

Bulgarian norm of words associations for color terms

MONY E. ALMALECH

Institute for Bulgarian Language – Sofia (Bulgaria)

Thirty Bulgarian words were presented in list as stimulus in an association to test 100 native speakers.

These thirty words are excerpt of the full list of Kent-Rosanoff's stimulus words.

The goal is to research the features of Bulgarian norm of word associations for color terms. That is the reason why all color terms from the list of Kent-Rosanoff's are presented within our thirty stimulus words.

The responses from our research of 1996 are compared to the responses from 1984 publications of Bulgarian Norms of Word Associations (Gerganov, 1984).

Our conclusions are:

I. The first word-response is mainly connected to the Prototype of Color: FLAME/FIRE or BLOOD – for RED; different PLANTS – for GREEN; SKY or SEA – for BLUE; SUN – for YELLOW; SNOW or MILK – for WHITE; NIGHT or DARKNESS – for BLACK. The objects, which are prototypes are wellknown by E. Rosch's publications (Rosch et al, 1976).

II. The STRUCTURE of Bulgarian Norm of Associations for Color Terms is:

3. KERNEL part, consists of the set of responses, which are absolutely the same as in 1982.
4. NUCLEAR part, consists of the responses, which are different nominal representations of reference area; KINDLINESS – POLITENESS.
5. PERIPHERY of the norm, which consists of words, that difer in form and semantics – SOLDIER – SALARY as associations of RED.

This structure is result of comparative approach on data from 1984 and 1996.

III. In the frame of the structure, mentioned above, there are cultured associations or metaphorical semantisations. Some of them are: for RED – *anger, love, hunt*; for GREEN – *calm, calmness, immature*; for BLUE – *free, freedom*; for BLACK – *tears, funeral, greef*; for WHITE – *pure, immaculate*.

I want to give some details on points II and III.

Concerning point II

The kernel, nuclear and peripheral parts of the structure of the word associations for colors;

At the kernel and nuclear parts of the norm very often there are words for the most specific features of the prototypes – *hot, hotness, warm* for RED and for YELLOW; *light, cool and coolness* for BLACK and *wide, expanse* for BLUE; *fresh, freshness, unripe* for GREEN.

Concerning point III.

In the kernel and two other parts of the norm there are a lot of responses, which are metaphorical semantisations of the prototypes and the colors by themselves. Such are *love, anger, death, passion*, for RED; *calm, calmness, rest, resting, tired, life, immature* for GREEN; *happy, marry, bad, crazy, jew, mature*, for YELLOW; *clean, pure, immaculate, light, honest, good, bride, veil, God* for White; *devil, bad, lie, dirty, unclean, unpure, grave, funeral, tears, sorrow, unhappy, darkness* for BLACK.

This kind of word associations are normative metaphorical semantisations of the colors. These meanings are cultured associations.

When we look at the literature, the problem that arises is: Do the normative metaphorical semantisations are used, and usefully by the writers?

What I found is, that most of kernel, nuclear and peripheral word associations are used by the Bulgarian writers. The norm of Bulgarian word associations for colors is used as common language between the writer and the reader. This common color language works at the level and at the field of subconscious.

We can speak for color language, which has the function to be common writer and the reader.

In the literature can happen even more – the color characteristics of a personage, by the help of that common color language, repeat the information for the same personage, given by the text.

Trying to prove this hypothesis, I tested the color characteristics of the personages by the Color Test of Lusher. This test is well-known in the psychology. The result was positive, i.e. the color language, with different meanings of the colors, repeats the information by the text at the level of subconscious.

In the literature the color language includes normative as well non-normative associations of the colors.

Normative and non-normative word associations represent the case, when different meanings of the colors are perceived by the acoustical signs of the natural language.

It will be very interesting, if there are some small number of meanings of the colors, which are the same, in case that the color is perceived by visual perception. Such case is the ritual meanings of the colors. You can find the ritual meanings of the colors in my book «BALKAN FOLK COLOUR LANGUAGE» (Almalech, 1996). This book is the result of my two years work on the project «Semantics of the Colors» at Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The areas where I research the meanings of the colors in this book is the Balkan Folklore and the Secret Mystic-Religious Knowledge (Jewish Cabbalah and Islam).

Finally, comparing the metaphorical and other semantisations of the colors in the natural language to the meanings of the colors in the folklore and the secret mystic-religious knowledge, I can describe small number of universal, archetype meanings of the colors. Such as: «hot», «aggression», «fire», «flame», «death», «blood» – for RED; «hope», «cool», «water», «fresh», «life», – for GREEN; «pure», «Immaculate», «veil», «God», «light», «death» – for WHITE; «bad», «secret», «night», «death», «funeral», «sorrow» – for BLACK.

These universal meanings of the colors are getting through different perception, at different times, among different peoples, with different religion.

To prove such affirmation I used numerous empirical facts from word associations, literature texts, Balkan Folklore, Islam and Jewish Cabbalah, and quite an amount of researches of many authors.

Someone can use that result for different goals – theoretical, practical, for application in some fields.

REFERENCES

- Almalech, M. 1996. *Balkan Folk Colour Language*, Sofia, St. Kliment Ohridski University, Press, 151 p.
Gerganov, E. 1984. *Bulgarian Norms for Word Association* «Nauka I Iskustvo, Sofia, 180 p. In Bulgarian.
Rosch, et al 1976. Basic Object in Natural Categories. *In Cognitive Psychology*, 8, 382-439.