

- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1972. *The Dyrbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guilfoyle, Eithne, Henrietta Hung & Lisa Travis. 1992. 'SPEC of IP and SPEC of VP: two subjects in Austronesian languages'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10, 373-414.
- Hestvik, Arild. 1986. 'Case theory and Norwegian impersonal constructions: a case against parameters'. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 9, 181-197.
- Holmer, Arthur. 1996a. *A parametric grammar of Seediq*. (Travaux de l'institut de linguistique de Lund 30). Lund: Lund University Press.
- Holmer, Arthur. 1996b. 'Passive typology – the Case link'. *Working Papers (Dept. of Linguistics, Lund University)* 45, 63-78.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra Thompson. 1980. 'Transitivity in grammar and discourse'. *Language* 56, 251-299.
- Laka, Itziar. 1993. 'Unergatives that assign ergative, unaccusatives that assign accusative'. *MIT Working papers in linguistics* 18 (=Papers on case and agreement I), 149 - 172.
- Ouhalla, Jamal. 1991. *Functional categories and parametric variation*. London: Routledge.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1988. *The case for lexicase: an outline of lexicase grammatical theory*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Starosta, Stanley. to appear. 'Ergativity, transitivity and clitic coreference in four Western Austronesian languages'. ms.
- Tang, Chih-Chen Jane. 1990. 'A note on the DP analysis of the Chinese noun phrase'. *Linguistics* 28, 337-354.

Case marking in infinitive (*ad*-form) clauses in Old Georgian¹

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.

¹We would like to thank the Swedish Institute for support during the research period while working on this article. Also, we would like to express our thanks to Darejan Chkhubianishvili of the Institute of Linguistics at the Georgian Academy of Sciences for consultations on various aspects of the infinitive in Old Georgian.

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.

	<i>Singular</i>	<i>Plural</i>	
'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 šec'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)

²Glossed as ABS.

³The person (and number) of the subject, direct object, indirect object (in this order) is indicated initially in the verb forms, as in: *vubr3ane* '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'erem	
	Conjunctive II (/Future II)	c'eris	
	Mixed Future	c'erodis	
III	Perfect	uc'eris	
	Pluperfect	ec'era	
	Iterative	ec'eris	
	Conjunctive III	ec'eris	

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

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)

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

bržana	ordered
aižula	forced
arc'muna	persuaded
isc'rapa	strove for
egulebis	intends
hnebavs	wants
žer-ičina	found necessary, wanted
šesžina	continued
qel-q'o	started
umžobes ars	is better
žer-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 maižuleb čuen gandgomad
 why S2SG.O1PL.force.PRS I.PL.(funct. DAT) go away.AD
 ymrtisagan.
 God.GEN.from
 'Why do you force us away from God' (sin. mr. 118.2)
- b. xolo me vic'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.

⁴Examples 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 verbs⁵.

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 ... aydginebad 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.

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

The same rule also applies in series III (6), a fact that has not been discussed in the literature before⁶.

- (6) a. *anu kmnad raj gwišc'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 dyeindlad dyemde vervis*
 and until of today.ADV.C day.ADV.C.till nobody.DAT
uk'adrebies ayebad 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'irmšojša*
 veneration.NOM image.SG.GEN.SG.NOM the first born baby.GEN
mis saxisa mimart ayslvad gwišc'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)

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

- 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 *žer-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) žer-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'

⁷As 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 šemizlon 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-izlon* (*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-izlos 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 šemizlos
not.too other.ERG born.ERG S3SG.O1PL.can.CONJ.II
čuen ganq'enebad siq'uarulsa ymrtisasa
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 position⁸ 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) ubr3ana mas dadebad žač'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 ymrtisasa
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)

⁸Indirect 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 krolad kar-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) aryaravin ik'adra miaglebad žuarsa
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 sibr3ne-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'avebdi 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 tavisā
 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) giyirs tkuen uprojsad damorčilebaj
 INV.S2PL.O3SG.be worth.PRS you (funct. DAT) more obey.NOM
 brzanebasa.
 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. žerarsa 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. žerarsa 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. ubrzano dak'r3alvaj 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. ubrzano dak'r3alvad 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
brilliant.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 ubr3ana cemađ 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. ubr3ana cema-j mata
S3SG.O3SG.O3SG.order.AOR. beat-NOM them.PL.ADDIT
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 language⁹, 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:

⁹One 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 žaric 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 mimyeobis 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 (čhubianišvili), Darejan. 1972. *inpinit'ivis sak'itxisatvis zvel kartulši* [On the problem of the infinitive in Old Georgian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Dzidziguri (ziziguri), 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 zvel kartulši* [Declination of nouns and functions of cases in Old Georgian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Jorbenadze (jorbenaže), Besarion. 1995. *kartuli enis morfologia* [The morphology of Georgian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Kiziria (k'iziria), Anton. 1963. *mart'ivi c'inadadebis šedgeniloba zvel kartulši* [The simple sentence in Old Georgian]. Tbilisi: Sakartvelos mecnierebata ak'ademiis gamomcemloba.

- Martirosovi (mart'irosovi), Aram. 1955. 'masdaruli k'onst'rukciis genezisisatvis zvel 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 (šaniže), Akaki. 1976. *zveli kartuli enis gramat'ik'a* [Grammar of Old Georgian]. Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba.
- Shanidze (šaniže), Akaki. 1980. *kartuli enis gramat'ik'is sapuzvlebi* [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 oxtavis ori zveli redakcia sami šat'berduli xelnac'eris mixedvit*. Tbilisi 1945.
- Kim.I: *kartuli hagiografiuli zeglebi* I. Tbilisi 1918.
- Luars. mart.: luarsabis mart'viloba: *zveli 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 zveli kartuli radakciebi X-XIII s-is xelnac'erta mixedvit* I. 1960.
- Romaelta mimart: *axali aytkumaj uplisa čuenisa ieso krist'esi*. Tbilisi 1963.
- Shush: kart. krest.I.1: c'amebaj c'midisa šušanič'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 lektionari*. Tbilisi 1944.
- Manuscripts*: A 1115, S-384.