

Modality from the Cross-cultural Studies Perspective: a Practical Approach to Intersemiotic Translation

Nataliia Holubenko¹

¹National Linguistic University, Faculty of Translation, Korunets Department of English Philology and Translation Kyiv, Ukraine

Correspondence: Nataliia Holubenko, PhD (Philology), Associate Professor, Korunets Department of English and German Philology and Translation, Kyiv National Linguistic University 03150, Kyiv, 73 Velyka Vasylkivska str., Ukraine.

Received: December 1, 2022

Accepted: January 10, 2023

Online Published: January 27, 2023

doi:10.5430/wjel.v13n2p86

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n2p86>

Abstract

Any scientific question should be understood as a process of dynamic semiosis in search of truth. The revelatory web is goal-oriented (teleological), but with no stable outcome, static method, redefinition, or fixed agent. All outcomes, methods, and agents are temporary and are temporary “trends” in translation studies that can be abandoned for new ones. The translation can be categorized as a fragmented record or metaphorically as a mosaic, whose components allow the construction of a figurative, diegetic, dramatic world in intersemiotic translation, to be inscribed in the diagram of the narrative. The translation adopts the repetitive and non-repeating behavior patterns of a particular culture, rejecting trendy or outdated translation tools. The same applies to intersemiotic translation with interpretive and reinterpretive meaning. The ideas of the classics about a global approach to semiolinguistics have turned the whole traditional approach to translation studies upside down. The traditional view of the question of intercultural, intersemiotic translation focused on untested dichotomies labeled as dogmatic forms of double self-reflection. Intersemiotic translation offers experimental and temporal responses of a skeptical and evolutionary nature at the boundaries of the translated and untranslatable, correspondence and non-correspondence, conformity and unconformity, the starring role and purpose of intelligence, the dynamism and emotionality of the Falabilist spirit and the Falabilist heart of the translator. It focuses on the concepts of translation and retranslation, the fate of the intercultural text, the fate of the target text, and other semiotic issues of translation in the broadest sense, in the sense of an encoded phenomenon rather than an intersemiotic code. This paper analyzes cultural and linguistic transsemiosis from the perspective of translation and transduction to reveal the essence of intersemiosis. One considers the extrapolarity and complexity phenomenon of modality in terms of cognitive-discursive and semiotic features of its manifestation during translation. In the contemporary scientific pattern, the linguistic category of modality is considered as a functional-semantic, semantic-pragmatic, semantic- syntactic, syntactic, grammatical or logical category. One defines it as the inner attitude of the narrator to the content. The essence of modality in intersemiotic translation is related to the inner linguistic thinking. Accordingly, intersemiotic translation is the recoding of the original text by means of another sign (semiotic) system.

Keywords: translation, intersemioticity, semiosis, intercultural communication, “other” culture

1. Introduction

1.1 Transposition and Cognition in Intersemiotic Translation

Questions of intersemiotics and cognition describe the essence of the meaning of the term translation. From a prototypical point of view, the definition of adequate translation of intercultural phenomena is characterized by the presence of common semantic features, for example concerning such terms as “operation”, “product”, “replacement end”, “orientation”, “precedence”, etc. Other features, on the other hand, overlap only partially, depending on the semantic variations inherent in the use of the concepts: those, for example, covered by the terms “equivalent” or “responder”. All forms of intralinguistic transposition involve the terms “linguistic” and “cultural”. Can it be argued that any translation is by definition “cultural” or “intercultural” based on the argument that if culture includes language, any translation is (also) a cultural transposition? Such an extension seems to contradict the elementary principle of “simple categorization,” that is, “the means by which one can determine whether an instance belongs to a category or not (distinguishing translation from non-translation)” (Wilson, 2019).

One defines the ideal goal of translation as the perfect one-way replacement of the text in the source language with corresponding text in another language. This reproduction in another language is done by a human agent (translator) to adapt (reinterpret, modify, reconstruct, restructure) the thematic, spatiotemporal, and conceptual fabric of the source text in the target language (Robinson, 2019). Guided by this definition, the paper proposes three of the most effective forms of intersemiotic translation.

The translation process is first and primary a product of the translator's demonstration; an echo of his inspiration, the first original is always the translator's semiotic signature (Yang, 2021). But according to (Jia, 2020), first of all, the translator should emphasize the cultural context of the original text, incorporating it through linguistic and cultural equivalence in the “linguocultural” gap between the source and target languages. The notion of language and culture should be a synergy of translation. In this regard, this article aims to

analyze the use of possible types of intersemiotic translation and to demonstrate the different means of intercultural translation. The aim is to define intersemiotic translation, to describe common semantic features, and semantic variations inherent in the use of intercultural concepts; to analyze forms of intralingual transposition, based on the scientific experience of scholars in this field.

1.2 Explore the Importance of the Problem

The notion of intersemiotic translation is based on an interlingual basis, is rarely defined theoretically. This is due to the lack of examples of historiographical analysis that would allow the institutional and intellectual frameworks to be reproduced with a certain precision. Here several aspects are relevant to this study: the study of the translation product as meaning constructed in a particular semiotic system should not obscure the significance and primordially of the translation process; the operation of translation always involves an interpretive action, an epistemic competence attributed to the subject of translation manifestation, the translator; translation is always the creation of a target text that meets the requirements of equivalence, which itself is graded based on the level of adequacy of imagistic universals. This vision of translation leads to the study of issues related to manipulation and competence in translation practice, as well as the issue of equivalence of figurative universals, which is approached at the level of the utterance. This paper analyzes the scholarly literature and develops a general methodology related to the study of intersemiotic communication through examples of modalities that convey distinct cultural traits that are sometimes insurmountable for translators. The research problem is to investigate the use of different translation strategies. The paper explores the use of modes of cultural variation in intersemiotic translation. In conclusion, the study will consider how other linguistic features reveal the translator's immanent perception of understanding intercultural communication.

1.3 Describe Relevant Scholarship

Meanwhile the category of intersemiotic translation is not recognized by the whole scholarly community, the paper reviews the growing number of publications focusing on this problem, based on questions of linguistic or textual translational variation (Kourdis & Petrilli, 2020). The author (Nguyen, 2020) describes the translation that is assumed in the exchange between distant cultures across time and space, in this case between European and non-European cultures (African, Asian, Caribbean, Latin American, etc.). The scholar appeals to the fact that today intersemiotic translation is the subject of a critical discourse that ties together three recurring themes. The first theme concerns translation as a vector of cultural difference: it defines and comments on its resources as well as its weaknesses. The second considers translation as an act of reading and an act of writing, thus stimulating researchers' interest in a practice that has long remained ancillary and "invisible," but has now come to the forefront of the literary and cultural scene. Finally, the third theme touches on various questions of methods and modalities. The work of (Huang, Wei & Liu, 2020) should be mentioned in this aspect. According to the authors, intersemiotic studies support the specificity of the postcolonial literary corpus in order to deny the so-called Western research methods that they cannot explain this specificity. This refers to a critique of "descriptive translation studies"- the concept that translation processes are initiated and produced by the target system rather than the source system-that contradicts the realities of literary communication in the colonial and even postcolonial era (Hasyim & Kuswarini, 2020). In fact, often, in the absence of an established or autonomous institutional structure in cultural peripheries, translations are simply imported from major literary metropolises instead of being initiated and produced locally. (Ojamaa, Torop, Fadeev, Milyakina, Pilipovec & Rickberg, 2019) suggest that intersemiotic translation is distinct enough to require a unique approach. But there are reasons to question the criteria on which the idea of such specificity is based. A correlated view (Presner, Tsolyk, Vanivska, Bakhov, Povoroznyuk & Sukharieva, 2021) notes that if the concept of translation changes (or its name, as in the case of many non-European cultures), whether a new translation prototype should be required, the structure of systemic relationships changes, and this are the basis for creating a specific methodology. Thus, the main task of the research is to understand the complex process of deconstruction and reconstruction of textual and cultural intersemiotic relations.

The generally accepted view of the intersemiotic perspective offers a dual approach to gesture and object translation (Hasyim, Saleh, Yusuf & Abbas, 2021). This view dominates the structuralist tradition, from optimistic and imaginative distinction to the teachings of foreign-language "competence" applied linguistics (Taylor, 2020). A broad body of knowledge about theories of translation explains the systematics of comparative analysis methodology, examining two idioms, comparing them, to determine the common and particular dissimilarities between the source and target languages. The contrastive method to semiotic symbol and entity encourages the systematic use of formal constraints in translation competence.

1.4 State Hypotheses and Their Correspondence to Research Design

We suggest that for a more effective intersemiotic translation, it is important to understand the cultural range of the country of initial translation. The double equivalence of stable structures from the initial text to translated text concerns applied didactics of content and meaning lexicography, graphological translation, transliteration, translation changes, as well as the parameters of technical translation capability. Linguistic models serve as contrastive techniques in relation to the linguistic tools of positive and negative definitions included in the contrastive analysis of translation. However, the technique of transferring notions of "other" culture in translation must take into account the changing nature of language that integrates the sociocultural elements of linguistic culture to form a meaningful, entire cause, focus on translation's pragmatics. The role of intersemiotic translation includes not only comparative taxonomy but also conceptual differences. The proof is that the meaning of a term can be changed without touching either its meaning or its sound, but only by modifying a neighboring term. At the same time, the role of translation is also to create a social act among linguistic and culturology.

2. Method

2.1 Identify Subsections

The main method in the work is the method of selecting factual materials and composing a literature review. Literature from various disciplines, such as linguistics and translation studies, semiotics, intercultural communication, and literary studies were used to provide a comprehensive understanding of the topic at hand.

2.2 Participant (Subject) Characteristics

The works of scholars in this field have been used to confirm the hypothesis. In addition, instead of different methods of the dissimilarity between the two idioms, the clear goal of the work is to observe the general positive theory about the relevance of pragmatic action, faced with metalinguistic problems, which could make up the puzzle of the “other” language and culture.

2.3 Sampling Procedures

The study was conducted by means of a qualitative research method. For intersemiotic translation, a meta-language strategy in translation was chosen. A translation triad of intersemiotic translation is proposed, which includes Piers semiosis, focusing on the goals of intercultural competence and experience of the translator.

2.3.1 Sample Size, Power, and Precision

Thus, we hold the view that intersemiotic translation is clearly related to the idea of possible equivalence, which gravitates toward Peirce's model: the interpreter's visualization, reminiscence, and capability to reconstruct the global similarity of the initial text. Semiosis is chosen as the main component of the interaction between sign, object, and interpreter. It is it that integrates the refinement of the cultural system into the source and target narrative.

2.3.2 Measures and Covariates

We propose three interaction points for the possibility of intersemiotic translation: the main interaction point is the translator's state of mind - for example, sign language translation; a fixed change in the medium of translation signs resulting from the comparative stylistics of structural linguistics - film script translation; equivalence between the initial text and the translation - technical translation.

2.3.3 The Potential Limitations to the Study

The lack of universal codes use in the work makes the limitation of the study. These codes organize messages of any type (social code, cultural code, ideological code, perception code, etc.), which is extremely important within the scope of the proposed work, what with intersemiotic reading of texts. Accordingly, from the standpoint of intersemiotic translation, it would be expedient to consider the general scheme of semiotic analysis proposed by U. Eco, but this will be a topic for the next article.

3. Results

The three points suggested interact to make an intersemiotic translation.

The first type is that there is an inequality in the translator's state of mind in terms of inclinations, attitudes, chances for a good translation, and understanding of the “other” culture. The translator's mind is not a symmetrical mechanism like structural linguistics, which unites the source and target in one linguistic translation. The sign is reduced to an internal fixed interaction of signs and to the mutual dependence between the material aspect of the sign (signifier) and object (signified). However, translation has no signifier, no fixed or unified meaning, but seems to conceal from anonymous readers the ambiguity of the original text and the text of the translation, this mediation between author and translator. In traductology, the translator can be understood as a pseudo-author, meta-author, or co-author. The reading of the interpreted text may denote a pseudo-image of the original text. For example, a surdo translator moderately breaks away from the speech details of the original message - words, sentences, fragments - and makes his or her own choices and questions for the objective translation. When one operates on selections in the rearrangement of the source to target, the terminology in effect is that of an interpreter of sign meaning, subject to the pseudo-concept of a quasi-interpreter created to stabilize the transpositional signs and make stable the degree of separation among source and target. The linguistic and extra-linguistic uprising makes the understanding of text interpretation, not just a mechanical procedure, but a skillful performance of transfer from one idiom to another.

The second type is the stable changing in the medium of translation signs, resulting from the comparative stylistics of structural linguistics. According to the symbol dichotomy and object and the collective decision to give it an inner association, the translator operates the common rules of the nature of words and practices of the literary genre. Stylistic devices are recognized as correct in the field of translation, although the theoretical and methodological framework in which they are used does not provide a full understanding of intersemiotic translation. Stylistic devices are external to the field of translation, but they complement its norms and meanings. This highlights the contradictory nature of intersemiotic translation. The source and target of translation is never a fixed norm, but a personalized context, open to all forms of stylistic and linguistic change and insulated from the dominance of social, political, and religious stylistics in personal stories. Stylistic significance reinterprets a stable full (determinate) the context and the environment into an incomplete indeterminate stream of translation. Consequently, it is as if the translation is moving away from an exploration for rational choice of the fixed meaning of the interpreted language toward linguistic and cultural changes of autonomous meaning in what might be called an interpretive meta-language.

The third type is the correspondence between the initial text and the translated text. A perfect equivalence of the ordinary translation of the source text disappears, turning into a degree of imperfect non-equivalence of the target text. In this standpoint, we view intersemiotic translation as an experimental, perhaps ambiguous fragment of speech that comprises the emotional tone and corporal or active recital of a linguistic product. The correspondence between the unique and the translators is not the same as in “ordinary” translation. Answers can be semiotized and re-semiotized by new translators - what remains of the original text in the target text is only a nuanced fidelity, not the real thing. In intersemiotic translation, placed more generally as ordinary translation, real equivalence is reduced as a reflection of only a “certain” degree or meaning of equivalence according to the method of innate resolution, generating more and more innate signs.

Intersemiotic translation is the translators' pursuit of the ideal of authentic semiosis, a pure sign-object relationship whose “ideal” sign is the third part of the finite and logical interpreter.

Intersemiotic translation interchanges the normative stability of the technical response - fixed equivalence (in overdetermination, underdetermination, concentration, compensation, explanation, and other “conventional” translation strategies) with the absolute autonomy of dynamic translation.

4. Discussion

The intersemiotic translation uses a way of thinking based on logical-semiotic processes of identifying and analyzing signs to train translators and determine the attribution of a sign to an object. The vision of translation studies (Torres-Martínez, 2020) is concerned with translating more type of meaning and signification in an open system of logical and non-logical terms assembled into a combination of coherent and illogical terms in an initial text. For (Yang, 2020) symbols are distributed into semiotic signs, objects, as well as interpreters, divided into diverse elements. (Petrilli & Ponzio, 2019) adhere to Peirce's concept of interpreters. Although this interpretation is controversial because it uses other possibilities such as: categorical, evocative, ejaculative, authoritative, ordinary, assigned, and normative interpreters. According to (Presner, Tsolyk, Vanivska, Bakhov, Povoroznyuk & Sukharieva, 2021) intersemiotic translation conveys a dynamic network of sign interpreters that are considered inadequate sign things, but semiosis interpretation purposes primarily through active signs to attain perfect nature. One solidarizes, the advanced action-signifier of interpretation can evolve from “imperfect” to “perfect.” The authors (Hasyim, Yolanda Latjuba, Akhmar, Kaharuddin & Jihad Saleh, 2021) are convinced that intersemiotic translation is the creative work of the translator, which goes through a sequence of moods, aspects, and phases of infinity of actions and varying notions and considerations in fluctuating space-time. Making simpler the hard mission of the translator, fuzzy or substandard translations completed by the “bad” translators make inaccurate, non-integrated structures and aspects that could, through the happy impulse of “good” translators, become “intermediate” translations and even good translations (Rędzioch- Korkuz, 2020). This last change means that any message translator can influence (and re-influence) varying meanings from “good” to “bad”. In semi-translation this is not a virtual myth, it is an actual reality.

The intersemiotic translation is seen as an interpretive system of symbols (Każmierczak, 2020). The translator's mental activity, divided into pierce triads, is able to identify all kinds of signs and non-signs and analyze both linguistic signs and non-linguistic messages - for example, graphic, acoustic, optical, and others, as a flow of semiotic signs to interpreters. But according to (Sohár, 2020) the problems of linguistic discourse are solved through off-customized media, in transmedia objects or transversal art objects (cross-media).

The distinction between the three types of translation gives the usual concept of translation pioneering dimensions in terms of extra-linguistic (or trans-linguistic) horizons, outside the fixed attributes of conventionalism. It goes beyond precise reformulation and less precise translation proper to emphasize the possibility of free and unbound forms of transmutation (Yau, 2016). Intersemiotic translation has become an uncoded and unfamiliar art form, far removed from the “ordinary” translation skill previously considered a familiar coded activity.

This paper can be summarized in three points. First, there is a need of a denial of linguistic domination, where a linguistic model is used for nonlinguistic entities over a metaphorical replacement, without taking into consideration the nature of the nonlinguistic entity. Second, semiology mainly studies denominators and skip the question what signs denote, but how they denote the object related to the sign. Third, binarity, the distinction of a priori oppositions is presented as the main tool for an exhaustive analysis claiming objective and scientific conclusions. The analysis of the significant aspects of language and culture, the differences in time and space between the sign and what it represents, the object, and, consequently, the forceful potentiality of the notion of the sign, established by the society and being an intersemiotic translation.

5. Further Directions of Examining the Concept

The category of modality as a special way of organizing the speech and occupies an important place in the theory of translation. Being one of the most difficult areas for equivalent translation, including in creolized texts, it would be interesting to dedicate the further works to the specific concept of differences in the cultural-linguistic code and the code of two different semiotic systems.

References

- Hasyim, M., & Kuswarini, P. (2020). Semiotic model for equivalence and non-equivalence in translation, humanities & social sciences reviews. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.8341>
- Hasyim, M., Saleh, F., Yusuf, R., & Abbas, A. (2021). Artificial Intelligence: Machine Translation Accuracy in Translating French-Indonesian Culinary Texts. *Available at SSRN 3816594*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3816594>

- Hasyim, M., Yolanda Latjuba, A., Akhmar, A. M., Kaharuddin, K., & Jihad Saleh, N. (2021). Human-robots and google translate: a case study of translation accuracy in translating french-Indonesian culinary texts. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*. Retrieved from <http://repository.unhas.ac.id/id/eprint/4391>
- Huang, X., Wei, X., & Liu, R. (2020). Rethinking cultural terminology translation. *Chinese Semiotic Studies*, 16(1), 47-70. <https://doi.org/10.1515/css-2020-0002>
- Jia, H. (2020). Reconsidering Semiospheric Translation Types. *Chinese Semiotic Studies*, 16(4), 581-601. <https://doi.org/10.1515/css-2020-0031>
- Każmierczak, M. (2020). From intersemiotic translation to intersemiotic aspects of translation. In *Deckert M., Kocot M., Majdzińska-Koczorowicz A.(eds.), Moving between Modes. Papers in Intersemiotic Translation in Memoriam Professor Alina Kwiatkowska, Łódź University Press, Łódź 2020*. Łódź University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18778/8220-191-8.05>
- Kourdis, E., & Petrilli, S. (2020). Introduction: Translation and Translatability in Intersemiotic Space. *Punctum-International Journal of Semiotics*, 6(IKEEART-2020-3297), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.18680/hss.2020.0001>
- Nguyen, T. (2020). *Intersemiotic Interpretation – The role of medium in intersemiotic translation of a poem*. Retrieved from <https://aaltodoc.aalto.fi/handle/123456789/97367>
- Ojamaa, M., Torop, P., Fadeev, A., Milyakina, A., Pilipovec, T., & Rickberg, M. (2019) Culture as education: From transmediality to transdisciplinary pedagogy. *Sign Systems Studies*, 47(1/2), 152-176. <https://doi.org/10.12697/SSS.2019.47.1-2.06>
- Petrilli, S., & Ponzio, A. (2019). Identity and Alterity of the Text in Translation: A Semioethic Approach. *International Journal of Semiotics and Visual Rhetoric (IJSVR)*, 3(1), 46-65. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJSVR.2019010104>
- Presner, R., Tsolyk, N., Vanivska, O., Bakhov, I., Povoroznyuk, R., & Sukharieva, S. (2021). Cognitive and Semiotic Model of Translation. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(3Sup1), 125-142. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.3Sup1/355>
- Rędzioch-Korkuz, A. M. (2020). Towards a semiotic model of interlingual translation. *Semiotica*, 2020(236-237), 215-230. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2019-0027>
- Robinson, D. (2019). *Becoming a translator: An introduction to the theory and practice of translation*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429276606>
- Sohár, A. (2020). Each to Their Own: Visual Representations of Terry Pratchett’s Discworld in Time and Space. *Imaginations: Journal of Cross-Cultural Image Studies/Imaginations: revue d’études interculturelles de l’image*, 11(3), 123-163. <https://doi.org/10.17742/IMAGE.VT.11.3.6>
- Taylor, C. (2020). Multimodality and intersemiotic translation. In *The Palgrave handbook of audiovisual translation and media accessibility* (pp. 83-99). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42105-2_5
- Torres-Martínez, S. (2020). On the origins of semiotic translation, the role of semiosis in translation and translating and the nature of sign systems: Response to Jia. *Semiotica*, 2020(236-237), 377-394. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2019-0118>
- Wilson, C. (2019). The translation applied in intersemiotic study. *Applied Translation*, 13(1), 9-15. <https://doi.org/10.51708/apptrans.v13n1.45>
- Yang, Y. (2020). The danmaku interface on Bilibili and the recontextualised translation practice: a semiotic technology perspective. *Social Semiotics*, 30(2), 254-273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2019.1630962>
- Yang, Y. (2021). Making sense of the “raw meat”: A social semiotic interpretation of user translation on the danmu interface. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 44, 100550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100550>
- Yau, W. P. (2016). Revisiting the systemic approach to the study of film adaptation as intersemiotic translation. *Translation Studies*, 9(3), 256-267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2016.1178595>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).