

SVETLANA ADAMIA

FOR THE HISTORY OF QUALIFICATION OF SO-CALLED VOICE AND VERSION FORMS IN GEORGIAN

In the scholarly literature there has been an ongoing debate concerning the existence of the morphological category of voice of the Georgian verb. In addition, some scholars consider the voice forms to be the outcome of the word formation process – new verbs, while others discuss it as related to flexion.

A. Shanidze divided the verbal categories into conjugative and formative ones. He considered the verb forms envisaged by the formative categories to be distinct verbs.

Arn. Chikobava believed that „version, causativity and voice form new lexical units while person, number, tense and mood do not...“

According to T. Uturgaidze, voice, version, etc. do not represent formative categories; they alter the grammatical sense of the verb, rather than its lexical meaning. The points of view proposed by A. Shanidze and Arn. Chikobava are not shared by B. Jorbenadze.

D. Melikishvili has critically analyzed the voice, its types, and the identification of active and passive. She has identified the grammatical category of diathesis, acknowledging the voice as a type of diathesis.

According to M. Nikolaishvili, the voice in Georgian is a semantic category which is within the process of formation while the verbal constructions are defined by transitivity.

In T. Putkaradze's view, the Georgian verbs are absolutely not characterized by the categories of voice and version; this is justified by tremendous amount of attested exceptions. For the analysis of verbs it is irrelevant to identify the varieties of the so-called deponents and the so-called medium; moreover, it is not feasible to provide algorithms by means of such non-systematic qualifications. These algorithms are essential for modelling of verb paradigms.

We agree with the so-called ranking paradigm proposed by T. Putkaradze which better highlights the inner logic of the Georgian verb.