

языке преимущественно в сопоставлении с русским. [Берлин]: Государственное издательство РСФСР, 1923. 120 с. **11.** Якобсон Р.О. О лингвистических аспектах перевода. *Вопросы теории перевода в зарубежной лингвистике*. М.: Междунар. отношения, 1978. С. 16-24. **12.** Троицкий Л.Д. Литература и революция. М.: Издательство политической литературы, 1991. 400 с. **13.** Луначарский А.В. Формализм в науке об искусстве. *Собрание сочинений*, Т. 7. М.: Художественная литература, 1967. С. 407-421. **14.** Большая Советская Энциклопедия. Т. 58 (Флора – Франция). Глав. ред. О.Ю. Шмидт. М.: ОГИЗ РСФСР, 1936. 799 с. **15.** Виноградов В.В. Из истории изучения поэтики (20-е годы). *Известия АН СССР. Серия литературы и языка*. № 3. 1975. С. 259-272. http://www.opojaz.ru/vinogradov/vinogradov_iz_istorii.html. **16.** Азов А.Г. Поверженные буквалисты: Из истории художественного перевода в СССР в 1920-1960-е годы. М.: Дом Высшей школы экономики, 2013. 304 с. **17.** Федоров А.В. О художественном переводе. Л.: Гослитиздат, 1941. 259 с. **18.** Федоров А.В. Введение в теорию перевода. М.: Издательство литературы на иностранных языках, 1953. 335 с. **19.** Успенский Л.В. Слово о словах. Киев: Веселка, 1987. 367 с.

Zaal Kikvidze
Kutaisi-Tbilisi, Georgia
Levan Pachulia
Sukhumi, Georgia

Demetrius Rudolph Peacock and the Languages of Georgia

The paper is a discussion of D.R. Peacock's lexicographic resource "Original Vocabularies of Five West Caucasian Languages" and provides information about the author and his work. The English headwords are accompanied by their translations in the languages spoken in Georgia: Georgian, Megrelian ("Mingrelian"), Laz ("Lazian"), Svan ("Swanetian"), and Abkhazian. With a number of positive aspects, Peacock's "Vocabularies" should be considered a significant vestige in the history of English-Caucasian lexicography which can yield much valuable information as a result of the thorough investigation of individual entries and their translation equivalents in the five Caucasian languages spoken in Georgia.

Key words: English-Caucasian lexicography, Caucasian languages, D.R. Peacock.

The present paper is based on the 12-page long resource authored by Demetrius Rudolph Peacock and published in *The Journal Royal Asiatic Society* in 1887 [1]. Last year the authors of the present work published a paper on Peacock's contribution to the early history of English-Megrelian

lexicography concentrating on how the Megrelian data were represented in the aforementioned resource [2]. This time we are going to provide a general description of the work in question.

Demetrius (sometimes also referred to as Dimitri or Dmitri) Rudolph Peacock was born on September 26, 1842, in the province of Tambov, Russia, to Charles and Concordia (née Schlegel) Peacock. There are a rather few sources from which one would pick up detailed information about his life and activities. The *Dictionary of National Biography* informs the following: “On 25 Oct. 1881 he was appointed a vice-consul at Batoum, which had then risen to considerable importance in consequence of its annexation by the Russians. He became consul on 27 Jan. 1890. He is said to have owed his appointment to his familiarity with the Russian language. Certainly few foreigners were better acquainted than he with the languages and customs of the mountaineers of the Caucasus, among whom he had established such friendly relations that he was admitted to into their most remote fastnesses” [3, p. 137]. While residing in Batumi, he is said to have made name both as an efficient civil servant and a kind friend and host. Here is what Sir John Oliver Wadrop, a British diplomat, traveler, scholar and translator, wrote about him: In Batumi “I took an early opportunity of presenting myself at the British Vice-Consulate, a small, two-storey cottage, the lower half of which is of brick, the upper of corrugated iron sheets. Mr. Demetrius R. Peacock, the only representative of British interests in the Caucasus, is a man whose services deserve fuller recognition. It would be hard to find a post where more diplomatic tact is required, yet he contrives to make himself respected and admired by all the many races with which he is in daily contact. Mr. Peacock was born in Russia, and has spent most of his life in that empire, but he is nevertheless a thorough Englishman. In Tiflis I heard a good story about him. On one occasion the French Consul-General jokingly said to him, “Why, Peacock, you are no Englishman, you were born in Russia.” To which our representative replied, “Our Saviour was born in a stable, but for all that He did not turn out a horse” [4, pp. 1-2]. In 1891, very soon following his appointment Consul-General residing in Odessa, he died in 1892, and was buried in the British cemetery there.

When we state the scarcity of mentions of D.R. Peacock and his work, we do not mean that he was totally neglected in the literature. There are two works that should be necessarily referred to: one of them is a book by Natalya Orlovskaya who provides some discussion about the work in point [5]. Another one is a collection of words for the comparison of the languages spoken in the Caucasus, based on lexicographic resources of various authors, including D.R. Peacock, and published within the

ARMAZI project (Caucasian Languages and Cultures: Electronic Documentation) [6].

The complete title of the publication is the following: *Original Vocabularies of Five West Caucasian Languages*. Compiled on spot by Mr. Peacock, Vice-Consul of Batúm, Trans-Caucasia, South Russia, at the request of, and communicated by, Dr. R.N. Cust, Hon. Sec. R.A.S., with a Note [1]. Thus, initially the reader has an opportunity to read a note of the initiator of the lexicographic resource: “When I visited Trans-Caucasia in 1882 for the purpose of collecting information regarding the Languages of the Caucasus, the result of which was published in Vol. XVII. of the Journal, I became aware of the scantiness of the Vocabularies, and I mentioned this to Mr. Peacock, the Vice-Consul of H.B.M. at Batúm, who had resided some time at Poti, and had made excursions into regions not often traversed. He was good enough to undertake the duty of collecting Vocabularies, and I forwarded to him a copy of the Standard Form of Words and Sentences prepared by the Bengal Asiatic Society. After some delay, owing to the heavy press of his official duties, and a visit to England, when I had a pleasure of seeing him, and again encouraging him on the subject, he has forwarded to me the subjoined Vocabularies, which are highly important” [1, p. 145].

Before going to the list of words, the author allows us to get familiarized with *Instructions for Compiling Vocabularies and Sentences*: “The enclosed List of English Words and Sentences has been prepared by the Bengal Asiatic Society to enable persons to compile an exhaustive specimen of Languages spoken in any Region. Each sheet contains Five Languages, and those Languages should be selected for each sheet which are cognate to each other. When the whole is completed and printed, it becomes the basis for a further advance as regards those Languages of which we have no Grammars or Vocabularies. Care should be taken that all loan-words from English, Arabic, Portuguese, etc., are excluded. Only the *pure* words of each language should be entered. One system of transliteration should be adopted for Languages entered upon the same sheet; and when Lepsius’ system is not adopted, explanatory noted should be added, giving the exact value of each symbol, letter, or diacritical mark employed” [1, p. 145].

Actually, attempts to collect various lists of words in order to compare languages were observed earlier. In the beginning of the 14th century, Dante Alighieri, in his treatise *De vulgari eloquentia*, pioneered a classification of European languages based on the words for “yes.” Another Italian, Giuseppe Giusto Scaligero (1540-1609) made use of a list of words for “God,” eventually identifying ‘*deus*-languages’ (Latin and Romance), ‘*gott*-languages’ (Germanic), ‘*boge*-languages’ (Slavic), and a ‘*theos*-language’

(Greek). Obviously enough, these and other attempts were noteworthy but just fragmentary observations. A systematic approach to collecting of linguistic data for the sake of comparison of languages emerged later.

It was Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) who, being interested in demonstrating how the study of individual languages was to be used to establish genetic links between and among their speakers, initiated a trend in the 18th century empirical linguistics which was concerned with word-collecting and comparison of languages. “In order to obtain material for his researches in this field Leibniz issued an appeal insisting on the collecting of glossaries and translations of prayers, etc. for the purpose of comparison” [7, p. 258]. It is noteworthy that he provided a list of words which, in his opinion, were the most significant for the purpose of comparison: “Numeral words, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, one hundred, one thousand. Relationships, ages: Father, mother, uncle, son, daughter, brother, sister. ... Parts of the body: Body, flesh, skin, blood, bone, head. ... Needs: food, drink, bread, water. ... Natural things: God, man, sky, sun, moon, star, air, rain, thunder, lightning, cloud, frost, hail, snow, ice, fire ... snow, sand ... dog, wolf, deer, fox, bird, snake, mouse. Actions: to eat, drink, speak, see, be, stand, go, strike, laugh, sleep, know, pluck, etc.” [7, pp. 258-259]. It was thanks to the Leibnizian initiative that such comprehensive encyclopedic resources as *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa* by Peter Simon Palas [8], *Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas* by Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro [9], and, finally, *Mithridates, oder allgemeine Sprachkunde* by Johann Christoph Adelung [10].

When we look at Peacock’s word-list, one readily understands that the Bengal Asiatic Society has literally followed the Leibnizian guidelines. Here are the headwords from Peacock’s “Vocabularies”: one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, twenty, fifty, hundred; I, of me, mine, we, of us, our, thou, of thee, thine, you, of you, your, he, of him, his, they, of them, their; hand, foot, nose, eye, mouth, tooth, ear, hair, head, tongue, belly, back; iron, gold, silver; father, mother, brother, sister, man, woman, wife, child, son, daughter; slave, cultivator, shepherd; God, devil, sun, moon, star, fire, water; house; horse, cow, dog, cat, cock, duck, ass, camel, bird; go, eat, sit, come, beat, stand, die, give, run; up, near, down, far, before, behind; who, what, why; and but, if, yes, no, alas. These are followed by wordforms (e.g. *a father, of a father, to a father, from a father, etc.*; *go, going, gone, etc.*) and twenty-two sentences (e.g. *What is your name?, My brother is taller than his sister, etc.*).

The English headwords are accompanied by their translations in the languages spoken in Georgia: Georgian, Megrelian (“Mingrelian”), Laz

Translation Tradition and Translation Theory

(“Lazian”), Svan (“Swanetian”), and Abkhazian. It should be noted that not all the headwords are translated in all the five languages. Below we provide a table of *white spots* in Peacocks “Vocabularies.”

Table 1. ‘White spots’ in D.R. Peacock’s “Vocabularies”

<i>English</i>	<i>Georgian</i>	<i>Megrelian</i>	<i>Laz</i>	<i>Svan</i>	<i>Abkhazian</i>
Of fathers	Mamebidgan	Mumalepische	Babapeshe	Mularesh	
To fathers	Mamebs	Mumaleps	Babapes	Mulars	
From fathers	Mamebidgan	Mumalepische	Babapeshe	Mularkhanko	
A daughter	Kali	Tsiraskwa	Tsiraskwa	Dina	
Of a daughter	Kalis	Tsiraskwashe	Bososhe (also Bozo)	Dinish	
To a daughter	Kals	Tsiraskwas	Bozos	Dinash	
From a daughter	Kalidgan	Tsiraskwashe	Bozoshe	Dinakhan	
Two daughters	Ori kali	Jiri tsiraskwa	Jur bozo	Yervi dina	
Daughters	Kalebi	Tsirask-walepi	Bozope	Dinal	
Of daughters	Kalebis	Tsirask-walepische	Bozopeshe	Dinalte	
To daughters	Kalebs	Tsirask-waleps	Bozopes	Dinals	
From daughters	Kalebidgan	Tsirask-walepische	Bozopeshe	Dinalkhan	
To good men	Kargi katsebs	Djghiri kotchebis	Kai kotchepes	Khotchash marrals	
From good men	Kargi katsebidgan	Djghiri kotchebishe	Kai kotchepeshe	Khotchash marralkhan	
A bitch	Dzwe-dzaghli			Djua	Alaps
Bitches	Dzwe-dzaghlebi			Djual	Alaps kua
A female	Dedali			Zura	
Goats	Tkhebi	Otchebi	Botchepe	Daklar	
A male deer	Mshveli	Otchi skweri	Mskweri	Natchv-irem	
A female deer	Dedali mshveli	Dulu skweri	Zura mskweri	Zura irem	
Deer	Mshveli	Skweri	Mskweri	Irem	
To be	Ikav			Lirde (?)	
Being	Kopeli				

Translation Tradition and Translation Theory

Having been	Khopeli	Ordi	Borti		
I should be	Me viknebodi	Ma kipuapudi	Ma bortare	Mi metchonol (?) ashkhidol	
To beat	Daartkma	Meghama	Ghetchi		
Beating					
Having beaten					
I am beating				Mi miker (/)	
I was beating				Mi khvas miker	
I had beaten				Mi khvakhd	
I may beat	Me shemidzlia davartka	Ma shemilebu mivoghe		Mi ere khvakhidi	
I shall beat	Me dagartkam			Mi khvakhde	
I should beat				Mi kakhvakhdas	
I am beaten				Mi naker khvi	
I was beaten				Mi khvas naker	
I shall be beaten				Mi khvakhde	

As it is seen, all of the entries with missing translations are wordforms. Moreover, whenever translation equivalents are provided, the most problematic segments in terms of adequacy are wordforms and sentences; only very few of them can be assumed to be completely adequate. Individual lexemes have been translated much better; there are more adequacies than inadequacies among them. This is definitely one of the positive aspects of the work in question as a multilingual lexicographic resource.

As for the transliteration of Georgian, Megrelian, Laz, Svan, and Abkhazian words, it is more than obvious that the aforementioned system, associated to R. Lepsius, appeared to be rather insufficient for the adequate transliteration of words in these languages. Here we should reiterate what we already stated in our earlier paper about the resource in point: “Whenever Peacock’s transliteration conventions are concerned, one should be most critical to the fact that he does not provide differences between aspirated and ejective stops and affricates as far as these phonemic contrasts

are essential for Megrelian, specifically, and for Kartvelian languages, at large” [2, p. 493]; of course, the same is true for Abkhazian as well. Alongside with the aforementioned distinctions, there are a handful of vocalic and consonantal features, peculiar to the five languages, but in no way reflected in the transliteration.

Generally, it is highly probable that both missing and inadequate translations have been an outcome of failures accompanied with fieldwork; the author seems to have relied on word-of-mouth from native (?) speakers of the Caucasian languages in point.

It is noteworthy that, with respect to the aforementioned Leinizian trend associated with collecting of word-lists from various languages, Peacock’s “Vocabularies” could be discussed in parallel with the historically preceding works by P.S. Pallas [8] and J.A. Güldenstädt [11]. However, except the very principle of word-lists, they represent two different lexicographic traditions independent of each other (P.S. Pallas and J.A. Güldenstädt, on the one hand, and D.R. Peacock, on the other). More specifically, neither of the parties is independent from the Leibnizian tradition but Peacock has not borrowed either the word-list or translations from his predecessors’ work.

With respect to this and other positive aspects, Peacock’s “Original Vocabularies of Five West Caucasian Languages” can be considered a significant vestige in the history of English-Caucasian lexicography which can yield much valuable information as a result of the thorough investigation of individual entries and their translation equivalents in the five languages spoken in Georgia: Kartvelian languages (Georgian, Megrelian, Laz, and Svan) and Abkhazian (an Abkhaz-Adyghe language).

References

1. Peacock D.R. Original Vocabularies of Five West Caucasian Languages (Georgian, Mingrelian, Lazian, Swanetian, and Abkhazian). *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 19/1, 1887: P. 145-156.
2. Kikvidze Z. & Pachulia L. An Early Landmark in the History of English-Megrelian Lexicography: D.R. Peacock’s Contribution. *8th International Research Conference on Education, Language and Literature. Proceedings Book*. Tbilisi: IBSU, 2018: P. 490-496.
3. Dictionary of National Biography, ed by S. Lee. Vol. XLIV. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1885. 450 pp.
4. Wardrop O. The Kingdom of Georgia. Notes of Travel in a Land of Women, Wine, and Song. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 1888. 204 pp.
5. Orlovskaya N. Essays on Literary Relations. Tbilisi: Russian Club, 2013. 512 pp. [in Russian]
6. Wörterammlung zur Vergleichung der im Kaukasus gangbaren Sprachen. <http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/armazi/language/material/tabelle.htm>.
7. Gulya J. Some Eighteenth Century Antecedents of Nineteenth Century Linguistics: The Discovery of

Finno-Ugrian. *Studies in the History of Linguistics: Traditions and Paradigms*, ed. by D. Hymes. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974. P. 258-276. **8.** Pallas P.S. *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa: augustissimae cura collecta. Sectionis primae. linguas Europae et Asiae complexae.* Petropoli: Schnoor, 1786. 411 pp. **9.** Hervás y Panduro L. *Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas, y numeración, división, y clases de éstas, según la diversidad de sus idiomas y dialectos.* Madrid: La administración del Real Arbitrio de Beneficencia, 1800. 396 pp. **10.** Adelung J.C. *Mithridates, oder. Allgemeine Sprachenkunde: mit den Vater unser als Sprachprobe in by nahe fünf hundert Sprachen und Mundarten.* Berlin: Vossische Buchhandlung, 1806. 686 pp. **11.** Güldenstädt J.A. *Reisen durch Russland und im Caucasischen Gebürge.* 2 vols. Saint Petersburg: Kayserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1787. 1063 pp.; 1791. 552 pp.

Ольга Линтвар
м. Київ, Україна

Максим Рильський – теоретик і практик українського перекладу

Maksym Rytsky as a theorist and expert of Ukrainian translation made his scholarly contribution into the development and gradual evolution of the main concepts of translation that are still highly topical today. Among the principles that he strongly adhered to in his practical translation experience one should mention creativity. The translation researcher also highlighted the importance of rendering the dominant idea, rhythm, tone and tune. Archaisms, neologisms, dialecticisms were depicted in the context of the major challenges any translator is bound to encounter. M. Rytsky is also known for his translations of librettos to operas and operettas of the world musical repertoire.

Key words: Maksym Rytsky, translation creativity, dominant idea, aesthetic equivalence, functions of translation, libretto translation.

Максим Тадейович Рильський – поет, талановитий перекладач, вдумливий теоретик перекладу, основні положення якого щодо ролі перекладу у міжкультурній взаємодії ще й досі не втратили своєї актуальності, а, почасти, передують дослідницьким потугам у сучасному перекладознавстві. М. Рильський займався перекладацькою діяльністю впродовж всього життя з 20-х років минулого століття.

Досконало володіючи технікою перекладу, М. Рильський відкрив для українського читача багато творів зарубіжної класики. Для нього надзвичайно важливим було апробувати українське слово на кращих зразках світової літератури, утверджуючи його в європейському