8-10 June 2015- Istanbul, Turkey
Proceedings of SOCIOINT15- 2nd International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities

828

THE DIFFICULTIES IN THE PROCESS OF TEACHING THE CATEGORY OF VOICE AND THE KARTVELIAN VERB

Damana Melikishvili[1], Natia Putkaradze[2] * and Nino Chichikoshvili [3]

[1]Prof. Dr., Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia, damanamel@yahoo.com
[2]PhD Student, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Giorgi Akhvlediani Society for The History of Linguistics, Georgia, natia.putkaradze@tsu.ge
[3]PhD Student, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia, ninochichikoshvili@yahoo.com
*Corresponding author

Abstract

In Georgian grammar textbooks until present-day, we have traditional classification of A. Shanidze, who classified the structural forms as the subcategories of the semantic criteria; i.e. he structured the formal classification under the semantical notion that contradicted the form and the meaning. The reason of this disagreement of the form and the function is the polypersonal nature of Georgian verb. Unlikely to Indo-European languages, in Georgian we cannot always get the passive meaning by the conversing of the so called "active voice" verbs. Conversion of the verbs not always gives us the passive voice verb forms, but, mostly, there are derived the verbs with active subject, that are considered to be the active voice verbs with the indirect object and the autoactive voice verbs.

Keywords: Voice, Diathesis, Kartvelian, Georgian, Megrelian, Verb, Classification, Dionysius Thrax.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of our work is to shape the particular difficulties in the process of teaching of the category of voice in Kartvelian Linguistics.

There are many contradictive definitions of voice in the different languages. In some of them, the category of diathesis is more acceptable than the category of voice. The category of diathesis, as the grammatical issue was first qualified by Dionysius Thrax in his "Art of Grammar"(Τέχνη Γραμματική, 2nd c. BC). In the grammar textbooks of the different languages, the category of diathesis was associated with categories of version, reflexivity and transitivity, it was called even gender of the verb.

Is there really something common among above-mentioned categories and the category of voice?

We have studied the diversional explanations of Dionysius Thrax's points of view about the category of voice: how is the category of voice interpreted in Indo-European and Kartvelian language grammars. For instance, according to the classification of Stefan (the glossiest of DionysiasThrax) the verb form "(I) live" (vcxovrob) is neutral towards the category of voice in Georgian; it is considered to be the verb of medial

voice. Though his definition of medial voice is nothing more but Georgian subjective version ("daviçere" wrote it for me).

For the second glossiest – Heliodore the category of diathesis is grammatical mood: "Diathesis is a wish of soul expressed by the words explaining how someone is doing something, or ordering something or praying…".

How linguists researching Indo-European languages define the categories of Voice and diathesis?

In order to answer this question the linguists of the Institute of Linguistics of St. Petersburg began to study the universal and typological concepts of voice and diathesis (A. Kholodovich, V. Khrakovski…) in the 60-ies of the 20-th century. They took the syntactic and semantic criteria for their classifications **instead of the morphological and syntactic ones.**. They analysed 1000 verbs like the exceptions, and as a result these verbs were left out of the system, without classification models (e.g.: intransitive verbs without –ся [sya suffix], -ся suffix verbs which don't have the opposite transitive verbs, вертит**ся**, крутится**...** etc.). This suffix is also the formant of the reciprocal verb forms: дерут**ся** "they are fighting"…

In some languages, the reciprocal forms are qualified as the forms of the voice, e.i. in Turkish language: Here we have five voices: 1. Active, 2.Causative, 3. Reflexive, 4. Passive and 5. Reciprocal.

In Rumanian language scientists give different explanations of voice: 1. Voice shows relationship between the subject and direct object expressed by verbal forms ("Gramatica limbii romine", v. 1, p. 243); 2.Voice is form of verbs, which show attitude between action and the subject of action. ("Limba romina (fonetica, vocabular, gramatica)" Bucuresti, 1956, p.125). In order to explain that fact L. I. Lukht wrote whole monograph about Rumanian Voice and tried to find special form for each semantic meaning, though his classification was still semantic and morphological, **not morphological and syntactic.**

In antique world besides the three traditional forms of voice (active, passive, medium) there were separated other forms, which were not voice forms indeed, but contextual functions of the forms and classification were made according to the semantic not the forms. So the same verbal form was considered medial and passive: **παιδευμαι** (I grow morphological up something/someone for me and I grow up myself). There exist verbal forms with active ending but medial meaning: **γελαω**- I laugh, **τρεω-**I tremble, etc.

The linguists of new Greek language have noticed the above mentioned issues and in order to express and describe verbal forms they have coined two terms: diathesis and voice (**διαθεση** , **φωνη**). It should be mentioned that maybe the term **φωνη** was created in order to classify forms of verbs, because the term diathesis could not take morphological meaning and stayed like semantical category.

The old Georgian linguists who translated Ioane Damask's "Dialectics" often used the term diathesis together with hexis. Hexis in "Dialectics" is eternal, that does not change, but diathesis is easily changeable order/category. Damask uses Aristotle's terms, which needed them to explain **ουσια**. By Aristotle diathesis is changeable, accidental, containing parts category.

In Georgian grammar textbooks until present-day, we have traditional classification that is followed by A. Shanidze, who classified the structural (morphological) forms as the subcategories **under** the semantic criteria; i.e. he structured the formal classification under the semantical notion that caused contradiction of the form and the meaning because of the polypersonal nature of Georgian verb. Unlikely to Indo-European languages, in Georgian we cannot always get the passive meaning by the conversing of the so called "active voice verbs".

2. MODERN CLASIFICATION: THREE DIATHESES FOR GEORGIAN

Taking into the consideration above mentioned problems and ambiguity, Prof. Dr. Damana Melikishvili qualified three syntactic groups and two morphological structural models of the Georgian Verb:

She distinguishes three types of diatheses; each of them combines verbs with the same morphological structure and syntactic construction.

Diathesis is a grammatically marked category defined by the combination of (morphological) structure and (syntactic) construction, and its subcategory is voice. The defining feature of voice is semantic category. Voice cannot be considered a grammatically marked category of the Georgian verb since the grammatical characteristics of the three semantically marked voices and shared within the framework of diathesis (autoactive [reflexive],direct and indirect transitive] active, and passive): namely, ergative construction passive verbs, active verbs containing an indirect object, and autoactive verbs share the same structure (R-

8-10 June 2015- Istanbul, Turkey
Proceedings of SOCIOINT15- 2nd International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities

830

i). Synthetic forms derived through conversion often are not semantically passive. That is why the new independent periphrastic form (consisting of the past objective participle+ 'iqmna' auxiliary verb) developed: it prevented polysemy and explicitly expressed passive meaning. This historically secondary form (distinguished from autoactive and active forms) cannot be typologically attributed to the diatheses that represent the primary system of the Kartvelian Verb.

In the scholarly literature it is absolutely ignored two main structures of all Georgian Verbs. It would be better if we will begin the lessons about the Georgian verb with the explanation of its general stem structure:
The theme (stem) of the Georgian verb is mainly based on the two following structures:
theme+Ø (R+Ø, R[e/i]+Ø, R[Ø/a]-TH+Ø, R[Ø/e]-TH+Ø, R-TH+Ø): žɣer+Ø (resound) - çer+Ø (write); tvlem+Ø (doze) -žɣvlem+Ø (squash/knead ineptly); ṭir-i+Ø (cry/weep) - tl-i+Ø (sharpen/peel), čr-i+Ø (cut); gor-av+Ø (roll about) - xaṭ-av+Ø (draw/paint), ḳl-av+Ø (kill); ḳanḳaleb+Ø (tremble)- aḳanḳaleb+Ø (make tremble/shake), aḳeTeb+Ø (do/make); cxovrob+Ø (live)- acxovreb+Ø (let live), atbob+Ø (warm up); ab-am+Ø (tie up).

theme+i (R+i, R-TH+i): xaṭ+i-(xar) (you are drawn/painted) - ixaṭeb+i (you are being drawn/painted), tbeb+i (you get/become warm), tetr-d-eb+i (you are being whitened/bleached; you become white or white-haired).

As a rule, the changeable construction (case-variable subject: nominative – ergative – dative) corresponds to the first structure verbs belonging to the first group, and this is the token under which the verbs are combined within the first diathesis which, for its part, consists of two subgroups. These subgroups are then distinguished by the presence or absence of a direct object.

The subject of verbs belonging to the first subgroup is active but it does not have a direct object, a potential recipient of the action. Or, more precisely, they contain direct object, namely, themselves, i.e. their subject is self-acting – autoactive. Shanidze considers them as the verbs belonging to the middle voice medioactive subgroup (medial verbs). But, by definition of the voice category, there exists no basis for differentiating middle voice. Arnold Chikobava considers these verbs voiceless stative forms. However, from the perspective of stativity, they hold a transitional position between absolute stativity (from state of motionlessness/inactivity) and the process of an action; they express the state of physical or mental activity (ḳanḳalebs – he/she trembles, ḳivis - he/she screams/shrieks, ṭiris - he/she cries/weeps, çuxs - he/she worries..). This can be graphically expressed as a circle/circular motion (unlike the absolute stativity which on its part can be expressed by a point): the circle starts from the point where it ends; likewise, the action of such verbs emanates from, and terminates at the same point, i.e. it returns to the self-acting person (subject). In short, these verbs have a reflexive content, the object of their action is the same as the subject, the action is directed inward, toward the centre. Accordingly, they use an appropriate marker, the prefix i- which we consider the marker of reflexivity

Within the monopersonal construction (in this case, it is not the marker borrowed from the subjective version active forms. In French, this same function is fulfilled by the reflexive pronouns, in Russian – by the suffix that has developed from the reflexive pronoun via modification/shortening (sebya (self)>-sya)). In the construction with the direct object though, the same prefix i- fulfills the function of subjective orientation. As mentioned above, the autoactives do not have a direct object, although a direct object can still appear in such verbs: sçavlobs gigla ṭiṭina.. - 'Little (prattling/who talks in a lively childish manner) Gigla studies' but: gigla sçavlobs gaḳvetils - 'Gigla studies the lesson'; gigla ḳargad xaṭavs, ḳargad çers - 'Gigla paints/writes well', but: gigla xaṭavs porṭreṭs, çers lekss - 'Gigla paints a portrait/composes a poem'. The forms of such complete construction gain membership in the second/following subgroup.

Unlike the first subgroup, the second subgroup verbs are direct transitive, and they express the process of an action; their subject is also active, but unlike the first subgroup, they have a direct object at which the action is directed. Their construction is also variable; the cases for the subject are: nominative, ergative, dative; the cases for the direct object are: dative and nominative; and the case for the indirect object is dative throughout.

Thus, **group I**, where verbs are united according to their theme and construction, constitutes the first diathesis which consists of the incomplete and complete construction subgroups. The first subgroup expresses the state of action and thus, has stative meaning. The second subgroup, on the other hand, expresses the process of action and has dynamic meaning. The first one is primary and generates the second subgroup verbs in terms of both structure and construction (ḳanḳalebs is 'he trembles/shakes' > a-ḳanḳalebs is mas 'he makes it shake', cxovrobs is 'he lives' > a-cxovrebs is mas 'he makes/lets her live').

This group can be named the ergative-construction diathesis (because of the subject's particular case assignment).

In terms of voice, the first subgroup's monopersonal (monovalent) verbs are reflexive, autoactive, they are intransitive (k̇ank̇alebs is 'he trembles/shakes', c̣uxs is 'he worries',iӡinebs is 'he falls asleep'. iӡaxis is 'he says') while its bipersonals are indirect transitive (šexeda man mas 'he looked at her'). As for the second subgroup verbs, they are active, and in terms of transitivity, they are the verbs of direct transitivity.

Group II, which also combines verbs with the same structure and construction, constitutes the second diathesis. Like the first diathesis, it consists of incomplete and complete construction subgroups. The first one is stative while the second one is dynamic; here as well, the first subgroup is the basis for the second subgroup in terms of both structure and construction (gd-i-/xar/ (Sen) 'you are lying about (idly)' > u-gd-i-/xar/, e-gd-eb-i (Sen mas) 'you are/will be lying about (idly) for him/her'). The verbs of this structure do not have direct object – their construction is stable: in all three series, subject is in nominative case while indirect object is in dative case. These verbs can be called indirect transitive. This is a nominative construction group. In terms of voice, the first subgroup verbs of this diathesis are neutral while the second subgroup verbs can be either autoactive, active/indirect transitive, or passive according to the activity or passivity of their subject. This is because of the fact that when considering the universal semantical definition of voice, according to which a verb is passive if its subject is not active but is a recipient of the action, the structures R-i, R-eb-i are not necessarily related to passive voice: about 350 e- and a-prefixed verbs have an active subject (elap̣arak̇eba is mas 'he talks to her', ečxubeba is mas 'he quarrels with her', eӡibreba is mas 'he competes with her', exmareba is mas 'He helps him' acxreba is mas 'he pounces on it', axṭeba is mas 'he jumps on it',..), approximately 100 i-prefixed so-called deponent verbs are autoactives (reflexives), also i-/e-prefixed ones are conversive autoactives and they as well have active subject (imaleba bavSvi 'the child hides (himself)', emaleba bavSvi dedas 'the child hides from his mother'). Furthermore,Tbeba-type and d-suffixed denominative dynamic verbs are semantically autoactives. Regarding passive semantics, basically only the R-eb-i structure verbs with inanimate subject are associated with it (see D. Melikhishvili - 2001, pg-s. 61-70; 2002, pg-s. 3-15; Paradigms ## 10(44), 11(45), 12(46), 14(48), 15(49), 16(50)).

Group III, which consists of dative-construction and mixed-structure verbs, constitutes the third diathesis. This diathesis could be called dative since the subject of verbs unified under it is invariably in dative case.

In the third diathesis (like in the first and second diatheses) two subgroups can be distinguished: subgroup I consist of primary verbs with an archaic construction and structure. They have stative meaning and express an emotional state; their subject experiences a certain emotional state, i.e. it denotes a person lacking volition (uq̇vars mas (is) 'he loves (her)', sӡuls mas (is) 'he hates (him)', učirs mas (is) 'he has difficulties (with it)').

It was exactly this archaic dative construction of these verbs that turned out to be the derivational model/source for the realization of the Georgian polypersonal verb's potential/possibilities; namely, via inversion of dynamic verbs - both first diathesis (a---eb) causative structure and second diathesis (R-eb-i) structure verbs - a new, second subgroup of the verbs having the subject with lack of volition and undergoing a certain non-material, emotional activity was produced (ak̇ank̇alebs šiši, sicive mas 'fear, cold makes him tremble' > ak̇ank̇alebs šiš/isagan/, siciv/isagan/ mas 'he trembles (involuntarily) because of fear/cold'; anaṭrebs is mas mas 'it makes him long for/miss her/it' >enaṭreba mas is 'he longs for/misses (involuntarily) her/it'...)*.

It is precisely the subject's lack of volition that distinguishes such verbs having identical structures but different constructions: amcxik̇vebs is 'he sneezes' > amcxik̇vebs mas 'he sneezes (involuntarily)', aceminebs is 'he sneezes' > aceminebs mas 'he sneezes (involuntarily)', axvelebs is 'he coughs' > axvelebs mas 'he coughs (involuntarily)'

...Furthermore, by analogy of first diathesis verbs, this process is extended to second diathesis structure verbs: emtknareba mas 'he feels like yawning', ecemineba mas 'he feels like sneezing', emcxikveba mas 'he feels like sneezing',exveleba mas 'he feels like coughing'...and thus, a whole new system with great generative potential is created (See. D. Melikhishvili, 2001, pg-s 344-346, Third Diathesis, Paradigms #7(59) - #14(66)).

At this stage we will not discuss the inversion issue of first diathesis series III forms at length (See. D. Melikhishvili, 2001, pg-s 19-31), but will only mention that this process (i.e. inversion) imparted the content of involuntary or non-witnessed actions to these verbs. This happened because of the fact that after acquiring

dynamic content (>damiçeria/damigdia 'I have (apparently) written/thrown it down'), the dative-case person of (is me) miçeria / migdia - type ('it is written/it lies about for me') stative verbs came to be understood as the subject, and, accordingly, m-type prefixes acquired the function of the subject markers in such verbs. Historically, these m-type prefixes are the archaic formation subject markers in affective verbs (where the subject is an undergoer of some emotional activity).

Thus, expressing involuntary semantics in series III as well as, in general, throughout the whole conjugation system of the Georgian verb, is related to the m-type prefixes, i.e. to the markers of the person in dative case (the person that is functionally the subject (v-ixseneb me mas 'I (try to) remember it/him/her' - m-axsendeba me is 'It comes back to my mind/I involuntarily remember it/him/her'; v-igvianeb me 'I am late (on purpose)'- m-agviandeba me 'I am running late (against my will)'; v-icini me 'I laugh'- m-ecineba me'I laugh (involuntarily)/I feel like laughing'; v-iɣimi me 'I smile' - m-eɣimeba me 'I smile (involuntarily)/I feel like smiling'; v-iɣviZeb me 'I wake up'- m-eɣviZeba me 'I wake up (involuntarily)'; v-ţiri me 'I cry/weep'- m-eţireba me 'I feel like crying/weeping'; v-nanob me mas 'I regret it'- m-enaneba me is 'I feel regret/sorry for it/him/her', v-natrob me mas 'I dream about it/him/her'- m-enaţreba me is 'I miss it/him/her (involuntarily)', v-ipxan me mas 'I scratch it'- m-epxaneba me is 'I feel itching in it'...).

When describing verbs morphologically (especially when working on languages by mechanical means, such as a computer), it is obviously not appropriate to use the logical terms and notions: this is a methodological issue of principle, to the analysis of which Chikobava's seminal work on syntax - 'The Problem of the Simple Sentence in Georgian' (1928; 1968) is devoted.** It is also obvious that the interrelationship of the person and case markers have not changed throughout the history of the Georgian language, i.e. the formal system remains invariable (the v–type markers are still associated with nominative and ergative cases, while the m–type markers – with dative and nominative cases, provided that these last ones are in combination with ergative, thus expressing the function of direct object), although in the evolutionary process of the Georgian simple sentence, the direct correspondence between the semantics and the morphological elements was destroyed, the functional orientation of the person markers has changed*** (i.e. inversion took place in the series III forms of the first diathesis both subgroups, as well as in the forms of the third diathesis second subgroup); these are the alterations that should by all means be represented in the table for describing the functions of person markers in the modern Georgian language.

Diathesis is a grammatically marked category defined by the combination of (morphological) structure and (syntactic) construction, and its subcategory is voice whose defining feature is semantic. Voice can not be considered a grammatically marked category of the Georgian verb since the grammatical characteristics of the three semantically marked voices are shared within the framework of diathesis (autoactive [reflexive], [direct and indirect transitive] active, and passive): namely, ergative construction autoactive (reflexive) and active verbs have the same structure (R-Ø) and nominative construction passive verbs, active verbs containing an indirect object, and autoactive verbs share the same structure (R-i). Synthetic forms derived through conversion often are not semantically passive. This is why the new independent periphrastic form (consisting of the past objective participle + 'ikmna' auxiliary verb) developed: it prevented polysemy and explicitly expressed passive meaning. This historically secondary form (distinguished from autoactive and active forms) cannot be typologically attributed to the diatheses that represent the primary system of the Kartvelian verb.

Diathesis is a primary scheme for the morphological structure and syntactic construction of the Kartvelian verb; it has undergone certain alterations during the course of development of the Kartvelian languages (which is a vast topic and requires special examination). Below is the table of the structure and construction of three Diathesis for Georgian:

Table 1. Diatheses for Georgian

I diathesis (Ergative)	
Stative (partially, relative statics)	Dynamic
Voice: Autoactive (Reflexive)	Voice: Active (Conveys process of action)
Structure:	Structure:
R-Ø	R-Ø
i-/u-R[e/i]-Ø	a/i-/u-R-Ø

8-10 June 2015- Istanbul, Turkey
Proceedings of SOCIOINT15- 2nd International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities

833

prev.-R-a/i/u/-R-th.s.-Ø construction: incomplete is _(nom) "he" - man _(erg) "he" is _(nom) mas_(dat) - man_(enr) mas_(dat)	a-/i-/u-R[e/i]-Ø a-/i-/u/R-th.s.-Ø Construction: Complete is _(nom) mas_(dat) "he him" - man _(erg) is_(nom) "he him" is_(nom) mas_(dat) mas_(dat) - man_(enr) is_(nom) mas_(dat)
II diathesis (Nominative)	
Stative (Absolute statics) Voiceless Structure: Ø-/i-/u-R-i Construction: incomplete is_(nom) - is_(nom) "he - he"	Dynamic Voice: Active, Autoactive, Passive Structure: Ø-/u-R-eb-i Ø-/u-R-d-eb-i a-R-eb-i; e-R-eb-i; i-/e-R-eb-i. Construction: complete is_(nom) mas_(dat) - is_(nom) mas_(dat) he him – he him"
III diathesis (Dative)	
Stative (Expresses affective, mental State) Primary Structure: i-/u-R-Ø i-/u-R-i Construction: mas_(dat) - mas_(dat) "him – him"; mas_(dat) is_(nom) - mas_(dat) is_(nom) "Him it – Him it"	Stative and Dynamic Derived Structure a-R-eb-Ø e-R-eb-i Construction: mas_(dat) - mas_(dat) "him – him"; mas_(dat) is_(nom) - mas_(dat) is_(nom) Him it – Him it]

3. THREE DIATHESES IN MEGRELIAN

The same can be said about other Kartvelian linguistic unit: We have into the consideration the case of Megrelian. All the grammar textbooks of Megrelian are based on the traditional classification. The voice and transitivity are considered as the main classification unit for Megrelian verb: "There are three voices in Megrelian: Active, Passive and Medium. All the transitive verbs constitute the active voice, the passive voice has the positive markers of the category of voice, all the rest intransitive verbs that are not passive, are considered to be the medium voice forms" (Chikobava 1936:112).

We have statistically analysed Megrelian verbs and their morphological structure. It became clear that there are two main stems (theme) for Megrelian verbs: R-(Th.s)-Ø, and R-Th.s-u/e(n).

We distinguish three diatheses in Megrelian according to the three syntactic constructions, which are distributed through the above mentioned two structures:

The first construction is nom-erg-dat (subject is inflected by the case markers of nominative, ergative and dative cases) that always happens to Megrelian verbs of the structure: R-(Th.s)-Ø. e.g.: çar-un-s "writes", where the verb root is çar, -un – is thematic marker of the present screeve and somethimes it does not appears, that is why we have put in the brackets in our Structure formula: R-(Th.s)-Ø. And –s is the personal marker. We do not have any structural formant (Ø) before the personal markers.

The second construction of the subject is nom-nom-nom and as a rule, this construction covers the verbs of the structure: R-(Th.s)-u(n). ṭib-u(n) - "he is warming (himself)", where ṭib-is the root of the verb and –u(n) formant is the formant of the structure.

The third group of the verb contains the both structures, because they are produced by the inversion of the first and the second constructions//diatheses.

e.g.: R-(Th.s)- Ø: e.g.: gaarzinuans – faces danger, pain, etc. (vardis mu garzinuans: what makes the rose to face danger, loneliness…) and R-(Th.s)-u(n): moteaṭru(n) "I am in the mood of theatre", etc.

So, we have both structures in the third diathesis. It consists of dative-construction and mixed-structure verbs, constitutes the third diathesis. This diathesis could be called dative since the subject of verbs unified under it is invariably in dative case. Like literary Georgian language, here we have the m-type prefixes as the personal markers; e.g., (ma si) **m-**iorq – (I) love (you).

So, the unity of construction and Structure we also call diathesis for Megrelian. We tested the theory of three diatheses (by Prof. Dr. D. Melikishvili). Of Course, there are lots of substructures according to the thematic markers, but all of them are inside the diatheses, the main rules of construction and structure are not changed. We have a small deviation in the verb construction of the 2ⁿᵈ diathesis in aorist: "doğuru kočiq" the man (*erg.*) died; We are of the opinion that spreading of the ergative case is normal in Megrelian, which is absolutely free of the language standards. It should be the result of the unification processes.

So, we have two main morphological structure and syntactic constructions in the grammatical present screeve in Megrelian, like literary Georgian language; that fact allows us to conclude that the theory of three diatheses, which is the unity of morphological structure and syntactic construction is working for Kartvelian verb forms. We think that the diatheses should be the main classification unit in the process of teaching of the Kartvelian Verb.

REFERENCE LIST

Chikobava, Arn. (1936). Grammatical analysis of Chan.

Chotiwari-Jünger, S., Wittek, L., Melikischwili, D. Georgiche Verbtabellen, bei Buske, 2010

Giorgobiani, T. (1998). The main categories of the Verb in Greek.

Gordeziani, R., Darchia I., Shamanidi S., (2001). Old and New Greek language (Comparative Grammar.

Gogolashvili, G., (1988). The system of the conjunction of Georgian verb.

Karosanidze, L. (2002). "Art of Grammar" (Τέχνη Γραμματική) by Dionysius Thrax and the Old Georgian Grammatical Thought .

http://gashol.ge/pdf/geo/Lia_Karosanidze_Art_of_Grammar_by_Dionysius_Thrax_and_the%20Old_Georgian_Grammatical_Thought.pdf

Kholodovich, A. (1977). The voice. The category of voice

Khrakovskii, V. C. (1978). The voce and reflexive. The problem of the theory of the grammatical voice.

Kiziria, A. (1982). The structure of the simple sentence in Karvelian Languages.

Lewis, G., L. (2001). Turkish Grammar.

Lomtatidze, K. (1953). The verbs of "tbeba"-type in Georgian, Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics, vol. IV.

Lukht, L.I. (1962). The voice in modern Ruminian Language.

Melikishvili, D., Humphries, D. J., Kupunia M., (2008). The Georgian Verb: A Morphosyntactic Analysis.

Shanidze, A. (1980). The issues of the Grammar of Georgian Language, III.

Jorbenadze, B. (1975). The issues of the formation and function of the forms of verbal voice.