

**Maguli Ghambashidze**

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

## **The Modal Verb “khel-tsipheba” in Georgian Literary Language<sup>1</sup>**

In Old Georgian literary language, one of the expressions of different kinds of modal semantics was the analytical forms of the verbs.<sup>2</sup> On the one hand, Internal or acquired ability and knowledge (“Subject oriented” Dynamic modality) and opportunity, determined by situation (“Neutral” Dynamic modality), on the other hand, command, prohibition, permission, to have a right/not to have a right, dare (Deontic modality) were expressed by “khel-tsipheba” analytical form in Old and Middle Georgian literary language.

It is well known in the scientific literature that one form can express different modal semantics. For example, the modal verb “may” in the English language expresses both Deontic (permission) and Epistemic (assumption, probability) modal semantics. Also, the modal verb “can”, whose initial meaning is to express Dynamic modality (opportunity), in spoken English has gained the function to express Deontic modality as well (Palmer, 1999, 2001; Traugott, 2011). We have the same situation in the Georgian language, when the modal form “unda” (must) expresses Deontic and Epistemic modal semantics. Furthermore, except “khel-tsipheba” analytical form we have one more analytical Dynamic and Deontic modal “dzal-uts” and its analytical and synthetic variants in the Georgian language. Consequently, it appears that the Georgian language, as well as many other languages, is characterized by the expression of different modal semantics with one form. In the case of complex verbs it should be conditioned by the semantics of their constituent noun components.

The hand is the part of the human body with which he can perform various actions. By attaching the verb component “tsipheba” (“to grant, to get some skills” (Abuladze, 1973, p. 549)) to the noun “hand”, we obtain a compound verb with the following meaning: “Can, to have a

---

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation (SRNSF), 218000 “The Category of Modality in the Georgian Language”.

<sup>2</sup> About the analytical dynamic modals see M. Ghambashidze, The Analytical and Synthetic Verbal forms Expressing Dynamic Modality in Georgian Literary Language. The article is given for printing to Linguistic Issues, the edition of 2019.

## The Modal Verb “khel-tsipheba” in Georgian Literary Language

right, to dare” (Abuladze, 1973, p. 569). There are many idioms in the Georgian language related to the form “hand” (kheli chaiknia – “give up”, kheli moecara – “nothing succeeded”, khelshi chaigdo – “gained”, “seized”...), which demonstrate the special importance of this part of the body in human’s life. It seems that for Georgian speakers the hand is associated with both physical actions and mental processes. That is why, it was possible for the verb “khel-tsipheba” to express on the one hand internal or acquired ability and knowledge and opportunity, determined by situation, on the other hand, command, prohibition, permission, to have a right/not to have a right or dare...

The verb “khel-tsipheba” has not only interesting semantics, it has interesting form as well. “tsipheba” form uses both objective ( *“Amis kacisa patiji me ararai **khel-metsiphebis**”* (Old Geor. Hag. Texts I, 32:7, Titus) (I cannot torture this man)) and subjective forms (*Aramed veckhlisa mistvis, romel stku Gabaelis tana, vitar **khel-vitsipho** moghebad?* (S, 5:2, Titus) (How can I get the silver that Gabael has?)) for creating the analytical form.

We can rarely see the subjective forms of the verb “tsipheba” both in Old and Middle Georgian languages. The verb “khel-vitsiphe” contextually expresses Deontic modality and Dynamic modality, but only the “Neutral” type of Dynamic modality.

In the following examples, Deontic modal semantics of the lack of right is conveyed by the subjective form of the verb “khel-tsipheba”:

*“Raisa **khel-itsipha** chem zeda tsolman chemman esevitarisa sakme?”* (Old Geor. Hag. Texts I, 4:28, Titus) (How did my wife dare to do such a thing?).

*“Da cxad ars ese chuen shorisca, rametu aravin **khel-itsiphis** tvinier mghdelta kitkhvai tsignisai sakurtkhevelsa ufrois xolo dghesa kviriakesa”* (Min. Ap. texts, 26:3, Titus) (It is clear to us that no one except the priests has the right to read a book in the altar, especially on Sunday).

*Ver **khel-itsiphos** pirvelman man kmarman, romelman ganuteva igi mikcevad da mikvanebad misa colad shemdgomad sheginebisa misisa, rametu bilts ars tsinashe uflisa ghmrtisa* (S, 24 : 4, Titus) (The husband cannot divorce his wife first and then marry again because the woman is already ashamed of God).

On the other hand, we can see the subjective forms of the verb “khel-tsipheba” in the context of the possibility or impossibility of action by environmental conditions, in the contexts of "Neutral" Dynamic semantics:

*kholo Herodia hemtera mas da unda moklvai misi da ver **khels-itsiphebda**, rametu Herodes eshinoda iovanesa, rametu gulitad utskoda kaci igi martlad* (Mark. 6:19-20, C,

Titus) (And Herodias became his enemy and was about to kill him, but she could not because Herod was afraid of John, as he definitely knows that John was a clear man).

*“**khel-nu-itsiphosa** ghmertman ganmzadebad tablai udabnosa?”* (Com. On St. Mat. Gos. 3:30, Titus) (Will God be able to lay the table in the desert?).

The objective forms of “*khel-tsipheba*” were frequently used in Old and Middle Georgian languages in the contexts of Deontic and Dynamic modalities.

Deontic modal semantics is expressed in the following examples:

*“Amis katsisa patizhi me ararai **khel-metsiphebis**, artsa pkrobilebai, aramed tsarudzghuanoa ege Tphiliss kalaksa kartlisa marzapansa, rametu kovlisa katsisa kartlisa mas **khel-etsiphebis** sikudili da tskhorebai”* (Old Geor. Hag. Texts I, 4:28, Titus) (I cannot suffer this man even to arrest him, I will take him to the governor of Kartli because he has the right of all Georgians’ death and life).

*Kholo aravis **khel-etsiphebis** ubnobad da metkuelebad urtiertas trapezsa zeda* (Mon. of Georg. Law, III, 138:28, Titus) (No one has the right to talk to each other while eating).

Expressions of “Neutral” Dynamic modal semantics:

*Da merme sxuaman hrkua: “tsoli shevirte da mis gamo **ver khel-metsiphebis** moslvad”* (L. 14:20, CDEFGHIK, Titus) (I got married and that is why I cannot come).

*Ukuetu vinme ara ishues meored, **ver khel-etsiphebis** khilvad sasufeveli ghmrtsai* (Old Geor. Hag. Texts I, 178:23, Titus) (Unless someone is born second, they cannot see heaven).

The following is a “Subject-oriented” Dynamic modal semantics:

*“Vitar **khel-etsiphebis** shobad kacsა bersa?”* (J. 3:4, DEFGHIK, Titus) (How can an old person give birth to a child?).

*“Nu **khel-etsiphebis** brmasa brmisa tsina-dzghuanvad?”* (L. 6:39, CDEFGHIK, Titus) (How can the blind lead the blind?).

The empirical material shows, that both subjective and objective forms of the verb “*khel-tsipheba*” create infinitive construction when expresses different modal semantics. As a rule, we have preposition of subjective and objective forms of “*khel-tsipheba*” and infinitive in Adverbial or in Nominative cases, for example: “*Vergha ukue **khelvitsiphe** ganrinebad*” (G. Aval. Journ. 96:22, Titus) (I could not let him go); “*Vervis **Kheletsiphebis** monebai orta uphaltai*” (Old Geor. Hag. Texts I, 274:18, Titus) (No one can be slave of two gods). Sometimes we may see participles or personal pronouns instead of the infinitive as well.

The semantic equivalent of the verb “*khel-tsipheba*” in expressing Deontic and Dynamic modality in Old and Middle Georgian language is the analytical verb “*dzal-uts*”:

## The Modal Verb “*khel-tsipheba*” in Georgian Literary Language

*“Da chuen ver khel-guetsiphebis mitsemad mata tsoli asultagan chuenta”* (Judg., 21:18, OJS, Titus) (We cannot give to them our daughters as wives).

Comp.: *“Rametu chuen ver dzal-guits mitsemai mati tsoltai asultagan chuenta”* (Right there, G, Titus).

*“Vidre igi me mival, shen ver khel-getsiphebis moslvad ats, kholo merme momdevde me”* (J. 13:36, FG, Titus) (Until I go, you can't come, and then you will come back).

Comp.: *ver dzal-gits* (Right there, DEHIK, Titus).

Even in Old Georgian language the verb “*khel-tsipheba*” and its other analytical forms were used only with Deontic semantics – *khelmtsiphebai akus, khelmtsiphe ars...* Deontic semantic of these forms is caused because of their first components, nouns (*Khelmtsiphe* (King) - Chief, Government, Commander, Possessor; *Khelmtsiphoba* (Government) - Right, Ownership, Possession, Governance (Abuladze, 1973, p. 568)), which are directly related to the semantics of order, prohibition, permission, to have a right or not to have a right, for example:

*Hrkua mas Pilate... anu ara utskia, rametu khelmtsiphebai makus juar-tsumad shenda da khelmtsiphebai makus gantevebad shenda* (J. 19:10, DEFGHIK, Titus) (Pilate told him... Do not you know, that I have a right (might) to crucify you and I have a right (might) to let you go).

*Rametu khelmtsiphe ars dzei katsisai kuekanasa zeda mitevebad tsodvata matta* (M. 9:6, DEFGHIK, Titus) (Because man's son can forgive sins).

Generally, analytical formation from the X-XI centuries begins with the transition to the synthetic formation (Kavtaradze 1964, p. 162). It is interesting, that for the verb “*khel-tsipheba*” is not searched a synthetic form expressing both Deontic and Dynamic modal semantics, It is true, that in Middle Georgian texts there is synthetic verb “*khelmtsiphobs*” (*khel-etsiphebis>khelmtsiphe>khelmtsiphobs*), but this form did not gain the modal semantics, “*khelmtsiphobs*” means: He is the King, The Lord (KEGL, 1986, p. 578). Obviously, this verb implies possession and right, but we can't reckon the verb “*khelmtsiphobs*” as an equivalence of the synthetic verb “*sheudzlia*”, which was developed in Old Georgian language as a synonym of the analytical verb “*dzal-uts*” and in Modern Georgian is one of the main means of expressing Dynamic and Deontic modal semantics. In the Georgian language the functional synthetic equivalent of the verb “*khelmtsipheba*” was not formed. That is why in new and modern Georgian, it is rarely used to express Dynamic modal semantics:

*“Nakhevardatsvashic aranaklebi ephekturobit khelmtsipheba tamashi”* (Georg. Rep. GNC) (I can play with no less efficiency in midfield).

*Mati problemebis gadachra dzlier lidres ufro **kheletsipheba**, vidre demokratiul mtavrobas* (24 hours, GNC) (A stronger leader can solve their problems than a democratic government).

The complex form “Kheletsipheba” with deontic modal semantics does not exist in Modern Georgian.

Finally, in Old and Middle Georgian the analytical form “kheletsipheba” with subjective and objective forms was actively used to express Deontic and Dynamic modal semantics. The synthetic functional equivalent of the verb “kheletsipheba” has not formed in the Georgian language. “Kheletsipheba” is one example from the complex verbs that have survived in modern Georgian. In modern discourse, this form is sporadically used, though in the contexts of Dynamic modal semantics.

#### References:

- Abuladze, I. (1973). Dictionary of Old Georgian. Publishing House “Science”.
- Haan, F. de. (2004). Typological Approaches to Modality. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Imnaishvili, I., V. (1996). Verb in Old Georgian, I, Main, Frankfurt.
- Ghambashidze, M. (2017). Dynamic Modal “dzal-uts” in Old Literary Georgian Language. Linguistic issues.
- Ghambashidze, M. (2019 a). Dynamic modal “Shedzleba” and its connection to the Negative Particles in Georgian Script Language, Collection of scientific works. Kartvelian Linguistics. (V). TSU Publishing House.
- Ghambashidze, M. (2019 b). The Analytical and Synthetic Verbal forms Expressing Dynamic Modality in Georgian Literary Language, The article has been submitted for publication for the 2019 issue of Linguistics.
- Kavtaradze, I. (1964). From the History of Changing Analytical Forms with synthetic forms of the Verb in Georgian. Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics. (XIV).
- Palmer, F. R. (1999). Modality and the English Modals. Longman.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). Mood and modality. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Sharashenidze, N., Advadze, M., Ghambashidze, M. (2019) The Interaction of Modality and Negation in the Georgian

## **The Modal Verb “khel-tsipheba” in Georgian Literary Language**

Language. BULLETIN OF THE GEORGIAN NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. (vol. 13, no. 2).

**Traugott, E. C. (2011).** Modality from a historical perspective. *Language and Linguistics Compass*. (5/6).

**Wymann, A. Th. (1996).** *The Expression of Modality in Korean*, Bern.

### **Sources:**

24 hours – 24 hours;

C – Adishi Gospel;

Com. on St. Mat. Gos. – Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel;

DE – Georgian Gospel's Preathonian Redaction;

FG HIK – Georgian Gospel's Athonian Redaction;

G – Gelati BiBle;

G. Aval. Journ. – Giorgi Avalishvili's journey;

Georg. Rep. – Georgian Republic;

J – Jerusalem Bible Version;

Judg. – Judges;

O – Oshki Bible Version;

Old Geor. Hag. Texts I – Old Georgian Hagiographical Texts;

Min. Ap. texts – Minor Apocryphal texts;

Mon. of Georg. Law – Monuments of Georgian Law;

S – Mcxeta Bible.