СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

UDC 1(091) – [82:17 – 82:347 – 821.124 – 821.14'02]

T. S. PARKHOMENKO[1*]

[1*]National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (Kyiv, Ukraine), e-mail discur@ukr.net,
ORCID 0000-0002-6923-7204

PLAGIARISM AS ANTROPOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL PHENOMENON

Purpose of the article is to determine plagiarism as anthropological and social phenomenon. **Theoretical basis.** The author has analysed authentic historical-philosophical and literary texts to explicate the original meaning of the terms, by which the phenomenon of plagiarism was denoted. There were used methods and principles of socio-philosophical and philosophical-anthropological research, in particular: social determinism and anthropological interpretation of human life phenomena (O. Bollnow). **Originality** consists of: clarifying the terminological evolution in relation to designating the phenomenon of plagiarism; 2) the philosophical-anthropological description of the motives and personal traits of the subject of plagiarism (plagiarist) proposed by author. **Conclusions.** 1. Plagiarism as practice and plagiarism as a term existed separately for a long time. With the nominates, which denoted the practice, "Plagium" had as its predecessors the Greek "Λογοκλόπία" and the Latin "Furta". The modern semantics genesis of the term "plagiarism" took place as a process of changing the nominal values due to the complication of the semantic structure of the word before reintegration. 2. Analysis of historical-philosophical and literary sources from the "Empedocles Case" and "Fedentinus Case" allowed reconstructing the anthropological characteristics of the named persons as plagiarists: both of them were induced to plagiarize by vanity, either due to temporary limitation of abilities to intellectual creation (Empedocles as a student) or due to constant limited ability to the literary creativity (Fedentinus). Plagiarism was also caused by the low moral qualities of both, that allows to consider plagiarism as one of the manifestations of the individual's integral characteristics. 3. Vanity, that motivates the commission of plagiarism, is one of the manifestations of the esteem needs, sociogenic by its nature, but unlike the next, higher stage in the hierarchy of basic needs (A. Maslow) does not foresee the self-improvement of man. Therefore, the plagiarist does not pass to the level of the need for self-actualization, the means to satisfy which is creativity in its various forms, "trampling" on the previous level. 4. Plagiarism is an ambivalent phenomenon, because in spite of plagiarists' anthropological peculiarities, the ontological foundations of plagiarism are rooted in the social nature of man.

Keywords: plagiarism; Empedocles; Martial; Fedentinus; Λογοκλόπία; fur; plagiarius; plagium; anthropological interpretation; social determination

Introduction

Over the past few years, a strong discourse on the plagiarized problem of scientific research in theses monographs, manuals, textbooks, and articles has been formed in Ukrainian social network, electronic and print media. At the same time, this rather intense discourse, as a rule, did not pass into the plane of scientific reflection, and lone attempts to make the phenomenon of plagiarism its subject suffered from narrativity and superficiality. In particular, due to the fact that their theoretical-methodological background was sometimes the postulates incorrect from historical and linguistic point of view. It did not allow to understand the essence of plagiarism, to discover its ontological foundations.

Meanwhile, in connection with the spread of plagiarism not only in Ukraine, but also in the world (Bergadaà, 2015), its definition not only in legal terms (as an offense), but also as a socio-anthropological phenomenon becomes more and more relevant.

Purpose

The purpose of the article is to determine plagiarism as an anthropological and social phenomenon.

Methodology. The author has analysed authentic, historical-philosophical and literary texts to

explicate the original meaning of the terms, by which the phenomenon of plagiarism was denoted in a historical retrospective. To achieve the purpose, there were used methods and principles of socio-philosophical and philosophical-anthropological research, in particular: social determinism and anthropological interpretation of human life phenomena (O. Bollnow).

Statement of basic material

In the Ukrainian legislation, the term "plagiarism" and its definition are present in the Law of Ukraine "On Copyright and Related Rights", the Laws "On Education" and "On Higher Education". The Article 50 of the Law of Ukraine "On Copyright and Related Rights" (1993) defines the plagiarism as "disclosure (publication), in whole or in part, of another's work under the name of a person who is not the author of this work".

In two "educational" laws, the term "plagiarism" is used with the addition of "academic" and is determined as followes: "academic plagiarism is the disclosure (in whole or in part) of scientific (creative) results obtained by others as the results of their own research (creativity) and/or reproduction of published texts (published works of art) of other authors without specification of authorship" (paragraph 2 of Part 4 of Article 42 of the Law "On Education" (2017), part 6 of Article 69 of the Law "On Higher Education" 2014)).

The first part of the definition of academic plagiarism extends to scientific results that have not been published, that is, either existed as an author's manuscript or was formulated orally. Having become known to the person who made them public already under her/his names, they appeared to be the object of plagiarism as a violation of copyright. A person who has made this kind of plagiarism is a plagiarist, just as a person who reproduced the published texts of "other authors without specifying" their "authorship".

The fact that both types of plagiarism existed for a long time and were formed in parallel, and that this phenomenon took place even in the days of antiquity, originally Greek one, and with a small (historically) lag Roman one, are evidenced by historical, historical-philosophical and literary sources.

The first plagiarist in Europe, whose name came to these days, was the ancient Greek philosopher Empedocles. This is reported by Diogenes Laertius (end of the II – beginning of III centuries AD) in "Vitae philosophorum", referring to a much earlier source: the multi-volume "History" by Timaeus. Sicilian historian of the second half of the IV century – the first half of the III century B. C. Timaeus from Tauromenium told about this fact of Empedocles's biography in the ninth book of his "History".

In addition to Timaeus, Laertius cites another Greek historian of the III century B. C. Neanthes Cyzicenus, who also mentioned this Empedocles's action.

Academic translations in Russian (absent in Ukrainian) of "Vitae philosophorum" by Diogenes Laertius, performed by M. L. Gasparov and A. V. Lebedev, differ significantly in relation to the fifthy fourth fragment of the book VIII, which deals with the plagiarism of the Empedocles. Thus, the indicated fragment, which is the translation of Timaeus's words, M. Gasparov translated as "appropriation of the doctrine": "Timaeus said that he (Empedocles – T. P.) was a listener of Pythagoras, in the book IX, adding that at the same time he was, like Plato, caught in appropriation of the doctrine and excluded from his studies" (Diogenes Laertius, 1979, p. 347). A. Lebedev (1989), translating the same fragment, uses the word "plagiarism": "Timaeus reports the fact that he (Empedocles – T. P.) listened to Pythagoras, in the ninth book…, saying that he was then accused in plagiarism, and, like Plato…, was forbidden to attend the lectures" (p. 331). The cor-

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

rectness of the use of the term "plagiarism" in A. Lebedev's translation is questionable, since the ancient Greek historian Timaeus, describing the action of Empedocles, is unlikely to use Latin. The study of the original source confirms: in the Greek original, Laertius, repeating Timaeus's description of the history with the plagiarism of Empedocles, uses the word λογοκλόπία (logoklopia), which literally means "theft of the doctrine" or "theft of ideas" (Diogenes Laertius, 1862, p. 217).

The same term, however, in the writing of λογοκλόπεία, is also present in the Greek texts of Timaeus, published in the first volume prepared by Carl and Thomas Muller and in the third volume prepared by Carl Muller of "Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum" of the Paris edition dated 1841 and 1849 (Timeae, 1841, p. 212; Neanthes Cyzicenus, 1849, p. 6). So, the first meaning of what is today defined as plagiarism, even in the fourth century B.C. was "theft of doctrine, ideas". However, it happened that in the historical perspective, the Greek term λογοκλόπία gave way to a Latin plagium, the primary meaning of which is "abduction of people". In the figurative sense, destined to become the main and exclusive one, the term plagiario derived from plagium was used by the Roman poet Marcus Valerius Martial (I century AD), who compared appropriation ("theft") of his poems by a man named Fidentinus (and not Fidentius, as it is incorrectly repeated in Russian and in Ukrainian textbooks) with the abduction of a slave. In several epigrams to the address of Fidentinus, included in the so-called plagiarized cycle (Book I, epigrams 29, 38, 52, 53, 72), only in the 52nd we encounter the term plagiario, herewith not directly to the address of Fidentinus, because his name in this epigram is not mentioned, but implicitly.

> "Ommendo tibi, Quintiane, nostros
> nostros dicere si tamen libellos
> possum – quos recitat tuus poeta.
> Si de servitio gravi queruntur
> 5adsertor venias satisque praestes,
> et, cum se dominum vocabit ille,
> dicas esse meos manuque missos.
> Hoc si terque quaterque clamitaris –
> **inpones plagiario pudorem**".
> (Martialis, 1976) (Hereinafter emphasis
> added by me – T. P.).

This is the only epigram of the cycle, in which Martial uses the word plagiarius – the "abductor" (plagiario – casus dativus of plagiarius). Where the name of Fidentinus appears, the term plagiarius is not used in relation to him by Martial.

The authors of Russian-language translations (there are no mentioned epigrams in Ukrainian, except 29) choose different synonyms, but in no case the term "plagiarist".

So F. Petrovsky translates the epigram 52 with the word "appropriator":

> "Я тебе, Квинтиан, вверяю наши –
> наши если мне можно так назвать их –
> книжки, те что поэт твой вслух читает;
> коль на рабство свое они заропщут –
> заступись ты за них как поручитель,
> и коль тот о правах на них заявит –
> объяви, что я вольную им выдал.
> Раза три иль четыре так воскликнув,

присвоителя   их   ты   опозоришь".
(Martialis, 1968, p. 42)

G. Sever while translating the same epigram uses the word "thief".

"Я   тебе,   Квинтиан,   вверяю   наши
(наши – если сказать могу, конечно)
книжки, те что поэт твой всем читает.
Если будут роптать на злое рабство –
к ним на помощь приди и стань защитой;
будь   себя   господином   он   заявит –
скажешь были мои, теперь на воле.
Раза три так четыре если кликнешь –
устыдишь   и   покроешь   срамом   вора".
(Martialis, 2018, p. 35)

However, "thief" in Latin is "fur" (from furta – theft). Martial himself directly calls Fidentinus a thief (but not a plagiarist) not in the 52nd, but in the 53rd epigram:

«Una est in nostris tua, Fidentine, libellis
Pagina, sed certa domini signata figura,
Quae tua traducit manifesto carmina furto.
…
Indice non opus est nostris nec iudice libris,
Stat contra dicitque tibi tua pagina "**Fures**"».
(Martialis, 1976)

In the translation of this epigram both F. Petrovsky and G. Sever use the word "thief". Translation by F. Petrovsky:

«Есть страница одна, Фидентин, твоего
сочиненья
В книжках моих, но печать господина ее
несомненна:
Каждая   строчка   на   ней   выдает   твой
подлог с головою!
…
Нет в заголовке нужды и в судье ни
одной нашей книжечке:
Против тебя страница твоя, и кричит
она: "Вор ты!"».
(Martialis, 1968, p. 43)

Translation by G. Sever:

«Есть, Фидентин, твоего страница одна
сочиненья
в наших книжонках, печать ее господина
бесспорна,
каждая строчка на ней – улика в подлоге с

> поличным.
>
> …
> Книжкам моим не нужны ни подпись, ни
> суд в оправданье –
> против тебя же страница твоя, заявляет:
> "Ворюга!"». (Martialis, 2018, p. 37)

(Epigram 53 testifies that, in addition to plagiarism, Fidentinus also falsified the stolen, inserting in the Martial's text the poems of his own "production").

The difference between fur and plagiarius is that during the times of Martial, the object of the plagiarism was a man. Such abductions were carried out in order to sell a free man or resale a slave that is they had exclusively commercial purposes. (Despite the brutal punishment for the plagium, such practices in the Roman Empire were quite common). While the object of the furta – theft – was not a man, but a thing.

Therefore, in the 53rd epigram, Fidentinus is said to be the usual thief. The implication (in order to avoid accusations of libel, as if Marcial directly used the word plagiarius with respect to Fedentinus) in reference to Fedentinus as an abductor (plagiarist) takes place in the 52nd epigram. But here Martial compares his books, the guarantor of which becomes the Quintian, with the people: slaves who got free – that is, plagiarius is used figuratively. As for the denoting the theft of a literary work (as opposed to Empedocle, here it is referred to the appropriation of authorship for text, and not for an idea or doctrine), and the direct accusation of Fidentinus, Martial uses the term derivative of furta (theft) that is semantically close, although not identical, to λογοκλόπία.

Consequently, in the I century AD the term plagium was not used in the modern sense.

Moreover, the plagium does not occur in the Latin translations of the texts of Timaeus and Diogenes Laertius, that is, is not used in the III century AD and later.

Thus, in the Latin translation of the fragment 54 of the book VIII of "Vitae philosophorum" by Diogenes Laertius, neither the term plagiarium nor the term plagiarius were used. Herewith there were several Latin translations.

Here is how the Latin version of Laertius's book looks like in the bilingual Parisian edition of Didot (1862), the texts for which were prepared by M. Gabriel Cobet: "Audisse autem Pythagoram Timaeus auctor est in nono Historiarum, dicens improbatum, quod **doctrinam evulgasset**, consortio exclusum fuisse, quemadmodum etiam Platonem…" (Diogenes Laertius, 1862, p. 217).

Today doctrinam evulgasset could be translated as "disclosure of doctrine". In the cultural realities of the time when this translation was made, it had another semantic load: "vulgarization of doctrine", in the sense of "accessibility to the crowd, common people".

This Latin translation is far from λογοκλόπία of the Greek original, as interpreted by the author of the translation according to the semantics of its not so much linguistic but cultural realities. At the same time, despite the fact that the term "plagium" has long existed, it is not considered to be the correspondence of λογοκλόπία.

The same fragment of Timaeus's "History" as quoted by Laertius, punlished in the first volume of the six-volume bilingual edition of "Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum", of the Parisian publishing house Didot in 1841, was translated differently in Latin: "Empedoclem auscultasse Pythagoram auctor est Timaeus, qui pluribus locis libri noni eum dicit accusatum, quod **doctrinam furatus esset** (sicuti etiam Plato), a sermonibus tunc esse exclusum…" (Timeae, 1841, p. 212).

Using in this translation doctrinam furatus esset – "abduction of doctrine" – is semantically the most adequate to λογοκλόπία (theft of doctrine) of the ancient Greek original.

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

However, in the third volume of the same bilingual edition, where the fragments of the works of Neanthes Cyzicenus are collected, the translation to Latin of the same 54 fragment as a whole (with a small change in the beginning of the sentence) is identical to the Latin translation of Laertius's book in the edition of Cobet: "Empedoclem andiisse Pythagoram Timaeus auctor est in nono Historiarum, dicens improbatum, quod **doctrinam evulgasset**, consortio exclusum fuisse, quemadmodum etiam Platonem…" (Neanthes Cyzicenus, 1849, p. 6), spelling of the original – T. P.

Consequently, there were at least two distinct Latin translations of one and the same fragment 54 from the ancient Greek original. To translate λογοκλόπία one used doctrinam furatus, while the other – doctrinam evulgasset. And with regard to the first part – λογο – the translations coincided: the word "doctrina" was used as the equivalent. But as to κλόπία it was translated both as furatus (from furta – theft), and as evulgasset (from vulgas – crowd, common people).

About the complexity of working with Latin translations, comparing some of them with the Augean stables, Cobet wrote in the letter to M. Ambroise-Firmin Didot (1862); while preparing the bilingual edition of Diogenes Laertius, he performed titanic work in the libraries of Vatican, Florence, Venice and Naples with manuscripts and lists in Greek and Latin: "Cette traduction latine est l'etable d'Augias" (p. ij-iij).

In any case, one may state that until the New Times, the term plagium was not used to denote theft of intellectual property either in the form of Empedocles's λογοκλόπία object, or as the Fedentinus's plagiarism object.

The object of λογοκλόπία was the teachings of the Pythagoreans, which, as Laertius testifies, referring to Neanthes, "Empedocles disclosed… in his poem", following which the Pythagoreans, who excluded him from the listeners, "were instructed not to allow any poet to them" (Diogenes Laertius, 1979, p. 347). That is, Empedocles stole ideas as scientific results – the teachings of the Pythagoreans can be considered as the result of long reflections – but not the text (record of the doctrine). Texturally the doctrine was objectified by Empedocles in the form of poems versed by him.

The object of the Fedentinus's plagium was the texts by Martial, which in the form of manuscripts were purchased by Fedentinus legally in the stores, to which they were brought by Martial himself (such way of spreading literary works existed at that time). Rewritten with his own hand, or with the help of another hired person, Fedentinus distributed, i.e. publicly recited, or brought for sale to the same stores, the very text but already under his name (Sever, 2006).

Unlike various objects of Empedocles's λογοκλόπία and Fedentinus's plagium, the motives guided by both the future philosopher and the pseudo-poet were identical – vanity, the desire to look more meaningful in the eyes of others: Empedocles – intelligent (philosopher) – the one he was not during his study at the Pythagoreans, Fedentinus – talented (poet) – the one he had never become.

The peculiarity of this motive is that it predetermines the specificity of plagiarism: unlike ordinary theft, plagiarism involves the presentation of a stolen to the public, but already under the name of a theft. In this regard, the behaviour of both Empedocles and Fedentinus is the same: public demonstration of a stolen object of intellectual property. The text (idea, doctrine, work), the author of which is another person, are appropriated in order to present it (them) to the world in one's own name. Without a public demonstration of the stolen the plagiarism is meaningless. Therefore, the phenomenon of plagiarism by its nature is ambivalent, because the plagiarist secretly appropriates (steals) something that belongs to another person, but in order to demonstrate publicly the stolen object.

Modern plagiarists do not differ from Empedocles or Fedentinus: they need to show the world the stolen intellectual property in order to improve their assessment in the eyes of society or their individual community.

At the same time, the desire of the plagiarist to join (in real or virtually) the circle of "the select few" – philosophers or poets – indicates the social prestige of a particular type of activity, which gives the exclusive status to those persons who belong to it. So Empedocle was attracted by the halo of the wise men around the Pythagoreans, and the fame of Martial in the higher circles of the Roman society, which he gained thanks to his epigrams, attracted Fedentinus. If philosophy and poetry lost their prestige, they would instantly lose their attraction for plagiarists. From this it follows that the vanity of the plagiarist is socially predetermined.

Vanity is a manifestation of the needs of man in social recognition, or, according to A. Maslow's (1943) terminology, "esteem needs" (p. 381). However, as a rule, vanity is not provided by the real acquisition of personal qualities: knowledge and skills. This may be due both to the limited capacity of certain abilities and to the moral qualities of a person.

However, plagiarism is just one of the phenomena motivated by vanity. Among other things, it differs not only in ambivalence. The peculiarities of plagiarism are also preconditioned by the nature of its objects: they are works, that is, the results of intellectual (scientific) or artistic (literary) activity – the one defined by Aristotle as theoria (knowledge of truth) and poiesis (artistic creativity, art in the part generating a new, previously absent) (Aristotle, 1983, p. 174). The work is an objectification of a qualitatively new result of a creative act, something that did not exist either in nature or in people's lives.

Failure to generate a new science or art, that is, the inability to intellectual or artistic activity of a creative nature (creativity), can push a vain man to resolve the contradiction between his own desires and his own capabilities by means of plagiarism.

Therefore plagiarism is connected not only with vanity, but with anthropological features of the plagiarist: limited (temporary or constant) abilities to creative (intellectual or artistic) activity.

Creativity is a manifestation of the need for self-actualization, which, according to A. Maslow, refers to the highest level of the hierarchy of basic needs for motivation of a person, which, like the needs of the previous step, are sociogenic. However, if the lower link, where the motive of vanity takes place, presents the needs of a people focused on themselves, then at the higher level – self-actualization, there are needs, motivated by which, a person is capable of socially directed activity. Therefore, we can assume that vanity is the manifestation of the egocentric position of a person who "stuck" at the stage of self-affirmation.

Yet, is it just the lack of creative abilities (intellectual and artistic) that prevents the plagiarist from moving to the level of self-actualization? The tendency to plagiarism is a constant or situational characteristic of a person?

We will try to answer this question, returning to the central figures of the plot of this article.

The testimonies of Neanthes Cyzicenus and Favorinus, quoted by Diogenes Laertius, suggest that plagiarism was only one epiphenomenon of Empedocles's vanity. The vanity of the philosopher was also manifested in appearance: Empedocles wore a purple mantle, made of expensive purple cloth, girt with a golden belt and copper sandals, and decorated the head with the Delphic wreath – the one worn by the Delphic oracle and winners of the Delphic Games. Even by his posture Empedocles demonstrated a claim that he must be worshiped almost as god on earth.

Referring to Timaeus, Laertius retells the following story:

One day, he (Empedocles – T. P.) was invited by one of the archons; the dinner lasted and lasted, but nobody served wine; everybody waited patiently, but Empedocles became angry and demanded the wine, and the master replied to him that they expected an official from the council. The latter appeared and immediately became the head of the feast – by means of explicit endeavor of the master who secretly sought the tyrannical power; and the guest ordered everybody to drink wine, or pour on their heads. Empedocles remained silent, but the next day he took both to court, the master and the administrator, and secured their conviction and execution. This was the beginning of his state affairs.

(Diogenes Laertius, 1979, p. 350)

With the help of which conclusions Empedocles could persuade judges to make a decision on the execution of persons who inadvertently invited him to dinner, is unknown. But regarding his personal traits, this episode suggests that λογοκλόπία was only a juvenile manifestation of the moral qualities of Empedocles.

As for Fedentinus, in addition to system plagiarism, the "abductor" of Martial's poems satisfied his vanity by engaging in the falsification of stolen works.

Therefore, the next characteristic of plagiarism is that it is committed by a person with low moral qualities. Plagiarism testifies to the fundamental readiness of a person to steal – an intention that is generated by dishonesty as an integral moral quality of an individual. Since integral quality can manifest itself in various modes of social life of man, plagiarism can be considered as one of the manifestations of constant personal characteristics.

Over time, to the motive of vanity, which prompts to plagiarism, starting from the XV century, there was added a financial motive, which ultimately led to the institutionalization of copyright.

It is believed that copyright was generated by the invention of the printing press in the 40's of the fifteenth century. The technical capabilities of replicating copies of the literary original set the issue of the protection of copyright, especially material rights. However, to be precise, the problem of copyright protection during replication arose even before the invention of Gutenberg: when reproducing the images in the form of wood etching from engravings, which spread in Europe at the end of the XIV – the beginning of the XV centuries.

Until the early modern era, the problem of authorship in the fine arts did not stand: the medieval artists did not sign their works, because it corresponded to the concept of the divine inspiration of the artist, and the claim of the latter to authorship was regarded as arrogance – one of the main sins in Christianity. Because of this anonymity there is a problem of attribution of many works of the medieval art.

Authorship of the artist began to be fixed by his own signature during the Renaissance, when the art became secular. Artists quickly found a means to preserve authorship on etchings as well: in the very original, from which the prints were made, the signature of the artist or his monogram was cut out.

This could not be done in principle when typesetting a text from separate letters. From the standpoint of authorship, the most vulnerable were written (literary) works. The speed of typesetting and the potential unlimited circulation exacerbated the problem of protecting the material rights of the authors, since the latter shared the revenue from the sale of their books with publishers and book distributors. The main losses inflicted the spread of counterfeit book products; as a result of the struggle therewith the first legislative acts of copyright appeared in Europe (Balázs, 2011).

Unlike Empedocles, between whom and the Pythagoreans there were no intermediaries, unlike Fedentinus, who personally copied the epigrams of Martial and already the rewritten scrolls sold as his own, with the invention of printing between the author and the plagiarist, in addition to a trader, there appeared a printer. If the latter members of this chain were producing and distributing counterfeit book products, then they appropriated only financial gain without claiming for authorship, that is, they were not plagiarists in the true sense. (The theft of rewards in this way became known as piracy).

The name of plagiarists was assigned therefore to the thieves of authorship (immaterial copyright). So the term plagium changed its meaning: once used by Martial in the figurative sense, it has become the main and exclusive meaning.

Originality

The analysis of historical-philosophical and literary sources from the "Empedocles Case" and "Fedentinus Case", with the support of the principle of anthropological interpretation of the phenomena of human life, allowed to reconstruct the anthropological characteristics of the named persons as plagiarists; and the application of the provisions of the A. Maslow's human motivation theory in conjunction with the principle of social determinism of human activity – to determine the ontological foundations of plagiarism, which are rooted in the social nature of man.

Conclusions

The analysis carried out in the article allows to formulate the following conclusions:

1. Plagiarism as practice and plagiarism as a term existed separately for a long time. The semantic changes of the nominate "plagiarism" from plagium – "abduction of a man" to the designation of one type of copyright infringement – took place over a long period of time. With the nominate, which denoted the latter practice, "plagium" had as its predecessors the Greek "λογοκλόπία" and the Latin "Furta", thereof only λογοκλόπία is semantically the closest to the present meaning of the term "plagiarism". However, both λογοκλόπία and Furta were rejected in the process of the genesis of the modern semantics of the term "plagiarism", which occurred as a process of changing the nominal values due to the complication of the semantic structure of the word before reintegration.

2. Analysis of historical-philosophical and literary sources from the "Empedocles Case" and "Fedentinus Case", with the support on the principle of anthropological interpretation of the human life phenomena, allowed reconstructing the anthropological characteristics of the named persons as plagiarists. Both were characterized by similar personal traits and motives: both of

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

them were induced to plagiarize by vanity, either due to temporary limitation of abilities to intellectual creation (Empedocles as a student) or due to constant limited ability to the literary creativity (Fedentinus). Plagiarism was caused by the low moral qualities of both historians. Plagiarism was only an epiphenomenon of the integral quality of an individual – dishonesty that can manifest itself in various modes of his/her social life and have various negative consequences for other people: the execution of people on the Empedocles's initiative based solely on the motives attributed to them by Empedocles, and the falsification by Fedentinus of Martial's poems along with systemic nature of plagiarism.

3. Vanity, that motivates the commission of plagiarism, is one of the manifestations of the esteem needs, sociogenic by its nature, but unlike the next, higher stage in the hierarchy of basic needs (A. Maslow) does not foresee the self-improvement of man. Therefore, the plagiarist does not pass to the level of the need for self-actualization, the means to satisfy which is creativity in its various forms, "trampling" on the previous level.

4. Plagiarism is an ambivalent phenomenon, because in spite of plagiarists' anthropological peculiarities, the ontological foundations of plagiarism are rooted in the social nature of man.

REFERENCES

Aristotle. (1983). Bolshaya ethica. T. A. Miller, Trans. from Ancient Greek. In A. I. Dovatura (Ed.), Trans., *Sochineniya* (Vol. 4, pp. 295-374). Moskow: Mysl. (in Russian)

Aristotle. (1983). Nikomakhova etika. N. V. Braginskaya, Trans. from Ancient Greek. In A. I. Dovatura (Ed.), Trans., *Sochineniya* (Vol. 4, pp. 53-293). Moskow: Mysl. (in Russian)

Balázs, B. (2011). Coda: A short history of book piracy. In J. Karaganis (Ed.), *Media piracy in emerging economies* (pp. 399-413). United States: Social Science Research Council. (in English)

Bergadaà, M. (2015). Une brève histoire de la lutte contre le plagiat dans le monde académique. *Questions de communication, 27,* 171-188. (in French)

Didot, A. F., & Didot, H.-F. (1862). Avis de Editeurs. In Diogenes Laertius, *Diogenis Laertii Vitae philosophorum* (pp. j-iij). Parisiis: Instituti Franciae Typographo. (in French)

Diogenes Laertius, & Didot, A. F. (Ed.). (1862). *Diogenis Laertii Vitae philosophorum.* Parisiis: Instituti Franciae Typographo. (in Greek & in Latin)

Diogenes Laertius. (1979). *O zhizni, ucheniyakh i izrecheniyakh znamenitykh filosofov.* M. L. Gasparov, Trans. Moskow: Mysl. (in Russian)

Lebedev, A. V. (1989). *Fragmenty rannikh grecheskikh filisofov. Seriya: Pamyatniki filosofskoy mysli* (Part 1). Moscow: Nauka. (in Russian)

Marcus Valerius Martialis. (1976). Epigrammaton. Liber 1. W. Heraeus, & J. Borovskij (Eds.). *Perseus Digital Library.* Retrieved from http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008. 01.0506%3Abook%3D1%3Apoem%3D53 (in Latin)

Marcus Valerius Martialis. (1968). *Epigrammy.* F. Petrovskiy, Trans. from Latin. Moskow: Khudozhestvennaya literature. (in Russian)

Marcus Valerius Martialis. (2018). *Perevody i materialy.* G. M. Sever, Trans. from Latin. In L.I LII. Retrieved from http://www.martialis.ru/index.xps?2.1.52#1 In L.I LIII. Retrieved from http://www.martialis.ru/index.xps?2.1.53 (in Russian)

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review, 50,* 370-396. (in English)

Neanthes Cyzicenus. (1849). Fragmenta. In A. F. Didot (Ed.), *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum* (Vol. III, pp. 2-11.). Parisiis: Instituti Franciae Typographo. (in Greek & in Latin)

On Copyright and Related Rights: Law of Ukraine 1993, № 3792-XII. (1993). Retrieved from http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3792-12 (in Ukrainian)

On Education: Law of Ukraine 2017, № 2145-VIII. (2017). Retrieved from http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19 (in Ukrainian)

On Higher Education: Law of Ukraine 2014, № 1556-VII. (2014). Retrieved from http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18 (in Ukrainian)

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

Sever, G. M. (2006). Marcus Valerius Martialis, ocherk. *Martialis.ru. Marcus Valerius Martialis. Perevody i materialy.* Retrived from http://www.martialis.ru/index.xps?4.1 (in Russian)

Timeae. (1841). Historia. Fragmenta. In K. Müller, & A. F. Didot (Ed.), *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (Vol. I). Parisiis: Instituti Regii Franciae Typographo. (in Greek & in Latin)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

Аристотель. Большая этика / Аристотель ; пер. с древнегреч. Т. А. Миллер // Аристотель. Сочинения : в 4-х т. / Аристотель ; пер. и ред. А. И. Доватура. – Москва : Мысль, 1983. – Т. 4. – С. 295–374.

Аристотель. Никомахова этика / Аристотель ; пер. с древнегреч. Н. В. Брагинской // Аристотель. Сочинения : в 4-х т. / Аристотель ; пер. и ред. А. И. Доватура. – Москва : Мысль, 1983. – Т. 4. – С. 53–293.

Balázs, B. Coda: A Short History of Book Piracy / B. Balazs // Media Piracy in Emerging Economies / Ed. by J. Karaganis. – United States, 2011 – P. 399–413.

Bergadaà, M. Une brève histoire de la lutte contre le plagiat dans le monde académique-Questions de communication / M. Bergadaà // Questions de Communication. – 2015. – No. 27. – P. 171–188.

Avis de Editeurs / Publisher by A. F. Didot & H.-F. Didot // Diogenis Laertii Vitae philosophorum / Diogenes Laertius. – Parisiis, [1862]. – P. j–iij.

Diogenes Laertius. Diogenis Laertii Vitae philosophorum / Diogenes Laertius ; Ed. by A. F. Didot. – Parisiis : Instituti Franciae Typographo, [1862]. – 340 p.

Диоген Лаэртский. О жизни, учениях и изречениях знаменитых философов / Диоген Лаэртский ; пер. М. Л. Гаспарова ; вступ. статья А. Ф. Лосева. – Москва : Мысль, 1979. – 620 с.

Фрагменты ранних греческих философов. Серия: Памятники философской мысли / сост. А. В. Лебедев. – Москва : Наука, 1989. – Ч. 1 : От эпических теокосмогоний до возникновения атомистики. – 576 с.

Marcus Valerius Martialis. Epigrammata. Liber I [Virtual Resource] / Marcus Valerius Martialis ; Eds. by W. Heraeus, J. Borovskij // Perseus Digital Library. – 1976. – Access Mode: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0506%3Abook%3D1%3Apoem%3D53 – Title from Screen. – Date of Access: 09.11.2018.

Марк Валерий Марциал. Эпиграммы / Марк Валерий Марциал ; пер. с лат. Ф. Петровского. – Москва : Художественная литература, 1968. – 486 с.

Марк Валерий Марциал. Переводы и материалы / Марк Валерий Марциал ; пер. с лат. Г. М. Севера. – [S. l. : s. n.], 2018. – L.I LII. Режим доступу: http://www.martialis.ru/index.xps?2.1.52#1 – Назва з екрану. – Дата звернення: 09.11.2018 ; L.I LIII. Режим доступу: http://www.martialis.ru/index.xps?2.1.53 – Назва з екрану. – Дата звернення: 09.11.2018.

Maslow, A. H. A Theory of Human Motivation / A. H. Maslow. – Psychological Review. – 1943. – № 50. – P. 370–396.

Neanthes Cyzicenus. Fragmenta // Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum / Ed. by A. F. Didot. – Parisiis, 1849. – Vol. III. – P. 2–11.

Про авторське право і суміжні права [Електронний ресурс] : Закон України від 23 груд. 1993 р. N 3792-XII [із змін. та доп.] // Законодавство України : [веб-сайт Верховної Ради України]. – Електронні текстові дані. – [Київ], 1993. – Режим доступу: http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3792-12 – Назва з екрану. – Дата звернення: 09.11.2018.

Про освіту [Електронний ресурс] : Закон України від 5 вер. 2017 р. № 2145-VIII // Законодавство України : [веб-сайт Верховної Ради України]. – Електронні текстові дані. – [Київ], 2017. – Режим доступу: http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19 – Назва з екрану. – Дата звернення: 09.11.2018.

Про вищу освіту [Електронний ресурс] : Закон України від 1 лип. 2014 р. № 1556-VII [із змін. та доп.] // Законодавство України : [веб-сайт Верховної Ради України]. – Електронні текстові дані. – [Київ], 2014. – Режим доступу: http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18 – Назва з екрану. – Дата звернення: 09.11.2018.

Север, Г. М. Марк Валерий Марциал, очерк [Электронный ресурс] / Г. М. Север // Martialis.ru. Марк Валерий Марциал. Переводы и материалы. – 2006. – Режим доступа: http://www.martialis.ru/index.xps?4.1 – Название с экрана. – Дата обращения: 09.11.2018.

Timeae. Historia. Fragmenta / Timeae // Müller, K. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum / Karl Müller ; Ed. by A. F. Didot. – Parisiis, 1841. – [Vol. I].

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

Т. С. ПАРХОМЕНКО[1*]

[1*]Національне агентство із забезпечення якості вищої освіти (Київ, Україна), ел. пошта discur@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-6923-7204

ПЛАГІАТ ЯК АНТРОПОЛОГІЧНИЙ І СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ ФЕНОМЕН

Метою статті є визначення плагіату як антропологічного і соціального феномену. **Теоретичний базис.** Для експлікації первинного значення термінів, якими позначався феномен плагіату, автор провів аналіз автентичних історико-філософських і літературних текстів у відповідних до теми дослідження частинах. Для досягнення мети було використано методи і принципи соціально-філософського і філософського-антропологічного досліджень, зокрема: соціального детермінізму та антропологічної інтерпретації феноменів людського життя (О. Больнов). **Наукова новизна** полягає: 1) в уточненні термінологічної еволюції щодо позначення феномену плагіату; 2) у запропонованій автором філософсько-антропологічній характеристиці мотивів й особистісних рис суб'єкта плагіату (плагіатора). **Висновки:** 1. Плагіат як практика і плагіат як термін тривалий час існували нарізно. З номінатем, якими позначалась відповідна практика, Plagium мав своїми попередниками грецьку Λογοκλόπία і латинську Furta. Генезис модерної семантики терміну "плагіат" відбувався протягом тривалого часу як процес зміни номінативних значень через ускладнення семантичної структури слова до переінтеграції. 2. Аналіз історико-філософських і літературних джерел з "кейсу Емпедокла" і "кейсу Фідентіна" дозволив реконструювати антропологічні характеристики названих осіб як плагіаторів: обох спонукало до вчинення плагіату марнославство у поєднанні з: або тимчасовою обмеженістю здібностей до інтелектуальної творчості (Емпедокл у статусі учня), або константною обмеженістю здібностей до літературної творчості (Фідентін). Вчинення плагіату було також зумовлено невисокими моральними якостями обох, що дозволяє вважати плагіат одним із проявів інтегральної характеристик особи. 3. Марнославство, яким мотивується вчинення плагіату, є однією з маніфестацій потреб у повазі, шануванні, соціогенних за своєю природою, але на відміну від наступного, вищого, щабля в ієрархії базових потреб (А. Маслоу), з необхідністю не передбачає самовдосконалення людини. Тому плагіатор не переходить на рівень потреби в самоактуалізації, засобом задоволення якої є творчість у розмаїтті її видів, "застрягнувши" на задоволенні потреб нижчого рівня. 4. Плагіат є амбівалентним феноменом через те, що, попри антропологічні особливості суб'єктів плагіату, його онтологічні підвалини вкорінені в соціальній природі людини.

Ключові слова: плагіат; Емпедокл; Марціал; Фідентін; Λογοκλόπία; Fur; Plagiarius; Plagium; антропологічна інтерпретація; соціальна детермінація

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ ЛЮДСЬКОГО БУТТЯ

и литературных источников по "кейсу Эмпедокла" и "кейсу Фидентина" позволил реконструировать антропологические характеристики названных лиц как плагиаторов: обоих подвигло к совершению плагиата тщеславие в соединении с: либо временной ограниченностью способностей к интеллектуальному творчеству (Эмпедокл в статусе учащегося), либо константной ограниченностью способностей к литературному творчеству (Фидентин). Совершение плагиата обуславливалось также невысокими моральными качествами обоих, что позволяет считать плагиат одним из проявлений константных характеристик личности. 3. Тщеславие, которым мотивируется совершение плагиата, является одним их проявлений потребностей в уважении, почитании, социогенных по своей природе, но в отличие от следующего, более высокого, уровня в иерархии базовых потребностей (А. Маслоу), с необходимостью не предполагает самоусовершенствования человека. Поэтому плагиатор не переходит на уровень потребности в самоактуализации, средством удовлетворения которой является творчество в его разных видах, "застревая" на удовлетворении потребностей нижнего уровня. 4. Плагиат является амбивалентным феноменом из-за того, что, несмотря на антропологические особенности субъектов плагиата, его онтологические основания коренятся в социальной природе человека.

Ключевые слова: плагиат; Эмпедокл; Марциал; Фидентин; Λογοκλοπία; Fur; Plagiarius; Plagium; антропологическая интерпретация; социальная детерминация