

Comparative Analysis of Stylistic Devices of Vazha-Pshavela's “Cosmopolitanism and Patriotism” and its English translation

ვაჟა-ფშაველას „კოსმოპოლიტიზმი და პატრიოტიზმი“ სტილისტური ხერხების შედარებითი ანალიზი ინგლისურ და ქართულ ენებს შორის

ანა ბარათელი

თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი

Anna Barateli

Tbilisi State University

აბსტრაქტი

ვაჟა-ფშაველას პუბლიცისტური წერილი „კოსმოპოლიტიზმი და პატრიოტიზმი“ წარმოადგენს ღრმა მსჯელობას ეროვნული ერთგულებისა და კოსმოპოლიტიზმის - მსოფლიო მოქალაქეობის იდეოლოგიის დინამიკურ ურთიერთობებზე. ეს ტექსტი, რომელიც 20-ე საუკუნის დასაწყისშია დაწერილი, ასახავს ავტორის დამოკიდებულებას პატრიოტიზმის მიმართ, მაგრამ ასევე არ უარყოფს სხვა ქვეყნის სიყვარულს. ეს პუბლიცისტური წერილი ემოციურ ინტენსივობასა და ფილოსოფიურ აზროვნებას აერთიანებს, რომელიც მკითხველს სთავაზობს კულტურული განსხვავებულობების პატივისცემას და გლობალური ღირებულებების გაზიარებას.

სტილისტური ხერხების გამოყენება მწერლებისათვის დამახასიათებელია, ვინაიდან ისინი ეხმარებიან ემოციის, დამოკიდებულებისა და აზრის დაფიქსირებაში. ამ მხრივ, არც ვაჟა-ფშაველაა გამონაკლისი. ვაჟა-ფშაველა თავის პუბლიცისტურ წერილში იყენებს სხვადასხვა სტილისტურ ხერხებს, რათა ჩასწვდეს ტექსტის ემოციურ და ფილოსოფიურ სიღრმეს. მეტაფორა, ანტითეზისი, ეპითეტი, რიტორიკული შეკითხვა და სხვა, არამარტო უნიკალური ნაწარმოების შექმნას უწყობს ხელს, არამედ ზუსტად გამოხატავს ავტორის დამოკიდებულებასა და აზრს.

„კოსმოპოლიტიზმი და პატრიოტიზმი“ ინგლისურად თარგმნა მოითხოვს არა მხოლოდ ენის ცოდნასა და შინაარსის ანალიზს, არამედ სტილისტური მახასიათებლების მიმართ განსაკუთრებულ ყურადღებას. სტატია განიხილავს როგორ არის შენარჩუნებული, შეცვლილი ან გამოტოვებული სტილისტური ხერხები და მათი არსი ინგლისურ ენაზე. ყურადღება გამახვილებულია თუ როგორ შეიძლება

შეცვალოს ენამ და მისთვის დამახასიათებელმა გამომსახველობითმა საშუალებებმა თარგმანის სტრუქტურა და შინაარსი.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: ვაჟა-შაველა, კოსმოპოლიტიზმი და პატრიოტიზმი, ლიგვისტური და კულტურული სხვაობები, ღირებულებები, თარგმანი, შედარება, მეტაფორმა, ეპითეტი, ჰიპერბოლა, ანტითეზისი

Keywords: Vazha-Pshavela, cosmopolitanism and patriotism, linguistic and cultural differences, values, translation, comparison, metaphor, epithet, hyperbole, antithesis

1. Introduction

Vazha-Pshavela's publicist letter *Cosmopolitanism and Patriotism* is a profound meditation on the dynamic relationship between national loyalty and universal human solidarity. Written in the early 20th century, the text reflects the author's deep-rooted patriotism while simultaneously expressing an enlightened vision of global coexistence. Rather than presenting cosmopolitanism and patriotism as mutually exclusive, Vazha-Pshavela argues for their compatibility: true love for one's homeland should not foster hostility toward others, and genuine cosmopolitanism must not come at the cost of national identity. The essay blends emotional intensity with philosophical reasoning, offering a moral framework that promotes respect for cultural distinctiveness alongside commitment to shared human values. Through this dual vision, Vazha-Pshavela presents a timeless perspective on how individual and collective identities can coexist within a broader, inclusive worldview.

The **methodology** for this study combines a descriptive and comparative approaches with tools from stylistic analysis. The research begins with the identification and classification of stylistic devices in Vazha-Pshavela's original Georgian text *Cosmopolitanism and Patriotism*. Each device is examined in terms of its function, emotional impact, and rhetorical effect. The corresponding English translation is then analyzed to determine whether these stylistic elements are preserved, modified, or omitted. Attention is given to how shifts in language and tone may influence the philosophical message of the text. Additionally, selected excerpts from both versions are presented side by side to provide textual evidence for the analysis. This methodology allows for a nuanced evaluation of how literary and ideological subtleties are transferred—or lost—through the process of translation. Thus, **this article aims to:** 1. identify and interpret key stylistic devices; 2. explore how these devices contribute to the emotional and philosophical depth of the original Georgian text; 3. examine the extent to which these stylistic elements are preserved, altered, or lost in the English translation; and 4. evaluate how linguistic and cultural differences influence the translation and reception of the central ideas of the text.

2. Theoretical framework

This study is grounded in two interrelated theoretical domains: stylistics and translation theory. Together, these frameworks provide the tools necessary to analyze how linguistic and

literary features function in the source text and how they are conveyed—or transformed—in translation.

Stylistics, a discipline situated between linguistics and literary criticism, examines the aesthetic and functional aspects of language across both written and spoken forms. It applies linguistic methods to analyze how language choices—such as word selection, sentence structure, and rhetorical devices—convey meaning, emotion, and authorial identity (Fowler, 1986; Verdonk, 2002). Style, often seen as an author's linguistic fingerprint, not only reflects personal expression but also enhances the persuasive and emotional force of a text.

The theoretical lens for analyzing translation draws on descriptive translation studies (DTS). According to Gideon Toury (1995), translation should be viewed as a target-oriented activity, with emphasis placed on how cultural and linguistic shifts influence textual choices. DTS encourages the comparative analysis of source and target texts in order to identify regularities in translation behavior, especially regarding the treatment of stylistic devices.

While analyzing a Georgian text alongside its English translation, it is important to focus on stylistic devices that are both central to the original and exhibit notable shifts in translation. Emphasis is placed on elements such as metaphor, antithesis, and rhetorical questions, as these often carry significant thematic and emotional weight. Special attention must be given to how such devices are preserved, transformed, or omitted in the translated version, since these variations reflect interpretive choices and the complexities of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural transfer.

3. Comparative stylistic analysis of *Cosmopolitanism and Patriotism*

Antithesis

Building on this example of antithesis, it becomes evident that the nuanced interplay of stylistic devices in Vazha-Pshavela's original is essential to the strength of his argument—and that even small shifts in translation can impact the tone, clarity, and rhetorical precision of the text.

The sentence „ზოგს ჰგონია, რომ ნამდვილი პატრიოტიზმი ეწინააღმდეგება კოსმოპოლიტიზმს, მაგრამ ეს შეცდომაა.“ (para. 1) exemplifies antithesis, contrasting patriotism and cosmopolitanism. The Georgian verb „ეწინააღმდეგება“ translates as “contradicts,” emphasizing direct opposition. In the English translation—“*Some people think that true patriotism excludes cosmopolitanism*”(para. 1)—“excludes” implies incompatibility but does not capture the full sense of contradiction. Vazha's original formulation seeks to confront the binary opposition often assumed between patriotism and cosmopolitanism, whereas the English version suggests incompatibility rather than an outright ideological opposition. This discrepancy slightly weakens the argumentative clarity and intensity present in the Georgian original.

Analogy

Vazha-Pshavela employs analogy to extend the metaphor introduced in paragraph 2 („შექსპირი ინგლისელია, ინგლისში მუშაობდა და ცხოვრობდა, მაგრამ მისი

ნაწერებით მთელი კაცობრიობა სტკება დღესაც”), comparing great writers to “*children of the entire earth*.” He writes: „ეგრეთვე სერვანტესი, გიოტე და სხვა გენიოსები თავის სამშობლოში, თავის თანამოძმეთათვის იღვწოდნენ, მაგრამ დღეს ისინი მთელს კაცობრიობას მიაჩნია თავის ღვიძლ შვილებად” (para. 2). The English translation—“*Likewise, Goethe, Cervantes and other geniuses wrote for their people, but their works made them children of the entire earth*” (para. 2)—effectively preserves both the metaphor and analogy. The sentences draw attention to the shared destiny of these authors, reinforcing the central idea: although they initially wrote for their own nations, their works transcended borders and now belong to all humanity. This use of analogy aligns these literary figures with Shakespeare, highlighting their universal legacy. English translation uses the word „*earth*” instead of „*mankind*” which better aligns with Georgian term, but it still preserves the same idea.

Chiasmus

The sentence „ყოველი ნამდვილი პატრიოტი კოსმოპოლიტია ისე, როგორც ყოველი გონიერი კოსმოპოლიტი (და არა ჩვენებური) პატრიოტია” (para.1) employs chiasmus to establish a reciprocal and mirrored relationship between two identities, illustrating that patriotism and cosmopolitanism are not only compatible but mutually reinforcing. The English translation—“*Every true patriot is a cosmopolitan and every genuine cosmopolitan (not the local kind) is a patriot*” (para. 1)—preserves chiasmus, emphasizing the mutual dependency between the two roles. However, the phrase “*not the local kind*” slightly softens the ironic or critical tone of the Georgian phrase „და არა ჩვენებური,” which more sharply critiques superficial or distorted forms of cosmopolitanism. Despite this tonal shift, the chiasmic structure remains intact in both versions

Rhetorical questions

Rhetorical questions are another key stylistic device that Vazha-Pshavela uses to engage his audience directly and provoke reflection. However, in translation, the impact of rhetorical questions can be diminished. The direct engagement they create might be lost if the translation fails to preserve the intended tone or urgency, reducing the reader's connection to the author's ideas. Translators must be mindful of this effect, ensuring that the rhetorical power of the original is maintained in the translated text.

The rhetorical question in the original Georgian text serves to directly engage the reader and emphasize the key argument being made. In the sentence „როგორ? ასე, – რომელი ადამიანიც თავის ერს ემსახურება კეთილგონიერად და ცდილობს თავის სამშობლო აღამაღლოს გონებრივ, ქონებრივ და მხედობრივ,” (para. 1) the question “*How?*” is posed and immediately answered by the author, drawing the reader's attention to the process of elevating one's nation. However, this rhetorical effect is lost in the English translation: “*Every true patriot is cosmopolitan and every genuine cosmopolitan is a patriot. Cosmopolitans serve their country and seek to uplift it intellectually, materially, and morally.*” (para.1) By omitting

the question, the translation loses the interactive and reflective aspect that the original Georgian sentence conveys, weakening the persuasive impact on the reader.

„შორს სად მივდივართ?“ (para. 3) This rhetorical question is entirely omitted in the English translation. In the Georgian original, the question serves as a moment of reflective pause, encouraging readers to consider the example of their own country. Its absence in English translation weakens the contemplative tone and removes a layer of authorial engagement with the reader. By excluding it, the translation misses an opportunity to provoke thought and emphasize the urgency or concern implied in the original.

„ნუთუ სხვა ქვეყნის შვილი ისე დასტკბება „ვეფხისტყაოსნით“ და ისე გაიგებს მას, რაც უნდა კარგი თარგმანი წაიკითხოს, ან თუნდაც კარგად იცოდეს ქართული ენა, როგორც თვით ქართველი?“ (para. 3)– Rendered as: *“No matter how excellent the translation, Rustaveli's Knight in the Panther's Skin will never sound as sweet as it does when recited in the language in which it was written. Even if the reader understands Georgian as well as a native Georgian speaker...”* (para. 3). The Georgian sentence is framed as a rhetorical question, which highlights the uniqueness of cultural and linguistic intimacy. However, in the English translation, this structure is transformed into a declarative statement. While the core idea is preserved, the rhetorical nuance is lost. The use of a rhetorical question in Georgian allows the author to subtly assert truth while appearing to question it—engaging the reader and reinforcing the emotional weight of the claim. The declarative version in English is more straightforward and less stylistically rich.

Another rhetorical question „რატომ?“ (para. 7) – *“Why?”* appears in the original text as a brief but emphatic device. However, it is also omitted entirely in the English version. The absence of *“Why?”* (para. 8) diminishes the dramatic pacing and the interactive voice of the author. Without it, the English translation loses a stylistic device that emphasizes the logical progression and emotional resonance of the text.

Metaphor

Metaphors play a central role in Vazha-Pshavela's writing, enabling him to convey complex ideas in a vivid, imaginative way. Yet, in translation, metaphors can be particularly challenging to maintain. The underlying imagery may not always have an equivalent in the target language, and as a result, some of the original resonance of the metaphor might be lost or altered. For example:

The phrase „ყოველმა ერმა მომეტებული ძალა, ენერგია, თავისებურობა გამოიჩინოს და საკუთარი თანხა შეიტანოს კაცობრიობის საღაროში...“ (para. 1) employs a metaphor that suggests that each nation, by cultivating its unique strengths and qualities, adds lasting value to the shared development of humankind. In the English translation—*“they will in their own separate ways increase the collective strength and beauty of the entire world”* (para. 1)—the metaphor is lost. The Georgian version evokes a powerful image of moral and cultural investment, whereas the English version, though stylistically elegant, loses its symbolic powerful image as it doesn't directly translate the idea „საკუთარი

თანხა შეიტანოს კაცობრიობის საღაროში”. In English it could be more directly translated as: “ [every nation] should put their own wealth in the treasury of humanity”

The sentence „შექსპირი ინგლისელია, ინგლისში მუშაობდა და ცხოვრობდა, მაგრამ მისი ნაწერებით მთელი კაცობრიობა სტკება ღღესაც“ (para. 2) employs metaphor by describing Shakespeare’s writings as something that attracts the entire world, symbolizing the lasting, enriching impact of his work on humanity. The word “sweeten”(„სტკება“) in the English translation shows that Shakespeare’s works have a pleasant and positive effect, highlighting how his writing goes beyond his own country and brings something good to people everywhere. In the English translation—*“Shakespeare is British through and through, but his writings sweeten the entire world to this day”*(para. 2)—the metaphor is preserved, with “sweeten” conveying the same sense of global enrichment. However, there is a slight shift in the phrase “through and through,” which emphasizes Shakespeare’s complete connection to his British identity, further strengthening the contrast between his national origins and his universal influence.

Similarly, „მისი შრომის ნაყოფს მთელი კაცობრიობა გემულობს“ (para. 2) employs metaphor by likening the creative or intellectual output of the subject to fruit—a naturally pleasurable and nourishing product—implying that his contributions are both delightful and sustaining for all humanity. In the English version—*“The entire world enjoys the fruits of his inventions”* (para. 2)—the metaphor is maintained. The word “fruits” captures the sense of long process and valuable resource. “enjoys” emphasizes the global appreciation and benefit derived from them. Like in the original Georgian sentence, the metaphor elevates his inventions to something both life-enhancing and universally accessible, much like literature or art that transcends borders and time.

Vazha-Pshavela uses wide range of metaphors to express how deeply and universally the individuals in question are loved and claimed by humanity: „ღღეს ისინი მთელს კაცობრიობას მიაჩნია თავის ღვიძლ შვილებად“. (para. 2) By referring to them as „ღვიძლი შვილები“ (biological children) of all humankind suggests an intimate, familial connection—indicating that their legacy has become so significant and beloved that people across the world feel a personal bond with them. In the English sentence—*“Their works made them children of the entire earth”*(para. 2) —*semantically the metaphor is preserved.* Describing them as “children of the earth” symbolizes their universal character and the emotional attachment people feel toward them, regardless of national or cultural boundaries.

Additionally, „ყველა გენიოსები ნაციონალურმა ნიადაგმა აღზარდა, აღმოაცენა და განადიდა იქამდის, რომ სხვა ერებმაც კი მიიღეს ისინი საკუთარ შვილებად“ (para. 3) uses metaphor to illustrate the relationship between a genius and their homeland. The phrase „ნაციონალურმა ნიადაგმა აღზარდა“(translated as “was raised by their national soil”) is a metaphor that describes the nation as a nurturing ground, suggesting that it supports and helps its people grow and succeed. In the English sentence—*“Every genius is raised and glorified by their native soil, but they are exalted to such heights that even other nations come to embrace them as their own children”*(para. 3)—the metaphor is preserved. The “native soil” represents

the cultural and national context that nurtures talent, while being embraced as “children” by other nations highlights the universal value of their work.

The author writes „ომები, რომელიც დღეს გამეფებულია დედამიწის ზურგზე“ (para. 4). In English—“*The looting and wars that rule the earth*” (para. 4)—the original metaphor is retained. Both texts, original and translation, emphasize the dominance and burden of global conflict uses by portraying war as a reigning power enthroned on the back of the earth.

The phrase „ვიდრე გაფართოვდება ბავშვის მხედველობა“ (para. 7) uses metaphor to describe the development of a child’s worldview. It does not refer to literal vision, but to the broadening of understanding, perception, and awareness as the child matures. Similarly, In English—“*Until a child begins to see more of the world*”(para. 7)—the metaphor is preserved with the help of the verb - the act of seeing symbolizes intellectual and emotional growth, suggesting the gradual expansion of perspective beyond immediate surroundings.

The sentence „რომელიმე პარტიის პროგრამით არის ხელფეხმეობილი“ (para. 8) metaphorically describes ideological restriction. The expression „ხელფეხმეობილი“ (literally “bound hand and foot”) suggests a loss of freedom or autonomy—not physically, but intellectually or morally—due to allegiance to a political party. The English translation—“*He is barred from speaking the truth by the doctrines of his political party*” (para. 8)—conveys the same idea, but does so without using metaphor. While both versions are straightforward, the Georgian employs figurative language, whereas the English opts for a direct, literal expression.

The phrase „კოსმოპოლიტიზმი მხოლოდ ჭკუის ნაყოფია“ (para. 9) (literally “*fruit of the mind*”) utilizes a metaphor to depict cosmopolitanism as an intellectual product, emphasizing its rational origin over emotional influence. Describing it as the “fruit” of the mind suggests a result of careful thought and reasoning, detached from personal feelings or lived experiences. In the English translation—“*It is a matter merely of the brain*” (para. 9)—the metaphor is lost, replaced by a direct anatomical reference, which eliminates the sense of cultivation or intellectual creation implied in the original.

Through the metaphor „მახინჯი გრძნობის პატრონი“ (para. 9) (literally “*possessor of a deformed feeling*”) Vazha- Pshavela expresses moral and emotional distortion. The word „მახინჯი“ (*deformed/ugly*) describes not a physical defect but a corrupted or twisted inner emotion, suggesting that the individual’s feelings are fundamentally flawed. In the English version—“*It bears no relation to the feelings that originate in the heart*”(para. 9)—the emotional contrast is highlighted, but the metaphor of “*deformed feeling*” is omitted. Instead of portraying the feeling as inherently defective, English focuses on its lack of authenticity or depth, shifting from metaphorical imagery to a more analytical tone

The expression „კოსმოპოლიტიზმი მხოლოდ ჭკუის ნაყოფია, იგი საღსარია იმ უბედურობის ასაცილებლად“ (para. 9) metaphorically presents cosmopolitanism as the rational solution to global issues. However, the English translation—“*Yet it is the core of the solution to the tragedy that haunts humanity today*” (para. 9)—introduces a new metaphor: “*the core of the solution.*” This metaphor does not appear in the original and reframes

cosmopolitanism as the central or most essential element of a remedy. While the Georgian sentence highlights ethical soundness and preventative strength of cosmopolitanism, the English version presents it as a practical and intellectual answer to human suffering, slightly altering the emotional and philosophical tone of the message.

Epithet

Epithet is a linguistic tool that adds emotional depth, cultural specificity, and poetic resonance to language. In the Georgian text under examination, several epithets are used to convey strong feelings and complex ideas related to patriotism, identity, and humanity. The task of translating these epithets into English presents a unique challenge, as the two languages have different cultural contexts and ways of expressing similar concepts.

The translation of „ნამდვილი პატრიოტიზმი”(para. 1) as “*True Patriotism*” (para. 1) remains faithful to the original Georgian term, maintaining the essential meaning of genuine devotion to one’s country. Both languages convey the same concept without any significant deviation.

Similarly, „ნამდვილი პატრიოტი” (para. 1) is directly reflected as “*True Patriot*” (para. 1) The essence of the phrase remains unchanged, with both versions emphasizing the deep and sincere patriotism of an individual.

The English translation “*Genuine Cosmopolitan*” (para. 1) of Georgian „გონიერი კოსმოპოლიტი” (para. 1) conveys the idea of someone who is both rational and open to global citizenship. It doesn’t directly match with the Georgian term, because it characterizes a cosmopolitan as having both intellectual depth and moral openness, while the direct meaning of the word implies being honest and sincere.

Both the English phrase “*The Best Members*” (para. 1) and the Georgian „საუკეთესო წევრები”(para. 1) fundamentally refer to individuals who are considered the best in terms of quality or value.

The phrase “*Collective Strength*” (para. 1) in the English translation conveys the idea of unified power and teamwork, which aligns with the overall sense of „*მომეტეხული ძალა*” (para. 1) in Georgian. However, the Georgian word „*მომეტეხული*” more precisely means “increased” or “enhanced,” rather than “collective” or “united.” Therefore, while the translation captures the general idea of greater strength, it shifts the nuance from an emphasis on increased or amplified power to one of collective or joint strength. Despite this subtle difference, the translation remains largely faithful in conveying the intended message.

“*A Sane Person*” (para. 8) captures the core meaning of the Georgian phrase „*ადამიანი სრული ჭკუისა*” (para. 8) as they imply rationality and clarity of thought. However, the Georgian phrase carries a slightly derogatory tone in context, potentially suggesting sarcasm or critique, which is softened in the English version. Similarly, the translation “*Crazy*” (para. 8) captures the essential meaning but is more informal compared to the formal tone of „*ჭკუნაკლები*”(para. 8) in Georgian. The Georgian term carries a heavier sense of a person

being disconnected from reason, while “Crazy” in English is more commonly used in everyday speech and lacks the formal tone of the original.

Both the Georgian and English versions of „*ნაციონალური ნიადაგი*” (para.2) - “Native Soil” (para. 2) convey the concept of one’s homeland or cultural roots. The translation is accurate and does not alter the meaning of the original term.

The translation “*Homelands that they love and cherish*”(para. 3) of the phrase „*საყვარელი, სათაყვანებელი სამშობლო*”(para. 3) is not quite accurate as it diminishes epithets contained in the Georgian words „*საყვარელი, სათაყვანებელი*“. The English translation expresses the same idea but without epithets and different sentence structure.

The metaphor „*ხელფეხშეზოჯილი*” (para. 8) in Georgian, meaning “*bound hand and foot*,” is somewhat diluted in the English translation “*He is barred from*,”(para. 8) losing the vivid imagery of physical restriction. The original phrase implies a more severe, helpless condition, while the English version conveys a more general restriction without the strong visual impact of being physically bound.

In conclusion, when comparing the Georgian epithets with their English translations, it becomes clear that while many translations remain faithful to the original meanings, certain epithets are omitted altogether in the English version. This omission results in a loss of cultural, emotional, or rhetorical weight carried by the original Georgian terms. For example, the epithets „*მომეტეხული ენერგია*” (para. 1), „*მშობელი ქვეყანა*” (para. 2), and „*ჭკვათმყოფელი ადამიანი*”(para. 5) are not translated into English

Personification

Vazha-Pshavela also uses personification to attribute human qualities to ideas, enhancing their emotional impact and making them more relatable. This technique deepens the connection between the reader and the themes. However, in translation, personification can lose its emotional weight and vividness without the same linguistic and cultural context, requiring careful attention to the depth of the original.

The phrase „*ყველა გენიოსები ნაციონალურმა ნიადაგმა აღზრდა, აღმოაცენა და განადიდა*” (para. 3) contains personification as the verb „*აღზრდა*” (raised) attributes a human action to „*ნიადაგი*”(soil), exemplifying personification by portraying the nation as a nurturing parent.

Philosophical statements

Vazha-Pshavela frequently employs philosophical statements to express profound truths and moral convictions, imbuing his arguments with emotional intensity and intellectual weight. These declarations serve not merely to persuade but to elevate the discourse, presenting patriotism, genius, and human identity as subjects of universal importance.

The sentence „*გენიოსებმა თავის სამშობლოს გარეშეც ჰპოვეს სამშობლო – მთელი ქვეყანა, მთელი კაცობრიობა*” (para. 3) articulates a philosophical view of genius as transcending national boundaries. The English version—“*A genius’s homeland exceeds the*

bounds of his native soil; such a person belongs to the entire world" (para. 3)—captures the essence of this worldview, albeit in slightly more tempered language. While both versions stress the universal legacy of great minds, the Georgian original carries a more exalted tone, suggesting an almost sacred connection between genius and humanity as a whole.

Similarly, the single word „არასდროს“ (“never”) functions as a powerful philosophical claim. It asserts a definitive truth that stands on its own, emphasizing the permanence and categorical nature of the idea it supports. In the English translation, this emphatic declaration is not rendered directly, which slightly diminishes its force. The omission demonstrates the challenge of conveying the same philosophical weight through a different linguistic structure.

The sentence „ვერც ერთი ჭკვათმყოფელი ადამიანი ვერ უარყოფს“ (para. 5) expresses a universal truth about patriotism, presenting it as something so foundational that no rational person could possibly reject it. The English version—“*It contains within itself forces that no thinking person can negate*” (para. 5)—reflects this idea faithfully, framing patriotism as a self-evident and universally accepted value.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the comparative stylistic analysis of Vazha-Pshavela's *Cosmopolitanism and Patriotism* and its English translation underscores both the successes and limitations of the translation process in preserving the original rhetorical devices. On the positive side, the translation retains the central philosophical themes of cosmopolitanism and patriotism, successfully conveying the core intellectual stance of the author. Moreover, some of the rhetorical devices, such as metaphor and rhetorical questions are effectively maintained, allowing the translation to capture the essence of the original argument and its persuasive force.

However, the analysis also reveals significant challenges in preserving the stylistic nuances of the original text. Several key rhetorical devices, particularly antithesis and epithets, do not fully survive the translation process. These devices, which contribute to the emotional intensity and intellectual profundity of the Georgian original, are often attenuated or modified, diminishing the overall impact of the text. Additionally, certain culturally specific references and linguistic subtleties inherent in the Georgian language are either obscured or entirely lost in the English version, posing a barrier to a complete understanding of the text's intricate layers of meaning.

This analysis highlights the complex challenges faced by translators in balancing accuracy with the retention of rhetorical richness, emphasizing the nuanced nature of literary translation and its impact on the reception of the original work.

References:

1. ვაჟა-ფშაველა. (1905). *კოსმოპოლიტიზმი და პატიროტიზმი*. საქართველოს ეროვნული ბიბლიოთეკა.
ბმული: <https://www.amsi.ge/istoria/div/kosmopolitizmi.html>
2. Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic criticism*. Oxford University Press.

3. Pshavela, V. (2016, October). *Cosmopolitanism and patriotism* (R. R. Gould, Trans.). Asymptote. https://research-information.bris.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/90452374/Cosmopolitanism_and_Patriotism_Asymptote.pdf
4. Rusieshvili, M., Dolidze, R., & Totibadze, S. (2022). *The course of stylistics: The reader for the seminars*. Tbilisi. <file:///C:/Users/User/Desktop/stylistics/Stylistics.pdf>
5. Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies – and beyond*. John Benjamins.
6. Verdonk, P. (2002). *Stylistics*. Oxford University Press.

ავტორის შესახებ:

ანა ბარათელი არის ივანე ჯავახიშვილის თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის ინგლისური ფილოლოგიის საბაკალავრო პროგრამის მეოთხე კურსის სტუდენტი. მას უკვე გამოქვეყნებული აქვს სტატია „ლივერპულის უნიკალური დიალექტის (Scouse) კვლევა“ და მონაწილეობდა არაერთ სამეცნიერო კონფერენციაში. იგი დაინტერესებულია ლინგვისტიკით.

About the author:

Anna Barateli is a fourth-year student of the English Philology Bachelor's program at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. She has already published an article: "Exploring Scouse-Liverpool's Unique Dialect" and has participated in a number of scientific conferences. She is interested in linguistics.

Email: anna.barateli2@gmail.com

სამადლობელი:

მადლობა ქ. მანანა რუსეიშვილს ამ შესაძლებლობისთვის. განსაკუთრებულ მადლობას ვუხდის ჩემს ხელმძღვანელს ქ. ნატო ფერაძეს ფასდაუდებელი შრომისა და მხარდაჭერისთვის. ვაფასებ, რომ მომეცა შესაძლებლობა მემუშავა და მესწავლა ისეთი პროფესიონალისაგან როგორც ქ. ნატოა.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Ms. Manana Ruseishvili for granting me this opportunity. I am especially thankful to my supervisor, Ms. Nato Peradze, for her invaluable guidance, dedication, and continuous support. I deeply appreciate the opportunity to work with and learn from a professional such as Ms. Peradze.