Case marking in infinitive (*ad*-form) clauses in Old Georgian[1]

Manana Kobaidze and Karina Vamling

A specific feature of both Modern and Old Georgian is that case marking of subjects and objects is sensitive to the choice of tense/aspect. This paper focuses on a construction that was found in complementation in Old Georgian (5th-11th centuries) where alongside with finite forms, an infinitive began to develop. Generally, this was a verb-noun in the adverbial case (-(*a*)*d*): *tesva* 'sowing' –> *tesva-d* 'sow'.

As the infinitive lacks expression of tense/aspect it is not able to assign case to its arguments in the same way as a finite verb does in Georgian. In this paper we will show that case marking of the direct object (and sometimes of the subject) of the infinitive is determined by the tense/aspect of the matrix verb.

Non-finite forms in Modern Georgian include participles and masdars (verb-nouns). Participles are declined as nouns, are formed from the finite forms of the verb, and usually they have the same functions as adjectives. Masdars are also case marked like nouns, but are formed from the finite forms of the verb and usually have the same functions as nouns.

In Old Georgian, a third non-finite form is found. Formally, it is a masdar in the adverbial case. This form has been called infinitive even though it has been observed by several authors (Martirosovi 1955; Dzidziguri 1989; Chkhubianishvili 1972) that it differs from what is called infinitive in, for instance, Indo-European languages. In order to avoid confusion, we will call this form the *ad*-form, where *ad* refers to the adverbial case marker *-(a)d*.

Before turning to masdars and *ad*-forms in complementation, it is necessary to have a look at case marking in simple sentences in order to understand how case is assigned to masdars as heads of complement clauses and to the objects of *ad*-forms.

1. Case marking in the simple sentence

The nominative, ergative and dative cases are those which occur in the marking of subjects and objects of finite verbs. (The dative has some other functions too, for instance to express locative and benefactive relations.) The genitive case shows up in the marking of the dependents of the masdars, although the dative also is allowed in this position. Apart from the syntactic cases, the set-up of cases includes the semantic cases: the instrumental, the adverbial and the vocative.

The Old Georgian case markers listed in table 1 (Schanidse 1982:36). Note that the nominative marker is realized as /-i/ following a stem ending in a consonant, and as /-j/ when the stem ends in a vowel.

Table 1. Case markers.

	Singular	Plural	
'Bare' stem[2]	-	-	-eb
Nominative	-i / -j	(n)-i	-eb-i
Ergative	-man	t(a)	eb-man
Dative	-s(a)	"	eb-s(a)
Genitive	-is(a)	"	eb-is(a)
Additive	-isa	"	eb-isa
Instrumental	-it(a)	"	eb-it
Adverbial	-ad / -d	"	eb-ad
Vocative	-o	(n)-o	eb-o

A common feature of both Old and Modern Georgian is that the case marking of the subject and objects is sensitive to the choice of the tense form in the sentence. As shown in (1a-c), which appear in different tenses, the subject appears in the nominative, ergative and dative cases.[3]

(1) a. mgel-i   šč'ams   cxovar-sa
         wolf.NOM   S3SG.O3SG.eat.PRS lamb.DAT
         'The wolf eats the lamb'

     b. mgel-man   šeč'ama   cxovar-i
         wolf.ERG S3SG.O3SG.eat.AOR   lamb.NOM
         'The wolf ate the lamb'

     c. mgel-sa   šeuč'amies   cxovar-i
         wolf.DAT INV.S3SG.O3SG.eat.PF lamb.NOM
         '(Apparently) the wolf has eaten the lamb' (Schanidse 1982:172-3)

---

[2] Glossed as ABS.

[3] The person (and number) of the subject, direct object, indirect object (in this order) is indicated initially in the verb forms, as in: *vubrʒane* 'I ordered him (it)': S1SG.O3SG.O3SG.order.AOR. In certain verb forms so-called inversion takes place: the logical subject is marked as an indirect object, both in the verb form and case marking. This is indicated in the glosses by INV. The *ad*-form is marked by AD in the glosses.

Finite forms are grouped into three series, where each series is related to one case marking pattern. The verb forms included in the three series in Old Georgian are listed in table 2 (Schanidse 1982:79-80).

Table 2. Series of finite verb forms in Old Georgian.

I	Present	c'ers	(S3SG.O3.write.PRS etc.)
	Present Iterative	c'ern	
	Imperfect	c'erda	
	Imperfect Iterative	c'erdis	
	Imperative I	c'erdin	
	Conjunctive I (/Future I)	c'erdes	
II	Aorist	c'era	
	Iterative II	c'eris	
	Imperative II	c'eren	
	Conjunctive II (/Future II)	c'eros	
	Mixed Future	c'erodis	
III	Perfect	uc'eries	
	Pluperfect	ec'era	
	Iterative	ec'eris	
	Conjunctive III	ec'eros	

Not all verbs show such a difference in case marking related to the choice of the finite verb form. It is however, relevant for transitives and active intransitives.

Another group of verbs is characterized by having experiencer subjects. The case marking differs from the first class in assigning dative case to the experiencer subject, and the nominative case to the object if any, independent of the choice of tense.

The remaining verbs, including one-, two- and three-argument verbs, constitute a more mixed group. The subject is usually low in activity and the increased valency is often due to the incorporation of relations such as the benefactive and locative case into the verb. These verbs have a stable case-marking pattern, not depending on the choice of tense. Nominative case is assigned to the subject and dative case to the object(s).

The case marking patterns of the three verb classes are summarized below. As shown in table 3, there is no accusative case for direct objects. Case marking of direct objects depends on the series of the finite verb.

2. Matrix predicates with *ad*-forms as complement predicates

A rather wide range of matrix predicates in Old Georgian take *ad*-forms as their complement predicate. Characterized from a semantic point of view (cf.

Table 3. Case marking patterns for the three verb classes.

Verb class	Series	Subject	Object(s)
(1)	I.	Nominative	Dative (DO), Dative (IO)
	II.	Ergative	Nominative (DO), Dative (IO)
	III.	Dative	Nominative (DO), Genitive+P[d(a)]
(2)		Dative	Nominative
(3)		Nominative	Dative (IO)

Noonan 1985), these matrix predicates include manipulatives, desideratives, aspectuals, modals. A sample is given below:

brӡana	ordered
aiӡula	forced
arc'muna	persuaded
isc'rapa	strove for
egulebis	intends
hnebavs	wants
ӡer-ičina	found necessary, wanted
šesӡina	continued
qel-q'o	started
umӡobes ars	is better
ӡer-ars	is necessary

In the following sections the masdar and the *ad*-form will be examined with respect to some verbal and nominal features such as case marking and adverbial modification.

3. Comparing masdars and *ad*-forms

The masdar is case marked as an ordinary noun. Therefore, it is to be expected that a masdar in the object position of a matrix verb in the series I and II will differ in case marking. This is illustrated by the following examples where the matrix verb in (2a) is in the present, motivating the dative case for its direct object. The matrix verb in (b) is in the future II, assigning the nominative case to its direct object (Chkhubianishvili 1972:139). Example (c) is in the perfect, i.e. in the third series. Here, the nominative case is assigned to the object.

(2)   a. čuen visc'rapit   monagebta   šek'reba-sa
          we   S1PL.O3SG.strive.PRS   property.PL.GEN collection.DAT
          'We strive for the collection of property'

b. uk'eutu čuen ara   visc'rapot   akave
    if   we not   S1PL.O3SG.strive.FUT.II   here
    aqoca-j   mati
    destruction.NOM   their
    'If we will not strive for their destruction …'

c. šeni   adgili   dagit'evebies.
    your.SG.NOM   place.NOM   INV.S2SG.O3SG.leave.PF
    'You have left your place' (shush: kart. krest.I.1.:135)

The syntactic relations in the masdar phrase are usually similar to the relations within the NP. The masdar marks its 'object' by the genitive case, as shown below.

(3)   čuen visc'rapit   monagebta   šek'reba-sa
           we   S1PL.O3SG.strive.PRS property.PL.GEN collection.DAT
           'We strive for the collection of property'

However, it was not a rare exception in Old Georgian that an object of a masdar was assigned the dative case (see below, section 9).

When examining the *ad*-forms in different positions, it becomes clear that they do not change for case. The *ad*-forms end in -(*a*)*d* (the frozen adverbial case), in the positions corresponding to the ones in (2a-c). The matrix verb in (4a) is in series I, (b) in series II, and (c) in series III, corresponding to direct objects in the dative (I) and nominative (II, III) cases.

(4)   a. rajsa maiʒuleb   čuen   gandgomad
           why   S2SG.O1PL.force.PRS I.PL.(funct. DAT) go away.AD
           ɣmrtisagan.
           God.GEN.from
           'Why do you force us away from God' (sin. mr. 118.2)

       b. xolo mevic'q'e   sit'q'uad
           and   I   S1SG.O3SG.begin.AOR   speak.AD
           'And I began to talk.' (shush.: kart.krest.I.1:139)

       c. tavadsa   iesos   ec'q'o
           himself.DAT Jesus.DAT   INV.S3SG.O3SG.begin.PLUP
           q'opad meocdaatesa   c'elsa
           do.AD   thirtieth.DAT   year.DAT
           'Jesus himself had started to fulfil his mission at 30 years of age'
           (luka. 3.23)[4]

Both the masdar and *ad*-forms may take objects. However, the case assigned to such objects may differ, as is shown in the following sections.

---

[4]Examples from the Bible are literal translations based on the Georgian text.

4. Case assigned to direct objects of *ad*-forms

4.1 Objects of ad-*forms in direct object position*

Before considering the case assigned to objects of *ad*-forms, one has to differentiate two functions of the *ad*-forms. Such forms can occur as either complement predicates, or as predicates of purpose clauses. We will first turn our attention to *ad*-forms as complement predicates.

As has been pointed out above, the case assigned to subjects and objects in finite clauses depends on the series of the finite verb. As both masdars and *ad*-forms lack tense, they also lack a way of differentiating series. Consequently, they cannot govern their objects in the same way, as do finite verbs. Despite this fact, objects of *ad*-forms (as complement predicates) appear in the dative or nominative case in the same way as the objects of finite verbs[5].

Alternations between case marking patterns due to the choice of the matrix verb forms from different series appear here, although the *ad*-form does not itself indicate tense. The argument of the *ad*-form is in the dative in (5a) (series I), and in the nominative in (5b) (series II).

(5)   a. titoeuli   matgani   isc'rapda
         everyone.SG.NOM of.them.NOM S3SG.O3SG.strive.IMP
         tesvad   k'actmoq'uareba-sa
         sow.AD   love.of.mankind.DAT
         'Everyone of them strove to sow the love of mankind'
         (Chkhubianishvili 1972:149)

        b. … isc'rapa …   aɣdginebad ek'lesiasa   šina
          S3SG.O3SG.hasten.AOR revive.AD   church.DAT   in
         sactur-i   borot'-i
         temptation.NOM evil.NOM
         '… hastened to revive the evil temptation in the church'
         (Chkhubianishvili 1972:149)

It appears as if the tense of the matrix verb has the effect of determining the case marking not only within the finite VP, but also in the *ad*-form phrase as suggested by Chkhubianishvili 1972. As expected from this hypothesis, the direct object of a transitive verb in series I (imperfect) takes the dative, and the direct object in series II takes the nominative in the examples above, as does the direct logical object of an *ad*-form in these positions.

The same rule also applies in series III (6), a fact that has not been discussed in the literature before[6].

---

5 In addition, objects of *ad*-forms in the genitive or genitive-adverbial case are also found (Martirosovi 1955:54, Chkhubianishvili 1972:77).

6 We are grateful to Guram Kartozia for giving us access to unpublished material from the Rustaveli fond in Tbilisi.

(6)   a. anu   kmnad   raj   gwisc'avies
            or   do.AD what.NOM   INV.S1PL.O3SG.learn.PF
            gank'urnebisatwis   k'actajsa.
            cure.GEN.for   man.PL.GEN.SG.GEN
            'or what we have learned to cure men' (A 1115. 15v. 24-25b)

        b. da   vidre dɣeindlad   dɣemde   vervis
            and   until   of today.ADV.C day.ADV.C.till   nobody.DAT
            uk'adrebies   aɣebad   igi   mašin šišisatvis
            INV.S3SG.O3SG.dare.PF   take.AD   it.NOM then   fear.GEN.for
            sp'arstasa (resp. sp'arstajsa)
            Persian.PL.GEN.SG.GEN.
            'and until these days nobody has dared to take it because of the fear
            of the times under the Persians' (luars. mart.I:416.3)

        c. p'at'ivi   xat'isaj   p'irmšojsa
            veneration.NOM image.SG.GEN.SG.NOM   the first born baby.GEN
            mis   saxisa   mimart   aɣslvad   gwisc'avies
            that.GEN face.GEN towards   ascend.AD INV.S1PL.O3SG.learn.PF
            'We have learned to ascend the veneration of image towards the face
            of that child' (S-384, 422.5a)

Consequently, the *ad*-form direct object is a semantic argument of the *ad*-form whereas case marking is determined by the matrix predicate.

4.2. Direct objects of ad-*forms in other positions*
The observation that the series of the matrix verb determines the case marking of the logical direct object of the *ad*-form holds in other positions as well. A verb like *hnebavs* 'he wants it', marks its logical subject (experiencer) by the dative case and the direct object (source) by the nominative (cf. table 3). The logical direct object of an *ad*-form in the object position of *mnebavs* and *gegulebis* below is, as expected, marked by the nominative.

(7) a. mnebavs   xivlad   adgomajca   misi
        INV.S1SG.O3SG.want.PRS   see.AD   ascension.NOM his
        'I want to see his ascension' (Chkhubianishvili 1972:87)

    b. romeli   gegulebis   sakmed,
       what.NOM   INV.S2SG.O3SG.intend.PRS do.AD
      q'av   adre
      S2SG.O3SG.do.IMPERATIVE.II quickly
      '… what you intend to do, do quickly' (i.DE.13.27)

The *ad*-form clause may also appear as a syntactic subject of a matrix verb. When looking at monovalent verbs like *ʒer-ars* 'have to, need to', the logical direct object of the *ad*-form is marked by the nominative case in the same way as a syntactic subject of the matrix predicate whose syntactic subject should be in the nominative case (cf. table 3)[7].

(8)   ʒer-arsa   micemad xark'i   k'eisarsa anu   ara?
           S3SG.necessary.PRS   give.AD   tax.NOM emperor.DAT or   not
           'Is it necessary to give tax to the emperor or not?' (mark.12.14)

The masdar *micemaj* corresponding to the form *micemad* also has the ability to govern its object in dative case (see section 10). Concerning the logical indirect object, compare this data with section 6.

4.3. 1st and 2nd person pronouns as objects of ad-*forms*

So far we have only considered case marking of third person NPs. First and second person objects are not case marked in finite clauses. Compare the examples below, where the object is represented by a personal pronoun in (9a), and a full NP in (9b).

(9) a. šemip'q'robs   is   me
        S3SG.O1SG.catch.PRS he.NOM   I
        šemip'q'ro   man   me
        S3SG.O1SG.catch.AOR   he.ERG   I
        ševup'q'rie   mas   me
        INV.S3SG.O1SG.catch.PF he.DAT   I
        'He catches/caught/has caught me'

     b. šeip'q'robs   is   k'acsa
        S3SG.O3SG.catch.PRS he.NOM   man.DAT
        šeip'q'ro   man   k'aci
        S3SG.O3SG.catch.AOR   he.ERG   man.NOM
        šeup'q'ries   mas   k'aci
        INV.S3SG.O3SG.catch.PF he.DAT   man.NOM.
        'He catches/caught/has caught the man'

---

[7]As masdars could be used with either active or passive meaning, it is also possible to suggest the passive form as an original form for the *ad*-form (*miecema xark'i*). In such a case, *xark'i* is a logical subject of the *ad*-form and a syntactic subject of the matrix verb.

The behaviour of the first and the second person pronouns as arguments of the *ad*-form is very significant.

Considering examples like (10b), Chkhubianishvili 1972:78 notes that there are no cases where the object of the infinitive (either direct or indirect) is expressed by personal pronouns of the first or the second persons without postposition. As the direct object of a finite verb this pronoun has the form *me* (10a), whereas it appears in the genitive case with the postposition *da* (*čem-da*) with the *ad*-form (b).

(10) a. šemip'q'robs   me
          S3SG.O1SG.catch.PRS I (by function DAT)
          'He is catching me'

      b. gamoxuedit   šep'q'robad čem-da
          S2PL.go out.AOR   catch.AD   I.GEN-to
          'You went out to catch me' (m.DE.26.55)

However, a close examination of the material reveals that bare first and second pronouns without any postposition do appear with *ad*-forms. Two conditions have to be fulfilled for this to occur: the first/second person pronoun has to appear in a complement clause (not a purpose clause); and it has to be represented by an agreement prefix in the matrix verb.

(11)   mun ver   še*mi*ʒlon   *čuen*
          there   not S3PL.O1PL.can.CONJ.II we (funct. DAT)
          šep'q'robad mtavarta   mat   bnelisata
          catch.AD   sovereign.PL.ERG those.PL.ERG darkness.SG.GEN.PL.ERG
          'The sovereigns of darkness will not be able to catch us there'
          (mamata sts. 230.10)

Compare the forms below. The *ad*-form clause in (12a), is a complement of the matrix verb, and at the same time, its object *čuen* is reflected in the matrix verb *še-m-iʒlon* (*m-* is a formant of the first object person), so *čuen* appears without any postposition. Therefore, it occurs in the same form as an object of the *ad*-form (12a) that it does after a finite verb (12b).

(12) a. še-m-iʒlos man šep'q'robad *čuen*
              'He can catch us'

      b. še-m-ip'q'robs *čuen*
              'He catches us'

      c. gamoxuedit tkuen šep'q'robad *čuen-da*
              'You went out to catch us'

In (12c), the *ad*-form is not a complement of the matrix verb. And, since the *ad*-form cannot govern its object in the same way as the finite verb does, the object of the *ad*-form is marked by a postposition.

(13) is another example where the first person of the logical direct object of the *ad*-form is marked as an object of the matrix verb.

(13)   arca   sxuaman dabadebulman   še*mi*ʒlos
        not.too   other.ERG   born.ERG   S3SG.O1PL.can.CONJ.II
        čuen   ganq'enebad siq'uarulsa   ɣmrtisasa
        we (by function DAT)   part out.AD love.DAT   God.SG.GEN.SG.DAT
        '… and no one of creatures will be able to part out us from love of
        God' (romaelta mimart, 8. 39)

This behavior of first/second pronouns is another confirmation of the integration of the *ad*-form clause into the matrix clause.

5. Case assigned to logical subjects of the *ad*-form

It is common for the *ad*-form clause to appear in the indirect object position[8] of the matrix verb. In this position, the logical subject of the *ad*-form is marked as the syntactic indirect object of the matrix verb as in (14).

(14) ubrʒana   mas dadebad   ʒač'wi   kedsa   missa
      S3SG.O3SG.O3.order.AOR   he.DAT put.AD   chain.NOM neck.DAT her.DAT
      'He ordered him to place a chain on her neck'
      (shush. kart. krest.I.1: 138)

The *ad*-form clause may also appear as the subject of a monovalent matrix predicate. In such a case (15a), the logical subject of the *ad*-form is marked by the nominative case. In (15b), the matrix verb is transitive, and the *ad*-form monovalent. The subject case assigned by a transitive verb in the second series is the ergative case, and it is this case which appears here.

(15) a. huadvilejs   ars   mankanisa   sabeli   qurelsa
         easier.ABS   S3SG.be.PRS machine.GEN rope.NOM   hole.DAT
         nemsisasa   ganslvad,   vidre mdidari šeslvad
         needle.SG.GEN.SG.DAT   go through.AD   than   rich.NOM go in.AD
         sasupevelsa ɣmrtisasa
         Paradise.DAT God.SG.GEN.SG.DAT
         'It's easier to lead a rope through the eye of a needle, than it is for a
         rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven' (Haem. mark. 10.25)

---

[8] Indirect object is to be understood as objects that appear in the dative case in the first and second series, cf. table 3.

b. ic'q'o   kroladkar-man
   S3SG.O3.begin.AOR   blow.AD   wind-ERG
   'The wind began to blow' (Chkhubianishvili 1972:73)

6. Case assigned to indirect objects of the *ad*-form

In examples with indirect objects of the *ad*-form, the case assigned is always the dative. (16) shows an example in series II, and (17) shows an example in series III.

(16)   arɣaravin   ik'adra   miaxlebad   ʒuarsa
          nobody   S3SG.O3SG.dare.AOR   come closer.AD cross.DAT
          'Nobody dared to come closer to the cross'
          (Chkhubianishvili 1972: 75)

(17)   numca   vis   tkuengansa
          not.Particle ('let')   who.DAT (here: anybody)   you.from.DAT
          uk'adrebies   amieritgan   uc'esosa
          INV.S3SG.O3SG.dare.PF   this time.INSTR.from improper.DAT
          sakmesa qelq'opad   monast'ersa   amas   šina   čemsa
          action.DAT   begin.AD friary.DAT   this.DAT in   my.DAT
          samk'widrebelsa
          proprietary.DAT
          'Hence none of you should have dared to begin any improper action
          in the friary belonging to me.' (vahanis kvab. gang. 62.27)

We have not found any examples where the matrix verb is in the III series, and the *ad*-form occurred with both direct and indirect logical objects.

7. The *ad*-form in purpose clauses

Apart from complement clauses, the *ad*-form occurs in purpose clauses as well. When purpose and complement clauses are compared, a difference is noted in the factors governing case marking. The verb series of the matrix verb is of importance for case marking only in complement clauses, no such regularity is observable in purpose clauses (Chkhubianishvili 1972:92-93). The most common situation in purpose clauses is that the direct object of the *ad*-form is marked by the dative case.

(18)   movida …   smenad   sibrʒne-sa   solomon-is-sa
          S3SG.come.AOR …   listen.AD   wisdom-DAT Solomon-GEN-DAT
          'He came to listen to Solomon's wisdom'

Also, there were other non-finite forms in Old Georgian that were able to govern their object in dative case (cf. sections 10 and 11).

8. Nominative case instead of the expected dative case

8.1. Complement clauses

In some examples, where the object of the *ad*-form is expected to be assigned the dative case, it appears in the nominative case.

(19)   q'ovelnive   šen-gan   elian
         all.PL.NOM   you.SG.(funct. GEN)-from   S3PL.O3SG.wait for.PRS
         mocemad   sazrdeli   mati   žamsa
         give.AD   food.NOM   their.SG.NOM   time.DAT
         'Everybody is waiting to get their food from you in time'
         (ps.103.27)

In some cases, the nominative case of an object that was expected to be in dative case may be explained by adjacency factors. For example:

(20)   xasc'avebdit   mat   damarxvad
         S2PL.O3PL.O3SG.teach.IMPERATIVE.I they.PL (funct. DAT)   keep.AD
         q'oveli   romeli   gamcen   tkuen
         all.NOM   which.NOM S1SG.O2PL.O3SG.report.AOR   you.PL (funct. DAT)
         'Teach them to keep everything what I have reported to you'
         (xanm. lekc.28.20)

The nominative case of the *ad*-form object *qoveli* seems to be conditioned by the nominative case of the adjacent member of the following clause *romeli,* that is assigned nominative case by finite verb *gamcen*.

8.2. Purpose clauses

The nominative case may also appear on objects of *ad*-forms in purpose clauses. However, in this position, the nominative case is found more rarely than the dative case according to Chkhubianishvili 1972:93.

(21)   da   c'arvida   moq'vanebad tavisa
         and S3SG.go.away.AOR   bring.AD   head.here:REFL.PRON.SG.GEN
         twisisa   coli
         his.ADDIT   wife.NOM
         'And he went away to bring himself a wife'

Such rare examples as (19-21) show the ability of *ad*-forms to take objects in the nominative case (that differs markedly from other non-finite forms in Old Georgian). Therefore, the *ad*-form has a certain degree of verbal features, but influence from foreign languages in translated literature cannot be excluded. Furthermore, as has been mentioned above, the dative case is found not only with *ad*-forms, but also with other non-finite forms in Old Georgian.

9. Dative case assigned by masdar

Like indirect objects of the *ad*-form, an object of a masdar may also be assigned the dative case.

(22)   giɣirs   tkuen   uprojsad damorčilebaj
        INV.S2PL.O3SG.be worth.PRS   you (funct. DAT) more   obey.NOM
        brʒanebasa.
        order.DAT
        'The order is worth obeying for you' (kim. I. 110.8)

Example (8) – repeated here for convenience as (23a) – includes both a direct and an indirect object of an *ad*-form. The same dative case occurs with the masdar of the verb *micemaj* (23b).

(23) a. ǯerarsa   micemad xark'i k'eisarsa   anu   ara?
         S3SG.necessary.PRS   give.AD   tax.NOM emperor.DAT or   not
         'Is it necessary to give tax to the emperor or not?' (mark.12.14)

    b. ǯerarsa   xark'isa   micemaj k'eisarsa?
        S3SG.necessary.PRS   tax.GEN   give.NOM   emperor.DAT
        'Is it necessary to give tax to the emperor?' (m.DE. 22.17).

In these examples, *micemaj* occupies the syntactic subject position that was held by *xark'i* in (23a), and *xark'isa* has become the argument of the masdar *micemaj.* As a result, it has changed its case to the genitive. Compare the behaviour of the indirect object *k'eisarsa,* which retains its dative case in both examples (23a) and (23b).

A masdar may assign dative case to its logical direct object as well. In (24a), the logical object of the matrix verb is a masdar marked by nominative case. The noun *k'ari* 'door' appears in the dative case as the object of the masdar. Compare this with (24b), where the object position of the matrix verb is occupied by an *ad*-form, and *k'ari* 'door.NOM' is marked by the nominative case.

(24) a. ubrʒano   dak'rʒalvaj k'arsa ek'lesiisasa
         S1SG.O3SG.O3SG.order.CONJII   keep.NOM   door.DAT of church.DAT
         'I shall order him to defend the door of the church.'

    b. ubrʒano   dak'rʒalvad k'ari ek'lesiisaj
        S1SG.O3SG.O3SG.order.CONJ II   keep.AD door.NOM of church.NOM
        'I shall order him to defend the door of the church.'
        (sin. mr.70.16)

10. Dative case assigned by other non-finite forms

As noted above, the *ad*-form along with masdars and participles may assign the dative case to their objects. Dative case assigned by non-finite forms has been studied by Shanidze 1980:143-144, 1976:58; Imnaishvili 1957:441-52, 690, 720; Kiziria 1963:187, and others. In Old Georgian there was another non-finite form that governed its object in dative case too: the comparative degree of adjectives (Shanidze 1976:158).

The dative case marking is considered to be connected with the verbal origin of these forms. The comparative degree of adjectives is also a finite form from its origin in Georgian (Shanidze 1980:143-144). Even a noun with the semantics of a participle could assign the dative case to its object (Imnaishvili 1957:692).

(25)   ara   var   vač'ar   sit'q'uasa
          not   S1SG.be.PRS salesman.ABS word.DAT
          'I am not a salesman of words.'

Other examples are given below: comparative degree of the adjective with dative case in (26a) and participle with dative case in (26b).

(26) a.   q'ovelive   siborot'e   umcires   arn   siborot'esa
          all.ABS   evil.ABS   less.ABS   S3SG.be.PRS.ITER evil.DAT
          mas   dedak'acisasa
          that.DAT woman.SG.GEN.SG.DAT
          'Any evil is less than the evil of woman'

     b.   daq'udebaj   ars   momp'ovnebel gwirgwinsa
          loneliness.NOM S3SG.be.PRS obtainer.ABS   crown.DAT
          brc'q'invalesa
          briliant.DAT
          'Loneliness is obtainer of a brilliant crown.'

11. Modifiers of masdars and *ad*-forms

Looking for further support for the verbal character of *ad*-forms and masdars, one finds, in the case of adverbial modifiers, that they behave similarly. Actually, according to Chkhubianishvili 1972:43-44, they pattern in the same way as do finite verbs. In the examples below, both the *ad*-form in (27a), and the masdar in (b), are modified by the adverbial *picxlad* 'fiercely'.

(27) a.   muntkuesve ubrʒana   cemad mata
          then   S3SG.O3SG.O3SG.order.AOR beat.AD them.ADDIT
          k'uertxita   picxlad
          stick.INSTR fiercely
          '… then he ordered him to beat them fiercely with a stick'

b. ubrʒana   cema-j   mata
   S3SG.O3SG.O3SG.order.AOR.   beat-NOM   them.PL.ADIT
   k'uertxita   picxlad.
   stick.INSTR   fiercely
   '… he ordered him to beat them fiercely with a stick'

The masdar can be modified by a declinable noun as well (Jorbenadze 1995:14).

12. The loss of *ad*-forms in Old Georgian

The resemblance in case marking of finite and non-finite forms is observed in the earliest texts. Later, the dative case marking of objects of masdars and participles has been gradually lost, and the genitive has become the only possible form in this position (Shanidze 1976; Imnaishvili 1957; Chikobava 1953). Still the governing of objects in dative case by participles (28) is also rarely retained in Modern Georgian (Kiziria 1963:187; Imnaishvili 1957:690). This government of objects appears more frequently in some dialects of Georgian than in others.

(28)   naxvas   moc'q'urebuli
            see.DAT   thirsting.NOM
            'Thirsting for seeing'

The *ad*-form gradually disappeared from the literary language, beginning around the 10th century AD. The part of the system that changed first was the dative/nominative case marking with *ad*-forms being replaced by the genitive marking. Chkhubianishvili notes that the infinitive construction remained for a longer time in religious texts and other texts written in a higher, archaic style. The *ad*-form was also found in purpose clauses for several centuries longer.

Although the *ad*-form has by now completely disappeared from the modern literary language[9], the form is still found in some peripheral dialects spoken in the mountains of northern Georgia such as khevsur, tushetian, mtiul, upper racha and others (Chkhubianishvili 1972:155-156). It has remained mainly in the purpose clause use, as in the tushetian example below:

---

[9]One type of purpose clause in Modern Georgian is formed by a future participle in the adverbial case as the subordinate predicate, having its object in the genitive case. This form is derived from a participle, not a verbal noun as in Old Georgian.

ševedi   samzareuloši   sadilis   gasak'eteblad
1.enter.AOR   kitchen.(DAT).in   lunch.GEN   do/PART.FUT-ADVERBIAL
'I entered the kitchen in order to prepare lunch'

(29)   … rusis ʒaric   šemosuliq'w šamilis   dač'erad
         … Russian army.NOM.too S3SG.came   Shamil.GEN catch.AD
         'The Russian army came to get hold of Shamil'

13. Conclusions

As we have seen, Old Georgian exhibits a number of cases where a notional argument of the *ad*-form, the subject or direct object, syntactically appear as a dependent of the matrix predicate. This phenomenon may thus be described in terms of raising (cf. Boeder 1989:73-74).

To summarise, we find examples of:

(1) direct object to direct object raising (5a-b), (6a-b)
(2) direct object to subject raising (8)
(3) subject to indirect object raising (14)
(4) subject to subject raising (15).

The marking of the raised object includes not only case marking, but also object agreement in the matrix verb (11), (13).

References

Boeder, Winfried. 1989. 'Zur Typologie der Satzverknüpfung in den Kaukasischen Sprachen'. *Annual of Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics* 16, 67-87.

Chikobava (čikobava), Arnold. 1953. 'masdarisa da mimɣeobis ist'oriuli urtiertobisatvis kartulši' [The relation between the masdar and participle in Georgian in a historical perspective]. *iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 5, 33-49. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Chkhubianishvili (čxubianišvili), Darejan. 1972. *inpinit'ivis sak'itxisatvis ʒvel kartulši* [On the problem of the infinitive in Old Georgian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Dzidziguri (ʒiʒiguri), Shota. 1989. *rtuli c'inadadebis p'roblema kartul enaši* [The problem of complex sentences in Georgian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Imnaishvili (imnaišvili), Ivane. 1957. *saxelta bruneba da brunvata punkciebi ʒvel kartulši* [Declination of nouns and functions of cases in Old Georgian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Jorbenadze (jorbenaʒe), Besarion. 1995. *kartuli enis morpologia* [The morphology of Georgian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Kiziria (k'iziria), Anton. 1963. *mart'ivi c'inadadebis šedgeniloba ʒvel kartulši* [The simple sentence in Old Georgian]. Tbilisi: Sakartvelos mecnierebata ak'ademiis gamomcemloba.

Martirosovi (mart'irosovi), Aram. 1955. 'masdaruli k'onst'rukciis genezisisatvis ʒvel kartulši' [On the genesis of masdar constructions in Old

Georgian]. *iberiul-k'avk'asiuri enatmecniereba* 7, 43-60. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Noonan, Michael. 1985. 'Complementation'. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description* 2, 42-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schanidse, Akaki. 1982. *Grammatik der Altgeorgischen Sprache*. Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Shanidze (šaniʒe), Akaki. 1976. *ʒveli kartuli enis gramat'ik'a* [Grammar of Old Georgian]. Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Shanidze (šaniʒe), Akaki. 1980. *kartuli enis gramat'ik'is sapuʒvlebi* [Foundations of Georgian grammar]. Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Sources

Haem. mark.: haemet'i t'ekst'ebi. *Tbilisis universit'et'is moambe* III. 1923.

I.DE: *kartuli otxtavis ori ʒveli redakcia sami šat'berduli xelnac'eris mixedvit.* Tbilisi 1945.

Kim.I: *kartuli hagiograpiuli ʒeglebi* I. Tbilisi 1918.

Luars. mart.: luarsabis mart'viloba: *ʒveli kartuli lit'erat'uris krest'omatia* I. Tbilisi 1946.

Luka: see I.DE.

M.DE: see I.DE.

Mamata sts.: *mamata sc'avlani X da XI saukuneta xelnac'erebis mixedvit.* Tbilisi 1955.

Mark.: see I.DE.

Ps.103.27: *psalmis ʒveli kartuli radakciebi X-XIII s-is xelnac'erta mixedvit* I. 1960.

Romaelta mimart: *axali aɣtkumaj uplisa čuenisa ieso krist'esi.* Tbilisi 1963.

Shush: kart. krest.I.1: c'amebaj c'midisa šušanik'isi : *kartuli enis ist'oriuli krest'omatia*, I, 1. Tbilisi 1982.

Sin. mr.: sinuri mravaltavi 864 c'lisa. Tbilisi 1959.

Vahanis kvab. gang.: *vahanis kvabta gangeba.* Tbilisi 1939.

Xanm. lekc.: *xanmet'i lekcionari.* Tbilisi 1944.

Manuscripts: A 1115, S-384.