IVAN KASABOV

NEW BULGARIAN UNIVERSITY, SOFIA

# Words' connotations and semantic construals

ABSTRACT. Within a semantic approach to different aspects of language experience language phenomena need to be revealed in their significance. In particular, what should be clarified is the common sign-structures of things and words at three different levels: of theoretical form, of actual existence and of socio-cultural values. This will help overcome the main referential illusion of dealing with "existent objects" irrelevant to their significance, or the sign-valued understanding. Respectively, the illusionary semantic study of word-meanings irrespective of their anthropological, social and psychological value-connotations would be avoided. The claim in this paper is that in human experience we have access to actual objects via sensations of physical, material character but we perceive or apprehend these objects as signs. Without being a sign, an object is not recognizable, nor communicable or understandable. This means that to become a sign, every single object has to identify some other object or any object like it, or be understood as presented in its specific features in an actual act of communication of any form. Such objects are predicative signs of speech or thought. A thing obtains its reality as an object on the level of cultural values or social functions as a sign-type with its own name, meaning and connotations. These connotations as values of meanings (or of values) govern the dynamics of object and word-transformations. As a result of a connotative analysis of word semantics, it may be possible to clarify the general types of word meaning: iconic-metaphorical, object-symbolical and symbolic-allegorical. Finally, it is necessary to extract the main semantic features (or marks), understood as named substantiated qualities like soundness, lightness (darkness), substantiality, formality, corporeality, humanity, etc. in their construal function as words' iconic etymons. On these grounds – on the grounds of sign-words' meanings – it is possible to build lexico-semantic architectonic categorization and systematization of words' meanings in order to establish a lexico-grammatical system of language and to understand lexico-semantic development of values, transformations of meanings and word-formation processes.

## 1. Introduction

From the semiotic point of view, it is especially important to investigate the main relation between words as signs and the objects which they signify. We have to establish if signified common natural objects and everyday artifacts are signs in their own right and, if they are signs, what they mean. In general then, we have to ask ourselves: is an adequate cognition of words' meanings possible without correspondence to meanings and values of signified objects and vice-versa? In other words, it is necessary to clarify the common sign-structures of things and words. Such an enterprise will be successful if we single out three interconnected but different levels of existence: of theoretical form (as architectonics or theory of sign possibility), of actual existence (as praxis), and of socio-

cultural values (as knowledge or language competence). This will help over-come the main referential illusion of dealing with "existent objects" irrelevant to their significance, or the sign-valued understanding. Respectively, the illu-sionary semantic study of word-meanings irrespective of their anthropological, social and psychological value-connotations would be avoided.

In this paper, the argument is put forward that in human experience we have access to actual objects via sensations of physical, material character but we perceive or apprehend these objects as signs. Without being a sign, an object is not recognizable, nor communicable or understandable. This means that to be-come a sign, every single object has to identify some other object or any object like it, or to be understood as presented in its specific features in an actual act of communication of any form. Such objects are predicative signs of speech or thought. A thing obtains its reality as an object on the level of cultural values or social functions as a sign-type with its own name, meaning and connotations. These connotations as values of meanings (or of values) govern the dynamics of object- and word-transformations.

## 2. Predicative word being

First of all we have to outline the modes of words' being. Besides having actual existence (in an actual utterance), every single word (as well as every single object) has its (imaginary, virtually or theoretically) possible existence and its realized existence as a socially established meaningful and understand-able word-symbol. In actual situational (contextual) utterances, we are on the level of sentence predication, governed by the deictic verb-copula *to be*. Such a predicative saying (something about something) provides what is being said with a modus of actual existence as actual reality. But this is not mere pragmat-ics and particular reality of language from which eventually a language system is abstracted. Predication actualizes meaningful word-symbol's semantics not only by determining one of its meanings in the case of situationally and contex-tually influenced denotation (*theme*), but also by putting a word-symbol in a predicative position (*rheme*). This is practical language experience leading to semantic knowledge, "sedimented" in the meanings of words. Predication in the sentence supplies the understanding of the predicate as an actual existence of the act and as the objectivity of the subject-word, notably as an actually exist-ing, separate, generalized and characterized object. The sentence predicative phrase provides not only the actuality of its words' existence (by means of ob-jectivation by virtue of other words connected with the phrase) but also infor-mation, transmitted by means of the word order.

## 3. Attributive word being

Language predication acts explicitly – in sentences, and implicitly – in sig-nification (as internal predication in the word), that is, *attribution*. Attribution, being the act of ascribing implicitly ("naturally") an essential property to one separate thing, is a natural language-logical act of an object's characterization that becomes the grounds on which to make the lexico-grammatical categoriza-tion of the object (as a word class or a part of speech). Attribution, then, is of crucial importance to the word-sign constitution because this process of ascrib-ing is the fundamental *motif* in the formation of signification of both an object's icon and the phonological complex in a sign's (symbolic) unity of the whole word.

Thus, (according to the principle of the sign) the signifier is a sign of the signified. Correspondingly, the signified object is accepted not only as a sign of all the objects of the same class, but as a sign of itself or of its essence (accord-ing to the principle of *autonymy*). From an actually ostensive single sign (*token*) it develops into a really existing sign-*type* of all objects in its class that, by their essence, get identified with it in its name. In this way primary (implicit) attribu-tion is internal, sign-sensible, language-nominative (signifying) predication. It is manifested as actual and concrete in single speech sentence-utterances, but is governed by the object's essence in the object's image as word's meaning (cf. Kasabov 2006).

The meaning is understanding (to a certain degree) an object's essence of the sign, that is, internal-predicative, attributive interpretation. The interpreta-tive understanding of such a sign has much in common with the new concept of *construals*, being either "an interpreting" (in the case of facts, data, a statement) or "interpretation" (here genealogy and taxonomy rest partly on admitted facts, but partly on the construal of facts) (cf. Kroeber 1923: 1939). Similar to the problems of construals are the problems presented by the modern concept of so-called *plastic invariants* (or figural expressive and content differential features of structure, colors, and forms), investigated in the field of visual semiotics (cf. Floch 1990, 1995; Lévi-Strauss 1979), where the distinction is made "between two levels of analysis in visual texts: the figurative level, which uses some ob-jects of the real world in order to create a fictional world; and a plastic level, where no object of the real world is recognizable. The plastic level, though, contains a network of non-figurative features, such as positions, forms and col-ors" in their oppositions and relations (cf. Leone 2010). In other words we have to deal with the problems of facts recognition in their interpretations by respec-tive signs. Hence the main problem is to single out the constitutive and con-structive elements of the sign.

## 4. Signification and nominative (naming) word being

The well known Peircean signs' divisions into three trichotomies and three correlations with reference to 3 types of signs in their 3 correlations (cf. Peirce 1998: 296) can be jointly presented in one matrix, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. An integrated matrix scheme of the sign

| SIGN | 1ST TRICHOTOMY: in relation to itself (as a *Type* of sign) | 2ND TRICHOTOMY: in relation to its *Object* | 3RD TRICHOTOMY: in relation to the *Interpretant* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1ST CORRELATE *First-ness* | 1 QUALISIGN | 2 ICON | 3 RHEME |
| 2ND CORRELATE *Second-ness* | 4 SINSIGN (SIGN-TOKEN) | 5 INDEX | 6 DICENT |
| 3rd CORRELATE *Third-ness* | 7 LEGISIGN (SIGN-TYPE) | 8 SYMBOL | 9 ARGUMENT (interpretative sign-symbol's understanding) |

A similar matrix – named as *the semiotic nonagon* – has been elaborated by Claudio Guerri (2009: 7):

Table 2. The matrix of the semiotic nonagon

| SIGN | 1ST TRICHOTOMY: COMPARISON POSSIBILITY *IMAGINARY* FORM | 2ND TRICHOTOMY: PERFORMANCE ACTUALIZATION *REAL* EXISTENCE | 3RD TRICHOTOMY: THOUGHT NECESSITY *SYMBOLIC* VALUE |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Form* 1ST CORRELATE THEORETICAL POSSIBILITY | *1. Form of Form* DIFFERENCE QUALISIGN | *2. Existence of Form* ICON | *3. Value of Form* RHEME |
| *Existence* 2ND CORRELATE ECONOMICAL PRACTICE | *4. Form of Existence* SINSIGN | *5. Existence of Existence* DIFFERENT INDEX | *6. Value of Existence* DICENT |
| *Value* 3RD CORRELATE CULTURAL STRATEGY | *7. Form of Value* LEGISLATION | *8. Existence of Value* SYMBOL | *9. Value of Value* DIFFERENTIATION ARGUMENT |

This matrix illustrates clearly the three types of sign's existence, namely: of imaginary form, of actual existence and of symbolic values – each intersecting with three correlates (theoretical possibility, economical praxis and cultural strategy). For our purpose here it is important to emphasize the left to right di-

agonal positions (*difference – different – differentiation*) in the matrix and to suggest giving more attention to the right to left diagonal positions. In the following matrix (Table 3), these positions are marked *congruence (systematization) – different – type of sign forms*, respectively:

Table 3. The matrix of the semiotic nonagon in further development

| SIGN | 1ST TRICHOTOMY: COMPARISON POSSIBILITY *IMAGINARY* FORM | 2ND TRICHOTOMY: PERFORMANCE ACTUALIZATION *REAL* EXISTENCE | 3RD TRICHOTOMY: THOUGHT NECESSITY *SYMBOLIC* VALUE |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Form* 1ST CORRELATE THEORETICAL POSSIBILITY | *1. Form of Form* DIFFERENCE QUALISIGN | *2. Existence of Form* ICON | *3. Value of Form* CONGRUENCE (SYSTEMATIZATION) RHEME |
| *Existence* 2ND CORRELATE PRACTICE | *4. Form of Existence* SINSIGN | *5. Existence of Existence* DIFFERENT INDEX | *6. Value of Existence* DICENT |
| *Value* 3RD CORRELATE CULTURAL STRATEGY | *7. Form of Value* TYPE-FORMS LEGISIGN | *8. Existence of Value* SYMBOL | *9. Value of Value* DIFFERENTIATION ARGUMENT |

In order to be understood, the sign has to be considered in its *status nascendi*. From the point of view of human necessity, a given sign (for instance *car* or *home*) could be considered as something different, a result of the process of elementary (that is based on habitual everyday experience) differentiation of a "means of transport" or "place of residence" from other things and places. Such a process would involve evaluating a given means of transport or a place of residence as suitable (comfortable, good, euphoric) or unsuitable (uncomfortable, bad, dysphoric) for a particular purpose. Differentiation, then, would be reduced to noticing a difference in the quality of transportation or living conditions in relation to everything else. From the opposite point of view – that of possibility – the sign *home* could arise from the abstraction or from the *qualisign* "habitableness". This theoretical point of view is very similar to the position of the architect who has to transform this qualitative possibility into an actualized possibility. From the abstract *qualisign* "habitation" achieved is an iconic sign-imagination standing for something with the same quality, or an object's icon with its specific *scheme, form* and *figure*. Such a presentation is an icon of the imagination or some kind of constructive (imaginable) "blueprint" scheme, or

model-imitation of "something convenient for habitation" and it could be named with a specific acoustic-iconic construct to become a possibly meaning-ful sign-word like *home, house, palace, dome,* etc. These are just theoretical possibilities for the creation of the sign: a *qualisign* (as an etymological possi-bility), an iconic sign (as an icon-acoustic possible imagination) and a (possibly meaningful) word-sign. In other words, this is the area of architectonics-design of the sign, corresponding in principle to the architectural design of a house in a project.

Table 4. The developed matrix of the semiotic nonagon

| SIGN | 1ST TRICHOTOMY: COMPARISON POSSIBILITY *IMAGINARY* FORM | 2ND TRICHOTOMY: PERFORMANCE ACTUALIZATION *REL* EXISTENCE | 3RD TRICHOTOMY: THOUGHT NECESSITY *SYMBOLIC* VALUE |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Form* 1ST CORRELATE THEORETICAL COGNITON (*epistêmê*) | *1. Form of Form* essential quality QUALISIGN (*etymon*) | *2. Existence of Form* imaginative form, figure, frame ICON (*eidos*) | *3. Value of Form* word-form as name RHEME (*onoma*) |
| *Existence* 2ND CORRELATE PRACTICE | *4. Form of Existence* individual (pronounced) word, naming object in actual situation SINSIGN | *5. Existence of Existence* deictic word, name, object-pointing image, drawing, model INDEX (*eidôlon*) | *6. Value of Existence* predicative word in sentence-phrase (explanatory word's content expression) DICENT (*logos*) |
| *Value* 3RD CORRELATE CULTURAL KNOWLEDGE | *7. Form of Value* type-forms LEGISIGN | *8. Existence of Value* word's meaning SYMBOL | *9. Value of Value* interpretative word-symbol's understanding ARGUMENT (*doxa*) |

Thus, for a house to be represented as its actual existence, it has to be lexi-cally, graphically or physically materialized or to be built (at least once) from appropriate materials and following a suitable technology for completing an architectural project. Similarly, to be presented as actually existing, every single sign has to be materialized – as far as it is physically, technologically and per-ceptually possible – in the form of a tactile, visual, acoustic *sinsign*, represent-ing another object that is similar or related to it. Such a *sinsign*, when used as an index, may represent something different. Such a sign-(named)-object as a sign-index is actualized in a sentence-phrase that predicatively ascribes existence and distinctive features to the object named *dicent*.

Table 5. A detailed representation of *Form of Form* (intersection 1 in Table 4)

| SIGN | 1ST TRICHOTOMY: COMPARISON POSSIBILITY *IMAGINARY* FORM |
|---|---|
| *Form* 1ST CORRELATE THEORETICAL COGNITION (*epistêmê*) that is, SEMIO-LINGUISTIC *QUALI-QUANTIFICATION* that is, possible relationships of pure form (in 3-dimensional imaginative space with structure, extent and discrete forms, figures, elements, states and in time-durational forms) | *1. Form of Form* QUALISIGN (*etymon*) essential quality with such possible (imaginable) essential qualities as: I. structural, i.e. positive (+) / negative (–) or between points only: positional (+) / oppositional (–); II. proportional, i.e. between couples of points / lines (and metrics between) the parts and the whole; III. symmetric, i.e. between twin-parts and formations in relation to line, plane, centre: 1. corporeal: a) visual: space-objectual; b) tactile: hardness / softness (roughness / smoothness) or solidity / non-solidity; 2. non-corporeal / iterative-periodic: a) waves of visibility: lightness / darkness and oppositions and gradation between colors; b) acoustic waves: sonority / soundlessness (noises) and oppositions and gradation between tone;s c) differential qualities of taste and smell. |

In order to become a real and permanent sign (rather then momentary and actual), an object-sign together with its word-sign, has to acquire the form of a sign-type and thus to begin to really exist as a word sign-symbol with its per-manent meaning within the network of other word-symbols in the language. And finally, such a sign has to become a consciously used word-symbol, inter-preted and understood as an acoustically perceivable indexical-iconic symbol with its socially established connotations (rooted in commonly shared opinion, that is doxa) as values or as sign-arguments.

It is possible to develop the matrix in Table 3 using Plato's (*Letter VII*) terms for the four levels of the object's cognition: *onoma, logos, eidôlon* as in principle different but necessary for the achievement of true cognition – that is *epistêmê* (theoretical form) – of the true idea in its *eidos*. The developed matrix is presented in Table 4.

Consequently we can establish the place of what is the main concern of this paper: the sign's invariant construals. They should be located in the area Form of Form (internal form) of the sign in our matrix (intersection 1 in Table 4). This form, shared by the sign-object and the word-sign, is a possible, imaginary form of theoretical cognition or *epistêmê*. It is presented in detail in Table 5.

Very similar to the problems of sign's qualities presented in Table 5 are the problems connected with singling out plastic invariants, which were discussed above, as pertaining to the field of visual semiotics (cf. Floch 1990, 1995; Lévi-Strauss 1979).

The area *Existence of Form* (intersection 2 in Table 4) may be described in a more elaborate way too. A proposal of such a description is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. A detailed representation of *Existence of Form* (intersection 2 in Table 4)

| SIGN | 2ND TRICHOTOMY:<br>PERFORMANCE<br>ACTUALIZATION<br>*(POSSIBLE) REAL* EXISTENCE |
|---|---|
| *Form*<br>1ST CORRELATE<br><br>THEORETICAL COGNITION (*epistêmê*)<br><br><br>that is,<br>SEMIO-LINGUISTIC *QUALI-QUANTIFICATION*<br><br><br>that is,<br>possible relationships of pure form<br>(in 3-dimentional imaginative space with structure, extent and discrete forms, figures, elements, states and in time-durational forms) | 2. *Existence of Form*<br>imaginative form, figure, frame<br>ICON (*eidos*)<br>I. outlined (schematic) shape-forms, i.e. imaginative diagrams;<br>II. figures (in focus, with back-grounds), i.e. imaginative figures (1) with specific formal iconic qualities (*Gestaltqualitäten*), such as static / dynamic, vivid / animate / personification and (2) with properties, such as colors, tones, sounds, noises, gestures, poses;<br>III. configurative-compositional and (con)textual-harmonic frames;<br>IV. iconic-acoustic associative forms;<br>V. figurative (metaphorical) and combined (fantastical) forms and synesthetic iconic-acoustic (gustatory, olfactory, tactile) associations. |

As to the area *Value of Form* (intersection 3 in Table 4), its fuller description is given in Table 7.

For the purpose of this paper it is not necessary to develop the row of the second correlate in the sign's matrix (intersections 4, 5, and 6 in Table 4). Instead, which seems to be much more interesting, let us apply further Peircean signs' divisions (Peirce 1998: 296) to expand the descriptions of the third row (intersections 7, 8, and 9 in Table 4).

Thus, the area *Form of Value* (intersection 7 in Table 4) might include three sub-trichotomies (being three types of *legisign*): type-objects' associated forms, type-words' associated forms and type-words; and three sub-correlates: anthropological prototypes, social stereotypes and psychological archetypes. In this way, as we can see in Table 8, it would split into nine, more specifically determined areas (intersections 7.1–7.9 in Table 8).

Thanks to what is depicted in Table 8, one can spot a general peculiarity of the language. The peculiarity is rooted in the dynamics of objects' and words' transformations from the forms of the sacral (such as totem, fetish, idol) to the forms of the profane in everyday language vocabulary and vice versa.

For example, to realize the semantic relevance of metaphors and other rhetorical tropes one needs to have in mind anthropologically prototypical magic and mystic prejudicial forms like "mana", "totem", "idol", "fetish" and the so-called *nomina-omina* together with their corresponding language forms (taboo, euphemism, etc.) of still undistinguished syncretic word-objects. Similarly, in order to understand social connotations we have to investigate emblematic social stereotypes like "heroes", "(stage)-divas" and "(movie)-stars", attributes and brands with their corresponding language forms like slang and argotic words or pseudonyms. For the understanding of individual stylistic connotations, we need to deal with archetypical psychological symbolic forms like gifts (and sacrifices) and language forms like acronyms, anagrams, puns (*calembours*, paronomasia) or paronymous, exotic and poetic word-forms.

Table 7. A detailed representation of *Value of Form* (intersection 3 in Table 4)

| SIGN | 3RD TRICHOTOMY:<br>THOUGHT<br>NECESSITY<br>*SYMBOLIC* VALUE |
|---|---|
| *Form*<br>1ST CORRELATE<br>THEORETICAL COGNITION (*epistêmê*)<br><br>that is,<br>SEMIO-LINGUISTIC *QUALI-QUANTIFICATION*<br><br>that is,<br>possible relationships of pure form<br>(in 3-dimentional imaginative space with structure, extent and discrete forms, figures, elements, states and in time-durational forms) | 3. *Value of Form*<br><br>RHEME (*onoma*)<br><br><br>that is,<br>word-form as name<br><br>that is,<br>acoustic-iconic word-forms (names) in their architectonic (formal-figural) congruence, structural (paradigmatic-syntagmatic) systematization and (aesthetical) harmonization |

Every single sentence on its own is an act of assertive expression, an act of a sender's assertion directed to a receiver, in which the verb-predicate or name-rheme in the complex predicate are asserted as actually existing and having certain qualities (cf. Peirce 1998: 292–293, 296). These assertions are narratives organized in stories and have not only actual, but almost real existence as well. Eventual assertions made by the receiver (responses) occurring in numerous dialogical situations establish in the speaker's mind opinions about words' connections and about the actual existence of words that are uttered for objects.

Then, such words can be put together to form a sentence on the basis of how they are related to objects' qualities, functioning as meanings of the uttered words.

Table 8. A detailed representation of *Form of Value* (intersection 7 in Table 4)

| SIGN | 1ST TRICHOTOMY: COMPARISON POSSIBILITY (*REALIZED*) FORM | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Value* 3RD CORRELATE | *7. Form of Value* LEGISIGN | | |
| | Type-objects' associated forms | Type-words' associated forms | Type-words |
| Types of nomination Form-content relation | 7.1 Anthropological Prototypes<br><br>type-objects of magic, mystic imaginations, divinations, superstitions: mana, totem, idol, fetish | 7.2 taboos, euphemisms, exorcisms, ethno-pseudonyms, proper names | 7.3 Autonyms: *nomina-omina* (sacral↔profane) |
| SEMIO-LINGUISTIC *QUALIFICATION* of CULTURE and KNOWLEDGE | 7.4 Social Stereotypes<br><br>type-objects, person-names as social emblems of groups of people: brands, attributes, heroes, (movie)-stars, (stage)-divas | 7.5 argot slang, jargon, calques, socio-pseudonyms, eponyms | 7.6 Heteronyms: synonyms, homonyms, proper↔common names |
| Symbolic Functions (Values Objectives)<br><br>that is SOCIO-CULTURAL SIGNS' FUNCTIONS | 7.7 Psychological Archetypes<br><br>type individual-evaluative objects' transformations with manipulative effect on emotions of individuals or groups: gifts, sacrifices | 7.8 anagrams, acronyms, puns (*calembours*), emotional-expressive words-compositional variants | 7.9 Paronyms: diminutive, augmentative, exotic, poetic words |

Narrative repetitions not only create opinions about words' connections and their object's meanings, but also transform the opinions into persuasive judgments about their real existence. Thus we come to understand words in a language not only as actual signifying word-symbols with objects' meanings, but also as commonly shared opinions, based on numerous repetitions of argumentative understanding-persuasions (*doxa*) of those symbols that are really (not

only possibly and actually) existent valuable word-signs for thing-objects. When these words are repetitively used for a given type of objects (and for concrete objects of that type), we arrive at persuasive conclusions about the legitimacy of words' meanings and their significations – conclusions of the inductive type.

Table 9. A detailed representation of *Existence of Value* (intersection 8 in Table 4)

| SIGN | 2ND TRICHOTOMY: PERFORAMNCE ACTUALIZATION *REAL* EXISTENCE |
|---|---|
| *Value* 3RD CORRELATE | *8. Existence of Value* SYMBOL<br><br>that is, word's meanings |
| Types of nomination Form-content relation | Iconic Symbol<br><br>figurative, iconic metaphorical meaning |
| SEMIO-LINGUISTIC *QUALIFICATION* of CULTURE and KNOWLEDGE | Indexical Symbol word's idea as system-associative, attributive-identificational relation between a verbal object's icon and named object's type objectual meaning in polysemic relations |
| Symbolic Functions (Values Objectives)<br><br>that is, SOCIO-CULTURAL SIGNS' FUNCTIONS | Symbolic Symbol<br><br>metaphorical objectual-meaning's second cultural symbolization allegoric-personificational meaning |

In the same vein developed may be the area *Existence of Value* (intersection 8 in Table 4). There, as one can see in Table 9, it is also possible to introduce three sub-correlates: an iconic symbol, indexical symbol, and symbolic symbol.

Finally, the area *Value of Value* (intersection 9 in Table 4), might be rendered more precisely as including the three sub-correlates of rhetoric connotations, common connotations, and emotional connotations (see Table 10).

Man's ability to legitimately signify a given type of objects (in any single utterance) with a certain word and the practice of denoting concrete objects of this type with a particular word are the grounds on which persuasive conclusions of the deductive type get established. Usually, however, one arrives at persuasive conclusions of this kind intuitively, on the basis of associative (paradigmatic) relations between meaningful word-signs and following the principle

of emblematic (synecdoche principle) examples or rhetorical tropes. Such conclusions result from probability-conclusions (that may be drawn thanks to the rhetoric argumentative figure of the so-called enthymeme) based on possible-probable premises, established as commonly shared opinions, that is, as hypothetical (abductive) conclusions. This type of persuasion is a result of the reciprocal influence of numerously repeated rhetoric inductive, deductive, and hypothetical argumentative interpretations.

Table 10. A detailed representation of *Value of Value* (intersection 9 in Table 4)

| SIGN | 3RD TRICHOTOMY: THOUGHT NECESSITY (*REAL*) *SYMBOLIC* VALUE |
|---|---|
| *Value* 3RD CORELATE | *9. Value of Value* ARGUMENT (*doxa*) |
| Types of nomination Form-content relation | Rhetoric innovative expressions, inverted and transformed signs (parody) |
| | tropes, figures, irony, archaization, neologization |
| SEMIO-LINGUISTIC *QUALIFIACTION* of CULTURE and KNOWLEDGE | Rhetoric connotations |
| | Interpretative word-symbol's understanding, stylistic-synonyms: social status (slang) |
| Symbolic Functions (Values Objectives) | functional registers |
| | Common connotations |
| that is, SOCIO-CULTURAL SIGNS' FUNCTIONS | Individual stylistic cultural and personal preferences, 'sense of language' |
| | common sense – Argument (*doxa*) |
| | Emotional connotations |

These interpretations, appear thanks to common functional connotations and unconscious intuitive cultural and personal preferences (the "sense of language"), which, together with the emotional-valuation connotations' motifs, establish the shared common opinions (*doxa*). These opinions play the role of veritable knowledge about the objects' essence or about the meaning of every single word and tend to later become the knowledge of the truth (the idea) about the word-symbols' essence – and thus about the object signified.

## 5. Words' connotations as cultural symbols' interpretations

The understandings of the persuasions of word-meanings discussed above are regarded here as connotations. There have been numerous attempts to define the term connotation. It is usually assumed that the connotation is a kind of a word's co-meaning, something like a barely sensible and difficult to define aureole around a word's meaning, or additional, associative semantic feature. But connotations could be explained much better as constituting the internal center, the core and "spirit" or motif of a word's meaning that persuasively influences a word's understanding. One of the most adequate definitions of connotations (of a word-term) is: "a term is said to be connotative if, when one of the features of the concept considered in terms of its comprehension is named, that term points to the concept as a whole" (Greimas & Courtés 1982 [1979]: 53).

From the semantic point of view, a signification is connotative when, by means of an emblematic semantic feature (or attribute or a *seme*, if we see it from the viewpoint of its interpretative understanding), presented can be the whole meaning (*sememe*) of the word-*semanteme*. In other words, connotation acts metonymically – more precisely, in a synecdochic way. Thus, connotations appear to be of the rank of a value system – the system of language values (*valeurs*). These values are not only differential semantic features, but values or valorizations of word-meanings, that is values of meanings or of values.

## 6. Value differentiation and types of connotation

One type of connotations could be based on an image feature in rhetoric figures of comparison and epithet (compare the tropes of metaphor, metonymy, allegory and others). If connotations are based on an indexical-denotative additional feature (with valorization relation to the signified object), they are social and are realized in slang and sociolectal vocabulary. If connotations have as their basis unconscious symbolic-cultural valorizations and personal emotional preferences, they are realized in emotional-expressive vocabulary. Some of these values could be of the iconic type and get explicitly manifested in language in the form of rhetoric tropes or "connotators". Others could be of the indexical-denotative communicative type and function as shared by the members of a society evaluative understandings of words' meanings and certain qualities of the signified objects. Usually such a society is value-consolidated according to the so-called "lifestyle" and social status based on consumption preferences for different object-artifacts. These are social connotations. And finally, connotations could be of the symbolic type. In this case they are cultural and personal preferences resting on fundamental modal basis and frequently remain unconscious (e.g. euphoric or dysphoric).

## 7. Conclusions

As a result of such a connotative analysis of words' semantics, it may be possible to clarify the general types of word meanings: iconic-metaphorical, object-symbolical and symbolic-allegorical. To achieve this aim, it is necessary to extract main semantic features, or marks, as named substantiated qualities (such as sonority, lightness / darkness, substantiality, formality, corporality and animate, spiritual, personification, etc.) in their constructive function as words' iconic construals, plastic invariants or etymons. However, it will not be possible to define these structural invariant-construals without any reference to connotations, discussed above as cultural symbols' interpretations and personal preferences founded on modal basis. On these grounds – on the grounds of sign-words' meanings – it is possible to build lexico-semantic architectonic categorization and systematization of words' meanings in order to establish a lexico-grammatical system of language and to understand lexico-semantic development of values, transformations of meanings and word-formation processes.

## References

Floch, Jean-Marie 1990: *Sémiotique, marketing et communication*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Floch, Jean-Marie 1995: *Identités visuelles*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Greimas, Algirdas, Joseph Courtés 1982 [1979]: *Semiotics and Language. An Analytical Dictionary*. Trans. Larry Crist, Daniel Patte, James Lee, Edward McMahon II, Gary Phillips, Michael Rengstrof. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press [*Sémiotique. Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage*. Paris: Hachette].

Guerri, Claudio 2009: The Semiotic Nonagon and the Graphic Language TSD: an operative model for qualitative research and the scope of a new graphic language. Presentation at the XV Early Fall School of Semiotics: "Sociosemiotics III", 5–15 September 2009, Sozopol, Bulgaria.

Kasabov, Ivan 2006: *Gramatika na semantikata* [The grammar of semantics]. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.

Kroeber, Alfred 1923: *Anthropology*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.

Kroeber, Alfred 1939: *Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Leone, Massimo 2010: The concept of semi-symbolism: a concise introduction. Presentation at the XVI Early Fall School of Semiotics: "Imagining & Understanding", 4–12 September 2010, Sozopol, Bulgaria.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude 1979: *La voie des masques*. Paris: Plon.

Peirce, Charles Sanders 1998: *The Essential Peirce*: Selected Philosophical Writings Volume 2 (1893–1913). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.