

Elements Determining the Linguocultural Specificity of the Text and their Reflection in the Russian Translations of *Grigol Khandzeteli's Life*

Abstract: In the scientific literature, it is noted that the linguistic and cultural specificity of the artistic text is largely determined by the unique vocabulary – different types of verbal realities, cultural context, situational realities, intertextualisms in the work reflect what the dictionary cannot cover. Accordingly, the cultural knowledge of the translator is the guarantor of the identification of non-linguistic realities of the text. The identification of linguistic and cultural features is the most important prerequisite for their reflection in the translation and the achievement of the desired.

Taking into account the above, the Russian translations of "The Lives of Grigol Khandzeteli" by Nicholas Marr and Ioseb Zeteishvili are discussed and the ways of reflecting the linguistic and cultural specifics of the works in each translation are analyzed in the current paper.

Keywords: *Nicholas Marr, Ioseb Zeteishvili, translations of hagiography, the Life of Grigol Khandzteli, linguocultural specificity of the text*

In the Patriarchal Library of the Cross Monastery of Jerusalem, in autumn of 1902, an important manuscript dated from the 12th century was found, here and there very badly damaged. In the "Georgian Miscellany" (N2) preserved in the repository, the participants of the scientific expedition found a completely unknown text, entitled – "Works and Labors from the Worthy Life of our Holy Blessed Father Archimandrite Gregory, Builder of Khandzta and Shatberdi and a Remembrance of the Many Blessed Fathers who were with Him". (*The Life...* 2015)

Niko Chubinashvili was the first, who saw the manuscript for the first time in 1845. Later, in 1894, Aleksandre Tsagareli published the references he copied out (Сведения, III, p. 49-50), but the reader got to know the work in 1911, when Niko Marr published Georgian and Russian texts in his series, "Тексты и разыскания по армяно-грузинской филологии" [Marr 1911].

The first publisher attached a whole volume to the work and along with the research, a diary of travel in Tao-Klarjeti and Shavsheti, and the Georgian text of the manuscript printed a Russian translation. This is the beginning of the history of Giorgi Merchule's work in a foreign language. Very soon, in 1917-1919, the Latin translation (Vie de S. Gregoire de Khandztha, pp. 207-309) by P. Peeters was completed and in 1922-1923 was printed in the volumes 36-37 of *Analecta Bollandiana*; Later, in 1956, in London was published David Marshall Lang's "Lives and Legends of Georgian Saints", which includes the first English translation of "The Life" (The Life of St. Gregory of Khandzta, in the book: *Lives and Legends of the Georgian Saints*, London 1956, p. 155-65); In December 1999, the second Russian translation of "The Life of Grigol Khandzteli" was published in the 42nd issue of the Russian-language magazine "Symbol" in Paris (pp. 245-341), the reworked version of which was published in 2008 by the CRITERIUM publishing house in Moscow (in the series "Mother of Saints" – *Masterpieces of Georgian Hagiography*) published as a book. In 2015, an American scientist of Norwegian origin, Theophane, Eric Halvorson, presented a new English translation of "Life" to the Georgian society [Gulishvili 2018].

Working on a foreign language text and its adequate translation into the target language requires from the translator thorough knowledge of the linguocultural peculiarities of this or that country. Unlike thematic, background information, which can be studied with reference books too, the elements containing the linguistic and cultural specificity of the work are not presented in a concentrated form in the text, they are scattered or encoded. One of the important, perhaps the first, tasks of the

translator, in such a case, is to reveal this specificity, for which he/she must possess/master the so-called language code of the text to be translated, which is the key to deciphering the linguocultural information and the perfect translation of the work in the target language.

What does the linguistic-cultural specificity of the text mean and what are considered its elements?

S. Vlachov and S. Florin mention the "national and historical particularity" of the text; G. V. Chernov talks about "non-equivalent vocabulary"; the issue of culture-bound realities is raised by A. E. Suprun, who also calls it exotic vocabulary (so-called exoticisms); before that, V. Rossels considers the realities a translational category and distinguishes their main signs. At the beginning of the 21st century, in the center of attention of researchers appears the specificity of the so called linguistic and cultural unity and its reflection in language and translation. [Kunina 2016: 9]

In the scientific literature it is noted that the linguistic and cultural specificity of the artistic text is mainly determined by the non-equivalent vocabulary. They classify as non-equivalent vocabulary: different types of word-realities, situational realities, cultural context, intertextual elements (the same intertextual elements), proper names. Each of them reflects something in the composition that the dictionary and grammar cannot grasp. Accordingly, the culturological erudition of the translator is the guarantor of the identification of non-linguistic realities of the text, and revelation of the linguistic and cultural peculiarities is the extremely important prerequisite for their reflection in the translation and achievement of the desired literary effect in the target language.

Realities: the cultural context and national color of the text are reflected by the so-called realities. This term is widely known, but translation science still does not have a fixed definition of it. Realities can be called objects and events that are specific constituents of the culture of a particular people, and the words denoting them. Accordingly, they distinguish between realities-objects and realities-words. The word realities are otherwise called exoticisms. Three thematic groups of realities are distinguished: [Vlachov&Florin 1986: 6]

1. Geographical realities:

a) Terms of physical geography: steppe in Russia, fjord in Scandinavian countries, prairies in Latin America and similar.

b) Endemics (biological groups that live or thrive in a limited area): sequoia, baobab, kangaroo.

2. Ethnographic realities: This group is the most numerous and includes: a) clothes (sombbrero – in Brazil; *chokha* – in Georgia); b) specific buildings (*hacienda* in Spain); c) customs, rituals, celebrations (*vendetta* – in Sicily, *Bar Mitzvah* – in Israel, *blood feud* – in Svaneti); d) mythology and cults (*trolls* in Scandinavia); e) realities of size, weight and money (*solis* – in Peru, *tkaveli* – in Georgia, *arshin* – in Russia); f) addressing forms (*sensei* in Japan) etc.

3. A group of social and political realities, which includes: a) names of administrative units and state institutions; b) organizations, parties; c) names of commercial offices, military, and police units; d) ranks, civil positions, professions; e) titles and ranks.

There are different ways of translating realities. V. S. Vinogradov in his work "Introduction to Translation Studies" distinguishes four main methods:

1. *Transliteration* – unchanged transfer of the graphic form of a word-name from one language to another, the same as phonemic resemblance

2. *Hypo-hyperonymous* – imprecise, but replacement with a related match in the target language.

3. *Periphrastic* (descriptive) – one word of the original is explained by a word combination in the target language. Paraphrases can be accompanied by transcription too.

4. *Calque (loan translation)* – exact transfer of the lexical unit by means of the target language, preserving its morphemic structure. Calques are often used when translating proverbs and sayings, as well as scientific literature. [Vinogradov 2001: 117-120]

N. Marr does not translate the official terms and titles that are attributed to the group of socio-political realities. In the text we have: *აზნაურები* (noblemen), *მთავარი* (chief), *მამპალი* (father lord), *ერის-თავომ* *ერის-თავომი* (chief lord, grand duke), *ერის-მთავარი* (feudal lord). Therefore, the translation uses the principle of transcription of words-realities, and for the Russian-speaking reader to understand the meaning of these foreign words, N. Marr attaches a kind of dictionary (*К лексике текста* – for the vocabulary of the text) to the text. [Marr 1911:]

I. Zeteishvili translates ‘*aznauri*’ (“nobleman”) with the word *дворянин* (279) and considers the variant – *вельможа* (“nobleman”, “baron”, “seignior”) (N. 50) acceptable; *Eristavt-eristavi* is translated as *князь-князей* (“prince of princes”, “knyaz of knyazs”), (281). Therefore, the principle of hypo-hyperonym translation of realities is used, however, in the notes of the text, the Georgian correspondences presented by transliteration are also read: *eris-mthavari* (N. 61), *aznauri* (N. 46), *eristhavth-eristhavi* (N. 136, 245), etc. [Zeteishvili 1999]

Proper names. There are certain principles of transferring proper names from the source language to the target language, and they are: 1. Transliteration as it was already told above – transferring the graphic appearance of the word from one language to another by means of appropriate graphemes; 2. Transcription – repetition of phonetic features, and 3. transposition, which involves the use of a word that has the same linguistic origin, but is formed according to the norms of the target language.

N. Marr and I. Zeteishvili's translations are accompanied by a list of Georgian variants of proper names used in the work and their Russian equivalents: in N. Marr's work - there are both names of people and geographical names [Marr 1911, 206], in the list of Ioseb Zeteishvili there are only names of people (27 names) [Zeteishvili 1999, p. 252].

Names of people:

<i>გრიგოლი</i> – Григол - Григорий,	<i>საბა</i> – Сава (p. 97) – Саба (p. 268);
<i>ანატოლე</i> – Анатолэ - Анатолия,	<i>თეოდორე</i> – Теодор (p. 103) – Теодорэ (p. 274);
<i>თემესტია</i> – Теместия - Феместия,	<i>ქრისტეფორე</i> – Христофор (p. 103) – Христофорэ (p. 274);
<i>იოვანე</i> – Иованэ - Иоанн,	<i>ციკირი</i> – Цкир (p. 137) – Цкири (p. 310)
<i>გაბრიელ</i> – Габриэл - Гавриил,	<i>ნერსე</i> – Нерсей (p. 87) – Нерсэ (p. 46)
<i>ჰუედიოსი</i> – Хуэдий (p. 91) – Хведиос (p. 262);	<i>არსენი</i> – Арсений (p. 112) – Арсени (p. 125)
<i>ეპიფანე</i> – Епифаний (p. 96) – Эпифанэ (p.267);	

Geographical proper names:

из Самцхии (p. 96) – из Самцхе (p. 267);
в Шавшию (p. 96) – в Шавшети (p. 267);
Кларджети (p. 83) – Кларджети (p. 254);
Тбь (Тбьтъ) (p. 136) – Тба (p. 309) – as in the original (65th chapter);
Картия (p. 96) – Картли (p. 267).

From the presented pairs, N. Marr always chooses the option in which is used the linguistic unit of the original, taking into account the morphology of the Russian language, accordingly, we can conclude that for translating of proper names he chooses the principle of transposition; As for I. Zeteishvili's variants, in them is repeated the original's sounding of the words, and the translator uses the principle of transcription:

I. შრომად და მოღუანებად... მამისა ჩუენისა გრიგოლისი (248)

- a) N. Marr: Труды и подвиги... отца нашего архимандрита Григория (p. 83)
- b) I. Zet.: Труд и подвижничество... отца нашего Григола (p. 253)

II. და ერეკუა მას სახელი ვაბრიელ დათაწხული (258) (And he was called Gabriel Dapanchuli)

- a) звали его Гавриил Дапанчул (p. 92)
- b) и назывался он именем Габриэла Дапанчула (p. 263)

Intertextual elements. which we meet in the works in the form of direct or implied quotations of different texts and are familiar to those who speak the source language due to common cultural and historical experience, are such elements that sometimes remain an insoluble task in translation, and the difficulty of integrating these ready-made fragments into the translation often gave theorists another proof of doubt in the possibility of accurate translation. Text inserts can include quotations from movies, commercials, popular songs, poems, etc.

Translators often try to somehow bypass intertextual barriers. The most common and effective way to do this is to add external and internal comments to the text. However, S. Vlachov and S. Florin in their famous work "Untranslatable in translation" note that footnotes, comments, and appendices distract attention and complicate understanding of the text, but, at the same time, they add that in many cases explanation is still necessary, but in no case – in the text itself, but outside the text, through comments and notes. [Vlachov&Florin 1986: 5]

In the hagiographical text, the source of the intext is more often the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Holy Fathers, which are world heritage and familiar to non-Christian society as well. That is why even a semantically accurate translation of intertextual elements is enough for the target language reader to be able to recognize the source. In most cases, there is no need to add an additional explanation. That is why it is much easier for the translators of the religious literature to find a way to reflect the intexts/the same quotations in the translation.

The first publisher of the life of Grigol Khandzeteli, N. Marr complained in his review of the process of translating the text into Russian: "Georgian literature is so poorly studied that it was impossible to list the sources and books of Giorgi Merchule, the author of the life of Grigol Khandzteli, and to determine the exact references" [Marr 1911]. However, despite this statement, in the first edition, Niko Marr indicated 102 sources of attestations, quotations, the same intertextualities on the margin; he even attached a table of attestations to the translation for greater visibility.

Ioseb Zeteishvili does not ignore the sources of intertextualities either. On the contrary, it seems that he pays special attention to them, and in his "notes" he sometimes even specifies which edition of the Holy Scriptures (Slavic, Greek, Armenian) the origin's quotation or paraphrase shows more similarity to. In 61 examples of his work, they are different from "Dzeglebi" ("Monuments") and N. Marr's notes, sometimes they are more reliable, sometimes – less convincing, and in many cases, they are a kind of filling, and instead of one passage of the "Sacred Scripture", several are indicated. Here are examples:

1. რამეთუ რაჟამს ბრძენთა ღუმლი ჰმატს, მაშინ „სინრძნეი მათი გამოსავალთა ზედა იქებინ“.

Both Marr and "Monuments" indicate "Proverbs. 1,20", and in I. Zeteishvili's work, these words are not even separated by quotation marks, the translator does not see confirmation here.

Proverbs 1.20 – „სინრძნე გამოსავალთა იქებინ და უბანთა ზედა განცხადებულად იქცევის“ (,... გამოსავალთა შინა იქებინ...“ – in the Bible of Bakar)[Out in the open wisdom calls aloud, she raises her voice in the public square]

2. ვითარცა იტყვის სოლომონ: „რამეთუ სიბერისა პატიოსნებაი არა მრავალი უამი არს და არცა რიცხვი დღეთაი აღრაცხილ, ხოლო მსცოვანებაი არს გონიერებაი კაცისაი,“ და ჰასაკ სიბერის – ცხორებაი უბინოი.“

Only I. Zeteishvili points out the source: Wisdom. 4,8-9 – რამეთუ სიბერისა პატიოსნება არა მრავალი უამი, არცა რიცხვი წელთა აღრაცხილ, რამეთუ მსცოვანება არს გონიერება კაცთა, და ჰასაკ სიბერის ცხოვრება უბინო. [For old age is not honored for length of time, nor measured by number of years; but understanding is gray hair for men, and a blameless life is ripe old age.]

Stylization. The process of both interlingual and intralingual translation of ancient texts falls within the framework of the confrontation of two main oppositions – domestication-estrangement and modernization-archaization.

The German philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher, while discussing different methods of translation, added that the translator has no other choice, "either he surrenders himself to the writer and makes the reader go to meet him, or he surrenders himself to the reader, and then the writer himself goes to meet him" (Schleiermacher 1992: 141-166). These words are echoed by the American translation theorist Lawrence Venuti's terms domesticating translation and foreignizing translation, of which the first goes through assimilation and appropriation of a text written in another language or created in another culture, and thus brings the text/writer to the reader, while its opposite, foreignizing translation reflects the linguistic and cultural differences of the translated text as much as possible and in this way already leads the reader to the text/writer. (Venuti 1995)

At the current stage of translation practice, foreignized translation is in the foreground - this trend can be explained by globalization and the development of intercultural dialogue, thus expressing the desire of the target language speakers, to learn more about the culture which created the original. In addition, translators, who often know the authors of the original, try to make the translated text as close as possible to the author. Danish philologist and translator P. Øhrgaard writes: "I will not hide that I want to transport the reader to the atmosphere of the book more than to adapt the book to the reader. We translate what we cannot write ourselves, so our translated text should not look the same, it should not be such kind as we would write it ourselves. Ideally, the principles of domestication and foreignizing should not contradict each other – the translator should be able to simultaneously preserve the originality of the text and meet the needs of the reader. But this happens only in ideal cases..." [Øhrgaard 2005: 39-42]

The strategy is more often premeditated and consciously chosen and depends on the place of cultural information in the value system of the original. If the task of the translator is to reduce the distance between the author and the reader, considering the linguistic and cultural parameters of the addressee, some correction becomes necessary and an attempt to adapt the culture in a certain way is seen. On the contrary, when the translator aims to transfer the reader to a different cultural atmosphere, the preservation of the cultural background is expected at the expense of the abundance of exoticisms.

However, distinguishing between foreignizing and domesticating translations, at the same time they underline that only one tendency, one method in its pure form is almost never found in the translations, and in the text, elements reflecting these two strategies are often combined.

For example, when Niko Marr transcribes *aznauri* (*nobleman*) and *erismtavari* (*feudal lord*) into the translation, in this way he foreignizes the text; when he chooses matching forms of Russian morphology for proper names, moreover, when he translates the entire work into literary Russian of the 19th century, he is guided by the strategy of domestication.

I. Zeteishvili revives the elements of the syntax and morphology of the old Slavic/Russian language for translation of the entire work, and when choosing the form of the same proper names, he prefers the version that is closer to the version of original, i.e., the version obtained by transcription – this is

foreignizing of the text; and when he translates the above-mentioned aznauri as вельможа, and refers to Eristavt Eristavi with the words князь князей – domestication.

As a conclusion, first of all, it should be said that the authors of the Russian translations of "The Life of Grigol Khandzteli" really managed to reveal the linguistic and cultural specific elements of the text (word-realities, proper names, intexts, elements of stylization), dealing with one of the important tasks of translation process. And then they used those principles of transferring each such element to the target language, which better respond to their general strategy (domestication-modernization in the case of N. Marr and foreignization-archaization in the translation of I. Zeteishvili). The two translations have different goals – Nico Marr aims to bring the world of original closer to the reality that is familiar and close to the speakers of the target language; and I. Zeteishvili, on the contrary, takes the reader, if possible, to the cultural space of the country that created the translated text. At the same time, the translations show the traditional general tendencies of translation practice, which are used by both translators.

References:

- Guliashvili 2018:** Gulishvili S. New Russian Translation of *The Life of Grigol Khandzteli*. The Kartvelologist. #27. Tbilisi: "Kartvelologi". 2018. <http://kartvelologi.tsu.ge/public/en/arqive/19/8>
- Kunina 2016:** Kunina T. *Transfer of cultural context when translating a work of art* (in Russian). Sankt Petersburg. 2016
- Marr 1911:** Marr Н., *Тексты и разыскания по армяно-грузинской филологии*, т. VII, Санкт-Петербург, 1911
- Мерчул (Законник) Георгий**, *Труд и подвижничество достойного жития святого и блаженного отца нашего Григола, архимандрита Хандзтийского Шатбердского строителя, и с ним поминовения многих отцов блаженных* (in Russian), [пер. прот. Иосиф Зетеишвили], журн. «Символ» №42, Париж, 1999.
- Øhrgaard 2005:** Øhrgaard P. Tysk til dansk. //Mål og Mæle. 2005. No 3, 4. URL: http://www.xn--mlogmle-exan.dk/MoM-arkiv/MoM_28/MoM28_34.pdf
- Schleiermacher 1992:** Schleiermacher F. (1992). On the different methods of translating. In *Translation/History/Culture: a sourcebook*/[tr. and ed.] André Lefevere. London and New York: Routledge. 1992.
- The Life of St. Gregory of Khandzta 2015:** *The Life of St. Gregory of Khandzta*, premier English translation by Theophan Eirik Halvorson. The Diocese of Nikozi and Tskhinvali. 2015
- Venuti 1995:** Venuti, L. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London, NewYork: Routledge. 1995
- Vinogradov 2001:** Vinogradov V. *Введение в переводоведение*. М. 2001.
- Vlahov, Florin 1986:** Vlahov V. Florin С. *Непереводимое в переводе*. М. 1986. [hQp://samlib.ru/w/wagapow_a_s/vlahovdoc.shtml](http://samlib.ru/w/wagapow_a_s/vlahovdoc.shtml)