



PECULIARITIES OF CONVEYING THE SEMANTICS OF NECESSITY ACCORDING TO THE GEORGIAN-TURKISH MATERIAL

Harun Cimke

Doctor of Philology, Asoc. Professor of
Kutaisi Akaki Tsereteli State University,
Georgia, Kutaisi, Tamar Mepe St #59 postal code 4600
+ (995) 593 555000, harun.cimke@atsu.edu.ge
(<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2790-1146>)

Abstract

The verb mood conveyance system is different in almost all languages. The article deals with the peculiarity of expressing the semantics of the necessity of a verb according to the Georgian-Turkish material, in particular, to find out what grammatical means exist to convey the semantics of the necessity of Georgian in Turkish.

In general, the category of mood in Georgian is one of the most difficult and controversial issues. There is a difference of opinion in the scientific literature regarding the number of moods. According to some scientists, a mood is three, according to some - four, some even name five, and in the end up to seven moods. In the grammars of the modern Georgian language, three moods are distinguished: narrative, connective and imperative. The others that could not take place in the language are as follows: demand, prohibition, conditional and consequential.

It is interesting to discuss the Georgian-Turkish data regarding the mood category. This time we will talk about the means of conveying the semantics of necessity in both languages.

The number of moods of a verb in Turkish linguistic literature is five. These are: narrative, imperative, obligative, narrative, and request-conditional. In Georgian, the verb *kilo* is not decorated with a grammatical sign, ie *kilo* has no sign. It is one of the elements of a sequence and is expressed in the form of any sequence, it is mostly considered as a semantic category. In Turkish, all grammatical moods are marked.

When conveying the semantics of Georgian necessity, a rather interesting picture is created in Turkish. In particular, in the sentence - "himself - should be considered nobility and the peasant - peasantry" = Turkish. "Beyn bey olduğu, köylünün de köylü olduğu anlaşılmalı". Due to the particle the obligation is expressed in both languages. "This story must mean something, so it must have very beautiful eyes" = Turk. „Bu haberin bir anlamı olmalı, normalde çok güzel gözleri olmalı“. The first proposition is doubtful and the second is speculative. In both cases, Turkish has the same meaning as in Georgian. "What should I be afraid of; What to be ashamed of; What should I want ...!" = Turk. „Neden korkmalıyım; neden utanmalıyım; ne isteyebilirim?“ Georgian must present an interesting picture when translating the present participle forms into Turkish. „Korkmalıyım, utanmalıyım“, = Turk. "You can read like that!" - Must also convey the action to be performed even in the particle II conjunction Turkish by means of the necessary mood signs (-MALI, -MELİ).

Comparative analysis of the forms of Georgian-Turkish verb moods clearly shows the common and different sides between the two structurally different languages. Similarities and differences relate to the relevance of semantic, grammatical and lexical means.

Keywords: Necessity; semantics; comparative analysis; Georgian-Turkish; peculiarities.

Introduction

Comparing the Georgian language with languages with different structures is associated with many difficulties. It can be said that the stylistic or grammatical differences between the languages, which often appear in relation to the semantics of necessity, are mostly the result of the peculiarities of the Georgian verb.

The Georgian verb is distinguished by its diversity and complexity. This applies to conveying the semantics of necessity according to the Georgian and Turkish material, which becomes especially visible at any level of language relations.

From the scientific literature it is known that the semantics of necessity in the Georgian language is expressed by the forms of should/must + present conjunctive, should/must + II conjunctive and should + II consequential, which often creates certain problems. This is especially true for indirect moods. Compared to ancient Georgian, the number of indirect and unrealistic moods in modern Georgian is reduced, and accordingly, the scope of using narrative moods with non-narrative content is expanding.

Method

In order to determine the regularity of expressing the semantics of necessity according to Georgian-Turkish material. We used both observation and data analysis methods. By means of utilising mentioned research methods, it was possible to identify and analyse the searched examples as the result of the observation.

Reasoning and Results

While researching the relation between the semantics of necessity and the Georgian language, we will try to determine the Georgian correspondences of the Turkish units, which will be acceptable and valuable.

The number of moods of the verb is more or less different in all languages. It is the same in Georgian and Turkish.

In the grammar of the Georgian language, mood is one of the categories of the verb. There are basically three moods in the Georgian

language: narrative, conjunctive, imperative (Shanidze, 1980:107; Kvachadze, 1993:236), although there are differences of opinions in Georgian scientific literature regarding the number of moods. Some scientists consider subjunctive and conditional mood as independent moods (Chikobava, 1952:48); G. Gogolashvili names about ten moods. Unlike others, he additionally separates such types of moods as: request, prohibitive, consequential, real and unreal (Gogolashvili, 2010: 116).

The conjunction mood in Georgian is distinguished by its special features. As is known from the linguistic literature, the conjunction mood expresses an action that is not a fact, but can happen now, happen in the future or happened in the past: to be writing, to write, to have written...

The issue of the number of connective moods in Georgian has also become controversial among scientists. It is not yet defined.

According to the scientific literature, the conjunction mood in modern literary Georgian is a grammatically expressed verb category: it is morphologically different from the narrative mood forms (Shanidze,1980:204; L. Kvachadze,1993:210-211), although this opinion is not universally recognized. Scientists, who have a completely different view are: B. Jorbenadze, G. Gogolashvili, A. Arabuli, A. Papidze. Regarding this opinion, A. Papidze talks about the contradiction that accompanies the understanding of the conjunction mood as a category. In his opinion: the inconsistency between the form and content of the conjunction mood, which sometimes makes it difficult to determine the semantics of mood, clearly points to the fact that in modern literary Georgian, the morphological category of mood, and in particular, the conjunction mood, is broken (Papidze, 1987: 59-62).

In modern literary Georgian, the connective mood is conveyed by means of three screeves. These are: I conjunctive or present conjunctive, II conjunctive and III conjunctive (Papidze, 1988:74).

With its content, the connective mood expresses an unreal action and presents it as possible, likely, desirable, etc. To express the relevant modal content, proper conjunctive mood forms are used both independently and (in most cases) together with conjunctions, modal verbs and particles. In Georgian, the content of the conjunction is also expressed by the forms of non-modal moods, with the help of certain modal words and particles. Nevertheless, in the designation of modal semantics, the conjunctive mood plays an important role and in certain cases expands its scope (comp. II pluperfect).

In Georgian, a process is established, when the form of the narrative mood acquires the function of the conjunctive, as it happened in the case of the second pluperfect, although the opposite trend is also observed in Georgian - a significant narrowing of the scope of the use of conjunctive forms. For example, the forms of the III conjugation are sometimes replaced by the forms of the II derivation (A. Papidze, 1984:83-84).

It can be said that the forms of expression of mood are usually different depending on the language. From this point of view, very interesting cases appear when the Georgian conjunctive mood forms are translated into Turkish. Georgian conjunctive mood forms can be used in Turkish with the functions of subjunctive, conditional, optional, imperative and verb tenses.

Unlike Georgian, the number of moods in Turkish is five. These are: narrative, conditional, imperative, subjunctive and necessitative (Zeynep Korkmaz, 2017:569; Muharrem Ergin, 2009:289). Narrative, conditional (also subjunctive - Arn. Chikobava) and imperative are common to both languages. In Turkish, the necessitative mood is different, although the said mood is produced in Georgian through the modal verb "should" and the present subjunctive, II subjunctive and II conditional form.

In literary Turkish, the narrative mood is considered separately, and the other four moods are in another group. In both languages, the

narrative mood is expressed by the tense forms of the verb. As for the rest, unlike Georgian, in Turkish all moods have their own sign: the conditional-subjunctive sign is **-sa / -se** (Günay Karaağaç, 2011:126). When this sign is attached directly to the stem of the verb, it expresses a wish, and when it is attached to a tense, it expresses a condition. For example: *Keşke Ayşe bize gelse* - I wish Ayşe would come to us... In the sentence, the conditional-optional sign **-se** expresses a wish, but *Bugün gelirsem yarın daha gelemem* - If I came today, I won't be able to come tomorrow... In the sentence **-se** expresses a condition.

The subjunctive sign is **-a / -e** (Tahsin Banguoğlu, 2000:468); necessitative – **-malı / -meli** (Nurettin Demir, Emine Yılmaz, 2010: 214); The signs of the imperative are the stem of the initial form of the verb in the second person singular, in the third person singular – **-sın / -sin, -sun, -sün**; In the second person plural – **-ın / -in, -un, -ün**; In the third person plural **-sınlar / -sinler, -sunlar, -sünler** will be added to the verb (Günay Karaağaç, 2011:121).

When conveying the semantics of necessity in Georgian, a very interesting picture is created in Turkish.

As we mentioned, the content of obligation / necessity in Turkish is expressed by the morphological sign **-malı / -meli** and also the modal word **Gerek/Lazım**, used with the verb stem, corresponding to **necessary**.

The semantics of necessity in languages can be presented in different nuances: compulsion, obligation, necessity, command, wish, request, demand, opportunity, condition, hesitation, warning, surprise, confusion, anger, emphatic advice, prohibition, reinforcement, invitation; Logical explanation of something, assumption, certainty.

N. Sharashenidze, while analyzing the modal form of **should/must**, writes that the modal form of **should/must** expresses logical necessity. But this is not the only semantics that is conveyed in this modal form. The form of the verb - mood and screeve - is of great importance. In different combinations, the construction is assigned

different semantics. Their different content is due to the form of the verb. Thus, this issue should be taken into account in the process of language teaching, although it should be noted that the analysis of such semantic nuances can only be done at a high level of language proficiency (Sharashenidze, 2014:84).

As we have already mentioned, the particle **should/must** together with the conjunction expresses categorical demand, obligation and necessity. In modern Georgian, the participle **should/must** is used with three screeves: the present participle, the second participle and the second participle.

A. Present Subjunctive

As is known, the present subjunctive was formed as a separate screeve after the disintegration of the first subjunctive resulted in the formation of the present subjunctive and the present participle (Papidze, 1984:81). The present subjunctive is used with different functions in modern Georgian.

In particular, in the sentence - "Nobility should act like nobility, and peasants like peasants." = Turk. „Beyin bey olduğu, köylünün de köylü olduğu anlaşılmalı“. Due to the particle **should/must** in both languages, obligation is expressed. "This story should mean something, and he should have very beautiful eyes." = Turk. „Bu haberin bir anlamı olmalı, normalde çok güzel gözleri olmalı“. The first sentence is doubtful, and the second one is conjectural. In both cases, Turkish has the same meaning as in Georgian. "What should I fear; What should I be ashamed of? What should I want...!" = Turk. „Neden korkmalıyım; neden utanmalıyım; ne isteyebilirim?“ When transferring the present conjunctive forms of the Georgian should/must participle into Turkish, an interesting picture is found, in particular, the first two sentences accurately express necessity „Korkmalıyım, utanmalıyım“, And the last sentence conveys the meaning of opportunity „isteyebilirim“, Which is one of the functions of the present participle should.

The present subjunctive with a complex subordinate clause often expresses conditionality. In connection with this, Papidze notes that the conditional modality of the present subjunctive can be confirmed in complex subordinate clauses replacing time-circumstantial independent clauses, cause, purpose... and other independent clauses (Papidze, 1984:94): if we were sitting on the other side of the table, my situation would be easier - Masanın diğer tarafına otursak durumumuz daha kolaylaşır.

In the Georgian literary language, such constructions of the present tense are also used in question-and-answer dialogues: if you had twice as many, what would you do? – Bundan iki kat fazla olsa ne yaparsın?

Expressing the subjunctive content of the verb is one of the distinct and characteristic functions of the present conjunctive mood. I wish I knew everything - Keşke her şeyi bilsem. The second conjunctive with "**I wish**" participle conveys the content of "**wishing**" in both Georgian and Turkish.

Present subjunctive mainly conveys constructions with the content of threats and appeals of the imperative mood. Be aware, you can't do that any more! – Bir daha böyle davranmamanız gerektiğini iyi bilin!

The particles **should** and **as if** are most used with the present tense: You are talking **as if we were going** to the army! – Sen öyle konuşuyorsun ki sanki askere gidiyoruz. The mentioned sentence is translated into Turkish in the present conjunctive verb form.

It is very interesting to use the present participle conjunctive, which is mainly employed for three functions:

1. **The present subjunctive, like the II subjunctive, conveys the modal content of obligation and necessity** and differs from the construction replacing the II subjunctive mainly in terms of aspect and temporal generalization. When II subjunctive forms denote an action to be performed in the future, and present subjunctive forms are

indefinite in time, they are general: I should be doing this – Benim bunu yapıyor olmam gerekiyor. As we can see in the given sentence, the time is not defined.

2. **The should participle of the present subjunctive can also express the contents of doubt, assumption, reason, possibility...:** This should mean something - Bu olay bize bir şey işaret ediyor olmalı! This sentence conveys the speaker's assumption and his point of view.

3. The should participle present subjunctive is often used in rhetorical sentences, dialogues, where a question is answered by a question. (Papidze, 1984:101-103): Aren't you going - Why should I go when I have a lot to do here?- Gitmiyor musun? – Burada işim varken neden gidiyor olmalıyım?

It should also be noted that the present tense is often used without a particle, which does not prevent the desired content from being expressed: I can't say that I understand everything - Her şeyi anlıyor olduğumu söyleyemem. In this case, the content of the "as if" particle is expressed.

B. II Conjunctive

As for the formation of the necessity mood, the modal verb "should" is written before the second subjunctive. For example: I have important work tomorrow, I should go to bed early – Yarın önemli işim var erken uyumalıyım. In this sentence -malı is sign of necessity.

In modern Georgian, the second subjunctive can express the necessary performance of an action in the future by means of the particle should and the modal word "necessary". For example, in the sentence – „You should not read like this!“ = თუბრძ. “Böyle okumamalısn!” – **should** in the second participle conjunctive in Turkish also conveys an action that must be performed through the necessitative mood signs (-Malı, -Meli): I think that the female artists should not get married - Sanatçı kadının evlenmemesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum. Sanatçı kadın evlenmemeli!

Unlike Georgian, the Turkish variant of the word **necessary** - **Gerek** is encountered with forms of different screeves and moods: **Verb stem + possessive pronoun sign + Gerek + screeve sign**:

Yapmam gerekiyor	I need to do (something)
Yapmam gerekiyordu	I needed to do (something)
Yapmam gerekecek	I will need to do (something)
Yapmam gerekecekti	I would have needed to do (something)
Yapmam gerekti	I had to do (something)
Yapmam gerekmiş	I have needed to do (something)
Yapmam gerekmişti	If I needed to do (something)
Yapmam gerekse	If I need to do (something)
Yapmam gerekebilir	I might need to do (something)

It is also interesting to note that the Turkish word **need** (Gerek) synonym **Lazım** doesn't have screeve signs, instead it is used with auxiliary verb forms: Yapmam lazım (= I need to do it), Yapmam lazımdı (= I needed to do it), Yapmam lazımmış (= my doing was necessary), Yapmam lazımsa (=if it was necessary for me to do). While working on the forms of semantics of necessity, we came across an interesting case, according to which future tense receptive forms are rendered in Turkish necessitative mood semantics. In this case, intonation should also be taken into consideration: I have to do it (=should do it - Yapmalıyım / Yapmam lazım), I have to go (=should go - Gitmeliyim / Gitmem lazım), I have to bring it (=should bring - Getirmeliyim / Getirmem lazım), I need to take care of it (=should take care of it - Bakmalıyım / Bakmam lazım), I need to return (=should

return - Dönmeliyim / Dönmem lazım), I have to tell (=should tell - Anlatmalıyım / Anlatmam lazım) etc.

In modern Georgian, in phraseological expressions **II conjunctive** is used – no matter what he says, does, thinks... For example, in the sentence – “No matter how he hurries, it’s still late.” = Turk. “Ne kadar acele ederse etsin, yinede geç kalınmış” – (No matter how) in Turkish is expressed with conditional mood sign (-sa/-se), as for (hurries), it’s expressed in receptive form (geç kalınmış).

Command/request/demand are closely related semantic meanings. Nuances are well visible in oral speech, where it can also be determined by intonation. Their exact separation in written texts is, in most cases, made possible by the wider context.

„You must be careful, really careful - Dikkatli, hem de çok dikkatli olmalısın“. The second conjunctive with conjunction **must** conveys the content of “**warning**” both in Georgian and Turkish.

The semantics of necessity in Georgian is used in interrogative and negative forms as well. In this case, it mainly expresses the absence of necessity and obligation. When expressing the meaning of the future must + II conjunctive sometimes the particle without must is used. For example: „He had decided not to think about it any more- O kararını vermişti. Artık bunu düşünmemesi gerekiyordu; Shouldn’t we go? – Biz gitmemeli miyiz?“. When expressing the first sentence into Turkish, it is necessary to use the necessitative mood sign or the word necessary in Turkish. Without it, the semantics of necessity cannot be expressed.

The semantics of necessity in the third person forms appears differently without a pronoun and it is determined according to the context: the construction “must go” expresses both desire and necessity at the same time. For those interested in the Georgian language, it is difficult to recognize which meaning it is used in. This issue is presented in Turkish with different grammatical signs and is easy to understand: He must go - gitmek istiyor expresses desire and gitmeli

expresses necessity, obligation. In Georgian, without context it is impossible to determine which expresses wish and which – necessity.

C. II Consequential

In modern Georgian, the second conveys past (sometimes future) time, narrative or conjunctive-conditional mood, sometimes - the semantics of unseen.

Georgian **should + II consequential** forms convey the content of past obligation/necessity, possibility, probability. Often these meanings are clarified by the context. For example, frequent meetings became boring; From now on, they should see each other less often. - Sık görüşmeler sıkıcı bir hal almıştı, bundan sonra birbirlerini daha az görmeleri gerekiyordu.”, I was supposed to come yesterday, but I couldn't make it. - Dün gelmeliydim ama bir türlü gelemedim...

II consequential with the participle **must** also expresses necessity in the past; certainty; doubt, the assumption reached by logical conclusion: That man must have had some reason- O adamın elle tutulur bir sebebi olmalıydı; This should have been said by one of those who were with us that evening - Bunu, o akşam bizde olanlardan biri söylemiş olmalı...

Sometimes in the Georgian language, request, compulsion, necessity, assumption, doubt are conveyed by constructions containing both the II conjunctive and the II consequential: I knew that you are old friends and you were supposed to attend the party last year - Eski dostlar olduğunuzu ve bu davete geçen sene de katılmanız gerektiğini biliyordum; If Ia refused, all the property was to be transferred to Shorena - İa'nın olumsuz cevap vermesi durumunda bütün malvarlığının Şorena'ya verilmesi gerekiyordu...

Frequently, in Georgian **must + II consequential** forms are used to display future: „He was thanful that he didn't have to come up with another plan - Yeni plan hazırlamayacağı için müteşekkir olmalıydı.“ In this sentence, didn't have to expresses repeating what has already been done in the future.

Must + II consequential forms in Georgian semantically correspond to obligation/necessity (which happened before the moment of speaking): "Certain interests, certain groups were fighting each other here. Leila must have found a protector." - Burada belli başlı çıkarlar ve düşünceler birbirleri ile çatışıyorlardı. Bundan dolayı Leyla kesinlikle kendisini koruyacak birisini bulmalıydı.“

Must + II consequential or only **II consequential** form in Georgian conveys the content of question, assumption, doubt, concern, advice and request: "My dear friend Ilia is such a kind person, that my family is grateful to him. I don't know what they would have done without him in that foreign city - Benim değerli dostum İlia o kadar iyi bir insan ki bizimkiler ondan çok memnunlar. O olmasaydı ne yapabilirlerdi bilemiyorum.“

Sometimes "**can**" in the infinitive construction is replaced by the modal particle **must**, which has the semantics of categorical necessity somewhat weakened in the interrogative form: "It was not a suicide. I'm sure there wasn't, but how was the murder supposed to happen? – Bu bir cinayet değilmiş. Cinayet olmadığından eminim ama bu nasıl bir cinayet olabilirdi ki?“ In the Turkish translation as well, depending on its content, the semantics of possibility is used.

Must + II consequential forms sometimes convey the semantics of a kind of reproach along with obligation / necessity: "He had to endure this attack. He had to spit on everything and disappear without a trace"- O, bütün bu saldırılara göğüs germeli, her şeyi elinin tersiyle itip arkasında iz bırakmadan ortalıktan kaybolmalıydı.“

In Georgian, the construction expressing desire, I want + the third person of II subjunctive and the third person of necessitative construction are used in the same way, so in the first case, **must** has the function of an independent verb and changes according to person and number, and in the second case, it has the function of a modal verb and does not change according to person and number.

I want to prepare	I should prepare
You want to prepare	You should prepare
He / She wants to prepare	He / She should prepare
We want to prepare	We should prepare
You want to prepare	You should prepare
They want to prepare	They should prepare

The mentioned peculiarity to a certain extent causes misunderstanding and creates an important problem in the language teaching process. Therefore, it is necessary to take it into account. Without semantics, we will not know which carries the content of necessity and which of desire? For example, the form "should go (wants to go)" can have the content of necessity as well as desire. In Turkish, a completely different picture is created: he must go (= Turk. Gitmeli.); he wants to go (= Turk. Gitmek istiyor). Both moods are used with their own signs and therefore there is no content confusion at all. A person interested in Georgian should pay attention to the semantic side in order to avoid the mentioned misunderstanding.

As a result of our analysis, it can be seen that the main grammatical correspondence is established by the forms of II subjunctive and II consequential. Conjunctive forms are mostly used with modal words and modal particles, independently and also without them.

As a result of the comparative analysis of the forms of semantics of necessity of the Georgian-Turkish verb, both common and different aspects between the two structurally different languages are clearly visible. Similarity and difference refer to the correspondence of semantic, grammatical and lexical means.

REFERENCES:

- Banguoğlu, Tahsin. (2000). *Grammar of Turkish*. Ankara: Turkish Language Association Publications, 528. (in Turkish).
- Bersenadze-Katsitadze, Marine. (2006). *"Modality in Georgian and English"*, Cand. thesis. Arnold Chikobava Institute of Linguistics. (in Georgian).
- Gogolashvili, Gogi. (2010). *Georgian Verb: Issues of Form Production*. Tbilisi: publishing house Meridiani. (in Georgian).
- Demir, Nurettin., Yılmaz, Emine. (2010). *Turkish Language Handbook*. Ankara: Grafiker Publications. (in Turkish).
- Ergin, Muharrem. (2009). *Grammar of Turkish*. Istanbul: Bayrak Printing / Publishing / Introduction. (in Turkish).
- Kvachadze, Leo. (1993). *Georgian Language*. Tbilisi: publishing house Rubikoni. (in Georgian).
- Korkmaz, Zeynep. (2017). *Turkey Turkish Grammar Morphology*, Ankara: Turkish Language Association Publications. (in Turkish).
- Papidze, Asmat. (1984). *Some Issues Related to the Functions of the Present Subjunctive*. Tbilisi. Publisher: Metsniereba. (in Georgian).
- Papidze, Asmat. (1987). *"Mood Category and Functions of Conjunctions in Modern Literary Georgian"*, Cand. thesis. Arnold Chikobava Institute of Linguistics. (in Georgian).
- Papidze, Asmat. (1988). *Present Subjunctive in Modern Georgian: The Issue of Georgian Speech Culture*. Book VIII. Tbilisi.
- Shanidze, Akaki. (1980). *Basics of Georgian Grammar*. Essays Vol. III. Tbilisi: TSU. publishing. (in Georgian).
- Sharashenidze, Nino. (2014). *Modality Category in Georgian: Teaching Methods and Strategies for Foreigners*. International Journal of Multilingual Education #3. (in Georgian).
- Chikobava, Arn. (1952). *Introduction to Linguistics*. Tbilisi: TSU. publishing. (in Georgian).