

Clitics in Modern Georgian

KOJIMA, Yasuhiro

JSPS Research Fellow, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

The present paper aims at a detailed description of clitics in Modern Georgian, drawing particular attention to their relative order in clitic sequences, the distinction of clitics from suffixes, what a clitic may take as its host, and their semantic scope. Clitics are grouped into six groups basically according to their relative ordering: clitic postpositions and five groups of clitic particles. Generally, clitics are grammatical words that have no phonological independence and, in this point, they show some affinity to affixes. It is demonstrated in the paper that these six groups of clitics show a coherent gradation from those more affix-like to those less so in several aspects.

Keywords: Georgian, clitic, particle, postposition, affix

1. Introduction
2. Modern Georgian
3. Clitics
4. Conclusion

1. Introduction *

Clitics are generally characterized as a grammatical word which is not an independent phonological word on its own. A clitic attaches to another element and forms a phonological word together with it (cf. Dixon and Aikhenvald 2002: 25). It is often the case in languages that some elements may appear either as a clitic or as a full phonological word. In the present paper, only those grammatical words which *never* represent an independent phonological word are called clitics. In Modern Georgian, there are then a scant twenty such clitics, all of which are enclitic. The present paper aims at a detailed description of them, drawing particular attention to their relative order in clitic sequences, the distinction of clitics from suffixes, what a clitic may take as its host, and their semantic scope.

Those elements which I refer to here as clitics have been rather passingly treated in the literature on the grammar of Modern Georgian.¹ They are a part of postpositions and what has been traditionally called *particles* (Geo. *nac' ilak' ebi*). A short survey devoted to Modern Georgian clitics is found in Harris (2002), which discusses both those types of elements which cliticize optionally and those which cliticize obligatorily. However, some elements such as =*me*, =*ġa*, as well as all the clitic postpositions that obligatorily cliticize are not dealt with at all by her.

I will group clitics into basically six groups, basically according to their relative ordering. Clitics are generally those grammatical words that have no phonological independence and, in this point, they show some affinity to affixes. I will demonstrate that these six groups of clitics show a coherent gradation from those more affix-like to those less so.

* An earlier version of the present paper was presented at a meeting held at Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, in December 2006. I wish to express my thanks to those at the meeting for valuable comments and to Ms. Giancarla F. Unser-Schutz for correcting the English. The investigation reported here was supported in part by the Grant-in-aid for JSPS research fellows from Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (No.4712, 2006-2009).

¹ Clitics of Old Georgian, in contrast, appear to have attracted more attention of researchers, probably due to the so-called "mesis," which is not attested in Modern Georgian (e.g. *aġ-raj-dga* in which the clitic *raj* "after" attaches to the finite verb *aġ-dg-a* "he rose"; cf. Boeder 1994).

Section 2 presents those aspects of Modern Georgian which pertain to the following discussion. In Section 3, the six groups of clitics are discussed in turn.

2. Modern Georgian

Georgian belongs to the South Caucasian or Kartvelian language family. It is the official language of Georgia and has approximately 5 million speakers. Georgian has a highly systematic orthography. According to said orthography, those elements which always occur as a clitic are unseparated from their host element or connected to it by means of a hyphen.

The phonemes of Georgian are as follows.

Vowels (5)	<i>i, e, a, u, o</i>
Consonants (28)	<i>b, p, p', d, t, t', g, k, k', q', ʒ [dz], c [ts], c' [ts'], j [dʒ], č [tʃ], č' [tʃ'], s, š, z, ž, x [χ], ǧ [ʁ], h, v, r, l, m, n</i>

Georgian has nouns, verbs, adverbs, postpositions, conjunctions, interjections, and a small number of particles. Nouns include so-called adjectives, pronouns and numerals. Among clitics, some are particles, while others are postpositions. Syntactically, the order of clause constituents is largely free, though SOV and SVO are regarded as basic orders.

The discussion to follow is germane to noun morphology. Nouns inflect in number and case, and the forms of case suffixes differ according to whether they follow a consonant or a vowel. Modifiers of a noun may show partial agreement with modified in case. An agreement suffix appears when the stem ends in a consonant, but not when it is vowel-final stem. The bracketed vowel *a* attached to the end of the dative, genitive and instrumental cases shows up only in certain contexts. The ablative (ABL) and terminative (TRM) cases are traditionally not included in the inflectional paradigm of a noun (see 3.1.2).

Table 1. Noun inflection and agreement of modifiers

		“this	tall	man”	“that	small	table”
SG	NOM	<i>es</i>	<i>maǧal-i</i>	<i>k'ac-i</i>	<i>is</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magida-∅</i>
	ERG	<i>am</i>	<i>maǧal-ma</i>	<i>k'ac-ma</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magida-m</i>
	DAT	<i>am</i>	<i>maǧal-∅</i>	<i>k'ac-s(a)</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magida-s(a)</i>
	GEN	<i>am</i>	<i>maǧal-i</i>	<i>k'ac-is(a)</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magid-is(a)</i>
	INST	<i>am</i>	<i>maǧal-i</i>	<i>k'ac-ii(a)</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magid-ii(a)</i>
	ABL	<i>am</i>	<i>maǧal-i</i>	<i>k'ac-idan</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magid-idan</i>
	ADV	<i>am</i>	<i>maǧal-∅</i>	<i>k'ac-ad</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magida-d</i>
	TRM	<i>am</i>	<i>maǧal-∅</i>	<i>k'ac-amde</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magida-mde</i>
PL	VOC		<i>maǧal-o</i>	<i>k'ac-o</i>		<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magida(-v)</i>
	NOM	<i>es</i>	<i>maǧal-i</i>	<i>k'ac-eb-i</i>	<i>is</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magid-eb-i</i>
	ERG	<i>am</i>	<i>maǧal-ma</i>	<i>k'ac-eb-ma</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>p'at'ara</i>	<i>magid-eb-ma</i>

In so far as nouns are concerned, it is usually easy to recognize what a grammatical word is. A noun employed independently must have a case suffix or agreement suffix which terminates inflection. Whatever elements following a case suffix inside a phonological word is a clitic. As for verbs, it is evident what a grammatical word is, as they also have fixed inflection.

It is, however, often the case that a phonological word is difficult to determine. This is due to the fact that stress in Modern Georgian is very weak and even, and its position is not entirely predictable (Vogt 1971: 15-16; Zhghenti 1963; Hewitt 1995: 28-29; Harris 2002: 232). Most frequently, the first syllable is stressed in mono- and two-syllabic words, while it is the antepenult that is stressed in words having more than two syllables (Zhghenti 1956: 249ff), albeit instances unconformable to this rule are not rare. Rogava (1963) maintains that the stress accent falls on the antepenult, while, at the same time, the pitch accent is on the penult.

For example, the negative particle *ar(a)* immediately precedes finite verbs, when it negates a predicate. It may also optionally cliticize to a finite verb, as in (1b). In (1b), *ar=mivdivar* as a whole is considered a phonological word in that it is assigned a single stress. *Ver(a)* “cannot,” like *ar(a)*, is

another negative particle and may also cliticize to a finite verb. In (2b), the stress is on *ver* as it is the antepenult of the phonological word.

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| (1) | a. | <i>ár</i> | <i>mí-v-dí-var.</i> | “I’m not going.” |
| | | NEG | PV-S1-go-S1SG | |
| | b. | <i>ar=mí-v-dí-var</i> ² | | “I’m not going.” |
| (2) | a. | <i>vér</i> | <i>v-náx-e.</i> | “I couldn’t see it.” |
| | | cannot | S1-see-AOR | |
| | b. | <i>vér=v-nax-e.</i> | | “I couldn’t see it.” |

In (3), a conjunction *rom* “when” may be adjoined to a finite verb as a clitic, but it does not attract stress (Harris 2002: 237).

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| (3) | a. | <i>róm</i> | <i>v-náx-e, ...</i> | “when I saw it, ...” |
| | | when | S1-see-AOR | |
| | b. | <i>rom=v-náx-e</i> | | “when I saw it, ...” |

These elements that optionally appear as clitics may be either proclitics or enclitics, whereas those which always cliticize are all enclitics.

In (4), the postposition *=tvís* “for” always appears as a clitic (“clitic postposition”), while *mier* “by” does not (“non-clitic postposition”). As shown in (4a), clitics cannot stand as an independent phonological word with stress of its own.

- | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| (4) | a. * | <i>k’ác-is</i> | <i>tvís</i> | |
| | | man-GEN | PP:for | |
| | b. | <i>k’ác-is=tvís</i> | | “for a man” ³ |
| (5) | | <i>k’ác-is</i> | <i>mier</i> | “by a man” |
| | | man-GEN | PP:by | |

In the following discussion, only elements like *=tvís*, that is, only those grammatical words which never appear as independent phonological words are referred to as “clitics.”

3. Clitics

No affixes attach to clitics, but a clitic may be followed by another clitic. In clitic strings, clitics are arranged in a particular order. No instance has been attested where any two clitics are ordered in one way or another. Clitics are grouped into six groups basically according to the relative ordering of clitic strings.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| [A] | Clitic postpositions |
| [B] | The clitic expressing non-specificity <i>=me</i> |
| [C] | The emphatic clitic <i>=ve</i> (“just, the same, also, again, all”) |
| [D] | Focus clitics |
| [E] | The clitic form of the copula verb <i>=aa/a</i> |
| [F] | Quotative clitics |

² In the present paper, clitics are separated by “=,” while affixes by “-.”

³ Modern Georgian does not have grammatical marking for definiteness. Without context, (4b) therefore may be translated either “for a man” or “for the man.” In translation of examples, I will give only one possibility for the sake of convenience.

- (12) *k'ac-eb=ze* (< **k'ac-eb-s-ze*) “about men”
 man-PL=PP:on
- (13) *k'ac-eb=ši* (< **k'ac-eb-s-ši*) “in men”
 man-PL=PP:in

It is assumed in the literature that the postposition =*vit* in general governs nouns in the dative, but a governed noun may also be in the nominative when the nominative case suffix is *-i* (cf. Vogt 1971: 70-71; Shanidze 1973: 600-601; Hewitt 1995: 69)⁴.

- (14) *gogo-sa=vit* “like a girl”
 girl-DAT=PP:like
- (15) *bič'-i=vit* ~ *bič'-sa=vit* “like a boy”
 boy-NOM=PP:like boy-DAT=PP:like

However, the analysis that =*vit* governs a noun phrase in the nominative is not free from doubt. When a noun to which the postposition =*vit* attaches appears to be in the nominative, (i) modifiers which show agreement sometimes have the agreement suffix $-\emptyset$ (as in (16a)), as well as *-i* (as in (16b))⁵; (ii) a modifying demonstrative must occur in the oblique form, not in the nominative form, as in (16c).

- (16) a. *am* *mağal- \emptyset* *bič'-i=vit* “like this tall boy”
 this:OBL tall-AGR boy-NOM=PP:like
- b. *am* *mağal-i* *bič'-i=vit* “like this tall boy”
 this:OBL tall-AGR boy-NOM=PP:like
- c. **es* *mağal- \emptyset i* *bič'-i=vit* (“like this tall boy”)
 this:NOM tall-AGR boy-NOM=PP:like

3.1.1. Case suffixes vs. postpositions

Although the distinction between case suffixes and postpositions is usually evident, there are some controversial cases owing mainly to historical changes.

A case suffix does not appear when followed by some clitic postpositions. For example, the postposition =*tan* attaches to a dative noun, but the dative case suffix *-s* does not surface when it would have followed a consonant.

- (17) a. *gogo-s=tan* “at a girl”
 girl-DAT=PP:at
- b. *k'ac=tan* (< **k'ac-s=tan*) “at a man”
 man=PP:at (< *man-DAT=PP:at)

⁴ The noun phrase governed by =*vit*, though quite rarely, may also be in the genitive (Martirosovi 1946: 236-237; Shanidze 1973: 600-601).

⁵ Vogt (1971: 71) remarks that modifiers of a nominative noun with =*vit* appear in $-\emptyset$ form. However, in so far as I have surveyed several pieces of literary work, examples wherein a modifier of a nominative noun with =*vit* takes *-i* are by no means infrequent, indeed more common than those with $-\emptyset$. In Giorgi Leonidze's novel *Nat'vris khe* (“Wish tree”), modifiers of a nominative noun with =*vit* take *-i* 15 times, while $-\emptyset$ only 5 times.

[Agreement by *-i*]

- (a) *is k'i axsovda gvinjuas, rom c'in, mtaze tovli gadmoc'oliliq'o tetr-i vešap'-i-vit.*
 “Gvinjua, however, remembered that snow was laying on the mountain before him like a white whale.”

[Agreement by $-\emptyset$]

- (b) *supraze aka-ik močandnen mosank'al- \emptyset tavtav-i-vit tavdamzimebuli st'umrebi.*
 “At the table, here and there were seen guests hanging their head like an ear to be reaped.”

In Mikheil Javakhishili's *Arsena Marabdeli*, modifiers of a nominative noun with =*vit* almost never take $-\emptyset$. Instances of agreement with *-i* are attested 111 times, while that of agreement with $-\emptyset$ only once.

If one observes (17b), =*tan* may seem to occupy the place for a case suffix, but (17a) makes it clear that this is not the case.

The dative case suffix *-s* also does not appear when followed by =*ze* “on” or =*ši* “in” in all nouns apart from a few pronouns.

- (18) *k'ac-eb=ze* (< **k'ac-eb-s=ze*) “about men”
 man-PL=PP:on (< *man-PL-DAT=PP:on)
- (19) *k'ac-eb=ši* (< **k'ac-eb-s=ši*) “in men”
 man-PL=PP:in (< *man-PL-DAT=PP:in)

These suffixes, however, are again postpositions and cannot be considered to be case suffixes. When these suffixes govern two noun phrases conjoined by *da* “and,” the first noun phrase takes a case suffix *-s*, as in (20) (Vogt 1971: 67; Shanidze 1973: 75; Chanishvili 1981: 21-22; Oniani 1988: 6; Boeder 2005: 16).

- (20) *k'ac-eb-sa da kal-eb=ze* “about men and women”
 man-PL-DAT and woman-PL=PP:on

A few pronouns retain the dative case suffix with =*ze* or =*ši*.

- (21) a. *ma-s=ze* “on it”
 3-DAT:SG=PP:on
 b. *ma-s=ši* “in it”
 3-DAT:SG=PP:in

The ablative and terminative cases are generally not treated as cases in the literature on the Georgian grammar. This widely accepted view is based on the fact that the ablative and terminative case suffixes have been formed historically by the fusion of a case suffix and a postposition. The ablative *-(i)dan* has been obtained from the instrumental case suffix *-it* and postposition =*gan*, while the terminative *-(a)mde* comes from the adverbial *-ad* and postposition =*mde* (Martirosovi 1946: 232, 234-236; Shanidze 1973: 74-75; Oniani 1988, 1989: 68-78; Aronson 1991: 236; Hewitt 1995: 76; Boeder 2005: 16).

- (22) *kalak -it =gan > kalak -idan*
 town -INST =PP:from town -ABL
 “from a town”
- (23) *kalak -ad =mde > kalak -amde*
 town -ADV =PP:as.far.as town -TRM
 “as far as a town”

In the modern language, however, *-(i)dan* and *-(a)mde* can never be separated into a case suffix and a postposition in any context. These suffixes cannot govern two noun phrases coordinated by *da* “and,” as shown in (24a) and (25a). To express the intended meanings, the suffixes must be repeated.

- (24) a. * *sopl-it da kalakidan*
 village-INST and
 b. *sopl-idan da kalak-idan* “from a village and town”
 village-ABL and town-ABL
- (25) a. * *sopl-ad da kalakamde*
 village-ADV and
 b. *sopl-amde da kalak-amde* “as far as a village and town”
 village-TRM and town-TRM

We must therefore regard *-(i)dan* and *-(a)mde* as case suffixes.

Shanidze (1973: 73-76) proposes the addition of “locative cases” (*lok'aluri brunvebi* in his terminology) to the traditional case paradigm. In the locative cases he includes not only the ablative

(*gamosvliti* or *dac'q'ebiti*) and terminative (*mic'evniti*), but also =*ši* and =*ze*, which should be treated as postpositions in my view. Chanishvili (1981: 23-24), following Shanidze, calls them semi-cases (*polypadeži*), whereas Oniani (1988; 1989: 68-78) comes to a similar conclusion as mine.^{6,7}

3.1.2. Clitic postpositions vs. non-clitic postpositions

Monosyllabic postpositions always constitute a phonological word together with the noun they attach to, while polysyllabic postpositions do not as they can have their own stress independently.

- (26) *k'ac-is=tvis* "for a/the man"
 man-GEN=PP:for
- (27) *k'ac-is mier* "by a/the man"
 man-GEN PP:by

In syntactic terms, both types of elements are nevertheless postpositions, be it clitic or non-clitic. However, apart from the number of syllables and stress assignment, I point out two differences between clitic and non-clitic postpositions in their syntactic behavior.

(i) Non-clitic postpositions are able to govern two noun phrases coordinated by a conjunction other than *da* "and" (i.e. *an, tu, anu*⁸ "or," etc.), whereas clitic postpositions are often not (cf. (20)).

- (28) *sakartvelo-s an somxet-is šesaxeb* "about Georgia or Armenia"
 Georgia-GEN or Armenia-GEN PP:about
- (29) * *sakartvelo-sa an somxet=ze* ("about Georgia or Armenia")
 Georgia-DAT or Armenia-(DAT)=PP:in
- (30) *čem-i amxanag-is, anu levan-is mier* "by my friend or Levan"
 my-AGR friend-GEN or Levan-GEN PP:by
- (31) * *čem-i amxanag-is, anu levan-is=tvis* ("for my friend or Levan")
 my-AGR friend-GEN or Levan-GEN=PP:for

To express the intended meanings of (29) and (31), both noun phrases must take a postposition.

(ii) The clitics =*me* (non-specificity) and =*ve* "the same, again, also" (see 3.2 and 3.3, respectively, in detail), can directly attach to a noun governed by a non-clitic postposition, but cannot attach to one governed by a clitic postposition.

- (32) a. *am k'ac-is=gan=ve* "again from this man"
 this man-GEN=PP:from=ve
- b. * *am k'ac-is=ve=gan*
- (33) a. *am k'ac-is mier=ve* "again by this man"
 this man-GEN PP:by=ve
- b. *am k'ac-is=ve mier* "by again this man"
 this man-GEN=ve PP:by

Clitic postpositions must be adjoined directly to a noun it governs unless the governed nouns are coordinated by *da* "and," whereas the connection between a non-clitic postposition and a noun it governs is less tight and they may be separated in wider contexts. In this light, it may make sense that Vogt (1971: 67-78) regards clitic postpositions as secondary cases (*cas secondaires*) and non-clitic postpositions as postpositions. However, I nevertheless consider both of them postpositions since they

⁶ Oniani (1988; 1989) calls the case *-(a)mde* "Allativ."

⁷ Uturgaidze (1979), controverting Shanidze's analysis, defends the traditional view. According to him, *-(i)dan* and *-(a)mde* are divided into a case suffix and a postposition in synchronic terms, too, as *-(i)d=an* and *-(a)=mde*. He considers *-(i)d* and =*an* in the former to be allomorphs of the instrumental case suffix *-(i)t* and the postposition =*gan*, respectively. As for the latter, he considers *-(a)*, i.e., *-a ~ -∅* to be allomorphs of the adverbial case suffix *-(a)d* and the consonant *d* drops for a phonetic reason as the postposition *-mde* attaches.

⁸ *Anu* usually indicates that both of the choices are possible, while *tu* implies that only one of the choices is possible. *Anu* is translated as "in other words" (Aronson and Kiziria 1999: 432-433).

both govern a noun in a particular case, which, in my view, must be the definitive qualification of postpositions. In addition, what should be called case must be inflectional, hence obligatorily indicated category.

3.2. The clitic of non-specificity =*me*

The clitic =*me* attaches to interrogative pronouns or adverbs and expresses nonspecificity: for example, *ra-∅=me* “something” (< *ra* “what”), *vin=me* “someone” (< *vin* “who”), and *sad=me* “somewhere” (< *sad* “where”). It may come after an adverb stem, a case or agreement suffix, or a clitic postposition, but never after any other clitic nor after a non-clitic postposition.

When an interrogative pronoun with =*me* declines, =*me*, as a clitic, is supposed to follow a case suffix: for example, NOM *ra-∅=me* “something” and DAT *ra-s=me*. There are, however, alternative forms of the same meaning in which -*me*, as a suffix, fuses with the stem and is followed by a case suffix.

(34)	NOM	<i>ra-∅=me</i>	~	<i>ra-me-∅</i>	“something”
		what-NOM= <i>me</i>		what- <i>me</i> -NOM	
	DAT	<i>ra-s=me</i>	~	<i>ra-me-s</i>	
		what-DAT= <i>me</i>		what- <i>me</i> -DAT	

When the nominative case suffix (or the agreement suffix in modifiers) is -*i*, it is taken into the stem altogether.

(35)	NOM	<i>ramden-i=me</i>	~	<i>ramden-i-me-∅</i>	
		how.many-NOM= <i>me</i>		how.many-NOM- <i>me</i> -NOM	
	DAT	<i>ramden-sa=me</i>	~	<i>ramden-i-me-s</i>	
		how.many-DAT- <i>me</i>		how.many-NOM- <i>me</i> -DAT	
		“several”			

Probably the same variation is assumed with interrogative adverbs as well, though the status of =*me* ~ -*me* is unclear with them since adverbs do not have inflectional categories (e.g. *sad=me* ~ *sad-me* “somewhere”).

From a historical point of view, such variation results from the reanalysis of the status of the clitic =*me* as a suffix. In the modern language, the declensional pattern with the suffix -*me* is actually more prevalent than that with the clitic =*me*. Moreover, the forms with the clitic =*me* do not have a full paradigm. For example, the only ergative form of *rame* “something” is *ra-me-m* [what-*me*-ERG] while **ra-m=me* [what-ERG=*me*] is not regarded as acceptable (Shanidze 1973: 105).

With some clitic postpositions, either pattern is essentially possible, as in (36), though *me* is again more likely a suffix rather than a clitic (i.e. (36b) is more common than (36a)); with others *me* is obligatorily a suffix, as in (37).

(36)	a.	<i>r-is=tvīs=me</i>		“for something”
		what-GEN=PP:for= <i>me</i>		
	b.	<i>ra-me-s=tvīs</i>		“for something”
		what- <i>me</i> -GEN=PP:for		
(37)	a. *	<i>ra=ze=me</i>		“on something”
		what=PP:on= <i>me</i>		
	b.	<i>ra-me=ze</i>		“on something”
		what- <i>me</i> =PP:on		

When a non-clitic postposition is employed, *me* is even more unlikely to be a clitic. If it ever appears as a clitic, it comes immediately after the case suffix and before a non-clitic postposition, as in (38a). Thus, as I have already noted above in 3.1.2, clitic postpositions (at least some, but not all, e.g. =*ze*) intervene between an interrogative pronoun and the clitic =*me*, but non-clitic postpositions never do, as in (38c).

- | | | | | |
|------|------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| (38) | a. ? | <i>v-is=me</i>
who-GEN= <i>me</i> | <i>mier</i>
PP:by | “by someone” |
| | b. | <i>vin-me-s</i>
who- <i>me</i> -GEN | <i>mier</i>
PP:by | “by someone” |
| | c. * | <i>v-is</i>
who-GEN | <i>mier=me</i>
PP:by= <i>me</i> | |

The use of the clitic =*me* is thus fairly limited in the modern language. In most cases *me* appears as a suffix rather than a clitic. It is uncontroversially a clitic only when it follows an oblique case suffix or a clitic postposition, but their combination is restricted.

3.3. The emphatic clitic =*ve*

The clitic =*ve* attaches to nouns, clitic or non-clitic postpositions, and adverbs.⁹ When attached to numerals, it means “all the ...”; otherwise it is generally translated as “the very same, just, again.”

- | | | |
|------|--|---------------------------|
| (39) | <i>xel-it=ve</i>
hand-INST= <i>ve</i> | “again by hand” |
| (40) | <i>bavšvob-idan=ve</i>
childhood-ABL= <i>ve</i> | “already since childhood” |
| (41) | <i>im saxl=š-i=ve</i>
that house(-DAT)=PP:in= <i>ve</i> | “again in that house” |
| (42) | <i>mašin=ve</i>
then= <i>ve</i> | “just then” |

When it is adjoined to numerals and some pronouns, =*ve* may alternatively act as a suffix and constitute a stem (Shanidze 1973: 104-105; with numerals, Harris 2002: 238). Note that, when -*ve* is a part of the stem, the original nominative case (or agreement) suffix -*i* before it is taken into the stem altogether. Forms with the suffix -*ve* are more prevalent than those with the clitic =*ve* in the modern language, similarly to cases with =*me* ~ -*me*.

- | | | | | | | |
|------|-----|---|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (43) | NOM | <i>sam-i=ve</i>
three-NOM= <i>ve</i> | ~ | <i>sam-i-ve-∅</i>
three-NOM- <i>ve</i> -NOM | | |
| | DAT | <i>sam-sa=ve</i>
three-DAT= <i>ve</i>
“all the three” | ~ | <i>sam-i-ve-s</i>
three-NOM- <i>ve</i> -DAT | | |
| (44) | NOM | <i>čem-i=ve</i>
my-AGR= <i>ve</i> | <i>švil-i</i>
child-NOM | ~ | <i>čem-i-ve</i>
my-AGR- <i>ve</i> | <i>švil-i</i>
child-NOM |
| | ERG | <i>čem-ma=ve</i>
my-AGR= <i>ve</i>
“just my child” | <i>švil-ma</i>
child-ERG | ~ | <i>čem-i-ve</i>
my-AGR- <i>ve</i> | <i>švil-ma</i>
child-ERG |

The same variation may again be assumed with adverbs as well, with which we have no clue to decide whether *ve* is a clitic or a suffix (e.g. *mašin=ve* ~ *mašin-ve* “just then”). Reanalysis of =*ve* as a suffix, however, is not possible with other types of hosts (Shanidze 1973: 105; Harris 2002: 238).

⁹ Although I placed the position of =*ve* after that of the clitic =*me* in Table 1, the sequence =*me=ve* is, in fact, quite unlikely and their relative order comes into question. However, forms such as *ramden-ad=me=ve* [how.many-ADV=*me=ve*] “to the same extent” are at least intelligible, whereas the sequence of the inverse order =*ve=me* seems totally impossible. The conclusion I made in 3.2 that =*me* can be separated from an interrogative pronoun or adverb only by a clitic postposition must hold true and I assume that =*ve* can never immediately precede =*me*, but can follow it marginally.

- | | | | | | | |
|------|-----|-----------|-------------------|---|-------------|----------------------|
| (45) | ERG | <i>im</i> | <i>k'ac-ma=ve</i> | ~ | * <i>im</i> | <i>k'ac-i-ve-m</i> , |
| | | that:OBL | three-ERG=ve | | that:OBL | man-NOM-ve-ERG |
| | DAT | <i>im</i> | <i>k'ac-sa=ve</i> | ~ | * <i>im</i> | <i>k'ac-i-ve-s</i> |
| | | that:OBL | man-DAT=ve | | that:OBL | man-NOM-ve-DAT |
| | | | “the same man” | | | |

3.4. Focus clitics

3.4.1. =ǰa

The clitic =ǰa “only” is adjoined to nouns, postpositions, adverbs and also the conjunction *tumca* “though.” With *tumca*, it seems to have simply an emphatic function.

- | | | | | | |
|------|-----------------|------------------------|--|---------------|----------------------------------|
| (46) | <i>sam-i</i> | <i>k'ac-i=ǰa</i> | | | “only three men” |
| | three-AGR | man-NOM=only | | | |
| (47) | <i>sam-∅</i> | <i>k'ac-s=ǰa</i> | <i>v-e-saubr-e.</i> | | “I talked with only three men.” |
| | three-AGR | man-DAT=only | S1-EV-talk-AOR | | |
| (48) | <i>sam-i</i> | <i>k'ac-is=tvis=ǰa</i> | <i>ga-v-a-k'et-e.</i> | | “I made it only for three men.” |
| | three-AGR | man-GEN=PP:for=only | PV-S1-TR-make-AOR | | |
| (49) | <i>am-is</i> | <i>šesaxeb=ǰa</i> | <i>i-saubr-a.</i> | | “He/She talked only about this.” |
| | this-GEN | PP:about=only | SV-talk-S3SG | | |
| (50) | <i>axla=ǰa</i> | <i>mi-v-xvd-i</i> | | | “I realized it just now.” |
| | now=only | PV-S1-realize-AOR | | | |
| (51) | <i>zlivs=ǰa</i> | <i>ga-da-v-rč-i.</i> | | | “I only barely survived.” |
| | barely=only | PV-PV-S1-survive-AOR | | | |
| (52) | <i>tumca=ǰa</i> | <i>čven</i> | <i>kartvel-ta</i> | <i>mepe-∅</i> | <i>gv-q'ol-i-a ...</i> |
| | though=only | 1PL:DAT | Georgian-PL:DAT | king-NOM | O1PL-have-PF-S3SG |
| | | | “though we had the king of Georgians, ...” (Mikheil Javakhishvili, <i>Arsena Marabdeli</i>) | | |

When added to an interrogative pronoun, =ǰa expresses “... on earth?” and may fuse with a stem as a suffix. In this usage, the suffix -ǰa is more usual than the clitic =ǰa in the modern language. As is the case with =me ~ -me, some interrogative pronouns with the clitic =ǰa do not have a full paradigm, whereas those with the suffix -ǰa do (Shanidze 1973: 106).

- | | | | | |
|------|-----|------------------|---|----------------|
| (53) | ERG | <i>ra-m=ǰa</i> | ~ | <i>ra-ǰa-m</i> |
| | | what-ERG=only | | what-only-ERG |
| | DAT | <i>ra-s=ǰa</i> | ~ | <i>ra-ǰa-s</i> |
| | | what-DAT=only | | what-only-DAT |
| | | “what on earth?” | | |

The same variation may also be obtained with interrogative adverbs. However, the status of =ǰa ~ -ǰa is not determinable with them (*sad=ǰa* ~ *sad-ǰa* “where (*sad*) on earth?”). With other types of hosts, affixation of =ǰa does not occur.

- | | | | | |
|------|----|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| (54) | a. | <i>sam-s=ǰa</i> | <i>a-v-i-ǰ-eb.</i> | “I will take only three pieces.” |
| | | three-DAT=only | PV-S1-SV-take-TS | |
| | b. | * <i>sam-ǰa-s</i> | <i>a-v-i-ǰ-eb.</i> | |
| | | three-only-DAT | PV-S1-SV-take-TS | |

3.4.2. =(a)c

The clitic =(a)c “too” attaches to nouns, postpositions, adverbs, some conjunctions, and even some particles as well.¹⁰ When it follows a consonant, an epenthetic vowel, *a*, usually appears.

¹⁰ Harris (2002: 239) writes: “=(a)c ‘too, also’ can be enclitic to any one of a variety of hosts – noun, pronoun, deictic, adjective.” Other various elements, however, can be its host.

- (55) *k'ac-sa=c* *v-nax-av*. “I will see a man, too”
 man-DAT=too S1SG-see-TS
- (56) *k'ac-is=tvīs=ac* *v-i-mḡer-eb*. “I will sing for a man, too”
 man-GEN=PP:for=too S1SG-SV-sing-TS
- (57) *k'ac-is* *šesaxeb=ac* *i-saubr-a*. “He/She talked about a man, too”
 man-GEN PP:about=too SV-talk-S3SG
- (58) *gušin=ac* *mo-ved-i*. “I came yesterday, too.”
 yesterday=too PV-S1SG:come-AOR

[The host is a conjunction.]

- (59) *is* *k'ac-i* *rom=c* *mo-vid-e-s*, ... “Even if he came, ...”
 that man-NOM if=too PV-come-SBJ-S3SG
- cf. *is k'ac-i rom mo-vid-e-s*, ... “If he came, ...”

[The host is a negative particle.]

- (60) *is* *k'ac-i* *ar=c* *mo-vid-a*.¹¹
 that man-NOM NEG=too PV-come-S3SG
 “Neither did that man come (e.g. ... nor did he call me).”
 cf. *is k'aci=c ar movida*.
 “That man did not come, either. (e.g. Mary did not come and ...)”

When added to an interrogative pronoun or adverb, =c forms a relative pronoun or adverb.

- (61) *mt-eb-i*, *roml-eb-sa=c* *v-xed-av-t*
 mountain-PL-NOM which-PL-DAT=too S1SG-see-TS-PL
 “the mountains which we see”
- (62) *adgil-i*, *sad=ac* *v-i-dek-i*
 place-NOM where=too S1-INTR-stand-AOR
 “the place where I was standing”

The combination of =ḡa and =c, when added to interrogative pronouns or adverbs, formed a specific indefinite pronoun or adverb in the old language. Shanidze (1973: 107) describes the historical change in their declensional pattern as shown in (63). First, =ḡa, and later =c as well, underwent reanalysis as a suffix. Today, the dative *ra-s=ḡa=c*, wherein both =ḡa and =c are clitics, is out of use; one may encounter *ra-ḡa-sa=c* fairly infrequently, and practically only *ra-ḡa-ca-s* is in actual use.¹²

- (63) NOM *ra=ḡa=c(a)* > *ra-ḡa=c(a)* > *ra-ḡa-c(a)* “something”
 DAT *ra-s=ḡa=c* > *ra-ḡa-sa=c* > *ra-ḡa-ca-s*

3.4.3. Focus clitics vs. clitics =me, =ve: relative order

In Table 1, I put the position of =ḡa and =c after =ve, as illustrated by the following examples.

- (64) *ik=ve=c* “just there, too”
 there=ve=too
- (65) *ik=ve=ḡa* “only just there”
 there=ve=only

In (64) and (65), however, there is still a possibility to consider *ve* a suffix rather than a clitic, as discussed in 3.3 (i.e. *ik-ve=c* and *ik-ve=ḡa*, respectively). In contexts wherein =ve is unambiguously a clitic (e.g. when an oblique suffix precedes =ve), the sequence =ve=ḡa is hard to imagine, though =ve=c is possible as in the following example.

¹¹ In (60), the negative particle *ar* is not a clitic as it receives its own stress (cf. ex. (1)).

¹² In some dialects, indefinite pronouns are formed by *-cxa* (e.g. *ra-cxa* “something”) which also go back to the two clitics =ḡa and =c but in the inverse order: *ra=c=ḡa* > *ra-c-xa* “something” (Shanidze 1973: 107).

- (66) *bavšvob-idan=ve=c* *rom* *i-cn-ob-d-e* *ma-s*, ...
 childhood-PP:from=ve=too if CV-know-TS-PST-SBJ 3SG:DAT
 “even if you knew him/her from as early as childhood, ...”

The sequences of the inverse order, $=c=ve$ and $=\check{g}a=ve$, are apparently excluded, even when their first element is analyzed as a suffix.

There is a similar situation with the clitic $=me$. It is assumed that the clitic $=me$ can precede $=\check{g}a$ and $=c$, but never follow them. However, the acceptability of the sequence $=me=\check{g}a$ is again uncertain. For instance, *rameġa* in (67) may be analyzed as either *ra-∅=me=\check{g}a* [what-NOM= $=me$ =only] or *ra-me-∅=\check{g}a* [what- me -NOM=only]. The latter is supported by the fact that in oblique cases, forms such as *ra-s=me=\check{g}a* [what-DAT= $=me$ =only], in which $=me$ is unambiguously a clitic, are hardly judged as acceptable by native speakers. Instead, *ra-me-s=\check{g}a* [what- me -DAT=only] is well accepted.

- (67) ... *akaur-i* *adat-is=gan* *mcire* *rameġa* *še-∅-rč-en-i-a*.¹³
 of.here-AGR custom-GEN=PP:from a.little PV-IO3-remain-PF-S3SG
 “... they have handed down only a little (something) from our custom.”
 (M. Javakhishvili, *Arsena Marabdeli*)

For the sequence $=me=c$, see example (7). Again, the inverted orders $=c=me$, $=\check{g}a=me$ appear to be excluded.

3.4.4. Focus clitics vs. the clitics $=me$, $=ve$: what do they attach to?

In this section, I dwell on the position these clitics may occupy in syntactic structures, particularly as to whether they can attach to what is not a clause constituent. I will demonstrate that there exists a difference between the clitics $=me$ and $=ve$, on the one hand, and the focus clitics, on the other, along with a difference between $=me$ and $=ve$.

To begin with, let us see whether these clitics may attach to a complement noun phrase of a postposition. With a *clitic* postposition, these clitics cannot be adjoined to the complement noun phrase directly. They must follow the postposition.

- (68) *v-is=tvis=me* “for someone”
 who-GEN=PP:for= me
- (69) *im* *k'ac-is=tvis=ve* “just for that man”
 that:OBL man-GEN=PP:for= ve
- (70) *im* *k'ac-is=tvis=\check{g}a* “only for that man”
 that:OBL man-GEN=PP:for=only
- (71) *im* *k'ac-is=tvis=ac* “for that man, too”
 that:OBL man-GEN=PP:for=too

When a non-clitic postposition is employed, in contrast, there are two possibilities: (a) a clitic is adjoined to the complement noun phrase and is followed by the non-clitic postposition, or (b) a clitic attaches to the postposition. The clitic $=me$ allows only (a) position, whereas $=\check{g}a$ and $=c$ only (b).¹⁴ The clitic $=ve$ may appear in either position.

¹³ In this example, a nonspecific indefinite pronoun is used with a specific meaning.

¹⁴ As noted in the beginning of 3.1, a few postpositions can be employed as a preposition as well: e.g. *garda amisa* [PP:apart.from this-GEN] “apart from this.” When $=c$ is attached to this prepositional phrase, we have *garda amisa=c* “apart from this, too,” not **garda=c amisa*. This reveals that, when $=c$ attaches to an adpositional phrase, be it a preposition or postposition, it is generally adjoined to the last element of the phrase, not to the syntactic head. With other clitics, I simply could not think of any felicitous example.

Table 3. The position of the clitics when a non-clitic postposition is employed

	NP= <i>clitic</i>	PP	NP	PP= <i>clitic</i>
= <i>me</i>		+		-
= <i>ve</i>		+		+
= <i>ġa</i>		-		+
= <i>c</i>		-		+

- (72) a. *v-is=me mier* “by someone”
 who-GEN=*me* PP:by
 b. * *v-is mier=me*
 who-GEN PP:by=*me*
- (73) a. *im k’ac-is=ve mier* “by that same man”
 that:OBL man-GEN=*ve* PP:by
 b. *im k’ac-is mier=ve* “again by that man”
 that:OBL man-GEN PP:by=*ve*
- (74) a. * *im k’ac-is=ġa mier*
 that:OBL man-GEN=*only* PP:by
 b. *im k’ac-is mier=ġa* “only by that man”
 that:OBL man-GEN PP:by=*only*
- (75) a. * *im k’ac-is=ac mier*
 that:OBL man-GEN=*too* PP:by
 b. *im k’ac-is mier=ac* “by that man, too”
 that:OBL man-GEN PP:by=*too*

Note that in (73a), =*ve* attaches to the complement noun phrase, and the semantic scope of =*ve* is “that man,” while in (73b), it is over the whole phrase “by that man.”

The same result is obtained from constructions wherein a noun modifies another.

- (76) a. *ramden-i=me kud-i* “(the) several caps”
 how.many-AGR=*me* cap-NOM
 b. * *ramden-i kud-i=me*
 how.many-AGR cap-NOM=*me*
- (77) a. *sam-i=ve kud-i* “all the three caps”
 three-AGR=*ve* cap-NOM
 b. *sam-i kud-i=ve* “the same three caps”
 three-AGR cap-NOM=*ve*
- (78) a. ?? *sam-i=ġa kud-i*¹⁵
 three-AGR=*only* cap-NOM
 b. *sam-i kud-i=ġa* “only three caps”
 three-AGR cap-NOM=*only*
- (79) a. * *sam-i=c kud-i*
 three-AGR=*too* cap-NOM
 b. *sam-i kud-i=c* “three caps, too”
 three-AGR cap-NOM=*too*

Again, the clitic =*ve* may attach to either a modifier or modified noun. To take another example, (80a) presupposes a preceding mention of something *white* other than a cap, while (80b) is used when the white cap is mentioned again. That is, when the clitic =*ve* attaches to a modifier, only the modifier is in

¹⁵ (78a) may not be unacceptable, yet is deemed awkward by native speakers. It is apparently at least not impossible for =*ġa* to be adjoined to a numeral modifier. The following is an example taken from Mukhran Machavariani’s poem *C’ola*.

(a) *ak’lda or-i=ġa c’ut-i* [two-NOM=*only* minute-NOM] *t’pilisidan mat’areblis gasvlas*.
 “It was *only two minutes* to the departure of a train from Tbilisi.”

its semantic scope; when it attaches to a modified noun, its semantic scope covers the whole noun phrase.

- (80) a. *tetr-i=ve* *kud-i* “an again *white* cap”
 white-AGR=*ve* cap-NOM
 b. *tetr-i* *kud-i=ve* “the same *white* cap”
 white-AGR cap-NOM=*ve*

As for the position of the clitic =*c*, Boeder (2005: 12) remarks that it “tends to occur after the highest noun phrase in which it is embedded.” In (81), for instance, even if =*c* “too” has only *čemi* “my” in its scope, it cannot be attached directly to *čemi*, but must occur after the modified noun.

- (81) a. * *čem-i=c* *tval-eb-i* *šav-i=a*. (“My eyes are black, too”)
 my-AGR=too eye-PL-NOM black-NOM=be:S3SG
 b. *čem-i* *tval-eb-i=c* *šav-i=a*. “My eyes are black, too.”
 my-AGR eye-PL-NOM=too black-NOM=be:S3SG

It is also well known that, when a relative pronoun with =*c* is in the genitive case and functions as modifier of a noun, =*c* takes the modified noun as its host (or does not occur at all) (cf. Kvachadze 1996: 415).

- (82) *is* *k'ac-i*, *roml-is* *saxel-i=c* *cnobil-i=a*
 that:NOM man-NOM which-GEN name-NOM=too famous-NOM=be:S3SG
 “the man whose name is famous”

I assume that the clitics =*c* and =*ǵa* are generally adjoined only to clause constituents. The pragmatic function of these clitics gives an account of this. The clitics =*ǵa* and =*c*, with their meanings translated as “only” and “too,” respectively, mark their host as the focal part of a proposition, or as the *focus domain*. Focus domains must be phrasal categories, not lexical ones. Lambrecht (1994) writes:

... focus domains must be PHRASAL categories (verb or adjective phrases, noun phrases, prepositional phrases, adverbial phrases, and sentences). Focus domains cannot be LEXICAL categories. This is so because information structure is not concerned with words and their meanings, nor with the relations between the meanings of words and those of phrases or sentences, but with the pragmatic construal of the relations between entities and states of affairs in given discourse situations. Entities and states of affairs are syntactically expressed in phrasal categories, not in lexical items. (Lambrecht 1994: 215)

These clitics may be adjoined to a clause constituent of a non-finite clause as well, even inside another phrasal unit.

- (83) *čem=tvis=ac* *did-i* *pexsacmel-i*
 1SG:GEN=PP:for=too big-NOM shoes-NOM
 “shoes which are big for me, too”
 (84) *sakartvelo=ši=ǵa* *darčeni-l-i* *mcenare-∅*
 Georgia=PP:in=only remain:PART-AGR plant-NOM
 “a plant which has remained only in Georgia”
 (85) *sam-∅* *saat=ze=c* *adre*
 three-AGR o'clock=than=too early
 “earlier than even three o'clock”

In all the examples given above in this section, the clitics =*ǵa* and =*c* as well as the others are adjoined to the last element of a phrasal category which is or a part of which is their scope. In contrast, when =*c* has scope over a verb phrase or a whole clause, it appears inside of it, not at its end. This is when =*c* attaches to a negative particle, or complementizer (conjunction) *rom* that leads a concessive clause. The host element, then, is not at the rightmost position of semantic scope of the clitic, yet

nevertheless it is usually the syntactic head of scope. Recall that a finite verb can never be a host of the clitic =*c*.

In (86), =*c* is adjoined to the negative particle *ar*. It has scope over the verb phrase (*ar mova* “will not come”).

- (86) *dato-∅ ar=c mo-va.*
 Dato-NOM NEG=too PV-come:S3SG
 “Neither will Dato come (e.g. ... nor will call me).”

In (87), =*c* attaches to the complementizer *rom* and has scope over the whole concessive conditional clause.

- (87) *tav-i rom=c m-t'k'i-od-e-s, c'a-val.*
 head-NOM if=too O1SG-hurt-PST-SBJ-S3SG PV-S1SG:go
 “Even if my head hurts, I will go.”

Note that in concessive conditional clauses, =*c* may be adjoined to an element other than the complementizer, namely, the head, as in (87'). (87') also allows a non-concessive reading, with the clitic =*c* having scope only over the host noun phrase.

- (87') *tav-i=c rom m-t'k'i-od-e-s, c'a-val.*
 head-NOM=too if O1SG-hurt-PST-SBJ-S3SG PV-S1SG:go
 “Even if my head hurts, I will go.”
 or “If my head, too, (besides, say, my hand) hurts, (then) I will go.”

In sum, =*ǰa* and =*c* are focus clitics and are adjoined to a clause constituent (or a clause itself). The clitics =*me* and =*ve*, in contrast, can be adjoined to a non-clause constituent. The other clitics to be discussed in 3.5 and 3.6 are like =*ǰa* and =*c* in this point.

3.5. The clitic form of the copula verb

The copula verb *q'opna* “be” has a clitic form only in the indicative present and in the third person singular: =*a* after a vowel, =*aa* after a consonant.

Table 4. Conjugation of *q'opna* “be” in the indicative present

1SG	<i>var</i>	1PL	<i>vart</i>
2SG	<i>xar</i>	2PL	<i>xart</i>
3SG	<i>aris ~ ari ~ =a/aa</i>	3PL	<i>arian</i>

The alternative forms *aris*, *ari*, and =*a/aa* do not differ in meaning and function from each other and are always interchangeable. The clitic form =*a/aa*, in so far as it is semantically feasible, can be adjoined to every type of element except for finite verbs (see also examples (6), (7)).

- (88) *is k'ac-i=a.* “He is that man.”
 that:NOM man-NOM=be:S3SG
- (89) *im k'ac-is=aa.* “It is that man’s.”
 that:OBL man-GEN=be:S3SG
- (90) *im k'ac-is=tvis=aa.* “It is for that man.”
 that:OBL man-GEN=PP:for=be:S3SG
- (91) *im k'ac-is=tvis=ac=aa.* “It is also for that man.”
 that:OBL man-GEN=PP:for=too=be:S3SG
- (92) *levan-i šin=aa.* “Levan is home.”
 Levan-NOM at.home=be:S3SG
- (93) *levan-i mand tu=a, ...* “If Levan is there, ...”
 Levan-NOM there if=be:S3SG

- (94) *es* *levan-i* *ar=aa.* “This is not Levan”
 this:NOM Levan-NOM NEG=be:S3SG

3.6. Quotative clitics

Georgian has three clitics that mark quotation in direct narration (cf. Hewitt 1982, 1995: 614-617).

- =*metki* the original speaker is the speaker
 =*tko* the original speaker is or the original speakers include the speaker or hearer
 =*o* the original speaker is not the speaker

These clitics can attach to literally any element, irrespective of the host element’s meaning and function. These are the only clitics that are able to be adjoined to a finite verb.

- (95) *g-i-txar-i,* *es* *c'eril-i* *m-is=gan=aa=metki.*
 O2-OV-tell-AOR this:NOM letter-NOM 3SG-GEN=PP:from=be:S3SG=Q
 “I told you, ‘This letter is from him/her.’”
- (96) *tkv-i,* *k'i=tko.*
 say-AOR yes=Q
 “Say ‘yes!’”
- (97) *levan-ma* *m-i-txr-a,* *av-ad* *var=o.*
 Levan-ERG O1SG-OV-tell-S3SG ill-ADV be:S1SG=Q
 “Levan told me: ‘I am sick.’”

It is possible for these clitics to occur in succession. Possible patterns are =*o=metki* and =*o=tko*. The clitics =*metki* and =*tko* cannot be followed by any other clitic.

- (98) *g-i-txar-i,* *levan-ma* *tkv-a,* *k'i=o=metki.*
 O2-OV-tell-AOR Levan-ERG say-S3SG yes=Q=Q
 “I told you that Levan said ‘yes.’”

Although in the present paper I treat =*metki* as a clitic, along with =*tko* and =*o*, it must be noted that actually this may not be correct if we take account of an independent, non-clitic use of *metki* meaning “I thought ...” (but not “I said!”). This is found only in a very colloquial style.

- (99) *metki,* *sanam* *mze-∅* *da-a-cxun-eb-s.*
 Q until sun-NOM PV-TR-be.hot-TS-S3SG
 “I thought: ‘until the sun would become hot.’” (Aka Morchiladze, *Agvist'os P'asiansi*)

4. Conclusion

In Modern Georgian grammatical words that always appear as clitics are all enclitics. They are grouped into six groups, basically according to their relative order.

- [A] Clitic postpositions
 [B] The clitic expressing non-specificity =*me*
 [C] The emphatic clitic =*ve* (“the same, also, just, again, all”)
 [D] Focus clitics
 [E] The clitic form of the copula verb =*a/aa*
 [F] Quotative clitics

The clitic postpositions [A] are special in that they require their host to be in a particular grammatical form and also in that they may trigger formal change in their host (particularly, loss of a case suffix). These points sharply distinguish clitic postpositions and the other types of clitics. In addition, clitics of

the groups [A], [B] and [C] are distinguished from the others in that they may attach to a non-clause constituent.

Table 4 shows what sort of elements can be the host of these clitics. The clitic postpositions [A] have the narrowest host restriction. As one goes down from [A] to [F], clitics come to be able to take a wider range of elements as their host. Quotative clitics [F] can even be adjoined to any element. If it is justified to consider that high selectivity of the host is characteristic of affixes, whereas low selectivity indicates an affinity to full-fledged phonological words, the clitic postpositions [A] are the closest to affixes and the quotative clitics [F] are the closest to a full-fledged word. The other types of clitics exhibit a coherent gradation between them.

Table 5. Host selectivity

	Noun	Adverb	Non-clitic PP	Conjunction	Finite verb
A	+	–	–	–	–
B	+	+	–	–	–
C	+	+	+	–	–
D	+	+	+	+	–
E	+	+	+	+	–
F	+	+	+	+	+

As for semantic scope, too, essentially the same applies. In one end, clitic postpositions [A] may have scope only over a noun phrase; while, in the other end, quotative clitics [F] can have a whole sentence in their scope. The scope of the other types of clitics may be wider than a noun phrase but never exceeds a clause.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative case	OV	objective version
ADV	adverbial case	PART	participle
AGR	agreement marker	PL	plural
AOR	aorist	PP	postposition
CAUS	causative	PRS	present
DAT	dative case	PST	past
ERG	ergative case	PV	preverb
FUT	future	Q	quotative
GEN	genitive case	S	subject
INTR	intransitive	SBJ	subjunctive mood
NEG	negative particle	SG	singular
NOM	nominative case	SV	subjective version
O	object	TRM	terminative case
OBL	oblique case		

References

- Aronson, Howard I. 1991. Modern Georgian. In Alice C. Harris (ed.) *The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus, Volume 1: The Kartvelian languages*, Delmar, New York: Caravan Books. pp.219-312.
- Aronson, Howard I. and Dodona Kiziria. 1999. *Georgian Language and Culture*. Bloomington: Slavica.
- Boeder, Winfried. 1994. Kartvelische und indogermanische Syntax: Die altgeorgischen Klitika. In Roland Bielmeier and Reinhard Stempel (eds.) *Indogermanica et Caucasia: Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp.447-471.
- Boeder, Winfried. 2005. The South Caucasian languages. *Lingua* 115: 5-89.
- Chanishvili, N. V. 1981. *Padež i glagol'nye kategorii v gruzinskom predložanii*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Dixon, R. M. W. and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. 2002. Word: a typological framework. In R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.) *Word: a cross-linguistic typology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- pp.1-41.
- Harris, Alice C. 2002. The word in Georgian. In R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.) *Word: a cross-linguistic typology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.227-242.
- Hewitt, Brian George. 1982. From direct to indirect speech: a South Caucasian anomaly. *Folia Slavica* 5: 206-213.
- Hewitt, Brian George. 1995. *Georgian: a structural reference grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kvachadze, Leo. 1996. *Tanamedrove Kartuli Enis Sint'aksi* [Syntax of the Modern Georgian language]. Fourth edition. Tbilisi.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Informational Structure and Sentence Form: topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martirosovi, Aram. 1946. Tandebuli kartulši [Adpositions in Georgian]. *Iberiol-K'avk'asiuri Enatmecniereba* [Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics] 1: 203-246.
- Oniani, Aleksandre. 1988. Zum Deklinationssystem in der modernen georgischen Literatursprache. *Georgica* 11: 5-7.
- Oniani, Aleksandre. 1989. *Kartvelur Enata Šedarebiti Gramat'ik'is Sak'itxebi: saxelta morpologia* [Problems of the Comparative Grammar of the Kartvelian Languages: morphology of nouns]. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.
- Rogava, Giorgi. 1963. Maxvilis sak'itxisatvis kartulši [On the question of stress in Georgian]. *Kartvelur Enata St'rukt'uris Sak'itxebi* [Questions on the Structure of the Kartvelian Languages] III: 5-10.
- Sarjveladze, Zurab. 1997. *Dzveli Kartuli Ena* [The Old Georgian Language]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi State Pedagogical University Press.
- Shanidze, Akaki. 1973. *Kartuli Enis Gramat'ik'is Sapudzvebi: morpologia* [Fundamentals of Georgian Grammar: Morphology]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.
- Uturgaidze, Tedo. 1979. Tandebulian saxelta bruneba kartulši [Case of nouns with a postposition in Georgian]. In Shota Dzidziguri (ed.) *Arnold Čikobavas (dabadebis 80 c'listavisadmi mižǵvnili k'rebuli)* [To Arnold Chikobava (Festschrift to his 80th birthday)], Tbilisi: Mecniereba. pp.114-124.
- Vogt, Hans. 1971. *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Zhghenti, Sergi. 1956. *Kartuli Enis Ponet'ik'a* [Phonetics of the Georgian language]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press.
- Zhghenti, Sergi. 1963. *Kartuli Enis Rit'mik'ul-Melodik'uri St'rukt'ura* [The rhythmic-melodic structure of the Georgian language]. Tbilisi: Codna.