FOR THE ISSUE OF THE TERMINOLOGY OF GEORGIAN RHETORIC

NATIA KENTCHIASHVILI
PhD in Philology,
Associate Professor at Caucasus International University,
ელ-ფოსტა: natia.kentchiashvili@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-8230-7633

Abstract: The subject of this study is the examination of terminology related to Georgian rhetoric. The analysis identifies two groups of terminology: vocabulary consisting of original Georgian terms, and vocabulary borrowed from various languages. The study of both groups is crucial for exploring Georgian word formation as well as linguistic contact with foreign languages. Furthermore, the terms examined in this research can also be classified according to the fields and genres in rhetoric. Special attention is devoted to the terminology used to denote rhetorical tropes in Georgian rhetorical tradition. Thus, the terminology under investigation is divided into three thematic groups: terminology related to rhetorical fields, genres, and tropes. The novelty and relevance of the research lie in the fact that it presents a corpus-based approach to studying the subject, which enables a continuation and renewal of scholarly research using modern methodology. In particular, it allows us to verify already identified lexical and phraseological terms using more extensive linguistic resources and frequency data on term usage. The empirical material consists of Old Georgian literature, spoken language, folklore, and oral traditions – most of which are included in the Georgian National Corpus (henceforth GNC), although not all. In addition to corpus resources, the research also utilizes terminology found in the first Georgian-language textbooks on rhetoric and Georgian academic literature, adding greater depth and completeness to the study. In quoting attested terms, preference is given to examples derived directly from oratorical texts. Based on the examination of early Georgian textbooks and academic literature, it is deemed necessary to clarify issues related to key rhetorical terminology.

Keywords: Georgian rhetoric; Terminology of Georgian rhetoric; Original terminology in Georgian rhetoric; Borrowed terminology in Georgian rhetoric

* * *

Introduction. This research focuses on the study of terminology related to Georgian rhetoric. Any scholarly inquiry into rhetorical studies necessarily requires the identification of its terminology, as this forms the foundational framework upon which subsequent research is built. This terminology serves as the basis for engaging with existing literature and producing new scholarly work in the field. It is worth noting that, alongside the historical development of Georgian rhetoric, many synonymous terms have emerged – some of which are of native Georgian origin, while others are borrowed from foreign languages. Over the centuries, this terminology has developed into a stable system comprising two principal lexical groups: original Georgian terms and borrowed terms. The examination of both groups provides insight into the historical development of Georgian rhetorical practice and its linguistic interactions with other cultures. Moreover, the terms can be classified based on field and genre divisions within rhetorical theory. Accordingly, we can distinguish two main categories of terminology: (1) terms related to rhetorical fields and (2) terms related to rhetorical genres. A separate subject of study is the terminology used to denote various tropes in Georgian rhetoric. Thus, in the current research, the rhetorical terminology under review is divided into three thematic groups: field-related terms, genre-related terms, and trope-related terms.

Review of Sources / Literature Review

It is noteworthy that the lexicon related to rhetoric was first scientifically studied by N. Kandelaki in his works. The author devotes attention to the study of general terminology of Georgian rhetoric in works such as „Georgian Rhetoric" (1958: 41-53), „Georgian Classical Rhetoric" (1961: 48-59), and „Georgian Rhetoric" (1968: 52-63), among others. The terminology of diplomatic rhetoric is examined separately in the work „Georgian Diplomatic Rhetoric" (1966: 18-28). For the study of terminology referring to tropes, we rely on the following studies: the article by N. Tsetskhladze and M. Khakhutaishvili, „The Anonymous Author's „Brief Rhetoric or Eloquence" (2011: 114-119); among other authors, the article by N. Kentchiashvili, „The Theory and Practice of Rhetoric in 18th-19th Century Georgia Based on the First Georgian-Language Rhetorical Textbooks" (2020: 133), and her monograph „Tropes in Georgian Rhetoric" (2021b: 25-26). Among the lexicons, we rely on Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani's „Dictionary of the Georgian Language" (1991; 1993), and others.

Methodology

The present study represents an attempt at a corpus-based investigation of the issue, which enables us to continue and renew the scientific study of the topic based on modern methodology. The novelty and relevance of the research are conditioned by the fact that it relies on a corpus-based methodology, which allows us to verify the already identified cases of lexical and phraseological terminology usage with the help of a greater linguistic resource than was previously possible. Additionally, a corpus-based study enables us to utilize frequency data of term usage. Besides the corpus resource, the research will also rely on the terminology used in the first Georgian-language rhetoric manuals, which adds completeness to the study. For this type of research, rich and diverse empirical material is provided by old Georgian literature, spoken language, folk oral tradition, and others. Most of these resources are included in the Georgian National Corpus (hereinafter, GNC), although not all of them. In addition to the corpus resource, the study will also rely on the terminology used in the first Georgian-language rhetoric manuals and in Georgian scientific literature, which adds further completeness to the research. Naturally, special importance is given to terms attested in written sources. When presenting them, preference is given to providing examples directly from oratorical samples.

General Terminology of Georgian Rhetoric

The foremost term with which we wish to begin the analysis is the word „მჭევრი" (mch'evri). In Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani's dictionary, it is defined as a rhetor, while „მჭევრობა" (mch'evroba) is defined as rhetoric (1991: 549). Thus, „მჭევრი" corresponds to the Greek ὀ ῥήτωρ (ho rhḗtōr) in Georgian. From this term, many designations indicating „oratory" subsequently emerged, among which „მჭევრმეტყველი" (mch'evrmetqveli) and „მჭევრმეტყველება" (mch'evrmetqveleba) eventually became established and are still in use today. In the GNC, „მჭევრი" is attested 36 times, „მჭევრმეტყველი" 88 times, and „მჭევრმეტყველება" 66 times (2025).

The terms derived from „მჭევრი" were widely spread in the 17th-18th centuries. A large part of them were used in the first half of the 19th century and continue to be used in scientific literature to this day. For example, such terms include „მჭევრმეთქჳ", „მჭევრ-მოუბნარი", which Anton Kathalikos confirms in „Tskhobil Sitqvaoba" as synonyms for orator, while „მჭევრთქმობა" is attested with the meaning of rhetoric (Bagrationi, 1980: cols. 657, 715, 753). The term „მჭევრ-მეთქვი" appears with the meaning of orator in Ioane Batonishvili's „Kalmashoba" (1948: 172), and „მჭევრ-მეთქუეობა", „მჭევრ-სიტყუაობა" meaning rhetoric are found in Solomon Dodashvili's Ritorika (1989: 151, 153).

In Georgian oratorical art, terms of Greek-Latin origin related to rhetoric are also common. Among them, the oldest and more widespread are „რიტორი" (ritori) and the derived forms „რიტორება" // „რიტორობა". These terms, whose introduction reflects connections with Byzantine culture, persisted in

Georgian speech until the mid-19th century. In the GNC, „რიტორი" is attested 61 times, „რიტორება"
7 times, and „რიტორობა" 5 times (2025).

In Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani's dictionary, „რიტორი" is defined as: „It is the language of the Greeks.
In Georgian, it is called basilikoni and mch'eviri" (1993: 12). The term „ბასილიკონი" (basilikoni), which
Saba names as a Georgian synonym of the Greek ritor and Georgian mch'evrmetqveli, is not widespread
in Georgian usage and is not used in oratorical art. According to Saba's explanation, „რიტორება" is
„the power of eloquent persuasive speech in civic matters, which aims to speak well for the conclusion"
(1993: 12).

The above-mentioned terms are of Greek origin: ὁ ῥήτωρ denotes the teacher of rhetoric or orator,
and ἡ ῥητορική (hē rhētorikē) – the theory of oratorical art. Among Latin-derived terms, the newly bor-
rowed and still widely used term „ორატორი" (oratori) should be noted, which derives from the Latin
word orator – „public speaker" – and refers to an orator, an oral speaker. In the GNC, „ორატორი" is
attested 288 times (2025). Also of Latin origin is the much rarer term „ელოკვენცია" (eloquentia) mean-
ing rhetoric, often with an ironic undertone. It derives from the Latin eloquentia – rhetoric (Kandelaki,
1968: 61).

These terms were especially widely used in 18th-19th century literature. For example, Ioane Ba-
tonishvili's „Kalmashoba" frequently uses „რიტორი" and sometimes its artificial substitutes: „რიტორ-
მომთხრობელი", „რიტორ-მჭევრმოუბნარი" (1948: 172, 185). In the same work, among the „most
important sciences" is named rhetoric, and its definition is given as the science of the theory of oratory.

The terms „რიტორიკა" (ritorika), „მჭერ მეთქვეობა", „მჭერ-სიტყვაობა", „მჭერსიტყვაობა",
„რიტორი", and „ორატორი" are used by Solomon Dodashvili in his first original Georgian-language rhet-
oric manual, written around 1828 (1989: 179-189). The term „რიტორი" appears alongside „ორატორი"
(1989: 151). Here, „რიტორი" corresponds to orator, „რიტორება" to rhetoric, and „რიტორიკა" to the
theory of rhetoric. Regarding „ორატორი", this term appears for the first time in Georgian in S. Do-
dashvili's Ritorika, where it occurs several times with the meaning of orator or oral speaker (1989: 151,
152). Thus, according to the author, the meaning of „რიტორი" does not coincide with the definition of
„ორატორი". The former represents the theoretical knowledge of rhetoric, i.e., the theoretician, while
the latter is the practical representative of oratory, i.e., a public speaker and practitioner.

An unknown author's 1879 publication titled Short Rhetoric or Useful Oratory for Young Men offers
the term „რეტორიკა" (retorika) in its title (1879). „რეტორიკა" is a direct translation of the correspond-
ing French equivalent (Rhétorique), which again indicates the foreign origin of the book and specifically
that the term was introduced as a calque (see Kentchiashvili, 2021a: 167; Kentchiashvili, 2021b: 47;
Kentchiashvili, 2023: 838).

The 1898 manual Theory of Eloquence, compiled by Archimandrite Kirion and Gr. Kipshidze, groups
oratorical samples under the title Oratorical Prose (1898: 267-303).

Regarding Georgian scientific literature, both the Latin root term „რიტორიკა" and its Georgian
equivalent „მჭევრმეტყველება" are used and established. Other variations include: oratorical prose
(mch'evrmetqveluri prose) (Baramidze, 1979), and others. As for rhetorical style, the following syn-
onyms exist: philosophical-rhetorical style // Attic // Aristotelian, metaphorical-ornamental style, theolog-
ical-rhetorical style, etc. (Bezarashvili, 2004; Bezarashvili, 2009: 152-164). In the GNC, „რიტორიკა"
is attested 1,350 times, while its Georgian-origin equivalent „მჭევრმეტყველება" is attested 66 times
(2025). Comparing these two figures shows that in Georgian, the former is used more frequently,
while the latter is less common.

Alongside the main terminology of rhetoric, it is necessary to note the so-called „auxiliary lexicon" re-
lated to oratorical art, which is found in Georgian written monuments and spoken language. N. Kandela-
ki classifies such lexical groups as: epithets, compounds, phraseological expressions, and antonymic
synonyms encountered in the field of rhetoric (1961: 58-59).

It is also important to note that the Georgian language features a variety of synonyms for the term
„ორატორი" (orator). For example, the following terms are used: რიტორი (ritori), მჭევრმეტყველი

(mch'evrmetqveli), მჭევრი (mch'eviri), ენამჭევრი (enamch'eviri), ენაწყლიანი (enatschliani), ენამეტყველი (enametqveli), ენამზე (enamze), ენამზიანი (enamziani), ენოვანი (enovani), ენამშვენიერი (enamshvenieri), ენამოქარგული (enamok'arguli), სიტყმატკბილი (sitqmatkbili), სიტყვამშვენიერი (sitqvamshvenieri), მშვენიერმოუბარი (mshvenirmoubari), ოქროპირი (okropiri), and others (Gaprindashvili & Tvaltvadze, 2007: 6).

Terminology of Rhetorical Fields (Domains)

The terms designating the branches of rhetoric were listed by the Georgian cleric Ephrem Mtsire in the second half of the 11th century. He mentions the functions of rhetoric and states: „There are three kinds of the orator's teaching: persuasive, deliberative, and ceremonial" (Qaukhchishvili, 1940: XL). Using synonymous terminology, these branches are: deliberative, judicial, and ceremonial.

The branches of rhetoric are referred to by other terms by the 12th-century Georgian philosopher Ioane Petritsi in his original work Explanation of Proclus Diadochus and Platonic Philosophy, which the author appended as a postscript translation of Proclus Diadochus' (410-485 AD) treatise The Links of God's Teachers (Qaukhchishvili, 1940: XXXV). Among the main scientific disciplines forming scholastic education, the author lists rhetoric and its principal fields. Here, Ioane Petritsi discusses the doctrines of the well-known theologian Gregory of Nazianzus, which are contained in his own work The Epitaphic Word of Great Basil (Qaukhchishvili, 1940: XXXV). Petritsi's explanation shows not only the Greek rhetorical branches but also the sectoral distinctions of Georgian rhetoric with corresponding terminology. Ioane Petritsi writes: „But the divine orator of rhetoric establishes three divisions, from which these are distinguished: deliberation, disputation, and celebration" (Qaukhchishvili, 1937: 223). Again, using synonymous terms, these are deliberative, judicial, and ceremonial branches. N. Kandelaki equates the „deliberation" branch with the „audience-hall" branch (1958: 82).

Chronologically following the terminology preserved in Georgian-language rhetoric manuals, it is necessary to mention the first printed Georgian rhetoric manual Short Rhetoric, where in naming the forms of rhetoric the author follows the antique rhetorical tradition and lists the three branches mentioned above under the following names: „Persuasive rhetoric", „Advisory rhetoric" and „Judicial rhetoric" (1879: 39). The synonymous terms for these are ceremonial, deliberative, and judicial.

The next Georgian-language manual addressing the four main branches of rhetoric is the Theory of Eloquence compiled by Archimandrite Kirion and Gr. Kipshidze; the rhetorical branches named there are: „Political rhetoric", „Judicial rhetoric", „Panegyric rhetoric" and „Spiritual rhetoric". This classification includes a note at the end referring to the emergence of a new branch of academic rhetoric, the so-called „academic rhetoric": „Recently, another kind of rhetoric has been introduced, called academic rhetoric. The word academic generally denotes some scientific discipline" (Archimandrite Kirion and Kipshidze (eds.), 1898: 51). According to this manual, not only new terminology is introduced, but also the number of rhetorical branches is increased, and authors no longer adhere strictly to the traditional antique classification of rhetoric.

The next attempt to classify the branches of Georgian rhetoric takes on a scientific character. This is the most systematic classification and belongs to N. Kandelaki, a researcher of the history of Georgian rhetoric. He studied the content and formal distinctions of Georgian rhetoric, based on which he identified branches, sub-branches, and subdivisions. The scholar names the oldest sub-branches of Georgian rhetoric as „banqueting and feast rhetoric" and „funeral rhetoric," and their genres, respectively, as toasts and funeral speeches (1968: 64).

According to Kandelaki's classification, six branches are distinguished in classical Georgian rhetoric (1st-18th centuries), using the following terms: „Preaching," „Audience-hall," „Military," „Judicial," „Ceremonial," and „Funeral" (1958: 80). In addition to the main branches, sub-branches and subdivisions are also identified. Among them, the preaching branch is the most diverse and includes five known sub-branches from the history of world Christian preaching rhetoric (pastoral, educational, panegyric, celebratory, and condolence) and one subdivision (disputational); the audience-hall branch has a sub-

division called diplomatic rhetoric; the ceremonial and funeral branches have a subdivision known as epistolary oratorical rhetoric (Kandelaki, 1968: 97).

It is noteworthy that historically, the branches of rhetoric have undergone changes, as noted by Kandelaki: „Within modern rhetoric, new substantive branches and genre forms of oratorical art have emerged and developed in our country; some old genres have changed and transformed into new substantive forms" (1968: 94). The historical change of rhetorical branches is best exemplified by the so-called „audience-hall" and „political" branches; V. Katchakhidze notes that according to Georgian historical sources, the oratory art called „audience-hall rhetoric" is also called political rhetoric and collectively referred to as „audience-hall-political rhetoric" (1980: 154). T. Jagodnishvili mentions „parliamentary rhetoric" alongside „political rhetoric" (1999: 10). T. Jagodnishvili, I. Gabisonia, and I. Jagodnishvili in their book also mention „audience-hall (diplomatic) rhetoric" (2018: 23). In modern Georgian rhetorical branch classification, political rhetoric has completely replaced audience-hall rhetoric.

Terminology of Rhetorical Genres

In Georgian oratory, the corresponding genre forms of the fields are established with the following terminology: „speech" „sermon" „teaching," „lesson" „praise" „eulogy" „lecture" „report" „address" „presentation" and so on. According to N. Kandelaki's classification, each field has main and auxiliary genres. The main genres are: word and sermon, while the auxiliary genres are: teaching, lesson, praise, eulogy, lecture, report, meeting speech, agitation speech, inaugural speech, and others. According to N. Kandelaki's classification, the main genre of the preaching field of oratory is the sermon, and its auxiliary genres are: teaching, lesson, praise, eulogy, and others; the main genre of the audience-hall, military, judicial, ceremonial, and funeral fields is the word; the auxiliary genre of audience-hall, military, and judicial oratory is the report; the auxiliary genres of ceremonial and funeral fields are praise and eulogy, and these fields also have epistolary subdivisions, whose genres are: prayer letter, condolence letter, and others (1968: 97). N. Kandelaki names the diplomatic oratory as a subdivision of the audience-hall field, which, according to its forms of expression, has oral and epistolary genre variations; oral diplomatic oratory genres are: word, conversation, question-answer (oral), report (oral), aja (oral); epistolary diplomatic oratory genres are: letter // book // epistle, correspondence, report card, address // presentation, question-answer (written), aja (written) // petition letter (1968: 407).

The widely used and long-established term is „sermon." According to Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani's dictionary, the term sermon is defined as „teaching with a loud voice," and sermonizer is explained as „a loud speaker of teaching" / „one who delivers sermons" (1993: 209), while preacher is defined as „one who speaks sermons" (1991: 534). It can be said that the terms „sermonizer" and „preacher" have the same meaning and denote one who publicly speaks orally.

In terms of meaning and homonymous nature, terms similar to sermon are: lesson and teaching, which indicate public oral teaching and guidance. As Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani explains: „Lesson is a sermon" (1993: 123).

The 12th-century philosopher Ioane Petritsi's work Explanation of Proclus Diadochus and Platonic Philosophy conveys: „Among the many views spoken above, there are also good teachings" (Qaukhchishvili, 1937: 183). In these contexts, „teaching" indicates oral instruction.

Elsewhere, it appears in the meaning of an educational, preaching work. For example, Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani named his collection of oratorical works „Lessons and Teachings" (1963). Here, the two synonymous terms represent the same phenomenon – lesson and teaching. Similarly, the 18th-century preacher Ambrosi Nekreseli's collection of oratorical works is titled „Sermons and Teachings" (1881).

Alongside the aforementioned terms, but more rarely used for publicly spoken works, Georgian literature employs praise and eulogy. For example, „Praise of the Holy Martyr Habosi" (Qubaneishvili (ed.), 1946: 69), which Ioane Sabanisdze separately highlights in his work.

Among ceremonial oratorical works, notable is the eulogy presented in the canonical work of Ruis-Urbnisi's „Chronicle," by Arsen Ikaltoeli addressed to King David IV with the title: „Eulogy of the faithful

servant and God-protected lord David" (Kavtaria (ed.), 2013: 109-110). The eulogy is followed by long commemorations of the living (kings, queens, and catholicos-patriarchs) and the deceased. K. Kekelid-ze called this part of the „Chronicle," which includes David's eulogy, a „Synodikon" (1951: 542).

In the preaching oratory field, notable collections of eulogy genre samples include, first and fore-most, Anton I Catholicos's „Martyrika," compiled around 1768-1769. The Martyrika contains 20 orator-ical works commemorating the feats of martyrs whose remembrance was established in the Georgian ecclesiastical calendar. All 20 works belong to the preaching and ceremonial oratory field and the eulo-gy genre. Each work's title has a similar structure, beginning with the same phrase: „Eulogy and narra-tion of the deeds and sufferings," followed directly by the name of the saint(s) and ending with „made by Anton, Archbishop of All Georgia, of the Davidiani-Bagratovani family." In addition, the collection uses and mentions the term „eulogies"; in the appended index, we find the generalization: „Pinax of the Book Martyrika of Thirty Eulogies," listing these „eulogies" (e.g., eulogy for Saint Ketevan, etc.). In the texts, the titles of oratorical works start with the word „eulogy": „Eulogy and narration of the deeds and sufferings of the great holy martyr Queen Ketevan, made by Anton, Archbishop of All Georgia, of the Davidiani-Bagratovani family" (Kavtaria & Gabidzashvili (eds.), 2008: 11-37).

Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani defines praise as „eulogy, glory, the utterance of good deeds, thanks, telling of someone's deeds" (1993: 219), and eulogy as „praise-decoration" (1993: 294).

Finally, it is notable that oratorical genres also undergo changes historically, just like the fields, as N. Kandelaki points out: „Within modern oratory, new substantive fields and genre forms of oratorical art have emerged and developed in our country; some old genres have changed and transformed into new substantive forms" (1968: 94). It is also necessary to consider the later historical situation; for example, the emergence of a new field – academic rhetoric – and new genre forms – lecture, report, abstract, discussion, and disputation – coincide with the period of new Georgian oratory, specifically the 19th century (Kandelaki, 1968: 93). The newer and especially the most recent academic rhetoric theory and practice widely use terms derived from Latin: lecture (lectio) – a publicly delivered work containing de-fined knowledge, or the academic process of delivering it; lecturer (lector – reader) – the one reading or delivering the lecture; report (re-fero – to carry or deliver) – a work containing the content of a scientific problem; discussion (discussio) – exchange of views on a disputable issue; disputation (disputo – to argue) – exchange of views on a scientific issue (Kandelaki, 1968: 61-62).

Terminology of Tropes

The study of terminology denoting tropes is made possible by Georgian-language rhetoric manuals. The very last paragraph of S. Dodashvili's „Rhetoric" addresses tropes, which the author explains as follows: „A trope is the substitution of one word by another with the same meaning, but mostly with a different expression" (1989: 179-189). The types of tropes listed are metaphor, irony, hyperbole, synec-doche, and metonymy: „Metaphor is a trope based on the similarity of the thing. For example: spring of life, beastly soul" (1989: 188); „Irony is a trope in which the opposite meaning of the thing expressed is implied. For example, rejoice, evil one, by your evil deed!" (1989: 188); „Hyperbole is a trope in which words representing a thing are used in an exaggeratedly greater or lesser degree (exaggeration is the greatest, understatement is the least). For example, a fountain of tears. He is as powerless as a fly" (1989: 188); „Synecdoche is a trope in which a general term is used instead of a particular feature, a related term instead of a name, and vice versa. For example, mortal instead of man" (1989: 188); „Me-tonymy is a trope in which the cause is used instead of the effect and vice versa. For example, I love reading Petre's [works]" (1989: 188).

In „Brief Rhetoric" alongside many other issues, „figures of speech (Figures)" are discussed, in which two subgroups are distinguished: „figures of words" and „figures of thoughts" (Part II of the work). These are types of tropes, which are stylistic devices and the main categories of stylistics. Here we also read: „It is the grammarian's duty to arrange words strictly and only to pay attention to the adornment of the subject; whereas the orator must excellently add some beauty to that" (Brief Rhetoric, 1879: 45).

The forms of words named in the manual include addition, overlapping, multiple repetition, similar sounding, and so on. This implies different types of repetition. As for the forms of thoughts, the manual gives the following explanation: „Every word pronounced outside of ordinary speech, whether said in a transformed or altered way, or in another form" (Brief Rhetoric, 1879: 45).

The manual provides and explains various types of tropes with examples. „გარდასხვაფერება" (Transformation) is defined as follows: „Changing the meaning of a word to another meaning, by similarity or coloration, for example, calling ink a pond of the eye, hair a field of eyelashes, a vineyard of tears, the mouth of the plotter and others" (Brief Rhetoric, 1879: 45). It is evident that „transformation" here refers to metaphor.

„ნაცვალ სახელობა" (Substitution of name) is defined as follows: „When the cause is put instead of the effect or the effect instead of the cause, or the wrong attribute instead of the right one, or the opposite, or the passage of time instead of the moment" (Brief Rhetoric, 1879: 52), which is the same as metonymy. However, elsewhere „substitution of name" is connected with „circumlocution" and mentioned together, defined as „using a general name instead of a specific name" (Brief Rhetoric, 1879: 58), for example, „son of destruction" meaning Judas, which approaches the meaning of periphrasis.

„მიმხდურობა" (Occurrence) is defined as „almost used like substitution of name, a part instead of the whole, a related type instead of the name, singular instead of plural, and so on" (Brief Rhetoric, 1879: 53) – synecdoche.

„გადაქართულება" (Alteration or different wording) the same as allegory, is explained as follows: „A word constructed with many transformed meanings, a word that represents one thing to indicate and signify another, for example, the vineyard depicted below symbolizes the tribe of Israel" (Brief Rhetoric, 1879: 56).

„ზომის გარდამეტებლობა" (Excess of measure) is defined as „exaggeration or diminution of the force of a word beyond its usual rank" (Brief Rhetoric, 1879: 59), which should be hyperbole; „raising the voice" is „speech expressing the excitement of the most pure heart" (1879: 60) – gradation, and so on.

As research has shown, in S. Dodashvili's „Rhetoric", tropes are defined according to the traditional, ancient classification, while in the „Short Rhetoric", the aspiration to create a national terminology is more pronounced. The analysis of the terminology denoting tropes clearly shows that in the Georgian-language rhetoric textbook, there was an attempt to establish Georgian equivalents instead of terms of foreign origin. As N. Tsetskhladze and M. Khakhutaishvili note: „To denote the types of tropes, the text uses not terms of Latin and Greek origin, but their direct or calqued translations" (2011: 115). This was despite the fact that terminology of foreign origin denoting the types of tropes was widespread and established in the written and oral speech of that period.

However, as the subsequent development process showed, this initiative did not prove successful: the Georgian terms failed to become established in the scientific meta-language, and their use was only episodic. The reason was that the Georgian equivalents sometimes expressed the concept vaguely, and their meaning could only be deduced from examples (Kentchiashvili, 2020: 133; Kentchiashvili, 2021b: 26). Thus, in the history of terminology denoting tropes, the attempt to create Georgian-language terms is of particular importance, which, despite its failure, bears witness to the aspiration towards national word formation. Ultimately, the terminology established in Georgian rhetoric is still linked to ancient, foreign sources.

Conclusion. The study of terminology related to Georgian rhetoric reveals that this discipline is deeply rooted in Georgian cultural traditions and has a historically developed form. The terminology of Georgian rhetoric still belongs to the active lexicon today. Only a small part of the terms has transitioned into the passive lexicon and now represents archaisms.

The terminological diversity includes both general nouns and designations for genres, types, and tropes. The generic classification clearly demonstrates that Georgian public life was closely intertwined with various forms of oratory. The generic forms suggest that Georgian rhetoric had a clearly structured generic system that functionally reflected various communicative needs.

In Georgian rhetoric textbooks from the 19th century onwards, one can observe an attempt to establish equivalents based on the Georgian language instead of terms of antique origin. However, this initiative proved unsuccessful, and as a result, the traditional terminology of foreign origin became established in the Georgian scientific meta-language. Nevertheless, the attempt to create Georgian equivalents demonstrated the aspiration for the development of national scientific thought and the formation of its own terminological system.

The historical attestation of terms in manuscripts, literary sources, and ecclesiastical texts makes it clear that oratory in Georgia served not only a practical but also an educational and cultural function. Furthermore, the research makes it clear that the terminology requires both historical-etymological and semantic-functional analysis in order to fully outline the dynamics of its development.

References:
1. Archimandrite Kirion & Kifshidze, Gr. (eds.). (1898). *Theory of Oratory with Additional Literary Examples, Textbook for Noble Schools, Theological and Educational Institutions, Seminaries and Diocesan Church Schools.* Tbilisi: Printing House of M. Sharadze and Associates, available at: http://dspace.gela.org.ge/handle/123456789/6509;
2. Bagrationi, A. (1980). *Tsqobilsitqvaoba.* prepared for publication, research, commentary and glossary added by Ivane Lolashvili, Tbilisi: Metsniereba, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/401461;
3. Baramidze, R. (1979). *Georgian Historical and Oratorical Prose.* Tbilisi: Sabtchota Sakartvelo;
4. Batonishvili, I. (1948). *Kalmasoba,* Vol. II, edited by K. Kekelidze and Al. Baramidze, Tbilisi: Sakhelgami, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/400953;
5. Bezarashvili, K. (2004). *Theory and Practice of Rhetoric and Translation: According to the Georgian Translations of Grigol the Theologian's Works.* Tbilisi: Metsniereba;
6. Bezarashvili, K. (2009). Literary-Theoretical Aspect of the Relationship Between Rhetoric and Philosophy in the Works of Georgian Hellenophiles (Ephrem the Minor, Ioane Petritsi), *Tsakhnagi: Philological Research Yearbook,* (1), 152-164;
7. Brief Rhetoric, 1879: *Brief Rhetoric or Oratory, Useful for Young Men.* Constantinople: Printing House of Antoine Guizalian, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/315624;
8. Dodashvili, S. (1989). *Works.* Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Publishing House;
9. Gaprindashvili, N. & Tvaltvadze, D. (2007). *Introduction to Rhetoric.* Tbilisi: Nekeri;
10. GNC (2025). *Georgian National Corpus,* available at: http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/page;
11. Jagodnishvili, T. (1999). *Georgian Oratorical Art.* Tbilisi: GTU;
12. Jagodnishvili, T., Gabisonia, I. & Jagodnishvili, Iv. (eds.). (2018). *Rhetoric: Chrestomathy.* Tbilisi: The World of Lawyers;
13. Kandelaki, N. (ed.). (1958). *Georgian Oratory: Monuments and Materials.* Tbilisi: Khelovneba;
14. Kandelaki, N. (1961). *Georgian Classical Oratory.* Tbilisi: Khelovneba;
15. Kandelaki, N. (1966). *Georgian Embassy Oratory.* Tbilisi: Literature and Art, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/465887;
16. Kandelaki, N. (1968). *Georgian Oratory.* Tbilisi: Sabtchota Sakartvelo;
17. Katchakhidze, V. (1980). *Court Oratory.* Tbilisi: Sabtchota Sakartvelo;
18. Kavtaria, M. & Gabidzashvili E. (eds.). (2008). *Georgian Literature: Multi-Volume,* Vol. 4, Sacred Writings, Anton I, Book Martyrika, Sacred Writings. Tbilisi: Tsitsinatela, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/321751;
19. Kavtaria, M. (ed.). (2013). *Georgian Literature: Multi-Volume,* Vol. 15, Book I. Tbilisi: Tsitsinatela;
20. Kekelidze, Kor. (1951). *History of Old Georgian Literature,* Vol. I, Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Publishing House;
21. Kentchiashvili, N. (2020). Theory and Practice of Rhetoric in 18th-19th Century Georgia According to the First Georgian-Language Rhetoric Textbooks, Scientia: Scientific Journal, No. 1, pp. 122-145, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/355701;

22. Kentchiashvili, N. (2021a). The First Printed Georgian-Language Rhetoric Textbook „A Brief Rhetoric“. *Scientia: The First International Scientific Conference (Challenges and Tendencies in the Humanities), Abstracts of Papers,* 162-176, Tbilisi: Korneli Kekelidze National Center of Manuscripts, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/355702;

23. Kentchiashvili, N. (2021b). *Tropes in Georgian Oratory.* Tbilisi: Meridiani, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/360442;

24. Kentchiashvili, N. (2023). On the Issue of the Probable Author of the „Brief Rhetoric“ Textbook. *Proceedings of the Interdisciplinary International Scientific Conference „The Black Sea Region at the Crossroads of Civilizations – I“, Works XVI,* 835-844, Batumi: Shota Rustaveli State University, Niko Berdzenishvili Institute;

25. Nekreseli, A. (1881). *Sermons and Teachings: Sermons and Teachings by Bishop Ambrose Nekreseli.* Tbilisi: Published at the expense of Bishop Alexander, E. Heladze Printing House, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/499262;

26. Orbeliani, S.-S. (1963). *Works in 4 Volumes, Vol. 3, Teachings, Spoken by Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani. Christian Doctrine,* prepared for publication, research, notes, and glossary added by I. Lolashvili; Tbilisi: Sabtchota Sakartvelo, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/495430;

27. Orbeliani, S.-S. (1991). *Georgian Lexicon.* Vol. 1, Prepared According to Autograph Manuscripts, Research and Explanatory Dictionary Added by Ilia Abuladze, Tbilisi: Merani, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/517406;

28. Orbeliani, S.-S. (1993). *Georgian Lexicon.* Vol. 2, Prepared According to Autograph Manuscripts, Research and Explanatory Dictionary Added by Ilia Abuladze, Tbilisi: Merani, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/517894;

29. Qaukhchishvili, S. (1937). Works of Ioane Petritsi, Vol. 2, Commentary on Proclus' Diadochos and Platonism Philosophy, text published and research added by Sh. Nutsukidze and S. Qaukhchishvili, Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Publishing House, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/450571;

30. Qaukhchishvili, S. (1940). Works of Ioane Petritsi, Vol. 1, On Proclus Diadochos Platonist Philosopher, Georgian Text Published, Research and Glossary Added by S. Qaukhchishvili, Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University, available at: https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/450641;

31. Qubaneishvili, S. (ed.). (1946). Chrestomathy of Old Georgian Literature, Vol. 1, Tbilisi, Stalin-named Tbilisi State University Publishing House;

32. Tsetskhladze, N. & Khakutaishvili, M. (2011). Stylistic Issues of the Unknown Author's „Brief Rhetoric or Oratory“. *Language and Culture: Scientific Journal,* (6), 114-119.