

a local day care centre. That evening, a two-minute report aired, "Some serious allegations of abuse and neglect have led the state to keep a closer eye on a day care centre in Barboursville," an anchor said. The reporter continued, "A mother says she took her children out of Kim's Kids day care in Barboursville because she claims her young son was sexually abused. ... The woman says this day care abused her trust and her child."

However, the report does not mention that the alleged abuse occurred between two four-year-old boys. One boy put his finger in the other boy's rectum and grabbed his genitals. The failure to mention this detail is a possible example of "defamation by omission," which occurs when a reporter omits facts that would negate an implied defamatory meaning. The director of the day care centre sued the television station in court. A reasonable jury found the statement defamatory. The case is emblematic of so-called "defamation by omission" claims. "In the context of a report about a day care centre caring for young children, the term 'sexual abuse' is particularly alarming and could lead a reasonable jury to conclude that the term used in that context indicates that an adult at the day care centre sexually abused a child," the court said [3] Thus, the omission of information used in a discourse has a great impact on shaping public opinion, which is why it is important to be a prepared and knowledgeable reader.

#### References:

1. Jocelyne, Vincent Marrelli & Castelfranchi, Cristiano "On the art of deception (How to lie while saying the truth)". *Possibilities and Limitations of Pragmatics*. John Benjamins publishing company, 1981: 749-777.

2. Half-Truths Leading To Fraud Even In Absence Of Duty To Disclose A Fact, As In Case Of Silence <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-5516-meresilence-as-fraud-exploring-the-ambit-of-half-truths-and-actionable-misrepresentation.html>

3. Libel by omission: *Creating a false impression with true statements* <https://www.rcfp.org/journals/libel-omission-creating-false-i/>

УДК 811.111'42

**Tarapatov M.M.**

Senior Lecturer of the Department of Applied Philology

### CONCEPTIONAL APPROACH TO ANALYZING THE METAMODERNIST MANIFESTO

The term "metamodernism" is known to have recently become widely spread as the name of the form of modern culture that followed the postmodern, whereas some researchers call it "postmodernism". However, many of the researchers agree with the syntactically correct but semantically incongruous term "postmodernism", which makes it imperative to coin a new terminological name meant to fully describe the new order in art. Thus, since deconstruction, irony and imitation were typical of postmodernism of its time, the discourse of metamodernism is characterized by revival of generosity, hope and romanticism, rejecting all that characterized postmodernism as a trend of art in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Rejection of the postulates of postmodernism, conceptualization of nowadays'

“right here and right now” through “the structure of feelings”, attempts are made to theoretically justify the basis of the metamodern almost simultaneously: there is neither temporary nor spatial distance between the researchers and the object of research, which actualizes our research of the theoretical background to metamodernism as a form of the modern cultural discourse.

It is the triple “threat” of credit crunch, collapse of centralized power and change of the climate that is considered to have caused the mankind to bear doubts and to have inspired the switch from postmodernism to metamodernism. When the theoreticians of postmodernism, namely Jean Francois Lyotard, Jurgen Habermas, Fredrick Jameson, Charles Jenks, Ihab Hassan, Linda Gatcheon and others promulgated that “the story is coming to an end”, they meant the specific concept of history, such as Hegel’s “positive” idealism. The modern and the postmodern being associated with Hegel’s “positive” idealism, metamodernism inherits Kant’s “negative” idealism, that can be referred to as an “as if” judgment.

This is what Curtis Peters writes about it: “we can view the history of the mankind in such a manner as if the mankind had a hagiography that could tell us about its own path to complete rational / social potential... or we can view it as if it were the story of development of the mankind” [5]. The scientist argues that even Kant used this indistinct terminology of the “as if” type, claiming that the human being is moving towards his/her invisible goal in such a manner as if following his/her own guidebook, i.e. the entire mankind is moving towards the natural though invisible goal, and in moving towards it, it is pretending to be developing morally and from the political point of view. [5].

The term “metamodernism” was suggested by the two European researchers Timotheus Vermeulen and Robin van den Akker. In 2010 they published “Notes on metamodernism”, where they tried to explain the cultural switch from cynicism and irony to generosity and romanticism. It was they who made the first attempt to theoretically justify metamodernism. The Russian journal concerned with metamodernism titled “METAMODERN” contains quite many articles concerned with the new cultural paradigm. In this journal, one can find the work by Timotheus Vermeulen and Robin van den Akker. The authors themselves referred it to the genre of essay. The article was translated by Andrii Yesypenko [2]. The authors willingly agree with other critics, experts and scientists that the postmodern must be rejected. However, they emphasize that rejecting the cultivation of the postmodern situation with ease, the scientific elite will fail to reach a compromise in terms of how the new circumstances shall be viewed and named or in terms of what contours shall be assigned for them. Timotheus Vermeulen and Robin van den Akker suggest considering the new cultural discourse as oscillation (the Latin *oscillatum* means “to fluctuate”), i.e. “swinging between the enthusiasm of modernism and the postmodernism mockery, which is metamodernism” [2].

The researchers present definition of the term “metamodernism” in accordance with the “Greek-English lexicon” also referred to as Liddell & Scott or Liddell – Scott-Jones, or as the abbreviation LSJ. This is a standard lexicographical work in Old Greek edited by Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie and published in 1843 by Oxford University Press. They herewith emphasize that the prefix “meta” refers to such concepts as “with”, “between” and “after” – all these meanings of the given prefix can be used to describe the term “metamodernism”, since epistemologically it is placed exactly “with” postmodernism,

ontologically it is placed “between” modernism and postmodernism and historically it is placed “after” postmodernism. The authors of the notes were apparently seeking an opportunity to unite quite many trends in their modern condition and modern aesthetics by means of a sequence of observations rather than an opportunity to combine them by means of a uniform line of reasoning through reevaluation thereof in terms of the newly born sensitivity called the metamodern, not trying to “impose a stipulated system of thinking on a particular set of cultural practices” [2].

On the basis of the concept of a manifesto in art, which is written presentation of literary or artistic principles of a particular trend or group in literature or art (according to the dictionary of literary terms in two volumes edited by N. Brodskyi), let us emphasize the fact that metamodernism has already succeeded in acquiring its manifesto regardless of the fact that this trend of art can be understood as a brand new one. The manifesto was formed and presented to the public by Luke Turner, a modern British photographer, artist and author of artistic performances. His photos, art videos and installations are apparently an attempt to evaluate some particular processes and vibrations of the modern world of art.

Thus, in 2011 the artist published “The Metamodernist Manifesto”, where he in fact introduced the very concept which reflects the changes and the condition of culture at the stage following the postmodern. In an interview for the AQNB Publishers in 2014, he characterized his manifesto the following way: “...was as if ironic, with meaningless language in the style of the early manifestos of modernism, at the same time serious, yet every word makes sense there and means exactly what I wanted to say; some people, especially in the USA, consider this text to be extremely generous; others perceived it as nothing but irony” [3].

Due to the manifesto, Turner is considered to be the next author after Timotheus Vermeulen and Robin van den Akker to have paid his tangible contribution to theorization of the metamodern. In the following years Turner published more works concerned with the new cultural trend, in particular the article “Metamodernism: brief introduction” (2015), where he continued pondering on metamodernism and on the future modern art as a whole as well as analyzing nowadays’ culture, i.e. the culture of the epoch of the postmodern. Besides Turner is also the editor of the Internet resource “Notes on Metamodernism”.

Let us turn back to the metamodernist manifesto itself. It was translated into a number of languages, including Ukrainian. Its translation into Ukrainian was performed in 2016 by the Ukrainian duet “Krolikowski Art” composed of Alexander Krolikowski and Alexandra Krolikowski. The duet works with various repositories, including analog photography and video, installations, new repositories and performances. The project launched its artistic activities in 2021 with an exhibition in London Museum. They call themselves on their official web-page on Facebook “Bonnie and Clyde in the field of art who do not fall apart even in bed, permanently working at psychological and political aspects of human mind, informational war and vision of the future” and never rejecting their romantic relationship in the background of the common goal, which apparently serves a kind of artistic device.

Here we deem it expedient to present some extracts from the text of the manifesto. Firstly, the metamodernist manifesto recognizes oscillation to be the natural order of the world. We must liberate ourselves from modernist ideological naivety and cynical insincerity. Movement shall henceforth be enabled by way of an oscillation between positions, with diametrically opposed ideas operating like the pulsating polarities of a

colossal electric machine, propelling the world into action. We acknowledge the limitations inherent to all movement and experience. The essential incompleteness of a system should necessitate an adherence, not in order to achieve a given end or be slaves to its course, but rather perchance to glimpse by proxy some hidden exteriority. It must be art's role to explore the promise of its own paradoxical ambition by coaxing excess towards presence. Secondly, the present is a symptom of the twin birth of immediacy and obsolescence. Today, we are nostalgists as much as we are futurists. The new technology enables the simultaneous experience and enactment of events from a multiplicity of positions. These emergent networks facilitate the democratization of history. Just as science strives for poetic elegance, artists might assume a quest for truth. All information is grounds for knowledge, whether empirical or aphoristic, no matter its truth-value. We should embrace the scientific-poetic synthesis and informed naivety of a magical realism. Error breeds sense. We propose a pragmatic romanticism unhindered by ideological anchorage. [3].

Thus, according to Alexander and Alexandra Krolikowski, metamodernism “shall be defined as the mercurial condition between and beyond irony and sincerity, naivety and knowingness, relativism and truth, optimism and doubt, in pursuit of a plurality of disparate and elusive horizons. We must go forth and oscillate!” [3].

In her article “Policies of identification in the art of modernism” [1], the researcher A.V. Vienkova explains the basis of the manifesto and once again accentuates the characteristic features of metamodernism.

#### **Література:**

1. Венкова А.В. Политики идентификации в искусстве метамоде́рнизма. / А.В. Венкова // Вестник Томского государственного университета. Культурология и искусствоведение. № 32. 2018. С. 203-211.

2. Вермюлен Т., Аккер ван ден Р. Заметки о метамоде́рнизме. URL: <http://metamodernizm.ru/notes-on-metamodernism/> (дата звернення: 01.12.2021).

3. Маніфест метамоде́рнізму // THE SYNCRETIC TIMES. URL: <https://thesyncretictimes.wordpress.com/2016/02/22/metamodernist-manifesto-ukrainian/> (дата звернення: 01.12.2021).

4. Мірошниченко В.С. Метамоде́рнізм, осциляція, інтерпеляція. Культура України. Випуск 55. 2017. С. 109 – 117.

5. Peters, C. Kant's Philosophy of Hope, New York: Peter Lang. 1993. 117 p.

6. Swift, T. An interview with Luke Turner & Nastja Säde Rönkkö. / T. Swift // AQNB, 19 May 2014. URL: [https://www.aqnb.com/2014/05/19/an-interview-with-luke-turner-nastja-sade-ronkko/?utm\\_referrer=https://syg.ma](https://www.aqnb.com/2014/05/19/an-interview-with-luke-turner-nastja-sade-ronkko/?utm_referrer=https://syg.ma) (дата звернення: 01.12.2021).