

DIALECTIC OF RATIONAL-IRRATIONAL IN IRONIC DISCOURSE

LAUTA O. D., PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and International Communication at the National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine,

E-mail: elena.lauta@gmail.com

GEIKO S. M., PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and International Communication at the National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

E-mail: svt.geyko@gmail.com

Abstract. *Analyzing the phenomenological philosophy of culture, in particular, the concepts of such modern phenomenologists as E. Husserl, P. Ricker, B. Waldenfels, we find that the condition for the existence and development of cultural worlds is their otherness.*

Key words: *irony, modernism, postmodernism, cultural universals, rationalism, irrationalism, dialectics.*

Introduction. Philosophical study of the concept of «irony» is conditioned by the transformation of the cultural paradigm that occurs at the turn of the millennium. The problem of understanding the new cultural content leads to a rethinking of the original universals of culture, which are concentrated in the theoretical-rationalist schemes of their understanding. The central philosophical concepts open new angles of the socio-cultural existence of a person and draw the attention of researchers to terms that previously occupied a marginal position in classical philosophy. Therefore, the concept of «irony» needs careful study in the context of the modern transformation of cultural paradigms.

The concept of «irony» exists in various cultural and philosophical contexts (starting from Socrates, Aristotle and up to Postmodernism), but there is no comprehensive history of its study. Each epoch brought its own nuances to the content of this universality, but it could not claim a leading role in any system of categories. Therefore, this concept has not received a final definition in any of the philosophical systems, and the prospects for its development and study remain open.

All of the above determines the indirect nature of the concept of «irony» and

its openness to related concepts, as well as ensures the duration of the integration of this concept into a single philosophical and cultural context. Therefore, irony can be defined as a universality of a certain cultural paradigm, the content of which is revealed only in the dynamics of philosophical discourse.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. The volume of literature on the chosen topic is quite significant. It covers the works of V. Asmus, N. Berkovsky, V. Windelband, A. Gulyga, O. Losev, V. Pivoev, V. Pigulevsky, A. Solovyov, F. Stepun, V. Shestakov, devoted to the study of the historical and cultural context of the concept «irony».

The problematization of irony in philosophical thought takes place under the conditions of overcoming the classical ideal of rationality. A corresponding role is played by the criticism of rationalist philosophy, which is presented in the works of T. Adorno, K. Popper, and M. Horkheimer. The non-classical definition of irony in the philosophy of Modernism is formed thanks to the works of L. Wittgenstein, F. Nietzsche, H. Ortega-y-Gasset and T. Mann.

In the postmodern style of philosophizing, irony becomes a fundamental uni-

versal that structures the sociocultural landscape and extrapolates its properties to other forms of culture. In Western literature, these contours are represented by a number of concepts: «ironic code» by R. Barth, «pastiche as white irony» by F. Jamieson, «liberal ironism» by R. Rorty, «irony is a metalanguage game» by U. Eco, etc.

The topic of irony is considered in the context of a change in the cultural paradigm by philosophers of the 20th century such as V. Benjamin, A. Gurevich, Y. Lotman, and M. Foucault. These researchers from different positions record the transformation of the ironic scheme depending on a certain historical type of culture.

Recognition of the role of irony in the formation of the philosophy of history can be traced in the works of J. B. Vico, H. Hegel, and K. Marx.

The nature of the understanding of irony and its connection with such problems of modern philosophy as language, play, tradition, narrative, carnival are expanded by the works of M. Bakhtin, G. Gadamer, J. Geisinga, P. Ricoeur, and E. Fink.

The aesthetic dimension of irony and its connection with other categories of aesthetics is revealed in the works of Yu. Borev, V. Vanslov, V. Propp, I. Slavov, and E. Yakovlev.

Philosophical classifications of varieties of irony were created by I. Pasi, V. Pivoev, O. Potebnaya, and R. Yanke.

Methods. complex of cognitive methods, in particular, scientific methods of historical and cultural research, critical analysis of cultural, historical, literary sources, specific historical analysis and interdisciplinary synthesis, induction and deduction, semantic-semiotic, hermeneutic and comparative methods will serve as the methodological basis of the cultural reflection of this phenomenon. Of the concrete scientific methods, problem-chronological and system-structural methods were used, as well as the method of socio-phenomenological analysis.

Results. The concept of «irony» is polysemantic, but different variants of its interpretation assume certain constants. The

etymological reference to deception does not reveal the meaning of irony, since the latter is not only the concealment of the truth. The content of the studied concept captures the transition from appearance to hidden meaning, and, therefore, the contrariety of nature is a defining characteristic of irony, which reveals the gap between ideal and reality, existing and proper, object and its concept, sensual and rational. Therefore, the aesthetic dimension of irony is the most obvious.

In the field of everyday communication, irony is usually used in an extremely condensed, reduced form. Often, light irony is present only in the intonations, facial expressions, and gestures of people talking. This is due to the fact that irony is aimed at destroying the logic of everyday life, depriving the unambiguity of cause-and-effect relationships. Marginal forms of existence in everyday life do not exhaust the existing existence of irony in culture, and in order to more fully and comprehensively investigate it, it is necessary to consider irony as a relation, a procedurality in various cultural forms, where it is used consciously and even acquires methodological significance. This indicates that reflexivity is an attributive feature of irony. In this sense, irony always tends to turn into ironism - a concept (not only theoretical, but also vital) that denies the natural instruction of a direct attitude to the world and turns irony into a methodological principle.

Irony implicitly contains the idea of the existence of the Other, even the Stranger, but does not insist on its destruction, assimilation. It is not surprising that ironism usually chooses the form of dialogue for its own implementation (Socrates, Plato, N. Kuzanskyi). It destroys the constancy of the subject-object opposition, defining for classical rationalism, and replaces it with a subject-subject relation. That is, within the philosophy of identity, irony legitimizes the existence of the other, even as a subject in the «I-Thou» relationship, although here, of course, there is a dominant superiority

when evaluating this other. Therefore, axiologicality is always an integral component of an ironic attitude to the world.

Irony is not only a means of fighting against the rough in life, but also a way of spiritual self-development of the individual (E. Yakovlev). Subjectively, irony is revealed as a sign of developed self-awareness, objectively - it is an indicator of the limitations of those historical forces that, acting on the principle of opposites, return to the past, not realizing a promising trend.

Therefore, irony is an existential aspect of human existence, which, according to a certain finite expression, indicates the possibility of disclosure, further formation. This function reveals its place among related concepts of cultural studies (game, symbol, carnival, cynicism) and aesthetics (tragic, comic, wit, pun, parody, satire). It is a tool of «reevaluation of values» (F. Nietzsche), and therefore a component of the procedure of transformation of historical types of culture. In their genesis, historical styles of philosophizing correlate with the corresponding types of ironism.

Irony arises as one of the first ways of human reflection, which does not yet reach the logical level, but has the character of a transition from the sensual to the rational. Therefore, the aesthetic projection of irony is the most obvious. Hence the artistic search of Antiquity (Aristophanes), not only in comedy, but also in tragedy, which testifies to the contrary nature of ironism, which from the beginning combines the serious and the funny.

The philosophical meaning of irony is first formed in the dialogues of Socrates, who established the sophistic turn from natural philosophy to man as a central problem in ancient Greek philosophy. He uses it as a technique for discovering the truth. The term «Socratic irony», which is already found in Plato, becomes a sign that demonstrates the gap between appearance and essence, disgust and understanding, a strategy aimed at rationalizing the world. The epistemologicalization of the problem of irony continues in the texts of Plato and Xenophon, where the latter itself already

becomes the subject of conscious analysis, and not just a creative movement of cognitive strategy.

Not only the philosophical work of Socrates, but also his whole life (both the style of behavior and the epilogue of his life's path) prompted the study of irony. This leads to the expansion of its subject matter in ancient philosophy, where it is interpreted in the ethical plane (a feature of the greatness of the soul, «the opposite of boasting» (Aristotle), or «pacification of other people's passions» (Theophrastus), or as «a figure that is understood differently than itself reveals itself» (Quintilian)).

The heuristic potential of Socratic irony was so great that it repeatedly became the subject of philosophical analysis (H. Hegel, S. Kierkegaard, O. Losev, P. Haydenko), but not during the Middle Ages or the Renaissance, since the former is permeated with the pathos of divine worship, and the second is an apology for humanism. In these periods, irony again becomes only an aesthetic means capable of enlivening the form («Praise of Stupidity» by E. Rotterdamsky, instruction of the scholastics by the «simpleton» by N. Kuzanskyi) of the philosophical text, but not its content. Only the artistic works of J. Boccaccio, S. Koster, and F. Rabelais demonstrate the steadfastness of the phenomenon of irony, which in those harsh times was nourished by the «popular culture of laughter» (M. Bakhtin), which challenges the «silent majority» (A. Gurevich).

New European philosophy in the process of «great reproduction of sciences» and the creation of a «new organon» again does not turn to irony, since the criticism of scholastic methods of substantiation of truth does not extend to the pathos and seriousness of the intentions of classical rationalism. In the pursuit of a comprehensive rationalization of the world, logocentrism loses the connection between truth and its ontological roots. Therefore, the transition from the sensual to the rational cannot be the work of an ironist, but is explained either as a divine miracle in the solution of a psychophysical problem by R. Descartes, or as

© *Lauta O. D., Geiko S. M*

a «pre-established harmony» by H. Leibniz. Only in J. Vico's philosophy of history, irony is interpreted as «a trope that by the power of reflection puts on a mask of truth» and is a sign of a certain stage of human history. The historical approach to the understanding of irony is thoroughly developed in the theory of romanticism.

Romanticism as «aesthetic metaphysics» (H. Gadamer) rejects the desire of logocentrism to rationalize all dimensions of human existence to the extreme and considers the mind's desire to go beyond experience. In contrast to this, romantic irony, starting from the Fichtean thesis about the absolute subject, becomes «infinite negativity» and the principle of «transcendental buffo» for F. Schlegel. The founder of Yen romanticism writes: «In irony, everything must be a joke and everything - serious, everything simple sincere and everything deeply pretended. It contains and evokes in us the feeling of an insurmountable contradiction between the unconditional and the conditioned, the feeling of the impossibility and necessity of the completeness of the expression. It is the freest of all freedoms, because thanks to it a person is able to rise above himself, and at the same time any pattern is characteristic of it, since it is unconditional and necessary. It must be taken as a good sign that the harmonious clowns do not know how to deal with this constant self-parody, when it is necessary to alternately believe, then disbelieve, until the head spins; to take a joke seriously, and to take something serious as a joke» [5, 190].

Irony in the romantic transformation of rationalism becomes a tool for denying all authorities and traditions, both ancient and classical, and a reflective distance that allows the romantic to immerse himself in history or art, but does not allow him to make a final choice. Irony elevates the artist above his creation, but, on the other hand, causes the «tragedy of aestheticism» (P. Haydenko) and, ultimately, romanticism in general (F. Stepun).

The negative consequences of the ironic's eccentric stance have been subjected to rationalist and existential criticism.

The first considered irony as an extreme form of subjectivity in its superficial understanding (H. Hegel), the second - as a form of expression of contradiction with reality (S. Kierkegaard), and not a solution to this opposition, as the romantics believed. These strategies of criticism, which are opposite in content, are united by the fact that although they pay tribute to the «negative infinity» of the subject (it is the «decisive instance in matters of truth, right, duty» even for the author of «Phenomenology of the Spirit»), they leave irony at the lower stages of the development of the spirit: H. Hegel - art as the starting point of the Absolute Idea, S. Kierkegaard - the aesthetic stage of man's path to God. Existential criticism differs from rationalistic criticism in that it translates irony from the position of consciousness into a way of human existence, which opens up the possibilities of a non-classical understanding of irony.

In the era of classical rationalism, reason was a universal cultural obviousness (N. Avtonomova), but it loses its authority during the era of Modernism, which causes a transformation of the world picture. Now it is interpreted not as a centralized system, always identical to itself, but as a changing flow of life, a mobile structure that changes the rules of its behavior depending on the context. With this understanding, irony becomes a means of destroying stable metaphysical systems, a tool that is not logical, rational, but rather aesthetic in nature. It creates and fills the distance from the logocentric instructions of classical rationalism to the absurdity of the interaction of atomic facts.

In the classical style of philosophizing, irony pointed to something hidden, to the gap between ideal and reality, object and concept, while the non-classical approach exposes the hidden, lays everything bare, helps to delve into the unmediated with the mind of being, carries out a «life rush». L. Wittgenstein claims to know not «true knowledge», but «true concreteness», irony should not interfere with the rules of language functioning, but should represent them.

© *Lauta O. D., Geiko S. M*

H. Ortega-y-Gasset points to the emergence of Don Juan's «impertinent irony», which reveals the «norm of the fullness of life». In this interpretation, Don Juan acts as a knight of life, vitality and its spontaneous manifestations. «He can submit only to such ethics, which would have the fullness of life as the first norm. But this must yield power to the vital mind» [4, 346].

T. Mann opposes the «irony of the heart» to reason, which bypasses romantic subjectivism and reproduces the «humanistic integrity of man». He deliberately contrasts this understanding of irony with romantic arbitrariness and romantic subjectivity. «I invest in it» writes T. Mann about the concept of irony, «a broader and higher meaning than the one communicated to it by romantic subjectivism». Due to its inherent ease, this content is almost limitless, because it is the content and meaning of art itself, - perception, and because of this, negation of everything; clear as the sun, a joyful look that covers the whole, and is the look of art, in other words, a look from the height of freedom, calm and objectivity, not obscured by any moralization» [3, 277].

Postmodernism, in the section of our study, is defined as the rejection of any «metanarratives» (J. F. Lyotard), the neutralization of all values (P. Kozlovskiy). Postmodern rethinks the relationship to the classics that prevailed during the era of Modernism: it is not classic and not absolutely negative, but free, ironic (G. Gadamer, R. Rorty). The fundamental difference between Modernism and Postmodernism lies in the radical rejection of exclusivity, which the former still claimed.

Therefore, if in Modernism irony denied the authority of reason from the standpoint of human existence, «norms of the fullness of life» (H. Ortega-y-Gasset), then in Postmodernism irony approaches «pastiche» (F. Jamieson) - it does not legitimize any norm, but therefore, it is not an instrument of deviation. In a society of «excess of meanings» and «deficit of authorities» (J. Baudrillard), irony is currently not a means of rising above reality with the help of reflexive (classical ideal of rationality) or

aesthetic (romanticism or Modernism) efforts, but a way of avoiding any certainty, the denial of the absolutization of any norm (rational or irrational) becomes a representation of the fundamental, even methodological anomie of the social and spiritual.

Ukrainian philosophers V. Lukyannets and O. Sobol define postmodern irony as «a way by which postmodern thinkers seek to liberate philosophy from claims to self-justification. This is the answer of postmodernists to the question: can the «final dictionary» have a final justification? They are convinced that any final justification of the «final dictionary» will inevitably turn out to be no more meaningful than the justification of the narcotic action of opium in that it makes people sleep thanks to its soporific power» [1, 309].

According to another Ukrainian thinker N. Khamitov, irony plays a key role in the culture of Postmodernism. He defines Postmodernism as a culture that translates pathos into irony. It is irony that becomes the pathos of Postmodernism. The philosopher interprets irony as a person's ability to comically perceive pathos in one's own or someone else's life strategy. It opposes pathos as being blinded by one's own or someone else's ideas and virtues. «Irony», writes N. Khamitov, «emerges as an important component of cultural activity, allowing a more critical perception of the possibilities of the individual and the community». Destroying the space of pathos, irony creates a new, more open reality, however, becoming pathos itself, it leads to the destruction of creative abilities and to self-destruction. Therefore, self-irony arises not only as a result of limiting one's own pathos, but also one's own irony. So, we can talk about the harmony of irony and pathos» [2, 80].

Conclusion. Therefore, the concept of «irony» does not lose its meaning in postmodern philosophy. The phenomenon of irony acquires a special status, founded on the idea of the impossibility of neither originality in the ontological sense nor originality in the creative sense. In Postmodernism, irony becomes a fundamental universal that structures the sociocultural landscape

© *Lauta O. D., Geiko S. M*

and extrapolates its properties to other forms of culture («ironic code» in R. Barthes, «the only spiritual form of the modern world» in J. Baudrillard, «pastiche as white irony» in F. Jamison, «liberal ironism» by R. Rorty, «irony is a metalanguage game» by U. Eco).

We see that somewhat new types of understanding of irony are reflected in modern philosophy. At the end of the second millennium, the figure of irony becomes a sign of the times. True irony is the one within which the relativity of language and discourse is determined and communication in another language and interaction with another discourse is possible, which in a situation of permanent catastrophism and unreliability gives society hope for the best.

Список використаних джерел

1. Лук'янець В. С., Соболев О. М. Філософський постмодерн. – К.: Абрис, 2018. – 352 с.
2. Манн Т. Мистецтво роману // Манн Т. Зібрання творів: В 10 т. – К.: Наукова думка. – Т. 10. – 2005. С. 272-287.
3. Ортега-і-Гассет Х. Тема нашої доби // Ортега-і-Гассет Х. Вибрані твори:

Пер. з іспан. – К.: Основи, 2004. – С. 315-369.

4. Хамітов Н. Іронія // Хамітов Н., Крилова С. Філософський словник. Людина і світ. – К.: КНТ, Центр навчальної літератури, 2016. – С. 79-80.

5. Шлегель Ф. Із «Лікейських фрагментів» // Мислителі німецького романтизму. – Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, 2013. – С. 189-192.

References

1. Luk'yanets V., Sobol' O. (2018) Filosofs'kyy postmodern. [Philosophical postmodernism]. – S. 352.
2. Mann T. (2005). Mystetstvo romana. [Art of the novel]. – S. 272-287.
3. Ortega-i-Gasset K. H. (2004). Tema nashoyi doby. [Topic of our time]. – S. 315-369.
4. Khamitov N. (2016). Ironiya. [Irony]. – S. 79-80.
5. Shlehel' F. (2013). Iz «Likeys'kykh frahmentiv». [Lycaean Fragments]. – S. 189-192.

ДІАЛЕКТИКА РАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО ТА ІРРАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО У ІРОНІЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ Лаута О. Д., Гейко С. М.

Анотація. *Поняття «іронія» існує в різних культурних та філософських контекстах (починаючи від Сократа, Арістотеля і до Постмодернізму), але немає наскрізної історії його вивчення. Кожна епоха привносила свої нюанси в зміст цієї універсали, але в жодній системі категорій воно не могло претендувати на провідну роль. Тому остаточного визначення цього поняття не набуло в жодній з філософських систем, а перспективи його розвитку та вивчення залишаються відкритими. Все зазначене вище зумовлює опосередкованість характеру поняття «іронія» та його відкритість щодо суміжних понять, а також забезпечує тривалість інтеграції даного поняття в єдиний філософсько-культурологічний контекст. Отже, можна визначити іронію як універсалію певної культурної парадигми, зміст якої розкривається лише в динаміці філософського дискурсу. Обсяг літератури за обраною темою є досить значним. Він охоплює праці В. Асмуса, Н. Берковського, В. Віндельбанда, А. Гуліги, О. Лосєва, В. Півоєва, В. Пігулевського, А. Соловйова, Ф. Степуна, В. Шестакова, присвячені дослідженню історико-культурного контексту поняття «іронія». Проблематизація іронії у філософській думці відбувається за умов подолання класичного ідеалу раціональності. Так, у класичному стилі філософування іронія вказувала на щось приховане, на розрив ідеалу та дійсності, предмета та поняття, тоді як некласичний підхід викриває приховане, все оголює, допомагає заглибитися розумом буття у неопосередковане, здійс-*

снює «життєвий порив». Некласичне визначення іронії у філософії Модернізму формується завдяки роботам Л. Вітгенштайна, Ф. Ніцше, Х. Ортеґи-і-Гассета та Т. Манна. У постмодерністському стилі філософування іронія стає фундаментальною універсалиєю, яка структурує соціокультурний ландшафт і екстраполює свої властивості на інші форми культури. Якщо у Модернізмі іронія заперечувала авторитет розуму з позиції існування людини, «норми повноти життя», то у Постмодернізмі іронія наближається до «пастиша» – не легітимізує жодної норми, а отже, і не є інструментом девіації. У сучасному суспільстві іронія наразі стає не засобом піднесення над дійсністю за допомогою рефлексивних (класичний ідеал раціональності) чи естетичних (романтизм або Модернізм) зусиль, а є способом уникнення будь-якої визначеності, заперечення абсолютизації будь-якої норми (раціональної чи ірраціональної), стає репрезентацією принципової, навіть методологічної аномії соціального та духовного. У західній літературі ці контури представлені низкою концепцій: «іронічний код» Р. Барта, «пастиш як біла іронія» Ф. Джеймсона, «ліберальний іронізм» Р. Рорті, «іронія – метамовна гра» У. Еко тощо. Тема іронії розглядається у контексті зміни культурної парадигми такими філософами ХХ століття як В. Бен'ямін, А. Гуревич, Ю. Лотман, М. Фуко. Ці дослідники з різних позицій фіксують трансформацію іронічної схеми в залежності від певного історичного типу культури. Визнання ролі іронії у формуванні філософії історії простежується у творчості Дж. Віко, Г. Гегеля, К. Маркса. Природу розуміння іронії та її зв'язок з такими проблемами сучасної філософії як мова, гра, традиція, наративність, карнавал розширюють праці М. Бахтіна, Г. Гадамера, Й. Гейзінґи, П. Рікьора, Е. Фінка. Естетичний вимір іронії та її зв'язок з іншими категоріями естетики розкривається у роботах Ю. Борєва, В. Ванслова, В. Проппа, І. Славова, Е. Яковлєва. Філософські класифікації різновидів іронії створювалися І. Пасі, В. Півоевим, О. Потєбнею, Р. Янке. Отже, поняття «іронія» не втрачає свого значення в постсучасній філософії. Феномен іронії набуває особливого статусу, фундованого ідеєю неможливості ні первозданності в онтологічному, ні оригінальності у творчому смислах. Ми бачимо, що в сучасній філософії дістають відображення децю нові типи розуміння іронії. Наприкінці другого тисячоліття, фігура іронії стає знаменням часу. Істинна іронія – та, в межах якої визначається відносність мови та дискурсу й можлива комунікація в іншу мову та взаємодія з іншим дискурсом, що в ситуації перманентного катастрофізму та ненадійності дає суспільству надію на краще.

Ключові слова: іронія, модернізм, постмодернізм, універсалії культури, раціоналізм, ірраціоналізм, діалектика.