http://knigolib.com/wpcontent/uploads/2014/02/Selindzher_Sobranie_sochineniy.473841.e
pub – Nazva z tytul. ekrana.

8. Sjelindzher Dzh. Izbrannoe / Dzh. Sjelindzher. – M.: Progress, 1982. – 438 s.

9. Sjelindzher Dzh. Nad propast'ju vo rzhi; Vyshe stropila, plotniki: Povesti. Rasskazy / Dzh. Sjelindzher. M.: TERRA, 1997. – 592 s.

10. Tarnavska M.M. «Polifonichnyi» pidtekst: trudnoshchi interpretatsii ta perekladu (na materiali opovidannia Dzh.D.Selindzhera «U chovni») // Naukovi zapysky. – Vyp. 116. – Seriia: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo). – Kirovohrad, 2013. – S. 211 - 214.

11. Tarnavska M.M. Emotsiinyi pidtekst ta trudnoshchi yoho perekladu (na materiali opovidannia Dzh.D.Selindzhera «Teddi») / M.M. Tarnavska // Naukovi zapysky. – Vyp. 104. – Ch.1. – Seriia: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo). – Kirovohrad, 2012. – S. 191 - 196.

12. Tarnavska M.M. Interpretatsiia ta pereklad intertekstovykh motyviv tsyklu opovidan selindzhera «Nine Stories» na materiali tvoru Dzh. D. Selindzhera "For Esmé – with Love and Squalor") // Naukovi zapysky. – Vyp. 138. – Seriia: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo). – Kirovohrad, 2015. – S. 378 - 383.

13. Tarnavska M.M. Intertekstualnist prykhovanykh smysliv opovidan Selindzhera ta yikh pereklad (na materiali opovidannia Dzh.D.Selindzhera "Just Before the War with the Eskimos") / M.M. Tarnavska // Naukovi zapysky. – Vyp. 126. – Seriia: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo). – Kirovohrad, 2014. – S. 257 - 262.

14. Tarnavska M.M. Osoblyvosti funktsionuvannia ta pereklad khudozhnoi detali yak zasobu stvorennia pidtekstu (na materiali opovidannia Dzh. D. Selindzhera "I tsi vusta, i ochi zeleni...") // Naukovi zapysky. – Vyp. 95. – Ch.1. – Seriia: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo). – Kirovohrad, 2011. – S. 439 - 443.

15. Tarnavska M.M. Filosofsko-estetychnyi pidtekst tvoriv Dzh.D. Selindzhera // Naukovi zapysky. – Vyp. 64. – Ch.2. – Seriia: Filolohichni nauky (literaturoznavstvo). – Kirovohrad, 2006. – S. 190–196.

ВІДОМОСТІ ПРО АВТОРА

Тарнавська Марина Миколаївна – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри перекладу, прикладної та загальної лінгвістики Кіровоградського державного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Винниченка.

Наукові інтереси: теорія літератури, інтерпретація та переклад художнього тексту, механізми творення підтекстових смислів та їх переклад.

SUBTEXT IN THE RHETORIC DISCOURSE: ARISTOTLE'S MODEL

Mariya FOKA (Kirovohrad)

З огляду історіографії теоретико-літературної думки стосовно проблематики підтексту у творах словесного мистецтва, важливо розглянути античну епоху, яка відзначається бурхливим процесом осмислення таємниць впливовості усного слова (риторика). Тож у статті досліджено специфіку прихованого вираження думок та ідей на матеріалі трактату "Риторика" Арістотеля. Зокрема, автор розглядає приклад та ентимему, що пов'язані з підтекстовим вираженням; охарактеризовує особливості портрету слухачів, знання якого дозволяє оратору сугерувати певний настрій і думку аудиторії; аналізує природу метафори, що несе в собі приховане значення; висвітлює створення експресивності, що насамперед полягає в емоційному підтексті. Погляди Арістотеля, що представлені в трактаті, значно уточнюють і

доповнюють теорію підтексту, яка розвивається в сучасному літературознавстві, розкривають феномен підтексту у всій його багатогранності, що дає змогу відчути його поліфункціональність та особливу значущість у сфері слова та його впливу.

Ключові слова: риторика, підтекст, Арістотель, приклад, ентимема, метафора, експресивність, емоція, оратор, слухач.

A historiography study of the theoretical and literary knowledge relating to issues of subtext in the oral culture necessitates a survey of how subtext was understood in the ancient times. This period is known to be the starting point for differentiating theoretical and literary knowledge from the general scientific discourse that was termed as "philosophy". Primarily a vivid example of such a development was "Poetics" ("Ars Poetica") by Aristotle. In this work the scholar worked out and analysed a number of fundamental concepts and categories which had been overarching for the theory of literature – mimesis, catharsis, major forms and genres of literature, entirety of a literary work etc. The above said tractate greatly influenced the aesthetics in the early modern period. In spite of the fundamentality of this theoretical tractate, the problem of subtext was not touched upon.

Alongside with the studies of a word in literature, there was a turbulent process of understanding the mysteries of oral word influence in rhetoric. The depth and scope of works in the area of antique rhetoric have been astonishing since the ancient times (Socrates, Plato, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Cicero, Quintilian etc.).

But a question of implicit expression of thoughts and ideas through the antique model is under research in the subtext theory. Meanwhile, Aristotle's views represented in "Rhetoric" complete and specify the understanding of the subtext phenomenon. This consideration defines *the topicality* of our paper. Its *main objective* is to examine the main and basic points that are both directly and indirectly connected with subtext, its nature, meaning, and ways of its creation. There are *a few questions* that require clarification: to study examples or enthymemes that are linked to subtext expression; to characterize the peculiarities of the listeners' portrait the knowledge of which allows an orator to suggest certain emotions and thoughts to the audience; to analyse the nature of metaphors that have implied meanings; to survey the creation of expressiveness that is primarily emotional subtext.

Aristotle described rhetoric "as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever" [1, p. 15], in such a way the studying of public speaking focused mainly on the methods of influence on listeners where subtexts and suggestions had a great role.

Firstly and foremostly, subtext arises in such main, the so-called non-technical, methods of proofs as examples and enthymemes: "all orators produce belief by employing as proofs either examples or enthymemes and nothing else…" [1, p. 19], Aristotle claims.

At the same time the proof by examples is built by the method of induction, while the proof by enthymemes is associated with the method of deduction. This is how the scholar explains these points: "…the proof from a number of particular cases that such is the rule, is called in Dialectic induction, in Rhetoric example; but when, certain things being posited, something different results by reason of them, alongside of them, from their being true, either universally or in most cases, such a conclusion in Dialectic is called a syllogism, in Rhetoric an enthymeme" [1, p. 21].

Speaking in a greater detail, the subtext phenomenon constitutes as the enthymeme which Aristotle terms as the syllogism where one of premises or parts is dropped out but is meant. (As it is known in the logics, the enthymeme is an abbreviated syllogism). Accordingly, this omitted or not clearly expressed premise emerges in the recipient's mind. Let us give an example of enthymeme: "…a woman has had a child because she has milk" [1, p. 27]. In this case, we can reconstruct an omitted part by the syllogistic way: any woman that has milk, has a child. So, this woman has milk, consequently, she has a child. Evidently, the information, that is in the omitted premise, can be obscure for recipients, but must be in their mind, in their consciousness, as the result, it is easily and promptly modeled and thought up by them.

In such a way, Aristotle explores the nature of the enthymeme, the peculiarities of its creation, underlining that the enthymeme "is the strongest of rhetorical proofs" [1, p. 9] and the most emphatic of the other methods of proofs ("Now arguments that depend on examples are not less calculated to persuade, but those which depend upon enthymemes meet with greater approval" [1, p. 21]).

The meaning of subtext for rhetoric is revealed through examples, the other method of proofs. Aristotle singles out two kinds of examples: "…one which consists in relating things that have happened before, and another in inventing them oneself. The latter are subdivided into comparisons or fables, such as those of Aesop and the Libyan" [1, p. 273].

Actually, the relation with subtext evolves through the comparisons and the fables where the truth is supplied in symbols, images, and allegories, in other words, it is hidden, suggested to listeners. The use of comparisons and fables as illustrative materials for good evidence of some thoughts or phenomena is very effectual. This rich material gives quality resources for an orator: "Fables are suitable for public speaking, and they have this advantage that, while it is difficult to find similar things that have really happened in the past, it is easier to invent fables; for they must be invented, like comparisons, if a man is capable of seizing the analogy; and this is easy if one studies philosophy" [1, p. 277].

For example, we can use a comparison finding analogous situations for proving something: "…if one were to say that magistrates should not be chosen by lot, for this would be the same as choosing as representative athletes not

those competent to contend, but those on whom the lot falls; or as choosing any of the sailors as the man who should take the helm, as if it were right that the choice should be decided by lot, not by a man knowledge" [1, p. 275].

The use of such impressive illustrative materials (comparisons and fables) shows both orators' and listeners' high culture, because the subtext effects need the adequate decoding for understanding the hidden truth.

To some extent, both enthymemes or examples denote the subtext expression, especially if we speak about a well-known fact which is concealed, but is easily thought up. Aristotle explains: "The necessary result then is that the enthymeme and the example are concerned with things which may, generally speaking, be other than they are, the example being a kind of induction and the enthymeme a kind of syllogism, and deduced from few premises, often from fewer than the regular syllogism; for if any of these is well known, there is no need to mention it, for the hearer can add it himself. For instance, to prove that Dorieus was a crown, it is enough to say that he won a victory at the Olympic games; there is no need to add that the prize at the Olympic games is a crown, for everybody knows it" [1, p. 25].

Aristotle determines that it is the audience that is a final goal for orators: "For every speech is composed of three parts: the speaker, the subject of which he treats, and the person to whom it is addressed, I mean the hearer, to whom the end or object of the speech refers" [1, p. 33]. So, the scholar studies the portrait of hearers, because, as we know, the success consists in the understanding of the audience, and, in any way, "…for opinions vary, according as men love or hate, are wrathful or mind, and things appear either altogether different, or different in degree; for when a man is favourably disposed towards one on whom he is passing judgement, he either thinks that the accused has committed no wrong at all or that his offence is trifling; but if he hates him, the reverse is the case. And if a man desires anything and has good hopes of getting it, if what is to come is pleasant, he thinks that it is sure to come to pass and will be good; but if a man is unemotional or not hopeful it is quite the reverse" [1, p. 171]. The above said is about the emotional and suggestive influence on the audience.

Also the philosopher analyses "the emotions" in detail, i.e. "all those affections which cause men to change their opinion" [1, p. 173], character traits, social positions etc., the knowledge of which helps an orator to create his speech in such a way to have influence on the hearers, their mood, thoughts, decisions, and judgements. For example, Aristotle describes the benevolent: "Let it then be taken to be the feeling in accordance with which one who has it is said to render a service to one who needs it, not in return for something nor in the interest of him who renders it, but in that of the recipient" [1, p. 221]. So, if we understand this specific feature, we can set against the audience, destroying the value of favour and defrauding of necessity to giving thanks. This is how Aristotle sees it: "It is evident also by what means it is possible to make out that there is no

favour at all, or that those who render it are not actuated by benevolence; for it can either be said that they do, or have done so, for their own sake, in which case there is no favour; or that it was mere chance; or that they acted under compulsion; or that they were making a return, not a gift, whether they knew it or not; for in both cases it is an equivalent return, so that in this case also there is no favour" [1, p. 223].

Furthermore, the speech has a great sense, it must be both "demonstrative and convincing" [1, 169], influential and impressive. And in this case the metaphor has an exact signification; because by its nature it has a hidden and implicit meaning and has a fantastic influence on the audience.

Aristotle explains the way of creating the metaphor: "But in all cases the metaphor from proportion should be reciprocal and applicable to either of the two things of the same genus; for instance, if the goblet is the shield of Dionysus, then the shield may properly be called the goblet of Ares" [1, p.p. 369–371]. But he notes that we need set one object in opposition to another as further as possible, drawing this figure of speech. This way a vivid metaphor is created. Let us have a closer look at the philosopher's interpretation: "As we have said before, metaphors should be drawn from objects which are proper to the object, but not too obvious; just as, for instance, in philosophy it needs sagacity to grasp the similarity in things that are apart. Thus Archytas said that there was no difference between an arbitrator and an altar, for the wronged betakes itself to one or the other" [1, p. 407].

Creating the metaphor, we need to remember about the emotional filling of the image, rather than about associative background. An orator needs to refer to beautiful things to bring positive feelings and to worse – negative: "And if we wish to ornament our subject, we must derive our metaphor from the better species under the same genus; if to depreciate it, from the worse" [1, p. 355].

Herein, almost every image can be imagined in opposite mood tonalities: "Thus, to say (for you have two opposites belonging to the same genus) that the man who begs prays, or that the man who prays begs (for both are forms of asking) is an instance of doing this; as, when Iphicrates called Callias a mendicant priest instead of a torch-bearer, Callias replied that Iphicrates himself could not be initiated, otherwise he would not have called him mendicant priest but torch-bearer; both titles indeed have to do with a divinity, but the one is honourable, the other dishonourable" [1, p.p. 355–357].

It is very important to realize that the tie between subtext, implied sense, and metaphor, in particular the enigma, is a productive source for its creation: "And, generally speaking, clever enigmas furnish good metaphors; for metaphor is a kind of enigma, so that it is clear that the transference is clever" [1, p. 359]. In addition, a good metaphor "gives perspicuity, pleasure, and a foreign air, and it cannot be learnt from anyone else…" [1, p. 355].

Consequently, the metaphor has a powerful effect of influence on the listeners, their mood, emotions, and thoughts.

Considering the rhetorical style features, including what characteristics the style must have for effective impact on the audience, Aristotle is concerned with the question of expressiveness which is known to be often associated with emotional overtones. The philosopher contemplates: "Style expresses emotion, when a man speaks with anger of wanton outrage; with indignation and reserve, even in mentioning them, of things foul or impious; with admiration of things praiseworthy; with lowliness of things pitiable; and so in all other cases" [1, p. 379].

Accordingly, such an emotional impact on the audience evokes confidence, even defusing the semantic quality of speech. Aristotle underlines: "Appropriate style also makes the fact appear credible; for the mind of the hearer is imposed upon under the impression that the speaker is speaking the truth, because, in such circumstances, his feelings are the same, so that he thinks (even if it is not the case as the speaker puts it) that things are as he represents them; and the hearer always sympathizes with one who speaks emotionally, even though he really says nothing. This is why speakers often confound their hearers by mere noise" [1, p. 379].

The achievement of a goal by the way of belief that influences the hearer's consciousness, and the achievement of a goal by the way of suggestion that influences the hearer's sub-consciousness, are closely intertwined. But in every way of speech influence subtext and its effects are very significant and valuable.

Currently, subtext is one of the keys and special methods in rhetoric. Different techniques of influence on the man's sub-consciousness, emotions, feelings, mind, behavior, thoughts etc. are described in detail. But first substantiated principles and basis are represented in "Rhetoric" by Aristotle where the subtext phenomenon and its expressions and effects (for example, suggestion) are analyzed directly or indirectly.

In sum, the focus of attention in Aristotle's "Rhetoric" is on the role of subtexts, on indirect evoking the listeners' thoughts and ideas in the process of persuading them. The subtext and its expressions and effects are given a thorough and all-round depiction in the said tractate, showing multi-functionality and importance of the implicitness in the word sphere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
1. Aristotle. The Art of Rhetoric / Aristotle ; with an English translation ; by John Henry Freese, formerly fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. – London : William Heinemann ; New York : G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926. – 491, [5] p. – (The Loeb Classical Library).

ВІДОМОСТІ ПРО АВТОРА
Фока Марія Володимирівна – кандидат філологічних наук, докторант кафедри української літератури Кіровоградського державного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Винниченка.
Наукові інтереси: теорія літератури, компаративістика.