machine language, it is enough to evaluate it from the side, to look at the very essence of the problem.

So, it becomes clear that programming and philosophical art have a lot of common, although there are clear differences. Each of them has periods of heyday and fall, they both develop and make a significant contribution to understanding and improving our lives.

Olha Haidamachuk  
*Senior lecturer, National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute"*  
(Kharkiv, Ukraine)  
*E-mail: haidamachuk@gmail.com*  
*ORCID: 0000-0002-0005-1380*

**PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTIONS IN "OF GRAMMATOLOGY"**  
**BY J. DERRIDA**

Philosophical questions most likely outline routes of author's thinking in a philosophical text. According to M. Meyer, "questioning is then the true and only possible starting point for thought and philosophy". Why is this statement expressed so categorically – this is a question for us. How seriously should we read the words "the true and only possible" here or the words "never" and "inevitable" in the next passage: although "philosophy has never questioned questioning so far", now such "task is inevitable"? And what matters a question without any attempt to answer it? Meyer is sure, that "Derrida's project contributes to a refoundation in philosophy", because he went further (than Marx, Nietzsche and Freud), "by denying the possibility of any reconciliation between the foundationalist interrogation and a possible answer. The questioning process has no closure". Ilyina, in her turn, agrees that the "topic of endless question" is essential for Derrida. We, in our turn, can add the next: 1) Derrida seldom uses single issues; he rather prefers to use questions networks as a part of his "the Exorbitant" method. It explains "endlessness" in the other way, as some kind of questionable continuity. 2) Philosophical questions can't be in their essence final or eventual. "Of grammatology"'s questions are not exception, but are special in their own way. According to Ilyina, Derrida's "question is exaggerated" and it "excludes any answer or reduces it to hypothesis as implicit question", because "the state of the question is absolutised in the form of a quasi-alternative without choice". In the other words, Ilyina says about Derrida's questions as about some multileveled structures with their reducing any choice force. And it might sound like accusation in monopolization of the right to choose, although there are rather excluded the necessity of such choice, when to select something means to abandon the rest options. So Derrida's quasi-alternative just does not require denials.
In *Grammatology* (1967), Derrida presents a much more comprehensive analysis of his revised theory of writing. Those who followed Derrida to practice his ability to unravel the threads of the construction of a text have quite understandably called this process of deconstruction a “method” by which one could proceed using clearly delineated steps. Derrida expands this contemplative process temporally by requiring that before a final choice is made, the hungry human must first consider every possible source of food in the world from carrots to pigs to onions and literally everything edible. Thus the process of choice can never end. Of all the problems addressed in the Western philosophical tradition, the central problem, I believe, has been the limits of human reason. Derrida went on to question in particular the restricted nature of national hospitality to legal and illegal immigrants. For Rosello, what makes the phenomenon of hospitality relevant for philosophical investigation is the potential for redefinition of the traditional roles and duties of the guest and the host. Alternating, Derrida’s *Of Grammatology* is perhaps his most famous, as well as his best, work. It is a masterpiece of postmodern philosophy and also, incidentally, Derrida’s most readable writing. The book is also a kind of showpiece of the deconstructive method: in it, the reader witnesses Derrida’s deconstructions of Saussure, Levi-Strauss and Rousseau, all of whom, according to Derrida, privilege speech over writing. But for Derrida, the supplement is identical with differance, that is to say, the play of signification in which chains of signifiers constantly defer to other signifiers ad infinitum.