Vittorio S. Tomelleri and Manana Topadze Gäumann*

Aspectual pairs in Georgian: some questions

Abstract: The aim of this article is to discuss the existence in Modern Georgian of a grammatical opposition between Perfective and Imperfective, formally expressed by the presence or absence of preverbs (Slavic-style aspect). In order to speak of aspectual pair, i.e. two morphologically distinct verb forms sharing the same lexical meaning and differing only aspectually, it is important to identify cases of obligatory imperfectivization, when a perfective form is substituted by the corresponding imperfective one according to grammar rules and not because of semantically contrasting content. The analysis of serial context and negative polarity in the Imperative mood allows some previous generalization about the (quasi)grammatical status of this derivational category in Modern Georgian.

Keywords: Georgian, aspectual pairs, preverbs, habituality, negative imperative

1 Introduction

The present article deals with the alleged aspectual opposition Perfective-Imperfective (further abbreviated PFV-IPFV) in Georgian, expressed by means of preverbs; one of the main tasks will be to ascertain whether we can speak, for this language, of a grammatical opposition in the same terms as it is attested in Russian and other Slavic languages.

There is indeed a good deal of variation in the definition of aspect and related terminology from author to author; for our purpose, we shall take as starting point, without deeper insights into it, the theory proposed by Johanson (2000), who refers to different types of terminality as a central dimension of aspectual meanings.

Vittorio S. Tomelleri: Università di Macerata, Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Via Illuminati 4, 62100 Macerata, Italy. E-mail: vittorio.tomelleri@unimc.it
***Corresponding author: Manana Topadze Gäumann**: Universität Bern, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Länggassstrasse 49, 3012 Bern, Switzerland.
E-mail: manana.topadze@isw.unibe.ch

The article is structured as follows. In section 2, some general terms regarding aspect as a grammatical category are shortly defined; section 3 tackles the question about aspect (or aspects) in Georgian. After a short presentation of the preverbs (section 4), we shall discuss the concept of aspectual pair and the problem of a grammatical category expressed derivationally (section 5). The core of the article is represented by the analysis of the correlation between habituality and aspect (section 6) and the consequences of negative polarity for the PFV-IPFV choice in the Imperative (section 7). Although the grammatical behavior of preverbs shows striking similarities with the Russian aspect system, there still remain some major differences, which need further investigation (section 8), as stated in the provisory conclusions (section 9).

2 Typology of aspect(s)

Before turning to the main object of our investigation, it is useful to give a preliminary definition of aspect, without pursuing a comprehensive definition of this complex category. We adhere to the interpretation of aspect as viewpoint operators, namely different ways of focusing on the crucial limits an event or action may have; this idea was formulated by Johanson in 1971 for Turkish and further developed and extended to other European languages in 2000. Viewpoint operators

> offer different choices for envisaging and presenting events as such, for opening perspectives on them and their internal phase structure, for viewing them in relation to their limits. They cannot specify the kind of event described, contribute to its definition, express ontological characteristics, or change the actional content they are chosen to operate on. What is conceived of as one and the same event is presented in different dimensions of terminality; the actional content is left intact and remains identical under different aspects, different ways of *viewing* the internal constituency of an event (Johanson 2000: 31).[1]

There is a general agreement in typological studies (Majsak 2005: 240–242) about the existence of at least two major types of aspectual distinctions,[2] for which Holt (1943) has coined the terms "aspect flexionelle", here labeled Romance type (section 2.1) and 'aspect syntagmatique', or Slavic-style aspect (section 2.2).

---

1 Some recent studies on aspect in South Caucasian (Kartvelian) languages have been carried out, within Johanson's framework, by Christophe (2004, 2005).
2 Mel'čuk (1998: 92–95 and 100–116) provides a quite interesting analysis of several different aspects.

2.1 Romance type (totality)

In the first one, which is widespread in the languages of the world, PFV, formally expressed by stem variation, views the situation as a single, indivisible whole (totality or holistic view, −INTRAterminality). PFV, considered the unmarked member of the aspect opposition, points to the totality of the verbal action; IPFV, on the other hand, indicates the same situation as an on-going, divisible process (processual meaning, +INTRAterminality) or does not carry any reference to a concrete situation (habitual and related meanings). This system is characterized by the fact that aspect cannot be expressed independently of tense distinction and is used only within past time reference.

2.2 Slavic-style aspect (adterminality)

The second type of opposition is cross-linguistically quite rare, being much more sensitive to the inherent semantic meaning of the verb (+telic) and formally expressed derivationally by means of prefixes and/or suffixes; this type is lexical-semantically conditioned and, from a morphological point of view, rather derivational than inflectional (Dahl 1985: 89); very well known from the amount of literature devoted to the description of Slavic languages, it has been labeled Slavic-style aspect by Dahl (2000: 17).[3] In order to avoid misunderstandings and mismatches, we propose not to identify the Slavic aspect with the Slavic-style aspect: by the last term a system is meant in which the grammatical opposition between PFV and IPFV is expressed by means of a closed set of not predictable affixes of adverbial or prepositional origin, that carry grammatical and lexical function without temporal or modal restrictions. The Slavic aspect should be seen simply as a "special case", perhaps the most representative and best described, of this peculiar and somehow idiosyncratic system.

   In the Slavic-style aspect, PFV is marked as +AD(terminality), envisaging a concrete event at the very attainment of its crucial limit; IPFV (−AD), instead, can denote the on-going process or indicate the same event as it is expressed by its PFV counterpart, adding "the aspectual sense of repetition (unbounded seriality), potentiality, reportedness, "vividness" (as in *praesens historicum*), etc." (Bulygina

---

3 The author himself, however, judged this label "unfortunate in that it implies that all Slavic systems look the same. 'North Slavic' would be a more adequate label" (Dahl 2000: 23, fn. 6). Dickey (2000) has individuated within Slavic two major areas according to the meaning of the perfective form, interpreted in terms of totality for the western group and temporal definiteness for the eastern one.

& Šmelev 1999: 99); in this last case one usually speaks of trivial meaning of the IPFV from.

2.3 Similarities and differences

When they are involved in foregrounding or backgrounding information in narrative discourse, the PFV-IPFV forms in the two aspect systems have nearly the same function, namely that of presenting a situation as an open interval (IPFV) which serves as the frame for an incident event (PFV).

The crucial point where the two types significantly differ from each other is to be found in the expression of past situations: while the totality view (−INTRA) focalizes the temporal bound of an action, the Slavic-style (+AD) aspect underlines the attainment of the internal limit (telicity, in Russian *predel'nost'*). To catch the semantic differences, it has been suggested to distinguish between material bound and temporal bound: "A material bound presupposes telicity and entails a temporal bound" (Lindstedt 2001: 775); in other words, +AD presupposes −INTRA but not the way around.[4]

The Romance type and the Slavic-style system do not differ in the expression of processual or habitual meanings (IPFV in both systems), but in the choice they make to indicate that a situation has taken place in the past, without explicitly referring to the result of this action (Dahl 1985: 75, Tournadre 2004: 32). In generic use, the distinction between IPFV and PFV tends to be neutralized (Dahl 1995: 420 in Haug 2005: 117), favoring the selection of the unmarked member of the binary aspect system, −AD in (North) Slavic languages and −INTRA in languages of the first type[5], like in the case of Italian *ho scritto* (PFV) 'I was engaged in writing' vs. Russian *ja pisal* (IPFV) 'same meaning'. Further, the totality view, it will be recalled, is limited to past time reference (Aorist-Imperfect opposition), whereas the Slavic-style aspect does not know any temporal or modal restrictions, except for the Present tense, which excludes any possibility of applying the PFV view operator, with some notable exceptions, which do not have relevance to our discussion.[6]

---

4 A similar formulation was proposed by Nebieridze (1987: 137) for the opposition, in Georgian, between *sruli* 'completed' (+AD) vs. *c'q'vet'ili* 'interrupted' (−INTRA).

5 For some criticism on the application of the markedness theory to aspect, however, see Zaliznjak & Šmelev (2000: 16–17) and Ludwig (2001: 402).

6 Note that the traditional generalization, according to which perfectivity is incompatible with present time reference, is not universally accepted (Klimonov & Klimonov 2008: 151–152).

3 Aspect(s) in Georgian

The two aspectual types presented in section 2 are not totally incompatible with each other. They can coexist, usually with some restrictions, as demonstrated by some Slavic languages, above all Bulgarian and, to a lesser extent, Macedonian (Holvoet 1993). The verbal system of Modern Georgian too features both types of aspect opposition. Historically speaking, Georgian has kept the old inflectional opposition between Imperfect (*uc'q'vet'eli*) and Aorist (*c'q'vet'ili*), at the same time building up, from approximately the 11th century onwards, a new aspectual system of derivational nature based on preverbs (Šanidze 1942, Palmajtis 1981).

3.1 How many aspects?

In the scientific literature, considerable differences in the definition and interpretation of aspect in Modern Georgian can be observed. Holisky (1981b: 134–139), for example, distinguishes up to five aspect oppositions, according to formal and semantic parameters that seem to perfectly match Vendler's verb classification: 1) the first set, preverb opposition, is characterized by the presence or absence of a preverb (accomplishments verbs), 2) the second regards activity or state verbs and their ingressive counterpart, expressed by means of the suffix *-d* (therefore called *doniani*-verbs), 3) the third contains some punctual verbs which derive their imperfective counterpart by the suffix *-ulob* (achievements), 4) to the fourth belong stative verbs and, finally, 5) the fifth comprehends preverbed semelfactives, derived from activity verbs.

Mač'avariani (1974: 121), on the other hand, speaks of three different aspectual oppositions: perfective-imperfective (*sruli-usruli*), interrupted-uninterrupted (*c'q'vet'ili*/punctual-*uc'q'vet'eli*/durative) and semelfactive-iterative (*ertgzisi-mravalgzisi*). The opposition interrupted-uninterrupted, inherited from Old Georgian, pertains to the temporal sphere of the past and is distributed between the first (Imperfect) and the second (Aorist) temporal series[7], nearly resembling the Romance opposition between Imperfect and (simple or compound) past Perfect.

Aronson (1991: 249), finally, distinguishes only two aspectual oppositions: a superordinated opposition PFV-IPFV and a subordinated opposition Aorist-Imperfect.

---

7 In Georgian, the three series are defined according to the case marking of the core syntactic arguments (Subject and Direct Object) of transitive verbs: NOM-DAT in the first, ERG-NOM in the second and DAT-NOM in the third.

A completely reversed interpretation was proposed by Vogt, who assigned grammatical status only to the Imperfect-Aorist-Perfect opposition and considered the PFV-IPFV as a lexical category (*déterminé-indéterminé*): "La catégorie de l'aspect, au sens étroit du mot, c.-à-d. des aspects durativ, ponctuel et résultatif, est fondamentale et domine tout le système. L'opposition indéterminé-déterminé est moins nette, exprimée par des procédés morphologiques (ou lexicaux) très divers" (Vogt 1971: 180).

The PFV-IPFV opposition, to be examined here, is formally marked by the presence of a preverb (*zmnisc'ini*) in the perfective form and its absence in the imperfective:

(1) Formal expression of the superordinated aspect opposition
     c'mends (IPFV) vs. *ga-c'mends* (PFV) 'X cleans' vs. 'X will clean' (clothing)
     imaleba (IPFV) vs. *da-imaleba* (PFV) 'X hides' vs. 'X will hide' (INTR)
     xdeba (IPFV) vs. *mo-xdeba* (PFV) 'X happens' vs. 'X will happen'

3.2 Aspect as a grammatical category

According to the majority of scholars, the PFV-IPFV opposition is considered as a grammatical category because each verb form, independently of its tense or mood marking, belongs to the IPFV or PFV aspect (Č'umburidze 1967: 347). The PFV-IPFV correlation, as in example (1), is viewed semantically as a privative opposition (Šanidze 1973: 262, Mač'avariani 1974: 119, Peikrišvili 1992: 154), and morphologically as a derivational device providing the prefixed lexemes with the meaning of attainment of the inherent end point (+AD): PFV (*sruli*) indicates that the action is carried out till the end, IPFV (*usruli*) that the action is not carried out till the end.

Such claims clearly depend on the Soviet (Russian) linguistic tradition, which was – and still is – very dominant in aspectological studies. Further, there is an important correlation between aspect and time reference with respect to the utterance time: verbs without preverb in the non-Past Indicative are Present tense forms, whereas their combination with a preverb usually implies Future time reference, as in North Slavic languages. All verbs opposing a prefixed to an unprefixed form are telic (*accomplishments*), but only the prefixed forms "carry an implication that the action has been or will be completed" (Holisky 1981b: 135).

In the remaining space we would like to discuss two items, namely the expression of habituality (section 6) and negative imperative constructions (section 7), with regard to the grammatical opposition expressed by verbs that contrast

prefixed to unprefixed forms. With respect to this, in the next paragraph we shall briefly present the preverbs before approaching the question of the grammatical status of the PFV-IPFV opposition.

4 Preverbs and their function

In Georgian there are nine productive spatial preverbs, expressing orientation (2a) or direction (2b). This meaning is very well preserved in combination with roots expressing motion:

(2) Preverbs in Modern Georgian[8]
   a. Orientation: *mi-* 'thither', *mo-* 'hither';
   b. Direction: *a(γ)-* 'up', *ga(n)-* 'out', *še-* 'in', *ča-* 'down into', *ga(r)da-* 'across, through', *c'a(r)-* 'away', *da-* 'down'.

Historically, the preverbs originate from free adverbial elements or adpositions, which in the course of time underwent univerbation. In Old Georgian, the phenomenon of tmesis, i.e. the insertion of pronominal forms or particles between the preverb and the stem (Schmidt 1969a, Šanidze 1976: 73–74, Č'umburidze 1986: 16–17), points to the formerly independent status of these morphemes; it seems to testify an earlier linguistic stage, when the preverb had not yet developed a close relation to the verb (Fähnrich 1991: 164, Tomelleri 2009a: 261–262).

4.1 Spatial meaning

Preverbs occupy a slot preceding the marker of the 1 or 2 person Subject; they can also be separated from the verbal stem by a preradical vowel, which indicates the version (C'ibaxašvili 1960a: 7). Their primary function, as already mentioned, is to express the direction of the action denoted by the verbal lexeme and, in the case of *mo-* and *mi-*, the orientation towards the deictic center (speaker and hearer)[9] or away from it (Hewitt 1995: 148):

---

8 In round brackets the consonants are given, which appear in some forms depending on the bookish (Old Georgian) tradition; Fähnrich (1989) provides a useful overview on the main lexical meanings of preverbs and on some of their special functions.
9 In Old Georgian, instead, the first person was exclusively associated with *mo-*, the third with *mi-*, while the second could be referred to by both *mo-* and *mi-* (Šanidze 1976: 72).

(3) Orientation [Vogt 1971: 173]

 mi-v-s-c'er-e-Ø   *c'eril-i*
 PRV-1S-3IO-write-II.AOR.1-SG letter-NOM
 'I wrote him a letter'

 mo-m-c'er-a   *c'eril-i*
 PRV-1IO-write-II.AOR-3SG letter-NOM
 'He wrote me a letter'

Only the *mo-* preverb (*hither* orientation) can be combined with the directional preverbs, while a single directional preverb indicates by default a movement from the speakers, like *mi-dis* 'X is going' vs. *mo-dis* 'X is coming', or *a-dis* 'X is going up' vs. *a-mo-dis* 'X is coming up':

(4) Orientation and direction [C'ibaxašvili 1959a: 263 and 1960a: 14]

 mat'arebel-i *ga-vid-a*   *mezobel* *sadguri-dan*
 train-NOM PRV_out-go.II-AOR.3SG neighbor station-ABL
 'The train moved from the neighbor station'

 mat'arebel-i *ga-mo-vid-a*   *mezobel* *sadguri-dan*
 train-NOM PRV_out-PRV_hither-go.II-AOR.3SG neighbor station-ABL
 'The train moved (hither) from the neighbor station'

The orientation preverbs *mi-* and *mo-* can further be combined to express an action (or movement) carried out in both directions:[10]

(5) Back and forth orientation

 man *irgvliv* *mi-mo-i-xed-a*
 3SG.ERG ADV.around PRV_thither-PRV_hither-PV-look.II-3SG
 'He looked around'

 kar-ma *potl-eb-i* *mi-mo-pant'-a*
 wind-ERG leave-PL-NOM PRV_thither-PRV_hither-scatter.AOR-3SG
 'The wind scattered the leaves in all directions'

With the exception of *da-* – but see the lexical counterexample *damouk'idebeli* 'independent' and relatives –, all preverbs can occur alone or in combination with the hither orientation preverb *mo-*.

---

10 The *mi-mo* preverbation with reduplicated root corresponds to the distributive Aktionsart of Russian: *mi-bnev-mo-bneva* – *porazbrasyvat'* 'cast away one after the other' (C'ibaxašvili 1959b: 46).

4.2 Lexical meaning

The lexical interplay of verbal roots and preverbs shows a high degree of variation and is highly idiosyncratic and lexicalized; here below some examples are given, based on the preverb *da-*, which as perfectivity marker shows the greatest degree of semantic bleaching):[11]

(6) Lexical meaning   [Lafon 1959: 14, Bašeleišvili 2007: 212]
   mo-k'vla 'kill' (with a fire shooting weapon, stone, stick or arrow)
   da-k'vla 'kill' (with a cold sharp weapon like a knife or a sabre)

(7) Spatial meaning of *da-*   [Bašeleišvili 2007: 213]
   mo-rbi-s 'X is running (towards speaker or addresse)'
   da-rbi-s 'X is running (in different directions)'

(8) Distributivity[12]   [Bašeleišvili 2007: 215]
   man   bavšv-i   ga-a-γviʒ-a
   3SG.ERG   child-NOM   PRV-PV-wake_up.II-AOR.3SG
   '(S)he woke up the child'
   man   bavšv-eb-i   da-a-γviʒ-a
   3SG.ERG   child-PL-NOM   PRV-PV-wake_up.II-AOR.3SG
   '(S)he woke up the children (one after the other)'

As far as we are interested in the study of derivation as a grammatical device, actional values or other lexical meanings conveyed by preverbs will not be considered here, although their semantic relevance should not be totally neglected. Notwithstanding the fact that aspect and morphologically derived actional meanings (further Aktionsarts) make use of the same set of morphological tools, i.e. prefixes and suffixes, the difference between them lies in the fact that Aktionsarts create new lexical items, while aspectual forms pertain to the same lexical meaning, operating within one and the same verbal lexeme (Wiemer 2006: 98).

---

11 Hewitt (1995: 155–160) illustrates the possible combinations of the root *-sc'r-* with different preverbs; secondary meanings of preverbs, lexical nuances and other functions are discussed in Bašeleišvili (2007: 212–215). For a comparative-contrastive analysis of Georgian and Russian preverbs see also Kremer (1950) and Vačnadze (1980).
12 Distributivity denotes plural events, occurring after each other, or indicates the plurality of the object of transitive verbs or of the subject of intransitive verbs.

5 Aspectual pairs

The combination of a base verb with a preverb changes not only the lexical meaning of the given verbal form, like it was the case in Old Georgian, but can also bear aspectual, temporal and modal consequences. In particular, as we have already seen, "the addition of the appropriate (and usually unpredictable) preverb to the Present Indicative of most Transitive and Intransitive verbs produces the Future Indicative" (Hewitt 1995: 153):

(9) IPFV (Present) vs. PFV (Future)
      vc'er 'I write Y, I'm writing Y' (IPFV) > *da-vc'er* 'I'll write Y' (PFV)

Because of this difference in the temporal meaning of *vc'er* and *da-vc'er*, the I series (Present stem) is usually splitted into two different subseries, Present and Future subseries respectively, as in the following chart of the temporal paradigms (adapted from Cherchi 1999: 62):

I series (Present)	Present	Imperfect	Present Conjunctive	without preverb
I series (Future)	Future	Conditional	Future Conjunctive	with preverb
II series	Aorist		Second Conjunctive	
III series	Present Perfect	Pluperfect	Conjunctive Perfect	

The prefixed form covers a broader field of meanings than the synthetic Russian Future form, which is opposed aspectually to the periphrastic Future with the auxiliary *budu*; therefore, *ga-v-ak'et-eb-t* (PRV-1S-do-I-PL) or *da-v-c'er-t* (PRV-1S-write.I-PL) can also be the proper translation of the analytical Future forms *budem delat'* 'we'll be doing' and *budem pisat'* 'we'll be writing' (C'ibaxašvili 1959a: 266);[13] this would make the assumption of the more temporal than aspectual meaning of prefixed verbs in Georgian more than plausible.[14]

---

13 Some cases of prefixed forms used in scientific publications without any aspecto-temporal meaning partially go back to the Old Georgian tradition or to modern Russian influence (C'ibaxašvili 1960b: 35).
14 Cross-linguistically, an aspect opposition with future time reference is scarcely attested (Tournadre 2004: 40, fn. 57).

Gecadze (1984: 262), however, assigns future time reference to unprefixed forms too, which can be disambiguated only contextually (on such cases see Megrelidze 1969: 45):

(10) Present form with future time reference
Me   dɣe-s   q'urʒen-s   nak'leb-ad   v-k'rep-Ø,   xval
1SG   day-DAT   grape-DAT   few-ADV   1s-collect.I-SG   tomorrow
k'i,   rogorc k'i   ga-ten-d-eb-a,   še-v-di-v-ar-Ø
CONTR   CONJ.when   PRV-dawn-PASS-I-3SG   PRV_in-1s-go-1-I.PRS-SG
venax-ši   da   v-k'rep-Ø   da[15]   v-k'rep-Ø
vineyard-ILL   CONJ.and   1s-collect.I-SG   CONJ.and   1s-collect.I-SG
'Today I'm less collecting grapes, but tomorrow, at day break, I'll go to the vineyard and will be collecting and collecting'   [Gecadze 1984: 262]
xval   me   v-c'er-Ø-   mtel-i   dɣe-Ø
ADV.tomorrow   1SG-S   1s-write.I.PRS-SG   whole-NOM   day-NOM
c'eril-eb-s
letter-PL-DAT
'Tomorrow I'll write letter all the day'   [Lafon 1959: 15]

In most cases it is not possible to predict which preverb will be employed with a given root, but «[...] it is nevertheless true that some preverbs have come to be associated with a particular nuance which they introduce into the semantics of a verb-form when they replace the root's normal preverb» (Hewitt 1995: 162):

(11) Attenuative meaning
še-tenda 'dawn broke somewhat' vs. *ga-tenda* 'dawn broke'
še-tvra 'X got a bit drunk' vs. *da-tvra* 'X got drunk'

The fact that the required preverb must be stored in the lexicon suggests the possibility of reversing the derivational picture, not from simple (Present) to prefixed (Future) form through prefixation but the other way around, from prefixed to simple through depreverbation: IPFV, obtained by dropping the preverb from the PFV, preserves the lexical meaning conveyed by the preverb. Thus, it could be possible to assert, from a strictly synchronic point of view, that the base form is actually the prefixed one, and this because of the

---

15 Corrected from *ga*.

particular lexical meaning a given preverb provides to the simple verb (Aronson 1990: 44).

Historically speaking, the preverbation is clearly a derivational, not inflectional process, creating a new subseries within the first series. This has led to the statement that the PFV-IPFV opposition, mainly restricted to I. and II. conjugation verbs, is "to a very great extent a lexical opposition, formally marked by the presence of a preverb in the perfective and its absence in the imperfective" (Aronson 1991: 250).

Aronson (1991: 306–307) speaks further of inherently PFV verbs, not having corresponding IPFV forms; thus, in his opinion, it is necessary to distinguish two groups of verbs, those opposing a Present series to a Future one, as in (12a), and those lacking such formal opposition, as in (12b):

(12) a. Two subseries (Future vs. Present)
　　　　 da-malavs vs. *malavs* 'X hides Y'
　　　　 a-ašenebs vs. *ašenebs* 'X builds Y'
　　　　 da-malavda (COND) vs. *malavda* (IMPF)
　　　 b. No formal opposition
　　　　 gada-c'ers vs. *c'ers* 'X rewrites Y'
　　　　 še-kmnis vs. *kmnis* 'X creates Y'

Unlike (12a), with verbs like *gada-c'ers* and *še-kmnis* there is a formal coincidence of Conditional and Imperfect, on the one hand and of Conjunctive Present and Conjunctive Future on the other.

This uneven state of affairs is further complicated by those verbs that show suppletion, with other without preverb:

(13) Suppletion　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[Aronson 1991: 247]
　　　 Present-Future-Aorist
　　　 svams 'X drinks Y', *da-levs* (FUT), *da-lia* (AOR)
　　　 ambobs 'X says Y', *it'q'vis* (FUT), *tkva* (AOR)
　　　 švreba 'X does Y', *izams* (FUT), *kna* (AOR)

It would be wrong, however, to identify inflection with grammar on the one side and derivation with lexic on the other; there is no contradiction or incompatibility between the status of grammatical category and its derivational expression (Wiemer 2006: 97 and 99). In many cases, as in Slavic, the preverb and the lexical meaning of the verb overlap semantically to a great extent: *na* 'onto a surface' + *pisat'* 'write' > *napisat'* 'write [words on some surface]', Georgian *da* 'down' + *c'era* 'write' > *da-c'era* 'write down'.

More often the perfectivization is the by-product of prefixation, creating new lexical items, e.g. *gada-c'era* 'rewrite' as Russian *pere-pisat'* 'same meaning' (Dickey 2006: 98):

(14) Grammatical vs. lexical meaning
   c'ers 'X writes Y' > *da-c'ers* 'X will write Y'
   c'ers 'same meaning' > *gada-c'ers* 'X will rewrite Y'

Preverbs sometimes seem to undergo partial or total delexicalization, acquiring a new function as perfectivity marker:

> The establishment of a single prefix as a *préverbe vide* "semantically organizes" the perfectivizing function of the remaining prefixes that function as perfectivizers on the basis of subsumption (Dickey 2006: 105).

A productive abstract perfectivizing meaning is obtained when the preverb has lost its spatial meaning and developed into a perfectivity marker;[16] as a consequence, it can provide a model for the entire system. In this regard, the question arises whether Georgian too belongs to the subsumptive type: are we allowed to assign to the already mentioned preverb *da-* the role of perfectivizer?

(15) a. Lost of the lexical function
       vak'eteb (IPFV) 'I'm doing/do Y' vs. *ga-vak'eteb* (PFV) 'I'll do Y'
       vamzadeb (IPFV) 'I'm preparing/prepare Y' vs. *mo-vamzadeb* (PFV) 'I'll prepare Y'
   b. Lost of the grammatical function
       mo-vxt'ivar 'I'm coming jumping' (IPFV)

This leads us to the conclusion that we do have in Georgian clear cases of total semantic bleaching of preverbs (*préverbes vides*), which are employed only to convey a PFV meaning.

5.1 Aspectual crossing

Besides the problem of its definition and interpretation, the notion of aspectual pairs seems to be silently accepted as such by most scholars. A lot of ink has been

---

16 Preverbs often carry at the same time a lexical and a grammatical function, the cases in which they lose one of these meaning are called by C'ibaxašvili (1960a: 19 and 1960b: 34) *šec'q'vet'a* or *pereboj* 'irregularity'.

spilled on the correlation between the Romance type and the Slavic-style aspect, as outlined in Tomelleri (2009b: 84–100). The coexistence of two different viewpoint operators (±AD) and (±INTRA) produces some interesting cases of aspectual crossings when both aspectual values do not match, giving rise to special readings: −AD/−INTRA and +AD/+INTRA.

The Imperfect of a PFV verb (+INTRA, +AD) refers to the unbounded repetition of an action or event that, in the case of a single occurrence, would be referred to with the Aorist form (Aronson 1991: 250). This apparently self-contradicting form, however, tends to develop a modal meaning, differentiating, besides Conjunctive Future and Conjunctive Present (temporal difference), also the Conditional from the Imperfect (modal difference), as we have seen above in (12a); when a formal opposition between presence vs. absence of a preverb is lacking (e.g. *gada-c'era* 'rewrite'), such forms coincide (Aronson 1991: 306–307).

The Aorist of an IPFV verb (−AD, −INTRA), on the other hand, denotes a closed process, which did not reach its natural conclusion; Met'reveli (1979) and Č'relašvili (1980) have tried to gain deeper insights into the correlation between these two aspectual types. According to Hewitt (1995: 160), "the nuance attaching to such forms is that an action, expressed as aspectually non-durative (hence the use of Series II), nevertheless does not reach its natural conclusion, which would motivate the presence of the preverb as marker of perfective aspect":

(16) Conative meaning of Aorist IPFV
tagv-ma   *txar-a,*   *txar-a,*   *k'at'a*
mouse-ERG   dig.II-AOR.3SG   id.   cat.NOM
gamo-txar-a
PRV_out.hither-dig.II-AOR-3SG
'The mouse dug (sc. the earth), (and) dug (and eventually) dug out a cat'

Quite a few sentences, above all in proverbs and brainteasers, contain such pairs, where the IPFV Aorist, indicating repeated attempts directed towards a certain result, not necessarily obtained, is followed by the PFV corresponding form, with or without negation, expressing the attainment or non attainment of the result (Šanidze 1973: 264), as in the conative use of IPFV in Russian:

(17) Conative meaning in Russian   [Bulygina & Šmelev 1999: 99]
On-a   *ego*   *budi-l-a*   *(no   ne*
3-F.NOM.SG   3SG.M.ACC   wake.IMPF-PAST-F.SG   but   NEG
raz-budi-l-a)
PFV-wake-PAST-F.SG
'She tried to wake him (but failed)'

5.2 Aspect and tense

To sum up, in Georgian the PFV-IPFV distinctions give rise to different oppositions, from aspectual to modal through temporal (Arabuli 1999: 48):

(18) Temporal modal correlations (*c'era* 'write')
     a. *c'era* vs. *da-c'era* (Aorist IPFV vs. Aorist PFV)
     b. *c'ers* vs. *da-c'ers* (Present vs. Futur)
     c. *c'erda* vs. *da-c'erda* (Indicative Imperfect vs. Conditional)

The correlation with the third (Perfect) series too is noteworthy. In fact, the presence or absence of the preverb allows distinguishing morphologically the evidential meaning from the stative meaning of the Perfect:

(19) Evidentiality vs. stativity   [Sumbatova 1999: 79]
     a. *bebia-s*   *t'axt'-ze*   *pardag-i*   *u-g-i-a*
        grandmother-DAT   ottoman-LOC   carpet-NOM   PV-spread-STAT-3SG
        'Grandmother has a carpet spread on the ottoman'
     b. *turme*   *bebia-s*   *es*   *pardag-i*   *tviton*
        apparently   grandmother-DAT   this   carpet-NOM   self
        da-u-g-i-a
        PRV-PV-spread-PFT-3SG
        'Grandmother has apparently spread this carpet herself'

5.3 Telic vs. trivial pairs

We have previously mentioned pairs of Aorist forms with and without preverb. Such telic pairs, called in the Russian aspectological tradition *predel'nye pary* (telic pairs), do not prove the existence of an aspectual opposition, as far as they show a lexical difference between the items involved and not what the derived element and the deriving one have in common. The aspectual opposition presupposes the possibility of neutralising the lexical difference in determinate circumstances (Wiemer 2006: 107).

    More interesting for determining and describing the aspectual system in a given language are the so-called trivial pairs, in which both forms, imperfective and perfective, carry the same meaning, denoting an event, i.e. a change from a state of affairs to another one. The IPFV form must be used in the cases of obligatory imperfectivization, not to be understood morphologically as the derivation of secondary imperfective forms through suffixation, but functionally

as the substitution of the perfective through its imperfective correlate in certain contexts, like in the Present tense (*praesens historicum*), according to Maslov's test, or in the expression of serial or habitual actions or events (Šmelev 2006: 376).

A Present form like Russian *ubeždaet* '(s)he convinces' (IPFV), e.g., in a narrative context can indicate a telic process as well as the event resulting from it, unlike the corresponding Lithuanian form *įtikinėja* '(s)he tries to convince' (Wiemer 2006: 108).[17] In other words, in Russian the choice of a verb in a telic situation is determined by the grammatical context and does not leave place for freedom, while in Lithuanian the choice depends first of all on the semantic meaning of the two verb forms within the alleged 'pair' (Wiemer 2006: 108).

Starting from this example, which shows the different behavior of Lithuanian and Russian (Wiemer 2001: 37–38), we detect in Georgian the same aspectual choice as in Russian. In (20), the form *arc'munebs*, notwithstanding the fact that it is IPFV, means that the husband every time succeeds in convincing his wife to go to the cinema:

(20) *kmar-i*   *col-s*   *a-rc'mun-eb-s*   *k'ino-ši*
     husband-NOM   wife-DAT   PV-convince(IPFV)-I-PRS.3SG   cinema-ILL
     c'asvla-ze   *da*   *mere*   *da-sa-ʒinebl-ad*   *c'v-eb-a*
     go.INF-LOC   CONJ.and   ADV.then   PRV-FIN-sleep-ALL   lay down-I-PRS.3SG
     'The husband convinces his wife to go to the cinema and then goes to bed'

This points to the fact that the selection of simple vs. the compound form, in Georgian, is grammatically conditioned. Nevertheless, there seems to be a quite strong correlation between derivational perfectivity and telic verbs in Georgian. A similar situation is observed in at least pre-classical Latin where, according to Haug (2005: 111), the Imperfect form proves incompatible with telicizing preverbs already deprived of lexical content. Therefore, we propose to consider pairs like *k'vla/mo-k'vla* 'to kill' or *c'era/gada-c'era* as two aspectually related forms, sharing the same lexical meaning (trivial pairs), to which the processual meaning, carried only by unprefixed form, can/must be added. This depends on the actional meaning of the verb: *accomplishments* allow the interpretation in the sense of a process with exclusion of the end point (*imperfectivity paradox*), while *achievements* exclude the processual meaning, licensing only the trivial meaning:

---

17 On *praesens historicum* in Slavic languages see Dickey (2000: 126–154).

(21) a. Accomplishments

      da-c'ers c'erils 'X will write a letter' (PFV) vs. *c'ers c'erils* 'X is writing a letter' (IPFV)

  b. Achievements   [Holisky 1981b: 137]

      ip'ovnis 'X will find Y' (PFV) vs. *p'oulobs* 'X finds Y' (IPFV)

Yet, it is not clear whether we are allowed to consider Present tense forms, used without preverbs, cases of obligatory imperfectivization. As a general rule, it can be stated that in Slavic-style aspect PFV forms cannot denote an on-going process (*incapability of presentness*). This means that PFV forms cannot denote actual processual meaning; hence, they express Future time reference. In Georgian too, the selection of the interval preceding the attainment of the result and the consequent change of state excludes the preverb; only motion verbs escape such a restriction, because in this case the preverb only specifies the direction and/or orientation of the movement, without focalizing the real attainment of the end point (Tomelleri 2007). The exclusion in the Present of any preverb, which in the compound form provides the verb with a new lexical content, produces a situation in which one simple form "is, at least potentially, the Imperfective of *all* its prefixed Perfectives" (Comrie 1976: 92). A single IPFV-form takes different senses, which in some cases can be opposite to each other; to illustrate this point, scholars often adduce the following example (Tschenkéli 1958: 96, Vogt 1971: 185):

(22) Enantiosemy or homonymy?

    gan-aiaraγebs (PFV) 'X disarms Y'

    še-aiaraγebs (PFV) 'X rearms Y'

    aiaraγebs (IPFV) 'both meanings'

Only the context can help disambiguating the Present tense *aiaraγebs*, which we are inclined to consider as two homonymous lexemes rather than a single polysemous form. A quite similar case is to be observed in Lithuanian, although under totally different conditions (Wiemer 2008: 408):

(23) a. Enantiosemy in Lithuanian

      daryti 'to open' and 'to close' vs. *ati-daryiti* 'to open'/*už-daryti* 'to close'

      jungti 'to turn on/off' vs. *į-jungti* 'to turn on'/*iš-jungti* 'to turn off'

  b. Imperative

      Daryk duris! 'Close/open the door!' (depending on the context)

Taking into account this fact, we propose to reverse the historical perspective and explain the synchronic state of the language in the following terms: the

lexically basic form is the prefixed, perfective one; therefore, it is the Present tense, or IPFV form, which is obtained by dropping the preverb from the Future (PFV). In this case the simple unprefixed verb does not represent the IPFV correlate of all the different prefixed forms, as maintained by Comrie (1976: 92); within this explanation, instead, the existence of a great number of simple homonymous forms, which differ lexically from each other, must be postulated.

Thus, we obtain a bidirectional derivation process: the aspecto-temporal grammatical meaning is obtained by adding a preverb to the simple form, whereas the lexical meaning goes the opposite way, from the prefixed perfective form to the simple imperfective one through depreverbation (Vaillant 1946: 31). Morphologically speaking, the perfective form is derived from the simple, imperfective verb through prefixation; functionally, however, an imperfective form is obtained through depreverbation in the case of obligatory imperfectivization (Šmelev 2006: 377). Within this perspective, we would postulate, in Georgian, the existence of different simple verbal lexemes, characterized by the same morphological form and a different semantic meaning, which form an aspectual opposition with different prefixed verbs.

Have we got two different verbs or two aspectually correlated forms of the same lexical item? Neither the derivational relation between the two forms, simple to compound verb through prefixation – but see the semantic caveat above –, nor the fact that, in dictionaries, the two items can receive separate entries, can serve as relevant criterion for the nature of counterparts within an 'aspectual' pair; besides that, it must be taken into account that Georgian, unlike Slavic, does not possess suffixation as a strategy for creating imperfective correlates to simple or prefixed perfective verbs, like in *dat'* (PFV) > *davat'* (IPFV) 'to give' or *perepisat'* (PFV) > *perepisyvat'* (IPFV) 'to rewrite'.

In addition, the two aspectual forms do not exhibit any gaps in the paradigm; there are, however, some restrictions in use (Aorist IPFV) and some differences in meaning (PRS PFV > FUT, IMPF PFV > COND), which testify a partial redistribution of functions between one and the same form.

Finally, it is difficult to say whether the aspect category encompasses the whole verbal system or not, as argued by Č'umburidze (1967: 347). It rather seems to be confined to verbs expressing changes of state (*accomplishments* and *achievements*). Activity verbs can be marked as PFV in the sense of the totality view (−INTRA); stative lexemes, on the other hand, must be classified as *imperfectiva tantum*, being labeled in the domestic tradition anaspectual (*uasp'ekt'o*); they cannot appear in the perfective aspect, referring to the point at which the state comes into being (ingressive reading), as it is the case in Russian *ljubit'* 'to love' vs. *po-ljubit'* 'to fall in love'.

Although the (general) category on aspect, in Kartvelian languages, is considered to be older than that of tense (Gecadze 1984: 261 and 267), the Slavic-style aspect is considered to be a clearly later development (Č'umburidze 1986); this is confirmed by the extant written documents, as well as by the existence of several exceptions to the rule of preverbation, together with several lexical idiosyncrasies. In Georgian, indeed, we find some simple perfective verbs (25a) as well as verbs not participating in the aspectual opposition because of their semantics, notwithstanding the presence of a preverb (24b):

(24) Simple perfective verbs vs. prefixed imperfectives
   a. *tkva* (AOR PFV) 'X said Y' – I series *it'q'vis*
      naxa (AOR PFV) 'X saw Y' – I series *xedavs*   [Gecadze 1984: 266]
   b. *c'armo-tkvams* (PRS IPFV) 'X pronounces Y'   [Schmidt 1963: 114]

This state of affairs leads us to propose a short historical excursus.

5.4 Aspect in Old Georgian

In Old Georgian, the aspectual distinction was carried by the first and second series; the Perfect (third series), as well as stative verbs, were outside this opposition (Schmidt 1984).[18] The new derivational system superposed itself on already existing aspecto-temporal distinctions, expressed by the three series, creating an interesting functional and paradigmatic interplay between (inflectional) tense and (derivative) aspect. The aspectual opposition between verb forms of the I (IPFV) and the II (PFV) series underwent a gradual transition to a new temporal-modal system. New Aorist forms, while retaining their aspectual meaning, came to express tense, future and past as well; some uses of the Aorist with future time reference should be considered as a modern relic of the transitory period (Lerner & Reuven 1999: 48–49).

In order to substantiate the existence of aspectual pairs we need some contexts of obligatory imperfectivization, requiring an automatic substitution of the PFV form with the IPFV corresponding one. This analysis is devoted to the expression of repeated events (*habituality*) and to the negative polarity.

---

18 A different opinion is held by Fähnrich (1991: 164) and Gec'adze (1961) for transitive verbs: I series was IPFV, II and III PFV.

6 Habituality

In Old Georgian, there were special endings used to express repeatedly performed actions or events in the Present, Imperfect, Aorist and Perfect (Fähnrich 1991: 192). The habituality in the past was expressed by the so called *permansive*, based on the Aorist (–INTRA) stem, to which special endings were added:

(25) Habituality in the Past   [Fähnrich 1991: 192]
    mi-vid-i   *me*   *senak'-eb-sa* *mat-sa*
    PRV_thither-1.go.II.AOR-SG 1SUB.SG cell-PL-DAT   III.PL.GEN-DAT
    q'ovel-ta   *dγe-ta*
    every-DAT.PL day-DAT.PL
    'every day I went to their cells'

In Modern Georgian, the particle *xolme*, from former *xwalme*, can be used with both simple and compound verb forms to express a frequent repetition of an action or event.[19] It corresponds, in the Past, to the English construction 'X *used to*':

(26) Habituality in the Past in Modern Georgian   [Kurtsikidze 2006: 130]
    adre   *ʒvel*   *šenob-eb-s*   *da-šl-i-d-nen,*
    ADV.early ancient building-PL-DAT PRV-take_apart.I-IMPF-3PL
    da-a-ngr-ev-d-nen   *da*   *axal-s*   *a-a-šen-eb-d-nen*
    CONJ PRV-PV-destroy-I-IMPF-3PL and new-DAT PRV-PV-build-I-IMPF-3PL
    xolme
    PTCL.usually
    'In the past (they) would usually take apart and destroy old buildings and build new ones'

The Imperfect form of compound verb is sufficient to express, without any modal shift from Imperfect to Conditional (see above), the unlimited number of occurrences of a complete and completed event, that of destroying old buildings and replacing them with new ones: the Imperfect provides a PFV form with the serial meaning, thus preventing from depreverbation.

    The situation changes in the Present, where we find, like in Russian, similar uses of IPFV, i.e. unprefixed forms in contexts of successive events:

(27) Habituality in the Present
    tengiz-i   *q'ovel* *dila-s*   *7 saat-ze*   *dg-eb-a,*
    Tengiz-NOM every morning-DAT 7 hour-LOC stand_up-I-PRS.3SG

---

19 On the development of habitual constructions see Kavtaradze (1961).

q'ava-s   sv-am-s,   šemdeg   gazet-s   k'itx-ulob-s
coffee-DAT   drink-I-PRS.3SG   ADV.then   newspaper-DAT   read-I-PRS.3SG
da   samsaxur-ši   mi-di-s
CONJ.and   work-ILL   PRV-go.PRS.3SG
'Tengiz stands up every morning at 7 o'clock, drinks coffee, then reads the newspaper and goes to work'

The serial meaning seems to prefer the use of an IPFV form in the Present, without the preverb, thus suggesting a strong tendency to apply the 'rule' of obligatory imperfectivization to such kinds of habitual context. It could be also possible, however, that a more important role is at work in this case, namely the fact that compound forms in the (morphological) Present are interpreted as referring to a single action to be completed in the Future; the habitual meaning clashes here with the concrete interpretation of a temporally localized form.

In Russian, the serial occurrence of a repeated event, in the sense of a bound action reaching its inherent limit, is obligatorily expressed by the IPFV; in such a case of obligatory imperfectivization (Šmelev 2006), IPFV shares with the corresponding PFV form the lexical meaning of denoting a completed event. There are in Russian, however, cases of aspectual triplets (Bulygina & Šmelev 1999: 103–107), with the secondary derived IPFV explicitly carrying the telic meaning, but this does not change the state of affairs of having an IPFV with the same meaning (event) of the lexically corresponding PFV:

(28) Primary and secondary IPFV in Russian   [Zaliznjak & Šmelev 2004: 316]
a. *On-Ø   každ-yj   den'-Ø   pered*
3SG.NOM.SG.M   every-ACC.SG.M   day(M)-ACC.SG   PREP.before
sn-om   čita-et   francuzsk-ij
dream(M)-INSTR.SG   read(IPFV)-PRS.3SG   french-ACC.SG.M
roman-Ø
novel(M)-ACC.SG
'He reads every day before sleeping a french novel' (IPFV, ±tel)
b. *On-Ø   každ-yj   den'-Ø   pered*
3SG.NOM.SG.M   every-ACC.SG.M   day(M)-ACC.SG   PREP.before
sn-om   pro-čityva-et
dream(M)-INSTR.SG   PRV_thorough-read(IPFV)-PRS.3SG
francuzsk-ij   roman-Ø
french-ACC.SG.M   novel(M)-ACC.SG
'He reads every day before sleeping a french novel (and finishes it)'
(IPFV, +tel)

As we have seen from example (26), in Georgian there is a lexical way, by means of the particle *xolme*, of describing habitual actions or events; in this case the aspectual distinction accounts more for the different semantic content than for a lexical identity of the PFV and IPFV forms. Without *xolme*, the PFV form is licensed by the older aspect opposition between Imperfect and Aorist, the Imperfect bearing the function of indicating unlimited repetition of the situation denoted by the verb, which can be PFV or IPFV.

With Present tense, the prefixed form (PFV) is substituted by the IPFV correlate probably because of the temporal localization of prefixed forms in the Future (obligatory imperfectivization).

A quite different picture, if compared with Russian, emerges from the analysis of Imperative constructions with negative polarity.

7 Negative Imperative

The analysis of negative Imperative constructions is relevant from a typological point of view. As it is well known, in every Slavic language the presence of the negation operator in the Imperative (prohibitive) selects the imperfective aspect. Let us see what happens in Georgian. Before examining the distribution of PFV and IPFV in the negative Imperative, it is suitable to give a look at the positive forms, involving diachronic data.

In Old Georgian, the Imperative mood in the second person singular as well as plural was contrasted to the Indicative form through the absence of the personal marker (Šanidze 1973: 206):

(29) Imperative vs. Indicative in Old Georgian   [Schmidt 1969b: 225]
     (da-)c'er-e(-t)[20] 'write' (IMP) vs. *(da-)s-c'er-e(-t)* 'You wrote' (IND AOR)
     mo-k'al 'kill' (IMP) vs. *mo-x-k'al*, *mo-h-k'al* 'You killed' (IND AOR)

In Modern Georgian, the corresponding form of the positive Imperative is identical to the corresponding form of the Indicative Aorist (for first and third person the optative being used), giving rise to an amazing interplay with the tense category; if the form refers to the past, it will be Indicative (Aorist), if it refers to the future it will be Imperative (Šanidze 1973: 207):

---

20 Here and in following examples the plural marker *t* for the 1st and 2nd person forms is given in round brackets.

(30) Imperative vs. Indicative in Modern Georgian
      a-a-šen-e(-t) (IMP) 'build up'/(AOR) 'You built up'
      da-c'er-e(-t) (IMP) 'write'/(AOR) 'You wrote'

This coincidence is due to the fact that in the modern standard language, but not in some dialects (Šanidze 1973: 207), the second person marker, showing different allomorphs according to the following consonant of the root, has been every-where lost, with the exclusion of the motion verb *svla* and its compound forms, which still retain the oldest allomorph *-x-*: *mo-val* 'I shall come' vs. *mo-x-val* 'You will come', *mo-vedi* 'I came' vs. *mo-x-vedi* 'You came' (Rudenko 1940/1972: 210).[21]

The negative imperative is usually formed with the particle *nu* followed by the second person of the Present or Future subseries, depending on the aspect (Aronson 1991: 251); as well as in the other Kartvelian languages, the negated Imperative (Prohibitive) with *nu* selects the Present stem (I Series):

(31) First series with the particle *nu*   [Schmidt 1969b: 223]
      nu (da-)s-c'er(-t) (IMP) 'Don't write' vs. *(da-)s-c'er(-t)* (IND) 'You write'

Do we observe in the negative Imperative a kind of aspectual distribution, a case of obligatory imperfectivization, like, for example, in Bulgarian?[22]

Handbooks and grammars of Georgian report the double possibility of as-pectual choice without giving any information about the semantic difference be-tween the two forms, *nu c'er(-t)* and *nu da-c'er(-t)*, e.g. Aronson (1990: 145): "Neg-ative imperatives are generally formed with the negative particle *nu* 'don't' plus the present or future tense"):[23]

(32) Negation with both aspects   [Kurtsikidze 2006: 127]
      nu a-puč'eb 'don't damage it' and *nu ga-a-puč'eb* 'don't damage it'
      nu angrev 'don't ruin it' and *nu da-angrev* 'don't ruin it'
      nu adnob 'don't melt it' and *nu da-adnob* 'don't melt it'

Unprefixed forms (IPFV) express a request not to perform an action which may be already in progress at the moment of speech (prohibitive type), or refer to an

---

21 *Svla* is the only verb with an exceptional Imperative form, differing from the Aorist one: the Imperative form *mo-di(-t)* vs. the Aorist Indicative *mo-x-ved-i(-t)* is probably due to contraction.
22 See Kuehnast (2008). In Russian, there are types of negated PFV Imperatives which are used when the depicted event is beyond the subject's control (Bulygina & Šmelev 1999: 100).
23 With some verbs the particle *nu* can be followed by an Aorist form, e.g. *nu gagiždi* 'don't be silly' (Abuladze & Ludden 2006: 222).

action not localized in time (general meaning); prefixed forms explicitly place the action in the future, aiming at preventing the situation expressed by the verbal lexeme (preventive type). It is also possible to form a less polite form with the negation *ar* followed by the Optative (*k'avširebiti*): *ar i-k'itx-o* 'don't read it' (Aronson 1990: 145); this hortative form possesses a higher degree of intensity, expressing a more categorical prohibition, which therefore is considered to be less polite (Aronson 1990: 145), while *nu* has a nuance of request, advice (Bašeleišvili 2007: 114), is a mild Imperative (Mantovani 1997: 150).[24]

A comparison with some examples taken from a handbook written in Russian, however, does not enable to identify precise correspondences or divergences in selection of aspect:

(33) Georgian-Russian negative Imperative   [Bašeleišvili 2007: 113 and 116]
    ar da-c'ero (PFV) – Ne piši (IPFV) 'Don't write'
    ar č'amo (IPFV) – Ne eš' (IPFV) 'Don't eat'
    ar ga-ak'eto (PFV) – Ne delaj (IPFV) 'Don't make'
    ar da-gavic'q'des (PFV) – Ne zabud' (PFV) 'Don't forget'
    ar ačkarde (IPFV) – Ne speši (IPFV) 'Don't hurry'
    ar da-agviano (PFV) – Ne opazdyvaj (IPFV) 'Don't be late'

Further, the selection of the preverbless form can again create lexically ambiguous forms (or enantiosemy cases?):

(34) Homonymous forms
    nu rtav t'elevizors 'Don't switch the TV on/off'

Historically speaking, we observe in Old and Modern Georgian a typological parallel to some Indo-European languages distinguishing between prohibitive (IPFV) and preventive (PFV). The Present stem (I series, IPFV) with inhibitive meaning was contrasted to the Aorist stem (II series, PFV) with a preventive meaning. This distinction holds, *mutatis mutandis*, for the aspectual opposition in North Slavic languages, like Russian, expressing this semantic distinction by the use of PFV vs. IPFV. Thus, Old Georgian distinguished between preventive, derived from the Aorist stem (II series) and prohibitive, being formed from the Present stem

---

24 With regards to *ar* and *nu* Vogt (1971: 197–198) gives a completely different (and wrong) explanation: «La première | construction a la valeur d'une prière, d'un ordre atténué, la seconde celle d'une interdiction péremptoire»: *ar dac'ero!* 'ne l'écris pas (je t'en prie)', *nu dac'er!* 'je te défends de l'écrire'.

(I series). The first form aimed at preventing from the occurrence of an action before it began, while the second was used in order to stop an action that was already being processed (Schmidt 1969b: 229).

In some cases, Modern Georgian has transferred this semantic distinction to the new PFV-IPFV opposition:

(35) Prohibitive vs. Preventive
  a. *nu c'er* (IPFV) 'don't write (now), stop writing' vs. *nu da-c'er* (PFV) 'don't write (in the Future)'
  b. *nu agvianeb* (IPFV) *(xolme)* 'don't be late'

It must be said, however, that the first form can also mean 'Don't write (in general)', without referring to any concrete on-going process.

In Russian, the secondary imperfectivization produces sometimes the so-called aspectual triples, allowing the opposition between two kinds of prohibition. If (36a) is a warning not to start eating, (36b) is an order (or a request) not to carry out the action till the end of the pie, to be understood as a warning not te repeat an action that has already occurred before:

(36) Prohibitive in Russian   [Bulygina & Šmelev 1999: 106]
  a. *Ne   eš'-Ø   pirog-Ø*
     PROH   eat.IPFV-IMP.2SG   pie-ACC.SG.(M)
     'Don't eat (≈ Don't touch) the pie'
  b. *Ne   s''-edaj-Ø   (ves'-Ø)   pirog-Ø*
     PROH   PRV-eat_up.PFV-IMP.2SG   all-ACC.SG.M   pie-ACC.SG(M)
     'Don't eat up the whole pie'

To express this difference, Georgian, which lacks secondary imperfectivization, makes use of the compound form *še-č'ama*, sharing with *s''edat'* the idea of the completion of the action. Curiously, the same PFV form is requested if the prohibition is intended to prevent the beginning of the action:

(37) a. Reply to the wolf in Russian   [Bulygina & Šmelev 1999: 106]
     Ne   eš'-Ø   menja,   ser-yj   volk-Ø
     PROH   eat.IPFV.IMP.2SG   1SG.ACC   grey-NOM.SG.M   wolf-NOM.SG(M)
     'Don't eat me, grey wolf'
  b. Reply to the wolf in Georgian
     nu   še-m-č'am   or   *ar   še-m-č'am-o*
     PROH   PRV-1SG.DO-eat   NEG   PRV-1SG.DO-eat-II.OPT
     'Don't eat me'

In the context of (37b), the form *nu m-čam*, without preverb, would be quite odd, meaning 'stop eating me'.

The older system of aspectual opposition, based on the series (Present vs. Aorist stem) has been enriched with the new derivational distinction of prefixed and unprefixed forms. The overlapping of old and new functions results in a negative Imperative, which can be combined both with PFV as IPFV. From this it follows that the choice of PFV or IPFV forms, in the Imperative, does not depend on the presence of the negation.

8 Some further questions

A comparative look at the historical development of aspect in Russian, taken as touchstone, could provide useful insights into the interpretation of Georgian aspect. The items discussed, habitual reading and negative imperatives, do not fully support the idea of a gradual development towards an extension of the derivational aspect and at the same time a restriction of the functional scope of the PFV and IPFV forms, as proposed by Lehmann (2004) for Russian. In addition, we observe only some restrictions in the functional scope of the aspectual forms, which resemble, but not coincide with, those of Russian in its historical evolution since the seventeenth century (Dickey 2006: 97):

1. a reduction in the ability of the perfective aspect to express habitual events: partially YES;
2. the loss of the perfective aspect from the narrative present and running commentaries (including stage directions): NO;
3. the restriction of the expression of sequences of events to the perfective aspect: this feature cannot be used as a parameter in discussing the Georgian aspect because of the presence of the other aspectual opposition between Aorist and Imperfect; however, the existence of some IPFV Imperfect forms denoting the simple statement of a fact in the past (general-factual meaning) with telic verbs points cannot be explained without looking at the opposition between PFV and IPFV;
4. the rise of the general-factual function of the IPFV: NO; see, however, below the tendency to use IPFV forms in the Imperfect to denote the fact that an action or event has taken place in the past (general-factual meaning).

The development of the Georgian aspect has in common with Russian the change in the temporal function of the aspects: PFV acquires a new function (Future), whereas IPFV usually indicates Present time reference. As far as there is in Geor-

gian no increasing productivity of imperfectivizing suffixes,[25] we cannot see the grammaticalization path as the consequence of the secondary imperfectivization, viewed as an inflecting device that changes only the grammatical status (and obviously the morphological shape) of the verbal form; according to this scenario, aspect pairs like *delat'*/*s-delat'* represent a secondary effect of the derivation of secondary imperfectives by means of suffixes (Maslov 1961: 168–169 = 2004: 449).[26]

Is an aspectual opposition based only on prefixation possible? If we are willing to consider forms like *k'vla*/*mo-k'vla* 'kill' to be aspectual pairs in a grammatical sense, we can/must rely only on preverbs. In this respect, the different approach, proposed by Dickey for the historical interpretation of aspect in Slavic languages, seems to be quite promising: "[...] considering the grammaticalization of Slavic aspectual systems with regard to individual linguistic units (which are in fact the traditional object of grammaticalization studies), in this case prefixes" (Dickey 2006: 96).

Another point is noteworthy, namely the obligatory use of an IPFV Imperfect to simply make a statement about the occurrence of an action or event in the past (general-factual meaning). As already observed, a difference between the totality (±INTRA) and the Slavic-style aspect (±AD) lies in the choice of the unmarked member of the opposition to express generic meaning. With the exception of medial verbs (−tel),[27] Georgian makes use of Imperfect (and IPFV) forms to denote temporally closed intervals of activities:

(38) Processual or general-factual meaning   [Aronson 1990: 152, sentence 3]
    k'olxet-is   *šesaxeb*   *gušin*   *v-k'itx-ulob-d-i-Ø*
    Colchis-GEN   POSTP.about   ADV.yesterday   1-read-I-SA-IMPF-SG
    'I was reading/read about Colchis yesterday'
    (NB: the English translation, on page 160, gives only the processual meaning)

With medial verbs, to express the bare fact that an event did take place, the Aorist form (−INTRA) is used, as in (39):

---

25 The iterative suffix -*ulob*- (K'alandadze 1972), notwithstanding the fact that it is used to create IPFV forms, as in example (21b), does not contradict this statement.
26 Scholz (1983: 194) supports this idea, noticing that suffixation, as a way of deriving actional meanings, in Old and Modern Georgian was and still is by far less widespread than in Slavic.
27 Medial verbs are taken under scrutiny by Holisky (1981a).

(39) a. General-factual meaning (Aorist)
    mtel-i   dγe-Ø   i-tamaš-a
    whole-NOM day-NOM PFV-play.II.AOR.3SG
    '(S)he played all the day'
   b. *dγe-s   bevr-i   v-i-mušave-Ø*
    day-DAT   much-NOM 1-PV-work.II-SG
    'I've worked a lot today'
                      [Lafon 1959: 15 – 'J'ai beaucoup travaillé aujourd'hui']

As a rule, the Imperfect denotes an on-going action (processual meaning) or a situation which occurs on several occasions (habitual meaning):

(40) Habitual meaning of the Imperfect   [Kurtsikidze 2006: 130]
    sanam   k'oncert'-ze   da-u-k'r-av-d-a,   p'ianist'-i   bevr-s
    CONJ.before concert-LOC PRV-PV-play-I-IMPF-3SG pianist-NOM lot-DAT
    mecadine-ob-d-a
    practice-I-IMPF-3SG
    'Before playing at a concert, the pianist practiced a lot'

The same sentence, in a different context, can also denote an action whose time intervals are closed (−INTRA):

(41) General-factual meaning (Imperfect)
    gušin   p'ianist'-i   bevr-s   mecadine-ob-d-a
    ADV.yesterday pianist-NOM lot-DAT practice-I-IMPF-3SG
    'Yesterday the painist practized a lot'

The distributions cannot be explained in semantic terms (telic vs. atelic verbs), nor does it depend on the different conjugation classes the verbs belong to.[28] In fact, there are interesting cases where the Imperfect of medial verbs, and not the Aorist, appears in the simple denotative use, e.g. in many commemorative plaques on the front of houses and buildings, which as a rule begin with the form:

(42) Imperfect of atelic verbs (−INTRA)
    am   saxl-ši   cxovr-ob-d-a ...
    DEM.this.OBL house-INES live-I-IMPF-3SG
    'In this house lived ...'

---

28 The four conjugation classes are illustrated by Hewitt (1987: 174–175).

Unlike Russian, IPFV cannot be used for the experiential meaning. In this case Georgian make uses of the III series (Perfect):

(43) Experiential meaning   [Mantovani 1997: 159]
  šeksp'ir-i   *c'a-g-i-k'itx-av-s?*
  Shakespeare-NOM   PRV-2IO-PV-read-III-PFT.3SG
  'Have You read Shakespeare?'

Thus, Georgian seems to prefer not only the IPFV (−AD), but also the Imperfect form when the expression of a simple fact in the past is involved, finding a quite intriguing parallel in the behavior of most Macedonian western dialects (Friedman 1993: 285). This phenomenon deserves careful investigation; the fact remains that telic verbs and some atelic medial verbs violate the totality view in the aspectual choice (−INTRA for the simple denotation of an event in the Past), preferring the Imperfect form, acting in this case like the IPFV in the Slavic-style aspect. According to Lehmann (1999), maximal degree of grammaticalization presupposes the following features:
a. each verbal form belongs either to the class of imperfective or perfective verbs;
b. perfective and imperfective are functionally in complementary distribution;
c. the opposition between perfective and imperfective is maximally abstract.

In Russian, one observes a spread of the aspect opposition to atelic (and stative)[29] verbs increased the inventory of verbal lexemes involved by this grammatical category (Dickey 2006: 101–102).
    This does not hold for Georgian, where stative verbs show a defective paradigm, with a single past tense form (Aorist) having a semantically conditioned imperfect(ive) meaning. Interestingly, these forms show in the Past, as medial verbs (atelic) in the second series, the preradical vowel *-i-*, typical of the passive (and reflexive) voice:

(44) Stative verbs   [Kavtaradze 1972: 99]
  zis − i-džda 'to sit'
  dgas − i-dga 'to stand'
  c'evs − i-c'va 'to lie'

---

29 Notwithstanding Dickey (2006: 102), arguing that "[...] stative predicates cannot be construed as totalities, and therefore the aspect opposition cannot be extended to this class of predicates".

Medial verbs too, being atelic, escape the aspectual opposition PFV-IPFV; it should be borne in mind, however, that some preverbs can be added to activity verbs (third conjugation), imposing clear temporal limits on the action, being performed for a short while and not occurring in the Present series (delimitative meaning):

(45) a. Future of medial verbs with the circumfix *i ... eb*   [Aronson 1990: 441]
     ilap'arak'ebs   'X will talk'   Russian: *on budet govorit'*
    b. Delimitative meaning   [Aronson 1990: 441]
     c'a-ilap'arak'ebs 'X will talk for a while' Russian: *on pogovorit*

9 Conclusions

The main question of the present article was to find out whether in Georgian simple and compound verbs form an aspectual pair, i.e. share the same lexical meaning, at least in some contexts where the preverbs cannot be used (obligatory imperfectivization). The condition for having a 'pure', not semantically conditioned grammatical opposition, is that the imperfective verb should have the same event reading as its prefixed counterpart. For the meanwhile, an answer can be only given in terms of a tendency to develop a Russian-like aspectual system; to this it should be also added the historically conditioned fact that Georgian aspectologists worked within the Soviet framework, thus adopting models which had been developed for the description of the Russian aspect opposition.

In Georgian, the correlation between perfectivity of the Slavic type and telic character of the situation denoted by the verbal lexeme seems to be very strong, stronger than in Russian; under most circumstances, PFV interacts with telic situations. This fact points to the less or not yet grammaticalized character of the Georgian aspect, as was already postulated by Comrie (1976: 93–94).

Still, the fact remains that the behavior of compound verbs, already excluding a processual meaning (with the exception of motion verbs), shows at least in the first series clear tendencies towards a new balancing of the system and distributions of functions (reduction of the focus) to the lexically correlated, if not totally identical, forms.

Abbreviations

1/2/3	first/second/third person	INTRA	intraterminality
I/II/III	first/second/third series	IO	indirect object
ABL	ablative	IPFV	imperfective
ACC	accusative	LOC	locative
AD	adterminality	M	masculine
ADV	adverb	NEG	negation
ALL	allative	NOM	nominative
AOR	aorist	OBL	oblique
COND	conditional	OPT	optative
CONJ	conjunction	PASS	passive
CONTR	contrastive topic	PAST	past tense
DAT	dative	PFT	perfect
DEM	demonstrative	PFV	perfective
DO	direct object	PL	plural
ERG	ergative	POSTP	postposition
F	feminine	PREP	preposition
FIN	final	PROH	prohibitive
FUT	future tense	PRS	present
GEN	genitive	PRV	preverb
ILL	illative	PTCL	particle
IMP	imperative	PV	preradical vowel
IMPF	imperfect	S	subject
IND	indicative	SA	stem augment
INES	inessive	SG	singular
INF	infinitive	STAT	stative
INSTR	instrumental	tel	telic
INTR	intransitive		

References

Abuladze, Lia & Andreas Ludden. 2006. *Lehrbuch der georgischen Sprache*. Hamburg: Buske.

Arabuli, Avtandil. 1999. Zmnis sauylebel erteulta raodenobis sak'itxisatvis kartulši. *Enatmecnierebis sak'itxebi* 1. 42–53.

Aronson, Howard I. 1990. *Georgian. A reading grammar*. Corrected edition. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Aronson, Howard I. 1991. Modern Georgian. In Alice C. Harris (ed.), *The indigenous languages of the Caucasus. Volume 1: The Kartvelian languages*, 219–312. Delmar, New York: Caravan.

Bašeleišvili, Liana Otarovna. 2007. *Učebnik gruzinskogo jazyka. Čast' I*. Moskva: Izdatel'skaja firma «Vostočnaja literatura» RAN.

Bulygina, Tatiana V. & Aleksei D. Šmelev. 1999. On the semantics of some Russian causative constructions. In Werner Abraham & Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *Tense-aspect, transitivity and causativity. Essay in honour of Vladimir Nedjalkov.* (Studies in Language Companion Series 50), 97–113. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Cherchi, Marcello. 1999. An instance of Georgian verbal analogy in light of Mańczak's tendencies and word-and-paradigm generative formalism. In Helma van den Berg (ed.), *Studies in Caucasian linguistics: Selected papers of the eight Caucasian colloquium*, 60–72. Leiden: Research School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies.

Christophe, Bernard. 2004. *Studies i de sydkaukasiske sprogs aspektologi.* (Series of dissertations submitted to the Faculty of Arts, University of Oslo 190; PhD 2003). Oslo: University of Oslo.

Christophe, Bernard. 2005. Some remarks on postterminality and evidentiality in South Caucasian. In Dag Haug & Eirik Welo (eds.), *Haptačahaptāitiš. Festschrift for Fridrik Thordarson on the occasion of his 77th birthday.* (Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, Serie B: Skrifter 116), 49–55. Oslo: Novus.

C'ibaxašvili, Giorgi. 1959a. K voprosu o glagol'noj prefiksacii v russkom i gruzinskom jazykach. *St'alinis saxelobis tbilisis saxelmc'ipo universit'et'is šromebi*, pilologiur mecnierebata seria 83. 257–274.

C'ibaxašvili, Giorgi. 1959b. Rusuli rtulzmnisc'iniani zmnebi da mati targmna kartul enaši. *K'omunist'uri ayzrdisatvis* 36(3). 43–48.

C'ibaxašvili, Giorgi. 1960a. *Glagol'nye pristavki v russkom i gruzinskom jazykach. Avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie učenoj stepeni kandidata filologičeskich nauk*. Tbilisi: Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. Stalina.

C'ibaxašvili, Giorgi. 1960b. Zmnisc'inis leksik'uri da gramat'ik'uli funkciebi. *K'omunist'uri ayzrdisatvis* 37(6). 30–35.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Č'relašvili, K'arlo. 1980. Asp'ekt'is, rogorc enobrivi k'at'egoriis arsi da asp'ekt'is samc'evrovani k'orelacia tanamedrove kartul enaši. In *Istoriko-filologičeskie razyskanija. Čast' I*, 232–244. Tbilisi: Tbilisskij ordena trudovogo krasnogo znameni Gosudarstvennyj Universitet.

Č'umburidze, Guram. 1967. Asp'ekt'isa da mokmedebis saxis mimartulebisatvis kartulši. In *Orioni. Ak'ak'i Šanidzes. Tbilisis saxelmc'ipo universit'et'i saiubileo k'rebuli, midzyvnili*

Ak'ak'i Šanidzis dabedabis 80 c'listavisadmi, 336–356. Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Č'umburidze, Zurab. 1986. *Mq'opadi kartvelur enebši*. Tbilisi: Universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford/New York: Basil Blackwell.

Dahl, Östen. 1995. The episodic/generic distinction in tense-aspect systems. In Gregory N. Carlson & Francis Jeffry Pelletier (eds.), *The generic book*, 412–425. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Dahl, Östen. 2000. The tense-aspect systems of European languages in a typological perspective. In Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, Eurotyp 20-6), 3–25. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dickey, Stephen M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic aspect: A cognitive approach*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Dickey, Stephen M. 2006. Prefixes in the grammaticalization of Slavic aspect: Telic *s-/z-*, delimitative *po-* and language change via expansion and reduction. In Bernhard Brehmer, Katrin Bente Fischer & Gertje Krumbholz (eds.), *Aspekte, Kategorien und Kontakte slavischer Sprachen. Festschrift für Volkmar Lehmann zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Studien zur Slavistik 16), 96–108. Hamburg: Kovač.

Fähnrich, Heinz. 1989. Die Funktionen der georgischen Präverbien. *Revue des études géorgiennes et caucasiennes* 5. 67–77.

Fähnrich, Heinz. 1991. Old Georgian. In Alice C. Harris (ed.), *The indigenous languages of the Caucasus. Volume 1: The Kartvelian languages*, 129–217. Delmar, New York: Caravan.

Friedman, Victor A. 1993. The loss of the imperfective aorist in Macedonian. Structural significance and Balkan context. In Robert A. Maguire & Alan Timberlake (eds.), *American contributions to the eleventh international congress of Slavists (Bratislava, August–September 1993)*, *Literature. Linguistics. Poetics*, 285–302. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Gec'adze, Davit. 1961. Gardamavali zmnebis III seriis pormata asp'ekt'is šesaxeb dzvel kartulši. In *Al. C'uluk'idzis saxelobis kutaisis saxelmc'ipo p'edagogiuri inst'it'ut'is šromebi* 23 (midz\'\'vnili sakartveloši sabč'ota xelisuplebis damq'arebis 40 c'listavisadmi), 335–342.

Gecadze, I. O. 1984. Kategorija glagol'nogo vida i aspektual'nost' v gruzinskom jazyke. In Aleksander V. Bondarko (ed.), *Teorija grammatičeskogo značenija i aspektologičeskie issledovanija*, 260–268. Leningrad: Nauka.

Harris, Alice C. 1985. *Diachronic syntax. The Kartvelian case*. (Syntax and Semantics 18). Orlando: Academic Press.

Haug, Dag. 2005. On a 'hole' in the Latin tense/aspect-system. In Dag Haug & Eirik Welo (eds.), *Haptačahaptāitiš. Festschrift for Fridrik Thordarson on the occasion of his 77th birthday*. (Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, Serie B: Skrifter 116), 105–118.Oslo: Novus.

Hewitt, Brian George. 1987. Review of Harris 1985. *Revue des études géorgiennes et caucasiennes* 3. 173–213.

Hewitt, Brian George. 1995. *Georgian: A structural reference grammar*. (London Oriental and African Language Library 2). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Holisky, Dee Ann. 1979. On lexical aspect and verb classes in Georgian. In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks & Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and*

levels (April 20–21, 1979. Including Papers from the conference on Non-Slavic languages of the USSR, 390–401. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Holisky, Dee Ann. 1981a. *Aspect and Georgian medial verbs*. New York: Caravan Books.

Holisky, Dee Ann. 1981b. *Aspect theory and Georgian aspect*. In Philip J. Tedeschi & Annie Zaenen (eds.), *Syntax and semantics. Vol. 14: Tense and aspect*, 127–144. New York/ London: Academic Press.

Holt, Jens. 1943. *Études d'aspect*. (Acta Jutlandica 15.2). København: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus.

Holvoet, Axel. 1993. Towards a typology of aspect systems in Slavonic. *Slavica Gandensia* 20. 25–32.

Johanson, Lars. 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems*. (Studia Turcica Upsaliensia 1). Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Johanson, Lars. 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, Eurotyp 20-6), 27–187. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

K'alandadze, Viola. 1972. *Gebulobs*, *yebulobs* t'ip'is zmnebi tanamedrove kartulši". In *Kartuli sit'q'vis k'ult'uris sak'itxebi. C'igni p'irveli*, 154–177. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Kavtaradze, Ivane. 1961. Xolmeobitis k'at'egoriis ist'oriidan kartulši. In *Kartvelur enata st'rukt'uris sak'itxebi. II: Edzyvneba sakartveloši sabč'ota xelisuplebis damq'aredbis 40 c'listavs*, 5–28. Tbilisi: Sakartvelos SSR mecnierebata ak'ademiis gamomcemloba.

Kavtaradze, Ivane. 1972. St'at'ik'ur zmnata erti džgupis mq'opadisatvis. In *Kartuli sit'q'vis k'ult'uris sak'itxebi. C'igni p'irveli*, 99–105. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Klimonov, Vladimir D. & Gerda Klimonov. 2008. The connections between modality, aspectuality, and temporality in modern Russian. In Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds.), *Modality-aspect interfaces. Implications and typological solutions*. (Typological Studies in Language 79), 147–173. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Kremer, Èleonora Levanovna. 1950. Glagol'nye pristavki v russkom i gruzinskom jazykach. *Trudy Tbilisskogo Gosudarstvennogo Pedagogičeskogo Instituta im. A. S. Puškina* 8. 43–57.

Kuehnast, Milena. 2008. Aspectual coercion in Bulgarian negative imperatives. In Werner Abraham & Elisabeth Leiss (eds.), *Modality-aspect interfaces. Implications and typological solutions*. (Typological Studies in Language 79), 175–196. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Kurtsikidze, Shorena. 2006. *Essentials of Georgian grammar. With conjugations tables of 250 most commonly used verbs*. (Lincom Student Grammars 2). München: Lincom Europa.

Lafon, René. 1959. Pour faire mieux connaître la langue géorgienne (suite). Constitution du verbe avec son sujet et son ou ses complements. *Bedi kartlisa* 32–33 (N. S. 6–7l). 7–19.

Lehmann, Volkmar. 1999. Sprachliche Entwicklung als Expansion und Reduktion. In Tanja Anstatt (ed.), *Entwicklungen in slavischen Sprachen*. (Specimina Philologiae Slavicae, Supplementband 66), 169–254. München: Sagner.

Lehmann, Volkmar. 2004. Grammaticalization via extending derivation. In Walter Bisang et al. (eds.), *What makes grammaticalization? A look from its fringes and its components*. (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 158), 169–186. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lerner, Konstantine & Enoch Reuven. 1999. Towards the problem of the transition from the aspectual to the temporal-modal system of the Georgian verb. In Helma van den Berg (ed.),

Studies in Caucasian linguistics: Selected papers of the eight Caucasian colloquium, 45–49. Leiden: Research School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies.

Lindstedt, Jouko. 2001. Tense and aspect. In Martin Haspelmath et al. (eds.), *Language typology and language universals/Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien/La typologie des langues et les universaux linguistiques*, vol. 1, 768–783. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ludwig, Ralph. 2001. Markiertheit. In Martin Haspelmath et al. (eds.), *Language typology and language universals/Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien/La typologie des langues et les universaux linguistiques*, vol. 1, 400–419. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mač'avariani, Givi. 1974. Asp'ekt'is k'at'egoria kartvelur enebši. In *Kartvelur enata st'rukt'uris sak'itxebi* 4, 118–142. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Majsak, Timur. 2005. *Tipologija grammatikalizacii konstrukcij s glagolami dviženija i glagolami pozicii*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskich kul'tur.

Mantovani, Luigi. 1997. *Piccola grammatica della lingua georgiana. Kartuli enis mcire gramat'ik'a*. Saronno: Urban.

Maslov, Jurij Sergeevič. 1961. Rol' tak nazyvaemoj perfektivacii i imperfektivacii v processe vozniknovenija slavjanskogo glagol'nogo vida. In Nikita Il'ič Tolstoj (ed.), *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju*, 165–195. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Maslov, Jurij Sergeevič. 2004. *Izbrannye trudy. Aspektologija, obščee jazykoznanie*. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Megrelidze, Ioseb. 1969. Gramat'ik'uli droisa da zmnis saxis urtiertobis šesaxeb. *Kartuli ena da lit'erat'ura sk'olaši* 2(13). 41–48.

Mel'čuk, Igor' Aleksandrovič. 1994. *Cours de morphologie générale. Vol. 2: Significations morphologiques*. Montréal/Paris: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal/CNRS Éditions.

Mel'čuk, Igor' Aleksandrovič. 1998. *Kurs obščej morfologii. Tom II, čast' vtoraja: Morfologičeskie značenija*. (Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 38/2; Russian trnslation of Mel'čuk 1994). Moskva-Vena: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Met'reveli, Teimuraz. 1979. Asp'ekt'is k'at'egoriisatvis kartulši. *Kartuli ena da lit'erat'ura sk'olaši* 3. 103–112.

Natadze, Nodar. 1961. Mq'opadisatvis kartvelur enebši. In *Kartvelur enata st'rukt'uris sak'itxebi. II: Edzyvneba sakartveloši sabč'ota xelisuplebis damq'aredbis 40 c'listavs*, 29–52. Tbilisi: Sakartvelos SSR mecnierebata ak'ademiis gamomcemloba.

Nebieridze, Givi. 1987. Asp'ekt'i kartulši. In *Ak'ak'i Šanidze (ed.), 100. Saiubileo k'rebuli*, 133–142. Tbilisi: Universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Palmajtis, M. L. 1981. Ot grečeskoj sistemy k slavjanskoj. K tipologii vida". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4. 45–54.

Peikrišvili, Žužuna. 1992. *Kartuli enis morpologia (salekcio k'ursi)*. Kutaisi.

Rudenko, Boris T. 1940/1972. *Grammatika gruzinskogo jazyka*. (Trudy Instituta Vostokovedenija 32; Reprint The Hague: Mouton. Ianua linguarum, series anastatica 7). Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Šanidze, Ak'ak'i. 1942. Izmenenie sistemy vyraženija glagol'noj kategorii vida v gruzinskom i ego posledstvija. *Soobščenija Akademii nauk Gruzinskoj SSR* 3(9). 953–958.

Šanidze, Ak'ak'i. 1973. *Kartuli enis gramat'ik'is sapudzvlebi. I: Morpologia*. (Dzveli kartuli enis k'atedris šromebi 15).Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Šanidze, Ak'ak'i. 1976. *Dzveli kartuli enis gramat'ik'a*. (Dzveli kartuli enis k'atedris šromebi 18). Tbilisi: Tbilisis universit'et'is gamomcemloba.

Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1963. Zu den Aspekten im Georgischen und in Indogermanischen Sprachen. *Bedi Kartlisa* 15/16. 107–115.

Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1969a. Zur Tmesis in den Kartvelsprachen und ihren typologischen Parallelen in indogermanischen Sprachen. In Shota Dzidziguri et al. (eds.), *To honour Giorgi Axvledians. Essays on the occasion of his eightieth birthday*, 96–105. Tbilisi: Tbilisis Universit'et'i.

Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1969b. Probleme des Prohibitivsatzes. *Studia classica et orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata. III*. 223–232. Roma: Herder.

Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1984. On aspect and tense in Old Georgian. In Howard I. Aronson (ed.), *Papers from the third conference on the Non-Slavic languages of the USSR* (University of Chicago March 23–25, 1983). (Folia Slavica, Volume 7 Numbers 1 and 2), 290–302. Columbus Ohio: Slavica.

Scholz, Friedrich. 1983. Der Verbalaspekt im Georgischen, im Slavischen und im Baltischen. Überlegungen zu seiner Entstehung und Entwicklung. In Gerd Freidhof et al. (eds.), *Studia slavica in honorem viri doctissimi Olexa Horbatsch. Festgabe zum 65. Geburtstag*, Teil 1: *Beiträge zur ostslawischen Philologie* (I), 185–198. München: Sagner.

Šmelev, Aleksej. 2006. Imperfektivizacija i vidovaja korreljacija. In Bernhard Brehmer, Katrin Bente Fischer & Gertje Krumbholz (eds.), *Aspekte, Kategorien und Kontakte slavischer Sprachen. Festschrift für Volkmar Lehmann zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Studien zur Slavistik 16), 372–379. Hamburg: Kovač.

Sumbatova, Nina. 1999. Evidentiality, transitivity and split ergativity. Evidence from Svan. In Werner Abraham & Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *Tense-aspect, transitivity and causativity. Essay in honour of Vladimir Nedjalkov*. (Studies in Language Companion Series 50), 63–95. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Tomelleri, Vittorio Springfield. 2007. Zur Typologisierung der historischen Aspektologie (Nochmal zu den präfigierten Bewegungsverben in der altrussischen Povest' vremennych let). In Wolfgang Hock & Michael Meier-Brügger (eds.), *Dar" sloves'nyj. Festschrift für Christoph Koch zum 65. Geburtstag*, 297–308. München: Sagner.

Tomelleri, Vittorio Springfield. 2009a. The category of aspect in Georgian, Ossetic and Russian. Some areal and typological observations. *Faits des Langues. Les Cahiers* 1. 245–272.

Tomelleri, Vittorio Springfield. 2009b. Osservazioni sull'aspetto verbale in Georgiano (2). *Rivista italiana di linguistica e dialettologia* 11. 49–109.

Tournadre, Nicolas. 2004. Typologie des aspects verbaux et intégration à une théorie du TAM. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 99(1). 7–68.

Tschenkéli, Kita. 1958. *Einführung in die georgische Sprache*. Band 1: Theoretischer Teil. Zürich: Amirani.

Vačnadze, Nino. 1980. *Zogierti rusuli p'reverbiani zmnis kartulad gadmocemis sašualebani (rusul-kartuli leksik'onebis mixedvit)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Vaillant, André. 1946. La dépréverbation. *Revue des études slaves* 22(1–4). 5–45.

Vogt, Hans. 1971. *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. (Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Serie B: Skrifter, 7).Oslo: Universitetsvorlaget.

Wiemer (Vimer), Björn. 2001. Aspektual'nye paradigmy i leksičeskoe značenie russkich i litovskich glagolov. Opyt sopostavlenija s točki zrenija leksikalizacii i grammatikalizacii. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2. 26–58.

Wiemer (Vimer), Björn. 2006. O razgraničenii grammatičeskich i leksičeskich protivopostavlenij v glagol'nom slovoobrazovanii ili: čemu mogut naučit'sja aspektologi na primere

sja-glagolov? In Volkmar Lehmann (Leman) (ed.), *Glagol'nyj vid i leksikografija. Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida IV*. (Slavolinguistica 7), 97–123. München: Sagner.

Wiemer, Björn. 2008. Zur Enantiosemie im strikten Sinn: zwischen Pragmatik und (lexikalischer) Semantik. In Bernhard Brehmer, Katrin Bente Fischer & Gertje Krumbholz (eds.), *Aspekte, Kategorien und Kontakte slavischer Sprachen. Festschrift für Volkmar Lehmann zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Studien zur Slavistik 16), 404–416. Hamburg: Kovač.

Zaliznjak, Anna A. & Aleksej D. Šmelev. 2000. *Vvedenie v russkuju aspektologiju*, Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Zaliznjak, Anna A. & Aleksej D. Šmelev. 2004. O meste vidovoj pary v aspektual'noj sisteme russkogo jazyka. In Milos Okuka & Ulrich Schweier (eds.), *Germano-Slavische Beiträge. Festschrift für Peter Rehder zum 65. Geburtstag*, 311–322. München: Sagner.