

LITERATURE OF POSTMODERNISM: BEYOND DIFFERENT SIDES

*Scriptorium is going to change the author...
The birth of the reader must be ransomed by the death of the Author.
Roland Barthes. "The Death of the Author"*

*Since then she has, in order to avoid mistakes,
Began to give away her smiles
Maupassant. "A Rustic Venus"*

I. THE SITUATION WITH POSTMODERNISM...

Space arises from chaos. It has nothing else to arise from. Literary process, by some measure, seems chaotic for many of its contemporaries. This applies to any literary period: say, romanticism seemed in chaos on the verge of the 18-19th centuries, as well as modernism during the turn of the 19-20th century. So it is not by chance that at the beginning of the 21st century postmodern literature seems chaotic to a certain degree. There are enough blog posts about it; they outnumber these literary works, but...

Of course, every researcher offers his/her own literary "model" or "map-scheme" of "postmodern space." Unfortunately, often this is not only done carefully (caution regarding new material is precisely appropriate), but somehow with confusion (desperate foray is a form of expression of this confusion). In some cases, it is done in the fog of philosophical perspective on this phenomenon and with almost no consideration of the poetics of specific works of art; in other cases, with emphasis precisely on their poetics, but often by simple cataloging of certain characteristics of postmodernism, without identifying its landmarks and trends, main lines of force, without any forecasts, but mainly on principle "and more about this." Perhaps the unwillingness to take responsibility for the proposed "model space" (inability to create it?) is due to the fact that postmodernism is often called not an artistic and / or ideological phenomenon, and not even a cultural era but ... "situation." So they write - "the situation of postmodernism". But what is allowed to theorists and writers cannot be afforded by teachers, whose duty is to explain ('make clear, understandable'). Imagine a situation where pupils or students study, say, "the situation of realism" or "the situation of Enlightenment."

The only justification for this state is that the same chaos, it is not defended by artistic phenomena and their ratings. Of course, this is the temporary condition, but we are all temporary, the other time to live in our life will not be, so we should deal with this situation of postmodernism (create the chaos of space) right now.

Of course, mistakes are inevitable and there is no other way, especially considering this year's lightning-fast introduction of postmodern literature to the school curriculum.

Any phenomenon can be studied in two ways: **extensive** (through depletion of material) and **intensive** (by determining and characterizing the most important and best representative facts, signs, milestones which are dominant). As for the postmodern literature, I believe, the second way is more appropriate, because the material is not "upheld" and it is impossible to explore it in detail, and probably inappropriate. So I go this way.

II. SCRIPTOR INSTEAD OF AUTHOR

The main specific feature of postmodern literature is its hyper receptivity which is a clearly expressed tendency to reception of any evidence of the cultural-historical discourse of humanity; and primarily and most actively from the works of world literature of various elements of their form and / or content: themes, motifs, images, concepts, genres, scenes, quotes, etc. (so called "**intertextuality**").

Usually postmodernists borrow all abovementioned elements, no matter to which literary movement, flow, style, method, period the text-donor belongs to. No wonder researchers emphasize *non-selection* (no dropouts or selection) and *non-hierarchy* (removal of the traditional demarcation center / periphery, main / marginal, central / peripheral) in the **aesthetics** of postmodernism.

In postmodern works there is usually no unique aesthetic and / or ideological program, typical of the original literature of the previous days. And then there is no division of predecessors and contemporaries into "us" / "them". For example, for Renaissance and Classicism the "aesthetic donor" was primarily

Antiquity, to Romanticism it was the Middle Ages, and for postmodernism it is the global cultural (especially literary) process. However, their fundamental rejection of the originality extends to the same thought: for example, on the verge of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Natalia Goncharova, a known Russian whitewasher-futurist already proclaimed the principle of "Any" ["everything that was before me is mine") or the adoption of a wide variety of phenomena of world culture] is very similar to postmodern art hyper receptivity at the beginning of the 21st century.

Usually, postmodernists calmly treated tradition and innovation, realism and modernism (the avant-garde) like the idea of nature and of unrestrained imagination, elitist and popular culture, utopia and anti-utopia. Let's take the last opposition, one component of which is sometimes interpreted as an attributive feature of postmodern culture ("culture has spread everywhere ... it is fundamentally anti-utopian. This is the postmodernism"). But the opposition "utopia-anti-utopia" for postmodern literature is irrelevant to exactly the same degree as any other opposition, the opposition in principle. After all, *"artists and philosophers of the past decades / XX / century often dream of a free intellectual without roots and bindings, of fun observer of universal ecstasy without the involvement of any responsibility, of pure pleasure of pure perception without judgment or moral rational assessment.* A "cheerful observer", "commentator of life" is absolutely and a priori indifferent to utopia and to anti-utopia. It's like a love-hate relationship among people, but, taken together, love and hate can be simply crushed by the rock of indifference and irony (see below about the irony of postmodern literature).

Thus, the typical for of postmodern time opposition **"either-or"** is replaced by the formula "omnivorous" all acceptance, hyperreceptivity - "and-and". That is why global and deep-essential **verbal emblem of postmodernism as such can be considered as the abovementioned formula by Nietzsche - "beyond..."**. Beyond absolutely all: what has been; what is; what will be. If it will be, of course.

In this connection it does not seem coincidental that one of the fundamental pillars of postmodern theory and practice is quite popular in the West, the teachings of French philosopher Jacques Derrida on so-called "Deconstruction", one of the most characteristic techniques of which is the destruction of established opposition ("either-or" - this the opposition; "and-and" - its destruction): "man-woman" and "language-speech" and so on. I will illustrate the "method" of deconstruction with just one example: if we usually say *"all men - brothers"* then deconstructionist will overturn this expression (opposition "brother-sister", where the left component for European subconscious is perceived as dominant, and the right as a subordinate component) replacing it with paradoxical *"all people - sisters."*

Of course, not all West experts share the Constructivists' views. Thus, Professor J. R. Searle in his crushing review of the work of one of the followers of Derrida, interesting literary critic Jonathan Culler, writes: *"... According to Culler, the effect of unconstructive analysis... is the knowledge and sense of mastering. "But this statement bumps into an obstacle: it requires a way to recognize what is true knowledge and what is counterfeiting and a justified sense of mastering the simple enthusiasm, generated by ambitious word eruption. All Cooler's and Derrida's examples are at least not very convincing: "the presence is a certain type of absence" (p.106) ... "The truth is a kind of fiction" (p.181); "Mental health is a kind of neurosis" (p.160), and "man is a kind of woman" (p.171). ... This list causes not that much of a feeling of mastering, than of monotony ... Anatomists undoubtedly will be interested to know that "what we perceive as the most interior space and body cavity - vagina, stomach, intestines are in fact all external pockets, turned inside" (p.198) ... The philosophy of Deconstructionism has (even deeper) sources of attraction. Apparently, anyone who is professionally engaged in fictional texts likes when they say that all texts are actually fictional, but the assertion that fiction is fundamentally different from science and philosophy can be deconstructed as logocentrism prejudice; and perhaps they feel a pleasant excitement to hear that what we call "reality" - is yet another text. In addition, these people's life is considerably facilitated ... because now they do not need to consider the author's intention, or worry about the difference between metaphorical and literal text or difference between the texts and the world, because everything is just the game of characters. The peak of this "sense of assimilation," which is given by deconstruction, and ... its reductio ad absurdum is Geoffrey Hartman's claim that **the main creative role is passed from writer to artist-literary critic.** "*

Note: The last phrase is significant. If it is true, if "the author is dead", and the main role in the dialogue "literary work - the reader" does not belong to the creator and interpreter of text (a literary critic), it means that all kinds of complexes in priority of the Creativity, Originality etc., can be easily replaced by compilation, editing texts borrowed from donor quotes, thoughts, etc. (We would not like to see "collapse" and "collapse" in the adjacent Glossary approach each other in the discourse of contemporary culture).

In addition, recent popular opinions and statements that "everything has been said," "nothing new to invent," etc. (and their authors are not amateurs or untalented people, and recognized scholars- R. Barthes, S. Averintsev etc.) in particular indicate a deep crisis of modern culture. Perhaps now we live in times that would later be called "dark age" of literature and culture, a sort of well-known period of the early Middle Ages. It is well known that the literature is not a progress but a process.

But what is comforting: just the fact that "everything has been said by Greeks, and after them there is nothing new to invent," and Roman comedians are only left to take the beginning from Arisofan and end from Menander, complained Romans Plautus and Terence in the III-II century B.C. But, thank God, after them a few new words appeared in the literature. I would like to believe that the situation will repeat, and culture will rise again.

In the meantime, *"the postmodern individual is open to everything, but perceives all as symbolic surface, not even trying to penetrate into the depth of things, meaning of signs. Postmodernism is a culture of quick and easy touches, unlike modernism, where the figure of drilling has operated, penetration inside, breaking the surface ... Everything is seen as the quote, as conditionality under which it is impossible to find any leaks, principles, origin "* and instead of genuine novelty postmodernists often offer removal of separation "old-new" / "my-alien" in the literature, as mentioned, it stimulates hyper receptivity of their works (the victory Scriptor over Author?). I hope Barthes will not take over the role of Cassandra, and his gloomy prediction about the "death of the author" (see. epigraph) will only stay as a sharply honed stylistic figure.

III. FORWARD-BACK TO PALIMPSEST?

The most productive form of realization of hyper receptivity of the literary postmodernism is intertextuality. Its classical definition belongs to prominent French linguist and semiotician of the twentieth century Roland Barthes: *"Every text is intertext; other texts present in it at different levels in more or less recognizable forms: texts of the previous culture and texts of surrounding culture. Each text is a new fabric, woven from old quotations. Pieces of cultural codes, formulas, rhythmic structures, fragments of social idioms, etc. - they are all mixed in the text and absorbed in it, as always there is speech before or around the text. As a prerequisite for any text, intertextuality cannot be reduced to the problem of sources and influences, it is a general field of anonymous formulas, whose origin is rarely found, unconscious or automatic quotations submitted without quotes."* Barthes is continued by modern Russian cultural studies scholars: *"In the culture of postmodern, intertextuality has become a mandatory part of the cultural discourse and one of the main artistic techniques, as fundamental eclecticism and quoting are dominant features of contemporary cultural situation"*.

Postmodernist works are somewhat similar to **palimpsest**, from the new layer of which here and there comes out an old layer; someone somewhere once had written this text. Thus, in one of the most famous post-modernist works - **the novel by U. Eco "The Name of the Rose"** clearly there is a reception, borrowing the stories by **Arthur Conan Doyle** (1859-1930) about Sherlock Holmes. The main hero of the work is a Franciscan scholar William of the Baskervilles (cf.: "The Hound of the Baskervilles"). His companion is Adso (cf.: Dr. Watson). In Doyle's stories, as in the novel by Eco, the narrators are "younger" (in age and status) members of "classic detective duets" - Watson and Adso respectively. Furthermore, from the text reader learns that *"England and Italy William conducted several processes as the inquisitor, became famous for his insight"* [Eco 36]. The word "Inquisitor" comes from Latin *"Inquisitio"* - "investigation" and, therefore if Holmes lived not in the UK in the nineteenth century but in medieval and Western Europe, he would not be called the investigator, but Inquisitor, like William. Both detectives, Holmes and William, do business in private, but they are far superior in mastery than the official investigators (according to detective Lestrade from Scotland Yard and of Papal Inquisitor Guy Barnard). Moreover, Holmes was an Englishman, and therefore, Baskerville's countryman, who was born in Ireland. The list goes on.

Rightly said prominent Russian philologist Yu. Lotman, *"The very first scenes, the acquaintance with William of the Baskerville seems a parodic quotation from the epic of Sherlock Holmes: Monk accurately describes the horse that ran and which he never saw again, and just exactly "calculates" where to find him, and therefore reproduces a picture of the murder - the first that was committed in the fatal walls of the monastery, where the novel unfolds- although he was not a witness"* [Lotman, 651].

In the description of the appearance and habits of the Baskervilles the parallels with the image of Holmes are not only hidden, but also specifically emphasized. Let's compare the almost textual matches in

postmodern novel by contemporary Italian semiotician and the English writer of detective stories, written on the verge of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. (Compared fragments are highlighted):

A. Conan Doyle stories (trans. From English.). - M.: Literature, 1982.	Eco U. "The Name of the Rose"
<p>"I saw a tall, thin Holmes shape" [p.43].</p> <p>"Him (Holmes. - JK) happened, wasn't possible to budge from the seat, except when it came to his profession. That's when he had been tireless and totally stuck to he's guns ... He had always exercised extreme moderation in eating and in his habits was simple to austerity. He was not committed to any vices, and if occasionally resorted to cocaine ... "[p.3].</p> <p>"... Tides of seething energy that helped Holmes in his investigations, glorified his name, alternated with periods of indifference, complete prostration. And then he spent whole days lying on the couch with his favorite books, only occasionally getting up to play the violin "[p.19].</p>	<p>"Brother William ... taller than usual, seemed even higher due to the thinness. ... He lived around fifty springs ... but did not know the tired body, moving with agility inaccessible to me also. In times of revival his courage amazed. But at times it was like something was breaking inside of him, and sluggish in full prostration, he sleeplessly lying in his cell, no answer or answering in monosyllables, without moving the muscles of the face are not united. Looking renders meaningless, empty, and it was possible to suspect that he is in the power of stupefying potion - whenever the augmented restraint of his life is not shielded from such suspicions. Yet I will not deny that in the way he was looking at the edges of meadows and woods on the outskirts of some grass (in my opinion, is always the same), tearing and chewing intently. He took with him to chew in moments of high-voltage power (a lot of waiting for us at the monastery!). I asked him what kind of grass, he laughed and said that a good Christian is learning also from infidels. I wanted to try, but he did not let me saying ...: that the great old Franciscan worthless young Benedict "[p.19].</p>

Hyperreceptivity of postmodern literature applies not only to the literary facts, but the real "life material" that can be realized both by "intertextual quotation" and in other ways.

Thus, the main opponent of the Baskervilles is called Jorge from Burgas (almost - "from Borges"), the guardian of monastic library, a native of Spain (then - Hispanic) that was blinded" at forty years ". This image is directly related to both the person and the works of outstanding Argentinean (Hispanic) writer Jorge Luis Borges (1899-1986), who, blinded in the second half of life, worked as director of the Argentine National Library, and whose work significantly influenced the Italian who admitted: "Everyone asks me why my Jorge, in appearance and name, looks like Borges, and why my Borges is so bad. I do not know. I needed a blind man to protect the library. I thought it was a winning novel situation. But library plus blind man anyway is Borges. Particularly, it is the fact that the debts should be paid".

What did Eco mean, speaking of his "debts" to Borges? That he took the name (Borges's name in "The Name of the Rose"?) and the image of the real writer? Maybe. But the Borges impact on Eco does not stop there: the Argentinean's art has identified specific features and even key fragments of Italian architectonics works (sometimes novels of the second are called the deployed novels of the first).

In particular, Borges is significant for postmodern image **maze model**, who became a component of interesting symbolic triangle ("Labyrinth" ↔ "Universe" ↔ "Library"), which is subsequently used by Eco. Thus, the Minotaur Asterion, the protagonist of **Borges'** novels "Asterion House" (and "Asterion house" = "Labyrinth"), said: "My house - as the universe, indeed, is the universe." A similar metaphor is found in the "Library of Babel": "Universe - some call it the library - consists of a large, perhaps infinite number of hexagonal galleries, with large ventilation wells, fences not high railing. ". How is it similar to the description of the abbey library in "the Name of the Rose", where the metaphor of the maze is also a cross-cutting symbol: "Only the librarian has the right to move in the book mazes ...Spiritual maze is substantial labyrinth. Upon entering, you cannot get out of the library "[Name of the Rose, 46-47] or "... I'm had never walked in the library. There's a maze... - The library is placed in a maze? - Behold the greatest labyrinth, the sign of the earth maze... "[Name of the Rose, 182-183].

And the very model of forbidden (hidden) book search that Eco used in his novel coincides with this example, the formula librarian - writer of Borges: "Someone proposed a regressive method: To locate book A, you should first refer to the book B which reveals the location of A; to locate book B, you must first deal

in the book *C, and so on to infinity* " ["Вавилонская библиотека", 84]. Incidentally, the same search for nonexistent books - Dictionary of the Khazars - drives the plot of the novel by Pavic, one of the heroes of which Dr. Mu'awiya "opens" the existence of lost "Khazar sermons". St. Cyril, approximately in the same way as the Baskervilles, "opens" the existence of the lost "Poetics of Aristotle".

In addition, the abbey church [Имя розы, 49] is surprisingly similar to Notre Dame, and ideological conflict of the Middle Ages and Renaissance (including Claude Frollo's and Jorge of Burgos' attitude to the books) combines novels by Hugo and Eco. The list of examples of postmodern hyper receptivity goes on and on.

Hyper receptivity (and thus - "palimpsests") is designated by **Patrick Suskind's novel "Perfume: The Story of a Murderer"**. No wonder the author of the foreword to its first Ukrainian translation is literally cataloging influences seen in the work: *"Reader, I think, noticed these similarities (Eco's novel and the story of Suskind.) the artistic phenomena (despite the fact that their artistic merit "Name of the Rose" is nevertheless higher) ... Thirty-with-something-year-old young Bavarian man was under the direct influence of the Italian, when taken to his story from the time of the Enlightenment, reasonably seeing a similar description of the life of a medieval monastery example of professional mastery of the reader interest and mastery of the technique ... Intertextual references to Dickens (character - a bastard-orphan shelter in childhood, bullying in apprentices, etc.), the French realism of Balzac and Zola (say, in describing the perfume shop Baldini, Parisian cemetery or of The Innocents); the clear parody of Diderot and Rousseau (the image of the Marquis de la Tayar-Espinasa), and at the same time and in the modern "theory of vitality"; parody (this time through hints on Flaubert - "Temptation of St. Anthony" and Mann - "Hermit") High topics "hermits" and "unity with nature"; an allusion to Dostoevsky with his "a trembling creature or have the right?"; an echo of the reaction of German literature on Nazism ("Doctor Faustus," "Brothers Lautenzak", etc.) and the response to new philosophical theory of totalitarianism, not to mention the almost scientific calculations from the scope of perfume - that's still not a complete list of the components of exciting game in which no less intensively involved and far from structuralism and other intellectual fun "mass" reader, captured simply detective story, Historical similar manner and insightful chronicle ageless charm of German romanticism ... Remember finally Hoffmann. Hero "Perfume" - a new "baby Tsakhes" man, though apparently not as incredibly ugly, but also morally disgusting and worthless. However, in Suskind is not so clear as his great predecessor: sometimes we even feel something like sympathy for our "Perfume": because the authorities inspire people to love to baby Tsakhes and fairy Rozsa-Hozha, all his strength is in useless three hairs among magnificently combed curls, while Grenuya reached power without fairies, generally without anyone's support and attention, he made himself beloved, by God, the owner of souls ... and became as Tsakhes but horrified at the sight of what love is worth to all the normal, ordinary, lovely, humane, obedient to the law people ... Undoubtedly, the "motive" or "baby Tsakhes" are crucial in postmodern system "Perfume". The author recalls the seemingly secondary parallels as the image of my friend Terje (pastor in Hoffman) or the owner of the Madame Gaillard orphan guesthouse (patroness of these fairy seekers in "baby Tsakhes") and others. Behind them, however, there is generally a parallel between the Duchy of Hoffmannesque Kerepes where, like smallpox "village blockheads" over education and instilled the spirit of order, and the era of Enlightenment, which selects Patrick Suskind the backdrop for his character. And "humorous Death" (an expression of Hoffmann) baby Tsakhes poured in ritual and terrible, and yet comic stage of and breaking and eating of God Grenuya by criminals - bums in the cemetery of the innocents "[Suskind].*

Not to agree with everything (yes, the Grenuy death scene with strongest desire I would not call comic), I allowed myself this "prolonged" quote above because of its completeness of the information therein hyper receptivity of the Suskind story. However, and this completeness is relative, for example, it is difficult to agree also with the fact that *"through the metaphor of smell - a brilliant individual finding of this great compiler"* [ibid], because she clearly recalls expanded the metaphor of **the game of beads** in the famous eponymous novel by **Hermann Hesse** (probably you should be born as scrupulously meticulous Germans not to get tired and not to give up metaphors hundreds of pages in length). A little further on the horizon – works- metaphors of German-speaking Jew **Kafka**.

But do not concern the conclusions of hyper reception ("palimpsests") of the postmodern literature only in mentioned works or works only by Western European writers? I just got the story from the Internet (and they say, not yet published in the Gutenberg way) by the popular Russian postmodernist V. Pelevin

"Water Tower". And his first lines betray Joyce's "stream of consciousness" ... Eco justly said that *"every book says only about other books and consists only of other books"* [H 624]

Thus, hyper receptivity is not a traditional literary borrowing but the characteristic of postmodernism deliberately emphasized and accentuated, undisguised active reception, and the main (though not only) by implementing a *"intertextual citation"* (U. Eco), "citation without the quotes" (R. Barthes), which leads to clearly defined "palimpsest" of postmodern works.

The writers of previous epoch (even something/ someone ridiculing, parodying, travesty and others) mostly sincerely and earnestly ("naively"?) believed, that it is possible to create something original, your own new word, to solve a certain problem, influence on existence of man and humanities. Post-modernisms "grew" up, cast aside "child's naivety" of their predecessors: all in them is saturated with irony, skepticism, sarcasm, parody, hidden after the augural smile: there is not an image - there is simulacrum, there is no originality - there is "palimpsestism", there is no author - there is a scriptor-compiler etc.

If the above-mentioned expression of Barthes, that "every text is a new fabric woven from old quotations", is understood literally, if a limit is really washed out between contrasting, from one side, author and, from other side, scriptor-compiler, then the best method for the latter to "save a face" – is to pretend, that he compiles **earnestly, jokingly, ironically**. And regardless whatever is said by whoever, not every artist wants to be associated with two funny heroes of G. Flaubert: *A "writer reminds Buvar and Pekushe, these eternal re-writers, great and funny at the same time, the deep comicalness of whom exactly signifies the truth of writing; he can only emulate what was written before and what by itself wasn't written for the first time; he can only mix up the different types of writing, mix up them from with each other, not leaning fully against none of them.*

The known Bomarshe hero declared that he is in a hurry to laugh, in order not to cry. Rephrasing him: post-modernism hurries to laugh at itself first, to pass others, because the best means to avoid irony of others – is to use **self-irony**.

If we already began a chain (irony → self-irony →.), then on the role of its next link should be **parody** that already determined as through holly "post-modernists", because contains: a) explicit and/or implicit quoting, support on somebody's the work-donor (see "hyperreception" and "intertextuality"); b) laughter (irony, sarcasm and others like that). In through ironical post-modernism literary discourse the parody and non-parody reception of material of others is difficult to delimit. Or maybe, all post-modernism literature is nothing other than parody on literature?

Certainly, parody not is opening of post-modernism time, but existed as long as "serious" literature (texts-donors) exists. Yes, the genius epos by Homer (VIII c. B.C.) was instantly "gone" after no less genius "Batrachomyomachy", that is sometimes added to ...Homer itself (sic!). Then, maybe, Eco, declaring, that *"post-modernism" is a term, suitable à tout faire [for any case /of fr./]" and "soon the category of post-modernism will overcome Homer"* [H, 635], wasn't so far from the truth, in fact *"in all books the question is about other books ...any history retells history already told.* It was known by Homer, it was known by Aristotle, not mentioning Rabelais or Cervantes" [H, 608]. And, I guess, in this remark Eco non-randomly mentioned name of one of the most prominent parodists of the world - Cervantes, that is *"easier than easy can be putted to the bed (let even Prokrustov. - U. K.) of the newest post-modernism poetics"* [Zatonskij, V.L.].

Maupassant in a verse "A Rustic Venus" represented a beautiful rustic girl that fell in love once, but was very quickly disappointed in a fellow. Consequently, to avoid new disappointments, she began to pay attention to all representatives of strong sex without exception. A verse ends with lines that, I guess, can originally specify post-modernism **irony** sources: "From that point she, to avoid an error became to give her smiles to everyone". Weren't post-modernisms as well, to avoid errors - accusing of liking, too serious attitude toward some concrete cultural phenomenon (it will suddenly take and go out from a fashion) - to "give the smiles" to all without an exception aesthetic work of humanity. Well, certainly, smiles ironical, exceptionally ironical.

V. "HIGHBROW LOVBROW"|"LOWBROW Highbrow OR MYTH ABOUT RETURNING OF THE MASS READER TO LITERATURE?

The next characteristic sign of literature of post-modernism and one of her important intensions there is **aspiration to return the mass reader**, but not to serve exceptionally to the small group of "chosen ones",

as it was characteristic, say, for many representatives of world modernism and Avant-guard. This intension the confessed meter of post-modernism culture Eco set forth writing-style metaphorically: "[*There is a necessity*] **to brake the wall that dissociates an art from entertainment**" and farther : "*to reach to the wide public - that is what Avant-guard means today*" [H, 638]. In unison sounds the voice of John Bart, a major figure for the western post-modernism culture : "*An ideal writer of post-modernism... must hope that he will manage to interest and conquer (at least someday) the certain circle of public - wider than circle of those, who Mann called first Christians, meaning the circle of professional servants of high art. The ideal novel of post-modernism must in find oneself above the duel of realism with irrealism, of formalism with "contentism", pure art with biased, an elite prose - with mass...In my opinion, here will be appropriate a comparison to good jazz or classic music. Listening repeatedly..., notice what remained out of eyeshot the first time. But this first time must be such a stun - and not only in opinion of specialists, -, that you would have desire to repeat it*"³² .

That such aspiration of post-modernisms is not casual, but programmatic, testifies philosophical-aesthetic soil of all paradigm of post-modernism culture, where the "*components of elite culture and mass culture are used in an identical measure as ambivalent playing material, and a semantic boundary between a mass and elite culture appears fundamentally washed out or taken off; in this case of differentiation of elite culture and mass culture practically loses sense*" and that is why there "*is elitisation of mass culture and at the same time - massing eliteness, that grounded the classic of contemporary postmodern U. Eco to characterise pop-art as "Lowbrow Highbrow", or, vice versa, as "Highbrow Lowbrow" (eng: Lowbrow Highbrow, or of Highbrow Lowbrow)*"[K, 559-560].

Certainly, a "Highbrow elite" mostly searches in literary work absolutely not the same that "Lowbrow mass" finds in it. Then how to connect in the same text unconbinable things, "wave and stone, verse and prose, ice and fire"? Very "simply": it is necessary to do so that **one text was perceived as different works**, meaning to "code" him on the different levels of reading (depending on "horizons of expectation" and, to say, "horizons of reader possibilities" of the already mentioned recipients).

Here is what writes a known semiotician (specialist in exactly area of codes, sign systems of etc.), a friend of Umberto Eco Yuriy Lotman, about different levels of perception of the "Name of rose" : "*It is possible to imagine to yourself a whole gallery of readers, that, reading a novel and meeting at certain "reader conference", will surely be surprised, that they red completely different books*" [Lotman, 650]. And in a letter to the author of this article he spoke out yet more radical: "*Fiction text always remains itself, never being equal to itself*" (Tartu. 01.07.1992).

Though in most showy way of implementation of the idea of multiplicity of reading of the same text by different readers in a bright metaphor was made by the French literary critic Tzvetan: "**Text - it only a picnic on which an author brings words, and readers - sense**".³³

The mentioned "coding" also is not the invention of post-modernism time. Say, on East since ancient times there was mighty "sufi" mystic tradition, that, being incarnated brighter in a poetry, produced the cultural "code", "codes": a "rose and nightingale" "The lovers", "wine and water" - accordingly 'courses of life of sufi/devoted and propham' and others like that. And on the Ukrainian literary walks of life some masterpieces could satisfy at the same time both the refined taste of gourmets from literature and query of its unpretentious "mass" consumers. Say, "Aeneid" of Kotlarevskij Russian intelligentsia of the XIX century perceived as comical "smallrussian exotic" [code 1]; Ukrainian (loyal to Moscow or politically indifferent) - as a comical encyclopaedia of Ukrainian folklore seasoned by a sharp folk word (like "*And wicked Juno, bitch daughter, got her monkey up , as a broody hen*". etc.) [code 2]; "independent" part of Ukrainian intelligentsia (as well as Polish, by the way) is radically adjusted - as codegramme for devoted, original portending of future independence of Ukraine, executed by a "Aesop language" [code 3].

"**Coding**" characteristic exactly for literature of post-modernism, in fact it, as marked, aims to return mass reader. Say, **finale of novel "Smells"** an ordinary mass reader will perceive as a disgusting fact of cannibalism [code 1]; for clerics - it is also a sacrilege, terrible parody on the saint ceremony of Christian parteciple (trying of "saint gifts" - bread and wine that symbolize a flesh and blood of Christ), in fact crowd ate "God-Grenua", and ... "from love" (sic!) [code 2]; and for intellectual persons, except the above-mentioned values, it is also an allusion and on Hellenic heathen holidays in honour of fertility God Dionysius, that, as well as Grenua, had been tore apart and eaten [code 3], and on the laceration of Orpheus by bacchantes, and who knows on what more [code 4 →∞]: "*./Grenui/ outpoured on himself content of this bottle and suddenly began to shine unearthly beauty. On an instant they, as though from a fire, jumped back*

from him with **piety**. But the same instant felt that jumped back only for that they could attack him, that their **piety** grew into passion, and surprise - in fascination. They felt insuperable traction to this person-angel. **Angel** radiated an unrestrained gravitation that nobody could resist, moreover nobody wanted to lean, because that gravitation was their unconcealed desire: there, quicker to him!... People surrounded Grenuja, twenty, thirty people, and narrowed this circle all stronger. But here a hoop couldn't contain all of them already, they began to press, to push away, to push each other, everybody wanted to be dragged as far as possible to the middle. They threw oneself on **angel**, leaned heavily on him, rode down. Everybody wanted to touch him, to break to themselves at least a piece from him, **at least porch, at least plume...**, spark of him surprising fire. They tear away his clothe, tear out hair, to tear off a hide from a body, plucked him, seized claws and teeth in his meat, attacking him as hyenas... Here flashed than, second knife, shots were strewed, cutting up a body, axes began to ring, crisply cutting joints and bones. In the shortest time an angel was decomposed for thirty, and every member of this covey, catching piece to himself, perched far away, persecuted by lustful thirst, and devoured him. In half an hour Jan-Batist Grenui to the last bone disappeared from the earth. When cannibals, by the end of a meal, again gathered near a hearth, nobody said a single word... Murder or other insignificant crime each of them, be that man or woman, already committed to the eyelid. But to guzzle a man?... They thought that on such nightmare they will never do this. And were surprised, how easily it went to them, and that at all inconvenience they did not feel even a hint of an impure conscience. The opposite! In a stomach, indeed, it was a bit weightily, but quite easily on a heart. Something pleasantly-light suddenly began to stir in their sullen souls. And the girlish, tender reflection of happiness appeared on faces... They were extraordinarily proud of themselves. **They first made something out of love" [Suskind].**

Thus, it would seem, all literary works of hyper receptivity postmodern and with its orientation on a mass reader, must be well perceived by wide audience. But in reality quite a bit of post-modernism texts are hardly accessible to many its recipients (to the readers and/or computer users), and is the circle of reading foremost of not numerous intellectual persons, in particular - literary professionals-critics. Meaning post-modernism that came on change to the modernism, wasn't able to do anything against the general tendency of "increase of distance between the cultures of experts and wide public" (J. Habermas), between elite and mass reader.

Nevertheless, postmodern literature - a concept is far from being homogeneous both in conceptual and in aesthetic sense. In it, in particular, noticeable "transparent" and "dark" styles (as at one time for provance troubadours, supporters of "clear" [trobarleu] and "reserved" [trobarclus] manners of work). Here, for example, list of **genre varieties of M. Pavich works** (who, in my opinion, gravitates foremost to "dark style", "reserved manner", unlike the same Eco and Zuskind) : "*Hazar dictionary*" is a **novel-lexicon**, "*Last love in Zarhorod*" is a **novel-manual** for an idea on tarot cards, the "*Internal side of wind*" is **novel-clepsydra**, "*Landscape drawn by tea*" is a **novel-cross-word**, collection the "*Glass snail*" is a **stories from a the internet**".

Recently appeared new work of writer - "Star mantle", that as well got unexpected genre determination - "**novel-astrological reference book**". Therefore appropriately a question appeared: "Mister Pavich, you by yourself do not consider that you invent books too difficult for an ordinary reader"? And although master of word did not start to climb after a word in a pocket: "My books are very popular - they were already read by about five million people. It casts aside an idea that books of My lord Pavich are too difficult" (L,13), reading his works, you think little bit different.

I guess, Pavich mistaking something or is cunning: foremost, even if these counts are correct, then did he compare drawing of the books with drawing presently fashionable detectives, "Fantasy" or woman novels? Or with drawing of only the "Name of rose" which is 10 million tonics? Besides, there is a concept of literary fashion 40, and the talented Serbian writer in the intellectual circles of many countries of the world now is not simply fashionable, but cult.

Other thing is that reading Pavich is really *interesting*. Agree, "gymnastics of mind" - one of varieties of intellectual pleasure: whether that during comparison of "masculine" and "feminine" versions of "Hazar dictionary", whether that during the supervision of "transfusion" of opinion of author and reader in "clepsydra" of the novel "Internal side of wind. Roman about Hero and Lenandr", that he needs to be readied from both ends (as a compendium of economy student that writes down two objects in one notebook from both his ends). Also agree that now some intellectuals contemptuously make a face even at the use of word-

combination "linear letter". But the question is exactly about intellectuals (at least - pseudointellectuals), but not about *mass* reader.

Consider therefore, that **"omnibusness" of postmodern literature is one of its myths**, maybe, intension of some writers, but in no way her absolute realization. In addition, the internet is not competitor to the literature in an esthetic sense *yet 41*, therefore rumours about its death are too exaggerated.

VI. Author-reader-text: "picnic club together"

A next line of postmodern literature is **propensity to the game with text and reader** that has, at least, two already mentioned sources: irony ("lack" of seriousness) and aspiration to return to literature of mass reader, fight for him.

Why lack of seriousness? Maybe, because lightness of borrowing provokes the same lightness of return (came "easily - went" easily)? Or so: if an author transforms in scriptor, and work - on palimpsest, then why not to line a reader too to play in a games, to become the accomplice of writer, giving him as well a part of "text creating" functions (look below about interactive)?

Why a fight for a mass reader? Because in this "reckless, reckless, reckless world" an ordinary man is often necessary to be seated for a book literally by force. A formula of one is of Russian "underground" poets " there were no bylines made about them but anecdotes left", for all postmodern irony is very significant in relation to denotation of the change of literary tastes. If a writer will not take (let useless and vulgar, but real) into account tastes of modern reader public, its favour, figuratively speaking "to the anecdotes, but not to the bylines", - he risks perishing as a writer. After expression of one researcher, if someone decided to write "Ulysses" now, he would carry out the "literary hara-kiri" - there would be simply nobody to read him.

A task is not very simple: elite literature, from one side, must learn something from mass literature, and from the other - not "play too much", growing into a cheap ersatz.

A writer always has two ways: either to orient on a reader "as he is" (and to risk populism), or to form, to bring up the reader (and to risk popularity). Therefore postmodernists often aiming to make "their" both elite and mass reader (because these readers already are), at the same time *"live by a hope - that is not too hidden, - that it is appointed to exactly to their books to produce and abundantly, new type of ideal reader"* [N, 625], And, maybe, a game with a text and reader is an attempt, by holding a blue titmouse in one handful, to grasp a crane by the free hand.

It is noticed in particular, that postmodernists gladly give initiative in interpretation of the works to the readers. I guess, in connection with this not by chance appeared such an idea in the novel of **M. Pavić "Hazar dictionary"**: *"...It's not me who mixes up paints but your look..., I only lay them on one wall one after another in the natural order, and the one who looks mixed them up in the eye, as though porridge. That is where the secret is. Who will cook porridge better, will have the best picture, but nobody can make good porridge from bad buckwheat. **More important is, thus, faith of contemplation, listening and reading** (in other words activity of spectator, listener and reader. - Y.K.), **than faith of drawing, singing or writing...** I work as with something such as a dictionary of paints..., and a spectator by himself creates from that dictionary sentences and books, merely pictures. That is what you could do, when you are writing. **Why not somebody create a dictionary of words that will form one book, and allow the reader to connect these words in single unit"**.*

Pavich by himself implements just now declared principle, which is demonstrated by both the name ("Hazar dictionary") and genre (novel-lexicon) of his significant to the postmodern literature work. Fairly alike opinion expressed U. Eco, giving determination of ideal hypertext (favourite term of postmodern) - *" an ideal hypertext is such hypertext in which it is possible to combine all words of all categories (like the construction of encyclopedia)".43*

What is also important to mention is that Pavich being named "the first writer of the Third millennium" gives for "reader porridge very good buckwheat ". A tendency of prominent Serbian writer to the permanent game with a reader the researchers of his work mark constantly: *"...Pavich, giving to the reader... practically unlimited power above his text, renounces the franchise right of author on truth"* [L, №17-20, c.13]. How exactly Pavich *"allows the reader to single this units together by themselves"*?

One of varieties of bringing a reader to co-creation is inviting him to transformation and/or creation of artistic text (especially in its electronic-internet variant): finishing writing of finale, beginning, the fragment, development of lines of personages and stuff like that. It is named "interactive reading" (by **"interactive literature"**). Certainly, say, Calderon or Proust did not give such an opportunity to the reader, and thus this is a fresh word in literature.

Mylord Pavich is highly educated man who engaged in classic literature professionally, and thus game with a reader - him conscious choice: *"All my life I studied classic literature and very i very love it. However, I think that the classic **method of reading books exhausted itself already**, it is time to change it - foremost when we speak about artistic prose. I try to give the reader more freedom; he together with me bears responsibility for development of plot of the book. I try to give the reader possibility to decide, where begins and where ends a novel, about plot and upshot, what fate is waiting for the protagonists. It can be named interactive literature - literature that evens a reader with a writer. Recently the version of "Hazar of dictionary" went out on a compact disk..., to services of reader there are two with a half million methods of reading of novel. Everybody can choose the phase of reading, create the own map of this book" [the same, p.1].*

If earlier the coding (see higher) took place on the basis of the fixed (canonical) texts that had been created and governed exceptionally by author, often not allowing to do it even to the editor, then now transformation of artistic work of "no author" often not only allowed but also encouraged. So the brilliant metaphor of Z. Todorov can be continued: lately on a literary picnic a reader, on invitation of author, brings with himself not only sense but also words, meaning actually text. (Leaving without consideration a question about whether the author itself is needed in such time, and who, actually author is.)

We should not forget the third participant of "literature picnic club together" - artistic text. Because the author himself often does not imagine how reader can understand, explain, interpret his work reader. Eco even admitted that *"nothing amuses author more than new readings that he even didn't think about and which arose in readers mind", though "text...creates its new meanings"*[N,598]. In approval he gives specific facts of "new readings" of his famous novel, when readers have found such things, that he himself didn't know about [N, 598-600]. Similar ideas stated Pavich, comparing own texts with kids that grow up and already *"running faster than himself"*.

Honestly speaking such behavior of artistic texts is also not exceptionally postmodern attribute. By this way probably nobody will ever find out what was Virgil up to when in famous fourth eclogue described birth of some boy, a "golden child", which was further interpreted by theologians as foresee of the birth of Jesus Christ, claiming Virgil himself a "Christian before Christ" (which further allowed Dante in his "Divine comedy" make a genius pagan his guide in the Christian "underworld") If such facts took place concerning artistic texts ("Bukoliks" - are not clerical work) then there is to tell about sacred texts. Thus at the time of Middle Ages that are loved so much by the postmodernists, you could be burn a life by the inquisition for...incorrect reading of the Bible. Because to reading and explanation the Sacred Writing could be conducted only by especially trained interpreter - the pope.

In the age of growth of semiotics (contemporary to the age of postmodern literature, approximately around 1970-s) the role of fiction text as relatively autonomous semantic - creative structure significantly grove. Let's not forget also that multi leveled coding of literature text is a programme setting of postmodernists. In addition the father of postmodern literature - U. Eko a world level semasiology scientist and his works are considered as translation of semiotic and *"cultural ideas on the language of artistic text. What gives the ground for different readings of "Name of the Rose"* (and also other texts of Eco and not only his works - Y.K.) [Lotman, 651] and even stronger: *"Eco's novel without doubts is an invention of contemporary thought and **could not have been created even quart century ago"*** [Lotman, 664].

And so in contemporary "picnic club on three" an artistic text is one of the major participants. Maybe that is why Eco through on a first glance paradox phrase: *"author should have died in the end of writing a book. In order to not block the way to the text"* [N, 600].

And weather classical reading of the book exhausted itself (M. Pavić) will show the future. Weather the books will disappear - nobody knows. But for now it is imposible not to acknowledge the ingenuity of postmodernists, who are doing everything in order for literature works to be read at least some way. The Russian poet once predicted" ...There will be no books? But readers will be!"

VII. VIRTUOSO OF VIRTUALITY

As was fairly mentioned by one of the Ukrainian specialist in literature *many postmodern novels arise on historical ground. But by the same time they are not historical: antique cities, abbeys and castles are only decorations for plays that fell out of the time. They can deny that, telling it already happened before Thornton Wilder's "Ides of March", "The Business Affairs of Mr. Julius Caesar " of Bertold Brecht, "False Nero" of Lion Feuchtwanger,-aren't it most actual contemporaneity, dressed in togas? Yes, but U.Eco's*

"Name of the Rose" or "Heaven Dogs" by Argentinean Abel Pisse or "The Last world" of the Austrian Christopher Ransmeier (1988) - this is something completely different: is not changed clothes for the sake of derision surrounding reality and not romantic admiration of antique ... [Zatonskiy, IL]. A question arises: and how to mark these – *"his is something completely different"*?

Indeed, postmodernists love a historical background; it is visible with a naked eye. But why? Not because in the cultural paradigm of postmodern present a *"melancholy after history, incarnate above the other in aesthetically beautiful attitude toward it, displacing the center of interests from a theme "aesthetics and policy" on a problem "aesthetics and history"*? [K, 349]. Isn't it in the end, because presently does the whole world lives under the sign of the idea of **"end of history"**, better than others formulated by American Japanese Francis Fukuyama? And if there is no Future (though The End of the history came), why not appeal to the past? Such realization of paradoxical (but actual in relation to postmodern) metaphor of R. Shvendter: *"Future is prolonged on endlessness past"*. Therefore postmodernists are taking their "favourite epochs": **Umberto Eco** - Middle Ages (*"Name of rose"*, *"Foucault's Pendulum"*); it is Middle Ages, Baroque and by a less measure, Antiquity – *"Khazar dictionary"*, *"Last Love in Constantinople"*, *"The Inner Side of the Wind. The Novel of Hero and Leander"*; **Christoph Ransmayr**-Antique (*The Last World*); **Milan Kundera**- Middle Ages (*Unhurry*); **Patrick Süskind**- Enlightenment (*Perfume: The story of a murderer*) etc.

But the representatives of other literary directions were interested in history also: in their own way comprehended it the artists of say, of Renaissance or Classicism, quite other gates are romanticisms or realists. So what **are peculiar features of historical method of works in literature of postmodern**?

You can't but agree with D. Zatonskiy that the historical method of works in literature of postmodern absolutely doesn't look like *"romantic admiration"*, *"Kulörlokál"* of romanticisms. And it is also no a pseudohistoricism of heroic epos, where events of the past were often consciously and/or unconsciously combined in the most unexpected manner: mark count Brittany Khruotland is suddenly killed by Muslims – Muslims, but not Basques-Christians, as it was in actual fact in 778 in Ronsel'vanskiy canyon [*"The song of Roland"*]; then thunderstorm of Europe Attila suddenly *"transformed"* on courteous-wasted king of burgundy Etcelya, in the time when in reality burgundy kingdom was completely blasted Huns (436) under the wire of that Attila [*"The song of The Nibelungs"*].

But indeed in Khazar Kaganat there was a polemic in relation to acceptance of religion, as by the way in Kievan Rus (princes of which from time to time were attempting to *"revenge unreasonable khazars"*), and consequently scientist of Middle Ages, professor of a few universities, academician Milorad Pavić in *"Khazar dictionary"* did not mess anything and exactly reproduced historical facts. And a *"historical moment on a background of which the action of the "Name of the rose" is taking place exactly allocated in a novel. According to Adson, "a few months prior to the events which will be represented, Lyudovik, entering into union with broken Frederic, entered to Italy". Lyudovik Bavarian was proclaimed an emperor and entered to Italy in 1327 year"*... [Lotman, 652]. Consequently did not make a mistake a scientist of the Middle Ages, professor of a few universities, academician Umberto, U. Eco.

Let Patrick Süskind not be a professor and academician but is highly intellectual and well-educated man, therefore he absolutely correctly reproduced the spirit of time of Enlightenment (XVIII c.) in France: *"...Everything became wrong, all must be different. In a glass of water lately must float some tiny pets, which were not seen before; syphilis must become fully normal illness, and not the Divine punishment; As though God created the world already not during seven days, but millions of years, if it was he at all; savages are the same people as we are; we educate our children wrong; and Earth already is not round as until now but pressed down from above and from below, as melon, as if something will change! In every industry they interrogate, drill, investigate, sniff up, experiment without rest. Already it is not enough to say, what is and how it is, – there is a necessity to proof everything, better with witnesses and numbers and funny experiments. These Diderot and d'Alamber and Voltaire and Rousseau and how to call all of those scribblers – even spiritual gentlemen also there and gentlemen noblemen! –they indeed succeeded in spreading on all society their own mean anxiety, permanent sense of dissatisfaction and insatiability, talking shortly a boundless chaos which dominates in their heads!"* [Süskind]. Consequently a historical method of postmodern is not pseudohistoricism. Then probably historical method of realism?

Neither they are – it not mimetic-analytical historical method of realism, in fact all here *"deceivers"*, and even real dates and geographical names are simulacra. But in relation to actual exactness, it is not simply self-possessed but also often confirmed documentarily (if certainly an author consciously does not

want to “transform” history). There is one – to characterize historical factual exactness of postmodern as hyperrealism.

A postmodern historical method is not and especially decorative (as was for example in “historical” knight's novels say, about Alexander the Great or Cleopatra, all historical “method” of which often consisted of the use of these popular from antique times names). A prime example of the modern use of the “decorative historical method” is a very popular and cash Hollywood film “Gladiator”.

It is also true that there are alike moments in postmodern works. People often think by certain stamps, by proof associations like: Ukraine? it is fat; Russia? – “bird-three” and bluestems in fur coats and others like that. Isn't that is why in interesting work of M. Pavić is one Russian character called Maksym Terentij Suvorov, because how differently a Serbian could name Russian after the glorious transition of count Rimmikskij through the Alps and help of Russia to Serbia during the Serbian-Turkish armed conflicts? Besides this Suvorov appears in a “most Russian” way:...*Father took Leander to take a look at Russians arrival. Leandr have been expecting to see riders with the spears stuck in a knee-boot, but instead of army saw the sledges, harnessed by three horses from which went out one and only man in an enormous fur coat*.⁴⁹ Although possibly it is from already mentioned irony. But in nobody of those who read works of postmodernists the competence of their authors in relation to knowledge of realities (and even details) of epochs, represented in these works, did not cause a single doubt.

Except for **decorative**, the historical method of postmodern carries out **plot- and concept- creation functions**. Say, opinion of blind librarian Khorkhe (“Name of the Rose”) that not all can be admitted to knowledge deepens perceptibly when it is considered in the Brecht key: who created nuclear apocalypse of Hiroshima or does clone a man, really aren't those who was at one time admitted to the library labyrinths-izms? What bilious irony: a former khazar *princess* Atekh has the Israel passport (became Jew?) and works as a *waitress* in Constantinople, which already a long ago (and Pavić knows about it, as nobody) not Orthodox of Constantinople, and even not Greek Constantinople but is Turkish Muslim Istanbul. This irony is consonant to bitter revelation of writer: *“I am the most known author of the most hateful people in the world”* [L+ '17-20, p.13]...

Consequently the historical method of postmodern literature works is in no way limited by the function of “scenery of theatricals, that fell out of time”. I repeat, it is a not “decorative historical method” although “sceneries” themselves are luxurious and besides allow an author to be instantly hidden behind wings and grasp any mask: to “become” ether a medieval monk [U. Eco. “Name of The Rose” (1980)], or khazar kagan [M. Pavić “Khazar dictionary” (1984)], or Paris perfumer [P.Süskind “Perfume: The story of a murderer” (1985)], whether ancient Jason that swims up in fatal for Ovid Volumes on a written-off military frigate with the simulacrum name “Argo” [C. Ransmayr - “The Last World” (1988)] et cetera. Here present another substantial for postmodern literature function: a **historical method promotes the already mentioned game with text and reader**, allows to make stylizations, “foresee” the past and others like that.

Then how to define *such* type of historical method? It is **emblematic for postmodern literature virtual historical method**. Once again I will transfer it's personal touches: hyper realism, almost scientific factual exactness; plot- and concept creating character; imitation, game of simulacra, quotations and others like that (see about intertextuality) and it without regard to the mentioned hyper realism; an assistance in postmodern game with a reader and text. Postmodernisms create “**palimpsest history**” (K. Bruk-Rouz), **virtual reality**, and for this purpose you need to be a virtuoso.

VIII. POST SCRIPTUM...

Voltaire once justly noticed that “there are no high or low genres but there are borings or interesting works”. To a full degree this formula can be applied to postmodern literature. It simply interesting to read it's best works. And thanks heavens: it means that Literature has not died yet.

And how will be perceived on the verge of say, XXI-XXII or XXII-XXIII century postmodern literary centon: as “Mauvais ton” or as “Bon ton”, as artistic “Second hand” or as a new word in a world literary process, – nobody can guess now. And there is no need to. As thought His Highness Time does not make mistakes. Space does arise from chaos.

 Уперше надруковано: Ковбасенко Ю. І. Література постмодернізму: по той бік різних боків // Зарубіжна література в навчальних закладах. – К. – 2002. – № 5. – С. 2-12
 Режим доступу в Інтернеті: http://ae-lib.org.ua/texts/kovbasenko_postmodernism_ua.htmhttp://ae-lib.org.ua/texts/kovbasenko_postmodernism_ua.htm