

References

1. Tschenkéli K. (1958). *Einführung in die Georgische Sprache, Band I. Theoretischer Teil*, Zürich (Switzerland): Amirani Verlag, 1958. 628 s.
2. Helbig G., Buscha I. (1980). *Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht*, 6. unveränderte Auflage, Leipzig: VEB Verlag Evzyklopädie. 629 s.
3. Götze L., Hess-Lüttich E. (1992). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache, Sprachsystem und Sprachgebrauch*, München: Droemer Knauer. 702 s.
4. Gallmann P. und and. (2017). *Schülerduden Grammatik*. 8., komplett überarbeitete und aktualisierte Auflage. Berlin: Dudenverlag. 536 s.
5. Zekalashvili R. (2009). Expression of the Infinitive in the Georgian Language [inpinitivis gadmocemis sašualebebi kartulši]. *Materials of Republican conference of Akhaltsikhe Institute [respublikur samecniero konperenciaze caqitxuli moxsenebebi]*. Tbilisi: Universali, P. 40-44 [in Georgian].
6. Zekalashvili R. (2010). Towards One Variety of Predicate in the Georgian Language [šemasmenlis erti saxeobisatvis kartulši]: *The collection of scientific works devoted to the 75 anniversary since the birth of the prof. Corneli Danelia [Iv. Javaxišvilis saxelobis Tbilisis saxelmcipo universiṭeṭis humaniṭarul mecnierebata pakulṭeṭis kartuli enis inṣtiṭuṭis samecniero šromebis krebuli]*. Vol. 1. Tbilisi: Universali, P. 100-107 [in Georgian].
7. Akbilek E. (2007). *Проблема перевода инфинитива и инфинитивных конструкций с английского на немецкий и русский языки: на материале переводов произведений Ч. Диккенса «Тяжелые времена», «Давид Копперфильд» и «Оливер Твист»*. Диссерт. канд. филол. наук, Москва. Available from: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/problema-perevoda-infinitiva-i-infinitivnykh-konstruktsii-s-angliiskogo-na-nemetskii-i-russk> (Last access: 09.02.2020).
8. Mamedov A. (2006). *Инфинитивные конструкции в немецком языке и их лексико-грамматические соответствия при переводе рекламных текстов на русский язык*. Диссерт. канд. филолог. наук. Москва. Available from: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/infinitivnye-konstruktsii-v-nemetskom-yazyke-i-ikh-leksiko-grammaticheskie-sootvetstviya-pri> (Last access: 09.02.2020).

Zaal Kikvidze, Levan Pachulia
Kutaisi – Sukhumi, Georgia

Laz Lexical Data from D.R. Peacock's Collection: Representation, Reflections, Translation

The paper is a discussion of the Laz lexical data contained in D.R. Peacock's lexicographic collection "Original Vocabularies of Five West Caucasian Languages", in which English headwords are accompanied by their translations in Georgian, Megrelian, Laz, Svan, and Abkhazian. Laz is the most under-resourced Kartvelian (South Caucasian) language; therefore, Laz data, available in various, particularly, so far thoroughly

unexamined sources, can serve as a valuable contribution to its representativeness. Hence, in order to fill in the gap, we provide a description of the lexical part of the collection in question and reflections of some following students of the Laz language.

Keywords: Laz, lexis, Kartvelian languages, D.R. Peacock

In the present paper we will discuss the Laz lexical data as they appear the 19th century publication of the lexicographic collection “Original Vocabularies of Five West Caucasian Languages” [1] by Demetrius Rudolph Peacock, a British diplomat residing in Batumi, Georgia. Since a general description of the resource in question was provided in our paper published last year [2], we will no longer elaborate on its individual properties. Here is necessary information about the structure of the collection: “The English headwords are accompanied by their translations in the languages spoken in Georgia: Georgian, Megrelian (“Mingrelian”), Laz (“Lazian”), Svan (“Swanetian”), and Abkhazian” [2, p. 18-19]. The collection consists of 224 entries, including 99 individual words (various parts of speech and lexico-semantic groups), 103 wordforms and 22 sentences.

Notably, data from D.R. Peacock’s lexicographic resource have occasionally become subject to discussion at various periods of time: N. Orlovskaya provided an overview of the Georgian data [3; 4]; in 2000, K. Genebashvili analyzed the Svan data [5]; and, recently, we addressed D. R. Peacock’s Megrelian data in the light of the history of English-Megrelian lexicography [6].

Since in the present paper we are going to deal with D.R. Peacock’s Laz lexical collection, some words should be said about the idiom in question. Laz is mostly spoken in Turkey and also in a couple of villages in Georgia. It belongs to the Kartvelian branch of the Ibero-Caucasian language family; however, its status has been a subject of dispute: some linguists believe that it is an individual Kartvelian language, while others maintain that, together with Megrelian, it is a dialect of the Zan language. As different from other languages in D.R. Peacock’s collections, “Laz is the least-studied and the most under-resourced of the Kartvelian languages” [7, p. 140]. Therefore, studies of Laz data, available in various, particularly, so far thoroughly unexamined sources, can serve as a valuable contribution to its representativeness.

For the sake of clarity, initially we will represent the Laz lexical items as they appear in D.R. Peacock’s “Vocabularies” and provide their verified versions in international transcription:

Table 1. Laz lexical items in D.R. Peacock's "Vocabularies" and their international transcriptions

English	Laz	Verified transcriptions
One	Ar	ar
Two	Jūr	žur
Three	Sum	sum
Four	Otkhu	otxu
Five	Khut	xut
Six	Ashi	aši
Seven	Shkit	škit
Eight	Orvo	orvo
Nine	Tchkholo	čxovro
Ten	Vit	vit
Twenty	Etchi	eči
Fifty	Jurnetchi da vit	žurnečedovit
Hundred	Oshi	oši
I	Ma	ma
Of me	Tchkimda	čkimda
Mine	Tchkimiran	čkimi
We	Tchku	čku
Of us	Tchkunda	čkuns
Our	Tchkuniran	čkuni
Thou	Si	si
Of thee	Skandan	skanda
Thine	Skani	skani
You	Tkwa	tkva
Of you	Tkwanden	tkvanden
Your	Skani	skani
He	Kiamushiren	hea
Of him	Hetepeshia	hemus
His	Hemushian	hemuši
They	Hemtepe	hentepe
Of them	Hemteps	hemtepes
Their	Hemtepeshia	hemtepeši
Hand	Khe	xe
Foot	Kutchkhe	k'učxe
Nose	Tchkhindi	čxindi
Eye	Toil	toli
Mouth	Nuku	nuk'u
Tooth	Kibiri	k'ibiri

Ear	Udji	uji
Hair	Toma	toma
Head	Ti	ti
Tongue	Nena	nena
Belly	Kolba	korba
Back	Shka	ška
Iron	Demiri	demiri
Gold	Altuni	altuni
Silver	Ghemiish	gumiši
Father	Baba	baba
Mother	Nana	nana
Brother	Djuma	ɟuma
Sister	Da	da
Man	Kotche	k'oči
Woman	Okhordja	oxorja
Wife	Tchili	čili
Child	Berre	bere
Son	Bidji	bič'i
Daughter	Bozo	bozo
Slave	Rële	Kjole
Cultivator	Makhatchkali	xačkva // xačkuri
Shepherd	Tchkeshi	č'k'eši
God	Tanghri	tangri
Devil	Sheitan	šeitani
Sun	Mjora	mžora
Moon	Tuta	tuta
Star	Muritskhi	murucxi
Fire	Datchkhuri	dačxuri
Water	Tskhari	c'k'ai
House	Okhori	oxori
Horse	Tskheni	cxeni
Cow	Pudji	Puɟi
Dog	Djoghori	ɟoɟori
Cat	Rato	k'at'u
Cock	Mamuli	mamuli
Duck	Ordeghe	ordeɟi
Ass	Guruni	guruni
Camel	Deve	deve
Bird	Kintchi	k'inči

Go	Tkzale	Igzali
Eat	Tchkhomi	č'k'omi
Sit	Dokhedi	doxedi
Come	Mokhti	moxti
Beat	Getchi	gobax
Stand	Missadovi	?
Die	Doghuri	doyuri
Give	Komomtchi	komomči
Run	Okhudkwatsini	?
Up	Jin	žin
Near	Kholos	xolos
Down	Tude	tude
Far	Mendra	menda
Before	Tsokhle	c'oxle
Behind	Okatchkhele	ukačxe
Who	Mik	mik
What	Munoren	mun
Why	Mushene	mušen
And	Do	do
But	Mara	mara
If	Si	si
Yes	Ko	ko
No	Var	var
Alas	Eivakh	?

Judging from the number of words, the resource is rather representative; however, the problem is how adequately they are rendered. This primarily concerns transliterations and translations of the words. As for the transliteration, the situation with the Laz data is absolutely the same with that of Megrelian: “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” [6, p. 493]. Therefore, the leftmost column of Table 1 provides adequate transcriptions of respective items.

One of the earliest (though not the earliest) reflections of the collection in question is N. Marr’s book on Laz in which the author reviews the literature about the language and notes: “Peacock’s work is too insignificant to be dealt with. It still has one advantage: he was in Lazistan and heard the real Laz” [8, p. XXIV]; in the footnote, he adds: “In Arkabi, he met a Laz man who was involved in Peacock’s activities; according to him, Peacock

stayed there for three days” [ibid.]. Irrespective of this utterly negative assessment, Nicholas Marr communicates rather notable information about D.R. Peacock’s fieldwork: he collected his resource based on word of mouth. Therefore, notwithstanding obvious shortcomings, it can in no way be doomed to total rejection. Moreover, with respect to what we see in Table 1 (a comparison of Peacock’s data and their verification), one can hardly agree with the utterly negative assessment, and, perhaps, the negative attitude at all; this is due to the fact that most of the items are rendered adequately in terms of both transliteration and translation.

It is particularly noteworthy that the very first mention of D.R. Peacock’s collections is associated with Laz. In 1899, Hratchia Adjarian published his “Étude sur la langue laze” in which we read: “When this study was in press, I learned about the existence of another work on the Laz language. It is a collection of a hundred words published in the *Asian Journal of London*, XIX (1887) by Mr. Peacock, consul of England in Batoum. These forms are almost always identical to those indicated here as Bt. I was able to include some of Mr. Peacock's forms in the *Dictionary*, indicating them as P. Others are found in the *Addenda* below. Mr. Peacock’s grammatical forms are quoted in the grammar” [9, p. 447]. There are 24 entries in the “Addenda;” 19 of them are picked from D.R. Peacock’s collection [9, pp. 447-448].

Table 2. Collated data from D.R. Peacock and H. Adjarian

Demetrius Rudolph Peacock		Hratchia Adjarian		
<i>Andgha</i>	To-day	<i>Andġa</i>	Voir <i>Antġa</i>	
<i>Ashi</i>	Six	<i>Aši</i>	Voir <i>Anš</i>	
<i>Berre</i>	Child	<i>Berre</i>	“child”	Cf. <i>bere</i>
<i>Bidji</i>	Son	<i>Bijči</i>	“son”	Cf. <i>biči</i> , <i>biši</i>
<i>Tsiraskwa</i>	A daughter	<i>Ciraskua</i>	“a daughter”	
<i>Tchkesi</i>	Shepherd	<i>Čkeši</i>	Voir <i>Češ</i> , <i>češi</i>	
<i>Tchuta</i>	Small	<i>Čuta</i>	petit	
<i>Tchkholo</i>	Nine	<i>Čxolo</i>	Voir <i>Čxoro</i>	
<i>Datchkhuri</i>	Fire	<i>Dacxuri</i>	feu	
<i>Etchi</i>	Twenty	<i>Eči</i>	Voir <i>Eč</i>	
<i>Guruni</i>	Ass	<i>Guruni</i>	Voir <i>Giruni</i>	
<i>Hemtepe</i>	They	<i>Hemtepe</i>	Voir <i>Entepe</i>	
<i>Djumadi</i>	Uncle	<i>Jumadi</i>	“oncle”	
<i>Ktche</i>	White	<i>Kče</i>	Voir <i>Xče</i>	
<i>Kēdi</i>	Village	<i>Kedi</i>	village	

<i>Ko</i>	Yes	<i>Ko</i>	Voir <i>Ho</i>	
<i>Kolba</i>	Belly	<i>Kolba</i>	Voir <i>Korba</i>	
<i>Mara</i>	But	<i>Mara</i>	mais	
<i>Makhatchkali</i>	Cultivator	<i>Maxačkali</i>	“cultivateur, laboureur”	

Since H. Adjarian decided to include at least some of D.R. Peacock’s Laz items in his work, one may assume that he viewed the resource as a likely contribution to the representativeness of his collection. As it is seen, he favors one-character symbols in rendering of Laz words as different from Peacock’s digraphs and even trigraphs. Whenever he believes that a word is not represented in a proper way, he refers to a correct version; e.g. *Kolba* – Voir (‘see’) *Korba*. In the rest of the instances, he provides either English or French translations as in:

Table 3. Collated translations from D.R. Peacock and H. Adjarian

Demetrius Rudolph Peacock		Hratchia Adjarian		
<i>Berre</i>	Child	<i>Berre</i>	“child”	Cf. <i>bere</i>
<i>Bidji</i>	Son	<i>Bijči</i>	“son”	Cf. <i>biči</i> , <i>biši</i>
<i>Tsiraskwa</i>	A daughter	<i>Ciraskua</i>	“a daughter”	
<i>Tchuta</i>	Small	<i>Čuta</i>	petit	
<i>Datchkhuri</i>	Fire	<i>Dacxuri</i>	feu	
<i>Djumadi</i>	Uncle	<i>Jumadi</i>	“oncle”	
<i>Kēdi</i>	Village	<i>Kedi</i>	village	
<i>Mara</i>	But	<i>Mara</i>	mais	
<i>Makhatchkali</i>	Cultivator	<i>Maxačkali</i>	“cultivateur, laboureur”	

In their reviews of the aforementioned French work, Antoine Meillet [10, p. 516] and Hugo Schuchardt [11, p. 380] mention D.R. Peacock among the authors whose data were used by H. Adjarian in his dictionary.

There are publications which only refer to D.R. Peacock’s “Vocabularies” as one of the resources of Laz, for instance, V. Minorsky [12, p. 22], A. Bryer [13, p. 184], etc. Later, in his dissertation on the Laz language, R. Lacroix devoted a single paragraph to the collection in point: “Peacock (1887, in English) translates about 200 words into Georgian, Megrelian, Laz, Svan and Abkhazian. Similarly to his predecessors, he does not mark the glottalization of consonants” [14, p. 6]. The problem is that hitherto no one has undertaken a thorough examination of the Laz lexical data provided in D.R. Peacock’s “Vocabularies” as it was done, for

instance, concerning its Georgian [3; 4], Svan [5] and Megrelian [6] data or as Hugo Schuchardt reviewed H. Adjarian's work on Laz [11].

The present article is an attempt to prepare and provide Laz lexical data from and on Peacock's collection in terms of how exhaustively they are represented, how adequately they are transliterated/transcribed and translated; it itself can serve as a resource for would-be researchers of the collection in question.

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. Demetrius Rudolph Peacock and the Languages of Georgia. *General and Specialist Translation / Interpretation: Theory, Methods, Practice: International Conference Papers*. Kyiv: Agrar Media Group, 2019. P. 15-22.
3. Orlovskaya N. Some notes about the Georgian language in 19th century England. *Mnatobi* 1-2, 1994. P. 174-176. [in Georgian]
4. Orlovskaya N. *Essays on Literary Relations*. Tbilisi: Russian Club, 2013. 512 pp. [in Russian]
5. Genebashvili K. Original Vocabularies of Five West Caucasian Languages. *Issues of Linguistics* 1. 2000. P. 120-124. [in Georgian]
6. 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.
7. Kikvidze Z. Copying direction as a factor in the classification system of Kartvelian echo-word constructions. *Papers of Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Humanities and Social Sciences* 5/2. 1998. P. 135-143.
8. Marr N. A Grammar of the Chan (Laz) Language with a Reader and Vocabulary. Saint Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1910. 240 p. [in Russian]
9. Adjarian H. Étude sur la langue laze. *Mémoires de la société linguistique de Paris* X, 1899. P. 165-448.
10. Meillet A. [rev.] L'Étude sur la langue laze. *Revue critique d'histoire et littérature* 47. 1899. 516 p.
11. Schuchardt H. [Rez. von:] MH Adjarian. Étude sur la langue laze. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 16, 1902. P. 379-404.
12. Minorsky V. Laz. *Brill's First Encyclopedia of Islam, 1913-1936*, ed. by M.Th. Houtsma, A.J. Wensinck, E. Lévi-Provençal, H.A.R. Gibb, W. Heffening; Vol. 5. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993. P. 20-22.
13. Bryer A. Some Notes on the Laz and Tzan (I). *Bedi Kartlisa, Revue de Kartvélogie* 21-22, 1966. P. 174-195.
14. Lacroix R. Description du dialecte laze d'Arhavi (caucasique du sud, Turquie): grammaire et texte. Thèse de doctorat, Université Lumière de Lyon 2, 2009. 901 p.