

21ST CENTURY GEORGIAN-RUSSIAN TRANSLATION: PRIORITIES AND INNOVATIONS IN INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE

Irine Modebadze

Shota Rustaveli Institute of Georgian Literature
5 Kostava St., 0108 Tbilisi, Georgia
Telephone: (+995 32) 299 53 00
Fax: (995 32) 299-53-00
E-mail: litinstitututi@yahoo.com

Received 15 December 2016; accepted for publication 20 December 2016

DOI:10.13165/SMS-16-8-2-03

Abstract. *Translation is an integral part of intercultural communication and one of the most actual forms of exchange of spiritual values. The evolution of literary traditions and associated changes in translation norms have a substantial impact on perceptions about the adequacy of translation. Serious fluctuations in translation priorities are fixed in post-soviet space.*

This article will provide the results of research carried out for the first time that deals with the specificity of modern translation strategies through the analysis of five new translations of Shota Rustaveli's poem. Analysis has proved that the postmodern mentality of translators at the end of the 20th century seeks to give the reader comprehension of the original – here the priority is attributed not to domestication but to hermeneutical interpretation of the text. A tendency of synthesis is outlined towards translation and publishing innovations, the main goal of which is translation of an original with preservation of the specificity of its cultural alter and decoding of a text from the position “other” is not “stranger”.

Keywords: *Georgian-Russian translation, postmodern mentality, modern translation strategies, publishing innovations, Shota Rustaveli*

Introduction

Since time immemorial, translation has served as a bridge uniting various cultures. Thanks to the translations over many centuries created the general field of human culture, with the foundation for mutual understanding between people was laid down and the exchange of cultural wealth was carried out¹. At the same time, text was transferred into the foreign-language cultural environment – the difficult communicative act: “unlike the person speaking, being in “the own” semantic sphere, a translator gets to crossing, at least, two semantic spheres: “the own” and “other’s”, provided by the text which is subject to the translation”². Translation activities determined by various semiotics models in the world firstly require the examination and overcoming of distinctions between them (cultural adaptation). N. K. Garbovskij highlights that “any translation assumes more or less considerable transformation of system of meanings of the initial speech work”³. A. D. Schweitzer calls this situation “a paradox in case of which: a) the translation shall be read as the original and b) the translation shall be read as the translation. <...> Any decision of a translator is of a compromise character”⁴. As a result, it is always possible to allocate a print of the translator’s own personality in the text they create – such as their world outlook and the aesthetic attitudes of his or her creative «I»⁵. If the activity of translation was once equated to craft, in modern studies it is understood as creative art: “the new text which completely and adequately replaced the text of the original in another culture and other communicative situation”⁶. In other words, attention is paid to the creative aspects of a translator’s activity, one priority of which is understanding and interpreting the original text. “Perceiving the text, we in a bigger or smaller measure analyse it in search of rational adaptation for system of the concepts, for own knowledge base, saved up by us when using accumulative function of the native language”⁷.

-
- 1 Deljoz, Žil'. *Logika smysla* [Deleuz Gilles. Logic of sense] Moskva: Akademija, 1995, p. 300.
 - 2 Bazylev, V.N., Sorokin, Ju. *Interpretativnoe perevodovedenie* [Bazilev V. N., Sorokin Y.A. Studies of interpretational translation] Ul'janovsk: izd. Ul'janovskogo universiteta, 2000, p. 56.
 - 3 Garbovskij, N.K. *Teorija perevoda* [Garbovskij, N. K. Theory of translation]. Moskva: MGU, 2007, pp. 227-228.
 - 4 Švejcer, A. D. *Teorija perevoda: status, problemy, aspekty*. [A. D. Schweitzer. Theory of translation: status, problem, aspects]. Moskva: LIBROKOM, 2009, p. 81.
 - 5 See: Modebadze, I. I. Svoboda i Neobhodimostj: ponimanie I interpretacija v perevode [Modebadze I. Perception and Interpretation: Freedom of a Translator and Necessity of a Text]. *Literary Researches, XXXIII*. Tbilisi: Institute of Literature Press, 2012: 153-170 (<http://literaturatmcodneoba.tsu.ge/dzieb-33.pdf>).
 - 6 Prokoničev, G. I. Konceptual'naja informacija I interpretacija poetičeskogo teksta [Prokoničev, G. I. Conceptual information and interpretation of a poetical text]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta, serija 22: teorija perevoda*. 2010, №4: 29.
Conceptual differences are fixed basically in the sphere of a created text recurrence understanding by its author, i. e. extent of its dependence on the original (See: Vinogradov, V. S. *Leksičeskije voprosy perevoda hudožestvennoj prozy* [Vinogradov, V. S. Lexical issues of a fictional prose]. Moskva: MGU, 1978, p. 8 and Garbovskij, N. K. [Garbovskij, N. K.], *op. cit.*, p. 357.
 - 7 Semjonov, A. L. Osnovy obšej teorii perevoda I perevodčeskoj dejatel'nosti [Semenov, A. L. *Basics of general theory of translation and translational activities*]. Moskva: Akademija, 2008, pp. 9-10.

The process of understanding includes “historical understanding”⁸, the hermeneutical process of disclosure of “plurality of meanings”⁹ in the text being translated, and also, to use M. Weber’s term, the “urgent understanding” of an individual that is guided by his daily experience and practical life¹⁰.

1. Intercultural dialogue and fluctuations in a grid of translation priorities in the countries of the former Soviet Union

Each translation provides only one particular (and always only a partial) interpretation of the translated work. In scientific literature on translation studies, the idea that in some circumstances translations are subject to “ageing” not only in terms of language, but also with respect to interpretations of them, has been repeatedly introduced. The evolution of literary traditions and the related change in translation regulations have a key impact on the idea of adequacy of a translation¹¹ that is firstly reflected in a grid of hierarchies of translation priorities. Since the end of the 20th century in the former Soviet Union, serious fluctuations in systems of translation priorities which have in many respects been caused by changes in the general geocultural situation are fixed. After the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the formation of independent states, the need for intercultural dialogue increased sharply on a parity basis. Full bilateral cultural exchange became a priority, with the increasing importance of broadcasting one’s own cultural wealth requiring the development of new translation strategies.

The choice of translation strategy and criteria for the assessment of these first of all depends on in what line item this or that culture acts in each case. From the line item accepting, any national culture, aiming at inclusion of the foreign-language text in its own cultural context, domesticus – house) – that is, considerable cultural adaptation requires domestication (*Latin* domesticus – domestic). At the same time for the culture which is in the line item transferring a priority acquaintance of the foreign-language reader with its own cultural achievements in case of which the minimum extent of adaptation is desirable. In

- 8 See: Hajdegger, M. *Bytie i vremja* Хайдеггер Мартин. [Martin Haidegger. Existence and time] online: http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/Philos/Haid_BtVr/
- 9 Rikjor, Pol'. *Konflikt interpretacij*. Očerki o germenevtike, per. s fr. I.S.Vdovina [Paul Ricker. Conflict of interpretations. Hermeneutics essays, I. S. Vdovin translation from French]. Moskva: *Kanon-Press*, 1995, p. 18.
- 10 Veber, M. *Protestantskaja etika i duh kapitalizma* [Max Veber. Protestant ethics and spirit of capitalism]. Moskva: Progress, 1990, pp. 227-228.
- 11 Korney Chukovsky was sure: “You can’t foresee in any way that will be considered as an accurate translation in 1980, or in 2003. Every era creates the idea of what is an accurate translation” (Čukovskij K. *Masterstvo perevoda* [Chukovsky, K. Mastercraft of translation]. Moskva: Sovetskij pisatel’, 1970, p.11). And at the end of the 80th years of the last century M. Hutsishvili noted: “... the concept of the correct method, the right translation, isn’t steady: throughout a long time of existence of translation activities it repeatedly changed” (Hucišvili M. *Problemy perevoda gruzinskoj poezii na russkij jazyk* [Hutsishvili, M. Problems of the translation of the Georgian poetry into Russian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1989, p.10).

the active dictionary of modern Georgian, the translation is called თარგმანი / targmani /. The concept of this ancient word carries an essence that has steadily become fixed in the cultural mentality of people over the centuries: once, the main function of translation was to *explain*¹². At present, “to explain” is first of all to facilitate the reader’s understanding of another as other, but not the stranger in case of all their otherness. The acquaintance of another with one’s own cultural achievements thus finds a special importance that can be clearly traced when studying the specifics of the translation strategy of modern Georgian-Russian translation and innovations in that area.

It is necessary to note that Georgian-Russian translation activity for nearly two centuries has been rigidly normalised by the accepting culture. In other words, all translated texts have been exposed to considerable domestication (cultural adaptation), in line with the specifics of reception of the Russian reader. Aside from this, during the Soviet era, state publishing policy (the system of state orders) with regard to translators, as well as ideological and artistic norms determined by state ideology, made a particular impact that has also affected variability in the understanding and interpretation of original texts¹³.

Modern translations of Shota Rustaveli’s poem into Russian may serve as a bright illustration of the current changes in a grid translation priorities. Ilia Chavchavadze (1837-1907), a leader of the national liberation movement, called the poem “a treasury of the soul of the Georgian people”, and “soul can’t be told” (M. Y. Lermontov), while only art is a language in which the communication of souls is possible. Translations of a treasury of the soul of our people therefore have special value. It should first be noted that the history of translations into Russian of Vepkhistkaosani, to them better known

-
- 12 The Dictionary of Georgian (seventeenth century) explains the word თარგმანი /targmani/ - translation, as «interpretation of the allegoric word» (Orbeliani, S.-S. *leksik’oni kartuli / ორბელიანის ს.-ს. ლექსიკონი ქართული* [Orbeliani, S.-S. *Dictionary of Georgian*], V. I. Tbilisi: Merani, 1993, p. 301 - in Georgian). The lexeme obviously specifies on even more ancient Judaic to “targumym”: “At the time of Ezdra (half of fifth century B. C.) Jews already had a custom to read the Pentateuch publicly, and then fragments from Prophets, reading was followed by the translation of the text to a national dialect. From there were chaldaic rather Jewish-Aramaic translations (targumym)...” (Biblejskie perevody. *Hristianstvo. Enciklopedičeskij slovar’*, t. I. [The translations of Bible. Christianity. Encyclopedic dictionary, V. I.]. M., 1993, p. 230). About history of theoretical judgment of the translation in Georgia see: Modebadze, I.I., Cicišvili, T.G. Iz istorii teoretičeskogo osmyslenija hudožestvennogo perevoda v Gruzii. *Russkij jazyk v načale XXI veka. Problemy razvitiija, funkcionirovanija, prepodavanija. Materialy meždunarodnoj naučnoj konferencii*. [Modebadze, I. I., Tsitsishvili, T. G. From history of theoretical judgment of the literary translation in Georgia. *Russian at the beginning of the 21st century. Problems of development, functioning, teaching. Materials of the international scientific conference*]. Vengrija, Peč, 2008, pp. 116-121.
- 13 In article “History of one cultural phenomenon (translation: the tradition and creative identity)” we visually illustrated as depending on ideological esthetic regulations of an era changed throughout the twentieth century interpretation of the text of the sonnet of T. Tabidze (Modebadze, I.I. *Istorija odnogo kul’turnogo fenomena (perevod, tradicija i tvorčeskaja individual’nost’* [Modebadze, I. I. History of one cultural phenomenon (translation: tradition and creative identity). *IX International Symposium “Contemporary Issues of Literary Criticism: Tradition and Contemporary Literature”*. Tbilisi: Institute of Literature Press, 2015, pp. 441-470).

as «Витязь в тигровой шкуре» / “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin” /, contains more than a century and a half. Today, more than 60 Russian-language transfers (including prosaic and partial) are known, including 10 full poetic translations¹⁴. Most of these were created in the 20th century, but the development of Russian studies of Rustaveli still continues intensively.

“Everything that is told or written by one person shall be understood by another in the course of perception and judgment”¹⁵, and this is the indisputable truth. But how is this apprehended, comprehended and understood? What is the main thing from semantic wealth that should not be lost when translating? Great works contain a set of meanings, and each translator first determines their priorities in interpreting the primary text to try to obtain maximum proximity to the original – and what they consider the most important elements that have escaped the attention of predecessors.

Each new translation is a cultural event – a new milestone not only in the history of a poem’s Russian-speaking life, but also a reflection of certain cultural tendencies of the time. Unlike in the Soviet era, in 21st century editions reflect the freedom of postmodern consciousness, in which “the principles of pluralism, decentralization, fragmentariness which are based on the principle of a variety deeply take roots has completely revealed. Under the influence of these processes ready standard decisions and actions are impossible” (A. A. Radugin and E. M. Gurina)¹⁶. Now, unlike the modernist style, the postmodern does not declare refusal of the principles of the previous era in intensive searches. The leading principle is that “everything is acceptable!” Translators conduct experiments in search of a new strategy for translation and opportunities for using these techniques in modern publishing.

2. 21st Century Studies of Rustaveli

In Georgia in the 21st century, five totally new Russian-language texts of the poem have been published: two full poetic translations (G. Devdariani – 2004, A. Halvashi – 2015), one partial translation (K. Gulisashvili – 2015), one short version (2014) and one (2011) adapted for young readers. But instead of “acquaintance of the Soviet reader with a monument of Georgian culture” that was popular in the Soviet period, text

14 Well-known: K. Balmont – 1933, G. Tsagareli – 1937, P. Petrenko – 1938, Sh. Nutsbidze – 1941, N. Zabolotsky – 1958; little-known (modern) – G. Devdariani – 2004, A. Halvasha – 2015, and also, the translations published only partially N. Mzareulova (Reullo), K. Ovanova and unpublished – V. Džordžikiya (about the unpublished translations see: andguladze lia. “vefixisty’aosnis” ucno bi mtargmnelebi /ანდღულაძე ლია. „ვეფხისტყაოსნის“ უცნობი მთარგმნელები/ [Andguladze, L.. Unknown translators of “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin»]. *Literary interrelations*, v. II. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1969 (in Georgian).

15 Semjonov, A. L. [Semenov, A. L.], *op. cit.*, p. 9.

16 Radugin, A. A., Gurina, E. M. Osnovnye harakteristiki epohi postmoderna [Radugin, A. A., Gurina, E. M. Main characteristics of an era of a postmodern]. *OHB. 2014. №5 (132)* p. 89. Naučnaja biblioteka KiberLeninka [Scientific library of KiberLeninka] *ONV. 2014. No. 5 (132)* of p. 89.: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osnovnye-harakteristiki-epohi-postmoderna#ixzz4GGln6Shp>

interpretation and explanation – that is, an aspiration to replace *knowledge of the poem* with *understanding of the original* – has become a translation priority.

It is significant that through a desire to open up the semantic richness of the poem for the reader, Russian publishers have been open to change – in particular, with regard to the editorial initiative of writer, poet and translator Natalya Sokolovskaya, the unique Russian-Georgian project of which two reprints of the poem achieved the above results. These comprised the 2007 two-volume bilingual book «Витязь в тигровой шкуре» / “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin” (Vita Nova, St. Petersburg), and the 2014 «Вепхисткаосани (Витязь в тигровой шкуре). Подлинная история» / “Vepkhistkaosani (The Knight in the Panther’s Skin). The True Story” / (Simpozium publishing house).

What is certain is that “before recent time this book <...> in Russia remained one of the most known, but not read literary monuments because, despite the titanic work of poets-translators, many important meanings remained outside the Russian poetic versions” (from the advertising summary). Publishers have published not the poetic, but equated to the word-per-word translation prose translation. Iordanishvili (1933)¹⁷, having supplied it with a scientific device¹⁸ designed to help the reader break cultural and chronological barriers, and to open up the philosophical and religious depth of the poem’s semantic richness lost during the domination of Soviet state atheism. The publishing credo is reflected even in the title of the book – *Подлинная история / The True Story* /. And whereas the two-volume book of 2007 appeared in an expensive gift format, the cheaper 2014 edition is focused on a much wider range of readers¹⁹.

Two new full poetic translations of the poem published in Georgia revealed that their creators, without being professional poets-translators, have been led by a single aspiration – “to break” the paradigm of perception of Rustaveli’s text created by Georgian researchers.

The scarcity of information about the 12th-century poet has surrounded his name with a secret aura that has excited the imagination and generated a set of legends and conjecture. While translating the poem, Giorgi Devdariani reflected much on Rustaveli’s identity. “I won’t hide, in operating time I had the idea of shape of the poet: I saw him as a young man with spiritual features, with the high forehead of the thinker and a radiant look, the poet able to comprehend the beauty of this frail world and to vest them with poetic stanzas”, the translator says²⁰. In his interpretation, doubts about traditional ideas of the poet’s biography are read: carried away by a solution of a mystery of an author’s

17 The translation has been edited and published in 1966. As the word-per-word translation (the hand-written original of “Samizdat” and the edition of 1966) many translators of the 20th century who were not knowing the old Georgian language used this text.

18 T. I. Chiladze’s *Preface, Epilogue and Comments* by N. V. Sulava and I. I. Modebadze’s *Notes*.

19 Let’s compare the cost of books by the time of writing of article: a number copy of the two-volume book in a leather cover of publishing house Vita Nova - 24 200 Rub (about \$374 the USA or 335 EUR), and a copy of Simpozium publishing house - 639 Rub (about \$10 the USA or 9 EUR).

20 Devdariani, G. Ot avtora perevoda. *Rustveli. Vepkhistkaosani. Perevod Georgija Devdariani* [Devdariani, G. From the translator. Rustveli. Vepkhis tkaosani] Georgy Devdariani’s Translation]. Тбилиси, 2004, p.8.

pseudonym, the translator suggests that the reader might be aware of the fact that “it isn’t necessary to exclude” a very romantic, but scientifically unconfirmed hypothesis that under the pseudonym “Rustaveli”, royal prince Demna Bagrationi²¹, in love with his cousin, but not a grandee of the Queen Tamar period hid himself. Interpreting the text from this perspective, the translator fixes the reader’s attention on those places that can be interpreted for the benefit of this uncanonical version²².

Archil Halvashi’s attention was drawn by another controversial issue with regard to studies on Rustaveli: he was not satisfied by the academic text of the original verified by textual critics. It is known that only pretty late manuscripts of the poem reached us (about 180 full and fragmentary ones) in which there are many distortions created by the additions of interpolators. Over centuries, the text was constantly corrected²³. The question of authorship of some fragments or chapters of the poem was often the subject of fierce scientific debate, and naturally, its interpretation by translators in many respects was defined by which version of the text was recognised by textual critics by the time of a translation’s creation.

The professional philologist, A. Halvashi aimed to create in Russian “the full text of the poem which has remained in manuscripts of the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries”²⁴, with respect for the rhythm of the original (16-syllabic shairi).

He has done double work: he has made the “critical text of the original”, including added fragments that were not in the original academic text, and has created his own translation. The book is published under a bilingual principle (specular reflection) and contains texts in the Georgian and Russian languages, with a difficult system of double numbering of stanzas (to denote academic and non-academic texts²⁵). This edition gives Russian-speaking readers the chance to study the uncanonical version of development of a plot of the poem and to make idea of variability of hand-written heritage of Rustaveli.

- 21 Demna Bagrationi - the son of the elder brother of the king Georgy III, the father Tamar.
- 22 In more detail see: Modebadze, I. I. “Rustveli. Vefhis tkaosani” Perevod Georgija Devdariani [Modebadze, I. I. “Rustveli. Vepkhis tkaosani”. Georgy Devdariani’s translation]. *VI International Symposium CONTEMPORARY ISSUES OF LITERARY CRITICISM. Medieval Literary Processes, Europe, Asia, Georgia. Proceedings. V. I*. Tbilisi: Institute of Literature Press, 2012, PP. 90 - 103.
- 23 Even by preparation of the first printing edition “Vepkhistaosani” (1712) the problem of recovery of the initial text was particularly acute for her publisher and the first commentator Vakhtang VI. In 1962 at Academy of Science of Georgia “The commission on establishment of the text of Vepkhistaosani” which result of activity were so-called academic publications of the text of the poem has been founded.
- 24 Halvaši Ramaz. “Vitjaz’ v tigrovoj škure” i ego novyj russkij perevod. *Vitjaz’ v tigrovoj škure*. Polnaja redakcija. Kritičeskij tekst originala i russki j perevod Arčila Halvaši [Ramaz Halvashi. “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin” and his new Russian translation. The Knight in the Panther’s Skin. Full edition. Critical text of the original and Russian translation of Archil Halvashi]. Tbilisi: «kartuli tsigni”, 2015, p.22.
- 25 The translator used both texts of academic publications, and the four-volume book *Varianty rukopisej “Vitjazja v tigrovoj škure”, otryvki* [Versions of manuscripts “Of the hero in a tiger skin”, fragments], Tbilisi, 1960-1963.

K. Gulisashvili has lived in the USA for many years. His translation of the poem's first and second chapters²⁶ is also focused on making them as close to the original text as possible and the correction of inaccuracies allowed by predecessors. In this translation, the fact that the translator goes on the way to a universalisation – adaptation of the text to the specifics of reception of Russian-speaking readers scattered across the globe – draws attention. This is first of all shown in lexical experiments, with regard to the use of synonymic ranks from lexemes – markers of various cultural areas:

Rostevan is a king /*король*/, the “tsar” /*царь*/, the sovereign /*государь*/, the governor /*правитель*/, the master /*повелитель*/, the lord /*владыка*/;

his daughter Tinatin is a “tsarevna” /*царевна*/ (but not the princess /*королевна*/), the empress /*владычица*/;

and Avtandil is a commander /*полководец*/, the knight /*витязь*/, sspaspet /*спаснет*/.

There are also direct replacements: amirspasalar → military minister /*ратный министр*/, hunters → trappers.

Emphasising the universality of a geocultural area of the poem in this way, the translator expands it from the borders of the civilised world in Rustaveli's era to the infinite scope of the modern world – that of an era of cultural globalisation.

In 2014, the Nekeri publishing house (Tbilisi) published the book “*Шота Руставели. Облеченный в шкуру тигра*” /“Shota Rustaveli. Dressed in the skin of a tiger”/. This is a short retelling of the poem executed in a poetic form by writer and translator Georgy (Guguli) Keburiya. The book includes the author's essay “Rustaveli's World”. It is adorned with the illustrations of S. Kobuladze, I. Toidze, M. Zichi familiar to readers according to numerous editions of the 20th century and designed “to acquaint” the widest range of readers with Georgian culture.

Special attention is merited by the 2011 edition of 2011 adapted for young readers – «*Витязь в тигровой шкуре. Необыкновенное путешествие в эпоху Шота Руставели*» /“The Knight in the Panther's Skin. Unusual travel to Shota Rustaveli's era”/ (Tbilisi: Palette 1 publishing house)²⁷.

We already noted that postmodern consciousness aims to be exempted from any dictatorship. However, commercialisation of the book market dictates the rules of the game, and in this edition, the experimental nature of searches of stimulation of the reader's interest was shown. The book is designed with the use of book-building equipment and is a mix of short prose retelling the poem's plot and fragments from known poetic translations by K. Balmont, Sh. Nutsbidze, P. Petrenko and N. Zabolotsky, and is also written in a fascinating form of all-informative inserts of an era of creation of the poem and the art world of Rustaveli, colourful illustrations, pocket insertions and inclusions in the style of children's books that contain surprises.

This edition is expected to draw the attention of the younger generation of various age groups.

26 Gulisashvili Konstantin. “Vitjaz' v tigrovoj škure” [Gulisashvili Konstantin. “The Knight in the Panther's Skin”. *Rustvelologija*, VII. Tbilisi: publishing house of Institute of literature, 2015, pp. 233-242.

27 The Author of the idea, the adapted and informative text **Ramaz Chilaia**. The book appeared in the Georgian, English and Russian languages.

Conclusions

Old bridges fell, and new ones will be constructed to form other ways of communication, as translators experiment in search of new techniques and strategies. Summing up this study, one may say that:

1. The postmodern consciousness of translators at the end of the 20th century aims to acquaint the reader with an understanding of the original version of the texts: the priority is not domestication, but hermeneutic interpretation of the text.
2. Translation experiments differ in type, the tendency to synthesise of translation and publishing innovations in which the main objective is to make the original available in other languages while preserving specifics of its cultural difference and a text decoding from a line item of *another* not the *stranger* is planned.
3. Time will tell which of the experiments will be most successful. Today, all of them are represented by rather shaky planked footpaths and one reason is that the books published in Georgia don't come into the Russian market and remain inaccessible to readers there. Moreover, editions already mentioned issued by Russian publishing houses have appeared in small circulations (1500 to 2000 copies), which is a drop in the ocean of the Russian book market.

References

- Andguladze, L. “Vefxistkaosnis” ucobi mtargmnelebi /ანდღულაძე ლა. „ვეფხისტკაოსნის“ უცნობი მთარგმნელები/ [Andguladze L. Unknown translators of “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin»]. *Literary interrelations*, v. II. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1969 (in Georgian).
- Bazylev, V. N., Sorokin Ju. *Interpretativnoe perevodovedenie* [Bazilev V. N., Sorokin Y.A. Studies of interpretational translation] Ul’janovsk: izd. Ul’janovskogo universiteta, 2000.
- Biblejskie perevody. *Hristianstvo. Enciklopedičeskij slovar’*, t. I. [The translations of Bible. *Christianity. Encyclopedic dictionary*, V. I]. Moskva, 1993.
- Deljoz, Žil’. *Logika smysla* [Deleuz Gilles. Logic of sense] Moskva: Akademija, 1995.
- Devdariani, G. Ot avtora perevoda. *Rustveli. Vefhistkaosani. Pervod Georgija Devdariani* [Devdariani G. From the translator. Rustveli. Vepkhis tkaosani” Georgy Devdariani’s Translation]. Тбилиси, 2004.
- Garbovskij, N. K. *Teorija perevoda* [Garbovsky N. K. Theory of translation]. Moskva: MGU, 2007.
- Gulisašvili, K. “Vitjaz’ v tigrovoj škure” [Gulisashvili Konstantin. “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin”. *Rustvelologiya*, VII. Tbilisi: publishing house of Institute of literature, 2015, pp. 233-242.
- Halvaši, R. “Vitjaz’ v tigrovoj škure” i ego novyj russkij perevod. *Vitjaz’ v tigrovoj škure. Polnaja redakcija. Kritičeskij tekst originala i russkij perevod Arčila Halvaši* [Ramaz Halvashi. “The Knight in the Panther’s Skin” and his new Russian translation. *The Knight in the Panther’s Skin. Full edition. Critical text of the original and Russian translation of Archil Halvashi*]. Tbilisi: «kartuli tsigni”, 2015
- Hajdegger, M. *Bytie i vremja*. [Martin Heidegger. Existence and time] online: http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/Philos/Haid_BtVr/
- Hucišvili, M. *Problemy perevoda gruzinskoj poezii na russkij jazyk* [Hutsishvili M. Problems of the translation of the Geor-

- gian poetry into Russian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1989
- Modebadze, I. I. Istorija odnogo kul'turnogo fenomena (perevod, tradicija i tvorčeskaja individual'nost' [Modebadze I. I. History of one cultural phenomenon (translation: tradition and creative identity). IX International Symposium "Contemporary Issues of Literary Criticism: Tradition and Contemporary Literature". Tbilisi: Institute of Literature Press, 2015, pp. 441-470
- Modebadze, I. I. "Rustveli. Vefhis tkaosani" Perevod Georgija Devdariani [Modebadze I. I. "Rustveli. Vepkhis tkaosani". Georgy Devdariani's translation]. VI International Symposium CONTEMPORARY ISSUES OF LITERARY CRITICISM. Medieval Literary Processes, Europe, Asia, Georgia. Proceedings. V. I. Tbilisi: Institute of Literature Press, 2012, PP. 90 - 103.
- Modebadze, I. I. Svoboda i Neobhodimostj: ponimanie i interpretacija v perevode [Modebadze I. Perception and Interpretation: Freedom of a Translator and Necessity of a Text]. *Literary Researches, XXXIII*. Tbilisi: Institute of Literature Press, 2012: 153-170 (<http://literaturatmcodneoba.tsu.ge/dzieb-33.pdf>)
- Modebadze, I. I., Cicišvili T.G. Iz istorii teoretičeskogo osmyslenija hudožestvennogo perevoda v Gruzii. *Ruskij jazyk v načale XXI veka. Problemy razvitija, funkcionirovanija, prepodavanija. Materialy meždunarodnoj naučnoj konferencii*. [Modebadze I. I., Tsitsishvili T. G.. From history of theoretical judgment of the literary translation in Georgia. *Russian at the beginning of the 21st century. Problems of development, functioning, teaching. Materials of the international scientific conference*]. Vengrija, Peč, 2008
- Orbeliani, S.-S. *leksik'oni kartuli / ორბელიანი ს.-ს. ლექსიკონი ქართული* [Orbeliani S.-S. *Dictionary of Georgian*], V. I. Tbilisi: Merani, 1993.
- Prokoničev, G. I. Konceptual'naja informacija I interpretacija poetičeskogo teksta [Prokoničev G.I. Conceptual information and interpretation of a poetical text]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta, serija 22: teorija perevoda*. 2010, №4.
- Radugin, A. A., Gurina, E. M. Osnovnye harakteristiki epohi postmoderna [Radugin A.A., Gurina E.M. Main characteristics of an era of a postmodern]. OHB. 2014. №5 (132) p. 89. Naučnaja biblioteka KiberLeninka [Scientific library of KiberLeninka] ONV. 2014. No. 5 (132) of p. 89: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osnovnye-harakteristiki-epohi-postmoderna#ixzz4GGln6Shp>
- Rikjor, Pol'. *Konflikt interpretacij*. Očerki o germenevtike, per. s fr. I.S.Vdovina [Paul Ricker. Conflict of interpretations. Hermeneutics essays, I. S. Vdovin translation from French]. Moskva: Kanon-Press, 1995.
- Semjonov, A. L. Osnovy obšej teorii perevoda I perevodčeskoj dejatel'nosti [Semenov A.L. *Basics of general theory of translation and translational activities*]. Moskva: Akademiya, 2008
- Veber, M. *Protestantskaja etika i duh kapitalizma* [Max Veber. Protestant ethics and spirit of capitalism]. Moskva: Progress, 1990
- Vinogradov, V. S. *Leksičeskie voprosy perevoda hudožestvennoj prozy* [Vinogradov V. S. Lexical issues of a fictional prose]. Moskva: MGU, 1978.
- Čukovskij, K. *Masterstvo perevoda* [Chukovsky K.. *Mastercraft of translation*]. Moskva: Sovetskij pisatel', 1970.
- Švejcer, A. D. *Teorija perevoda: status, problema, aspekty*. [A. D. Schweitzer. Theory of translation: status, problem, aspects]. Moskva: LIBROKOM, 2009.

GRUZINŲ-RUSŲ KALBŲ VERTIMAI XXI-E AMŽIUJE. TARPKULTŪRINIO DIALOGO PRIORITETAI IR INOVACIJOS

Irine Modebadze

Šota Rustaveli Gruzinių literatūros institutas, Gruzija

Santrauka. *Vertimas – neatsiejama tarpkultūrinės komunikacijos dalis ir vienas svarbiausių dvasinių vertybių pasikeitimo kelių. Literatūrinių tradicijų supratimas ir su juo siejami pokyčiai vertimo standartuose ryškiai įtakoja vertimo adekvatumo sąvoką. Po-sovietinėje erdvėje stebimi itin platūs vertimų prioritetų svyravimai.*

Straipsnyje pateikiami pirmą kartą atliktų vertimų tyrimų, atsižvelgiant į moderniąsias vertimų strategijas, rezultatai. Apžvelgiami penki nauji Šota Rustavelio poemos vertimai. Tyrimai parodo, kad postmodernioji vertėjų mąstysena XX-o amžiaus pabaigoje, orientuoja į siekį leisti skaitytojui pajusti originalą. Pirmenybė teikiama ne teksto priartinimui prie kasdienės aplinkos, bet teksto hermeneutiniam aiškinimui. Stebima sintetinė tendencija tarp vertimo ir leidybos inovacijos, kuri siekia originalo vertime išsaugoti jo kultūrinį kitiškumą ir skaityti teksto kodus interpretuojant juos kaip „kitiškumo“, o ne „svetimumo“ pozicijas.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: *gruzinų-rusų vertimai, postmodernioji mąstysena, šiuolaikinės vertimo strategijos, leidybos inovacijos, Šota Rustavelis.*

Irine Modebadze, Šota Rustavelio gruzinų literatūros instituto, Literatūros teorijos ir lyginamosios literatūros mokslo skyriaus vyresnioji mokslinė bendradarbė, Humanitarinių mokslų daktarė. Mokslinių tyrimų kryptys: lyginamosios literatūros studijos, slavistika, Kartvelų studijos, kultūros studijos, hermeneutika, vertimo studijos.

Irine Modebadze, Shota Rustaveli Institute of Georgian Literature, Scientific Department of Literary Theory and Comparative Science, Senior Researcher, PhD. Research interests: comparative literary studies, Slavistics, Kartvelology, cultural studies, hermeneutics, translation studies.