(1) Panel aims: Universalism meets localism

a. Philology, grammaticalisation theory, theoretical linguistics, and typology all aim, in different and overlapping ways, to be empirically answerable to a worldwide range of grammatical phenomena. Hence, an effort to devise the most generally applicable inventory of descriptive terminology.

b. The study of individual languages is a focused activity, often with centuries of tradition pre-dating the work in (a). Hence, an effort to devise terms that suit local perceptions of needs.

c. Universalists’ challenge. Language-specific terminology impedes clarity and slows progress.

d. Localists’ challenge. Terminological differences make it hard for, e.g., Algonquianists and Kartvelianists to see when they are trying to come to grips with the same concept and build on each other’s insights.

(2) Example: Screeves, impedimentary terminology?

a. თქვენ თაგვები ჩვენ ბუებს გვატყუებთ

\[ \text{tkven tagveb-i ěven bueb-s gv- a- t’q’u-eb- t} \]
2PL mice- NOM 1PL owls-DAT 1PL-O-LOC-trick-THM-(2)PL

‘You mice trick us owls’

b. თქვენ თაგვება ჩვენ ბუება მოგვატყუებთ

\[ \text{tkven tagveb-ma ěven bueb-i mo-gv- a- t’q’u-e- t} \]
2PL mice- ERG 1PL owls-NOM PVB-1PL-O-LOC-trick-1/2AOR-(2)PL

‘You mice tricked us owls’

c. თქვენ თაგვება ჩვენ ბუება დოღვები მოგვატყუებთ

\[ \text{tkven tagveb-s ěven bueb-i mo-g- i- t’q’u-eb- v- ar-t} \]
2PL mice- DAT 1PL owls-NOM PVB-2PL-O-LOC-trick-THM-1AOR-be-(1/2)PL

‘You mice have tricked us owls’

d. მწკრივი mc’k’rivi ‘screeve (ling.), series (math.)’

e. In (a–b), the agent and patient control the same agreement (agent -ფ- თ; patient გვ- გ-), but case marking changes, (a) agent.NOM patient.DAT, (b) agent.ERG patient.NOM. — This is common crosslinguistically, no need for special terminology.

f. In (c), agent and patient more or less swap agreement roles: the agent agrees as it would have as the patient in (a–b) (agent გ-....-ფ...-თ; patient ფ-....-ფ v-....t). Concomitantly, the case pattern is the opposite of (a): not agent.NOM patient.DAT, but agent.DAT patient.NOM. (Cf, the nomenclature “indirect” in some Kartvelian literature.) — But again, this isn’t surprising. The meaning of (c) is the perfect ‘have tricked’. Languages without transitive have frequently use be and place the holders of the possessee in an oblique case, which leaves nominative case for the possessee. The Georgian perfect does all this for want of an auxiliary have. There is a verb არ ar ‘be’, the holders of the state (those having tricked) are dative marked (თაგვები tagvebs ‘mice.DAT’), and the patients (those in the state) are nominative marked (ბუები buebi ‘owls.NOM’). The agreement transparently reflects this case alignment: ‘mice’ governs dative agreement (ფ-....-ფ g-....-t), ‘owls’ governs agent patient ფ-....-ფ v-....t).
Panel’s plan for today: Three labels for productive reinterpretation

a. Preverbs (Harbour)
b. Versions(iser)s (Nash)
c. Thematic suffixes (McGinnis)

Preverbs: Two basic facts — transparent versus opaque

a. Directional semantics when combined with verbs of motion:
   ო-ფრინდა  a-prinda  ‘flew up’
   ო-ფრინდა  da-prinda  ‘flew down onto’
   ო-ფრინდა  ča-prinda  ‘flew down into’
   ო-ფრინდა  še-prinda  ‘flew in’
   ო-ფრინდა  ga-prinda  ‘flew out’
   ო-ფრინდა  mo-prinda  ‘flew hither’
   ო-ფრინდა  mi-prinda  ‘flew thither’
   ო-ფრინდა  gada-prinda  ‘flew across’
   ო-ფრინდა  c’a-prinda  ‘flew away’

b. Aspectual semantics when combined with nondirectional verbs: e.g., (2b) ო-გვატყუეთ mo-gvat’q’uet  ‘you tricked us’, (2c) ო-გიტყუებივართ mo-git’q’uebivart  ‘you have tricked us’, as well as future ო-გვატყუებთ mo-gvat’q’uebt  ‘you will trick us’.

Challenges

a. Philology – What are the lexical sources of these prefixes and what are their correlates in other Kartvelian languages?

b. Grammaticalisation – Did Georgian reach its current state of affairs by exploiting common pathways of grammatical cooption?

c. Theoretical linguistics – What conceptual atoms (features) and structures do the various stages of Georgian exploit?

d. Typology – Is the Georgian preverb a special typological category, or an amalgam of more typical ones (and, if the latter, how unusual an amalgam is it)?

Georgian preverbs: familiar semantics, unfamiliar packaging

a. There is a natural link between locatives and aspect: events that are tied to particular paths end when the path ends. Hence, locative elements can have perfectivising roles; e.g., write vs write up; писать pisát’ ‘write.IMPF’ vs на-писать na-pisát’ ‘write.PF’ (where на na also has prepositional uses, as in на стене ‘on the wall’).

b. Between the transparent and opaque uses of Georgian preverbs, there are numerous pockets of regular meanings:
   – clusters of roots pairing with the same preverb, revealing a conceptual core
     (cf, inhale, ingest, imbibe)
   – clusters of preverbs pairing with same root for quite different (“idiomatic”) meanings
     (cf, compel, expel, repel; apprehend, comprehend, reprehend)
   – clusters of preverbs pairing with same root for nuances in meaning
     (cf, cook and outcook, overcook, recook)

c. Concentrating on the last of these, I draw attention to the conceptual network of ways in which preverbs can nuance the meaning of their verbs, following work by Regier: the meanings typically associated with reduplication form natural clusters of association and languages tend to pick coherent subnetworks of the overall range of possibilities (rather than randomly selecting them).
(7) Modification of middles

a. ო- ო-: andative (applies only to middles in present and like tenses; related to directional meaning; see also ო- ო-):

ო-მითირა ო-თ’ირის ‘goes crying’ (თ’ირის ‘cries’)
ო-მოთირა ო-მი-რ’ირის ‘goes shouting’ (რ’ირის ‘shouts’)
ო-მილოთირებ ო-მი-ილ’t’ირის ‘goes seeking refuge’ (ილ’t’ირის ‘seeks refuge’)

b. ო- ო-: ventive (applies only to middles in present and like tenses; related to directional meaning; see also ო- ო-):

ო-მოთირა ო-თ’ირის ‘comes crying’ (თ’ირის ‘cries’)
ო-მომ’) ო-მი) ‘comes shouting’ (მ’) ‘shouts’)
ო-მოიმ’) ო-მი) ‘comes seeking refuge’ (ილ’t’ირ) ‘seeks refuge’)

(8) More pluractionals ო- ო-

a. Plural object readings (no restriction to middles or present-like tenses)

ო-გითქი ო-გითქ’ი ‘you will pluck [them]’ (თ’ირის ‘cries’)
ო-გითქი ო-გითქ’ი ‘you will send [them]’ (თ’ირის ‘shouts’)
ო-გითქი ო-გითქ’ი ‘you will kill [them]’ (თ’ირის ‘seeks refuge’)

b. Event and result plurality (no restriction to middles or present-like tenses)

ო-ხეთქ ო-ხეთქ’ი ‘you will split [them], you will split it many times’
ო-ტეხ ო-ტეხ’ი ‘you will break [them], you will break it many times’

(9) More pluractionality (გადა- gada-) — and its opposite?

a. Reiterative

გადახნა ო-გადახ) ‘you will replough’
გადაიანგარი ო-გადაიანგარ) ‘you will redo a sum’
გადაარქმე ო-გად) ‘you will rename’
b. Augmentative

(და-რბილდა da-rbilda ‘softened’)  
(და-მწარდა da-mc’arda ‘turned bitter’)  
(და-მჟავდა da-mžavda ‘soured’)  

(და-რბილდა da-rbilda ‘softened’)  
(და-შრა da-šra ‘dried’)  
(და-წითლდა da-c’itlda ‘reddened’)  

(იტირებ it’ireb ‘you will cry’)  
(ივახშმებ ivaxšmeb ‘you will dine’)  
(იმღერებ imġereb ‘you will sing’)  

b. Sudden onset, i.e., the edge of the event: ღა- ც’a-

(იტირებ it’ireb ‘you will cry’)  
(ივახშმებ ivaxšmeb ‘you will dine’)  
(იმღერებ imġereb ‘you will sing’)  

(11) Endpoints as bits: more ღა- ც’a-

a. Activities affecting ends and edges: ღა- ც’a-

(იტირებ it’ireb ‘you will cry’)  
(ივახშმებ ivaxšmeb ‘you will dine’)  
(იმღერებ imġereb ‘you will sing’)  

b. Sudden onset, i.e., the edge of the event: ღა- ც’a-mo- (mostly middles – pertaining to emission of sound)
(12) Conclusion and new questions

a. The range of meanings that lie between purely directional and purely aspectual readings of preverbs forms a coherent whole, paralleling those commonly associated with reduplication crosslinguistically. At one end, these link up naturally with directional readings (andative, ventive, distributive; დო-, ძო-, ღა-, მი-, მო-, და-). At the other, the meanings verge into the aspectual (picking up on the edges of events წა- წა’- or their wholesale repetition გადა- გადა-). So, these “intermediary” readings of preverbs are not only internally coherent, but provide a connection between the directional and aspectual uses.

b. Philology – When did each of these readings emerge for each prefix? What other readings have been gained and lost?

c. Grammaticalisation – Is there a systematic pattern of gradual extensions to meanings, or did the system become established in other ways?

d. Theoretical linguistics – How is the current state of Georgian speakers’ knowledge to be represented? Does the label PVB (preverb) really subsume (at least) three independent uses—DIR (directionals), ASP (aspect), and QUAL? (“qualitative”) or MULT? (“multiplicative”)—and what is the featural interpretation of these labels?

e. Typology – How similar are genetic and areal neighbours of Georgian? Is the packaging we find in Georgian (DIR + ASP + QUAL/MULT + ...) found elsewhere. In what other grammatical guises does the conceptual network often encoded by reduplication present itself?

(13) And how does this integrate with other data pertinent to preverb semantics?

a. Semantic clusters around particular preverbs; e.g., შე- (cf, -ში -ši ‘in’; cf, Latinate ingest, inhale, imbibe)

- შე-ჩ’ ma ‘eat’
- შე-sveneba ‘breathe’
- შე-suntkva ‘inhale’
- შე-srut’va ‘absorb’
- შე-c’ova ‘absorb’
- შე-tviseba ‘assimilate’

b. Semantic clusters around particular roots; e.g., ქვლა k’vla ‘kill’

- ქო-ქვნი ‘killed’
- და-ქ’la ‘killed [for food, ritual]’
- ჩა-ქ’la ‘suppressed [a feeling]’
- შე-აკ’la ‘sacrificed [oneself]’

- შე-(ქ)-mak’vdeba ‘I will unwittingly kill’
- შე-(დ)-gemxxvrev ‘you will unwittingly shatter’
- შე-(დ)-gat’q’deba ‘you will unwittingly break’