УДК 81'255.4:82-98

V. Ye. Spitsyna, PhD student
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

PHYLOSOPHICAL SYMBOL IN HANNAH ARENDT'S WORKS: TRANSLATION PARTICULARITIES

The article is devoted to the problem of symbols translation in the philosophical discourse, their characteristics and the links between linguistic and extra linguistic context, the interdependence between the author's aim and the choice of translation strategies. Philosophical discourse is viewed as a phenomenon of communication, which has a complex linguistic structure and reflects the peculiarities of the nation's way of thinking and perceiving reality.

Key words: *translation, philosophical text, text interpretation, philosophical symbol.*

The philosophical way of perception is synthetic, as it flexibly combines the features of the "theory (the desire to delve into the essence of the subject, and its universal characteristics) and features the spiritual and the practical level (turning to the subject of the expression, focusing on the key values and goals as well as emotions)" [Zolotukhina 1988, 118]. The synthetic nature of philosophy links it on one hand, to science, and on the other hand to art, and the philosophy of language generates syncretism – a specific coexistence of rational, conceptual and figurative art and discursive strategies.

The syncretism of philosophical discourse creates difficulties in its definition. Thus, it is a new one-way direction, which identifies philosophy with either science or art, as it enshrines the antinomy "scientism / antiscientism". Such an approach requires the philosophy to aim solely on natural and logical-mathematical knowledge, appealing to the rationality of philosophical discourse, identifying philosophical symbols with scientific concepts. The convergence of philosophy and art asserts the fundamental role of creator in philosophy emphasizing imagery and poetic philosophical concepts [Kolesnikov 2000, 27], their personal origin and the solution of common problems. Such an idea is supported by the example from Hannah Arendt's books "*Eichmann in Jerusalem. Report on Banality*

of Evil" that was translated as *"Банальність зла. Суд над Айхманом в Єрусалимі"* and *"Men in Dark Times"* as *"Люди в темні часи"*. In both languages the phrases that were translated quite literally became philosophical symbols and the topics for comprehension.

While recognizing the autonomy of philosophy as a special form of spiritual culture, we are able to identify its own principles in the reflection of reality, the general principle of construction, and some methods of notion and sense formation that require a special language.

The selection of rationally of the conceptual and figurative art and discursive strategies presupposes the revelation of solely the surface of philosophical discourse. Therefore, the controversy in defining philosophy and the strategies of linguistic syncretism may be removed by the symbol as a basic unit of philosophical discourse. The combination of figurative, metaphoric, formal and logical tendencies comprises a special type of philosophical symbolism.

Philosophy is fundamentally verbal. Language and philosophy come into close relationships overlap: philosophy is possible only when expressed in the word. "The inabilities of a philosopher to deliver his/her own thoughts – claims Jaspers – are a criterion of the untruth of his thinking." The philosophical sense exists only in the language. The language of philosophy is not a separate form, which is expressed by some external sense as to the content of its philosophical thought, namely the appearance of philosophical idea. Therefore this study views the discourse as the unity of the external and internal, and the language as the means to express special mentality. It is important that the category of discourse "includes the concept of consciousness" [Temnova 2004, 24]. The mental world of philosophy activates some features of language, especially grammar and lexicon, special rules for syntax and its usage. Philosophical discourse is truly "an alternative world in the field of language" [Stepanov 1995, 34–35].

The language of philosophy contains occasional nomination (transcendental subject, thing in itself); the usage of the specific methods of derivation (lexical and syntactic: volition-of-itself); international terminology (idea, determinism, substance, positivism); nonstandard expression, qualified not as erroneous, but as close to

the thought (freedom of existence, nothing insignificant); convergence of contrast in the semantic lexemes (identical in distinction); the usage of semantic repetition, which creates the impression of tautology. The complex syntactic constructions in philosophical text are due to the efforts of adequate translation. However, deployed syntax is not a constant feature of philosophical discourse. System-language tools depend on the linguistic personality of a philosopher, and the cognitive semantics of his/her discourse.

The existential and sense symbolism is the most important factor in the philosophical discourse semantics. Philosophical discourse as a special kind of deep communication derives all of its features. Philosophical discourse does not describe the objective reality of the world, as it is rooted in the spiritual depth of the philosopher's personality; it is based on character's archetype and metaphysical level. Learning to translate the language of philosophy requires identifying links of philosophical words with the meaningful philosophy of objectivity, and its relations with the subject of philosophy. We shall expand cognitive features of philosophical discourse:

- Transcendence. Philosophy is the search for answers to the eternal problem of human existence: the fundamental principle of the possibility of reaching the truth in their knowledge, the essence of goodness, beauty and justice, the origin and destiny of man. Issues of this nature are qualified as philosophical or metaphysical. The subject of philosophy is over empirical, as it achieves the transcendence in the world comprehension. Due to this is the fact the philosophical language is often defined as bizarre, artificial, and intangible and. The abnormal usage, that is impossible to perceive, is conceptualized as the "strangeness" of philosopher's speech [Tuzova 2001, 119]. Such language deviations are the evidence of specific cognitive procedures underlying philosophical discourse. The requirement of the estrangement from the common habits of understanding, which are conceived by everyday language, is a condition of initiation to philosophical discourse. Leaving the world of things, the philosopher leaves the empirical linguistic meaning behind; operating with only philosophical sense: *Those who are on the lookout for representatives of an era, for mouthpieces of the*

Zeitgeist, for exponents of History (spelled with a capital H) will look here in vain[Arendt 1968, 8]. – *Хто шукає представників епохи, рупорів Zeitgeist, виразників історії з великої літери, тут їх не знайде* (переклад – В.І. Менжулін). The correct choice of the metaphor translation will stay in the language for many generations to come and may be introduced to the language as a separate concept. The misplaced literal translation, however, will fail to convey the idea and will exist only in that particular context.

The transcendence of philosophical discourse leads to a high degree of representation in the symbolic language, which refers not to the objects of the external world but to the internal world of the individual states. Yu. Stepanov defines the semantic law of "text depth" that exactly reflects the specificity of the symbolic language of philosophical discourse: the more diffusive, elusive, ambiguous and vague the wording is – the deeper is the text, the stronger is the tension between language and thought [Stepanov 1995, 38]. The depth of philosophical text is an absolute, transcendent reality as the thought is not covered by the semantics of natural language, designed primarily for pragmatic orientation in the physical world.

Philosophical discourse provokes deep semantic processes in the word in order to acquire wide significance. Consequently, the philosophical categories have symbolic potential: they are able to induce one another, be defined through one another, and form a closed integrated system (time determined through space, life in death) creating polar symbolic opposition.

Detonates may occur in the texts of different content and transmit its meaning in any language works, because they belong to the "proper" language, whereas a symbolic word expresses the content in a contextual field and loses significance out of it. This explains the problem of lexicographical interpretation of words such as conscience, freedom, goodness and time. The higher the degree of the symbolic words, the more space it covers and the more questions can be raised as for its meaning. The words of general semantics and word-substitutes are widely used in the philosophy [Rozina 2004, 65]. Philosophical text is constructed in such a way that language means that are higher than themselves in all aspects acquire symbolic

meaning. The semantics of transcendence, that requires existential sense references, is a fundamental feature of philosophical discourse.

➢ Existentialism. Metaphysical generalization belongs to a particular individual nature which determines the perception of the world and the nature of metaphysics. Philosophizing has existential roots. The solution is the meaning of being, that lies in the depths of human subjectivity. Existential philosophy means taking into consideration such a reality that cannot be the subject of empirical research: mind, love, freedom, immortality, God and even matter. Philosophical discourse has no property reference to the subject-empirical reality but it refers to the spiritual world of man: *There is no escape, according to Heidegger, from the "incomprehensible triviality" of this common everyday world except by withdrawal from it into that solitude which philosophers since Pannenides and Plato have opposed to the political realm… Das Licht der Offentlichkeit verdunkelt alles ("The light of the public obscures everything")* [Arendt 1968, 9] – *Згідно з Гайдеггером, з "неусвідомлюваної вульгарності" спільного повсякдення немає іншого виходу, крім занурення в те усамітнення, котре філософи, починаючи з Парменіда й Платонаб протиставляли політичній сфері… ("Світло публічності все затьмарює")* (переклад – Н. Рогачевська). – *Згідно з Хайдеггером, з "неосяжної хтивості" спільного повсякденного світу немає виходу, окрім уходу в ту самоту, яку філософиб починаючи з Парменіда та Платона, протиставляли політичній сфері* (переклад – В.І. Менжулін). The reader's interpretation vastly depends on the translator's vision of the original text and the meaning that is implied. The way of translation and the equivalent that the translator chooses will determine the perception of the target readership.

Philosophy cannot be impersonal, that is, non-subjective. Personal philosophy, as noted by Berdyaev, can be seen in the range of problems, in the choice of philosophy type, in the amount of spiritual experience [Berdiaev 2006, 40–41]. The world as a whole, is not given, but only imagined as "the construction of reality in general is largely a matter of personal creativity" [Iershov 1990, 103]. Where one thinker sees movement and change, the other contemplates only silent peace. For one world – is the eternal

harmony of ideas; another feels a volcanic chaotic will to live. Philosophy always bears the signature [Delez 2008, 17]. The philosophical dictum is built in the first person and is not anonymous. Thoughts are not born, distributed, sorted and folded; they boil at the very beginning of the spiritual life of the philosopher.

➢ Versatility. The fundamental principle in building cognitive philosophical discourse is the law of integrity and universalism. The world that the individual perceives is not sufficient, forcing him to philosophize, that appeal to their integrity. Philosophical thought, breaking away from a potentially infinite series of observations covering the whole world. Any discourse can be embedded in philosophical one, philosophers "should build their structure so that no one, even an unknown discourse could fall out of its structure" [Gutner 2009, 260].Therefore even the literal conveyance of some of the new ideas and concepts will be adequately perceived by the target readers, who will comprehend the same idea as the original readers have done: *That humaneness should be sober and cool rather than sentimental; that humanity is exemplified not in fraternity but in friendship; that friendship is not intimately personal but makes political demands and preserves reference to the world* [Arendt 1968, 25]. – *Що гуманність має бути тверезою і холодною, а не сентиментальною, що людяність виявляється не в братерстві, а в дружбі; що дружба не інтимно особистісна, а висуває політичні вимоги і лишається зв'язком зі світом* (переклад – Н. Рогачевська). Here in both languages the concept *friendship* refers to the subjectivity of the philosophic comprehension.

Philosophers are building concept by which these situations and these relationships can be widely represented, and then think beyond the borders [Lotman 1996, 135]. The radicalization of the subject of philosophy creates language absolutes. The compression of cultural information is considered as the basic cognitive philosophical discourse.

The philosophical statement can be attributed to the statements of universal type, to distinguish it from the same specific expression. Universal expressions have a special place in a language and perform certain functions in it: cumulative, evaluative, comment, classifying, didactic, persuasive and others. The philosophical expression tends to become the aphoristic form. The high cognitive value and

effectiveness of pragmatic philosophy is emphasized by L. Sinelnikova [Sinelnikova 2004, 9, 12].

One of the rules of philosophical expression creation is generalization. The emphasis on the ability of word generalization strengthens its symbolic potential. It is difficult to enter the philosophical discourse without the removal of any limits of the word meaning. Philosophical symbol is such a generalization, which acts as a law that creates an infinite number of details that is the principle of dynamic beginning of everything. Symbol to a maximum degree satisfies the need for philosophical universalization. "The very structure of a symbol is intended to sink every single thing in the element of the beginning of life and to give a complete image of the world" [Averintsev 1972, 827]. The cognitive role of a philosophical symbol is defined by its ability to produce the most global categorical generalization in the world as a whole and to deal with the limited grounds for the human mind.

➢ Autonomy. Philosophy requires the formation of a problem that is not based on the usual vision and understanding and does not attach any significance of what is already known. The methodological principle of autonomy means that the philosophers refuse to rely on anything that precedes the same philosophy, which they are trying to build. In the translation it is as important to covey the preliminary idea as well as the new one. However, if in case of a new philosophical idea we may find some new equivalents, the old and conventional concepts must be conveyed the same way as they were before: *Jaspers needed the great philosophers. And he has splendidly repaid them for their help, so to speak, by establishing with them a "realm of the spirit" in which they once more appear as speaking persons-speaking from the realm of the shades… who because they have escaped from temporal limitations can become everlasting companions in the things of the mind* [Arendt 1968, 79]. *– Ясперс відчував потребу у великих філософах. И він щедро відплатив їм за допомогу, заснувавши разом з ними "царство духу", в якому вони знов виступають як особи, що говорять – говорять із царства тіней, – та, відійшовши від часових обмежень,* (переклад – В.І. Менжулін).

In the language of philosophy the law of autonomy manifests itself as auto semantics. The word in philosophical discourse is endowed not with the ordinary meaning through the context of philosophical discourse; therefore it has the only sense that was intended by a philosopher. A. Barabashev agrees that "the sense of philosophical concepts as compared to content concepts used in all other areas of knowledge is completely tied to the context of concepts" [Barabashev 2001]. The philosophical word is deeply implanted in discursive structure so that it makes no sense outside this structure.

The philosophical text expresses what cannot be expressed directly, stated or shown. In a situation of "when and where direct reference is meaningless or impossible", that is philosophy, a symbol is not a choice, but a fundamental necessity [Kuznetsov 2001, 224]. V. Kuznetsov believes that philosophical arguments do not refer directly and indirectly to the extra-linguistic universe and are building complex relationship with the content.

➢ Symbolism. P. Yushkevich believed that philosophical concepts are the symbols that are full of "hints and promises of "being","existence", "coming into being" – and are not dry abstract terms of logic, they are – complicated characters, which, in addition to their direct meaning have special content deeply rooted inside" [Yushkevich 1921, 8].

S.Sycheva views philosophical symbol as a "very general concept or law that specifies the relation of the universal signs of nature and thought. Each word has a denotative and connotative meaning. Symbol is such a variety of characters that has no denotation, while remaining meaningful [Sycheva 2001, 13]. S. Katrechko believes that if one classifies the signs by the denotative degree, the symbols will represent metaphysical objects, as they occupy the extreme position because they have no physical (sensory) referent. However, unlike functional language fictions or empty characters (such as "round square") they have the maximum sense … Thus it is the philosophy of language symbols" [Katrechko 2010]. Philosophy is able to maintain universal coverage as it represents a special way of symbolization.

Overall, not all researchers recognize the peculiar nature of philosophical symbol. Often the concepts that form the logical and

rational thinking are considered to be the basic unit of philosophy. However, the concept nomination in the generation of philosophical discourse accompanies inevitable changes and details; the description of special properties of philosophical concepts as emotionally valuable components; blurred semantics and others. In other words, the concept is not an integrated, adequate universal form of philosophical knowledge. We can say that a concept of philosophy is part of the possible means, but it is not the principle of philosophy units' generation.

The world is constantly changing – there is new metaphysics and another set of categories or new overtones in semantics. Philosopher invents a new concept or re-interprets the one already known, invents new concept links, reveals what is hidden or provides new meanings to the concept. One example serves well-known philosophical concept of matter, spirit, substance, quality, goodness, beauty; and every philosophical system gets new interpretation. [Nikiforov 2001, 67, 68]. The philosophy of a particular author can be reduced to the register of keywords – the categories of his/her philosophy. Exploring specific philosophic symbols of the philosopher, the unique set of categories have to be dealt with.

Thus, the particularities of philosophical symbols are as follows:

- Philosophical symbol mediates between reality and the act of its semantic meaning, a subject-object interaction. The translated symbol has to be associated with the deep perspective of both the known and the to-be-known.
- Philosophical symbol mediates between the act of transcendence (laying of meaning) and the linguistic context.
- Philosophical symbol as a structural and semantic category is integral, synthetic and inexhaustible. The symbol needs to serve as a principle of infinite deployment of its semantic content. A single reference is antisymbolic.
- In contrast to the concept, a symbol in translation should not eliminate personal and individual components of meaning.
- Philosophical symbol expresses the sense, not the subject. The philosophical detachment is the detachment from facts and phenomena. No sign, no concept or other categories may overcome objectivity, but this is possible for a symbol. In a philosophical

symbol the semantic component dominates the imaginative, creating that special voltage which determines the specifics of philosophical symbol. Philosophical discourse appears as a special variant of the language (grammar and vocabulary) due to the cognitive specifics of a philosophical symbol.

The symbolic nature of philosophical discourse creates it unique philological hermeneutics – necessary for understanding the art of interpretation. The multiplicity of interpretations is a way of existence of a philosophical symbol. Reading philosophy is the act of transformation of the inner world. Understanding the philosophical discourse is the existential action, meaning accomplishments in which personal and unique. All philosophical discourse has "the quality performativity": it carries the "a call, a command, a request to go on in a specific cognitive or practical way" [Zolotukhina 2007, 49]. The performativity of philosophical discourse is also linked to the fact that the only reality of the philosophy, its expression is language.

Cognitive structures are only partially expressed explicitly and form implicature. We share methodological orientations O. Selivanova, who claims, that reading of the text is primarily a penetration in consciousness and conceptual system as linguistic identity of the author. The effectiveness depends on the penetration of pragmatic communicative strategies of the author, their realization in the text and the reader's conceptual system and compliance strategies [Selivanova 2006, 122]. Philosophers express themselves in philosophical language by contacting the inner language of symbols, facts of consciousness, and shifts in perspective interpersonal communication. Understanding the philosophical concept is primarily the cognitive reconstruction of the philosopher's spiritual code and the system of symbols.

REFERENCES

1. *Аверинцев С. С.* Символ / С. С. Аверинцев // Краткая литературная энциклопедия : в 9 т. / под ред. А. А. Суркова. – М. : Сов. энцикл., 1962 – 1978. Т. 7. – 1972.

2. *Барабашев А. Г.* Философия как схематизм образного мышления [Електронний ресурс] / А. Г. Барабашев. – Режим доступу: http://www.philosophy.ru/library/kn_book/01.html.

3. *Бердяев Н. А.* Я и мир объектов. Опыт философии одиночества и общения // Бердяев Н. А. Дух и реальность / Николай Бердяев; вступ. ст. и сост. В. Н. Калюжного. – М. : АСТ ; Харьков : Фолио, 2006. – 679 с. – С. 23–156.

4. *Гутнер Г. Б.* Предельность философского дискурса (Замечания по поводу сборника "Событие и смысл") / Григорий Гутнер // Событие и смысл (Синергетический опыт языка) / ИФ РАН ; ред. : Л. П. Киященко, П. Д. Тищенко. – М. : ИФ РАН, 2009. – 279 с. – С. 257–265.

5. *Делез Ж.* Что такое философия? / Ж. Делез, Ф. Гваттари; пер. с фр. и послесл. С. Н. Зенкина. – М. : Ин-т эксперим. социологии ; СПб. : Алетейя, 2008. – 288 с.

6. *Ершов М. Н.* Влияние личности философа на философское построение / М. Н. Ершов // На переломе. Философские дискуссии 20-х годов: Философия и мировоззрение / сост. П. В. Алексеев. – М. : Политиздат, 1990. – 528 с. – С. 103–106.

7. *Золотухина-Аболина Е. В.* Рациональное и ценностное (проблемы регуляции сознания) / Е. В. Золотухина-Аболина. – Ростов-н/Д. : Изд-во Ростов. ун-та, 1988. – 144 с.

8. *Золотухина-Аболина Е. В*. Философский текст: академичность или свобода? / Е. В. Золотухина-Аболина // Эпистемология и философия науки. – 2007. – № 1. – С. 49–54.

9. *Изотов А. И*. Современные подходы к изучению дискурса // Филология. – М.: МАКС Пресс, 2004. – Вып. 26. – С. 24–32.

10. *Катречко С. Л.* Символьный язык философии [Електронний ресурс] / С. Л. Катречко. – Режим доступу: http://www.philosophy.ru/library/ksl/katr_024.html

11. *Колесников А. С.* Философия и литература: современный дискурс /А. С. Колесников // История философии, культура и мировоззрение. Сборник к 60-летию проф. А. С. Колесникова. – СПб. : Санкт-Петерб. филос. о-во, 2000. – (Серия "Мыслители"). – Вып. 3. – С. 8–36.

12. *Кузнецов В. Ю.* Философия языка и непрямая референция / В. Ю. Кузнецов // Язык и культура: Факты и ценности: К 70-летию Юрия Сергеевича Степанова / отв. ред. Е. С. Кубрякова, Т. Е. Янко. – М. : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. – С. 217–225.

13. *Лотман Ю. М.* Символ – "ген сюжета" // Лотман Ю. М. Внутри мыслящих миров. Человек – текст – семиосфера – история / Ю. М. Лотман. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 1996. – С. 115–145.

14. *Никифоров А. Л.* Природа философии: Основы философии / А. Л. Никифоров. – М. : Идея-Пресс, 2001. – 168 с.

15. *Розина Р. И.* Когнитивные отношения в таксономии. Категоризация мира в языке и тексте / Р. И. Розина // Вопр. языкознания. – 2004. – № 6. – С. 60–78.

16. *Селіванова О.О.* Актуальні напрями сучасної лінгвістики (аналітичний огляд) / О.О.Селіванова. – К.: Вид-во Укр. Фітосоціологічного центру, 2006. – 148 с.

17. *Синельникова Л. Н.* Философский дискурс как проявитель языковой личности / Л. Н. Синельникова // Вісн. Луган. нац. пед. ун-ту. – 2004. – № 12. – С. 8–26.

18. *Степанов Ю. С*. Альтернативный мир, Дискурс, Факт и принцип причинности // Язык и наука конца XX века : сб. статей. – М. : РГГУ, 1995. – 432 с. – С. 35–73.

19. *Сычева С. Г.* Проблема символа в философии / С. Г. Сычева. – Томск : Изд-во Том. ун-та, 2000. – 197 с.

20. *Темнова Е. В*. Современные подходы к изучению дискурса / Е. В. Темнова // Язык, сознание, коммуникация : сб. ст. / ред. В. В. Красных А. И. Изотов. М.: МАКС Пресс, 2004. Вып. 26. С. 24–33.

21. *Тузова Т. М*. Специфика философской рефлексии / Т. М. Тузова ; Ин-т философии Нац. АН Беларуси. – Мн. : Право и экономика, 2001. – 262 с.

22. *Юшкевич П. С.* Сущность философии (к психологии философского миросозерцания) / П. С. Юшкевич. – Одесса, 1921. – 25 с.

23. *Arendt H.* Men in Dark Times, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968. – 281 p.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 30.10.15

В. Є. Спіцина, асп.
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка

Філософські символи в працях Х. Арендт: особливості перекладу

Стаття присвячена проблемі перекладу символів у філософському дискурсі, їх характеристикам та зв'язку між мовним та позамовним контекстом, взаємозалежності між метою автора і вибором відповідних стратегій перекладу. Філософський дискурс розглядається як феномен комунікації, який має складну лінгвістичну структуру і відображає особливості мислення і сприйняття світу народом.

Ключові слова: *переклад, філософський текст, інтерпретація тексту, філософський символ*

В. Е. Спицына, асп.
Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко (Украина)

Философские символы в работах Х. Арендт: особенности перевода

Статья посвящена проблеме перевода символов в философском дискурсе, их характеристикам и связи между языковым и внеязыковым контекстом, взаимозависимости между целью автора и выбором соответствующих стратегий перевода. Философский дискурс рассматривается как феномен коммуникации, который имеет сложную лингвистическую структуру и отражает особенности мышления и восприятия мира народом.

Ключевые слова: *перевод, философский текст, интерпретация текста, философский символ.*