Version and Object Marking in Georgian Verbs

Version and Object Marking in Georgian Verbs

Yasuhiro Kojima

Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa,
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

In Georgian, the verb indicates the person of both the subject and object, the latter being either a direct object or an indirect object. The verb can contain only one marker for the object. When a verb has more than one object that may potentially be coded in the verb, one of them must be chosen. Generally, first or second person indirect objects take precedence over other objects. In relation to version (i.e., a derivational category of the verb which often changes valency), Boeder (1989, 2002, 2005) maintains that indirect objects introduced by version override every other object. The present paper argues that this is not the case and reviews the verb morphology regarding version and object marking.

Key words: version, direct object, indirect object, polypersonalism, zero morph

1. Verb types and the case-marking of core arguments

Georgian verbs are divided into active and inactive verbs on the basis of their conjugation. Active verbs include transitive and intransitive verbs and their core arguments show case alternation according to "series", as shown in Table 1.[1)]

The series are groups of conjugational forms sharing a common stem (e.g., the Aorist Series includes aorist and aorist subjunctive, the Future-Present Series includes future, present, past imperfective, etc.). Inactive verbs, on the other hand, are intransitive and the case-marking of their arguments is fixed.

221

Table 1   Verb types and case-marking of the core arguments

	Active verbs			Inactive verbs	
	S	DO	IO	S	IO
Future-Present Series	NOM	DAT	DAT	NOM	DAT
Aorist Series	ERG	NOM	DAT	NOM	DAT

Examples (1a, b) and (2a, b) illustrate the case-marking of the core arguments of active and inactive verbs, respectively.

Active verb
(1) a. *bič'-i   gogo-s   c'ign-s   mi-s-c-em-s.*[2)]
        boy-NOM   girl-DAT   book-DAT   PV-IO3-give-TS-S3SG (FUTURE)
        'The boy will give the girl a book."
     b. *bič'-ma   gogo-s   c'ign-i   mi-s-c-a.*
        boy-ERG   girl-DAT   book-NOM   PV-IO3-give-S3SG (AORIST)
        'The boy gave the girl a book."

Inactive verb
(2) a. *bič'-i   gogo-s   mi-e-salm-eb-a.*
        boy-NOM   girl-DAT   PV-PRV-greet-TS-S3SG (FUTURE)
        'The boy will greet the girl."
     b. *bič'-i   gogo-s   mi-e-salm-a.*
        boy-NOM   girl-DAT   PV-PRV-greet-S3SG (AORIST)
        'The boy greeted the girl."

2.   Person prefixes

To illustrate the verb morphology, let us take a finite verb form *gamogagdeben* 'they will throw you out (hither)' for example. Its morphological structure is analyzed as follows. The verb root meaning 'to throw' is *gd*.

(3) *ga-   mo-   g-   a-   gd   -eb   -en*
     PV(out)-   PV(hither)-   O2-   PRV-   throw   -TS   -S3PL
     'they will throw you out (hither)'

The thematic suffix (TS) attaches to the aorist stem to form the future-present stem. The post-radical morphology can be more complex by means of various suffixes such as *-t* indicating the plural number or *-in* deriving the causative. Before the root, on the other hand, preverbs (PV), person prefixes, and a pre-radical vowel (PRV) occur, though any of these may be absent. Preverbs denote direction and/or perfectivity. I shall elaborate below on the person prefixes and pre-radical vowels.

The person prefixes are presented in (4).

(4) Person prefixes
Subject prefix   s1   *v-*
Object prefix   o1sg   *m-*
                              o1pl   *gv-*
                              o2   *g-*
Indirect object prefix   io3   *h/s/Ø-*

A verb may contain only one prefix among the subject and object prefixes (not including the indirect object prefix). When both the subject prefix *v-* and the second person object prefix *g-* are expected, only the object prefix surfaces.[3)] Compare (5a) and (5b).

(5) a. *me*   *levan-i*   *v-nax-e.*   'I saw Levan.'
        1sg.erg   Levan-nom   s1-see-aor
     b. *me*   *šen*   *g-nax-e.*   'I saw you.'
        1sg.erg   2sg.nom   o2-see-aor

The object prefixes (*m-*, *g-*, *gv-*) represent either direct or indirect objects. The indirect object of the third person is marked by one of the allomorphs *h-*, *s-*, or *Ø-* (zero), depending on the ensuing phoneme. It is *Ø-* before a vowel. The indirect object prefix can co-occur with the subject prefix, as in (6).

(6) *me*   *levan-s*   *mi-v-s-c-em*   *c'ign-s.*
     1sg.nom   Levan-dat   pv-s1-io3-give-ts   book-dat
     'I will give Levan a book.'

However, the indirect object prefix cannot appear together with any of the object prefixes. When both an object prefix and the indirect object prefix are expected, the indirect object prefix does not appear (Boeder 1989: 166). Compare (6) and (7).

(7) *me*   *levan-s*   *mi-g-c-em*   *šen.*
     1sg.erg   Levan-dat   pv-o2-give-ts   2sg.dat
     'I will give you to Levan.'

In (7), the third person indirect object is not marked in the verb by any prefix. Also, the important point to note is that third person direct objects are not marked by any affix in the verb.[4)]

3. Pre-radical vowels and version

The pre-radical vowels are *a-*, *e-*, *i-*, and *u-*. The verb root may be immediately preceded by one of these vowels. They deal with voice-related semantics and often change the valency of

the verb. In particular, these vowels serve to indicate the grammatical category "version".

Researchers' views widely differ from each other concerning the classification of version types. In the present paper, I basically follow Boeder (2005: 34–37) and distinguish five versions: namely, the neutral, objective, locative (or superessive), subjective versions and the *e*-version. The following examples (8) to (12) illustrate each version.

The neutral version (8) is the base form or the form unmarked for version.

(8) *is*   *da-v-xat'-e*.   NEUTRAL VERSION
     3SG.NOM   PV-S1-paint-AOR
     'I painted it.'

Although the verb in (8) has no pre-radical vowel, verbs in the neutral version may have any of the pre-radical vowels as the one that is lexically determined (Boeder 2005: 37).

The other versions, except for the subjective version, mostly create an indirect object, which I will call "version object" hereafter. In the objective version, the version object typically expresses an affected experiencer or a referent to which the action is directed. When the version object is first or second person, the pre-radical vowel is *i*-; otherwise it is *u*-.

(9) a. *is*   *da-g-i-xat'-e*   *šen*.   OBJECTIVE VERSION
        3SG.NOM   PV-O2-PRV-paint-AOR   2SG.DAT
        'I painted it for you.'
     b. *is*   *da-v-u-xat'-e*[5]   *ma-s*.   OBJECTIVE VERSION
        3SG.NOM   PV-S1-PRV-paint-AOR   3SG.DAT
        'I painted it for him/her.'

In the locative version, the pre-radical vowel is *a*-. It denotes that the action is fulfilled on(to) or from the surface of the version object referent (Boeder 2005: 35).

(10) *is*   *da-v-Ø-a-xat'-e*   *ma-s*.   LOCATIVE VERSION
      3SG.NOM   PV-S1-IO3-PRV-paint-AOR   3SG.DAT
      'I painted it on it/him/her.'

The *e*-version is applied to those inactive verbs that have the pre-radical vowel *i*- in the neutral version. Such verbs do not derive the objective and locative versions. The *e*-version covers the meanings of both.

(11) a. *is*   *da-i-xat'-a*.   NEUTRAL VERSION
        3SG.NOM   PV-PRV-paint-S3SG
        'It was painted.'
     b. *is*   *da-Ø-e-xat'-a*   *ma-s*.   *e*-VERSION
        3SG.NOM   PV-IO3-PRV-paint-S3SG   3SG.DAT
        'It was painted for/on it/him/her.'

The subjective version is possible only with transitive verbs and is indicated by the pre-radical vowel *i-*. It expresses reflexive meaning. In this version, the verb never has an indirect object.

(12) *is*   *da-v-i-xat'-e*.   SUBJECTIVE VERSION
         3SG.NOM   PV-S1-PRV-paint-AOR
         'I painted it for myself.'

The function of the pre-radical vowels is not limited to the distinction of the version types. The pre-radical vowel *a-* is also used to derive an active verb with causative meaning, as in (13).

(13) *is*   *da-v-Ø-a-xat'-v-in-e*   *ma-s*.
         3SG.NOM   PV-S1-IO3-PRV- paint-TS-CAUS-AOR   3SG-DAT
         'I made him/her (DAT) paint it (NOM).'

4. Object marking in the neutral version

To begin with, I would like to concentrate on the neutral version in order to illustrate some principles of object marking in Georgian, before turning to the object marking in the other versions. In so far as the neutral version is concerned, the basic patterns to be presented in this section generally conform to what previous studies describe (see Boeder 1989, 2002, 2005: 25–29, among others).

Verbs can have only one prefix that marks an object, be it a direct or indirect object. As a general rule, when a verb has both direct and indirect objects, it is the indirect object that is marked in the verb. When the verb marks the indirect object, the direct object cannot be first or second person. This is because of the rule given in (14) (cf. Boeder 2002: 100).

(14) When there is a first or second person object, it is obligatorily marked in the verb
         by a corresponding person prefix.

In (15), for example, *me* cannot occur as a direct object.

(15) **levan-ma   me   šen   ga-g-a-cn-o*.
         Levan-ERG   1SG.NOM   2SG.DAT   PV-O2-PRV-introduce-s3SG
         (Intended meaning: 'Levan introduced me to you.')

In order to express the intended meaning of (15), the direct object must be formally made into a third person noun phrase with a help of "a dummy head noun" *tavi* (Boeder 2002: 97, 2005: 54–56), which literally means 'head', as in (16).

(16) *levan-ma   čem-i   tav-i   šen   ga-g-a-cn-o.*
     Levan-ERG   my-AGR   head-NOM   2SG.DAT   PV-O2-PRV-introduce-s3SG
     'Levan introduced me to you.'

Although the direct object *čem-i tav-i* in (16) notionally refers to first person, it is formally third person and hence does not require any person prefix in the verb. In Braithwaite's term, the first person direct object undergoes "tavization" (Braithwaite 1973). Harris (1981: 51) calls such a construction "object camouflage".[6]

However, when the indirect object is third person, the direct object can actually be first or second person. The verb then marks either the indirect object or the direct object depending on whether the direct object undergoes "tavization" or not. For example, 'Levan sold me to him/her' can be expressed in either way, as in (17) or (18).

(17) *levan-ma   čem-i   tav-i   mi-h-q'id-a   ma-s.*
     Levan-ERG   my-AGR   head-NOM   PV-IO3-sell-s3SG   3SG-DAT
     'Levan sold me to him/her.'

(18) *levan-ma   me   mi-m-q'id-a   ma-s.*
     Levan-ERG   1SG.NOM   PV-O1SG-sell-s3SG   3SG-DAT
     'Levan sold me to him/her.'

Example (17) involves "tavization" so that the verb marks the third person indirect object by the prefix *h-*. In (18), on the other hand, the verb marks the first person direct object by the prefix *m-*, but does not have any marker for the third person indirect object. As noted in Section 2, when both an object prefix (*m-*, *g-*, or *gv-*) and the indirect object prefix *h-* are expected, the latter does not surface.

Some researchers consider that a first or second person direct object (without "tavization") and a third person indirect object cannot co-occur in a clause and deem sentences like (18) dialectal and unacceptable in Standard Georgian (Harris 1981: 282–283, note 4; Tuite 1988: 260–261, 1998: 21). In their view, the object marking of Standard Georgian verbs is always associated with, what Dryer (1986) calls, the "primary object" (i.e., the direct object of monotransitive verbs and the indirect object of ditransitive verbs; see Tuite 1988: 261, 1998: 21). However, examples like (18) are in fact well accepted by Standard Georgian speakers. Every speaker native to Tbilisi whom I consulted judged (18), along with (17), natural. Similar examples, where the verb marks a first or second person direct object in the presence of a third person indirect object, are also mentioned by a number of researchers within the scope of Standard Georgian.[7] Such a construction certainly belongs to the standard language.

(19)a and (19)b are another pair of examples, in parallel with (17) and (18).

(19) a. *deda-šen-ma   šen-i   tav-i   ča-Ø-a-bar-a   ma-s.*
       mother-your-ERG   your-AGR   head-NOM   PV-IO3-PRV-commit-s3SG   3SG-DAT

b. *deda-šen-ma*   *šen*   *ča-g-a-bar-a*   *ma-s.*
   mother-your-ERG   2SG.NOM   PV-O2-PRV-commit-s3SG   3SG-DAT
   'Your mother committed you to him/her'.

In (19)a, the prefix for the third person indirect object is zero (cf. Boeder 1968: 90, 2002: 98) as it occurs before the vowel *a*-. This is the pre-radical vowel that this verb has in the neutral version.

5. Boeder's analysis and the slot filling hierarchy

Boeder (1989, 2002) investigates the person marking of Georgian verbs in depth. The general scheme of his analysis regarding the marking of objects is presented in Table 2, which is taken from Boeder (2005: 24) with some simplification (the subject markers labeled as (a), plural forms, and the marking of number are omitted). The names of the versions are supplied by me.

Rows (b) and (c) represent the prefixes marking first and second person objects and those marking third person indirect objects, respectively, in the neutral version. In section (d), Ø- is a special element that appears only in the subjective version. Boeder calls it "the reflexive indirect object marker" (Boeder 2005: 27). Rows (e), (f), and (g) display the marking of indirect objects (i.e., version objects) in each non-neutral version. In the non-neutral versions, the pre-radical vowels "specify the semantic role of the indirect object whose marker they follow" (Boeder 2005: 34). In this sense, Boeder calls version objects that are marked in the verb as presented in Table 2 "specified indirect objects". He maintains that verbs in the non-neutral versions obligatorily mark the "specified indirect objects" and formulates what he calls a "slot filling hierarchy" (Boeder 1989: 174, 2002: 96, 2005: 28).

(20) Slot filling hierarchy:
      specified indirect object > 1st/2nd person indirect object > other objects

In Sections 6 and 7, I will point out some counterexamples to the slot filling hierarchy, where a direct object takes precedence over a version object.

Table 2 Object person marking

	1SG	2SG	3	
(b)	*m_*	*g_*		neutral version
(c)			*s / h / Ø _*	
(d)		*Ø-i_*		subjective version
(e)	*m-i_*	*g-i_*	*Ø-u_*	objective version
(f)	*m-e_*	*g-e_*	*Ø-e_*	*e*-version
(g)	*m-a_*	*g-a_*	*Ø-a_*	locative version

6. Object marking in the locative and objective versions

According to the slot filling hierarchy, the person prefix that marks a version object must be consistently present in the verb, even when the version object is third person and its corresponding person prefix is Ø-. However, this is not always the case. In the locative version, verbs sometimes do mark a direct object in the presence of a third person version object. See the following examples:[8]

(21) *cxen-s   me   še-m-a-sv-i.*
       horse-DAT   1SG.NOM   PV-O1SG-PRV-set-AOR
       'Sit me on the horse.'

(22) *picar-s   da-m-a-k'r-es*.   (Shanidze 1973: 231, §294)
       board-DAT   PV-O1SG-PRV-stick-S3PL
       'They stuck me on the board.'

(23) *katam-ma tkv-a,   ğor-i   da-k'l-es,   tan   da-m-a-k'l-es*, …
                                                                     (Boeder 1968: 112)
       hen-ERG   say-S3SG   pig-NOM   PV-kill-S3PL   together   PV-O1SG-PRV-kill-S3PL
       'The hen said, "They killed a pig and killed me as well (*lit.* on it), …" '

The person prefix *m-* in every sentence marks the direct object, not the indirect object, which is the version object.[9] Instead, the third person version object (e.g., *cxen-s* of (22)) is not marked in these verbs, as the prefixes *m-* and Ø- cannot co-occur (see Section 2). In these examples, the person prefix *m-* for the direct object thus overrides the marking of the version object.

The slot filling hierarchy would predict (24), instead of (21). In (24), the first person object is made into a *tavi* phrase so that the verb marks the version object. However, (24) actually sounds unnatural to native speakers, if not unacceptable. I do not pursue here the reason why (24) is disfavored.

(24) *cxen-s   še-Ø-a-sv-i   čem-i   tav-i.*
       horse-DAT   PV-IO3-PRV-set-AOR   my-AGR   head-NOM
       'Sit me on the horse.'

Based on this observation, I assume that the person prefix that marks the version object of the locative version does not have any special status prior to the marking of another object. Let us now turn to the object marking in the *e*-version and that in the objective version.

The *e*-version is applied only to inactive, hence intransitive verbs (see Section 3). Verbs in the *e*-version have, as a rule, only one indirect object and there is no possibility of any alternative object marking. The hierarchy is hence irrelevant.

In the objective version, the verb may have more than one object other than the version object. As mentioned in Section 3, the pre-radical vowel of the objective version alternates

according to the person of the version object. It is *i-* when the version object is first or second person; otherwise it is *u-* (see Table 2 (e)). The point to note is that the pre-radical vowel *u-* never follows an object prefix (i.e. **m-u-*, **g-u-*, **gv-u-*). In this regard, *u-* sharply differs from the pre-radical vowel *a-* indicating the locative version. Compare (25) with (21) given above.

(25) **ma-s   me   ga-m-u-gzavn-e*.
      3SG-DAT   1SG.NOM   PV-O1SG-PRV-send-AOR
      (Intended meaning: 'Send me to him/her.')

If *u-* of the objective version exactly paralleled *a-* of the locative version, (25) might be obtained, with the verb marking the first person direct object. But (25) is categorically unacceptable.

Recall the general rule that verbs can have only one prefix that marks an object. In this connection, I would like to draw attention to the fact that the pre-radical vowel *u-*, though it is not a person prefix, signals that the indirect object (i.e., the version object) is third person. If the pre-radical vowel *u-* itself is considered to mark an object, it is understandable why it does not co-occur with another person prefix such as *m-*. In contrast to *u-*, the pre-radical vowel *a-* of the locative version does not have any indication about the person of the version object. It does not mark an object and hence co-occurs with another person prefix marking an object.

Given this perspective, the pre-radical vowel *u-* can be treated as a portmanteau morpheme, which integrates the marking of an indirect object and that of version. This idea concurs with the interpretation of Harris (1981: 90) that *u-* is "a fusional morpheme" in the sense that the indirect object prefix *s/h/Ø-* and the pre-radical vowel *i-* combine to *u-* "by a synchronic morphophonemic rule".[10]

It follows from this assumption that the pre-radical vowel *u-* does not co-occur with third person indirect object prefix *Ø-*, either. It is *u-* itself that indicates that the version object is third person. In the literature, the objective version form such as *dauc'era* 's/he wrote it for it/him/her' is usually decomposed as *da-Ø-u-c'er-a* with the third person indirect object prefix *Ø-* (Boeder 1989, 2002, 2005; Hewitt 1995: 177–184), but there must be no *Ø-* (see (9b)). Compare the morphological composition of the verb of (26) in the objective version and that of (27) in the locative version. Only the latter is analyzed to contain the indirect object prefix *Ø-*.

(26) Objective version
      levan-ma   nino-s   da-u-c'er-a   misamart-i.
      Levan-ERG   Nino-DAT   PV-PRV-write-S3SG   address-NOM
      'Levan wrote the address for Nino.'

(27) Locative version
      levan-ma   k'onvert'-s   da-Ø-a-c'er-a   misamart-i.
      Levan-ERG   envelope-DAT   PV-IO3-PRV-write-S3SG   address-NOM
      'Levan wrote the address on the envelope.'

It is also known in the literature that verbs in the locative version are not always correlated with a dative noun phrase (i.e., indirect object), but sometimes a postpositional phrase with -*ze* accompany them instead (Tschenkéli 1958: 394–395; Vogt 1971: 124; Aronson 1981: 74–75; 1991: 277–278; Hewitt 1995: 184–187; Boeder 1968: 112, 2005: 35). As an alternative to (27), one may say:

(28)   *levan-ma*   *k'onvert'=ze*   *da-a-c'er-a*   *misamart-i.*
       Levan-ERG   envelope.DAT=on   PV-PRV-write-s3SG   address-NOM
       'Levan wrote the address on the envelope.'

In (28), the verb is considered not to contain the prefix Ø- since it does not have any corresponding indirect object. Though the variation between (27) and (28) in the nominal expression has been well known in the literature, researchers have never paid attention to the morphological difference between the verb forms of (27) and (28).[11]

Example (28) has, in fact, a significant implication. It illustrates that the locative version does not necessarily create an indirect object, though the objective version does. The pre-radical vowel *a-* in (28) indicates the locative version, but does not have any preceding object marker to "specify", in Boeder's terms. If the function of *a-* in the locative version is the specification of the semantic role of the indirect object, it is incomprehensible why the verb in (28) has *a-*, as there is no indirect object. I consider that the function of the pre-radical vowels as version markers cannot be sought in their combination with a person prefix. This will be more obvious in regard to the subjective version.

7.   Object marking in the subjective version

The subjective version is indicated by the pre-radical vowel *i-* (irrespective of the person of the subject, in contrast to the objective version) and expresses a reflexive meaning. In the subjective version, verbs never take an indirect object, but have a direct object.

Take a verb *ixat'avs* 's/he paints it for herself/himself' for example. In the neutral version, it can take an object prefix marking a direct object (cf. *xat'-av-s* 's/he paints it' vs. *g-xat'-av-s* 's/he paints you'). According to Boeder, however, the corresponding form in the subjective version cannot take any object prefix. The meaning 's/he paints you for herself/ himself' is expressed not as *g-i-xat'av-s*, but as *ixat'avs šen-Ø tav-s* by means of "tavization". To explain this, he supposes that a special prefix Ø- precedes *i-* in the subjective version, as in (29) (Boeder 2002: 104–105, 2005: 28; see Table 2).

(29)   *is*   *surat-s*   *Ø-i-xat'-av-s.*
       3SG.NOM   picture-DAT   Ø-PRV-paint-TS-s3SG
       'S/he paints a picture for herself/himself.'

The prefix Ø- blocks another person prefix from occurring, except for the subject prefix *v-* (e.g., *v-Ø-i-xat'-av* 'I paint it for me/myself'). I confirmed, however, that *g-i-xat'-av-s*, as a form of the subjective version, is not categorically excluded and it thus appears unnecessary

to posit the special prefix Ø- in question.

As a matter of fact, *g-i-xat'-av-s* is quite a usual expression itself as a form of the objective version. It then means 's/he paints it for you'. Another interpretation is indeed difficult out of context. However, it can be used, at least, if some specific context is given. Suppose two people are talking about Dato, who got a tattoo on his arm. One asks the other as (30a). The answer can be (30b) or (30c).

(30) a. *dato-m   xel=ze   vin   da-i-xat'-a*?
Dato-ERG   arm.DAT=on   who.NOM   PV-PRV-paint-s3SG
'Who did Dato paint on his (own) arm?'

b. *šen   da-g-i-xat'-a*.
2SG.NOM   PV-O2-PRV-paint-s3SG
'He painted you (on his own arm).'

c. *šen-i   tav-i   da-i-xat'-a*.
your-AGR   head-NOM   PV-PRV-paint-s3SG
'He painted you (on his own arm).'

Native speakers I consulted preferred (30c), where the second person direct object undergoes "tavization", to (30b), but (30b) is still a possible alternative. Compare this with (25), which is categorically rejected.

Boeder (2002: 104, note 39) distinguishes those verbs that have *i-* and express a reflexive meaning into two types: those with Ø- before *i-* (e.g., *ga-mo-i-c'er-a* 's/he summoned it/him/her') and those without (e.g., *da-Ø-i-xat'-a* 's/he painted it'). He considers that the former verbs are in the neutral version and the latter verbs are in the subjective version. The two types can be differentiated by checking whether a given verb can take an object prefix or not. Such a criterion, however, is not always applicable because of the meanings of individual verbs. See (31), for example.

(31) *tav-s   i-ban-s*.
head-DAT   PRV-wash-s3SG
'S/he washes her/his (own) head.'

The verb *i-ban-s* is certainly in the subjective version (see Boeder 2005: 36). It takes a direct object that refers to a body part, but hardly a first or second person direct object. This would make it difficult to tell whether Ø- actually blocks object prefixes or not before *i-*. Such a problem does not arise if the special prefix Ø- is done away with.[12)]

8. Conclusions and further remarks

In the present paper, I have argued:

(i)   verbs in the locative version can mark a direct object;
(ii) the pre-radical vowel *u-* of the objective version marks a third person indirect object

and is not preceded by a zero prefix marking an indirect object;

(iii) the locative version may not create a new indirect object and then no object prefix for it is present in the verb;

(iv) verbs in the subjective version can mark a direct object.

Version often introduces an indirect object to the valency of the verb. Boeder (1989; 2002; 2005) considers that the new indirect object gains a privileged status over other objects with respect to the object marking in the verb. However, as demonstrated above, verbs may still mark another object, rather than the new indirect object. Such instances make it clear that the new indirect object does not differ from an ordinary indirect object in so far as the object marking is concerned. One may say that version does not essentially change the rules of object marking. The only case that needs special attention is the objective version indicated by *u-*. It marks a third person indirect object as well as the objective version at the same time. For this reason, verbs in the objective version inevitably mark an indirect object, if it is third person.

In this regard, version can be contrasted with the derivation of causative verbs. Causative verbs generally mark the causee argument, which is a direct object or an indirect object depending on whether the base verb is intransitive or transitive. See (32), for example.

(32) *ma-n   mo-m-a-k'vl-evin-a.*
       3SG.ERG   PV-O1-PRV-kill-CAUS-S3SG
       'S/he made me kill X'.   (*'S/he made X kill me.')

The object prefix *m-* marks the causee-indirect object. The alternative reading with *m-* marking the direct object is impossible (on this point, I disagree with Vogt (1971: 130)). Compare (32) with (21) (see also note 10). In contradistinction to version, the causative derivation apparently alters the rules of object marking and assigns a specific status to the causee argument. More detailed discussion on this topic is reserved for future work.

Abbreviations

AGR	agreement marker	AOR	aorist	CAUS	causative
DAT	dative case	DO	direct object	ERG	ergative case
FUT	future	GEN	genitive case	IO	indirect object
NOM	nominative case	O	object	PL	plural
PRV	pre-radical vowel	PV	preverb	S	subject
TS	thematic suffix	SG	singular	VOC	vocative case

Notes

1) One more series called Perfect Series is omitted from the table as being irrelevant to the present discussion.

2) The word order is generally free, if pragmatic factors are ignored. Georgian does not have any

grammatical distinction regarding definiteness. Without context, (1) may also be translated as 'a boy will give a girl', 'the boy will give a girl', etc. Clitics are separated by '='.

3) Researchers interpret the non-cooccurrence of the subject prefix *v-* and the object prefix *g-* in different ways. Some assume that *v-* is deleted (Harris 1981: 31) or dropped (Hewitt 1995: 131) before *g-*. Boeder (2002: 94) supposes that a zero allomorph of *v-* occurs before *g-*. The relative order between the two prefixes *v-* (or its allomorph *Ø-*) and *g-*, however, cannot be verified.

    Hewitt (1995: 128–129), Boeder (2002: 90, 2005: 27), and many others, in fact, also assume a zero prefix for the second person subject, whose existence is again not certifiable. They consider that the zero prefix for the second person subject has an allomorph, *x-*, which appears only with the two verb roots: *c'a-x-val* 'you will go' and *x-ar* 'you are'. In my view, however, *x-* cannot be treated as a subject prefix in the same way as *v-* in the modern language, though it was undoubtedly a subject prefix in its oldest attested stage. In Modern Georgian, *x-* may be considered a part of the root that exceptionally alternates according to the person of the subject, at least, as far as the verb *c'axval* 'you will go' and its related forms are concerned. See the following example taken from Ilia Chavchavadze's novel *Otaraant kvrivi* (1887):

> *švil-o,   c'a-m-i-x-vel?   mo-m-i-k'vd-i?   c'a-m-i-x-vel,*
> son-VOC PV-O1SG-PRV-S2?-go.AOR PV-O1SG-PRV-die-AOR PV-O1SG-PRV-S2?-go.AOR
> *c'a-m-i-xvel   da   ağar   mo-m-i-x-vel!*
> PV-O1SG-PRV-S2?-go.AOR and no.more PV-O1SG-PRV-S2?-come.AOR
> 'My son, did you go away from me? Did you die? You went away, away and never came to me anymore.'

    In the verb form *c'a-m-i-x-vel* 'you went away from me', *x-* appears after, not before, the pre-radical vowel *i-*, which in turn follows the person prefix *m-*. Although this example is in fact dialectal, speakers of Modern Standard Georgian, too, can easily conjugate the same verb in the objective version (see Section 3) as *c'a-m-i-x-val* 'you will go away from me', *c'a-m-i-x-ved-i* 'you went away from me', etc., albeit such forms are practically rare. These examples definitely show that *x-* appears in a different place than the person prefixes.

4) Tuite (1988: 259–260), Boeder (1989), and Hewitt (1995: 130) claim that the third person direct object is marked by a zero prefix in the verb, but they do not argue for any phonological or morphological evidence for it.

5) I do not analyze this verb form as *da-v-Ø-u-xat'-e* with the indirect object prefix *Ø-*, as is usually done in the literature, for the reason to be discussed in Section 6.

6) In the framework of relational grammar, Harris (1981: 51) defines "object camouflage" as: "If a clause contains an indirect object, a first or second person direct object in that clause is realized as a possessive pronoun + *tavi*, where the possessive reflects the person and number of the input form".

7) See Vogt (1971: 87–88), Shanidze (1973: 231–233, §294), Vamling (1989: 181–182), Hewitt (1995: 139–141), Melikishvili (2001: 74–77), Boeder (1989: 182–183, note 18, 2002: 97–98, 2005: 28).

8) The verbs in these examples are surely in the locative version. Compare them with the corresponding forms of the neutral version: *še-m-sv-i* 'sit me', *da-m-k'r-es* 'they shot X at me', and *da-m-k'l-es* 'they killed me'.

9) This may not be clear in (23). If the noun phrases of the core arguments are added, (23) would be … *tan ǧor-s* [pig-DAT] *me* [1SG.NOM] *da-m-a-k'l-es*. It may also be noted that the verb forms in these examples, if taken out of context, allow another reading as well, in which the person prefix *m-* marks an indirect object. The verb of (21) *še-m-a-sv-i*, for example, means 'sit me on X' (*m-* marking a direct object) or 'sit X on me' (*m-* marking an indirect object).

10) Machavariani (1980: 48–51) focuses on a functional difference between *u-* and the other version markers and remarks that the former, in contrast to the latter, functions as if it is a person marker (p. 51).

11) Hewitt (1995: 184ff) appears to consider that verbs in the locative version always contain a person prefix (including Ø-) for an indirect object, irrespective of whether there is actually an indirect object or not. Jorbenadze (1983: 76) discusses a historical syntactic change in which indirect objects become adjuncts.

12) It remains to be explained, however, why the subjective version may trigger "tavization". I suppose that the condition for tavization is semantic, rather than morpho-syntactic, as far as the subjective version is concerned. When the subjective version expresses '*for* the subject him/herself', the direct object generally cannot be the first or second person and tavization is required.

References

Aronson, Howard I.

   1981   On the status of version as a grammatical category in Georgian. *Folia Slavica* 5: 66–80.

   1991   Modern Georgian. In *The Indigenous languages of the Caucasus*, Volume 1, *Kartvelian Languages*, ed. by Alice C. Harris, 219–312. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.

Boeder, Winfried

   1989   Verbal person marking, noun phrase and word order in Georgian. In *Configurationality*, Studies in Generative Grammar 34, ed. by Lázró Marácz and Pieter Muysken, 159–184. Dordrecht: Mouton de Gruyter.

   2002   Syntax and morphology of polysynthesis in the Georgian verb. In *Problems of polysynthesis* Studia Typologica 4, ed. by Nicholas Evans and Hans-Jürgen Sasse, 87–111. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

   2005   The South Caucasian languages. *Lingua* 115: 5–89.

Braithwaite, Kim

   1973   Case shift and verb concord in Georgian. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Dryer, Matthew

   1986   Primary objects, secondary object and antidative. *Language* 62: 808–845.

Harris, Alice

   1981   *Georgian syntax: A study in relational grammar*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hewitt, B. G.

   1995   *Georgian: A structural reference grammar.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jorbenadze, Besarion

   1983   *Zmnis Xmovanp'repiksuli C'armoeba Kartulši* [Verbal Derivation with a Vocalic Prefix in Georgian]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.

Machavariani, M.

    1980   Kcevis k'at'egoriis sak'itxistvis [On the problem of the category of version]. *Iberiul-K'avk'avsiuri Enatmecniereba* [Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics] 22: 39–66.

Melikishvili, Damana

    2001   *Kartuli Zmnis Uǧlebis Sist'ema* [The System of conjugation of Georgian verbs]. Tbilisi: Logos Presi.

Shanidze, Akaki

    1973   *Kartuli Enis Gramat'ik'is Sapuʒvlebi I: Morpologia* [The fundamentals of Georgian grammar I: Morphology]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.

Tschenkéli, Kita

    1958   *Einführung in die georgische Sprache*, Band I., *Theoretischer Teil*. Amirani: Zürich.

Tuite, Kevin

    1988   A note on split objectivity in Georgian. *University of Chicago Working Papers in Linguistics* 4: 257–265.

    1998   *Kartvelian morphosyntax: Number agreement and morphosyntactic orientation in the South Caucasian languages*, Studies in Caucasian Linguistics 12. München: Lincom Europa.

Vamling, Karina

    1988   A feature-based analysis of Georgian morphology—case study: object agreement. In *Studia Caucasologica I, Proceedings of the Third Caucasian Colloquium*, ed. by Fridrik Thordarson, 309–319. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

Vogt, Hans

    1971   *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. Oslo: Universitetsvorlagets.