

UDC 13+81

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30970/PHS.2021.28.11>

THE PHENOMENON OF TRANSLATION CONTINUITY AS AN ATTEMPT TO UNDERSTAND ORIGINAL TEXTS

Pavlo Sodomora

*Lviv National Medical University
Pekarska str., 69, Lviv, 79010, Ukraine
e-mail: pavlosodom@gmail.com
ORCID ID 0000-0002-2006-1383*

The article aims at discussing translation difficulties and ways of their solutions. It has been suggested that certain texts can not be translated but can be interpreted only. Several issues on the interpretation and reading of philosophical texts, especially in the Ukrainian cultural environment, are addressed here. To produce an adequate translation different compensative means sometimes are required, such as adding a new word in order to explain the meaning of the whole discourse. This presupposes ambiguity of the notion of translation adequacy taken as a literal translation. This fact results in the phenomenon of a variety of translations of the same text seen as translation continuity. The practice of double translations is being considered as a result of the application of various approaches to the same text. The study aims at supporting the expediency of double translation of the same text due to the variety of approaches and ambiguity of the notion of translation adequacy. The article is based on English and Ukrainian translations of Greek and Latin texts.

Key words: translation, cultural environment, double translation, interpretation, translation adequacy.

Difficulties

While analyzing various translations of the same Greek or Latin texts, it has been suggested that some texts cannot be actually translated, they can be interpreted only in their own way. This can be seen on the basis of several translations of ancient masterpieces, which was analyzed somewhere else (Sodomora, 2010), but some key points of the aforementioned study are to be presented here. The research deals with the problem of reproducing realia (or culture-specific words) in a target language and presents a many-sided contrastive analysis of two Ukrainian translations of Homer's "Odyssey". Different theories of artistic translation are described with a special emphasis on poetic translation. It has been found, that the ethnolinguistic component was fully reproduced in the translation of "Odyssey" by Borys Ten (Homer, 1963). Most of the realia were reproduced, alongside the hexameter of the original. The ethnolinguistic component was partly reproduced in Petro Nishchyn'skyi's (Homer, 1890) "Odyssey": he maintained the original hexameter and preserved some of the realia. Each translation was done in a different epoch, which influences the style of each translation. The translations from different periods enrich the treasury of Ukrainian literature.

Translation adequacy presupposes the correspondence of the target text to the source text, including the expressive means in translation, and it is distinct from literal translation. This is why every translation of ancient texts, especially of philosophical ones, is accompanied by various problems. An innovative approach to rendering specific words or philosophical terms is to be administered carefully, as well as some solutions to translation difficulties that may cause

semantic substitution from the perspective of the source or the target languages resulting in translation inadequacy. It is worth saying that translation inadequacy is a more definite notion in contrast to previously mentioned translation adequacy, insofar as the former possesses relatively clear features of being inadequate, unlike the latter, which can be identified only by the absence of those.

Issues linked to translation become more complicated along with the subject being discussed. For example, Plato's works settle even more complicated issues for translators, and particularly "Cratylus" (Plato, 1892) provides us with a variety of difficulties. The most striking and obvious case of so-called "untranslatability" is the one with the Greek word "anthropos" explained in terms of its etymology. According to Plato's analysis, the word is compiled of the prefix "ana-" followed by the root "opos", which means "the one who looks up". For Plato, as well as for Socrates, the unique feature of a human being is stargazing, which is entirely missing in all the rest creatures. Unfortunately, the plain and smooth structure of the dialogue should be disturbed in the process of its interpretation into any language, as well as there is no direct correspondence between the meaning of vocabulary and its components, e.g. prefixes. Neither Polish, English, nor Ukrainian languages possess anything similar in order to render the example provided hereby Plato.

The second, more obscure issue enlightened in the aforementioned dialogue, is the controversy between conventionalism and naturalism, two opposite streams, which since have been represented during all four ages of understanding in the European thought and acquired their development in various fields. This is why St Augustine, being a true Platonist, developed his theory of sign on the basis of some thoughts expressed in "Cratylus". Finally but not lastly, the theory of language acquisition acquired its continuation in the so-called "20-century debate" between nativism and empiricism represented by Chomsky and Skinner's theories of language respectively. This is why the truth promulgated by Socrates as well as questions settled by his great disciple still remain valid in post-modern civilization.

Again, this settles another question, i.e. how these features can be identified, but the difficulty was subject to discussion in another extensive work based on St. Thomas' "Summa Theologiae" and its translations (Sodomora, 2010), and here just some excerpts are to be presented in order to clarify the point of view. The fact that Latin was always dependent on Greek shows common sites of both cultures. There are plenty of words in Latin that are translated directly from Greek, e.g. individuum is translation from Greek atom, accidens is translation from Greek symbebekos etc. This fact approves using copying as one of the methods of specific vocabulary reproducing in Ukrainian writings. For example, Thomas Aquinas uses Latin translations of Greek words widely in his works, but at the same time he applies entirely Greek words, e.g. hypostasis alongside with substance. Similar problems are faced in many modern languages, including Ukrainian. The difference between Latin-specific words and their modern equivalents is explained on the material of various approaches and in various cultural contexts, including the Ukrainian one. The untranslatable words are examined in the contrastive bilingual analysis. It is emphasized that in most cases there are no direct equivalents for some words in the Ukrainian language.

In contrast to Plato, Aristotle was convinced that we can learn from experience only. His great follower, Thomas Aquinas, in his "Summa" says, "nihil est in intellectu quod non-erat in sensibus" – "there is nothing present in the intellect what was not present in the senses". In such a way Aquinas establishes a basis for empiristic theories. But the question of empiricism versus nativism underwent newer development in theories of Descartes, as well as his John Locke, his contemporary opposer. This point is being represented currently by nativistic theories of Noam Chomsky.

Solutions

The main point of the debate is that the major part of the terms can be translated differently. The first method to be generally preferred is transliteration, i.e. rewriting the word according to the rules of the target language, the second one is copying, i.e. reproduction of morphological structure, and sometimes translators apply analogy as well, i.e. finding the word with similar semantics. The difference between these methods presupposes a discrepancy in the semantic content of a term. At the first glimpse, transliteration seems to be more convenient, but it is not so. In this case, one would have a strange text full of incomprehensible words.

Hence this threefold way of terms translation should be considered step by step. Definitely, it is much easier to translate all the terms by transliteration. But there is a big difference between the modern meaning of the word *accident* and Latin *accidentia*, as well as between the modern word *habit* and Latin *habitus* even in the English language. There are different works of scholars concerning this problem, for example, Jean Torrell discusses the meaning of *habitus* and its difference from modern *habit* according to Torrell (Torrell, 1996).

A completely different approach to rendering philosophical terms is based on copying. This method consists in the precise translation of the morphological structure of a word. Prefix, root, suffix, and ending are rendered separately by equivalents of the target language. A striking example of this approach is the term *accidentia* and its rendering into Ukrainian. The Latin word consists of prefix *ac-*, which means by- root *-cid-*, which means to fall, the suffix *-ent-*, which indicates participle form, and ending *-ia*, which means plural neutral. The Ukrainian word *prypadkovist'* is formed by the same structure as the Latin one. Prefix *pry-* means by-, root *-pad-* means to fall, but the suffix and the ending indicate feminine noun, singular. From a philosophical perspective, a very important grammar form is lost. Neutral gender indicates something unstable and additional, and this semantics is very important for contrasting this term with substance, which is feminine. In the same way term *accidentia* is translated into the Polish Language: *przy-padlost*.

Thus, given the morphological structure of these terms, it is necessary to determine what is signified by *accidentsia* and *prypadkovist'*. These terms, in spite of their common meaning, have some discrepancies in semantic content. The action or so to say the impact of these two words is different, though the meaning is almost the same. The semantic content of the term *accidentsia*, when transliterated into Ukrainian, includes uncommon and extraordinary semanteme in terms of foreign origin. At the same time, the foreign origin of this word is a real advantage because it is not filled with any commonly used meaning. But the same advantage implies a serious disadvantage: this is not a Ukrainian word and hence it is not understood widely. So an average reader does not grasp the whole semantic content of this word. Of course, this is terminology, and it is natural for it to contain certain foreign vocabulary. In addition to this, the word *accidentsia* is also deprived of its original grammatical form.

Furthermore, the following option, i.e. copying, should be considered on the basis of the Polish translation of "Summa". From the perspective of this approach the Ukrainian word *prypadkovist'*, has its own advantages and disadvantages as well. First of all, this is an entirely Ukrainian word and so it is more understandable for an average Ukrainian reader. It implies semantics which helps to grasp the necessary content of this concept. Besides, the term *prypadkovist'* had been used by Ukrainian scholars in the 19th century, but not frequently. Keeping in mind the concept of entire Ukrainian philosophical terminology, this is the only term one can use for translation of Latin *accidentia*. By means of using *prypadkovist'* only the image of something non-substantial can be formed in the mind of a reader. Any transliterated term can not form such an impression due to its emotional emptiness and different semantics. It is significant that two words with similar meanings, *accidentsia* and *prypadkovist'* create

a completely different image. Despite the fact that these words are synonyms, they are of different connotations.

There is one more argument supporting copying as a translation method: the Latin word *accidentia* is a translation of the Greek word *symbebekos*, and the method of translation from Greek into Latin (*symbebekos* – *accidentia*) is exactly the same one as from Latin into Ukrainian (*accidentia* – *prypadkovist*). This argument supports using *prypadkovist* in Ukrainian translation. Of course, transliteration was not considered by St. Thomas to be an appropriate method of rendering a Greek term into Latin. We can not suppose St. Thomas used transliteration of Greek terms in his works.

Therefore the question is if the sign “*accidentsia*” and the sign “*prypadkovist*” represent one and the same object. Apparently, they represent the same object but they do so by different means. These signs have special relations to their object. This is only one example of a term and options of its translation. In fact, it is not easy to decide what method is better without having a broad view of different philosophical terms and methods of their translation. Paying attention to the context of each and every term is essential. Obviously, all the terms must be agreed with each other. The proper solution to these problems contributes to compiling an adequate translation significantly.

The discussion on the methods of translation becomes more complicated with the fact that one and the same word can be applied to different contexts (Deely, 2001). This is why in order to understand properly the position of Socrates (or Plato) in “*Cratylus*” it is necessary to know what exactly he understands by this or that word. The task looks really simple, but at the first glimpse only, because by one and the same word Plato sometimes means various things. Here we arrived again at the word “*onoma*” which is used by Plato in various meanings. Primarily, in the “*Cratylus*” this word can be used in general meaning “word”; again, in other contexts, it can be understood as “name”; this word sometimes is used in order to describe nouns in general or even adjectives in certain contexts. This four-fold meaning of one and the same word should be clearly distinguished in order to avoid difficulties in understanding the dialogue. For this purpose, these meanings are to be clarified.

First of all, Plato is convinced that etymology is a proper way to cognition, which gives him the right to judge and conclude on the meaning of the names of Greek gods. One and a quite large part of “*Cratylus*” is dedicated to the explanation of functions and purposes of various gods relying on the analysis of their proper names, e.g. Dionysius: “Dionysus, the giver (διδούς) of wine (οἶνος), might be called in jest Didoinsus, and wine, because it makes most drinkers think (οἷεσθαι) they have wit (νοῦς) when they have not, might very justly be called Oeonus (οἰόνους)” (406 c) and many others.

But Plato was interested in god’s names not only due to just being a religious person. Proclus in his “*Commentary*” on “*Cratylus*” explains the immense depth of Plato’s theology “If the God himself is so-called, it is clear that both his first and his median activities may be given the same name as his ultimate one. Now (406C) referring to that, Socrates calls the God “*Didoinsos*”, deriving the name from wine (oinos), which, as we have stated, reveals all the powers of the God. For the oionous (406C5-6) is nothing else than the intellectual form which is separated off from the whole, and is already participated in (e.g. by soul), and has become single and “specific” (hoion). The altogether perfect Intellect is all things and operates in accordance with all things in the same way” (Proclus, 2007). Apparently, Proclus provides us with a completely so-called “internal” meaning of Plato’s text, similarly to what Swedenborg says about the internal meaning of the Word.

This is how the reason arises for a deeper understanding of Plato’s dialogues, and especially “*Cratylus*”. The basis for considerations of two main characters in the dialogue, namely Cratylus

and Hermogenes, is language. Socrates, being a moderator of the discussion, strives to reconcile the two opposite views. The philosophy of language which was initiated in this dialogue, still has not obtained answers to the questions settled by Plato. In fact, it just acquired various solutions among different approaches during all four ages of understanding, namely Ancient, Scholastic, Modern and Post-modern periods (Deely, 2007). Questions, risen by Plato in his “Cratylus”, found their continuation in various nativistic theories of language, especially in recent works of Noam Chomsky (Chomsky, 2002).

The complexity of this question, raised by Plato, prompts variety of approaches to the interpretation of the dialogue and, consequently, a variety of translations. The three English translations of the dialogue (Plato, 1892) present different renderings of keywords, starting from the very first paragraph. For example, Greek “synthemenoī” is translated as “conventional” (Plato, 1892), and in another “by agreement” (Plato, 1921). It would be improper to ask which one presents a better option: there is no direct 100% equivalent to Greek word neither in English nor in Ukrainian. And one more thing which complicates translation is that Plato preferred spoken word to written. Plato never became a writer of philosophical treatises, even though the writing of treatises (for example, on rhetoric, medicine, and geometry) was a common practice among his predecessors and contemporaries. This occurs due to the fact that Plato never expresses his exact position on the discussed issue, namely the correlation between two opposite views on the nature of language, which are represented by contemporary notions of conventionalism and naturalism. The influence of Plato’s works was evident in various periods of development of European culture in general and philosophy in particular (Proclus, 1908). Several translations are available in Ukrainian (Plato, 1995), although the work on translations is being continued.

St Augustine, being a true Platonist, speaks of “signum naturale et conventionale”, and provides explanation to these terms in his “De Doctrina Christiana”. Signs for Augustine are genera for what words (Greek “onoma”) and theory of signs (Greek “semeion”) are the same species (Eco, 1986). It is the mutual (and mute) convention, that Latin words are being constantly used as equivalents for Greek terms, but this present situation is quite paradoxical, although this was a subject to discussion in other work (Sodomora, 2010) on the basis of St. Thomas’ works.

Although it looks like quite a vein undertaking from the first glimpse, it is evident that any translation is deprived of hundred-percent preciseness due to the natural discrepancies between languages. In addition, significant time span adds up many points of interest to the question. The practice of double translations is pretty common, especially of those works which are difficult to interpret: note the difference from translate. But still, this evokes significant interest due to its disputable essence.

Plato, speaking in his dialogues on behalf of Socrates, his teacher, etymologically proves that the stargazing is the unique ability of humans. In fact, this is what can be seen even from the etymology of the Latin verb “considerare”, which is common in the English language as well, the root of which (sidera) means “star”. Plato says, that the word is compiled of the prefix “ana-” followed by the root “opos”, which mean “the one who looks up”: consequently, humans stare at what is considered to be “beauty”, or “cosmos”, which consists in harmony and is opposite to Chaos, from which the world was created by Demiurge.

It has just been represented the first, or external, level of difficulties that arise in the process of translation of Plato’s “Cratylus”, as well as in the process of reading of the translated text. Plato provides the reader with a good set of words, primarily with names of gods, and strives to explain their etymology by the means of, naturally, Greek language. But the problem of interpretation of those so-to-say straightforward Greek names into various languages arises due to rare coincidences on the level of their etymology. There are but few correspondences with these words that can be found in, for example, the Ukrainian language.

The other, or internal type of difficulty in translating Plato's "Cratylus" is linked with the interpretation of key terms. This question can be called "a posterior", as well as it does not appear directly at the reading of the text, but arises during its more precise interpretation: it deals with the usage of various target-language words for the single word of the original language. One of the most striking examples of such difficult words is Greek "onoma". But this question required preliminary explanation, regardless of the first-glimpse simplicity. We need to interpret the work itself to find out what it, or Plato the author, is saying. Similarly, when we ask how a word that has several different senses is best understood, we are asking what Plato means to communicate to us through the speaker who uses that word.

Despite the fact that dialogues possess relatively easy and reader-friendly form of explanation, the interpretation of dialogues requires a deep understanding of questions settled by their author. Plato never strives to establish his authoritative solution to this or that issue that arises in the process of discussion: this is why it causes certain complications in grasping his precise point of view. Socrates, being the representative of Plato's positions in the dialogues, uses his well-known "Socratic method" of arriving to the proper solution, the most famous feature of which is avoiding direct indications to the correct answer.

Results

According to Heraclitus, the whole Cosmos is a well-organized system that resembles the language (Curd, 2016). As it has been shown above, there is a variety of difficulties that cannot be solved unequivocally in a given translation of any text, not speaking about a philosophical one. Therefore, it is quite obvious and logical to administer different approaches to the text being translated. In addition to the lexical approach, recent changes in the political and cultural life settle newer approaches to the reading and understanding of previous ideas. This is how the appearance of one more translation of already translated work amounts to the renewed need for well-known, and at the same time slightly forgotten ideas, but not misshaped, though.

There are a variety of examples in the modern practice of important works being double translated into Ukrainian. This amounts more to the newer understanding of these works, not to their being translated improperly though. Therefore recently Descartes' "Meditations" have been rendered into Ukrainian for the second time by Oleg Khoma (2014) (Descartes, 2017), regardless of the fact that the work had been translated earlier (2000) (Descartes, 2000). The approach of these two translations to the Descartes' work itself is completely different, which is apparent from the first paragraph already.

As it follows from the aforesaid, there are several reasons for compiling several translations of a single work. The same can be said about one more translation of John Locke's "Two Treatises on Government" (Locke, 2020). The first one, or subjective reason, is linked to physical impossibility of compiling a hundred-percent equivalent translation due to the possibility of interpreting same notions ambiguously. The second one, or objective reason, is linked to significant changes our society had experienced since the appearance of the first (2001) translation of "Treatises" (Locke, 2001). It is worth mentioning that compiling the second translation can in no way be linked to any "wrongs" in the first one. Any translation is accompanied by its own "catches" and "misses", which sometimes can be mutually exclusive. In fact, several translations taken together provide us with a broader comprehension of the great works of Ancient and Modern thinkers.

References

1. Curd, P. Presocratic Philosophy. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/presocratics/>.
2. Chomsky, N. On Nature and Language. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2002. 362 p.
3. Davis, W. Philosophy of Language. Malden : Blackwell, 2003. 254 p.
4. Deely, J. Four Ages of Understanding. Chicago : University of Scranton Press 2001. 1250 p.
5. Deely, J. Intentionality and Semiotics. Chicago : University of Scranton Press, 2007. 475 p.
6. Descartes, R. Meditations. Transl. O. Khoma. K. : Duch i litera, 2017.
7. Descartes, R. Meditations. Transl. Z. Borusiuk. K. : Universe, 2000.
8. Eco, U. La Struttura Assente. Introduzione alla ricerca semiologica. Milan, 1986. 237 p.
9. Homer. Odyssey. Transl. by Borys Ten. K., 1963. 466 p.
10. Homer. Odyssey. Transl. by Petro Nishchyn's'kyi. Lviv, 1890. T. 1. 144 p., 1892. T. 2. 158 p.
11. Lewiss, D. *Convention*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1969. 395 p.
12. Lepore, E., Stone, M. Imagination and Convention. Oxford : Oxford University Press 2015. 254 p.
13. Locke, John. Two Treatises on Government. K. : Osnovy, 2001.
14. Locke, John. Two Treatises on Government. K. : Nash Format, 2020.
15. Montgomery, E. Plato's Cratylus: The Comedy of Language. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2013. 248 p.
16. McNally, Th. *Wittgenstein and the Philosophy of Language: The Legacy of the Philosophical Investigations*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2017. 269 p.
17. Plato. *Cratylus*. (C. Reeve, Trans.). Indianapolis and Cambridge : Hackett, 1997. 345 p.
18. Proclus. On Plato Cratylus. (B. Duvick, Trans.). London : Bloomsbury, 2007, 350 p.
19. Plato. Cratylus. (B. Jowett, 1892 Trans.). URL: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1616/1616-h/1616-h.htm>.
20. Plato. Works in 12 vol. V. 12. (H. Fowler, 1921 Trans.). Cambridge : Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd. URL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=plat.+crat.+383a>.
21. Proclus Diadochus. In Platonis Cratylum Comment. Lipsiae : In aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1908. 1250 p.
22. Proclus Diadochus. In Platonis Cratylum Comment. Lipsiae: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1908. 1250 p.
23. Platon. Tvory. (In Ukrainian). (J. Kobiv, Trans.) Kyiv : Osnovy, 1995. 450 p.
24. Rescorla, M. Convention. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2008.
25. Sedley, D. Plato's *Cratylus*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. 328 p.
26. Sodomora, P. Philosophy of Language: Ukrainian Translations. (In Ukrainian). Lviv : Spolom, 2010. 180 p.
27. Sodomora, P. Terminological System of St. Aquinas. (In Ukrainian). Lviv : Spolom, 2010. 280 p.
28. Torell J. St. Thomas Aquinas. The Person and his Work / J. Torell / trans. Robert Royal. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1996. 407 p.

ФЕНОМЕН ПОСЛІДОВНОСТІ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ ЯК УМОВА РОЗУМІННЯ ОРИГІНАЛЬНИХ ТЕКСТІВ

Павло Содомора

Львівський національний медичний університет

вул. Пекарська, 69, Львів, 79010, Україна

e-mail: pavlosodom@gmail.com

ORCID ID 0000-0002-2006-1383

Стаття розглядає питання, що стосуються проблем перекладу філософських текстів, відштовхуючись від припущення, що деякі тексти надаються не до перекладу, а радше до інтерпретації. Саме тому задля створення адекватного перекладу необхідно вдаватися до різноманітних так званих компенсаторних засобів, завдяки яким уможлиблюється передача як інформації, так і культурного навантаження тексту. Матеріалом статті є українські й англійські переклади класичних грецьких і середньовічних латинських філософських текстів. Такий матеріал є показовим, оскільки грецька мова була основною мовою філософських текстів античності, а латинська мова була основною мовою текстів епохи середньовіччя.

З уваги на встановлене твердження, що точний переклад створити практично неможливо, розглядається питання подвійних перекладів одного й того ж твору. Це питання розглядалося у попередніх дослідженнях, тому висновки базуються також і на них, попри те стаття намагається прослідкувати явище подвійного перекладу й на матеріалі новіших перекладів, щоб встановити ключові тенденції. Античний матеріал є вдачливим середовищем для дослідження, оскільки саме від нього походить практично вся європейська філософія. Твори Гомера й Гесіода стали першими пам'ятками писемності, на яких опиралися усі наступні автори.

Основним матеріалом статті є діалоги Платона і коментарі Прокла до деяких із них, насамперед діалог «Критил». Саме у цьому діалозі зустрічаємося з неможливістю перекласти деякі уривки тексту, оскільки Платон пояснює етимологію грецьких слів, як-от слово «антропос». За Платоном, це слово означає «той, хто дивиться вгору», оскільки лише людина цікавиться космосом, на відміну від усіх інших тварин, які спрямовують свій погляд на пошуки поживи, до землі. Відтворити текст неможливо жодною сучасною мовою, тому інтерпретатори вдаються до різних допоміжних засобів.

Діалог викликав цікавість починаючи з давніх часів, оскільки неоплатонік Прокл видав обширний і деталізований коментар до нього. Читаючи коментар Прокла, бачимо глибини античної міфології, які слугували витоками творчості Платона. Коментар Прокла дає можливість побачити, наскільки складнішими є питання, які обирає Платон для обговорення із співрозмовниками. Сам діалог «Критил» не справляє на читача враження такої складної теологічної системи, яка стала основою для пояснення етимології.

Стаття намагається показати неперервність традицій європейської філософії, незважаючи на створення різних шкіл й адаптацію різних поглядів. Реалізм Аристотеля й переосмислення традицій античності у християнському дусі Св. Томи з Аквіну, незважаючи на привнесення нового матеріалу, були б неможливими без такого підґрунтя. Подальший раціоналізм Декарта, який хоча й не був платоністським, все ж у певному ракурсі продовжує ідеї Платона.

Діалоги продовжують справляти значний вплив і на сучасних дослідників, як-от на теорію мови Ноама Хомського, що базується на подібних засадах, зокрема на теорія «пригадування» Платона. Сучасні дискусії щодо так званих вічних питань неможливі без грецького й латинського підґрунтя. Стаття має за мету висвітлити деякі з них й вказати на те, що питання, які ставив Платон, досі не отримали повної відповіді. Українські переклади, на яких базується стаття, ще не є опубліковані.

Ключові слова: переклад, культурне середовище, подвійний переклад, інтерпретація, адекватність перекладу.