

---

**FORM AND FUNCTION CORRELATION OF OLD GEORGIAN  
CAUSATION**

**ESKİ GÜRCÜ DİLİNDE ETTİRGENLİK, BİÇİM VE İŞLEVSEL  
KORELASYONU**

**ФОРМАЛЬНО-ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНОЕ СООТНОШЕНИЕ В  
КАУЗАТИВЕ ДРЕВНЕГРУЗИНСКОГО ЯЗЫКА**

**Lamzira KOBALDZE\***

**ABSTRACT**

Akaki Shanidze discusses the category of causation in the old Georgian in its third volume of his works; He considers the causation morphosyntax number in the context of the morphological category and names it as “Contact” (he did not apply the term “Causation”). As for direct contact he discusses it as a non-causative formation, while intermediary causation is the causative one, when in the act there are two objects one verbal (VS-K) and another real (RS – Э) or a Causator and an Executor. As for the function, there is a great difference, the form of a direct contact means one actor, which is known as a subject and it acts directly with a direct objective person (or a direct object). Intermediary contact means two actors, one is a leader (or an organizer), and the second is an implementer (an executor). The leader is a subject, while the direct implementer (an executor) is an indirect object.

According to the study by Akaki Shanidze there are some questions raised regarding the causation morpho-syntactic peculiarities in the Old Georgian language. Based on the study, it seems that the intermediary contact (or causation) is linked with the transitivity. There is one form (of a transitive verb), which can express transitivity and at the same time express causation. Though Ak. Shanidze did not formulate it this way. He did not discuss the causation in reference with other Caucasian languages. Regardless we can find the answer regarding identity in terms of form and bi-functional causation in it.

The languages of the northern Caucasus have no transition and causation, they express them by the same form. It refers to the objective conjugation which is performed based on class and the verb expresses transition by means of a direct object marking, it does not require to express transition separately; while in Georgian, transition has no mark, while availability of a direct object is important for the transition, the objective conjugation marks, the verbs of an objective conjugations are remained, like I “g-a-k-eb” (გაკებ - praise) you, where the priority is an object and regardless Georgian is the language expressing the personal

---

\* ORCID: [0000-0001-7849-9460](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7849-9460), Kobaidze,L., Associated Professor of Samtskhe-Javakheti State University, Akhaltsikhe, Georgia, [lamzira.kobaidze@mail.ru](mailto:lamzira.kobaidze@mail.ru)

## Form And Function Correlation Of Old Georgian Causation

conjugation, this is the pattern of the class conjugation, remained in Georgian, which was characterized as a class conjugation language before divergence from Kartvelian languages, later on it became class-person and finally person conjugation one by the influence of other systems of languages having the person conjugation.

Unlike Indo-European languages, Georgia is a polyvalent marking language, it indicates on its direct linkage to Iberian-Caucasian language system. In the causation initial system-structure this is the possibility to mark polyvalence marking (for both class, as well as person conjugation languages). During discussion of the Causation the focus is made on two subjects, verbal and real one and on the means of lexical, analytical – descriptive or morphological expression and not on the direct object marking. Though according to our observation, the key issue is marking of the direct object and reference to the semantic and form of the verb, what can be discussed as the category of causation in the Old Georgian language.

**Key Words:** Causation, a Causator, an Executor, Analyzing, morphological and mixed causations, verbal subject, real subject.

### Öz

Akaki Şanidze, eserlerinin üçüncü cildinde eski Gürcü dilinin ettirgeni üzerine durmuştur. Ettirgenlerin morfosentaks tipolojisini morfolojik kategoriler bağlamında ele alır ve onları "temas" terimi olarak adlandırır (Şanidze tarafından "Ettirgen" terimi kullanmamıştır). Ona göre, bu ettirgensel bir sonuç değil de bir ara temas terimidir, yani bu durumda ettirgensel sonuç iki özne konunun birbirinden ayrıldığı anlamına gelmektedir. Bunlardan biri sözlü (VS - K) ve diğeri ise reeldir (RS - E) yani ettirgensel ve uygulayıcılar. Ettirgenlik özne- nesnel şahısla ilişkilendirip eylem gerçekleştiren şahıs olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Ettirgen ise iki eylem oluşturan şahıs anlamını taşımaktadır: biri yöneten diğeri ise eylemi uygulayan. Bunlardan özne yöneten vasfını, asıl eylemi yapan ise dolaylı nesne vasfını taşımaktadır. Biri özne olarak bilinen doğrudan iletişim formu, konu olarak bilinen tek bir aktörü ima eder ve bunun da nesne ile doğrudan alakası vardır (veya doğrudan bir nesnedir). Ara temas iki aktöre atıfta bulunur: biri yönetici (veya organizatör), diğeri ise uygulayıcıdır. Bunlardan yönetici bir özne olarak hareket eder, doğrudan uygulayıcı ise dolaylı bir nesne rolündeki eylemini gösterir. Biri özne olarak bilinen tek eylemi yapan şahıs doğrudan iletişimde nesne ile dolaysız şahısla alakası veya doğrudan bir nesne oluşturan şahısdır.

Akaki Şanidze'nin araştırmasına göre, eski Gürcü Dilin'in ettirgenliği morfosentaksın özellikleri hakkında belli başlı soru işaretleri ortaya koymaktadır. Araştırmaya göre, ara temasın (veya ettirgen) geçişli fiille ilişkili olduğu sonucuna varabiliriz. Fiil gerek geçişliliği aynı zamanda gerekse ettirgenlik ifade edebilir. Ancak Ak. Şanidze bu tür tanımlamayı vermemektedir. Bununla birlikte, ettirgenin diğer Kafkas dilleriyle ilişkisini ve eski Gürcücedeki konumu da dikkate almamıştır. Fakat adı geçen tanımlamada ettirgenin biçimsel kimliği ve çift işlevliliği hakkında buradan yola çıkarak bir yanıt bulabiliriz. Kuzey Kafkasya dillerinde geçişlilik ve ettirgenlik arasında ayrım olmadığı için, her ikisi de aynı şekilde ifade edilebilir. Ele aldığımız konu, nesne çekimlemesi fiilin geçişliliği direk dolaysız nesne vasfıyla gösterilmektedir. Kıyaslamak gerekirse Gürcüce'de geçişlilik belirtisi bulunmayıp geçişlilik için en önemli unsur dolaysız nesnenin bulunmasıdır. Nesnel çekim fiillerinde - Ⴑ - Ⴑ - Ⴑ - Ⴑ Ⴑ Ⴑ Ⴑ korunmuştur. Burada nesnenin öncelik sırada olduğu belli olmaktadır. Gürcü Dili şahıslı çekimli olmasına rağmen sözcük konusu çekimleme modeli Kartvel Dillerinin farklılaşmasına dek hep sınıfsal olup sonrasında sınıfsal-şahıslı ve sonunda ise diğer dil sistemlerinin etkisi ile şahıslı çekimli karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Hint-Avrupa ailesi dillerinden farklı olarak, Gürcüce çok değerleri sahibi olan bir dildir. Bu durum ise İberiya-Kafkas dil sistemi ile doğrudan bağlantısını gösterir. Sistemin yapısındaki ettirgen, çok

değerlikli etiketleme için bir imkândır (hem sınıf hem de şahıslı çekim dillerinde). Ettirgen tartışırken, aslında iki özneye -sözlü ve reel olan konulara, bunlarla birlikte sözlü, analitik-tanımlayıcı veya morfolojik ifadelere değinmek gerek. Doğrudan bir dolaysız nesneyi işaretlemek için hiçbir vurgu yapılmamıştır. Gözlemimizin bir sonucu olarak, doğrudan nesnenin etiketlenmesi, fiilin anlambilim ve fiilin oluşumu göz önünde bulundurmakla beraber bu belirleyicinin bir neden olduğu gösterilmiştir. Bu durumda ise eski Gürcü Dili'ndeki ettirgen kategorisinin dikkate alınması gerekmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** nedensellik, nedensel faktör, uygulayıcı, analizci, morfolojik ve karışık nedensellik, verbal özne, reel özne.

### Аннотация

Акаки Шанидзе, в третьем томе своих сочинений обсуждает вопрос каузатив древнегрузинского языка; он рассматривает морфосинтаксическую типологию каузативов в контексте морфологических категорий и называет их термином “контакт”. (Он не использует термин “каузатив”). По его мнению, это некаузативное производство, а промежуточный контакт, т.е. каузативное производство, когда два субъекта разделены в актантах, один - вербальный (VS - K), а другой реальный (RS - Э), то есть каузатор и экзекутор. Форма прямого контакта подразумевает одно действующее лицо, известное как субъект, и который имеет дело непосредственно с лицом прямого объекта (или лицом, являющимся прямым объектом). Промежуточный контакт относится к двум действующим лицам: один - руководитель (или организатор), другой - исполнитель (экзекутор). Из них руководитель выступает в роли субъекта, а прямой исполнитель действия (экзекутор) в роли косвенного объекта. Согласно исследованиям Акакия Шанидзе, возникают вопросы об особенностях каузального морфосинтаксиса древнегрузинского языка. Согласно исследованиям, мы можем сделать вывод, что промежуточный контакт (или каузатив) связан с переходностью. У нас есть одна форма (переходного глагола), которая может выражать переходность и в то же время может выражать каузативность. Однако, Ак. Шанидзе такой формулировки не давал. Также не рассматривается древнегрузинское положение каузатива по отношению к другим кавказским языкам. Однако, там можно найти ответ о формальной идентичности и бифункциональности каузатива. Северокавказские языки изначально не различали переходности и каузативности, выражались одной и той же формой. Дело касается объективного спряжения, которое является классовым, и глагол выражает переходность, отмечая прямой объект, он не требует отдельного выражения переходности; Ср. В грузинском языке - переходность не имеет знака, главное для перехода - наличие прямого объекта, сохранены глаголы объективного спряжения - ზ - ზ- ე - ებ დე დებ - где объект является приоритетным и, хотя сегодня грузинский язык является языком личного спряжения, это модель классового спряжения, который оставался классовым до расхождения картвельских языков, а затем стал классово-личным и, наконец, личным под влиянием других языковых систем. В отличие от языков индоевропейской семьи, грузинский является языком поливалентной маркировки, что указывает на его прямую связь с иберийско-кавказской языковой системой. Каузатив, в структуре системы - это возможность для поливалентной маркировки (как в языке классового, так и личного спряжения). При обсуждении каузатива акцент делается на двух субъектах: вербальном и реальном, а также на лексических, аналитико-описательных или морфологических средствах их выражения; не делается акцент на маркировке прямого объекта. Хотя, в результате нашего наблюдения, именно маркировка прямого объекта, семантика и формирование

## Form And Function Correlation Of Old Georgian Causation

глагола, являются решающими причинами, в результате чего, в древнегрузинском языке следует рассматривать категорию каузатива.

**Ключевые слова:** причинность, причинный фактор, исполнитель, анализирующая, морфологическая и смешанная причинность, вербальный субъект, реальный субъект.

### Introduction

We consider that an Old Georgian language is not diverged radically from the root system-structure of Iberian-Caucasus languages and therefore neither analyzing, and moreover, morphological causations are found in Old Georgian; This phenomenon takes place later. In Old Georgian verb marking of the direct object valency takes place by means of personal marks (this is entirely Iberian-Caucasus language pattern), this is the “possibility” to demonstrate causation morpho-syntax in the same way, as it is given in the north Caucasus languages having class conjugation.

Gradually, some verbal suffixes started expression of causation (the examples are given below), but the language, at the same time, is looking for the analyzing way of expression and like other Caucasian languages, uses transitive verb – “Stsa” (სცა) forced to write “daatserina“ (დააწერიდა). It can be an indication that the objective conjugation pattern became weak and it requires compensation, analyzing formation. The history of Georgian language proves that analyzing formation is a transition stage and finally morphological causation is developed applying the principle of economizing in the language by means of already realized verbal markers with different syntactic-grammatical and functional meaning.

### Main Part

Besarion Jorbenadze defines formal and functional determinations in the following way “form determination is the precondition for constructing the linguistic data forms. Functional determination defines the linguistical data functional structure... During the determination of the form the formal element of the basic data either directly transforms into formed structure, or directly transforms and at the same time introduces strictly defined member in the structure, or directly does not transform into produced form, but it becomes precondition of existing specific and not any other element. For instance, “a-ket-eb-s ga-ket-eb-ul-i” (აკეთებ-ს გაკეთებ-ულ-ი) in the latest form “-eb” is transferred from the basic (a-ket-eb-s) data but at the same time availability of “-eb” producer is the precondition of introducing -ul” and not any other producer in this structure. Functional determination supports to development of the semantic structure of the produced form, its form from the functional prospective what is directly defined by the semantic structure of a basic form, its functional meaning (Jorbenadze, 1980:97-98; 303-304).

“Atsukhebs-atsukhebinebs” (აწუხებს-აწუხებინებს disturbs- makes to disturb) in this couple one is causation form and another non-causation one. Accordingly, inclusion of the “primary” and “secondary” causations into one category faces the formal and functional-semantic difficulties. The issue of the formant of a causation category for the primary, as well as secondary causations is

very important out of formal issues, like “Tsukhs-atsukheninebs” („წუხს-აწუხებინებს“ - is disturbed-makes to disturbed)

„Causations, as the process of the world formation is characterized by addition of a person (actant), this additional person is a direct object; Though it is a real performer of the act, but it implements for others (the act enforced by others.. in the definitions of the causation the important thing is that a subject acts on the direct object by the initiative of a subject, for its reason (G. Machavariani, T. Gamkrelidze, Z. Kiknadze...) it means that the valuable in the causation is that a subject is an initiator and not an executor (Aketebinebs, Ashenebinebs –აკეთებინებს, აშენებინებს - makes to make, makes to build). As it is known the causation is the category for the transitive verb and it creates the opposition of the transitive non-causative and causative forms, as the root and formed forms; morphologically formed forms are extended by means of the relevant affixes, syntactically it is expressed by increase of valence (he writes a letter – he makes him to write a letter) (tsers is tserils -atserinebs is mas therils- წერს ის წერილს- აწერინებს ის მას წერილს); a grammatical status of the actor creates functional and semantic difference in the non-causative and causative forms; in non-causative verbs, an executor is a subject acting based on its will (he writes a letter-thers is therils წერს ის წერილს), while in causative verbs an executor acts based on others (subject’s) will or dictation, actor who acts by others’ initiative is an indirect object (he makes him to write a letter – atserinebs is mas tserils აწერინებს ის მას წერილს). The subject of this another causative verb is mainly the causer of the act and an initiator; as in certain cases a subject can be an executor of an act, for instance, if an inanimate noun (what-group) is marked in the verb, the function of an indirect object, as a direct actor becomes unclear and the action is performed by a subject, for instance, hail makes fruit trees to fall its fruit “setkva khekhils nakofs akrevinebs - სეტყვა ხეხილს ნაყოფს აყრევინებს”). Here a performer is not an indirect object (fruit-tree), but a subject (hail). ( Gogolashvili, 2011 p.583-585). A scientist notes that “an indirect object is not always the only performer of an action in the intermediary contact forms. In most cases it has a co-actor, a subject, for instance, makes it to wash, makes him to bring, makes him to take, etc. – abaninebs, amoataniebs, amoiakvaninebs -აბანინებს, ამოატანინებს, ამოაკვანინებს). (p. 585. The same)

If being the initiator by a subject is more valuable in the causation rather than being an executor, as it is said by Mr. Giorgi Gogolashvili, when the examples given below should not be considered as the cases of causation.

In the scientific literature there are different opinions regarding to the formatives of the causation (Ak.Shanidze, Arn. Chikobava, G. Machavariani..... one part of the researchers names the suffixes (- in, -evin) as the formatives of the causation. Others consider only a- prefix as a producer of causative. The producer of the causation of a transitive verb prefix-suffixes (a- -in, a- -evin) are considered. As a note, -ev is found in several verbs: (chams-achmevs, svams-asmevs, itsvams-atsmevs, artmevs and arkmevs ჭამს-აჭმევს, სვამს-ასმევს, იცვამს-აცმევს,

## Form And Function Correlation Of Old Georgian Causation

ართმევს, არქმევს) but they have lost the understanding of intermediary contact (A. Shanidze). – in suffix is a productive producer. It is applied in the majority of transitive verbs with theme mark or without theme mark: of the productive causation. (tsers-atserinebs -წერს---აწერინებს...) formation of causation by -evin suffice is also productive: (shlis-ashlevinebs, abams-abmevinebs შლის--აშლევინებს, აბამს-აბმევინებს...(Gogolashvili, 2011: 585).

In order to understand causation as a grammatical category deeper I thought to review the ancient hagiographical works “Torture of children from Kola”, briefly describing the story of children residing at the head of the river Mtkvari in the VI century, relationship between the Christians and local pagans, social and legal aspects of their life and other important issues. The author of the work is unknown, it should be written in the IX century. The monument is famous by the manuscript of X century found on the mount Athos. N. Mari made a copy in 1897 and printed it in 1903. (Dzveli Qartulis Qrestomatia 1, Tb. 1946, p.71). It was hard to find the examples of intermediary contact in this text. I can freely say that similar type of form can not be found in the text and it authorizes me to say, that during the period when the monument was written the causation function as a category is unclear and is not found. It seems that this is symptomatic. From this prospective I found „Grigol Khantstelis Cxovreba“ by Giorgi Merchule, very interesting, for having examples I searched the forms:

“The monk was young and belonged to the fathers of the dessert by spirit, we took his hands and made to cross us (datserad-gutsa დაწერად-გუცა) and dressed him and we have called him by our name, we promised to have his son to be our student and he was very happy” (Grigol Khantstelis cxovreba, Tb. 1986 School Edition, p. 89).

Then Kuropalates ordered to go to Ishkhani, as it was close to evening and told to blesses father Grigol “I did not do it consciously, as you did not make me to write a letter (Mitsrad-gets მიწერად-გეც )(the same, p. 93).

“As soon as Theodore and Christophore, the great blessed fathers saw Arsen and Ephrem who were young and wise, they remembered they were made to swear (aghetkua - აღეთქუა) to father Grigol to have those young men with them until they grow. ( Grigol Khantstelis cxovreba, Tb. 1986 School Edition, p.102).

„And when he finished the words, he told to all the brothers to come together. Theodor and Christophore, including thirteen holly brothers and others were divided into three groups and made them to be sent (tharegzavnes - წარეგზავნეს) to Shatberd (the same, p. 101)

“The place of the Theodore was named as Nedzvi, the place of Christophore was named as Kviriketsminda and the students were made to stay (dautevnes - დაუტევნეს) there (the same, p. 101).

„He, seized by the arrogance, removed the divine threat and secretly called the layman from Ancha, the poor man who was good at archery and promised (aghetkua აღეთქუა) to pay three bags of millet and five goats and send (tsaravlina -წარავლინა-) to kill father Grigol to Khantsta” (the same, p. 118)“.

„The true parish of Christ listen to the poor and old people, as Catholicos Arsen is the catholicos by the will of the God and those who abuse him, those who do not regret (Sheinanon-შეინანონ), respect and be shy in this world and age” (the same, p. 106)”.

„The Life of Grigol Khantsteli“ by Giorgi Merchule is the monument of the second half of the X century, as it is known, it includes many descriptive and morphological causation examples. The descriptive forms characterized for the ancient Georgian are more represented “tsema- ცემა was added to the initial form of the verb in the form of different row or person in the adverbial case (R. Saghinadze, p. 160)”. The similar types of the form are represented in the old Georgian, mostly they are given in the form of the series II. Above given examples are the following: Datsrad-gutsa (დაწერად-გუცა) (he, to us, him) represented by the form of the first person in plural. There is another example (“mitsrad-gets- მიწერად-გეც- made you write to him, which is in singular. There are causations of morphological type, produced by different suffixes, like: a-ghetkua -ა-ღეტკუა, tsaregz-av-nnes- წარეგზ-ავ-ნნეს, daut-ev-nes - დაუტ-ევ-ნეს, tsar-avl-ina წარ-ავლ-ინა..... „the contact in the old Georgian is formed by the prefix a-, what is the simplest and oldest way. This is why the special meaning of the causation is not seen in all these forms clearly. Sometimes it is hidden somehow (I. Imnaishvili, V. Imnaishvili).

In the form daut-ev-nes დაუტ-ევ-ნეს -ev mark should be the oldest, but “as it is known from old Georgian such formation was not spread in Georgia” (Saghinadze, p. 159. 2008).

In the forms “Tsarv-a-ls, tsar-a-vl-en-s, tsar-a-vl-in-a (წარვ-ა-ლს--წარ-ავლ-ენ-ს-წარ-ავლ-ინ-ა) a-en (a-in) are the confixes of the causation.

I became interested with the Gospel (Sakhareba Otkhtavi), in particular “prayers, full collection, 2013) to study how the causative forms were built, several examples are referred

The prayer of St. Basil the Great (an extract) „and when, we trust you and pray for the mercy, hear our petitions and forgive us (momiteven -მომიტევენ) all our sins, deeds, words and minds...(p. 31, Locvani, 2013).

„Bless, Lord, your people and their places. Give the power of the cross over Barbarian and protect (daitsev -დაიტევ), our nation and we will say “O, lord, Glory to you” (the same, p. 34)

„Those who refuse orthodox belief and made mistake from the true way, who are confused to understand your bless, help them to turn to (Moaktsien igini - მოაკციენ იგინი) the real belief and they partake of your holiness in the Catholic Apostolic Church, so that they may know you, the only true God, and worship you (takvan-gtsen) (kneeling) (the same, p. 37).

„A word of the Lord and Lord, make me embers your St. flesh (nakuertskhal-mekmenin me- ნაკუერცხალ-მეკმენინ მე), enlightener of me, who

## Form And Function Correlation Of Old Georgian Causation

am in darkness and makes my soul pure with your holly blood” (the same, locvebi ziarebis win, p. 130-131).

„ as you said for the first time, Christ, be with me, the slave of you and stay with me as you promised (აღმითქუ) as I am eating your divine flesh and drink you blood (the same, tropari, p. 130).

„....Wherever you bow your head, but as you humble yourself, we humble ourselves to you, and as if you were humbled by my humility, as you take responsibility tavs-idev -თავს-იდევ) to born and be in the cattle shed... (the same, p. 146).

„... Jesus Christ, the wisdom of the Lord, peace and power, who Christ Jesus, the wisdom of God, the peace and the power that humbleth thee by thy living by cross, nails, knives and death, - they made to die (sikudili – moakudinen სიკუდილი- მოაკუდინენ) to my soul and flesh - (the same, p. 148).

During working on the text of the Gospel the following findings were made, in particular, the intermediary contact forms are rarely met in the old translated texts. We mainly found the morphological formation of the causation. The forms with -ev suffix are dominant, like momiteven-მომიტევენ, tavs-idev-თავს-იდევ, daicev -დაიცევ, which has the ancient origin, “in the second serial the mentioned suffix is turned into -i(v) suffix, like atkumia -ათქუმია, akmnia -აქმნია, the latest is more spread which is caused by the abundance of the second serial forms (Saghinadze, 2008; p. 159)“. The examples of -in suffix is very rear, like sikudili - სიკუდილი (death)- moakudinen -მოაკუდინენ (killed), takvuanis-gcen -თავუანის-გცენ worshipped (comp. takvanis-acemia - თავუანის-აცემია (Saghinadze, p. 160). In the old Georgian a-in confix was very seldom. There was no fixed descriptive (analytical) forms of the causation in the translated Biblical forms, morphological causation forms are more widespread, as well as mixed types of causation forms. The opinion about causation marking given in the scientific literature is noteworthy. For instance,

The forming suffixes of the intermediary contact in, ev, evin. “in” is applied in the majority of the verbs. While this mark is the main producer of the intermediary contact in new Georgian language. It was not used till the X century (Ar. Takaishvili). -ev suffix is used in few verbs in new Georgian language, like achmevs, asmevs -აჭმევს-feeds, ასმევს -gives drink. while it was the main produced in the old Georgia, and it was used often in intermediate Georgian, like akhnevs, akvlevs... ასწევს, აკვლევს..(makes to plow, makes to kill) (Zh. Peikrishvili, 2002: 199).

It is interesting how it is given in the monument of the second half of the V century, “Torture of Shushanik”/

„I have turned (movakts-in-e -მოვაქც-ინ-ე my wife and children by nature into the same belief as I am („Shushanikis wameba“ ,1985 : 6).

„And she told me: Do not let it to become on me (ikop-in chemda- იყოფ-ინ ჩემდა) that I share the deeds and sins of Varsken (the same, p. 9) .



„I came and told, as “you have turned my icon down and spread the ash over my place. And you have left (dagit-ev-ebies -დაგიტ-ევ-ებიეს) my house and gone to another place. (the same, p. 10).

„As soon as he came and entered to the queen and he said lots of convincing words (tried to win over) when st. Shushanik said. (the same, p. 12)

„When she used to urge, he ordered to let her go (განტ-ვე-ბად) and to take her to one room and guard her secretly (the same, p.14).

„I made her to eat a little (ვაიძულე მიღებად ჭამადი) which was provided to her (p.15)“.

When he made the guards to be (დაადგ-ინ-ნა- daadg-in-na) with her and told her, to kill her with love” (p. 18).

„An the blessed Shushanik was told “your children were made to turn into sorcery (მიაკც-ინ-ა-miakts-in-a) p. 21)“.

The work is very interesting from this prospective. The examples of the causation if we can consider it as the examples of contact are very limited. There are not almost morphological formants except one or two cases, like მიაკცინა, მიაკცინე (Miaktsina, Miaktsine). It is doubtful if language knows the suffixes as the producers of contact. Language is a different system it means that it will use the suffixes in other cases too. Moreover, we can say that causation, as a grammatical category has not been formed yet. Neither morphological, nor analytical and mixed type patterns are found. The language structure tends to express the meaning of the causation by means of semantics. For instance,

„When they reached and entered to the queen’s place and many convincing words were said (do their best to win over) and then St. Shushanik told them (დასაჯერებელსა სიტყუასა ეტყოდეს (ძლიერ ცდილობდნენ დაეტანხმებინათ) (the same, p. 12).

In the mentioned sentence the content of the causation is shown, which is not expressed by the producing markers in the language. Though only -ev and -in suffixes, producing causation are met in the text, though it seems that given examples should not be the producers of the causation. It is proved by the examples taken from the same text having totally different meaning (see examples above). It is interesting what are the function of the mentioned markers? can these suffixes available in the language have different status? “It isn’t possible that constant labels will not be in the language and in case of need any formal element can be used per need by a language any time with any purpose, introduce in totally different system and put together with totally different element. The language has such a potential, though it is possible that realization of this potential does not take place often. Of course, arbitrary use does not mean absence of the system, it has its regularity. Individual approach is required for each specific example”. (Jorbenadze, 1980:261).

### Conclusion

As a conclusion, we can say, that in the Old written or translated monuments causation as a grammatical category has not established till the second half of the X

## Form And Function Correlation Of Old Georgian Causation

century. Regardless there are some morphological markers, like **-in**, **-evin**, but they have not the mentioned function. The language is more tend to express meaning of compulsion characterized to causation more semantically, moreover, the role of an indirect object (an executor), as a direct implementer of the particular act is not demonstrated. Only a leading person, i.e. causator is shown. A causation, as a grammatical category is well shown already in the text of the X century, “Grigol Xantstelis Covreba”, where it is demonstrated mainly by descriptive form.

### Bibliography

- Gogolashvili G. (2011): Tanamedrove Qartuli Enis Morpologia (salitertauro ena) gamomcemloba “Meridiani”, Tbilisi.
- Saghinadze R. (2008): Dzveli Qartuli Ena (V-XI centuries), Tbilisi
- Peikrishvili Zh. (2002): Qartuli Enis Morpologia, saleqcio kursi, (meore gamocema), Kutaisi
- Shanidze Ak. (1980): Txzulebata mesame krebuli, Qartuli Enis Gramatikis Sapudzvebi, Tbilisi.
- Jorbenadze B. (1980): Qartuli zmnis pormobrivi da punqciuri analizis principebi, Tbilisis universitetis gamocema.
- Grigol Khantstelis Cxovreba (1986): (School Edition) Tbilisi.
- Locvani, sruli krebuli (2013): Locvani, Yovladwmida Gvtismshoblis paraklisi, sagmrto liturgia. Tbilisi
- Dzveli Qartulis Qsrestomatia , I (1946): Tbilisi.
- ShuSHanikis Wameba ,,saskolo gamocema“(1985): Tbilisi