

N .Shengelaia,
CLLS, Tbilisi

On the General Character of Substitution Cohesion, and its Nature in Georgian

Abstract

Cohesive device of substitution as a device without identical co-reference between antecedent and substitute is analyzed in the paper with some parallels to anaphoric device. Some general features of this device are presented, and the formal and semantic peculiarities of the Georgian substitution pattern are discussed.

Key words: Identical co-reference, substitution cohesion device, types of substitution meaning, contrastive meaning of substitutes.

1.0. Text as a unit of communication is **semantically** and not grammatically structured, and it is the semantic relations of its parts that build its connectedness with the properties of **cohesion** and **coherence**, which grants transmitting utterer's intended meaning.

So the importance of a detailed study of the ways of semantic connections in the text, also their cross-linguistic comparison is beyond doubt.

The connectedness of any text in all languages is granted, in the first place by:

a. **lexical connections**, i.e. either repeating the same lexical items or using lexical items of the same or related semantic groups to make the text semantically homogeneous.

b. **anaphoric cohesive devices:** anaphora and cataphora;

c. **a substitution cohesive device.**

After commenting briefly on the essence of anaphoric devices we will turn to the main purpose of the paper – presenting the analysis of the cohesive device of substitution and of substitution in Georgian.

1.1. The semantic basis for the general **anaphoric cohesive device** universally employed in text building is formed with co-reference to the identical meaningful units by nominal headwords (antecedents) on the one hand, and pro-forms (anaphoric elements) on the other, which creates close ties between the items of text; and the whole pattern of anaphoric device is mostly an utterance dependent **endophoric** structure.

Particular kinds of the general anaphoric device are anaphora and cataphora. Both of them are patterns of **thematization**.

The structuring of **anaphora** and ordering of its items follows the pattern of a natural logical (and linguistic) sequence of text items in discourse – antecedent nominal first, and a pro-form following it.

Because of such natural order anaphora is the most widely used cohesion pattern – a neutral one, and with anaphoric element devoid of its own content with the only function of connecting parts in text; that is why anaphora is hardly ever perceived by either utterer or listener

(1) **Our teacher** is very kind; **he** never reproaches us for minor spelling errors.

Cataphora is a variant of the anaphoric device which also rests on identical co-reference of cataphoric pronominal element and a nominal headword; but ordering in cataphora is different from anaphora: an inversion of natural logical sequence with a pro-form occurring first and a nominal headword following is the pattern order of cataphora, like in:

*The one to start discussion was **my son!**
Go there, and see for yourself. Everybody is **in the kitchen***

Such contrary-to-logic ordering of co-referring units (it could also be called front-referring) naturally causes semantic markedness of this pattern with certain additional specific meanings such as, e.g., emphasis or modality.

2.0. Below we will be concerned with **substitution cohesion**: it will be characterized as a kind of cohesive device of text building [1] as semantically distinct from anaphoric devices.

2.1. In the case of substitution cohesion the immediate impression of its meaning is that of adding another person or thing to the same kind of things or persons mentioned earlier in the text; also, of a certain kind of rejection or declining of an item already named by antecedent by means of introducing a dissimilar item, another item of a different character.

A further analysis shows that in substitution the semantic pattern of connectedness also rests on some kind of repeating the certain meaning of the antecedent context. But it is not **the identical** semantic co-reference of an antecedent (a nominal headword) and a substitution pro-form, as it is in the simpler case of anaphoric cohesion. The pattern of substitution device displays certain system of meaningful correlation that is a bit more complicated.

The meaning repeated in substitution device is the general denotative meaning of both of an antecedent headword and of a substitution element. Which means that an antecedent headword and a contrasting substitute belong to the same general class of entities – “the same defining property of class”, as J. Lyons calls it [2, 79], and the sense-relations of an antecedent and of its substitute are related to the general denotative meaning as its hyponyms; denotation of a substitute is the same class of objects as that of an antecedent, but at the same time another, different object-member of the given lexical class is introduced by it.

Often an attributive predicate is provided for characterization of a newly named object, of a particular item of the same class which is dissimilar, and often better to that named previously by an antecedent.

The typical **context** for using substitution is a coordinated sequence of lexical hyponyms of the same general denotation class, the difference between the two lexical items being underlined in substitution.

*Go there, and see for yourself. Everybody is **in the kitchen***

*Yes, I need a pencil, but it should be **a red one** (and not black);*

*...a knife but the one that is **different, sharper, better.***

In the same way:

*...a car but mine (which is **different** from yours);*

*...a tree but **an apple** tree (or an apple tree in my **garden**);*

*... yes, an idea, but **a better** one.*

So it could be said that substitution is a cohesive device that underlines the distinction between different object-members of the **same** lexical class and, at the same time, connects the items because the **common** lexical class of the named object is implied.

2.2. Particular types of the meaning-relations in substitution could be presented as follows (the data is English):

a. semantic addition in series of homogeneous coordinated nominals that are quite indefinite, (with *more, another* and *else* in English, and also with phrases like:) :

one more/ some more apples

what more (can I do?)

to do more/ something more

who else(is coming)? What else? Where else ? elsewhere

someone else/ somebody else / something else

(look for it) somewhere else

another apple / others

another time

another one

Like in:

*“I can’t find a pencil you have just given me.” “Don’t worry, here’s **another one**”*

*“I’m going to have **another** beer” (one more of the same kind, the context is non-verbal)*

b. introduction of a very general new indefinite object that is weakly defined, a new item, that is dissimilar to the previously mentioned, even not necessarily repeating the same denotation class (with *some/ something, some other, different, a different one,*):

something different
something red
something better

some other notebook
(some) other things
some other time (not now)

*Your method does not work, find **another** way of solving the problem*
(this way of solving the problem is not what is needed, that is why **some** other, different way should be tried).

*The house was too small so they decided to look for **something different** (a bigger house).*

*The knife does not cut, give **me something different** (it could be even scissors, if they are sharp enough).*

c. introducing a new indefinite object defined by the substitute, also by an adjectival predicate as dissimilar to the previously mentioned (with *another one, other; someone else;* also often with: comparative adjectives + *one* or *de-lexicalized words* like *man, thing etc*):

a better one, a red one; a better thing or a wiser man.

Another person or object of the denotation class is introduced, often attended by a new predication that specifies the quality of an object that seems to be more appropriate in the context:

*Not Dr. Milton, I don't want him, bring **a cleverer man***
(let a doctor come but not this one / another one / some other man).

*I don't want to see Nick. Let **someone else** come*

d. introducing a new definite object, exactly defined (always dissimilar to the previously mentioned):

the one/that one
the red one
mine

*I'm tired of his dull stories – but have you heard **the one** about an Englishman in France?*

*I'd like **the one** with chocolate on the top(not what you're giving me)*

Some other semantic features of substitution:

2.3. Let us remember L.Tesnière's well-known example about traffic lights, where he illustrates the semantic importance of syntactically dependent words – the lower word on the scale of syntactic dependencies acquires more semantic value, and is of more semantic importance than the head-word of the phrase. In his example – *Le signal vert indique la voie libre* - it is important that the light is **green** [3,54].

In the same way, because the distinctive character of the given lexical item should naturally be underlined in substitution by a new predication, **a syntactically peripheral element of the phrase – attributive** is semantically most important, far more important than the substitute itself.

*She buys only few summer dresses, but she always wants to have **the best** (dresses in the store!)*

*This knife is bad, I need a **sharper one***

We shall see below that also this phenomenon could explain the elliptical omission in Georgian substitutive constructions.

2.4. I have mentioned that both kinds of anaphoric cohesion are patterns of thematization. As we have seen substitution cohesion brings an **indefinite, rhematic** (new) meaning into text.

Introducing a rheme is attended by the following semantic processes:

a. Substitution cohesion introduces a new, indefinite **rhematic** item into text with naming contrastive or additional item, and arresting the development of the process of thematization of the first named rhematic item, because the latter is rejected as not adequate enough or acceptable. Thematization of a newly named item is then carried on.

*My brother gave me flowers, **he** knows I love them (anaphoric thematization)]*

*My brother gave me **a red rose**, but I wanted **a white one**: it reminds me of my childhood (a red rose and a white one are both rhematic but a red rose is rejected and the process of thematization of a white rose then follows).*

b. Because of the importance of the non-verbal context (situational context) where objects can be ostensively defined, **new** but **quite definite** items can be named in substitution with further thematization.

*You have given me a wrong mug, I drink coffee only from **this one!** It is from Egypt.*

*I can't read this copy, give me **the one** you have in your drawer, **it** is clearer.*

In special cases of exophoric substitution it is possible to introduce quite definite objects attended by **definite articles, possessive adjectives, demonstratives, superlative adjectives, etc** with the information still contrastive and new – rhematic. (It could also be the case of neutralization of theme-rheme opposition because of the strongly marked situational context).

*I do not want to drive his car, I prefer to take **my own car**, it is more reliable*

3.1. The first thing to be done before considering the substitution cohesion data **in Georgian** is presenting possible substitutes that are used in this device in Georgian text.

Most of Georgian substitution elements are morphologically structured with question words (pronouns) + indefinite particles suffixed to them.

Georgian interrogative pronouns:

ra - what

vin - who

romeli - which

rodis - when

rogor - how, and others.

To these question words indefinite particles **-me** and **-yac** are suffixed; as a result indefinite pronominal words are received:

With the suffix **-me**:

ra-me - something,

vin-me - somebody,

romeli-me - some of which, etc.

rogor-me - somehow, in some way

With the suffix **-yac**:

ra-yac – an inanimate thing (what) of an indefinite quality, something,

sad-yac - somewhere,

vi-γac - somebody etc.

This kind of suffixation is rather regular and the suffixed particles have identical occurrence; there is a slight difference in the degree of their indefiniteness, though.

–**me** indicates an object, person, location, etc. that are of the available or expected set of objects, locations etc; the meaning is in a way positive. (cf Russian: -**нибудь: кто-нибудь, etc.**);

vpigrob vin-me mova -

I think someone (who has heard of the story/ someone of my friends) will come.

-**γac** makes the meaning more indefinite and general: something or somebody, some location, etc, that I do not know of, or I can't even suppose what, who, where, etc. (cf Russian: -**то: кто-то, где-то, etc.**)

viγaca karze -

there is somebody at the door – I have no idea who it is.

The verbal context for using these substitutes can often be:

sul ertia - *it makes no difference*

...not the way you're doing it, do it, it makes no difference how(sul ertia), somehow (rogorme)

Rayac moaxerxa - *he managed something, he managed somehow(I don't know exactly how he managed it, and it makes no difference).*

One more word frequently used in contrastive substitution is the attributive - **sxva** - different, another. It is rather freely used in combination with other substitutes.

3.2. The substitution phrases in Georgian could be:

a. pronominal, like

sxva rame – some different thing – I do not know which;

sxva vinme - some different “body”, I do not know who;

sxva ra? - (used in questions) - different what?

sxva rayac – (most indefinite) - a different thing.

b. attributive, like

rayac aseti – something such ,

aseti rame - something of this kind

romelime - whichever of this kind.

sxva aset - (an)other of the kind

Pronominal and attributive substitutes are inflected for number and case.

c. adverbial:

rogorme sxvanairad - somehow, makes no **difference** how, in a different way,

ramenairad - in some indefinite way.

In colloquial speech, as we will see below one of the two elements could be sometimes omitted in Georgian.

3.3. Besides repeating logically and linguistically universal patterns attested in other languages the Georgian material on substitution shows some regular formal peculiarities. We will try to present a clear synopsis of these cases, and then explain what the possible reasons there could be.

3.3.1. One of the pronounced peculiarities of substitution in Georgian is the regular occurrence of ellipsis in this device.

There are two grounds for omission in Georgian substitution: one is the general semantic basis for any elliptical structure - the omission of a semantically well comprehensible item – a head-word in substitution; another is the general semantic peculiarity of a syntactic construction with a syntactically dominant word and its attribute where, as we have mentioned (see above **2.3.**), syntactically dependant word is semantically dominant and should therefore be preserved in ellipsis. Georgian elliptical substitution these semantic motives are made active.

Always when the lexical class word is semantically comprehensible because it is repeated (as in case **2.2.a**), or weakly (as in case **2.2.c**) and strictly (as in case **2.2.d**) defined, the pronominal item is **regularly** omitted in Georgian.

In type **2.2.c**. introducing a new indefinite item defined by attributive predication the previously mentioned headword is substituted in English (like: *another **one**, a better **thing**, a wiser **man***). In Georgian only defining words are presented and substitute is left out:

meore - Θ, **sxva** - Θ, **uketesi** - Θ
another - different - better -

In type **2.2.d**. a new exactly defined object of the same denotation class is introduced (with *the one, that one, the red one*). In Georgian only the defining word is named, and a substitute is left out:

es/is - Θ **citeli** - Θ **čemi** - Θ
this/that - red - mine -

The same could be said about type **2.2.a.** – addition, where a denotation of a substitute is not changed. In Georgian the particle **kidev** – again, more – is often used.

The cases of ellipsis in Georgian are the case of nominalization of attributives like **meore** – *other/ another*, **sxva** – *different*, **uketesi** – *better*, or **citeli** red, – which is made easier by the fact that attributives have the same full morphological case endings as nominal words in Georgian, and at nominalization can add plural suffixes as well as nominal postpositions.

The Georgian substitution pattern seems to be more laconic, and more strict keeping closer to the matter.

Let us consider a well known English example from [1]:

My axe is blunt, I need a sharper one – meaning *I need a sharper, better axe*;

A parallel Georgian example of it is with an indefinite pronominal substitute **rame** – *something*.

rame	upro mcreli/	rame sxva	minda
some -thing	sharper	/ some-thing different	I need]

which means the following: *the axe is bad because it is not sharp, it is in no way important what you give me – the **thing** must be **sharp and cutting**.*

If another **axe** be needed the substitution **should be elliptical**:

upro mcreli	O	minda
<i>more sharp</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>I need</i>

In cases of emphasis (weaker or stronger depending on the nonverbal context), the **headword itself** (here: **dana** – a knife) is repeated, and then it is a strange case of “substitution without a substitute”:

upro mcreli	dana	minda
<i>more sharp</i>	<i>knife</i>	<i>I need</i>

It is interesting to note that the English attributive possessives *mine, ours, hers, etc.* “which are like genitive with ellipsis” (according to Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (4)– 4.87), and their use in substitution type d. is also elliptical.

Otherwise, the pattern of substitution rarely allows any ellipsis in English, because of the great variety of pronominal substitutes (*one, something, another, other, this, that, possessive words, etc.*).

There are no pronouns in Georgian that are indefinite **and**, at the same time, as unmistakably concrete and exact in their pronominal substitution as, e.g., the

English *one*. While, e.g., the typical English substitutive device with *one* is quite concrete, explicit and rhematic, the parallel device in Georgian (with **rame**) is general, and indefinite. And, as we have seen above, Georgian has two suffixal particles –me and –*rac* that differ in the degree of indefiniteness.

3.2.2. One more interesting case is also connected with particular elliptical forms of substitutes in Georgian. It concerns peculiar morphological form of the defining attributive of a contrastive item in substitution.

Often the attributive is genitive and to the genitive case ending –**is** more case suffixes can be added: a plural suffix of a left-out pronominal, an inflexion syntactically necessary to mark the sentence membership of the omitted pronominal; also a case governed by a postposition + a postposition itself can be added at the end. It looks like that:

Attr stem + pl + genitive + dative or any other syntactically demanded case +
a case demanded by postposition + postposition.

Xels nu axleb čems čiqas, šen –i- dan dalie
Don't take my mug, out of your drink

šen- -i -dan
poss adj abl postp

čemi d- -is -as mogiḳvebi - *I'll tell you [the story] of my sister -*
my sister- gen- dat I tell you

The comprehensiveness about the left-out item is perfect in these cases, either from the verbal or nonverbal contexts.

One quite natural example with an attributive plus three suffixes of the left out nominal is given below:

axlandeli studentebis čačmuloba mirčevnia šaršandelebisas

The English translation of the sentence is:

*I prefer (the) uniforms of this-year students **to** [that] **of** the last-year students,*

where the “students” is not mentioned for the second time in Georgian, it is left out, so it goes like this:

to this-year students’ uniform I prefer **last-year – pl - gen -dat**, and the last attributive (*last-year*) is as follows:

šaršandel- -eb- -is -as
last-year (attr) pl gen dat

last-year *[student]* **pl – of (gen) – to(dat)**
a stem of an attr + Θ + Pl + Gen + Dat

References

1. Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaia Hasan, Cohesion in English. Longman, 1976
2. Lyons, J., Linguistic Semantics. Cambridge University Press, 2002
3. Tesnière, L., Éléments de Syntaxe Structurale – The Russian edition, Progress, M., 1988
4. Quirk, r., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and Svartvik, J., A University Grammar of English, Longman, 1972