

ON THE ISSUE OF SEMANTICS OF ONE TYPE OF PARONOMASTIC EXPRESSION IN
GEORGIAN AND TURKISH
(Comparative Analysis)

TAMAR KAROSANIDZE-KIRSAC

PhD in Philology,

Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University

E-Mail: tamar.karosanidze@erdogan.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0002-4604-8267

Abstract: In the languages, structurally different from each other, various grammatical phenomena may have analogues. Although Turkish and Georgian belong to different language groups, there are observed a certain kind of syntactic similarities. Paronomasia is a natural phenomenon for Georgian. Especially often it is used in Old Georgian, though it is not unknown to modern Georgian either. This kind expressions are wide spread also in Turkish. Paronomastic expressions have many times become the subject of linguists' attention in both Georgian and Turkish. However, no one has been interested in the comparative analysis of similar forms in the two languages until now. The subject of our research is paronomastic expressions of the type „naḥvit naḥa“ „görmesine gördü“ „as for seeing, he saw“; „časvliṭ čaval“ „gitmeye giderim“ „as for going, I'll go“. This article discusses paronomastic expressions in Georgian and Turkish. The similarities that emerged when comparing the studied forms are shown.

The introductory part of the study discusses the essence of paronomasia. There is presented a brief review of the Georgian and Turkish scientific literature related to the issue. The central part is dedicated to the discussion of the structure and semantics of one type of paronomasia in Georgian and Turkish. Its syntactic qualification and functions are discussed. In the final part are given the results of the study. During the study were revealed similarities between Georgian and Turkish paronomastic expressions, which indicates that such expressions may be considered linguistic universals.

Keywords: Paronomastic expressions; Georgian; Turkish.

* * *

Introduction. In Georgian scientific literature, paronomasia is defined as follows: „Paronomasia is representation of one verb in two forms, which evoke one concept in the reader (listener)“ (Tsereteli, 1954: 461). There are cases when the infinitive form of a verb in instrumental case without postposition is connected to the personal form of the same verb, which is known as paronomasia (Kvachadze, 1977: 124). Paronomasia is a syntactic-stylistic figure in which several words with similar pronunciations, but different functions, are positioned close to each other (Davitiani, 1973: 410).

There are different opinions in the Turkish scientific literature regarding the naming of the expressions of interest to us. It is mainly discussed together with other structurally similar expressions and is named as follows: fiil biçimi, deyimisel kullanım, kalıp, fiil kalıbı, birleşik yapı, kalıplaşmış yapı, kısaltmış yapı (Altınöz, 2013:37); anlatım kalıbı (Altınöz, 2013).

The aim of our research is to compare the structure and semantics of paronomastic expressions in two structurally different languages, to highlight the similarities between the two languages. The work is based on the relevant Georgian and Turkish scientific literature.

The issue of paronomasia in Georgian was first studied by Konstantine Tsereteli. He dedicated special work to this issue: „Paronomasia in Georgian“. An extensive discussion regarding the issue is presented in Ivane Imnaishvili's work „Declension of Nouns and Functions of Cases in Old Georgian“; Leo Kvachadze discusses the forms to be analysed in „The Syntax of the Modern Georgian Language“,

and Leila Geguchadze dedicated a special paper „For the Syntactic Qualification of Paronomastic Expressions in Georgian“ to the determination of the syntactic qualification of paronomastic forms.

Such expressions in Turkish are discussed in Mehmet Altınöz's doctoral thesis „Türkiye Türkçesinde Anlatım Kalıpları“. In this work, the interesting us phrases are studied in depth along with various phraseological units. The issue of syntactic qualification and semantic field of the studied expressions are discussed in the following works: Doğan Aksan „Anlambilim“; Deny Jean (çev. Ali Ulvi Elöve) „Türk dili grameri“; Fatma Erkman-Akerson „Türkçe Örneklerle, Dile Genel Bir Bakış“; Atabay, N.; Kutluk İ. ve Özel „Sözcük türleri“; Muharrem Daşdemir „Oklama yöntemiyle Türkçenin yapısal-işlevsel söz dizimi“...

Methods. In the research are used the method of analysis and comparison-matching. The structure, semantics, and syntactic functions of one type of paronomastic expressions in Georgian and Turkish are researched. Georgian examples are taken from the Georgian Language National Corpus (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/page>). Turkish examples are taken from Mehmet Altınöz's doctoral thesis „Türkiye Türkçesinde Anlatım Kalıpları“.

Discussion. Paronomastic expressions in Turkish and Georgian consist of two components: a deverbative noun and a personal form of a verb. Both components are derived from a common verb stem. In Georgian, the masdar, as a member of a paronomasia, is always in the instrumental case. The deverbative noun is also one of the members of a paronomasia in Turkish, although, unlike in Georgian, in Turkish the deverbative noun is always in the dative form. One part of the compound is represented by the suffix -mAyA “ -mAsInA, and the other part is a verb derived from the same stem.

The question arises: on what basis is this or that case selected in the languages to be studied? The special literature notes that in Georgian paronomastic expression, one of the members (the initial) always is in the instrumental case (Imnaishvili, 1957: 234). However, nothing is said about the content features of the instrumental case in similar expressions. It is also underlined here that paronomasia has a native basis in Georgian. The opinion about its mechanical transfer from another language cannot be considered correct.

As for Turkish, the famous Turkologist Zeynep Korkmaz in such kind expressions draws attention to the function of the dative case to express the opposite, contrary meaning: *Uyku ilaci da para etmiyor. Uyumasına uyuyor da erken uyanmanın çaresini bulamıyor* „Even sleeping pills don't help. As for sleeping, he sleeps, but he can't find a way to wake up early.“ (Korkmaz 2014: 297).

The part of deverbative noun of Georgian paronomastic expressions mostly is before the verb-predicate:

gazeti bevr rames dakargavda, tumca gamosvliṭ gamovidoda <http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>
The newspaper would lose a lot, but as for publishing, it would still be published.

The part of deverbative noun precedes the predicate in Turkish as well, although it is not uncommon for it to come after the predicate:

Bahşiş verir vermeye, Şaban Bey sana... „As for giving, Mr. Shaban will give you the remuneration“... (Altınöz, 2013: 323).

In Georgian, the verbal part of paronomastic expressions can be in various forms of mood, tense, person:

laṭarakit laṭarakoben As for speaking, they speak (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>); *gagebit gai-go* As for understanding, he understood (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>); *mosvliṭ movlen* As for going, he was going (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

The similar situation is in Turkish, although in Turkish such expressions are not used with forms of conditional mood (Altınöz, 2013: 320).

Söylemesine söyledim „As for telling, I told him; *Yaşamaya yaşıyormuşum* „As for being alive, it seems, I am alive“; *Kalmasına kalmazdık* „As for staying, we would not stay“; *Küsmesine dünyana küsmüşsün* „As for sulking, you have sulked with whole world“; *Git, gitmeye* „As for going, go“, *Almaya alsam* „As for taking, even if I take“ (Altınöz, 2013: 320).

Syntactic qualification. There are differences of opinion regarding the syntactic qualification of paronomastic expressions in Georgian. According to Shanidze, such forms are simple complements (Shanidze, 1948: 44). According to Tsereteli, no member of a paronomasia can be separated as a separate syntactic member, otherwise the paronomasia loses its specificity and the given polysemy becomes incomprehensible (Tsereteli, 1954: 476). Ivane Imnaishvili also considers paronomastic pairs to be one concept (Imnaishvili, 1957: 239), according to Davitiani, paronomastic expressions usually have a circumstantial function (Davitiani, 1973: 410). In Kvachadze's opinion, when a word used in the instrumental case is not accompanied by an attributive definition/ attributive adjective, a paronomasic pair appears as a solid combination of words, expresses one concept and, as a member of a sentence, should be called a predicate conveyed by the solid connection of words (Kvachadze, 1988: 125). Geguchadze considers the following types of word combinations to be „real paronomasia“: As for going, we shall go, as for finishing, it is finished... Geguchadze calls such combinations „paronomastic compound predicate “ (Geguchadze, 2010: 145).

In Turkish scientific literature, the following opinions are mainly expressed regarding such expressions: it is a composite (Hatiboğlu, 1971: 41), it is represented by the function of a dependent clause. It is connected to the main clause by the adversative conjunctions „ama, dA, ya“ (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 410). The part of deverbative noun of the word combination is an objective complement (Daşdemir, 2015: 77); it is an adverbial modifier (Atabay; Kutluk; Özel 2003:93), it is gerundium (Tiken, 2003: 325).

We think that separating any part of a word combination into a separate syntactic member cannot be considered correct, because in this case the semantic integrity that the paronomastic expression gives to the sentence will be violated.

Functional-semantic analysis. The functions of paronomastic expressions are discussed in Georgian scientific literature. It is said that such expressions are a kind of rhetorical means, which is characterized by a categorical tone. Here are also named the following functions of paronomastic expressions: necessity of action, assertive tone, a kind of conditionality... (Tsereteli, 1947: 483; Imnaishvili, 1957: 234).

They consider main semantic functions of such expressions in Turkish as the accuracy and certainty of the action, event, situation that has been carried out, will be carried out, or is planned to be carried out (Altınöz, 2013:327); the presence of causal-resultativeness, an opposite, contrary action, conditionality... (Erkman-Akerson, 2007: 274)

In Georgian, to enhance the intensity of paronomastic expressions is used the particle „ki“ (and, but) (Kvachadze, 1988: 124). We believe that this particle gives such word combinations a clarifying tone. In such expressions, the particle „**ki**“ is the same meaning as „**as for the question**“.

*otañi hkonda dakiravebuli da kithvisas isedac saçolze ijda. **kithvit ki** amberki qoveltvis **kithulobda** (**kithvit ki** = **rac šeeñeba kithvas**)* „He had rented a room and was already sitting on the bed while reading. As for reading, Amberki was always reading (as for reading =concerning, regarding reading)“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

*qovel mosvlaze (**mosvliť ki ħširad modioda**) aucileblad ikithavda prikses asağs (**mosvliť ki** = **rac šeeñeba mosvlas**)* „Every time he came (and as for coming, he was coming often) he would definitely ask Frixe's age (as for coming = with regard to coming)“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

*qvelaperi icoda, **gağetebit ki** verapers **ağetebda** ise, rogorc tviton undoda. (**gağetebit ki** = **rac šeeñeba gağetebas**)* „He knew everything, but, concerning doing, he could not do anything as he wanted. (by doing = as for doing)“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

*„eg rağa šeni sakmea“, – gaipikra parnaozma, **tkmit ki araperi utkvams**. <http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance> (**tkmit ki** = **rac šeeñeba tkmas**)* „What business is that of yours,“ thought Parnaoz, but as for saying, he didn't say anything (as for saying = with regard to saying)“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

In paronomastic expressions, the fact that „as for“ is implied and emphasizes the action conveyed by the masdar is noted by Kvantaliani in his work „Issues of the Syntax of Georgian Oral Speech“ (Kvantaliani, 1990: 115). However, in the aforementioned work nothing is said about the function of the particle „ki“.

In this regard, the situation in Turkish is also interesting. In Turkish scientific literature, we find the opinion that the expressions of interest to us are obtained as a result of the diminution, disappearance of the lexical unit **Gelince** „as for“ (Deny, 1921:849). The following examples are given to confirm this:

Bilmesine bilir amma domuzluğundan söylemez (**bilmesine=bilmesine gelince**) „As for knowledge, he knows but he won't say it, because he's a pig (with knowledge=regarding knowledge)“ (Deny, 1921:849).

Yazmasına yazarım; fakat zaman bulamıyorum (**yazmaya gelince**) „As for writing, I will write, but I can't find the time (as for writing)“ (Deny, 1921:849).

Korkmasına korktuk lakin ses çıkaramadık (**korkmaya gelince...**). As for fear, I was terrified, but I couldn't make a sound (as for fear) (Deny, 1921:849).

In Georgian, in addition to the particle „ki“, the lexical unit „maints“ (still, however) is often found with paronomastic expressions, which gives the paronomastic expression the semantics of condition and concession.

tumca, **dareḡvit mainc dareḡes** ik – šeicvala čveni gegmebio „However, as for calling, they still called there – that our plans have changed“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

ras mogiḡveḡia es ḡaraḡura, **čaḡebit mainc ar čaiḡeb** „Why have you gathered this junk, as for taking, nevertheless, you won't take it“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

“Gene“ corresponding to the lexical unit „maints“ is also found in Turkish with the same function:

Yeryüzüm parçalanmıştı sanki. **Çalışmasına çalışıyordum gene...** „It was as if the whole world had been destroyed. As for working, I was still working...“ (Altınöz, 2013:319).

In Georgian and Turkish, paronomastic expressions express the semantics of necessity and insistence, which is confirmed by the lexical unit „necessarily“ used with such expressions in Georgian and its equivalent „kesin“ in Turkish.

šeifḡeba bevri veraperi gavigo, magram **čaḡiḡvit aucileblad čaviḡiḡhavo** „I may not understand much, but, as for reading, I will definitely read it“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

Buluruz ama, biraz uğraşırız! İşte o kadar. **Bulmaya kesin buluruz!**... „We'll find it, but we'll struggle a little! That's it. As for finding, we'll definitely find it.“ (Altınöz, 2013:319).

In both Georgian and Turkish, paronomastic expressions are accompanied by an opposite action, which is outwardly expressed by the conjunction that is used with the expression. In Georgian, these conjunctions are mainly „magram“ (but), „Tumtsa“ (although), in Turkish – „ama“, „da“...

mosvliḡ movida, magram čigni ar mouḡania“; „**čamit čama**, magram ugemurad „As for coming, he came, but he has not brought the book“; „As for eating, he ate, but in a tasteless way“ (Imnaishvili, 1957: 242).

Kitabı **okumasına okudum da (ama)** anlamadım „As for reading, I read the book, but I couldn't understand it“ (Aksan, 2005: 213-214).

In Georgian, the above-mentioned conjunctions mainly follow such word combinations. However, we also have cases where the conjunction comes first and the word combination comes after.

aḡlac qepda ḡeleponši, **magram mosvliḡ mainc movida** da isev tavidan daiḡqo qvelaperi. He was still barking into the phone, but as for coming, anyway he came and it all started again (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

The existence of cases where the adversative conjunction precedes the word combination, is explained by the influence of colloquial language in Turkish (Altınöz, 2013:319).

Buluruz **ama**, biraz uğraşırız! İşte o kadar. **Bulmaya kesin buluruz!**... „We'll find it but we'll have to struggle a little. That's all. As for finding, we'll definitely find it“ (Altınöz, 2013:319).

In Georgian, we can observe disconnected pairs, when a word or words are placed between the members of a paronomastic expression (Imnaishvili, 1957:238).

ḡithvit ḡargad vḡithulobdi, magram čemi ubedureba is iqo, rom rusuli ar mesmoda. As for reading, „I was reading well, but my hardship was that I did not understand Russian“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

is iqo, rom mosvlis „grapiḡs“ arasodes icavda, magram časvliḡ zuṡad icoda, romel saatze da romel čutze unda časuliḡo. „The thing was that he never was respecting the „schedule“ of arrivals, but as for leaving, he knew exactly what time and at what minute he had to leave“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

Disconnected paronomastic pairs are also used in Turkish:

Baṡüstüne, ekmesine biz ekeriz, ama bey, bitmez ki... Bizim topraklarda mısır bitmez „As you command, we will sow it, but sir, it doesn't grow... Corn doesn't grow in our land“ (Altınöz, 2013:323).

In similar cases, in both languages is observed an attempt to focus attention on the lexical unit or units that are included between the components of the paronomastic expression.

In Georgian, paronomastic expressions may also be found in sentences with a negative context (Kvachadze 1988: 124). In this case, paronomastic expressions have the function of excluding action (Davitiani, 1973: 410). A negative suffix may be attached to the verbal part of such a phrase in Turkish as well (Altınöz, 2013: 319).

It is noteworthy that in both languages, unlike the positive context, the negative form is devoid of the semantics of necessity, and there is no assertive tone. However, it is often accompanied by the opposite semantics.

kali ṡehqurebda ṡeleiupitērebit ganatebul scenas, magram mosmenit isic ar usmenda oraṡors „The woman was looking at the stage lit by the floodlights, but as for listening, she wasn't listening to the speaker either“ (<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/concordance>).

Seyirci takıma zarar vermeye vermez de ama... „As for harm, a fan won't harm the team, but...“ (Altınöz, 2013:319).

Conclusion. The main semantic nuances of the paronomastic expressions to be researched are similar in Georgian and Turkish. The structure of the word combinations is also similar. This may be caused by the universal nature of paronomastic expressions. Along with the similarities, we also find differences, which are mainly reflected in the specific form features of the two languages.

References:

- gegučaḡe, I. (2010). ṡaronomaziuli gamotkmis ṡinṡaksuri ḡvalipḡaciisatvis kartulṡi. humaniṡ aruli ḡv-levebi, čeličdeuli (ṡomi: I, gv. 141-149). tbilisi: tbilisis universiṡetiṡ gamomcemloba.
- davitiani, a. (1973). kartuli enis ṡinṡaksi. tbilisi: ganatleba.
- imnaiṡvili, i. (1957). saḡelta bruneba da brunvata punkciebi ḡvel kartulṡi. tbilisi: tbilisis saḡelmcipo universiṡetiṡ gamomcemloba.
- ḡvanṡaliani, I. (1990). kartuli zepiri meṡḡvelebis ṡinṡaksis saḡitḡebi, tbilisi: mecnierēba.
- ḡvačaḡe, I. (1988). tanamedrove kartuli enis ṡinṡaksi. tbilisi: ganatleba.
- ṡaniḡe, a. (1948). kartuli enis gramaṡika. načili. 2, ṡinṡaksi (martlčeriṡ saḡitḡebiturt). tbilisi: saḡelgami.
- čereteli, k. (2025). ṡaronomazia kartulṡi. iberiul – ḡavḡasiuri enatmecnierēba (ṡomi:VI, ḡḡ. 461-500). tbilisi: sakartvelos mecnierēbata aḡademiis gamomcemloba.
- kartuli enis erovnuli ḡorpusi. naḡvis tariḡi: 5.04.2025 bmulı: <http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/page>
- Atabay, N.; Kutluk İ. ve Özel S. (2003). Sözcük Türleri. İstanbul: Papatya Yayıncılık.
- Altınöz, M. (2013). Türkiye Türkçesinde Anlatım Kalıpları, Doktora Tezi. Adana: Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana bilim Dalı.
- Daṡdemir, M. (2015). Oklama yöntemiyle Türkçenin yapısal-iṡlevsel söz dizimi. Erzurum: Fenomen Yayıncılık.
- Deny Jean (1941). Türk dili grameri (çev. Ali Ulvi Elöve). İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.

- Dođan, A. (2005). Anlambilim. Ankara: Engin Yayınevi.
- Erkman-Akerson, F. (2007). Türkçe Örneklerle, Dile Genel Bir Bakış, İstanbul: Multilingual.
- Göksel, A. ve Kerslake C. (2005). Turkish: a comprehensive grammar. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hatibođlu, Vecihe (1981). İkileme. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Korkmaz, Z. (2014). Türkiye Türkçesi Grameri Şekil Bilgisi. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Tiken, K. (2003). Türkiye Türkçesinde Basit ve Birleşik Zarf-Fiillerin İfade ve İşlevleri. Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı – Belleten (47(1999), 279-364).