palgrave pivot

Intersemiotic Translation
Literary and Linguistic Multimodality

Aba-Carina Pârlog

palgrave
macmillan

Intersemiotic Translation

Aba-Carina Pârlog

Intersemiotic Translation

Literary and Linguistic Multimodality

palgrave
macmillan

Aba-Carina Pârlog
Department of Modern Languages
and Literatures
West University of Timişoara
Timişoara, Romania

ISBN 978-3-030-16765-3 ISBN 978-3-030-16766-0 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019936154

This Palgrave Pivot imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Contents

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Abstract This chapter of the book is meant to offer a first glimpse of the main topic selected with a short presentation of the subtopics discussed. This part draws attention to the problems analysed in each of the theoretical/applicative chapters and informs the international readership about some of the issues that one must deal with when tackling particular types of intersemiotic translation (viewed as an umbrella construction for sign and sign set transposition—whether one deals with images, sounds, linguistic units). Signs, symbols and meanings are so closely related that one cannot create any communicative strand only by considering one of them.

Keywords Aesthetics · Code · Intersemiotic translation · Multimodality · Sign

Intersemiotic Translation: Literary and Linguistic Multimodality centres on the study of intersemiotic translation as a field meant to explain the complex process of understanding meaning that is necessary for various forms of coded expression. Even though less studied than other fields of knowledge, such as linguistics, semantics, phonetics, translation studies, etc., semiotics (or semiology, as it is also called) is paramount to the clarification of relations between different types of signs whose signification changes according to the links that can be made between the main

A.-C. Pârlog, *Intersemiotic Translation*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0_1

subject, the predicate and the other less significant elements involved in the process of constructing meaning.

Among the most important representatives of this domain, one can mention the name of Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914), an American philosopher who laid the foundation of the theory of signs or semiotics, even though he actually focused more on pragmatics. Peirce (cf. Atkin 2010) defines "a *Sign* as anything which is so determined by something else, called its *Object*, and so determines an effect upon a person, which effect I call its *Interpretant*, that the latter is thereby mediately determined by the former"—a somewhat obsolete definition for nowadays semiotics and the process that it refers to. According to Albert Atkin (2010), he also makes use of such words as "representation" or "ground" for sign aspects, i.e., the way in which a sign is envisaged or one motivates its existence. For him, the object determines the sign and stresses the parameters that the object must have, a view which is still limitative, as it does not include the more complex aspects of a sign and its meaning(s) which are quite obvious nowadays.

As David Savan and James Liszka state, "an interpretant" is the manner in which one perceives a particular sign or its translation (cf. Atkin 2010). Even if the term is debatably illustrative rather making one think of a human being, in the light of this definition, the process of (intersemiotic) translation can be viewed as *an effect of understanding a semiotic set*. For example, in George Orwell's novel *1984*, the author uses the diary as *a sign* of Winston Smith's (*the object*) rebellion (*the interpretant*) against the totalitarian regime in Oceania.

Another very important representative of the field of semiotics is Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913), a Swiss linguist and semiotician, founder of structural linguistics whose notorious theory is still used nowadays to explain the original process of language creation. After his death, his students at the University of Geneva published his *Cours de linguistique générale* (1916) in which he defines several fundamental concepts:

1. the distinction made between "langage" (discourse), "langue" (language) and "parole" (speaking);
2. the differentiation between the synchronic and the diachronic dimensions in general linguistics; and
3. the arbitrary character of the linguistic sign (Saussure 1995).

For example, the word "desk" must be understood in terms of its *arbitrary connection* with the object proper, whether made of wood, metal, plastic and so on. The necessity of creating names for all objects, situations, phenomena, animals, types of persons, their features, etc. at one moment in time made it easier for one to identify them once these were invented. What he of course leaves out is the etymological history of words which would somehow explain the link one can find between words and their meanings. The so-called arbitrary nature of language with a few exceptions, represented by interjections, was under much study by Saussure and his followers.

Besides them, Charles William Morris (1901–1979), an American philosopher considered the most important founder of semiotics, even though his theory is also limitative to what we today know about language and its strata, divides this field into three scientific dimensions:

1. syntax,
2. semantics and
3. pragmatics.

In his essay "Esthetics and the theory of signs" (1939), Morris (cf. Rossi-Landi 1978: 8) distinguishes between "aesthetic semiotics" and "semiotic aesthetics". While the former represents a special application of the science of signs and is a bridge between art and the theory of the art of signs, the latter may even be called "Speculative Aesthetics" and seen as a subdomain of "some Philosophical Super-science". Their philosophical nature makes them rather less applicable in the case of intersemiotic translation.

Aesthetics and semiotics have already been considered as parts of the same area of knowledge due to the problem of style. This topic can be discussed in relation to any type of sign network which is meant to produce meaning in a certain way defined by the style used. *Intersemiotic translation presupposes the establishing of parallel sets of signs between which a transfer can be achieved*. These may belong to either art or literature, when one may deal with an ekphrasis or they may belong to other types of symbolic representation which can have various forms.

Generally, literary texts are filled with figures of speech (metaphors, personifications, epithets, metonymies, synecdoches, etc.) which are difficult to translate by maintaining the same level of textual aesthetics.

Consequently, an intersemiotic translation takes place which is influenced by the linguistic and cultural permissibility of the target codification.

Morris (cf. Rossi-Landi 1978: 8) believes that "the field of aesthetic criticism" includes "aesthetic analysis and aesthetic judgment", which he sees as metalinguistic disciplines, even though textual aesthetics can also be discussed in connection with the figurative language, the chromatic elements and the register employed in a certain text. The aesthetic sign is "an iconic sign whose *designatum* is a value".

The value of an aesthetic sign or of a set of aesthetic signs can be viewed according to the impact it has on the receiver, be that a spectator, a reader or a listener, etc. S/He decides whether it is a complex value meant to be grasped depending on some semiotic sets which already lie at its foundation or a simpler value clarified by the new meanings that are created in the new representation.

The framework in which this value is included transforms the already existing semiotic sets and consequently, modifies the whole semiotic network, which defines a certain subfield or even field. Morris (cf. Rossi-Landi 1978: 9) makes a link between "aesthetic criticism" and the existence of values regarding "aesthetic analysis" and values regarding "aesthetic judgment". The classification of values depends on the context which suggests their existence and on the role that they have in that particular context.

In art, aesthetics can be divided into two main directions the aesthetics of ugliness and the aesthetics of beauty. *Various trends emphasise a different type of aesthetics which defines ugliness or beauty according to new sets of ideas taking the form of new sets of aesthetic signs.*

William Shakespeare, for example, attaches diverse values to his texts which he creates with the help of colour symbolism. As I (1998: 74) point out in my article "Colour Symbolism in Shakespeare's Plays", words designating colours do not indicate anything else but colours, if they are not accompanied by other parts of speech and by a proper context in order to become a code which is meant to be broken. By their symbolism, these may sometimes suggest the main theme of a spectacle, for instance, being more than a simple ornamental element that is added to the topic of the play.

In *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, for example, as I (1998: 75) explain in this chapter, one can find that colour black may sometimes indicate unwished for things, such as *evilness* ("beetles black" (Shakespeare 1966: 205), i.e., 'gândaci negri', in the Romanian language or 'des bousiers

noirs', in the French language) or *the depth of hell* ("fog as black as Acheron" [Shakespeare 1966: 213], i.e., 'ceață neagră ca Aheronul', in Romanian or 'brouillard noir comme l'Achéron', in French). At other times, they indicate *the lack of colour* or *importance*, as in *As You Like It* ("All the pictures fairest lin'd / Are but black to Rosalinde" (Shakespeare 1966: 267–268), i.e. "Ca Rosalinda chip frumos şi blând / N-a fost în lume, nu va fi nicicând" [Shakespeare 1964: 439] or "Les portraits les plus parfait / Sont noirs à côté de Rosalinde" [Shakespeare 1966]).

But Shakespeare is not the only one to employ colour symbolism in his oeuvres, in Orwell's *1984*, one can as well notice that the preponderance of dark or greyish colours or of colour white indicate the writer's depressed state (because he was ill, suffering from tuberculosis, when he was writing the novel, alone on the island of Jura), the lack of freedom in his book and the inexistence of alternatives, because of the compulsory nature of the totalitarian party politics and its effects.

According to Martin Esslin (cf. Fisher Dawson 1999: 28), there are "three basic sign elements: icon (a sign that represents what it signifies), symbol (a sign derived by convention having no relation to the signified), and index (a sign that points to an object)". To employ his terminology, the symbolical colours that are mentioned above become significant based on the icons that Shakespeare and Orwell introduced in their literary works, which symbolise significant ideas that help them to develop their creations in a linguistically efficient way. Unfortunately, Esslin's fundamental sign set does not include aesthetic signs devoid of significance, which are only meant to please the eye, multiple signs which as a set indicate singular meaning or linguistic signs which have a different meaning because of their context.

Chapter 2, entitled *Intersemiotic Translation and Multimodality*, includes theoretical approaches based on Gunther R. Kress' discussion about multimodality and Roland Posner's study on communication, a rather complicated theoretical perspective, as presented in his essay "Believing, causing, intending: The basis for a hierarchy of sign concepts in the reconstruction of communication". He (1993: 220–222) intricately considers four fundamental semiotic types—the signal, the indicator, the expression and the gesture—which stem from a cause-effect relationship. These types of signs are explained with the help of various kinds of realities whose semiotic content suggests different interpretations according to the behavioural system that applies in each case.

The signs employed in Posner's system of understanding iconic meaning have an abstract nature. These can include sounds, movements, body language signs, intralingual and interlingual acoustic and written signs.

Verbal and written language cannot function in the absence of signs which are decoded in accordance with one's empirical grasp of the world. Body language is sometimes understood with more difficulty, especially by those who are not specialists in the fields of psychology or psychiatry. Since the times of Renaissance, discourse and anatomy have been regarded as essentially connected (Pârlog et al. 2009: 14). The "articulate structure" of such discourse is explained as functioning according to rules that are similar to those of skeletal construction (Pârlog et al. 2009: 14).

Bodily organs are central elements of expressions indicating activities which are mirrored in conjunction with the symbolical meanings attached to these organs. Plenty of constructions gravitate around the noun 'heart' perceived as the locus of various sorts of feelings.

Culturally specific groups of words, such as idioms have been created based on this noun, which, in the Romanian language, is most of the time rendered either by its direct equivalent, or by its indirect one suggested to be 'soul', 'spirit', 'effort'. More rarely, it can also be rendered as 'intention', the context implying the existence of a well-meant endeavour.

Nevertheless, in more complex constructions that have an important cultural framework, such as "heart of oak" (Garrick in Cohen and Cohen 2002: 173), even though a literal translation can apply, the text cannot be understood without the reader's previous knowledge about the importance of oak for British culture and civilisation.

Signs, symbols and meanings fuse in an indestructible linguistic and cultural mechanism which each time makes significance more appealing for one to discover. The specificity of each language can only be studied if these are considered separately at first and only then as the three parts of communicative essence. Communication relies on meaning which is created with the aid of symbols based on signs.

Chapter 3, *Aesthetics, Discourse and Ekphrasis*, deals with communication as mediated by the act of transposition or transmutation. Intersemiotic translation and multimodality can be analysed in many cases in order to clarify meaning or make it become a part of a new system of meanings or a new context, depending on the degree of ambiguity contained by that specific interpretation of the original idea.

In this part of the book, a special focus is laid on the issue of ekphrasis and its classification. Visual culture makes use of ekphrasis proper, reverse ekphrasis and notional ekphrasis. When it comes to body language, intersemiotic translation is of utmost importance, because it helps operate a transfer of meaning by exchanging codes. In this case, one speaks about a shift from non-verbal codes to verbal codes.

The problem of visual and textual representation can be taken further and discussed in relation with different types of signs and their evocative potential. By connecting visual and verbal translation, one becomes aware of *the richness of significance that can be attached to intersemiotic translation and multimodality. The general nature of the concept allows one to consider it inclusive of a vast number of sense transfer types.*

There are plenty of examples of ekphrastic syntagms that one can encounter both in everyday language in all sorts of fields and in the language used in literature. Shakespeare's (1996: 105) "false face" or Orwell's (1990: 65) "facecrime" are just two of the examples that would apply in this case, whose translations into Romanian and into French reveal the same manner of forming the construction ("un chip viclean", "un visage faux") and the compound ("crimăchip", "crimevisage") by employing their respective basic equivalents in these languages.

The noun 'head' is also often encountered in English, Romanian and French expressions and in each language, the corresponding translation shows the presence of a similar expression with the same meaning. The link between constructions describing mimics, gestures or movements can also be considered a part of the linguistic ekphrastic bank that helps one put images into words and vice versa.

Metaphorical ekphrastic expressions are common when reference is made to a body part whose symbolical role in connection with a certain activity is meant to suggest a completely different meaning from what the expression initially seemed to suggest. For such English idioms containing body parts, one can generally find equivalent idioms both in Romanian and in French. Still, the study does not take into account such a considerable number of idiomatic expressions, so there is more research to conduct in this respect by examining the translation of a greater number of such idioms.

Chapter 4, *Visual and Verbal Code Translation*, details the way in which diverse codes work at a social, textual and interpretative level. These are pondered on from Daniel Chandler's point of view, as presented in his *Semiotics: The Basics*, published in 2002, by Routledge.

The understanding of classes of codes (social, textual and interpretative) and their numerous subcodes makes it easier for one to clarify them under the umbrella of a different contextual system because sign sets change according to the field, subfield or microfield that one must deal with and are culturally conditioned.

Decoding is a general problem regardless of the type of intersemiotic translation one must do. Language, behaviour and coding are strictly linked in a program meant to have human beings function efficiently, logically and meaningfully within the boundaries of a specified behavioural area. Even though not basically imprisoned, the person on whom these behavioural limits are imposed with the help of language and certain code sets is required to comply, so that no additional measures should be taken for the optimal standards of behaviour to be imposed.

When it comes to painting, poetry and intersemiotic translation, transposition or transmutation can rarely be achieved successfully, if one attributes an aleatory context to the initial work, as it happens with ekphrasis. Deciphering the codes can only be done accurately, should one study the author's life, tastes and options for topical subject or object, because the title of such works—if they have a title at all—is usually ambiguous or only partly informative. The multiplicity of perspectives matches the process of ekphrastic transposition. The abstract coding used allows for correspondences to be made between works that were created centuries apart. Verbal and visual code sets are closely linked as there is no possibility of having one of these without the existence of the other at some level of awareness. Words lie at the basis of everything that one knows, so there is no possibility of understanding any image without a verbal basis of that process of awareness.

Sign sets are also dealt with in the context of the various forms of multimodality. The tendency of nowadays' society to strive for the annihilation of meaning can be encountered in the case of literature, advertisements, games of various sorts, jokes, etc.

In order to explain messages, Ilie Gyurcsik's (2017: 99) "frames" are discussed and the way these influence the understanding of jokes. Roland Barthes' (cf. Silverman 1983: 251–274) explanations and classification of codes also helps one to crack jokes and to understand the mechanics of various code types.

The link between visual codes and verbal codes is also explained in the context of the evocative nature of photographs, sculptures and other forms of visual representation. The vibrations caused by colours, lines,

forms, etc. are seen as making up sets of sign codes in themselves which determine changes in an esoteric way. Energetic paths are interpreted as sign codes whose intersemiotic translation results in an enlightening text that changes life.

According to George Herbert Mead (1967: 341), the laws of association must be carefully dealt with and the way these are integrated in the selected contextual analysis. Semiotics does not function in the absence of association which is a necessary process for unravelling special combinations of ideas.

In *A Dictionary of Stylistics*, Katie Wales (1989: 265) dwells on the problem of isotopy, i.e. "the level of meaning which is established by the recurrence in a text of semes belonging to the same semantic field and which contributes to our understanding of the theme". Isotopy helps one grasp the core of a text in as much as it is emphasised by such repetitions that are generally necessary for a facile coherent textual stratum.

Chapter 5, *Direct and Indirect Intralingual Translation*, explores the topic of translation by focusing on the problems that various forms of intralingual translation raise. Roman Jakobson's standpoint on linguistic formulae, as elaborated in his article *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation* (1959), is insisted upon with the aim of giving a clear perspective on ways of regarding direct intralingual translation, on the one hand, (this can be done either by rephrasing or by paraphrasing), and indirect intralingual translation, on the other hand (which can be done by adaptation or free translation).

Each of these ways of reformulating a sentence is dealt with separately and analysed with a focus on sign types, be they iconic, symbolic or indicative. The link between discourse, images and the organised world (Dines Johansen and Larsen 2002: 144) helps one create texts which presuppose the existence of common sense that must be as much a part of linguistics and communication as it is of human behaviour.

In order to exemplify ways of using direct or indirect intralingual translation, I look at the same sentence in its rephrased and paraphrased variant and study its necessary and unnecessary linguistic transformations. I also give an excerpt from Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595), as an example, and its adapted French variants (created by François Pierre Guillaume Guizot, in 1862 and by François-Victor Hugo, in 1865) and I concentrate on a discussion about their evocative character, their euphony and their general stylistic specificities.

Problems connected to form, shades of meaning and dissimilar ideational associations are also taken into account in order to prove the importance of faithfulness even in the case of play translation which has features of poetic texts. The analysis goes in depth by focusing on vocabulary selection and adaptation issues.

For comparative reasons, I include a fragment extracted from John Milton's epic poetical work *Paradise Lost* (1667) and its free Romanian translation variants written by Aurel Covaci (1972) and Adina Begu (2004). The changes brought about by interpretation can be noticed and the translator's role, as a new author of the mentioned literary work.

The importance of source language polysemy and its accurate analysis are considered because sometimes reformulation across languages should not be allowed, if it essentially alters the original text and its ordering of ideas. Interpreting source language quite freely without considering the author's linguistic and stylistic options can thus determine the creation of a variant in another language that can only incidentally be similar to the original. The topic remains the same, but the chaining of ideas and the peripheral convergence of meaning makes it difficult for one to recognise the original text in the translation.

Towards the end of the chapter, I examine Lewis Carroll's source language compound words introduced through the medium of his poem *Jabberwocky* which he included in his novel *Through the Looking Glass, and What Alice Found There* (1872). Examples of telescoped words, portmanteaus or blends and their effect of obscuring meaning are called to attention. Meaning transposition falls under a question mark in this case, where the complexity of constructions makes it difficult for one to create new equivalents in a target language.

Last but not least, I focus on *The Constraints of Interlingual Translation*, in Chapter 6. In this last part of the book, the simplest ways of translating texts together with the more complex ones and their problems are taken into account. Texts are seen as living organisms and their healthy linguistic functioning is paid attention to in order to prove the translator's necessity of analysing this organic mechanism in order for him or her to be able to maintain the same organic discursive mechanism in the target language.

There are many elements that one must look at, so that no fundamental mistake should seep into the target language. Romanian semiotician Ilie Gyurcsik's (2017: 100) perspective on the confusion that one makes on distinguishing between three reality levels (words, meanings

and states of the world) explains the difficulties that one encounters on rendering more intricate texts from the source language into the target language. The levels of text (Pârlog 2014: 73–75) must be rendered with utmost faithfulness in order for one to be able to read a relevant variant of the original text in the target language which would have the same effect in the case of the target language reader as it does in the case of the source language reader. What Eugene A. Nida (cf. Venuti 2000: 19) calls "receptor response" should be a guiding light for those translating literary works in general and other kinds of works too.

I also examine some translation problems raised by various idioms and expressions, some of which have been taken from Pelham Grenville Wodehouse's well-known novel, *Joy in the Morning* (2008/1947). The idioms found in the literary work that I have mentioned above are not the only ones considered, there are also idioms and expressions belonging to the French language with the aim of having a more comprehensive view upon the linguistic phenomenon in translation in the case of Romance languages, i.e., Romanian and French.

Parts of the dialogue, description and narrative of Tracy Chevalier's book *The Lady and the Unicorn* (2003) are also used as material for the analysis of translation problems, this time with a sole reference to the Romanian language. Hidden meanings are of particular interest as well as the various changes of meaning that appear once a translation has been done by neglecting the restrictions of the source language text.

Culture plays a most important part in understanding languages regardless of their original source. Understanding the features of the linguistic system dealt with may ensure the wording of a cogent variant in the target language which may function as a faithful mirror of the original text for speakers of a different language that was used in the process of translation. The crossroad of source language and target language must be managed by focusing on both linguistic and stylistic details, by looking at textual levels comparatively and by rendering them with the same consistency, if that is truly possible. *The rewriting of texts in the target language must be done within certain limits that should not be overlooked, so that one may be able to discover foreign writers without the impairment caused by misinterpretations, omissions or needless semantic enrichment of source language texts.*

The conclusion of the book gives a brief presentation of the results of the problems analysed in each chapter and renders the importance of doing intersemiotic translation by acknowledging its interdisciplinary

perspective on the process that it entails. The theoretical issues debated in each part are taken in turn and explained as essential issues of the translation process, viewed as playing the role of a transformative medium. They are generally linked to particular textual elements or sets of elements and indicate the problems that must be solved in the case of certain types of texts.

All in all, intersemiotic translation appears as a vast field that applies to all areas of knowledge which employ signs and symbols as means of conveying meaning. Signs, sign sets and subsets together with symbols of various kinds concentrate meanings and connotations under an efficient form meant for modern man to save time and energy and thus ensure his/her longer life. The evolution of language towards telescoped words, abbreviations and emoticons is only a natural consequence of our overall effort of prolonging our gift from God. This theoretical reflection shows the necessity of *finding a balance between form and meaning changes, so that translated texts may find their optimal corresponding encodings in different kinds of systems.*

References

Atkin, Albert. 2010. Peirce's Theory of Signs. In *Standford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/peirce-semiotics/. Accessed 9 Feb 2017.

Cohen, John Michael, and Mark J. Cohen. 2002 (1960). *The New Penguin Dictionary of Quotations*. London: Penguin Books.

de Saussure, Ferdinand. 1995 (1916). *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Edition Payot et Rivage. Available at: http://centenaire-linguistique.org/uploads/medias/downloads/le-cours.pdf. Accessed 9 Feb 2017.

Dines Johansen, Jørgen, and Svend Erik Larsen. 2002. *Signs in Use: An Introduction to Semiotics*. London: Routledge.

Fisher Dawson, Gary. 1999 (1946). *Documentary Theatre in the United States: A Historical Survey and Analysis of Its Content, Form, and Stagecraft*. Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Press.

Gyurcsik, Ilie. 2017. *Modern Paradigms: Authors, Texts, Harlequins*, trans. Georgina Gabor. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, and Plymouth, UK: Hamilton Books.

Mead, George Herbert. 1967 (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Orwell, George. 1990 (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books.

Pârlog, Aba-Carina. 1998. Colour Symbolism in Shakespeare's Plays. In*Lucrările sesiunii de comunicări ştiinţifice studenţeşti*. Timişoara: West University of Timişoara Press.

Pârlog, Aba-Carina. 2014. *Translation and Literature: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Timişoara: West University of Timişoara Press.

Pârlog, Hortensia, Pia Brînzeu, and Aba-Carina Pârlog. 2009. *Translating the Body*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Posner, Roland. 1993. Believing, Causing, Intending: The Basis for a Hierarchy of Sign Concepts in the Reconstruction of Communication. In *Signs, Search, and Communication: Semiotic Aspects of Artificial Intelligence*, ed. René J. Jorna, Barend van Heusden, and Roland Posner. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. 1978. On Some Post-Morrisian Problems. In *Ars Semeiotica III: International Journal of American Semiotic*, ed. Luigi Romeo. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.

Shakespeare, William. 1964. *Teatru*. Traducere de Virgil Teodorescu. Bucureşti: Editura pentru literatură universală.

Shakespeare, William. 1966 (1951). *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Peter Alexander. London and Glasgow: Collins.

Silverman, Kaja. 1983. *The Subject of Semiotics*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2004 (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, advisory ed. Mona Baker. London and New York: Routledge. Available at: www.questia.com. [2016, August 7].

Wales, Katie. 1990 (1989). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London and New York: Longman.

CHAPTER 2

Intersemiotic Translation and Multimodality

Abstract This chapter focuses on the facets of intersemiotic translation viewed as a prism. Whether it is employed while decoding or re-encoding a message mentally, or while decoding or re-encoding it in speech or in writing, one must think of the impact of the communicative exchange. This part of the book also consists of an analysis of Roland Posner's fundamental semiotic types, i.e. the signal, the indicator, the expression and the gesture. Communication relies on sign or sign set correspondences whose slight changes generally mirror cultural issues. This chapter mostly addresses students and persons new to the field who are unaware of the translational links that underlie the process of communication whatever form it may take.

Keywords Code · Communication · Expression · Idiom · Multimodality

Communication is the most important tool that one possesses that makes people succeed in everything they do. Its flexibility allows for various approaches depending on one's purpose and on the level at which one means to use it. The complexity of its codification sometimes triggers unforeseen difficulties which determine the interactional clarification of problems that have not been considered before that. The selected sign sets and symbols must thus fit each communicative goal, for it to be successfully achieved according to one's wish. The semiotic formulas

A.-C. Pârlog, *Intersemiotic Translation*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0_2

translate into ideas that influence the interlocutor(s) depending on the kind of translational methodology taken into account.

If "all behaviour is communication" (Rossi-Landi 1978: 25), intersemiotic translation can be said to take place in all situations. The understanding of simple behaviour presupposes a switch to a different kind of semiotic set, no matter how intricate the original set may be. Whether behaviour is seen in the classical sense of interacting with people or in the sense of acting in a certain way in the context of a particular field, the process of analysing and explaining behaviour requires an intersemiotic translation.

Gunther R. Kress' (2010) discussion about multimodality (which he [2010: 1] defines as "the normal state of human communication") clarifies the ways of seeing various communication forms as "modes" (Kress 2010: 79) of representation. Social semiotics is quite useful for understanding interaction as a communicative exchange.

In his essay, "Believing, causing, intending: The basis for a hierarchy of sign concepts in the reconstruction of communication", Roland Posner (1993: 220–222) thinks that the basic semiotic types are: *the signal*, *the indicator*, *the expression* and *the gesture*. They are all determined by a relation of the type cause-effect and blend in an interdependent way by creating semiotic sets which can be translated in various ways according to each situation and explain non-inscribed semiotic sets that carry relevant meaning.

Posner explains *the signal* (a noise, for instance), as a cause which makes a certain being (a bird, in his example) *react* in a certain manner (in his exemplification, the bird flies off). As a consequence, one can infer that the signal can be a sign of *a behavioural system* and the understanding of its role in a particular situation rendered as a multimodal representation results in an intersemiotic translation.

The indicator ("a grumbling noise", Posner 1993: 221) is also a cause which this time makes the subject of the example (a skier) believe that something has started *happening* (an avalanche, in this case). Therefore, the indicator stands for a sign of *a behavioural system* which determines a particular interpretation of a situation, due to one's *piece of knowledge* about it that can be seen as a type of intersemiotic translation. The multimodal understanding of the chain of events creates a different chain of events based on a personal decoding system accessed due to a simple interpretation of a sign set.

The theorist also defines *expression* (a banged door, in his example) as a cause that makes the subject (a neighbour) understand what *the state* of the other person in the exemplification is, based on the interpretation (the tenant is angry) of a particular type of behavioural system. The expression is a sign of *a behavioural system* which determines a certain *interpretation* based on another *interpretation* caused by *a behavioural system*.

The last sign discussed by Posner is *the gesture* (the noise of the engine of a starting car), which, in this case, is a cause that makes the subject of the example understand what *the intention* of the other person in the example is, based on a particular *interpretation* of *a behavioural system*. This time a particular behavioural system determines a certain interpretation which is caused by the understanding that a particular behavioural system would react in a certain way in a certain situation.

All the signs Posner uses in his theoretical approach are abstract and they all are intersemiotically translated at the level of cognition. This overall web of interpretations can be viewed as a way of creating sign sets to be employed in similar contexts. Intersemiotic translation may be considered in the case of multimodality, i.e. sounds, movements, concrete signs determined by body language, intralingual and interlingual verbal and written communication.

In *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*, Umberto Eco (1986: 27) reminds one that Aristotle thought both words conveyed in speech and in writing are symbols of soul affections. Words are distinct from sounds made by animals because they are "conventional and arbitrary", while other types of sounds are "natural and motivated".

Body parts are also used as symbols of the diverse realities that the speaker or writer wishes to express. Corporeality can be read, translated and/or transposed into various verbal or written codes as any other textual source. "Biology and language, anatomy and rhetoric are linked within a transport system of correspondences" (Pârlog et al. 2009: 14).

According to Pârlog et al. (2009: 14), many linguists have attempted to give reasons that would clarify the structure of different languages by making reference to human anatomy. In Renaissance, "the representation of literary discourse as an articulate structure, as a body constructed of joints and members, was common in the Elizabethan texts about anatomy or rhetoric".

Nowadays, the close relation between body and language can be noticed in the meanings attached to symbols represented by diverse body

parts and in the metaphorical constructions which contain words denoting body parts in order to indicate a reality that is completely different from the independent meanings of the construction elements. One of the symbols very much exploited in today's culture is that of *the heart*, which can stand for various degrees of affection: passion, love, sympathy, care, strength, etc. As Chevalier and Gheerbrant (cf. Pârlog et al. 2009: 73) state, ancient Egyptians, Hebrews, the Greeks before Homer and Tibetan Buddhists saw the heart as the locus of the mind, i.e. the centre of thoughts, reason, will and moral life. In modern times, the heart is regarded as a symbol of one's soul, being associated with love in its two forms, of *eros*, romantic love and *agapé*, the love for people in general; it is also the symbol of excitement and honesty (Pârlog et al. 2009: 73).

In such expressions as 'to have one's heart in the right place' (i.e., 'a avea inimă bună'; 'a avea *intenții* bune'), 'to have one's heart in one's boots' (i.e., 'a i se face inima cât un purice'), 'to put one's (whole) heart (and soul) into something' (i.e., 'a-şi pune tot sufletul/toată inima în ceva'), 'to sing one's heart out' (i.e., 'a pune suflet în cântat'), 'to tire sb.'s heart out' (i.e., 'a scoate sufletul cuiva'), the intersemiotic translation at the level of language shows that in Romanian, the noun 'heart' can be rendered as 'inimă' (its closest equivalent), 'intenții' (i.e., 'intentions') or 'suflet' (i.e., 'soul'). The cultural variations between the Germanic and Romance language which presuppose the existence of completely different systems of thought, seem to be less present in the case of the expressions given as examples above.

In the Romanian language, the most obvious dissimilarity is determined by the passing from 'heart' to 'intention', as it can be seen in the expression 'to have one's *heart* in the right place' ('a avea *intenții* bune'; literal translation: 'to have good intentions'). Generally, the heart is rendered as a noun suggesting feelings or the soul. It is interesting to notice that 'heart' can also be understood as "an aim or plan" (Pearsall 1999: 736) in this case, according to the definition of 'intention' in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Even though used at the same time as the similar expression which contains the noun 'inimă' instead ('a avea inimă bună', i.e. 'to have a good heart'), the expression 'a avea intenții bune' (i.e. 'to have good intentions') changes the idea of a person's friendly nature which suggests feelings of affection, to a person's beneficial plan of activity.

On passing from English to French, one can find many similar expressions containing the noun 'heart' which is preserved in the latter and

thus expressed as 'coeur': 'to go heart and soul into something', i.e., 'se donner corps et âme' or 'avoir du cœur à l'óuvrage'; 'to lay one's heart bare', i.e., 'soulager son cœur'; 'to wear one's heart upon one's sleeve', i.e., 'avoir le cœur ouvert / déboutonné'. However, in the following idiom, 'Cross my *heart* and hope to die / Stick a needle in my eye!' whose corresponding saying is '*Croix* de bois, *croix* de fer / Si je mens, je vais en enfer', 'heart' is translated by 'croix' (i.e. 'cross'). The cultural difference of perspective is obvious, even though one can notice the fact that the idea of honesty is linked to one's following the teachings of the Bible; so 'crossing one's heart' or 'swearing on a cross made of wood or iron' both connect the symbol of Christianity to that of truth.

Hence, one can draw the conclusion that the symbolism of the heart depends upon culture, especially when it comes to language specific expressions. Multimodality allows one to see it differently according to one's cultural background. As Pârlog et al. (2009: 73–74) point out, the heart can also indicate "religious devotion" and Christian believers' love of for God. The heart is also the locus of the spirit, the place where one can discover and worship divinity for other believers too, not only for Christians. "Muslims admire God with the eye of the heart (*aïn-al-yaqîn*), a sacred centre from where all that is evil has been expelled."

The expressions containing the noun 'heart' are very many and are quite often employed in current communication, both oral and written. Starting with the time of *The Bible*, they were already present in messages meant to suggest the influence of various topics on one's state of mind, the attitude of peoples as far as different events were concerned, etc. In Shakespeare's literary works, one also finds idioms including the noun 'heart', which symbolise one's feelings, honesty, care, etc. The eighteenth and the following centuries did not neglect such constructions, maintaining their use and the general symbolism of the heart as a locus of feelings.

In David Garrick's *Heart of Oak* (*Inimă de stejar*), through the metaphoric use of the noun "heart", the lines, "*Heart* of oak are our ships, / *Heart* of oak are our men" (Cohen and Cohen 2002: 173), emphasise the patriotism of English soldiers. Oak is seen as an enduring material, which, in this case, implies the soldiers' resistance and determination to fight against the enemy ships.

The sign set combined with symbolism that forms this message allows the intersemiotic translation to take place at multiple levels depending on one's purpose. Firstly, this takes place on decoding the message while

reading the lines; secondly, this occurs on rendering it into a different language and thirdly, on explaining its metaphorical constructions. In the poem, the strong ships and well prepared soldiers are perceived as ready to bring glory to their country. As the oak is England's national tree, "the heart of oak" can also be interpreted as being the most representative of what the country can produce in order to bravely vanquish the enemy.

The faithful translations into the Romanian language—'*Inimă* de stejar sunt corăbiile noastre, / *Inimă* de stejar sunt oamenii noştri' (my translation)—and into the French language—'*Cœur* de chêne sont nos bateaux, / *Cœur* de chêne sont nos hommes' (my translation)—contain the closest equivalents of 'heart' (i.e., 'inimă' or 'cœur') and for 'oak' (i.e., 'stejar' or 'chêne'), preserving the same message and the same stylistic elements.

Mary Knowles' answer to James Boswell's *Life of Johnson* about Dr. Samuel Johnson, the eighteenth century poet, essayist and bibliographer, and his achievements, "He gets at the substance of a book directly; he tears the *heart* out of it" (Cohen and Cohen 2002: 242) includes the noun 'heart' with the meaning of main problem. 'Heart', in the case of this message, is no longer the symbol of feelings, but rather of the central matter of something, even if it preserves its metaphorical construction. The intersemiotic translation into Romanian for the quotation above 'Trece direct la substanţa cărţii; îi smulge *spiritul*' (my translation) is similar to the intersemiotic translation into French, i.e. 'Il passe directement à la substance du livre; il lui arrache le *cœur*'.

Thus, 'heart' indicating a most important issue is equated with 'spirit' in Romanian and it remains expressed with the help of the close equivalent 'cœur' in French, when it comes to the key topic that a literary work deals with. The 'heart' of a book would entail its essence which makes it functional, while its spirit would rather imply the real meaning of a book suggesting the writer's intellectual capacity. Apart from the association that one can make between the nouns which are used in English and Romanian and which express the same ideas in different ways, the meaning remains unchanged.

The intersemiotic translation brings about changes whether one focuses on correspondences between signs in distinct languages or in the same language. Finding the right code for the re-encoding process presupposed by multimodality results in new variants of information or sign sets which always allow for slight changes of form or meaning depending

on how similar languages or the words/expressions present in the same language are.

Multimodality, regardless of its sort, is established by using different types of signs. Whether one has to tackle signals, indicators, expressions, gestures or other kinds of signs, symbols and their intertwining under the form of messages, the intersemiotic translation makes the understanding of knowledge widely available for those who are not able to grasp it properly. Without it, the paramount aspect that makes us different from animals would be lost.

References

Cohen, John Michael, and Mark J. Cohen. 2002 (1960). *The New Penguin Dictionary of Quotations*. London: Penguin Books.

Eco, Umberto. 1986. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Kress, Gunther R. 2010. *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London: Routledge.

Pârlog, Hortensia, Pia Brînzeu, and Aba-Carina Pârlog. 2009. *Translating the Body*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Pearsall, Judy, ed. 1999. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 10th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Posner, Roland. 1993. Believing, Causing, Intending: The Basis for a Hierarchy of Sign Concepts in the Reconstruction of Communication. In *Signs, Search, and Communication: Semiotic Aspects of Artificial Intelligence*, ed. René J. Jorna, Barend van Heusden, and Roland Posner. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. 1978. On Some Post-Morrisian Problems. In *Ars Semeiotica III: International Journal of American Semiotic*, ed. Luigi Romeo. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.

CHAPTER 3

Aesthetics, Discourse and Ekphrasis

Abstract In this chapter, details the problems connected to the beauty of language, figures of speech, euphony and the semiotic formulae that one employs in arts in order to emphasise concise ways of rendering meaning. Body language, for instance, is one of the most debatable codifications of meaning. Ekphrasis, reverse ekphrasis and notional ekphrasis are also discussed and exemplified, so that one may get a better idea about how the process of translation can be grasped. The concept of ekphrasis also is extended so that it may refer to prose writing which details imagery. To this the concept of ekphrastic syntagm is added clarifying the way body language can be linguistically rendered and the way such language changes, if it does, as a result of the process of translation.

Keywords Aesthetics · Ekphrasis · Image · Intersemiotic translation · Symbolism · Multimodality

The beauty of art is part of aesthetics as developed in painting, graphics, sculpture, literature, acting, music or dance. In one of his *Letters*, Friedrich Schiller (cf. Habermas 2000: 59) shows that art is a form of multimodality which will be understood according to the aesthetic development taking place in the future. The semiotic formulas available in each of the arts are expressed by using a different kind of discourse than the one which inspired them, which offers intricate sign sets to be

A.-C. Pârlog, *Intersemiotic Translation*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0_3

deciphered by codes specific to each field. These codes vary according to the original multimodal representations and to the sort of transformation meant to take place.

Similarly to Jakobson's (cf. Pârlog et al. 2009: 98) definition, *transposition* or *transmutation* can be defined as an intersemiotic translation or transformation of "a non-verbal code into a verbal code", while rendering "images, gestures or sounds into words or vice versa, words into non-verbal codes". This kind of translation is quite common and necessary for an optimal apprehension of various sign sets.

According to Pârlog et al. (2009: 98), on analysing the intersemiotic translation of body language, one can notice:

a. the transposition of body language signs (including the language of the deaf-mute) or of the images marked on the body or which represent the body (drawings, paintings, photographies, advertisements, etc.);
b. "the reverse transposition", i.e., the body rendered in a certain written text which is recreated under the form of "an image, a sculpture, a musical piece, a dance, etc".

A specific type of transposition which presupposes the transformation of non-verbal codes into literary texts is called *ekphrasis*. Its opposite is *reverse ekphrasis* which refers to the transposition of literary texts into non-verbal codes. *Notional ekphrasis* refers to a kind of transposition that presupposes the transformation of non-verbal codes describing actual objects that have vanished or imaginary objects into literary texts (Hollander in Pârlog et al. 2009: 109).

As Judith Harvey (2002) clarifies, the ekphrastic principle "ut pictura poesis" was inspired by Horatio's *Ars poetica* and it implies a comparison between "the art of painting" and that of poetry writing. The ekphrastic poem is a description of a scene or more often of an art work, which is full of life.

In Jane Hedley's article *Introduction: The Subject of Ekphrasis* (2010), there are a series of ekphrastic strategies which are considered to be connected to visual studies or visual culture. According to J. W. T. Mitchell (cf. Hedley 2010: 18), these strategies presuppose that in "visual culture", vision itself is educated and cultivated, so it is often used in society in "the ethics and politics, aesthetics and epistemology"

required by the process of perceiving something or someone visually and being perceived in the same way.

The use of static and moving images can be noticed everywhere, in the case of digital photography, advertisements, images provided by the CCTVs used in public space (shops, malls, airports, etc.). They are all translated by understanding or interpreting the message codified by various postures, facial expressions, gestures, etc.

As Mitchell states (1995: 164), ekphrasis is placed between two types of foreign realities and two forms which are seemingly impossible to translate and change:

1. the transformation of "visual representation" into textual representation, either through description or through the process determined by a ventriloquist;
2. the reconversion of textual representation into visual representation while reading and understanding the text.

The theorist (1995: 156–157) further explains that the ekphrastic poem is a genre which puts texts and their own strange semiotic realities face to face, i.e., those strange rival ways of "representation called visual, graphic, plastic or 'spatial' arts". The so called "scientific terms" of this strange reality, as Mitchell refers to them, are represented by common oppositions which belong to the field of semiotics: "symbolic and iconic representation, conventional and natural signs, temporal and spatial modes, visual and aural media" (Mitchell 1995: 156).

It is easy to establish a link between body image, as an external presentation of human body, and corporeal language which remains ambiguous and interpretable without a precise context. Various images that may depict symbolic sequences of body language can be found either in written or in spoken language which is then interpreted, the images being recreated in the reader's or the interlocutor's mind (this emphasises Hollander's *notional ekphrasis* [in Pårlog et al. 2009: 109] in a *reverse* manner).

There are plenty of examples of *ekphrastic syntagms* based on corporeal representation. For instance, in Shakespeare's tragedy *Macbeth*, one can find the construction "false face" which is part of Macbeth's final line at the end of the first act in the play. This construction can be translated by "chip viclean" into the Romanian language and by "un visage faux" into the French language:

1. "*False face* must hide what the false heart doth know" (Shakespeare 1966: 1005)
2. "Şi-*un chip viclean* s-ascundă cât mai bine / Ce inima vicleană ştie-n sine" (Shakespeare 1964: 980)
3. "*Un visage faux* doit cacher les secrets d'un coeur faux" (Shakespeare 1837: 519).

The construction is meant to suggest the protagonist's manipulative acts which symbolise Macbeth's treason and deceit. He wishes to kill King Duncan having been included in a plot against the latter by his wife, Lady Macbeth and does not wish to reveal that.

In Orwell's well-known novel *1984*, the compound noun "facecrime" (Orwell 1990: 65), translated by "crimăchip" into Romanian or by "crimevisage" into French implies the image of a character who betrays his thoughts against the totalitarian Party by the mimics made use of. In the following text, one can find the compound used as a symbol of a possible rebellion against the Party because one contradicts its ideology and shows it through the medium of one's facial expression:

1. "In any case, to wear an improper expression on your face (to look incredulous when a victory was announced, for example) was itself a punishable offence. There was even a word for it in Newspeak: *facecrime*, it was called" (Orwell 1990: 65).
2. "În orice caz, a arbora o expresie nepotrivită pe faţă – de exemplu, să ai o mutră neîncrezătoare când se anunţă câte o victorie – este în sine un delict care se pedepseşte. Există şi un cuvânt pentru asta în Nouvorbă: *crimăchip*" (Orwell 2002: 87).
3. En tout cas, avoir une expression impropre sur le visage (par exemple, avoir un visage méfiant quand on annonçait une victoire) était en soi un délit pour lequel on était puni. Il y avait même un mot pour cela en Novlangue: *crimevisage* [my translation].

In this fragment, the writer gives as an example the case in which one would show one's distrust of the news popularised by the Party. This entails one's distrust of the Party and poses a threat to its rule.

The reverse notional ekphrasis, i.e., the image one has in one's mind as a result of reading an imaginary text is essential in establishing the atmosphere of the textual sequence. It consequently allows the reader

to experience Oceanian life much more easily and to understand a more complex form of intersemiotic translation.

Besides ekphrastic syntagms, there are also diverse *expressions* which describe the mimics, gestures or movements made by various persons. These expressions evoke images full of meanings which prove that ekphrasis is inherent to language. Some verbal expressions, for example, containing nouns denoting body parts can be found in the following, in which in all three languages one can notice the presence of the same body part—*the head*—employed as a means of expressing the same idea:

a. to nod one's *head*/a face semn afirmativ cu *capul*; a da din *cap* (afirmativ)/acquiescer de la *tête*;
b. to scratch one's *head*/a se scărpina în *cap*/se gratter la *tête*;
c. to turn one's *head*/tourner la *tête*/a-şi întoarce *capul*.

The movements of the head are denotative of different ways of reacting to a piece of knowledge. In the first example, one can use the ekphrastic expression mentioned in order to suggest one's agreement or emphasis of a message delivered before, depending on the context in which it can be found. The second example implies one's surprise, ignorance or hesitation, according to the context in which it is employed. The last one may indicate one's avoidance, arrogance or defiance. In all the three cases, one deals with reverse ekphrasis which is a way of translating corporeal reactions into images including body parts.

In terms of cultural expressions, one can find many metaphorical ekphrastic expressions which imply a particular idea by including a body part. This body part may be, for instance, present in the English language and sometimes lacking in the Romanian language or in the French language or changed with a different body part in these Romance languages.

One can find several examples in the following examples:

- till/until one is blue in the *face*/până nu mai poți/n'en pouvoir plus;
- to stare one in the *face*/a sări în *ochi*; a fi chiar sub *nasul* său/sauter aux *yeux*;
- to shake the dust off one's *feet*/a pleca supărat, enervat/partir fâché, nerveux;

- one's *foot* has gone to sleep/a-i amorți *piciorul*/son *pied* a engourdi;
- to eat one's *head* if… /a-și pune *capul* jos că nu; a-și mănânca pălăria, căciula dacă…; a se lăsa de meserie dacă/en mettre sa *tête* sur le billot, mettre sa *tête* à couper que.

In the given examples, one can notice that when there is a noun indicating a body part present in the Romanian metaphorical expression, one can find one in the French metaphorical expression too, just as when there is none in the Romanian, there is none in the French either. If the noun indicating the same body part as in the English expression is present, one can generally find it both in the Romanian and in the French expression, as one can see in the examples given above. Thus, one can say that Romance languages have undergone a similar process of cultural development due to their common linguistic ancestor which is the Latin language. It is interesting to notice the influence of the same language upon English culture and Romanian culture when one finds idioms with similar reference to the same body part in order to express the same idea.

As far as the connective elements existing between ekphrasis and metaphor are concerned, in the examples above, the highly symbolical image created by a metaphor which can be likened to surrealism up to a point, results in a representation that is supposed to make sense through cultural links that are learned by artificial logic. Whether the implied comparison is tragic, comic, common or abnormal, this is filled with meaning at all the levels of the linguistic expression, which, because of its overuse, is no longer perceived as artistically relevant, but rather as a common cliché metaphor.

The aesthetic importance of ekphrastic expressions is emphasised when these are not part of the well-known group of cliché metaphors. All other metaphors, especially those newly created, besides other figures of speech that have not been so often employed in various contexts, enrich texts from the point of view of their vividness and contribute to the creation of a highly developed style that readers enjoy due to their poetical leaning.

The lyricism of prose discourse can be discussed in the case of an excess of figures of speech, alliterations, assonances, rhymes or sound effects. The existence of such a literary discourse can only open new doors to the world of literature and allow people from all over the world to access a new perspective on story telling that may add to their understanding of multimodality, to their perception of the reality surrounding them and to their interpreting of general and particular symbolical contexts that do not allow themselves to be easily decoded.

References

Habermas, Jürgen. 2000. *Discursul filosofic al modernității. 12 Prelegeri*. Bucharest: All Educational.

Harvey, Judith. 2002. *The University of Chicago: Theories of Media: Keywords Glossary—Ut pictura poesis*. Available at: http://csmt.uchicago.edu/glossary2004/utpicturapoesis.htm. Accessed 15 Feb 2015.

Hedley, Jane. 2010 (2009). Introduction: The Subject of Ekphrasis. In *In the Frame: Women's Ekphrastic Poetry from Marianne Moore to Susan Wheeler*, ed. Jane Hedley, Nick Halpern, and Willard Spiegelman. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Mitchell, William John Thomas. 1995 (1994). *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Orwell, George. 1990 (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books.

Orwell, George. 2002. *O mie nouă sute optzeci şi patru*, trans. Mihnea Gafiţa. Iaşi: Polirom.

Pârlog, Hortensia, Pia Brînzeu, and Aba-Carina Pârlog. 2009. *Translating the Body*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Shakespeare, William. 1837. *Chefs d'oeuvre de Shakespeare*, vol. 3. French trans. M. Nisard. Paris: Belin Mandar.

Shakespeare, William. 1964. *Teatru*. Traducere de Virgil Teodorescu. Bucureşti: Editura pentru literatură universală.

Shakespeare, William. 1966 (1951). *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Peter Alexander. London and Glasgow: Collins.

CHAPTER 4

Visual and Verbal Code Translation

Abstract This chapter elaborates on the topic of coding and communication. David Chandler's (Semiotics: The Basics. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, London and New York, p. 149, 2002) social, textual and interpretative codes and their respective subcodes enable the unravelling of the complex illusions of the world with a high degree of accuracy. Depending on the field that they belong to, their often manipulative aim betrays the real purposes of their various communicative strands (see propaganda). The issue of language and control and their interpretation is also tackled together with that of wisecracks and their corresponding parallel sets of meanings out of which one is many a time more difficult to find as it is quite unusual to the reader/listener to make such conceptual connections.

Keywords Code · Discourse · Image · Translation

Intersemiotic translation includes a range of transformative stages which point to the process of decoding visual or verbal texts. Each type of text has its own specific sets of signs which may be viewed as forming the code employed by a particular visual code or verbal code producer. These are interpretable, even if the context can be clarified by various means. Thus, sometimes a specific set of signs may be seen as having different meanings and creating a different story from the original, according to the level of understanding that the viewer or reader has of that particular semiotic work.

A.-C. Pârlog, *Intersemiotic Translation*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0_4

Generally, this is the result of the overall ambiguity or rather abstract form of expression that is often encountered in postmodern art or literature. It is known that some writers inspired their literary works from paintings, consequently recreating, through ekphrasis, the symbolically vague world rendered on canvass. One such writer was, for instance, Samuel Beckett who was a great admirer of abstract art and wrote many of his short plays with an eye to the main elements of indefinite art representations that could linguistically suggest the artificial nature of communication.

Art is communication whether this is visual or verbal. The form of multimodality considered always relies on the code type(s) that one wishes to use in order to express an idea in a certain way.

According to Chandler (2002: 149), *Semiotics: The Basics*, there are three types of codes that one can make use of on interacting with the world around one: *social codes* (I), *textual codes* (II) and *interpretative codes* (III). Each of these can include a series of sub-codes (as one could call them). The first class of codes, *social codes*, comprises verbal language subcodes (1), bodily subcodes (2), commodity subcodes (3) and behavioural subcodes (4).

Social codes are important for both visual and verbal representation, with the exception of the first set (verbal languages subcodes) that one usually cannot find in the case of visual representation. Such codes are commonly noticed in everyday situations and are useful in understanding the nature of intersemiotic translation when it comes to recoding sign relations at the level of language, interaction, personal expression or situational requirements.

As Chandler (2002: 149) explains, the second class of codes, i.e. *textual codes*, presupposes scientific subcodes (1), aesthetic subcodes (2), "genre, rhetorical and stylistic" subcodes (3) and mass-media subcodes (4). These are employed in representing ideas meant to generally contain a set of pre-established subcodes meant to function as a linking device in a certain area or help create a new one in the same or a related area.

These are translatable by using ekphrasis of different kinds, with the exception of the third group of subcodes, whose general character makes them available only at a theoretical level. The other groups of subcodes (1, 2, 4) can be intersemiotically translated by making use of ekphrasis. Coding and recoding using these sets of signs are valuable for anyone analysing the fluctuation of the process of intersemiotic translation.

The third class of codes, *interpretive codes*, as Chandler clarifies (2002: 149), can be considered to cover perceptual subcodes (1) of visual perception (Hall 1973: 132; Nichols 1981: 11ff.; Eco 1982; cf. Chandler 2002), for instance, when there is no wished communication assumed and ideological subcodes (2) which include subcodes for "'encoding' and 'decoding' texts—dominant (or 'hegemonic'), negotiated or oppositional" (Hall 1980; Morley 1980; cf. Chandler 2002: 149–150). The latter, the theorist reveals, may indicate different '-isms', such as objectivism, individualism, progressivism, feminism, racism, materialism, capitalism, liberalism, conservatism, socialism, and populism (Chandler 2002: 150).

These codes and their subsets are of a philosophical nature and are generally used in order to intersemiotically translate external reality for one's own understanding and to represent, through an intersemiotical translation, the ideology of the trends which can be used in order to explain ways of thinking and acting and ways of manipulating people.

Jean Baudrillard (1994: 122) believes that "the illusion of our history opens on to the greatly more radical illusion of the world". This illusory aspect is mainly determined by the overuse of ideological subcodes meant to distort past or present reality in order to have it serve a small group of people involved in leading a country.

It has been noticed at different moments along the course of history that the perspectives from which various important events defining the state of a country at a particular moment in time were mirrored in a distorted or intentionally ambiguous manner, so that the younger generations might be manipulated into swallowing half-truth or false versions of past reality. Still, ideological codes can be found everywhere and combine in messages that often have underlying motives. This is not only the case of politics. It may be the case of all fields where there is something less readily acceptable which must be delivered or applied in order to finish the process of creation.

According to Rossi-Landi (1981: 37), "Wittgenstein developed a conception of human conduct and intelligence which could be labelled 'the automaton conception of human life'". This concept helps one understand that codes and subcodes pass unnoticed even if they are in front of our eyes. People's general habit of focusing only on one's immediate interests because of the lack of time, together with daily concerns either urgent or not, contribute to the development of ignorance about one's surrounding reality. Its cryptic ways of turning one into a pawn through the medium of appealing texts that sometimes have a subversive

character or intricate imagery which may have an inductive effect as far as particular cognitive processes are concerned, are hard to decode by most people who have either no knowledge on the subject or no time to devote to it.

Jurij M. Lotman (cf. Rossi-Landi 1981: 37) sees culture in terms of information and its transmission as a "conservation of sign systems suitable for *controlling the behaviour of individuals*". Furthermore, these sign systems cover "programs of behaviour" (Rossi-Landi 1981: 37), communication itself being programmed. If everything abstract is seen as having resulted from the process of learning pre-taught sets of signs forming sign systems, then the reality created by visual and verbal encoding is part of a rather artificial programming of life meant to limit consciousness.

In such conditions, the natural process of reasoning is limited and thus, "false thought", as Rossi-Landi (1981: 45) calls it, can easily find its way through on the part of those who evade the pre-established paths of thinking. He (1981: 45) very well clarifies that "false thought is linguistic alienation" which entails that verbal codes and the way one employs them may result in unusually uncomfortable states of mind. These may reflect a difficulty of deciding between right and wrong, normal and abnormal or reality and imagination.

Postmodern literature focuses on such problems and uses them as a source of creating narrative techniques whose verbal encodings suggest the multiplicity of perspectives and endless permutations that can result from the necessity of expressing the fluctuation of life and the changing waves that pass through human mind either consciously or unconsciously.

The same thing happens in the case of visual codes, when the ambiguity of the topic can open the door to many interpretations and one can suddenly discover various stories hiding behind the image or images. Linking visual and verbal codes can consequently be done at the level of the surface representation, through ekphrasis, while the source of inspiration will in most cases remain unknown unless one studies the artist's life in depth.

The surrounding madness of everyday life determines one to make an effort of fast intersemiotic translation of an overwhelming amount of messages whose content is not always logically organised from the point of view of meaning, on purpose or out of sheer ignorance. Newer literature mirrors this at the level of form which fragments meaning to such a degree that coherence is annihilated in the end.

This general elusiveness takes over all forms of art and signs are less easily recognisable in a chosen set leading to great loss of meaning. Reliably turning art into text becomes much more questionable in case one's creativity is given rein to and the ensuing text loses its initial veil of mystery. The elements of abstract art are given a glimpse of in absurd literature, in which the idea of one's role in this world, for instance, is emphasised with a repetitive care rather than the development of a particular story.

Given the distinct character of the signs that one has at one's disposal when dealing with painting, to take one of the arts, as opposed to literature, the faithful exchange of colour for word is almost impossible to achieve. Sign sets are rethought by using different signs, so the effect is what one should look for. Confusion, typically determined by abstract art, is found in newer literature too, to the point of creating loss on all levels: sense, space and time.

The lack of logic produces confusion in the case of advertisements too whose content has evolved to such abstract and encrypted forms that it is at times difficult for one state with certainty what the advertised product is. This game of blending sign sets in order to achieve originality seems to be a deceiving one from the start, as, because of time constraints, one does not dwell on the aim of such advertising minutes later, despite what the advertisement creators may assume. Confusion does occasionally create controversy though, but this is hardly a good method to sell a product. This, after all, remains obscure to the detriment of those displayed in plain sight.

Multimodality, due to its plural nature, appears to entertain a perpetual dialogue between its various forms of expression whose intersemiotic translation is constantly necessary in order for one to become aware of the significance of the various dimensions which make up life. Visual and verbal sign code translation takes place so that coherence can be re-established, together with logic, sense and normality. The strange tendencies contained by games of various sorts which force one to leave one's comfort zone from the point of view of understanding and reconstructing meaning show one unknown patterns of unravelling signs whose labyrinthine construction may determine one's confusion or madness.

Perseverance sometimes works against the gamer who pointlessly tries to solve the puzzle of signs and cannot do it. The variation of codifying sign sets is much richer in the case of sign combinations whose associations and figurative character goes beyond the convention

familiar to everybody. Generally, the notions and concepts attached to rarely employed patterns of sign set puzzles reveal a secondary or tertiary regrouping of meaning around clusters of ideas which are meant to remain hidden. The metaphorical stratum is at times replaced by a new language altogether whose mechanics function along the lines of a completely different system of thought. The strangeness of the associations makes it liable to malfunction unless often or continuously used.

As Gyurcsik (2017: 99) explains in his book *Modern Paradigms*, when one unwinds while listening to a joke, for example, one must decode the words listened to and not the things suggested by the short text. Generally, one gives "the current, everyday meaning" to the words heard, until one makes one's point, thus revealing the punchline of the joke. "We view the frames (meanings) in their transparency, as things which evoke words. The point of the wisecrack reminds us we hear words which have more meanings (or frames)." Consequently, one no longer thinks in terms of the automatisms of everyday life, but tries to break them in order to be able to understand the funny semantic webbing of the witticism.

In this case, the code of the sign sets comprised by the joke must be replaced by a different code made up of superposed sign sets which make one think of puns. One must intersemiotically translate the joke against one's habit by employing codes that one generally neglects and one will also forget, as Gyurcsik (2017: 99) points out in his chapter dedicated to Franz Kafka's *The Trial*.

The ephemeral character of the encoding process helps one understand Chandler's view upon the determinants of existing codes, which, he (2002: 15) thinks are the world (in the case of "social knowledge" codes), "the medium and the genre" (in the case of "textual knowledge" codes), the relationship between the world, on the one hand, and "the medium and the genre", on the other hand (in the case of "modality judgement" or interpretive codes, as he calls them). The intertwining possibilities of combining such sets of visual and verbal codes allow one to view encodings as genetic strands which may evolve in ways one might not have thought of.

Many theorists have focused on the problem of coding and among them, Barthes (cf. Silverman 1983: 251–274) has managed to classify codes from a quite different perspective than Chandler. He discusses the semic code (whose role is that of adding various signifiers to a proper name or of temporarily turning a simple signifier into a sort

of proper name), the hermeneutic code (having ten parts—"thematization, proposal of the enigma, formulation of the enigma, request for an answer, snare, equivocation, jamming, suspended answer, partial answer, and disclosure", Barthes cf. Silverman 1983: 257), the proairetic code (which ensures a predictable ordering of event clusters), the symbolic code and the cultural code. These types of codes overlap Chandler's more thoroughly defined codes and subcodes, with the exception of the symbolic one, which, as Barthes (cf. Silverman 1983: 270) explains, deals with "the formulation of antitheses, especially that variety which admits no mediation between its terms".

When it comes to ekphrasis or transposition one may need to turn symbolic codes, in Barthes' sense, from visual ones into verbal ones by employing linguistic encodings that clarify the highly concentrated form in which they appear in the painting, picture, photograph or any other visual form of representation. According to Victor Ieronim Stoichiță (2015: 12), "in the rhetorical exercise and all the more, in the exercise of visual retranslation of an ekphrasis, one weaves multiple connections between the pictorial expression and the descriptive discourse, between the sense of sight and hearing".

Perception plays a key role in the translation process helping one to choose the proper codes for an objective rendering of the message. Even though some believe that codes should be considered only when dealing with painting, drawing, theatre or cinema (see Barthes 1979: 17), photography can also be viewed as an encoded message since not all pictures are easily decodable, being difficult for one to realise the episode, partial episode or fragment of an episode caught in a picture. The context is even harder to guess because of the fleeting moments that are sometimes caught in pictures.

The evocative nature of pictures creates unseen links with the world of elusive energies, by using a complex combination of visual signs in order to generally mark an important moment in one's life. The colours, mimics, lines, objects, background, possible verbal codes included in the picture connect past sign sets with present ones determining unexplainable changes of the person's present or future. Unseen sign sets influence one's life by their mere energy which fluctuates depending on one's activities. However, intersemiotically translating esoteric messages is only the gift of a few and one's training in it goes beyond one's simple knowledge of source language and target language as the traditional process of translation demands.

Creating meaning by decoding sometimes requires knowledge belonging to a great many fields which must overlap on one's establishing sense for the purpose of one's turning visual sign sets into verbal ones. As one can discuss energetic paths, one can also refer to the unseen signs that create them. In this case, intersemiotic translation indicates a threefold process which presupposes unravelling the visual representation, intersemiotically translating it into unseen energetic semiotics which is then explained by using words, so it is retranslated into written or acoustic signs for everyone to be able to grasp it.

The energetic paths link images and their intersemiotic translation(s) in various ways, from reading the position of planets and delivering the horoscope, to reading a picture on the mantelpiece and establishing the elements that it keeps alive in one's mind and brings to one's life over and over again every time one sees it, to going as far as delivering a set of changes it can bring to one's life or it has already brought to one's life, if it is, for example, the picture of a saint or the sculpture of a saint or any form of representation meant to influence one's state of mind.

George Herbert Mead (1967: 341) points out that "the laws of association are now generally recognised as simple processes of reintegration, in which the imagery tends to complete itself in its temporal, spatial, or functional (similarity) phases". When turning the image into text, the resulting verbal encoding adds all the missing elements from a unilateral point of view just by associating them according to what one knows about its author.

The reverse ekphrasis limits the available codes to a representation which again stands for only one way of perceiving a lyrical text. Postmodern poems due to their highly concentrated lines can determine so many possibilities of combining visual codes, thus turning the process of intersemiotic translation into a source of indefinite options of rethinking codes.

Ekphrasis may be a "partial transposition" (Pârlog et al. 2009: 104), "the transposition of a real or an imaginary object", "the transposition of an artistic object" (Pârlog et al. 2009: 109), presupposing "three consecutive operations": choosing the essential visual elements for translation, describing them (starting by preserving and foregrounding particular elements as opposed to others) and interpreting them (Pârlog et al. 2009: 110). It is interesting to see how ekphrasis can be noticed in fashion, the colour and material being meant to convey coded ideas that emphasise the main message of the fashion designer. "Fashion clothes

(…) are the language at the level of vestimentary communication and speech at the level of verbal communication" (Barthes 1983: 26). In *Elements of Semiology*, he (1983: 28) also discusses alimentary language which depends on various rules, such as those of exclusion, of association, rituals of use and opposition. The multimodality of diets is very complex depending both on their purpose, and on their material.

Coding on a verbal level is however much clearer than ekphrasis and it can be analysed based on the discourse type and all its underlying elements. The translation from a language into another, for instance, is a very tortuous process which entails deep knowledge of language subtleties, synonymic sets and connotational implications. The cultural richness of every linguistic system always makes it more difficult for one to preserve all the aspects that one can find in a source text and requires one to heed all formal aspects that may play an important role for the reception of the text in a language that is different from the original.

Both visual and verbal coding pose problems while being read which is why the translator must be well learnt in decoding these ways of putting forth messages through the medium of a variety of intricate signs or sign sets. The field of semiotics contributes to the unravelling of these signs and the understanding of the sense depth attached to simple elements which at first sight may seem to have no importance at all. The process of translation covers a wide variety of intersemiotic transfers, a reason for which the signs selected so that this process may take place, must correspond to the exact context in which and purpose for which the writer, artist or speaker thought these may be endowed with special meanings.

References

Barthes, Roland. 1979 (1977). *Image, Music, Text*. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins.

Barthes, Roland. 1983 (1964). *Elements of Semiology*. New York: Hill and Wang (A Division of Farrar, Strauss and Giroux).

Baudrillard, Jean. 1994 (1992). *The Illusion of the End*. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press in assoc. with Blackwell Publishers.

Chandler, Daniel. 2002. *Semiotics: The Basics*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Gyurcsik, Ilie. 2017. *Modern Paradigms: Authors, Texts, Harlequins*, trans. Georgina Gabor. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, and Plymouth, UK: Hamilton Books.

Mead, George Herbert. 1967 (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Pârlog, Hortensia, Pia Brînzeu, and Aba-Carina Pârlog. 2009. *Translating the Body*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. 1981. Wittgenstein, Old and New. In *Ars Semeiotica IV: International Journal of American Semiotic*, ed. Luigi Romeo. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.

Silverman, Kaja. 1983. *The Subject of Semiotics*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stoichiță, Victor Ieronim. 2015. *Cum se savurează un tablou şi alte studii de istoria artei*. Bucharest: Humanitas.

CHAPTER 5

Direct and Indirect Intralingual Translation

Abstract This chapter explains the positive and negative aspects of dealing with intralingual translation. Roman Jakobson's (On Translation. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, p. 233, 1959) view on textual transposition from one form into another within the same language is employed in order to show the way direct (rephrasing or reformulating and paraphrasing) and indirect (adaptation and free translation) intralingual translation function. The chapter is mainly meant for students who do not yet know how to tackle the usage of linguistic formulae and their interchange according to various communicative situations which require particular registers of language. It also addresses translators that have only just begun work in the field and are unaware of language subtleties.

Keywords Adaptation · Free translation intralingual translation · Image · Shakespeare

The linguistic sign is "an obstacle, something which destroys the delicate, fleeting and fragile impressions of individual consciousness" (Bergson; cf. Fokkema and Kunne-Ibsch 1977: 51). Using such signs can only lead to artificial presentations of reality (see post-structuralist linguistic theories) mirrored by restrictive formulations which are meant to evoke one's feelings regarding the various situations that one is forced to deal with in everyday life and not only. Henri Bergson's theory on the subjective impression left by the passing of time on the individual clarifies

A.-C. Pârlog, *Intersemiotic Translation*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0_5

the necessity of turning the linguistic sign into a flexible instrument that can be employed in order to describe reality in a manner that is very close to what one could perceive in the process of understanding a particular issue or the attempt of solving a certain problem.

The necessity of translating one reality into another draws one's attention to the importance of expressing constructions or sentences according to one's experience about reality and one's knowledge about the endless possibilities that one has at one's disposal, of exploiting notions of native or foreign vocabulary. Refining one's wording sheds light on the problem of intralingual translation which is very much made use of in order for one to be able to situate one's verbal approach closer to the lived experience.

Intralingual or endolingual translation, as Jakobson (1959: 233) calls it, in his article *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*, is the transposition of a text from one form into another within the same language. This can be done by *direct intralingual translation* through (a) *rephrasing or reformulating*, i.e. the change of linguistic formulation or of construction or register and is based on synonymy and through (b) *paraphrasing*, i.e. explicitation of meaning, which is based on explanation. It can also be done by *indirect intralingual translation* through (a) *adaptation*, i.e. loosely expressing the same idea in the same language and through (b) *free translation*, i.e. interpreting meaning by indirectly translating the original construction or phrase intralingually.

According to Patrick Mahoney (cf. Shapiro 2005: 98), intralingual translation represents the description of a word or event by one's using other codes than the ones initially selected. Among the simplest examples of intralingual translation, he proposes that one should consult the available definitions which one can easily find in dictionaries.

For example, in the case of the English sentence, 'The expanse was bathed by the last rays of the sun', a rephrased variant may be: 'The grassland was shining in the dusk light', while a paraphrasing of the same sentence may be: 'The endless grassland was lit up by the countless rays of the sun that was setting.' The relation between intralingual translation and semiotic translation is essential so that language may make sense regardless of its encoding (Dines Johansen and Larsen 2002: 144). In other words, if iconic and indicative signs could not be linked to the symbolic ones, natural languages would lose their connection with human activity and the natural and cultural environment and thus, they would lose their capacity of meaning or indicating something.

According to Dines Johansen and Larsen (2002: 144), there is an intrinsic connection between discourse which presupposes images and the organised world which surrounds us, just as the images and the organised world which surrounds us presuppose the existence of discourse in order to convey meanings (there is, in fact, the possibility of making sense and communicating without presupposing the existence of language, but the possibilities of understanding reality without the help of language are limited).

In order to study apparent examples of indirect intralingual translation, one may compare the so-called adaptations of texts belonging to different playwrights. The same text can be found reworded under the form of another variant of translation which may be exposed to more transformations that make the original blurry.

For instance, in the case of William Shakespeare's 1595 play, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, act II, scene I, translated into the French language as *Le songe d'une nuit d'été*, one can study the versions created by François Pierre Guillaume Guizot (1862) and by François-Victor Hugo (1865). The source language fragment contains various linguistic and stylistic problems as one can observe in the following:

> Fairy.
> Over hill, over dale,
> Thorough bush, thorough brier,
> Over park, over pale,
> Thorough flood, thorough fire,
> I do wander every where,
> Swifter than the moon's sphere;
> And I serve the Fairy Queen,
> To dew her orbs upon the green.
> The cowslips tall her pensioners be;
> In their gold coats spots you see;
> Those be rubies, fairy favours,
> In those freckles live their savours.
> I must go seek some dewdrops here,
> And hang a pearl in every cowslip's ear. (Shakespeare 1966: 202)

Guizot's (1) and Hugo's (2) translations of the fragment above reflect changes of both vocabulary, aesthetics and rhythm, as well as the translators' propensity for particular lexical units that determine distinct effects in the French language as opposed to the English

language. The descriptive character of the lines is preserved by reducing their evocative impact:

(1) LA FÉE.
Sur les coteaux, dans les vallons,
À travers buissons et ronces,
Au-dessus des parcs et des enceintes,
Au travers des feux et des eaux,
J'erre au hasard, en tous lieux,
Plus rapidement que la sphère de la lune.
Je sers la reine des fées,
J'arrose ses cercles magiques sur la verdure
Les plus hautes primevères sont ses favorites:
Vous voyez des taches sur leurs robes d'or.
Ces taches sont les rubis, les bijoux des fées,
C'est dans ces taches que vivent leurs sucs odorants.
Il faut que j'aille recueillir ici quelques gouttes de rosée,
Et que je suspende là une perle aux pétales de chaque primevère.
(Shakespeare 1862: 26)

(2) LA FÉE.
Par la colline, par la vallée,
à travers les buissons, à travers les ronces,
par les parcs, par les haies,
à travers l'eau, à travers le feu,
j'erre en tous lieux,
plus rapide que la sphère de la lune.
Je sers la reine des fées,
et j'humecte les cercles qu'elle trace sur le gazon.
Les primevères les plus hautes sont ses pensionnaires.
Vous voyez des taches sur leurs robes d'or:
ce sont les rubis, les bijoux de la fée,
taches de rousseur d'où s'exhale leur senteur.
Il faut maintenant que j'aille chercher des gouttes de rosée,
pour suspendre une perle à chaque oreille d'ours.
(Shakespeare 1865: 26)

The key of these indirect intralingual translations can be found in the original where words and expressions have a distinct form, different shades of meaning and dissimilar associations of ideas. The two French adaptations employ stylistic devices in a way which renders the translators' more or less faithful interpretation of Shakespeare's lines.

On passing from one version of the French text to another, one can notice the apparent rephrasing of the adaptations which reflects the translators' intention of allowing various elements to seep into their text. If Guizot's variant is less faithful to Shakespeare's literary work than Hugo's variant, one can also see that Hugo moves further away from the vegetal symbolism of the English playwright, endowing his text with new vegetal elements which are meant to aesthetically embellish the French version of the comedy.

Thus, Shakespeare's noun "cowslip", "a wild primula with clusters of drooping fragrant yellow flowers in spring", *Primula veris* (Pearsall 1999: 330), is faithfully translated by "primevère" by both translators, in its first instance and then as "oreille d'ours" by Hugo. If one compares them, the two French nouns do not indicate the same flower, as "oreille d'ours" (syn. 'auricule'), Hugo's choice of noun indicates 'bear's ear' in the English language (*Primula auricula*), "an Alpine primula with leaves said to resemble bears' ears" (Pearsall 1999: 88). Even if they are part of the same Primulaceae family, the former is a perennial flowering plant which appears in spring, whereas the latter is a flowering plant which grows on rock and is common to mountainous areas.

Hugo's selection of target language vocabulary is based on an abstract idea of faithfulness, which in this instance, is formal, as the type of flower selected by him in order to render Shakespeare's logical sequence, though including the noun "ear", makes one think of a completely different reality. Due to the fact that the British writer does not mention any mountain range, only hills, Hugo's choice of noun phrase indicating a flowering plant specific of the mountainous area hardly fits the context and can be considered a mistake. Still, he chooses this noun phrase in order to create the same metaphorical image as far as the activity of the fairy is concerned, because she is supposed to suspend metaphorical pearls, i.e. dewdrops, on flower's 'ears', as Shakespeare formulates it and thus have them become some sort of metaphorical earrings. In the translation, there is, in conclusion, the need of employing words or constructions denoting plants that would be closest both in meaning and in form to what one can find in the original text.

The basic vocabulary employed by both translators is similar in most cases, but Guizot and Hugo formulate their target language according to distinct euphonic rules. Shakespeare's repetitions, annihilated by Guizot in his target text, can be noticed in Hugo's target text, which leaves the

impression of a more fluid form of expression that has greater aesthetic impact upon the reader or listener.

Still in the realm of indirect endolingual translation, John Milton's epic poem *Paradise Lost* (1667) can be taken as an example, because it was repeatedly translated into the Romanian language. Among the translators who dealt with this literary work, I have selected Aurel Covaci's 1972 version and Adina Begu's 2004 version. By comparing their individual translations, one can notice that free translation can be used in order to offer a completely different text in the target language.

Milton's fragment below is relevant from the point of view of the way in which a story of the Bible can be concentrated in just a few lines of poetic narrative. It is also difficult to translate, if interpretation replaces the sequencing of ideas that one can find in the source language employed by the British writer:

> Of Mans first disobedience, and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
> With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
> Restore us, and regain the blissful seat, (…). (Milton 1821: 3)

If the translations written by Covaci and Begu had been compared, one could discover that they barely maintain the same main ideas that one can find in Milton's poem. The rewriting of the English text in the Romanian language creates a completely different manner of conveying Milton's set of ideas and viewing his poetical imagery. Here are their translations in the order mentioned above, first Covaci's version and then Begu's version:

> (1) Dintâia omului neascultare
> Şi fructul pomului oprit, al cărui
> Gust ucigaş aduse-n Lume moartea,
> Năpasta noastră grea, pierdut Edenul,
> Până când alt Om, mult mai mare, iară
> Acest pământ al binecuvântării
> Ni-l va reda prin sfântă mântuire (…). (Milton 1972: 1)

> (2) Atât de fericiți în Ceruri, ei, stăpânii lumii,
> De Creatorul lor s-au îndepărtat, nesocotindu-i voia,
> Doar pentru că li s-a oprit un fruct.

Spre-această răzvrătire cine oare i-a împins?
Doar infernalul şarpe, ce cu-a sa viclenie,
Mânat de răzbunare şi invidie, a amăgit
Pe-a omenirii mamă,
Trufia când l-a izgonit din Rai, cu toată gloata-i
De îngeri răzvrătiţi, cu a căror ajutor spera să se înalţe întâiul, printre cei asemeni lui,
La fel cu însuşi Preaînaltul. (Milton 2004: 5)

Just as painters making a short transposition on deciding which title they should give their painting and on choosing "a verbal text with explanatory functions, which may or may not be in concordance with the image" (Pârlog et al. 2009: 115), the translator that employs the free translation method relies more on interpretation and may end up rewriting an original text altogether. The key elements of Milton's fragment are present in the Romanian language under the form of symbols meant to remind one of the same episode in the Bible, Adam and Eve, the lost heaven, the forbidden fruit and the sly snake.

Because of "the principle of manifold or 'polysemous' meaning, as Dante calls it" (Frye in Chiţoran et al. 1971: 127), any text can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Consequently, the differences noticed in Covaci's and Begu's translations, as opposed to the source text, clarify the new perspectives that one can take when reformulating ideas on a specific topic while rendering a text from a source language into a target language. As a result, especially on reading Begu's version, one has the impression that one deals with a completely new text, while in the case of Covaci there are constructions which cannot be found in the source language, such as "acest pământ al binecuvântării" (i.e. 'this land of blessing') which Jesus Christ will give people back or as "sfântă mântuire" (i.e. 'blessed redemption') which will find its way towards people through Christ's sacrifice.

Begu's variant makes Adam and Eve the rulers of the world and mentions that the evil snake is the cause of their being expelled from Eden, because the snake wished to have the same place as God. The translator's free perspective on translation ignores Milton's textual focus on Christ and his redemption of all sin.

The two versions of the original are indirect intralingual or endolingual translations which ever so often seem to be quite imperfect rewordings that emphasise source language ideas in a different way or

generally leave less important words or constructions aside. Stylistically, texts always suffer on undergoing this process of linguistic transformation. They are much longer than the original one and tell the story of the lost heaven, as if it were a common text which can be freely reworded according to one's will. Nevertheless, Covaci heeds Milton's linguistic selections more than Begu. As a result, one cannot consider Covaci's text an indirect endolingual translation of Begu's text because her linguistic transformations are too drastic.

In Lewis Carroll's novel *Through the Looking Glass, and What Alice Found There* (1872), one may discover a lot of new compound words which, in case they are translated or transposed with the help of other synonymous constructions, will result in a longer more complicated text, whose main ideas are more difficult to grasp than those of the source language explained in a footnote. The opacity determined by portmanteau words or blends will turn into a different kind of opacity, if exposed to the process of translation or transposition caused by the necessity of paraphrasing them. At the level of meaning, the translation is less affected, due to the fact that the degree of linguistic difficulty is maintained, even though its innovative character is annihilated, which affects the translated text from a stylistic point of view.

Carroll's poem *Jabberwocky* contains many such words whose authentic nature contributed to the development of the English language, as nowadays one can find many new compounds formed according to the linguistic pattern set by the British writer. These can mostly be found in the field of advertising and politics.

Some such words are "brillig", "frumious", "vorpal" or "burbled". Humpty Dumpty explained them in turn pointing out that "brillig" (Carroll 2007: 18) came from the verb 'to broil', the activity one performed at four o'clock before dinner, thus also suggesting the time which such an adjective might be alluding to. In Romanian, it was translated by Mirella Acsente (2002) as "frigază" (Carroll 2002: 22), an adjective resulting from the Romanian verb 'a frige' (i.e. 'to broil') and the noun 'amiază' (i.e. 'afternoon'). Using the paraphrase of "brillig" in Romanian would result in a long explanation which would make the wording of the text more complicated and its grasping more difficult. So, whether one deals with reformulations of such words in English or Romanian, their explanation would complicate the text.

The adjective "frumious" (Carroll 2007: 18) was explained by Carroll as a combination of the adjectives 'fuming' and 'furious'. By retaining

the first syllable of the mentioned present participle and the suffix of the adjective and incorporating the letter 'r' (which is part of the second adjective), the writer created a new word with a more intricate meaning. This was translated as "arțăvajnic" (Carroll 2002: 22) which comes from 'arțăgos' (i.e. 'quarrelsome') and 'vajnic' (i.e. 'courageous'). The paraphrase of the two words considered would have prolonged the verses of the poem and thus irremediably affected the style created by Carroll, if one thought of the Romanian text.

Another portmanteau extracted from Carroll's *Jabberwocky* is the presupposed adjective "vorpal" (Carroll 2007: 18). The suffix '-al' added to it suggests that it pertains to the morphological class of adjectives, even if it is not clear to which class the writer wished to have his puzzling portmanteau belong to. Even though he stated that he could not give any explanations about this blend, one can perceive the fact that it is a mixture of the adjective 'verbal' and the noun 'gospel'. The "vorpal sword" (Carroll 2007: 18) is a sword that could bring justice to the fantastic world in *Through the Looking Glass* where the evil dragon only spread terror, caused destruction and sorrow.

Acsente interpreted the meaning of the English adjective "vorpal", in the original, and created the feminine adjective "grozavnică" which can been viewed as a combination of the masculine adjective 'grozav' (i.e. 'great') and the feminine adjective 'vajnică' (explained above). The subtextual implication of the Romanian text is that one deals with a great sword that helps one courageously vanquish the hideous beast. The source text inference that this is a special sword with which one will be able to re-establish the word of God, i.e. Biblical justice, is ignored and the translation only introduces the idea of a magic sword which can incidentally be associated to Excalibur and thus indirectly linked to faith, religion and God. Still, this association may not be clear for everyone, least of all for children. In the case of children, the linguistic problem is not as important as Carroll meant to write a poem with a great sound effect for them rather than a set of meaningful lines clarifying Alice's story.

The last word of *Jabberwocky*, taken as an example of a portmanteau, is the verb 'to burble' employed in the past tense by the writer, i.e. "burbled" (Carroll 2007: 19). The innovative author explained this part of speech as being a combination of the verbs 'to bleat', 'to murmur' and 'to warble'. Its shades of meaning are therefore more difficult to entirely render into the target language by the use of only one word. This is used

in connection with the dragon that comes in a hurry, being angry and making its characteristic noise.

The Romanian translator created the verb 'a şuiermăi' which does not cover the meanings of all the original subtextual verbs. This results from a mixture of the verb 'a şuiera' (i.e. 'to whistle') and the verb 'a mormăi' (i.e. 'to mumble'). Consequently, part of the original sense is maintained and in the absence of a paraphrase or of a free translation, the Romanian verses have almost the same length, so the rhythm is not affected.

In the case of blends, when transposing meaning in the same language, there is a narrow range of synonymic possibilities. Rephrasing is demanding unless paraphrasing is employed. Intralingual translation generally requires extensive knowledge of a particular language and a rich display of formulae which aid one to envisage a whole set of perspectives from which a specific idea can be expressed.

The purpose of one's statements influences the selection of constructions which must prove efficient and evocative as far as the aim of the message is concerned. Rewriting texts is generally done according to the requirements of the field they will belong to after the reformulating process. They must be transformed by employing lexical elements that represent the new field they must become a part of.

Whether one deals with literature, history, geography, chemistry, physics, mathematics or biology, one must situate one's text within a certain specialised vocabulary. The registers employed can only emphasise the audience the text addresses and less the manner in which the writer or translator generally chooses to express himself or herself. Intralingual translation is a necessary tool for every culture where reformulation lies at the basis of creating new texts meant to respond to the multimodal forms of expression available in nowadays' society.

References

Carrol, Lewis. 2002. *Alice în Ţara din Oglindă*, trans. Mirella Acsente. Bucharest: Corint Press.

Carroll, Lewis. 2007. *Through the Looking Glass.* Plain Label Books. Available at: https://books.google.ro/books?id=ZyOUoHvxmjcC&printsec=frontcover&dq=through+the+looking+glass&hl=ro&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjAmZ_A86PaAhWIqaQKHTPoAKwQ6AEIJjAA#v=onepage&q&f=false. Accessed 5 Apr 2018.

Dines Johansen, Jørgen, and Svend Erik Larsen. 2002. *Signs in Use: An Introduction to Semiotics*. London: Routledge.

Fokkema, D.W., and Elrud Kunne-Ibsch. 1977. *Theories of Literature in the Twentieth Century*. London: C. Hurst and Company.

Frye, Northrop. 1971. Ethical Criticism: Theory of Symbols. In *An Anthology of Literary, Criticism, Linguistics, and Modern Literature*, ed. Dumitru Chițoran, Livia Deac, and Maria Mociornița. Bucharest: Bucharest University Press.

Jakobson, Roman. 1959. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In *On Translation*, ed. Reuben Arthur Brower. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Milton, John. 1821. *Paradise Lost*. London: John Bumpus, Holborn Bars.

Milton, John. 1972. *Paradisul pierdut*, trans. Aurel Covaci. Bucharest: Minerva Press.

Milton, John. 2004. *Paradisul pierdut*, trans. Adina Begu. Bucharest: Aldo Press.

Pârlog, Hortensia, Pia Brînzeu, and Aba-Carina Pârlog. 2009. *Translating the Body*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Pearsall, Judy (ed.). 1999. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 10th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shakespeare, William. 1862. Le songe d'une nuit d'été. In *Œuvres complètes de Shakespeare*. Tome III. Traduction par François Pierre Guillaume Guizot. Paris: Didier. Available at: http://www.crdp-strasbourg.fr/je_lis_libre/livres/Shakespeare_LeSongeDUneNuitDEte.pdf. Accessed 10 Mar 2017.

Shakespeare, William. 1865. Le songe d'une nuit d'été. In *Œuvres complètes de Shakespeare*. Tome II. Traduction par François-Victor Hugo. Paris: Pagnerre. Available at: https://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Le_Songe_d%E2%80%99une_nuit_d%E2%80%99%C3%A9t%C3%A9/Traduction_Hugo,_1865. Accessed 10 Mar 2017.

Shakespeare, William. 1966 (1951). *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Peter Alexander. London and Glasgow: Collins.

Shapiro, Theodore. 2005. The Representational World and the Linguistic Idiom. In *Psychoanalysis on the Move: The Work of Joseph Sandler*, ed. Peter Fonagy, Arnold M. Cooper, and Robert S. Wallerstein. London: Routledge.

CHAPTER 6

The Constraints of Interlingual Translation

Abstract This chapter centres on *The Constraints of Interlingual Translation*, as its title clarifies. Starting with the problems of Google Translate (GT) and Google Neural Machine Translation (GNMT), I have highlighted the essential matter of regarding language and its classes and subclasses from the perspective of genetics. For explanatory purposes, I have included a translation analysis of various English and French idioms into Romanian and of some microtexts taken from Tracy Chevalier's novel *The Lady and the Unicorn* and analysed the problems of transforming sense in an inaccurate way in the target language. The blend of the visual and the linguistic is highlighted so that the wider sense of the process of translation may be more easily understood by considering supratext and subtext at the same time.

Keywords Communication · Expression · Faithful translation · Interlingual translation · Source language · Target language

In the light of Claude Elwood Shannon's theory, the father of information theory, Russian formalist and semiotician, Boris A. Uspenski considered meaning a set of "representations and connotations" that are linked to a particular symbol or as 'the invariant in reversible operations of translation' (Fokkema and Kunne-Ibsch 1977: 40–41). Due to the various ways of translating a word or a construction, machine translation (MT), among other ways of translating, for instance, must be

A.-C. Pârlog, *Intersemiotic Translation*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0_6

done with an eye to all possible ways of understanding and interpreting a word, a construction, an expression, a part of a sentence or an entire sentence. The various equations available in the field of mathematics can aid program such type of MT, thus increasing its rate of accuracy. When employing Peter Newmark's (1995: 45–46) word-for-word translation method, Google Translate (GT) is a very useful tool of rendering the meaning of the source language into the target language.

Nevertheless, for less simple texts, this type of MT may cause misunderstanding and consequently, impede the process of communication. Just as any other MT tool, one should handle GT in such a manner as to pay attention to grammar, context, cultural phrases, figurative language and all the other linguistic aspects that make up the essence of a text depending on its kind and the requirements of translation for that genre. Still, this proves to be a futile attempt, in the case of GT, because of the rudimentary solutions it provides.

The most important flaw of this programmed MT type is its impossibility of checking the level of equivalence it considers. Google Neural Machine Translation (GNMT), a newer, more advanced form of GT which considers equivalence at various levels and which theoretically improves with time, could be perfected by conditioning it based on Bruno de Finetti's theorem on exchangeable sequences of random variables.

Genetic linguistics theory clarifies the importance of interpreting more complex stretches of language in the light of the basic phenotypic features which are combined in a genomic sentential structure. This lies at the basis of the DNA strands that make up the organism of a text.

A text can be viewed as a living organism whose homeostasis depends on the writer's choice of topic, aim, idiolect and personality. Interlingual translation requires that all these details be taken into account, so that a similar homeostasis may be established between the physiological linguistic processes determined by the new text or the target text.

One of the most difficult types of translation is the one pertaining to literature. Literary translation is the most complex field of translation due to the many specificities of a particular writer's style which fluctuates according to the topic s/he selected for his/her literary work. The constraints of translation are thus conditioned by supratext and subtext (Pârlog 2014: 73–75), which force one to pay attention to the entire literary work as well in order to discover hidden elements whose importance can be noticed only if the text is analysed as a finished product.

Even though a common aspect of almost all types of translation in the field of literature, the assessment of the original does not imply its correction, which would trigger inaccurate transformations in the target language. This constraint demands that the translation be quite faithful to the source language and reproduce any of the vocabulary, grammar or logical sequencing mistakes made by the writer. Playing with logic may only be a defining feature of the trend that the literary work belongs to, so coherence or its lack may stand for the presence or absence of madness in today's world which is reflected in the book.

The volatile charms of literary translation can be easily analysable in the case of the Romanian translation of Tracy Chevalier's novel *The Lady and the Unicorn*. Even if it is not a literary work relying much on the abnormal features of postmodern narrative, her novel is a good example of how language can be rendered in an inappropriate way. In the case of interlingual translation, there is a whole process of interpretation which translators may take advantage of. Creating and recreating a text indicates an interlingual fluctuation between an author's selective codes and a translator's own. This deaf interplay can be looked at when having both texts in front of our eyes, being conversant in both languages and able to assess the target language mirror which often deforms the original object.

If Italo Calvino thought that a book should not be anything else but the equivalent of the unwritten world translated into writing, then the translation proper of this writing should not be anything else but a concrete representation of the same unwritten world using different kinds of signs. Chevalier's novel brings back the world of the fifteenth century interhuman relations which she mirrors with the help of the English language and her imaginative story. Fraga Cusin (2005) changes the linguistic codes of the Germanic language with those specific of the Romanian language, i.e. of those of a Romance language.

On having a closer look at the Romanian translation, one can notice dilutions of meaning, explicitations of sense, alterations of the source language style, misinterpretation of various parts of speech, semantic improvements of the target language text and so on. All these give one an idea about the way the silver of the translation glass shows a distorted image of the source language under the influence of the translator's understanding of literary translation rules and what they presuppose.

Romanian semiotician Gyurcsik (2017: 100) mentions in his chapter on "The Trial of the Letter and the Letter of the Trial" which is part of

his quite inspiring book *Modern Paradigms: Authors, Texts, Harlequins* (2017), that modern writers seem to have grasped "the implications of the eternal confusion between *three* different 'levels of reality': *words*, *meanings*, and *states of the world*" much more thoroughly that their harbingers. He then explains this "confusion" as becoming greater when one considers the lack of clarity regarding a lexeme as a "matter of inference" (Eco) and "'productive' imagination" (Kant). The linguistic facets touched upon shed more light on the elements that a translator must examine on attempting to adjust his/her mirror of the original literary work.

The "states of world" as level of reality indicates the richness of phenomena, activities, experiences, processes, etc., out of which the writer selects those that must find their way to the pages of the book. The inferences that belong either to the supratext or to the subtext (Pârlog 2014: 73–75) of the narrative create confusion in as far as the ambiguity characteristic of the modern trend can be found in the latter glass constructed by the writer.

As far as the translation is concerned avoiding a wrong interpretation is only one of the challenges that a translator must face. Among the most difficult problems of interlingual translations, one can discuss idioms in general, those fixed expressions that have cultural dimensions that cannot be understood by grasping the meaning of their individual words and are often paraphrased. This situation is encountered much more often in the case of English idioms than in the case of French idioms, when one refers to a translation from these languages into Romanian.

On the problem of English idioms, one can read an analysis in the chapter "Adapting Culture in Translation: Wodehouse's *Joy in the Morning*" of my book *Translation and Literature: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (2014). One can find such idioms as 'to get a thick ear' translated as 'a primi o palmă zdravănă' or 'to shoot one's head off' translated as 'a îndruga vrute şi nevrute'. There are plenty of such idioms in novels dealing with a high concentration of cultural problems. One such case is that of the language in P. G. Wodehouse's series about butler Jeeves, which is a good example in this respect, as it deals with Englishness and it is filled with expressions that are specifically British.

These idioms were translated as plain expressions into Romanian, which makes the cultural dimension appear less obvious in the translation. Still, if paraphrased, these would have been much longer and more difficult to understand by the reader.

In the case of French idioms, such as 'donner carte blanche à qqn', i.e. 'a da mână liberă cuiva' or 'en pincer pour qqn', i.e. 'a fi îndrăgostit lulea de cineva', the translation can be done in a similar way, there being no equivalent idioms in Romanian despite its belonging to the Latin group of languages, just as the French language. It always depends on the etymology of the French idiom. If these were inspired by a German language, chances are that unless the same etymological source was used, one would not find an equivalent idiom in the Romanian language.

Sometimes, there are common cultural elements and idioms which are translated as specific Romanian expressions that are very close to those present in English and French. This happens, as I (2014: 128–133) have shown in *Translation and Literature: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, especially in the case of those which include body parts in the used structures. Some examples are 'to split hairs', i.e. 'a despica firu-n patru', 'to curdle the blood', i.e. 'a-i îngheța sângele-n vine', 'to put one's finger on the nub', i.e. 'a pune degetul pe rană'. As far as French is concerned, one can think of such examples as: 'se donner corps et âme à qqn, à qqch', i.e. 'a se dedica trup şi suflet cuiva/unei cauze'; 'fourrer qqch dans la tête/le crane de qqn', i.e. 'a vârî cuiva ceva în cap'; 'couper bras et jambes', i.e. 'a i se tăia picioarele'.

Even though the body parts are included in the Romanian expressions, sometimes only one of these can be found in the Romanian equivalent translation, the other remaining understood or being unnecessary in order to express the same meaning. As one can see in the translation above, the Romanian constructions are generally much clearer than the English or French ones, the cultural elements being more easily decodable as metaphors standing for a particular reality.

Looking for hidden meaning must always be at the back of translators' mind, whether one discusses a word, a compound, a phrase, an idiom, a sentence, a fragment or a whole book. There are various ways of interpreting the reasons for which translators choose a particular translation method instead of another. Typically, the faithful method of translation (as defined by Newmark [1995: 46]) is of great use for those who wish to render the exact style developed by a certain writer.

The enantiomorphic feature of translation is the paramount issue that all translators deal with. It must ensure this high degree of faithfulness, so that the structural construction of the original may be transformed even at the level of language, not only at the level of text, to such a

degree as to make one unable to recognise the specific elements defining the way the writer preferred to express himself/herself in the original book.

In the following, I will be having a close look at the translation of Chevalier's novel mentioned earlier, i.e. *The Lady and the Unicorn*, the manner selected by the translator to render the sense of the original language into Romanian. I will start by insisting on an example of neutralising shades of meaning, which makes the target language more restrictive, limiting the implications that one can find in the source language text:

> *SL*: "(…) her eyes are shrewder than Béatrice's". (Chevalier 2003: 55)
> *TL*: "(…) deşi privirea ei e mai pătrunzătoare decât a lui Béatrice". (Chevalier 2005: 66)

The problem that must be debated concerns the way the adjective "shrewd" employed in the comparative degree was rendered into Romanian. The Romanian translation suggests the intelligence of the girl compared to Béatrice and less her evilness or mischievousness, which are transparent in the English language. Such interpretations only lead to lack of meaning which, if less emphasised than in the original, determines the creation of a protagonist that is less clearly defined in Romanian, whose streaks of character are diluted and whose personality appears rather ambiguous to the reader. These differences of essential conception of characters should not be allowed in the translation because a book translated according to such fluctuating rules will be a creation belonging to the translator and to the original writer no longer.

There is always a risk for a translator of literature to become a new author of the text, but this is a major misunderstanding of the role that a translator should have on transposing meaning by switching verbal codes. Cusin frequently misinterprets the source language, creating a Romanian version which shows her own way of writing the story inspired by Chevalier.

For instance, in the case of the short fragment:

> *SL*: "Thank you, I said when I was standing". (Chevalier 2003: 45)
> *TL*: "– Mulţumesc, am zis pe când mă ridicam". (Chevalier 2005: 55)

She interprets the verb 'to stand' as the verb 'to stand up'. Even though before this passage, there is a suggestion that the character was

"helped up", he only expressed his gratitude after he had managed to stand. The transformation of the sequencing of activities, even though not very important, in this case, indicates the translator as an author rather than a human tool rendering a foreign language into Romanian.

Unfortunately, the series of misinterpretations does not end here. In the example below, the translator adapts the last part of the fragment to such a degree that she changes it altogether:

> *SL*: "And the wind wasn't blowing through the drawing – the banner wasn't rippling, and the lion and unicorn sat tamely rather than standing rampant as they did in mine". (Chevalier 2003: 47)
> *TL*: "Şi prin desen nu sufla vântul, flamura nu flutura, iar leul şi licornul şedeau cuminţi, nu dezlănţuiţi, ca în desenul cu mine". (Chevalier 2005: 57)

Consequently, instead of translating the adverb "tamely" by a synonym of 'domesticated', she chose the noun "cuminţi" (i.e. 'obedient' in the plural, respecting the Romanian adjective-noun agreement) and thus eliminated the idea of the wild origin of these animals or their potential of being dangerous. She also interpreted "rampant" as "dezlănţuiţi" (i.e. 'unleashed') again annihilating an idea, this time, of a static picture, typical of various coats of arms. It could have been rendered as 'gata de luptă' (i.e. 'ready to fight'), if one takes into consideration the fact that the lion or other animals represented on coats of arms generally stand on their hind legs and have their fore legs in the air showing that they are ready to attack the opponent at any time.

Another problem of Cusin's interpretation is linked to the translation of the following short fragment:

> *SL*: "I didn't sit down, but scraped my toe in the pebbles". (Chevalier 2003: 200)
> *TL*: "Nu m-am mai aşezat. Îmi frecam călcâiul de pietriş". (Chevaleir 2005: 224)

Here, the translator chose to employ the noun 'călcâi' (i.e. 'heel'), instead of using the Romanian equivalent for the noun "toe", i.e. 'deget de la picior', modifying the English text in such a way as to offer a rewritten version in Romanian. She also divided the sentence into two, changing the rather simple original sentence. The right translation would

have been: 'Nu m-am aşezat, ci mi-am frecat degetele de la picior de pietriş', i.e. only one sentence long. Even the presence of the adverb 'mai' (i.e. 'anymore') suggests the fact that the character thought about sitting down, which the original text does not imply.

Besides misinterpretation, problems of naturalness may occur, such as in the case of the translation of the next sentence taken from Chevalier's novel:

> *SL*: "His eyes darted between her and the designs (…)". (Chevalier 2003: 85)
> *TL*: "Ochii lui alergau între ea şi proiecte (…)". (Chevalier 2005: 100)

In the Romanian language, it is very unusual to use the verb 'a alerga' (i.e. 'to run') in connection with the noun 'ochi' (i.e. 'eyes'). An accurate, natural translation would have been 'Ochii îi treceau brusc de la ea la proiecte'. This retains all the shades of meaning in the original and is a common sentence in current Romanian as well.

Another instance of an unnatural translation from English into Romanian appears in the case of the following question:

> *SL*: "What man would choose a blind girl over someone with eyes that aren't broken?". (Chevalier 2003: 141)
> *TL*: "– (…) Ce bărbat ar alege o fată oarbă în locul uneia care are ochii întregi?". (Chevalier 2005: 162)

In this source language interrogative sentence, there is a rather unusual construction, i.e. "eyes that aren't broken", which is rendered with the help of an even less common construction in Romanian 'ochi întregi' (i.e. 'whole eyes'), that suggests the fact that there is nothing missing from their structure. Nevertheless, the problem is not that they lack a part, but rather that they no longer function, so it is more a question of faulty physics rather than incomplete biology.

In the absence of a common cultural and thus linguistic pattern of thinking, some expressions change in translation to such a degree that they are semantically quite different from the original words, constructions or sentences. An example in this sense may be the sentence: "De ce nu-ţi iei o seară liberă?" which would be translated by "Why don't you take the night off?". While the Romanian noun "seară" is literally translated by the English noun "evening", the interrogative sentence given

as an example suggests the context of night shifts which cover the entire night time, including the evening.

Another similar example is that of the translation of the Romanian greeting "Sărutmâna!". Reminding one of the old formal custom of kissing one's hand, today this greeting can either be translated by "Good day!" or by "Thank you!", depending on context.

Sometimes, because of the constraints of British collocations, Romanian sentences such as "Paşii proprietăresei se apropie", must be clarified in the English language by explicitation: "The concierge's footsteps can be heard as she comes closer". The English sentence also contains the subtext of the original Romanian sentence, the fact that these steps can be heard, because the initial sentence has an unusual subject-predicate combination. This is improper, as the sound of steps is determined by the concierge who comes closer; they are not independent entities making noise. The literal translation of the original Romanian sentence is 'The concierge's steps come closer'.

As a Latin language, Romanian contains many of such common sentences in which improper constructions occur, that would seem very unusual and as a result, considered wrong in the English language. Being a Germanic language, the latter is much more exact and is logical as far as the linguistic links between the presented persons, objects, phenomena, notions, concepts, etc. and the activities that they are said to be involved in or presuppose are concerned. Finding a suitable bridge between the linguistic freedom allowed by Latin languages and the pretentious constraints of Germanic languages is always a problem.

Interlingual translation generally deals with two languages, so the specificities of the source language must become transparent in the target language despite its constraints. Even in the case of back translation, the new version will most likely differ from the initial source language in many respects. However, when translating from English into French and then from French into Romanian, it is almost certain that the original ideas are deeply transformed both in form and in meaning, especially if the French version contains many interpretations of various expressions, constructions or strand of text.

Style is not always the norm, so the form may suffer changes, but sense is the essence of the message and the translator runs the risk of creating a wrong variant by rendering, in this case, the French version faithfully. The original plays the most important role and the translator

must make an attempt at finding it and, if necessary, ask a speaker of the original language, should s/he not know it, for clarifications.

Playing with textual levels, be they supra-textual, textual or sub-textual (Pârlog 2014: 73–75), alters source language semantic organisation and generally determines a target text which not only has a different form and evocative quality, but also a different effect upon the reader. Eugene A. Nida (cf. Venuti 2000: 19) discusses "receptor response" and explains the importance of selecting the right transformative codes in order to have a target language which achieves the same effect that the original achieved upon its reader or listener.

Avoiding wrong interpretation should be a goal in itself which should fuel the translator's attention to all the aspects of the text that may mislead him/her. Forgetting his/her illusory option of becoming an author per se, the translator must follow the detailed lacing of the work and not allow himself/herself to modify the linguistic labyrinth of the source language.

The more intricate the work, the less chances that the target language will be faithful and that generalising or ambiguous interpretations will not seep into the text. There is no flawless translation, but the gates of the labyrinth must remain the same and so should the passages.

The complexities of translation depending on genre require a constant focus on the source language and a constant awareness of the target language as of a tool that can always offer the material needed in order for one to render the original and its particular architecture. Using target language-focused translation methods and diminishing the importance of the source language generally determines the creation of texts whose correct grammar and natural language are misleading.

References

Chevalier, Tracy. 2003. *The Lady and the Unicorn*. London: HarperCollins.

Chevalier, Tracy. 2005. *Doamna şi licornul*. Iaşi: Polirom.

Fokkema, D.W., and Elrud Kunne-Ibsch. 1977. *Theories of Literature in the Twentieth Century*. London: C. Hurst and Company.

Gyurcsik, Ilie. 2017. *Modern Paradigms: Authors, Texts, Harlequins*, trans. Georgina Gabor. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, and Plymouth, UK: Hamilton Books.

Newmark, Peter. 1995 (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Phoenix ELT.

Pârlog, Aba-Carina. 2014. *Translation and Literature: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Timişoara: West University of Timişoara Press.
Venuti, Lawrence. 2004 (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, advisory ed. Mona Baker. London and New York: Routledge. Available at: www.questia.com [2016, August 7].

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

Abstract This chapter emphasises the innovative nature of the interdisciplinary work and shows its applicability in a wide range of fields, such as linguistics, translation studies, semiotics, multimodality etc. Multimodality is closely related to various forms of inscribing meaning in order to inform, sell, embellish, program behaviour, create false thought, etc. Intersemiotic translation makes all these transparent for the educated eye. The perspective upon the text, seen as a living organism meant to reach homeostasis which interlingual translation must re-establish with the help of different sign sets, imposes the idea of perceiving textual specificities as part of linguistic processes similar to the complex cellular ones that we encounter in the case of genetic development.

Keywords Code · Discourse · Multimodality · Translation

Intersemiotic Translation: Literary and Linguistic Multimodality covers a variety of sign signs, their representation and interpretation and an entire set of manners of examining the field of translation, viewed as a process of transposing meaning from one form into another. The original semiotic representation of the text and the coding used can be transformed according to the requirements of the new semiotic medium, be that a new field, a new system, a new language, a new semantic pattern, etc. Whenever such a change takes place, one should include the transparent rendering of the message at its core.

A.-C. Pârlog, *Intersemiotic Translation*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0_7

The *Introduction* of the book is meant to offer a first glimpse at the main selected topic with a short presentation of the subtopics discussed. This chapter draws attention to the theoretical and practical problems analysed in this work and thus informs the readership about some of the issues that one must deal with when tackling particular types of intersemiotic translation or multimodality. Signs, symbols and meanings are so closely related that one cannot create any communicative strand only by considering one of them.

Chapter 2, *Intersemiotic Translation and Multimodality*, focuses on the facets of intersemiotic translation viewed as a prism, whenever a switch of multimodality form is taken into account. The immense complexity of the domain allows one to consider it an intrinsic part of communication. Whether it is employed while decoding or re-encoding a message mentally, or while decoding or re-encoding it verbally or in writing, one must think of the impact of the communicative exchange.

Interactional problems may occur when intersemiotic translation is done with an eye to the wrong code sets which determines the misunderstanding of the speaker's message and thus, subverts communicative goals. According to Rossi-Landi (1978: 25), "all behaviour is communication", which makes one draw the conclusion that everything can be read in a certain way, consequently decoded in a certain way, so nothing is meaningless and nothing lacks importance when one looks for answers regarding communicative interaction.

Kress' theory on multimodality clarifies the existence of a plurality of inscription forms whose intersemiotic translation aids the understanding of encoding. Changing coding patterns reveals the flexibility of associating various signs and sign sets for the purpose of meaning clarification or of a mental exercise meant to show one's depth of understanding.

This part of the book also consists of an analysis of Posner's (1993: 220–222) fundamental semiotic types, i.e., the signal, the indicator, the expression and the gesture, without which one would not be able to grasp the meaning of various activities taking place around one. The given examples show that behaviour and knowledge are interwoven and that their interpretation depends on the cause-effect relation that one can find beyond the interactional surface.

The connection language-biology stated by different theorists, philosophers and writers, among whom Aristotel, Shakespeare, Garrick, Knowles, Chevalier and Gheerbrant, Pârlog, Brînzeu, etc., reflects the necessity of seeing words as natural vehicles of real meaning that allow

a body and mind to be transposed to a distinct medium, there being created an energetic chord between one's self and one's text, regardless of the way one choose to express one's message.

Since Renaissance, literary discourse has been perceived as an "articulate structure" (Pârlog et al. 2009: 14) that functions in a similar way to human anatomic structure. Various organs were turned into symbols and included in cultural expressions whose rendering in a different language generally imposes the use of the same symbolic body part or a different one, as a central focus of the selected expression. This happens in the case of the noun 'heart', which can be viewed as very important for several fields, such as that of religion, literature, history, not only suggesting care, love, devotion, but also honesty, spirit and courage.

Communication relies on sign or sign set correspondences or multimodality form correspondences whose slight changes generally mirror cultural issues. No matter what kind of communication one deals with, intersemiotic translation allows the transmission of messages, thus ensuring that the distinctive quality of human nature is not lost.

Chapter 3, *Aesthetics, Discourse and Ekphrasis*, details the problems connected to the beauty of language, figures of speech, euphony and the semiotic formulae that one employs in arts in order to emphasise concise ways of rendering meaning. The shift of signification between non-verbal and verbal media shows how coded energetic traces create fluctuations of ideas. Body language, for instance, is one of the most debatable codifications of meaning, whose real text is familiar to the agent and to those used to deciphering such code sets according to each context and its specificities. However, its more hermetic instances remain a mystery to most of the people.

Ekphrasis, based on the old principle, "ut pictura poesis" (Horatio), presented as a way of turning visual representation of meaning into poetical representation of meaning through several types of ekphrastic processes, can be viewed as having a wider use in this book. The types of ekphrasis mentioned in this chapter, i.e. the common, the reverse and the notional one (Hollander in Pârlog et al. 2009: 109), indicate a limited number of ways that one can follow in order to transform aesthetically-encoded meaning. Ekphrastic strategies contribute to the process of beautifying meaning and can be extended to the case of re-encoding visual representation of many kinds and textual representation in general, not only poetical representation.

One comes across ekphrastic syntagms in all languages. They abound in literature, where their use makes the expression of meaning much

more efficient and aesthetically beautifying for the linguistic stratum. The comparative analysis of some such examples taken from English literature and translated into Romanian and French shows the necessity of faithfully rendering stylistic details for a correct perception of the original writer's creation and personality for a readership belonging to a different culture.

This time a greater focus is laid on the noun 'face' and the noun 'head', which are often encountered in common expressions and in original constructions invented in order to determine the evolution of language from an evocative point of view. The connection metaphor-ekphrasis is always interesting to analyse, if one rather deals with a metaphor that does not pertain to the group of clichés. This appears as surrealistic up to a point. The aesthetic importance of ekphrastic expressions in the creation of a vivid discourse makes their poetical leaning transparent and also the necessity of revealing lyric symbolism which is conditioned by culture.

Chapter 4, *Visual and Verbal Code Translation*, elaborates on the topic of coding, communication and multimodality. Chandler's social, textual and interpretative codes and their respective subcodes enable the unravelling of the illusions of the world with a high degree of accuracy. Depending on the field that they pertain to, their often manipulative aim betrays the real purposes of their various communicative strands. Multimodality abounds in such codes which cover almost all the fields of knowledge that one may be interested in.

Wittgenstein's "automaton conception of human life" (cf. Rossi-Landi 1981: 37) explains the occasional highly elusive character of most codes, the urgency of one's interests determining the neglect of their truthful intent. The cryptic ways of manipulation and their subversive nature, mostly encountered in the case of ideological codes, not only have an inductive effect which turns people into pawns without reason, but also contribute to the programming of behaviour and life in general. Art and literature shows such cases of political madness represented for the purpose of mirroring the lack of logic governing certain societies.

Programming behaviour through sign systems (Rossi-Landi 1981: 37) made up with an eye to reducing range of thought can be considered as a token of the importance of sign set choice and its selection. The reality created by visual and verbal encoding is part of a rather artificial programming of life meant to limit consciousness, if the abstract is perceived as having been the result of learning pre-taught sign

systems. Communication thus becomes programmed and no flexibility of intelligence can be possible.

False thought can easily become the norm and "linguistic alienation" (Rossi-Landi 1981: 45) the result. Making the right choices no longer counts and sign sets become aleatory poisons for human mind.

Transparent frames of meaning create glass houses in which power cannot dwell. Kafka's *The Trial* is an example in this sense and so are many of the books offering different perspectives on the problems of totalitarianism and its forms. Both visual and verbal codes employed in order to write subtle language, create synonymic sets and various connotational implications are translated with a view to their evocative character and their contribution to the stylistic intricacy of language.

This stylistic intricacy can go as far as annihilating sign sets and their sense value. Fragmentary narratives have the effect of creating loss of meaning, and literary works with such forms, like the absurd ones, appear as if inspired by abstract art being dominated by confusion. Advertising also presents such multimodality problems, because it blends sign sets whose role remains a mystery, not being able to convey any message proper. In the case of various games, the labyrinthine organisation of signs may as well cause loss of meaning, confusion or madness. The regrouping of meaning according to a set of parallel clusters of ideas organised following elusive patterns of logic result in strange associations whose mechanism does not function.

Furthermore, jokes can be included here. They force one to leave aside the usual thinking patterns and to break them at the same time, in order to discover the funny semantic webbing of the joke or witticism. Sign sets that one generally neglects come to the surface only to be forgotten after the mystery has been solved (Gyurcsik 2017: 99).

Reading visual codes is also difficult to do, unless the links of the images are seen as a complex combination of signs which may determine essential changes in one's life, if heeded. The vibrations of colours, the interaction of planets, the representation of important figures, such as those of saints, all create meaning which influences one's life through energetic paths unravelled by the reader/viewer.

Chapter 5, *Direct and Indirect Intralingual Translation*, explains the positive and negative aspects of dealing with intralingual translation. Jakobson's (1959: 233) view on text transposition from one form into another within the same language is used in order to show the way direct (rephrasing or reformulating and paraphrasing) and indirect (adaptation and free translation) intralingual translation function.

The given examples, be they a sentence which was rephrased and paraphrased or a fragment from Shakespeare's *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* and its adapted versions of translation into French or a fragment from Milton's *Paradise Lost* and its freely translated Romanian versions, all reveal the effects of divergent equivalence and its implications. Reformulating messages should not alter their meaning at the level of vocabulary, aesthetics, rhythm, euphony or sequencing of ideas, even though their form is automatically changed. In the same sense, translation as a process of re-encoding should not alter meaning in any essential way allowing the connection between the original author and text and the translated version to be obvious. Consequently, the translated versions belonging to the same language should contain similar texts. The translator must not become an author even in the case of poetry, as it happens with Milton and his epic poem whose title was mentioned above.

Free translation can go as far as rewriting an original and preserving only the framework which is viewed from a different angle. Here, adaptation is defined as the loose expression of the same idea in the same language, while free translation is seen as the interpretation of meaning by indirectly translating an original construction or phrase intralingually.

The chapter also focuses on blends (taken from Carroll's *Jabberwocky*) whose innovative linguistic dimension is difficult to trace in another language and whose explanation makes communication less efficient and less expressive. The writer's playful endeavours, taking the form of telescoped words, find their echo in the translator's own creations, this time the translator being forced to become a sort of creative author, doing the job of a translator. The reformulation of a portmanteau or a portmanteau construction is impossible unless a new word or a new construction is invented which must carry the meaning of the initial word or construction. Intralingual translation is a cultural tool, necessary for reformulation, which responds to multimodal requirements.

As its title clarifies, the last part of the book centres on *The Constraints of Interlingual Translation*. Starting with the problems of Google Translate and Google Neural Machine Translation. I have mentioned the importance of conditioning the newer form of GT according to Bruno de Finetti's theorem on exchangeable sequences of random variables. I have also highlighted the essential matter of regarding language and its classes and subclasses from the perspective of genetics (genetic linguistics). Their intrinsic links which function similarly to

those of DNA encoding and its subsequent phenotypic forms draw attention to the main elements that bind stretches of language into unifying entities with a life of their own.

The perspective upon the text, seen as a living organism meant to reach homeostasis which interlingual translation must re-establish with the help of different sign sets, imposes the idea of perceiving textual specificities as part of linguistic processes similar to the complex cellular ones that we encounter in the case of genetic development.

Literary translation, a complex field of interlingual translation is conditioned by supratext and subtext (Pârlog 2014: 73–75). Corrections of literary books are forbidden in the process of translation, the specific constraints centring on the faithful reproduction of vocabulary, grammar, logical or sequencing mistakes made by the original author.

For explanatory purposes, I have included an analysis of the translation of various English idioms and of various French idioms into Romanian. The cultural differences are less pregnant in the case of body idioms and more obvious in the case of other kinds of idioms and expressions. Their etymology plays an important role in viewing the same reality with different eyes. One must be aware of the enantiomorphic feature of translation on switching codes or sign sets.

I have also included some microtexts extracted from Chevalier's novel *The Lady and the Unicorn* and pondered on the problems of transforming sense in an inaccurate way in the target language. The translation of these short fragments often emphasises dilutions of meaning, explicitations of sense, stylistic alterations, misinterpretations and semantic improvements.

The constraints of interlingual translation can also be viewed in the case of commonly uttered greetings, statements or descriptions which show that the Romanian language makes use of much more ambiguous sign sets than the English language. Its openness resides in the multiple ways that one can see a particular Romanian utterance as opposed to an English one regardless of context transparency. This is due to the fact that English is a Germanic language that is much more exact than Latin, hence the existence of collocations, whose logic is debatable if this is looked at from a Germanic perspective.

Back translation or translating an original based on a generally accepted published translation results in fluctuations of forms and meanings that can be correctly retraced by keeping in mind the purpose of the translation process in each case. Interlingual translation though must

ensure that the specificities of the source language must become transparent in the target language despite its constraints. Thus, back translation becomes more of an exercise than one of the types of interlingual translations which should be taken into account from the point of view discussed in this chapter.

Textual levels that seep into one another must be left with their initial consistence and not blend differently in another language, despite the requirements of foreign constructions that would turn the text into a partially faithful version of the original, with a distinct effect and evocative quality. Whether the translator broods over supra-textual, textual or sub-textual levels (Pârlog 2014: 73–75), s/he must follow the detailed stratification of the original creation. In the case of more intricate works, the translation is bound to contain more generalising or ambiguous interpretations. Both source language and target language are important, but it is source language which must be considered first and only then target language and its available linguistic bank.

The essential nature of intersemiotic translation, viewed as a kaleidoscope of surrounding reality, must be understood for a widely informative perspective on transforming messages or knowledge expressed in various ways. Signs, symbols and their great variety which makes them function as part of different systems of meaning create frames of intelligence necessary for a successful process of communication, which is the aim of all multimodality forms. Without semiotics, one would get lost in the activity of coding meaning and would be unable to interact sensibly and connect pertinently, so that the exchange of messages may be possible in a suitably natural way.

References

Gyurcsik, Ilie. 2017. *Modern Paradigms: Authors, Texts, Harlequins*, trans. Georgina Gabor. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, and Plymouth, UK: Hamilton Books.

Jakobson, Roman. 1959. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In *On Translation* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature), ed. Reuben Arthur Brower. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pârlog, Aba-Carina. 2014. *Translation and Literature: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Timişoara: West University of Timişoara Press.

Pârlog, Hortensia, Pia Brînzeu, and Aba-Carina Pârlog. 2009. *Translating the Body*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Posner, Roland. 1993. Believing, Causing, Intending: The Basis for a Hierarchy of Sign Concepts in the Reconstruction of Communication. In *Signs, Search, and Communication: Semiotic Aspects of Artificial Intelligence*, ed. René J. Jorna, Barend van Heusden, and Roland Posner. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. 1978. On Some Post-Morrisian Problems. In *Ars Semeiotica III: International Journal of American Semiotic*, ed. Luigi Romeo. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. 1981. Wittgenstein, Old and New. In *Ars Semeiotica IV: International Journal of American Semiotic*, ed. Luigi Romeo. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.

Bibliography

Atkin, Albert. 2010. Peirce's Theory of Signs. In *Standford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/peirce-semiotics/. Accessed 9 Feb 2017.

Barthes, Roland. 1979 (1977). *Image, Music, Text*. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins.

Barthes, Roland. 1983 (1964). *Elements of Semiology*. New York: Hill and Wang (A division of Farrar, Strauss and Giroux).

Baudrillard, Jean. 1994 (1992). *The Illusion of the End*. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press in assoc. with Blackwell Publishers.

Carrol, Lewis. 2002. *Alice în Țara din Oglindă*, trans. Mirella Acsente. Bucharest: Corint Press.

Carroll, Lewis. 2007. *Through the Looking Glass*. Plain Label Books. Available at: https://books.google.ro/books?id=ZyOUoHvxmjcC&printsec=frontcover&dq=through+the+looking+glass&hl=ro&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjAmZ_A86PaAhWIqaQKHTPoAKwQ6AEIJjAA#v=onepage&q&f=false. Accessed 5 Apr 2018.

Chandler, Daniel. 2002. *Semiotics: The Basics*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Chevalier, Tracy. 2003. *The Lady and the Unicorn*. London: HarperCollins.

Chevalier, Tracy. 2005. *Doamna și licornul*. Iași: Polirom.

Cohen, John Michael, and Mark J. Cohen. 2002 (1960). *The New Penguin Dictionary of Quotations*. London: Penguin Books.

de Saussure, Ferdinand. 1995 (1916). *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Edition Payot et Rivage. Available at: http://centenaire-linguistique.org/uploads/medias/downloads/le-cours.pdf. Accessed 9 Feb 2017.

A.-C. Pârlog, *Intersemiotic Translation*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0

Dines Johansen, Jørgen, and Svend Erik Larsen. 2002. *Signs in Use. An Introduction to Semiotics*. London: Routledge.

Eco, Umberto. 1986. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Fisher Dawson, Gary. 1999 (1946). *Documentary Theatre in the United States: A Historical Survey and Analysis of Its Content, Form, and Stagecraft*. Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Press.

Fokkema, D.W., and Elrud Kunne-Ibsch. 1977. *Theories of Literature in the Twentieth Century*. London: C. Hurst and Company Ltd.

Frye, Northrop. 1971. Ethical Criticism: Theory of Symbols. In *An Anthology of Literary, Criticism, Linguistics, and Modern Literature*, ed. Dumitru Chițoran, Livia Deac, and Maria Mociornița. Bucharest: Bucharest University Press.

Gyurcsik, Ilie. 2017. *Modern Paradigms: Authors, Texts, Harlequins*. Translated by Georgina Gabor. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, and Plymouth, UK: Hamilton Books.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2000. *Discursul filosofic al modernității. 12 Prelegeri*. Bucharest: All Educational.

Harvey, Judith. 2002. *The University of Chicago: Theories of Media: Keywords Glossary—Ut pictura poesis*. Available at: http://csmt.uchicago.edu/glossary2004/utpicturapoesis.htm. Accessed 15 Feb 2015.

Hedley, Jane. 2010 (2009). Introduction: The Subject of Ekphrasis. In *In the Frame: Women's Ekphrastic Poetry from Marianne Moore to Susan Wheeler*, ed. Jane Hedley, Nick Halpern, and Willard Spiegelman. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Jakobson, Roman. 1959. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In *On Translation* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature), ed. Reuben Arthur Brower. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kress, Gunther R. 2010. *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London: Routledge.

Mead, George Herbert. 1967 (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Milton, John. 1821. *Paradise Lost*. London: John Bumpus, Holborn Bars.

Milton, John. 1972. *Paradisul pierdut*, trans. Aurel Covaci. Bucharest: Minerva Press.

Milton, John. 2004. *Paradisul pierdut*, trans. Adina Begu. Bucharest: Aldo Press.

Mitchell, William John Thomas. 1995 (1994). *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Newmark, Peter. 1995 (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Phoenix ELT.

Orwell, George. 1990 (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books.

Orwell, George. 2002. *O mie nouă sute optzeci şi patru*, trans. Mihnea Gafiţa. Iaşi: Polirom.

Pârlog, Aba-Carina. 1998. Colour Symbolism in Shakespeare's Plays. In *Lucrările sesiunii de comunicări ştiinţifice studenţeşti*. Timişoara: West University of Timişoara Press.

Pârlog, Aba-Carina. 2014. *Translation and Literature: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Timişoara: West University of Timişoara Press.

Pârlog, Hortensia, Pia Brînzeu, and Aba-Carina Pârlog. 2009. *Translating the Body*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Pearsall, Judy (ed.). 1999. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 10th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Posner, Roland. 1993. Believing, Causing, Intending: The Basis for a Hierarchy of Sign Concepts in the Reconstruction of Communication. In *Signs, Search, and Communication: Semiotic Aspects of Artificial Intelligence*, ed. René J. Jorna, Barend van Heusden, and Roland Posner. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. 1978. On Some Post-Morrisian Problems. In *Ars Semeiotica III: International Journal of American Semiotic*, ed. Luigi Romeo. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.

Rossi-Landi, Ferruccio. 1981. Wittgenstein, Old and New. In *Ars Semeiotica IV: International Journal of American Semiotic*, ed. Luigi Romeo. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.

Shakespeare, William. 1837. *Chefs d'oeuvre de Shakespeare*, vol. 3. French trans. M. Nisard. Paris: Belin Mandar.

Shakespeare, William. 1862. Le songe d'une nuit d'été. In *Œuvres complètes de Shakespeare*. Tome III. Traduction par François Pierre Guillaume Guizot. Paris: Didier. Available at: http://www.crdp-strasbourg.fr/je_lis_libre/livres/Shakespeare_LeSongeDUneNuitDEte.pdf. Accessed 10 Mar 2017.

Shakespeare, William. 1865. Le songe d'une nuit d'été. In *Œuvres complètes de Shakespeare*. Tome II. Traduction par François-Victor Hugo. Paris: Pagnerre. Available at: https://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Le_Songe_d%E2%80%99une_nuit_d%E2%80%99%C3%A9t%C3%A9/Traduction_Hugo,_1865. Accessed 10 Mar 2017.

Shakespeare, William. 1964. *Teatru*. Traducere de Virgil Teodorescu. Bucureşti: Editura pentru literatură universală.

Shakespeare, William. 1966 (1951). *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Peter Alexander. London and Glasgow: Collins.

Shakespeare, William. 2006. Comme il vous plaira. In *Œuvres complètes de Shakespeare*, vol. IV. Traduction de François Pierre Guillaume Guizot. Version 1863 (EBook #18162). Available at: https://www.gutenberg.org/files/18162/18162-h/18162-h.htm. Accessed 15 Feb 2015.

Shapiro, Theodore. 2005. The Representational World and the Linguistic Idiom. In *Psychoanalysis on the Move: The Work of Joseph Sandler*, ed. Peter Fonagy, Arnold M. Cooper, and Robert S. Wallerstein. London: Routledge.

Silverman, Kaja. 1983. *The Subject of Semiotics*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stoichiță, Victor Ieronim. 2015. *Cum se savurează un tablou și alte studii de istoria artei*. Bucharest: Humanitas.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2004 (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, advisory ed. Mona Baker. London and New York: Routledge. Available at: www.questia.com [2016, August 7].

Wales, Katie. 1990 (1989). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London and New York: Longman.

Wodehouse, Pelham Grenville. 2006. *Bucuria matinală*. Iași: Polirom.

Wodehouse, Pelham Grenville. 2008 (1947). *Joy in the Morning*. London: Arrow Books.

Index

A.-C. Pârlog, *Intersemiotic Translation*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16766-0