

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

Faculty of Humanities

Department of Georgian Philology

With the right of manuscript

Expression of modality in Georgian discourse

Specialty - Linguistics

Nino Tsiklauri

Annotation of the dissertation

(submitted to obtain the degree of Doctor of Philology)

Scientific Supervisor: Professor M. Pagava

Batumi – 2021

Introduction

Scientific paradigms (comparative-historical, structuralism, anthropocentrism) change with the flow of time. Semantic perspective of issue analysis makes way for a pragmatic vision. Terms such as speech acts, functional-semantic field and concept are actively emerging.

Namely, as one of the challenges of modern linguistics can be named the art of discourse and the anthropocentric alternative to Frege's semiotic triangle, with sharply expressed aspects:

1. Intention goals;
2. Specific conditions of communication;
3. Interrelationship between communicators.

Existing data support Perkins' view that “modality research is very similar to moving around a crowded room when it is hard to move in such a way not to press anyone's foot.” (Perkins, 1983: 4)

Research object - In the doctoral dissertation we focused on modality - the linguistic universal, which expresses both the different attitudes of the speaker towards reality and the subjective perception of what is said.

The direct object of the research was: old, new and middle Georgian literary works, dialects, newspaper articles, live dialogues, analytical forms searched in the Georgian language corpus.

Research goal and objective - "Exceptions exist not at the level of the language system, but at the level of our knowledge, and it remains an exception until it finds its place in the system." (G. Gogolashvili, 2008: 6) Accordingly, we aimed to construct-systematize the functional-semantic possibilities of modality expression in Georgian discourse, pragmatic formation of verbal acts and analysis of theoretical material or postulates related to these topics.

The actuality of the topic - "Modality - this is the spirit of the sentence; As well as opinion and it arises as a result of the active operation of the speaking subject. Therefore, we cannot assign the meaning of a sentence to an expression if it does not contain any expression of modality at least." (Balli 1955: 44- 45)

Herewith, as we have already mentioned, the essential data of communication is permanently changed by implicit verbal acts; Anthropocentrism gives a central place to the communicator with the status of so-called "user"; The ways of recognizing intention become more difficult – which, on the one hand, requires the need to study discourse and, on the other hand, to activate pragmatic thinking in modern linguistics, - all this is synthesized by the actuality of the modality category.

The research methodology - Due to the complexity of the topic, for in-depth analysis of the issue, we used both traditional and contemporary research methods.

1. Based on the **(classical) -comparable-historical** method, we compared the linguistic situation of old, new and middle Georgian in relation to the research object, which, in turn, made it possible to contrast historical facts with the norms of literary language and dialect data.

2. Analysis of morphosyntactic aspects in the **functional-semantic** field helped us to find and construct specific signs or universals existing within the topic;

3. On the **synchronous-diachronic** axis, in chronological terms, we present the basic means of modal expression.

4. **Media monitoring** was found to be an effective indicator of the formation of stylistic markers during the study.

Scientific novelty - Modality as a functional-semantic category in Georgian has not been the subject of monographic research to date. There is a lot to be said, but little is said. It should be noted that the research paper is based on completely unexplored empirical material. The problem in unity is somewhat novel, thus linguistically interesting and dissertable.

We tried to present a unified picture of modality as a category; We think that we have added innovative aspects of the paper and identified new trends.

The theoretical value of the work is the discussion of current Georgian and foreign language scientific literature, here we add that based on theoretical considerations, the specific structure of the modality is revealed - taking into account the linguistic, pragmatic, semiotic aspects.

Practical significance: In addition to the fact that modality is manifested in different layers of the functional-semantic field (morphological, syntactic, lexical, etc.) in almost all languages, its universality is revealed in other ways as well, we have in mind the epistemic

nature of modality, which is the subject of interest of a number of disciplines or areas. To demonstrate it, here are some of them:

1. Translation Studies - The category of modality is an important and considerable prerequisite in the field of translation studies. It allows us to avoid the inconvenience caused by linguistic inaccuracies that accompany conceptual analysis of different languages.

2. Marketing - One of the essential factors of successful marketing is quality advertising, which, in turn, is directly proportional to the successful communication between the customer and the consumer.

3. Literary Studies - the content and sub-textual information in a fictional text is multifaceted and diverse. The sub-text is always new in the imagination directly compared to the presented one. Modality will help us to understand the in-depth layers of the text and to read the implicit information correctly.

4. Mass Media - In the language of the press, rhetorical sentences clearly outweigh the interrogative sentences. (!?) This means that the publicist style is less interested in the primary function of interrogative modality; This communicative type of sentence often has a secondary or expressive function and is more of a stylistic means of emotionally charged speech.

The structure of the work is determined by the goals and objectives set. It consists of introduction, three chapters divided into paragraphs and sub-paragraphs, and concluding provisions. Bibliography and appendices are attached to the paper.

The first chapter covers the postulation of modality as a linguistic universal and related concept, in which we discussed:

1. The social nature and concept of language as an operating of the mental process;
2. Modality is a linguistic universal: definitions, concepts, types;
3. Pragmatics - a component of modal formation;
4. Functional loading of discourse in linguistic thinking.

In **the second chapter** we talked about the modal modes of questions in Georgian discourse.

The third chapter deals with the functional-semantic means of modal expression according to the levels discussed within the field.

The concluding part of the paper summarizes the basic provisions of the study.

Chapter I. Modality and Postulate of Related Concepts

Language is a kind of intermediate link between the individual and the outside world, reflecting the material and spiritual culture of the nation. Language is characterized by a specific internal form, which is an expression of the national spirit. It appears as a form of primary conceptualization of the universe and rationalization of human experience; A repository of unconscious natural knowledge about the universe and historical memory **(Postovalova, 1999:30)**.

The human ability to understand other people is the basis of the communication process, to which all means of expressing and conveying the emotional state of communicators are subject. It is necessary to emphasize that in the process of socialization a person develops a habit of redistributing attention to the verbal and non-verbal aspects of a communicative act and subconsciously considering both, which are not comprehended when the addressee perceives the message. But in one way or another, they refer to the addressee's attitude towards the message and external reality **(Nikolaeva, Uspenski, 1966: 71)**.

Both lexical and syntactic-morphological paradigms change and evolve over time. Consequently, the study of any issue becomes even more considerable at an early stage of development. Especially if the dynamics are distinguished by the contrast of the production of structures.

Modality is a broad logical-semantic category that generally expresses the attitude of an expression towards reality.

“Modality research is very similar to moving around a crowded room when it is hard to move in such a way not to press anyone's foot.” **(Perkins, 1983: 4)** Perkins's point of view, the complexity and universality of the category is also reinforced with a cycle of numerous and heterogeneous views presented on the synchronous-diachronic axis.

The object of our research was originally touched upon by the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle in his famous work "Metaphysics", in which the author distinguished three main modal concepts: necessity, possibility and reality.

Some linguists consider modality to be a grammatical, in particular, syntactic category **(Budagov, 1958: 294; Palmer, 2001: 6)**, whereas most of them consider it as a semantic data. **(Kolshanskii 1961: 97; Zvereva, 1983: 18)**. One thing is clear - Modality, which is expressed in specific languages by grammatical, lexical, namely modal, intonation,

textual means, can be said to be one of the linguistic universals; nevertheless, different languages convey its aspectual characteristics in different ways, among which grammatical means play a sharply emphasized role (**M. Babukhadia 2010: 12**).

The category of modality in linguistics is the subject of extensive discussion, but it is not yet clearly defined. There are many definitions, however this category is mainly understood as a reference:

1. of the subject of the action to the action performed (expressed in modal verbs);
2. of the speaker to the content of the expression (expressed in modal words);
3. of the content of the expression to the reality in terms of reality-unreality (expressed in mood forms) ...

Part of the researchers consider the so-called general or **constitutional modality**, which is one of the categories of predicative and belongs to the obligatory grammatical meaning of the sentence.

If we consider the works created in different times and in different theoretical contexts, five points will be highlighted:

1) The first of them is presented from the broadest point of view. The visible confirmation of this is **F. Palmer's** extensive study, in which he notes that "modality is related to the status of the proposition that describes this or that event" (**Palmer, 2001: 1**).

2) Of course, there are some narrower and more concretized definitions as well. They include **I. Van der Auwera** and **V. Plungian's** explanation, according to which the notion of modality should be used in semantic fields that refer to possibility and necessity as paradigmatic variants.

3) In the third type we can combine the definitions that focus on subtypes of modality. For example: "Modality is a semantic category, it includes concepts such as possibility, probability, necessity, will, obligation and permission." In this case the semantic areas are really fully represented, but still no clear boundaries of modality are defined.

4) There are some papers in which there is not given any explanation at all; Instead, the focus shifts to empirical analysis of the meaning and use of modal linguistic units. We can use **Jennifer Coates'** work "Semantics of Modal Auxiliary Verbs" as an example (**1983**).

5) Finally, we consider worthy to mention such explanations, which place more

emphasis on the philosophical aspects of modality. For example, **F. Kiefer** says that modality is "the adaptation of the meanings of a sentence to possible worlds, in which we talk about the means by which people are able to perceive the world differently".

All categories of the language system are classified by certain markers. Linguists divide our research object into two groups: epistemic and deontic modalities.

Epistemic modality (Greek. Episteme 'knowledge') refers to what is possible or necessary based on what we know. **Deontic** (Greek: Deon 'duty') means that which is possible, necessary, permissible or obligatory according to the law or moral principles.

After discussing the general definitions and concepts, we consider it expedient to discuss the types of modality, which, in turn, are of two types according to the object of evaluation: **objective** and **subjective**.

The first of them (objective) is grammatically formulated in many languages and it is necessarily expressed in any expression, while the second (subjective) is optional. Such a separation stems from linguistic reality.

In the special literature, along with the two types mentioned above, internal modality is also distinguished. It represents the attitude of the grammatical subject (subordinate) towards the event, which in some languages (for example, English, German ...) is conveyed in the infinitive form of the verb. As for what kind of attitude we are talking about in this or that case, it is expressed in the primary meaning of the modal verb (**Kurakov 2000:65**).

It can be said that modality encompasses the whole vocabulary of the diverse and multifaceted means of classifying the expression actually existing in natural language;

- 1) modal words and particles;
- 2) a special lexical-grammatical class of words, as well as word combinations and sentences that are functionally close to them (in the composition of the sentence, these means usually take an autonomous position and play the role of the parenthesis);
- 3) words' order;
- 4) interjections;
- 5) special intonations to express surprise, doubt, steadfastness, distrust, protest, irony, and other emotionally-expressive aspects that typically show a subjective attitude toward what is being said;
- 6) compositional ways.

The modal function of expression - promise, request, informativeness, etc. is directly related to pragmatics - the study of the meaning, the context of the speaker, because he means more than what is said.

In the process of studying the pragmatic dimension, more and more attention was paid to the study of such phenomena as intention or intentionality.

Linguists' understanding of language and speech, interest in the semantic and pragmatic aspects of language functioning, and semiotic studies have shown that the study of the types of conjunctions in a single sentence was not sufficient to explain human interaction. The study therefore went beyond the scope of the sentence, namely, it transcended speech as a linked sequence of verbal acts expressed in different texts and which need to be analyzed in different aspects. These aspects can be pragmatic, semantic, referential, emotional-evaluative, and more. Linguists, in turn, have also addressed to discourse, which includes non-linguistic factors in addition to the text, such as the recipient's mood, purpose, views, self-esteem, evaluation of others, and so on. According to the dichotomy presented by F. Saussure, language is part of the speech act, a system of signs that express concepts, and speech is a manifestation of language. The contrast between language and speech is interpreted differently in different concepts: sometimes as code and message, sometimes as pragmatics and semantics, sometimes as norm and style, etc. (Omiadze 2006:20).

Chapter II. Interrogative modal modes in Georgian discourse

In Georgian grammatical literature, according to the modality or variety, there are five types of sentences. These are:

Narrative - provides us with any information about this or that fact in a positive or negative form.

Interrogative - which contains a question.

Imperative - expresses the fulfillment of the will of the speaker, the command.

Exclamation - conveys the feelings and emotions of the addressee.

Question-exclamation - includes feeling-emotion, surprise and question at the same time.

In the second chapter of the paper we will focus on the interrogative modality, which, on the one hand, paints a diverse picture of the Georgian written language and living speech, on the other hand, is a less studied problem, which further strengthens our interest and makes the issue relevant.

If the types of sentences contradict each other according to the modality, interrogative sentences differ in that they express a special form of thought - question. Their

communicative purpose is not to transmit information, but to influence the reception of information.

Question should be thought of as a definite communicative intention that has a specific purpose. It is manifested in interrogative speech acts, which are characterized by corresponding purposes.

One group of researchers believes that interrogative speech acts are based on interrogative sentences and they, in turn, oppose them to the interrogative expressions.

The means of expressing the interrogative sentence in Georgian are:

- interrogative words and particles;
- specific intonation.

Sometimes a narrative sentence is followed by a negative particle **‘not’**, or confirmation particle, by which the speaker demands confirmation of what has been said. Such a particle is represented as an independent unit, a word equals to a sentence and is highlighted with the sentence stress.

Georgian interrogative particles are: **‘a’**, **‘me’**, **‘ghana’** (indicating surprise), **‘nutu’** (really?), **‘khom’** (right), **‘tu’** (if).

In Old Georgian, the interrogative particle **‘a’** was often found in the questions, which turned the sentence into interrogative.

Particle **‘a’** was usually attached to the verb, regardless of where it was in the sentence: in the beginning, end or middle.

The interrogative particle **‘a’** is considered to be a common Georgian belonging. Functional and partly phonetic matches of **‘a’** are found in Megrelian-Chanuri and Svanuri.

It is probable that in ancient Georgian interrogative particle **‘a’** was highlighted with the sentence stress. We should have “Utskia’ Khutses?” (Priest, do you know?) and not “Utski’a Khutses?”.

Particle **‘a’** is also found in the writings of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, we find it sporadically in "Visramiani", "Amirandarejaniani", "Rusudaniani", "Georgian historical documents" or other Middle Georgian monuments; It is also confirmed by the authors of the nineteenth century.

The new literary Georgian does not use the interrogative particle ‘a’. However, it is still alive in some local accents of Georgian.

In **Pshauri**: “Ki itsia’ shalshavi?” (Do you know about bilberry?) (K.D. 127); “Daidzine, genatsvale, aba, fekhT ki daibadea?” (Sleep, my dear, were you born standing?) (K.D. 135).

In **Gudamakruli**: “Dedav agarc rit geshveleba, aras maswavlia?” (Mummy nothing can help you, rats.) (K.D. 97).

In **Mtiuluri**: “Ar dardobsa’ dedasheni? Gzada? (Doesn’t your mother worry? On the way?) (Chikobava, 55).

In **Tianeturi**: “Gatkhovili ara khara’?” (Aren’t you married?) (K.D. 147).

Muhajirs: “Inatiani khara’?” (Are you Stubborn?)

Shavshuri: “Inegols shigan khara’?” (Are you in Inogal?); “Isa aria’?” (Is it?); “Ikevrobas tsnobilofsa’?” (Is it known there?) (Futkaradze. 11).

Klarjuli: “Tanze rasa vitsvamta’?” (What are we wearing?); “Mea’ tu?” (Do you mean me?); “Dges kortsili aria’?” (Is wedding today?); “Sagamos vtchama’a?” (Should we eat in the evening?) ((Futkaradze. 18-19).

Taouri: “Shen khara’? mea’?” (Is it you? Me?) (Kvabagi); “Ama vimgerrmea’ tu?” (Will I sing this?) (Right there).

As for the sentence stress on the particle ‘a’, in this regard, one group of scientists thinks that the stress should have been not on the particle ‘a’, but on the preceding vowel, i.e. on the second syllable from the end. Particle ‘a’ left without stress got weakened and then totally lost by the influence of a stressed preceding vowel.

In Old Georgian, the particle “**me**” also expressed the question. There is a diversity of opinion in the special literature about the genesis of particle “**me**”.

Most linguists in Old Georgian consider the use of the interrogative particle “**me**” as a sporadic phenomenon.

Particle “**me**” is often seen with particle ‘a’.

For instance: “Povos**mea**’ sartsmunovebai, queyanasa zeda?” (Could he gain faith in this world?) (L. 18,8);

“Aramea’ orive jurgmulsan shtatsvn? (Did they both fall in a deep pit?) (L. 6,39 C).

Sometimes particle “**me**” is inserted in a verb as a result of tmesis, while particle ‘a’ is kept in its place.

“Mi-**me**-vin-utkhrobdesa samarebsa shina tsyalobasa shensa?” (Shall anyone in the sepulchre declare thy mercy?) (Psalm 87,12).

Often interrogative particles ‘**a**’ and ‘**me**’ are found with different words in a sentence.

For instance: “Arame pirvelad dajdesa da agirackhos?” (For which one of you does not first sit down and calculate the cost?) (L. 14,28 C);

“Arameupkrasa da agmoitkuas igi?” (Will you not take hold of it and lift it out?) (M. 12,11);

The interrogative particle “**me**” is often attached to interrogative pronouns;

For instance: “Viukhvi da davshurebi da rame vko?” “(Weary I intreat; and what have I done?) (Job 17,2);

“Radme, ufalo, ganishireb sursa chemsa?” (Lord, why castest thou off my prayer: why turnest thou away thy face from me?) (Psalm 87,15);

“Nu zrunavt, vitarme anu rasme ityodit?” (Do not worry about what to say or how to say it) (M. 10,19).

On the one hand, we believe that the purpose of the particle “**me**” in Old Georgian was unconditionally to express a question, although in the surviving forms it is already sporadically represented and its original function begins to fluctuate even in Old Georgian, as a result of which the particle “**me**” can no longer function independently and is used together with the particle “**a**”, it is finally removed from the interrogative at the initial stage of Georgian, when the transition to a new system of expression of the future tense and the conjugation of conjunctions begins. Particle “**me**” gives its place to particle “**mtsa**”, (which we think we got with “**me**” + “**tsa**” construction) and undergoes functional-semantic alteration. In Middle Georgian, even the particle “**mtsa**” is slowly disappearing, it is first used in conjunction with verb forms and violates the main regularity of its use, and then gives its place to the optative particle “**netav**” (if only). Finally, in the diachronic section, we get the following picture of the interrelationship of particles “**me**”, “**mtsa**” and “**netav**”: **me** > **mtsa** > **netav** – where along with their formal difference, their function also changes over time.

If in Old Georgian scholars talk only about particles ‘**a**’ and ‘**me**’ while expressing a question on the basis of relevant empirical material and among them they doubt about particle “**me**” to be interrogative, we see a different picture in the later period of the development of literary Georgian and in the syntactic constructions of living speech.

The area of the reading particles expands. Particles “**gana**”, “**khom**”, “**tu**” and “**nutu**” with different semantics combine the function of expressing question as well.

Consider each of them.

Particle “**gana**” is not used in Old Georgian. It is formed as a particle in Middle Georgian and expresses the same as “**Aki, khom?**” (right?).

Gana=but: “Gvnakhes katsTa mat, romelni jashushad idgnen, **gana** ar gagvamJgavnes da sitsilit ertmanetsa eubnebodnen...” (The men who were standing as spies, noticed us, but they did not reveal us and told each other with a laugh ...) (Rusud. 432).

Gana=but rather: “Mtsire kmas velad siaruli dauskia, ara nadirta srolisa khalisita, **gana** metis javrisagan tavgametebisatvin” (The little slave began to walk in the field, not with the joy of hunting shooting, but rather to self-sacrifice because of much sorrow) (Rusud. 589).

In modern Georgian, the particle “gana” has many meanings:

Question: “**Gana** agora khar, magram khalkhi, dagivitskebs **gana** odes?” (You are not alive any more, but will people ever forget about you?) (L. Asat. 29).

Surprise: “(nutu) **gana** chvenshi tavadi, aznauri, ise miukarebelia glekhisatvis rogorts skhvagan?” (Is the prince or the nobleman at our place really as unapproachable for the peasant as elsewhere?) (Ilia, VI, 56).

Gana=I wonder why: “**Gana** sitsotskhle rad minda? Igi ar migirs chalada” (I wonder why do I want life? It is totally worthless) (Vajha, II,7).

Gana=right: “Giorgim da mtsariam moitanes **gana?** ikitkha khalkhma” (Giorgi and Mtsaria brought it, didn’t they? asked the people) (Vajha, V, 141).

Gana=isn’t it?: “Hoi tkve rjuldzaglebo, aka khart **gana?**” (Hey you bastards, you are here, isn’t it?) (Vajha, VII, 304).

Gana=I wonder: “Chvenistana bednieri, **gana** aris sadme eri?” (I wonder is there a happy nation like ours anywhere?) (Ilia, I, 83).

As it turns out from approved examples, “**gana**” has different meanings in different contexts, but its main function is still to express question-surprise and since the question expressed with the particle “**gana**” is always accompanied by a nuance of astonishment, it is considered expedient to call it a “question-surprise particle, and to put a question-exclamation mark (!?) at the end of the interrogative sentence with particle “**gana**”, because single question mark cannot grasp the meaning of the construction with particle “**gana**”.

The interrogative particle “khom” is derived from “hom // ho” (Shanidze, 1980.: 6-9). Both “Hum (// Hom)” and “Khum (// Khom)” forms are confirmed in the Kobuleti sub-dialect of the Adjara dialect.

“**Hum** movida? **Hum** gaaketa? **Khum** gindoda” (He came, didn’t he? He did it, didn’t he? You wanted, didn’t you?) and some similar forms.

In Upper Adjara we can find **“khosh”** (<khom): “ikvire da ikav, zorit **khosh** ver aartum?” (Shout and stay like this, you cannot take it by force, can you?).

It should be noted that “khosh” is used only in negative constructions.

In modern Georgian, **“ho”** (>kho) is not usually used with the interrogative function, if we do not take into account the language of some writers. There is another situation in dialects, where ho / kho particle forms are quite common.

Kartluri: “Katso, najakhi **kho** ar gipovniao?” (Man, did you find the ax?) (K.D. 303); “Khelmtsifestan sakme mak da mamasheni kho ar tsamkveba?” (I am dealing with a sovereign, and can your father accompany me?) (K.D. 299).

Ivriskheuli: “E gogo kiota (=khom) stsavlobs?” (This girl is studying, isn’t she?) (K.D. 147).

Mtiuluri: “Tetri betsvi khom ar ginakhavto?” (Have you seen white fur?) (K.D. 76).

Garekakhuri: “Aket kaks kho aravis gauvliao?” (Has anyone passed here?) (K.D. 207).

Thus, **“khom”** particle constructions are often double modality carriers. On the one hand, they express their main function, question, and on the other hand, the semantic nuances of the exclamation sentence.

The question is also expressed by the particle **“nutu”**. It is a confirmation-questioning particle in Old Georgian (**Babunashvili, 1953.: 126**).

In Middle Georgian “nutu” is used with two meanings.

Nutu=Maybe: “Nutu gmertma dagitsvas, shentsa mogtses jhami siketisa da takhti mamapapata shentao” (Maybe God will protect you, give you a time of goodness and the throne of your fathers) (Rusud. 7-9).

Nutu=expresses question: “Agre mitkhra, vina khar, dzmao, anu rad stskrebi, nutu ubadota katsta gawyines rameo?” (Then he said to me, "Who are you, brother? Why are you angry? Did wicked men offend you?) (Rusud. 23-24).

In Modern Georgian **“nutu”** is an interrogative particle. It is defined in the "Dictionary of Georgian Language" as it follows:” Nutu” is an interrogative particle that is accompanied by a hint of surprise – **“gana”**, **“mash”** (really? Surely?). For example: “Nutu am sityvas tkvenshi lilikhana tsaukhda?” (Did your word fade?) (Ilia, 146) (Kegl. 374).

The question is also expressed by particle “tu” (if), which belongs to Modern Georgian.

“Tu” is a particle which is originally a grouping conjunction that connects two members of a sentence, or two sentences. It is formed as a conjunction in Middle Georgian and acquires the content of question. In the form of a rudiment it is observed in the "Panther-

skinned". Initially, this function is mastered by the particle "tu" in spoken language, from which it is transferred to the written language.

The main means of expressing interrogative modality in Georgian are descriptive constructions or interrogative words. It requires an answer to a question word that can be conveyed briefly (often in one word).

Interrogative words are: interrogative and interrogative-possessive pronouns: Who? What? Which one? Where from? Of what time? How many/much? Whose? Of what? and interrogative adverbs: Where? When? How? Why? For what? How many times?... They are also members of the sentence and convey a subject, object, adjective or adverb.

In all three stages and dialectal forms of Georgian literary language in terms of productivity, "ra" (what) pronoun was revealed as the leading one to produce a question, it is most often found in nominative and adverbial cases, used both in the prepositional form and without preposition.

"Ra" pronoun gives us a diverse picture not only in the language of literary monuments, but also in dialectal forms.

"Shen gushin simtvraleze ras ambobdi?" (What did you say about drunkenness yesterday?) (K/Rachuli. 506).

"Kve ra gikavie amkhanagisav?" (What came to you friend?) (Khevsuruli.18).

"Ras chastsker mitsasao?" (What do you look for in a land?) (Mtiuluri. 70).

"Razed mamikles kmari?" (Why did they kill my husband?) (Javakhuri. 242).

"Is lashkari raze etsemoda tavzedi?" (What did that army attack?) (Gudamakruli. 87).

Sometimes a single-question sentence includes two interrogative words:

"Ra ambaviao shensa tavs, fitsarze ratom khar gakruli?" (What happened to you, why are you stuck on the plank?) (Mtiuluri. 67).

"Ra ambavi shes tavs, risgan khar mokluli?" (What happened to you, what killed you?) (Gudamakruli. 96).

In addition to the interrogative pronoun "ra", who, what, why, where, when and other interrogative words are also confirmed, however, their function and intensity of consumption on the diachronic axis are different.

Khevsuruli: "Vin tsina nigvzians ormochia?" (Who is in the pit in Front Nigvziani?) (p.24).

Mtiuluri: "Es vin tiriso, es beberio?" (Who cries, this old man?) (p. 76).

Imeruli: "Tkven vina khart ...?" (Who are you?) (p. 298).

Rusudaniani: “Vin khar utskho garibi?” (Who are you stranger poor?) (p. 156);
“Chemta gazrdilta vin atsnobebda?” (Who would inform my grown-ups?) (p. 24).

Here we will focus on the syntactic constructions with the synonymous question sought in this monument, in order to enhance the emotional background of which the whole interrogative sentence is repeated.

To illustrate, here are some examples:

“Rad iden tsremlda mtsareta anu rad moiklav tavsas?” (Why are you so bitter of tears or why do you kill yourself?) (Rusud. 165).

“Ats ra vkhat anu ras mravals vityodet?” (What can we do or what can we say further?) (Rusud. 154).

“Rad mizam da anu rad moiklav tavsao, anu shenita sevdita me rad momklao?” (Why do you do it to me and why do you kill yourself, or why do you kill me with your sorrow?) (Rusud. 190).

“Vin damibnela nateli mze da vin tsamartva tsiskari brtskinvale?” (Who darkened the bright sun, and who took the shining dawn away?) (Rusud. 198).

“Vis vkitkho anu visita gavago?” (Who should I ask or with whom should I understand?) (Rusud. 178).

Observing the analytical forms, we can conclude that the interrogative word usually starts a sentence, while in the second place there is its pair of pieces. Verb-related interrogative words –subject-object adapted pronouns and adverbial modifier conveyed by the interrogative adverb- are immediately followed by a predicate, and the question pronouns that are related to the noun in the sentence and therefore have the function of a definitive, - a modified member. The function of question words and the intensity of consumption are different on the diachronic axis. They fill in the cases with the flow of time and the language also prefers the modality of descriptive question.

Organic production of interrogative sentences are syntactic constructions created without interrogative words and particles, where the expression of the question is intonation’s responsibility.

In order to convey an organic interrogative sentence, especially in dialects, it is not uncommon to confirm interrogative constructions of affirmative content, we mean with negative particles.

Khevsuruli: “Ar dagidzinav?” (Didn't you sleep?) (24).

Mokheuri: “Iman araferi giamba?” (Didn't he tell you anything?) (27).

Gudamakruli: “Chemo dedi, araferi tsamali ar itsi ra amisio?” (Mummy, don't you know any medicine for this?) (100).

Mtiuluri: “Shents unda dalivo, agar daishli?” (You too have to drink; won't you break up anymore?) (54).

The organic production of interrogative modality expression on the whole diachronic axis was productive in Georgian literary monuments or in oral speech. The expression of question is and was done through intonation. The choice is diverse: along with the interrogative stress, language uses the logical stress, negative particles, and word order (rarely), the intonation is also, accordingly, ascending or ascending-descending. The interrogative stress, regardless of its position, is almost always connected to the last syllable of the predicate.

Given the wide variety of possibilities for producing an interrogative modality, we have also focused on the publicist style in our paper. It must be said that rhetorical sentences clearly outweigh namely the interrogative sentences. This means that the publicist style is less interested in the primary function of the interrogative sentence, this communicative type of sentence often has a secondary or expressive function and is more of a stylistic means of emotionally charged speech.

As a result of the analysis of the interrogative modality in Georgian discourse, a typological group of questions observed in the indirect speech acts was revealed:

1. Question – **Proof** – “Vis ar ukvars lamazi kali?!” (Who does not love a beautiful woman ?!)
2. Question - **Assumption** - “Neta dges itsvimebs?” (Is it raining today?)
3. Question – **Denial** – “Martalia ara?” (Isn't that right?)
4. Question – **Command** – “Ar tsavedit, katso?” (Aren't we going, man?)
5. Question – **Promise** – “Khval kinoshi tsavidet?” (Shall we go to the cinema tomorrow?)
6. Question – **Educational** – “Es fanjaraa?” (Is this a window?)
7. Question – **Etiquette** – “Rogor khar?” (How are you?)
8. Question – **Emotion** – “Daifitse, martla?” (Swear, really?)
9. Question – **Request** – “Shegidzlia gaago fanjara?” (Can you open the window?)

The present material once again indicates that the analysis of modality in the linguistic context, in the analysis of verbal acts or discourse in general, is the universal manifestation of the objective reflection of reality and the mechanism of successful communication, the main goal of communications.

Chapter III. Functional-semantic means of modality expression

At first glance, conceptual analysis is like semantic analysis, but the purpose of semantic analysis is to explain the word, while conceptual analysis is to present the peculiarities of existing knowledge about the world. It should also be noted that semantic analysis is aimed at exploring the semantic structure of a word, clarifying the denotative, significant and connotative meanings of a word; Conceptual analysis, in turn, involves the search for those concepts which unite around an integral sign and define the existence of that sign as a cognitive structure. In conclusion, it can be said that the concept is a multidimensional idealized formation that includes linguistic, cultural, mental and cognitive elements. (T.Sharashenidze, 2018;4)

Modality plays an important role in language, as it reveals a constant relationship between expression and its semantics. In a broad sense, a sentence is completely emptied of modal content if there is no discourse. There is always a certain attitude towards the content expressed in the sentence - cognitive, emotional or rational. The speaker always reveals this attitude, but the means of its expression are different. Attitudes towards expression can be expressed through verb mood and modal elements, focus, word order, intonation, and gestures. Linguistic forms that reveal a certain modal semantics in all contexts are considered to be the main means of expressing modality as a semantic category. Thus, linguistic forms, i.e. modal verbs and elements, are considered to be the main means of expressing modality.

In terms of the attitude towards the action expressed by the verb, three moods are distinguished in Georgian: direct, real - narrative and indirect, unreal – subjunctive and imperative. In terms of modality expression, the main load falls on the indirect moods, especially on subjunctive one. (Zambakhidze.E. Zambakhidze. M. 2012)

“Verb mood forms are the main morphological means of expressing sentence modality. So, for example, the form of **the narrative mood**, when it is used in its direct or basic meaning, expresses 28 actions as a fact that takes place at one of the times. **The subjunctive mood form** presents the action not as a fact, but as desirable or possible; The form of **the command mood** conveys the will of the speaker, which must be fulfilled ” (Kvachadze 1988: 31).

If we consider modality as a grammatical category, obviously it must have some kind of marking. With this approach, subjunctive mood markers (i.e. row markers with subjunctive mood) may be considered as morphological markers of modality in Georgian. It is well

known that row markers are actually time-mood markers, and in fact, to date we do not have an exact unambiguous morphological definition - what markers they are of time, moods or row. (We testify it according to T. Makharoblidze.)

The first type of construction:

Modal Construction	Modal Verb Tense	Verb Tense	Semantics
Epistemic “Vitsi aketebs/aketeabda” (I know he is doing/was doing)	Present	Present imperfect	Knowledge / certainty about the process but unknown outcome
Epistemic “Vitsi gaaketeabda” (I know he would do)	Present	Future subjunctive	Knowledge / certainty about the result
Epistemic “Vitsodi aketeabda” (I knew he was doing)	Past	Imperfect	Knowledge / certainty about the process but unknown outcome
Epistemic “Vitsodi aketeabda” (I knew he would)	Past	Future subjunctive	Knowledge / certainty about the result
Deontic “Minda (ga) vaketo” (I want to do)	Present	Optative	Desire to have the process (result - by preverb)
Deontic “Minda vaketeabda” (I wish I was doing)	Present	Present subjunctive	Desire to have the process
Deontic “Mindoda (ga)meketeabina” (I wanted to do)	Past	Second conditional	Desire to have the process (result - by preverb)

The second type of construction:

Modal Construction	Modal Verb Tense	Verb Tense	Semantics
Deontic “Unda (ga)vaketo” (I must do)	must	Optative	Future Need / Obligation (prepositional forms imply the result)
Deontic “Unda vaketebde” (I must be doing)	must	Present subjunctive	Need/Obligation to have the process
Deontic “Unda (ga)meketebina” (I must have been doing)	must	Second conditional	Need/Obligation to have the process (prepositional forms imply the result)

The third type of construction:

Modal Construction	Modal Verb Tense	Verb Tense	Semantics
Epistemic-deontic “Vitsi (rom) unda (ga)vaketo” (I know (that) I must do)	vitsi” (I know) (Present) must	Optative	Knowledge / confidence in the need for the process (prepositional forms imply result)
Epistemic-deontic “Vitsi (rom) unda vaketebde” (I know (that) I must be doing)	“vitsi” (I know) (Present) must	Present subjunctive	Knowledge / confidence in the need for the process
Epistemic-deontic “Vitsodi (rom) unda	“vitsodi” (I knew) (Past) had to	Second conditional	Knowledge / confidence in the need for the process prepositional forms imply

(ga)meketebina” (I knew (that) I had to do)			result)
---	--	--	---------

Modal words often appear to be a parenthesis. A parenthetic word and connection of the words vary according to meaning. In terms of modality expression, it is divided into two categories:

1. A parenthesis expresses that the speaker is confident in the certainty of what is being said: “**ashkaraa**” (it is obvious), “**tskhadia**” (definitely), “**rasakvirvelia**” (of course), “**martlats**” (indeed), “**udavoa**” (unquestionable), and so on. “Kazarma, ra tkma unda, enaneboda, magram vigatsis nasakhlarshi mofusfuse, ufro da ufro rtsmundeboda, rom vajhkatsoba tavis gamochena da sikvdili ki araa, aramed – gadarchena, radats ar unda dagijdes igi.” (He felt sorry for the barracks, of course, but in someone's settlement, he became more and more convinced that courage was not to show yourself up or even death, but - rescuing, no matter how much it cost you.) (**Chiladze 1981: 82**)

2. A parenthesis expresses the speaker's assumption, considering the opinion expressed in the sentence as uncertain or doubtful: “**ikneb**” (maybe), “**mgonia**” (it seems to me), “**shesadzlebelia**” (it is possible), “**albat**” (perhaps), “**rogorts etkoboda**” (as it seemed), “**titkos vimedovneb**” (as if I hope), and so on.

The main markers of the modality system in the Georgian language are the verbs indicating **desire** and the **ability**. It should be noted that they also have an independent verb function in Georgian. They are usually conjugated and have the form of all three persons in the singular and the plural. As for the modal element, it is the third person singular form of the verb **desire** – “**unda**” (want) which invariably attaches to the verb paradigm. Here we add that the construction expresses several modal semantics.

“**Unda**” - varies with the function of the independent verb according to the person and the number;

“**Unda**” - with the function of the modal verb it does not change according to person and number.

“Me minda gavaketo” (I want to do)	“Shen ginda gaaketo” (You want to do)	“Mas unda gaaketos” (He/She wants to do)
------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--

“Me unda gavaketo” (I must do)	“Shen unda gaaketo” (You must do)	“Man unda gaaketos” (He/she must do)
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

The modal system in the Georgian language forms a different semantic group by activating the modal elements that are attached to the verb and give it a modal semantics. These are: “**egeb**” (perhaps), “**ikneb**” (maybe), “**lamis**” (nearly), “**titkos**” (as if), “**titkmis**” (almost), “**kinagam**” (just about), “**maints**” (still/at least).

In order to analyze the given issue, we searched for the relevant empirical material in the Georgian language corpus system and based on the examples, we tried to structure the issue in the functional-semantic field.

In modern Georgian “**ikneb**” is found for two purposes: modal verb and itself verb meanings. Observation of the analytical forms, showed that with a modal function it semantically expresses **desire** and **probability**.

	“ ikneb Should ”	chemi dila mudam mzis chasvla iyos?” my morning always be sunset?
	“ ikneb Maybe ”	gimili es ketilshobilebaa adamianis?” smile is nobility of a human?

The modal particle “**egeba**” (perhaps) expressed the **assumption** and **probability** in the 155 sentences we discussed. In Old Georgian it was represented as “**egebis**”. It was often used with the meaning – ability. (Abuladze 1973: 29).

	“ Egeba (Perhaps	martladats es kali mamamisis bedi ikos?!” it's really up to this woman to be her father's fate.)
“Akhlave tsadi da gaudeg ukan, (Go right now and follow	egeba perhaps	moakhelo sadme.” you will get him somewhere.)

It should be noted that 10667 forms of the modal word “**maints**” (still/at least) were observed and we applied it to a semantic group of beliefs and decisions.

“Pirvel khanebshi (For the first time,	maints at least	, sanam dro im iarliks ar moadzvelebs” until time does not make that label obsolete)
“Am leksebit gmiris fikrebi With these poems, the thoughts of the hero	maints still	kals dastrialebs tavs.” are about the woman.)

“**Titkos**” (< “**tu itkvas**”) (**Ak. Shanidze**) from 6407 analytical forms, in the constructions we have discussed, the word - “**titkos**” (as if) expressed **evaluation-imagination**.

“Akhla kvela ise damtskeris, (Now all so dazzling,	titkos as if	chashi itskirebian da ragatc sastsauls khedaven.” they’re looking into the well and see a miracle.)
“Stsored akhla iseti grdznoba gamichnda, (Right now I feel	titkos as if	uzarmazari sitsotskhle – lodi mergo me.” I got a huge life – a large rock.)

In Old Georgian “**lamis**” was used as an independent verb and expressed desire and wish. Today it is already in the form of a modal element and It gives the content of **evaluation** and **approximation** to what is being said.

“Ki dagamebula dqa eseni akhlave mosulan, (It’s already night and they came now,	lamis nearly	kokhebshiats shemogvitsivdnen.” bursting in our huts.”
“Akhal epokashi igi (In the new era it	lamis nearly	araseriozul “teoriad” iktsa.” became a non-serious "theory".

The modal element “**titkmis**” (almost) in the constructs we have discussed – expressed approximation.

	“Titkmis (Almost	kvelas itsnobda Chichia.” everyone was familiar to Chichia.)
--	--------------------------------	---

“Tumtsa mis leksebshi (However in his poems	titkmis almost	ara chans kvali adamianis sulis mgrgneli.” there is no trace of a rodent in the human soul.)
--	-------------------------------------	---

Approximation, evaluation is expressed by the word - "**kinagam**", in terms of content it is very close to the modal elements “lamis” and “titkmis”; However, nuancedly it is still different from them.

“Utseb ise moenatra, rom (Suddenly he missed her so much that he	kinagam almost	atirda, misi suli.” cried his soul.)
—	“Kinagam (Almost	daikvira Kobam, - ar tsakhvide!” cried Koba, - do not go!

The modal adverb "**albat**" (probably) expresses probability in syntactic constructions.

– “Akedan, (- From here,	albat probably	, mochans “Kongo”, ara?” "Congo" is visible, right?)
– “Tkven kvelas, (- You all,	albat probably	, jer kidev didi tskurvili gakvt tskhovrebisa.” still have a great thirst for life.)

In terms of modality expression, one of the most prominent units is - “**unda**”. It is used in modern Georgian with two meanings:

1. Desire, wish;
2. Necessity, urgent need.

“Ra tkma -	unda (Of course	, konkretuli realoba arts am shemtkhvevashia.” , it is not the concrete reality in this case either.)
“Khelisuflebis romeli organo	unda	chaitvalos sistemis birtvad?”

(Which body of government	should	be considered as the core of the system?)
---------------------------	---------------	---

“**Shesadzloa**” (might/maybe) - basically expressed the **assumption** and the **expected result**.

“Zaravda imis gafikreba, rom (It was scaring for him to think that	shesadzloa maybe	ukve gvianits kofiliko.” it was already late.)
“Sitkvam khmalze advilad (A word rather than a sword	shesadzloa might	mokvetos tavi ...” easily cut off the head...)

The word "**sheidzleba**" (may) expresses **permission** and **logical possibility**. It differs from the modal element “**shesadzloa**” with a slight semantics.

“Imdens bchoben, rom (They fight so much that I	sheidzleba may	usakhelod davrche.” be left without a name.)
“Sheidzleba tsvims, sheidzleba tovs, (It may rain, it may snow, you	sheidzleba may	gikvars, sheidzleba eli.” love, you may be waiting.)

Finally, the semantic correspondences of the modal elements are:

“**Shedzleba**” - logical possibility, permission, ability and capability

“**Unda**” - logical necessity, obligation and duty

“**Ikneb**” - probability, desire, voluntative

“**Egeb**” - assumption, probability

“**Netav**” - strong desire, wish, emotional evaluation (surprise)

“**Maints**” - belief-opinion, decision.

From all of the above, it can be said that discourse, as a functional-semantic unity and a complex conceptual framework considering modal elements, is a universal virtual model.

General conclusions

1. “Modality research is very similar to moving around a crowded room when it is hard to move in such a way not to press anyone's foot.”
2. Linguistics acknowledges mainly **epistemic** (possibility, deduction) and **deontic** (necessity) modalities. According to what is the object of evaluation in the given case, non-linguistic reality or itself an expression, accordingly, two types of modality are distinguished: **subjective** and **objective**.
3. In addition to the fact that modality is manifested in different layers of the functional-semantic field (morphological, syntactic, lexical, etc.) in almost all languages, its universality is revealed in other ways as well, we have in mind the epistemic nature of modality, which is the subject of interest of a number of disciplines or areas.
4. The analysis of modality in the linguistic context, in the analysis of verbal acts or discourse in general, is the universal manifestation of the objective reflection of reality and the mechanism of successful communication, the main goal of communications.
5. Interrogative modality is a well-expressed phenomenon in Georgian. We distinguished the descriptive and organic production of a question, and as a result we got:
 - 1) **Descriptive production of interrogative modality;**
 - a. **Interrogative constructions with interrogative particles;**
 - b. **Interrogative sentences composed of interrogative words;**
 - 2) **Organic production of interrogative modality:**
 - a. **Without interrogative words and particles, with specific intonation.**
6. Georgian interrogative particles are: ‘a’, ‘me’, ‘ghana’ (indicating surprise), ‘nutu’ (really?), ‘khom’ (right), ‘tu’ (if).

In Old Georgian, the interrogative particle ‘a’ often turned the sentence into interrogative. Particle was usually attached to the verb, regardless of where it was.

The interrogative particle ‘a’ is considered to be a common Georgian belonging. Functional and partly phonetic matches of ‘a’ are found in Megrelian-Chanuri and Svanuri.

The purpose of the particle “**me**” in Old Georgian was to express a question, although in the surviving forms it is already sporadically represented and its original function begins to fluctuate even in Old Georgian, as a result of which the particle “**me**” can no longer function independently and is used together with the particle “**a**”, it is finally removed from the interrogative at the initial stage of Georgian, when the transition to a new system of expression of the future tense and the conjugation of conjunctions begins. Particle

“me” gives its place to particle “**mtsa**”, (which we think we got with “me” + “tsa” construction) and undergoes functional-semantic alteration. In Middle Georgian, even the particle “mtsa” is slowly disappearing, it is first used in conjunction with verb forms and violates the main regularity of its use, and then gives its place to the optative particle “**netav**” (if only). Finally, in the diachronic section, we get the following picture of the interrelationship of particles “**me**”, “**mtsa**” and “**netav**”: me > mtsa > netav – where along with their formal difference, their function also changes over time.

“**Gana**” has different meanings in different contexts, but its main function is still to express question-surprise.

“**Khom**” particle constructions are often double modality carriers. On the one hand, they express their main function, question, and on the other hand, the semantic nuances of the exclamation sentence.

“**Nutu**” is a questioning particle accompanied by a hint of surprise. “Gana”, “nutu” both materially or meaningfully are close to particle “tu”. It also carries the questioning content.

“**Tu**” is a particle which is originally a grouping conjunction that connects two members of a sentence, or two sentences. It is formed as a conjunction in Middle Georgian and acquires the content of question. In the form of a rudiment it is observed in the "Panther-skinned". Initially, this function is mastered by the particle "tu" in spoken language, from which it is transferred to the written language.

7. **The main means of expressing interrogative modality in Georgian are descriptive constructions** or interrogative words. Interrogative words are: interrogative and interrogative-possessive pronouns: Who? What? Which one? Where from? Of what time? How many/much? Whose? Of what? and interrogative adverbs: Where? When? How? Why? For what? How many times?... In all three stages and dialectal forms of Georgian literary language in terms of productivity, “**ra**” (what) pronoun was revealed as the leading one to produce a question.
8. **The organic production of interrogative modality expression** on the whole diachronic axis was productive in Georgian literary monuments or in oral speech. The expression of question is and was done through intonation. The choice is diverse: along with the interrogative stress, language uses the logical stress, negative particles, and word order (rarely), the intonation is also, accordingly, ascending or ascending-descending. The interrogative stress, regardless of its position, is almost always connected to the last syllable of the predicate.

9. The analysis of the interrogative sentence in the publicist language revealed that rhetorical sentences clearly outweigh namely the interrogative sentences. This means that the publicist style is less interested in the primary function of the interrogative sentence, this communicative type of sentence often has a secondary or expressive function and is more of a stylistic means of emotionally charged speech.
10. The main markers of the modality system in the Georgian language are the verbs indicating **desire** and the **ability**.
11. Subjunctive mood markers (i.e. row markers with subjunctive mood) may be considered as morphological markers of modality in Georgian.
12. In addition, there are some other modal elements that are attached to the verb and give it a modal semantics. These are: **“egeb”** (perhaps), **“ikneb”** (maybe), **“lamis”** (nearly), **“titkos”** (as if), **“titkmis”** (almost), **“kinagam”** (just about), **“maints”** (still/at least).

The semantic correspondences of the modal elements are:

“Shedzleba” - logical possibility, permission, ability and capability

“Unda” - logical necessity, obligation and duty

“Ikneb” - probability, desire, voluntative

“Egeb” - assumption, probability

“Netav”- strong desire, wish, emotional evaluation (surprise)

“Maints” - belief-opinion, decision.

From all of the above, it can be said that discourse, as a functional-semantic unity and a complex conceptual framework considering modal elements, is a universal virtual model.

The main provisions of the dissertation were reflected in the following publications:

1	"For the interrogative particles 'a' and 'me' in Literary Georgian and dialects."	2019	Dialectological Collection, p.141-146	ISBN 978-9941-13-902-4
2	"The study of modality - a sociolinguistic directive of the modern era."	2019	Philological Herald V, p.121-131, e-mail: info@iverioni.com.ge	ISSN 2587-4799

3	“Interrogative constructions in the publicist language.”	2019	Adjara Non-Regional Scientific Center of the Georgian Academy of Sciences „Proceedings V”, p.205-207.	ISSN 2449-2507
4	“Interrogative sentence without any question words.”	2020, 9-10 October	XL Proceedings of the Republican Dialectological Scientific Session, p.191-196.	ISBN