

"Syntax and Semantics 18: Diachronic Syntax - The Kartvelian Case" by Alice C Harris, Academic Press, 1985 (xxiii + 463 pp.)

A Review Article by B G Hewitt, Linguistics Department,
Hull University, England.

1. Given the prestige attaching to this series in the general linguistics world, it is highly likely that the present (exceptionally expensive) volume will be read or consulted by many who have no direct acquaintance with the languages being described but who are nevertheless interested to discover something about the four Kartvelian languages, that happily seem to be attracting ever more attention. Thus, it is only fair that such a readership should have at its disposal a detailed and critical examination of the central arguments of this book so that they will be in a better position to judge for themselves the validity of what I see as the major claim of the work (namely, that, although an Ergative-alignment existed to control case-marking with Series II tense-mood forms in proto-Kartvelian, this gave way, possibly as early as in the Late Common Kartvelian period, to one of Active-alignment). The active-hypothesis was advanced for Modern Georgian by Harris in 1981. In my review of that earlier work (Hewitt 1983) I demonstrated the irrelevance of 'activity' to case-assignment in the modern language, whilst recognising the potential for its future development, and argued in favour of the traditional Ergative-hypothesis (see also the more extensive defence of this view in Hewitt Forthcoming a). It will, therefore, hardly surprise anybody that I find no merit in seeking to trace back to the parent-language, which is what

Harris is here essaying, a phenomenon that does not actually exist. However, since arguments in favour of 'activity' and against ergativity are here vigorously presented, it is necessary yet again to consider how the facts of the languages concerned could possibly lead to Harris' idiosyncratic interpretation(s).

I shall first set out the facts of case-marking and verb-agreement found in Modern Georgian; variations on these patterns within the sister-languages will then be noted, so that the uninitiated reader will thereby gain a frame of reference within which to place the summary of Harris' views that follows. The way will then be open for the presentation of the major criticisms. Slips and errors, important in themselves but not bearing crucially on any line of argumentation, will then be considered, and I shall finish with a list of plain errata.

2. Three patterns of case-marking exist in Georgian (the bracketted Roman numerals indicate the set of verbal concord-markers associated with each nominal):

| | <u>Subject</u> | Direct | Indirect |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|
| | | <u>Object</u> | <u>Object</u> |
| <u>Pattern A</u> | Narrative(i) | Nominative(ii) | Dative (ii) |
| <u>Pattern B</u> | Nominative(i) | Dative(ii) | Dative(ii) |
| <u>Pattern C</u> | Dative(ii) | Nominative(i) | <u>tviz</u> -nominal |

(where -tviz is the postposition 'for' and governs the Genitive case). The tense-mood forms (=screeves) are grouped into three series - Series I consists of the Present Indicative, Present Subjunctive, Imperfect Indicative, Future Indicative, Future Subjunctive and Conditional; Series II consists of the Aorist

Indicative and Aorist Subjunctive (= Optative); Series III consists of the Perfect (= 1st Evidential), Pluperfect (= 1st Ind Evidential) and 3rd Subjunctive. The distribution of case-marking patterns among the four verb-classes is:

| | Series | I | II | III |
|---------|--------|---|----|-----|
| Class 1 | | B | A | C |
| Class 2 | | B | B | B |
| Class 3 | | B | A | C |
| Class 4 | | C | C | C |

Examples will illustrate the differences between the verb-classes: the a-example will show the Present (Series I), the b-example the Aorist (Series II), the c-example the Perfect (Series III) form in each case -

Class 1

- (1a) k'ac-i magida-s ak'etebs
 man-NOM table-DAT he/makes/it/PRES

'The man is making a table'

- (1b) k'ac-ma magida gaak'eta
 NARR NOM AOR

'The man made a table'

- (1c) k'ac-s magida gauk'etebia
 DAT NOM PERF

'The man (has) apparently made the table'

Class 2

- (2a) k'ac-i k'vdeba
 NOM he/dies/PRES

'The man is dying'

(2b) k'ac-i mok'vda

NOM AOR

'The man died'

(2c) k'ac-i momk'vadara

NOM PERF

'The man (has) apparently died'

Class 3

(3a) k'ac-i t'iris

NOM he/cries/PRES

'The man is crying'

(3b) k'ac-ma it'ira

NARR AOR

'The man cried'

(3c) k'ac-s ut'ir(n)ia

DAT PERF

'The man (has) apparently cried'

Class 4

(4a) k'ac-s c'ign-i mosc'ons

DAT book-NOM he/likes/it/PRES

'The man likes the book'

(4b) k'ac-s c'ign-i moec'ona

AOR

'The man liked the book'

(4c) k'ac-s c'ign-i mosc'onebia

PERF

'The man (has) apparently liked the book'

Although the surface-forms of the morphemes often differ in the

sister-languages, essentially this same overall patterning is also characteristic of Svan, whilst in Mingrelian Georgian's Nominative nominal with all Class 2 and 4 verbs in Series II stands in the Narrative case (marked by -k), and in Laz the Narrative case (marked by -k also) has replaced the expected Nominative desinence for the subjects of Class 1 and 3 verbs in Series I (with a new Narrative-Nominative configuration and verb-form rivalling the old Dative-Nominative pattern in Series III of these same verb-classes).

2.1 Class 1 can be thought of as the transitive class, Class 2 as the intransitive class; Class 4 contains the 'inverted' verbs, but the real problem is posed by Class 3 (the Medials) - why do these Medials, most of which can never appear with more than a single (subject) argument, pattern like the transitives of Class 1 as regards case-marking and verb-agreement, especially in Series II and III? Traditionally it has been assumed that, leaving aside the Class 4 verbs, we can think of the Narrative (in Georgian motxrobiti) as an Ergative case. Series I is, thus, characterised by Nominative-Accusative alignment, Series III by 'inversion' for transitive verbs, whilst Series II displays Ergative-Absolutive alignment in the matter of case-marking - this applies to Svan as well as Georgian; Laz will be Ergative-Absolutive also in Series I, whilst Mingrelian will show Nominative-Accusative patterning in both Series I and II. As regards the Class 3 verbs, they have to be viewed as either exceptions or as being essentially transitive. For Harris, on the other hand, ergativity has no place in the individual Kartvelian languages - she claims that in place of

Ergative-Absolutivity these languages actually manifest Active-Inactive alignment in case-marking, and that 'inversion' is also sensitive not to the transitivity but to the 'activity' of the verb. Her basic definition is presented on p.4: "Active verb forms are those that have surface subjects that are agentive, that control the action. Inactive verb forms are those with surface subjects which do not control the action; usually these subjects are semantic patients." This semantic opposition is then accommodated within Harris' model of Relational Grammar by assigning 'active' verbs an initial subject (plus direct object where necessary), but by assigning 'inactive' verbs an initial direct object only [sic]. This latter rises to final subject-hood by Unaccusative to be case-marked with the Nominative/Absolutive wherever the Active alignment is in force, final subjects that are also initial subjects taking the Narrative (or, for Harris, Active) case (pp. 20-21). And in anticipation of the obvious objection that we shall interpose below Harris argues (pp. 14-15): "In some languages active case marking can be sensitive to controllability in context ... Alternatively, active case marking may be fully grammaticized, a given verb form governing a single subject case in all contexts ... A further difficulty in understanding the active type ... is that different verbs are interpreted as active or inactive by various languages; within a language there is typically not a perfect correlation between the controllability of an action and the syntax the verb governs. The fundamental difference between the active and inactive clause types is one of relational valence

... rather than semantics. Thus, in a given language, the CLASS of inactive intransitives may contain certain verbs that are semantically active, and vice versa" [italics added]. So a semantic opposition is first suggested to account for differences in case-marking patterns; this is then the basis for establishing a difference in relational valence; and then, when the semantic opposition is shown to be manifestly inadequate, the answer comes that this is of no real consequence since it is the differing relational valences that are after all responsible for the morpho-syntax! I would suggest that this circularity damns the whole enterprise from the start. However, any proponent of the Harris-type Activity-hypothesis for Kartvelian must still at least try to explain four things: (a) Why are there so many unambiguously 'inactive' predicates in (Harris' 'active') Class 3 (cf. the lists of Medials given by Holisky (1981))? (b) Why are there so many prototypically 'active' predicates in (Harris' 'inactive') Class 2? (c) As we shall see, Harris believes that a rule of Inversion applies to initial subjects in Series III, demoting them to final indirect objects. She also proposes that a number of Georgian dialects have 'regularised' the exceptional predicates of problem-(b) by marking their subjects with the Narrative case in Series II. Since then she must view this 'regularisation' as a process of assigning them initial subjects, why does none of the dialects apply Inversion to the 'regularised' predicates in Series III, since this rule too for Harris is sensitive to initial subjecthood? (d) And why also in the dialects concerned is it relatively easy to find both the 'regularised' predicates still taking Nominative subjects in

(*dialectal co-existence, according to Harris - p. 113*)
 Series II/and, more fatally, prototypically 'inactive' predicates governing a Narrative subject in Series II? With these questions temporarily in abeyance, let us look at the general structure of the book.

3. There are five parts: I (Introduction) consists of two chapters, which discuss the problem presented by the Kartvelian family and the methodology to be followed both for a synchronic and diachronic study. "Cautious optimism as to what the comparative method and internal reconstruction can accomplish in the area of rule alignment" is expressed (p. 33). II (Reconstruction) consists of four chapters: the case-marking patterns in the four modern languages as well as in Old Georgian are set out and a reconstructed Common Kartvelian case-system is proposed with Nominative, Narrative, Dative, Genitive, Instrumental and Adverbial proto-desinences for singular nouns. Arguments are presented in support of the view that Series I developed out of Series II. Chapter 6 then addresses the question as to what was the original alignment-type in Series II. This is concluded to have been Ergative-Absolutive, which allows Harris to make explicit the suggestion of other commentators (Anderson 1977; Aronson 1979; Boeder 1979) that Series I could have developed from an earlier antipassive configuration that will have been linked to imperfective/durative aspect. A rule of Object Demotion is postulated to have developed in Middle Common Kartvelian, such that, while it existed as a productive rule, all verb-forms subject to it were intransitive at their final stage of derivation - hence all had their subjects marked by the

Nominative, and the initial direct object became a final (Dative) indirect object. The rise of Series III is dated to Late Common Kartvelian. While Series II still showed Ergative-alignment, the ancestral forms of Class 3 verbs (which for Harris are, in the vast majority of cases, simply intransitive) took Nominative subjects. At some stage, either just before or soon after Svan broke away from the proto-language, Ergative-alignment gave way to Active-alignment and the Medial verbs began to take Narrative subjects in Series II - Harris claims to have discovered evidence in the Nak'ra-Laxamula dialect of Svan for competing Ergative- vs. Active-alignment with these verbs; she also argues that there is Old Georgian evidence in favour of the earlier Ergative-stage. We shall demonstrate that this 'evidence' evaporates on closer inspection. The switch to Active-alignment in Series II meant that the present-day Series I screeves were no longer derivable by any productive rule, so they were re-interpreted as independently existing forms, thereby creating Series I with its Nominative-Accusative configuration.

Part III (The Development of Series I in Common Kartvelian) consists of six chapters, where the derivation of Series I's ancestral forms is formally presented and the work of Gamq'relidze/Mač'avariani (1965) on ablaut-patterns is drawn on to support the view that Series I's ancestral forms were all intransitive. The 'series markers' (found in all Series I screeves) are all reduced to a proto-form **-ev* (though the marker *-i* is given a different original function altogether), as are the plural-suffixes *-eb-*, *-epe*, *-ep-*, *-en-*. A collective sense is

ascribed to this parent-form, which was then differentiated as a pluraliser for nouns and as a sign of durative aspect for verbs. Chapter 10 examines EN-agreement in Old Georgian verbs; it is suggested that this was a rule sensitive to initial direct objecthood (ie it was activated by 'inactive' nominals) and vestiges of it are supposedly seen in the modern language(s) - again we shall dispute these claims. Retired indirect object marking is examined in Chapter 11, and Chapter 12 summarises the arguments of Part III.

Part IV (Other Changes Related to Case Marking) consists of three chapters, dealing with the origins of Series III, the shift from Ergativity to Activity and variations in case-marking found in certain Kartvelian dialects, which are linked to the shift to Activity. We shall have cause to question Harris' notions about the origin and essence of Series III, number-agreement for 3rd person dative nominals, and her opinions about analyses of Class 3 verbs not in harmony with her own.

Part V (Kartvelian and Language Universals) presents two concluding chapters, one of which examines some residual aspects of verbal morphology to see if they can be related to the innovated Active-alignment, whilst the other 'summarizes the contributions of the study of Kartvelian case alignment changes to an understanding of diachronic syntax' (p. 413). Since we shall now proceed to prove the non-existence of Active-alignment in Kartvelian, any importance claimed for this work on the basis of arguments presented in favour of the existence, or development, of an Active-alignment in Series II simply

vanishes.

4. What, then, of the four problems listed above, which any proponent of the Activity-hypothesis must at least try to tackle?

Regarding the presence in Class 3 of such 'inactive' predicates as bdyvrial-eb-s 'it flashes', gruxun-eb-s 'it thunders', qizgiz-eb-s 'it flickers', dux-s 'it boils' etc ... (and the list is sizeable), Harris follows Holisky in classifying them as 'expressives' and concludes 'that they are best considered exceptions in Georgian, both synchronically and diachronically' (p. 359). As to the presence in Class 2 of prototypically 'active' predicates, Harris specifically mentions the roots svla 'come, go', da-^ydoma/da-sxdoma 'sit down', a-dgoma 'stand up', da-c'ola 'lie down', all of which are Class 2 verbs and take Nominative subjects in Series II in the literary language. Again for Harris these are exceptions (p. 111), and, were they the only such predicates in Class 2, one might perhaps not feel their irregularity to be too damaging to Harris' approach. However, the number of 'active' predicates in Class 2 is considerably larger than this list of a mere four would lead one to suppose. Class 2 verbs belong to one of three morphological types known as (a) i/e-prefixal intransitives, (b) d-suffixal intransitives, and (c) markerless intransitives, each of which sub-groups contains 'active' predicates, though there seems to be an especially large number in the e-prefixal sub-group, where curiously we sometimes find the relative form (ie with indirect object) of a root which in its absolute guise (ie without indirect object) appears as a Class 3 verb - an odd state of affairs indeed if semantics were in any way the

- (6) žma-m ... gayaribda
brother NARR he/became/poor

'The brother became poor'

(Kartlian - quoted by Sardžveladze 1975.244)

- (7) žeiran-ma daptxa
gazelle-NARR it/grew alarmed

'The gazelle became frightened'

(Mesxian - Dzidziguri 1974.63)

- (8) šec'uxta kal-ma
she/became upset woman-NARR

'The woman became upset'

(Gurian - Džadžanidze 1977.17)

- (9) imis švileb-ma gaqdes suniv xaneb-i
his sons-NARR they/became all khans-NOM(!)

'His sons all became khans'

(Fereidani - quoted by Sardžveladze 1975.244; Boeder 1979.467)

Examples of this type are only mentioned by Harris with reference to the Lower Ač'arian dialect (p.377), where she ascribes them to Mingrelian influence, which of course cannot explain their occurrence in dialects far removed from Mingrelia (Fereidani is spoken in Iran). However, it is helpful to bear Mingrelian in mind in seeking to understand why the Narrative case is being extended beyond its normal privileges of occurrence in these dialects. Although our problem is to determine the nature of case-marking in Series II, it is quite clear that (with the possible synchronic exception of Class 4) cross-referencing on

the verb follows the Nominative-Accusative pattern (both the Narrative nominal for Class 1 and 3 verbs and the Nominative nominal of Class 2 and 4 verbs motivate the same set of agreement-affixes on the verb, whilst the Nominative nominal of Class 1 and occasionally Class 3 verbs requires the other set). The Narrative case is the most highly marked subject-case in Georgian, since fundamentally it serves only to show subjects of Class 1 and 3 verbs in Series II (cf. Fähnrich 1967:41-2). It is thus gradually being extended in Series II to occur on all subjects, which is precisely what has already happened in Mingrelian to produce the Accusative-alignment we have seen to exist in this language, though with Class 4 verbs in Mingrelian the logical subject, which synchronically is also probably to be regarded as the grammatical subject, remains Dative and takes a Set-ii agreement-affix, reflecting its original indirect object status (cf. Harris' rejection of this particular indirect-object-to-subject development for this same Dative nominal in Georgian on p.319). In Mingrelian, then, the Narrative case marks all nominals that take Set-i agreement-affixes on the verb in Series II. One may surmise that at the time the Narrative replaced the Nominative desinence on the argument of a Class 4 verb this Nominative nominal still functioned as the verb's grammatical subject. But in view of the following Fereidani example:

- (10) em kenizeb-ma-c pul-i k'i
 these servants-NARR-too money-NOM indeed
 gouxardaq'e amma ...
 they/rejoiced/at it but

'These servants were greatly pleased with the money
but ...' (Gigineišvili et al. 1961.266)

where the Narrative has replaced the expected Dative with this verb, which, though formally a Class 2 relative verb-form, is functionally a Class 4 inverted form by virtue of being a 'borrowed' formation providing the missing screeves for the Class 4 stative uxaria 'X rejoices (at it)' (Tschenkéli 1958.475), one would predict that any Georgian dialect fully extending the Narrative to all verb-classes in Series II would similarly replace not the Nominative (as Mingrelian has) but the Dative nominal (as this example in Fereidani exemplifies), thereby confirming the change in status of this nominal with Class 4 verbs from earlier indirect object to present-day subject (cf. Cole et al 1980). Now, since I accept that most Class 1 and 3 subjects are semantically agents, I agree that it may well be that the first or most frequent intransitive subjects in the dialects concerned to take the Narrative desinence in Series II will be 'active' predicates (cf. Boeder 1979.469), but this is wholly different from supposing an Active-alignment as the basic determiner of case-marking in any aspect of Kartvelian syntax. As to difficulty-(c), I am not aware that Harris has discussed it.

4.1 And so, since 'activity' is patently incapable of accounting for the full array of the facts of the language(s), one may wonder why anyone was ever misled into espousing the idea when there is a theory available that accounts for all the facts with (virtually) no exceptions. This theory is that, excepting Class 4 verbs, in Series II we have (apart from in Mingrelian)

Ergative-alignment, transitive subjects taking the Narrative (ie Ergative) case, intransitive subjects and direct objects the Nominative (Absolutive) case. The obvious obstacle is the class of Medial verbs (Class 3). It is now time to prove that in Series II (and III, and even in parts of Series I) Medials are, underlyingly at least, transitive, whether or not they can ever appear with a surface direct object.

In the Present sub-series of Series I (ie Present Indicative, Present Subjunctive, Imperfect Indicative) Medials may be formed with a variety of 'series markers' and generally show no prefix before the root. However, their defining characteristic, as argued by Holisky (1981), is that their 3rd person singular Future form is marked by the circumfix i- eb-s; this means that (a) unlike most verbs, the Future is not distinguished from the Present by addition of a perfectivising preverb, (b) the i- prefix occurs in all other Series I screeves (sc. outside the Present sub-series) and throughout Series II, (c) the essentially Class 1 morphology of Series II and most of Series I gives way naturally to the typically Class 1 (= transitive) phenomenon of 'inversion' in Series III. In her Preface Harris thanks Calvert Watkins for his wise advice concerning 'the necessity of explaining the origin of every morpheme in Series I forms' (p. xii). It is a pity that this advice is not taken as seriously when it comes to determining the reason for the presence of the i- prefix with Class 3 verbs, especially as the answer easily explains their Ergative-alignment in Series II. The i- in question has long been recognised to be

the so-called Subjective Version, which serves to show that the subject of a transitive verb is acting on himself or in his own interests. Taking, then, the example:

- (11) q'vav-ma i-prin-a
 crow-NARR it/flew

'The crow flew'

Deeters (1930.85) clearly stated that this could be viewed 'als verkürzt aus'

- (12) q'vav-ma tav-i i-prin-a
 self-NOM he/made/it/fly

'The crow made itself fly'

which demonstrates that we are dealing with the Subjective Version of a causative verb like:

- (13) k'ac-ma(n) q'vav-i a-prin-a
 man-NARR crow-NOM he/made/it/fly

'The man made the crow fly'

Assuming that Deeters had in mind a diachronic explanation here, we can adapt his views to a synchronic analysis of the language(s) by saying that, outside the Present sub-series, Medials (for some historical reason that is unclear) are underlying transitives with an obligatorily deleted reflexive object-pronoun or possibly in some cases an internal direct object, which would account for such Old Georgian collocations as:

- (14) i-marxet marxva-y
 fast! fast-NOM

'Fast a fast!//Proclaim a fast' (I Kings 21:9).
 (Cf. Nebieridze (Forthcoming) as cited by Harris on p. 352).
 Where a Medial takes a normal direct object as in:

- (15) man i-tama[✓]sa burt-i
 XINARRJ he/played/it ball-NOM
 'X played ball'

the *i-* is simply retained as now an integral sign of the morphological class of the verb. Some Medials (especially in the sister-languages) show the *i-* in the Present sub-series too, which may be ascribed to analogical levelling (pace Nozadze 1974). Deletion of an underlying reflexive pronoun is not uncommon, as may be seen by taking the Class 1 verb 'to bathe':

- (16) kal-ma (tav-i) da-i-bana
 woman-NARR self-NOM she/washed (/herself)
 'The woman bathed (herself)'

where the deletion is optional (NB the Subjective Version vowel in the verb).

4.2 Harris refuses to accept the above-account of the Medial verbs and argues against both any close association of the *i-* with the use of the Narrative in Series II and the assumption of underlying transitivity here. She observes (p. 348) that *i-* is found both with one sub-group of Class 2 verbs, whose Series II subject stands in the Nominative, and with certain Class 1 verbs. But, whatever the origin of *i-* prefixal Class 2 verbs (see Deeters 1930.86), the role of *i-* is quite distinct when comparing Classes 2 and 3: in Class 3 it accompanies transitive suffixal morphology whereas in Class 2 it accompanies intransitive suffixal morphology, eg.

- (17) (Class 3) i-t'ir-eb-s vs. (Class 2) da-i-c'er-eb-a
 X/will/cry it/will/be/written
 'X will cry' vs. 'It will be written'

where the Class 2 verb has a perfectivising preverb plus the intransitive ending -eb-a. To distinguish between Class 1 verbs with i- and Class 3 verbs is also straightforward, eg.

- (18) (Class 3) i-t'ir-eb-s vs. (Class 1) a-i-γ-eb-s
 X/will/take/it
 'X will cry' vs. 'X will take it'

where, again, the Class 1 Future takes a preverb and may also be passivised to give a-i-γ-eb-a 'it will be taken', whereas no such conversion is possible for the Medial. In the case of a Class 1 like mo-i-q'van-s 'X will bring Y[Animate]', the preverb is necessary and the suffix -eb- is absent. So the distinctness of Class 3 remains intact.

4.3 In questioning the assumption of underlying transitivity, Harris appeals to causative syntax. She observes that whether or not a causativised Class 1 verb has a surface direct object, because of their clear underlying transitivity, the embedded Class 1 verb's subject will always be surface indirect object (p. 352), eg (Harris' numberings are in brackets):

- (19)[31] vano-s davac'erine (c'eril-i)
 Vano-DAT I/made/him/write(/it) letter-NOM
 'I made Vano write (a letter)'

whereas the same does not apply to Class 3 verbs, the embedded subject surfacing as direct object (unless there is an embedded direct object already filling this slot, in which case we shall have an exact parallel to (19) with surface direct object), eg.

(20a)[32a] Vano-s vatamašē^v nard-i
 DAT I/made/him/play/it backgammon-NOM
 'I made Vano play backgammon'

(20b)[32b] vano vatamašē^v
 NOM
 'I made Vano play'

where Vano is now surface direct object, as with any embedded intransitive verb. The problem with this line of argument is that it fails to reflect the correct direction of derivation - Medial screeves outside the Present sub-series are themselves the Subjective Version forms of the already existing bi-valent causative; the causative is not the derivative of the Medial screeves under discussion. The verb in (20) is, thus, the expected, simple bi-valent Class 1 verb, lacking any preverb for the same reason that Medials normally take no preverb - they are of atelic aspect (Holisky 1981).

4.4 The final objection to the linkage of the i-prefix with Narrative subjects in Series II necessitates a discussion of some Old Georgian forms. We are presented with (p. 115):

(21)[7] katam-i q'iva
 chicken-NOM it/crowed
 'The cock crowed' (Mt. 26:74; L. 22:60; J. 18:27)

whose Modern Georgian equivalent is the Medial:

(21a)[8] mamal-ma i-q'ivla
 cock-NARR

and again:

- (22)[9] k'onst'ant'ine ... mepa
 Constantine-NOM he/reigned
 'Constantine reigned' (Q'auxčičšvili 1973.277)

whose modern form would show the Medial:

- (22a) k'onst'ant'ine-m i-mepa

NARR

On the other hand, c'inac'armet'q'uela 'X prophesied' (= Modern Georgian i-c'inasc'armet'q'vela) and kadaga 'X preached' (= Modern Georgian i-kadaga) are stated to have occurred with Narrative subjects despite the absent i- (p. 348) - no sources are quoted for these observations, and I have been unable to find appropriate examples. Thus, evidence seems to be available to make the link between the i- prefix and Narrative subjects in Series II suspect. But the answer is simple - if we accept Holisky's basic definition of a Medial as a verb with i- eb-s in its 3rd person singular Future (and Harris made no objection to this in her review of Holisky in 1982), then, since no Medial has i- in the Future and lacks it in Series II, if we have verb-forms without the necessary coupling of i- prefix and Class 1 suffixal morphology in Series II, they cannot ex vi termini belong to the Medial class. The Old Georgian forms in (21) and (22), thus must by virtue of taking a NOM subject be markerless Class 2 intransitives, and, if the observation made about the Old Georgian verbs for 'prophecy' and 'preach' is accurate, then they must be classified as Class 1 verbs in Neutral Version, just like man c'era 'X[NARR] wrote (it)', as must lales '(they[NARR]) barked' in Laz (p. 53), since here too we have no i- prefix in Series II; if 'preach' in Old Georgian belonged to Class 1, this

would straightforwardly explain the appearance of i-kadag-o-s as a passive 'it will be preached' at Mt. 26:13, where Modern Georgian has i-kadag-eb-en 'they will preach it'. Thus, such observations by Harris as that contrasting examples (21) and (21a), namely, 'while several aspects of this sentence have changed ... nominative in Old Georgian, narrative in Modern Georgian, **it** is also probably not an accident that the morphology of the verb changed also ... q'iva to iq'ivla' (p. 115) must just be disregarded as failing to reflect the correct historical linkage between prefix and case, and one must also add an asterisk to (p. 342):

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| (23)[26c] | igi | (*i)glova |
| | X[NOM] | X/mourned |
| | 'X mourned' | |

because this morpho-syntax is set up on the basis of examples (21) and (22) - there is not a single example in the whole of Georgian literature that has so far been noted (as far as I am aware) of a Series II Medial verb (sc. with i-prefix) taking a Nominative subject. And so we conclude there to be an absolutely crucial link between i-prefix and Narrative subjects in Series II for the Medials - the i- indicating basic transitivity, which determines Ergative case-marking for the subject.

4.5 In the sister-languages suffixal morphology for verbs is not in exact correspondence with that of Georgian, and so, just because Georgian Medials end in -eb-s in the Future 3rd person singular, this does not mean that such an ending will be found in the other Kartvelian languages. However, all four languages do

have the Subjective Version *i*-prefix. And so, we shall expect this prefix for the Medials in Series II and most (if not all) of Series I to be coupled with the respective Class 1 suffixal morphology; the subject in Series II will stand in the Narrative case, and Series III will be marked by 'inversion'. With these expectations in mind, let us consider the Nak'ra-Laxamula dialect of Svan, where Harris thinks she has discovered evidence for the original Ergative-alignment, that she imputes to Common Kartvelian, co-existing with the perhaps recently borrowed Active-alignment in the constructions used with the Class 3 verbs. On pp. 120-121 she quotes nine pairs of examples, of which this is one:

(24a)[24a] dina ädšdiral
 girl[NOM] she/played

(24b)[24b] dina-d ädšdirale

NARR

both meaning 'The girl played' (the unlauted initial vowel derives from **ad-i...*). She argues that in each of the pairs we have two forms for the Medial concerned, of which the (a)-example reflects the old Ergative-alignment, whilst the (b)-example is the newer Active-pattern. One's immediate suspicion is that the (a)-examples are really *i*-prefixal Class 2 forms with an entirely regular Nominative (intransitive) subject. We shall now show this to be the case.

4.6 The unusual feature of Nak'ra-Laxamula is that the verb-forms in the (a)-examples are particularly characteristic of the Lower Bal villages of Laxamula and its neighbours. But, whilst the forms actually quoted by Harris may be foreign to

other dialects of Svan, this does not mean that there might not exist parallel doublets elsewhere which would help to throw some light on the nature of the Nak'ra-Laxamula pairs. My Upper Bal informant, Chato Gudžedžiani, offered the following as exact structural parallels:

- (25a) ež^əa ädxeirän
 X[NOM] it/flourished
 (25b) ež^ənem ädxeire
 X[NARR]
 'X flourished'

where the verb in (25a) is Class 2, whilst that in (25b) is Class 3. Harris declines to interpret her (a)-examples as Class 2 verbs because firstly she sees their suffix -al as being 'derivational' (ie as defining a Class 3 verb) and not as the homonymous suffix of 'plurality' (including the ability to mark iterative aspect), and secondly she seems to think that non-ablauting Class 2 verbs necessarily take the suffix -än (Lower Bal = -än or -an) in the Aorist (p. 46). And so what picture actually emerges when we look at one of the articles cited at this point by Harris from the author whose fundamental works on Svan are copiously represented in this book's bibliography? Kaldani (1978), a native speaker of Laxamulan, notes the productivity of the (a)-examples in his native dialect, but in an interesting footnote against otsdiral^v 'I played', the 1st person singular form of the very verb of (24a), he states: 'The element -al with intransitive verbs indicates the iterative

nature [mravalqzisoba - BGH] of the action' (p. 152). His use of the term gardauvali 'intransitive' to describe the (a)-example verbs, along with Gudžedžiani's use of the term p'asiuri 'passive' for them, is a good indication that the verbs belong to Class 2, since in Georgian a Class 3 verb would almost certainly be styled sašuali qvaris zmna 'verb of middle voice'. And, in any case, the suffix is here clearly being ascribed the force that Harris specifically denies it. Why is the reader not told this? And if Harris has detailed grounds for rejecting Kaldani's statement, why are these not presented in the context of a discussion about Kaldani's footnote? Kaldani also quotes parallel formations (eg läyt'ebdal 'it warmed up') which not even Harris, I imagine, would want to call a Medial - in Georgian this is the Class 2 qatba. Also he gives examples of non-ablauting Class 2 verbs that contain no suffix -an (eg äddavaš 'it turned black'). The verbs in Harris' (a)-examples thus seem merely to present a root, which may also surface with Medial morpho-syntax, in a Class 2 mantle. This in itself is not surprising - in Georgian after all many Class 3 verbs have a d-suffixal Class 2 counterpart that has inceptive force, though i-prefixal Class 2 correlates are less common (one example quoted by the Academy Dictionary is is ič'ida 'X[NOM] wrestled' to parallel the Medial man ič'idava); it is just that the particular forms in question have limited distribution in Svan, being used maximally in Nak'ra-Laxamula.

Regarding the morphology of the (b)-verbs, Harris sets up the following contrasts between Classes 1 and 3 (pp. 134ff.):

| | <u>Class 1</u> | <u>Class 3</u> |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 'darkened it' | 'sang' |
| 1st person singular | otbür | otyiral |
| 2nd person singular | atbür | ätyiral |
| 3rd person singular | adbur-e | ädtyiral-e |

She argues that when Ergative-alignment existed alone, the 'intransitive' Medial would have behaved like a Class 2 verb in taking no person-suffix in the Aorist and in lacking umlaut on the vowel of the last syllable. When Active-alignment developed, the (b)-example verbs borrowed -e from Class 1 verbs to show solidarity with their fellow 'active' predicates - hence the morphological difference in the 3rd person (and in all plurals) between the (a)- and (b)-verbs, and the part-similarity between the (b)-verbs and those of Class 1. Now, if we add the other conjugational pattern that albeit a minority of Class 1 verbs follows (Kaldani 1978.155):

| | |
|---------------------|---------------|
| | 'ploughed it' |
| 1st person singular | oqan |
| 2nd person singular | aqan |
| 3rd person singular | aqān |

we can dismiss Harris' proposal and rather argue as follows: Class 2 verbs (regardless of their structure - suffixless or al-suffixal) never had an Aorist ending that could cause the final syllable to umlaut; the majority of Class 1 verbs lost an ending in the first two persons singular of the Aorist that caused the final syllable to umlaut; in a minority of Class 1 verbs this ending was lost in the first two persons singular before a rule

of umlaut applied but was lost in the other persons after umlaut began to operate; for the Medials, which had always had typically Class 1 morphology, the first two persons singular of the Aorist lost the suffix before umlaut developed (like the minority Class 1 verbs) but then retained it elsewhere (like the majority Class 1 verbs).

It follows that there is no evidence in Svan for a shift to Active-alignment. All pseudo-Medials that take Nominative subjects in the Aorist must actually, in the current absence of convincing arguments to the contrary, be regarded as Class 2 formations (there are too many dotted around the book to list them separately), and the pseudo-Medial quoted on p. 44 (also on p. 349):

(26)[12] dede-d adč'k'ūre
 mother-NARR she/thought
 'Mother thought'

is actually a Class 1 verb, as we have here no i-prefix and the form derives from *ad-a-č'k'ūr-e, where the -a- is Class 1's Neutral Version vowel.

4.7 The Old Georgian evidence plus an interesting case in Laz is left for consideration before the notion of 'activity' in Kartvelian can finally be laid to rest.

4.7.1 In Chapter 10 Harris discusses the Old Georgian rule of EN-agreement. The old form of the Nominative plural was formed by -n-i, and in Series II the verb contained an agreement-affix -(e)n for such Nominative plural direct objects. This marker was also triggered 'by initial direct objects that are final subjects in five morphological categories' (p. 217), which is Harris' way

of saying 'inactive' subjects. The presence of this morpheme in five morphological categories looks impressive until one reflects that all five categories reduce to one morphological type, ie intransitive verbs formed by means of the i/e-prefix. This means that the failure of the agreement-rule to occur with markerless Class 2 verbs produces yet another bag of exceptions (p. 221), whilst its absence from the n/d-suffixal variety is (perhaps plausibly) to be explained on phonological grounds, as Harris argues. However, since we are faced with the same sort of semantic inconsistencies that characterise Modern Georgian ('active' predicates showing EN-agreement, which for Harris is an 'inactive' feature, vs. 'inactive' predicates lacking it, which for Harris is an 'active' characteristic), I conclude that EN-agreement was (albeit imperfectly) a rule of Ergative-alignment, determined by plural direct objects or intransitive subjects, as long as the intransitive verb was formed by means of the i/e-prefix.

4.7.2 On pp. 116 ff. Harris presents some Soviet Laz examples to show the use of both Narrative and Nominative subjects in both Series I and II for verbs of Class 2 and 3, which she interprets as reflecting: '(a) the archaic case marking dichotomy between Series I and II, (b) the accusative-type marking ... reconstructed for Series I after it was reanalyzed .., (c) the analogical restructuring of Series I in Laz.., (d) the original ergative marking in Series II ..., and (e) the development of active case marking in this series...' (p. 119). Whilst I have never rejected the possibility of Georgian developing

Active-alignment for Series II at some future stage and accept that we might here have evidence for such a change in progress in this variety of Soviet Laz, I would wish to see the results of a full investigation into the variety concerned by a competent specialist before accepting the case as proven. In the meantime I note that (a) there are very few Laz speakers in Soviet Georgia (most being in Turkey), (b) when one examines any Kartvelian dialect, one usually finds a number of deviations from expected norms, (d) case-marking seems especially susceptible to adaptation (cf. Harris Chapter 15; Boeder 1979), all of which suggests to me that this variety of Laz will turn out to be displaying the recent and on-going breakdown of basically the standard Georgian system, outlined at the start of this article, which everyone accepts will have been the starting-point for all the varying developments in Kartvelian as a whole.

4.8 The position we have reached is that, with the possible exception of Laz, there is no evidence for the development of Active-alignment anywhere in Kartvelian. We must conclude that the basic configuration for Series II was (and remains in Svan, Georgian and probably Laz) Ergative-Absolutive. We have four verb-classes, and the use of the Narrative case is motivated by the transitivity of the verbs with which it appears (Classes 1 and 3). In such a complex language as Georgian (along with its sisters) it would not be surprising to find anomalies. Although the Medials as a group are far from being straightforward phenomena, the only real difficulties that arise for the traditional analysis of Kartvelian are the following: (i) the presence of apparently monovalent verbs in Class 1 (the

which in Modern Georgian would be:

(29a) mepe-m daa₃ina [✓]sen-i ₃lier-eb-i

NOM

Harris treats type-(ii) predicates as verbs governing Lexical Object Demotion (p. 8), which may be acceptable in purely synchronic terms, but it fails to capture their real essence.

With tri-valent Class 2 verbs like:

(30) sap'at'io c'odeba-s ertmanet-s [✓]seecileba
 honorary title-DAT each other-DAT X/will/vie with/Y

16 uzlieresi mo[✓]c'adrak'e kal-i
 strongest chess playing woman-NOM

'The 16 strongest lady chess-players will vie with
 each other over//for the honorary title...'

(Newspaper 'Lelo')

one perhaps has no difficulty seeing the second Dative nominal as indirect object and the first as some sort of oblique, but in a case like:

(31) gamoa[✓]sk'arava, rom levan-i [✓]sehp'irda
 she/revealed/it that Levan-NOM he/promised/it/to her
 mis [✓]svil-s gap'areba-s
 her child-DAT stealing away-DAT

'She revealed that Levan had promised her child to
 steal her away' (D K'ldiašvili - Academy Dictionary)

one feels that the second Dative nominal functions more as a direct object to the first Dative nominal's indirect objecthood. It is thus not surprising that even in Tbilisi speech the case-marking with this and some other verbs has been altered to the normal Ergative-pattern, which would give:

(31a) ... levan-ma šehpr'irda mis švil-s gap'areba
NARR NOM

The problem now is that we have Ergative-alignment with Class 2 morphology. The two verbs mat e-zeb-es 'They[NARR] searched (for it [NOM])' and mat e-srol-es isar-i irem-s 'They [NARR] shot an arrow [NOM] at the deer [DAT]' have presumably adapted not only their case-marking but also their morphology (e.g. the ending here is Class 1 -es not Class 2 -nen), for they now behave like simple Class 1 verbs despite the e-prefix, which would be expected only with relative Class 2 verbs whose absolute form takes the i-prefix. Such are the negligible difficulties associated with the Ergative-hypothesis, and the general reader is now in a position to balance these against the gross problems that render the Active-hypothesis wholly irrelevant to Kartvelian.

5 We may now pass on to contemplate Series III. I will leave Harris' speculation about how the three screeves may have come to acquire their evidential force out of the discussion and concentrate on the syntactic role of the verbal arguments together with the question of number-agreement for 3rd person plural Dative nominals. In my review of Harris (1981) I fleshed out Sanidze's observations that 'forms of the active voice in Series III completely coincide with the forms of the stative passive. This means that in origin they are one' (1973.435). In particular, the Perfect derives from the Present stative, the Pluperfect from the Aorist, the IIIrd subjunctive from the Aorist

subjunctive. If the forms were in origin stative passives (= intransitives), the Nominative argument will have been the subject and any second argument will have been Dative indirect object (ie the bi-valent forms in question derive from bi-valent, or relative, intransitive structures). As these forms gave rise to the IIIrd Series for transitive verbs, the roles of the two verbal arguments will have altered by reason of pressure from the rest of the verbal paradigms of which they were becoming a part - the Dative (indirect object) nominal corresponded to the Nominative subject in Series I and to the Narrative subject in Series II, and so it too became re-analysed as subject in the newly created Series III; the Nominative (subject) nominal corresponded to the Dative direct object in Series I and to the Nominative direct object in Series II, and it too changed from original intransitive subject to direct object. This development straightforwardly explains the odd case-marking and verb-agreement with Class 1 and 3 verbs in Series III, features which are anachronistically retained to the present day. Mutatis mutandis, this will also apply to the 'inverted' verbs of Class 4 in all three Series - this latter development had been discussed by Cole et al (1980) with special reference to the Class 4 verbs, and their discussion may be compared with my own Series III orientated suggestion. The relative changes in syntactic ~~satus~~ ^{status} are reflected in the alteration to the capacity of the nominals for imposing number-agreement on the verb - formerly a Nominative 3rd person plural rational noun would have had its plurality marked on the verb by virtue of its subject-status, whereas today the Nominative nominal's plurality is ignored in favour of

marking the plurality of the Dative (ie new subject) nominal.
Compare the old and new patterns respectively for a typical Class
4 verb in:

(32) mas // mat uq'var-an iqi-n-i
(s)he[DAT] they[DAT] (s)he//they/love(s)/them them-PL-NOM
'(s)he//they love(s) them'

(32a) mat uq'var-t is // isi-ni
him//her//it[NOM] them-NOM
'They love him//her//it//them'

Harris believes that there exists a rule of Inversion, which makes initial subjects indirect objects, and that Unaccusative then operates to raise the stranded direct object to final subjecthood. Both rules jointly operate in Series III of Class 1 and 3 verbs and in all forms of Class 4 verbs. She further argues that we no longer have need of a separate Class 4, since, as case-marking and verb-agreement reflect final grammatical relations, the 'inverted' verbs become a special type of Class 2 verb (vid Chapter 13). However, she feels that we still need to distinguish between these 'inverted' verbs (ie those having undergone Inversion + Unaccusative) from relative intransitives (ie those with an indirect object attached that was indirect object even at the initial stage of derivation) in Class 2. She proposes that the difference resides in the different capacities of the two types of Dative nominal to have their plurality indicated on the verb when they are 3rd person. ~~No~~ quote the examples from her earlier (1981) book (which may be compared with

I/

her remarks on p. 320 of the present work):

(33)[16a] m[✓]sobleb-s daek'arg-a bav[✓]sv-i
 parents-DAT he/was lost/to him child-NOM
 'The child was lost to his parents'

(33a)[16b] m[✓]sobleb-s daek'arg-nen bav[✓]sv-eb-i
 they/were lost/to him children-NOM
 'The children were lost to their parents'
 (Harris 1981.217)

Both these forms are relative intransitives since only the Nominative nominal is controlling the number of the verb. She then quoted (p. 259) in her earlier work:

(33b)[35a] evian zmneb-s v ek'argeba-t
 in-ev verbs-DAT v[NOM] they/lose/it
 'Verbs in -ev lose the y'

where the Dative nominal is taken to be the initial subject (final indirect object) and hence controls the pluraliser -t on the verb! In truth the verb in (33b) is simply the Present form of those in (33(a)), and the Dative nominal in all three cases is the (initial and final) indirect object. Since Harris refuses to accept this point, extending the argument to Svan, and since Anderson has also entered this debate (1984:188-9), it is necessary to go into some detail over the facts of number-agreement for Dative nominals in Georgian (and Svan).

5.1 Harris' outlook is based on the prescriptivist statements of at least three commentators: Čikobava (1968.276) says that -t is found in some East Georgian writers' works even when correlating with an 'actual' indirect object (ie for Čikobava this phenomenon is dialectal and in the literary language -t

should only correlate with subject Dative nominals); the editorial panel for 'The Norms of the Modern Georgian Literary Language' (1970.182) express this same view; and Tschenkéli (1958.406-7) omits -t from the appropriate places in his tabular presentation of agreement-patterns for relative Class 2 verbs. And so we would not expect to find Class 2 relatives with this offending -t in the works of Čikobava or in the comment-sections of 'The Norms'. What, then, is to be made of the following? -

- (34) *tvit iapet'ur eneb-s k'i ra*
 themselves Japhetic languages-DAT but what[NOM]
mouvida-t
 it/came/to them

'But what happened to the Japhetic languages themselves?' (Čikobava 1985a:32)

- (35) *m-,na-,sa- tavsarteb-s im tavitve*
 prefixes-DAT that head/INST/right
mokmedebiti da vnebiti gvaris garčeva
 active and passive voice/GEN differentiation[NOM]
rom ar ek'isreboda-t
 that not it/was charged/to them

'that the function of differentiating active and passive voice was not right from the start charged to the prefixes *m-, na-, sa-* ...' (Čikobava 1985b:54)

- (36) *sap'irisp'iro mimartulebis aymnišvneli p'reverbeb-i*
 opposite direction/GEN signifying preverbs-NOM
daertvi-t [masdareb-s]
 they/attach/to them masdars-DAT

'Preverbs indicating opposite direction attach to them [masdars]' ('The Norms' 1970:151)

And Tschenkéli (1958.486-498) cannot avoid facing some problem-cases. He says: 'In bezug auf den Ausdruck der Pluralität des indirekten Objekts in der 3. Person herrscht bei intransitiven Verben in relativer Form weder in der Literatur- noch in der Umgangssprache Einheitlichkeit. Man beobachtet nämlich, dass sehr oft bei diesen Verben zum Ausdruck des gleichen Gedankens die Personalzeichen bei ein und demselben Verb entweder in ihrer normalen Funktion oder auch im Sinne der Inversion gebraucht werden, d.h. die Personalzeichen des indirekten Objekts dienen nicht selten zum Ausdruck des logischen Subjekts.'

'Diese Erscheinung ist wohl nicht zuletzt darauf zurückzuführen, dass beim Sprechenden gewisse affektive Momente mitspielen: Will man nur auf die Person oder Sache hinweisen, die als grammatikalisches Subjekt fungiert, so gebraucht man die Personalzeichen in ihrer normalen Funktion. Möchte man jedoch die Person betonen, die von der Handlung betroffen wird, so gebraucht man die Form mit Inversion, d.h. das indirekte Objekt wird als logisches Subjekt empfunden und als solches gewöhnlich an den Satzanfang gestellt.' There follow three pairs of examples, where the difference resides in the presence vs. absence of -t coupled with the shift in word-order described by Tschenkéli. I repeat the final pair of examples (p. 488):

(37)[3a] kurd-i gaep'ara p'olicieleb-s

thief-NOM he/escaped/from them police-DAT

(37a)[3b] p'olicieleb-s gaep'ara-t kurd-i

Both examples are translated as 'Der Dieb entkam den Polizisten', though the former is said to have the emphasis 'Der Dieb brachte es fertig, den Polizisten zu entkommen', whereas the latter is rather 'Die Polizisten sind die "Betroffenen", indem sie das Missgeschick hatten, dass ihnen der Dieb entkam'. This somewhat impressionistic account of Tschenkéli's is made into an explicit proposal by Anderson - I have altered his example-numbers to conform with those used in this article: 'Since the morphological patterns associated with relative intransitive verbs and with inverted (Class IV) verbs are almost identical, shifts between these classes usually have no formal reflection beyond that shown as the difference between (33) and (33b), (37) and (37a). We have to do here then ... with switches between two inflectional classes depending on whether the dative NPs associated with certain verbs are interpreted as experiencer subjects or simply as affected goals' (1984:189). So Anderson is arguing explicitly (and Harris implicitly) that for every relative Class 2 verb there exists a parallel 'inverted' (Class 4) form which is identical to it in every morphological aspect in every screeve EXCEPT in the matter of which 3rd person plural nominal (the Dative or the Nominative) imposes its plurality on the verb - for relative Class 2 verbs the Nominative nominal's plurality is marked, for the 'inverted' (Class 4) equivalent that of the Dative nominal. I personally regard the assumption of parallel relative Class 2 and 'inverted' (Class 4) forms differing only in respect of this single feature as a trifle far-fetched. Such ambiguous verb-formations as do exist

well! This would suggest that plural-agreement for a Nominative rational subject in -eb- is not as simple a matter as is usually stated (eg Cikobava 1968:273) - in fact K'vač'adze (1977:101) gives three examples of non-agreement from the literary language, and in the following example we even see non-agreement when the rational Nominative subject is marked by -n-i rather than by the common -eb-i, whose original function was of course to mark a collective plural:

(38c) msurvelebsi moxuc-n-i-c k'i mravlad
 volunteers/among old-PL-NOM-too indeed much
 gamočnd-a
 appeared-SG

'Amongst the volunteers even old people were much in evidence' (D K'ldiasvili - Works II, 1981, p. 109).

Of course, it remains to be investigated as to whether there is any principle controlling which variant is actually selected in examples like (38) and (38a). I would suggest that a fruitful line of enquiry might be to examine whether such pragmatic factors as stress (cf. Dzorbenadze 1981:74-5), topic and focus might not be relevant here. It should certainly not be necessary to have to follow Harris and Anderson in viewing the Dative nominal as the subject of a Class 4 verb. Indeed, I find it quite incredible that anyone should wish to ascribe subject-status (at any level of derivation, and certainly not underlyingly) to the Dative nominal in these examples - consider especially examples (34), where the verb is mosvla 'come' and (39) - (42) below:

- (39) arac'minda žala eupleba-t
 unholy power[NOM] it/takes hold of/them
 [gandgomileb-s]
 apostates-DAT

'An unholy power takes hold of them [apostates]'

(Church Calendar 1986:10)

- (40) dip'lomeb-i ... gadaeca-t tušetis
 diplomas-NOM it/was handed over/to them Tušeti/GEN
 sap'at'io mokalakeeb-s
 honorary citizens-DAT

'Diplomas were handed over to the honorary citizens
 of Tušeti' (Newspaper 'Samšoblo' 1984.606. p.2)

- (41) es žildoeb-i mienič'a-t ...
 these prizes-NOM it/was awarded/to them
 ševardnadze-s ... kavtarasvil-sa-c da ...
 Ševardnadze-DAT Kavtarasvili-DAT-too and
 pandžik'ize-s
 Pandžik'idze-DAT

'These prizes were awarded to Ševardnadze,
 Kavtarasvili and Pandžik'idze' (ibid.)

(where in both these latter cases the Dative nominals follow
 their verbs)

- (42) kartvel art'ist'eb-s ak didi q'uradyeba
 Georgian artists-DAT here great attention[NOM]
 ekceoda-t ... xel-i ec'q'oboda-t
 it/was being turned/to them hand-NOM it/was
 being arranged/for them

'Great attention was here turned toward Georgian

artists ... assistance was given to them'

(D K'ldiašvili, a noted writer from Western Georgia).

I suppose my objections might occasion an appeal to Tschenkéli's discussion on p. 489 to 'Verbformen, die zwar rein formmässig gleich lauten, aber zweierlei bedeuten können, je nachdem in welcher Funktion die Personalzeichen auftreten.

'Nehmen wir beispielsweise die Verbform e-čven-eb-a. Diese Verbform kann bedeuten:

a) "er zeigt sich ihm"

In diesem Falle handelt es sich um das Relative Passiv mit e-:
... Z.B.

| | | |
|------------|-------------|--------------|
| mepe | e-čven-eb-a | xalx-s |
| [king/NOM] | | [people-DAT] |

Der König wird sich dem Volke zeigen

b) "ihm erscheint jemand/etwas (z.B. im Traum)"

In diesem Falle handelt es sich um das Indirekte Verb ... Z.B.

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| deda-s | e-čven-eb-a | švil-i | sizmarš-i |
| [mother-DAT] | | [child-NOM] | [in/dream] |

Der Mutter erscheint das Kind im Traum, oder: die Mutter sieht das Kind im Traum'

(glosses in English are mine - BGH). I respectfully submit that e-čven-eb-a is purely and simply a relative Class 2 verb meaning 'X appears to//before Y', and that the Dative nominal in the (b)-example is no more the subject of this verb in Georgian than the Dative der Mutter is the subject of erscheint in German or to (its) mother is the subject of appears in the English translation

'The child appears to (its) mother in a dream'.

If one is really interested in the way standard Georgian actually behaves rather than in what grammarians prescribe for it, the facts are clear: for 'inverted' verbs (Class 1 and 3 forms in Series III, and Class 4 verbs generally), a 3rd person plural Dative nominal, if rational, will have its plurality marked in the verb by $-t$ (sc. in the presence of a 3rd person Nominative nominal), whereas a 3rd person Nominative nominal's plurality will not be marked - an entirely regular state of affairs if the Dative is subject and the Nominative is direct object, as we have proposed (which seems to answer Harris' criticism of the assumption of a diachronic change in status for these two nominals enunciated in paragraph 2 on p. 319).

Case-marking and verb-agreement for 'inverted' verbs simply reflect their origins - intransitive stative verbs with Nominative subject and Dative indirect object. On the other hand, a 3rd person plural rational Dative nominal that is the indirect object of a relative Class 2 verb may optionally have its plurality shown on the verb by $-t$ (sc. in the presence of a 3rd person Nominative nominal). My informant, who checked her judgments with at least one other Georgian before replying, confirms this by discerning no semantic difference between each of Tschenkéli's three pairs of examples (cf. (37) and (37a)) and by allowing both a $-t$ optionally where Tschenkéli has none and no $-t$ optionally where Tschenkéli does have one. Such being the case, the presence of $-t$ cannot be regarded as a mark of initial subjecthood for the Dative nominal with these verbs, and equally we shall have no example from Georgian of initial relational

status having any determining role on agreement-patterns.

5.2 We can now correct the agreement-tables Harris presents on p. 320 (without stating their source). Harris' tables are set out below, and, in brackets, I give the forms as listed by Georgia's most venerable and revered grammarian, Ak'ak'i^v Šanidze (1973.434):

Present of relative intransitive verb (Series 1)

mas uc'eria is 'he has it written' (uc'eria)

mat uc'eria is 'they have it written' (uc'eriat)

mas uc'erian isini 'he has them written' (-)

First evidential of transitive verb (Series III)

mas uc'eria is 'he has written it' (uc'eria)

mat uc'eriat is 'they have written it' (uc'eria(t))

mas uc'eria isini 'they have written them' (-)

This shows at once that for a native Georgian (born in Western Georgia) the pluraliser -t is entirely natural on Class 2 relatives, whilst Harris refuses to allow it. Indeed, it would appear that the -t is more stable in the Class 2 relatives than in the Series III transitives. I imagine that the reason for^v Šanidze's brackets is to show that, since transitive subjects need not be rational nouns, the pluraliser would not be obligatory were the Dative noun to be plural but non-rational, whereas with this particular Class 2 form it is highly unlikely that the Dative indirect object would be anything other than rational. The final (minor) quibble over Harris' table is that, again with this Class 2 form, it is improbable that the Nominative subject could be rational, so that, although the

pluraliser -an is theoretically expected in line 3, with this particular verb it would be pragmatically unusual.

On p. 312 it should be noted that the number-agreement rule quoted by Harris from Topuria (1967.21) is *indeed* the rule Topuria gives for Svan's Class 4 verbs, whereas the examples Harris cites at the top of the page to illustrate the rule's application are relative Class 2 verbs. I quote here her examples (72b) and (72c) with their Georgian forms in brackets so that the reader can see this for himself:

(43)[72b] bopš^ǂ-ar-s (bavšv^ǂ-eb-s) čuätkarwän-x

child-PL-DAT it/was lost/to them

(daek'arga-t) xäm (γor-i)

pig[NOM]

'The children lost a pig//A pig was lost to the children'

(43a)[72c] bepšw^ǂ-s (bavšv^ǂ-s) čuätkarwän-x (daek'arg-nen)

DAT they/were lost/to it

xam-är (γor-eb-i)

PL

5.3 In my review of Harris (1981) one of my complaints about her interpretation of the 'inverted' construction was that no motive was offered in that work to explain why the rule of Inversion (followed by Unaccusative) occurred in Series III for verbs of Classes 1 and 3 and generally for verbs of Class 4 (Hewitt 1983.272). On p. 288 of the present book this omission is corrected. It is suggested that 'Inversion is a device for removing the subject or the speaker from the action expressed by the verb' either to 'indicate that the action was unintentional'

(e.g. Georgian uq'vars '(X[DAT]) loves (Y[NOM])'), or in Laz-Mingrelian to mark 'an event as a root potential' (eg Laz turums '(it[NOM]) draws' vs. atoren '(it[DAT]) can draw'). There is a special device in Georgian, albeit of limited application, for showing unwillingness on the part of the subject, and it does involve placing the subject in the Dative (cf. Poxišvili 1969.152-5). Also I have myself argued that potential-marking in Abkhaz is an example of spontaneous subject-demotion in transitive verbs (Hewitt 1979.236). And so these suggestions cannot be dismissed out of hand. However, because of the general arguments in favour of the re-interpretation analysis presented in both my reviews of Harris' books, I prefer to adhere to this latter view and see case-marking combined with verb-agreement for person in the 'inverted' construction as an example of 'today's morphology reflecting yesterday's syntax' (Givon 1971).

So much for the central arguments of the book.

6 Non-implicational 'Corrigenda' and Observations

p. 22 l. 1: for a discussion of the claim that synthetic passives in Georgian 'cannot normally co-occur with an agent phrase' see my review of Harris' first book (Hewitt 1983.264-5).

p. 91 Fn. 17: It is stated that 'personal names may add -is [= Genitive ending - BGH] before some case desinences; eg davit-is-it-gan 'from David' (... Shanidze 1976:42..)'. A moment's glance at the reference here reveals that the Genitive ending is added because the meaning is 'from the time of David'; cf. Modern Georgian's shorter and longer versions of a phrase

like:

- (44) [✓]čemi ak q'opn-isa-s (// q'opn-is dro-s)
 my here being-GEN-DAT time-DAT
 'at the time of my being here'

p. 127 ll. 9 ff: Given the Svan example:

- (45)[39] e[✓]ji xec'ad beps[✓]-s
 X[NOM] X/saw/him child-DAT
 'X saw the child'

the Dative (final indirect object) nominal is argued to be an initial direct object since in Series III we have the 'inverted' instruction that is motivated by the verb's underlying transitivity, eg.

- (45a)[40] mi e[✓] mare ču mic'wa
 I[DAT] this man[NOM] PREVERB I/have/seen/him
 'I have apparently seen this man' (Lent'ex dialect).

In the associated footnote (12) Harris then notes the existence of non-inverted forms in Series III. If we compare the morphology of the following non-inverted and the above inverted forms. eg.

- (45b) (mi mar-a) xvac'eda (Gagua 1976:104)
 I[NOM] man-DAT I/have/seen/him

we see that Nominative subjects combine with Dative objects in both Series II and III if the verb-stem contains the element -a/ed. Gagua describes this as a 'passive' (i.e. intransitive) suffix - in other words, where it is present, the verb-stem is to be regarded as Class 2, and the non-subject nominal will be the indirect object of this now relative Class 2 form. Where it is absent, the root is free to take a normal direct object like any

Class 1 transitive verb, as in (45a).

p. 131: Harris here produces two pairs of examples from the Nak'ra-Laxamula dialect representing the verb-forms illustrated earlier as (24a) and (24b) but this time with a lexical object present. Where the verb is a straightforward Medial (Narrative subject plus verb-suffix *-e*), the object is Nominative. For the other formation that is especially typical of this dialect (Nominative subject plus no suffix on the verb), the object is Dative. This presents Harris with a problem - why is it Dative? According to the argument we presented above, the Dative is entirely normal with these verbs since we have demonstrated that they are Class 2 verbs, such that an additional argument will simply be an indirect object and produce the verb's relative morphology. As for the differently formed Upper Bal relative lāxsdirān 'he played with him' given in footnote (13), if this form exists in the Nak'ra-Laxamula dialect, we shall have in this dialect two different relative Class 2 formations, one for 'X played with Y', the other an intransitive equivalent to the regular Medial for 'X played Y' (when the aspect presumably is iterative (Kaldani 1978:152)).

p. 154 l. 3 up (cf. p. 398 l. 10 up and Fn. 4 of Chapter 16): The Mingrelian suffix *-k* occurs for the 1st and 2nd persons singular in the Present, Future and Perfect screeves (not just the Present). My own observations on the omissibility of this *-k* together with the *-n-* of the preceding 'series marker' would suggest that it is optional unless the verb-form is monosyllabic, in which event it is not permitted.

p. 164 Fn. 1: The Svan Imperfect suffix -da is said to have been secondarily extended by some verbs to the Aorist. In fact, these verbs form their Aorists by prefixing a preverb to their Imperfects, which is not quite the same thing (Topuria 1967:159).

p. 169 ll. 13-15: In Svan it is being argued that 'e-grade of the transitive present can be reconstructed on the basis of the masdar li-t'ex'. It should be noted that Svan distinguishes active from passive (intransitive) masdars and lit'ex is the intransitive form; the transitive masdar is lit'xe, where we have zero-grade of the root, a complication which at least deserves to be stated and explained.

p. 169 Table 8.4: Although all forms quoted here exist, x-i-k'ed and e-x-i-k' do not belong to the same paradigm as an-k'id, as presented. The meanings are 'I take it', 'You took it' and 'He destroyed it' respectively (Topuria 1967:12).

p. 190 l. 16: ^vSanidze (1976:88) is cited as source for the statement that in Old Georgian 'the series marked ^v~~-ev~~ occurs in only two verbs'. What ^vSanidze actually says is that, among the verbs with which -ev appears, in two cases it completely disappears in Series II (as opposed to being altered to -i- < -iv-).

p. 192 l. 5 (cf. p. 193 l. 2^{up}): Although Harris does not make any such suggestion, a casual reader might be tempted to see in such forms as the Perfect u-la?ap-in-u 'X has apparently played' quoted on p. 301 an example of the 'series marker' -in-. Actually, in such Perfects this morpheme should be bracketted, for it is optional (as it is in the preceding verb u-ragad-(in-)u), and may be compared....

with the optional -n- that appears in Series III with Georgian Medials, which on p. 408 (l. 7 up) Harris declares to be an exclusively Georgian development, unaware of what she had already illustrated on p. 301 for Mingrelian and on p. 287 (example 38) for Laz (= umgar-in-un). Svan also has it, as in xorgäd-n-a 'X apparently spoke' (Topuria 1967:115). For a suggested explanation of this morpheme see Hewitt (Forthcoming b).

p. 212: Two examples (8) and (9) are quoted from Šanidze (1976:159) which differ in that in the first instance the Nominative plural takes the old ending -n-i and causes EN-agreement on the verb, whilst in the second the collective suffix -eb-i is used and causes no such concord-affix on the verb. Harris states that Šanidze quoted these minimal pairs to show that only nouns formally marked with -n-i could bring about EN-agreement, which she then proceeds to demonstrate to be wrong. In fact Šanidze goes on to quote examples where we have EN-agreement but no formal ending -n-i on the noun at the top of p. 162. His aim in quoting the minimal pair seized upon by Harris was to contrast this feature of plural-marking by -n-i with its absence for nouns marked by -eb-i and NOT to make the false claim Harris mistakenly attributes to him.

p. 216 Example 20a: This Old Georgian quote begins with tus, which Harris translates as 'if'. 'If' would be tu, and if one takes the trouble to consult the actual text (Matthew 6:25 Adiš Ms.), one sees that the word in question is the postposition 'for', which in Blake's edition (1976) is written tus and stands as a separate word, whereas Šanidze's edition (1945) more

regularly writes it as -twis attached to the preceding word - both editions utilise the modern script as against that of the actual manuscript. And so, both tus and its gloss should be erased.

p. 217 Example 22b: I would suggest that the analysis is 'I will kiss you [Dative indirect object] on the feet' rather than 'I will kiss the feet to//for you', as proposed.

pp. 226-7: Given such 3rd person singular vs. plural verb-forms in Laz-Mingrelian as the following (final -n deletes in Mingrelian):

| | | | |
|--------|----------|-----------|------------|
| xe-n | 'X sits' | xe-n-an | 'they sit' |
| χuru-n | 'X dies' | χuru-n-an | 'they die' |

one can sympathise with Cikobava's opinion that -n(-) is the 3rd person subject-marker with -an showing plurality. Whilst allowing this synchronically, Harris believes the analysis to be deficient historically, suggesting that, were it true, (a) verbs marked by -s in the 3rd person singular would have *-s-an (they have -an alone) in the plural, and (b) the 3rd person pluraliser should have the same shape as that used for 1st and 2nd persons (= -t). I do not follow the logic of this - why should -n/-n-an not be the appropriate way of marking the relevant features for intransitive verbs (which have a vowel stem-finally) as against -s/-an for transitive verbs (which have a consonant stem-finally) with different pluralisers for the first two as against the 3rd person? Harris proposes that in the irregular Georgian forms dqanan 'they stand', c'vanan 'they lie', hqvanan 'they resemble X' (plus Old Georgian mrc'manan 'I believe them') the final -an is the 3rd person final subject marker, which regularly surfaces

as -en, whereas the penultimate -an- is also from *-en-, which in this case is the marker of initial direct-objecthood - ie we have here a reflection of EN-agreement occurring in Series I. The Laz-Mingrelian sequence -n-an is then assumed also to go back to this hypothetical *-en-en, which of course divorces plural -n-an from singular -n totally! Might one not suggest that, given the pair dga-s 'X stands' vs. dga-n-an 'they stand', the -n- be taken as an epenthesis to split the vowels and that the sequence -an-an was then extended by analogy to the mere handful of forms quoted above for Georgian to avoid having monosyllabic 3rd person plural verbs? Retaining [✓]Cikobava's suggestion, might one not seek to link the Laz-Mingrelian pluraliser -an with the -en that today occurs with ALL Series I screeves in Georgian to mark 3rd person plural subjects (becoming -an after -i- and in the verbs listed above) - cf. also ēan-an 'they are visible' - Georgian e regularly corresponds to a in Laz-Mingrelian? This morpheme can then be linked to EN-agreement in Series II since, at its inception, Series I consisted exclusively of intransitive forms, which could be expected to have undergone EN-agreement. There are difficulties with this view - why was this pattern of agreement restricted to the ancestors of the non-past screeves of Series I (as still in Laz-Mingrelian), and why did it apply to all formations whilst being restricted to i/e-prefixal intransitives in Series II? However, I think this suggestion no less implausible than Harris' as a basis for future investigation. s/

p. 240 Example 36: We are told that in Mingrelian 'although only the allative was elicited as marking for retired indirect

objects, in texts the dative can also be found'. Looking at Harris' illustration, we would not expect any cause for complaint here, eg.

- (46) [36] mešare-s kaγard-iši gurapa
traveller-DAT reading/writing-GEN teaching[NOM]
'[The priest began] to teach reading-writing to the
traveller'

where we do seem to have a Dative 'retired' indirect-object with the masdar. But we need yet again to consult the original text (Kluge 1916:82) to uncover the reality of the syntax. The three words above are preceded by:

- (46a) p'ap'a-k kigeuč'q'ə ...
priest-NARR he/began/it/for him

What has happened is that by a regular and common transformation (that is equally frequent in Georgian) an argument (in this case the underlying indirect object) has been removed from the masdar-phrase to become indirect object of the main verb.

Without this transformation we would have had:

- (46b) p'ap'a-k kigi(i)č'q'ə mešare-ša kaγard-iši gurapa

ALL

which explains why only Allatives were elicited (and are ^{probably} in fact permitted) in the role of truly 'retired' indirect objects.

Compare the Georgian equivalents:

- (47) myvdel-ma dauc'q'o mgzavr-s
priest-NARR he/began/it/for him traveller-DAT
c'era-k'itxv-is sc'avleba
writing-reading-GEN teaching[NOM]

- (47a) myvdel-ma daic'q'o mgzavr-is-tvis ...

he/began/it

p. 256 Fn 13: with reference to examples such as (61a) in Chapter 11, where the verb not only agrees with its subject but carries an indirect object affix despite the fact there is no Dative nominal present to represent the indirect object but rather a postpositionally governed nominal, Harris says: 'Danelia (1975) attributes agreement of this kind to the influence of other languages, especially Greek'. This wording suggests that these 'other languages, especially Greek' behave in the way just described for (61a). Greek, of course, had only subject-agreement in the verb. Danelia's point was that examples like (61a) display native Georgian morphology but foreign syntax, in that, where a notional indirect object is present, the Georgian verbal morphology will indicate it just as if it were actually placed in the Dative case according to the requirements of Georgian syntax, whereas outside the verbal complex the translator, influenced by the presence in the original text of a preposition with the relevant nominal, will have mimicked the source-language by employing a Georgian postposition.

pp. 292-3: (mo-)k'ud-a 'X died' is presented as the Series II intransitive form of (mo-)k'l-a 'X killed Y', whereas the form (mo-)i-k'l-a 'X was killed' would be a more likely candidate, I think - cf. Revelations 9:20 for the form moik'lnes 'they were killed'.

p. 303 l. 7 up: Lent'ex at-a-kač-en-s translated as 'he would have cut it' (Topuria 1967:177) occurs. Topuria translates this into Georgian as dasc'rodes. We are thus dealing with a

IIIrd subjunctive form of a bi-valent Class 2 verb. This screeve is rare, occurring in some wishes and in contexts like 'I can't remember X happening' - it is not the equivalent of a Conditional as translated here, a meaning which would correspond to Georgian dač'rida. And so we must translate somewhat as follows: '(I don't recall) it being cut for him' or 'May it be cut for him!'. If Harris wants to quote the IIIrd subjunctive for a Class 1 verb, Topuria (p. 177) gives the Upper Bal x-o-xt'aw-ēn-s, which correlates with the Lent'ex Pluperfect x-o-xat'aw-an 'X had painted Y', quoted by Harris 3 lines previously.

p. 318 ll. 9 ff: The Mingrelian suffix -na(n) (which in past tense screeves will be -es) is regarded as pluraliser for subjects only. Since it marks plurality for 3rd person plural Dative nominals with Class 2 relative intransitives, eg.

(48) mu-k ayol-es (= Georgian: ra mouvida-t)

what-NARR it/happened/to them

'What happened to//came over them?'

we must repeat our earlier question - what possible sense does it make to regard the Dative nominal with such verbs as the subject?

p. 338 Example 16: The verb here aixila is still Class 1 even in Modern Georgian, not Class 3 as appears to be being claimed.

p. 340 Example 22c: This example is presented as:

(49) [22c] [ganis]uennet

'Rest[yourselves]' (Mt. 26:45, Birdsall 1971:65)

It is then pointed out that other manuscripts have ganisuenet,

which latter is stated to lack 'the morphology of a Class 2 form'. I fail to understand this weird statement but suppose it must have something to do with Harris being troubled by the presence of the extra -n- in (22c). The verb-form in question is in fact in both cases a Class 1 verb that is apparently monovalent by virtue of appearing with only a surface-subject. But since we have the Subjective Version vowel -i- as an obligatory constituent, we can easily supply an obligatorily deleted, appropriate underlying direct object. We could then say that, quite exceptionally for this type of verb, this plural object here seems to have caused EN-agreement to apply (cf. p. 48 example (29) for a parallel case with a Class 3 verb). However, this would still not explain everything. We clearly need an imperative, since the whole phrase is 'sleep on and rest', as attested by the other manuscripts and other language-versions. But, although Birdsall translates the verb-form as an imperative (requiem-praestate//requiescite), the Old Georgian imperative would actually have been (sc. if the unexpected EN-agreement is allowed to apply) ganisuenen(i)t (Šanidze 1976:100). What the text contains, as it stands, is the Aorist subjunctive, and so it should be translated as a future (requiem-praestabit//requiescet). Taking this contextual incompatibility together with the odd occurrence of EN-agreement, and in the light of Birdsall's remark (p. 62) that 'several errors mar the ms.', I suggest that we have here simply another error and that the unwanted and unwarranted extra

-n- be disregarded. Birdsall (p.c.) now agrees with this proposal.

The verb in question appears again in the associated footnote (10). We have the sentence (p. 360):

(50) [38] c'mida-y p'et're-y ganisuenā
 holy-NOM Peter-NOM he/died

'St Peter died' (Marr 1974:723)

This is the one and only example quoted by Harris for Georgian where we appear to have subject case-marking determined by something other than verb-class (being Class 1, the subject should be Narrative). In two other published editions of this text (Sanidze 1959:249; Kurcik'idze 1959:48), the subject is in the Narrative, e.g.

(50a) c'mida-man p'et're ganisuenā

The traditional Georgian explanation for examples like (50) is that the translator will have been influenced by the syntax of the source-language, where the subject will have been in the Nominative (Ciala Kurcik'idze - p.c.). An alternative possibility could have been that the translator intended to write gardaicuala 'X died', which, being a Class 2 verb, would take a Nominative subject. Clearly one can hardly build a theory on such a hapax legomenon - great care is needed in interpreting manuscript evidence for dead languages, and this is singularly lacking in the treatment here afforded to gansueneba.

p. 411 Fn 6: The Mingrelian 3rd person singular subject-markers -s and -n are correctly described as being distributed between consonant-final and vowel-final stems respectively. But it is not quite accurate to go on to call 'go'

an exception quoting ma meuli 'I go' vs. tina meurs 'X goes', not *meuli(n) or *meuri(n). The form in -ul- does not exist in the 3rd person singular nor in the 1st and 2nd persons plural; the form in -ur- is regular but lacks a 3rd person plural, eg. (after Margvelasvili 1982:94):

| | | |
|-------------|--------------------------|--------|
| me-(v)urk// | me-(v)ul ^o /u | 'I go' |
| me-urk | // me-ul ^o | |
| me-urs/c | - | |
| me-(v)urt | - | |
| me-urt | - | |
| - | me-ula(n) | |

7 Concluding Statement

The rigorous scrutiny to which I have now subjected this book probably speaks for itself. Interestingly, the penultimate paragraph of my review of Harris' earlier work read as follows: 'In places it has been suggested that a fuller range of data should have been cited or that greater discrimination should have been brought to bear on the analysis of data actually included, as in the interpretation of the construction attested with IInd series' verbs. If these deficiencies detract from the value of the book as it stands, one may hope that any resulting re-appraisal that Harris may feel inclined to make of her work will reveal insights both of theoretical interest and of value to G[eorgian] linguistics in particular' (p. 272). Clearly no re-appraisal has taken place - on the contrary, Harris has extended her questionable analysis both synchronically into the

other South Caucasian languages and diachronically into Old Georgian and Common Kartvelian. The paragraph just quoted could thus equally well have served as conclusion to the present review, were some stronger judgment not in fact required.

Though a great deal of work palpably went into the research for this book, I feel that the undertaking was probably over-ambitious from the start, and that no large-scale publication should have been contemplated until the author had become much better acquainted with the languages concerned - all / there are too many errors of an absolutely basic kind to inspire confidence in her judgment in the larger issues that she tackles. If one is familiar with the languages described and has access to the sources quoted, one can check and emend at leisure. But it is probably not at the Kartvelologist that this volume is principally directed. It will doubtlessly be promoted as a significant contribution to the literature on languages displaying evidence of active-alignment and as such will attract the attention of typologists and general linguists (to say nothing of historical linguists), who, being in no position to challenge the central claims of the book, will then contribute to the dissemination of what I believe and hope to have shown to be seriously flawed analyses. It is because of this danger that I chose to present such detailed comments and criticisms. If, after reading the arguments in favour of Ergative-alignment for Series II and of re-interpretation for Series III in Kartvelian, colleagues still believe that Harris' interpretation better accounts for the facts of the language(s), then at least their decision will have been reached on the basis of a full

presentation of the evidence. As it stands, this book should only be approached, if at all, with extreme caution.

8. Errata

p.7 1.10: is (not 'got'); p.21, 1.9 up: cer-; 1.2 up: icereba;
 1.1 up: dacerilia (< dacerili); p.29 1.16 up: millennium; p.50
 1.1 up: 'stood by//for him'; p.54 1.5: 'whistled to him'; 1.8:
ikancun; p.58 1.6: cases; p.83 1.5: sat; p.95 1.2: parison;
 p.108 1 12: omitted; 1.13: changes; 1.14: 3(?); p.119 1.3 up:
 Lenjera;
 p.124 11.7&10 up: ate supper (not 'supped'); p.128
 1.12 up: on (someone); p.145
 1.16: (1970:153)(not 1968:135)); p.160: asterisk surely belongs
 to ex.(5) not (6); p.175 11.9-10: 'I left off it' ... from
 *ad-xw-e-geč; p.195 1.8: 'I will remember...'; p.206 1.3 up:
 being written; p.208 1.23: kac-(eb-)ob-a; p.210 1.16: vixilen;
 p.211 1.17: shall gather; 1.8 up: seguvedren; p.212 1.4:
sehmusren; 1.15 up: 'whoever have wives'; p.214 1.4: -(e/i)t,
 unless reference is to intransitives only, in which case -(i)t is
 correct; p.215 1.6 up: pitied; p.229 1.18: sxdomay; 1.22:
 (13a); p.230 1.2: likely to be; p.245 1.2: tribute-GEN; p.249
 1.16: indirect objects with; p.282 1.14 up: (< *om < *av);
 1.13 up: being cut; p.283 1.2 up, p.284 11. 1&11: wine (not
 'whiskey'); 1.20: vaacopu; p.288 1.15 up: atoren; p.289 1.19:
 had caught; p.292 1.11 up: which; p.295 1.13: (o)re; p.304
 11.1-2: 'May he cut it!'; p.313 1.11: had (not 'have'); p.327

1.18 up: 172; 1.13 up: Mingrelian; p.332 1.8 up: had compassion (not 'took pity on him'); p.336 11.20-21; embedded (not 'matrix'); p.337 1.15 up: sins; p.340 1.9 up: will rest; p.341 1.15 up: općopi; p.342 1.3: assigned; p.346 1.10 up: 'called out the name'; 1.2 up: krec̣(av)s; p.348 1.19: Georgian; p.357 1.4: kriali; p.361 1.1: criticised; p.397 1.18 up: šecuxnebi-s; p.400 1.7: skid-u(-n) yur-u(-n); 1.15: Lomtadidze; p.408 1.4: iterative; p.411 1.12 up: no (not 'not'); p.417 1.13 up: millennium; p.428 1.8 up: reanalyzed; p.430 1.19: ergative; p.435 1.5 up: oldest (not 'ancient'); p.438 1.10: Gramatikul; 1.7 up: Sampirian; p.442 1.7: secular (not 'national'); p.443 1.25 up: lazskago; p.445 1.19 up: nakvtebi; 1.4: Šoušanik(?); p.446 11.15,18,20,24 up: Shanidze; p.448 1.17: gēorgien; p.450 1.1: Vaxušti; 1.9: gēorgien; 1.15: 5 (not '4'); 1.28: Svaneti (not 'Sakartvelo')...Svaneti (not 'Georgia'); p.451 1.6: Esenç; 1.14: Materialy.

References

- ANDERSON, STEPHEN R. 1977. On mechanisms by which languages become ergative. Mechanisms of syntactic change, ed. by C N Li, 317-363. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- 1984. On representations in morphology: case, agreement and inversion in Georgian. Natural language and linguistic theory, 2, 157-218.
- ARONSON, HOWARD I. 1979. Towards a typology of transitivity: The strange case of the Georgian subject. The Elements, CLS parasession volume, 297-306.

- BIRDSALL, J. NEVILLE. 1971. Khanmeti fragments of the synoptic Gospels from Ms. Vind. Georg. 2. Oriens Christianus, 55, 62-89.
- BLAKE, ROBERT P. 1976. The Old Georgian version of the Gospel of Matthew. Patrologia Orientalis, 24, fasc. 1 (first edition, 1933).
- BOEDER, WINFRIED. 1979. Ergative syntax and morphology in language change: The South Caucasian languages. Ergativity, ed. by F. Plank, 435-480. New York: Academic Press.
- ČIKOBAVA, ARNOLD. 1968. mart'ivi c'inadadebis p'roblema kartulsi, I [The problem of the simple sentence in Georgian, I]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- 1985a. rodis iq'o da rogor [When and how it was]. Annual of Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics, XII, 24-38.
- 1985b. up'repikso mimyeobata c'armoebisa da ist'oriis zogi sak'itxi kartulsi [Some questions on the formation and history of prefixless participles in Georgian]. Annual of Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics, XII, 53-55.
- COLE, P., HERBERT, W., HERMON, G., and SRIDHAR, S.N. 1980. The acquisition of subjecthood. Language, 56, 719-743.
- DANELIA, K'ORNELI. 1975. ucxo enata gavlenis k'vali zveli kartuli c'erilobiti zeglebis enasi [Traces of the influence of foreign languages in the language of Old Georgian written monuments]. Macne, 4, 79-90.

- DEETERS, GERHARD. 1930. Das kharthwelische Verbum. Leipzig: Kommissionsverlag von Markert und Petters.
- DŽADŽANIDZE, P'OLIK'ARP'E. 1977. guruli dialekt'i, I [The Gurian Dialect, I]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- DZIDZIGURI, ŠOTA. 1974. kartuli dialekt'ologii masalebi [Materials on Georgian dialectology]. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.
- DŽORBENADZE, BESSARION. 1981. Principy stanovlenija inversionnyx glagolov v gruzinskom jazyke [Principles of the formation of inverted verbs in Georgian]. Annual of Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics, VIII, 66-75.
- FÄHNRIICH, HEINZ. 1967. Georgischer Ergativ im intransitiven Satz. Beiträge zur Linguistik und Informationsverarbeitung, 10, 34-42.
- GAGUA, K'LARA. 1976. dronak'li zmnebi svanurši [Tense-defective verbs in Svan]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- GAMQ'RELIDZE, TAMAZ G., and MAČ'AVARIANI, GIVI I. 1965. sonant'ta sist'ema da ablaut'i kartvelur enebši [The system of sonants and ablaut in the Kartvelian languages]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- GIGINEIŠVILI, IVANE., TOPURIA, VARLAM and KAVTARADZE, IVANE. 1961. kartuli dialekt'ologia I [Georgian dialectology I]. Tbilisi: Universit'et'i.
- GIVON, TALMY. 1971. Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: An archaeologist's fieldtrip. Papers from CLS, 7, 394-415.
- HARRIS, ALICE C. 1981. Georgian syntax: A study in relational grammar. Cambridge: CUP.
- 1982. Review of D A Holisky 'Aspect and Georgian Medial Verbs'. Annual of Armenian Linguistics, 3, 77-78.

- HEWITT, B. GEORGE. 1979. Aspects of verbal affixation in Abkhaz. Transactions of the Philological Society, 211-238.
- 1983. Review article of A C Harris 'Georgian Syntax'. Lingua, 59, 247-274.
- Forthcoming a. Ergativity vs. activity - a re-assessment of the Georgian evidence. Lingua.
- Forthcoming b. Unerwartete Subjektmarkierung in Kartwelischen. Georgica.
- HOLISKY, DEE ANN. 1981. Aspect and Georgian medial verbs. NY: Caravan Books.
- IMNAISVILI, IVANE. 1971. kartuli enis ist'oriuli krest'omatia, I, 2 [A historical chrestomathy of the Georgian language, I, 2]. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.
- KALDANI, MAKSIME. 1978. aorist'is c'armoeba svanurši [The formation of the aorist in Svan]. Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecnierba, 20, 150-161.
- KLUGE, THEODOR. 1916. Beiträge zur mingrelischen Grammatik. Berlin: Verlag von W Kohlhammer.
- KURCIK'IDZE, CIALA. 1959. kartuli versiebi ap'ok'ripebisa mocikulta sesaxeb [Georgian versions of the Apocrypha concerning the Apostles]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- K'VAC'ADZE, LEO. 1977. tanamedrove kartuli enis sint'aksi [Syntax of the Modern Georgian language]. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.

- MARGVELASVILI, MAGULI. 1982. monacvle zmnebi megrul[✓]ši
[Suppletive verbs in Mingrelian]. Macne, 3, 88-100.
- NEBIERIDZE, GIVI. Forthcoming. Problema érgativnoj
konstrukcii v kartvel'skix jazykax [Problem of the ergative
construction in the Kartvelian languages]. In
q axvledianisadmi mi[✓]z[✓]vnili k'rebuli. Tbilisi.
- NOZADZE, L. 1974. medioakt'iv zmnata c'armoebis zogi sak'itxi
kartul[✓]ši [Some questions on the formation of medio-active
verbs in Georgian]. Iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba,
19, 25-51.
- POCXISVILI, A. 1969. unebliobis k'at'egoria kartul zma[✓]ši [The
category of unwillingness in the Georgian verb]. Saiubileo
k'rebuli, mi[✓]z[✓]vnili giorgi axvledianis dabadebis 80
c'listavisadmi, 152-155.
- Q'AUXCISVILI, SIMON. 1973. kartlis cxovreba, IV: bat'oni[✓]švili
vaxu[✓]št'i, "axc'era sameposa sakartvelosa" [History of
Georgia, IV: Vaxu[✓]št' Bat'oni[✓]švili, "Description of the
kingdom of Georgia"]. Tbilisi: Sabč'ota Sakartvelo.
- SANIDZE, AK'AK'I. 1945. kartuli otxtavis ori [✓]zveli redakcia
[Two old redactions of the Georgian Gospels]. Tbilisi:
Mecniereba.
- 1959. sinuri mravaltavi 864 c'lisa [The Sinai
Polycephalon of 864]. Tbilisi: Universit'et'i.
- 1973. kartuli enis gramat'ik'is sapuzvlebi, I
[Fundamentals of the grammar of the Georgian language, I].
Tbilisi: Universit'et'i.
- 1976. zveli kartuli enis gramat'ik'a [Grammar of the
Old Georgian language]. Tbilisi: Universit'et'i.

- SARDZVELADZE, ZURAB. 1975. kartuli salit'erat'uro enis ist'oriis sak'itxebi [Questions on the history of the Georgian literary language]. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.
- 1984. kartuli salit'erat'uro enis ist'oriis sesavali [Introduction to the history of the Georgian literary language]. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.
- TOPURIA, VARLAM. 1967. svanuri ena, I: zmna [The Svan language, I: The verb]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba (first published 1931).
- TSCHENKELI, KITA. 1958. Einführung in die georgische Sprache, I. Zürich: Amirani.