Subjects of Decreased Control in Kartvelian Anticausatives

This paper portrays part of my work-in-progress research on verbal valency and aims to provide a hierarchical representation of valency operations in Kartvelian. A special emphasis will be placed on the pre-radical valency marker e- (in Georgian and Svan), a prefix, as will be shown below, of subtlest function, and on the most complex valency derivation, namely the anticausative of decreased control, in whose formation e- is involved. This phenomenon is addressed from the perspectives of morphology, syntax, and semantics.
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The Kartvelian, or South-Caucasian, Languages

- lit.: Georgian: Old Georgian [the literary tradition going back to the 5th century AD],
  Middle Georgian, Modern Georgian
- non-lit.: Svan, Megrelian, and Laz

FIGURE 1. THE KARTVELIAN LANGUAGES
Proto-Kartvelian
  (Deeters 1930: 2)
  Svan Laz Megrelian Georgian
- spoken by approx. 4,500,000 people in Georgia, Turkey, Azerbaijan, Iran, and Russia
- perhaps the best described language family, only 2nd to IE
MAP 1. THE GEOGRAPHICAL LAYOUT OF THE KARTVELIAN DIALECTS

- general typological information:

(i) a complex consonant phonology that comprises three rows of stops and affricates, namely voiced \( (b, d, g, z, \ddagger) \), voiceless aspirated \( (p^h, t^h, k^h, q^h, c^h, \ddagger c^h) \), and voiceless glottalized, or abruptive/ejective \( (p', t', k', q', c', \ddagger c') \);
(ii) a mostly agglutinative morphology with different degrees of fusion (including the ablaut) and a sophisticated system of verbal inflection and derivation;
(iii) an ergative-to-active (Laz) and ergative-to-accusative (Georgian, Svan, and Megrelian) morphosyntax.\(^2\)

- quite different for Kartvelianists, these languages seem to typologists to exhibit similar valency changing patterns; for reasons of space, it is Georgian and Megrelian that will be chosen as a major source for illustration;

- with literary Georgian taken as a standard, lots of phenomena evidenced in the colloquial language but not addressed in respected normative grammars have never been described for its sister languages either, no matter how widespread these tend to appear.

The Kartvelian Verb

- both suffixation and prefixation employed;
- long affix chains possible;
- cross-referencing up to three participants;

\(^1\) Conventionally, the aspirated stops and affricates will be presented hereafter without the aspiration sign \(^h\).

\(^2\) The labels “ergative-to-active” and “ergative-to-accusative” imply that the morphosyntactic systems are basically active (in Laz) and accusative (in Georgian, Svan, and Megrelian) from a synchronic point of view, but for all the languages, ergative morphosyntax is reconstructed and, moreover, a number of trends and features, characteristic of ergativity, still persist.
- a range of morphologized valency operations, to be discussed in detail in this talk;
- plenty of room for morphological polysemy despite the existence of a great variety of morphological means;
- plenty of instances of syncretism and lexicalization;
- plenty of affixes of unclear status with respect to derivation vs. inflection

The Structure of the Finite Verb


**FIGURE 2A. THE MEGRELIAN VERB TEMPLATE MODEL. PREFIXATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOT</th>
<th>-7</th>
<th>-6</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARKER</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>AFF/PRF</td>
<td>PRV</td>
<td>IMPRF.PRV</td>
<td>EVID.PRV</td>
<td>IO/DO/S</td>
<td>VER</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEGR (1) 
```
ge- g[i]=no- no- r- -c’ar- -u -e[n] -t
```
write +1 +4 +9

‘X has seemingly been rewriting [e.g. poems] for you<sub>pl</sub>.

**FIGURE 2B. THE MEGRELIAN VERB TEMPLATE MODEL. SUFFIXATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOT</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
<th>+5</th>
<th>+6</th>
<th>+7</th>
<th>+8</th>
<th>+9</th>
<th>+10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARKER</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R.EXT</td>
<td>AUX₁/C A U S</td>
<td>INCH.INTR</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>MOOD</td>
<td>AUX₂</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>COND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEGR (2) 
```
m- o- -c’ar- -ap=u[n] -an -d -a -s
```
write +2 +4 +5 +6 +8

‘So that X makes me write Y’

Agreement & Inversion

- slot -2 and +8 (+9) affixes maintain person and number agreement; slot -1 affixes are also involved, see below;
- two basic sets are the SUBJECT markers and OBJECT markers;
- in case they co-occur (e.g. in slot -2), OBJECT markers override SUBJECT markers due to a deictic hierarchy (LOCUTOR vs. NON-LOCUTOR, cf. Kibrik 2003: 276–279); this opposition is continuously morphologized in the agreement systems of all the Kartvelian languages and expands on the area of spatial deixis as well;
- slot +8 markers divide into two subsets, namely “active” and “inactive” (or, rather, “not as active as the proper active”):

  (e.g. GEO -s vs. -al-∅; MEGR -s vs. -ul-∅)

GEO (3) 
```
ic’q’eb-s
```
‘X begins<sub>TR</sub> Y’

GEO (4) 
```
ic’q’eb-a
```
‘X begins<sub>INTR</sub>’
- different portmanteaus possible (e.g. GEO gv- O1PL);
- disambiguation is sometimes required, as in ex. (5) below featuring the slot +9 PL marker -t (GEO, MEGR, LAZ) that can refer to either SUBJECT or OBJECT, i.e. works according to the leftover principle; it also overrides the s3SG -s in case they co-occur:

GEO (5)  
\[ ga\text{-}i\text{-}g\text{-}o\text{-}Ø/s\text{-}t \]
PRV-IO2-VER0-understand-SBJ-S/S3SG-PL
‘so that I/we/XSG understand(s) you\_sg/you\_pl/you\_hnr’

The term “inversion” stands for a particular means to refer to the roles of the arguments of the verb in a specific way and involves the interplay of agreement markers, pre-radical vowels, and certain suffixal morphemes in two major domains, namely the perfect TAM paradigms of agentive verbs and a class of verbs of decreased SUBJECT control, aka EXPERIENCER verbs, which refer to states denoting possession, feelings, emotions, intention and possibility to take an action.

The EXP coded by the DAT is cross-referenced in the prefixal slot -2 and is often accompanied by the pre-radical vowel, i- for the 1st and 2nd persons, and u- for the 3rd. If this vowel is e-, the marker does not vary depending on the person.

GEO (6)  
\[ m\text{-}i\text{-}q\text{'var-}s \]
IO1-VER0-love-S3SG
‘I love X’

GEO (7)  
\[ g\text{-}i\text{-}q\text{'var-}s \]
IO2-VER0-love-S3SG
‘you\_sg love X’

GEO (8)  
\[ Ø\text{-}u\text{-}q\text{'var-}s \]
IO3-VER0-love-S3SG
‘X loves Y’

Morphosyntax & Case-Marking Alignment

Agentive verbs (write, cut, jump, play, sing, but also: cough, yawn) case-shift, whereas non-agentive verbs (be, stand/sit/lie, grow\_intr, but also: stand up/sit down/lie down, walk, go, play for smb, sing for smb) and experiencer verbs (love, like, remember, have, but also: bring\_prs/fut, take\_prs/fut) do not.

FIGURE 3. CASE-MARKING ALIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“A” VERBS</th>
<th>“N-A” VERBS</th>
<th>“E” VERBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS TAM paradigms</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR TAM paradigms</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF TAM paradigms</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>BEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-Radical Vowels and Their Functions

Pre-radical vowels, aka versionizers (cf. the traditional label “version” as a cover term for the troublesome vowels that pop up right in front of the root and crucially affect the valency of the verb) represent one of the core domains in the Kartvelian verb. They are a set of slot -1 morphemes that only occur in finite verb forms and convey a great amount of functions connected with valency and other areas of grammatical structure, both synchronically and diachronically.

The pioneer of Kartvelian studies in the West, Gerhard Deeters labeled them “Charaktervokale” and defined them as follows:

„bestimmte Vokale, die in Verbalformen zwischen Personalpräfix und Wurzel stehen und die Beziehung zwischen Täter und Ziel oder zwischen näherem und fernerem Ziel zum Ausdruck bringen“ (1930: 70).


A General Overview

These vowels are involved in the forming of passives and interact with modality to create [passive] potentials, as well as pseudo-passives and their lookalikes in the domains of decreasing and interpreting derivations.

They also increase the number of the core arguments of the verb in several ways, thus creating applicatives and causatives.

Finally, these vowels can increase the valency of the downgraded verb or decrease the upgraded one; in neither way does this happen along the same cline, down which the verb had been derived from its verbum simplex, e.g. the anticausatives of decreased control which title this talk.

Etymology and Diachrony

(Klimov 1998; Fähnrich, Saržvelaże 2000)

In the traditional terminology, version markers (= pre-radical vowels) can be “locative”, “relative”, “objective”, and “subjective”, the latter kind being often viewed as a sub-type of the objective version. All Kartvelian languages share this pattern and seem to have very few exceptions with respect to the application of the markers at issue in function, diachronic use, and conventionalization.

FIGURE 4. KARTVELIAN PRE-RADICAL VOWELS IN THE ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>version</th>
<th>PK archetype</th>
<th>GEO</th>
<th>SVAN</th>
<th>MEGR</th>
<th>LAZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>°a</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>o-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td>°e</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjective</td>
<td>°i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objective</td>
<td>°u-</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>u-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synchrony

All pre-radical vowels are involved into the formation of **APPLICATIVES**:

**GEO** (9)  \( \emptyset\text{-c’er}-s \)
DO\(_3\)-write-S\(_3\)SG
‘X writes Y’

(10)  \( \emptyset\text{-u-c’er}-s \)
IO\(_V\)-write-S\(_3\)SG
‘X writes Y for Z’

(11)  \( \emptyset\text{-i-c’er}-s \)
DO\(_3\)-VER\(_S\)-write-S\(_3\)SG
‘X writes Y for herself/himself’

(12)  \( \emptyset\text{-a-c’er}-s \)
IO-VER\(_R\)-write-S\(_3\)SG
‘X writes Y on Z’

the so-called “objective version(izer)” controls the IO that refers to one of the following roles (listing by Lacroix 2011):
- plain beneficiary
- deputative beneficiary
- recipient beneficiary
- maleficiary
- allative
- possessor

the so-called “subjective version(izer)” re-analyzes and decreases the valency of the “objective version” applicative by co-referencing the S with one of the above roles

**GEO** (13)  \( \text{bič’}-i \)
(gogona-[i]s[a]-tvis)  \( \text{leks}-s \)
\( \emptyset\text{-c’er}-s \)
boy-NOM  girl-GEN-BEN  verse-DAT  DO\(_3\)-write-S\(_3\)SG
‘The boy is writing a verse (for a girl)’

**MEGR** (14)  \( \text{boš}-i \)
(cira-šo[t])  \( \text{lers}-i-s \)
\( \emptyset\text{-č’ar-un}-s \)
boy-NOM  girl-BEN  verse-R.EXT-DAT  DO\(_3\)-write-S\(_M\)-S\(_3\)SG
‘idem’

**GEO** (15)  \( \text{bič’}-i \)
gogona-s  \( \text{leks}-s \)
\( \emptyset\text{-u-c’er}-s \)
boy-NOM  girl-DAT  verse-DAT  IO\(_3\)-VER\(_O\)-write-S\(_3\)SG
‘The boy is writing a verse for a girl’

**MEGR** (16)  \( \text{boš}-i \)
cira-s  \( \text{lers}-i-s \)
\( \emptyset\text{-u-č’ar-un}-s \)
boy-NOM  girl-DAT  verse-R.EXT-DAT  IO\(_3\)-VER\(_O\)-write-S\(_M\)-S\(_3\)SG
‘idem’
The boy is writing a verse for himself

Idem

X builds a house for herself/himself

(Lacroix 2009: 511)

I plough X for myself

You plough X for your self

X ploughs Y for herself/himself

(Topuria 1967: 45)

The boy is drawing a picture on the table

The children drew horns to/on the portraits (e.g. in school textbooks)
It is more or less obvious that the horns are to be added in this case on top of the heads of the people painted on the pictures, not on their sides, shoulders etc., that is, one could speak here of, in Talmy’s terminology (1982: 242), a specific “adjacency to a biased part” and Levinson’s “intrinsic frame of reference” to the IO (1996: 366: ff.). A rewording such as GEO rkebi p ’ort ’eb-ze (PSTP SUPERESS) da-Ø-xat’ es // MEGR kalepi p ’ort ’ep-s (DAT:LOC) do-xant ’-es ‘they painted the horns on the portraits’ would therefore be entirely inappropriate.

Valency Decrease

Valency decreasing operations are typically yielded by the pre-radical vowel i- accompanied by inactive suffixation:

GEO (9) Ø-c’er-s
      DO3-write-S2SG
‘X writes Y’

decausative (potential) reading:

GEO (27) es saxel-i sxvanairad Ø-i-c’er-eb-a (prang-eb-is mier)
      DEMp,NOM name-NOM otherwise S3-VERs-write-SM-S2SG.INACT French-PL-GEN by
‘This name is/can be written (on its own)’

GEO (28) Zurab-i Germani[a]-idan [c’eril-eb-s] Ø-i-c’er-eb-a xolme
      Zurab-NOM Germany-EL letter-PL-DAT S3-VERs-write-SM-S2SG.INACT HAB
‘Zurab writes (letters) [home] from Germany from time to time’

Perfectivity in the finite verb does not correlate with the antipassive meaning:

GEO (29) *is pul-s xolme da-Ø-i-xarţ-a
      DEMp,NOM money-DAT HAB PRF-S3-VERs-spend-S3SG.PRT
expected translation: ‘S/he spent money from time to time’

and is hardly compatible with the passive (potential) meaning:

GEO (30) pul-i sc’rapad da-Ø-i-xarţ-a (??im-is mier)
      money-NOM quickly PRF-S3-VERs-spend-S3SG.PRT DEMp,OBL-GEN by
‘The money got spent quickly (??the money was spent by her/him quickly)’

which is why with the perfective aspect the decausative reading is preferred.
In addition to decausatives, the vowel *i* - can mark autocausatives:

GEO (31)  Ø-mal-av-s  
DO3-hide-SM-S3SG  ‘X hides Y’

(32)  Ø-i-mal-av-s  
DO3-VER3-hide-SM-S3SG  ‘X hides Y for herself/himself’

(33)  Ø-i-mal-eb-a  
S3-VER3-hide-SM-S3SG.INACT  ‘X hides TR/TRTR from time to time’

A statistical remark on the productivity:

A frontal check of Rayfield’s 2006 voluminous “Comprehensive Georgian-English Dictionary” (some 120k entries) provided the following numbers for parallel finite forms out of some 14k verb entries) with and without one of the pre-radical vowels:

VERBUM SIMPLEX (Ø-’c’ers) vs. VER3a- + VERBUM SIMPLEX (a-’c’ers)  1005 pairs

VERBUM SIMPLEX (Ø-’c’ers) vs. VER3i- + VERBUM SIMPLEX (i-’c’ers)  169 pairs

VERBUM SIMPLEX (Ø-’c’ers) vs. VER3a- + VERBUM SIMPLEX (a-’c’ers)  1561 pairs

(CAUS & FACT also included)

VERBUM SIMPLEX (gada-Ø-xdeba) vs. VER3e- + VERBUM SIMPLEX (gada-e-xdeba)  6 pairs

The Pre-Radical Vowel *e*-

No active-marking pairs according the above accounts being available (cf. e.g. *e-brʒvis* ‘X struggles against Y’ vs. *Ø-brʒvis* expected translation: ‘X struggles’), the *e*-derivates basically parallel the *i*-derivates with inactive suffixal marking (143 relevant pairs found):

GEO (34)  bič ’-i  sardap[s]-ši  Ø-i-mal-eb-a  
boy-NOM  basement.[DAT]-INESS  S3-VER3-hide-SM-S3SG.INACT  ‘The boy is hiding in the basement’

GEO (35)  bič ’-i  sardap[s]-ši  Ø-e-mal-eb-a  deda-s  
boy-NOM  basement.[DAT]-INESS  IO3-VER3e-hide-SM-S3SG.INACT  mother-DAT  ‘The boy is hiding in the basement from his mother’

---

3 I am largely indebted to a friend of mine, M.A. Oleg Bulatovskij of Lviv, who kindly performed the accounting procedures.
MEGR (36) bayana-∅ sardap-i-s ∅-i-t’q’-eb-u  
child-NOM basement-R.EXT-DAT S3-VERs-hide-SM-S3SG.INACT  
‘The child is hiding in the basement’

MEGR (37) bayana-∅ sardap-i-s ∅-a-t’q’-eb-u nana-s  
child-NOM basement-R.EXT-DAT IO3-VERR-hide-SM-S3SG.INACT mother-DAT  
‘The child is hiding in the basement from his/her mother’

Being the most peculiar and at the same time under-described pre-radical vowel in Kartvelian (quite often not even included into the relevant paragraphs), e- in GEO & SVAN as well as their MEGR & LAZ cognate a- are most troublesome in the ways they work. Their basic function is to relate the ACTION/EVENT/STATE to a new participant in a way that the latter becomes indirectly involved.

For verbal lexemes featured in examples (35) and (37), the tradition holds the term “relative passive/potential”, which, however, does not seem to be perfectly adequate. In fact, these represent an instance of and upgrade of autocausatives, i.e. an applicative derivation (semantically of a quite subtle kind though).

Decausatives increase their valency by adding a(n agentive) participant whose control over the action is decreased; this new participant (DAT) is either an unwilling performer of the action, or the one who unwillingly provides the venue for the action, or the intended RECIPIENT, or the EXPERIENCER (cf. the aforementioned “relative passives” and “relative potentials”).

GEO (38) bič’-s ∅-e-c’er-eb-a leks-i  
boy-DAT IO3-VERR-write-SM-S3SG.INACT verse-NOM  
‘The verse is/can be written to/for/at the place of the boy’

MEGR (39) boš-i-s ∅-a-c’ar-u[n]-∅ lers-i  
boy-R.EXT-DAT IO3-VERR-write-SM-S3SG.INACT verse-NOM  
‘The verse is written by/to/for/at the place of the boy’

MEGR (40) boš-i-s ∅-a-c’ar-e[n]-∅ lers-i  
boy-R.EXT-DAT IO3-VERR-write-POT-S3SG.INACT verse-NOM  
‘The verse can be written by/to/for/at the place of the boy’  
= ‘The boy can write a/the verse’

SVAN (41) ĺq’int’-s leks-∅ x-e-ir-un-i-∅  
boy-DAT verse-NOM IO3-VERL-write-CAUS-INACT-SG  
‘The verse is/can be written to/for the boy’
Intermediary Results

The data on valency change so far discussed can be summarized in the following chart below:

FIGURE 5. VALENCY DERIVATIONS IN GEO. PART 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c’er-s</th>
<th>morphology</th>
<th>syntax</th>
<th>semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘X writes Y’</td>
<td>addition of versionizer a-</td>
<td>+ ARG 3 IO DAT</td>
<td>+ venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-c’er-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘X writes Y on Z’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1b)</td>
<td>addition of versionizer u-</td>
<td>+ ARG 3 IO DAT</td>
<td>+ beneficiary etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-c’er-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘X writes Y for Z’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>replacement of versionizer u-</td>
<td>– ARG 3 IO DAT</td>
<td>reflexivization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-c’er-s</td>
<td>by versionizer i-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘X writes Y for herself/himself’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>replacement of active suffix(es)</td>
<td>– ARG 1 S NOM/ERG/DAT, loss of case-shifting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-c’er-eb-a</td>
<td>-(eb)-s by inactive suffixes -eb-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘X gets/is written (by Y)’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>replacement of versionizer i-</td>
<td>+ ARG 3 IO DAT</td>
<td>applicative of indirect involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-c’er-eb-a</td>
<td>by versionizer e-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘X gets/is written for Y’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Causatives

(Kec’aze et al. 1969)

Kartvelian causatives are formed by means of circumfixation. The prefixal part is the pre-radical vowel associated with the locative version (a- in GEO), whereas the suffixal part can vary depending on semantic and formal properties of the verb (e.g. -in, -(e)v-in, -eb-in, etc. in GEO).

The addition of the CAUSER to the proposition shifts the case-marking alignment of the verb as follows:

**FIGURE 6. CASE MARKING ALIGNMENT IN GEO (EXTRACT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Arg 1, S/A</th>
<th>Arg 2, DO/P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRS TAMS</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR TAMS</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF TAMS</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEO (42)**  
gogona-Ø bič’-s leks-s Ø-a-c’er-in-eb-s
‘The girl makes the boy write a verse’

**MEGR (43)**  
cira-Ø boš-i-s lers-i-s Ø-o-c’ar-apu[n]-an-s
‘idem’

**SVAN (44)**  
dina-Ø č’q’int’-s leks-s x-a-un-e-Ø
‘idem’

Note that a canonical passivization of a causative is not possible: the PATIENT, say, a verse in a sentence, such as, e.g. ‘The girl makes the boy write a verse’, is the 2

**FIGURE 7. CASE MARKING IN GEO CAUSATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>CAUSER</th>
<th>ex-Arg 1, ex-S/A</th>
<th>Arg 2, DO/P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRS TAMS</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR TAMS</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF TAMS</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEO (45)**  
*bič’-i leks-s ?Ø-i-c’er-in-eb-a gogona-[i]s mier
boy-NOM verse-DAT S3-VERe-write-CAUS-SM-S3SG INACT girl-GEN by
expected translation: ‘The boy is forced by the girl to write a verse’
as it would imply the promotion of the non-1\textsuperscript{st} argument of the (transitive) causative verb to the SUBJECT position requiring the NOM/ERG/DAT encoding.

This phenomenon of causative downgrades is only scarcely represented in translations of examples in dictionaries (cf. e.g. (46) net’avi k’vesi xom ar gapuč’da, cecxls rom ayar i-q’r-ev-in-eb-a\footnote{Kadagiže, D. & N. Kadagiże. 1984. Batsbi-Georgian-Russian Dictionary.} ‘I wonder if the flint steel got broken, as it \textbf{is} no longer \textbf{starting} a fire’, ANTIPASS from a-q’r-ev-in-eb-s ‘X makes Y drop/throw Z’ < q’r-i-s ‘X drops/throws Z’).

The pre-radical vowel e- takes part in increasing the valency of (allegedly) decreased causatives, this derivation mechanism implying the deletion of the CAUSER without returning the agentive argument into the SUBJECT position. Morphologically, the starting point is the CAUS stem, say, a-c’er-in- ‘make write’ (cf. ex. (42) a-c’er-in-eb-s above), which undergoes the pre-radical vowel change, from a- to e- (quite likely through the intermediate i-stage), and attaches the series marker -eb with the medial (INACT) set of agreement suffixes. What also happens is the shift of the SUBJECT cross-reference in the prefixal agreement slot from (formal) SUBJECT marking to (formal) OBJECT marking.

\textbf{GEO} (47) \begin{center} \begin{tabular}{l} bič’-s \hspace{1cm} \textit{Ø}-e-c’er-in-eb-a \hspace{1cm} leks-i \\ boy-DAT \hspace{1cm} IO3-VER\textsubscript{R}\hspace{-0.05cm}-write-CAUS-SM:STAT\textsubscript{-}S\textsubscript{3}SG.INACT \hspace{0.2cm} verse-NOM \end{tabular} \end{center}

‘The boy \textbf{is very much like to and is about to write/cannot help writing a verse’}

This construction (highly colloquial in Standard GEO) is perhaps the solution that GEO offers for the problem of the CAUS valency downgrade, cf. ex. (45) ??i-c’er-in-eb-a above.

In MEGR, a similar vowel change takes place, viz. o- (> ??i- ) > a-, and yields a parallel derivation (which is quite likely to be the source for the similar phenomenon in GEO):

\textbf{MEGR} (48) \begin{center} \begin{tabular}{l} boš-i-s \hspace{1cm} \textit{Ø}-a-c’ar-apu[n]-apu[n]-Ø \hspace{1cm} lers-i \\ boy-R.EXT-DAT \hspace{1cm} IO3-VER\textsubscript{R}\hspace{-0.05cm}-write-CAUS-STAT\textsubscript{-}S\textsubscript{3}SG.INACT \hspace{0.2cm} verse-NOM \end{tabular} \end{center}

‘idem’

\textbf{SVAN}, unlike \textit{LAZ} (according to my informants), allows for a similar downgrade of the CAUS verb (quite probable, again under the MEGR influence):

\textbf{SVAN} (49) \begin{center} \begin{tabular}{l} c’q’int’-s \hspace{1cm} x-e-ir-un-ā:li-i-Ø \hspace{1cm} leks-Ø \\ boy-R.EXT-DAT \hspace{1cm} IO3-VER\textsubscript{R}\hspace{-0.05cm}-write-CAUS-SM:DECAUS-INACT-SG \hspace{0.2cm} verse-NOM \end{tabular} \end{center}

‘idem’

Considering that every CAUS falls into the active transitive group according to all parameters (active morphology, transitive morphosyntax, case-shifting, etc.), one might try to apply to it the operations illustrated by FIGURE 5 on page 11 and finally find out that only two steps out of the aforementioned four for a proper non-CAUS transitive are in this case available.
First of all, step (1b) falls out, because a CAUS verb needs the -1 “version” slot for its mere existence: on the one hand, the pre-radical vowel, otherwise responsible for a locative argument, is involved in the formation of the CAUS circumfix, which means that it is formally impossible to replace the pre-radical vowel by any other one from the respective set; on the other hand, this operation would have also been blocked semantically, as one does not necessarily need to create applicatives (i.e. make an additional upgrade) from causatives.

Step (2) is ruled out due to the same reason, as it should have been a direct consequence of step (1b).

Step (3) is seemingly quite imaginable and not ruled out by the language, but always causing frowns in my informants.

Step (4) perfectly exists—most probably thanks to its semantic necessity and through the morphological *imaginability* of the problematic step (3).

These data can be summarized in the chart below:

**FIGURE 8. VALENcy DERIVATIONS IN GEO. PART 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a-c’er-in-eb-s</th>
<th>morphology</th>
<th>syntax</th>
<th>semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘X makes Y write Z’</td>
<td>replacement of active suffixes -in-eb-s by inactive suffixes -eb-a</td>
<td>~ ARG 1 S NOM/ERG/DAT, ARG 3 IO DAT &gt; ARG 1 NOM, loss of case-shifting</td>
<td>decausativization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??i-c’er-in-eb-a</td>
<td>exp. tr.: ‘X is made write Z by Y’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-c’er-in-eb-a</td>
<td>replacement of phantom versionizer i- by versionizer e-</td>
<td>+ ARG 3 IO DAT in place of ARG 1 S NOM/ERG/DAT</td>
<td>anticausatives of decreased control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>1st, 2nd, 3rd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTIPASS</td>
<td>antipassive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL</td>
<td>applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>distal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECAUS</td>
<td>decausative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>extension marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVID</td>
<td>evidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>experiencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>factitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>Georgian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNR</td>
<td>honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPRF</td>
<td>imperfectivizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INACT</td>
<td>inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INANM</td>
<td>inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCH</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAZ</td>
<td>Laz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGR</td>
<td>Megrelian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>patient; proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRV</td>
<td>preverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTP</td>
<td>postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.EXT</td>
<td>root extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>submorph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>series marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>sociative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIM</td>
<td>stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERESS</td>
<td>superessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVAN</td>
<td>Svan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>tense-aspect-mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VER</td>
<td>locative versionizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERr</td>
<td>neutral versionizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERs</td>
<td>objective versionizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERg</td>
<td>relative versionizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERs</td>
<td>subjective versionizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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