THE POSTMODERN PARADIGM: GENITORS OF THE POSTMODERN *DIALOGUE*

Paul GORBAN[1]

[1] Lecturer, PhD, "Apollonia" University of Iasi
Corresponding author: vongorby24@yahoo.com

Abstract

Along their historical evolution, human beings modify their communication system, as well as the signs they use, which is a consequence of the fact that man, together with and in relation with his fellows, creates and cultivates signs. The assertion to be made is that the act of cultivation is an act of giving significance, namely semiosis. Accordingly, we might agree that icons, codes, signals, may suffer mutations. However, in spite of such possible mutations, the new signs include, in their very existence, the first notations, in the same manner in which Eliade, talking about the atheist who had been once a Christian, will never lose the first love feelings he experienced. Nevertheless, philosophers assert that the contemporary world is facing a crisis of identity, crossing in the stage of "metaphysical finality", of "going beyond the metaphysical aspects", of "recodification", of "opening-closing", as a form of "weak thinking"[1], etc. However, postmodernism, as many other cultural periods, had its own incipit. From this perspective, it is essential to understand the postmodern cultural semiosis, alongwith this mixture of sign recodification or reconstruction, to attempt at building up an anthropology of postmodern culture, and even at identifying its roots.

Keywords: *modernism, avangardism, postmodernism, transmodernism, semiotics, semiosis, metaphysics, cultural anthropology, nihilism, poetic language*

According to vanguardism concepts (including all movements of this trend, from surrealism to dadaism), seeking for a new language, beyond any grammar, may appear as an *ars poetica*. Poetics of vanguardism, appearing as a nihilistic one, by the *will of denying* all forms of traditional, worn out, obsolete expression, abandoning any Aristotelian isolation, the poetry of the street, the poetry of the immense metropolis, the poetry of the technicized Being adapted to the functional-mechanical style of the epoch, the poetry dependent on the language of the latest technical inventions, a poetry whose vocabulary and grammar goes beyond the limit of perception of modernism, a poetry whose dynamic language is reinforced by ludic and parodic elements. All these new elements are put into a direct relation with the old historicism, announcing the paradigms of the new movement, the postmodernism, fully established in 1960, with the text of Daniel Bell, *End of Ideology*.

Even if most of the theoreticians of the program of the new civilization consider that between postmodernism and modernism the relations of cultural transfer have been accomplished, Ihab Hassan[2,] one of the important theorists of postmodernism, claims that no total breaking exists between the two trends, but only a common, shared contribution to the new type of historism. Postmodernism, says Hasan, is present in *modernism* and inversely, even if the two movements are denying each other. The relation between them is based – as also shown by terminology, on the idea of continuity. Postmodernism comes after modernism, in the same way in which postmodernism, whose historicity appears as consumed, leaves space to post-postmodernism, or to *transmodernism*, a notion proposed by Theodor Codreanu[3]. In a study published in the beginning of the last dacade, Irina Stănciugelu provided a most elegant explanation to the relation of prefix *post-* and suffix *-ism,* on which *our modernity* is substantiated. According to Stănciugelu, prefix *post* suggests, in a first phase, *what follows after something:* "Prefix *post* is a common terminological instrument in the language of history, frequently a neutral and convenient means of indicating the position, in time, of certain events, in relation with some previous crucial moment. The fact that some phenomenon is characterized by its posterity *versus* another phenomenon does not imply, in any way, its inferiority. However,

prefix *post* expresses the absence of some positive division into periodical criteria, an absence generally characteristic to transition periods."[4] Apparently, prefix *post* acquires substance only in the moment in which artists confer to it aesthetic dimensions, even if, in the beginning, most of them granted to it only a honour-giving condition, caused by the annulment of the old restrictions and preconceived ideas. The new term, as seen in the beginning of vanguardisms, acquires its ludic condition with the liberty offered to imagination by the new, undefined, yet exceptionally attractive experiences. Researchers from various domains (philosophy, sociology, epistemology and history) consider that modernity is worn out, its consumption expressing a crisis of identity, an axiological crisis, announcing a new, legitimate historism, a result of hazard, chaos, of rapid technicization, of social capitalism, of the architecture of the new universe. Postmodernism comes into contact with the public opinion and public behaviour, acquiring sociological dimensions and thus becoming a new form of life, a political instrument for the implementation of the new values, a model of expression and positioning towards signs, a fashion nowadays defined as *postmodernity*[5]. Postmodernity includes industrialization, valoric and social extension of the concept of postmodern. Jean-François Petit considers postmodernity as an epoch of "the new technologies, of ecology, of alternative policies, of hope, of the new forms of social integration, as well as one of doubtful reason, of subjective crises"[6]. On the other side, Paul Cornea considers postmodernity as a myth of criticism addressed to rationality. One of his observations is that, especially in the second half of the XXth century, numerous critical opinions have been formulated, from Heidegger up to Derrida, coming from fields such as philosophy, history and logic (see also the *and/and* logic of Ştefan Lupaşcu) or epistemology, with reference to the problem of reason. Celebrating disagreement instead of consensus[7], a differentiated, deconstructivistic argumentation, allergy to the imperatives of reasoning, as well as the carnival of heterogeneity build up the photogrammme, the icon of postmodern textualism, situated by the Canadian researcher Linda Hutcheon within the field of poetics, namely in the area of a continuously open structure, permanently "subjected to change, by means of which both our cultural knowledge and the critical procedures might be put in order"[8].

Heidegger is probably one of the most analysed precursors of the criticism of reasoning, as the German philosopher insisted mainly on its mechanical aspect, illustrated by the world of technique taken as a whole, the so-called *Ge-Stell*. As an expression of the will for power, it appears as a danger for humankind as, by the nature of its imperatives, it estranges the Being from its true essence. Heidegger, as Paul Cornea observed, even asserts, in his criticism, that "reasoning…, glorified for centuries, is the most stubborn opponent of thinking"[9]. On the other side, the Italian philosopher Gianni Vattimo, considered one of the fathers of philosophical postmodernism, by his "weak thinking" theory, discovers in the criticism of Heidegger a new type of historism, in which the new human being develops an encyclopaedic relation with his past, within which, by his own will of power, the character puts on him any of the clothes of history. "The world of *Ge-Stell* is not only the all-inclusively manifested world of technique, namely the challenge-production-assurance world, it is also, and necessarily, the world of *History*, of historiography, seen as a laborious reconstruction of the past, in which historiographical diligence comes to annul, by its excessive intervention, any sacre and hierarchical relation with past itself. The creature of *Ge-Stell* is not an ignorant in history; however, he develops with the past that type of relation described by Nietzsche, in his second *Obsolete consideration*, as the one of a tourist walking around in the garden of history, … a deposit of theatrical costumes."[10] Consequently, one may agree with the Italian philosopher that, once losing his metaphysical endowments, getting technicized and leaving history aside (in the terms of Francis Fukuyama), man comes to consider his being as a *different mode of existence*. Such an opening of the being, such reconsideration, such differentiation involves apriorialy the ludic dimension of the poetic language, of the metaphor, considered by Umberto Eco an instrument for new ontologies. The new aesthetic-philosophical thinking forces

us to identify the aspects of a new categorial organization. Eco believes that nothing is to astonish us once such types of ontological openings may create, in their turn, other openings. One may therefore state that postmodernism, by the series of interpretations appearing to us as facts, is the shelter of infinite hermeneutical forms, it is the work built up from the unexpected openings of a creative and unexpected utilization of the language, it is therefore the element which enriches, *to a certain extent*, our encyclopaedia[11]. One should know that, in the interpretation of Umberto Eco, a semantic thinking of encyclopaedic type is situated in the vicinity of "weak thinking", when this one forces the laws of significance to a continuous determination of the context and of the circumstances. "Which renders the encyclopaedia especially weak is that it never acquires a definite and close representation, and also that an encyclopaedic representation, never a global, yet always a local one, is provided by some determining contexts and circumstances, which provide only a limited perspective upon semiotic activity. (…) The encyclopaedia does not offer a complete pattern of reasoning, instead it provides *reasoning rules*, capable of permanently controlling the conditions permitting the utilization of language, for becoming aware – according to some temporary ordering criteria – of the disordered world in which we live"[12].

In relation with French thinking, Jean-François Lyotard[13], one of the first theorists of postmodernism, together with Derrida and Deleuze, announces that he does no longer believe the metastories of "the hermeneutics of significance", in the alliance between theory and criticism, the bases of modern reasoning, that, nowadays, it is paralogy the new form of dialogue, that interpretations are *local*, context-dependent, entitledly viewed as *opinions*. In other words, metastory, the sum of all great narrations, are doomed to decomposition, once the usual linguistic exchange involves *disputes*. Such disagreements will lead to the pluralism so loudly promoted by Gilles Deleuze, the one who will look differently at the philosopher: „he is no longer the one who searches for truth in the vast domain of eternal ideas, but the one who creates concepts, adapting himself, through the problems approached, to a present time under continuous

transformation"[14]. On the other side, following the thinking of Heidegger, who situated the position of the human being in the language, Derrida proposes a new type of criticism, oriented towards the analysis of language theories. In his opinion, metaphysics is no longer the home of the being, as for Heidegger, but the centre of Logos, understood as a full and direct presence. The Derridarian project aims at deconstructing the theories of language. In other words, the program of Derrida may be synthesized as *an attempt at going beyond metaphysics by criticism of logocentrism, viewed essentially as phonocentrism*[15]. The French philosopher, by criticizing phonocentrism, brings to light the problem of writing, which he considers essential for understanding a text or an activity. The texts (writings) of the various forms of language (literary, plastic, musical, etc.), by entraining any semnificate in textual semiosis, require re-evaluation of the relation between speech and writing, which will evidence a mutation in the history of writing, speech being replaced by writing, which thus come to represent even "history as writing."[16] Gabriel Troc interprets the Derridarian deconstruction as the main expression of the poststructuralist ethos which defines postmodernism, an expression opposed to the main systematic dimension of structuralism, thus "raising questions as to the idea that all phenomena may be reduced to the operations of the system, on also considering the implication of such a situation – the fact that one can fully control one's language (by understanding the "grammar" of the structures within which the phenomena are included)".[17]

The postmodernism, this contemporary cultural octopus, seem to pose o new problem, the problem of reference which is interesting to both the analytic philosophy, especially the American one, and to the semiotic philosophy. Of course, when we analyze the problem of reference, we pay attention to different degrees of its recognition, which I may refer to as *fields of reference*, and this is because, in some situations, a body (text) can be used in reasoning the self, ontological and epistemological contradictions.

These types of contradictions appear especially in literature, painting and electronic arts, texts that are sometimes used as paradox, lie and

fantasy. Semiotics, as well as the philosophy of creation aims to develop the referential creational matrix. In other words, semiotics, trying to overcome a so-called methodological "enclosure" proposes its "opening" by means of a model of "creative communication", in the form of a network. In order to have an operational semiotic analysis of the creational universe it has to be related to at least three types of relationships: 1. creation and sign, 2. creation and text and 3. creation and discourse.[18] On the other hand, the analysis of the creative communication represents an answer to the call of the subjects (arts) that use the sign, therefore opening the multidisciplinary character of semiotic research. We remember that in 1971 Josette Rey-Debove wrote: *People coming from every field where the notion of sign represented the preliminary matter of every research, or even its ground, semioticians became acquainted to each other and gathered their efforts.*[19] Maria Carpov, paying attention to sign and contemporary languages theories notices that current debates, which sometimes acquire the nature of the conflicts, admits that semiology gains its own dimensions in the contemporary thinking, and especially that, in its subjects, one may notice at least two directions: 1. semiotics becomes the epistemological basis of the humanist sciences, meaning that *this direction considers that the signification is a humanistic phenomenon that cannot be explained by sheer knowledge, which means that the study has to involve the researcher* and 2. the investigations are focused on the problem of communication and information, going beyond the anthropological condition.[20]

We ask ourselves how exactly language relates to reality. What part of this connection represents the nature of reference? Can language really mean something, if it is a purely poetic one? The answers to these questions will be given by the literary sciences, semiotics, the philosophy of creation, the history of philosophy, logic, esthetics, but also methapoetics, a science that helps develop a new interpretation of the scientific knowledge of arts.[21] Interpreting Rorty, Linda Hutcheon finds that the debate on existence and the nature of reference in fiction has taken on different forms, varying from the denial of the value of truth to awarding a special status to fiction. Pierre Fontanier urges us not to wonder because *fiction represents the soul of poetry*.[22] This point of view based on "denying the value of truth" claims that the language of fiction cannot be separated, both syntactically and semantically, from that of the everyday language.[23] Postmodern poetry especially that of the 1980s could be referred to as referential poetry, especially if we follow the biological vein and the histographic metafiction,[24] which is usually met in novelists. The poets' tendency towards reality, that "lunedist wing" as George Bădărău[25] used to call it, will set refers to *the loss of the high style* used up to the middle of the previous century by the symbolists. The evocation of the objects and their introduction in the poetic register, the overthrow of the roles and the gnoseologic intentions, the reflection of the textual avatars and the achievement of self-conscience contribute to what we can know call textualist poetry.[26]

The poets' project on the demythisation of poetry, of building it a new aesthetic framework, which is related to kitsch, as well as the search for some elaboration techniques which will eventually lead to a poetic recipe, and also to the translation from a poetic transcendence register, which was related to a superior logic, into a poetry of artifice, are all the reasons that show us that the Poet does no longer intend to deliver a hidden emotion, but to discover in the adjacency of the immediate reality, where the themes and the signs are visible. The interest for the daily and for the new anthroponcentrism determines the postmodern poet to execute or to resuscitate, in the virtue of authenticity and of the aesthetic truth his pleading for recovering the being (as a whole), as a coherent assembly of the spiritual, biological and of reality. Alexandru Muşina talking about *The Cinderella of postmodernism*, and namely poetry, said that this is based on "the denial of the fundamental postulates of modernism: instead of the eternally suspended time of poetry we have the perishable (and amorphous, destructured, apparent) time of daily life; instead of the pure and incontingent space of the second game, we have the profane space of the current existance; instead of the empty transcendence space we have a full immanency (of objects, going-ons and sensations)."[27]

We know from Umberto Eco that a linguistic message can aim at different functions, among which: referential, emotional, connotative (or imperative), phatic (or contact function), aesthetic and metalinguistic[28], and this is why we say that the postmodern poem aims at the same functions. What is certain is that poetry, which is a function of the ludic[29] is like a dream of science, it is a semantic body full of aesthetic function, even though this is related to the nature of phantasy, of virtuality or of reality. No matter in which place the semiosis appears (an established relationship between the poet and his world), the poetry will fulfill the need for beauty, entertainment, communication and the search for the being. The postmodern poetic sign, of a linguistic nature, assumes in its exertion the cultural-ontological meaning that the poet transfers it in accomplishing the creative semiosis. At the same time, the postmodern poetic sign also has a referential and emotional discourse, a discourse that is related to the aesthetic nature of the language. It is true that, in most cases, in the postmodern poetry, the aesthetic and the biological argument are often confused, but in the place where the aesthetic argument is strong, this is due to the iconic signs, through metaphor. We can say together with Umberto Eco that once we reach the threshold of aesthetic success, we realized that the aesthetic value does not belong to the emotional discourse, but rather to the referential discourse; for example, the theory of the metaphor admits a varied use of the references. The aesthetic use of the language (poetic language) implies an emotional use of the references and an referential use of emotions, because the emotional reaction represents an achievement of a field of connotative meanings. All these can be achieved by distinguishing between the means and the way, in other words, the aesthetic sign is something that Morris calls *iconic sign*, in which the reference to the semantic value does not end when referring to *denotatum*, but it continuously enriches itself every time it is aesthetically used.[30] The unpredictable is another factor which enriches the poetic discourse, and this may be why both the avant-gardists and the postmodernists have paid it great attention. They understand that the poetic discourse is what triggers a new relationship between the sound and the notion (idea, of aesthetic nature), and together it transmits a certain meaning, an unusual emotion.

Some critics, rightly, notice that much of the postmodern poetry is meaningless but that instead, it conveys a pile of information that is more about the pun, a wordplay, in direct relationship with the reality and the cosmology of the author. The alienation the deep meaning of the poetic word, shocking the reader through an artificial means, directing the reader towards a poetic element proposed by the author, does nothing but to bring to attention to a text full of information. In most cases, this type of information imposed by the author (poet) does not meet the expectation system of the receiver, because the latter seeks openness. It has been shown that in postmodern poetry, there are texts whose experimental value[31] consists precisely in imposing limits (of interpretation). In general, the receiver looks for aesthetic information, designed to satisfy his need of beauty and song. Today it is possible to produce poetic language with the aid of the computer. It was found that many theorists and scholars, scientists are drawn to art, especially if its implementation is done using a computer, actually it can be encoded and achieved by someone else. Both semiotics researchers and researchers of the creation philosophy or of the epistemology and logic are seeking to define the relationships established between art (as final product) - computer (as executor of codes) - artist (anyone with ideas, aesthetic emotions information, fantasies, etc.). We can say together with Dana Altman that the phenomenon of computerization of culture is another appearance of postmodernism closely relating the postmodernity, that the postmodern world no longer shares the rationality universe of the human being faithful to the power of logic but that he, rather, identifies himself with this irrationality. The difference in tools does not imply a difference in the basic principles of the artistic creation, we might say. But, how man relates, philosophically and semiotically speaking, to reality, the way observes the interlocutor may influence a product with aesthetic value. Dana Altman says that "it is difficult to define the direction in which the contemporary art is heading to , or to decide

whether there is a defining technique, even though the symbiosis will still continue for a while, because there are too many styles that coexist and the curatorial world seems to continue to keep aloof from the general public, encouraging innovation in its most obvious forms, which makes the gap even more visible."[32]

On the other hand, the postmodernism brings to attention the *quantity*. We know that in most of the fields of aesthetic manifestation there occur creation semiosis that come to show us that the world that surrounds us is an infinite amount of codes that must be encoded or decoded. The direction opened in Eco's form, we might make us happy, but when you're dealing with an invasion of codes you fail to focus on one, the more that each one carries a certain amount of information. The poetics of hazard in relation to the invasion of postmodern informative codes, seems now a reality. In post-communist Romania, for example, hundreds of authors from different fields (from literature to music and arts) begin or present their work in a starving manner. Most of the times the work in its turn, proves to be suffocating. Stefan Aug. Doinaș rightly notes down that in the Romanian postmodern poetry the metaphor is used only to transmit pleonastic mages with the reality presented in the text. "In as far as we are concerned, we do not profess the rejection of metaphor, we do not try to lay aside what the modern poetry has gained from associative freedom expected and excessively theorized by the surrealists; but we protest against the abusive metaphorism, a symptom characterized by the anarchic proliferation of the image in poetry. In an era of the visual, when the technical progress itself contributes to the development of a civilization of the eye, the image cannot be driven away from an empire that it governs with pride and naturalness, and that it has expanded to limit the unexplainable."[33] The poet and critic Aug. Doinaș sees in the young poetry a hazardous poetry of images and codes, an industrial production of images, in which the poet's metaphorical inertia seems to replace lyric expressions adequate to the human being. However, he believes that among these poets there may be found authors, who despite the temptations to produce visual effects manage to give unity and lyric energy to poems.[34]

In the same manner, Theodor W. Adorno talking about the decline of the arts (visual and literary) condemns the irrationalitythe futurist and Dadaist shock, the postmodern daily editing. Adorno pitilessly criticizes the policies of mediocre aestheticism on short term because their goal is to weaken the creative being, in other words the weakening of the aesthetic force "The paradoxical fact that what happens in the rational world has however a history, shocks ultimately not because the capitalist ratio reveals itself to be irrational due to historicity. Sensitivity perceives with horror irrationality of the rational."[35]

Some semioticians urge us to be cautious when we have in mind the analysis of the iconic figures and the verbal figures. It is understood that in order to describe an iconic figure, we need a series of concepts, namely isotopy and altopy, conceived degree and perceived degree, interaction between perceived and conceived carrier, shaper and revealing, sudden and decisive levels.[36]

However in creative semiosis act (here poetic semiosis) two types of figures, iconic and linguistic intersect. In the case of the linguistic metaphor what is shown in different fields are signs. Where we are dealing with concrete visual poetry, the poetry in whose field we find iconic elements (colours or plastic figures) and linguistic elements, the intersection may concern not only semantic features, but also formal features. Actually a relation between the verbal figures (linguistic) and the iconic ones will be established, a relation that will lead us to the *word suitcase* of the poetic communication, from where we will be able to notice the level of expression of the aesthetic language too. We could call the visual poetics, a postmodern poetic of atmosphere, when we state that we do not rule out the idea that in the classic-made poetics there isn't an area of the atmosphere. On the contrary, it stakes on the hidden playfulness of words, on the logic, on the grammar of tropes (stylistic figures in a text). The tropes *are some meanings, more or less different from the primitive meaning, which is offered, in the expression of thought by the words applied to some ideas*[37]. We can say now that the world, an atmosphere text pictures, I, for the transmitter and the receiver the projection of a desire, the

projection of the ego. The receiver is the poetic atmosphere and each time it reinterprets itself or speaking in Heideggerian terms, it recalls itself. In the atmosphere texts, the objects and the ideas represented by words or colours (where we deal with a visual poem) will be invested by the transmitter with functions similar to those spaces meet[38]. Hence, the approach, in its turn creative, between transmitter and receiver. In the poetics of the atmosphere there are texts to whom we recognize the aesthetic dimension, as they appear to us especially in the act of communication. In other words, we recognize not only the linguistic dimension, but also the extralinguistic one[39], just because together they bring out the characteristics of creative semiosis.

The postmodernism, by inverting the symbols and the values of modernity, through the globalization process of culture, through the entire denial of the strong traditions, a chaotic universe is established in the signs appearing under the policy *of the reign of quantity*[40]. However the civilization is stifled by the individual cultures that impose themselves in a barbarian manner. The postmodern man, who lives with all the post-isms possible, becomes restless, unable to recognize an aesthetic message, turns easily into a mechanism dominated by technology and builds exploits his ideologies and beliefs in relation to the discovery of the cyberspace.

Despite these strong assumptions underlying the defense of postmodernism and postmodernity, researchers, and here I mean the logicians, physicists, poets and aestheticians show their interest in updating the values, the tradition. For many of them the postmodernism has declined, consuming its historicity. Thus Basarab Nicolescu, Theodore Black, Horia Badescu, Cassian Maria Spiridon, Theodor Codreanu and others, talk about the limits of postmodern language and the possibility of the future, namely the interdisciplinary relationship between domains , the relationship of the levels of reality and the re-enchantment of the world, about transdisciplinary vision of the world. The idea of postmodernity end prompted the authors to seek ways to follow in philosophy, sociology, culture, to identify what the problems of the future will be and how the answers will be looked for. The fact is that sciences (general,

specific or applied) will seek to contribute to the analysis of the relationship between different languages and to present new works of art of the civilizations.

Endnotes

1. See Gianni Vattimo &nPier Aldo Rovatti, *Gândirea slabă*, Romanian translation: Ştefania Mincu, Pontica, Constanţa, 1998.
2. Ihab Hasan, *POSTmodernISM, The Literature of Silence*, în *The Postmodern Turn. Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture*, Ohio State University Press, 1987.
3. See Theodor Codreanu, *Transmodernismul*, Princeps Edit, Iaşi, 2011 or Junimea, Iaşi, 2005.
4. Irina Stănciugelu, *Prefixul „post" al modernităţii noastre*, Trei, Bucureşti, 2002, p. 16.
5. See *Postmodernism şi postmodernitate*, in Daniel Corbu, *Postmodernismul pe înţelesul tuturor*, Princeps Edit, Iaşi, 2004, pp. 29-32.
6. Jean-François Petit, *Penser aprés les postmodernes*, Éd. Buchet/Chastel, Paris, 2005, p. 17, apud Delia Pop, *Provocări ale postmodernităţii – pornind de la Mircea Cărtrescu*, Princeps Edit, Iaşi, 2010, pp.12-13.
7. Paul Cornea, *Interpretare şi raţionalitate*, Polirom, Iaşi, 2006, pp. 205-209.
8. Linda Hutcheon, *Poetica postmodernismului*, translated into Romanian by Dan Popescu, Univers, Bucureşti, 2002, p. 34.
9. Paul Cornea, *op.cit*, p. 206.
10. Gianni Vattimo, *Aventurile diferenţei*, translated into Romanian by Ştefania Mincu, Pontica, Constanţa, 1996.
11. Umberto Eco, *De la arbore spre labirint*, translated into Romanian by Ştefania Mincu, Polirom, Iaşi, 2009, pp. 60-64.
12. *Idem*. p.494.
13. Jan-François Lyotard, *Condiţia postmodernă*, translated into Romanian by Ciprian Mihai, Idea Desing & Print, Cluj, 2003.
14. Deleuze, *Différence et Répétition*, 1969; Deleuze, Guattari, *L`Anti-Œdipe*, 1972, apud Paul Cornea, *op. cit*. p.207.
15. Gabriel Troc, *Postmodernismul în antropologia culturală*, Polirom, Iaşi, 2006, p. 100.
16. *Idem, .* p. 103.
17. *Idem*, p.119.
18. Traian D. Stănciulescu, *Introducere în filosofia creaţiei umane*, Ed. Junimea, Iaşi, 2005, p. 117.
19. Maria Carpov, *Introducere la semiologia literaturii*, Ed. Univers, Bucureşti, 1978, p. 68.
20. *Idem*, p. 69.
21. Al. Husar, *Metapoetica*, Ed. Princeps Edit, Iaşi, 2005. p.339. În viziunea esteticianului Al. Husar *metapoetica* e altceva decât suma poeticilor. *Ea nu*

e Suma ci Summa poetica. Ea se bazează pe organizarea teoriilor date cu scopul alcătuirii unei concepţii de ansamblu. Principiile ei fundamentale conţin implicit, sub forma foarte generală, faptele particulare şi adevărurile cele mai specifice pe care e vorba de a le sistematiza. Ca o teorie a sistemului, ea contribuie la integrarea cunoştinţelor ştiinţifice.

22. Pierre Fontanier, *Figirile limbajului*, traducere rom. de Antonia Constantinescu, Ed. Univers, Bucureşti, 1977, p. 371.
23. Linda Hutcheon, *op.cit*. p.238.
24. Daniel Corbu, *Generaţia poetică ″80 şi rostirea postmodernă*, Ed. Princeps Edit, Iaşi, 2006, pp. 15-50.
25. George Bădărău, *Postmodernismul românesc*, Ed. Institutul European, Iaşi, 2007.
26. Marin Mincu, *Experimentalismul românesc*, Ed. Paralela 45, 2006, p. 346.
27. Iulian Boldea, *Vârstele criticii*, Ed. Paralela 45, Piteşti, 2005, p.230.
28. Umberto Eco, *Opera deschisă*, traducere rom. de Cornel Mihai Ionescu, Ed. Paralela 45, Piteşti, 2006, p. 81.
29. Johan Huizinga, *Homo ludens*, ed. cit., pp. 204-208.
30. Umberto Eco, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
31. vezi noţiunea de *experiment literar* la Ciprian Voloc, *Sumar excurs în culisele noţiunii de experiment literar*, în Revista Feed Back, Nr. 5-6, 2009, Iaşi, pp. 3-4.
32. Dana Altman, *Mediul Virtual – despre multiplicitatea artei*, Ed. Bastion, Timişoara, 2008, p. 109.
33. Ştefan Aug. Doinaş, *Poezie şi modă poetică*, Ed. Eminescu, Bucureşti, 1972, p. 173.
34. *Idem*, pp. 174-175.
35. Theodor Adorno, *Teoria estetică*, traducere rom. de Andrei Corbea, Gabriel H. Decuble, Cornelia Eşianu, Ed. Paralela 45, 2006, pp. 452-453.
36. Jean-Marie Klinkenberg, *Iniţiere în semiotica generală*, ed. cit., p. 377.
37. Pierre Fontanier, *op.cit.*, p. 27.
38. Mariana Neţ, *O poetică a atmosferei*, Ed. Univers, Bucureşti, 1989, p. 70.
39. Umberto Eco, *A spune cam acelaşi lucru*, traducere rom. de Laszlo Alexandru, Ed. Polirom, Iaşi, 2008, p. 267.
40. René Guénon, *Domnia cantităţii şi semnele vremurilor*, traducere rom. de Florin Mihaescu şi Dan Stanca, Ed. Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2008, pp. 234-248.