

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHLI (Russia) = 3.939  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

## International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2023 Issue: 07 Volume: 123

Published: 18.07.2023 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



**Ekaterine Nakhutsrishvili**

Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University  
Doctor of Education in Teacher Education (English Language Teaching Methodology)  
Georgia

**Elene Dzamiashvili**

Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University  
Doctor of Education in Teacher Education (English Language Teaching Methodology)  
Georgia

**Ketevan Shashviashvili**

Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University  
Doctor of Education  
Georgia

## DIFFERENTIATION OF THE GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY OF VOICE IN ENGLISH AND GEORGIAN LANGUAGES

**Abstract:** The paper deals with the study of a verb and one of its categories – the Voice. It is worth mentioning that the verb represents the spine of the grammar of any language. It is the most complex and capacious part of speech. The Voice is one of the essential and principal among the English verb categories characterized by distinct peculiarities, which should be known by the English language learners. Like the English language, the Voice in Georgian is one of the most complicated categories. The difficulty stands in the fact, that none of the Voices except for passive has any proper, specific markers. Moreover, one voice resembles the other with a number of signs. The difficulty of the verb is conditioned by its polypersonalism.

In our study we aimed at finding out and analyzing some distinctions of the grammatical category of Voice in two different languages – the English and Georgian ones. According to our findings it becomes obvious that the problem of the Voice category is quite different in the English and Georgian languages. From this point, the acquisition of the Georgian Voice category is more difficult than the English one, though the latest is characterized by specific peculiarities as well. In addition, we can also mention that the Voice is mainly analyzed with its form in English and transitivity in Georgian; the essential thing is that the word order is of great importance while forming the Voice in English, but it lacks importance in the Georgian language; besides, the verb has only 10 forms for Passive Voice in English, whereas the Georgian Passive Voice has the forms of all screeves; English is an analytical language, but Georgian – synthetical; Mostly, English language Passive Voice verb is translated with the Active Voice form in Georgian.

**Key words:** the category of voice, passivisation, differentiation, transitivity, analytical, synthetical.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Nakhutsrishvili, E., Dzamiashvili, E., & Shashviashvili, K. (2023). Differentiation of the Grammatical Category of Voice in English and Georgian Languages. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 07 (123), 121-125.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-07-123-18> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.07.123.18>

**Scopus ASCC:** 1203.

### Introduction

The verb represents the spine of the grammar of any language. It is the most complex and capacious part of speech. Among the verb categories, the Voice

is one of the most essential and important grammatical categories, which is characterized by certain peculiarities and it is quite necessary to study and analyze it for the language learners.

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

In English the category of voice is the system of two-member opposeemes (*loves – is loved, loving – being loved, to love – to be loved, has loved – has been loved, etc.*) which show whether the action is represented as issuing from its subject (**the active voice**) or as experienced by its object (**the passive voice**). The active is the most common, unmarked voice while the passive is a marked member of the voice opposition as it is formed with the auxiliary *be* + **the past participle of the main verb**. The passive verb forms are less common and used for special discourse functions. Compared to active voice, passive voice reduces the importance of the agent (i.e. the doer of the action) and allows the receiver of the action to become the subject of the sentence. (Greenbaum & Quirk, 1995, 45-46).

However, passive verb phrases can also be formed with the auxiliary **get**, called the **get-passive** (e.g. *get dressed, get caught, etc.*). They are characteristically used in sentences involving adversity or benefit. (e.g. *Kim got sacked. vs. Kim got promoted*). **Get-passives** are usually used in conversation or in informal English. They tend to be avoided in formal style. For example: *It's about these people who got left behind in Vietnam*.

There are short and long passives. In short passives (also called agentless passives) the agent is not specified while long passives contain a **by-phrase** which specifies the agent of the action. E.g.:

*The children were sent to the camp. (short passive)*

*The children were sent to the camp by their uncle. (long passive).*

The frequency of both forms of the passive varies greatly across registers. Passive voice verbs are most common in the expository registers, where agents are often unknown or unimportant. In academic prose, passives account for about 25 percent of all finite verbs. Passives are also common in news (about 15 percent of all finite verbs), where they often report negative events that happened to someone. In contrast, passive voice verbs are rare in conversation. (Ward, Birner, Huddleston, 2002, 142).

## Similarities and Differences of the Grammatical Category of Voice in English and Georgian

### Study Analysis

Like English, the Voice is one of the most difficult verb categories in Georgian. This difficulty is caused by the fact that the Verb category does not have its own, specific marker (except for the passive voice). In addition, one Voice is very similar to another with a number of signs (Talakvadze, 1959, 229). The complexity of the verb is primarily determined by its finite forms.

Both in terms of expression and function, this category of verb can be quite different in various

languages. In this case, the matter of the Voice category distinctions in English and Georgian languages is of great interest for us. For this, first of all, the grammatical category of voice of these two languages should be compared from the quantitative point of view. The majority of linguists recognize the existence of only two voices - Active and Passive in English. As we have already mentioned, the active voice shows that the action is directed from the subject to the object and the subject itself is the doer of an action. The passive voice is used to show that the action is directed to the subject and not from it. The subject itself is not the doer of an action but is acted upon. The passive voice is not simply a parallel construction of the active voice. Very often we do not find the doer of an action in the passive constructions. This is because sometimes we do not know the doer of an action or we are not interested in it or sometimes we do not want to mention it for some reason or other. Some grammarians (e.g. Ilyish, 1971, 115) hold that the number of voices is more than two. Some of them count even five voices in Modern English, namely: the Active Voice, the Passive Voice, the Reflexive Voice, the Middle Voice, and the Reciprocal Voice. Unlike English, in Georgian language we have only three voices: Active, Passive and Middle. Since nowadays in both languages, the main attention is paid to the active and passive voice and only these two forms are explained in the class, we consider it appropriate to differentiate them.

In English, the passive is more widely represented, since passive forms are taken by both transitive and intransitive verbs, including prepositional verbs. In addition, there are those, which have the aptitude for having the object, but cannot produce a passive form. As such, we can consider a subclass of stative verbs that have a weakly expressed dynamism or reflect possession: *have, belong, cost, resemble, fail, etc.* Thus, verbs in English can or cannot allow passivisation (transformation of a sentence from an active form to a passive form), but the passive as a category is not in doubt, since even non-passivisation verbs can produce passive forms in certain contexts. Through the process of passivization, the direct object of an active declarative sentence can become the subject of a passive sentence. The opposite of passivization is activation. In order to understand passivization, it is helpful to view examples from a variety of texts.

"Passivisation ... keeps together those units or bits of language that form a constituent. The passive counterpart of an active clause usually contains a form of *be* and a *past participle*: *The man in the service station was seen by Muriel. The man was seen by Muriel in the service station.*" (Downing, A., & Locke, Ph. 2002).

"Passivisation allows you to leave out the Actor in Material processes, Experiencer in Mental

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

processes, and Sayer (speaker) in Verbal process clauses:

Material: *Poachers killed the elephant - the elephant was killed.*

Mental: *Rangers noticed the vultures - the vultures were noticed.*

Verbal: The marksmen told the poacher to freeze - the poacher was told to freeze.

Sometimes this enables newspapers, for instance, to protect sources by omitting the reporter, or to retail their own opinions as though they were someone else's: e.g. 'It is widely believed the BJP will not survive the confidence vote in the Indian Parliament.' ... the omission of an Actor will avoid apportioning blame or responsibility." (Goatly, A. 2000).

As for the use of the passive voice in the Georgian language, Charkviani (2014, 90) believes that it is very different from the passive voice of the English language. Moreover, the determination of the voice itself as a morphological category of the verb is based on different principles. The common thing in the definition is that when we talk about the category of voice in both cases we mean to differentiate the relation of the verb process. By relation, only the grammatically expressed direction is meant and not by any other means (vocabulary, occasional structures, etc.).

In addition, the issue of Voice in English is much easier than in Georgian. In English, even with the naked eye, the difference between the active and passive voice is clearly visible, as here the passive voice is a marked member of the opposition: it is characterized by the form - to be, the corresponding tense form of the auxiliary verb "to be" + the third form of the conjugation verb, while the active voice is unmarked, the mentioned form is completely unacceptable for it. In the Georgian language, the prefix-suffixes (i-, e-, -d) produce the passive voice, and most importantly, the issue of the Voice category is related to the transitivity of the verb. All active voice verbs are transitive, i.e. they have a direct object, and passive and middle voice verbs are intransitive. Accordingly, active voice verbs are two-person or three-person, while those of passive and middle voice are one-person or two-person (Kvatchadze, 1981, 231). In contrast, in English, the intransitive verb does not produce a passive form, e.g.: [*The cat ran away*].

Thus, in English, the voice is distinguished mainly from a formal point of view, and in Georgian, it is distinguished by its transitivity.

It is worth noting that during the production of Voice in the English language, extremely great importance is attached to the order of words, which is strictly determined during the transformation, which implies that in the active voice sentence in English, the subject must necessarily be in the first place, then the verb and the object must follow, e.g.: *I write the letter [me vwer werils]*. We cannot shuffle this order in any

way, because if we do not give great importance to it and write the object in the first place, then the sentence will lose its active form and we will get a passive voice sentence, e.g.: *The letter is written by me [werili iwereba chem mier]*. This issue is completely different in the Georgian language, where no meaning is assigned to a row of words and the content of the sentence is not changed by their replacement, that is, in Georgian we can move the subject to the end of the sentence and thus the content does not change, for example: let us compare, [*bavshvi werils wers*] (the subject is at the beginning of the sentence) and [*wers wers bavshvi*] (here the subject is at the end). As we can see, the sentence structure has not changed, in both sentences the subject is active and therefore the sentence belongs to active voice. Even in the passive construction, it is not necessary to write the object at the beginning of the sentence, as it is typical for English.

In addition, it is also worth mentioning that in the English language the verb has only 10 passive voice forms, these are: present indefinite (*is sent*), past indefinite (*was sent*), future indefinite (*will be sent*), future in the past indefinite (*would be sent*), present continuous (*is being sent*), past continuous (*was being sent*), present perfect (*has been sent*), past perfect (*had been sent*), future perfect (*will have been sent*), future in the past perfect (*would have been sent*). Consequently, some forms of the active voice do not have a proper counterpart in the passive. These are: future continuous (*will be sending*), present perfect continuous (*has been sending*), past perfect continuous (*had been sending*) and future perfect continuous (*will have been sending*). On the contrary, in the Georgian language, the verbs of the passive voice have the form of all screeves.

The next matter that distinguishes English and Georgian languages is the analytical (descriptive) and synthetic (organic) character of the passive form. As we know, in analytical (descriptive) passive, the past tense participle is represented in the form of a stem and by an auxiliary verb [*ikna, iknes, ikneba*], and in synthetic (organic) forms it is accompanied by a nominative marker. In this regard, it can be said that only analytical (descriptive) passive forms are characteristic of English, where the voice is constructed through the auxiliary verbs. Such verbs are "be", "get", "become", "have".

As for the Georgian language, here the analytical (descriptive) passives in modern literary Georgian are mostly confirmed in such cases when the verb cannot produce the usual passive form. Such forms are characteristic of the official-business style and are used even when there are synthetic (organic) forms of the same stem. For example: *garitskhul ikna // gairitskha, gavgavnil ikna // gaigavna...* Therefore, where it is possible to produce the ordinary passive, it is better to give preference to it, and not to the descriptive passive form: *gaketebul ikna – gaketda,*

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

*gamzadebul ikna* – *gamzadda* and so on. (Gogolashvili et al., 2011, 442).

As we have already mentioned, English is an analytical language, while Georgian is a synthetic one. Despite the fact that the Georgian language has both prefixed, suffixed and unmarked passive forms, it still uses descriptive forms and sometimes compound predicate, which should be attributed to the influence of translation from English. All this leads to the conclusion that nowadays the Georgian language is better able to convey information in analytical forms than in synthetic ones of the passive voice.

In most cases, the English passive voice verb is translated into Georgian in the form of the active voice (even because the word order of the Georgian language is not limited, and at the same time, whether the person is a familiar or an unknown one is reflected in the Georgian verb in the same way) and the verb finite form in such case (when the passive-passive is not translated) to a large extent is expressed by the of the objective person, e.g.: I **was put** on a plane (the New York Times, Dec. 3, 2014, A1) – [*chamsves tvitmprinavshi*].

Descriptive forms are common in the Georgian press, and it can be said that the English passive voice mostly corresponds to the Georgian descriptive passive. And the complex tenses of the English passive voice also appear in Georgian with a compound predicate, which is very similar in form to the descriptive passive (Charkviani, 2014, 92).

Furthermore, it is also important that the spelling issues related to the grammatical category of voice completely differentiate English and Georgian from each other, because in English there are often prepositional verbs, which are used mainly at the end of the sentence in the passive voice, e.g.: *he must be written to*. The preposition *by* is used before the subject expressed by an animate noun, and when we are dealing with a substance or an inanimate object in

the case of the subject, we use the preposition *with* instead of *by*.

In the Georgian language, spelling issues are more difficult in relation to the grammatical category of voice. Here the difficulty is caused by the thematic markers. In connection with the production of the passive voice forms, we should take into account that:

1. If the preverb *მი* [*mi-*] is attached to the second or third person forms of the passive voice, the two *ი* [*i*] are joined together: *მი-იმალე* [*mi-imale*], *მი-იმალა* [*mi-imala*];

2. When adding the preverb *შე* [*she-*] to the 2nd and 3rd person forms of the passive voice, two *ე* [*e*] are joined together: *შე-ეფარები* [*she-efarebi*];

3. If the suffixed passive is derived from a word that ends in *დ* [*d*], two *დ* [*d*] are joined together: *ბინდ-ი* [*bind-i*] – *ბინდ-დება* [*bind-d-eba*];

4. If from a word starting with *ე* [*e*], the *e*-form is added by the preverb *შე* [*she-*], the three *ე* [*e*] comes together: *შე-ე-ეჭვა* [*she-e-etchva*];

5. The participle of the descriptive passive is used as a stem if it precedes the auxiliary verb, and it is in the nominative case if it is given after the auxiliary verb: *დანიშნულ იქნა* [*danishnul ikna*], but: *იქნა დანიშნული* [*ikna danishnuli*] (Kvatchadze, 1993, 238-239).

## Conclusion

According to the findings of our study concerning the distinctions of the grammatical category of voice in English and Georgian languages, it should be concluded that the question of the grammatical category of voice is completely different in English and Georgian languages. In this regard, it is more difficult to identify the Georgian language voice category than the English one, however, the latter is also characterized by certain peculiarities.

## References:

1. Charkviani, N. (2014). The Use of Analytical Forms of the Passive Voice in the Georgian and American Press. *Scientific Refereed Journal "Language and Culture"* #11, Kutaisi.
2. Downing, A., & Locke, Ph. (2002). *A University Course in English Grammar*. Routledge.
3. Giorgobiani, L., Kakhishvili, L., Matskhonashvili, G., & Kvividze, R. (2004). *Theory and Methodology of Teaching Foreign Languages*. Tbilisi: Publishing House "Language and Culture".
4. Goatly, A. (2000). *Critical Reading and Writing: An Introductory Coursebook*. Routledge.
5. Gogolashvili, G., et al. (2011). *Morphology of Modern Georgian Language*, Tbilisi.
6. Greenbaum, S., & Quirk, R. (1995). *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
7. Ilyish, B.A. (1971). *The Structure of Modern English*. Leningrad.
8. Kvatchadze, L. (1981). *Georgian Language, Part I. 3rd revised and updated edition*. Tbilisi: Publishing House "Education".

<b>Impact Factor:</b>	<b>ISRA (India) = 6.317</b>	<b>SIS (USA) = 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland) = 6.630</b>
	<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582</b>	<b>ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939</b>	<b>PIF (India) = 1.940</b>
	<b>GIF (Australia) = 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ) = 8.771</b>	<b>IBI (India) = 4.260</b>
	<b>JIF = 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184</b>	<b>OAJI (USA) = 0.350</b>

---

9. Kvatchadze, L. (1993). *Georgian Language – the fourth revised edition*. Tbilisi: Publishing House "Rubikoni".
10. Talakvadze, M. (1959). *Methodology of Teaching Georgian Language Grammar*. Tbilisi: State University Publishing House.
11. Ward, G., Birner, B., & Huddleston, R. (2002). *Information Packaging. In: The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.