

# Originally Nominal Affixation on Finite Verb Forms in Modern Georgian and Laz

Nino Amiridze (Utrecht University)  
Nino.Amiridze@let.uu.nl

Cross-linguistically nominal marking is restricted to (pro)nominals and possibly also to non-finite (i.e., participial and gerundive) forms (1). Some languages illustrate case endings, locative markers or postpositions cliticized to finite forms as well, though grammaticalized into subordinators (see the Laz genitive marker *-ši* (2) and the Emérillon (Tupi-Guarani) postposition *-ehe* “with” (3b vs. 3a), both used as subordinators).

Although Laz came to cliticize the GEN case marker *-ši* to finite forms under the influence of Turkish [Jik67], the cliticization in Laz and Turkish crucially differ [HC95, p. 145]. In Turkish the locative marker attaches exclusively to non-finite forms (1). Although Laz has several deverbal nouns similar to the Turkish gerundive (1), Laz cliticizes a GEN marker *-ši* instead to a finite verb form (2).

According to [HC95], none of the sister languages of Laz cliticizes case markers to finite verbs. However, Modern Georgian cliticizes a segment of morphemes *-s-a-vit*, consisting of the postposition *-vit* “like”, “as”, the DAT case marker *-s* that it governs and an epenthetic vowel *-a*, to fully inflected finite verb forms to express uncertainty, doubt [JKB88, p. 170] (cf. 4a vs. 4b).

It will be argued in this paper that although Laz and Georgian are sister languages, the grammaticalized Laz *-ši* (2) and the Georgian *-s-a-vit* (4a) do not have a common path of development. There are at least three reasons for that: (i) Laz cliticizes the case marker *-ši* after Turkish influence while the cliticization of the Georgian *-s-a-vit* cannot be attributed to Turkish influence since Georgian has no intensive contact with Turkish; (ii) Laz cliticization involves the GEN marker while Georgian cliticizes a postposition together with the DAT marker it governs; (iii) the semantics of the cliticized material are different in Georgian and its sister Laz: while in Laz the clitic *-ši* is grammaticalized into a subordinator (2), the Georgian clitic *-s-a-vit* is grammaticalized as a modality marker (4a vs. 4b).

- (1) Turkish, from [HC95]  
kadin tarla-ya git-tiğ-in-de.  
woman field-DAT go-GER-3.SG-LOC  
‘when the woman went to the field.’
- (2) Laz, from [HC95, p. 145]

oxorǰa qona-ša idu var-idu-ya-ši.  
 woman field-ALL she.went NEG-she.went-QUOT-GEN  
 ‘when the woman went into the field. . .’ / ‘as soon as the woman went into  
 the field. . .’

(3) Emérillon (Tupi-Guarani), from [Ros03, p. 529]

- a. awak<sup>w</sup>əl-a-l-aʔil o-kel-o o-iba-l-ehe.  
 Man-a-RELN-son 3.I-sleep-CONT 3.COREF-pet-RELN-with  
 ‘The little boy sleeps with his pet.’
- b. awak<sup>w</sup>əl o-kiǰe-l-ehe, ka-wi o-wag.  
 Man 3.I-be.scared-RELN-because wasp-ABL 3.I-go  
 ‘Because the man is scared, he goes away from the wasps.’

(4) Georgian

- a. ilo-m xel-i ga-i-pxačn-a-s-a-vit.  
 Ilo-ERG hand-NOM PV-PRV-scratch-3A<sub>ERG</sub>.SG.AOR-DAT-EV-like  
 ‘Ilo kind of scratched his hand.’
- b. ilo-m xel-i ga-i-pxačn-a.  
 Ilo-ERG hand-NOM PV-PRV-scratch-3A<sub>ERG</sub>.SG.AOR  
 ‘Ilo scratched his hand.’

## References

- [HC95] A. C. Harris and L. Campbell. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [Jik67] S. Jikia. turkul-lazuri enobrivi urtiertobidan [From Turkish-Laz Language Contact]. In *turkuli sintaksuri kalkebi lazursi* [*Turkish Syntactic Calques in Laz*] (*Dedicated to the anniversary of Akaki Shanidze*), volume 2. Orioni, Tbilisi, 1967. (in Georgian).
- [JKB88] B. A. Jorbenadze, M. Kobaidze, and M. Beridze. *kartuli enis morpemebis da modaluri elementebis leksiķoni* [*Dictionary of Morphemes and Modal Elements of Georgian*]. Mecniereba, Tbilisi, 1988. (in Georgian).
- [Ros03] F. Rose. *Morphosyntaxe de l’emerillon, langue tupi-guarani de Guyane française*. PhD thesis, Université Lumière Lyon 2, Faculté des Lettres, Sciences du Langage et Arts, Département de Sciences du Langage, Ecole Doctorale ECLIPS, Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage, 2003.