

*Linguistics*

## The “Regular” Type of Georgian Verbal Super-Paradigm

Giorgi Chikoidze

*Archil Eliashvili Institute of Control Systems of Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi*

(Presented by Academy Member Mindia Salukvadze)

**ABSTRACT.** The work is dedicated to the Georgian verb super-paradigm. The sums of the paradigms that are derived from one and the same lexical unit are meant under the name. The “regular” subset that is the most widespread and has less complicated structure, members of which consist of causative, active transitive and passive paradigms is used to regulate this rather numerous set. It is shown that the main actants of these paradigms behave correspondingly with certain semantic roles (CS, AG, OB, AD). One of the non-regular classes (INTR) the main difference of which is that OB role can be substituted by IC role (Intermediate Causer) is also considered in the paper. Ascertainment of the structure of these units first of all depends on surface appearance of verb-actant relations, which is realized by verb affixes and by the cases of actants. © 2012 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.

**Key words:** *super-paradigm, action chain, semantic role.*

The super-paradigm is a set of Georgian verb paradigms derived from one and the same verbal lexeme. As a result these paradigms have a common semantic kernel and as a rule are derived from one and the same morphologic root.

The semantics of super-paradigm is based on the quite stable relations between participants of process/state defined by the semantic kernel of super-paradigm; nevertheless the grammatical form of actants expressing one and the same participant in the context of different members (paradigms) of super-paradigm are different. The main purpose of this work is demonstration and classification of correlations between choice of actants, grammatical form (in the first instance, of its case) and the semantic

nuances which characterize the role and function of the corresponding participant in the context of the given paradigm. The peculiarities of these contexts which define the choice of actant, grammatical features essentially depend, in their turn, on the position of the given paradigm in the sequence of paradigms belonging to one and the same super-paradigm.

As to the ordering of the member-paradigms in the frames of their super-paradigm, it is based on semantic relations between these members and, in the first place, on the cause-consequential ones, according to which the position of each member in this “Action Chain” [1] should be situated after those by which the corresponding paradigm is conditioned

and before those ones which it itself conditions.

Analogous relations of causation and influence take place between the participants of process/state representing the semantic kernel of the super-paradigm. As a result they are also ordered and create something like “Actor Chain” [2], where each preceding link influences the following ones and, in the first instance, its immediate “right” neighbour.

These relations are, at least in the case of the “regular” super-paradigms, even more obvious than those between links of “Action Chain”. So, for example, if we consider super-paradigm:

- 1)  $A_1$ -ma aašenebina  $A_2$ -s  $A_3$ -i  $A_4$ -istvis/-s (‘ $A_1$  caused  $A_2$  to build  $A_3$  for  $A_4$ )
- 2)  $A_2$ -ma a(a/u)šena  $A_3$ -i  $A_4$ -istvis (‘ $A_2$  has built  $A_3$  for  $A_4$ )
- 3)  $A_3$ a(u)šenda  $A_4$ -istvis/-s (‘ $A_3$  was built for  $A_4$ ),

it becomes quite obvious that  $A_1$  influences immediately  $A_2$  stimulating him “to build  $A_3$ ”: that endeavours of  $A_2$  are immediately directed at  $A_3$ , which “is being created” by him; and that the final result of these “endeavours” ( $A_3$ ) is oriented to  $A_4$ , which will become “the proprietor” of the latter. The most general scheme of these relations can be represented by (1)

$$A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow A_3 \rightarrow A_4 \quad (1)$$

where ( $A_i \rightarrow A_{i+1}$ ) implies that  $A_{i+1}$  undergoes some kind of immediate influence from  $A_i$ .

The potential structure of a super-paradigm as an “Action Chain” can be represented as a sequence of three components:

$$\text{CAUS} \rightarrow \text{PROC} \rightarrow \text{RES} \quad (2)$$

where the first member (CAUS) includes the actions which initiate actions of PROC and the latter ones produce as a result the state or process-RES. No one of them is obligatory: so, for example,

midis (‘he goes’),

is represented by PROC only, though somebody/something causing this process can be pragmatically imagined without any difficulty. It is important to mention here that this verb has no RES-component

either, because the latter implies something more than completion of the process expressed by the perfective form

mivida (‘he came there’);

Unlike this, the RES component must represent a “full-fledged” new process/state which emerged as a result of completion of the preceding PROC, particularly, as a result of its completion (but not as this “completion” itself).

The opposite example may be supplied by super-paradigms generated from verb lexemes like

qepa (‘to bark’), c’uxili (‘disturbance’), etc., which include all three parts of (2); so the super-paradigm corresponding to the c’uxili (‘disturbance’) is;

1. CAUS: 1.1) šeac’uxebina p’etrem p’avles ivane (‘Peter caused Paul to disturb John’)
- 2) šeac’uxa p’avlem ivane (‘Paul has disturbed John’)
2. PROC: šec’uxda ivane (‘John became disturbed’)
3. RES: c’uxs ivane/ic’uxa ivanem/uc’uxia ivanes (‘John is/was turned out to be disturbed’)

The chains (1) and (2) (of “actors” and of “actions”) are correlated with each other, their development is in some sense, mutually parallel. Their interdependence is represented on the surface level by the verb affixes explicitly pointing to the actants representing some of the “actors” ( $A_i$  of (1)), on the one hand, and the cases of these and some other  $A_i$  “actants”, on the other.

Each paradigm of super-paradigm explicitly is addressed by its affixes one or two links of “Actor Chain” (1), and it is this choice that most obviously demonstrates the correlation between links of “action” and “actor” chains. Particularly, in the case of the pair of addressed “actors” the leading part belongs to the “upper” actor, that is, to the nearest to the “head” of the chain (1) with the minimal value of  $i$ .

The above mentioned regular super-paradigms “šeneba” (‘to build’) can be used as illustration of this aspect of correlation between two chains - (1) and (2): 1) affixes of first (causative) paradigm verbs

addresses the participant  $A_1$ , who has “caused” the process of “building”, and his nearest right neighbour  $A_2$ , who immediately leads the process of “building”; 2) just the latter of them ( $A_2$ ) is the “head” of sub chains of both active paradigms, addressed (*ušenebs*) and non-addressed (*ašenebs*); at the same time one of the following  $A_2$  participants ( $A_3, A_4$ ) can be chosen as the second member of this sub-chain of (1); 3) both passive paradigms (*a(u)šenda*) have  $A_3$  as “lead” participant, representing the object of immediate influence of  $A_2$ , which at the end of the process will be “given” to  $A_4$ , nearest right neighbour of  $A_3$  and possible second link of sub-chain of passive paradigms.

So, if we accept the correspondence of causative paradigm to CAUS of (2), both actives “to PROC and both passives – to RES, we will have the obvious correlation between (1) and (2):

$$\text{CAUS} \leftrightarrow A_1, \text{PROC} \leftrightarrow A_2, \text{RES} \leftrightarrow A_3 \quad (3)$$

Moreover, “Actor Chain” of some super-paradigm includes those and only those actors which are explicitly addressed at least by affixes of one of its paradigm. As a result the length of chain (1) varies for different super-paradigms: particularly, four members of (1) are characteristic of regular and some other super-paradigms, but many other ones deviate from this regular characteristic, which as it seems, should be the maximal one. One of the examples with a single actor was already mentioned earlier; it is the verb “midis” (‘to go’); if the causative form of “akvs” (‘to have’) is acceptable (‘akonina’  $A_1$ -ma  $A_2$ -s  $A_3$ -i “ $A_1$  caused  $A_2$  to have  $A_3$ ), then this super-paradigm would have three participants, otherwise it would be only:

$$A_1\text{-s akvs } A_2\text{-i (} A_1 \text{ has } A_2\text{)}.$$

Nevertheless most super-paradigms have “Actor Chains” identical to (1), so that the shortening of this chain may be considered as some deviation from regularity, moreover the boundary between “regularity” and “non-regularity” is often not fully clear from this point of view (particularly, there often turns out

to be a contradiction between purely grammatical and pragmatical considerations: e.g. *c’vims* – *ac’vimebinebs/ac’vimebs* where causative forms are quite felicitous grammatically, but quite dubious pragmatically).

Up to now we considered the influence of verb affixation on the structure of super-paradigm, without taking into account the distinctions between kinds of this affixation, that is between roles of subjective (SUB) and objective (OBJ) types of verb affixes. The priority of the former one shows in the position of the actor to which SUB-affixes are most often addressed: it is the “head” position of the actor’s sub-chain immediately addressed by verb affixes.

The most regular deviations from this rule represent the inersive verb forms, particularly, those of the III series; moreover it is the exchange of the positions of SUB and OBJ affixes that constitutes the main feature of this inversion. For that all other forms of regular super-paradigms satisfy this rule:

CAUS: (*da*)-v-axat’vine me ( $A^1_1$ ) mas ( $A^2_2$ ) – ‘I( $A^1_1$ ) caused her/him ( $A^2_2$ ) to draw’

PROC: *da*-v-(u)-xat’e me ( $A^1_1$ ) is ( $A^2_3$ ) (mas  $A_3$ ) – ‘I ( $A^1_1$ ) drew it ( $A^2_3$ ) (for her/him ( $A_4$ ))’

RES: *da*-v-(i/e)-xat’e me ( $A^1_1$ ) (for her/him  $A_4$ );

in all these examples the “head” (first) position is occupied by the first person “me” (‘I’), because it is addressed by the most obvious SUB affix (-v-); the lower index of  $A^i_1$  symbols corresponds to the basic position of  $A_1$  actor in “Actor Chain” (1) and the upper one (j) points to its position in sub-chain corresponding to the given verb form, that is including actors which are explicitly addressed by affixes of this form.

At the same time the III series forms of the same verbs demonstrate inversion of SUB and OBJ affixes, that is just OBJ affixes point at the first link of the sub-chain ( $A^1_j$ ) and SUB – to the second one ( $A^{2_{i+1}}$ ): e.g.

*da*-mi-xat’avs me ( $A^1_2$ ) is ( $A^1_3$ ) – ‘it seems that I ( $A^1_2$ ) have painted it ( $A^2_3$ )’;

da-v-u-xat'i-v-ar me ( $A^2_3$ ) mas ( $A^1_2$ ) – ‘it seems he ( $A^1_2$ ) has painted me ( $A^2_3$ )’;

the active actor (“painter”) is addressed in the first example by the OBJ affix -mi- and the object of painting process ( $A^2_3$ )- by double SUB affixes -v- which additionally turns out in the auxiliary verb “var” (‘I am’) incorporated by the verb of the second example.

Other deviations from this rule are less regular, but for that matter, quite rare. So, some super-paradigms derived from lexical units with “emotional” semantics include paradigms which are inversive in all three series;

m-3uls/še-m-3ulda/m-3ulebia me ( $A^1_3$ ) is ( $A^2_4$ ) – ‘I ( $A^1_3$ ) hate/ begin to hate / it seems hate him ( $A^2_4$ )’;

v-3ul-v-ar/še-v-3uldi me ( $A^2_4$ ) mas ( $A^1_3$ ) – ‘I ( $A^2_4$ ) am / begin to be hateful for him ( $A^1_3$ )’;

Some paradigms derived from lexical units with semantics oriented to (mostly “unconscious”) states demonstrate analogous inversive behaviour:

m-e3ineba/ m-3inavs me ( $A^1_3$ ) – ‘I ( $A^1_3$ ) want to sleep/ sleep’.

Nevertheless the greatest part of verb paradigms (with the exception of the above mentioned forms of III series) follows the rule, according to which to SUB affixes may be ascribed higher priority than that of OBJ affixes:

$$\text{SUB} \rightarrow \text{OBJ} \rightarrow Z \quad (4)$$

where Z symbolizes the lack of any explicit address to some actor by means of verb affixes.

Lastly, it is worth mentioning that we simplify (4) by ignoring the difference between direct and indirect objective affixation.

We have considered up to this point the expression of “action → actor” relation from the verbal point of view, but not less, perhaps even more, meaningful is the substantival aspect of this relation, particularly, the case values, which mark corresponding actants in all three series of verb paradigm and are the most important feature of these relations.

The main case values marking actants corresponding to “Actor Chain” (1) are:

e(rgative) – ‘motxrobiti’, n(ominative) – ‘saxelobiti’, d(ative) – ‘micemiti’.

Just they mark the actants immediately addressed by SUB or OBJ affixes; the same actants, when they are not addressed explicitly, may be additionally marked by g(enitive) – ‘natesaobiti’, i(nstrumental) – ‘mokmedebiti’ and most often by some preposition combined with the corresponding case value (g+tviz, d+ze, ...). The prepositional forms in general will be represented by the symbol – p, and other case values – by the first letter of their Latin terms. One more symbol (z) points to the lack of a corresponding actant form; which is conditioned by the lack of the corresponding verb form (e.g. by the lack of the II series forms; thus, for example, the verb paradigm jdoma (‘to sit’) has the forms of I (‘zis’ – ‘is sitting’) and III (mj dara – ‘it turns out that she/he was sitting’) series only.

It may be said that the complex language sign, the content of which corresponds to the action – actor relation, has expression, which on the level of the single paradigm as a whole is represented by a pair of correlated triples, the first of which includes the characteristics of verb affixes addressing the given actant (SUB, OBJ) and the other is represented by case markers of the actant, in the all series of the given paradigm. The full scheme of this expression can be given by (5).

$$VA_1, CV_1-VA_2, CV_2-VA_3, CV_3 \quad (5)$$

where VA means Verbal Affixes (SUB, OBJ), CV – implies Case Value and the indexes point to the verb series (I, II, III respectively).

The values of  $VA_i$  and  $CV_i$  are strongly correlated and their interdependence supplies the possibility to restrict and accordingly to simplify (5). In the first instance, SUB affixes point to the “head” position of sub-chain corresponding to the given paradigm only and only two triples of CV may be combined with it:

n, e, d and n, n, n,

though the first of them changes in the inversional III series the SUB affixes by OBJ ones:

ašeneb-s is ( $A^1_2, n$ ) mas ( $A^2_3, d$ ) – ‘he ( $A^1_2$ ) is building ( $A^2_3$ )’,

aušen-a man ( $A^1_2, e$ ) is ( $A^2_3, n$ ) – ‘he ( $A^1_2$ ) has built it ( $A^2_3$ )’,

but

a-u-šenebia mas ( $A^1_2, e$ ) is ( $A^2_3, n$ ) – ‘it turns out that he ( $A^1_2$ ) has built it ( $A^2_3$ )’.

The first and second examples belonging to the I and II series have suffixes –s and –a of SUB type, but prefix -u- of III series form belongs to the OBJ type.

The behaviour of “head” position of causative paradigm (aašenebina man mas is) is identical with this of active one demonstrated above.

The use of this version of SUB is exhausted in the frames of regular super-paradigm by marking “head” positions of two paradigms, causative ( $A^1_1$ ) and active ( $A^1_2$ ). In terms of the (1) these versions of SUB address the left (“head”) part of this chain, which represents the most active participants of the situation mirrored by regular super-paradigm: first of them ( $A_1$ ) causes the activity of the other ( $A_2$ ), which in its turn is directed immediately to  $A_3$  and it is this influence of  $A_2$  and  $A_3$  that represents the core of super-paradigm semantics as a whole. Proceeding from this it seems sensible to consider  $A_1$  as a causer (CS) of the situation and  $A_2$  as an agent (AG), the influence of which on the  $A_3$  as the object (OB) of AG’s activity, which leads the process (PROC) that defines the essence of regular paradigm semantics.

The priority of SUB affixations supposed by (4) additionally justifies itself by marking the relation between verb and OB ( $A_3$ ) placed in the “head” position, which it takes in the context of passive verb paradigms:

v-ixat’ebi / da-v-ixat’e / da-v-xat’vul-v-ar me (OB) – ‘I’m being drawn / am drawn / it seems I’m drawn; though in this context SUB is present in all three verb series (that is without exclusion of the third one), on

the one hand, and is combined with the constant case value – n, which does not change by e in the second series and retains itself in the third series also, on the other hand:

ixat’eb-a is (OB-n) – daixat’a is (OB-n) – daxat’ul-a is (OB-n) – ‘she/he is being drawn / (it seems) is drawn’.

In what follows we shall address these two modes of marking by their most characteristic components corresponding to the II series:

(SUB, e) and (SUB, n),

instead of

SUB, n – SUB, e – OBJ, d

And

SUB, n – SUB, n – SUB, n,

which give their full expression according to (5).

The “tail” link of (1), that is –  $A_4$ , does not take the “head” position in sub-chains of any paradigm of regular sub-paradigm and accordingly is never addressed by SUB affixes: its verb marker is OBJ which combines with d actant markers in the I and II series, but in the III series becomes “ignored” by the verb affixes (z) and is marked by some versions of prepositional actant form (pp) only:

u-xat’avs is ( $A_2, AG, n$ ) mas ( $A_3, OB, d$ ) mas ( $A_4, AD, d$ ) – ‘he/she paints something for somebody’;

da-u-xat’a man ( $A_2, AG, e$ ) is ( $A_3, OB, n$ ) mas ( $A_4, AD, d$ ) – ‘he/she has painted something for somebody’;

da-u-xat’avs mas ( $A_3, AG, d$ ) is ( $A_3, OB, n$ ) mistvis ( $A_4, AD, g+vis$ ) – ‘it seems she/he has painted something for somebody’;

The role of AD(dressee) of  $A_4$  is quite obvious in this context (though in some other contexts it can be less definite).

The marking of this verb-actant ( $A_4, AD$ ) may be characterized by the simplified expression of (5):

(OBJ, d – z, pp),

where the left part corresponds to I, II series and the right one – to the III series.

We have reached the “tail” of (1) by the last example ( $A_4$ , AD), at least in the case of the regular super-paradigms. This “tail” link of (1) can take the second position of the corresponding sub-chains ( $A_2$ ,  $A_4$  and  $A_3$ ,  $A_4$ ) only. We shall now consider the means of marking which characterize such second positions of the rest of the chain (1) that is of  $A_2$  and  $A_3$ , because  $A_1$  can belong to the first position of sub-chain and of the chain (1) as a whole. “By that we shall proceed in the direction opposite to the previous one: from the “tail” – to the “head”.

Thus, in the first instance, after  $A_4$  will be addressed  $A_3$  (OB), which can be placed in the second position immediately after  $A_2$  only:  $A_2A_3$  is a sub-chain of the active paradigm which does not address  $A_4$  (AD) explicitly. Receding to the back position  $A_3$  (like the other links of (1)) becomes addressed by the OBJ affixes in I, II series

m-xat’avs/ da-m-xat’a is /man ( $A_2$ , AG) me ( $A_3$ , OB) – ‘she / he is drawing / has drawn me ( $A_3$ , OB)’;

At the same time OB retains SUB addressation in the inversive III series:

da-v-uxat’i-v-ar mas (AG) me (OB) – ‘it turns out that she/he has drawn me’.

As to case values,  $A_3$  changes them in the I series only that is it becomes marked by d (instead of n):

(ixat’eba is (OB, n)) → xat’avs is (AG) mas (OB, d) – ‘(it is being painted) → she / he is painting it’. Thus “retreat” to the back position reduces the priority of OB markers: SUB → OBJ (I, II series) and n → d (I series). The former of these changes is inevitable (verb cannot address two different actants by one and the same type of affixes); as to the latter one, it may be supposed that language in this case (as in many others) avoids coincidence of forms of different members in one and the same context.

More drastic transformations follow AG’s replacement to the second position of sub-chain correspond-

ing to the causative paradigm: its marking becomes identical with that of AD ( $A_4$ ):

OBJ, d – OBJ, d – Z, g+tv is.

It may be supposed that this coincidence has some semantic basis: obviously, AG functions in this causative context as an addressee (as a “sink”) of stimulus information, which is immediately pointed at AG.

This combination of functions fulfilled by one and the same participant ( $A_2$ ) in different contexts (causative, active paradigms) remembers the concept of “blending” [3], on the one hand, and underlines the fact that the surface characteristics of verb-actant relations have immediate deep semantic correspondences, on the other. It is the latter point that supports the supposition that these surface markings can be considered as an expression of a complex language sign.

Thus far we have considered the behaviour of this sign in the frames of the super-paradigms, which were accepted as regular:

causative paradigm (CAUS) → active transitive (PROC) → passive (RES).

The general “Actor Chain” (1) was interpreted in terms of semantic roles:

CS → AG → OB → AD (6)

(the concrete interpretations of these terms here are quite different from those of [4], which nevertheless is the original general concept of “semantic role”).

Each paradigm chooses some sub-chain of (6) pointing at its links by verb affixes (SUB, OBJ); causative paradigm – CS, AG; active – AG, OB/AD; passive – OB, (AD). Each position of these sub-chains can be characterized by combinations of surface markers: case values of actants representing semantic roles of (6) and verb affixes explicitly pointing at them. The most characteristic for super-paradigm surface structure are markers which show in the context of I and II (non-inversive) series: 1) the actants of “tail” positioned roles ( $AG^2$ ,  $OB^2$ , AD) are addressed

by OBJ verb affixes and marked by *n* (OB) or *d* (AG, AD) case values.

According to the correlation between case values and positions of corresponding roles we can suppose the following scheme of priorities for the former ones;

$$e \rightarrow n \rightarrow d \rightarrow pp \quad (7)$$

where the “head” position of *e*-value is justified by marking of “head” position role actants only; the third place of *d*-value is conditioned by its use mainly for marking second position actants; unlike them, *n*-value serves for marking of both positions of sub-chains and it is this that determines its intermediate place between *e*/*d*-values; lastly, the *pp*-value never marks actants of the role which does not belong to the sub-chain of the given paradigm, that is such that is not directly addressed by the verb affixes of this paradigm (though the same role may be expressed by an actant addressed by the verb affixes in the context of some other paradigm of the same super-paradigm, and, as a result, marked by *e*/*n*/*d*-values):

es saxli (OB, *n*) ašenda mistvis(AD, *g*+*tvis*) čems mier (AG, *g*+*tvis*)→me (AG, *e*) avušene mas (AD, *d*) es saxli (OB, *n*)

I have built something (for) him ↔ something was built by me (for) him!

The considerations given so far were mainly based on the most numerous class (“regular”) class of Georgian super-paradigms. Of course this type, in spite of its multiplicity, does not exhaust the diversity of the whole set of these verbal super-units.

The choice of precisely this class is justified, besides its numerosity, by the relevant simplicity of its structure and, in the first instance, by transparency correspondence between the semantic roles (7) and their surface marking. One of the most essential features of this class is the stability of OB-role’s behaviour: it is almost always present in non-elliptic utterances built on the basis of some verb belonging to the regular super-paradigm and, moreover, the surface marking of OB actants is remarkably stable in all

these contexts: its case marker is mainly *n*, though sometimes – *d*, but never – *pp*, even in the contexts where OB is not immediately addressed by verb affixes.

The most essential deviation from the regularity of the super-paradigms, which may be considered next, is just the lacking of this central role of the regular ones, that is OB-role. This class, proceeding from this important quality, will be mentioned in what follows as an “intransitive” (INTR).

On example of this class (*c’uxili*- ‘sorrow/worry’) was given above. According to this single example it may be said already, that the main structure of this type of super-paradigm looks as: causative paradigm 1 – causative paradigm 2 (active, transitive) – passive – active intransitive paradigm; by that the first pair (causative 1, 2) fulfills the CAUS function of scheme (2), first passive corresponds to PROC and the last one – to the RES.

The behaviour of the “Actor Chain” “head” ( $A_1$ ) is the same as in the previous case: it has obviously the status of “causer” (CS):

šec’uxebina man (CS) mas ( $A_2$ ) is ( $A_3$ ) – ‘She/he caused him to trouble somebody’;

but the second position of this causative paradigm sub-chain (unlike the regular case) does not fulfill the AG role, which should be a “tail” of active part of the role chain : it influences one more participant ( $A_3$ ), which, in its turn, is interpreted as active and at the same time represents the “tail” of activity (AG):

šec’uxebina  $A_1$ -ma (CS)  $A_2$  -s (IC)  $A_3$  (AG)→šec’uxa  $A_2$ -ma  $A_3$  – ‘He/she has troubled somebody’; the result of the two proceeding (“causative”) steps is that  $A_3$  (AG) firstly “gets” in the state of “trouble” under immediate influence of  $A_2$ : šec’uxda is  $A_3$  (AG) – “somebody gets troubled” and then the same  $A_3$  (AG) “is troubled”/“has been troubled”:

*c’uxs* is  $A_3$  (AG) / *ic’uxa* man  $A_3$  (AG).

The last two steps represent the PROC and RES studies of the whole super-paradigm proceeds: the first of them is formed as passive paradigm (šec’uxda)

and its single actant ( $A_3$ ) is marked according to the usual rule of passives (SUB; n,n,n), as though it continues to be under the influence of  $A_2$  (IC) exerted on it in the previous paradigm, where it was placed in the second position and as the result was marked as usual in this position by (SUB, d,n,n) that had the usual marking of OB in this position. It may be said that in these two steps (intermediate causation and caused by it the process of “getting in the final state”) AG demonstrates the features of “blending” with OB, which nevertheless manifests itself as an explicit AG and the resulting (“tail”) study of the whole process.

The preference given here to AG as a component of the “blend” may look somewhat doubtful and to solve this problem we propose the general principle, according to which the AG role should be ascribed to the active  $A_i$  nearest to the “tail” of (1) and “activity” as such should be defined by the type of surface marking of corresponding verb-actant relation in particular, it must be as a rule of “top priority”, that is – (SUB, e).  $A_3$  is marked in such way in a resulting state (c’uxs), which, according to this, is interpreted by the language as active (‘somebody feels uneasy’).

The final state (RES) of INTR class super-paradigm may have a quite “passive” interpretation also, as it is e.g. in the case of *zili* (‘to sleep’), where obviously the “passive”, “unconscious” participant’s actant is marked by (OBJ,d), but, in spite of this, it is at the end considered as AG, thanks to the marking which it has in the preceding study (SUB,e):

*izinebs is – daizina man – dauzina mas* – ‘she/he is asleep – it seems, that he has fallen asleep; and this process of “dropping to sleep” is interpreted as active, because this paradigm is the last one with actant marked by (SUB, e).

It can be supposed in general that INTR super-paradigm differs from regular ones, besides its lacking the OB role, by an additional paradigm with first position actant addressed and marked by (SUB,e).

The “tail” link of (1) can be again interpreted as AD; sometimes it corresponds to the AG’s “proprie-

tor”, in some other contexts it may be the object to which the AG’s activity is directed; an example given below demonstrates the case characterized by the possibility of both interpretations:

*auqepa man(IC) mas (AD) zayli* – ‘he caused a/his dog to bark (on him/)’.

Thus, the main characteristics of the INTR class of super-paradigms can be represented by the following interpretation of the general chain (1):

$$CS \rightarrow IC \rightarrow AG \rightarrow AD$$

The “head” and “tail” links (CS, AD) of this scheme are identical with these of regular super-paradigm class. The differences between these classes are concentrated in its middle component, where AG is shifted from the second position ( $A_2$ ) to the third ( $A_3$ ) and the “gap” is filled out by the new role IC (Intermediate Causer). The scheme makes obvious both main features of INTR super-paradigms: lacking of OB role and a triple cascade of active roles (CS, IC, AG), the middle of which fills up the lack of OB.

Of course, the pair of super-paradigm classes considered above does not exhaust the variety of this set. This work makes an accent on the supposed centre of this set (regular) and demonstrates with a single example of INTR class the possible character of deviations from “regularity”. The main merit of these examples is demonstration of the supposed basis on which the structure of super-paradigm can be built; “Actor chain” (1), “action Chain” (2), and correspondence between them (3). Moreover, the most important aspect of the proposed analyses is the preference of the features of surface representation, that is, of the means of marking of verb-actant relations corresponding to the predicate-role dependences.

This work is a continuation and development of Georgian super-paradigm study and of their untraditional concept justification, the beginning of which is given in [5] and [2].



ენათმეცნიერება

## ქართული ზმნური სუპერ-პარადიგმის “რეგულარული” ტიპი

გ. ჩიკოიძე

საქართველოს ტექნიკური უნივერსიტეტის არჩილ ელიაშვილის მართვის სისტემების ინსტიტუტი

(წარმოდგენილია აკადემიკოს მ. სალუქვაძის მიერ)

ნაშრომი ეძღვნება ქართული ზმნური სუპერ-პარადიგმების განხილვას. შემოკლებული სახელის ქვეშ იგულისხმება ზმნური პარადიგმების ერთობლიობა, რომელიც ნაწარმოებია ერთი და იმავე ლექსემისაგან. ამ საკმაოდ მრავალრიცხოვანი სიმრავლის მოსაწესრიგებლად გამოყენებულია მისი ერთეულების ყველაზე გავრცელებული და შედარებით მარტივი სტრუქტურის მქონე “რეგულარული” ქვესიმრავლე, რომლის წევრები შედგებიან კაუზატური, აქტიური გარდამავალი და პასიური პარადიგმებისგან. ნაჩვენებია, რომ ამ პარადიგმების ძირითადი აქტანტები იქცევიან გარკვეული სემანტიკური როლების შესაბამისად (CS, AG, OB, AD).

განხილულია აგრეთვე ამ ერთეულთა ერთ-ერთი არარეგულარული (INTR) კლასი, რომლის მთავარი განსხვავება მდგომარეობს OB როლის IC (შუალედური კაუზატორის) როლით შეცვლით.

ამ ერთეულთა სტრუქტურის დადგენა, პირველ რიგში, ეყრდნობა ზმნურ-აქტანტური მიმართულების ზედაპირულ გაფორმებას, რომელიც ხორციელდება ზმნური აფიქსების და აქტანტების ბრუნვების მეშვეობით.

## REFERENCES

1. *R.W. Langaker* (1991), *Concept, Image and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin-New York.
2. *G.D. Chikoidze* (2007), *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> Tbilisi International Symposium on Logic, Language and Computation*. Berlin-Heidelberg. 85-96.
3. *G. Fauconnier, M. Turner* (1996), *Blending as a Central Process of Grammar*. In: A. Goldberg (ed.), *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language, CSLT* (distributed by Cambridge University Press), 113-130.
4. *C.J. Fillmore* (1968), *The Case for Case*. In: E. Bach & R.T. Harms (Eds.), *Universals of Linguistic Theory*. New York.
5. *G.D. Chikoidze* (2010), *Sistematzatsiia znachenii nekotorykh klassov iazykovykh edinits*. Institut Sistem Upravleniia. Tbilisi, 519 p. (in Russian).
6. *R.D. Van Valin, Jr; R.J. Lapolla* (1997), *Syntax, Structure, Meaning and Function* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics Series). Cambridge.

Received August, 2012