Approximative Verbs: A Symbiosis of the Nominal and the Verbal Domain (on the Example of the Georgian Language)

Mariam Kamarauli

The Georgian language has always been characterised by many peculiarities, be it *suffixaufnahme*, which is the phenomenon of adding (and thus duplicating) the case endings of preceding nouns to postpositioned attributive nouns (in the genitive), adjectives or pronouns (Kamarauli 2022:29), or the existence of deictic adjectives, which are a combination of demonstratives and adjectives (Kamarauli 2022:76) – both pertaining to the nominal domain. It will come as no surprise that there are particular phenomena in the verbal domain as well. One of these topics is discussed in the present paper: this is a type of symbiosis of verbs and nouns, hereinafter called **approximative verbs**. Before presenting this phenomenon in particular, the basis and the components must be discussed. All examples in this paper are from the Georgian National Corpus (GNC), to be precise from the subcorpora GRC (Georgian Referential Corpus) and GNC Modern Georgian; examples marked with "M.K." are constructed by myself to demonstrate the functionality of some NP elements.

I define approximative verbs on the example of constructions such as *momibodišasavit* '(s)he almost/seemingly/nearly/slightly/barely/kind of apologised to me', which can be analysed as follows:

(1) *mo-* *m-* *i-* *bodiš-* *a-* *s-* *a-* *vit*

 PV O1SG OV apologize S3SG DAT.SG EMPH.V like

'(s)he almost/seemingly/nearly/slightly/barely/kind of apologised to me'

Up to including the subject marker for the 3rd person singular *-a*, the form is purely verbal and contains the necessary morphemes such as the preverb *mo-*, the object marker (1st person, singular) *-m-*, the objective version marker *-i-* (which is originally a subjective version marker but functions as an objective version marker if it is combined with the object marker, Šaniʒe 1980: 331) and the stem *-bodiš-*. After the subject marker *-a*, three nominal morphemes are suffixed: the dative singular marker *-s*, the emphatic vowel *-a* (which is used e.g. in combinations with some postpositions or postpositionally placed genitive nouns) and the postposition *-vit*. I assume that the dative case marker *-s*, the emphatic vowel *-a* and the postposition *-vit* went altogether through a grammaticalisation process yielding a lexical unit *-savit* which has the function of marking approximative constructions.

This phenomenon has already been mentioned before by several linguists. In 1963, Z. ʒapariʒe wrote a paper about the usage of the postposition *-vit* in verbal constructions and quoted examples from Sulxan Saba Orbeliani's lexicon such as *gaačuma* '(s)he silenced him/her' vs. *daadumasavit* '(s)he kind of silenced him/her', stating that "for Saba, forms with *-vit* represent a method of referring to the meaning of a word with a synonymous word. He refers to the similarity of explanatory words and the word to be explained, i.e., this postposition is used with

the same meaning that it generally has in the Georgian language" (Ǯapariʒe 1963: 95);[1] he further stated that this kind of construction can be also found with adverbs such as *agersavit* 'kind of here' and conjunctions such as *magramsavit* 'kind of but' (Ǯapariʒe 1963: 96). V. Imnaišvili additionally referred to the function of *-vit* as a means for expressing similarity, analogy and identity (Imnaišvili 2008: 75).

Before starting the analysis of approximative verbs, I below demonstrate the declension system of the Modern Georgian language, which comprises seven cases and two numbers:

	consonantal stems				vocalic stems
SG.	'mother'	'king'	'girl'	'deaf'	'boy'
NOM.	*deda*	*mepe*	*gogo*	*ġru*	*bič–i*
ERG.	*deda-m*	*mepe-m*	*gogo-m*	*ġru-m*	*bič-ma*
DAT.	*deda-s(a)*	*mepe-s(a)*	*gogo-s(a)*	*ġru-s(a)*	*bič-s(a)*
GEN.	*ded-is(a)*	*mep-is(a)*	*gogo-s(i)*	*ġru-s(i)*	*bič-is(a)*
INST.	*ded-it(a)*	*mep-it(a)*	*gogo-t(i)*	*ġru-t(i)*	*bič-it(a)*
ADV.	*deda-d*	*mepe-d*	*gogo-d*	*ġru-d*	*bič-ad*
VOC.	*deda-o/v*	*mepe-o/v*	*gogo-o/v*	*ġru-o/v*	*bič-o*
PL.	'mothers'	'kings'	'girls'	'deafs'	'boys'
NOM.	*ded-eb-i*	*mepe-eb-i*	*gogo*	*ġru-eb-i*	*bič-eb-i*
ERG.	*ded-eb-ma*	*mepe-eb-ma*	*gogo-eb-ma*	*ġru-eb-ma*	*bič-eb-ma*
DAT.	*ded-eb-s(a)*	*mepe-eb-s(a)*	*gogo-eb-s(a)*	*ġru-eb-s(a)*	*bič-eb-s(a)*
GEN.	*ded-eb-is(a)*	*mepe-eb-is(a)*	*gogo-eb-is(a)*	*ġru-eb-is(a)*	*bič-eb-is(a)*
INST.	*ded-eb-it(a)*	*mepe-eb-it(a)*	*gogo-eb-it(a)*	*ġru-eb-it(a)*	*bič-eb-it(a)*
ADV.	*ded-eb-ad*	*mepe-eb-ad*	*gogo-eb-ad*	*ġru-eb-ad*	*bič-eb-ad*
VOC.	*ded-eb-o*	*mepe-eb-o*	*gogo-eb-o*	*ġru-eb-o*	*bič-eb-o*

Table 1: Declension paradigm in the singular and plural in Modern Georgian

Note that three cases, namely the dative, the genitive and the instrumental case, can affix the emphatic vowel after the case marker, e.g. to mark the borders of the NP.

As for the last element in the approximative verb, the Georgian languages possesses a large diversity of bound postpositions, which govern different cases:

Postposition	Governed case	Meaning	Example
-vit	nominative/dative	like	*adamiani* 'human' → *adamian-i-vit* 'like a human' (NOM.); *mama* → *mama-s-a-vit* 'like a father' (DAT.)
-ši	dative	in, to	*saabazano* 'bathroom' → *saabazano-s-ši* → *saabazano-ši* 'in the bathroom'

---

[1] "საბასათვის -ვით თანდებულიანი ფორმები სიტყვის მნიშვნელობაზე სინონიმური სიტყვით მითითების ხერხს წარმოადგენს. იგი განსამარტავი და „განმმარტებელი" სიტყვების **მსგავსებაზე** მიუთითებს, ე. ი. ეს თანდებული გამოყენებულია იმ მნიშვნელობით, რომელითაც იგი საერთოდ გვხვდება ქართულში."

-ze	dative	on	*magida* 'table' → *magida-s-ze* → *magida-ze* 'on the table'
-tan	dative	at, by, near	*sadguri* 'station' → *sadgur-s-tan* → *sadgur-tan* 'near the station'
-tvis	genitive	for	*bebia* 'grandmother' → *bebi-is-tvis* 'for the grandmother'
-gan	genitive	from (a person, a thing)	*da* 'sister' → *d-is(a)-gan* 'from sister', *tovli* 'snow' → *tovl-is(a)-gan* '(made) from the snow'
-dan	instrumental	from (a place)	*sḳola* 'school' → *sḳol-it-gan* 'school + INST + from'→ *sḳol-i-dan* 'from school'
-mde	adverbial	up to, as far as, until (local, temporal)	*ak* 'here' → *ak-ad-mde* 'here + ADV + until'→ *ak-a-mde* 'until here'

Table 2: Bound postpositions in Modern Georgian

It should be pointed out that:

1. as a result of phonological assimilation, the dative case marker *-s* preceding the postpositions *-ze* and *-ši* fuses with these postpositions and is omitted – this is due to the phonemes [s], [z] and [ʃ] all being sibilants;
2. the dative marker remains if the postposition *-tan* is suffixed to a noun with a vocalic stem; *-vit* is an exception as the dative marker is always present;
3. the postposition *-dan*, which governs the instrumental case, is derived from *-gan* suffixed to the instrumental case marker *-it* and developed from *-it-gan* to *-id-gan* to finally *-i-dan*;
4. the adverbial case marker *-ad*, only governed by the postposition *-mde*, is reduced to *-a* when the postposition is suffixed;
5. the postposition *-vit* is the only postposition aside from *-gan* (GEN and INST) which governs two cases: the nominative and the dative;
6. the postposition *-vit* governs the nominative case only if the noun has a consonantal stem (demonstrated by the declension of *biči* 'boy' in Table 1) – if the noun has a vocalic stem, the postposition is suffixed to the dative case marking;
7. in the nominal domain, the postposition *-vit* is mostly used with a comparative function: *vardi**vit** lamazi* 'as beautiful as a rose'.

When searching the GNC (gnc.gov.ge) for statistics concerning the postposition *-vit*, I came across a peculiar anomaly: while the postposition *-vit* should only govern the nominative and dative case, the corpus actually shows three cases governed by this postposition: nominative, dative and genitive. The latter is, statistically speaking, the rarest among the cases: while nouns in the nominative with suffixed *-vit* amount to 46,108 hits (singular: 37,176, plural: 8,932) and nouns in the dative to 12,608 hits (singular: 12,388, plural: 220), the genitive case marker is only found in 127 examples (singular: 110, plural: 17). It should further be noted that it was expected that the GNC shows more hits for the *-vit* postposition with the nominative case as there are more nouns with consonantal than with vocalic stems and thus the postposition *-vit*

governs the nominative case in more cases than the dative case. However, some unexpected exceptions are also attested in the GNC, in which the same noun appears in all mentioned combinations:

(2) | *tval-s* | *sṭacebda* | *ḳoxṭa* | *eḳlesia-monasṭr-eb-i,* |
|---|---|---|---|
| eye-DAT.SG | catch.S3SG.IMPF | pretty.NOM.SG | church-monastery-PL-NOM |

šeabǯrul-i	***važḳac-i-vit***	*gora-ze*
armed-NOM.SG	young man-NOM.SG-like	hill.DAT.SG-on

'The eye was captivated by the pretty churches-(and-)monasteries, the castles standing on the hill like an armed young man […]' (Journal *Liṭeraṭuruli ṗaliṭra*, 2008)

(3) | *ḳargi,* | *balġ-o,* | *ḳargi!* | *balġ-i* | *xar* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| good | child-VOC.SG | good | child-NOM.SG | be.S2SG.PRES |

magram	***važḳac-s-a-vit***	*laṗaraḳob*
but	young man-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like	speak.S2SG.PRES

'Okay, child, okay! You are a child, but you speak like a young man...' (Aleksandre Qazbegi, *Elguǯa*)

(4) | *es* | *otxmoc-is* | *çl-is-a* | *iḳo* | *da* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| this.NOM.SG | eighty-GEN.SG | year-GEN.SG-EMPH.V | be.S3SG.AOR | and |

isev	***važḳac-is-a-vit***	*šeʒleba*	*hḳonda*
again	young man-GEN.SG-EMPH.V-like	capability.NOM.SG	have.S3SG.AOR

'He was in his eighties and still had a capability like a young man.' (Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani, *Mogzauroba evroṗaši*)

Example (2) shows how a regular noun with consonantal stem would suffix the postposition *-vit*: because the noun *važḳaci* 'young man (NOM.SG)' has a consonantal stem, the postposition is suffixed after the nominative case marker *-i*, governed by the postposition. Example (3) demonstrates the regular procedure of suffixing the postposition *-vit* to a noun with vocalic stems, namely, by putting the noun in the dative before adding the postposition; in the given case, this is unexpected. Lastly, example (4) contains quite a peculiar construction because it can be analysed in two different ways: a) the approximative formation *važḳacisavit* 'like a young man' can be regarded as a genitive noun modifying the following noun *šeʒleba* 'capability (NOM.SG)' so that the approximative reading is applied to the whole phrase; in that case, the genitive case would be governed by its syntactic function and the postposition *-vit* would function as a conjunction, but then the question arises why the postposition is suffixed to the modifier and not to the head. Or b) the postposition *-vit* is suffixed to the genitive *važḳacisa* indicating a contrast to the preceding genitive phrase *otxmocis çlisa* 'of eighty years (GEN.SG)', with the approximative reading being only applied to the genitive noun. I here assume the latter to be the case because of the contrast, offering the following argumentation for the governed genitive case: the phrase *važḳacisavit šeʒleba* 'capability (NOM.SG) like a young man (GEN.SG)' could originally have been *važḳacis msgavsi šeʒleba* 'capability (NOM.SG) alike/similar to that of a young man (GEN.SG)', in which the free postposition *msgavsi*

'alike/similar (NOM.SG)' (originally a lexicalised deverbal adjective) governs the genitive case; if the bound postposition -*vit* here substituted the free postposition *msgavsi* for economical reasons (as both have identical function and semantics), the genitive case could have remained as an exception.

The threefold variation with the postposition -*vit* governing three different cases can be found with other nouns, too:

(5) *ber-ma*   *gašlil-i*   *xel-i*   *zeaġmarta*   *da*
     monk-ERG.SG   open-NOM.SG   hand-NOM.SG   raise.S3SG.AOR   and

     cxovel-i   *ķaṭ-is*   ***ķnuṭ-i-vit***   *aķruṭunda*
     animal-NOM.SG   cat-GEN.SG   kitten-NOM.SG-like   purr.S3PL.AOR

'The monk raised his outstretched hand and the animal purred like a cat's kitten' (Journal *Sakartvelos resṗubliķa*, 2014)

(6) *vnaxe,*   *rom*   *čem-i*   *ertad-ert-i*   *ʒma,*   *ertad-ert-i*
     see.S1SG.AOR   that   my-NOM.SG   only-NOM.SG   brother.NOM.SG   only-NOM.SG

     ķetilis-mq̇opel-i   *ķaṭ-is*   ***ķnuṭ-s-a-vit***   *čamomirčes*
     benevolent-NOM.SG   cat-GEN.SG   kitten-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like   hang.S3PL.AOR

'I saw that they hung my only brother, the only one, benevolent, like a cat's kitten' (Ilia Čavčavaʒe, *Saxrčobelazed*)

(7) *krisṭian-i*   *ķac-is*   *švil-i-a*   *ķaṭ-is*
     christian-NOM.SG   man-GEN.SG   child-NOM.SG-COP   cat-GEN.SG

     ķnuṭ-is-a-vit   *xom*   *ver*   *gadaagdeb*
     kitten-GEN.SG-EMPH.V-like   AFF   NEG   throw away.S3SG.FUT

'He's a Christian man's son, you can't throw him away like a cat's kitten [...]' (Niķo Lortkipaniʒe, *Keduxrelni*)

Example (5) shows again how the postposition -*vit* would be suffixed normally to nouns with consonantal stems (governing the nominative); example (6) demonstrates the usual suffixing for nouns with vocalic stems, which is incorrectly executed in the given case (this could be due to the fact that example (6) as well as (3) are both from the 19th century and are therefore not subject to today's morphological rules); and example (7) displays once again the completely unexpected combination of the postposition -*vit* with the genitive case.

This anomaly can be found in nouns with vocalic stems, too:

(8) *rac*   *mtavar-i-a,*   ***mam-is-a-vit***   *ķalam-i-c*
     what   main-NOM.SG-COP   father-GEN.SG-EMPH.V-like   pen-NOM.SG-FOC

     učris   *da*   *xaṭovan-i*   *siṭq̇v-is*
     cut.S3SG.PRES   and   figurative-NOM.SG   word-GEN.SG

osṭaṭ-i-c-a-a	*čven-i*	*ketevan-i*
master-NOM.SG-FOC-EMPH.V-COP	our-NOM.SG	Ketevan-NOM.SG

'Most importantly, like her father, our Ketevan is good at writing and a master of figurative language' (Journal *Sakartvelos resṗubliḳa*, 2008)

The noun *mama* 'father (NOM.SG)' has a vocalic stem, so it would be expected to stand in the dative when suffixing the postposition *-vit*; instead, once again, the postposition governs the genitive case. Incidentally, this is the only occurrence of *mamisavit* 'like the father (GEN.SG + vit)', *mamasavit* 'like the father (DAT.SG + -vit*; the correct execution) being found 172 times, and there is no evidence for a construction with the nominative case (**mama-vit*).

Given the analysis above, it is clear that systematically, an inflected verb like *momibodiša* '(s)he apologised to me' is treated like a noun with a vocalic stem, with the postposition *-vit* governing the dative case. The corpus reveals 166 hits with similar constructions which, however, differ in their semantic function and their grammatical composition. Below, I propose a first attempt at systematisation for such approximative verbs.

1. Semantic function

1.1 Approximativity

In certain contexts, such constructions simply denote approximativity; a similar function is found in approximative adjectives, with a grading level marked by affixes and expressing an unachieved quality (*lamazi* 'beautiful' → *mo-lamaz-o* 'almost beautiful'):

(9a)	*martla*	*ase*	*mogeçone?*	**gamiġima-s-a-vit**
	really	like this	like.O2SG.S1SG.AOR	smile.O1SG.S3SG.AOR- DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like

'Did you really like it that much? – he kind of smiled at me' (Magda Ḳalandaӡe, *Eperebian*)

This example can be paraphrased as follows to determine the function of the approximative verb:

(9b)	*martla*	*ase*	*mogeçone?*	**odnav**	*gamiġima*
	really	like this	like.O2SG.S1SG.AOR	slightly	smile.O1SG.S3SG.AOR

'Did you really like it that much? – he slightly smiled at me' (M.K.)

The grading adverb *odnav* 'slightly' denotes the same reduced intensity as intended with the approximative verb in (9a) so that *gamiġimasavit* 'he almost smiled' can be replaced by *odnav gamiġima* 'he slightly smiled' without changing the semantics of the sentence.

1.2 Epistemic modality

By using epistemic modals, a speaker can avoid taking responsibility for the truthfulness of the utterance expressed. In example (10) below, there are four verbs, with the postposition *-vit* attached to only one of them; the speaker believes that the protagonist used to go to the store and used to wash and pick up Levushka from the garden, but (s)he considers the claim that the protagonist was studying English to be doubtful and evaluates it as such:

(10a)	*dġisit*	*maġazi-eb-ši*	*dadioda,*	*recxavda*	*da*
	during the day	store-DAT.PL-in	go.S3SG.IMPF	wash.S3SG.IMPF	and

inglisur-ši	***mecadineobda-s-a-vit.***		*sam-ze*
English.DAT.SG-in	study.S3SG.IMPF- DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like		three.dat.sg-on
levušḳa	*gamohq̇avda*	*baġi-dan*	
Levushka.NOM.SG	pick up.S3SG.IMPF	kindergarden.inst.sg-from	

'She used to go to the stores during the day, [she] used to wash and, supposedly, [she] used to study in English. At three, she used to pick up Levushka from the kindergarten.' (Journal *Sakartvelos resṗubliḳa*, 2008)

A paraphrasis of this expression could run as follows:

(10b)	*dġisit*	*maġazi-eb-ši*	*dadioda,*	*recxavda*	*da*
	during the day	store-DAT.PL-in	go.S3SG.IMPF	wash.S3SG.IMPF	and
	titkos	*inglisur- ši*	*mecadionebda.*	*sam-ze*	
	as if	English.DAT.SG-in	study.S3SG.IMPF	three.dat.sg-on	
	levušḳa	*gamohq̇avda*	*baġi-dan*		
	Levushka.NOM.SG	pick up.S3SG.IMPF	kindergarden.inst.sg-from		

'She used to go to the stores during the day, [she] used to wash and seemingly to study English. At three, she used to pick up Levushka from the kindergarten.' (M.K.)

1.3 Attempt

Approximative verbs can convey the attempt of an action and thus be paraphrased with verbs meaning 'to try' in a synonymous verbal construction:

(11a)	*mḳitxa*	*cimerman-i*	*tu*	*çagiḳitxavs-o?*	*sçored*
	ask.S3SG.O1SG.AOR	Zimmermann-NOM.SG	if	read.S2SG.FUT-QUOT	exactly
	mašin	*gavige*	*rom*	***mçerlobda-s-a-vit***	
	then	hear.S3SG.AOR	that	write.S3SG.IMPF-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like	

'He asked me if I had read Zimmermann. It was just then that I got to know that he was kind of writing.' (Salome Šengelia, *End In Burgh*)

(11b)	*mḳitxa*	*cimerman-i*	*tu*	*çagiḳitxavs-o?*	*sçored*
	ask.S3SG.O1SG.AOR	Zimmermann-NOM.SG	if	read.S2SG.FUT-QUOT	exactly
	mašin	*gavige*	*rom*	***cdilobda***	***mçerloba-s***
	then	hear.S3SG.AOR	that	try.S3SG.IMPF	write-DAT.SG

'He asked me if I had read Zimmermann. It was just then that I got to know that he was trying to write.' (M.K.)

1.4 Contextual evidentiality

The last of the semantic functions of approximative verbs to be discussed here is contextual evidentiality. Evidentiality is "a semantic-pragmatic category that refers to the way in which

the speaker responds to the validity of what is said in his or her utterance. The characterisation of a sentence's content as known through one's own perception is called evidential, with the speaker assuming responsibility for the truth of the expressed proposition" (Glück 2016: 191).[2] Evidentiality is often marked by peculiar morphemes, particles, adverbs or certain verbs, or it may be apparent from the context:

(12a) *is*   *ṗaṭimar-i*   *mġvdl-is*   *punkci-eb-s*
that.NOM.SG   prisoner-NOM.SG   priest-GEN.SG   function-PL-DAT

asrulebda-s-a-vit.   *saḳan-i*   *xaṭ-eb-it*
fulfill.S3SG.IMPF-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like   cell-NOM.SG   icon-PL-INST

hkonda   *savse*   *da*   *mudam*   *ento*   *ḳandel-i*
have.S3SG.IMPF   full   and   always   light.S3SG.AOR   candle-NOM.SG
'That prisoner kind of performed a priest's functions. He had a cell full with icons and a candle was always burning.' (Guram Megrelišvili, *Šeni gamoḳvleva mezobeltgamoḳvlevis sapuʒvelze*)

In example (13a), the speaker has reasons to assume that the prisoner did some acts that are typical for priests because he saw that he had icons and lightened candles in his room. The Georgian language does possess evidential adverbs which can be used to paraphrase this example:

(12b) *is*   *ṗaṭimar-i*   *mġvdl-is*   *punkci-eb-s*
that.NOM.SG   prisoner-NOM.SG   priest-GEN.SG   function-PL-DAT

asrulebda   **turme.**   *saḳan-i*   *xaṭ-eb-it*   *hkonda*
fulfill.S3SG.IMPF   apparently   cell-NOM.SG   icon-PL-INST   have.s3sg.impf

savse   *da*   *mudam*   *ento*   *ḳandel-i*
full   and   always   light.S3SG.AOR   candle-NOM.SG
'That prisoner apparently performed a priest's functions. He had a cell full with icons and a candle was always burning.' (M.K.)

In fact, the GNC even reveals some occurrences of approximative verbs together with evidential adverbs such as *titkos* 'as if', but also with nonspecific adverbs (*raġac/raġacnairad/racxa* 'somehow') or grading adverbs (*cota* 'little, few', *ḳidev upro* 'even more'):

(13) **titkos**   **minavlda-s-a-vit**   *disḳusia*   *da*
as if   extinguish.S3SG.AOR-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like   discussion.NOM.SG   and
ḳoṭe   *ꝗubaneišvil-ma*   *axal-i*   *sabab-i*
Ḳoṭe   Ꝗubaneišvili-ERG.SG   new-NOM.SG   reason-NOM.SG

---

[2] "Semant.-pragmat. Kategorie, welche sich auf die Art und Weise der Stellungnahme des Sprechers zur Geltung des in seiner Äußerung Gesagten bezieht. Als [evidentiell] bezeichnet man die Kennzeichnung eines Satzinhaltes als durch eigene Anschauung bekannt, wodurch der Sprecher die Verantwortlichkeit für die Wahrheit der ausgedrückten Proposition übernimmt[…]."

miašvela	
help.S3SG.O3SG.AOR	

'It seemed as if the discussion was coming to an end, and Ķoṭe Qubaneišvili provided new reasons.' (Vasil Maġlaperiʒe, *Mamulis ḳvamlit serṭipicirebulni*)

(14) | *es* | *ambav-i* | *or-sam* | *dġe-s* | *grʒeldeboda.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| this.NOM.SG | matter-NOM.SG | two-three.DAT.SG | day-DAT.SG | continue.S3SG.IMPF |

raġacnair-ad	***čamošorda-s-a-vit***		*tavis*
somehow-ADV.SG	remove.S3SG.AOR-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like		own.DAT.SG

ʒmaḳac-eb-s	*da*	*ʒiritadad*	*dro-s*	*čem-tan*
male friend-PL-DAT	and	mainly	time-DAT.SG	my-DAT.SG-by

saubar-ši	*aṭarebda*
talk.DAT.SG-in	spend time. continue.S3SG.IMPF

'This matter was continuing for two-three days. He somehow kind of turned away from his male friends and mainly was spending his time talking with me.' (Mixeil Antaʒe, *Saidumloebit moculi u.š.*)

(15) | *raġac* | *xmaur-i* | *momesma,* | ***coṭa*** |
|---|---|---|---|
| some | noise-NOM.SG | hear.S3SG.AOR | slightly |

šemešinda-s-a-vit		*da*	*çamovdeki,*	*ramdenime*
fear.S3SG.AOR-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like		and	stand up.S1SG.AOR	several

nabiʒ-i	*otax-ši*	*umisamarto-d*	*gadavdgi*
step-NOM.SG	room.DAT.SG-in	unaddressed-ADV.SG	move.S3SG.AOR

'I heard some noise, I slightly kind of got scared and stood up, took several directionless steps in the room.' (Magda Ḳalandaʒe, *Eperebian*)

Given the contexts of (14), (15) and (16), I analyse these examples as cases of contextual evidentiality. Without these contexts, one could argue that they might also be cases of epistemic modality:

(16) | *is* | *ṗaṭimar-i* | *mġvdl-is* | *punkci-eb-s* |
|---|---|---|---|
| that.NOM.SG | prisoner-NOM.SG | priest-GEN.SG | function-PL-DAT |

asrulebda-s-a-vit.
fulfill.S3SG.IMPF-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like

'That prisoner kind of performed a priest's functions' (evidential: reportative – hearsay OR sensory – visual) OR 'That prisoner may have performed a priest's functions' (modal epistemic) (M.K.)

Without the original continuation given as in (13a), example (17) can be interpreted in two different ways: a) as contextually evidential, trying to code the source of the information (and

thus completely depending on the context/situation)[3] or b) as epistemic modal and thus coding the probability/likelihood of the prisoner being a priest.

Generally, drawing a line between evidentiality and epistemic modality has been proven to be difficult, as the former is often considered a subtype of the latter. However, de Haan (1999: 88) proposes the differentiation of "evidentiality, the coding of the source of information, and epistemic modality, the coding of the degree of commitment on the part of the speaker to his/her statement". In addition to that, de Haan states in a later work that "[e]videntiality thus fulfills the same function for marking relationships between speakers and actions/events that, say, demonstratives do for marking relationships within speakers and objects" (2005: 379). In Georgian, this is particularly true for the quotative particles, which distinguish between personal deixes: 1st (*-metki*, grammaticalised form of *me vtkvi* 'I said', 1st person quoting him-/herself); 2nd (*-tko,* 2nd person quoting someone else); and 3rd (*-o*, 3rd person quoting someone else).

2. Grammatical features

Aside from their semantic classification, the occurrences can be grouped according to their grammatical features.

2.1 Screeves and series

The Georgian language possesses three series of screeves which encode tense, aspect and mood. The examples of approximative verbs from the GNC can be classified as belonging to series I, series II or series III, with only one example being found for the latter:

SERIES	SCREEVE	EXAMPLE
Series I	Present	*meridebasavit* 'I kind of feel shy', *mexveçebasavit* '(s)he kind of begs me', *mibneldebasavit* 'it sort of begins to get dark for me'
	Imperfect	*asrulebdasavit* '(s)he kind of was used to fulfilling', *mecadineobdasavit* '(s)he kind of was used to studying', *gviçqebdasavit* '(s)he kind of was used to start for us'

---

[3] The paragraph containing this example runs as follows: გიორგის სძულდა თავი, თუმცა თვითმკვლელობაზე არც უფიქრია, მისი ყოფნა გაურკვევლობა იყო მხოლოდ და ამ გაურკვევლობით იყო, რომ ჯერ ისე არ იტანჯებოდა. მერე ერთი პატიმარი გაიცნო. ის პატიმარი მღვდლის ფუნქციებს ასრულებდასავით. საკანი ხატებით ჰქონდა სავსე და მუდამ ენთო კანდელი (*giorgis sʒulda tavi, tumca tvitmķvlelobaze arc upikria. misi qopna gaurķvevloba iqo mxolod da am gaurķvevlobit iqo, rom ʒer ise ar iţanʒeboda. mere erti paţimari gaicno. is paţimari mġvdlis punkciebs asrulebdasavit. saķani xaţebit hkonda savse da mudam ento ķandeli*). – 'Giorgi hated himself, but he didn't even think about suicide. His presence was only an uncertainty, and it was with this uncertainty that he did not yet suffer so much. Then he met a prisoner. That prisoner kind of performed a priest's functions. He had a cell full with icons and a candle was always burning.' Either someone reported to the speaker that Giorgi met a prisoner and that that prisoner behaved like a priest and his cell was full of icons (because the reporting person saw it or another person told him/her – then it would be indirectly evidential through hearsay) OR the speaker himself saw everything, which then would be sensory evidential (visual). It should be noted that the speaker most likely is not a prisoner himself but a prison guard or an acquaintance, a friend or a family member of Giorgi from outside – if (s)he were a prisoner, I would expect to find deictic expressions such as an adverb of place and proximal or medial demonstratives in the example: *mere **ak** erti paţimari gaicno. **es/eg** paţimari mġvdlis punkciebs asrulebdasavit.* – "Then he met a prisoner **here**. **This** (proximal)/**that** (medial) prisoner kind of performed a priest's functions."

Series II	Aorist	*imartlasavit* '(s)he kind of justified him-/herself', *gauḳvirdasavit* '(s)he kind of was surprised', *moibodišasavit* '(s)he kind of apologized'
Series III	Perfect	*dauciniatsavit* 'they have kind of mocked them'

Table 3: Series & screeves in approximative verbs

It is noteworthy that the only example from series III, perfect, *dauciniatsavit* has actually a consonantal stem (*dauciniat*), so it would be expected that the postposition *-vit* should govern the nominative case. The fact that it does not confirms my assumption of *-savit* being grammaticalised and used as a unity without being dependent on whether the verbal form yields a vocalic or a consonantal stem. Additionally, the perfect tense usually functions to express evidentiality in Georgian, so that the more precise translation would be 'they apparently have kind of mocked them'.

2.2 Transitivity

Approximative verbs are not restricted to a specific type of transitivity or valency:

TRANSITIVITY	VALENCY	EXAMPLE
intransitive	avalent	*gamoidarasavit* 'it [the weather] kind of cleared up '
	monovalent	*aġšpotdasavit* '(s)he kind of bristled up', *daiʒabasavit* '(s)he kind of tensed up'
monotransitive	divalent	*gaamxnevasavit* '(s)he kind of cheered him/her up', *gaaḳriṭiḳasavit* '(s)he kind of criticised him/her'
ditransitive	trivalent	*xeli mousvasavit* '(s)he kind of touched [the twenty-lari bill] with the hand'

Table 4: Transitivity & valency in approximative verbs

It should be noted that the examples for intransitive-avalent and ditransitive-trivalent verbs are the only cases attested in the corpus; more frequent are intransitive-monovalent and monotransitive-divalent verbs appearing in the approximative form.

2.3 Voice

In the attested examples of approximative verbs we find several voices: active, passive, causative, and medioactive[4]; the latter is especially interesting as medioactive verbs in Georgian mostly do not have a direct object, behaving nevertheless like regular transitives and taking an ergative subject in the aorist tense.

---

[4] Šaniʒe (1980: 289); referred to as pseudo-active verbs by Vogt ("verbes pseudo-actifs", 1971: 133).

VOICE	EXAMPLE
active	*ubrʒanasavit* '(s)he kind of commanded'
passive	*gabrazdasavit* '(s)he kind of got angry'
medioactive	*daiçuçunasavit* '(s)he kind of complained'
causative	*maçqurebdasavit* 'it kind of made me thirsty'

Table 5: Voice in approximative verbs

Aside from medioactive verbs there are also mediopassive verbs[5] attested in the Georgian language; these do not change the case of the subject independently from series and screeves and do not take a direct object. Although the GNC shows no example of mediopassive verbs in approximative form, the verb *dgoma* 'to stand' can be freely used in such forms as *idgasavit* '(s)he/it kind of stood'.

2.4 Person and number

Different persons and numbers (referring to subjects as well as objects) are attested in approximative verbs. Below, different person and number markings within the same verb are contrasted:

še-m-e-ķitx-a-s-a-vit

PV-O1SG-PASS-ask-S3SG[AOR]-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like

'**(s)he** kind of asked **me**'

VS.

še-Ø-e-ķitx-a-s-a-vit

PV-O3SG-PASS-ask-S3SG[AOR]-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like

'**(s)he** kind of asked **him/her**'

The widest variety of person marking can be found in the verb *mobodišeba* 'to apologise':

mo-i-bodiš-a-s-a-vit

PV-SV-apologise-S3SG[AOR]-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-LIKE

'**(s)he** kind of apologised'

VS.

mo-m-i-bodiš-a-s-a-vit

PV-O1SG-OV-apologise-S3SG[AOR]-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-LIKE

'**(s)he** kind of apologised to **me**'

VS.

mo-u-bodiš-a-s-a-vit

PV-O3SG- apologise-S3SG[AOR]-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like

'**(s)he** kind of apologised to **him/her**'

VS.

---

[5] Šaniʒe (1980: 290); referred to as pseudo-passive verbs by Vogt ("verbes pseudo-passifs", 1971: 133).

mo-gv-i-bodiš-a-s-a-vit

PV-O1PL-OV-apologise-S3SG[AOR]-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-LIKE

'**(s)he** kind of apologised to **us**'

3. Peculiar cases

Lastly, some peculiar cases of approximative verbs and verbal constructions can be demonstrated.

3.1 Transformation of sentences into verbal phrases and used as approximatives

In the GNC, three very peculiar cases of approximative verbs are attested in which a whole sentence with several words is merged together, transformed into a phrase and then used as an approximative verb:

(17a) *deda*   *ķi*   *dil-it*   *aratu*   *gamoķetdeba*
mother.NOM.SG   AFF   morning-INST.SG   not only   get better.S3SG.FUT

xolme,   ***vitom-çuxel-araperi-mčirda-s-a-vit***
usually   as if-yesterday-nothing-was wrong with .S1SG.IMPF- DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like

çamoprindeba   *da*   *iaṭaķ-is*   *çmenda-s*   *içǵebs.*
leap to one's feet.S3SG.FUT   and   floor-GEN.SG   cleaning-DAT.SG   start.S3SG.PRES
'Mother would usually get better in the mornings, she would leap to her feet like "as-if-nothing-was-wrong-with-me-yesterday" and start cleaning the floor.' (Guram Megrelišvili, *Diagnosi švili*)

This example is peculiar not only because it comprises a whole sentence transformed into a word and then used as an approximate verbal construction but also because of the rendering of an indirect speech as a direct speech: instead of *vitomçuxelaraperisčirdasavit* 'like-as-if-nothing-was-wrong-with-**her**-yesterday', the phrase is represented from the 1st person's view without any quotation mark; this means that it shifts from the 3rd person view (which would have been expected) to the 1st person view. If paraphrased, the sentence could be constructed as follows:

(17b) *deda*   *ķi*   *dil-it*   *aratu*   *gamoķetdeba*
mother.NOM.SG   AFF   morning-INST.SG   not only   get better.S3SG.FUT

xolme,   *aramed*   ***vitom/titkos***   ***çuxel***   ***araper-i***
sometimes   but   as if   yesterday   nothing-NOM.SG

mčirda-o   *çamoprindeba*   *da*   *iaṭaķ-is*
going on.S1SG.IMPF-QP   leap to one's feet.S3SG.FUT   and   floor-GEN.SG

çmenda-s   *içǵebs.*
cleaning-DAT.SG   start.S3SG.PRES
'Mother would usually get better in the mornings, but as if (saying), "nothing was going on with me yesterday," she would leap to her feet and start cleaning the floor.' (M.K.)

It should be emphasised that the use of *vitom* and *titkos* 'as if' can trigger either an evidential or an epistemic reading but it is quite difficult to make a sharp distinction between those two functions.

An equally interesting example is (18):

(18) *deda-čem-is*   *ķreb-eb-ze*   *titkos*   *simšvide-a*   *ķi*
mother-my-GEN.SG   meeting- DAT.PL-On   as if   peace.NOM.SG-COP   AFF

ara,   *upro*   **ķarg-i-a-s-a-vit**   *sinamdvile-ši*
NEG   more   good-NOM.SG-COP-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like   reality.DAT.SG-in

sašineleba-a
horror.NOM.SG-COP

'At my mother's meetings, it's not like it's peaceful, it's more like kind of okay, it's actually horrible.' (Guram Megrelišvili, *Šeni gamoķvleva mezobeltgamoķvlevis sapuʒvelze*)

The interesting aspect of this approximative verbal construction is its components and the interaction with the grading adverb *upro* 'more': *ķargiasavit* contains the adjective *ķargi* 'good (NOM.SG)', the copula suffix *-a* (from *aris* 'is (3rd person)') and then the typical morphemes for approximate verbs. A primary analysis would suggest that the grading adverb *upro* 'more' builds together with *ķargi* a 1st level comparative (Kamarauli 2022: 113), so that both the copula and the approximative apply not only to the adjective but to the grading level built with *upro*. On the second glance, however, it becomes obvious that the grading adverb is not used with a grading function here but as a contrastive element (in the sense of 'rather').

One more example of such a construction is given in (19):

(19) *tumca*   *ʒaan*   *gamičirda,*   *[…]*   *mainc*   *ševʒeli*
although   very   make difficult.S1SG.AOR   […]   however   being able.S3SG.AOR

da   **vitom-c-araper-i-a-s-a-vit**   *pul-i*
and   as if-FOC-nothing-NOM.SG-COP-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like   money-NOM.SG

vtxove   *[…]*
ask.S3SG.O3SG.AOR   […]

'Although it was very difficult for me [(I almost died of shame)], I was yet able to do it and even-as-if-nothing-were-up, I asked for money [for the sake of love I asked for money].' (Guram Megrelišvili, *Nesi*)

Again, a copula construction is used as the basis for the approximative verb, this time with a focus marker on the evidential adverb *vitom* 'as if'.

3.2 Lexical approximativity

The Georgian language provides some cases of a lexical encoding of approximativity in verbs, of which, however, only a few exist:

(20) *saertod*   *zemo*   *egvipṭe-ši*   *ar*   **çvims**   *xolme,*
generally   upper   Egypt.DAT.SG-in   NEG   rain.S3SG.PRES   usually

is	*ḳi*	*ara,*	*mašin*	*tebe-ši*	*albat*
that.NOM.SG	AFF	NEG	then	Thebes.DAT.SG-in	probably

mxolod	*çinçḳlavda*
only	drizzle.S3SG.IMPF

'Generally, it doesn't rain in Upper Egypt at all, no, then in Thebes, it used to probably only drizzle.' (Herodotus, *Isṭoria,* translated by Tinatin Ġauxčišvili)

This example perfectly demonstrates a "full" verb and its approximative counterpart: *çvima* is the verb for raining, while *çinçḳvla* is the verb for a drizzle, so not quite a full but an approximate rain. Nonetheless, even if the GNC does not provide any evidences for the approximative form *çvimdasavit* 'it kind of rained', it is quite often used in the Georgian spoken language.

3.3 Case stacking and approximative constructions

The last form of approximatives to be discussed here is admittedly not a verb or a verbal construction but it is no less peculiar:

(21) | *[...]* | *da* | *mḳar-ad* | *gansaʒa* | | *ḳidec* |
|-----|------|---------|----------|--|--------|
| […] | and | hard-ADV.SG | condemn.S3SG.O3SG.AOR | | yet again |

ase-c	*gabuṭul-ma-s-a-vit*
like this-FOC	indignant-ERG.SG-DAT.SG-EMPH.V-like

'[…] and yet again, he fiercely condemned him kind of indignantly.' (Journal *Liṭeraṭuruli ṗaliṭra* 2008)

The approximative form in this example has quite a unique structure:

a) the stem *gabuṭul-* is a participle and thus deverbal;
b) it is marked for the ergative case *-ma,* which is unexpected but can be explained as follows: the participle in this example functions as a *participium coniunctum* and in such cases, it agrees with the subject in case and number; in the given case, it is the ergative case because the verb *gansʒa* 'to condemn' is transitive and transitive verbs in Georgian govern their subjects in the ergative case in the aorist;
c) then the participle is marked for the dative case *-s* and receives the emphatic vowel *-a;*
d) lastly, the postposition *-vit* is suffixed.

One of the enigmatic aspects of this construction is that both case markers, the ergative marker *-ma* as well as the dative marker incl. postposition *-savit* are both functional, the former still carrying its morphosyntactic function and agreeing with the subject in the ergative and the latter exerting its semantic-pragmatic function of expressing approximativity. As this example is the only one of its kind in the GNC, further assumptions or analyses cannot be made. What can be stated, however, is that on the first glance, it seems like an example of case stacking (*-ma-s-* (ERG.SG+DAT.SG)); but as already mentioned above, the ergative marker *-ma* is governed by the transitive verb *gansʒa* 'to condemn' in the aorist (which means that the ergative case is syntactically determined) while the dative case marker incl. postposition *-savit* has no grammatical function but only semantic content. This can be taken as a proof that the suffix *-savit* has been grammaticalised and lexicalised as a semantic unity to express approximativity.

4. Conclusions

This paper has shown that the Georgian language can merge verbal and nominal elements together and thus form approximative verbs. These approximative verbs differ in their semantics as well as their grammatical features from each other: semantically, they can express approximativity, epistemic modality, attempts or contextual evidentiality (certainly, there are even more semantic classifications). Grammatically, they provide a broad variety of different grammatical features, such as screeves/series, transitivity, voice, and person & number. The different semantic functions can be paraphrased with synonymous constructions; e.g., the verb *cdiloba* 'to try, to attempt' can be used for the paraphrasis of approximative verbs with the semantic function of attempt; the evidential adverb *vitom* 'as if' can be used for the paraphrasis of approximative verbs with the semantic function of evidentiality; etc. It was also observed that these approximative verbs often cooccur with certain other elements such as evidential adverbs (*titḳos* 'as if'), nonspecific adverbs (*raġac/raġacnairad/racxa* 'somehow') or grading adverbs (*cota* 'little, few', *ḳidev upro* 'even more'). The various grammatical features attested in the examples showed that the category of approximativity in Georgian is not restricted to a certain tense, voice, person, number or transitivity model. I draw my perhaps most significant conclusions from the presented peculiar cases above:

a) there are cases which show that approximative constructions do not only appear in verbal constructions but also in copula constructions and even in sentences that have been merged into a word;

b) the Georgian language can express approximativity lexically (shown on the example of *çvima* 'rain' and *çinçḳvla* 'drizzle');

c) the suffix *-savit*, which triggers the approximative reading, can be attached not only to verbs but also to already declined nouns (as shown in (21)), which supports my assumption of *-savit* being grammaticalised as one lexical unity;

d) aside from the dative and nominative case, the postposition *-vit* can govern other grammatical cases such as the genitive, which means that the syntactic function can override the morphological rule concerning the postposition *-vit*.

Nonetheless, it should not be forgotten that even if the suffix *-savit* comes from the nominal domain when it is attached at the end of a verb, the construction itself must still be analysed as a verb and not as a nominal formation. Of course, for a more elaborate analysis, a much deeper investigation would have to be undertaken, which is beyond the scope of the present paper.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADV	adverbial case	GEN	genitive case	PL	plural
AFF	affirmative	IMPF	imperfect tense	PRES	present tense
AOR	aorist tense	INST	instrumental case	PV	preverb
COP	copula	NEG	negation	QP	quotative particle
DAT	dative case	NOM	nominative case	S	subject
EMPH.V	emphatic vowel	NP	noun phrase	SG	singular number
ERG	ergative case	O	object	VOC	vocative case
FOC	focus	OV	objective version	1/2/3	1st/2nd/3rd person
FUT	future tense	PASS	passive		

LIST OF TABLES

LITERATURE

Glück, Helmut (ed.) (2016). *Metzler Lexikon Sprache*. 5. Auflage. Stuttgart, Weimar: J.B. Metzler.

de Haan, Ferdinand (1999). "Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality: Setting Boundaries". *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18, 83–101.

de Haan, Ferdinand (2005). "Encoding speaker perspective: evidentials". In: Frajzyngier, Z., Roods, D. (eds.), *Linguistic Diversity and Language Theories*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 379–397.

Imnaišvili, Vaxṭang (2008): "Vit tandebuliani zmnebi tanamedrove kartulši [Verbs with the postposition -*vit* in Modern Georgian]". *Kartvelologia: samecniero žurnali* [*Kartvelology: scientific journal*] 9, 75–81.

Kamarauli, Mariam (2022): *The nominal domain in Georgian. A diachronic analysis*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Šaniȝe, Aḳaḳi (1973): *Kartuli enis gramaṭiḳis sapuȝvlebi* [*Fundamentals of the Grammar of the Georgian Language*]. Tbilisi: Tbilisis universiṭeṭis gamomcemloba.

Vogt, Hans (1971): *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Ȝapariȝe, Zurab (1963): "-vit tandebulis xmarebisatvis zmnastan kartulši [On the usage of the postposition -*vit* with verbs in the Georgian language]". *Kartvelur enata sṭruḳṭuris saḳitxebi* [*Structural issues of the Kartvelian languages*] 3, 95–98.

აპროქსიმატული ზმნები: სახელური და ზმნური დომენების სიმბიოზი (ქართული ენის მაგალითზე)

მარიამ ყამარაული

ქართულ ენას თავისი ისტორიული განვითარების განმავლობაში ყოველთვის ახასიათებდა თავისებურებები, როგორებიცაა ორმაგი ან სამმაგი ბრუნების ფენომენი (ე.წ. suffixaufnahme), რომელიც სახელურ დომენებში სახელური ფრაზის შემადგენელი კომპონენტების მორფოსინტაქსურად მარკირებული სტრუქტურის განსაკუთრებულ შემთხვევაა პოსტპოზიციურ წყობაში; ან დეიქტური ზედსართავი სახელების პოვნიერება, რომელიც წარმოადგენს ჩვენებითი ნაცვალსახელებისა და ზედსართავ სახელთა სიმბიოზს (Kamarauli 2022: 29, 76). ორივე აქ დასახელებული ფენომენი სახელურ დომენების თავისებურებებს ასახავს, თუმცა ქართულ-ში ზმნური დომენებიც ხასიათდებიან განსაკუთრებუ-ლი თავისებურებებით. წინამდებარე ნაშრომში განხილულია ქართული ენისა-თვის დამახასიათებელი თავისებურებების ერთ-ერთი ასეთი შემთხვევა − სახე-ლური და ზმნური დომენების სიმბიოზი, კერძოდ, ზმნურ ფორმებში სახელური მორფოლოგიის გრამატიკული ელემენტების გამოყენების შემთხვევები, რომლებ-საც შემდგომში **აპროქსიმატულ ზმნებს** ვუწოდებთ. აპროქსიმატულ ზმნებში იგულისხმება „*მომიბრძანიშასაგით*" ტიპის ზმნური ფორმები, ანუ ის შემთხვევები, როდესაც ზმნის პირიან ფორმას მიცემითი ბრუნვის ნიშანი *-ს(ა)* დაერთვის − *ვით* თანდებულთან ერთად და ახდენს ზმნით გადმოცემული მოქმედების სე-მანტიკის მოდიფიკაციას.

აღნიშნული ფენომენი, ანუ სახელური მორფოლოგიის ელემენტების გამო-ყენება ზმნურ ფორმებში, დადასტურებულია ჯერ კიდევ სულხან-საბა ორბე-ლიანის ლექსიკონში, სადაც *-ვით* თანდებულიან ფორმებს საბა ზმნათა შინა-არსის განმარტების მიზნით იყენებს. მაგ.: *გააჩუმა - დააღუმასაგით.* როგორც ზ. ჯაფარიძე მიუთითებს, *-ვით* თანდებულის გამოყენება ზმნებთან საბასთვის **სიტყვის მნიშვნელობაზე სინონიმური სიტყვით მითითების ხერხია** და „განსა-მარტავი" და „განმარტებული" სიტყვების მსგავსებაზე მიუთითებს (Ǯapariʒe 1963: 95). ამგვარი ფორმები სამეცნიერო ლიტერატურაში განხილული აქვს ც. იმნა-იშვილსაც. მასვე ეკუთვნის *-ვით* თანდებულის ფუნქციური სემანტიკის დადგენა ზმნებთან, გამოხატოს ზმნით გადმოცემული შინაარსის **სემანტიკური მსგავსება, ანალოგია, იდენტურობა.**

საკვლევი საკითხის კორპუსლინგვისტურმა ანალიზმა, რომელიც ეფუძნება კორპუსულ კვლევებს (განსახილველად გამოტანილი ფორმები მოპოვებულია ქართული ენის ეროვნულ კორპუსში), გვიჩვენა, რომ გარდა სახელობითი (თან-ხმოვანფუძიან სახელებთან) და მიცემითი (ხმოვანფუძიან სახელებთან) ბრუნვის ფორმებისა, *-ვით* თანდებული გამოიყენება ასევე ნათესაობით ბრუნვაში. კორ-პუსში დადასტურდა პარალელური ხმარების შემთხვევებიც:

შდრ.:

(1) „*თვალს სტაცებდა კონტა ეკლესია-მონასტრები, შეაბჯრული ვაჟკაციით, გორაზე*".

(2) „*კარგი, ბალღო, კარგი! ბალღი ხარ, მაგრამ ვაჟკაცსავით ლაპარაკობ*".

(3) „*ეს ოთხმოცი წლისა იყო და ისევ ვაჟკაცისავით შეძლება ჰქონდა*".

-ვით თანდებულიანი პარალელური ფორმების არსებობა იმაზე მიუთითებს, რომ სინტაქსურ ფუნქციას (ნათესაობითში დასმული მსაზღვრელი: *ვაჟკაცის შეძლება*) შეუძლია გადაღახოს მორფოლოგიური წესი (*-ვით* თანდებული თან-ხმოვანფუძიან სახელებთან, როგორც წესი, სახელობით ბრუნვაში გვხვდება) და გაიფართოვოს გამოყენების არეალი (*-ვით* თანდებული გამოიყენოს მიცემით და ნათესაობით ბრუნვებთან).

როგორც ადინიშნა, *-ვით* თანდებული ხმოვანფუძიან სახელებს მიცემით ბრუნვაში დაერთვის. სახელური მორფოლოგიისათვის დამახასიათებელი ელე-მენტების ეს კომბინაცია (მიცემითი ბრუნვის ნიშანი *-სა* + თანდებული *-ვით*) დადასტურდა ზმნებშიც. მორფოლოგიური ელემენტების კომბინაცია *-სავით* და-ერთვის ზმნურ ფორმებს და იწვევს ზმნით გადმოცემული მოქმედების სემანტი-კის მოდიფიკაციას − გადმოსცემს აპროქსიმატულობას:

(4) „*მართლა ასე მოგეწონა? გამიდიმასავით.*"

(5) „*ღდისით მადაზიებში დადიოდა, რეცხავდა და ინგლისურში მეცადინეობდა-სავით.*"

(6) „*რადაც ხმაური მომესმა, ცოტა შემეშინდასავით და წამოვდექი.*"

ქართული ენის ეროვნულ კორპუსში დადასტურებულმა მაგალითებმა და გრამატიკულმა მახასიათებლებმა აჩვენა, რომ ქართულში აპროქსიმატულობის კატეგორია არ შემოიფარგლება გარკვეული დროით, გვარით, პირითა და რი-ცხვით; იგი გვხვდება როგორც გარდამავალ, ისე გარდაუვალ ზმნებთან. შდრ.: *მოვკიბრდიშასავით, მოიბრდიშასავით, მომიბრდიშასავით, მოუბრდიშასავით; გაამართლასავით, იმართილასავით, იმართილებდასავით, იმართლებოდასავით.*

ქართული ენის ეროვნული კორპუსის მონაცემების მიხედვით, აპროქსიმა-ტულობის ფუნქციური ელემენტის *-სავით* გამოყენების სიხშირე არა მარტო

საგრძნობლად გაიზარდა თანამედროვე ქართულში, არამედ გაიფართოვა კიდეც გამოყენების არეალი – იგი შეიძლება დაერთოს არა მარტო ცალკეულ ზმნურ ფორმებს (სხვადასხვა პირში, რიცხვსა და მწკრივში), არამედ სინტაქსურ კონ-სტრუქციებს – ზმნურ ფრაზებსა და წინადადებებსაც კი. ასეთ შემთხვევაში გვაქვს ე.წ. **აპროქსიმატული კონსტრუქციები**. ამის ნათელი მაგალითია შემდეგი წინადადებები:

(7) „*დედახუქმის კრებებზე თითქოს სიმშვიდეა კი არა, უფრო* **კარგია-სავით**“.

(8) „*თუმცა ძაან გამიჭირდა, ...მაინც შევძელი და* **ვითომც-არაფერია-სავით** *ფული ვიხოვე*“.

(9) *ყოველთვის მინდოდა დამეწერა რამე მარკესაზე, მაგრამ რამდენჯერაც დავწერე, დავხიე, – ყალბი იყო, –* **არ-მეკადრებოდა-სავით**.

(10) „*დედა კი დილით არათუ გამოკეთდება ხოლმე,* **ვითომ-წუხელ-არაფერი-მჭირდა-სავით** *წამოფრინდება და იატაკის წმენდას იწყებს*“.

მიუხედავად იმისა, რომ ზმნურ ფორმებში დადასტურებული სახელური მორფოლოგიური ელემენტების კომბინაცია *-სავით* სახელური დომენიდან მო-დის, ზმნა/ზმნური ფრაზა მაინც ინარჩუნებს პრედიკაციის ფუნქციას, თუმცა განიცდის სემანტიკურ მოდიფიკაციას – გადმოსცემს ზმნით გადმოცემული მო-ქმედების აპროქსიმატულობას, რაც გვავარაუდებინებს, რომ მიცემითი ბრუნვის ნიშანმა **-ვით** თანდებულთან ერთად გაიარა გრამატიკალიზაციის პროცესი, რის შედეგადაც წარმოიქმნა ლექსიკური მოდიფიკაციის ელემენტი, რომელიც ემსახურება აპროქსიმატულობის გადმოცემას.

სახელურ მორფოლოგიაში დადასტურდა ერთი განსაკუთრებული შემთხვე-ვა, როდესაც სახელური მორფოლოგიური ელემენტების კომბინაცია *-სავით* არსებით სახელს დაერთვის მოთხრობით ბრუნვაში:

(11) „... *და მკარად განსაჯა კიდეც, ასეც,* **გაბუტულ-მა-სა-ვით**“.

ამ წინადადებაში **გაბუტულმასავით** ზმნური მოდიფიკატორის ფუნქციას ასრულებს (**გაბუტულმასავით განსაჯა** შდრ.: **გაბუტულმა განსაჯა**). ეს შე-მთხვევა უდრესად საინტერესოა: მოთხრობით ბრუნვაში დასმულ მიმღეობას **გაბუტული** დაერთვის მორფოლოგიურ ელემენტთა კომბინაცია *-სავით* და მი-მღეობურ ფორმას გარდაქმნის ზმნიზედურ ფორმად. ამ შემთხვევის განსაკუთ-რებულობა ფუნქციურ-სემანტიკური თვალსაზრისით იმაში მდგომარეობს, რომ გარდამავალ ზმნასთან მოთხრობითი ბრუნვის ნიშანი **-მა** კვლავაც ახორციე-ლებს სახელის მორფოსინტაქსურ შეთანხმებას ზმნასთან [გაბუტულმა (A$_{ERG}$)

განსაჯა (Vtr)], თუმცა სემანტიკურ-პრაგმატული თვალსაზრისით ზმნა მოდიფი-კაციას განიცდის და გადმოსცემს ზმნით გადმოცემული მოქმედების აპროქსი-მატულობას.

როგორც განხილული მაგალითების ანალიზმა გვიჩვენა, ქართულ ენას გააჩნია უნარი ზმნური და სახელური დომენების სიმბიოზისა, რასაც აპროქსი-მატულობის გადმოსაცემად ზმნებში სახელური მორფემების გამოყენება ადას-ტურებს.

აპროქსიმატული ზმნებით გადმოცემული სემანტიკა მრავალფეროვანია: სე-მანტიკურ-პრაგმატულად მათ შეუძლიათ გამოხატონ მიახლოებითობა, ეპისტე-მური მოდალობა, მცდელობა ან კონტექსტური მტკიცებულება (სავარაუდოდ, არსებობს კიდევ უფრო მეტი სემანტიკური ფუნქციები). გრამატიკულად ისინი წარმოდგენილი არიან მრავალფეროვანი ფორმით – სხვადასხვა გვარის ზმნებ-ში, განსხვავებულ მწკრივებსა და სერიებში, სხვადასხვა პირისა და რიცხვის ფორმებით. სემანტიკურ-პრაგმატული ფუნქციების დადგენა შესაძლებელია პე-რიფრაზირების მეშვეობით, სინონიმური კონსტრუქციების ჩანაცვლებით, სუბ-სტიტუციის მეთოდის გამოყენებით; მაგ., ზმნა „მცდელობა" შეიძლება გამოვი-ყენოთ აპროქსიმატული ზმნების პერიფრაზისთვის მცდელობის სემანტიკური ფუნქციით; ზმნიზედა „ვითომ" და „თითქოს" შეიძლება გამოყენებულ იქნეს აპროქსიმატული ზმნების პერიფრაზისთვის მტკიცებულების სემანტიკური ფუნ-ქციით; ასევე დადასტურდა, რომ აპროქსიმატული ზმნები ხშირად ემთხვევა ზოგიერთ სხვა ფუნქციურ ელემენტს, როგორიცაა მაგალითად, ფუნქციური ელემენტები **ვითომ, თითქოს**, არასპეციფიკური ფუნქციური ელემენტები **რადაც, რადაცნაირად** ან შეფასების ფუნქციური ელემენტები **პატარა, ცოტა, კიდევ უფ-რო.**

საკითხი, რასაკვირველია, შემდგომ კვლევას მოითხოვს ქართულში აპროქ-სიმატულობის, როგორც გრამატიკული კატეგორიის, გადმოცემის თვალსაზრი-სით, რაც კვლევის შემდგომ ეტაპზე არის დაგეგმილი.