



International Journal of  
**MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION**

**ISSN: (Print)** ISSN 1987-9601

**(Online)** E ISSN 1512-3146

**Journal homepage:** <https://multilingualeducation.openjournals.ge/>

---

## **The English Semantic Correlates of the Georgian Conditional Resultative Constructions**

**Maia Lomia**

*Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State*

*University, Georgia*

Email: [maia.lomia@tsu.ge](mailto:maia.lomia@tsu.ge)

**Nino Tchumburidze**

*Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State*

*University, Arn. Chikobava Institute  
of Linguistics, Georgia*

Email: [nino.chumburidze@tsu.ge](mailto:nino.chumburidze@tsu.ge)

To cite this article: Maia Lomia, Nino Chumburidze,  
The English Semantic Correlates of the Georgian Conditional  
Resultative Constructions:

International Journal of Multilingual Education, #25;

DOI:10.22333/ijme.2024.25000;pp. 54-60.

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.22333/ijme.2024.25007>

Maia Lomia,

*Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia*

Nino Tchumburidze

*Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University,*

*Arn. Chikobava Institute of Linguistics, Georgia*

## The English Semantic Correlates of the Georgian Conditional-Resultative Constructions <sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The mechanism of conditional-resultative construction is defined by the correspondence between the verb mood and the subordinating conjunction. The paper analyzes three types of hypotactic constructions in Georgian and their semantic correlates in English. The aim is to identify the similarities and differences between the two languages. The comparative theoretical analysis of the Georgian-English empirical material is of practical value as well: the research outcomes are interesting and useful for translator-linguists, language teachers and students.

**Keywords:** *Georgian, English, Hypotactic construction, Conditional-Resultative Constructions*

### Introduction

The Kartvelian (resp. South Caucasian) group embraces four languages, out of which Georgian is literary, whereas Megrelian, Laz and Svan are non-written languages. Megrelian, Laz and Svan languages are linguistically independent language systems, yet, from the viewpoint of their sociolinguistic function, they are considered as dialects.

One of the important means of formulation and transfer of information is the relation between condition and result. Such contexts are found in every language, although each language expresses them differently.

### 2. The structure of conditional-resultative construction

Conditional-resultative hypotactic constructions consist of two components – main and subordinate clauses; the condition is given in the subordinate clause, the predicate of which represents the action which serves as a precondition for the fulfillment of the second action. The condition is

<sup>1</sup> The research was carried out with financial support of Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG). Grant number FR-21-352 and was presented as a presentation on the Capelt23 conference, 1-2 September, Nevsehir, Turkey: <https://capelt.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Capelt-Abstract-Book-2023.pdf>.

followed by the result, which is given in the main clause and takes place if the corresponding condition is fulfilled (Shanidze, 1980, 208-209; Kvachadze, 1988, 390).

The structure of conditional-resultative construction is fixed: subordinate clause + main clause. The initial position of the subordinate clause is essential. However, in some rare cases, especially in the language of poetry, the order might be reversed: the main clause + the subordinate clause.

### **3. On the Understanding of the Semantics of the Conditional-Resultative Hypotactic Construction**

The conditional-resultative hypotactic construction has many peculiarities, including the semantic relation between the components which defines the entire semantics of the construction. On the material of the Georgian language, this issue has been discussed in several regards, namely, the conditional-resultative hypotactic construction has been evaluated based on the following:

1. The conditional sentences expressing real and unreal actions (Hewitt, 1987).
2. Evidentiality (Kurdadze et al 2018; Kurdadze et al 2019, 66-72; Margiani et al 2019, 194-202; 381-395).
3. The affirmative and negative condition-result (Shanidze, 1980, 209; Lomia & Chumburidze, 2018, 13-19; Kurdadze et al 2022, 258-263; 400-407).
  - The semantics of conditional clauses has been differentiated because they denote either real or unreal actions. Such semantic division is expressed by the conjunctions *rom* “that” and *tu* “if”: *tu* “if” forms a real conditional clause, whether, *rom* “that” forms an unreal one (Hewitt, 1987, 73).
  - Analysis of the conditional-resultative complex sentence from the viewpoint of evidentiality is justified because all the conditions are of epistemic modality, while the results are of diverse semantics. The semantic diversity is defined based on the logical relation between the condition and the result. This relation can be based on the speaker’s background knowledge or perceptive facts (Kurdadze et al, 2018; Kurdadze et al, 2019, 66-72; Margiani et al, 2019, 194-202; 381-395).
  - Akaki Shanidze was the first scholar who distinguished conditional and resultative mood in Georgian. He analyzed two contexts of different semantics:
    - a. When the condition is expressed by a verb in the negative and the result is positive, the final result (resp. The meaning of the entire sentence) is positive.
    - b. When the condition is expressed by the affirmative verb and the result is negative, the final result (resp. the semantics of the entire sentence) is negative (Shanidze, 1980, 209).

Further research of the issue has proved that the predicates of the conditional-resultative hypotactic constructions express condition and result within a single sentence based on a mutual relation. Similarly to the two above-mentioned cases, two additional contexts have been distinguished:

- c. When both the condition and the result are expressed by negative verb-forms, their conceptual relation yields a positive final result i.e. the semantics of the entire sentence is positive.
- d. If both the condition and the result are expressed by the verbs in the affirmative form, their conceptual relation yields a negative final result i.e. the semantics of the entire sentence is negative.

In-depth research has focused not only on the affirmative-negative forms of the components expressing the condition and the result, but also on their analysis based on the categories of tense and mood (Lomia&Chumburidze, 2018, 13-19; Kurdadze et al, 2022, 258-263; 400-407).

#### **4. The Means of Connection in the Conditional-Resultative Hypotactic Construction and the Issue of Correspondence with the Predicate**

The conditional clause is connected to the main clause by means of a subordinating conjunction. There are numerous such conjunctions in the literary Georgian language: *“if”*,

*tuk’i* “if”, *uk’uetu* “if”, *rom* “that”, *tu rom* “if”, *torem* “otherwise”, *rodesac* “when”, *oyond* “but”, *oyondki* “if only”. Out of these, the most widespread ones are **rom** “that” and **tu** “if”<sup>2</sup>.

In the conditional-resultative hypotactic construction, the conjunction *rom* “that” corresponds to the subjunctive mood, whereas the conjunction *tu* “if” corresponds to the indicative mood (Dzidzigiuri, 1973, 272)<sup>3</sup>. In some rare cases, the verb with the conjunction *tu* “if” may be found in the subjunctive mood (ibid: 272). On the early stage of development of the literary Georgian language, the conjunction *tu* “if” was more frequent in the conditional-resultative hypotactic construction than the conjunction *rom* “that”. This was due to the fact that the conjunction *tu* “if” also expressed the meaning of *rom* “that” (Kiziria, 1956, 154). Such alteration of the above-mentioned conjunctions has been also noted by Akaki Shanidze in his work dedicated to the language of George the Hagiorite<sup>4</sup> (Shanidze, 1946, 154).

<sup>2</sup> Other complex conjunctions with particles express not only condition and result, but also other semantic nuances. Therefore, we will not discuss them in this research.

<sup>3</sup> Later, this opinion was proved by G. Hewitt’s research (Hewitt, 1987, 73); see the arguments above.

<sup>4</sup> Here we mean the language of the work written by George the Hagiorite (“The Life of John and Euthymius”). George the Hagiorite, also known as George the Atonite, was a 11<sup>th</sup> century Georgian religious and public figure, writer, translator, promoter of the Georgian national culture, Hegumen of the Iviron Monastery on mount Athos in Greece; he is also buried

It is interesting to find out the semantic difference between the conditional sentences containing the conjunctions *rom* “that” and *tu* “if”. According to H. Vogt, the predicate with the conjunction *rom* “that” introduces a hypothetical proposition, whereas the verb in the indicative mood with the conjunction *tu* “if” expresses the condition necessary for achieving the result expressed in the main clause. The scholar also notes an interesting detail: when the conjunction *tu* “if” is followed by a verb in the subjunctive mood, the meaning of the subordinate clause is close to the subordinate clause with the conjunction *rom* “that” (Vogt, 1971, 209-210).

## 5. The Constructions under Analysis: Georgian-English Correlates

As was mentioned above, the mechanism of conditional-resultative construction is defined by the correspondence between the verb mood and the subordinating conjunction. The paper analyzes three types of hypotactic constructions in Georgian and their semantic correlates in English. The aim is to identify the similarities and differences between the two languages.

Geo	1. თუ (if). SBOR კარგი ამინდი იქნება. FUT.INDC, გარეთ ვითამაშებთ. FUT.INDC <u>tu(if). SBOR</u> kargi amindi <u>ikneba.FUT.INDC</u> , garet <u>vitamašebt. FUT.INDC</u>
Eng	(1a). <u>If. SBOR</u> the weather <u>is.PRS. INDIC</u> fine, we <u>will play. FUT.INDC</u> outside.
Geo	2. კარგი ამინდი რომ (that). SBOR იყოს. CONJ, გარეთ ვითამაშებდით. CONJ kargi amindi <u>rom (that). SBOR ix'os. CONJ</u> , garet <u>vitamašebdit.CONJ</u>
Eng	(2a). <u>If. SBOR</u> the weather <u>were. CONJ</u> fine, we <u>would play.CONJ</u> outside.
	3. კარგი ამინდი რომ (that). SUB ყოფილიყო. CONJ, გარეთ ვითამაშებდით. CONJ

Geo	kargi amindi <b>rom(that).SBORx'opilix'o. CONJ</b> , garet <b>vitamašebdit.CONJ</b>
Eng	(3a). <b>If. SBOR</b> the weather <b>had been. CONJ</b> fine, we <b>would have played. CONJ</b> outside.

(Golitsinsky & Golitsinskaya, 2006, 294-308)

## 6. Conclusions

In Georgian, the verb accompanying the conjunction *tu* “if” is given in the indicative mood (1); the verb accompanying the conjunction *rom* “that” is given in the subjunctive mood (2), (3). All the three types of the Georgian construction are represented in English with a conditional subordinate clause starting with the conjunction *tu* “if”. As for the mood, in English it is similar to Georgian in all the three types of conditional sentences. Mention should be made of the differences in the tense forms: in Georgian, the verb in the subordinate clause in Conditional (1) is given in the future tense, whereas in English, the verb in the identical clause is in the Present Tense (1a).

## 7. Practical Value and Perspectives

The comparative theoretical analysis of the Georgian-English empirical material is of practical value as well: the research outcomes are interesting and useful for translator-linguists, language teachers and students. It is important to enhance the research in this direction and carry out the structural-semantic analysis of conditional-resultative hypotactic constructions of different semantics in Georgian and English.

## References

- Dzidziguri Sh. (1973). Conjunctions in the Georgian Language. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Tbilisi University Press”.
- Goksadze L., Mamatsashvili N., Gigineishvili M. (2020). An Advanced Course in Current ENGLISH GRAMMAR. Volume I, Revised by Nana Mamatsashvili. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Tbilisi University Press”.
- Goksadze L., Mamatsashvili N., Bolkvadze S., Siria D. (2021). An Advanced Course in Current ENGLISH GRAMMAR. Volume II, Revised by Nana Mamatsashvili. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Tbilisi University Press”.
- Golitsinsky I. & Golitsinskaya N. (2006). The Grammar of the English language. A Book of Exercises for Students, New Revised Edition. “KAPO” Publishing House. Translated into Georgian by Marine Logua. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Sakartvelos Matsne”.
- Hewitt, Brian G. (1987). The Typology of Subordination in Georgian and Abkhaz. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1987. 288 pages. Published online by Cambridge University Press: 27 June 2016.
- Kiziria A. (1956). The Usage of Certain Conjunctions in New Georgian. Issues of Teaching Georgian Language and Literature at School. Book IX. Tbilisi.
- Kurdadze R., Lomia M., Margiani K. (2018). Condicional-Resultative Hypotactic Constructions from the Viewpoint of Evidentiality on the Empirical Material of the Kartvelian Languages. International Linguistics Conference: “Linguistics Beyond and Within 2018”, 18-19 October. Lublin, Poland. The program of the conference and the book of abstracts: <https://lingbaw2018.webclass.co/>
- It was also published in the international electronic Journal of Multilingual Education Research (JMER), #13, 2019, pp. 66-72: <http://www.multilingualeducation.-org/en/article/46>
- Included in the book: Margiani K., Kurdadze R., Lomia M.(2019).The Category of Evidentiality in the Kartvelian Languages, 528 pages. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Petiti”.
- Kvachadze L. (1988). Syntax of the Contemporary Georgian Language. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Ganatileba”.
- Lomia M. & Chumburidze N. (2018). Negation and Condicional-Resultative Hypotactic Constructions in the Kartvelian Languages: International Journal of Multilingual

Education Research (JMÉR), #12, pp. 13-19.

[http://www.multilinguaeducation.org/storage/uploads/articles\\_contents/Lomia-Chumburidze.pdf](http://www.multilinguaeducation.org/storage/uploads/articles_contents/Lomia-Chumburidze.pdf)

Included in the book: Kurdadze R., Lomia M., Margiani K., Tchumburidze N. (2022). *The Category of Negation in the Kartvelian Languages*, 560 pages. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Universali”.

Shanidze A. (1946). *The language of George the Hagiorite Based on “The Life of John and Euthymius”*. Old Georgian Texts 3, pp. 65-168. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Tbilisi University Press”.

Shanidze A. (1980). *The Basics of the Grammar of the Georgian Language*, collected works in 12 volumes, volume III. Tbilisi: Publishing House “Tbilisi University Press”.

Vogt H. (1971). *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. Oslo: Instituttet for sammenlignendekulturforskning – Serie B. LVII, 1971.

#### **Electronic Resource:**

<https://ka.wikipedia.org/wiki/>

#### **Abbreviations:**

FUT – Future

PRS – Present

INDC– Indicative

CONJ–Conjunctive

SBOR – Subordinate