

1. OLD GEORGIAN

1.1 Introduction

The Georgian language has a written history of more than 15 centuries and is one of the most well-researched Caucasian languages worldwide. The earliest written sources in Georgian, mostly inscriptions, can be dated back to the 5th century. The extant manuscripts comprise theological and secular, historical and juridical texts and are mainly stored in Georgian museums, archives, and at the National Center of Manuscripts (Tbilisi), however, some of them are scattered across the globe. Georgian manuscripts can be found, e. g., in the Monastery of Iviron on Mt. Athos (Greece), in Saint Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai (Egypt), in the Matenadaran (Yerevan, Armenia), in Jerusalem (Israel), St. Petersburg (Russia), Vienna (Austria), Graz (Austria), Cambridge (England), Oxford (England), and Paris (France). Investigations into the historical development of the Georgian language are based on these written documents.

The development of written Georgian can be categorized in three stages:

- a) The Georgian language as found in documents from the 5th to the 11th century, usually called **Old Georgian**. Documents belonging to this period are, I.A., the Bolnisi inscriptions (5th century), the Ukangori inscriptions (5th–6th centuries), the Jvari inscriptions (6th–7th centuries), the Tskisi inscriptions (7th centuries), the Khanmeti lectionary (7th–8th centuries), the Martyrdom of Saint Abo (8th century), the Sinai Mravaltavi (9th century), the Šatberdi codex (10th century) and the Parxali codex (11th century).
- b) The Georgian language from the 12th to the 18th century, often styled **Middle Georgian**.
- c) From the 19th century on, the Georgian language is named **Modern Georgian**, thus representing the third and last developmental stage of written Georgian.

1.2 The Transmission of Old Georgian

The written documents of Old Georgian are classified in three groups: *khanmeti*, *haemeti* and *sannarevi*. This division is based on morphological differences: in *khanmeti* texts, the 2nd person subjects and 3rd person objects are marked by a verbal prefix *x-*. The morpheme *x-* can also be found in the comparative grade of adjectives. In a slightly later period, we find a prefix *h-* instead of the *x-*; this period is called the *haemeti* period. Lastly, the term *sannarevi* denotes those texts, in which a 2nd person subject and a 3rd person object is (partly) marked by an allomorph *s-*.

Khanmeti texts are dated back to the period from the 4th to the 8th century, *haemeti* texts from the 7th to the 8th century, and *sannarevi* texts from the 9th century onwards. Concerning the inter-relationship of *khanmeti* and *haemeti* features, several different opinions exist:

1. According to I. Žavaxišvili's (1922: 365) and A. Oniani's (1978: 185–187) opinion, the *x-* and *h-* morphemes are, diachronically speaking, each other's substitutes; the *x-* morpheme was replaced by the *h-* morpheme over time.
2. After A. Šaniže (1957: 293), the *khanmeti* and *haemeti* texts were created in two different regions and represent two dialectally differentiated units.

For Middle and Modern Georgian, no such classification is possible.

A concomitant historical development, which is documented over the centuries, is that of the Georgian alphabet. The date of the origin of the Georgian alphabet has to this day been a controversial issue. In Georgian historical sources (*Kartlis cxoveba*, the Georgian Chronicle), the emergence of the alphabet is linked to the name of King Parnavaz, who reigned in the 4th century BCE. According to researchers such as K. Kečeliže (1980) and T. Gamqrelize (1989), the creation of the Georgian writing system was rather connected with the spread of the Christian religion in Georgia, i.e., the 4th–5th centuries CE. After the instalment of Christianity as the official religion in Georgia, the alphabet soon became widespread, not only within Georgia but also, e.g., in Palestine.

In written Georgian documents, three different manifestations of the alphabet are represented: *asomtavruli* majuscules (also styled *mrg(v)lovani* ‘rounded’), *nusxa-xucuri* (or *nusxuri*) minuscules, and *mxedruli* minuscules. The oldest documents found are written in *asomtavruli* throughout (up to the 10th century) whereas the oldest text written in *nusxa-xucuri* is one of the inscriptions from the Ateni Sioni church, which is dated back to 835 AD. The *mkhedruli* script first appears in the 10th century; it was, for a long time, used simultaneously with *nusxa-xucuri*, but as a cursive variant. In manuscripts, all three scripts can be found side by side.

As mentioned before, the origin of the Georgian alphabet is, according to some scholars, connected to the spread of the Christian religion. Indeed, the oldest documents (in form of both inscriptions and manuscripts) are inscriptions from ecclesiastical buildings and translations of biblical texts. Apart from translations, an original Georgian literature developed soon after, which is attested to by the legends of the saints allegedly written from the 5th–8th centuries (e.g., the Martyrdom of St. Abo). Thus, the oldest written documents of the Georgian language comprise translations as well as original Georgian texts.

This statement is crucial for the Georgian language, especially for research into Old Georgian, because it may be assumed that certain grammatical and structural phenomena found in this language might reflect interference from the source languages of the translations and not represent features of the internal structure of Old Georgian.

1.3 Old vs. Modern Georgian

According to general belief, Old and Modern Georgian do not differ very much from each other and the system of the Georgian language did not change drastically in its history. As a result, Old Georgian texts are mostly understandable even today. However, apart from this, some phonological, morphological and syntactical differences can be observed:

- a) Modern Georgian differs from Old Georgian with respect to the phonemic inventory: the phonemes *j* <Ɑ> and *q* <ჭ> of Old Georgian and the graphemes representing them are no longer used in standard Modern Georgian. The same is true for the graphemes, ჳ (usually transcribed ē), ჳ (w), and ჳ (ō), which did not represent individual phonemes in Old Georgian but sequences of two phonemes (*e+j*, usually with a morpheme border in between, and *w+i*) or an allophonic variant (prosodically lengthened *o*, only occurring as an interjection and in foreign names).
- b) Accordingly, from the 38 letters of Old Georgian, only 33 have remained in use in Modern Georgian. In addition, the digraph *ow* (<ოჴ>), which represented the vowel *u* in Old Georgian, was merged yielding the single character <უ> (*u*) in the transition from the *asomtavruli* to the *nusxa-xucuri* script.
- c) From a syntactical point of view, we may note considerable changes in the word order; in addition, the Georgian language became a radical pro-drop language, meaning that the per-

sonal pronouns in subject and object function are usually omitted because both are marked in the verb.

The Georgian language has been steadily documented in writing since the 5th century, which gives us the possibility to trace the diachrony of grammaticalization processes and other changes. The morphological structure changed with respect to the case system and the declension types. Old Georgian had nine grammatical cases, comprising an absolutive, nominative, ergative, dative, genitive, directive, instrumental, adverbial and a vocative case. In contrast to this, Modern Georgian has a seven-case system (nominative, ergative, dative, genitive, instrumental, adverbial and vocative).¹ The declension types changed as well: the declension paradigms of nouns with vocalic stems and consonantal stems differ noticeably from each other in Modern Georgian; rules of syncope and apocope changed and, alongside syncope and apocope, a combined syncope-apocope declension type appeared (cf. *kveqnis* ‘country (GEN.SG)’ with syncope + apocope vs. *kveqanis* ‘id.’ only with apocope, NOM. *kveqana*). Table 1 shows the declension paradigm of the nouns *deda* ‘mother’ (vocalic stem in -a), *mepe* ‘king’ (vocalic stem in -e), *saxli* ‘house’ (consonantal stem), *çqaro* ‘source, fountain’ (vocalic stem in -o) and *qru* ‘deaf’ (vocalic stem in -u) in Old Georgian.

ABS.	<i>deda</i>	<i>mepe</i> ²	<i>saxl-Ø</i>	<i>çqaro</i>	<i>qru</i>
NOM.	<i>deda-j</i>	<i>mepe-j</i>	<i>saxl-i</i>	<i>çqaro-j</i>	<i>qru-j</i>
ERG.	<i>deda-man</i>	<i>mepe-man</i>	<i>saxl-man</i>	<i>çqaro-man</i>	<i>qru-man</i>
DAT.	<i>deda-s(a)</i>	<i>mepe-s(a)</i>	<i>saxl-s(a)</i>	<i>çqaro-s(a)</i>	<i>qru-s(a)</i>
GEN.	<i>ded-is(a)</i>	<i>mep-is(a)</i>	<i>saxl-is(a)</i>	<i>çqaro-js(a)</i>	<i>qru-js(a)</i>
DIR.	<i>ded-isa</i>	<i>mep-isa</i>	<i>saxl-isa</i>	<i>çqaro-jsa</i>	<i>qru-jsa</i>
INST.	<i>ded-it(a)</i>	<i>mep-it(a)</i>	<i>saxl-it(a)</i>	<i>çqaro-jt(a)</i>	<i>qru-jt(a)</i>
ADV.	<i>deda-d</i>	<i>mepe-d</i>	<i>saxl-ad</i>	<i>çqaro-d</i>	<i>qru-d</i>
VOC.	<i>deda-o</i>	<i>mepe-o</i>	<i>saxl-o</i>	<i>çqaro-o</i>	<i>qru-o</i>

Table 1

The NP structures of Old and Modern Georgian differ from one another, too: the postnominal word order, which was frequent in Old Georgian (*saxli gvtisaj* ‘house of God’), changed more and more into the prenominal word order of Modern Georgian (*gvtis saxli* ‘God’s house’). Furthermore, the agreement rules between the components of the NP changed: in Modern Georgian, determiners and quantifiers do not agree in number with their head (cf. Old Georgian *samni kacni* ‘three men (NOM.PL)’ vs. Modern Georgian *sami kaci* ‘three men (NOM.SG)’); the same applies to modifiers such as adjectives or participles. Proper names, which had no case marking in the absolutive, nominative or ergative case in Old Georgian, do so in Modern Georgian in the nominative and ergative case, just like common nouns. Local adpositions are rather independent in Old Georgian; some of them (e.g. *çinaše* ‘in front of’) can be used both prenominally and

- 1 Zurab Saržveladze (2004: 23) does not share this view, acknowledging only the seven grammatical cases for Old Georgian that are also represented in Modern Georgian. According to his opinion, the absolutive and the nominative freely substitute each other and, because of this, these two cases should be regarded as two variants of the same case; concerning the directive, Saržveladze considers it as secondary and does not list it in the case system.
- 2 The sequence *e+j* in the nominative of nouns with vocalic stems in -e, appearing, e.g., in *mepe-j*, is usually rendered by the grapheme <ღ> (yielding *mepē* etc.). In the other cases with an ending beginning with *i*, the stem-final -e is suppressed instead (*mepisa* GEN./DIR.SG, *mepita* INST.SG.).

postnominally. Some such adpositions vanished completely in Modern Georgian, while others are now attached to nouns as bound postpositions, e. g. Old Georgian *saxlsa šina* ‘in the house’ > Modern Georgian: *saxl-ši* ‘in the house’.

The verbal morphology went through several changes as well: the conjugation paradigm of Old Georgian comprises 14 series, some of which have vanished in Modern Georgian (e. g. the Old Georgian iterative tense, which already disappeared in Middle Georgian), leaving 11 series. The preverbs changed in functional terms: in Old Georgian, they expressed mostly direction and orientation and produced new lexical units, while in Modern Georgian, preverbs primarily express verbal aspects.

As a result of the grammaticalization of particular verbal forms, the Georgian language developed modal elements (adverbs or particles); cf. e. g. *egebis* ‘it is possible’ (verbal) > *egeb* ‘perhaps’ (particle), *mgonia* ‘I think’ (verbal) > *mgoni* ‘in my view’ (particle). The lexical expression of direct and indirect speech was replaced by enclitical elements (*metki-/tko/-o*), which resulted from the grammaticalization of verbal forms of *tkma* ‘say’.

The existence of a continuous writing tradition enables linguists to research the older stages of the language based on original resources and to come to significant conclusions by analyzing reliable empirical materials. The structures of the Old Georgian NP and its determiners and modifiers, as discussed in this chapter, are based on these written resources, which are collected in the Georgian National Corpus GNC (gnc.gov.ge) and the TITUS corpus (titus.uni-frankfurt.de).

1.4 The structure of NPs in Old Georgian

The Old Georgian NP is characterized by a free and unstable word order: determiners, modifiers and heads do not show a fixed placement within the NP. Most of the oldest texts were translated from Ancient Greek, Old Armenian, or Arabic, so that the structure and the syntax of the NP in Old Georgian may be influenced by the translation sources. As a result, it is difficult to identify the genuine structure of Old Georgian NPs. Nonetheless, I will try to find some regularities concerning the word order in the Old Georgian NP and analyze its structure in the following sections.

1.4.1 Demonstratives

Demonstratives in Old Georgian are differentiated by a three-way deixis: *ese* ‘this close to me’ (proximal), *ege* ‘that close to you’ (medial), and *igi* ‘that/yonder’ (distal) (the form *isi* and its declension in singular and plural developed at a later date). The declension of the demonstratives is displayed in Table 2.

	<i>ese</i>		<i>ege</i>		<i>igi</i>	
	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.
ABS.	—	—	—	—	—	—
NOM.	<i>ese</i>	<i>ese-n-i</i>	<i>ege</i>	<i>ege-n-i</i>	<i>igi/isi</i>	<i>igi-n-i/isi-n-i</i>
ERG.	<i>ama-n</i>	<i>ama-t</i>	<i>maga-n</i>	<i>maga-t</i>	<i>(i)ma-n</i>	<i>ima-t</i>
DAT.	<i>ama-s</i>		<i>maga-s</i>		<i>(i)ma-s</i>	
GEN.	<i>am-is(a)</i>		<i>mag-is(a)</i>		<i>(i)m-is(a)</i>	
DIR.	—	—	—	—	—	—
INST.	<i>am-it(a)</i>	—	<i>ma-it(a)</i>	—	<i>(i)m-it(a)</i>	—
ADV.	<i>am-ad</i>	<i>ama-t-a</i>	<i>mag-ad</i>	<i>maga-t-a</i>	<i>(i)m-ad</i>	<i>ima-t-a</i>
VOC.	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table 2

Old Georgian demonstratives have some specific features:

- the stem present in the direct case (*ese* ‘this’) differs significantly from the stem appearing in the oblique case (*amis* ‘this (GEN.SG)’);
- they do not have absolute, directive or vocative forms;
- all three demonstratives can be used as 3rd person pronouns (with the inherent deictic differentiation);
- the genitive forms can be used as 3rd person possessive pronouns (with the inherent deictic differentiation).

The demonstratives can be used attributively or independently, but in contrast to Modern Georgian demonstratives, the forms do not differ from each other in attributive and independent use. However, there is a difference concerning the placement of attributive demonstratives: when placed postnominal, they function as definite articles; in prenominal placement, they maintain their function as demonstratives:

“Of all the Kartvelian languages, only Old Georgian had articles, and they were postponed. The indefinite article was *erti* which functioned as an article only if postponed, and as a numeral ‘one’, if preposed. The demonstrative pronouns *igi*, *ese*, *ege* ‘this, that’ were preposed; if postponed, they functioned as definite articles.”

(Testelec 1998: 247)

Prenominal placement indicates demonstrative use:

- | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| (1) | <i>aç</i>
now | <i>ese</i>
this.NOM.SG | <i>sixarul-i</i>
joy-NOM.SG | <i>romel</i>
which.ABS.SG |
| | <i>čem-i</i>
my-NOM.SG | <i>ars</i>
be.S3SG.PRES | <i>ağsrulbul-i</i>
fulfilled-NOM.SG | <i>ars</i>
be.S3SG.PRES |

‘Now **this** joy, which is mine, is fulfilled.’ (Jo. 3.29, C)

Demonstrative pronouns agree with their head not only in case but also in number:

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (2) | <i>da</i>
and | <i>ormeoc</i>
forty.ABS.SG | <i>dge</i>
day.ABS.SG | <i>gamoicadeboda</i>
test.S3SG.OPT |
| | <i>ešmaḡ-is-a-gan</i>
devil-GEN.SG-EXT.V-from | <i>da</i>
and | <i>arara-j</i>
nothing-NOM.SG | <i>čama</i>
eat.S3SG.AOR |
| | <i>mat</i>
this.DAT.PL | <i>dge-ta</i>
day-DAT.PL | <i>šina</i>
in | |

‘And for forty days, he would be tested by the devil and he did not eat anything during **these** days.’ (Lk. 4.2, C)

In postnominal position, the demonstratives function as a definite article:

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| (3) | <i>da</i>
and | <i>mamcno</i>
command.S3SG.AOR | <i>čuen</i>
we.DAT.SG | <i>kadageb-ad</i>
preach.MASD.-ADV.SG |
| | <i>er-s-a</i>
people-DAT.SG-EXT.V | <i>mas</i>
the.DAT.SG | <i>da</i>
and | <i>čam-eb-ad</i>
testify.INF-PL-ADV |

<i>rametu</i> since	<i>igi</i> (s)he.NOM.SG	<i>tavad-i</i> personally-NOM.SG	<i>ars</i> be.S3SG.PRES
<i>rčeuł-i</i> chosen-NOM.SG	<i>ğmrt-is-a-j</i> god-GEN.SG-EXT.V-NOM.SG	<i>msažul-i</i> judge-NOM.SG	
<i>cxovel-ta-j</i> living-GEN.PL-NOM.SG		<i>da</i> and	<i>mķudar-ta-j</i> dead-GEN.PL-NOM.SG

‘And he commanded us to preach to **the people** and to testify since **he personally** is the one chosen by God as judge of the living and the dead.’ (Acts 10.42, Sin.)

(3) shows not only the definite NP *ersa mas* ‘the people (DAT.SG)’ but also the use of the demonstrative pronoun *igi* as a 3rd person pronoun (together with *tavadi* as a subject reflexive) in *igi tavadi* ‘he himself (NOM.SG)’.

Articles mostly take the second position in the NP, which is simultaneously the last position if the NP consists only of a noun and an article. Boeder (1995: 155) formulated the following rule for NPs containing an article, a modifier and a head:

“Assuming a phrase-initial position of clitics in basic structure, a clitic movement rule is formulated, with *Y* representing the first non-clitic constituent and *X* a clitic dominated by the same phrasal node as *Y* and *Z*.”

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} [& X & - & Y & - & Z &] \\ & 1 & & 2 & & 3 & \end{array} \rightarrow 213$$

As an article, Old Georgian mostly uses the demonstrative pronoun *igi* (3rd-level deictic) but the other demonstratives appear in this function, too (though much less frequently than *igi*):

(4)	<i>šen</i> you.NOM.SG	<i>sarçqul-i</i> water pot-NOM.SG	<i>ara</i> NEG	<i>gakus</i> have.S2SG.PRES	<i>da</i> and
	<i>žurğmul-i</i> well-NOM.SG	<i>ese</i> the.NOM.SG	<i>ğrma</i> deep	<i>ars</i> be.S3SG.PRES	

‘You do not have a water pot and **the well** is deep.’ (Jo. 4.11, C)

(5)	<i>qırma-j</i> child-NOM.SG	<i>ege</i> the.NOM.SG	<i>ara</i> NEG	<i>momķudar</i> dead.ABS.SG
	<i>ars</i> be.S3SG.PRES	<i>aramed</i> but	<i>szinavs</i> sleep.S3SG.PRES	

‘**The child** is not dead but sleeping.’ (Mk. 5.39, C)

is-i appears only rarely in Old Georgian, as an equivalent of *ig-i*:

(6)	<i>vin</i> who.NOM.SG	<i>ars</i> be.S3SG.PRES	<i>ķac-i</i> man-NOM.SG	<i>is-i</i> the-NOM.SG
	<i>mimaval-i?</i> walking-NOM.SG			

‘Who is **the man** walking (there)?’ (Balavariani, 98, 32)

Within an NP in the nominative, if the head of the article is marked for plural, the article typically stays in the singular, which is another significant difference between demonstratives and articles:

- (7) *iqvnes* *kac-n-i* *igi* *qovel-n-i*
 be.S3PL.AOR man-PL-NOM the.NOM.SG all-PL-NOM
atormeṭ
 twelve.ABS.SG

‘The men were in all twelve.’ (Acts 19.7, Sin.)

- (8) *rametu* *iqvnes* *igi-n-i* *kac-n-i*
 because be.S3SG.AOR this-PL-NOM man-PL-NOM
didebul-n-i *da* *gansakwrvebel-n-i*
 majestic-PL-NOM and amazing-PL-NOM

‘Because **these men** were majestic and amazing.’ (*Martyrium Eustratii, Auxentii, Eugenii, Mardarii et Orestii*, 137, 6)

Nonetheless, a few examples with the head and article agreeing in the plural can be found (from the 10th century):

- (9) *da* *mepe-n-i* *igi-n-i* *mat-n-i* *romel-ta*
 and king-PL-NOM the-PL-NOM their-PL-NOM which-DAT.PL
uṗqries *kalak-i* *čuen-i*
 conquer.S3PL.O3SG.PRES city-NOM.SG our-NOM.SG

‘And their kings (*lit.* **the kings of theirs**), who conquered our city.’ (*Timothy of Antioch*, 364, 11)

The function of the “article” in Old Georgian still needs to be researched; whether it was as a simple article denoting definiteness or whether it always involved explicit deixis is not certain yet, nor is the issue concerning their use in generic expressions.

1.4.2 Possessives

The stems of the 1st person plural and 2nd person singular and plural possessive pronouns are based on the respective personal pronouns: *šen* ‘you (NOM.SG)’ vs. *šeni* ‘your (NOM.SG)’, *čuen* ‘we (NOM.SG)’ vs. *čueni* ‘our (NOM.SG)’, *tkuen* ‘you (NOM.SG)’ vs. *tkueni* ‘your (NOM.SG)’. The 1st person singular is an exception because it has different stems for the possessive and the personal pronoun: *me* ‘I (NOM.SG)’ vs. *čemi* ‘my (NOM.SG)’. The declension of the possessive pronouns in Old Georgian is illustrated in Table 3.

	1 st person SG.	2 nd person SG.	1 st person PL.	2 nd person PL.
NOM.	<i>me</i> ‘I’	<i>šen</i> ‘you’	<i>čuen</i> ‘we’	<i>tkuen</i> ‘you’
ABS.	<i>čem</i>	<i>šen</i>	<i>čuen</i>	<i>tkuen</i>
NOM.	<i>čem-i</i>	<i>šen-i</i>	<i>čuen-i</i>	<i>tkuen-i</i>

ERG.	<i>čem-man</i>	<i>šen-man</i>	<i>čuen-man</i>	<i>tkuen-man</i>
DAT.	<i>čem-s(a)</i>	<i>šen-s(a)</i>	<i>čuen-s(a)</i>	<i>tkuen-s(a)</i>
GEN.	<i>čem-is(a)</i>	<i>šen-is(a)</i>	<i>čuen-is(a)</i>	<i>tkuen-is(a)</i>
DIR.	<i>čem-isa</i>	<i>šen-isa</i>	<i>čuen-isa</i>	<i>tkuen-isa</i>
INST.	<i>čem-it(a)</i>	<i>šen-it(a)</i>	<i>čuen-it(a)</i>	<i>tkuen-it(a)</i>
ADV.	<i>čem-ad</i>	<i>šen-ad</i>	<i>čuen-ad</i>	<i>tkuen-ad</i>
VOC.	<i>čem-o</i>	<i>šen-o</i>	<i>čuen-o</i>	<i>tkuen-o</i>

Table 3

The stems of the 3rd person possessive pronouns are identical with the genitive case forms of the demonstratives, implying that they are also differentiated by a three-level deixis. Instead of the distal 3rd person possessive pronoun, a deictically neutral shorter stem was most frequently used, as shown in Table 4.

	3 rd person proximal	3 rd person medial	3 rd person distal	3 rd person neutral
ABS.	<i>amis</i>	<i>magis</i>	<i>imis</i>	<i>mis</i>
NOM.	<i>amis-i</i>	<i>magis-i</i>	<i>imis-i</i>	<i>mis-i</i>
ERG.	<i>amis-man</i>	<i>magis-man</i>	<i>imis-man</i>	<i>mis-man</i>
DAT.	<i>amis-s(a)</i>	<i>magis-s(a)</i>	<i>imis-s(a)</i>	<i>mis-s(a)</i>
GEN.	<i>amis-is(a)</i>	<i>magis-is(a)</i>	<i>imis-is(a)</i>	<i>mis-is(a)</i>
DIR.	<i>amis-isa</i>	<i>magis-isa</i>	<i>imis-isa</i>	<i>mis-isa</i>
INST.	<i>amis-it(a)</i>	<i>magis-it(a)</i>	<i>imis-it(a)</i>	<i>mis-it(a)</i>
ADV.	<i>amis-ad</i>	<i>magis-ad</i>	<i>imis-ad</i>	<i>mis-ad</i>
VOC.	<i>amis-o</i>	<i>magis-o</i>	<i>imis-o</i>	<i>mis-o</i>

Table 4

In the Old Georgian subcorpus of GNC, 1st-level *amisi*, 2nd-level *magisi* and 3rd-level (neutral) *misi* are attested primarily, while the 3rd-level *imis-i* occurs only 49 times:

- (10) *anu* *ara* *deda-s-a* *amis-s-a*
 or NEG mother-DAT.SG-EXT.V his-DAT.SG-EXT.V

 hrkwian *mariam?*
 be called.S3PL.ITER Mary

‘Or isn’t **his mother** called Mary?’ (Mt. 13.55, R)

- (11) *miecit* *bečed-i* *qel-s-a* *magis-s-a*
 give.S2PL.IMPV ring-NOM.SG hand-DAT.SG-EXT.V his-DAT.SG-EXT.V

‘Give a ring to **his hand**’ (Lk.15.22, C)

- (12) *da* *ze-man* *mis-man* *šeičqnara*
 and son-ERG.SG his-ERG.SG grant asylum.S3SG.O3SG.AOR
igi *sixarul-it-a* *did-it-a*
 he-NOM.SG joy-INST.SG-EXT.V big-INST.SG-EXT.V

‘And **his son** granted him asylum with great joy’ (Alexander Cypriensis, *Chronica*, 69, 16)

Old Georgian possessed no reflexive pronouns. However, reflexivity could be expressed by the noun *tavi* ‘head (NOM.SG)’ in combination with a possessive pronoun:

- (13) *roml-is-a-gan* *ar-ca* *tav-i* *čem-i*
 which-GEN.SG-EXT.V-from NEG-FOC head-NOM.SG my-NOM.SG
girs-mičnda *mislv-ad* *šen-da*
 deem worthy.S3SG.AOR come-INF.ADV.SG you-ADV.SG

‘Which (is why) I did not deem **myself** worthy for coming to you.’ (Lk. 7.7, C)

Besides the construction shown in (13), Old Georgian had a reflexive possessive pronoun *twsi* ‘own (NOM.SG)’ which was only used for 3rd persons and could appear in combination with *tavi* ‘head’:

- (14) *mčqems-man* *ketil-man* *tav-i* *tws-i*
 shepherd-ERG.SG good-ERG.SG head-NOM.SG his-NOM.SG
dadvis *sacxovar-ta* *tws-ta* *zeda*
 put.S3SG.ITER sheep-GEN.PL own-GEN.PL upper

‘The good shepherd lays down **himself** (*lit. his own head*) for **his (own) sheep**.’ (Jo. 10.11, C)

1.4.3 Indefinite pronouns

The indefinite pronouns of Old Georgian are based on the interrogative pronouns *vi-* ‘who’ (human) and *ra-* ‘what’ (non-human), which are declined as shown in Table 5.

NOM.	<i>vi-n</i>	<i>ra-j</i>
ERG.		<i>ra-man</i>
DAT.	<i>vi-s</i>	<i>ra-s</i>
GEN.	<i>vi-s-</i>	<i>ra-js(a)</i>
INST.	<i>(vi-t-)</i>	<i>ra-jt(a)</i>
ADV.	—	<i>ra-d</i>

Table 5

By suffixing a particle *-me*, these interrogative pronouns constitute indefinite pronouns as in (15) and (16):

- (15) *ḡac-i* *vinme* *iḡo* *Anania*
 man-NOM.SG someone.NOM.SG be.S3SG.AOR Anania
saxel-it
 name-INST.SG

‘(There) was **a certain man**, Anania by name’ (Acts 5.1, Sin.)

- (16) *nazaret-it* *šesazlebel* *arsa*
 Nazareth-INST.SG possible.ABS.SG be.S3SG.PRES
ḡetil-is-a *ra-ḡsa-me* *ḡop-ad?*
 kind-GEN.SG-EXT.V something-GEN.SG-*me* be-INF-ADV.SG

‘Is it possible for **anything** good to be from Nazareth?’ (Jo. 1.46, R)

As shown in (15) and (16), the particle *-me* is suffixed after the case markings pertaining to *vi-* and *ra-*.

1.4.4 Quantifiers

The numerals in Old Georgian are in general based on the vigesimal system, with 1–10 and 100 being exceptions as primitives that are not based on the vigesimal base structure. The remaining numerals are built upon 1–10, 20 and 100. In writing, the numerals are represented by the letters of the alphabet:

<i>Asomtavruli</i>	<i>Nusxuri</i>	<i>Mxedruli</i>	Transcription	Numerical value
Ⴀ	Ⴁ	Ⴂ	<i>a</i>	1 – <i>erti</i>
Ⴃ	Ⴄ	Ⴅ	<i>b</i>	2 – <i>ori</i>
Ⴆ	Ⴇ	Ⴈ	<i>g</i>	3 – <i>sami</i>
Ⴉ	Ⴊ	Ⴋ	<i>d</i>	4 – <i>otxi</i>
Ⴌ	Ⴍ	Ⴎ	<i>e</i>	5 – <i>xuti</i>
Ⴐ	Ⴑ	Ⴒ	<i>v</i>	6 – <i>ekusi</i>
Ⴔ	Ⴕ	Ⴖ	<i>z</i>	7 – <i>šwdi</i>
Ⴘ	Ⴙ	Ⴚ	<i>ē</i>	8 – <i>rvaj</i>
Ⴜ	Ⴝ	Ⴞ	<i>t</i>	9 – <i>cxraj</i>
Ⴟ	Ⴐ	Ⴑ	<i>i</i>	10 – <i>ati</i>
ႼႠ	ႰႡ	ႱႢ	<i>ia</i>	11 – <i>atertmeḡi</i>
ႼႣ	ႰႤ	ႱႥ	<i>ib</i>	12 – <i>atormeḡi</i>
ႼႦ	ႰႧ	ႱႨ	<i>ig</i>	13 – <i>atsameḡi</i>
ႼႩ	ႰႪ	ႱႫ	<i>id</i>	14 – <i>atotxmeḡi</i>
ႼႬ	ႰႭ	ႱႮ	<i>ie</i>	15 – <i>atxuḡmeḡi</i>
ႼႰ	ႰႱ	ႱႲ	<i>iv</i>	16 – <i>atekusmeḡi</i>