New Analytical Perfects in Modern Georgian

Maia Sackokia

Institute of Oriental Studies of Academy of Sciences
of Georgia, str. Cereteli 3, Tbilisi - 62, 380062,
Tbilisi, Georgia
Fax: (995 32) 233008
E-mail:505-mmc.net.ge

Abstract

The paper describes diachronic and synchronic aspects of two analytical perfects that can be found in Modern Georgian.

Analytical (periphrastical) perfects are well attested in human languages (Benveniste 1960, Maslow 1989, Schmalstieg, Sackokia 1985, 1998 and references there). Analytical perfects may be functioning together with synthetic (inflectional) forms or not. They may have oblique (ergative) or nominative morphosyntactic structures.

In Modern Georgian several analytical morphosyntactic sequences may be singled out. Among them, the different types of analytical perfects are the most important (for details, see Sackokia 1985, 1998, 1999). Some of the taxemes are described by Ak. Shanidze in his grammar as: "absolutive compound predicate" like the ones in (1).

(1)   cerili gagzavnilia
        the letter is sent
        puli gadaxdilia
        the money is paid
        saxli asenebulia
        the house is constructed

(cf. below the agentless perfect A), and "relative compound predicate" as in (2)

(2)   my brother has sent the money
        cems dzmas gagzavnili akvs puli
        S-dat-Agens part-past-passive copula V-habere - O

(cf. below, the perfect - B) (Shanidze 1973, 295, paragr. 365). These perfective Georgian sentences were also discussed by different authors at different times (Boeder 1980, Macavariani 1983, Canishvili 1981).

The classification of these sentence forms was especially studied by Sackokia 1985, 1998, 1999, 2000 in the light of typological comparison and diachronical analysis of possessivity, ergativity and transitivity in Georgian (Kartvelian) and Indo-European languages (All conclusions mentioned below may be useful and relevant for logical and formal structural or computational analyses of natural languages. I distinguished two new analytical perfects in modern Georgian: A and B (Sackokia 1985: 141-186) with models:
A: S-gen+Part.Pass.+V-esse+O-nom and
B: S-dat+Part.Pass.+V-habere+O-nom (*habet* as *estalicui*, so the agent appears in dative possessive). It may be expressed by the formulae: A: alicuius factum est aliquid (factum est aliquid); B: alicui factum habet aliquid (*habet* as *est alicui*).

(3)   A:
Misi gamomcxvaria torti.
The cake is baked by her.
Cemi gaketebulia sadili.
The dinner is cooked by me.

         B:
Mas nanaxi akvs es pilmi.
He has seen this film.
Mas naqidi akvs puri.
He has bought some bread.
Mas nanaxi hqavs bavsvi.
She has seen the children.

As I have claimed before, these morphosyntactic surface structures are essentially *ergative*. All periphrastic constructions mentioned above have morphosyntactic ergative subject structures. The agent is expressed by an oblique subject, that is in an other than nominative case. The copula is obligatory in forming the perfect A in Georgian, without the V-esse this utterance is adjectival as in (4).

(4)   Cemi gaketebuli sadili
         The dinner done by me.

Modern Georgian perfect taxemes include V-esse and V-habere as auxiliaries. The interchange of V-esse and V-habere in different periphrastical perfective taxemes in Georgian seems similar to the pattern in certain Indo-European data. The formal model of Georgian verba-habere and corresponding B-perfective taxemes includes the semantics of "animate/inanimate" for the direct object (cf. m-akv-s, m-qavs). But both semantics are correlated with the same formal model "est mihi" (cf. Russian *umenya*, Estonian, Latvian *man ir*. Lithuanian *man yra*, etc) (cf. Gamkrelidze-Ivanov 1984: 288, 288-293). I.e. formal clusters with models Indirect Obj becoming S-obl (possessor) with V-esse, and corresponding perfective taxemes including V-esse and V-habere are found in both Indo-European and Kartvelian. Observing the Georgian diachronic data throughout Old Georgian- Middle Georgian - Modern Georgian, I suppose, that the Modern Georgian perfect A is derived from the Old Georgian and Middle Georgian constructions in (5).

(5)   Ese ustari ars cemgan monagvacebi (Rustaveli)
         Agens-gen (+gan-postpos.)   +Part.Pass.+V-esse (copula) +O-nom.
         (postposition GAN "from")
         This letter is written by me

The combination Gen+"gan" functions as Ablativus Agentis (details in Sackokia 1998).

These Georgian data show typological similarity with postpositional agentivity or prepositional periphrastic participle taxemes (Slavic, Russian, Latvian, etc), as in Old Russian

(6)   Ubien ot Jaroslava
         He is killed by Jaroslaw

(see Schmalstieg 1985, Orr 1989 and others). As to the second, dative perfect B, which may be expressed by the formula *Alicui habet factum aliquid*, it seems to arise in later Middle Georgian, (XVII- XVIII cent.) and is rather frequent from the second part of the XIXth century. (7)gives an example.

(7)   Es qoliperi gatvaliscinebuli hkonda mtavrobas.(XIX cent. Cereteli)
         All these things were considered by the government.

The cyclic regeneration of morphosyntactic clusterings shows the "great" and the "small" cycles, - the great cycle involving whole phrase forms (taxemes), and the small its separate elements (case forms, pre- and postpositions, the change of copula and so on). The great morphosyntactic cycle includes

the small cycle. The universal process of the cyclic renovation of declension seems here to be especially important. The small cycles in Georgian in analytical perfect A involve the form of agens: GEN-, GEN-POSTPOS. - GEN. The cycle of the copula: ars - a-aris ("is" full-short-full), misi- misgan-misi gaketebuli ars - a-aris ("he has done"). One sequence of person markers derives from personal forms of the copula (V-esse) and is added in the first place to intransitive verbs. The Intransitive verbs of the IIIrd series in Georgian show copulative personal markers as in (8).

(8)   cavsul-var, cas(r)ul ..ars, a
         S-intr-Nom + Part.Intr. +CopulaV-esse
         I am gone, he (she) is gone.

The cycle of forms is *cas(r)ul arian casulan, casuliarian*. So the perfective sequences show the oblique (ergative) agent forms for transitive verbs, and S-intrans-Nom for intransitives. The agentivity of S-gen and S-dat in the perfects A and B may be attested by the possibility of coordination of agents as in (9).

(9)   Mas nanaxi akvs es pilmi da ar mova
         He has seen this film and he won't come to see it
         Misi gamomcxvaria torti da ar unda (ar secams)
         The cake is baked by her and she won't have it
         Mas naqidi akvs puri da ar cirdeba
         He has bought some bread and he doesn't need it
         Cemi gaketebulia sadili da davpatizeb .....ar minda
         The dinner is cooked by me and I don't want it...and I shall invite them.

The procedure of dialogic "question- answer" shows the interchange of Agentless and Agentive forms, and the importance of the agent for perfective taxemes.

(10)   Visi gamogzavnili xar?
          S-agens-gen+ Part. Pass. + Past-V-esse
          By who sent are you?
          Who has sent you?

          Bavsvi gamogzavnilia.
          -Visi? - Mascavleblis
          "The child is sent -
          -By whom (gen.)?- By the teacher (gen).

It is interesting and important to note, that the inflected Modern Georgian perfects tend to have a modal semantics, and that the new analytical perfects tend to have a resultative perfective semantics. They also occur in different styles: A and B are more used in colloquial, scientific, press and office style, while the inflected, "turmeobiti"- is more used in the *belles lettres*. Thus, the A and B perfects are proper perfects without modal semantics. Also, the Modern Georgian dative taxemes with future passive participial nucleus usually express obligation. The action expressed by these taxemes is obligatory for both transitives and intransitives.

(11)   S-agens-dative+Part.-Pass.-Fut.+copula- V-Habere+ O-nom-trans:
          Saqideli makvs puri.
          I have to buy some bread
          Sanaxavi mqavs bebia.
          I have to visit the grandmother.
          Intransitive.
          casasvleli var
          I have to go.
          Sintr.Nom+Part.Fut.Intr.+ copula-esse

The future participial perfective possessive (ergativoide) clusterings in Modern Georgian express especially obligation or imperativity. The communicative semantics is connected with surface morphosyntactic features. The

interchange of V-esse and V-habere in different perfective taxemes in Georgian seem similar to certain diachronic Indo-European data.

The A-perfective future models (perfecta futuri) have the same semantics of obligation.

(12)   Cemi saqidelia puri
         l have to buy some bread
         Cemi agsazrdelia bavsvi
         I have to educate the children
         S-gen-Agent+Part.Fut. + copula-V-esse+O-nom

The problem of the Georgian ergativoid aorist taxemes including the active intransitive verb lexemes is relevant here. I suppose verba intransitiva activa may become ergativoid by analogy to ergativoid transitiva. The semantics defines which verb lexemes may acquire an ergative surface structure. So, S-erg for active intransitive is of secondary nature, depending on their active ("dual") semantics. As a result Georgian shows in the 2nd series so-called "split ergativity" (see Schmalstieg 1986, 1989, Boeder, Harris). Perhaps also, it is partially the semantics of "volitionality" (cf. Boeder for Kartvelian, Sackokia 1999).

In Georgian, the analytical perfects of verbs such as: to dance, to cry, to run, to cough, to sing, to bite, to frisk, to laugh, to smile and many others show the intransitive models.

(13)   S-intr-Nom+ Part.act.Intr.+copula-V-esse
         nacekvi var
         I have danced.

The correlation of different participial forms with lexical and grammatical semantics can be observed in Georgian, e. g. the "pseudotransitive taxemes" with the model (14).

(14)   S-nom+ Part.-Past.-Pass. +V-esse

(cf. the same model with S-erg-dat and V-habere). This model functions as transitive, as (15)

(15)   S-dat+Part+V-habere.
         nacami, nasvami, (slang: nacmi, nasmi), nakitxi var
         I have eaten, drunk, read

The interchange of the verbs "esse" and "habere" in different perfective taxemes seems here similar to certain Indo-European data. (esse instead of habere). I(semantical) and II (grammatical) morphosyntactic types which can be dominants or cofunctioners in the language system seem important here. Part.Pass. and Part.Mediopass can function as transitives or pseudotransitives.

(16)   S-nom+Part.+V-esse
         nacami var, dakvirvebuli var
         I have observed
         narbeni var
         I have run
         nakitxi var
         I have read
         cemi sarbenia, sasiarulo makvs
         I have to run, to go

The use of different participial forms must be precisely studied from a diachronic perspective . Three Georgian verbal series are inflected (see Schanidze), the IVth is analytical, a new, additional series. This is probably a new feature of analytical nature within the dominant morphological range of the Georgian language system. These types of past or future perfective possessive(ergative) clusterings Modern Georgian may be interpreted as a new, additional, IVth series with the principal variants (A S-gen and B S-dat) showing all possible (traditional) Shanidze's "screeves", as full verb conjugation paradigms,

with the passive participial in past or future. The new conjugation paradigm operates by the interchange of both copulas V-esse and V-habere. Special morphosyntactic constructions like ergative or constructions of "grammatical possession" also include the cofunctioning of I (semantical) and II (grammatical) morphosyntactic types being dominants or cofunctioners in the language system.

The special cases show both diachronic and synchronic interdependence of semantics on the one and grammatical arguments on the other hand. E.g. the arrangement of animate/inanimate in Georgian verba habendi and corresponding Modern Georgian perfect B. The "special" constructions from the point of view of the morphosyntax show the both diachronic and synchronic interfunctioning of semantics and grammatical arguments, e.g. two possessive Georgian "verba habere"" with dative models: for animate *mqvas* and for inanimate *makus*.

They resemble the two corresponding Modern Georgian perfect taxemes (ergative) as in (17):

(17)   Perfect B:
         mas nanaxi hqvas avdmqopi
         He (she) has seen (visited) the patient (anim)
         mas nanaxi akus pilmi
         He (she) has seen the film (inan)

The intersections "passivoide/ergativoide" in Old Georgian and Middle Georgian are unique but quite important typologically. More common are contaminations on the basis of the participial predicate nucleus being able to coordinate with both "possessive" or "passive" Agent forms (GEN, DAT, IN-STR, etc). So, see the Agent-gen+Postp "gan" from (by) misgan (by him) cf. Russian "ot" (from). That is, the participial nucleus in the diachrony of perfect "A": S-agent-gen+Gan. This participial nucleus is of a *dual* nature: both possessive/passive, as in (18) (gandidebulia and ididebis are morphosyntactic synonyms).

(18)   misgan ididebis
         "He(she) is exalted of him
         inflectional passive verb
         misgan (misi) gandidebuli ars(-a)
         participial nucleus

The paradigmatical exchange noun-verb in participial predicate nucleus shows the phenomenon and its - phenomenological mechanisms of both formal-structural and deep-semantical connections between the ideas of possessivity and transitivity-ergativity in perfective utterences (clusters). So the nouns or denominative lexemes and verb participial nucleus are exchangable (or interchangable) in perfective predicate paradigms by the scheme: NOUN-verb (N-V) or thing /object - action.

That is the possessive noun sentences on the one and analytical perfective clusters on the other hand among the structures (models) mentioned below are systematically related.

(19)   Es cemi naxatia (sacukaria, naceria, targmania, naxelavia, agmocenaa)
         This picture is mine, this is my picture (present, script(letter), translation, handcraft, discovery).
         Mas naxati (sacukari, naceri, targmani, naxelavi, agmocena) akvs.
         He (She) has a picture (a present, a letter, a translation, a handcraft, a discovery).
         Perfect A: Es cemi daxatulia (nacukaria, dacerilia, natargmnia, targmnilia gaketebulia, agmocenilia).
         I have painted (I have made a present, written, done, translated, discovered) it.
         Perfect B: Mas daxatuli akvs (nacukari, dacerili, gaketebuli, targmnili, natargmni, agmocenili).
         He has painted (written, done, translated, made a present, discovered)

5

On the other hand, the Georgian taxemes with actor expressed by active participial forms are used in Modern Georgian discourse on the whole ininterrogation or in negation taxemes. (only rarely in affirmative sentences). They include the semantics of "possibility" as in (20)

(20)   Amis gamketebelia axla es?
        Is he the doer of this action?
        Can he do it?
        He is not the doer of this action".

The communicative semantics indicates "possibility" , "obligation", "imperativity", "mind", "knowledge", "modality", "interrogation", "negation" and so on). As we see, the communicative semantics is also here connected with surface morphosyntactic features.

I mean here the different pragmatic functions expressed, like obligation, negation, interrogation, especially in imperative utterances. In the same way, the different semantical roles may be distinguished (Possessor, Recipient, Location etc.). There is also a correlation between the formal model and the semantics of the participial nucleus.

For example, for different semantical groups the dative possessive morphosyntactic surface structure model can be seen, S-dat with different semantical roles like Recipient, Possessor, Actor, Agent, Direction, Adressee.

In the Perfect B (S-dat) a split of roles can be observed. There are clusters with Subject Orientation (S-orient) and others with Object Orientation (O-Orient); the syntactic role of S-Agent-Obl(Dat) is S-oriented and Indirect Object (Dat) is O-oriented. Predicate nuclei like in (21) have split semantic roles.

(21)   S-oriented
        Mas nabrdzanebi (commanded), natkvami (said), davalebuli (entrusted), micemuli (given) akvs mistvis.
        He has commanded, said, entrusted, given to somebody.
        S-Dat-Agent+ Part-Pass +copula-V-habendi+ O-external (preposition tvis (for))
        Object-oriented
        Misgan nabrdzanebi (commanded), natkvami (said), davalebuli (entrusted), micemuli (given) mas.
        It is commanded, said entrusted, given... (to him, her...)O orient (O-DatRecipient/Adressee).
        S-agent-prepositional Part-Pass. O-Dat.

Such split roles (semantic or syntactic or pragmatic roles) can only be distinguished by context. Generally the role semantics is dependent on lexical semantics or the predicate nucleus and/or on the semantics of S and O. I mean here semantic features such as: animate, inanimate, human, non-human, person, according to M. Silverstein's scheme of the hierarchy of noun semantics features.

The morphological forms of more distant actants shows the true role semantics of principal actants S and O too (as e.g. O-external "for him", and "from somebody" mentioned above: mistvis and misgan).

A start has been made in a computational project led by Levan Chxaidze to provide formal descriptions of all the structural semantic morphosyntactic clusters described above indicating the different semantic and syntactic roles.

References

Benveniste, E. [1952] La construction passive du parfait transitif. Bulletin de la Societe de linguistique de Paris 48, 52-62.

Benveniste, E. [1960] "Etre" et "avoir" dans leurs fonctions linguistiques, Bulletin de la Societe de linguistique de Paris 55, 113-134.

Boeder, W. [1980] "Habere" in den Kartwel Sprachen. Wege zur Universalienforschung. Tübingen. Beitrage zur Linguistik 145, 207-218.

Canishvili, N. V. [1981] Padezh i glagolnie kategorii v gruzinskom predlozhenii.

Gamkrelidze, T.V. & V.V. Ivanov [1984] Indoevropeiski jazik i indoevrope-jcy I. Tbilisi.

Harris, A.C. [1981] Georgian Syntax - a study in relational grammar. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 33, Cambridge University Press.

Macavariani, M.V. [1983] Stativ, rezultativ, passiv i perfekt v gruzinskom jazike. Tipologia rezultativnix konstrukciy. 133-141.

Maslov, J.S. [1984] Ocerki po aspektologii. Leningrad.

Sackokia M.M.M. [1985] Possessivnost, perexodnost i ergativnost Tbilisi.

Sackokia, M.M.M. [1997]. Diaxroniceskaya tipologia v morfosintaksise in-doevropeyskix i kartvelskix jazikov. PhD diss., Tbilisi. 1997.

Sackokia, M.M.M. [1998] Diachronic Typology and Deep Reconstructions in Morphosyntax. Proceedings of the second Tbilisi Symposium of Language, Logic and Computation, Tbilisi, 252-260.

Sackokia, M.M.M. [2000] Dannie russkogo jazika v svete tipologiceskix morfosintaksiceskix edinstv indoevropejskix i kartvelskix jazikov. Second Winter Typological School, Moscow, 171-173.

Schmalstieg, W.R. [1980] Indo-European Linguistics: A New Synthesis. The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Schmalstieg, W.R. [1982] The shift of intransitive to transitive passive in the Lithuanian and Indo-European Verb. Baltistica 18(2), 119-133.

Schmalstieg, W.R. [1986] The Ergative Function of the PIE Genitive. Journal of Indo-European Studies 14, 161-172.

Schmalstieg, W.R. [1989] The Genitive of Agent vs. the Instrumental of Means: An Old Idea Worth Retaining. General Linguistics 29(4), 272-275.

Shanidze, A. [1968, 1973] Kartuli enis gramaticis sapudzvlebi (Grammar of the Modern Georgian Language), Tbilisi.

Shanidze, A. [1976] Dzveli kartuli enis gramatica (Grammar of the Old Georgian Language), Tbilisi.

Silverstein, M. [1976] Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In Dixon, R.M.W. (ed.) Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages, Canberra, 112-171.