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1/2/3 SG, First/second/third person singular personal pronouns
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A, set A agreement affix
ABC, absolutive case
ACC, accusative case
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ADV, adverbial case
AG, agent
AGR, agreement
AOR, aorist
ASSRT, assertion
AUX, auxiliary

B, set B agreement affix
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SUBJ, subjunctive
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VOC, vocative case
V, verb
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This dissertation is a study of reflexivization strategies in Georgian, a language of the Kartvelian (South Caucasian) family, spoken in Georgia by around 4 million people and furthermore by around 1 million in Iran, Turkey, Europe and the United States.

Although the term “South Caucasian” is popular and widely used in the literature, it shows more the geographic location of the family, than the actual genetic relationship towards the other autochthonous language families spoken in Caucasus—North-West Caucasian and North-East Caucasian [Wor05]. The relationship between the two North Caucasian families has not even been proven to be genetic yet [Kli65, KK03]. In general, the Caucasus as a whole does not form a Sprachbund and can therefore not be referred to as a linguistic areal, as is possible in the case of the Balkans, India, etc. [Tui99].

Apart from Georgian, the Kartvelian language family consists of Svan, Megrelian and Laz (the latter one mostly spoken in Turkey as well as in the South West Georgian province Adjara). The Megrelian *dud-ldu*- (cf. Megr. *dudili* “head” [Kip14, Mar64a]), Laz *ti-* (cf. Laz *dudili* “head” [Mar10, Mar64a]), Svan *txvim/txum* (cf. Svan *txwim/txum* “head” [Mar64a, Boe01, Boe03]) are all being used as reflexive pronouns. They seem either to use the grammaticalized body-part noun for “head”, in the corresponding languages, or a derived form of this [FS90, KK03]. It has been argued in the literature that the reflexive pronouns in these languages are innovations and must have developed recently under the immediate influence of Georgian, which employs the grammaticalized body-part noun *tav- “head”* as a reflexive pronoun [Mar64a].

Even for Georgian proper it has been argued by [Mar64a, p. 126], [Mar64b, p. 123] that the reflexive pronouns in Old Georgian were first used in the literary language and only later in the official spoken language as well as in various Georgian dialects. It is even claimed by [Mar64a, p. 109] that (presumably by the year 1964, which is the date of the publication) the Georgian reflexive pronoun *tav- is not really as established as other classes of pronouns are.\(^1\)

\(^1\)The relevant passage from [Mar64a, p. 109] is as follows: თავი, რაც ცოდნის უკრებით აქტიურად ხდება, უნდა იყოს შეუძლებელი გამოქვანილი. თავი რაც ცოდნის უკრებით აქტიურად ხდება, უნდა იყოს შეუძლებელი გამოქვანილი, რაც ცოდნის უკრებით აქტიურად ხდება უკრებით ხდება. თავი, რაც ცოდნის უკრებით აქტიურად ხდება, უნდა იყოს შეუძლებელი გამოქვანილი.
This dissertation will challenge this claim by investigating the syntax of the modern Georgian reflexive pronouns. Naturally, the reflexives contrast with other classes of pronouns by having their own function and purpose, but this does not make them less established or their use either obscure or unclear.

After considering several morphosyntactic issues of Georgian (e.g., case and agreement marking in Chapter 2) the dissertation will investigate the use of the Georgian reflexives within the generative Binding Theory of [Cho81] in Chapter 3 in order to find out their distribution. Moreover, it will be argued that Georgian in fact possesses two nominal reflexivization strategies based on the grammaticalized body-part $tav$- “head”, that are diachronically related but synchronically distinct. The first one is the complex strategy—a reflexive phrase employing the $tav$- as a head of the phrase and a possessive as its determiner. The second one is the simplex strategy—the $tav$- used as a head without a determiner but with the obligatory presence of the verbal reflexive marker, the prefix $i$- in the verb form. Chapter 3 will argue that both strategies behave as an anaphor by being obligatorily bound in a local domain by a c-commanding antecedent. Additionally, the chapter will deal with the Georgian reciprocals and their form as well as their distribution within the Binding Theory [Cho81].

Since verbal reflexive marking is not an issue in the Binding Theory of [Cho81] and as there are not many means to dig further into the differences between the two Georgian nominal reflexivization strategies, Chapter 4 will deal with another theory of referential dependencies and reference maintenance—the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93]. This theory takes into close consideration the verb semantics by distinguishing between those verbs that are inherently reflexive and those that are not. Furthermore, the theory does not only distinguish between pronominals and anaphors, as does the Binding Theory of [Cho81], but in fact makes a difference between pronominals, SELF type anaphors and SE type anaphors. This distinction is made on the basis of the two features $[±\text{SELF}]$ and $[±\text{R}]$ by which nominal expressions can be characterized. An expression is $[+\text{SELF}]$ if it makes a reflexive reading of a predicate possible and it is $[+\text{R}]$ if it is referentially independent by possessing, for instance, features like gender, person and number. In [RR93] pronominals are classified as $[-\text{SELF}; +\text{R}]$ based on the fact that they are able to reflexivize a predicate and are referentially independent. The SE type anaphors, as for instance, the Dutch $zich$, have the feature composition $[-\text{SELF}; -\text{R}]$ because it is unable to reflexivize a predicate (and mostly occurring with inherent reflexive verbs) and because it is referentially dependent [RR93]. As for the SELF type anaphors, as for instance, the Dutch $zichzelf$, they are characterized as $[+\text{SELF}; -\text{R}]$ because of the ability to reflexivize and because they are referentially dependent. The most important claim of the Reflexivity Theory by [RR93] is that the verbal semantics are in close interaction with the distribution of the anaphors. For, if the SELF type anaphors are absolutely necessary to make a reflexive reading of a non-reflexive predicate possible, the SE type anaphors are insufficient and ungrammatical. However, the SE type anaphors are grammatical with inherently reflexive verbs while the SELF type anaphors are redundant and forcing a focused reading. In addition, SE anaphors occur
as subjects of small clauses and in locative PP, where they can be covalued with an antecedent without forming a reflexive predicate.

In Chapter 4, the two Georgian nominal reflexivization strategies will be investigated with respect to their referential properties and reflexivizing ability. It will be shown that the Georgian simplex reflexivization strategy uses a SE type anaphor, while the complex strategy uses a [+SELF]; [+R] element. Note that by having both features positive the Georgian complex reflexivization strategy does not fit into the classification of [RR93]. Thus, the Georgian data offered in this dissertation give an opportunity to investigate the syntax of anaphoric structures of a type not dealt with in the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93]. Furthermore, the behavior of the two nominal strategies will be considered with regard to the verbal reflexive marker i-, which makes a reflexive reading of a predicate possible.

Chapter 5 will offer some data which seemingly violate both the Binding Theory [Cho81] and the Reflexivity Theory [RR93], which can be seen in the case of so-called object camouflage. The term has first been used by [Har81] to describe the use of a phrase headed by the grammaticalized body-part tav- “head” and preceded by a possessive determiner (thus, formally identical with the Georgian complex reflexivization strategy), to facilitate the needs of agreement. In Georgian, any 3-argument verb form is coded for the 3rd person direct object by default. However, whenever the direct object taken by a verb is in 1st or 2nd person, the language uses a kind of camouflaging tool to “wrap” a non-3rd person argument into a 3rd person NP. The phrase headed by tav- and preceded by a determiner is an ideal tool for camouflage as the determiner shows the referential features of the direct object while the phrase as a whole triggers the 3rd person agreement. Therefore it is not in conflict with the phi-features encoded in the verb form. It will be argued here, that in the case of object camouflage, the seemingly complex anaphor is not actually an anaphor but a pronominal. It has no antecedent either in the clause or in the previous/following discourse, but refers to the direct object of the 3-argument verb.

Georgian seems to illustrate two different kinds of uses of the phrase headed by the grammaticalized body-part tav- “head”. One use is anaphoric, requiring a co-argument antecedent (see Chapter 3 and particularly Subsection 3.4.2) and the another use in object camouflage is pronominal (see Chapter 5 and particularly Section 5.2). The Georgian data illustrates the effects of grammaticalization of body-parts and, more generally, that of nouns. In Georgian, the lexeme tav- “head” got grammaticalized into a morpheme of various functions, both anaphoric and non-anaphoric (see also [AL02]). It will be argued that for the morpheme tav-, the body-part semantics are responsible for it becoming an anaphor eventually. However, the agreement marking properties of the phrase headed by tav-, and the fact that it is a 3rd person NP, is due to it having originated from a noun.

Chapter 5 presents some additional challenges for the Binding Theory [Cho81] and

---

2See also [Har81] for an argumentation for distinguishing the two different phenomena.
Chapter 1. Introduction

the Reflexivity Theory [RR93], such as the Georgian complex reflexivization strategy and the Georgian reciprocal ertmanet-, used as a subject argument of a verb.

It is well-known that there has been a discussion in the literature on the ban of subject use of anaphors. The attempts to explain the subject anaphor gap will be considered in Chapter 6. An example of this is the so called anaphor agreement effect/principle by [Riz90], according to which anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement. The universality of the principle has been acknowledged by [Woo99], who claims that if anaphors still trigger an agreement, it will be either anaphoric or “default”. The chapter argues furthermore that by having agreeing anaphors both in object and in subject position, Georgian represents a counter-example for both versions of the principle [Riz90, Woo99].

Additionally, Chapter 6 considers the explanation for the availability of the Greek anaphoric phrase as a subject argument, offered by [AE99] within the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93]. As claimed by [AE99], the form and anaphoric properties make it possible for the Greek anaphor, which is [+SELF;+R], to appear in any position, including the subject position. By analogy to the Greek facts discussed in [AE99], the previously reported subject uses of the Georgian complex reflexivization strategy [AE00] could possibly be explained by [Eve01] and [Eve03] using the form of the anaphor and it being a [+SELF;+R] reflexivization strategy.

However, Chapter 6 will argue against the importance of the form of the complex strategy in its distribution. Among other arguments, the Georgian reciprocal ertmanet-will be used to comment on this issue. This reciprocal can appear as a subject argument of a verb (see Chapter 5 and, in particular, Section 5.5) but which cannot be qualified as a [+SELF;+R] anaphor. The chapter illustrates that there are some similarities between the verb forms and verb readings taking the Georgian anaphors as a subject argument, and therefore it is suggested to have a closer look at the lexical semantics and the thematic structure of the verbs involved in the phenomenon.

Lastly, Chapter 7 will discuss the use of the Georgian complex reflexive as a subject argument in a more detail. The data used, comes from the studies published since 1982 [Asa82] up to the present, as well as some from the fieldwork notes made by the author of this dissertation in 1999 and 2001 in Georgia. It will be argued in the chapter that the data illustrates a binding, rather than a coreference relation between the anaphor in subject position and its postcedent. Two main readings of the anaphors will be identified: One with the complex reflexive phrase interpreted as an aspect/property of the postcedent and another one as an image/representation of the postcedent. Both uses represent a challenge for the Binding Theory [Cho81] as well as for the Reflexivity Theory [RR93] by violating the relevant principles of those theories. Recently, complex anaphors have been analyzed as a relevant function of the antecedent [Reu01]. Since the Georgian complex reflexive phrase in subject position gets interpreted either as an aspect/property or as an image/representation (thus, as some kind of function) of the postcedent, the analysis by [Reu01] could in principle be applied to the Georgian data. However, the Georgian reciprocal ertmanet-, which gets interpreted similarly in subject
position but does not appear to have the same structure as the complex anaphors, will be argued to make the application of the analysis by [Reu01] problematic.

In Chapter 8, the conclusions of this dissertation will be presented.
Chapter 2

Notes on Georgian Morphosyntax

2.1 Introduction

Chapter 2 discusses several aspects of the morphology and syntax of Georgian, which may be helpful when anaphoric binding, the main topic addressed in this dissertation, is discussed.

To be able to understanding the anaphoric system of Georgian, it is necessary to know (1) into which arguments of verbs the anaphoric elements can be realized; (2) which arguments the anaphoric elements depend on for their interpretation (e.g.: antecedents, postcedents); (3) what structural relationship holds between the anaphoric elements and their antecedents/postcedents.

While many of these issues will be discussed in a detail in the chapters 3–7 that are dedicated solely to binding in Georgian, an overview of certain aspects of the morphology and syntax in Georgian will be given in this chapter.

In specific, this chapter will discuss how arguments of verbs can formally be realized. Since verbal arguments in Georgian trigger agreement marking which does not reflect a simple subject vs. object distinction, the agreement marking will be discussed in detail in Section 2.2. More precisely, that specific section will deal with various attempts in the literature to solve the problem as to what are the basic principles underlying the two sets of agreement markers: a subject vs. object dichotomy with a possible inversion in certain Tense-Aspect-Mood (TAM) Series; some hierarchy of several semantic constrains, or something else. After this, a different glossing into the Set A vs. Set B affixes will be offered, one that is already mentioned but not consistently followed in the previous studies on Georgian. The glossing of the agreement markers offered in this dissertation will be argued to be free of a bias towards any theoretical background and, thus, descriptively accurate.

The discussion of agreement marking will be followed by an overview of the TAM Series and paradigms in Georgian in Section 2.3. It might be helpful to have an idea how the Series are organized, in order to discuss the case as well as agreement patterns within the Series later when dealing with what type of language Georgian represents, a nominative, ergative, “split-ergative” or something else. In Section 2.3, a closer look
will be taken at the traditional partitioning of the TAM Series by [Sha73] (which will be held throughout the dissertation) as well as a different reordering of TAM paradigms offered by [Gog88]/[Oni98]. Both attempts are based on formal criteria, the latter trying to solve some semantic inconsistencies that are characteristic to the former.

Section 2.4 is concerned with what type of language Georgian represents. To be able to answer this question the case marking of verbal arguments must be explained, which depends not only on the TAM paradigms but also on volition and the verb semantic class. While going over the case alignment in all the three TAM Series within several verb classes, it will be argued that the case marking reflects a split between the nominative and active alignment, where nominative alignment is a characteristic of the TAM Series I, while the active alignment characterizes Series II and III. Additionally, the agreement marking will be examined, which depends on the TAM paradigms as well as on volition and the verb semantic class. It will be argued that the agreement marking again illustrates a split between the nominative and active alignment types, however, with a different distribution than in the case marking. Namely, the agreement marking in Georgian is of a nominative type in the TAM Series I and II and it is active in Series III. The data presented and analyzed in the section will be, thus, argued to show a split between a nominative and active alignment types rather than reflect an ergative or a “split-ergative” language (the latter term being most frequently used in the literature to characterize Georgian).

Section 2.5 deals with which types of verbs can be involved in the reflexive and reciprocal binding in Georgian. Two different classifications of Georgian verbs offered by [Har81] and [Hew95b] will be examined. Although both classifications group verbs into several classes on some common semantic grounds, the main criteria of the groupings are formal. This makes it unavoidable to have verbs of different thematic composition in the same class or to have verbs of the same thematic structure in different classes. In this section it will be argued that both the reflexive and reciprocal binding affect verbs associated with more than one argument. Thus, it would be easier to follow a simple division between 1- and more-than-1-argument verbs (with the former group being irrelevant for the anaphoric binding in Georgian), rather than to choose either of the classifications [Har81, Hew95b] where almost all the classes could be involved in the binding process.

Section 2.6 will offer a summary of the chapter.

2.2 Agreement Marking in Georgian

The literature on agreement in Georgian (including the Georgian traditional linguistic literature) assumes the language to have subject-object agreement (see [Sha20, Chi50, Sha61, Cha63, Vog71, Sha73, Boe79, Gam79, Har81, Aro82, And84, Fäh87, JKB88, Boe89, And92, HM93, Kin94b, Tui98, Mel01a, Boe02] among many others).¹

¹[Sha20] is reprinted as [Sha81].
However, the so-called subject markers do not always refer to the agent (2.2.1a) but sometimes also to the theme (2.2.1b). Similarly, there are so-called object markers are able to indicate both theme (2.2.1c, 2.2.2b) and agent respectively (2.2.1b, 2.2.2a):

2.2.1. Example.

a. ƙac-i ƙ-ƙl-av-s datv-s.
   man-NOM 3SG-kill-TS-3SG bear-DAT [traditional glossing]
   “The man kills a bear.”

b. (me)³ datv-i ar mo-m-i-ƙl-av-s.
   1SG.DAT bear-NOM NEG PV-1O₁.SG-PRV-kill-TS-3SG [traditional glossing]
   1SG.DAT bear-NOM NEG PV-1B-DAT-SG-PRV-kill-TS-3A-NOM-SG [this dissertation]
   “I have not killed a bear.”

c. (is) (me) ƙ-ƙl-av-s.
   3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT O₁.SG-kill-TS-3SG [traditional glossing]
   3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT 1B-DAT-SG-kill-TS-3A-NOM-SG [this dissertation]
   “(S)he kills me.”

2.2.2. Example.

a. (ƙen) datv-i ar mo-g-i-ƙl-av-s.
   2SG.DAT bear-NOM NEG PV-2O₂.SG-PRV-kill-TS-3SG [traditional glossing]
   “You have not killed a bear.”

²In the glosses the indices to the Set A and Set B affixes show the case of the argument triggering the particular agreement marker. For instance, 1B-DAT-SG refers to the 1st person singular Set B agreement marker m- triggered by the DAT argument me while 3A-NOM-SG refers to the 3rd person singular Set A agreement marker -s triggered by the NOM argument datv-i (2.2.1b). However, note that the indices show only the case but not the number of the NPs triggering them. What is referred to as SG when glossing agreement markers is the grammatical number agreement. It cannot give any indication about the singularity or plurality of the referent of the NPs. As (i) and (ii) below illustrate, the singular agreement marker ƙ- is triggered also by semantically plural NPs. However, the glosses will reflect grammatical number only.

i. ƙac-i ƙ-ƙl-av-s datv-s/ datv-eb-s.
   “The man kills a bear/bears.”

ii. ƙac-eb-i ƙ-ƙl-av-ɛn datv-s/ datv-eb-s.
    “The men kill a bear/bears.”

³Georgian is a pro-drop language. Any personal pronoun, in principle, can be dropped unless emphasized.
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b. (jšen) 3SG.NOM 2SG.DAT O₂,SG-kill-TS-S₂,SG [traditional glossing]
   3SG.NOM 2SG.DAT 2B₁DAT,SG-kill-TS-3A₁NOM,SG [this dissertation]
   “(S)he kills you.”

As the above mentioned works acknowledge, the distribution of the two sets of affixes in Georgian depends on the argument structure of a verb, verb class, aspeccual and temporal characteristics expressed by the verb form and sometimes is idiosyncratic to the verb. Neither of the sets of affixes show one-to-one correspondence to the particular grammatical relations.

Some authors argue that the formal distinction subject vs. object is irrelevant for Georgian and try to find categories triggering either “subject” or “object” affixes [Oni78] or to figure out different hierarchically organized universal constraints and tendencies influencing verbal agreement as well as case marking of arguments with the 1st/2nd vs. 3rd person distinction being on the top of the hierarchy of constraints for Georgian⁴—[+ 1st/2nd] vs. [- 1st/2nd] > + ACT vs. - ACT > + S/O vs. - S/O > + SA⁵ vs. - SA (see the detailed discussion of the issue in [Asa86] and [Asa94, p. 28-43; 65-72]). Other authors stick to the subject vs. object distinction, and assume Georgian to be an S/O agreement language while acknowledging the importance of verb classes and Aspect and Tense distinction with respect to the agreement patterns.

In order to get rid of the labels “subject” vs. “object” markers, wrongly predicting subject vs. object distinction, [Oni78] initiated the use of the terms “obligatory” and “non-obligatory markers” accordingly. The obligatory affixes, corresponding to the traditional “subject” [Sha73] and our Set A affixes, are called so because, as [Oni78] argues, they are obligatory in the verb form, while the non-obligatory affixes (i.e., the traditional “object” and our Set B affixes) do not necessarily have to appear in the verb form (Example 2.2.3). However, the cases of the examples 2.2.4 and 2.2.5 are a counter-argument for characterizing agreement affixes as obligatory vs. non-obligatory because there the so-called non-obligatory affixes are, on the contrary, obligatory (Example 2.2.4) and the so-called obligatory affixes are simply ungrammatical if present (Example 2.2.5):

2.2.3. Example.

a. (me) (mas) v-kl-av.
   1SG.NOM 3SG.DAT 1A₁NOM,SG-kill-TS
   “I kill him/her.”

b. (šen) (mas) ĵ-kl-av.
   2SG.NOM 3SG.DAT 2A₁NOM,SG-kill-TS

⁴Pretty much like optimality theoretic approach however not formulated in OT terms.
⁵By Semantic Agreement (SA) [Asa94] means formal means of expressing the universal agreement of a theme argument to transitive verbs.
“You kill him/her.”

### 2.2.4. EXAMPLE.

a. (me) (šen) g-kl-av.
   1SG.NOM 2SG.DAT 2B.DAT-SG-kill-TS
   “I kill you.”

b. (šen) (me) m-kl-av.
   2SG.NOM 1SG.DAT 1B.DAT-SG-kill-TS
   “You kill me.”

### 2.2.5. EXAMPLE.

a. *me šen v-kl-av/ v-g-kl-av/
   1SG.NOM 2SG.DAT 1ANOM.SG-kill-TS 1ANOM.SG-2B.DAT-SG-kill-TS
   g-v-kl-av.
   2B.DAT-SG-1ANOM.SG-kill-TS
   “I kill you.”

b. *šen me x-∅-kl-av/ x-∅-m-kl-av/
   2SG.NOM 1SG.DAT 2ANOM.SG-kill-TS 2ANOM.SG-1B.DAT-SG-kill-TS
   m-x-∅-kl-av.
   1B.DAT-SG-2ANOM.SG-kill-TS
   “You kill me.”

The data given above illustrate that if a label for agreement affixes is descriptive, making reference either to grammatical relations [Sha73] or to the distribution [Oni78], there will be exceptions requiring explanation in Georgian. Namely, what needs to be explained in cases of “subject” vs. “object” affixes are the cases with agents triggering “object” affixes and themes triggering “subject” affixes. As for the “obligatory” and “non-obligatory” affixes, those cases are problematic when the “obligatory” affixes are not obligatory but, on the contrary, ungrammatical; or when the “non-obligatory” affixes are obligatory.

Another possibility could be to simply avoid any descriptive labels and to give such names to the two sets of affixes which themselves do not pretend to make any explanations as such—neither semantic-functional nor distributional. There have been such tries, for instance, [Boe89, Hew95b] where one will find Set A and Set B affixes. In principle it does not matter what the affixes are called—the Set A vs. Set B, Set V vs. Set M, Set X vs. Set Y or something else. However, since Set A vs. Set B affixes are

---

*Some authors call the two groups of affixes correspondingly Set V and Set M affixes according to the 1st person agreement morphemes of the two sets in Georgian, correspondingly v- (2.2.3a) and m- (2.2.4b). Although this notation is more neutral than the division into the S(subject) and O(object) affixes, it still makes reference to particular affixes of the language and might be confusing to a general linguist that is not particularly working on Georgian but is using the data.*
already given in the literature these terms will be held on to in this dissertation. The most important aspect of this terminology is that it does not announce in advance anything regarding the behavior of the affixes. In the dissertation the Georgian verb forms will be glossed with the agreement markers labeled as Set A and Set B affixes.\(^7\) The labeling is neutral and makes it easy for the readers to decide themselves for each verb form what is the relation between the affixes and the arguments triggering them. Although not giving ready explanations and solutions to the agreement facts, the labeling into the Set A and Set B affixes is descriptively accurate.

### 2.3 Screeves or TAM Paradigms

In Georgian, there is no single verb form referring to a certain tense only and at the same time also to the mood and/or aspect. In order to avoid the reference to a certain tense only and to capture TAM combinations, another term მგრი “screeve” (see [Sha73, pp. 215-235; 423-488] and also [Hew95b]) has been used in traditional grammars of Georgian.

Traditionally (see [Chi50, Sha73] and most of the Georgian linguistic literature following them), there are three TAM Series: Series I (divided into the Present and Future Sub-Series), Series II and Series III given in Table 2.1.\(^8\)


It should be noted that the number of forms in screeves depends on the number of arguments taken by a verb. For a 1-argument unaccusative or unergative verb there

\(^7\)See Footnote 2 in Chapter 2.

\(^8\)Table 2.1 reflects [Hew95b]’s terminology. Compare a slightly different terminology by [Hol81, p. 4]. However, both [Hew95b] and [Hol81] follow the traditional analysis by [Sha73, Chi50, Tsc58]. [Chi50] lists only 10 screeves while [Chi50] gives an additional “Conditional-Subjunctive”, equalling to [Sha73]’s conditional, and lacking in the classification by [Chi50]. [Sha73, p. 223] lists IInd Conditional and Imperative in Series II additionally. However, as [Sha73, p. 223] also acknowledges, the former is not used in Modern literary Georgian but has been used in the earlier stages of the language as well as in some modern dialects. As for the latter, the Imperative, it has unique forms for some but not all verbs of movement and even that only in the 2nd person (both singular and plural) and in affirmative sentences, while for making orders to the 1st or 3rd person Georgian movement verbs use the forms of Aorist Subjunctive. The verbs of other semantics than movement have no separate unique forms for Imperative and use Aorist forms for addressing the 2nd person, and the forms of Aorist subjunctive for making orders to the 1st or 3rd person, just like the movement verbs. Perhaps that is the reason why other authors do not include IInd Conditional and Imperative among the screeves.
2.3. Screeves or TAM Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Sub-Series</th>
<th>Screeves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfect Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Future Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Aorist Indicative (or Simple Past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>Aorist Subjunctive (or Optative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIIrd</td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: TAM Series in Georgian.

will be 6 theoretically possible forms—those taking (1) 1st person singular subject argument, (2) 2nd person singular subject argument, (3) 3rd person singular subject argument, (4) 1st person plural subject argument, (5) 2nd person plural subject argument and (6) 3rd person plural subject argument (see the examples for an unaccusative verb in A.1.1–A.1.11 in Appendix A.1 and those for an unergative verb in A.2.1–A.2.11 in Appendix A.2). However, for a 2-argument transitive verb there will be much more forms since both arguments may trigger an agreement marker (see the examples A.3.1–A.3.11 in Appendix A.3).

There are works like [Gog88], [Oni98, p. 213-221] arguing for a different reordering of screeves based on a number of inconsistencies in the traditional model, which is given in Table 2.1. Namely, from the formal side, each screeve in Series II and Series III have forms with and without preverbs that are distinguished by aspect (those with preverb being perfective and those without—imperfective). However, in Series I, the forms formally distinguished by preverbs belong to different screeves.

From the semantic side, another inconsistence is related to the fact that in the Present Sub-Series there is a screeve Imperfect Indicative which always refers to the past, sometimes to the future but never to the present (see Table 2.2). Also, in the Future Sub-Series there is a screeve for Conditional which may also refer to the past, not just to the future (Table 2.2). Besides, the forms of Present indicative and Present Subjunctive can also have a future reading (Table 2.2).

Irrespective of whether a form has a preverb or not (correspondingly reflecting imperfective vs. perfective distinction), the forms of the Series II and Series III are unified.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Sub-Series</th>
<th>Screeves</th>
<th>Tenses Expressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present Indicative</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfect Indicative</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present Subjunctive</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Future Indicative</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Subjunctive</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aorist Indicative</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(or Simple Past)</td>
<td>Aorist Subjunctive</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(or Optative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIIrd Subjunctive</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Screeves and their temporal characteristics.

in the same screeve. Therefore, [Oni98] proposes to unify also the preverbless screeves of the Present Sub-Series with the screeves of the Future Sub-Series characterized by the obligatory presence of preverbs in Series I. This results in a different model of Screeves (Table 2.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present-Future</td>
<td>Non-Past</td>
<td>Present Indicative, Future Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect-Conditional</td>
<td>Non-Present</td>
<td>Imperfect Indicative, Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Subjunctive</td>
<td>1st Subjunctive</td>
<td>Present Subjunctive, Future Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: TAM Series I in Georgian.

By unifying the screeves of the Present and Future Sub-Series, the formal inconsistence will be solved. In Series I, just like Series II and Series III, preverbless verb forms and forms with preverbs will co-exist.

The inconsistence in semantics will also be taken care of. The Imperfect Indicative (Table 2.1), which always refers to the past (Table 2.2) but never to the present will not be in the so-called Present Sub-Series of the Series I anymore (see [Sha73] and Table 2.1) but in the unified screeve called Non-Present [Oni98, p. 218] or Imperfect-Conditional [Gog88].

10The compound title Imperfect-Conditional by [Gog88] as well as the title Non-Present by [Oni98,
The Conditional as well, which may refer both to the past and to the future but never to the present (Table 2.1), will therefore not be in the Sub-Series with the confusing title “Future Sub-Series” anymore but in the unified scheme Non-Present [Oni98, p. 218] or Imperfect-Conditional [Gog88].

However, it is unclear how changing only the titles may be a solution to the obvious problems. If there would be only the formal side and the availability of preverbs to worry about, then the unified scheme like Table 2.3 will certainly contain forms both with and without preverbs. However, one severe inconsistence for the scheme in Table 2.3 will still remain. If verb forms with a preverb vs. forms without a preverb reflect perfective vs. imperfective distinction in Series II and Series III, then the same opposition in Series I in the unified scheme (Table 2.3) never reflects the perfective vs. imperfective distinction but instead a present vs. future distinction.

Thus, taking care of formal inconsistence does not provide an adequate solution for the semantic inconsistence that is characteristic to the reordering of the schemes à la Gogolašvili/Oniani. The opposition between the verb forms with and without a preverb will be based on aspect in Series II and Series III (see Table 2.1) while it will be based on Tense in the unified Series I (see Table 2.3 reflecting the views of [Gog88] and [Oni98] which are the same in principle but distinguished only by terminology). It is argued that if in some cases only one criterion is decisive for a classification, while in other cases a second criterion is needed, the classification itself will lack systemic character. Thus, the classifications into the three Series, whether by [Sha73] (see Table 2.1) or by [Gog88]/[Oni78] (Table 2.3), if approached from the semantic side, are not homogeneous. They are purely formal classifications respecting the form but not the form-meaning correspondence.

2.4 Case and Agreement Patterns of Georgian

2.4.1 Introduction

In Section 2.2 it was argued that in Georgian neither the Set A nor the Set B agreement affixes show one-to-one correspondence to their particular grammatical relations. In the present section it will be argued that the same goes for the case marking in Georgian. Namely, it will be illustrated that the cases like NOM and DAT are able to mark both

---

11The division into the three Series in [Sha73, Gog88, Oni78] is based on formal principles, namely on the form of the verbal stem characteristic to certain schemes or groups of them. The verb stem principle underlying classifications of schemes dates from N. Marr’s works.

12It is not only the case that Series I versus Series II/Series III base the opposition between the verb forms with preverbs and those without it on different criteria, namely, tense vs. aspect respectively. But also neither the Series I, II or III, taken alone, are homogeneous. Namely, as the Table 2.2 shows, most of the schemes may express more than one tense, depending on a construction or a context. Because of this, there is no semantic ground for putting them into the Series according to their temporal characteristics.
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the subject and object arguments depending on the argument structure of a verb, verb class, aspectual and temporal characteristics expressed by the verb form.

Additionally, it will be argued that the existence of the case label ERG in the description of Georgian does not necessarily presuppose that Georgian is an ergative or a “split-ergative” language. The traditions of labeling the case marker and the actual application/distribution of it diverge, and Georgian does not show the ergative alignment in either of the three TAM Series. In addition, it will be argued that neither the application of the Set A and Set B agreement affixes illustrates an ergative or split-ergative alignment. However, there is a NOM vs. ACT alignment split in the case and agreement marking in Georgian, which will also be discussed in the present section.

2.4.2 Case Alignment and TAM, Volition, Verb Class Distinction

Georgian has seven cases (see [Sha73, p. 44-46; 51-72], [Hew95b, p. 33-45]) of which three are involved in marking of verbal arguments—NOM, ERG and DAT. If the case marking of verbal arguments in Georgian is considered, it can be seen that it is impossible to have the subject and the direct object arguments be marked by a particular case marker. The marking depends not only on the syntactic status of the verbal arguments, but also on such factors as tense, aspect, volition and verb class.

For instance, the subject of (di)transitives can be marked by all the three cases—ERG (2.4.1a, 2.4.2a), NOM (2.4.1b, 2.4.1c, 2.4.1d, 2.4.2b, 2.4.2c, 2.4.2d) and DAT (2.4.1e, 2.4.2e) depending on the TAM characteristics. Similarly, the direct object argument, also depending on the TAM characteristics, can be marked by both NOM (2.4.1a, 2.4.1e, 2.4.2a, 2.4.2e) and DAT (2.4.1b, 2.4.1c, 2.4.1d, 2.4.2b, 2.4.2c, 2.4.2d).

2.4.1. Example. (Ditransitive)

a. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

kal-ma bavšv-s čeril-i
woman-ERG child-DAT letter-NOM
ga-∅-u-gzavn-a.

“The woman sent a letter to the child.”

In the Georgian linguistic literature, another term—narrative (motxrobiti in Georgian, [Sha73]) is used for the case referred to as ergative elsewhere, probably because it is exclusively used in the Aorist (Simple Past) and nowhere else in Georgian. See [Har85] using the term narrative instead of ergative with respect to Kartvelian language family (including Georgian) to avoid the bias towards the ergative alignment type.

There is also a forth case—GEN—used with a small group of verbs to mark their object argument. The interested reader is referred to Appendix B of Chapter 8 in [Har81, p. 144], as well as to [Koj98] and [Dam00].

The case marking of the arguments of (di)transitive verbs is summarized in Table 2.4.
b. Imperfect Indicative, TAM Series I

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{kal-i } \text{bavšv-s } \text{cheril-s} \\
\text{woman-NOM child-DAT}_{1} \text{ letter-DAT}_{2} \\
\emptyset-u-gzavn-i-d-a. \\
3B_{\text{DAT}_{1}.SG-PRV-send-TS-IMPERF-3A_{\text{NOM}.SG}} \\
\end{array}
\]

“The woman was sending a letter to the child.”

\[c. \text{ Present Indicative, TAM Series I}\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{kal-i } \text{bavšv-s } \text{cheril-s } \emptyset-u-gzavn-i-s. \\
\text{woman-NOM child-DAT}_{1} \text{ letter-DAT}_{2} 3B_{\text{DAT}_{1}.SG-PRV-send-TS-3A_{\text{NOM}.SG}} \\
\end{array}
\]

“The woman sends a letter to the child.”

\[d. \text{ Future Indicative, TAM Series I}\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{kal-i } \text{bavšv-s } \text{cheril-s } \text{ga-∅-u-gzavn-i-s.} \\
\text{woman-NOM child-DAT}_{1} \text{ letter-DAT}_{2} \text{PV-3B}_{\text{DAT}_{1}.SG-PRV-send-TS-3A_{\text{NOM}.SG}} \\
\end{array}
\]

“The woman will send a letter to the child.”

\[e. \text{ Perfect, TAM Series III}\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{kal-s } \text{bavšv-is-tvis } \text{cheril-i } \text{ga-∅-u-gzavn-i-a.} \\
\text{woman-DAT child-GEN-for letter-NOM PV-3B}_{\text{DAT}.SG-PRV-send-PERF-3A_{\text{NOM}.SG}} \\
\end{array}
\]

“The woman has sent a letter to the child.”

\[2.4.2. \text{ Example. (Transitive)}\]

\[a. \text{ Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II}\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{kac-ma } \text{xut } \text{tve-ši } \text{a-∅-a-šen-a} \\
\text{man-ERG five month-in PV-3B}_{\text{NOM}.SG-PRV-build-3A_{\text{ERG}.SG}.AOR.INDIC} \\
\text{saxl-i.} \\
\text{house-NOM} \\
\end{array}
\]

“The man built a house in five months.”

\[b. \text{ Imperfect Indicative, TAM Series I}\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{kac-i } \text{xut-i } \text{tv-is } \text{ganmavlobaši} \\
\text{man-NOM five-NOM month-GEN during} \\
\text{∅-a-šen-eb-d-a } \text{saxl-s.} \\
3B_{\text{DAT}.SG-PRV-build-TS-IMPERF-3A_{\text{NOM}.SG} \text{house-DAT}} \\
\end{array}
\]

The numbering of the DAT NPs in the glosses of the examples throughout this dissertation does not reflect any structural but linear precedence. The numbers serve to make it clear which NP triggers the agreement marker in the verb form.
“The man has been building a house during five months.”

c. Present Indicative, TAM Series I

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kač-i} & \quad \text{∅-a-šen-eb-s} \\
\text{man-NOM} & \quad \text{saxl-s.} \\
\text{PV-3B\text{DAT},SG-PRV-build-TS-3A\text{NOM},SG} & \quad \text{house-DAT}
\end{align*}
\]

“The man builds (/is building) a house.”

d. Future Indicative, TAM Series I

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kač-i} & \quad \text{xut tve-ši/ xut-i tv-is ganmavlobaši} \\
\text{man-NOM} & \quad \text{five month-in five-NOM month-GEN during} \\
\text{a-∅-a-šen-eb-s} & \quad \text{saxl-s.} \\
\text{PV-3B\text{DAT},SG-PRV-build-TS-3A\text{NOM},SG} & \quad \text{house-DAT}
\end{align*}
\]

“The man will build a house in five months / during five months.”

e. Perfect, TAM Series III

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kač-s} & \quad \text{mšvenier-i saxl-i} \\
\text{man-DAT} & \quad \text{wonderful-NOM house-NOM} \\
\text{a-∅-u-šen-eb-i-a.} & \quad \text{PV-3B\text{DAT},SG-PRV-build-TS-PERF-3A\text{NOM},SG}
\end{align*}
\]

“The man has built a beautiful house.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAM Series</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indirect Object</th>
<th>Direct Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Case Marking of Arguments of (Di)transitive Verbs in the TAM Series in Georgian.

There is a different case marking with verbs taking exclusively an indirect object apart from the subject argument. Although these verbs take more than one argument, they are called “intransitive” verbs in the Georgian grammatical tradition (see, for instance, [Sha73, p. 172]). The reason for this is that they illustrate a different case marking pattern than the transitive verbs discussed in the above. Namely, the transitive verbs have their subject argument marked by NOM and their direct object argument marked by DAT in TAM Series I (2.4.2b–d). The subject of transitives gets marked by ERG and the direct object by NOM in TAM Series II (2.4.2a). As for the TAM Series III, the subject of transitives gets marked by DAT and the direct object by NOM (2.4.2e). However, the so-called intransitive verbs have their subject argument marked by NOM and their
indirect object argument by DAT in all the three TAM Series (see Example 2.4.3 as well as Table 2.5):

2.4.3. EXAMPLE. (“Intransitive”)

a. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

\[
\text{kaç-i da-∅-e-lapaɾak-a mezobel-s. man-NOM PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-talk-3A_NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC neighbor-DAT}
\]

“The man talked to the neighbor.”

b. Imperfect Indicative, TAM Series I

\[
\text{kaç-i 0-e-lapaɾak-eb-od-a mezobel-s. man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-talk-TS-IMPERF-3A_NOM.SG neighbor-DAT}
\]

“The man was talking to the neighbor.”

c. Present Indicative, TAM Series I

\[
\text{kaç-i 0-e-lapaɾak-eb-a mezobel-s. man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-talk-TS-3A_NOM.SG neighbor-DAT}
\]

“The man talks (/is talking) to the neighbor.”

d. Future Indicative, TAM Series I

\[
\text{kaç-i da-∅-e-lapaɾak-eb-a mezobel-s. man-NOM PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-talk-TS-3A_NOM.SG neighbor-DAT}
\]

“The man will talk to the neighbor.”

e. Perfect, TAM Series III

\[
\text{kaç-i da-∅-lapaɾak-eb-i-a17 mezobel-s. man-NOM PV-3B_DAT.SG-talk-TS-PERF-COP_3A(NOM.SG) neighbor-DAT}
\]

“The man has talked to the neighbor.”

17The affix -a in 2.4.3e is a cliticized copula (cf. (i) vs. 2.4.3e, (ii) vs. 2.4.3e). Note that a cliticized copula can get qualified either as an agreement marker or as a clitic. In this dissertation it is referred to as an agreement marker when it is the only marker for an agreement triggered by an argument (see 2.4.3e). However, if there is already an agreement marker for an argument and the copula refers to the same argument, the copula behaves as a clitic in clitic doubling (see (i) and (ii) below) and will be qualified as a clitic:

i. me da-v-lapaɾak-eb-i-var mezobel-s. 1SG.NOM PV-1A_NOM.SG-talk-TS-PERF-COP_1=A(CL.NOM.SG) neighbor-DAT

“I have talked to the neighbor.”

ii. ˇsen da-∅-lapaɾak-eb-i-xar mezobel-s. 2SG.NOM PV-2A_NOM.SG-talk-TS-PERF-COP_2=A(CL.NOM.SG) neighbor-DAT

“You have talked to the neighbor.”
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Table 2.5: Case Marking of Arguments of “Intransitive” Verbs in the TAM Series in Georgian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAM Series</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indirect Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb class distinction can also be seen in the similar marking of the subject argument of (di)transitives and unergatives as opposed to that of unaccusatives. Namely, just like the subject of (di)transitives (2.4.1, 2.4.2), the subject of unergatives is marked by \textit{ERG} in the TAM Series II (2.4.4a), by \textit{NOM} in the TAM Series I (2.4.4b–d) and by \textit{DAT} in the TAM Series III (2.4.4e). As for the subject of unaccusatives, it is marked by \textit{NOM} irrespective of the TAM Series (2.4.5).

2.4.4. Example. (Unergative)

a. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

\begin{verbatim}
kal-ma  pilm-is  bolo-s  \$^{18, i-}\text{tir-a.}
woman-ERG film-GEN end-DAT 3B_{NOM}.SG-PRV-cry-3A_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC
\end{verbatim}

“The woman cried at the end of the film.”

b. Imperfect Indicative, TAM Series I

\begin{verbatim}
18Unless cited from other works, unergatives will be glossed as ordinary 2-argument transitives throughout this dissertation—with both slots for agreement markers filled (see, for instance, 2.4.4a–2.4.4e, 2.4.8b, 2.4.9b, 2.4.10b, 2.4.11b, 2.4.12b among others). An affix for an optional argument clearly can be seen in unergatives in TAM Series III (see the Set A affix \textit{a} in (i)–(iii) below) which makes it necessary to put an affix for a theme argument for unergatives in general in other TAM Series forms as well. As [Har81, pp. 181-184] argues, any verb in Georgian governs an initial direct object (i.e., the term of the Relational Grammar equalling to the theme argument) either obligatorily or optionally or not at all. The verbs taking the theme argument obligatorily correspond to transitive verbs, those taking the theme argument optionally correspond to unergatives, while those not taking it at all are simply intransitive. In the third group of intransitives [Har81, p. 182] includes the unergatives like \textit{qiqinu} “croak”, \textit{xixitii} “giggle” which, according to [Har81], do not govern an initial direct object. However, as the examples (iv)–(vi) below illustrate, such unergatives are also able to take a theme argument at least formally (see the NP \textit{bevr-} in (iv)–(vi) and to compare its marking to the marking of the theme argument \textit{saxl-i} in 2.4.2a, 2.4.2c and 2.4.2e consequently). In this dissertation it is sufficient for such uses as (iv)–(vi) to qualify as transitive. The verb forms will be glossed with an agreement marker triggered by the argument that is formally qualifying as a theme argument.

i. Perfect, TAM Series III

\begin{verbatim}
kal-s  \$^{u-tir-i-a.}
woman-DAT 3B_{DAT}.SG-PRV-cry-PERF-3A_{NOM}.SG
\end{verbatim}

“The woman has cried.”

ii. Perfect, TAM Series III

\begin{verbatim}
18

kal-ma  pilm-is  bolo-s  \$^{18, i-}\text{tir-i-a.}
woman-ERG film-GEN end-DAT 3B_{NOM}.SG-PRV-cry-3A_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC
\end{verbatim}

“The woman has cried.”
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kal-i  pilm-is  ganmavlobaşi  ţ-tir-od-a.
woman-NOM  film-GEN  during  3B_{DAT:SG-cry-IMPERF-3A_{NOM:SG}

“The woman cried during the film.”

c. Present Indicative, TAM Series I

kal-i  ţ-tir-i-s
woman-NOM  3B_{DAT:SG-cry-TS-3A_{NOM:SG}

“The woman cries(is crying).”

d. Future Indicative, TAM Series I

kal-i  pilm-is  bolo-s/  pilm-is  ganmavlobaşi
woman-NOM  film-GEN  end-DAT/  film-GEN  during
ţ-tir-eb-s.
3B_{DAT:SG-PRV-cry-TS-3A_{NOM:SG}

“The woman will cry at the end of the film / during the film.”

e. Perfect, TAM Series III

kal-s  pilm-is  gamo  ţ-u-tir-i-a.
woman-DAT  film-GEN  because.of  3B_{DAT:SG-PRV-cry-PERF-3A_{NOM:SG

me  m-i-tir-i-a.
1SG.DAT  1B_{DAT:SG-PRV-cry-PERF-3A_{NOM:SG

“I have cried.”

iii. Perfect, TAM Series III

ţen  g-i-tir-i-a.
2SG.DAT  2B_{DAT:SG-PRV-cry-PERF-3A_{NOM:SG

“You have cried.”

iv. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

baq-qa ma  bevr-i  ţ-i-qiqin-a.
frog-ERG  much-NOM  3B_{NOM:SG-PRV-croak-3A_{ERG:SG}.AOR.INDIC

“The frog croaked a lot.”

v. Present Indicative, TAM Series I

baq-ı  bevr-s  ţ-i-qiqin-eb-s.
frog-NOM  much-DAT  3B_{DAT:SG-croak-TS-3A_{NOM:SG

“The frog croaks.”

“The frog is croaking a lot.”

vi. Perfect, TAM Series III

baq-qı  bevr-s  ţ-u-qiqin-i-a.
frog-DAT  much-NOM  3B_{DAT:SG-PRV-croak-PERF-3A_{NOM:SG

“The frog has (apparently) croaked a lot.”
“The woman has cried because of the film.”

2.4.5. EXAMPLE. (Unaccusative)

a. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

\[ \text{kva-∅ da-gor-d-a  kld-i-dan.} \]
\[
\text{stone-NOM PV-roll-INTR-3\text{NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC} rock-INST-from}
\]

“The stone rolled down the rock.”

b. Imperfect Indicative, TAM Series I

\[ \text{kva-∅ gor-d-eb-od-a  kld-i-dan.} \]
\[
\text{stone-NOM roll-INTR-TS-IMPERF-3\text{NOM.SG} rock-INST-from}
\]

“The stone has been rolling down the rock.”

c. Present Indicative, TAM Series I

\[ \text{kva-∅ gor-d-eb-a  kld-i-dan.} \]
\[
\text{stone-NOM roll-INTR-TS-3\text{NOM.SG} rock-INST-from}
\]

“The stone starts rolling down the rock.”

d. Future Indicative, TAM Series I

\[ \text{kva-∅ da-gor-d-eb-a  kld-i-dan.} \]
\[
\text{stone-NOM PV-roll-INTR-TS-3\text{NOM.SG} rock-INST-from}
\]

“The stone will start rolling down the rock.”

e. Perfect, TAM Series III

\[ \text{kva-∅ da+gor+eb+ul-a^{19}  kld-i-dan.} \]
\[
\text{stone-NOM PV+roll+TS+PPART-COP}_(3\text{NOM.SG}) \text{rock-INST-from rolled-is}
\]

“The stone has rolled down the rock.”

\[^{19}\text{The affix } -a \text{ in 2.4.5e is a cliticized copula (cf. (i) vs. 2.4.5e, (ii) vs. 2.4.5e). See also Footnote 17 in Chapter 2:}
\]

i. me \[ da-v-gor+eb+ul-var  kld-i-dan. \]
\[
\text{1SG.NOM PV-1\text{NOM.SG-roll+TS+PPART-COP}_(1=\text{NOM.SG}) rock-INST-from Lit.: I rolled-I.am from.rock}
\]

“I have rolled down the rock.”

ii. šen \[ da-∅-gor+eb+ul-xar  kld-i-dan. \]
\[
\text{2SG.NOM PV-2\text{NOM.SG-roll+TS+PPART-COP}_(2=\text{NOM.SG}) rock-INST-from Lit.: You rolled-you.are from.rock}
\]

“You have rolled down the rock.”
The importance of volition can be seen in the case alignment patterns of psych verbs. If the subject experiencer undergoes a feeling volitionally, the psych verb behaves like a normal transitive verb. The volitional experiencer gets marked just like the subject of transitives, namely by ERG (cf. 2.4.6a vs. 2.4.2a), NOM (cf. 2.4.6b vs. 2.4.2b, 2.4.6c vs. 2.4.2c, 2.4.6d vs. 2.4.2d) and DAT (cf. 2.4.6e vs. 2.4.2e), depending on the TAM Series:

2.4.6. EXAMPLE. (Psych Verb with a volitional experiencer)

a. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II
   me uceb ʂe-v-i-zul-e papa-∅.
   1SG.ERG at.once PV-1AERG,SG-PRV-hate-AOR.INDIC porridge-NOM
   “I (volitionally) hated the porridge at once.”

b. Imperfect Indicative, TAM Series I
   me xut-i tv-is ganmavlobaši
   1SG.NOM five-NOM month-GEN during
   v-i-zul-eb-d-i papa-s.
   1A,SG-PRV-hate-TS-IMPERF-INDIC porridge-DAT
   “I have been (volitionally) hating the porridge during five months.”

c. Present Indicative, TAM Series I
   me v-i-zul-eb papa-s.
   1SG.NOM 1ANOM-SG-PRV-hate-TS porridge-DAT
   “I am (volitionally) hating the porridge.”

d. Future Indicative, TAM Series I
   me ʂe-v-i-zul-eb papa-s.
   1SG.NOM PV-1ANOM-SG-PRV-hate-TS porridge-DAT
   “I will (volitionally) hate the porridge.”

e. Perfect, TAM Series III
   me ʂe-m-i-zul-eb-i-a papa-∅.
   1SG.DAT PV-1BDAT,SG-PRV-hate-TS-PERF-3ANOM-SG porridge-NOM
   “I have (volitionally) hated the porridge.”

However, if the experiencer undergoes a feeling spontaneously, without having it planned or having thought over it beforehand, it gets only DAT marking (2.4.7a-e) irrespective of the Tense and Aspect:

20For more on the volitional vs. non-volitional distinction in Georgian see [Asa98].
21Georgian is not the only language in the world that formally reflects volitional vs. non-volitional distinctions (see Hindi [Sak80], Hittite [Lur86], Batsbi [Gag53] among others).
2.4.7. **Example.** (Psych verb with an non-volitional experiencer)

a. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

```
1SG.DAT at.once PV-1BDAT.SG-hate-INTR-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC porridge-NOM
```

“I (non-volitionally) hated the porridge at once.”

b. Imperfect Indicative, TAM Series I

```
1SG.DAT five-NOM month-GEN during
m-zul-d-eb-od-a papa-∅.
1BDAT.SG-hate-INTR-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG porridge-NOM
```

“I have been (non-volitionally) hating the porridge during five months.”

c. Present Indicative, TAM Series I

```
1SG.DAT m-zul-s papa-∅.
```

“I (non-volitionally) hate the porridge.”

d. Future Indicative, TAM Series I

```
1SG.DAT PV-1BDAT.SG-hate-INTR-TS-3ANOM.SG porridge-NOM
```

“I will (non-volitionally) hate the porridge.”

e. Perfect, TAM Series III

```
1SG.DAT PV-1BDAT.SG-hate-TS-PERF-3ANOM.SG porridge-NOM
```

“I have (non-volitionally) hated the porridge.”

Thus, particular case markers in Georgian do not correspond to particular grammatical relations but their distribution rather depends on the TAM categories; verb class distinction as well as the volition of the referent of the subject argument.

### 2.4.3 Georgian is not an Ergative Language

Let us recall that in ergative languages, ERG marks the agent of the transitives and opposes it to formally undistinguishable roles as subject of intransitives (both unergatives and unaccusatives) and object of transitives, marked by absolutive (ABS, often zero) (Table 2.6).²²

²²To illustrate the case as well as agreement marking patterns in the Tables 2.6–2.11 there are three semantic classes of verbs and their arguments given—transitive with the subject (S) and direct object (DO)
However, as Example 2.4.8 illustrates, the Georgian ERG case marker \(-ma\)\(^{23}\) does not only mark the subject of transitives (2.4.8a) but also the subject of unergatives (2.4.8b) (see also 2.4.1a, 2.4.2a, 2.4.4a). Note that the subject of unaccusatives gets marked exactly like the object of (di)transitives—by NOM (cf. 2.4.8a vs. 2.4.8c and also 2.4.1a vs. 2.4.5a, 2.4.2a vs. 2.4.5a):

2.4.8. EXAMPLE. (Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II)

a. Transitive

\[
\text{kac-ma da-∅-çex-a ŕeša-∅.}
\]

\[
\text{man-ERG PV-3B_{NOM,SG}-chop-3A_{ERG,SG,AOR,INDIC} firewood-NOM}
\]

“The man chopped firewood.”

b. Unergative

\[
\text{kal-ma 0^{24}-i-tir-a.}
\]

\[
\text{woman-ERG PRV-cry-3A_{ERG,SG,AOR,INDIC}}
\]

“The woman cried.”

c. Unaccusative

\[
\text{kac-i ça-vid-a.}
\]

\[
\text{man-NOM PV-move-3A_{NOM,SG,AOR,INDIC}}
\]

“The man went.”

Thus, the so called ERG marker in Georgian does not reflect ergative alignment (see Table 2.6).\(^{25}\) In fact it illustrates the active alignment which, according to [Kli73, Kli77, arguments, unergative and unaccusative with the only subject (S) argument. Note that thematically very different subject argument of unergatives and unaccusatives are given similarly (as S) only to indicate their syntactic status, the subjecthood. No indication of their thematic status is given, as it is done in [Dix94] by differentiating the agentive subject of unergatives and the non-agentive subject of unaccusatives as A and S correspondingly.

\(^{23}\)The ergative marker has two allomorphs, \(-ma\) with consonant-final stems (2.4.1a, 2.4.2a) and \(-m\) with vowel-final stems (2.5.5).

\(^{24}\)See Footnote 18 in Chapter 2.

\(^{25}\)The view of Georgian being an ergative language is shared by [Hew87, Hew95a, Nas95, Nas97]. For the works arguing against Georgian as an ergative language see also [Aro70, Com73, Kli73, Kli77, Kli79, Har81, Asa82, Ami98, Me98].
Kli79], groups the subject of (di)transitives and that of the unergatives together by using the same marker and opposing them to the similarly marked subject of unaccusatives and the direct object of (di)transitives (see Table 2.7).

| Transitive  | S_{ERG} | DO_{ABS} |
| Unergative  | S_{ERG} |
| Unaccusative| S_{ABS} |

Table 2.7: Active Alignment.

Whatever the labels for case markers are, Georgian shows the same grouping of verbal arguments as in the case of active alignment (cf. Table 2.7 vs. Table 2.8).

| Transitive  | S_{ERG} | DO_{NOM} |
| Unergative  | S_{ERG} |
| Unaccusative| S_{NOM} |

Table 2.8: Georgian case alignment in Aorist.

From the examples given above it becomes clear that Georgian case alignment (Table 2.8) is different from that of Ergative languages (Table 2.6). Additionally, the same examples illustrate that Georgian is different from the languages displaying nominative alignment as well (Table 2.9). In nominative alignment the direct object argument of (di)transitives gets marked differently (by ACC) than the rest of the arguments, such as the subject of (di)transitives, unergatives and unaccusatives (all marked by NOM, often \(-\emptyset\)) (see Table 2.9).

| Transitive  | S_{NOM} | DO_{ACC} |
| Unergative  | S_{NOM} |
| Unaccusative| S_{NOM} |

Table 2.9: Nominative alignment.

It is known that, in nominative languages the case NOM signals the subject and the ACC signals the direct object. Clearly, the concept that is referred to as a NOM marker in the literature on Georgian is not equal to what is referred to as NOM in the Nominative type languages (Table 2.9). The NOM marker does not necessarily signal the subject in Georgian (see the nominative-marked arguments in 2.4.1a, 2.4.2a, 2.4.6a, 2.4.7a, 2.4.8a).

Therefore, the case marking is not a good test for identifying grammatical relations in Georgian, since there is no unilateral correspondence between a certain case and a
As is argued above, the case marking in Georgian does not illustrate the ergative alignment (see Table 2.6). From this, it follows that it cannot be considered to be an ergative language.

### 2.4.4 Georgian is neither a “Split-Ergative” Language

The case alignment split according to the TAM categories, verb class and volition (Subsection 2.4.2) and the existence of the term ergative in the works on Georgian might raise the impression that the language is among those showing split ergativity.\(^{27}\)

However, as is argued in Subsection 2.4.3, in Georgian there is no ergative alignment in Aorist, where the so-called ERG marker surfaces. Note that there is no ergative alignment in either of the three TAM Series. The case alignment in the TAM Series I (see the examples 2.4.9 and 2.4.10) is identical to the alignment in nominative languages. If the nominative alignment in Table 2.9 is considered, when it is compared to the alignment patterns for Georgian in Present and Future according to the examples 2.4.9 and 2.4.10, it can be seen that irrespective of the label for the cases in Georgian, the patterns are identical—the subject arguments of transitives, unergatives and unaccusatives get the same marking whereas the object of transitives gets a different marking.

#### 2.4.9. EXAMPLE. (Present Indicative, TAM Series I)

**a. Transitive**

\[
\text{kac-i} \quad \emptyset - kl-av-s \quad \text{datv-s.} \\
\text{man-NOM 3B}_{\text{DAT}} \cdot \text{SG-kil-} \text{-TS-3}_{\text{A}} \text{NOM} \cdot \text{SG bear-DAT}
\]

“The man kills/is killing a bear.”

**b. Unergative**

\[
\text{kac-i} \quad \emptyset^{28} - qvir-i-s. \\
\text{man-NOM 3B}_{\text{DAT}} \cdot \text{SG-shout-} \text{-TS-3}_{\text{A}} \text{NOM} \cdot \text{SG}
\]

“The man shouts/is shouting.”

**c. Unaccusative**

\[
\text{kac-i} \quad \text{kvdb-eb-a.} \\
\text{man-NOM die-} \text{-TS-3}_{\text{A}} \text{NOM} \cdot \text{SG}
\]

“The man dies/is dying.”

#### 2.4.10. EXAMPLE. (Future Indicative, TAM Series I)

\(^{26}\)Note that indirect objects represent an exception, since they are exclusively marked by the only one case—DAT (cf. the DAT marked indirect object bavv-\~sv-s in 2.4.1a–d).

\(^{27}\)Listed are some of the works analyzing Georgian as “split-ergative”: [Boc79, Kin94a, Tuu99, And01].

\(^{28}\)See Footnote 18 in Chapter 2.
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a. Transitive

\[ \text{kac-i mo-\emptyset-kl-av-s datv-s.} \]
\[ \text{man-NOM PV-3B_{DAT-SG}-kill-TS-3A_{NOM-SG} bear-DAT} \]

“The man will kill/be killing a bear.”

b. Unergative

\[ \text{kac-i \emptyset^{29}-i-qvir-eb-s.} \]
\[ \text{man-NOM 3B_{DAT-SG}-PRV-shout-TS-3A_{NOM-SG}} \]

“The man will shout / will be shouting.”

c. Unaccusative

\[ \text{kac-i mo-kvd-eb-a.} \]
\[ \text{man-NOM PRV-die-TS-3A_{NOM-SG}} \]

“The man will die / will be dying.”

As for the case alignment in Aorist Indicative (TAM Series II) (see Example 2.4.11) and Perfect (TAM Series III) (see Example 2.4.12), this is identical to the active alignment. If the active alignment in Table 2.7 is considered and compared to the alignment patterns for Georgian in Aorist Indicative and Perfect according to the examples 2.4.11 and 2.4.12, it becomes clear that whatever the label for the cases in Georgian, the patterns are identical—the subject arguments of transitives and unergatives get the same marking as opposed to the similarly marked subject of unaccusatives and the object of transitives.

2.4.11. Example. (Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II)

a. Transitive

\[ \text{kac-ma mo-\emptyset-kl-a datv-i.} \]
\[ \text{man-ERG PV-3B_{NOM-SG}-kill-3A_{ERG-SG-AOR.INDIC} bear-NOM} \]

“The man killed a bear.”

b. Unergative

\[ \text{kac-ma \emptyset-i-qvir-a.} \]
\[ \text{man-ERG 3B_{NOM-SG}-PRV-shout-3A_{ERG-SG-AOR.INDIC}} \]

“The man shouted.”

c. Unaccusative

---

^{29}See Footnote 18 in Chapter 2.
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\[ \text{kač-i } \text{mo-\textit{iş}d-a.} \]
\[ \text{man-NOM PV-die-3A\textit{NOM SG AOR INDIC}} \]

“The man died.”

2.4.12. Example. (Perfect, TAM Series III)

a. Transitive

\[ \text{kač-s } \text{mo-\textit{iş}-u-k\textit{l-av-s} datv-i.} \]
\[ \text{man-DAT PV-3B\textit{DAT SG PRV kill-3TS 3A\textit{NOM SG bear-NOM}} } \]

“The man has (apparently) killed a bear.”

b. Unergative

\[ \text{kač-s } \text{0-u-q\textit{vir-i-a.} } \]
\[ \text{man-DAT 3B\textit{DAT SG PRV shout-PERF 3ANOM SG} } \]

“The man has (apparently) shouted.”

c. Unaccusative

\[ \text{kač-i } \text{mo+mk\textit{vard-a}.30} \]
\[ \text{man-NOM PV+dead-COP 3=3ANOM SG} \]

“The man has (apparently) died.”

Thus, according to the case marking, Georgian shows the nominative alignment in TAM Series I (the examples 2.4.9, 2.4.10) and the active alignment in the TAM Series II (Example 2.4.11) and the TAM Series III (Example 2.4.12). Therefore, there is a split between the nominative and active alignment patterns in Georgian case marking (Table 2.10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Type</th>
<th>Series I</th>
<th>Series II</th>
<th>Series III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>$S_{\text{NOM}}$ DO$_{\text{DAT}}$</td>
<td>$S_{\text{ERG}}$ DO$_{\text{NOM}}$</td>
<td>$S_{\text{DAT}}$ DO$_{\text{NOM}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unergative</td>
<td>$S_{\text{NOM}}$</td>
<td>$S_{\text{ERG}}$</td>
<td>$S_{\text{DAT}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccusative</td>
<td>$S_{\text{NOM}}$</td>
<td>$S_{\text{NOM}}$</td>
<td>$S_{\text{NOM}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.10: Case marking in Georgian.

Georgian does also not qualify as split-ergative according to the agreement marking. The TAM Series I (see Example 2.4.9, 2.4.10) and the TAM Series II (see Example 2.4.11) both reflect nominative alignment—the subject of transitives, unergatives and unaccusatives group together by triggering Set A affixes whereas the object of

\[ ^{30}\text{See Footnote 19 in Chapter 2 by Example 2.4.5.} \]
transitives triggers Set B affixes (see also Table 2.11). As for the TAM Series III (see Example 2.4.12), there is an active alignment—the subject of transitives and unergatives group together by triggering Set B affixes whereas the object of transitives and the subject of unaccusatives group together because both trigger Set A affixes (see also Table 2.11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Type</th>
<th>Series I</th>
<th>Series II</th>
<th>Series III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>$S_A\ DO_B$</td>
<td>$S_A\ DO_B$</td>
<td>$S_B\ DO_A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unergative</td>
<td>$S_A$</td>
<td>$S_A$</td>
<td>$S_B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccusative</td>
<td>$S_A$</td>
<td>$S_A$</td>
<td>$S_B$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.11: Agreement Marking in Georgian.

Therefore, according to the agreement marking, Georgian shows the nominative alignment in TAM Series I (the examples 2.4.9, 2.4.10) and the TAM Series II (Example 2.4.11) and it shows the active alignment in the TAM Series III (Example 2.4.12). Thus, there is a split between the nominative and active alignment patterns in Georgian agreement marking (Table 2.11).

If both the case (Table 2.10) and the agreement marking in Georgian (Table 2.11) are considered, the only split is between the nominative and active alignment (Table 2.12). Since there is no single occurrence of ergative alignment in Georgian (Table 2.12), Georgian cannot be regarded a split-ergative language.

Without actually giving a relevant reference, [Har81, p. 306] notes that it is suggested in the literature that verb agreement in the Series III should be qualified as ergative. These suggestions are based on the claim that the “intransitive subject” and the “direct object” trigger the same agreement marker in the Series III. For instance, [Asa94, p. 29] argues for the ERG alignment based on the Series III forms for transitives (Example 2.4.13) and unaccusatives (Example 2.4.14). In Example 2.4.13 the subject argument of the transitive verb is marked by DAT, while the direct object is marked by

\[31\] For a similar view on Georgian having a split between the nominative and active systems see [Mel01b]. Particularly, the views on the type of case or agreement marking in Series I, II or III are identical. [Mel01b] also considers the case marking in TAM Series I to be of the nominative type and in the Series II and Series III of the active type. As for the agreement marking, for [Mel01b], as well as for the author of this thesis, the Series II is nominative and Series III is active. [Mel01b] does not mention the type of the agreement marking for Series I. However, since Series III is considered in [Mel01b] as active, because both the case and agreement marking reflect the active system, and Series II reflects the nominative-active system, because the agreement marking is and the case marking is active, it should be concluded that the Series I, qualified as nominative in [Mel01b] and having the nominative agreement marking, must have the case marking of the nominative type as well. Additionally, see [BK01, p. 18] which qualifies Georgian as “split active”. This work identifies the nominative case marking system in TAM Series I while the active one for the TAM Series II and III.

\[32\] This once again shows how the term ERG for the case marker in Georgian is misleading. See Footnote 13 in Chapter 2.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAM Series I</th>
<th>Case Marking</th>
<th>Agreement Marking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAM Series II</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM Series III</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.12: Alignment Types in the TAM Series According to the Case and Agreement Marking in Georgian.

NOM. The subject of the unaccusative verb in 2.4.14 is also marked by NOM. Thus, the subject of the unaccusative verb (2.4.14) and the direct object of the transitive verb (2.4.13) group together, opposing the subject of the transitive verb—a classic ergative alignment (see [Dix94]).

2.4.13. Example.

\[
\text{giorgi-s levan-i ar } \emptyset\text{-u-cem-i-a.} \\
\text{Giorgi-DAT Levan-NOM NEG 3B_{DAT,SG-PRV-beat-PERF-3A_{NOM,SG}}} \\
\text{“Giorgi has not beaten Levan.”}
\]

2.4.14. Example.

\[
\text{giorgi-\emptyset ar da+vardn+il-a.} \\
\text{Giorgi-NOM NEG PV+fall+PPART-3A_{NOM,SG}} \\
\text{“Giorgi has not fallen.”}
\]

However, it can be doubted that the Series III reflects the ERG pattern, as was claimed by [Asa94]. If not only transitives (2.4.13) and unaccusatives (2.4.14) are considered but also unergatives (2.4.15) in the Series III, it can be seen that the subject of unergatives, like the subject of transitives gets marked by DAT. Thus, the two are grouped together by being marked similarly, whereas the subject of unaccusatives and the direct object of transitives get marked by NOM in Series III. The distribution of the cases DAT vs. NOM in 2.4.13, 2.4.14 and 2.4.15 illustrates the active alignment (Table 2.7).

2.4.15. Example.

\[
\text{giorgi-s ar ga-\emptyset\text{-u-cin-i-a.}^{33}} \\
\text{Giorgi-DAT NEG PV-3B_{DAT,SG-PRV-laugh-PERF-3A_{NOM,SG}}} \\
\text{“Giorgi has not laughed.”}
\]

As for the agreement marking, this again displays the active alignment. Namely, the subject of the transitive verb in 2.4.13 and the subject of the unergative in 2.4.15

---

^{33}See Footnote 18 in Chapter 2.
behave similarly as they both trigger the 3rd person Set B marker $\emptyset$. Note that the subject of unaccusative verb in 2.4.14 and the direct object of the transitive verb in 2.4.14 also behave similarly as they trigger the 3rd person Set A marker $\text{a}$.

In the end, ACT but not ERG alignment is reflected in case marking or agreement marking in the TAM Series III in Georgian (see also the tables 2.10, 2.11).

### 2.4.5 Conclusion

Section 2.4 dealt with the case and agreement marking in Georgian. In Subsection 2.4.2 it was illustrated that the case marking depends on the argument structure of a verb, verb class, TAM categories and volition. In Subsection 2.4.3 arguments have been presented against Georgian being an ergative language. In Subsection 2.4.4 the assumption that Georgian is a “split-ergative” language was argued against. In conclusion, the NOM vs. ACT alignment split in Georgian, both in the case and agreement marking were illustrated and argued against.

### 2.5 What Kind of Verbs Are Relevant for Anaphoric Binding?

#### 2.5.1 Introduction

Since neither case nor verbal marking helps with uniquely identifying what is a subject and what is an object in Georgian it is necessary to look at the thematic status of verbal arguments. Before a new kind of grouping of verbs better suited for the main goal of this dissertation—the study of anaphoric binding in Georgian—is suggested (Section 2.5.3), an overview of some of the existing classifications of Georgian verbs into the verb classes will be given (Section 2.5.2).

#### 2.5.2 Some Classifications of Verbs

According to the classification by [Har81], Georgian verbs are divided into 4 classes. The classification is based on purely morphological criteria. Each class is characterized by a certain set of morphological features listed in [Har81, p. 260]:

**CLASS1:**
- The future/aorist tenses are formed with a preverb.
- In the future tense, the suffix $-s$ marks third person singular subjects, the suffix $-en$ third person plural subjects.
- In the aorist tense, the third person plural subject is marked by the suffix $-es$.

**CLASS2:**
- The future/aorist tenses are formed with a preverb or the character vowel $e$.
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b. In the future tense, the suffix -a marks third person singular subjects, the suffix -an third person plural subjects.

c. In the aorist tense, the third person plural subject is marked by the suffix -en.

CLASS3:  

a. The future/aorist tenses are formed with the circumfix i–(eb).

b. In the future tense, the suffix -s marks third person singular subjects, the suffix -en third person plural subjects.

c. In the aorist tense, the third person plural subject is marked by the suffix -es.

CLASS4:  

a. The future/aorist tenses are formed with the character vowel e–.

b. In the future tense, the suffix -a marks third person singular subjects, the suffix -en third person plural subjects.

c. In the aorist tense, the third person plural final subject is marked as a singular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future/Aorist</th>
<th>S3SG(Future)</th>
<th>S3PL(Future)</th>
<th>S3PL(Aorist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>preverb</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>preverb/e–</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>i– -eb</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>e–</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.13: Harris’ verb classes.

The classification of verbs is formal (see also Table 2.13 summarizing the criteria) and not semantic. For instance, although Class 1 includes mainly transitives (Example 2.5.1), it also includes unergatives (Example 2.5.2). Similarly, although Class 2 mainly includes unaccusatives like 2.5.3, it also includes a few deponent verbs like i–gin–eb–a in 4.4.24a and even transitives (Example 2.5.4):

2.5.1. Example.

a. (is) (mas) ga-∅-a-šr-ob-s.  
3SG.NOM 3SG.DAT PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-dry-TS-3ANOM.SG  
“(S)he will dry it (off/out).”

b. (is) (mas) ča-∅-a-kr-ob-s.  
3SG.NOM 3SG.DAT PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-put.light.out-TS-3ANOM.SG  
“(S)he will put it (light) out.”

34The deponent verbs have thematic structure similar to unergatives. More on deponent verb in Georgian see [Sha73, Tui02].
2.5.2. Example.

a. (is) 3SG.NOM PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-yawn-TS-3A NOM.SG
   “(S)he will yawn.”

b. (is) 3SG.NOM PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-cough-TS-3A NOM.SG
   “(S)he will cough.”

2.5.3. Example.

a. (is) 3SG.NOM PV-melt-TS-3A NOM.SG
   “It will melt.”

b. (is) 3SG.NOM PV-go.out-TS-3A NOM.SG
   “It (light) will go out.”

2.5.4. Example.

(is) (mas) 3SG.DAT fairy.tale-DAT PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-tell-TS-3A NOM.SG
   “(S)he will tell him/her a fairy tale.”

There is another classification of verbs into transitive ([Hew95b, p. 217-276]), intransitive ([Hew95b, p. 276-338]), medial ([Hew95b, p. 339-363]), indirect ([Hew95b, p. 364-392]) and stative verbs ([Hew95b, p. 393-406]) given by [Hew95b].

Although the names of the verb classes seem to suggest that they divide verbs into semantic classes, it can be seen that some formal criteria are also taken into account, for instance the case marking of arguments. For instance, the transitive verb class includes verbs taking a direct object together with a subject and marking their subject by ERG in the Aorist. However, the same class contains also such verbs as migneba “to locate” marking its subject by ERG but taking an indirect object instead of a direct object (see 2.5.5 taken from [Hew95b, p. 217-218]):

36Like unergative verbs (see Footnote 18 in Chapter 2), the Set B agreement prefix ∅- in the deponent verb da-∅-a-mtknar-eb-s (2.5.2a) has no corresponding cognate object which could trigger the marker. However, if the pseudo direct object phrase bevr-s “much-DAT” is used, it will behave just like an ordinary direct object of transitives with regard to case marking. Note that the form amo-∅-a-xvel-eb-s does indeed have a possible cognate object, for instance, sisxl-s “blood-DAT” (2.5.2b).

36The fact that the object is indirect can be shown by putting the verb in different other screes where the head of the phrase bude- keeps getting marked by DAT, which is typical for indirect objects (cf. 2.5.5 vs. (i)).

i. Present Indicative, TAM Series I
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### 2.5.5. Example.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mela-m } & \text{či-t-is } \text{bude-s } \text{mi-∅-a-gn-o.} \\
\text{fox-ERG } & \text{bird-GEN } \text{nest-DAT PV-3B\text{DAT.SG-PRV-locate-3A\text{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC}}} \\
\text{“The fox located the bird’s nest.”}
\end{align*}
\]

Based on formal criteria the class of transitive verbs also includes unergatives like \text{mo-∅-šard-a} in 2.5.6, which take an ERG subject. However, note that the unergative verb does not take any direct or indirect object at all. As [Hew95b, p. 217] notes, such verb forms must have been associated historically with a direct object (like šardi/pseli “urine” in the case of 2.5.6) which over time was dropped because of its predictability: \[37\]

### 2.5.6. Example.

\[
\begin{align*}
bavšv-ma & \text{mo-∅-šard-a.} \\
baby-ERG PV-3B\text{NOM.SG-urinate-3A\text{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC}} \\
\text{“The baby urinated.”}
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, according to the classification given in [Hew95b] “transitive” does not always mean “more-than-one-argument-verb” just as “intransitive” does not always mean one-argument verb. The intransitives include both one-argument (2.5.7a) and two-argument verbs (2.5.7b):

### 2.5.7. Example.

a. \text{ŋac-i } \text{brma-v-d-eb-a.} \\
\text{man-NOM blind-EC-INTR-TS-3\text{NOM.SG}} \\
\text{“The man is getting blind”; “The man is loosing sight.”}

b. \text{tal-eb-i } \text{m-i-brma-v-d-eb-a.} \\
\text{eye-PL-NOM 1B\text{DAT.SG-PRV-blind-EC-INTR-TS-3\text{NOM.SG}}} \\
\text{Lit.: eyes it.is.getting.blind.to.me} \[38\] \\
\text{“I am loosing my sight.”}

\[
\begin{align*}
mela-∅ & \text{či-t-is } \text{bude-s } \text{∅-a-gn-eb-s.} \\
\text{fox-NOM } & \text{bird-GEN } \text{nest-DAT PV-3B\text{DAT.SG-PRV-locate-3A\text{NOM.SG}}} \\
\text{“The fox locates the bird’s nest.”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[37\] Note that TAM Series III clearly illustrates the marker for the cognate object of unergatives (see the Set A agreement suffix -s for the cognate object in (i) below as well as Footnote 18 in Chapter 2). However, semantically 1-argument unergatives synchronically are no more associated with a direct object.

i. Perfect, TAM Series III

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{len } & \text{mo-g-i-šard-av-s.} \\
2\text{SG.DAT PV-2B\text{DAT.SG-PRV-urinate-TS-3\text{NOM.SG}}} \\
\text{“You have urinated.”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[38\] Non-animate plural nouns trigger singular agreement as illustrated by Example 2.5.7b.
The medial verb class by [Hew95b] includes verbs depicting movement, light and noise (the so-called “expressives”) ([Hew95b, p. 339]) and weather verbs. Most of these verbs never appear with a direct object (2.5.8a) and in weather verbs it is sometimes problematic to identify even its single argument, although the formal argument marker is present on the verb form (2.5.8b). 39

2.5.8. Example.

a.  kac-i 040-qvir-i-s.
   man-NOM shout-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “The man is shouting.”

b.  pasanaur-ši qovel cel-s tov-s.
   Pasanauri-in every year-DAT snow-3ANOM.SG
   “It snows every year in Pasanauri.”

The class includes also 2-argument unergatives like in (2.5.9b), which are derived from 1-argument unergative verbs (2.5.9a):

2.5.9. Example.

   child-NOM 3BDAT.SG-play-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “The child is playing.”

b.  Bavšv-i 0-tamaš-ob-s damalobana-s.
   child-NOM 3BDAT.SG-play-TS-3ANOM.SG hide.and.seek-DAT
   “The child is playing hide-and-seek.”

39Weather verbs usually do not take any argument, but still have a Set A agreement marker in a form which functionally equals to the impersonal pronouns in European languages, like it in English It rains or es in German Es schneit. Note that in Georgian it is ungrammatical to have a (pro)nominal triggering the Set A agreement marker present overtly with a weather verb (see (i)). However, in poetry, one may occasionally find the cognate object for weather verbs as a subject argument (see (ii)). In literature, one might find even first or second person forms for weather verbs. For instance, there is a song called me gavtovdebi “I will start snowing” performed by Nino Katamadze (downloadable from http://ramaz.swmed.edu/Music/Georgian/K.shtml):

i.  (*is) 3SG.NOM snow-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG
   “It snowed.”

ii. (From [Leb87, p. 295])
mteli -ame tov-i tov-d-a.
whole night snow-NOM snow-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG
Lit.: Whole night snow snowed
   “It snowed the whole night.”

40Note that [Hew95b] does not give the 0- prefix as an agreement marker triggered by a cognate object in unergatives. See Footnote 18 in Chapter 2.

41See Footnote 40 by Example 2.5.8a.
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This means that the class of medial verbs too includes verbs taking different number of arguments.

The indirect verb class includes the verb forms of which the logical subject gets DAT marking and triggers the Set B agreement marker on the verb while the logical object gets NOM and triggers the Set A agreement marker (see 2.5.10a, 2.5.10b):

**2.5.10. Example.**

a. šen pexpert-i zalian g-i-qvar-s.

2SG.DAT football-NOM very.much 2B_{DAT}.SG-PRV-love-3_{NOM}.SG

“You love football very much.”

b. me otx-i tv-is lekv-i m-q-av-s

1SG.DAT four-NOM month-GEN puppy-NOM 1B_{DAT}.SG-have-TS-3_{NOM}.SG

saxl-ši.
house-in

“I have a four-month old puppy at home.”

However, according to these criteria, the TAM Series III forms of the transitive verbs, having the DAT marked subject and triggering the Set B agreement marker (see $da-∅-u$-mal-av-s in 2.5.11a), will also fall into the class of indirect verbs. Note that the Aorist Indicative (TAM Series II) verb form $da-∅-mal-a$ (2.5.11b) falls in the transitive verb class by having the ERG marked subject argument triggering a Set A agreement affix and the NOM marked direct object argument triggering a set B agreement marker in the Aorist Indicative (2.5.11b). The same way, the Present Indicative (TAM Series I) verb form $∅$-mal-av-s (2.5.11c) also falls in the transitive verb class by having the NOM marked subject argument triggering the Set A agreement marker and the DAT marked direct object argument triggering a Set B agreement marker in the Present Indicative (2.5.11c):

**2.5.11. Example.**

a. elene-s ana-s tojina-∅ bališ-is kveš

Elene-DAT Ana-GEN doll-NOM pillow-GEN underneath
da-∅-u-mal-av-s.
Pv-3B_{DAT}.SG-PRV-hide-TS-3_{NOM}.SG

“Elene has hidden Ana’s doll under the pillow.”

b. elene-m ana-s tojina-∅ bališ-is kveš

Elene-ERG Ana-GEN doll-NOM pillow-GEN underneath
da-∅-mal-a.
Pv-3B_{NOM}.SG-hide-3A_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC

“Elene hid Ana’s doll under the pillow.”
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c. elene-∅ ana-s tojina-s bališ-is kveš
   Elene-NOM Ana-GEN doll-DAT pillow-GEN underneath
   ∅-mal-av-s.
3B_DAT.SG-hide-TS-3A NOM.SG
   “Elene is hiding Ana’s doll under the pillow.”

Therefore, in [Hew95b] the verb classes are designed in such a way that they obey some formal (morphological and syntactic) constraints, such as having a certain case and agreement marker in certain TAM paradigms. However, semantic/thematic characteristics might not be shared by the verbs within one class in the classification. As is illustrated above, as a result the verbs of different thematic composition either fall into the same class or the same verb falls in different classes when put in different TAM paradigms (see 2.5.11a vs. 2.5.11b, 2.5.11a vs. 2.5.11c).42

Thus, the classifications suggested by [Har81] and [Hew95b] group verbs that share common semantic parameters. However, since the main criteria for the classes are formal, they contain few formally homogeneous but thematically different verbs. Or, as in the case of [Hew95b], the same verb in different TAM paradigms may even fall in different verb classes according to the formal criteria.

2.5.3 The Verbs Relevant for Anaphoric Binding in Georgian

Since reflexives, reflexivization and binding from the inside will be looked at in this dissertation, it is necessary to consider reciprocals as well. It is known that in some languages reflexivization and reciprocity are associated with detransitivization. For instance, to express a reciprocal relation in Russian, either a transitive verb43 has to take a reciprocal pronoun as an object argument (2.5.12b vs. 2.5.12a) or the verb has to be marked by a detransitivizing suffix -s’/-sja (cf. 2.5.12c vs. 2.5.12d):

2.5.12. Example. (Russian detransitivizing reciprocal suffix -s’/-sja)
   a. my vstretili druz-ej.
      we. NOM met friends-ACC
      “We met friends.”
   b. my vstretili drug drug-a.
      we. NOM met each other-ACC
      “We met each other.”
   c. my vstretili-s’.
      we. NOM met-s’ja
      “We met each other.”

42 The last class of stative verbs which make a small group will not be discussed ([Hew95b, p. 396-406] lists 71 such verbs in all). In the above, the four verb classes are enough to make clear that the classification is based on formal rather than on purely semantic/thematic criteria.

43 That the verb form vstretil in 2.5.12b is transitive can be checked by comparing 2.5.12a vs. 2.5.12b.
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d. *my vstretili-s’ drugrug-a.  
   we.NOM met-sja each.other-ACC  
   “We met each other.”

In Georgian, neither reciprocity nor reflexivization is associated with detransitivization and the least number of arguments taken by a verb form, in order to express either reflexivity or reciprocity, has to be more than one. Thus, it is necessary to consider more-than-1-argument verbs. The huge number of verbs corresponding to 1-argument unergatives, 1-argument unaccusatives, 1-argument passives and 1-argument weather verbs, will simply be irrelevant, and are therefore left out of the discussion.

However, verb forms other than those having more than one agreement marker should be considered as well. As the examples 2.5.6 or 2.5.13 illustrate, a verb form may be marked by both Set A and Set B agreement affixes, but in fact take only one argument. Such verb forms, with more than one agreement affixes but actually taking one argument will not be considered either.

2.5.13. Example.

a. (me) m-civ-a.  
   1SG.DAT 1B_DAT.SG-cold-3A_NOM.SG  
   “I feel cold.” (cf. German Mir ist kalt.)

b. (šen) g-zin-av-s.  
   2SG.DAT 2B_DAT.SG-sleep-TS-3A_NOM.SG  
   “You are sleeping.”

The fact that agreement affixes are not to be taken very seriously when choosing more-than-1-argument verbs also becomes clear from the examples 2.2.3, 2.2.4 where there is the only agreement affix, but the verb form takes two arguments. Based only on formal criteria (such as the number of agreement affixes on the verb form) this would falsely exclude such verbs from more-than-1-argument verbs. The criterium when choosing the “right” verb, thus, has to be the number of arguments taken, rather than the number of the agreement affixes triggered by them.

The classifications of verbs offered by [Har81] and [Hew95b], based on morphological criteria may be confusing, because accepting those, verbs allowing reflexivization in all the classes described might occur. The criteria on which the classifications of verbs in [Har81] and [Hew95b] are based do not give a clear-cut division between

---

44Although Georgian has a verbal reflexive marker, the prefix i- (to be discussed in Subsection 4.4.2), which is involved also in intransitive verbs like unaccusatives, unergatives and deponent verbs as well as in synthetic passives (Subsection 4.4.3), taken alone does not make a reflexive interpretation of a predicate possible. The verb forms marked by the prefix, obligatorily require the involvement of a nominal reflexive, which typically occupies an object position and selects the subject co-argument as an antecedent (see the examples 3.5.16, 3.5.18, 3.5.20, 3.5.22). Thus, even the verbs forms marked by the reflexive prefix i- have to take at least 2 arguments in order to get a reflexive interpretation.
the verbs involved in reflexivization and reciprocity and those which are not. What is needed for looking inside the reflexive as well as inside of reciprocal binding, is a division of the verbs into one-argument and more-than-one-argument verbs without considering the case and agreement marking patterns.

2.5.4 Conclusion

Section 2.5 dealt with the verb classes suitable for the reflexive and reciprocal binding in Georgian. Subsection 2.5.2 offered an overview of the verb classes by [Har81] and [Hew95b]. Both classifications are based on different morphological and/or syntactic criteria, while the thematic composition of a verb is less relevant there. In Subsection 2.5.3 it was claimed that reflexives and reciprocals in Georgian can be realized overtly as an argument only of those verbs which take more than one argument. Thus, the classification of verbs that is needed for the reflexive/reciprocal binding in Georgian has to be thematic/semantic rather than morphological and/or syntactic.

2.6 Summary

Chapter 2 dealt with some issues of Georgian morphosyntax that are important for the discussion to come on the anaphoric binding in Georgian (see Chapters 3–7). After having presented a plan of the chapter in Section 2.1, the issue of agreement marking in Georgian was discussed in Section 2.2, which does not strictly show a subject vs. object dichotomy but is dependent on such factors as the TAM Series, volition of the subject argument and verb class. Section 2.3 dealt with the TAM Series and paradigms that were later helpful when looking through the case and agreement marking patterns in Georgian in Section 2.4. It was argued in Section 2.4 that Georgian is more accurately analyzed as a language having a split between the nominative and the active alignment according to the case and agreement marking, rather than as ergative or “split-ergative”. In Section 2.5 there was an attempt to find out whether the classifications in the literature of verbs into verb classes might prove to be helpful when looking into the verbs involved in reflexive and reciprocal binding. The classifications of verbs in [Har81] and [Hew95b] were presented, which are based mostly on formal criteria (while displaying an overlap as far as the thematic structure of verbs is concerned). It was argued that these classifications (or any possible other classifications focusing on formal but non-thematic characteristics of verbs) will not lead to a straightforward grouping into verbs that are involved in reflexive and reciprocal binding and verbs which are not. Instead, there will be a focus on verbs taking more than one argument, irrespective of the formal characteristics, rather than following any of the formal classifications and having to deal with some large or small portions of verbs from each class there.

In Section 2.6 Chapter 2 is summarized and the focus is moved to the topic of Chapter 3, which is the first of the rest of the chapters which are all concerned with the syntax of reflexives and reciprocals in Georgian.
Chapter 3

Binding Issues in Georgian

3.1 Introduction

The goal of Chapter 3 is to introduce the problems of binding in Georgian to the reader, and to outline the characteristics of reflexives and reciprocals. Section 3.2 gives a brief overview of the literature on Georgian reflexives and reciprocals. Section 3.3 deals with some basic concepts of the Government and Binding (GB) Theory according to which Georgian reflexives and reciprocals will be evaluated in the remaining sections in this chapter. In Section 3.4 the Georgian complex reflexive phrase consisting of a nominal head (grammaticalized body-part noun tav- “head”) preceded by a nominal specifier (possessive pronoun) is considered. Section 3.5 deals with another reflexivization strategy—the simple reflexive pronoun tav- which is diachronically related but, as argued in this dissertation, synchronically distinct from the POSS+tav-. Section 3.6 is concerned with Georgian reciprocals. Section 3.7 contains a summary of the chapter.

3.2 Literature on Georgian Reflexives and Reciprocals

Specialist literature on Georgian reflexives and reciprocals produced by Georgian scholars is mostly concerned with their morphological form and diachronic origin. For instance, the largest investigation of the pronominal system of Georgian (and that of the other Kartvelian languages and the dialects) by [Mar64a] is solely devoted to the form and the origin of various classes of pronouns, among which are also reflexive possessive pronouns, reflexive pronouns and reciprocals.1 [Sha73, p. 42-43] believes the reflexive tav- to belong to the personal pronouns. However, [Sha73], to distinguish tav- from other personal pronouns, calls the "personal pronoun" tav- a reflexive too (ukukeviti in the terminology of [Sha73]).2 In the Syntax of Modern Georgian [Kva96] various

---

1In the preface to [Mar64a] the author notes that it is unfortunate that two additional chapters on the syntax of pronouns and word formation have been removed in the printing process because of the economy of place.

2This view on the tav- being a personal pronoun seems to be shared by other Georgian linguists. For instance, [Sar97] also includes reflexive pronouns among personal pronouns. This perspective on
issues are discussed, among them types of sentences (simple vs. complex, affirmative vs. interrogative vs. negative), parts of speech, functions of cases. However, anaphoric dependencies or reference maintenance are not among those issues.

However, there are studies concerning the syntax of reflexives and reflexivization in Georgian. The 1973 dissertation by Braithwaite [Bra73] uses the concept of tav-ization, the operation which turns indirect and direct object into a phrase with a grammaticalized body-part tav- “head” as its head. Since the very phrase appears not only in reflexive, but also in other contexts (for instance, in object camouflage cases, see Section 5.2). [Bra73] avoids calling (i) the use of tav- a reflexivization strategy, and (ii) the operation involving the application of tav- a reflexivization process.

[Har81], a study in relational grammar, discusses reflexivization involving pronominal tav- and possessive pronominal tavis- as its determiner. The pronominal reflexive tav- is argued to be coreferent with the subject of its clause and thus, to serve as a test for subjecthood. The singular and plural reflexive possessive pronouns tavis- and taviant- can be coreferent with any argument of the verb (whether it is subject, indirect object or direct object) but not with postpositional phrases. In relational terms, this means that reflexive possessives serve as a test for termhood.

[Har81] talks about tav-reflexivization ([Har81, pp. 23-27]), while bringing examples with the pronominal tav- preceded by a determiner, a possessive pronoun (i.e., tavis- tav-). However, this dissertation will distinguish between the two strategies—(i) tav- pronominal preceded by a determiner, a possessive pronoun (i.e., the POSS+tav-reflexivization strategy) and (ii) the tav- pronominal alone, without a determiner, but with the obligatory presence of the verbal reflexive marker i- in the verb form. It will be argued that, although diachronically related, the two strategies are principally different (see Subsection 3.5.2 as well as subsections 4.3.2, 4.3.3 within the Reinhart and Reuland Reflexivity Theory [RR93]).

The most recent paper [Apr03] also continues the Georgian tradition by calling tav- a personal pronoun. Additionally, [Apr03] calls tavis- and taviant- possessive reflexives. However, it would be more precise to qualify them as reflexive possessives

---
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---

Georgian reflexives as personal pronouns must be motivated by the cases in which the phrase headed by tav- does not serve as a reflexive but as a 3rd person phrase, namely in object camouflage cases (see Section 5.2). The term object camouflage from [Har81] is used for cases when a 3-argument verb takes either a 1st or a 2nd person theme argument. Since any 3-argument verb form in Georgian is by default coded for a 3rd person theme argument, the 1st and 2nd person theme argument cannot properly agree with the verb. In order to overcome this, 1st or 2nd person theme arguments are camouflaged into 3rd person phrases via a phrase headed by a grammaticalized body-part noun tav- “head” preceded by a determiner, a possessive pronoun (that is the phrase formally identical to the complex reflexivization strategy, namely, the POSS+tav- phrase). The possessive makes reference to the person of the theme argument (of the 1st/2nd person) and the head of the phrase tav- functions as a 3rd person strategy making the whole phrase a 3rd person phrase. Thus, by the head tav-, determined by a possessor of the 1st or 2nd person, theme arguments of 3-argument verbs are camouflaged into 3rd person phrases in order to properly agree with the 3-argument verb form (by the default form associated exclusively with the 3rd person theme argument).

3The term tav-ization is used also in [Asa82] after [Bra73].
rather than as possessive reflexives. The reason for this is that both tavis- and taviant-
are possessives just like the 1st person singular and plural possessive pronouns čem-,
čeven-, 2nd person singular and plural possessive pronouns šen-, tkven- and 3rd person
singular and plural possessive pronouns mis-, mat- (Example 3.4.37). The difference
between the 3rd person singular mis-, plural mat- and the 3rd person singular tavis- and
plural taviant- is that the former are simple possessives while the latter are reflexive
possessives (see Subsection 3.4.5).

[Apr03] considers the root tav-, on which both the “personal reflexive” tav- and
“possessive reflexive” tavis-, taviant- are based, to be borrowed from a noun tav-i
“head”. Literature on grammaticalization in general and the works on grammatical-
ization of body-part nouns in particular (see [Mor72, Hei97, Mat99, Sch99, Hei99,
KS00b, Kön01] among others) have successfully shown that languages never borrow
any element from one construction and take it into another. It is rather the case that
the use of the element gets extended into other construction(s). The root tav- came to
be used in different constructions, not because it was borrowed from the lexeme tav-i
“head”, but because the lexeme became delexicalized and consequently grammatical-
ized and suitable for being used in those constructions.

Since the simple tav- often participates in idioms where it is difficult to speak of
canonical reflexivity (that is, binding between the subject and the object), [Apr03]
prefers to discuss the reflexive phrase with the tav- as a head and with a modifier, a
possessive pronoun. It is claimed in [Apr03] that “the word tav-i alone is not enough
to express reflexivity.” However, contrary to [Apr03], it will be argued in this disserta-
tion that the simple tav- indeed is a reflexivization strategy. It is diachronically related
[AL02] but synchronically distinct from the POSS+tav- reflexivization strategy (see
Subsection 3.5.2 as well as the subsections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3).

Furthermore, [Apr03] claims that the tav- never occurs as a subject. The present
dissertation will also show that indeed the simple tav- strategy can never appear as a
subject with a reflexive reading but only with its original body-part reading (Example
4.3.22a, 4.3.22b). However, in this dissertation, it will be argued that the POSS+tav-
reflexivization strategy can indeed appear as a subject argument of verbs (Chapter 7).
Georgian is not unique in having a reflexivization strategy marked by ergative as a
subject argument, since there are languages both in the areal (for instance, Dargwa
[Kib97], Bagwalal [Lju99b]) and beyond it (for instance, Basque [Art03], Modern
Greek [Ana99], Hungarian [Kis87], Nepali [BY00]) which show subject uses of reflexives as well.

3.3 Binding Conditions of the Government and Binding Theory

Binding Theory (BT) is one of the modules of the Government and Binding (GB) model
of grammar given in [Cho81, Cho82, Cho86]. Binding Theory is concerned with in-
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interpretive dependencies between nominal expressions and offers a set of grammatical principles to explain these relations.

The main three grammatical principles, *binding conditions*, as presented in [Cho81] are the following:

**Condition A.** An anaphor is bound in its Governing Category.
**Condition B.** A pronominal is free in its Governing Category.
**Condition C.** An R-expression is free.

Thus, within the Binding Theory, nominal expressions fall in either of these three categories: *anaphors, pronominals* and *referential expressions* (R-expressions).4

Condition C will be discussed first. When an element is *free*, it means that its interpretation does not depend on anything else. For instance, the R-expression *John* in 3.3.1 selects a particular referent from the discourse and is not dependent on any other nominal expression(s) for its interpretation. Specifically, *John* cannot depend on *He*, or in terms of Condition C, *John* cannot be bound by *He*. In this sense, the R-expressions are free.

**3.3.1. Example.**

He hoped that John could finish the chapter.

Anaphors are NPs that have no capacity for “inherent reference” [Cho81]. Reflexives and reciprocals fall into this category, since they have no reference of their own and are exclusively dependent on the interpretation of their antecedents.

Pronominals may depend on an antecedent, but it is not necessary for their interpretation. Pronominals possess the phi-features: gender, number and person and they may also have a case.

Since some types of reflexives may also share the same phi-features and case, it is non-trivial to distinguish all anaphors and pronominals in terms of their inherent features. Establishing such a distinction will not be attempted here (but see [Reu] for a proposal). For current purposes it suffices to distinguish the two classes of NPs on the basis of the main crucial point—their distribution. The interpretation of both anaphors and pronominals is dependent on their antecedent in the following way: the antecedent of an anaphor has to be within a certain local domain (its governing category, as defined below) while the antecedent of a pronominal has to be outside this local domain. For instance, while the anaphor *himself* must be bound by the subject NP *John* in 3.3.2a, the pronominal *him* cannot be bound by the subject *John* in 3.3.2b as it can only have an antecedent outside this clause.

**3.3.2. Example.**

a. John saw himself in the mirror.

---

4R-expressions are fully referential expressions, that is, not pronouns or anaphors.
b. John saw him in the mirror.

The distributional properties of anaphors and pronominals are captured by the Condition A and Condition B of the Binding Theory. More formal definitions of the terms *bound* and *free* (or more precisely *A-bound* and *A-free*) are given here:

### 3.3.3. DEFINITION.

\[ \alpha \text{ is A-bound by } \beta \text{ iff } \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are coindexed, } \beta \text{-commands } \alpha \text{ (and } \beta \text{ is in an A-position).} \]

\[ \alpha \text{ is A-free iff it is not A-bound.} \]

In order to understand the definitions it is necessary to know what it means to be coindexed, what is a c-command and what is an A-position.

Two elements are said to be coindexed if they share the same index. The coindexed elements have to match in features. For instance, the two nominal expressions such as *John* and *himself* are coindexed in 3.3.2a. The coindexed antecedent *John* determines the reference of the anaphor *himself* and the features such as gender, number and person are shared by anaphor and antecedent (cf. the grammatical sentence in 3.3.2a to the ungrammatical sentences in 3.3.4a,b,c where the constraint on matching the grammatical features is not met).

### 3.3.4. EXAMPLE.

a. *John, saw herself, in the mirror.

b. *John, saw themselves, in the mirror.

c. *John, saw myself, in the mirror.

An A-position, in contrast to A′-position, is a potential theta or Case position. It is the position to which a theta-role can be assigned, that is the argument position. For instance, *He* and *John* both occupy an A-position in 3.3.1. As for the anaphor *Himself* in 3.3.5, it does occupy a non-argument, thus, an A′-position:

### 3.3.5. EXAMPLE.

Himself, John, had always hated.

C-command or constituent-command is a structural relation between constituents. According to [Rei76], \( \beta \) c-commands \( \alpha \) iff the first branching node dominating \( \beta \) dominates \( \alpha \). According to this definition, in the tree in Figure 3.1, \( \beta \) c-commands \( \alpha \)

\[ 5 \text{There is another definition of c-command by [AS83]: } \beta \text{-commands } \alpha \text{ iff every maximal projection that dominates } \beta \text{ also dominates } \alpha. \]

"Dominates" means "comes above" in the tree reflecting the structural relations between the elements. And "immediately dominates" means "comes immediately above" in the tree. For instance, \( \gamma \) dominates everything in the tree in Figure 3.1—\( \beta, \delta, \zeta, \epsilon \) and \( \alpha \). \( \delta \) dominates \( \epsilon \) and \( \alpha \) but does not dominate \( \zeta \). \( \beta \) dominates \( \epsilon \) but does not dominate any of the other nodes in the tree. Nodes dominated by the same element are said to be "sisters". Examples of such sister nodes are, thus, \( \beta \) and \( \delta \) as well as \( \epsilon \) and \( \alpha \).
because the first branching node dominating $\beta$, which is $\gamma$, dominates $\alpha$. Furthermore, according to the definition, $\beta$ c-commands everything below the node $\gamma$.\footnote{Note however that a node does not c-command itself or material it dominates, but rather c-commands its sister node and everything the sister node dominates. Thus, in the tree in Figure 3.1 the node $\beta$ c-commands everything but itself and the node $\zeta$ dominated by $\beta$.} Namely, $\beta$ c-commands $\delta$ and $\epsilon$ as well because the first branching node dominating $\beta$, which is $\gamma$, also dominates $\delta$ and $\epsilon$. The $\delta$ itself can c-command $\beta$ and the node dominated by $\beta$, namely $\zeta$, because the first branching node dominating $\delta$, which is $\gamma$, also dominates $\beta$ and $\zeta$. However, none of the $\alpha$ or $\epsilon$ can c-command $\beta$ because the first branching node dominating $\alpha$ and $\epsilon$, which is $\delta$, does not dominate $\beta$. Similarly, $\zeta$ is unable to c-command $\epsilon$, $\alpha$ or $\delta$ because the first branching node dominating $\zeta$, which is $\beta$, does not dominate $\epsilon$, $\alpha$ or $\delta$.\footnote{Under the definition of c-command by [Rei76], sister nodes c-command each other. Whichever is chosen among the sister nodes, the first branching node dominating that sister node dominates also the other sister node.}

Assuming that the structure of the transitive verbs have a direct object as an internal argument of the VP, the verb phrase, while the subject as an external argument and the specifier of the IP, the inflectional phrase, in the example (3.3.1) the NP John is c-commanding the NP the chapter (Figure 3.2) but not the other way around.

In binding, the notion of c-command is crucial. For an anaphor to satisfy condition A it means that it is not only c-commanded by an antecedent but the structural relation has to hold in a certain domain, a governing category.

The examples like 3.3.6 and 3.3.7b suggest that in English, such local domain has to be a clause. In these cases, reflexives and reciprocals have to be bound in a sufficiently local domain, by a clause-mate constituent. For instance, the reflexive himself in 3.3.2a is bound by the NP John, because the former is c-commanded by the latter and the two nominal expressions are coindexed. If an anaphor and its antecedent are not clause-mates this often results in ungrammaticality (that is, the reflexive in the lower clause bound by an antecedent in the higher clause (Example 3.3.6)):

3.3.6. Example.

John, thinks that Peter saw himself in the mirror.
As for the pronominals, their antecedent has to be non-local. For instance, the pronounal *him if bound by a local binder is ungrammatical as can be seen in 3.3.7a and 3.3.7b:

3.3.7. **Example.**

a. *John$_i$ saw him$_i$ in the mirror.

b. John$_i$ thinks that Peter$_j$ saw him$_i/$_j in the mirror.

However, other examples like 3.3.8, show clearly that the binding domain is not merely the clause containing the anaphor. The minimal clause [himself$_i$, to be clever] in 3.3.8, which is an infinitival clause, contains just the anaphor himself. If the minimal clause is to be the governing category, according to Condition A, the anaphor has to be bound in the minimal clause included in the square brackets in 3.3.8. However, in that minimal clause the anaphor is not bound, and even though it is free, the whole sentence is still grammatical.

3.3.8. **Example.** (From [Cho95, p. 101])

John$_i$ believes [himself$_i$, to be clever].

This kind of evidence brings up the question as to what is a binding domain for English anaphors. Examples such as 3.3.8 illustrate that the reflexive should be governed and case-marked from outside the minimal clause, namely by the verb believe.
Such examples allow an extension of the notion of binding domain by allowing governors\(^8\) of anaphors to be included in such a domain. By making such an extension the binding domain in 3.3.8 will include the governor of the anaphor, which is the verb \textit{believe}. And within the extended binding domain, the anaphor is bound by the subject of the clause containing the governor, that is the NP \textit{John}.

Some other pieces of evidence like the one in 3.3.9 illustrating the reflexive bound by the subject of the NP suggests that subjects should also be allowed to determine the domain in which a reflexive can be bound.\(^9\)

3.3.9. Example.

Mary believes [NP John, \text{’}s characterization of himself,].

Let the agreement properties (\textit{AGR}) of the subject of finite clauses be referred to as \textit{SUBJECT}. The data above illustrated the importance of having subjects (or in pro-drop languages the corresponding agreement of finite clauses, \textit{AGR}) determine a binding domain. Following from this, the domain otherwise called a governing category will be defined formally as follows:

The governing category for \(\alpha\) is the minimal domain containing \(\alpha\), \(\alpha\)’s governor and an accessible\(^10\) subject/\textit{SUBJECT}.

Under \(\alpha\), in the definition of governing category, both anaphors and pronominals can be implied. Both for anaphors and pronominals the governing category is the minimal domain containing them, their governor and a subject/\textit{SUBJECT} accessible to them. The difference between anaphors and pronominals however, is that the former have to be bound in that domain (Condition A) while the latter must be free there (Condition B).

In the following sections, (3.4, 3.5 and 3.6) it will be shown that correspondingly the Georgian complex reflexive phrase POSS+\textit{tav}-, the simple reflexive \textit{tav}- and the reciprocals \textit{ertmanet}- and \textit{ertimeore}- are anaphors in the sense that they must be locally bound.

---

\(^8\)Governors are the lexical heads (A, N, V, P) and tensed I. One of the formal definitions of \textit{government} is as follows:

\(X\) governs \(Y\) iff

(i) \(X\) is either of the category A, N, V, P, I;

or

(ii) \(X\) c-commands \(Y\);

(iii) no barrier (i.e., a maximal projection) intervenes between \(X\) and \(Y\);

(iv) there is no \(Z\) such that \(Z\) satisfies (i), (ii), (iii) and \(X\) c-commands \(Z\).

\(^9\)The NP in the [Spec, NP] is considered to be the subject of an NP in 3.3.9, analogously to the subject NPs of a clause occupying the specifier of the IP position (i.e., [Spec, IP]).

\(^10\)In order for a subject/\textit{SUBJECT} to be accessible for an anaphor the co-indexation of the two should not violate any grammatical principles [Cho81].
3.4 The Complex Reflexive Phrase POSS+tav-

3.4.1 Introduction

Section 3.4 considers the Georgian complex reflexive phrase consisting of a nominal head (grammaticalized body-part noun tav- “head”) preceded by a nominal specifier (possessive pronoun), henceforth, POSS+tav-. The following subsections deal with different issues concerning the complex reflexive POSS+tav-: Subsection 3.4.2 discusses the locality issue; Subsection 3.4.3 illustrates the partial lack of the influence of the word order on binding; Subsection 3.4.4 examines Georgian data through a few tests for identifying relations between arguments, like asymmetric c-command between the subject and direct object, or between the indirect and direct objects; Section 3.4.5 discusses the determiner of the complex reflexive phrase, which can be represented by simple possessive pronouns, complex possessive pronouns or the possessive sakutar- “own”; Subsection 3.4.6 offers examples of the complex reflexive POSS+tav- itself serving as a determiner; In Subsection 3.4.7 conclusions will be drawn.

3.4.2 Domain and C-Command

As was mentioned before, Georgian uses a complex reflexive phrase with a nominal head preceded by a nominal specifier (abbreviated as POSS+tav-). The head represents a grammaticalized body-part noun for “head” while the specifier is a possessive pronoun. The literal translation of the phrase POSS+tav- is “one’s head”. However, since it does not have the meaning of a body-part in reflexive constructions anymore (see [Sha73, Har81] among others) it will be referred to as self in glosses whenever necessary.

Example 3.4.1a illustrates the reflexive phrase tav-s in the lower clause, which cannot be bound by an antecedent in the matrix clause mam-iko-s. Thus, similar to English, the Georgian anaphoric POSS+tav- in an A-position must be bound in its governing category:

3.4.1. EXAMPLE.

a. mam-iko-si, ū-xar-i,a, rom ana-∅j
   father-DIM-DAT 3B_DAT-SG-PRV-be.glad-3ANOM-SG that Ana-NOM
   [tavis ^11 tav-s]i,j kargad ū-u-vl-i,-s.
   3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT well 3B_DAT-SG-PRV-take.care-3ANOM-SG
   Lit.: Daddy he.is.glad.of.it that Ana self’s self well she.takes.care.of.him/her
   “Daddy is glad that Ana takes care of herself/*him well.”

^11 Throughout this dissertation the determiner of the reflexive phrase, tavis, in dative is always given as a bare stem. The DAT case marker -s is lost because of the final consonant of the stem. However, in other cases the marker for the determiner is always present, like in (i). The marker on the determiner is present even in DAT with the obligatory presence of a cliticized focus particle to the determiner like in (ii):
b. ilia, pikrobs, rom gia-s sjera, ḷaxa-s surs, bakar-is

Ilia.NOM he.thinks that Gia-DAT he.believes Kakha-DAT he.wants Bakar-GEN
zma-m akos [tav-is-i tav-i]s/sj/sk/sl/m.
brother-ERG he.praises.SUBJ him's-NOM self-NOM

“Ilia, thinks that Gia believes [that] Kakha wants [that] Bakar’s brother praises
him-self_s/sj/sk/sl/m."

The same applies to 3.4.1b, where the reflexive phrase tav-i tav-i in the lower
clause can have only the local, clause-mate antecedent zma-m but no other theoreti-
cally possible noun phrases (such as kaxa-s, gia-s, ilia) from the upper clauses. Thus,
the reflexive phrase in Georgian can not function as a long distance anaphor [And86]
which is possible for the reflexive, for instance, in Icelandic (Example 3.4.2):

3.4.2. EXAMPLE. (Icelandic, from [Thr76])

Jóni segir að María elska SIGi.
John says that Maria loves. SUBJ self

“John says that Maria loves him.”

The fact that the specifier bakar-is of the NP bakar-is zma-m is unable to serve as
an antecedent for the reflexive phrase tav-i tav-i in 3.4.1b illustrates that Georgian
reflexives require not only a clause-mate, but also a c-commanding antecedent.12

It is well-known that English himself can have a logophoric use (Example 3.4.3):

3.4.3. EXAMPLE. (Examples of logophors from [KS97, p. 100])
a. On behalf of myself and USAir, we would like to thank you (...) b. Anyone but yourself would have noticed the change. c. There are groups for people like yourself.

i. ana-m ə-a-k-o
tavis-i/ *tavis
Ana-ERG 3B1 NOM.SG-PRV-praise-3AERG.SG. AOR.INDIC 3REFL. POSS.SG 3REFL. POSS.SG
tav-i.
self-NOM

“Ana praised herself.”

ii. ana-∅
tavis-s-a-v/ *tavis-s-a-v/ *tavis-v 
tavis-ve 
tav-s
0-a-ke-b-s.
3B1 DAT.SG-PRV-praise-TS-3A NOM.SG

“Ana praises herself.”

12For the definitions of c-command by [Rei76] and [AS83] see Section 3.3 and Footnote 5 given there.
In structural terms, zma-m in 3.4.1b c-commands the anaphor tav-i tav-i but bakar-is, which is a speci-
 fier, does not c-command the anaphor; therefore, only the first can be the antecedent of the anaphor.
As is illustrated in Example 3.4.4 the Georgian complex anaphor cannot be used logophorically:

**3.4.4. Example.**

a. *[ჭემ-ი ოს-ი] და რექტორ-ი საქსე-ი*

1POSS,SG-NOM self-GEN and head.of.a.university-GEN name-INST

“On behalf of myself and the head of the university visit the university printing house.”

b. *[შე-ი ოს-ი] გარდა ნებისმიერ-ი*

2POSS,SG-NOM self-GEN except anybody-NOM

“Anyone but yourself will notice the president’s ignorance and being politically cross eyed.”

c. *[შე-ი ოს-ი] მსგავს-ი ხალქ-ისთხი დიქტატორ-ს ყოველთვის*

2POSS,SG-NOM self-GEN alike-NOM people-GEN-EV-for dictator-DAT always

“For people like yourself there can always be searched a prison cell by the dictator.”

Therefore, the Georgian reflexive phrase must be bound in a local domain by a c-commanding antecedent and can never be used as a long-distance anaphor (3.4.1) or in logophoric contexts (3.4.4).

### 3.4.3 Binding and Word Order

Movement of an NP within a clause is referred to as scrambling [Mah90]. Georgian shows different possible orderings of constituents within a clause. There is a question for the 2nd person imperative Georgian uses the Aorist Indicative form (3.4.4a) while for the 1st and 3rd person imperative the subjunctive forms are used. See Footnote 8 in Chapter 2.

On free word order and scrambling see also [Sai85, Miy97, SF98, BT98] among others.

In the literature Georgian is often referred to as a SOV language with free word order. There has not been conducted extensive research on the modern spoken (or even written (literary or media)) language of the last two decades (except some prescriptive studies). However, one of the most extensive studies of word order available, [Apr86], based on the literary prose of the second half of the XIX century up.
whether the reorderings illustrate A-movement (or in other words a movement to an A-position) or A'-movement (i.e., a movement to an A'-position).

For some languages, scrambling is considered to be an A'-movement because in those languages it does not have an effect on binding relations. For instance in Albanian, a binding relation between a quantifier and a pronoun holds both with and without a scrambled object over the subject (cf. 3.4.5a vs. 3.4.5b):

3.4.5. EXAMPLE. (From [Mas92] cited in [McG99b])

a. Secili djalê [i kujtohet baba i tij].
   each boy.DAT CL remembers father his.NOM
   “Each boy remembers his father.”

b. [baba i tij] [i kujtohet [Secili djalê [t]].
   father his.NOM CL remembers each boy.DAT
   “Each boy remembers his father.”

However, in other languages scrambling is A-movement, since there it has effect on binding relations. For instance in Korean, in the unscrambled structure, a wh-object is not able to bind a pronoun embedded in the subject. However, when there is a scrambling of the object over the subject, the binding relation between the arguments holds (cf. 3.4.6a vs. 3.4.6b):

3.4.6. EXAMPLE. (From [FLR96] cited in [McG99b])

a. *[pro chinkwu]-ka [nwukwu-lul paypanhaiss-ni]?
   friend-NOM who-ACC betrayed-Q
   “Who did his friend betray?”

As for 2-argument verbs, the SVO order is used (rather than SOV, as in [Nas95]) because it seems to be neutral. Similar to 3-argument verbs, the ones with 2 arguments, other than SVO, also get a contrastive focus reading for the constituent placed in pre-verbal position. Free word order will not be further explored here. Some changes have occurred since the last 50–60 years, both in morphology and syntax of Georgian (see for instance, [Ami04b] and [AG05]) and the results of the statistical research on highly conservative literary language of the 1850’s–1980’s reported in [Apr86] might prove to be different from today’s spoken as well as the written language.
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b. nwukwu-lul [pro chinkwu]-ka [t paypanhaiss-ni]?
   who-ACC friend-NOM betrayed-Q
   “Who did his friend betray?”

As argued by [McG99a], like Korean, Georgian is also a language illustrating A-scrambling. The unscrambled object nino-s in 3.4.7a cannot bind a possessive anaphor tavis- embedded in the subject. Note, however that the scrambled object in 3.4.7b can do so:

3.4.7. EXAMPLE. (From [McG99a])

a. *tavis-i Nino-ERG deida-∅ nino-s 3REFL.POSS.GNOM aunt-NOM 3BDAT.SG-draw-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “Her aunt is drawing Nino,”

b. nino-s tavis-i deida-∅ nino-3REFL.POSS.GNOM 3BDAT.SG-draw-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “Her aunt is drawing Nino,”

[McG04] puts forward an example of an A-scrambled direct object over an indirect one in a double-object construction. As [McG04] argues, in Georgian, the direct object bavšv-i in 3.4.8a cannot bind a reflexive possessor tavis- embedded in the indirect object, unless it A-scrambles above the indirect object, as in 3.4.8b:

3.4.8. EXAMPLE. (From [McG04])

a. *nino-m [tavis deda-s] bavšv-i
   Nino-ERG 3REFL.POSS.GNOM aunt-DAT child-NOM
   3BDAT.SG-PRV-see-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Nino showed the child to its mother.”

b. nino-m bavšv-i [tavis deda-s]
   Nino-ERG child-NOM 3REFL.POSS.GNOM aunt-DAT
   3BDAT.SG-PRV-see-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Nino showed the child to its mother.”

An example of an A-scrambled indirect object over a subject is given below. Although in Georgian the unscrambled object gela-s in 3.4.9a cannot bind the anaphoric possessive tavis-ma embedded in subject, the scrambled object in 3.4.9b can do so. Thus, scrambling in Georgian does create new binding relations and could therefore qualify as A-scrambling:

3.4.9. EXAMPLE.
a. *tavis-ma₃, da-m gela-s_i cēril-i
   3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG sister-ERG Gela-DAT letter-NOM
   mi-s-cer-a.
   PV-3B_DAT:SG-write-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Gela₃’s sister wrote him₃ a letter.”

b. gela-s_i tavis-ma₃, da-m cēril-i
   Gela-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG sister-ERG letter-NOM
   mi-s-cer-a.
   PV-3B_DAT:SG-write-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Gela₃’s sister wrote him₃ a letter.”

This is true when the anaphoric possessive tavis- is embedded in an argument NP (3.4.9a vs. 3.4.9b). However, the complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav- shows no change in binding relations with various reorderings of constituents, except the difference in contrastive focus reading characteristic to the scrambled version (see 3.4.10b). Whether there is an unscrambled direct object (3.4.10a) or a scrambled one (3.4.10b), the result is grammatical, unless the reflexive ends up in subject position (cf. 3.4.11a vs. 3.4.11b). Note that the scrambling of the direct object in 3.4.11b does not create a new binding relation and the sentence is as ungrammatical as the unscrambled one in 3.4.11a. What the examples 3.4.10 and 3.4.11 illustrate is that it is the nominative, i.e. the subject argument which can serve as an antecedent for a reflexive, but not the dative, i.e. the direct object argument.¹⁶

3.4.10. EXAMPLE. (Present Indicative, TAM Series I)

a. kać-i₃, ³∅-a-k-eb-s
   “The man praises himself.”

b. [tavis ³tav-s_i] ³∅-a-k-eb-s kać-i₃,
   “The man praises HIMSELF.”

3.4.11. EXAMPLE. (Present Indicative, TAM Series I)

a. *[tavis-i ³tav-i₃] ³∅-a-k-eb-s
   “The man praises himself.”

b. *kać-s_i ³∅-a-k-eb-s [tavis-i ³tav-i₃],
   “The man praises himself.”

¹⁶Certain verbs and verb readings in Georgian do allow reflexives and reciprocals in subject function. The phenomenon of having anaphors in subject function in Georgian as well as in some other languages is discussed in Chapter 7.
Even if the case marking of arguments is different depending on a TAM Series, verb class or volition, the reflexive is a direct object having a subject argument as an antecedent for 2-argument verbs. For instance, in the Aorist Indicative, transitive verbs take an ERG subject and a NOM direct object. Irrespective of what the order of the arguments in a sentence is, it is only the nominative argument, i.e., the direct object, that can be realized as a reflexive. Furthermore, and it is the ergative, i.e., the subject argument, which can serve as an antecedent for a reflexive (cf. 3.4.12a vs. 3.4.13a, 3.4.12b vs. 3.4.13b).

3.4.12. Example. (Aorist Indicative (or Simple Past), TAM Series II)

a. ḵač-ma₃, 0-a-k-o [tavis-i
man-ERG 3B NOM-SG-PRV-praise-3A ERG-SG.AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM
tav-i₃],
self-NOM
“The man praised himself.”
b. [tavis-i tav-i₃], 0-a-k-o
3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM 3B NOM-SG-PRV-praise-3A ERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
kač-ma₃,
man-ERG
“The man praised HIMSELF.”

3.4.13. Example. (Aorist Indicative (or Simple Past), TAM Series II)

a. *[tavis-ma₃ tav-ma₃], 0-a-k-o
3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG 3B NOM-SG-PRV-praise-3A ERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
kač-i₃,
man-NOM
“The man praised himself.”
b. *[kač-i₃ 0-a-k-o [tavis-ma₃
man-NOM 3B NOM-SG-PRV-praise-3A ERG-SG.AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG
tav-ma₃],
self-ERG
“The man praised himself.”

As is illustrated by the subject experiencer verbs and non-volitional readings of transitive verbs as well, the object argument can be realized as a reflexive, but the

---

17 For the role of the TAM characteristics, verb class and volition for the case as well as for the agreement marking in Georgian see Subsection 2.4.2.
18 As was already mentioned, certain verbs and verb readings or certain special contexts in Georgian allow reflexives and reciprocals in subject function. See Chapter 7.
19 In Georgian the subject experiencer verbs and transitive verbs on a non-volitional reading take a DAT subject and the NOM object in any of the three TAM Series (cf. 3.4.14a vs. 3.4.10a, 3.4.16a vs. 3.4.10a).
subject argument cannot (cf. 3.4.14a vs. 3.4.15a, 3.4.14b vs. 3.4.15b, 3.4.16a vs. 3.4.17a, 3.4.16b vs. 3.4.17b):

3.4.14. EXAMPLE. (Present Indicative, TAM Series I)

a. me, m-zul-s [čem-i tav-i],
1SG.DAT 1BDAT.SG-hate-3ANOM.SG 1POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
“I hate myself.”

b. [čem-i tav-i]i m-zul-s me,.
1POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM 1BDAT.SG-hate-3ANOM.SG 1SG.DAT
“I hate MYSELF.”

3.4.15. EXAMPLE. (Present Indicative, TAM Series I)

a. *[čem-s tav-s]i, v-zul-var me,.
1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT 1ANOM.SG-hate-COP1(=CLNOM.SG) 1SG.NOM
“I hate myself.”

b. *me, v-zul-var [čem-s tav-s]i.,
1SG.NOM 1ANOM.SG-hate-COP1(=CLNOM.SG) 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT
“I hate myself.”

3.4.16. EXAMPLE. (Aorist Indicative (or Simple Past), TAM Series II)

a. me, šemo-m-e-lanzγ-a [čem-i
1SG.DAT PV-1BDAT.SG-PRV-hate-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC 1POSS.SG-NOM
mez-i],
self-NOM
“I cursed myself unintentionally.”

b. [čem-i tav-i]i šemo-m-e-lanzγ-a
1POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM PV-1BDAT.SG-PRV-hate-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
me,.
1SG.DAT
“I cursed MYSELF.”

3.4.17. EXAMPLE. (Aorist Indicative (or Simple Past), TAM Series II)

a. *[čem-s tav-s]i šemo-v-e-lanzγ-e me,.
1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT PV-1ANOM.SG-PRV-hate-AOR.INDIC 1SG.NOM
“I cursed myself unintentionally.”

b. *me, šemo-v-e-lanzγ-e [čem-s tav-s]i.
1SG.NOM PV-1ANOM.SG-PRV-hate-AOR.INDIC 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT
“I cursed myself unintentionally.”
Note that the binding relations in the examples above are not disrupted either, considering the 3 argument verbs, which show all kinds of reorderings for their constituents. This means that the scrambling in 3-argument verbs, just like in 2-argument verbs, is an instance of A’-scrambling. As the 3-argument structures below also illustrate, pre-movement hierarchical relations are preserved. For instance, in 3-argument structures an indirect object cannot be bound by a direct object irrespective of what the order of the arguments is. Whether the direct object follows the indirect object (3.4.18a, 3.4.19a, 3.4.20a, 3.4.21a) or precedes it (3.4.18b, 3.4.19b, 3.4.20b, 3.4.21b), an indirect object can never be given as a reflexive phrase bound by a direct object, this can only be done by a subject. Thus, if the reflexive phrase is an indirect object, it can never select a lower argument, like the direct object as an antecedent, but only a higher one, like the subject argument. This illustrates the asymmetry between the indirect and direct object arguments, with the indirect object being hierarchically higher.

3.4.18. Example.

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. me \text{ bakar-s_i \[tavis-i \ tavi-i, \text{3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM } \gamma-v-u-\text{-cer-e.} \text{PV-1ERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC} 
  \text{Lit.: I to.Bakar himself described} 
  \text{“I described Bakar to himself.”} 
  \item b. me \text{ [tavis-i \ tavi-i], \text{baker-s_i,} \text{3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM } \gamma-v-u-\text{-cer-e.} \text{PV-1ERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC} 
  \text{Lit.: I himself to.Bakar described} 
  \text{“I described Bakar to himself, (not, for instance, Gela to himself.)”} 
\end{itemize}

3.4.19. Example.

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. *me \text{ [tavis \ tavi-s], \text{bakar-i,} \text{3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM } \gamma-v-u-\text{-cer-e.} \text{PV-1ERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC} 
  \text{Lit.: I to.himself Bakar described} 
  \text{“I described Bakar to himself.”} 
  \item b. *me \text{ bakar-i, \text{[tavis \ tavi-s],} \text{3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT } \gamma-v-u-\text{-cer-e.} \text{PV-1ERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC} 
\end{itemize}
3.4.20. EXAMPLE.

a. giorgi-mi bakar-sj [tavis-tav-i]i/sj
   Giorgi-ERG Bakar-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
dα-∅-u-xat-a.
Pv-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AErg.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi for.Bakar himself drew/painted
   “Giorgi, drew/painted himself for Bakar.)”

b. giorgi-mi [tavis-tav-i]i/sj bakar-sj
   Giorgi-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM Bakar-DAT
dα-∅-u-xat-a.
Pv-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AErg.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi for.Bakar himself drew/painted
   “Giorgi, drew/painted himself for BAKAR.)”

3.4.21. EXAMPLE.

a. giorgi-mi [tavis tav-s]i/sj bakar-i j
   Giorgi-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
dα-∅-u-xat-a.
Pv-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AErg.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi for.himself Bakar drew/painted
   “Giorgi, drew/painted Bakar for himself.)”

b. giorgi-mi bakar-i j [tavis tav-s]i/sj
   Giorgi-ERG Bakar-NOM 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT
dα-∅-u-xat-a.
Pv-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AErg.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi Bakar for.himself drew/painted
   “Giorgi, drew/painted Bakar for HIMSELF.)”

Notice that in case all the three arguments of a 3-argument verb are 3rd person
and there can be a binding relation between any two of the three arguments, Georgian
differentiates between binding between the subject and direct object on the one hand,
and binding between the object arguments on the other hand. If there is a binding
between the subject and a direct object, the reflexive phrase has a 3rd person reflexive
possessive tavis- as a determiner (Example 3.4.20a), while in the binding between the
objects, a simple possessive mis- acts as a determiner (3.4.22a):
3.4.22. EXAMPLE.

a. giorgi-mi bakar-sj [mis-i tav-i]s_i//j
   Giorgi-ERG Bakar-DAT 3POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
dα-∅-u-xat-a.
Pv-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi for.Bakar himself drew/painted
   “Giorgi, drew/painted Bakar, for him_{s_i//j}.”

b. giorgi-mi [mis-i tav-i]s_i//j bakar-sj
   Giorgi-ERG 3POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM Bakar-DAT
dα-∅-u-xat-a.
Pv-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi himself for.Bakar drew/painted
   “Giorgi, drew/painted Bakar, for HIM_{s_i//j}.”

If it is taken into account that normally, word order changes do not affect the grammaticality of sentences (cf. for instance, 3.4.18a vs. 3.4.18b, 3.4.20a vs. 3.4.20b, 3.4.21a vs. 3.4.21b), then, in cases with the simple possessive mis- as a determiner of the reflexive phrase, the order of object arguments with preceding direct object is bad (Example 3.4.22a). If there is a binding relation between the object arguments as is the case in 3.4.22a, it cannot be maintained when the direct object gets scrambled over the indirect object (3.4.22b). Thus, the direct object anaphor mis- tav- in 3.4.22a, which is coindexed exclusively with the indirect object, cannot maintain the binding relation when it is scrambled over the indirect object in 3.4.22b. Thus, the scrambling cannot be qualified as A’-movement in this case but it should be categorized as A-movement.

The sentences in 3.4.18a vs. 3.4.19a, 3.4.18b vs. 3.4.19b, 3.4.20a vs. 3.4.21a, 3.4.20b vs. 3.4.21b suggest that, irrespective of the word order of arguments, the reflexive phrase takes a higher syntactic constituent than the reflexive phrase itself as its antecedent. Thus, whether or not the anaphoric phrase is allowed does not depend on the linear order, but on the hierarchy between the arguments. The indirect object reflexive is not c-commanded by the direct object, irrespective of the order of the constituents. Therefore, the indirect object cannot be bound by the direct object.

20The sentence in 3.4.22b is grammatical only under a body-part reading (see (i) below) and even that is only possible when the possessor of the body-part is distinct from the referent of both the subject and the object arguments:

i. giorgi-mi [mis-i tavs_i//k] bakar-sj
   Giorgi-ERG 3POSS.SG-NOM head-NOM Bakar-DAT
dα-∅-u-xat-a.
Pv-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi his head for.Bakar drew/painted
   “Giorgi, drew/painted his_{s_i//k} head for BAKAR_j.”
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It is important to note that there is nothing wrong with the indirect object position itself. A reflexive phrase in the indirect object position is perfectly grammatical when it is co-indexed with the subject of the verb (see the examples 3.4.21, 3.4.23).

3.4.23. Example.

a. giorgi-mi [tavis tav-s]i/sj bakar-i j
   Giorgi-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
   aγ-∅-u-çer-a.
   PV-3B_DAT,SG-PRV-describe-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   Lit.: Giorgi to.himself Bakar described
   “Giorgii described Bakarj to himselfi/sj.”

b. giorgi-mi bakar-i j [tavis tav-s]i/sj
   Giorgi-ERG Bakar-NOM 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT
   aγ-∅-u-çer-a.
   PV-3B_DAT,SG-PRV-describe-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   Lit.: Giorgi Bakar to.himself described
   “Giorgi described Bakarj to himselfi/sj.”

Binding relations do not depend on case morphology either. Although the case of the reflexive phrase in 3.4.21b and 3.4.23b is the same as in 3.4.24 (namely, DAT), Example 3.4.24 is grammatical, while the sentences in 3.4.21b and 3.4.23b are ungrammatical when the object arguments are co-indexed. Obviously, it is not the case marking of the reflexives that causes their ungrammaticality but their position. The antecedent for the reflexive in 3.4.21b and 3.4.23b is the direct object that gives rise to the Principle A violation. As for the antecedent for the reflexive in 3.4.24, it occupies a higher position than the reflexive itself and therefore it does not cause a violation:

3.4.24. Example.

   bakar-i j [tavis tav-s]i
   Bakar-NOM 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT
   da-∅-akvir-d-a sarkë-ši.
   PV-3B_DAT,SG-PRV-observe-INTR-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC mirror-in
   Lit.: Bakar.NOM [self’s self].DAT observed in the mirror
   “Bakar observed himself in the mirror.”

Thus, it was shown that in most cases, binding relations are unaffected by either case morphology (being dependent on the tense, aspect, mood, verb class and volition (Subsection 2.4.2)) or word order. The facts presented in this section, illustrate that binding is sensitive to the hierarchy between constituents.

In the next subsection it will be discussed whether Georgian shows subject vs. object asymmetry using a number of tests, such as quantifier variable binding, weak crossover, Principle C effects and superiority effects.
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3.4.4 S/O Asymmetries
A Short Introduction

The tests that were used originally to determine a c-command relation between the goal and the theme in English [BL86], can be put forward here, in order to identify the relation between the subject and object. However, such tests as the Each... the other construction and negative polarity items cannot be used for Georgian, since in reciprocals both the distributor and the reciprocator are encoded as one word (see Subsection 3.6.2) and the conditions on polarity are different for English and Georgian.

Although the Anaphors/Reciprocals test seems reliable and universal, it does not work in the case of Georgian. Although it is suggested in Example 3.4.1 that the asymmetric c-command relation between the subject and the object in Georgian, with a large number of verbs (object experiencer verbs, non-agentive reading of transitive verbs and agentive transitive verbs in specific contexts) forms that are morphologically identical to anaphors, can appear both as a subject and as an object (see Chapter 7).

Below, tests such as quantifier variable binding, weak cross-over effects, superiority effects and principle C effects will be considered.

Quantifier-Variable Binding

It is well-known that a pronoun can be interpreted as a variable that is bound by a quantificational expression, if the expression c-commands the pronoun [Rei76]. For instance, the pronoun tavis-i in 3.4.25a is c-commanded and gets co-valued by the quantificational expression qvela bavšv-s. Thus, the pronoun qualifies as a bound variable:

3.4.25. Example.

a. qvela bavšv-s-i  ∅-u-qvar-s  tavis-i  
   every child-DAT 3B_{DAT,SUJ-PRV-NOM,SG} 3REFL.POSS,SG-NOM
   deda-∅.
   mother-NOM
   “Every child loves his/her mother.”

b. *tavis-s  deda-s  ∅-u-qvar-s  qvela bavšv-i-s.
   3REFL.POSS,SG mother-DAT 3B_{DAT,SUJ-PRV-NOM,SG} every child-NOM
   “His/her mother loves every child.”

Note that in Georgian, just like in English, it is ungrammatical to interpret pronoun as a variable in the specifier position of the subject argument (3.4.25b).\(^{21}\)

\(^{21}\)Note that the reflexive possessive tavis- interpreted as a variable is unable to occupy the specifier position of the subject argument (3.4.25b), whether the co-indexed element is a quantifier or not. For instance, the examples with the demonstrative pronouns as a determiner (cf. (i) vs. (ii)) illustrate the same
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The ungrammatical 3.4.25b and the grammatical 3.4.25a illustrate that the c-command condition on variable binding holds in Georgian and that the subject asymmetrically c-commands the direct object.

**Weak Cross-Overlap Effects**

According to [Rei76], “quantified NPs and Wh-traces can have anaphoric relations only with pronouns that they c-command”. These are referred to as *weak cross-over effects* (*WCO*).

As the examples 3.4.26a vs. 3.4.26b and 3.4.27a vs. 3.4.27b illustrate, Georgian does not have Weak Cross-Overlap effects in Wh-phrases and therefore, it does not show S/O asymmetry:

**3.4.26. Example.**

a. romel-i mosçavle-∅, ∅-a-pas-eb-s
   which-NOM pupil-NOM 3B_DAT-SG-PRV-respect-TS-3A_NOM-SG 3REFL.POSS.SG
   masçavlebel-s?
   teacher-DAT
   “Which pupil respects his/her teacher?”

b. romel mosçavle-si ∅-a-pas-eb-s
   which pupil-DAT 3B_DAT-SG-PRV-respect-TS-3A_NOM-SG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM
   masçavlebel-i?
   teacher-NOM
   “*Which pupil does his teacher respect?*”

**3.4.27. Example.**

a. romel mşobel-si mi-∅-u-qva-e
   which parent-DAT PV-3B_DAT-SG-PRV-bring-AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM
   bavşv-i?
   child-NOM

   effects as the examples with a quantified expression (cf. 3.4.25a vs. 3.4.25b), thus, the S/O asymmetry:

   i. am/ mag/ im bavşv-si ∅-u-qvar-s
      PROX.DAT MED.DAT DIST.DAT child-DAT 3B_DAT-SG-PRV-love-3A_NOM-SG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM
      deda-∅.
      mother-NOM
      “This/that_MED/that_DIST child loves his/her mother.”

   ii. *tavis, deda-s ∅-u-qvar-s
       es/ eg/ is 3REFL.POSS.SG mother-DAT 3B_DAT-SG-PRV-love-3A_NOM-SG PROX.NOM MED.NOM DIST.NOM
       bavşv-i.
       child-DAT
       “His/her mother loves this/that_MED/that_DIST child.”
“Which parent did you bring his/her kid?”

b. romel-i bavšv-i mi-∅-u-qvan-e tavis-i
which-NOM child-NOM PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-bring-AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG
mšobel-s?
parent-DAT
“*Which kid did you bring his/hers parent?”

However, it should be noted that the direct object scrambled over the indirect one is ungrammatical (cf. 3.4.28a vs. 3.4.26a, 3.4.28b vs. 3.4.26b, 3.4.29a vs. 3.4.27a, 3.4.29b vs. 3.4.27b):

3.4.28. EXAMPLE.

a. *tavis-i mascavlebel-s romel-i moscavle-∅ₐ
3REFL.POSS.SG teacher-DAT which-NOM pupil-NOM
∅-a-pas-eb-s?
3B_DAT.SG-PRV-respect-3ANOM.SG
“Which pupil respects his/her teacher?”

b. *tavis-i mascavlebel-i romel moscavle-sₐ
3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM teacher-NOM which pupil-DAT
∅-a-pas-eb-s?
3B_DAT.SG-PRV-respect-3ANOM.SG
“*Which pupil does his teacher respect?”

3.4.29. EXAMPLE.

a. *tavis-i bavšv-i romel mšobel
3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM child-NOM which parent-DAT
mi-∅-u-qvan-e?
PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-bring-AOR.INDIC
“Which parent did you bring his/her kid?”

b. *tavis-i mšobel-s romel-i bavšv-i
3REFL.POSS.SG parent-DAT which-NOM child-NOM
mi-∅-u-qvan-e?
PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-bring-AOR.INDIC
“*Which kid did you bring his/her parent?”

Neither Example 3.4.29a nor Example 3.4.29b shows s/o asymmetry, because both sentences are ungrammatical. However, they illustrate that word order in Georgian is not as free as it may appear to be in some cases, and that scrambling within the clauses is qualified as A-movement rather than as A’-movement.
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Superiority Effects

Superiority is a condition for the application of transformations. Whenever a transformation can be applied to more than one constituent in the structure, in principle it should be applied to the one that is superior [Cho73].

In wh-questions, some languages show superiority effects in allowing only one constituent to be fronted, but not the other(s). For instance, a wh-phrase in English cannot be moved over wh-phrase that is c-commanding it, because the latter wh-question is 'superior' to the first (3.4.30):

3.4.30. Example.

a. Who saw what?
b. *What who saw?

The same effects are observed by [BL86] in double object constructions in which the dative is superior to the accusative, as only the dative can be fronted (cf. 3.4.31a vs. 3.4.31b):

3.4.31. Example. (Adopted from [BL86, p. 349], Example 11)

a. Who did you give which book?
b. *Which book did you give who?
c. Echo-reading
   Which book did you give who?

Georgian shows superiority effects with the direct object wh-movement across the subject (cf. 3.4.32a vs. 3.4.32b). Note that wh-movement across the subject becomes grammatical in echo-questions22 characterized by a raised intonation (3.4.32c) as opposed to “normal” questions having a stress on the question word vic and exhibiting a falling intonation in general (3.4.32a).

3.4.32. Example.

a. vin vic ∅-e-zeb-s?
   who.NOM who.DAT 3B.DAT.SG-PRV-look.for-3A.NOM.SG
   “Who is looking for whom?”
b. *vic vin ∅-e-zeb-s?
   who.DAT who.NOM 3B.DAT.SG-PRV-look.for-3A.NOM.SG
   “For whom is who looking for?”

22Note that the ungrammatical English sentence in 3.4.31b also becomes grammatical on the echo reading (3.4.31c).
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3.4.33. Example.

a. (šen) vis romel-i çıgn-i ga-∅-u-gzavn-e?
   2SG.ERG who.DAT which-NOM book-NOM PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-send-AOR.INDIC
   “Who did you send which book?”

b. *(šen) romel-i çıgn-i vis ga-∅-u-gzavn-e?
   2SG.ERG which-NOM book-NOM who.DAT PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-send-AOR.INDIC
   “*Which book did you send who?”

c. Echo-reading
   (šen) romel-i çıgn-i vis ga-∅-u-gzavn-e?
   2SG.ERG which-NOM book-NOM who.DAT PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-send-AOR.INDIC
   “*Which book did you send who?”

Because the examples 3.4.32c and 3.4.33c are grammatical only as echo-questions, 3.4.32a vs. 3.4.32b still show a subject-object asymmetry regarding superiority effects, just like 3.4.33a vs. 3.4.33b shows the asymmetry between the two objects.

**Principle C Effects**

According to Principle C, an R-expression has to be free (see Section 3.3 as well as [Cho81]). As is illustrated in 3.4.34a, Georgian shows Principle C effects when an R-expression is a direct object bound by an indirect object pronoun. The pronoun and the R-expression cannot be co-indexed in the construction with the scrambled direct object across the indirect object either (3.4.34b):

3.4.34. Example.

a. me mas elene-s satamašo-∅ mi-v-e-c-i.
   1SG.ERG 3SG.DAT Elene-GEN toy-NOM PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-give-AOR.INDIC
   “I gave her_{s1/j} Elene,’s toy.”

b. me elene-s satamašo-∅ mas mi-v-e-c-i.
   1SG.ERG Elene-GEN toy-NOM 3SG.DAT PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-give-AOR.INDIC
   “I gave Elene,’s toy to her_{s1/j}.”
The scrambled construction (3.4.34b) can become acceptable only if either the intensifier *tvit*/tviton/tavad is adjoined or a focus particle -ve is attached to the indirect object (some speakers also accept the presence of both the intensifier and the particle (Example 3.4.35):

3.4.35. Example.

```
me elene-si satamašo-∅ tvit/ tviton/ tavad mas_i-ve
1SG.ERG Elene-GEN toy-NOM INTENS INTENS INTENS 3SG.DAT-FOC
mi-v-ε-c-i.
PST-1ERG:SG-PRV-give-AOR.INDIC
```

“I gave Elene’s toy to her.”

However, neither the intensifier used as a determiner, nor the focus particle that is cliticized to the pronoun, can turn 3.4.34 into a grammatical sentence in 3.4.36:

3.4.36. Example.

```
*me tvit/ tviton/ tavad mas/ mas_i-ve elene-si
1SG.ERG INTENS INTENS INTENS 3SG.DAT 3SG.DAT-FOC Elene-GEN
satamašo-∅ mi-v-ε-c-i.
toy-NOM PST-1ERG:SG-PRV-give-AOR.INDIC
```

“I gave Elene’s toy to her.”

Therefore, Georgian shows Principle C effects and consequently it also shows the c-command relation between the subject and object.

A Short Summary

From the tests that were used in the above, Principle C, quantifier variable binding and superiority effects can directly identify the c-command relation between S and O, while WCO cannot.

The tests also show the role of the pragmatic factors that influence the lack of superiority effects in echo-questions (3.4.32c).

3.4.5 The Determiner of the Complex Reflexive Phrase POSS+tav-

A Short Introduction

The Georgian complex reflexive phrase headed by a grammaticalized body-part tav- “head” has a specifier which can be represented by various elements such as simple possessive pronouns (including simple reflexive possessives), complex possessive pronouns (including complex reflexive possessives), or by a possessive sakutar- “own”. Each of them will be considered separately in Subsection 3.4.5.
3.4. Simple Possessive Pronouns

Georgian distinguishes between simple and reflexive 3rd person possessives, while 1st and 2nd person possessives do not have a reflexive counterpart (3.4.37):

### 3.4.37. Example.

- **ˇcem-** 1POSS.SG “my”
- **šen-** 2POSS.SG “your”
- **mis-** 3POSS.SG “his/hers/its”
- **tavis-** 3REFL.POSS.SG “self’s”
- **ˇcven-** 1POSS.PL “our”
- **tkven-** 2POSS.PL “your”
- **mat-** 3POSS.PL “their”
- **taviant-** 3REFL.POSS.PL “selves”

As is shown in 3.4.38 and 3.4.39, each of the possessive pronouns can be used as a specifier of the head of a phrase. The case endings are simply added to the stems given in 3.4.37. Note that the same case-marked forms can be used as possessive nominalizations as well (see the examples 3.4.38 and 3.4.39):

### 3.4.38. Example.

#### a. ˇcem-i mego- bar-i movi da
   1POSS.SG-NOM friend-NOM PV-move-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC 1POSS.PL-at
   šen-i/ mis-i/ tkven-i/ mat-i — ara.
   2POSS.SG-NOM 3POSS.SG-NOM 2POSS.PL-NOM 3POSS.PL-NOM not
   “My friend came to us [but] not yours(SG)/his/hers/yours(PL)/theirs.”

#### b. šen-i/ mis-i/ tkven-i/ mat-i
   2POSS.SG-NOM 3POSS.SG-NOM 2POSS.PL-NOM 3POSS.PL-NOM
   tuta-∅ ga-qvav-d-a, ˇcem-i/
   mulberry.tree–NOM PV-blossom-INTR-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC 1POSS.SG-NOM
   čven-i ķi — ga-xm-a.
   1POSS.PL-NOM while PV-fade-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Your/his(her)/your/their mulberry tree blossomed while mine/ours faded.”

### 3.4.39. Example.

- **ana-s tavis-i sadardebel-i 0-a-kv-s** —
   Ana-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM worry-NOM 3BDAT.SG-PRV-have-3ANOM.SG
   rogor 0-i-pov-o-s (man) gadamul-i
   how 3BNOVG.SG-PRV-find-SUBJ-3AERG.SG 3SG.ERG hidden.away-NOM
   ˇso ko lad-i, elene-s-a-c — tavis-i: rogor
   chocolate-NOM Elene-DAT-EV-too 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM how
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The 3rd person singular reflexive possessive *tavis-* is historically a GEN form of *tav-* "head" (see 3.4.40a and also [Sha73, p. 115]) but the form *tavis-* is no more analysable as a case form of a body-part in the reflexive phrase, while it is so otherwise (3.4.40b):

3.4.40. EXAMPLE.

a. kac-ma ga-gv-a-cn-o
tav+is-i
man-ERG PV-2B_DAT.PL-PRV-introduce-3A_3ERG.PL.AOR.INDIC head+GEN-NOM
važ-i.
son-NOM

“The man introduced his son to us.”

b. tav-is têšv-ën-i
head-GEN ache-NOM

“Heade ache”

The plural reflexive possessive *taviant-* (Example 3.4.41) is also a grammaticalized form consisting of the root *tav-*, a possessive suffix *-ian* and a plural morpheme *-t*.

3.4.41. EXAMPLE.

momxsenebl-eb-ma, čeven tav+ian+t-i,
našrom-eb-i
speaker-PL-ERG IPL.DAT self+POSS+PL-NOM work-PL-NOM
ga-gv-a-cn-es.
PV-2B_DAT.PL-PRV-introduce-PV-3A_3ERG.PL.AOR.INDIC

“The speakers presented us their works.”

The 3rd person singular reflexive possessive pronoun *tavis-* and its plural counterpart *taviant-* are not available as a modifier of a subject. This is true not only for 1-argument (Example 3.4.42) but also for more-than-1-argument verbs (3.4.9a):

23The pronouns the verbs take are reconstructed in Example 3.4.39 in order to avoid confusion with agreement markers and the NPs triggering them. However, there is an important difference between the pro-dropped version of the sentence and the one with actual pronouns. If the absence of the pronouns refers exclusively to the persons mentioned in the very sentence (see the NP Anna with the verb form ∅-i-pov-o-s and the NP Elene with the verb form čar∅-e-ziar-o-s) the actual pronouns may also refer to someone else apart from the persons mentioned. This may lead to the idea that, perhaps agreement affixes should be considered to be pronominal arguments of the verb (à la Baker), while considering actual NPs to be adjuncts. However, the cases with under-represented agreement markers (see the examples 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 3.4.35) are a counter argument to such a view.
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3.4.42. Example.

gela-∅₁ sin da-rē-a. *tavis-i₄
Gela-NOM at.home PV-stay-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM
da-∅₂ tbilis-ši ça-vid-a.
sister-NOM Tbilisi-in PV-move-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
“Gela stayed at home. His sister went to Tbilisi.”

The ungrammatical example of the reflexive possessive tavis- as a specifier of the subject argument opposed to the grammatical example of the possessive as a specifier of the object argument illustrate the subject-object asymmetry (cf. 3.4.43a vs. 3.4.43b):

3.4.43. Example.

a. (Given under 3.4.9a)

*tavis-ma₄ da-m gela-s₁ çeril-i
3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG sister-ERG Gela-DAT letter-NOM
mī-s-cer-a.
PV-3BDAT.SG-write-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC

“Gela’s sister wrote him a letter.”

b. gela-m₄ tav-i₄ da-s çeril-i
Gela-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG sister-DAT letter-NOM
mī-s-cer-a.
PV-3BDATE.SG-write-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC

“Gela wrote a letter to his sister.”

The ungrammatical Example 3.4.42 and the examples 3.4.43a vs. 3.4.43b illustrate that the reflexive possessive tavis- requires a c-commanding antecedent.

The distribution of the 3rd person mis- vs. tavis- or mat- vs. taviant- is as follows: while the reflexive possessive tavis-taviant- requires a clause-mate antecedent (Example 3.4.44) the simple possessive mis-mat- never takes a clause-mate antecedent (Example 3.4.45):

3.4.44. Example.

levan-ma₄ ṭ-tkv-a, rom iraḳli-m₄ šaršan
Levan-ERG 3BNOM.SG-say-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC that Irakli-ERG last.year
a-∅₄-šen-a tav-i₄/ⱽ
PV-3BNOM.SG-PRV-build-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM
saxl-i.
house-NOM

“Levan, said that Irakliⱽ built hisⱽ house last year.”
3.4.45. **Example.**

Levan-ERG 3B_NOM:SG-say-3A_ERG:SG.AOR:INDIC that Irakli-ERG last.year
a-∅-a-šen-a mis-i_sj saxl-i.

“Levan_i said that Irakli_j built his_sj house last year.”

It is interesting to check 3-argument verbs in which *tavis-* has 2 potential antecedents and to find out which is the actual one suited for the reflexive possessive. According to [Har81, p. 28], which is a study within the relational grammar, “all and only terms can serve as antecedents of *tavis-*” which means that any non-postpositional phrase qualifies as an antecedent:

3.4.46. **Example.**

a. nino-∅_i 0-azl-ev-s  bavšv-sj tavis_i_sj
deda-s.
mother-DAT
1. “Nino_i is giving the child_sj to its_sj mother.”
2. “Nino_i is giving the child_sj to her_sj mother.”

b. gela-∅_i 021-saubr-ob-s  gia-s-tanj tavis_i_sj
cīgn-ze.
book-on
   “Gela_i is chatting with Gia_sj about his_sj book.”

The example 3.4.46b by [Har81] illustrates that the reflexive possessive *tavis-* cannot be bound by a PP *gia-s-tan*. However, even if the verb form is changed into a 2-argument intransitive ∅_s-saubs-eb-a that takes two non-PP arguments (3.4.47a), the indirect argument *gia-s* will still not be possible as an antecedent. As is illustrated in 3.4.47a, there is no binding relation between the reflexive possessive *tavis-* embedded in a PP and the indirect object *gia-s*. Note that the 3rd person non-reflexive possessive *mis-* is the one which may be coindexed with the indirect object in 3.4.47b:

3.4.47. **Example.**

a. gela-∅_i 0-saubs-eb-a  gia-sj tavis_i_sj cīgn-ze.
   “Gela_i is chatting with Gia_sj about his_sj book.”

24Note that [Har81] does not give the ∅_s prefix as an agreement marker triggered by a cognate object in unergatives. See Footnote 18 in Chapter 2.
3.4. The Complex Reflexive Phrase POSS+tav-

b. gela-∅, 0-e-saubr-eb-a gia-sj mis-sj çign-ze.
Gela-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-chat-TS-3A_NOM.SG Gia-DAT 3POSS.SG book-on
“Gela, is chatting with Gia, about his_sj book.”

It is not only impossible for a PP embedded tav- to be bound by a non-subject argument (3.4.47a) but it is also not possible for the one embedded in a direct object to be bound by an indirect object (cf. 3.4.48a vs. 3.4.48b, 3.4.49a vs. 3.4.49b, 3.4.50a vs. 3.4.50b):

3.4.48. Example.

a. gela-m, mezobel-sj, tavisi_sj çign-i
Gela-ERG neighbor-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG book-NOM
mi-s-c-a.
Pv-3B_DAT.SG-give-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
“Gela, gave a neighbor_i his_sj book.”

3.4.49. Example.

a. ana-m, elene-sj, tavisi_sj mezobel-i
Ana-ERG Elene-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG neighbor-NOM
da-∅-u-xat-a.
Pv-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-draw-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
“Ana, drew her_i his_sj neighbor for Elene_j.”

3.4.50. Example. (From [Ghv80])

a. giorgi-m, švil-sj, še-∅-a-kažm-v-in-a
Giorgi-ERG son-DAT PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-saddle-TS-CAUS-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
tavisi_sj cksen-i.
3REFL.POSS.SG horse-NOM
“Giorgi, made his son_sj saddle his_sj horse.”
b. giorgi-ERG shvil-DAT še-∅-a-kažm-v-in-a
   Giorgi-ERG son-DAT PV-3B-DAT SG-PRV-saddle-TS-CAUS-3AERG SG.AOR.INDIC
   mis-iša/ʃə xcen-i.
   3POSS SG-NOM horse-NOM
   “Giorgi made his son saddle his horse.”

Although [Kva80] argues that constituents other than subjects can serve as antecedents as well, the only type of example the author offers is a causative verb form mo-∅-a-tan-in-a “he made him bring it” (3.4.51). Since 3-argument verbs in 3.4.47a, 3.4.48a, 3.4.49a, 3.4.50a illustrate tavis- as an exclusively subject-oriented reflexive possessive, and since causatives can be analyzed as embedded structures, it could be argued that causatives illustrate the binding of tavis- both by the upper subject and by the embedded one (see 3.4.51).

3.4.51. EXAMPLE.

   nodar-ERG tavis-i/ʃə čanta-∅
   Nodar-ERG 3REFL.POSS SG-NOM bag-NOM
   mo-∅-a-tan-in-a tengiz-DAT.
   PV-3B-DAT SG-PRV-bring CAUS-3AERG SG.AOR.INDIC Tengiz-DAT
   “Nodar made Tengiz bring his bag.”

   Note that the verb form given by [Har81] in 3.4.46a is a non-causative one and there the tavis- is coindexed both with the subject and with the direct object. It seems possible that the interpretation in 3.4.46a1 in which the tavis- is bound by the indirect object, is forced by the use of the relational noun deda-s with the noun bavš-s “child”. Note that in Georgian the latter noun is often used as a synonym to svil- “son/daughter”, thus, as a relational noun. If the noun bavš-s is replaced by some other non-relational form, for instance, by a proper noun giorgi-s, it is impossible for the indirect object to bind the tavis- whether the direct object is unscrambled (3.4.52a) or scrambled over the indirect one (3.4.52b).25

3.4.52. EXAMPLE.

   a. nino-∅, ʃə-a-zl-ev-s tavis-i/ʃə deda-s
      Nino-NOM 3B-DAT SG-PRV-give TS-3ANOM SG 3REFL.POSS SG mother-DAT
      Giorgi-DAT

   25Note that the example in 3.4.46 by [Har81] illustrates the scrambled direct object over the indirect object. Observe the unscrambled direct object in (i) unable to bind tavis-:

   i. nino-∅, ʃə-a-zl-ev-s tavis-i/ʃə deda-s bavš-s/ʃə,
      Nino-NOM 3B-DAT SG-PRV-give TS-3ANOM SG 3REFL.POSS SG mother-DAT child-DAT
      “Nino is giving the child to its, mother.”
      “Nino is giving the child to her, mother.”
1. “*Nino, is giving Giorgi to his mother.”
2. “Nino, is giving Giorgi to her mother.”

b. nino-∅, ṭav-i/s j giorgi-s j
deda-s.

Thus, verbs do not allow a non-subject argument to bind the reflexive possessive ṭav-is sees 3.4.47a, 3.4.48a unless there is a phi-features conflict between the 3rd person singular ṭav-is and the subject argument (cf. 3.4.48a vs. 3.4.53a or 3.4.48a vs. 3.4.53b) or unless the binding by subject is constrained by some other semantic inconsistency, like real world knowledge in 3.4.54a (note that when real world knowledge does not constrain the coindexation of the ṭavis with the subject argument, the binding relation does still not hold (3.4.54b)):

3.4.53. Example.

a. mei mezobel-s j ṭav-i/s j cign-i
 1SG.ERG neighbor-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM book-NOM
  mi-v-e-c-i.
  PV-1ERG,SG-PRV-give-AOR.INDIC
  “I gave a neighbor his book.”

b. tkven(i1+...+i m) mezobel-s j ṭav-i/s j cign-i
 2PL.ERG neighbor-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM book-NOM
  mi-∅-e-c-i-t.
  PV-2ERG,SG-PRV-give-AOR.INDIC-PLERG
  “You gave a neighbor his book.”

3.4.54. Example.

a. mankana-∅, da-∅-e-jax-a erekle-s j
car-NOM PV-3BDAT,SG-PRV-hit-3ANOM,SG.AOR.INDIC Erekle-DAT
tavis-s j saxl-tan.
3REFL.POSS.SG house-at
  “The car, hit Erekle near his house.”

b. giorgi-∅, mankan-it da-∅-e-jax-a
Giorgi-NOM car-INST PV-3BDAT,SG-PRV-hit-3ANOM,SG.AOR.INDIC
erkle-s j tavis-s j saxl-tan.
Erekle-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG house-at
  “Giorgi, hit Erekle by car near his house.”
Therefore, the reflexive possessive \textit{tavis-} is unable to take any co-argument of its head other than the subject as an antecedent.

\textbf{Complex Plural Possessive Pronouns}

The paradigm in Example 3.4.55 illustrates the complex possessive pronouns in Georgian:

\textbf{3.4.55. Example.}
\begin{verbatim}
    čven-čven- 1PL-1POSS.PL “our”
tkven-tkven- 2PL-2POSS.PL “your”
tav-tavis- 3REFL-3REFL.POSS.SG “their own”
tav-taviant- 3REFL-3REFL.POSS.PL “their own”
\end{verbatim}

The examples in 3.4.56 illustrate the use of complex possessive pronouns as a specifier of the POSS+\textit{tav-} phrase in Georgian:

\textbf{3.4.56. Example.}
\begin{verbatim}
    a. čven čven-s tav-s
        1PL.NOM 1PL-1POSS.PL-DAT self-DAT
da-v-u-\textit{kvird-i-t.}
        PV-1\textsc{nom}.SG-PRV-pay.close.attention-AOR.INDIC-PL\textsc{nom}
    “*We (as a group) paid a close attention to ourselves.” (collective)”
    “We (as individuals, not as a group) paid a close attention to ourselves.” (distributive)
    b. tkven tkven-s tav-s
        2PL.NOM 2PL-2POSS.PL-DAT self-DAT
da-∅-u-\textit{kvird-i-t.}
        PV-2\textsc{nom}.SG-PRV-pay.close.attention-AOR.INDIC-PL\textsc{nom}
    “*You (as a group) paid a close attention to yourselves.” (collective)”
    “You (as individuals, not as a group) paid a close attention to yourselves.” (distributive)
    c. isini tav-tav+ian+t tav-s
        3PL.NOM self-self+POSS+PL self-DAT
da-∅-u-\textit{kvird-nen.}
        PV-3\textsc{dat}.SG-PRV-pay.close.attention-3\textsc{nom}.PL-AOR.INDIC
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{Although it is tempting to call the forms in Example 3.4.55 as well as in the examples 3.4.59c and 3.4.59d, the reduplicated forms (like it is done, for instance, in [Sha73]) such a view will be argued against. In other words, there will be an argument against considering \textit{those} forms as being derived via reduplication [Ami02] and the term \textit{complex possessives} (rather than \textit{reduplicated possessives}) will be used when they are referred to.}
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“*They (as a group) paid a close attention to themselves.” (collective)

“They (as individuals, not as a group) paid a close attention to themselves.” (distributive)

Simple plural possessive pronouns such as ľven-, tkven-, mat-, taviant- (Example 3.4.37) can have both collective (3.4.57a) and distributive readings (3.4.57b):

3.4.57. EXAMPLE.

mat gada-0-çv-es tav+ian+t-i
3PL.ERG PV-3B NOM-SG-burn-3A ERG. AOR. INDIC self+POSS+PL NOM saxl-eb-i.
house-PL-NOM
Lit.: They burned their own houses
a. “They (as a group) burned their own houses.” (collective)
b. “They (as individuals, not as a group) burned their own houses.” (distributive)

Therefore, plural possessive reflexives are ambiguous between collective and distributive readings and given a particular context they can refer to either of them (Example 3.4.57). However, the complex plural possessive pronouns in 3.4.55 are non-ambiguously distributive and never give a collective reading (see the examples 3.4.56, 3.4.58):

3.4.58. EXAMPLE.

mat gada-0-çv-es tav-tav+is-i/
3PL.ERG PV-3B NOM-SG-burn-3A ERG. AOR. INDIC self-self+GEN NOM tav-tav+ian+t-i saxl-eb-i.
self-self+POSS+PL NOM house-PL NOM
Lit.: They burned their own houses
a. “*They (as a group) burned their own houses.” (collective)
b. “They (as individuals, not as a group) burned their own houses.” (distributive)

When the examples 3.4.58 and 3.4.57 are compared, it can be seen that the only difference is in the possessive pronouns. In Example 3.4.57, the 3rd person plural reflexive possessive taviant- is used, while in Example 3.4.58 the complex form tav-tavis/ tav-taviant- occurs (both can be used here interchangeably without any semantic or stylistic difference). Example 3.4.59 shows the 3rd person reflexive possessive forms:
3.4.59. Example.

a. tav+is-
   self+GEN-
   3REFL.POSS.SG
   “his/her/its own”

b. tav+iian+t-
   self+POSS+PL-
   3REFL.POSS.PL
   “their own” (both distributive and collective readings are available)”

c. tav-tav+is-
   self-self+GEN-
   3DISTR.REFL.POSS.SG
   “their own” (only distributive, no collective reading)

d. tav-tav+iian+t-
   self-self+POSS+PL-
   3DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL
   “their own” (only distributive, no collective reading)

Although the translation of both tav+iian+t- (3.4.59b) and tav-tav+is- (3.4.59c) is given as “their own”, there are important differences between them. First of all, there is an obvious difference in the forms. Secondly, there is a difference in the distribution of those forms. While tav+iian+t- (3.4.59b) can have both collective (3.4.57a) and distributive (3.4.57b) readings, the complex form tav-tav+is- (3.4.59c) has only a distributive reading (Example 3.4.58).

The forms tav-tav+is- in 3.4.59c and tav-tav+iian+t- in 3.4.59d are translated identically as well, namely, as “their own”. Both of them have the distributive but not the collective reading. The question remains as to what is the difference between the two forms of the complex/distributive reflexive possessive. Both tav-tav+is- and tav-tav+iian+t- require a plural antecedent (Example 3.4.58) and therefore the sentences with a singular antecedent are ungrammatical (Example 3.4.60):

3.4.60. Example.

*man  gada-∅-cv-es
3SG.ERG PV-3B_NOM,SG-burn-3A_ERG,PL,AOR,INDIC
tav-tavis-i/       tav-taviant-i    saxl-eb-i.
3DISTR.REFL.POSS.SG-NOM 3DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL-NOM house-PL-NOM
Lit.: (S)he they.burned.them their own houses.

The ungrammaticality of the sentence in 3.4.60 is not solely due to the fact that the singular subject NP man triggers a plural Set A agreement marker -es (see the verb form
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If the Set A agreement marker is made singular as it is in Example 3.4.61 the sentence will not become grammatical:

3.4.61. Example.

*man gada-∅-cv-a
3SG.ERG PV-3B.NOM-SG-burn-3AE.ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
tav-tavis-i/ tav-taviant-i sxl-eb-i.
3DIST.REFL.POSS.SG-NOM 3DIST.REFL.POSS.PL-NOM house-PL-NOM
Lit.: (S)he he.burned.them their own houses.

Thus, the antecedent for the distributive reflexive possessive pronouns tav-tav+i/ tav-tav+i+ian+t- should be a plural NP.

However, there is no requirement for those phrases to trigger a plural agreement. At least reciprocals (for the detailed discussion see Section 3.6.5) obligatorily requiring plural NPs as an antecedent do not trigger plural agreement. Thus, having a PL antecedent and triggering a PL agreement do not seem to be the same concept.

However, it seems to be impossible to check which kind of agreement the distributive reflexive possessive phrases tav-tav+i/ tav-tav+i+ian+t- actually trigger—a singular or a plural one. Since only heads can trigger agreement and not specifiers, and the distributive reflexive possessive phrases tav-tav+i/ tav-tav+i+ian+t- are never heads of the phrase but only specifiers, it is impossible to find out the kind of agreement they trigger.

Even if nominalizations\(^{27}\) (see tkven-tkven-s-a-s in Example 3.4.62) are made out of the possessive phrases having either 1st or 2nd person distributive reflexive as a determiner (Example 3.4.63), they will get the features of the deleted head, among them case\(^{28}\) and person—3rd (cf. the examples 3.4.62 vs. 3.4.63):

3.4.62. Example.

tkven tkven-tkven-s-a-s
2PL.NOM 2DIST.REFL.POSS-DAT-EV-DAT
mo-∅-u-vl-i-t.
PV-2A.NOM.SG-PRV-take.care-TS-PL-NOM
“You will take care of yours.” (distributive reading)

3.4.63. Example.

\(^{27}\)Headless possessives in the terminology of [Dan04].

\(^{28}\)The case of the deleted head (DAT) is actually seen on the form of the nominalization tkven-tkven-s-a-s in the final -s immediately following the suffix -a which usually appears whenever there is a deletion of a head.
However, it is possible to check what kind of NPs the two modify and whether there is a difference between the two forms in this respect. As 3.4.64 shows, the distributive reflexive possessive  tkven-tkven+s can modify both singular (3.4.64a) and plural nouns (3.4.64b), while  tkven-tkven+s+ian+t modifies plural nouns (3.4.65b) but not singular ones (3.4.65a):

3.4.64. EXAMPLE.

a. mascavlebl-eb-ma tav-tavis-i jgup-i
teacher-PL-ERG 3DISTR.REFL.POSS.SG-NOM group-NOM
cqa-lo-i-qvan-es ekskursia-ze.
PV-3B_NOM.SG-PRV-take.away-3AERG.PL.AOR.INDIC excursion-on
“The teachers took their own group to the excursion.” (=Each teacher took his/her own group to the excursion)

b. mascavlebl-eb-ma tav-tavis-i jgup-eb-i
teacher-PL-ERG 3DISTR.REFL.POSS.SG-NOM group-PL-NOM
cqa-lo-i-qvan-es ekskursia-ze.
PV-3B_NOM.SG-PRV-take.away-3AERG.PL.AOR.INDIC excursion-on
“The teachers took their own groups to the excursion.” (=Each teacher took his/her own groups to the excursion)

3.4.65. EXAMPLE.

a. ?mascavlebl-eb-ma tav-taviant-i jgup-i
teacher-PL-ERG 3DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL-NOM group-NOM
cqa-lo-i-qvan-es ekskursia-ze.
PV-3B_NOM.SG-PRV-take.away-3AERG.PL.AOR.INDIC excursion-on
“The teachers took their own group to the excursion.” (=Each teacher took his/her own group to the excursion)

b. mascavlebl-eb-ma tav-taviant-i jgup-eb-i
teacher-PL-ERG 3DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL-NOM group-PL-NOM
cqa-lo-i-qvan-es ekskursia-ze.
PV-3B_NOM.SG-PRV-take.away-3AERG.PL.AOR.INDIC excursion-on
“The teachers took their own groups to the excursion.” (=Each teacher took his/her own groups to the excursion)
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It would be interesting to look at the similarities/differences of *tavis-* and *taviant* with regard to the quantifiers. The quantifier *qvela* "everyone / everybody" always requires a singular agreement, both with the noun it modifies and with the verb, while another quantifier *qvela-n-i* (*qvela-PL-NOM*) "everyone / everybody" requires a plural agreement with the verb (as for the modification, it never modifies a noun).

It should be checked which distributive possessive reflexive is appropriate with either of the quantifiers. It seems that *qvela* allows only a singular distributive possessive reflexive *tav-tavis* (Example 3.4.66), while the plural *tav-taviant* is ungrammatical (Example 3.4.67):

3.4.66. EXAMPLE.

a.  

\[
\text{qvela-}∅  \quad \text{tav-tavis}  \quad \text{gmir-s} \\
\text{everyone/everybody-NOM} 3\text{DISTR.REFL.POSS.SG}  \text{hero-DAT} \\
\text{∅-baz-av-s.} \\
3\text{B}_{\text{DAT.SG-imitate-}} 3\text{A}_{\text{NOM.SG}} \\
\text{"Everyone/everybody imitates his/her own hero."}
\]

b.  

\[
\text{qvela-}∅  \quad \text{tav-tavis}  \quad \text{gmir-eb-s} \\
\text{everyone/everybody-NOM} 3\text{DISTR.REFL.POSS.SG}  \text{hero-PL-DAT} \\
\text{∅-baz-av-s.} \\
3\text{B}_{\text{DAT.SG-imitate-}} 3\text{A}_{\text{NOM.SG}} \\
\text{"Everyone/everybody imitates his/her own heros."}
\]

3.4.67. EXAMPLE.

a.  

\[
*\text{qvela-}∅  \quad \text{tav-taviant}  \quad \text{gmir-s} \\
\text{everyone/everybody-NOM} 3\text{DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL}  \text{hero-DAT} \\
\text{∅-baz-av-s.} \\
3\text{B}_{\text{DAT.SG-imitate-}} 3\text{A}_{\text{NOM.SG}} \\
\text{"Everyone/everybody imitates his/her own hero."}
\]

b.  

\[
*\text{qvela-}∅  \quad \text{tav-taviant}  \quad \text{gmir-eb-s} \\
\text{everyone/everybody-NOM} 3\text{DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL}  \text{hero-PL-DAT} \\
\text{∅-baz-av-s.} \\
3\text{B}_{\text{DAT.SG-imitate-}} 3\text{A}_{\text{NOM.SG}} \\
\text{"Everyone/everybody imitates his/her own heros."}
\]

As for *qvela-n-i*, it allows only a plural distributive possessive reflexive *tav-taviant* (Example 3.4.69) while the singular *tav-tavis* is ungrammatical (Example 3.4.68):
3.4.68. Example.

a. *qvela-n-i tav-tavis gmir-s
everyone/everybody-PL-NOM 3DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL hero-DAT
∅-baz-av-en.
3B_DAT.PL-imitate-TS-3PL
“Everyone/everybody imitates his/her own hero.”

b. *qvela-n-i tav-tavis gmir-eb-s
everyone/everybody-PL-NOM 3DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL hero-PL-DAT
∅-baz-av-en.
3B_DAT.PL-imitate-TS-3PL
“Everyone/everybody imitates his/her own heros.”

3.4.69. Example.

a. qvela-n-i tav-taviant gmir-s
every-PL-NOM 3DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL hero-DAT
∅-baz-av-en.
3B_DAT.PL-imitate-TS-3PL
“Everyone/everybody imitates his/her own hero.”

b. qvela-n-i tav-taviant gmir-eb-s
every-PL-NOM 3DISTR.REFL.POSS.PL hero-PL-DAT
∅-baz-av-en.
3B_DAT.PL-imitate-TS-3PL
“Everyone/everybody imitates his/her own heros.”

Therefore, the singular reflexive possessive tav-tavis- can be c-commanded only by the singular quantifier qvela (cf. the examples 3.4.66 vs. 3.4.67) and the plural reflexive possessive tav-taviant- can only be c-commanded by the plural quantifier qvela-n-i (cf. the examples 3.4.69 vs. 3.4.68).

Possessive sakutar- “own”

The specifier of the reflexive phrase—POSS—can be replaced with sakutar- (“own”, not marked for person) without rendering anything ungrammatical:

3.4.70. Example.

prezident-mer tavis-i/ sakutar-i tav-i
president-ERG 3REFL.POSS.PL.NOM own-NOM self-NOM
∅-i-xsn-a.
3B_NOM.PL-PRV-save-3ERG.PL.AOR.INDIC
“The president saved himself/herself.”
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3.4.71. Example.

me čem-i/ sağutar-i tav-i
1SG.ERG 1POSS.SG-NOM own-NOM self-NOM
še-v-i-bral-e.
PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-pity-AOR.INDIC
“I pitied myself.”

However, this is not true in 3-argument verbs where the sağutar- “own” selects only the subject argument as its antecedent. As the examples 3.4.72a vs. 3.4.73a and 3.4.72b vs. 3.4.73b illustrate, it is not possible to have the sağutar- replaced by the 1st person singular possessive pronoun čem- serving as a specifier of the direct object phrase POSS+tav-:

3.4.72. Example.

a. bakar-ma₁ mej [eğutar-i tav-i₁]j
   Bakar-ERG 1SG.DAT own-NOM self-NOM
aγ-m-i-čer-a.
PV-1ADAT.SG-PRV-describe-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Bakar me own self he.described.him/her.to.me
   “Bakar described himself to me.”
   “*Bakar described me to myself.”

b. bakar-ma₁ [eğutar-i tav-i₁]j mej
   Bakar-ERG own-NOM self-NOM 1SG.DAT
aγ-m-i-čer-a.
PV-1ADAT.SG-PRV-describe-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Bakar own self to.me he.described.him/her.to.me
   “Bakar described himself to ME.”
   “*Bakar described me to MYSELF.”

3.4.73. Example.

a. bakar-ma₁ mej [čem-i tav-i₁]j
   Bakar-ERG 1SG.DAT 1POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
aγ-m-i-čer-a.
PV-1ADAT.SG-PRV-describe-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Bakar me own self he.described.him/her.to.me
   “*Bakar described himself to me.”
   “Bakar described me to myself.”
b. bakar-ma_i [čem-i] _tav-i]_i/s_j _ me_i
Bakar-ERG 1POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM 1SG.DAT
1\gamma-i-čer-a.
Pv-1DAT.SG-PRV-describe-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Bakar own self to.me he.described.him/her.to.me

"*Bakar described himself to ME."

"Bakar described me to MYSELF."

Below, more examples will be given in order to show that the sakutari- "own" is subject-oriented (see the examples 3.4.74–3.4.76), irrespective of the word order changes or the pro-drop of the personal pronouns. Namely, the examples 3.4.74a vs. 3.4.74b, 3.4.75a vs. 3.4.75b, 3.4.76a vs. 3.4.76b illustrate that as soon as the sakutari- "own" selects a subject argument as its antecedent, the subject can be in any person — 1st, 2nd or 3rd—whatever the word order of the arguments themselves is.

3.4.74. Example.
a. (me_i) bakar-s_j [sakutari-tav-i]_i/s_j
1SG.ERG Bakar-DAT own-NOM self-NOM
1\gamma-v-čer-e.
Pv-1AERG.SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: I to.Bakar own self I.described.him/her.to.him

"I described myself to Bakar."

"*I described Bakar to himself."

b. (me_i) [sakutari-tav-i]_i/s_j bakar-s_j
1SG.ERG own-NOM self-NOM Bakar-DAT
1\gamma-v-čer-e.
Pv-1AERG.SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: I own self to.Bakar I.described.him/her.to.him

"I described myself to BAKAR."

"*I described Bakar to HIMSELF."

3.4.75. Example.
a. (šen_i) bakar-s_j [sakutari-tav-i]_i/s_j
2SG.ERG Bakar-DAT own-NOM self-NOM
di-0-u-časiat-e.
Pv-2AERG.SG-PRV-characterize-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: You.SG to.Bakar own self you.SG.characterized.him/her.to.him

"You characterized yourself to Bakar."

"*You characterized Bakar to himself."
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b. (šen,) [sakutar-i tav-i]i/sj bakar-sj
2SG.ERG own-NOM self-NOM Bakar-DAT
da-∅-u-xat-a.
PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3A ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi for.Bakar himself he drew/painted.him
“Giorgi drew/painted himself for Bakar.”
“*Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for him.”

3.4.76. EXAMPLE.

a. giorgi-m, bakar-sj [sakutar-i tav-i]i/sj
Giorgi-ERG Bakar-DAT own-NOM self-NOM
da-∅-u-xat-a.
PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3A ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi for.Bakar himself he drew/painted.him
“Giorgi drew/painted himself for Bakar.”
“*Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for him.”

Thus, the syntax of sakutar- “own” is unaffected by word order changes. In 3-argument predicates it is subject-oriented. Since in 2-place predicates the only possible antecedent is the subject argument, it could be said that sakutar- “own” is subject-oriented in general.

The examples 3.4.77a vs. 3.4.77b, 3.4.78a vs. 3.4.78b, 3.4.79a vs. 3.4.79b also illustrate sakutar- “own” as being subject-oriented. Similarly to the examples 3.4.72, 3.4.74–3.4.76, the examples 3.4.77–3.4.79 show that the possessive cannot select a lower argument,29 the direct object bakar-i, as an antecedent:

3.4.77. EXAMPLE.

29Chapter 7 offers the evidence that the complex reflexive POSS+tav- is able to appear as a subject argument of certain verb classes and certain verb reading. The possessive sakutar- “own” is able to serve as a specifier of the POSS+tav- phrase there. In those cases the sakutar- “own” as a specifier of the subject argument will be selecting a lower argument as an antecedent. See Footnote 6 in Chapter 7.
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3.4.78. Example.

a. (me,.) [sakutar tav-s]i/sj bakar-i j aγ-v-u-cer-e.
1SG.ERG own self-DAT Bakar-NOM PV-1AERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: I to.own self Bakar I.described.him.to.him/her
“I described Bakar to myself.”
“*I described Bakar to himself.”

b. (me,.) bakar-i j [sakutar tav-s]i/sj aγ-v-u-cer-e.
1SG.ERG Bakar-NOM own self-DAT PV-1AERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: I Bakar to.own self I.described.him.to.him/her
“I described Bakar to MYSELF.”
“*I described Bakar to HIMSELF.”

3.4.79. Example.

a. giorgi-m [sakutar tav-s]i/sj bakar-i j
Giorgi-ERG own self-DAT Bakar-NOM
da-∅-u-xasiat-e.
Pv-3BDATE,SG-PRV-characterize-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi to.own self Bakar he.drew/painted.him
“Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for himself.”
“*Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for him.”
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b. giorgi-mi bakar-i jel [sakutar tav-s]i/∗j
    Giorgi-ERG Bakar-NOM own self-DAT
    da-∅-u-xat-a.
    PV-3DAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
    Lit.: Giorgi Bakar to.own self he.drew/painted.him
    “Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for HIMSELF.”
    “*Giorgi i drew/painted Bakar for HIM j.”

Thus, the sakutar- “own” as a specifier of the POSS+tav- complex reflexive phrase selects the subject argument of the verb as the antecedent.

A Short Summary

The present subsection dealt with the specifier of the Georgian complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav-, which can be given by simple and complex possessive pronouns, as well as by a possessive sakutar- “own”. Of the category “simple pronouns”, the 3rd person mis- “his/her/its” and its reflexive counterpart tavis- “self’s” were discussed. Whereas the latter selects exclusively a clause-mate antecedent, the former never does so. Within the plural possessive pronouns, there is a distinction between simple and complex posses-sives. The simple plural possessives are ambiguous between the collective and distributive readings, while the complex plural possessives are exclusively distributive. The possessive sakutar- “own” is not specified for the person feature and can in fact serve as a specifier of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav-, selecting an antecedent of any person. However, the antecedent of the sakutar- “own” can exclusively be the subject argument.

3.4.6 The Complex Reflexive Phrase POSS+tav- as a Determiner

As has become clear already in Subsection 3.4.5, the 3rd person reflexive possessive pronoun tavis- appears as a determiner of a phrase. This subsection describes the complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav-, serving as a determiner of NPs.

Observe that it is the reflexive phrase tavis- tav- (3.4.80a) but never the 3rd person singular reflexive possessive tavis- “self’s” (3.4.80b) or the head of the phrase tav- “self” (3.4.80c) that appears as a determiner of the head noun ekim-i-c:

3.4.80. Example.

a. igi tavis-i tav-is ekim-i-c aris da
    3SG.NOM 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-GEN doctor-NOM-ADD he.is and
    vekil-i-c.
    lawyer-NOM-ADD
    Lit.: (S)he is his/her own doctor and lawyer
    “(S)he is taking care of himself/herself, (s)he is his/her own master.”
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b. *igi tavis-i ekim-i-c ar-i-s da vekil-i-c.
   3SG.NOM 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM doctor-NOM-ADD he.is and lawyer-NOM-ADD
   “(S)he is taking care of himself/herself, (s)he is his/her own master.”

c. *igi tav-is ekim-i-c ar-i-s da vekil-i-c.
   3SG.NOM self-GEN doctor-NOM-ADD he.is and lawyer-NOM-ADD
   “(S)he is taking care of himself/herself, (s)he is his/her own master.”

Example 3.4.80a together with the examples in 3.4.81 and 3.4.82 illustrate the determiner use of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- in existential sentences:

3.4.81. Example.

ruca lingvist-eb-i  kaavkasia-shi lingvistur ekspedicia-shi
when linguist-PL-NOM Caucasia-in linguistic expedition-in
mi-d-i-an, (isini) taviant-i tav-is
PV-move-3A-NOM-PL 3PL.NOM 3REFL.POSS.PL-NOM self-GEN
mzareul-eb-i-c arian da damlagebl-eb-i-c.
cook-PL-NOM-ADD they.are and cleaning.lady-PL-NOM-ADD
“When linguists go to a linguistic expedition in the Caucasus they are their own cooks and cleaning ladies.” (i.e., it is not that they are occupied exclusively by doing fieldwork but they also are taking care of themselves completely alone without any help from others30)

3.4.82. Example.

(is) tavis-i tav-is miter-i-a.
3SG.NOM 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-GEN enemy-NOM-COP
“(S)he is his/her own enemy.”

Example 3.4.80a is about someone being both a doctor and a lawyer to himself/herself, or, in other words, being able to take care of himself/herself. The other example, 3.4.81, is about linguists doing fieldwork in Caucasus and how they are forced by the circumstances to work as a cook or a cleaning lady as well. Lastly, Example 3.4.82 is about someone acting towards himself/herself like an enemy would have acted towards him/her. In all these cases, the referent of the reflexive phrase (serving as a determiner) is identical to the referent of its antecedent. For instance, the referent of the tavis-i tav-is in Example 3.4.80a is identical to the referent of the antecedent igi. Similarly, the referent of the taviant-i tav-is in Example 3.4.81 is identical to the referent of the antecedent isini which is co-indexed with the phrase lingvist-eb-i from the upper clause.

30The example illustrates not only the determiner use of the reflexive phrase but also reflects the reality of doing fieldwork in the Caucasus. To have a better understanding about fieldwork and how it has been conducted in such diverse and unfortunately not always safe geopolitical areas as the Caucasus, the reader is recommended to consult for instance, [Bor01].
Besides, the referent of the *tavis-i tav-is* is identical to the referent of the antecedent *is* in Example 3.4.82. Thus, everywhere in these examples there is a full identity match between the referent of the reflexive phrase serving as a determiner of an NP and that of the corresponding antecedent.

However, not every case of the reflexive phrase as a determiner of an NP can be interpreted in this manner. Depending on the lexical semantics of the head of the NP that the reflexive phrase modifies, it might be possible to get an interpretation in which there is no full identity match between the referents of the reflexive phrase and the antecedent. These are the cases in which the head noun of the phrase having the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- as a determiner does not refer to a potential agent but rather to a potential theme. For instance, if the head noun that is modified by the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- in Example 3.4.80a is a doctor and a lawyer, or in 3.4.81 in which it is linguists doing fieldwork and in 3.4.82 in which it is someone acting as an enemy, and the characters are all agents rather than being acted upon, an example such as 3.4.83 involves the head noun referring to a potential theme. In 3.4.83 the head noun *msxverpleb-ad* being modified by the reflexive phrase *sakutar-i tav-is* refers to victims or a potential theme (rather than to an abuser which would be a potential agent).

3.4.83. EXAMPLE. (Adopted from [KT04]31)

```
tu čven am тяждзі quradγeba-∅ ar
if 1PL.ERG this.OBL tragedy.DAT attention-NOM not
mi-v-a-κκ-i-e-t..., (чven) qoveltvis msxverpleb-ad
PV-ІА_ЕРG,SG-PRV-direct-TS-INDIC-PL_ЕРG 1PL.NOM always victim-PL-ADV
da-v-rč-eb-i-t — sakutar-i tav-is
PV-ІА_ΝΟM,SG-remain-TS-INDIC-PL_ΝΟM own-NOM self-GEN
msxverpleb-ad.32
victim-PL-ADV

“If we do not pay attention to this tragedy we will always remain victims—victims of our own selves.”
```

31 The sentence in Example 3.4.83 is from an article published in a daily newspaper in Tbilisi, Georgia in May 2004 [KT04]. The article reflects a discussion held between school teachers, methodologists, psycholinguists and the Ministry of Education officials responsible for the school education reform in Georgia. The main concern of the discussion has been poor results of the tests in Georgian language taken by 9 and 10 year old school children. The sentence reflects the reaction from one of the participants who argued against blaming only the test quality and possible errors of calculation but to make radical changes to the education system.

32 The full version of the extract which might be needed when analyzing the interpretation of the reflexive phrase and its referent is presented here:

>`чven am тяждзі quradγeba-∅ ar
mi-v-a-κκ-i-e-t..., (чven) qoveltvis msxverpleb-ad
PV-ІА_ЕРG,SG-PRV-direct-TS-INDIC-PL_ЕРG 1PL.NOM always victim-PL-ADV
da-v-rč-eb-i-t — sakutar-i tav-is
PV-ІА_ΝΟM,SG-remain-TS-INDIC-PL_ΝΟM own-NOM self-GEN
msxverpleb-ad.32
victim-PL-ADV

“If we do not pay attention to this tragedy we will always remain victims—victims of our own selves.”`
In Example 3.4.83 in which the head noun that is modified by the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- refers to a potential theme, there is no full identity match between the referents of the reflexive phrase and the antecedent. More precisely, the referent of the reflexive phrase is an aspect, property, something related to or associated with the referent of the antecedent. Taking into account the circumstances in which the utterance in 3.4.83 was produced (see Footnote 31 as well as Footnote 32 in this chapter), the referent of the reflexive phrase sakutari tav-is refers to only some aspect(s) of the referent of the corresponding antecedent, the nominative-marked ēven. The meaning of the sentence in 3.4.83 is that unless they (i.e., the authorities responsible for the school reform in Georgia) pay attention to the reasons for the bad test results among the school kids and unless radical changes to the education system of Georgia in general, are made they will be victims of their own carelessness. Thus, the reflexive phrase serving as a determiner in fact does not refer to the referent of the antecedent ēven (i.e., the authorities responsible for the school reform in Georgia) but rather to a property of the antecedent, namely, the carelessness.

The same could be said of Example 3.4.84a. Whereas the nominalization ubedur-i alone (as in 3.4.84b) means “unlucky [one]”, the same nominalization modified by the reflexive phrase tavis-i tav-is in 3.4.84a refers to someone who gets hurt by circumstances, and which is therefore a potential theme, rather than a potential agent).

3.4.84. EXAMPLE.

a. tavis-i tav-is ubedur-i
   3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-GEN unlucky-NOM
   “unlucky [one]” (said about someone who does not do anything wrong to anybody and only harms himself/herself unintentionally; whatever (s)he does, it always turns out to be harming to him/her)”

b. ubedur-i
   unlucky-NOM
   “unlucky [one]”

Thus, examples 3.4.80a, 3.4.81, 3.4.82, as opposed to examples 3.4.83, 3.4.84 illustrate correspondingly that the full versus partial identity match between the referents of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and its antecedent is sensitive to the thematic characterization (agent vs. theme).\footnote{Note that the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- as well as the reciprocal ertmanet- when used as a subject argument are in some cases also sensitive to the thematic characteristics (agent vs. theme). See Chapter 7.}

In the rest of this subsection there will be an attempt to draw a comparison between the 3rd person reflexive possessive tavis- and the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- as a determiner of an NP. Note that neither the 3rd person reflexive possessive tavis- (3.4.42, 3.4.43a) nor the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (3.4.85, 3.4.86) can be a determiner of the subject argument of verbs, whether it is transitive or intransitive:
3.4. The Complex Reflexive Phrase POSS+tav-

3.4.85. Example.

\[
gela-∅_i \quad šin \quad da-rē-a. \quad \text{*tavis}_i \quad \text{tav-is}_i
gela-\text{NOM} \quad \text{at.home} \quad \text{PV-stay-3A}_{\text{NOM}, \text{SG}, \text{AOR}, \text{INDIC}} \quad \text{3REFL.POSS.SG.NOM} \\
\text{tav-is}_i \quad \text{da-∅}_i \quad \text{tibilis-ši} \quad \text{ça-vid-a.}
gela-\text{NOM} \quad \text{self-GEN} \quad \text{Tbilisi-in} \quad \text{PV-move-3A}_{\text{NOM}, \text{SG}, \text{AOR}, \text{INDIC}}
\]

"Gela stayed at home. His sister went to Tbilisi."

3.4.86. Example.

\[
*\text{tavis}_i \quad \text{tav-is}_i \quad \text{ekim-i}
3\text{REFL.POSS.SG.NOM} \quad \text{self-GEN} \quad \text{doctor-NOM} \\
(∅-a-k-eb-s)_i \quad \text{gela}_i
3\text{B}_{\text{DAT}, \text{SG}, \text{PRV}-praise-\text{TS}} \quad 3\text{A}_{\text{NOM}, \text{SG}} \quad \text{Gela-DAT}
\]

"Gela, acting as his own doctor, praises himself."

Furthermore, it is the 3rd person reflexive possessive tavis- (3.4.87) but not the reflexive phrase tavis-i tav-is- (3.4.88) which is able to modify the object.

3.4.87. Example.

\[
gela-∅_i \quad (∅-a-k-eb-s)_i \quad \text{tavis}_i \quad \text{ekim-s}.
gela-\text{NOM} \quad 3\text{B}_{\text{DAT}, \text{SG}, \text{PRV}-praise-\text{TS}} \quad 3\text{A}_{\text{NOM}, \text{SG}} \quad 3\text{REFL.POSS.SG} \quad \text{doctor-DAT}
\]

"Gela praises his doctor."

3.4.88. Example.

\[
*gela-∅_i \quad (∅-a-k-eb-s)_i \quad \text{tavis}_i \quad \text{tav-is}
gela-\text{NOM} \quad 3\text{B}_{\text{DAT}, \text{SG}, \text{PRV}-praise-\text{TS}} \quad 3\text{A}_{\text{NOM}, \text{SG}} \quad 3\text{REFL.POSS.SG-NOM} \quad \text{self-GEN} \\
\text{doctor-DAT} \\
\text{ekim-s}.
\]

"Gela praises his doctor."

The difference between the two modifiers is that the use of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- as a determiner of NPs is restricted to the intransitive verbs like be, remain, become, turn into, etc. (see the examples 3.4.80a, 3.4.81, 3.4.82, 3.4.83, 3.4.89a). No other classes of verbs, intransitive (3.4.85) or transitive (3.4.86, 3.4.88), allow the phrase as a modifier of an argument.

On the contrary, the 3rd person reflexive possessive tavis- is ungrammatical in existential sentences with verbs such as be, remain, become, turn into, etc. (3.4.89b). The possessive pronoun never occurs as a modifier of the subject argument of verbs, whether transitive (3.4.43a) or intransitive (3.4.42), while it is freely available as a modifier of the object argument of transitive verbs irrespective of whether it is a direct (3.4.87) or an indirect object (3.4.43b).
3.4.89. Example.

a. gela-∅ [tavis-i₃, tav-is] gušematekvar-i-a₄.
   Gela-NOM 3REFL.Poss.SG-NOM self-GEN fan-NOM-COP
   “Gela is a fan of himself.”

   Gela-NOM 3REFL.Poss.SG-NOM fan-NOM-COP
   “Gela is a fan of himself.”

The Georgian examples with the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- as a determiner of the predicate NP with existential verbs in 3.4.80a, 3.4.81, 3.4.82, 3.4.83, 3.4.84a, 3.4.89a are similar to the English examples in 3.4.90a vs. 3.4.90b and 3.4.91a vs. 3.4.91b:

3.4.90. Example. From [Hae98, p. 239]

a. She₁ is [[[herᵢ] own] cookᵢ₄].

b. *She₁ is [herᵢ cookᵢ₄].

3.4.91. Example.

a. Youᵢ are [[[yourᵢ] own] enemyᵢ₄].

b. *Youᵢ are [yourᵢ enemyᵢ₄].

In the examples 3.4.90b and 3.4.91b, there is a circular coindexation, which is ruled out by the condition called i-within-i filter (3.4.92, see [Cho81]). This condition prevents the co-indexation of a phrase with a phrase that contains it:

3.4.92. Filter. The i-within-i filter is defined as *

Like the English her in 3.4.90b or your in 3.4.91b, the Georgian reflexive possessive tavis-i in 3.4.89b is coindexed with the phrase containing it. Because of the circularity, the i-within-i filter is violated and the examples are ungrammatical. However, the same reflexive possessive tavis-i, when embedded further inside another phrase [tavis-i tav-is] (3.4.89a), could be coindexed with a larger phrase containing them (just like the English her in 3.4.90a or your in 3.4.91a).

As is shown in the examples 3.4.93a vs. 3.4.93b, the head of the phrase tav-is gund-is (3.4.93b) in which the reflexive possessive is embedded, might even be deleted, leaving the case-marker as a residue (3.4.93a). That the use in (3.4.93a) is grammatical shows that, as far as the reflexive possessive is embedded into some phrase, its coindexing with the upper phrase does not lead to ungrammaticality:

3.4.93. Example.
3.4. The Complex Reflexive Phrase POSS+tav-

a. gela-∅ [[[tavis-i]-s] gulšemaťıkvar-i-a].
   Gela-NOM 3REFL.Poss.SG-NOM-GEN fan-NOM-COP
   “Gela is a fan of his one.”

b. gela-∅ [[[tavis-i] gund-is] gulšemaťıkvar-i-a].
   Gela-NOM 3REFL.Poss.SG-NOM team-GEN fan-NOM-COP
   “Gela is a fan of his team.”

Finally, the behavior of the 3rd person reflexive possessive tavis- and the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- when used as a determiner of an NP is summarized in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Type</th>
<th>Argument Modified</th>
<th>3rd Person Reflexive Possessive tavis-</th>
<th>Reflexive Phrase POSS+tav-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Predicate NP</td>
<td>* (3.4.89b)</td>
<td>✓ (3.4.89a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>* (3.4.42)</td>
<td>* (3.4.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>* (3.4.43a)</td>
<td>* (3.4.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>✓ (3.4.87)</td>
<td>* (3.4.88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: The 3rd Person Reflexive Possessive tavis- and The Reflexive Phrase POSS+tav- as a Modifier.

The subject argument, whether intransitive or transitive, does not allow either of the reflexive modifiers (3.4.42, 3.4.43a, 3.4.85, 3.4.86). This illustrates that both the reflexive possessive tavis- and the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- need a c-commanding antecedent and, additionally, in 3.4.85 and 3.4.86 there is a circularity which makes the sentences ungrammatical in any case.

That the c-command relation is important, can be concluded from the fact that tavis- is allowed to modify the object argument of transitive verbs as well (3.4.87). The reflexive possessive is c-commanded and bound by the subject which is in fact the antecedent for the possessive.

The fact that the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- is not allowed to modify the object argument of transitive verbs (3.4.88) is due to the circularity which causes a violation of the i-within-i filter.

Finally, the distinction between the use of the reflexive possessive (3.4.89b) versus the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (3.4.89a) as a determiner of the predicate NP in existential sentences again illustrates circularity and the i-within-i effect.

3.4.7 Conclusion

This section dealt with the Georgian complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav-. The distribution of the phrase has been looked at. A plan of the subsections was presented in Subsection 3.4.1. In Subsection 3.4.2 it was shown that the Georgian reflexive phrase
has to be bound in a local domain, necessarily by a c-commanding antecedent and can never serve as a long-distance anaphor or as a logophor. That the anaphor requires a c-commanding antecedent, irrespective of the word order was shown in Subsection 3.4.3. To check whether the structural dominance exists between arguments in Georgian the Georgian data was tested with the use of the tests like Quantifier-Variable Binding, Weak Cross-Over Effects, Superiority Effects and Principle C Effects in Subsection 3.4.4. The very tests have shown that there is an asymmetric c-command relation between the subject and direct object as well as between the indirect and direct object arguments.

Apart from the distribution of the POSS+tav- the determiner of the phrase was discussed in Section 3.4.5. It was determined what the difference between the 3rd person singular possessive mis- “him/her/it” and its reflexive counterpart tavis- “self’s” and between the simple plural possessives and the corresponding complex plural possessives were. Additionally the possessive sakutar- “own” was considered, which can also serve as a determiner of the POSS+tav- phrase. Since the sakutar- is underspecified with regard to the person feature, it can select an antecedent of any person. The only restriction for the sakutar- is that it must have the subject argument as an antecedent. Subsection 3.4.6 dealt with the determiner use of the reflexive POSS+tav-, hereby illustrating the i-within-i filter at work. Finally, Subsection 3.4.7 concludes Section 3.4.

3.5 The Simple Reflexive Pronoun tav-

3.5.1 Introduction

The previous Section 3.4 dealt with the reflexive phrase POSS+tav-. In this section the simple reflexive pronoun tav- within the Binding Theory of [Cho81] will be considered. There will be an attempt to show how the two diachronically related [AL02] but synchronically distinct anaphoric strategies—the complex POSS+tav- and the simple reflexive pronoun tav—differ within the latter theory.

3.5.2 Is the Simple Reflexive tav- the Same POSS+tav- Strategy?

It is important to note that the POSS can be optional in the complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav- which results in reflexive tav- that stands alone. For instance, for any of the POSS+tav- phrases in 3.5.1a, 3.5.1b, 3.5.2a, 3.5.2b, 3.5.3a, 3.5.3b it is possible to have the possessive deleted (cf. 3.5.1a vs. 3.5.4a, 3.5.1b vs. 3.5.4b, 3.5.2a vs. 3.5.5a, 3.5.2b vs. 3.5.5b, 3.4.20a vs. 3.5.6a, 3.4.22a vs. 3.5.6b):

3.5.1. Example.

a. me1 bakar-sj [čem-i tav-i],
   ISG.ERG Bakar-DAT IPOSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
3.5. The Simple Reflexive Pronoun tav-

aŋ-v-u-čer-e.
PVA1ERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: I to.Bakar myself I.described.him/her.to.him
“I described myself to Bakar.”

b. me, bakar-sj [tavis-i tav-i]j
1SG.ERG Bakar-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
aŋ-v-u-čer-e.
PVA1ERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: I to.Bakar himself I.described.him.to.him
“I described Bakar to himself.”

3.5.2. Example.
a. ˇsen, bakar-sj [ˇsen-i tav-i]i
1SG.ERG Bakar-DAT 2POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
da-∅-u-xasiat-e.
PVA2ERG,SG-PRV-characterize-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: You.SG to.Bakar yourself you.SG.characterized.him/her.to.him
“You characterized yourself to Bakar.”

b. ˇsen, bakar-sj [tavis-i tav-i]i
1SG.ERG Bakar-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
da-∅-u-xasiat-e.
PVA2ERG,SG-PRV-characterize-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: You.SG to.Bakar self’s self you.SG.characterized.him.to.him
“You described Bakar to himself.”

3.5.3. Example.
a. (Given also under 3.4.20a)
 giorgi-m, bakar-sj [tavis-i tav-i]i/sj
 Giorgi-ERG Bakar-DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
da-∅-u-xat-a.
PVA3B DAT,SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi to.Bakar self’s self he.drew/painted.him.for.him
“Giorgi drew/painted himself for Bakar.”

b. giorgi-m, bakar-sj [mis-i tav-i]i/sj
 Giorgi-ERG Bakar-DAT 3POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
da-∅-u-xat-a.
PVA3B DAT,SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
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Lit.: Giorgi for.Bakar himself he.drew/painted.him.for.him

“Giorgi, drew/painted Bakar for him.”

3.5.4. EXAMPLE.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{me}_1 & \quad \text{bakar-s}_j & \quad \text{tav-i}_{j/i} & \quad \gamma-v-u-\text{čer}-e. \\
\text{1SG.ERG Bakar-DAT self-NOM PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC} & \\
\text{Lit.: I to.Bakar self I.described.him/her.to.him} & \\
an. & \quad \text{“I described myself to Bakar.”} \\
b. & \quad \text{“I described Bakar to himself.”}
\end{align*}
\]

3.5.5. EXAMPLE.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{šen}_1 & \quad \text{bakar-s}_j & \quad \text{tav-i}_{j/i} & \quad \emptyset-u-xasiat-e. \\
\text{1SG.ERG Bakar-DAT self-NOM PV-2AERG.SG-PRV-characterize-AOR.INDIC} & \\
\text{Lit.: You SG to.Bakar self you SG characterized.him/her.to.him} & \\
an. & \quad \text{“You characterized yourself to Bakar.”} \\
b. & \quad \text{“You described Bakar to himself.”}
\end{align*}
\]

3.5.6. EXAMPLE.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{giorgi-m}_1 & \quad \text{bakar-s}_j & \quad \text{tav-i}_{j/i} \\
\text{Giorgi-ERG Bakar-DAT self-NOM} & \\
\text{da-∅-u-xat-a.} & \quad \text{PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC} & \\
\text{Lit.: Giorgi for.Bakar self he drew/painted.him.for.him} & \\
an. & \quad \text{“Giorgi drew/painted himself for Bakar.”} \\
b. & \quad \text{“Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for him.”}
\end{align*}
\]

The examples 3.5.4, 3.5.5 and 3.5.6 illustrate a direct object use of the \text{tav-} which lacks a possessive as a determiner. In the presence of a determiner, the choice of an antecedent depends on the determiner (cf. 3.5.1a vs. 3.5.1b, 3.5.2a vs. 3.5.2b, 3.5.3a vs. 3.5.3b). Since the anaphor and its antecedent must share the person feature, the person feature of a certain possessive determines one particular antecedent while at the same time excluding others. For instance, the reflexive phrase which has \text{čem-i} as a determiner in 3.5.1a, \text{šen-i} in 3.5.2a and \text{tavis-i} in 3.5.3a, can only have a corresponding subject NP as an antecedent but not the indirect object NP \text{bakar-s}. Similarly, the reflexive phrase which has \text{tavis-i} as a determiner in 3.5.1b and 3.5.2b and \text{mis-i} in 3.5.3b, can have the indirect object NP \text{bakar-s} as an antecedent but not the corresponding subject NP.

Whenever the determiner is absent there is no restriction on any particular antecedent. Consequently, any NP can serve as an antecedent and bind the anaphoric
simple tav-. For instance, the simple tav- in 3.5.4, 3.5.5 or 3.5.6 can have both the subject and the indirect object as an antecedent. The simple tav-, which is an indirect object in 3.5.7, 3.5.8, 3.5.9, takes the subject as an antecedent (cf. the examples 3.5.7 vs. 3.5.10a, 3.5.8 vs. 3.5.11a, 3.5.9 vs. 3.5.12a). However, it is impossible for it to take the direct object bakar-i as an antecedent, since the latter cannot bind the indirect object (cf. the examples 3.5.7 vs. 3.5.10b, 3.5.8 vs. 3.5.11b, 3.5.9 vs. 3.5.12b).

3.5.7. Example.

me₁ tav-s₁/₈ bakar-i₁ aγ̄v-u-čer-e.
1SG.ERG self-DAT Bakar-NOM PV-1ERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: I.to.myself Bakar I.described.him.to.him/her
a. “I described Bakar to myself.”
b. “*I described Bakar to himself.”

3.5.8. Example.

ˇsen₂ tav-s₂/₈ bakar-i₂ da-∅u-xasiat-e.
2SG.ERG self-DAT Bakar-NOM PV-2ERG,SG-PRV-characterize-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: You.SG to.myself Bakar you.SG.characterized.him.to.him/her
a. “You characterized Bakar to yourself.”
b. “*You characterized Bakar to himself.”

3.5.9. Example.

giorgi-m₁ tav-s₁/₈ bakar-i₁ Giorgi-ERG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
da-∅u-xat-a.
PV-3BDAT,SG-PRV-draw/paint-3ERG,SG,AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi to.myself Bakar he.drew/painted.him.to.him
a. “Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for himself.”
b. “*Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for him.”

3.5.10. Example.

a. me₁ [čem-s tav-s₁]₁ bakar-i₁
1SG.ERG 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT Bakar-NOM
aγ̄v-u-čer-e.
PV-1ERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: I.to.myself Bakar I.described.him.to.him/her
“I described Bakar to myself.”
3.5.11. EXAMPLE.

a. ˇsen [šen-s \tav-s] tābakar-i
2SG.ERG POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
\tā\t-b-u-xasiat-e.
PV-2AERG.SG-PRV-characterize-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: You to.yourself Bakar you.SG.characterized.him.to.him
You characterized Bakar to yourself.”

b. ˇsen [šen-s \tav-s] tābakar-i
2SG.ERG POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
\tā\t-b-u-xasiat-e.
PV-2AERG.SG-PRV-characterize-AOR.INDIC
Lit.: You to.yourself Bakar you.SG.characterized.him.to.him/her
“*You characterized Bakar to yourself.”

3.5.12. EXAMPLE.

a. giorgi-m [giorgi-m \tav-s] tābakar-i
Giorgi-ERG POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
\tā\t-b-u-xat-a.
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-GERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi to.himself Bakar he.drew/painted.him.to.him
“Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for himself.”

b. giorgi-m [giorgi-m \tav-s] tābakar-i
Giorgi-ERG POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
\tā\t-b-u-xat-a.
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-GERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi to.himself Bakar he.drew/painted.him.to.him
“*Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for himself.”

b. giorgi-m [giorgi-m \tav-s] tābakar-i
Giorgi-ERG POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
\tā\t-b-u-xat-a.
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-GERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi to.himself Bakar he.drew/painted.him.to.him
“*Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for himself.”

b. giorgi-m [giorgi-m \tav-s] tābakar-i
Giorgi-ERG POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
\tā\t-b-u-xat-a.
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-GERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi to.himself Bakar he.drew/painted.him.to.him
“*Giorgi drew/painted Bakar for himself.”

b. giorgi-m [giorgi-m \tav-s] tābakar-i
Giorgi-ERG POSS.SG self-DAT Bakar-NOM
\tā\t-b-u-xat-a.
The fact that the POSS is optional in the POSS+tav- phrase might give rise to the idea that there is the only strategy POSS+tav- with an optional POSS. However, this is true only in 3-argument verbs, whether these are prototypical (cf. the examples 3.5.4 vs. 3.5.1, 3.5.5 vs. 3.5.2, 3.5.6 vs. 3.4.20a) or derived (cf. the examples 3.5.13 vs. 3.5.14):

3.5.13. Example.

\[
\text{man}_i \text{ me}_j \text{ tav-}_i/j \\
\text{3SG.ERG 1SG.DAT self-NOM} \\
\text{ga-m-a-lanzγ-v-in-a.} \\
\text{PV-1B\_DAT\_SG\_PRV\_curse\_TS\_CAUS\_3A\_ERG\_SG\_AOR\_INDIC} \\
\text{"He made me curse himself/myself."}
\]

3.5.14. Example.

a. \[
\text{man}_i \text{ me}_j \text{ [tav-}_i/tav-}_i j \\
\text{3SG.ERG 1SG.DAT 3REFL.POSS\_SG\_NOM self-NOM} \\
\text{ga-m-a-lanzγ-v-in-a.} \\
\text{PV-1B\_DAT\_SG\_PRV\_curse\_TS\_CAUS\_3A\_ERG\_SG\_AOR\_INDIC} \\
\text{"He made me curse himself."}
\]

b. \[
\text{man}_i \text{ me}_j \text{ [čem-}_i/tav-}_i j \\
\text{3SG.ERG 1SG.DAT 1POSS\_SG\_NOM self-NOM} \\
\text{ga-m-a-lanzγ-v-in-a.} \\
\text{PV-1B\_DAT\_SG\_PRV\_curse\_TS\_CAUS\_3A\_ERG\_SG\_AOR\_INDIC} \\
\text{"He made me curse myself."}
\]

As for 2-argument verbs, they show that the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the simple tav- are two different strategies (cf. 3.5.15a vs. 3.5.16a, 3.5.15b vs. 3.5.16b, 3.5.15c vs. 3.5.16c, 3.5.17a vs. 3.5.18a, 3.5.17b vs. 3.5.18b, 3.5.17c vs. 3.5.18c, 3.5.19 vs. 3.5.20, 3.5.21 vs. 3.5.22):

3.5.15. Example.

a. \[
\text{me čem-i tav-}_i/v-a-k-e. \\
\text{1SG.ERG 1POSS\_SG\_NOM self-NOM 1A\_ERG\_SG\_PRV\_praise\_AOR\_INDIC} \\
\text{"I praised myself."}
\]

b. \[
\text{šen šen-i tav-}_i/∅-a-zag-e. \\
\text{2SG.ERG 2POSS\_SG\_NOM self-NOM 2A\_ERG\_SG\_PRV\_curse\_AOR\_INDIC} \\
\text{"You cursed yourself."}
\]

c. \[
\text{man tav-}_i/tav- \\
\text{3SG.ERG 3REFL.POSS\_NOM self-NOM} \\
\text{ga-∅-a-masx\_r-a.} \\
\text{PV-3B\_NOM\_SG\_PRV\_clown\_3A\_ERG\_SG\_AOR\_INDIC}
\]
“He made fun of himself.”

3.5.16. **Example.**

a. me tav-i v-i-k-e.  
1SG.ERG self-NOM 1AERG-SG-PRV-praise-AOR.INDIC  
“I praised myself.”

b. šen tav-i ū-i-zag-e.  
2SG.ERG self-NOM 2AERG-SG-PRV-curse-AOR.INDIC  
“You cursed yourself.”

c. man tav-i ga-ū-i-maskr-a.  
3SG.ERG self-NOM PV-3BNOM-SG-PRV-clown-3AERG-SG.AOR.INDIC  
“He made fun of himself.”

3.5.17. **Example.**

a. me i v-a-kritik-eb  
1SG.NOM 1ANOM-SG-PRV-criticize-TS 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT  
“I criticize myself.”

b. šen i ū-a-kritik-eb  
“You criticize yourself.”

c. is i ū-a-kritik-eb-s  
3SG.NOM 3BDAT-SG-PRV-criticize-TS-3ANOM-SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT  
“He criticizes himself.”

3.5.18. **Example.**

a. me i v-i-kritik-eb tav-s.  
1SG.NOM 1ANOM-SG-PRV-criticize-TS self-DAT  
“I criticize myself.”

b. šen i ū-i-kritik-eb tav-s.  
2SG.NOM 2ANOM-SG-PRV-criticize-TS self-DAT  
“You criticize yourself.”

c. is i ū-i-kritik-eb-s tav-s.  
3SG.NOM 3BDAT-SG-PRV-criticize-TS-3ANOM-SG self-DAT  
“He criticizes himself.”

3.5.19. **Example.**

me i v-a-k-eb  
1SG.NOM 1ANOM-SG-PRV-praise-TS 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT  
“I praise myself.”
3.5. The Simple Reflexive Pronoun \textit{tav-}

3.5.20. **Example.**

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{me}_i \quad \text{v-i-k-eb} \quad \text{tav-s}_i. \\
1\text{SG.NOM} 1\text{ANOM-SG-PRV-praise-TS self-DAT}
\end{array}\]

“I praise myself.”

3.5.21. **Example.**

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{giorgi-m}_i \quad [\text{tavis-i} \quad \text{tav-i}]_i. \\
\text{Giorgi-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM}
\end{array}\]

\[\begin{array}{l}
(\emptyset-a-k-o). \\
3\text{B_NOM.SG-PRV-praise-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC}
\end{array}\]

“Giorgi praised HIMSELF.”

3.5.22. **Example.**

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{giorgi-m}_i \quad \text{tav-i}_i \quad (\emptyset-i-k-o). \\
\text{Giorgi-ERG self-NOM 3B_NOM.SG-PRV-praise-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC}
\end{array}\]

“Giorgi praised himself.”

3.5.23. **Example.**

\[\begin{array}{l}
a. \text{me}_i \quad [\text{čem-i} \quad \text{tav-i}]_i \quad \text{v-i-k-e}. \\
1\text{SG.ERG 1POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM 1A_ERG.SG-PRV-praise-AOR.INDIC}
\end{array}\]

“*I praised myself.”

“*I praised MYSELF.”

\[\begin{array}{l}
b. \text{šen}_i \quad [\text{šen-i} \quad \text{tav-i}]_i \quad (\emptyset-i-zag-e). \\
2\text{SG.ERG 2POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM 2A_ERG.SG-PRV-curse-AOR.INDIC}
\end{array}\]

“*You cursed yourself.”

“*You cursed YOURSELF.”

\[^{34}\]If the complex POS+S+tav- is accompanied with the verbal reflexive \textit{i}-, there still is a focused reading. See Footnote 14 in Chapter 4 about the use of complex reflexivization strategies together with intrinsically reflexive verbs.
c. man [tavis-i tav-i],
3SG.ERG 3REFL.Poss.SG-NOM self-NOM
ga-∅-i-masxr-a.
Pv-3B NOM.SG-PRV-clown-3aERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
"*He made fun of himself."
“He made fun of HIMSELF.”

3.5.24. EXAMPLE.
a. me, v-i-ķriṭik-eb [ĉem-s tav-s].
1SG.NOM 1ANOM.SG-PRV-criticize-TS 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT
"*I criticize myself.”
“I criticize MYSELF.”
b. šen, ∅-i-ķriṭik-eb [šen-s tav-s].
2SG.NOM 2ANOM.SG-PRV-criticize-TS 2POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT
"*You criticize yourself.”
“You criticize YOURSELF.”
c. is, ∅-i-ķriṭik-eb [tavis tav-s].
3SG.NOM 3B DAT.SG-PRV-criticize-TS-3ANOM.SG 3REFL.Poss.SG self-DAT
"*He criticizes himself.”
“He criticizes HIMSELF.”

3.5.25. EXAMPLE.
me, v-i-k-eb [ĉem-s tav-s].
1SG.NOM 1ANOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT
"*I praise myself.”
“I praise MYSELF.”

3.5.26. EXAMPLE.
giorgi-m, 0-i-k-o [tavis-i
Giorgi-ERG 3B NOM.SG-PRV-praise-3aERG.SG.AOR.INDIC 3REFL.Poss.SG-NOM
tav-i].
self-NOM
"*Giorgi praised himself.”
“Giorgi praised HIMSELF.”

The possessive part of the reflexive phrase can not simply be dropped (cf. 3.5.15a vs. 3.5.27a, 3.5.15b vs. 3.5.27b, 3.5.15c vs. 3.5.27c, 3.5.17a vs. 3.5.28a, 3.5.17b vs.
3.5.28b, 3.5.17c vs. 3.5.28c, 3.5.19 vs. 3.5.29, 3.5.21 vs. 3.5.30) or added (cf. 3.5.16a vs. 3.5.23a, 3.5.16b vs. 3.5.23b, 3.5.16c vs. 3.5.23c, 3.5.18a vs. 3.5.24a, 3.5.18b vs. 3.5.24b, 3.5.18c vs. 3.5.24c, 3.5.20 vs. 3.5.25, 3.5.22 vs. 3.5.26) without losing an aspect of the meaning or its grammaticality.

3.5.27. Example.

a. *me tav-i v-a-k-e.
   1SG.ERG self-NOM 1AERG:SG-PRV-praise-AOR.INDIC
   “I praised myself.”

b. *šen tav-i ž-a-zag-e.
   2SG.ERG self-NOM 2AERG:SG-PRV-curse-AOR.INDIC
   “You cursed yourself.”

   3SG.ERG self-NOM PV-3BNOM:SG-PRV-clown-3AERG:SG.AOR.INDIC
   “He made fun of himself.”

3.5.28. Example.

a. *me v-a-šriš-eb tav-s.
   1SG.NOM 1ANOM:SG-PRV-criticize-TS self-DAT
   “I praised myself.”

b. *šen ž-a-šriš-eb tav-s.
   2SG.NOM 2ANOM:SG-PRV-criticize-TS self-DAT
   “You criticize yourself.”

c. *is ž-a-šriš-eb-s tav-s.
   “He criticizes himself.”

3.5.29. Example.

*mei v-a-k-e tav-si,.
   1SG.NOM 1ANOM:SG-PRV-praise-TS self-DAT
   “I praise myself.”

3.5.30. Example.

*giorgi-m tav-i ž-a-k-o.
   Giorgi-ERG self-NOM 3BNOM:SG-PRV-praise-3AERG:SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Giorgi praised himself.”
Thus, the POSS+tav- and the simple tav- are not interchangeable. Although diachronically the latter is derived from the former one, synchronically the two are different.

If the two (the simple tav- and the POSS+tav-) would be the same strategy with and without the optional POSS, then not only the examples with the simple tav- but also the corresponding examples with the POSS+tav- should be grammatical in an unfocused reading. However, as the examples 3.5.16a vs. 3.5.23a, 3.5.16b vs. 3.5.23b, 3.5.16c vs. 3.5.23c, 3.5.18a vs. 3.5.24a, 3.5.18b vs. 3.5.24b, 3.5.18c vs. 3.5.24c, 3.5.20 vs. 3.5.25, 3.5.22 vs. 3.5.26 illustrate, this is not the case.

Furthermore, if the simple tav- and the POSS+tav- would be the same strategy with and without the optional POSS, then not only the examples with the POSS+tav- but also the examples with the simple tav- should be grammatical. However, as the examples 3.5.15a vs. 3.5.27a, 3.5.15b vs. 3.5.27b, 3.5.15c vs. 3.5.27c, 3.5.17a vs. 3.5.28a, 3.5.17b vs. 3.5.28b, 3.5.17c vs. 3.5.28c, 3.5.19 vs. 3.5.29, 3.5.21 vs. 3.5.30 illustrate, this is not the case.

Thus, the POSS is optional in the POSS+tav- phrase with 3-argument verbs and there the tav- that stands alone, represents the same POSS+tav- strategy with an optional POSS. In 3-argument verbs, after having dropped the POSS, the co-indexing is possible between the alone standing reflexive tav- and any other co-argument NP (unless the reflexive c-commands the NP).

However, in 2-argument verbs the simple tav- is not the same POSS+tav- strategy with the dropped POSS. In 2-argument verbs POSS is not optional at all but it serves as an obligatory co-indexing tool between the anaphor and the antecedent. The POSS can not be deleted unless another co-indexation tool, the verbal reflexive prefix i-, is used.

Thus, the complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the simple reflexive tav- (requiring the verbal i- support) should be recognized as being two different reflexivization strategies.

When discussing the simple tav- only the strategy used with the obligatory presence of the verbal reflexive i- in 2-argument verbs will be referred to and not the occurrences of the head tav- with an optional and dropped POSS determiner in 3-argument verbs.

### 3.5.3 Domain and C-Command

The reflexive simple tav-, just like the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (Example 3.4.1), must be bound in a local domain (3.5.31a). The simple tav- must have a clause-mate antecedent and if the reflexive is in the lower clause, an NP from the upper clause cannot serve as an antecedent (3.5.31b):

#### 3.5.31. Example.

35Old Georgian only used the POSS+tav- strategy [Sha76, Sar97].
3.5. The Simple Reflexive Pronoun 
tav-

a. levan-i, 0-pikr-ob-s, rom meutherland 
v-i-k-e.
1A-ERG:SG-PRV-praise-AOR.INDIC
“Levan thinks that I praised myself.”
“*Levani thinks that I praised himi.”

b. iliai 0-pikr-ob-s, rom gia-s
s-jer-a, kaxa-sk-sj-sur-s, bakar-isl
zma-m, 0-i-k-o-s tav-i/sj/sk/sl/m*
“Iliai thinks that Giaj believes [that] Kakhak wants [that] Bakarl’s brotherm praises
himself**sj/sk/sl/m***.”

Besides the locality constraint, the simple tav- has to have a c-commanding antecedent. As Example 3.5.31b illustrates, the bare tav- can only have a c-commanding zma-m as an antecedent but no noun phrases (such as kaxa-s, gia-s, ilia) from the upper clauses. Therefore, the simple reflexive pronoun tav- can not act as a long distance anaphor [And86] which is possible, for instance, for the Icelandic reflexive (Example 3.4.2).

The fact that the specifier of the phrase bakar-is zma-m cannot serve as an antecedent, also shows the importance of c-command. The determiner bakar-is is unable to c-command and consequently bind the reflexive tav-i in 3.5.31b. Therefore, the simple tav- does not only require a clause-mate but also a c-commanding antecedent.

As illustrated by Example 3.5.32, the simple tav- cannot be used in logophoric contexts (cf. the logophoric use of the English self-form in Example 3.4.3):

3.5.32. Example.

a. *tav-is da rektor-is saxel-it
self-GEN and head.of.a.university-GEN name-INST
0-e-ev-i-e universitet-is stamba-s.
“On behalf of myself and the head of the university visit the university printing house.”

b. *tav-is garda qvela-∅ še-∅-a-men-ev-s
prezident-is uvicoba-s-a da politikur sibece-s.
president-GEN ignorance-DAT-EV and political being.cross.eyed-DAT
“Anyone but yourself will notice the president’s ignorance and being politically cross-eyed.”

c. *tav-is msgavs-i xalx-is-a-tvis dikta-tor-s qoveltvis
   self-GEN alike-NOM people-GEN-EV-for dictator-DAT always
   mo-∅-e-zebn-eb-a ert-i  sakan-i.
   PV-3B_DAT,SG-PRV-search-TS-3A_NOM,SG one-NOM prison.cell-NOM
   Lit.: For people like yourself there can always be searched a prison cell by the dictator
   “For people like yourself the dictator always has a prison cell.”

Therefore, the Georgian simple reflexive pronoun *tav*-must be bound in a local domain by a c-commanding antecedent and cannot be used either as a long-distance anaphor (3.5.31) or as a logophor (3.5.32).36

3.5.4 Binding and Word Order

As was already mentioned in Section 3.4.3 when the Georgian complex reflexive phrase POSS+*tav*- was discussed, word order does not influence binding in most cases. The examples 3.5.33a vs. 3.5.33b illustrate that this is true for the simple reflexive pronoun *tav*- as well:

3.5.33. EXAMPLE.
   a. kac-i  ∅-i-keb-s  tav-si.
      man-NOM 3B_DAT,SG-PRV-praise-TS-3A_NOM,SG self-DAT
      “The man praises himself.”
   b. tav-si  ∅-i-keb-s  kac-i.
      self-DAT 3B_DAT,SG-PRV-praise-TS-3A_NOM,SG man-NOM
      “The man praises HIMSELF.”

Thus, word order changes do not affect a binding relation between the simple reflexive pronoun *tav*- and its antecedent.

3.5.5 POSS+*tav*- , *tav*- and Sub-Classes of Transitive Verbs

Among the differences in distribution of the simple and complex nominal reflexivization strategies, there is specific one that concerns their behavior with regard to certain sub-classes of transitive verbs. Namely, the transitive verbs referring to physical destruction, acts of violence and activities which are very unlikely to be committed by

---

36 As already mentioned in Footnote 16 in Chapter 3, certain verbs and verb readings in Georgian show anaphors as a subject argument. However, this is true for the complex reflexives only (to be discussed in Chapter 7), not for the simple *tav*-.
3.5. The Simple Reflexive Pronoun \( \text{tav-} \)

A person towards himself/herself. Whereas for other transitive verbs both the complex reflexive \( \text{POSS+}\text{tav-} \) and the simple reflexive pronoun \( \text{tav-} \) are available normally, (cf. 3.5.15a vs. 3.5.16a, 3.5.15b vs. 3.5.16b, 3.5.15c vs. 3.5.17a vs. 3.5.17a, 3.5.17b vs. 3.5.18b, 3.5.17c vs. 3.5.18c, 3.5.19 vs. 3.5.20, 3.5.21 vs. 3.5.22), with the verbs of physical destruction and acts of violence only the simple reflexive pronoun \( \text{tav-} \) is possible and no use of \( \text{POSS+}\text{tav-} \) is grammatical (3.5.34a vs. 3.5.34c, 3.5.35a vs. 3.5.35c, 3.5.36a vs. 3.5.36c).

3.5.34. Example.

a. *\( \text{kač-ma mo-∅-kl-a} \) \( \text{tavis-i} \)
   \( \text{man-ERG PV-3B_{NOM.SG.-}3A_{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG.-NOM}} \)
   \( \text{tav-i} \).
   self-NOM
   “The man killed himself.”

b. *\( \text{kač-ma mo-∅-kl-a} \) \( \text{tav-i} \)
   \( \text{man-ERG PV-3B_{NOM.SG.-}3A_{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC NOM self-NOM}} \)
   “The man killed himself.”

c. \( \text{kač-ma mo-∅-kl-a} \) \( \text{tav-i} \)
   \( \text{man-ERG PV-3B_{NOM.SG.-}3A_{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC NOM self-NOM}} \)
   “The man killed himself.”

d. *\( \text{kač-ma mo-∅-kl-a} \) \( \text{tavis-i} \)
   \( \text{man-ERG PV-3B_{NOM.SG.-}3A_{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG.-NOM}} \)
   \( \text{tav-i} \).
   self-NOM
   “The man killed himself.”
   “The man killed HIMSELF.”

3.5.35. Example.

a. *\( \text{kač-ma ča-∅-a-xrē-o} \) \( \text{tavis-i} \)
   \( \text{man-ERG PV-3B_{NOM.SG.-PRV-3A_{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG.-NOM}} \)
   \( \text{tav-i} \).
   self-NOM
   “The man hung himself.”

b. *\( \text{kač-ma ča-∅-a-xrē-o} \) \( \text{tav-i} \)
   \( \text{man-ERG PV-3B_{NOM.SG.-PRV-3A_{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC NOM self-NOM}} \)
   “The man hung himself.”

\[37\] Although transitive verbs still allow the complex \( \text{POSS+}\text{tav-} \) in the presence of the verbal reflexive marker \( i- \) on a focused interpretation (see the examples 3.5.23–3.5.26), for the verbs referring to physical destruction and acts of violence such occurrence of the strategies is ungrammatical (3.5.34d, 3.5.35d, 3.5.36d).
   man-ERG PV-3B NOM-SG PRV-3ERG-SG AOR.INDIC self-NOM
   “The man hung himself.”

   man-ERG PV-3B NOM-SG PRV-3ERG-SG AOR.INDIC 3REFL.Poss.SG.NOM
   self-NOM
   “The man hung himself.”
   “The man hung HIMSELF.”

3.5.36. Example.

a. *ქა-მა და-ი-ა-საქ-ე-რ-ა
   man-ERG PV-3B NOM-SG PRV-crippled-3A ERG-SG AOR.INDIC
   tavis-ი თავ-ი.
   3REFL.Poss.SG.NOM self-NOM
   “The man crippled himself.”

b. *ქა-მა და-ი-ა-საქ-ე-რ-ა
   man-ERG PV-3B NOM-SG PRV-crippled-3A ERG-SG AOR.INDIC self-NOM
   “The man crippled himself.”

c. ქა-მა და-ი-ა-საქ-ე-რ-ა
   man-ERG PV-3B NOM-SG PRV-crippled-3A ERG-SG AOR.INDIC self-NOM
   “The man crippled himself.”

d. *ქა-მა და-ი-ა-საქ-ე-რ-ა
   man-ERG PV-3B NOM-SG PRV-crippled-3A ERG-SG AOR.INDIC
   tavis-ი თავ-ი.
   3REFL.Poss.SG.NOM self-NOM
   “The man crippled himself.”
   “The man crippled HIMSELF.”

The cases like the ones above that contain physical destruction and acts of violence (see the examples 3.5.34–3.5.36) are formally similar to the cases with verbs referring to actions affecting inalienable nouns (see the examples 3.5.37–3.5.39). As the examples 3.5.37a, 3.5.37d, 3.5.38a, 3.5.38d, 3.5.39a, 3.5.39d illustrate, the inalienable nouns modified by a possessive are ungrammatical. Similarly, the grammaticalized tav- modified by a possessive is ungrammatical with the verbs of physical destruction and of violence (3.5.34a, 3.5.34d, 3.5.35a, 3.5.35d, 3.5.36a, 3.5.36d). Note that the only possibility is the inalienable noun (cf. 3.5.37c vs. 3.5.37b, 3.5.38c vs. 3.5.38b, 3.5.39c vs. 3.5.39b) / the grammaticalized tav- (3.5.34c vs. 3.5.34b, 3.5.35c vs. 3.5.35b, 3.5.36c vs. 3.5.36b) with the obligatory presence of the verbal prefix i-:
3.5.37. Example.

a. *van gog-ma tavis-i qu-i
van.Gogh-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM ear-NOM
mo-∅-čr-a.
Pv-3B NOM,SG-cut.off-3A ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
"Van Gogh cut off his ear."

b. *van gog-ma qu-i mo-∅-čr-a.
van.Gogh-ERG ear-NOM PV-3B NOM,SG-cut.off-3A ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
"Van Gogh cut off his ear."

c. van gog-ma qu-i mo-∅-čr-a.
van.Gogh-ERG ear-NOM PV-3B NOM,SG-PRV-cut.off-3A ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
"Van Gogh cut off his ear."

d. *van gog-ma tavis-i qu-i
van.Gogh-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM ear-NOM
mo-∅-čr-a.
Pv-3B NOM,SG-PRV-cut-3A ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
"Van Gogh cut off his ear."

3.5.38. Example.

a. *giorgi-m tavis-i pir-i
Giorgi-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM face-NOM
ga-∅-pars-a.
Pv-3B NOM,SG-shave-3A ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
"Giorgi shaved."

b. *giorgi-m pir-i ga-∅-pars-a.
Giorgi-ERG face-NOM PV-3B NOM,SG-shave-3A ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
"Giorgi shaved."

c. giorgi-m pir-i ga-∅-i-pars-a.
Giorgi-ERG face-NOM PV-3B NOM,SG-PRV-shave-3A ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
"Giorgi shaved."

d. *giorgi-m tavis-i pir-i
Giorgi-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM face-NOM
ga-∅-i-pars-a.
Pv-3B NOM,SG-PRV-shave-3A ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC
"Giorgi shaved."
3.5.39. Example.

a. *giorgi-m tav-i  
   Giorgi-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM head-NOM  
   da-∅-ban-a.  
   PV-3B\_NOM SG-wash-3A\_ERG SG AOR.INDIC  
   “Giorgi washed his head.”

b. *giorgi-m tav-i  
   Giorgi-ERG head-NOM PV-3B\_NOM SG-wash-3A\_ERG SG AOR.INDIC  
   “Giorgi washed his head.”

c. giorgi-m tav-i  
   Giorgi-ERG head-NOM PV-3B\_NOM SG-PRV-wash-3A\_ERG SG AOR.INDIC  
   “Giorgi washed his head.”

d. *giorgi-m tav-i  
   Giorgi-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM head-NOM  
   da-∅-i-ban-a.  
   PV-3B\_NOM SG-PRV-wash-3A\_ERG SG AOR.INDIC  
   “Giorgi washed his head.”

Therefore, the verbs referring to physical destruction, acts of violence or of affecting inalienable nouns (3.5.34–3.5.39) group together, distinctly from the rest of the transitive verbs according to the use of the reflexivization strategies and co-indexing tools. Perhaps the more affected patient should be distinguished from less affected patient as a direct object argument of the verbs representing the two major groupings.

A different effect can be seen with verbs taking only an indirect object apart from the subject argument (see an example of such a verb in 2.4.3a–e). For these verbs, the only available reflexivization strategy is the full reflexive phrase POSS+tav- while the dropping of the determiner POSS is not allowed (3.5.40a vs. 3.5.40b, 3.5.41a vs. 3.5.41b, 3.5.42a vs. 3.5.42b). The verbal reflexive i- support also does not make the use of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- with (3.5.40d–3.5.42d) or without the determiner (3.5.40c–3.5.42c) grammatical:

3.5.40. Example.

a. kāc-i ∅-e-laparāk-eb-od-a  
   man-NOM 3B\_DAT SG-PRV-talk-TS-IMPERF-3A\_NOM SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT  
   “The man was talking to himself.”

b. *kāc-i ∅-e-laparāk-eb-od-a  
   man-NOM 3B\_DAT SG-PRV-talk-TS-IMPERF-3A\_NOM SG self-DAT  
   “The man was talking to himself.”
3.5. The Simple Reflexive Pronoun tav-

3.5.41. Example.

a. *kac-i 0-i-lapar-eb-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-talk-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was talking to himself.”

b. *kac-i 0-i-lapar-eb-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-talk-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was talking to himself.”

c. *kac-i 0-i-lapar-eb-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-talk-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was talking to himself.”

d. *kac-i 0-i-lapar-eb-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-talk-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was talking to himself.”

3.5.42. Example.

a. kc-i 0-e-brz-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-fight-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was fighting with himself.”

b. *kc-i 0-e-brz-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-fight-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was fighting with himself.”

c. *kc-i 0-i-brz-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-fight-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was fighting with himself.”

d. *kc-i 0-i-brz-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-fight-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was fighting with himself.”

a. kc-i 0-e-komat-eb-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-debate-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT  
   “The man was debating with himself.”

b. *kc-i 0-e-komat-eb-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-debate-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was debating with himself.”

c. *kc-i 0-i-komat-eb-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-debate-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was debating with himself.”

d. *kc-i 0-i-komat-eb-od-a tavis 
   man-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-debate-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT 
   “The man was debating with himself.”
The intransitive verbs in 3.5.40, 3.5.41 and 3.5.42 take an addressee/benefactive as the only object argument, which means that the affectedness is low. Certainly the indirect object of the intransitive verbs is less affected than the direct object argument in the verbs of violence and destruction in the examples 3.5.34–3.5.36, or in the transitive verbs of affecting inalienable nouns in the examples 3.5.37–3.5.39.

The facts regarding the use of the complex reflexive POSS+tav- versus the simple reflexive pronoun tav-, are summarized in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Verb Classes</th>
<th>Syntactic Role of the Anaphor</th>
<th>Affectedness of the Referent</th>
<th>POSS tav-</th>
<th>tav-</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Argument Intransitive</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3.5.40a vs. 3.5.40c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>3.5.41a vs. 3.5.41c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.42a vs. 3.5.42c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive Verbs of Violence and Destruction</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.5.34a vs. 3.5.34c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.35a vs. 3.5.35c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.36a vs. 3.5.36c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.37a vs. 3.5.37c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.38a vs. 3.5.38c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.39a vs. 3.5.39c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 2-Argument Transitive Verbs</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.5.15 vs. 3.5.16,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.17 vs. 3.5.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.19 vs. 3.5.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.21 vs. 3.5.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: The Use of the Complex Reflexive POSS+tav versus the Simple Reflexive Pronoun tav in 2-Argument Verbs.

Table 3.2 shows the fact that the simple reflexive pronoun tav- is available with 2-argument verbs, even when the object argument is of high affectedness. The 2-argument intransitive verbs taking an indirect object (naturally of low affectedness) the tav- becomes unavailable.

### 3.5.6 Conclusion

Section 3.5 dealt with the Georgian simple reflexive pronoun tav-. Subsection 3.5.2 argued that in 2-argument transitive verbs, the tav- is not a subtype of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- but rather a different reflexivization strategy. Subsection 3.5.3 characterized the simple reflexive pronoun tav- as having to be bound in a local domain by a c-commanding antecedent and to be unable to serve as a long-distance anaphor or as a logophor. Subsection 3.5.4 has argued that the word order does not affect the interpretation and the antecedent choice of the tav-. Subsection 3.5.5 provided evidence to
relate the low affectedness of the object argument with the unavailability of the simple reflexive pronoun *tav*.

### 3.6 The Georgian Reciprocals

#### 3.6.1 Introduction

In this section, the behavior of Georgian reciprocals will be described and analyzed. Subsection 3.6.2 deals with the form of the reciprocals, while Subsection 3.6.3 discusses their anaphoric properties. In Subsection 3.6.4, it is argued that word order does not affect the interpretation and antecedent choice for the reciprocals in most cases. Furthermore, it illustrates that reciprocals have a restriction disallowing an indirect object to be bound by a direct object, irrespective of word order changes. It is generally assumed that reciprocals, requiring plural NPs as antecedents, should trigger plural marking. However, the Georgian data discussed in Subsection 3.6.5 illustrate that plural agreement is not necessary. Finally, in Subsection 3.6.6 the section is concluded.

#### 3.6.2 The Form of the Reciprocals

**A Short Introduction**

Georgian has no verbal reciprocal marker and uses the following reciprocal forms: *ertmanet-* and *ertimeore-*.

There is also a third one—*erturt*—used in some of the Modern Georgian dialects (Xevsurian, Moxevian and Pshavian, [Mar64a, pp. 213-214]). For the rest, its use is restricted to literary works (mainly those whose authors are speakers of the dialects, [Mar64a, pp. 213-214]). The works consist mainly of poetry and therefore the use of *erturt* is stylistically marked if it appears in everyday speech. When looking at the form of reciprocals (Subsection 3.6.2) the various forms occurring in modern dialects will be considered as well as the previous periods of the language, like the Old or Middle Georgian. However, in the rest of the Section 3.6 when discussing the distribution of the Georgian reciprocals only the Modern Georgian *ertmanet-* and *ertimeore-* will be referred to.

**Two Main Patterns**

If the reciprocal expressions both in Old, Middle, Modern Georgian and the modern dialects are considered, it can be seen that the forms are compounds consisting of two pronominal elements. Irrespective of the phonological processes, the reciprocal expressions have gone through, all the forms make use of the indefinite pronoun *ert*—“one” (historically derived from the cardinal *ert*—“one”) and another pronominal, which is

---

38Since the use of *erturt* in Modern Georgian is characteristic mainly to literary works, the study of literary sources is important for the precise description of its distribution.
either the same indefinite ert-, definite meore (historically the ordinal meore “second”) or definite sxva “another, other”.

All the reciprocal forms can be categorized into two different groups: (i) the group with reciprocal forms built on one+(CASE)+one and (ii) the group with reciprocal forms built on one+another.

The examples 3.6.1–3.6.4 (taken from [Mar64a]) illustrate the reciprocal expressions built on the compounding of the indefinite pronoun one (one+(CASE)+one):

3.6.1. Example. Old Georgian
   a. ert+i+ert-
one+NOM+one
   b. urt+i+ert+a-
one+NOM+one+EV

3.6.2. Example. Middle Georgian
   ert+man+ert-
one+ERG+one

3.6.3. Example. Modern Georgian
   a. ert+man+et-
one+ERG+one
   b. ert+urt-
one+one

3.6.4. Example. Various mountainous dialects
   a. ert+man+ert-
one+ERG+one
   b. ert+urc (< ert+urt+s) one+one.DAT one+one+DAT

   The examples 3.6.5–3.6.7 (taken from [Mar64a]) illustrate the reciprocal expressions built on the compounding of the indefinite pronoun one and the definite another (one+(CASE)+another):

3.6.5. Example. Modern Georgian
   ert+i+meore-
one+NOM+another

---

39The form was used in Middle Georgian and is used in Modern Georgian dialects (see Example 3.6.4a as well as [Mar64a]).
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3.6.6. Example. Imeretian, Gurian, Rach’an dialects

\[
\text{ert+i+more-} \quad (< \text{ert+i+moore-} < \text{ert+i+meore-}) \\
\text{one+NOM+another} \quad \text{one+NOM+another} \quad \text{one+NOM+another}
\]

3.6.7. Example. Xevsurian dialect

\[
\text{ercxva-} \quad (< \text{ert+sxva-}) \\
\text{REC-} \quad \text{one+another-}
\]

Although the forms of the Modern Georgian reciprocals \textit{ertmanet-} and \textit{ertimeore-} are transparent (Example 3.6.8), each of them is already grammaticalized into an unanalyzable unit (Example 3.6.9) which can further be marked for case according to its syntactic function. For instance, in Example 3.6.10, the reciprocal gets the DAT marker as a direct object in the Present Indicative and in 3.6.11 it is marked by NOM as a direct object in the Aorist Indicative:

3.6.8. Example.

a. \textit{ertmanet-} \ < \textit{ert+man+et-} \ < \textit{ert+man+ert-}^{40} \\
\quad \text{one+ERG+one-} \\
\quad \text{“each other.”}

b. \textit{ertimeore-} \ < \textit{ert+i+meore-} \\
\quad \text{one+NOM+another-} \\
\quad \text{“each other”}

3.6.9. Example.

a. \textit{ˇcven} \ 1\text{PL.NOM}*ert-s-et-s/ \ ert+man+et-s \ ˇsrˇsan \ 1\text{PL.DAT.one+DAT one+ERG+one-DAT(=REC-DAT) last.year} \\
\quad \text{še-v-xvd-i-t.} \\
\quad \text{PV-1\text{AOM,SG-meet-AOR,INDIC-PL.NOM}} \\
\quad \text{“We met each other last year.”}

b. \textit{ˇcven} \ 1\text{PL.NOM}*ert-s-meore-s/ \ ert+i+meore-s \ ˇsrˇsan \ 1\text{PL.DAT.another-DAT one+NOM+another-DAT(=REC-DAT) last.year} \\
\quad \text{še-v-xvd-i-t.} \\
\quad \text{PV-1\text{AOM,SG-meet-AOR,INDIC-PL.NOM}} \\
\quad \text{“We met each other last year.”}

^{40}\text{See Footnote 39 at Example 3.6.2, Chapter 3.}
3.6.10. Example.

megobr-eb-i  ertmanet-s/ ertimeore-s  
friend-PL-NOM REC-DAT REC-DAT  
∅-a-mxne-v-eb-en.  
3B_DAT-SG-PRV-cheerful-EC-TS-3A_NOM.PL  
The friends cheer up each other.

3.6.11. Example.

ˇcven  ertmanet-i/ertimeore-∅  šaršan  
1PL.ERG REC-NOM REC-NOM last.year  
ga-v-i-can-i-t.  
PV-1A_ERG SG-PRV-get.acquainted.with-AOR.INDIC-PL.ERG  
“We met each other last year.”

Thus, the modern Georgian reciprocals ertmanet- and ertimeore- were formed on the basis of the indefinite pronoun ert- “one” and the definite meore “another, other”. However, in the modern language, each of the forms is just one whole, which can no longer be analyzed as being constituted of different parts.

Movement analysis is not possible for ertmanet- and ertimeore-

In the following, it will be argued that it is not possible to derive the syntax and semantics of ertmanet- and ertimeore- compositionally from the syntax and semantics of the elements they consist of, which was proposed in [HLM91] for the English reciprocal each other.

These authors build their analysis on decomposing the reciprocal each other into two parts—the distributive quantifier each and the reciprocator other. Since each is a quantifier, each other could be a kind of complex quantifier in itself. The authors assume that each moves and leaves an NP trace. The relation between each and its antecedent is subject to Principle A. Thus, each is an anaphor, while [e other] is an R-expression.

The arguments for treating reciprocals as quantifiers are the following: The meaning of the reciprocals could be represented using quantifiers; reciprocals and quantificational each are similar; like universal quantifiers, reciprocals also exhibit (i) a distributive reading and (ii) scope ambiguities with propositional attitude verbs (first noticed by [Hig80]).

However, in another paper [DMP94] it is argued that there are counter-arguments for the analysis of reciprocals as quantifiers. One of the counter-arguments is that the analysis given in [HLM91] cannot be maintained with other languages. For instance, this is the case for Chichewà, which has a verbal reciprocal marker (see [DMP94] and the example 3.6.12a given there) and for Danish (3.6.12b), which is a language closely related to English but has a reciprocal as one word: 
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3.6.12. **Example.**

a. Chichewa

Mbidzi zi-ku-mény-an-a.
10zebras 10SM-PRES-hit-REC-FV

“The zebras are hitting each other.”

b. Danish

Zebraerne slår hinanden.
zebra.PL.DEFIN hit.PRES each.other

“The zebras are hitting each other.”

In Chichewa, it is impossible to have a distributor and reciprocator encoded separately, since the reciprocal is a single verbal morpheme (see the morpheme -an- in Example 3.6.12a). As for Danish, although it has a non-verbal reciprocal, it is difficult to maintain a movement analysis of a distributor, as both the distributor and the reciprocator are encoded as one word (3.6.12b).

Another counter-argument is the distributivity. The same distribution effects are observed with the NPs which are not necessarily quantifiers, for instance as is the case with bare plurals in Example 3.6.13. Thus, having the same distribution effects does not automatically mean that the reciprocals are quantifiers. It could simply be that reciprocals inherit the distributive properties from their antecedents, which are plural NPs.

3.6.13. **Example.** Vans carrying emergency aid arrive at this village every three days.

a. A different van comes every three days (distributive reading).

b. A group of vans arrive every three days (collective reading).

It is impossible to have a movement analysis for the Georgian reciprocals as was proposed for the English *each other* by [HLM91]. The reason for that is that Georgian has reciprocals as one word rather than as a combination of two words.

Even if it is attempted to decompose the forms into their parts as is done in the examples 3.6.14b and 3.6.15b there will be no reciprocal reading anymore:

3.6.14. **Example.**

a. bavšv-eb-ma ertmanet-i
child-PL-ERG REC-NOM
ga-∅-i-cn-es.
Pv-3Bnom.sg-prv.acquainted.with-3aerg.pl.aor.indic

“The children met each other.”
b. bavšv-eb-i-dan ert-ma ert-i
child-PL-INST-from one-ERG one-NOM
gaicno.
prv-3bNOM.sg-prv-get.acquainted.with-3AERG.sg.aor.indic
"*Each of the children met the other."
“One of the children met one (of the rest).”

3.6.15. Example.
“The children are talking to each other.”
child-PL-INST-from one-NOM another-dat 3bDAT.sg-prv-talk-ts-ts-3AERG-sg
"*Each of the children is talking to the other."
“One of the children is talking to another [one].”

Thus, it is not possible to maintain a movement analysis for the Georgian reciprocals as is possible for English each other [HLM91].

A Short Summary

Subsection 3.6.2 provided an overview of the reciprocal forms in Old, Middle Georgian as well as in modern Georgian dialects. This was done to illustrate that the forms are based on the pronouns such as the indefinite ertz- “one” and the definite meore “another, other”. It was argued that the reciprocal forms are no longer analyzable in Modern Georgian as being constituted of different parts. This automatically rules out the movement analysis for the Georgian reciprocals as was possible for the English each other.

3.6.3 Domain and C-Command

A Short Introduction

In this subsection the antecedent choice of the Georgian reciprocals, whether the c-command relation is important for their distribution and how the person and number features of the potential antecedents influence the actual choice will be discussed.

Any C-Commanding Clause-Mate NP as an Antecedent

The Georgian reciprocals ertmanet- and ertimeore- can only have a clause-mate antecedent, as Example 3.6.16 illustrates. When they appear in the lower clause, they
cannot be bound by an antecedent in the matrix clause. Thus, the binding domain for the reciprocals is a clause:

3.6.16. Example.

\[
\begin{align*}
bav\-eb\-ma_{i_j\cdots+i_n} & \quad \text{ga-}0\-i\-xsen-es & \text{child}-\text{PL}-\text{ERG} & \quad \text{PV}-3\text{B}_{\text{NOM}}\text{-SG}\text{-PRV-recall}-3\text{A}_{\text{ERG}}\text{-PL} & \text{AOR}\text{-INDIC} \\
\text{(is),} \quad \text{rom} \quad \text{student-}eb\-i_{i_j\cdots+i_n} & \quad \text{ertimeore-}s_{s_{i_j\cdots+i_n}}/\text{ERTMANET-}s_{s_{i_j\cdots+i_n}}/\text{REC-DAT} & \text{3SG} & \text{NOM} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{student}-\text{PL}-\text{NOM} & \text{REC-DAT} \\
\text{ertimeore-}s_{s_{i_j\cdots+i_n}}/\text{ERTMANET-}s_{s_{i_j\cdots+i_n}} & \quad \text{0}-\text{-cxub-nen.} & \text{REC-DAT} & \text{3B}_{\text{DAT}}\text{-SG-PRV-argue-3A}_{\text{DAT}}\text{-PL} & \text{AOR}\text{-INDIC} \\
\text{“The children recalled that the students argued with each other.”} & \text{“The children recalled that the students argued with them.”} & \text{Example 3.6.17 illustrates that neither \textit{ertimeore} nor \textit{ertimeore} can be embedded in the subject position of the clause and have an antecedent in the higher clause:} \\
\text{That it is not possible for the reciprocals \textit{ertimeore} in Example 3.6.18 to take any of the coordinated phrases as \textit{ilia da levan-i}, \textit{gia-s-a da luka-s}, \textit{kaxa-s-a da giorgi-s} as an antecedent, shows that the reciprocals can not be bound long-distance but only locally:} \\
\text{3.6.18. Example.}\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[\text{ilia da levan-i}]_{i_j} & \quad \text{0-pikr-ob-en,} & \text{rom} \quad [\text{gia-s-a da luka-s, kaxa-s-a da giorgi-s}]_{i_n} & \text{and} \quad \text{ILIA} & \text{NOM} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{LEVAN} & \text{NOM} \quad \text{3B}_{\text{DAT}}\text{-SG}\text{-think-TS-3A}_{\text{NOM}}\text{-PL} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{GIA} & \text{DAT} & \text{EV} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{LUKA} & \text{NOM} & \text{3B}_{\text{DAT}}\text{-SG}\text{-believe-3A}_{\text{NOM}}\text{-SGPL}_{\text{DAT}} \quad \text{KAKHA} & \text{DAT} & \text{EV} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{GIORGI} & \text{DAT} & \text{3B}_{\text{DAT}}\text{-SG}\text{-want-PL}_{\text{DAT}} \quad \text{BAKAR} & \text{GEN} & \text{EV} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{IRAKLI} & \text{GEN} \\
\text{zm-eb-ma}_{i_{n+1}} & \quad \text{0-a-k-o-n} & \text{brother}-\text{PL}-\text{ERG} & \text{3B}_{\text{NOM}}\text{-SG}\text{-PRV-praise-SUBJ-3A}_{\text{ERG}}\text{-PL} & \text{ertimeore-}s_{s_{i_j}}/\text{ERTMANET-}s_{s_{i_j}}/\text{REC-DAT} & \text{REC-NOM} \\
\text{ertimeore-}s_{s_{i_j}}/\text{ERTMANET-}s_{s_{i_j}}/\text{REC-NOM} & \text{0}(i_{i+j})/(s(k+l)/(s(m+n)/s(o+p)/(q+r))) & \text{RECE-NOM} & \text{ertimeore}(i_{i+j})/(s(k+l)/(s(m+n)/s(o+p)/(q+r))) & \text{REC-NOM} \\
\end{align*}
\]
“Ilia and Levan think that Gia and Luka believe [that] Kakha and Giorgi want [that] Bakar’s and Irakli’s brothers praise each other.”

However, even within the clause, not every argument can be realized as a reciprocal. For instance, usually none of the reciprocals can appear as a subject argument and have an antecedent in the same clause (cf. 3.6.19a vs. 3.6.19b).41

3.6.19. Example.

a. *ertmanet-i/*ertimeore-∅ gv-a-k-eb-s
   REC-NOM REC-NOM 1B_DAT.PL-PRV-praise-TS-3A NOM.SG 1PL.DAT
   Lit.: Each other praises us.

b. (čven) v-a-k-eb-t ertmanet-s/ertimeore-s.
   1PL.NOM 1A NOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS-PL NOM REC-DAT REC-DAT
   “We praise each other.”

Since in Example 3.6.18 it is impossible for the reciprocals to be bound by the clause-mate bakar-is-a da irakli-s which is a specifier of the subject argument bakar-is-a da irakli-s zm-eb-ma it can be concluded that Georgian reciprocals require not only a clause-mate but also a c-commanding antecedent.

Thus, the Georgian reciprocals ertmanet- and ertimeore- must be bound in a local domain necessarily by a c-commanding antecedent. For them to have a long-distance antecedent, is impossible.

As was said already, neither of the reciprocals is exclusively subject-oriented but they can take also a non-subject argument as an antecedent. Here an example illustrating any of the subject and indirect object arguments as possible antecedents is given (Example 3.6.20):

3.6.20. Example.

[giorgi-m da bakar-ma]_{i+j} [ilia-s-a da levan-s]_{k+l} ertmanet-i_{(i+j)/(k+l)}
Giorgi-ERG and Bakar-ERG Ilia-DAT-EV and Levan-DAT REC-NOM
ertimeore-∅_{(i+j)/(k+l)} aγ-∅-u-č-er-es.
REC-NOM PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-describe-3A ERG.PL AOR.INDIC
Lit.: Giorgi and Bakar to. Ilia and to. Levan each other they.described.them.to.them
   “Giorgi and Bakar described each other to Ilia and Levan.”

   “Giorgi and Bakar described Ilia to Levan and Levan to Ilia.”

41Note however that with certain verbs and verb readings the reciprocal ertmanet- as a subject argument is still possible. See, for instance, Example 5.5.1 or the discussion of the issue of subject anaphors in Chapter 7.
However, the indirect object reciprocals in 3.6.21 cannot have a non-subject argument (here the direct object coordinated NP *ilia-*∅ *da levan-*i) as an antecedent:

3.6.21. Example.

\[ [\text{giorgi-m da bakar-ma}]_{i+j} \text{ertmanet-s}_{(i+j)/(k+l)} / \text{ertimeore-s}_{(i+j)/(k+l)} \]

Giorgi-ERG and Bakar-ERG REC-DAT REC-DAT

\[ [\text{ilia-∅ da levan-i}]_{k+l} \text{aγ-∅-u-çer-es.} \]

Ilia-NOM and Levan-NOM PV-3B\text{DAT}.SG-PRV-describe-3AERG.PL.AOR.INDIC

Lit.: Giorgi and Bakar to.each.other Ilia and Levan they.described.them.to.them

“We described Ilia and Levan to Bakar and Bakar described Ilia and Levan to Giorgi.”

“*Giorgi and Bakar described Ilia to Levan and Levan to Ilia.”

The fact that in Georgian the indirect object reciprocals fail to be c-commanded by the direct object argument, illustrates the indirect object vs. direct object asymmetry as well as the importance of c-command in reciprocal binding in general.\(^{42}\)

Restrictions on the Antecedent

As was shown in Example 3.6.20, Georgian reciprocals have no subject restriction and can have any c-commanding NP as an antecedent. Some more examples are given in 3.6.22:

3.6.22. Example.

a. čven\(_{(i_1+\ldots+i_n)}\) [ilia-s-a da levan-s\(_{(j+k)}\) ertmanet\(i_{(i_1+\ldots+i_n)/(j+k)}\)]

1PL.ERG Ilia-DAT-EV and Levan-DAT REC-NOM

ertimeore-∅\(_{(i_1+\ldots+i_n)/(j+k)}\) aγ-v-çer-e-t.

REC-NOM PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC-PLERG

Lit.: We to.Ilia and to.Levan each.other

we.described.him/her/them.to.him/her/them

“We described each other to Ilia and Levan.”

“We described Ilia to Levan and Levan to Ilia.”

b. tkven\(_{(i_1+\ldots+i_n)}\) [ilia-s-a da levan-s\(_{(j+k)}\) ertmanet\(i_{(i_1+\ldots+i_n)/(j+k)}\)]

2PL.ERG Ilia-DAT-EV and Levan-DAT REC-NOM

ertimeore-∅\(_{(i_1+\ldots+i_n)/(j+k)}\) aγ-∅-u-çer-e-t.

REC-NOM PV-2AERG.SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC-PLERG

\(^{42}\)In Section 3.4.4 there was an evidence from the domain of bound variable interpretation showing that the subject asymmetrically c-commands the direct object, and that the indirect object asymmetrically c-commands the direct object. Even if one might not accept the notion “c-command” but instead wants to rely on notions such as o-command/syntactic rank from HPSG/LFG, which both are broadly similar to the hierarchies of grammatical relation in relational grammar, there is a hierarchical asymmetry.
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Lit.: You.PL to.Ilia and to.Levan each.other
you.PL.described.him/her/them.to.him/her/them

“You described each other to Ilia and Levan.”
“You described Ilia to Levan and Levan to Ilia.”

c. mat_{i_1+\ldots+i_n} [\text{ilia-s-a} \ da \ \text{levan-s}_{j+k} \ \text{ertmanet-i}_{i_1+\ldots+i_n}/(j+k)/]
\begin{align*}
3\text{PL.ERG} & \text{ Ilia-DAT-EV and Levan-DAT REC-NOM} \\
\text{ertimeore-}\emptyset(i_1+\ldots+i_n)/(j+k) & a_{\gamma} \emptyset\text{-u- çer-es.} \\
\text{REC-NOM} & \text{PV-3B\text{DAT}SG-PRV-describe-3A\text{ERG}PL.AOR.INDIC}
\end{align*}
Lit.: They to.Ilia and to.Levan each.other
they.described.him/her/them.to.him/her/them

“They described each other to Ilia and Levan.”
“They described Ilia to Levan and Levan to Ilia.”

However, reciprocals do require plural antecedents. Even if theoretically the direct object reciprocal can have either the subject or the indirect object as an antecedent (Example 3.6.22) the result will be ungrammatical unless the potential antecedent is plural.

For instance, it is not wrong for the direct object reciprocals to have a subject argument as an antecedent (Example 3.6.22). However, as soon as the subject argument is singular, the anaphoric relation between the reciprocal and the argument cannot be maintained (cf. 3.6.22a vs. 3.6.23a, 3.6.22b vs. 3.6.23b, 3.6.22c vs. 3.6.23c):

3.6.23. EXAMPLE.

a. me_{i} [\text{ilia-s-a} \ da \ \text{levan-s}_{j+k} \ \text{ertmanet-i}_{i_1+\ldots+i_n}/(j+k)/]
\begin{align*}
1\text{SG.ERG} & \text{ Ilia-DAT-EV and Levan-DAT REC-NOM} \\
\text{ertimeore-}\emptyset_{i_1+\ldots+i_n}/(j+k) & a_{\gamma} \emptyset\text{-v- çer-e.} \\
\text{REC-NOM} & \text{PV-1A\text{ERG}SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC}
\end{align*}
Lit.: I to.Ilia and to.Levan each.other I.described.him/her/them.to.him/her/them

“I described Ilia and Levan to each other.”

b. šen_{i} [\text{ilia-s-a} \ da \ \text{levan-s}_{j+k} \ \text{ertmanet-i}_{i_1+\ldots+i_n}/(j+k)/]
\begin{align*}
2\text{SG.ERG} & \text{ Ilia-DAT-EV and Levan-DAT REC-NOM} \\
\text{ertimeore-}\emptyset_{i_1+\ldots+i_n}/(j+k) & a_{\gamma} \emptyset\text{-u- çer-e.} \\
\text{REC-NOM} & \text{PV-2A\text{ERG}SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC}
\end{align*}
Lit.: You.SG to.Ilia and to.Levan each.other
you.SG.described.him/her/them.to.him/her/them

“You described Ilia and Levan to each other.”
3.6. The Georgian Reciprocals

3.6.24. Example.

a. čven(1+,...+n) masj ertmanet-i(1+,...+n)/sj/ ertimeore-∅(1+,...+n)/sj
   1PL.ERG 3SG.DAT REC-NOM REC-NOM
   aγ-∅-u-cer-e-t.
   PV-1AERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC-PLERG
   Lit.: We to.him/her each.other we.described.him/her/them.to.him/her/them
   “We described each other to him/her.”

b. tkven(1+,...+n) masj ertmanet-i(1+,...+n)/sj/ ertimeore-∅(1+,...+n)/sj
   2PL.ERG 3SG.DAT REC-NOM REC-NOM
   aγ-∅-u-cer-e-t.
   PV-2AERG,SG-PRV-describe-AOR.INDIC-PLERG
   Lit.: You.PL to.him/her each.other you.PL.described.him/her/them.to.him/her/them
   “You described each other to him/her.”

c. mat(1+,...+n) masj ertmanet-i(1+,...+n)/sj/ ertimeore-∅(1+,...+n)/sj
   3PL.ERG 3SG.DAT REC-NOM REC-NOM
   aγ-∅-u-cer-es.
   PV-3BART,SG-PRV-describe-3AERG.PL.AOR.INDIC
   Lit.: They to.him/her each.other they.described.him/her/them.to.him/her/them
   “They described each other to him/her.”

Note that mass nouns (cf. the examples 3.6.25a, 3.6.25b) and compounds referring to more than one referent (3.6.25c) but formally representing singular NPs (by triggering a singular agreement) can also serve as an antecedent for reciprocals in Georgian. The fact that the mass nouns and compounds behave as singular NPs can be seen on the agreement they trigger on the verb form (cf. *∅-e-kamat-eb-od-a vs. *∅-e-kamat-eb-od-nen in 3.6.25a, *šemo-s-cqr-a vs. *šemo-s-cqr-nen in 3.6.25b, *∅-e-laparak-eb-od-a vs. *∅-e-laparak-eb-od-nen in 3.6.25c):
3.6.25. EXAMPLE.

a.  cçvil-i(1+i+j)  ertmanet-s(1+i+j)/  ertimeore-s(1+i+j)
   couple-NOM  REC-DAT  REC-DAT
   ∅-e-kamat-eb-od-a/
   3BDAT:SG-PRV-argue-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM:SG
   *∅-e-kamat-eb-od-nen.
   3BDAT:SG-PRV-argue-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM:PL
   “The couple was arguing with each other.”

b.  xalx-i(i1+···+in)  ertmanet-s(i1+···+in)/  ertimeore-s(i1+···+in)
   people-NOM  REC-DAT  REC-DAT
   ˇsemo-s-cqr-a/
   PV-3BDAT:SG-get.disappointed-3ANOM:SG.AOR.INDIC
   *ˇsemo-s-cqr-nen.
   PV-3BDAT:SG-get.disappointed-3ANOM:PL.AOR.INDIC
   “The people got disappointed on each other.”

c.  da-zma-∅(1+i+j)  ertmanet-s(1+i+j)/  ertimeore-s(1+i+j)
   sister-brother-NOM  REC-DAT  REC-DAT
   ∅-e-lapak-eb-od-a/
   3BDAT:SG-PRV-talk-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM:SG
   *∅-e-lapak-eb-od-nen.
   3BDAT:SG-PRV-talk-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM:PL
   “The sister and brother were talking to each other.”

Therefore, it is necessary for the antecedent to refer to more than one referent (cf. 3.6.22a vs. 3.6.23a, 3.6.22b vs. 3.6.23b, 3.6.22c vs. 3.6.23c). However, it is not necessary for the antecedent to trigger a plural agreement, as illustrated in Example 3.6.25.

Verb Semantics and Reciprocal Interpretation

The verb of which the lexical semantics imply an interaction between the referents of the plural subject, for instance, meet, play, argue, cooperate, contest, get divorced, split, etc. (see the examples 3.6.26a–3.6.29a) when taking a plural subject, can get a reciprocal interpretation, unless the object argument or the relevant adjunct postpositional phrase is specified.

\[\text{For more information on so-called reciprocal verbs see [Sil]. It seems that Georgian resembles English as it does not have any special morphology for verbs with a reciprocal interpretation. [Sil] gives a number of devices that these verbs are associated with, such as affixation (Russian, Hungarian), cliticization (Italian, Serbo-Croatian, Czech), special verbal template (Hebrew) and having no morphological marking at all (English).}\]
3.6. The Georgian Reciprocals

The examples 3.6.26b and 3.6.27b illustrate unergative verbs taking an agentive subject. The verbs can take an addressee as an adjunct postpositional phrase which is optional unless it is specified.

If no adjunct postpositional phrase is specified, then two interpretations are possible, which is exemplified in 3.6.26a and 3.6.27a. Namely, one referring to a state (being involved in arguing in 3.6.26a1 and being involved in playing in 3.6.27a1) and the other interpretation being reciprocal (see the examples 3.6.26a2 and 3.6.27a2). Getting the same reciprocal interpretation is also possible via an adjunct postpositional phrase (see the examples 3.6.26c and 3.6.27c).


a. politikos-eb-ma ∅45-i-ḵamat-es.
   politician-PL-ERG 3BNOM-SG-PRV-argue-3AErg.PL.AOR.INDIC
   Lit.: Politicians they argued

1. “The politicians argued.”

2. “The politicians argued with each other.”

44Example 3.6.27 illustrates the unergative verb which can take also a cognate object, e.g. play a certain game, however the unergative in 3.6.26 does not imply any cognate object whatsoever. Still it is possible to have nominals like bev- “many/much”, cot-a- “little” used as a pseudo-object, marked in the TAM Series as a DO of transitives. See Footnote 45 in Example 3.6.26.

45The prefix ∅ in the form ∅-i-ḵamat-es (3.6.26a-c) is triggered by an optional argument for unergatives. Although any cognate object marked as an object argument is ungrammatical unless given as an adjunct (cf. (i) vs. ii), such nouns as bev- “many/much”, cot-a- “little” behave as a direct object by case-marking (cf. (iii) vs. 2.4.2a, (iv) vs. 2.4.2c, (v) vs. 2.4.2e):

i. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II
   *politiqos-eb-ma politika-∅ ∅-i-ḵamat-es.
   politician-PL-ERG politics-NOM 3BNOM-SG-PRV-argue-3AErg.PL.AOR.INDIC
   Lit.: Politicians politics they argued
   “The politicians argued about politics.”

ii. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II
   politikos-eb-ma politika-ze ∅-i-ḵamat-es.
   politician-PL-ERG politics-on 3BNOM-SG-PRV-argue-3AErg.PL.AOR.INDIC
   Lit.: Politicians politics on they argued
   “The politicians argued about politics.”

iii. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II
   politikos-eb-ma bev-i/ cot-a-∅ ∅-i-ḵamat-es.
   politician-PL-ERG much-NOM little-NOM 3BNOM-SG-PRV-argue-3AErg.PL.AOR.INDIC
   Lit.: Politicians much/little they argued
   “The politicians argued a lot/little.”

iv. Present Indicative, TAM Series I
b. politikos-eb-ma_{i_j,\ldots+i_n} 0-i-kamat-es
   politician-PL-ERG 3B_{NOM,SG-PRV}-argue-3A_{ERG,PL,AOR,INDIC}
   zurnalistaeb-tan_{(j_j,\ldots+j_n)}:
   journalist-PL-with
Lit.: Politicians they.argued.with.journalists
“The politicians argued with journalists.”

c. politikos-eb-ma_{i_j,\ldots+i_n} 0-i-kamat-es
   politician-PL-ERG 3B_{NOM,SG-PRV}-argue-3A_{ERG,PL,AOR,INDIC}
   ertmanet-tan_{(i_j,\ldots+i_n)}/ertimeore-s-tan_{(i_j,\ldots+i_n)}:
   REC-with REC-DAT-with
Lit.: Politicians they.argued.with.each.other
“The politicians argued with each other.”

3.6.27. EXAMPLE.

a. me 1SG.ERG  
   da ana-m  
   v-i-tama\’s-e-t.
   Lit.: I and Ana we.played
1. “Ana and I played.”
2. “Ana and I played with each other.”

b. me_i 1SG.ERG  
   da ana-m_j  
   v-i-tama\’s-e-t
   Lit.: I and Ana we.played with.children
   “Ana and I played with the children.”

c. me_i 1SG.ERG  
   da ana-m_j  
   v-i-tama\’s-e-t
   Lit.: Politicians much/little they.argue
   “The politicians argue a lot/little.”

v. Perfect, TAM Series III
   politikos-eb-s  
   bev-i/ cot\’a-\theta  0-u-kamat-i-a-t.
   politician-PL-DAT much-NOM little-NOM 3B_{DAT,SG-PRV}-argue-PERF-3A_{NOM,SG,PL,DAT}
   Lit.: Politicians much/little they.have.argued
   “The politicians have (apparently) argued a lot/little.”
Lit.: I and Ana we played with each other
“Ana and I played with each other.”

The examples 3.6.28b and 3.6.29b show the so-called intransitive verbs taking a subject and the only indirect object.\(^{46}\) Whenever the indirect object is absent, there can be two interpretations which is exemplified in 3.6.28a and 3.6.29a. Namely, the interpretation implies an indirect object inferrable from the verb form but being deleted because of the possible pro-drop (see the examples 3.6.28a1 and 3.6.29a1), and the other interpretation is reciprocal (see the examples 3.6.28a2 and 3.6.29a2). It is also possible to get the same reciprocal interpretation by representing the indirect object by a reciprocal (see the examples 3.6.28c and 3.6.29c).

3.6.28. EXAMPLE.

a. me da ana-∅ še-v-xvd-i-t.
   1SG.NOM and Ana-NOM PV-1ANOM,SG-meet-AOR.INDIC-PLNOM
Lit.: I and Anna we met him/her/them
   1. “Ana and I met him/her/them.”
   2. “Ana and I met.”

b. me da ana-∅ še-v-xvd-i-t giorgi-s.
   1SG.NOM and Ana-NOM PV-1ANOM,SG-meet-AOR.INDIC-PLNOM Giorgi-DAT
Lit.: I and Anna we met him/her/them Giorgi
   “Ana and I met Giorgi.”

c. mei da ana-∅ j še-v-xvd-i-t ertmanet-s₁+∫j/ERT.
   1SG.ERG and Ana-NOM PV-1ANOM,SG-meet-AOR.INDIC-PLNOM REC-DAT
   ertimeore-s₁+∫j.
   REC-DAT
Lit.: I and Anna we met him/her/them each other
   “Ana and I met each other.”

3.6.29. EXAMPLE.

a. čven da-v-cil-d-i-t.
   1PL.NOM PV-1ANOM,SG-separate-INTR-AOR.INDIC-PLNOM
Lit.: We we got separated from him/her/them
   1. “We got separated from him/her/them.”
   2. “We got separated.”

\(^{46}\)See Example 2.4.3 and Table 2.5 in Chapter 2.
b. 
\[
\text{\v{c}ven}_{i_1, \ldots, i_n} \text{ da-v-cil-d-i-t}
\]

\[
\text{1PL.NOM PV-1ANOM.SG-separate-INTR-AOR.INDIC-PLNOM}
\]

megobr-eb-\(s(i_1, \ldots, i_n)\).
friend-PL-DAT

Lit.: We we.got.separated.from.him/her/them friends

“We got separated from the friends.”

However, not specifying an indirect object does not always lead to a reciprocal interpretation. For instance, in 3.6.28a or in 3.6.29a, as well as in Example 3.6.30a the indirect object is not specified. However, unlike 3.6.28a2 and 3.6.29a2, a reciprocal reading is not possible for 3.6.30a2.

3.6.30. Example.

a. me da ana-m gasa\(\gamma\)eb-\(i\) da-v-u-tov-e-t.

\[
\text{1SG.ERG and Ana-ERG key-NOM PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-leave-AOR.INDIC-PLERG}
\]

Lit.: I and Ana key we.left.it.for.him/her/them

1. “Ana and I left the key for him/her/them.”
2. “*Ana and I left the key for each other.”

b. me da ana-m gasa\(\gamma\)eb-\(i\) da-v-u-tov-e-t

\[
\text{1SG.ERG and Ana-ERG key-NOM PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-leave-AOR.INDIC-PLERG}
\]
elene-s.

Elene-DAT

Lit.: I and Ana key we.left.it.for.him/her/them Elene

“Ana and I left the key for Elene.”

c. me\(j\) da ana-m\(j\) gasa\(\gamma\)eb-\(i\) da-v-u-tov-e-t

\[
\text{1SG.ERG and Ana-ERG key-NOM PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-leave-AOR.INDIC-PLERG}
\]
ertmanet-\(s_{i+j}\) / ertimeore-\(s_{i+j}\).

REC-DAT REC-DAT

Lit.: I and Ana key we.left.it.for.him/her/them each.other

“Ana and I left the key for each other.”

The verbs of which the lexical semantics imply an interaction between the referents of the plural subject could be considered as “lexically reciprocal” by the analogy of
“lexically reflexive” verbs. Just like lexically reflexive verbs as *shave, wash*, etc. which have a reflexive reading, unless the direct object is specified (cf. 3.6.31a vs. 3.6.31b), lexically reciprocal verbs have a reciprocal reading unless their object argument or an appropriate adjunct is specified (cf. 3.6.26a vs. 3.6.26b, 3.6.27a vs. 3.6.27b, 3.6.28a vs. 3.6.28b, 3.6.29a vs. 3.6.29b):47

3.6.31. **Example.**

a. John washes.

b. John washes a pullover.

Thus, whenever the reciprocal reading is available, this is due to the lexical semantics of verbs.

**A Short Summary**

In Subsection 3.6.3, there were arguments present that were in favor of any c-commanding clause-mate NP being potential antecedent for Georgian reciprocals. However, it was also argued that only that c-commanding clause-mate NP can actually serve as an antecedent which represents a plural NP either morphologically (marked by the plural suffix *-eb*) or lexically (mass nouns, compounds referring to more than one referent but triggering a singular agreement). The subsection provided some data illustrating unergatives and 2-argument intransitives, of which the lexical semantics imply the interaction between the referents of their plural subject, get a reciprocal reading whenever the adjunct postpositional phrase (with unergatives) or the indirect object (in the so-called 2-argument intransitives), are not overtly specified.

3.6.4 **Binding and Word Order**

It was noted earlier that the word order changes do not affect binding relation between the complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and its antecedent (Subsection 3.4.3) or between the simple reflexive pronoun *tav* and its antecedent (Subsection 3.5.4) in most cases. Similarly, the reordering of the arguments within a clause does not affect binding relations between the reciprocals and their antecedents (cf. the examples 3.6.32 vs. 3.6.16, 3.6.33 vs. 3.6.18, 3.6.34 vs. 3.6.20, 3.6.35 vs. 3.6.21).

3.6.32. **Example.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bavšv-eb-mañ}_{(i_1, \ldots, i_n)} & \text{ ga-∅-i-xsen-es} \\
\text{child-PL-ERG} & \text{ PV-3B\_NOM-SG-PRV-recall-3A\_ERG-PL-AOR.INDIC} \\
\text{(is), rom ertmanet-s}_{*[(i_1 + \cdots + i_n)/(j_1 + \cdots + j_n)]} & \text{ that REC-DAT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

47See [RS05] discussing reciprocalization as an arity (valency changing, here reducing) operation.
3.6.33. EXAMPLE.

Luka-DAT 3Bₐ-DAT.SG-believe-3Aₐ-NOM.PL-Kakha-DAT-EV and Giorgi-DAT ʔ-sur-t, e rtmanet-ₐ-iₜₐ₊ₐ₊j-s(-(k+l)/s(m+n)/s(o+p)/q+r)jₐ
3Bₐ-DAT.SG-want-PL-DAT REC-NOM ertimeore-ʔ-s(-(i+j)/s(k+l)/s(m+n)/s(o+p)/q+r) REC-NOM
ʔ-a-k-o-n [bakar-is-a da irakli-s]ₐ₊o+p 3Bₐ-NOM-SG-PRV-praise-SUBJ-3Aₐ-ERG.PL Bakar-GEN-EV and Irakli-GEN
zm-eb-maₐ₊q+r, brother-PL-ERG
“Ilia and Levan think that Gia and Luka believe [that] Kakha and Giorgi want [that] Bakar’s and Irakli’s brothers praise EACH OTHER.”

3.6.34. EXAMPLE.

[giorgi-m da bakar-ma]ₐ₊j e rtmanet-iₜₐ₊ₐ₊j-s(-(i+j)/s(k+l)/ ertimeore-ʔ-s(-(i+j)/s(k+l)) REC-NOM REC-NOM
aₚₐ-u-ṣer-es [iliₐ-s-a da levan-s]ₐ₊k+l. PV-3Bₐ-DAT.SG-PRV-describe-3Aₐ-ERG.PL.AOR.INDIC Iliₐ-DAT-EV and Levan-DAT Lit.: Giorgi and Bakar each other they described them to them to Iliₐ and to Levan
“Giorgi and Bakar described EACH OTHER to Iliₐ and Levan.”

“Giorgi and Bakar described Ilia to Levan and Levan to Iliₐ (rather than describe someone else to Iliₐ and Levan).”

3.6.35. EXAMPLE.

[giorgi-m da bakar-ma]ₐ₊j [iliₐ-ʔ da levan-i]ₐ₊k+l e rtmanet-s(-(i+j)/s(k+l)) G iorgi-ERG and Bakar-ERG Iliₐ-NOM and Levan-NOM REC-DAT ertimeore-s(-(i+j)/s(k+l)) aₚₐ-u-ṣer-es.
REC-DAT PV-3Bₐ-DAT.SG-PRV-describe-3Aₐ-ERG.PL.AOR.INDIC Lit.: Giorgi and Bakar Ilia and Levan to each other they described them to them
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“Giorgi described Ilia and Levan to Bakar (rather than to someone else) and Bakar described Ilia and Levan to Giorgi (rather than to someone else).”

“*Giorgi and Bakar described Ilia to Levan (rather than to someone else) and Levan to Ilia (rather than to someone else).”

The fact that, irrespective of the word order, the direct object cannot serve as an antecedent for the indirect object reflexive (cf. 3.6.35 vs. 3.6.21), shows the indirect vs. direct object asymmetry in Georgian.48

However, there is a difference in the anaphoric relations when reciprocals get embedded in the subject argument. Namely, whereas an unscrambled object cannot be in a binding relation with a reciprocal embedded in a subject (3.6.36a), this is possible for the scrambled object over the subject (3.6.36b):49

3.6.36. Example.

a. *[ertmanet-is\textsubscript{i+j}/ erttimeore-s\textsubscript{i+j} masçavlebl-eb-ma]  
   REC-GEN REC-GEN teacher-PL-ERG  
   ga-∅-a-Êkrítik-es  
   PV-3B\textsubscript{NOM,S,G}-PRV-criticize-3A\textsubscript{ERG,PL,AOR,INDIC} Giorgi-NOM and Bakar-NOM  
   “Each other\textsubscript{i+j}’s teachers criticized Giorgi\textsubscript{i} and Bakar\textsubscript{j}.”

b. [giorgi-∅ da bakar-i\textsubscript{i+j} [ertmanet-is\textsubscript{i+j}/ erttimeore-s\textsubscript{i+j} masçavlebl-eb-ma]  
   Giorgi-NOM and Bakar-NOM REC-GEN REC-GEN teacher-PL-ERG  
   ga-∅-a-Êkrítik-es.  
   PV-3B\textsubscript{NOM,S,G}-PRV-criticize-3A\textsubscript{ERG,PL,AOR,INDIC}  
   “EACH OTHER\textsubscript{i+j}’s teachers criticized Giorgi\textsubscript{i} and Bakar\textsubscript{j}.”

Although the scrambling illustrated in the examples 3.6.32 vs. 3.6.16, 3.6.33 vs. 3.6.18, 3.6.34 vs. 3.6.20, 3.6.35 vs. 3.6.21 do not disrupt binding and seem to be an instance of A’-movement, cases like 3.6.36a vs. 3.6.36b do show A-scrambling.

3.6.5 Number Agreement of Reciprocals in Georgian

Although it is generally known that reciprocal pronouns require plural antecedents (cf. 3.6.22a vs. 3.6.23a, 3.6.22b vs. 3.6.23b, 3.6.22c vs. 3.6.23c, 3.6.22a vs. 3.6.24a, 3.6.22b vs. 3.6.24b, 3.6.22c vs. 3.6.24c as well as 3.6.37a vs. 3.6.37b, 3.6.38a vs.

48Recall that Georgian reflexives behave just like Georgian reciprocals by having a restriction disallowing an indirect object to be bound by a direct object (see the examples 3.4.19, 3.4.21, 3.4.23, 3.4.77, 3.4.78, 3.4.79, 3.5.7, 3.5.8, 3.5.9, 3.5.10b, 3.5.11b, 3.5.12).

49The same effect was illustrated above for the anaphoric possessive tavis- embedded in a subject (cf. 3.4.9a vs. 3.4.9b).
3.6.38b) it may not be necessary for reciprocals to be plural NPs triggering PL agreement themselves (see, for instance, Example 3.6.25).50

3.6.37. EXAMPLE. ([HLM91, p. 63])
a. The spies suspected each other.
b. *The spy suspected each other.

Example 3.6.38a illustrates the Georgian reciprocals as direct object arguments of the verb. According to 3.6.38a vs. 3.6.38b, the antecedent of the reciprocals must be plural:

3.6.38. EXAMPLE.
a. isini  ø-a-ḵrîtiḵ-eb-en  erta mana-t-s/  erta ma-ne-s.
   “They criticize each other.”
b. *is ø-a-ḵrîtiḵ-eb-s  erta mana-t-s/  erta ma-ne-s.
   Lit.: (S)he criticizes each other.

If the reciprocals in Example 3.6.38a are replaced by a nominal it can be seen that the very verb form is underspecified with respect to the number of the object argument (Example 3.6.39). Thus, both singular and plural direct object NPs are able to trigger the singular Set B agreement prefix ø-:

3.6.39. EXAMPLE.
   isini  ø-a-ḵrîtiḵ-eb-en  politiko-s/
   politiko-s-eb-s.
   politician-PL-DAT
   “They criticize the politician/politicians.”

How can it be found out what kind of agreement can be triggered by the reciprocals—singular or plural? The verb form that takes the reciprocals as a direct argument in 3.6.38a has a Set B agreement marker for direct object arguments, which in principle can be triggered by either a singular or plural direct object argument, as is illustrated in 3.6.39. Thus, the reciprocals in 3.6.38a can be interpreted either as a singular or as a plural NP. But following from a wide range of cross-linguistic data in which reciprocals

50The phenomenon—reciprocals triggering singular agreement—is not restricted to Georgian and has been found cross-linguistically as well. For instance, the Basque reciprocal pronoun elkar “each other” invariably displays singular agreement ([Tra03a, p. 160], [Art03, p. 607]).
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trigger plural agreement and also following from the fact that reciprocals must have a plural antecedent, it is tempting to believe that the reciprocal in 3.6.38a is a plural NP triggering a plural agreement.

However, the examples of verbs taking the reciprocal ertmanet- as a subject argument\(^{51}\) unambiguously show that the only agreement the reciprocal triggers is singular (3.6.40a). In 3.6.40a, the reciprocal appears as a subject argument of the given verb (cf. 3.6.40a vs. 3.6.40d) and triggers the singular Set A agreement marker -s rather than the plural -en (cf. 3.6.40a vs. 3.6.40b, 3.6.40a vs. 3.6.40c). Thus, according to Example 3.6.40a, it is not possible to qualify the Georgian reciprocal ertmanet- as plural.

3.6.40. Example.

a. ertmanet-i gv-a-oc-eb-s/
   REC-NOM 1B\_D\_AT-PL-PRV-surprise-TS-3ANOM-SG
   *gv-a-oc-eb-en
   1B\_D\_AT-PL-PRV-surprise-TS-3ANOM-PL 1PL\_DAT
   Lit.: Each other it surprises us / *they surprise us
   "We are surprised by something related to each other."

b. gv-a-oc-eb-s
   1B\_D\_AT-PL-PRV-surprise-TS-3ANOM-SG
   "(S)he/it surprises us."
   "*(S)he/*it surprises us.

c. gv-a-oc-eb-en
   1B\_D\_AT-PL-PRV-surprise-TS-3ANOM-PL
   "*(S)he/*it surprises us."
   "They surprise us."

d. (čven) ertmanet-s v-a-oc-eb-t.
   1PL\_NOM REC-DAT 1ANOM-SG-PRV-surprise-TS-PL\_NOM
   "We surprise each other."

It might be debatable whether the NOM reciprocal ertmanet-i is the subject argument of the verb form gv-a-oc-eb-s "(s)he/it surprise us" in 3.6.40a. The reason for this is the difference in the thematic structure of criticize and surprise. Whereas 0-a-krätk-eb-en “They criticize him/her/it/them” in 3.6.38a is a regular transitive verb taking a human, agentive, volitional agent as a subject argument and a human (and possibly a non-human) theme as an object argument, gv-a-oc-eb-s “(s)he/it surprises us” in 3.6.40a is an object experiencer verb taking a stimulus/theme as a subject argument.

\(^{51}\)Note that unlike ertmanet- the other reciprocal ertimeore- never appears as a subject argument (see Chapter 7).
and a human experiencer as an object. Since the experiencer is higher on the animacy hierarchy, it is often perceived as the optimal candidate for being a subject of the clause by native speakers. Thus, under such an interpretation, the seemingly subject reciprocal in 3.6.40a is perceived as an ordinary object, while its DAT-marked binder ˇcven—is perceived as a subject argument (dative-marked subjects are no surprise, since most Georgian psych verbs take a DAT experiencer and a NOM theme, see m-zul-s “I hate him/her/it” in 2.4.7c).

However, it is important to make a distinction between the two different classes of verbs taking a DAT experiencer as an argument in Georgian. These classes correspond to the well known division in the literature between the frighten type and the fear type predicates. In Georgian, the difference in semantics and thematic structure of these two classes of psych verbs is reflected in case alignment. Namely, if subject experiencer verbs mark their experiencer subject by DAT in all the three TAM Series (see giorgi-s in Example 3.6.41a,b,c) and their theme/stimulus argument by NOM (see kitxva-∅ in Example 3.6.41a,b,c), the object experiencer verbs behave similar to the transitive verbs that mark their theme/stimulus argument by NOM and the experiencer object by DAT in the TAM Series I (cf. 3.6.42a vs. 3.6.43a), the theme/stimulus argument by ERG and the experiencer object by NOM in the TAM Series II (cf. 3.6.42b vs. 3.6.43b) and the theme/stimulus argument by DAT and the experiencer object by NOM in the TAM Series III (cf. 3.6.42c vs. 3.6.43c):

3.6.41. Example.

a. Present Indicative, TAM Series I

\[
\text{giorgi-s mo-s-çon-s kitxva-∅.}
\]
\text{Giorgi-DAT PV-3B_{DAT}:SG-like-3}A_{NOM,SG} \text{ reading-NOM}

“Giorgi likes reading.”

b. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

\[
\text{giorgi-s mo-∅-e-çon-a kitxva-∅.}
\]
\text{Giorgi-DAT PV-3B_{DAT,SG}-PRV-like-3}A_{NOM,SG,AOR,INDIC} \text{ reading-NOM}

“Giorgi liked reading.”

c. Prefect, TAM Series III

\[
\text{giorgi-s mo-s-çon-eb-i-a kitxva-∅.}
\]
\text{Giorgi-DAT PV-3B_{DAT,SG}-TS-PERF-3}A_{NOM,SG} \text{ reading-NOM}

“Giorgi has (apparently) liked reading.”

[52][BR88]’s preoccupare(worry)/piacere(appeal) types of verbs.
3.6.42. Example.

a. Present Indicative, TAM Series I

(is) (čven) gv-a-oc-eb-s.
3SG.NOM 1PL.DAT 1B_{DAT}.PL-PRV-surprise-3A_{NOM}.SG

“(S)he/it surprises us.”

b. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

3SG.ERG 1PL.NOM PV-1B_{DAT}.PL-PRV-surprise-3A_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC

“(S)he/it surprised us.”

c. Prefect, TAM Series III

(mas) (čven) ga-v-u-oc-eb-i-vart.
3SG.DAT 1PL.NOM PV-1A_{NOM}.SG-PRV-surprise-3A_{NOM}.PERF.COP_1.PL(=CL_{NOM}.PL)

“(S)he/it has (apparently) surprised us.”

3.6.43. Example.

a. (is) (me) m-kl -av-s.
3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT 1B_{DAT}.SG-kill-3A_{NOM}.SG

“(S)he kills / is killing me.”

b. (man) (me) mo-m-kl -a.
3SG.ERG 1SG.NOM PV-1A_{NOM}.SG-kill-3A_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC

“(S)he killed me.”

c. (mas) (me) ar mo-v-u-kl -i -var.\(^{53}\)
3SG.DAT 1SG.NOM NEG PV-1A_{NOM}.SG-PRV-kill-PERF.COP_1.SG(=CL_{NOM}.SG)

“(S)he has not killed me.”

Therefore, if the subject experiencer and object experiencer verbs are compared in Georgian, the latter will group with transitive verbs by case alignment of their arguments. As a consequence, čven, the DAT argument of gv-a-oc-eb-s (3.6.40a), must be qualified as an object argument while ertmanet-i, the NOM argument, must be qualified as a subject.

In principle, whatever the grammatical relation, the NOM marked reciprocal ertmanet-i in 3.6.40a triggers singular agreement (see the singular Set A agreement suffix -s on the verb form gv-a-oc-eb-s in 3.6.40a) and serves as a piece of evidence for arguing against analyzing the reciprocal as plural in Georgian.

\(^{53}\)The verb form mo-v-u-kl-i-var employing the perfective suffix -i (3.6.43) is not considered by prescriptive grammarians as a literary form. However, it is used in everyday speech and in the media far more often than the normative form mo-v-u-kl-av-var (employing the thematic suffix -av).
3.6.6 Conclusion

Section 3.6 dealt with reciprocals in Georgian. Subsection 3.6.2 has argued in favor of the Georgian reciprocals ertmanet- and eretimeore- to represent one word, which excludes the movement analysis for them. In Subsection 3.6.3 it was shown that any c-commanding clause-mate NP referring to more than one referent can be an antecedent for Georgian reciprocals, irrespective of the agreement the NP triggers, a singular or a plural. That subsection has also illustrated some intransitive verbs acquiring a reciprocal reading when taking a plural subject. In Subsection 3.6.4 it was claimed that the word order changes do not affect the interpretation of the reciprocals in Georgian, unless they are embedded in an argument. The same subsection has illustrated that the Georgian reciprocals obey a restriction disallowing an indirect object to be bound by a direct object. In Subsection 3.6.5 it was stated that the reciprocal ertmanet- triggers a singular agreement, making the analysis of the reciprocal as plural doubtful. Finally, Subsection 3.6.6 concluded the section.

3.7 Summary

Chapter 3 has explored some issues of binding in Georgian. Section 3.1 offered a plan of subsections, each discussing different issues. Section 3.2 gave an overview of the works on Georgian reflexives and reciprocals. Most Georgian authors, although recognizing the grammaticalized body-part tav- as a reflexive, tend to group it together with personal pronouns. This has probably to do with the ability of the tav- to be used in the so-called object camouflage cases [Har81] as a 3rd person pronominal phrase, rather than as a reflexive phrase. Also, the existing literature fails to make a clear distinction between the uses of the tav- with and without the specifier, the possessive pronoun. After some basics of the Government and Binding module of the GB Theory [Cho81] were presented in Section 3.3, the GB theoretical analysis of the two diachronically related, but synchronically distinct reflexivization strategies—the complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the simple reflexive pronoun tav—has been given respectively in the sections 3.4 and 3.5. It was shown that both the POSS+tav- and the tav- must be bound in a local domain by a c-commanding antecedent and it is impossible for either of them to be used as a long-distance anaphor or a logophor. Word order changes mostly do not affect the interpretation and the antecedent choice of the two reflexivization strategies.

In Section 3.4, while studying the POSS+tav- strategy, the specifier of the reflexive phrase was discussed and a distinction between the 3rd person possessive mis- “his/her/its” and its reflexive counterpart tavis- “self’s” was made as well as distinction between the simple and complex plural possessive pronouns. The possessive sakutar- “own” was considered, which may serve as a specifier of the phrase POSS+tav- and which is exclusively subject-oriented. Additionally, there was a focus on the use of the complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav- as a determiner of an NP, illustrating the i-within-i
3.7. Summary

In Section 3.6 the form and the distribution of the Georgian reciprocals ermanet- and ertimeore- have been studied. It was argued that the reciprocals constitute of one word. This makes their partition into a quantifier and a reciprocator for applying the movement analysis [HLM91] implausible. As has been argued, any c-commanding clause-mate plural NP serves as a potential antecedent for ermanet- and ertimeore-. Like in the case of the two reflexivization strategies, the change of word order mostly has no effect on the interpretation of the reciprocals. The same section argued against considering the Georgian reciprocal ermanet- as a plural NP based on the data illustrating an exclusively singular agreement triggered by the reciprocal.
Chapter 4

Outline of Reflexivization Strategies in Georgian

4.1 Introduction

In Chapter 3, the Georgian complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the simple reflexive pronoun tav- have been discussed within the framework of the Binding Theory [Cho81]. This chapter will provide an analysis of the two reflexivization strategies within the framework of another reflexivization theory—the Reinhart and Reuland’s Reflexivity Theory [RR93].

For the study of reflexivization strategies in Georgian, it is important to consider both the Binding Theory of [Cho81] (see Chapter 3), which is concerned with the referential properties of nominal expressions, and the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93], which is concerned with the semantic properties of predicates (this chapter). As both theories have different points of focus, they will offer different tools for creating a formal account of the reflexivization strategies.

In this chapter the Reflexivity Theory will be presented first in Section 4.2, then the nominal and verbal reflexivization in Georgian will be discussed in sections 4.3 and 4.4 respectively. Finally, in Section 4.5 there will be a summary of the chapter.

4.2 The Reflexivity Framework

Whereas in the Standard Binding theory [Cho81] the distribution of anaphors, as well as intra-sentential anaphora and referential expressions, are subject to syntactic constraints, in Reinhart and Reuland’s Reflexivity Theory [RR93] the distribution of reflexives is dealt with in two different modules of grammar—(i) two non-structural binding conditions (Reflexivity conditions) A and B and (ii) a structural condition on A-chain formation. The definitions are given below:

Non-structural conditions of Reflexivity:

A. A reflexive-marked syntactic predicate is reflexive.
B. A reflexive semantic predicate is reflexive-marked.

4.2.1. Definition. (Syntactic and Semantic Predicates)

- The **syntactic predicate** of (a head) $P$ is $P$, all its syntactic arguments and an external argument of $P$ (subject). The **syntactic argument** of $P$ are the projections assigned—role or Case by $P$.

- The **semantic predicate** of $P$ is $P$ and all its arguments at the relevant semantic level.

4.2.2. Definition. (Reflexive and Reflexive-Marked Predicates)

- A predicate is **reflexive**, iff two of its arguments are coindexed.

- A predicate (formed of $P$) is **reflexive-marked** iff either $P$ is lexically reflexive or one of $P$’s arguments is a SELF-anaphor.

**Structural condition of Reflexivity:**

- Generalized Chain Condition: $C=(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ is a chain iff $C$ is the maximal sequence such that
  - there is an index $i$ such that for all $j$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, $\alpha_j$ carries that index, and
  - for all $j$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, $\alpha_j$ governs $\alpha_{j+1}$.

- Condition on A-chain: A maximal A-chain $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ contains exactly one link $\alpha_1$ which is $+$R.

- An NP is $+$R iff it carries a full specification for phi-features (person, number, gender) and structural case.

The idea that in the distribution of the anaphora the semantics of predicates is important, is crucial for Reflexivity and this is clearly different from the standard Binding Theory. Reflexivization is defined over predicates without any involvement of syntactic structure. As for the configurational effects of binding, this is taken care of by the Chain condition. For instance, according to [RR93, p. 665], by Condition A both She praised herself and *Herself praised her are equally allowed. It is the Chain condition that disallows the existence of chains headed by [-R] elements like the English herself and, thus, rules out the latter.

Instead of having a difference between anaphors and simple pronouns, which was the case in the standard Binding Theory [Cho81], there is a partitioning of NPs according to the properties [R] and [SELF]. An element is [+R] if it carries a full specification for phi-features and structural Case, and it is [-R] if it does not. An element is [+SELF] if it reflexivizes a predicate, and consequently an element is [-SELF] if it does not. It
is not the case that anaphors and pronouns are grouped apart (as it is in the standard Binding Theory). They can both fall in the same group according to their features of [-R] or [+R], [-SELF] or [+SELF]. Not their status as either anaphors or pronouns but their feature specification is important for their ability to form a chain, and thus for their behaviour.

Depending on the combination of [R] and [SELF] features [RR93] gives the typology of anaphoric expressions shown on Table 4.1. According to [RR93], NPs are divided into three classes—SELF type anaphors, SE type anaphors and Pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflexivising function ([SELF])</th>
<th>SE type anaphor</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential independence ([R])</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Typology of anaphoric expressions

However, in fact NPs have to be grouped into the 4 different groups depending on the characteristics of [±R] and [±SELF] (see Table 4.2). As the authors of the Reflexivity Theory note themselves [RR93], they do not discuss the type of anaphors with the feature specification [+SELF]; [+R].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[+SELF]</th>
<th>[-SELF]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[R]</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-R]</td>
<td>SELF type anaphor SE type anaphor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Typology of NPs

According to this system, not all [-R] elements function as reflexive markers. For instance, unlike the Dutch [+SELF] anaphor zichzelf (Example 4.2.3b), zich is [-SELF] because it is not able to reflexivize the predicate (Example 4.2.3a). The reflexive zich is referred to as a SE type anaphor just like those from the other languages having the feature composition [-R; -SELF] and functioning like pronominal anaphors but not as reflexivizers:

4.2.3. EXAMPLE.

   Max hates zich

1Later works within the Reflexivity Theory such as [AE99] (among others) qualify the Greek anaphor o eafos tu as a [+SELF]; [+R] element which affects its distribution and properties. This dissertation argues for the Georgian POSS+inv- strategy to be a [+SELF]; [+R] element (Subsection 4.3.2).
b. Max haat zichzelf.

Max hates zichzelf

Lexically reflexive predicates do not need to be reflexive-marked by a SELF type anaphor. Since they are semantically reflexive predicates, they are already reflexive-marked and can take only [-SELF] elements like pronominal SELF anaphors (see Condition B of [RR93]).

Dutch provides an example for that:

4.2.4. EXAMPLE. (From [Eve86])

a. Jani wast zichi.

“Jan washes.”

b. Arnoldi vergist zichi nooit.

Lit.: Arnold mistakes himself never

“Arnold is never mistaken.”

As far as the cases like Example 4.2.5 are concerned, they do not involve reflexive-marked predicates [RR93]. For a predicate to be reflexive-marked it must be either lexically reflexive or one of its arguments has to be a SELF-anaphor. The sentences in Example 4.2.5 do not involve lexically reflexive predicates, but they do involve a SELF-anaphor. However, the anaphor either (i) is not in an A-position (see Example 4.2.5a by [Ros70] cited in [RR93], Example 4.2.5b by [ZH89] cited in [RR93] and Example 4.2.5d by [RR93]) or (ii) it is an argument but not co-indexed with any of the co-arguments (see Example 4.2.5c by [RR93]). As claimed by [RR93], in such uses as Example 4.2.5a,b,d (labelled by the authors as logophoric), reflexivity marking does not apply and the distribution of SELF is governed solely by discourse principles.

4.2.5. EXAMPLE. (Logophors)

a. Physicists like yourself are a godsend.

b. She gave both Brenda and myself a dirty look.

c. *She gave myself a dirty look.

d. Max boasted that the queen invited Lucie and himself for a drink.

According to [RR93], the so-called focus anaphors (or emphatic anaphors (by [Kun87, ZH89, Kis87]), i.e. those SELF anaphors which as focus, can occur even in

2As noted in [RR93, p. 667], the fact that intrinsically reflexive verbs favor SELF anaphors over SELF anaphors, follows from the principle of economy—the same property should not be marked twice. However, it is also acknowledged in [RR93] that the SELF anaphor can still appear with such verbs if discourse requires that.

3Note that the SELF anaphors in Example 4.2.5 can be replaced by simple pronouns and that the choice between the SELF anaphor and a simple pronoun is motivated by discourse considerations.
an A-position) are treated the same way as the logophors (expressing the point of view of the narrator, Example 4.2.5). In other words, they are not subject to the reflexivity conditions, even though they occur in an A-position. In neither of the cases does reflexive-marking (see [RR93] as well as Section 4.2) apply, and the interpretation of the SELF anaphor is regulated by discourse principles.

[RR93] bring up the issue of disjoint reference in order to show that Condition B does operate on semantic predicates. The sentences in examples 4.2.6a (taken from [RR93, p. 676], example(32a)) and 4.2.6c (taken from [RR93, p. 676], example(32b)) trigger a preference for a distributive interpretation of the plural / coordinated NP, while those in the examples 4.2.6b (taken from [RR93, p. 677], example(35a)), 4.2.6d (taken from [RR93, p. 677], example(35b)) force a collective interpretation:

4.2.6. EXAMPLE.  
a. *We$_2$ voted for me$_1$.  
b. We elected me.  
c. *[Felix and Lucie$_1$]$_2$ praised her$_1$.  
d. Felix and Lucie$_1$ authorized her$_1$ to be their representative.

If a distributive reading is forced like it is done in the examples 4.2.7a (taken from [RR93, p. 677], example(38a)) and 4.2.7c (taken from [RE01]) it results in ungrammatical sentences (see the interpretations of the examples 4.2.7a and 4.2.7c in 4.2.7b (taken from [RR93, p. 677], example(38b)) and 4.2.7d (taken from [RE01]) respectively):

4.2.7. EXAMPLE.  
a. *Felix but not Lucie praised her.  
b. [Felix ($\lambda x (x$ praised her))] but not [Lucie ($\lambda x (x$ praised x))]  
c. *Both Max$_1$ and Lucie talked about him$_1$.  
d. Max ($\lambda x (x$ talked about x)) & Lucie ($\lambda x (x$ talked about him))

According to [RR93], under the collective reading (see the examples 4.2.6b, 4.2.6d) no reflexive predicate is formed, as the predicate is not distributed over the two NPs in the subject but they are taken as a set. However, under the distributive reading, there is always a reflexive predicate formed (see 4.2.7b, 4.2.7d). Since there is a reflexive predicate formation but no actual reflexive marking (no SELF anaphor is involved there) the sentences are ruled out by Condition B.

In the next sections the Georgian reflexivization strategies will be described and an attempt will be made to accommodate anaphoric binding phenomena within the Reflexivity framework.
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4.3 Nominal Reflexivization in Georgian

4.3.1 Introduction

For making anaphoric reference, in Georgian one or more of the following reflexivization strategies are used: (1) a reflexive phrase POSS+tav-; (2) a simple reflexive pronoun tav-; (3) verbal reflexivization strategy, the pre-radical vowel i-. Section 4.3 gives a description of each of the nominal reflexivization strategies within the Reflexivity Theory [RR93] and shows their anaphoric properties (while verbal reflexivization strategy, the pre-radical vowel i- will be studied in Section 4.4). In Section 4.3 the subsections are organized as follows: Subsection 4.3.2 discusses the POSS+tav- strategy, Subsection 4.3.3 is concerned with the simple reflexive pronoun tav- and in Subsection 4.3.4 conclusions will be drawn.

4.3.2 The POSS+tav- Strategy

A Short Introduction

First, the discussion on nominal reflexivization in Georgian will start with assessing anaphoric properties and distribution of one of the two nominal reflexivization strategies, namely a reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (Section 3.1), as in Example 4.3.1:

4.3.1. Example.

giorgi-mi, karg-ad da-∅-a-xasiat-a
Giorgi-ERG good-ADV PV-3bNOM.SG-PRV-characterize-3A3AERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
[tavis-i tav-i].
3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
Lit.: Giorgi well characterized self’s self
“Giorgi characterized himself well.”

As was mentioned before, the complex reflexive phrase consists of a nominal head tav-, a grammaticalized body-part noun for “head”, which gets a possessive pronoun as a specifier. As is illustrated in Example 4.3.1, both the head and the possessive get case-marking corresponding to the syntactic role of the reflexive phrase. In 4.3.1, the reflexive phrase is a direct object and consequently gets the nominative marking like direct object NP would have gotten in the Aorist Indicative (3.6.43b, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4 among others).

4The POSS+tav- construction is a standard case of the so called head reflexive (in the terminology of [Fal85]): a nominal morpheme indicating reflexivity (here, tav- “head, self”) acts as the head of a noun phrase in which it is preceded by a possessive pronoun. Some other language with a “head reflexive” might illustrate a head noun followed by a possessive, depending on the constituent order of that language.
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4.3.2. Example.

man igi ga-∅-lax-a.
3SG.ERG 1SG.NOM PV-3BNOM.SG-beat-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
“(S)he beat him/her.”

4.3.3. Example.

man naqin-i še-∅-čam-a.
3SG.ERG ice.cream-NOM PV-3BNOM.SG-eat-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
“(S)he ate the ice-cream.”

4.3.4. Example.

man čqal-i da-∅-a-kc-i-a
3SG.ERG water-NOM PV-3BNOM.SG-PRV-pour-TS-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
iatašk-ze.
floor-on
“(S)he poured water on the floor (intentionally).”

In Chapter 3, the properties of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- were discussed within the Binding Theory [Cho81]. In this chapter, the reflexive phrase within the Reflexivity theory [RR93] will be explored. It is important to find out where to locate the phrase within the typology of anaphoric expressions. In other words, it is necessary to determine which type of anaphor the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- is. Is it a SELF or SE type anaphor (Table 4.1), that is, is it possible for the phrase to reflexivize a lexically non-reflexive predicate?

In order to check what type of anaphor the POSS+tav- is, the feature composition for the POSS+tav- must be identified according to the features [±R] and [±SELF]. Checking whether the phrase is [+R] or [-R], or whether it is referentially independent or not, would mean to check the phrase with regard to the phi-features and to the availability of structural case (Section 4.2). Furthermore, checking whether the phrase is [+SELF] or [-SELF] would mean to check how the phrase behaves with regard to lexically reflexive predicates.

First, the POSS+tav- will be checked for phi-features and the availability of structural case and later, the behavior of the phrase in combination with lexically reflexive predicates will be checked. The only note to be made at this point is that among the phi-features which include person, number and gender, the gender feature is irrelevant in the grammar of Georgian in general and, thus, for the POSS+tav- strategy in particular as well. Therefore, in order to identify the referential (in)dependence of the POSS+tav-, the strategy will be tested for only two phi-features (person and number) and the availability of structural case.
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The POSS+tav- and Person Feature

The phrase POSS+tav- takes either a 1st (Example 3.5.15a), 2nd (Example 3.5.15b) or 3rd person (Example 3.5.15c) antecedent depending on the person feature of the POSS, which agrees in person with the antecedent. Thus, the person feature is not underspecified.

Note also that irrespective of the person of the POSS and, correspondingly, of the antecedent, the POSS+tav- always acts as a 3rd person NP. Although the phrase may sometimes not trigger the actual 3rd person marker on the verb form (3.5.15a, 3.5.15b) as it is in Example 3.5.15c it is still possible to check the person triggered by the POSS+tav-. For instance, the verb form v-a-k-e which takes the phrase čem-i tav-i in Example 3.5.15a can also take any 3rd person NP as an object argument (Example 4.3.5a) but never 1st (Example 4.3.5b) or 2nd person NPs (Example 4.3.5c): 5

4.3.5. Example.

a. me is levan-i/ prezident-is politika-/∅
   1SG.ERG 3SG.NOM Levan-NOM president-GEN politics-NOM
   v-a-k-e.
   1AERG-SG-PRV-praise-AOR.INDIC
   “I praised him/her/Levan/the president’s politics.”

b. *me me v-a-k-e.
   1SG.ERG 1SG.NOM 1AERG-SG-PRV-praise-AOR.INDIC
   “I praised myself.”

c. *me šen v-a-k-e.
   1SG.ERG 2SG.NOM 1AERG-SG-PRV-praise-AOR.INDIC
   “I praised you.”

Similarly, the verb form ∅-a-zag-e which takes the phrase šen-i tav-i in Example 3.5.15a can also take any 3rd person NP as an object argument (Example 4.3.6a) but never 1st (Example 4.3.6b) or 2nd person NPs (Example 4.3.6c):

4.3.6. Example.

a. šen is levan-i/ prezident-is politika-/∅
   2SG.ERG 3SG.NOM Levan-NOM president-GEN politics-NOM
   ∅-a-zag-e.
   2AERG-SG-PRV-curse-AOR.INDIC
   “You cursed him/her/Levan/the president’s politics.”

5The examples 4.3.5b and 4.3.5c are not grammatical because their object arguments condition agreement markers, namely, m- and g- respectively (2.2.1c, 2.2.2b), but those markers are not found in these verb forms. The same applies to 4.3.6b and 4.3.6c as well as to 4.3.7b and 4.3.7c.
b. *šen me 0-a-zag-e.
   2SG.ERG 1SG.NOM 2AERG.SG-PRV-curse-AOR.INDIC
   “You cursed me.”

c. *šen šen 0-a-zag-e.
   2SG.ERG 2SG.NOM 2AERG.SG-PRV-curse-AOR.INDIC
   “You cursed yourself.”

Analogically, the verb form ga-0-a-masxr-a which takes the phrase tav-i tav-i in Example 3.5.15c can also take any 3rd person NP as an object argument (Example 4.3.7a) but never 1st (Example 4.3.7b) or 2nd person NPs (Example 4.3.7c):

4.3.7. Example.

a. man is/ levan-i/ prezident-ıs politika-0
   3SG.ERG 3SG.NOM Levan-NOM president-GEN politics-NOM
   ga-0-a-masxr-a.
   PV-3B NOM.SG-PRV-clown-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he made fun of him(her)/Levan/the president’s politics.”

b. *man me 0-a-masxr-a.
   2SG.ERG 1SG.NOM PV-3B NOM.SG-PRV-clown-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he made fun of me.”

   2SG.ERG 2SG.NOM PV-3B NOM.SG-PRV-clown-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he made fun of you.”

Another piece of evidence for POSS+tav- phrases as 3rd person NPs comes from the use of preverbs. According to [Sha73, p. 246], several verb forms (give, sell, write, address, bring) with both mi- and mo- preverbs show that the 2nd person groups together with 1st person with respect to the preverb they can get. Namely, the proximate mo- is available only when the beneficiary is 1st (Example 4.3.8a) or 2nd person (Example 4.3.8b) and ungrammatical when the beneficiary is 3rd person (Example 4.3.8c). On the contrary, the distant mi- is available with the 3rd person beneficiary (Example 4.3.8c) but not with the 1st (Example 4.3.8a) and 2nd (Example 4.3.8b):

4.3.8. Example.

a. man me cign-i no-m-c-a/
   3SG.ERG 1SG.DAT book-NOM PV-1BDAT.SG-give-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   *mi-m-c-a.
   PV-1BDAT.SG-give-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he gave me a book.”
b. man šen čign-i mo-g-c-a/
   3SG.ERG 2SG.DAT book-NOM PV-2B_DAT.RG-give-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   *mi-g-c-a.
   PV-2B_DAT.RG-give-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he gave you a book.”

c. man mas čign-i *mo-s-c-a/
   3SG.ERG 3SG.DAT book-NOM PV-3B_DAT.RG-give-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   mi-s-c-a.
   PV-3B_DAT.RG-give-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he gave him/her a book.”

Now if the use of the distant mi- and proximate mo- with the POSS+tav- is considered, it can be seen that the reflexive phrase (the examples 4.3.9a, 4.3.10a, 4.3.11a) groups together with 3rd person NPs (the examples 4.3.11b, 4.3.11c, 4.3.11d) in the sense that they require the use of the distant mi-, but never of the proximate mo-. As for the 1st and 2nd person NPs, they behave just the opposite: they require the proximate mo- but never the distant mi- (the examples 4.3.9b, 4.3.9c, 4.3.10b, 4.3.10c).

For instance, the reflexive phrases taking the 1st and 2nd person antecedents—čem-s tav-s (Example 4.3.9a) and šen-s tav-s (Example 4.3.10a) respectively—just like the 3rd person NPs (the examples 4.3.11b, 4.3.11c, 4.3.11d) require the distant mi-, but never the proximate mo-.

As for the 1st (the examples 4.3.9b, 4.3.9c) and 2nd person simple pronouns (the examples 4.3.10b, 4.3.10c), they, unlike the reflexive čem-s tav-s (Example 4.3.9a) and šen-s tav-s (Example 4.3.10a) and 3rd person NPs (the examples 4.3.11b, 4.3.11c, 4.3.11d), always require the proximate mo-, but never the distant mi-.

4.3.9. Example.

a. me čem-s tav-s mi-v-e-salm-e/
   1SG.NOM 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT PV-1A=NOM.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   *mo-v-e-salm-e.
   PV-1A=NOM.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   “I greeted myself.”

b. is me *mi-m-e-salm-a/
   3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT PV-1B=DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-3A=NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
   mo-m-e-salm-a.
   PV-1B=DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-3A=NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he greeted me.”

c. šen me *mi-m-e-salm-e/
   2SG.NOM 1SG.DAT PV-1B=DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   mo-m-e-salm-e.
   PV-1B=DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
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“You greeted me.”

4.3.10. Example.

a. ˇsen 2SG.NOM ˇsen-s 2POSS.SG 2DAT mi-∅-e-salm-e/ 2PV-2A-NOM.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   *mo-∅-e-salm-e. 2PV-2A-NOM.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   “You greeted yourself.”

b. is 3SG.NOM *mi-g-e-salm-a/ 3SG.DAT PV-2B-DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-3A-NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
   mo-g-e-salm-a. PV-2B-DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-3A-NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he greeted you.”

c. me 1SG.NOM *mi-g-e-salm-e/ 1SG.DAT PV-2B-DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   mo-g-e-salm-e. PV-2B-DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   “I greeted you.”

4.3.11. Example.

a. is tavis 3SG.NOM 3REFL.POSS.SG 2DAT mi-∅-e-salm-a/ 3PV-3B-DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-3A-NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
   *mo-∅-e-salm-a. PV-3B-DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-3A-NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he greeted himself/herself.”

b. is mas 3SG.NOM 3SG.DAT PV-3B-DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-3A-NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
   *mo-∅-e-salm-a. PV-3B-DAT.SG-PRV-greeting-3A-NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he greeted him/her.”

c. me mas 1SG.NOM 1SG.DAT PV-1A-NOM.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   *mo-v-e-salm-e. PV-1A-NOM.SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   “I greeted him/her.”
d. ˇsen mas mi-∅-salm-e/
   2SG.NOM 3SG.DAT PV-2A\_NOM,SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   *mo-∅-salm-e.
   PV-2A\_NOM,SG-PRV-greeting-AOR.INDIC
   “You greeted him/her.”

Just like the 3rd person NPs (the examples 4.3.11b, 4.3.11c, 4.3.11d), the reflexive phrase tavis tav-s that takes the 3rd person antecedent (4.3.11a) and the reflexive phrases ˇcem-s tav-s (4.3.9a) and ˇsen-s tav-s (4.3.10a) that require the 1st and 2nd person antecedent respectively, but that function as 3rd person NPs, all require the distant mi- and never use the proximate mo-.

Thus, the phrase triggers the 3rd person agreement. However, the POSS unambiguously shows the person (and number) of the antecedent. As a whole, the phrase POSS+tav-, irrespective of the agreement it triggers, is transparent with regard to the person feature.

Therefore, the POSS+tav- strategy is specified for the person feature.

The POSS+tav- and Number Feature

In general tav- as a noun\(^6\) can be marked for plural (Example 4.3.12). The tav- as a head of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- does not get a plural marking in Modern Georgian (Example 4.3.13):\(^7\)

4.3.12. Example.

(me) es tav-eb-i gamo-v-ţov-e.
   1SG.ERG PROX.NOM head-PL-NOM PV-1A\_ERG,SG-omit-AOR.INDIC
   “I omitted these chapters.”

4.3.13. Example.

---

\(^6\)The item tav- is used synchronically as a body-part for “head” as well as with some other meanings like “chapter” (4.3.12, 5.2.12a), “top”, etc.

\(^7\)In Old Georgian, by contrast, tav- in the reflexive phrase could still be marked for plural (see (i) as well as [Sha76, p. 49]; [Imn79, p. 489]):

i. da-∅-i-ev-en-i-t tav-n-i tkven-n-i qovl-is-a-gan
   angahreb-is-a.
   covetousness-GEN-EV
   “Keep yourselves from all covetousness.” (Luke 12, 15; translation from [Dar61])
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laškroba-ši bakar-ma, da ilia-m, [taviant excursion-in Bakar-ERG and Ilia-ERG 3REFL.POSS.PL tav-(*-eb)-s-a-c\textsubscript{1}/s(k+l) mi-∅-xed-es da self-PL-DAT-EV-too PV-3BDAT.SG-take.care-3AERG.PL.AOR.INDIC and ana-s-a\textsubscript{k} da elene-s-a-c\textsubscript{l}.
Ana-DAT-EV and Elene-DAT-EV-too

“During the excursion Bakar and Ilia took care of themselves as well as of Anna and Elene.”

However, the number of the antecedent still makes a difference for the phrase as a whole. Namely, in case there is a plural antecedent for the POSS\textsubscript{+}tav- phrase, this will be reflected on the POSS (cf. 4.3.13 vs. 4.3.14):

4.3.14. Example.

laškroba-ši bakar-ma, [tavis tav-s-a-c\textsubscript{i}/s\textsubscript{j} excursion-in Bakar-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT-EV-too mi-∅-xed-a da ana-s-a-c\textsubscript{j}.
PV-3BDAT.SG-take.care-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC and Ana-DAT-EV-too

“During the excursion Bakar took care of himself as well as of Anna.”

This means that the POSS\textsubscript{+}tav- strategy is specified for the person feature.

The POSS\textsubscript{+}tav- and Structural Case

It is known that two types of case marking are distinguished—structural and inherent [Cho81, Cho86]. Structural case is assigned by specifier-head agreement, while inherent case is assigned by a theta role or by government. For instance, structural case is assigned by the finite inflection on the verb to the specifier of the IP, i.e. to the subject. Other structural case assigners are, for instance, postpositions.

As was already mentioned in Section 2.4, in Georgian, actual case marking is sensitive to the argument structure of a verb, verb class and aspectual and temporal characteristics expressed by the verb form (but not to particular grammatical relations). The case marking of the subject argument—whether NOM, ERG or DAT—is dependent on the inflectional properties of the clause. Since the case of the subject argument is assigned by the finite inflection, the cases mentioned above could qualify as structural cases.

However, the dative assigned to the subject argument in the TAM Series III should be distinguished from the dative assigned to goals and experiencer arguments. Since the latter arguments invariably get the dative marking, irrespective of the inflection, the dative case in goals and experiencer arguments is an inherent case depending on the theta role (goal, experiencer).
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Throughout this dissertation one will find examples of the POSS+tav- phrase being marked for case according to its syntactic role in the sentence as a direct object (for instance, 3.4.1a, 3.4.1b, 4.3.1 among others), irrespective of the case marking. The POSS+tav- phrase can even be marked by ERG, the case of the subject in Aorist Indicative (the examples 5.4.1, 6.6.4, 7.3.11b among others) or by NOM, the case of the subject in Present Indicative (Example 7.2.5a). Thus, the POSS+tav- strategy does not lack structural case.

The POSS+tav- is a [+SELF;+R] Type Anaphor

It follows from the discussion above, that at the moment nothing prevents the complex POSS+tav- strategy to be regarded as [+R]. As could already be seen, the phrase POSS+tav- carries full specification for the phi-features (person and number, while gender being irrelevant) and structural case. Thus, the POSS+tav- reflexivization strategy qualifies as a [+R] element.

Apart from knowing that the POSS+tav- phrase is [+R] it is necessary to know whether the POSS+tav- is a [+SELF] or a [-SELF] element. This is necessary in order to locate the POSS+tav- phrase within the typology of NPs (Table 4.2) in which the four types of NPs are categorized according to the features [+R] and [+SELF].

In the Reflexivity Theory [RR93] an element is [+SELF] if it can reflexivize a predicate, and an element is [-SELF] if it cannot. Therefore, it should be checked how the POSS+tav- phrase behaves with verbs. As the examples 3.5.15, 3.5.17, 3.5.19, 3.5.21 and 4.3.1 illustrate, the POSS+tav- phrase does reflexivize the verbs which are not lexically reflexive and can make the reflexive reading of the sentences possible. Therefore, the POSS+tav- can reflexivize and, thus, is [+SELF]. At the same time, the POSS+tav- phrase acts as a [+R] element. Based on these findings, the POSS+tav- should be characterized as a [+R; +SELF] reflexivization strategy.

As the authors of the Reflexivity theory note when discussing the types of anaphoric expressions (see [RR93, p. 658], footnote 4), they do not discuss the properties of possessive anaphors although these are widespread cross-linguistically. Thus, the types of the anaphors with a head specified by a possessive pronoun, to which the Georgian POSS+tav- strategy belongs, are not considered in the Reflexivity theory of [RR93]. However, there are works studying the behavior of such types of anaphors. For instance, [AE95, EA97, AE99, Eve03] consider the Greek anaphor o eafa tos tu within the Reflexivity theory of [RR93] and give it the same feature specification as has been given here to the Georgian POSS+tav- strategy, namely [+R; +SELF]. These authors note that O eafa tos tu crucially differs from the Dutch [-R, +SELF] anaphoric strategy zichzelf in that it is headed by a noun eafa tos which acts as a SELF-element while, at the same time, it is fully specified for phi-features ([masc],[3-pers],inflected for [numb/case]). Exactly this specification of O eafa tos tu as a [+R; +SELF] makes it possible for the Greek

8See [Eve03, p. 7] for a similar view.
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anaphor to be in the subject position. As is known already, Conditions A and B equally allow reflexives in both positions (subject and object) while the Chain condition rules out the chains headed by \([-R]\) elements. In Dutch or English the reflexives are ruled out in subject position because they are \([-R]\) while in Greek \(o\ eaf\os\ tu\) is \([+R]\) and the chain condition simply does not hold. Also, even if not the \([+R]\) feature of the Greek anaphor, there cannot be any chain formation since only the determiner of the reflexive phrase is co-indexed with the antecedent (see the co-indexed elements \(tu\) and \(tu\ Petru\) in Example 4.3.15 taken from [AE99] adopting the co-indexation given in [Iat88]):

4.3.15. Example.

a. \([O\ eaf\os\ tu_i]\_i\) ton provlimatizi [ton Petro],.
   The self his CL.ACC puzzle-3SG the Petros.ACC
   “Himself puzzles Petros.”

b. \([O\ eaf\os\ tu_i\)j\ (+[R])\ [(ton Petro),i\ (+[R])]\]

The reflexive phrases look very much alike in Georgian and in Greek. However, instead of adopting the analysis of Greek by [AE99] for the Georgian POSS+tav-, as implied in [Eve03], it will be argued against the analysis in Chapter 6.

Such work as [Eve03, p. 20] uses an idea that was first discussed in [AE99] which says that \([+R, +SELF]\) anaphors are allowed to show non-anaphoric behavior because they do not violate Chain formation [RR93]. They do not violate Chain formation because of one simple reason: there is no Chain formation in languages with the anaphors of the structure \([+R, +SELF]\). Thus, the non-anaphoric behaviour of \([+R, +SELF]\) anaphors simply reduces to the structure and the feature specification of anaphors themselves. However, in Chapter 7 it will be shown that for Georgian and for Greek (as well as for Basque having the reflexive of the same structure) the form of the anaphor cannot account for its non-anaphoric behavior, in other words, for its ability to appear in the subject position.

The Structure of the POSS+tav- Phrase

As was mentioned before, the Georgian reflexive phrase consists of a head and its determiner, a possessive pronoun. It is important to note that only the determiner agrees in phi-features with the antecedent and not the whole phrase (see 3.5.17a and 3.5.17b).

The phrase looks very similar to the Greek reflexive phrase \(ton\ eaf\os\on\ mu\) in 4.3.16, which consists of the definite determiner \(ton\), the head noun \(eaf\os\on\) and the possessive clitic \(mu\). The similarity consists of the fact that in both languages only the possessive determiner is co-indexed with the antecedent of the reflexive phrases but not the whole reflexive phrase as such. Namely, it is the Georgian determiner \(\check{c}em\-s\) in 3.5.17a (or \(\check{shen}\-s\) in 3.5.17b) and the Greek determiner \(mu\) in 4.3.16 which agree in phi-features with the antecedent:
4.3.16. Example. (Greek, [Iat88])

Egho₁ ton₁ xero [ton₁ eafton₁ mu₁].
I CL.ACC.MASC.SG know DET.ACC.MASC.SG REFL POSS.GEN.1SG

“I know myself.”

On the basis of this structure [Iat88] has argued that the Greek reflexive phrase is not subject to Principle A, since only the possessive clitic is co-indexed with the antecedent but not the whole phrase.

A different analysis of the Greek reflexive o eaftos tu is offered in the Reflexivity theory [RR93] by [AE95, EA97, AE99]. The authors call the Greek type of anaphor an *inalienable possession anaphor*. It is argued that o eaftos tu qualifies as a [+R, +SELF] anaphor. As it is fully specified for phi-features (and, thus, being [+R]), the Greek anaphor is unable to form an A-chain with the antecedent because according to [RR93]’s chain condition, the formation of A chains with two [+R] links is not allowed.

In Subsection 4.3.2 it was argued that the Georgian reflexive phrase POSS+tav- was a [+R, +SELF] anaphor. This makes it tempting to follow the analysis of [AE95, EA97, AE99] for Greek which has the anaphor of the same feature specification as the Georgian POSS+tav- strategy. Namely, it could be argued that just like in Greek, in Georgian the POSS+tav- strategy qualifies as an *inalienable possession anaphor* and does not form an A-chain because of its structure. This would explain why it is possible in Georgian to have anaphors in subject position, just like it is possible to have nominative anaphors in Greek [AE95, EA97, AE99]. However, it would not be possible to explain why only some verbs allow *inalienable possession anaphors* as subjects but others do not (cf., for instance, 3.4.13a vs. 7.3.11b).

The indexation given by [Iat88] for the Greek o eaftos tu can also be adopted for Georgian (3.5.17). However, following [Eve01], the view that the possessive alone is an anaphor [Iat88] should be argued against. [Eve01] suggests to “distinguish the element that agrees with an antecedent as a result of an anaphoric relation from the anaphoric element itself”.¹

Thus, if [Eve01] is followed in distinguishing agreement and anaphoric relations it is possible to identify the whole reflexive phrase as an anaphor. If the structure of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- is considered again, it can be seen that the determiner is a possessive pronoun which is obligatorily bound only to the head tav- (cf. the examples 3.5.19 vs. 3.5.29, 3.5.19 vs. 4.3.17).

4.3.17. Example.

*me₁ v-a-k-eb [cem-s₁].
1SG.NOM 1ANOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS 1POSS.SG-DAT

“I praise myself.”

¹[Eve01] refers to [AE99] who have shown that “α is an anaphor” and “α agrees with its antecedent” are not equivalent at all.
Thus, as far as the Georgian POSS+tav- strategy is concerned, only the combination of the possessive and the head noun (but not the possessive (4.3.17) or the head alone (3.5.29)) have anaphoric properties.

A Short Summary

Subsection 4.3.2 has discussed the POSS+tav- reflexivization strategy. It was argued that it is specified for the person and number features and that it does not lack structural case. Provided that the gender feature is irrelevant for the grammar of Georgian, the reflexive phrase should be qualified as [+R]. Since the POSS+tav- reflexivizes the verbs which are not lexically reflexive it can qualify as [+SELF]. The feature composition makes the Georgian reflexive phrase POSS+tav- a [+SELF;+R] type anaphor. In the same subsection it was also argued that although only the specifier of the reflexive phrase agrees in phi-features with the antecedent but with not the whole phrase, only the combination of the specifier and the head tav- has anaphoric properties.

4.3.3 The Simple tav- Strategy

A Short Introduction

Before turning to the verbal reflexive strategy (Section 4.4) another nominal reflexivization strategy will be considered in this subsection. As was already mentioned above, apart from the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (see Subsection 4.3.2), there is another reflexivization strategy, a simple reflexive represented by a grammaticalized body-part tav- "head", referred to here as a bare tav- strategy (4.3.18):

4.3.18. Example.

tvit+na+ket-i  bomb-it  terorist+ma,  tav-i,
INTENS+PPART +make-NOM  bomb-INST  terrorist-ERG  self-NOM
a-∅-i-petk-a  da  sxv-eb-i-c
PV-3BNOM.SG-PRV-explode-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC  and  other-PL-NOM-too
da-∅-a-saxiĉ-r-a.
PV-3BNOM.SG-PRV-cripple-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC

"By a self-made bomb the terrorist blew up himself and also crippled others."

It was argued extensively in Subsection 3.5.2 that the simple reflexive tav- is not the same as the POSS+tav- strategy with a dropped specifier. Although diachronically related (see [AL02]), the two strategies are distinct. In this section the simple tav- will be checked with regard to the phi-features and the availability of structural case to determine whether it is either [+R] or [-R]. Then it will be shown how the simple tav- behaves with lexically reflexive predicates, in order to determine whether it is [+SELF] or [-SELF].
The Simple *tav*- and Person Feature

The reflexive simple *tav*- is not restricted with regard to the person feature of the antecedent and can take not only 3rd person (see the examples 3.5.16c, 4.3.18) but also 1st (Example 3.5.16a) and 2nd person antecedents (Example 3.5.16b). Therefore, the simple *tav*- is underspecified with regard to person feature.

The Simple *tav*- and Number Feature

In the examples above, the simple *tav*- has singular antecedents (4.3.18, 3.5.16). However, it can also take plural antecedents (Example 4.3.19):

4.3.19. Example.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bakar-ma}_i & \text{ da } \text{ ilia-m}_j \text{ } \text{ščavλ-it } \text{ tav-i}_{(i+j)} \\
\text{Bakar-ERG} & \text{ and } \text{ Ilia-ERG good-NOM study-INST self-NOM} \\
\text{gamo-}∅ & \text{-i-čin-es.} \\
\text{PV-3B\text{NOM,SG-PRV-distinguish-3A\text{ERG,PL-AOR,INDIC}}} \\
\text{“Bakar and Ilia distinguished themselves by studying well.”}
\end{align*}
\]

As has become clear from the comparison of the examples 4.3.19 vs. 4.3.20, the simple *tav*- is underspecified with regard to the number feature, disallowing explicit number marking. Whether the simple *tav*- has a singular antecedent (4.3.18) or a plural one (4.3.19) it makes no difference with regard to the form of the simple *tav*- strategy:

4.3.20. Example.

\[
\begin{align*}
*\text{bakar-ma}_i & \text{ da } \text{ ilia-m}_j \text{ } \text{ščavλ-it } \text{ tav-eb-i}_{(i+j)} \\
\text{Bakar-ERG} & \text{ and } \text{ Ilia-ERG good-NOM study-INST self-PL-NOM} \\
\text{gamo-}∅ & \text{-i-čin-es.} \\
\text{PV-3B\text{NOM,SG-PRV-distinguish-3A\text{ERG,PL-AOR,INDIC}}} \\
\text{“Bakar and Ilia distinguished themselves by studying well.”}
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, it should be concluded that the simple *tav*- strategy does not carry a full specification for the phi-features as person and number.

The gender feature is irrelevant since it is actually never specified in the nominal or verbal system in Georgian, and not just for the simple reflexive *tav*- (or the POSS+*tav*-strategy, Section 4.3.2).\(^{10}\)

\(^{10}\) In Georgian, gender is identified exclusively on the lexical level.
The Simple tavg and Structural Case

Unlike the POSS+tav- strategy, which can appear as a subject argument of the verb (7.3.11b, 4.3.21 as well as other relevant examples from Chapter 7), the reflexive simple tavg can never be marked by the cases of subject, for instance, by ERG in Aorist Indicative. If the item tavg appears with the ERG marker (4.3.22), the only available reading is a body-part reading:

4.3.21. Example.

a. [tavis-ma tav-ma]  
   3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG  
   gamo-∅-a-mzγavn-a zaza-∅.  
   PV-3BNOM.SG-PRV-uncover-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC Zaza-NOM  
   Lit.: Himself uncovered Zaza  
   “His own properties, his good actions or wrong doings uncovered (made it possible to identify) Zaza.”

b. [tavis-ma tav-ma] mo-∅-kI-a  
   3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG PV-3BNOM.SG-kill-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC  
   kac-i.  
   man-NOM  
   Lit.: Himself killed the man  
   “*His head killed the man.”  
   *Himself killed the man.  
   “His own properties, his actions and/or wrong doings made the man suffer (or caused his death).”

4.3.22. Example.

a. tav-ma gamo-∅-a-mzγavn-a zaza-∅.  
   self/head-ERG PV-3BNOM.SG-PRV-uncover-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC Zaza-NOM  
   Lit.: *Self/Head uncovered Zaza  
   “[His] head uncovered (i.e., made it possible to identify) Zaza.”

b. tav-ma mo-∅-kI-a kac-i.  
   self/head-ERG PV-3BNOM.SG-kill-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC man-NOM  
   Lit.: *Self/Head killed the man  
   “The head killed the man.” (for instance, the cut head of a dragon killed the man (in a fairy tale) or the head from a Lenin’s deconstructed statue killed the man)

Note that the simple reflexive tavg can be marked as an object argument, that is by NOM and DAT. Thus, it does not lack structural case. However, since it does not
carry a full specification for phi-features (person, number, (gender being irrelevant)), the simple tav- qualifies as a [-R] element.

**The Simple tav- is a SE Type Anaphor**

As could be seen above in this section, the simple tav- lacks phi-features. Therefore, it should be considered to be a [-R] element. In order to locate the simple tav- strategy within the typology of NPs schematized in Table 4.2 or within the typology of anaphoric expressions in Table 4.1 and to identify it as either a SELF or a SE anaphor it is necessary to identify whether it is a [+SELF] or a [-SELF] element. As was already noted, in the Reflexivity Theory [RR93] an element is [+SELF] if it reflexivizes a predicate, and an element is [-SELF] if it cannot do so.

If the simple tav- besides being [-R] is also a [-SELF] element, that is the element which is unable to reflexivize, just like the Dutch zich (4.2.3a), it should be concluded that the strategy is a SE type anaphor. However, if the simple tav- is [+SELF], so if it is able to reflexivize, it will qualify as a SELF type anaphor, just like the Dutch zichzelf (4.2.3b).

The Dutch zich is unable to reflexivize since, as Example 4.2.3a illustrates, it cannot reflexivize the verbs which are not lexically reflexive and cannot make the reflexive reading of the sentences possible. On the contrary, the Dutch zichzelf is able to reflexivize such verbs (Example 4.2.3b). Consequently, zichzelf qualifies as a SELF anaphor and zich — as a SE anaphor.

Now the simple tav- should be considered. As the examples 3.5.27–3.5.30 illustrate, the simple tav- is not able to reflexivize the verbs which are not lexically reflexive. The fact that the simple tav- can also appear in grammatical sentences, for instance, in 3.5.16, 3.5.18, 3.5.20, 3.5.22 does not mean that the simple tav- strategy can reflexivize. The sentences show not just the simple tav- but also the verb forms marked by the pre-radical vowel i-, which is a verbal reflexivization strategy in itself.

Thus, the simple tav- strategy, taken alone, without any verbal reflexive i- support, is unable to reflexivize (cf. 3.5.27a vs. 3.5.16a, 3.5.27b vs. 3.5.16b, 3.5.27c vs. 3.5.16c, 3.5.28a vs. 3.5.18a, 3.5.28b vs. 3.5.18b, 3.5.28c vs. 3.5.18c, 3.5.29 vs. 3.5.20, 3.5.30 vs. 3.5.22) and, thus, has to be qualified as [-SELF]. As could be seen already, the simple tav- strategy is also [-R]. Therefore, the simple tav- functions as a [-SELF, -R] strategy or, in other words, it is a SE type anaphor (Table 4.2).

**A Short Summary**

Subsection 4.3.3 has discussed the simple tav- reflexivization strategy. It was shown that it is specified neither for the person nor for the number features and, thus, has to be qualified as [-R]. Since the simple tav- is unable to reflexivize the verbs that are not lexically reflexive, it has to be qualified as [-SELF]. This makes the simple tav- strategy a [-SELF; -R] and, thus, a SE type anaphor.
4.4 Verbal Reflexivization

4.4.1 Introduction

In the previous section, the nominal reflexivization strategies in Georgian were discussed within the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93] (Section 4.3). This section considers the Georgian pre-radical vowel $i$- as a verbal reflexivization strategy as well as a marker present in some classes of intransitive verbs. The use of the pre-radical vowel $i$- as a verbal reflexive will be dealt with in Subsection 4.4.2. The other occurrences of the $i$- as a homonymous morpheme in passive, unaccusative, unergative verbs will be discussed in Subsection 4.4.3. Finally, in Subsection 4.4.4 there will be a conclusion of the section.

4.4.2 Reflexive Pre-Radical Vowel $i$-

A Short Introduction

This subsection describes the use of the verbal pre-radical vowel $i$- as a reflexive marker. First it will be argued that the status of the vowel as a reflexive marker is unclear within the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93] unless some notions are modified. Then all the Georgian reflexivization strategies, some of their combinations and their ability to make a reflexive reading possible will be reviewed. Georgian inalienable nouns used without an appropriate determiner but with an obligatory presence of the verbal pre-radical vowel $i$- will also be discussed in order to illustrate the fact that this vowel is a component of a further reflexivization strategy.

Verbal Reflexive $i$- and its Status in the Reflexivity Theory

Subsection 4.3.3 has illustrated the simple reflexive $tav$- alone to be unable to reflexivize a predicate. Only when the simple $tav$- is accompanied by the pre-radical vowel $i$-, it is possible to get a grammatical result as in the examples 3.5.27a vs. 3.5.16a, 3.5.27b vs. 3.5.16b, 3.5.27c vs. 3.5.16c, 3.5.28a vs. 3.5.18a, 3.5.28b vs. 3.5.18b, 3.5.28c vs. 3.5.18c, 3.5.29 vs. 3.5.20, 3.5.30 vs. 3.5.22.

Furthermore, the pre-radical vowel $i$- is by itself also not able to reflexivize, whether the binding is meant to be between the subject and the direct object (4.4.1–4.4.4) or between the direct and indirect objects (Example 4.4.5):
4.4.1. EXAMPLE.
   a. *me v-i-k-e.
      1SG.ERG 1AERG.SG-PRV-praise-AOR.INDIC
      “I praised myself.”
   b. *šen ʃ-i-zag-e.
      2SG.ERG 2AERG.SG-PRV-curse-AOR.INDIC
      “You cursed yourself.”
      3SG.ERG PV-3BNOM.SG-PRV-clown-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
      “(S)he made fun of himself/herself.”

4.4.2. EXAMPLE.
   a. *me v-i-krit-eb.
      1SG.NOM 1ANOM.SG-PRV-criticize-TS
      “I criticize myself.”
   b. *šen ʃ-i-krit-eb.
      2SG.NOM 2ANOM.SG-PRV-criticize-TS
      “You criticize yourself.”
   c. *is ʃ-i-krit-eb-s.
      3SG.NOM 3BDAT.SG-PRV-criticize-TS-3ANOM.SG
      “(S)he criticizes himself/herself.”

4.4.3. EXAMPLE.
   *me v-i-k-eb.
   1SG.NOM 1ANOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS
   “I praise myself.”

4.4.4. EXAMPLE.
   *giorgi-m ʃ-i-k-o.
   Giorgi-ERG 3BNOM.SG-PRV-praise-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Giorgi praised himself.”

4.4.5. EXAMPLE.
   *me mas v-i-k-e.
   1SG.ERG 3SG.DAT 1AERG.SG-PRV-praise-AOR.INDIC
   “I praised him/her to himself.”

However, the vowel i- alone can serve as a reflexivizer in case the binding is meant to be between the subject and the indirect object arguments (cf. 4.4.6a vs. 4.4.7a, 4.4.6b vs. 4.4.7b, 4.4.6c vs. 4.4.7c):
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4.4.6. Example.

a. me mo-v-i-čer-i namcxvar-i.
   1SG.ERG PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-cut-AOR.INDIC cake-NOM
   “I cut myself a cake.”

b. šen da-∅-i-sx-i qava-∅.
   2SG.ERG PV-2AERG.SG-PRV-pour-AOR.INDIC coffee-NOM
   “You poured yourself [some] coffee.”

c. ana-m ga-∅-i-tal-a vašl-i.
   Ana-ERG PV-3B NOM-SG-PRV-peel-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC apple-NOM
   “Ana peeled herself an apple.”

4.4.7. Example.

a. me mo-v-čer-i namcxvar-i.
   1ERG PV-1AERG.SG-cut-AOR.INDIC cake-NOM
   “I cut a cake.”

b. šen da-∅-a-sx-i qava-∅.
   you.ERG PV-2AERG.SG-PRV-pour-AOR.INDIC coffee-NOM
   “You poured coffee.”

c. ana-m ga-∅-tal-a vašl-i.
   Ana-ERG PV-3B NOM-SG-peel-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC apple-NOM
   “Ana peeled an apple.”

If the verb forms with the pre-radical vowel ĩ- are compared to the verb forms without the vowel, the reflexive semantics can be attributed to the presence of this vowel (cf. 4.4.6a vs. 4.4.7a, 4.4.6b vs. 4.4.7b, 4.4.6c vs. 4.4.7c). Example 4.4.6a–c illustrates that the marker ĩ- can appear in any person. That the presence of both the vowel and the indirect object yields ungrammatical results (cf. 4.4.8a vs. 4.4.6a, 4.4.8b vs. 4.4.6b, 4.4.8c vs. 4.4.6c) illustrates that the pre-radical vowel ĩ- can in fact absorb the indirect object argument:

4.4.8. Example.

a. *me čem-s tav-s mo-v-i-čer-i
   1SG.ERG 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT PV-1AERG.SG-PRV-cut-AOR.INDIC
   cake-NOM
   “I cut myself a cake.”

b. *šen šen-s tav-s da-∅-i-sx-i
   2SG.ERG 2POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT PV-2AERG.SG-PRV-pour-AOR.INDIC
   coffee-∅.
   “You poured some coffee.”
“You poured yourself coffee.”

c. *ana-m tavis tav-s
Ana-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT
ga-∅-i-tal-a vaśli.i.
PV-3B NOM.SG-PRV-peel-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC apple-NOM

“You peeled herself an apple.”

Within the Reflexivity Theory [RR93], the verb forms mo-v-i-ˇc. er-i, da-∅-i-sx-i and ga-∅-i-tal-a in 4.4.6a, 4.4.6b and 4.4.6c, are reflexive predicates, since two of their arguments, namely the subject and indirect object, are coindexed (see Definition 4.2.2 of reflexive predicates in Section 4.2). It is important to know whether the very verbs can also be reflexive-marked. According to Definition 4.2.2 of reflexive-marked predicates in Section 4.2, a predicate is reflexive-marked iff either the predicate is reflexively reflexive or one of its arguments is a SELF-anaphor.

The verbs used in 4.4.6a-c are not lexically reflexive. At least the roots on which the verb forms in the examples 4.4.6a-c are based (-ˇc. er- “cut”, -sx- “pour”, -tal- “peel”) are not lexically reflexive. Clearly if there is any kind of reflexive reading available for the verbs in 4.4.6a-c, it is due to the presence of the pre-radical vowel i- (cf. 4.4.6a vs. 4.4.7a, 4.4.6b vs. 4.4.7b, 4.4.6c vs. 4.4.7c) but not due to the lexical semantics of the verbs. Thus, there is some kind of marking, the pre-radical vowel i- but its status is unclear within the available definitions of the Reflexivity Theory. These predicates are not lexically reflexive, however the forms have morphological reflexive marking.

Neither do the sentences in 4.4.6a–c show a SELF-anaphor as an argument of the verbs presented there. In fact, Georgian does not even have a SELF type anaphor as such, but only a SE anaphor (see Section 4.3.3) and a [+SELF;+R] type anaphor (see Section 4.3.2). However, even if theoretically not only a SELF-anaphor but also a [+SELF;+R] type anaphor can make a predicate reflexive-marked, the verb forms marked by the pre-radical vowel i- in Example 4.4.6a-c are not able to take [+SELF;+R] type anaphoric strategy POSS+tal- as an argument (4.4.8a–c).

Thus, according to the definitions of Reflexivity Theory, the predicates in Example 4.4.6a-c are reflexive but it cannot be said that they are reflexive-marked, which means a violation of [RR93]’s Condition B. Most probably Definition 4.2.2 is based on a limited set of languages which does not include those languages possessing other types of anaphors and having other means of expressing reflexivization instead of lexically reflexive verbs or SELF type anaphors having a feature specification [+SELF;+R].

Accepting SELF type anaphors (or, in other words, [+SELF;−R] type anaphors) as crucial elements that can make a predicate reflexive-marked (see Definition 4.2.2 in Subsection 4.2) is restrictive for such languages as Georgian that do not have this precise type

---

11The [+SELF;+R] type anaphor and the SELF type anaphor differ by the feature [R]. If the former is characterised by [+R], the latter, the SELF type anaphor is characterized by [−R] (Table 4.2).

12Note that [RR93] does not discuss [+SELF;+R] type anaphors.
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Georgian Reflexivization Strategies, their Combinations and the Ability to Reflexivize

First the reflexivizing ability of each of the available reflexivization strategies and their combinations will be summarized (Table 4.3). Once again, there are two nominal reflexivization strategies, the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (see Subsection 4.3.2) and the simple tav- (see Subsection 4.3.3) and one verbal reflexivization strategy, the pre-radical vowel i- (see Subsection 4.4.2).

The [+SELF;+R] type anaphor POSS+tav- taken alone, reflexivizes a predicate (see 3.5.15, 3.5.17, 3.5.19, 3.5.21). There is no need to have the verb form additionally marked for the verbal reflexive, with the use of the pre-radical vowel i- (the complex POSS+tav-, when accompanied by the verbal reflexive i-, results in a focused reading (3.5.23–3.5.26)).

The verbal reflexive i- alone, without a help of any nominal strategy, only partially serves as a reflexivizer, namely, when the subject and the indirect object arguments of 3-argument verbs are coindexed (cf. 4.4.6a vs. 4.4.7a, 4.4.6b vs. 4.4.7b, 4.4.6c vs. 4.4.7c). In the rest of the cases, such as when either the subject and direct object (the examples 4.4.1–4.4.4) or the direct and indirect object arguments (4.4.5) are coindexed, the verbal vowel i- is unable to reflexivize a predicate.

The simple reflexive tav- alone (which is a SE type anaphor characterized by the features [-SELF;-R]) never reflexivizes a predicate (3.5.27–3.5.30) unless it is used in combination with pre-radical vowel i- (3.5.16, 3.5.18, 3.5.20, 3.5.22). This means that the verbal i- is a reflexivizer (irrespective of its status within the Reflexivity Theory).

Here, an example from Kannada [Lid96] can be used, in which the SE anaphor taanu alone cannot serve as a reflexivizer but only in combination with the verbal reflexive -koLL- (cf. 4.4.9b vs. 4.4.9a).

4.4.9. Example. (From [Lid96])

   Hari self-ACC hit-PAST-3SM
   “Hari hit himself.”

---

13In [RR93], as well in some later works such as [RE01], the feature [SELF] refers to the reflexivizing function and being marked [+SELF] means that an element is able to reflexivize the predicate. However, according to [RR93]’s definition of reflexive and reflexive-marked predicates (see Definition 4.2.2 in Subsection 4.2), it is the SELF type anaphors that make predicates reflexive-marked, not just the feature [+SELF].

14See also [RR93], according to which lexically reflexive predicates do not need to be reflexive-marked by a SELF type anaphor. They are already reflexive-marked and can take SE anaphors as an argument. However, in [RR93] it is also acknowledged that the SELF anaphors can still appear with intrinsically reflexive verbs if discourse requires that. See also Footnote 2 in Chapter 4.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anaphoric Strategies and their Combinations</th>
<th>Ability to Reflexivize</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSS+tav-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3.5.15, 3.5.17, 3.5.19, 3.5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple tav-</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3.5.27–3.5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-radical vowel i-</td>
<td>partially</td>
<td>4.4.1–4.4.5, 4.4.6 vs. 4.4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple tav- &amp; Pre-radical vowel i-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3.5.16, 3.5.18, 3.5.20, 3.5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS+tav- &amp; Pre-radical vowel i-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3.5.23–3.5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Anaphoric Strategies, their Combinations, and the Ability to Reflexivize.

   Hari self-ACC  hit-PP-REFL.PAST-3SM
   “Hari hit himself.”

   Hari self-ACC-self  hit-PAST-3SM
   “Hari hit himself.”

   Hari self-ACC-self  hit-PP-REFL.PAST-3SM
   “Hari hit himself.”

4.4.10. EXAMPLE.

a. *elene-m tav-i še-∅-a-k-o.
   Elene-ERG self-NOM PV-3B_NOM-SG-PRV-praise-3A_ERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Elene praised herself.”

b. elene-m tav-i še-∅-i-k-o.
   Elene-ERG self-NOM PV-3B_NOM-SG-PRV-praise-3A_ERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Elene praised herself.”

c. elene-m tavis-i tav-i
   Elene-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
   še-∅-a-k-o.
   PV-3B_NOM-SG-PRV-praise-3A_ERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
   “Elene praised herself.”

d. elene-m tavis-i tav-i
   Elene-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
   še-∅-i-k-o.
   PV-3B_NOM-SG-PRV-praise-3A_ERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
   **Elene praised herself.”
   “Elene praised HERSELF.”
The similarity between the Georgian and Kannada data is striking. Both require the verbal reflexive (Georgian i- and Kannada -ko marker (-koND in the past tense)) in the presence of the simpler nominal strategy (the Georgian simple reflexive tav- and the Kannada taanu) (cf. 4.4.9b vs. 4.4.9a and 4.4.10b vs. 4.4.10a) but not with the complex strategy (the Georgian reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the Kannada tann-CASE-taane) (cf. 4.4.9d vs. 4.4.9c and 4.4.10d vs. 4.4.10c).

Based on the behaviour of the Kannada verbal reflexive marker, [Lid96] proposes to include verbal reflexivization in the Reflexivity framework [RR93]. According to [Lid96], this could be done by extending the definition of reflexive-marked predicate (see Definition 4.2.2) and assuming that reflexive marking can be realized lexically (sometimes through a verbal affix (see [Lid96] and also Example 4.4.9b)) or syntactically (through a SELF anaphor) (see [RR93] and also Example 4.4.9c).

The ungrammaticality of the Kannada Example 4.4.9a is predicted under such an approach [Lid96]. Namely, the predicate in 4.4.9a is reflexive—two of its arguments are coindexed—but not reflexive-marked. It is not reflexive-marked because the predicate is not lexically reflexive (there is no verbal reflexive there), and there is no SELF strategy used there. Therefore, it results in a Condition B violation [RR93].

In the Kannada Example 4.4.9b, the verbal reflexive morphologically reflexive-marks the predicate and both Condition A and Condition B are satisfied.

In the grammatical Kannada Example 4.4.9c the predicate is reflexive (two of its arguments are coindexed). The predicate is not lexically reflexive (there is no verbal reflexive there). However, the SELF strategy is used, which reflexive-marks the predicate (see Definition 4.2.2 in Subsection 4.2). Thus, in 4.4.9c both Condition A and Condition B are satisfied.

In the Kannada Example 4.4.9d, the verbal reflexive morphologically reflexive-marks the predicate and both Condition A and Condition B [RR93] seem to be met. However, both the SELF strategy and the verbal reflexivization are redundant.

The same way, the ungrammaticality of the Georgian Example 4.4.10a is predicted under the [RR93] approach modified by [Lid96] because the predicate is reflexive —
two of its arguments are coindexed—but not reflexive-marked. The predicate is not reflexive-marked, since the predicate is not lexically reflexive, and it also does not take a SELF anaphor as an argument. Thus, there is a Condition B violation [RR93].

In the Georgian Example 4.4.10b the verbal reflexive morphologically reflexive-marks the predicate and both Condition A and Condition B are satisfied.

In the grammatical Georgian Example 4.4.10c the predicate is reflexive because two of its arguments are coindexed). Although the predicate is not lexically reflexive (there is no verbal reflexive there), there is another reflexivization strategy used, which is [+SELF] and which reflexive-marks the predicate. Thus, in 4.4.10c both Condition A and Condition B are satisfied.

In the Georgian Example 4.4.10d, the verbal reflexive morphologically reflexive-marks the predicate and both Condition A and Condition B [RR93] seem to be met. However, both the SELF strategy and the verbal reflexivization are redundant, which results in a focused reading.

It seems that, just like for Kannada, Georgian data could also be accounted for by extending the definition of reflexive-marked predicate (see Definition 4.2.2 of [RR93] given in Subsection 4.2), as proposed in [Lid96], assuming that reflexive marking can be realized not only via a nominal reflexivization strategy, a SELF anaphor18 but also otherwise.

However, in this dissertation, arguments against considering the morphological reflexive marking under the label “lexical” [Lid96] will be given. The reflexive i- is a morpheme like any other morpheme in the pre-radical slot of affixes in Georgian verb forms. Thus, unlike the [Lid96]'s analysis for the Kannada verbal reflexive marker, the Georgian prefix i- should not be called a lexical manifestation of reflexivization and the verb forms marked by the verbal reflexive marker i- should not be forced under the label “lexically reflexive verbs”.

Moreover, the so-called “lexically reflexive verbs” should not be considered to be a class of verbs which are necessarily associated with reflexivization or with co-indexing of two of its arguments. Even such a verb as wash put forward as an example of a lexically reflexive verb, whenever there is a discussion on inherent reflexivity, in Georgian in Present Indicative, Imperfect Indicative and Present Subjunctive fails to be associated with any reflexivization strategy available (Example 4.4.11a), either the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (Example 4.4.11b), the simple reflexive pronoun tav- (Example 4.4.11c), the verbal reflexive marker i- (Example 4.4.11d) or the combination of the simple reflexive pronoun tav- and the verbal marker i- (Example 4.4.11e):

4.4.11. EXAMPLE. Present Indicative of the TAM Series19

a. levan-i ban-a-ob-s.
   Levan-NOM wash-TS-TS-3A NOM:SG
   “Levan washes himself.”

18See Footnote 16 in Chapter 4.
19For the TAM Series, Sub-Series and Screves see Table 2.1 in Chapter 2.
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b. *levan-i tavis tav-s ban-a-ob-s.
   Levan-NOM 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT wash-TS-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “Levan washes himself.”

c. *levan-i tav-s ban-a-ob-s.
   Levan-NOM self-DAT wash-TS-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “Levan washes himself.”

d. *levan-i i-ban-a-ob-s.
   Levan-NOM PRV-wash-TS-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “Levan washes himself.”

e. *levan-i tav-s i-ban-a-ob-s.
   Levan-NOM self-DAT PRV-wash-TS-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “Levan washes himself.”

This means that if the grooming verbs (falling under a larger class of medial verbs) are considered as lexically reflexive, it will result in the [RR93]’s Condition B violation for Georgian. If they are lexically reflexive, it has to be reflected via being reflexive-marked. However, the verb in Example 4.4.11a has no reflexive marking.

Perhaps morphological reflexive marking should be included in the definition so that the cases such as 4.4.1–4.4.5, 4.4.6 could also be accounted for by the Reflexivity Condition B. These examples illustrate the predicates whose arguments are coindexed. Thus, the predicates are reflexive, according to the definition of Reflexive-Marked Predicates (see Definition 4.2.2). According to the Condition B of the Reflexivity Theory, reflexive predicates have to be reflexive-marked. However, within the available definitions (see [RR93]), the predicates in 4.4.1–4.4.5, 4.4.6, which are reflexive cannot be reflexive-marked, since for being reflexive-marked a predicate either has to take a SELF type anaphor as an argument or it has to be a lexically reflexive predicate. The examples 4.4.1–4.4.5, 4.4.6 do not show a SELF type anaphor. Neither these predicates are lexically reflexive. Thus, within the Reflexivity Theory these predicates are reflexive but not reflexive-marked, which results in the Condition B violation, unless the notion of reflexive-marked is reconsidered and the verbal morphological reflexive markers are included as one of the manifestations of reflexivity.

However, this might not be done easily, especially because the marker may have a distribution which includes not only reflexive uses. Both Kannada and Georgian reflexive markers have a broader usage, including intransitive uses.20

The non-reflexive uses of the Georgian pre-radical vowel i- will be discussed below in Subsection 4.4.3. But before that, the inalienable possessive constructions in Georgian will be dealt with.

20[Rei02] and [RS05] bring these uses under the general heading of lexical operations (including passive, middle, reflexive, unaccusative). In many languages such lexical operations co-occur with some morphological marking (a reflexive clitic, a verbal affix, sometimes a SE anaphor) to check/absorb a residual structural case.
Georgian Inalienable Nouns Do Not Require a Possessive Determiner

The use of the Georgian inalienable nouns exclusively with the verbal reflexivization strategy in the examples 3.5.37–3.5.39 is analogical to the inalienable possessive constructions in other languages, like for instance, French (Example 4.4.12) and Spanish (Example 4.4.13) in which inalienable nouns alone result in ungrammatical sentences (4.4.12a, 4.4.13a) and it is necessary to have also a reflexive marker (French verbal reflexive clitic s’ (≪ se) and Spanish se, see 4.4.12b, 4.4.13b). The Georgian case with obligatory combination of the grammaticalized inalienable noun and the verbal i- strategy (cf. 3.5.37b vs. 3.5.37c, 3.5.38b vs. 3.5.38c, 3.5.39b vs. 3.5.39c) is similar to those constructions of the Romance languages (cf. 4.4.12a vs. 4.4.12b, 4.4.13a vs. 4.4.13b).

4.4.12. EXAMPLE. (From [Kön99], examples 44, 45)

a. *Marc_i a lavé les pieds_i.
   Marc_i has washed the feet_i.

b. Marc_i s’ est lavé les pieds_i.
   Marc_i SELF_i is washed the feet_i.
   “Marc_i washed his_i feet.”

4.4.13. EXAMPLE. ([Lid96], example 24)

a. ??Maria abrió los ojos con la manos.
   Maria opened the eyes with the hands
   “Maria opened her eyes with her hands.”

b. Maria se abrió los ojos con la manos.
   Maria REFLEX opened the eyes with the hands
   “Maria opened her eyes with her hands.”

However, in languages where no verbal reflexivization strategy (either a clitic or a verbal marker) is available, for instance, in English, it is obligatory to have a possessor of the inalienable noun expressed overtly as a possessive pronoun (cf. 4.4.14a vs. 4.4.14b):

4.4.14. EXAMPLE.

a. *I washed hands. (≠ I washed my hands.)

b. I washed my hands.

The possessor and the subject in 4.4.14b refer to the same referent and, thus, are of the same feature specification. Overtly specifying a possessor is one way to mark co-indexing of arguments.\(^\text{21}\) An alternative way is to have a reflexive verbal clitic or

\(^{21}\text{A possessor can be given either as a possessive determiner (4.4.14b) or as an extra possessor argument (cf. (i) vs. (ii)).}\)
a verbal reflexive affix. For instance, Georgian verbal reflexive i- implies that only the subject is the possessor of the inalienable noun (4.4.15a):

### 4.4.15. Example.

a. ana-m ˇse-∅-i-ˇc.-a  
Ana-ERG PV-3B NOM-SG-PRV-cut-3A ERG-SG AOR.INDIC hair-NOM doll-DAT  
*elene-s).  
Elene-DAT  
“Ana cut her hair.”  
“*Ana cut the doll’s/Elene’s hair.”

b. ana-m ˇse-∅-ˇc.-a  
Ana-ERG PV-3B DAT-SG-cut-3A ERG-SG AOR.INDIC hair-NOM doll-DAT  
elene-s).  
Elene-DAT  
“*Ana cut her hair.”  
“Ana cut the doll’s/Elene’s hair.”

This once again suggests the pre-radical vowel i- to be regarded as a reflexivization strategy on its own, irrespective of the fact that not each and every occurrence of the vowel is a manifestation of the reflexivization.

### A Short Summary

In Subsection 4.4.2, the pre-radical vowel i- as a reflexivization strategy was discussed. It was illustrated that i- alone, without a help of any other nominal reflexivization strategies, marks the reflexivity when there is a coindexing of the subject and indirect object arguments. Further, it was shown that the simple reflexive pronoun tav- obligatorily requires the presence of the pre-radical vowel i-. Since the simple tav- is an SE type anaphor and, thus, unable to reflexivize a predicate, the pre-radical vowel i- has to be the tool which reflexive-marks the predicate. Therefore, the verbal i- is a pure reflexivization strategy.

Some similar facts from Kannada were reviewed (according to [Lid96]) illustrating a simple nominal reflexivization strategy of the SE anaphoric type obligatorily requiring

---

i. *Sie kämmte die Haare.
   she.NOM combed the hair.ACC
   “She combed her hair.”

ii. Sie, kämmte sich, die Haare.
   she.NOM combed sich.DAT the hair.ACC
   “She combed her hair.”
a verbal reflexive marker. Together with Kannada, Georgian illustrates the need for the verbal reflexivization to be incorporated in the [RR93]'s Reflexivity Theory. Some notions in the theory should be modified in order to avoid the [RR93]'s Condition B violations. However, the present work is limited to describing the distribution of the Georgian verbal reflexivization strategy. The theoretical issues and modifications will be left for further research.

Furthermore, the examples of Georgian inalienable nouns were brought up, which never appear with a specifier but need the pre-radical vowel $i$- to be present in the verb form. A similar case was shown in French and Spanish allowing inalienable nouns without a specifier but with the obligatory presence of a verbal reflexive clitic, and a different case of English and German obligatorily requiring a specifier for inalienable nouns while having a verbal reflexive device that is unavailable. French, Spanish and Georgian data suggest that the verbal reflexive clitic in French and Spanish and the pre-radical vowel $i$- in Georgian are able to mark the referential identity of the subject and the possessor of the inalienable noun while there is no need to overtly specify the possessor. Thus, these verbal devices, among which the Georgian pre-radical vowel $i$- can be found, are true reflexivization strategies on their own.

### 4.4.3 Non-Reflexive Pre-Radical Vowel $i$-

#### A Short Introduction

Subsection 4.4.2 dealt with the pre-radical vowel $i$- as a reflexivization marker. The same slot is a home to several other vowels like $e$-, $u$-, $a$- serving as valency changing morphemes participating in voice alternations. There is also a homonymous non-reflexive $i$- used in 3-argument transitive verbs, as well as the $i$- used in synthetic passive forms, and there is the $i$- used in intransitive verbs like unaccusatives and unergatives. All of these non-reflexive, intransitive and passive uses of the pre-radical vowel $i$- will be dealt with in Subsection 4.4.3.

#### Other-Directed Benefactive $i$- and $u$- in 3-Argument Verbs.

In 3-argument transitive verbs, when there is no referential identity between the subject and the indirect object and the indirect object is either the 1st (Example 4.4.16) or the 2nd person (Example 4.4.17), verb forms show a vowel $i$- in the pre-radical slot.

**4.4.16. Example.**

a. šen me komentar-s m-i-gzavn-i.
   2SG.NOM 1SG.DAT comment-DAT 1B_{DAT,SG}-PRV-send-TS
   “You send me comments.”

b. is me komentar-s m-i-gzavn-i-s.
   3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT comment-DAT 1B_{DAT,SG}-PRV-send-TS-3A_{NOM,SG}
"(S)he sends me comments."

4.4.17. Example.

a. me šen komentar-s g-i-gzavn-i.
   1SG.NOM 2SG.DAT comment-DAT 2B_DAT.SG-PRV-send-TS
   “I send you comments.”

b. is šen komentar-s g-i-gzavn-i-s.
   3SG.NOM 2SG.DAT comment-DAT 2B_DAT.SG-PRV-send-TS-3A_NOM.SG
   “(S)he sends you comments.”

The marking is sensitive to a 1st/2nd vs. 3rd person distinction—when the indirect object is 3rd person instead of the vowel i- the vowel u- appears in the verb forms (4.4.18):

4.4.18. Example.

a. me mas komentar-s v-u-gzavn-i.
   1SG.NOM 3SG.DAT comment-DAT 1A_NOM.SG-PRV-send-TS
   “I send him/her comments.”

b. šen mas komentar-s ř-u-gzavn-i.
   2SG.NOM 3SG.DAT comment-DAT 2A_NOM.SG-PRV-send-TS
   “You send him/her comments.”

c. is mas komentar-s ř-u-gzavn-i-s.
   3SG.NOM 3SG.DAT comment-DAT 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-send-TS-3A_NOM.SG
   “(S)he sends him/her comments.”

Although the sentences in the examples 4.4.6a–c and those in 4.4.16, 4.4.17 all imply a benefactive action, the differences in semantics—self-directed (4.4.6a–c) vs. other-directed action (4.4.16, 4.4.17)—suggest a distinction between the reflexive (or the self-directed benefactive) i- (4.4.6a–c) and non-reflexive, the other-directed benefactive i- (4.4.16, 4.4.17).

Note that not only the semantics is different but also the form. In case the subject and indirect object are coindexed, the pre-radical slot is occupied by i-, irrespective of the person (4.4.6a–c). However, when there is no coindexation and, consequently, no reflexive reading possible, there is a i- vs. u- alternation in the slot, depending on the person of the indirect object (correspondingly 1st/2nd vs. 3rd) (cf. the examples 4.4.16 vs. 4.4.18 or 4.4.17 vs. 4.4.18).

The Pre-Radical Vowel i- in Synthetic Passive Verb Forms.

Among the three types of synthetic passive distinguished by [Sha73, pp.288-290] there is a so-called i- passive. These are the synthetic passive forms of which the pre-radical
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The pre-radical vowel \(i\)- is present in unaccusatives\(^{22}\) (4.4.20a, 4.4.21a, 4.4.22a) which, in the presence of an extra possessor argument, turn into 2-argument unaccusatives and have the vowel \(e\)- in the pre-radical slot (4.4.20b, 4.4.21b, 4.4.22b):

---

\(^{22}\)Unaccusatives correspond to a part of the [Sha73, pp.485-488]'s medio-passive verbs, a part of the Class 2 verbs in [Har81, pp. 259-267] and to the static verbs in the terminology of [Hew95b, pp. 393-406].
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4.4.20. Example.

a. çqeuł-i компонuître-i isev gada-i-ʒɪrt-a.
   damned-NOM computer-NOM again PV-PRV-load
   “The damned computer rebooted again.”

b. me çqeuł-i компонuître-i isev
   1SG.DAT damned-NOM computer-NOM again
   gada-m-e-ʒɪrt-a.
   PV-1B_DAT,SG-PRV-load-3A NOM,SG.AOR.INDIC
   Lit.: To.me damned computer again rebooted
   “My damned computer rebooted again.”
   “I rebooted the computer again.”

   damned-NOM computer-NOM again PV-PRV-load-3A NOM,SG.AOR.INDIC
   “The damned computer rebooted again.”

d. *me çqeuł-i компонентuître-i isev
   1SG.DAT damned-NOM computer-NOM again
   gada-m-i-ʒɪrt-a.
   PV-1B_DAT,SG-PRV-load-3A NOM,SG.AOR.INDIC
   Lit.: To.me damned computer again rebooted
   “My damned computer rebooted again.”
   “I rebooted the computer again.”

4.4.21. Example.

a. xačapuri-i ɨɛv-eb-a.
   Khatchapuri-NOM PRV-burn-TS-3A NOM,SG
   Lit.: Khatchapuri it.is.getting.burned
   “Khatchapuri is getting burned.”

b. šen xačapuri-i g-e-ɛv-eb-a.
   2SG.DAT Khatchapuri-NOM 2B_DAT,SG-PRV-burn-TS-3A NOM,SG
   Lit.: To.you.SG Khatchapuri it.is.getting.burned.to.you
   “Your Khatchapuri is getting burned.”
   “You are burning Khatchapuri.”

---

This is an example of a de-nominal verb. The verb form has a nominal root ʒɪrt- “load”, “luggage”. The verb form gada-i-ʒɪrt-a “it rebooted” with the preverb gada- “from one place to another” and another one ɛv-i-ʒɪrt-a “It loaded” with the preverb ɛv- “down into” belong to computer jargon.
   Khatchapuri-NOM PRV-burn-TS-3A NOM.SG
   “Khatchapuri is getting burned.”

d. *šen xaçapur-i g-i-çv-eb-a.
   2SG.DAT Khatchapuri-NOM 2B.DAT.SG-PRV-burn-TS-3A NOM.SG
   “Your Khatchapuri is getting burned.”
   “*(S)he is burning Khatchapuri.”

4.4.22. Example.
a. otax-i i-vs-eb-a buz-eb-it.
   room-NOM PRV-fill-TS-3A NOM.SG fly-PL-INST
   Lit.: Room it.is.getting.filled.with.flies
   “The room is getting filled with flies.”

b. mas otax-i ø-e-vs-eb-a buz-eb-it.
   3SG.DAT room-NOM 3B.DAT.SG-PRV-fill-TS-3A NOM.SG fly-PL-INST
   Lit.: To.him/her room it.is.getting.filled.to.him/her with.flies
   “His/her room is getting filled with flies.”
   “*(S)he is filling the room with flies.”

c. *otax-i e-vs-eb-a buz-eb-it.
   room-NOM PRV-fill-TS-3A NOM.SG fly-PL-INST
   “The room is getting filled with flies.”

d. *mas otax-i ø-i-vs-eb-a buz-eb-it.
   3SG.DAT room-NOM 3B.DAT.SG-PRV-fill-TS-3A NOM.SG fly-PL-INST
   “His/her room is getting filled with flies.”

The unaccusative forms gada-i-t . virt-a in Example 4.4.20a, i-çv-eb-a in Example 4.4.21a and i-vs-eb-a in Example 4.4.22a take the only argument which triggers the 3rd person singular Set A affix. As for the corresponding (b) sentences, the verb forms gada-m-e-t . virt-a in Example 4.4.20b, g-e-çv-eb-a in Example 4.4.21b and ø-e-vs-eb-a in Example 4.4.22b take an additional argument that represents a possessor but that is marked by DAT triggering the Set B agreement affix.

The i- vs. e- opposition shows a valency alternation. The e- appears instead of the i- when there is an increase in valency (here by adding an extra possessor argument). It is i- but never e- which is used in 1-argument unaccusative forms (cf. 4.4.20a vs. 4.4.20c, 4.4.21a vs. 4.4.21c, 4.4.22a vs. 4.4.22c). And the other way around, it is e- but never i- which is used in 2-argument unaccusative forms (cf. 4.4.20b vs. 4.4.20d, 4.4.21b vs. 4.4.21d, 4.4.22b vs. 4.4.22d).24

24It should be noted that it is not always the case that e- forms are 2-argument verbs. Modern Georgian has a few examples which have the pre-radical vowel e- but which take only one argument (see gada-e-g-o
Although the pre-radical vowels i- and e- are described as passive in the traditional literature [Sha73, Dam82] the verb forms given in the examples 4.4.20, 4.4.21, 4.4.22 are unaccusative. As in passives there is an implied agent, while in the examples 4.4.20, 4.4.21, 4.4.22 there is no such implication, so the verbs in the examples cannot qualify as passive. The verb forms showing the i- in the pre-radical slot do not take an agent but a theme as a subject argument (see the examples 4.4.20a, 4.4.21a, 4.4.22a). Therefore, they qualify as unaccusative.

The Pre-Radical Vowel i- in Unergative Verbs.

Unergatives (labelled as medio-active in [Sha73, pp.470-484], Class 3 verbs in [Har81, p. 259-267] and medial verbs in the terminology of [Hol81] and [Hew95b, pp. 339-363]) show the vowel i- in the pre-radical slot in the Future Sub-Series of the TAM Series I\(^25\) (Example 4.4.23c) and the TAM Series II (Example 4.4.23d) while there is no i- in the Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I (4.4.23a and 4.4.23b):

4.4.23. EXAMPLE. (Unergative)

a. Present Indicative, Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bavšv-i & 0}^26.\text{-tir-i-s.} \\
\text{child-NOM 3B}\text{DAT.SG-cry-TS-3A}\text{NOM-SG}
\end{align*}
\]

“A/the child cries.”

\(^25\) For the TAM Series see Table 2.1 in Chapter 2.

\(^{26}\) In (i) which is Tschenkeli’s example cited by [Aro94, p. 17]). Those verbs had a wider use before, while today they sound archaic and are stylistically marked.

In Old Georgian, there were several 1-argument verbs with e- (among them also da-e-bad-a in (ii) taken from [Sar97, p. 90]) which got i- marking in the last period of the Old Georgian around the X-XI centuries (cf. (ii) vs. (iii)). This period seems to be important in the spread of the polysemous (or homonymous) pre-radical vowel i-, since in the period, namely, X century, the vowel appears in unergatives, unaccusatives and several passives never before having the i- marking ([Sar97, p.90]):

i. (Modern Georgian)

\[
\text{[is]} \text{gada-e-g-o.} \\
3\text{SG.NOM PV-PRV-g-3A}\text{NOM-SG.AOR.INDIC}
\]

“(S)he died.”

ii. (Old Georgian)

\[
\text{*da-i-bad-a/ PV-PRV-born-3A}\text{NOM-SG.AOR.INDIC PV-PRV-born-3A}\text{NOM-SG.AOR.INDIC}
\]

“(S)he was born.”

iii. (Modern Georgian)

\[
\text{da-i-bad-a/ *da-e-bad-a.} \\
PV-PRV-born-3A\text{NOM-SG.AOR.INDIC PV-PRV-born-3A}\text{NOM-SG.AOR.INDIC}
\]

“(S)he was born.”
“A/the child is crying.”

b. Imperfect Indicative, Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I

\[ \text{bavšv-i } ³\text{-tir-od-a.} \]
child-NOM 3B_{DAT-SG-cry-IMPERF-3_{A NOM-SG}}

“A/the child was crying.”

c. Future Indicative, Future Sub-Series of the TAM Series I

\[ \text{bavšv-i } ³\text{-i-tir-eb-s.} \]
child-ERG 3B_{DAT-SG-PRV-cry-3_{A NOM-SG}}

“A/the child will cry.”

“A/the child will be crying.”

d. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

\[ \text{bavšv-ma } ³\text{-i-tir-a.} \]
child-ERG 3B_{NOM-SG-PRV-cry-3_{AERG-SG-AOR-INDIC}}

“A/the child cried.”

There are a few verbs of active semantics (deponent verbs in the terminology of [Sha73, p. 296-300] and other works mostly adopting the terminology\(^{27}\)) which also show the vowel \(i\)- in the pre-radical slot in the Future Sub-Series of the TAM Series I (4.4.24c) and the TAM Series II (4.4.24d) as well as in the Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I (4.4.24a and 4.4.24b). Traditional literature cites them as examples of a mismatch between the form (passive) and the meaning (active) ([Sha73, p. 296-300], [Asa87]). However, it is not clear why the vowel is referred to as passive. Even less clear is what label would be appropriate for the vowel \(i\)- in those verbs:

4.4.24. EXAMPLE.

a. Present Indicative, Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I

\[ \text{is } i\text{-gin-eb-a} \quad (*\text{mtavroba-s}). \]
3SG.NOM PRV-curse-3_{A NOM-SG} government-DAT

“(S)he is engaged in cursing (*the government).”

b. Imperfect Indicative, Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I

\(^{26}\)See Footnote 18 in Chapter 2.

\(^{27}\)For deponent verbs in Georgian see also [Tui02].

\(^{28}\)Although neither mtavroba- “government” nor any other nominal is able to be used as a direct object of the \(i\)-marked verb forms in 4.4.24, the bev-r- “many”; “much”; “a lot” might serve as a quasi object and be marked as a direct object of transitives (cf. 4.4.24a vs. 2.4.2c, 4.4.24b vs. 2.4.2b, 4.4.24c vs. 2.4.2d, 4.4.24d vs. 2.4.2a).
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is i-gin-eb-od-a (*mtavroba-s).
3SG.NOM PRV-curse-TS-IMPERF-3A NOM.SG government-DAT
“(S)he was engaged in cursing (*the government).”

c. Future Indicative, Future Sub-Series of the TAM Series I
is ˇse-i-gin-eb-a (*mtavroba-s).
3SG.NOM PV-PRV-curse-TS-3A NOM.SG government-DAT
“(S)he will curse (*the government).”

d. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II
man ˇse-i-gin-a (*mtavroba-∅).
3SG.ERG PV-PRV-curse-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC government-NOM
“(S)he cursed (*the government).”

One thing that becomes absolutely clear is that the object argument is absorbed in
Example 4.4.24a–d (cf. 4.4.24 vs. 4.4.25) and the subject argument is an agent rather
than a theme (as it is in unergatives):

4.4.25. Example.

a. Present Indicative, Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I
is ˇse-a-gin-eb-s 29 mtavroba-s.
3SG.NOM 3B DAT.SG-PRV-curse-TS-3A NOM.SG government-DAT
“(S)he curses the government.”

29The nominal mtavroba- in 4.4.25 is a malefactive, while the cognate object is not present as such.
The malefactive gets marked by DAT in all the three TAM Series, as normally indirect object argument
of ditransitives do (cf. 4.4.25a vs. 2.4.1c, 4.4.25b vs. 2.4.1b, 4.4.25c vs. 2.4.1d, 4.4.25d vs. 2.4.1a).
However, the nominal deda- “mother” might serve as a quasi object and get the marking of direct object
of ditransitives (i.e., DAT in TAM Series I, NOM in TAM Series II, NOM in TAM Series III, cf. (i) vs. 2.4.1c,
(ii) vs. 2.4.1b, (iii) vs. 2.4.1d, (iv) vs. 2.4.1a):

i. Present Indicative, Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I
is deda-s ˇse-a-gin-eb-s 29 mtavroba-s.
“(S)he curses the government.”

ii. Imperfect Indicative, Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I
is deda-s ˇse-a-gin-eb-d-a mtavroba-s.
“(S)he was cursing the government.”

iii. Future Indicative, Future Sub-Series of the TAM Series I
is deda-s ˇse-ˇse-a-gin-eb-s mtavroba-s.
“(S)he will curse the government.”

iv. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II
man deda-ˇse-ˇse-a-gin-a mtavroba-s.
3SG.ERG mother-NOM PV-3B DAT.SG-PRV-curse-3A ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC government-DAT
“(S)he cursed the government.”
b. Imperfect Indicative, Present Sub-Series of the TAM Series I

is 3SG.NOM 3BDAT.SG-PRV-curse-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG mtavroba-s.

mtavroba-s. government-DAT

“(S)he was cursing the government.”

c. Future Indicative, Future Sub-Series of the TAM Series I

is 3SG.NOM PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-curse-TS-3ANOM.SG mtavroba-s.

mtavroba-s. government-DAT

“(S)he will be cursing the government.”

d. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

man 3SG.ERG PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-curse-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC mtavroba-s.

mtavroba-s. government-DAT

“(S)he cursed the government.”

Thus, the verb forms in Example 4.4.24 are unergative verbs irrespective of their form.

The i- vs. e- Alternation in Synthetic Passives and Unaccusatives versus Unergatives.

There is a small note that should be made regarding i- vs. e- alternation. It is not the case that every 1-argument verb taking i- has a 2-Argument e- counterpart. Only unaccusatives and passives with i- can have e- as a pre-radical vowel when there is an extra (DAT-marked) possessor/benefactor/goal argument (cf. 4.4.19a vs. 4.4.19b, 4.4.20a vs. 4.4.20, 4.4.21a vs. 4.4.21b, 4.4.22a vs. 4.4.22b). As for unergatives, there is no i- vs. e- alternation when getting 2-argument unergatives from 1-argument ones (cf. 4.4.26a vs. 4.4.26c, 4.4.26b vs. 4.4.23d):

4.4.26. EXAMPLE. (Unergatives)

a. Future Indicative, Future Sub-Series of the TAM Series I

*baβv-i me m-e-ţir-eb-s.

child-NOM 1SG.DAT 1BDAT.SG-PRV-cry-TS-3ANOM.SG

“A/the child will mourn me.”

“A/the child will be mourning me.”

b. Aorist Indicative, TAM Series II

*baβv-ma me m-e-ţir-a.

child-ERG 1SG.NOM 1BDAT.SG-PRV-cry-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC

“A/the child mourned me.”
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Deponent verbs, thematically identical to unergatives, do also not allow \(i\)- vs. \(e\)- alternation when getting 2-argument forms from 1-argument ones. For instance, observe the ungrammatical verb form \(m-e\-kbin\-eb\-a\) that takes the NP \(\acute{c}vil\-i\) as an agent argument in Example 4.4.27b, derived via adding a possessor to the argument frame of the 1-argument deponent verb, that is unergative \(kbin\-eb\-a\) in Example 4.4.27a. However, observe the homonymous form \(m-e\-kbin\-eb\-a\) in Example 4.4.28b which is grammatical under the passive interpretation, i.e. when the corresponding 1-argument verb \(kbin\-eb\-a\) in 4.4.28a takes the only NP \(\acute{c}vil\-i\) representing a theme argument:

4.4.27. Example. (Deponent verbs)

a. \(\acute{c}vil\-i\) i-\(kbin\-eb\-a\).
   infant-NOM PRV\-bite-TS-3A\_NOM\_SG
   “The infant bites (for instance, it is in a stage of the development when babies are getting new teeth and like something hard to bite on).”

b. *\(\acute{c}vil\-i\) me m-\(e\-kbin\-eb\-a\).
   infant-NOM 1SG\_DAT 1AD\_DAT\_SG\-PRV\-bite-TS-3A\_NOM\_SG
   “The infant bites me (whenever it sees me it bites me).”

4.4.28. Example. (Passives)

a. \(\acute{c}vil\-i\) i-\(kbin\-eb\-a\).
   infant-NOM PRV\-bite-TS-3A\_NOM\_SG
   “The infant gets bitten (e.g., by insects).”

b. \(\acute{c}vil\-i\) me m-\(e\-kbin\-eb\-a\).
   infant-NOM 1SG\_DAT 1BD\_DAT\_SG\-PRV\-bite-TS-3A\_NOM\_SG
   “My infant gets bitten (e.g., by insects).”

It is also not the case that every 2-argument \(e\)- form has a 1-argument counterpart with the pre-radical \(i\)-. Again passives and unaccusatives are the ones allowing the alternation (4.4.29, 4.4.30) whereas unergatives do not allow \(e\)- vs. \(i\)- alternation (cf. 4.4.31a vs. 4.4.31b, 4.4.32a vs. 4.4.32b). In fact for 1-argument unergative verb forms in Present Indicative, there is no need of the pre-radical vowel as illustrated by the examples 4.4.31c, 4.4.32c:

4.4.29. Example. (Passives)

a. es \(\acute{c}ign\-i\) \(\acute{kargad\-i\-qid\-eb\-a}\).
   PROX\_NOM book-NOM well PRV\-sell-TS-3A\_NOM\_SG
   “This book sells well.”

b. (me) es \(\acute{c}ign\-i\) \(\acute{kargad\-m\-e\-qid\-eb\-a}\).
   1SG\_DAT PROX\_NOM book-NOM well 1BD\_DAT\_SG\-PRV\-sell-TS-3A\_NOM\_SG
   Lit.: To.me this book well it.sells.to.me
   “This book sells well (I am selling the book).”
4.4.30. EXAMPLE. (Unaccusatives)
   a. gul-i i-γl-eb-a.
      heart-NOM PRV-get.tired-TS-3\textsubscript{ANOM.SG}
      “The heart gets tired.”
   b. (šen) gul-i g-e-γl-eb-a.
      2SG.DAT heart-NOM 2B\textsubscript{DAT.SG}-PRV-get.tired-TS-3\textsubscript{ANOM.SG}
      “Your heart gets tired.”

4.4.31. EXAMPLE. (Unergatives)
   a. giorgi-∅ (me) m-e-buzγun-eb-a.
      Giorgi-NOM 1SG.DAT 1B\textsubscript{DAT.SG}-PRV-grumble-TS-3\textsubscript{ANOM.SG}
      “Giorgi grumbles to me.”
      “Giorgi is grumbling to me.”
      Giorgi-NOM PRV-grumble-TS-3\textsubscript{ANOM.SG}
      “Giorgi grumbles.”
      “Giorgi is grumbling.”
   c. giorgi-∅ 2\textsuperscript{30} buzγun-eb-s.
      Giorgi-NOM 3B\textsubscript{DAT.SG}-grumble-TS-3\textsubscript{ANOM.SG}
      “Giorgi grumbles.”
      “Giorgi is grumbling.”

4.4.32. EXAMPLE. (Unergatives)
   a. tatia-∅ (šen) kargad g-e-tamaš-eb-a.
      Tatia-NOM 2SG.DAT well 2B\textsubscript{DAT.SG}-PRV-play-TS-3\textsubscript{ANOM.SG}
      “Tatia plays well with you.”
      “Tatia is playing well with you.”
      Tatia-NOM well PRV-play-TS-3\textsubscript{ANOM.SG}
      “Tatia plays well.”
      “Tatia is playing well.”
   c. tatia-∅ kargad 2\textsuperscript{30} tamaš-ob-s.
      Tatia-NOM well 3B\textsubscript{DAT.SG}-play-TS-3\textsubscript{ANOM.SG}
      “Tatia plays well.”
      “Tatia is playing well.”

\textsuperscript{30}For glossing unergatives with an extra agreement marker, adopted in this dissertation, see Footnote 18 in Chapter 2.
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Thus, although the pre-radical vowel $i$- may appear in unergatives, unaccusative and synthetic passives, the vowel $e$- is available only in those 2-argument verb forms of which the 1-argument alternate does not take an agent argument—such are unaccusative and synthetic passive verb forms.

A Short Summary

Subsection 4.4.3 has discussed several classes of verbs which display the vowel $i$- in the pre-radical slot while they do not trigger reflexive reading. The first case discussed was the vowel $i$-, alternating with a vowel $u$-, to register the presence of an indirect object which is not co-indexed with the subject argument. The distribution of the $i$- vs. $u$- corresponds to the person of the indirect object argument, namely, 1st/2nd vs. 3rd.

Other cases discussed include synthetic passive verb forms, unaccusative, unergative verbs and the so-called deponent verbs. According to the form, the deponent verbs group together with the synthetic passive verb forms and unaccusatives. More precisely, the deponent verbs as well as synthetic passive verb forms and unaccusatives have the pre-radical vowel $i$- in all the screeves of the TAM Series I and II while the unergative verbs have the vowel only in some screeves (see above).

However, deponent verbs can be grouped together with unergatives because they have a similar thematic structure. They both take an agent as a subject argument, unlike synthetic passive verb forms and unaccusatives that have a theme as a subject argument.

Additionally, whereas the synthetic passive verb forms and unaccusatives display the pre-radical vowel $e$- when there is an increase in valency, the deponent verbs and unergatives never do so.

4.4.4 Conclusion

Section 4.4 discussed the Georgian pre-radical vowel $i$-. Subsection 4.4.1 offered an introduction into the section. Subsection 4.4.2 gave a description and an analysis of the vowel as a verbal reflexivization strategy within the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93]. Although the status of the reflexive pre-radical vowel $i$- is unclear within the theory, because verbal reflexivization is not incorporated there, it has been argued in the subsection that the vowel is a pure reflexivization strategy.

Subsection 4.4.3 dealt with a non-reflexive homonymous pre-radical $i$- obligatorily being present in 3-argument verb forms when the 1st/2nd person indirect object is not coindexed with the subject.

The same subsection discussed the other occurrences of the $i$- as a homonymous morpheme in synthetic passive forms, unaccusative, unergative and deponent verbs. A comparison of these classes of verbs has also been given with regard to the use of the vowel. Finally, Subsection 4.4.4 concluded the section.
4.5 Summary

Chapter 4 offers a description and analysis of Georgian reflexivization strategies within
the Reflexivity Theory [RR93].

Section 4.1 is an introductory section in which a plan of the chapter is given.

Section 4.2 offered an overview of the Reflexivity Theory according to which the
distribution of anaphors, referential expressions and intra-sentential anaphora is regu-
lated by two modules—structural and non-structural. The crucial claim of the theory
(in contrast with the Binding Theory of [Cho81]) is that the distribution is sensitive to
the semantics of predicates. Consequently, the Reflexivization is defined over predi-
cates without any involvement of syntactic structure. The non-structural module of the
theory allows utterances like The man killed himself and *Himself killed the man since,
according to the basic definitions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, the predicates in both of the sen-
tences are reflexive as well as reflexive-marked. However, the structural condition on
A-chains rules out the starred utterance because, according to the structural condition,
the chains can be headed only by [+R] (i.e. referential) elements, while the English
reflexive qualifies as [-R].

Instead of the division of NPs into anaphors and simple pronouns, as is done in the
Binding Theory of [Cho81], the Reflexivity Theory makes a further distinction of three
main types of anaphoric expressions according to the features [+R] and [+SELF] (i.e.
having a reflexivizing function). Namely, these are SELF type anaphors characterized
by the features [-R; +SELF], SE type anaphors which are [-R; -SELF] and pronouns of
the [+R; -SELF] feature characteristics (Table 4.1).

Within this theory, only the SELF type anaphors are able to reflexivize, because
they possess the feature [+SELF]. As for the SE type anaphors, they are unable to make
a reflexive reading of an utterance possible, unless the predicate is lexically reflexive
(i.e., verbs of grooming, etc.). In the latter case it is believed that the lexically reflexive
predicate is reflexive-marked in itself. That is why the use of the SE type anaphors (not
possessing the reflexivizing [+SELF] feature but only [-SELF]) with such predicates
does not lead to an ungrammaticality.

Section 4.3 deals with the two Georgian nominal reflexivization strategies—the
reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (see Subsection 4.3.2) and the simple reflexive pronoun tav-
(see Subsection 4.3.3)—within the Reflexivity Theory [RR93]. Previously, in Chapter
3 and, in particular, in Subsection 3.5.2 it was argued that the two strategies should
be distinguished on the synchronic level. In Section 4.3 the properties of each of the
strategies were studied and indeed they prove to be different types of anaphors. Namely,
the POSS+tav- strategy is identified as a [+SELF;+R] type anaphor (Subsection 4.3.2)
and the simple tav- strategy—as a SE type anaphor (see Subsection 4.3.3).

Section 4.4 studied the Georgian pre-radical vowel i-. A description and an analysis
of the vowel as a verbal reflexivization strategy is given within the Reflexivity Theory
of [RR93]. It was argued that because verbal reflexivization is not incorporated in the
theory, the purely reflexive uses of the pre-radical vowel i- have no clear status within
The same section also dealt with the occurrences of the prefix $i$- as a non-reflexive homonymous morpheme in 3-argument verb forms exclusively when the 1st/2nd person indirect object is not coindexed with the subject, as well as in synthetic passive forms, unaccusative, unergative and deponent verbs.

In Section 4.4.4 Chapter 4 is concluded. In the next chapter the discussion on the occurrences of the phrase $\text{POSS}+tav$- will be treated, which presents challenges to the Binding Theory of [Cho81] and the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93].
Chapter 5

“Anaphors” that Violate the Binding Theory

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 3 showed the properties of local binding of reflexives and reciprocals in Georgian. It was illustrated that these reflexives and reciprocals never serve as long-distance anaphors. That is, they never allow long-distance binding. Furthermore, they cannot have a logophoric use.

This chapter will discuss the cases in which anaphoric expressions fail to obey the binding principles, whether they are of the type given in the standard Binding Theory [Cho81] or in the Reflexivity Theory [RR93]. In Section 5.2 it will be argued that in so-called object camouflage cases the phrase formally identical with the Georgian complex reflexivization strategy POSS+tav- shows non-anaphoric behavior. In Section 5.3 the non-anaphoric use of the phrase formally identical with the Georgian complex reflexivization strategy POSS+tav- in "wish"-formulae will be discussed. The sections 5.4 and 5.5 offer, respectively, examples of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the reciprocal ermanet- as a subject argument, which is apparently not bound by a c-commanding antecedent. Finally, Section 5.6 will consist of a summary of the chapter.

5.2 The Use of the Phrase POSS+tav- in Object Camouflage

The Georgian phrase POSS+tav- has a special domain in which it is neither bound locally nor long-distance. For instance, the phrase čem-s tav-s in Example 5.2.1 formally is identical to the reflexive POSS+tav- discussed in Section 3.4 and Subsection 4.3.2. However, if the phrase čem-s tav-s in Example 5.2.1 is regarded as a true reflexive phrase, it would exemplify a violation of the Binding Theory [Cho81].

5.2.1. Example.

šen mas [čem-s tav-s] ə-u-xat-av.
2SG.NOM 3SG.DAT 1POSS.SG-DAT head-DAT 2A_NOM.SG-PRV-draw/paint-TS
“You draw/paint me for him/her.”
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In Example 5.2.1 the reflexive phrase čem-s tav-s violates Principle A of the standard Binding Theory (see Section 3.3 as well as [Cho81]). In order to be bound in its governing category, the reflexive phrase has to be coindexed with its antecedent and has to be c-commanded by it. But neither a c-command relation nor of coindexation is possible for the antecedent, since there is no possible antecedent for the reflexive phrase čem-s tav-s in Example 5.2.1.

The reflexive phrase cannot be considered as a logophor either, since even if a possible previous context is constructed, the phrase čem-s tav-s will not be able to refer to previously mentioned referents in the discourse, but only to deictically present direct object argument of the given verb form ∅-u-xat-av in Example 5.2.1.

And, unlike logophors, which do not change meaning if replaced by personal pronouns, Georgian reflexive phrases in this context cannot be replaced by personal pronouns (cf. the examples 5.2.1 vs. 5.2.2):

5.2.2. Example.

*šen mas me ∅-u-xat-av.
2SG.NOM 3SG.DAT 1SG.DAT 2A NOM,SG-PRV-draw/paint-TS
“You draw/paint me for him/her.”

In the Reflexivity framework (see Section 4.2 as well as [RR93]) too, the phrase čem-s tav-s in Example 5.2.1 taken as a reflexive phrase is problematic. Reflexivity condition A states that a reflexive-marked syntactic predicate is reflexive. If the phrase čem-s tav-s in Example 5.2.1 is regarded as a reflexive (just as the same phrase is regarded reflexive in the examples 5.2.3a, 5.2.3b), the predicate in 5.2.1 will be reflexive-marked. However, the predicate cannot be regarded as reflexive in the sense of Reinhart and Reuland’s reflexivity of a predicate at the same time (see Definition 4.2.2 in Section 4.2). In order for a predicate to be reflexive, two of its arguments have to be coindexed. In Example 5.2.1 none of the arguments are co-indexed, and, thus, the predicate cannot be called reflexive.

5.2.3. Example.

a. me mas [čem-s tav-s] v-u-xat-av.
1SG.NOM 3SG.DAT 1POS.SG-DAT head-DAT 1A NOM,SG-PRV-draw/paint-TS
“I draw/paint myself for him/her.”

b. is me [čem-s tav-s]
3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT 1POS.SG-DAT head-DAT
m-i-xat-av-s.
1B DAT,SG-PRV-draw/paint-TS-3A NOM,SG
“(S)he draws/paints me for myself.”

The form of a certain phrase in a certain syntactic environment is important. However, the semantics are also crucial. The reflexive phrase čem-s tav-s in 5.2.1 is clearly
used non-anaphorically. In fact, in such uses, binding is not an issue at all. All the phrase čem-s tav-s in 5.2.1 does, is to mark agreement by identifying the direct object argument as a deictically referring element (“me”).

This kind of “camouflaging” of a direct object by an apparent reflexive has been called object camouflage and recognized as a distinct phenomenon in studies of Georgian. For instance, [Har81, p. 52] points out that object camouflage and tav-reflexivization apply under different conditions and cannot be accounted for under a common syntactic rule. Similarly, [And84, p. 209] notes that “first and second person anaphors are (exceptionally) [-Anaphor] under the conditions of the object camouflage construction”.

Object camouflage is obligatory whenever a non-3rd person argument functions as a direct object of a 3-argument verb. The number of arguments is important, since object camouflage applies to direct objects, only when there is also an indirect object in that clause (see [Har81, p. 51]): “If a clause contains an indirect object, a first or second person direct object in that clause is realized as a possessive pronoun + tavi, where the possessive reflects the person and number of the input form”.

Restrictions on non-3rd person direct objects in this context are known cross-linguistically. In many languages, in which this issue has been studied, the 1st and 2nd person direct object is constrained in the presence of the indirect object. Within the optimality theoretic account [Bon94] discusses the existence of a universal Person-Case Constraint (PCC) which disallows first or second person agreement with a direct object when dative agreement is also present, leaving 1st and 2nd person pronouns ungrammatical in such cases.

It has been shown in the literature that the PCC affects phonologically weak elements like clitics (Greek, French (Example 5.2.4), Italian, Catalan, Spanish and Arabic [Bon91, Bon94, Ana02]), agreement affixes (Basque (Example 5.2.5 from [Ana02]), Georgian (Example 5.2.6 from [Har81]))¹ and weak pronouns (Swiss German in Example 5.2.7, Henk van Riemsdijk personal communication to [Ana02]).

5.2.4. Example. (French, [Kay75], cited in [Bon94, p. 37])

a. On va te lui mettre dans les bras.
   “They will put you in his arms.”

b. On va lui mettre le bébé dans les bras.
   “They will put the baby in his arms.”

¹The other examples throughout this dissertation also show that irrespective what is the person of the agent argument, 3-argument verb forms taking the 1st person recipient and the 2nd person theme or, vice versa, 2nd person recipient and the 1st person theme never display the agreement affix triggered by the 1st or 2nd person theme argument.
5.2.5. EXAMPLE. (Basque, [Ana02])

a. *Azpisapoek etsaiari ni saldu na-I-o-te.
   [Tr]aitors.ERG enemy.DAT me.ABS sell 1.ABS-root-3.DAT-3.ERG
   “The traitors sell me to the enemy.”

b. Azpisapoek etsaiari misila saldu d-∅-I-o-te.
   “The traitors sell the missile to the enemy.”

5.2.6. EXAMPLE. (Georgian, [Har81, pp. 48-49])

a. *van-o-m ˇse-g-a-dar-a
   givi-s.
   Givi-DAT
   “Vano compared you to Givi.”

b. van-o-m ˇsen-i tav-i
   [V]ano-ERG 2POS.SG-NOM head-NOM
   ˇse-∅-a-dar-a givi-s.
   PV-3B DAT-SG-PRV-compare-3A ERG-SG.AOR.INDIC Givi-DAT
   “Vano compared you to Givi.”

5.2.7. EXAMPLE. (Swiss German, [Ana02])

a. *D’Maria zeigt em mich.
   The.Maria shows to.him me
   “Mary shows me to him.”

b. D’Maria zeigt mir en.
   The.Maria shows to.me him
   “Mary shows him to me.”

[Has] cites more languages from the literature exemplifying the phenomenon. Such
languages are Albanian (Indo-European), Romanian (Romance), Maltese (Semitic),
Hakha Lai (Chin, Tibeto-Burman), Kambera (Central Malayo-Polynesian), Manam
(Oceanic, Austronesian), Timas (Sepik-Ramu), Monumbo (Torricelli), Warlpiri (Pama-
Nyungan), Ojibwa (Algonquian), Passamaquoddy (Algonquian), Tetelcingo Nahuatl
(Uto-Aztecan). Instead of the term used in [Bon94], Person-Case Constraint, [Has]
uses Ditransitive Person-Role Constraint (DPRC) because he realizes that (i) case mark-
ing may not be comparable across languages while semantic roles are and (ii) some

Among many other languages Georgian also illustrates that certain cases do not necessarily cor-
respond to certain grammatical relations. For instance, the NOM case marker can mark the subject of
transitives (in TAM Series I) as well as the direct object (in TAM Series II) (see Section 2.4).
languages show person restrictions in montransitive verbs (banning the combination of 3rd person agents and non-3rd person patients). [Has] argues in a usage based (functional) account that it is in fact a (dis)preference but not a universal constraint (as claimed by [Bon94]).\footnote{According to [Has], (The strong version of) the Ditransitive Person-Role Constraint is as follows: Combinations of bound pronouns with the roles recipient and theme are disfavored if the theme pronoun is first or second person.} One of the arguments of [Has] is that there are languages not disallowing combination of the 3rd person recipient and non-3rd person theme, such as —Lakhota, Noon (Northern Atlantic, Senegal), Haya (Bantu-J, Tanzania) and Kabardian (Northwest Caucasian, see 5.2.8a):\footnote{Another Northwest Caucasian language—Adyghe, also allows the 3rd person theme argument in the presence of the recipient (see Example 5.2.8b from [KVK96]).}

5.2.8. Example.

a. Kabardian (Northwest Caucasian), cited in [Has] from [KV98]
   w-je-s-te-n-s’.  
   2SG.TH-3SG.REC-1SG.AG-give-FUT-ASSRT
   “I will give you to him.”

b. Adyghe (Northwest Caucasian), [KVK96]
   w-je-s-te-ˇs’t.
   2SG.TH-3SG.REC-1SG.AG-give-FUT
   “I will give you to him.”

The two major different ways of looking at the facts reported from the languages mentioned above—the formal ([Bon94, Ana02] among others) and functional [Has]—will not be reviewed here. This section is only intended to present Georgian facts and show that the strategy—the phrase POSS+tav—which is used in object camouflage and which has a form of the reflexive phrase, is in fact not anaphoric at all.\footnote{In most of the languages in which this issue has been studied so far, the use of an apparent reflexive marker in 3-argument verbs with non-3rd person theme seems present in Southern Tiwa [Ros90].}

In Georgian all non-3rd person direct object arguments must be “camouflaged” as 3rd person, in order to agree properly with the verb (cf. 5.2.1 vs. 5.2.2, 5.2.9 vs. 5.2.10). It should be claimed that the use of the POSS+tav- strategy instead of a personal pronoun is one of the strategies that languages may use to avoid violating PCC (or DPRC).

5.2.9. Example.

me mas [sen-s tav-s] v-u-xat-av.
1SG.NOM 3SG.DAT 2POSS.SG-DAT head-DAT 1A NOM.SG-PRV-draw/paint-TS
“I draw/paint you for him/her.”
5.2.10. Example.

*me mas ˇsen v-u-xat-av.
1SG.NOM 3SG.DAT 2SG.DAT 1A NOM.SG-PRV-draw/paint-TS

“I draw/paint you for him/her.”

In Georgian, the lexeme tav- “head” got grammaticalized into a morpheme of various functions, both anaphoric and non-anaphoric. It were probably the body-part semantics which made the lexeme become an anaphoric element. As for the non-anaphoric use of the phrase POSS+tav- in object camouflage, it can be explained by the persistence of certain characteristics in the behavior of the grammaticalized tav-that are typical for nouns, namely their being 3rd person NPs. In other words, since the morpheme tav- is derived from a noun historically, it can function as a 3rd person element, just as any other lexical noun does (see also [AL02]).

In Georgian, nouns keep the referential feature [+3rd person] irrespective of the change in their lexical meaning either historically or synchronically via (i) polysemy or (ii) in a particular context. For instance, the items in Example 5.2.11 have changed their lexical semantics in the course of time but they all still trigger the 3rd person agreement and, thus, represent 3rd person NPs. The examples 5.2.12a vs. 5.2.12b illustrate polysemous items which, irrespective of the difference in lexical semantics, do represent 3rd person NPs. Example 5.2.13 illustrates the change of lexical semantics depending on a context (deixis). It is important that, although the lexical semantics of the item changes, the item will still be a 3rd person NP:

5.2.11. Example. (From [Sar97, p. 193])

a. cxedar-
   1. Old Georgian “a bed”
   2. Modern Georgian “a dead body of a human”

b. agarak-
   1. Old Georgian “a ground for cultivating”
   2. Modern Georgian “a country-house”

c. simamr-
   1. Old Georgian “a brother of a wife”, “a father of a wife”
   2. Modern Georgian “a father of a wife”

5.2.12. Example. (Polysemy)

a. am tav-ma (me) did-i dro-∅
   PROX.ERG chapter-ERG 1SG.DAT big-NOM time-NOM
   ca-m-a-rtv-a.6
   PV-1B.DAT.SG-PRV-take-3A.ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
“This chapter costed me much time.”

b. am tav-ma (me) did-i dro-∅
   PROX.ERG head-ERG 1SG.DAT big-NOM time-NOM
c-a-m-a-rtv-a.
Pv-1bDAT.SG-PRV-take-3aERG.SG.AOR.INDIC

“This head costed me much time.” (said by a hairdresser)

5.2.13. Example. (Irony)

am genios-ma šekreba-∅-c ki ar
   PROX.OBL genius-ERG addition-NOM-ADD PART NEG
(∅)-i-c-i-s.
3bNom.SG-PRV-know-ts-3aERG.SG

“This genius does not know even addition.” (i.e. ignoramus)

It seems that nouns retain the person feature not only when changing the lexical meaning (cf. 5.2.11a1 vs. 5.2.11a2, 5.2.11b1 vs. 5.2.11b2, 5.2.11c1 vs. 5.2.11c2, 5.2.12a vs. 5.2.12b, 5.2.13) but also when they lose the feature completely and turn into a grammatical item, like the Georgian tav- does. When it is used as a reflexive marker, it always triggers a 3rd person agreement [AL02].7

The cases of object camouflage (5.2.1) as well as the cases of reflexive POSS+tav- (5.2.3a, 5.2.3b) show that phrases POSS+tav- trigger 3rd person agreement and, thus, turn semantically non-3rd person referents into formally 3rd person ones (cf. 5.2.3a vs. 5.2.14a, 5.2.3b vs. 5.2.14b).8

---

7 Although the verb root in Example 5.2.12 is glossed as “take” the form ca-m-a-rtv-a has a negative flavor and means taking something against the will of its owner.

8 Recall the use of pre-radical vowels to register indirect object arguments of 3-argument verbs discussed in Subsection 4.4.3 when discussing the examples 4.4.16–4.4.18. This type of marking is sensitive to a 1st/2nd vs. 3rd person distinction. More precisely, in the presence of the 1st and 2nd person indirect objects with 3-argument verbs the pre-radical slot features the vowel -i- (4.4.16, 4.4.17) as opposed to the 3rd person indirect objects, which show the pre-radical vowel -u- (4.4.18).

Given this rule, in 3-argument verbs one would expect the 1st or 2nd person indirect object to be marked on the verb by the pre-radical -i-. However, when the 1st or 2nd person indirect objects are given as the phrase POSS+tav- only verb forms with the pre-radical vowel -u- are grammatical, even though -u- is otherwise a marker for 3rd person indirect objects. Thus, 1st or 2nd person indirect objects given as POSS+tav- in fact act as a 3rd person NPs in the construction of the sentence, triggering 3rd person -u-:

i. me čem-s tav-s mivid garemo-s v-u-kmn-i/
   1sg.nom 1poss.sg-dat self-dat peaceful environment-dat 1anom.sg-prv-create-indic
   *v-i-kmn-i.
   1anom.sg-prv-create-indic
   “I create a peaceful environment for myself.”

ii. šen šen-s tav-s mivid garemo-s (∅)-u-kmn/2
   2sg.nom 2poss.sg-dat self-dat peaceful environment-dat 2anom.sg-prv-create-indic
5.2.14. Example.

a. me mas naṭurmort-s v-u-xaṭ-av.
   1SG.NOM 3SG.DAT steel.life-DAT 1ΑΝΟΜ.3G-PRV-draw/paint-TS
   “I draw/paint a still life for him/her.”

b. is me naṭurmort-s m-i-xaṭ-av-s.
   3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT steel.life-DAT 1ΒΔΑΤ.3G-PRV-draw/paint-TS-3ΑΝΟΜ.3G
   “(S)he draws/paints a still life for me.”

Due to the combination of a possessive and a noun, the phrase POSS+tav- in general is ideally suited to express both the person of the object and act as a 3rd person grammatical item. Sometimes when the POSS determiner of the phrase shares the referential feature of person with another argument, the phrase POSS+tav-, representing a 3rd person NP, gets interpreted as being anaphoric (5.2.3a, 5.2.3b). In other cases, when there is no shared person feature and, consequently, no coinde xation, the phrase POSS+tav- is just a 3rd person camouflage for non-3rd person referents (cf. 5.2.1 vs. 5.2.2, 5.2.9 vs. 5.2.10).

It is important to note that a POSS+tav- occurrence is reflexive only in some cases, while it triggers 3rd person agreement in each and every occurrence. The fact that it is reflexive is only one side of the grammaticalized body-part tav- “head”. The fact that it is derived diachronically from a (body part) noun might provide grounds for allowing both an anaphoric and a non-anaphoric use. The question is whether, synchronically, one can account for POSS+tav- being used both as a reflexive and as a deictic pronoun (object camouflage). In an optimality theoretic framework one might formulate

9 Exact ly the same phenomenon can be observed in Basque, which has a complex reflexivization strategy of the type “POSS + body-part noun” exemplified in (i), neatly paralleling Georgian in its use of a possessive and the body-part noun buru-a “head-DET” ([Reb95, p. 315]). Regardless of the grammatical person of the antecedent, POSS+burua is always cross-referenced as 3rd person in the finite form of the verb:

i. Aita-k bere buru-a hil d-u.
   father-ERG his head.ABS-DET kill 3SG-have
   “The father killed himself.”
   “The father killed his head.”

10 The phrase POSS+tav- as a camouflaging tool (cf. 5.2.3a vs. 5.2.14a, 5.2.3b vs. 5.2.14b) as well as a reflexivization strategy (cf. 3.5.1a vs. 3.5.1b, 3.5.2a vs. 3.5.2b or (i) vs. (ii) in Footnote 8 in Chapter 5) is a 3rd person NP triggering a 3rd person agreement.

11 See [Har81, p. 52] which also differentiates between the reflexivization and object camouflage irrespective of formal similarity between the strategies used (in both cases the phrase POSS+tav-). The author argues that there is no single syntactic rule which could account for both phenomena because they apply under different conditions. Thus, [Har81] argues that it is not possible to unify reflexivization and object camouflage.
it as follows: given a certain grammaticalization process, the grammatical system in Georgian gives the option of either violating the PCC constraint or violating Binding Condition A. Apparently the PCC constraint is ranked higher than Binding Condition A, because object camouflage prevents a PCC constraint violation at the cost of Binding Condition A violation. Another way of formulating it is the following: the Georgian tav- “head” is grammaticalized into a fully reflexive SELF-noun comparable to English self or Greek eafios. But contrary to English self or Greek eafios it does not force the accompanying possessive pronoun into a bound reading (like in she bumped her/*his head), but instead allows the possessive pronoun to be unbound, just as English own in my own mother hates him versus John hates his own mother.

5.3 The Use of the Phrase POSS+tav- in Wish Formulae

The standard way of expressing wishes in Georgian is the use of subjunctive morphology with a particle netav “would that”. Example 5.3.1 illustrates such a use in which the verb with subjunctive morphology takes arguments which can be expressed either by full NPs or by personal pronouns. The latter are actually optional because of the availability of pro-drop:

5.3.1. Example.

\[
\text{netav (me) \(\#\text{sen}\) g-mal-av-d-e.}
\]

OPT.PART 1SG.NOM 2SG.DAT 2BDAT.SG-hide-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ

“I wish I were hiding you.”

However, there is one more alternative to the subjunctive-marked verb forms to express a wish which also uses the particle netav, however the verb shows no subjunctive but indicative morphology:

5.3.2. Example.

\[
\text{netav da-m-a-mal-(v)-in-a (me)}
\]

OPT.PART PV-1BDAT.SG-PRV-hide-TS-CAUS-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC 1SG.DAT
\(\#\text{sen}\). 
\text{\(\#\text{sen}\).}

2POSS.SG-NOM head-NOM 2SG.NOM

“I wish I were hiding you.”

The second option illustrated in Example 5.3.2 has no subjunctive marking. The verb used in 5.3.2 is indicative. It has a 2-argument reading. Note that the direct object

---

12 The form of the particle may vary according to dialects. The translation of the particle as “would that” is taken over from [Hew95b, p. 447].

13 Such wish formulae with an indicative verb form illustrated in 5.3.2 are widely spread in the North-Eastern dialects of Georgian as well as in the North-Western Racha’ dialect, namely its Glola subdialect [Sha84, Jor89]. However, one can occasionally find the wish formulae in the standard literary texts as well.
argument is necessarily expressed by the phrase POSS+tav-. The use of a simple pronoun instead of the phrase POSS+tav- in 5.3.2 is ungrammatical. It is also not possible for the phrase POSS+tav- to be optional otherwise it would result in another interpretation (cf. 5.3.3 vs. 5.3.2):

**5.3.3. Example.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{net} & \text{av} \quad \text{da-m-a-mal-(v)-in-a}, \\
\text{OPT.PART} & \text{PV-1B}\text{DAT.SG-PRV-hide-TS-CAUS-3A}\text{NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC} \\
\text{“I wish I were hiding him/her/it/them/*you.”}
\end{align*}
\]

As is known, the phrases headed by a grammaticalized body-part tav- “head” are used as reflexive phrases, whenever arguments of a verb are coin dexed. However, the phrase šen-i tav-i in Example 5.3.2 cannot be analyzed as a reflexive, since there is no antecedent for it in the given sentence. Furthermore, it cannot be regarded as a logophor with an antecedent in a possible previous discourse because, unlike the logophors across languages, the phrase šen-i tav-i in 5.3.2 cannot be replaced by a simple pronoun. And, more importantly, the only referent to which the phrase šen-i tav-i in 5.3.2 makes reference is not a referent previously mentioned in the discourse, but the theme argument of the given verb form da-m-a-mal-(v)-in-a, the theme argument whom the utterer wishes to hide.

Generally, when the arguments of 2-argument verbs are not coindexed, they are simply coded in the verb form and can be given by simple pronouns which are optional because of the available pro-drop and can be deleted unless emphasized (see the examples A.3.1–A.3.11 in Appendix A.3). So the appearance of the phrase POSS+tav- as an argument of a verb with a 2-argument reading seems to be unmotivated at first.

[Ami05b] offers data illustrating that a verb form with a certain number of arguments always gets 1-argument-less interpretation within the wish formulae. For instance, the form mo-m-kl-a taking 2 arguments in 5.3.4a gets a 1-argument reading in the wish formula in 5.3.4b. Or the verb form ga-m-a-cin-a taking 2 arguments in 5.3.5a gets a 1-argument reading in the wish formula in 5.3.5b. The verb form a-m-a-šen-eb-in-a taking 3-arguments in 5.3.6a gets a 2-argument reading in the wish formula in 5.3.6b.

**5.3.4. Example.**

a. man (me) mo-m-kl-a.  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(s)he.ERG 1NOM PV-1B}\text{NOM.SG-kill-3A}\text{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC} \\
\text{“(S)he killed me.”}
\end{align*}
\]

b. netav (me) mo-m-kl-a.  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OPT.PART 1NOM PV-1B}\text{NOM.SG-kill-3A}\text{ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC} \\
\text{“I wish I would die.”}
\end{align*}
\]
5.3. The Use of the Phrase POSS+tav- in Wish Formulae

5.3.5. Example.

a. man (me) ga-m-a-cin-a.
   (s)he.ERG I.NOM PV-1BNOM-SG-PRV-laugh-3AERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he made me laugh.”

b. netav (me) ga-m-a-cin-a.
   OPT.PART I.NOM PV-1BNOM-SG-PRV-laugh-3AERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
   “I wish I would laugh.”

5.3.6. Example.

a. man (me) (is)
   (s)he.ERG I.DAT it.I.NOM
   a-m-a-šen-eb-in-a.
   PV-1BDAT-SG-PRV-build-TS-CAUS-3AERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he made me build it.”

b. netav (me) (is)
   OPT.PART I.DAT it.I.NOM
   a-m-a-šen-eb-in-a.
   PV-1BDAT-SG-PRV-build-TS-CAUS-3AERG-SG.AOR.INDIC
   “I wish I would build it.”

Thus, each of the examples in 5.3.4a–5.3.6a illustrates a verb form with a certain number of arguments which gets 1-argument-less interpretation within the wish formulae (5.3.4b–5.3.6b). [Ami05b] illustrates several arguments in favor of this view. One of the arguments includes, for instance, the use of a transitive root -kəl/-kəl- “killing” for the intransitive “dying” (cf. 5.3.4a vs. 5.3.4b). This means that the wish formulae with a n-argument reading involve the verb forms taking n+1 arguments.

As argued by [Ami05b], the kind of wish formulae with the particle netav making use of indicative verb forms are derived from wish formulae having a God or some higher power as an agent argument which got eventually lost but the form of the verb was kept. The wish formulae must have undergone syntactic reanalysis which changed the argument structure of the verbs used in the formulae while leaving the form intact.14

Perhaps the explanation for the use of the non-anaphoric phrase POSS+tav- in the wish formula in Example 5.3.2 lies exactly in the morphological peculiarity of the wish formulae. As could have been observed, the wish formulae with a n-argument reading make use of the verb forms taking n+1 arguments. Thus, the wish formula having a 2-argument reading in 5.3.2 has to be using a 3-argument verb form. And exactly, if

14According to [Lan77, p. 58], reanalysis is a “change in the structure of an expression or class of expressions that does not involve any immediate or intrinsic modification of its surface manifestation. According to [HC95, p. 61], “reanalysis involves a change in constituency, hierarchical structure, category labels, grammatical relations”.

Chapter 5. “Anaphors” that Violate the Binding Theory

the verb form used in the formula in 5.3.2 is compared to the same verb form taken out of the formula in 5.3.7 it can be seen this is indeed the case:

5.3.7. Example.

(man) (me) (is)
3SG.ERG 1SG.DAT 3SG.NOM
Pv-1B.DAT.SG-PRV-hide-TS-CAUS-3A.ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
“(S)he made me hide him/her.”

Therefore, the verb form used in the wish formula 5.3.2 is a 3-argument verb taking the 2nd person theme. And since non-3rd person theme arguments of 3-argument verbs always require to be expressed via a camouflaging tool—the 3rd person non-anaphoric and non-emphatic phrase POSS+ tav- (see Section 5.2 on object camouflage), it is expected to have the 2nd person theme expressed via the phrase ˇsen-i tav-i in 5.3.2.

It will be claimed here that the phrase POSS+ tav- in Example 5.3.2 is not anaphoric at all. It simply behaves as a 3rd person NP. This is reflected in the coding of arguments as well—POSS+ tav- conditions 3rd person theme argument coding in the verb form. As Example 5.3.8 illustrates, both POSS+ tav- with 2nd person possessive and an obviously 3rd person referential expressions such as devnil-i or tık bileul-i require the same coding:

5.3.8. Example.

netav da-m-a-mal-(v)-in-a (me)
OPT.PART PV-1B.DAT.SG-PRV-hide-TS-CAUS-3A.NO.M.SG.AOR.INDIC 1SG.DAT
[ˇsen-i tav-i]  devnil-i/ tık bileul-i.
2POSS.SG-NO.M head-NO.M fugitive-NO.M sweeties-NO.M
“I wish I were hiding you/the fugitive/the sweeties.”

Thus, there is nothing mysterious in the use of a non-anaphoric phrase POSS+ tav- in wish formulae in Georgian. It is, in fact, a subcase of object camouflage and the phrase POSS+ tav- used there is not anaphoric but rather a 3rd person camouflaging tool.

5.4 The Reflexive Phrase POSS+ tav- as a Subject Argument

As was illustrated earlier in the examples 3.4.10–3.4.13, the reflexive phrase POSS+ tav- in general is unable to serve as a subject argument. However, the examples like 5.4.1 vs. 5.4.2 (as well as those in 7.3.11b vs. 7.3.11a) show that sometimes there is no subject/object asymmetry and the reflexive phrase POSS+ tav- can serve as a subject argument:
5.4. The Reflexive Phrase POSS+tav- as a Subject Argument

5.4.1. Example.

ˇcem-ma tav-ma m-i-xsn-a
1POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG 1B NOM.SG-PRV-save-3 AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC 1SG.NOM
Lit.: Myself (s)he/it saved me

“[Something related to] myself saved me.” (i.e., my past doings, personal charm, etc. helped me to escape)

5.4.2. Example.

me v-i-xsen-i čem-i tav-i.
1SG.ERG 1AERG.SG-PRV-save-AOR.INDIC 1POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM

“I saved myself.”

Example 5.4.1 above shows an Aorist Indicative transitive verb form m-i-xsn-a “(s)he/it saved me” taking the phrase POSS+tav- as a subject argument. That the reflexive phrase is the subject argument can be seen in the case (ERG) the phrase is marked by and in the agreement (the Set A agreement suffix -a) that it triggers.\(^{15}\)

That the reflexive phrase functions as a subject argument, can also be seen when it is substituted by some other ergative NP (cf. 5.4.1 vs. 5.4.3):

5.4.3. Example.

ˇcem-ma megobar-ma m-i-xsn-a
1POSS.SG-ERG friend-ERG 1B NOM.SG-PRV-save-3 AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
(me).
1SG.NOM

“My friend saved me.”

In Example 5.4.1, the subject argument is realized as a phrase POSS+tav-. Since its interpretation depends on something else and its reference cannot be maintained independently, the qualification of the phrase čem-ma tav-ma in 5.4.1 as an R-expression is ungrammatical (see Condition C of the Binding Theory [Cho81], also Section 3.3).

The phrase čem-ma tav-ma in 5.4.1 can also not be qualified as a pronominal because pronominals are free in their governing category (see Condition B of the Binding Theory of [Cho81], also Section 3.3) while this phrase in specific is referentially dependent on the co-argument NP me.\(^{16}\)

Since the NP on which the interpretation of the phrase čem-ma tav-ma in 5.4.1 depends is in the same clause as the phrase itself, or in other words, in its governing

\(^{15}\)In Aorist Indicative transitive subjects are marked by ergative and they trigger the Set A agreement (see 3.6.43b).

\(^{16}\)Note that the phrase POSS+tav- in object camouflage cases (5.2.1, 5.2.9) is free in its governing category and, thus, qualifies as a pronominal.
category, the very phrase does qualify as an anaphor. However, the case of Example 5.4.1 is anomalous in the sense that the antecedent of an anaphor is hierarchically superior to the anaphor, either taken as c-command, or o-command (higher on an order list of grammatical functions), as in Example 5.4.2. In Example 5.4.1 the anaphoric phrase čem-ma tav-ma is the subject argument itself clo-commanding the postcedent NP me, the NP on which the interpretation of the phrase čem-ma tav-ma depends.

One would normally expect the direct object reflexive to be c-commanded by a subject argument of a 2-argument verb, as in 5.4.2, but not the other way around as in 5.4.1. Both the reflexive phrase čem-ma tav-ma and the NP me are in the same clause (clause-mate condition) in Example 5.4.1. No matter what title is given to the reflexive phrase čem-ma tav-ma in 5.4.1—a reflexive in subject position, anaphor, cataphor or postcedent reflexive—it displays a truly anaphoric behavior: its interpretation is dependent on the co-argument NP. However, the structural relation c-command seems to be reversed—the subject reflexive seems to locally “bind” its postcedent.

The binding in the subject occurrences of the reflexive phrase will be discussed in a more detail in the following chapters such as Chapter 6 and Chapter 7. It is necessary to figure out whether in such uses there is binding in the Binding Theoretic sense (see [Cho81] as well as Definition 3.3.3) and if it is, what exactly is bound by what. Here the subject uses of the phrase POSS+tav- are presented in order to introduce the topic and show that there are uses of the reflexive phrase which seem to violate Binding Conditions [Cho81].

Note that in the subject uses of the reflexive phrase, if there is a violation of agreement rules, the grammaticality fails. For instance, if POSS+tav-, instead of triggering a 3rd person Set A agreement marker (like in Example 5.4.1), conditions a non-3rd person Set A agreement marker (Example 5.4.4) the sentence becomes ungrammatical:

5.4.4. Example.

*čem-ma  tav-ma  v-i-xsen-i  me.
IPOSS.SG-ERG self-ERG IERG;SG-PRV-save-AOR.INDIC 1SG.NOM
Lit.: Myself I.saved.him/her/it me

“[Something related to] myself saved me.” (i.e., my past actions, personal charm, etc. helped me to escape)

The subject uses of the phrase POSS+tav- discussed in the present Section 5.4 are anaphoric even though they violate the standard binding principles [Cho81]. The same phrase in object camouflage (Section 5.2) and in wish formulae (argued in this work to be a subcase of object camouflage, Section 5.3), should be qualified as pronominal. However, both the anaphoric and non-anaphoric uses of the phrase POSS+tav- do trigger the 3rd person agreement and act as 3rd person NPs. If the phrase is associated with a non-3rd person agreement—there will be ungrammaticality (5.4.4). Thus, as it was argued in Section 5.2 as well, the phrase POSS+tav- seems to serve, in general, as a camouflaging tool for an argument of any person into a 3rd person NP.
As was already illustrated before in Chapter 3, the Georgian reciprocals ertmanet- and ertimeore- show local binding (3.6.16, 3.6.18). Additionally, Example 3.6.19 illustrated that none of the reciprocals are able to serve as a subject argument. But then again, like in the case of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (see Section 5.4), there is a possibility for one of the reciprocals, namely ertmanet-, to appear as a subject argument of verbs of certain characteristics. The conditions allowing the phenomenon will not be treated in detail here, but the reader is referred to Chapter 7 for an extensive discussion. Here, only an example will be presented to illustrate the non-anaphoric behavior of the reciprocal:

5.5.1. Example.
ertmanet-i gv-kl-av-s (čven).
REC-NOM 1B_{DAT}.PL-kill-TS-3ANOM:SG 1PL.DAT
Lit.: Each other it.kills us us

"[Something related to] each other makes us suffer."

Example 5.5.1 illustrates a Present Indicative transitive verb form gv-kl-av-s "(s)he/it kills us" taking the reciprocal ertmanet-i as a subject argument. The fact that the reflexive phrase is the subject argument can be seen on the case (NOM) the phrase is marked by and on the agreement (the Set A agreement suffix -s) that it triggers.\footnote{In Present Indicative, transitive subjects are marked by nominative and they trigger the Set A agreement (3.6.43a).}

That the reciprocal functions as a subject argument, can also be seen when it is substituted by some other nominative NP (cf. 5.5.1 vs. 5.5.2):

5.5.2. Example.

a. ertmanet-is simorxcve-∅ gv-kl-av-s (čven).
   REC-GEN shyness-NOM 1B_{DAT}.PL-kill-TS-3ANOM:SG 1PL.DAT
   Lit.: Each other’s shyness it.kills us us
   "Each other’s being shy makes us suffer."

b. simartove-∅ gv-kl-av-s (čven).
   loneliness-NOM 1B_{DAT}.PL-kill-TS-3ANOM:SG 1PL.DAT
   Lit.: Loneliness it.kills us us
   "Loneliness makes us suffer."

The reciprocal ertmanet-i in Example 5.5.1 is certainly anaphoric because it is referentially dependent on the clause-mate NP čven.
However, the reciprocal could be claimed to perform a non-anaphoric behavior. Instead of being bound by its antecedent as in 5.5.3, the reciprocal ertmanet-i in Example 5.5.1 itself locally “binds” the postcedent NP čven, on the interpretation of which the reciprocal depends:

5.5.3. Example.

(čven) v-kļ-av-t ertmanet-s.
1PL.NOM 1ANOM.SG-kill-TS-PLNOM REC-DAT
Lit.: We we.kill.him/her/it/them each.other
“We kill each other.”

The subject uses of the reciprocal ertmanet- will be discussed in a more detail in Chapter 7. Here our purpose was to introduce the topic and illustrate that there are uses of the reciprocal, which, in spite of violating Binding Conditions [Cho81], are still grammatical (Example 5.5.1).

5.6 Summary

Chapter 5 dealt with the uses of the Georgian phrase POSS+tav- and the reciprocal ertmanet- which seem to violate Binding Conditions [Cho81]. Section 5.1 gave an outline of the sections of the chapter. We discussed the use of the Georgian phrase POSS+tav- in object camouflage in Section 5.2 and the use of the phrase in wish formulae in Section 5.3. Although both uses might seem to be violations of Binding Condition A (see [Cho81] as well as Section 3.3), it was argued that they are not anaphoric but pronominal and, thus, it does not make sense to discuss whether they obey the Condition A of the Binding Theory or not.

Although it may seem from Chapter 3 that the reflexive uses of the Georgian phrase POSS+tav- obey the Binding Condition A [Cho81], this chapter has shown that there are facts which seem to violate that same condition. Namely, the subject use of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and that of the reciprocal ertmanet-, discussed correspondingly in the sections 5.4 and 5.5. Finally, in Section 5.6 the chapter was summarized.
Chapter 6
Anaphors and Agreement

6.1 Introduction

Many languages ban nominative/subject anaphors. This chapter deals with several possible explanations for this fact. Sections 6.2 and 6.3 discuss, respectively, the Anaphor Agreement Principle of [Riz90] and its modified version by [Woo99], which is claimed to account for the lack of subject anaphors, supplementing the Binding Theory [Cho81]. Section 6.4 shows that Georgian anaphors represent a counter-example for both versions of the Anaphor Agreement Principle. Section 6.5 refers to an alternative explanation within the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93] offered in [AE99]. Section 6.6 argues that the Reflexivity theoretic explanation in [AE99] for the Greek subject anaphors cannot be adopted for Georgian, as was previously suggested in [Eve01, Eve03]. For [Eve01, Eve03] following [AE99], it is the internal structure of the anaphor in a given language that allows such a language to have subject anaphors. Section 6.6 offers data illustrating subject uses of reflexives in Georgian which cannot be explained by the internal structure of anaphors and the related anaphoric properties alone, contrary to what is argued by [Eve01, Eve03]. Instead of concentrating only on the form of the anaphors it is suggested in this chapter to pay attention also to the verb classes which allow both the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the reciprocal ertmanet- as their subject argument. In Section 6.7 the chapter will be summarized.

6.2 Anaphor Agreement Effect

Taking some Italian and Icelandic data into account [Riz90, p. 32] argues that there could be “an intrinsic incompatibility between the property of being an anaphor and the property of being construed with agreement.”

The Icelandic and the Italian data illustrate that when an anaphor is marked by nominative and, therefore, triggers agreement like any nominative NP does in these languages, the sentences are ungrammatical (6.2.1a, 6.2.2a). But if the anaphors are marked by a case other than nominative (i.e., accusative in example 6.2.1b and genitive
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in example 6.2.2b) and, thus, do not trigger agreement, the sentences are grammatical:

6.2.1. Example. (Icelandic, [Mal84])

a. *Jón, segir að sig diri elski Maria.
   "Jon says that he loves Maria."

b. Jón, segir að Maria elski sig diri.
   "Jon says that he loves Maria."

6.2.2. Example. (Italian, [Riz90, p. 33])

a. *A loro interessano solo se stessi.
   "They’re only interested in themselves."

b. A loro importa solo di se stessi.
   "They only matter to themselves."

The anaphor in Example 6.2.1a is a subject and the sentence is ungrammatical, while the same anaphor in object position (6.2.1b) is fully grammatical. This could give rise to the idea that there are certain positions (i.e., object position) associated with anaphors in which they can appear, as opposed to other positions in which one can never find anaphors.

According to [Riz90], what precludes a nominative anaphor is the presence of agreement. On the basis of this he formulates a generalization which “holds quite systematically in natural languages” the following way:

The Anaphor Agreement principle: Anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement.

As [Riz90] shows, not the subject/non-subject status of an anaphor is crucial but the presence/absence of agreement ([Riz90, p. 33]). As is illustrated in Example 6.2.3, an anaphor becomes available in subject position if it is marked by a non-nominative case, consequently does not trigger agreement. And an object anaphor becomes ungrammatical if marked nominative, consequently triggering agreement (Example 6.2.4):

6.2.3. Example. (Icelandic, [Mal84])

Hún sagdi að sig diri vantadi peninga.
   "She said that she lacked money."
6.3. Modified Anaphor Agreement Effect

6.2.4. Example. (Icelandic, [Mal84])

*Sigga, telur að mer líki sigi.
Sigga thinks that to me likes

Therefore, it does not matter whether a reflexive is a subject or an object argument. The most important condition is that the reflexive is not associated to agreement.

Contrary to [And82, Mal84] who suggest that the ungrammaticality of nominative anaphors is related to the lack of the nominative form of the long-distance reflexives in Icelandic, [Riz90] supposes that there has to be “a deeper syntactic incompatibility between anaphors and agreement” than just the lack of a form in the case paradigm”.

In order to explain the incompatibility of anaphors and agreement, [Riz90] claims that the agreement affix, assumed to be pronominal [Cho81], and the anaphor will clash whenever forming a chain. Both members of the chain are never able to satisfy binding conditions simultaneously. Since the agreement is pronominal, it is subject to the Principle B and is required to be locally free while the anaphor has to satisfy principle A and is required to be locally bound. Under these considerations, agreeing anaphors are correctly predicted to be ungrammatical.

Since anaphors are incompatible with agreement, anaphors in the absence of agreement should be grammatical, as predicted by the principle. Chinese, which lacks agreement, is a support for the hypothesis since it allows subject anaphors:

6.2.5. Example. (Chinese from [Hua82] cited in [Riz90, p. 40])

Zhangsan, shuo ziji, hui lai.
Zhangsan said himself will come

“Zhangsan said he will come.”

Thus, according to [Riz90], anaphors are incompatible with agreement.

6.3 Modified Anaphor Agreement Effect

The Anaphor Agreement Effect proposed by [Riz90] is discussed in [Woo99], in which the author first gives a short overview of the arguments offered by [Riz90] in support of the principle. Then to the Chinese example 6.2.5, brought by [Riz90] from [Hua82], [Woo99] adds such languages as Khmer, Vietnamese, Korean and Thai to support the idea that nominative/subject anaphors are expected in languages without agreement. All of these languages allow subject anaphors while they lack agreement.

Additionally, [Woo99] proposes that not only agreeing subject anaphors are ungrammatical but object anaphors will also be excluded in languages with object agreement. Data from object agreement languages support this prediction. These languages show that the normal object agreement cannot be used when the object is an anaphor. Some of them behave like, for instance Swahili, in which anaphors can only trigger
anaphoric agreement (Example 6.3.1a) but not the normal object agreement (Example 6.3.1b) while others, like Inuit, employ intransitive constructions reflecting only subject agreement for expressing reflexivity (compare the reflexive example 6.3.2a employing the intransitive verb form to the normal transitive verbal marking in 6.3.2b\(^1\)):

**6.3.1. Example.** (Swahili, [Vit81])

a. Ahmed a-na-ji-penda mwenyewe.
   Ahmed 3S-PRES-REFL-love himself  (emphatic reflexive)
   “Ahmed loves himself.”

b. *Ahmed a-na-m-penda mwenyewe.
   Ahmed 3S-PRES-3O-love himself  (emphatic reflexive)
   “Ahmed loves himself.”

**6.3.2. Example.** (Inuit, [BB91])

a. Angut, immi-nut, taku-vuq.
   man himself.DAT see-INDIC.3SG
   “The man sees himself.”

b. Angutip arnaq taku-vaa.
   man.ERG woman.ABS see-INDIC.3SG.3SG
   “The man sees the woman.”

[Woo99] argues that if a language still allows agreement triggered by an anaphor, like the languages with object agreement do, then the agreement will exclusively be special—not normal object agreement characteristic to these languages but a special anaphoric form of agreement (see, for instance, 6.3.1a). [Woo99], thus, modifies Rizzi’s principle as follows:

*The Anaphor Agreement Effect* (modified): Anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement, unless the agreement is anaphoric.

\(^1\) Note also that the subject of the transitive verb in 6.3.2b is marked ergative while the subject in the reflexive example in 6.3.2a is not, which reflects how the reflexive actions are classified within this language, namely, as intransitive.

Many ergative languages do not use the ergative construction when the object is an anaphor (cf. for instance, the Inuit 6.3.2a vs. 6.3.2b). However, [Woo99] argues against the ungrammaticality of object anaphors to follow from ergativity. By illustrating an examples from Enga (see (i) from [Lan73] cited in [Woo99, p. 268]) the author shows that not all ergative languages bar object anaphors in ergative constructions. Enga is in fact an example which supports the anaphor agreement principle in that the language allows object anaphors while not having object agreement:

i. Baa-mé tänge pi-ly-á-mo.
   he-ERG self hit-PRES-3S.SG-AUG
   “He is hitting himself.”
As [Woo99] notes, there are counter-examples to the modified version of the principle. There are languages with object agreement that still have object anaphors, such as Tamil, Modern Greek, Georgian, Albanian, Jacaltec, Selayarese (an Austronesian language spoken in Indonesia) and French. [Woo99] tries to show that, for different reasons, the languages in question are not real counter-examples. [Woo99] argues that, for instance, in Georgian the features of the agreement morpheme do not match those of the anaphor and the agreement is a default form of agreement (thus, in the technical sense, no agreement). For instance, a reflexive object phrase in Georgian always triggers 3rd person object agreement even when it is bound by the 1st or 2nd person antecedent (Example 6.3.3). Thus, only the possessor within the reflexive NP is coindexed with the antecedent, while the agreement between the object NP and the verb is triggered by the whole phrase:

6.3.3. EXAMPLE. (Georgian, [Har81])

(me) ˇcem-s tav-s v-a-k-eb.
1SG.NOM 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT 1ANOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS

Lit.: I myself praise.him/her

“I praise myself.”

[Woo99] groups Albanian and Georgian together because they both use a default agreement strategy to avoid the violation of the Anaphor Agreement effect. In Albanian, like in Georgian, the anaphors trigger 3rd person agreement whatever the person of the antecedent:

6.3.4. EXAMPLE.

a. Vētja mē dhimset.
self.NOM CL.1SG.DAT feel.sorry.for.3PRES.INACT

“I feel sorry for myself.”

Jacaltec is only mentioned but not discussed in any detail in [Woo99]. Even from those object-agreement languages that are considered in [Woo99] only Albanian and Greek will be mentioned because they are similar to Georgian, the main focus of this dissertation. In general [Woo99] tries to argue that the languages employ default agreement for their object anaphors and that agreement in technical sense does not hold. As for the French past participle, default agreement was not in question as such. There the reflexive clitic gets the same agreement as a non-reflexive one (see the suffix -e on the past participle form décrit-e in (i) vs. (ii)). One of the solutions found in [Woo99] was to argue that, under [Mar84]’s account, the reflexive clitic s’- is not an object clitic but an intransitivizing morpheme while the agreement -e on the verb form in (i) is instead triggered by the surface NP subject Cécile, moved from the object position:

i. Cécile s’était décrit-e comme chaotique.
   Cécile REFL-was described-FEM as chaotic
   “Cécile described herself as chaotic.”

ii. Cécile l’a décrit-e comme sympathique.
   Cécile her-has described-FEM as friendly
   “Cécile described her as friendly.”
b. Dritës dhimset vetja.

Drita.DAT CL.3SG.DAT pity.3SG.PAST.INACT self.NOM

“Drita pities herself.”

[Woo99] argues that the subject-verb agreement relation in the Albanian examples 6.3.4a (from [Hub85]) and 6.3.4b (from [Mas91]) is a manifestation of a “default” agreement, and that such agreement does not count for the Anaphor Agreement principle, because the agreement morpheme is an inert slot filler, not indicating actual agreement.

According to [Woo99], Greek uses a different strategy to avoid the Anaphor Agreement effect. As Example 4.3.16 (repeated as 6.3.5) illustrates, in Greek a reflexive NP consist of a definite determiner (ton), a possessor (mu) and a head (eafton) and it triggers some kind of non-anaphoric agreement (here the accusative, masculine, singular clitic ton), contrary to the predictions of both versions of the Anaphor Agreement Principle [Riz90, Woo99]. However, as [Woo99] argues, the Greek case is no counterexample to the Anaphor Agreement principle. As already discussed by [Iat88], the element that agrees with the antecedent is, in fact, the embedded possessive. In Example 6.3.5 it is not the anaphor (mu) that is doubled by a clitic but the whole NP (ton eafton mu).

6.3.5. EXAMPLE. (Greek, [Iat88])

Egho ton, xero [ton eafton, mu,]

I CL.ACC.MASC.SG know DET.ACC.MASC.SG REFL POSS.GEN.JSG

“I know myself.”

Although the way the verbal complex agrees with subjects/objects is different in Georgian and Greek (agreement marking vs. clitic doubling) they both employ the same mechanism with regard to the reflexive NP—the whole phrase gets clitic-doubled in Greek (Example 6.3.5) / marked in Georgian (Example 6.3.6) but not the possessive. The agreement mechanism remains the same irrespective of whether the same treatment of Georgian possessors as embedded anaphors is adopted and, thus, Georgian is put into the same group as Greek according to the coindexing (cf. 6.3.5 vs. 6.3.6):

6.3.6. EXAMPLE.

(me,) [cem-si, tav-s,j,] v-a-k-eb.

1SG.NOM 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT 1ANOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS

Lit.: I myself I.praise.him/her

“I praise myself.”

It could be argued as well that Greek employs, in fact, the same “default agreement” strategy as Georgian. In both languages, the whole reflexive phrase (but not its
possessive) is in an agreement relation with the verbal complex (clitic in the case of Greek and a person marker in the case of Georgian). The agreement could be called a default agreement in the sense that these agreement markers are constant and do not vary with regard to the person feature of the antecedent. For instance, in Greek, the clitic “triggered” by the reflexive with the 1st person antecedent in Example 6.3.5 will be the same Accusative, Masculine, Singular as the clitic triggered by the reflexive with 3rd person, feminine antecedent in Example 6.3.7:

6.3.7. Example. (Greek, [Iat88])

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{DEFIN.NOM.FEM.SG } \text{Maria CL.ACC.MASC.SG admires} \\
&\text{REFL. POSS.GEN.FEM.SG}
\end{align*}
\]

“Maria admires herself.”

The same holds for Georgian, the reflexive phrase with 1st person antecedent (Example 6.3.3) will trigger the same object agreement as the reflexive with 2nd (Example 6.3.8a) or 3rd person antecedent (Example 6.3.8b):

6.3.8. Example.

a. *(\text{\texten{sen}})* \text{sen-s} \text{tav-s} \text{∅-a-k-eb}.

\text{2SG.NOM 2POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT 2ANOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS}

Lit.: You.SG yourself you.SG.praise.him/her

“You praise yourself.”

b. *(\text{\texten{tavis}})* \text{tavis} \text{tav-s} \text{∅-a-k-eb-s}.

\text{3SG.NOM 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT 3BDAT.SG-PRV-praise-TS-3ANOM.SG}

Lit.: (S)he himself/herself (s)he.praises.him/her

“(S)he praises himself/herself.”

Greek and Georgian reflexive constructions are treated the same way by [Eve01] who is calling them “inalienable possession anaphors” (the term comes from [AE99] discussing the Greek anaphor). [Eve01] argues that the possessive itself could not be called an anaphor (for the Binding Theory), only the combination of the possessive and the head noun have anaphoric properties (cf. the examples 4.3.17 vs. 6.3.6, 6.3.9a vs. 6.3.8a, 6.3.9b vs. 6.3.8b):

6.3.9. Example.

a. *(\text{\texten{\texten{seni}}})* \text{și-s} \text{∅-a-k-eb}.

\text{1SG.NOM 1POSS.SG-DAT 2ANOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS}

“*You praise yourself.”
b. *is_i [tavis_i] ∅-a-k-eb-s.
1SG.NOM 1POSS.SG 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-praise-TS-3A NOM.SG
“(S)he praises himself/herself.”

Following [AE99], who showed that “α is an anaphor” is not equivalent to “α agrees with its antecedent”, [Eve01] argues that the element that agrees with an antecedent as a result of an anaphoric relation should be distinguished from the anaphoric element itself.

This means that when considering what exactly is an anaphor in Georgian, the phrase POSS+tav- as a whole should be distinguished from its determiner, namely, the POSS. Perhaps it is the POSS which shares the features with the antecedent, however, the determiner alone is unable to serve as an anaphor (cf. 4.3.17 vs. 6.3.6, 6.3.9a vs. 6.3.8a, 6.3.9b vs. 6.3.8b) but only the combination of both the determiner and the head of the phrase tav-.

### 6.4 Georgian and the (Modified) Anaphor Agreement Effect

It will be shown here that there is no reason to assume that Georgian has a default agreement strategy. If the language would have had such a strategy, default agreement would hold only in the cases where the phrase ˇsen-s tav-s is a reflexive like it is in Example 6.3.8a (or tavis tav-s in Example 6.3.8b). However, Example 6.4.1 shows that the same phrase also triggers 3rd person agreement when used non-anaphorically, either as a body-part (6.4.1) or in object camouflage (5.2.1, 5.2.9):

#### 6.4.1. EXAMPLE. (From [Ami03, p. 105])

(1) (me) sarke-šī ˇsen-s tav-s v-xed-av, tan-s
1SG.NOM mirror-in 2POSS.SG-DAT head-DAT 1A NOM.SG-see-TS body-DAT
ki vera.
while/but cannot
“I see your head in the mirror, but I cannot see your body.”

Therefore, the agreement is regular, triggered by the phi-feature specification of the head of the phrase tav-: 3rd person, singular. It is clear that not the anaphoric status of the phrase is responsible for triggering the 3rd person agreement in the examples 6.3.3, 6.3.8a, 6.3.8b but the referential properties of the whole phrase, namely the person feature (3rd) of the head of the phrase (iav-). The fact that agreement both in Greek and Georgian is always 3rd person singular, irrespective of the phi-features of the antecedent, is due to the morphosyntactic properties of the specific type of anaphoric expressions these languages use, not to their referential (anaphoric) status [Eve01]. Therefore, Georgian still remains a counter-example for the Anaphor Agreement Effect. The language has object agreement and also object anaphors which trigger neither
anaphoric agreement, nor default agreement but instead only normal object agreement, contrary to the Anaphor Agreement Effect [Riz90] or its modified version [Woo99].

Observe that Georgian not only allows agreeing object anaphors but also agreeing anaphors in subject position, contrary to what [Woo99] claims. In discussing Georgian data [Woo99] argues that the language does not allow subject anaphors. The author relates their ungrammaticality to the fact that Georgian allows "default" agreement in the construction where the anaphor is an object but not in the construction where it is a subject ([Woo99, p. 272]). However, certain verbs in Georgian do not show the usual subject-object asymmetry for binding (cf. 6.4.2a vs. 6.4.2b) and the reflexive phrase in subject position, by the way, triggering the subject agreement (see the 3rd person Set A agreement marker -a on the verb form g-a-çam-a3) is perfectly grammatical with them (Example 6.4.2a):

6.4.2. EXAMPLE. (From [AE00])
a. ˇsen-ma tav-ma g-a-çam-a
   2POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG 2B NOM.SG-PRV-torture-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   (ˇsen).
   2SG.NOM
   Lit.: Yourself.SG it.tortured.you.SG you.SG
   “Something related to you made you suffer.”
b. (ˇsen) ˇsen-i tav-i 0-a-çam-e.
   2SG.ERG 2POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM 2AERG.SG-PRV-torment-AOR.INDIC
   “You tormented yourself.”
   “You made yourself suffer.”

Thus, the Georgian reflexive phrase POSS+tav- can appear both in object and in subject positions triggering an agreement which has been argued in Section 6.4 to be neither anaphoric nor default. Thus, the very phrase is a counter-example to the original Anaphor Agreement Effect [Riz90] as well as to its modified version [Woo99].

6.5 Reflexivity Theoretic Explanation for Subject Anaphors

It has been established that the standard Binding Theory does not give a straightforward account for the nominative/subject anaphor gap. Rizzi’s hypothesis [Riz90] and its modified version [Woo99] have been designed to account for that gap. However, the Georgian reflexive expression is a problem for both the original Anaphor Agreement Effect [Riz90] and its modified version [Woo99] since, as argued in Section 6.4, the expression triggers a regular agreement (not a default one as argued by [Woo99]) and

3See Footnote15 in Section 5.4.
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counter to both versions, it can appear as an object (Example 6.4.2b) and even as a subject (Example 6.4.2a).

In [AE99] an explanation is given for the fact that Greek allows a nominative/subject anaphor with certain verbs. [AE99]’s explanation is formulated within the Reflexivity [RR93] Theory. Treatment of the Georgian data through the reflexivity framework (like that of the Greek by [AE99]) also seems to be possible.

As was already noted in Chapter 4, and, in particular, in Section 4.2, in the Reflexivity framework binding is not directly about the relative distribution of anaphors vs. pronominals, as it was in the standard Binding Theory, but about reflexive predicates. It should be repeated here that the two non-structural conditions of Reflexivity such as Conditions A and Conditions B given earlier in Section 4.2 which make clear what it means for a predicate to be reflexive and reflexive-marked:

- A predicate is reflexive, iff two of its arguments are coindexed.
- A predicate (formed of \( P \)) is reflexive-marked iff either \( P \) is lexically reflexive or one of \( P \)’s arguments is a SELF-anaphor.

As was already noted, unlike in the standard Binding Theory, in Reflexivity the configurational effects of anaphora are not attributed to the Conditions A and Conditions B (which are non-structural and, thus, do not refer to the notion c-command) but to the Condition on Chain Formation based on the notion of Generalized Chain Condition defined in Section 4.2 and repeated below:

- Condition on A-chain: A maximal A-chain \((\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)\) contains exactly one link \( \alpha_j \) which is +R.
- An NP is +R iff it carries a full specification for phi-features (person, number, gender) and structural case.

In Reinhart and Reuland’s view [RR93], every lexical element is subject to A-Chain Formation under the conditions given above. The Chain Condition interacts with the Reflexivity Conditions A and B, and in the example below it will be explained how this works exactly. Nominative anaphors are excluded by the Chain Condition under the assumption that anaphors are typically [-R]. To illustrate this, consider the examples in 6.5.1a, 6.5.1b:

6.5.1. Example.

a. The man, pleases himself.

b. *Himself, pleases the man.

In 6.5.1a, 6.5.1b the predicates are both reflexive and reflexive-marked satisfying Reflexivity Conditions A and B. In other words, as far as the Reflexivity Conditions are
concerned, both 6.5.1a and 6.5.1b are grammatical. The ungrammaticality of 6.5.1b is due to a violation of the Condition on A-chains because in 6.5.2b the head of the chain is [-R] since the English anaphor *himself* is not fully specified for phi-features, as argued for by [RR93].

6.5.2. Example.

a. [(the man), [+R], himself, [-R]]

b. [himself, [-R], (the man), [+R]]

So let us turn the argumentation around. If in a language a sentence like 6.5.1b would be grammatical, the Chain Condition, apparently, has not been violated. But that is only possible if the anaphor is marked [+R]. As claimed in [AE99], this is the case in Greek. *O eaftos tu* is headed by a noun (*eaftos*) which acts as a [+SELF] element, satisfying the Reflexivity conditions, while, at the same time, it is fully specified for phi-features (masculine, 3rd person, inflected for number/case), thus being [+R].

In Example 6.5.3a which illustrates a subject reflexive there can be no violation of the Chain Condition because the two coindexed elements *tu* and *tu Petru* do not form an A-chain.

6.5.3. Example.

a. [O *eaftos*, *tu*], *tu* aresi [tu Petru].
   The self his CL.DAT like.3SG the Petros.DAT
   "Himself pleases Petros."

b. [(O *eaftos*, *tu*), (+R)] [(tu Petru), (+R)]

Recall that for proper A-Chain Formation, it is obligatory that the chain is headed by [+R] element. In 6.5.3a (see also 6.5.3b) both NPs that could potentially form a chain are characterized as [+R]. Note, however, that the predicate in 6.5.3a is reflexive-marked but not reflexive, therefore not satisfying Reflexivity Conditions A [RR93]. It is not reflexive because its arguments are not co-indexed, but it is reflexive-marked because one of its arguments is an anaphor with the feature [+SELF] (see Definition 4.2.2). To account for this, [AE99] assume that the head of the reflexive phrase undergoes covert head incorporation, with subsequent possessor raising (6.5.4). By noun incorporation analysis the possessor *tu* and the object *tu Petru* are co-arguments. Therefore, *o eaftos tu* confines with condition A.

6.5.4. Example.

[O *tu*], *tu* [eaftos, aresi] [tu Petru].
   The his CL.DAT self-like.3SG the Petros.DAT
As is well-known, overt noun incorporation is restricted to subjects of unaccusative verbs [Bak88]. According to [AE99], it is expected that covert noun incorporation will be restricted likewise. Since nominative anaphors in Greek are restricted to unaccusative verbs (while being unavailable with unergative/transitive verbs) the incorporation analysis makes it possible to account for the verb class restriction in the distribution of nominative anaphors in Greek.4

6.6 Georgian and the Reflexivity Theoretical Explanation

The Georgian reflexive phrase POSS+tav- is exactly of the same feature specification as the Greek anaphor, namely, [+SELF;+R] (see Subsection 4.3.2), the subject occurrences of the reflexive phrase could also be attributed to the feature specification and the specific structure of the phrase, as it is done for Greek in [AE99]. However, before adopting the treatment of the “inalienable” type of anaphors also to Georgian, first, the Georgian data will be thoroughly examined in this section.

First of all, in Example 6.6.1 the Chain Condition is not violated. Given the structure of the anaphor, there is no Chain Formation in this Georgian example, contrary to the English example just discussed—the two coindexed elements tavis- and president cannot form an A-chain (see Condition on A-chain in Section 4.2):

6.6.1. Example. (Adapted from [Ami04a, p. 429])

[tavis-ma, tav-ma], i-xmn-a
3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG 3B NOM.SG-PRV-save-3A ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
prezident-i, president-NOM
Lit.: Himself/herself (s)he/it.saved.him/her president
“His own positive/*negative personal properties, and/or his past achievements/*failures, etc. saved the president.” (the only available reading is to be out of the hard situation rather than to survive physically)

Example 6.6.1 is grammatical, contrary to 6.5.1b. Note, however, that the predicate is reflexive-marked but not reflexive, therefore not satisfying Reflexivity Condition A and B [RR93]. It is not reflexive because its arguments are not-coindexed, but it is reflexive-marked because one of its arguments is an anaphor with the feature [+SELF] (see Definition 4.2.2). To account for this, [AE99]’s analysis for Greek could be followed (6.5.3a) and, it could be assumed like the Greek (6.5.4) that the head of the reflexive phrase undergoes covert head incorporation, with subsequent possessor raising:

4See, however, [RS04] arguing against the unaccusative analysis of reflexives in general.
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6.6.2. Example.

\[ \text{tavis-ma} \quad \text{tav-ma} \]
\[ \text{3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG} \quad \text{self-ERG-3B NOM.SG-PRV-save-3A ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC} \]
\[ \text{prezident-i} \]
\[ \text{president-NOM} \]

However, the difference between the Greek and Georgian examples respectively in 6.5.3a and 6.6.1 is immense, in the sense that the Greek one exemplifies an unaccusative verb while the Georgian one involves a transitive verb. The covert head incorporation that is feasible for Greek, gives an ungrammatical result for Georgian, since cross-linguistically, and in particular in Georgian, transitive subjects do not incorporate (Example 6.6.2). The phrase *[tavis-ma tav-ma] in 6.6.1 is marked by ergative, the case of the subject argument in Aorist Indicative (TAM Series II, see Table 2.4 in Chapter 2) and triggers the Set A agreement marker -a (triggered by the subject argument of (di)transitives and unergatives in TAM Series II).

There is another issue that should be raised here. In [AE99], there is an implication that, just as in Greek, in a language no Chain Formation is possible because of the type of anaphor, the language will allow subject anaphors.

Analogically to Greek [AE99], works like [Eve01, Eve03] argue that subject anaphors are allowed in Georgian thanks to their structure and properties as [ +SELF;+R] elements which are able to escape Chain Formation due to their internal structure.

However, it is not clear how it is possible that the same type of anaphor, for instance, in Georgian with the same ability to escape the Chain Formation, is grammatical in subject position only with some verbs (4.3.21, 5.4.1, 6.4.2a, 6.6.1, 6.6.3, 6.6.4, 7.3.11b) and not with others (3.4.1a, 3.4.13a, 6.6.5, 6.6.6, 6.6.7):

6.6.3. Example.

\[ \text{tavis-ma} \quad \text{tav-ma} \]
\[ \text{3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG} \quad \text{self-ERG PV-3B NOM.SG-PRV-scare-3A ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC} \]
\[ \text{kač-i} \]
\[ \text{man-NOM} \]

Lit.: Himself scared man

“The man got scared because of something related to himself.”

6.6.4. Example. (Georgian, adapted from [Ami04a, p. 428])

\[ \text{tavis-ma} \quad \text{tav-ma} \]
\[ \text{3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG} \quad \text{self-ERG} \]
\[ \text{ga-∅-a-oc-a} \quad \text{kač-i} \]
\[ \text{PV-3B NOM.SG-PRV-surprise-3A ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC man-NOM} \]

Lit.: Himself surprised man

“The man got surprised because of something related to himself.”
6.6.5. EXAMPLE.
*tavis-ma tav-ma da-∅-xat-a kac-i.
3REFL.POSS-erg self-ERG PV-3B.NOM.SG-draw-3A.ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC man-NOM
Himself drew the man.

6.6.6. EXAMPLE.
*tavis-ma tav-ma ga-∅-lanγ-a
3REFL.POSS-ERG self-ERG PV-3B.NOM.SG-curse-3A.ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
kac-i.
man-NOM
Himself cursed the man.

6.6.7. EXAMPLE.
a. *tavis tav-s ∅-u-qvar-s giorgi-∅.5
3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT 3B.DAT.SG-PRV-love-3A.NOM.SG Giorgi-NOM
Himself loves Giorgi.
b. giorgi-s ∅-u-qvar-s tav-i.
Giorgi-DAT 3B.DAT.SG-PRV-love-3A.NOM.SG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
“Giorgi loves himself.”

The same can be observed in the languages with the same type of anaphor, for instance, in Greek and Basque where only some verbs allow reflexives as a subject (see 4.3.15a (here repeated as 6.6.8a), 6.6.9a for Greek and 6.6.11, 6.6.12, 6.6.13a for Basque) while others do not (see 6.6.9b, 6.6.10 for Greek and 6.6.13b, 6.6.14, 6.6.15 for Basque):

6.6.8. EXAMPLE.
The self his CL.ACC puzzle-3SG the Petros.ACC
“Himself puzzles Petros.”
b. [(O eaftos tuj)j (+R)] [(ton Petro)j (+R)]

6.6.9. EXAMPLE. (Greek, from [Ana99])
a. Tin Maria tin provlimatizi/enoxli/anisihi o eaftos tis.
DEFIN Maria.ACC CL-Acc puzzles/bothers/worries DEFIN REFL-NOM her
“Maria is puzzled/bothered/worried with/at/by herself.”

5Georgian subject experiencer verbs take a dative experiencer as a subject and a nominative theme as an object (6.6.7b). Thus, the reflexive phrase *tavis tav-s in 6.6.7a is the subject argument of the corresponding verb.
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b. *Tin Maria den tin thavmazi/aghapai o eaftos tis.
   DEFIN Maria.ACC not CL-ACC admires/likes  DEFIN REFL-NOM her
   Herself does not admire/like Mary.

6.6.10. EXAMPLE. (Greek, from [Ana99])

   *Tin eafto tu tu aresi o Petros.  
   the REFL POSS.ACC CL.DAT like-3SG DEFIN Petros.NOM
   Himself likes Petros.

6.6.11. EXAMPLE. (Basque, X. Artiagoitia, personal communication)

   neure buru-a-k hilko nau.
   my head-DET-ERG it.kills.me AUX
   Lit.: Myself kills me
   “Something like my personality, the things I do and worry about...that is going to
   kill me.”

6.6.12. EXAMPLE. (Basque, from [Art03, p. 630])

   Niri batez ere neure buru-a-k ematen dit beldurra.
   1SG.DAT above all my.own head-DET-ERG give.IMPERF AUX fear
   “Above all it is myself that causes me fear.”

6.6.13. EXAMPLE. (Basque, from I. Laka’s Basque Grammar Page)

   a. Egunotan, neure buru-a-k kezkatzen nau.
      day.DET.in my.own head-DET-ERG worry.HAB me.has.it
      “These days, my(own)self worries me.”
   b. *Neure buru-a-k ikusi nau ni.
      my.own head-DET-ERG seen me.has.it I
      “Myself has seen me.”

6.6.14. EXAMPLE. (Basque, [Art03, p. 622])

   *Bere buru-a-k Mirande hil zuen.
   his head-DET-ERG Mirande kill AUX
   Himself killed Mirande.

6.6.15. EXAMPLE. (Basque, I. Laka, personal communication, 2001)

   *Bere buru-a-k Miren maite du.
   her head-DET-ERG Miren.ABS love has
   Herself loves Miren.

*aresi is a subject experiencer verb [Ana99] taking a dative experiencer as a subject and a nominative theme as an object. Thus, the anaphor in 6.6.10 is the subject argument of the verb.
If only the structure of an anaphor would matter (enabling to escape the Chain Formation) then, the anaphors in these languages (or in any language with the same type of anaphor) would have to be grammatical in any position (subject or object position) in any context irrespective of the verb semantic class. While the data shows that this is not the case in either of the above given languages, additional assumptions are necessary. As was already mentioned, [AE99] argue that, ultimately, the distinction between unaccusative and unergative verbs is relevant: the former allowing subject anaphors, the latter barring subject anaphors. The distinction is linked to the fact that noun-incorporation from subject position is generally excluded. In the case of unaccusative verbs, noun-incorporation is allowed because the subjects are underlyingly objects. However, as the examples 6.6.1–6.6.4 (as opposed to the examples 6.6.5, 6.6.6) show, it is not an unaccusative vs. unergative distinction that is responsible for (not) allowing subject anaphors in Georgian.

Therefore, it should be concluded that it is not the structure of an anaphor which is responsible for the grammaticality of subject anaphors (contrary to [AE99] for Greek and [Eve01, Eve03] for Georgian). Note, furthermore, that if the form of an anaphor matters ("inalienable possession" type, [AE99]) reciprocals should be expected to be barred from subject positions, since they are not of the "inalienable possession" type in Georgian and have rather a different structure than reflexives (see Section 3.6.2 and the examples 3.6.3a and 3.6.5). However, as the examples 3.6.40a, 5.5.1, 6.6.16a, 6.6.17a and 6.6.18a illustrate, Georgian does allow the reciprocal ertmanet- as a subject (cf. 3.6.40a vs. 3.6.40d, 5.5.1 vs. 5.5.3, 6.6.16a vs. 6.6.16b, 6.6.17a vs. 6.6.17b, 6.6.18a vs. 6.6.18b):

6.6.16. EXAMPLE.

a. ertmanet-i ԑ-tanj-av-t
   ivane-s-a da meri-s.
   Lit.: Each other it.torments.them Ivane and Meri
   *Each other torment(s) Ivane and Meri
   *[Something related to] each other makes Ivane and Meri suffer (i.e. their shyness, etc.)."

b. ivane-ԑ da meri-ԑ ԑ-tanj-av-en
   ertmanet-s.
   “Ivane and Meri torment each other.”

6.6.17. EXAMPLE.

a. amxanag-eb-s ԑ-a-xar-eb-t
   ertmanet-i.
   friend-PL-DAT 3B_DAT:SG-PRV-happy-TS-PL_DAT REC-NOM

7[Reu01] relates the subject anaphor gap to the phi-feature deficiency of anaphors. Since Georgian anaphors are not phi-feature deficient, their distribution is not inconsistent with [Reu01]’s approach.
Lit.: Friends it.makes.them.happy each.other

“This something related to each other makes the friends happy.”

b. From [Tui98, p. 133], example (77)

amxanag-eb-i ∅-a-xar-eb-en ertmanet-s.
friend-PL-.NOM 3B_DAT-.SG-.PRV-.happy-.TS-.3A_NOM-.PL REC-.DAT

Lit.: Friends they.make.them.happy each.other

“The friends make each other happy.”

6.6.18. EXAMPLE. (Georgian, adapted from [Tui87, p. 300])

a. am  gogo-eb-s  ertmanet-i  ∅-a-interes-eb-t.
    this-.DAT girl-.PL-.DAT REC-.NOM 3B_DAT-.SG-.PRV-.interest-.TS-.PL-.DAT

Lit.: this girls each.other it.makes.them.interested

“This something related to each other interests these girls.”

b. es  gogo-eb-i  ertmanet-s  ∅-a-interes-eb-en
    this-.NOM girl-.PL-.NOM REC-.DAT 3B_DAT-.SG-.PRV-.interest-.TS-.3A_NOM-.PL
    zγap-eb-it.
tale-.PL-.INST

Lit.: this girls each.other they.make.them.interested with.tales

“These girls are getting each other interested in folk tales.”

Furthermore, note that, apparently, the reciprocal being coindexed with the postce-

dent does not create a chain condition violation.

All this might suggest that there is not a simple primitive concept anaphor. A dis-
tinction between reflexives and reciprocals has to be made (for the similar view see
also [Eve00]), just like it is made for different types of reflexives [RR91, RR93, Saf96,
AE99]. If this is accepted, there should be a distinction between reflexives and recipro-
cals and it should be agreed that in the distribution of the subject reflexives, their form
is a relevant factor:

If a language has a subject anaphor, the anaphor will be “non-pronominal”.

i.e. its form (structure, properties) is relevant [AE99].

Note that [Tui98]’s original example (78) on page 133 (brought in this footnote as (i)) gives
the reciprocal as a determiner. However, the reciprocal can be given not only as a determiner but also as a
head of the phrase as in 6.6.17a or in 3.6.40a:

i. amxanag-eb-s  ∅-a-xar-eb-t  ertmanet-is amb-eb-i.
    friend-.PL-.DAT 3B_DAT-.SG-.PRV-.happy-.TS-.PL-.DAT REC-.GEN
    news-.PL-.NOM

Lit.: Friends it.makes.them.happy each.other’s news

“Each other’s news makes the friends happy.”
This is in accordance with the data, since all the languages reported in the literature having subject reflexives also have non-pronominal anaphors (Basque (6.6.12, 6.6.13a), Modern Greek (4.3.15a, 4.3.16, 6.3.7), Dargwa [Kib97], Nepali [BY00], Albanian (6.3.4a and also [Hub85, Wil88]), Toba Batak [Sch84, CH05]. However, a cross-linguistic examination is required to establish whether the reverse is also the case—whether languages having non-pronominal anaphors always show the phenomenon of subject anaphors. If the answer is “yes”, then the reason of having subject anaphors could lie in their structure. If not, then either the structure of the anaphor is not relevant at all, or there is also something else apart from the structure which needs further investigation.

Perhaps it is not the structure of the anaphor but the semantic/structural properties of the classes of verbs that make it possible for reflexives to appear as a subject.

In Georgian irrespective of the structure of the anaphor, whether it is an inalienable type reflexive (the reflexive phrase POSS+tav-) or a non-inalienable type reciprocal (ertmanet-), it can surface as a subject with verbs of certain characteristics.

The next chapter will be devoted to assessing the verb classes allowing/disallowing the reflexive phrase and reciprocal as their subject argument. Below, this chapter will be summarized in Section 6.7.

### 6.7 Summary

While some authors have related the non-existence of nominative/subject anaphors to the lack of the nominative forms in the paradigm of anaphors [And82, Mal84], others have proposed the gap in the paradigm of anaphors to be related with an inconsistency between anaphors and agreement. [Riz90] has called this the Anaphor Agreement Effect discussed here in Section 6.2. The principle, according to which anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement, has been claimed by [Riz90] to be working cross-linguistically. Via applying the principle to wider data including some languages having object agreement, [Woo99] modified the principle acknowledging its cross-linguistic character. Section 6.3 dealt with the Anaphor Agreement Effect modified by [Woo99], which says that if anaphors trigger an agreement, the agreement will be exclusively either anaphoric or “default”.

Section 6.4 has argued that Georgian represents a counter-example for both versions of the principle. Namely, it was argued that the agreement triggered by anaphors in Georgian is neither anaphoric nor default, but instead is a normal agreement. Additionally, it was argued that apart from agreeing object anaphors, Georgian also allows agreeing anaphors in subject position with certain verbs and verb readings so that the agreement is neither anaphoric not default. Thus, the cross-linguistic nature of the principle becomes doubtful.

Section 6.5 discussed another explanation for the presence/absence of the gap in the paradigm of anaphors by [AE99]. To be more precise, [AE99] has offered an expla-
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The authors have claimed the Greek anaphor to be \([+\text{SELF};+\text{R}]\) which makes Chain Formation with the antecedent unavailable. If there is no Chain Formation, consequently Chain Formation violation is not an option. And if in Greek there is no Chain Formation violation, the anaphors can appear in any position. The far reaching prediction implied in [AE99] is that if in a language no Chain Formation is possible because of the type of anaphor, the language will allow subject anaphors.

Later [Eve01, Eve03] have tried to extend the explanation of [AE99] also for Georgian and argued that, because of its structure and properties, the \([+\text{SELF};+\text{R}]\) type anaphoric phrase \(\text{POS}+\text{tav}\) (see Subsection 4.3.2) is unable to form an A-Chain and thus, it could appear in any position, including the subject position.

Section 6.6 has argued against adopting the treatment of the Greek data by [AE99] also for Georgian. Even for Greek (and also for Georgian), if the structure enables the anaphors to appear in subject position it has to be possible for the anaphor to be a subject of verbs of any semantic class. However, this is not true in either Greek or Georgian. Additionally, the Georgian reciprocal \(\text{ertmanet}\), which is of a different formation and not at all a \([+\text{SELF};+\text{R}]\) anaphor, is also allowed in subject position.

Since it is not the structure and the anaphoric properties of the reflexive phrase \(\text{POS}+\text{tav}\) and the reciprocal \(\text{ertmanet}\) that are shared but the verb classes and verb reading which allow them as a subject argument, it was suggested in Section 6.6 to take into the consideration the verb classes and verb readings allowing the phenomenon.

In Section 6.7 Chapter 6 was summarized, and the next Chapter 7 will continue with a detailed discussion on subject uses of the Georgian reflexive phrase \(\text{POS}+\text{tav}\) and those of the reciprocal \(\text{ertmanet}\) and thereby looking into the verb classes allowing the phenomenon.
Chapter 7

Georgian Anaphors as a Subject Argument

7.1 Introduction

Everywhere in the traditional Georgian literature (see [Mar64a, Sha73, Kva96] among others) as well as in the works on Georgian by foreign linguists (see [Har81, And84, Hew95b] among others) in one form or another one will find a restriction on the use of reflexives and reciprocals as a subject.¹ According to those authors, Georgian reflexives and reciprocals are never marked by the ergative case marker which is the case exclusively of the subject.² Subjects can only serve as an antecedent but they can never be given as a reflexive or a reciprocal.³ However, [Asa82, Tui98, Ami98] give a small amount of data on reflexives [Asa82, Ami98] and reciprocals [Tui98] used as a subject.⁴

This chapter deals with the subject uses of the Georgian reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the reciprocal ertmanet-. The data given in [Asa82, Ami98, Tui98] will be considered in addition with other data published either later or from the field notes made by the author of this dissertation in Georgia in the summers of 1999 and 2001. The chapter is organized as follows: Section 7.2 gives an overview of the cases of the

---

¹Sometimes such a restriction on the use of the reflexive and reciprocals is not even overtly formulated in the literature on Georgian, since it is already assumed that the use is ungrammatical.
²As already discussed in Section 2.4 (see also Table 2.4), subject arguments are not marked just for ergative case. Verbs of different verb classes have different alignment in different TAM Series (see, for instance, [And84, Aro94, Boe89, Hew95b, Kva96, Sha73] among others). For instance, transitive verbs have the subject argument marked by ERG in TAM Series II, by NOM in TAM Series I and by DAT in TAM Series III. Thus, the examples of subject reflexives (or subject reciprocals) are not only those marked by ERG (5.4.1, 6.4.2a, 7.3.11b) but also those marked by NOM (3.6.40a, 5.5.1, 6.6.16a) or DAT.
³Although Georgian media and everyday spoken language offer examples of reflexives and reciprocals as a subject argument, prescriptive Georgian grammarians refuse to acknowledge that the phenomenon exists. They observe correctly that Russian sebja and the reciprocal drug-druga never appear as subjects. However, this is irrelevant to the behavior of reflexives and reciprocals in Georgian. I am grateful to Kevin Tuite (personal communication, 2000) for suggesting to concentrate not only on reflexives as in [AE00] but also pay attention to the subject occurrences of reciprocals in Georgian with object experiencer verbs.
⁴The Candidate Dissertation later published as [Asa82] has been carried out between 1974–1981 and defended in 1981 at the Tbilisi State University. As for [Tui98], it is a revised version of the PhD thesis defended by the author at the Department of Linguistics of the University of Chicago in 1988.
ergative-marked reflexive phrase POSS+tav-. By examining the ergative-marked reflexive phrases with quantificational postcedents it is argued that the cases are of genuine binding rather than those of coreference. Section 7.3 discusses the interpretation the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- or the reciprocal ertmanet-get in subject position. Two major readings of anaphors in subject position in Georgian are identified. Namely, the reading in which anaphors are interpreted as an aspect/property (Subsection 7.3.2) or an image/representation of the postcedent (Subsection 7.3.3). As was noted earlier in [Ami03, Ami04a], the cases in which anaphors are interpreted as an aspect/property of the postcedent, illustrate constraints on the thematic composition of the verbs taking them as a subject argument. Namely, the anaphoric subject must be a theme/cause rather than an agent and the direct object postcedent has to be an experiencer. This narrows down the classes of verbs being able to take a subject anaphor to object experiencer verbs as well as transitive verbs on their psych (object experiencer reading). However, the subject uses of the anaphors that are interpreted as an image/representation of the postcedent, do not give rise to such a constraint. On the image/representation reading, the anaphor in subject position can refer to inanimate or animate referents proximate to the postcedent. The cases with animate referents illustrate transitive verbs with their agitative reading. Thus, in general, subject uses of anaphors are not really constrained by the semantics/thematic properties of verbs, contrary to what [AE99] claims for Greek and [Ami04a] for Georgian.

The form of anaphors also does not seem to be an explanation for the distribution. There were already arguments in Chapter 6 against relating the distribution of the Georgian anaphors to their structure, as is done for the Greek anaphor of a similar structure in [AE99]. In this chapter another recent work such as [Reu01] will be referred to, which also relates the proxy reading of the Dutch anaphor zichzelf to its being a complex reflexive, thus, to its structure. Although both the Georgian anaphor POSS+tav- and the Dutch zichzelf are interpreted as a relevant function of their antecedent/postcedent and are both complex anaphors by the form, for another Georgian anaphor, the reciprocal ertmanet- it is problematic to fit in the explanation. The reciprocal also gets the same proxy reading in subject position. However, it does not have a similar structure as complex reflexives cross-linguistically. In Section 7.4 the chapter will be summarized.

7.2 Can It Be Called Binding?

The first mentioning of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- as a subject argument seems to be in [Asa82] (later pointed out also in [Boe89] after [Asa82]). [Asa82]'s original examples of ergative-marked reflexive phrases, like the one in Example 7.2.1, involve causative verbs where the subject argument is given as a reflexive phrase:

7.2.1. Example. (Adapted5 from [Asa82, p. 86])

5In the original example of the reflexive phrase as a subject by [Asa82] the indirect and direct objects
7.2. Can It Be Called Binding?

tavis-ma\textsuperscript{6}$^\text{REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG}$
a-g-o-a-ket-eb-in-a [nino-s es].
PV-3\text{DAT}.SG-PRV-do-TS-CAUS-3\text{AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC nino-DAT this.NOM}
Lit.: Herself she/it.made.her.do.it Nino this

“Something in Nino’s personality made her do this.”

Apart from causatives, either synthetic (7.2.1, 7.2.2) or analytical (7.2.3), transitive verbs are also able to take the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (4.3.21, 5.4.1, 6.4.2a, 6.6.1, 7.2.4, 7.2.5a) and the reciprocal ertmanet- (5.5.1, 6.6.16a) as a subject argument:

7.2.2. EXAMPLE.

čem-ma 1POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG
tav-ma
ča-m-a-den-in-a (me) današaul-i.
PV-1\text{DAT}.SG-PRV-commit-CAUS-3\text{AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC 1SG.DAT crime-NOM}
Lit.: Myself it.made.me.commit.it me crime

“[Something in] myself made me commit the crime.”

7.2.3. EXAMPLE.

čem-ma 1POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG
tav-ma m-a-izul-a amis
PV-1\text{DAT}.SG-PRV-force-3\text{AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC this.DAT}
gaketeba-∅. doing-NOM

“[Something in] my personality made me do this.”

are dropped, however they are reconstructed here according to another example of [Asa82] and are given in the square brackets.

“Note that the POSS can also be given as the possessive sakutar- “own”. Since the possessive is underspecified with regard to the person feature, it can select a postcedent of any person (see (i) and (ii)):

i. sakutar-ma tav-ma ga-g-o-a-ket-eb-in-a nino-s es.
own-ERG self-ERG PV-3\text{DAT}.SG-PRV-do-TS-CAUS-3\text{AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC nino-DAT this.NOM}

“Something in Nino’s personality made her, do this.”

ii. sakutar-ma ča-m-a-den-in-a (me) današaul-i.
own-ERG self-ERG PV-1\text{DAT}.SG-PRV-commit-CAUS-3\text{AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC 1SG.DAT crime-NOM}
Lit.: Own self it.made.me.commit.it me crime

“Something in myself made me commit the crime.”
7.2.4. Example. (From [Ami04a, p. 429])

tavis-ma tav-ma da-∅-γup-a
3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG PV-3BDET.SG-ruin-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
prezident-i.
president-NOM
Lit.: Himself ruined the president

“His own *positive / negative personal properties, and/or his past *achievements/failures, etc. ruined the president.” (the only available reading is to have no way out of the hard situation rather than to be destroyed physically)

7.2.5. Example. (From [Ami04a, p. 437])

a. tavis-i tav-i 3∅-a-çam-eb-s ḱac-s.
3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM 3BDET.SG-PRV-torture-TS-3ADET.SG man-DAT
Lit.: Himself is torturing the man

“His own property(/properties) make(s) the man suffer.” (non-agentive reading)

b. ḱac-i 3∅-a-çam-eb-s tav-i tav-s.
man-NOM 3BDET.SG-PRV-torture-TS-3ADET.SG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT

“The man is torturing himself.”

Additionally, object experiencer predicates, being treated as causative constructions [Pes95], can also take both the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- (6.6.3, 6.6.4, 7.2.6) and the reciprocal ertmanet- (3.6.40a, 6.6.17a, 7.2.7a) as a subject argument:

7.2.6. Example. (From [Ami98, p. 117])

tavis-ma tav-ma 3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG
še-∅-a-pikrian-a ivane-∅.
Pv-3BDET.SG-PRV-thoughtful-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC Ivane-NOM
Lit.: Himself he/it.puzzled.him Ivane

“[Something related to] himself puzzled Ivane.”

7.2.7. Example.

a. ertmanet-i g-a-braz-eb-t (tkven).
REC-NOM 2BDET.SG-PRV-anger-TS-PLDAT 2PL.DAT
Lit.: Each.other it.angers.you.PL you.PL

“[Something related to each other] angers you.”

b. (tkven) ertmanet-s 3∅-a-braz-eb-t.
2PL.NOM REC-DAT 2ADET.SG-PRV-anger-TS-PLNOM

“You make each other angry.”
The examples in 7.2.8 illustrate that there is no subject-object asymmetry in these cases: 7.2.8a is a case of a subject anaphor, 7.2.8b a case of an object anaphor:

7.2.8. **Example.**

a. ertmanet-i ∅-a-mxiarul-eb-t  
   bavšv-eb-s.  
   REC-NOM 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-cheerful-TS-PL_DAT child-PL-DAT  
   “Something in each other makes the children cheerful.” (i.e., their behavior, the way they look, etc.)

   child-PL-NOM REC-DAT 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-cheerful-TS-3_A NOM.PL  
   “The children make each other cheerful.” (i.e., by performing, telling, etc.)

Before going into a further discussion on the subject uses of the Georgian anaphors it should be illustrated that the uses are the cases of binding rather than those of coreference.

In order to verify that the relation between the ergative-marked subject reflexive phrase and its nominative postcedent (or between the nominative-marked subject reflexive phrase and its dative postcedent) is binding and not just a coreference in the examples like 4.3.21a, 4.3.21b, 5.4.1, 6.6.1, 6.6.3, 6.6.4, 7.2.1 as well as in 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4, 7.2.5a, 7.2.6, 7.3.11b, subject anaphors with a quantificational postcedent should be considered.

It is well-known [Rei76] that, a pronominal can be dependent on the interpretation of a quantificational expression, if there is a binding relation between them. For instance, the pronominal he in Example 7.2.9a cannot get the value of the quantificational expression everyone because there is no binding relation between them. However, the pronominal he can get the value of the quantificational expression when there is a binding relation between the two, as in Example 7.2.9b:

7.2.9. **Example.** (Based on [RE01])

a. *Everyone/John, had been worrying himself stiff. He, was relieved.

b. Everyone,John, who had been worrying himself stiff said that he, was relieved.

c. *Everyone,s/John,s mother said that he, was relieved.

Thus, if in Georgian the interpretation of the reflexive phrase in subject position is dependent on the interpretation of the postcedent quantificational expression it could be argued that there is a true binding relation between the anaphoric phrase and the quantificational expression.

The sentences in 7.2.10, 7.2.11, 7.2.12 offer some examples of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- as a subject argument with a quantificational postcedent. Each of these examples has an ergative marked reflexive phrase tavis-ma tav-ma as a subject argument. The interpretation of the reflexive phrase tavis-ma tav-ma “himself/herself” is
dependent on the interpretation of the postcedent *qvela-∅* “everybody”, which shows a relation of variable binding:

**7.2.10. Example.**

cxovreba-ši ertxel mainc tav-ma qvela-∅
life-in once at.least 3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG everybody-NOM
šeižleba da-∅-a-prtx-o-s.
it.is.possible PV-3BNOM-SG-PRV-scare-SUBJ-3AERG-SG
Lit.: In.life once at.least himself/herself everybody it.is.possible
(s)he/it.scares.SUBJ.him/her

“At least once in the life everybody can get scared of himself/herself.”

**7.2.11. Example.**
tquil-ad da-∅-a-bral-eb-t
demo-dan zecola-s,
üzraob-is čl-eb-ši mainc, tav-ma tav-ma
Stagnation-GEN year-PL-in at.least 3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG
∅-u-bizg-a qvela-s,
3B_DAT-SG-PRV-push-3AERG-SG.AOR.INDIC everyday-DAT
šesuliqo partia-ši,
him/her.to.be.entered party-in
Lit.: Wrongly you.PL.will.blame.it from.above press, of.Stagnation in.years at.least
it.pushed.him/her everybody to.join party

“You will wrongly blame the press from above, at least in the years of Stagnation
everybody was pushed by himself/herself to enter the party.”

**7.2.12. Example.**
gadamqveṭ moment-ši tavis-ma tav-ma qvela-∅
decisive moment-in 3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG everybody-NOM
šeižleba da-∅-a-pikr-o-s.
it.is.possible PV-3BNOM-SG-PRV-think-SUBJ-3AERG-SG
Lit.: Decisive moment.in himself/herself everybody it.is.possible
(s)he/it.makes.SUBJ.him/her.start.think

“In a decisive moment a property/aspect of one’s own can make everybody start
thinking.”

---

*What is meant by Example 7.2.11 is the following: in the Soviet Union in the years of Stagnation (1970’s) people used to join the already corrupt communist party mainly to use the membership for their own carrier, not at all for sharing the principles of the party.*
The cases with quantificational postcedents in the examples 7.2.10, 7.2.11, 7.2.12 illustrate variable binding, not just coreference, between the subject anaphor and its postcedent. Therefore, in general, subject anaphors in Georgian could be claimed to be binding their postcedents and not just be coreferential with them.

That the reflexive phrase is the subject argument of the verb forms in the examples 7.2.10, 7.2.11, 7.2.12 can be shown by the substitution test in 7.2.13, 7.2.14, 7.2.15:

7.2.13. Example.

cxovreba-ši ertxel mainc umćeob-is grznoba-m qvela-∅
life-in once at.least helplessness-GEN feeling-ERG everybody-NOM
šeizleba da-∅-a-prtX-o-s.
it.is.possible PV-3B_NOM,SG-PRV-scare-SUBJ-3A_ERG,SG
Lit.: In.the.life once at.least.of.helplessness feeling everybody it.is.possible it.scares.SUBJ.him/her

“At least once in the life the feeling of helplessness can scare everybody.”

tqul-ad da-∅-a-bral-eb-t zemo-dan zecola-s,
uzraob-is čel-eb-ši mainc, uket moçqob-is
Stagnation-GEN year-PL-in at.least better making.oneself.comfortable-GEN
survil-ma 0-u-bizg-a qvela-s,
will-ERG 3B_DAT,SG-PRV-push-3A_ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC everybody-DAT
šesuliqo partštia-ši.
him/her.to.be.entered party-in
Lit.: Wrongly you.PL.will.blame.it from.above press.of.Stagnation in.years at.least better of.making.
.oneself.comfortable will it.pushed.him/her everybody to.join party

“You will wrongly blame the press from above, at least in the years of Stagnation the will to make oneself comfortable pushed everybody to enter the party.”

7.2.15. Example.
gadamqvet moment-ši tavis-ma tviseb-eb-ma qvela-∅
decisive moment-in 3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG quality-PL-ERG everybody-NOM
šeizleba da-∅-a-pikr-o-s.
it.is.possible PV-3B_NOM,SG-PRV-think-SUBJ-3A_ERG,SG
Lit.: Decisive moment.in self’s qualities everybody it.is.possible it.makes.SUBJ.him/her.start.think
“In a decisive moment one’s own qualities can make everybody start thinking.”

Thus, the reflexive phrase in subject position has to be co-valued with an argument in the VP not only when the argument is a referential expression (as in the examples 4.3.21a, 4.3.21b, 6.6.1, 6.6.3, 6.6.4, 7.2.1, 7.2.4, 7.2.5a, 7.2.6, 7.3.11b) but also when it is quantificational (as in the examples 7.2.10, 7.2.11, 7.2.12).

7.3 Georgian Subject Anaphors and their Postcedents

7.3.1 Introduction

In the previous Section 7.2 it was argued that the relation between the Georgian anaphors used as a subject and their postcedents is a relation of binding rather than that of a coreference. The present Section 7.3 deals with the interpretation of those anaphors appearing as a subject argument of a verb. In general, none of the subject uses displays a full referential identity between the anaphor and its postcedent but there is an obligatorily partial identity. Two main groups of subject uses are discussed according to what is the interpretation of the anaphor with regard to its antecedent. Namely, the cases in which the anaphors get interpreted as an aspect/property of the postcedent (Subsection 7.3.2) and the cases in which the anaphors get interpreted as an image/representation of the postcedent (Subsection 7.3.3). Although both (i) the structure of the anaphors and (ii) the thematic composition of the verb may sometimes appear as a decisive factor for the ability of an anaphor to appear as a subject argument, the importance of both will be reviewed.

7.3.2 The Aspect/Property of Reading of the Subject Anaphors

In general, body-part reflexives in the languages of the world illustrate how body-part terms are being interpreted as a synecdoche for the whole referent (pars pro toto, [Sch99], see the examples 3.4.1, 7.3.1 for Georgian):

7.3.1. Example.

( me) ( mas)
1SG.ERG 3SG.DAT my-NOM head-NOM
da-v-u-xat-e.
PV-1A_{ERG}.SG-PRV-draw/paint-AOR.INDIC
“I drew myself for him/her.”

“I drew my head for him/her.”

*Note that plural inanimate subjects trigger a singular agreement (in contrast with plural animate subjects).*
Some of the examples of the subject anaphors, like 4.3.21a, 4.3.21b, 5.4.1, 6.4.2a, 6.6.1, 6.6.3, 6.6.4, 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4, 7.2.5a, 7.2.6 presented so far in this study illustrate that the anaphors refer to some aspect(s) or some property/properties of the referent of the postcedent NP. This might make an impression that body-parts when grammaticalized into reflexive markers retain a concept of being a part of a whole and refer to a part, property, an aspect of the referent of the postcedent (pars pro parte reading).

However, as argued by [Ami04a] and in Section 6.6, the subject uses of the reciprocal ertmanet- show that the aspect/property of reading has nothing to do with the form of the anaphor. The reciprocal, when it appears in subject position has the aspect/property of reading (3.6.40a, 5.5.1, 6.6.16a, 6.6.17a, 7.2.7a, 7.2.8a) but it neither forms a possessive construction nor is derived from any body part (3.6.3a). Therefore, the aspect/property of reading is characteristic for the subject uses of anaphors as such.

This means that the semantics do not depend on formal properties like whether it has a possessive morphosyntax (in the case of the reflexive) or not (in the case of the reciprocal). As argued in [Ami04a], there must be something else that makes it possible for the subject uses of anaphors to be interpreted as an aspect/property of the postcedent. It is just a coincidence that the Georgian reflexive has a structure of the possessive construction. If the aspect/property of reading of a pro-form (or some other word) in the subject position were related to the structure of that pro-form (e.g. POSS+tav-) then the acceptable subject reciprocal ertmanet- would also have to be of a possessive form but in fact, it is not (3.6.3a).

Since the formally different reflexive POSS+tav- and the reciprocal ertmanet-, when put in a subject position of a certain class of verbs both get interpreted alike, the similar interpretation has to be related to the verb class rather than to the form of any of the anaphors.

It is argued in [Ami04a] that two generalizations seem to hold: (i) these anaphors are grammatical when the subject has a cause/theme reading (of the originally transitive verbs) but not on the agentive subject reading,9 and (ii) none of the subject experiencer verbs (taking a dative experiencer subject) are able to take the reflexive phrase POSS+tav-.10 (6.6.7a, 7.3.2a) or the reciprocal ertmanet- as a dative marked (i.e. sub-

---

9Some of the examples of subject anaphors, like 4.3.21b, 6.4.2a, 6.6.3, 6.6.4, 7.2.5a, 7.2.6 illustrate that reflexives as subjects cannot refer to agents but can only be understood as causers. The theme argument of transitive verbs on a non-agentive reading is, in fact, an experiencer. Therefore, on their non-agentive reading agentive verbs are turned into object experiencer verbs. The phenomenon of turning a transitive into a psych verb on the stative reading is discussed in [Bou95] and [Ara98]. According to [Ara98], agentive verbs can have a psych interpretation if the subject cannot be construed as agentive (This joke really killed the audience; An idea hit Mary). It has been observed by [Bou95] that in fact any verb can be interpreted as a psych verb if (a) the verb has one animate argument which will be interpreted as an experiencer (necessary but non-sufficient requirement), (b) the external argument is incapable of physical action.

10The same is true for Greek and Basque. In both languages reflexive phrases appear as subjects only with object experiencer verbs while the subject experiencer verbs are ungrammatical with reflexive sub-
It can be concluded that the subject anaphors are not allowed when they fulfill the role of agent or experiencer:

**7.3.2. Example.**

a. *tavis 3REFL.POSS.SG s-zul-s 3B_DAT.SG-hate-3A_NOM.SG Šalva-NOM*
    
    **Himself hates Šalva.**

da. 3REFL.POSS.SG s-zul-s 3B_DAT.SG-hate-3A_NOM.SG Šalva-NOM self-NOM
    
    **“Šalva hates himself.”**

**7.3.3. Example.**

    
    **Each other long(s) for the sisters.**

da. 3B_DAT.SG-PRV-long.for-TS-3A_NOM.SG-PL-DAT REC-NOM
    
    **The sisters long for each other.”**

In [Ami04a] it is argued that the interpretation of anaphors in subject position of verbs with experiencer objects should be related to the thematic properties of the verbs. Namely, it has been argued that although the form and the anaphoric properties of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the reciprocal ertmanet- differ, they get the same kind of interpretation, because the verb reading can only be associated with the subject argument as a cause rather than as an agent. In other words, the anaphors get interpreted not fully identical to the postcedent but as an aspect/property of it because the verbs taking them as a subject argument can only have a cause but not an agent as a subject.

However, several questions remain. First of all, if the reason of having subject anaphors is in the thematic properties of verbs, then why are subject anaphors with object experiencer verbs and transitive verbs on a non-agentive reading disallowed in so many languages (such as English, Dutch, Icelandic, Russian, etc.)?

There is another question which might arise. Since both the reflexive POSS+tav- and the reciprocal ertmanet- of a different formation are allowed as a subject it was argued against the importance of the form of the anaphor for its appearance in the subject position of a verb. But then why are only the reciprocals of a certain type allowed as a subject argument in Georgian while the reciprocal of another type is not allowed?

More precisely, the question is whether the difference in the form of the reciprocals ertmanet-, erturt- vs. ertimeore- accounts for the differences in the distribution. The
data suggest that those reciprocal forms such as the literary ertmanet- and the dialectal erturt- built via compounding of the indefinite pronoun ert- “one” (3.6.40a, 6.6.16a, 7.2.7a, 7.3.4, 7.3.5, 7.3.6) are grammatical as a subject while the literary ertimeore- built via compounding of the indefinite pronoun ert- “one” and the definite meore- “another” are ungrammatical (7.3.7, 7.3.8, 7.3.9):

7.3.4. EXAMPLE.

erturt-i  
REC-NOM 1BDAT.PL-PRV-surprise-TS-3ANOM-SG 1PL.DAT
Lit.: Each.other it.surprises.us us
“We are surprised by something related to each other.”

7.3.5. EXAMPLE.

erturt-i  ∅-k.l-av-t  
REC-NOM 3BDAT-SG-kill-TS-PLDAT  Ivane-DAT and Meri-DAT
Lit.: Each.other it.kills.them John and Mary
“Something related to each other makes John and Mary suffer (i.e. their shyness, etc.).”

7.3.6. EXAMPLE.

erturt-i  g-a-braz-eb-t  
REC-NOM 2BDAT-SG-PRV-anger-TS-PLDAT 2PL.DAT
Lit.: Each.other it.makes.you.PL.angry you.PL
“You get angry by something related to each other.”

7.3.7. EXAMPLE.

ertimeore-∅  
REC-NOM 1BDAT.PL-PRV-surprise-TS-3ANOM-SG 1PL.DAT
Lit.: Each.other it.surprises.us us
“We are surprised by something related to each other.”

7.3.8. EXAMPLE.

ertimeore-∅  lamis ∅-k.l-av-t  
REC-NOM almost 3BDAT-SG-kill-TS-PLDAT  Ivane-DAT and Meri-DAT
Lit.: Each.other almost it.kills.them Ivane and Meri
“Something related to each other makes Ivane and Meri suffer (i.e. their shyness, etc.).”
7.3.9. Example.

?ertimeore-∅ g-a-braz-eb-t
REC-NOM 2B_DAT.SG-PRV-anger-TS-PL_DAT 2PL.DAT
Lit.: Each other it. makes you.PL angry you.PL

“You get angry by something related to each other.”

The next question arises if the group of examples is not limited to subject anaphors with transitive verbs on a non-agentive reading (equalling thematically to object experiencer verbs\(^{11}\)) but also take into account the examples with transitive verbs with affected theme allowing subject anaphors. Such examples are those in 4.3.21a, 5.4.1, 6.6.1, 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4 which use a verb form referring to a transitive action carried out by the subject affecting a theme.\(^{12}\)

Thus, it is not the semantics and thematic properties of the verb readings which constrain the interpretation of the anaphors in subject position. Subject anaphors in Georgian are available both on the non-agentive (object experiencer) and the agentive readings of transitive verbs. Thus, their interpretation as an aspect/property of the postcedent is not conditioned by the verb semantics, as was initially argued by [Ami04a].

In the next subsection 7.3.3 some additional data of subject uses of the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- will be presented which also turn out to be problematic if the availability of the subject anaphors is related to the thematic properties of verbs allowing them.

7.3.3 The Image/Representation of Reading of the Subject Anaphors

As could have been seen above, most of the instances of the reflexives as subjects presented so far in this dissertation imply the referent of the reflexive to be an aspect/property of the referent of its postcedent (see also Example 7.3.10) so that the apparent subject reflexives in fact refer to a cause rather than an agent argument of the verb:

7.3.10. Example.

[tavis-ma tav-ma] da-∅-marx-a
3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG PV-3B_NOM.SG-bury-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
mixa-∅.\(^{13}\)
Mixa-NOM
Lit.: Himself.ERG he/it.buried.him Mixa.NOM

\(^{11}\)See Footnote 9 in Chapter 7.

\(^{12}\)Note that in the examples 4.3.21a, 5.4.1, 6.6.1, 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4 the subject refers exclusively to a cause rather than to an agent but the object argument is still an affected theme.
“No one (/nothing else) but Mixa’s savings made it possible to pay for all the expenses related to his funeral.”

Below additional data will be discussed in which it is not necessary for the referent of the reflexive to be an aspect/property of the referent of its postcedent but a representation such as a mirror image (7.3.11b), TV image (Example 7.3.13), a recorded voice (Example 7.3.15) or a closely resembling person such as a twin (7.3.17). The contexts will now be considered one by one.

Example 7.3.11 reflects the situations where a girl who is looking into the mirror, smiles. Note that the context for the sentence in 7.3.11a is such that the girl smiles to herself so that she is aware of her emotions, and controls her body movements. However, the sentence in 7.3.11b is grammatical only if the girl smiles without intending to do so, unexpectedly, the smile just comes upon her lips. Perhaps in the very moment of witnessing the scene from the mirror the girl is somewhere away with her thoughts and, thus, does not comprehend it is herself she is seeing, but takes the reflection as an actor. Since in Example 7.3.11a the girl smiles agentively to her own reflection in the mirror, it qualifies as the agent of the 2-argument unergative verb ga-∅-u-γim-a. However, the girl in 7.3.11b is the experiencer object. In Example 7.3.11b the ergative-marked reflexive phrase refers to the mirror image of the girl. Although the mirror image itself cannot be agentive, the referent of the postcedent gets affected as an ordinary addressee (cf. 7.3.11b vs. 7.3.12):

7.3.11. Example. 14

a. gogo-m tavis tav-s
girl-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT
ga-∅-u-γim-a sarke-ši.
PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-smile-3ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC mirror-in
“The girl smiled to herself in the mirror.”

---

13 This sentence in itself taken out of a context does not make much sense. One interpretation it can get is the following: “Some property of Mixa (/some aspect of Mixa’s personality) ruined his life/career”. However, according to my fieldwork notes of 1999, it is from a conversation between three cousins in a small village in North-Eastern Georgia. Two of the cousins (in their 50s) each tried their best to argue that their own family had paid a better respect to their grandfather and after his death took care of his funeral. Finally the third cousin (in her 30s) uttered the sentence in 7.3.10 to contradict them and to say that it was the grandfather who had worked hard all his life to collect and leave the money for his own funeral. In the area the dialect Mitulian and Gudamaqrijan [Jor89, Tu98] is spoken. However, neither of the cousins have really lived there but used to visit the village during their summer holidays. All of them have been brought up and had their education from a primary school up to a university in Tbilisi, the capital, where the Tbilisi Georgian (relatively close to the literary Georgian) is spoken. Additionally, the utterer of the sentence had spent some 10 years in the Western Georgia, specifically in the area where a different dialect Imeretian is spoken. I am not sure which of the varieties of the language—only the Tbilisi Georgian, or additionally any or both of the dialects—had to be blamed in the use of the construction.

14 I am grateful to Kakhi Sakhltkhutsishvili for pointing out the sentences in Example 7.3.11.
b. tavis-ma   tav-ma  ga-∅-u-γim-a
3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-smile-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
gogo-s  sark-i-dan.
girl-DAT mirror-INST-from
Lit.: Herself she/it.smiled.to.her to.girl from.mirror
“The reflection of the girl smiled to her from the mirror.”

7.3.12. EXAMPLE.

megobarma-ma ga-∅-u-γim-a  gogo-s.
friend-ERG PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-smile-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC  girl-DAT
Lit.: Friend (s)he.smiled.to.her to.girl
“A/the friend smiled to the girl.”

In the TV image context in 7.3.13 the referent of the postcedent, the full NP parti-is lider-i, refers to a certain individual while the ergative marked subject reflexive phrase refers only to his/her TV-image. Another possibility is that the person gets affected by an aspect of his/her personality—being the party leader. However, irrespective of how the referent of the postcedent is qualified—as affected by his/her TV image or by one of the aspects of his/her personality—it gets affected as an ordinary patient (7.3.13), similar to what is exemplified in 7.3.14:

7.3.13. EXAMPLE. (TV-image context, [Ami05a])

televizor-is ekran-i-dan  [tavis-ma  tav-ma]
TV-GEN screen-INST-from 3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG
da-∅-mozγvr-a parti-is lider-i.
PV-3B_NOM.SG-instruct-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC party-GEN leader-NOM
Lit.: From the TV screen himself/herself.ERG (s)he.instructed.him/her party leader.NOM
The context: The leader of the party was watching his/her own speech on the TV and was instructed by himself/herself as an ordinary TV viewer would have been instructed by a party leader.

7.3.14. EXAMPLE.

prezident-ma da-∅-mozγvr-a parti-is
president-ERG PV-3B_NOM.SG-instruct-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC party-GEN lider-i.
leader-NOM
“The president instructed the party leader.”
Example 7.3.15 illustrates a context in which a recorded voice of a person helps him/her to recall the schedule for the next day. In this particular example a voice recording is a representation of that person affecting him/her just as an ordinary agent affects an addressee (cf. 7.3.15 vs. 7.3.16):

**7.3.15.** Example. (Voice recording context, [Ami05a])

\[
\text{xširad ucnaur-i grznoba-∅ m-i-ĉn-d-eb-a,}
\]

often strange-NOM feeling-NOM 1B\(\text{DAT-SG-PRV-appear-INTR-TS-3A\_NOM-SG}\)

roca [čem-i-ve tav-i] m-e-ubn-eb-a,

when 1POSS\(\text{.SG-NOM-FOC self-NOM 1B\_DAT-SG-PRV-tell-TS-3A\_NOM-SG}\)

ris šemdeg ra-∅ unda ga-v-a-ket-o.

what\.GEN after what-NOM should PV-1\_A\_E\_R\_G\_SG-PRV-do-SUBJ

Lit.: Often strange feeling it.appears.to.me when MYSELF it.tells.me what I should do after what

[The context: Sometimes I dial my home number and leave a list of instructions for myself on the voice mail in order to listen to them when returned back home and remember what still has to be done the next day.] “It is always a strange feeling to hear my own voice and realize that it is myself who tells me what has to be done and in which order.”

**7.3.16.** Example.

\[
[čem-i-ve xelkeiT-i] m-e-ubn-eb-a (me)…
\]

my-NOM-FOC subordinate-NOM 1B\_DAT-SG-PRV-tell-TS-3A\_NOM-SG 1SG\_DAT

“My own subordinate tells me…”

Example 7.3.17 illustrates a twin context in which the reflexive phrase does not represent an aspect or image of the referent of the postcedent as it is in 7.3.13, 7.3.15 but it is a completely different personality closely resembling the referent of the postcedent.

**7.3.17.** Example. (Twin context, [Ami05a])

\[
\text{mašin ki martla v-i-pikr-e, rom}
\]

then really 1A\_E\_R\_G\_SG-PRV-think-AOR\_INDIC that

m-e-sizmr-eb-od-a, rogor

1B\_DAT-SG-PRV-dream-TS-IMPERF-3A\_NOM-SG how

[lo-kocn-i-d-a [tavis-i tav-i] natia-s.]


[Context (an amazed viewer): I came out and got amazed. Natia has turned into two persons. They stood and talked to each other. Finally they also kissed each other.] “It was only then when I really thought that I was dreaming how Natia was being kissed by her(own)self.”
In 7.3.17 the reflexive phrase refers to the twin of the referent of the postcedent NP natia-s. It is as human and as agentive as the referent of the full NP deda in 7.3.18:

**7.3.18. Example.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{deda-∅  } & \text{0-kocn-i-d-a natia-s.} \\
\text{mother-NOM} & \text{3B_{DAT}, SG-kiss-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM}, SG Natia-DAT} \\
\text{Lit.: mother-NOM she was kissing her Natia-DAT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“The mother was kissing Natia.”

In these contexts, the Georgian reflexive phrases refer to an image or a close associate which is not necessarily [-human]/[-animate] at all but can perform agentive behavior and act as an agent.\(^{15}\) In other contexts, such as 7.3.11b, 7.3.13 and 7.3.15 correspondingly the mirror image of the girl, the TV image of the party leader and the voice recording, are in no way agentive. However, the referent of the postcedent gets affected by the images as an ordinary patient (cf. 7.3.13 vs. 7.3.14) or as an ordinary addressee (7.3.11b vs. 7.3.12, 7.3.15 vs. 7.3.16). As for the twin context in 7.3.17, not only the referent of the postcedent gets affected as an ordinary patient (7.3.17 vs. 7.3.18) but also the referent of the reflexive phrase—the twin—performs an agentive behavior. In 7.3.17, the reflexive phrase refers to the twin of the referent of the postcedent NP natia-s which is as human and as agentive as the referent of the full NP deda in Example 7.3.18.

One might call the cases like 7.3.11b, 7.3.13, 7.3.15, 7.3.17 non-anaphoric. However, as [Jac92] shows, reflexive pronouns may be interpreted to refer to a representation of their antecedents and not only strictly identical to their antecedents. Although [Jac92] discusses “canonical” uses such as object uses of anaphors, the Georgian data makes it possible to extend the observation to non-canonical uses of anaphors such as the subject uses (7.3.11b, 7.3.13, 7.3.15, 7.3.17).\(^{16}\)

\(^{15}\)Such contexts where the utterer uses subject reflexive as a representation of the postcedent are mostly those describing irdal worlds, dreams, associations.

\(^{16}\)[Jac92] discusses object uses of anaphors on English data illustrating a proxy reading. The examples brought by [Jac92] are adopted from several sources and illustrate a statue, recording, actor and dream contexts, where both a referential expression (see Ringo in (i)) and a reflexive (see himself in (ii)) can refer to a representation of a person. However, a statue reading for a referential expression in subject position is unacceptable (iii). Note that Georgian would use a reflexive in subject position (iv) to express the case like (iii). Compare the examples (iv) and (v), where the change of a position of an anaphor results in a change of the interpretation.

i. All of a sudden I accidentally stumbled and fell on Ringo. (At Mme. Tussaud’s)

ii. Ringo fell on himself.

“The actual Ringo fell on the statue of Ringo.”

iii. *Ringo fell on himself.

“The statue of Ringo fell on the actual Ringo.”
The examples in which the referent of the reflexive phrase refers to an image / representation of its postcedent (7.3.11b, 7.3.13, 7.3.15, 7.3.17) also show that it is not necessary for the lexical semantics or thematic properties of the verbs to undergo changes in order to be able to take subject anaphors.

This is not to say that the interpretation of subject anaphors is not also largely dependent on the lexical semantics of the verb, in a different sense. For instance, depending on whether there is the verb like “save” or “ruin”, the interpretation of the anaphoric subject argument changes (cf. 7.2.4 vs. 6.6.1)—it is the positive aspects and properties which help the president avoid trouble in 6.6.1, while it is his negative sides which put him into trouble in 7.2.4.

However, as 6.6.1 and 7.2.4 together with some other examples like 4.3.21a, 5.4.1, 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3 illustrate as well, it is not necessary for a verb to be an object experiencer verb to be able to allow an anaphor as a subject argument. It is perfectly possible to have an agentive reading of the verb as well.

Similar contexts like Mme. Tussaud’s and Münchhausen’s are discussed for Dutch in [Reu01]. In both cases the Dutch complex anaphor zichzelf is interpreted as a representation of the antecedent (7.3.19b, 7.3.20b) while the simplex zich as identical to it (7.3.19a, 7.3.20a). Both in 7.3.19b and 7.3.20b the SELF anaphor zichzelf expresses a relation between the antecedent and its function that bears a systematic resemblance to the antecedent, but can be distinguished from it.17

7.3.19. EXAMPLE. Madame Tussaud context, from [Reu01, p. 483]
Marie is famous and walked into Madame Tussaud’s. She looked in a mirror and . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iv.</th>
<th>tavis-i</th>
<th>tav-i</th>
<th>da-∅-e-c-a</th>
<th>ringo-s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM</td>
<td>self-NOM</td>
<td>PV-3</td>
<td>B-DAT.SG-PRV-PV-3</td>
<td>ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The statue of Ringo fell on the actual Ringo.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“*The actual Ringo fell on the statue of Ringo.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v.</th>
<th>ringo-∅</th>
<th>da-∅-e-c-a</th>
<th>tavis</th>
<th>tav-s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ringo-NOM</td>
<td>PV-3</td>
<td>B-DAT.SG-PRV-PV-3</td>
<td>ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC</td>
<td>3REFL.POSS.SG self-DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The statue of Ringo fell on the actual Ringo.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The actual Ringo fell on the statue of Ringo.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17Georgian, like English (or Dutch, Greek), allows a “property of” reading of nouns in examples like 4.3.21a, 4.3.21b, 5.4.1, 5.5.1, 6.4.2a, 6.6.1, 6.6.3, 6.6.4, 6.6.16a, 6.6.17a, 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4, 7.2.5a, 7.2.6, 7.2.7, 7.2.8a, 7.3.10. Among the English examples illustrating a “property of” reading are Glenn Gould plays Bach [work composed by Bach], I saw Ringo in Madame Tussaud [statue of Ringo], etc. The “image/representation of” reading in Georgian is an instantiation of this general process. What might make Georgian different is that this process allows more interpretations (guises, to use a terminology of [Hei98]) for POSS+inv- constructions than are readily available for reflexives in languages like Dutch, English or Greek.
“she saw herself standing in a creepy corner.”

b. *ze zag zichzelf in een griezelige hoek staan.*
   “she saw herself in a creepy corner stand”
   “she saw her statue standing in a creepy corner.”

7.3.20. **Example.** Münchhausen context, [Reu01, p. 483]

a. De baron trok zich uit het moeras.
   the baron pulled SE out of the swamp
   “The baron pulled himself out of the swamp.” (by grabbing a branch of a tree hanging over him)

b. De baron trok zichzelf uit het moeras.
   the baron pulled himself out of the swamp
   “The baron pulled himself out of the swamp.” (by his hair)

Since the complex reflexive *zichzelf* is able to refer to objects which stand proxy to the antecedent and not be strictly identical to it while the simplex *zich* cannot do so, [Reu01] interprets complex anaphors as a relevant function of the antecedent. For instance, the Frisian complex anaphor *himsels* in 7.3.21a is interpreted as a function (7.3.21b) which maps the antecedent onto an object standing proxy for the antecedent.

7.3.21. **Example.**

a. From [Reu01, p. 480]

   Willem haet himsels.
   Willem hates himself

b. Willem λx (x hates f(x))

According to [Reu01], it is no coincidence that cross-linguistically the equivalent of *his head/soul/body/bone/eye/etc.* is a possible anaphor, and the equivalent of *his table* is not. Body-parts are inalienable nouns which in many languages can stand to refer to a person or objects which stand prox to that person. Thus, it is possible to consider the semantics of body-part nouns to be responsible for interpreting them as a relevant function of the antecedent in reflexive constructions. The subject uses of the reflexive phrase in Georgian (headed by a body-part *tav*- “head”) which refer to an image of the postcedent (7.3.13, 7.3.15, 7.3.17) are a nice illustration of a complex reflexive to be interpreted as a function of the postcedent.

However, it is then again problematic to explain why the reciprocal *ertmanet* in subject position (7.2.7a, 7.2.8a) gets the same interpretation as a reflexive phrase in subject position would have gotten (see, for instance, 7.2.5a). The reciprocals in 7.2.7a
and 7.2.8a are interpreted as aspect/property of their postcedents but they have no structure of inalienable anaphors. This would mean that the logical form given by Reuland (7.3.21b) would be available, independent of the morphosyntactic properties of the anaphor. But if that would be the case, the explanation for the different reading of anaphors, as in example 7.3.19, is lost.

The use of the body-part reflexive in contexts with a close associate, such as a twin (Example 7.3.17), looks very much like the use of other body-parts to refer to a relative or a family member in conventionalized expressions like the one in Example 7.3.22:

7.3.22. Example.

[čem-i sisxl-i da xorč-i] tu
IPOSS.SG-NOM blood-NOM and flesh-NOM if

gamčir-av-d-a ver
PV-1BDAT.SG-betray-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM.SG.INDIC NEG

tv-i-pikr-eb-d-i.

1ANOM.SG-PRV-think-TS-IMPERF-INDIC

Lit.: my blood and flesh if it.would.betray.me could.not I.would.think

“I would not think that my own flesh and blood will betray me.” (not necessarily a family member but also a relative or even a compatriot)

It seems that body-parts have always been a source for metaphors in Georgian, and some of them such as soul, heart and head even got grammaticalized into the reflexive markers or markers of ownership, possession. [Fäh91, p. 154] gives some examples from Old Georgian brought here under 7.3.23 and 7.3.24 which illustrate the lexemes that are no longer referring to a particular body-part during the history of the language but to a certain grammatical function. Namely, tav- “head” (7.3.23, 7.3.24b), sul- “soul” (7.3.24a) and gul- “heart” (see [Fäh91]), together with a possessive pronoun, function as a reflexive phrase:

7.3.23. Example. (head, Old Georgian, from [Fäh91])

gan-0-i-qv-es [samosel-i]
PV-3B NOM.SG-PRV-divide-3AERG.PL.AOR.INDIC garments-NOM
čem-i [tav-is-a mat-is-a].

IPOSS.SG-NOM head-GEN-EV 3POSS.PL-GEN-EV

“They divided my garments among themselves.”

7.3.24. Example. (soul, Old Georgian, from [Fäh91])
a. nu h-zrun-av-t [sul-ta tküen-ta-tvis].
NEG 2ANOM.SG-care-TS-PL.NOM soul-GEN.PL 2POSS.PL-GEN.PL-for

“Do not care for yourselves.”
b. nu h-zrun-av-t [tav-ta tkœn-ta-tvis].
NEG 2ANOM.SG-care-TS-PLNOM head-GEN.PL 2POSS.PL-GEN.PL-for
“Do not care for yourselves.”

Some more examples from Modern Georgian like 7.3.25, 7.3.26 illustrate the use of other body-parts as lever or skin that are also grammaticalized, namely the former as a possessive (lever > own, 7.3.25) while the latter as a reflexive (skin > self, 7.3.26):

7.3.25. EXAMPLE. (lever, Modern Georgian)
kal-s daoblebul-i čvil-i γvižl-i čvil-i-vit
woman-DAT orphaned-NOM infant-NOM lever-NOM son/daughter-NOM-like
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-love-INTR-3ANOM.SG.AOR.INDIC
“The woman loved the orphaned infant like her own child.”

7.3.26. EXAMPLE. (skin, Modern Georgian, from [Mor02, p. 12])
sak . utar sipripana tqv-ze, upro kì, ḷan-ze, unda
own thin hide-on more though skin-on must
gamo-∅-cad-o da mere alal-ad
PV-3BNOM.SG-try-3AERG.SG.SUBJ and then honest-ADV
∅-i-nan-o.
3BNOM.SG-PRV-regret-3AERG.SG.SUBJ
“[You] must experience [it] on [your] own thin hide, more though on the skin, and then honestly regret.”

However, the uses of other body-parts than tav- “head” do not exceed the figurative contexts, while the grammaticalized body-part tav- has firmly been fixed as a general marker of reflexivity among other functions.

7.3.4 Conclusion

Section 7.3 was concerned with the interpretation of the complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav- as well as with the reciprocal ertmanet- acting as a subject argument of a verb. The uses with the anaphors being interpreted either as (i) an aspect/property (Subsection 7.3.2) or (ii) an image/representation of the referent of the postcedent (Subsection 7.3.3) were presented here. Although it might seem that the verbs involved in the phenomenon have to be interpreted as object experiencer verbs (i.e., have an object argument interpreted as an experiencer), there is evidence that this is not necessary and the anaphors can serve as a subject argument also for transitive verbs with an affected theme argument.

In Subsection 7.3.3 the Georgian reflexive phrase was discussed as a subject argument of verbs in special contexts. Such contexts include a TV, mirror image, voice
recording and twin contexts which illustrate the referent of the anaphor interpreted as an image/representation of the postcedent. The facts, although problematic for both the Binding Theory [Cho81] and the Reflexivity Theory [RR93], could in principle be accounted for by the analysis of complex anaphors as a relevant function of the antecedent, proposed in [Reu01]. However, the Georgian reciprocal erta–tav–, which is unable to get the same treatment as the Georgian reflexive phrase but, at the same time, is able to appear as a subject argument of verbs, makes the application of the analysis offered by [Reu01] to the Georgian data problematic.

Note that the examples discussed in this chapter not only pose a challenge to the regular binding conditions [Cho81] but also to theories in which binding conditions are formulated on the basis of a thematic hierarchy [EA97] or grammatical functions, such as HPSG [PS94] or LFG [Bre00].

7.4 Summary

Georgian is a language allowing reflexives as a subject argument of verbs. The subject use of the Georgian reflexive phrase was first documented with causative verbs by [Asa82]. The later works such as [AE00, Ami03, Ami04a] discuss the use with object experiencer verbs and transitive verbs on non-agentive reading and [Ami05a] considers the use in special contexts such as a TV or mirror image, voice recording and twin contexts. After a plan for the chapter in Section 7.1 was presented, different uses of the anaphoric phrase POSS+tav– in Section 7.2 were considered. It was argued for having a binding rather than a coreference relation between the anaphor in subject position and its postcedent. Section 7.3 was concerned with the interpretation of the subject uses of anaphors. Namely, the uses of the reflexive phrase were reviewed and it was analyzed when the phrase gets interpreted as an aspect/property of the postcedent (Subsection 7.3.2) and as an image/representation of the postcedent (Subsection 7.3.3). The latter uses employ transitive verbs on their agentive reading in special contexts and can refer to inanimate or animate referents standing proxy to the referent of the postcedent. The uses are problematic for the Binding Theory of [Cho81] as well as for the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93]. The data could be accounted for within the approach developed in [Reu01], which regards complex anaphors as a relevant function of the antecedent, thus, relates the syntax and semantics of the complex anaphors to their form. The analysis of complex anaphors by [Reu01] seems to be appealing for the subject uses of the Georgian complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav– because the complex reflexive phrase is interpreted either as an aspect/property or as an image/representation, thus, as some function, of the postcedent. However, the Georgian reciprocal erta–tav–, getting the same interpretation in subject position but having no structure of complex anaphors, makes the analysis by [Reu01] unapplicable to the Georgian data.
This dissertation investigated reflexivization strategies of Georgian, a language with a split between the nominative and active alignment in both case and agreement marking (Chapter 2). Unlike the previous studies, considering the reflexives as not well established in Georgian grammar [Mar64a], [Mar64b], the present work has argued in favor of having a consistent anaphoric system in Georgian.

The idea of not having a developed class of reflexives probably resulted from not distinguishing several formally similar anaphoric elements by function. After having identified two historically related but synchronically distinct nominal reflexivization strategies—a simplex and a complex one, both based on a grammaticalized body-part noun—this study offered a precise description of their distributional and semantic properties within the Binding Theory [Cho81] (Chapter 3). Apart from having two overt reflexive elements, i.e., two nominal strategies, Georgian uses a verbal reflexivization strategy, the prefix \( i- \), which interacts in an interesting way with the nominal strategies.

The study of the reflexivization strategies has been considered within a different theory of anaphoric dependencies—the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93] (Chapter 4). The latter theory enables not only a distinction between different functions of even seemingly similar anaphoric elements but also makes it possible to study their behavior with respect to the verb semantics.

Apart from describing the anaphoric system of Georgian the work has offered a discussion on the uses which are apparent violations of principles of either the Binding Theory [Cho81] or the Reflexivity Theory [RR93] (Chapter 5). One of such violations was a non-anaphoric use of the phrase formally identical with the complex nominal reflexivization strategy in “object camouflage” [Har81]. This means that the 1st or 2nd person direct object of ditransitive verbs gets expressed via the phrase formally identical to the complex strategy. Like the previous study of the phenomenon [Har81], the dissertation has recognized and argued in favor of a distinction of the two uses of the phrase headed by the grammaticalized body-part—the anaphoric (in binding cases) and pronominal (in “object camouflage”). The twofold and contrasting behavior of the phrase as an anaphor and as a pronominal is an illustration of the grammaticalization process that the body-part has undergone [AL02]. As is known, cross-linguistically,
body-parts are among the material grammaticalized into reflexive markers and intensifiers [Mor72], [Sch99], [Hei99], [KS00a], [KS00b], [Kön01]. On the other hand, nouns retain the referential properties (e.g., the person feature [+3rd]) even after having been grammaticalized. That is how the Georgian body-part that is grammaticalized as a reflexive also functions as a 3rd person phrase. Exactly being 3rd person allows the phrase to be used as a pronominal in “object camouflage” to serve the needs of agreement.

The dissertation has observed a potential problem for the two theories [Cho81], [RR93] such as the subject use of the Georgian complex nominal reflexivization strategy and that of the reciprocal ertmanet-

The subject use of anaphors is a counter-example also for various other proposals in the generative linguistic literature which try to explain why nominative/subject anaphors are banned cross-linguistically or when they are available in some language what the reason of their presence is (Chapter 6). Examples of such explanations have been the anaphor agreement effect and its modified version according to which anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement [Riz90], and if they still appear the agreement is either anaphoric or “default” [Woo99]. However, the Georgian data have illustrated the contrary. According to another explanation within the Reflexivity Theory [RR93], a subject use of the Greek anaphor is due to its form and its being a [+SELF;+R] reflexivization strategy [AE99]. It was proposed to extend the analysis of the Greek anaphor to the Georgian complex nominal strategy as well [Eve01], [Eve03]. However, the Georgian reciprocal ertmanet- not being a [+SELF;+R] reflexivization strategy but nevertheless being able to appear in the subject position makes the proposal by [Eve01], [Eve03] not applicable to Georgian.

It seems that relating the form and the behavior of the anaphors is attractive. A recent analysis of complex anaphors also relates their interpretation as a relevant function of the antecedent to their being complex by form [Reu01]. This might seem to be relevant for accounting for the Georgian complex nominal reflexivization strategy, which in subject position gets interpreted as either an aspect/property or an image/representation (thus, some kind of function) of the postcedent (Chapter 7). However, the Georgian reciprocal ertmanet-, unable to be analyzed as a complex anaphor but being able to appear as a subject argument exactly with the same “function of” interpretation, makes the application of the solution to Georgian data problematic and leaves the issue of subject anaphors open for further investigation.
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Some Classes of Verbs in the Screeves of the Three TAM Series

A.1 The 1-Argument Unaccusative -citld/-citol “turn red”

A.1.1. Example. (Present Indicative, Present Sub-Series, Series I)

a. v-citol-d-eb-i
   1ANOM.SG-red-INTR-TS-INDIC
   “I am turning red”; “I turn red”

b. ∅-citol-d-eb-i
   2ANOM.SG-red-INTR-TS-INDIC
   “You.SG are turning red”; “You.SG turn red”

c. citol-d-eb-a
   red-INTR-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “(S)he is turning red”; “(S)he turns red”

d. v-citol-d-eb-i-t
   1ANOM.SG-red-INTR-TS-INDIC-PLNOM
   “We are turning red”; “We turn red”

e. ∅-citol-d-eb-i-t
   2ANOM.SG-red-INTR-TS-INDIC-PLNOM
   “You.PL are turning red”; “You.PL turn red”

f. citol-d-eb-i-an
   red-INTR-TS-INDIC-3ANOM.PL
   “They are turning red”; “They turn red”

The unaccusative verb is derived from the adjective citel “red”. The presence of the intransitivizing suffix -d is obligatory (see the examples A.1.1 – A.1.8). However, the screeves of the TAM Series III (see the examples A.1.9 – A.1.11) using the adjective-based participial form (ga-citol-eb-ul- [PV-red-TS-ppart-] “become red”; “reddened”) do not have the suffix.

243
Appendix A. Some Classes of Verbs in the Screes of the Three TAM Series

A.1.2. Example. (Imperfect Indicative, Present Sub-Series, Series I)

a. \(v\text{-citl-d-eb-od-i}\)
   \(1\text{ANOM-SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-INDIC}\)
   “I was turning red”

b. \(\emptyset\text{-citl-d-eb-od-i}\)
   \(2\text{ANOM-SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-INDIC}\)
   “You,SG were turning red”

c. \(\text{citl-d-eb-od-a}\)
   \(\text{red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM-SG}\)
   “(S)he was turning red”

d. \(v\text{-citl-d-eb-od-i-t}\)
   \(1\text{ANOM-SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM}\)
   “We were turning red”

e. \(\emptyset\text{-citl-d-eb-od-i-t}\)
   \(2\text{ANOM-SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM}\)
   “You,PL were turning red”

f. \(\text{citl-d-eb-od-nen}\)
   \(\text{red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM-PL}\)
   “They were turning red”

A.1.3. Example. (Present Subjunctive, Present Sub-Series, Series I)

a. \(v\text{-citl-d-eb-od-e}\)
   \(1\text{ANOM-SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ}\)
   “[If] I were turning red”

b. \(\emptyset\text{-citl-d-eb-od-e}\)
   \(2\text{ANOM-SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ}\)
   “[If] You,SG were turning red”

c. \(\text{citl-d-eb-od-e-s}\)
   \(\text{red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3ANOM-SG}\)
   “[If] (S)he were turning red”

d. \(v\text{-citl-d-eb-od-e-t}\)
   \(1\text{ANOM-SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PLNOM}\)
   “[If] we were turning red”

e. \(\emptyset\text{-citl-d-eb-od-e-t}\)
   \(2\text{ANOM-SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PLNOM}\)
   “[If] you,PL were turning red”

f. \(\text{citl-d-eb-od-nen}\)
   \(\text{red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM-PL}\)
   “[If] they were turning red”

2When translating the verb forms in Present Subjunctive in the examples A.1.3 as well as A.2.3 and A.3.3 the particle \textit{if} will be put in the square brackets while not giving the corresponding particle \textit{rom} “if” in the Georgian examples for the sake of space and clarity.
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A.1.4. Example. (Future Indicative, Future Sub-Series, Series I)

a. ga-v-čitl-d-eb-i  
PV-1ANOM,SG-red-INTR-TS-INDIC  
“I will turn red”

b. ga-∅-čitl-d-eb-i  
PV-2ANOM,SG-red-INTR-TS-INDIC  
“You,SG will turn red”

c. ga-čitl-d-eb-a  
PV-red-INTR-TS-3ANOM,SG  
“(S)he will turn red”

d. ga-v-čitl-d-eb-i-t  
PV-1ANOM,SG-red-INTR-TS-INDIC-PLNOM  
“We will turn red”

e. ga-∅-čitl-d-eb-i-t  
PV-2ANOM,SG-red-INTR-TS-INDIC-PLNOM  
“You,PL will turn red”

f. ga-čitl-d-eb-i-an  
PV-red-INTR-TS-INDIC-3ANOM,PL  
“They will turn red”

A.1.5. Example. (Conditional, Future Sub-Series, Series I)

a. ga-v-čitl-d-eb-od-i  
PV-1ANOM,SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-INDIC  
“I would turn red”

b. ga-∅-čitl-d-eb-od-i  
PV-2ANOM,SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-INDIC  
“You,SG would turn red”

c. ga-čitl-d-eb-od-a  
PV-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM,SG  
“(S)he would turn red”

d. ga-v-čitl-d-eb-od-i-t  
PV-1ANOM,SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM  
“We would turn red”

e. ga-∅-čitl-d-eb-od-i-t  
PV-2ANOM,SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM  
“You,PL would turn red”

f. ga-čitl-d-eb-od-nen  
PV-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM,PL  
“They would turn red”
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A.1.6. EXAMPLE. (Future Subjunctive, 3 Future Sub-Series, Series I)

a. ga-v-çitl-d-eb-od-e
   PV-1ANO.M.SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[I wish] I were turning red”

b. ga-∅-çitl-d-eb-od-e
   PV-2ANO.M.SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[I wish] you.SG were turning red”

c. ga-çitl-d-eb-od-e-s
   PV-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3ANO.M.SG
   “[I wish] (s)he were turning red”

d. ga-v-çitl-d-eb-od-e-t
   PV-1ANO.M.SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PLNOM
   “[I wish] we were turning red”

e. ga-∅-çitl-d-eb-od-e-t
   PV-2ANO.M.SG-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PLNOM
   “[I wish] you.PL were turning red”

f. ga-çitl-d-eb-od-nen
   PV-red-INTR-TS-IMPERF-3ANO.PL
   “[I wish] they were turning red”

A.1.7. EXAMPLE. (Aorist Indicative (or Simple Past), Series II)

a. ga-v-çitl-d-i
   PV-1ANO.M.SG-red-INTR-AOR.INDIC
   “I turned red”

b. ga-∅-çitl-d-i
   PV-2ANO.M.SG-red-INTR-AOR.INDIC
   “You.SG turned red”

c. ga-çitl-d-a
   PV-red-INTR-3ANO.M.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “(S)he turned red”

d. ga-v-çitl-d-i-t
   PV-1ANO.M.SG-red-INTR-AOR.INDIC-PLNOM
   “We turned red”

e. ga-∅-çitl-d-i-t
   PV-2ANO.M.SG-red-INTR-AOR.INDIC-PLNOM
   “You.PL turned red”

3The screeve of Future Subjunctive is used in unreal future conditions and in wishes [Hew95b, p. 240]. For instance, kargi ìkeboda, rom ga-çitl-d-eb-od-e-s [good it.would.be that/if (s)he/it.turns.red] “It would be good if (s)he/it turns red” or net ãv ga-çitl-d-eb-od-e-s [would.that (s)he/it.turns.red] “I wish (s)he/it turns red”. When giving the examples with Future Subjunctive in A.1.6 as well as later in A.2.6 and A.3.6, the particle net/heñeñi-netav “would that” will be meant while not actually presenting it for the sake of space and make the translations as wishes.
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f. ga-çitl-d-nen
PV-red-INTR-3A NOM.PL.AOR.INDIC
“They turned red”

A.1.8. EXAMPLE. (Aorist Subjunctive (or Optative), 4 Series II)

a. ga-v-çitl-d-e
PV-1A NOM.SG-red-INTR-AOR.SUBJ
“[I wish] I turned red”

b. ga-∅-çitl-d-e
PV-2A NOM.SG-red-INTR-AOR.SUBJ
“[I wish] you.SG turned red”

c. ga-çitl-d-e-s
PV-red-INTR-AOR.SUBJ-3A NOM.SG
“[I wish] (s)he turned red”

d. ga-v-çitl-d-e-t
PV-1A NOM.SG-red-INTR-AOR.SUBJ-PL NOM
“[I wish] we turned red”

e. ga-∅-çitl-d-e-t
PV-2A NOM.SG-red-INTR-AOR.SUBJ-PL NOM
“[I wish] you.PL turned red”

f. ga-çitl-d-nen
PV-red-INTR-3A NOM.PL.AOR.SUBJ
“[I wish] they turned red”

A.1.9. EXAMPLE. (Perfect, 5 Series III)

a. ga-v-çitl-eb-ul-var
PV-1A NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP1.SG(=CL NOM.SG)
“I have (apparently) turned red”

b. ga-∅-çitl-eb-ul-xar
PV-2A NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP2.SG(=CL NOM.SG)
“You.SG have (apparently) turned red”

c. ga-çitl-eb-ul-∅
PV-red-INTR-SUBJ-COP3.SG(=3A NOM.SG)
“(S)he has (apparently) turned red”

4The screeve of Aorist Subjunctive is used to express several things among which are also wishes [Hew95b, p. 254]. When giving the examples with Aorist Subjunctive in A.1.8 as well as in A.2.8 and A.3.8 the particle net.x net.xi net.xi “would that” will be meant and given in square brackets in the translations to the examples. However, the particle will not be actually present in Georgian examples for the sake of space.

5The verb forms in the screeve of Perfect (exemplified in A.1.9, A.2.9 and A.3.9) express evidentiality when used in affirmative sentences while in negative ones there is no such reading.

6Example A.1.9c illustrates the copula aris “(s)he/it is” cliticized in its reduced form -a<aris “(s)he/it
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d. **ga-v-[citl-eb-ul-var-t**
   
   &lt;PV-1NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP1.SG(=CL NOM.SG)-PLNOM
   
   “We have (apparently) turned red”

e. **ga-[∅-citl-eb-ul-xar-t**
   
   &lt;PV-2NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP2.SG(=CL NOM.SG)-PLNOM
   
   “You.PL have (apparently) turned red”

f. **ga-[citl-eb-ul-an**
   
   &lt;PV-red-TS-ppart-COP3.PL(=3NOM.PL)
   
   “They have (apparently) turned red”

---

**A.1.10. EXAMPLE.** (Pluperfect, 7 Series III)

a. **ga-v-[citl-eb-ul-igavi**
   
   &lt;PV-1NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP1.SG(=CL NOM.SG)
   
   “I [should] have turned red”

b. **ga-[∅-citl-eb-ul-igavi**
   
   &lt;PV-2NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP2.SG(=CL NOM.SG)
   
   “You.SG [should] have turned red”

c. **ga-[citl-eb-ul-igo**
   
   &lt;PV-red-TS-ppart-COP3.SG(=3NOM.SG)
   
   “(S)he [should] have turned red”

---

is”). Note that only 3rd person copula gets reduced while the 1st and 2nd person forms are the same. See the cliticized copulas -var (<<var “I am”) in Example A.1.9a and -xar (<<xar “You.SG are”) in Example A.1.9b.

Since the cliticized copula -a in A.1.9c is the only affix which refers to the referential properties of the argument taken by the verb, it equals to an agreement marker and will be qualified so in the glosses in this dissertation (see also A.1.9f, A.1.10c, A.1.10f, A.1.11c, A.1.11f, A.3.9a1–a4, A.3.9c1–c4). However, in cases a verb form shows both a cliticized copula and an agreement marker, both referring to the same argument, the copula will be qualified as a clitic (A.1.9a, A.1.9b, A.1.9d, A.1.9e, A.1.10a, A.1.10b, A.1.10d, A.1.10f, A.1.11a, A.1.11b, A.1.11d, A.1.11e, A.3.9c1–c4). See also Footnote 17 in Chapter 2.

The forms of the screeve Pluperfect translate as English past perfect as well as present perfect, depending on a construction they are used. The forms can be used with the particle *netalnetav/netavi “would that” to form a past wish or with a modal particle *unda “should” [Hew95b, p. 267]. For instance, *rom ar ga-[citl-eb-ul-igo, ver ganoarcevdnen ssx-eb-is-gan [that/NEG he.had.turned.into.red NEG they.would.have.distinguished.him.from.them other-PL-GEN-from] “If (s)he had not turned red they would not have told him from others”. Among the particle *netalnetav/netavi “would that” and a modal particle *unda “should” the latter will be meant and given in square brackets in the translations to the examples in A.1.10, A.2.10 or A.3.10. However, the particle will not be actually present in Georgian examples for the sake of space.

The 1st person copulas *vigavi “I was” and *vigavit “we were” get cliticized as -igavi (A.1.10a) and -igavit (A.1.10d) respectively. As for the 2nd person copulas *igavi “you.SG were”, *igavit “you.PL were” or the 3rd person copulas *igo “he was”, *igven “they were”, they keep their shape when cliticized (see -igavi (A.1.10b), -igavit (A.1.10e) and -igo (A.1.10c), -igven (A.1.10f) respectively).
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d. ga-v-cīlt-eb-ul-igavi-t
PV-1A NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP1.SG(=CL NOM.SG)-PL NOM
“We [should] have turned red”

e. ga-∅-cīlt-eb-ul-igavi-t
PV-2A NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP2.SG(=CL NOM.SG)-PL NOM
“You. PL [should] have turned red”

f. ga-cīlt-eb-ul-īqven
PV-red-TS-ppart-COP3.PL(=3A NOM.PL)
“They [should] have turned red”

A.1.11. Example. (III rd Subjunctive, 9 Series III)

a. ga-v-cīlt-eb-ul-īqo10
PV-1A NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP1.SG(=CL NOM.SG)
“[Who said as if] I had turned red”

b. ga-∅-cīlt-eb-ul-īqo
PV-2A NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP2.SG(=CL NOM.SG)
“[Who said as if] you. SG had turned red”

c. ga-cīlt-eb-ul-īqos
PV-red-TS-ppart-COP3.SG(=3A NOM.SG)
“[Who said as if] (s)he had turned red”

d. ga-v-cīlt-eb-ul-īqo-t
PV-1A NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP1.SG(=CL NOM.SG)-PL NOM
“[Who said as if] we had turned red”

e. ga-∅-cīlt-eb-ul-īqo-t
PV-2A NOM.SG-red-TS-ppart-COP2.SG(=CL NOM.SG)-PL NOM
“[Who said as if] you. PL had turned red”

f. ga-cīlt-eb-ul-īqven
PV-red-TS-ppart-COP3.PL(=3A NOM.PL)
“[Who said as if] they had turned red”

9 According to [Sha73, p. 223], the use of the screeve III rd Subjunctive is considerably narrowed in modern Georgian and the forms of the screeve Pluperfect are in use instead. One of the expressions that could require the use of a verb form in III rd Subjunctive is vin tkva, titkos... “who said as if...”. In the examples of the screeve III rd Subjunctive (A.1.11, A.2.11 and A. 3.11) the expression will be meant and given in the square brackets in translation while not giving the Georgian expression itself for the sake of space.

10 The 1st person copulas viq “[if] I were” and viqot “[if] we were” get cliticized as -iqo (A.1.11a) and -iqot (A.1.11d) respectively. As for the 2nd person copulas iqc “[if] you. SG were”, iqot “[if] you. PL were” or the 3rd person copulas iqos “[if] (s)he were”, iqven “[if] they were”, they keep their shape when cliticized (see -iqo (A.1.11b), -iqot (A.1.11e) and -iqos (A.1.11c), -iqven (A.1.11f) respectively).
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A.2 The 1-Argument Unergative -cin- “laugh”

A.2.1. Example. (Present Indicative, Present Sub-Series, Series I)

a. v-i-cin-i
   1\text{ANOM-SG-PRV-laugh-TS}
   “I am laughing”; “I laugh”

b. \emptyset-i-cin-i
   2\text{ANOM-SG-PRV-laugh-TS}
   “You.SG are laughing”; “You.SG laugh”

c. \emptyset^{11}-i-cin-i-s
   3\text{BDAT-SG-PRV-laugh-TS-3\text{ANOM-SG}}
   “(S)he is laughing”; “(S)he laughs”

d. v-i-cin-i-t
   1\text{ANOM-SG-PRV-laugh-TS-PL-NOM}
   “We are laughing”; “We laugh”

e. \emptyset-i-cin-i-t
   2\text{ANOM-SG-PRV-laugh-TS-PL-NOM}
   “You.PL are laughing”; “You.PL laugh”

f. \emptyset-i-cin-i-an
   3\text{BDAT-SG-PRV-laugh-TS-3\text{ANOM-PL}}
   “They are laughing”; “They laugh”

A.2.2. Example. (Imperfect Indicative, Present Sub-Series, Series I)

a. v-i-cin-od-i
   1\text{ANOM-SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-INDIC}
   “I was laughing”

b. \emptyset-i-cin-od-i
   2\text{ANOM-SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-INDIC}
   “You.SG were laughing”

c. \emptyset-i-cin-od-a
   3\text{BDAT-SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-3\text{ANOM-SG}}
   “(S)he was laughing”

d. v-i-cin-od-i-t
   1\text{ANOM-SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-INDIC-PL-NOM}
   “We were laughing”

e. \emptyset-i-cin-od-i-t
   2\text{ANOM-SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-INDIC-PL-NOM}
   “You.PL were laughing”

\footnote{11 See Footnote 18 in Chapter 2.}
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f. \( \emptyset \text{-cin-} \text{od-nen} \)
   \( 3B_{DAT} \text{-SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-}3A_{NOM.PL} \)
   “They were laughing”

A.2.3. Example. (Present Subjunctive,\(^\text{12}\) Present Sub-Series, Series I)
   a. \( v-i\text{-cin-}od\text{-e} \)
      \( 1A_{NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-SUBJ} \)
      “If I were laughing”
   b. \( \emptyset \text{-i-cin-od-} \text{e} \)
      \( 2A_{NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-SUBJ} \)
      “If you were laughing”
   c. \( \emptyset \text{-i-cin-od-} \text{e-s} \)
      \( 3B_{DAT.SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-SUBJ-3A_{NOM.SG}} \)
      “If (s)he were laughing”
   d. \( v-i\text{-cin-od-} \text{e-}t \)
      \( 1A_{NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL_{NOM}} \)
      “If we were laughing”
   e. \( \emptyset \text{-i-cin-od-} \text{e-}t \)
      \( 2A_{NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL_{NOM}} \)
      “If you.PL were laughing”
   f. \( \emptyset \text{-i-cin-od-nen} \)
      \( 3B_{DAT.SG-PRV-laugh-IMPERF-3A_{NOM.PL}} \)
      “If they were laughing”

A.2.4. Example. (Future Indicative, Future Sub-Series, Series I)
   a. \( ga-v-i\text{-cin-} \text{eb} \)
      \( PV-1A_{NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-TS} \)
      “I will laugh”
   b. \( ga-\emptyset \text{-i-cin-} \text{eb} \)
      \( PV-2A_{NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-TS} \)
      “You.SG will laugh”
   c. \( ga-\emptyset \text{-i-cin-} \text{eb-s} \)
      \( PV-3B_{DAT.SG-PRV-laugh-TS-3A_{NOM.SG}} \)
      “(S)he will laugh”
   d. \( ga-v-i\text{-cin-} \text{eb-}t \)
      \( PV-1A_{NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-TS-PL_{NOM}} \)
      “We will laugh”
   e. \( ga-\emptyset \text{-i-cin-} \text{eb-}t \)
      \( PV-2A_{NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-TS-PL_{NOM}} \)
      “You.PL will laugh”

\(^{12}\)See Footnote 2 in Appendix A.1.
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f. \( ga∅-i-cin-eb-en \)
\( \text{PV-3B}_{\text{DAT}} \cdot \text{SG-PRV-laugh-3A}_{\text{NOM,PL}} \)
“They will laugh”

A.2.5. EXAMPLE. (Conditional, Future Sub-Series, Series I)

a. \( ga-v-i-cin-eb-d-i \)
\( \text{PV-1}_{\text{ANOM,SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-INDIC}} \)
“I would laugh”

b. \( ga∅-i-cin-eb-d-i \)
\( \text{PV-2}_{\text{ANOM,SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-INDIC}} \)
“You, SG would laugh”

c. \( ga∅-i-cin-eb-d-a \)
\( \text{PV-3}_{\text{B}_{\text{DAT}} \cdot \text{SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-INDIC}} \)
“(S)he would laugh”

d. \( ga-v-i-cin-eb-d-i-t \)
\( \text{PV-1}_{\text{ANOM,SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-INDIC-3PL-NOM}} \)
“We would laugh”

e. \( ga∅-i-cin-eb-d-i-t \)
\( \text{PV-2}_{\text{ANOM,SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-INDIC-3PL-NOM}} \)
“You, PL would laugh”

f. \( ga∅-i-cin-eb-d-nen \)
\( \text{PV-3}_{\text{B}_{\text{DAT}} \cdot \text{SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-3PL-NOM}} \)
“They would laugh”

A.2.6. EXAMPLE. (Future Subjunctive,\textsuperscript{13} Future Sub-Series, Series I)

a. \( ga-v-i-cin-eb-d-e \)
\( \text{PV-1}_{\text{ANOM,SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-SUBJ}} \)
“[I wish] I laugh”

b. \( ga∅-i-cin-eb-d-e \)
\( \text{PV-2}_{\text{ANOM,SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-SUBJ}} \)
“[I wish] you, SG laugh”

c. \( ga∅-i-cin-eb-d-e-s \)
\( \text{PV-3}_{\text{B}_{\text{DAT}} \cdot \text{SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3ANOM,SG}} \)
“[I wish] (s)he laughs”

d. \( ga-v-i-cin-eb-d-e-t \)
\( \text{PV-1}_{\text{ANOM,SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3PL-NOM}} \)
“[I wish] we laugh”

e. \( ga∅-i-cin-eb-d-e-t \)
\( \text{PV-2}_{\text{ANOM,SG-PRV-laugh-3TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3PL-NOM}} \)
“[I wish] you, PL laugh”

\textsuperscript{13}See Footnote 3 in Appendix A.1.
A.2. The 1-Argument Unergative -cin- “laugh”

f. ga-∅-i-cin-eb-d-nen
   PV-3DAT.SG-PRV-laugh-TS-IMPERF-3NOM.PL
   “[I wish] they laugh”

A.2.7. EXAMPLE. (Aorist Indicative (or Simple Past), Series II)
   a. ga-v-i-cin-e
      PV-1ERG.SG-PRV-laugh-AOR.INDIC
      “I laughed”
   b. ga-∅-i-cin-e
      PV-2ERG.SG-PRV-laugh-AOR.INDIC
      “You, SG laughed”
   c. ga-∅-i-cin-a
      PV-3NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-3ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
      “(S)he laughed”
   d. ga-v-i-cin-e-t
      PV-1ERG.SG-PRV-laugh-AOR.INDIC-PLERG
      “We laughed”
   e. ga-∅-i-cin-e-t
      PV-2ERG.SG-PRV-laugh-AOR.INDIC-PLERG
      “You, PL laughed”
   f. ga-∅-i-cin-es
      PV-3NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-3ERG.PL.AOR.INDIC
      “They laughed”

A.2.8. EXAMPLE. (Aorist Subjunctive (or Optative), Series II)
   a. ga-v-i-cin-o
      PV-1ERG.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ
      “[I wish] I laughed”
   b. ga-∅-i-cin-o
      PV-2NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ
      “[I wish] you, SG laughed”
   c. ga-∅-i-cin-o-s
      PV-3NOM.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-3ERG.SG
      “[I wish] (s)he laughed”
   d. ga-v-i-cin-o-t
      PV-1ERG.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-PLERG
      “[I wish] we laughed”
   e. ga-∅-i-cin-o-t
      PV-2ERG.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-PLERG
      “[I wish] you, PL laughed”

14 See Footnote 4 in Appendix A.1
f. ga∅-i-cin-o-n
PV-3BNOM,SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-3AERG.PL
 “[I wish] they laughed”

A.2.9. EXAMPLE. (Perfect,15 Series III)
  a. ga-m-i-cin-i-a
PV-1BDAT,SG-PRV-laugh-PERF-3ANOM,SG
 “I have (apparently) laughed”
  b. ga-g-i-cin-i-a
PV-2BDAT,SG-PRV-laugh-PERF-3ANOM,SG
 “You.SG have (apparently) laughed”
  c. ga∅-u-cin-i-a
PV-3BDAT,SG-PRV-laugh-PERF-3ANOM,SG
 “(S)he has (apparently) laughed”
  d. ga-gv-i-cin-i-a
PV-1BDAT,PL-PRV-laugh-PERF-3ANOM,SG
 “We have (apparently) laughed”
  e. ga-g-i-cin-i-a-t
PV-2BDAT,SG-PRV-laugh-PERF-3ANOM,SG,PLDAT
 “You.PL have (apparently) laughed”
  f. ga∅-u-cin-i-a-t
PV-3BDAT,SG-PRV-laugh-PERF-3ANOM,SG,PLDAT
 “They have (apparently) laughed”

A.2.10. EXAMPLE. (Pluperfect,16 Series III)
  a. ga-m-e-cin-a
PV-1BDAT,SG-PRV-laugh-3ANOM,SG
 “I [should] have laughed”
  b. ga-g-e-cin-a
PV-2BDAT,SG-PRV-laugh-3ANOM,SG
 “You.SG [should] have laughed”
  c. ga∅-e-cin-a
PV-3BDAT,SG-PRV-laugh-3ANOM,SG
 “(S)he [should] have laughed”
  d. ga-gv-e-cin-a
PV-1BDAT,PL-PRV-laugh-3ANOM,SG
 “We [should] have laughed”
  e. ga-g-e-cin-a-t
PV-2BDAT,SG-PRV-laugh-3ANOM,SG,PLDAT
 “You.PL [should] have laughed”

15 See Footnote 5 in Appendix A.1.
16 See Footnote 7 in Appendix A.1.
A.3. The Transitive -čr-/-čer- “wound”

Throughout A.3.1–A.3.11 the examples (a1)–(a4) illustrate the verb forms taking the 1st person subject and the 2nd person direct object; (b1)–(b4) illustrate the verb forms taking the 1st person subject and the 3rd person direct object; (c1)–(c4) — the 2nd person subject and the 1st person direct object; (d1)–(d4) — the 2nd person subject and the 3rd person direct object; (e1)–(e4) — the 3rd person subject and the 1st person direct object; (f1)–(f4) — the 3rd person subject and the 2nd person direct object and (g1)–(g4) — the 3rd person subject and the 3rd person direct object.

A.3.1. EXAMPLE. (Present Indicative, Present Sub-Series, Series I)

(a1) 2_BDAT.SG-licit-TS
“I am wounding you.SG”; “I wound you.SG”

A.2.11. EXAMPLE. (IIIrd Subjunctive,17 Series III)

a. ga-m-e-cin-o-s
PV-1BDAT.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-3ANOM.SG
“[Who said as if] I had laughed”

b. ga-g-e-cin-o-s
PV-2BDAT.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-3ANOM.SG
“[Who said as if] you.SG had laughed”

c. ga-∅-e-cin-o-s
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-3ANOM.SG
“[Who said as if] (s)he had laughed”

d. ga-gv-e-cin-o-s
PV-1BDAT.PL-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-3ANOM.SG
“[Who said as if] we had laughed”

e. ga-g-e-cin-o-t
PV-2BDAT.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-PLDAT
“[Who said as if] you.PL had laughed”

f. ga-∅-e-cin-o-t
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-laugh-SUBJ-PLDAT
“[Who said as if] they had laughed”

17See Footnote 9 in Appendix A.1.
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a3. \( g-\text{c}r-\text{i-t} \)
\( 2B_{\text{DAT.SG-wound-TS-PL-NOM}} \)
“We are wounding you.SG”; “We wound you.PL”

a4. \( g-\text{c}r-\text{i-t} \)
\( 2B_{\text{DAT.SG-wound-TS-PL}} \)
“We are wounding you.PL”; “We wound you.PL”

b1. \( v-\text{c}r-\text{i} \)
\( 1A_{\text{NOM.SG-wound-TS}} \)
“I am wounding him/her”; “I wound him/her”

b2. \( v-\text{c}r-\text{i} \)
\( 1A_{\text{NOM.SG-wound-TS}} \)
“I am wounding them”; “I wound them”

b3. \( v-\text{c}r-\text{i-t} \)
\( 1A_{\text{NOM.SG-wound-TS-PL-NOM}} \)
“We are wounding him/her”; “We wound him/her”

b4. \( v-\text{c}r-\text{i-t} \)
\( 1A_{\text{NOM.SG-wound-TS-PL-NOM}} \)
“We are wounding them”; “We wound them”

c1. \( m-\text{c}r-\text{i} \)
\( 1B_{\text{DAT.SG-wound-TS}} \)
“You.SG are wounding me”; “You.SG wound me”

c2. \( gv-\text{c}r-\text{i} \)
\( 1B_{\text{DAT.PL-wound-TS}} \)
“You.SG are wounding us”; “You.SG wound us”

c3. \( m-\text{c}r-\text{i-t} \)
\( 1B_{\text{DAT.SG-wound-TS-PL-NOM}} \)
“You.PL are wounding me”; “You.PL wound me”

c4. \( gv-\text{c}r-\text{i-t} \)
\( 1B_{\text{DAT.PL-wound-TS-PL-NOM}} \)
“You.PL are wounding us”; “You.PL wound us”

\(^{18}\) If after comparing the forms \( g-\text{c}r-\text{i} \) (A.3.1a1) vs. \( g-\text{c}r-\text{i-t} \) (A.3.1a2) the plural marker \( -t \) can be attributed to the dative marked direct object argument, and if after comparing the forms \( g-\text{c}r-\text{i} \) (A.3.1a1) vs. \( r-\text{c}r-\text{i-t} \) (A.3.1a3) the plural marker \( -t \) can be attributed to the nominative marked subject argument, the plural marker \( -t \) in A.3.1a4 can potentially be triggered either by the subject or by the direct object argument. However, since it is impossible to decide exactly which one triggers the \( -t \), the suffix will be glossed as PL without indicating in the index the case of the argument triggering the marker. The same applies to those examples where the verb form takes the 1st person plural subject and the 2nd person plural direct object such as A.3.2a4, A.3.3a4, A.3.4a4, A.3.5a4, A.3.6a4, A.3.7a4, A.3.8a4 or in the TAM Series III to the forms taking the 2nd person plural subject and the 1st person plural direct object A.3.9c4, A.3.10c4, A.3.11c4.
A.3. The Transitive -čr-/čer- “wound”

d1. φ-čr-i
   2ANOM.SG-wound-TS
   “You.SG are wounding him/her”; “You.SG wound him/her”

d2. φ-čr-i
   2ANOM.SG-wound-TS
   “You.SG are wounding them”; “You.SG wound them”

d3. φ-čr-i-t
   2ANOM.SG-wound-TS-PLNOM
   “You.PL are wounding him/her”; “You.PL wound him/her”

d4. φ-čr-i-t
   2ANOM.SG-wound-TS-PLNOM
   “You.PL are wounding them”; “You.PL wound them”

e1. m-čr-i-s
   1BDATE.SG-wound-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “(S)he is wounding me”; “(S)he wounds me”

e2. gv-čr-i-s
   1BDATE.PL-wound-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “(S)he is wounding us”; “(S)he wounds us”

e3. m-čr-i-an
   1BDATE.SG-wound-TS-3ANOM.PL
   “They are wounding me”; “They wound me”

e4. gv-čr-i-an
   1BDATE.PL-wound-TS-3ANOM.PL
   “They are wounding us”; “They wound us”

f1. g-čr-i-s
   2BDATE.SG-wound-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “(S)he is wounding you.SG”; “(S)he wounds you.SG”

f2. g-čr-i-t
   2BDATE.SG-wound-TS-PLDATE
   “(S)he is wounding you.PL”; “(S)he wounds you.PL”

f3. g-čr-i-an
   2BDATE.SG-wound-TS-3ANOM.PL
   “They are wounding you.SG”; “They wound you.SG”

f4. g-čr-i-an
   2BDATE.SG-wound-TS-3ANOM.PL
   “They are wounding you.PL”; “They wound you.PL”

g1. φ-čr-i-s
   3BDATE.SG-wound-TS-3ANOM.SG
   “(S)he is wounding him/her”; “(S)he wounds him/her”
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g2. ∅-č-r-i-s
   3B\text{DAT}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-3A\text{NOM}.\text{SG}
   “(S)he is wounding them”; “(S)he wounds them”

g3. ∅-č-r-i-an
   3B\text{DAT}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-3A\text{NOM}.\text{PL}
   “They are wounding him/her”; “They wound him/her”

A.3.2. Example. (Imperfect Indicative, Present Sub-Series, Series I)

a1. g-č-r-i-d-i
   2B\text{DAT}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC}
   “I was wounding you.\text{SG}”

a2. g-č-r-i-d-i-t
   2B\text{DAT}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC-PL}\text{DAT}
   “I was wounding you.\text{PL}”

a3. g-č-r-i-d-i-t
   2B\text{DAT}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC-PL}\text{NOM}
   “We were wounding you.\text{SG}”

a4. g-č-r-i-d-i-t
   2B\text{DAT}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC-PL}
   “We were wounding you.\text{PL}”

b1. v-č-r-i-d-i
   1A\text{NOM}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC}
   “I was wounding him/her”

b2. v-č-r-i-d-i
   1A\text{NOM}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC}
   “I was wounding them”

b3. v-č-r-i-d-i-t
   1A\text{NOM}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC-PL}\text{NOM}
   “We were wounding him/her”

b4. v-č-r-i-d-i-t
   1A\text{NOM}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC-PL}\text{NOM}
   “We were wounding them”

c1. m-č-r-i-d-i
   1B\text{DAT}.\text{SG}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC}
   “You.\text{SG} were wounding me”

c2. gv-č-r-i-d-i
   1B\text{DAT}.\text{PL}-\text{wound-}TS-\text{IMPERF-INDIC}
   “You.\text{SG} were wounding us”
A.3. The Transitive -čr-/čer- “wound”

\[ c3. \quad m-čr-i-d-i-t \]
\[ 1B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM \]
\[ “You.PL were wounding me” \]

\[ c4. \quad gv-čr-i-d-i-t \]
\[ 1B_{DAT}.PL-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM \]
\[ “You.PL were wounding us” \]

\[ d1. \quad ɔ-čr-i-d-i \]
\[ 2A_{NOM}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC \]
\[ “You.SG were wounding him/her” \]

\[ d2. \quad ɔ-čr-i-d-i \]
\[ 2A_{NOM}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC \]
\[ “You.SG were wounding them” \]

\[ d3. \quad ɔ-čr-i-d-i-t \]
\[ 2A_{NOM}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM \]
\[ “You.PL were wounding him/her” \]

\[ d4. \quad ɔ-čr-i-d-i-t \]
\[ 2A_{NOM}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM \]
\[ “You.PL were wounding them” \]

\[ e1. \quad m-čr-i-d-a \]
\[ 1B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM}.SG \]
\[ “(S)he was wounding me” \]

\[ e2. \quad gv-čr-i-d-a \]
\[ 1B_{DAT}.PL-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM}.SG \]
\[ “(S)he was wounding us” \]

\[ e3. \quad m-čr-i-d-nen \]
\[ 1B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM}.PL \]
\[ “They were wounding me” \]

\[ e4. \quad gv-čr-i-d-nen \]
\[ 1B_{DAT}.PL-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM}.PL \]
\[ “They were wounding us” \]

\[ f1. \quad g-čr-i-d-a \]
\[ 2B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM}.SG \]
\[ “(S)he was wounding you.SG” \]

\[ f2. \quad g-čr-i-d-a-t \]
\[ 2B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM}.SG-PL_{DAT} \]
\[ “(S)he was wounding you.PL” \]

\[ f3. \quad g-čr-i-d-nen \]
\[ 2B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM}.PL \]
\[ “They were wounding you.SG” \]
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f4. g-čr-i-d-nen
   2B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM.PL}
   “They were wounding you,PL”

g1. ∅-čr-i-d-a
   3B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM.SG}
   “(S)he was wounding him/her”

g2. ∅-čr-i-d-a
   3B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM.SG}
   “(S)he was wounding them”

g3. ∅-čr-i-d-nen
   3B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM.PL}
   “They were wounding him/her”

g4. ∅-čr-i-d-nen
   3B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3A_{NOM.PL}
   “They were wounding them”

A.3.3. Example. (Present Subjunctive, 19 Present Sub-Series, Series I)

a1. g-čr-i-d-e
   2B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[If] I were wounding you,SG”

a2. g-čr-i-d-e-t
   2B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL_{DAT}
   “[If] I were wounding you,PL”

a3. g-čr-i-d-e-t
   2B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL_{NOM}
   “[If] we were wounding you,SG”

a4. g-čr-i-d-e-t
   2B_{DAT}.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL
   “[If] we were wounding you,PL”

b1. v-čr-i-d-e
   1A_{NOM.SG}-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[If] I were wounding him/her”

b2. v-čr-i-d-e
   1A_{NOM.SG}-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[If] I were wounding them”

b3. v-čr-i-d-e-t
   1A_{NOM.SG}-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL_{NOM}
   “[If] we were wounding him/her”

19See Footnote 2 in Appendix A.1.
b4. \(v\-\text{čr-i-d-e-t}\)
\(1_{\text{NOM},\text{SG}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL\_NOM
“[If] we were wounding them”

c1. \(m\-\text{čr-i-d-e}\)
\(1_{\text{DAT},\text{SG}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
“[If] you.SG were wounding me”

c2. \(gy\-\text{čr-i-d-e}\)
\(1_{\text{DAT},\text{PL}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
“[If] you.SG were wounding us”

c3. \(m\-\text{čr-i-d-e-t}\)
\(1_{\text{DAT},\text{SG}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL\_NOM
“[If] you.PL were wounding me”

c4. \(gy\-\text{čr-i-d-e-t}\)
\(1_{\text{DAT},\text{PL}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL\_NOM
“[If] you.PL were wounding us”

d1. \(ϕ\-\text{čr-i-d-e}\)
\(2_{\text{ANOM},\text{SG}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
“[If] you.SG were wounding him/her”

d2. \(ϕ\-\text{čr-i-d-e}\)
\(2_{\text{ANOM},\text{SG}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
“[If] you.SG were wounding them”

d3. \(ϕ\-\text{čr-i-d-e-t}\)
\(2_{\text{ANOM},\text{SG}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL\_NOM
“[If] you.PL were wounding him/her”

d4. \(ϕ\-\text{čr-i-d-e-t}\)
\(2_{\text{ANOM},\text{SG}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL\_NOM
“[If] you.PL were wounding them”

e1. \(m\-\text{čr-i-d-e-s}\)
\(1_{\text{DAT},\text{SG}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3\_ANOM,\text{SG}
“[If] (s)he were wounding me”

e2. \(gy\-\text{čr-i-d-e-s}\)
\(1_{\text{DAT},\text{PL}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3\_ANOM,\text{SG}
“[If] (s)he were wounding us”

e3. \(m\-\text{čr-i-d-nen}\)
\(1_{\text{DAT},\text{SG}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-3\_ANOM,\text{PL}
“[If] they were wounding me”

e4. \(gy\-\text{čr-i-d-nen}\)
\(1_{\text{DAT},\text{PL}}\)-wound-TS-IMPERF-3\_ANOM,\text{PL}
“[If] they were wounding us”
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f1. g-čr-i-d-e-s
   2B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3\_NOM\_SG
   “[If] (s)he were wounding you.SG”

f2. g-čr-i-d-e-t
   2B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL\_DAT
   “[If] (s)he were wounding you.PL”

f3. g-čr-i-d-den
   2B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3\_NOM\_PL
   “[If] they were wounding you.SG”

f4. g-čr-i-d-den
   2B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3\_NOM\_PL
   “[If] they were wounding you.PL”

g1. ę-čr-i-d-e-s
   3B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3\_NOM\_SG
   “[If] (s)he were wounding him/her”

g2. ę-čr-i-d-e-s
   3B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-3\_NOM\_SG
   “[If] (s)he were wounding them”

g3. ę-čr-i-d-den
   3B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3\_NOM\_PL
   “[If] they were wounding him/her”

g4. ę-čr-i-d-den
   3B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3\_NOM\_PL
   “[If] they were wounding them”

A.3.4. Example. (Future Indicative, Future Sub-Series, Series I)

a1. da-g-čr-i
   PV-2B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS
   “I shall wound you.SG”

a2. da-g-čr-i-t
   PV-2B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-PL\_DAT
   “I shall wound you.PL”

a3. da-g-čr-i-t
   PV-2B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-PL\_NOM
   “We shall wound you.SG”

a4. da-g-čr-i-t
   PV-2B\_DAT\_SG-wound-TS-PL
   “We shall wound you.PL”

b1. da-v-čr-i
   PV-1\_NOM\_SG-wound-TS
   “I shall wound him/her”
b2. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{v-čr-i} \]
\( \text{PV-1NOM-SG-wound-TS} \)
“I shall wound them”

b3. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{v-čr-i-t} \]
\( \text{PV-1NOM-SG-wound-TS-PLNOM} \)
“We shall wound him/her”

b4. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{v-čr-i-t} \]
\( \text{PV-1NOM-SG-wound-TS-PLNOM} \)
“We shall wound them”

c1. 
\[ \text{da-m-čr-i} \]
\( \text{PV-1DAT-SG-wound-TS} \)
“You.SG will wound me”

c2. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{gv-čr-i} \]
\( \text{PV-1DAT-PL-wound-TS} \)
“You.SG will wound us”

c3. 
\[ \text{da-m-čr-i-t} \]
\( \text{PV-1DAT-SG-wound-TS-PLNOM} \)
“You.PL will wound me”

c4. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{gv-čr-i-t} \]
\( \text{PV-1DAT-PL-wound-TS-PLNOM} \)
“You.PL will wound us”

d1. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{∅-čr-i} \]
\( \text{PV-2NOM-SG-wound-TS} \)
“You.SG will wound him/her”

d2. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{∅-čr-i} \]
\( \text{PV-2NOM-SG-wound-TS} \)
“You.SG will wound them”

d3. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{∅-čr-i-t} \]
\( \text{PV-2NOM-SG-wound-TS-PLNOM} \)
“You.PL will wound him/her”

d4. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{∅-čr-i-t} \]
\( \text{PV-2NOM-SG-wound-TS-PLNOM} \)
“You.PL will wound them”

e1. 
\[ \text{da-m-čr-i-s} \]
\( \text{PV-1DAT-SG-wound-TS-3NOM-SG} \)
“(S)he will wound me”

e2. 
\[ \text{da-} \text{gv-čr-i-s} \]
\( \text{PV-1DAT-PL-wound-TS-3NOM-SG} \)
“(S)he will wound us”
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e3. \(da-m\-\text{Čr}-i\-an\)
   \(PV\-\text{1BDAT.SG-wound-TS-3\text{ANOM.PL}}\)
   “They will wound me”
e4. \(da-gv\-\text{Čr}-i\-an\)
   \(PV\-\text{1BDAT.PL-wound-TS-3\text{ANOM.PL}}\)
   “They will wound us”
f1. \(da-g\-\text{Čr-i-s}\)
   \(PV\-\text{2BDAT.SG-wound-TS-3\text{ANOM.SG}}\)
   “(S)he will wound you.SG”
f2. \(da-g\-\text{Čr-i-t}\)
   \(PV\-\text{2BDAT.SG-wound-TS-PLDAT}\)
   “(S)he will wound you.PL”
f3. \(da-g\-\text{Čr-i-an}\)
   \(PV\-\text{2BDAT.SG-wound-TS-3\text{ANOM.PL}}\)
   “They will wound you.PL”
f4. \(da-g\-\text{Čr-i-an}\)
   \(PV\-\text{2BDAT.SG-wound-TS-3\text{ANOM.PL}}\)
   “They will wound you.SG”
g1. \(da-\emptyset\-\text{Čr-i-s}\)
   \(PV\-\text{3BDAT.SG-wound-TS-3\text{ANOM.SG}}\)
   “(S)he will wound him/her”
g2. \(da-\emptyset\-\text{Čr-i-s}\)
   \(PV\-\text{3BDAT.SG-wound-TS-3\text{ANOM.SG}}\)
   “(S)he will wound them”
g3. \(da-\emptyset\-\text{Čr-i-an}\)
   \(PV\-\text{3BDAT.SG-wound-TS-3\text{ANOM.PL}}\)
   “They will wound him/her”
g4. \(da-\emptyset\-\text{Čr-i-an}\)
   \(PV\-\text{3BDAT.SG-wound-TS-3\text{ANOM.PL}}\)
   “They will wound them”

**A.3.5. Example.** (Conditional, Future Sub-Series, Series I)
a1. \(da-g\-\text{Čr-i-d-i}\)
   \(PV\-\text{2BDAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC}\)
   “I would wound you.SG”
a2. \(da-g\-\text{Čr-i-d-i-t}\)
   \(PV\-\text{2BDAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLDAT}\)
   “I would wound you.PL”
a3. \(da-g\-\text{Čr-i-d-i-t}\)
   \(PV\-\text{2BDAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM}\)
   “We would wound you.SG”
a4. da-g-čr-i-d-i-t
   PV-2BDAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PL
   “We would wound you.PL”

b1. da-v-čr-i-d-i
   PV-1NOM-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC
   “I would wound him/her”

b2. da-v-čr-i-d-i
   PV-1NOM-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC
   “I would wound them”

b3. da-v-čr-i-d-i-t
   PV-1NOM-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM
   “We would wound him/her”

b4. da-v-čr-i-d-i-t
   PV-1NOM-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM
   “We would wound them”

c1. da-m-čr-i-d-i
   PV-1BDAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC
   “You.SG would wound me”

c2. da-gv-čr-i-d-i
   PV-1BDAT.PL-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC
   “You.SG would wound us”

c3. da-m-čr-i-d-i-t
   PV-1BDAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM
   “You.PL would wound me”

c4. da-gv-čr-i-d-i-t
   PV-1BDAT.PL-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM
   “You.PL would wound us”

d1. da-∅-čr-i-d-i
   PV-2ANOM-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC
   “You.SG would wound him/her”

d2. da-∅-čr-i-d-i
   PV-2ANOM-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC
   “You.SG would wound them”

d3. da-∅-čr-i-d-i-t
   PV-2ANOM-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM
   “You.PL would wound him/her”

d4. da-∅-čr-i-d-i-t
   PV-2ANOM-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-INDIC-PLNOM
   “You.PL would wound them”
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A.3.6. Example. (Future Subjunctive\textsuperscript{20}, Future Sub-Series, Series I)

\textsuperscript{20}See Footnote 3 in Appendix A.1.
A.3. The Transitive -čr-/čer- “wound”

a1. *da-g-čr-i-d-e*
   PV-2B_DAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[I wish] I wounded you.SG”

a2. *da-g-čr-i-d-e-t*
   PV-2B_DAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL_DAT
   “[I wish] I wounded you.PL”

a3. *da-g-čr-i-d-e-t*
   PV-2B_DAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL NOM
   “[I wish] we wounded you.SG”

a4. *da-g-čr-i-d-e-t*
   PV-2B_DAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL
   “[I wish] we wounded you.PL”

b1. *da-v-čr-i-d-e*
   PV-1A NOM.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[I wish] I wounded him/her”

b2. *da-v-čr-i-d-e*
   PV-1A NOM.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[I wish] I wounded them”

b3. *da-v-čr-i-d-e-t*
   PV-1A NOM.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL NOM
   “[I wish] we wounded him/her”

b4. *da-v-čr-i-d-e-t*
   PV-1A NOM.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL NOM
   “[I wish] we wounded them”

c1. *da-m-čr-i-d-e*
   PV-1B DAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[I wish] you.SG wounded me”

c2. *da-gv-čr-i-d-e*
   PV-1B DAT.PL-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[I wish] you.SG wounded us”

c3. *da-m-čr-i-d-e-t*
   PV-1B DAT.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL NOM
   “[I wish] you.PL wounded me”

c4. *da-gv-čr-i-d-e-t*
   PV-1B DAT.PL-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ-PL NOM
   “[I wish] you.PL wounded us”

d1. *da-∅-čr-i-d-e*
   PV-2A NOM.SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-SUBJ
   “[I wish] you.SG wounded him/her”
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d2. \(da\)-\(\phi\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(e\)
PV-\(2A_{NOM}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-SUBJ
“I wish you.\(SG\) wounded them”
d3. \(da\)-\(\phi\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(e\)-\(t\)
PV-\(2A_{NOM}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-SUBJ-\(PL_{NOM}\)
“I wish you.\(PL\) wounded him/her”
d4. \(da\)-\(\phi\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(e\)-\(t\)
PV-\(2A_{NOM}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-SUBJ-\(PL_{NOM}\)
“I wish you.\(PL\) wounded them”
e1. \(da\)-\(m\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(e\)-\(s\)
PV-\(1B_{DAT}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-SUBJ-\(3A_{NOM}\)-\(SG\)
“I wish (s)he wounded me”
e2. \(da\)-\(gv\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(e\)-\(s\)
PV-\(1B_{DAT}\)-\(PL\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-SUBJ-\(3A_{NOM}\)-\(SG\)
“I wish (s)he wounded us”
e3. \(da\)-\(m\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(n\)-\(en\)
PV-\(1B_{DAT}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-\(3A_{NOM}\)-\(PL\)
“I wish they wounded me”
e4. \(da\)-\(gv\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(n\)-\(en\)
PV-\(1B_{DAT}\)-\(PL\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-\(3A_{NOM}\)-\(PL\)
“I wish they wounded us”
f1. \(da\)-\(g\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(e\)-\(s\)
PV-\(2B_{DAT}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-SUBJ-\(3A_{NOM}\)-\(SG\)
“I wish (s)he wounded you.\(SG\)”
f2. \(da\)-\(g\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(e\)-\(t\)
PV-\(2B_{DAT}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-SUBJ-\(PL_{DAT}\)
“I wish (s)he wounded you.\(PL\)”
f3. \(da\)-\(g\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(n\)-\(en\)
PV-\(2B_{DAT}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-\(3A_{NOM}\)-\(PL\)
“I wish they wounded you.\(SG\)”
f4. \(da\)-\(g\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(n\)-\(en\)
PV-\(2B_{DAT}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-\(3A_{NOM}\)-\(PL\)
“I wish they wounded you.\(PL\)”
g1. \(da\)-\(\phi\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(e\)-\(s\)
PV-\(3B_{DAT}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-SUBJ-\(3A_{NOM}\)-\(SG\)
“I wish (s)he wounded him/her”
g2. \(da\)-\(\phi\)-\(cr\)-\(i\)-\(d\)-\(e\)-\(s\)
PV-\(3B_{DAT}\)-\(SG\)-\(wound\)-\(TS\)-IMPERF-SUBJ-\(3A_{NOM}\)-\(SG\)
“I wish (s)he wounded them”
A.3. The Transitive -čer-/čer- “wound”

3. da-∅-čer-i-d-nen
   PV-3BDAT-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM-PL
   “[I wish] they wounded him/her”

g4. da-∅-čer-i-d-nen
   PV-3BDAT-SG-wound-TS-IMPERF-3ANOM-PL
   “[I wish] they wounded them”

A.3.7. EXAMPLE. (Aorist Indicative (or Simple Past), Series II)

a1. da-g-čer-i
   PV-2B NOM-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC
   “I wounded you. SG”

a2. da-g-čer-i-t
   PV-2B NOM-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC-PL NOM
   “I wounded you. PL”

a3. da-g-čer-i-t
   PV-2B NOM-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC-PL ERG
   “We wounded him/her”

a4. da-g-čer-i-t
   PV-2B NOM-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC-PL
   “We wounded you. PL”

b1. da-v-čer-i
   PV-1AERG-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC
   “I wounded him/her”

b2. da-v-čer-i
   PV-1AERG-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC
   “I wounded them”

b3. da-v-čer-i-t
   PV-1AERG-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC-PL ERG
   “We wounded him/her”

b4. da-v-čer-i-t
   PV-1AERG-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC-PL ERG
   “We wounded them”

c1. da-m-čer-i
   PV-1B NOM-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC
   “You. SG wounded me”

c2. da-gv-čer-i
   PV-1B NOM-PL-wound-AOR.INDIC
   “You. SG wounded us”

c3. da-m-čer-i-t
   PV-1B NOM-SG-wound-AOR.INDIC-PL ERG
   “You. PL wounded me”
Appendix A. Some Classes of Verbs in the Screves of the Three TAM Series

c4. da-gv-čer-i-t
   PV-1B N NOM, PL-wound-AOR. INDIC-PL ERG
   “You.PL wounded us”

d1. da-ψ-čer-i
   PV-2A ERG, SG-wound-AOR. INDIC
   “You.SG wounded him/her”

d2. da-ψ-čer-i
   PV-2A ERG, SG-wound-AOR. INDIC
   “You.SG wounded them”

d3. da-ψ-čer-i-t
   PV-2A ERG, SG-wound-AOR. INDIC-PL ERG
   “You.PL wounded him/her”

d4. da-ψ-čer-i-t
   PV-2A ERG, SG-wound-AOR. INDIC-PL ERG
   “You.PL wounded them”

e1. da-m-čr-a
   PV-1B N NOM, SG-wound-3A ERG, SG.AOR. INDIC
   “(S)he wounded me”

e2. da-gv-čr-a
   PV-1B N NOM, PL-wound-3A ERG, SG.AOR. INDIC
   “(S)he wounded us”

e3. da-m-čr-es
   PV-1B N NOM, SG-wound-3A ERG, PL.AOR. INDIC
   “They wounded me”

e4. da-gv-čr-es
   PV-1B N NOM, PL-wound-3A ERG, PL.AOR. INDIC
   “They wounded us”

f1. da-g-čr-a
   PV-2B N NOM, SG-wound-3A ERG, SG.AOR. INDIC
   “(S)he wounded you.SG”

f2. da-g-čr-a-t
   PV-2B N NOM, SG-wound-3A ERG, SG.AOR. INDIC-PL NOM
   “(S)he wounded you.PL”

f3. da-g-čr-es
   PV-2B N NOM, SG-wound-3A ERG, PL.AOR. INDIC
   “They wounded you.SG”

f4. da-g-čr-es
   PV-2B N NOM, SG-wound-3A ERG, PL.AOR. INDIC
   “They wounded you.PL”
g1.  
\[ da-\theta-\check{c}-r-a \]  
\[ PV-3B_{NOM}.SG-wound-3A_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC \]  
“(S)he wounded him/her”

g2.  
\[ da-\theta-\check{c}-r-a \]  
\[ PV-3B_{NOM}.SG-wound-3A_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC \]  
“(S)he wounded them”

g3.  
\[ da-\theta-\check{c}-r-es \]  
\[ PV-3B_{NOM}.SG-wound-3A_{ERG}.PL.AOR.INDIC \]  
“They wounded him/her”

g4.  
\[ da-\theta-\check{c}-r-es \]  
\[ PV-3B_{NOM}.SG-wound-3A_{ERG}.PL.AOR.INDIC \]  
“They wounded them”

A.3.8. Example. (Aorist Subjunctive (or Optative), Series II)

a1.  
\[ da-g-\check{c}-r-a \]  
\[ PV-2B_{NOM}.SG-wound-SUBJ \]  
“[I wish] I wounded you.SG”

a2.  
\[ da-g-\check{c}-r-a-t \]  
\[ PV-2B_{NOM}.SG-wound-SUBJ-PL_{NOM} \]  
“[I wish] I wounded you.PL”

a3.  
\[ da-g-\check{c}-r-a-t \]  
\[ PV-2B_{NOM}.SG-wound-SUBJ-PL_{ERG} \]  
“[I wish] we wounded you.SG”

a4.  
\[ da-g-\check{c}-r-a-t \]  
\[ PV-2B_{NOM}.SG-wound-SUBJ-PL \]  
“[I wish] we wounded you.PL”

b1.  
\[ da-v-\check{c}-r-a \]  
\[ PV-1A_{ERG}.SG-wound-SUBJ \]  
“[I wish] I wounded him/her”

b2.  
\[ da-v-\check{c}-r-a \]  
\[ PV-1A_{ERG}.SG-wound-SUBJ \]  
“[I wish] I wounded them”

b3.  
\[ da-v-\check{c}-r-a-t \]  
\[ PV-1A_{ERG}.SG-wound-SUBJ-PL_{ERG} \]  
“[I wish] we wounded him/her”

b4.  
\[ da-v-\check{c}-r-a-t \]  
\[ PV-1A_{ERG}.SG-wound-SUBJ-PL_{ERG} \]  
“[I wish] we wounded them”

c1.  
\[ da-m-\check{c}-r-a \]  
\[ PV-1B_{NOM}.SG-wound-SUBJ \]  
“[I wish] you.SG wounded me”
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c2.  

\textit{da-gv-čr-a}  
\text{PV-1B} \text{NOM, PL-wound-SUBJ} 
\textquote{[I wish] you.SG wounded us}

c3.  

\textit{da-m-čr-a-t}  
\text{PV-1B} \text{NOM, SG-wound-SUBJ-PLERG} 
\textquote{[I wish] you.PL wounded me}

c4.  

\textit{da-gv-čr-a-t}  
\text{PV-1B} \text{NOM, PL-wound-SUBJ-PLERG} 
\textquote{[I wish] you.PL wounded us}

d1.  

\textit{da-ψ-čr-a}  
\text{PV-2AERG, SG-wound-SUBJ} 
\textquote{[I wish] you.SG wounded him/her}

d2.  

\textit{da-ψ-čr-a}  
\text{PV-2AERG, SG-wound-SUBJ} 
\textquote{[I wish] you.SG wounded them}

d3.  

\textit{da-ψ-čr-a-t}  
\text{PV-2AERG, SG-wound-SUBJ-PLERG} 
\textquote{[I wish] you.PL wounded him/her}

d4.  

\textit{da-ψ-čr-a-t}  
\text{PV-2AERG, SG-wound-SUBJ-PLERG} 
\textquote{[I wish] you.PL wounded them}

e1.  

\textit{da-m-čr-a-s}  
\text{PV-1B} \text{NOM, SG-wound-SUBJ-3AERG, SG} 
\textquote{[I wish] (s)he wounded me}

e2.  

\textit{da-gv-čr-a-s}  
\text{PV-1B} \text{NOM, PL-wound-SUBJ-3AERG, SG} 
\textquote{[I wish] (s)he wounded us}

e3.  

\textit{da-m-čr-a-n}  
\text{PV-1B} \text{NOM, SG-wound-SUBJ-3AERG, PL} 
\textquote{[I wish] they wounded me}

e4.  

\textit{da-gv-čr-a-n}  
\text{PV-1B} \text{NOM, PL-wound-SUBJ-3AERG, PL} 
\textquote{[I wish] they wounded us}

f1.  

\textit{da-g-čr-a-s}  
\text{PV-2B} \text{NOM, SG-wound-SUBJ-3AERG, SG} 
\textquote{[I wish] (s)he wounded you.SG}

f2.  

\textit{da-g-čr-a-t}  
\text{PV-2B} \text{NOM, SG-wound-SUBJ-3AERG, SG-PLNOM} 
\textquote{[I wish] (s)he wounded you.PL}
A.3. The Transitive -č-/-čer- “wound”

f3. da-g-č-r-a-n
PV-2B NOM-SG-wound-SUBJ-3 AERG.PL
 “[I wish] they wounded you.SG”

f4. da-g-č-r-a-n
PV-2B NOM-SG-wound-SUBJ-3 AERG.PL
 “[I wish] they wounded you.PL”

g1. da-0-č-r-a-s
PV-3B NOM-SG-wound-SUBJ-3 AERG.SG
 “[I wish] (s)he wounded him/her”

g2. da-0-č-r-a-s
PV-3B NOM-SG-wound-SUBJ-3 AERG.SG
 “[I wish] (s)he wounded them”

g3. da-0-č-r-a-n
PV-3B NOM-SG-wound-SUBJ-3 AERG.PL
 “[I wish] they wounded him/her”

g4. da-0-č-r-a-n
PV-3B NOM-SG-wound-SUBJ-3 AERG.PL
 “[I wish] they wounded them”

A.3.9. EXAMPLE. (Perfect21, Series III)
a1. da-m-i-č-r-i-xar
PV-1B DAT-SG-PRV-wound-PERF-COP2.SG(=2A NOM.SG)
 “I have (apparently) wounded you.SG”

a2. da-m-i-č-r-i-xar-t
PV-1B DAT-SG-PRV-wound-PERF-COP2.SG(=2A NOM.SG)-PL NOM
 “I have (apparently) wounded you.PL”

a3. da-gv-i-č-r-i-xar
PV-1B DAT-PRV-wound-PERF-COP2.SG(=2A NOM.SG)
 “We have (apparently) wounded you.SG”

a4. da-gv-i-č-r-i-xar-t
PV-1B DAT-PL-PRV-wound-PERF-COP2.SG(=2A NOM.SG)-PL NOM
 “We have (apparently) wounded you.PL”

b1. da-m-i-čr-i-a
PV-1B DAT-SG-PRV-wound-TS-3 A NOM.SG
 “I have (apparently) wounded him/her”

b2. da-m-i-č-r-i-a
PV-1B DAT-SG-PRV-wound-TS-3 A NOM.SG
 “I have (apparently) wounded them”

---

21 See Footnote 5 in Appendix A.1.
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b3. da-gv-i-čr-i-a
PV-1B_DAT.PL-PRV-wound-TS-3A_NOM.SG
“We have (apparently) wounded him/her”

b4. da-gv-i-čr-i-a
PV-1B_DAT.PL-PRV-wound-TS-3A_NOM.SG
“We have (apparently) wounded them”

c1. da-gi-čr-i-var
PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-PERF-COP1.SG(=1A_NOM.SG)
“You.SG have (apparently) wounded me”

c2. da-gi-čr-i-var-t
PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-PERF-COP1.SG(=1A_NOM.SG)-PL_NOM
“You.SG have (apparently) wounded us”

c3. da-gi-čr-i-var-t
PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-PERF-COP1.SG(=1A_NOM.SG)-PLDAT
“You.PL have (apparently) wounded me”

c4. da-gi-čr-i-var-t
PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-PERF-COP1.SG(=1A_NOM.SG)-PL
“You.PL have (apparently) wounded us”

d1. da-gi-čr-i-a
PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS-3A_NOM.SG
“You.SG have (apparently) wounded him/her”

d2. da-gi-čr-i-a
PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS-3A_NOM.SG
“You.SG have (apparently) wounded them”

d3. da-gi-čr-i-a-t
PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS-3A_NOM.SG-PLDAT
“You.PL have (apparently) wounded him/her”

d4. da-gi-čr-i-a-t
PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS-3A_NOM.SG-PLDAT
“You.PL have (apparently) wounded them”

e1. da-vu-čr-i-var
PV-1A_NOM.SG-PRV-wound-PERF-COP1.SG(=CL_NOM.SG)
“(S)he has (apparently) wounded me”

e2. da-vu-čr-i-var-t
PV-1A_NOM.SG-PRV-wound-PERF-COP1.SG(=CL_NOM.SG)-PL_NOM
“(S)he has (apparently) wounded us”

e3. da-vu-čr-i-var
PV-1A_NOM.SG-PRV-wound-PERF-COP1.SG(=CL_NOM.SG)
“They have (apparently) wounded me”
A.3. The Transitive -čr/-čer- “wound”

e4. da-v-u-čr-i-var-t
PV-1ANOM.NOM-PRV-wound-PERF-COP1.SG(=CLNOM.SG)-PLNOM
“They have (apparently) wounded us”
f1. da-∅-u-čr-i-xar
PV-2ANOM.NOM-PRV-wound-PERF-COP2.SG(=CLNOM.SG)
“(S)he has (apparently) wounded you.SG”
f2. da-∅-u-čr-i-xar-t
PV-2ANOM.NOM-PRV-wound-PERF-COP2.SG(=CLNOM.SG)-PLNOM
“(S)he has (apparently) wounded you.PL”
f3. da-∅-u-čr-i-xar
PV-2ANOM.NOM-PRV-wound-PERF-COP2.SG(=CLNOM.SG)
“They have (apparently) wounded you.SG”
f4. da-∅-u-čr-i-xar-t
PV-2ANOM.NOM-PRV-wound-PERF-COP2.SG(=CLNOM.SG)-PLNOM
“They have (apparently) wounded you.PL”
g1. da-∅-u-čr-i-a
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS3ANOM.SG
“(S)he has (apparently) wounded him/her”
g2. da-∅-u-čr-i-a
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS3ANOM.SG
“(S)he has (apparently) wounded them”
g3. da-∅-u-čr-i-a-t
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS3ANOM.SG-PLDAT
“They have (apparently) wounded him/her”
g4. da-∅-u-čr-i-a-t
PV-3BDAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS3ANOM.SG-PLDAT
“They have (apparently) wounded them”

A.3.10. EXAMPLE. (Pluperfect22, Series III)
a1. da-m-e-čer-i
PV-1BDAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS
“I [should] have wounded you.SG”
a2. da-m-e-čer-i-t
PV-1BDAT.SG-PRV-wound-TS-PLNOM
“I [should] have wounded you.PL”
a3. da-gv-e-čer-i
PV-1BDAT.PL-PRV-wound-TS
“We [should] have wounded you.SG”

---

22 See Footnote 7 in Appendix A.1.
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a4. da-gv-ečer-i-t
PV-1B_DAT.PL-PRV-wound-TS-PL-NOM
“We [should] have wounded you.PL”

b1. da-m-ečr-a
PV-1B_DAT:SG-PRV-wound-3A_NOM:SG
“I [should] have wounded him/her”

b2. da-m-ečr-a
PV-1B_DAT:SG-PRV-wound-3A_NOM:SG
“I [should] have wounded them”

b3. da-gv-ečr-a
PV-1B_DAT:PL-PRV-wound-3A_NOM:SG
“We [should] have wounded him/her”

b4. da-gv-ečr-a
PV-1B_DAT:PL-PRV-wound-3A_NOM:SG
“We [should] have wounded them”

c1. da-g-ečeri
PV-2B_DAT:SG-PRV-wound-TS
“You.SG [should] have wounded me”

c2. da-g-ečeri-t
PV-2B_DAT:SG-PRV-wound-TS-PL-NOM
“You.SG [should] have wounded us”

c3. da-g-ečeri-t
“You.PL [should] have wounded me”

c4. da-g-ečeri-t
PV-2B_DAT:SG-PRV-wound-TS-PL
“You.PL [should] have wounded us”

d1. da-g-ečr-a
PV-2B_DAT:SG-PRV-wound-3A_NOM:SG
“You.SG [should] have wounded him/her”

d2. da-g-ečr-a
PV-2B_DAT:SG-PRV-wound-3A_NOM:SG
“You.SG [should] have wounded them”

d3. da-g-ečr-a-t
“You.PL [should] have wounded him/her”

d4. da-g-ečr-a-t
“You.PL [should] have wounded them”
A.3. The Transitive -čer- “wound”

e1. da-ve-čer-i
   PV-1A NOM-SG-PRV-wound-TS
   “(S)he [should] have wounded me”

e2. da-ve-čer-i-t
   PV-1A NOM-SG-PRV-wound-TS-PL NOM
   “(S)he [should] have wounded us”

e3. da-ve-čer-i
   PV-1A NOM-SG-PRV-wound-TS
   “They [should] have wounded me”

f1. da-∅-e-čer-i
   PV-2A NOM-SG-PRV-wound-TS
   “(S)he [should] have wounded you.SG”

f2. da-∅-e-čer-i-t
   PV-2A NOM-PL-PRV-wound-TS-PL NOM
   “(S)he [should] have wounded you.PL”

f3. da-∅-e-čer-i
   PV-2A NOM-SG-PRV-wound-TS
   “They [should] have wounded you.SG”

f4. da-∅-e-čer-i-t
   PV-2A NOM-PL-PRV-wound-TS-PL NOM
   “They [should] have wounded you.PL”

g1. da-∅-e-čer-a
   PV-3B DAT-SG-PRV-wound-3A NOM-SG
   “(S)he [should] have wounded him/her”

g2. da-∅-e-čer-a
   PV-3B DAT-SG-PRV-wound-3A NOM-SG
   “(S)he [should] have wounded them”

g3. da-∅-e-čer-a-t
   PV-3B DAT-SG-PRV-wound-3A NOM-SG-PL DAT
   “They [should] have wounded him/her”

g4. da-∅-e-čer-a-t
   PV-3B DAT-SG-PRV-wound-3A NOM-SG-PL DAT
   “They [should] have wounded them”

A.3.11. EXAMPLE.  (IIIrd Subjunctive\textsuperscript{23}, Series III)

\textsuperscript{23}See Footnote 9 in Appendix A.1.
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a1. da-m-e-čeri
PV-1BDAT,SG-PRV-wound-TS
“[Who said as if] I had wounded you.SG”

a2. da-m-e-čeri-t
PV-1BDAT,SG-PRV-wound-TS-PLNOM
“[Who said as if] I had wounded you.PL”

a3. da-gv-e-čeri
PV-1BDAT,PL-PRV-wound
“[Who said as if] we had wounded you.SG”

a4. da-gv-e-čeri-t
PV-1BDAT,PL-PRV-wound-TS-PLNOM
“[Who said as if] we had wounded you.PL”

b1. da-m-e-čr-a-s
PV-1BDAT,SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-3ANOM,SG
“[Who said as if] I had wounded him/her”

b2. da-m-e-čr-a-s
PV-1BDAT,SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-3ANOM,SG
“[Who said as if] I had wounded them”

b3. da-gv-e-čr-a-s
PV-1BDAT,PL-PRV-wound-SUBJ-3ANOM,SG
“[Who said as if] we had wounded him/her”

b4. da-gv-e-čr-a-s
PV-1BDAT,PL-PRV-wound-SUBJ-3ANOM,SG
“[Who said as if] we had wounded them”

c1. da-g-e-čeri
PV-2BDAT,SG-PRV-wound-TS
“[Who said as if] you.SG had wounded me”

c2. da-g-e-čeri-t
PV-2BBDAT,PL-PRV-wound-TS-PLNOM
“[Who said as if] you.SG had wounded us”

c3. da-g-e-čeri-t
PV-2BBDAT,PL-PRV-wound-TS-PLDAT
“[Who said as if] you.PL had wounded me”

c4. da-g-e-čeri-t
PV-2BBDAT,PL-PRV-wound-TS-PL
“[Who said as if] you.PL had wounded us”

d1. da-g-e-čr-a-s
PV-2BBDAT,SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-3ANOM,SG
“[Who said as if] you.SG had wounded him/her”
d2. \( \text{da-g-e-čr-a-s} \)
\( \text{PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-3A_NOM.SG} \)
“[Who said as if] you.SG had wounded them”

d3. \( \text{da-g-e-čr-a-t} \)
\( \text{PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-PL_DAT} \)
“[Who said as if] you.PL had wounded him/her”

d4. \( \text{da-g-e-čr-a-t} \)
\( \text{PV-2B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-PL_DAT} \)
“[Who said as if] you.PL had wounded them”

e1. \( \text{da-v-e-čer-i} \)
\( \text{PV-1A_NOM.SG-PRV-wound-PS} \)
“[Who said as if] (s)he had wounded me”

e2. \( \text{da-v-e-čer-i-t} \)
\( \text{PV-1A_NOM.PL-PRV-wound-PS-PL_NOM} \)
“[Who said as if] (s)he had wounded us”

e3. \( \text{da-v-e-čer-i} \)
\( \text{PV-1A_NOM.SG-PRV-wound-PS} \)
“[Who said as if] they had wounded me”

e4. \( \text{da-v-e-čer-i-t} \)
\( \text{PV-1A_NOM.PL-PRV-wound-PS-PL_NOM} \)
“[Who said as if] they had wounded us”

f1. \( \text{da-∅-e-čer-i} \)
\( \text{PV-2A_NOM.SG-PRV-wound-PS} \)
“[Who said as if] (s)he had wounded you.SG”

f2. \( \text{da-∅-e-čer-i-t} \)
\( \text{PV-2A_NOM.PL-PRV-wound-PS-PL_NOM} \)
“[Who said as if] (s)he had wounded you.PL”

f3. \( \text{da-∅-e-čer-i} \)
\( \text{PV-2A_NOM.SG-PRV-wound-PS} \)
“[Who said as if] they had wounded you.SG”

f4. \( \text{da-∅-e-čer-i-t} \)
\( \text{PV-2A_NOM.PL-PRV-wound-PS-PL_NOM} \)
“[Who said as if] they had wounded you.PL”

g1. \( \text{da-∅-e-čr-a-s} \)
\( \text{PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-3A_NOM.SG} \)
“[Who said as if] (s)he had wounded him/her”

g2. \( \text{da-∅-e-čr-a-s} \)
\( \text{PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-3A_NOM.SG} \)
“[Who said as if] (s)he had wounded them”
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3. \(da\-\emptyset-e\-\epsilon r-a-t\)
   PV-3B\_DAT, SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-PL\_DAT
   “[Who said as if] they had wounded him/her”

4. \(da\-\emptyset-e\-\epsilon r-a-t\)
   PV-3B\_DAT, SG-PRV-wound-SUBJ-PL\_DAT
   “[Who said as if] they had wounded them”
Appendix B

Notes on the Grammaticalization of tav- “head”

Introduction

As already mentioned in Chapter 5, being reflexive is only one side of the grammaticalized body-part tav- “head” and does not explain its non-reflexive uses while its being historically a (body-part) noun explains both anaphoric and non-anaphoric uses. In this appendix the origins of the reflexive phrase headed by the grammaticalized body-part tav- are explored.

Reflexives vs. Intensifiers

One of the pervasive sources of polysemy across the world’s languages are nouns denoting the human body or parts of it. The best-known development in this context is the use of body-part nouns to express spatial orientation [Hei97], [Mat99]. An interesting example is Finnish kainalo “armpit”, whose body-part term semantics provides a template for the expression of various spatial relations such as the following in Finnish [Oju00, p. 4]:

B.0.12. Example.

tuomiokirko-n kainalo-ssa sijaitse-va konttori.
cathedral-GEN armpit-INE locate-PRES.PART office
“The (post)office located in the basement of the cathedral.”

The use of terms for body-parts, particularly the more basic or salient ones such as “head”, “face”, “hand” etc. [Sch99], in more grammaticalized functions is based on the fact that linguistic conceptualization is anthropocentric: “whenever possible, we use human categories to describe and understand non-human ones” [Hei97, p. 40].

Not surprisingly, body-parts terms have been found to provide the source for such diverse categories as numerals, possessive markers [Hei97], demonstratives and various subordinating conjunctions [Hol95], intensifiers [Mor72], [Hei99, p. 3] and reflexives.

---

1The appendix heavily draws on a joint paper with Torsten Leuschner—[AL02].
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In the sample of 150 languages studied by [Sch99], 60% of reflexive markers are based on body-part terms, with “body” and “head” clearly predominant and “head” the less frequent and more areally restricted term [Sch99, p. 108], [Hei99, p. 9]. Other, more rarely encountered source terms are “eye” (Arabic āyn), “soul” (Arabic nafs), “bone” (Hebrew etsem), “skin” (Maba ndu) etc. [Mor72], [Hei99], [Sch99]. The following are examples of reflexives based on “body” from Ibibo (see B.0.13 taken from [Hei99, p. 12]), and of “head” from Kabuverdiano (Example B.0.14 from [Sch99, p. 105]) and Georgian (Example B.0.15):

B.0.13. Example.

Imé ́ám ́e ́etìgha ́idèm (áinh).
Ime❓ shot body his
“Ime shot himself.”

B.0.14. Example.

Manél ferí sè ˇcabeça.
Manuel hurt 3SG.POSS head
“Manuel hurt himself.”

B.0.15. Example.

man-ERG head-NOM PV-3B-NOM-3A.ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
“The man made fun of himself.”

As mentioned above, body-part nouns in numerous languages form the etymological basis for intensifiers and reflexives corresponding to English *x-self*, as in sentences like the following:

B.0.16. Example.

a. (intensifier) The Queen herself will be present.
b. (reflexive) The Queen is proud of herself.

As these examples suggest, the distinction between intensifiers and reflexives is quite straightforward syntactically: whereas intensifiers are adjuncts to noun phrases or verb phrases, reflexives function as arguments, typically objects of verbs or complements to prepositions (see [KS00a, p. 40], [Kön01] for more discussion). In some languages including English, intensifiers and reflexives are formally identical (a fact which may be responsible for the terminological confusion in some of the literature), but in many others they are distinct both synchronically and diachronically. Examples include Russian (*sam* vs. *sebja*), Latin (*ipse* vs. *se*), Italian (*stesso* vs. *se*) and, as in examples B.0.17a and B.0.17b, German (*selbst* vs. *sich*; from [KS00a, p. 50]):
B.0.17. Example.
a. (intensifier)
   Der Kanzler selbst wird anwesend sein.
   “The Chancellor himself will be present.”
b. (reflexive)
   Der Kanzler ist stolz auf sich.
   “The Chancellor is proud of himself.”

A third possibility is that intensifiers and reflexives in a given language are distinct synchronically but closely related diachronically. This is the case in Georgian, which has three intensifiers and two reflexives all based on tav-. The intensifiers (used more or less interchangably) are tavad (< tav-ad head-ADV), tvit (< tav-ir head-INST) and tviton (< tvit-on / tvit-an < tvit-van < tvit-man < tvit-ERG; [Sha73, p. 43]):

B.0.18. Example.
   tavad/ tviton/ tvit prezident-i
   INTENS INTENS INTENS president-NOM
   da-∅-e-scr-o šexvedra-s.
   PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-attend-3A_NOM.SG.AOR.INDIC meeting-DAT
   “The president himself/herself attended the meeting.”

The reflexives are simple tav-, as in the examples B.0.15 above and B.0.19 below, and the POSS+tav-, as in Example B.0.20:

B.0.19. Example.
   prezident-ма ucxoel diplomat-eb-s tav-i
   president-ERG foreign diplomat-PL-DAT self-NOM
   çar-∅-u-dgin-a.
   PV-3B_DAT.SG-PRV-introduce-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “The president introduced himself to the foreign diplomats.”

B.0.20. Example.
   prezident-ма tavis-i tav-i
   president-ERG 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM
   0-i-xsn-a.
   3B_NOM.SG-PRV-save-3A_ERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
   “The president saved himself/herself.”
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As recent literature suggests [KS00b, p. 56], [Kön01], the recruitment of body-part nouns for use as reflexives proceeds either directly from body-part nouns to reflexives, or via intensifiers which are in turn derived from body-part nouns:

B.0.21. Example.

- body-part noun ⇒ (intensifier ⇒) reflexive

Although all the Georgian intensifiers and reflexives are derived more or less transparently from the body-part noun tav- “head”, and at least partly result from similar formative processes (e.g. tav- + case ending), there is nothing in the reflexives to suggest that they ever passed through a stage of being intensifiers first (as e.g. in the case of English -self, [KS00a]). Of the three grammaticalization paths implicit in Example B.0.21, only those in the examples B.0.22a and B.0.22b are therefore valid in Georgian:

B.0.22. Example.

- a. body-part noun ⇒ intensifier
- b. body-part noun ⇒ reflexive

The Simple tav- vs. POSS+tav- in Old and Modern Georgian

As was argued in Subsection 3.5.2, in Modern Georgian the simple reflexive tav- is a reflexivization strategy in its own right, distinct from the complex reflexive phrase POSS+tav-. However, this does not, of course, mean that there is no diachronic relation between the two.

Old Georgian invariably has POSS+tav- where in modern usage both the reflexive phrase POSS+tav- and the simple reflexive pronoun tav- are the available options. This difference is sometimes obscured by the data. Consider Luke 4, 23, in example B.0.23a in Old Georgian beside the Modern Georgian version in example B.0.23b:

B.0.23. Example.

- a. Old Georgian, [Imn79, p. 448]

  mkurnal-o, gan-∅-i-kurn-∅² tav-i šen-i.
  physician-VOC PV-2AeRG.SG-PRV-heal-AOR.INDIC self-NOM 2POSS.SG-nom
  “Physician, heal yourself.” (translation from [Dar61])

- b. Modern Georgian, [Bib89, p. 1016]

  The verb form gan-∅-i-kurn-∅ in Example B.0.23 is an Aorist Indicative form which takes an ERG agent argument. As already mentioned, in Georgian Aorist Indicative forms are used for the 2nd person imperative forms. See also Footnote 8 in Chapter 2.
All that appears to have changed here is the word order; as for POSS in reflexivization, the Modern Georgian translation of the New Testament mostly follows the Old Georgian. In fact, however, this usage feels redundant in modern Georgian, and simple $tav$- as in example B.0.24 nowadays suffices in speech and everyday writing:

**B.0.24. Example.**

mķurnal-o, gan-∅-i-kurn-e $tav$-i.
physician-VOC PV-2A_ERG, SG-PRV-heal-AOR.INDIC 2POSS.SG-nom self-NOM

“The president saved himself/herself.”

Only in a contrastive reading (when emphasis on “yourself (rather than anyone else)” is intended) would POSS now occur as in example B.0.23b.3

**Persistence of Features and De-Categorialization of $tav$-**

The relationship of simple $tav$- and POSS+$tav$- in modern Georgian can be analysed in terms of the five principles of grammaticalization as defined by Hopper [Hop91, pp. 22-31], [HT93, pp. 94-129], viz. *layering, divergence, specialization, persistence* and *de-categorialization*. The co-existence of the older, complex strategy with the newer, pronominal one is an example of *layering*, with the two strategies related diachronically by the *divergence* of the newer from the older. This divergence would have involved phenomena of *de-categorialization* (i.e. loss of nominal behavior) in both simple $tav$- and POSS+$tav$-, while the *persistence* of POSS+$tav$- would have been due to its *specialization* (ibid.) for specific functions.

Here two of the Hopper’s [Hop91, pp. 22-31] “Principles of Grammaticalization” are looked at, namely, (i) de-categorialization of the noun $tav$- in reflexives and (ii) the persistence of certain features in the process of grammaticalization.

Examples like B.0.25 provide an excellent clue to the de-categorialization involved in the change from body-part nouns to reflexives:

**B.0.25. Example.**

Women who have lost their husbands’ affection, are justly reproved for neglecting their persons, and not taking the same pains to keep, as to gain a heart . . .

Such changes start in constructions where the body-part noun functions as object and is modified by a possessive that co-refers to the subject [Sch99, p. 113]. In the

---

3Recall also the example B.0.13 from Ibibo: there the possessive modifier (´am) is optional.
case of the noun body, it proceeds via what [Hei99, p. 12] calls an overlap between a literal reading where the object can still be interpreted as referring to the whole body (as opposed to any specific limb) on the one hand and as a reflexive on the other. In the case of actual body-part terms, the noun is additionally being interpreted as a synecdoche for the whole referent (pars pro toto, [Sch99, p. 113]). The ambiguity is still clearly visible in modern Georgian examples with POSS+tav-like the following:

**B.0.26. Example.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mešen čem-t tav-s g-i-xat-av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG.NOM 2SG.DAT 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT 2B_DAT.SG-PRV-draw/paint-TS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I draw/paint my head for you.”

“I draw myself for you.”

Grammaticalization has been accomplished (from a semantic point of view) when the literal, body-part reading is no longer available, due e.g. to selectional restrictions on the verb as in Example B.0.27 from Basque [Sch99, p. 113], also given in Footnote 9 in Chapter 5) and Example B.0.28 from Georgian:

**B.0.27. Example.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aita-k bere buru-a hil d-u.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>father-ERG his head.ABS-DET kill 3SG-have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The father killed himself.”

“*The father killed his head.”

**B.0.28. Example.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kac-ma (čven) tav-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>man-ERG 1PL.DAT 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ga-gv-a-cn-o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV-2B_DAT.PL-PRV-introduce-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The man introduced himself to us.”

“*The man introduced his head to us.”

The ability for a body-part term to occur as an argument with a verb with which it is semantically incompatible on a literal reading, is a clear sign of de-categorialization. Another is the inability to be marked for number, as in Example B.0.29 from Hausa [Hei99, p. 14] and Example B.0.30 from Georgian (see also Example 4.3.13):

**B.0.29. Example.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sun kash-k á-su.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>they kill their.head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“They killed themselves.”
B.0.30. **Example.**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{kac-eb-ma } \check{\text{cven}} \text{ taviant-i} \quad \text{tav-(*eb)-i} \\
&\text{man-PL-ERG 1PL.DAT 3REFL.POSS.PL-NOM self-PL-NOM} \\
&\text{ga-gv-a-cn-es.} \\
&\text{PV-1B.DAT.PL-PRV-acquaint-3A.ERG.PL.AOR.INDIC}
\end{align*}
\]

“The men acquainted us with themselves.”

In Old Georgian, by contrast, \textit{tav-} could still be marked for plural (see \cite{Sha76, p. 49}, \cite{Imn79, p. 489} as well as example B.0.31, also given in Footnote 7 in Chapter 4), illustrating an earlier stage in the grammaticalization process that has now been superseded:

B.0.31. **Example.**

(Luke 12, 15; translation from [Dar61])

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{da-}\emptyset\text{-i-cv-en-i-t} \\
&\text{qovl-is-a-gan} \quad \text{angahreb-is-a.} \\
&\text{all-GEN-EV-from covetousness-GEN-EV}
\end{align*}
\]

“Keep yourselves from all covetousness.”

Other signs of de-categorialization include the inability to accept nominal modifiers altogether, and at later stages could be expected to show also phonological reduction, cliticization etc. \cite{Hei99, pp. 13-16}, \cite{Sch99, pp. 114-116}. Pronominal \textit{tav-} has not undergone phonological reduction and cliticization, but observe what happens to its meaning when nominal modification is applied:

B.0.32. **Example.**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{amit } \text{kac-ma (\check{\text{cven}) } karg-ad} \\
&\text{DIST.INST man-ERG 1PL.DAT good-ADV} \\
&\text{ga-gv-a-cn-o} \quad \text{tavis-i} \\
&\text{PV-1B.DAT.PL-PRV-acquaint-3A.ERG,SG.AOR.INDIC 3REFL.POSS.SG-NOM} \\
&\text{sulel-i} \quad \text{tav-i.} \\
&\text{stupid-NOM self-NOM}
\end{align*}
\]

\begin{enumerate}
  \item “By this the man made us better understand his stupid self.” (= how stupid he is)
  \item “By this the man made us better understand his stupid head.” (= how stupid his head is)
\end{enumerate}

Without nominal modification, \textit{tav-} is a reflexive, but the original, body-part reading of \textit{tav-} becomes available again as soon as nominal modification is applied (see B.0.32b).
Here the next principle, persistence of certain behavior in the grammaticalization of the *tav*-head. A particularly interesting instance is the association between POSS+*tav-* and a syntactic peculiarity of Georgian (and possibly other languages) called “object camouflage” (Section 5.2).

From the grammaticalization point of view, the use of POSS+*tav-* for Object Camouflage can be explained by the persistence of certain characteristics in its behavior that are typical of nouns and are not present in the pronoun, simple *tav*- (thereby providing extra evidence of the de-categorialization of the latter).

Recall the use of pre-radical vowels to mark IO arguments. This type of marking is sensitive to a person / non-person distinction. More precisely, 1st and 2nd person indirect objects are marked by -i- as opposed to the 3rd person indirect objects, which are marked by -u- (see examples 4.4.16–4.4.18 in Subsection 4.4.3):

**B.0.33. Example.**

a. is me saxl-s m-i-šen-eb-s.
   3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT house-DAT 1B_DAT:SG-PRV-build-TS-DAT 3ANOM:SG
   “(S)he builds me a house.”

b. is šen saxl-s g-i-šen-eb-s.
   “(S)he builds you a house.”

c. is mas saxl-s ʔ-u-šen-eb-s.
   “(S)he builds him/her a house.”

Given this rule, it would be expected for the 1st or 2nd person indirect object to be marked on the verb by pre-radical -i-, but that is not the case. Only verb forms with -u- are grammatical, even though -u- is otherwise a marker for 3rd person indirect objects:

**B.0.34. Example.** (Given in Footnote 8 of Chapter 5)

a. me čem-s tav-s mšvid garemo-s
   1SG.NOM 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT peaceful environment-DAT
   v-u-kmn-i/ *v-i-kmn-i.
   1ANOM:SG-PRV-create-INDIC 1ANOM:SG-PRV-create-INDIC
   “I create a peaceful environment for myself.”

b. šen šen-s tav-s mšvid garemo-s
   2SG.NOM 2POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT peaceful environment-DAT
   ʔ-u-kmn-i/ *ʔ-i-kmn-i.
   2ANOM:SG-PRV-create-INDIC 2ANOM:SG-PRV-create-INDIC
   “You create a peaceful environment for yourself.”
Thus, 1st or 2nd person indirect objects rendered as POSS+*tav- in fact act as a 3rd person grammatical items in the construction of the sentence, triggering 3rd person -u-.

Similarly, consider examples B.0.35 and B.0.36a:

**B.0.35. Example.**

\[
\text{ˇsen me m-xat-av.}
\]

2SG.NOM 1SG.DAT 1B\text{DAT}.SG\text{-draw-TS}

“You draw me.”

**B.0.36. Example.**

\(a\). me v-xat-av čem-s tav-s.

1SG.NOM 1A\text{NOM}.SG\text{-draw-TS} 1POSS.SG\text{-DAT} self-DAT

“I draw myself.”

\(b\). me v-xat-av šav-i aragv-is xeoba-s.

1SG.NOM 1A\text{NOM}.SG\text{-draw-TS} black-NOM Aragvi-G\text{EN} gorge-DAT

“I draw the Black Aragvi gorge.”

In Example B.0.35, the 1st person object triggers direct object agreement while the 1st person reflexive POSS+*tav- in example B.0.36 triggers 3rd person agreement instead (cf. the examples B.0.36a vs. B.0.36b). As the examples B.0.37 and B.0.38 illustrate, POSS+*tav- with 1st or 2nd person agreement is ungrammatical:

**B.0.37. Example.**

\[
\text{*m-i-xat-av čem-s tav-s.}
\]

1B\text{DAT}.SG\text{-PRV}\text{-draw-TS} 1POSS.SG\text{-DAT} self-DAT

“I draw him for myself.”

**B.0.38. Example.**

\[
\text{*g-i-xat-av šen-s tav-s.}
\]

2B\text{DAT}.SG\text{-PRV}\text{-draw-TS} 2POSS.SG\text{-DAT} self-DAT

“You draw him for yourself.”

Therefore, due to the combination of possessive and noun, POSS+*tav- can express both the person of the object and act as a 3rd person grammatical item.

The body-part noun *tav- “head”, from earlier uses as a marker of direct object reflexivity, generalized its functions to those of a general co-reference marker, yet retained its “nouny” behavior throughout, viz. the typical property of nouns to be referred to as 3rd person grammatical entities.

The POSS+*tav- phrase was recruited for marking the S-DO co-reference relation and then generalized to the other co-reference relations; after this the second phase
was the divergence of pronominal simple tav- and the specialization of POSS+tav- for certain contexts and functions (including *Object Camouflage*). Thus, there has been generalization and de-categorialization—the two phenomena typically involved in the early and the later stages of grammaticalization, respectively [HT93, pp. 94-129].

It has been increasingly emphasized in recent thinking about grammaticalization that grammaticalizing lexemes are not literally “free” at the outset but already part of some grammatical construction [Tra03b]. One obvious way to apply this idea to tav- is to point out that tav- was first grammaticalized as part of the POSS+tav- phrase. It should be stressed also that, given that reflexives are basically a strategy to mark co-reference relations, the POSS+tav- construction itself has always been involved in (clause-level) grammar. Probably, the original POSS+tav- construction was generalized as a co-reference marker over different grammatical relations until it was ready to enter into further grammaticalization. POSS+tav- eventually came to mark co-reference between any two arguments of the verb, as shown in 3.5.1–3.5.3, 3.5.10a, 3.5.11a, 3.5.12a and it must have been in this function as a generalized marker of reflexivity that it started to drop POSS.

**Conclusion**

[AL02] suggest the following account of the grammaticalization of tav-. The division of labour between simple tav- and POSS+tav- is the synchronic result of a diachronic development beginning with a single source construction, viz. POSS+tav-, which is still intact in Old Georgian. Later on, POSS was partly lost,4 giving rise to simple tav- which in turn became grammaticalized as a reflexive pronoun, while POSS+tav- was retained to mark reflexivity in specific circumstances (including *Object Camouflage*) in modern Georgian.

---

4There was presumably a transitional phase where POSS was optional, as in the earlier example B.0.13 from Ishbo, where the possessive modifier may apparently be dropped or retained.
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In deze dissertatie worden de reflexivisatie-strategien van het Georgisch onderzocht, een taal met een rijk naamvalse- en congruentiesysteem (Hoofdstuk 2). In tegenstelling tot wat eerdere studies suggereren [Mar64a, Mar64b], laat het huidige onderzoek zien dat Georgisch een consistente anaforisch systeem heeft. Het idee dat de categorie van reflexieven onderontwikkeld is, is waarschijnlijk voortgekomen uit het feit dat verschillende formeel vergelijkbare anaforische elementen niet gescheiden werden op basis van hun functie. Er wordt een enkelvoudige en een complexe reflexivisatiesstrategie gedefinieerd die, hoewel historisch gezien wel verwant, synchroon toch duidelijk verschillend zijn, beide zijn gebaseerd op een gegrammaticaliseerd “body-part” naamwoord.

In hoofdstuk 3 wordt een gedetailleerde beschrijving gegeven van de distributieve en semantische eigenschappen van deze reflexivisatie strategien binnen de Binding Theory [Cho81]. Naast deze twee nominale strategien, beschikt het Georgisch ook over een verbale reflexivisatie-strategie, namelijk het voorvoegsel i-, dat in een bijzondere relatie staat met de nominale strategien.

In hoofdstuk 4 worden de reflexivisatie-strategien geherformuleerd binnen het raamwerk van Reflexivity Theory [RR93]. Deze laatste theorie geeft niet alle en de mogelijkheid om verschillende functies van aan de oppervlakte vergelijkbare anaforische elementen te onderscheiden, maar ook om hun gedrag ten opzichte van de semantiek van werkwoorden te bestuderen.

Hoofdstuk 5 stelt klaarblijkelijke schendingen van de Binding Theory en de Reflexivity Theory aan de orde. Een van deze schendingen is het niet-anaforische gebruik van POSS+tav-reflexieven, het zogenaamde “object camouflage” fenomeen [Har81] waarbij de 1ste of 2de persoon van het directe object van ditransitieve werkwoorden uitgedrukt wordt op dezelfde manier als in de complexe reflexief strategie. Net als in [Har81], wordt in deze dissertatie een onderscheid gemaakt tussen het anaforisch gebruik van de “reflexief vorm” (in het geval van binding) en het pronominaal gebruik van de “reflexief vorm” (in het geval van “object camouflage”). Het ambigue karakter van gedrag van de POSS+tav-reflexief, als anafoor en als pronomine, volgt uit het grammaticalisatie-proces aan dat het “body-part” nomen tav ondergaan heeft [AL02]. Uit taalvergelijkend onderzoek is al eerder gebleken dat “body-part” nomina (zoals
hoofd, lichaam, etc.) binnen de groep van elementen vallen die als gevolg van grammaticalisatie als reflexief markeers en intensifeerders gebruikt kunnen gaan worden [Mor72, Sch99, Hei99, KS00a, KS00b, Kön01]. Aan de andere kant, wordt aangetoond dat de als reflexief gebruikte zelfstandig naamwoorden hun referentiele eigenschappen, zelfs nadat ze gegrammaticaliseerd zijn, niet geheel verliezen, zoals het fenomeen “object camouflage” illustreert.

In hoofdstuk 6 wordt een tweede type potentieel probleem voor de Binding en Reflexivity Theory [Cho81, RR93] besproken, namelijk het gebruik van reflexiefen en reexiproken als onderwerp. Verschillende voorstellen in de literatuur om te verklaren waarom nominatieve/onderwerp anaforen crosstalesistische slechts zelden voorkomen, passeren de revue. De belangrijkste van deze verklaringen is het Anaphor Agreement principe, die stelt dat anaforen niet voorkomen in syntactische posities die een congruentierelatie met het werkwoord hebben [Riz90, Woo99]. In dit proefschrift wordt evidentie aangedragen dat het Georgisch het Anaphor Agreement principe schendt. [AE99] geven een alternatieve verklaring voor dit fenomeen, binnen de Reflexivity Theory [RR93], gebaseerd op een analyse van de Griekse reflexief o eae to tu. Centraal in deze analyse is de hypothese dat de vorm van de reflexief anafoor in het Grieks—een “body part” nomen—verantwoordelijk is voor de mogelijkheid de reflexief als subject te gebruiken. [Eve01, Eve03] stelt voor om deze analyse van de Griekse anafoor uit te breiden naar Georgische meervoudige nominale strategien. Er wordt aangetoond dat dit voorstel empirisch niet adequaat is. Het relateren van de vorm en het gedrag van anaforen lijkt echter een aantrekkelijk voorstel. Een recente analyse van complexe anaforen [Reu01] lijkt ook aan te geven dat hun interpretatie als relevante functie van het antecedent gerelateerd moet worden aan het feit dat ze een complexe vorm hebben. Dit concept is relevant wanneer verklaard moet worden dat de Georgische meervoudige reflexivisatie-strategie in subject-positie als “eigenschap/aspect van” of als “beeld/representatie van” (dus, als een soort functie) van de postcedent genterpreteerd kan worden (Hoofdstuk 7). Echter, de Georgische reciprocal ertmanet-, die niet geanalyseerd kan worden als een complexe anafoor, maar die wel kan voorkomen als subject argument met precies dezelfde “functie van” interpretatie, is problematisch voor deze analyse.
Government and Binding Theory, [Cho81]

(Reflexivity Theory, [RR93]).
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