

The Bulgarian «picture of the world» as a cultural model

Ivan Kassabov

New Bulgarian University, Sofia

When we discuss the possibilities for a complete and (also simultaneously) economic representation of the human knowledge of the world, we end up with the classical model of the encyclopaedia as a systematic representation of human cultural history (usually from a contemporary point of view). At the same time every single natural language presents the physical and the cultural universe from the specific viewpoint of the community which speaks this language. Every language segments the continuum of the world in a specific way and organizes it contentfully part into its own «picture of the world» within the context of the long cultural tradition of the respective civilization.

In contemporary semiotics (following the stoics, Sextus Empiricus and St. Augustine, and also according to F. de Saussure and L. Hjelmslev, Ju. Lotman and U. Eco) it is considered a genuine truth that language is the primary shaping semiotic system through which all other systems find their material expression. The linguistic «picture of the world» finds its systematic representation in the classical model of the Dictionary. I will adopt the standard view that the Encyclopaedia represents the world objectively and scientifically, while the Dictionary represents the world on popularly grounds and naivistically.

The practical work for the compiling of a dictionary shows that a pure lexicographic semantization is not possible without an encyclopaedic one. Neither is it possible to achieve a pure encyclopaedic semantization, without the lexicographic one. As a matter of fact, it is as rare to find a linguistic dictionary of a «pure» type, as it is to find a «pure» encyclopaedia. They seem to be pure only from a strictly technical point of view, e.g. whether or not they include proper names in their corpora. Strangely enough, however, proper names have to be defined, or else one will need to use his/her encyclopaedic knowledge in order to understand the definition. For example, the word **Bulgarian** is defined as «*a person of the basic population of Bulgaria*» and *Sisyphian (toil)* is defined as «*a very hard, but useless work (from the legend of Sisyphus)*». On the other hand, both the encyclopaedia and the dic-

tionary contain not only words which are common for the linguistic areas of society and culture, but also words which are names of animals and plants and are indispensable for both the dictionary and the encyclopaedia. However, names of animals or plants are not sufficient by themselves and cannot be described uniquely with the resources of the natural language (as has been pointed out by A. Wierzbicka in her «Lingua Mentalis» theory). Therefore, it becomes difficult to identify the plants or the animals only by their dictionary definitions. This is why definitions usually add the corresponding Latin name, or the picture of the plant or the animal.

Apart from these clear distinctions between the dictionary and the encyclopaedia, we should be particularly aware of the fact that a «pure» linguistic definition necessarily contains a partial encyclopaedism. Alternatively, «pure» encyclopaedias necessarily contain a partial «linguisticism», if I can say so. This problem has already been pointed out in view of its practical ramifications for the lexicographic theory, but I believe that it is the theory of semantics which has to provide a practical solution. Moreover, in my opinion, the solution lies in the nature and the way the linguistic sign functions (especially in the nature of the word as a fundamental linguistic sign).

In my view, Pierce's idea that all complex signs divide exhaustively into indices, icons and symbols, should be interpreted as allowing for the possibility of a transfusion among these three types. Moreover, the lexicographic experience allows us to go one step further, namely to claim that the basic linguistic sign –the word– manifests itself simultaneously as a three-part unit: as a sign-index (this is its terminological meaning); as a sign-icon (in its metaphorical meaning); and as a sign-symbol (this is its linguistic meaning). In fact, this opinion reflects the more general view that the meaning itself is a concept (or idea) and at the same time it is what is usually called the linguistic meaning. It also corresponds to the view that meaning is an unfixed (unstable), diffusional and flexible (within certain limits, of course) substance which makes possible all sorts of metaphors and metonymies, hence the metaphorical and the metonymic meanings.

Such an understanding about the tripartite character of the linguistic sign refers to all words in the language, even to the simplest ones, such as, for example,

water = H_2O (terminological meaning);
 = «colourless, transparent liquid occurring on earth as rivers, lakes, oceans, etc. and used for drinking and washing» (linguistic meaning);
 = «something which has no specific content of its own, a washy or insipid matter» (metaphorical meaning).

Even words which typically do not possess any of the above types of meaning, may occasionally acquire it in the course of language evolution.

To summarize, the three types of meaning which I envisaged above, namely the index (i. e. the scientific-encyclopaedic meaning), the symbol (i.

e. the «pure» linguistic meaning) and the icon (i. e. the metaphorical meaning-image) constitute all necessary and sufficient characteristic features of the semantics of the word.

From a more practical point of view, this approach motivates the need for the creation of a Universal Dictionary (i. e. an Encyclopaedic and a Linguistic one), which results from and at the same time adequately represents the proper combination of the objective-scientific and the linguistic «picture of the world».

My work on an *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Bulgarian* (in print) applies this particular type of linguistic (lexicographic) modelling. The understanding of language as an organized system calls forth the need for constructing a model for the meaningful part of language, i. e. for its lexico-semantic system. This model can work by itself, i. e. by computer. Such an approach is best revealed through the basic principle which underlies mathematic modelling: an object can be shown to exist truly if and only if there is an algorithm for its description. In other words, in the field of lexicography we can demonstrate the adequacy of the theory by creating a particular model which may serve as the connecting pole between the ideal theory and the real object, i. e. the natural language.

It is well-known that in order for such a model to work, it has to have a finite number of units (no matter how great) and several simple arrangement rules. It is also clear that these units have to be structured in such a way as to create a sufficiently rigid system. The almost unlimited number of units in natural language and their complexity requires that they be artificially limited down to the core part of the lexico-semantic system so that the model can meet the necessary and sufficient requirements for preserving the specific properties of the object. This limitation derives from the two objective qualities of the description –its completeness and its detailed elaboration. At the same time, the heuristic power of the model, especially when it functions, may compensate for the disadvantages of this limitation. The model shows new regularities and new standard characteristic features of the object, despite the fact that lexical semantics is the most difficult field for modelling. As a first step towards building up of a model for the lexico-semantic field, I have constructed a *Minimal Semantics Dictionary* (Sofia 1990) which serves as a theoretical construct representative for the lexical system as a whole. On the handout you will find an illustration for the structural organization of the lexico-semantic fields in a network system which reveals the specific «picture of the world» in Bulgarian.

On the basis of this theoretical construct and following the same theoretical principles I have created an *Universal (linguistic-encyclopaedic) Dictionary* which comprises 10,000 units-lexical entries. The latter are organized into 80 terminological fields (with 45 subfields) taking into account the peculiarities of the respective scientific domain. Each of these terminological

fields contains only those terms which are necessary for the adequate representation of the respective scientific domain and are at the same time sufficient for the adequate representation of the encyclopaedic knowledge of the world. Each of these terms is defined and they are arranged in alphabetical order. Each lexical entry is divided into three parts – a terminological, a common linguistic and a metaphorical one. In the first part the entry is defined as a *terminus technicus*, in the second part it is defined with its everyday, naïvistic meaning and in the third part – with its metaphorical meaning (or the general, non-concrete meaning). As a result of this approach, every word becomes a cross-section of three semantic fields which are principally different from one another: *the terminological-taxonomic, the popular-linguistic and the associative-metaphoric* field. These fields are domains which belong to three principally different and co-existent «pictures of the world» in the natural language. The *scientific-encyclopaedic* picture presents the scientific knowledge of the current state of the world, perceived as objectively true. The *popular-linguistic* picture presents the common, naïve knowledge of the world which has been accumulated over the centuries and is socially significant for the present day. The *associative-metaphoric* picture is in fact a picture of the possible worlds in the domain of the imaginative, the poetic and the mythological.

Such a state of the art requires that the semantization and the respective definition of each lexical entry be made to follow each of these three «keys» in accordance with the three respective registers, because the terms, the regular linguistic meanings and the metaphorical figurative meanings enter different types of semantic relations with the respective meanings of the rest of the words-units of the lexico-semantic system.

The theories of interpretation in the «keys» of the different scientific paradigms, starting with the ones created by Aristotle and Porphyrius, going through those of the stoicists, Sextus Empiricus, St. Augustine, J. Locke, G. Leibniz, B. Spinoza, the French encyclopaedists (d'Alembert in particular) and including the philosophers of language, were reduced by U. Eco back to the well familiar dichotomy *Dictionary versus Encyclopaedia*. In doing that he represents the principles of semantization by means of the visual-metaphorical juxtaposition between Porphyrius's «*Tree*», and a «*Labyrinth*», arguing at length in favour of the second at the expense of the first.

A closer inspection of the practical problems of interpretation in dictionary definitions, however, suggests that such an indisputable prevalence of the «*Labyrinth*» type of semantization over the «*Tree*» one is hardly justifiable. In practice, both models are functional, but in different «registers» and –no matter how paradoxical it may seem– the relation between the two is quite contrary to the one offered by U. Eco.

It is exactly the «*Tree*» that acts as the appropriate model for defining the terminological meanings in the respective terminological fields (but not

for the linguistic ones in the dictionaries). The «*Labyrinth*» (of the Meander type), on the other hand, is characteristic of the semantization of the dictionary linguistic meanings in the lexical-semantic fields. The interpretation of the figurative and metaphorical meanings into associative fields brings to life yet another model –the «*Network*» (of the Rhizome type). The problem is that both in Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias we interpret not just words or terms, but complex sign units which (even when they appear as whole entry units) act as words (with everyday meanings), as terms (with terminological meanings), and as metaphors (with figurative meanings). The paradox lies in the very urge of lexicographers to introduce «*scientificity*» and «*encyclopaedicity*» in their dictionary definitions, and in the attempts of encyclopaedists to offer strict scientific definitions by using the words which are the means of expression in everyday speech. In other words, both the former and the latter try to present themselves not for what they are (by virtue of their own object of study), but for what they are short of being, due to lack of adequate means of interpretation. It is precisely this illusion (which Eco might define as «the illusion of the mirror») that the suggested Universal (combined) Dictionary-Encyclopaedia helps us overcome.

Thus, we really should imagine the semiotic «universe, i.e. the universe of human culture» (as defined by U. Eco) as a «*labyrinth of the third (Rhizome) type*». If, however, by the term *Culture*, represented by «a semantic encyclopaedia which exists as a *guiding idea*, rather than as a finished entity» we mean just «an actually possible isolation of a part of the social encyclopaedia insofar as such an isolation can prove useful for the interpretation of definite segments of real language communication (or texts)» (U. Eco, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*, 1984), excluding the spheres of science and the arts. In fact, this is exactly what d'Alembert suggests in his introduction to the French Encyclopaedia: «The general system of the sciences and the arts is a labyrinth, a meandering road, which the human spirit faces...»

So it turns out that, as regards the «*key*», the semantic universe can be represented as a «*Tree*» (when defining the terminological taxonomies), as a «*Labyrinth*» of the Meander type (in defining the «*purely linguistic*» lexical-semantic fields), or as a «*Labyrinth-Network*» of the Rhizome type (in the semantic representation of the associative fields of the metaphoric and figurative meanings). In reality, however, both the semantic universe, and the words –its «atoms»– are, by virtue of their versatile nature, all of the above three. For this reason, in order to achieve an adequate presentation we need such a Universal Dictionary, in which all these aspects are combined.

As a final conclusion, I would like once again emphasize the historical and the cultural character of the Encyclopaedia and the Dictionary. The Encyclopaedia on its own *differentia specifica* is a presentation of the history and the culture from a contemporary point of view. The linguistic semantics

of the Dictionary contains, transfers and represents the popular (every-day) «*Picture of the world*». Consequently, the combination of an *Encyclopaedia* and a *Dictionary* is a real *Cultural model* achieved by means of a specific type of lexicographic modelling of the semantic domain in order to arrive at a real structural representation of the culture as a whole. The best representation of such a semantic universe will be the *Multimedia Encyclopaedia-Dictionary*, which will present and demonstrate the real richness, the internal tension and the flexibility of the relationships and their variety in the organization of such a complex sign-system.