

# Relative Time Reference in a Conditional Construction in Georgian

KOJIMA Yasuhiro

Keywords: Georgian, conditional sentence, relative time reference, controllability, prohibition

In Modern Georgian, the aorist, which is generally used to express a past situation, may have relative time reference and may express a non-past situation in conditional clauses led by *tu* ‘if.’ The availability of relative time reference is conditioned by semantic and pragmatic factors. The aorist may have relative time reference in “prohibitive conditionals,” which carry the message “Don’t realize the situation expressed in the conditional clause.” Relative time reference is unlikely elsewhere if the given situation is supposed to be effected by the speaker or the hearer under his or her control.

## 1. Introduction

In Modern Georgian, the aorist form, one of the indicative conjugational forms of a verb, expresses a past situation, as in (1). The example illustrates the absolute time reference of the aorist; the expressed situation is past relative to the speech time.

- (1) *ga-c`vim-d-a.*  
 PV-rain-INCH-S3SG (AOR)  
 ‘It began raining.’

The aorist, however, may have relative time reference and describe a non-past (relative to the speech time) situation in some constructions, such as conditional clauses led by *tu* (“*tu* protasis”). The predicate verb in the aorist in *tu* protases may sometimes be interpreted either with absolute time reference or with relative time reference. (2), for example, allows either reading, (a) or (b).

- (2) *tu ga-c`vim-d-a, kolga-s c`a-v-i-b-eb.*  
 if PV-rain-INCH-S3SG (AOR) umbrella-DAT PV-S1-PRV-take-TS (FUT)  
 (a) ‘If it has (already) begun raining, I will take an umbrella.’ (absolute time reference)  
 (b) ‘If it begins raining, I will take an umbrella.’ (relative time reference)

With relative time reference, the situation expressed in the protasis is past, not relative to the speech time, but relative to the time of the occurrence of the apodosis situation.

Relative time reference of the aorist predicate, however, is not always possible in *tu* protases. In (3), the protasis has its predicate verb in the aorist, similarly to the case in (2), yet it is unlikely to have relative time reference.

- (3) *tu axali k'omp 'iut 'er-i i-q 'id-e, m-a-čven-e.*  
 if new computer-NOM PRV-buy-AOR O1-PRV-show-AOR  
 ‘If you have (already) bought a computer, show me.’ (absolute time reference)  
 (? ‘If you buy a computer, show me’ (relative time reference))

It has been well known in the literature on Georgian that the aorist may be used to describe a conditional “future” event in *tu* protases, although it expresses past situations (Dzidziguri 1959: 266, 1973: 371; Hewitt 1987: 74; Kvachadze 1996: 446; Aronson and Kiziria 1999: 408). No further attention, however, has been paid to this temporal meaning of the aorist. Regarding *tu* protasis with a predicate verb in the aorist, the present paper makes the following points.

- (4) a. When the aorist is employed to express a conditional *non-past* (rather than *future*) situation in *tu* protasis, it has relative time reference, typically, in relation to the time point of the occurrence of the apodosis situation.  
 b. In *tu* protasis, relative time reference of the aorist is not always available. Its availability correlates with semantic and pragmatic factors.

We shall further address (4a) in Section 3 and (4b) in Section 4.

In Kojima (2005), I investigated relative time reference of the perfect in *tu* protases and concluded that it is possible only in a special type of conditional sentence, by which the speaker conveys the message “Don’t make the protasis event happen.” I shall call such conditional sentences “prohibitive conditionals.” The aorist can have relative time reference in prohibitive conditionals, just like the perfect; however, differently from the latter, relative time reference is possible with the aorist outside prohibitive conditionals as well.

## 2. Grammatical notes

Georgian, the official language of Georgia, belongs to the Kartvelian or South Caucasian language family. It is spoken by approximately five million speakers. Modern Georgian has five vowels and twenty-eight consonants: *i, e, a, o, u, p, p', b, t, t', d, k, k', g, q' [q' ~ χ'], c [ts], c', ʒ [dz], č [tʃ], č', ʒ' [dʒ], v, s, z, ž, š, ʁ, h, m, n, r, and l*. The present section mentions below only those points of the grammar that are relevant to the topic of the paper.

Table 1 presents the conjugation forms of the verb. The exemplary verb forms given in the table have both the subject and object in third person singular (the verb marks person and number of the subject as well as object). Conjugation forms are grouped into the three series on the basis of common morphological and syntactic features.

Table 1. Verb conjugation

Future-Present Series	FUTURE <i>da-c'er-s</i> 'will write'	FUTURE-IN-PAST <i>da-c'er-d-a</i> 'would write'	FUTURE SUBJUNCTIVE <i>da-c'er-d-e-s</i>
	PRESENT <i>c'er-s</i> 'writes/is writing'	IMPERFECT <i>c'er-d-a</i> 'was writing'	PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE <i>c'er-d-e-s</i>
Aorist Series	AORIST <i>da-c'er-a</i> 'wrote'		AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE <i>da-c'er-o-s</i>
Perfect Series	PERFECT <i>da-u-c'er-i-a</i> 'has written'	PLUPERFECT <i>da-e-c'er-a</i> 'had written'	PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE <i>da-e-c'er-o-s</i>

The present paper focuses on the interpretation of aorist forms. The aorist is essentially perfective in aspect, except for the aorist of stative verbs. I shall touch on the problem of the imperfective aorist in Section 3.2.

The negation of the aorist by *ar* 'not' usually implies that the actor intentionally did not perform the action, when the expressed situation includes an actor (Vogt 1971: 193; Hewitt 1995: 571). A neutral statement that an event simply did not occur in the past is expressed by the negation of the perfect. Compare (5) and (6).

- (5) *es c'ign-i ar c'a-v-i-k'itx-e.*  
 this book-NOM NEG PV-S1-PRV-read-AOR  
 'I did not read this book (e.g., because I did not want to).'
- (6) *es c'ign-i ar c'a-m-i-k'itx-av-s.*  
 this book-NOM NEG PV-O1SG-PRV-read-TS-S3SG (PF)  
 'I did/have not read this book.'

Modern Georgian has two conditional conjunctions that mark a protasis: *rom* and *tu*. It is generally considered that protases with *rom* express "unreal conditions," whereas those with *tu* represent "real conditions" (Hewitt 1987: 73). The predicate verb is in the subjunctive mood in protases with *rom*, as in (7). In protases with *tu*, the predicate verb is usually in the indicative mood, as in (8).

- (7) *msxl-eb-s rom p'ir-i h-kon-d-e-t, xom ertmanet-s*  
 pear-PL-DAT if mouth-NOM IO3-have-PST-SBJ-PL (PRSSBJ) PTC each.other-DAT  
*da-s-c'am-d-nen.* (Leonidze)  
 PV-IO3-eat-PST-S3PL (FUTURE-IN-PAST)  
 'If pears had a mouth, they would eat up each other, wouldn't they?'
- (8) *tu ar gamo-x-val, milicia-s mo-v-i-q'van.* (Chokheli)  
 if NEG PV-S2-come (FUT) police-DAT PV-S1-PRV-bring (FUT)  
 'If you don't come out, I will call the police.'

As the aorist is indicative in mood and forms conditional clauses only with *tu*, the present paper deals with only those conditional clauses having *tu* (hereafter, "tu protases").

The order of the protasis and apodosis is essentially free. The position of *tu* in the protasis is syntactically

not fixed. It is placed somewhere before the predicate verb of the protasis.

### 3. Relative time reference

#### 3.1. Absolute and relative time reference

Absolute time reference is the temporal location of a situation in relation to the speech time as the reference point, whereas the reference point for location of a situation is some point in time given by the context with relative time reference (cf. Comrie 1985: 56). When a *tu* protasis has relative time reference, the reference point is generally the time point of the occurrence of the apodosis situation (but see Section 3.3). The predicate verb in the aorist in *tu* protases, when it has relative time reference, describes a situation of relatively past time in relation to that reference point.

As already noted in Section 1, it has been well known in the literature on Georgian that the aorist may express a conditional “future” event in *tu* protasis. It is not the case, however, that the aorist can be employed to describe any conditional future event. It may describe a conditional future event in *tu* protases only when the protasis event is supposed to precede the apodosis one temporally. Compare the following examples, (9) and (10). In (9), the predicate of the protasis is in the future, while in (10) it is in the aorist. The predicate in the future always has absolute time reference.

- (9) *tu st'umar-i mo-va, saxl-s da-v-a-lag-eb.*  
 if guest-NOM PV-come.S3SG (FUT) houses-DAT PV-S1Q-PRV-tidy-TS (FUT)  
 ‘If a guest comes, I will tidy the house.’
- (10) *tu st'umar-i mo-vid-a, saxl-s davalageb.*  
 if guest-NOM PV-come-S3SG (AOR) house-DAT PV-S1Q-PRV-tidy-TS (FUT)  
 ‘If a guest comes, I will tidy the house.’ (or ‘If a guest has come, I will tidy the house.’)

Although both (9) and (10) may be translated in English as ‘If a guest comes, I will clean the house,’ their interpretations may differ in terms of the temporal order between the two events. (9) does not specify whether the speaker will clean the house before or after a guest comes, while (10) does. (10), with the aorist, means that the speaker will clean the house *after* a guest comes. If we put the phrase *sanam mova* ‘before he or she (here, referring to ‘a guest’) comes’ in the apodosis, as in (11), the protasis predicate cannot be in the aorist.

- (11) *tu st'umar-i [mo-va / \*mo-vid-a], saxl-s*  
 if guest-NOM [PV-come.S3SG (FUT) / \*PV-came-S3SG (AOR)] house-DAT  
*da-v-a-lag-eb, sanam mo-va.*  
 PV-S1-PRV-tidy-TS (FUT) before PV-come.S3SG (FUT)  
 ‘If a guest comes, I will tidy the house *before he* (= a guest) *comes*.’

When the aorist describes a conditional future event in *tu* protasis, it is denoted that the apodosis event will occur after the protasis event is realized. In contrast, when the future is used, the temporal order between the two events is left unspecified. Accordingly, one may say that the aorist in *tu* protases has relative past time reference in relation to the time point of the apodosis event.

Previous studies of Georgian have noticed only those cases where the aorist describes a conditional “future” event in *tu* protases. The aorist with relative time reference in *tu* protasis, however, is not necessarily oriented to future time, but can express a habitual or generic situation whose temporal reference includes the present, as in (12) and (13). (In (12), *xolme* is an adverb that expresses habituality.)

- (12) *tu gvian a-v-dek-i, sauzme-s ar v-č'am xolme.*  
 if late PV-S1-stand-AOR breakfast-DAT NEG S1-eat (PRS) usually  
 ‘If I get up late, I usually don’t have breakfast.’
- (13) *tu zamtar-ši did-i tovl-i mo-vid-a, im c'el-s*  
 if winter.DAT-in big-AGR snow-NOM PV-came-S3SG (AOR) that year-DAT  
*cud-i mosaval-i-a.*  
 bad-AGR harvest-NOM-be.S3SG (PRS)  
 ‘If it snows heavily in winter, we have a poor harvest that year.’

In *tu* protases of these examples, too, the aorist has relative past time reference in relation to the time point of the occurrence of the apodosis event.

One may then wonder if the aorist in *tu* protases with relative time reference can express a “past” situation in absolute time. In (14), for example, both the protasis event and the apodosis one belong to the (absolute) past time and the former temporally precedes the latter.

- (14) *tu dato-m nino nax-a, da-e-lap'arak'-eb-od-a.*  
 if Dato-ERG Nino.NOM see-S3SG (AOR) PV-PRV-talk-to-TS-PST-S3SG (FUT-IN-PST)  
 ‘If Dato has seen Nino, he would have talked to her.’

In such cases, the apodosis predicate is in the future-in-past. That is, the apodosis predicate, rather than the protasis one, has relative time reference, as it expresses a “future” situation relative to the protasis event of the past. The protasis predicate in the aorist, on the other hand, has absolute time reference. The protasis predicate in the aorist is considered to have relative time reference in *tu* protases only when it expresses a past situation relative to another *non-past* situation.

In *tu* protases, the aorist may also have absolute time reference and “retain its regular past meaning” (Hewitt 1987: 74). In general, the aorist can always have absolute time reference in *tu* protases as far as the context permits. Thus, the actual interpretation of whether the time reference of the aorist is absolute or relative depends on the context. The following examples are taken from literary works. The protasis predicate of (17) has absolute time reference, while that of (18) has relative time reference.

- (17) *tu pex-it c'amo-vid-nen, exla-ve da-v-e-c'ev-i.*  
 if foot-INST PV-leave-S3PL (AOR) now-EMPH PV-S1-PRV- catch.up-IA (FUT)  
 ‘If they left on foot, we will catch up with them at once.’ (Javakhishvili)

- (18) *amaḡam tu kar-i ča-dḡ-a, xval šuadbisās*  
 tonight if wind-NOM PV-cease-S3SG (AOR) tomorrow in.the.daytime  
*mi-vl-en sadḡur-ši.*  
 PV-go-S3PL (FUT) station.DAT-to  
 ‘If the wind ceases tonight, they will go to the station in the daytime.’ (Choxeli)

In what follows, I shall concentrate on whether predicates in the aorist may have relative time reference or not. No account will be taken of the possibility of absolute time reference. The asterisks and question marks in the subsequent examples indicate the unavailability of relative time reference, even though absolute time reference might be possible, unless otherwise specified.

### 3.2. Aspect of the aorist

Although the aorist is generally characterized as perfective in aspect, the aorist of stative verbs, such as *ec’era* ‘was written,’ *eḡina* ‘was sleeping,’ *iq’o* ‘was,’ and so forth (cf. Vogt 1971: 182–183), is imperfective. In contrast to the perfective aorist, the imperfective aorist never has relative time reference. In (19) and (20), for instance, only absolute time reference is available with the protasis predicate.

- (19) *tu bavšv-s e-ḡin-a, p’ianino-ze ar da-v-u-k’r-av.*  
 if child-DAT PRV-sleep-S3SG (AOR) piano.DAT-on NEG PV-S1-PRV-play-TS (FUT)  
 ‘If the child was sleeping, I won’t play the piano.’  
 (\*‘If the child is sleeping, I won’t play the piano.’)
- (20) *saxl-ši tu nino i-q’-o, da-v-e-laḡ’arak’-eb-i.*  
 house.DAT-in if Nino.NOM PRV-be-S3SG (AOR) PV-S1-PRV-talk.to-TS-IA (FUT)  
 ‘If Nino was home, I will talk to her.’  
 (\*‘If Nino is home, I will talk to her.’)

Preverb-less aorist forms of verbs that usually take a preverb in the aorist, such as *vc’ere* ‘I wrote (repeatedly)’ and *vsvi* ‘I drank (repeatedly),’ are often called “imperfective aorist” as well (Tschenkéli 1958: 170; Shanidze 1973: 262–264; Machavariani 1974: 119–121; Fähnrich 1986: 76; Boeder 2005: 29). Vogt (1971: 186–188) considers that such forms (*aoriste indéterminé*) are as aspectually punctual as ordinal aorist forms are, in opposition to *imparfait* (imperfective), which is durative in aspect. To argue details of the problem of the preverb-less aorist would carry us too far away. I would like to just point out that forms such as *vc’ere* can have relative time reference in *tu* protases, as in (21).

- (21) *q’oveldbe tu sv-i, žanmrteḡoba-s ga-i-puč’-eb.*  
 every.day if drink-AOR health-DAT PV-PRV-spoil-TS (FUT)  
 ‘If you drink every day, you will spoil your health.’

This may suggest that the preverb-less aorist is aspectually perfective, rather than imperfective.

It is thus assumed that the availability of relative time reference crucially hinges on perfective aspect of the

protasis predicate. Imperfective conjugational forms such as the present and imperfective never receive relative time reference in *tu* protases as well as in other constructions.

### 3.3. Conditional relationship

When the aorist has relative time reference in *tu* protasis, the semantic relationship between the two situations is typically causal, as in the examples given so far. The protasis presents a condition for the occurrence of the apodosis situation. Such conditionals are generally called “content conditional” (Sweetser 1990: 113–116; Dancygier 1998: 80–86).

The aorist predicate of the protasis may have relative time reference in other types of conditional sentences, too, namely, in epistemic conditional and speech-act conditional (or pragmatic conditional) sentences (Sweetser 1990: 116–121; Dancygier 86–93; cf. Comrie 1986: 78–83). (22) is an example of an epistemic conditional, where the protasis serves as a premise for the speaker to conclude that the apodosis content is true. (23) is an example of a speech-act conditional, where the protasis makes the speech act of the apodosis relevant.

- (22) *tu dato-m es ga-i-g-o, inglisur-i i-c-i-s.*  
 if Dato-ERG this.NOM PV-PRV-understand-S3SG (AOR) English-NOM PRV-know-IA-S3SG (PRS)  
 ‘If Dato understands this, he knows English.’
- (23) *tu mo-g-šiv-d-a, magida-ze p'w-i d-ev-s.*  
 if PV-O2-hungry-INCH-S3SG (AOR) table.DAT-on bread-NOM lie-TS-S3SG (PRS)  
 ‘If you get hungry, there is some bread on the table.’

These examples may appear to contradict the view that the aorist predicate has relative time reference, as the apodosis situations apparently precede the protasis ones in time. In (23), for example, the apodosis content is true at the time of the utterance irrespective of whether the protasis situation will or will not take place in the future. However, the aorist predicate is nevertheless taken to have relative time reference in such cases, too. It expresses a “past” situation not relative to the time of the occurrence of the apodosis situation, but relative to a different time point. In epistemic conditionals, it is the time point when the speaker becomes able to assert the apodosis content, whereas in speech-act conditionals, it is the time point when the speech act becomes relevant.

### 3.4. Relative time reference of the aorist outside *tu* protases

Relative time reference of the aorist is observed marginally in subordinate clauses other than *tu* protases. (24), for example, contains a relative clause.

- (24) *p'riz-s mi-v-s-c-em ima-s, vinc sc'or-ad*  
 prize-DAT PV-S1-IO3- give-TS (FUT) DEM-DAT who.NOM correct-ADV  
 [?m-i-p'asux-a / m-i-p'asux-eb-s] šek'itxva-ze.  
 [?O1-PRV-answer-S3SG (AOR) / O1-PRV-answer-TS-S3SG (FUT)] question.DAT-on  
 ‘I will give a prize to the one who correctly answers the question.’

In the relative clause of (24), use of the aorist appears to be possible, at least, though not fully felicitous as that of

the future, to describe a future situation that precedes the main clause event. A native speaker of Georgian reported that the use of the aorist, instead of the future, sounds informal. Note that the use of the aorist in *tu* protasis never influences the style of the sentence. (25) is an example of a temporal clause. The aorist cannot be used.

- (25) *roca* [*\*mo-i-cal-e* / *mo-i-cl-i*], *da-m-i-rek'-e*.  
 when [*\*PV-PRV-spare.time -AOR* / *PV-PRV-spare.time -TS (FUT)*] *PV-O1SG-PRV-call-AOR (IMP)*  
 ‘When you become free, call me.’

Thus, relative time reference of the aorist is available to a limited extent in relative clauses, while it is not available in temporal clauses.

In the present paper, the discussion is confined to conditional constructions, where the relative time reference of the aorist obtains systematically. The study of relative time reference of Georgian in general is an interesting topic to be pursued in the future.

#### 4. Relative time reference in *tu* protases

Section 3 showed that the aorist predicate in *tu* protases may have either absolute time reference or relative time reference. While absolute time reference is always available unless the context contradicts it, relative time reference is not. The availability of relative time reference is conditioned by pragmatic and semantic factors, which will be examined in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, respectively.

##### 4.1. Prohibitive conditional

The aorist may have relative time reference in *tu* protases when the conditional sentence as a whole represents a prohibitive conditional. “Prohibitive conditional” is a tentative name for conditional sentences by means of which the speaker performs a type of speech act that is characterized as “prohibition,” “warning,” or “threatening.” To put it plainly, the speaker utters a message by prohibitive conditional: “Don’t make the protasis situation happen (or the apodosis event will take place)!” To take simple examples, (26a) and (27a) are prohibitive conditionals, while (26b) and (27b) are not; the sentence pairs in (26) and (27) share the same protases. Relative time reference of the aorist is fully available in (26a) and (27a), but it is unlikely in (26b) and (27b).

- (26) a. *tu es vašl-i še-č'am-e, ga-v-braz-d-eb-i.*  
 if this apple-NOM PV-eat-AOR PV-S1-angry-INCH-TS-INAC  
 ‘If you eat this apple, I will get angry.’  
 b. ? *tu es vašl-i še-č'am-e, ga-m-i-xar-d-eb-a.*  
 if this apple-NOM PV-eat-AOR PV-S1-PRV-angry-INCH-TS-INAC  
 (Intended meaning: ‘If you eat this apple, I will become glad.’)
- (27) a. *tu garet ga-x-ved-i, g-cem.*  
 if outside PV-S2-go-AOR O2-beat (FUT)  
 ‘If you go outside, I will beat you.’

- b. ? *tu garet ga-x-ved-i, prt cil-ad i-q'av-i.*  
 if outside PV-S2-go-AOR careful-ADV PRV-be-AOR (IMP)  
 (Intended meaning: 'If you go outside, be careful.')

(26b) and (27b) are acceptable if the aorist is taken to have absolute time reference.

Examples (28) to (31) contain prohibitive conditionals taken from literary works. The *tu* protases have their predicate verb in the aorist with relative time reference. Note that "prohibition" may be directed to the hearer, as in (28) and (29), as well as to the speaker him/herself or people including the speaker, as in (30) and (31).

- (28) *tu ar c'a-m-i-q'van-e-t, tav-s mo-v-i-k'l-av-o.*  
 if NEG PV-O1SG-PRV-take-AOR-PL myself-DAT PV-S1-PRV-kill-TS-HS (FUT)  
 'She says, if you don't take me, I will kill myself.' (Javakhishvili)
- (29) *ase tu ken-i, babua, šen*  
 in.this.way if do-AOR grandfather.NOM 2SG.DAT  
*ga-g-i-č'ir-d-eb-a cxovreba.*  
 PV-O2-PRV-be.hard-INCH-TS-S3SG (FUT) life.NOM  
 'If you do it this way, Grandpa, you will find your life hard.' (Dumbadze)
- (30) *zurab-ma i-pikr-a, tu lap'arak'-ši dro da-v-k'arg-e-o,*  
 Zurab-ERG PRV-think-S3SG (AOR) if talk.DAT-in time.NOM PV-S1-lose-AOR-HS  
*vinme mo-gv-a-sc'r-eb-s da sakme*  
 someone.NOM PV-O1PL-PRV-forestall-TS-S3SG (FUT) and job.NOM  
*c'a-xd-eb-a-o.*  
 PV-be.spoiled-TS-S3SG-HS (FUT)  
 'Zurab thought, if I lose time in talk, someone will forestall us and our job will be spoiled.' (Gogebashvili)
- (31) *rigrigobit tu ar v-i-suntk-e-t, tbilis-amde ar*  
 in.turn if NEG S1-PRV-breathe-AOR-PL Tbilisi-TRM NEG  
*gv-e-q'op-a agi haeri!*  
 O1PL-PRV-suffice-TS-S3SG (FUT) this air.NOM  
 'If we don't breathe in turn, we won't have enough air up to Tbilisi.' (Dumbadze)

In Kojima (2005), I investigated time reference of the perfect in *tu* protases. It was argued that the perfect may have relative time reference only when the conditional sentence expresses prohibition of the situation expressed in the protasis, namely, only in prohibitive conditionals. In regard to this point, the perfect demonstrates a similarity with the aorist. The latter, however, may have relative time reference in other types of conditional sentences, too.

#### 4.2. Intentional action of the speaker or hearer

Prohibitive conditionals are not the only type of conditional sentences in which the aorist has relative time reference. The aorist may have relative time reference in conditional sentences other than prohibitive

conditionals as well, but under certain semantic conditions. It is unlikely to have relative time reference when the occurrence of the protasis situation is under control of the first or second person actor. In the rest of this section, I shall illustrate this point drawing on a number of contrastive examples. Note that the following discussion is limited to conditionals other than prohibitive ones.

To begin with, contrast the following examples in (32). In these examples, the protases express that the actor, which concurs with the subject, intentionally performs an action under his or her control. In such cases, relative time reference of the aorist is fully available only when the actor is a third person, as in (32c). When the actor is the first or second person, however, it is less likely.

- (32) a. ?? *tu es c'amal-i da-v-li-e, mo-v-rč-eb-i.*  
 if this medicine-NOM PV-S1-drink-AOR PV-S1-become.well-TS-INAC (FUT)  
 (Intended meaning: 'If I take this medicine, I will become well.')
- b. ?? *tu es c'amal-i da-li-e, mo-rč-eb-i.*  
 if this medicine-NOM PV-drink-AOR PV-become.well-TS-INAC (FUT)  
 (Intended meaning: 'If you take this medicine, you will become well.')
- c. *tu es c'amal-i da-li-a, mo-rč-eb-a.*  
 if this medicine-NOM PV-drink-S3SG (AOR) PV-become.well-TS-S3SG (FUT)  
 'If he/she takes this medicine, he/she will become well.'

(32a) and (32b) are fully acceptable if the aorist is taken to have absolute time reference. (32), for example, is a natural sentence meaning 'If you have taken this medicine, you will become well.'

When the occurrence of the protasis situation is not under control of the first or second person, the aorist can have relative time reference, even with the first or second person subject, as illustrated in (33).

- (33) a. *tu ar da-v-i-k'arg-e, ert saat-ši mo-val.*  
 if NEG PV-S1-PRV-get.lost-AOR one hour.DAT-in PV-come.S1 (FUT)  
 'If I don't get lost, I will come in one hour.'
- b. *tu ar da-i-k'arg-e, ert saat-ši mo-x-val.*  
 if NEG PV-PRV-get.lost-AOR one hour.DAT-in PV-S2-come (FUT)  
 'If you don't get lost, you will come in one hour.'
- c. *tu ar da-i-k'arg-a, ert saat-ši mo-va.*  
 if NEG PV-PRV-get.lost-S3SG (AOR) one hour.DAT-in PV-come.S3SG (FUT)  
 'If he doesn't get lost, he will come in one hour.'

Compare (34) and (35). The sentences are semantically similar, but the difference is that the protasis of (34) describes a controllable action, while that of (35) does not. Accordingly, (35) is judged as being unlikely to have relative time reference.

- (34) *akedan tu gada-vard-i, da-m-i-č'er-en.*  
 from.here if pv-fall.down-AOR PV-O1-PRV-catch-S3PL (FUT)  
 'If I fall down from here, they will catch me.'
- (35) ?? *akedan tu gada-v-xt'-i, da-m-i-č'er-en.*  
 from.here if PV-S1-jump.down-AOR PV-O1-PRV-catch-S3PL (FUT)  
 (Intended meaning: 'If I jump down from here, they will catch me.')

The important point to note is that whether the expressed situation is to be realized under the first or second person's control or not is determined simply by the meaning of the predicate verb, but by the overall context. Compare the following pairs of examples. In each pair, the protases have the same predicate verb. However, the protases of (36a) and (37a) describe a controllable action, while those of (36b) and (37b) an uncontrollable situation.

- (36) a. ?? *es k'ino tu nax-e, mo-g-e-c'on-eb-a.*  
 this movie.NOM if see-AOR PV-O2-PRV-like-TS-S3SG (FUT)  
 (Intended meaning: 'If you see this film, you will like it.')
- b. *keip-ze tu nino nax-e, es u-txar-i*  
 party.DAT-at if Nino.NOM see-AOR this.NOM PRV-tell-AOR (IMP)  
 'If you see Nino at the party, tell this to her.'
- (37) a. ?? *dʒes tu i-tevzav-e, vaxšam-ze tevz-s še-v-c'v-av-t.*  
 today if PRV-fish-AOR dinner.DAT-on fish-DAT PV-S1-fry-TS-PL (FUT)  
 (Intended meaning: 'If you fish today, we will fry fish for dinner.')
- b. *dʒes tu k'arg-ad i-tevzav-e, vaxšam-ze tevz-s še-v-c'v-av-t.*  
 today if good-ADV PRV-fish-AOR dinner.DAT-on fish-DAT we.will.fry:FUT  
 'If you fish *successfully* today, we will fry fish for dinner.'

In (36b), whether I will see Nino or not is not controlled by "me," but rather its occurrence depends on Nino, that is, if she will come to the party or not. The difference between (37a) and (37b) is just that (37b) has the adverb *k'argad* 'well,' which here refers to successfulness of the fishing. 'To fish' is to be effected under the actor's control, whereas 'to fish *successfully*' is not so. Accordingly, the aorist predicate of the protases in (36a) and (37b) is unlikely to have relative time reference. The sentences in (38) and (39) are similar examples where the aorist can have relative time reference because the occurrence of the protasis situation is not under the actor's control, though the actor is the second person.

- (38) *tevz-i tu da-i-č'ir-e, m-a-čven-e.*  
 fish-NOM if PV-PRV-catch-AOR O1SG-PRV-show-AOR (IMP)  
 'If you catch a fish, show me.'

- (39) *es tamaš-i tu mo-i-g-e, čemp'ion-i ga-xd-eb-i.*  
 this game-NOM if PV-PRV-win-AOR champion-NOM PV-become-TS-INAC (FUT)  
 'If you win this game, you will be the champion.'

In Section 2, it was noted that negation of the aorist by means of *ar* 'not' usually denotes that the actor, if any, intentionally did not perform the action. As is expected, such negated aorist cannot have relative time reference in *tu* protases when the actor is the speaker or hearer, as in (40a). Compare this with (40b). In the latter, the predicate in the aorist is negated by *ver* 'cannot' instead of *ar* 'not.' In (40b), the occurrence of the expressed protasis situation is not considered to be under the control of the actor, and it can be expressed by the aorist with relative time reference.

- (40) a. ?? *tu p'ur-i ar še-č'am-e, mo-m-e-c-i.*  
 if bread-NOM NEG PV-eat-AOR PV-O1SG-PRV-give-AOR (IMP)  
 (Intended meaning: 'If you don't eat the bread, give it to me.')
- b. *tu p'ur-i ver še-č'am-e, mo-m-e-c-i.*  
 if bread-NOM NEG PV-eat-AOR PV-O1SG-PRV-give-AOR (IMP)  
 'If you can't eat the bread, give it to me.'

#### 4.3. Relationship between pragmatic and semantic conditions

In Sections 4.1 and 4.2, I discussed the pragmatic and semantic conditions that impinge on the availability of relative time reference of the aorist in *tu* protases. The pragmatic condition is as follows: The aorist may have relative time reference in prohibitive conditionals. The semantic condition, on the other hand, is the following: The aorist is unlikely to have relative time reference when the occurrence of the protasis situation is under the control of the speaker or the hearer who is an actor. These two conditions work independently of each other as the semantic condition pertains only to the protasis, whereas the pragmatic condition pertains to the sentence as a whole. However, one may suppose that these two types of condition are, at least partly, interrelated regarding two points.

Firstly, in the speech act of prohibition, the prohibitee is typically prohibited from doing some action that would be carried out under his or her own control: for example, "Don't jump!" or "Don't go away!" However, this is not necessarily so. A prohibited situation can be one that is realized without control, but its non-occurrence may be controlled: e.g., "Don't fall" or "Don't get lost!" Thus, the protasis of a prohibitive conditional may describe either a controllable or uncontrollable action.

Secondly, when one performs the speech act of prohibition, the prohibition is typically directed to the hearer or, less typically, to the speaker him/herself. The protasis of the prohibitive conditional is therefore likely to describe an action of the first or second person. However, this is not necessarily so. The prohibition may be directed to the third person as well. In such cases, the aorist can naturally have relative time reference, as the first or second person actor is not involved, whether the sentence is a prohibitive conditional or not; hence, the aorist is not helpful in making the point. As mentioned above, the perfect can have relative time reference in *tu* protases only when the sentence is taken to be a prohibitive conditional (Kojima 2005). The perfect may have relative time reference when the prohibition is directed to the third person, too, as in (41) (Kojima 2005: 110).

- (41) *bavšv-eb-s panjara tu ga-u-t'ex-av-t, v-cem.*  
 child-PL-DAT window.NOM if PV-PRV-break-TS-PL (PF) S1-beat (FUT)  
 ‘If the children break a windowpane, I will beat them.’

## 5. Conclusions and further remarks

What has so far been shown in the discussion is summed up in the following: (i) The aorist in *tu* protases may sometimes have relative past time reference, in addition to absolute time reference; and (ii) the relative time reference of the aorist is conditioned by semantic and pragmatic factors.

On the basis of these findings, one may now address a further question: Why is the relative time reference of the aorist in *tu* protasis thus conditioned? How do the speech act “prohibition” and semantics of the protasis situation interact with the availability of relative time reference of the aorist? — The following is an attempt at argumentation in answer to this question.

The shift from absolute time reference to relative time reference indicates that the subordinate clause (here, the protasis) becomes more dependent on the main clause as the subordinate clause loses independent temporal specification of its own. This is roughly schematized as follows:

- (a) [if P]<sub>TNS</sub>, [Q]<sub>TNS</sub>  
 (b) [if P, Q]<sub>TNS</sub>

(a) denotes the structure of a conditional construction whose protasis has absolute time reference, while (b) shows the same when the protasis has relative time reference. The protasis is more bound to the apodosis in (b) than in (a).

At the same time, the internal structure of the protasis is more restricted in (b) than in (a). The protasis with relative time reference lacks not only independent temporal specification, but also other semantic categories. In particular, *tu* protases with relative time reference cannot contain any element expressing (epistemic or deontic) modality, as demonstrated by (42).

- (42) *tu (\*aucilebl-ad) dato mo-vid-a, da-v-e-lap'arak'-eb-i.*  
 if inevitable-ADV Dato.NOM PV-come.S3SG (FUT) PV-S1-PRV talk-TS-INAC (FUT)  
 ‘If Dato (\*certainly) comes, I will talk to him.’

In contrast, when the predicate of the protasis is in the future, as in (43), and has absolute time reference, modal elements can appear in the protasis.

- (43) *tu aucilebl-ad dato mo-va, da-v-e-lap'arak'-eb-i.*  
 if inevitable-ADV Dato.NOM PV-come.S3SG (FUT) PV-S1-PRV talk-TS-INAC (FUT)  
 ‘If Dato certainly comes, I will talk to him.’

The protasis, when it has relative time reference, cannot contain any subjective evaluation about the likelihood

of the occurrence of the situation in question. It might perhaps be due to the fact that a situation whose occurrence is under the control of the speaker or the hearer as an actor cannot be expressed in *tu* protases having relative time reference. That is, the speaker cannot present a situation as conditional whose realization is to be determined by his or her own will. Additionally, the speaker cannot tell the hearer that possibility of the expressed situation is open and, at the same time, that it is to be determined by the hearer's will. The semantic condition that the aorist hardly receives relative time reference in *tu* protases when the occurrence of the protasis situation is under control of the speaker or hearer as an actor may be explained in this way, in so far as non-prohibitive conditionals are concerned.

In prohibitive conditionals, the protasis situation may assume an actor of the first or second person, when the predicate has relative time reference. The prohibitive conditional pronounces that the protasis situation should not take place. It would not be improbable to suppose that such pragmatic implication makes it irrelevant how the situation unfolded, under the speaker or hearer's control or not.

The argument awaits elaboration in further investigation of the overall structure of conditional constructions. The present paper is a part of the comprehensive study of conditional constructions in Georgian.

### Authors and sources

Dumbadze	Nodar Dumbaḡe, “zaxli,” “Hellados”
Gogebashvili	Iak'ob Gogebašvili, “Iavnanam ra hkna”
Javakhishvili	Mixeil Javaxišvili, “Okros k'bili”

### Abbreviations

ADV	adverbial case	O	object
AOR	aorist	PF	perfect
DAT	dative case	PL	plural
ERG	ergative case	PLUPF	pluperfect
FUT	future	PRS	present
GEN	genitive case	PRV	preradical vowel
HS	hearsay	PST	past
IMP	imperative	PTC	particle
IMPFV	imperfective	PV	preverbal prefix
INAC	inactive	S	subject
INCH	inchoative	SBJ	subjunctive
INF	infinitive	TOP	topic
NEG	negation	TS	thematic suffix
NOM	nominative case		

### References

- Aronson, Howard I. and Dodona Kiziria (1999) *Georgian Language and Culture*. Bloomington, Indiana: Slavica Publishers.
- Boeder, Winfried (2005) The South Caucasian languages. *Lingua* 115: 5-89.

- Comrie, Bernard (1985) *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard (1986) Conditionals: a typology. In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy Snitzer Reilly and Charles A. Ferguson (eds.) *On Conditionals*, 77-99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dancygier, Barbara (1998) *Conditionals and Prediction: Time, Knowledge, and Causation in Conditional Constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dzidziguri, Shota (1959) *Kartuli Salit'erat'uro Enis Ist'oriisatvis* [On the History of the Literary Georgian Language]. Tbilisi: Sabč'ota Sakartvelo.
- Dzidziguri, Shota (1973) *K'avširebi Kartul Enaši* [Conjunctions in the Georgian Language]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.
- Hewitt, Brian G. (1987) *The Typology of Subordination in Georgian and Abkhaz*. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hewitt, Brian G. (1995) *Georgian: A Structural Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kojima, Yasuhiro (2005) The conditional sentence expressing undesirability: perfect in *tu* protasis in Modern Georgian. *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 24: 99-114.
- Kvachadze, Leo (1996) *Tanamedrove Kartuli Enis Sint'aksi* [Syntax of Modern Georgian]. Tbilisi.
- Shanidze, Akaki (1973) *Kartuli Enis Gramat'ik'iis Sapuzylebi I: morfologia* [Foundations of the Georgian grammar I: morphology]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.
- Sweetser, Eve (1990) *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vogt, Hans (1971) *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

## 現代グルジア語の条件文における相対時制

児島 康宏

キーワード：グルジア語、条件文、相対時制、コントロール、禁止

### 要旨

接続詞 *tu* に導かれる条件節において、述語動詞がアオリスト形と呼ばれる過去形をとった場合、条件節の時制の解釈として、絶対時制に加え、相対時制の解釈が可能であることがある。相対時制の解釈では、アオリスト形の述語は非過去の事態を表わす。相対時制の解釈が可能なのは、意味的・語用論的に条件づけられる。条件文が「条件節で表される事態を実現させるな」という禁止的な発話行為を述べるものであれば、相対時制が可能である。また、そのほかの場合、相対時制では、条件節は事態の生起に対して制御 (control) を有する 1・2 人称の行為を表しにくい。

(こじま・やすひろ)