Humanities & Social Sciences

Philosophy

Personal Freedom and Open Society

Mamuka Dolidze

S. Tsereteli Institute of Philosophy, Tbilisi

(Presented by Academy Member G. Tevzadze)

ABSTRACT. There is a deep connection between personal freedom and open state of a society stemming from phenomenological consideration of the society as an alive system, as a subject. Social contract is shown here as a sign of emergence of the subjective being within the wholeness of the society. Such a subjective being is typical not only in the sphere of sociology, but also in various fields of human activity: in the spheres of art, literature and special sciences, physics and psychology. Phenomenological approach is considered as a basis of analogy between various fields of human activity. © *2007 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.*

Key words: subjective being, phenomenology, open society.

To begin with, it would not be useless to acknowledge the distinction between philosophical thinking and political thought.

While doing so, it is my conviction that this distinction is a furtive way of revealing the unity of different spheres. The purpose of both researches is truth but when passing from philosophical thinking to the area of political thought, the meaning of truth is shifted in a subtle way. Therefore the world of philosophical insights and the reality of political acts are far from being the same. Such distribution is wedded by the discovery of at least two faces of truth: philosophical truth, the truth in itself, as an accordance of actual state of things and events with its cognitive reflection in human mind, and political truth being indifferent to the actual situation but expressing the thought of the majority of the people. So philosophical thinking turns into political thought because of changing the meanings of truth.

Political thought, oriented to find the truth as of a will of overwhelming majority does not merely imply denial of the philosophical sense of subject-object relation, just the opposite: there is a deeper and more unselfish motive for political ambition to make a statement, which is suitable for others to destroy the direct causal link between mind and object, to purify the phenomenon of thinking and orient it to an internal, intersubjective truth.

This way of thinking evidently has an intentional structure which means that it always strives to go beyond itself in order to find something alien for its subjective essence that is objective existence.

Thus the discovery of the intentionality of the cognitive act supports the belief in the world of objects and the process of thinking might reflect these objects. To put it differently, intentionality refers to the idea of adequacy between internal and external. Indeed, this is a miraculous correspondence, for there is no causal pattern of connecting subjective ego with corporeal matter of things; the physical laws and the mental ideas are not in contact like cause and effect, nevertheless, thanks to intentional structure of being, there is correspondence between them, which makes it possible to actually understand the world.

Political thought is worth considering as a purposeful process, which goes beyond the individual mind, though keeps the body-mind distinction. It reaches objectivity not in the direct way, connecting thought with physical object, but by round-about way. Political thought goes beyond itself and at the same time does not overstep its limit of subjectivity, for there is no logical bridge between subject and object. Thus it goes but does not go beyond itself, which means that here the thinking creates an alien, different object within itself and eventu-

ally the sameness of the subjective self, thanks to intentionality, turns into the sense of otherness. This dialectical process of unity of self-being and otherness by changing the sense of the self within subjectivity means that political thinking reveals the individual essence of person thanks to self-alienation and relation to the other person. Hence, the political person gets the thinking to confirm the reality of other person which, in his turn, by the self-intentionality, comes back to the reality of the first person. Therefore, the individual person needs political thinking to establish his real existence within its subjective essence.

But it is here that we encounter difficulties. To speak more precisely, relation of two individuals is not sufficient to establish personal existence. The thing is that the intentionality is not a reversible phenomenon and the other person on his way of purposeful thinking cannot return to the first person. The other person needs the third person, the latter needs the fourth person and so on… This endless relation is confined by the idea of society, which embodies all real and possible people needing each other to establish their own existence. Only the realization of the idea of society, which is an intersubjective entity of existentially bound people, is the sufficient basis for the establishing of my own self. Thus, the society is thought to be the existential basis of an individual person. Personal relations leading to the integrity of new social wholeness do not erase the individual freedom and uniqueness of a person, right on the other way round: it is the freedom of the individual being that makes possible to integrate separate members in a society. Thus, the process of differentiation leads us to the unity of the society. But if the society established the existence and revealed the essence of personal uniqueness it would have the feature of individuality and in this case is to be open to the other system of human relations. So the society, existentially establishing the person, is an individual and open wholeness.

Openness is the phenomenon of both, individual being and social system, and we are in readiness of waiting for the unattainable aim of individualization of being. Here I can not help evaluating such an endless chain as a tendency of grasping the cosmological idea of the world as a subjective being, and hence, the political way of thinking, despite confining with various political systems, has wide perspective of unfolding from the uniqueness of personal ego to the subjectivity of the total world. Open society, on this way of development, plays the part of an ultimate goal of this process. Open society presents the general integrity of human interactions and simultaneously shows its individual, indivisible nature.

Now it is high time I retired from the sociological point of view and glanced at political thought in terms of aesthetics. Indeed there is a furtive but deep connection between art and sociology. Political reality and artistic world,

both areas have conditional nature. Artistic creative work looks like political thinking, for the primordial task of both activities is to establish the individual being of person through the relation of other being; but the latter arises not as a real person but as an ideal structure of otherness, unfolding endlessly on the basis of the idea of open society. Aesthetically it means the existence of artistic hero and the relation between an author and a personage seems to fall short of the ideal link of self and otherness in political thinking. Both political truth and artistic truth have similar faces, different from absolute, philosophical truth; it is called 'the truth within the situation'. Finally, both political as well as artistic truth pretend to coincide with philosophical truth, for the process of self-alienation (aesthetically or sociologically) attaches to human activity the sense of subject-object relation.

Now let us consider the problems emerging in modern society in the light of a new paradigm of 20th century thinking. It is the awareness of entity of art and nature as the heart of the life phenomenon. All the achievements of contemporary art, literature, modern physics, post-modern philosophy, phenomenology etc, have emerged from the wholeness of life, implying that everything is alive, for there is nothing beyond the process of individualization of the world. Here life is thought in an extremely wide sense, as a realization of the idea of self being, but in its new shade, that it is the interconnection of all the things (including human being) which creates the uniqueness of being and in its endless set of relations refers to the universe as a top point of personal existence. It is important to take into account that the wholeness, mentioned above, is compatible with the duality of spirit and matter, eventually leading us to the many-world universe. Thus the universe as a subject is one and indivisible, and at the same time is objectively plural. Such weirdness of the new paradigm demands an alternative style of thinking connecting the various fields of human activity: political thought, artistic creativeness, scientific research, psychology, sociology… Although each of the realm is stipulated, they merge altogether in a stream of philosophical thinking.

With respect to an analogy between art and sociology it is worth considering the way of impressionistic manner of painting and the emergence of social contract in the history of political thought. I would like to limit the association of this similarity to the relation of subject and object. Impressionism appears, as I see, to establish the body-mind duality in the art of painting. Remarkably, such split serves to reach the unity of creative work according to the general theory of creation of the world. The development of philosophical thinking has not confirmed the hypothesis that the world presents the fruit of generalization of individual beings. Just the contrary, it is an act of separation which outlines the face of being in endless interactions of the world. The act of distinc-

tion seems to anticipate the being of all. Having no idea how to comprehend the act of distinction before the existence of things, nevertheless I assert that differentiation and unity, totality and uniqueness of the world must be unexplainable unless I assume the distinction as an origin of being, which turns homogeneous void into heterogeneous existence. Therefore the being arose as something with its individual form and face. His Majesty distinction has begot such single object in a deep darkness of not-being and in order to prolong itself as an act of distinction makes an expectation of new phenomenon which is not an object. This phenomenon is relation. But relation needs at least two objects being in relation with each other. Hence the first object refers to the other object to establish the relation between them. Remarkably, relation is not the consequence of twofold being, quite the reverse; relation anticipates the emergence of another object as it presents a phenomenon which is not an object and hence keeps and develops the process of distinction.

Unlike an object, relation as a phenomenon of distinction has not got an existential dimension, it embodies all interactions of objects, extending itself beyond objective reality and eventually comes back to its starting point, to the first object. Relation refers to the object as its own not-being, it does not exist as an individual existence, but it includes the implication of all objects which might interact with the first one. Hence relation presents the senses and meanings of an object in the whole system of the world. Such significant content forms the essence of an individual object. It determines the appearance of the object. That is the reason for identification of the appearance and existence of an object. If the process of distinguishing is thought to be the source of being, the emergence of an object and its relation through the other objects and eventually to its own self will design two stages of an act of discerning, i.e. the process of making the appearance of being. The object's relation to its own self including all relations to the other objects creates the individual face of the object where the appearance and being mean the same. Such phenomenological issue derives from the principle of distinction, claiming to be the source of the world. It leads us through an object to the fact of self-relation, which is not an objective fact, for the relation as a not-being of object seems to be the subjective essence of the individual. Hence, thanks to the primordial intentionality of distinction, the individual object and its subjective essence is distinguished. Therefore the differentiation of being, leading to the interaction with other objects, means at the same time the generalization of being. It is worth repeating that the unity and wholeness of being is obtained through distinction, provided that the difference between objective existence and subjective essence, according to duality of spirit and mater, is maintained.

If I applied such judgment to social reality the necessity of other person would be clear to distinguish the subjective essence of myself. The mentioned necessity does not frame itself by the other person but needs the ideal concept of otherness in order to extend the relation to all possible individuals comprising the whole society, which in its turn unlocks its objective reality towards the subjective self. Such 'openness' of society presents the turning point of social relation to the subjective essence of myself. Thus, instead of objective reality the society became the subject, which helps me to be in relation with myself through the relations with other members and whole society. This global relation, furtively passing to self-relation, creates my true essence in accordance with my freedom in alliance with the wholeness of the society. To put it differently, I create myself according to the society, which as a subject influences me to realize my uniqueness as a way of social unity. I create my freedom according to the internal sense of responsibility.

In order to unfold the idea of analogy between art and sociology I have already remarked, it is worth appealing to the work of Merleau-Ponty "The Eye and the Mind" [1]. The author emphasized (p. 34) that the painter draws no more but his own body… Descartes' duality of body and mind appears to be the basis of the author's conception. Indeed if mental and physical are not compatible, the eye of my mind cannot depict the physical object to express it in a picture. There is the only chance to touch the physical by the art of painting – to draw my own body, for it is myself who through the sense of life is exclusively given to me as a miraculous unity of body and mind. My body is accessible to a paint-brush as far as it merges with my mind. Therefore it presents the object and subject of painting simultaneously. Hence, the mentioned body is something which is pictured and at the same time it is someone who is picturing…But my body directly is seen as an object (its subjectivity is not seen at all). Therefore to express the subjective state of my body, I am forced to invent something that is not my body and plays a role of subject toward my objectiveness. To conclude, the artistic reality of the picture might include things and events of the world provided that they are an extension of my physical body and at the same time they express the subjectivity of myself. The painting goes beyond the physical extension of my body in the mode of otherness (other objects), which in its turn, does not express itself directly but playing a role of subject, acquires subjective features.

Thus retreating from the natural position of dupe painting, which used to assume the direct contact between spiritual eye and physical object, Merleau-Ponty, keeping Descartes' duality of spirit and matter, seems to restore such contact by a round-about way, provided that the external nature of painting acquires the subjec-

tive shadow of the painter and thus immortalizes something in nature, which corresponds to my subjective self.

It becomes obvious that Merleau-Ponty implies the impressionistic manner of painting. Accidentality and uniqueness of life have been merely responding to the uniqueness of my subjective self.

Impressionism does not present my subjective relation to the world; it is an extension of my subjectivity beyond me, in nature.

The difference consists in the fact that here we do not express the world as the author perceives it, but rather the emphasis is made on the subjective being of nature – the accidentality and instantaneity of the world and unique character of life.

We think that such tendency eventually is wedding in deconstruction of "objective reality" of art, attaching to the picture conditional face, though instead of abstraction of speculative thinking, it is the conditionality of life.

As a result, the picture becomes a subject of the creative act. In the process of painting, the picture influences the painter, creating the psychoemotional essence of his spirituality. There is no distinct border between cause and effect, painter and picture mutually influence each other and the role of subject and object of creativity is permanently interchanged.

For the crowning of our inquiry into the origins of the analogy between art and sociology, let us return to the self-regulated nature of open society stemming from the social contract of Rousseau. The author of the phenomenology of life Anna-Tereza Tymieniecka in her work " The Origins of Life" [2] raises the question about the origins of such social contract from the angle of its generation. " …I have tried to show successfully the self-prompted and self-regulated nature of the social sphere of life, which is manifestly an original matrix of generation. I submit that by approaching social life from the angle of its generation we see both its fully human origins and its status as an autonomous though existentially dependent sphere of life significance…I believe that its generative matrix, as described above, qualifies its being accounted a new form of life, specifically that of human sharing-in-life" [2, p. 10].

Let us see how this position accounts for grounding society by the freedom and normative structure of life; intentional content of time, place, circumstance, individual psychology and communicative relations – all these factors are responsible for the coexistence of individuals who out of necessity seek support in group cooperation and create a community as such.

Tymieniecka's point of view encourages us to suggest that the necessity of social contract has conditional roots and in fact the social contract is the extension of personal freedom and subjectivity in society. The members of the society make an agreement to arrange their coexistence; the necessity of the exchange of goods, mutual aid in handling the difficulties of life, necessity of solidarity in common defence against aggressors and cataclysms, all of these factors lead humans to unite under the social contract. But the mentioned factors are external motives of agreement. There is no deterministic link between the people when making the social contract. Here purposeful conditionality substitutes causal interaction. If the social contract were a fruit of necessity it would not be only the necessity of people's coexistence, but also it could be the necessity of the whole society, as a live phenomenon, to bring out in itself the conditionality of life, transforming the "objective" system of society into the subject. Social contract is the index of emerging subjectivity in the society. This subjectivity, expressed by Rousseau through the concept of universal will, does not absorb the individual; quite the contrary; it makes clear the unique essence of citizen providing his true freedom through the personal imperative of responsibility by assimilation with universal will.

Thus the analogy between impressionism and social contract becomes clear.

Art of painting:

1. The painter wants impressionistic painting to extend his subjectivity in nature;

2. He gets used to painting the accidentality and instantaneity of the world – the external agents of the internal uniqueness of his own self;

3. For the crowning of his creative work, he gets the picture to influence his psychoemotional state;

4. Here the roles of subject and object interchange;

5. The picture - the resulting effect of painting, acquiring the features of self existence, turns into the subject which inversely influences the painter;

6. The painter – the subject of the creative work becomes an object of reset action of the picture;

Social contract:

1. The person needs a social contract to arrange his coexistence with other individuals. Such interaction goes beyond the objective necessity of social defence in order to unfold the subjective essence of a person. Hence, the person wants social contract to develop and extend his subjectivity in the society;

2. Through the social contract he gets used to expressing the freedom and conditionality of his coexistence, which are the external agents of the uniqueness of his own self;

3. For the crowning of his social creativity he gets the society to influence his self through the internal sense of responsibility;

4. Here the roles of subject and object interchange;

5. The society – the resulting effect of individual's coexistence, acquiring the features of self-existence turns into the subject which inversely influences the person;

6. The person – the subject of the social contract becomes an object of reset action of the society.

As we see, in both cases – in social and artistic reality the creative development of human activity comes across a turning point – the point of extension of subjectivity beyond the subject. The effect of the subject's creative work (picture or the society) is considered to be a live self-existence, which obtains a unique entity of subject and inversely influences the person.

Such influence does not oppress the person. Just the contrary; through the social contract the society as a subject helps the person to find his true essence.

The same is true with painting;

The reinfluence of picture does not oppress the painter. Moreover, thanks to impressionistic appearance, the picture as a subject helps the painter to find his true essence.

This pattern of the societal ordering of existence, similarly to impressionistic art, shows the vital coexistence of subject and object. The complexity of this interaction lies in the fact that we get opposite points – differentiation and unity to create the indivisible integrity of subject and object. The vital process of creativity is offered to solve this problem. We raise the question – How to explain the unity of being not despite but because of individuality and difference of subject and object (deriving from the duality of spirit and matter).

To support this deliberation it is worth going back to the philosophies of Socrates and Plato.

It is my conviction to assert that the difference between the philosophies of Socrates and Plato started from the distinction between oral and written forms of thinking. It was not accidental that Socrates had never written down his thoughts for he believed that vital speech should easily catch the initial stream of thinking arising from the unique sense of debating people. Here we can't help seeing the influence by the sophists, namely Gorgias' argument that the word, bearing a general meaning, differs from both – the private sensation and the individual thing so that it couldn't be able to express either subjective sense or objective being. Sharing this problem, Socrates nevertheless attempted to restore the communicative function of the word providing that we take into account only oral speech. Indeed, the oral word has an advantage before the written one since the former is uttered the conversation by a real person who embodies all the contradictions between unique sense and general thinking.

Plato dared write down the oral teaching of his master although this teaching was offered to him as an attempt to restore the communicative ability of vital word. Plato's intention was to create the written text so that it could keep the flexibility of oral word and hold the differentiation and unity of manifold existence. Moreover; Plato regarded the written text as the most convenient form for this purpose;

the written text could bracket the reality of speech in order to construct the ideal essence which would be responsible for holding together the individuality and unity of life. Plato did not want the act of bracketing to rub out the reality of speech; it should be maintained, but maintained out of claim of being as an ideal phenomenon of vital word. This is the very process of artistic creation - the process of turning the actual world into an artistic reality (individuals into heroes). That is why instead of theoretical issues, Plato reproduced his philosophy through literature, by the dramatic art of dialogue.

Leo Straus remarked ([3]) that Platonic dialogue is in a way insoluble, for Plato tried to keep the flexibility of oral speech in written line. Here we see the problem which sounds as follows: if speech was written down, it would lose the individual listener whom the speaker might address; writing leads us in relation to the abstract reader. Such relation also minds losing the individuality of speaker, turning him into the voice of the writer. Therefore Plato's Socrates was in danger to lose the face of real Socrates representing Plato's image of his master.

Plato tried to break away from this problem and to answer the question: Will the subject and object of speech keep individuality if they pass from oral to written word? The positive answer implies the polyphony of written form, for only in case of significance of the word there is a chance of returning to the individual faces of listener and speaker. Polysemantic meaning provides the flexibility of artistic word through its figurative sense. This is the clue of variety of understanding of this word, appealing to individual efforts of readers. Thus metaphorical writing, like oral speech, refers to the reader who contributes his own energy to perceive and understand the word. Such contribution points out the individual reader, though apart from the listener, the number of perceiving individuals might endlessly increase.

On the other hand, the method of expression of the speaker of this metaphorical word turns into an irony. Plato's Socrates was full of irony, not because of his character, that he had the listener sneered at; but in order to keep the individuality of subject and object when replacing the oral conversation by written dialogue.

Thus we obtain the similarity and difference between Socrates conversation and Plato's dialogue. The similarity has occurred as the individuality of speaker and listener (speaker and reader) is kept. But the ways of supporting such individuality are different. Socrates used oral speech and direct meaning of the word. Plato, as he wrote down the hearing was obliged to use the figurative word to reach the same effect. Irony as a methodological background of metaphorical word transforms the direct speech of Socrates into reported text of Plato.

Therefore Plato's written form includes some kind of uncertainty; this is a sacrifice to the freedom of speaker

and listener to avoid the directness of author and homogenous perception of infinite reader.

Such uncertainty provides the insoluble character of Plato's dialogue in a kind of positive feature, for it keeps together the individuality and unity of subject and object, which animates the written text and turns it into a phenomenon of life.

Irony and flexibility of figurative text, creating the area of uncertainty within the dialogue, helps out Plato from obedience to his teacher.

If I determined political thought according to Rousseau, it would be clear that the vital entity of society, which is considered to be the subject of political interactions, does not oppress the individual, for the universal will, through internal responsibility coincides with personal freedom. Such political point of view is compatible with both: Socrates' oral thinking and Plato's dialogue. In comparison with personal existence, who reveals his true essence through interaction with another person, Socrate's speech discovers the truth by conversation. During conversation people influence each other and come to the point of general concept of truth, keeping at the same time their own relations to the truth. Such coexistence of individuality and unity is not incredible thanks to oral word and vital stream of thinking.

Things become complicated in case of Plato. Plato as a writer couldn't preserve the individuality of speaker and listener unless he created an area of uncertainty within the dialogue to ensure the metaphorical freedom of artistic word. Hence, instead of clarity of the concept of truth, Plato was obliged to offer the idea of truth, which is, in a way, an unobtainable goal of playing on figurative words appealing to the individual efforts of speaker and reader. As the idea of truth couldn't have been reached the philosophical thinking of Socrates acquires the face of political thought, where the artistic word is used as a rhetorical element, or a way of persuasion.

The deliberation we have been compelled to carry out takes place under the shadow of modern phenomenology. Our viewpoint about the difference between Socrates and Plato seems to be reducible to the distinction between oral and written word. Plato couldn't help having difference with his master. If Plato even had been true to Socrates' convictions, he couldn't have restored his philosophy, because of spontaneous difference between oral and written word. Quite on the contrary. It is just Plato's faithfulness to Socrates that causes the emergence of difference between them. In order to fix precisely the hearing, Plato wrote down Socrate's speech and came across the difficulty of losing the individuality of speaker and listener. Therefore he was forced to diverge his writing in the area of uncertainly through irony and figurative sense. Socrates created an exact concept of things, Plato turned this concept into an idea which,

because of uncertainty of artistic word, was inexhaustible by the concept.

Therefore if Socrates' concept belonged to the reality of things, Plato's idea would be considered beyond this reality in the nominal sphere, for if the idea had really existed, the reader and speaker couldn't have kept their individuality. The existence of general truth, according to the idea would have destroyed the freedom of the individual comments of written word.

On the other hand, if the idea did not exist at all, both individual speaker and actual reader would lose their unity. The non-existence of an idea (in reality) provides the individual relation of subject and object of speech. The existence of an idea (beyond reality) is responsible for the unity of the mentioned subject and object. The idea exists not really but nominally, as an unobtainable aim of reality and unity becomes an interminable point of subject-object interaction. Therefore Plato's dialogue has unfinished nature in principle. Eventually there was no summarizing position of the author about the idea discussed before. Platonic dialogue is "open" for further debate.

So, as we see, the monologic rationality of Socrates' which is based on the unity of life-world, turns into a duality of reality and nominal sphere (the sphere of ideas), yielding Plato's theory of ideas.

Thus, two various fields of creativity are proposed to be similar to political thought. These are impressionistic painting and Plato's dialogue. This analogy happens to relate to the philosophical problem of the unity of the world in the case of taking into account the individuality of being and duality of spirit and matter. The unity of life does not appear to have difficulty in correlating such mutually exclusive phenomena. There are some turning points in different branches of development of human thinking, which point out the emergence of subjectivity and integrity of life. Quantum theory in atomic physics, impressionistic style of painting, polyphony and "unfinished" nature of Plato's dialogue, open state of society, all these achievements of creative thinking are witnesses as such turning points to subjective existence.

Namely, according to Bohr's interpretation of the quantum theory, if the principle of complementarity was taken into account, it would be clear that the quantum object acquires physical meaning by its interaction with the measurement instruments. This interaction is indivisible and cannot be subject to control. It reflects not only the interaction between the classical and quantum objects, but also between the subject and object, or, strictly speaking, between subjective and objective being. Otherwise, the uncontrolled character of the interaction could not be explained.

Finally, in order to sum up and summarize our discourse in various fields of human thinking, we would like to underline the conclusion which echoes the phenom-

enology of life: it is the process of individuality of being, leading us to the unity of the world.

Phenomenological principles of the integrity of life and unity of the subject and object both are revealed in various fields of human activity: in the spheres of art,

literature, in the fields of special sciences: physics, psychology.

In sociology this conception is reducible to a deep connection between personal freedom and open state of society.

ფილოსოფია

პიროვნების თავისუფლება და ღია საზოგადოება

მ. დოლიძე

ს. წერეთლის ფილოსოფიის ინსტიტუტი, თბილისი

(წარმოდგენილია აკადემიკოს გ. თევზაძის მიერ)

ნაშრომში განხილულია ერთგვარი ანალოგია სოციოლოგიის სფეროს, მხატვრულ რეალობასა და ანტიკურ ფილოსოფიურ აზროვნებას შორის. ავტორი იკვლევს პიროვნების თავისუფლების პრობლემას "ღია" საზოგადოებაში. მისი შეხედულებით, პიროვნების თავისუფლება ვლინდება ინტენციონალურ მიმართებაში სხვა პიროვნებებთან და, საბოლოო ჯამში, მთელ საზოგადოებასთან. პიროვნების თავისუფლების საფუძველია "ღია" საზოგადოება, რომელიც ფუნქციონირებს როგორც ადამიანთა ურთიერთობების ცოცხალი სისტემა, როგორც სუბიექტი. ავტორის აზრით, ობიექტურად არსებული სისტემის სუბიექტად ქცევა, სუბიექტური ყოფიერებისთვის დამახასიათებელი მთლიანობა, თავისუფლება და განუმეორებლობა ვლინდება არა მხოლოდ სოციოლოგიის სფეროში, არამედ მეცნიერებაში (კერძოდ, კვანტურ მექანიკაში) და ხელოვნების ფენომენო- ლოგიაში. განიხილავს რა მერლო-პონტის ნაშრომს "თვალი და გონება", ავტორი დაასკვნის, რომ იმპრესიო- ნისტულ ხელოვნებაში ხდება არა შემოქმედის სუბიექტური დამოკიდებულების გამოხატვა მხატვრული ობიექტის მიმართ, არამედ ავტორის სუბიექტურობის გადატანა რეალობაზე (მხატვრულ რეალობაზე), რის შედეგადაც მხატვრული ნაწარმოები თავად იქცევა სუბიექტად და უკუშემოქმედებს ავტორზე (გავიხსენოთ ტიციან ტაბიძის ცნობილი სტრიქონი: "მე არ ვწერ ლექსებს, ლექსი თვითონ მწერს..."). ანტიკური ფილოსოფიის სფეროში ავტორი განიხილავს სოკრატესა და პლატონის მიმართებას და ასაბუთებს, რომ განსხვავება სოკრატესა და პლატონის ფილოსოფიებს შორის შეიძლება აღსხნათ განსხვავებით სოკრატეს ზეპირსიტყვი- ერებასა (ცნობილია, რომ სოკრატე არ აკეთებდა თავისი საუბრების ჩანაწერს) და პლატონის წერილობით — დიალოგურ ფორმას შორის. ზეპირი საუბარი საუკეთესო გზაა, შევინარჩუნოთ მთქმელისა და მსმენელის (სუბიექტისა და ობიექტის) ცოცხალი, ინდივიდუალური მიმართება, მაგრამ თუკი ჩავიწერთ ამ საუბარს დიალოგის სახით, თუკი ზეპირი სიტყვა იქცევა ტექსტად, მსმენელი იქცევა მკითხველად და მისი რიცხვი უსასრულოდ გაიზრდება. მკითხველის ასეთი აბსტრაქციის შემოზღუდვაში, ცხადია, დაიკარგება ინდივიდუალური მიმართება სუბიექტსა და ობიექტს შორის, და ამ ინდივიდუალობის აღდგენის მიზნით პლატონი მიმართავს მხატვრულ-მეტაფორულ სიტყვას, რომელიც თამაშობს მრავალი მნიშვნელობებით, რომელსაც შეაქვს ირონიის ელემენტები სოკრატეს ნათქვამში, და რომელიც მკითხველის მხრიდან ინდივიდუალურ ძალისხმევას მოითხოვს, რათა მრავალაზროვანი სიტყვიდან ამოირჩიოს ერთ-ერთი, საკუთარი გაგების შესატყვისი აზრი. ყოველივე ეს იწვევს მკითხველის ინდივიდუაციას, აღადგენს დაკარგულ მიმართებას, მაგრამ წარმოშობს ერთგვარ განუზღვრელობასაც და სოკრატეს მიერ შემუშავებული ზუსტი ცნება საგანთა რაობის შესახებ, ჩანაცვლე- ბულია პლატონის იდეით, რომელიც ამოუწურავია ცნებითი დეფინიციის მხრივ. ამრიგად, სოკრატეს ცნებითი აზროვნებიდან პლატონის იდეათა თეორიაზე გადასვლა, პლატონის ფილოსოფიის მხატვრულ-ლიტერატუ-

რული ფორმა, ავტორის აზრით, განპირობებულია სუბიექტისა და ობიექტის ინდივიდუალური მიმართების შენარჩუნების მცდელობით ზეპირსიტყვიერებასა და წერილობით ტექსტში.

დასასრულს, მოკლედ ჩამოყალიბებულია ჩატარებული ანალიზით მიღწეული შედეგები და გაკეთებულია დასკვნა საკვლევი პრობლემის ავტორისეული გადაწყვეტის შესახებ. ხაზგასმულია, რომ ავტორის მიერ განხილულ სფეროებში, სოციოლოგიაში, ხელოვნებაში, სპეციალურ მეცნიერებებში, სახეზეა ყოფიერების ინდივიდუაციის პროცესი – სუბიექტურ მოვლენათა და ობიექტურ ზღომილებათა განსხვავებისა და დიფერენცირების აქტი, რომელიც იწვევს არა სამყაროს დანაწევრებასა და გაფანტვას, არამედ პირიქით, საგანთა და მოვლენათა დაკავშირებასა და გაერთიანებას.

სოციოლოგიაში განსხვავებისა და ერთიანობის ეს დიალექტიკური პროცესი გამოიხატება პიროვნების თავისუფლებისა და ღია საზოგადოების ფენომენოლოგიურ მთლიანობაში.

REFERENCES

1. Merleau-Ponty (2007), The Eye and the Mind. Translated into Georgian and edited in Tbilisi by D. Labuchidze.
2. *A-T Tymieniecka*. – In: J. Analecta Husserliana, LXVII, p. 3-12.
3. Essays and Lectures by Leo Straus (1989), Chicago and London, p.151.

Psychology

Basic Points of the Anthropic Attitude Theory

Shota Nadirashvili

Academy Member, D. Uznadze Institute of Phsychology

ABSTRACT. Dimitri Uznadze developed the General Psychological Theory of Attitude, which explains not only the illusions of perception, but also an individual's reasonable behavior. He elaborated a method of the study of attitude, and on its basis identified many peculiarities of attitude. But this theory examined only the issues of relationship of an individual and the material environment. The study of sensorymotor and social attitudes called for the use of new methods. It became necessary to identify numerous peculiarities of attitude and to change existing theories through them. It was determined that attitude is developed not on the basis of the interrelationship of objects, but on the basis of a separate object, action and social value. It appeared that assimilative and contrastive illusions emerging on the basis of attitude have their functions. Assimilation reinforces attitude and broadens its sphere of activity. Contrastive illusion weakens the effect of attitude and forces it out of the given situation.

The author has singled out three forms of attitude: sensory, sensorymotor and social. Their formation and activity is characterized by specific peculiarities.

Assimilative impact of attitude on a different motor activity and the law of its contrastive experience were identified in the operation of sensorymotor activity. Its action results in the weakening and suppression of an attitude that is not adequate with the environment.

Affective disposition constitutes a dominating feature of social values in respect to human beings and social values. Social relations are organized on their basis.

Social attitudes are changed under the influence of the affective component of other human beings and individual social attitudes. In the process of relations of social attitudes systems of compatible and non-compatible attitudes are developed, forming the basis for human collaboration and conflict relations.

Compatible micro-system of attitudes is formed on the basis of four types of positive and negative attitudes. A specific union of positive and negative attitudes forms the non-compatible micro-system of attitudes. On the basis of the above factors the anthropic theory of attitude was developed, enabling to understand and explain the basic regularities of psychic activities of an individual, subject and person.

The author has formed the theory of attitude with three factors and three components, in distinction from the theory of attitude with two factors and one component. It represents a later development of D. Uznadze's General Psychological Theory of Attitude. *© 2007 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.*

Key words: Uznadze Theory of Attitude.

The reason for the introduction of the concept of attitude was the explanation of illusory perceptions. For example, objects having equal weight and unequal size are conceived as objects of unequal weight – a big object is conceived as light and a small one as heavy. This phenomenon was explained on the basis of the attitude theory. Supposedly, a human being lifts a big object with a strong impulse, and a small one with a weak impulse. An object lifted with a strong impulse seems lighter to him/her than a small object having equal weight that he/she has lifted with a weak impulse. The condition of a person who has been prepared for lifting weights in such a way was termed as the motor attitude. Almost analogous situations were studied in relation to the time of

reaction. During the study of the time of reaction it appeared that when the attention of an experimental subject is directed to the conceiving of an irritant, more time is needed for triggering his/her reaction than in the case when his/her attention is focused on a reaction. This phenomenon was explained with the concept of attitude. In this case too, the concept of attitude was understood as the preparation of an individual for a certain action. Later a psychological theory was developed, according to which a person has certain expectations about the qualities of perceived objects. During disappointment an object is perceived inadequately. This was the theory of disappointment.

On the basis of experimental studies D. Uznadze demonstrated that illusions of perception are not solely connected with the sphere of motor activity. They can appear in every modality of perception. Also, disappointment is not a reason for illusory perception. Using his own method, Uznadze worked on attitude while keeping his subjects in hypnotic condition. An illusory result was obtained with the subjects after they woke up and were free from expectations about the objects' peculiarities.

Piaget called the phenomenon identified in the above-mentioned method "Uznadze effect" and used it for the characterization of specific stages of the development of intellect.

Using the Uznadze method, Georgian psychologists studied numerous peculiarities of attitude and mental phenomena. By this method, Uznadze developed a General Psychological theory, according to which not only illusory perceptions can be explained by the concept of attitude but also every reasonable behavior of a person. He defined attitude as an individual's psychophysical readiness for a behavior, with which he/she satisfies his/her vital requirements. Attitude is developed through the simultaneous influence of two factors - of the requirement and an object that satisfies that requirement. It depicts peculiarities of an object. The theory of attitude was formed as theory with two factors and one component.

The general psychological theory primarily served as the basis for the explanation of the reasonable behavior of a person, psychological basics of unconscious activity, regularities of teaching and upbringing, developmental steps of human beings and their role in the formation of a personality were identified. Development of the subject's thinking and generalization skills, stages and forms of development of concepts and acquisition, peculiarities of impairment of mental activity were studied and means of psychotherapeutic influence were determined. On the basis of the attitude theory it became possible to classify behavioral forms and significant success was achieved in sports, pedagogical, social and other spheres of psychology. That is why the attitude theory gained recognition in Georgian and Russian psychology;

its results were recognized in international scientific circles.

In the second half of the 20th century, through the impact of changes that took place in public life the problems of an individual and social psychology became high profile. Materials obtained through the classical method of attitude research and the attitude concept that was defined on its basis hampered the study of the above-mentioned problems. In the concept of attitude those points had to be revised which were not confirmed by empirical data. As the classical method of study of attitude was successful in identifying the effect of attitude, the latter was assigned many features that were not characteristic of attitude. Since in attitude-forming experiments two unequal objects were used, the position was adopted that the relationship between objects is reflected in attitude and this attitude causes illusory perception of equal circles. That is why attitude was declared an intellectual phenomenon reflecting relationship. Such concept of attitude made it difficult to analyze appraisal, emotional and social relations. We caused the development of an attitude through the perception of one object and showed that on its basis a smaller object is contrastively perceived to be even smaller, and a larger object, contrastively, even larger; consequently, we were enabled to analyze the attitude to one action or to other social values, its impact on another action and other social values.

We also considered as unacceptable the so-called basic law of attitude change, according to which attitude immediately changes to an opposite attitude upon perceiving an inappropriate object, which is followed by a contrastive-illusory perception.

On the basis of experiments we demonstrated that when perceiving inappropriate objects attitude does not immediately change to an opposite attitude.

In terms of intensity, in a drastically different situation attitude causes contrastive-illusory perception of objects, which accelerates the suppression of an inappropriate attitude of a human being towards the environment, and speeds up the adaptation of a human being to a sharply changed situation. These data shed light on the function of attitude-caused illusions in the process of adapting to the environment.

As a result of subsequent studies it transpired that not only cognitive data of objective reality is reflected in attitude, but also those operational resources are prepared on the basis of which an individual's behavior must be performed. In order to study them, we developed a research method of sensorymotor attitude. In this experiment we fixed the attitude of the movement of a certain magnitude in the subjects. Afterwards, they were instructed to draw a line which was different from the fixed attitude. It appeared that after fixation of the attitude, instead of a different magnitude movement, as instructed, the subjects drew lines closely assimilated to the atti-

tude, considering them as contrastive. Apart from the above-mentioned qualities, the attitude proved to possess the characteristic of positive and negative affective disposition towards events.

This quality of attitude is especially evident in social behavior. On the basis of positive attitude an individual demonstrates positive disposition and collaboration towards the environment and people. On the basis of negative attitude a subject carries out hostile, contrary actions. The affective component of attitude has a significant impact on the process of a human being's social behavior.

Appropriate studies have demonstrated that in an attitude of social behavior three types of content are implied – objective, cognitive, and affective towards the object of behavior, i.e., positive-negative disposition.

Earlier the general psychological theory of attitude was considered a single-component phenomenon. Actually, however, attitude has proved to comprise three components: cognitive, motor and affective. We have arranged them according to supremacy: objective, sensorymotor and social attitudes.

Social attitude, in addition to the unprejudiced objective reality, implies disposition towards other people, social environment. Attitudes, apart from differing in the content and components reflected in them, differ from each other by their ways of formation. According to the anthropic theory of attitude we differentiate situational and dispositional types of attitude. After discovering attitudes of these different types, the minor theory of attitude gave way to a general psychological theory of attitude. People talk of fixed attitude. It would be a mistake to consider it a dispositional attitude. Fixed attitude is simply reinforced situational attitude. It is not an attitude that has been introduced in the personality. That is why it is not characterized by personal peculiarities. It does not occupy a definite place in the system of dispositional attitudes.

1. *Situational attitude*. Situational attitude lies at the basis of impulsive behavior. In everyday life people frequently evince impulsive behavior. At such times an individual develops certain demands, perceives appropriate objects, prepares necessary operational possibilities – on the basis of these he/she develops a situational attitude and performs the necessary behavior. This behavior occurs at a lower, first level of the person's activity. Earlier we described this corresponding activity of this level and appropriate attitude.

2. *Dispositional attitude* is not developed prior to an individual's behavior. After behaving in one and the same way many times the situational attitudes underlying it are generalized as dispositional attitudes, become unified as an attitude of one content, and are stored in a person's psyche. The more successful it is, the more reinforced is its underlying attitude – it is formed as a

dispositional attitude. For renewed actualization of a dispositional attitude, it is not necessary for all three factors to be present. For its re-actualization the presence of one factor is often enough.

In English-language psychology the concept of attitude implies only dispositional attitude. So far we have discussed only situational attitude. Situational attitude is sometimes denoted by the term "set", while "attitude" is used to denote dispositional attitude. It should be noted also that Uznadze's monograph was translated under the title of the theory of "Set".

We considered it advisable to define both forms of attitude as "attitude", and for differentiation, to call the former "situational attitude", and the latter "dispositional attitude". On the basis of experimental and theoretical work we singled out three forms of situational attitude. These are: situational attitude of impulsive behavior, situational attitude of cognitive behavior, and attitude of behavior that is motivated by spiritual values. It would be simpler to say: impulsive, intellectual and spiritual situational attitudes.

Impulsive attitude. On the basis of impulsive behavior an individual performs consumptive and service behaviors. Consumptive behavior is oriented towards satisfying vital demands of the individual. Of these behaviors some are given in the form of instincts, while he/she performs the majority of behaviors on the basis of situational attitude which is formed in him/her as a result of the impact of demands and appropriate situation. Once the idea was put forward that situational attitude could be considered as a merely hypothetical variable, the existence of which has to be proven through experiments.

The experiments that were carried out at our request shed some light on this issue. The subjects were requested to solve certain difficult problems during 10 minutes. They were told in advance that they had to solve as many difficult problems as possible. Another group of subjects was set the same problems with a contrary instruction, i.e., to solve as many easy tasks as possible.

It transpired that the group of subjects supposedly solving difficult problems produced much better results than the group that allegedly tackled easy problems. The first group of subjects was better able to mobilize intellectual abilities than the group working on easy problems. Similar results were obtained in the evaluation of paintings. One group of subjects was given a painting as if by a well-known Russian artist. The same painting was given to the other group with an instruction that this was a painting by a 2nd year student. They were asked to evaluate the painting on a 5-point scale. The first group of subjects gave on the average 5 points, and the second group gave for the same painting 3 scores on the average.

Preliminary preparation of a human being for a specific activity, i.e., the formation of an appropriate atti-

tude, has an impact on his/her behavior which extends to all aspects of behavior, being real and serious.

Similar experiments were carried out in another sphere of activity. In order to evolve the so-called Charpentier Illusion we prepared two cubes, each weighing 3 kilograms. One of the small cubes was perceived by the subjects as weighing 4 kg, and it was 5 times smaller in size than the other cube. With the help of a certain device the subjects were asked to lift both cubes up to a certain height until they got tired, as many times as possible. It was found that the subjects lifted the object that was perceived by them as light almost twice as many times (higher) than the object with an identical weight but perceived as heavy.

As we can see, in every situation the attitude of certain behavior that an individual develops prepares him for necessary behavior, bringing into action his/her intellectual, sensory, motor and physical forces to perform a necessary behavior. Through uniting the above-mentioned components, a situational attitude prepares the individual for impulsive behavior.

3. Intellectual attitude is one of the forms of situational attitude. It is developed in a situation when an individual's behavior is hampered, when his/her impulsive action loses appropriateness, failing to satisfy his demand. In such situation a human being stops his impulsive behavior and tries to sort out the situation. As Uznadze would say, activity rises to a higher - objectivization - level. Now the individual opposes the environment that impedes his/her behavior, considering it to be an object independent of him/her and himself becoming a subject. One of the factors of his further action is an unclear situation, the other factor is the need to clarify. In addition to these objective and subjective factors he/she needs those operational capabilities through which a situation is clarified. To prepare necessary behavior it is absolutely enough to join these factors. It may be said that the subject develops readiness, an intellectual attitude to start sorting out the obtaining situation, to reason. Intellectual situational attitude allows the subject to find the possibility of behaving and evolving an attitude necessary for thought-out, reasonable behavior. When studying the ability to develop the skills of generalization in school age children we showed which skills and abilities of utilizing operations the children have to master in order to be able to include in the process of concept development common, general, necessary and sufficient features. Using them, it becomes feasible to develop an intellectual situational attitude and solving appropriate problems.

4. The third form of situational attitude is that underlying spiritual activity. A human being faces the necessity of such activity when his behavior is opposed not by an objective reality but internal, personal forces. In an attitude forming the basis of such activity desirable

behavior and appropriate environment (to which the behavior has to correspond) is taken into consideration. Such behavior takes place through the motivation and will of a person, these components being taken into account in its preparation or in the attitude.

Thus, in situational attitudes that underlie impulsive, intellectual and spiritual behavior a human being's psychophysical forces, which are necessary and sufficient for the realization of proper activities of the organism, subject and personality, are reflected and prepared. An organism uses unconscious and psychological forces for performing advisable behavior; subject and person operate on a high, objectivization level; to carry out high level expedient behavior they use reasoning and the forces that regulate will, both reflecting the environment.

As noted above, dispositional attitudes are not developed prior to behavior, at a given moment. When in similar situations situational attitudes repeat and condition the successful behavior of an individual, they are fixed, reinforced and transformed into dispositional attitudes of a human being. The formation of each new dispositional attitude happens through the entry into a certain system of dispositional attitudes.

Three forms of dispositional attitudes can be singled out.

1. One of the forms of dispositional attitude is the attitude underlying consumption and servicing. Such attitudes form the basis of behaviors in the form of habits. These behaviors are mastered by an individual since childhood. The whole system of underlying attitudes helps an individual to acquire attitudes and customs. They facilitate consumptive and service behavior. In our society, where the custom of eating with a knife and fork is established, in China individuals reinforce attitudes of eating using chopsticks and customs realized on their basis. A representative of any nation, society and specialization possesses definite systems of dispositional attitudes, serving as a basis for the form of behavior that is acceptable to him/her and his/her environment; expedient behaviors are performed through these systems. They have entered an individual's psyche through experience.

2. Sensorimotor attitudes constitute one of the forms of dispositional attitude. Study of the mutual influence of certain movements and actions has shown that the space in which an individual acts is a kind of structured reality for him. a) For example, different individuals are advised to act in different areas to depict a structure of some size on the blackboard.

3. Different subjects chose movements of different sizes as a starting size. Every human being was found to have his/her own characteristic value, considered to be his/her initial value. This initial value is found best by using the following instruction: "On the blackboard, draw from any specific point a line that is clear and of a length

convenient for you, which you will subsequently repeat precisely". For every subject this line on the blackboard is mostly of a definite location and a definite length. The subjects would draw a line differing from it in length assimilatively, i.e. they drew it as resembling, appraised them contrastively - as different. We called the line selected by the subject in advance a baseline. Lines smaller than the baseline are called by people small lines, and lines larger than the baseline are generally considered as large lines.

We conducted experiments on attitude, using these sizes. It appeared that the subjects reconstructed the size and location of this baseline with much more precision than the repetition of a line of requested size; b) when instructed to carry out a movement of half of the baseline, they made a bigger movement and appraised it as small, i.e. they acted assimilatively and appraised it contrastively. c) when instructed to carry out a movement twice as big, they made an assimilatively small movement and appraised it contrastively as big.

Besides this, when assessing movements of different sizes, a movement bigger than that selected by the subject is evaluated as "big movement" and, respectively, a movement smaller than it as "small movement".

It should be noted also that in a space of a different scale, e.g. on an A4 paper, structurally the same relations are preserved, which was identified when working on the blackboard. The same regularity proved to be applicable in a definite form in sports activities as well.

4. The next form of dispositional attitude is that of affective disposition. The system of such attitudes plays a major role in the social relations of human beings. Affective dispositional attitudes play an essential role in the process of regulation of the social life of human beings. It is called attitude in American social psychology. It is formed on the basis of already performed behaviors. It has nothing of situational attitude. It does not play any role in the process of formation of behaviors. It is a mental phenomenon of the same particular type as perception, imagination, custom, reflex, etc. According to the general psychological theory of attitude, attitude is a form of dispositional affective attitude that is formed on the basis of situational attitudes. Affective acceptance and non-acceptance, positive and negative disposition holds a major place in affective dispositional attitude towards the object of behavior.

In the process of social relations affective dispositional attitudes play an essential role, that is why we call them social attitudes. At the same time, they can also be related to specific material values.

In LaPierre's experiment, his subjects – owners of a hotel - sent a written refusal to accept Chinese clients in their hotel, but when lavishly dressed Chinese came to the hotel in fashionable cars, the hotel owners accepted them. The hotel owners had negative dispositional atti-

tudes towards the Chinese. After the visit of the Chinese to the hotel the owners developed positive situational attitudes towards the latter.

Situational attitude was unknown to LaPierre, hence he considered the behavior of the hotel owners, i.e. acceptance of Chinese guests, as non-attitudinal.

Social attitudes are described according to what disposition exists towards the social values expressed through it. Its peculiarities are measured on a number scale. For this we routinely use an 11-point scale. On this scale attitude is characterized by: valency – positive-negative disposition towards social values; valency intensity – how much more intensive is attitude valency in terms of positivity versus negativity; zone of acceptance, which expresses the intensity of attitudes acceptable to a person; toleration zone – this is a zone of intensity of attitudes that can be tolerated by a person; sharpness - diffusivity attitude, expressing the number of steps by which a person's attitude can be characterized, etc.

Based on these features, a system of a person's positive attitudes can be formed, through which the reality sphere, acceptable to a person can be characterized. The reality sphere can also be distinguished of negative attitudes held by a person towards the objective and value category. These systems largely determine a person's activity. A large number of tolerance zones expresses the person's plasticity – staticalness in conflict situations. Moral views are present in a person's system of acceptable attitudes, as well as socially unacceptable moral views that cause conflict relations with other human beings. Acceptable and unacceptable attitude systems of a person, its link to the compatible and incompatible moral views of society are characterized by a definite regularity. A person's relationship with his social environment is mainly determined by his internal social systems of attitudes. People having positive attitudes towards each other usually develop similar attitudes towards certain social events and other persons.

According to the general psychological theory of attitude, every behavior of an individual is performed through the development of a definite attitude or of a past attitude. Attitude reflects and prepares in itself data necessary for expedient behavior; hence it is natural that attitude should be a unit of analysis of every activity type of an individual. The emergence of an attitude is based on certain necessary factors and certain components are given in it, the unity of which imparts a certain direction to behavior.

Dispositional social attitude is formed and reinforced in a person's mind when, through behavior performed on its basis, a person achieves success, i.e., he receives social support, when, on the basis of this attitude he imitates a person acceptable to him, when he identifies himself with a person worthy of imitation, when a person performs a desirable role.

***

After discussing the above-mentioned problems the general question arises as to the emergence and operation of attitude in the process of development of living organisms.

As is known, protozoans live in their own habitat. Their living activity is limited to the processes of assimilation and dissimilation of phenomena. No psychical processes are involved. Their relation to the environment is limited to physical contact. More distant objects and events have no meaning for them. They do not exist for them. The development of living organisms started with the overcoming of spatial and temporal distances. They developed abilities of relation with objects distant in time and space. Highly developed animals and human beings can receive information about objects via vision and hearing over distance. But, of course, the development of such abilities would not be of any benefit, unless they at the same time developed the ability of moving in space and coming near to these objects. But this ability would not mean much if they could not distinguish between necessary and useless objects over distance. It appears that they at the same time developed the ability of elementary identification of definite objects. In the same process they developed the ability of overcoming distance. Approaching necessary objects, of course, involves a certain distance, hence the relation with the same object over a definite time distance and its consumption requires the maintenance of an activity that started at a certain time point. Therefore, selection of an object of consumption, its identification, differentiation among other objects, and approaching are abilities that will mean nothing to an individual taken separately - in isolation. They must develop in interrelationship for them to be usable. In an individual's behavior activity they are included as integral events and operate in a definite period of time.

We can state briefly and simply that in the general psychological theory of attitude this condition is characterized by the formation of impulsive attitude and impulsive behavior. The functioning of an organism in this way can be considered as an elementary process of psychic activity with the environment. If an individual does not have a vital requirement, operational capabilities of obtaining them, and if his/her activity fails to fit in a certain section of time, he will not be able to satisfy his requirements and to continue living. The performance of such activity is possible only on the basis of attitude. These processes mean the emergence of mind of living organisms. This mental process can be characterized by

the concept of situational attitude. It is in this way that the attitudinal activity of living organisms starts, constituting their mental activity.

Here we can briefly state that these various general psychological approaches attempting to understand the nature of psyche are reduced to two directions: cognitive and behavioral theories. In our opinion, neither rationalism nor behavior is sufficient to understand the psychic nature of an organism. Overcoming this one-sidedness, in our opinion, is possible on the basis of the general psychological theory of attitude. Psyche emerged on the basis of the relationship of an organism. This idea is well taken into consideration in the general psychological theory.

The theory of attitude studies not only the initial forms, impulsive behavior and the unconscious of the psyche, but also the complex intellectual creative and social behavior phenomenon of a human being, performed by a subject and personality.

In order to understand the psychic peculiarities of a human being, it is necessary to take those forms of activity into consideration that are manifested by a person in his/her relationship with other people.

At the human level of psychic development conscious, cognitive and moral behaviors emerge. Attitudes are actively involved in these processes as well. On the basis of new qualities emerging in attitudes in the process of development and performed at the level of objectivization, they prepare the subject and personality for conscious and moral behaviors. We have discovered the regularities of the operation of such attitudes. What we would like to emphasize here is that it is possible to understand and explain behavior and personal peculiarities of a human being according to the peculiarities of the formation and operation of attitudes. But, whereas on the basis of the action of situational attitudes it becomes possible to study mainly the peculiarities of the behavior of a human being, it is possible to understand a person's nature on the basis of the regularity of operations of dispositional attitudes.

At the highest developmental level of the psyche the activity of a human being is determined by social attitudes.

On the basis of social attitudes a person develops systems of positive and negative attitudes. The values reflected in attitudes are structured according to their objective meanings, forming a person's general orientation towards reality. As can be seen, every level of activity of a human being is conditioned by the operation of a definite type of attitude.

ფსიქოლოგია

განწყობის ანთროპული თეორიის ძირითადი დებულებები

შ. ნადირაშვილი

აკადემიის წევრი, დ. უზნაძის ფსიქოლოგიის ინსტიტუტი

დიმიტრი უზნაძემ შექმნა განწყობის ზოგადფსიქოლოგიური თეორია, რომელიც არა მხოლოდ აქქმის ილუზიებს, არამედ ინდივიდის მიზანშეწონილ ქცევასაც ხსნის. მან შეიმუშავა განწყობის კვლევის მეთოდი, რომლის საფუძველზე განწყობის მრავალი თავისებურება დაადგინა. მაგრამ აღნიშნული თეორია მხოლოდ ინდივიდის და საგნობრივი გარემოს ურთიერთობის საკითხებს იკვლევდა. სენსომოტორულ და სოციალურ განწყობათა შესწავლისათვის კი ახალი მეთოდების გამოყენება გახდა საჭირო. მათი საშუალებით კვლევის დროს სტატიის ავტორმა განწყობის მრავალი ახალი თავისებურება დაადგინა და არსებული დებულებები შეცვალა. დადგინდა, რომ განწყობა იქმნება არა საგანთა ურთიერთმიმართებაზე, არამედ ცალკეულ საგანზე, მოქმედებაზე და სოციალურ ღირებულებაზე. აღმოჩნდა, რომ განწყობის საფუძველზე აღმოცენებულ ასიმილაციურ და კონტრასტულ ილუზიებს აქვთ თავისი ფუნქციები. ასიმილაცია განამტკიცებს განწყობას და აფართოებს მისი მოქმედების არეს, ხოლო კონტრასტული ილუზია ასუსტებს განწყობის მოქმედებას და დევნის მოცემული სიტუაციიდან.

ავტორის მიერ გამოყოფილი იქნა განწყობის სამი ფორმა: სენსორული, სენსომოტორული და სოციალური განწყობები. მათი ფორმირება და მოქმედება სპეციფიკური თავისებურებებით ხასიათდება.

სენსომოტორული განწყობის მოქმედებაში დადგინდა განსხვავებულ მოტორულ აქტიობაზე განწყობის ასიმილაციური მოქმედება და მისი კონტრასტული განცდის კანონი. მისი მოქმედების შედეგად ხდება გარემოსათვის შეუსაბცვისი განწყობის დასუსტება და ალკევთა.

სოციალური ღირებულებების დომინირებულ თვისებას ადამიანთა და სოციალური ღირებულებების მიმართ აფექტური დამოკიდებულება წარმოადგენს. მათ საფუძველზე ხდება სოციალური ურთიერთობების ორგანიზება.

სოციალური განწყობების შეცვლა სხვა ადამიანების და საკუთარი სოციალური განწყობების აფექტური კომპონენტის გავლენით ხდება. სოციალური განწყობების ურთიერთობის პროცესში იქმნება თავსებადი და არათავსებადი განწყობების სისტემები, რომლებიც საფუძვლად ედება ადამიანთა თანამშრომლობასა და კონფლიქტურ ურთიერთობებს.

განწყობათა თავსებადი მიკროსისტემა იქმნება ოთხი სახის დადებითი და უარყოფითი განწყობების ერთობლიობის საფუძველზე. დადებითი და უარყოფითი განწყობების სპეციფიკური ერთობლიობა კი განწყობათა არათავსებად მიკროსისტემას ქმნის. აღნიშნული მონაცემების საფუძველზე ჩამოყალიბდა განწყობის ანთროპული თეორია, რომელიც საშუალებას იძლევა გაგებული და ახსნილი იქნას ინდივიდის, სუბიექტისა და პიროვნების ფსიქიკური აქტიობის ძირითადი კანონზომიერებანი.

განწყობის ორფაქტორიანი და ერთკომპონენტიანი თეორიისაგან განსხვავებით, ავტორმა ჩამოაყალიბა განწყობის სამფაქტორიანი და სამკომპონენტიანი თეორია. იგი დ. უზნაძის განწყობის ზოგადფსიქოლოგიური თეორიის შემდგომ განვითარებას წარმოადგენს.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Sh. Nadirashvili* (1963), განზოგადების განვითარება სასკოლო ასაკში. Development of Generalization at School Age. Tbilisi.
2. *Sh. Nadirashvili* (1975), პიროვნების სოციალური ფსიქოლოგია. Social Psychology of Personality. Tbilisi.
3. *Sh. Nadirashvili* (1977), ბავშვის აღზრდის სანიმუშო პროგრამა. Exemplary Program of Child Rearing. Tbilisi.
4. *Sh. Nadirashvili* (1985), განწყობის თეორია. ტ. 1, 2. Attitude Theory. Vol. 1. Tbilisi 1983; Vol. 2. Tbilisi
5. *Sh. Nadirashvili* (1971), Ôèêñèôî âàí í àÿ óñòàí î âêà è ñåí î î ôî ðí àÿ àêòèâí î ñòü. Ñáî ðí èê ýêñï åðè ì åí òàëüí û õ èññëåäî âàí èé ï î ï ñèõî ëî ãèè óñòàí î âêè. Vol. 5. Òáèëèñè.
6. *Sh. Nadirashvili* (1975), Ï ñèõî ëî ãè÷åñêèå ï ðî áëåì û âî ñï ðèÿòèÿ. Òáèëèñè.
7. *Sh. Nadirashvili* (1980), Ï ñèõî ëî ãèÿ ï ðî ï àãàí äû. Òáèëèñè.
8. *Sh. Nadirashvili* (1987), Óñòàí î âêà è äåÿòåëüí î ñòü. Òáèëèñè.
9. *Sh. Nadirashvili* (2001), განწყობის ანთროპული თეორია. Anthropic Theory of Attitude. Tbilisi.
10. *D. Uznadze* (1940), ზოგადი ფსიქოლოგია. General Psychology. Tbilisi.
11. *D. Uznadze* (1947), ყურადღების პრობლემის არსისათვის. "ფსიქოლოგია" ტ. IV. Towards the Problem of the Essence of Attention. "Psychology" Vol IV. Tbilisi.
12. *D. Uznadze* (1949), განწყობის ფსიქოლოგიის ექსპერიმენტული საფუძვლები. ტ. VI. Experimental Basics of Attitude Psychology. Vol. VI. Tbilisi).

Received September, 2007

History of Literature

The Trace of Rustaveli's *The Man in the Panther's Skin* in Shakespeare's Theatre (Early 17th century)

Elguja G. Khintibidze

Academy Member, I. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

ABSTRACT. The paper deals with the striking coincidence of the plots of Shota Rustaveli's *The Man in the Panther's Skin* and "A King and No King" by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. If the view presented in the paper is accepted, the knowledge of Rustaveli's poem in Europe shifts by two centuries back (early 17th century) from the generally current view (early 19th century). On the other hand, Rustaveli's *The Man in the Panther's Skin* will be considered the source of the plot of F. Beaumont and J. Fletcher's place "A King and No King", believed to be unknown in English literary criticism to the present day. © *2007 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.*

Key words: F. Beaumont and J. Fletcher, Shota Rustaveli, The Man in the Panther's Skin, A King and No King.

In 1611 a license was granted in England to the Theatre Royal for the play "A King and No King" by Shakespeare's contemporaries and successors Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. Meeting with great success, the play remained on the English stage for one hundred years – till the 1720s. Contemporaries placed the dramaturgy of Beaumont and Fletcher, including "A King and No King", on a par with Shakespeare's works.

In English literary criticism this play is the subject of versatile study. One principal aspect of this research is the question of ascertaining, if not the direct source of the work, at least of the main plot of its immediate source. The point is that, according to the play, the action in it takes place in Iberia. However, the story told in it is not related either to the authors' contemporary Iberia or to its historical counterpart. On the other hand, the introduction of the Iberian theme into European, and English proper, literature of the period was by no means unexpected. On the contrary, Iberia began to appear in English literature precisely from this period, i.e. the early 17th century; soon Georgia – known at the time under the name of Iberia – became an attractive corner of oriental exotic character. It is generally assumed that the authors of "A King and No King" had knowledge of some Greek and Roman historical sources on Iberia and Armenia, using them in a couple of cases in giving the names

to the characters of the work, as well as in reference to the fact of military confrontation of these two countries[1-3]. At the same time, it became clear that the direct source of the plot of Beaumont and Fletcher's play on the Iberian theme remains unknown, hence the belief that it was *probably* devised entirely by the authors[1,4]. At the same time, we are dealing with European literary style of the close of the 16th century: an author of the period looks for a plot for his literary piece, reworks it by transferring the story to another country, altering the names of the characters, changes the line of development of the plot, alters the end, and so on. However, the plot of his work has some source: nearly always it proceeds from some story. This is often the carse with Shakespeare's plays as well. In the case of "A King and No King", action specifically takes place in Iberia, with no indication of the source of the plot, which is generally unexpected in the works of Beaumont and Fletcher. It is generally believed that the stories used by them in their plays were never the fruit of their fancy, i. e. thought up by them [4].

Why did Beaumont and Fletcher act out the story of their play in Iberia? What has the extraordinary love of the prince and princess, told in the play "A King and No King", to do with Georgia? My observations have led me to the belief that the main plot of Beaumont and Fletcher's play was suggested by *The Man in the*

Panther's Skin (MPS) – the greatest monument of Georgian literary tradion of the end of the 12th century, authored by the Georgian writer Shota Rustaveli. The intrigue of the plot of "A King and No King" - the love plot of the prince (king) and the princess - receives an impulse from the love story of Tariel and Nestan. The authors seem to have adapted the basic outline stemming from the Indian subject of the *MPS* altering it according to their own literary principles. Now, according to Rustvelological literature, the translation of the first stanza of Rustaveli's poem and the narration of the content of the poem by the Metropolitan of Kiev Evgeni Bolkhovitinov in his book on Georgia (*Historial Description of Georgia in Her Political, Church and Educational State, St. Petersburg, 1802*) is considered to have been the earliest fact of the penetration of the *MPS* into the European world[5]. Hence, the view presented by me in the present paper shifts the entry of the *MPS* into Europe two centuries backward. Bearing in mind the responsibility devolving on me, I wish to consider the present study as a statement of the problem and to continue research towards its substantiation.

The following are my arguments in support of the relationship of the plot of Beaumont and Fletcher's play "A King and No King" and the basic plot of the *MPS*.

1. The basic facts of the romantic intrigue of the pair of lovers in the play by Beaumont and Fletcher, the temporal and spatial coordinates or the framework coincide with the Indian story of the *MPS*: The Iberian Prince (young king) Arbaces of the play is actually not the son of the king and the queen – he was adopted in order for the kingdom to have an heir. A real daughter, called Panthea, was later born to the king and the queen. The son or prince adopted as heir to the Iberian Kingdom, and the real princess fall madly in love. Beaumont and Fletcher turn this plot into the basis or framework of their tragicomedy. They build the subject of the play on it, using their own literary principles – rapid change of situations, swift difusing of situations and new dramatism; contrasts and surprises, and happy end. These three basic subject facts of Beaumont and Fletcher's play – the temporal and spacial coordinates – coincide exactly with the three basic subject facts of the dramatic story of the Indian royal court of the *MPS*: adoption of the newborn Tariel as heir to the throne; birth later of a daughter, Nestan, at the royal court; the madly falling in love of the heir and the princess.

2. The overlapping of the basic subject facts of the plot of "A King and No King" with the temporal and spatial coordinates of the Indian story of the *MPS* is followed by further likeness – already in the subject of the play. In the English play the same amount of time passes between the adoption of the prince Arbaces at the Iberian court and the birth of the princess as between the adoption at the Indian royal court of the prince Tariel and the birth of Nestan. Significantly enough, the

length of this time is pointed out in both works, and in the same way: the age of the adopted prince is stated, as well as the time when the queen became pregnant. Arbaces is told of his childhood:

" ... You grew up,
As the king's son, till you were six years old;
Then did the King die, and did leave to me
Protection of the realm; and, contrary
To his own expectation, left this queen
Truly with child, indeed, of the fair princess..."[6, 83].

The same happened in the Indian royal court of the *MPS*: Tariel aged five was still the only son of King Parsadan of India. Tariel relates:

"When I was five years old I was like an opened rosebud;...

P'harsadan cared not that he had no son" (310 - M. Wardrop's translation [7]).

After a short while the queen of India became pregnant. Tariel continues:

"I was five years old when the queen became with child" (312)

3. The Iberian prince and princess were separated already in childhood and, similarly to Tariel and Nestan in the India of the *MPS*, saw each other only after a long time of separation, and again, like Tariel and Nestan in the India of the *MPS*, the dramatic knot of the Iberian story was tied in the English play: Tariel fell head over heels in love with Nestan. The same happens in the play of Beaumont and Fletcher. The Iberian king was disconsolately charmed with the sight of the princess – a tragic knot was tied.

4. The likeness goes deeper. The quick and inordinate emotion of the sudden love is followed by the physical enfeeblement and mental confusion of the Iberian prince – described in detail by Beaumont and Fletcher. He seemed to be deprived of the faculty of speech. The princess implores him, "Do not stand as if you were dumb; say something" (p. 31). The closest adviser and commander says to him: Answer her something: "A tree would find a tongue to answer her" (p. 31). Arbaces' conduct, questions and demands became irrelevant to the situation. His attendants and friends ask, "What, is he mad?" (p. 32). Upon recovery, Arbaces himself says. "I pray thee, hear me, if thou canst. Am I not a strange weight?" "Why, my legs refuse to bear my body!" (p.39). His closest adviser begs him "Pray you, go rest yourself"(p.39). The same happens in the *MPS*. The quick emotion of love deprived Tariel of bodily strength and mind:

"I fell, I fainted, force was fled from mine arms and shoulder. When I came back to life...
I lay in a fair bed in a great chamber" (336; 337).

Thus, not only do the principal temporal and spatial coordinates of the frame of the romantic intrigue of the English play coincide with the frame of the love intrigue of the Indian story of the *MPS* but the tying of the knot of both dramatic works takes place almost identically.

Hence the argumentation of the relation of Beaumont and Fletcher's "A King and No King" to the plot of

Rustaveli's *MPS* may be considered completed.

It is this central plot of the *MPS*, and the dramatic knot tied like this story that Beaumont and Fletcher turned into an absolutely independent tragicomedy of a different idea, problems and interest, and which is considered one of their classic examples in this genre[2;8;3]. A subject built on temporal and spatial coordinates similar to those of the Indian plot of the *MPS* turned into a typical Beaumont and Fletcher tragicomedy. I should note also that in this already independent subject of tragicomedy occasional facts of the literary subject of the *MPS* seem to occur. Further reminiscences from Rustaveli's Indian literary space seem to be obvious, making me persistently wonder whether they are all casual.

Thus, the statement of love of the young king and the princess comes from the latter. The king, gone to war for a long time, is repeatedly informed from home about the beauty of his sister and her favourable attitude to him. At their first meeting the princess declares to Arbaces her great loyalty and love for him, asking for a response, as it were. The initiative of the declaration of love between Nestan and Tariel also comes from Nestan. This is a regularity of Rustaveli's romance: the love of the other pair in his poem develops in the same way.

A woman's letter figures in the love between Arbaces and Panthea. Gobrias (who turns out to be the king's real father) – the adviser of Arbaces and temporary ruler of the country, who is entrusted with the protection of the princess – advises the lady to write a letter to Arbaces and personally hands the letter to the king. The woman's letter in the love of the Indian pair in the *MPS* – and here too, at the start of the love intrigue – is of essential significance.

According to Beaumont and Fletcher's play, it is Arbaces who introduces the young king of a neighbouring country – the would-be future husband of the princess – to the Iberian court; he starts preparations for the wedding, informing the palace about this. But he is immediately forced to remove this lover by sending him to prison. The situation – albeit specific – is analogous in the India of the *MPS*: Tariel is charged with according a royal reception to the prince of a neighbouring country, invited to be Nestan's bridegroom. He, too, is forced to rid himself of a rival by killing him.

When one familiar with the subject of Rustaveli's poem reads "A King and No King", some episodes of the fighting valour of the king in the play evoke reminiscences of Tariel's heroic deeds in the *MPS*, in particular, the return of Arbaces to Iberia after a brilliant victory over Armenia, bringing the defeated king with him, will doubtless recall the triumphant return of Tariel to India with the captured king of the Khatavians, following his rout of the latter.

A closest friend of Arbaces, and a commander, gazing at the king whose mind is dimmed with love and is enfeebled bodily, recalls this king's entry into an unequal war a few days earlier thus: "He, that had seen this brave fellow charge through a grove of pikes but t'other day,

and look upon him now, will ne'er believe his eyes again"(p.56). The reader familiar with the *MPS*, will, without fail, recall Tariel's unequal war against the Khatavian army: "When I came near they looked at me: 'He is a madman,' said they. I, strong-armed, made my way thither where the main body of the army stood; I pierced a man with my lance, his horse I overturned, they both departed from the sun (i.e.; life), the lance broke, my hand seized (the sword); I praise, O sword, him who whetted thee (431). "I swooped in like a falcon among a covey of grey partridges, I threw man upon man, I made a hill of men and horses, the man thrown down by me spins like a dragon-fly; I completely destroyed at one onslaught the two front squadrons" (432).

The finale of "A King and No King" – conformably to Beaumont and Fletcher's usual style – is happy, yet it has its specificity: two happy pairs leave the scene hand-in-hand – ready for the wedding: Arbaces, reared to be king of Iberia, and the real princess, and the King of Armenia Tigranes and his faithful bride Spakonia sent by Tigranes to the Iberian royal court to thwart his wedding the princess. Let me remind the reader who is little versed in Rustaveli's work that in the finale of the *MPS*, too, we have two weddings of happy pairs: the person reared to be king of India and the real princess, and that of the Arabian royal pair.

The experience of comparative literary studies shows that it is not only the principal plots of literary subjects that are migratory but individual subject episodes as well. They easily become migratory both by written and oral means – often without a definite address. Hence, some of the coincidences, attested in the foregoing, between the subject episodes of the *MPS* and "King and No King" may be accidental. But is all this taken together, accidental? In my view, it is more important to give a thought to the ideal impulses of tragism and comism of Beaumont and Fletcher's play. Did the Indian romantic story of the *MPS* provide impulses for the tragism and comism of the theme embodied in "A King and No King"?

The main axis of tragism in this play by Beaumont and Fletcher rests on the psychological burden of the sin of incest. Could the love of Tariel and Nestan serve as an impulse to the foreign reader to recall or pose this theme or problem? I think, it could. The love between Tariel, the adopted son of the king and queen, and their real offspring Nestan may have given an impulse to a foreign mind to invent the theme of incest: Tariel – like Arbaces of the English play – was being reared as prince from his childhood. Tariel and Nestan were being reared for seven years as siblings at the royal court; they ostensibly belonged to a single royal house. However, there indeed is an impulse in it for an outsider's eye to remember incest. And the sin of incest did cross the minds of Beaumont and Fletcher. But, noticing that it is not clearly defined in this subject plot, the authors "corrected" the frame of the Indian history of the *MPS* towards adding

elements of tragism in the psychological interpretation of this sin. They concealed to the prince and princess that they were not siblings and by demonstrating their not being siblings, they allowed their marriage.

The very title of Beaumont and Fletcher's play contains the idea of comism: "A King and No King". Did the Indian story of the *MPS* give any ground for putting this theme forth? I believe, it did. The point is that Tariel is not king of India. (Whether he was entitled to kingship is another matter). To be sure, he was adopted by the king and the queen but when a daughter was born to them, the latter revealing her high capacities, they returned the adopted son to his father. Furthermore, following the demise of his father, Tariel was appointed commander-in-chief of the country and he acquitted himself well in the new duty. Nevertheless, according to the poem, Tariel reveals his claim to the Indian throne. This dilemma is intensified further by the stand of Rustaveli himself: he repeatedly refers to Tariel as king of India. This is done not only by the characters of the poem but the author as well. Thus, "The King of the Indians merrily spoke somewhat with Asmat'h"(1338). "The King of the Indians, with uplifted hand, joyously shouted this" (1339). Herein lies the impulse for the comic theme, which may take the following shape: a King and no King. In order for the impulse stemming from calling the commander-in-chief of India a king should really turn into a theme of comism: a king and no king, Beaumont and Fletcher will give the subject of the play a different development: they indeed make the adopted Iberian prince king, have him fight a war under the king's title, then let it be known that he is not the true successor to the throne, making him utter these words as a finale: "I am proved No King"(p.87).

Finally, about the names of the characters of Beaumont and Fletcher's play. It is generally believed that the English authors of "A King and No King" borrow the personal names from the works of Greek and Roman chronographers and historians[2;3]. The principal of these historical sources are: Xenophon's *Cyropoedia* or the history of the structure of the state of Cyrus, Tacitus' *Annals,* Plutarch's *Lives*, and the descriptions of the campaigns of Alexander the Great. However, the play's characters bearing names stemming from these sources (Gobrias, Tigranes, Mardonius, Bessus ...) in no way resemble their prototypes, or their adventures and geographical area of action. At the same time, Beaumont and Fletcher clearly endeavour to bring the history acted out at the Iberian royal court in some way close to historical Iberia. From this point of view, the fact of a war Between Iberia and Armenia, which did take place in the 1st cent. A.D. and is described in Tacitus' *Annals*, is striking. However, the victory of the Iberians over the Armenians, as given in the play, does not resemble in any way the facts of historical sources – neither by the names of the kings of the belligerent sides nor by the stories of the hostilities. Yet the

desire of the English playwrights to get close to Iberia is obvious: the name of one of the nobles at the Iberian royal court is Bacurius or Bacurias. This name is also borrowed from historical sources, being obviously the name of an Iberian king or his descendant, a Roman commander at the confines of Palestine. It is referred to in Tyrranius Rufinus' *Historia Ecclesiastica* (Lib. I, cap X), as well as in the "Ecclesiastical History" of Gelasius of Caesarea. This Bacurius is credited with telling the story of the Christianization of the Iberians. The choice of the name of the Armenian king Tigranes by the English playwrights is also significant. Several Armenian kings of various epochs are referred to by this name in Greek and Roman historical sources. In this case Beaumont and Fletcher must have been more familiar with the Armenian Prince Tigranes mentioned in Xenophon's *Cyropoedia.*

Thus, two trends are noticeable in the choice of the names of the characters of "A King and No King": the names are borrowed from historical sources and – wherever possible – adapted to the realities of Iberia and Armenia. From this standpoint, the names of the principal pair in love – the prince and the princess – are important: Arbaces and Panthea. English researchers again find the latter name (Panthea) in Xenophon's *Cyropoedia.* She is the most devoted wife of one of Cyrus' comrades-in-arms, commiting suicide over the body of her husband who dies a hero's death in battle (*Institutio Cyri,* VII, 3)[9]. Why should have Beaumont and Fletcher chosen the name of the spouse of the petty king of a region allied to the Persian King Cyrus, who lost his life in the war with the Egyptians, as the name of the happy princess of their play who was about to marry? I believe, this choice was due to the name *Panthea* itself. If – as I contend – the plot of "A King and No King" was suggested by the love of Nestan and Tariel of the Indian story of the *MPS*, then it cannot be surprising that *the panther* – symbolic name of Nestan, in whom Rustaveli sees an embodiment of panther, cladding the enamoured Tariel in a panther's skin to symbolize this, and calling the poem *The Man in the Panther's Skin*, be given to a character of the English play – inspired by Nestan's romantic story. The *vepkhvi* of Rustaveli's poem is associated with panther in an English reader's mind. *Panther* may be the name of that beautiful princess, deriving from the romantic story of Nestan, conceptualized in the image of a panther. Here I wish to remind the English reader of Tariel's words: "Since a beautiful panther is portrayed to me as her image, for this I love its skin, I keep it as a coat for myself"(639). Beaumont and Fletcher's choice of Panthea from Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* as a name for the princess explains their choice of Arbaces as the name of the enamoured Iberian king. Now, the heroically dying husband over whose corpse the Panthea of the *Cyropoedia* committed suicide, was called Abradatas. This name served as an impulse for choosing the name of the prince enamoured of Panthea in the English play. But, naturally enough, the playwrights don't wish to transfer the pair of

characters of the tragedy taking place at Cyrus' court to their own work of an absolutely different design and, in order to link it with Georgia they modify it according to the Iberian King *Artag's* name, attested in historical sources but in an absolutely different period. Researchers point to the resemblance of the name of the Iberian King Artag (1st cent. A.D.) with Arbaces of Beaumont and Fletcher, largely because the historical source in which this name is mentioned, viz. Eutropius Flavius' descriptions of the campaigns of Lucullus and Pompey, were already translated into English in the 16th century, the name of the Iberian King appearing in it as *Arthaces* [2].

The doubt that may arise in an English researcher of "A King and No King" in connection with the suggestion of a link between the name Panthea and panther and via this with the *MPS* may be connected with the originality of the title of Rustaveli's poem and in general the attachment of such essential importance to the simile of Nestan and the panther. In my view, the title of Rustaveli's poem – *Vepkhistqaosani* ("The Man in the Panther's Skin") – must have been given by the author. However, the main thing is that from the early 17th century, when Beaumont and Fletcher were writing their play, manuscripts of Rustaveli's poem were extant in Georgia, in which we find unequivocal indication to its title, *Vepkhistqaosani* ("The Man in the Panther's Skin"). On the other hand, the conceptualization of the panther as Nestan's image and symbol is one of the principal and essential axes of Rustaveli's imagery. This symbolism is not only directly indicated in Tariel's words quoted above but in a number of other passages of the poem: Rustaveli's comparison of the wrathful Nestan with a panther; the capture of a panther by Tariel to kiss it, and so on.

Georgian literary critics may question the doubtlessness of taking Rustaveli's *vepkhi* for 'panther' by the English playwrights. Why should Beaumont and Fletcher translate Rustaveli's *vepkhi* as 'panther' rather than 'tiger' (as established in Georgia, largely through Russian translations)? As is known, the *MPS* had not been translated into English by that time. Yes, in Beaumont and Fletcher's time the *MPS* had not been translated into English. But when it was translated – three centuries later – it was called "The Man in the Panther's Skin". Rustaveli's *vepkhi* was translated as 'panther' by all English translators of the *MPS*: of these three were English by birth: Marjory Wardrop, Katharine Vivian and Robert Stevenson. The latter even devoted a special commentary to this question [10]. Thus, it may be assumed that at the beginning of the 17th century English playwrights could have understood Rustaveli's *vepkhi* in the same way as English translators did three centuries later. Judging by facts, we may be positive in stating that Beaumont and Fletcher must have understood Rustaveli's *vepkhi* as denoting 'panther'. The point is that if we take the fact for granted that the English playwrights were aware of the *MPS*, it should also be assumed that they

had a Georgian translator, consultant or narrator of the story. Therefore, they must have had the same idea of Rustaveli's *vepkhi* as in old Georgia, to be more precise, in 16th-century Georgia. Now, old Georgian sources point out that *vepkhi* denoted 'leopard' or panther. This is the situation in the Georgian translations of the biblical books – in the texts of the Old Testament (e.g. *Isaiah 11.6*) as well as the New Testament (e.g. *The Revelation 13,2*). The same is the case with the Georgian translations of other monuments of ecclesiastical literature (e.g. of Basil the Great's *Hexaemeron*). The same situation is attested in works translated from the Persian ("Visramiani", "Kilila and Damana"). The tiger of foreign languages was translated into Georgian as *jiki*. The interchange of the meaning of these names (*vepkhi* and *jiki*) should be presumed from the 19th century. To revert to the time of Beaumont and Fletcher. Some 17th century Georgian manuscripts of the *MPS* are illumined with miniatures. In all of them (e.g. H-599; S-5006) *vepkhi* (and Tariel's panther skin) is depicted as an animal with spots (and not stripes), pointing to a leopard or panther. Thus, including the early 17th century, Rustaveli's *vepkhi*, implies the predatory animal that was called panther or leopard in English.

My suggestion of a possible hint at panther in Beaumont and Fletcher's Panthea as a symbolic image of her prototype Nestan rests on one more circumstance. Of course, Beaumont and Fletcher almost never give a direct indication of the source of the plots of their plays, yet they do not eschew intimating it. For example, one play by John Fletcher, whose source of its subject is a novel by a Spanish writer "The Tragic Poem of the Spanish Woman Gerardo", is addressed by the authors to Spain, and its title is "A Spanish Priest". There are many more such examples. Furthermore, it is not alien for John Fletcher to name his characters by the semantic principle, or selection of personal names according to meaning. Thus, e.g. the characters of his play "Wit Without Money" bear such names as Lovegood, Heartweal, and many others. Thus, in my opinion, when Beaumont and Fletcher chose *Panthea*, a well-known name in Classical onomasties, as the name for the Iberian princess, they must have borne in mind the outward resemblance, or its near identicalness, with the English word 'panther', for the name is given to a princess whose prototype is her counterpart of the Iberian poem "The Man in the Panther's Skin", panther being a symbolic image of that princess.

Thus, the plot framework of the celebrated play by Beaumont and Fletcher, "A King and No King" is based on the love story of Nestan and Tariel of Rustaveli's *MPS*. It also appears that the story did not come to the attention of the English playwrights as some remote, migratory hearsay story. The authors seem to have been more or less acquainted with the *MPS*. But from where and how? The present level of study of the life and activities of Beaumont and Fletcher does not allow to make any significant suggestion.

To return again to the resemblance of the frame of the plot of "A King and No King" and its temporal and spatial coordinates with the *MPS*. The relations I have pointed out remain within the boundaries that existed in works of European literature of the period, in particular those of Beaumont and Fletcher, between the plot frame and its source. Hence, the assertion of the existence of the relation should not develop into discussion of literary influence. We are dealing with a typical phenomenon of the works of Beaumont and Fletcher: some story, the relation with which will become apparent with more or less intensity, gives impulse to the subject scheme or subject facts on which the plot is based. But in every case a new work is created, with a new subject, different ideal purpose, and reflecting different problems with a different genre.

ლიტერატურის ისტორია

რუსთველის *ვეფხისტყაოსნის* კვალი შექსპირის თეატრში (მე-17 საუკუნის დასაწყისი)

ე. ხინთიბიძე

აკადემიის წევრი, ივანე ჯავახიშვილის თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის ქართული ლიტერატურის ინსტიტუტი

ინგლისურ ლიტერატურათმცოდნეობაში უცნობადაა მიჩნეული ფაბულის წყარო შექსპირის მემკვიდრეების ფ. ბომონტისა და ჯ. ფლეტჩერის პიესისა „მეფე და არა მეფე", რომლის მოქმედება იბერიაში ანუ საქართველოში მიმდინარეობს.

სტატიაში წარმოდგენილია ახალი თვალსაზრისი და არგუმენტირება იმისა, რომ „მეფე და არა მეფის" ფაბულა ემყარება რუსთველის *ვეფხისტყაოსანს*. ეს თვალსაზრისი – რუსთველის *ვეფხისტყაოსნის* ევროპულ სამყაროში შედღწევისა, დღეისათვის გამოვლენილი ფაქტებით დამკვიდრებულ თარიღს ორი საუკუნით უკან გადასწევს – მე-17 საუკუნის დასაწყისში. მეორე მხრივ, დადგინდება ინგლისურ ლიტერატურათმცოდნეობაში დღემდე ამოუცნობად მიჩნეული ფ. ბომონტისა და ჯ. ფლეტჩერის პიესის „მეფე და არა მეფის" ფაბულის წყარო – რუსთველის *ვეფხისტყაოსანი*.

REFERENCES

1. *R. Warwick Bond* (1904), Introduction to "A King and No King". – The Works of Fr. Beaumont and John Fletcher (ed. A.H. Bullen), London.
2. *E. M. Waith* (1969), The Pattern of Tragicomedy in Beaumont and Fletcher: Archon Books.
3. *H. K. Orlovskaya* (1986), Questions of Literary Contacts of Georgia with the West, Tbilisi (in Russian).
4. The Cambridge History of English and American Literature in 18 Volumes, vol. VI. – The Drama to 1642.
5. *A. Baramidze* (1975), Shota Rustaveli, Tbilisi (in Georgian).
6. "A King and No King". - http://www.people.ex.ac.uk/pellision/BF/noking/frameset.htm
7. *Shota Rustaveli* (1912), "The Man in the Panther's Skin". A Romantic Epic by Shot'ha Rust'haveli. A close Rendering from the Georgian, attempted by M.S. Wardrop, London.
8. *W.W. Appleton* (1956), Beaumont and Fletcher, London.
9. *Xenophon* (1968), Institutio Cyri. Edidit W. Gemoll.
10. *R.H. Stevenson* (1977), Introduction. – Shota Rustaveli, The Lord of the Panther's-Skin. (Translated by R.H. Stevenson), Albany.

Linguistics

The Languages of the Multicultural Achaemenid Empire

Rüdiger Schmitt

University of Saarbrücken

(Presented by Academy Member Th. V. Gamkrelidze)

ABSTRACT. The article contains a review of languages of the Achaemenid Empire, with a special emphasis on their role and social functions in the Multicultural Empire. © *2007 Bull. Georg. Natl. Acad. Sci.*

Key words: *Achaemenid Empire, languages of the Empire, lingua franca, alloglottography.*

Between 550 and 539 B.C. the Persian King Cyrus II (559–530 B.C.) succeeded in liberating his country from the yoke of the Medes' sovereignty, conquering the Lydian Empire of Croesus and assuming power also in the Neo-Babylonian Empire of Nabonidus. By this the impressive rise of a really universal empire, the first in the history of mankind, took place that included all the previous countries of the Ancient Near East with an advanced civilization. Under Cyrus' successors the frontiers of that new Persian Empire were pushed still further forward, since Cambyses II (530–522 B.C.) subjugated Egypt and the neighbouring countries to the south and west, and Darius I (522–486 B.C.) from another branch of the ruling dynasty could extend the borders also towards the east, north and west. During the reign of that king, in the time of its greatest extension, that empire encompassed, as we can read in two of his inscriptions[1] (DPh 5–8, DHa 4–6), the countries "from the Scythians who (are) beyond Sogdiana, from there as far as Nubia, from the Indus province, from there as far as Lydia". The large number of the peoples who were united in that empire – on the one hand Persians, Medes, Parthians, Sogdians, Bactrians and other Iranian-speaking tribes, on the other

hand Elamites, Babylonians, Assyrians, Arabs, Egyptians, Lydians, Armenians and the rest of them – is plainly reflected in the various surveys of the Empire's countries and peoples preserved in the form of lists of names (with fairly varying numbers though) as well as of figurative representations. As regards those depictions there are well-known the tribute-bearers portrayed in the reliefs of the audience hall (the so-called *apadâna*) at Persepolis, the throne-bearers on the façades of the royal tombs at Naqsh-i Rustam and – in Egyptian style, but showing a fusion of Egyptian and Achaemenid ideas – the figures depicted on the base of the large (larger than life-size) statue of Darius I found at Susa, which seemingly are supporting the ground on which the king stood[2]. But though all those peoples were dominated by the Persians, the Persian language of that period, which in linguistics is called Old Persian and which was the mother tongue of the kings themselves, never spread all over that vast empire[3]. This perhaps surprising fact means nothing else than that the language of the rulers never became the language of the Empire itself.

Old Persian is the language (or at least one of the dialects) spoken in Persis, the region around Shiraz

---

[1] References to the Old Persian texts follow a system initiated by Kent 1953, but developed further by the present author for the sake of unambiguity and greater systematization. The English translation of the text quoted here is taken over from Schmitt 2000, p. 64.

[2] The most comprehensive study of the base of that statue is still found in Roaf 1974.

[3] The linguistic situation of the Persian Empire and the use of the various languages are dealt with, e.g., by Schmitt 1993 and 1998; Stolper 2005 and Stolper and Tavernier 2007, pp. 18–25; moreover, cf. Briant 2000 for multilingual texts and Briant 2001 for the situation in Asia Minor.

(where Pasargadae and Persepolis are situated) and the modern province of Fârs. It belongs to the family of the Iranian languages and according to the dialectological classification is part of the south-west group of that language family[4]. But the form of Old Persian as it is attested in the official and partly programmatic royal inscriptions never was spoken, since it is an artificial form of language with a lot of stylistic figures, with archaic forms and words and with several borrowings from another Iranian language which only in a few particular cases can be determined as of Median origin[5]. Colloquial Old Persian as spoken at the time of Darius or his son Xerxes (486–465 B.C.) was much more advanced anyway in its linguistic development (e.g., by the monophthongization of older diphthongs) as one can see in Old Persian words and names reflected in foreign languages (its so-called collateral tradition)[6].

In the sphere of its use Old Persian is entirely restricted to the Great Kings, in practice it is the language of Achaemenid kingship and serves together with the cuneiform writing system elaborated specially for it[7] only the kings' prestige and representation purposes. Such purely representative use of the Old Persian script and language for decorative purposes as it were can be seen already from the fact that several of those inscriptions were not at all meant for reading for the simple reason that they had been engraved at a dizzy height on inaccessible rock faces or had been set into the foundations of the royal palaces. But it is of little importance that texts such as the great inscription DB next to Darius' relief at Mount Bîsutûn (which is the most famous example of that kind) could not be read, since Darius himself expressly stated (DB IV 91f.)[8] that for making known his message he sent that text everywhere in the countries of his Empire, to be precise, sent away copies of it in the various languages of the subject peoples. We see this information confirmed by the fragments of a Babylonian version of DB that have been excavated in Babylon and by scraps of papyrus with a younger copy of the Aramaic translation of the Bîsutûn text that came to light in Upper Egypt. Such Aramaic versions of the royal texts, written on papyrus or parchment, easily could be spread over the empire, but as they were written down on rather transient material, only meagre remains have survived.

The Old Persian language is inseparably combined with Old Persian cuneiform writing which was of no sig-

nificance in everyday life, but was used only "for show", as becomes evident also from the aesthetic criteria followed at its creation. We see this assertion reinforced by the fact that inscriptions are found without exception on solid objects, mostly on rocks and stone or metallic tablets, some also on other stone objects (vessels, weights) and more rarely on clay tablets – only quite recently one single Old Persian text, though unfortunately scarcely understood, has been detected by Matthew Stolper even among the many thousands of Elamite administrative texts from the Persepolis Archive[9] –, but obviously Old Persian was never written on parchment, papyrus or similar stuff, for which other writing materials than hammer and chisel were used and on which one did scribble in a more running handwriting. The major part of the royal inscriptions comes from the Empire's core, chiefly from the royal capitals in Persis (Pasargadae and, since Darius I, Persepolis with nearby Naqsh-i Rustam, the cliff with the royal tombs), Elam (Susa) and Media (Ecbatana = modern Hamadan). Among the most important texts from the other countries are Darius' inscriptions from his Suez Canal (since a prestigious enterprise like that structure required appropriate representative appreciation), the inscription on the large statue of Darius I, that was excavated at Susa, but as we learn from the text itself, had been manufactured in Egypt, and also a rock-inscription of Xerxes from Lake Van obviously ordered on the occasion of a visit of the King in Armenia.

Already these remarks make one thing perfectly clear: Old Persian was never used for the administration of the Achaemenid Empire. The official language of the Empire's strictly organized administration on the contrary was the Aramaic language, as it was already in the centuries before. For in the period of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, when the small states of the Aramaeans in Syria and Upper Mesopotamia came under the influence of that Empire and when on the other hand more and more Aramaeans had come to Mesopotamia, that the Semitic language had widely spread and thus had become, especially under King Sargon II (721–705 B.C.), a lingua franca in the Ancient Near East and the language of international diplomacy. This development was combined with a change in the script used, since the Aramaeans brought with them their own writing system, which had been developed from the Phoenician script and was superior to the age-old cuneiform script, since one

---

[4] A comprehensive handbook of the Iranian languages is Schmitt (ed.) 1989; there are both a survey of the Old Iranian languages in general (pp. 25–31) and a sketch of Old Persian (pp. 56–85), each authored by the editor.

[5] The problems concerning the evidence available for the language of the Medes are dealt with in great detail by Schmitt 2003.

[6] A clear example is found in the name of King Xerxes himself, if one compares two-syllable Gk. *Xérxçs* and Elam. *Ik-še-ir-ša* with four-syllable OPers. *Xšaya-ršâ*.

[7] The history of the monument at Mount Bîsutûn makes it absolutely clear that originally there were planned only Elamite captions to the figures of the relief and an Elamite inscription; and even the first extension (with the Babylonian versions) did not yet present Old Persian letterings.

[8] A new edition and an English translation of the Old Persian texts of the Bîsutûn inscriptions may be found in Schmitt 1991.

[9] This sensational find of an Old Persian administrative record has been edited, very well documented and sensibly commented upon by Stolper and Tavernier 2007.

needed not even two dozens of different signs for spelling out the single sounds of the words. Thus the Aramaic language and script became the leading means of communication in the Persian Empire as regards the regional administration of the Empire's single countries and the interregional correspondence from the centre to the various countries as well as between them. The use of that language made it possible to surmount the many language boundaries within the Empire and therefore made the contact between the many different peoples much easier, without impairing their own languages in one way or other. For we see that in the different regions of the Empire at the same time also locally or regionally spread languages were used aside from the Aramaic language at least in a restricted extent, especially where Aramaic had not yet gained acceptance in pre-Achaemenid times. Such languages with only local or regional significance were, e.g., Elamite in Elam, Babylonian in Southern Mesopotamia, Egyptian in Egypt, and after all in Asia Minor Greek as well as Lydian or Lycian, which all in multilingual texts are brought together with Aramaic.

From the very beginning, i.e. from the first occurrence of the Old Persian cuneiform writing in Darius' Bîsutûn inscription of 521/20 B.C., the proclamations of the Persian Great Kings mostly were written in three languages; and where a certain order of precedence or hierarchy can be made out among the three versions, that is not in accordance with the chronological order of their origin (as it is the case with the Bîsutûn texts), they always are in the fixed sequence Old Persian – Elamite – Babylonian. The Old Persian language as the kings' mother tongue has priority. Elamite is entitled the second place since it is the very old language of that civilized people, which was the first victim of the Persians' expansion. That also the Babylonian language was included in that triple canon, notwithstanding the fact that at that time in practice it was without any significance outside of Babylonia, can be interpreted only as meaning that the Achaemenids regarded themselves the legitimate successors of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings even after Cyrus II, who had emphasized this attitude quite clearly in his most important inscription on the famous Cyrus Cylinder[10], which like many other royal inscriptions has something of a propagandistic nature. But it must be underlined here that the Babylonian versions of the trilingual texts owing to strong influence of Old Persian and/or Elamite stand out for a great deal of striking loan-translations (calques), so that the old language tradition, which is still perfectly evident in the Cyrus Cylinder, seems deliberately cut off by Darius and his successors.

With this policy of information (as we call it nowadays) the Persian Kings intended to take up ancient Mesopotamian traditions of epigraphy. In all, it becomes perfectly clear, that that trilingualism of the royal inscriptions is politically motivated. In several cases further versions in one of the regional languages are added to the three cuneiform inscriptions (and to the Aramaic text made known all over the Empire), though the fortuitousness of tradition and preservation often leaves the matter in suspense. Good examples are the inscribed stelae of the Suez Canal and the inscriptions on the statue of Darius, in all of which a fourth text is added to the three cuneiform versions, written in Egyptian hieroglyphs and as regards its length in exact agreement with the total volume of the three cuneiform inscriptions. The text's two halves of equal size may either be written on two sides (front and reverse) of one and the same stone (as it is the case with one of the Suez stelae, viz. that of Kabrî t) or be arranged side by side in a symmetrical manner, whether on two parallel stones or on one and the same. The one alternative is attested on the two stelae of Tell el-Maskhñta (at the Suez Canal), the other on the statue of Darius whose ankle-length robe shows on the left (as seen from the observer) four folds with ten lines of cuneiform and on the right four folds with hieroglyphs.

In the short trilingual cuneiform text of the Suez stelae we read only a concise account of Darius' work, whereas the additional part of the Egyptian text consists of a complete listing of all the Empire's countries and peoples as well as a much more detailed description of the canal-building, in which its importance is particularly stressed. The hieroglyphic text of the statue is characterized on the other hand by formulations that follow the tradition of Egyptian monumental inscriptions. In part we have to do even with something like a hymn of praise of the pharaoh in classical Egyptian language, to which only at the end has been added a vernacular passage in Demotic language with the actual titles of Darius in literal translation. The preceding main part of the text, on the contrary, features a long series of often rather metaphorical titles as they were typical of the Egyptian pharaohs: "King of Upper and Lower Egypt", "personification of Rç", "son of Atum", and similar. In all, these are titles which the Achaemenid Kings (of the 27th Egyptian dynasty) as the legitimate successors of the pharaohs were entitled to.

The same distribution of a longer fourth text added to the three cuneiform versions we must assume in my opinion also for the two inscribed stelae[11] that according to the information given by Herodotus (4,87,1–2) Darius had ordered to be put up on the occasion of crossing the Bosporus. Since those two stelae, the one inscribed with cuneiform characters (or *Assýria grámmata* as the Greeks usually called them[12]) and the other one

---

[10] The most recent treatment of that text is in Schaudig 2001, pp. 550–556.
[11] I have treated this topic in some detail already in Schmitt 1988, pp. 32–34.
[12] For a discussion of the Greek expression Assýria grámmata and of the question what the Greeks did know about cuneiform writing see Schmitt 1992.

with a text in Greek letters, are no more extant, we can say (or guess) hardly anything about their content. But we scarcely make a mistake if we imagine the situation to be comparable with the Suez stelae, particularly since Herodotus says also something about an enumeration of the Empire's peoples, which we have to insert then into the more detailed Greek text. Above all we must conclude from such evidence, however, that royal inscriptions that originated outside the core area of the Persian Empire and are destined only for some special region, usually were written not only in the three common (cuneiform) versions, but as well in an additional fourth text drawn up in the regional language concerned (Egyptian, Greek or whatever).

It is a matter of course, however, that the question arises, how those additional versions apart from the tri-lingual cuneiform inscriptions came into being and from what language they have been translated. In order to judge this problem we are given a decisive hint by another Greek inscription the authenticity of which is not undisputed, although the formulation and phraseology found in it must have a real background and cannot be dismissed just as a pure invention. It concerns an inscribed stone from the vicinity of Magnesia on the Meander with a late copy (dated to the reign of Emperor Hadrian) of the Greek version of a letter King Darius I sent to a certain Gadatas, about whom nothing else is known, surely a local official or deputy, but hardly (as some scholars had suggested) the satrap of that province. In the Greek text of that so-called letter of Gadatas the phrase *péran Euphrátou* "beyond the Euphrates" is attested for denoting the area between the River Euphrates and the Mediterranean Sea, i.e. roughly Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine. The Eastern perspective of that expression (and I mean not only the East–West orientation of it) becomes evident from the simple reason that in the Greek language something of that kind is entirely unusual; a similar formulation we find only in the translation of the Old Testament book Ezra (4,10) where the Septuagint version's expression *péran toû potamoû* "beyond the river [scil. Euphrates]" is easily explained, however, as the exact rendering of the Aramaic original. For the phrase in question is known from both Babylonian (*eber nâri*) and Aramaic (*'abar naharâ'*). In any case that expression therefore comes from the East, and since it is absolutely foreign to the Achaemenid Persian geographical terminology, in the end it is evidently an Aramaic pattern on which it is based.

With this, our discussion has come back again to Aramaic, that remained the official written and administrative language as long as the Achaemenid Empire existed and obviously well over its decline. The Aramaic language made it possible to get over the many language boundaries within the Empire and thus proved to be a suitable means of communication – the only alternative would have been to make use of a non-verbal medium, e.g. visual arts and their pictorial "language" – and a comfortable tool for easier contacts between the Empire's numerous peoples. Therefore this special form of the Aramaic language usually and not by accident is called Imperial Aramaic (in German "Reichsaramäisch"), with a term that was introduced by Josef Markwart, but in the end is based on an idea developed half a century before by the French Semitist Charles Clermont-Ganneau. That scholar had smoothed the way for understanding the linguistic stituation within the Persian Empire in general when interpreting the fragments of a papyrus preserved in the Egyptian Museum of Turin (A5.3[13]) as belonging to a letter which the Egyptian Pakhim (*phym*) had written to the Iranian (perhaps Persian) Mithravahisht (*mtrwhš t*), whose ethnic origin becomes clear from their names. Now if an Egyptian at that time wrote to a Persian neither in the Egyptian nor the Persian language, but made use of a third language, in this case Aramaic, then this proves that in the 5th century B.C. the Aramaic language had taken the function of an administrative language of the Empire in its entirety, that means: also in those regions where it did not yet have it in pre-Achaemenid times.

This conclusion that all the activities of scribes, clerks, archivists etc. were in the hands of Aramaeans as the Persians had found them in the Assyro-Babylonian tradition, could be strengthened by further observations in hundreds of Aramaic texts: letters, contracts, official accounts, graffiti, tomb and other inscriptions, particularly by observations concerning the form of address or dates after Persian Kings. An especially informative and presumably the most striking evidence of that kind is the collection of the so-called letters of Arshama (A6.1–16). Most of them are letters written by the then Persian satrap of Egypt, the Persian Arshama (*'rš m*), and several of them are addressed to other Persians; nevertheless those letters are written not in Persian, but in the Aramaic language. One should qualify that statement, however, by the reservation that not all Aramaic texts from Achaemenid times have been written in Imperial Aramaic; on the contrary we find other Aramaic dialects as well used chiefly in private letters and non-official documents, the language of which clearly differs from the administrative language in that the Persian influence on syntax and lexicon is much less marked there.

Aramaic documents and inscriptions are known for the period of the Achaemenid Empire from its whole territory from Upper Egypt and the Aegean coast in the West up to Central Asia and North West India in the East and with a certain concentration in Persepolis. Most of the Persepolis material, however, has not yet been edited, but one has to distinguish here between seal impressions on a good deal of the Elamite clay tablets, marginal epigraphs on such tablets, graffiti on the re-

---

[13] This is the symbol for the text in question in the now authoritative edition by Porten and Yardeni 1986.

mains of buildings, inscriptions written in ink on stone mortars, pestles and plates from Arachosia (modern South Afghanistan), and finally more than 500 texts on clay tablets that were excavated together with the much more numerous Elamite tablets in the fortification wall of the terrace. A text full of problems is on the other hand the 25-line inscription in Aramaic characters on the façade of the tomb of Darius at Naqsh-i Rustam, which seems to have been written, however, only in post-Achaemenid (Seleucid?) times; but one has to be rather cautious with such a date since the former reading of a group of signs as the name of Seleucus (*slwk*) recently has been doubted. Be this as it may, the more or less uniform use of Aramaic script and language in the Empire's administration in the end led to the use of an own Aramaic-based writing system in later times not only by Persians and Parthians, but also by Sogdians and Chorasmians (and surely by other Iranian tribes for which we cannot prove it). Moreover, it was obviously a stimulation from Achaemenid Iran that caused the creation of the sinistroverse Kharoshthî script in the oldest Indian inscriptions after an Aramaic model.

The communication between the various administrative organs of the Empire may have taken place in that way that the orders and announcements of the King or the (mostly Persian) top officials were enacted in Old Persian, then were translated into Aramaic, were written down and in this form were sent to the destination, let us say, the seat of a satrap. For all such communication seemingly proceeded by letters that have been carried by messengers on those famous major roads right across the Empire, of which the well-known "Royal Road" from Susa to Sardis with its 111 post-stations had exceedingly impressed the Greeks (see Herodotus 5,52–54); in any case only traffic routes of that kind made such a regular and reliable courier-service possible. In the appropriate office of the local or regional administration at the destination, e.g. at a satrap's residence, the letters or other texts received according to what circumstances required then were either translated or orally interpreted from Aramaic into the local or regional administrative or vernacular language.

One has always to be aware of this chain of dictation, recording in Aramaic and oral interpretation into the particular language needed. Only if one brings to his mind that in Achaemenid times official documents were written down in Aramaic script, but read out in different specific languages – linguists are used now to call that phenomenon "alloglottography"[14] – one is able to comprehend the entire meaning of an interesting passage of the book of Ezra (4,7). There we read about the letter the Jews had written to King Artaxerxes concerning the res-

toration of the temple in Jerusalem and may first be startled by a formulation that seems to be redundant when it says that the letter "was written in Aramaic and has been interpreted [i.e. read] in Aramaic" (*katûb 'aramît um^e turgâm 'aramît*). What to the lay reader seems redundant here, in reality was not a matter of course, but well needed clarification.

That permanent translating to and fro between Old Persian and Aramaic (as in addition also the translating from Aramaic into other languages) led to numerous phenomena of interference, so that in Imperial Aramaic texts the Iranian influence is quite plainly recognizable (e.g. as regards the borrowing of particular terms, loan-translations and, of course, onomastics). And the role of Aramaic as the mediator to a third language has become particularly clear in the case of Egypt, since already Kurt Sethe[15] had shown on the basis of unambiguous examples that the Iranian words and names attested in Egyptian (hieroglyphic or demotic) writing went through an Aramaic intermediate stage.

After all we know about Imperial Aramaic, it is not in accordance with the historical facts at any rate, that the Persian King had written "to each people in its own language", as we read in the book of Esther (1,22), in which it is being said also in quite exaggerated form that the Empire had 127 provinces from the Indus River to the Nile and that each of them had used its own script and language (8,9). But since in that book of Hellenistic times any close familiarity with the period of the Achaemenid Empire is lacking, we have to interpret that linguistic information merely as an idealizing literary topos.

Among the countless Imperial Aramaic texts the multilingual specimens are of particular interest. Here may be cited only some impressive examples: There is a bilingual Lydian–Aramaic tomb inscription from Sardis, a pseudo-bilingual Aramaic–Greek text of the same kind from Lycian Limyra, where the Greek text, however, only has been added by the deceased's great-grandson. In the case of the trilingual Greek–Lycian–Aramaic inscription from the Letoon at Xanthus dealing with the institution of some cults, differences are to be recognized not only in the language, but also in the content of the text and in the attitude to it. Thus it becomes clear that the Lycian language and text are related to the inhabitants of Xanthus, the Aramaic to the Persian Empire as a whole and the Greek to the dynasts ruling at that time over Lycia, i.e. the Carian Hecatomnids. For Lycia it could be ascertained, too, from the many sepulchral inscriptions, which mention the municipal committee responsible for building and protecting the grave monuments, that the use of the Lycian language was obligatory in the municipal administration[16]; and the coins with Lycian legends

---

[14] A cross-cultural discussion of alloglottography in the Ancient Near East (not only in Achaemenid times) may be found now in Rubio 2006.

[15] See Sethe 1916.

[16] The use of the various languages (Lycian, Greek, Aramaic) in Achaemenid Lycia was studied on the basis of the sepulchral inscriptions by Le Roy 1989.

minted by the Lycian cities confirm this in the best way. But one has to bear in mind as well that to a certain extent a cultural shift towards Greek, which strengthened the position of that language as one of major cultural prestige enormously, took place at the time in question (5th/4th centuries B.C.).

Aside from Aramaic also other languages have been used in "official" texts, with a regional limitation each, as it seems, and mainly in those areas where the Aramaic language had not yet taken root before Cyrus II and Darius I. To this extent we are quite right to speak of a pragmatic language policy pursued by the Persian kings. Such languages of only regional importance are, for instance, in Asia Minor Lydian, Lycian and Greek. But apart from those languages also other indigenous idioms remained in use there as non-official, though written languages and/or everyday vernaculars. Not rarely we know them only by some onomastic material or just by name. The Greek language was of crucial importance as well, above all in the many Greek cities, as a language of culture, if we think only of the poetic texts found here and there in form of epitaphs.

As relatively rich evidence shows, Phoenician could hold its position in Phoenicia also under Persian rule, and it is attested elsewhere, too, in the great centres of trade and along the "international" trade routes to the Red Sea or even to Arabia. It is little wonder that in part it got under pressure by the closer related Aramaic language, as we see it also from the situation in Palestine for the Hebrew language, which survived, however, to a certain extent as literary language and was outside the greater cities also fairly unchallenged as the colloquial idiom used in everyday life.

Insofar as the supremacy of the Persians had not been touched, all the peoples of the Empire had well the benefit of a certain autonomy, so that each of them could keep its traditional customs, its religion and language. Only this is the explanation for the exceptionally rich evidence of Babylonian texts in Babylonia: on the one hand in the archives of temples and on the other in the private archives of the great business-firms with their enormous amount of juridical and economic documents, since in both of these fields ancient Babylonian traditions remained as before.

For most of the peoples of the Persian Empire east of the Tigris River written records are lacking, even for the Medes, who were close relatives of the Persians, and this despite their privileged position. As far as textual evidence is available, all the other languages spoken in the provinces of the Persian Empire are put in the shade of Elamite as regards the number of inscriptions. As already mentioned above, that language is attested by inscriptions not only from Elam proper (especially from the Elamite capital Susa), but also, and above all, from Persepolis. As many thousands of clay tablets show, it was there the administrative language of the Achaemenid court until the reign of Artaxerxes I (465–425/24 B.C.) and it was written by scribes who spoke Persian at least as a second language. Only in the course of a fundamental administrative reorganization changing over to other kinds of writing and to the Aramaic language, the Elamite script and language were displaced more or less completely and for ever. But aside from the Elamite tablets (and those in Aramaic; see above) the Persepolis archives exhibit even isolated pieces[17] in other languages, one each in Babylonian, Phrygian, Greek and Old Persian (for which see above). There is nothing surprising in this, however, since the transfers of (mostly) food rations listed in those tablets very often are referring to the employees working there. On that occasion one should mention as well the graffiti from the quarries above the Persepolis platform, in which Greek stonemasons have left their marks.

Unfortunately the linguistic situation in that multinational state owing to the lack of evidence is known rather inadequately, the more so since for a reasonable judgement not only the official texts written for administrative or representative purposes are of relevance. Questions like "Who used what language at what place in what communicative situation for what purpose?" we are unable to answer, because we know nearly nothing about what sociolinguists call non-standard idioms. Therefore we are able to judge only in relatively few cases with certainty, whether we have to do with an official written or spoken language, a literary or religious dialect, a language of interregional trade and traffic, the vernacular of private life or the like[18].

From the linguist's view large parts of the Achaemenid Empire are unknown territories. Notwithstanding, its character as a multinational or, better, multiethnic state is beyond any doubt. That characteristic is clearly reflected also in two royal titles used by the Persian Kings, at least as they are attested for Darius I and Xerxes I: "King of the countries containing all races" (OPers. *xšâyaθiya dahyûnâm vispazanânâm*) and "King of the countries containing many races" (OPers. *xšâyaθiya dahyûnâm paruzanânâm*) respectively. Realizing that language is one of the expressions of ethnicity, the authors of the Babylonian versions of those inscriptions did render both of these variants as "King of the countries of the entirety of all tongues" (*šar mâtâti ša naphar lišânu gabbi*) and thus took well into account that multiethnic state was above all a multilingual state.

---

[17] For those special items see now the treatment by Stolper and Tavernier 2007, pp. 3–5.

[18] For sociolinguistics of the Achaemenid Empire and especially the cultural-historical implications of the use of script and language see Rossi 1981 and 1986. An interesting model which perhaps may be adapted to the situation of the Persian Empire was drawn up for pre-Islamic Central Asia by Frye 1991.

ენათმეცნიერება

აქემენიდთა მულტიკულტურული იმპერიის ენები

რიუდიგერ შმიტი*

* *საარბრუკენის უნივერსიტეტი*

(წარმოდგენილია აკადემიკოს თ. გამყრელიძის მიერ)

სტატია მიმოიხილავს აქემენიდთა იმპერიაში გავრცელებულ ენებს და განსაზღვრავს მათ დანიშნულებასა და სოციალურ ფუნქციებს მულტიკულტურულ სახელმწიფოში.

REFERENCES

Briant 2000 = P. Briant, "Inscriptions multilingues d'époque achéménide: Le texte et l'image", in: Le décret de Memphis. Actes du Colloque de la Fondation Singer-Polignac, Paris 2000, pp. 91–115.

Briant 2001 = P. Briant, "Remarques sur sources épigraphiques et domination achéménide en Asie Mineure", in: Achaemenid Anatolia. Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Anatolia in the Achaemenid Period, Leiden 2001, pp. 13–19.

Frye 1991 = R. N. Frye, "Les Sogdiens et les religions de l'Asie Centrale", in: Histoire et cultes de l'Asie Centrale préislamique. Sources écrites et documents archéologiques, Paris 1991, pp. 163–165.

Kent 1953 = R. G. Kent, Old Persian: Grammar, texts, lexicon, New Haven, CT ^{2}1953.

Le Roy 1989 = Ch. Le Roy, "Aspects du plurilinguisme dans la Lycie antique", Anadolu/Anatolia 22, 1981/1983 [1989], pp. 217–226.

Porten and Yardeni 1986 = B. Porten and A. Yardeni, Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt. 1: Letters, Winona Lake, IN 1986.

Roaf 1974 = M. Roaf, "The Subject Peoples on the Base of the Statue of Darius", CDAFI 4, 1974, pp. 73–159.

Rossi 1981 = A. V. Rossi, "La varietà linguistica nell'Iran achemenide", AIÙ N 3, 1981, pp. 141–196.

Rossi 1986 = A. V. Rossi, "I materiali iranici", Rivista Biblica 34, 1986, pp. 55–72.

Rubio 2006 = G. Rubio, "Writing in Another Tongue: Alloglottography in the Ancient Near East", in: Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures, Chicago, IL 2006, pp. 33–66.

Schaudig 2001 = H. Schaudig, Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros' des Großen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften: Textausgabe und Grammatik, Münster 2001.

Schmitt 1988 = R. Schmitt, "Achaimenideninschriften in griechischer literarischer Überlieferung", in: A Green Leaf. Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen, Leiden 1988, pp. 17–38.

Schmitt (ed.) 1989 = R. Schmitt (ed.), Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum, Wiesbaden 1989.

Schmitt 1991 = R. Schmitt, The Bisitun Inscriptions of Darius the Great. Old Persian Text, London 1991.

Schmitt 1992 = R. Schmitt, "Assyria grammata und Ähnliches: Was wußten die Griechen von Keilschrift und Keilinschriften?", in: Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike, Stuttgart 1992, pp. 21–35.

Schmitt 1993 = R. Schmitt, "Die Sprachverhältnisse im Achaimenidenreich", in: Lingue e culture in contatto nel mondo antico e altomedievale. Atti dell'VIII Convegno Internazionale di linguisti, Brescia 1993, pp. 77–102.

Schmitt 1998 = R. Schmitt, "Übersetzung im Dienst der Politik: Die mehrsprachigen Königsinschriften im Achaimenidenreich", in: Wort–Text–Sprache. Festschrift für Hans Schmeja, Innsbruck 1998, pp. 157–165.

Schmitt 2000 = R. Schmitt, The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-i Rustam and Persepolis, London 2000.

Schmitt 2003 = R. Schmitt, Die Sprache der Meder – eine große Unbekannte", in: Continuity of Empire (?): Assyria, Media, Persia, Padova 2003, pp. 23–36.

Sethe 1916 = K. Sethe, "Spuren der Perserherrschaft in der späteren ägyptischen Sprache", NGWG 1916, pp. 112–133.

Stolper 2005 = M. W. Stolper, "Achaemenid Languages and Inscriptions", in: Forgotten Empire: The World of Ancient Persia, London 2005, pp. 18–24.

Stolper and Tavernier 2007 = M. W. Stolper and J. Tavernier, "From the Persepolis Fortification Archive Project, 1: An Old Persian Administrative Tablet from the Persepolis Fortification", ARTA 2007.001, pp. 1–28.