

THE ADOPTION OF OWN CHOICE AND THE ASPECT OF TRANSLATION METAPHYSICAL COMPONENT

(Recibido el 15-06-2017. Aprobado el 04-09-2017)

Zulfiya Zaytunovna Ibragimova

Kazan Federal University,

Department of General Philosophy at the Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications of Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Associate Professor, Kazan, Russia, yuldyz@rambler.ru

Adelya Kamilevna Khayaleeva

Kazan Federal University, Department of Social Philosophy at the Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications of Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, postgraduate student, Kazan, Russia, adel.alpen@gmail.com

Abstract: An attempt to find out the conditions of mastering one's own freedom through a choice leads to the concretization of a thinking situation itself. Indeed, we are not always ready to choose. The latter appears in different ways: as an instant flash, as a long agonizing process, suffering, as an indifferent, spontaneous pressing of the corresponding "right" keys. The issues inevitably arise in connection with a choice subjectification¹ and objectification. The irony is that reality does not tolerate a delay almost always. It is merciless to our attempts to make an unnamed decision. This solution must have an "author". He can not neglect his identity. I.e., a choice should coincide with the most diverse components of human nature and random meanings and accents up to the mystical movement of a soul. But the genuine "authorship" of choice does not mean that it is shared and agreed by us. There are some solutions taken in spite of. Should this be considered as the will of a subject? Where do we see a true person? At the moment of his nature acceptance or in the moment of its rejection? That is why the questions about the "correctness" of the adopted decision are simply removed by default. The following fact is at the heart of everything: we accept ourselves, our actions and thoughts as our true thing or not.

The main methods used to write the article: dialectical, axiomatic and comparative one.

Keywords: choice, freedom, decision, authorship, man, self-care, desperation, M.Fuko, hypostasis, translation, subject, being

Citar, estilo APA: Ibragimova, Z. & Khayaleeva, A. (2017). The adoption of own choice and the aspect of translation metaphysical component. *Revista QUID (Special Issue)*, 719-723.

¹ M. Foucault considers subjectification as the process of constituting himself as a subject (moral, political, reasonable)

1. INTRODUCTION

The previous logic of our studies began with the comprehension of Paydaya phenomenon importance to denote the internal transformations that a person experiences and which lead to the development of a strong state. This is a great ideal of all times - a public virtue serving to a state. This necessitated the question of education in general as the instrument of a man himself and a state creation. An incredible complexity of this problem was originally predetermined by another major universal value - the conditions of a person's life choice and his freedom. Following J. Hoyzing, we emphasized the fundamental meaning of the task of own nature mastering by a man as one of the tasks of the twentieth century culture. We have long crossed this time period. But the goal did not become any closer. The internal logic of the problem was indicated fruitfully by Socrates, Plato, M. Heidegger, M. Foucault and others. M. Foucault's view allowed to comprehend the Hellenistic life practices of "taking care of oneself" creatively. Existentialism and neo-Freudianism revealed the ambiguity of freedom understanding, partly questioning its shining pathos. Our readiness to make a decision, to master one's own nature and the desire for freedom turned out to be unobvious. Nevertheless, a person can not refuse from the "authorship" of making a choice and exercising his freedom. Accepting yourself, your choice, your understanding of freedom requires courage sometimes. We have outlined only some aspects of the posed problem.

Michel Foucault studies this issue after M. Heidegger, "concentrating (unlike the German philosopher) precisely on the ways of his existence acceptance as his own task. He performs not an ontological, but an ontical analysis, however, certainly containing ontological implications, which can be projected into that concern for oneself, which is realized within the framework of philosophical education" (Lechzier, 2005). The main issue related to the realization of identity and freedom sounds extremely clear and monosyllabic: how to live your own life, realize your own ideas about freedom, learn to make choices constantly? (Learn to be free? Being always unprepared for this?). Every time it's like the first time. This imaginary simplicity is comparable to the popular statement that we do not attach importance to the fact that we breathe oxygen ... Mirkina Z. writes that "G. Pomerants, being a schoolboy, wrote the essay on the topic: "Who do I want to be?". Grisha

wrote: "I want to be myself". These words caused the teacher's indignation. The answer is not Soviet one. It seemed abstruse and individualistic for the teacher. And individualism was not strongly encouraged then. But Grisha really wanted to be himself. And he became himself. Becoming oneself means to be true to your depth. Dare to search for this depth. Find it and be faithful to it" (Mirkina, 2017).

2. METHODS

The dialectical method in the article reveals itself as a cognitive procedure that links the fragments of personal being, the conditions for the realization of freedom and choice, the irrational aspects of the acceptance of one's life choice into a contradictory unity. The comparative method was realized in comparison of different historical and philosophical trends in relation to the problem of choice and its acceptance by a man. This method allows you to count on the search for universal bases and differences of the phenomenon under study. The axiomatic method used in the article is represented by those starting points about the objective possibility of a person to realize his ideas about freedom through choice. This is realized proceeding from deduction - the judgments about freedom as a universal value.

3. RESULTS

Our efforts to create the prerequisites and the conditions for the understanding of human choice phenomenon and the realization of his personal perceptions of freedom are just another transition, a step in a problem understanding. The understanding of subjectivity and subjectivization requires a deeper study, in particular, the study of M. Foucault's heritage. An important guideline for us is the formulation of the issue about the "human presence" in this world, "the abandonment", the role of charity as a qualitative measure of culture in individual acts of acceptance and the organic nature of life choice. The concept of the plurality of human hypostases, the possibility of their plastic translation into the generally valid language of culture inspire certain optimism.

Conclusion: How can we determine that a real life has begun, and not an endless preparation, its evaluation, various tricks, quite rational, that's why frightening us, the aim for "slowing down" the events of our own lives. For what purpose? In order to make your "project" the most perfect and

invulnerable? Then why is it so difficult to accept your life, your existence as an organic product? Why the rejection of one's own essence can cause not only negative feelings, but also despair in us. The hero of the story by V. Kantor Pavel Galakhov, who turned out to be a sick and a lonely person in his old age, thought about the "chaos of his life". After a painful death of one of his friends, he called the happened thing "a cruel death of despair". "No, Pavel thought, there is no eternal return, Nietzsche is wrong, there is only a constant return of a man into non-existence. This is the eternal path that everyone goes through" (Kantor, p. 19, 8, 5].

Everyday life teaches us to run from despair. Religious dogmas are negatively categorical in despair evaluation. But despair is not just an important detail of our existence. According to G. Pomerants, it is impossible to go into the depths of being without it where good and grace reigns. After all, the world "lies in evil" on the surface.

This position comes into the disagreement with another vision, for example, with M. Foucault's opinion and others. It is not the depth of being that is important, but its surface. Dyakov A.V. writes that "M. Foucault does not deny the existence of a subject. He speaks only of the fact that 1) a subject is the senses generated by him and that 2) a subject is constantly moving. Foucault offers us a model of a "flat" world in which surface meanings are not exchanged for deep "essences", and since the meaning has no roots, it constantly slides along a plane. Moreover, the meanings themselves create this plane. A subject moves constantly, moves along this plane of meaning. ... This means not only that a subject is absent at any point, but that he is at all points at once. If we give up hope of localizing him, we will be able to locate its whereabouts, its topos. Foucault states this in a calm way. He simply tells us that skin is a person, there is no "person" to whom this skin belongs or by which he would be covered. In general, he repeats P. Valerie's favorite post-structural formula: the deepest thing is the skin. A person does not have depth, he has a surface only. And all the meanings and all the "stories" occur on the surface of a man's skin. Or rather, not on its surface - this would be the return to teleological thinking again - but on the skin itself, which is the surface, which is a man. All meanings arise on our surface, on us as a surface. There are no deep entities behind the surface effects. Are we our surface? No, not "our", but just a surface" (Dyakov, 2008).

Despair, so obvious to S. Kierkegaard (Kantor, V. (2008, p. 367), is the individual's realization of his tragic loneliness, dramatic existence, "throwing" into being. Despair, according to Kierkegaard's opinion, points to the very causality and the possibility of existence, reveals a person's involvement in life (Kierkegaard, 1993).

As for other lives, everything is obvious and does not make doubts. But the very justifications of unpreparedness, the non-obviousness of the author's vital "handwriting" are so clear to us. This is the language by which we write the most complex and interesting text of our life. The handwriting sometimes changes dramatically, the colors fade and come to life again. Our reasoning about the non-obviousness of a man's readiness to master his freedom, to make his choice constantly, lead to the realization that he is inevitably waiting for any of us. Subjectivity, as a necessity, a regularity can be removed from our shoulders. In the end, as it happens often and routinely, a choice is made by someone for us. It is an unthinkable task for many to make their choice. There is no point to expose it to pejorative criticism. We are all helpless, sometimes we evade personal responsibility deliberately. It is the easiest way to justify and say by M. Heidegger's words: "Being turned away from us from the very beginning ... We are only trying to think" (Heidegger, n. d).

"Physical tightness is only the projection of our thinking economy. Our world is never better than our speech" according to a sharp note by V. Bibikhin (1993) - and this can be formalized as the methodological component of our question. When a subject is confronted with the issue of his own nature (as an active subject, of course) he is forced to formulate the question. But we can not fail to note after Heidegger (Heidegger, 2009) that even inner speech is always translated from the mode of premonition of thought into a finite form, existing according to the laws of language. At this moment a kind of "collision" in the translation can happen (and usually it happens) - after all, the ideal translation does not exist. Even in this primary formulation of the question a flux appears, which, of course, distances our subject from the possibility of a direct question about his own nature.

Let's expand the problem of translation a little more widely. Translation is always a possible world. Sometimes translations can be resisted by political, cultural, and especially linguistic factors. The moment of uncertainty arises in the process of translation. At the smallest level the choice from a

string of synonyms takes place, in a broader one - the definition of a translated text dominant: a bias in a form or a content. Among the many options it is necessary to stop on one and apply one more smear to the translation canvas. The canvas metaphor unintentionally symbolizes that translation is not only a bad or good copy, but a new, or even a different work.

So, we find the metaphysical component of the translation: it is the mode of being that sets the situation of choice for us. The translator has the means in the form of words, signs, background knowledge, text history, with which he can approach the world of the original: to recreate the "aura" of an authentic source. Following Benjamin, we use the word "aura" as "a unique sensation of a distance, no matter how close the subject under consideration is" or "as an expression of the cult significance for a work of art" (Benjamin, 2008). In a purely technical translation, this process turns into the conversion of signs from one system to another according to the principle of the first association. A. Markov points out to this phenomenon: "The translator does not reproduce what he understands, he does not follow his thinking, but he always divides the text in a new way and lives it through existentially ..." (Markov, 2009). We understand the translation in a broad sense as the transformation of certain semantic signs, images, knowledge into another system that has different codes of this information fixation.

4. SUMMARY

The analysis of some approaches to the understanding of the problem of our own choice making did not give us the opportunity to develop a rigorous, logically verified picture of the phenomenon. Rather, we received separate fragments of reflection, which require our systematic historical and philosophical construction. It is important that the trend of analysis is associated with a new historical vision of subjectivity, the search for "inner man" as the prerequisites and factors for making his own choice. Zaitseva T.B. (Zaitseva, 2012, p. 66) notes that the meaning of existential fear is revealed only in relation of an individual to himself and determines the degree of the individual maturity, and a man's spirituality. Fear is the "dizziness of freedom" (Lyubetsky, 2005, p. 160), which covers a person before a precipice, i.e. an opportunity and a need for a personal choice. A person attracts and pushes away an opportunity to make a decisive choice simultaneously, which requires the courage

from him to be free, makes him responsible for his own existence.

Lyubetskoy V.I. sees the only way of gaining freedom through an individual choice. "The transition to the "inner" must take place, where the existential dimension of man is located in everyday and numerous manifestations of life. This finding of existence is realized through the decisive choice of a person, his exit from an objective being to a unique self. This can be understood as an ideal man's action, a movement towards its fundamental predetermination, a unique individual progress that relies only on that elusive thing that is contained in the object of faith" (2005).

The exercise of freedom through own choice rests, ultimately, on a person's existential potential. He, who once escaped from the bosom of nature in search of his inorganic, spiritual essence and created the world of culture, has to remember the possibility of a permanent free return to his nature at any point of this culture. The dialectic of such a shuttle movement requires a very strong spiritual transformation of a man and society. Fortunately, this movement is reversible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- Benjamin, W. (2008). *The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction*. Penguin UK.
- Bibikhin, V. V. (1993). Language philosophy. *International philosophical journal*. 3, 57-119.
- Dyakov, A. V. (2008) Michel Foucault: about the "death of a man", about freedom and about the "end of philosophy". *Journal of History and Philosophy of Kazan State University. Series "Philosophy"*, 2, p. 45, Retrieved from: <http://jkhora.narod.ru/foucault001.pdf>
- Heidegger, M. (2009) *Parmenid [Parmenides]*. Saint-Petersburg, Vladimir Dal.
- Heidegger, M. (n. d) What does it mean to think? Retrieved 19 May 2017 from: http://www.libok.net/writer/5885/kniga/17957/haydegger_martin/chto_znachit_myislit/read

Kantor, V. (2008). *Death of a pensioner*. The Star. №10, p. 20. Retrieved 15 May 2017 from: <http://magazines.russ.ru/zvezda/2008/10>

Kierkegaard, S. (1993). *The disease to death*. Republic, 251-350.

Lechzier, V. L. (2005). Self-care and the problem of philosophical education. The idea of the university and the topos of thought. Conference materials issued on October 3-5, 2005 - Samara: Samara State University, 2005. - pp. 51-65. Retrieved 15 May 2017 from: <http://hpsy.ru/public/x4111.htm>

Lyubetsky, V. I. (2005). Existentials of human existence in the philosophy of Søren Kierkegaard: from despair to faith. *Young scientist*, 24, 1175-1178. Retrieved from: <https://moluch.ru/archive/104/>

Markov (2009). Difficulty learning and translation. *Questions of literature*, 2, 109-117.

Mirkina, Z. (2017). Livejournal. *Essays. Longing for God*. Retrieved 15 May 2017 from: <http://pomerants.livejournal.com/36146.html>

Zaitseva, T. B. (210) The category of despair or "Illness to death" in the philosophy of Søren Kierkegaard. *Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, culturology and art history. Questions of theory and practice*, 11. Retrieved from: <http://www.gramota.net/materials/3/2012/11-1/11.html>