
**PHILOSOPHICAL METHODOLOGY OF TRANSLATION
STUDIES: THE RATIONALISM OF V. VON HUMBOLDT
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE DECONSTRUCTION
OF POSTMODERNISM**

Stezhko Yuriy

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-712-3-1-17>

INTRODUCTION

The topic of translatability/untranslatability has held a key place in translations studies discourse throughout the history of linguistics. The problem of translatability/untranslatability traces its origins in times of translating the Word of God, as the issue of preserving the truth. Divergence in positions were determined by philosophical methodological conceptions regarding the essence of translation. Some linguists grounded their position on the universal nature of human's way of thinking, while other linguists focused on the ontological nature of language – the profound conditionality of a sense translating by feature of culture. In all cases, the solution to the dilemma of translatability /untranslatability is determined by philosophical methodology.

However, to date, the linguistic reflection on translation has not reached its completion. Perhaps this is why during the Modern era, a stance emerged (House J., Nida E., Reiss K. et al.) according to which translation is possible, and the only question is the degree of functional equivalence with which it reflects the meaning of the source text. The translation method is determined by the specific characteristics of the text. Proponents of this approach proceeded from practical considerations without concerning themselves with philosophical substantiation. Consequently, two distinct concepts of translation emerged: one relies on philosophy as a methodology, while the other is based on the empirical analysis of translation practices. However, the attempt to resolve the problem of translatability/untranslatability while ignoring philosophy as a methodology has not gained widespread recognition among linguists.

Yet, philosophy itself has undergone changes. Prior to the expansion of postmodernism into translation studies, V. von Humboldt's linguistic

rationalism was considered the leading methodology. But the deconstruction of postmodernism overthrew the hegemony of rationalism, liberalized translation studies, and provided the translator with a strategy of transcreation. The scientific article is devoted to answering the question of whether Humboldt's fundamental theory has lost its significance.

The studies of linguistic methodology need understanding of general principles of the dominant philosophical paradigm. Today, the methodology of scientific studies, and linguistics as well are on the crossroad between universal logocentrism (or absolutization of mind) of the epoch of Modern and epistemic relativism of postmodernism – the phenomenon of modern philosophy, which paradigm has its own (dominantly perceptive and pluralistic) model of reality and its own logic as the historical product of culture and language. Methodological norms of postmodernism determine the humanization of linguistic studies in accordance with the requirements of the new cultural and linguistic reality.

Thus, following V. von Humboldt's advice "Besitzt daher das gegenwärtige Zeitalter einen Vorzug an dieser Bildung, dieser Stärke und diesem Reichtum, so muß man ihm auch die Freiheit gewähren, auf welche derselbe mit Recht Anspruch macht"¹ we will consider the postmodern methodology of linguistics from the standpoint of diachrony.

Studies of scientific achievements of outstanding thinkers of the past give the key to understanding the problems of the development of science today. Outstanding in the rationalistic anthropology of the language was, undoubtedly, the linguistic philosophy of V. von Humboldt, which influence on the development of translation study is currently atop of discuss. The scientific achievements of the philosopher and linguist V. von Humboldt pointed the direction of the development of linguistic anthropology for years to come; his scientific heritage is reflected every time in new facets as linguistic technologies develop. The acceptability of V. von Humboldt's linguistic philosophy and its modern paradigm is yet to be more investigated.

The provided study was preceded by a study of the results of fundamental research, commonly published in scientific journals with an index Scopus and Web of Science."

An analysis of contemporary philosophical literature has shown a lack of special researches on the significance of V. von Humboldt's philosophy of linguistics in the context of contemporary postmodern transformations. However, we note a number of working-out relevant to our study of linguistic methodology problem in the context of general philosophical issues.

¹ Humboldt W. Ideen zu einem Versuch, die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit des Staats zu bestimmen. 1792. S. 3.

We like the conceptualization of general scientific norms proposed by Meier G.S., van der Voet P., and Yan T., which facilitate an understanding of the possible ethical implications of literary translations as a form of international communication, conditioned by linguistic differences in the reflection of reality. “Doing research in a globalized context – regardless of the discipline – requires language decisions at different stages of the research process,”² the authors think.

We paid attention in our research on formulated in the editorial article “Diametros” the general principles of scientific research. In particular, the authors Surmiak A., Męćfal S. note: “social research has always involved ethical reflection, the ethicality of research during the predominance of the positivist paradigm simply meant methodological correctness. In recent years, attention to ethical issues in social research is much more broadly understood, as also avoiding harm to research participants, respecting their autonomy ...”³

The approach to reflecting social reality is relevant to our study research of the relationship between the philosophy of linguistics of V. von Humboldt and postmodern deconstruction, undoubtedly forecasts high efficiency, since, “despite the consideration of various topics, all of them reflect the spirit of modernity”⁴.

The works I. Aponenko, M. Zhaldun, W. Koller, L. Kovtun, L. Nemlii, I. Ostapenko, M. Raihani, Y. Shabanova, O. Sosnjuk, could be considered as propaedeutics for the topic of our research⁵.

However, in our opinion, the field for the search for methodological foundations for increasing the effectiveness of linguistic practices, first of all, in the field of literary translation, remains underexplored. Also, gaps are remained in research on the specifics of translation as a way for communication

² Meier G.S., Voet P., Yan T. Research ethics in a multilingual world: A guide to reflecting on language decisions in all disciplines *Diametros*. 2024. 80. P. 38.

³ Surmiak A., Męćfal S. Ethical challenges in contemporary social research (editorial). *Diametros*. 2024. 80. P. 1.

⁴ Kaziliūnaitė A. Living in ‘Interesting Times’ as the Imperative of Asking Unimagined Questions. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 2025. 36 (1). Pp. 1–4.

⁵ Aponenko I.M., Zhaldun M.I., Zaporozhets O.S. On the question of the linguistic methodology importance. *The 19th International scientific and practical conference “Innovative approaches to solving scientific problems”*. May 16–19, 2023. Tokyo. Pp. 296–299.; Koller W. Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft. Quelle & Meyer Verlag GmbH & Co., 7., aktualisierte Auflage. 2004.; Kovtun L.V., Shabanova Y.O. Anthropology of “Philosophy of Translation”: Contemporary Ukrainian Philosophical Dimension. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. (21). 2022. Pp. 38–53.; Nemlii L., Stezhko Yu. Transcreation as the strategy of the cultural recoding of literary works. *International Humanitarian University Herald. Philology*. 2026 76. Pp. 236–240.; Raihani M.S. Translatability and Untranslatability (A Historical Background). *English Language Teaching*. Vol. 19. 2. 2026. Pp. 114–126.; Sosnjuk O., Ostapenko I. Cultural codes as markers of national identity: possibilities of actualization in the educational space. Problems of Personal Identity Development in the Educational Space: Materials of the III Roundtable Meeting. October 2024. Pp. 93–103.

at the stage of mental interaction between author and reader in the context of W. von Humboldt's anthropological philosophy of linguistics. This shortcoming is significant, we think as it leads to: 1) discrepancies between the level of understanding of the problems and their methodological support; 2) a decrease in the effectiveness of the implementation of the humanistic ideas of postmodern philosophy in translation theory.

The linguistic discrepancy between the philosophical understanding of research objects and their linguistic decoration at the mental level often leads to arbitrariness in translation studies and, consequently, to the distortion of practical goals. Moreover, we may not exclude the possibility of using a simplified understanding of the underlying problems of translation practice in other theoretical and methodological studies. An example is the “substitution” of human cognitive phenomena with an artificial model, and, in the foreseeable future, the conflation of authentic and artificial intelligence as a justification for substituting a machine model for a translator's cognitive abilities. Therefore, we fully support the statement: “Doing research in a globalized context – regardless of the discipline – requires language decisions at different stages of the research process.”⁶ We fully believe that philosophical-methodological research into the problems of translation theory in diachronicity, taking into account the specifics of postmodern transformations, will lead to tangible practical results and become a benchmark for improving translator training in national universities.

We think it so, omissions determined purposes of our research in the study of the philosophical foundations of linguistics in the diachrony as the evolution of the methodology of translation studies from the rationalism of the founder of linguistics as a science, V. von Humboldt, to the deconstruction of Postmodernism.

The research is carried out using the **method** of comparative analysis based on the principle of the unity of the historical and logical.

The subject of scientific paper: to identify the general and special in philosophical- and metodologi principles by of V. von Humboldt, and Postmodernism in the context of the translation theory with solution of the following tasks: to reveal the principle of deconstruction as a liberalization of translation practice; to determine the essence of the transcreation strategy in the cultural recoding of nationally marked concepts; to substantiate the methodological consistency of V. von Humboldt's linguistic-specific philosophy with the contemporary postmodernist paradigm of philosophy as the particular and the general.

⁶ Meier G.S., Voet P., Yan T. Research ethics in a multilingual world: A guide to reflecting on language decisions in all disciplines. *Diametros*. 2024. 80. P. 38.

1. Cultural- and historical conditionality of the change of philosophical priorities of linguistic methodology

Known is that functioning scientific concepts runs on the ground of philosophical categories. The categories provide the researcher with a vision of the concrete- and scientific, conceptual apparatus through the prism of a global comprehension of the object of study. Therefore, we base our exploration on Hegel's guidance: "...Wissenschaften mögen es mit Rasonieren ohne die Philosophie versuchen, soviel sie wollen, ohne sie nicht Leben, Geist, Wahrheit in themen zu haben vermögen."⁷ This is about the scientific philosophy.

Since the time of R. Descartes, dominant position in the development of science has got rationalistic philosophy. The theoretical language studies of W. von Humboldt were also formed methodologically with influence of philosophical rationalism as a universalism of thoughts. Unrestricted rationalism creates the conditions for untranslatability, which dominated the visions of translation theorists and practitioners until postmodern deconstruction. According to V. von Humboldt, "Übersetzen scheint mir schlechterdings ein Versuch zur Auflösung einer unmöglichen Aufgabe."⁸ However, is the untranslatability really so absolute? Postmodernist translation practices provide grounds for doubt. Let us consider the causes of the conflict between Humboldtian theory and contemporary practice.

Under the prevalence of logic in methodology, a strict adherence to the author's intentions in translations was unquestionable. V von Humboldt's linguistic methodology also aligned with philosophical rationalism and culturally supported the translation practices of the time.

Civilizational changes in quality of life have manifested themselves in the philosophy and culture of postmodernism, which is, not without reason, interpreted as the culture and philosophy of the consciousness of the comfortable consumer.

Modernism, with its methodological principles, has faded into oblivion. Philosophical rationalism, which for centuries had centered and consolidated paradigms of social practice, has lost its dominant methodological role in scientific theories, particularly, in translation studies as well, and stepped aside to pluralism and the translator's freedom to be themselves.

A reassessment of values has passed, the assertion of a new intellectualism and humanism, a liberalization of text interpretation. Translation theory has seen a noticeable shift in priorities from authenticity to superficial

⁷ Hegel G. Die Phänomenologie des Geistes. Vorrede. 1807.

⁸ Humboldt W. Sprachwissenschaftliche Korrespondenz Wilhelm von Humboldt an August Wilhelm von Schlegel. 23.07. 1796. Handschrift: Grundlage der Edition: Dresden, SLUB, Mscr. Dresd. e 90. Nr. 57. S. 240.

aestheticization, to carnivalization, from the sacred to the profane. Cause-and-effect interconnections, essence, and objectivity call less and less interest to translators. Subjectivism has taken primary place in the form of translation simulacrum and performance.

The linguistic transformations of postmodernism (the removal of rationalism out from its methodological pedestal, and the cancellation of the demands of objectivity) created the conditions for a strategy of transcreation, establishing parity between the translator and the author in the formation of meaning. Postmodernism liberalized the demands to the language culture and legitimized the creative shaping reality. The word aesthetics became subordinated to the reader's demands. The sphere of the new philosophy as a linguistic methodology – is freedom like Feyerabend's “everything is permitted”. The translation theory in the spirit of “La traducción ha muerto! Viva la traducción!”⁹ was adjusted.

Rationalism, through the implementation of non-logical forms of textual comprehension, acquired a humanistic meaning. According to precise concept of V. Kremen: “The new rationality – is the irrationalism formed on the basis of information culture...”¹⁰ This is on time, as further scientific development based on the unlimited rationalism inherent in modernism would not only complete the dehumanization of science but, according to futurologists, would also be reflected in public consciousness as Ekpyrosis. But already, the crisis of rationalism has taken another form: researchers' loss of faith in philosophy itself as a methodology.

2. Philosophical reflection about the essence of methodology of translation studies

However, postmodernist humanism wasn't taken by every researcher for a new philosophical methodology. Not all linguists understood postmodernist transformations as a modernization of V. von Humboldt's linguistic methodology, i.e., was not taken for an inevitable given. Dogmatically thinking researchers, oriented traditionally toward philosophical rationalism as an infallible sanctity, effectively lost their methodological bearings. The loss of rationalism's dominant position was perceived as a devaluation of the very philosophy itself—science no longer saw its *own* knowledge in it. Researchers failed to take into account that philosophy is not inherently servile. “Sie wird häufig für ein formelles inhaltsleeres Wissen gehalten, und es fehlt sehr an der Einsicht, daß, was auch dem Inhalte nach in irgendeiner Kenntnis und Wissenschaft Wahrheit ist, diesen Namen allein dann verdienen kann, wenn es von der Philosophie

⁹ Ortega y Gasset J. Miseria y esplendor de la traducción. 1937. S. 11.

¹⁰ Kremen V.H. Philosophy: thinkers, ideas, concepts. Kyiv: Book. 2005. P. 382.

erzeugt worden.”¹¹ Unfortunately, not all researchers took G. Hegel’s words as a methodological guideline.

The conservatism of some linguists’ thinking prevented them from understanding that philosophy is sub to civilizational transformations, and therefore they could not see the positive in the shift in priorities – rationalism onto anthropologism as a humanistic value. As a result, researchers developed different visions of what linguistic methodology should be and how was justified the correction of philosophy of V. von Humboldt in accordance with the demands of postmodernism culture. Somebody enthusiastically has embraced the fundamental tenets of the new philosophy and culture and began to build a new paradigm for translation theory, while another fall to seek an alternative instead of philosophy. And they found one, spotting a complex of theories and methods in methodology, and that an eclectic rather than a systematic combination of its, what was worse. For example, in the “Dictionary of Philological Terms” we read: “Methodology – 1) the study of the methods of scientific research; 2) strategies and procedures applying by scientists in their researches; a set of methods.”¹² Or – methodology is “a set of scientific- and research aspects and methods of training.”¹³ As we see, philosophy is not mentioned in the concepts. Such definitions are more concerned with limited, specific scientific methodology, rather than a general scientific one, such as philosophy.

The most harmful thing for science is the researcher’s reliance on common sense, without understanding that common sense is– a reliable guide for everyday life – is insignificant in the theoretical understanding of reality. We are impressed by M. Heidegger’s assessment of it: “Sound” common sense. It harps on the demand for palpable utility and inveighs against knowledge of the essence of beings, which essential knowledge has long been called “philosophy.”¹⁴ And, known is, the very understanding of the essence is a guide for the translator in overcoming untranslatability. The basis for replacing philosophy with common sense was a misunderstanding of the scientific determinacy of philosophical abstractions. “The abstractness of philosophy, on the one hand, and the dominance of common sense, on the other, have led to the fact that linguists do not see behind the mass of particular objects the general that determines their place in the research.”¹⁵ Happened that the methodological principles of the new philosophy failed the competition with the typical for man

¹¹ Hegel G. *Die Phänomenologie des Geistes*, Vorrede. 1807.

¹² Baran Ye., Hazdah V. *Dictionary of philological terms*. Ferenc Rakoczi. Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education. 2024. P. 59.

¹³ Zherybylo T.V. *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms*. Ed. 5th, Nazran: “Pilgrim”. 2010. P. 177.

¹⁴ Heidegger M. *On the Essence of Truth*. 1961. P. 1.

¹⁵ Stezhko Yu. *Philosophy of Postmodernism as a Marker of Modern Linguistic Methodology of Research on Interlinguistic Communication*. *Philosophy. Sociology*. 34. 3. 2023. P. 263.

“economy of thinking”, a commitment to simple, easy conclusions, solutions.¹⁶ And AI only multiplied the desire to comfortable way of thinking. In contrast to researchers neglected the scientific nature of methodology, progressively thinking linguists, – who constitute the majority – have found general points of distinctive linguistic philosophy of V. von Humboldt's with contemporary postmodernist principles, recognized postmodern philosophy for methodology of linguistics, based on its principles built the translation strategy of transcreation – moving beyond logical thought into the realm of the irrational: religion, art, and intuition.

3. Postmodernist liberalization as a condition for the translators creative self-expression

The synergy of the logical and the irrational, and non-logical, the linguistically specific, and the postmodernist universal in methodology created a ground for the elimination of untranslatability. In linguistic discourse, instead of a theme about the binary opposition of translatability/untranslatability has been replaced by a new theme: “the residual untranslatability of nationally marked concepts”. The translation strategy of transcreation, which is formed on the basis of postmodernism's liberal concessions (the refuse of the untouchability of authorial intentions, the parity of the translator with the author in interpreting sense), has revealed the translator's creative potential in the cultural recoding of a text. The irrational concessions of postmodernism as a linguistic methodology are the basis for creatively interpretation of the text in accordance with the reader's cultural needs, since “creativity is an entirely irrational, a mystical faculty.”¹⁷ Successful transcreation practices have created an empirical basis for rethinking translation theory, protected researchers from extremes in their vision of translation possibilities. Residual untranslatability, or, as A. Pavlova calls it, “partial equivalence in translation is both permissible and inevitable.”¹⁸ However, this residuality does not constitute the untranslatability that was conditioned by objectivism and the absolutization of authorial cognition in modernist methodology. Untranslatable residuality is connected with that, what the translation of a word into the foreign language equivalent does not always ensure the perceptibility of the original.

¹⁶ Imperfections of this position in the scientific research become apparent even at the stage of the very formulating the problem and hypothesis. A poorly or incorrectly defined problem, and then a hypothesis, distorts all subsequent steps of the research, not to mention the results.

¹⁷ Popper K. The Open Society and Its Enemies. Oracular philosophy and the revolt against reason. New One-Volume. Princeton University Press. Princeton and Oxford. 1994. P. 434.

¹⁸ Pavlova A. Translatability in Translation Studies and Linguocultural Studies. *Acta Linguistica*. Mainz, Germany. Vol. 5. 2. 2011. P. 7.

4. Conditionality of thinking by the method of linguistic reflection of reality in the linguistic- and specific philosophy of V. von Humboldt

Logical thinking as a universal human trait does not necessarily imply uniformity of understanding among all peoples. As V. von Humboldt noted, “Ihre Verschiedenheit ist nicht eine von Schällen und Zeichen, sondern eine Verschiedenheit der Weltansichten selbst”¹⁹ – the postulate that defines the methodological attitude to cultural recoding of a text. An illustration of such «Verschiedenheit der Weltansichten» is found in Ortega and Gasset: “Since languages are formed in different landscapes, through different experiences, their incongruity is natural. It is false, for example, to suppose that the thing the Spaniard calls a bosque [forest] the German calls a *Wald*, yet the dictionary tells us that *Wald* means bosque.”²⁰

We are impressed by V. Manakin's illustration of the different perceptions of the word “*сонує*.” “Sun in Ukrainian, he writes, it is completely different from *кۈەش* in Uzbek, and certainly not from *офтоб* in the Tajik language. After all, an Uzbek living most part of the year under scorching rays of the sun, would never use the affectionate diminutive “*сонечко*”... [in Ukrainian]”²¹, since the languages developed in different climatic conditions. Clearly, the word in a literary context is completely different from its dictionary translation.

Differences in word perception also point to an extra in thinking that is conditioned by the national specificity of how reality is reflected in language, a distinctive aspect imprinted in the mentality of a people. “Das Denken ist nicht bloss abhängig von der Sprache überhaupt, sondern, bis auf einen gewissen Grad, auch von jeder einzelnen bestimmten”²², writes V. von Humboldt. We see an example of this conditionality in the different ways of understanding reality – mental inclination of Ukrainians, known as “philosophy of the heart”, and the culturological rationalism of the peoples of the Romano-Germanic Conglomeration. Therefore, we should agree with A. Pavlova about the inevitability of residual untranslatability.

Therefore, it appears the question, what is meant by translation, and therefore by translatability: preserving the referential correspondence of the original lexeme to the target lexeme, or achieving a perceptual correspondence of words through cultural recoding. Referential translatability is in achieving unambiguous reference of lexical elements of different languages to the same extralinguistic object and is explained by the fact that “jede ist ein Anklang der

¹⁹ Humboldt W. Über das vergleichende Sprachstudium. 1820. S. 20

²⁰ Ortega y Gasset J. Miseria y esplendor de la traducción. 1937. S. 10.

²¹ Manakin V. Contrastive Lexicology. Kyiv: Znannya. 2004. P. 23.

²² Humboldt W. Über das vergleichende Sprachstudium. 1820. S. 17

allgemeinen Natur des Menschen.”²³ However, this is not enough for translation as achieving perceptual correspondence. Translatability and preservation of the perceptual coloring of the text achieving not by lexical re-expression so much as more by cultural recoding, the possibilities of which are revealed by the postmodernist understanding of intertextuality as a “means of analyzing a literary text” (V. Kremen). The strategy of transcreation, based on the liberal foundation of postmodernism, presupposes the translator's unlimited capacity to create reality (intertextuality as a “text without boundaries”).

5. Eliminating the untranslatability of concepts marked for national as a philosophical expression of the mental interaction of the author and the translator

W. von Humboldt declared the untranslatability (let us remind “Übersetzten scheint mir schlechterdings ein Versuch zur Auflösung einer unmöglichen Aufgabe”²⁴) in transcreation effected itself in the dualism of mentalities, which, as to V. von Humboldt, are manifested by concepts in the languages of peoples, and need cultural recoding. The humanistic potential of postmodernist methodology revealed possibilities of such text recoding up from culture to another one with preserved perception.

However, the literature on translation theory, the definitions *notion* and *concept* are quite often indistinguishable in meaning. Without falling into the rationale for their differences, because this is not our aim, we only will cite interpretation of concept of V. Manakin. He things that concepts – are “the concentrations of culture in the human mind; there are it, what culture uses for to get inside the mental world of human. A concept – it is the fundamental unit of a person's mental world.”²⁵ A notion, unlike a concept, provides merely information about the essential features of extralinguistic object, while a concept informs about its national- and cultural significance²⁶. For example, the words *калина, рушник, вишиванка* [in Ukrainian] have become roots as markers of national identity in the mentality of the Ukrainian ethnic group.

Illustrative is the example of cultural recoding given by A. Pavlova. In her translation of the novel “Three Comrades”, the phrase “*I wonder, what would you look with a cylinder hat on?*” the answer is “*Like a chimney sweeper*”.

²³ Ibid. 20.

²⁴ Humboldt W. Sprachwissenschaftliche Korrespondenz Wilhelm von Humboldt an August Wilhelm von Schlegel. 23.07.1796. Handschrift: Grundlage der Edition: Dresden, SLUB, Mscr. Dresd. c 90. Nr. 57. S. 240.

²⁵ Manakin V. Contrastive Lexicology. Kyiv: Znannya. 2004. P. 23–24.

²⁶ We like the illustration of the difference between a *notion* and a *concept* of Manakin V. “A person won't fight and shed blood for a *notion*, but they will for a *concept*, if we're talking, for example, about such *concept* as Motherland, flag, Fatherland, and so on” (Manakin, P. 24)

A “*Schornsteinfeger*” is a respected person in a tall top hat in German culture, and a meeting with whom is a luck, comparing to unsightly vision of the chimney sweeper in Ukrainian culture. Therefore, she says, “*better variant of interpretation would words “Like an English lord.”*”²⁷ Above provided example demonstrates, it is clear that the translator, through cultural recoding, would have fully achieved a perceptual correspondence between the words “*Schornsteinfeger*” and “*English lord*”. Such cultural recoding, from the standpoint of their social status, may seem illogical, but from the position of ensuring perceptual validity, it is justified. Translating concepts with preserving perceptual load need a higher level of thinking that is an order of magnitude higher than the referential translation of concepts, namely, the generation of ideas at a divergent level of thinking²⁸.

If the translation of notion is easy, transcreating concepts requires creativity of the extraordinary level. For example, the concept of “*калина*” [in Ukrainian] literally translated into English would only acquire the meaning of a dendrological name without national character. Transcreating concepts de facto is recoding of national identity. Perceptually translation of a concept means immersing oneself in the author's mentality and aligning it with the reader's. In this, postmodernist methodology is agreed with the linguistic philosophy of V. von Humboldt, whose background idea is the “intercondition of language and national spirit”. “Die Sprache kann und muss sogar als die äusserliche Erscheinung des Geistes der Völker angesehen werden, ihre Sprache ist ihr Geist und ihr Geist ihre Sprache.”²⁹ “Die Sprache ist gleichsam die äusserliche Erscheinung des Geistes der Völke.”³⁰ Concepts are a concentrated expression of the spirit of a nation.

Thus, the philosophical sense of translation of the residual untranslatability of concepts lies in intertextuality as the interaction of cultures and peoples' mentalities. Consequently, the answer to the question of what linguistic methodology should be is intertextual, pluralistic with the specific aesthetic of textual interpretation. Postmodernist philosophy is precisely this methodology.

²⁷ Pavlova A. Translatability in Translation Studies and Linguocultural Studies. *Acta Linguistica*. Mainz, Germany. Vol. 5. 2. 2011. P. 6.

²⁸ Incidentally, the very generation of divergent stage, inaccessible to algorithms of artificial technology, constitutes an argument for refuting accusations about dangers of artificial intelligence spreading to the translation of literary works. “We have an unfounded fear that machines will someday start thinking like humans. What we should really fear is that humans have already started thinking like machines” (Neumeier, 2012).

²⁹ Humboldt W. *Gesammelte Schriften. Ueber die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*, Berlin. 1907. Band 7. S. 46.

³⁰ Humboldt W. *Gesammelte Schriften. Ueber die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*, Berlin. 1907. Band 7. S. 42.

6. The linguistic philosophy of V. von Humboldt as “Specific” within the general philosophical conceptualization of linguistics

The postmodern principle of deconstruction expands the boundaries of methodological freedom. But does this mean the loss of relevance of V. von Humboldt's linguistic philosophy? No. Transcreation as cultural recoding is agreed methodologically with V. von Humboldt's linguistic philosophy in its statement that speech is an expression of the cultural landscape of the people in which it was formed. The validity of the comparison of the tenets of the linguistic philosophy of the German classical era by V. von Humboldt with the philosophy of the new era is explained by him as follows: “Auch ist keine andre Art der Reform unsrem Zeitalter so angemessen, wenn sich dasselbe wirklich mit Recht eines Vorzugs an Kultur und Aufklärung rühmt.”³¹ We believe that these words extrapolated fully to the Postmodern era.

Researchers should take into account that methodology used to separate the universal and the linguistic-specific, which is the philosophy of W. von Humboldt. Recognizing the translatability, which denied W. von Humboldt, means cultural conformity of the methodological statements of philosophy postmodernism, a distinctive feature of which is the humanized rationalism as a reinterpretation of V. von Humboldt's linguistic specific philosophy. That is, postmodernist philosophy should not be seen as an opponent of V. von Humboldt's linguistic-specific philosophy; they are methodologically consistent as the general and the particular. Let us recall Hegel's remark: “The different systems which the history of philosophy presents are therefore not irreconcilable with unity. We may either say, that it is one philosophy at different degrees of maturity: or that the particular principle, which is the groundwork of each system, is but a branch of one and the same universe of thought. In philosophy the latest birth of time is the result of all the systems that have preceded it, and must include their principles.”³²

Postmodern philosophy is at the highest stage of maturity in visions of humanism and cultural relevance. This superiority is a manifestation of the natural evolution of philosophy, its permanent adaptation to civilizational changes. However, the implementation of irrationalism into methodology should not be seen as a denial of the viability of rationalism. Postmodernism does not presume only its privilege as a methodological principle of the translation theory. To deny the rationalism of philosophy meant the denying the very essence of humanity. Another question is, what should rationalism

³¹ Humboldt W. Ideen zu einem Versuch, die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit des Staats zu bestimmen. 1792. S. 3.

³² Hegel G. Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. Part One. I Introduction. 1830. § 13.

look? The answer – it should be focused on the highest spiritual values of man, since postmodernism is positioned as a humanistic flow. The social aspect of modern methodology lies in the translator's national self-expression in the cultural recoding of the work.

And finally, ignoring thru the improvement of philosophical methodology means neglecting the linguistic authenticity, and the cultural accordance of the translation.

CONCLUSIONS

The above mentioned provides grounds to claim that V. von Humboldt's linguistic- and philosophical ideas have not lost their relevance *in a special look* [у знятому вигляді, in Ukrainian – Autor] as a component of the postmodernist methodology of translation studies. His ideas about the conditionality of thought by language are interpreted in a modern sense as the translator's freedom in the art process of creating a new semantic reality for the text.

By overthrowing rationalism from its methodological pedestal, postmodernism became a new intellectualism and humanism, revealed the methodological potential of deconstruction, and the freedom of interpretation. Postmodern philosophy solves methodologically the problem of translatability/untranslatability in favor of residual untranslatability regarding nationally marked concepts.

The analysis of philosophy in diachrony testifies to the evolution of methodology of linguistic research in accordance with civilizational transformations. Both now and in the coming post-postmodern civilizational transformations, philosophical universalism will not lose its methodological function and significance relative to specific scientific methodologies.

Postmodernist admonishes in translation studies demonstrate the continuity of V. von Humboldt's ideas and their practical significance.

SUMMARY

The article is devoted to the study of the issue about methodological support of translation studies in the dimensions of postmodernist transformation. Rationalism has lost its dominant status in the methodology of linguistics. Postmodernist concessions to irrationalism were reflected in the methodology of humanization and liberalization of the theory and practice of translation, and served as the basis for transcreation as a strategy for the elimination of untranslatability. There is an opinion on methodological agreement of linguistic philosophy of W von Humboldt with postmodernist philosophy as both a special and general. The following provisions are aimed at confirming modern philosophy as the only true linguistic methodology.

Originality is in the substantiation of the continuity of the philosophical conceptualization of translation studies at each stage of the civilization development. For pedagogical practice the study of the philosophy of translation in a diachrony will become a orienteer in improving the training of translators

Bibliography

1. Aponenko I.M., Zhaldun M.I., Zaporozhets O.S. On the question of the linguistic methodology importance. *The 19th International scientific and practical conference "Innovative approaches to solving scientific problems"* (May 16–19, 2023) Tokyo, Japan, International Science Group. Pp. 296–299. URL: <https://repo.dma.dp.ua/8465/1/%D1%82%D0%B5%D0%B7%D0%B8%20%D0%96%D0%B0%D0%B4%D0%BB%D1%83%D0%BD.pdf>
2. Baran Ye., Hazdah V. Dictionary of philological terms. Ferenc Rakoczi. Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education. 2024. URL: https://kme.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/slovník-filologických-termínů_ua_full.pdf
3. Hegel G. Die Phänomenologie des Geistes, Vorrede. 1807. URL: <https://www.marxists.org/deutsch/philosophie/hegel/phaenom/vorrede2.htm>
4. Hegel G. Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. Part One. Introduction. 1830. URL: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/sl/slintro.htm>
5. Heidegger M. On the Essence of Truth. 1961. URL: <https://aphelis.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Martin-Heidegger-On-the-Essence-of-Truth.pdf>
6. Humboldt W. Über das vergleichende Sprachstudium. 1820. URL: <https://uepo.de/2024/06/21/wilhelm-von-humboldt-ueber-das-vergleichende-sprachstudium/>
7. Humboldt W. Ideen zu einem Versuch, die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit des Staats zu bestimmen. 1792. 79 s URL: https://homepage.univie.ac.at/henning.schluss/seminare/060-Bild-Pol-Potsd-ss-2011/Texte/Humboldt_Grenzen_des_Staates.pdf
8. Humboldt W. Gesammelte Schriften. Ueber die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts, Berlin, Band 7. 1907. URL: <https://archive.org/details/1gesammelteschri07humbuoft/page/46/mode/2up>
9. Humboldt W Sprachwissenschaftliche Korrespondenz Wilhelm von Humboldt an August Wilhelm von Schlegel, 23.07.1796. Dresden, SLUB, Mscr. Dresd. e 90, Nr. 57. S. 237–240. URL: <https://wvh-briefe.bbaw.de/images/pdf/577.pdf>
10. Kaziliūnaitė A. Living in 'Interesting Times' as the Imperative of Asking Unimagined Questions. *Filosofija. Sociologija*. 36(1). 2015. Pp. 1–4.

11. Koller W. Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft. Quelle & Meyer Verlag GmbH & Co., 7., aktualisierte Auflage. 2004. URL: <https://www.twirpx.com/file/1403251/>
12. Kovtun L.V., Shabanova Y.O. Anthropology of "Philosophy of Translation": Contemporary Ukrainian Philosophical Dimension, *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2022. (21). Pp. 38–53. <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i21.260319>
13. Kremen V.H. Philosophy: thinkers, ideas, concepts. Kyiv: Book. 2005. 528 p.
14. Manakin V.M. (2004), Contrastive Lexicology. Kyiv: Znannya. 326 p.
15. Meier G.S., van der Voet P., Yan T. Research ethics in a multilingual world: A guide to reflecting on language decisions in all disciplines, *Diametros*. 2024. 80. Pp. 38–58. doi: 10.33392/diam.1926
16. Nemlii L.S., Stezhko Yu.H. Transcreation as the strategy of the cultural recoding of literary works. *International Humanitarian University Herald. Philology*. 76. Published 03/24/2026. Pp. 236–240. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2409-1154.2025.76.49>
17. Neumeier M. Metaskills: Five Talents for the Robotic Age. 2012. URL: www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/168221.Marty_Neumeier?page=2
18. Ortega y Gasset J. Miseria y esplendor de la traducción. 1937. URL: www.tramaeditorial.es/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Ortega_y_Gasset_Traduccion_Texturas_19.pdf
19. Pavlova A. Translatability in Translation Studies and Linguocultural Studies. *Acta Linguistica*. Mainz, Germany. 2011. Vol. 5. 2. Pp. 3–21. URL: www.actalinguistica.com/arhiv/index.php/als/article/view/376/512
20. Popper K. The Open Society and Its Enemies. Oracular philosophy and the revolt against reason. New One-Volume. Princeton University Press. Princeton and Oxford. 1994. 754 p. URL: [www.cdn.oujdaibrary.com/books/998/998-the-open-society-and-its-enemies-new-one-volume-edition-\(www.tawcer.com\).pdf](http://www.cdn.oujdaibrary.com/books/998/998-the-open-society-and-its-enemies-new-one-volume-edition-(www.tawcer.com).pdf)
21. Raihani M.S. Translatability and Untranslatability (A Historical Background). *English Language Teaching*. Vol. 19. 2. 2026. Pp. 114–126. doi: 10.5539/elt.v19n2p114
22. Sosnjuk O., Ostapenko I. Cultural codes as markers of national identity: possibilities of actualization in the educational space. *Problems of Personal Identity Development in the Educational Space: Materials of the III Roundtable Meeting*. October 2024. Pp. 93–103. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387328526_Kulturni_kodi_ak_markeri_nacionalnoi_identichnosti_mozlivosti_aktualizacii_v_osvitnomu_prostori_Cultural_codes_space

23. Stezhko Yu. Philosophy of Postmodernism as a Marker of Modern Linguistic Methodology of Research on Interlinguistic Communication. *Philosophy. Sociology*. 2023. 34. 3. Pp. 261–268. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2023.34.3.6>

24. Surmiak A., Męcfal S. Ethical challenges in contemporary social research (editorial). *Diametros*. 2024. 80. Pp. 1–6. doi: 10.33392/diam.1979

25. Zherybylo T.V. Dictionary of Linguistic Terms. 2010. URL: <https://rus-lingvistics-dict.slovaronline.com>

Information about the author:

Stezhko Yurii,

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of English
for Technical and Agrobiological Specialties,
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
15, Heroes of Defense Street, Kyiv, Ukraine