

# The Diachronic Puzzle of Georgian NP-Clitics

Tekla Gabunia  
University of Göttingen

Tekla Gabunia

RTG 2636: Georg-August-Universität Göttingen



# Research Focus

Old Georgian NP/DP shows four interesting phenomena:

1. Post-nominal definiteness marking with *igi/ese/ege*
2. Indefinites with *=me* (on *wh*-stems) & postposed *erti*
3. Additive enclitic *=(a)c* (Modern *-c/-ts*)
4. Case concord (*Suffixaufnahme*)

**Goal:** Test whether these elements are truly Wackernagel clitics or distinct DM processes (features + PF operations)

# Research Focus

Traditionally described as NP-2P clitics;

Reanalyzed here in Distributed Morphology as Local Dislocation (D[+def]), scope-aligned edge attachment (Add[+add]), and NP-bounded AgrCase Concord (Suffixaufnahme), with diachronic change via lexicalization and impoverishment.

# OG Definiteness Markers

- *igi* 'that (distal)'
- *ese* 'this (near speaker)'
- *ege* 'that (near addressee)'

Dual life:

Prenominal, stressed: classical demonstrative use.

*igi k'atsi*  
that man  
'that man'

Post-nominal, enclitic, unstressed: definite article use.

*k'ats=igi*  
man=DEF  
'the man'

Clitic status: Boeder (1995), Harris (2002), Testelefs (1998): NP-2P clitics, predicted to attach after first NP word.

# OG Definiteness Markers

**Placement: predicted NP-2P (Boeder, Harris), but corpus shows strong noun adjacency preference.**

lamazi=igi k'aci “the beautiful man” (Adj host, rare).

isni dyuare ul-ta=igi

“the twelve men” (plural mismatch: sg. article, pl. head).

*lamazi=igi*

“the beautiful one” (N ellipsis).

**Constraint: Host hierarchy N >> A >> Num; prosodic repair if N absent.**

# 3 Step Analysis (OG)

## Step 1

Syntax builds D[+def].

Demonstratives distinguished by [ $\pm$ proximal], [ $\pm$ speaker], [ $\pm$ addressee].

## Step 2

/ese/  $\Leftrightarrow$  D[+def, +prox, +speaker]

/ege/  $\Leftrightarrow$  D[+def, +prox, +addressee]

/igi/  $\Leftrightarrow$  D[+def] elsewhere

Operation: Local Dislocation (LD) with Host Hierarchy = N  $\gg$  A  $\gg$  Num/Q.

Prosodic contingency: if N is ellipsed/deaccented  $\rightarrow$  attach to leftmost lexical host.

## Step 3 (PF)

N host (dominant): k'aci=igi 'the man'.

Rare A host: lamazi=igi k'aci 'the beautiful man'.

Number mismatch (clitic-like)

Ellipsis host: lamazi=igi 'the beautiful one'.

$\rightarrow$  Not a free NP-2P rule; constrained LD predicts the attested pattern.

# 3 Step Analysis (MG)

## Step 1 (Syntax):

- D[+def] present in structure.

## Step 2 (Vocabulary Insertion):

- Impoverishment: delete exponent for D[+def] at VI → no article allomorph.

## Step 3 (PF linearization):

- Enclitic article absent; demonstratives es/is used instead.

# Wh-indefinites & NP+erti

/=me/ ⇔ D[+indef, -spec] / \_ [+wh].

Restriction: attaches only to [+wh] stems  
(e.g., vin=me, ra=me).

no NP=me attested in my sample.

/erti/ realizes indefiniteness with  
specificity (often analyzed on Num);  
contrasts with =me (non-specific).

- Old Georgian: case precedes =me → *raj-s=me*

NP+erti:

Postposed numeral →  
“a certain N” (*k’atsi erti*).

Preposed numeral → “one  
N” (*erti k’atsi*).



# 3 Step Analysis

## Step 1

Syntax: D[+indef].

If a QP with [+wh] is present →  
licenses =me.

If a NumP with erti is present →  
licenses the “a certain N” reading.

## Step 2

Vocabulary Insertion (context-sensitive):

/=me/ ⇔ D<sup>o</sup>[+indef, –specific] / \_\_ [+wh]

/erti/ ⇔ D<sup>o</sup>[+indef, +specific] (via  
Num<sup>o</sup>[one])

## Step 3

PF linearization (Old Georgian):

Case attaches before =me → *ra-s=me*,  
*vin-is=me*.

Postposed erti → *k’aci erti* “a certain  
man”.

# Diachrony of Wh-indefinites & NP+erti

## - Old Georgian:

Two complementary indefinite strategies:

=me → non-specific indefinites (weak existentials). case precedes clitic (vin-s=me).

erti (postposed) → specific indefinites (anchored existentials).

## -Middle Georgian:

NP+erti fades

## - Modern Georgian:

Modern: Fusion(wh+me) → portmanteau; case outside (e.g., *vinme-s*, *rame-s*).

Blocking: erti (D[+indef, +spec]) bleeds =me in specific contexts.

Modern: specific-indef use lost (competition outcome).

# Additive clitic =ts

- **Function:** enclitic marker of additivity “also/too.”
- **Domain:** [+add]; enclitic with scope = XP (NP, PP, RC). Placement is scope-sensitive, not blind 2P.
- **Prosody:** unstressed enclitic, phonologically dependent.
- **Diachrony:** Old G = enclitic at left edge of XP; Modern G = enclitic at right edge.
- **Clitic does not cross RC/PP boundaries** → scope-bounded alignment.

# 3 Step Analysis

## Step 1

A single Add0 head merges with XP (NP, PP, or RC).

Merge site = scope domain:

Add0 with RC → narrow scope in the relative clause.

Add0 with PP → scope over NP containing that PP.

## Step 2

Vocabulary Insertion

/=ts/ → Add0[+ADD]

PF rule: Align(Add, Edge, XP).

OG: left edge; MG: right edge.

Host filter: nearest lexical prosodic word

No verbs, no RC/PP crossing.

## Step 3

Attested:

NP: *k'atsi=ts*;

PP: *mis tana=ts*;

AdvP: *axla=ts*.

- A true clitic, but scope-aligned rather than free 2P.

# Suffixaufnahme

## Descriptive facts

Possessors and other dependents show double case:

*perx-ni k'ac-isa-ni*  
foot-NOM.PL man-GEN-NOM.PL  
“the man’s feet.”

Concord is NP-bounded; no spreading into PPs attested.

Semantics: concord only (no new  $\theta$ -roles).

Old G: robust in 5th–10th c.; Middle G: weakened;

Modern: Modern loss via Impoverishment: copied [Case] features deleted, leaving only GEN on possessor.

# 3 Step Analysis

## Step 1

Outer K assigns case to NP; possessor inside NP gets GEN from inner K.

AgrCase node (dissociated) available for Concord.

## Step 2

/-is/  $\Leftrightarrow$  GEN; /-ni/  $\Leftrightarrow$  NOM.PL.

PF Concord: copy outer [Case] onto N/A with [Concord] inside NP (NP-bounded; no PP).

Modern: Impoverishment deletes copied AgrCase.

## Step 3

Old G: both cases surface  $\rightarrow$

*k'ac-is-a-ni*  
man-GEN-TV-NOM.PL).

Modern G: PF impoverishment deletes outer AgrCase  $\rightarrow$

*k'ac-is*  
man-GEN

# Conclusions

Georgian NP clitics are not one homogeneous Wackernagel system. They represent different PF processes predicted by DM.

- Articles: LD with host hierarchy; article lost via Impoverishment.
- =me/erti: wh-licensed =me → Fusion in MG; erti (specific) lost via competition.
- =ts: scope-aligned edge clitic; L-edge (OG) → R-edge (MG).
- Suffixaufnahme: Concord (AgrCase), NP-bounded; lost via Impoverishment.

Georgian “NP-clitics” form a mosaic of DM PF operations (Local Dislocation, Concord, lexicalization, scope alignment). The Wackernagel unification is too broad; DM accounts for both synchronic restrictions and diachronic change.

# References

Boeder (1995)  
Chikobava (1950)  
Gogsadze (2007)  
Shanidze (1980)  
Harris (1981, 2003)  
Chomsky (2000)  
Hopper & Traugott (2003),  
Haspelmath (2004)  
Plank (1995)  
Kojima (2007)  
Rostovtsev-Popiel (2016)  
Makharoblidze (2018)  
Tuite (2023)