

ФИЛОСОФСКИ НАУКИ. ЕСТЕТИКА

THE ISSUE OF INDIRECT SENSE: ON THE RHETORICAL MODIFICATIONS IN FINE ARTS

Olena Viacheslavova

PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, Bioethics and History of Medicine,
Bogomolets National Medical University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Elena.via@ukr.net

ORCID 0000-0003-4868-9663

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.34017/1313-9703-2021-1\(17\)-2\(18\)-9-24](https://doi.org/10.34017/1313-9703-2021-1(17)-2(18)-9-24)

Резюме

Олена Вячеславова. Въпросът за косвения смисъл: реторическите модификации в изобразителното изкуство. Статията предлага да се адаптира опитът на реторичното разбиране на текста към естетическите проблеми на тропа в изобразителното изкуство. Разграничавайки реториката на фигурите и реториката на текста като цяло, авторът обосновава определението на реторичната (поетичната) функция в изобразителното изкуство като средство за самооткриване на художествения език на произведението, участващ в създаването на смисъл и като съвкупност от операции, водещи до семантични промени и интегриране на текстовата семантика. Разкрито е значението на металолизма като вид на реторична трансформация в изобразителното изкуство. Изложена е тезата, че категорията на визуалните металолизми включва операции, свързани с отклонения от визуалните перцептивни и логически кодове, присъстващи в произведението, което е спецификата на съвременните системи в изобразителното изкуство. Във връзка с анализа на металолизмите, авторът стига до извода, че отклонението от принципите на мимезиса, намаляването на оптичната илюзия и сюжетния принцип, характерни за изкуството в края на 19-20 век, са начини за реализиране на поетичната (реторичната) функция на езика във визуалните изкуства. Статията разкрива функционалната хетерогенност на различните видове интертекстуални отношения, предложени от реториката на текста. Подчертано е, че един от изворите, който поражда косвени чувства в изкуството, е комуникативната ситуация, която се дължи на наличието в произведението на центрове със семантична несигурност и води до активиране на автокомуникационните актове. Вземайки предвид разграничаването между езиковата и екстралингвистичната символика, предложеният модел може да се превърне в методологична основа за диференциация на историческите видове символика в изкуството, включително специфичните за изкуството на неклаasicите.

Ключови думи: реторика на текста, автореференция, фигура, металолизъм, интертекст, семантична неопределеност

Анотація

Олена Вячеславова. Питання непрямого сенсу: про риторичні модифікації в образотворчому мистецтві. У статті пропонується адаптувати досвід риторичного розуміння тексту до естетичних проблем тропосу в образотворчому мистецтві. Диференціюючи риторику фігур та риторику тексту в цілому, автор доводить визначення риторичної (поетичної) функції у образотворчому мистецтві як засобу самовиявлення художньої мови твору, що бере участь у створенні сенсу та як сукупності операцій, що ведуть до семантичних змін та інтеграції

семантики тексту. Виявлено значення металогізму як виду риторичної трансформації у образотворчому мистецтві. Висунуто тезу про те, що категорія візуальних металогізмів включає операції, пов'язані з відхиленнями від зорових перцептивних та логічних кодів, наявних у творі, що є специфікою образотворчих мистецьких систем сучасного мистецтва. Щодо аналізу металогізмів, автор приходиться до висновку про те, що відмова від принципів мімезису, зменшення оптичної ілюзії та сюжетного принципу, характерні для мистецтва кінця XIX-XX століть, є способами реалізації поетичної (риторичної) функції мови у образотворчому мистецтві. У статті розкрито функціональну неоднорідність різних типів інтертекстуальних відносин, запропонованих риторикою тексту. Було підкреслено, що одним із джерел, що породжує непрямі смисли в мистецтві, є комунікативна ситуація, яка обумовлена наявністю в творі центрів семантичної невизначеності та призводить до активації актів аутокомунікації. Беручи до уваги розрізнення лінгвістичної та екстралінгвістичної символіки, запропонована модель може стати методологічною основою для диференціації історичних типів символізму в мистецтві, включаючи специфічні для мистецтва "нон-класики".

Ключові слова: риторика тексту, автореференція, фігура, металогізм, інтертекст, семантична невизначеність

Abstract

Olena Viacheslavova. The Issue of Indirect Meaning: On the Rhetorical Modifications in Fine Arts. The article proposes to adapt the experience of rhetorical understanding of the text to the aesthetic issues of trope in the fine arts. Differentiating the rhetoric of figures and the rhetoric of the text as a whole, author proves the determination of the rhetorical (poetic) function in the fine arts as a means of self-detection of work's artistic language involved in creation of meaning and as a set of operations leading to the semantic changes and to the integration of text semantics. Significance of metalogism as a type of rhetorical transformation in the fine arts has been revealed. A thesis that the category of visual metalogisms includes operations associated with the deviations from visual perceptual and logical codes present in a work, which is the specificity of the fine art systems of the modern art, has been put forward. Regarding the analysis of metalogisms, author concludes that the refusal from the principles of mimesis, the reduction of the optical illusion and the beginning of scene, which were typical for the art of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, are the ways to realize poetic (rhetorical) function of language in the fine arts. The article reveals the functional heterogeneity of the various types of intertextual relations, suggested by the rhetoric of text. It has been accented that one of the sources, that generate indirect meanings in art, is a communicative situation, given by the presence of the centers of semantic uncertainty in a work and leading to activation of autocommunication acts. Taking into account the distinguishing between linguistic and extralinguistic symbolism, the proposed model can become a methodological basis for the differentiation of historical types of symbolism in art, including non-classic specific for art.

Keywords: rhetoric of text, autoreference, figure, metalogism, intertext, semantic uncertainty

Introduction. The current situation, marked by exhaustion of the normative model of aesthetic cognition and the restructuring of subject field of aesthetic research, encourages professionals to find theoretical foundations that would provide an opportunity to eliminate the gap between artistic classics and non-classics. It can be assumed that the harmonization of the non-classical and classical discourse about an art would have allowed the aesthetics get closer to the scientific standards accepted in modern knowledge. What could be the approaches to this integration? Productivity of rhetorical model ("the rhetoric of literary text") was marked in the modern Russian aesthetics as a justification of the art's philosophy (Volkova, 2009, web resource). In our

view, this approach is worth considering, but requires a methodological reflection, because the approach proposed by the author of the specified work does not meet the semiotic and structural-functional concept of the rhetorical and is not relevant with respect to the fine arts, engaged with a number of other arts as an empirical research base. The need for specification of the concept of "the rhetoric of text" in the non-verbal forms of art requires an appeal to the issue of representation and the symbolic nature of art.

Ernst Gombrich pointed the presence of two aesthetic traditions within the meaning of the symbol – Aristotelian rationalistic and neo-Platonic mystic that represent two fundamental reactions of a thinking person on the problems posed by the existence of language (1972, p.190). Differentiation of the extralinguistic and linguistic symbolism has already taken place in the Christian scholasticism (Meyzerski, 1991, p.14), but in the classical art both traditions have always accompanied each other. Their heterogeneity has sharply declared itself in the second half of the twentieth century, when the art of post-modernism has refused from a symbol and an image in favor of the simulacrum, keeping and increasing their rhetorical intentions. Thus, the explication of the discourse about the fine trope from an array of general problem of symbolism suggests a reference to the issues of artistic language by which the symbolism is carried out.

The duality of rhetorical phenomenon, combining aspects of creativity and pragmatism of impact to a recipient, has identified specificity of interest on trope in aesthetic thought and art studies of the twentieth century. On the one hand, the fundamental problem of visual symbolism and its historical forms studied by Panofsky, Gombrich (1960; 1982), Goodman (1968; 2001) and other outstanding scientists "dissolved" inside itself also the rhetorical component while retaining a certain place for a traditional, since romanticism times, critic assessment of the rhetoric as a sphere of decoration, ornamentation (Goodman, 2001) as well as an art of "ready" forms and meanings. The latter position culminated in the structural discourse with its criticism of rhetoric as an "ideology" (Eco, 1998), giving the term "rhetorical" predominantly negative connotations in the art. At the same time the actualization of the problem of representation has aroused serious theoretical interest to the metaphor, giving rise during 1930-1980s of impressive number of philosophical concepts of Ivor A. Richards, Philip Wheelwright, Max Black, Donald Davidson, Monroe Beardsley, John W. Miller, Derek Bickerton, Nelson Goodman, George P. Lakoff, Mark L. Johnson, Earl McCormack, Ted Cohen, John Searle, Samuel R. Levin and other thinkers (The theory of metaphor,1990) that stimulated interest in the fine metaphor and the formation of indirect senses in the fine arts. The fine metaphor has been studied by Carl R. Hausman (1989), James A.W. Heffernan (1985), the rhetoric of fine art in comparison with the literature has been analyzed by Wendi Steiner (1982), the heterogeneity of the art and rhetoric – still the rhetoric of art – stated Arthur K. Danto (1981), pointing to the metaphor, expression and style as the main means of expression in art. Nuyen (1989) gives an interpretation of his ideas, Laurence M. Porter (1983) interprets the space as a metaphor in painting. Rhetorical categories in classical art have been the subject of attention of Caroline van Eck (2002) and Jennifer Montagu (1994). Don Bialostosky (2004) traces the ratio of Aristotle's "Rhetoric" and Bakhtin's theory of discourse, Deborah J. Haynes (2002) wrote about the possibility of adapting the conceptual apparatus of the dialogical concept of Bakhtin on the problems of fine arts, Anthony J. Cascardi (2004) studied the ratio of aesthetics and rhetoric. Rhetorical category was demanded also in the studies of cinematography (Bordwell, 1991; Chatman, 1990).

No less important is the range of issues that relate to the problems of semantic change, but are not marked by the authors as related to the phenomenon of rhetorical in the art. Among them especially should be noted Goodman's doctrine on the languages of art (1968; 2001), in particular, provisions on expression and exemplification as the types of reference in art and studies that interpret his concepts (Ross, 1981); the works dedicated to the abstraction and deformation in art (Harrison, 1987; Deregowski, 1984), the ratio of representation and expression (Donell-Kotroso,

1980), as well as numerous works dedicated to the artistic formalism and expressiveness (Osborne, 1982; Desmond, 2011; Sowers, 1990; Dziemidok, 1993), including realistic art (Hemingway, 2015). The theming of uncertainty in the art and the role of artistic form in its production (Eco, 2004; Stecker, 2003) should be attributed to the same number of issues.

In post-Soviet philosophical thought Meyzerskyi (1991) has identified methodological possibilities of rhetorical patterns. In modern Ukrainian aesthetics the interest in the phenomenon of rhetorical in the art takes many forms. Thus, Bondarevska (2005) analyzed the relation of aesthetics and rhetoric, as well as the rhetoric of icon as a factor of identifying the specificity of aesthetic in the Ukrainian culture of XVII-XVIII centuries. Fedoruk (2008) considers the poetics of metaphor as determinant in Ukrainian fine art of the last decades. Indicative is the tendency to analyze phenomena that have a rhetorical nature apart from the rhetorical model, which is typical for the works of Karanda (2006), Tarasenko (2007), who studied myth-poetical imagery and visual reasoning as the basis of polysemy. The ratio of aesthetic norm and its violation, the dialectic of form and content as the source of a multiplicity of interpretations are considered by Mizina (2006), Kholodynska (2008) within the hermeneutic approach. Nevertheless these opposite views are responsible for the procedures of semantic changes in the art, leading to the creation of tropes and figures, which highlights the issue of the complementarity of rhetoric and hermeneutics as the theory of creation and understanding of the text, as indicated by Gans-Georg Gadamer (1991).

In the Russian aesthetics and art studies the productivity of rhetorical approach was focused by Borev, while Daniel (2002), Loktev (2004) paid attention to the issue of pictorial metaphor. It should be noted that the non-adaptation of concepts of literary studies to the issue of ratio of an image and a word in the fine arts is a serious obstacle for the further adequate work in this direction, as evidenced by Zlydneva's monograph (2008), based on a comparative analysis of the rhetoric of verbal and non-verbal arts. Perhaps that is why there is a tendency in the Russian scientists' works to consider phenomena of rhetorical nature apart from a rhetorical approach. Thus, the hermeneutical position prevails in the study of lampolski (1993), containing a number of valuable observations about the mechanisms of intertext in the cinema and in the fine arts (in the art of Leger, Dali) that allows us to conclude that any study of this phenomenon is also a study of certain aspects of the rhetoric of text. Thanks to the concepts of Kristeva, Barthes an intertext becomes the subject of discussion for a number of years, but its connection with the rhetoric model remains beyond the attention of Mankovska, Bychkov, Dianova and other scientists who are studying the aesthetics and the art of post-modernism. In general, the field of intertext reflection is dominated by stable literature-centrism that is rarely interrupted by the works of art critics. The study of lampolski (2010) about the semantic uncertainty in the art is worth attention among the notable works of the last decade.

Thus, even a very cursory list allows to say that the indicated problem was not bypassed by the researchers' attention. However, the given review indicates that diverse manifestations of trope in the fine arts were not considered from the positions of the rhetoric of text, and therefore, the systemic approach to this phenomenon is still waiting for its wording.

In light of the foregoing, our **task** assumes, first of all, an attempt to integrate, within the model of the rhetoric of text, the above mentioned aspects of understanding of rhetorical that expresses aesthetic specifics of the trope in the fine arts; secondly, to clarify the concept of "rhetorical" in the fine arts, aimed at its adaptation as an analytical tool in aesthetics and art studies.

Presenting main material. The role of interdisciplinary research activities of Roman Jakobson was significant for the recovery of interest in rhetoric in the first half of the twentieth century. Having developed a model of the communicative act, Jakobson (1975) emphasized the poetic function of language, which by providing the autoreference is a major in the art. Researcher has identified the structural apparatus and the mechanism of realization of the poetic function of

language, linking the rhetorical operations of forming the tropes and figures with paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes of language. Jakobson's ideas were used by theorists of neo-rhetoric (Jacques Dubois, Francis Edeline, Francis Pire, Jean-Marie Klinkenberg, Philippe Minguet, Hadelin Trion), who identified the poetic and rhetorical functions of language for the purpose of structural analysis of the rhetoric of figures (Dubois et al., 1986). Their position made the structuralist version of the semantic philosophy of art (Basin, 2012, p.151), considering the rhetoric as an instrument of poetics. According to this approach, the artistic and rhetorical statements have structural commonality whereupon the rhetorical model is relevant for the analysis of literary texts, including the fine arts (Dubois et al., 1986, p.57).

Addressing the rhetorical model of aesthetics, it is necessary to consider the possibility of different approaches to the understanding of a text. The focus of the interdisciplinary textual discourse of the second half of the twentieth century was to identify the mechanisms of creation of sense in the iconic formations, which was accompanied by recognition of the insufficiency of denotation as the main model of meaning and has actualized the traditional rhetorical issues of generating the indirect senses. The essential thing was that the rhetorical (poetic) function of language is practically implemented in the text and serves as a criterion for its definition. In addition to the above-mentioned concepts, the ideas of Propp, Bakhtin, Levi-Strauss were involved in the formation of rhetorical and semiotic theories of the text, a significant contribution to their development was made by Greimas, Riffaterre, Kristeva, Barthes, Van Dijk, Todorov, Genette, Lotman. Meyzerskyi noted the dominance of interpretive model (1991, p.109) as a certain specificity of the rhetoric of text, which sets it apart from the textual theories that eliminate position of "author" and are aimed at the presentation of the text as a process of non-final sense-genesis. Thanks to this the rhetoric of text is methodologically relevant for both the aesthetics and philosophy of art, as well as for the art studies with its focus on the work as an object of cognition. According to Lotman, a text for the researcher is an analytical instrument, "a kind of useful abstraction of artistic unity" (1998, p.271).

The Lotman's theory of text is of interest for us, given the orientation of his concept not only to the poetry, but also to the "broader issues of constructing a work of art" (1998, p.104). The original thesis that poetry is based "under the laws of not a linguistic, but a figurative mark" (Lotman, 1998, p.153) served as the rationale for his broad aesthetic generalizations. On this basis, Lotman's analysis of the structure of a literary text can be regarded as a theory of iconic mark, which allows doing some explications of a general nature, useful for understanding the rhetoric of text in the fine arts.

Lotman, like Riffaterre, considered that a necessary condition for the rhetoric of text is the possibility to present a work as a holistic unit (mark) that performs the signifying functions (Meyzerskyi, 1991, p.110). In the fine arts such a text / sign has the iconic continuum nature, assuming the primacy of a text as the carrier of sense in relation to the language of its expression. Dialectical characteristics of a literary text (expression, structure, the presence of boundaries and immersion in the extra-textual structure) indicate that the two aspects of the rhetorical ("the rhetoric of figures" and the rhetoric of the text as a whole (Lotman, 1992, p.168)) exist in a work in the form of a holistic hierarchical structure, inevitably giving rise to the question of how to relate the elements of such a rhetorical formation.

Considering this position, we believe that the immanence of a text in the fine arts and its interaction with the extra-textual structures imply the relations between two levels. At the first of them the rhetoric of figures relates to the intra-textual organization, the foundation of which are the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic axes of the artistic language. The rhetoric of the text as a whole includes the rhetoric of figures as the basic subsystem, considering that the work may include unmodified syntagmas. In turn, the rhetoric of the text as a whole is focused on its relation to extra-textual structures of two types – the structures of a sender and a addressee of the artistic message.

The rhetoric of figures was thoroughly developed by scientists of Liège school (Dubois 1986), the relevance of their approach in the fine arts was previously explicated in our special studies by the example of the analysis of referential metaphors and rhythmic rhetorical modifications. The immanent structure of any artistic text is based on two types of relations: the principle of rhythm, repetition makes the non-equivalent equivalent; the principle of metaphor connects the unconnected (Lotman, 1998, p.88). The rhythmic repetition is connected with syntagmatics of text, in classical rhetoric the different ways of organizing repetitions belonged to the sphere of figures of speech. The metaphor as a semantic trope-figure expresses the paradigmatic relations, performing the function of creating the text. Meanwhile, when it comes to the fine arts, conceptual asymmetry becomes apparent: if the concept of pictorial metaphor interpreted in the light of interactionism theory is generally accepted, the concept of *metabola* (figure) for the syntagmatics of work in the aesthetic and artistic discourse is almost never used, though the syntagmatic aspect in context of the semiotics of icon has been accented by Boris Uspenskiy. A certain difficulty here makes “the blurring” of the status of a figure in the traditional rhetorical theory.

Should be noted the key points in the rationale of relevance of the “figure” concept in the fine arts including the isomorphism of visual phenomena and verbal rhetoric modifications. Liège approach combined aspiration to keep valuable, inherited from the tradition, with the removal of “substantialist prejudices” inherent in classical rhetoric. As a result, the nomenclatures and taxonomy were recognized untenable and the *metabolas* were determined as the procedures, operations, hence not the “substances”, but the relations (Dubois et al., 1986, pp.232-233). It is quite obvious that the types of rhetorical operations in the fine arts can not be uniquely consistent with the models of *metabola*’s formation proposed by the theorists of neo-rhetoric: it is impossible in the art to highlight figures that correlate *metaplasms*; distinguishing between the figures of form and the figures of content is irrelevant (only in a particular work we can determine what belongs to the plan of expression, and what to the plan of content); distinguishing between the semantic and the syntax figures is untenable. The starting chain of conceptualization is the provision on the *asyntactic*, the nonlinearity of iconic syntagm, which goes back to the theory of A. J. Greimas (Meyzerskiy, 1991, pp.77, 81). The hierarchical order of pictorial syntagm implies substantializing of all levels, both belonging to the plan of expression and the plan of content. The possibility of such understanding of the figure, which “does not necessarily fit into the boundaries of traditional linguistic concepts” (Dubois et al., 1986, p.66), was recognized by the theorists of neo-rhetoric. This makes it possible to interpret the *metabolas* of the syntagmatic level in the fine arts as a system of mutually agreed relations with the immanent nature, hence, primarily the compositional relations, with a plurality of all the modes of expression, forming a holistic product.

Indeed, despite the above-mentioned differences, expressive, stylistic, rhythmic operations in the fine arts in general meet the key definitions of figure, worked out by the classical rhetoric (Todorov, 1998) and by the neo-rhetoric theory, for example, position of P. Fontanier who differentiated a trope as the method of generating an indirect sense and a figure of speech as the communication relation between two or more words simultaneously present in the saying (Todorov, 1998, p.98); or Fontanier’s functional definition, according to which the rhetorical modifications “attract attention and create... the effect” (Todorov, 1998, p.122), hence, are the markers forcing the viewer to “see the language” (Dubois et al., 1986, p.158); finally, pictorial *metabolas* correspond with the sustainable (since Quintilian’s times) structural understanding of the figure as a form that is attached to the thought (Greek schema, *schemata* – “turn”, “posture” of speech; Latin – *forma*, *figura*), as a “deviation from the usual... expression”, i.e. from the common norm (Todorov, 1998, pp.61, 71).

Studying classical rhetorical treatises of C.C. Du Marsais (“Des tropes”, 1818), N. Beauzee (“Grammaire generale”, 1767) and P. Fontanier (“Figures du discours”, 1818), T. Todorov came to

quite modern interactionist conclusions: the concept of figure is irrelevant to the linguistic level, but it makes sense at the level of discourse perception (Todorov, 1998, pp.116-117). Based on Fontanier's understanding of figure as a non-clichéd formation that always belongs to an author and is unauthorized in use (Dubois et al., 1986, p.380), any ratio of formal elements and pictorial motifs can be considered as a figure in the fine arts – this is potential possibility fully dependent on whether a viewer notices and realizes the effect of impact that is not contained in the figure itself, but arises in response to a particular stimulus (Dubois et al., 1986, p.71).

What exactly is able to act as such a stimulus shows an overview of rhetorical operations presented on the pages of "General Rhetoric" (Dubois et al., 1986, pp.121-159), T. Todorov's "Poetics", in the works of V. Shklovsky, R. Jakobson (1975), Yu. Lotman (1998). At the same time they are present in the traditional and contemporary terminology used in aesthetics, literary studies, stylistics, that does not negate their rhetorical origin. They are: repetition, symmetry (asymmetry), pleonasm, ellipse (break, pause, silence), inversion, gradation, framing ("frame in the frame", plot in the plot), parallelism, equivalence, analogy, contrast, antithesis, growth, the slowdown, alternation, highlighting the main, accentuation, rhythmization. They all are related with capabilities of mutual transformations and are generalized by R. Jakobson, who defined the art as "continuous parallelism" (1975, p.226), where the decisive role belongs to the rhythmic forms. A key role of rhythm in organizing the stimulating effect of metabola is confirmed by a conclusion in frames of the prosody made by A. Kolmogorov: "...the rhythm acts as a norm and as a violation" (Rhythm, 1974, p.81). In other words, the rhythm has a structure of rhetorical operation.

It is quite obvious that all of these procedures are presented in various forms in the fine arts, traditionally being called the formal (imaginative, artistic) means. However, while the term "means" familiar for us indicates the auxiliary, service nature of these operations, an approach from the perspective of the rhetoric of text allows to emphasize the synthetic variety of their artistic functions, including formative, figurative, expressive, function of affective impact on the audience, marking, autoreference, intensification, as well as semantic, because only "a repetition reveals the structure", only "rhythmic figures" (Lotman's concept) divide and connect the visual and expressive elements of the text, establishing relations in the pictorial syntagm and allowing to highlight semantic units of the text in order to achieve the articulation (Lotman, 1998, p.135). It should be noted that the operations of such a type are universal in nature and act as formative principles in all the arts – architecture and music, choreography and the fine arts, poetry and cinema.

Liège School's theory is valuable also by the fact that reveals the importance of metalogism for the fine arts at the level of rhetoric of the text as a whole. Metalogism as the type of metabola occurs when the author addresses "to objective reality "as such" in order to depart openly from it later and get a desired effect" (Dubois et al., 1986, p.225). Metalogism assumes a situation of correlating the text with reality and goes beyond the frames of "normal" relationship between the mark and the denoted thing, "when the norms... of the specular reflection of truth are affected" (Dubois et al., 1986, p.241). Metalogism's function is "to strain the reference situation or context" or to change the logical significance of a message (Dubois et al., 1986, pp.242, 67).

Pointing out the connection of metalogism with classical rhetorical figures of thought, the theorists of neo-rhetoric have focused that these are poorly studied and the need to "engage seriously in the analysis of metalogism" (Dubois et al., 1986, p.230). Pointing out that irony, hyperbole, paradox, allegory, parable belong to the category of metalogism, the authors of "General Rhetoric" noted the difficulty of identifying the metalogism that act in the text together with "the rhetoric of figures". In order to differentiate them it should be taken into account that metalogism changes the significance of the entire syntagmatic sequence, while the semantic "action of tropes applies only to the specific elements of a sequence" (Dubois et al., 1986, pp.251, 176).

Based on the foregoing, it is clear that the group of metalogisms in the fine arts includes not only the named types of figures. More significant is the fact that the metalogical operations associated with deviations (deformations) from visual perceptual and logical codes, which is the specificity of the fine art of modern type systems since the late nineteenth century. The characteristic of the latter is associated in aesthetics and art studies with a departure from the principle of mimesis, with the movement “from image to mark”. Referring to G. Deleuze metalogism can be regarded as a manifestation of “orgiastic representation”, “making a difference” and organizing the expressiveness: “...orgiastic representation turns the things into expression” (Deleuze, 1998, p.64).

The deformation principle in the art attracted the attention of researchers (Deregowski, 1984). The rhetorical nature of this phenomenon would be obvious, if we turn to the question of the semantic structure of a literary text. According to Lotman, it is a feature of its dual existence: its belonging to the system of poetic language does not cancel its general linguistic meanings. The correlation in the perception of both semantic systems and the tension between them creates an aesthetic effect (Lotman, 1998, p.186). Considering that perceptual visual code performs the function of natural language in the fine arts, we should note that this ratio is exactly the specifics of art of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The structure of pictorial metalogism is formed with overlaying of rhythmic dynamic codes on the visual perception code – double coding serves as a source of “expressive aureole”, notional “blurriness” inherent for the works of such a type. At the level of the rhetoric of figures the acceptance of the admissibility of deviations from perceptual visual code led also to the changes in the way of forming the tropes – to exposing the connector nature of metaphor, to mounting metaphor, metaphor-metamorphosis (G. de Chirico, “The Great Metaphysician”, 1924, National Gallery, Berlin).

In our view, the transformations, that have marked the pictorial art of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, were a way of implementing in the art of the poetic function of language, which consisted of activating of forming the tropes, metalogisms, and enhancing of various forms of rhythmic development of the space and flatness relations (based on the color, tone, line, stains, texture), though the latter are rhetorical modifications (stylistic, rhythmic, expressive metabolas) that perform not only imaging function, but also a function of autoreference. Considering the problem of referential metaphor, we have noted a consistent pattern: an optical illusion “extinguishes” trope, the beginning of a plot “dissolves” it, making it imperceptible. Refusing to use optical illusions and plot, the artists of landmark time “create a language where the reality does not serve as a “bail”, the basis of which are rhetorical figures (including metalogisms) – “the only means that can take away the language from its utilitarian role, and this is the first condition of its transformation into the poetic language” (Dubois et al., 1986, p.60). In some fields of semantic philosophy, for example, in the works of S. Langer or “common semanticists” (Basin, 2012; Harrison, 1987), these transformations were characterized as the acts of artistic abstraction. In our opinion, the rhetorical model allows to differentiate the components of such a formative process, identifying the specific forms of its realization in a work of art.

Unlike metalogism, the phenomenon of intertext as a way of realizing an extra-textual links is sufficiently studied within the rhetoric of text, where M. Riffaterre’s works are significant, as well as outside of the rhetoric model of literary criticism. In the seventeenth century, E. Tesauro first wrote about a quotation as on the rhetorical operation leading to a semantic change. J. Kristeva introduced the term “intertext” into the aesthetics as a result of the transfer on a soil of post-structuralism of a problem of “strange voices”, theoretical comprehension of which has been given by M. Bakhtin. Leaving aside the known mechanisms of intertextuality, we should note the possible (for this sphere) typological differences that are significant for the fine arts. As our antecedent study has shown, intertextuality is realizing also within the rhetoric of figures, in particular, pictorial metaphor has the intertextual nature, therefore it is necessary to distinguish between the functions of extra-textual

links at the language level and at the level of text: only the links of the second type integrate the semantics of text. A particular work can include simultaneously heterogeneous types of intertext, acting as a source of metaphor, as well as serving as referential mediator, not leading the formation of a trope, but creating a specific "expressive aureole" (F. Krychevsky's "Family", the "Life" triptych, 1925-1927, National Art Museum of Ukraine, Kyiv). Actually the issue of differentiating the rhetorical operations of different levels is a challenge, as shows the analysis of "heraldic construction", made by M. Lampolski (1993, pp.71-72), in which the author wrongfully mixes "the text in text" that provides a transformation of sense with the mechanism of doubling, rhythmic figures of a repetition ("frame in frame" type), the main purpose of which is the effect of semantic resonances that leads to the transcending of sense, to the destruction of clarity of semantic modality and "overcoming the clarity of content due to the complexity of form" (Lampolski, 1993, pp.82, 90, 196-197).

This brings us to the need to address the issue of extra-textual relations of the second type, which are specified by the possibility of a mismatch of the codes of a sender and an addressee of artistic message. It was obvious for C.S. Peirce that no message from one person to another can be absolutely clear. The development of this idea was the thesis of R. Jakobson on the impact of rhetorical function on all the participants of a communicative act: "A double sense corresponds to the splitting of sender and addressee" (1975, p.221). Basing on the conducted differentiation of "the grammar of speaker" and "the grammar of listener", Lotman developed the concept of "creolization" of sender's language in the act of artistic communication at the intersection with the languages available for an addressee, in case the latter partially or fully has to construct a decryption code (Lotman, 1998, p.37). The perspectives of language creolization are also responsible for the production of indirect and occasional senses, because the presence of the random, spontaneous in a literary text, taking into account the presumption of its meaningfulness, stimulates the viewer to organize additional secondary semantic order, to endow them with significance. These ideas get an extreme degree of expression in the aesthetics of post-structuralism that endows a "reader" with significance of the main instance producing the senses.

The perspective of language creolization in the projection on a work requires the presence of the centers of semantic uncertainty in the artistic text as a condition of generating or changing senses.

Semantic potential of uncertainty in the art is great, it includes the uncertainty associated with the "meaningless" or "abstruse", as indicated by M. Lampolski (2010; 1993, pp.337-338). Experience in the analysis of modernism art has shown that even the radical destruction of cultural symbols does not lead to the abolition of symbolism as such, but to the secondary semantization in which the "devastated" form gets occasional senses (Lampolski, 1993, pp.324-325; Lampolski, 2010, p.503).

All kinds of rhetorical operations to different extent act as the sources of the semantic uncertainty of work. The rhythmic, stylistic and expressive modifications have this property to the greatest extent. These modifications existing as the figures, according to the classical rhetorical theory, entirely is determined by whether or not they will be noticed and perceived by the viewer: modifications of this type acquire significance during the acts of perception. Belonging to the "rhetoric of figures" (the immanent level of text), they simultaneously discover own dialectical nature orientated on the system of extra-textual relations (the possible addressee's codes). In other words, like in the case of the pictorial tropes, we are dealing here with the split reference. The modifications of such a type and corresponding principles of generating the indirect senses, where the main role belongs to the acts of autocommunication, receive the key value in the art of the twentieth century expressing the logic of a transition from representational to expressive model of art. Indirect senses are created not through transmit of "ready" ideas, but through "differentiating shimmering of the material itself", expressive manipulation with it, "inscribing differences in it" (Lampolski, 2010, p.124).

Conclusion. Summing up we should note the following as the **conclusions**:

1. The rhetoric of text in the fine arts is a hierarchical structure, the type of artistic unity and cooperation of immanent and extra-textual links of a text that provide semantic changes.

2. The rhetoric of the text as a whole includes the rhetoric of figures as a “language” subsystem that organizes the immanent relations of a literary text. Along with the semantic trope-figures the metabolas of syntagmatic level, which are rhythmic formations, belong to the rhetoric of figures. All compositionally important repetitions and their variations in the work of art, that have a structure of norm and deviation from it, belong to the rhetorical modification of such a type. Irrelevant to the linguistic level they acquire sense at the level of perception of the text and perform a number of functions in a work, namely: formative, figurative, expressive, function of influencing the viewer, marking, autoreference, artistic intensification and are involved in realizing the semantic function. Formal operations, which are the referred rhetorical modifications, acquired the fundamental importance in forming all the arts, including the fine arts.

The dialectical nature of the metabola belonging to the immanent level of the rhetoric of figure is expressed in focusing and extra-textual links: the nature of pictorial metaphor is intertextual; the rhythmic, expressive, stylistic figures are focused on the possible codes of an addressee. As a result, a split reference forms the basis of the mechanism of semantic changes, realized in a work and representing the phenomenon of pictorial trope.

3. The rhetoric of the text as a whole assumes types of operations, such as metalogisms and formation of functionally heterogeneous intertextual links. The metalogism category in the fine arts, taking into account the nature of artistic systems of modern type, includes transformations associated with deviations from visual perceptual and logical codes that are present in a work. The mentioned allows us to conclude that the reduction of optical illusions and plot, the retreat from the principles of mimesis, that were typical for the art of late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, are the ways of autoreference, the form of realizing the rhetoric (poetic) function of language in the fine arts.

4. One of the sources generating indirect senses in art is a communicative situation with a potential mismatch between the codes of a sender and addressee of message, caused by the presence of the centers of semantic uncertainty in the text and leading to increased autocommunication acts. All the rhetorical operations in varying degrees are the source of the semantic uncertainty in a work.

5. The foregoing allows us to characterize the rhetorical function (“rhetorical”) in art, at first, as a set of operations leading to semantic change; secondly, as a way of autoreference, self-detection of work’s artistic language involved in generating the sense and being a key element of the construction of a content of plan.

The advantage of the considered rhetorical model is orientation on a specific work (object, artistic act), that in general corresponds to the main trend of modern philosophy of art that is focused during last decades on issues arising from specific artistic forms (Newall, 2014). Michael Newall indicates that the two most common aspects of the philosophical issues associated with painting, namely, the problem of representation and forms overlap. In our opinion, the approach from the perspective of the rhetoric of text exactly determines the nature and results of their interaction, enabling system analysis of hierarchical structure of a work, serving to disclose completeness of its semantic intentions. At the same time the semantic structure undoubtedly includes the levels of work, traditionally referred to as “formal”, that reveals the falsity of antinomy of representation and expression. Taking into account the distinction between linguistic and extralinguistic symbolism, the proposed model provides convincing methodological basis for differentiating the historical types of symbolism in art, including the specific for the second half of XX – XXI centuries, that are positioned as the non-classic.

Bibliography and Works Cited

- Басин, Е. Я. (2012), *Семантическая философия искусства*, Гуманитарий, Москва, 348 с.
- Bialostosky, Don (2004), "Aristotle's Rhetoric and Bakhtin's Discourse Theory", *A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism* (eds W. Jost and W. Olmsted), Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, pp. 393-408.
- Бондаревська, І. А. (2005), "Контури естетичного в риторичному модусі культури", *Парадоксальність естетичного в українській культурі XVII-XVIII століть*, ПАРА-ПАН, Київ, с.108-158.
- Bordwell, David (1991), *Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 334p.
- Cascardi, Anthony J. (2004), "Arts of Persuasion and Judgment: Rhetoric and Aesthetics", *A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism* (eds W. Jost and W. Olmsted), Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, pp.294-308.
- Chatman, Seymour (1990), *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*, Cornell University Press, London, 256 p.
- Даниэль, С. М. (2002), *Сети для Протея: Проблема интерпретации формы в изобразительном искусстве*, "Искусство – СПб", Санкт-Петербург, 304 с.
- Danto, Arthur K. (1981), *Transfiguration of the Commonplace*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 212 p.
- Делёз, Жиль (1998), *Различие и повторение*, [пер. с фр., ред. Н.Б.Маньковская], ТОО ТК "Петрополис", Санкт-Петербург, 384 с.
- Deregowski, Jan B. (1984), *Distortion in Art: The Eye and the Mind*, Routledge and Kegan Paul London, 143 p.
- Desmond, Kathleen K. (2011), "Expression and Aesthetic Experience", *Ideas about Art*, Willey-Blackwell, Oxford, pp.67-77
- Donell-Kotroso, Carol (1980), "Representation and Expression: A False Antinomy", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 39, no.2, pp.163-173.
- Дюбуа, Ж., Пир, Ф. и др. (1986), *Общая риторика* [пер.с фр.; ред. А.К.Авеличева], Прогресс, Москва, 392 с.
- Dziemidok, Bohdan (1993), "Artistic Formalism: Its Achievements and Weaknesses". *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 51, no.2, pp.185-193.
- van Eck, Caroline (2002), "Rhetorical Categories in the Academy", *A Companion to Art Theory* (eds P. Smith and C. Wilde), Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, pp.104-115.
- Эко, Умберто (1998), *Отсутствующая структура. Введение в семиологию* [пер. с итал. А. Г. Погоняйло, В. Г. Резник], "Петрополис", С.-Петербург, 432 с.
- Эко, Умберто (2004), *Открытое произведение. Форма и неопределенность в современной поэтике* [пер. с итал. А. Шурбелева], Академический проект, Санкт-Петербург, 384 с.
- Федорук, О. (2008), "Величнейший знак метафоры", *Перетин знаку: Вибрані мистецтвознавчі статті*, У 3-х книгах. Книга 3. Інтертехнологія, Київ, с. 25-53.
- Гадамер, Ганс-Георг (1991), "Риторика и герменевтика", *Актуальность прекрасного* [пер. с нем.], Искусство, Москва, с.188-206,
- Gombrich, Ernst H. (1960), *Art and Illusion. A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, Phaidon Press, London, 388 p.
- Gombrich, Ernst H. (1972), *Symbolic Images. Studies in the Art of the Renaissance*, Phaidon, London, 247 p.
- Gombrich, Ernst H. (1982), *The Image and the Eye: Further Studies in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, Cornell Phaidon Books, Ithaka, 320 p.

- Goodman, Nelson (1968), *Languages of Arts. An Approach to the Theory of Symbols*, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, NY; Indianapolis, 277 p.
- Гудмен, Нелсон (2001), *Способы создания миров*; пер. с англ. М. В. Лебедева, "Идея-Пресс", "Праксис", Москва, 326 с.
- Harrison, Andrew (1987), *Philosophy and the Visual Art: Seeing and Abstracting*, D.Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, 360 p.
- Hausman, Carl R. (1989), *Metaphor and Art: Interactionism and Reference in the Verbal and Nonverbal Arts*, Cambridge University Press, New-York, 238 p.
- Haynes, Deborah J. (2002). "Bakhtin and the Visual Arts", *A Companion to Art Theory* (eds P. Smith and C. Wilde), Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, pp.292-302.
- Heffernan, James A. W. (1985), "Resemblance, Signification and Metaphor in Visual Art", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 44, no.2, pp.167-169;171-180.
- Hemingway, Andrew (2015), "Realism under Duress", *A Companion to American Art* (eds J. Davis, J. A. Greenhill and J.D. La Fountain), John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Chichester, pp.617-636.
- Холодинська, С. (2008), "Інтерпретація як фактор формування нового мистецького феномену", *МІСТ: Мистецтво, історія, сучасність, теорія: Збірник наукових праць з мистецтвознавства та культурології*, ред. В. Д. Сидоренко, О. О. Авраменко, О. Я. Боднар, випуск 4-5. Музична Україна, Київ, с. 352-360.
- Ямпольский, М. (2010), "Сквозь тусклое стекло": 20 глав о неопределенности, *Новое литературное обозрение*, Москва, 688 с.
- Ямпольский, М. (1993), *Память Тиресия: Интертекстуальность и кинематограф*, РИК "Культура", Москва, 464 с.
- Якобсон, Р. (1975), "Лингвистика и поэтика". *Структурализм: "за" и "против". Сб. статей* [пер.с англ. И. А. Мельчука], Прогресс, Москва, с. 193-230.
- Каранда, М. В. (2006), *Неорелігійні мотиви в естетиці та мистецтві зламу XIX-XX століть*, автореферат дисертації на здобуття вченого ступеню кандидата філософських наук за спеціальністю: 09.00.08 – естетика. Національний ун-т імені Т.Г.Шевченка, Київ, 16 с.
- Лотман, Ю.М. (1998), "Структура художественного текста", *Об искусстве*, "Искусство-СПб", Санкт-Петербург, с.14-285.
- Лотман, Ю. М. (1992), "Риторика", *Избранные статьи: В 3- томах. Т.1. Александра, Таллин*, с. 167-183.
- Локтев, В. (2004), *Барокко от Микельанджело до Гварини (проблема стиля)*, Архитектура-С, Москва, 496 с.
- Мейзерский, В. М. (1991), *Философия и неориторика*, Лыбидь, Киев, 192 с.
- Мізіна, Л. Б. (2006), *Естетична інтерпретація історії мистецтв: сучасне бачення*, Видавництво СЧУ імені В. Даля, Луганськ, 200 с.
- Montagu, Jennifer. (1994), *The Expression of the Passions: The Origin and Influence of Charles Lebrun's "Conference l'expression generale et particuliere"*, Yale University Press, New Hawen, 234 p.
- Newall, Michael (2014), "Painting and Philosophy", *Philosophy Compass*, 9, no.4, pp. 225-237.
- Nuyen, A. T. (1989), "Art and Rhetoric of Allusion", *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 27, no. 4, pp. 495-510.
- Osborne, Harold (1982), "Expressiveness in the Art", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 41, no.1, pp.12-26.
- Porter, Laurence M. (1983), "Space as Metaphor in Delacroix", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 42, no.1, pp. 29-37.
- Ритм, пространство и время в литературе и искусстве* (1974), Сб. статей [отв. ред. Б.Ф.Егоров], Наука, Ленинград, 298 с.

- Ross, Stephanie (1981), "Art and Allusion", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 40, no.1, pp.59-70.
- Sowers, Robert (1990), *Rethinking the Forms of Visual Expression*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 139 p.
- Stecker, Robert (2003), *Interpretation and Construction: Art, Speech and the Law*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, 212 p.
- Steiner, Wendi (1982), *The Colors of Rhetoric: Problems in the Relation Between Modern Literature and Painting*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago; London, 263 p.
- Тарасенко, А.А. (2007), *Міфологічні мотиви і образи в образотворчому мистецтві Одеси останньої третини ХХ-початку ХХІ століття*, автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеню кандидата мистецтвознавства за спеціальністю 17.00.05-образотворче мистецтво, ХДАДМ, Харків, 20 с.
- Теория метафоры* (1990), Сборник [пер.с англ., фр., нем., исп., польск. яз.; ред. Н. Д. Арутюновой и М. А. Журиной], Прогресс, Москва, 512 с.
- Тодоров, Цветан (1998), "Конец риторики", *Теории символа*; пер. с фр. Б. Нарумова. Дом интеллектуальной книги, Русское феноменологическое общество, Москва, с. 81-134.
- Волкова, П. С. (2009), *Рейнтерпретація художественного тексту (на матеріалі мистецтва ХХ століття)*, автореферат дисертації на соискание ученой степени доктора искусствоведения (специальность 17.00.09 – теория и история искусства), Краснодарский государственный ун-т культуры и искусств, Краснодар. Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа (25.02.2021): <http://www.cheloveknauka.com/reinterpretatsiya-hudozhestvennogo-teksta>
- Злыднева, Н. В. (2008), *Изображение и слово в риторике русской культуры ХХ века*, "Индрик", Москва, 304 с.

References

- Basin, E. Ya. (2012), *Semantic philosophy of art [Semanticheskaya filosofiya iskusstva]*, Gumanitariy, Moscow, 348 p. [in Russian]
- Bialostosky, Don (2004), "Aristotle's Rhetoric and Bakhtin's Discourse Theory", *A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism* (eds W.Jost and W.Olmsted). Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, pp.393-408.
- Bondarevskaya, I.A. (2005), "The contours of the aesthetic in the rhetorical mode of culture", *The paradox of the aesthetic in the Ukrainian culture of the XVIII-XVIII centuries*, ["Konturi estetichnogo v ritorichnomu modusl kulturi", *Paradoksaln1st estetichnogo v ukrayinsky kulturl XVII-XVIII stolit1*], PARAPAN, Kyiv, pp.108-158. [in Ukrainian]
- Bordwell, David (1991), *Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 334p.
- Cascardi, Anthony J. (2004), "Arts of Persuasion and Judgment: Rhetoric and Aesthetics", *A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism* (eds W. Jost and W.Olmsted). Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, pp.294-308.
- Chatman, Seymour (1990), *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*, Cornell University Press, London, 256 p.
- Daniel, S. M. (2002), *Networks for Proteus: The Problem of Form Interpretation in the Visual Arts [Seti dlya Proteya: Problema interpretatsii formy v izobrazitelnom iskusstve]*, "Art - SPb", St. Petersburg, 304 p. [in Russian].
- Danto, Arthur K. (1981), *Transfiguration of the Commonplace*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 212 p.

- Deleuze, Gilles (1998), *Difference and Repetition*, [trans. from fr., ed. N.B. Mankovskaya], [*Razlichie i povtorenie* [per. s fr., red. N. B. Mankovskaya], "Petropolis", St. Petersburg, 384 p. [in Russian].
- Deregowski, Jan B. (1984), *Distortion in Art: The Eye and the Mind*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 143 p.
- Desmond, Kathleen K. (2011), "Expression and Aesthetic Experience", *Ideas about Art*, Willey-Blackwell, Oxford, pp.67-77.
- Donell-Kotroso, Carol (1980), "Representation and Expression: A False Antinomy", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 39, no.2, pp.163-173.
- Dubois, J., Peer, F. and others (1986), *General rhetoric* [translated from fr.; ed. A.K. Avelichev], [*Obschaya ritorika* [per.s fr.; red. A.K.Avelicheva], Progress, Moscow, 392 p. [in Russian].
- Dziemidok, Bohdan (1993), "Artistic Formalism: Its Achievements and Weaknesses", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 51, no.2, pp.185-193.
- van Eck, Caroline (2002), "Rhetorical Categories in the Academy", *A Companion to Art Theory* (eds P. Smith and C. Wilde), Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, pp.104-115.
- Eco, Umberto (1998), *Missing structure. Introduction to semiology* [translated from ital. A.G. Pogonyailo, V.G. Reznik], [*Otsustvuyuschaya struktura. Vvedenie v semiologiyu* [per.s ital. A.G.Pogonyaylo, V.G.Reznik], "Petropolis", St. Petersburg, 432 p. [in Russian].
- Eco, Umberto (2004), *Open work. Form and uncertainty in modern poetics* [trans. with ital. A. Shurbelev], [*Otkryitoe proizvedenie. Forma i neopredelennost v sovremennoy poetike* [per. s ital. A. Shurbeleva], St. Petersburg, Academic project, St. Petersburg, 384 p. [in Russian].
- Fedoruk O. (2008), "The majestic sign of metaphor", *Cross section of the sign: Selected art articles*, In 3 books. Book 3, ["Velichnyy znak metafori". *Peretin znaku: Vibrant mistetstvoznachl stattl*, U 3-h knigah. Kniga 3], Intertechnology, Kyiv, pp. 25-53. [in Ukrainian]
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1991), "Rhetoric and Hermeneutics", *The Relevance of the Beautiful* [trans. with it.], ["Ritorika i germeneytika", *Aktualnost prekrasnogo* [per. s nem.], Art, Moscow, pp.188-206. [in Russian]
- Gombrich, Ernst H. (1960), *Art and Illusion. A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, Phaidon Press, London, 388 p.
- Gombrich, Ernst H. (1972), *Symbolic Images. Studies in the Art of the Renaissance*, Phaidon, London, 247 p.
- Gombrich, Ernst H. (1982), *The Image and the Eye: Further Studies in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, Cornell Phaidon Books, Ithaca, 320 p.
- Goodman, Nelson (1968), *Languages of Arts. An Approach to the Theory of Symbols*, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, NY; Indianapolis, 277 p.
- Goodman, Nelson (2001), *Ways to create worlds* [trans. from English. M.V. Lebedev], [*Sposobyi sozdaniya mirov*; per.s angl. M.V.Lebedeva], "Idea-Press", "Praxis", Moscow, 326 p. [in Russian]
- Harrison, Andrew (1987), *Philosophy and the Visual Art: Seeing and Abstracting*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, 360 p.
- Hausman, Carl R. (1989), *Metaphor and Art: Interactionism and Reference in the Verbal and Nonverbal Arts*, Cambridge University Press, New-York, 238 p.
- Haynes, Deborah J. (2002), "Bakhtin and the Visual Arts", *A Companion to Art Theory* (eds P. Smith and C. Wilde), Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, pp. 292-302.
- Heffernan, James A.W. (1985), "Resemblance, Signification and Metaphor in Visual Art", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 44, no. 2, pp.167-169; 171-180.
- Hemingway, Andrew (2015), "Realism under Duress", *A Companion to American Art* (eds J. Davis, J. A. Greenhill and J. D. La Fountain), John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Chichester, pp. 617-636.

- Kholodynska, S. (2008), "Interpretation as a factor in the formation of a new artistic phenomenon", *CITY: Art, history, modernity, theory: Collection of scientific works on art history and culturology* [ed. V. D. Sidorenko, O. O. Avramenko, O. Y. Bodnar], issue 4-5, ["Interpretatsiya yak faktor formuvannya novogo mistetskogo fenomenu", *MIST: Mistetstvo, Istoriya, suchasnist, teoriya: Zbirnik naukovih prats z mistetstvoznavstva ta kulturologiyi* [red. V. D. Sidorenko, O. O. Avramenko, O. Ya. Bodnar], випуск 4-5], Musical Ukraine, Kyiv, pp.352-360. [in Ukrainian].
- Yampolsky, M. (2010), "Through Dim Glass": 20 Chapters on Uncertainty, ["Skvoz tuskloe steklo": 20 glav o neopredelennosti], *New Literary Review*, Moscow, 688 p. [in Russian].
- Yampolsky, M. (1993), *Memory of Tiresias: Intertextuality and Cinematography*, [*Pamyat Tiresiya: Intertekstualnost i kinematograf*]. RIK "Culture", Moscow, 464 p. [in Russian].
- Jacobson, R. (1975), "Linguistics and Poetics", *Structuralism: Pros and Cons. Sat. articles* [translated from English. I.A. Melchuk], ["Lingvistika i poetika", *Strukturalizm: "za" i "protiv"*, Sb. statey [per.s angl. I. A. Melchuka], Progress, Moscow, pp.193-230. [in Russian].
- Karanda, M.V. (2006), *Neo-religious motives in aesthetics and art of the turn of the XIX-XX centuries*, Author's thesis, [*Neoreligiyni motivi v estetitsi ta mistetstvi zlamu XIX-XX stolit*, avtoreferat disertatsiyi na zdobuttya vchenogo stupenyu kandidata filosofskih nauk za spetsialnistyu: 09.00.08 – estetika], T. Shevchenko National University, Kyiv, 16 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Lotman, Yu. M. (1998), "The structure of a literary text", *On Art*, ["Struktura hudozhestvennogo teksta", *Ob iskusstve*] 14-285, "Art-SPb", St. Petersburg, pp.14-285 [in Russian]
- Lotman, Yu. M. (1992), "Rhetoric", *Selected articles*: In 3 volumes. Vol. 1, ["Ritorika", *Izbrannyye stati*: V 3- tomah. T. 1], Alexandra, Tallinn, pp.167-183 [in Russian]
- Loktev, V. (2004), *Baroque from Michelangelo to Guarini (the problem of style)*, [*Barokko ot Mikelandzhelo do Gvarini (problema stilya)*], Architecture-S, Moscow, 496 p. [in Russian]
- Meizersky, V. M. (1991), *Philosophy and non-rhetoric*, [*Filosofiya i neoritorika*], Lybid, Kiev, 192 p. [in Russian].
- Mizina, L. B. (2006), *Aesthetic interpretation of art history: modern vision*, [*Estetichna Interpretatsiya Istoriyi mistetstv: suchasne bachennya*], V. Dahl SNO Publishing House, Luhansk, 200 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Montagu, Jennifer. (1994), *The Expression of the Passions: The Origin and Influence of Charles Lebrun's "Conference l'expression generale et particuliere"*, Yale University Press, New Hawen, 234 p.
- Newall, Michael (2014), "Painting and Philosophy", *Philosophy Compass*, 9, no.4, pp.225-237.
- Nuyen, A.T. (1989), "Art and Rhetoric of Allusion", *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 27, no.4, pp.495-510.
- Osborne, Harold (1982), "Expressiveness in the Art", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 41, no.1, pp.12-26.
- Porter, Laurence M. (1983), "Space as Metaphor in Delacroix", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 42, no.1, pp.29-37.
- Rhythm, space and time in literature and art* (1974), Select. articles [resp. ed. B. F. Egorov.], [*Rhythm, prostranstvo i vremya v literature i iskusstve*, Sb. statey [otv. red. B. F. Egorov], Science, Leningrad, 298 p. [in Russian]
- Ross, Stephanie (1981), "Art and Allusion", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 40, no.1, pp.59-70.
- Sowers, Robert (1990), *Rethinking the Forms of Visual Expression*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 139 p.
- Stecker, Robert (2003), *Interpretation and Construction: Art, Speech and the Law*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, 212 p.

- Steiner, Wendi (1982), *The Colors of Rhetoric: Problems in the Relation Between Modern Literature and Painting*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago; London, 263 p.
- Tarasenko, A. A. (2007), *Mythological motives and images in the fine arts of Odessa of the last third of the XX-beginning of the XXI century*, Author's thesis, [*Mifologichni motivi i obrazi v obrazotvorchomu mistetstvi Odesi ostannoyi tretini XX-pochatku XXI stolittya*, avtoreferat disertatsiyi na zdobuttya naukovogo stupenyu kandidata mistetstvoznavstva za spetsialnistyu 17.00.05-obrazotvorche mistetstvo], KhDADM, Kharkiv, 20 p. [in Ukrainian]
- The theory of metaphor: collection* (1990) [translated from English, French, German, Spanish, Polish; ed. N. D. Arutyunova and M. A. Zhurinskaya], [*Theoriya metaforyi. Sbornik* [per. s angl., fr., nem., isp., polsk.yaz.; red. N. D.Arutyunovoy i M. A. Zhurinskoy], Progress, Moscow, 512 p. [in Russian]
- Todorov, Tsvetan (1998), "End of rhetoric", *Symbol theory* [tr. with fr. B. Narumov], ["Konets ritoriki", *Teorii simvola* [per. s fr. B.Narumova], House of Intellectual Books, Russian Phenomenological Society, Moscow, pp. 81-134 [in Russian]
- Volkova, P. S. (2009), *Reinterpretation of a literary text (based on art of the twentieth century)*, Author's thesis, [*Reinterpretatsiya hudozhestvennogo teksta (na material iskusstva XX veka)*, avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoy stepeni doktora iskusstvovedeniya (spetsialnost 17.00.09 – teoriya i istoriya iskusstva)]. Krasnodar State University of Culture and arts, Krasnodar, available at (25.02.2021): <http://www.cheloveknauka.com/reinterpretatsiya-hudozhestvennogo-teksta> [in Russian]
- Zlydneva, N. V. (2008), *Image and word in the rhetoric of Russian culture of the twentieth century*, [*Izobrazhenie i slovo v ritorike russkoy kulturyi XX veka*], "Indrik", Moscow, 304 p. [in Russian]

© **Olena Vyacheslavova**