საქართველოს მეცნიერებათა ეროვნული აკადემიის მოამბე, ტ. 2, №2, 2008
BULLETIN OF THE GEORGIAN NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, vol. 2, no. 2, 2008

Linguistics

Georgian as an Active/Ergative Split Language

Irine Melikishvili

Institute of Theoretical and Comparative Linguistics and Phonetics,
I. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

(Presented by Academy Member Th.V. Gamkrelidze)

ABSTRACT. The aim of the paper is to offer an interpretation of the three basic syntactic constructions of the Georgian language and to discuss the problem of their diachronic interrelationship. Georgian is regarded as a language with semantically based marking of verb arguments. The aspect-conditioned systems of marking of core arguments are difined as Active (construction of the *imperfective* series of verb forms), and Ergative (constructions of the *aorist* and *perfective* series of verb forms). The system connected with the imperfective aspect, with obvious binary distinction of Active and Inactive arguments, is regarded as Active. Both constructions of completive aspectual forms – that of the II series of verb forms with the ergative case of the subject and of the III series of perfective verb forms with dative case marking of the subject are considered as extended Ergative constructions. From the syntactic point of view, Georgian is a language of Nominative construction.

It is argued that the underlying principles of the three constructions are different. The underlying principle of active construction is direct semantically based marking of arguments. The main opposition is that of active/inactive participant, the active member of the opposition having the status of unmarked category. In ergative construction the underlying principle is the immediate constituent structure of the VP: the nearest arguments (O, S) of the VP are regarded as unmarked, Agentive participant having the second position in the hierarchy of arguments. In nominative construction the underlying principle is the topicalisation of Subject-Predicate relationship; the position of the subject is regarded as unmarked. All of these three principles are universal, but in each construction one of them has a dominant position in organizing the verb arguments into macroroles and determining their hierarchy. *© 2008 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.*

Key words: *Kartvelology, morphosynthesis typology.*

I. Introduction. Three aspect-conditioned systems of marking of thematic roles are functioning in the Georgian language. As a rule, they are defined as Nominative, Ergative and Dative constructions. The aim of the present paper is to offer a different interpretation of these constructions and to discuss the problem of their diachronic interrelationship.

Georgian is a language with a rich synthetic morphology. For marking thematic roles it has a differentiated case system and a verbal inflectional system with two patterns of personal markers. Three cases mark the main arguments: Nominative, Ergative and Dative. The Nominative and Dative cases mark the subject and direct and indirect objects. Ergative is an aspect-conditioned case marking only for the subject. The two patterns of personal markers are often designated as subject and object markers. The aim of the present paper is to show that they do not mark the subject/object distinction, but rather the distinction of active /inactive arguments. In the paper it is argued that Georgian is a semantic marking language (for the division of languages into languages with semantically based vs. syntactically based marking, see Dixon, 1998; for semantic interpretation of the problems of Georgian morphology see also

Holisky, 1981, Van Valin, 1990) The case marking of the nouns and the cross-referencing in the verb expresses the semantic roles connected with the verb and not the logical/informational structure of the clause.

II. Active construction – the construction of imperfective forms. The first construction is connected with the imperfective aspect. To this group of verbal forms (the I Series of verbal forms in Georgian grammatical tradition) belong six screeves (paradigmatic sets of verbal forms varying only in person and number): Present, Imperfect, Present Subjunctive, Future, Conditional and Future Subjunctive. As a rule, this construction is called the Nominative construction, but as it will be shown below, it is more appropriate to define it as an Active construction. The logical/informational subject can have two types of marking in this group of forms, Nominative and Dative: the active, controlling argument is marked with the nominative case and *v*- pattern of personal markers and the inactive subject (Possessor, Perceptor, Experiencer of affections, mental processes, physiological conditions of the body etc.) is marked with Dative case and the *m*-series of personal markers.

(1) *k'ac-i(N) mi-di-s(3rd p)*
man (N) goes
"The man goes"

(2) *k'ac-i(N) i-maleb-a(3rd p)*
man (N) himself-hides
"The man hides himself"

(3) *bavšv-i(N) curav-s (3rd p)*
child (N) swims
"The child is swimming"

(4) *k'ac-i(N) saxl-s(Dat) a-šeneb-s(3rd p)*
man(N) house(Dat) builds
"The man builds a house"

(5) *k'ac-i(N) kal-s(Dat) e-lap'arak'eb-a(3rd p)*
man (N) woman (Dat) to-speaks
"The man speaks with the woman"

(6) *k'ac-i(N) švil-s(Dat) saxl-s(Dat) u-šeneb-s(3rd p)*
man (N) child (Dat) house (Dat) for-him-builds
"The man builds a house for his child"

(7) *k'ac-i(N) švil-s(Dat) burt-s(Dat) a-dzlev-s (3rd p)*
man (N) child (Dat) ball (Dat) him-gives
"The man gives a ball to his child"

(8) *k'ac-i(N) muša-s(Dat) saxl-s(Dat) a-šeneb-in-eb-s(3rd p)*
man (N) worker (Dat) house (Dat) makes-build
"The man makes the worker build the house"

In the examples above the Agent is in the Nominative and the Patient, Recipient, Addressee, Benefactive are in the Dative. There is no special case marking for the Patient. The Agentive argument is marked with the Nominative and all Inactive arguments are marked with the Dative. There is a binary distinction: the arguments are differentiated into active and inactive ones. There is no further morphological distinction between them. Only the personal marking distinguishes the Addressee, Recipient, Benefactive (human roles) and the Patient (inhuman goal) in the forms of the 3rd person. This is in accordance with the dominant concept of the Active/Inactive distinction, because the 1st and 2nd persons, which prototypically are human, are cross-referenced with the personal markers of the inactive pattern both as Patients (direct objects) and as Recipients (indirect objects), but the 3rd person and common nouns are cross-referenced in the verb when they are Recipients (human participants) and are not cross-referenced when they are Patients (unanimated, nonhuman participants):

(9) ***m****(1st p)-c'er-s(3rd p)* "He writes to **me**"
g*(2nd p)-c'er-s(3rd p)* "He writes to **you**"
s*(3rd p)-c'er-s (3rd p)* "He writes to **him**"

(10) ***m****-č'am-s* "He eats **me**"
g*- č'am-s* "He eats **you**"
č'am-s "He eats it"

The 3rd person Patient is prototypically inanimate, non-human - "a thing", and accordingly it has no marking in the verb structure. Animate, human arguments (Recipient, Addressee, and Benefactor - indirect objects) of all persons are cross-referenced in the verb.

The Dative is the case of the inactive Subject too.

Pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons have no distinct forms for the Nominative, Ergative and Dative cases. *me* "I", *šen* "you", *čven* "we", *tkven* "you"(pl) have the same form in all these cases. They are differently cross-referenced in different cases: with the *v*-pattern of personal markers for Nominative and Ergative and with the *m*-pattern for the Dative.

(11) *me m(1st p inact)-civ-a (3rd p)*
me colds
"I am cold"

(12) *me m(1st p inact)-jer-a (3rd p)*
me believes
“I believe”
As controlled action:
(12a) *me v(1st p act)-i-jer-eb*
I believe

(13) *me m-a- xveleb-s*
me coughs
”I am coughing (uncontrolled action)”
The same action can be presented as controlled:
(13a) *me v(1st p act)-a-xveleb*
“I cough (controlled action)”

(14) *me m(1st p inact)-i-q’var-s(3rd p act) bavšv-i(N)*
me loves child
“I love the child”

(15) *me m(1st p inact)-e-smi-s(3rd p act) xma(N)*
me hears voice
“I hear a voice”

(16) *k’ac-s(Dat) e-smis xma(N)*
man(Dat) hears voice(N)
“The man hears a voice”
The same action can be presented as controlled:
(16a) *kac-i(N) u-smen-s simghera-s(Dat)*
man (N) to-listens song(Dat)
“the man listens to the song”

(17) *me m(1st p act)-akv-s(3rd p act) saxl-i(N)*
me has house
“I have a house”

(18) *k’ac-s (*Dat) *akv-s saxl-i(N)*
man has house
“The man has a house”

(19) *me m-i-nda p’ur-i(N)*
me wants bread
“I want bread”

(20) *k’ac-s (Dat) unda p’ur-i(N)*
man wants bread
“The man wants bread”

(21) me šemidzli-a cek’va(N)
me can dance (N)
“I can dance”
(22) k’ac-s (Dat) šeudzli-a cek’va(N)
man(Dat) can dance(N)
“The man can dance”

(23) *k’ac-s(Dat) saxl-i(N) e-p’at’araveb-a*
man(Dat) house(N) small-considers
“The house seems too small to the man” (for his opinion the house is too small)

The class of verbs with the Dative subject is large and productive. Most verbs of perception, possession, affection, belief, thinking, having an opinion (seems to...), wish, having a mood or ability to do something, physiological reactions or states of the body (cough, shriek, tremble...) have subject in the Dative, cross-referenced by the *m*- (inactive) pattern of personal markers. The argument in the Nominative case is as a rule the Causer, determining the processes of perception, affections, mental activities etc. The second argument of the verbs of possession can be defined as the Theme (***k’ac-s akv-s saxl-i*** “the man has a house”, ***kal-s h-q’av-s švil-i*** “the woman has a child”).

These verbs are often qualified as inversive, as the subject is marked with the *m*- pattern of personal markers. (Chikobava,1950, Melikishvili D., 2001) But if we assume that direct semantic marking is the governing principle of Georgian morphology, there is no need of such a qualification. The Dative and *m*- pattern of personal marking express directly the semantics of inactive verbs. The subject has no expression in the morphology of Georgian verb. The Dative is the case of all inactive arguments without taking into account whether it is a subject, direct object or an indirect object: **m**-*akv-s* “**I** have”, **m**-*iq’var-s* “**I** love*”,* **m**-*esmi-s* “**I** hear”, **m**-*adzlev-s* “He gives it to **me**”, **m**-*išeneb-s* “He builds it for **me**”, **m**-*ak’etebineb-s* “He makes **me** do it”, **m**-*k’lav-s* “He kills **me**” (For non- inversive interpretation of these forms see Van Valin, 1990, also Melikishvili I., 2005).

The construction of imperfective forms in Georgian can be defined as an Active construction. The dominant morphological category expressed by means of morphology in imperfective forms is the distinction of the Active/Inactive arguments. As shown above, there are two main ways of argument marking in imperfective forms: Nominative (cross-referenced by the *v*- pattern of personal markers) and Dative (cross-referenced by the *m*- pattern of personal markers). These two cases mark all main arguments:

The Nominative – marks the Agent, the main argument of state verbs (***is*** *(N)* ***gdi-a*** “**it** is lying”...), the Patient in the main position in passive forms (***saxl-i (N) šendeb-a*** “the house is built”), the Effector of the verbs with inactive subject (***xma (N) m-esmi-s*** voice me hears

“I hear a voice”, ***m-(***_1st p inact)_***c’am-s ghmert-i*** _(N)_ “I believe in God” (God excites my belief in him).

In the opposition Active/Inactive the Active is the unmarked category. This explains the Nominative marking of some non-agentive arguments. In these cases the opposition active/inactive remains unmarked and the unmarked Nominative case functions for the expression of the unmarked category.

The Dative *– marks the Experiencer (***k’ac-s*** esmi-s* “the man hears”, ***k’ac-s*** *s-dzag-s* “the man hates”), the Possessor (***k’ac-s*** *akv-s* “the man has”), the Wisher (***k’ac-s*** *unda* “the man wants”), the Executor (masc’avlebeli **bavšv-s** a-c’erineb-s davalebas “the teacher makes the child write the home work”), the Recipient (*k’ac-i* ***kal-s*** *c’ign-s adzlev-s* “the man gives the woman a book”), the Addressee (k’ac-i **kal-s** e-ubneb-a “the man tells the woman”), the Benefactive *(k’ac-i* ***švil-s*** *saxl-s u-šeneb-s* “the man builds a house for the child”), the Patient (*k’ac-i k’lav-s* ***irem-s*** “the man kills the deer”).

This system shows an obvious binary distinction of Active and Inactive arguments. Accordingly this construction must be defined as Active and not as Nominative. G. Klimov spoke about the active construction in Georgian, but in another sense. He defined the aorist construction as Active and not Ergative because the distribution of Ergative and Nominative for **A** and **S** does not depend on the transitivity/intransitivity of the verbs and many intransitive verbs have the Agent in the Ergative case (Klimov, 1973). This construction will be discussed in the next section and defined as Extended Ergative. It is more appropriate to consider the construction without accusative case and no distinction between Patient and Recipient (direct and indirect objects), with obvious dominance of the categories human/inhuman, person/non person, active/inactive as Active construction. There are two differently marked main arguments: Active – marked with Nominative, and Inactive – marked with Dative. (for grouping of main arguments in languages with Active construction see Fillmore, 1970, p 54). The cognitive principle governing the morphology of imperfective aspectual forms (I series) is to be defined as the opposition of active/inactive participants of the event. The hierarchy of semantic oppositions expressed by the verbal morphology is as follows:

1. Person-non person. To the category of person belong the 1st and 2nd person pronouns and human 3rd person pronouns and common nouns (prototypical Agent and Recipient). Non-persons are the inhuman 3rd person pronouns and the common nouns - things. Persons are marked in the verb, and the non-persons (prototypical patients, direct objects) are not cross-referenced in the verb.

2. Active-inactive. Persons participating in the speech event can have active and inactive roles. When they are Agents (initiative and controlling) they are marked with the Nominative case and the active *v-* pattern of personal markers and when they are inactive participants (Recipients), they are marked with the Dative case and the inactive *m-* series of personal markers (not taking into account the syntactic function of the argument as Subject or Object).

I think, the macroroles in this construction can be designed as **Actor** and **Recipient**. The macroconcept, uniting all kinds of Recipients (indirect objects), Patient and Subject of the verbs of affection and perception can be considered as Recipient in general sense; The Patient is receiving the direct influence of the action, the Addressee, Benefactor, Possessor, etc - the results of the action, the Subjects of affection and perception – the stimuli, coming from the Effectors. Besides, all the morphologically marked arguments are human and animate.

In this connection it may be interesting that the former Dative serves in English as undifferentiated Objective form: *him, her.* Dative, the Recipient role serves as unmarked syncretic Dative-Accusative form.

Georgian passives are not true passives, but rather the verbs of the class of Achievement (for verb classification into States, Achievements, Accomplishments and Activities see Dowty 1979; for correspondence of the four verb classes of Georgian morphology to the classification of Dowty see Holisky,1981).

is k’vd-eb-a	he/she dies
is šr-eb-a	it becomes dry
is kr-eb-a	it disappears
is i-zrd-eb-a	“he/she/it is growing”
is i-mal-eb-a	“he/she hides himself”
is mas e-zrd-eb-a	“he/she grows for him/her”
is mas e-mal-eb-a	“he/she hides from him/her”
is c’itl-d-eb-a	“he becomes red”
is braz-d-eb-a	“he/she becomes angry”
is t’q’-d-eb-a	it becomes broken

To this class of verbs belong the primary Achievement verbs: *kreba* “disappears”, *šreba* “dries” type and two derivational patterns: 1. **Oriented** (versional) type a)towards the Actor (reflexive), derived with prefix i-: *i-mal-eb-a* “ he/she hides himself” and b)towards the Recipient, derived with the prefix e-: *e-mal-eb-a mas* “he/she hides himself from him”; 2. **Transformative (become)** type, derived with suffix *-d*: *c’itl-d-eb-a* “becomes red”, *braz-d-eb-a* “becomes angry”. Conversional passive appears as the secondary, not general use of the verbs of Accomplishment. So the morphology of I-st (imperfective) series has no independent concept of the Patient (Undergoer) role.

The Active construction can be considered as the basic construction among the three constructions of Georgian, as the corresponding group of verbal forms shows all functional features of an unmarked category (for the criteria of markedness see Greenberg,1966):

a) All verbs have present and imperfective forms, and the gaps in the system are distributed in the aorist and perfective subsystems.

b) The number of distinct verbal forms (“screeves”) of the Imperfective series is larger (6 screeves) than that of the aorist (2 screeves) and of the Perfect series (3 screeves).

c) Deverbal nouns are derived from the stem of the Imperfective series.

d) The text frequency of imperfective forms is larger than the text frequency of the aorist and perfective forms.

For these reasons the imperfective series of verbal forms and accordingly the Active construction can be considered as dominant and unmarked for the Georgian verbal system.

II. Extended Ergative – the construction of aorist forms. The aorist series consists of two screeves: Aorist and Optative. Two types of constructions function in the Aorist system. The case marking of thematic roles and their cross-referencing in the verb are based on different principles. The case marking of arguments is of the Extended Ergative type (S and Odir are marked with the Nominative and the Subject of transitive verbs and of intransitive atelic verbs with the Ergative case), but the pattern of the cross-reference in the verb is the same as in Imperfect – Sact is marked with the active *v-* pattern of personal markers, and Sinact, Od, Oind with the inactive *m-* pattern of personal markers. So the marking of the main arguments has a split character conditioned by the noun and verbal systems.

In the imperfective series there were only two morphologically marked roles: the Active – expressed by the Nominative and the Inactive – expressed by the Dative. This binary system undergoes a double division in the case marking of the main arguments: in the aorist system the category of Agent is divided into two morphologically differently marked categories: one is marked with the Nominative and the other with the Ergative. The Subjects of transitive verbs and of intransitive agentive atelic verbs (the semantic definition of this verbal class was given by Holisky, 1981; in Georgian grammatical tradition these verbs are called medial verbs) are marked with the Ergative case. The Subject of all other intransitive verbs, except those which have the Subject in the Dative as in Imperfective series, is Nominative case.

The Inactive macrorole undergoes a division too: the Patient is marked with the Nominative and all other inactive arguments – with the Dative. We have three types of Subjects (marked with the Nominative, Ergative and Dative cases) and two types of objects (marked with the Nominative and Dative cases) in this series. If we follow the logic of morphological marking, we can say that there are three basic morphological arguments marked with Nominative, Ergative, and Dative. The examples below illustrate this pattern of argument marking.

1. Subject in Nominative [Oind in Dative]

(24) *k’ac-i(N) mi-vid-a*
man(N) came
“the man came”

(25) *k’ac-i(N) da-i-mal-a*
man(N) himself-hid
“the man hid himself”

(26) k’ac-i(N) kal-s(Dat) da-e-mal-a
man from the woman himself-hid
“the man hid himself from the woman”

(27) *saxl-i(N) a-šen-d-a*
house was built
“the house was built”

(28) nik’o-s(Dat) saxl-i(N) a- u- šen-d-a
niko(Dat) house(N) was for-him-built
“the house was built for Niko”

2. Subject in Ergative – Patient in Nominative – Recipient in Dative

(29) k’a*c-ma(Erg) saxl-i(N) a-a-šen-a*
man(Erg) house(N) built
“the man built a house”

(30) k’ac-*ma(Erg) švil-s(Dat) saxl-i(N) a-u-šen-a*
man(Erg) for his child(Dat) house(N) built
“the man built a house for his child”

(31) *k’ac-ma(Erg) muša-s(Dat) saxl-i(N) a-a-šeneb-in-a*

man(Erg) worker(Dat) house(N) made build
"the man made the worker build the house"

2. Subject in Ergative
Intransitive atelic verbs

(32) *k'ac-ma(Erg) i-cur-a*
man swam
"the man swam"

(33) *davit-ma(Erg) i-mep-a*
David(Erg) reigned
"David reigned"

3. Subject in Dative

(34) *k'ac-s(Dat) da-a-xvel-a*
man (Dat) coughed (uncontrolled)
"the man coughed"

(35) *k'ac-s(Dat) mo-e-sm-a xma(N)*
man(Dat) heard voice(N)
"the man heard a voice"

(36) *k'ac-s(Dat) mo-u-nd-a p'ur-i(N)*
man(Dat) wanted to have some bread(N)
"the man wanted bread"

(37*) k'ac-s(Dat) saxl-i(N) e-p'at'arav-a*
man (Dat) house seemed small
"the house seemed small to the man"

(11), (14) and (17) have no aorist forms as the verbs involved are static.

The principle of the morphological grouping of arguments changes in the aorist – the dominant principle is no longer the binary distinction of active/inactive. The construction functioning in the Aorist system can be called Extended Ergative. The constructions of the Imperfect and Aorist series of verb forms show different principles of the grouping of semantic roles.

4. Dative construction – Extended Ergative construction with the Agent in the Dative case – the construction of perfective forms. To the Perfective series belong three screeves: the Perfect, Pluperfect and Perfect Subjunctive. The construction of the Perfective series (III series in Georgian linguistic terminology) is the Extended Ergative Construction as in the aorist series. The subject of most intransitive verbs and the direct object are marked with the Nominative case and the subjects of transitive verbs and intransitive atelic verbs are marked with the oblique case, the Dative. The construction of this series of forms is more consistent than the construction of Aorist series, where the Ergative construction functions only in noun morphology but not in the verbal marking of arguments. In the Perfective series of forms the Ergative principle of the marking of arguments functions both in noun and verbal morphology: the Subject of transitive verbs is cross-referenced with the *m*-pattern of personal markers..

The principle of the formation of the forms of perfective series is transparent. The Perfective series is formed in accordance with the principle of perfect formation, formulated by E. Benveniste. According to E. Benveniste, new formations of the perfect are achieved by the connection of the meanings of state and possession and referring it to the inactive Subject. When this principle is used analytically, as in many Indo-European languages, the concept of state is expressed through the verbal noun, and the concept of possession with the possessive construction. Benveniste shows two ways of perfect formation according to the pattern of the possessive construction in the given language: "habeo factum" and "mana tya krtam" (Benveniste, 1952, 1960). In the languages of the type "habeo factum" the resulting perfective construction is of the Nominative type (for ex. Engl. I have done, Germ. *Ich habe gemacht*) and in the languages of the type "mana tya krtam" where the subject of the possessive construction is in an oblique case, the resulting perfective construction has the subject in oblique case – Dative, Genitive, Instrumental; in this way aspect-determined split Ergativity is generated, as in many Indo-Iranian languages (Old Persian: *mana kartam astiy*>Middle Persian: *man kart ham* (astiy)>modern Persian: man kardam "I have done").

This principle is realized in a synthetic way in Georgian. Georgian is a highly synthetic language and expresses most of the categories in a synthetic way. Many Old Georgian analytic constructions are transformed into synthetic constructions in modern Georgian. Though there are some analytic constructions in Georgian (***k'acs*** *ašenebuli akvs saxli* "the man has built a house"), synthetic constructions are far more frequent. There are interesting cases of transformations of analytic constructions into synthetic ones*:* ***v****(1st p)-****ẓi****(sit)-****v****(1st p)-****ar****(be)* "I am sitting". The 1st person is marked in the auxiliary verb **v-ar** "I am" and the whole structure has the 1st person prefix too.

The perfect form ***(da)m-i-c'er- i-a*** "I have written" is formed on the basis of static form:

(38) *es me* ***m-i-c'er-i-a*** *rveulši*

it me(Dat) is me-for-write-state-it in copy-book
”It is written in my copy-book / I have it written in my copy-book”

This static verb has other version forms too:
(39) *c’er-i-a* - unmarked form
“It is written”

(40) *k’ar-s(Dat) a-c’er-i-a* - locative form
door(Dat) on-write-state-3rd p
“it is written on the door”

The forms of the perfect are semantic transformations of benefactive-possessive forms of stative verbs. The static perfect is reinterpreted as an active perfect on the basis of the forms of the benefactive-possessive version:

(41) *m-i-c’er-i-a* “it is written for me”
g-i-c’er-i-a “it is written for you”
u-c’er-i-a “it is written for him”

As perfective forms they have an “active” meaning:
(42) *(da)-m-i-c’er-i-a*
(preverb)-me(1st p inact)-write-state- 3rd p
“I have written it”

The basic static verb can have oppositions of version forms, but the perfective forms have only the forms of the benefactive-possessive version: **m-i-** “for me”, **g-i-** “for you” **u-** “for him”:

(43) *(ga)-m-i- k’et-eb-i-a* “I have done”
(ga)-g-i-k’et-eb-i-a “you have done”
(ga)-u-k’et-eb-i-a “he has done”

The forms of the active perfect do not have a benefactive meaning. The three-personal benefactive forms receive two-personal interpretation in the perfect: ga-m-i-k’et-eb-i-a me is. If there is a need of expressing benefactive semantics it is done analytically: ga-m-i-k’et-eb-i-a mi-s-tvis “I have done it for him”.

The benefactive-possessive version is a marked member of version oppositions, and without taking into account the principle of perfect formation of Benveniste it would be impossible to understand why this marked form has become the only version form in the perfect system. The Perfect in Georgian and in other Kartvelian languages is formed in accordance with the principle of Benveniste: the concept of state, expressed by the static form of the verb (***c’er-i-a*** “Is written”, ***gd-i-a*** “is lying”) is connected with the concept of possession – expressed synthetically through the benefactive/possessive version and referred to inactive subject marked with the Dative and cross-referenced by inactive *m-* pattern of personal markers: **m-i-** “for me”, g-i- “for you” and **u-** “for him”, resulting in forms:

(44) *m-i-c’er-i-a* “I have written”
g-i-c’er-i-a “you have written”
*u-c’er-i-*a “he has written”
(45) *da-m-i-gd-i-a* “I have thrown it down”
da-g-i-gd-i-a “you have thrown it down”
da-u-gd-i-a “he has thrown it down”.

The perfect of the medial (agentive, atelic) verbs is formed in the same way:

(46) *m-i-cek’v-i-a* “I have danced”
g-i-cek’v-i-a “you have danced”
u-cek’v-i-a “he has danced”

The principle of the extension of the Ergative construction remains the same – the same verb classes have the subject in the Ergative as in Aorist series.

The intransitive verbs have the subject in the Nominative and the active *v-* pattern of personal markers:

(47) *da-v-malul-var*
prev-1st p act-hidden(participle)-I-am “I have hidden myself”
da-malul-xar “you have hidden yourself”
da-malul-a(<ars) “he has hidden himself”

The perfect forms of verbs with the subject in the Nominative show a tendency towards synthetic formation: The arguments are marked twice: with prefixes of the whole verb and in the enclitic auxiliary verb “to be”: ***v-ar*** “I am”, ***x-ar*** “you are”, ***ar-i-s>-a*** “he is”. The Old Georgian analytic construction ***damalul var*** is transformed in Modern Georgian into a synthetic construction: ***da-v-malul-v-ar*** “I am hidden”.

5. The Nominative construction in Georgian on the syntactic level. In syntax we have a different evaluation of arguments. The main arguments of different clauses can be linked together without taking into account their morphological marking:

(48) bavšv-s(Dat) zar-i(N) moesm-a, k’las-ši(Loc) še-vid-a da c’ign-i(N) gada-šal-a
child(Dat) bell-ringing(N) heard, classroom-into went and book(N) opened
“The child heard the bell ringing, went into the classroom and opened the book”

All verbs in this sentence are in aorist. All three clauses have subjects in different cases:

(49) (a) ***bavšv-s (Dat)*** *zar-i(N) mo-e-sm-a* inactive verb
child(Dat) bell(N) heard
"The child heard the bell ringing"

(b) ***bavšv-i(N)*** *k'las-ši(Loc) ševid-a* intransitive telic verb
child(N) classroom-into went
"The child went into the classroom"

(c) ***bavšv-ma(Erg)*** *c'ign-i(N) gada-šal-a* transitive verb
child(Erg) book(N) opened
"The child opened the book"

The subject of the first clause is in the Dative (the verb is inactive), that of the second clause in the Nominative (an intransitive telic verb), that of the third clause in the Ergative (a transitive verb). The differences in case marking do not impair the identification of the arguments in subject function.

(50) *kal-ma (Erg) megobar-i(N) mo-i-q'van-a da c'a-vid-a*
woman(Erg) friend(N) brought and away-went
"The woman brought her friend and went away"

The subjects are linked together without a pronoun in spite of the difference of case marking:

(51) (a) kal-ma(Erg) megobar-i(N) mo-i-q'van-a
woman(Erg) friend(N) brought
"The woman brought the friend"

(b) *kal-i(N) c'a-vid-a*
woman(N) away-went
"The woman went away"

If there is a need to express that it is the friend who went away, the use of the pronoun is necessary:

(52) kal-ma megobar-i mo-i-q'van-a da **is** c'a-vid-a
woman friend brought and she away-went
"The woman brought the friend and she/he (the friend) went away"

megobar-i "the friend", which is in the Nominative case in both clauses, cannot be co-referenced without the pronoun.

6. Conclusions. There are *three distinct ways of marking semantic roles in Georgian*:

1. The Active construction of the Imperfective series is based on the binary distinction of Active/Inactive semantic roles. Active roles are marked with the Nominative case and cross-referenced with the active *v*- pattern of personal markers, and Inactive roles are marked with the Dative case and cross-referenced with the inactive series of personal markers. The morphological marking of arguments is determined by the semantics of thematic roles and is independent of their syntactic (informational/logic) value. The morphological marking of arguments is semantically based in Georgian. Georgian morphology expresses semantic categories and takes almost no account of syntactic relationships. The construction of the imperfective series must be defined as Active and not as Nominative/Accusative, because:

a) there is no Accusative case in the system,

b) there is no distinction between the roles of Patient and Recipient. Both are marked with the Dative case and the inactive *m*- pattern of personal markers,

c) the main distinction of arguments is the binary distinction of Active and Inactive participants. The system shows all features of the Active/Inactive binary opposition, expressed morphologically.

2. The construction of the Aorist series can be defined as an Extended Ergative construction. The Ergative case marks the subject of transitive verbs and of intransitive agentive atelic verbs. The patient and the main argument of intransitive telic and static verbs are marked with the Nominative case. Verbal marking is of the Active/Inactive type.

3. The construction of the perfective series is also the Extended Ergative. This construction is generated through the transformation of a static perfect into an active perfect on the basis of the principle of perfect formation formulated by Benveniste. The subject of transitive verbs and of intransitive agentive atelic verbs is marked with the Dative and cross-referenced with the inactive *m*- pattern of personal markers. The Patient and highest argument of intransitive telic and static verbs are marked with the Nominative. The verbal cross-reference is of the Ergative type.

The diachronic relationship of these constructions can be reconstructed in the following way: The secondary character of the perfective series is transparent. The problem consists in the interpretation of the interrelationship of the imperfective and aorist constructions. It can be argued that the imperfective construction is unmarked in relationship to the aorist construction and accordingly it can be regarded as the dominant and primary construction:

1. The binary distinction of Active/Inactive acts in the whole system. Verbs with the inactive subject, when they possess the screeves of the II and III series, have the subject in the Dative case, as in the I series.

2. The Imperfective series has all features of unmarkedness in opposition to the aorist and perfective series: a) The tense and aspect forms of these series are the unmarked members of tense and aspect oppositions: present versus past, imperfective versus aorist and perfect. b) The number of the different screeves of the I series is larger than the number of screeves of the II and III series. The I series includes 6 screeves, the II series 2 screeves and the III series 3 screeves. c) All verbs possess the imperfective series, but there are many verbs with defective paradigms lacking the forms of the aorist and perfective series. d) the text frequency of imperfective forms is larger than the text frequency of aorist and perfective forms. e) Verbal nouns are derived from the forms of the I (imperfective) series.

3. The case marker of the Ergative case cannot be reconstructed on Common Kartvelian level. (Nebieridze, 1987) The Megrelian-Laz Ergative marker *-k* has no correspondences in the other Kartvelian Languages. The case marker **-n*, which can be reconstructed on the basis of Georgian-Svan correspondences, has Dative-Transformative semantics, capable of receiving the function of an Ergative, quite like the Dative in the Kartvelian Perfective series and the Dative, Genitive and Instrumental cases in Indo-Iranian languages.

The Active, Ergative and Nominative constructions are based on different cognitive principles of organizing the core arguments into macroroles.

The Active construction is based on the semantic division of the participants into a) human and inhuman and b) active and inactive. Inhuman participants receive no marking in the verb system. Human participants receive different markings as active and inactive participants. The Active is regarded as unmarked in opposition to the Inactive and is expressed with the unmarked Nominative case (Common Indo-European syntactic construstion was of the Active type too. [Gamkrelidze, Ivanov, 1984]).

The cognitive principle governing the Ergative construction is the immediate constituent structure. The unmarked Nominative case is employed for the closest arguments of the verb. The participant marked with the Nominative is the unmarked category among the thematic roles. This is the Patient of transitive verbs and the Subject of intransitive verbs. These arguments are closest to the verb in the immediate structure of the clause.

Both principles – the semantic distinction of active/inactive arguments and the immediate constituent structure of the clause - are universal. Different languages and different verb classes in a language use different universal principles as the main organizing principles of thematic roles into macroroles.

ენათმეცნიერება

ქართული, როგორც აქტიურ/ერგატიულ კონსტრუქციათა თანაარსებობის ენა

ი. მელიქიშვილი

თეორიული და შედარებითი ენათმეცნიერებისა და ფონეტიკის ინსტიტუტი,
თბილისის ი. ჯავახიშვილის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი

(წარმოდგენილია აკადემიკოს თ. გამყრელიძის მიერ)

ქართულში არსებობს ასპექტურად შეპირობებული სამი აქტანტური სტრუქტურა: 1) I სერიის კონსტრუქცია, სადაც გვაქვს ორი მაკროროლი — აქტიური და ინაქტიური: პირველი გამოხატულია სახელობითი ბრუნვითა და *ვ*-ს რიგის პირის ნიშნებით, ხოლო მეორე — მიცემითი ბრუნვითა და *მ*-ს რიგის

პირის ნიშნებით. არამარკირებული სტატუსი მათგან აქვს პირველს. 2) II სერიის კონსტრუქცია, სადაც ძირითადი არგუმენტების რიცხვი იზრდება ერთით: ა) მაკროროლი, გამოხატული სახელობითი ბრუნვით, ბ) როლი, გამოხატული მოთხრობითი (ერგატიული) ბრუნვით და გ) როლი, გამოხატული მიცემითი ბრუნვით. აქ I სერიის არააქტიური მაკროროლი იშლება ორად: სახელობითი ბრუნვით მარკირებულ პირდაპირი ზემოქმედების ობიექტად და მიცემითი ბრუნვით მარკირებულ ირიბი მიმართების ობიექტად. ხოლო ზმნური მარკირება ისეთივეა, როგორიც პირველ სერიაში. 3) III სერიის კონსტრუქცია, სადაც კვლავ ორი ძირითადი არგუმენტია, მაგრამ ორგანიზაციის პრინციპი განსხვავებულია: გვაქვს ა) სახელობითი ბრუნვითა და *ვ*-ს რიგით მარკირებული როლი და მიცემითი ბრუნვითა და *მ*-ს რიგით მარკირებული როლი; წინამდებარე სტატიაში პირველი სერიის კონსტრუქცია განისაზღვრება როგორც აქტიური, ხოლო მეორე და მესამე — როგორც გაფართოებული ერგატივი. პირველი და მესამე სერიების კონსტრუქციათა ბუნება ერთგვარია სახელური და ზმნური მარკირების თვალსაზრისით, ხოლო მეორე სერიის კონსტრუქცია სახელური თვალსაზრისით გაფართოებული ერგატიული პრინციპისაა, მაგრამ აქტიური პრინციპისაა ზმნური მარკირების თვალსაზრისით. ფუნქციონალური თვალსაზრისით აქტიურ კონსტრუქციას უნდა მიენიჭოს პრიორიტეტული, არამარკირებული სტატუსი, რაც დიაქრონიული თვალსაზრისით მის პირველადობაზე მიუთითებს.

REFERENCES

დ. მელიქიშვილი (2001), ქართული ზმნის უღლების სისტემა, თბ. [*Melikishvili D.*, Conjugational System of Georgian Verb], Tbilisi.

ი. მელიქიშვილი (2002), ქცევა, როგორც ასპექტურ დაპირისპირებათა გამოხატვის საშუალება ქართულში. – ენათმეცნიერების საკითხები. [*Melikishvili I.*, Version as a Means of Expressing Aspectual Oppositions in Georgian], Enatmecnierebis sakitxebi [Issues in Linguistics], 2002, 4: 120-131, Tbilisi.

გ. ნებიერიძე (1987), როგორი სისტემა უნდა აღდგეს ქართველურ ფუძე ენაში – ერგატიული თუ ნომინატიური? [Nebieridze G., Which System must be Reconstructed for Common Kartvelian – Ergative or Nominative?], *Macne*, 1988, 2: 83-95, Tbilisi.

ა. ჩიქობავა, 1928 - მარტივი წინადადების პრობლემა ქართულში, [Chikobava, A. The Problem of Simple Sentence in Georgian], Tbilisi.

ა. ჩიქობავა,1950 - ქართული ენის ზოგადი დახასიათება, [Chikobava, A. General Characterisation of the Georgian Language], Kartuli enis ganmartebiti leqsikoni [Explanatory Dictionary of the Georgian Language], Tbilisi, Mecniereba.

Т. В. Гамкрелидзе, В. В Иванов 1984 - Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы Тбилиси [Gamkrelidze T. V. Ivanov V.V. Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans], Tbilisi.

Г. А. Климов (1973), Очерк общей теории эргативности, М. [Klimov G. A. A Sketch of the Theory of Ergativity], Moscow, Nauka.

Г. А. Климов (1977), Типология языков активного строя, М. [Klimov G. A. Typology of the Languages of Active Structure], Moscow, *Nauka*.

E. Benveniste (1952), La construction passive du parfait transitif, BSL, t. 48.

E.Benveniste (1960), «Être» et «avoir» dans leurs fonctions linguistiques, BSL, t. 55.

R.M.W.Dixon (1998), Ergativity, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, Cambridge University Press.

Ch. J. Fillmore (1968), The Case for Case, Universals in Linguistic Theory, ed. by E. Bach and R. T. Harms, London, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

J. H. Greenberg (1966), Language Universals, Current Trends in Linguistics, **3**: 61-112, The Hague, Mouton.

D. A. Holisky (1981), Aspect and Georgian Medial Verbs, Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.

R. D. Van Valin Jr. (1990), Semantic Parameters of Split Intransitivity, Language, **66**, 2: 221-259.

Received April, 2008