

РОЗДІЛ 6 ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 81'255

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2024.33.1.26>

PRINCIPLES OF COGNITIVE MODELLING OF INTERSEMIOTIC TRANSLATION OF A LITERARY TEXT

ПРИНЦИПИ КОГНІТИВНОГО МОДЕЛЮВАННЯ ІНТЕРСЕМІОТИЧНОГО ПЕРЕКЛАДУ ХУДОЖНЬОГО ТЕКСТУ

Holubenko N.I.,
orcid.org/0000-0002-4850-721X
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Lecturer at the Department of Languages and Literature
Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic,
Associate Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of English Translation
Kyiv National Linguistic University

In the article the main methodological principles of cognitive and semiotic modelling of a literary intersemiotic translation are highlighted. The semiotic model of translation is viewed as a construct/scheme for reproducing the meaning, representing a certain segment of the world through the signs of the recipient's language. The most complex element of this model is the cognitive-semiotic reproduction of modality, both of the whole original text and its fragments with modal meanings through signs of another linguoculture. Particular attention is paid to the conceptualization of translation in semiotics by researchers E. Kourdis and M. Zafiri, who approach this from the perspective of language teaching when discussing cognitive-semiotic translation. The sense and meaning of a literary text are realized and amplified through continual translation processes. We state in this investigation that literary texts incorporate language in conjunction with other semiotic resources, such as images, descriptions of playing musical instruments, singing, various environmental sounds, colors, etc. These are the modalities that express the deontic, epistemic, and axiological modalities of the text. This indicates that every text is inherently multimodal as a result of the configuration of various semiotic modes within its modal framework. From this perspective, the semiotic model of translation is both a process and a result of transferring meaning between two languages through the translation of signs into signs. In the analyzed literary texts various sign systems are present, ranging from universal cultural codes to their national symbols. Accordingly, the author's modality as a cognitive-semiotic construct in the translation process must be reproduced by comparing signs of different semiotic systems and their adequate construction by another language system.

Kew words: literary text, multimodal text, sign, intersemiotic translation, translation strategies and tactics.

У статті обговорюються основні методологічні принципи когнітивного та семіотичного моделювання художнього інтерсеміотичного перекладу. Семіотична модель перекладу розглядається як конструкт/схема відтворення значення, яке представляє певний сегмент світу за допомогою знаків мови реципієнта. Найскладнішим елементом цієї моделі є когнітивно-семіотичне відтворення модальності, як цілого оригінального тексту, так і його фрагментів із модальними значеннями за допомогою знаків іншої лінгвокультури. Особлива увага приділяється концептуалізації перекладу в семіотиці дослідниками Е. Курдісом та М. Зафірі, які розглядають цей процес з позиції викладання мови на основі технології когнітивно-семіотичного перекладу. Смісл і значення художнього тексту реалізуються та посилюються через неперервні процеси перекладу. У дослідженні зазначено, що художні тексти охоплюють мову у поєднанні з іншими семіотичними ресурсами, такими як зображення, описи гри на музичних інструментах, співу, різних звуків навколишнього середовища, кольорів тощо. Вони є модусами, що виражають деонтичну, епістемічну та аксіологічну модальності тексту. Відповідно кожен текст є мультимодальним за своєю природою в результаті конфігурації різних семіотичних модусів його модального плану. З цієї перспективи, семіотична модель перекладу є одночасно процесом і результатом передачі значення між двома мовами шляхом перекладу одних знаків в інші знаки. В аналізованих художніх текстах присутні різні знакові системи – від універсальних культурних кодів до їх національних символів. Отже, авторська модальність як когнітивно-семіотичний конструкт у процесі перекладу має бути відтворена шляхом зіставлення знаків різних семіотичних систем та їх адекватною конструкцією іншою мовною системою.

Ключова слова: художній текст, мультимодальний текст, знак, інтерсеміотичний переклад, перекладацькі стратегії й тактики.

Introduction. The cognitive-semiotic turn in Translation Studies has reinvigorated scholarly interest in the concept of intersemiotic translation origi-

nally introduced by the structuralist R. Jakobson, who interpreted it as the interpretation of verbal signs through nonverbal means [6, p. 114]. In his semi-

nal work “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation”, Jakobson [6, p. 233] delineates three modes of translating verbal signs: intralingual translation (translation within the same linguistic signs), interlingual translation (translation by means of another language), and intersemiotic translation (translation from one language into another by transforming verbal into non-verbal systems of symbols).

Today, the definition of intersemiotic translation has been expanded to encompass non-verbal semiotic resources [8]. This expansion is particularly pertinent in the translation of various modalities of artistic texts, taking into account signs from different semiotic systems such as images, drawings, and figures, which “coexist, cooperate, and must be translated” [7, p. 11].

In this context, intersemiotic translation, that is, the continuous translation of signs from various semiotic systems by other signs, including those from different linguistic systems, forms the basis of cultural and intercultural communication. As the Italian philosopher and semiotician U. Eco explains [5, p. 71], culture continuously translates signs into other signs, definitions into other definitions, words into pictograms, icons into ostensive signs, and ostensive signs into new definitions.

Methodology. Accordingly, the methodology for investigating the textual modality is based on the principle of a multimodal approach to analyzing the modes and means of expressing modality in text, where significant emphasis is placed on signs requiring interpretation both in the original and its translation versions.

For intersemiotic translation, a key concept is the individual-author’s modality that reflects his intent to achieve the objectives. This is considered a multifaceted category that encompasses character depictions and manifests across all the textual levels, particularly within the contextual layers (specific text fragments), both horizontal (verbal) and vertical (non-verbal/extra-linguistic). Various contextual analysis methods are deemed suitable for this purpose.

To elucidate the interaction of individual-author’s modality, a pragmatic analysis is suggested. In the context of the proposed study, we apply the sequential schema of this analysis by F.S. Bacevich, considering a functional approach that enables identification of: 1) pragmatic aspects of the linguistic code (types of speech acts and their modal dimension); 2) the role of non-verbal and extra-verbal signs – ascertaining their pragmatic value; 3) pragmatic aspects of the text’s register characteristics [1].

Decoding symbols and signs, along with the semantic structures of a literary text is performed

using semiotic analysis to determine the characteristics of the linguistic personality representing a specific linguaculture with a particular worldview and social status. Therefore, the research methodology envisages adherence to and implementation of three sequential stages:

The first stage involves the definitive method to interpret key concepts of the study – modality, sign, semiotic resources, and intersemiotic translation.

The second stage focuses on the semiotization of the macro-image, or the author’s image, which possesses a hierarchical structure within the modality of a literary text, aimed at restructuring and recognizing source meanings. Occasional linguistic analysis methods, componential and descriptive, are employed to describe and systematize configurations of signs from various semiotic systems within the whole text. Contextual-interpretative analysis is used to isolate discursively and culturally significant contexts reflected by the author of the source text to convey intentions and purposes.

The third stage involves conducting a comparative translation studies analysis to compare the source and translated texts, with the aim of identifying translational challenges and difficulties, and to describe the intersemiotic activity of the translator.

Discussion. The inherently subjective and immanent anthropocentric nature of any text allows for a triplanar explication of the subjective-modal coloring. This perspective facilitates analysis of the author’s text from the standpoint of their individual style, which represents the author’s worldview both in the original and in translation. In the natural verbal process, meaning creation is a semiotic phenomenon that emerges from actional (performative, operative) excursions beyond consciousness into the communicative space.

From a pragmatic perspective, intersemioticity is a distinctive strategy for actualizing the internal space of the text – the authorial intent. This is attributed to the complexity of organizing a literary text, which allows the author to fully realize themselves, “more vividly express their authorial self, experiment, and expand the representational-expressive features of the artistic word” [11, p. 212]. Therefore, intersemioticity, arising during the interaction of various semiotic codes, creates a cohesive polyartistic space within the cultural system (or constructs an artistic metalanguage of culture) [11, p. 214].

We concur with Y.M. Lotman’s view that the recoding of signs from one semiotic system to another involves an interaction of meanings, as delineated by the author of the original text, who is responsible for shaping and embedding the modality through-

out the entire text [11, p. 221]. In psychology and neurophysiology, modality is regarded as a particular aspect of a stimulus [13, p. 137]; it is determined by the structure of sensory organs and the characteristics of the environment affecting them. In encoding the modality of a stimulus, the type of sensory receptor activated by the stimulus plays a pivotal role. Thus, the fundamental concept of modality is a mode, i.e., a resource that enables the realization of a particular meaning [13].

The focalization of a specific mode, which contains certain information, is determined by the speaker's intention. The combination of modes for the full comprehension of an utterance, a text, is considered multimodality [10, p. 8]. According to the multimodal approach, a text is viewed as a complex semiotic entity defined not only by linguistic but also by extralinguistic factors [10, p. 10].

The discussion surrounding modality and its formalization in literary texts has facilitated the development of another type of modality – textual modality – which lies in its execution of axiological and communicative-pragmatic functions. Understanding modality as a textual category is based on the study of the author's modality as behind the text stands the figure of the author – creator of an individual worldview, who forms part of the national-linguistic and conceptual worlds of people.

Accordingly, the text is considered as a product of the individual-author's worldview, where a key role belongs to the semiosis of the author's modality, which reproduces the value constants of the linguo-culture of a specific historical period.

The individual author's modality, along with its other types [12, p. 3], reproduces not only a worldview, but a world as seen through the author's eyes.

Consequently, the overall modality of the text is revealed not only and not so much by the presence of special modal and evaluative markers, but by the selection of characteristics that represent the objects presented in the text, and by the selection of the objects themselves for evaluation.

Thus, we are inclined here to state that the study of the nature and functions of modality in the text relies on the cognitive aspect of its semiotization (the characterization of the informativeness of the statement against the backdrop of deontic, epistemic, and axiological modalities). The pragmatic aspect of the author's modality is linked with the semiosis of speech acts in a literary text.

The multidimensional and complex nature of speech acts have been extensively analyzed in the works of John L. Austin [3], who systematically studied the philosophical, particularly cognitive, aspects of language. J. Austin pointed out that there is no characteristic form of the speech act that could be successfully formalized. Austin asserted that linguistic actions can be performed in various ways, despite the instructions of the most prototypical performative form in which they occur, that is, presenting the category of mode from the first person (from which the narrative is conducted and which allows for determining the individual-author's modality) using the performative verb before the adverb hereby.

A distinctive understanding of textual modality from a cognitive perspective involves the assumption that language is modal not in relation to itself, but to the author, even to a specific author, Dan Brown, who is the creator of an individual-author's worldview. Such construction of each statement with modal significance directly depends on the author's own

Table 1

Translation strategies in reproducing the textual modality of literary texts

Signs	Reproductive strategies and tactics		Adaptive strategies and tactics	
	N	%	N	%
Verbal	3824	29.14%	6041	26.22%
Phonological level	111	0.84%	398	1.73%
Lexical level	3002	22.88%	4609	20.00%
Lexico-grammatical level	309	2.35%	85	0.37%
Syntactic level	402	3.07%	949	4.12%
Non-verbal	3384	25.78%	5429	23.57%
Graphic	988	2.51%	2441	10.60%
Sounding	1133	8.63%	2627	11.40%
Kinethic	1263	2.00%	361	1.57%
Extraverbal	736	1.40%	201	0.22%
Exterior	318	0.61%	140	0.15%
Interior	278	0.53%	54	0.06%
Appearance	140	0.27%	7	0.01%

beliefs and value system, as well as the main idea and participants implementing it, that in Ukrainian are conveyed mostly by adaptive strategies and tactics, as presented in Table 1.

From the analyzed material, it is evident that intersemiotic translation of a literary text is executed using reproductive (29.14%) and adaptive (26.22%) strategies that involve a transformation of signs – from verbal to non-verbal and vice versa. For example, graphic identifiers, italicization, and boldface fonts, serving as catalysts for both horizontal and vertical discourse, are reproduced in Ukrainian translations in the following ways: a) by preserving the source form and epistemic modality; b) by preserving the source form with a strategy of addition to enhance dynamic modality; c) by omission in the translated text, thereby leveling authenticity and verification of information; and d) by omission with compensation through an alternative level unit, shifting the emphasis from epistemic to dynamic and axiological modalities.

The following excerpt from the novel “The Lost Symbol” describes a situation in which the characters attempt to identify a person who has access to a document via a specific IP address, but their attempt ends in failure. Within the context of the source text, the characters are confident that the document indeed exists on the server at the specified IP address. However, the person possessing the document attempts to conceal their identity.

Eng: *Who has this document?* The “who is” results appeared quickly, showing no match, and Trish held up her hands in defeat. “It’s like this IP address doesn’t exist. I can’t get any information about it at all.”

“Obviously the IP *exists*. We’ve just searched a document that’s stored there!”

True. And yet whoever had this document apparently preferred not to share his or her identity. “I’m not sure what to tell you. Systems traces aren’t really my thing, and unless you want to call in someone with hacking skills, I’m at a loss.” [4, p. 113].

Укр: “В кого ж зберігається цей документ?”

Результати з’явилися швидко: відповідника не знайдено, і Триш підняла руки вгору, визнаючи свою поразку.

– Таке враження, що цієї айпі-адреси просто не існує. Я не можу здобути про неї й крихти інформації.

– Та ну! Адреса напевне існує. Ми ж щойно розшукали документ, що там зберігається!

Истинна правда. Однак хто б не був власником цього документа, він точно волів не розголошувати своєї особи.

– Навіть не знаю, що тобі сказати. Взагалі, трасувальні програми – не моя спеціалізація, тому я вмиваю руки. Хіба що хакера якогось запросити. [2, p. 93].

The conveying of modality in the fragment encompasses not only the translation of the original content but also the consideration of nuances of meaning and expressiveness inherent to each language. In this fragment, the sentence “Who has this document?” was translated as “В кого ж зберігається цей документ?” by adding the particle “ж” typical for expressing a sense of definitiveness, or in this case, an undertone of surprise or uncertainty. The use of “ж” enhances the emphasis on the question and expresses a partial degree of surprise or unexpectedness in the context of searching for this document, thereby conveying epistemic uncertainty that is intensified axiologically. Dan Brown’s idiosyncratic style is characterized by dynamic and energetic dialogues among characters, whose remarks are rendered in italics a) to highlight important phrases, b) thoughts, and c) whispered thoughts, enhancing the mystery and intrigue, i.e., axiological modality, which in Ukrainian translations is replaced by removing italics and adding quotation marks “В кого ж зберігається цей документ?”. Furthermore, in Ukrainian, quotation marks are used to denote direct speech, to separate new or important words, typically used ironically. Thus, the Ukrainian translation conveys the remark without preserving the axiological shade.

This approach is also evident in the following conceptually significant excerpts from the novel: “Mal’akh smiled. Yes, Jesus is indeed both–man and God–but a virgin birth is not the prerequisite for divinity. That is not how it happens” is translated as “Малах посміхнувся. Так, Ісус дійсно є одночасно і людиною, і Богом, але непорочне зачаття не є передумовою божественності. Це трапляється зовсім не так”.

Italics, used to highlight an important thought and certainty about the existence of an address in the source text, is represented in the next quote from the specified excerpt – “Obviously the IP exists”. In the Ukrainian translation, italics are omitted and compensated with the addition of the expression “Та ну!”, which in Ukrainian is used to express refusal, doubt, irony, or dissatisfaction. In this context, the expression “Та ну!” is used to enhance the confidence in the existence of the address, further intensified in the following sentence by adding the emphasizing particle “ж”, providing new semantic and modal nuances – strengthening the speaker’s confidence and emotionality, which in the source text is represented syntactically by an exclamatory sentence. Additionally,

italics are used to denote agreement and certainty, True, which in translation is rendered with the addition of the adjective “істинний” – “Істинна правда,” thus emphasizing the focus on absolute objectivity.

Conclusions. Given that the focus of this study is on the modality of literary texts and their intersemiotic translation, it is appropriate, in addition to these translational strategies, to delineate axiological, epistemic, and deontic strategies that emerge from the possibility of selecting one of the modal expression means inherent to a specific linguoculture, depending on the sender’s intention, the time and place of occurrence, and the nature of interaction. For instance, axiological strategies are actions

by the communicator to make sense of axiological reality, considering the choice of means to express the modal attitude towards a particular element of reality under certain conditions to achieve a corresponding purpose. The adequacy of translation is feasible with consideration for moral-ethical values. Moreover, the axiological meaning of modality is constructed by an array of heterogeneous and multilevel means of discursive and cognitively relevant parameters of the situation in which an appeal to value orientations occurs, as well as by a collection of diverse linguistic and extralinguistic factors that enable the recipient to interpret the translated text.

REFERENCES:

1. Бацевич, Ф. С. *Нариси з лінгвістичної прагматики*. Львів: ПАІС, 2010.
2. Браун Д. Втрачений символ. Книжковий клуб «Клуб сімейного дозвілля», 2018.
3. Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. London: Oxford University Press. Barker, 1962.
4. Brown D. *The Lost Symbol*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2012, 624.
5. Eco, U. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.
6. Jakobson, R. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In Brower (Ed.), *On Translation* (pp. 232–239). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.
7. Kourdis, E., & Petrilli, S. Introduction: Translation and Translatability in Intersemiotic Space. *Punctum: International Journal of Semiotics*, 2020, 6(1), 5–14. <http://doi.org/10.18680/hss.2020.0001>
8. Kourdis, E., & Yoka, C. “Intericonicity as Intersemiotic Translation in a Globalized Culture. In Wang & Ji (Eds.), *Our World: A Kaleidoscopic Semiotic Network*, Proceedings of the 11th World Congress of the IASS/AIS, 5–9 October 2012 (pp. 162–176). Hohai University Press, 2014.
9. Kourdis, E., & Zafiri, M. Semiotics and translation in support of mother tongue teaching. *Signs – International Journal of Semiotics*, 2010, 3, 108–133. <https://tidsskrift.dk/signs/article/view/26856>
10. Kress, G. R., & van Leeuwen, T. *Multimodal Discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. London: Edward Arnold, 2002.
11. Lotman, J., & Uspensky, B. On the semiotic mechanism of culture. *New literary history*, 1978, 9(2), 211–232.
12. Palmer, F. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
13. Robinson, C. W., & Sloutsky, V. M. Development of cross-modal processing. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 2010, 1, 135–141.