KETEVAN GADILIA
Institute for Bible Translation, Moscow, Russia

Mood in the book of Genesis (1:3-28):
hortative, jussive, optative, imperative (Georgian, Ossetic, Kumyk)

I. The presentation is devoted to the establishment of areal and typological similarities of mood in some Caucasian languages belonging to the different language groups. The analysis is based on the well known verses from the book of Genesis (1:3, 6, 9, 11, 20, 22, 24, 28) translated into Georgian, Ossetic and Kumyk.

II. One of the grammatical ways of expression of the morphological derivational verbal category of mood is modality. Modality as a syntactic category conveys various types of relations between the speaker, the recipient (addressee) and the utterance with respect to the situation of the speech. Thus, the field of meaning of mood coincides with the field of meaning of the modality. The verbal categories of mood and modality can be conveyed by auxiliary words like Russ. *pust'*, *by*; Georg. *dae/de*, Engl. *let*, Os. *yazd* etc.

The grammatical meaning of mood assumes obligatory existence of the speaker's speech that includes not only the fact of action, but also its evaluation as desirable, possible, presumable etc. Thus, the mood conveys the speaker's personal (individual) attitude to the action and reflects various types of attitude of the subject of speech to the situation of speech. Many nuances of speaker's attitude are borne by the diverse paradigms of mood in various languages.

In Kumyk the imperative mood of the 2nd person formally coincides with the stem of the verb. The form of the 1st person is logically absent. The imperative of the 3rd person is a combination of the root of a verb and a stressed suffix *sin/sin/sun/sün* (in plural + *lap*). The suffix *-a/-e* is a plural marker of the 1st person optative with a meaning of a proposal to do something or exhortation, and at the same time participation of the speaker is obligatory. The optative of the 2nd person coincides with the form of the preterit that is marked by the stressed possessive suffix.

There are four types of mood in Ossetic: indicative, imperative, optative and conjunctive. The markers of imperative are *-äd* (3rd pers., singular), *-ut* (2nd pers., plural) and *-änt* (3rd pers., plural) which usually are added to the stem of the present tense. As for optative and conjunctive, these categories have gradually been eliminated and merged. Some linguists identify a so-called old optative in the paradigm of the conjunctive. In the abstract we do not describe the whole paradigm of the moods that have special forms in the past (transitive and intransitive verbs), present and future tenses.

According to Ak. Shanidze in Georgian the category of mood has two forms: imperative and conjunctive [8], although the imperative does not have its own grammatical form, and is conveyed by the form of the conjunctive or indicative. The 1st person plural uses the future conjunctive screeve and the 3rd person is conveyed by the optative screeve. The 2nd person is expressed by the indicative form of the aorist screeve.

Despite the different morphosyntactic patterns of imperative, optative, hortative and jussive moods in the Caucasian languages some areal/typological peculiarities can be ascertained.

III. In Biblical Hebrew the temporal forms express tenses and moods of action at the same time. Different definitions and understanding are found in linguistic research. Some scholars [3], [7]

consider that both jussive and cohortative mood are conveyed by the form of the imperfect. In Hebrew the imperfect is a simple action in future time. The imperfect can convey repeated, habitual actions in past, present and future It also designates the actions that are contingent or dependent upon other factors in the context. The Hebrew jussive may be used in either the 2nd or 3rd person. The latter usage is more common. It is also used to express the speaker's desire, wish or command. The cohortative mood is a 1st person imperfect form that has both plural and singular manifestations. It expresses the speaker's desire, intention, self-encouragement, or determination to perform a certain action. In several cases it reflects the meaning of will, desire, judgment, premonition and permission. The Hebrew imperfect may be translated in different ways by modal auxiliaries like "may, can, shall, might, could should".

Joüon [6] thinks that *perfect* and *future* are more appropriate terms for designating the complex nature of the two finite tenses of Hebrew. He describes mood in terms of direct and indirect volitive moods. The volitive moods are the imperative, two forms of which are modifications of the future indicative:

(1) Cohortative is a volitive mood of the 1st person (Gen. 1:26).

(2) Jussive is a volitive mood of the 3rd person. It indicates the speaker's wish or any nuance of will like command, exhortation, advice, invitation, permission as well as prayer, request for permission (Gen. 1:3). It is normally used instead of the imperative with negation. Jussive of the 2nd person is rare and the 1st is suspect.

(3) Imperative is the volitive mood of the 2nd person, in the positive. It is mainly used for immediate action (here and now). Sometimes it is used for a more or less remote action (which is usually expressed by the future). Dn 1.13 "you will do (then)". In Gen. 1:28 the direct form of imperative is used five times (see below).

A distinction must be made between jussive mood (a syntactic category) and jussive form. In the book of Numbers 6:24 the jussive is used six times and just two of them have an explicit form.

IV. We distinguish the abovementioned verses (see I) into three groups:
Group A: The Hebrew plural of majesty (in other words *we* with singular referent) or the plural of deliberation [Joüon, 6] (Gen. 1:26) is expressed by the cohortative form of a verb.

Group B. Seven creative commands (Gen. 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14-15, 20, 24). In Hebrew they are expressed by the jussive.

Group C. Formula of blessing (Gen. 1:22, 28) is conveyed by the imperative in Hebrew.

V. The presentation will introduce the results that we obtained after analysis of the language data. The main result that will be presented in detail is the similarity of Groups B and C and the significant distinctions in group A (Ossetic *s-feldis-äm* "let us create" coincides with the indicative mood of presence. Georgian *še-v-kmna-t* "let us create" is a form of the future screeve. Kumyk uses the optative mood *yarat-ayïq*).

References:
1. Driver S. R. The Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions. Michigan 1874 – 1998.
2. Дмитриев Н. К. Грамматика кумыкского языка. М., 1940.
3. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Ed. & enlarged by E. Kautzsch, New York, 1910.

4. Green Jay P. The Interlinear Bible. Hebrew/English. V, 1. Michigan, 1976.
5. Isaev M. I. The Ossetic Language. Essential principles of Iranian studies. New Iranian Languages. (in Russian)
6. Joüon Paul, S. J. A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Rome, 1996.
7. Kelley P. H. Biblical Hebrew. An Introductory Grammar. Michigan, 1992.
8. Shanidze Akaki. Grammar of the Georgian language. Tbilisi, 1953. (in Georgian)
9. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, by Victor P. Hamilton. The Book of Genesis. Michigan, 1990.
10. The Historical and Typological Study of Iranian Languages. Moscow, 1979. Essential principles of Iranian studies. New Iranian Languages. (in Russian)
11. Grammar of the Ossetic Language. Ed. by G. C. Akhvlediani. V.I, Ordzonokidze, 1963 (in Russian)