (*й)эла-ры-л-у-хтл* "chosen". The indicator of the direct object *j-* (3 p., singular, subst. cl.), as it is supposed, takes place in the absolute beginning of the word. The direct object *баца ауыкъл* "long switch" stands directly before the predicate, so its formant *j-* positionally falls out. It is necessary to pay attention on the following fact: noun – direct object *баца* "switch" takes preposition in relation to the predicate, but distantly. The adjective-attribute *ауыкъл* "long" is placed between the predicate and direct object. However, the attributive complex *баца ауыкъл* "long switch" is recorded morphologically as one word, as a result of which and in the position before the predicate it is perceived as one syntactic unit. The result of the last one is falling out of the class-personal formant of the direct object *j-*, as in the previous cases, when the direct object takes the contact preposition in relation to the predicate.

2. In the separate cases the convergence of two phonetically similar morphological elements – grammatical indicators of the subject and objects, expressed by formant *j*. In such cases the grammatical indicators of the nominative range (the subject of intransitive and direct object of transitive verbs) and ergative (indirect object of transitive and intransitive verbs) are coincided and standardly form the indicator of the nominative range *j-*. *Йацъырцтыз атишквэ Къарим дъжьжера йырцатл* "K'arim drove the unharnessed horses to the horse-pond". The predicate *йырцатл* "lead, drive" is two-personal relative-transitive (causative affix *-r-*) dynamic verb, in which the affix of direct object *j-* (3 p., pl.) and subject formant *j-* (3 p., sing., m. cl.) phonetically coincide, as a result of which and are merged in one indicator. *Ахъамайгъыгълв йхъвы ала йчвафитл.* "the part of careless person is eaten by the dog (a sharp stomach makes short devotion)". The predicate is expressed by three-personal transitive dynamic finite verb (*й)й-чв-а-ф-умл* "eats (on the contrary to)". In connection to the fact that the first two formants *j-* (3 p., sing., m. cl.) and *j-* (3 p., sing., subst. cl.) coincide phonetically and designated by the similar affixes (*j-*), they are merged and pronounced (and written upon this basis) as one affix *j-*. If to change the grammatical parameters of one of the affixes, the complete grammatical verbal form is restored: *й-с-чв-а-ф-умл* «that (it) eats something against my will".

3. There are cases of absence of class-personal formants of ergative range, namely the indicator of the grammatical subject. This is observed in the predicate structure, expressed by the transitive verb of the positive form in imperative mood. The subject indicators *u-* and *b-* are represented in such verbal predicates (Klychev, 1967). *Усыцъыргъьа сыгъьэ, йсыцхъва урад.* "Rejoice with me, a friend of mine and sing a song with me". In the second part of the sentence the predicate is expressed by three-personal transitive dynamic finite verb (*й)сы-ц-у-хлв-умл* "speak (sing) together with me" in the positive form of imperative mood *й)сы-ц-хлва* "sing together with me". In the structure of the verb the class-personal affixes of direct (*j-*) and indirect (*s-*) objects. The subject formant *u-* is not expressed standardly. *Азамат ласыта аквтылэлаг, баргъы ахлэв мца тауцал!* "Azamat, bring the hen quickly, and you start up fire in the stove". In this sentence the predicate (*й)элаг* "bring", (*й)мауцал* "start up fire" is two-personal transitive dynamic verbs. Their peculiarity is that, being two-personal, they don't have either class-personal formant in this situation, i.e. from their structure no one indicator fell out positionally, but two. The indicator of direct object *j-* (3 p., sing., subst. cl.), taken the absolute beginning of the word, fell out by the reason that was described in the clause 2, and the subject formant *u-* (2 p., sing., m. cl.) in the first case and *b-* (2 p., sing., f. cl.) in the second case are not expressed upon the reason that action is appealed to them (imperative mood). Thus, two-personal verbal predicate, which must be coincide with subject and direct object, has no such possibility, the basic structure-forming parts of the sentence in this case don't concord in anyway. However, in case of absence of one of the above-mentioned conditions (transitive verb, positive form, imperative mood), the subject indicator (subjective affix) is restored and the predicate again acquires the grammatical complete form.

4. The certain interest represents subjective-reflexive form (grammatical category of the subjective version), which exists only in the transitive (including at the regulatory-transitive) verbs of Abazin language and which is formed by affix *tsh-* (Klychev, 1967). In contrast to the corresponding forms of Abkhazian language verb, in the Abazin language in the subjective-reflexive forms the direct object indicator is not expressed (in the other grammatical forms it is restored). *Амашакв ахъа тшэланартллатл.* "His tongue has been loosened" (literally: the sack got untied). The subject formant is the affix *on-*, which relates to the word *ахъа* "beginning, head" in the sentence, consequently, this word performs the subject function. The indicator of the direct object in the predicate structure standardly is not expressed. In the

corresponding Abkhazian language verbs the class-personal affix of the direct object stands before the reflexive prefix **tsh-**, i.e. in the absolute beginning of the word. *Гисабшакл шацтацуз ачкӀвӀн тширьӀдузан* "Each second Saturday the lad disappeared" *АхӀвӀ тшгӀлайдӀрхӀмӀ* «The consciousness returned to the wounded». The predicate in this sentence is expressed by two-personal transitive dynamic finite verb *тшгӀланарӀтӀламӀ* "untied".

3. Conclusion

The sentences with the verbal predicate in the reflexive form (subjective reflexive version) have no direct object as the separate independent word or word-combination: one and the same word performs function of the subject and direct object. The grammatical form of the verbal predicate, losing the class-personal formant of the direct object in the absolute beginning of the word, tries to correspond to the sentence structure and standardly.

References

- Aristava, Sh. K. 1982. The problems of simple sentence in the Abkhazian language. – Tbilisi.
- Balkarov, B. Kh. 1987. About peculiarities of expression of the direct object in the Abkhazian-Adyghe languages. The case content and the system of mood in the Caucasian languages. – Makhachkala. 22-28.
- Genko, A. 1955. The Abazin language. The grammatical essay of the Tapanta dialect. M.: AS USSR.
- The grammar of Kabardino-Circassian literary language. M., 1970.
- The grammar of the Russian language. Edited by V. V. Vinogradov. In 2 volumes. M., 1954 – 1956.
- Esperen, O. 2002. The philosophy of grammar. M.: URSS. 170.
- Zekokh, U. S. 1987. The essays about the syntax of Adyghe language. – Mycop.
- Kambachokov, A. M. 1997. The problems of the simple sentence in Kabardino-Circassian language. Nalchik.
- Kartsevskii, S. 1928. The repeated course of the Russian language. M. 27.
- Katsnelson, S. 1986. The general and typological language study. – L., 1986. – P. 88.
- Kerashaeva, Z. 1995. The brief grammar review of Adyghe language. The selected works and articles. Mycop. 9-52.
- Klychev, R. 1987. Some issues of syntaxes of Abazin language. Annual of Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics. V. XIV. Tbilisi: Metsniereba. 127-160.
- Klychev, R., Tabulova-Malbakhova, N. 1967. The brief grammar review of Abazin language. Abazin-Russian vocabulary. M. 532.
- Lomtadze, K. 1977. The reflection of nominative range in the verbs of sentence parts in Abkhazian-Adyghe languages. The issues of syntactic order of Iberian-Caucasian languages. Nalchik. 18-19.
- Shvedova, N. 1980. The Russian grammar. V. 2. Moscow.
- Solntsev, V. 1977. The language as a system-structural education. M., 211.
- Fortunatov, F. 1956. The selected works. M., 183.
- Kholodovich, A. The problems of grammatical theory. L., 197
- Chikobava, Arn. 1968. The problems of simple sentence in the Georgian language. I. The subject and object in the ancient - Georgian language. The second edition. Tbilisi: Metsniereba. 243.
- Shanskii, N., Rasporov, T., Tikhonov, A. 1981. The modern Russian literary language. L.: Prosveshchenie. 442-444.
- Yakovlev, N., Ashkhamaf, D. 1941. The grammar of Adyghe literary language. M.-L.: Nauka.
- Allen, Y. 1956. Structure and System in the Abaza Verbal Complex. Transaction of the Philological Society. Hertford. 134.

Accepted Abbreviations

- p. – person (grammar category of person)
n. – number (grammar category of number)
cl. – class (grammar category of class)
sing. – singular
pl. – plural
subst. cl. – substantiation class (imprudent, unconscious)
h. cl. – human class
m. cl. – masculine class
f. cl. – feminine class