

IZA CIANTLADZE

WAS ABSOLUTIVE CASE PART OF PARADIGMATIC SYSTEM OF THE SVAN NOUNS?

I. Forms of absolutive case remained both in modern nouns with *-auslaut* (dīna, kāda, shīra, etc.) and those lexemes that historically possessed *-a* vowel in the final position which has *apocoped* over the course of time without any traces left in a stem (gezal < *gezala "child", bap' < *bapa "priest < grandfather", kor < *kora "house", pUSD < *pusda "Lord, God", etc.). Thus, Modern nouns with –

auslaut as well as those nouns that historically had *-auslaut* followed the same pattern – transformed into the form of indefinite nominative or absolutive case.

II. the nominative case prevailed:

1. in those nouns with the *-e* endings (**māre**, **dzākhe**, **pkhule**, etc.) that historically had *-auslaut*: however, occasionally primary forms (absolutive case!) still remain (Upper Svan: a'ana'a, Upper Bal: **lara**, Upper Bal, Lashkian: **dēra**, **atkha**, **zomkha**, Lower Bal: **lūha**, Lashkian: **mashēna**, Lentekhian: **maneskūra**...cf.: the same stems in the nominative case: **akhenakhe**, **dere**, **atkhe**, **zā'y**'makhe, **lūhe**, **mashēne**, **manesküre**, **lāre**..).

2. **chafá-y**, **zā-y**, **mūshā-y**, Upper Svan, Lentekhian: **Twe-y**' (cf.: Lashkian: **To-y**), etc. in nouns containing a *diphthong*.

3. in *consonant-stem* nouns which currently do not contain a nominative morpheme anymore (but the two exceptions! – cf.: **yor-i**, **sem-i**), however, its trace is evident in the form of the umlaut in the final syllable of the stem (**Tūr** < **Tar-e/i** "pus", **Chādz** * < **Chadz-e/i** "a horse", **kham** * < **khām-e/i** "a pig", **kwep** < ***kop-e/i** "a button", **Tkhwim** < ***tkhum-e/i** "a head", etc.).