SCTCMG 2019

International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

ROLE OF SUBJECT TO SYSTEM OF MAJOR MEMBERS OF SENTENCE IN AVAR

Daniyal Magomedov (a)*, Magomed Magomedov (b)
*Corresponding author

(a) Institute of Language, Literature and Art. G. Tsadasy of the Dagestan Scientific Center of the Russian Academy
of Sciences, 45, M. Gadzhiyeva st., Makhachkala, 367000, Russia
m.daniyal@yandex.ru, 8 928 524 72 43
(b) Institute of Language, Literature and Art. G. Tsadasy of the Dagestan Scientific Center of the Russian Academy
of Sciences, 45, M. Gadzhiyeva st., Makhachkala, 367000, Russia
rafrus1@yandex.ru, 8 988 291 09 39

Abstract

The article discusses the status of one of the main members of the proposal in the Avar language. A nominative in Avar language is a form of a subject in a sentence with a transitional predicate. The class verb refers to the nominative in the sentence structure. Coordination of the predicate with the subject in the class and in the number is in the Avar language the only way to visually express their connection in a non-transitional structure. As a subject in the Avar language, the designation of that object is used, which in the act of communication is evaluated as the direct carrier of the produced feature. Only use in the form of a nominative and coordination of the verb-predicate provides the noun the right to function in the role of the subject. Thus, the subject as a component of the sentence is opposed to other spokespersons of the subject by grammatical meaning and by role in the structural organization of the sentence. The syntactic nature of main parts of a sentence can only be determined within syntactic correlation. The subject in the Avar language is included in the predicative basis. Its role in forming predicative basis consists in its coordinating with the predicate verb in class and number. In the structure of a sentence a class verb refers to a noun in the nominative case. Ergative does not reflect its categorical substance in the verb. In Avar language, only the name in the nominative is subject.

© 2019 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Subject, ergative, nominative, object, subject, collocation.

1. Introduction

In linguistics there are several views on the status of the main members of a sentence. According to the first of these, the subject is recognized as the dominant member of the proposal. According to another point of view, the equality of the two main members of the sentence, subject and predicate, is assumed. This view is most common in the grammatical tradition. According to the third theory, the dominant member of the sentence is predicate. The fourth point of view implies the presence in some Caucasian languages of the three main members of the sentence – subject, predicate and object (Avar, Dargin, Lak, and other languages).

Subject, direct object and predicate are the basis of a typical two-part intransitive or three-part transitional simple Avar language sentence. These are the organizing centers of the proposal, with their help, thought and judgment are expressed in it.

2. Problem Statement

Avar nominal members of the sentence — the subject and the object — differ from each other in their morphological forms. The role of a word in a sentence is determined by its morphological design. Each nominal member of the sentence has a case specially associated with it, which is its only form of expression. Such a case for the subject Avar language is the nominative. The following add-ons may be the following forms: nominative, ergative, dative, possessive, locative. These nominal members, each of which is characterized by a certain semantic originality and has a corresponding case form, determined by the nature of the verb-predicate, have the same syntactic status - they all perform the functions of addition. Based on the names of case forms, these additions have the following names: nominative object, ergative object, dative object, possessive object, and locative object. Subject to and object other cases are not indicated. Thus, the subject and the object are characterized not only by a number of common features, but also by some fundamental differences, the main ones of which are as follows:

1) The subject and the predicate are two interrelated and interdependent dominant sentences. Coordination of the predicate with the subject in the number and class is the morphologically determined ratio of the two main parts of the sentence. Object has no coordination with the predicate.

2) The subject (with a morphologically formed predicative link) can be expressed only by a nominal word form in the nominative, and the object is made only by indirect cases.

3) The role of the subject is not only that it is one of the elements of the environment of the predicate (along with various types of "objects" and "syrconstants"): the subject is the "syntactic basis" of the sentence, its initial position, to which already in the second stage of the process The derivations are joined by the predicate with its objects and the constants.

It is known that the classical type of ergative sentence construction usually includes three sentence members — the subject expressed by the ergative, the predicate expressed by the transitive verb, and the direct object expressed by the nominative name. However, Avar language does not fit into this scheme. In it the cool verb refers in the sentence structure to the name in the nominative. Consequently, the form of the subject in the Avar language is the nominative.

3.   Research Questions

It is traditionally considered that in the Avar language, with an ergative construct, the subject of the sentence is the subject that designates the subject of the action. Proponents of this view point out that the category of the subject of the action influences the formation of the subject as a member of the proposal. Meshchaninov (1976) wrote that

in the syntactic constructions of sentences, its leading members, which also include the subject, come forward. It stands out in the ergative sentence by its special designation given to it by this syntactic system. The grammatical form obtained by the subject expresses not its syntactic position of the term of the sentence, but the content of the subject transmitted in it. It is established in its action and in the state it experiences. Their different content is reflected in the grammatical form of the sentence member, which in its ergative transmission does not correspond only to the syntactic segmentation of the sentence. (p. 106)

According to Meshchaninov (1976), the name in ergatives, denoting the subject of an action or state, becomes a subject.

In the Avar language, the distinction between syntactic and logical-grammatical levels is manifested in the fact that the subject and the object as units of the syntactic level of a sentence often do not coincide with the logical-grammatical subject and object as structural components of a sentence at the logical-grammatical level.

Ergatives, as a rule, relate to indirect cases, and its content is polyfunctional. The main semantic functions of an ergative are the subject and object of action (agent and patient). The main syntactic functions of an ergative are the subject and indirect object. In the Avar language, the main syntactic function of an ergative is an indirect object (Magomedov, 2011).

Consider the non-transitive construction of the Avar language sentence, in which, with non-transitive construction, the predicate is expressed by the non-transitive verb, and the subject is the name in the nominative. An intransitive construction is inherently objectless, since an intransitive verb expresses only a state or an action that does not transfer to another object. For example: *бакъбаккана* «sun has risen», *васвачӀача* «boy came», *эбелйачӀана* «mother came» etc. As a rule, the subject and the subject in non-transitional constructions coincide (Bokarev, 1949)

A nominative in Avar language is a form of the subject also in a sentence with a transitional predicate. For example: *Вацас къалам бекана* literally "Brother pencil is broken," where the name in the nominative *къалам* is coordinated with the prefixed numeric index of the verb *бекана.* The name in the ergative *вацас* is not reflected in the verb. Consequently, an ergative here can be qualified as a minor member of a sentence. The subject in this sentence is *къалам,* since the class verb belongs to the nominative in the sentence structure, and *вацас* ergative is an indirect object in the sentence structure. Changes in the class and number of an indirect object do not affect the form of the predicate: *Ясалъ къалам бекана* «Girl broke a pencil», *Васас къалам бекана* literally "The boy broke a pencil", etc.и т.д. Changes in the form of the class and the number of the subject entail the corresponding changes in the form of the predicate:: *Вацас къалам бекана* «Pencil is broken by a brother», *Вацас къалмал рекана* «Pencils are broken by a

brother» etc. Consequently, this construction is nominative.

It is important to emphasize that the specificity of the subject meaning of the subject in comparison with other minor members of the sentence, which also stably express the subject of the feature or have an implicit shade of subject semantics, is that the minor members of the sentence cannot transform into a grammatical subject.

In addition, the distinction between the subject and the complement can be made through logical analysis and the formulation of questions.

Consequently, different words with different case forms, answering different questions and different class-number coordination differing from each other cannot be considered single-level members of a sentence. Here the word *эмен* is the subject, and the word *васасда* is the complement. The verb-predicate of *вихьана* transition semantics is coordinated with the subject *эмен*. The subject of *эмен* and the addition of *васасда* mutually presume one another.

An interesting feature of the subject is its interconnectedness with nouns denoting animate participants, especially people, among them names of participants of a speech act etc. Still, we suppose that such features indicate the subject not as a concept of grammatical structure of a sentence, but substances referring to other conceptual areas (Magomedov, 2014).

However, the independent position and the objective value in themselves do not yet constitute the subject. The morphological-syntactic characteristic of the word is also important here. In the Avar language, the function of the subject is an independent, direct form of the name, expressed by the nominative, with which the numerical indicators of the predicate verb are coordinated. For example*: Инсуе бокьула гӀеч* «Father loves apple» (literally «Apple is loved by father. »). Here, the prefixal class-number indicator of the verb-predicate is b-coordinated with the name in the nomination *гӀеч,* which is the subject. In Avar language, there is no category of person, so coordination can only follow the line of class and number.

According to the established tradition in avarology, the subject is considered as the equivalent of the subject of action. In this case, the subject in the Avar proposal indicates a name that does not have any grounds for that. As a result, in the Avar proposal, a object is accepted as a subject. The present subject is traditionally regarded as the "third" main member of the sentence - the object (along with the subject and predicate). Such an approach in determining the subject is, in our opinion, more systematic, expedient and logical. "The more consistent the rules, the easier it is for us to assimilate and understand them; the clearer the initial principles, the less rules we need to describe and the more noticeable the number of exceptions decreases (Arnauld & Lancelot, 1990).

The nominal term of a sentence, denoted by ergative, has its syntactic function in the verb-predicate of transition semantics: *Дос шиша бекана* «He broke the bottle» (literally «the bottle is broken by him»). The name in the ergative *дос* is a object and here coincides with the subject of the action. And the name in the nominative *шиша* is subject, since the prefixal class-number indicator of the verb-predicate b- is coordinated with it. This nominal member (*шиша*) corresponds to an action object. Thus, the first actant, indicated by an ergative (*дос*), transmits the semantics of the agent, and the second actant, indicated by a nominative (*шиша*), transmits to the patient.

In the case of the verb-predicate intransitive semantics, the nominal term of the sentence, indicated by the nominative, has its syntactic function of the subject: *Шиша бекана* « the bottle broke» Here the

subject and the predicate form the structural and semantic minimum of the sentence. The name in the nominative *шиша* is subject, as in the three-term sentence of *дос шиша бекана*. The word *шиша* in the two-sentence sentence of *шиша бекана* is the subject of action. Consequently, the actant in the nominative, coordinated with the prefixal class-number index of the verb-predicate b-, is characterized as an agent.

Nominal components in sentences can express various semantic relations. The following semantic types of sentences can be distinguished.

Constructions whose nominal components express the semantic relation "producer of action - object of action". In the structures of this semantic type, the name with the value of the producer of the action takes the position of indirect object, and the name with the value of the action object - the position of the object: *Васас тІехь босана* « Boy bought a book »; *Васас шиша бекана* «Boy broke a bottle». In these sentences, the names that occupy the positions of the subject and the indirect object appear in the semantic function of the real participants in the situation, the actants connected by real action (Haspelmath, 1993).

Structures with names that convey the semantic relation "possessor-possessed" have affiliation relations. For example: *Досул къалам буго* «He has a pencil» etc. Since the names of the "possessor-posessed" semantic relations are established between the names in the sentences of this type, the position of the add-on allows for the possibility of using the recurrent pronoun *жив* "himself". This is a formal indicator of the ownership of an item or property expressed by a object, the item denoted subject. For example: *Дос жиндиего тІагъур босана* «He bought himself a hat»; *Долъие жиндирго лъимер бокьула* «She loves her child» etc.

When describing syntactic phenomena, the functional-semantic approach is the most fruitful. But in the conditions of development of this direction, at the same time, the problem of grammatical syntactic constructions and sentence members is actualized (Magomedov & Magomedtagirova, 2015).

In particular, the grammatical meaning of the subject still needs to be interpreted more precisely.

It is important that there is a whole series of "indirect" spokesmen of the subject of the feature: *Рокъоб бецІго буго* «The house is dark»; *Досие гьаниб квеш буго* «He is bad here» and so on. This raises the question of whether the grammatical meaning of the subject has any specificity compared with the "indirect" spokesmen of subject meaning.

The grammatical meaning cannot be recognized as the meaning of the "theme of the utterance," since any noun or pronoun-noun can pretend to the role of the spokesperson of the subject, which is reported in the sentence, to one degree or another. member proposal. For example: *ТІехь* "bought a book" (reported about the book); *Васас тІехь босана* "Boy bought a book" (reportedly a boy and a book), etc.

The recognition of the specific meaning of the subject subject value is hindered by the fact that the value of the subject is expressed not only by the grammatical subject, but also by some minor members of the sentence (Dumézil, 1933).

It is important to emphasize that the specificity of the subject meaning of the subject in comparison with other minor members of the sentence, which also stably express the subject of the feature or have an implicit shade of subject semantics, is that the minor members of the sentence cannot transform into a grammatical subject.

It is this definition of the subject that corresponds to linguistic facts. Therefore, class and numerical conjugation of the verb and coordination of the predicate expressed by it with the subject and the direct

object (object) are important grammatical characteristics of the Avar language, on the basis of which the essence and originality of the main parts of the sentence can be determined.

One of the most important tasks of the syntactic analysis of a sentence is a comprehensive description of its members. In Avar language, a sentence member can be expressed in one word or a group of words denoting a single concept. For example, in sentence *Васас тIехь босана* «Boy took the book» each member is expressed in a separate word and the sentence has as many members as there are words in it, and in *Васас столалда тIаса тIехь босана* «Boy from the table took the book», consisting of five words, we we have four members, since two words were used to express one of them — the name in the locative of the 1st series of *столалда* and the postposition *тIаса*. Therefore, the sentence sentence can be expressed not only by one word, but by two or more words denoting one concept and answering one question.

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this article is to determine the place of the subject in the system of the main members of the sentence in the Avar language, where the question of how to qualify syntactically those nominal members of the sentence, one of which expresses the subject of action in an ergative, indicated by a transitional verb, and the other expresses the action object in the nominative.

Object, as a rule, is allocated on the basis of its opposition to the subject. Supporters of the logical direction in linguistics believe that the object and the object of action and between the subject and the subject are equal. Therefore, in many papers, addition is defined as a member of a sentence that denotes an action object. If the subject of the action does not coincide with the subject, the object of the action and the addition also do not coincide. There are significant differences between the syntactic and logical-grammatical segmentation of the sentence in the Avar language. The ratio of these two types of division of the sentence shows that they are qualitatively different phenomena both in terms of grammatical nature, and in terms of their functional purpose (Charachidzé, 1981).

The sentence in each language is characterized by certain grammatical features. For example, in Russian, a subject cannot be a name in an indirect case.

An important fact when deciding whether a nominal member of a sentence is a subject is whether the name actually acts as the organizing center of the sentence and how it is reflected in the form of a predicate verb. In the Avar language, the name in ergative cannot act as the organizing center of a sentence and does not find its reflection in the verb-predicate. Consequently, a name in an ergative cannot claim to be the subject.

Abdullayev (1967) wrote: "The ergative case only in this case should be considered the exponent of the grammatical subject, if he has a personal or classy suffixal concord of the predicate verb. The ergative case, lacking agreement on the verb-predicate, cannot be considered to be the spokesman of the grammatical subject, it is the spokesman of the secondary member of the sentence" (p. 198). Thus, the criterion for recognizing an ergative construction can be considered to be that the subject has a personal or class suffixal verb-predicate agreement. This relationship is presented in Dargin and Lak languages.

5.   Research Methods

The object of the research of this article is the role of the subject in the system of main members of the sentence in the Avar language.

The nature of this study involves the use of general scientific methods of analysis and linguistic observation, allowing to determine the role and place of the subject in the system of the main members of the sentence in the Avar language.

6.   Findings

It can be concluded that in the Avar language, when describing syntactic phenomena, the functional-semantic approach is the most fruitful. But in the conditions of development of this direction, at the same time, the problem of grammatical syntactic constructions and sentence members is actualized.

In our opinion, the nominative, ergative, dative, possessive and locative are subject cases. They are closely related to the lexical and grammatical forms of the verb, however, they cannot be qualified as subject forms.

7.   Conclusion

Thus, the study of the role of the subject in the system of the main members of the sentence in the Avar language showed that in recent years the special literature notes that the subject is a complex concept, which not only serves to differentiate semantic roles in the structure of the sentence, but also stably correlates with some values related to different cognitive spheres. For example, the subject often reports known information (this), while the direct object reports a new one. An interesting property of the subject is contingency with the names denoting the animated participants, especially people, and among them - with the names of the participants of the speech act, etc. However, we believe that these properties do not indicate the subject as a concept of the grammatical structure of the sentence, but on entities related to other conceptual areas.

It is impossible to identify the subject and the subject, belonging to different levels of the sentence. In the Avar language, the subject coincides with the subject only in the nominative.

As for the ergative, the semantic and syntactic aspects of its functioning must be clearly distinguished.

The problem of ergativeness is to find an acceptable way of analyzing the sentence of languages of ergative order by the members of the sentence. It is necessary to answer the question: where is the subject in the proposal of an ergative construction? The main syntactic functions of an ergative are subject and indirect object. In the Avar language, the main syntax function of the ergative is in direct object.

References

Abdullayev, Z. G. (1967). The ergative construction of a sentence in the mountain written languages of Dagestan. *The ergative construction of a sentence in languages of various types*. Leningrad.

Arnauld, A., & Lancelot, C.L. (1990). *"General and Rational Grammar, containing the fundamentals of the art of speaking, explained in a clear and natural manner"*. Moscow.

Bokarev, A. A. (1949). *Syntax of Avar language.* Moscow, Leningrad.

Charachidzé, G. (1981). *Grammaire de la langue Avar (langue du Caucase Nord-Est).* Editions Jean-Favard.

Dumézil, G. (1933). *Introduction a la grammaire comparée des langues caucasiennes du Nord.* Paris.

Haspelmath, M. (1993). *B*. New York: Mouton-de Gruyter.

Magomedov, D. M. (2014). The ratio of complex words and phrases in the Avar language. In *Abstracts of the IV International Scientific and Practical Conference "Caucasian Languages: Genetic and Typological Communities Areal Relationships"* (pp. 103–105). Makhachkala.

Magomedov, D. M., & Magomedtagirova, I. G. (2015). Syntactic functions of a series III locative in Avar language. *Herald of the Dagestan Scientific Center, 56*, 102–106.

Magomedov, M. I. (2011). The concept of the subject and ergativeness in the Avar language. In *III International Symposium "Iberian-Caucasian Languages: Structure, History, Functioning*, (pp. 307–310). Tbilisi.

Meshchaninov, I. I. (1976). *Ergative construction in different types of languages*. Leningrad: Science.