7. Lash, S. (2006). Sociology of Postmodernism. Lviv. Kalvariy [in Ukraine].

8. Pavlova, O. (2017). Do definiciï ponjattja «kul'turna industrija»: deskripcija simptomiv ta analiz tendencij. Ukraïns'ki kul'turologichni studiï. № 1(1). S. 39 – 47 [in Ukraine].

9. Sontag, S. (2012). On photography. Moskva: Ad Marginem. URL: http://artguide.com/posts/265-s-iuzien-sontagh-o-fotoghrafii-m-ad-marginem-2012-295 [in Russian].

10. Boehm, G. (2011). Representation, Presentation,Presence: Tracing the Homo Pictor In Alexander J., Bartmanski D., Giesen B. (Eds.) Iconic Power. Materiality and Meaning in Social Life (pp. 15 – 25). New York: Palgrave Macmillan [in English].

11. Butler, J. (2018).Television. Visual Storytelling and Screen Culture-Routledge. London; New York: Routledge [in English].

12. Dahlgren, A. (2018)Travelling Images. Looking Across the Borderlands of Art, Media and Visual Culture. Manchester: University Press [in English].

13. Fearn, D. (2017). Pindar's Eyes: Visual and Material Culture in Epinician Poetry. Oxford: University Press [in English].

14. Garrett, M; Thomas, Z. (2018). Suffrage and the Arts: Visual Culture, Politics and Enterprise. London: Bloomsbury Visual Arts [in English].

15. Ryan, L. (2016)The Visual Imperative. Creating a Visual Culture of Data Discovery. Cambridge: Morgan Kaufmann [in English].

16. Lemelson, R.; Tucker, A. (2017). Afflictions: Steps Toward a Visual Psychological Anthropology. Cham: Springer International Publishing[in English].

17. Toth, E. (2018). Design and Visual Culture from the Bauhaus to Contemporary Art_ Optical Deconstructions. London; New York: Routledge [in English].

UDC 008:81'42:808.5

Gumenyuk Tatyana
Doctor of Philosophy, Professor,
Honored Worker of Education of Ukraine,
Vice-Rector for Scientific and Methodical Work
of the Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
ORCID 0000-0001-9210-6424
t_gumenyuk@ukr.net
Legenkiy Yuri
Doctor of Philosophy, Professor,
Professor of Kyiv National University
of Culture and Arts
ORCID 0000-0002-6567-4730
Y.Legenkiy1949@i.ua

POST-COMMUNIST CULTURE IN THE METAMODERN MIRROR:
A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The purpose of the article is to carry out a discursive analysis of a post-communist culture in the context of metamodern. **The methodology** consists of theoretical-interpretational models of discourse analysis of post-communist culture, which is carried out in the article as a poetic and rhetorical interpretation of the discourse of the power of Soviet and post-Soviet culture. The monism of the use of the increasing synecdoche in the "Soviet culture" in the post-Soviet culture has multiplied, the synecdoche is replaced by metonymy, which, in turn, represents the metaphorical transformations of speech. **Scientific novelty** consists in revealing the features of the imaginative constellations of the rhetoric of the post-Soviet discourse, which have a composite, mannerist character without clearly defined ideological, ethical, aesthetic priorities of interpretation and description of cultural values. **Conclusions.** The discourse of post-Soviet culture demonstrates the traditional rhetorical instrumentality characteristic of the Soviet culture because the monism of increasing synecdoche is pluralized, the speech has signs of a mannerist discourse, in which the composition as cultural integrity is formed by a composite mixture of syntagm without prioritizing combination definition. Metamodern, as a widely stated paradigm of cultural creation, describes the grammatical whole only as relativistic syntax – a-topos, which even by the models of the Liege school of neo-rhetoric is a fragmentary and overly metaphorical description of cultural creation. The "completion" of the rhetorical model of discourse to the cultural provides adequate horizons for discursive analysis, which must be cultural and be formed on the basis of a reconstruction of post-communist culture as a manneristic (composite) integrity. Therefore, the problem of the post-communist culture functioning in the contemporary space of cultural creation requires the instrumental discursive analysis regarding the presentation of meaning, figurative and cultural constants, and transformative mechanisms of the text.
Key words: postcommunist culture, postmodernism, metamodern, discourse, rhetoric.

Гуменюк Тетяна Костянтинівна, *доктор філософських наук, професор, заслужений працівник освіти України, проректор з науково-методичної роботи Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв;* ***Легенький Юрій Григорович,*** *доктор філософських наук, професор, професор Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв*
Посткомуністична культура в дзеркалі метамодерну: дискурсивний аналіз
Мета статті – здійснити дискурсивний аналіз посткомуністичної культури в контексті метамодерну. **Методологію** дослідження становлять теоретико-інтерпретаційні моделі дискурсивного аналізу посткомуністичної культури, здійсненого у статті як поетико-риторична інтерпретація дискурсу влади радянської та пострадянської культури. Монізм застосування підвищувальної синекдохи у рядянській культурі і пострадянській культурі плюралізується, синекдоха замінюється метонімією, яка презентує метафоричні трансформації промови. **Наукова новизна** полягає у розкритті особливостей образних констеляцій риторики пострадянського дискурсу, що мають композитний, маньєристичний характер без явно визначених світоглядних, етичних, естетичних пріоритетів інтерпретації й дескрипції культурних цінностей. **Висновки.** В результаты проведено дослідження втсанов-

лено, що сутність посткомуністичної культури як сучасного феномена глобалізації полягає в тому, що її порівнюють з культурою постмодерну, але такі аналогії в контексті метамодерну видаються поверховими. Теоретики метамодерну розширили горизонти постмодерністської парадигми, адже визначення метамодерного синтаксису як а-топічного метатаксису потребує дискурсивного аналізу на основі напрацювань неориторики.

Ключові слова: посткомуністична культура, постмодернізм, метамодерн, дискурс, риторика.

Гуменюк Татьяна Константиновна, *доктор философских наук, профессор, заслуженный работник образования Украины, проректор по научно-методической работе Киевского национального университета культуры и искусств;* ***Легенький Юрий Григорьевич***, *доктор философских наук, профессор, профессор Киевского национального университета культуры и искусств*

Посткоммунистическая культура в зеркале метамодерна: дискурсивный анализ

Цель статьи - осуществить дискурсивный анализ посткоммунистической культуры в контексте метамодерна. **Методологию исследования** составляют теоретико-интерпретационные модели дискурсивного анализа посткоммунистической культуры, осуществленного в статье как поэтико-риторическая интерпретация дискурса власти советской и постсоветской культуры. Монизм применения повышающей синекдохи в советской культуре и постсоветской культуре плюрализуется, синекдоха заменяется метонимией, представляющей метафорические трансформации речи. **Научная новизна** заключается в раскрытии особенностей образных констелляций риторики постсоветского дискурса, которые имеют композитный, маньеристический характер без явно определенных мировоззренческих, этических, эстетических приоритетов интерпретации и дескрипции культурных ценностей. **Выводы.** В результате проведенного исследования посткоммунистической культуры как современного феномена глобализации заключается в том, что ее сравнивают с культурой постмодерна, но такие аналогии в контексте метамодерна выдаются поверхностными. Теоретики метамодерна расширили горизонты постмодернистской парадигмы, ведь определение метамодерного синтаксиса как а-топического метатаксиса требует дискурсивного анализа на основе наработок неориторики.

Ключевые слова: посткоммунистическая культура, постмодернизм, метамодерн, дискурс, риторика.

Introduction*.* The global transformations of culture taking place in today's world context cannot be imagined without the influence of the post-communist culture formed after the loss of the great narratives: "communist ideal", "socialist labor", "practice" and so on. However, the nomination "post-communism" is only its ideological dimension. No one has abolished communist ideology; the modern left in the West is once again enthralled with the ideals of "equality", "freedom", but the experience of socialism building in the Soviet society has proved the fallacy of u-topos island ontologies. Therefore, the definition of "post-Soviet" culture is more correct, it shows that the ontology of Bolshevik extremism (ideological, political, cultural) is exhausted.

The problem of post-communist culture interpreting in Ukraine became relevant with the acquisition of Independence, with the search for ways of autochthonous capitalism adaptation to the European space. Thus, in 1995, many models of development emerged, in which the postmodern interpretation of the current state of cultural creation seemed quite relevant. E. Bystrytskyi notes: "The concept of "post-communism" reflects the common for the present experience of the completeness state of a certain cultural period. Beginning, if not with Nietzsche and Heidegger, but at least with Gvardini, Letara, Derrida, Eco, and other contemporary philosophers, this experience is captured by the creation of widespread images of the end of morality, metaphysics, the ideology of the end of New Times, the project of Modern. In general, it was entrenched in public opinion due to the known notion of postmodern. The usage by historian, politician Fukuiama of a typically postmodern image of the end of the history, in our view, testifies to the internal affinity of the postmodernity and postcommunism concepts" [2, 18-19]. O. Bilyi, V. Polokhalo believe that cultural formation is being replaced by state formation (etatism), and democracy by ochlocracy.

This period of cultural reflection in Ukraine is a romantic one, focused on finding an adequate model of development associated with postmodern reflection. After a quarter of a century of building up an independent state, the search for analogs has reached its limits - the destruction of statehood as such, the ochlocracy has become virtual, extremely conflicting. Postmodern culture is gradually being transformed into "a metamodern" culture. It is widely accepted that the post-postmodern stage has been replaced by a metamodern one, which is characterized by "oscillations" - a wide fluctuation between the extreme points, the limits of the procedural dynamics of the integrity of culture forming.

The definition of the "metamodern" category was for the first time defined by philosophers from the Netherlands - Timoteus Vermülen and Robin van den Acker: "If modernism expresses itself as a utopian syntax, and postmodern expresses itself as a hopeless parataxis, metamodernism expresses itself as an a-topical metataxis. The Greek-English Lexicon interprets the atopos (ατοπος) as strange, extraordinary, and paradoxical. However, most theorists and critics insist on its literal meaning: it is a place (topos) for which there is no place. It can be argued that the atopos is both a place and a non-place, a territory without borders, a position without limits. We have already described metataxis as being here, there and nowhere. We will add that a taxis (τάξις) means ordering. Thus, if modernism involves temporal ordering, and postmodernity is a spatial disorder, then metamodern should be understood as a space-time that is neither in order nor in disorder simultaneously. Metamodernism replaces the borders of the present on the verge of an infinite future; change the boundaries of familiar places at the description of something unlimited. In fact, this is the "fate" of a person metamodern person: to pursue the horizons, which are infinitely receding "[5]. This neologism only Hextends the boundaries of the postmodern. Thus, the next nominative relation is "metapostmodern". It is necessary to change not the prefix, but the morpheme that marks the phenomenon. This neologism is of interest only as a statement of changes that are taking place in contemporary philosophical reflection. The construction of cultural paradigms should be started with discourse analysis.

Analysis of the research and publications. Problems of cultural creation and post-communist culture, in particular in the globalization, ideological-political, existential aspects, are considered in the works of Ye. Bystrytskyi, V. Bychkov, O. Bilyi, V. Polokhalo, Yu. Pyvovar, etc. [2; 3; 1; 9; 8]. However, the category of "post-communist culture" in its correlation with the "goal of modernity" category and the discursive dimension has been little explored.

The purpose of the article is to conduct a discursive analysis of a post-communist culture in the context of the metamodern.

The main material. Culture, in its worldview dimension, is defined as the "carrier" of the highest values - the Absolute, God, spirit, communist ideal, national idea, etc. Such a traditional understanding of it is formed from mythological, religious beliefs about the world. In the phenomenological dimension, culture is something where the world is given to a person, one cannot escape from culture, as one does from one's consciousness, without destroying oneself or the world around oneself; in praxeological, culture is a "live action", an activity, an "objectified" action, the result of an activity. These connotations are purely subjective, they represent the activity of a person in a certain form. The subjective dimension of culture presents its initial constituent constants - behavior (ethical aspect), state (aesthetic aspect) and activity (praxeological aspect). Culture normally has a certain dominant. Thus, in the archaic culture behavior, canon, taboo are dominated, in the medieval - the regulation of the state (ecstasy, mystical take off, Epiphany), in the culture of modern and postmodern - the regulation of practice (business, market, management, marketing, etc.).

The culture of the soviet and post-soviet space is focused on the effectiveness as itself, activity, practice or practices of culture. V. Mezhuiev once wrote that the substance of culture is "common labor", according to K. Marx [7]. Consequently, the quasi-Marxist theory of culture of "developed socialism" tends to substantialism, for which the horizon of cultural descriptive is practice. The phenomenological theory of culture is also no less substantive, since the horizon of cultural creation is consciousness and its intentionality. In any case, the subject of culture is reflected as a producer (praxiological aspect), as a carrier of cultural and historical potential, as an ethical and aesthetic subject, as a subject of discourse. The subject of discourse loses its quasi-natural features and is "embedded" in the text, becoming an attribute of the action of the sign (semiosis). That is, the subject of the discourse is also substantiated, representing activity, power of discourse.

T. Vermülen, R. van den Acker describe the metamodern culture as a-topical metataxis (metataxis is a type of syntax that represents the independence of grammatical structures from semiosis which understood in J. Derrida's spirit). However, it is known that syntax, as a certain system for constructing grammatical structures, involves the syntagmatic (spatial zoning) of these structures. Thus, F. de Saussure prefers syntagatics over syntax [11]. The discourse in the rhetorical interpretation of the cultural practices time-space is represented by several figures, tropes that represent syntax as a certain composition of grammatical structures (compositio), reflecting the spatial aspect of cultural creation as dispositio (disposition, juxtaposition) and the temporal aspect as transpositive (moving from one position to another) .

However, everything, that philosophers from Holland present as a syntactic norm of culture (parataxis, metataxis), associating it with chronotope, theorists of neo-rhetoric are unable to do (Francois Pirou, Jean-Marie Clinkenberg, Adlen Trinon, Jacques Dubois, Francis Eispuis, Francesis Menge - the Leu group) consider the grammatical constructions of the text as the integrity of its transformation. Time is eliminated from the grammatical structures of "common rhetoric." The authors emphasize: "The basis of all rhetorical operations is one of the important features of linear discourse, namely, the possibility of its division into smaller elements" [4, 62]. Non-rhetoric has a purely transformative character, as in R. Barthes, it begins with a "zero degree" - an unambiguous transmission of information, which, through rhetorical transformations (reductions, inversions, etc.), acquires a poetic function. Rhetorical operations (metabolites) are defined as morphological, syntactic, semantic, logical. In order to reach the cultural model of discursive analysis, we have added a group of cultural transformations [6]. That is, to the such groups as "grammatical figures" (metaplasmas, metataxis, metasemems), "thought figures" in which graphematic, morphological, syntagmatic, syntactic, semantic, logical operations are performed, we add the groups "culture metabolites" and "meta cultural metabolites by presenting universals of culture.

So the main question arises: What is the difference between the languages (discourses) of Soviet culture and post-Soviet culture? It is known that in Soviet times the principle of action nomination prevailed (instead of the verb "to work", for example, used the phrase "to carry out work") and the trope of increasing synecdoche ("girl" - a small woman, "worker" - proletarian "). Ці образні констеляції по-різному обіграли А. Платонов і В. Сорокін. These figurative constellations were played by A. Platonov and V. Sorokin differently. В ореолі завтрашнього дня й комуністичного ідеалу формувалась унікальна мова («соцяз» – рос.), яка за інерцією перейшла і в пострадянський простір, ще більше універсалізувавши номінативну функцію дискурсу, надавши їй універсальної маніпулятивності. Та чи мала радянська культура свою мову? In the halo of tomorrow and the communist ideal, a unique language ("sots-speak"– Rus.) was formed, which by inertia passed into the post-Soviet space, further universalising the nominative function of discourse, giving it universal manipulability. But did the Soviet culture have its own language?

P. Serio emphasizes: "There is a widespread opinion that there is a special language in the USSR and other socialist countries (Langue). This phenomenon is unique in its own way: it is the language of pow-

er, and, if you believe in the results of numerous Soviet and foreign studies, it can be understood and defined as a language.

This language is known in France as "angue de bois", or "Soviet". It has special features allegedly: magic, secrecy, relevance and maximum opacity. In our view, this set of features, in itself is very heterogeneous and implies at least such initial postulate: "Soviet language" does exist. It is the object of a study and, whether it is to be studied or destroyed, protected, it exists and is a language. So, let's start with the initial idea of language. What exactly is meant when claiming that "Soviet language" is a language? What vision of language and its functioning follows from this statement? What understanding of the speaker or the language community prevails with this? "[10, 83].

P. Serio calls the Soviet language "negative poetry," arguing that, using predominantly uplifting synecdoches, the subjects of this poetic discourse form the poetic function of the word. After all, the word mainly represents the nominative function, that is, it names the names of things, and the verb is eliminated. P. Serio emphasizes that it is an archaic form of discourse that conceals responsibility for action. "With such a vision of language," he considers, "when its primary function is the presentation of what exists, the relation between language and reality seems to give the existence of an implicit realistic postulate of those (structures of text, subjects of discourse - Yu. L., T. H) who by their attempts try to determine the degree of adequacy of the "official language" of reality, because they only reach the effect of the reality perception obviousness. In ideology, transparent representational facts speak for themselves, reality is incomprehensible to any interference with language, and truth, by itself, is grasped beyond any language.

In our view, practically, any consideration of style and mark in the "official language" prevents the problem of the adequacy verifying means of the referent mark. This is tantamount to introducing an ontology into a language and refusing to admit that "there is no metalanguage". There is no position external to the language from which one can make judgments about its adequacy, there is no "natural" space where reality would pass into knowledge. The fact is that language, as a generative element of the articulation of meaning in general (verbal language, musical language, stage language, etc.) is eliminated and replaced by speech (discourse), which is dominated by primitive nominalistic syntactic construction. Presentation nominalism prevails. So, social realism is an intrinsically complex stylistic system. This is a real set from above. It exists as an imperative, an ideal, and the way it is presented is archaic, primitive because it appeals to nominalism (there are only words, not substances, entities). Hence the "struggle" with "formalism" and intellectualism of the artistic form in art. In the post-Soviet culture, " the struggle of languages" as a means of presenting a national idea in its nominalist dimension lies the struggle of power discourses.

P. Serio points out: "… the official language is not something magical, because it is not a language at all. It is a discourse characterized by an extremely tense relationship between universally recognized homogeneity and solidity and intrinsic heterogeneity. This heterogeneity, which can be identified as a deep syntactic phenomenon, indicates the constant presence of opposing discourses. Any ideology aims to conceal its attitude to reality by presenting itself as universal, natural and ahistorical, not seeking to expose lies in Soviet political discourse. We consider it is more useful to study the functioning of discourse in this society based on the recognition of the ideologically deterministic nature of the word reference establishing. But if the Soviet political discourse has such a clear orientation on the impliedness of the speech subject, on the subjugation of the speaker to the universal subject, we have the right to raise the question of the roots of such subordination in political practice that leads to the collapse of Marxism-Leninism. "[10 , 100]. The conclusion is predictable. What is changing in the post-Soviet discourse?

The function of increasing synecdoche is performed by metonymy (the spatial complexity of the elements of discourse); it is even more generalizes synecdoche, abstracting it extremely. If R. Jacobson argued that metonymy was the original metabolism of rhetoric, and sharply opposed its to metaphor, then the authors of the Miu group see the metaphor and metonymy as the basic principle of synecdoche. The authors of the Miu group write: "We have already said that the metaphor is not simply a replacement of meaning - it is a change in the semantic meaning of a word that arises in consequence of two basic operations: adding and reducing of semes. In other words, the metaphor is the result of a combination of two synecdoches "[4, 194].

It is about a combination of increasing and lowering synecdoches. The declining synecdoche of the whole is represented by the name of its part, for example, instead of "sailboat" they say "sail". "From a formal point of view, metaphor is a syntagm that exists in the contradictory holistic identity of two signifiers and the mismatch of their respective definitions. This challenge of (linguistic) consciousness requires a reduction, which is to the extent that the reader is somehow trying to justify a combination of signifiers that can be viewed, " the authors of the Miu group argue [4, 195]. The combination of contradictions arises not immediately, but gradually, as the "overlay" of semes, that is, the authors present the temporality of the act of dispositive (transition to another quality) as the elimination of dispositio (confrontation of the designated). Such syntagmatic bring metaphor closer to metonymy, in which the definitions no longer need to be combined because they belong to a certain general integrity - the syntagm.

In the context of paradigmatic attitudes of the metamodern, there is an escalation of the distance of the signified: the chronotope is represented by the combination of its two models - point and eternity (in archaic cultures it is the altar as a sacred center in eternity), moments and infinity in modern culture. Metonymy in post-communist culture is presented as a syntagm that falls into the field of broad oscillations presented

17

by mimicry in discourse from rising synecdoche to lowering synecdoche. That is, the metaphorizatyon of discourse as a linguistic reality occurs, and reality itself is ontologized and presented as a "realized metaphor." In terms of virtual and digital technologies, this paradox of the substitution of reality with the reality of discourse becomes invariant.

There is a quite common saying: "I'll dial you" instead of: "I'll dial your phone number." It illustrates not only the reduction of seme but also the manipulative code of discourse. "You", the other performs the function of a phone, device. The well-known advertising banner, which combines photos of Poroshenko and Putin, can be reconstructed as a rhetorical mechanism for transforming information with the help of "seme reduction with the application." The visual syntax of the two photos prompts the opponent to be eliminated as a "weak figure", replacing him with a "strong figure" with which the poster customer competes. Thus, in the post-communist culture, the concept of "activity" as a horizon of cultural creation was replaced by the concept of "discourse", which is presented by metonymy as a "modernized" rising synecdoche. The observer, the consumer of information, is in the space of "realized metaphors" that present the newest nominalist discourse of post-Soviet culture. There is a certain "exchange of places" in life. This is the old code of cultivation. "Take my virgin daughters," Lot told the scoundrels of the Sodomites. It is known that the daughters "avenged" Lot in the absence of men - got drunk and conceived from his father. It should be noted that this story from the Bible almost did not fall into the mythological field of fine iconography. Only the mannerists portrayed the priest of Israeli people in an inadequate condition with a glass of wine and naked daughters around him. The mannerist discourse has a marginal ethos. The same can be said of post-communist culture as a mannerist stage of the metamodern. Morality is not in discourse, because it is distorted by the temptation and the need to survive.

Conclusions. The discourse of post-Soviet culture demonstrates the traditional rhetorical instrumentality characteristic of the Soviet culture, because the monism of increasing synecdoche is pluralised, the speech has signs of a mannerist discourse, in which the compositio as cultural integrity is formed by a composite mixture of syntagm without prioritizing combination definition . Metamodern, as a widely stated paradigm of cultural creation, describes the grammatical whole only as relativistic syntax – a-topos, which even by the models of the Liege school of neo-rhetoric is a fragmentary and overly metaphorical description of cultural creation. The "completion" of the rhetorical model of discourse to the cultural provides adequate horizons for discursive analysis, which must be cultural and be formed on the basis of a reconstruction of post-communist culture as a manneristic (composite) integrity. Therefore, the problem of the post-communist culture functioning in the contemporary space of cultural creation requires the instrumental discursive analysis regarding the presentation of meaning, figurative and cultural constants, and transformative mechanisms of the text.

Література

1. Білий О. Новітні метаморфози радянського „новоязу". Політологія посткомунізму. Київ: Політична думка, 1995. С. 86–88.
2. Бистрицький Е. Посткомуністична філософія посткомуністичної доби. Політологія посткомунізму. Київ: Політична думка, 1995. С. 13–67.
3. Бычков В. В. Эстетика. Москва: Гардарика, 2002. 556 с.
4. Дюбуа Ж., Пир Ф., Тринон А. Общая риторика : пер с фр. Москва: Прогресс, 1986. 392 с.
5. 5.Заметки о Метамодернизме. METAMODERN. URL: metamodernizm.ru/notes-on-metamodernism (дата звернення: 15.09.2019).
6. Легенький Ю. Г. Об архитектуре (очерки теории дизайна интерьера). Киев: КНУКиМ, 2005. 690 с.
7. 7.Межуев В. М. Всеобщий труд как субстанция культуры. Проблемы философии культуры: опыт историко-материалистического анализа. Москва: Мысль, 1984. С. 56–64.
8. Пивовар Е. И. Постсоветское пространство: альтернативы интеграции: исторический очерк. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя, 2010. 400 с.
9. Полохало В. Українська політична система на тлі посткомуністичної трансформації. Політологія посткомунізму. Київ: Політична думка, 1995. С. 135–142.
10. Серио П. О языке власти: критический анализ. Философия языка: в границах и вне границ. Т. 1. Харків: Око, 1993. С. 3–53.
11. Соссюр Ф. де. Курс общей лингвистики / пер. с фр. Н. А. Слюсаревой. Москва: Логос, 1998. 296 с.

References

1. Bilyj, O. (1995). The newest metamorphoses of the Soviet „novoiazu". Political science of post-communism. Kyiv: Politychna dumka [in Ukrainian].
2. Bystrycjkyj, E. (1995). Post-communist philosophy of the post-communist era. Political science of post-communism. Kyiv: Politychna dumka [in Ukrainian].
3. Bychkov V. V. (2002). Aesthetics. Moskow: Gardarika [in Russian].
4. Diubua, Zh., Pyr, F., & Trynon, A. (1986). General rhetoric: trans. from French. Moskow: Progress [in Russian].
5. Notes about Metamodernism. METAMODERN. Retrieved from: metamodernizm.ru/notes-on-metamodernism [in Russian].
6. Legenkiy, Yu. G. (2005). On architecture (essays on interior design theory). Kyiv: KNUKiM [in Russian].
7. Mezhuev, V. M. (1984). Universal labor as culture substance. Problems of the philosophy of culture: experience of historical materialistic analysis. Moskow: Mysl [in Russian].
8. Pivovar, Ye. I. (2010). Post-Soviet space: alternatives to integration: historical outline. St. Petersburg: Aleteyya [in Russian].
9. Polokhalo, V. (1995). Ukrainian political system against the background of post-communist transformation. Political science of post-communism. Kyiv: Politychna dumka [in Ukrainian].