

Are Verbs Always What They Seem To Be?

B.G. Hewitt

The general pattern of verbal agreement in the small North West Caucasian language-family may be assumed to be (reasonably) well-known to caucasologists. In summary the system operating in one member of the family, Abkhaz, is as follows. With no case-marking to differentiate between a verb's arguments, the language relies on three, morphologically somewhat similar sets of pronominal agreement-prefixes, designated 1, 2, and 3, which simply reflects their linear order within the verbal complex. Set 1 cross-references an intransitive subject (S) or transitive direct object (O/P); Set 2 correlates with indirect/oblique objects; Set 3 marks a transitive subject (A). Though this is not directly relevant to the discussion below, this patterning means that the language can be characterised as Ergative in alignment. The three sets of affixes are these:

Table 1
Pronominal Agreement-affixes in the Verb¹

	<u>Singular</u>			<u>Plural</u>		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
1st	s-	s-	s-(/z-)	ʁ-	ʁ-	ʁ-(/ɑ-)
2nd Masc/N-Hum	w-	w-	w-	ʃ ^w -	ʃ ^w -	ʃ ^w -(/ʒ ^w -)
2nd Fem	b-	b-	b-	ʃ ^w -	ʃ ^w -	ʃ ^w -(/ʒ ^w -)
3rd Masc Hum	d-	j-	j-	j-/ø-	r-(/d-)	r-(/d-)
3rd Fem Hum	d-	l-	l-	j-/ø-	r-(/d-)	r-(/d-)
3rd N-Hum	j-/ø-	ɑ-/ø-	(n)ɑ-	j-/ø-	r-(/d-)	r-(/d-)

It is to be noted that (a) in Set 1 the affix /j-/ drops, if immediately preceded by its referent, (b) in Set 3 the variant /nɑ-/ is used, if the verb is tripersonal or contains a preverb, and (c) in Sets 2 and 3 the variant /d-/ replaces /r-/, if the verb is causative, the latter substitution being illustrated by:

1. ɑ.ts²ʔajɑ ø.rn.ɛ.ʃ.ɑ.tsɑ.ø.jt² vs ɑ.rɑs.k^wɑ [ɑ.]ɑ(.)rɑ(.)χ(.)rɑ²
 the.plant it₁.not.thrive.PAST.FIN(-AOR) the.fern.PL the.harvest
 ø.d.rnɑ.r.ɛ.ʃ.ɑ.tsɑ.ø.jt²
 it₁.they₃.not.CAUS.thrive.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 'The plant did not thrive' vs 'The ferns did not allow the harvest to thrive'

¹To save space the schwa that may, depending on the stress-patterning, be associated with all the unaccompanied consonantal affixes is not indicated; a schwa in immediate contact with the voiceless uvular fricative is lowered to /ɑ/.

²Square brackets enclose morphemes present but not realised phonetically. A full-stop indicates a morpheme-boundary; brackets around such morpheme-boundaries mean that the boundaries in question are not important, and the morphemes concerned are not individually glossed. The medial rhotic in the word for 'harvest' is the Causative marker, as shown by the agent-affix in: j.ɑ.d.rɑ.χ.ə.ø.jt² 'they₃ harvested it/them₁'.

If we take the adjective for 'low', namely /a.la.q^{W?}/ (or /a.na.q^{W?}/), as in /a.yna.la.q^{W?}/ '(the) low house', we see the causative verb derived from it in:

2. a.ʒ^W a.xa ø.la.na.r.q^{W?}a.ø.jt[?]
 the.cow its.head it₁.PREV.it₃.CAUS.low.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'The cow lowered its head'

which demonstrates that in the verb the root is /-q^{W?}-, whilst /-la-/ functions as preverb, /-na-/ being selected as the allomorph for the 3rd person non-human singular agent-affix because of the presence of the preverb, and of the three affixal sets only an affix belonging to Set 3 can stand between preverb and root.

Given this expression for 'lowering the head', one might expect that it would figure in the expression 'lower one's head before X = bow down before X', but consider the following:

3. a.p^hwas a.n^tq^Wa d.j.aj.xa(.)r(.)x^Wa.ø.jt[?]
 the.woman the.god she₁.him₂.PREV.bow-down.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'The woman bowed down before God'

Clearly, this is a different verb, but how is it to be analysed? Whilst the question is easily posed, the answer is more complicated.

Apart from affixes of Set 3, two other elements may stand between preverbs and the verbal root: these are the causative affix and the negative marker /-m-/ (sc. in those forms where the negative precedes rather than follows the root). If we causativise the example in (3), we get:

- 3'. a.p^hwas a.n^tq^Wa d.j.aj.sa.r.xa(.)r(.)x^Wa.ø.jt[?]
 the.woman the.god her₁.him₂.PREV.I₃.CAUS.bow-down.PAST.FIN(-
 AOR)

'I made the woman bow down before God'

According to this test, then, we cannot treat the element /-aj-/ as anything other than a preverb, leaving /-xa(.)r(.)x^Wa-/ to function as the root. But before we examine the structure of this root, we have to note that, if we negate the verb in (3), our expectations about affixal ordering are frustrated, as shewn by:

- 3". a.p^hwas a.n^tq^Wa də.j.m.aj(.)xa(.)r(.)x^Wa.ø.jt[?]
 the.woman the.god she₁.him₂.not.bow-down.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'The woman did not bow down before God'

for, according to this test, it would seem that there is no preverb and that the root consists of /-aj(.)xa(.)r(.)x^Wa-/. In fact, it is possible to adduce a number of similar examples which suggest uncertainty on the part of native speakers as to the precise structure of the verb-form in question. Take the verb for 'shove, jostle', which it would seem reasonable to derive from the bivalent intransitive root /-s-/ 'hit', as seen in:

4. $\text{at}^{\text{f}^{\text{k}}\text{w}^{\text{a}}\text{an}} \text{amp}^{\text{a}}\text{l} \text{d.a.sə.}\text{əjt}^{\text{a}}$ vs $\text{d.a.m.a.sə.}\text{əjt}^{\text{a}}$
 the.lad the.ball he₁.it₂.hit.PAST.FIN-AOR he₁.it₂.not.hit.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'The lad hit the ball' vs 'The lad did not hit the ball'

with which we can compare:

5. $\text{at}^{\text{f}^{\text{k}}\text{w}^{\text{a}}\text{an}} \text{amp}^{\text{a}}\text{l} \text{d.a.tə}^{\text{w}^{\text{x}}\text{a}}\text{sə.}\text{əjt}^{\text{a}}$ vs $\text{d.a.tə}^{\text{w}^{\text{x}}\text{a}}\text{m.sə.}\text{əjt}^{\text{a}}$
 the.lad the.ball he₁.it₂.PREV.shove.PAST.FIN(-AOR) he₁.it₂.PREV.not.shove.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'The lad shoved the ball' vs 'The lad did not shove the ball'

The verb in (5) behaves exactly as one would predict on the assumption that $/-tə^{\text{w}^{\text{x}}\text{a}}-/$ is a(n unanalysable) preverb. But what is to be made of the variants for the negated Past in (5)?

- 5'. $\text{d.a.m.tə}^{\text{w}^{\text{x}}\text{a}}\text{(.)sə.}\text{əjt}^{\text{a}}$ // $\text{d.m.a.tə}^{\text{w}^{\text{x}}\text{a}}\text{(.)sə.}\text{əjt}^{\text{a}}$

The first alternative is explicable, if one assumes that the preverb has become fused with the root, but the second example contravenes all the rules, as the negative infix should NEVER precede any Set 2 affix present in the complex. Substituting a plural entity as indirect object produces:

- 5". $\text{dəm.r.a.tə}^{\text{w}^{\text{x}}\text{a}}\text{(.)sə.}\text{əjt}^{\text{a}}$
 (s)he₁.not.them₂.shove.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'(S)he did not shove them'

which proves that the morpheme in question is still being interpreted as the indirect object. It might well, however, be that the treatment of the Set 2 affix in the second verb of (5') is being influenced by what we see in a much commoner verb, namely the verb 'hear'. On the basis of only the examples in (6):

6. $\text{wə.b}^{\text{z}}\text{ə}$ $\text{ə.s.a(.)fə.}\text{əjt}^{\text{a}}$ vs $\text{ə.s.m.a(.)fə.}\text{əjt}^{\text{a}}$
 your(-MASC).voice it₁.I₂.hear.PAST.FIN(-AOR) it₁.I₂.not.hear.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'I heard vs did not hear your-MASC voice'

one would perhaps conclude that 'hear' in Abkhaz is a normal transitive verb with Set 1 (direct object) and Set 3 (transitive subject) affix, but vowel-initial roots are a rarity in this family of languages, and so one needs to consider matters a little further. Let us take the causative form seen in:

- 6'. $\text{wə.b}^{\text{z}}\text{ə}$ ə.sə.w.mə.r.fə.n
 your(-MASC).voice it₁.me₂.you-MASC₃.not.CAUS.hear.PROH

'Don't let me hear your-MASC voice!'

The open vowel that seemed to be part of the root in the examples of (6) has disappeared, which would not happen if it were actually part of the root. It is, in truth, likely that 'hear' in Abkhaz is not (in origin, at least) transitive but a bivalent

intransitive with the same indirect object marking prefix /-a-/ more unambiguously attested in the second verb of (7):

7. akʰgla ø.sə.m.fʷa.ø.jtʰ vs ø.s.ələm.fʷa.ø.jtʰ
 one.even it₁.I₃.not.say.PAST.FIN(-AOR) it₁.me₂.to.she₃.not.say.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'I said nothing' vs 'She said nothing to me'

And so, a literal way of capturing the structure of the first verb in (6) would be to render it in Latin as *tua vox mihi audita est*, the misplacement (sc. according to expectations based on the language's normal morphology) of the negative in the second verb of (6) being explicable if the intransitive verb 'be(come) audible to' is on the way to reclassification as transitive 'hear'³.

But we have not yet said all that needs to be said about the verb 'shove'. If we causativise it, what we obtain is presented in (8):

8. d.ətʰsə.r.χa(.)sə.ø.jtʰ
 him/her₁.it₂.PREV.I₃.CAUS.shove.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'I made him/her shove it'

which would result in an analysis that made /-tʰsəʷ-/ alone the preverb, leaving the sequence /-χa(.)s-/ to function as the complex root — in other words, there is evidence from this range of elicited forms that three different analyses are currently in competition for one and the same verb. And so, whilst causativising a verb or negating it in the Aorist would in most cases indicate the internal structure (viz. whether or not a preverb is present along with the structure of both preverb and root), neither test can be guaranteed to provide a definitive answer⁴.

We can now finally return to address the question of the structure of the complex root /-χa(.)r(.)χʷa-/ . We know from example (2) that Abkhaz for '(the) head' is /a.χa/

³For an exact parallel in the sister-language Ubykh see Vogt (1963.170, entry 1502). In the case of what one suspects to be a similar association of the indirect object marking prefix with a separate original root for the meaning 'obtain', if such was indeed the origin, then the fusion has become complete, as no test splits the open vowel from the labial glide that would be the postulated original root. Consider:

- a.pəra ø.s.a(?)wə.ø.jtʰ vs ø.s.m.a(?)wə.ø.jtʰ vs ø.s.a(?)wə.r(.)tʰ
 the.money it₁.I₃.get.PAST.FIN(-AOR) it₁.I₃.not.get.PAST.FIN(-AOR) it₁.I₃.get.RES
 ø.qʰa.l.tʰsʰa.ø.jtʰ
 it₁.PREV.she₃.do.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'I got the money' vs 'I did not get the money' vs 'She arranged for me to acquire the money'

where Abkhaz neatly avoids the problem of where to insert the causative prefix in a synthetic causative verb-form by resorting to its alternative analytic causative, which associates the matrix causative verb 'do, make' with its Resultative converb in /-r(.)tʰs/ to mark the verbal action caused.

⁴In even the commonest of verbs (/a.qʰa.tʰsʰa.ra/ 'do, make'), whilst the simple (unnegated) Aorist reveals the true structure, whereby the verb-stem consists of preverb /-qʰa-/ and root /-tʰsʰa-/ , the causative test does not, as in these forms the preverb fuses with the root, as seen in:

- je.qʰa.s.tʰsʰa.ø.jtʰ vs je.l.sə.r.qʰa(.)tʰsʰa.ø.jtʰ
 it/them₁.PREV.I₃.do.PAST.FIN(-AOR) it/them₁.her₂.I₃.CAUS. do.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 'I did it/them' vs 'I got her to do it/them'

and that the causative prefix is /-r-/; what might the remaining morpheme be? Consider the verb-forms in (9):

9. $\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{l}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{b}\bar{\epsilon} \quad \text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{x}^{\text{w}}\bar{\alpha}.\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}$ vs $\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{l}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{b}\bar{\epsilon} \quad \text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{r}\text{x}^{\text{w}}\bar{\alpha}.\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}$
 his.stick it₁.bend.PAST.FIN(-AOR) his.stick it₁.he₃.CAUS.bend.PAST.FIN
 (-AOR)

'His stick bent' vs 'He bent his stick'

Quite clearly we are dealing with a causative verb, whose stem (i.e. causative prefix and root together) has fused with the noun for 'head' to produce a complex INtransitive stem in the meaning 'bow' produced out of semantic primes meaning 'cause the head to bend', where one would perhaps have expected the constituent elements to retain their basic functions, such that the verb-form, by virtue of being a causative, might thus have been expected to remain transitive.

The verb for 'bow down to' is not the only one where an intransitive verb-form contains the causative prefix embedded within a complex verb-stem. Consider:

10. $\text{d}.\text{g}^{\text{w}}\bar{\alpha}(\cdot)\text{r}(\cdot)\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}$ vs $\text{d}.\text{r}.\bar{\alpha}.\text{j}.\text{g}^{\text{w}}\bar{\alpha}(\cdot)\text{r}(\cdot)\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}$
 (s)he₁.rejoice.PAST.FIN(-AOR) (s)he₁.them₂.PREV.rejoice.PAST.FIN(-
 AOR)

'(S)he rejoiced' vs '(S)he rejoiced at them'

Here, when an indirect object is present, the same preverb as the one in example (3) is added, but, apart from the causative prefix, what are the other elements in the complex stem? / $\alpha.\text{g}^{\text{w}}\bar{\alpha}$ / is the Abkhaz for '(the) heart', whilst the verbal root might be the one seen in (11):

11. $\bar{\alpha}\text{x}^{\text{w}}\bar{\text{r}}\bar{\alpha} \quad \text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}$ vs $\bar{\alpha}\text{x}^{\text{w}}\bar{\text{j}}^{\text{w}} \quad \bar{\alpha}\text{x}^{\text{w}}\bar{\text{r}}\bar{\alpha}$
 the.wound it₁.heal.PAST.FIN(-AOR) the.medicine the.wound
 $\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\bar{\alpha}.\text{r}.\bar{\epsilon}.\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}$
 it₁.it₃.CAUS.heal.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'The wound healed' vs 'The medicine healed the wound'

It is true that the semantics here are not perfect, but the idea of healing, mending, soothing the heart is perhaps not too distant from that of making it joyful.

For another example consider:

12. $\text{d}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{t}|\text{t}|\bar{\alpha}.\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}$ vs $\text{d}.\bar{\alpha}.\text{r}.\text{t}|\text{t}|\bar{\alpha}.\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}$
 (s)he₁.laugh.PAST.FIN(-AOR) him/her₁.it₃.CAUS.laugh.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 '(S)he laughed' vs 'It made him/her laugh'

with which we can compare:

- 12'. $\text{d}.\text{p}\bar{\alpha}|\text{j}^{\text{w}}\bar{\alpha}(\cdot)\text{r}(\cdot)\text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{j}\bar{\epsilon}$ vs $\bar{\alpha}.\text{l}\bar{\alpha}(\cdot)\text{s}\bar{\text{b}}\bar{\alpha} \quad \bar{\alpha}.\text{p}\bar{\alpha}|\text{j}^{\text{w}} \quad \text{\textcircled{\scriptsize r}}\text{p}\bar{\epsilon}.\text{d}\bar{\text{z}}\bar{\alpha}.\text{w}.\text{p}^{\text{r}}$
 (s)he₁.smile.PAST.FIN(-AOR) the.pup its.face it₁.pretty.STAT.FIN-PRES
 '(S)he smiled' vs 'The puppy's face is pretty'

and conclude that elements together signifying 'make the face laugh' have fused as part of a process of lexicalisation to produce a complex intransitive verb-stem for 'smile'.

A final example in this category, albeit with a twist, would be:

13. $jə.tʃʰa \quad \text{ø.j}ə.r. \mathbf{a}f\mathbf{a}.\text{ø.jt}^{\prime}$ vs $d.tʃʰ\alpha/\text{ə}(\cdot)r(\cdot)f\mathbf{a}(\cdot)s\mathbf{a}.\text{ø.jt}^{\prime}$
 his.mouth it₁.he₃.CAUS.wide.PAST.FIN(-AOR) (s)he₁.yawn.PAST.FIN(-
 AOR)

'He opened his mouth wide (in amazement)' vs '(S)he yawned'

The verbal root /- $\mathbf{a}f\mathbf{a}$ -/ is a problem: what is the initial open vowel, which disappears in the complex root of 'yawn'? Is the remaining element /- $\mathbf{f}\mathbf{a}$ -/ in some way cognate with the initial sequence in the adjective / $\mathbf{a}f\mathbf{a}r\mathbf{a}k$ / 'high, tall'? When the external noun for 'mouth' fuses with the causative marker and verbal root (minus initial open vowel) in the process of forming the complex root for 'yawn', another element is required. This looks to be the root of the verb 'hit', which we encountered in examples (4)-(5''), but that it does not retain independent radical status is shown by both the negative and causative tests, as in:

- 13'. $d\mathbf{a}m.tʃʰ\alpha/\text{ə}(\cdot)r(\cdot)f\mathbf{a}(\cdot)s\mathbf{a}.\text{ø.jt}^{\prime}$ vs $d.s\mathbf{a}r.tʃʰ\alpha/\text{ə}(\cdot)r(\cdot)f\mathbf{a}(\cdot)s\mathbf{a}.\text{ø.jt}^{\prime}$
 (s)he₁.not.yawn.PAST.FIN(-AOR) him/her₁.I₃.CAUS.yawn.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 '(S)he did not yawn' vs 'I made him/her yawn'

for in both cases the negative and causative markers stand before the complex root.

The four verbs illustrating the shift of transitive to intransitive under lexicalisation have in common that the nominal element incorporated into the complex verb-stem is a part of the subject's body, but the following example deviates from this pattern:

13. $\mathbf{a}p\mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{a}s \quad [\mathbf{a}.] \mathbf{a}f^{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{a} \text{ ø.l.f}^{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{a}.\text{ø.jt}^{\prime}$ vs $d.f^{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{a}(\cdot)\mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{a}.\text{ø.jt}^{\prime}$
 the.woman the.song it₁.she₃.say.PAST.FIN(-AOR) she₁.sing.PAST.FIN(-
 AOR)

'The woman sang (= said a/the song)' vs 'The woman sang'

This time there is no causative marker in either form, as the basic root is inherently transitive, but the incorporation of the noun for 'song', which is clearly not a body-part, and its fusion with this root causes the switch under lexicalisation to an intransitive complex root. That fusion has taken place is again demonstrated by both the negative and causative tests, as in:

- 13'. $d\mathbf{a}m.f^{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{a}(\cdot)\mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{a}.\text{ø.jt}^{\prime}$ vs $d.s\mathbf{a}r.f^{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{a}(\cdot)\mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{a}.\text{ø.jt}^{\prime}$
 (s)he₁.not.sing.PAST.FIN(-AOR) him/her₁.I₃.CAUS.sing.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 '(S)he did not sing' vs 'I made him/her sing'

The next stem for investigation involves a difference of analysis depending on the semantics, but there is no shift from transitive to intransitive. The basic combination of preverb and root is illustrated by:

14. a.yna d.ɔk^wəm.ʒə.ɔ.jt^ʔ vs ɔχra
 the.house (s)he1.it3.PREV.not.circle.PAST.FIN(-AOR) the.hill
 d.ɔχak^wəm.ʒə.ɔ.jt^ʔ
 (s)he1.it2.PREV.PREV.not.go-round.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'(S)he did not go around the house' vs '(S)he did not skirt round the hill'

In the first example of (14) the subject goes right round the house, whilst in the second the suggestion is that a deviation on one's route is necessary because of a hill blocking the direct path, and that is the force provided by the insertion of the additional preverb, which usually implies the notion 'over (the surface of)' and is clearly related to the noun for 'head'. Both forms in (14) can be causativised in the normal way, e.g.

- 14'. ɔχazo tskɔ ja.sak^w.sə.r.ʒə.ɔ.jt^ʔ vs ɔχra
 the.blanket well it1.me2.PREV.I3.CAUS.go-round.PAST.FIN(-AOR) the.hill
 d.ɔχak^w.sə.r.ʒə.ɔ.jt^ʔ
 him/her1.it2.PREV.PREV.I3.CAUS.go-round.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'I pulled the blanket nicely around myself' vs 'I made him/her skirt round the hill'

But now consider the following:

15. f.naɣ^wə(.)ra ɔχ.fər.k^w(.)ʒə.ɔ.jt^ʔ
 our.walk it1.PREV.we3.CAUS.circle.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'We wound up our walk'

Here we see fusion into a complex root of the basic preverb, which together with the original simplex root provides the notion of 'circling round', whilst the new preverb seems to retain more of its original nominal force than is attested in either of the second verbs seen in (14) and (14'), so that a literal rendition here would be something akin to 'we caused our walk to come round to a head' or 'we rounded off our walk'. One morphological analysis, then, applies to the literal meaning of 'making go round (the surface)', whilst quite another applies to the metaphorical meaning of 'making come to a head = winding up/completing'.

The following example of an interplay with a causative verb is of a different type again from those examined so far. Let us start with the non-causative expression:

16. s.tj^ʔə / sχə s.ɑ(.)f^w(.)fɔ l.ɔχ^j jaχəw.p^ʔ
 my.face my.head my.sister her.towards it1.direct.STAT.FIN-PRES

'I am on my way to my sister's'

Literally, this is 'my face/head is directed towards my sister', or even more literally 'my face/head is headed towards my sister', for the root of the Stative verb here could verb well in origin be cognate with the noun for 'head'; comparison with Abaza /qɑ/ 'head' indicates that the form in proto-Abkhaz-Abaza had the open rather than the

close vowel⁵. If we want the Dynamic equivalent 'turn in some direction', we use the causative form of this root, to give:

16'. s.tʃʰə / sɣə ə.nə.sə.r.ɣə.ʊ.jtʰ
 my.face my.head it₁.PREV.I₃.CAUS.direct.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 'I turned thither'

This expression can also mean 'I set off (thither)', but the more usual way of indicating the start of motion is to fuse the first external NP with the verb-form so that it occupies the slot normally taken by the Set 1 pronominal affix, to give:

16''. s.tʃʰə.nə.sə.r.ɣə.ʊ.jtʰ
 my.face₁.thither.I₃.CAUS.head.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 'I set off (thither)'

[N.B. Though this paper is not concerned with reflexivisation, Abkhaz has two ways of forming a reflexive pronoun: (a) some verbs employ the free standing nominal root for 'head' (coupled with the appropriate possessive prefix), which variant is obligatory if the reflexive functions as anything other than the verb's direct object; (b) /-tʃʰə-/, coupled with the appropriate possessive prefix (although the possessive is absent in Abaza), occupies the slot normally taken in the verbal complex by the Set 1 pronominal prefix. This latter reflexive must surely derive from /ə.tʃʰə/, the body-part noun seen in the last few examples⁶ — the sister-languages have no cognate form as their reflexives.]

Now that we have produced a verb exemplifying incorporation, we have a synonym for (16''), which is:

16'''. s.tʃʰə.nə.s.ɣə.ʊ.jtʰ
 my.face₁.thither.I₃.direct.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

which variant contains no Causative. Since the last two examples are entirely synonymous, all that the Causative marker is doing in (16'') is underlying the verb's basic transitivity. This is a function of the causative which is not unknown elsewhere in the Caucasus⁷, whereas no parallels (from South Caucasian, at least) with the sort of examples examined earlier in this paper come to mind.

⁵The parallelism with English, where 'heading for' is synonymous with 'moving in the direction of', is obvious.

⁶Another verb in which this nominal root is incorporated into the verb to stand (without any possessive accompaniment) in place of the normal Set 1 pronominal prefix is the word for 'call, shout', as in:

ə.ɣʰtʃʰə tʃʰə.j.tə.ʊ.jtʰ vs ə.rbəʊ tʃʰə.nə.tə.ʊ.jtʰ
 the.child mouth.he.?give.PAST.FIN(-AOR) the.rooster mouth.it.?give.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 'The child cried out' vs 'The cock crowed'

Is the root here linked to that for 'giving' (= /-tə-/?). Though the incorporated element is occupying the Set 1 affixal slot, it is also interpreted as a preverb, which accounts for the presence of /-nə-/ as subject-affix in the second verb here.

⁷For example, in Georgian if /dɑ.rβ.i.s/ is the intransitive 'X is running', we have the transitive equivalent (at one level of causation) /ɣ.ɑ.rβ.ɛ.n.s/ 'X runs Y = makes Y move quickly', which is a dialectal form, and then the normal morphological causative built on this gives us /ɣ.ɑ.rβ.ɛ.n.in.ɛ.b.s/, which does not mean 'X makes Y make Z run' but is rather the simple transitive 'X makes Y run' or 'X conveys X at a run'.

The next set of cases, in most of which the causative again figures, also illustrate a phenomenon with which I am not familiar elsewhere. Before adducing any examples it is necessary to introduce a new item of verbal morphology. This is the complex reciprocal marker /-(a)j(.)ba-/ , which is found in transitive verb-forms and (usually) takes the place of the anticipated Set 3 pronominal prefix (though, where the reciprocity holds between transitive subject and indirect object, the affix sometimes replaces the latter), e.g.

17. d.a.ba.ø.jt' vs f.a.j(.)ba.ba.ø.jt'
 him/her₁.we₃.see.PAST.FIN(-AOR) us₁.REC.see.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 'We saw him/her' vs 'We saw one another'

Naturally, it is possible to associate the reciprocal and causative to produce a verb with the anticipated meaning, e.g.

- 17'. d.f.a.j(.)ba.r.ba.ø.jt'
 him/her₁.us₂.REC.CAUS.see.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 'We got one another to see him/her' or 'We shewed him/her to one another'

But the following is not so straightforward and introduces us to the peculiarity to be discussed:

18. a.tʂ.kʷa zɑŋla ø.y.ɑ.tʂ'ə.j(.)ba.r.qj'ɑ.ø.jt'
 the.horse.PL all them.PREV.it.from-under.REC.CAUS.shoot.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'The horses all made one another shoot off (<= shoot out from under the start)'

Whilst this is a perfectly grammatical sentence, one might ask for clarification as to the precise meaning. In fact, the meaning is little more than 'the horses all shot off together', where the notion 'together' is a function of the association of reciprocal with causative. I have amassed a number of similar examples:

19. a.lɑ.kʷɑj a.kʷadʒmɑj ø.a.j(.)ba.r.kʷɑmpɑlɑ.ø.jt'
 the.dog.PL.& the.wolf.& them₁.REC.CAUS.roll.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 'The dogs and the wolf rolled over together in a bundle'

20. a.kʷtj'ɑ.rɑ.kʷɑ ø.a.j(.)ba.r.χjəwsaw.wɑ
 the.chick.PL.PL them₁.REC.CAUS.whimper.DYN(-PRES-NON-FIN)
 j.ɑ.lɑ.gɑ.ø.jt'
 they.it.into.move.PAST.FIN(-AOR)
 'The chicks started whimpering all at the same time'

21. r.nɑ(.)pʰ.kʷɑ ø.a.j(.)ba.r.kʰ.ø.nɑ jə.kʷɑŋɑ.ø.jt'
 their.hand.PL them₁.REC.CAUS.hold.PAST.ABS they₁.dance.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

'They danced holding one another's hands'

22. a.χʷətj'kʷɑ ø.a.j(.)ba.r.ə.wɑ
 the.child.PL them₁.REC.CAUS.run.DYN(-PRES-NON-FIN)

da.∅.h.pʰir.d.a
 PREV.it_B.him/her_B.promise.SUFF.(s)he_A(-AOR)

vs

27'. ma(.)stsʰavl(.)eb(.)el.ma da(.)χmar(.)əb(.)a ma(.)tsʰap(.)ə.s
 teacher.ERG_A help(-NOM)_B pupil.DAT_B
 da.∅.h.pʰir.d.a
 PREV.it_B.him/her_B.promise.SUFF.(s)he_A(-AOR)

'The teacher promised the pupil help'

To understand the structure, we need to note that Georgian has two sets of pronominal agreement-affixes, set out below:

Table 2

Agreement-pattern A in Georgian

	Singular	Plural
1st person	v-	v- -t
2nd person	∅(/χ)-	∅(/χ)- -t
3rd person	-s/a/o	-(a/s)n/es/re n ⁸

Agreement-pattern B in Georgian

	Singular	Plural
1st person	m-	gv-
2nd person	g-	g- -t
3rd person	∅(s/t)-	∅(s/t)- (-t)

The agreement-relations in the examples above are indicated by subscript capital A vs subscript capital B. The language additionally (and unlike Abkhaz) makes use of cases to indicate nominal functions. There are a number of classes of verb, of which those in Class 1 are prototypically transitive and, for the Aorist Indicative, take an Ergative subject with Set A agreement, a Nominative/Absolutive direct object with Set B agreement, and, if appropriate, a Dative indirect object with again Set B agreement. Class 2 verbs are prototypically intransitive and take in all their tense-mood forms a Nominative subject with Set A agreement; where appropriate an indirect object goes into the Dative case and requires Set B agreement. The verbs illustrated in (26)-(27') are anomalous Class 2 verbs with two Dative nominals, so that in origin the case-assignment given in the non-prime variants was the only one

⁸The agreement-suffixes for the 3rd person vary according to the tense or mood (or, in kartvelological parlance, 'screave') of the relevant finite verb.

allowed. Because of the nature of the anomaly, which, by analogy with prototypically ditransitive trivalent verbs, easily permitted one of the Dative nominals to be perceived more as a direct than an indirect object, case-assignment shifted to reflect this, so that the second variants above arose initially in imitation of the patterning of Class 1 ((di)transitive) verbs and for some (?many) speakers today has come to represent the norm. The alternative patterning was already in the language in the mid-1960s, for it was discussed by Varlam Topuria in his 'The Georgian Language and Some Questions of Orthography' (1965.92-3, in Georgian). With reference to the second construction for the two verbs adduced here (and for four others he cited) Topuria wrote: 'This error should be corrected. With these verbs there is no change of construction: the subject is always in the Nominative, the object[s] in the Dative. The Present tense-form serves as control: if the verb for the 1st and 2nd person [singular] in the Present has the ending /-sɔb.i/, then there is no change in the case of the subject and object[s]...'. For Georgian speakers today who do not accept Topuria's 'correct' (viz. the original) construction, there is an incompatibility between verbal morphology and clausal syntax (much as there is in English for such, entirely natural structures as 'I was given a present' — how to explain the function of 'present' with the passivised verb?). Incompatibilities are taken in their stride by native speakers, who are blithely unaware of the problems they create for the grammarian. But no linguist would surely be happy to claim that 'relate (X to Y)' and 'promise (X to Y)' are transitive verbs in modern Georgian.

If the above-verbs might initially look (to some) like transitives, even though they are really intransitive, the opposite is true in the following example, which, given that it is the translation-equivalent of 'The child came out in spots all over his/her body', looks as though we have an intransitive verb with Nominative 'spots' as subject; the analysis, however, indicates otherwise, for the verb is part of a transitive paradigm, where 'spots' functions as direct object to the verb 'scatter' with unexpressed 3rd person (singular) subject — according to the verbal morphology an indirect object is presupposed, but instead of the expected Dative /mtɔl t'an.s/, the locative postposition /-zɔ/ 'on' is employed (as it often is) to reinforce the locative notion:

28. bəvɔv.s mɔts'uk'sɔb.i mtɔl t'an.zɔ
 child.DAT_B spot.PL.NOM_A whole body.on
 gə(.)mɔ.ø.ø.(a.)q'ər.a
 PREV.them_B.it_B.LV.scatter.X_A(-AOR)

'The child came out in spots over his/her whole body'

The Abkhaz equivalent also has a 3rd person (non-human) Set 3 agent-affix here:

28'. a.x'wɔtj'a (jə.)jə.k'w.nə.p.sə.ø.jt'
 the.child it/them₁.him₂.PREV(=on).it₃.scatter.PAST.FIN(-AOR)

where we can hypothesise that originally here the now dropped agent⁹ will have been something concrete like 'the disease' or more abstract like 'Providence'.

Whilst the verb in (28) is admittedly on the margins of Georgian grammar, there is an entire class, many of whose members are extremely common, and these verbs (the Medials) have stimulated much discussion over the years as to their true nature. To limit the discussion here to their morphosyntax in the Aorist Indicative, we can say that the essence of their peculiarity lies in the fact that in most cases they are used with only an overt subject, with the result that they have been interpreted as intransitive, and yet this subject stands in the case which is normally rendered in English as the Ergative. Those who hold that the relevant verb-forms are indeed intransitive argue that the case in which their subjects stand should be interpreted not as an Ergative, since the essence of ergativity is that in languages with a formal Ergative case that case's main (and possibly only) function is to mark the subject of transitive verbs, but as an Active, whose function is to mark subjects (of either transitive or intransitive verbs) which act volitionally. Let us illustrate with two concrete examples of Medials:

29. dzælmə i.q'əp.ə vs ts'q'əlmə ø.i.duə.ə
 dog.ERG_A ??bark.it_A(-AOR) water.ERG_A ??boil.it_A(-AOR)

'The dog barked' vs 'The water boiled'

Whilst one might allow that dogs only bark when volitionally inclined to do so, that semantic argument is irrelevant when it comes to water boiling. Referring to Topuria's criterion mentioned above, we can note that no Medial anywhere in its paradigms has 1st or 2nd person subjects marked by the ending /-əb.i/, which immediately raises doubts about any analysis which treats them as intransitive. Secondly, we have to address the question of the function of the initial element /i-/. It is true that some intransitives have an i-prefix in some of their paradigms, but those that do also have 1st and 2nd person subjects marked by the ending /-əb.i/ in their Present and Future tense forms. The i-vowel of interest to us in Medial paradigms is undoubtedly the exponent of the so-called Subjective Version, which is a means that Georgian has for indicating that transitive actions (in some tense-mood forms such as the Present, Future and Aorist) are reflexive in nature, somehow affecting the subject. Compare the Neutral Version (NV) and Subjective Version (SV) variants of the verb 'build' in the following:

30. k'əts.mə səxl.i ə.ø.ə.jən.ə
 man.ERG_A house.NOM_B PREV.it_B.NV.build.he_A(-AOR)

'The man built the/a house'

vs

⁹Note that in this example there is no word equating to Georgian /mut s'uk'əb.i/ 'spots'.

30. kʰɑts.mɑ sɑɣ.li ɑ.ø.i.fɛn.ɑ
 man.ERG_A house.NOM_B PREV.it_B.SV.build.he_A(-AOR)

'The man built himself the/a house'

If the initial i-vowel of the Medials is indeed the Subjective Version, it follows that the verbs are basically transitive and will in origin have had associated with them an object of such a kind as to motivate the Subjective Version. It has been surmised that this 'lost' object might have been either the *Ersatz*-reflexive /tɑv.i/ 'head; self' or an internal object, which means one built from the same root as the Medial itself. I have been looking for the presence of one or other of these elements with a Medial for over a quarter of a century and have finally found one. Amongst a selection of panegyrics of Stalin published in the book /mɣɑtʰvruli sɪtʰqʰvɑ/ 'Artistic Speech' from 1951 and described as /xɑtɣur.i/ 'folk' in origin is a poem entitled /stʰɑlini, kvɑqʰnis bɛlɑdi/ 'Stalin, Ruler of the Country' (p. 27), which contains the following verse:

dʒɛr kʰidɔv dʒɑvri ɑtsʰɣɛbs
 ʊrdʒulo mɪdɪrɛbisɑɔ,
 dʒɛbnɑ stʰɑdian ɟurisa,
 ɑkɑr idzɪnɛbs dʒɪsɑɔ.

Still troubled by anger

At the infidel rich,

Vengeance is what he seeks,

No longer will he sleep (the sleep).

We need concern ourselves with only the last two words. Whilst /idzɪnɛbs/ alone is normally sufficient to convey the meaning 'X will sleep'¹⁰, what we have here is verb plus direct object:

31. ø.i.dzɪn.ɛb.s dzɪl.sɑ.ɔ
 it_B.SV.sleep.TS.he_A(-FUT) sleep.DAT_B.SP-PART¹¹

'He will sleep'

Clearly the verbal root /-dzɪn-/ is combined with the cognate nominal root /-dzɪl-, functioning as internal direct object with what is conclusively demonstrated to be a transitive verb-form. Who would have thought that such a precious example would come from such a source?

¹⁰/idzɪnɛbs/ can either mean 'X goes to sleep' as a Present or 'X will sleep' as a Medial(-type) Future. /dɑidzɪnɛbs/ is the Future for 'X will go to sleep', not a prototypical Medial but a transitive verb without overt direct object whose subjective version is explained in the same way as that of regular Medials. 'X is asleep' is represented by the Stative Present /ɛdzɪnɑvɛs/, a morphologically bipersonal intransitive whose sole surface-argument stands in the Dative; its usual Future form is /ɛdzɪrɛbɑ/, another morphologically bipersonal intransitive form with sole surface-argument in the Dative.

¹¹One can either interpret this as the speech-particle, which serves to mark the original words spoken or thought, and translate it as 'it is said' or see it as a vowel added (as is /-ɑ/ sometimes) to make up the requisite number of syllables.

And so, we see that, for a variety of reasons, verbs are not always what they might appear to be at first glance. A careful consideration of the general morphosyntactic patterning of the language in question, however, usually resolves any problems, though the results of misanalyses by native speakers which become established in a language can always present difficulties.

References

- Topuria, V. 1965. *kartuli ena da martlts' eris zogierti sak' itxi* [The Georgian Language and Some Questions of Orthography]. Tbilisi: Nak' aduli.
- Vogt, H. 1963. *Dictionnaire de la langue oubykh*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Abbreviations

ABS	Absolute	N-HUM	Non-Human
AOR	Aorist	NOM	Nominative
CAUS	Causative	NV	Neutral Version
DAT	Dative	OV	Objective Version
DYN	Dynamic	PL	Plural
ERG	Ergative	PRES	Present
FEM	Feminine	PROH	Prohibition
FIN	Finite	REC	Reciprocal
FUT	Future	RES	Resultative
HUM	Human	SP-PART	Speech-Particle
IMPERF	Imperfect	STAT	Stative
LV	Locative Version	SUFF	Suffix
MASC	Masculine	SV	Subjective Version