

**TRANSLATION OF POSTMODERN TERMINOLOGY
IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS
BY M. FOUCAULT, J. BAUDRILLARD, AND J. DERRIDA**

M. A. Beley¹, E. G. Fonova¹

¹ Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University
236016, Russia, Kaliningrad, 14 A. Nevsky St.
Submitted on September 27, 2020
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-1-3

*The article examines the specifics of the translation of postmodern philosophical terminology. The authors explore Russian translations of the works of the modern French postmodernist philosophers Michel Foucault, Jean Baudrillard and Jacques Derrida. Postmodernism as a philosophical movement is based on the concept of radical plurality. It is characterised by the multiplicity of dimensions and types of analysis. The authors look into the problem of choosing strategies for the translation of postmodern terminology and analyse the dilemma translators have to face: how to manoeuvre between polysemy and ambiguity in the translation of philosophical terms. The article analyses the translation of Foucault's seminal work *Les Mots et les Choses* (translated by Avtonomova and Vizgin). Special attention is paid to the problem of translation of the postmodern terms discourse and episteme. Another focus of research is the analysis of the translation of Baudrillard's work *Simulacres et Simulation* (translated by Pechenkina). In the final part of the article, the authors analyse the peculiarities of the translation of Derrida's treatise into Russian.*

Keywords: *postmodernism, Derrida, Foucault, Baudrillard, translation strategies, post-modern terminology, episteme, discourse, simulacre*

Each epoch has its own individual language and style of communication, which is formed by the dominant explicit systems. The second half of the C 20th and the beginning of the C 21st is characterized as an epoch of postmodernism, which manifested itself as the main direction of philosophy, literature, art and science.

1. Special aspects in translating postmodern essays

The processes of globalization, development of information technologies determined the vector of gravitation of art, culture, science and literature towards cross-culturality and, as a consequence, towards multidiscursivity. The growing need for new forms of aesthetic reflection of the new time entailed the search for ways to overcome existing (including ethnic) stereotypes of artistic thinking. The rejection of "concepts that claim universal coverage and interpretation of reality as a holistic phenomenon subordinated to



a certain law" (Zverev, 2005, p. 334), the feeling of heterogeneity, the fundamental "unfitness" of the world, which opens up countless variations in the possibilities of its interpretation, none of which can claim to be final judgment, the heterogeneity of languages and concepts stimulated the emergence of a broad trend called postmodernism in literature, art and science. Postmodernism, with its inherent genre syncretism, fragmented text structure, soft and non-military tactics of deconstruction, recomposition and rethinking of past epochs' experience, has spread all over the world.

The philosophy of postmodernism contrasts itself, first of all, with Hegel's philosophy, seeing it as the embodiment of rationalism and logocentrism. In this sense, it can be defined as anti-Hegelian. Hegel's philosophy is known to be based on such categories as "being, one, whole, universal, absolute, truth, reason, etc.". Postmodern philosophy harshly criticizes all this from the standpoint of relativism" (Frolov, 2003, p. 215).

Postmodernism began to act as a concept expressing the uniqueness and inexpressibility of the cultural situation of the last decades of the twentieth century. The majority of researchers use such definitions as plurality, adogmatism, alogism, absence of the first symbol, ironic attitude to the previous cultural values as characteristic definitions. In postmodernism, the boundaries of the beautiful and ugly are blurred; the contrast between the center and periphery of high and low, elite and mass culture loses its meaning. According to U. Eco, "postmodernism is the answer to modernism: since the past is impossible, it must be rethought: ironically, without naivety" (Eco, 1989, p. 462).

If we continue to analyze the problem of postmodern texts translation it is interesting to what J. Derrida writes about it. Without being a translation theorist, he devoted two works to the problems of translation: *Des tours de Babel* (1997) and *Qu'est-ce qu'une traduction relevante?* (2005). It greatly influenced on the development of postmodernism, poststructuralism through the proposed deconstructive text analysis strategy.

According to Derrida translation is a ritual which creates a reality for the first time ever and creates our attitude to this reality. The translation is impossible because it is not exact, but any inexact translation can be precised. The translation is impossible first of all because it keeps a memory about the invalid possibilities of the language: about the fact that these things could have been told earlier, could be told in the other way or could be written in the annals and could be done in the world's construction.

We can read in *Des Tours de Babel*: "...A translation espouses the original when the two adjoined fragments, as different as they can be, complete each other so as to form a larger tongue in the course of a survival that changes them both. <...> It is what I have called the translation contract: hymen or marriage contract with the promise to produce a child whose seed will give rise to history and growth. <...> In the translation the original becomes larger; it grows rather than reproduces itself – and I will add: like a child, its own, no doubt, but with the power to speak on its own which makes of a child something other than a product subjected to the law of re-



production. This promise signals a kingdom which is at once "promised and forbidden where the languages will be reconciled and fulfilled." <...> This kingdom is never reached, touched, trodden by translation. There is something untouchable, and in this sense the reconciliation is only promised..." (Derrida, 1985, p. 190–191).

Besides, Derrida's significance for linguistics, literature and translation is related to the interpretation of the meaning of text, which turns out to be unstable, multidimensional, subjective and intertextual and such text also has variable contextual lines.

There are different approaches in translation theory which correspond to different types of texts. We can find cognitive approaches, committed approaches, functional, interpretive and so on. But we did not find any universal approach to translate postmodern philosophical works.

2. Main stages in translating postmodern texts

Translation is a complex and multifaceted human activity. Although we usually talk about translation as transfer "from one language to another", in fact there is more than just a substitution of words between languages. In translation, different cultures, different personalities, different ways of thinking, different literature, different eras, different levels of development, different traditions and attitudes are encountered. The theory of translation is revealed not only in philological, but also in cultural, ethnographic, psychological, historical, philosophical studies (Komissarov, 2002, p. 12).

In essence, the necessity arises when it is impossible to keep the same plan of language sign expression, so the direct result of translation is realized on the language level, in our case – on the level of philosophical concepts.

It seems that the reorganization of the linguistic space in the postmodern era has qualitatively influenced the system of translation possibilities and implementations introduced in the translation of traditional texts, in particular – in the translation of philosophical concepts. In order to understand the consequences of this influence, it is necessary to analyze potential translation problems that manifest themselves at the appropriate stages of the translation process (Ibid., p. 150).

At the first stage of the translation process, i. e. the stage of perception of the original text, the translator risks to face, first of all, not so much the problem of interpreting the meaning of game language units, as to separate them from the text space. Division of a unit of translation and introduction of the new postmodernist term is one of the basic components of translation process as erroneous acceptance of a text piece as a unit of translation will inevitably lead to loss of sense.

At the second stage of the translation process, the translator has a task to transfer text sense simultaneously in the conditions of plurality of meanings and absence of sense. The problem of pluralism of meanings in postmodern philosophical discourse is that the meaning does not depend directly on the interpretation of the subject, but is constantly generated by the text itself, with each interpreter perceiving this or that postmodern element differently.



3. Pluralism of meanings and unambiguity: how to manoeuvre

The problem of pluralism of meanings and lack of meaning raises the question of translatability of the philosophical discourse of postmodernism. In translation theory, there are different points of view regarding the question of translatability. V. von Humboldt also suggested that language, by actively influencing native speakers, is an "intermediate world" between a people and the objective world around it (Humboldt, 2000, p. 45).

A philosophical term often fails to meet another important requirement traditionally imposed on the term – unambiguity, as its semantic scope is much broader than the semantic scope of the term in any other field of scientific knowledge. It seems logical that the author of the philosophical text puts into the terms used the same meanings that were put into it by other philosophers in already existing works. However, this is often not the case. There are philosophical terms with precise and invariable semantics, the use of which is fully due to the previous philosophical tradition, but at the same time there are also terms formed from the words of the common layer of vocabulary and used to nominate controversial, polemical philosophical concepts, which leads to ambiguity of the terms themselves. Terms in philosophical texts should be considered not only in the context of the whole work, but also in the context of the whole work of the philosopher, because each author gives such terms their individual, author's content. Therefore, it is more logical to speak not about the phenomenon of polysemy, but about different interpretations of the term. Thus, the philosophical term does not have a precise definition, its meaning is gradually increasing within the framework of the general concept and the specific text, and, accordingly, is also extracted from the context of the entire text. Nevertheless, there is no reason to believe that a philosophical term is not inherently definitive, but definitions are formulated not directly by the authors of the texts, but by researchers of the philosophical terminology system (Kozlovskaya, 2011, p. 84).

4. Translation strategies of postmodern terms: examples

Vinay and Darbelnet provide a good example of translation procedure (procédés techniques de traduction), understood as a process that comes into play when shifting between languages. Their seven procedures are divided between «direct translation» (three types) and «oblique translation» (four types) looking at equivalences obtained from comparing English and French. These procedures operate on three linguistic levels (lexical, morpho-syntactic and semantic) (Gambier, 2010, p. 413).

Translating terminological items in postmodern discourse into another language is, as we have already noted, of a significant difficulty. Thus, we specify four different strategies for translating peculiar postmodern terms:

1. Transliteration as a specific translation technique («direct translation»)
2. Modulation as a polysemous approach («oblique translation»)
3. Translation comment as a way to explain the translation («oblique translation»).
4. Neologism as a translation solution («oblique translation»).



4.1. Michel Foucault and "discours"

Turning to these translation strategies, let us observe the peculiarities of translation of the term "discourse", proposed by the French philosopher, historian and theorist of culture, a prominent representative of French structuralism and postmodernism, one of the most influential thinkers of the second half of C 20th. Michel Foucault in *Les mots et les choses* (1966).

The translation of «*Les mots et les choses*» (*Words and Things*) into Russian («*Слова и вещи*») was made by N.S. Avtonomova and V.P. Vizgin (1994).

In translating the term "Discourse" as a central concept in Foucault's work, the translators were not limited to a simple transcription. The new philosophical term "Discourse" appears with a special logical and conceptual structure.

In Foucault's original text, discourse is a polysemous term that can be interpreted and translated as:

1. Speech, performance – речь, выступление
2. Discussion, speech – дискуссия, речь
3. Text – текст
4. Treatise – трактат
5. Reasoning – рассуждение

6. In the figurative sense: A way of thinking, a system of concepts – манера мышления, система концептов

7. In colloquial language: Discussion, analysis – дискурсия, анализ

The word discourse, as a neologism in the translation, is used by N.S. Avtonomova and V.P. Vizgin, as a rule, when describing the episteme (эпистема) of classical rationalism.

As for the translation commentary, we believe it is necessary to clarify that in Foucault the discourse is both what is created from a set of signs, and a set of acts of formulation, a number of proposals or judgments. Discourse is created by a set of sign sequences that represent a statement; discourse is a set of statements that are subject to the same system of formation. At the same time, discourse is not only a text or speech; rather, it could be said that it is a text together with the social practice which the text refers to and which predetermines the features of speech statements.

The discourse is created by a limited number of statements. It is historic. It can be called a fragment of history, its unity and continuity. As Paul Veyne noted, Foucault's discourse means "the most accurate, most concise description of a historical formation in its purity, revealing its most individual differences," the discourse "is, in fact, what is not said and remains implicit," it "is that invisible part, that unthinkable thought, in which each event of history acquires its identity (Veyne, 2003, p. 121).

Discourse is one of Foucault's most used words. It cannot be unequivocally translated into Russian. Where it does not have a clear terminological meaning, it has to be translated into "speech,"-речь occasionally "reasoning. Where it is used as a term, and the term is original and undefined – in "Words and things" it usually refers to the language of the classical epoch with its ability to dissect thinking notions, to express them in a sequence of verbal signs – it has to be translated by the words – дискурс ("discourse"),



дискурсивный ("discursive"). In Foucault's later works, the meaning of this word further expands to cover, in essence, the whole set of structural mechanisms of superstructure, as opposed to "non-discursive" — недискурсивный economic, technical — mechanisms and regularities.

In translating Foucault's iconic term *episteme*, the translators N.S. Avtonomova and V.P. Vizgin used the term *эпистема*. P. Vizgin used three translation tactics at once. Here we are dealing with both transliteration and the formation of a neologism *episteme* adapted to Russian (according to the analogy with the system — *система*). Translation commentary is also important to explain the new postmodern phenomenon.

An *episteme* is a historically changing structure that defines the conditions for the possibility of opinions, theories or sciences in each historical period; a structure of thinking that expresses the way of thinking inherent in a certain historical epoch and forms an individual order: fundamental language codes, patterns of perception, hierarchies of practices. The *episteme* is a historically conditioned cultural and cognitive *a priori*, a set of rules and relationships in a particular place and time, forming the conditions for the existence of historical forms of culture and knowledge. It includes a set of discursive practices that create the apparatus for knowledge production.

Foucault introduces the distinction between knowledge and cognition (French *savoir* and *connaissance*, English *knowledge* and *learning* — Russian *знание и познание*); the level of *episteme* (knowledge) precedes scientific discourses (cognition) and therefore makes their existence possible: Foucault's introduction of "archaeology" *археология* does not study superficial changes, but deep events. An *episteme* is not a body of knowledge or a feature of the research of an epoch; it is not of universal significance, but rather is strictly limited to the discourses under study.

The underlying *epistemes* of hidden structures determine the order in which "things" are embodied in "words"; the structures of discursive practices vary according to the level of organization of thought or culture. Important features of an *episteme* are the relationship between its elements and synchronization. Making up a system of invisible rules, the *episteme* not only defines the "order of things," but also allows you to explain the emergence of certain forms of knowledge in a particular historical period.

This observation draws attention to the approach of translators to the transfer of Greek and Latin words to another language — there may also be certain difficulties due to the structure of the language of translation. Thus, a Russian translator should "look for Russian words that are morphologically and syntactically flexible" (Avtonomova, 2008, p. 378). Therefore, the main word-concept of Foucault's "Words and Things" *epistème* is translated by N.S. Avtonomova as an *episteme* — *эпистема*.

Russian theorist of postmodernism I.P. Ilyin focuses his attention on understanding the *episteme* as an «implementation in speech practice of a strictly defined code» (Ilyin, 1996, p. 60). This allows us to see the *episteme* as a socio-cultural structure in which language is a structuring mechanism. The human being in the context of such a vision is not seen as a subject. N.S. Avtonomova interprets the *episteme* (*эпистема*) as a configuration of an "archaeological" or cognitive field of historical character (Avtonomova, 1994, p. 20). Avtonomova also gives an understanding of the *episteme* as the



latent structure of consciousness that determines the existence of individual ideas (Avtonomova, 1972, p. 143). She pays attention to Foucault's attempt to isolate a common structuring mechanism in all formations of consciousness and culture. At the same time, she emphasizes that the absolutization of Foucault at the pre-conceptual level at which he is conducting his research limits the search for universal forms of structuring superstructure contents to the superstructure itself. We share Avtonomova's opinion that «the broad context of social relations of each epoch could significantly strengthen the justification of epistemes» (Avtonomova, 1994, p. 43).

Thus, we can assume that if Foucault had had a different context for the recognition of the "human form," he would have obtained a different form. We think that Avtonomova's position is a confirmation of lack of heterogeneity in Foucault's human image. In his approach to the concept of episteme V.P. Vizgin proceeds from the main tendencies of structuralism, based on the ideas of G. Bachelard. In this regard, the structure, as interpreted by Vizgin, includes such concepts as "attitude" (позиция) and "field" (сфера). The focus is on the "structure of a certain social-historical field" and its various characteristics. According to Vizgin, it is the "field" aspect of cultural history which is expressed in the concept of episteme (Vizgin, 1996, p. 49). This interpretation of the episteme implies the analysis of history on an impersonal level. Episteme history is the history of impersonal positions occupied by people forced to reckon with these positions, in the same way as physics analyzes different positions of atoms. Just as quantum mechanics calculates the energy levels that can be occupied by individual particles, in contrast to the classical one that comes from the particle itself and its properties, so the historian describes the positions that subjects occupy under certain conditions. According to Vizgin, the historian's goal is to create complete disposition maps and determine their dynamics in the historical and cultural space.

In general, the idea of reality and history as something objective and really existing, gradually disappears into the consciousness, "the reality is agonizing" (Baudrillard, 2013, p. 11). "Now, when even the opposite of the real and the unreal — this cornerstone of culture in general — is in doubt, the soil leaves under the feet of the fantastic: one cannot undermine the credibility of what is not already trusted. Transgression is one of the key notions of postmodernism, which fixes the phenomenon of crossing the impassable boundary and, above all, the boundary between the possible and the impossible" (Ilyin, 1996, p. 211). The limit (i.e., the transformed reality or its border) and the transgression (qualitative transformation, expansion of reality; unreality)," Foucault wrote, as if summing up the history of the fantastic. Here we propose our translation "If we owe each other the density of their being: there is no limit beyond which it is absolutely impossible to cross; on the other hand, any transgression of the illusory or ghostly limit will be futile" (Foucault, 1966, p. 117).

4.2. Jean Baudrillard: "hyper-réalité" and "simulacre"

Jean Baudrillard is considered one of the founders of the philosophy of postmodernism. The main themes of the philosopher's research were the relationship between reality and its symbolic representation, as well as the mechanisms of consumption as a sign system of modern society.



Baudrillard introduced the concept of "hyper-reality" – гипер-реальность as a development of the Marxist concept of "superstructure" and proclaimed "the end of ideology". According to this concept, the basis of hyper-reality is "simulation". Units of hyper-reality are "simulacra" – симулякры – signs or non-self-configuous phenomena that refer to something else, and therefore simulated.

Simulacres et Simulation (*Simulacra and Simulations – Симулякры и симуляция*) is a philosophical treatise by Baudrillard, written in 1981. In this treatise, Baudrillard explores the relationship between reality, symbols and society, summarizing his previous theoretical developments. It is the most complete and accessible book of its kind, from which you can begin to immerse yourself in the world of modern philosophy. The author gives the most detailed definitions of such concepts as "hyper-reality" and "simulacra", which have long been in mass use. This work has helped many people around the world to look at our reality from a fundamentally different perspective, from the point of view of its fictitious, fake, "copy of the copy", illusory substance, and inspired filmmakers to create a cult film "Matrix", where it is not only quoted, but also flickers in the frame. "Simulacrum" is not something that hides.

According to O. A. Pechenkina, the translator of Baudrillard's «*Simulacra and Simulations*», Jean Baudrillard starts operating in the late 70s. It was during this period that the postmodernist stage of his work opens. However, his early works prepared the transition to postmodernist positions with lots of respect. They were devoted to "a kind of sociological psychoanalysis of the world of things and consumer society, not alien to semiology, structuralism and neo-Marxism (a great influence on Baudrillard was the views of F. de Saussure, R. Bart, G. Marcuse, H. Lefevbre).

While translating the term *simulacrum* into Russian – симулякр, O. A. Pechenkina used a transliteration strategy, not forgetting, however, to apply the tactics of a translation comment. Following O. A. Pechenkina, we consider the following interpretation of the term "Simulacrum is an imitation of non-existent." To simulate means to pretend that you have something that does not really exist. In a postmodern situation where reality becomes a model, the opposition between reality and signs is erased and everything becomes a simulacrum. In a total simulation space, there are no more boundaries between real and imaginary, and reality now becomes hyper-realistic, characterized by the dominance of totally scattered simulators, model precession, and the replacement of real with real signs.

It is believed that unlimited semiosis of simulacres in hyper-reality of the postmodern era is doomed to acquire the status of the only and self-sufficient reality. Baudrillard emphasized the special significance of the logic of symbolic exchange, as its violation contributes to the "abstract rationalization" of objects and their transformation into a commodity or sign. This process means a systematic reduction, reducing the qualitative diversity of objects of exchange to a single form of value, combining consumer, exchange and sign forms and converting the objects themselves into goods.

Baudrillard points out that the information space is overloaded with postmodern chimeras, myths and simulacra: "The chimeric dimension is a



serious alternative to your real inner mentality. In postmodern-era simulacra "are produced with an archaic mythological consciousness that has a symbolic function" (Baudrillard, 2013, p. 3).

Simulacrum is more often used as a metaphor for the semantic emptiness (in this sense, the term is used in our study). Myths, both as archetypal texts and as simulacra, are the two extremes of metalanguage mythological structuring.

As a result of continuous exploitation of the code language as a social control tool by the end of C 20th, signs are finally detached from their referees and receive full autonomy of signals — simulacra reproducing and translating meanings that are inadequate to events and facts that cannot be unequivocally evaluated. Baudrillard has developed the doctrine of three orders of simulators: copies, functional analogues and the simulators themselves. He included all modern phenomena, including money, public opinion and fashion, into the third order of simulacra.

4.3. *Jacques Derrida*

As for Jacques Derrida, he develops a special technique of text interpretation — deconstruction, which leads him to the proof of this statement. Deconstruction is a form of philosophical and literary analysis. On the basis of this notion there is a question of the fundamental conceptual distinctions, or "oppositions". Deconstruction is a dividing into separate parts and the analysis of their origin with the aim to understand how the whole functions. If we talk about a text, deconstruction is the finding of the contradiction between logic and rhetoric, between the meaning of the text and the idea that is transferred by the mediator language. It is a sort of game of the text versus signification and the clarifying the degree of independence of the language in regards to the meaning.

Besides, Derrida's significance for linguistics, literature and translation is related to the interpretation of the meaning of text, which turns out to be unstable, multidimensional, subjective and intertextual and such text also has variable contextual lines.

He created many new concepts which are the basis of his philosophical theory. The most significant of them are "dissémination", "différance", "présence", "logocentrisme", "grammatologie", "déconstruction". Among the most famous translators of Derrida's writings into Russian are V. Lapitsky, N. Avtonomova, V. Bibihin and recently D. Krachkin. Usually they translated different works of the French philosopher but sometimes there were retranslation of the same treatise, as for example with *L'écriture et la Différence*.

His translator into English wrote about his style: "Derrida often refers to his own previous work, anticipating the future and not talking about it explicitly [...]. Nevertheless, this difficulty is accentuated by frequent using of classical philosophy vocabulary, without explication and explicit reference. In his writings Derrida is always very attentive to the etymology, his word-play and echoes" (Bass, 1978, p. XIV — XV).

How did the different translators try to find the acceptable strategy to transfer the new philosophical notions, Derrida's neologisms into Russian? Thus «dissémination» was translated into Russian as «диссеминация» or



«рассеяние», «différance» as «различание» or «дифферанс»), «présence» as «наличие» or «присутствие», and so on. As we can see there are different translator's approaches to the problem of the transference of new philosophical notions into Russian. It can be transliteration (as for «дифферанс») or the attempt to find a new notion in the language of translation, which could reflect the key idea of the original. Moreover every new philosophical term demand to explain all the conceptual nuances in the comments. In Derrida's reflection about Husserl we can read: "Nous essaierons néanmoins de proposer des solutions qui se tiendront a mi-chemin entre le commentaire et la traduction" (Derrida, 1967, p. 30).

5. Conclusion

Summing up the above, it should be noted that the potential of philosophical thinking is to a certain extent predetermined by the semantic, word-formative and grammatical possibilities of a language, its flexibility. It is known that most philosophical concepts are multi-dimensional. From the point of view of the requirements of rigor and accuracy of scientific terminology, multivalued is a disadvantage that must be avoided. However, in a philosophical text multi-variance can be manifested as an insufficient development of the formal and logical structure of the concept, it can become a support for reflection – for comprehension of a philosophical concept in different aspects and meanings. The essence of work of the translator of postmodern philosophical texts consists in selection of translation strategies by means of which he can fully and correctly transfer the sense of complex philosophical concepts to another language.

Thus, we can conclude that a postmodern philosophical term is a unique language unit. It has such qualities as non-objectivity, polysemy and "inseparability" from the non-technological meaning of the term. In addition, it allows for many interpretations and is defined solely by the context of the whole text and the author's philosophical concept.

References

- Avtonomova, N.S., 1972. Concept of "archaeological knowledge" by M. Foucault. *Voprosy filosofii* [Problems of philosophy], 10, pp. 142–150 (in Russ.).
- Avtonomova, N.S., 1994. Michael Foucault and his book "Words and Things". In: M. Foucault. *Slova i veshchi. Arkheologiya gumanitarnykh nauk* [Words and Things. Archaeology of Humanities]. St. Petersburg (in Russ.).
- Avtonomova, N.S., 2008. Knowledge and Translation. Experiences of Language Philosophy. Moscow (in Russ.).
- Barkhudarov, L.S., 1975. Language and translation: Questions on general and private theory of translation. Moscow (in Russ.).
- Bass A., 1978. *Jacques Derrida, Writing and Difference*. London.
- Baudrillard, J., 1981. *Simulacres et simulation*. Paris.
- Baudrillard, J., 2013. *Simulacres et Simulation*. Translated by O. A. Pechenkin. Tula (in Russ.).
- Derrida, J., 1967. *La voix et le phénomène. Introduction au problème du signe dans la phénoménologie de Husserl*. Paris.
- Derrida, J., 1985. *Des tours de Babel. Difference in Translation*. Translated by Joseph F. Graham. London.



- Derrida, J., 1999. *Qu'est-ce qu'une traduction « relevante »? Actes des 15èmes Assises de la traduction littéraire*. Arles.
- Eco, U., 1989. *Zametki na polyakh «Imeni rozy»* [Notes in the fields "Names of the Rose"]. Moscow (in Russ.).
- Foucault, M., 1966, *Les Mots et les Choses*. Paris.
- Foucault, M., 1994. *Slova i veshchi. Arkheologiya gumanitarnykh nauk* [Words and Things. Archeology of the Humanities]. St. Petersburg (in Russ.).
- Foucault, M., 1996. *Arkheologiya znaniya* [Archeology of knowledge]. Kiev (in Russ.).
- Frolov, I.T., 2003. *Vvedenie v filosofiyu: ucheb. posobie dlya vuzov* [Introduction to philosophy: Teaching aid for universities]. Moscow (in Russ.).
- Gambier, Y., 2010. Translation strategies and tactics. In: *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia.
- Humboldt, V., 2000. *Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniyu* [Selected works on linguistics]. Moscow (in Russ.).
- Ilyin, I.P., 1996. *Poststrukturalizm. Dekonstruktivizm. Postmodernizm* [Post-structuralism. Deconstructivism. Postmodernism]. Moscow (in Russ.).
- Komissarov, V.N., 2002. *Sovremennoe perevodovedenie* [Modern translation studies]. Moscow (in Russ.).
- Kozlovskaya, N.V., 2011. Peculiarities of Russian Philosophical Terminology of the end of XIX – Beginning of XX Centuries. *Vestnik Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni A.S. Pushkina* [Vestnik of A.S. Pushkin Leningrad State University], 3, pp. 102 – 110 (in Russ.).
- Mankovskaya, N.B., 2003. Simulacre. In: V.V. Bychkov, ed. *Leksikon nonklassiki. Khudozhestvenno-esteticheskaya kul'tura XX veka* [Lexicon nonclassics. Art and aesthetic culture of the XX century]. Moscow (in Russ.).
- Popov, D.A., 2016. Humanities and postmodern challenge. *Izvestiya Saratovskogo universiteta. Ser.: Filosofiya. Psikhologiya. Pedagogika* [Izvestiya Saratov University. Vol.: Philosophy. Psychology. Pedagogy], 16(1), pp. 35 – 39 (in Russ.).
- Veyne, P.-M., 2003. *How they write history. Experience of Epistemology – Comment on écrit l'histoire: essai d'épistémologie*. Translated by. L. A. Torchinsky. Moscow.
- Vizgin, V.P., 1996. Post-structural methodology of history: achievements and limits. In: A. Ya. Gurevich, ed. *Odissei. Chelovek v istorii* [Odyssey. Man in History]. Moscow (in Russ.).
- Zverev, A., 2005. Postmodernism. In: *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' angliiskoi literatury XX veka* [Encyclopedic Dictionary of English Literature of the 20th Century]. Moscow (in Russ.).

The authors

Dr Maria A. Beley, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia.
E-mail: maria.beley86@gmail.com

Dr Eugenia G. Fonova, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia.
E-mail: eugeniefonova@gmail.com

To cite this article:

Beley, M.A., Fonova, E.G. 2021, Translation of postmodern terminology in the philosophical works by M. Foucault, J. Baudrillard, and J. Derrida, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 12, no. 1, p. 50 – 62. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-1-3.



ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПЕРЕВОДА
ПОСТМОДЕРНИСТСКОЙ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ
В ФИЛОСОФСКИХ РАБОТАХ М. ФУКО, Ж. БОДРИЙЯРА
И Ж. ДЕРРИДА

М. А. Белей¹, Е. Г. Фонова¹

¹ Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта
236016, Россия, Калининград, ул. Александра Невского, 14

Поступила в редакцию 27.09.2020 г.

doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-1-3

Рассматриваются особенности перевода постмодернистской философской терминологии. Спектр исследований включает переводы на русский язык современных французских постмодернистских философов Мишеля Фуко, Жана Бодрийяра и Жака Деррида.

Постмодернизм как особый тип философии, основанный на концепции радикального плюрализма, отличается программной множественностью, включающей в себя различные проекты.

В статье выделяется проблема выбора стратегий перевода постмодернистской терминологии, анализируются способы маневрирования между плюрализмом смысла и однозначностью в переводе философских терминов. Рассматриваются особенности перевода основных произведений Фуко: особое внимание уделяется переводу его постмодернистских терминов «дискурс» и «эпистема»; работы Бодрийяра «Simulacres et simulacres et simulacres» (перевод О. А. Печенкиной), в частности, различные переводческие решения его постмодернистской терминологии. Также анализируются некоторые особенности перевода трактата Ж. Деррида на русский язык.

Ключевые слова: *постмодернизм, Ж. Деррида, М. Фуко, Ж. Бодрийяр, переводческие стратегии, постмодернистская терминология, эпистема, дискурс, симулякр*

Список литературы

- Bass A. Jacques Derrida, Writing and Difference. L., 1978.
Baudrillard J. Simulacres et simulation. P., 1981.
Derrida J. Des tours de Babel. Difference in Translation / transl. by J.F. Graham. L., 1985.
Derrida J. La voix et le phénomène. Introduction au problème du signe dans la phénoménologie de Husserl. P., 1967.
Derrida J. Qu'est-ce qu'une traduction « relevante »? Actes des 15èmes Assises de la traduction littéraire. Arles, 1999.
Foucault M. Les Mots et les Choses. P., 1966.
Gambier Y. Translation strategies and tactics // Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia, 2010. Vol. 1.
Veyne P.-M. How they write history. Experience of Epistemology — Comment on écrit l'histoire: essai d'épistémologie / transl. from fr. by. L. A. Torchinsky. M., 2003.
Автономова Н. С. Концепция «археологического знания» М. Фуко // Вопросы философии. 1972. №10. С. 142–150.
Автономова Н. С. Мишель Фуко и его книга «Слова и вещи» // Слова и вещи. Археология гуманитарных наук. СПб., 1994.
Автономова Н. С. Познание и перевод. Опыты философии языка. М., 2008.



- Бархударов Л. С.* Язык и перевод: Вопросы общей и частной теории перевода. М., 1975.
- Бодрийяр Ж.* Симулякры и симуляция / пер. О. А. Печенкина. Тула, 2013.
- Визгин В. П.* Постструктуралистская методология истории: достижения и пределы // Одиссей. Человек в истории. М., 1996. С. 39–59.
- Гумбольдт В.* Избранные труды по языкознанию. М., 2000.
- Зверев А.* Постмодернизм // Энциклопедический словарь английской литературы XX века. М., 2005. С. 334.
- Ильин И. П.* Постструктурализм. Деконструктивизм. Постмодернизм. М., 1996.
- Козловская Н. В.* Особенности русской философской терминологии конца XIX – начала XX в. // Вестник Ленинградского государственного университета имени А. С. Пушкина. 2011. №3. С. 102–110.
- Комиссаров В. Н.* Современное переводоведение. М., 2002.
- Маньковская Н. Б.* Симулякр // Лексикон неонклассики. Художественно-эстетическая культура XX века / под ред. В. В. Бычкова. М., 2003.
- Попов Д. А.* Гуманитарные науки и постмодернистский вызов // Известия Саратовского университета. Сер.: Философия. Психология. Педагогика. 2016. Т. 16, вып. 1. С. 35–39.
- Фролов И. Т.* Введение в философию: учеб. пособие для вузов. М., 2003.
- Фуко М.* Археология знания. Киев, 1996.
- Фуко М.* Слова и вещи. Археология гуманитарных наук. СПб., 1994.
- Эко У.* Заметки на полях «Имени розы». М., 1989.

Об авторах

Мария Александровна Белей, кандидат филологических наук, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Россия.
E-mail: maria.beley86@gmail.com

Евгения Геннадьевна Фонова, кандидат филологических наук, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Россия.
E-mail: eugeniefonova@gmail.com

Для цитирования:

Белей М. А., Фонова Е. Г. Особенности перевода постмодернистской терминологии в философских работах М. Фуко, Ж. Бодрийяра и Ж. Деррида // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2021. Т. 12, №1. С. 50–62. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-1-3.