L. V. KOVTUN[1*], Y. O. SHABANOVA[2*]

[1*]Dnipro University of Technology (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail fs.libri@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-8116-0687
[2*]Dnipro University of Technology (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail jshabanova@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-5876-4140

Anthropology of "Philosophy of Translation": Contemporary Ukrainian Philosophical Dimension

Purpose. The study is aimed at the "philosophy of translation" methodology outlining as an original philosophical texts translation tool from the point of view of culture as anthropological phenomena, namely, individuals' participating in the text creation process providing the consistent following tasks solution: a) clarifying the text author's role, which is the object of recipients' perception; b) the human psyche inexhaustible potential realization for the primary text semantic content understanding by the translator to prevent its distortion; c) defining the requirements for the translation process as a mean of bringing the reader closer to author's understanding by language barrier elimination as an intuitive "obstacle" on its way. **Theoretical basis.** The author proceeds from the factual absence of the "philosophy of translation" concept unambiguous definition in the modern anthropological and philosophical space and seeks to take into account all the factors affecting the newly created text quality due to the all participants' features reviled on every stage of the text translation process. Today, the "philosophy of translation" is a widely used phrase, though ignoring the characteristics of man as a single meaning creator of the concept under study. The article provisions are based on philosophical, translation, and psychological studies with an emphasis on classical and non-classical anthropology research (Gadamer, Khoma, Holovach, Chepeleva, Dizdar, Leonov, Lotman, Bakhtin, etc.). **Originality.** The author proposes a methodology for the original philosophical text adaptation and presents a generalized step-by-step scheme for its translation, which helps to solve the personality of the researcher and/or translator's influence problem on the individual author's meaning preservation during its reproduction in a reader's convenient language. **Conclusions.** A look at the "philosophy of translation" from the philosophical anthropology point of view allows us not only to consider the process of translation from the individual characteristics of all the participants (author / philosopher-reader-researcher / translator-reader-philosopher / reader) but also to describe such translation methodology by concentrating on highlighting the author's reasoning course, which rises new knowledge and encourages further philosophical reflection within the human nature instability problem. The translation of a philosophical text not only reproduces the semantic structure of the original message but also provides a number of possible dialogical reactions to it as an object of human phenomenology. The proposed concept takes into account any reader's needs, fully preserving the author's position.

Keywords: philosophy of translation; personality; identity; understanding; psyche inexhaustibility; meaning; human nature; hermeneutic circle

Introduction

Today "philosophy of translation" is an urgent concept in the modern philosophical environment and affects the interests of both philosophers-researchers studying foreign-language sources and a wide range of foreign philosophical sources readers. It requires a methodology formulation for creating world-famous philosophical works with primary Ukrainian translations based on promoting and qualitatively improving both the work on the text and the Ukrainian-language text.

In the course of "philosophy of translation" problems research, it is advisable to take into account the anthropological component allowing, first of all, to single out several target text reader categories determining the way of work and the degree of possible original source interpretations in the new text, with its content full preservation. Thus, the "philosophy of translation" aims to outline not only the tools but also the limits of possible deviations from the main text, depending on a particular person's final request.

_____

For a long time, the question of a philosophical text translation was discussed mainly within the analytical philosophy framework without taking into account anthropological multidimensionality, the psyche inexhaustibility while various interpretations appeared, and did not correlate with culture as an anthropological phenomenon. The ancient heritage in Latin was translated only during the Renaissance casting doubt on the many translations adequacy carried out at the intersection of cultural eras expressed in the 'purity' of the newly created text meaning. In the XX century, and even stronger in the XXI, due to the philosophical space globalization and the anthropological issues actualization, the foreign-language philosophical texts translation acquires an individual revision. On the one hand, the differences in the cultural epochs' temporal dimensions (source creation time/translation time/modernity) must be taken into account, on the other hand, there is a philosopher – a person capable of comprehending the source thought but not always able to independently accurately select words in the native language to fully convey the content, especially in a language accessible to the wide non-philosophical community.

Consequently, the focus on a possible reader should take place within the language of translation itself, which, while preserving the meaning of lexical units, turns to hermeneutic interpretation, based on the instability of human nature. Thus, the "philosophy of translation" emphasizes the anthropological issue of overall modern Ukrainian philosophical thought identity in the multilinguistic discourse.

Purpose

Taking into account the activity intensification among the Ukrainian-speaking philosophical and translation community in order to form national identity and its own philosophical thought from the beginning of the XXI century, the research aims to determine the "philosophy of translation" methodology as a tool for translating primary philosophical texts from the point of view of anthropology, namely, direct participants of creating and understanding the text involving the following tasks solution: "philosophy of translation" concept concretization in order to preserve the key principles of working with primary texts in a relatively new but extremely important anthropological direction by clarifying the author's personality role as the primary text creator, which is the subject for further perception by other recipients; revealing the semantic content understanding aspects of the primary text by the translator in order to carry out the translation to prevent its distortion; requirements for the translation process determination as a means of bringing the reader closer to understanding the author by the language barrier elimination as one of the culture as an anthropological phenomenon manifestations.

Statement of basic materials

Recent publications analysis

D. Dizdar's (2011) *Deconstruction* examines in detail Jacques Derrida's deconstruction as a means of reading and translating a philosophical text from the point of view of the final recipient and emphasizes the peculiarities of the method's influence on the final text content formation in order to preserve its meaning, rejecting the individual's influence on the text presentation way.

M. Lederer's (2010) *Interpretive Approach* is devoted to a fundamentally new way of the text meaning understanding, outlining the spheres of its perception intersection by the author and readers, and the translator's role, supposed to grasp this boundaries coincidence when creating the translation, similar to the non-classical anthropology provisions.

To create an algorithm for working with a philosophical text during its translation, we studied J. Naudé's (2010) *Religious Translation* suggesting ways to preserve important features for religious texts and paying attention to such a translator's competencies. Considering the lasted mutual influence of philosophy and religion, we find it important to study the methods of translating similar texts.

Since a high-quality translation is impossible without a correct primary text meaning understanding, it is important to take into account the human nature instability and the psyche's inexhaustibility while the author and the reader interact within a certain text described in *Text and Reader* by N. Chepeleva (2015).

The entries from the *European Dictionary of Philosophy: The Lexicon of Untranslatables* in 4 volumes (Cassin, Sihov, & Vasylchenko, 2011a, 2011b, 2013, 2016), are also taken into account clearly demonstrating a modern approach to the translation of philosophical texts emphasizing the need to preserve the original edition meaning for the Ukrainian-speaking reader's identity.

V. Porus (2016) tries in his *What does it mean to 'understand' a literary text?* to consider artistic text understanding from the meanings polysemy perspective and greater potential of interpretations arising as a result of individual linguistic expressions used by the author and the reader's (and the translator's) ability to reproduce in his vision an integral system of signs and images created by the author, and endowing their specific properties due to the certain lexical units choice allows us to talk about the relevance of a deeper study of the meaning formation processes participants within the source and translation languages. In the introductory articles and afterwords to philosophical modern translations, we find a brief argumentation of philosophers-translators serving as a justification for such source text interpretation (Husserl, 2009; Khoma, 2014; Plato, 2018) emphasizing the translator-editor's and the whole research group personalities' importance as understanding and preserving source meaning inherence.

Thus, the meaning does not arise by itself and the work cannot lose meaning after its translation, however, a dialogue between the reader and the author may not happen leading to only the content transfer with the complete or partial loss of its identity. Translations into Ukrainian of two philosophical texts aimed at different recipients are considered as an example allowing stating the methodology universality proposed in the article (Patton & Cannon, 2019; Plato, 2018).

Participants needed for a philosophical text translation process

What is the reason for the communication between the personalities of the authors and the readers? What contributes to the formation of adherence to the theories of one philosopher and makes to critically deny the work of another? Why is it difficult to perceive foreign language philosophical texts even in the native language? What did the *author* really want to tell? Note that a philosophical text, in contrast to an artistic one, is primarily focused on illuminating the internal dialogue that occurs in the process of attracting a new type of sensibility. That is, when writing a text, there is a process of self-awareness and building of logical, cause-and-effect, evidence, or vice versa, contradictory manifestations of inexhaustible mental processes later offering the reader new or once again confirmed theses. To introduce a 'new' meaning, the author mainly focuses on his own intuitive experience. The 'consistency' and 'obviousness' of the proposed concepts are clear from the very beginning for him personally and are not always so accessible to readers who are not the author's students, followers, or researchers, especially when the text is read after centuries in a completely different cultural-historical environment. The question of how much the philosophical text author seeks to simplify and adapt his text is quite complicated. Does the author

strive to be understood by others? Whether he 'thinks' of all possible ways of his text interpreting? Does he take into account the possibility of translating his texts into other languages? We can surely assert that when creating the majority of philosophical texts, the author does not focus on a specific readership and uses a language 'convenient' for him personally, using both established philosophical and general concepts and giving new meanings to well-known words.

The *reader's* personality seems even less ambiguous. In addition to the working language, the reader can differ in a number of criteria and factors that, due to the differences in human nature and the psyche inexhaustibility and even intuition, affect the degree of the necessary text adaptation for its holistic perception. Of course, when translating, the author's word authenticity should be kept, and not adapted to a recipient and every individual's needs, however, it should carry out the translation taking into account the *author-reader* pair.

The question "Who should translate a philosophical text?" is still under discussion due to strivings for perfection, but there is no single answer. We will only try to outline a portrait of the "ideal" *translator*. Speaking about an ideal translation, we will mention the potential for the original text author to be a simultaneous bearer of several languages and cultures. In this case, we will talk about bi- or even possibly polylinguism positively affecting the creation of the text in several languages. However, the author is unlikely to translate himself. There will be his intuitive expression in another language minding cultural characteristics as an anthropological phenomenon. Let a translator be a person who is not the author of the original source. R. Stolze in his *Hermeneutics and Translation* notes:

> The translator expresses content understood from a source text and becomes a co-author for the target text, but before translating the source text he or she has to grasp the message. … The focus is on translation competence as a deeply subjective phenomenon as regards comprehension and writing, and this situation is best analyzed against the background of hermeneutics. (Stolze, 2010, p. 141)

Usually, before a text is translated, a so-called technical task outlining the further observational when working with the text points is drawn up. In other words, the hermeneutic approach presupposes a clear distinction between the translator's own point of view and what the text actually expresses (Stolze, 2010). That means that translation can be carried out by an ordinary translator after clear instructions given by philosophers-anthropologists.

Text as an anthropological and philosophical category

To create a set of actions for working on a philosophical text translation, let us remind its hermeneutic definition: the text is an intermediate stage in the process of establishing mutual understanding between the author and the reader "acting only as a temporary intermediate fixation of a linguistic work fulfilling its mission in the act of reading/pronouncing" (Gadamer, 1991, p. 65). That is, to understand the author means to understand all the texts he wrote. Semi-

otics as well as non-classical anthropology brings a philosophical text author to the level of a unique code with known and to be decoded symbols. Y. Shaev explains:

> Even the unique techniques that the author uses, the individual "traits",
>
> the peculiarities of the author's style (considered in a broad sense as the
>
> philosophical texts author, artistic texts and various works of art), accord-
>
> ing to essence, is a lexicode that, after study, can be codified and conven-
>
> tionalized. Thus, Schleiermacher's task is to understand the author – this
>
> is the author's code understanding, the possibility of its mastering.
>
> (Shaev, 2012, p. 1)

For us, this means that such decoding should precede the direct translation and should be carried out precisely by a philosopher, or a group engaged in a deeper author's heritage research and analysis. At this stage, the main thing is the meaning understanding inherent in the content and reaching an agreement within the professional philosophical community regarding the meanings that the lexical units used by the author, acquire as a result of an unintentionally created 'language game'. It requires a long interpretation period with the study of professional, historical, cultural, social, and other, possibly purely personal, anthropological factors that could influence the formation and formulation of the author's views. This stage is extremely important and avoids an unreasonable multiplicity of translation attempts due to the individuality of the author's visions interpretation. The pre-translational stage also allows selecting or creating the best equivalents to convey the original text meaning. It can also beneficially affect the priority of an author's works by translating and determining the potentially interested readers.

Anthropological trend of philosophical translations

As soon as the philosophical community determines the author's text importance the next step should be this translation purpose clarification and the actual possibility of its creation. D. Dizdar offers his explanation of J. Derrida statement:

> "Therefore the thesis of philosophy is translatability in this common
>
> sense, that is, as the transfer of a meaning or a truth from one language to
>
> another without any essential harm being done" (Derrida, 1985, p. 120).
>
> As this translatability thesis is vital for the survival of philosophy, the
>
> failure of translation also means the failure of philosophy itself. (Dizdar,
>
> 2011, p. 32)

Based on the following considerations, the question of translation possibility is not correct, however, one should distinguish the degree of its proximity to the original text content in order to achieve a specific goal. For example, if we are talking about working with sources involved in the specific author decoding, there may be a *translation for personal use*, occurring fragmentarily or selectively with the exception of irrelevant (according to the researcher) information and be a pure 'draft'.

If the text is of a certain historical, philosophical, cultural, historical, scientific, or literary value, its translation should be as close to the meaning of the original text as possible with the maximum possible approximation to the method of its original presentation by the author. In other cases it should be translated as close to the source text as possible. Imagine that human nature allows the author to speak any native for the reader language. Could this text sound slightly different? Probably yes. Can the meaning expressed in the target language in a different way change? Maybe, but this is what we are trying to avoid in a pre-interpretational stage.

Another way of presenting the text is possible for non-philosophers. In this case, we are talking about the degree of already translated text adaptation with an extended editor's commentary. Now the book is no longer a direct translation, but a kind of the source text content presentation in a simplified language, explaining the author's opinions in an appropriate for him way. Such texts focus on the translation and become independent works based on the source texts or their translations but they do not claim to be accurate.

Such an example is the Ukrainian translation of a *Philosophy* (Patton & Cannon, 2019) from the *Science in Comics* series done by O. Nehrebetskyi and edited by N. Kryvda. In fact, the book is a history of philosophy in personalities. There are 6 sections: Logic, Perception, Consciousness, Free Will, God, and Ethics. The choice of materials was done in English, which is not the native language for most of the thinkers mentioned in the book. However, it was the high-quality primary translation into English and a deep meaningful understanding of each thinker's concepts that made it possible to convey the most important essence of the trend and to create a witty visual series positively affecting the philosophical terminology perception, testifying to the benefit of the quality and degree of the previously translated text simplification. The book also has a Glossary and Bibliography sections allowing continuing the deeper study of philosophy.

Let's study the Ukrainian translation of the English-language book, which in our case can be considered the primary source. The English book *The Cartoon Introduction to Philosophy* (Patton & Cannon, 2015) immediately states the circle of possible readers *focused on the introduction to philosophy*. The Cartoon indicates a way of presenting material, namely *'in comics'*, appealing to even more specific readers focused on the visual perception. Yes, the Ukrainian translation is a part of the *Science in Comics* series, however, *Philosophy from the Science in Comics series* and *Introduction to Philosophy in Comics* are perceived differently by the reader and can cause the philosopher to lack a scientific approach while a beginner is interested in a more simplified edition. At the same time, we find translations of this English book in a total of 14 different editions, in particular in Spanish *Filosofía en Viñetas* (Patton, n.d.) and Greek *Η φιλοσοφία σε κόμικσ* (Patton, n.d.). In these titles we also do not find an "Introduction to", but fully preserved the phrase "philosophy in comics". It turns out that the original source names, and their translation into Ukrainian and two other languages are by no means fully preserved. Does this affect the very meaning put by the author? Does this understanding bring us closer or, on the contrary, mislead the original text perception? Also, note that in all translations the author's illustrations are fully preserved; that is, only the text has undergone adapta-

© L. V. Kovtun, Y. O. Shabanova, 2022

tions and interpretations. Unfortunately, the book lacks sections like *Translator's Comments* or *Reviewer's Commentary*, allowing us to understand the methodology for implementing this translation from the philosophical point of view. There is also no recommended readership (except marking the book as a *popular scientific* edition on the last page. In *Glossary*, it is useful to see not only the terms interpretation in Ukrainian (which is not a translation) but also the correspondence to the source language contributing to the formation of a bilingual perception. Some terms are presented with the Latin origin word which later formed the term. For example, *'консеквенціалізм'* (Ukrainian) is not a proper Ukrainian word and rather difficult to perceive, but borrowed, or rather transliterated from English *consequentialism*, which comes from the English *consequence* (which is more common in use and is known in Ukrainian as *'наслідок'*) coming from the Latin *consequens* and retains its original meaning in English. The Ukrainian-speaking reader, not a philosopher, rather forms the word *'наслідковість'*, not included in the modern Ukrainian lexical stock but is clearer and easier to remember and use.

The *Bibliography* section includes a list of Ukrainian-language translations of classical philosophical texts. It significantly differs from the English reference list, not allowing the Ukrainian-speaking reader to delve into the works selected by the author of the English-language edition to substantiate their claims; therefore, it supplementary informs about Ukrainian texts available for further reading. Thus, we can conclude that attention to the anthropological factors contributes to a better understanding of the philosophical text's meaning and brings the reader closer to the author.

The necessity of philosophical texts translation

Talking about the author's understanding, we must read the source text in mind all the factors influencing his way of thinking. Otherwise, it creates artificial extra barriers preventing the author's meaning integration into the reader's space at a sufficient for further comprehension and processing level. As Y. Shaev notes,

> Philosophical creativity within the framework of this "connotative type"
>
> (perception of works not as metaphysical total-explanatory schemes, but
>
> as directions of interpretation, which are a kind of semantic perspectives,
>
> within which possible experiences of thinking as a movement are not fol-
>
> lowed by the thought, but rather in the semantic space of thought) is
>
> largely based on hermeneutic interpretations of predecessor thinkers
>
> texts. In this sense, in general, any philosophical work is to some extent
>
> historical and interpretive in its essence. (Shaev, 2012, p. 4)

This is how philosophical trends, traditions, and schools were formed. These searches demand original texts re-reading and translation to overcome the age-old human nature instability problem.

Philosophical text understanding features

The attention to the philosophical text understanding is different in certain points' emphasis depending on the translator's view and target language though the original text meaning remains unchanged. Though the original meaning was embedded in the original text, which remains unchanged, this forces our contemporaries to return to the study of primary sources in an attempt to find truth through understanding.

Understanding according to N. Chepeleva's *The Text and a Reader*

…is the meanings assimilation and generation process, which main characteristics are the source message meaning (concept) restoration and the synthesis of new meaning as a result of interaction, the collision of meaning embedded in the text by its author and the subject's semantic field perceiving the message. (Chepeleva, 2015, p. 53)

Thus, the translator needs to make the text clear for the reader "on two levels: structural (meaningful), the main characteristic of which is the author embedded meaning restoration, and semantic, which can be considered as a process of the source text content transformation into another sign-semantic system, i.e. its rethinking by the recipient" (Chepeleva, 2015, p. 53).

The main understanding characteristic at the first level is based "on M. Zhinkin idea defining meaning as an informational formation that does not contain words, but can be deployed in a number of synonymous texts" (Chepeleva, 2015, p. 53), the process of reproducing the text meaning. This is one of the keys for philosophical texts translation because it is the initial and final stage of the information folding process in one language and its unfolding in another. In other words, the translation process depends on a deep original text understanding occurring in the case of 'folding' 'correct' information for further expression in the reader's language allowing him to 'translate' this text into his own internal language of meaning.

M. Zhinkin (1982) explains this by the subject-schematic code formation allowing text content to be captured in the form of a generalized semantic scheme. Thus, the philosophers' pre-translation task is to understand the meaningful text level by its folding and compression. As a result, the original message semantic structure is reproduced, which is key to further qualitative translation. It is due to cognitive comprehension operations, first of all, structuring and restructuring of textual information, its compression and semantic weighing that the author decoding takes place allowing the translator to further restore the meaning.

This process is especially important for the translation of the philosophical texts because it has a potential set of meanings, which, in turn, due to the contextual richness of the original message, i.e. the presence of a large number of semantic layers, each of which sends the recipient to the appropriate context, creating the *language game* effect. The philosopher's task is to find those 'semantic keys' ('codes') allowing him to reproduce the text concept. We insist that this process should be carried out by a specialist or a group of specialists in a particular philosophical field in order to increase the author and the primary recipient contextual systems coincidence to avoid described by H. Gadamer "throwing meaning on the text" possibly leading to seeing in the

message some content that is missing in the text. In the case of only a partial author and philosopher (translator) contextual systems coincidence, the latter builds his own 'counter text' based on the original message semantics and complements it with his own understanding (Kolesnykova & Matveyeva, 2019). In such a case we are talking about the understanding manifested in the clash of the author and philosopher (translator) meanings. As a result, the original text is not translated but an independent work appears continuing one of the mental paths laid in the original work meaning.

In order to verify the decoding process and further understanding, text restructuring must be done. That ensures a work meanings hierarchy establishment helping to properly build the internal (semantic) translated text structure. In this way, we will ensure the correctness of future translation in advance, because the restructuring of textual information will not only understand the original text as a whole, but also

> …highlight its main idea, determine the essential, establish semantic connections between individual elements of the work. Failure to restructure the text leads to misunderstanding. This is primarily due to the fact that the individual semantic blocks of the work often contain information that is different from what they would carry, being included in another context. Restructuring, thus, makes it possible to understand the text in its entirety, highlighting its main content. (Chepeleva, 2015, p. 56)

A. Leonov's (2015) *David Chalmers' "Zombie Argument": Translator's Foreword* is an example of a pre-translation stage in which the author argues the selection of Ukrainian equivalents to English lexical units with numerous references to Chalmers' own publications and his researchers in order to find common ground in each of the reader's languages. Thus, translations of both individual words and whole sentences are offered for contextual completeness. The author also refers to the other philosophers' translation experiences giving him confidence in the relevance of their interpretations.

> In this introductory article, I will discuss some of the problematic aspects of the key terms translation – this, in my opinion, should somewhat facilitate the translated text understanding and perception. The analyzed concepts are placed here not in the chronological order in which they appear in the translated text, but in the order that reproduces the general logic of their use. (Leonov, 2015, p. 51)

In our opinion, such articles aim to find word combinations in the target language confirming the text identity for the reader.

The new type of sensitivity in target text creation

After completing all the decoding stages and creating a 'key' guaranteeing the target text content meaning preservation, one can proceed to its reproduction in the reader's language. This happens by the primary text content unfolding in another language. At this stage, the main indicator is the understanding control. Text structuring in the target language happens on the conditions necessary to preserve its meaning as a whole, its main idea. The preference for one or another way of formulating a new text is given on the basis of the main unifying principle of meaning explication. This enriches a professional translation with such blocks as *From the Translator, Glossary*, or *References* and gives the reader an opportunity to see the relevance and validity of such translation.

Speaking of adapted text for wider reading on the basis of such a translation, the presence of such sections separately from the translated text could help to better adapt it to the needs and requests of individual readers, thereby simplifying its perception and understanding.

Such sections contribute to more accurate text adaptation to individual reader needs and demands by its simplification. The ability to foresee such questions and separate possible answers into another block helps to maintain control over the original text meaning preservation, establish semantic connections between work individual elements, fix text's main semantic nodes and predict the further way its content formatting. They are aimed at optimizing the unfolding text meaning process.

In the adapted text, the author's explanatory comments allow to activate the reader's cognitive sphere and arouse his attention and cognitive interest in a specific issue, which contributes to more successful discipline mastery.

Implementing the target philosophical text content formatting the translator should be aware that the leading understanding mechanism is the dialogue between the author and the reader thanks to his (the translator's) competent mediation. It is defined as a communicative process of real or supposed partners, during which "not only an information exchange happens, but the identification of semantic positions points of view, value orientations and partners' personal meanings. The result of such a dialogue is a new meaning synthesis arising as an interaction result, the interlocutors' semantic positions collision" (Chepeleva, 2015, pp. 57-58).

Thus working on a foreign language philosophical text the translator reproduces the semantic original message structure and presupposes a number of possible dialogical reactions to it, caused by the points of view mismatch, the author and the future reader's semantic positions clash. Among the possible reactions, M. Bakhtin singles out the dialogical reaction, which, in our opinion, can also be considered the greatest deviation source from the primary text content affecting the meaning preservation quality.

Psychologists, in particular N. Chepeleva (2015, p. 58), distinguish among the factors causing reader's and translator's dialogical reactions:

• everyday ideas and inherent in the text theoretical knowledge collision. A solution should be in a pre-translation work with the text by philosophers-specialists;

• the difference between the reader/philosopher's personal experience and the information contained in the text. It is to avoid individual decoding of the author's foreign language text we propose to involve the experience of a wider professional community, aware of the author works;

• discrepancy in the assessments of the author and the reader/philosopher of certain provisions, events, and persons. It is the text's relevance and priority determination in a particular country due to historical, cultural, or other circumstances. Actually, this criterion should form an initial request;

• different author and the reader/philosopher and/or translator's theoretical background (belonging to different scientific schools). At the stage of decoding the author, it is important to use the actual, generally accepted in the target language country philosophical terminology. In Ukraine, the implementation of this task is facilitated by the use of the *European Dictionary of Philosophy*, designed not only to help qualitatively and accurately choose the Ukrainian equivalent of a certain term but also to provide additional information helping in navigating the topic and trend understanding;

• the discrepancy between the emotional attitude of the author and the reader/philosopher to certain events, facts, persons, or opinions in the original text may interfere with an actual assessment of the text's importance for the development of a certain philosophical community and may form an attitude towards a particular text or the entire author's heritage as such that shouldn't be translated;

• not justifying the expectations, hypotheses, or guesses of the reader/philosophical society regarding the further work content. Sometimes researchers are encouraged to work with the source text by the work through already existing translations using intermediary language or machine translations. While working with the source, the erroneousness of the first impression may become clear and the decision of further studying this text in order to translate it can be agreed;

• the difference between the author and the reader/philosopher's goals. In our opinion, this factor should be taken into account at the stage of a full-fledged source reading and may remain relevant under the condition of a fragmentary contextless translation of a certain widespread author's quote, which, without full context, can be interpreted in favor of various, sometimes contradictory theories.

As a completed translation of the original into Ukrainian, consider Plato's (2018) *Feast* translated by Uliana Holovach, published in 2018. The book is a new interpretation of one of the thinker's key works, carried out as a result of translation from ancient Greek according to the publication of Harvard University in 1925 (Plato, 2018). "The translation and commentary were made thanks to the Science Support Foundation (Kasa im. Josefa Mianowskiego) and the International Center for Plato Research of the International Academy of Philosophy in Liechtenstein" (Plato, 2018), which speaks of the international philosophical community involvement in the fundamental study of the author's creative heritage and contributes to the formation of a leading method of interpreting and translating the work meaning. We also find the recommended readership: *"For philosophers, ancient philologists, literary scholars, theologians and everyone who is interested in the history of European philosophical thought"* (Plato, 2018), which provides a high scientific and professional level translation appropriate for readings by specialists in the field of philosophy, linguistics, literary criticism, theology and a wide range of readers interested in the history of philosophy.

Analyzing the publication structure, we note the *Introduction to Reading Plato's Feast* by Giovanni Reale, whose purpose is to prepare the reader to perceive the thinker's text and is designed to tune in to perceive and comprehend not only the work content but, first of all, its meaning. The researcher, starting with consideration of hermeneutic nature issues, reveals the essence

of Plato's work step by step, giving the reader a key to the so-called symbolic author's code of the primary source, which in advance helps to reduce the number of potential interpretations of meaning through contextual combinations of lexical units.

The text of the *Feast* itself is presented in a bilingual format, which allows you to access the original text and, if you know Old Greek, at any time 'contact' the author directly with your reader's or purely professional request. Also in the Ukrainian text, we find the link *Comments on reading Plato's Feast* posted in a separate block and are fully designed for the Ukrainian-speaking reader, who, if necessary, could refer to the section for a detailed philosophical and translation commentary or deepen his own knowledge on the issue. Further, we find a bibliographic index allowing us to independently refer to the primary sources of world researchers who influenced the creation of such ancient Greek text interpretation with subsequent direct translation into Ukrainian.

The researcher also created a subject index using a modern Ukrainian-language philosophical conceptual base with a link to the translation text. It is also supplemented with indexes of names and titles and sources and citations, a list of abbreviations is presented separately. Such applications are valuable for a wide range of scientists, researchers, and readers allowing maximizing the translated text potential to meet the reader's needs, while it remains possible to independently read the text of the *Feast* without the translator's intervention in the interlinear space of the Platonic text.

In our opinion, this approach to translation clearly demonstrates the strategy of "philosophy of translation" and allows determining the hermeneutic adaptation approach methodology for adapting the original source for its translation into the recipient's language taking into account the anthropological trend.

"Philosophy of translation" as an anthropocentric view of the text guarantor

In our publication *Problematic Field of "Philosophy of Translation"* we proposed the following definition of the concept of *"'Philosophy of translation' as a philosophical methodology of primary sources meanings creative adaptation to the semantic field of actualized requests against the primary content cumulative space background"* (Kovtun & Shabanova, 2020, p. 56).

In our opinion, in this article we have presented in detail possible source philosophical text adaptation methodology during its translation, relying on the research results in the field of philosophy, anthropology, psychology, and modern translation studies. Summarizing the entire described process of working on the text, we propose the following step-by-step scheme for philosophical text translation: 1. Research group formation consisting of philosophers who are experts in the work of a particular author (possibly at an international level); 2. Study of the psychological features of the author's mental realization whose work is being translated; 3. Works translation priority determination according to the philosophical society request; 4. Study of available texts of translations and comparative analysis of their specifics in order to identify hermeneutic variability and phenomenological reconstructions of the original text; 5. Determining the worldview request of the philosophical community for the actual translation of the original text; 6. Determining the range of potential readers and features of anthropological demand; 7. Carrying out meaning 'decoding' of the work by agreeing within the philosophical community of the lexical items' contextual meanings that can significantly affect the understanding of the text content; 8. In case of impossibility to translate independently, appeal to translators who are competent in philosophical issues; 9. Implementing the control use of the translated work in the text in

order to verify the preservation of meaning; 10. Creating a list of possible questions and grounds for reviewing the relevance of such a translation of the work and, based on them, creating philosophical comments in accordance with the recipients' anthropological requests; 11. Clarify the appropriateness of a more adapted text for the non-professional philosophical community and the implementation of such texts on the basis of professional translation, taking into account the needs of a particular category of readers, indicating that the text is not a direct translation of the work.

It should be noted that adherence to such an algorithm does not guarantee the need for further primary sources clarifications; however, the wide involvement of representatives both on the part of research philosophers and the part of competent translators within the same cultural and linguistic space increases the likelihood of consolidating efforts and improving the general quality. This should benefit the Ukrainian philosophical thought development and the Ukrainian philosophy identity formation within its own linguistic space marked by the presence of the historical and philosophical classical creative heritage in a language clear for the majority of interested readers.

Originality

The author substantiated the source philosophical text adaptation methodology to the actual request and the recipient's linguistic space, and presented a generalized step-by-step philosophical text translation scheme, taking into account the key anthropological doctrine ideas, arising from the hermeneutic circle and phenomenological intentions helpful for the problem of preserving the author's meaning reproduced in a convenient for the reader language.

Conclusions

The process of translating a foreign language philosophical text is extremely complex and multifaceted. It is impossible without the involvement of the human ability to understand and realize the meanings. Today, the process of creating our own Ukrainian fund for translating classical and modern philosophical texts is under formation adding to its actualization and relevance in the light of the desire to master the Ukrainian-language cultural and historical heritage. The *philosophy of translation* anthropological dimension allows not only to consider the translation process by all its participants (author/philosopher-reader-researcher/translator-reader-philosopher/reader) but also to describe the methodology of such translation, focusing on the main features of content construction philosophical text – highlighting the course of the author's reasoning, which generates new knowledge and should encourage further philosophical reflections. The philosophical text translation presupposes a number of possible dialogical reactions caused by the author and the future reader's semantic positions collision. The proposed methodology is aimed at overcoming the problem of preserving meaning when transferring the primary text content into a new linguistic, historical-philosophical, anthropological, cultural, social, and other contexts leveling participants' personal factors influence the final text. Primary source understanding and presenting it in the reader's native language promotes better information assimilation and allows its further transformation, expanding the semantic limits of philosophical multidimensionality.

Considering the fact that philosophy has long included language, text message interpretation, and ambiguity in the range of its interests, interlanguage translation is a relatively new field. It is

only forming its principles and expecting philosophical heritage preservation in an extremely fast-paced multicultural world in which the concept of man is decisive and as a derivative of the meanings exchange at the level of multilingual space increasingly requires the involvement of anthropological algorithm of the "philosophy of translation".

Considering the fact that philosophy has already included language, text message interpretation, and its ambiguity to its interests, interlingual translation aims to preserve the invaluable treasure of philosophical heritage in an extremely complex multicultural world seeking to translate meanings through the defining concept.

REFERENCES

Cassin, B., Sihov, K., & Vasylchenko, A. (Eds.). (2011a). *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles* (2nd ed., Vol. 1). Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (in Ukrainian)

Cassin, B., Sihov, K., & Vasylchenko, A. (Eds.). (2011b). *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles* (Vol. 2). Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (in Ukrainian)

Cassin, B., Sihov, K., & Vasylchenko, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles* (Vol. 3). Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (in Ukrainian)

Cassin, B., Sihov, K., & Vasylchenko, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles* (Vol. 4). Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (in Ukrainian)

Chepeleva, N. V. (2015). *Tekst i chytach: Posibnyk*. Zhytomyr: Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University. (in Ukrainian)

Derrida, J. (1985). *The Ear of the Other* (P. Kamuf, Trans.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (in English)

Dizdar, D. (2011). Deconstruction. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 31-36). John Benjamins Publishing Company. (in English)

Gadamer, H.-G. (1991). *Aktualnost prekrasnogo*. Moscow: Iskusstvo. (in Russian)

Husserl, E. (2009). *Dosvid i sudzhennia. Doslidzhennia henealohii lohiky* (V. Kebuladze, Trans.). Kyiv: PPS-2002. (in Ukrainian)

Khoma, O. (Ed.). (2014). *"Medytatsii" Dekarta u dzerkali suchasnykh tlumachen: Jean-Marie Beyssade, Jean-Luc Marion, Kim Sang Ong-Van-Cung*. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (in Ukrainian)

Kolesnykova, T., & Matveyeva, O. (2019). An Analysis of Digital Library Publishing Services in Ukrainian Universities. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice, 14*(4), 52-71. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip29510 (in English)

Kovtun, L., & Shabanova, Y. (2020). Problematic field of "philosophy of translation". *Epistemological Studies in Philosophy, Social and Political Sciences, 3*(1), 51-61. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15421/342006 (in Ukrainian)

Lederer, M. (2010). Interpretive approach. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 173-179). John Benjamins Publishing Company. (in English)

Leonov, A. (2015). "Argument Zombi" Devida Chalmersa: Perednie slovo perekladacha. *Philosophical Thought*, (5), 51-59. (in Ukrainian)

Naudé, J. A. (2010). Religious translation. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 285-293). John Benjamins Publishing Company. (in English)

Patton, M. F. (n.d.). *The Cartoon Introduction to Philosophy: Editions*. Goodreads. Retrieved from https://www.goodreads.com/work/editions/41612348-the-cartoon-introduction-to-philosophy

Patton, M. F., & Cannon, K. (2015). *The Cartoon Introduction to Philosophy*. Hill and Wang. (in English)

Patton, M., & Cannon, K. (2019). *Filosofiia* (O. Nehrebetskyi, Trans.). Kyiv: Ridna mova. (in Ukrainian)

Plato. (2018). *Benket* (U. Holovach, Trans., 2nd ed.). Lviv: Ukrainian Catholic University. (in Ukrainian)

Porus, V. N. (2016). What Does It Mean to "Understand" a Literary Text? *Voprosy Filosofii,* (7), 84-96. (in Russian)

Shaev, Y. M. (2012). *Tekst kak germenevticheskiy fenomen*. Retrieved from https://pgu.ru/editions/un_reading/detail.php?SECTION_ID=2987&ELEMENT_ID=13329 (in Russian)

Stolze, R. (2010). Hermeneutics and translation. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 141-146). John Benjamins Publishing Company. (in English)

Zhinkin, N. I. (1982). *Rech kak provodnik informatsii*. Moscow: Nauka. (in Russian)

TOPICAL ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

Європейський словник філософій: Лексикон неперекладностей / упоряд. Б. Кассен, К. Сігов, А. Васильченко. Вид. 2-ге. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2011. Т. 1. 576 с.

Європейський словник філософій: Лексикон неперекладностей / упоряд. Б. Кассен, К. Сігов, А. Васильченко. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2011. Т. 2. 488 с.

Європейський словник філософій: Лексикон неперекладностей / упоряд. Б. Кассен, К. Сігов, А. Васильченко. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2013. Т. 3. 328 с.

Європейський словник філософій: Лексикон неперекладностей / упоряд. Б. Кассен, К. Сігов, А. Васильченко. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2016. Т. 4. 440 с.

Чепелєва Н. В. *Текст і читач* : посібник. Житомир : Вид-во ЖДУ ім. І. Франка, 2015. 124 с.

Derrida J. *The Ear of the Other* / trans. by P. Kamuf. Lincoln : University of Nebraska Press, 1985. 164 p.

Dizdar D. Deconstruction. *Handbook of Translation Studies* / ed. by Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011. Vol. 2. P. 31–36.

Гадамер Г.-Г. *Актуальность прекрасного* / пер. с нем. Москва : Искусство, 1991. 367 с.

Гусерль Е. *Досвід і судження. Дослідження генеалогії логіки* / пер. з нім. В. Кебуладзе. Київ : ППС-2002, 2009. 356 с.

"Медитації" Декарта у дзеркалі сучасних тлумачень: Жан-Марі Бейсад, Жан-Люк Марйон, Кім Сан Он-Ван-Кун / уклад. О. Хома. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2014. 368 с.

Kolesnykova T., Matveyeva O. An Analysis of Digital Library Publishing Services in Ukrainian Universities. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*. 2019. Vol. 14, No. 4. P. 52–71. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip29510

Ковтун Л., Шабанова Ю. Проблемне поле "філософії перекладу". *Епістемологічні дослідження в філософії, соціальних і політичних науках*. 2020. Т. 3, № 1. С. 51–61. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15421/342006

Lederer M. Interpretive approach. *Handbook of Translation Studies* / ed. by Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010. Vol. 1. P. 173–179.

Леонов А. "Аргумент Зомбі" Девіда Чалмерса: Переднє слово перекладача. *Філософська думка*. 2015. № 5. С. 51–59.

Naudé J. A. Religious translation. *Handbook of Translation Studies* / ed. by Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010. Vol. 1. P. 285–293.

Patton M. F. The Cartoon Introduction to Philosophy: Editions. *Goodreads*. URL: https://www.goodreads.com/work/editions/41612348-the-cartoon-introduction-to-philosophy

Patton M. F., Cannon K. *The Cartoon Introduction to Philosophy*. Hill and Wang, 2015. 176 p.

Паттон М., Кеннон К. *Філософія* / пер. з англ. О. Негребецький. Київ : Рідна мова, 2019. 176 с.

Платон. *Бенкет* / пер. У. Головач. Вид. 2-ге, випр. Львів : Видавництво Українського католицького університету, 2018. lii, 220 с.

Порус В. Н. Что значит "понять" художественный текст? *Вопросы философии*. 2016. № 7. С. 84–96.

Шаев Ю. М. *Текст как герменевтический феномен*. 2012. URL: https://pgu.ru/editions/un_reading/detail.php?SECTION_ID=2987&ELEMENT_ID=13329

Stolze R. Hermeneutics and translation. *Handbook of Translation Studies* / ed. by Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010. Vol. 1. P. 141–146.

Жинкин Н. И. *Речь как проводник информации*. Москва : Наука, 1982. 160 с.

Л. В. КОВТУН[1*], Ю. О. ШАБАНОВА[2*]

[1*]Національний технічний університет "Дніпровська політехніка" (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта fs.libri@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-8116-0687

[2*]Національний технічний університет "Дніпровська політехніка" (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта jshabanova@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-5876-4140

TOPICAL ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Антропологічність "філософії перекладу" у сучасному українському філософському просторі

Мета. Дослідження спрямовано на окреслення методології "філософії перекладу" як інструменту для здійснення перекладів першоджерельних філософських творів із точки зору учасників створення як об'єкту філософської антропології, що передбачає послідовне розв'язання таких задач: а) з'ясування ролі індивідуальності автора як творця первинного тексту, який виступає об'єктом сприйняття та розуміння реципієнтами; б) дослідження потенціалу людської психіки як модусу смислового контенту первинного тексту перекладачем та здійснення перекладу задля запобігання його викривлення; в) визначення вимоги до процесу перекладу як засобу антропологічного наближення до розуміння автора засобами усунення мовного бар'єру. **Теоретичний базис.** Автори виходять із практичної відсутності однозначного визначення поняття "філософії перекладу" в сучасному філософсько-антропологічному просторі, враховуючи сукупності чинників, які впливають на якість новостворюваного тексту через особливості функціонування всіх учасників процесу на кожному етапі роботи з текстом. На сьогодні "філософія перекладу" є широко використовуваним словосполученням, проте без урахування особливостей людини, яка є творцем єдиного сенсу досліджуваного поняття. Описані в статті положення ґрунтуються на дослідженнях в галузі філософії, перекладознавства, психології з акцентом на положення класичної та некласичної антропології (Гадамер, Хома, Головач, Чепелєва, Діздар, Леонов, Лотман, Бахтін та інші). **Наукова новизна.** Запропоновано методологію адаптації першоджерельного філософського тексту та представлено узагальнену покрокову схему здійснення перекладу філософського тексту, що сприяє вирішенню проблеми впливу особистості дослідника та/або перекладача на збереження індивідуального авторського сенсу під час його відтворення зручною для читача мовою. **Висновки.** Погляд на "філософію перекладу" з точки зору філософської антропології дозволяє не лише розглянути процес здійснення перекладу з боку індивідуальних особливостей всіх учасників цього процесу (автор / філософ-читач-дослідник / перекладач-читач-філософ / читач), а й описати методологію здійснення такого перекладу, концентруючись на головній особливості побудови змісту філософського тексту – висвітленні ходу міркування автора, спонукаючи до подальшої філософської рефлексії в рамках проблеми нестійкості людської природи. Переклад філософського тексту не лише відтворює смислову структуру вихідного повідомлення, а й передбачає цілу низку можливих діалогічних реакцій на нього, як об'єкту феноменології людини. Запропонована концепція враховує потреби будь-якого можливого читача, повністю зберігаючи авторську позицію.

Ключові слова: філософія перекладу; особистість; ідентичність; розуміння; невичерпність психіки; сенс; людська природа; герменевтичне коло