A Rhetoric
of Meanings

A Rhetoric of Meanings

Exploring the Frontiers of Language Usage

By

Gergana Apostolova

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

A Rhetoric of Meanings: Exploring the Frontiers of Language Usage

By Gergana Apostolova

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Intercultural Rhetoric
    1.1 Rhetoric as Intercultural Mediator
    1.2 Social Networking
    1.3 The Outlines of a Contemporary Intercultural Rhetoric
    1.4 Multilevel Intercultural Communication
    1.5 An Analytical Rhetorical Model
    1.6 Towards a General Rhetorical Matrix
    1.7 Cultural Matrix Data Character
    1.8 The Topics of Modern Cross Cultural Compatibility
    1.9 A Note on the State of Bulgarian Rhetorical Studies

The Nature of the Argumentative Approach
    2.1 Explain to Me
    2.2 When the World Suddenly Expanded
    2.3 Overview of the Argumentative Teaching Background
    2.4 The Nature of the Argumentative Approach

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

PREFACE

This book is about words, meanings and significances, mind structures, free play of choice of self-expression and virtual extensions of human existence in the years of transition from the single-mindedness of a reigning government-imposed ideology to the chaotic chains of nearest-survival individual reasoning. It is not the choice of words but the choice of meanings to be followed in our search for the significant things for our continued existence, both physical and mental; and it is sense that guides us in that incessant chain of choices where values that had served as the stolid grounds of our thinking had melted leaving us to a motivation of a generic type for the human nature.

Language is slow to register transition of that type if left alone.

Wordplay is like the photographed chain of all the stages of the jump of a cat through time and space: a word or a set of words jumps across time while the world has turned round, to find itself in another space; it jumps across space and finds itself in another time. Sets of meanings form, which need the choice of a human in order to get activated in each next situation of individual identification of a Self, a culture, a purpose or an activity to clear out or mask intricate connections in an intricate world.

Transition needs the stir of competing languages to find the clues for restructuring our brain structures to broader frontiers of our self-identification.

In the 1990s Bulgaria found itself in the beginning of a great turn that involved three generations at various stages of their outspoken mindsets. We jumped across a Wall of ideology starting from the netted discourse of a social pyramid made of human units of no individual significance to find ourselves in the WWW-generated agora of individuals free to use avatars in order to make our walled silence speak up in a multitude of voices.

We turned from Russian to English as our world-connecting vehicle of a second tongue, and this turn was carried out in the fast changing environment of Bulgarian public discourse.

It is curious that the Bulgarian tongue has one word for both "meaning" and "significance". That makes its meanings flash with the colors of cultural turn in each next communicative situation.

I was curious of how it happened that meanings became tuned by significances to ambiguity that did not interfere with situational usage but rather enriched it. The fascination with this play of language became the motivation and the main vehicle of this study.

I was also concerned with the cultural turn expressed in activated sets of meanings of Bulgarian and English for Bulgarians of all ages who were reconstructing their Self-identities to fit a set of worlds and survive. It has been a time of fixing mind structures in a long-lasting procedure of social and cultural transition and transcendence between traditional and virtual existence.

Consequently the heroes of this study are the learner, the teacher, the translator and the creator of text in the translingual search of our Bulgarian identity in the English speaking world.

The initial stage of this study was philosophy. It was not even philosophy of language but rather philosophy of existence where the Subject needed pragmatic and fast reconsideration of its identity.

That made the field of search broad enough to look for priorities and find a working method of study.

Then came the vast and colorful field of my object of study which is the extension of our language capacity for knowledge in the expressive wealth of English, first as extension of our competence and next as a broad set of performances to individual pragmatic purposes.

Consequently this book is not what is expected from philosophy of language to be. It is the practical field beyond philosophy of language where the self-identification of the Subject gets to practices of a higher stage of communicative creativity than a primary denotation of singular type. The stories of our present need all the meanings that the generations of transition have accumulated to feed our identities into the spaces of the talkative WWW and thus ensure our virtual survival as E-kind.

The Rhetorical Theory of Argumentation is seen as the relevant grounds for building a holistic tool of language learning where language acquisition is seen as capability of the Self to construct worlds in a universe whose leading structure involves the rhetoric criteria of ethos, pathos and logos on the one hand, and self-identifying choice of meanings to situations of complex nature, on the other.

It is then linguistics, rhetoric, semiotics of culture, ethics and language learning viewed through a philosophical concern about humanity next and getting beyond it to build its tools for making it visible today.

The product of our effort is a generation that speaks the same language as us but have their sets of meanings fixed up to their sets of significances. We have taught them so and today we have to teach ourselves in order to keep touch with them. The language creativity never ends for the play with meanings and significances is but inbuilt in our human nature.

Therefore the title of this book is not designed to sound unusual: it is the true signifier of the phenomenology of translingual activity that is brought up in the text to follow.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This page of acknowledgements is a duty I am obliged to fulfil paying tribute to the people who have added to my growth in research and have given me ideas and advice in personal conversation outside from what I have read in their books:

Bogdan Dyankov, **p.m.** a professor of logic and a member of the Bulgarian Academy of Science, who was my first official reviewer and guide into the public presentation of my PhD dissertation and further studies into the nature of the argument in natural language, and my first instructor into the vast field of semiotics;

Boris Chendov, a professor of logic whose colloquia on Mathematical Modelling and Formal Logic have gained international popularity, and on whose advice I still rely for there are but very rare people of such broad erudition and clear view of what is to be searched for next by philosophy, logic, social science, and social semiotics. The latest of his advice related to the present study focused my attention on the concept of *noosphere* developed by Vygotski and its relationship to the concept of *infosphere* which I have extrapolated here on the grounds of Luciano Floridi's development as *philosophy of the infosphere.*

Veliko Milutinovich, the head of the Mathematical faculty at Belgrade University and the initiator and head of a series of elite conferences IPSI/ViIPSI, who was my first international reviewer and supported my participation in three major conferences in 2005 and 2006 that modelled the search for my scientific identity which is now in progress;

Noam Chomsky, a professor emeritus at the Department of Linguistics and Philosophy at MIT, Cambridge, Mass., and a world celebrity, who somehow challenged me to cope with immense difficulties and whose support for my visit to his department opened vast horizons for me – and particularly for his wise and friendly advice that fixed me firmly on further holistic studies of language and mind;

Irina Perianova, a professor of English and Intercultural Studies, who always turns up at the most intriguing international conference discussions I happen to take part in, giving life to further enquiry and light to new information, and whose style of writing I am trying to follow now still being far from the elegance of her text;

Ivanka Mavrodieva, the initiator and Editor in chief of the first Bulgarian e-journal of rhetoric, the academic secretary of the council of SU and a member of the EU Association of rhetoric, who is always ready to listen to and share on any topic of modern rhetoric, never looking at her watch, and never leaving matter for a 'later period' even when at a distance of 2000 kilometres;

Plamen Bratanov, the first Bulgarian professor of PR who has systematized the existing theories and models of social communication in a series of books where I happen to occupy a separate chapter, and the head of a flexible training program for PR, who has always invited me in his team of lecturers at the UNWE and other universities this program has been adopted;

Valentina Alexandrova, a professor of finance and law at the SWU and my devoted team mate in futuristic scientific adventure, who believes in me more than I do, thus stimulating me to keep on with my projects based on this text but aiming further into the nature of E-kind.

Also, I shall mention my friend *Diana Milcheva*, who has been my first devoted editor of Bulgarian texts, and consultant about certain matter of probabilistic nature in Book 2.

Stanislav Grozdanov and Petar Dimkov, two of my latest students with whom I have discussed in detail empirical matter from their own experience and research corpuses, inspiring a further study into theory and literature, and giving additional ground for the present dissertation.

Special gratitude I owe to my family: Angel, Petar and Julian, and to all my students from the past 24 years. All of them took part in the design and application of my method of learning.

There are pages to be added to this list, but here I shall mention only two people more who supported me in personal exchange favouring me with some of their own time, and in whose books I have found precious knowledge: facts and approaches to tender matter: professor Ray Jackendoff and professor Tsvetan Davidkov.

We are studying a real object, the language faculty of the brain, which has assumed the form of a full I-language and is integrated into performance systems that play a role in articulation, interpretation, expression of beliefs and desires, referring, telling stories and so on. For such reasons, the topic is the study of human language.

—Noam Chomsky, New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind, CUP. 2005, p. 27

Three-dimensional worlds built through the use of computers and experienced with head-mounted displays allow for the sensations associated with touching and feeling objects to be replicated through sensors, gloves and acoustic and magnetic input devices. Yet, and this is the extraordinary thing, even with all the mediators and technologies that are used, imagescapes remain places that encourage direct, unmediated experiences. I would like to suggest that the reason these processes remain so powerful is because the nodes of interaction are varied enough that different people with different needs and perspectives will nevertheless find some place for themselves inside the heavily constructed spaces. This is largely because imagescapes have enough fluidity that meaning is never just a function of what is in images, what has been intended, or what has been constructed for the purposes of display. The combination of reverie, empathy, and the need to give meanings to sight encourages the process of visualization.

—Ron Burnett, How Images Think, MIT PRESS, Cambridge MA, 2005, p. 41

INTRODUCTION

When the Time machine inbuilt in us,
Accelerated the individual particles of our human Selves,
And the histoire collider of human cultures,
Rooted us out of former chaining routine,
We were set free on the move,
Bumping against no other wall but
The soft humming call of the inside micro cosmos
In adventurous star child talking the world into being,
Exploring the reaches of freedom and bondage:
The freedom to enjoy life; imprisoned in our formal bios.
The freedom to get out of history; imprisoned in our physical existence.
The freedom to create new worlds; imprisoned in our daily routine.
The longing for the lost future; imprisoned in the presence of our day.
The freedom to be a Mind, a Doer, a Risk-taker, a Creator;
Imprisoned in the She-form in a He-world. And vice versa.
The freedom to tell the truth;
Imprisoned in the habit of not being heard and given an answer.
The freedom to be an adventurer;
Imprisoned in an age of self-establishing.

Why 'Rhetoric of Meanings' or What the Formal Starting Grounds for This Study Are

The nature of this study might seem interdisciplinary while its prospective applications might look intercultural to the occasional reader of any part of the following text. Yet it is based on the careful study of the semiotics of the Bulgarian opening for the English speaking world in the beginning of this century with the only goal of reaching efficiency of our mental placement in the developing world in terms of our self-identification expressed in transcultural language productivity.

I have been trying to establish Bulgarian paradigms in both, Bulgarian attitudes to English and Bulgarian self-expression in English. This inevitably leads the search to answering two questions: *how* the transformation of our mental language structures is done and *why* is it happening. The aim of the search is connected with prognostics, which positions the question *what is to be done next* as the final goal of the study,

and the answer to that final *what* is grounded on the care for the Bulgarian transition to the new spaces of Earth culture so that our cultural existence gains its freedom of growth.

All this is sought for in the formative role of teaching an ethics of cultural, professional and individual survival concurrent with the English language learning efforts of two generations. The generation of the parents in the early 1990s needed fast transition to the significant contexts of a completely foreign culture, and the generation of their children needed a fast turn to the e-culture that followed the spread of computing and the growth of the WWW. Today, some 24 years from the historic border of the transition era, both goals still exist and still I cannot state that their pressing sharpness has softened, although it has changed.

I have approached the outlined set of questions as a philosopher and as a teacher of English. Consequently, the following study belongs to the field of Philosophy, which operates on the grounds of its methodology for transcending from and back to empirical data. I have used data whose significances for our cultural existence are related to a variety of practices. I have reached the idea that the results do not necessarily need to be generalized for the practical fields of their application. Therefore I needed only to summarize my philosophical approach, find out how and where it works and upon verification publish its development and expansion step by step and area by area.

Thus my main contribution is a philosophical method related to humanitarian studies and carried out through language as the means of expressing our cultural existential frontiers and identity. It is a procedure of transcendence from significances to meanings, which inevitably touch upon reconceptualization of priorities and need for a constructive practical application of activated translingual and transcultural communication tools.

Description of Hypothesis

Intercultural communication supported, guided, and limited by the ubiquitous web has created spaces for application of human texts into emerging contexts of fast changing environment concerning the existence of humanity. There are instances of language productivity based on the three '*I*': *I*nternet, *I*ntertext, and *I*nterculture. The uses of all texts ever written and saved in the web recesses have grown beyond the control of single human educators while the results in linguistic competence and performance have reached mean progress. We are rather skeptic about the future of humanity and still under the influence of pessimistic existential prognoses made round the turn of global cultures on the technology-

supported highway to mind-speaking-to-mind mode. Environment shifts, introducing its time-based shift of meanings. It is the time of texts and communication based on complex signs beyond the levels of language while still within the environment of pragmatics.

This reminds of a turn of the spiral of human development back into Antiquity where spoken culture produced rhetoric as the art of language performance for public purposes. Before entering the next turn supposedly leading to direct mind-to-mind speech we need to establish what happens to our minds at the present time of gigantic cultural turn. One part of humanity has played active role in starting this change. The greater part of humanity, though, forms the mass to be moved. Within this mass there are processes unplanned and influences to be further considered. Here is where I expect to find clues to *how* and *why meanings shift,* and go further to finding realistic answer to the questions *why do they shift this way and not some other way,* and *what could that eventually lead to?*

Since this shift is carried out within the WWW and the latter is the conscious product of cognitive science, which still needs motivation in its vast and fast changing practices, and is based on global talk, I presume that rhetoric analysis could be used as general approach to the study of meanings conveyed into the textures of global communication in a mother-tongue environment based on Bulgarian and *netted* inside the spaces of W*eblish or Netspeak* in the terms of Davis Crystal (Crystal 2008: 19).

We may also call it *Intercultural Rhetoric* in the broadest application of the concept *'intercultural'* and the narrower application of the concept of *'rhetoric'* as *t*he art and science of influencing the public mind through speech, which in itself is a specific state of the acting mind[1].

Intercultural Rhetoric is based on Intercultural Semiotics, marking the attitudes of the subjects of communication to the Signs through which they talk new worlds into being globe-over and time-over. The exploration of the *frontiers of our world* (in the terms of Wittgenstein) in the specifics of Bulgarian expression of the human I-language (in the terms of Chomsky 2005) is seen against the present state of *the state of knowledge* and its *antinomic transcendence* (in the terms of Kant) in the *infosphere* (in the terms of Floridi 1999) where humankind acquires its projected existence as *E-kind* (in my own terms).

The premises for using Intercultural Rhetorical Analysis as the starting ground for developing an approach of learning lie in a previous study of

---

[1]Although I follow the tradition of the Bulgarian school of rhetoric and am very close to Yordan Vedar's definition of rhetoric in his *Popular Rhetoric* (1984:4) and in the opening of his lectures on rhetoric later on published as *Fragments* (1992), I prefer to render the basic definition in my own words.

the nature of Rhetorical Argumentation and the finding that it is a procedure where synthetic thinking leads to constructive practices in both mental structures and physical action (Apostolova1990: PhD Dissertation *Logical and Methodological Grounds of Persuasive Discourse*).

I started to teach English 24 years ago: the approach I applied was open for further development for the field of ELT was new to me. I called my scientific method "Argumentative approach (AA) to learning". It combines metatheory, learning and teaching with the organization procedures of my own school for the teaching of English.

Today I can generalize this complex effort as a study of active language based on the Subjects of the translingual phenomenology of signs used by Bulgarians to communicate efficiently in English: the learner, the teacher, the translator and the creator of language phenomena. The application of the AA is where intercultural talk crosses bridges of meaning for pragmatic reasons based on shifting significances of common values, and this needs changes of mental structures for which we need a correspondent methodology that is aimed at preserving the efficiently functioning human brain in a multitude of communicative situations.

Objectives

Thus the objectives in the initial state of the present study formed a set of applied linguistic appearance and pragmatic nature:

1. Defining processes and procedures in language-use from the point of view of the science of rhetoric[2].
2. Finding reasons for the shifts of meanings to the uses of the same expression to fit a changing set of values.
3. Finding out the uses of texts for affecting such shifts.
4. Establishing the course of change.
5. Establishing its possible effects on Bulgarian culture.
6. Suggesting clues of how to make use of these effects.
7. Arguing on the value of human participation in further education of humans.

---

[2]The functioning of rhetoric as art, technique and a system of knowledge has produced numerous interrelated fields that are based on our present-day science. The core of turning rhetoric into a part of science is its Theory of argumentation, on which I have developed my doctoral studies and later on published as a monograph on Persuasive Discourse (Apostolova 2000: 13-30; 31-32; 53-80213-219); the latest explicit publication on the nature of Rhetoric is I. Mavrodieva's book Rhetoric and PR (2013: 11-55).

8.   Motivation of a next phase in human existential meanings.

It is evident that there are two stages in the development of this project: an analytical stage and a synthetic stage, which run coherent and concurrent in the basic moments of productive value.

The initial objectives only ask for answers that translate concepts across fields of knowledge (rhetoric, semantics, linguistics, ethics and ELT) and establish the tangible markers of the subject matter and its frontiers. The data collected is varied in its purpose, quality and form and its amount seems monstrous. Yet, it is all drawn from the same practice where phenomena occur and a teacher is expected to give them a motivation and a direction. This needs a synthetic theory, reconsidering realities and concepts, giving names to objects of composite nature and looking for an opening in the theory of prognostic value.

The secondary assessments of my objectives has led to the finalization of this book in its present form: a framework of a theory where the wealth of data is fixed in the effect-stage of its analysis to an intricate and incessantly moving maze of transcending concepts to the simple language appearance of today's discourse textures where meanings flash to a hierarchy of priorities. Transition generations see through time and make out the ambiguity of words. Meanings are activated simultaneously by story-telling. The same language appears to serve individual choice within community usage and in the pragmatics of the time. This is where I am prepared to search for the generative power of language: in recombination of verbal and non-verbal agents of meaning-shifts and in the play with meanings to the purpose of activating them multi-modally. There are bigger and smaller results, which appear as conclusions planned and conclusions unexpected. This makes the following text open. And it is to the best of applications of the AA.

Practical value of the study

Establishing the values of educating the next generation through texts in contextual change is based on the interferences of Bulgarian and English in the mental productivity of English language learners in Bulgaria. This statement concerns both traditional ELL practices and those based on the WWW environment and tools. It also has its history in the records of my teaching experience ever since 1990 and it also refers to each next current moment of our fast-changing environment where we have to *run very fast in order to remain in the same place* (as Lewis Carroll's Red

Queen tells Alice while they are walking in the garden of speaking flowers[3]) of social significance.

Principles of investigation

The search into the *mental* grounds of rhetorical *choice of meaning* based on the unity of *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* adopts a *holistic approach* to our object of study where the extraordinary is pursued, not the average even when cultural features are in view. The outlines of *uniqueness* stand up against the background of statistics that describe the common, the regular, and the habitual. The difference is in our methodology allowing us to see things in a different perspective and notice features that might serve as keys to exits from our problem circles.

Therefore the two basic principles guiding the search for the unique, the absurd, and the individual, as the features of creativity allowing further existence are:

> *There is nothing new under the sun;*
> *The sun is every day new.*

Antinomies here are not necessarily understood as dichotomy: there are steps and stages, blind ends and turns. In that the guiding role is given to practical efficiency where philosophy is seen as the reaching of the frontiers of a teacher's skills in leading the young minds through time-bound and space-bound cultures.

Practice is varied. Consequently, a theory that tries to describe and explain only can easily fall into ecclectics. This is one more reason to turn to the field of Rhetoric and choose it as my starting grounds: it has the valuable feature of prescriptivism, but it combines it with the powerful tools of activating speech to efficiency or leading to the nearest working practical change.

Thus we arrive at the third principle I am going to follow*: the principle of the nearest explanation of gathered data* concerning its fluctuating time-and-space environment. My generation has been the eye-witness of changes that are to be inevitably lost in time. Our motivation for taking one or another action is to fade in future losing its circumstantial significances and the meanings following them. We have been trained to look for the objective processes, yet, the individual actions are those which

---

[3] Since this is a study of rhetoric, I feel bound to use or rather demonstrate the efficiency of the tools of rhetoric employed in my own text to the purposes of building my contexts of choice.

would lead us to the answers of *how* changes happened. Interpretations next are outside the scope of this particular text, although it suggests further enquiries.

Methods of investigation

This is a teacher's study and its nearest goals are education and demonstration. The methods of study then form a set which in its application serves to the purposes of AA constructivism:

Educationalist approach starting from the traditional grounds of theory each time in order to outline the association chains of achieving the concept to be introduced.

Analysis based on relevant application of induction and deduction but not explicated here otherwise than in its finalizing stage;

Definition and *classification* of events, processes and facts;

SIAN[4]: Systematic Integrated Approach to the Net;

AA[5]: Verification in two-step educational practices of *argumentation* through *motivation*, and building *awareness* through heaping database.

Nowadays it is clear that it was not the invention of nuclear bombs, nor the escalation in war supplies and technology that has conquered the world, but the binding of the globe into the talking web where language is the tool, the environment and the measure for an individual's freedom and responsibility for the future survival of humanity. It is all in *language and some other less important things* (Chomsky: 2007)[6].

Teacher-centered classroom methodology of the mental experiment carried out within the AA practices: the East gives the leading role to the teacher while the West gives the right of choice to the learner. These two enter into an AA-based matrix where each next step into the English-based knowledge about a changing world is negotiated, while the teacher remains the key figure in an incessant learning process.

---

[4] SIAN (Systematic Integrated Approach to the Net), I first introduced it in a VIP conference presentation in Venice, 2005

[5] AA (Argumentative Approach) – my first presentation of a rhetoric matrix based on the contents of Aristotle's rhetoric and the matrix of Kelly and Tibault for psychographic study was at a conference of Logic and Modelling in 1992 in Blagoevgrad, but I presented it in reference to ELT in 1993 to the conferences of IATEFL and in my first collections of practical exercises Reading Comprehension, Blgrd, 1993 and The Composition, Blgrd, 1993

[6] This is the title of a lecture by Chomsky in the fall semester of 2007 at MIT.

Structure

The text of the study is organized in three Books, each of them designed in the fashion of a level of a mind play that are to be completed by the four Subjects of the study: the learner, the teacher, the mediator of cultures and the author. It is not to the fashion of scientific discourse today but it is to the purpose and method of the study itself which gets beyond the field of philosophy to its secondary reactivated status of pragmatics.

Book I *Argumenting the Method* is divided in two chapters introducing the complex concept of intercultural analytical rhetoric as the background for developing a method for approaching the intercultural situation of semiosis, and a description of the beginnings, the development and the nature of the Argumentative approach to learning as a successful restructuring of cross-cultural mental structures avoiding cultural shock.

Book II *Rhetoric and Cultural Significances* is based on the extended and revised text of a multilevel research published in 2010 in a concise fashion and reader-addressed order as a monograph under the title *Cultures and Texts* and employing *SIAN*[7].

Book III *Re-conceptualised Existence-based Language Practices* presents the effects of AA in some applications of the modernized rhetorical theory as a pragmatic continuation of the theory of meanings in the intercourse of cultures to certain linguistic matters. This book consists of five chapters which have been developed as a result of revisited theory and its practical application to the lectures in the linguistics auditorium of my current teaching practice.

A fast-changing approach to language uses, texts, literature and interpersonal communication, based on e-communication practices, is setting challenges to rhetoric and that leads to rethinking of linguistic matter. The latter matters only when involved in the texture of a story or as I would call it further in an 'active text'. A text is activated when involved in particularly employed discourse; and discourse is seen as the communicative value of the text in a socially significant situation. To put an end to a host of choicy definitions rooted in mountains of theoretical investigations and debate in the complex field of rhetoric and all the related theories (Mavrodieva 2013:38-49), I shall focus on the uses of the English-based texts as culture formative agents whose effect on the learning mind is of dynamic nature.

---

[7] See Apostolova, G. Cultures and Texts. Internet. Intertext. Interculture. SWU PRESS, 2010

In a comparative context the general rhetorical matrix[8] has proven quite useful to certain areas of cross cultural understanding based on differences in language practices and linguistic explanation.

Style

I am too much involved with the study of rhetoric to neglect it as a combined tool for designing a text. Therefore I shall use it to my best performance for *eloqutio* in the AA fashion. Every singular attempt to speak up and talk the next world into being is a matter of rhetoric where we give the performance of our own lives: we are the creators of a universe, the Subjects of investigation, the heroes of text, and the center of a galaxy. That is why poetry is used in motto to start up the inspiration. The quotes are marked, and the unmarked pieces are mine.

The following text will be fixed on rhetoric and therefore is bound to employ the τεχηνε of rhetoric in an attempt to manifest both its power as a science and its beauty as an art.

The language and cultural environment for writing this book is Bulgaria. Consequently, I use the Bulgarian tongue (or I-language) to reconstruct Bulgarian cultural phenomena in English. Sometimes I have to invent words and terms to my reconstructed concepts and to my choice given as explanation.

Although this text is based on a thousand of studied theories, I use them as matter of inspiration to go further and as examples to follow. I happen to agree with some theories and say so in my text. I happen, more often, to like an aspect of the quoted theory that fits to my purpose. In no way does this oblige the author of the reference to look for their concepts: I bear the singular responsibility for employing them for furnishing my construction with objects of common value. In my spatial mental picture other people's theories touch upon, support, mark, and emphasize a multi-dimensional construction without breaking their own structure or purpose.

This is a polyphonic text of secondary type (trying to bridge primary theories in setting up practices), open for development and bound as a singular construction by the AA. Being of composite nature, it employs all the registers of academic discourse from high standard to professional standard to jargon where borrowed terms acquire adopted and integrated sounding (Popova 2013) and the author is not insured against ambivalency and popular misuse nor is the interference of tongues avoided.

---

[8] General Rhetoric Matrix, based on Aristotle's Rhetoric was first developed in 1992 in an unpublished Conference report, first published in Apostolova 1993: 14.

The Use of Terminology

There are two aspects to the question of terminology to clear in the beginning of this work. The first aspect is connected with the interdisciplinary nature of the study. There are four basic theoretical fields involved and a couple more touched upon while exploring the phenomenology of the agent of interlingual action: 1) philosophy of language, 2) rhetoric, 3) philosophy of the infosphere and theories about the WWW, and 4) applied linguistics in its varied appearances as approaches to and methods of language teaching and learning. A classroom is an open space, where clear fields of knowledge do not work isolated. It is the space where philosophy acts in its essential role as the mother of all knowledge.

The second aspect of the present study is its exploration of the frontiers of human creativity, expressed in language phenomena. This needs a change in the volume and contents of concepts, which need renaming. I use quite a number of coined names and a number of established denotates of categories and scientific terms whose frontiers are fluctuating or changed to fit the constructive character of this study. Therefore I do not use them as terms nor do I dare call them 'categories' or even 'denotates'. I prefer using at this stage them as 'names' to signify that it is a procedure of reconceptualization.

The described attitude to terms is not confusing since I have defined their meanings to the purposes of this theory. Besides, they are coherent with the style where figures of language, figures of rhetoric and figures of mind (Murphy 1974: 21) are used in their richness of associative meanings but, again to the purposes of this theory. All questions that might arise from the specific contents of predominantly archetypal structural and semantic calques (Alexiev 2013, 2014; Popova 2013:21-22, 23) are grounded on the individual predefined experience of the reader who might turn helpful in contributing to this open theory. In harmony with the accepted style, terms have been used to the purpose of efficiency of synthesis following *conceptual, pragmatic and lexical* criteria of application and *integration* within the following theory. There are also the numerous cases of translating of one theory into the terms of another e.g. rhetoric into applied linguistics and applied cultural study.

A Note on I-Language

I admit I was challenged and further tempted into the exploration of diversity of meanings growing out of sheer rhetorical criteria such as *ethos*,

pathos and *logos*, and given significance by means of individual choice by the idea of Chomsky about I-language. In its turn it was derived as an opposition to Frege's understanding of *shared* or *public language* and *public meanings* (1995: 30, 33). The unanswered question of HOW pointed out by Neil Smith in the Foreword of *The Minimalist Program* (1995: ix–*how we put that competence (to use the term now replaced by I-language) to use in our performance is still largely a closed book, perhaps a mystery*) played a key role in my exploration of the I-language as the generative basis for human communication (*Mentalese* or *lingua mentis* as Hilary Putnam calls it Ibid.:185)

HOW is the question of science. The question a philosopher asks in such cases is WHY. I found myself in a vacuum between the HOW and the WHY and in a pressing need for a method (in the terms of philosophy) of synthetic nature. The answers to these two questions inevitably lead to the metatheory of I-language *embedded in performance systems, which access the generative procedure* of *'internal,' 'individual,'* and *'intensional'* nature (Chomsky 1995: 15-17).

The following text is focused on *I-language as a component of the mind/brain* (Chomsky 1995: 132) and not on external constraints or structures, or, to put it in a simpler way: I am concerned with the fillers of language matrices that can be changed to a purpose to embed different meaning. That is the area of human generative capacity based in language as the container of mindstructures, forms and knowledge procedures.

In this line Rhetoric is not viewed by external structure analysis because its forms are of synthetic nature involving features from the standard levels of activated within a communicative situation performance. This has lead me to the idea of using it as the fundament E-language for producing a synthetic approach. Based on previous analyses of the rhetorical instrumentaria, I assumed that there could be a second level of I-linguistics where the units or expressions have a complex or secondary nature. Rhetorical figures have deep roots in ancient languages and expressions that are easily reproduced in any language. Turning to the cognitive capacity of rhetorical theory, and the broadened practices of virtual rhetoric, the next step is to view I-language as internal to the virtual space again not in its computational structures but as a display of internal, individual and intensional features of the language-using mind.

It is again Chomsky who gives the idea of integrated form of the full I-language into performance systems:

The I-language is a (narrowly described) property of the brain, a relatively stable element of transitory states of the language faculty. Each linguistic expression (SD) generated by the I-language includes instructions for

performance systems in which the I-language is embedded. It is ony by virtue of its integration into such performance systems that this brain state qualifies as language. Some other organism might, in principle, have the same I-language (brain state) as Peter, but embedded in performance systems that use it for locomotion. We are studying a real object, the language faculty of the brain, which has assumed the form of a full I-language and is integrated into performance systems that play a role in articulation, interpretation, expression of beliefs and desires, referring, telling stories and so on. For such reasons, the topic is the study of human language. (Chomsky 2000:27).

The other concepts related to the starting grounds of this study are: *I-sound, I-meaning* (Ibid. 170), and *I-sense* seen as a *misuse* of   *I-language, involved in behaviour* (Ibid. 70). I also accept the statement that *successful communication... does not entail the existence of shared meanings* (Ibid. 30). In the following text I do not tend to overuse these terms, though, for I need expressions that correspond with the singularity of I-language in the interlingual phenomenology of performance in the two *tongues* Bulgarian and English.

The object of my interest next is I-language seen also as a capacity of generating SDs of higher level of synthesis where performance extends beyond the standard theory of language and is concerned with all modes of meaning and intermodal translation. The topic continues to be human language. It is the viewpoint that is changed and the first complex tools to do the study at a hygher level of synthesis are the synthetic approaches that facilitate the exchange between HOW brain structures get involved in performance and Why.

What Is So Special About the Bulgarian Case?

A language can be seen as a time-machine which registers the cultural crosspoints and influences on its codification, reconceptualization, spread and growth, and productivity. Bulgarian contains layers of cultural influences, all bound with temporal values and signifying political, economic and environmental practices all leading to the physical and mental survival of our culture.

The period between 1990 and 2014 has the strength of concussion concerning our existential-bound language structures. The change of our knowledge of the world and of our individual positioning in it needed expansion of our tongue.

As it is occurs in our current cultural practices Bulgarian translingual upgrading has two generative aspects of contradicting nature: it is very

careful about the preservation of Bulgarian mentality and self-identification in specifics of language units from all the levels of language. At the same time it is open to the pragmatic imperatives of an age and adopts forms, methods, structures and terminology which allow its updating in fast and efficient ways without the pains of immediate translation. We are open to learning languages and using them on all the possible levels of cultural exchange and practical efficiency.

These two aspects are activated in our attitudes to transition in a series of translingual phenomena: the translation of Bulgarian texts into English is often reffered to as impossible to the full sounding of the target text (Vlahov & Florin 1969) because of "untranslatable" realia. This has two additional effects: 1) the growth of both translation theory and practice concerning human translation, and 2) the extensive growth of the number of bilingual Bulgarian writers who write in both Bulgarian and English (A. Dimova, G. Gospodinov, Z. Eftimova, M. Marinov etc.) and use compatible language structures and translatable images.

Another feature of today's Bulgarian is its enlarging terminological dictionary (M. Popova Op.cit.) which influences the uses of Bulgarian on its phonological, onomatopoeic, lexico-semantic, syntactic and textual levels in terms of its broadening discursivity. Bulgarian linguistics is reconsidering this expansion of our mother tongue while paying tribute to the non-standard uses of Bulgarian. We are still rather conservative in sharing classical Bulgarian texts in modern adaptations while at the same time we are filling in the world web spaces with our self-identification and cultural identification expressed in writing and speech.

The third feature to our transition to unacknowledged globality of our language mentality is concerned with the learning and teaching of English again expressed in two outlined tendencies: 1) using well-known methods and approaches with very little adaptation to the purpose of fast and efficient acquisition of the target level and type of English needed by the learners; 2) inventing our own approaches and methods of learning and teaching to the purpose of keeping our cognitive structures intact and saving our individuality, Bulgarian identification and efficiency as professional people in an English-speaking global environment where English is seen as an extension of our tongue aiding the understanding of other languages, cultures and professional communities.

The adaptability and flexibility of our transcultural uses of Bulgarian has led to its neglect as an object of transcultural display and Bulgarian linguistics still keeps closed database that is very slowly opening to the network of global linguistics. In other words, the world does not know much about the Bulgarian tongue in its wealth of embedded cultural codes

of expressing in a pragmatically efficient, and even eclectic ways the turns of existentially sound mindstructure.

Bulgarian is culturally environmental language: its concepts serve immediate survival in a circumstantially-dominated situation. We do not have our philosophical or scientific texts of importance and do not have the terminology invented to such purposes. Users' culture, though, has its own paths of creativity in adapting, combination and expanding the meanings to a word or a structure. In the mixture of previous environmental meanings with current constructions of significance Bulgarian metaphors occur in all their ambiguity to form a secondary complex level of usage in both narrative and scientific discourse.

The enlarging gap between temporally distant generation-based uses of language and choice of meanings for the same expression within a globally pointed usage thus has led to the accumulation of complex language structures of specific transition nature. We still have the complete command of previous standard, enriched with the freedom to use non-standard speech of all types of sociolect, expanding towards present-day interlingual uses of Bulgarian and the fascinating freedom of choice in constructing our idiolect as a display of our singularity. It is important to mention the educational role of the Bulgarian language studies based on the one hand on the changing information and values within the meanings of our lexical units, and, on the other hand, on the onomastics, or the personal name sounding where the cultural pattern is analysed in its dynamics (e.g. Stoilov 2011, 2010, 2005).

The E-orality of the WWW as a *melting pot* (Perianova 2006) for culturally diverse communities has also mixed the dialects of different Bulgarian regions and one and the same user of Bulgarian can construct non-standard speech from previously incompatible elements.

Bulgarian linguistics today is based on numerous studies in the fields of onomatopoeia, phraseology, terminology, borrowings, expanding ranges of sociolect and typology of discourse trying to establish tendencies into a next standard. Applied linguistic studies touch upon the related fields of language education policies, sociolinguistics, logopedia, pragmatics, methods of language teaching and the teaching of human translators. Philology has enormous corpus of analytical studies of Bulgarian texts in historical, comparative and profiled databases. There seems to arise a need for a constructive approach for assessment of the singularity of our tongue in terms of cultural survival through a period of intensive change and in relation with current philosophy of existence and projection of humanity to the virtual spaces of E-culture or its transfer from humankind into E-kind.