

Introduction

Recently we have been able to observe a tendency to reattach Andy Warhol to his Slavic roots (a notable example being Herbenick 1987). It is the aim of this book to analyse the linguistic picture of popular culture in the written works by the godfather of pop art, to present its selective, multi-layered, axiological, contextual and dynamic character. The methodology of the linguistic picture of the world, developed by the Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin scholars, has been often applied for analysing the folk picture of the world of areas culturally close Andy Warhol's roots. It was but one of the reasons why it seemed apposite to apply these tools while interpreting the linguistic picture of the world of the works written (or co-authored) by one of the most prominent artists of the new folk culture, the culture of the global village.

On the theoretical plane, emphasis was placed on the problem of linguistic worldview, a picture of the world suggested or imposed by language, but it is the hope of this author that the outcome of the present study of Warhol's linguistic world view could also be seen as a humble attempt at contributing to the study of the elaborate systems of mechanisms operating between language and reality.

The above mentioned methodology developed by Bartmiński and his fellow ethnolinguists in Lublin should be seen as a continuation of the semiotic thought of such 20th century structuralists and post-structuralists as Ferdinand de Saussure, Charles Sanders Peirce, Charles William Morris, Mikhail Bakhtin, Algirdas Greimas, Roland Barthes, Yuri Lotman, Christian Metz, Roman Jakobson, Louis Hjelmslev, Umberto Eco and Julia Kristeva to name only a few. The examples of the Prague School of Linguistics and Semiotics or the Copenhagen School show that the ties between early European semiotics and structuralism were really strong. Other major structuralists include the recently deceased anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, who considered his subject to be a branch of semiotics, and psychoanalyst and psychiatrist Jacques Lacan. All of them engaged in a search for 'deep structures' underlying the 'surface features' of phenomena and it is the main objective of this research to do so with reference to elements of the linguistic picture of popular culture as described by Warhol.

The analysis of the linguistic picture of the world of Andy Warhol's selected written works, which is presented in Chapter 4, is based on the cognitive structure derived from the SACRED—PROFANE and CHAOS—COSMOS oppositions (cf. Kajfosz 2009, 157–158). One of the key hypotheses of the analysis is that the linguistic picture of the world presented in Warhol's works has a basis the POP IS RELIGION metaphor, with conclusions formulated in Chapter 5.

1. Between reality and the system of language: an overview of the past and present trends in semiotic studies

1.1. The forefathers of structuralism and cultural studies

As I remarked in the Introduction, modern semiotics is closely related to structuralism, which Barthes once defined as a way of analysing cultural artefacts that originates in the methods of linguistics (cf. Barthes [1964] 1983). It follows that while ‘semiotics’ denotes a field of study, ‘structuralism’ will constitute a method of analysis which is frequently applied in semiotic research.

1.1.1. Giambattista Vico and the ‘poetic’ savage

Even though I have already declared Saussure and Peirce as the originators of modern semiotics it seems that the understanding of the roots of the 20th century structuralism requires at least some insight into the written heritage of Giambattista Vico, whose work *New Science* ([1725] 1984) is considered a milestone of modern social theory. Vico sought to prove that human beings are structuralists by nature and he envisaged a ‘science’ of human society, or ‘physics of man’, which would be modelled on the renaissance-era ‘natural’ science of the likes of Galileo, Bacon and Newton.

Vico’s basic assumption was that it is by all means wrong to regard so-called ‘primitive’ man as ‘childishly ignorant’ and ‘barbaric’, as was often the case in the history of the ‘western’ civilisation but, on the contrary, we should appreciate his instinctively ‘poetic’ approach and his inherent *sapientia poetica*. This kind of knowledge informs his responses to his environment results in forming of a ‘metaphysics’ of metaphor, symbol and myth. According to Vico the accounts of creation and the foundation of social institutions that occur in early societies were not intended to be taken literally and their function was ultimately cognitive. They should by no means be interpreted as ‘lies’ about the facts, but rather as mature and sophisticated ways of knowing, encoding and presenting them. He constates that the first science to be learned should be mythology which he describes as ‘interpretation of fables’ (cf. Hawkes 2003, 1–5).

Myths are rooted in the actual generalized experience of ancient peoples and result from attempting to impose a graspable and humanizing shape on it, which springs from the human mind itself, and it becomes the shape of the world that that mind perceives as ‘natural’, ‘given’ or ‘true’. Vico believes that all human beings, regardless of their nationality, are equipped with ‘mental language’ which manifests itself as man’s universal capacity not only to formulate structures, but also to submit his own nature to the demands of their structuring. The gift of *sapientia poetica* should be understood as the ‘gift of structuralism’ (cf. Hawkes 2003, 1–5).

1.1.2. Sinn and Bedeutung: Gottlob Frege

Friedrich Ludwig Gottlob Frege’s greatest achievement, from the point of view of semiotics, is the discovery that in addition to having a *Bedeutung* which could be translated as *denotation* or *reference* (and, as Eco pointed out [1979, 59–62], must not be understood as synonymous with a *referent*), names and descriptions also have a *Sinn* (*sense*). The sense of an expression is related to its cognitive significance – it is the way by which the denotation of the term is perceived. If we analyse the expressions ‘4’ and ‘8/2’, they turn out to have the same denotation. However, as they express different ways of conceiving the same number, they have different senses. Another widely cited example is that of ‘the morning star’ and ‘the evening star’ which both denote the same planet Venus, but express different ways of conceiving of Venus so they have different senses. The distinction between *Sinn* and *Bedeutung* can also be explained in a different manner – if we take the name ‘Unicorn’ and the description ‘the most powerful Greek god’, they both have a culturally determined sense, but neither has a denotation. The names ‘Mark Twain’ and ‘Samuel Clemens’ denote the same person but they express two different senses (cf. Zalata 2004, 36). Frege was also concerned with the pragmatics of deictic expressions. For instance he studied those situations in which different expressions are used for the same thought depending on the time when they were uttered. We may refer to the same day using different deictic forms form as what is TODAY today will be YESTERDAY tomorrow. So even though we refer to the same idea, the sense of the expression is different. The same is true in the case of ‘here’ and ‘there’. He also pointed out that it is impossible to understand the full meaning without the knowledge of the context of the utterance (Frege [1892] 1967, 24).

1.1.3. Jean Piaget and his definition of structure

While Vico's main objective was to present all men as structuralists, Swiss philosopher and natural scientist Jean Piaget set to define *structure*. In his definition the functioning of structure depends on three fundamental ideas, i.e.: (1) the idea of wholeness, (2) the idea of transformation, and (3) the idea of self-regulation. Wholeness refers to the sense of internal coherence. The constituent parts of a structure conform to a set of intrinsic laws which determine its nature and theirs. Because of these laws structure is substantially different from an aggregate: its constituent parts cannot exist outside the structure in the same form that they do within it. Structure is not static. The laws which govern it act so as to make it not only structured, but structuring. Thus, in order to avoid reduction to the level merely of passive form, the structure must be capable of transformational procedures, whereby new material is constantly processed by and through it. So language, a basic human structure, is capable of transforming various fundamental sentences into the widest variety of new utterances while retaining these within its own particular structure (cf. Hawkes 2006, 5). Finally, the structure is self-regulating in the sense that it makes no appeals beyond itself in order to validate its transformational procedures. The transformations act to maintain and underwrite the intrinsic laws which bring them about, and to 'seal off' the system from reference to other systems. A language does not construct its formations of words by reference to the patterns of 'reality', but on the basis of its own internal and self-sufficient rules. The word 'dog' exists, and functions within the structure of the English language, without reference to any four-legged barking creature's real existence. The word's behaviour derives from its inherent structural status as a noun rather than its referent's actual status as an animal. Structures are characteristically 'closed' in this way (cf. Hawkes 2006, 5–6). So it might be concluded that structuralism is a way of thinking about the world which is concerned with the perception and description of structures of which it is made up. Structural thinking requires the realisation that the world does not consist of independently existing objects, whose concrete features can be perceived clearly and individually, and whose nature can be classified accordingly (cf. Hawkes 2006, 6).

1.1.4. Ernst Cassirer's philosophy of culture

Ernst Cassirer is famous for developing philosophy of culture based on a theory of symbols. His philosophy bridges two main directions in twentieth-century philosophy, that is 'analytic' philosophy rooted in Russell, Frege and Wittgenstein and the 'continental' philosophy rooted in the irrationalism of Kierkegaard and