<div align="center">

Indirect transitives in Georgian
Kevin Tuite
<revised version of paper published in BLS 13 (1987), pp 296-309>

</div>

Georgian, the major language of the South Caucasian (Kartvelian) family, has received a degree of notoriety for its complex pattern of case assignment, a paradigm example of split ergativity [in fact, all three varieties of split ergativity recognized by Dixon 1979; see Boeder 1979 for an excellent and concise presentation]. Georgian indicates grammatical relations by means of both nominal case and crossreferencing verb morphology, with somewhat different patterns of marking in the two systems. Kartvelian verb stems divide into two primary lexical classes commonly labelled **active** and **passive** [Shanidze 1953:289-90]. The labels are rather misleading — many verbs in the passive class are agentive (e.g. verbs of directed motion), while a few formally active verbs are semantically stative (**arsebobs** "s/he,it exists"; **q'vavilobs** "it blooms") [Harris 1981:268-74]. Also, while many active verbs are transitive, a sizeable subclass of them is not [Holisky 1981a]. What does distinguish the two classes is case and agreement patterning. Active verbs undergo **case shift** in certain tense/mood paradigms, while passives do not. The correlation between typical semantic roles and formal markers for verbs of the two classes in each of the three tense-mood series is laid out in {1}.[1] The Kartvelian languages employ two sets of agreement affixes, termed Set V ("subject") and Set M ("object" — which, in the 3rd person, distinguishes Md "direct" and Mi "indirect object" affixes).

{1}	ACTIVE STEM			PASSIVE STEM	
	AGENT	PATIENT	IP (rec/ben)	THEME	IP
Series I					
agr.	V	Md	Mi	V	Mi
case	NOM	DAT	DAT	NOM	DAT
Series II					
agr.	V	Md	Mi	V	Mi
case	ERG	NOM	DAT	NOM	DAT
Series III					
agr.	Mi	V	—	V	Mi
case	DAT	NOM	[+ postp]	NOM	DAT

---

[1] The Georgian verb, of whichever stem class, takes further markings indicating its membership in one of three series of tense-mood paradigms:
      SERIES I: present, future, imperfect, conditional, present & future conjunctives.
      SERIES II: aorist, optative, (non-negative) imperative
      SERIES III: present perfect (evidential), pluperfect
In glossing Georgian verbs I will indicate series (by roman numeral), and person, in the order V/Mi/Md.Georgian declension comprises six cases: NOMinative, ERGative, DATive, GENitive, INStrumental, ADVerbial. The semantic roles given in {1} are only the most typical — many formally passive verbs have agent subjects (e.g. verbs of directed motion). 'IP' stands for **interested party**, a catchall rubric for addressees, recipients, benefactives, experiencers, and similar semantic wallflowers.

A sample conjugation of the active and passive stems derived from the root **gzavn-**"send" is given in {2} and {3}.

{2a}   ACTIVE

Series I	švil–eb–i	c'eril–s	ga–u–gzavni–an	mama–s
	[child-PL-NOM	letter-DAT	will.send.I.3pl/3/3	father-DAT]
Series II	švil–eb–ma	c'eril–i	ga–u–gzavn–es	mama–s
	[child-PL-ERG	letter-NOM	sent.II.3pl/3/3	father-DAT]
Series III	švil–eb–s	c'eril–i	ga–u–gzavni–a–t	mam–isa–tvis
	[child-PL-DAT	letter-NOM	have.sent.III.3/3pl	father-GEN-for]

"The children will send/sent/have sent their father a letter.

{2b}   PASSIVE

Series I,II,III   ga–e–gzavneb–a

c'eril–i   ga–e–gzavn–a   švil–s

ga–h–gzavnebi–a

[letter-NOM   will.be/was/has.been.sent.3/3   child-DAT]

"The letter will be sent/was sent/has been sent to the child."

The shift in case patterning for active verbs between series I and II is of a type seen in many of the world's languages [Dixon 1979, DeLancey 1981]. Active verbs in series III undergo what Harris [1981: ch 8] terms **inversion** — essentially conversion into the moral equivalent of a passive with a dativus auctoris indirect object. This phenomenon occurs in the other Kartvelian languages as well [Harris 1985: 271-327]. Many Georgian and Western European linguists, confronting the complex relation between case, agreement and semantic role just illustrated, have resorted to a terminological distinction between "real" and "grammatical" subject and object [Schuchardt 1896; Chikobava 1967, 1968; cp Shanidze 1963]. Grammatical subjecthood is usually defined in terms of person agreement: that argument crossreferenced by Set V person affixes is the grammatical subject (GS). So, for the sentences in {2a}, the GS would be bavšveb– for the Series I and II examples, and c'eril– for the Series III example. For the passive verbs in {2b}, c'eril– is the GS in all three series. The correspondence of GS to RS for the verbs in {2} is shown in {3}.

{3}	ACTIVE STEM			PASSIVE STEM	
	agent	**patient**	**IP**	**theme**	**IP**
Series I,II	GS/RS	GDO/RDO	GIO/RIO	GS/RS	GIO/RIO
Series III	**GIO/RS**	**GS/RDO**	**— /RIO**	GS/RS	GIO/RIO

The notion of "real" subject (RS) was defined in terms of agentivity, with the most agentive core argument in the clause designated RS. While the category is clearly an import from the west, it is in fact the case that the RS is more likely to come first in the sentence [Apridonidze 1986:17-21], be represented by a zero anaphor [Enukidze 1978:74], bind reflexive and reciprocal pronominals [Harris 1981:24], and be the coreferential argument in control con-structions [Harris 1981:154-6].

While any 1st or 2nd person NOM, DAT or ERG argument, that is, any 1st or 2nd person **term**, can govern number agreement in modern Georgian, regardless of syntactic role, only 3rd person RSs have this privilege [Harris 1978; Aronson 1976]. Series III inversion is not the only case of non-overlap between GS and RS. In Georgian, as well as in the other Kartvelian languages, there is a large subclass of passive verbs of perception, emotion and sensation (e.g. u–q'var–s "s/he<DAT> loves her/him<NOM>; e–smi–s "s/he <DAT> hears/understands it<NOM>; e–mc'areb–a "s/he-<DAT> finds it<NOM> bitter-tasting" [Merlan 1982]. The DAT argument associated with these verbs denotes the experiencer of some physical or psychological phenomenon, and the NOM argument denotes the object of the experience.[2] In such cases, note, the DAT experiencer outranks the NOM theme on the agentivity hierarchy and serves as RS. I will term these **indirect passive** verbs, following the usage of K.Tschenkeli 1958:490]. The significance of the indirect passive subclass should not be underestimated. Its existence indicates that neither formal verb-stem criteria nor case and person-agreement patterning are sufficient to indicate RS status, the only morphological characteristic of which, as mentioned above, is ability to govern number agreement in all three persons. While the direct/indirect distinction has long been recognized for passive verbs, it is only very recently that descriptions of what we might call indirect active, more precisely, **indirect transitive** verbs appear in the Georgian linguistics literature [Jorbenadze 1983:82-83; K'iziria 1985]. All Georgian transitives, save for a handful which are formally passive [Harris 1981:268-74] manifest the pattern of case marking and person agreement in {1}. Included in this class are transitive verb stems of the sort shown in {4} and {5}:

{4}	**Indirect transitives: RS = GDO**
a. *da–a–elmeb–s*	sthg makes sb crosseyed
b. *da–a–k'ut'eb–s*	sthg makes sb crippled
c. *ga–a–p'irkušeb–s*	sthg puts sb in a bad mood
d. *ga–a–rindeb–s*	sthg makes sb mute
e. *aɣ–a–t'q'ineb–s*	sthg makes sb ecstatic
f. *da–a–pikrianeb–s*	sthg makes sb pensive
g. *aɣ–a–prtovaneb–s*	sthg thrills sb
h. *a–a–caχcaχeb–s*	sthg makes sb tremble

{5}	**Indirect transitives: RS = GIO**
a. *a–u–k'ank'aleb–s*	sthg makes sb's sthg[e.g.hands]shake
b. *da–u–manč'av–s*	sthg [e.g.pain] distorts sb's face
c. *a–u–msuq'eb–s*	sthg [rich food] sates sb's heart
d. *še–u–ružav–s*	sthg [flame] singes sb's sthg[e.g.hair]
e. *a–a–t'k'iveb–s*	sthg makes sb's sthg [body part] hurt

---

[2] A not inconsiderable number of verba sentiendi do not subcategorize for a NOM argument [Tschenkeli 1958:594-7;Shanidze 1961:223]. Since the morphotactics of the Kartvelian languages require the presence of a Set V affix on every finite verb [Oniani 1978:40], these verbs are formally speaking bipersonal, with a Set Mi affix crossreferencing the experiencer, and a 3sg Set V affix crossreferencing, if you will, a NOM case dummy. Some examples are: mas h–ɣviʒav–s [s/he-DAT is-awake.I.3/3]; mas e–mtknareb–a [s/he-DAT feels-like-yawning.I.3/3].

f. *a–u–panckaleb–s*   sthg makes sb's heart fibrillate
g. *u–cχuneb–s*   sthg [sun] burns sb's sthg [body part]
h. *u–ǯiǯgni–s*   sthg torments sb's heart

The verbs in {4} and {5} only allow inanimate agents (or sources). The patients in {4} and the inalienable possessors in {5} are obligatorily animate, usually human. Though otherwise formally indistinguishable from direct transitives, the number agreement pattern for indirect transitives is somewhat different.[3] The agents of these verbs, if plural, will almost never govern plural NA. This reflects a more general principal in modern Georgian, especially the spoken register, that animate RSs always govern NA in the verb, but inanimate RSs rarely do so [K'vach'adze 1977:99-104].

{6}   a.   ǯarisk'ac–eb–i   ezo–ši   dga–nan/*dga–s
            [soldier-PL-NOM   yard-in   stand.I.3pl/*stand.I.3sg]
            "Soldiers are standing in the garden."
       b.   cacχv–eb–i   ezo–ši   dga–s/dga–nan
            [linden-tree-PL-NOM   yard-in   stand.I.3sg/stand.I.3pl]
            "Linden trees are standing in the garden."

More interesting is the agreement behavior of plural **objects** of indirect transitives. As with indirect passives, the grammatical **object** (either GDO or GIO as the case may be),may govern plural NA if plural, and, indeed, take on other properties characteristic of RSs. Here is a 19th century example collected by A. K'iziria [1985:109]. The verb agrees in number with the 3rd plural GIO (inalienable possessor of the GDO), not with the GS "sleep."

{7}   mere ʒili   **mo–s–t'aceb–t** tvals   ∅.
       [then sleep-NOM abduct.I.3/3pl/3   eye-DAT   ∅-3pl-DAT]
       "Then sleep will carry off their eyes." (G.Shat'berashvili)

Given the existence of both direct and indirect relation correspondences for both active and passive verbs, fig {3} stands in need of revision, as follows:[4]

---

[3] In the discussion to follow, all statements about number agreement (NA) will in fact be statements about **3rd person** number agreement. As mentioned above, NA with 1st or 2nd person arguments is not dependent on syntactic role, and therefore does not differ between direct and indirect forms of a given verb class.

[4] Georgian is not the only Kartvelian language with a class of indirect transitives. Such verbs are found in Mingrelian and Svan as well. As in Georgian, the grammatical object can govern NA in the 3rd person, though the number of verbs allowing this NA pattern is smaller than in Georgian. Here are two examples, elicited from Elisabedi Gazdeliani (Svan: Lent'ex dialect) and Maq'vala Xarebava (Mingrelian).

{i} [SVAN] sk'odi ǯavr   gvis   χ–o–c'χvavd–a–χ   al   č'q'int'i
           dedes i mamas
           [deep   worry-NOM   heart-DAT   trouble.I.3/**3pl**/3   this   boy-GEN
           mother-DAT and father-DAT]
"Deep worry [agent,GS/RO] troubled the hearts [patient,GDO/RO] of this boy's mother and father [possessor,GIO/RS]"

{8}	ACTIVE			PASSIVE	
	agent	*patient*	*IP*	*theme*	*IP*
DIRECT	*agent*	*patient*	*IP*	*theme*	*IP*
Series I,II	GS/RS	GDO/RO	GIO/RO	GS/RS	GIO/RO
Series III	GIO/RS	GS/RO	—-/RO	GS/RS	GIO/RO
INDIRECT	*agent*	*patient*	*IP*	*theme*	*IP*
Series I,II	GS/RO	GDO/RS	—	GS/RO	GIO/RS
or:	GS/RO	GDO/RO	GIO/RS		
Series III	GIO/RO	GS/RS	—	GS/RO	GIO/RS
or:	GIO/RO	GS/RO	—-/RS-chômeur		

In the course of reading contemporary Georgian literature I have run across a couple dozen cases of indirect transitives with plural patients, two of which I give here:

{9}   me   megobari   ɣvtis   c'q'alobit   bevri   mq'avs,
        [I-DAT   friend-NOM god-GEN   grace-INS   many   have.I.3/1,
        tanac isetebi¡   arian,   st'umroba   tu   ganizraχes,
        also   such-NOM-PL are.I.3pl,   guesthood-NOM if   intend.II.3pl/3,
        veranairi amindi   ver   **daabrk'oleb–t** ø¡.
        no-kind   weather-NOM   cannot   hinder.I.3/3pl   Ø-3pl-DAT]
        "By the grace of God I have many friends; furthermore they are the sort of people that if
they decide to visit, no kind of weather can hinder them." (J.Karchxadze <u>Mnatobi</u>#1:70 [1986])

{10} ar   vici,   ikneb   mat_j   tvalšic   ucnauri včanvar da
        [not   know.I.1/3 perhaps their   eye-in-too odd   appear.I.1 and
        amit'omac   meridebian. ucχo,   dak'virvebuli mzera   makvs
        therefore   avoid.I.3pl/1. strange attentive   look   have.I.3/1
        da   šeiзleba   esec   **ak'rtob–t** ø_j.
        and   possible-is this-too   spook.I.3/3pl Ø-3pl-DAT]
        "I don't know, I must seem odd to them, and so they avoid me. I have a strange attentive
gaze, and perhaps this, too, spooks them." (M.Xucishvili; short story "Ganc'menda"[1985])

The animate GDOs and GIOs of the above verbs govern NA, despite the presence of a more agentive core argument in the clause. This means that rank on an agentivity hierarchy alone is not sufficient to determine RS-hood. The plural NA marker in all of these examples is **-t**, the same affix used in conjunction with the 3pl DAT agent of the Series III active verb in {2}, and with 3pl DAT experiencers of indirect passive verbs (e.g. **mat χač'ap'uri mo–s–c'on–t** [they-DAT cheese-bread-NOM like.I.3/3pl]). Not all of the indirect transitives in exs {7}-{10} **obligatorily** subcategorize for inanimate agents. There is in fact a sizeable number of Georgian verbs which

---

{ii} [MINGRELIAN] *bošeps*   **u–k'ven–a**   artianiš   ambe
                          [child-PL-DAT surprise.I.3/**3pl** each.other-GEN   news-NOM]
"The children are surprised by each other's news." lit: "Each other's news [agent,GS/RO] surprises the children [patient,GDO/RS]"

swing both ways, functioning as either direct or indirect transitives (from the point of view of agreement morphology) depending on the animacy of the agent, or on factors of focus and even lexical meaning. Some representatives of this subclass are listed in {11}.

{11} LABILE TRANSITIVES
a. *da–a–int'ereseb–s*   sb/sthg interests sb
b. *ga–a–k'virveb–s*   sb/sthg surprises sb
c. *da–a–mt'vrev–s*   sb/sthg makes sb extremely tired
d. *da–a–mʒimeb–s*   sb/sthg burdens sb
e. *da–a–naɣvleb–s*   sb/sthg troubles sb
f. *ga–a–oceb–s*   sb/sthg astonishes sb
g. *še–a–c'uχeb–s*   sb/sthg bothers sb
h. *ga–a–χareb–s*   sb/sthg makes sb rejoice

One characteristic of labile transitives is that properties tied to RS status (e.g. the Georgian equivalent of the Nominative Island Constraint) will shift from the GS to the GO depending on the direct/indirect status of the verb. Consider the binding behavior of the two principal arguments of **daaint'eresebs**, in its direct (a) and indirect (b) uses.

{12}   a.   es   gogo–eb–i   ertmanet–s   a–int'ereseb–<u>en</u>   zɣap'rebit
              [these   girl-PL-NOM   each-other-DAT   interest.I.3pl/3   tales-INS]
              "These girls are getting each other interested in folk tales."
        b.   am   gogo–eb–s   ertmanet–i   a–int'ereseb–<u>t</u>
              [these   girl-PL-DAT   each-other-NOM   interest.I.3/3pl]
              "These girls are interested in each other."

Note the shift in meaning between the two sentences in {12}. The direct use of the verb requires an additional argument in the instrumental case, while the indirect use, with a more reflexive meaning, does not. Literally translated, {12a} is "These girls interest each other with folk tales"; {12b} would be something like "Each other interest the girls."[5] This indicates that semantic factors — often rather subtle — can bring about a shift of both morphological and syntactic RS properties from one argument to another, independently of the agentivity hierarchy. Number agreement between indirect transitive verbs and their animate patients, possessors and benefactives is not as automatic as that between direct transitives and their (animate) agents. Several factors contribute to the presence or absence of NA; so far I have isolated three of them, which I will discuss here.

---

[5] Similar instances of direct/indirect lability are found with passive verbs; in fact, it is much more common than for active verbs. Tschenkeli 1958:486-90 discusses the following minimal pair:
{i}   gak'vetil–i   e–c'q'eb–a   moc'ape–eb–s   χval
        [lesson-NOM   begin.I.3/3   pupil-PL-DAT   tomorrow]
{ii}   <u>moc'ape–eb–s</u>   e–c'q'eb–a–<u>t</u>   gak'vetil–i   χval
The difference, says Tschenkeli, is one of "Betonung." The first sentence states simply that "der Unterricht beginnt." The more marked indirect version in {ii} carries the additional nuance that "die Schüler sind die 'Betroffenen' indem sie morgen beim Unterricht zu erscheinen haben." See also Jorbenadze 1981:66-75.

<u>Word order</u>: For some of my Georgian consultants, but not others, which argument immediately precedes the verb is crucial for determining the pattern of NA. Compare these sentences:

{13} a. am   k'ac–eb–s   s–c'vav–**t**   sircχvil–i
          [these   men-DAT   burn.I.3/3pl   shame-NOM]
      b. am   k'ac–eb–s   sircχvil–i   s–c'vav–**t/–s**
          "these men burn with shame."

Both sentences have the same meaning. Placing the grammatical subject before the verb increases its chances of blocking NA with the animate GDO (RS).

<u>Anaphora</u>: In the examples given in {9}-{10}, the indirect transitive agrees in number with a zero anaphor having plural reference. It is indeed the case that more highly presupposed arguments are more likely to govern NA. Speech act pronominals, which are presupposed by the act of speaking itself [Silverstein 1981] govern NA more readily than 3rd person forms, and among the latter, NP types associated with topicality (anaphors; NPs denoting animate, more agentive arguments) are favored by the NA mechanism. My consultants confirmed that NA with the 3pl DAT RS of an indirect transitive verb was more to occur if the argument in question is represented by a zero anaphor than by an overt NP.

<u>Aspect and series</u>: One of the central categories around which the Georgian verbal system is organized is aspect. As in the Slavic languages, perfective vs. imperfective aspect is correlated with the presence vs. absence of a prefix of more or less directional meaning [Mach'avariani 1974; Schmidt 1985]. Series I verbs can be used with or without prefixes — in this way the future and conditional (with prefix) are distinguished from the present and imperfect (without). Verbs inflected for Series II or III are rarely used without prefixes; this is especially true of Series III [Pxak'adze 1984:37-78]. In the case of indirect transitives, series III presents an interesting situation. As shown in fig {8}, inversion has vastly different effects on the relational structure, depending on whether the GDO or GIO is the RS in series I and II. For verbs of the first type (e.g. the verbs in {4}) series III inversion in a sense undoes the effects of inversion, "restoring" the RS to GS status. For verbs of the second type, inversion demotes the animate argument to a postpositional phrase. As it turns out, series III forms of RS = GIO type indirect transitives are in fact extremely rare.[6] However, the primary factor determining the acceptability of these forms is the lexical aspect of the verb, not its

---

[6] In compiling his dictionary, Tschenkeli did in fact generate series III indirect transitives of the sort I am describing here. The present perfect of, for example, a–m–i–k'ank'aleb–s "sthg makes my sthg (e.g.hands) shake" [with RS = GIO in DAT case] is given as a–u–k'ank'alebi–a čem–tvis lit."sthg-DAT has made sthg-NOM shake for-me" with the experiencer argument demoted to a postpositional phrase. Since neither of the verb's term arguments is animate, it is unlikely that either of them would have much in the way of RS properties. Series III constructions with RS=GDO indirect transitives (such as the verbs in {4}), are a bit less rare, being occasionally attested in Georgian literature. Pxak'adze 1984:103 cites an example from the 17th century writer Sulxan-saba Orbeliani:
{i}   me   niadag   šensa   sakme–sa   ga–v–u–k'virvebi–var
      [I-NOM   always   your   affair-DAT   surprise.III.1/3]
      "Your affairs [source,GIO/RO] have always surprised me [experiencer,GS/RS]"

argument structure [on Georgian lexical aspect see Holisky 1979, 1981b]. Indirect transitives fall into two main groups: those that focus on states (usually psychological), and those that describe changes of state. Several of the verbs in {4} and almost all of those in {11} are of this first type.[7] As one would expect, the perfective stem forms of these verbs are marked, though not unacceptable. However, my consultants deemed NA with the grammatical object to be more unlikely, or even impossible, for prefixed forms of indirect verbs.[8] In the case of change-of-state indirect transitives (e.g. about half of the verbs in {4} and {5}) certain prefixed forms, even without plural NA with 3rd person objects, seemed very artificial to Georgian speakers. Among indicative-mood forms, present (i.e. non-prefixed) indirect transitives were almost always acceptable, future and aorist forms were occasionally rejected or disfavored, and (Series III) present perfect forms of indirect transitives — although listed in Tschenkeli's three-volume dictionary — were rarely judged to be acceptable. Whenever an indirect transitive was disfavored, a monopersonal passive with an oblique agent phrase was substituted. For example, the present, future and aorist forms of **gaabelat'ebs** "it

---

[7] These verbs are similar, semantically speaking, to most indirect **passive** verbs, which also denote psychological or physical states. The deep-case role of the argument I have been calling the "agent" is, for stative indirect transitives, closer to that of a **source** rather than an agent as typically conceived. Correspondingly, the "patient" is much closer semantically to the experiencer arguments of indirect passives than to prototypical patients. It is even the case that some stative indirect transitives fluctuate between Class A and Class P conjugation [Jorbenadze 1983:82-3; Aronson 1985].

[8] Series II indirect transitives with 3pl object NA do crop up from time to time in Georgian literature. K'iziria 1985 has found several such instances in works by 19th century authors, e.g.

{i}   šimšil–ma   ʒlier   še–a–c'uχ–a–**t**   lek'v–eb–i
        [hunger-ERG   greatly   bother.II.3/**3pl**   puppy-PL-NOM]
        "Hunger was seriously troubling the puppies." (I. Gogebashvili)

Most of my consultants consider such constructions unacceptable in modern Tbilisi Georgian. The use of the 3pl marker **-t** in {i} is viewed as a (nonstandard) dialectism [on NA in the modern Georgian dialects, see the author's dissertation, due to appear before the next ice age]. There is evidence that presence of a prefix may not be an absolute bar to (3rd person) object agreement, even among fairly conservative speakers of standard Georgian. Melikashvili 1978 briefly notes that many transitive verbs — especially causatives — can be used in the aorist with the desiderative particle net'av(i). These verbs undergo a surface valence change, in that no ERG case NP may appear in the clause. 3rd person arguments seldom occur as objects of these modal aorists, but when they do, NA with the verb is possible if the grammatical object in question is DAT:

{ii}   net'avi   ga–a–k'etebin–a–(t)   is   mat
        [may   cause-to-make.II.3/3pl/3   it-NOM   them-DAT]
        "May they make it" (lit."may sb/sthg cause them to make it")

The 3sg Set V marker -a in {ii} crossreferences the GS, a dummy ERG argument; the -t crossreferences the 3pl DAT RS/GIO. Similar to the above are verbs which direct the agency of some other-worldly being upon an earthling. K'iziria 1985 gives some examples, among them

{iii}   da–s–c'q'evl–o–**t**   ɣmert–ma!
        [damn.II.3/3pl   god-ERG]
        "God damn them!"

In both cases, a more discourse-salient grammatical object is pitted against a dummy or a spirit, and receives preferential treatment by the agreement morphology [on similar phenomena in Kashmiri, also involving transitive verbs with dummy agents, see Hook 1986]. Also, note that both of these are modal constructions. These data imply that Series II constructions which do not denote completed past action are more likely to allow object NA than those that do.

makes him bald" were deemed acceptable by one of my consultants, but the present perfect sounded odd. She was much happier with the present perfect of the corresponding passive:[9]

{14}   a. (aorist)   sibere–m   k'ac–i   ga–a–belat'–a
                                  [age-ERG   man-NOM   make.bald.II.3/3]
       "Age made the man bald."
       b. (present perfect)   ?? sibere–s   k'ac–i   ga–u–belat'ebi–a
                                  [age-DAT   man-NOM   make.bald.III.3/3]
       c. (passive pres.perf.) siber–isa–gan   k'ac–i   ga–belat'ebul–a
                                  [age-GEN-from   man-NOM   is.made.bald.III.3]
       "The man has become bald from age."

DISCUSSION: Though indirect and labile verbs are in the minority compared to direct ones, they are important indicators of typological changes within the Kartvelian family. I will discuss one of them here.

animacy and morphological prominence: While the case assignment and person agreement mechanisms in Georgian have undergone relatively little change since the earliest attested period (5th century AD), number agreement patterning has changed profoundly from Old Georgian to the modern language [Cole et al 1980;Tuite 1985]. Case has declined in importance as a determiner of NA, and animacy has become a more central criterion. In Old Georgian no DAT argument governed NA[10] while any ERG and NOM argument, including the patients of Series II and III active verbs had this morphological privilege [Shanidze 1982:75]. The following examples come from Old Georgian:

{15}   c'ina–uk'ana   i–ar–**n**–es   or–n–i   dɣe–n–i   da   ɣame–n–i
       [front-back   go.II.3pl/3pl   two   day-PL-NOM   and   night-PL-NOM]
       "Two days and two nights they travelled, one after the other." [Vepxist'q'aosani 215:1]
       (cp ModGeo iares_orni_dɣeni_da_ɣameni)

---

[9] Several types of verbs manifest a shift between active and passive stems for reasons of aspect rather than argument structure. Verbs of motion, for example, are passive if telic and active if atelic. Verbs denoting activities as such, without focussing on their beginning or end points, are active; their corresponding inchoatives are passive [Holisky 1981a]. This distinction is especially clear in series III. One can find telic/atelic pairs in Georgian where the expected passive/active stem opposition is only found in the perfect, e.g. comitative activity verbs ["X does sthg with Y"] such as the following:
{i} tamaš– "play" [Tschenkeli 1960-74]:
       I. ATELIC COMITATIVE: PRES v–e–tamašeb–i (passive)"I play with sb"
        AOR v–e–tamaš–e (passive), PRESPF m–i–tamašni–a (**active**)
       II. TELIC COMITATIVE: PRES v–e–tamašeb–i (passive) "I begin to play with sb"
        AOR ga–v–e–tamaš–e (passive), PRESPF ga–v–s–tamašebi–var (**passive**)
[10] The one exception is represented by the opposed Set M prefixes m- and gw-. This was at one time a means of marking exclusive vs inclusive 1st person, traces of which system are attested in early Old Georgian texts [Shanidze 1982:74]. It was reanalyzed as a 1sg/1pl opposition.

{16} vitarca e–sm–**n**–**es**   mepe–sa   sit'q'wa–n–i ese
　　　[as　　　hear.II.3pl/3   king-DAT   word-PL-NOM this]
　　　"As the king heard these words.." [Sibrdzne Balavarisi I:30]
　　　(cp ModGeo esmod**a** mepes es sit'q'vani)

In example {15}, a Class A verb in series II agrees in number with its plural NOM object "two days and nights." The indirect passive verb smena "hear" in {16} agrees in number with its NOM theme, but not with its DAT experiencer. Note that in both cases an **inanimate** NP controls NA. In the conservative mountain dialects of Pshavi and Xevsureti, NA is extended to 1st/2nd person arguments, but not 3rd person, even if serving as the RS of inverse or indirect verbs [Gogolauri 1978].

{17} q'mac'vil–eb–s　　u–tkom–**o**　　　　　　　　　　[Gigineishvili et al:24,12]
　　　[boy-child-PL-DA　　say.IIIa.3/3]
　　　"The children have said it." (cp ModGeo q'mac'vilebs_u–tkvam–t)

Number agreement in -n- with plural direct objects of series II transitive verbs is still attested in these dialects, especially in texts collected before the second World War:

{18} iman　　　　ise–n–i　　　　　ga–i–cil–**n**–a　　　　　[ibid:116,7]
　　　[s/he-ERG　them-PL-NOM　　accompany.IIa.3/3p]
　　　"She accompanied them."　　(cp ModGeo iman_iseni_ga–i–cil–a)

In several eastern and northwestern dialects (Kaxetian, Fereidanian, Imeretian, etc.) **any** term argument in **any** person, especially if animate and topical, can govern NA [Chikobava 1968:276-7; K'iziria 1974]. The following passage is in the Kaxetian dialect [Gigineishvili et al:207,12]:

{19} šemo–id–nen　　q'ačɣ–eb–i_j.　uproš–i　　e–ubneb–a–**t**　0_j
　　　[enter.IIp.3pl　　bandit-PL-NOM.　boss-NOM　tell.Ip.3/3pl]
　　　"The bandits entered. The boss says to them...."

The suffix -t in the second verb marks the plurality of the addressee (the bandits). Note that this plural marking occurs even though the RS/GS of the verb is itself animate. So, in these dialects, unlike Tbilisi Georgian, the **relative** salience of RS and RO is not relevant in determining the presence of object agreement, but rather the prominence of the individual argument as such. GDO's in the 3rd person can also govern NA, though this is less commonly attested. In this Lower Imeretian example, the suffix –q'e(n) indicates the plurality of a grammatical object, in this case the patient [Gigineshvili et al:467].

{20} švil–eb–i　　　　gamo–v–zard–e–**q'en**　　rva　　　ertat**.**
　　　[child-PL-NOM　raise.II.1/3pl　　　　　eight　　together]
　　　"I raised eight children all together."

The resemblance to NA with NOM direct objects in Old Georgian is only superficial. The Old Georgian phenomenon was strictly conditioned by surface case, the Imeretian one by animacy and topicality. Modern standard Georgian, the dialect spoken by educated Tbilisi residents (such as my consultants) is, I believe, in an intermediate position between Old Georgian and Kaxetian. I have attempted to represent the number-agreement situation in the dialects mentioned here in fig {21}. X indicates NA (for animate arguments) in all three persons; 1/2 = NA in 1st and 2nd person only; (1) = prefixal 1st plural NA only.

{21}		Old Georgian	Pshav-Xevsur	Mod. Georg,	Fereidan/Imer.
class A					
series I	NOM	X	X	X	X
	DAT	(1)	1/2	(X)	X
series II	ERG	X	X	X	X
	NOM	X	X	1/2	X
	DAT	(1)	1/2	1/2	X
series III	DAT	(1)	1/2	X	X
	NOM	X	X	1/2	X
class P — direct					
all	NOM	X	X	X	X
	DAT	(1)	1/2	1/2	X
class P — indirect					
	DAT	(1)	1/2	X	X
	NOM	X	X	1/2	X

Two primary trends are represented in this chart. On the one hand, the morphological prominence of NOM case arguments — a remnant of the ergative typology reconstructed for Common Kartvelian [Harris 1985] — decreases from Old Georgian to Modern Georgian, with Pshav-Xevsurian representing a conservative holdout. On the other hand, as case decreases in importance, NP type increases, following the scale shown in {22}:

{22} 1st >   2nd   >   3rd real subject > 3rd topical / animate

This says a lot about the significance of **subject** as a grammatical category in the various dialects of Georgian. If we take "real subject" as the closest Georgian equivalent — on semantic and syntactic grounds — to what we call subject in Standard Average European languages, then we note a surprising lack of morphological "privileges" attaching to it. Neither case marking nor person agreement pick it out in any straightforward way, in any of the dialects mentioned above.[11] Nor does number agreement, with the exception of Tbilisi Georgian and those dialects of similar structure [Kartlian, Javaxian], where only the RS can govern NA if 3rd person. But, rather than

---

[11] The one notable exception in the Kartvelian-speaking area is the southwest Georgian dialect group (Gurian and Ach'arian), where both case and number-agreement systems are realigning to mark RS in more direct way [see K'iziria 1974:76-8; Harris 1985:376-80; Tuite 1985].

being an end in itself, the morphological prominence of the RS in standard Georgian appears to be only a way station between the ergative morphology of Common Kartvelian and the topicality/animacy-based system found in dialects like Kaxetian and Imeretian.[12]

references

Sh. Apridonidze 1986 *sit'q'vatganlageba aχal kartulši* (Word order in modern Georgian) [Tbilisi: Mecniereba]

H. Aronson 1976 Grammatical subject in Old Georgian. **Bedi Kartlisa** 34:220-231

H. Aronson 1985 Paradigmatic and syntactic subject in Georgian. (to appear in Festschrift for A. Shanidze [Columbus:Slavica])

W. Boeder 1968 Über die Versionen des georgischen Verbs. **Folia Linguistica** 2:82-151

W. Boeder 1979 Ergative syntax and morphology in language change. F. Plank (ed) *Ergativity* [NY: Academic] 435-480

Arn. Chikobava 1967 Gruzinskij jazyk. *Jazyki narodov SSSR* [Moscow: Nauka] IV:22-61

Arn. Chikobava 1968 *mart'ivi c'inadadebis p'roblema kartulši* (The problem of the simple sentence in Georgian) [Tbilisi: Mecniereba]

P. Cole, W. Harbart & G. Hermon 1980 The acquisitiion of subjecthood. **Language** 56:719-731

G. Deeters 1930 *Das kharthwelische Verbum* [Leipzig: von Markert & Petters]

S. DeLancey 1981 An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns. **Language** 57:626-657

R. M. W. Dixon 1979 "Ergativity" **Language** 55:59-138

L. Enukidze 1978 zmnis mier martul saχelta siχširuli daχasiateba kartulši. (On characterizing the frequency of actants governed by the verb in Georgian) **Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba** 20:61-77

I. Gigineishvili, V. Topuria and I. Kavtaradze 1961 *kartuli dialekt'ologia I* (Georgian dialectology I) [Tbilisi: University Press]

T. Gogolauri 1978 pšauri k'ilos taviseburebani. (Characteristics of the Pshav dialect) **macne** #3:111-30

A. Harris 1978 Number agreement in modern Georgian. B.Comrie (ed) *Classification of grammatical categories* [Edmonton: Linguistic Research]: 75-98

---

[12] Probably correlated with this lack of morphological prominence is the somewhat less pivotal status of the Georgian RS in the syntactic component as compared to that of Standard European subjects. Most of the syntactic privileges enjoyed by the Georgian RS — initial position in the sentence, reciprocal and reflexive binding, participation in topic chaining and zero anaphora — do not pertain to it exclusively, but only with a higher frequency than for other argument types [Enukidze 1978; Harris 1981; Apridonidze 1986].

A. Harris 1981 *Georgian syntax* [Cambridge Univ Press]

A. Harris 1985 *Diachronic syntax: the Kartvelian case (Syntax & semantics 18)* [NY:Academic]

D. A. Holisky 1979 On lexical aspect and verb classes in Georgian. CLS Parasession on the elements: 390-401

D. A. Holisky 1981a *Aspect and Georgian medial verbs* [Delmar,NY: Caravan]

D. A. Holisky 1981b Aspect theory and Georgian aspect. P.Tedeschi and A. Zaenen (eds) *Tense and aspect (Syntax & semantics 14)* [NY: Academic]

P. Hook 1986 Null valents in the expression of impersonal action in Kashmiri and Russian. **CLS** 22#1:179-194

B. Jorbenadze 1981 Principy stanovlenija inversionnyx glagolov v gruzinskom jazyke. **Annual of Ibero-Caucasian linguistics** VIII:66-77

B. Jorbenadze 1983 *zmnis χmovanp'repiksuli c'armoeba kartulši* (Prefixed vowel derivation of the verb in Georgian) [Tbilisi:University Press]

A. K'iziria 1974 kvemdebare–šemasmenlis urtiertoba kartuli enis dasavluri dialekt'ebis miχedvit. (The subject-predicate relation in the west Georgian dialects) **kartvelur enata st'rukt'uris sak'itxebi** IV:75-91

A. K'iziria 1985 obiekt'is mier zmnis šetanχmeba mravlobit ricχvši tanamedrove kartulši. (Object-verb plural number agreement in modern Georgian) **iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba** 24:100-112

L. K'vach'adze 1977 *tanamedrove kartuli enis sint'aksi* (Modern Georgian syntax) [Tbilisi: Ganatleba]

G. Mach'avariani 1974 asp'ekt'is k'at'egoria kartvelur enebši. (Aspect in the Kartvelian languages) **kartvelur enata st'rukt'uris sak'itxebi** IV:118-141

D. Melikishvili 1978 uč'irs zmna da masc'avleblis gasač'iri. (The verb "to need" and the teacher's problems with it) **kartuli ena da lit'erat'ura sk'olashi** #4

F. Merlan 1982 Another look at Georgian inversion. **Folia Slavica** 5#1:294-312

A. Oniani 1978 *kartvelur enata ist'oriuli morpologiis sak'itχebi* (Issues in Kartvelian historical morphology) [Tbilisi:Ganatleba]

D. Pxak'adze 1984 *I turmeobitis punkciebi kartulši* (Functions of the resultative I [present perfect] in Georgian) [Tbilisi:Univ.Press]

K-H. Schmidt 1985 Aspekt und Tempus im Altgeorgischen. **Annual of Ibero-Caucasian linguistics** XII:79-90

H. Schuchardt 1896 Über den passiven Charakter des Transitivs in den kaukasischen Sprachen. **Sitzungsberichte philos-hist. Classe Akad. Wiss. Wien** 133:1-91

A. Shanidze 1953 *kartuli gramat'ik'is sapuɜvlebi I* (Fundamentals of Georgian grammar I) [Tbilisi:Univ. Press]

A. Shanidze 1963 Le sujet grammatical de quelques verbs intransitifs en géorgien. **Bull. Soc. Ling. de Paris** 58:1-27

A. Shanidze 1982 *Grammatik der altgeorgischen Sprache* [Tbilisi: Univ.Press]

M. Silverstein 1981 "Case marking and human nature" **Australian J.Ling.**1:220-40

K. Tschenkeli 1958 *Einführung in die georgische Sprache* [Zürich:Amirani]

K. Tschenkeli 1960-74 *Georgisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* [Zürich: Amirani]

K. Tuite 1985 Syntactic subject in Georgian. (to appear in Festschrift for Ak'ak'i Shanidze [Columbus, Ohio :Slavica])

K. Tuite 198? *Number agreement in Georgian* (dissertation-in-progress,U Chicago)