

LELA TSIKHELASHVILI

SUBJECT ISSUE IN PERIPHRASTIC STRUCTURES OF EXPRESSING FUTURE IN OLD WRITING IN GEORGIAN

In ancient Georgian writing, simultaneously there were two ways of expressing future of the narrative mood: 1) **Organic** - the subjunctive series - (I subjunctive and II subjunctive) and 2) **Periphrastic** - which was formed by the infinitive in the adverbial case together with the monovalent "To be" (I am; You are; He/She/It is/ We are; You are; They are) or with bivalent auxiliary verb "have" (mits, gits, uts; miskhen; giskhen; uskhen) presented in the form of present series. Organic production was more productive.

The article deals with one nuance of periphrastic derivation of the future, which has not been the subject of the special research in Georgian scientific literature. In particular, the connection, in respect of the subject ranged with the verb, is clear between organic forms of expressing the future and the periphrastic derivation.

The research showed that if the verb with organic derivation designed with subjunctive mood is intransitive, is mono or bivalent, its subject is identical with the subject of periphrastic derivation (both absolute and relative auxiliaris) and is active or inactive with its nature.

If the verb of organic formation is transitive, bivalent or three-valent, the direct object ranged with the verb is transformed into the subject in both constructions containing absolute and relative auxiliary verbs. Such subject is inactive with its nature as it is identical to the direct object of organic derivation.

The future tense expressed with periphrastic model in ancient Georgian was different functionally from the future designed with subjunctive series, as it was carrying the modal essence: It expressed the action that should definitely happen in the future, that is, **the necessity** of the action (**Epistemic modality**) as well as – **obligation** of performing some actions (**Deontic modality**).