

This is an offprint from:

Werner Abraham and Leonid Kulikov (eds.)

*Tense-Aspect, Transitivity and Causativity*

*Essays in honour of Vladimir Nedjalkov*

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam/Philadelphia

1999

(Published as Vol. 50 of the series

STUDIES IN LANGUAGE COMPANION SERIES, ISSN 0165-7763)

ISBN 90 272 3053 6 (Eur.) / 1 55619 936 8 (US)

© 1999 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form,  
by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means,  
without written permission from the publisher.

# Some notes on the Georgian resultative

Winfried Boeder  
*University of Oldenburg*

## Abstract

In addition to what is known as a 'perfect tense' (with evidential and other meanings), Modern Georgian has resultative constructions with *to be* and *to have* plus 'passive' past participle, which, in spite of their constructional similarity and functional overlap, differ from "Standard European" perfect constructions. This paper singles out 'possessive resultatives', which were recognized by V. Nedjalkov as a core group occurring in many languages. These Georgian core group resultatives (of the type: *s/he has her/his mouth opened*) are shown to be related to participial compounds that incorporate their subject or direct object (as in (literally): *mouth-opened dragon* in the sense of: 'a dragon who has his mouth opened'). Some semantic and formal restrictions on this formation are discussed, and it is suggested that they may have served as a basis for the historical development of resultative constructions.

## 1. Introduction

Reading the St. Petersburg "encyclopedia" of resultatives (Nedjalkov (ed.) 1988) one cannot help being impressed by the amazing wealth of insights offered by Vladimir Nedjalkov and his colleagues, and many questions and classifications based on systematic data collection and sound knowledge of the languages involved can be used as guide-lines for future research. The following notes try to supplement Maia Mač'avariani's description of Georgian resultatives (1988) with a few tentative observations that a non-native speaker might venture.<sup>1</sup>

The paper is organized as follows. Sections 2 and 3 discuss the main properties of resultatives with "to be" and "to have", respectively. From the latter construction, "possessive resultatives" are singled out as a "core group" and

distinguished from its extensions (section 4). In section 5, the relation between the Georgian resultative and the “European perfect” is considered, while section 6 investigates the relation between “core group” resultatives and incorporating participial compounds. A final observation on the diachronic development of resultative constructions terminates the paper.

## 2. Prerequisites

Grammars of Georgian usually concentrate on the rich system of its “synthetic” verb forms with its many tenses, aspects, moods and diatheses. Some of these forms that are relevant in the present context have to be distinguished from resultatives: these are the “dynamic” synthetic passives as in (1), the stative passives as in (2), and the dynamic analytic passive as in (3):<sup>2</sup>

- (1) *i-c'er-eb-a*  
 NV-write-thematic.suffix-3SG  
 ‘it is being written (present)’
- (2) *s-c'er-i-a*  
 3IO-write-PM-3SG  
 ‘it is written (present state)’
- (3) *da-c'er-il-i*            *i-kn-a*  
 PREV-write-PP-NOM NV-do-3SG  
 ‘it was/became written (aorist)’

Resultatives, on the other hand, are analytic forms with “to be” and “to have” plus passive perfect participle (PP):

- (4) a. *našrom-i da-c'er-il-i aris / da-c'er-il-i-a*  
 work-NOM PREV-write-PP-NOM it.is / PREV-write-PP-NOM-it.is  
 ‘the work has been written’
- b. *ma-s našrom-i da-c'er-il-i akvs*  
 s/he-DAT work-NOM PREV-write-PP-NOM s/he.has.it  
 ‘s/he has written it’

Before I concentrate on the analytic forms with “to have” + PP (type b), a few words on “to be” + PP (type a) are in order. Consider:

- (5) *aravin gagvigos k'ia da es alvis xe gvelis t'q'avze-a amosuli* (Γ 38)  
 ‘but nobody shall understand that this aloe-tree has (“is”) grown on a snake’s skin’

- (6) *kmris tavi zmas moeba da zmisia kmars [...] imis coli ikneba, vis t'azedac kmris tavi-a mibmuli* (Γ 63)  
 'The husband's head *was attached* (synthetic form with "dynamic" meaning) to (his) brother and (his) brother's head to her husband [...] She will be the wife of him on whose body the husband's head *is attached* (resultative).'
- (7) *q'vela igrzino mašinve rom rayac šemc'vari iq'o šenaxuli* (B1 78)  
 'Everybody noticed that something roasted *was kept* (preserved) there.'
- (8) *švaze erti bozi iq'o dasobili* (B1 80)  
 'In the middle a pillar *was inserted*.'
- (9) *tetr zuas gaxsni, tetri t'anisamosit, iarayit da cxenit iknebi gamoc'q'obili* (B1 122)  
 'The moment you detach the white hair, *you will be arrayed* in white clothes, a weapon, and a horse.'
- (10) *Zurabis da gač'orili-a*  
 'Zurab's sister is being gossiped about.'  
 (Harris 1981: 115 (28e); her translation; lit.: '... gossiped-is')

This type of resultative seems to occur with agent phrases (with the postposition *mier*) and other phrases appropriate for "dynamic" verb forms if the corresponding "source", "direction" etc. is still of current relevance. A sentence like:

- (11) *bavšvi dak'benilia zaylis mier*  
 'The child is bitten *by the dog*'  
 (Harris 1981: 102 (2b); her translation)

is considered as rather artificial and stilted ("administrative style") by some Georgians — but is perhaps appropriate in an expertise: "The child is the victim of a dog-bite" (i.e. the bite is such that it must be that of a dog). — Similarly:

- (12) *es kvebi gadaq'rilia panžridan*  
 'These stones were thrown *from the window*.'  
 (Harris 1981: 104 (4b); her translation; lit.: '... are thrown ...')

could be used by a detective: "These stones have obviously been thrown from the window."

- (13) *c'erili mic'erilia zmistvis*  
 'The letter is written *to his/my brother*.'  
 (Harris 1981: 110 (18a); her translation)

means that the letter *is* addressed to my/his brother. In:

- (14) *axali šarvali šek'erilia šentvis*  
 'New trousers are made for you.'  
 (Harris 1981: 116 (29); her translation)

the result still preserves the act of producing it, and it is of current interest for the destinee, e.g. in a context like: "There are two trousers, one is for you", while in:

- (15) *vašli micemulia masc'avleblastvis*  
 'The apple is given to the teacher.'  
 (Harris 1981: 102 (1b); her translation)

the result normally does not preserve a trace of the act of giving, and (15) seems to be less acceptable than (13)–(14). Time adverbials can refer to "the moment at which a property is observed" (Mač'avariani 1983: 134; 1988: 262):

- (16) *k'ari dilit daxuruli iq'o 'Dver' utrom byla zakryta.'*  
 (Mač'avariani 1983: 134);  
 'In the morning the door *was closed*.'  
 (Mač'avariani 1988: 262).

But they may also be used to categorize a result (Rezo K'ik'naze):

- (17) *es p'rograma 1918 c'els Leninis mier aris šemušavebuli*  
 'This program was ('is') *worked out* by Lenin in 1918.'

This means that it is Lenin's program and that it is the one of 1918 (contrasting e.g. with another program proposed in a different year).<sup>3</sup> The following sentence, however, seems to exclude both meanings of time adverbials in resultative clauses, and is unacceptable for some speakers:<sup>4</sup>

- (18) *zayli axlaxan aris daxat'uli mamis mier*  
 'Sobaka *nedavno* otcom narisovana.' (Mač'avariani 1983: 135);  
 'The dog has *recently* been drawn by father.' (Mač'avariani 1988: 264).

These resultatives with "to be", then, require a persistence of the underlying event's result in the subject and the current relevance or categorizing quality of the other constituents.

### 3. Constructions with “to have”

Turning now to the construction with “to have” + PP (type b), first consider the properties of “to have” in Georgian.<sup>5</sup> The Georgian verbs for “to have” are suppletive variants of “to be”, differing from the latter in that they have an additional “possessor” argument which is coded as a dative noun phrase (i.e. like an indirect object), the “possessum” argument being coded as a nominative noun phrase.<sup>6</sup> In Šanize’s (1973:295, §365) terms, “to have” supplies the “relative form” of the verb “to be” (i.e. the form with an object). Otherwise “to have” behaves like “to be” in that it has a nominal predicate construction:

- (19) a. *tvalebi aris cisperi*  
 eyes is blue  
 ‘(his/her) eyes are blue’  
 b. *coli aris č’k’viani*  
 wife is clever  
 ‘(his) wife is clever’
- (20) a. *tvalebi akvs cisperi*  
 eyes s/he.has.them blue  
 ‘his/her eyes are blue’  
 b. *coli hq’avs č’k’viani*  
 wife s/he.has.her clever  
 ‘his wife is clever’
- (21) a. *rogora xar?*  
 ‘How are.you?’  
 b. *rogora gq’avs ožaxi?*  
 how you.have.it family  
 ‘How is your family?’
- (22) *am xnis ganmavlobaši Ninoc movvleli mq’avda* (MD 5/1/79)  
 ‘During that time I couldn’t take care of Nino, too.’  
 (lit. ‘I had Nino uncared for’)

A possible translation of “to have” in English is a corresponding possessive pronoun with the “possessed” argument: (20a) ‘her eyes are blue’ (but French: *elle a les yeux bleus*), (20b) ‘his wife is intelligent’, (21)b. ‘how is your family’. Even ‘my Nino’ may be appropriate in (22) (similar to colloquial *our Jimmy* for a family member), but the dative subject of “to have” in (21)–(22) is not primarily a possessor but an experiencer or beneficiary who is somehow affected by the state of affairs expressed by the clause. As we will see, most, but not all, subjects of “to have” are systematically related to dative indirect objects.

Constructions with “to be” + PP are related to “to have” + PP as (19a) and (b) are related to (20a) and (b), i.e. “to be” + PP has a paradigmatically complete counterpart “to have” + PP:

- (23) *tu xelevi daxetkili gakvt, daibanet q'avis nalekit* (from a calendar, 3/6/1982)  
 ‘If you have cracked hands, wash them with coffee-grounds.’ (lit.: ‘if hands *cracked* (PP) *you.have.them ...*’) (present)
- (24) *miviye tkveni bolo barati, saertod, tkveni q'vela barati, c'igni da amanati miyebuli makvs* (MD 10/7/80)  
 ‘I (have) received (aorist) your last letter, in general, *I have received* (PP) all your letters, the book and the parcel.’ (present)
- (25) *mic'uri saxlebi iq'ven. mic'aši iq'o čadgmuli. zeidan erdo konda, mic'a konda c'aq'rili* (I 90)  
 ‘These were houses made of earth. They *were set* into the earth. From above, they had a flat roof, and were covered with earth.’ (lit.: ‘earth *they.had.it thrown.on*’) (imperfect)
- (26) *mic'uri saxli iq'o gat'ixruli [...] sakonels konda gak'etebuli bagai* (I 90)  
 ‘The earth house *was partitioned* (PP) [...] there was a manger made for the cattle.’ (lit.: ‘the cattle *had made a manger*’) (imperfect)
- (27) *an pexebi ekneba damt'vreuli da an mxrebio* (Γ 59)  
 ‘[He thought:] Probably either its (sc. the goose’s) feet are broken or its shoulders.’ (lit.: ‘or feet *it.will.have.them broken* (PP) or ...’) (future)
- (28) *axla ayar č'amso. imas šeč'muli erti t'aroc ar ekneba* (I 77–78)  
 ‘Now it (sc. the bear) will not eat it (sc. the maize) any more, they say. It probably hasn’t eaten even one cob.’ (lit.: ‘... it *eaten* one cob.too not *it.will.have.it*’) (future)
- (29) *amastan čartuli unda gvkondes t'oršeri* (medical advice from a calendar, 17/8/83)  
 ‘In doing this (sc. watching television), *we must have* a torch *switched on* (PP).’ (present subjunctive)
- (30) *martlis mtkmels cxeni šek'azmuli unda q'avdeso* (proverb)  
 ‘The teller of (the) truth must *have* (his/a) horse *saddled* (PP).’ (present subjunctive)

- (31) *arc me mkonia guli mattan mindobili* (Ilia Č'avč'avaze apud Imn 204)  
 'Nor have I poured out my heart to them.' (lit.: 'nor *I.have.had.it* heart at.them *entrusted*') (perfect)

For the rest of this paper I will concentrate on this construction. Following Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988), I call it "possessive resultative".

#### 4. Possessive resultatives

It is one of Vladimir Nedjalkov's merits to have provided for us a list of concepts that make up the universal, semantically homogeneous core group of possessive resultatives (Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 23) and which are exemplified below:

- 1) verbs meaning 'to take', 'to receive', 'to lose' (see (24) and (32)–(34));
- 2) verbs meaning 'to put on (clothes)' (see (35)–(36));
- 3) verbs describing motion of body parts, cf. *to lower one's head*, *to open one's mouth* (see (37)b.);
- 4) verbs [...] describing actions upon body parts by the agent, cf. *to break one's leg* (see (23) and (27));
- 5) verbs of "self-attaching", cf. *to surround*, *to follow (sb)* ((38));
- 6) verbs meaning 'to eat', 'to drink' (see (28) and (39));
- 7) verbs of the type *to see*, *to learn*, *to study (sth)*, etc. (see (40)–(42));
- 8) verbal collocations *to perform (a deed)*, *to make (a mistake)*, *to win (a victory)*, etc. (I have no material illustrating this group.)

- (32) a. *iq'o gamočenili sazogado moyvac'e. minič'ebuli hkonda mecnier-ebis damsaxurebuli mogvac'is c'odeba.*

- b. *dažildoebuli iq'o mravali ordenita da medlit.* (biographical note from a calendar, 22/5/1982)

'He was a distinguished social activist. The title of an activist of merit in the sciences was/had been bestowed on him (lit. '*bestowed he.had.it* of.science merited activist's title'). He *was/had been rewarded* (PP) with many orders and medals.'

- (33) *amat exla davic'q'ebuli hkondat tavianti varami* (Šio Aragvisp'irveli apud Imn 204)

'They *had forgotten* (PP) now their misery.'



- (34) *šen rom cixeši damc'q'vdeuli Q'aramani gq'avda, is me gaušvio* (Bl 118)  
 'Qaramani (a hero), who you had locked up (PP) in your fortress, I have freed (aorist), he said.'
- (35) *erti moxuci kali zis dids ormoši, rumelsac tavi daxuruli akvs* (Bl 24)  
 'an old woman is sitting in a big pit, the opening of which is covered.' (lit.: '... which head covered (PP) it.has.it')
- (36) *[zizias] zeidan c'amogdebuli hkonda šali* (Aleksandre Q'azbegi apud Imn 204)  
 'Dzidzia had put on a shawl from above.' (lit.: '... put.on she. had.it')
- (37) a. *mok'led šek'reč'ili tma mtlad gač'ayaravebuli akvs ...*  
 b. *tvalebi daxuč'uli akvs* (Ek'at'erine Gabašvili apud Imn 204)  
 'His short-cut hair had completely turned grey ... his eyes were closed.' (lit.: '... he.had.it turned.grey ... he.had.them closed')
- (38) *sasaplaos kvīs lamazi q'ore akvs šemovlebuli* (RK)  
 'the churchyard has a beautiful mound of stones around it.' (lit.: '...it.has.it surrounded')
- (39) *erts droši is c'amali imasac daleuli hkonda [...] radganac met'i c'amali dalia* (Bl 70)  
 'Once, he too drank/had drunk (PP) that medicine. [Therefore he considered himself strong, but the other king was twice as strong] because he drank/had drunk (aorist) more medicine.'
- (40) *čems p'at'araobaši bevri ram mkonda gagonili am cixis šesaxe* (Šio Aragvisp'irveli apud Imn 204–5)  
 'In my childhood, I had heard (PP) much about this fortress.'
- (41) *kveq'nierebis avk'argi, ueč'velia, gacnobili geknebat* (Soprom Mgaloblišvili apud Imn 205)  
 'You will, no doubt, have got acquainted (PP) with the good and bad things of the world.'
- (42) *zapxulis gegmac ara makvs xeirianad mopikrebuli* (VG 7/4/79)  
 'I haven't properly made a plan for the summer, either.' (lit.: '... I.have.it properly thought.out')
- (43) *rodesac "Vepxist'q'aosnis" musik'as vc'erdi [...] c'armodgenili mkonda adamiani da samq'aro* (Samšoblo 26/12/1987)  
 'When I wrote (imperfect) the music for "Vepkhistqaosani", I had man and the world before me.' (lit.: '... had represented.to.me ...')

These possessive resultatives denote a contact with the “affected” subject of “to have” (or a reversal of this contact, as with “to lose”), or even “incorporation” in a literal or metaphorical sense (as in subgroup 6) and 7)). The subgroups are of course semantically related to each other: 2) is a kind of attaching related to 5), 7) is a mental counterpart of 6), and 3) is an internal counterpart of 4) with its external effects upon body parts. Notice, however, that the assignment e.g. to group 4) is often undecidable: without a context, you cannot tell if the goose in (27) broke her feet or if somebody else injured it. In subgroup 1), on the other hand, the subject of “to have” is not an agent. Subgroup 1) also has a converse variant with verbs like “to bestow” (32). Similarly, a subgroup may have intransitive converses: e.g. (48) below is related to 1).

However, there are possessive resultatives that do not fit neatly into the semantic subgroups of V.P. Nedjalkov and S.E. Jaxontov, and which we consider as “extensions” of the core group.

Firstly, there are cases in which the object of “to have” is not in “contact” with its subject, but only belongs to it or simply falls into its “sphere of interest”. Let us call these examples the “sphere of interest group”:

- (44) *txa txilnarši mq'avš dasak'lavad dabmuli* (Demna Šengelia apud Imn 205) ‘I have a goat fastened in the hazel-wood ready for slaughter.’ (‘... *I.have.it* for.killing fastened (PP)’)
- (45) *xrmlisa nat'exi dasvrili akvs, sisxli čamosdioda* (Rustaveli: Vepxist'q'aosani 591(593),3) ‘His sword was broken and soiled, blood flowed down.’ (transl. M. Wardrop) (lit.: ‘sword's broken.piece soiled *he.has.it* ...’)
- (46) *semest'ri [...] amžerad aračveulebrivad dat'virtuli makvs* (RQ 2/8/83) ‘this time my semester is burdened more than usual’ (lit.: ‘... *burdened I.have.it*’)

We will certainly be inclined to consider the goat and the sword as a possession of the subject of “to have”, and this is the normal interpretation with body parts (as e.g. in (37)). But in examples like (29)–(30), it is not necessarily your own horse or your own lamp that is ready for you. (Compare (25)–(26), (39), (41) etc., where the concept of possession is doubtful, to say the least.) What we do have, however, is an extension of the core group where the subject of “to have” is a beneficiary or experiencer.

Second, there are other examples where both the contact and the beneficiary or possessive meaning is more or less absent, and which thus form a further extension. Let us call these examples the “non-possessive group”:

- (47) *gadac'q'vet'ili gvakvs čvenc čamovidet* (DV-G 14/4/78)  
'We have decided to come down, too.'
- (48) *c'q'evsebsa q'andat mouravi c'akceuli* (I 84)  
'The herdsmen had thrown down the *mouravi* (feudal steward).' (lit.:  
'... *they.had.him mouravi thrown.down*')
- (49) *c'liuri tema ar mkonda dac'erili* (MD 18/12/80)  
'I had not (yet) written my annual research paper.' (lit.: '... not  
*I.had.it written*')
- (50) *tkven k'argad gakvt gamok'vetili [...] q'vela p'roblemat'uri mxare*  
(IM 9/5/79)  
'You have well elucidated every problematic aspect.' (lit.: '...  
*you.have.it worked.out ...*')
- (51) *sapost'o ganq'opilebaši mitxres rom q'velaperi gagzavnili gvakvso*  
(VG 7.4.79)  
In the post-office department, they told me: "We have posted  
everything". (lit.: '... everything *sent we.have.it*, they said')
- (52) *am bat'on-s eg ambav-i misul-i konda: ama da am k'acs kali ro*  
*moq'ams...* (I 80)  
'This news had come to the ears of this lord: when such and such  
man will marry a wife...' (lit.: 'this lord-DAT this(NOM) news-NOM  
*come-NOM (PP) he.had.it: ...*')

What the core group, the sphere of interest group and the non-possessive group have in common, however, is a resultative meaning in the sense already described for "to be" + PP; there *is* a visible state of affairs in (48): the feudal lord is on the ground. In some examples, however, the existence of a resultant state is less obvious in the object of "to have": although the parcel *is away* in (51),<sup>7</sup> "to send" is not a good example of a "terminative verb" with a resultant state of its object (Nedjalkov — Jaxontov 1988: 5). On the other hand, the subject of "to have" in (51), although far from contracting a current "contact" or possessive relation with the object, is still currently involved in the result. It is not altogether clear to me what the difference between (51) and its event counterpart is:

- (51') *q'velaperi gavzavnet*  
'we sent/ have sent (aorist) everything'

But (51) seems to imply a current responsibility of the subject of "to have",<sup>8</sup> a current relevance of its agenthood which is not necessarily part of the meaning of (51'). In addition, the subject of "to have" in all three groups seems to be

restricted in a way remotely reminiscent of the English perfect: even a third person variant of (49) or (51) ('s/he had written the paper', 's/he has posted the parcel') can only be predicated of someone who is still alive at the reference time or for whom the result somehow continues to be relevant. For example, the fact of having staged an opera is a persistent feature of relevance for the director — even after his death:<sup>9</sup>

- (53) *rogorc režisors, dadgmuli akvs Verdis "Aida"* (from a biographical note, 25 years after director's death)  
'As a director, *he has staged* Verdi's "Aida".'

Does this mean that the Georgian possessive resultative has become a "perfect"<sup>10</sup> of the common "European" type?

### 5. Resultative and "perfect"

One typical feature of the "European" perfect is a correspondence between the subject of "to have" and the subject of the other forms of the same verb: in English, *the shepherds* bears the same syntactic and semantic relation to the rest of the clause in: *the shepherds have thrown him down* (cp. (48)) as in: *the shepherds threw him down*. It is subject and agent in both clauses, and *have thrown* and *threw* are parts of one and the same paradigm. So let us look at the properties of the subject of "to have" in Georgian possessive resultative clauses.

In many examples, the subject of "to have" has an obvious beneficiary or experiencer counterpart in the corresponding event clause, and this counterpart is *not* the agent subject: There is no doubt in (26) that somebody else made the manger for the cattle as a beneficiary. In other words, (26) corresponds to an action clause with the beneficiary coded as an indirect object noun phrase:

- (26') *sakonel-s baga-i ga-u-k'etes*  
cattle-DAT manger-NOM PREV-OV-they.made.it  
'they made a manger for the cattle'

Similarly, the subject of "to have" with intransitive resultatives has a non-agent, non-subject counterpart in the corresponding event clause. Compare (52) with:

- (52') *ambav-i mi-u-vid-a ma-s*  
news-NOM PREV-3OV-go-3SG.S(Aorist) he-DAT  
'the news had come to his ears'.<sup>11</sup>

And again, (37) corresponds to:

- (37a') *tma*            *ga-u-č'arayda*            *ma-s*  
 hair(NOM) PREV-OV-it.turned.grey(Aorist) he-DAT  
 'his hair turned grey' (lit.: '... turned grey to/for him')

Most subjects of "to have" are beneficiaries, but it can bear other case roles, in particular a types of locative:

- (54) *xula, romelsac zed hkonda modgmuli caltvala sasiminde* (Ilia Č'av-  
 č'avaze: K'acia adamiani?)  
 'a hut, which *had* a one-eyed maize-granary *put on/against* it'

All these beneficiaries/experiencers and locatives are coded as indirect objects in Georgian (and are further specified by the "version vowels" *u, i, a, e* in the verb; see Boeder 1968).

In other examples, the subject of "to have" *can* have an agent counterpart in a corresponding event clause, if the agent is identical to a reflexive beneficiary noun phrase; this is a possible, but by no means necessary, interpretation of (30): either the teller of the truth saddled the horse for himself or somebody else did it for him. Only the former interpretation fulfills the correspondence criterion. Similarly, in (29) you simply can't decide who lit the lamp, although it might seem plausible that you did it for yourself, and it is probable in (45) that the blood on the hero's sword is a result of his own fighting. Out of context, it is undecidable if somebody else broke the goose's feet in (27). And (44) can mean both that somebody fastened the goat for the speaker or that he did it for himself.

On the other hand there are examples, that meet the correspondence criterion of the European perfect. Firstly, the semantic structure of "to receive" in subgroup 1) requires a beneficiary subject, and indeed the subject of "to have" has a beneficiary subject counterpart in the corresponding action clause (cp. (24)). Second, the subject of "to have" has an agent subject counterpart in the corresponding event clauses with verbs from the subgroups 2)-4) and 6)-7). But while subjects of "to drink, eat, think out, devise" might be conceived of as agents and experiencers at the same time, other examples allow no beneficiary/experiencer interpretation: in a sense, the subject of "to have" is only an agent in sentences like (49) and (51).

But notice that correspondence is not identity. It is not simply the beneficiary or agent relation of the event clause itself that matters in resultative clauses. As with the non-possessive resultatives we considered in the first section, the relational characteristics of the constituents of the resultative construction must persist or at least be of current relevance: those who have received a letter, put on their clothes, opened their mouth, broken their legs, are surrounded by

something, have a goat fastened for them, a semester burdened with duties etc., continue to have a beneficiary/experiencer relation of current relevance; and if people say they have sent the letters, they are not at that moment agents of the act of sending, but their agenthood seems to be of current relevance in an example like (51).

Still, possessive resultatives show some overlap with what we might call the "European perfect". In particular, it shares its resultative and current relevance meaning. Also, the subject of "to have" corresponds to an agent subject in some examples (to write, to send...) or to an agent that is at the same time a beneficiary or experiencer (to receive, drink, eat, get to know, forget...). But in many cases, it does not necessarily correspond to the subject of its event clause counterpart, and some verbs even require a *non*-subject beneficiary (to bestow, to entrust, to go...).

## 6. Possessive compounds

In the classification given above we considered the core group established by V.P. Nedjalkov and S.E. Jaxontov as an essentially universal concept. Let us look now at some independent evidence for the "reality" of this concept in a different part of Georgian grammar. Consider the following compound:

- (55) a. *sircxvil-dak'argul-*  
shame-lost-  
'(one) who has lost his/her shame'
- b. *ma-s sircxvil-i akvs dak'argul-i*  
s/he-DAT shame-NOM s/he.has.it lost-NOM  
's/he has lost his/her shame'

(55a) is a word; the bare stem *sircxvil-* contrasts with the nominative noun phrase *sircxvil-i* in clausal constructions like (55b). Constructions like (55a) match the pattern of adjectival compounds like: *p'ir-γia* mouth-open 'with open mouth', *t'an-c'vrili* body-thin 'slim', *q'el-tetri* neck-white 'with a white neck', *gul-tbili* heart-warm 'warmhearted', *gul-c'rpeli* heart-sincere 'sincere' (Šanize 1973 §194). Broadly speaking, both formations have a possessive meaning (heart-sincere = whose heart is sincere; shame-lost- = whose shame is lost), although only the participial variety is called "possessive compound" by Šanize (1973 §196). Compounds of this type have core group constructions with "to have" + PP as their counterparts: (a) corresponds to (b) in (55). Below are some additional examples ordered according to the core group subgroups:

- 1) (56) *žildo-minič'ebuli moɣvac'e*  
prize-bestowed activist  
'an activist who has been awarded a prize' (cp. (32))
- 2) (57) *axalux- da šalvar-čacmuli* (Ilia Č'avč'avaže apud Š §196)  
'who has put on an Akhalukh (Caucasian coat) and trousers'
- (58) *tavsapar- uk'an- c'ak'ruli kal-is tav-i* (Davit K'ldiašvili: "Saman. dedin." apud Š §196)  
'the head of a woman with a scarf fastened from behind' (lit.: 'head.kerchief-behind-fastened woman-Gen head-Nom')
- 3) (59) *p'ir-dayebuli vešap'i* (Г 31)  
'a dragon with a wide-open(ed) mouth' (lit.: 'mouth-opened dragon')
- (60) *k'bileb-dak'reč'ili* (Aleksandre Q'azbegi apud Š §196)  
'gnashing, showing one's teeth' (lit.: 'teeth-gnashed')
- (61) *mt'k'aveli — cer- da nek'-gašlili* (Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani apud Š §196)  
'with his/her span, thumb and little finger stretched' (lit.: 'span-thumb- and little.finger-stretched')
- 4) (62) *q'ovelnive erbamad zaza-štacumuli da nacar- tav-sa -gardasxmul ikmnebodes* (from the Old Georgian ms. Sinuri Mravaltavi 107,38 apud Š §196)  
'all together shall have put on sackcloth and sprinkled their heads with ashes' (lit.: '...sackcloth-put.on and ash- head-DAT sprinkled they.shall.become')
- (63) *naxa rom misi gagzavnili mocikulebi tav-dač'rilebi iq'vnen šit* (B1 68)  
'he saw that the messengers he had sent were inside with their throats cut' (lit.: '... his sent messengers head-cut.off were inside')
- (64) *naxa rom misi coli mt'irali zis tma-gac'ec'ili* (B1 68)  
'he saw his wife sitting there weeping and with dishevelled hair' (lit.: '... hair-dishevelled')
- (65) *zroxā rka-dayma-dadrek'ili* (Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani apud Š §196)  
'a cow with horns curved downwards'
- 5) (66) *vercxl-, t'q'via da sp'ilenz-narevi madani* (Š §196)  
'ore mixed with silver, lead and copper' (lit.: 'silver-lead and copper-mixed ore')

- (67) *garšemo šav q'aitan-movlebuli* (G. Sunduk'ianci: "P'ep'o" apud Š §196)  
 'encircled with black silk-lace' (lit.: 'around black silk.lace surrounded')
- 6) (68) *Terg-daleuli* (Š §196)  
 'one who has drunk from the Terek (name of a group of intellectuals who had studied in Russia)' (lit.: 'Terek-drunk') (cp. (39))

All these compounds can be transformed into constructions in which the incorporated noun (or rather the nominal group: see (57)–(58), (61)–(62), (65)–(67), (87)a.) becomes the nominative "object" of "to have", and the head noun of the attributive compound its dative "subject".

There are some exceptions with lexicalized compounds. E.g. the compound:

- (69) *q'ur-moč'rili* (Š §196)  
 'ear-cut'

has a counterpart if used in a literal sense: *q'uri moč'rili akvs* 'he has his/her ear/s cut off, his/her ear/s is/are cut off'. But the normal meaning is metaphorical: *q'ur-moč'rili q'malmona* 'obedient servant/slave', which has no counterpart: *monas q'uri moč'rili akvs* in the sense of e.g. 'the servant is obedient'. Idiomaticity could also be the reason why the following compounds have event clause counterparts (b), but lack resultative clause counterparts (c):

- (70) a. *sul-gasuli*  
 soul-gone.off  
 'fainted'
- b. *sul-i c'a-u-vida*  
 soul-NOM PREV-3OV-it.went.off  
 's/he fainted'
- c. \**suli c'asuli akvs*
- (71) a. *tav-da-vic'q'ebuli*  
 head-PREV-forgotten  
 'enraptured'
- b. *tav-i da-i-vic'q'a*  
 head-NOM PREV-SV-s/he.forgot.it  
 's/he was carried away'
- c. \**tavi davic'q'ebuli akvs*

What is more important, however, are the systematic gaps. Many details remain



to be established and theoretical implications must be omitted, but the following constraints seem to be valid:

1) The referent of the incorporated noun must have the autonomy property "independent existence" (Keenan 1976:312-313), i.e. be independent of the action expressed by the participle. The following compounds seem to be ungrammatical because the incorporated noun is a resultant object:

(72) \**gegma-mopikrebuli kali*  
       'plan-thought.out woman' (cp. (42))

(73) \**baga-gak'etebuli sakoneli*  
       'manger-made cattle' (cp. (26))

Similarly,

(74) *sk'ola-damtavrebuli gogo*  
       school-finished girl  
       'a girl who has finished school' (subgroup 7)

is possible, but not:

(75) \**našrom-damtavrebuli gogo*  
       paper-finished girl  
       'a girl who has finished her paper' (cp. (49))

2) The counterpart of the incorporated noun is the subject of intransitive verb forms or the direct object of transitive verb forms in the corresponding event clause. As noted by Šaniže (1973 §196, note 2),

(76) *c'q'al-c'ayebul-i* (xavs-s eč'ideboda-o)  
       water-taken.away-NOM (moss-DAT he.clung.to.it-they.say)  
       'the man taken away by the water clung to the moss' (proverb)

is an exception.<sup>12</sup>

3) The head noun of the modifying possessive compound must always bear a beneficiary/experiencer or a locative relational role. There are two subgroups:

a) The reflexive subgroup: the beneficiary etc. is at the same time an agent who does something for or to him/herself: the action affects the agent's body, clothes etc. The following compound is an example from subgroup 3) of the core group: the subject of its event counterpart in b. is an agent and experiencer at the same time, i.e. the meaning is reflexive, although the verb form has no formal exponent of reflexivity:

- (77) a. *xel-gašlili kali*  
hand-extended woman  
'a woman who has extended her hands' (cp. (61))
- b. *kal-ma xel-eb-i gašala*  
woman-ERG hand-PL-NOM she.extended.them  
'the woman extended her hands'

Examples of this type belong to the core group, but some of its members from subgroup 1) have no compound counterparts:

- (78) a. *\*barat-miyebuli megobari*  
letter-received friend  
'the friend who has received the/a letter'
- b. *megobar-ma barat-i miyo*  
friend-ERG letter-NOM he.received.it  
'the/a friend received the/a letter'

- (79) *\*bevr-gagonili k'aci*  
much-heard man  
'a man who has heard much' (cp. (40))

In these examples, the subjects of the event clause counterparts are not agents. — Now compare the following ungrammatical compound with (71)a.:

- (80) *\*varam-davic'q'ebuli gogo*  
'misery-forgotten girl' (cp. (33))

(71a) and (b) possibly contain an element of agentivity which is absent from (33)/(80): 's/he let her/himself be carried away'.

b) The non-reflexive subgroup: the beneficiary etc. and the agent are not co-referential; that is to say, the beneficiary is a non-reflexive indirect object. This is why (56) *žildo-minič'ebuli moyvac'e* is possible, in contrast with its converse verb in (78): the activist is an indirect object in (81), but the friend is a subject in (78b):

- (81) *žildo mi-a-nič'es ma-s*  
prize(NOM) PREV-3NV-they.bestowed.it he-DAT  
'they awarded him a prize'

Similarly, the head-noun corresponds to a beneficiary/experiencer indirect object in:

- (82) *švil-mok'luli deda*  
child-killed mother  
'a mother whose child was killed'

- (83) *švil-ganebivrebuli deda*  
 child-spoiled mother  
 'a mother whose ('to/for whom') child was spoiled'
- (84) *cxen-šek'azmuli k'aci*  
 'horse-saddled man' (cp. (27))

These sentences have no reflexive reading: (82) cannot mean that the mother killed her child, and in (83) it was not she who spoiled her child.

For locative indirect objects cp. (85a) and (b) with (54):

- (85) a. *sasiminde-modgmuli xula*  
 maize.granary-put.on hut  
 'a hut with a maize-granary leaning against it'
- b. *xula-s sasiminde mo-a-dges*  
 hut-DAT maize.granary(NOM) PREV-NV-they.put.it  
 'they put the maize-granary on/against the hut'

For intransitives see (55) and:

- (86) a. *švil-gardacvlili*  
 child-deceased  
 'whose child has deceased'
- b. *švil-i garda-e-cvala ma-s*  
 child-NOM PREV-3EV-he.deceased  
 'the child deceased "to" her/him'
- (87) a. *tav-ze p'ap'-is cxvr-is t'q'av-is kud-čamopxat'uli*  
 head-on grandfather-GEN sheep-GEN skin-GEN hat-pulled.down  
 'with his grandfather's sheepskin hat slid down on his head'  
 (Ek'at'erine Gabašvili apud Š §196)
- b. *kud-i čamo-e-pxat'a*  
 hat-NOM PREV-3EV-it.slid.down  
 'his hat slid down' (lit.: 'the hat slid down "to" him')

c) The following compounds are ungrammatical. Maybe the head noun has to be interpreted not as a beneficiary but as an addressee:

- (88) \**ambav-misuli bat'oni*  
 'news-gone.to lord' (cp. (52))
- (89) \**c'eril-gamogzavnili megobari*  
 letter-sent friend (cp. 47)  
 (in the sense of 'a friend to whom a/the letter was sent')

The compounds considered so far all belong to the core group or the “sphere of interest group”. The non-possessive group is different: the sentences (47)–(52) have no possessive compound counterparts:

- (90) \**mourav-c'akceuli mc'q'emsebi*  
 steward-thrown.down herdsmen (cp. (48))
- (91) \**c'ign-dac'erili p'ropesori*  
 book-written professor  
 ‘the professor who has written the book’ (cp. (49))
- (92) \**p'roblema-gamok'vetili mk'vlevari*  
 problem-worked.out researcher  
 ‘a researcher who has worked out the problem’ (cp. (50))
- (93) \**amanat-gagzavnili mosamsaxure*  
 parcel-sent official  
 ‘an official who has sent the parcel’ (cp. (51))

We conclude that participial possessive compounds correspond to a subset of the possessive resultative constructions. As usual, lower-level word-formation is more restricted than its clause level counterpart.

## 7. The genesis of possessive resultatives: a proposal

A comparison between possessive resultative clauses and participial possessive compounds is instructive.

Firstly, it yields a semantically relevant classification:

- a) Resultative constructions with a possessive compound counterpart correspond to V.P. Nedjalkov’s core group plus my extension, the “sphere of interest group” (as described in section 3). On the basis of the properties of the head noun modified by the possessive compound (constraint 3) above) we get a further subdivision: With some exceptions (subgroup 1) and 5): “to receive”..., “to surround”...), the core group corresponds to the reflexive subgroup, while the sphere of interest group corresponds to the non-reflexive subgroup.
- b) Possessive resultative constructions without possessive counterparts are the exceptions in group a) on the one hand and the non-possessive group on the other.

Second, we may speculate about the development of the resultative constructions.

Taking adjectival compounds of the type *p'ir-γia* open-mouth ‘with open mouth’ as a point of departure, we may assume that participial possessive

compounds of the type *p'ir-dayebuli* 'mouth-opened' 'with opened mouth' (cp. (50)) from group a) were formed after their model. Both compounds have resultative counterparts: *p'ir-γia* > *p'iri γia aris* 'the mouth is open' and *p'iri γia akvs* 's/he has his/her mouth open' have an analogon in: *p'ir-dayebuli* 'mouth-opened' > *p'iri dayebuli aris* 'his/her mouth is opened' and *p'iri dayebuli akvs* 's/he has his/her mouth opened'. But how did the possessive resultative without possessive compound counterpart arise?

One possible model of analogy are the reflexives in the core group, where the benefactive etc. is at the same time an agent-subject. The moment the benefactive case role is dropped as a constraint, the core group can serve as a model for any agent-subject clause: *man p'ir-i daayo* 's/he(Erg) mouth-Nom s/he.opened.it': *ma-s p'iri dayebuli akvs* 's/he has the mouth opened' = *man mouravi c'aakcia* 's/he threw down the steward' (cp. (48)): X; X = *ma-s mouravi c'akceuli akvs* 's/he has thrown down the steward'.

A second source of analogic extension could be the constructions that syntactically belong to group b), but which semantically are converses of group a) constructions. Such are the verbs of "receiving" etc., i.e. the exceptions mentioned above (subgroup 1) of the core group; cp. (24)) which we grouped together with their converses, the verbs of "giving" (cp. (32)–(34)), but which contrast with the latter in allowing no compound counterpart (cp. (78a) vs. (56)). If this analysis is correct, constructions like (24): "I have received your letters" are formed after the semantic pattern of (32) "Prizes were bestowed on him" (lit.: "He had prizes bestowed"). In both constructions, the subject of "to have" is a benefactive, but only "to receive" has a subject counterpart in the corresponding event clause. Disregarding the non-reflexivity constraint of the "sphere of interest group", "to receive" can be used in a resultative construction after the model of "to give".

The relevance of the core group in the discussion of two different formations of Georgian grammar lends additional support to V.P. Nedjalkov's semantic core group as a well-motivated universal concept.

### Acknowledgments

I wish to express my gratitude to Rezo Kiknadze (Lübeck/Tbilisi) for his generous and patient assistance as a native speaker consultant. I have to say, however, that my observations do not do justice to his subtle interpretations, and that he should not be held responsible for their misrepresentation, or for any mistake. — I am indebted to Robert McLaughlin for correcting the English of this paper.

## Abbreviations

Bl = Robert Bleichsteiner 1931; Dat = dative; Erg = ergative; EV = version vowel *e*; Γ = Aleksandre Plont'i 1974; Gen = genitive; I = Grigol Imnaišvili 1974; Imn = Ivane Imnaišvili 1948; IO = indirect object marker; NOM = nominative; NV = neutral version vowel; OV = objective version vowel; PART = participle marker; PL = plural; PM = paradigm marker; PP = perfect participle; PREV = preverb; s = Subject; Š = Šaniže 1973; SG = singular; sv = subjective version vowel; 3 = 3rd person. Other abbreviations are initials of letter writers.

## Notes

1. Information on resultative constructions is rather scanty in grammars of Georgian; see Šaniže 1973 §365; Basilaia 1974: 74–76; 85; Hewitt 1995: 501–502. Č'abašvili (1988), who offers interesting examples of complex possessive compounds, came to my attention only after completion of this article.
2. These forms supply dynamic passives where a synthetic form does not exist; see Šaniže 1973 §365. In general, they have specific stylistic connotations; see Γvinaže 1989: 106–140.
3. This sentence is modelled on: *q'rilobaze miŋyes p'art'iis p'rograma, romelic Leninis mier iq'o šemušavebuli* 'Na s'ezde prinjali programmu partii, kotoraja byla razrabotana Leninyŋ.' (Mač'avariani 1983: 139); 'The congress adopted the party program which was worked out by Lenin' (Mač'avariani 1988: 270). This is a result already existing in the past, which gives it the meaning of a specifically "remote past" (information received from Lamara Gvaramaže, Institute of Georgian Literature at the Academy of Sciences, Tbilisi).
4. Similarly, the following example is a problem: *k'ari dilit daxuruli iq'o, magram ar vici, rodiz iq'o daxuruli* [mat mier] 'Dver' utrom byla zakryta, no (ja) ne znaju kogda (ona) byla zakryta'; Mač'avariani 1983: 134; 'in the morning the door was closed, but I don't know when it got closed [by them]' (Mač'avariani 1988: 262). While the first clause is impeccable for all speakers, the second clause is not: *iq'o daxuruli* means 'was closed' and not: 'got closed'. *rodiz* 'when' cannot refer to "the moment at which a property is observed", and a categorizing reading is not possible, either.
5. Georgian has two verbs for "to have" which differ according to animacy of the possessed argument (for more details see Boeder 1980): *cisperi tvalebi akvs* 's/he has blue eyes' vs. *č'k'viani coli hq'avys* 'he has a clever wife'.
6. The "object" properties of the nominative noun phrase X and the "subject" properties of the dative noun phrase Y in the Georgian equivalent of "X has Y" cannot be discussed here.
7. Being removed is sometimes categorized as a state. See the Homeric Greek perfect form in οὐδέ σε [...] μῆτις' Ὀδυσσῆος προέλοιπεν '(nor) has the skill of Ulysses left (you)' (Wackernagel 1904: 5).
8. Compare this with Lohmann's (1953: 193) comment on a dialogue in Aeschylus' Eumenids 587–8: the choir of the Eumenids ask Orest: τὴν μητῆρ' εἰπὲ πρῶτον εἰ κατέκτονας; ('First tell us if you have killed (perfect) your mother?'). Orest answers: ἔκτεινα. ('I killed (aorist) her.'). "Für die Eumeniden handelt es sich um ein "Urteil": "du bist ein Mutter-Mörder" — Orest aber entweicht in das rein faktische Ereignis, das er ja nicht leugnen kann: "ich tötete". "Allmählich tritt [...] das Perfektum aus der Beschränkung auf die Verwendung für das objektiv

- gegenwärtige Resultat (d.i. also ein SEIN des "Subjektes": sie ist tot) heraus, und wird damit zur Bezeichnung eines "konstatierenden" Urteils über ein Kausal-Verhältnis [...]: DU HAST deine Mutter getötet."
9. One comment I got was: "His staging is immortal, there is something that survives ("continues") (misi režisori uk'vdavia, rayac grzeldeba)" (Valeri Gaprindašvili).
  10. Georgian has a tense called "perfect", but this tense mostly has an evidential meaning in Modern Georgian, and cannot be discussed here.
  11. Unlike (52'), many speakers find (52) somewhat awkward or unusual. It is taken from a dialect text from Kartli.
  12. Šaniže explicitly adds that it does not mean: 'who has taken away (the) water'. I wonder if this compound would allow such an interpretation even if it conformed to the regular pattern.

## References

- Basilaia, Nik'andre. 1974. *Šemasmeneli da šemasmenluri damok'idebuli c'inadadeba Kartulši*. Soxumi: Alašara.
- Bleichsteiner, Robert. 1931. "Beiträge zur Sprach- und Volkskunde des georgischen Stammes der Gurier", *Caucasica* 7: 87–110; 9: 63–87.
- Boeder, Winfried. 1968. "Über die Versionen des georgischen Verbs", *Folia Linguistica* 2: 82–152.
- Boeder, Winfried. 1980. "'Haben' in den Kartwelsprachen", in: Gunter Brettschneider and Christian Lehmann (eds.) *Wege der Universalienforschung. Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler* (= Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 145). Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 207–217.
- Č'abašvili, Mixeil. 1988. "K'utvnilebiti k'omp'ozit'eb martlc'erisatvis", *Kartuli siq'vis k'ult'uris saqitxebi* 8: 93–105.
- Γvinaze, Tinatin. 1989. *Kartuli zmnis vnebiti gvaris pormata st'ilist'ik'a* (Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Ak'ademia, Enatmecnierebis Inst'it'ut'i). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Plont'i, Aleksandre. 1974. *Kartuli z'ap'rebi*. Šeadgina, šesavali da šenišvnebi daurto Aleksandre Plont'ma Tbilisi: Ganatleba.
- Harris, Alice C. 1981. *Georgian Syntax. A study in relational grammar* (= Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hewitt, Brian George. 1995. *Georgian. A structural reference grammar* (= London Oriental and African Library 2). Amsterdam — Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Imnaišvili, Grigol. 1974. *Kartluri dialekt'i II: T'ekst'ebi* (Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Ak'ademia, Enatmecnierebis inst'it'ut'i). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Imnaišvili, Ivane. 1948. "Šedgenili šemasmeneli Kartulši", *A.S. P'ušk'nis saxelobis Tbilisis saxelmc'ipo P'edagogiuri Inst'it'ut'is Šromebi* 5: 187–215.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1976. "Towards a universal definition of 'subject'", in: Charles N. Li (ed.) *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 303–333.

- Lohmann, Johannes. 1953. "Gemeinitalisch und Uritalisch (Ein Beitrag zur sprachwissenschaftlichen Methodenlehre)", *Lexis* 3,2: 169–217.
- Mačavariani, Maja P. 1983. "Stativ, rezul'tativ, passiv i perfekt v gruzinskom jazyke", in: V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.) 1983: 133–142.
- Mačavariani, Maja P. 1988. "Stative, resultative, passive, and perfect in Georgian", in: V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.) 1988: 259–275.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (ed.). 1983: *Tipologija rezul'tativnyx konstrukcij (rezul'tativ, stativ, passiv, perfekt)*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (ed.). 1988: *Typology of Resultative Constructions* (= Typological Studies in Language 12). Amsterdam — Philadelphia: Benjamins [translation of Nedjalkov, V.P. (ed.) 1983].
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Sergej Je. Jaxontov. 1988. "The typology of resultative constructions", in: V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.) 1988: 3–62.
- Šanize, Ak'ak'i. 1973. *Kartuli enis gramat'ik'is sapuzvlebi I: Morpologia. Meore gamocema* (= Txzulebani III; = 3veli Kartuli enis k'atedris šromebi 15). Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1904. "Studien zum griechischen Perfectum", in: *Programm zur akademischen Preisverteilung Göttingen 1904*: 3–32 [= J.W.: *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953, 1000–1021].



**W. Boeder: "Some notes on the Georgian resultative"**  
**Corrections provided by George Hewitt (SOAS, London)**

- p. 119: (7) q'velam igrzino [sic!]
- p. 121: (22) 'during this time....'
- p. 122: (30) 'a truth-teller should have his horse saddled up [sc. to make a hasty get-away, if needs be]
- p. 124: (36) 'Dzidzia was wearing a shawl just tossed pver on top'
- p. 124: (37) 'His short-cut hair has completely turned grey, ... his eyes are closed'  
(literally: '...he.has.it turned.grey... he.has.them.closed')
- p. 124: (41) 'you will, no doubt, be acquainted'
- p. 126: (52) 'when such and such man takes a wife'
- p. 130: (61) 'span - thumb and little finger outstretched' (lexical explanation of the word *mt'k'aveli* !)
- p. 131: (70) gasuli ⇒ c'asuli
- p. 133: (77) *xel-gašlili* is normally used to mean 'generous'
- p. 134: (85) *mo-a-dges* 'PREV-locative.version-they.put.it'
- p. 134 (86a) 'whose child is deceased'
- p. 134 below: addressee
- p. 136, 4th line from below: have an analogue
- p. 136, last line of the 2nd paragraph: *mas mouravi c 'akceuli hq 'avs*
- p. 137, footnote 7: μῆτις (without apostrophe)
- p. 137, footnote 8: Eumenides, Orestes
- p. 137, footnote 9: One comment I received was: .... (misi režisoroba uk'vdavia)
- p. 138: Imnaišvili, Ivane 1948 ....A. S. P'ušk'inis saxelobis