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1. Preliminaries

The South Caucasian languages, also called “Kartvelian” after their historically and numerically dominant member, Georgian (G kartv-el- ‘Georgian (person)’), comprises Georgian (G kartul- in the Republic of Georgia and in small pockets in North-East Turkey, in the North Caucasus, in Azerbaijan and in Iran; Mingrelian or Megrelian (G megr-ul-) in Western Georgia (estimated 300,000 speakers), Laz (G č’an-ur-) mainly in the Pontic region of North-East Turkey (and in one village on the Georgian side), and Svan in the north-western mountainous area of Georgia (estimated 35,000 speakers). According to the census of 1989, 98% of 3,981,000 Georgians in the Soviet Union (most of them living in Georgia at that time) declared Georgian to be their mother tongue (including however Mingrelian and Svan). According to the standard interpretation, Mingrelian and Laz, which once formed a dialect continuum, are genetically closer to Georgian, with the archaic Svan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Modern Georgian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegPot</td>
<td>negation of possibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegImp</td>
<td>prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>Old Georgian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt</td>
<td>optative, subjunctive II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OptParticle</td>
<td>optative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>objective version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>participle formant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plpf</td>
<td>pluperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>paradigm marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prev</td>
<td>preverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quot</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>particle marking relative pronouns (G -c, M -t, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>subordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupV</td>
<td>superessive version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Svan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>subjective version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>thematic suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
language standing somewhat apart from its sister languages. There are, however, features that cut across genetic boundaries, for instance the development of additional evidential forms found in Mingrelian, Laz, Svan and some western and southern Georgian dialects. Similarly, specific analytic future tense formations (derived from ‘to want’) are found in some dialects both of Laz and of Southern Georgian, etc. In general, these languages have been in contact with each other for a very long time, and many features must have spread across dialect and language boundaries. For 1500 years, Georgian has been used as a literary language by Georgians, Mingrelians and Svanians. It is the language of a vast literature, and has been used in writing, in schools, at the university (since 1918) and in the media (Hewitt, 1985).

The Georgian alphabet in all probability was created in connection with the Christianisation of the country (4th–5th century; Boeder, 1975; Gamq’relişe, 1994). It is remarkable by its (almost) complete match with the Old and Modern Georgian phonological system.—Most Mingrelian, Laz and Svan texts have been published in Georgian script (with some additional letters and diacritics). For Laz a Latin script has been created on the basis of the Turkish orthographic writing system (with some necessary extensions; Lazoğlu and Feurstein, 1984), and is used in Turkey and some recent linguistic publications.

The transcription used in this article is the one used by most English-speaking linguists. The traditional caucasiological transcription (as developed by N. Troubetzkoy) deviates from it in that it uses a dot to indicate glottalisation: ə = p, ŋ = t, k’ = k, c’ = ç, ĺ = ĺ, q’ = Ɂ.

In the following, I will use “Kartvelian” as a term comprising all Kartvelian languages: Old Georgian (OG), Modern Georgian (MG), Mingrelian (M), Laz (L) and Svan (Sv). “Modern Kartvelian” comprises present-day varieties of Kartvelian in this sense. The unspecified term “Georgian” (G) refers to Modern Georgian, without excluding identity of Old Georgian forms. Where necessary, the term “Modern Georgian” is used to distinguish it from Old Georgian as documented between the 5th and 18th centuries.

2. Phonology

2.1. Vowels and consonants

The vowels of literary Georgian form a three-level system: a, e, o, i, u. e and i are front vowels, o and u back vowels. Phonetically a is a front vowel in most environments, but in some respects it behaves like a back vowel (e.g. in darkening following l). Vowel length is not a phonemic feature, but phonetically long vowels do occur as expressive variants and e.g. as a result of processes like coalascence at morpheme boundaries in some Georgian dialects (ga + u + k’eta > gük’eta in Ač’arian), compensatory lengthening (sircxvili > sicxvili in Ač’arian), phrasal “tonal accent” (on second-last syllable of the phonemic word including clitics: ninia + Šen t’q’uil-s ar ġet’q’vis ‘Ninia-you lie-Dat not he.will.tell.you’

1 There are many Georgian studies on Kartvelian phonetics and phonology; apart from relevant sections in grammars and surveys, see Robins and Waterson (1952), Uturgai泽 (1976), Imna泽 (1989), Aronson (1997) and particularly the studies by Vogt (1958) and Job (1977), chapter 3.1, for Georgian, for Mingrelian Imna泽 (1981), for Laz N. K’iziria (1980), A. Wodarg in Kutscher et al. (1995). For a historical study of Kartvelian fricatives and affricates see Lomta泽 (1999).
in Mtiulian, Žorbenaje, 1991: 280), etc. Some dialects have umlauted vowels (as in 'c'vima > 'c'öma ‘rain’), others have schwa allophones (k'aršə < k'arsi ‘the door’) or add schwa in several positions (arisə ≈ Standard Georgian aris ‘is’, cxəra ≈ Standard cxra ‘nine’). Morphemic fusion sometimes yields minimal pairs like: g-e-zina ‘you slept’ vs. go-e-zina (‘we slept’, Ingilo dialect of Georgian).

Mingrelian and Laz have similar systems; Mingrelian has schwa, which is often in allophonic variation with i, u or o (t'ibu—t’ëbə ‘warm’).—Laz has some ō and ū allophones both in Turkish loans and as a result of assimilation.

Svan has a rich vowel system: an additional shwa vowel ə, and in some dialects: the umlauted vowels ă, ŏ, ŭ and long counterparts for all vowels. The system of the Upper Bal dialect (Oniani, 1998: 22) is depicted in Table 1.

All (and only) vowels are syllable peaks.²

Like most other Caucasian languages, Kartvelian languages have a rich consonant system, and the Common Kartvelian system might have been even more complex (Schmidt, 1962; Mač’avariani, 1965) (Table 2).

Stops and affricates are distinguished by a “common Caucasian” three-way opposition between “voiced”—voiceless (aspirated)—glottalised (see Aronson (1997, 933) for the markedness hierarchy in this triad).—Georgian h occurs almost only in word-initial position (mainly in a few foreign words like haeri ‘air’) and in some dialects as a verbal prefix allomorph (see 3.2.2.d.), but it is common in Svan and Laz. q occurs in Old Georgian, in some archaic dialects of Georgian and in Svan and has become x elsewhere (on q and q’, see Gəmq’rəliże, 2001). Some Kartvelian languages and dialects (particularly Old Georgian,

² For a reconstruction of syllabic sonants in Proto-Kartvelian, see Gəmq’rəliże and Mač’avariani (1965, 1982).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Svan (Upper Bal) vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front vowels</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medial vowels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-labial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Stops and affricates</th>
<th>Fricatives</th>
<th>Sonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labials</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentals</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-alveolars</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-alveolars</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɛ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velars</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-velars</td>
<td>[q]</td>
<td>q’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laryngeal</td>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Svan, Laz) have j (mostly as an allophone of i). Mingrelian and some Georgian dialects
(for instance, Tush) have ŋ.

Among the phonetic processes of Georgian are:³ (a) dissimilation of the sequence
r...r...l (Grigol < Grigor, german-ul¬i ‘German’ [vs. inglez-ur-i ‘English’], arapeli
‘nothing’ (dialect form of ara-per-i) (cp. Fallon, 1993); (b) deletion of v before u, o, m:
toab < tav-ob-a ‘generation’, s-ma- (<sv-ma) ‘drinking’; (c) some dialects have onglides
like wori < ori ‘two’, ješmak’i < ešmak’i ‘devil’.

Svan has some morphophonemic processes that make the morphological shapes of
words much less transparent than those of their Georgian counterparts. One of them is
vowel reduction.⁴ It is usually connected with the working of an assumed dynamic stress.
Examples are: katal ‘hen’—plural katlär, gezal ‘child’—genitive gezlääš, bâgi
‘strong’—libge ‘strengthening’, i-meger-i (Lentekh dialect)—i-mger-i (Upper Bal dialect)
‘gets to know’. The second process is metathesis: t’ixe ‘turns it round, takes it back’—
*wx – t’ixe > t’wixe ‘I turn it round’ (where the 1st person marker wx- is shifted into the
verbal root!), nābez ‘evening’—genitive nābzwäišt. Svan is also known for its extensive and
very complex umlaut phenomena in some of its dialects:⁵ x-o-dgar-a (<x-o-dagar-a) ‘s/he
has (apparently) killed me/you/er/him’—m-a-dgär-i (<m-a-dagar-i) ‘s/he kills me’. The
concurrency of different processes (assimilation, metathesis, umlaut, reduction) make the
initial segment of verbs particularly opaque.⁶

While personal markers and preverbs are involved in Svan, it is the numerous preverbs
that are particularly subject to morphophonemic changes in Mingrelian and Laz (see 3.2.4).

A remarkable feature is sound symbolism in Georgian (see e.g. Č'anisvili, 1988; Holisky, 1988; Holisky and K’axaše, 1988) and particularly in Mingrelian: for a verb
like “s/he minces”, there are three sound shapes with increasing size of the “product”: G
c’ic’k’nis, cicknis, čiģnis, M č’ic’k’nis, čičknis, čićgnsis; micunculebs ‘is trotting’ is said
e.g. of a hare, mizunjulebs of a bear, etc.

2.2. Phonotactics

Contrary to most other Caucasian languages, initial consonant clusters can be very
prtxvinavs ‘[a horse] snorts’, prcvnvi ‘you.peel.it’; adding a prefix may yield a form like
gv-prcvnvi ‘you.peel.us’ (one syllable!). These clusters are subject to restrictions which
require e.g. a distinction according to the “direction” in their articulation: “decessive”
clusters (from more front to more back: bd, dg, px, t’k’, sk, etc., with one closure only) and
“acessive” clusters (reverse order: db, gd, xp, k’t’, ks, etc.). Decessive clusters with a post-
dorsal second component and whose components share identical manner of articulation
features (voiced, aspirated, glottalised) are called “harmonic” and have the same
distribution as single consonants. So d (deda ‘mother’) and dy (dye ‘day’), t’ (mat’li

---
³ See e.g. Neisser (1953).
⁶ For some rules see A. Oniani apud Hewitt (1982a).
⁷ For an extensive description, see Vogt (1958), Job (1977, Chap. 3.1). For a non-hierarchic interpretation
onset-structure see Gil and Radzinski (1987); for harmonic clusters see Chitoran (1998).
‘worm’) and t’q’ (mat’q’li ‘wool’), etc. have the same distribution: they occur e.g. before e and l, respectively, but while k’ occurs e.g. before l (mok’la ‘s/he killed him’), the non-harmonic cluster k’b (k’bili ‘tooth’) does not (‘k’bl-). Non-harmonic clusters are less natural in Georgian and tend to be replaced: ga-t’q’-da ‘it.broke’ (instead of ‘ga-t’x-da) vs. t’ex-s ‘s/he.breaks.it’.

Disregarding personal prefixes and initial m-, most syllable-initial groups can be described by a formula representing the maximum of complexity: CRCRRV, where C is a simple obstruct or a harmonic cluster, with various positional constraints on R (Vogt, 1958). Sequences like C llrln + V are aligned to the canonical phonotactics by metathesis: xn-a plough-Pres-Masdar ‘ploughing’ > xvna, t-rva-met’i ten-eight-more ‘18’ > tvramet’i.

There are heavy co-occurrence restrictions between the initial and final segments of roots (Gamq’relije and Mač’avariani, 1982). In non-root morphemes, the consonant features voice and glottalisation bear little functional load: sonorants (m-roots (Gamqvetymatically related morphemes, p-languages: the nominal plural morpheme is –ep- in Mingrelian; the imperfect ending is –di in Georgian and Mingrelian, but –t’i in Laz; the verbal pluralizer is –t in Georgian and Mingrelian, but –d in Svan, etc.

Svan has less complex initial clusters: harmonic clusters as in č’q’int’ ‘child’, šd as in šdim ‘ear’, C + w as in ṣwač ‘male’, t’wet ‘hand’. On the other hand, final clusters can be very complex (Tuite, 1997: 8): żāryw ‘vein’, lemasgw-šw ‘fire-Instr’.

Mingrelian and Laz clusters are more restricted with regard to phoneme and phonemic properties: the maximum occurs in internal position: mar3gyvani ‘right side’ (T’. Gudava apud Harris, 1991b: 318).

2.3. Morphophonemics

2.3.1 The original Proto-Kartvelian ablaut system has left its traces in all Kartvelian languages (Gamq’relije and Mač’avariani, 1965, 1982). It is most transparent in Georgian (see e.g. Vogt, 1939) with its qualitative ablaut in the noun stem: vowel deletion, ‘syncope’, occurs before full-grade inflectional suffixes (i.e. before genitive -is, instrumental -it, adverbial -ad, plural -eb-, but not before (nominative) -i#, which must be of a later origin) particularly with some stems having a final sonant l, r, m, n and some others: obol-i ‘orphan’, st’umar-i ‘guest’, irem-i ‘hart’, ak’van-i ‘cradle’, mindor-i ‘field’, somex-i ‘Armenian’ vs. obl-is, st’umr-is, irm-is, ak’vn-is, mindyr-is, somx-is, etc.; obl-eb-, st’umr-eb-, irm-eb-, ak’n-eb-, mindv-eb-, somx-eb-. Syncope in noun stems is a recessive feature; in words with a secondary, dissociated meaning, only the latter preserves syncope: tval-i (1) genitive tval-is ‘eye’, (2) genitive tvl-is ‘gem, jewel’.

2.3.2 Similarly, quantitative ablaut in Georgian verb stems occurs before full-grade suffixes. Again, the extension formant -i- (in first and second person subject forms) does not count as a full-grade suffix: k’l-av-s kill-3SgS ‘he kills him’, mo-k’l-a Prev-kill-3SgS(Aor) ‘s/he killed him’ vs. mo-k’al-i Prev-kill-PM(Aor) ‘you killed him’, i-cn-ob Version-know-3SgS ‘you.know.him’, ga-i-cn-o Prev-Version-know-3SgS(Aor) ‘s/he got to know him’ vs. ga-i-can-i Prev-Version-know-PM(Aor) ‘you got to know him’; in contrast, the present-stem suffix -i counts as a full-grade suffix: kmn-i create-3SgS ‘you.create.it’
(cp. ŝe-kmn-a Prev-create-3SgS(Aor) ‘s/he.created.it’) vs. ŝe-kmen-i Prev-create-PM(Aor) ‘you.created.it’.

2.3.3 In qualitative ablaut, e alternates with i (‘‘reduced grade’’): i-smen Version-hear ‘you hear it’ vs. i-smen-e Version-hear-PM(Aor) ‘you heard it’, a-kc-ev Version-put.to.-flight-TS ‘you put(Pres) him to flight’ vs. ga-a-kc-i-e (<ga-a-kc-i-v-e Prev-Version-put.to.-flight-TS-PM(Aor) ‘you put him to flight’, c’q’veṭ’ ‘you.tear.into.pieces’, ga-c’q’vit’e Prev-tear-PM(Aor) ‘you tore into pieces’.

2.3.4 Notice, however, that ablaut is not completely predictable from phonological shape: c’q’veṭ’, ga-c’q’vit’e (see above), but: k’vet ‘you.cut.into.pieces’, ga-k’vet-e Prev-cut-PM(Aor) ‘you cut into pieces’; k’l-av, mo-k’al-i (see above), but: mal-av hide-TS ‘you hide it’, da-mal-e Prev-hide-PM(Aor) ‘you hid it’. (These exceptions are accounted for by the assumption of a lengthened grade by Gamq’reliże and Mać’avariani, 1965, 1982.)

2.4. Prosodic features

In Georgian, phoneticians find a (not easily discernible) dynamic word stress on the first syllable (see e.g. McCoy, 1991). In addition, most authors indicate stress on the antepenultimate syllable (particularly in words with 5 or more syllables), or even on the penultimate syllable (e.g. in words with 4 syllables; Tevdoraţe, 1978).—Svan stress is often said to be dynamic (mostly on the basis of morphophonemic considerations like vowel reduction in supposedly unstressed syllables). Similarly, very little is known on stress in Laz and Mingrelian (with the exception of the Senak dialect described by T’Gudava, see Harris, 1991b: 320).

Among the many intonation contours (N. K’iziria, 1987), yes-no-questions are characterised by a fall-rise (neutral) or fall-rise-fall pattern (asking for elucidation) on the predicate:

(1) mxat’var-ma surat-i daxat’a (G)
painter-Erg picture s/he.painted.it?
‘did a/the painter paint a/the picture?’

2.5. Clisis

Old Georgian had phrasal and clausal clitics (cp. 3.2.4).8

(2) da [erti xolo vinme č’abuk’i] mihsdevda mas (Marc 14,51) (OG)
and one but some young.man he.followed.him him
‘and only one young man followed him’

(3) t’wros-s tumca da sidon-s ikmnēs ʒalni (Matthew 11,21) (OG)
Tyros-Dat if and Sidon-Dat they.had.been.made forces
‘if the mighty things had been done in Tyros and Sidon’

8 Boeder (1994), Christophe (2003); for a different interpretation, see Cherchi (1994).
OG -ca ‘too’ is a clitic occurring in the second position of its phrasal scope:

(4) xolo ac’ [[[mixiles-ca me] da [mo-ca- miʒules [[me-ca] da [mamaj-ca čemi]]]
John 15,24) (OG)
but now they.saw.me-too I and Prev-too-they.hated.me I-too and father-too my
‘But now, they have both seen and hated both me and my father’

In Modern Georgian, -c tends to occur after the highest noun phrase in which it is
embedded (see however (206)):

(5) am c’ign-is targman-i-c arsebobs (G)
this(Obl) book-Gen translation-Nom-too exists
‘there is a translation of this book, too’
(where the scope of -c is the book, not the translation).9

3. Inflectional morphology

Nouns, pronouns and adjectives are inflected by suffixation (and rarely by prefixation; see 3.1.1d; 3.1.2f), verbs by suffixation and prefixation. Some adverbials (including
postpositional forms, see 3.1.1h below) may take the instrumental and adverbial cases
(see (185); 5.1.4d.e).

3.1. Nominal inflection

Nominal inflection is largely the same for all nominal forms, except for stem suppletion
in some pronouns. However, Svan nouns have several types of nominal inflection with a
variation of both stem and case morphemes. In addition, modern Kartvelian differentiates
modifier inflection according to syntactic position in relation to the head noun.

3.1.1. Inflection of substantives and postpositional marking

There are no morphological classes, but animacy plays an important role in agreement
(5.2.1f, 5.2.4b) and in case marking (see e.g. Manning 1994).—Apart from Svan,
morphological variation in fully inflected head nouns is minimal both in the stem and
in the inflectional morphemes. As a starting point we may take a noun like G kal- ‘woman’,
the Old Georgian proper name Grigol- ‘Gregory’, M k’oči ‘man’, Sv māre ‘man’, zeɣ
‘dog’. As is apparent from Table 3, Old Georgian has a stem-based inflection, Laz and
Mingrelian and some Georgian dialects tend to have a word-based inflection.10

a. Mingrelian and Laz have lost the counterpart of the Old Georgian absolutive. The
forms of the Modern Georgian ergative (-ma/-m) are conditioned by the final stem
vowel. Old Georgian –man is perhaps the result of a reanalysis and generalisation of

9 For the clitic “article” and phrasal clitic demonstratives see 3.1.3c; for clitics after preverbs 3.2.4; for -c in
relative clauses 5.5.2.

10 For some discussion of the historical tendencies in Georgian noun inflection, see Boeder (1987); for a
historical study of Mingrelian noun inflection see Lomtage (1987).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G common nouns</th>
<th>OG proper name</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sv</th>
<th>Sv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absolutive</strong></td>
<td>kal-Ø</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>k’oči</td>
<td>māre</td>
<td>žey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocative</strong></td>
<td>kal-o</td>
<td>kal-n-o</td>
<td>k’oči</td>
<td>māre</td>
<td>žey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominative</strong></td>
<td>kal-i</td>
<td>kal-n-i</td>
<td>Grigol-Ø</td>
<td>Grigol-Ø</td>
<td>žey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ergative</strong></td>
<td>kal-man</td>
<td></td>
<td>k’očk / k’očik</td>
<td>mār-ed/-ēm</td>
<td>žaywem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive</strong></td>
<td>kal-is(-a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>k’očiš(i)</td>
<td>mārēmiš</td>
<td>žaywem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental</strong></td>
<td>kal-it(-a)</td>
<td>kal-ta</td>
<td>Grigol-it</td>
<td>k’očit(i) / -ite(n)</td>
<td>mār-oš/-awš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dative</strong></td>
<td>kal-s(-a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grigol-s</td>
<td>k’os / k’očis</td>
<td>māra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverbal</strong></td>
<td>kal-ad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grigol-ad</td>
<td>k’očo</td>
<td>mārad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k’očiša</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ablative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k’očiše(n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k’očišo(t)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3rd person pronominal ergatives (3.1.3c and Table 4 X) like ama-n, ima-n as a-man, i-man (Boeder, 1979: 457–458). The origin of Mingrelian and Laz –k is unknown. Svan –em has been considered a borrowing from Circassian by some scholars (for some discussion see G. Topuria, 2002). Svan –d (which is also the adverbial; cp. măred) is considered to be the Proto-Kartvelian ergative suffix (- if it had one!).—

b. The “short forms” of the genitive, dative and instrumental (kal-is, etc.), which in Old Georgian occurred under certain syntactic conditions (Boeder 1995:157–158), are the norm now, but the “long forms” surface e.g. in coordination (kal-isa da k’ac-is woman-Gen and man-Gen), before some postpositions (kal-isa-tvis) and before clitic particles like -c ‘too’ (2.5), -o ‘quotative’ (5.5.6) (kal-isa-c, kal-sa-c; kal-isa-o, kal-sa-o, etc.).

c. The Old Georgian nominative and ergative zero forms of proper names have been replaced by the corresponding common noun forms in modern Kartvelian (G Grigol-i, Grigol-ma). But the vocative of proper names preserves Ø in Modern Georgian: Grigol! (and not: "Grigol-o!).

d. In Modern Georgian, the old plural forms are sometimes found in formal or poetic contexts, but they are regular in demonstrative pronouns (3.1.3c). -ta is a plural marker; case marker omission (-ta instead of e.g. a genitive form like -ta-isa), which restricts the number of inflectional suffixes to one (G Nom kal-eb-i, Erg kal-eb-ma . . .; M k’oč-ep-i, k’oč-en-k . . . ‘men’, Sv txum-är, txum-är-d ‘heads’). The Old Georgian oblique form with -ta still occurs in Modern Georgian with an attributive or rather derivational function (kal-ta šroma woman-P/Ob/ labour(Nom) ‘women’s (or female) labour’ vs. kal-eb-is šroma woman-P/Gen labour ‘work of women’).—In two archaic Georgian dialects, Khevsurian and Pshavian, the old plural has developed special meanings; for instance, it denotes groups of 2–3 items (“dual”; Boeder, 1998a, with further references).—Svan terms for relatives have prefix-suffix combinations that otherwise occur as participial forms: mu-xwb-e ‘brother’—la-xwb-a ‘brothers’ (cp. la-č’m-a ‘(what is) to be mown, hay-meadow’; 3.2.8b).

e. Stem allomorphy (Nom c’q’al-i ‘water’ vs. Gen c’q’l-is, Nom da ‘sister’ vs. Gen d-is; see 2.3.1) as well as affix allomorphy is minimal in Georgian, Mingrelian and Laz.

f. Svan offers a more intricate situation because of umlaut (e.g. qān ‘bull.Nom’ vs. qanšw ‘bull-Instr’) and extensive allomorphy and variation of simple and complex suffixes. Some case forms seem to be based on the dative (Dat māra—Erg mārad), others on a form with –em (Gen mārediš), etc. This “double-stem system” has been compared with the formation of oblique stem inflection in many other Caucasian languages.11

g. All Kartvelian languages have postpositions, but Mingrelian and Laz, with their richer case system have only a few. Most of them govern the genitive or the dative. In some cases, the distinction between suffix and postposition is problematic. For instance,

11 See e.g. Čant’laše (1998: 64–125); for a critical view G. Topuria (2002).
Table 4
Inflection of adjectives and pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact form of consonantal adjectives</th>
<th>Vocalic adjectives</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>MG contact form</td>
<td>MG non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>contact form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“complete”</td>
<td>“inter-mediary”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>“complete”</td>
<td>“inter-mediary”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“complete”</td>
<td>“inter-mediary”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative c’itel-o</td>
<td>c’itel-o</td>
<td>c’itel-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative c’itel-i</td>
<td>c’itel-i</td>
<td>c’itel-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative c’itel-man</td>
<td>c’itel-ma</td>
<td>c’itel-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive c’itl-is(a)</td>
<td>c’itl-is</td>
<td>c’itl-is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental c’itl-it(a)</td>
<td>c’itl-is</td>
<td>c’itl-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative c’itel-s(a)</td>
<td>c’itel-s</td>
<td>c’itel-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial c’itl-ad</td>
<td>c’itl-s</td>
<td>c’itl-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mc’vane-o</td>
<td>mc’vane-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mc’vane-j</td>
<td>mc’vane-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mc’vane-m</td>
<td>mc’vane-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mc’vane-sa</td>
<td>mc’vane-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mc’vane-ti</td>
<td>mc’vane-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mc’vane-s(a)</td>
<td>mc’vane-Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mc’vane-d</td>
<td>mc’vane-Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Old Georgian forms I and VI are largely identical with the modern non-contact stem and the consonantal stem (Table 4, II, VII and IX) and non-contact form (I (but Erg c’itelma), VIII and X): the consonantal stem surfaces in: saxl-sa da bay-ši ‘house-Dat and garden(Dat)-in’. But with the other postpositions, the distinction between case + postposition and simple locative case is less obvious in Modern Georgian: -mdis/-mde ‘up to’ takes the adverbial with elision of—d: kalak-a-mde (<kalak-ad-mde ‘city-Adv-upto’), but: ‘kalak-ada da sopl-a-mde city-Adv and village-Adv-upto, for: kalak-a-mde da sopl-a-mde ‘upto the city and the village’ is unacceptable. Similarly: kalak-idan < kalak-it-gan city-Instr-from ‘from the city’, but: ’kalak-ita da sopl-i-dan, ”kalaki da soplidan (for: kalak-idan da soplidan). Notice, however, that modifiers presuppose at least a Gen/Instr vs. Dat/Adv case distinction in the head noun: ěem-s (Dat/Adv) kalak-a-mde ‘up to my city’ vs. ěem-i (Gen/Instr) kalak-i-dan ‘from my city’.12—Another problem is the morphonological rather than syntactic conditioning of case in G-vit ‘like’. It may always combine with the (long form of) the dative morpheme: kal-sa-vit ‘like.a.woman’, but consonantal stems allow the “nominative”: kal-i-vit ‘like.a.woman’ (but gogo-sa-vit ‘like a girl’, not: ‘gogo(i)-vit. Expressions with—vit are also special in that they can occur as premodifiers: rk’ina-sa-vit k’ac-i ‘iron-Dat-like man-Nom’ (V. Immakhvili, 1997; Boeder and Schroeder, 2000: 196).

h. Finally, some Georgian dialects adjacent to the Nakh (East Caucasian) linguistic area allow adverbial (e.g. postpositional) forms to be case-marked: saxl-ši-it house-in-Instr ‘from out of the house’. The combination of postpositions in Svan (Šorbenaże, 1991: 88) is similar: kor-te-isga < kor-te-isga house-to-in ‘into the house’. Such combinations seem to be coordinative (“in and from”, “to and in”).

3.1.2. Adjectives

In Old Georgian, nominal modifiers agreed with their head noun for case and number; in Modern Kartvelian, they agree for case only (5.1.1a), if at all (see a. below). In Modern Kartvelian, adjectives and in general nominal forms occurring immediately before an overt head noun (i.e. in a contact position) have what may be called a “contact form” to distinguish it from attributive forms that occur in distant position or with their head deleted (see below e.). This is a more or less reduced form of inflection exhibiting some diachronic and dialectal variation. Consider the paradigms of attributive adjectives and pronouns in contact form (Table 4, II–V, VII and IX) and non-contact form (I (but Erg c’itelma), VIII and X): the consonantal stem c’itel- ‘red’ (with syncope in II as in I; cf. 2.3.1), the vocalic stem me’vane- ‘green’, and pronominal es/am ‘this’.

a. The Old Georgian forms I and VI are largely identical with the modern non-contact forms VIII, and X is largely identical with the Old Georgian form (except that Old Georgian also had long forms: amisa, amita, amasa; see e. below). II was the literary norm in the 19th century. III is the norm today. Ambiguous contact forms like c’itel-i in III will be glossed with quotation marks: red-‘Nom’, red-‘Gen’, red-‘Instr’, etc. Notice that the attributive forms continually lose morphonological properties that characterise head nouns: case distinctions (in II) and allomorphy (loss of syncope in III).

12 The inflection of ěem- follows Table 4, II, see 3.1.3f.
b. **Attributive nouns** behave like adjectives: *gazet-Ø Lile-s* newspaper Lile-Dat ‘the newspaper Lile’ (paradigm III); *mdinare-Ø Mr’k’var-s* ‘the river Kura’, etc. (paradigm VII).

c. IV is a more “advanced” paradigm. Disregarding the vocative, it shows a nominative (rectus)—oblique dichotomy. IV is also the norm for titles: *bat’on-Ø p’ropesor-Ø Melikivišvil-s* ‘mister-Ø professor-Ø Melikishvili-Dat’. But names are completely uninflected in non-final position: *Davit-Ø A’iınašeneli-i* ‘David-Ø Aghmassenebeli-Nom’. Paradigm V shows that (after the loss of the absolutive) the nominative form tends to be the stem, which it has been for vocalic stems (VIII) since the 12th century.

d. Mingrelian and Laz mostly have IV or V; Svan mostly has V (*maxe kor* ‘new house.Nom’, *maxe kors* ‘new house.Dat’ ...), but sometimes preserves a nominative-oblique distinction similar to IV and IX (*maxe kor* (Nom) vs. *maka kors* (Dat)).

e. The **non-contact forms** are differentiated into short and long forms: *dabanak’ebul-s* Kartvel-eb-is Laškar-s ‘encamped-Dat Georgian-Pl-Gen army-Dat’ (with the short form of the dative in the adjective separated from its head noun by a genitive; *K’vačage, 1996:174*) vs. *dabanak’ebul-s(a)* (which army-Dat do you mean?—) encamped-Dat ‘... the encamped one’. All forms occur in: *axalgažrda-s, lamaz-sa da p’at’iosan-Ø kvriv-s* ‘young-Dat [short non-contact form] beautiful-Dat [long non-contact form; see 3.1.1b] and honorable(-Dat) [contact form] widow-Dat’.

e. Except for some archaisms (e.g. suppletive *G k’arg* ‘good’ - *u-k’et-es* ‘better’, etc.), **comparison** is mostly analytic in modern Kartvelian (G upro ‘more’, etc.); in Georgian, the standard of comparison is marked by the postposition -ze ‘on’ or vidre ‘than’; *kal-i (upro) did-i-a k’ac-ze* ‘woman-Nom (more) big-Nom-she.is than man-Nom’, *kal-i (upro) did-i-a vidre k’ac-i* ‘woman-Nom (more) big-Nom-she.is than man-Nom’, both meaning: ‘the woman is bigger than the man’. — Old Georgian had a synthetic form: *(x-)u-mok’le-js* ‘shorter/shortest’, which has the indirect object prefix *x-*, plus objective version that must have related to the standard of comparison in pre-literary Georgian (but see (92) without *x*); it has a counterpart in Sv *x-o-mšx-e* ‘blacker’ besides *ma-mšx-e* ‘blackest’ (*Oniani, 1998: 104–107*) and M *u-skvam-aš-i* ‘most beautiful’ (*skvami* ‘beautiful’) (*Q’ipšiše, 1914: 33–35*). The standard can be in the dative in copula sentences: *u-sast’ik’-ej is ars zyu-a sa* Pref-severe-Suffix it.is sea-Dat ‘it is severer than the sea’, but otherwise it is an abnominal genitive: *tapl-isa u-t’k’bo-js*- honey-Gen Pref-sweet-Suffix- ‘sweeter than honey’. — In addition, there are **approximatives**: G *mo-šav-o* ‘somewhat black’ (*šav- ‘black’; *Tschenke, 1958: 228*) = Sv *mo-mšx-a* and a Mingrelian equative: *tiši ma-skvam-a* s/he.Gen Pref-beautiful-Suffix ‘as beautiful as s/he’ (*Q’ipšiše, 1914: 33–35*).

g. The Modern Georgian **superlative** has a circumfix identical with the old comparative form: *u-_____es*: *u-lamaz-es-i kal-i* Pref-beautiful-Suffix-Nom woman-Nom ‘the most/a very beautiful woman’. Alternatively, *q’vela-ze* may be used: *q’vela-ze lamaz-i kal-i* all-on beautiful-Nom woman-Nom ‘the woman which is more beautiful than all, the most beautiful woman’.

---

13 See Gippert (1999), with further references.
3.1.3. Pronouns

a. **Personal pronouns** are “uninflected”; the Georgian forms are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>čeven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>šen</td>
<td>tkven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These forms are used as counterparts of verbal affixes; examples with the 1st person pronoun are (arrows mean correference):

(7) me v-ambob ‘I say (it)’ (G)

(8) me mo-m-cem ‘you will give it to me’ (G)

(9) me mo-m-k’lav ‘you will kill me’ (G)

Verb-internal markers differentiate between subject and object form (see Table 5), the verb-external pronoun does not. For instance in Georgian, v- is the 1st person subject marker and m- is the 1st person object marker. The general rule for 1st and 2nd person pronouns is that they are morphologically case-marked either inside (subject–object) or outside the verb (possessive, see f. below). The choice of verb-internal marking recurs with another category: Svan has an inclusive vs. exclusive opposition in 1st person plural verbs, but not in the verb-external pronoun nāj: nāj l-ārid ‘we (incl.) are’—nāj xw-ārid ‘we (excl.) are’; nāj gw-amāre ‘s/he prepares us (incl.)—nāj n-amāre ‘s/he prepares us (excl.)’ (see 3.2.2).

b. 1st and 2nd person pronouns occur in two forms. One is used as an optional counterpart of a verb-internal person marker. The other is the possessive (see f. below) which supplies **non-subject and non-object forms** that have no verb-internal counterparts: G čem-s uk’an my-Dat behind ‘behind me’; čem-it k’maq’opili iq’o (Vogt, 1971, §1.49) my-Instr satisfied s/he.was ‘s/he was satisfied with me’; me rom šen-i viq’o I Sub your-Nom I.should.be ‘if I were you’. (But me rom šen viq’o also occurs; Boeder, 1989a: 183 note 23.) In these examples, the possessive forms behave like determiners of non-overt head nouns.

c. Georgian **demonstratives** have the “classical” threefold distinction of deixis, related to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd person respectively.14 Their inflection shows a suppletive nominative (rectus)—oblique dichotomy:

(10) I. es ‘this; Latin hic’ II. eg ‘this, that (what you say, etc.’); Latin iste’ III. is or igi ‘that; Latin ille’

---

14 A comparative-historical study of Kartvelian demonstratives is Čartolani (1985).
The Modern Georgian oblique contact forms for both numbers are:

(11)  
I. am   II. mag   III. im

e.g. es kal-i ‘this(Nom) woman-Nom’, am kal-ma ‘this(Obl) woman-Erg’ (cp. Sv eža ‘that’ vs. oblique mič-). In Old Georgian, the oblique stems have final—a, which is preserved in the Modern Georgian non-contact forms:

(12)  
I ama-   II maga-   III ima-, unstressed ma-

Similar forms exist in all Kartvelian languages and dialects, but they rather tend to have a twofold system with a this/that distinction (Čartolani, 1985). Demonstratives exhibit a rich inventory of short and long variants (e.g. M t(ena)’a, Gen te(na)ši ‘this’, (t)ina/e, Gen te(na)ši ‘that’ . . .). Sv eža ‘that’ has a short form ža (oblique stem mič, possessive miča; see (122)) which is sometimes interpreted as a reflexive; but it is a 3rd person pronoun which by its contrast with zero anaphora (“pro-drop”) has the meaning ‘s/he (him/herself)’ in specific contexts (Boeder, 2003a). It is frequently used in “semi-indirect speech” (5.5.6). Similar pronouns with non-reflexive or reflexive readings are found in Mingrelian and Laz.—The inflection of demonstratives in Mingrelian, Laz and Svan is nominal. Georgian demonstratives have some specific forms: the ergative has -n instead of -m: ama-n, maga-n, ima-n/ma-n; the plural follows the Old Georgian paradigm (with the short form -t for the the oblique):

(13)  
Nominative I ese-n-i   II ege-n-i   III isi-n-i (or: igini)
Oblique       I ama-t            II maga-t    III ima-t/ma-t

Clitic demonstratives (occurring after the first constituent of the noun phrase) had an article-like function in Old Georgian (see (92), (95), (96); Boeder, 1997):

(14)  
q’ovel-ta ma-t c’mida-ta udabno-ta šina (OG)
all-PlObl that-PlObl holy-PlObl wilderness-PlObl in ‘in all the holy monasteries (in the wilderness)’

d. Interrogatives have the usual personal vs. non-personal contrast, for instance G vi-‘who?’, ra- ‘what?’; vi-n is unlike other nominal and pronominal stems, but similar to personal names, in that it codes both ergative (with -n as in ama-n, etc., see above) and nominative. The third interrogative G romel- ‘which?’ is neutral with regard to the person vs. non-person distinction. - Repeated interrogatives ask for enumeration in the answer (Vogt, 1971 § 1.52): G vin da vin movida? who and who came ‘Who all came? [answer: Nino, Avtandil . . .]’.—For a generative interpretation of negative pronouns (ara-vin ‘nobody’, ara-peri ‘nothing etc.) see King (1996).

Kartvelian interrogatives function as relative pronouns, but in most variants, a particle like G -c ‘too’(see 2.5), M –ti ‘too’, Sv –i ‘too’ (and –wā-) is added: G vin-c, Sv jer-wā-j ‘who’, G romel-l-i-c, M namu-ti ‘who, which, that’, etc.

e. Georgian indefinites are derived from interrogatives by adding the particles -yac(a) (specific) and -me (non-specific): vi-yac(a) ‘someone’ vs. vin-me ‘anyone’, etc.
Modern Georgian, stem plus particle tend to form the base of inflection: today Gen vin-me-s is preferred to the older v-is-me, etc.

f. Every pronominal genitive is a possessive stem: G im-is-, m-is- ‘his, her, its’, tav-is- ‘his/her/its own’ (see g. below); v-is- ‘whose’, etc. Georgian 1st person pronouns have a special possessive stem: čem- ‘my’ vs. me ‘I’, but: čven- ‘our’ and čven ‘we, us’, šen- ‘your(Sg)’ and šen ‘you(Pi)’, and tkven ‘you(Pl)’. For the possessive (genitive counterpart) interpretation of the stem čem-, čven-, etc., compare the circumfixed adjectival form G u-čem-o- ‘without me’ with: u-im-is-o- ‘without him’ (derived from im-is ’s/he-Gen’); cp. M ma ’I’, čkim- ‘my’, u-čkim-et ‘without me’ = G u-čem-o-d ‘Neg-my-Suffix-Adv’ (cp. (160)–(162)).—Mingrelian, Laz and Svan always differentiate personal pronoun and possessive stem: M/L si ‘you’ vs. skani/skani, Sv si ‘you’ vs. isgwi ‘your’, etc. Svan also has an exclusive vs inclusive distinction in 1st person possessives: nišgwej ‘our (excl.)’ vs gwišgwej ‘we (incl.)’: possessives, contrary to personal pronouns, have no verb-internal counterpart in which the distinction could be coded (3.2.2).—Notice that possessives deviate from the usual modifier contact form (Table 4, paradigm III) in preferring -s instead of Ø in the dative and adverbial (Vogt, 1971, § 1.49): čem-s kalak-s ‘my-Dat city-Dat’, čem-s kalak-a-mde ‘up to my city’.

g. There is no reflexive pronoun exclusively controlled by the subject. Non-emphatic reflexive indirect object markers in the verb are Ø (see 3.2.2d; f.III). Elsewhere, reflexivity is expressed by noun phrases with the appropriate possessive and the noun for “head” as their head noun: G čem-s tav-s my-Dat head-Dat ‘myself’, etc. (5.2.2a); however, these phrases with “head” also occur with non-reflexives.—The Modern Georgian genitive tav-is- functions as the reflexive 3rd person possessive (see f. above), as in (33) below, but the reflexive vs. non-reflexive distinction was not very common in Old Georgian, and is variable in Modern Georgian. Notice that only 3rd person possessives have a reflexive vs non-reflexive distinction: tav-is-i p’asux-it head-Gen-Instr answer-Instr ‘(somebody did it) with his/her own answer’ vs. m-is-i p’asux-it s/he-Gen-Instr answer-Instr ‘(somebody did it) with (somebody else’s) answer’, but: čem-i p’asux-it my-Instr answer-Instr ‘with my/my own answer’ (see also 3.2.6c.). Again, tavis- also refers to non-subjects: to direct objects (as in (15), (16), (159)) and to indirect objects (17).15

(15) Nodar-i šeak’to tavis-ma xma-m (G)
Nodari-Nom it.frightened.himḥi hisḥ-Erg voice-Erg
‘His own voice frightened Nodar’;

(16) ʒma agarak’-ze gavistumre tavis-i col-švil-it (G)
brother.Nom, villa-on I.sent.them hisḥ-Nom wife-child-Instr
‘I sent my brother to the resort together with his wife and his children’;

(17) ma-s tavis-i barat-i Svanet-ši ga-u-gzavne (G)
sheğ-Dat heri-Nom letter-Nom Svaneti-in I.sent.it.to.heri
‘I sent heri heri letter to Svaneti, i.e. the letter addressed to her’

3.1.4. Numerals

a. Georgian has a combined decimal and vigesimal system: **ert-** ‘1’, **or-** ‘2’, **sam-** ‘3’, **otx-** ‘4’, **xut-** ‘5’, **ekvs-** ‘6’, **švid** ‘7’, **rva-** ‘8’, **exra-** ‘9’, **at-** ‘10’; the numbers from 10 to 20 are combinations with a reduced form of **at-** ‘10’ plus decimal number 1-9 plus **met**- ‘more’: **t-ert-met**- ‘11’, **t-or-met**- ‘12’, etc. **oc-** ‘20’ is morphologically simple. The numbers up to **as-** ‘100’ are vigesimal (multiplication of 20 plus **da** and plus 1-19): **oc-da-t-ekvs-met**- ‘36’, **sam-oc-da-t-ekvs-met**- ‘76’, **as-oc-da-ekvs**- ‘126’ (with the coordinative compound **as-oc**- ‘hundred-twenty’; see 4.2.3), **at-as**- ‘ten-hundred **1000**’.—The other languages are similar, but some Svan dialects have a decimal system.

b. Georgian ordinal numbers except **p’irvel**- ‘first’ (cp. **p’ir-** ‘mouth, face’) are derived by circumfixing the last conjunct with **me-** (cp. 4.1.1m): **me-ekvs-e** ‘6th’, **me-at-e** ‘10th’, **me-t-ekvs-met-e** ‘16th’, **oc-da-me-ekvs-e** ‘26th’, **oc-da-me-at-e** ‘30th’, **sam-oc-da-me-t-ekvs-met-e** ‘76th’, **as-me-ekvs-e** ‘106th’, **as-oc-da-me-ekvs-e** ‘126th’.17 The other languages have similar forms.

3.2. Verbs

The following outline is restricted in two respects: Firstly, since the verbal system of all Kartvelian languages is largely the same, Georgian with its more transparent morphology can be taken as representative. Second, the morphological details and systematic features of Georgian are easily accessible through grammars and monographs (e.g. Deeters, 1930; Tschenkéli, 1958; Vogt, 1971; Aronson, 1982; Hewitt, 1995; Tuite, 1998; Cherchi, 1997; Uturgaiže, 2002), and the main features of the other Kartvelian languages are well represented in the contributions to the corresponding volume of *Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus* (Harris (ed.) 1991d).

3.2.1. Overview. Order of morphemes

Syntactically, most finite verb forms are **endocentric nuclei** of the clause. There are reasons to interpret the relationship between verb-internal pronominal markers and verb-external arguments not as the result of feature copying in the verb, but as linking (5.2.4).—Some arguments are codable as pronominal markers in the **polypersonal verb**, but others are not (3.2.2f; 5.2.2a), so that the interpretation of a morphological form (its assignment to a particular place in the paradigm or “catalysis” in Louis Hjelmslev’s terminology; Vogt, 1971: 79–80; Boeder, 2002a: 107–108) depends both on its paradigmatic properties (3.2.3a) and on its context.—To the extent that verb-internal relationmarking is specific, or even more specific than, verb-external marking, the Kartvelian verb may be called “**concentric**” (T. Milewski apud Lazard, 1998).—Kartvelian verb forms are **morpholo**-

---

16 See Žinjixiaje (1997).

17 NB. **me-or-as-e** ‘200th’, where the last conjunct is **or-as**- ‘200’, not **as-** ‘100’; see 4.2.3).
gically complex, and they code many of its fundamental relational, modal, temporal, aspectual, etc. features. — Some inflectional categories are alternatively coded by particles: OG –mca (preserved in some archaic dialects) and Svan –u combined with indicative forms are largely equivalent to the corresponding subjunctive forms (see (41)); G –q’e (and –k’e) occur as subject or object pluralisers (Tuite, 1998: 83–84; Gippert, 2002); the particle G xolme overlaps in its meaning with the Old Georgian iterative (3.2.3f) and G turme, Sv esnār ‘apparently’ with the evidential forms (3.2.3b. and g.).

a. In Standard Modern Georgian, most verb forms can be segmented into agglutinatively concatenated morphemes most of which seem to form a right-branching word structure (4.2.1). Contrary to nominal forms, the non-root morphemes are either suffixes or prefixes; examples of circumfixation are less easy to justify than in nominal derivation (4.1). Disregarding interdependencies between morphemes and combinations with the copula (see d. below), the following sequential positions may be distinguished in Georgian:

(18) 1. Preverb I: uk’u- ‘back’ (3.2.4)
2. Preverb II, e.g. še- ‘into, onto’ (3.2.4)
3. Preverb III: mo- ‘hither’ (3.2.4)
4. Subject marker, e.g. v- ‘I’ (3.2.2)
5. Object marker, e.g. m- ‘me’ (3.2.2)
6. Version vowel: a-, e-, i- or u- (3.2.5)
7. Root, e.g. dg- ‘stand’
8. Passive marker, -d (3.2.7)
9. Thematic suffix (TS), e.g. -eb (3.2.3b.)
10. Participle formant: e.g. -ul- (3.2.8)
11. Causative formant: (-ev)-in- (4.3)
12. Causative thematic suffix (see 4.3)
13. “Extension marker” (EM): e.g. -d 19
14. “Paradigm marker” (PM): e.g. -i 20
15. 3rd person subject marker (3.2.2)
16. Object Plural marker (3.2.2)

In the following, some of the paradigm markers will be coded by special terms: Subj(unctive), Aor(ist), Opt(ative).

18 Kartvelian verbs are a particularly interesting challenge to morphological theory in general; one proposal has been made by Anderson (1984, 1992). Notice that the study of Kartvelian verbs comprises more than a principled theory of morphological word structure and a classification on the basis of morphological and semantic features (3.2.3c): it also has to specify paradigmatic relationships between different groups of verbs (basicness and predictability of parts of the paradigm). In this connection, see e.g. Gogolašvili (1988).
19 “Extension (marker)” is Fähnrich’s (1991) translation of Ak’ak’i Šaniže’s term: savrcobi (see below 3.2.3d.); Aronson (1991) uses “imperfect/conditional marker” and includes -n- of some of the perfect forms (uq’ep-n-i-a) and the copula in complex verbs (3.2.1d, 3.2.2e, 3.2.3a, 3.2.3d) in this position.
20 “Paradigm marker” is taken from Fähnrich; Aronson, following A. Šaniže (mc’k’rivis nisani, see below 3.2.3a.), uses “screeve marker.” Vogt calls the paradigm marker -e of the “weak aorist”: “suffixe thématique” and -i of the “strong aorist”: “voyelle d’appui”; Hewitt (1995) calls -e “indicative”.
The other Kartvelian languages have largely similar chains of slots. However in Mingrelian and Svan, some morphs can shift rightwards into the root (for Svan see 2.1) or into the preverbal complex (Cherchi, 2000a, b with further references): M gegş-c’o-r-lapu Prev-Prev-2O-it.fell/gegş-r-c’o-lapu Prev-2O-Prev-it.fell ‘your...fell out’.

b. Examples (Damenia, 1982):

(19) uk’u-še-mo-g-a-brun-a (G)
    back(1)-PrevII(2)-PrevIII(3)-2O(5)-Version(6)-(re)turn(7)-3SGs(14)
    ‘(s)he made (Aor) you turn back hither’

(20) mo-m-e-c-i-t (G)
    PrevIII(3)-1O(5)-EV(6)-give(7)-PM(14)-Pl(16)
    ‘give(Aor) it to me! (addressee in the plural)’

(21) da-g-a-c’er-in-eb-d-a-t (G)
    PrevII(2)-2O(5)-Version(6)-write(7)-Caus(11)-CausTS(12)-EM(13)-3SGs-Pl(16)
    ‘s/he would make (Cond) you(Pl) write it’

(22) da-Ø-u-xat’-av-s (G)
    PrevII(2)-3IO-OV(6)-paint(7)-TS(9)-3SGs(14)
    ‘s/he will paint(Fut) it for him/her’ or: ‘s/he has painted(Perf) it’

(23) ga-Ø-u-cocxl-d-eb-od-nen (G)
    PrevII(2)-3IO(5)-OV(6)-alive(7)-Inchoative(8)-TS(9)-EM(13)-3Pl(15)
    ‘they would become alive (Cond) for her’ or: ‘(if) they became alive (Subj) for her’

c. Some of these positions are mutually exclusive. E.g. object markers (5) almost always oust subject markers (4) (3.2.2f). On the other hand, one important principle of Georgian verb morphology is that the presence or absence of one position may require the presence of another. This is a phenomenon called “circumfixation” by some authors (but see Harris, 2002). The causative (11) e.g. requires the presence of a version marker (6), the default marking (3.2.5f) being a-...-in, as in:

(24) da-v-a-ćagvr-in-eb (G)
    PrevII(2)-1S(4)-Version(6)-oppress(7)-Caus(10)-TS(9)
    ‘I make him/her/them oppress him/her/them’

d. With some verbs, 1st/2nd person subject prefixes (4) co-occur with the appropriate form of the copula as a second component of the verb (as in (25) vs (26)), some with subject prefixes on the copula (as in (25) and (27)), and some some without (as in (28)) (Vogt, 1971 §2.117):
Table 5
Verbal person and number markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>morphological object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) 1</td>
<td>v___</td>
<td>v___t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ø / x___</td>
<td>Ø / x___t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>___ a / o / s</td>
<td>___n / an / en / es / nen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) 1 m___ gV___
2 g___ g___t

(c) 3 s / h / Ø___(t)

(d) 1 Ø-i___ reflexive
2 Ø-i___ non-em-
3 Ø-i___ phatic

(e) 1 m-i___ gV-i___ non-re-
2 g-i___ g-i___(t) flexible
3 Ø-u___(t)

(f) 1 m-e___ gV-e___
2 g-e___ g-e___t
3 Ø-e___(t)

(g) 1 m-a___ gV-a___
2 g-a___ g-a___t
3 Ø-a___(t)
3.2.2. Person and number

In the following, the terms “morphological subject” and “morphological object” are defined in terms of their markers in the verb: morphological subjects are referred to by the markers (a) in Table 5, morphological objects by those in (b)–(g). (For the syntactic concepts of “subject” and “object” see 5.2.1a)

Table 5 presents the Georgian markers. The other Kartvelian languages have etymologically related markers (e.g. 1st person Sv xw-, M/L v/b/p'p/, which are phonologically conditioned), but there is some divergence in the third person and number markers. Apart from ablaut and suppletion (see e. and g. below), person is coded by prefixes, non-person (“3rd person”) and number mostly by suffixes (except 1st person plural subject and object; see Tables 5 and 6). Svan 3rd person singular forms have a zero ending (Table 6), while other languages tend to have an additional 1st/2nd person marking (e.g. M –k in the present and future paradigm and added copulas in Modern Kartvelian; 3.2.2e; 3.2.1d).

Svan deserves special interest. Table 6 presents two present tense paradigms: the final segment, -e is a tense marker, and there is no 3rd person subject affix as in Georgian, Mingrelian and Laz. -mār- is the root, a- is a version vowel (as in Georgian). For the 2nd person subject marker x-, see b. below.—The plural marker –x is used for 3rd person subject and for 2nd person object marking. In Mingrelian, 1st and 2nd person subject or

Table 6

Svan verbal paradigm of “to prepare” (extract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inflection</th>
<th>With subject markers</th>
<th>With object markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>xw-a-mār- ‘I prepare it’</td>
<td>m-a-mār-e ‘s/he prepares me’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x-a-mār-e ‘you prepare it’</td>
<td>ʒ-a-mār-e ‘s/he prepares you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a-mār-e ‘s/he prepares him/her/it’</td>
<td>a-mār-e ‘s/he prepares him/her/it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 incl.</td>
<td>1-a-mār-e-d ‘we prepare it’</td>
<td>n-a-mār-e ‘s/he prepares us’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 excl.</td>
<td>xw-a-mār-e ‘we prepare it’</td>
<td>gw-a-mār-e ‘s/he prepares us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x-a-mār-e-d ‘you prepare it’</td>
<td>ʒ-a-mār-e-x ‘s/he prepares you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a-mār-e-x ‘they prepare him/her/it’</td>
<td>a-mār-e ‘s/he prepares him/her/it’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
object plurals are marked by –t, but the presence of any 3rd person subject or object triggers –es (according to tense series) as plural markers of subject or object. In other words, there is no need of a slot filling hierarchy (cp. Harris, 1991b: 340):

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1st person singular</th>
<th>1st person plural</th>
<th>2nd person singular</th>
<th>2nd person plural</th>
<th>3rd person singular</th>
<th>3rd person plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg.</td>
<td>do-v-dv-an-d-a</td>
<td>do-v-dv-an-d-a</td>
<td>do-v-dv-an-d-a</td>
<td>do-v-dv-an-d-a</td>
<td>do-v-dv-an-d-a</td>
<td>do-v-dv-an-d-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first person plural of subject and object markers show an inclusive-exclusive distinction (3.1.3a; Oniani, 1998: 149) which seems to be Kartvelian heritage: the object markers m- and gu- are somewhat inconsistently used with these meanings in OG: mo-m-e-c Prev-1O-Version-give ‘give me/us’ (where the addressee is not included, as in: ‘Give us our daily bread’, Matth. 6,11), gu-itxr-a-s 1O-OV-say-Opt-3SgS ‘he will tell us’ (where the addressee is included, as in John 4,25) (see Oniani 2003).

To give an impression of a Kartvelian verbal inflection, a fragment of the particularly simple and transparent Mingrelian paradigm of “to put” is given in Table 7 (Kažaia, 2001: 66–68; allomorphic variation and compound forms omitted).

Number agreement in Kartvelian shows much variation, both synchronically and diachronically. It is an important diagnostic for the nature of syntactic and pragmatic primehood.21

---

21 Variation in number agreement has been carefully studied by Tuite (1992, 1998), who also discusses implications for morphosyntactic orientation and subjection in Kartvelian.
The principles of person marking in Modern Georgian (and to a large extent for Kartvelian in general) are the following:

a. There is **no 3rd person direct object marker**: (c) refers to indirect objects only. On the other hand, Old Georgian, but not Modern Georgian, had a **direct object plural marker** –(e)n (Boeder, 1979: 450–451; Harris, 1985): MG mi-s-
\(-3SgS \text{ 's/he gave(Aor) it/them to him/her'}\), but OG mi-s-
\(-3SgS \text{ 's/he gave it to him/her'}\) vs. mi-s-
\(-3SgS \text{ 's/he gave them to him/her'}\) (cp. (116)). The Svan suf
\(fi\)–al sometimes marks plural direct objects, but also plural intransitive subjects (Boeder, 1979: 452), and is similar in distribution to the clitic particle G –q’e (3.2.1) and the preverb G da- (3.2.4a; Tuite, 1997: 36).

b. The **2nd person subject marker** x- and h- is used in some of the oldest variants of Old Georgian (e.g. x-
\(-c’am-e \text{ 'you ate it'}\) and is preserved in Svan (x-a-mär-e ‘you prepare it’). In Georgian, it survives in the copula and in the verb “to go”: x-ar ‘you are’, mo-
\(x\)-ved-i ‘you came’, but: Ø-c’er ‘you write it’. In the following, 2nd person subject Ø will be omitted, because it is morphologically irrelevant.

c. The distribution of **3rd person subject suffixes** depends on tense, mood and diathesis. In a sense, then, they contribute to the coding of these categories.

d. The **3rd person indirect object marker** is x- or h- in early Old Georgian (see (109)) and x- in Svan. In Modern Georgian the distribution of its variants in (c) is phonologically conditioned, but the non-zero markers survive only in the literary language and in many dialects, they rarely occur in urban colloquial speech (see McCoy 1995).—Notice that the reflexive indirect object marker Ø in Table 5 occurs only with the version vowel -i-. There is no other reflexive person marker, neither for direct, nor for non-specified indirect objects (3.2.5). For instance, the reflexive in “I said to myself; she said to herself, etc.”cannot be marked as such in the verb; it must be a reflexive indirect object expressed by “my head; her head”, etc. (5.2.2a), which has a non-reflexive 3rd person verb-internal counterpart.

e. The opposition between 1st/2nd person and 3rd person (i.e. non-person) **subject** is coded by ablaut and/or affixes, e.g.: mo-v-k’al-i ‘I killed him/her’, mo-k’al-i ‘you killed him/her’ vs. mo-k’l-q ‘s/he killed him/her’ (with ablaut in the root: k’al- vs. k’l- [2.3.2]; and suffix -i vs. -a in the aorist); in other verb forms, the appropriate copula (3.2.1d.) contrasts with a simple 3rd person suffix: mo-v-dif-[v-ar] Prev-1S-go-[1S-be] ‘I come’, mo-dif-[x-ar] Prev-go-[2S-be] ‘you come’ vs. mo-di-s Prev-go-3SgS ‘s/he comes’. - In the following, the term “person marker” and “plural marker” refer only to the markers listed in Table 5.

f. Kartvelian verbs are **polypersonal** in the sense that subjects and different objects are coded in the verb.22 But prefixed person markers are almost always restricted to one overt prefix, and suffixed person and number markers to one overt suffix. The following morphological and morphosyntactic rules concur to produce this effect:

I. **Prefix sequence constraint**: The only obvious exception to the prefix sequence restriction is the combination of 1st person subject + 3rd person indirect object marker according to older literary norm (see d. above), e.g. in: v-x-c’er ‘I write it (to)

---

him/her’. But 1st or 2nd person subject markers are suppressed in the presence of 1st or 2nd person object markers, e.g. in:

\[(29)\]  
\[
minda g-a-k’oc-o, m-a-k’oc-o (Važa Pšavela) \quad (G)\]
\[\quad I\text{.want.it} \quad 2O-\text{Version-kiss-Opt}, 2O-\text{Version-kiss-Opt}\]
\[\quad ‘I want to kiss you, [and] you to kiss me’ \quad (*v-g-a-k’oc-o, *(x-)m-a-k’oc-o).\]

II. There is a **suffix sequence constraint** whose conditions vary according to language, dialect, and history: \(g\text{-}xat’-av\text{-}en\) 2O-paint-Pres-3Pl ‘they paint you(Sg/Pl)’ (where a direct object plural marker is suppressed in the presence of a subject plural marker; a disambiguating plural object marker -t is not possible: \(*g\text{-}xat’av\text{-}en\text{-}t\).)

These rules I. and II. have no syntactic impact.

III. Prefix **slot filling constraint**: There is one, and only one, morphological slot for objects. In a form with only one object like \(g\text{-}nax\text{-}e ‘I saw you’\), \(g\) fills this slot. Notice, however, that not being marked is different from \(\emptyset\) (i.e. phonologically empty) marking. Zero in the sense of Table 5 may prevent an object marker from filling the object slot. E.g. the simple reflexive marker of the indirect object (“for myself/yourself/herself . . .”) is \(\emptyset\); its slot cannot be filled by a direct object marker like \(g\text{-}: ‘s/he paints you for herself’ is \(\emptyset\text{-}i\text{-}xat’avs ŝens tav-s\) (5.2.2a.), and not: \(g\text{-}i\text{-}xat’avs\) (which means: ‘s/he paints it for you’).

IV. Object slot competition is regulated by the following **slot filling hierarchy**:

specified indirect object > 1st/2nd person indirect object > other objects  
(For “specified indirect objects”, see 3.2.5).

In a sentence like:

\[(30)\]  
\[
tvalebi g-i-gav\text{-}s maq’val\text{-}sa \quad (G)\]
\[\quad \text{eyes} \quad 2O\text{-OV-resemble-3SgS blackberry-Dat}\]
\[\quad ‘your eyes are like blackberries’\]

the specified indirect object \(g\text{-}i\text{-} ‘you’ takes precedence over the non-specified 3rd person indirect object \(maq’val\text{s}\) which cannot be marked in the verb (cp. (134)).— Notice that “other objects” leaves an alternative in some cases. In: “He will sell me to him”, both objects are available for the slot. If the 1st person direct object (“me”) is chosen, the form will be (31a), alternatively, we may have (31b):

\[(31)\]
\[\text{a. } \quad mi\text{-m-q’id\text{-}i\text{-}s me ma-s} \quad (G)\]
\[\quad \text{Prev-1O-sell-TS-3SgS I he-Dat;}\]
\[\text{b. } \quad mi\text{-h-q’id\text{-}i\text{-}s ěem\text{-}s tav-s} \quad (G)\]
\[\quad \text{Prev-3O-sell-TS-3SgS my-Dat head-Dat}\]

where \(h\) marks the 3rd person indirect object, while the direct object is not coded in the verb and must appear again in a syntactically different form (\(ćem\text{-}s tav\text{-}s\) instead of \(me\); see 5.2.2a; cp. (90)a. vs b.).

So the coding of objects in the verb has syntactic consequences.\(^{23}\)

\(^{23}\) For a more detailed discussion see Boeder (2002a).
g. There is a number of verbs with number suppletion: v-źi-v-ăr ‘I sit’ - v-sxed-v-ăr-t ‘we sit’, mi-v-a-gd-e ‘I threw something somewhere’ - mi-v-q’-ăr-e ‘I threw several things somewhere’, v-k’l-av ‘I kill him/her/it’ - v-xoc-av ‘I kill them’, etc.

3.2.3. Tense, mood, aspect

a. The Georgian verbal paradigm consists of a number of “tenses” and “moods”. They form a tripartite paradigm of morphologically and semantically characterised systems or “series”:\(^{24}\)

I. the present series (present stem system) comprising two subseries: (a) present, imperfect, present subjunctive (subjunctive Ia); (b) future, conditional, future subjunctive (subjunctive Ib);

II. the aorist series (aorist stem system): aorist, optative (subjunctive of the aorist series, subjunctive II);

III. the perfect series (perfect stem system): perfect, pluperfect, perfect subjunctive (subjunctive III).

These series are mostly marked by suffixes and/or ablaut (see (19)–(24) and 2.3). The perfect series additionally has inversion with objective version marking (3.2.6d; 5.2.3d) and 1st and 2nd person copulas in Modern Georgian and in Lower Svan (adjacent to Georgian) (see (25)–(28)) (3.2.1d, 3.2.2e).

It is useful to speak of tense, mood and aspect markers, but these categories are coded both by “screeve” morphemes (paradigm markers) and by paradigmatic contrasts of other morphemes in the verb form. E.g. in a form like da-c’er-e, -e may be called a paradigm marker of the aorist, but it is only the position in the system which tells us that it is not an optative with the marker -e (as in: ga-tb-e ‘you may get warm’), and the form i-sc’avl-i ‘you(Sg) will learn it’ is identified as a 2nd singular future and not e.g. a 2nd singular present (like i-xd-i ‘you pay it’), because it contrasts with the present tense form sc’avl-ob, etc.—Notice that a series is also identified by case marking (5.2.3c.–d.) and by suppletion of the root morpheme: mi-v-di-v-ăr ‘I go/am going’, mi-vał ‘I will go there’, mi-yęd-i ‘I went there’, mi-v-z-ul-v-ăr ‘I have gone there’; v-ăr ‘I am’, v-i-kt-eb-i ‘I will be’, v-i-q’-av-i ‘I was’, v-q’op-il-v-ăr ‘I have been’, v-a-mb-ob ‘I say it’, v-i-t’q’v-i ‘I will say it’, v-tkv-i ‘I said it’, etc.

b. The subseries I b) is the aspectually\(^{25}\) perfective counterpart of the subseries I a). Aorists and optatives (series II) and perfects, pluperfects and subjunctives III (series III) normally are perfective. In most verb groups, the aorist series is marked by a perfectivizing preverb, but there are imperfective aorists without preverbs (3.2.4):

(32) katam-ma čxrik’-a, čxrik’-a, da tavsi dask’lav-i dana gamo-čxrik’-a-o (G)
hen-Erg rake-3SgS, rake-3SgS, and its for.killing-Nom knife Prev-rake-3SgS-Quot
‘The hen raked(imperfective aorist) and raked(imperfective aorist), and
raked up (perfective aorist) the knife for its own slaughter’.

\(^{24}\) For a historical interpretation of the Kartvelian series system see Harris (1985).

\(^{25}\) For aspect in Georgian see Holisky (1981a,b); for aspect in Laz see Mattissen (2001a,b, 2003).
The **aorist** is the typical narrative tense:

(33)  

\[
\text{ertxel savač’rod mi-di-od-a, tavisi kališvil-i mo-i-xm-o da h-k’itx-a} \quad \text{(G)}
\]

once for.commerce Prev-go-EM-3SgS, his-Nom daughter-Nom

Prev-SV-call-3SgS and 3IO-ask-3SgS

‘once he was going(Impf) for commerce; he summoned(Aor) his daughter and asked (Aor) her’.

The **perfect** often has evidential meaning (Friedman, 1999; Sumbatova, 1999; Boeder, 2000):  

\[
u’c’vim-i-a \quad \text{‘obviously, it has rained’}; \text{ cp. (70), (208) and:}
\]

The perfect is used in negative clauses:  

\[
ar \text{mo-sul-a} \quad \text{not Prev-gone-3SgS ‘s/he hasn’t come(Perf)’; the corresponding aorist form, }
\]

\[
ar \text{mo-vid-a} \quad \text{Prev-go-3SgS means: ‘s/he did not want to come’. Similarly, the perfect is frequent with questions: p’ariz-ši q’op-il-x-ar Paris-in be-Part-2S-be ‘have you been to Paris?’} \quad \text{(Vogt, 1971 § 2.165).}
\]

The positive **imperative** is the 2nd person aorist:  

\[
da’c’er-e \quad \text{Prev-write-Aor(Sg), da-c’er-e-t) Prev-write-Aor-Pl ‘write it!’}. \text{ The negative imperative is nu + present or future form: nu (da-)c’er(-t) ‘don’t write it!’ (5.3.2).}
\]

The **optative**\(^{26}\) expresses wishes and is used after verbs with a modal meaning (it is necessary, I must, I want, I can, etc.):  

\[
\text{mo-vid-e-s Prev-go-Opt-3SgS ‘Let him come!’}, \text{ šeizleba movides ‘it.is possibile that.s/he.comes’, unda movides ‘it.is necessary that.s/he.comes’}. \text{ Past modality is expressed by the pluperfect (Vogt, 1971 § 2.166): unda mo-sul-i-q’-o it.is.necessary Prev-gone-Version-be-3SgS(Aor) ‘s/he should have come’.—Unreal (counterfactual) conditional clauses have the subjunctive I or II or the pluperfect: c’er-d-e-s ‘(if) s/he wrote (imperfective), da-c’er-d-e-s ‘(if) s/he wrote (perfective), da-e-c’er-a ‘(if) s/he had written’.
\]

c. Grammarians offer slightly different **classifications** of verb forms on the basis of morphological and syntactic characteristics.\(^{27}\) Verb classes and details of modal and temporal morphology need not be presented here, since they are described in extenso in easily accessible monographs. Still, a few less obvious categories related to A. Šaniže’s (1973) concept of “voice” might be mentioned here, because it remains a point of reference. According to this system, Georgian has three “voices” (reminiscent of Ancient Greek school grammar): active, passive, middle. **Active** and **passive** are characterised by their morphological form (e.g. specific thematic suffixes, paradigm markers and the like, as in (19)–(22); (inchoative) passive markers, as in (23); 3.2.7), by their semantics (actives typically denote activities, passives typically

\(^{26}\) For a study of mood in Georgian see K’ot’inovi (1986); for tense and mood in Laz, Amse-de Jong (1995).

\(^{27}\) A survey of thirteen classifications is found in Cherchi (1997: 31–60); to which may be added D. Melikišvili’s (1978, 2001).
do not), and by their syntax (actives are typically transitive and passives are related to them by “conversion”, i.e. passivisation). However, there are passives that are semantically “active” and transitive (i-zle-va ‘gives’, see 3.2.7.III. and (171)) — “deponents” which “maintain the same diathesis as the corresponding active” (Tuite, 2002: 378). The “middle” voice is intransitive; semantically it somehow denotes a kind of activity of the subject “for itself” (which makes it similar to the Greek middle voice!). The first variant is the “medioactive” with active morphological form, subjective version in the future and aorist tenses and transitive subject case marking — inspite of its intransitivity: bavš–i t’ir-i-s child-Nom weeps-TS-3SgSS ‘the child weeps’, bavš–i i-t’ir-eb-s child-Nom Version-weep-TS -the child will weep’, bavš–ma i-t’ir-a child-Erg Version-weep-3SgS(Aor) ‘the child wept’ and (145). The second variant of the middle, the medio-passive, has passive forms in the future and aorist tenses, nominative subjects, and is not the result of “conversion”: bavš–i c’ev-s, bavš–i i-c’ev-a, bavš–i i-c’v-a ‘the child lies/will lie/lay’.

d. Besides “dynamic passives” (3.2.7) like i-c’er-eb-a ‘it is being written’, there are stative passives with a marker -i and the copula in 1st and 2nd person forms (3.2.1d; 3.2.2e): v-c’er-1f-v-ar/ 1S-write-Suffix-[1S-be ‘I am written’; Ø-a-c’er-i-a 3IO-SupV-write-Suffix-3SgS ‘it is written on it’, Ø-u-c’er-i-a 3IO-OV-write-Suffix-3SgS ‘it is written at him/her/it’, a-mt-i-a ‘it is kindled’, u-rćevni-i-a ‘s/he prefers’. In the absence of a version vowel, the indirect object marker (3.2.2d.) must be used as a default marker: s-c’er-i-a ‘it is written’; h-k’id-i-a ‘it hangs’, (h-)q’r-i-a ‘they are thrown’.

e. “To be” plus passive participle has a resultative meaning: c’ign-i da-c’er-il-i aris book-Nom Prev-write-Part-Nom is ‘the book is written’ (i.e. the work of writing is completed and its result is there). There is a corresponding form with “to have” (5.2.1f), as in (35) (Boeder, 1999b). The subject of “to have” (in the dative) is not, however, necessarily the “agent”, but may denote the “experiencer”, as in (36):

(35) c’ign-i da-c’er-il-i m-a-kv-s (G) book-Nom Prev-write-Part-Nom IO-VERSION-have-3SgS ‘I have written the book’.

(36) Žildo mo-nič’-eb-ul-i makvs (G) prize(Nom) Prev-bestowe-TS-Part-Nom I.have.it ‘a prize was bestowed on me’.

f. Old Georgian and some Modern Georgian dialects have an iterative (habitual, generic) form (Georgian: xolmeobiti, Schuchardt, 1895: Perpetual, Deeters, 1930: 111–113: Permansiv; see Šanije, 1973 §§ 276, 279): OG v-c’er-i ‘I used to write’, c’er-is ‘s/he used to write’ (belonging to the aorist series!), c’er-n ‘s/he usually writes’ (Deeters, 1930: 53).

g. All Kartvelian languages more or less share the tense-mood system given above, but Svan and Mingrelian have an additional “fourth series”. Whereas the perfect is the evidential counterpart of the aorist in all the languages, the fourth series is the

---

28 Medial verbs have been studied by Holisky (1981a).
29 Analytic constructions (copula plus participle) have been studied by Vašak’iže (1993).
evidential counterpart of the present and imperfect: M (prefix no-, suffix –u-e): no-
č’ar-u-e ‘evidently s/he writes, was writing it’, no-č’ar-u-e-d-u ‘evidently s/he was
writing it’; Sv (suffix –ina): x-ā-cwr-ina ‘s/he evidently was leaving it to him/her (x-)’;
(prefix ləm-, suffix -un/-in, etc.): ləm-sq’āv-in ‘s/he evidently used to make it’. The
Georgian neighbour dialects of Mingrelian (but not Laz!) have similar forms. Notice
that while third series verb forms have inversion (5.2.3d), fourth series verbs have the
construction of their present tense series counterparts.

3.2.4. Preverbs

In Modern Georgian, preverbs are inseparable prefixes. In early medieval Georgian and
in Svan they are detachable, and can be used as sentence fragments in answers (37) and
with gapping (as in (38), where the second occurrence of “invited” is reduced to its
preverb):

(37) a. mibrzanə: mo-gc’ona-o? movaqse: mo-metki (OG)
[he said: Prev-it.pleased.you-Quot? I.replied: Prev-Quot] ‘He said: Did you
like it? I replied: Yes’ (see Boeder 1994: 448 note 3)
b. kāč̑ad (< ka-a-č̑ad) mo? – ka (Topuria 1967: 62) (Sv)
‘did s/he go out (ka-)? – Yes

(38) amn̄em ešxu ladex ċv-c’je xalx, aljar-caxan miča gezal ʒəm-il-dačuri č̑u, maj
sak’vrel li (Arsena Oniani et al. 1979: 81,2) (Sv)
he.Erg one day Prev-he.invited.them people.Nom, these-with his son brother-sister.
too Prev, what astonishing is
‘One day he invited people, and with these of course his son and his brother and
sister, too’

The position of clitics between preverb and verbal root (“tmesis”; 2.5) reveals a former
word-like status of the latter in Old Georgian and Svan:

(39) rajta še-xolo-axon pesu-sa (Matthew 14,36) (OG)
that Prev-but-that.they.touch.it hem-Dat
‘that they might only touch the hem (of his garment)’

(40) aγ-raj-dga mk’udret-it (John 21,14) (OG)
Prev-when-he.rose realm.of.the.dead-Instr
‘that he had risen from the dead’

(41) sgā-w eser otlqid (< ad-o-qid) (Sv)
into-OptParticle Quot s/he.brought.it.here ‘may s/he bring it in here’

In Modern Georgian, preverbs have a perfectivizing effect in the majority of verbs: c’er-s
‘s/he write’ (present) vs. da-c’er-s ‘s/he will write’ (3.2.3b).
There are three groups of Georgian preverbs: I uk’u ‘back’ is compatible with II and III; it is very rare. II is similar to the preverbs of many Indo-European languages. With verbs of movement, these preverbs have local (directional) meanings like ‘into’ (G șe-), ‘up(wards)’ (G ay-), etc. and can be combined with mo- ‘hither’ of group III, e.g. șe-mo- ‘into-hither’. Group III preverbs have a deictic function: mo- ‘hither’, mi- ‘thither’, and da- with different meanings (Vogt, 1971, §§ 2.131–145; 150–153).

a. With verbs of movement, mo- expresses a direction towards the speaker (mo-rb-i-s ‘comes running’, mo-m-c’ere ‘you wrote me’) or the hearer (mo-g-c’ere ‘I wrote you’—even if the recipient is somewhere else at the time of speaking) or in general towards the speaker’s sphere:

(42) mamam Mosk’ovidan mo-s-c’er-a c’erili (G)  ‘the/his father wrote him a letter from Moscow’, implying that the recipient of the letter lives e.g. in the same town as the speaker). In Old Georgian, this latter meaning was even more relevant (Deeters, 1937, cf. Mt. 7,11: ‘your Father which is in heaven shall give good things to them that ask him’, where Old Georgian has mo-s-c’es, but Modern Georgian mi-s-c’ems), while, on the other hand, a direction towards the hearer is not “hither” in Old Georgian (and Mingrelian; Šerōzia, 2003) as it is in Modern Georgian (Mt. 4,9: ‘All these things will I give thee’, where Old Georgian has mi-g-c’e, but Modern Georgian mo-g-c’em).

da- expresses, among other things, non-specific direction: ma-prinavs ‘it comes flying here’, mi-prinavsv ‘it is flying there’, da-prinavsv ‘it is flying here and there’. With transitive verbs this meaning shades into plurality of the direct object:

(43) (mgelma) cxvari șe-č’ama / cxvari da-č’ama (G)  ‘(the wolf) a/sheep ate / sheep ate’.

And finally, da- functions as an non-specific perfectiviser: c’ere vs. da-c’ere ‘you wrote it’, but specifically: mi-s-c’ere ‘you wrote it (to him, there)’, ča-c’ere ‘you wrote it down’, ăy-c’ere ‘you described it (“up”)’, ga-c’er-e ‘you imposed (a tax)’, ga-mo-c’ere ‘you subscribed it (e.g. a newspaper)’, șe-c’ere ‘you assessed it’.

b. Group II preverbs often have a quite concrete local meaning with verbs of movement. In Georgian, they refer to very general aspects of space, with specific preferences (e.g. verticality over other properties; see Boeder, 1992; Kutscher, 2003, for Laz): besides mo-svla ‘to come (here)’ and mi-svla ‘to go (there)’ one has: a-svla ‘to go up’, a-mo-svla ‘to come up’, șe-svla ‘to go in(side)’, șe-mo-svla ‘to come in’, ča-svla ‘to go down’, ča-mo-svla ‘to come down’, ga-svla ‘to go out’, ga-mo-svla ‘to come out’, etc.

However, all preverbs have meanings that cannot immediately be derived from local meanings: mo-k’vla ‘to kill’, mi-yeba ‘to receive’, a-xsna ‘to explain’, ga-kroba ‘to go out (of a candle)’, c’a-k’itxva ‘to read, peruse’, ga-mo-cda ‘to experience’, etc.

While Georgian preverbs are normally restricted to one topological and/or one deictic item, Mingrelian and Laz exhibit a richer system remotely reminiscent of Northwest
Caucasian prefixation; however, in no Kartvelian language does a preverb ever govern a person marker. Examples from Mingrelian (Kašaia, 2001: 59–61): gitu-
vatunas (Xubua, 1937: 15,3) ‘[the khan is sitting there and] is blinking [his pitch-black eyes] from below [i.e. he looks daggers at them]’ (gitu < ge- ‘down’; ge-to- ‘from below outside’); gomša-
čuru ‘s/he swam in’ (go- ‘outside (horizontally)’, mi- = G mi-, ša- ‘to, inside’). Particles may be added, for instance negative va- (see 5.3.2) and confirmative ko-, which may even be combined: va-ko-
žirua ‘s/he certainly did not see it’.30 One further difference is that Mingrelian and Laz preverbs can denote location, not only direction as in Georgian: ala-
m-i-xe besides-1IO-OV-sits ‘s/he sits on my side’.31

Svan has topological and deictic preverbs like Georgian (Gippert, 1987: 197): an-
‘hither’, ad-, es- ‘thither’ and la- immediately precede the version vowel, whereas the topological preverbs ži- ‘on’, sga- ‘into’ (both also used as postpositions), ča- ‘down’, ka-
‘out’ are separable (see above). Examples of non-separated forms: an-qid ‘s/he brought it (here)’, ž’an-

3.2.5. Version

Version is expressed by the version vowels preceding the root (position 6; Boeder, 1969; Harris, 1981, Chap. 6). These vowels either specify the semantic role of the indirect object whose marker they follow (see Table 5 (d)–(g); a.-e. below), or they do not (see f. below). While unspecified indirect objects normally belong to the valency of the root (as with “to give”), non-neutral versions mostly specify additional arguments; in this sense they increase valency like causatives.—The system of versions is largely the same in all Kartvelian languages; only Georgian forms will be given here, if not otherwise stated:

a. With verbs denoting “stance”, the **Objective version** (u-/i-) denotes a “close”
location to something/somebody:

34 W. Boeder / Lingua 115 (2005) 5–89

(44) mỳvdeli p’avle-s mi-
žda ‘the priest sat down besides Paul’ (G)

With verbs of movement it denotes a direction:

(45) moc’vevas u-gzavnida ‘s/he was sending an invitation to him/her’ (G)

(46) xels m-
-knevš ‘s/he waves his/her hand at me’ (G)

(47) gzas gamo-
dga ‘s/he set out hither on his way’ (G)

With other verbs it specifies the indirect object as a beneficiary or an experiencer
who may, but need not be the possessor of the subject or object:

30 For ko- in Laz, see Amse-de Jong (1991).
31 For a survey of Laz preverbs, see Kutscher, 2003.
It is an open question to what extent the different languages and dialects make use of the objective version. Experiencer plus body part object seems to be the most common use.

b. The **superessive version** (*a-*) denotes the location at or movement on or from a surface:

(48) zamtarma ga-gv-i-mp’ara miusarobgas gr3noba (G)  ‘the winter has made the feeling of unprotectedness bitter for us’ (i.e. ‘our feeling’)

(49) kals u-žiałebda saq’ure (G)  ‘an earring jingled at/for the woman’ = ‘the woman’s earring jingled’

(50) pigura-s u-prtxildeba (G)  ‘she watches over her weight’

(51) mo-g-i-k’les kmari (G)  ‘they killed your husband’ (lit. ‘they killed you the husband’)

(52) Ač’ara da-u-brunda Sakartvelo-s (G)  ‘Atchara returned to Georgia’ (‘...was reunited with Georgia’)

(53) u-ŷamdeboda (G)  ‘night was coming on for him’ (lit. ‘it became night to him’)

In the following example, the location is coded both by the version vowel and by the postposition added to the indirect object:

(54) magida-s a-zis (G)  ‘s/he sits on a table’

(55) da-m-a-ţek-i zurgeze (G)  Prev-1O-SupV-sit-PM back-on ‘sit on my back!’

(56) mc’vad-s niaxuri da-v-a-c’eri (G)  ‘I cut (and strewed) celery on the shashlik’

(57) Eteri Abesalom-s da-a-k’vda (G)  ‘Eteri died (lamenting) on Abesalom’

(58) gav-a-ʒrob txas t’q’avs (G)  ‘I will skin the goat’ (i.e. ‘remove it off the goat’)

In the following example, the location is coded both by the version vowel and by the postposition added to the indirect object:

(59) kvab-i da-v-a-dgi navtura-ze (G)  ‘I put the kettle on the petroleum fire’

c. The **subjective version** (*i-*) is the reflexive counterpart of any indirect object. In this sense it neutralises the opposition between objective version, superessive version and unspecified indirect objecthood:

– objective version vs. subjective version
superessive version vs. subjective version:
(60) a. v-u-k’rep vašl-s (G) ‘I pick an apple for him’ vs.
b. v-i-k’rep vašl-s (G) ‘I pick an apple for myself’

(61) a. arapers ar v-u-malav (G) ‘I conceal nothing from him (“to him”)’ vs.
b. arapers ar v-i-malav (G) ‘I conceal nothing from myself’

Contrary to Mingrelian, Laz seems to restrict the subjective version to body part objects: xe i-bonums ‘s/he washes her/his hand’, but Mingrelian has: i-tasuns ‘is sowing for him/herself’ (Zorbena, 1991: 131).

d. The e-version (-e-) is used when an indirect object is added to a “prefixed passive” with the version vowel i- (3.2.7.III). It is similar to the subjective version in that it neutralises the contrast between different types of indirect objects: with an indirect object i-c’er-eb-a Version-write-TS-3SgS ‘is (being) written’ becomes e-c’er-eb-a ‘is (being) written for/him/her’ or ‘on it’ or ‘to him/her’:

(62) a. kalma c’a-a-åro xelidan beč’edi (G) ‘the woman stripped off the ring from his hand’ vs.
b. kalma c’a-i-åro xelidan beč’edi (G) ‘the woman stripped off the ring from her (own) hand’

(63) a. x-ii-gwše (Sv) 3-SupV-pours ‘s/he pours it on it’ vs.
b. i-gwše (Sv) 3-SV-pours ‘s/he pours it for her/himself’

unspecified indirect objecthood vs. subjective version

(64) a. da-å-ca Eterma dana gulši (G) ‘Eteri pierced his heart with a knife’
(lit.: Eteri hit (the) knife to him in (the) heart) vs.
b. da-i-ca Eterma dana gulši (G) ‘Eteri pierced her (own) heart with a knife’

Contrary to Mingrelian, Laz seems to restrict the subjective version to body part objects: xe i-bonums ‘s/he washes her/his hand’, but Mingrelian has: i-tasuns ‘is sowing for him/herself’ (Zorbena, 1991: 131).

d. The e-version (-e-) is used when an indirect object is added to a “prefixed passive” with the version vowel i- (3.2.7.III). It is similar to the subjective version in that it neutralises the contrast between different types of indirect objects: with an indirect object i-c’er-eb-a Version-write-TS-3SgS ‘is (being) written’ becomes e-c’er-eb-a ‘is (being) written for/him/her’ or ‘on it’ or ‘to him/her’:

(65) a. megobar-s c’eril-s v-u-c’er (G) friend-Dat letter-Dat 1S-OV-write ‘I write the letter for my friend’ > c’eril-i megobar-s e-c’er-eb-a ‘the letter is written for my friend’
b. k’onvert’-s misamart-s v-a-c’er (G) envelope-Dat address-Dat 1S-SupV-write ‘I write the address on the envelope’ > misamarti k’onvert’-s e-c’ereba ‘the address is written on the envelope’
c. megobar-s ceril-s v-(s)-c’er (G) friend-Dat letter-Dat 1S-(3IO-)write ‘I write the letter to my friend’ > c’eril-i megobar-s e-c’er-eb-a ‘the letter is written to my friend’.

e. Where a paradigmatic opposition between specified and unspecified indirect objects is found at all, objects specified by the objective or superessive version generally differ
from unspecified indirect objects in that the former have a more specific beneficiary or locative meaning and the latter a general goal or addressee meaning:

(66) a. da-v-(h-)k’ideb mas surats (G) ‘I hang the picture on something’ vs.
b. da-v-u-k’ideb mas surats (G) ‘I hang the picture for him’

(67) a. še-v-(h-)k’ivleb (G) ‘I address him by shouting’ vs.
b. še-v-u-k’ivleb (G) ‘I shout in his direction’

(68) a. mi-v-(s-)c’er (G) ‘I write to him’ vs.
b. mi-v-u-c’er (G)
   ‘I write it for him’ (or: ‘I write it at it, I add it to it by writing’) vs.
c. mi-v-a-c’er (G) ‘I write it on it’ (or: ‘I ascribe it to him’)

f. **Non-specifying version** vowels

Non-specifying (‘neutral’) version vowels are lexically or grammatically determined. For instance, in v-a-k’eteb ‘I do it’, a- does not specify an indirect object; a- is a lexically determined version vowel. Similarly, i- in v-i-smen ‘I hear it’ is part of the lexical entry, and it does not specify g- in: g-i-smen ‘I hear you’. Non-specifying version vowels also occur in specific grammatical forms, e.g. i- in “prefixed passives” (3.2.7.III): i-c’er-eb-a ‘it is (being) written’; in future and aorist tense forms of the “medio-active” verbs: duy-s ‘it boils’ - i-duy-eb-s ‘it will boil’ - i-duy-a ‘it boiled’ (3.2.3c); the version vowel in the perfect series of transitive verbs: mi-i-c’eria ‘I have written it’ (3.2.3a, 3.2.6d, 5.2.3d); and a- in causatives: v-a-c’er-in-e 1S-Version-write-Caus-Aor ‘I made him write it’ (4.3).

These lexically or grammatically determined version vowels are **default** choices. They are replaced by appropriate version vowels in the presence of indirect objects: v-a-k’eteb ‘I do it’ with non-specifying a- vs. v-Ø-u-k’eteb ‘I do it for him’; similarly: v-i-smen ‘I hear him/her/it/them’ vs. v-Ø-u-smen ‘I listen to him/her/it/them’, i-duy-eb-s ‘it will boil’ vs. Ø-u-duy-eb-s ‘it will boil for him/her’, ga-v-u-šveb ma-s ‘I will let him/her go’ (with neutral –u-) vs. ga-v-i-šveb ‘I will free it for myself, something belonging to me’. Notice that this concept of non-specifying version vowel overlaps, but does not cover, the concept of “neutral version” as used in traditional Georgian grammar (Šaniże, 1973), where only -a- is considered to be neutral (in verbs like v-a-k’eteb and in causatives). The traditional concept blurs the distinction between the relational semantics of beneficiaries, locatives, etc., and lexical or grammatical (categorial) semantics.

This is a strictly structural approach based on paradigmatic contrasts that does not have to be confused with general semantic considerations (as is done by Forest, 1999). Grammatically and/or lexically determined version vowels may have a common “meaning”. For instance, the future and aorist forms with grammatically determined i- “generally share a common lexical meaning: the direct object of the verb is as a rule not directly affected by the action denoted by the verb, while the subject is” (Aronson, 1991: 277): v-s-c’avl-ob ‘I learn it’ - Aorist: v-i-sc’avl-e ‘I learned it’, similarly: mi-v-Ø-g-e ‘I received it’, ga-v-Ø-g-e ‘I understood something’, etc.
Simplifying matters, a general meaning may be posited for \( u- \) (3rd person objective version) as a marker of ‘‘extrovert(ed) orientation’’ and for \( i- \) as a marker for ‘‘introvert(ed) orientation’’ (comprising e.g. indirect object reflexivity in the subjective version, 1st and 2nd person in the objective version and in passives prefixed with \( i- \)) (Mač’avariani, 1987).—A feature like ‘‘introvert’’ would also explain the difference between: \( g-i-smen \) ‘‘I hear you’’ and \( v-i-smen \) ‘‘I hear him/her/it’’ on the one hand, and \( g-išveb \) ‘‘I let you go’’ and \( v-u-šveb \) ‘‘I let him go’’, on the other. In all these verb forms, the version vowel does not specify a preceding indirect object marker (the \( g- \) of \( g-išveb \) and \( g-i-smen \) marks a 2nd person direct object, and there is no object marker in \( v-u-šveb \) and \( v-i-smen \) at all); in other words, it is neutral. But \( -i- \) occurs in the ‘‘introvert’’ verb form \( v-i-smen \) (orientated towards the subject) and \( -u- \) in the ‘‘extrovert’’ form \( v-u-šveb \) (orientated away from the subject).

3.2.6. Inversion

There is a morphologically heterogeneous class of ‘‘indirect’’ verbs with morphological indirect objects that have subject properties (‘‘inversion’’) and morphological subjects that have direct object properties, e.g. \( mo-\text{-}m-c’-on-s \) Prev-1O-please-3SgS ‘‘it pleases me, I like it’’. Semantically speaking, they denote having and having the possibility of something, feelings and experiences like desiring, thinking, hurting, being cold, being hungry, wanting, sleeping, etc.\(^{32}\) Their distinctive features are (Vogt, 1971 § 2.85):

a. The morphological subject has direct object properties in that 1st and 2nd person subject forms are marked by an additional copula form which functionally correspond to 1st and 2nd person direct object markers: \( m-i-q’\var-x-ar \) 1O-love-2S-be ‘‘I love you’’, \( g-i-q’\var-v-ar-t \) 2O-love-1S-be-Pl ‘‘you (Sg/Pl.) love me/us’’, but: \( u-q’\var-s \) ‘‘s/he loves him/her/them’’, \( u-q’\var-t \) ‘‘they love him/her/them’’ (see 3.2.2e.). But 3rd person morphological subjects are neutralised for number like 3rd person direct objects: \( m-i-q’\var-s \) ‘‘I like him/her/it/them’’ (like e.g. \( xedav-s \) ‘‘s/he sees him/her/it/them’’; see 3.2.2a).

b. In unmarked word order, the indirect object occurs in the position which is normal for ordinary subjects (5.3.1): \( deda-s \text{-} švil-i u-q’\var-s \) ‘‘the mother loves her child’’ is like: \( deda \text{-} švil-s \text{-} xedav-s \) ‘‘the mother sees her child’’.

c. Reflexive \( tavis- \) and \( tav- \) refer to the morphological indirect object (see, however, 3.1.3g. and 5.2.2a):

\[(69) \quad q’vav-sa-c \text{-} tavis-i \text{-} baxala \text{-} mosc’ons \quad (G)\]
\[
\text{crow}_1\text{-Dat-too its.own}_1\text{-Nom young-Nom it.pleases.it}_1
\quad \text{‘‘Even the crow likes its young’’}\]

\[(70) \quad māra-j \text{-} māra \text{-} ušxvāre \text{-} tvxim \text{-} x-a-lt’-ēna-x \quad (Šaniże - Topuria (edd.) 1939: 6,1) \quad (Sv)\]
\[
\text{man.Dat-and man-Dat each.other.Gen head.Nom 3IO-Version-love-Perf-PIIO}
\quad \text{‘‘people apparently liked each other’’}\]

d. Verb forms of the perfect series have all the properties of indirect verbs. For instance, they control of “her own” in the following example; the morphological indirect object is marked by objective version markers (-u/-i-):

\[(71)\]

a. deda-s tavis-i švil-i u-k-i-a (G) ‘the mother (apparently) has praised her (own) child’
b. deda-s tavis-i švil-eb-i u-k-i-a (G) ‘... her (own) children’
c. g-i-k-i-v-ar (G)

2O-Version-praise-Suffix-1S-be ‘you have apparently praised me’

3.2.7. Derived intransitives, morphological passives and potentials

There is a group of intransitives, the so-called “dynamic passives”, whose forms have a paradigm marker -i and some additional markers in the present series. Notice that “passive” is a convenient label that does not necessarily imply a corresponding semantic character (“passives” may denote “actions”, and “actives” may have passive or stative semantics) or syntactic pattern (some “passives” may have direct objects; see III below) (3.2.3c).33 The Georgian subgroups are:

I. Passives with the suffix -d: k’et-d-eb-a ‘it is (being) done’; with indirect object: Ø-u-k’et-d-eb-a ‘it is done for him/her’. d-passives are largely confined to Georgian: c’itl-d-eb-a ‘is getting red (c’itel-)’ vs. M i-č’itar-eb-u, Sv i-c’rân-i ‘id.’ (“prefixed passives”), and even within Georgian, some dialects show variation: standard da-i-yal-a (prefixive passive) vs. Imeretian da-yal-d-a (d-passive) ‘became tired’ (žorbenase, 1991: 179).

Most of the “d-passives” are denominatives with an inchoative meaning and with a causative counterpart (4.3): tetr- ‘white’ - tetr-d-eb-a ‘it becomes white’ - v-a-tetr-eb ‘I whiten it’, mepe- ‘king’ - mep-d-eb-a ‘s/he becomes a king/queen’ - v-a-mep-eb ‘I make him/her a king/queen’. Notice the contrast between inchoative e-m-i-q’var-d-eb-a (with inversion; 3.2.6) ‘I will fall in love with him/her’ and durative m-e-q’var-eb-a ‘I will love him/her’ (Vogt, 1971 § 2.43).

II. “Root passives”: tb-eb-i ‘I am getting warm’ (aorist: ga-v-tb-i; cf. causative v-a-tb-ob ‘I warm it up’); v-k’vd-eb-i ‘I am dying’ (without a regular active counterpart) with indirect object: Ø-u-k’vd-eb-a ‘his/her/their...dies’ (lit. ‘s/he dies to her/him/them’), Ø-a-k’vd-eb-a ‘s/he dies on it’.

III. “Prefixed passives” with the default version vowel i- (see 3.2.5f): i-mal-eb-i ‘you are hiding’. - This type often simply detransitivises the corresponding active in the present series (Vogt, 1971 § 2.53): h-k’ben ‘you bite it’ - ʒayli i-k’bin-eb-a ‘the dog bites’. These forms may even have a direct object: ra-s i-c’er-eb-i ‘what do you write?’ (Vogt, 1971 § 2.53).—Prefixed passives with indirect objects (“relative passives”) have e- (3.2.5d.): i-mzad-eb-a ‘is (being) prepared’ - g-e-mzad-eb-a ‘is (being) prepared for you’. Some verbs occur only with an indirect object: g-e-lap’arak’-eb-a ‘s/he speaks to you’ (active: lap’arak’-ob-s ‘s/he speaks’). On the

other hand, some verbs with e- have no indirect object: Ø-e-mzad-eb-a c’asvl-isa-riage
’s/he prepares for departure’ (with a postpositional phrase instead of a dative: c’asvla-s).

Passives with prefixed i-/e- have some special meanings (Šanižé, 1973 §§ 359–362): potentialis: es c’q’ali ar i-sm-eb-a ‘this water is not drinkable (“is not drunk”)’ (Vogt, 1971 § 2.46). This category is very productive in Mingrelian (prefix i-/la-):

(72) ižgura čki ak mu m-a-yol-en-a (Xubua, 1937: 16,1) (M) 

‘How can we prepare such [sc. a medicine] here’

It differs morphologically from the simple passive in the present tense series: i-tas-u(n) ‘it is sown’ vs. i-tas-e(n) ‘it can be sown’ (Kašaia, 2001: 91).

feeling: m-e-lamaz-eb-a 1O-EV-(make)beautiful-TS-3SgS ‘I feel something/someone to be beautiful’.

disposition: m-e-zin-eb-a 1O-EV-sleep-TS-3SgS ‘I feel like sleeping’ (cp. m-zin-av-s 1O-sleep-TS-3SgS ‘I sleep’, with inversion; 3.2.6); similarly: m-e-myer-eb-a ‘I feel like singing’, m-e-cin-eb-a ‘I feel like laughing’ and (112).

Only some lexicalised passives have their own verbal noun: k’vl-a ‘killing’ vs. k’vd-oma ‘dying’ (3.2.8a).

3.2.8. Masdars and participles

These nominal forms exhibit both verbal (inflectional) categories and nominal (derivational) properties. The following outline refers to Georgian, if not otherwise stated.

a. Different verbal nouns (masdars) normally represent different lexemes, but the reverse is not true: one and the same masdar may represent several paradigmatically and semantically different lexemes: p’ireba belongs to: v-a-p’ir-eb ‘I plan (to do something)’ and v-p’ir-d-eb-i ‘I promise (something to somebody)’.

Most verbal categories are not coded in the masdar. However, there is a contrast between gzavn-a ‘sending’ and perfective ga-gzavn-a (although the forms without preverbs are seldom used), between the basic form ga-gzavn-a and the causative form ga-gzavn-in-eb-a ‘making somebody send’, and - in a few lexicalised examples or morphologically restricted cases (Oniani, 1998: 265) - between “active” and “passive”: G (ga)t’ex-a, Sv li-k’wš-e ‘breaking(transitive)’ vs. G (ga)t’q’d-om-a, Sv li-k’weš ‘break (intransitive), being broken’ (but G ga-gzavn-a is both ‘sending’ and ‘being sent’).

Examples of masdar formation: v-tvl-i ‘I reckon it’ - tvl-a ‘reckoning’, v-mal-av ‘I hide it’ - mal-v-a ‘hiding’; v-dg-eb-i ‘I stand up’ - dg-om-a, v-c’ev-(y)ar ‘I lie’ - c’ol-a; others have -il: dum-s ‘s/he is silent’ - dum-il-; u-q’var-s ‘s/he loves him/her’ - si-q’var-ul-i, etc. For some denominatives, their basic noun is used: v-lap’arak’-ob ‘I speak’ - lap’arak’-.

Affixation is unevenly distributed in Kartvelian masdars: in Georgian, simple suffixation is most productive, and it is almost exclusively so in Mingrelian (-a, -u-a,
-ap-a, -al-a, -u-al-a, etc., mostly related to the present tense system; Laz masdars are almost exclusively “circumfixal”: o-č’ar-u ‘writing’, the prefix being in complementary distribution with preverbs: me-čam-u Prev-give-suffix ‘giving’ (Čikobava, 1936: 174–176). Svan (Oniani, 1998: 262–265) has a prefix (li- ÷ G si-) with or without suffixes distributed according to present tense formation: li-gem ‘building’, li-sq’-i ‘doing’, li-mār-e ‘preparing’. Here as elsewhere in Kartvelian the overall historical development seems to be: prefixation > circumfixation > suffixation.

b. **Participles** have contrasts between subject-orientation and object-orientation, for example: ga-m-gzavn-el- ‘(who is) sending’ vs. ga-gzavn-il- ‘sent’. Notice that the morphological category terms “active” and “passive” do not completely cover the syntactic use of the respective participles (see 5.5.7b.):

I. **Active participles** have the prefix m- or ma-, and some have the additional suffix -el (cf. 4.1.1d): da-m-c’er- ‘(one who is) writing’, ga-m-k’et-eb-el- ‘doing’, da-m-p’q’r-ob-el- ‘conquering’.

II. The **passive future participle** differs from the active participle in having sa- instead of m(a)-: da-sa-c’er- ‘(what is) to be written’, da-sa-p’q’r-ob(el)- ‘(what is) to be conquered’, etc. (cp. 4.1.1j).


IV. **Negative passive participles** have the negative prefix u- and (in general) the suffix -el: da-u-c’er-el- ‘not written’, a-u-šen-eb-el- ‘not built’; the counterparts of m-___-ar preserve their “circumfix”: ga-u-m-th-ar- ‘unheated’.

There are other small groups of participial forms like: m-dg-om-ar-e- ‘standing’ (derived from the masdar dg-oma-) or m-t’ir-al- ‘weeping’, etc.

Mingrelian and Laz have essentially the same types of participles, and most affixes are genetically related to their Georgian counterparts, although their distribution is somewhat different (for a survey see Kažaia, 2001: 143–146). But while the basis of derivation is mostly the present stem in Georgian, it tends to be the root in Mingrelian: G mo-mat-’eb-ul- Prev-add-TS-Part- ‘increased’ ÷ M mo-zin-er- Prev-add-Part-. - Georgian, Mingrelian and Laz have past participles with a suffix, but in Svan (Oniani, 1998: 267–273), all participles have prefixes and some have suffixes; all are derived from the root: m₂-gem Part-build ‘built’, m₂-mār-e ‘preparing’, m₂-sq’-i ‘doing’, le-sq’-e ‘done’, le-sq’-i ‘to be done’.

Notice the lack of aspectual oppositions: in Georgian participles, preverbs seem to be rather lexicalised (Vogt, 1971: 247), in Svan, participles cannot have preverbs (V. Topuria, 1967: 88). Indeed, participles are rather derivational than inflectional, and most participial affixes are found in non-participial nominal forms. On the other hand, some facts of Georgian relate them to the verbal paradigm: participles are mostly derived from a present tense stem instead of the root, and future participles are systematically used in the adverbial case as expressions of purpose clauses (see 5.5.7e).
4. Word formation

Kartvelian words are normally delimited by their morphological form. However, Kartvelian languages have many uninflected words: conjunctions, subordinators, modal particles (3.2.1) and other “minor words”, that deserve further study (see e.g. Šengelaia, 2000).

Georgian has a productive word formation which can be very complex:

(73) [ [cert-gvar-] [[p’ir-] [mi-u-mart-av-] ] [[da- mat’- eb-] eb-] } ian- ](G) one-type- person- Prev-Neg-govern-TS- Prev- add-TS- Pl- Poss.Suffix- ‘(sc. a sentence) with objects of one (and the same) type not pointing to (verbal) person’

For obvious reasons, such forms are less common in non-written languages like Svan. Word formation is a somewhat neglected field of Kartvelian linguistics; the best survey is given in V. Topuria’s studies (1979: 63–131).

4.1. Derivation of nouns and adjectives

Kartvelian has prefixes, suffixes and circumfixes (or pseudo-circumfixes: Harris, 2002). The most usual affixes of Georgian (if not otherwise stated) are:

4.1.1. Affixes

a. Diminutive -a: dedopal-a ‘doll’ (dedopal- ‘queen’), -uk’-a: cxen-uk’-a ‘little horse’ (cxen- ‘horse’), -ik’-o: ded-ik’-o ‘mummy’ (deda- ‘mother’), -il-o: ded-il-o ‘id.’, -un-a: bič’-un-a ‘little boy’ (bič’- ‘lad’), -un-i-a: k’at’-un-i-a ‘little cat’ (k’at’a- ‘cat’). - b. Suffixes of possession: -ier/-iel: c’es-ier- ‘orderly’ (c’es- ‘order, law’); -osan: cxen-osan-rider’ (cxen- ‘horse’), -ován: k’ld-ován- ‘rocky’ (k’lde- ‘rock’), -a with modifier + head noun as a base: c’itel-perang-a ‘red-shirted’, cal-tval-a ‘one-eyed’, -ian: c’ver-ian-‘bearded’ (c’ver- ‘beard’). Svan has a possessive suffix (bač ‘stone’: bač-ăr ‘stony’), but the prefix lo- is more common: lo-xån ‘having an ox’. - c. Affixes of non-possession: in Georgian, they consist of the negative prefix _u_ (see 3.2.8b.IV. for negative participles) and a suffix -ur or -o: u-c’es-ur-lu-c’es-o- ‘unorderly, improper’, u-bed-ur-ı ‘unfortunate’, u-bed-o ‘unlucky’ (bed- ‘fate, luck’), u-xel-o ‘handless’ (xel- ‘hand’); cp. M夸大 ‘mother’: u-did-o ‘motherless’. By contrast, Svan has a suffix: txum ‘head’: txum-ur ‘headless’ (cp. G tav- ‘head’: u-tav-o- ‘headless’). The etymology of some Georgian lexemes with –u speak for a common Kartvelian heritage of negative suffixation: q’r-u ‘deaf’ (related to q’ur- ‘ear’), etc. The development of negative affixation seems to be the reverse of the general tendency (3.2.8a): suffixation > circumfixation. - d. Suffixes of provenance are (Şorbenaze, 1991: 100–102): -el often with reference to persons (kalak-el- ‘city dweller’: kalak- ‘city’), german-el- ‘German’. Some old derivations have m.____el: m-egr-el- ‘Mingrelian’ (living in the historical province of Egr-is-i); in older derivations, -el replaces the suffixes -is, -et: OG t’pil-el- ‘inhabitant of Tpil-is-i’ vs. MG tbilis-el-; k’ax-el-
‘inhabitant of K’ax-et’; -ur is said to be used for reference to non-persons: kalak-ur-i simyera ‘a song sung in the city’, megr-ul-i c’ic’ak’a ‘red (“Mingrelian”) pepper’; but the kind of attributive relationship has to be taken into account (kartv-él-i k’irít’ik’os-i ‘Georgian critic’ vs. liter’at’ur-ul-i k’irít’ik’os-i ‘literary critic’), and the simple distribution is disturbed by all types of historical and dialectal variation. - e. -eul has a collective meaning: tevz-eul- ‘fish’ (tevz- ‘(individual) fish’), vercxl-eul- ‘silver(ware)’ (vercxl- ‘silver’). - f. -indel-, -amdel- (cp. -mde ‘till’, 3.1.1g) are rather new suffixes with a temporal meaning: revoluci-amdel- ‘reaching until the revolution’. - g. -oba derives all types of abstract nouns: ʒm-oba ‘brotherhood’, bavšv-oba- ‘childhood’, kartvel-oba- ‘Georgianhood’; its instrumental is used in the sense of ‘by the...’: tve-ob-it ‘monthly’ (tve- ‘month’), as-ob-it ‘by the hundreds’ (as- ‘hundred’). There is a negative counterpart: u-k’ac-oba- Neg-man-Suffix- ‘the lack of men’. - h. -eba also derives abstract nouns: tavisupl-eba- ‘freedom’ (tavisupal- ‘free’). - i. si-__e derives abstract nouns from adjectives: si-gr3-e- ‘length’ (g3-‘ ‘long’), si-k’et-e- ‘kindness’ (k’et-il- ‘good’). - j. sa-__e denotes something designed for something: sa-pul-e- ‘purse’ (pul- ‘money’), sa-tval-e- ‘spectacles’ (tval- ‘eye’). - k. sa-__o derives nouns and adjectives: sa-kartvel-o- ‘Georgia’ (kartvel- ‘Georgian’), sa-saibr-o- ‘colloquial’ (saibr- ‘conversation’). - l. na-__ar, na-__ev derive nouns and adjectives for what somebody/something formerly was and the like: na-col-ar- ‘former wife’ (col- ‘wife’); cp. M no-či-li ‘former wife’ or ‘one who had a wife formerly’, Q’ipšiže, 1914: 1029], na-sopl-ar- ‘site of a former village’ (sopl- ‘village’), na-t’vi-ar- ‘a place hit by a bullet’ (t’q’via- ‘lead’), na-mt’iral-ev- ‘tear-stained’ (mt’iral- ‘weeping’), na-šaγam-ev- ‘the time after midnight’ (šaγame- ‘midnight’). In Svan, na- plus suffix derives adjectives with different meanings (Ţorbenaţe 1991: 95): nä-bm-un ‘rope’ (li-bem ‘to bind’), na-w-gem-i ‘state of being unbuilt’ (u-g-a ‘unbuilt’: li-gem ‘to build’), etc. - m. me-__e derives nouns for professions: me-bay-e ‘gardener’ (bay- ‘garden’); similarly: me-__ur: me-bad-ur- ‘fisherman’ (bade- ‘net’). - n. -et (etymologically the full grade form of the Old Georgian plural -t; 3.1.1d.) is frequent in geographical names: k’ax-et- ‘Kakhetia’, rus-et- ‘Russia’, sa-prang-et- ‘France’ (prang- ‘French’), but also: sa-giz-et- ‘land of fools, madhouse’ (giz- ‘fool’; cp. (40)). - o. For comparative u-__es and approximative mo-o see 3.12f.-g. - p. Derivations from instrumental and adverbal case forms (Ţaniţe, 1973, §175) are productive since their use in medieval philosophical texts (particularly in the language of the sciences): uarq’op-it- ‘negative’ (uarq’opa- ‘denial’), šemtvev-it- ‘accidental’ (‘by accident’, šemtvexeva- ‘occurrence’), p’ur-ad- ‘ hospitable’ (p’ur- ‘bread’), petk-ad- ‘explosive’ (petka- ‘blow up’). Historically, these formations were zero-derivational modifiers in Old Georgian (5.1.1c.).

4.1.2. Phrasal properties

Some affixes pose particular problems for island constraints on words and for the relationship between syntax and morphology. First, forms like G u-am-kal-o-d Neg-this-woman-Suffix-Adv ‘without this woman ‘ (cp. (160)) and G im dro- indel-i that(Obl) time-Suffix-Nom ‘of that time’ show inbound anaphora. Second, the pronominal element in such cases is the oblique stem (am- in (74) and im-; see 3.1.3c; Ţaniţe, 1973 § 177), and adjectives appear in their stem form (see (75)–(77)):
As these examples show, the derivational base has phrasal properties (cp. 4.2.4) in that it seems to comprise the whole range of determiner and premodifier-head constructions that occur in a noun phrase, but without agreement in simple modifiers (’tormet’-ma abaz-ian-ma). Genitives and possessives (see u-im-is-o- in 3.1.3f), on the other hand, are preserved (as in (78)–(80); cp. (161)), and possessives (81) and complex adjective phrases (82) show agreement:

The genitival, possessive and agreeing units seem to be co-constituents of the derived nominal and not of its derivational stem. For example, šavo in the last example is a co-constituent of tvalebian0 and not of tvaleb-, but its semantic domain is not the addressed person, but her eyes.

One general principle of Kartvelian is that the rightmost immediate constituent of a “word” is the base of derivation. In most cases this is trivial, since the base consists of one
stem or has a suffix whose domain could be either the whole word or the last constituent. But there are cases where it is clear that it is only the last constituent that takes the affix, although its domain is the whole word (see 3.1.4b). Consider the Svan counterparts of (75) and (78):

(83) tvetne lu-patv māre (Sv) ‘white Poss.Prefix-hair man(Nom)’.

(84) pūri ʒǔʒ(v)i ɬə-t’ar gāč (A. Oniani) (Sv)
cow.Gen horn.Gen POSS.PREFIX-handle knife.NOM

Although the semantic domain of ɬə-/lu- is the whole modifier, it is only its last constituent that has an affix.

4.2. Compounds

4.2.1 There is a particular Georgian type of verbal compounds (Fähnrich, 1986: 137–139) which seems to show a right-branching structure consisting of three constituents: (1) the preverb, (2) the personal prefix, version vowel and verbal root (positions 4–7 in (18)), (3) all suffixes. Consider conjunction reduction in: mimovixedavad = [[mi-[[v-i-xed-]-av]][mo-[[v-i-xed-]-av]]] Prev-Version-1S-look-TS-1S-Version-look-TS, or: mimovixedavad = [[mi-[[v-i-xed-]-av]][-]/[mo-[[v-i-xed-]-av]]] ‘I look around’; mimovixedav = [[mi-[[i-y]-o]-][mo-[[i-y]-o]]] Prev-Version-take-3SgS-Prev-Version-take-3SgS ‘s/he turned it in all directions’; čaiyinčackiˇkusunebrda = [[ča-[[i-yi]-in]-eb-d-a]] [ča-[[i-k’suni]-eb-d-a]] Prev-Version-hum-TS-EM-3SgS-Prev-Version-groan-TS-EM-3SgS ‘s/he was humming and groaning’.

4.2.2 Reduplication in nouns: G ʒrial-ʒrial- ‘continuing rustling’ ∼ Sv ʃəl-ʃəl; G cxel-cxel- ‘all hot’ (cxel- ‘hot’) ∼ M ʧxet-ʧxet ∼ Sv ătu-ătu; they sometimes show consonantal variation: cer-cet- ‘reckless, thoughtless’ (cf. cet- ‘to be reckless’) or consonant dropping: p’ac-’ac-’a ‘tiny, wee’ (p’ac-’a- ‘tiny’) or vowel variation (mostly with -u- in the second constituent): G balax-balax- ‘weeds’ (balax- ‘grass, weed’), bič’-buč’- ‘boys (contemptuous)’ (bič’- ‘boy’), rič-raž- ‘dawn’, Sv ʒari-ŋura ‘gorges’; or with a replacement of initial CV by o r (giž- ‘fool’), kox-max- ‘hut’ (kox- ‘id.’). The distributive meanings of reduplicated adjectives are of some importance for noun phrase structure (Gil, 1988, Junker 1990); cp. (175).

4.2.3 Nominal coordinative compounds: A few have da ‘and’: G dje-da-yaame ‘day and night’; most combine nominal stems: G dana-čangal- ‘knife and fork’, xvec’na-k’oc’na ‘imploring and kissing’, deda-švil- ‘mother and child’, mic’a-c’q’al-‘fatherland’ (‘earth and water’), pšav-xevxuret- ‘[the provinces of] Pshavi and Khevsureti’; Sv dece-gim (or: dec i gim) ‘heaven and earth’, txvim-č’išxv ‘head and

---

34 For Georgian compounds see e.g. Imnaišvili (1999); for repetition and reduplication in Georgian word formation Neisser (1953).
foot’. These compounds tend to have the plural, particularly in the older language and in the mountain dialects (Boeder, 1998a): col-kmar-n-i ‘wife-husband-Pl-Nom’ (‘husband and wife’; in Georgian, the female is traditionally named first). The scope of quantification (including the plural) can be the hyperonym of the coordinated constituents: \(\text{or-i kal-važ-i} ‘\text{two-Nom girl-boy-Nom}’\), where “two” quantifies the hyperonym of “girl and boy”: ‘two children, a girl and a boy’. (Similarly, the plural -n- quantifies the hyperonym of col-kmar-: “spouses”.)

**Determinative compounds:** Sv dïna-gezel girl-child ‘daughter’, ezer-măre goodman ‘friend’, q’or-māk’är door-open = G k’ar-yia ‘with open door’.

**Bahuvrihi:** č’k’ua-txel- ≈ L nosi-tutxu brain-thin ‘stupid’.

**4.2.4 Participles** can be combined with their direct object in a compound: G tav-mocˇ’ril- ≈ Sv tvvim-mekce ≈ M dud(i)-k’vattri head-cut ‘whose head is cut’. For example:

(85) naxa rom mis-i col-i mt’iral-i zis tma-gac’ec’il-i (G)
he.saw(Aor).it that his -Nom wife-Nom weeping-Nom she.is.sitting hair-tossed-Nom ‘he saw his wife sitting there weeping, with tousled hair’.

This type of composition is subject to several constraints: e.g. the incorporated noun must be or become an (intimate) possession of the related head noun (“\(\text{semest’r-dat’viri p’ropesori} \) intended meaning: ‘term-burdened professor’), its referent must have independent existence (“\(\text{gegma-mopikebuli gogo} \) ‘plan-devised girl’), intended meaning: ‘a girl who has devised a plan’), etc. - The first constituent of these compounds has a phrasal character (cp. 4.1.2); see (73) and: [or-tav-]močˇ’ril vešap’i [[two-head-]cut.off dragon] ‘a dragon with two heads cut off’, [vercxl-, t’q’via- da sp’ilen3-]narevi madani [[[silver-, lead- and copper-]mixed ore] ‘an ore mixed of silver, lead and copper’, uercrad cxel c’q’al-tav-gadasxmuli suddenly hot water head-poured.over ‘somebody on whose head hot water has been poured suddenly’ (Šaniże, 1973, §196; Boeder, 1999b).

**4.3. Verbal derivation: Causatives**

Georgian causatives have the default version vowel a-, and the thematic suffix -eb in the present and perfect series and in the verbal noun.

b. Causatives from **transitives** take the additional suffix -in or -ev-in, depending on the morphological class of the verb: v-c’er ‘I write it’ - v-a-c’er-in-eb ‘I make him/her write it’ (Aorist: da-v-a-c’er-in-e; v-u-c’er-in-eb ‘I make him/her write it for him/her’, Aorist: da-v-u-c’er-in-e, etc.). Notice that most causatives are derived from present stems, whose formants (thematic suffixes) are preserved: v-a-šen-eb ‘I build it’ - v-a-
šen-eb-in-eb ‘I make him/her build it’, Aorist: a-v-a-šen-eb-in-e. The result is a present stem form with two thematic suffixes, one belonging to the causative base, the other to the present stem (positions 9 and 12 of (18), separated by the causative formant of position 11, e.g. -eb-in-eb).

The other languages have similar formations: Sv a-mār-e Version-prepare-Pres ‘prepares something’: x-a-mār-un-e 3IO-Version-prepare-Caus-Pres ‘makes her/him prepare something’.

Causatives sometimes have a “permissive” (120) or “assistive” meaning (Gecadze et al., 1969): m-a-lak’arāk’-e ‘let me finish!’ (lit. ‘make me speak!’). According to Guščina (1990), simple causative and “assistive” are differentiated in Svan (Upper Bal):

(86)  māšk’id x-a-šk’ād-un-e č’q’int-s čāž-s (Sv)
smith. Nom 3IO-Version-forge-Caus,-Pres boy-Dat horse-Dat
‘the smith makes the boy the horse’

(87)  č’q’int x-a-šk’ād-un-āwn-e māšk’id-s čāž-s (Sv)
boy. Nom 3IO-Version-forge-Caus,-Caus,-Pres smith-Dat horse-Dat
‘the boy helps the smith make the horse’.

Causatives are different from, for instance, “passives” in that they are derivational rather than inflectional: they have their own verbal nouns (masdar), whereas most passives have not: da-c’er-a ‘writing’ vs. da-c’er-in-eb-a ‘making somebody write’.

As for syntax, the causee (i.e. the subject of the corresponding basic clause) becomes a dative indirect object in the causative construction (see Sumbatova, 1993, for Svan):

(88)  megobar-ma p’asux-i da-c’er-a (G)
f friend-Erg answer-Nom Prev-write-3SgS
‘A friend wrote(Aor) the answer’

(89)  man megobar-s p’asux-i da-a-c’er-in-a (G)
s/he.Erg friend-Dat answer-Nom Prev-Version-write-Caus-3SgS
‘S/he made(Aor) the friend write the answer’

Either the 3rd person indirect object or the direct object can be marked in the verb (see 3.2.2f.IV., 5.2.2a.II., 5.2.2b.II.); cp. (90) a. vs. b. with (31)a. vs. b. (Vogt, 1971 § 2.74):

(90)  a. is ma-s m-a-ʒarcv-in-eb-s me (G)
he(Nom) he-Dat IQ-Version-rob-Caus-Pres me
b. is ma-s a-ʒarcv-in-eb-s čem-s tav-s (G) (“... my head”)
‘he makes him (indirect object in Georgian) rob me (direct object in Georgian)’
5. Syntax

5.1. Structure of the noun phrase

5.1.1. Relational coding in the noun phrase

a. Agreement: In Old Georgian, (almost) all non-genitive modifiers agreed with their head nouns in case and number (see c. below; for genitive agreement see 5.1.3). Modern Kartvelian has (almost) no number agreement (but see Čant’laże, 1998: 217–222) partial or no case agreement depending on dialect (‘vulgar’ paradigm V in Table 4), position (contact vs. non-contact), and morphology (vocalic stems without agreement; see 3.1.2c).

b. Number in quantified noun phrases is subject to some semantically conditioned variation. The singular is the norm with cardinal numbers: G sam-i bič’-i three-Nom boy-Nom ‘three boys’. But dialectal and colloquial G sam-i bič’-eb-i three-Nom boy-Pl-Nom ‘three boys’ is not rare. Old Georgian prefers the plural at least with animate nouns in this case (Innaiśvili, 1957: 476–477). In Modern Georgian, the plural tends to be used with indefinite number expressions that are more ‘articulate’: sxva-da-sxva ‘sundry’, calk’eul- ‘single’, zog- ‘some’, and with quantifiers like amden- ‘so many (as)’, ramden- ‘how many’, q’vela- ‘all’, whereas indefinite mass expressions like ramdenime ‘a few’, asobit ‘by hundreds’ prefer the singular (K’alaže, 1981). (For quantification with coordinative compounds see 4.2.3, for countability and related problems Boeder, 1998a.)

c. Modern Georgian shuns modifiers without genitive marking or agreement. Non-genitive noun phrases are avoided (except with verbal nouns, see 5.5.7c; for raising see 5.2.2b.IV., 5.5.7a). Adjunct relations in the noun phrase tend to be coded by derivational (4.1) and participial (i.e. verbal) constructions (Boeder, 1999a; Boeder and Schroeder, 2000):

(91) panžara-s-tan dadgm-ul-i savaržel-i (G) window-Dat-near put-Part-Nom chair-Nom ‘the easy chair by the window’

Old Georgian favours simple agreement (zero-derivation):

(92) rametu mun-i igi mat’l-i udičs ars (OG) for there-Nom that(Nom) worm-Nom bigger is ‘for the worm which is there is bigger’

Ellipsis of the head noun results in constructions like:

(93) saplav-eb-is šina-ta cxovreb-is mimnič’ebel-i (Easter Hymn apud Saniže 1973§158) (OG) grave-Pl-Gen in-PIObi life-Gen bestowing-Nom ‘giving life to those who are in the graves’

---

5.1.2. Relative order of constituents

Modern Kartvelian noun phrases are more or less uniform (with some dialect variation). The following materials are from Georgian.

a. Noun phrases are normally head-final, preceded by their modifiers, but relative clauses (5.5) can precede or follow their head noun under specific conditions. The normal order of modifiers is: non-classifying genitive noun phrases (possessive, temporal and local, subjective and objective genitives)—quantifiers—demonstrative and indefinite pronouns—numerals—descriptive adjectives—relational (denominal) adjectives and classifying adjectives and genitives. (For clisis after the noun phrase-initial constituent see 2.5.) In some dialects, genitives immediately preceding their head noun seem to behave like adjectives in their contact form: masp’inzl-i saxl-i host—‘Gen’ house-Nom ‘the host’s house’ (instead of: masp’inzl-is saxl-i, similar to: axal-i saxl-is ‘new—‘Gen’ house-Gen’), and some have become constituents of compounds: ḷar-is-k’ac—army-Gen-man—‘soldier’, mam-i-da (<mam-is da) father-Gen-sister ‘aunt’.

b. In Modern Georgian, postposed genitives (mostly in their “long form”, 3.1.1b) sometimes occur: esa-a norma-Ø axal-i kartul-i salit’erat’uro-Ø en-isa this(Nom)-is norm-Nom new—‘Gen’ Georgian—‘Gen’ literary—‘Gen’ language-Gen ‘this is the norm of the Modern Georgian literary language’; postposed genitives behave like adjectives in their non-contact form (3.1.2e): they agree with their head nouns: M k’etebas ñude-ši-s (Xubua, 1937: 21,20) making-Dat house-Gen-Dat ‘the making of the house’.

c. Position distinguishes head noun modifiers from dependent noun modifiers: did-i vir-is q’ur-eb-i big—‘Gen’ donkey-Gen ear-Pl-Nom ‘the ears of a big donkey’ vs. vir-is did-i q’ur-eb-i donkey-Gen big-Nom ear-Pl-Nom ‘the big ears of a donkey’. However, while k’arg-Ø c’q’l-is dok-s good-Dat water-Gen jug-Dat ‘a good water-jug’ is unambiguous, k’arg-i c’q’l-is dok-i good-Nom/‘Gen’ water-Gen jug-Nom means both ‘a good water jug’ and ‘a jug with good water’.

d. Non-classifying genitives also may occur in pre-head position. Besides the expected Lenin-is šav-čarčoian-i surat-i Lenin-Gen black-framed-Nom picture-Nom ‘a black-framed portrait of Lenin’ one has: šav-čarčoian-i Lenin-is surat-i with the same meaning (but also: ‘the portrait of (a) black-framed Lenin’), where word order seems to underline conceptual unity (‘a Lenin portrait’).

e. Phrase-initial position sometimes disambiguates the relation between classifying genitives and adjective modifiers: t’q’av-is lamaz-i axal-i čanta-Ø skin-Gen beautiful-Nom new-Nom bag-Nom ‘a beautiful, new leather-bag’ (vs. ambiguous lamaz-i axal-i t’q’av-is čanta-Ø with the “normal” position of the classifying genitive: ‘a beautiful, new leather-bag’ or ‘a bag made of beautiful, new leather’).

5.1.3. Agreement of genitives

Old Georgian had simple pre-head genitives like: mt’er-isa igi saq’opel-i enemy-Gen that(Nom) residence-Nom ‘the residence of the enemy’. Rightward and leftward extra-position required agreement of the genitive phrase (“suffixxaufnahme”; Boeder, 1995; cp. Manning, 1994):

---

36 See Ležava (1972) and Testelec (1997).
This type of agreement applies recursively (cp. Michaelis, Kracht, 1997): (94) [keba-] [mam-isa 3-is-a da c’mid-isa sul-isa-j] (OG) [praise-Nom] [father-Gen son-Gen and holy-Gen spirit-Gen-Nom] ‘the praise of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost’

(95) xuro-isa-j iga 3e-j (Matthew 13,53) (OG) carpenter-Gen-Nom that(Nom) son-Nom ‘the carpenter’s son’

This type of agreement applies recursively (cp. Michaelis, Kracht, 1997):

(96) [q’ovel-i iga sisxl-i] [saxl-isa-j m-is] [Saul-is-isa-j] (2Reg 16,8) (OG) [all-Nom that(Nom) blood-Nom] [house-Gen-Nom that-Gen] [Saul-Gen-Gen-Nom] ‘all the blood of the house of Saul’

In the modern Kartvelian languages, this type of agreement is very rare and has an archaic flavour. However, ellipsis results in the same form (without recursiveness, though):

(97) v-is saxl-s e3eb? - ċem-i amxanag-isa-s (G) who-Gen house-Dat you.look.for.it? - my-“Geņ”-Dat comrade-Gen-Dat ‘Whose house are you seeking? - That of my comrade.’

Elliptic forms with the dative have a locative meaning (see 5.1.4b): megobr-isa-s friend-Gen-Dat ‘at my friend’s [sc. home]’.

5.1.4. Function of case

All Georgian cases are “grammatical” in the sense that in at least some of their uses they alternate with each other according to their syntactic environment. Ergative, nominative and dative alternate with each other in their subject functions, and nominative and dative in their object functions (5.2.3c.-d.). As in other languages, the genitive is the counterpart of subject and object case marking in adnominal position. The adverbial is related to e.g. predicative (subject complement) nominatives: p’ropesor-ad danišnes professor-Adv they.appointed.him ‘they appointed him/her as a professor’ is related to the result: p’ropesor-i-a professor-Nom-is ‘s/he is a professor’. Similarly, the instrumental in (16) is related to (98):

(98) 3ma da mis-i col-švil-i agarak’ze gavist’umre (G) brother.Nom and his-Nom wife-child-Nom villa-on I.sent.them ‘I sent my brother his wife and his child(ren) to the resort’

The Old Georgian absolutive mostly had a predicative function, as in (92) and

---

37 Studies of case functions in Old Georgian are Vogt (1948) and I. Imnaišvili (1957).
In addition, all cases except the ergative have adverbial functions:

a. The **nominative** has a temporal sense in: *sam-i dʰe-Ø imušava three-Nom day-Nom s/he.worked ‘s/he worked for three days’.

b. The **dative** has temporal uses: dʰe-s dila-s gelodebodi day-Dat morning-Dat I.waited.for.you(Impf) ‘this (lit. “(to)day”) morning I waited for you’, *mtel-Ø dila-s vimušave* whole-Dat morning-Dat I.worked(Aor) ‘I worked the whole morning’. In Old Georgian, the dative also had a locative meaning: *Ierusalim-s ‘in Jerusalem’*.

c. Apart from subjective, objective and complement uses (*maimun-is msgavs-i ape-Gen similar-Nom ‘similar to an ape’, maimun-is mešinia ‘I am afraid of the ape’), the **genitive** has a whole range of attributive meanings: possession (*megobr-is saxl-i friend-Gen house-Nom*), material (*x-is saxl-i wood-Gen house-Nom ‘a wooden house’), age (*sam-i c’l-is bavšv-i three-Gen year-Gen child-Nom ‘a child three years old’), etc.

d. The **instrumental** designates instrument (*p’ur-s dan-it č’rian bread-Dat knife-Instr they.cut.it*; cp. (184)), accompaniment (see (16)) and related notions (*siamovneb-it movida* pleasure-Instr *s/he.came, etc.*), path (*am gz-it this(ObI) way-Instr ‘by/in this way’, *mosk’ov-it ‘(passing) by Moscow’*), ablative (as in (40)), directional location (*agmosavlet-it ‘in/to the East’, *ik-it there-Instr ‘in that direction’, time (*dil-it ‘in/during the morning, mornings’), duration (*ramden-i xn-it how.much-‘Instr’ time-Instr ‘for how long’), difference in comparative constructions (*or-i c’l-it umcros-i two-‘Instr’ year-Instr younger-Nom ‘two years younger’), respect:

(101) silamaz-it mze-s ecileboda (*Ghlont’i, 1974: 21*) beauty-Instr sun-Dat she.competed.with.it ‘she rivalled the sun in beauty’

e. The **adverbial** has an essive or transformative meaning (*Vogt, 1971 § 1.89; cp. (158)–(162)):

(102) a. mas’c’avl-leb-ad mušaobs (G) teacher-Adv s/he.works ‘s/he works as a teacher (e.g. temporarily)’
b. abxz-i kal-i col-ad hq’avs (G) Abkhaz-Nom woman-Nom wife-Adv he.has.her ‘he has an Abkhaz wife [lit. “an Abkhaz woman as wife”]’
c. ma-s megobr-ad vtvl (G) s/he-Dat friend-Adv I.count.him/her ‘I consider him/her my friend’
d. nac’vnebss gvirgv-in-ad ik’ravda tav-ze (G) plaits crown-Adv she.plaited.them head-on ‘she plaited her locks into a crown on her head’
Adverbials of adjectives are manner adverbials (Gabunia, 1993):

(103)  
   a. k’arg-ad mušaobs  (G) good-Adv s/he.works ‘s/he works well’  
   b. k’arg-ad var    (G)  ‘I am well’  

5.2. Structure of the clause

5.2.1. Preliminaries and miscellaneous matters

a. Because of phenomena such as inversion (3.2.6) and causatives (4.3), it is necessary to distinguish between the concepts of morphological subjects and objects (3.2.2) and subject and object on a deeper level of description. In the latter sense, subjects in this sketch correspond to what Dixon (1994) calls A and S, and objects correspond to the concept of O. That is, they designate combinations of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties of noun phrases the convergence of which give them a primehood status.  

b. If we disregard ellipsis, gapping and the like, every Georgian clause has a finite verb and a morphological subject. Non-finite verbs are verbal nouns or participles (3.2.8); there are no gerunds, converbs or the like.

c. Georgian tends to maximise the number of objects coded in the verb: beneficiaries (“for somebody”) and locatives (“near or on somebody”; see 3.2.5) can be indirect objects, and “instrument” body parts, etc. are available for direct objects, as in (64) and:

(104)  
   man cxen-s mat’rax-i da-h-k’ra    (G)  
   s/he(Erg) horse-Dat whip-Nom Prev-3IO-s/he.hit.it(Aor)  
   ‘s/he hit the horse with his/her whip’.

(105)  
   ga-Ō-u-št’era tval-eb-i    (G)  
   Prev-3IO-OV-s/he.stared.them(Aor) eye-Pl-Nom  
   ‘s/he stared at him/her with his/her eyes’

However, this tendency has its problems. The morphological problem is that (mostly) only one slot is available for subject and object markers. One strategy to overcome this problem is to transpose objects into forms that are not marked in the verb (3rd person direct objects; see 5.2.2a). The syntactic problem is that valency-increasing forms (causatives (4.3) and optional beneficiaries, etc. (3.2.5)) produce additional indirect objects that need to be distinct from “initial” ones. In most cases, the solution is change of status (5.2.2b).

In addition, secondary predicates and comitatives are linked with subjects and objects by case agreement or an “is a”-relation (5.2.5).

d. Normally, finite verbs are minimal clauses; “pro-drop” is always possible. But emphasis and contrast require explicit pronouns:

\[(106)\]
\[
\text{datik’o...rom ar dabrundes, ſen ras izam? (G)}
\]
\[
\text{Datiko...Sub not he.might.return, you what you.will.do.it}
\]
\[
\text{‘If Datiko will not return, what will you do?’}.
\]

e. There are some cases of lexically generic subjects, as in:

\[(107)\]
\[
\text{k’ac-ma ſeižleba ipikros}
\]
\[
\text{man-Erg it.is.possible he.may.think ‘one might think’}.
\]

3rd person subjects need not be definite in conditional contexts, and verb-internal objects need not be anaphoric (Boeder, 2002a: 92–93):

\[(108)\]
\[
\text{tu ecodineba, imas ecodineba bat’is garemoeba (Ghlont’i 1974: 60) (G)}
\]
\[
\text{if s/he.will.know.it, he he.will.know.it goose-Gen whereabout}
\]
\[
\text{‘if anyone knows, he will know where the goose is’}
\]

\[(109)\]
\[
\text{romel-i x-e-ʒieb-n p’ov-i-s (Matthew 7,8) (OG)}
\]
\[
\text{who- Nom 3IO-EV-seek-Iterative(Pres), 3SgS find-Iterative(Aor)-3SgS}
\]
\[
\text{‘he who seeketh [sc. something] findeth [sc. it’}
\]

Notice the unexpressed indefinite subject in modal clauses with G net’av ‘if only’ (Hewitt, 1995: 92; Suxisvili to appear): net’av mi-s-ca if.only Prev-3IO-give(Aorist)-3SgS ‘if only [somebody] gave it to him/her; if only s/he were given . . .’, net’av m-a-čven-a if.only 1O-Version-show-3SgS ‘if only I were given, if only I could see it’.

f. The copula is obligatory: lamaz-i x-ar beautiful-Nom 2S-be ‘you are beautiful’, lamaz-i ar-i-s beautiful-Nom be-TS-2Sg/lamazi-a beautiful-Nom-is ‘s/he is beautiful’ (cp. (103b)). There are different verbs for “to have” (with inversion; 3.2.6), particularly in Mingrelian and Svan (Boeder, 1980). Some supply copulas with indirect objects (A. K’iziria, 1982: 122). Semantically they differ according to syntactic and semantic features, e.g. animacy, as in (110) vs. (111):

\[(110)\]
\[
\text{oğați k’arg-ad m-q’av-s (G)}
\]
\[
\text{family good-Adv 10-have-3SgS ‘my family is well’,}
\]

\[(111)\]
\[
\text{tvalebi cisperi φ-a-kv-s (G)}
\]
\[
\text{eyes heaven.coloured 3IO-have-3SgS ‘s/he has blue eyes; her eyes are blue’}.
\]

g. There are cleft sentences:\(^{39}\)

\(^{39}\) On clefts in Mingrelian and Laz, see Harris (1993).
5.2.2. Alignment of pronominal expression and syntactic status

There are some processes in which verb-internal and verb-external form interact.

a. Alignment of pronominal expression: the dummy head noun (Harris, 1981, Chap. 3 and 14; Boeder, 1989a, 2002a)

With the exception of 3rd person direct objects and under specific conditions, all arguments (subjects and objects) of a verb can be marked in the Kartvelian verb. But their presence varies according to morphological rules: some are explicitly coded, and some are suppressed (3.2.2), but syntactically present (‘active’); some other arguments, and non-arguments, cannot be marked in the verb. It is the last group that triggers a particular verb-external construction: a dummy head noun ‘head’ plus appropriate possessive pronoun (G šen- tav- ‘your- head’ instead of šen ‘you’, etc.):

(112) amistvis aris, rom rok’aps ... gaecineba (Bleichsteiner 1919: 28)  (G)
      therefore it.is, Sub witch ... he.must.laugh
      ‘This is why the witch must laugh’;

(113) ori dže-a, rac pex-ze davdeki  (G)
      two day-it.is, what foot-on I.stood
      ‘It is two days that I have recovered’.

where ‘because of yourself’ has no counterpart in the verb mogiva ‘it happens to you’. The general rule is: nominals (pronouns and nouns) that cannot be coded in the verb must be either zero pronouns (‘pro drop’; see 5.2.1d) or coded as verb-external, case-marked noun phrases. However, 1st, 2nd, reflexive and intensified pronouns cannot be case-marked heads; therefore, they appear as possessive pronoun determiners of the dummy head noun ‘head’. (For possessives with zero head nouns see 3.1.3b)

There are three instances where these conditions are met:

I. The pronoun is not an argument but some adverbial expression as in (114) or in the vocative:

(114) rac mogiva dav-ita-o, q’vela šeni tav-ita-o (proverb)  (G)
      whatever it.happens.to.you dispute-Instr-Quot, all your head-Instr-Quot
      ‘whatever happens to you by dispute, it all happens to you by/because of yourself, it is said’

(Addresses or calls like šen ‘you!’ instead of *šen-o tav-o! may be an exception.) Notice that sabralo ēven-o tav-o is a normal noun phrase with an adjective modifier, and “head” is not a pronoun. “Head” could be pluralised and have number agreement in Old Georgian (116), but grammaticalisation has led to an exclusion of the plural in
Modern Kartvelian (Amiridze and Leuschner, 2002: 268): the Modern Georgian form would be tkven-i tav-i instead of: tav-n-i tkven-n-i:


II. The argumental pronoun cannot be coded in the verb because of the morphosyntactic slot filling constraint (3.2.2f.III.), e.g. in:

(117) a-m-i-zarda šeni tav-i (G) ‘s/he raised you for me’

The slot is filled with a 1st person indirect object marker m-, therefore the direct object “you” cannot be marked in the verb and occurs as “your head”. Cp.

(118) yertem m-a-c’vën-a-s švidebd isgvej txvim (Šaniže - Topuria (edd.) 1939: 47,3) (Sv) God.Erg 1O-Version-see-Opt-3SgS peacefully your head.Nom ‘May God let me see you in peace!’

Similarly, in causative constructions (4.3b):

(119) ʒa eser xäjsenävne txvim-s [sc. davär-s] (A. Saniže et al. (edd.) 1978; 162,30) (Sv) he,Nom Quot 3IO.Version.kill.Caus.Fut head-Dat [sc. dev.Pl-Dat] (semi-indirect speech; 5.5.6) ‘[Sosruq said:] I will make the devs [fabulous giants] kill me’

(120) ʒ’čser čva-x-ašg-un-i txum (Šaniže - Topuria (edd.) 1939: 250,33) (Sv) she.Nom Quot Prev-3IO-milk-Caus-Fut.3SgS head.Dat ‘I will let you milk me (says the hind)’

(121) g-a-k’vl-evin-eb čem-s tav-s (G) ‘I make you kill me’

In the last example, the direct object “me” must be “my head” because the object marker position is filled with the indirect object marker g- ‘you’ for the causee (4.3).

Notice that the purely morphological sequence constraint (3.2.2f.I.) has no syntactic consequence at all; although v- is suppressed, g-a-k’vl-evin-eb behaves as if the “complete” form *v-g-a-k’vl-evin-eb were there (i.e. “my head” is not used as a subject noun phrase).

III. The argumental pronoun cannot be coded in the verb because no appropriate marker is available:
First, direct object reflexives and non-specified indirect object reflexives (3.2.2d) are not just Ø like the reflexive indirect object markers for specified indirect objects (Table 5): they do not exist (3.2.2f.III.). Therefore they must be determiners of the dummy noun “head”:

(122) xākx miča txum (Šanițe - Topuria (edd. ) 1939: 393,19) (Sv)
    he.said.to.him his head.Dat
    ‘he said to himself’

(123) ečka ser mij txum xv-i-dgari (Šanițe - Topuria (edd. ) 1939: 379,2) (Sv)
    then more I.too head.Dat 1S-SV-kill
    ‘then I will kill myself, too’

(The possessive “my” of “my head” is normally deleted under identity with the subject of the clause.)

Notice that “head” is also used in expressions of reciprocity:

(124) aljär-dī čvatirx ušxvāre txvim (Šanițe - Topuria (edd. ) 1939: 260,14) (Sv)
    they-Erg.too they.recognised each.other.Gen head.Nom
    ‘they recognised each other, too’

Second, as the person markers in the verb are non-emphatic, the construction with “head” supplies an emphatic variant for all three persons:

(125) čem-s tav-s v-u-k’rep (G)
    ‘(For whom do you pick the apple?) I pick it for myself!’

(126) čem-ma tav-ma m-aiʃula me (Asatiani 1982: 89) (G)
    my-Erg head-Erg 1O-it.forced me ‘It was me who forced myself’

b. Alignment of syntactic status (termhood)

When a derived indirect object co-occurs with an “initial” indirect object, the latter tends to loose its object status (and become a non-term in the sense of Relational Grammar; see Harris, 1985 Ch. 11): it becomes marked by a postposition or a local case, and it is “un terme nominal en dehors du noyau” (Vogt, 1971: 131). This change of status is a consequence of the slot-filling constraint of the verb (3.2.2f.III.; see I.–III. below) and of a relational marking constraint in noun phrases (5.1.1c; see IV. below). In Modern Georgian, the postposition -tvis ‘for’ is normally used to mark the “initial” indirect object, in Mingrelian and Laz the allative (Harris, 1985: 238–240), and in Svan the postposition -d ‘for’ (mostly governing the genitive).
I. Alignment of case (inversion, 5.2.3d) is required where the subject of transitive verbs in the perfect series becomes an indirect object, and a co-occurring indirect object must lose its status:

(127) megobar-s p’asux-i mi-Ø-u-c’er-i-a vekil-is-tvis (G)
friend-Dat answer Prev-3IO-OV-write-PM-3SgS lawyer-for
‘a friend has written the answer to the lawyer’.

(128) dēmšāš-d lohodax i alas rokv immār lahvedna? (Šaniže - Topuria (edd.) 1939: 333,29) (Sv)
nobody.Gen-for he.has.given.her.to.them and this.Dat how would.he.give.her.to.
him ‘if he has not given her to anybody, why should he give her to this one?’

II. The dative causee with causatives (4.3; Harris, 1981, Chap. 5) is similar to the dative argument occurring with perfect series verbs: both are underlying subjects. This shared property may be responsible for their similar coding. Starting from a basic clause (129) we get a causative construction like (130) (cp. Vogt, 1971: 131):

(129) megobar-ma vekil-s p’asux-i mi-s-c’er-a (G)
friend-Erg lawyer-Dat answer-Nom Prev-3IO-write-3SgS
‘my friend wrote(Aor) an answer to the lawyer’

(130) man megobar-s p’asuxi mi-a-c’er-in-a vekil-is-tvis (G)
s/he(Erg) friend-Dat answer-Nom Prev-Version-write-Caus-3SgS(Aor) lawyer-
Gen-for ‘s/he made(Aor) a friend write an answer to the lawyer’

However, an alternative coding by the dative is also possible:

(131) kal-s ar mi-g-a-cem-in-eb-t Teimuraz-s (Kartuli enis ganmart’ebiti leksik’oni s.v. miaceminebs; Vogt 1971: 130) (G)
woman-Dat not Prev-2O-Version-give-Caus-CausTS-PIO Teimuraz-Dat
‘I will not let you give the young woman to Teimuraz’

and both forms are acceptable in:

(132) mi-g-i-šver-in-e (me Šen) ʒoξ-i mçqems-s xbo-s-tvis / xbo-s (A. Arabuli apud Boeder 2002a: 96 note 22)) (Khevsur, Georgian dialect)
Prev-2O-OV-hold.out-Caus-PM (I you) stick-Nom sheperd-Dat calf-Gen-for / calf-
Dat
‘I made the shepherd hold out the stick at your calf’

These quadrivalent constructions are rare and difficult to elicit: they are “en dehors du système” (Vogt, 1971: 130). But they do occur (Šaniže, 1973, § 402; Vogt, 1971: 130), particularly if one of the indirect objects has no verb-external expression: it is either marked in the verb only or it is left unspecified, as in:
III. Obligatory indirect objects that lose their status in the presence of an additional specified (beneficiary) indirect object (as in: “to give something to someone for (in the interest of) somebody”) are again not easy to elicit. But the following example exhibits the usual form (allative in Mingrelian) where the presence of the specified indirect object in the verb follows the slot filling hierarchy (3.2.2f.IV.):

(134) sumoneči ʒori-š xarga orko do varčxili ki-me-m-i-č-i-t te-ša (Xubua 1937: 18,30) (M) sixty mule-Gen load.Nom gold.Nom and silver.Nom Prev-Prev-1O-OV-give-PM-3SPI he-All
  ‘On my instruction (“for me”) give him a load of gold and silver such as sixty mules are able to carry’

IV. With verbal nouns and participles, subjects and direct objects can be coded by the genitive. Indirect objects are raised into the matrix clause and either become its derived indirect object (5.5.7a) or are regularly marked by –tvīs in Georgian:

(135) bat’-is-tvīs top-is srola-Ø daic’q’o (G)
    goose-Gen-for gun-Gen shooting-Nom s/he.began.it
    ‘s/he began to shoot at the goose’

5.2.3. Alignment of case

a. The Kartvelian languages are traditionally classified as “ergative languages” because direct objects of transitive verbs of the aorist series bear the nominative case-marking found in (most) intransitive verb subjects, the agent being marked by the ergative (or “narrative”, a calque of the native grammatical term motxrobītī):

(136) bavšv-i pex-ze i-dg-a (G)
    child-Nom foot-on Version-stand-3SgS(Aor)
    ‘the child stood on his feet’

(137) kal-ma bavšv-i a-a-q’en-a (G)
    woman-Erg child-Nom Prev-Version-raise-3SgS(Aor)
    ‘the woman raised(Aor) the child’

---

40 For some aspects of “ergativity” in Kartvelian, see Boeder (1979), Saxokija (1985), King (1994), Hewitt (1987b) and the literature of the active/un-accusative controversy mentioned below.—For actant-marking in Laz, see Lüders (1992), Kutscher (2001).
As so many ergative languages, Georgian is syntactically non-ergative:

(138) kal-ma bavšv-i aaq’ena da daeca ʒirs  (G)
      woman-Erg child-Nom she.raised.him and s/he.fell.down to.earth
      ‘the woman raised the child and fell down’

can only mean that the woman fell down, and not the child (although “fell down” requires a nominative, not an ergative subject).—Notice that there are many phenomena pointing to an identification of S and P (in the sense of Dixon, 1994), particularly in Old Georgian.41

b. Some authors prefer to call the Kartvelian languages “accusative” or “active languages”.42

The following arguments may be advanced in this connection:

(1) Medioactives and some other intransitive verbs have an ergative-marked subject with aorist-series verbs (see 3.2.3c).
(2) Verbal person marking follows the nominative-accusative pattern:

(139) şec’uxebul-i pex-ze v-ideki  (G)
      sorry-Nom foot-on I.stood
      ‘Upset I stood on my feet’

(140) şec’uxebul-ma bavšv-i a-v-aq’ene  (G)
      sorry-Erg child-Nom Lraised.him
      ‘Upset I raised(Aor) the child’

(141) şec’uxebul-ma v-i-t’ir-e  (G)
      sorry-Erg 1S-Version-weep-Aor
      ‘Upset I wept’

where the verbal subject-marker v- is indiscriminately linked with either a nominative or an ergative phrase. Similarly, an object marker is indiscriminately linked with either a nominative or a dative phrase:

(142) man şec’uxebul-i a-m-a-q’en-a  (G)
      s/he(Erg) sorry-Nom Prev-1O-Version-raise-3SgS
      ‘s/he set (Aor) me on my feet, (who was) upset’

(143) is şec’uxebul-s a-m-a-q’en-eb-s  (G)
      s/he(Nom) sorry-Dat Prev-1O-raise-TS-3SgS
      ‘s/he will set me on my feet, upset’

41 The arguments are discussed in Boeder (1979); for a different view see Harris (1985).
42 Klimov (1977); see also Harris (1985, 1995) diagnoses an ergative to active change.
Notice that the linking of e.g. the adjective phrase šec’uxebul-ma with the first person subject marker v- does not imply, that it is a first person phrase (Boeder, 1989a: 178).

(3) The ergative occurs with aorist series verbs only (“split ergativity”; see the last two sentences above).

The “unaccusative” hypothesis for Georgian has provoked a heated and ongoing debate,43 which is riddled with theoretical and empirical problems. One interpretation of the ergative with intransitive verbs is suppression (or loss) of a direct object (Deeters, 1930: 85, 97–98; Hewitt, 1987a; Lazard, 1995; Suxišvili 1986 and to appear), but the theoretical status of different kinds of ellipsis is not always clear. Similarly, if we accept the “unaccusative hypothesis”, what kind of verb class shall we assume that shows this phenomenon: what is the theoretical status of a “strong tendency” (Holisky, 1981a: 119) in morphology and lexicon? And if the semantically based concept of “activity” is used as an explanation, how is it related to the general tendency to expand the use of the ergative (its generalisation in Mingrelian and Laz; see c. below), but also in second language acquisition (Boeder, 1979: 468)? And finally, we lack a variational study of ergative marking in the Georgian dialects, where it cannot be related to “activity” (e.g. with verbs such as “to die”; Boeder, 1979: 463–469).

c. Disregarding inversion and the presence or absence of objects with particular verb groups, we may chart the case marking distribution of Georgian and Svan as in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment of case with present and aorist series verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With transitive (“active”) or medioactive verbs in the aorist series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere (with non medioactive intransitives and with present series verb forms)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. With forms of the perfect series, case marking is again different (see Table 9 and 3.2.6d; 5.2.2b.I.): subjects are in the dative with transitive (“active”; 3.2.3c) verbs (as in (127), (128), (144)) and “medioactives” (as in (145)), but in the nominative elsewhere (as in (146)).

---

44 For a short survey including variation in Georgian dialects see Boeder (1979).
But in contrast with the present and aorist series verbs, dative subjects have some morphological indirect object properties (being coded by indirect object verbal person markers in the verb), and nominative direct objects have some morphological subject properties (being coded by verbal subject person markers in the verb; see 3.2.1d; 3.2.2e.; 3.2.6a).

5.2.4. Agreement

a. The verb agrees with subjects and objects in the sense that verbal person markers are linked with subject and object noun phrases by a co-reference relation.45 But this kind of agreement is not the result of person copying:

(144) kal-s bavšv-i a-Ø-u-q’en-eb-i-a (G)
woman-Dat child-Nom Prev-3IO-Version-raise-TS-PM-3SgS
‘the woman has obviously set the child on his feet’

(145) bavšv-s Ø-u-t’ir-i-a (G)
child-Dat 3IO-Version-weep-PM-3SgS
‘the child has obviously wept’.

(146) bavšv-i pex-ze mdgar-a (G)
child-Nom foot-on stand(Part)-3SgS
‘the child has obviously stood on his feet’

But in contrast with the present and aorist series verbs, dative subjects have some morphological indirect object properties (being coded by indirect object verbal person markers in the verb), and nominative direct objects have some morphological subject properties (being coded by verbal subject person markers in the verb; see 3.2.1d; 3.2.2e.; 3.2.6a).

5.2.4. Agreement

a. The verb agrees with subjects and objects in the sense that verbal person markers are linked with subject and object noun phrases by a co-reference relation.45 But this kind of agreement is not the result of person copying:

(147) če-m-žđved baba-s (Šaniže - Topuria (edd.) 1939: 65,34) (Sv)
Prev-1Q-believe(Imp) father-Dat
‘believe me(,) your father’

(148) a. vi-n icnob-t Solo-s ? (M. žavaxišvili) (G)
who-Erg you.know.him-Pl(S) Solo-Dat
‘who of you knows Solo?’

b. sam-ta-gan ert-i še-u-val-t, sxva garet v-s-cem-d-e-t gar-eb-sa (Rustaveli)
three-PIOb1-from one-Nom Prev-3IO.OV-go-Pl outside 1S-3IO-give-EM-PM-SPI outsider-Pl-Dat
‘three men hold a council of war:] One of the three [of us] will go in[to the inner part of their fortress], the others outside will strike those who are outside’ (lit. ‘we will go ...we will strike...’)

45 For object agreement see Vamling (1988); for a generative approach to agreement see Nash-Haran (1992).
These are cases of disagreement in person and number: *baba* in (147), *vin* in (148)
a. and *erti* in (148) b. are 3rd person noun phrases contracting a partitive co-reference
relation with the 1st and 2nd person verbal subject markers of the verbs, and the
singular subject noun phrase “disagrees” with a verbal plural marker in (148) a. and b.
(Boeder, 1989a: 178). - In addition, verbal and nominal semantic number choices are
sometimes independent of each other, for instance in cases of number suppletion
(3.2.2g):

(149) a. tkven zi-x-ar-t (G)
you sit(Sg)-2S-be-Pl ‘you(Sg) are sitting(Sg)’
b. tkven sxed-x-ar-t (G)
you(Pl) sit(Pl)-2S-be-Pl ‘you(Pl) are sitting’

where the polite plural *tkven ‘you.Pl’* in a. triggers a plural subject marker –*t*, but the
“singular” verb root *zi* in *zi-xar-t*, and not the “plural” (“collective”) verb root *sxed-
(as in b.).

Notice that personal pronouns are copies of verb-internal person markers (rather
than the other way round), since the latter are richer in their feature composition; they
code a subject-object opposition, whereas verb-external pronouns do not (3.1.3b.).
Similarly, Old Georgian sometimes had verbal number marking where the external
noun phrase did not:

(150) 3ir ara da-e-b-n-es (Mark 4,6) (OG)
root-Ø not Prev-EV-bind-Pl-3SPl(Aor) ‘they had no roots’.

b. In modern Kartvelian, number agreement does not simply mark a structural
relationship. In general, it is subject to some semantic restrictions: it is obligatory
with 1st and 2nd person objects:

(151) mi-g-q’id-a-t (G)
Prev-2O-sell-3SgS-PIO ‘s/he sold you (DO Pl) to him/her/them’

(152) mo-g-c’er-a-t (G)
Prev-2O-write-3SgS-PIO ‘s/he wrote it to you (IO Pl)’

and with animate subjects, whatever their case-marking.

Number agreement is rare with 3rd person indirect objects of transitive verbs, but usual
with intransitive verbs (K’vač’aże, 1996: 110):
Preverbal position of the indirect object seems to favour verbal plural marking; compare the underlying subject of indirect verbs (3.2.6a; Tuite, 1998: 134–135):

According to Tschenkéli (1958: 488), b. has the sense of: “The policemen had the misfortune to have the thief escape them” (they are “affected” by the fact; see however Tuite, 1998: 124). – Agreement of predicative nominals shows much variation (K’vač’aże, 1996: 124–131): Old Georgian often had no agreement (see (100), and Western Kartvelian tends to have neither (K’vač’aże, 1996: 126). In Modern Standard Georgian, nouniness seems to matter (participles mostly seem not to agree, adjectives do or do not, nouns normally do).

5.2.5. Adjuncts

Most adverbial relations are coded by adpositions (3.1.1g.) or cases (5.1.4). Some secondary predicates agree with their controller in case:

(155) mšier-i uk’etes-ad mušaobs (G)
      hungry-Nom better-Adv s/he.works
      ‘he works better hungry’

(156) dedeb-ma bavšveb-i mšier-i daac’vines (G)
      mothers-Erg children-Nom hungry-Nom they.put.them.to.bed
      ‘the mothers put their children to bed hungry’

(157) 16 c’l-isam daamıtrva gimnazia (G)
      16 year-Gen-Erg he.completed.it gymnasium(Nom)
      ‘He graduated from a secondary school at the age of 16 years’

(Examples with adjunct participles: (85) and (231).) Comitative relations are sometimes expressed by derivations with -ian ‘having’ in the adverbial (5.1.4e), thus establishing a
temporary “is a”-relation with the subject or object of the clause which contrasts with the more permanent attributive relation:

(158)  

a. movida cxen-ian-i k’ac-i  
he.came horse-Poss.Suffix-Nom man-Nom  
‘a horse-owning man came; a man came on horseback’ vs.

b. cxen-ian-ad movida (G) horse-Poss.Suffix ‘he came with a horse’

(159) am ʒroxa-s tavis xbo-ian-ad dagit’oveb (Vogt 1971 § 1.91, from a fairy tale) (G)  
this cow-Dat its.own calf-Poss.Suffix-Adv I.will.leave.it.to.you  
‘I’ll leave you the cow with its calf’ (cp. 4.1.1b)

The same holds for its negative counterpart u-____-o-d (4.1.1c):

(160) u-šen-o-d cxovreba ar šemižlia (Bleichsteiner 1919: 120) (G)  
Neg-you-Suffix-Adv living not I.can ‘without you I cannot live’

(161) u-p’arxl-is saxareb-o-da-c cxadia (apud Šaniže 1973 § 177) (G)  
Neg-P’arxali-Gen gospel-Suffix-Adv-too it.is.clear  
‘it is obvious even without the gospel from Parkhalí’

(162) hk’itxa mamida-m tav-a-u-γeb-l-ad  
she.asked.him aunt-Erg head-Prev-Neg-take-TS-Part-Adv  
‘the aunt asked without lifting her head’

The semantics of adverbials is often included in the semantics of verbs; Georgian is a “satellite-framed” type of language (in the sense of L. Talmy and D. I. Slobin): mi-t’ir-i-s Prev-weep-TS-3SgS ‘s/he goes (there) weeping’ (Boeder, 1992: 382).

5.3. Major clause types

5.3.1. Affirmative declarative: unmarked order of major constituents

The order of constituents in the clause (Vogt, 1974; Apridoniże, 1986; Testelec, 1997; Harris, 2000) is free in the sense that—if phonological, morphological (heavy constituents), contextual and communicative factors are not taken into account - major constituents may occur in any order. (For elisis see 2.5.) There is, however, a statistical prevalence of the verb to be clause-final in short sentences of 2-4 constituents (3 is by far the most frequent number; Apridoniże, 1986). The unmarked order seems to be subject - object- verb.

Adverbial constituents occur mainly on the periphery. In longer sentences with a central position of the verb the first clausal constituent and/or the verb tend to be followed by a short pause (Apridoniže, 1986: 16). Sentence-initial verbs can have an presentative character: movida k’aci he.came man ‘there came a man’.
5.3.2. Negation

Negation occurs immediately before the verb (Vogt, 1971, §§ 2.201–2.202, 208; Harris, 1984). In Georgian, there are three forms of clausal negation: nu mainly with present series imperatives (163) (Vogt, 1971, § 2.170), ver(a) ‘not possible’ (164) (cp. (199)) and ar(a) elsewhere (165):46

(163) sxv-is amara-d parto k’arav-s nu daidgam-o (proverb) (G) other-Gen not.having-Adv big tent-Dat NegImp you.will.pitch.it-Quot ‘Don’t pitch a big tent if you have nobody else’

(164) ver moit’ans (G) NegPot s/he.will.bring.it ‘s/he cannot bring it’

(165) a. ara c’ers (G) ‘s/he does not write’, b. ar dac’eros (G) ‘s/he shall not write(Opt)’.46

In Mingrelian, a negative preverbal particle va- is used: va-m-i-čku ‘I don’t know’. The lack of an equivalent of G ver seems to be connected with the extensive use of the verbal category of the potential in Mingrelian (3.2.7).

Svan has many different forms of negation particles that only partially correspond to the Georgian system (Šaraženiže, 1946).

Multiple negation is common in Modern Georgian and its dialects, but not in classical Old Georgian, nor in the other Kartvelian languages (V. Topuria, 1924; K'vač'aže, 1996: 40):

(166) ar-c erti bednieri dye ar axsovda (G) not-too one happy day not s/he.remembered.it ‘s/he didn’t even remember one happy day’.

5.3.3. Questions

a. Yes-no questions are formed by the intonation contour of the verb (see 2.4; Tevdoraže, 1978; N. K’iziria, 1987; Harris, 1984).—Old Georgian and some other Kartvelian languages have clitic question particles following the verb and its clitics (Boeder, 1994: 463):

(167) ara me a’rantos-a santeli (Luke 15,8) (OG) not maybe she.will.light.it-IntParticle candle ‘will she not probably light a candle?’

(168) ˇhesmi-mo? (Sv) ‘do you understand?’ (cp. (37)b.)

(169) kő-mortu-o (M) ‘has s/he come?’ (Laz ko-mortu-i ‘id.’)

46 For the meaning “didn’t want to” with aorist forms see 3.2.3b.; for negative word formation see 4.1.1c.
In Modern Georgian, *xom* has the meaning of the English tag question, and occurs in preverbal position:

(170) čem-tan sakme xom ara gakvs? (N. K’iziria 1987; or: čem-tan sakme ara gakvs, xom?)  (G)
me-at matter Particle not you.have.it
‘You don’t have any business with me, do you?’

There are similar particles in the other Kartvelian languages.

b. In Modern Georgian, content questions have interrogatives in preverbal position (before negation, like *xom* in yes-no-questions; Vogt, 1971 § 2.208; Harris, 1984) and form one tone unit with it (N. K’iziria, 1987: 45):

(171) c’l-is bolo-mde ra p’iroba-s i-3lev-i (Ghlont’i 1974: 47)  (G)
year-Gen end-until what condition-Dat Version-give-PM
‘What conditions do you give until the end of the year?’

c. In Georgian, alternative questions (Vogt, 1971 § 2.192; Harris, 1984: 74) require *tu* (which also introduces indirect questions (218) and conditional clauses (188)):

(172) važi eq’ola tu kali?  (G)
boy she.has.borne.him or girl
‘Has she given birth to a boy or a girl?’

d. Echo questions repeat the question with the appropriate person switch and then give the answer:

(173) saidan modixar ? - saidan movdivar da, saikio-dan movdivar (G. Imnaišvili 1974: 51) (G) from.where you.come - from.where I.come and other.world-from I.come
‘From where do you come? - From the otherworld, of course!’

5.4. Coordination

Mostly the same conjunctions are used for phrasal and clausal coordination.47

5.4.1. Coordination of phrases

G *da* ‘and’: *me da šen* ‘I and you’; *an(da), gind ‘or’: *me anda šen* ‘I or you’; *an šen anda me* [lit.: or you or me], *gind šen gind me* ‘either you or me’. G -c ‘too’ may underline coordination: *col-ma-ca da kmar-ma-c* wife-Erg-too and husband-Erg-too ‘both wife and husband’; any verbs and nouns can be coordinated by asyndesis:

In Old Georgian and Svan, the hierarchy of phrasal coordination tends to be “flattened” by postposing the second conjunct:

5.4.2. Coordination of clauses (Vogt, 1971, § 2.191)

a. Coordinating conjunctions normally belong to the preceding tone unit (Tevdoraze, 1978: 46, N. K’iziria, 1987: 58, see (177), (179) and (180)), or the conjunction is a unit of its own (178):

(177) k’aci c’avida, xolo | kali darča  (G)
man he.went.away, but | woman she.stayed
‘the man went away, but the woman stayed’

(178) k’aci c’avida, | xolo | kali darča  (G)

(179) skani osuri vešona vara, ... didi zarali migac’amin (Xubua 1937: 17,18-19)  (M)
your wife, Nom do.not.take.here there otherwise | ... great damage it.will.be.given.
to.you ‘Do not take your wife there, otherwise you will have great trouble.’

(180) daič’eka topma dabla, da | ma’yla korma šeiprxiala  (G)
it.crashed gun below, and above hawk it.fluttered.up
‘there was the thunder of a gun below, and a hawk fluttered up above’

The non-symmetric, cataphoric character of da (pointing to the following clause) does not require that the coordinated clauses are of the same type (Boeder, 1983: 304):

(181) ucxo mxare-s mivdivar da ra mogit’anot (Ghlont’i 1974: 30)  (G)
foreign area-Dat I.go.there and what I.shall.bring.you
‘I am going to leave for a foreign country, (so) what shall I bring you?’
As in many other languages, “and” also marks protases with conditional meaning:

\[ \text{şen zurg-ze magrad şemažeki da me naxt’oms vizam (Bleichsteiner 1919: 98)} \] (G)
you back-on strongly sit.on.me and I leap I.will.make
‘Sit firmly on my back, and I will leap / If you sit..., I will ...’

b. **Asyndesis** occurs both in phrasal coordination (5.4.1) and in clause coordination (Basiliaia, 1974):

\[ \text{moč’ri p’ur-sa, p’uri inteldea-o (Ghlont’i 1974: 33)} \] (G)
you.will.cut.from.it bread-Dat, bread it.will.become.complete
‘if you cut from the bread, it will become complete again’

c. Examples of conjunction reduction with **gapping** are (38) and:

\[ \text{ast ɣunex t’eboła lęišv i vokr-s şide, męaxišv i verxel-s, igvni i marglit’-år-s şide} \] (Şaniţe - Topuria (edd.) 1939: 287,9) (Sv)
they.bathe.her warm water-Instr and gold-Dat she.scatters.it, cold-Instr and silver,
she.weeps and perl-Pl-Dat she.scatters
‘when they bathe [the baby] with warm water, she scatters gold, if with cold water –
silver, if she weeps, she scatters pearls’

5.5. **Subordination**\(^{48}\)

The most important means of subordination are the general subordinators typical of Modern Kartvelian (5.5.1); relative pronouns (5.5.2); and conjunctions (5.5.3), which contrast with their absence (asyndesis: 5.5.4), exhibit a special similarity with coordinating conjunctions (5.5.5), and often introduce direct speech (5.5.6); nominalisation (5.5.7) is also used. In addition, minor forms occur such as lengthening of the last syllable in some dialects (Lomtatişe, 1946) (185), the use of an interrogative particle (186)), and even case and postpositional marking in Laz (187) (interpreted by Žikia, 1967 as a Turkish calque):

In Modern Georgian relative clauses with either a general subordinator or a relative pronoun occur on both sides of their head noun.

5.5.1. Clauses with a general subordinator

The general subordinator of Modern Kartvelian occurs in three positions: clause-initial, clause-internal, and clause-final. Clause-internal subordinators sometimes co-occur with clause-initial conjunctions:

(185) ik-it rom didi saxli-ä, ik-ši-a gogo (Gurian, Georgian dialect) there-Instr Sub big house-it.is, there-in-she.is girl ‘the big house which is in that direction, therein is a girl; in the big house which is in that direction there is a girl’

(186) mertes-o – mik’-mik’i kugurena k’ata (Xubua 1937: 15,31) (M) they.went.there-IntParticle – around they.stand people ‘when they went there, people stood around him’

(187) a. jak’ini-ša ʔidu-si (Ćikobava 1936, texts 123,17) near-Allative he.went-Dat ‘when he went near’ (Turkish: yakina gittikte)

b. geide ek’ic’k’edes-š k’ule (Ćikobava 1936: 120) back they.looked-Gen after .... ‘when they looked back’ (Turkish: geriye baktıktan sonra)

In Modern Georgian relative clauses with either a general subordinator or a relative pronoun occur on both sides of their head noun.

Clause-initial subordinators occur with all types of postposed clauses, for instance in object clauses (189), sometimes with a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun in the protasis (190):

(188) tu rom xvalamdis ver gamovrek’e, ... (Vogt 1971 § 2.188) (G) if Sub till.tomorrow NegPot I.drove.him.out ‘if I am not able to drive him out till tomorrow...’

Clause-initial subordinators occur with all types of postposed clauses, for instance in object clauses (189), sometimes with a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun in the protasis (190):

(189) naxa rom γvino a’par iq’o (G. Imnaiśvili 1974: 40) (G) s/he.saw.it Sub wine not.anymore it.was ‘s/he saw that there was no wine anymore’

(190) k’idev am-is-tvis miqu’s zapxuli rom niavi-vit tavisupali var mašin (V. Barnovi apud Ghlon’ti 1978: 146) (G) also this-Gen-for I.love.it summer Sub breeze-like free I.am then ‘This is also a reason why I like the summer because I feel free like a breeze’
Clause-internal position (Vogt, 1974) is characteristic of preposed (temporal and conditional) clauses, where the subordinator occurs after the first constituent or before (the negation plus) the verb (Vogt, 1975):

(191) kali *ro* mo ʃua xid-ze ʃedga, ʒaɾtəp’ir-eb-ma dauʒaxes (G. Imnaišvili 1974: 99) (G)
woman Sub middle bridge-on she.stood, dogfaced-Pl-Erg they.called.her
‘when the woman stood on the bridge, the dog-faced men called her’

(192) korcʼilis-tvin pʼur-is cxbas *ro* daicʼqʼeben, varcxls davdgamt (G. Imnaišvili 1974: 36) (G)
wedding-for bread-Gen baking Sub they.begin, trough we.put.it
‘when they begin to bake bread for the wedding, we shall set up the kneading-trough’

But there are examples with initial subordinators in preposed clauses (193) and with internal subordinators in post-posed clauses ((194) with an afterthought function):

(193) *ro* am adgila-s moxvalt, unda gaačerot (G. Imnaišvili 1974: 17) (G)
Sub this place-Dat you.come, it.is.necessary you.stop.it
‘when you come to this place, you must stop it [sc. the carriage]’

(194) cʼqʼals da gemos gavsinžav, mlaše *ro* ar iqʼos (G. Imnaišvili 1974: 37) (G)
water and taste I.will.try.it, bitter Sub not it.be(Opt)
‘I will try the water and the taste, thus preventing it from being bitter’

Mingrelian has a clause-final subordinator (see e.g. Hewitt, 2001):

(195) meurs šara-ša-n, kauxvd arti k’oči-k (Xubua 1937: 19,6) (M)
he.goes road-Dat-Sub, he.met.him one man-Erg
‘as he went along the road, he met a man’

Clause-internal subordinators also occur in preposed “relative clauses”, particularly in colloquial language. The relativised noun phrase is either Ø (“gap”; see (196) and (201)) or it is retained (197):

---

These constructions behave like sentence-initial temporal and conditional clauses in allowing forward and backward pronominalization (or a pro-drop “gap”). Compare (198) with its synonymous variant (199):

\text{(198)} \quad \text{rom ve'ara naxa im bič’ma taviánti t’q’ve, gaikca sopel-ši (G. Imnaiśvili 1974: 8)} \\
\text{(G)} \quad \text{Sub NegPot he.saw.him that young.man-Erg his(own) prisoner, he.fled village-in} \\
\text{‘when the young man could not see his prisoner any more, he fled to his village’}

\text{(199)} \quad \text{rom ve’ara naxa taviánti t’q’ve, is bič’-i gaikca sopel-ši} \\
\text{(G)} \quad \text{Sub NegPot he.saw.him his(own) prisoner, that young.man-Nom he.fled village-in}

Notice that these “relative clauses” need not be adjacent to their “antecedent”. The following sentence seems to be acceptable:

\text{(200)} \quad \text{maṣal k’ibe-ze, bat’on eduar-ds rom hgavda, moulodnelad is muša šemdgariq’o} \\
\text{(adapted from Ghlont’i 1978)} \quad \text{(G)} \quad \text{high ladder-on, mister Eduard-Dat Sub he.resembled.him, unexpectedly that worker he.stood} \\
\text{‘That worker who resembled Mister Eduard had stood on the high ladder unexpectedly’}

However, there are postposed “relative clauses” of this type:

\text{(201)} \quad \text{davanaxve is p’at’ara saxli irodioni rom cxovrobdra (Vogt 1975: 164)} \quad \text{(G)} \quad \text{I.made.see.him that little house Irodion Sub he.lived} \\
\text{‘I let him see the little house where (in which) Irodion used to live’}

5.5.2. Clauses with relative pronouns
In addition to general subordinators, there are relative pronouns (see 3.1.3d; Aronson, 1972), with clause-internal and clause-initial positions, the latter being obligatory in literary Georgian. (For the position of -c in (205) and (207) see 2.5.)
Retaining the relativised noun phrase (non-gap strategy) seems to be common in preposed generalizing relative clauses (207). Retaining both the relativised and the antecedent noun phrase is also possible (208):

men remote [sc. relatives] who-Rel are, those Prev they.line.up
‘those men who are remote relatives line up’

(203) arža didebul-ep-i, muši saxano-s namu-t korda-n (Xubua 1937: 16,29) (M)
all noble-Pl-Nom, his khanate-Dat who-Rel he.was-Sub
‘all noblemen who were in his khanate’

(204) is ena, romel-zeda-c ... dairīgīna rustavel-ma (G)
that tongue, which-on-Rel ... he.hummed Rustaveli-Erg (I. Čavčavaže apud Ertelišvili 1962: 47)
‘that language in which Rustaveli hummed’

(205) ševip’are erts otax-ši, [roml-is k’ar-i-c] datik’o-s otax-ši midioda (G)
I.stole.into one room-in, [wh-Gen door-Nom-Rel] Datiko-Gen room-in it.went
‘I stole into a room whose door went into Datiko’s room’

(206) [romel-i-c bat’on-i] darča, imas k’idev q’mebi hq’vda (G. İmniavšvili 1974: 85) (G)
[who-Nom-Rel lord-Nom] he.stayed, that still serfs he.had.them
‘[There were two feudal lords, one of whom had to leave.] The lord who stayed
still had serfs’

Retaining the relativised noun phrase (non-gap strategy) seems to be common in preposed generalizing relative clauses (207). Retaining both the relativised and the antecedent noun phrase is also possible (208):

(207) [romel tit-sa-c] movičër, q’vela ertnaired met’k’ineba-o (proverb) (G)
[wh finger-Dat-Particle] I.cut.it(Aor), all the.same.way they.hurt.me-Quot
‘whatever finger I cut, they will all hurt the same’

(208) dauc’q’iat sopl-eb-is ašeneba-Ø, magram im gėgm-it k’i ara, ra gėgm-ita-c mašin
q’opila (G. İmniavšvili 1974: 25) (G)
they.began.it village-Pl-Gen building-Nom, but that plan-Instr however not, what
plan-Instr-Rel then they.were(Perf) (lit. “it.was”)
‘they began to rebuild the villages, but not in conformity with the plan they
reportedly) had before’

(On “indexical” aspects of Old Georgian relative particles see Manning (1997).)

5.5.3. Conjunctional clauses
There is a large variety of conjunctions, both in Old Georgian and in Modern Kartvelian (Vogt, 1971, §§ 2.177–2.190). They are mostly derived from interrogative pronouns (cp. the interrogative strategy in (186)) or are based on some other dialogic form of adjacency pairs
They show the same positional and intonational variants as the general subordinator. Old Georgian had clause-initial conjunctions (209), but clause-final position also occurs (210):

\[(209)\] šen x-i-c-i [šen (John 21,15)] (OG) m-i-q’var šen \(\text{you 2S-Version-know-TS that 1O-Version-love you} \)
\[\text{‘you know that I love you’}\]

\[(210)\] moc’ape-ta tws-ta up’ovareba-j ixila raj, miic’ia ... (OG) his.own-PlOb1 neediness-Nom when, he.proceeded...
\[\text{‘when he saw the neediness of his disciples, he proceeded...’}\]

Modern Kartvelian has all variants, including clause-internal position:

\[(211)\] dedak’ac-s sanam kmar-i hq’avs, amirani-a, roca mouk’vdeba - amirantamiran-i -a-o (G)
\[\text{woman-Dat as long as husband-Nom she.has.him, hero-she.is, when he.dies.to.} \]
\[\text{her-hero.of.heroes-Nom-she.is-Quot} \]
\[\text{‘As long as her husband is alive, a woman is a hero, when he dies, she is a great hero.’} \]

5.5.4. Asyndetic subordination

Some types of subordination can be asyndetic (Basiliaia, 1974), particularly if the verb of the subordinated clause has dependent tense marking (212); other clauses seem to require correlative demonstratives (213):

\[(212)\] k’argi iq’o, šen-c q’opiliq’avi (G)
\[\text{good it.was, you-too you.had.been(Plpf)} \]
\[\text{‘It would have been good, if you had been there, too.’} \]

\[(213)\] kartli imitom dav’tove, tovls dadebs, ajar ariqebs (proverb) (G)
\[\text{Kartli therefore I.left.it, snow it.puts.it.down, not.anymore it.takes.it.up} \]
\[\text{‘I left Kartli, because if it snows, it will not go away’} \]

5.5.5. Protasis marking

Modern Kartvelian clause combining tends to be constructed as a protasis-apodosis structure (Boeder, 2001), with a subordinator in the final position of the protasis. In coordinated clauses this is the coordinative conjunction that belongs to the preceding clause (5.4.2a), and a similar form occurs where the apodosis is a subordinated clause: the conjunction belongs to the preceding tone unit (Tevdoraše, 1978, N. K’iziria, 1987), and thus cataphorically points to the following clause (214)–(215); alternatively, it may form a unit by itself (216):
Notice, however, that the prosodic inclusion of a ‘‘cataphoric’’ subordinator into the protasis is sensitive to clause-type: it is not possible with conditionals (which normally precede their main clause):

(214) iseti Žriamuli at’q’da rom / t’q’e zanzarebda (G) such twittering it.broke.off Sub / wood it.quaked ‘such a twittering broke out that the wood began to quake’

(215) gol xonark namuda, ate do ate xan-s nosa mo?uns ate dro-s (Xubua 1937: 14,23) (M) it.ran.forth voice that, this and this khan-Dat daughter-in-law he.her.leads.hither this time-Dat ‘A rumour was going around that this and this khan was taking a daughter-in-law at this time’

(216) man šenišna / rom / kali šemovida (G) ‘s/he noticed / that / a.woman came.in’

In indirect questions the different syntactic status of the conjunction and the interrogative pronoun is obvious:

(217) gaexardeboda / rom šesuliq’avi ma-s-tan (N. K’iziria 1987: 59) (G) s/he.would.have.been.glad / Sub you.had.entered s/he-Dat-at ‘s/he would have enjoyed it if you had paid him/her a visit’ (*gaexardeboda rom / šesuliq’avi ma-s-tan)

In indirect questions the different syntactic status of the conjunction and the interrogative pronoun is obvious:

(218) panžr-idan močanda tu / roger tovda (N. K’iziria 1987: 60) (G) window-from it.appeared if / how it.snowed ‘from the window it was visible how it was snowing’

Notice that the protasis-final marking converges with the clause-final position of Old Georgian raj (210) and Mingrelian –n (195), and also with the marking of the protasis by a correlative in the absence of a subordinator (213).

5.5.6. Reported speech

Reported speech (Hewitt, 1982b, 1995: 614–619; Čant’laže, 1998: 223–234, Boeder, 2002b) is marked by clitic quotative particles (see (37a)): G -metki (< me vtkvi ‘I said it’) for 1st person speech, -tko/-tkva (< tkva ‘you.shall.say’) for 2nd person instructions and 1st person plural speech, and -o elsewhere (or even with 2nd person speech); Svan –əξ in the sense of G metki and –tko, eser elsewhere. In colloquial Georgian speech, the quotative particle can be attached to any clause constituent (219) (cp. Manning, 1995); sometimes direct speech is introduced by a subordinator (220), which harmonises with its cataphoric, protasis-final position; cp. (220) with (215): in both, there is a possible pause after the subordinator.
Notice that this form is extensively used for subordination:

Svan reported speech normally does not occur as “direct speech”. Instead, it uses “semi-indirect speech” (Hewitt, 1982b) with person shift (as in (119): I > he; (120): I > she), except actual speech act participants (Boeder, 2002b: 28). Indicative tenses with past time reference shift to their evidential counterparts (except in 1st person speech); for the evidential imperfect see 3.2.3g). Otherwise, “semi-indirect speech” preserves direct speech properties (deictics, vocatives, interjections, etc.).

5.5.7. Nominalization

In Modern Kartvelian, masdars and participles have a nominal syntax (subjects and objects are in the genitive), but postpositional phrases can freely be added (as with verbs).

a. **Masdars** are used as complements with equi-NP deletion after verbs of wishing, daring, trying, possibility, expectation, intention, forgetting (to), advising, teaching, (dis)liking, etc., i.e. it has a potential or hypothetical meaning (223); as complements after verbs of beginning, ending and continuing (224); as complements of postpositions (225); and as complements of nouns (226):

(223) lek’vajx xoxrōlašvd usk’vi ka liyeš-s (Arsena Oniani et al. 1979: 76,33) (Sv) they.tried younger(sister).Instr apple.Gen taking.away-Dat ‘they tried to take the apple away from their younger sister’

(224) p’ur-is Ė’ama-s daudga (G) bread-Gen eating-Dat he.set.out.to it ‘he set out to eat the bread’

(225) čem-s naxva-ze isev dadumda (G) my-Dat seeing(Dat)-on again he.became.silent ‘on seeing me he became silent again’

(226) Ėamosvl-is sašualeba gyakvs (G) coming.down-Gen means(Nom) we.have.it ‘we have the possibility to come down’.
Direct object complements of masdars can be raised into the position of indirect objects in the matrix clause. In (227), the default version marker -i- of da-i-c’q’-o in a. (3.2.5f) is replaced by the appropriate objective version marker -u- specifying the raised indirect object bavšv-s ‘child’ in b.:

(227) a. bavšv-is k’ocna da-i-c’q’-o (G) >
    child-Gen kissing(Nom) Prev-SV-she.begin-3SgS(Aor)
    ‘she began to kiss the child’

b. bavšv-s da-Ø-u-c’q’-o k’ocna (G)
    child-Dat Prev-3IO-begin-3SgS(Aor) kissing.Nom
    ‘she began to kiss the child’.

(Compare bat’-s top-is srola da-u-c’q’-o ‘s/he began to shoot at the goose’ with (135).)
—Old Georgian had a specific “infinitive” construction with subject and object raising and adverbial case masdars; see e.g. Kobaidze, Vamling (1997).

b. **Participles** are used as modifiers (228) and have subjects and direct objects in the genitive/possessive:

(228) mis-i gagzavnil-i mocikuleb-i (Bleichsteiner 1919: 68) (G)
    his-Nom sent-Nom messengers-Nom
    ‘the messengers he had sent’

(229) es mepe col-is momt’acebel-i k’i dat’ova isev tavis samepoši (Bleichsteiner 1919: 70) (G)
    this(Nom) king(Nom) wife-Gen abducting-Nom but he.left.him again his kingdom.in ‘but the king, who had abducted his wife (he) left for his kingdom again’

c. Other arguments and adjuncts occur in the form used with their finite verb counterparts:

(230) gaγvižeba-s čveul-ma (Vogt 1971: § 1.83) (G)
    wakening-Dat used.to-Erg ‘one used to wakening up’

d. Participles are often used as predicate modifiers (**secondary predicates**):

(231) ramdenime dy-is šimšil-is šemdeg miaγc’ia dasust’ebul-ma ert-s kalak-s
    (Bleichsteiner 1919: 80) (G)
    a.few day-Gen hunger-gen after he.reached.it weakened-Erg one-Dat town-Dat
    ‘after a few days of hunger he reached a town, weakened’.

e. In the adverbial case they are used for purpose clauses 3.2.8b.II.; (232), and their negative form to express contingency 3.2.8b.IV.; (233):

(232) q’vela midioda vašl-is sašebbl-ad (Ghlont’i 1974: 21) (G)
    all s/he.went apple-Gen searching-Adv ‘everybody went to look for the apple’

(233) mšobleb-is u-naxav-ad ver c’aval (Vogt 1971 § 1.93) (G)
    parents-Gen Neg-having.seen-Adv NegPot I.will.go
    ‘I cannot go without having seen my parents’
f. In negative contexts, participles express something conceivable:

(234) mis-i momt’an-i ar arian (G. Imnaišvili 1974: 97) (G)

its-Nom bringing-Nom not they are
‘they are not people who could bring it (sc. the water of immortality)’

6. Genetic and areal considerations

The Kartvelian languages are one of the best-studied language families of the world. This also includes historical and comparative studies. For more than a hundred years, there have been comparative investigations on all levels of description (early classics are, for instance, Schuchardt, 1895; Deeters, 1930), and many central features of the protolanguage have been reconstructed. (For a reconstruction of the sound system on the basis of a rigorous methodology see Schmidt, 1962; Mač’āvari, 1965 and Gamq’relje, 2000, a collection which includes relevant papers from the 1950s and 1960s, among others); the most influential monograph on classical topics of Kartvelian morphophonemics (reminiscent of Proto-Indoeuropean) and related problems of morphology is Gamq’relje and Mač’āvari, 1965. (A partial German translation of 1982 also gives a survey of ensuing discussion and later developments.) The historical development of some morphosyntactic phenomena such as transitivity, ergativity, subject and object marking has also been treated in many comparative studies (e.g. by Boeder, 1979, 1987; Harris, 1985; numerous sections in Harris and Campbell, 1995). The well-documented long history of Georgian has been the subject of very detailed scrutiny (many problems are treated in Saržvelaše, 1984).

We also have large etymological dictionaries (Klimov, 1998; Fähnrich and Saržvelaše, 1995, 2000).

In view of their structural and lexical similarities, the historical relationship between some early forms of Kartvelian and Indo-European is an intriguing problem (Klimov, 1994b; Gamq’relje and Ivanov, 1995).—The contact between Kartvelian languages and their neighbours is of great historical interest (see e.g. Klimov, 1999 for Svan). There are many Armenian, Greek, Iranian, Arabic, Turkish and other loanwords in all Kartvelian languages (for a short survey see Thordarson, 1990, 1999); structural features resulting from contacts between the western dialects of Kartvelian and Northwest Caucasian languages such as Abkhaz have been studied (see for example Hewitt, 1991, 1992a,b), and many features are shared by Georgian, Armenian and Ossetian (see articles in Vogt, 1988; for Laz and Pontic Greek see Drettas 1994; for Laz and Anatolian languages see Haig, 2001). The autochthonous languages of the Caucasus have sometimes been said to form a “Sprachbund”. But while it makes sense to study their typological similarities and differences (Deeters, 1957; Klimov (ed.), 1978), specific common features are quite few (Tuite, 1999).

A genetic relationship between Kartvelian and the other autochthonous languages of the Caucasus has not been conclusively demonstrated so far and remains doubtful as long as even the reconstruction of the North-West Caucasian and particularly East Caucasian proto-languages is riddled with enormous difficulties.—There have been dozens of proposals on the genetic relationship between Kartvelian and non-Caucasian languages. By far the most favourite candidate has been Basque during the last hundred years (for a
short critical assessment see Rayfield, 1990), but also Etruscan, virtually un-documented Pre-Greek languages of the Aegeis, Sumerian, Dravidian, Burushaski, etc. An inclusion into the “Nostratic” family also finds its supporters (Starostin, 1999). Most of these proposals suffer from serious weaknesses of methodology. On the other hand, typological comparisons with, for instance, Basque (see, for example, Rayfield, 1985) and Indo-European (Schmidt, 1998), are very worthwhile, and an investigation of the linguistic area, including for instance the languages of ancient Asia Minor (such as e.g. Hurrian) is a promising field of research.
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Appendix A

A.1. Selected Bibliography

Limited space prevents the author from giving a fuller list of the vast amount of native grammatical literature written in Georgian: almost only books of the last 20 years and earlier surveys and otherwise fundamental books are given. The preponderance of non-Georgian titles should not be taken as indicator of European or American preeminence in this field. The coverage of “western” literature cannot be complete, either; but older standard works and most items that have come to my attention during the last 20 years have been included.

For a quick survey of the Caucasian languages including Kartvelian, see Deeters (1963) and Klimov (1994a); a survey of Kartvelian is offered by Žorbenaş (1991); for a historical and comparative grammar of Kartvelian see G. Mač’avarian (2002); an extensive documentation of the grammatical features of Georgian dialects is given by Žorbenaş (1989–1998). For an overview of the history of Kartvelian, see Harris (1991a); for a historical-comparative study of the Kartvelian verb, see Deeters (1930) and Oniani (1978); for the noun see Oniani (1989); for a comparative syntax of Modern Kartvelian see A. K’iziria (1982).


Short surveys of Svan grammar are Gudjedjiani and Palmaitis (1986), Gippert (1987), Schmidt (1991), Tuite (1997); Oniani (1998) is a description of Svan phonology and of nominal and verbal morphology.

The only comprehensive Mingrelian grammar so far is Kipşidze (1914); Harris (1991b) offers a sketch.

The only grammar of Laz is Čikobava (1936); short surveys are given by Holisky (1991) and Kutscher et al. (1995); the verbal complex has been described by Lüders (1992), the noun phrase by Kutscher (2001).

A.2. The following additional abbreviations are used in the bibliography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BK:</td>
<td>Bedi Kartlisa. Le destin de la Géorgie/Revue de kartvélologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gam-ba:</td>
<td>gamomcemloba ‘publishing-house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK’E:</td>
<td>Iberiul-k’av’asuri enatmecniereba/Iberijsko-kavkazskoe jazykoznanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK’EC:</td>
<td>Iberiul-K’av’asuri enatmecnierebis c’elic’deuli/Ežegodnik iberijsko-kavkazskogo jazykoznanija/Annual of Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics (SMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS:</td>
<td>Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap/Norwegian Journal of Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGC:</td>
<td>Revue des études géorgiennes et caucasiennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPU:</td>
<td>Sulxan-Saba Orbelianis saxelobis Tbilisis saxelm’ipo p’edagogiuri universit’et’i/Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani Pedagogical University Tbilisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU:</td>
<td>[Ivane ʒavaxišvilis saxelobis] Tbilisis saxelm’ipo universit’et’i/Tbilisskij gosudarstvennyj Universitet/[Ivane Javakhishvili] Tbilisi State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.3. NB

Gh is used as the capital counterpart of γ (voiced uvular fricative) in initials of names; glottalized consonants follow their non-glottalized counterparts (k before k’, t before t’, etc.); consonants with haček follow those without (c before č, ʒ before ʒ, etc.); ʒ counts as dz, ʒ as dz.
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