

Отже, міжкультурна комунікація постає не як різноманітні смішні випадки і непорозуміння, а як особлива форма спілкування, що вимагає глибоких знань і навичок, виконавчого таланту, неабияких здібностей і постійного бажання вдосконалювати свої знання в цій галузі.

Література:

1. Бацевич Ф.С. *Основи комунікативної лінгвістики*. К., 2004. 342 с.
2. Бацевич Ф.С. *Нариси з лінгвістичної прагматики: Монографія*. Львів: ПАІС, 2010. 225 с.
3. Манакін В.М. *Мова і міжкультурна комунікація*. К., 2012. 288 с.
4. Слющинський Б.В. *Міжкультурна комунікація як феномен сучасної культури. Нова парадигма*. 2004. Вип.37. С.223-232.
5. Sakshi Dubey. *Contrastive linguistics: Its Importance and Uses (CSPILAS/SL)*. 2016. P.1-7.

УДК 101

*V. Chernyshov, PhD, Associate Professor
National University "Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic"*

POIESIS OR NOËSIS: A FUNDAMENTAL DILEMMA OF THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

The epoch of visual culture and digital technologies seems now and again actualises one of the fundamental philosophical dilemmas: a choice between *poiesis* and *noësis*. The former, utilising the means of aesthetics, appeals to emotions as the latter, using the logical tools, rather appeals to reason. However, the former as the latter can be expressed verbally, that is with the use of words.

The roots of this dilemma get back to the ancient times. Ancient Greek philosophy is younger than the Greek poetry. Philosophy emerges – at least in its rational form – much later than poetry: upon its arrival poetry had already settled down and its dignity been widely recognised by the people. Although the early Greek philosophers sometimes utilised the poetical form in their works, the general tendency was to demarcate the area of *noësis* (philosophy) from the area of *poiesis* (poetry, rhetoric).

A turning point in this matter came to be the polemics between Socrates and his opponents called *sophists*, which culminated in Socrates' judgement, death sentence, and execution. Athenian majority unambiguously supported sophists, whose method had been based on *poiesis*: the *noësis*, founded on the principles of geometry, proposed by Socrates looked for them either too sophisticated or even pointless. However, Plato had made quite a successful effort to re-introduce it in as much pure form as it was possible; there was even an inscription made at the front door of Plato's house: 'Let no one who is not a geometer enter my house'. After Socrates' tragic death, Plato was definitely annoyed with poets.

Since Plato, over centuries, the *principle of separation* – philosophy from poetry – had been kept almost rigorously, with a very few exceptions which

might rather confirm the rule. Aristotle, for instance, speaks of *poiesis* only within the framework of his practical philosophy. In his *Nicomachean Ethics*, he does not oppose *poiesis* and *noësis*, but *poiesis* and *practice*. Distinguishing *poiesis* from *practice*, Aristotle says that they are different because ‘making and acting are different’ [1, col. 1140]. In his *Politics*, Aristotle notes that the *poiesis* – as much as *noësis*, but in contrast with *practice* – is a prerogative of free people [see 2, col. 1254]. That is Aristotle insists that freedom is a necessary precondition of any *poiesis* (creativity) as much as *noësis* (thinking).

This state of affairs had remained unchanged till the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when Nietzsche undertook a frantic effort of the radical revision of philosophy, which became however quite successful. Nietzsche made an effort to construct his philosophy not as much on the foundations of reason and logic as on aesthetics and creativity: that is on the foundation of *poiesis*. The result of this project went beyond any expectations. In the twentieth century continental philosophy, there are a number of thinkers – Martin Heidegger is the most celebrated of them [e.g. see 4], who tried treading (and not without success) the same path Nietzsche had once trod out. Karl Popper had even gone as far as pronouncing Plato, Aristotle, Hegel, and Marx to be the enemies to the open society [see 7; 8].

The history of the twentieth century philosophy shows with utmost clarity that – in contrast with the classical tradition – *poiesis* has become an unalienable part of the contemporary philosophy [e.g. see 5; 6]. Moreover, it has come to be a dilemma not only to philosophers. The choice between the appeal to emotions (or at least to the common sense) seems often no better option (or even equally undesirable) than the appeal to logical clarity and philosophical attitude towards reality. In the first case the appellant risks provoking a wave of unwanted and uncontrolled emotions, as in the second case there is a risk of misunderstanding based on the lack of common cultural background and difference of educational level.

References

1. Aristotle. *Ethica Nicomachea*. In *The Works of Aristotle / Tr. into English under the Editorship of W.D. Ross*. Vol. IX. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 1094-1181.
2. Aristotle. *Politica*. In *The Works of Aristotle / Tr. into English under the Editorship of W.D. Ross*. Vol. X. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 1252-1342.
3. Badiou A. *Manifesto for Philosophy: Followed by Two Essays*. New York: Albany, 1992. 145 p.
4. Heidegger M. *What Is Called Thinking? / Tr. by J. Glenn Gray*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1968. 242 p.
5. Maritain J. *Creative Intuition in Art and Poetry*. New York: Pantheon Books, [1953] 1955. 339 p.
6. Maritain J. *Art and Scholasticism and The Frontiers of Poetry*. Tr. Joseph W. Evans. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962. 233 p.
7. Popper K.R. *The Open Society and Its Enemies. Volume I: The Spell of Plato*. London: Routledge, [1945] 1947. 268 p.
8. Popper K.R. *The Open Society and Its Enemies. Volume II: The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the Aftermath*. London: Routledge, [1945] 1947. 352 p.