

Contents

Foreword, 6

Hijran Aliyeva: The transit of Caspian petroleum by pipe-line. BAKU (Azerbaijan) – SUPSA (Georgia) – ODESSA – BRODY (Ukraine) GDANSK (Poland), 8

Nino Amiridze: Mismatches between form and meaning. Reanalysing wish and blessing formulae in Georgian, 9

Marine Beridze and Manana Kock Kobaidze: Ethnic identity features: Creation, loss and revival dynamics. (The case of Turkish Meskhetians), 13

Tinatin Bolkvadze: On some concepts about the Georgian language and concepts about the Georgian language and cultural identity in Old Georgia, 15

Mark Bromberger: The Georgian diaspora: A case study of the Georgian community in Israel, 17

Marika Butskhrikidze: The status of the sonorant /v/ in Georgian, 18

Nani Chanishvili: The language situation in Caucasus and national identity, 19

Marina Chumakina: The cultural setting for a XXI century dictionary, 19

Ib Faurby: ‘A small victorious war’: Human rights violations, terrorism and the destruction of Chechen society, 21

Ketevan Gadilia: The history of the translation of the Bible into Georgian, 22

- Rebecca Gould: Terrorizing power: Abrechestvo in Caucasian mountaineer culture, 23
- Teimuraz Gvantseladze: The language situation in Abkhazia. (Facts without comments), 24
- Zaal Kikvidze: Sociolinguistic deficit in the social capital of some ethnic Groups in post-Soviet Georgia, 25
- Giorgi Kipiani, Thea Kacharava and Nino Japharidze: The impact of the socio-cultural setting and identity on childrens' perceptions of ethnic well-being, 26
- Dodona Kiziria: The semiotics of naming: Literary names of streets in Tbilisi, 28
- Yasuhiro Kojima: Relative clauses in modern Georgian, 29
- Andrea Kuzmich: The continuity of a tradition: A survey of the performance practice of Georgian traditional polyphonic songs in Tbilisi, 30
- Gucha Kvaratskhelia: Conversation manners in Georgian proverbs, 31
- Amiran Lomtadze and Manana Tabidze: Some problems of the functioning of the Georgian language in Georgia, 31
- Märta-Lisa Magnusson: International mediation in intrastate conflicts. Why no settlement in the Karabakh conflict?, 34
- Anna Meskhi: Phoenician 'Aleph and Kartuli Asomtavruli Ani and Khari (Based on complex comparative linguistic, cultural, paleographic, and esoteric analyses), 35
- Florian Muehlfried: Post-Socialist or post post-Socialist? – Continuity and change in contemporary Georgia, 36
- Annegret Plontke-Lüning: Research into Armenian and Georgian medieval architecture in the 20th century, 37

- Tariel Putkaradze and Natia Putkaradze: Some aspects of the national and linguistic identity of descendants of Georgian Muhajirs, 35
- Kakhi Sakhltkhusishvili: The semantics of the Georgian tense system and the Reichenbachian tripartition, 39
- Vazha Shengelia: The semantic category of human beings and objects in Kartvelian and Circassian languages, 41
- Revaz Sherozia: On the development of verbal forms in Megrelian-Laz, 42
- Ether Soselia: Kartvelian models of color categorization, 43
- Manana Tabidze: The contemporary language situation in Georgia. Some problems in the linguistic identity of the population, 44
- Bela Tsipuria: Cultural identity in Soviet / post-Soviet Georgia, 45
- Kevin Tuite: The autocrat of the banquet table: The political and social significance of the Georgian supra, 47
- Karina Vamling and Revaz Tchantouria: Language use and identity among Megrelians from Abkhazia and Megrelia, 48
- Rune Westerlund: What is the present-day situation for the minority ethno-linguistic peoples within the Avaric region in the Republic of Dagestan?, 50

Foreword

The international conference *Language, History and Cultural Identities in the Caucasus*, 17-20 June 2005, is hosted by the School of International Migration and Ethnic Relations (IMER) at Malmö University, Sweden (conference program: www.mah.se/imer/caucasus_conference).

Caucasus studies is an expanding multidisciplinary field of research. The conference brings together both Caucasian and Western scholars with diverse disciplinary backgrounds – social anthropology, linguistics, literature, social psychology, political science – who focus on the Caucasus in their research.

The Caucasus is a very complex region in many ways. It embraces four states (Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan and parts of Southern Russia), a number of autonomous republics and approximately fifty different ethnolinguistic groups. Due to its strategic geopolitical location on the strip of land between Europe and Asia, the Black and Caspian Seas, the Caucasus has repeatedly during the course of history been invaded by great powers – Persians, Arabs, Mongols, Turks and Russians. Despite this foreign domination, the peoples of the Caucasus have managed to maintain specific cultural traits and identity. Increased Russian/Soviet control over the region during the last two centuries has led to deep political, social and cultural changes, including deportations of entire peoples and extensive migration.

The post-Soviet period has been characterized by ethnopolitical conflicts and problems with refugees and IDPs (for instance, in Chechnya, Karabakh, Abkhazia, South Ossetia) and has in various ways affected all the states in the region. In building their national identities, language, religion and historical and cultural symbols have an important unifying function in the newly independent states. Several events during the last few years have increased international interest for and presence in the region: the views on international terrorism following the events of September 11 (primarily in relation to the conflict in Chechnya), the US involvement in neighbouring Iran, the ‘Rose’ revolution in Georgia and Turkey’s rapprochement to the EU.

The theme of the conference – Language, History and Cultural Identities – thus reflects important issues in the past and present situation in the Caucasus.

The conference was made possible thanks to funding from the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet). We would like to express our sincere gratitude for this support.

On behalf of the Organizing committee of the conference and the School of International Migration and Ethnic Relations (IMER) we would like to wish all participating scholars a warm welcome to Malmö and its University.

Malmö, 30 May 2005

Karina Vamling
Associate professor

Jean Hudson
Professor, Deputy Head of IMER

Dr Revaz Tchatouria

Dr Manana Kock Kobaidze

Hijran Aliyeva (*Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences*)

The transit of Caspian petroleum by pipe-line

BAKU (Azerbaijan) – SUPSA (Georgia) – ODESSA – BRODY (Ukraine) – GDANSK (Poland)

Before the collapse of the Soviet Union, petroleum from the Caspian Sea region was transported to Europe mainly through Russia. This situation has changed after the declaration of independence by Azerbaijan. At that time, the building of new and independent pipe-lines started on the territory of the Caucasus.

In 1993 the European Union initiated the program TRACEKA, (Transport System Europe – Caucasus – Asia, known as the ‘Silk Road’), which specified the way of transportation of gas and petroleum from Central Asia and Caucasus to Europe.

On the 27th of May 2003 a session of the European Commission in Brussels took place with the assistance of Ukraine and Poland representations. As a consequence a decision was adopted about the extension of the pipe-line BAKU – SUPSA – ODESSA – BRODY on the territory of Poland up to GDANSK, which is under construction.

The Basin of the Caspian Sea has an ideal position because of its closeness to the European market, the countries of the Near East and Central Asia.

The development and openness of the markets of the post-Soviet countries (countries of Central Asia) means that Azerbaijan becomes an unusually attractive country of the Caspian Sea region. Even the ‘Silk Road’ from Asia to Europe crosses the territory of Azerbaijan. This oil corridor provides safety and stability in all of the region.

Nino Amiridze (*Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS, The Netherlands*)

Mismatches between form and meaning. Reanalysing wish and blessing formulae in Georgian

The talk addresses the instances of formally transitive verbs having intransitive semantics in wish formulae mostly spread in the folklore of North Eastern Georgia, in the works of writers coming from that area or in the speech of the speakers of the dialects spoken there. Examples 1a and 2a illustrate such uses.

Although the readings of the verb forms in 1a and 2a imply one argument each, a theme (1a) and an agent (2a), formally the verb forms used there are 2-argument transitives (cf. *mo-m-k'l-a* (1a) vs. *mo-m-k'l-a* (1b) and *ga-m-a-cin-a* (2a) vs. *ga-m-a-cin-a* (2b)).

Similarly, although the reading of the verb form in 3a implies two arguments, formally the verb form used there is 3-argument transitive (cf. *a-m-a-šen-eb-in-a* (3a) vs. *a-m-a-šen-eb-in-a* (3b)).

Therefore, something that formally is a 2-argument verb is semantically understood as a 1-argument verb (1a, 2a). And what is formally a 3-argument verb is semantically understood as a 2-argument verb (3a). I will be arguing that this is an example of *reanalysis*, a common mechanism changing the underlying structure (constituency, hierarchical structure, grammatical relations) of a syntactic pattern but not involving any modifications of its surface manifestation (cf. Langacker 1977)

Hewitt (1995:447) when translating wish formulae similar to those in 1a and 2a uses the lexeme *God* to make the translation transitive and thus explaining the use of formally transitive verb forms in formulae. However, according to Tuite (1996:260) criticizing (Hewitt 1995), in his fieldwork none of the speakers ever used *God* or any extraterrestrial to explain the morphology.

Together with (Tuite 1996) I think that giving a 2-argument verb reading as a 3-argument verb (cf. 3a) or a 1-argument verb reading as a 2-argument verb (cf. 1a, 2a) only because of the verb form would be inaccurate. However, I think that the verbs with 2-argument reading (3a) are making use of 3-argument verb forms (3b) and the verbs with 1-argument reading (1a, 2a) are making use of 2-argument verb forms (correspondingly 1b, 2b).

What Tuite's fieldwork illuminates is that in Modern Georgian, in this particular construction, formally 3-argument verb forms are no longer understood as 3-argument ones and formally 2-argument verb forms are no longer understood as 2-argument ones but, in each case, one digit less. I suggest that a wish formula which is finally understood as having a n-argument structure has historically derived from a formula having a n+1-argument structure (4). Syntactic reanalysis has then taken place, changing the argument structure but not the form.

This way of looking at the facts presented in 1a, 2a, 3a allows me to conclude that historically there has to be a God or some higher power present as an agent argument in the wish formulae, although in modern Georgian it is completely lost, as illustrated by Tuite's fieldwork mentioned in (Tuite 1996) and exemplified in 1a, 2a, and 3a. Since in reality not all wishes can come true and not everything depends on the person making a wish, it is natural to entertain hopes of someone or something that is believed to have power over nature and control over human affairs.

Synchronically there are many 'inconsistencies' in the language for which there is no explanation if they are taken in isolation. However, if we take into account not just the present interpretation of a certain form but also the appropriate source and the circumstances in which the 'inconsistency' came about, we have a relatively clear picture of the diachronic development for that particular construction.

The next apparent 'inconsistency' can be noticed in the speech of those having the influence of the Western dialects of Georgian. In conversations between relatives the utterer (of the older generation) addresses the hearer (of the younger generation) not by the kinship term referring to the hearer but by the term referring to the utterer him/herself. For instance, the grandmother in 5 when addressing a grandson, instead of saying something like 'Grandson, come to me' utters 'Grandmother, come to me'. This seems inconsistent until we consider the instances as reanalyzed blessing formulae (cf. 5 vs. 6). The vowel-final stem nominal form *bebia* 'grandmother' allows the double interpretation, both as vocative and nominative. The nominative *bebia* of the possible diachronic source blessing formula (6) became reanalyzed into the vocative *bebia* in a construction used as an address of exclusive love and care (5).

- (1) a. net'av (me) mo-m-k'l-a
would.that I.NOM PV-DO1.SG-kill-S3.SG.AOR
'I wish I die'
- b. man (me) tu mo-m-k'l-a
(s)he.ERG I.NOM if PV-DO1.SG-kill-S3.SG.AOR
- (2) a. net'av (me) ga-m-a-cin-a
would.that I.NOM PV-DO1.SG-PRV-laugh-S3.SG.AOR
'I wish I laugh'
- b. man (me) tu ga-m-a-cin-a
(s)he.ERG I.NOM if PV-DO1.SG-PRV-laugh-S3.SG.AOR
'If (s)he makes me laugh...'
- (3) a. net'av (me) is
would.that I.DAT it.NOM
a-m-a-šen-eb-in-a
PV-IO1.SG-PRV-build-TS-CAUS-S3.SG.AOR
'I wish I build'
- b. man (me) is tu
(s)he.ERG I.DAT it.NOM if
a-m-a-šen-eb-in-a
PV-IO1.SG-PRV-build-TS-CAUS-S3.SG.AOR
'If (s)he makes me build it...'
- (4) I wish [VERB_n] < I wish [God/the forces of nature/etc. made
[VERB_n]]
where n is the arity of the predicate and can equal to 1, 2 or 3
- (5) Grandmother addressing her grandchild:
bebia, modi čem-tan
grandmother.VOC come to.me
Lit. Grandmother, come to me
'[My dear/my love/etc.], come to me'

- (6) (šen) g-e-nacval-o-s
 you.SG.DAT IO2.SG-PRV-replace-SUBJ-S3.SG
 bebia, modi čem-tan
 grandmother come to.me
 Lit.: You.SG let.her.replace.you.SG[in.need] grandmother,
 come to me
 ‘Let your grandmother replace you.SG in need, come to me’

Abbreviations: AOR=aoist; CAUS=causative; DAT=dative; DO1=1st person direct object; ERG= ergative; IO1=1st person indirect object; IO2=2nd person indirect object; NOM=nominative; PRV= pre-radical vowel; PV=preverb; S3=3rd person subject; SG=singular; SUBJ=subjunctive; TS=thematic suffix; VOC=vocative

References

- Hewitt, B. G. (1995) *Georgian: A structural Reference Grammar*, volume 2 of London Oriental and African Language Library. John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia
- Langacker, R. W. (1977). Syntactic reanalysis. In C. N. Li, editor, *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, pages 57–139. University of Texas Press, Austin
- Tuite, K. (1996) Review article on B. G. Hewitt’s *Georgian: A Structural Reference Grammar* (London Oriental and African Language Library, 2. Amsterdam: Bejamins 1995. xviii+714 pp.). *Functions of Language*, 3(2):258–260

Marine Beridze (*Chikobava Institute of Linguistics, Georgian Academy of Sciences*) and **Manana Kock Kobaidze** (*IMER, Malmoe University, Sweden*)

Ethnic identity features: Creation, loss and revival dynamics

(The case of Turkish Meskhetians)

The process of ethnic change, that started in Southern Georgia (Meskheti/Samtskhe-Dzhavakheti) in the 16th-17th centuries, was aimed at forming a new ethnic group out of the local population (Georgians, in particular, Meskhetian) and the immigrant population (Turks and Kurds). This was a complex and long process and was going on under the control of two powerful states: Turkey and, later, Russia. To create a new ethnic group and use it as a 'tool' for mastering this strategically important territory was a policy of these states that has remained unchanged during three to four centuries.

The gradual development of the features, unifying these groups, is documented in the historical sources: 1. Change of confession (encouraged by economic and other means) 2. Language shift (first within some domains and within high social classes and later in all domains and even among lower classes of the population) 3. Change of surnames (as a result of or final step in identity change) 4. New perception of own identity.

The change of the name of the group has reflected the group's development dynamics: Georgians who remained Christians retained their name *Kartveli* ('Georgian' in Georgian), Georgians who became Muslims in the 17-18th centuries were called *Jerli* ('local' in Turkish), and immigrated Muslims, who were ethnic Turks and Kurds, were called *Tarakama*.

The next step was a unification of *Jerli* and *Tarakama* by the confessional feature and the naming of these two groups as *Tatari* (Muslim). In the Russian censuses since the 19th century the unifying name of these groups, indicating confession (*Tatari*), has been changed with the unifying name indicating ethnicity (Turk) (regardless of the fact that the ethnic composition of 'Turks' was diverse).

The Muslim population of this area also obtained an economic advantage. After the power change in Georgia in 1918, fear of losing property strengthened the loyalty of this group to Turkey. In the 1920s Georgian schools were closed and Turkish schools were opened for the Georgian Muslims in Samtskhe-Dzhavakheti. When the political climate changed, during the census before the Second World War, it was suggested that they should be registered as Georgians but this attempt failed. In the 1939 census they were called Azerbaijanis by officials, thus avoiding the term Turk in the census. This group was deported to Central Asia in 1944.

The group has retained and strengthened its unity after the deportation. Later, all Muslims deported to Central Asia from Samtskhe-Dzhavakheti (Meskheta) irrespective of their ethnic diversity (Georgians, in particular, Meskhetians, as well as non-Georgians: Turks, Kurds) received the new shared name Turkish Meskhetians, where two names denoting different ethnic origins are presented on the same level, which is quite confusing. Nowadays people called 'Turkish Meskhetians' protest against this name and demand to be called 'Meskhetians' (Such a change, in turn, can cause new misunderstandings).

It is noteworthy that Muslim Georgians try to avoid the term Turkish as a name of the Turkish language spoken by them and regularly call it 'Our language'. This seems to be a way to differentiate 'our language' as a language obtained through the new confession and indicating the confessional loyalty, on the one hand, and the Turkish language that is spoken by ethnic Turks as a part of their ethnic identity and an indicator of their ethnic belonging, on the other hand.

The group strives and acts for repatriation.

The history of this group is an obvious case of the attempt to form one ethnic group out of different ethnic groups in the process of interaction between internal and external forces. It also confirms that identity features function as an entire complex. Efforts to reconstruct the whole complex of the features and overcome the lack of the missing features (language, ideology, territory, autonomy...) may add vitality to the group. It is another matter that these efforts may be employed for other goals by different political forces.

Tinatini Bolkvadze (*Dept. of General and Applied Linguistics, Tbilisi State University, Georgia*)

On some concepts about the Georgian language and cultural identity in Old Georgia

The paper deals with some sociolinguistic data taken from old Georgian written sources about how the old Georgian society tried to give special significance to their language and nation.

The growing national consciousness of the Georgians, who were flourishing politically, economically and culturally, was persistently demanding historical comprehension of the antique period of Georgians past. 'The Life of Kings' by Leonti Mroveli, an 11th century ecclesiastic figure, bishop of the Ruisi eparchy, in J. Fishman's words, attests to the quest for the 'respectable' past. King Parnavaz' decision 'to expand' the Georgian language was, of course, political and it was conditioned by extralinguistic factors - the number of people who spoke the language in Kartli and the integration of those speaking other languages with the national i.e. Georgian culture.

The Eastern Christian language tradition was the main factor that conditioned the changing of 'Kartli' into 'Sakartvelo' (Georgia) and into the meaning of 'Kartveli' (Georgian). In this case 'the language centre' has an advantage over the territory, economy and political structure. Giorgi Merchule in 'The life of Grigol Khandzteli' defines the borders of Kartli with precision. His statement is in accordance with the Eastern Christian tradition, and the cultural and political ideal of the 9th - 10th century Georgia as well.

From the same time, the internal qualities of the Georgian language strengthen the wish to be equal to Greek. These are - flexible stability that allows modification according to cultural changes in the language, and intellectualization, since a codified version of the Georgian language into which the Holy Scripture and theological literature are translated and in which original works are written, differs from everyday Georgian, the former being very artificial. The Gospels and other parts of the Bible translated into Georgian guaranteed a normative stability of the Old Georgian language by its constant ecclesiastic use in church services and in other forms of spiritual life. The native language is a cognized norm for Georgian scholars working in cultural centers abroad - and they set a standard. Besides functioning to unite the language community and separating it from communities speaking different

languages, the Georgian language had also acquired the function of self-protection a cause of national pride. This increases the prestige of the language.

The principle of equality of the languages of the newly converted nations with Greek and other official languages of the Church is gradually substituted by the priority of national languages and their qualitative excellence. From this point of view 'Praise and Glorification of the Georgian Language' is extremely noteworthy. (This work is also known under different titles, such as 'Praise of the Georgian Language', 'On the Georgian language'). Its author or copier is Ioane-Zosime.

In the 17th-18th centuries in Georgia, the Georgian language had to exist side by side with many other languages. Apart from that it should also be taken into consideration that the country, disintegrated into small kingdoms and principalities, was united only by the language. In order to avoid the disastrous influence of foreign languages and solve the problem of the standardization of the state language normative orthography, grammar and dictionary was needed. Sulkhani-Saba Orbeliani's aim was to put an end to the distortion of the language on the one hand and to facilitate the proper knowledge and use of its rich vocabulary, on the other. But as the information provided in the preface makes it clear, it was not only Sulkhani-Saba's wish. The dictionary was the result of the language policy of the Royal Court of Georgia of that time. In spite of the discrepancy of opinions on certain problems, Sulkhani-Saba and the Royal Court set themselves the task that 'Sitqvis Kona' become the arbitrator acknowledged by the Georgian language community. Special attention should be paid to the foreign words called 'not usable' ('ukhmari') by Sulkhani-Saba Orbeliani. The greater part of these words were introduced into the Georgian language 'due to the changes of time', but the use of these words should be avoided. The reason Sulkhani-Saba included these words in the dictionary is that 'a student should recognize what is to be used and what is not, which is suitable and which is not'.

Mark Bromberger (Stockholm, Sweden)

The Georgian diaspora: A case study of the Georgian community in Israel

There are Georgians living outside their native country in countries like the US, France, Iran and even Sweden. This abstract will deal with the Georgian community of Israel. This subject is of interest since Georgians living in Israel often have a dual identity: 1) a traditional Georgian; 2) a Jewish-Israeli. Georgian-Jewish relations have been relatively harmonious which has contributed to a strong Jewish identification with the Georgian culture and language.

Georgian-Jewish relations

Not much is known about Georgian-Jewish history until the beginning of the 19th century. The first to investigate this subject more closely were Russian-Jewish scholars who after Russia's annexation of Caucasus in 1801 traveled frequently to Georgia, primarily researchers interested in the myth of the Ten Lost Tribes and the mystery of the Khazar kingdom. Scientific studies of the Georgian Jewry began however in the 1930s led by scholars at the Historical and Ethnographic Museum in Tbilisi. This museum was closed in 1951 and since then there have been few publications about Georgian-Jewish history. The political conditions in the Soviet Union made conditions more difficult for the Jewish community in Georgia.

Georgian immigration to Israel

The establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 changed the collective identity of the Jewry in Georgia and elsewhere. *Aliyah* to Israel – which had already begun under the pre-State *Yishuv* era – intensified. The great aliyah from the former Soviet Union began as early as the 1970s with Georgian *olim* leaving their native country for their 'ancestral homeland'. Today there are slightly more than 100.000 persons of Georgian origin living in Israel. Around 25 per cent of them reside in the port town of Ashdod whereas urban hubs like Jerusalem and Tel Aviv have relatively small populations of the Georgian community of the country. Of the many members of the Knesset with backgrounds in the former Soviet Union, one was born in Georgia: Itzhak Gagula (Shas; 15th Knesset).

Further discussion

- The position of Georgian culture and language in Israel today
- Multiple identities: sender (sending) country; receiver (receiving) country; religion; language
- The Georgian community's role in the larger Russian-speaking community
- Georgian-Israeli relations
- Other relevant topics

Marika Butskhrikidze (*Leiden University Centre for Linguistics, The Netherlands*)

The status of the sonorant /v/ in Georgian

Nepveu (1994) and Bush (1997), after observing that many of the clusters in Georgian contain /v/, and that it varies in pronunciation between [v], [ϕ] and [w], suggest that it is a 'defective segment'. Nepveu argues that it is specified only for labial place of articulation, and acquires other features from the preceding consonant. It can be treated as dependent segment, i.e. a secondary articulation on the preceding consonant. I accept the analysis of the sonorant /v/ as a secondary articulation in consonant sequences and substantiate the claim with additional data from phonological processes, distributional regularities and historical evidence. Reduplication data is also considered to support this claim (Butskhrikidze 2002).

The important consequence of establishing the status of /v/ as a secondary articulation in consonant sequences is that the combination of C + /v/ can be described not as a true cluster, but as a complex segment, i.e. a labialized consonant, the sequence of a consonant followed by [ʷ]. This reanalysis offers a better understanding of long consonant clusters in Georgian.

References

- Bush, R. (1997). *Georgian syllable structure*. MA thesis, UC Santa Cruz.
- Butskhrikidze, M. (2002). *The consonant phonotactics of Georgian*. Doctoral Dissertation, Leiden University. LOT: Utrecht. LOT 63.
- Nepveu, D. (1994). *Georgian and Bella Coola: Headless syllables and syllabic obstruents*. MA thesis, UC Santa Cruz.

Nani Chanishvili (*Dept. of Modern Georgian, Tbilisi State University, Georgia*)

The language situation in Caucasus and national identity

1. The problem of national identity, language and migration can be discussed from the diachronic and synchronic point of view generally and for the Caucasus area concretely. A very interesting picture is seen in Georgia, where about 87 nationalities have been living during centuries. What is the mechanism for keeping their national identity through all these years – is this language, traditions or other parameters...?
2. The process of assimilation through official language policy and the process of natural assimilation in Caucasus show us the mechanisms of changing or preserving the national identity.
3. There are different types of assimilation process – forced and natural.
4. There are different types of societies – strong assimilators and those which forbid assimilation altogether by legislative and other means.
5. The language situation in Georgia from a diachronic and synchronic view point.
6. The process of migration and national minorities in Georgia now and historically.
7. Who wants to be assimilated and why?

Marina Chumakina (*Linguistic, Cultural and International Studies, School of Arts, University of Surrey, Great Britain*)

The cultural setting for a XXI century dictionary

The paper focuses on the ongoing project on creating a digital dictionary of a Daghestanian language, Archi, with sound and picture files.

Archi is spoken by about 1200 people who live in seven settlements situated within walking distance of each other in Southern Daghestan. Traditionally, Archi is viewed as having no dialectal differentiation though the latest studies give indications that some dialectal differentiations are evolving. Archi is used in everyday family communication by all age groups. It is spoken but not written. Speakers of Archi are

almost exclusively first-language speakers, and intermarriage is rare. All Archi people speak Russian and Avar, which are also the languages of instruction at school; some of the older generation speak Lak as well, Lak and Avar being Archi's immediate neighbours.

Archi is remarkable both for linguistic reasons and in terms of its cultural setting. The language is remarkable in its phonetics (81, mainly consonantal, phonemes), and in showing a great irregularity in all its inflecting word classes. Its morphological system strains credibility by the size of the paradigms (Kibrik calculates that a verb can have 1,502,839 forms), and to this must be added the fact that the stems tend to pattern irregularly.

The culture of the Archi is one of the most distinctive and best-preserved cultures of Daghestan. There are many untranslatable notions, especially in areas like shepherding, traditional clothes and traditional food. The dictionary provides picture files for all culture-specific objects, whether the word itself has an English or Russian equivalent or not.

We are producing a digital Archi-Russian-English dictionary to meet the needs of speakers and the interests of linguists. The dictionary includes sound files for each word form in every lexical entry (which will be a useful means of access for speakers and an essential tool for linguists), graphic files (to capture cultural artefacts, and again to provide access to speakers) and the ability to employ different types of search. The dictionary entries include essential syntactic and morphological information, sufficient to obtain any form of a given word (all necessary stems). We have created a Microsoft Access database which allows us to produce the dictionary in different formats (a dictionary for speakers and a dictionary for linguists) at the same time.

The paper also deals with the difficulties we are experiencing in the project: untranslatable items both in the area of cultural-specific material objects (mainly nouns) and in the area of cultural-specific abstract notions (mainly verbs), gaps in paradigms, morphological levelling of old irregular paradigms and differences in the speech of older and younger speakers.

Ib Faurby (*Royal Danish Defence College, Copenhagen, Denmark*)

'A small victorious war': Human rights violations, terrorism and the destruction of Chechen society

The two Russian-Chechen wars (1994-96 and 1999-) have been a catastrophe for Chechen society. Russian forces have committed gross violations of human rights and international humanitarian law resulting in more than one hundred thousand deaths and innumerable wounded and traumatized people as well as the destruction of the infrastructure and means of livelihood. The Chechen fighters have also committed human rights violations and Chechen groups and individuals have committed crimes and terrorist attacks on civilians.

The result of the wars and the violations of human rights has been an almost total destruction of Chechen society, not only in terms of human lives and economy but culturally and morally as well. The prospects for re-establishing a functioning Chechen society including peaceful and legally regulated Russian-Chechen relations are – in the foreseeable future – extremely poor. On the contrary, the centuries old conflict is likely to continue for years to come.

The international reactions to the human rights violations in Chechnya have always been half-hearted and after September 11, 2001 and the Chechen terrorist attacks in Moscow and Beslan, the international community has become even less interested in the conflict and its solution.

Ketevan Gadilia (*Bible Institute, Moscow, Russia*)

The history of the translation of the Bible into Georgian

The beginning of the XXI century was remarkable with regard to the history of Bible translation into Georgian, with several important publications of the Holy Scriptures:

- The new translation of the whole Bible (the Institute of Bible translation, 2002)
- The new translation of the Gospel of Matthew (The Georgian Orthodox Church)
- The scientific and critical edition of the so-called Adishi Gospel

Each of these publications is very valuable despite their diversity, as all of them can illustrate the historical succession as well as new stages in the development of Bible translation traditions in Georgia.

The presentation introduces the attempt to distinguish four major historical periods of Bible translation with a description and analysis of each of them:

I period: approximately IV-V centuries to IX century (undated fragments of manuscripts, the so-called khanmeti and haemeti versions/editions, palimpsests)

II period: from IX-XII to XVIII centuries (dated manuscripts and versions/editions, pre-Athenian period, the Athenian period itself, the gelati version/edition)

III period: from XVIII to the second part of XX century (the version/edition of Mtskheta, the beginning of printed publications)

IV period: XX century and beginning of XXI century (new modern translation of Georgian Orthodox Church of Bible translation, the scientific and critical publications).

Rebecca Gould (*Comparative Literature Dept, City University of New York, USA*)

Terrorizing power: Abrechestvo in Caucasian mountaineer culture

My paper will analyze the representation of the abrek in Chechen and Georgian folklore and literary texts. My primary sources will be the Chechen writer Magomed Mamakaev's novel *Zelimkhan*, which was originally written in Chechen in 1963 and later published in Russian translation, the Ossentian writer Dzakho Gatuev's novel *Zelimkhan: From the History of the National Liberation Movement in the North Caucasus*, published in Russian in 1922, and Mikhel Javaxishvili's *Arsena of Marabdeli*, written in Georgian during the years 1926 to 1932, and published soon thereafter in a Russian translation which the author collaborated in producing.

My central argument is that abregoba in Georgian culture can be distinguished from abrechestvo in Chechen culture by the fact that it was more of a social phenomenon and less part of a campaign of national liberation. The Georgian abrag Arsenia fights against serfdom as well as the oppression of the Georgian people, whereas the Chechen abrek Zelimkhan's struggle can be formulated more clearly along ethnic lines. There are historical, religious, and socio-economic reasons for this difference, the most important of which is that social inequality was more a feature of Georgia's feudal economy before and soon after its incorporation into the Russian empire than it was in Chechnya.

In spite of these differences, however, I will argue for a fundamental similarity between abrechestvo and abragoba. One of the most salient links connecting the two ideologies are the many passages in Mamakaev's *Zelimkhan* which clearly bear the influence of Javaxishvili's *Arsena*. These connections will be examined for the first time in literary scholarship, and the argument will be made that they ought to provide us with a new way of understanding the triangular relationship between Chechens, Georgians, and Russian power.

I will also consider the political, historical, and philosophical significance of abrechestvo. In political and historical terms, the abrek, particularly in the Chechen context, offered the community a way of feeling empowered during a time when they were disempowered in every other way. The political abrek can thus be seen as a surrogate for political power. Philosophically, in terms of the significance of the

concept of abrechestvo for the non-specialist, abrechestvo is a form of decentralized resistance to the unjust imposition of political power. Consequently, the texts which tell the story of abrechestvo from a local perspective offer an insight into the experience of political pressure for minority groups which cannot be met with in other sources.

Teimuraz Gvantseladze (*Chikobava Institute of Linguistics, Georgian Academy of Sciences*)

The language situation in Abkhazia

(Facts without comments)

Since 1993 there have been radical changes in the demographic, ethnic and language situations in Abkhazia. To date:

- The Georgian population (more than 200,000) has been forced to leave the region.
- The majority of the Hebrew, Greek and Estonian population and also some of the Russians and Armenians have gone to their historical homeland.
- Thousands of Abkhazians have migrated from the region to Russia and other post-Soviet countries.
- The official status of the Georgian language as a state language has been abolished (the Georgian language as well as Russian and Armenian has had this status since 1925): Georgian is forbidden in official spheres: Not a single Georgian newspaper, journal or book is printed. There are no programs in Georgian on TV or radio. Cultural and educational centers in the Georgian language have been closed (the Georgian section of the Writers union, the Sukhumi branch of Tbilisi Iv. Djavakhishvili State University, the Georgian Theatre of Sukhumi, and the Folk Ensemble now function in Tbilisi). Not a single street named after Georgian public figures remains in Abkhazian towns. Not a single Georgian school is to be found in 5 districts (out of 6). Instruction in the Georgian language is forbidden in the majority of schools in the Gali district where 100 000 Georgians lived

before the conflict – these have become, for example, mission schools.

- The Abkhazian language remains as one of the state languages, but its sphere of use has become seriously restricted – official business is carried out mainly in Russian while Abkhazian is used only in monoethnic areas (mainly in the countryside of Abkhazia). The majority of the Abkhazian population under 50 either does not know or has a poor command of Abkhazian. In Abkhazian schools, from the first year all the main disciplines are taught in the Russian language. Abkhazian students of all faculties of the university (except for the Department of Abkhazian Language and Literature in the Philological Faculty) have instruction in Russian. The language of the massmedia in the region is predominantly Russian.

Zaal Kikvidze (*Dept. of General Linguistics, Kutaisi University, Georgia*)

Sociolinguistic deficit in the social capital of some ethnic groups in post-Soviet Georgia

Irrespective of the fact that Bernstein's theory of elaborated and restricted codes, and, hence, his deficit hypothesis, have been seriously challenged in sociolinguistics (Labov 1976), currently, the concept of *deficit* may gradually become instrumental concerning the language situation in some parts of Georgia, which are mostly inhabited by ethnic groups other than Georgian. The paper is an attempt to re-introduce the concept of (sociolinguistic) deficit in sociolinguistic research, also applying Bourdieu's notions of economic, socio-cultural, and linguistic capitals.

After the breakup of the Soviet Union, local residents of the regions in question (for instance, Armenians in South-eastern Georgia and Azerbaijanis in Eastern Georgia) maintained their *de facto* status of the quantitative majorities. Under Soviet rule, they also enjoyed the privileges of qualitative majorities as long as they preferred Russian in their social activities (this, of course, was greatly encouraged by the Soviet authorities). After Georgia's becoming an independent state, Russian no longer enjoyed any formal status, while the ethnic groups in question did

not do their best to learn Georgian, the state language of the country they were (and are) citizens of. As a result, most of them are not able to participate in the formal life of the country, in finding employment, and so on.

According to Bourdieu's conception of the various forms of capital, *viz.* linguistic capital as a specific form of social and cultural capitals which in turn can be converted into economic capital, since there is an obvious deficit in the linguistic capitals of the communities in question, this is regularly converted into a deficit in their economic capital. Therefore, the concept of deficit is truly instrumental in such circumstances, and, hence, this leads to the identification of the said individuals as the sociolinguistically disabled.

Giorgi Kipiani, Thea Kacharava and Nino Japharidze (*Social Psychology Dept., Institute of Psychology, Georgian Academy of Sciences*)

The impact of socio-cultural setting and identity on children's perceptions of ethnic well-being

Children's views on the past and the present situation of their ethnic group may be quite different depending on the child's socio-cultural setting and identity orientations. Georgian children in Russian and Georgian language schools, as well as Russian and Armenian children in the Russian schools of Tbilisi (the capital of Georgia) were asked (individually) to complete open-ended sentences about the past, present, and future of their ethnic group and relations with other nationalities.

Georgians in both Georgian and Russian schools evaluate the past very positively. Themes of courage and fighting for the homeland are prevalent. Life in the past is evaluated as better than in the present, Georgians in the past are identified as heroes who love their country and are members of a great nation. Georgians in Russian schools evaluate the past positively, but negative responses are twice as common as in Georgian schools: the theme of the underdeveloped nation is prevalent in their negative responses. For Armenians, the past is also very positive, but they give more negative and neutral responses: themes of richness and might are important. Russians often characterize their

ethnic group as powerful and mighty, while Georgians in Russian schools mention the power of Georgians in the past only once.

Georgians evaluate the present situation very negatively. Some adolescents even think that Georgians are close to catastrophe and degradation: Georgians are characterized as oppressed, and the economic situation in Georgia as poverty. Georgians in Russian schools give almost an equal number of negative, positive and neutral evaluations. Russians give more neutral than positive evaluations of the present. Most of the Armenians evaluate the present situation positively; negative evaluations are few.

Georgians see the future more positively, but negative responses are not uncommon. There are also a number of responses including the word 'perhaps', expressing hope and doubt about the future. Georgians in Russian schools also think positively about the future, negative responses are very few. The future perspective for Armenians is positive without any doubt.

When completing the sentence about relations with other nations, Georgians in Georgian schools often mention themes of competition with, suppression from, or dominance by other nations. In responses by Russians and Armenians positive descriptions of relations (respect and love) with other nations prevail. Georgians in Russian schools give the same number of positive and negative responses to this question. They emphasize hospitality and respect for other nations together with Armenians.

Dodona Kiziria (*Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Indiana University, USA*)

The semiotics of naming: Literary names of streets in Tbilisi

The naming and renaming streets has an archaic nature representing a sacral action; it manifests the creation of a new or the annulment of an old world accompanied by complex political and cultural connotations. From this point of view, we can tentatively identify three periods of varying lengths during which the street names of Tbilisi underwent significant changes: historic, colonial and Soviet. The first covers many centuries of the city's gradual transformation into one of the main urban centers of the country. The second, the colonial period, began with Georgia's annexation by Russia, while the establishment of Soviet rule gave rise to the third phase that followed it. Street names emerging in the third period emphasize on the one hand, the country's subordination to the political rule of the Soviet Russia, and on the other, the privileged state of literature in the Union. It was manifested by the fact that an extraordinary number of streets in the center of Tbilisi carried the names of writers and poets, both Georgian and Russian. The third period and its abrupt end will be the focus of my paper.

Traditional reverence for literary names and the political engagement of many of them in dissident movements afforded a particular prestige to writers, and reaffirmed their popularity among readers. Because of specific cultural traditions and political circumstances in Georgia, the street names in the center of the country's capital represented a rather contradictory mixture of new Soviet and old national symbols. This curious symbiosis manifested the prestigious role of literature with dual connotations: literature as the voice of the Soviet leadership and literature as the symbol of national traditions and artistic freedom.

The collapse of Soviet rule in 1991 and the events that followed fundamentally changed the role and position of writers. Under the influence of political and economic reality, the image of the writer as the torch-bearer of national traditions and high moral values was all but obliterated. The naming and renaming of streets in Tbilisi during this transitional period reflects the process of restructuring of the cultural narrative in the country.

Yasuhiro Kojima (*Dept. of Linguistics, University of Tokyo, Japan*)

Relative clauses in modern Georgian

Modern Georgian has two types of relative clause containing a finite predicate: (i) relative clauses formed by a relative pronoun, and (ii) ones with a subordinator *rom*.

Formal characteristics of these constructions have so far been intensively studied by many scholars (H. I. Aronson, A. C. Harris, B. G. Hewitt, K. H. Schmidt, H. Vogt, among others), but little attention has been paid to their functions. Save the stylistic difference between them, it is generally assumed that these two types of relative clause are always interchangeable as far as their structures allow. However, this is not the case. While relative clauses of type (i) are either restrictive or non-restrictive and can be employed in any case to connect two clauses which share the same referent, those of type (ii) can only be restrictive and their use is semantically and pragmatically restricted.

As in relative clauses of type (i), the predicate verb may be either in the indicative mood or in the subjunctive in relative clauses of type (ii).

With the indicative relative clause of type (ii), the head noun must be definite and the content of the relative clause must be presupposed in the discourse, that is, already known to the hearer. The relative clause of type (ii) functions to help the hearer to identify the referent. For example:

- (a) d̄yes movida erti k'aci, romelsac satvale ek'eta.
Today he.came one man relative pron. glasses he.wore
- (b) *d̄yes movida erti k'aci, satvale rom ek'eta.
Today he.came one man glasses ROM he.wore
'Today a man who wore glasses came.'

Compare (c):

- (c) d̄yes movida is k'aci, satvale rom ek'eta.
'Today that man who wore glasses came.'

Subjunctive relative clauses of type (ii), in contrast to indicative ones, have a non-referential head noun and the existence of its referent is not implied.

- (d) vezeb st'udent's, arabuli-c rom icodes.
I.look.for student Arabic-too ROM he.knows:SUBJ
'I look for a student who knows Arabic, too.'

Andrea Kuzmich (Toronto, Canada)

The continuity of a tradition: A survey of the performance practice of Georgian traditional polyphonic songs in Tbilisi

Over millenia of invasions and occupations, Georgia has not only survived as a culture, but it has maintained a distinct identity. No more is this apparent than through its traditional musical practices. Georgian vocal polyphony is unlike any other polyphony in the world. Of particular interest is the extraordinary variety of polyphonic music offered by such a small country situated in a part of the world normally associated with monophonic musical practices.

The Georgian tradition, however, is undergoing great change. Villages, the original source of the polyphony, are losing touch with their cultural heritage. Over the past decades, economic conditions have forced rural people to emigrate to the capital city, Tbilisi. Population growth and the development of a stronger national identity (since the downfall of the Soviet regime) have contributed to the vibrant community of traditional music making in Tbilisi.

Today, the performance practice of traditional songs is most evident in Tbilisi where influential ensembles are made up of musicologists, individuals who highly value Georgian history and music culture and who encourage the music to be part of an active tradition. This paper intends to look at how the musical tradition continues to develop and maintain its Georgian-ness in light of historical and current practices. An overview of the tradition will be followed by a discussion of current performance practices in Tbilisi looking at: 1) the musical and performance stylings of the ensembles, 2) the contexts in which the music is performed, and 3) foreign interests, which highlight certain aspects of the tradition.

Gucha Kvaratskhelia (*Chikobava Institute of Linguistics, Georgian Academy of Sciences*)

Conversation manners in Georgian proverbs

Georgian proverbs provide rich material about the mental and moral life of Georgians. The *paremies* which point to the weight of words or describe the rules of speaking, give us great insight into the Georgian manner of speaking, which has been formed through the centuries.

The classification of the proverbs revealed all the maxims distinguished by Grice: quantity, quality, manner, and relevance. Furthermore, a type of proverb expressing a specific Georgian manner of address was distinguished. Here, all possible types of vivid and well-aimed assessment by speaker and listener were expressed.

Amiran Lomtadze (*Institute of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Tbilisi, Georgia*) and **Manana Tabidze** (*Chikobava Institute of Linguistics, Georgian Academy of Sciences*)

Some problems of the functioning of the Georgian language in Georgia

Georgian is a standardized language. It was formed over the centuries as a unified and stable language medium, drawing on the three major Kartvelian dialectal groups (Georgian, Megrelian-Chan, Svan) and their subdialects. Attempts to regulate Georgian scholarly, literary, and linguistic norms are traceable from the 5th century.

The differentiation of the Georgian dialects is based on the principle of tribal and geographical classification. The linguistic criterion of classification of the dialects consists in the unity of distinctive features of dialects and subdialects. The dialects of Georgian are divided into Eastern and Western dialectal groups.

Georgian is spoken in Georgia, in the western part of modern Azerbaijan, on the territories of the North-eastern part of Turkey and in Iran (in Fereidan). The Georgian-speaking population is also scattered in post-Soviet republics, a small group emigrated to France in the 1920s, and there are settlements of Georgian Jews in Israel who also speak Georgian dialects.

Georgia's territorial borders changed as a result of historical processes. Early class confederations of Kartvelian tribes appeared in the Caucasus at the turn of the 2nd-1st millennia B.C. Colchis and Iberia emerge as powerful states back in the 7th-6th centuries, B.C. Processes of unification, the defence of independence (Byzantium, Persia, Arabs, Mongols, Turks, Russians) and the struggle for cultural revival are in evidence in the development of Georgian history.

From 1801 to 1918 Georgia was conquered by Russia and the country's borders suffered a drastic change. From 1918 to 1921 Georgia was an independent state and it took measures towards defining the state borders. From 1921 to 1991 the country was again conquered by Russia and the population of the border regions and the actual borders were again artificially altered. Georgia has lost considerable territories as a result of historical processes.

Statistical data in the Soviet period were distorted for political and ideological reasons (in order to disguise the policy of Russification, to conceal an economic crisis, and so on). Accordingly, none of the statistic tables available are reliable. However, the available data are offered here: according to the 1989 census, 3,777,017 Georgians and 302,829 non-Georgians were fluent speakers of Georgian. About the same number of persons spoke, read and wrote in Georgian, as in Georgia of the Soviet period secondary education was general and compulsory.

Speakers of Georgian live across the entire territory of Georgia. Due to the military conflict in Abkhazia from 1992-93 the Georgian population (about 200,000 persons) was expelled from the homeland. These people took refuge in other regions of Georgia. Part of them left Georgia in search of work. The exact statistics of this displacement are unavailable. Thousands of Georgians were expelled from their native land, Samachablo (Shida Kartli), during the military conflict with the Ossetians, inspired by Russia in 1990-92.

According to available data, the change in the number of Georgians speaking Georgian corresponds to the change in the number of Georgians. The interest of non-Georgians in knowing Georgian gradually decreased under the influence of the Russificative regime, as Russian was a language of interethnic relations and it enjoyed a greater influence in all the republics than the language of the republic itself. Since 1921, when Georgia announced her independence and Georgian really became the state language, the interest of non-Georgians in Georgian has increased.

The number of speakers of Georgian did not change from generation to generation among the Georgians. Among non-Georgians, in the 20th century Soviet period a decline of interest in Georgian was especially felt in the post World War II. From the end of the 1980s interest in Georgian has increased, this process continuing to the present day.

The policy of Soviet Russia limited the functioning of the Georgian language: Non-Georgians mainly used Russian in contacts with Georgians, and although Russians sometimes spoke Georgian in everyday situations, they almost never did in official contexts. Non-Georgians chose Russian schools and Russian faculties for their education.

At present several important political and social factors are influencing the fate of the Georgian language considerably:

- The expulsion of about 200,000 Georgians from their homes as a result of the 1992-93 war in Abkhazia, inspired by Russia and the Abkhaz separatists.
- The oppression of Georgians by Ossetians incited by Russia in the Samachablo region of Eastern Georgia and the expulsion of several thousand Georgians from their homes.
- As a result of the grave economic crisis, the migration of the population since 1992 in search of employment beyond the country's borders.
- The search for refuge in Georgia by Armenians and Azerbaijani during the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict.
- The planned return to Georgia of Meskhetian Turks deported during the Stalin regime, although Turks were deported at the time not only from Georgia but also from Armenia and Azerbaijan. The settlement of a large number of Turkish-language speakers will be detrimental to the Georgian language.

Märta-Lisa Magnusson (*Dept. of Political Science, University of Copenhagen, Denmark*)

International mediation in intrastate conflicts. Why no settlement in the Karabakh conflict?

Since 1992 the OSCE Minsk Group, comprising a dozen participant States, has been involved in attempts to mediate a settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The Minsk Group is co-chaired by USA, Russia and France (since 1996). However, despite considerable efforts the OSCE mediators have failed to obtain a comprehensive settlement. Beyond a Russia-brokered cease-fire in 1994 no substantial results have been achieved.

Why has this “high profile” international mediation effort produced such meagre results?

This paper argues that the obstacles to a settlement shall be sought in three interrelated conditions.

Firstly, since the very beginning of the Minsk process there has been a contradiction between the format of the mediation and the nature of the conflict. The conflict involves three parties: Azerbaijan, Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. However, the format used has not allowed for the full participation of Nagorno-Karabakh. The marginalization of Nagorno-Karabakh has prevented meaningful negotiations on key issues. It has also allowed Nagorno-Karabakh to block for settlement proposals on which Armenia and Azerbaijan agreed.

Secondly, efforts to reach a settlement have been blocked by external actors’ economic and geopolitical interests in the Caucasus region. USA and Russia, both Co-chairs of the Minsk Group, and Turkey, a member of the Minsk Group, all have interests in the resource rich region. Iran, not a member of the Minsk Group (or OSCE) participates in the geopolitical game. The external competition for influence in the Caucasus has, on the one side, encouraged attempts to obtain a settlement of the conflict. On the other side it has given the parties to the conflict incentives to maintain intransigent positions. This is especially true for the marginalized party, Nagorno-Karabakh.

Thirdly, democratization processes in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh, albeit slow and incomplete, have made political leaders increasingly dependent on their electorates. Leaders are compelled to take popular reactions to unpopular decisions seriously. Popular resistance to compromise solutions has been, and still is, considerable.

Anna Meskhi (Isik University, Istanbul, Turkey)

Phoenician ‘Aleph and Kartuli Asomtavruli Ani and Khari

(Based on complex comparative linguistic, cultural, paleographic, and esoteric analyses)

The paper addresses one of the crucial problems of the cultural development of mankind – the creation of an alphabetic system and its interrelation with different alphabets. The centerpiece of the work is a complex comparative investigation of the first letter of the Phoenician alphabet ‘**Aleph (bull)** and the Kartuli Asomtavruli letter-signs **Ani** and **Khari**.

The study consists of two basic sections: a) a comparative analysis of the Phoenician ‘**Aleph** and the Kartuli Asomtavruli **Ani**, and b) a similar investigation focusing on ‘**Aleph** and the Kartuli **Khari**, also meaning a **bull**. The connections between the Phoenician-Kartvelian pairs mentioned above are of two types: a) exoteric or visible, such as the graphic design and the acrophonic principle of nomination, and b) cryptic or invisible – ties lying in deeper layers of Semito-Kartvelian relations and embracing mathematical, geometric, astronomical, calendrical, and religious bonds. Interestingly, the latter, of which only the last two aspects will be discussed in detail in the paper, turned out to be much more diverse and significant for the establishment of genetic relations between the two different writing systems than the systemic features (shape, phonetic value, alphabetic order, etc.) acknowledged by traditional paleography so far. For instance, in terms of calendrical relations, the study throws light on a combined Semito-Kartvelian **Moon God – Bull** (as the sacrificial animal of the Moon God) formula where

being a dependent member, ‘**Aleph**’ is governed by the Asomtavruli **Ani**. Similar subordinate relations are exhibited by the entire Phoenician alphabet in relation to its Kartvelian counterpart whose Khari group of seven letter-signs is an obligatory complement for the North Semitic mother alphabet to accomplish the lunar cycle of the month.

The second part of the paper is a linguistic and cultural analysis of the Semitic ‘**Aleph**’ and a group of six Kartvelian words as its possible equivalents. The uncovered Kartvelian group represents a super-informational unit where the semantics of each member discloses a specific aspect of the Phoenician alphabet and contributes towards the formation of a massive informational bank, confirming not only some well-known historical facts but more importantly, elucidating a number of interpenetrating, interdependent, and harmonious esoteric affinities uniting the Phoenician and Kartuli Asomtavruli alphabets as mutually complementary systems.

Florian Muehlfried (*Institute of Social Anthropology, University of Hamburg, Germany*)

Post-socialist or post post-socialist? – Continuity and change in contemporary Georgia

For the time being, Georgia is the only ‘success story’ for US-American foreign policy in Eurasia. The ‘velvet revolution’ in November 2003 was ideologically and financially backed by American institutions like the Open Society Institute. Due to this bloodless transfer of power, a new elite took over the strategic key-positions in politics and economy. The new elite is young in age and often educated in Western countries.

As the new leadership is widely regarded as being independent of social networks stemming from soviet times, Georgia is frequently labeled a ‘post post-socialist’ country these days. This label indicates that the soviet ‘heritage’ has become history.

In my paper I argue that cultural practices shaped in the soviet times still dominate the social behavior of most Georgians. Over the decades, mistrust of the State and written orders strengthened the role of face-to-face communication and verbal skills. The highly ritualized Georgian banquet (*supra*) is a crucial social institution where networks are created

and reinforced, information and opinion is exchanged, and the ‘art of speaking’ is trained.

Additionally, the Georgian banquet is a key-marker of Georgian cultural identity. Both in Georgian scholarly and popular discourse, the *supra* is considered to be an essential part of the Georgian tradition. According to historical sources, though, the *supra* in its recent shape is a product of the 19th century, closely linked to the rise of the national movement.

In soviet times, the *supra* became a key element for both ‘orthodox’, and ‘un-orthodox’ nationalism (following Suny’s classification): As my interviews indicate, Georgian professors presented a completely different version of Georgian history and ethnography at a *supra* than they did in their lectures at the university, and dissidents used banquets as a socially acceptable way to meet with each other.

In recent times, attitudes towards the *supra* divide people in Georgia into ‘traditionalists’ and ‘modernists’, the latter being associated with the post post-soviet society. For the ‘traditionalists’ the *supra* is a major way of marking national distinction in the flow of globalization. For the ‘modernists’ the *supra* symbolizes the obstacles of tradition to modernization. In fact, both sides engage in traditional banqueting when it comes to socializing individual passages like birth, baptism, marriage, death etc.

Annegret Plontke-Lüning (*Dept. of Classic Archaeology, Friedrich-Schiller University, Jena, Germany*)

Research into Armenian and Georgian medieval architecture in the 20th Century

The paper deals with the implications of different theories for the writing of the history of church architecture in Armenia and Georgia. First, there is the immense influence of the great work of the Vienna art historian Josef Strzygowski ‘Die Baukunst der Armenier und Europa’ (1918). But we must also take into consideration the specific influence of the Stalinistic theory of culture whose aim was to construct deeply autochthonous developments in the history of the peoples.

Tariel Putkaradze (*Kutaisi State University Dialectology Research Institute*) and Natia Putkaradze (*I. Javakhishvili State University of Tbilisi*)

Some aspects of the national and linguistic identity of descendants of Georgian Muhajirs

‘Descendants of Georgian Muhajirs’ implies descendants of Georgians who migrated from Southern and South-western Georgia – Achara, Samtskhe-Javakheti, Imerkhevi, Tao-Klarjeti, Livana-Machakheli and Lazeti – to central Turkey in the 19th century, who have preserved an awareness of their Georgian (Gurj or Laz) identity.

The main aspects of the identity of personal self are: language, ethnic origin, citizenship of a state, way of conscious and private life (religion, culture, etc.). Our present scope of analysis does not include other personal features (sex, appearance, character/temperament, education, etc.). However, for a comprehensive consideration of the problem of our immediate interest they too are surely to be taken into account, as a particular person’s anthropological and emotive features are not rarely of essential importance in the analysis of Georgian identity.

As a rule, the main factor in defining national identity is a knowledge of the mother tongue. The knowledge of the mother tongue is the inherent, immanent awareness of one’s own nationality (this implies thinking and at least family communication on the basis of either the literary language or any of its dialects, in the given case: Acharan, Laz, Megrelian, Lashkhan, Lentekhian, Imerkhevian, Samtskhe-Javakhetian, Livanan, etc.). The problem arises from the viewpoint of national identity under the conditions of forgetting the mother tongue. Thus, in a similar case, the Jews survived thanks to their religion. For the Georgian Muhajirs, the religious feature had already been obliterated before they left Georgia, hence Mohammedanism became an additional factor on the way to losing their Georgian identity.

To persons living outside their motherland and to those who have found themselves in their territory under the jurisdiction of the state of a different ethnos, the strength of the mother tongue, awareness of culture, religion or other aspects of the national identity is not the same as the identity of persons living in their motherland. Thus, some Georgians living in Turkey no longer have either their mother tongue (the Georgian

literary language or the native dialect) or their traditional religion. However, they still regard themselves as Georgians due to an awareness of their Georgian origin. They distinguish themselves from others by means of their original dance style, which is different from the Turkish style, their traditional Georgian cuisine, their habitual manner of loud conversation, and other such features.

The present-day generation of Georgian Muhajirs who have lost their mother tongue falls into two distinct groups:

- Turkish-minded people who are ashamed of knowing the Georgian language (regarding this as provincialism!).
- Those who do not speak their mother tongue and have only a scant knowledge of their historical homeland, traditional religion and the modern Georgian state, but still consider themselves Georgians due to a memory and an awareness of their Georgian genetic code. These people cling to their own ethnic roots and even engage publicly in heated arguments with their already Turkicized fellow countrymen (see articles by Fevzi Chelebi, Juneit Diasamidze, Selma Kochiva, Gubaz Chibaris, Iunus Zeirek, and others).

Kakhi Sakhltkhutsishvili (*Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS, The Netherlands*)

The semantics of the Georgian tense system and the Reichenbachian tripartition

In the present talk I will be concerned with the semantics of the Georgian tense system in the light of the Reichenbachian tripartition.

Reichenbach (1947) introduced three points in order to account for temporal relations: the time of speech–S, the event time–E, and the reference point–R. He defined tenses in terms of different configurations of these three points as shown in the following matrix:

	Past R-S	Present R,S	Future S-R
Anterior E-R	Past Perfect <i>He had eaten</i>	Present Perfect <i>He has eaten</i>	Future Perfect <i>He will have eaten</i>
Simple E,R	Past Indefinite <i>He ate</i>	Present Indefinite <i>He eats</i>	Future Indefinite <i>He will eat</i>
Posterior R-E	Past Conditional <i>He would do it</i>	Present Conditional	Future Conditional

The Reichenbachian approach, despite having several shortcomings that will be pointed out in the presentation, nevertheless serves as an excellent tool by which to shed light on the internal structure of the complex system of tense in Georgian.

For example, it offers tools to define the tense *šeč'muli ekneba* 'X will have eaten', which is built from the Future screeve stem of the verb **q'av/kon** 'have' and the Perfect Participle. This form is left unaccounted for in the traditional Georgian grammar. The Reichenbachian system can deal with it in terms of the S-E-R configuration. We could refer to this form as an Analytic Future Perfect and assign it a place in the matrix alongside the Perfect Subjunctive and the Analytic Perfect Subjunctive in the anterior future box.

On the other hand, the Reichenbachian matrix does not enable us to distinguish between some Georgian tenses. First of all, it is too weak to account for the clear semantic differences between the Imperfect, the Aorist and the Perfect. All three tenses are analysed in terms of the same configuration E,R – S. The system faces an analogous problem when dealing with the Future, Future Subjunctive and Optative on one hand, and the Present and Present Subjunctive on the other. It is also insensitive to the opposition between the perfective and imperfective aspect, aspectual opposition being very important in the Georgian tense system.

To conclude, the Reichenbachian tripartition leads us to interesting insights into the Georgian tenses. On its basis it is possible to build up an appropriate theory, which would allow us to thoroughly analyse the semantics of the Georgian temporal system. An attempt of this is done in the author's PhD thesis, of which the current presentation is an excerpt.

Vazha Shengelia (*Chikobava Institute of Linguistics, Georgian Academy of Sciences*)

The semantic category of human beings and objects in Kartvelian and Circassian languages

The semasiological (lexico-semantic) category of human beings and objects is a characteristic feature for all Ibero-Caucasian languages. The relevant grammatical category functions in most of the highland Ibero-Caucasian languages.

In the Kartvelian and Circassian languages the grammatical category of human beings and objects is not present, though human beings and objects are distinguished from each other by lexico-semantic means. Among these are the interrogative pronouns 'who' and 'what', where 'who' refers to human beings and 'what' to the rest.

Words denoting 'God' are found among the nouns of the 'who' groups, whereas the words for 'devil' and 'evil' are in the 'what' group. It is noticeable that in these languages the word for 'a baby' is included in the 'what' group.

In Georgian the suffix *-el* denotes the origin of the person and the suffix *-ur* expresses the origin of the object.

In Old Georgian the semantic division of verbs of possession was based on the contrast between human beings and objects. The expression of this contrast is found the Kabardian verb of knowing (being acquainted to), which takes only human beings as its object.

Revaz Sherozia (*Chikobava Institute of Linguistics, Georgian Academy of Sciences*)

On the development of verbal forms in Megrelian-Laz

1. According to written sources of the last 15 centuries we can observe the development of language structure and changes in some separate elements in the structure. Hence, we can make some conclusions about the development of the formal and functional differences of a given element of any dialect (comparing it to the literary language).

2. In making this comparison we find the routes and directions of changes which have taken place in Megrelian-Laz. A comparison of current data in Megrelian-Laz with the literary language gives us an opportunity to define the approximate time at which the different morphological elements appeared.

3. In (a)-(c) Megrelian-Laz morphological elements that differ from the literary language are illustrated:

(a) In Megrelian, the suffix *-k* occurs in all forms of the present tense, singular forms 1st and 2nd persons of the III and IV series. In Laz, its morphological correlate is the suffix *-r*, which is found only in the present tense of intransitives.

(b) The auxiliaries in future and conditional forms in Laz may be considered as the forming elements of these creoles and not as verbal forms:

k'vat-a-s-ere//k'vat-as-unon 'he will cut it'

k'vat-um-t'-u-doren//k'vat-up-t'-ere 'evidently, he was cutting'

(c) In Megrelian we have the specific *no-* forms of conditionals (*no-k'vat-u-e* 'evidently, he was cutting', 'it seems, that it was possible to cut it'). Similar forms were not developed either in Laz or in the literary language, although the prefix *no-* is quite productive with conditional forms in Laz. Its morpho-phonetic equivalent in the literary language is the prefix *na-*.

4. The foundation of the comparative research on Megrelian-Laz (Zan) was introduced by Arnold Chikobava with his 'Grammatical analysis of Chan'. Research in these issues is important because of the current situation of Laz.

Ether Soselia (*Department of General Linguistics, Tbilisi State University, Georgia*)

Kartvelian models of color categorization

Researching language data is interesting for studying the culture of any nation, and especially the time depth of this culture

Our paper is devoted to the study of color terms. On the basis of a synchronic and diachronic analysis of Kartvelian color term systems it becomes possible to reveal Kartvelian models of color categorization reflecting cognitive processes characteristic of the speakers of the language in question. These processes reflect the main direction of cultural development in the speakers.

As is well known, color terms in any language are divided into basic and non-basic ones. Basic color terms reflect color space categorization and define the color term systems.

We have carried out a synchronic analysis of Kartvelian color terms and established basic color term systems in each of the languages: Georgian, Megrelian, Laz and Svan. As they are genetically related, it is possible to carry out a diachronic analysis as well. The first step is to find phonologically corresponding forms among the basic color terms. As we have discovered, only the terms denoting the category RED are phonological correspondences:

Georg. c'itel- : Megr. č'ita : Laz mč'ita

Svan c'-rni denoting the same category does not correspond phonologically to the forms mentioned above, and so *c'itel- (with the same semantics) is reconstructed on the Georgian-Zan stage.

The fact that the terms denoting the category RED are different in Georgian-Zan and Svan suggest that the category RED was not formed as an independent category in Proto-Kartvelian. Thus, only two basic color categories are proposed to be in existence in the Proto-Kartvelian language: DARK-COOL and LIGHT-WARM. These categories are reconstructed according to the universal model of color categorization, which is based on the well-known universal model proposed by Berlin & Kay.

The above-mentioned model gives us the opportunity to make further semantic reconstructions and to determine the evolutionary routes from Proto-Kartvelian to contemporary independent basic color term systems for each of the Kartvelian languages.

Manana Tabidze (*Chikobava Institute of Linguistics, Georgian Academy of Sciences*)

The contemporary language situation in Georgia. Some problems in the linguistic identity of the population

Demographic changes in the Georgian population have given rise to changes in the language situation. In this respect Georgia is divided into two periods during the 20th century:

- a) Mass movements of the population during the first half of the century, giving abundant material for researching cultural spread and contacts.
- b) During the second half of the century, migration which was more social in character. Here, the cultural individuality of the migrant population was reduced, making contact between 'comers' and 'receivers' more social and less cultural, and facilitating cultural assimilation of the 'comer'.

Language choice for the ethnos which finds itself in a foreign surrounding is the first and most important step on the way to the formation of a new cultural perception of this ethnos. Population movements have always taken place in the world, but in the 20th century they had a specific character.

The present author aims at determining which category the different language communities (collectives) living in Georgia belong to. Here, the following questions arise: When did this or that ethnos arrive in the country? What was the reason for migration? Did integration of these ethnic groups with a 'receiver' ethnos take place or not? What is the level of knowledge of the state language of a 'comer'? What is the

quality of social integration of a ‘comer’ in the new homeland, that is, how much of the social activity of a ‘comer’ is conditioned by their knowledge of the state language? How should the effectiveness of teaching the state language to a linguistic minority be evaluated – as an attempt at cultural assimilation or as an aid to integration. Science today has already found answers to these and many other questions and to take these answers into consideration is very important for the author. Here, we will discuss reasons for changes in the demographic conditions of non-autochthonous linguistic minorities living in Georgia and their language orientation conditioned by these changes. Members of other nationalities have settled side by side with Georgians in Georgia at different times and for different reasons. But they never amounted to decisive numbers, nor did they lead to a cultural atmosphere that could change the Georgian ethnos and unity. The reason for this seems to be: peculiarities of Georgian social life, language consolidation, the religious differences of the ‘comers’, and systematic internal migration. The latter has led to the preservation of a numerical balance of ethnic Georgians due to permanent internal migration and isolation from foreigners having immigrated non-volitionally. Some of the immigrants are still living in Georgia. Here, we will discuss some clear examples, without giving a full description of the ethnic groups who have immigrated to Georgia at different times.

Bela Tsipuria (*Dept. of Modern Literature, Tbilisi State University, Georgia*)

Cultural identity in Soviet and post-Soviet Georgia

Few cultural spaces can be identified in Georgia of Soviet times. In the 1920s, when the Soviet state entered Georgia and started to use the culture of Socialist Realism for political and ideological domination, it also enforced quite a strong influence of Modernist culture in a most aggressive way. Georgian modernists themselves subsequently attempted to counteract the domination of Soviet ideology through national ideas expressed in culture. Thus the culture of national narrative was created. It worked to develop a national identity that came to be oriented towards a cultural norm rather than a political system. Thus a cultural existence was understood as a substitute for the political existence of an independent state. From the 60s and 70s another cultural space was set up as a

result of a cultural orientation towards Modern and Postmodern Western culture. This was an alternative not to Soviet, but to the national cultural space, to the real dominant in Georgia at that time. At the time of the collapse of the Soviet Union, three cultural spaces were interacting in Georgia:

1 Official Soviet culture

Ideological basis:	Soviet ideology
Aesthetical basis:	Socialist realism
Aesthetical position:	Normative
Cultural integrity (synchronic):	Soviet Union
Cultural centre:	Moscow, Russia
Supported:	By the state
Culture:	Identifying political belonging
Identity:	Soviet

2 National culture

Ideological basis:	National ideology (the idea of independence)
Aesthetical basis:	Realism
Aesthetical position:	Normative
Cultural integrity (diachronic):	Georgian traditional culture
Cultural centre:	Tbilisi
Supported:	By people
Culture:	Identifying national belonging
Identity:	Non-Soviet

3 Alternative culture

Ideological basis:	Modernist philosophy
Aesthetical basis:	Modernist aestheticism
Aesthetical position:	Innovative
Cultural integrity (diachronic):	Western, Russian and Georgian Modernist culture of the beginning of the 20 th century
Cultural integrity (synchronic):	Contemporary Western culture
Cultural centre:	Western Europe and USA
Supported:	By some people
Culture:	Identifying cultural belonging
Identity:	Non-Soviet

The transition from a Soviet to a post-Soviet system was reflected also in changes in the cultural situation. It is obvious that the whole cultural system – Soviet culture – was supposed to be canceled together with the political system. In post-Soviet times, with the abolition of Soviet culture, two cultural spaces continued to interact. The culture of National narrative is strongly altered by the Postmodern culture, which is becoming the dominant culture in post-Soviet Georgia.

Kevin Tuite (*Dept. of Anthropology, University of Montreal, Canada*)

The autocrat of the banquet table: The political and social significance of the Georgian supra

The Georgian banquet (supra) – a lavish affair featuring a toastmaster (tamada), elaborate toasts, and the ingestion of inordinate quantities of wine – has attracted much attention for its ubiquity in Soviet and post-Soviet Georgian social life. Recently, some intellectuals have cast a more critical eye on the supra, and called into question the widespread belief in its ancientness. In particular, they discuss the sociopolitical ideology reflected in supra etiquette (the tamada as ‘dictator’, the competitive nature of consumption and eloquence at the banqueting table, the insincerity of much toast-making, etc.), and wonder whether it is compatible with Western liberal values and the building of civil society. In this talk I will compare the present-day Georgian supra to its historical antecedents. The conception of sociopolitical space, and the asymmetric host-guest relationship, underpinning the traditional banquet will be compared and contrasted with the values symbolized by the Western-style ‘à la fourchette’ buffet, which is becoming increasingly popular in today’s Georgia. I will then present my personal views concerning the future of the Georgian supra.

Karina Vamling and Revaz Tchantouria (*IMER, Malmoe University, Sweden*)

Language use and identity among Megrelians from Abkhazia and Megrelia

The topic of the present paper is the use of Megrelian among Megrelians of different generations from Abkhazia and Megrelia. It further investigates the views of these speakers on the importance of language for their perception of identity, compared to other features.

Speakers of Megrelian constitute a cohesive, dominant population in Western Georgia, in the regions of Zugdidi, Senaki, Poti, Tsalendzhikha, Khobi, Martvili, Abasha, including the prosperous Black Sea coast. Before the peak of the ethno-political conflict in Abkhazia in 1993, the Georgians – including mostly Megrelians – constituted the most numerous group in Abkhazia, in particular in the regions of Gali, Ochamchire and Sokhumi. Today, there are almost no Georgians in Abkhazia. Most of them are considered as IDPs and have settled in camps in and around the Georgian capital and in Megrelia.

The speakers of Megrelian use Georgian as their written language. In official censuses and statistics they are included among Georgians, as Megrelian is not distinguished as an official nationality. There is no institutional support for the language and all speakers are at least bilingual in Megrelian-Georgian. The main language of instruction in schools in Megrelia is Georgian. Despite such factors, that would be expected to lead to language shift, Megrelian is quite a thriving language in some areas. Within communities with compact settlement of Megrelians, adherence to the language is very high in everyday life, in family and social activities. Outside the Megrelian area the language is often not transmitted to the second generation, typically in mixed marriages. However, due to the recent migration of Megrelians from Abkhazia to other parts of Georgia, the linguistic map has changed and Megrelian is now used actively even outside its traditional area.

The paper presents data from a pilot field study¹ based on multiple choice questionnaires (in Georgian) distributed among speakers of Megrelian in Megrelia and IDPs from Abkhazia, presently living in the

¹The data collection in Georgia was conducted by Revaz Tchantouria with support from the Swedish Research Council.

Tskhneti area in Tbilisi. The questionnaire was answered by 175 persons, 100 from Megrelia and 75 from Abkhazia.

The questionnaire data show that there is a clear functional division between the domains of use for Megrelian and Georgian, which is typical of a diglossic situation with stable bilingualism among speakers. There is a higher fluency ranking for Megrelian in Megrelia, whereas knowledge of Russian is considerably higher among speakers from Abkhazia. Knowledge of Georgian does not show drastic differences in the two groups.

The questionnaire includes a ranking of six factors according to perceived importance for national identity (Georg. *erovnuli vinaobis mtavari nishnebi*). The replies single out one factor as the most important one: the *common literary language*. The factors *common cultural heritage*, the *Megrelian language* and *common religion* pattern similarly, whereas *common history and origin* are lower in ranking. The fact that *common literary language* is chosen by the respondents to be the most important feature in the perception of their national identity, may be understood as an indication that they consider themselves Georgian in a wide sense, closely tied by cultural and historical bonds to other Kartvelian groups.

Rune Westerlund (*Department of Languages and Culture, Luleå University of Technology, Sweden*)

What is the present-day situation for the minority ethno-linguistic peoples within the Avaric region in the Republic of Dagestan?

In Dagestan, with a total area of 50 000 sq. kms, more than 30 languages are spoken. The largest ethnic group is the Avars who traditionally inhabit the mountainous area of North-western Dagestan. In this area the Avar people have been in a leading position and at least 15 ethno-linguistic peoples have lived alongside the majority for centuries.

These ethno-linguistic peoples are sometimes called the Andi-Tsez groups. Most of them were independent census categories in the first Soviet census of 1926 but in each subsequent census, those census categories were reduced to one category only, namely Avar.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia had its first All-Russian census in October 2002, where ethno-linguistic peoples of the Andi-Tsez groups again became separate census categories. The official result of the Census of 2002 has been published in parts, but it is not yet evident what the final outcome of the Dagestan figures will be.

However, the government of the Republic of Dagestan seems **not** to have counted some of the Andi peoples separately, for example: Botlikh, Godoberi and Bagulal.

Between 2001 and 2004 I have interviewed some representatives of the ethno-linguistic peoples within the Avaric region. In this paper I will present a short background concerning the minority peoples of Dagestan. I will discuss the results of the 2002 census and also forward some comments from my interviews with native speakers from the Andi-Tsez groups.